JUN 19 1950

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 95—PART 16

AUGUST 25, 1949, TO OCTOBER 19, 1949

(PAGES A5543 TO A6800)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The President and the Labor Monopolists Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the President and the labor bosses do not like the Taft-Hartley Act. The people do, but the President and the labor bosses want to repeal it outright. The people want to keep it and their Representatives refuse to repeal it. It is the law today.

The President and the labor bosses propose to raise wages and make the people pay. Since the people are not being protected by the President under the Taft-Hartley Act and since the steel industry is helpless to resist the fourth round of wage rises, the people too are at the mercy of this labor monopoly. The President, the steel companies' biggest customer, and the absolute, Nation-wide labor monopoly are able to force the steel industry to do what they ask.

What happens in steel will set the pattern in all labor-controlled industry as it has on three previous occasions. Fundamentally, the Taft-Hartley law was enacted to stop this. The law says:

Whenever, in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry, or a substantial part thereof, engaged in production for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position but shall not contain any recommendations.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act the Government must remain neutral in disputes between management and labor. It is the guardian of the whole people—the collaborator and partner of no special group. The law provides for finding the facts. It denies the President the power to appoint political boards to make political decisions on wages and prices.

Exposition of the facts by an impartial board without compulsory recommendations would help both labor and management reach a decision compatible with public opinion. If the facts showed that the national income justifies a fourth round of wage rises, then the people would support such a rise. If not, they would oppose it.

A sound economic basis for such a decision should be found. There is good authority for the assertion that available spending power will provide an average wage of only $1.26 an hour. Under present conditions any monopoly attempt to force average wages to $1.45 an hour will mean there is not enough pay-roll money to employ everybody and that the present average industrial wage of $1.37 is 11 cents too high. It follows that, with a falling national income, any attempt to force the average wage up to $1.45 will mean increased unemployment, because the national income cannot pay everybody even the present average wage. When total national income decreases, total wages must fall if everyone is to remain employed. If the average wage does not fall some must lose their jobs. There is no other solution.

President Truman and the labor bosses not only ignore the labor law of the land but the law of economics itself. They place themselves above the economic law of supply and demand. They act as though they are the law. They propose to use compulsion and prestige of office to force acceptance of higher wages for the organized monopoly, with lower real wages and unemployment for the rest.

Apparently both the President and the labor bosses are committed to a fourth round of wage increases because they have accepted the economic fallacy that higher wages will create buying power and prosperity. Such reasoning is fantastic because taking away more money from employers and giving it to employees does not create any additional purchasing power.

The conspiracy of a President and labor bosses to set aside constitutionally enacted law and become themselves the makers of arbitrary personal rule must fail. All arbitrary monopoly power must fail, whether it be in business combinations, Government assumptions of power, or labor-boss monopoly. Especially is this true in the face of the disastrous experience we had between 1929 and 1939. Then they set in motion a wage-rise spiral that kept 10,000,000 workers unemployed. We do not want to see that again.

The President should save himself and the country from the disaster of violating the laws of the law-making side of Government as well as the laws of economics.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE ROBBERY ROAD TO RICHES

(By Williford I. King)

The assumption that, by each robbing the other, everyone in a community can become rich seems the height of absurdity. But, when it is translated into terms of a great nation instead of a small community, its untenable nature is often obscured. Let us use for illustration the case of the United States today.

John L. Lewis notices that the Nation's total volume of new spending power is shrinking, and that this means a lessened demand for coal. With falling demand and fixed supply the price of coal will almost certainly decline unless remedial action is taken. Moreover, lower coal prices and slowly declining cost of living are likely to lead some mine owners to try to cut the miners' pay for digging out a ton of coal. Therefore, Mr. Lewis decides that the way out is to reduce supply and thus keep coal prices and wage rates high—hence he orders the miners to work only 3 days a week.

Fuel is a very essential article. So, if Mr. Lewis can keep the supply low enough, he may raise the price of coal and the miners' wage rates until the average mine worker may get as much pay for 3 days as he formerly received for 5 days of toil. If so, the miners can enjoy both prosperity and extra leisure.

But alas. There is something in the ointment—if not a fly, at least a gnat. At higher prices, fewer tons of coal can be sold—hence fewer miners will be needed. Already, as a result of the shortened workweek, it is reported in the press that a public-utility company in Ohio is making pilot tests substituting oil for coal in part of its operations. But why worry about unemployed miners? Let them find jobs elsewhere. The steel industry has been booming. Steel works are usually near coal mines. Why not go to work there?

Unfortunately, when the coal miners appear at the steel works, they find that a shrinkage in the Nation's new spending power has curtailed orders for steel products. Moreover, the decline in steel orders is being accentuated by the fact that higher coal prices have made it nonfeasible to reduce steel prices to offset declining demand. Furthermore, it is expected that the result

of the President's steel-commission inquiry will be to raise the pay of steel workers, and hence the price of steel. If this happens, sales of steel will decline further. So the steel companies are laying off men—not taking on more help.

Building has been active lately. Probably that's a good place to look for work. Inquiry shows, however, that the reduction in the Nation's new spending power is lowering the demand for new buildings. Besides, higher-priced coal has increased the costs of producing cement, brick, and steel. Hence, the construction industry is also laying off workers—not taking on new hands. So the discharged coal, steel, and building workers fall back upon unemployment insurance for support.

Months pass. Unemployment insurance allowances run out. In desperation, the idle coal, steel, and building workers decide to go out into the country and get jobs on the farms where there is at least something to eat. But the farmers look at them with fishy eyes. They inform the would-be farm hands that unemployment in coal mining, steel production, construction and other urban industries, accompanied by the high taxes, required to pay the cost of unemployment insurance, and coupled with the exorbitant cost of coal and housing, have reduced tremendously the city demand for farm products. The situation has, indeed, become so bad that the Secretary of Agriculture is asking farmers to cut down sharply their plantings of leading farm crops in order to keep prices of farm products up to parity. This year only the most skilled and industrious farm hands can count on steady work. For outsiders, there's not a chance.

In other industries, the story is the same. Wage rates have been pushed up. Product prices have been well maintained. Everybody ought to be happy. But they are not. Unemployment is rife. Workers who have jobs are on part time. Sales have shrunk and profits are decreasing rapidly. Living costs are slowly decreasing, but the average man's income is way down, and his tax bill is way up. It is terribly difficult for him to make both ends meet.

Such is the inevitable outcome when, in the face of a declining volume of new spending power, labor unions, and government conspire to raise wage rates and maintain prices, in the various branches of industry. Under such circumstances, the only feasible way of keeping prices up is to reduce production. But people cannot eat or wear or use goods that are not produced.

No matter how skillful the camouflage artists, the hard truth will eventually come out that reduced output means less for the average person—therefore increased poverty. Hence, all attempts to bring prosperity by organizing each industry to maintain wages and prices by limiting production—in other words to gain prosperity for itself by robbing others—can lead to but one result—hard times for all concerned. The present experience with this type of planning in Great Britain furnishes an excellent illustration of how it works in practice. Do we want to follow in her footsteps?

When politicians and their biased boards take over control of wages and prices, free enterprise is destroyed and a Fascist or collectivist state or society set up. The President, to please Phil Murray and the labor bosses, is undermining the principles of economic freedom which made America the best place in the world in which to live. Worse still, he is usurping the policy-making powers which the Constitution places exclusively in the Congress. There must be a Nation-wide outburst of protest from citizens in all walks to repel this attack upon constitutional principles and to safeguard our form of government and competitive free enterprise.

The President's appointment of his extra-legal Board was in itself wrong, and his lopsided Board is doubly so.

Mystic River, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 5472, it being the first major river and harbor and flood-control bill reported since 1946. I am committed to a policy of economy but I want to see economy effected by eliminating waste, extravagance, and duplication in government by putting a stop to experimentation with alien ideologies and by streamlining the Government by breaking up our sprawling, overlapping, and unwieldy bureaucracy. It certainly is not economy to longer postpone authorization for completion or continuance of domestic projects already under way and for new projects approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and deemed by the Committee on Public Works to be essential to the national welfare through the development of our natural resources.

I shall confine my remarks to two projects, one having to do with flood control and being entirely in my district and the other a river and harbor project just outside my district but indirectly affecting my constituency. I shall take them up in reverse order.

The importance of the city of Boston as a tidewater port on the eastern seaboard has been evident for the last 300 years as shown by the tonnage and the value of merchandise passing through that great port. In recent years, the Army engineers have recognized the importance of this fact and recommended improvements from time to time. The Federal Government has authorized and completed a main ship channel with a 40-foot depth at mean low water through various portions of Boston Harbor and up to the bulkhead which leads to the Mystic River project now under consideration.

The fact that the Mystic River Development Authority of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is now in the process of constructing an overhead bridge known as the Chelsea North Bridge at a cost of $27,000,000 under which all of the great new tankers now contemplated may pass and which will be available to the section served by this project without the aid of the drawbridge and also the fact that many, if not all, of the dry cargo ships using this proposed deepened waterway will also be able to pass without the necessity of drawbridge action shows how important the Commonwealth of Massachusetts considers this great arm of Boston Harbor. The depth of 35 feet which the Army engineers have now recommended in their report will undoubtedly care for the needs for years to come. Many of the dry cargo ships as well as the tankers now in use and more in construction need a minimum of 32-foot clearance draft at mean low water whereby to use this entire waterway with safety at all times of the day or the night without the consequent loss of time awaiting favorable tides and daylight hours. The 35-foot depth will give only a 3-foot safety allowance under these great ships, which authorities agree is necessary as an element of safety.

The removal of the ledge near the entrance to this waterway is a most important part of the project and without which justification of this 35-foot channel would be seriously questioned.

This section of the Mystic River under which the present project is planned at an estimated cost of $2,908,000 is the entrance to a large portion of my congressional district including four of the largest cities in my district, namely, Medford, population 67,000; Everett, population 47,000; Somerville, population 102,000; and Malden, population 63,000, which is reached by a tributary of the Mystic River known as Malden Creek. The total approximate population of these four cities is 279,000. There are various industries located in these four cities, some of which already use the waterway when smaller ships are delivering merchandise but such use can be greatly expanded with the completion of this development.

The second project involves that portion of the Mystic River beginning at the point where this contemplated river deepening ends at Wellington Bridge and continues up the Mystic River to the Craddock Bridge in Medford. This is referred to in the bill on page 28, lines 12 and 13, Mystic River and its tributaries. I have already been instrumental in obtaining the approval of the Department of the Army in Washington to permit the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to construct a dam with lock, drawbridge, and works and equipment thereto in the Mystic River in the cities of Medford and Somerville at a point about 700 feet upstream from the Wellington Bridge on the Fellsway, also to dredge a channel varying from 6 feet to 4 feet at mean low water and in width from 100 feet to 50 feet extending upstream from the lock in said dam to the Craddock Bridge near Medford Square and straighten the natural river channel by making certain land cuts and filling certain existing ox-bows. This will permit larger vessels to pass through the locks in the proposed dam and proceed to points in Somerville and Medford, thereby increasing the usefulness of this waterway and serving a number of additional industries not possible at the present time. I mention this project which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts expects to undertake as only incidental to but contingent upon the action which the Federal Government takes in the Mystic River waterway which connects the upper Mystic River.

Misusing "Welfare"—Article by Senator Humphrey and Editorial From the Wheeling Intelligencer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and an accompanying editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer for August 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of August 22, 1949]

MISUSING WELFARE

Elsewhere on this page today we give, in part, a recent statement by United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, inveighing against political misuse of the word "welfare," which has had a long and honorable position in American history.

It is standard Communist tactic to take an ordinary word and distort its meaning. In fact, the Communists borrow the most sacred words of their political opponents and, using the device of political semantics, deceive and bewilder their dupes.

The word "democracy" is a case in point. When Soviet Russia pledged a democratic government to Poland at the Tehran and Yalta conferences, they meant democratic in the sense the word is used by Communists. According to their interpretation of the word, Communist dictatorship is the highest form of democracy, because it allegedly rests upon the will and authority of the proletariat. But such a democratic dictatorishp as the Communists establish, in reality, is the harshest form of tyranny, rule by a police state, secret police, complete abolishment of all the freedoms—religion, press, speech, and assembly—such as Americans mean when they allude to a democratic form of government. Similarly when Communists speak of a democratic labor union they mean a labor union run by Communist dictatorship or artifice.

So we greatly regret to see the word "welfare" so flagrantly misused. We think the position taken by Senator HUMPHREY is essentially sound and forward-looking. It is unfortunate, as he says, that the word "welfare" has come to have the restricted meaning of charity only. That is not the true meaning of the word at all, as Senator HUMPHREY points out.

Thus we wholeheartedly join him in the hope that there will be no more sneers and jeers at the word "welfare." To deride and mock the word "welfare" is to betray our own Constitution, as well as the ideals of the Mayflower compact, which established a government by the people for the general good.

We hope our readers will study the full implications in Mr. HUMPHREY'S statement.

"WELFARE" AN HONORABLE WORD IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

Misuse of the word "welfare" in political propaganda—particularly derision of the so-called welfare state—has aroused national concern. Hitherto the word has been an honorable one in American history, since the United States Constitution says our Government was instituted to promote the general welfare. United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, stoutly defends welfare, used in its proper connotation, in the following statement he recently made in the Senate of the United States:

"Mr. President, I have listened with great interest on this date to Senate Resolution 147 and to the proposal to create a Department of Welfare.

"I am in complete agreement with those who contend that the establishment of such a department, as urged by the President, is necessary for the more efficient operation of our Government, and that it follows the basic philosophy and recommendations of the Hoover report.

"I am in complete agreement with those who insist that the adoption of the proposal will not limit in any way our freedom to take subsequent action affecting the status of the Public Health Service.

"And I resent bitterly the misdirected efforts of a $3,500,000 lobby to defeat this first reorganization plan. This issue has nothing to do with health insurance.

"I am also concerned, however, with another factor which so far has been touched upon only in passing. It seems to me that it transcends all of the other questions which have been raised in this debate.

"Involved in this controversy, but not immediately a part of it, is a much larger issue, which boils down to the simple question: Which side of the fence are we on?

"RESTRICTED MEANING

"Do we favor measures to promote the welfare of the people of this country? Or are we against measures to promote the welfare of the people of this country?

"I am using the term 'welfare' deliberately for the very word itself acquired a political significance that far overshadows its actual definition. And without question, the fact that the new Department is to be called a Department of Welfare lends an intensity to this debate which might otherwise be lacking.

"The dictionary defines welfare as 'state of faring, or doing well; especially condition of health, prosperity, etc.; negatively, exemption from evil or calamity.'

"It is unfortunate, of course, that in the minds of many people the word has become associated with the various community social services to aid the poor and the helpless—a wholly restricted meaning which carries with it the aura of charity. But this, certainly, is not welfare as we understand the word. Even in this restricted sense, however, it displays a deplorable lack of social conscience and understanding to argue that health is not or should not be involved in 'welfare.'

"But it is far more unfortunate, I think, that in recent years another and wholly different meaning has become attached to the word. For on the tightening battlefront between the Tory conception of government and the Liberal conception of government we have begun to hear a great deal about the so-called welfare state.

"CONTEMPT AND SCORN

"The reactionaries have seized on this phrase to express their contempt and scorn for all progressive social legislation. Or perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, their fear of all progressive social legislation. Yet why they should fear it, except out of blindness, I am at a loss to understand, because this kind of legislation, if wisely drawn, is the only hope we have of preserving the system of free private enterprise—and I am in dead earnest about that.

"'Welfare state.'

"The Senator from Minnesota called it political semantics. That is exactly what it is. The phrase is spoken with a curl of the lips, a sneer, a hint of terror, as if welfare were a synonym for police. It is repeated in the same way, with the same inflection and the same sinister insinuation, time after time. And finally, those who themselves conceived the phrase as a means of smearing policies and programs which they know the people want, come to believe the implications they read into it, and even to attribute the phrase itself to us.

"But let us not be deceived as to their intentions. Let us not be influenced by semantics. This is the same battle that has been fought in this country ever since it was said, in the preamble to the Constitution, that one of the major purposes of this Government was to promote the general welfare. Every time, almost without exception, that an attempt has been made to apply that purpose to the people at large and not simply to the rich and the well-entrenched, the same cry has been raised by the same kind of people. Only the phrase changes.

"The phrase 'welfare state' is comparatively new. But the tone of voice is always the same, the purpose is always the same, the philosophy is always the same. Throughout our history, any project of government which involved the spending of the people's money in the interest of the people has called forth the same thunder and the same forked lightning.

"Let me read you an excerpt, Mr. President, from a speech by a former high-ranking Government official, Hugh Legare, Secretary of State under J. Q. Adams—a former Secretary of State—which I think you will agree has a familiar, disturbing ring.

"'The Government,' this gentleman says, 'has been fundamentally altered * * * instead of confining itself in times of peace to the diplomatic and commercial relations of the country, it is seeking out employment for itself, by interfering with the domestic concerns of society, and threatens in the course of a very few years to control in the most offensive and despotic manner all the pursuits, the interests, the opinions, and the conduct of men.'

"This, gentlemen, was a speech delivered in 1828, in an attack against President John Quincy Adams of the Massachusetts Adamses. And his crime was that he had proposed an extensive program of internal improvements for the country, to be financed by the Government out of the sale of public lands. If the term 'welfare state' had been in existence it certainly would have been included in that speech.

"IN THE CONSTITUTION

"As for myself, every instinct calls for resentment against this deliberate twisting and distortion of the simple and homely word 'welfare,' and the implied assumption that anything connected with it is leading this Nation down the road to statism or socialism.

"In considering the basic intent and purpose of this proposed Department of Welfare we can well turn to the Constitution of this Nation and read, once again, the phraseology of its magnificent preamble:

"'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.'

"Let me repeat that phrase—the phrase which introduced a brand new light into a world of tyranny and darkness: 'To promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and for our posterity.'

"Even so cursory a summary indicates what a potent force the general welfare clause has been in the peaceful progress of our country along the road to democracy. Each generation has interpreted the clause according to its own needs, to meet its own peculiar problems. The establishment of a Department of Agriculture, a Department of the Interior, a Department of Commerce, and a Department of Labor, the beginnings we have made in providing public-health and social-welfare services, all have come in response to definite and concrete needs of the people. And all of these functions of Government have contributed, and contribute today, to the general welfare of the people of the United States whose Government this is."

Bridges Turns to Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at the request of Senator BUTLER, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Bridges Turns to Politics," from the Omaha Morning World-Herald for August 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha Morning World-Herald of Tuesday, August 23, 1949]

BRIDGES TURNS TO POLITICS

Last June, following a visit to Hawaii, HUGH BUTLER issued a report in Washington on communistic penetration of the Hawaiian Islands. He concluded that the islands were not yet ready for statehood. The Reds, he charged, had burrowed deep into the economic structure of the Pacific paradise, and that the Territorial government's first step would be to clean them out.

Hawaii's immediate reaction was to blow its top like an overcharged volcano, spewing out hot ashes all the way to Washington. For Mr. BUTLER was speaking as the ranking Republican on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

"No citizen," trumpeted the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, "who believes in Hawaii and the patriotism, loyalty, and capacity for self-government of its people can be silent when such charges are made by a Senator of the United States."

George H. McClane, executive secretary of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, addressed a letter to the World-Herald, in which he said: "In your editorial, 'Butler Has Something,' you call attention to the fact that in his report on Hawaii, Senator HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska, has raised some pertinent points:

"'Is Communist-ridden Hawaii ready for statehood?

"'Will it or can it control the subversive in its midst?'

"The answer is 'yes' to both points."

The ensuing events of the summer have, perhaps, undermined some of Mr. McClane's assurance. And Mr. BUTLER's late-spring appraisal seems more authoritative than ever. Communist Harry Bridges and his longshoremen are extending into a fifth month their stranglehold on Hawaii's half million citizens. And, while Governor Stainback's single-handed efforts to break the dock strike have been heroic, they have plainly not been enough.

Last week, Keyes Beech of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch cabled his paper a story from Honolulu which began:

"There is no reason to doubt and every reason to believe that Harry Bridges and his Communist-led International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union are out to seize political as well as economic control over Hawaii."

He goes on to say that, while communism isn't an issue in the current shipping strike, it "certainly is a political issue because the ILWU, many of whose top leaders have been charged with being Communists, has won control of the Democratic Party in Hawaii."

These union leaders are identified not only by Mr. Beech, but by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as including Jack Hall, Bridges' right-hand man, and publicity chief Robert McElrath. They boast openly that, without ILWU men in key positions, the deteriorating Democratic Party in the islands "wouldn't amount to anything."

The Republicans at present hold 55 of 91 elective offices, outnumbering Democrats in the Territorial legislature by 29 to 16. The union does not control the minority vote, Mr. Beech said, but the Bridges influence can readily be seen in the backing of 30,000 union members among the longshoremen, sugar, and pineapple workers.

* * * * *

Governor Stainback, the dispatch reported, "keeps in his desk a list of known and suspected Communists which he shows to casual visitors. He says there are about 200 known Communists in Hawaii and several hundred more sympathizers."

Offhand, the number doesn't sound ominous. But what these relatively few Reds can accomplish when placed in positions of strategic importance is more than evident in the economic stagnation of Hawaii today.

Communist organizers know their business. They are shrewd, tireless, and well financed. Surely, there is no guaranty that the Republicans will always remain in power. Facing even the remote possibility of an ILWU-dominated Democratic regime, it would seem wise for the people of Hawaii to start action now, with a coalition of all loyal citizens, to drive the Red rascals out.

The islands only then will have proven their capacity for self-government.

True Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Searcy Ridge, a widely known businessman of Kansas City, Mo., to the editor of the Kansas City Star, and published in that newspaper under date of August 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of August 22, 1949]

A PLEA FOR AMERICANISM

To THE STAR: Do we believe in socialism? If we do, we believe in subsidies, doles, Government housing, socialized medicine, governmental control of education, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions and eventually totalitarianism. We do not believe in local government, local charity, States' rights.

Shall we discard the principles, ideals, and form of government that made us the greatest, freest Nation on earth?

Shall we let the politicians, who thirst for power, lead us into socialism or shall we, the people, do something about it? What can we do about it?

There is but one sure way, but it will take some of our time and effort. We must see that delegates to the party conventions, who believe in true Americanism, are selected.

I sincerely believe that any party that will come out with a platform of true Americanism can win the election, in spite of the millions of officeholders, politicians, and others now feeding at the trough. Such a platform must not equivocate, must challenge the minds of the thinking Americans, must stand forthrightly for the principles we know to be sound, those which have made our Nation great. It must be against everything with even a tinge of socialism. There can be no fence straddling, no middle ground.

SEARCY RIDGE.

Relief For Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by B. H. Hofmann, national secretary, American Relief For Germany, Inc., at the German relief day festival at Paterson, N. J., on August 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a distinct honor for me to play the role of bodyguard and escort to the distinguished champion of human rights, our friend and defender, Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Only we who observe him under the strain and grind of official responsibility and endless duty can adequately appreciate his willingness to come out and talk with our people on occasions such as this German relief-day picnic. I am happy and proud to be here with the Senator to bring encouragement and new inspiration to you in your continued efforts to bring aid to the needy in Germany.

RELIEF MUST GO ON

Thousands of appeal letters received at the national office of American Relief for Germany (ARFG) and hundreds of thousands more received by our constituent members in the 36 American cities in which we are organized are telling us that relief is still necessary, that the currency reform has not brought production and prosperity, that the average worker's earnings are barely enough to buy the rationed food for the family, but leave no thought for buying shoes and clothes for the children, that the aged, the invalid, and particularly the millions of homeless (heimatvertriebene) are in direst distress. The story in the letters we receive from our friends and relatives is borne out by the official reports of the zonal governments of occupation, by the field representatives of CRALOG, by the German public-welfare

offices, by the host of devoted volunteer workers of Caritas, Evangelical Hilfswerk, Arbeiter Wohlfahrt, and Rotes Kreuz.

Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army, in a recent report said the work of the CRALOG agencies cannot be too highly commended and we quote: "There is real and urgent need for the continuation of the effective relief and welfare services of these voluntary agencies."

Attorney General Tom Clark after attending the German Relief Day festival in Chicago and Milwaukee, together with Senator LANGER, wrote the national office of ARFG: "I enjoyed the privilege of participation in the program of your organization." And in his own handwriting he added a P. S.: "You had some great meetings, the enthusiasm was contagious and augurs well for the continued success of your relief work."

Are we to permit ourselves to grow tired? Are we to think of stopping our efforts? Give up now that at last we have won our case in Washington—ARFG—a Government-licensed agency for relief to Germany?

Let all groups made up of Americans of German extraction unite their relief efforts in solid strength. The stronger our program of relief, the more effective our voice in Washington. ARFG offers initiative and leadership. We are not content to engage in pamphleteering and release of mimeograph bulletins.

ARFG champions the cause of German relief and rehabilitation in Washington, D. C. Not as foreigners pleading the cause of foreigners, but as American citizens we are demanding that the problem of European recovery be approached in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of world peace and democracy.

DISMANTLING

For the American taxpayer we demand that further dismantling of German plants and the razing of industrial buildings be stopped at once. It just does not make sense to keep on tearing out machines with one hand and with the other reach into the pockets of the American taxpayer to restore industry in Germany, and expect us to keep on feeding and clothing unemployed Germans who are willing and eager to work and support themselves and produce economic value to back up the world exchange value of their currency.

UNEMPLOYMENT BREEDS UNREST

With all the economic and political hindrances in the way of a sound revival of German industry and the continued nonsense of dismantling, it is no wonder that there are, according to latest reports, 1,500,000 unemployed—and that does not make sense in a country where everything beckons the employment of labor for restoration and production. As spokesman of the host of Americans of German descent, ARFG is requesting the President of the United States to call for a moratorium on dismantling. We need the united support of all groups of Americans of German extraction in the molding of public opinion to back up the action we expect the President to take.

STRENGTHENS ENEMIES OF DEMOCRACY

We welcome and appreciate the very strong declaration by the International Labor Relations Committee of the A. F. of L. by Chairman Matthew Woll from which we quote "To continue the policy of dismantlement means to fight German democracy and its mainstay, free German Labor, and, thereby, to encourage the national front of Communists, Nazis, and reactionary German big businessmen who want to play an anti-democratic game with the Russians. * * * We urgently appeal to the British Trades Union Congress and the Force Ouvriere and other bona fide trade-union leaders in France to bring to bear the strongest pressure on their governments to put an end to this economically unsound and politically insane policy of dismantlement in Germany."

TWELVE MILLION EXPELLEES WANT WORK

American relief for Germany summons the forces of all groups of Americans of German descent to come to the rescue of not less than 12,000,000 expellees (heimatvertriebene). In their behalf our united cry should be, stop dismantling. How can any number of these millions be absorbed into the German economy unless there is a strong revival of industrial employment. Industrial buildings, instead of being razed, industrial machinery instead of being demounted and taken away, should be hooked up with the potential power of the labor energy of these millions. The industrial and agricultural employment of the expellees is the first step toward the solution of this greatest problem of German relief and rehabilitation. Mass resettlement and colonization is an international problem and must be tackled by a United Nation authority.

REMOVE DISCRIMINATION FROM DP ACT

To a certain degree emigration would ease the tension of the expellee problem. ARFG summons the support of every group of every group of Americans of German descent in voicing in the strongest terms possible the protest of some 30,000,000 Americans of German extraction against the discriminatory exclusion of persons of German ethnic origin from the nonquota immigration privileges provided in the Displaced Persons Act. This discrimination is not only against the expellees themselves, it is against every American of German descent. We demand for Americans of German origin the same rights provided for Americans of any other origin. In the battle for our rights Senator LANGER succeeded in obtaining at least the concession of section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 under which the German immigration quota is opened and 50 percent thereof set aside for the expellees (volksdeutsche heimatvertriebene). The sons and daughters of the sturdy, industrious people who centuries ago emigrated from Germany and contributed their hard labor and their skill in farming and industry to the building up of Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Russia have a claim on the land of their fathers from which they were driven. Everyone of these countries has been enriched by their labor. The U. S. S. R. now in occupation of these lands should be held accountable for these people. But this being poor consolation for the expellees (few of them hope to return home except perhaps as a result of another war—which God forbid) the American immigration laws should not discriminate against them. Industrious people such as those from the Banat, the Batchka, the Sudetenland would be an economic asset to this country. We must not desert them. ARFG appeals to all groups of German origin to delegate some one to testify at the hearings of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and to speak up for the inclusion of the expellees in the rights and benefits of the Displaced Persons Act without discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin. We cannot change the IRO—this is a United Nations set-up—but we can, if we unite, cause the change of an American law which is an insult to us and unfair to the expellees who have suffered so much by the cruel dislocation from homestead and homeland.

THREE MILLION CHILDREN—800,000 ORPHANS

One of the most tragic problems challenging our attention is the children in Germany. Every fourth expellee is a child under 14. It is estimated that there are in western Germany 800,000 war orphans. Is it not quite natural and rather to be expected that Americans of German descent respond to the cry of direct distress coming from these children who have lost father, mother, and home? Three hundred thousand of them are in orphan camps and asylums, a half million roaming amid the ruins of the destroyed cities, using the cellars as hide-outs from police by day, as shelter for the night, bumming their way through the countrysides, wandering, stealing, pilfering—without hope and destiny. What a menace to the new German Republic. What a threat to civilization.

TEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR WAR ORPHANS

When advised of this challenge of almost a million youngsters growing up without parental affection, without education and moral discipline, our friend Senator LANGER at once responded by introducing with Senators EASTLAND and MCCARTHY bill S. 2263 appropriating $10,000,000 to save these innocent victims of war. How can we speak of European recovery and permit a half million children to grow into a horde of criminals in the very heart of Europe?

On this 14th day of August 1949 the German people are voting—what will it be? A vote for a German republic, a democratic government charged with responsibility and vested with authority or will it be "western Germany, limited," limited by the control, approval or disapproval of any or all of the victorious allied nations?

A new western German state can only live on the basis of peace treaties and the restoration of diplomatic representation in the capitals of the world.

The responsibility for molding American public opinion in favor of a sound European recovery program, a fair deal for the German people at the same time a square deal for the American taxpayer, rests upon us Americans of German origin. Let us, therefore, stand united.

In closing I ask you not to stand idly by, but to help with contributions for relief and to give us the benefit of your advice, observations, and suggestions by writing our National Headquarters, American Relief for Germany, Inc., 2627 West Fond du Lac Avenue, Milwaukee 6, Wis.

Communist Attacks on Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the current attacks by Communist leaders on religion in the countries under Russian domination, including the unwarranted assaults upon Protestant clergy and leaders, have focused attention upon the conflicting aims and objectives of these totally incompatible ways of life. A statement outlining the principles of Christianity and communism, prepared by the faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., summarizes most effectively the points of conflict between the Christian and Communist ideologies.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of this analysis, as contained in the New York Times of Sunday, August 21, 1949, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM RATED CREED OF SLAVERY—THEOLOGICAL STUDY COMPARES SYSTEM WITH CHRISTIANITY—OFFERS SOCIAL FORMULA

(By George Dugan)

A detailed analysis of the aims and principles of Chritianity and communism together with a listing of the "crucial" points at issue between the two ideologies has been prepared by the faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., it became known yesterday.

The document was evolved after several months of consultation among staff members of the theological seminary and interested laymen representing various fields of endeavor.

It was made available to the New York Times by Dr. Murray H. Leiffer, professor of sociology and social ethics at the Methodist institution. The Evanston seminary serves as the school of religion for Northwestern University and is the largest of the denomination's 10 theological schools.

Conceding that Christianity and communism have certain goals in common, notably the attainment of racial equality and economic betterment, the document goes on to point out that communism is "radically in conflict with Christianity, especially in its methods, but also in its goals and its attitude toward persons."

TWO SYSTEMS COMPARED

Under four parallel headings the analysis compares the aims and teachings of the two systems, bringing their differences into sharp focus. In respect to the "character of a just social order," the document declares:

"Communism proclaims the supremacy of the proletariat, in which the individual's significance derives from his membership in the class; a classless society which is to be secured by eliminating all but one class; economic security as the supreme concern (secured, however, by the sacrifice of human freedoms, as we understand that term); and no racial discrimination (but other types of discrimination are deliberately used)."

On the other hand, the document says, "Christianity proclaims the supremacy of the person, who is conceived of as a child of God and an object of inherent worth; the brotherhood of man, in which all individuals and groups work for the common good; security with freedom (economic security, while imperative, is not the sole or even the supreme good. Genuine security requires intelligent self-restraint and uncoerced concern for the general welfare); and equality before God, which means all men of all races and classes are entitled to justice and freedom from discrimination."

WHAT LIFE MEANS

In a section on the "meaning of life," the document notes that communism teaches that religion is a "product of fear and a flight into fantasy"; that the only significant standards and values are those which arise out of society; that human existence will find fulfillment on earth in a "progressively improved social order, through the operation of economic laws and by means of the class struggle"; that the interests of the individual must be subordinated to the Communist system; and that "fellowship, though potentially world-wide, is earth-bound and is restricted to those holding the Communist philosophy."

Christianity, however, it says, teaches that an "all-righteous, all-loving God is the source of man's existence and his only final deliverance from sin and evil"; that all moral and spiritual values are found in the character of God; that if men "will obey the will of God, justice and peace will increasingly prevail in history"; and that "every individual is of infinite worth in the eyes of God and must always be regarded by his fellows not as a means to an end, but as an end in himself."

SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPERATIVE

In a concluding paragraph the document asserts: "As long as there is poverty, insecurity, fear, oppression, there will be a fruitful field for such false messiahs as have led peoples astray in this last generation. No campaign against communism can succeed unless it also attacks these evils and proceeds toward the realization of a just and Christian society."

A program of "appropriate actions" designed to meet as well as to combat the threat of communism is appended to the document. It includes the following proposals:

1. Resist all individual and group practices which restrict or threaten constitutional human rights.

2. Support efforts to extend civil liberties to individuals or minority groups now denied them.

3. Provide more adequate and equitable educational facilities and services throughout the country.

4. Develop a broad program of health protection, to secure reasonably satisfactory medical care for all, regardless of location or economic condition.

5. Work for a comprehensive housing program, realistically planned and executed so as to make possible wholesome home life.

6. Advocate opportunity for regular work for persons desiring it without regard to race, religion, or national origin.

7. Warn against the threat of mounting militarization in America and elsewhere; advocate world disarmament; strengthen the civil functions of Government.

8. Insist upon the larger and more efficient use of United States Government funds to reconstruct the peacetime economies of the nations.

9. Advocate government by law on a world basis and support constructive movements in that direction.

Truth Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truth Versus Communism," published in the Charleston Gazette for August 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH VERSUS COMMUNISM

The most effective weapon that can be used to defeat communism is the truth. That weapon is being sadly neglected.

It is not enough to let communism wear itself out, to wait for it to prove itself a failure. That may take too long. Democracy ought to go about showing by cold facts that communism is a fallacy, has always been such and can never be anything else.

The conception of communism is popularly attributed to Karl Marx, German economist who preached it about 100 years ago. His idea was that all wealth is produced by labor and should go to labor. Incidentally he ignored the fact that management of capital is also labor—mental labor, but nevertheless labor.

But the theory of communism was by no means original with Marx. Plato, Greek philosopher, born 427 B. C., voiced it as an idealistic philosophy but he did it with tongue in cheek. He said it would work only if backed by a colossal lie. The people would have to be made to believe that the system would prove infallible.

In all the history of the human race no system of government has ever proved infallible. No system can be perfect so long as man himself is imperfect. The best we can do is go ahead and profit by our errors that are the outcome of necessary experimentation.

Probably never in the history of civilization has wise experimentation in government been carried on to the extent it has since the advent of the Roosevelt era, and never so successfully. Admittedly the process has not been entirely free from mistakes, but the progress made in the improvement of human relations and conditions of living has far overshadowed the errors.

An argument that adherents of communism advance is that it is the system by which the ants carry on their organization successfully. Students have been intrigued by the efficiency with which ant colonies are governed. They note the ruthlessness of the system, the fact that the individual itself is of no consequence, and that the good of the collective colony only is of importance. Thus, we have the theory of communism that only the welfare of the state matters and that the interests of the individual as such are not to be considered. This idea is pushed so hard that the existence of God is denied, the state being substituted for Him.

Out of the theories of Plato and Karl Marx has grown the conception that man is totally incapable of governing himself collectively. That theory is in direct and violent opposition to the theory of democracy. Communism holds that peoples to be governed successfully must be completely regimented in their every action, even their thinking. That they must be totally subjugated to one all-powerful guiding head. That is the totalitarianism that now controls the Russian people and to considerable if not full extent the Russian satellite or captive nations of Europe.

Seeping out from under the iron curtain there is an increasing volume of facts that shows that while communism is working it is doing so to the great disadvantage of the individuals under its control. We are not told whether our Government has been assembling and coordinating this detailed information, but by all means this ought to be done. And by all means there ought to be full publicity of the facts so that all in this country who are inclined to suspect that communism offers anything of value be fully informed so that they can reform their opinions.

We ourselves know what values democracy offers. We see them all about us when we stop to look. But one wonders if knowledge of the blessings of democracy is disseminated with any effectiveness among the peoples of totalitarian nations? Could not plainly unprejudiced facts, pro and con, be arrayed so that all peoples everywhere could judge for themselves whether communism is preferable to democracy?

Plato said that communism could succeed only if backed by a colossal lie. The only way to combat a colossal lie is by publication of the unvarnished truth. That is a job for our democratic Government that has been neglected too long.

A Stamp for Poe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the August 12, 1949, issue of The Evening Star of Washington, D. C., and a fitting tribute in verse from the trenchant pen of James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a former captain in our Army during the First World War, and the special Washington representative of the Arizona Daily Sun.

The title of the editorial is a fitting one: A Stamp for Poe. All American readers will be happy to see the editorial and to read Captain McGovern's tribute.

There being no objection, the editorial and tribute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STAMP FOR POE

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, announcing that he has approved a postage stamp in honor of Edgar Allan Poe, has taken a step which long has been urged by the philatelists of the United States. The tragic lyricist, short-story writer, and critic certainly merits such recognition. His claims were set forth many years before Washington Irving, James Fenimore Cooper, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Louisa May Alcott, Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain), Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Greenleaf Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Walt Whitman, and James Whitcomb Riley were commemorated.

But delay in admitting Poe to the Nation's gallery of literary celebrities was not an unnatural circumstance. Time was needed for adequate appreciation of his qualities. He was out of step with his own generation. His earliest biographers were bitter enemies who sought to damage his reputation irreparably after he himself had passed beyond their malice. They were followed by commentators who were so fanatic in their admiration that their judgment could not be trusted. Thus, the author of the Raven and the Gold Bug suffered almost as much at the hands of some of his friends as he did at those of his foes.

Even now there still is confusion about what Poe actually accomplished. The power of his imagination commonly is conceded. He was one of the principal founders of the romantic school of fiction which still flourishes. If he did not invent the "who-dunit," he at least set the style to which the most noteworthy producers of mystery tales conform. In verse he established models which continue to guide practitioners of the metric art who really wish to be metrical. He was the forerunner of Kipling and Masefield, William Butler Yeats, and many French and German bards. His influence may be detected in even so different an artist as Robert Frost.

But Poe's life also is important—as a life. He needs to be studied for the drama of his career, a poignant series of incidents unmatched in the history of American letters. When what happened to him is understood, his poems and his stories and his appraisals of the endeavors of other persons are seen to be mere reflections of his own experience, his own ordeal, his own incredible yet authentic achievement. He looms in our native landscape as Shakespeare does in that of England or Dante in that of Italy—not necessarily for the productions of his pen but for his tremendous sensitivity, his prodigious capacity to see, to hear, to feel, to know sorrow and joy.

The stamp for Poe will be released on the centennial of his death on October 7, 1849. It will testify to the fact that he survived that event as much as any author ever did.

EDGAR ALLAN POE

Rare dreams inspired, how mystic, poignant, real,
You lived, you wrote, in vibrant prose and rhyme;
A pathos awesome, love deathless and sublime
Pulsed in your tragic strains, whose tones are seal
Of passions patterned in their keen-wrought lines
With blending colors of your gem-hued art,
Symmetrical in intellect and heart,
Harmonious in classical designs.
Pioneer of poetry and story,
Critic leader with no laureate brow,
To whom thorns were the only crown of glory,
To whom, reviled, our age pays homage now.
Melody's musician, by whose tomb
Haunts the magic of your "Ulalume."

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

The Arrogance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Arrogance of Power," by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

(By Marquis Childs)

The charitable view of Gen. Harry Vaughan's associates that he is merely a good fellow anxious to do favors for his friends has been considerably dimmed by the testimony before the Senate investigating committee.

While the General may be able to refute the testimony presented in open session by witnesses under oath, the picture as it stands now is not a pretty one. The implications of the influence exercised from the White House in behalf of a fixer's client are bad enough. But there is another aspect of the Vaughan affair that is just as reprehensible.

That is the use of coercion and threat against a minor Government officeholder who was reluctant to do a favor for a firm that had flagrantly violated the law. This is an example of the arrogance of power wielded by a party long in office.

General Vaughan has never been elected to anything. It is most unlikely that he ever could be elected to any office. Yet, on the testimony of Henry C. Hathorn, a former officer of the Department of Agriculture, under oath, we see Vaughan arrogating unconscionable powers to himself.

This is a symptom of political unwisdom; yes, of political atrophy, that the administration will ignore at its peril. The public may be cynical about the gift of deep freezers. But the American people are acutely sensitive to the intimation that the power of office is a permanent and God-given right.

Other instances of the same abuse of power have occurred in recent months. One of the most notorious was the way in which Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER drove an able civil servant, Roy James, out of office. James' only offense appears to have been that he ran for Congress on the Republican ticket in opposition to WALTER, who is now serving his ninth term in the House.

The suspicion grows that this arrogance of office conceals something worse. Far too little attention is given to the public interest. All that the public sees are the convenient arrangements of the inner circle glossed by public statements often wide of the facts.

An example is the way in which the confirmation of Attorney General Tom Clark to be a Justice of the Supreme Court was put ahead of urgent legislation and of other nominations long sidetracked. This was done even though Clark cannot sit with his eight brethren on the Supreme Bench until October when the sessions of the Court are resumed.

It was done in the face of rumors current on the floor of the Senate that the role of the Department of Justice in the 5-percenter investigation would eventually be developed. At the same time the Senate inquiry was postponed.

This may have been a most innocent arrangement. But timed as it appears to have been in relation to the Vaughan inquiry, there will be doubts. The action on Clark came as Government departments and the European Cooperation Administration were desperately casting about for some way to stay in business in the face of the Senate's failure to pass essential appropriation bills.

The symptoms of arrogance of a party in power since 1933 had something to do, in my opinion with the defeat of the Democrats in the congressional election of 1946. That ancient slogan of American politics, "Turn the rascals out," may sound a bit primitive. But it is still a going rule of conduct.

Despite the final outcome, I have always believed that the independent voter at the outset of the campaign last fall was looking for an alternative. Failing to find it, he voted the Democrats back into office.

Perhaps the most baleful effect of the 5-percenter revelations is the example it sets in the Nation. It will encourage the system of fix-and-favor, the graft and the criminality already far too prevalent on the level of local administration.

We hear a great deal of talk these days about the danger of a welfare state. Much of that talk seems to me beside the point. To run a welfare state you must have competence, responsibility and ordinary honesty at every level.

The greater danger, in my opinion, is that we shall get the handout state. Under the guise of social welfare the entrenched politician will pass out pensions and perquisites to the favored. And the handout state can be far more costly in every way than the welfare state.

Smuts Says Events in Europe Are Small Potatoes Compared to Those in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following extracts from an article in the London Times of June 8, 1949, reporting a statement by Gen. Jan Christian Smuts, whose predictions of things to come have proved him one of the most far-seeing prophets and statesmen of our times. It is instructive that at a time when we are being beguiled into concentrating our attention and efforts on Europe, he—along with the Russians—believe that events in Asia are enormously more important.

The extracts follow:

The indifference displayed by the British people toward events unparalleled in history was regretted by General Smuts when, in a statement to the press in London yesterday, he suggested that much more was required from the nation in a time of "twilight of man's spirit."

He spoke of sinister and tremendous movements which threatened to submerge peoples, and of a theory that the history of mankind displayed rhythms. Mankind, he said, was now in the trough of waves, and in the horrors of that experience should be more watchful than ever before, for that was the time when things went wrong.

General Smuts said he did not attach great importance to difficulties experienced in Europe. The dispute in Germany was just a game of high politics which should not be taken seriously provided the Western Powers were wide awake. The greatest changes in a world which had changed enormously were in the Far East.

Asia was developing a new nationalism—a tremendous event of which the results could not yet be comprehended. The population, representing two-thirds of the human race, had for a century been guided by European genius, capital, and knowledge, but the driving force was now being sapped. The Europeans were going. God only knew what would happen now that Asia was thrown back on her own resources. The situation might be the gravest for hundreds of years, and western events by comparison were small potatoes. * * *

Strength of spirit, courage, and independence were the great needs. Nothing was more dangerous than to sit like a mouse watching an oncoming snake—paralyzed and reduced to a state of frustration. Mankind should stand up and fight what seemed to be the dangers—the cold war, the underground movements which were sapping the spirits of peoples. Nor were the dangers only external. Western civilization was at a low ebb. If those peoples stood firm now, they would again stand at the top of the world. Events would be determined by individuals, for nations were the summation of their peoples.

Middle-Income Families Need Houses, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Catherine Bauer, who is vice president of the National Housing Conference and an authority on housing:

Passage of the Housing Act of 1949 is a major victory for the administration and the American people. It was also a major defeat for the real-estate lobby, whose ignoble hysteria probably weakened the well-organized and very well oiled campaign against the bill. (In their Washington letter of June 30, the National Association of Home Builders blamed Dewey and Taft more than Truman and the Democrats for this triumph of socialization.)

The long fight for effective housing legislation would be worth some real political analysis. Why, for instance, has housing reform remained such a bitterly antiadministration issue in the House, while it has long been so thoroughly bipartisan in the Senate? The popular line-up is also interesting. Collaborating actively with the National Housing Conference were all the national labor, veteran, religious, welfare, and civic organizations, almost without exception. Local governments were solidly behind the bill, and several slum-conscious city councils even voted contributions to the National Housing Conference. Funds for the campaign, meager though they were, dribbled in from all over the country, rather more from the South than from big northern cities or powerful national organizations. The Dixiecrats in the House, who almost defeated the bill by voting with their Republican friends at the last minute, may well turn out to have made a big mistake.

On the other side were the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders, and the United States Saving and Loan League, backed up by their friends in the Producers' Council, and the United States Chamber of Commerce. In its die-hard strategy, moreover, the real-estate lobby did not even represent fairly the views of its own constituents. Many local real-estate boards are on record in favor of a limited public-housing program, and the principle of Federal aid for slum clearance and redevelopment is widely accepted by property interests.

This was therefore a victory for a new kind of line-up of some potential significance, which might be called a consumer civic welfare coalition. In the past there was always some other angle to housing legislation: Employment in the 1930's, war-production efficiency in the early forties. But in the postwar period housing has been a straight consumer issue, a question of family and community welfare pure and simple. And the political weakness of the consumer in America has been reemphasized by the recent history of price controls, etc. This time, however, the consumers finally won.

The 5-year controversy was itself a big factor. A great resounding Nation-wide row may be a pretty crude form of adult education, blurred by the smoke of propaganda and distorted by the heat of embattled political emotion. But there is no more effective instrument for speedy popular enlightenment on the ins and outs of a complicated question of public policy. The basic facts do come out in the open, one way or another. So we can probably thank the real-estate lobby for the fact that the American people, including their Senators and Representatives, have learned a great deal about housing in the past few years.

But we'll need all this public enlightenment and a lot more besides if the next two steps in housing policy and civic planning are to be accomplished successfully.

QUESTION NO. 1. ADMINISTRATION OF THE NEW PROGRAM

The Housing Act merely provides a good set of tools for rehousing slum dwellers, for the improvement and replacement of decrepit farm homes, for much-needed research, and for the clearance and redevelopment of blighted areas. The operating initiative and responsibility for this program is entirely local, but the framework of purpose and policy must nevertheless be shaped at the Federal level, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent, the Public Housing Administration. These are pretty weak agencies at the present moment. Almost everyone who spoke at the Washington housing convention last May made some pointed allusion to the inadequacy of the present top administrative set-up for such vast new responsibilities.

The PHA was unfortunately the particular butt of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. Most of its able and experienced personnel were lost, and with few exceptions an atmosphere of shell shock, fear, and demoralization still pervades the offices in the Longfellow Building. It was not their fault, but unless fresh zeal is rapidly developed and energetic new blood injected at all levels, the dead hand of a timid and tired bureaucracy will dull and delay and frustrate the great creative possibilities of the new public-housing program.

The HHFA is also, by and large, a timid, stodgy, and unimaginative agency. Its Administrator, always considered a safe FHA man by the real-estate lobby (which publicly consoles itself with this thought), contributed very little to the development or defense of the program which he is now responsible for carrying out. The revitalization of the PHA and the establishment of entirely new agencies and policies to handle urban redevelopment and research (perhaps cooperatives, as well, in the near future) will be a major test of his social ideals and administrative acumen.

But the real and ultimate responsibility for this program is at the grass-roots level, all the more so if dynamic leadership from Washington is lacking. The quality of the results depends on the quality of the local housing authorities, planning commissions, and redevelopment agencies that will devise the plans and programs, buy the land, negotiate for its future use, and build and manage the low-rent housing. But the issues involved are very literally close to home; that's why they're both complicated and controversial. And even if a city hires the best experts available, they won't get very far without well-organized and well-informed citizen support behind them.

Here are a few of the issues:

In the first place, the public-housing program is five times as large as that started under the United States Housing Act before the war, and the results will have no small effect on urban environment and community life. But housing projects, however decent, safe, and sanitary in accord with the law, can be dull and dreary, ugly, unsuited to family life, badly located, and managed with officious paternalism. And tenant selection, without citizen vigilance, can acquire a political tinge.

The problem of designing large-scale housing so that it is humane and attractive as well as efficient has by no means been solved, whether by public, institutional, or speculative builders. What is needed is a free and experimental attitude, the most imaginative architectural and managerial talent available, and the kind of popular interest and concern that can mow down obsolete building codes, stupid zoning restrictions, too rigid minimum standards handed out from Washington, and bureaucratic or political opportunism. Above all, perhaps, we must dispense with the notion that housing for poor people should look the part and maintain a sort of charity atmosphere. Here is one field at least where a little utopianism, however unfashionable, could be used to great advantage.

Then there is the fact that Federal subsidies for redevelopment require the preparation of over-all local land-use plans, which means that every city and metropolitan district will have to make some profound and far-reaching decisions, for better or worse.

Vast urban areas have been completely rebuilt in the past, only to find that the basic urban problems of congestion and transportation had become more insoluble than ever. This time the reconstruction will be by public initiative, at considerable cost to the taxpayers, who had better make sure they are getting their money's worth in improved civic arrangements.

Moreover, the Housing Act offers specific encouragement for metropolitan and regional planning, and for the development of new outlying communities as well as slum clearance. These new tools should be exceedingly important right now, when the housing shortage will force construction on vacant sites before wholesale clearance can be tackled. But in most areas the full use of these tools depends on basic changes in the structure and functioning of chaotic and overlapping local governments. These changes are long overdue, but they will be unpopular with politicians and property owners wedded to status quo arrangements. Only a great metropolitan civic movement can force action for unified planning and development.

Local decisions about housing and land use will also affect very greatly the whole future pattern of race and class relations in every community. In the North, at least, the day of enforced residential segregation by color is unquestionably drawing to a close. But the transition will be quick or slow, smooth or violent, depending wholly on the quality and good sense of responsible civic leadership. In my opinion, there is likely to be more delay and controversy in the long run in the communities that try to temporize than in cities like New York and San Francisco, where a positive official stand against subsidized segregation has already been taken.

Similarly, only enlightend citizen action can stop the trend toward wholesale class segregation. The increasing standardization of rents, prices, and building types over vast areas is the diametrical opposite of bona fide neighborhood planning which receives so much lip-service today.

What it all comes down to is the fact that every town, metropolitan area, and rural region in this country should have an energetic citizens' housing and planning organization, representing a cross-section of popular interests and professional knowledge, intimately acquainted with the operations of local agencies, and in close touch with such national groups as the National Housing Conference in Washington. The latter played a major role in formulating the new Housing Act and steering it through Congress because all the public interest organizations concerned with better housing conditions made it their information center and focal point. Some such coordinated leadership is now needed in every community.

QUESTION NO. 2. COOPERATIVE HOUSING TO FILL THE GAP

The Housing Act is very good so far as it goes. But it still leaves a large no man's land in the housing market: the families who are ineligible for subsidized public housing but who cannot afford the ordinary speculative home as currently produced.

There is nothing new about the limited market for private-housing enterprise. But today the veterans and labor organizations are acutely interested in housing, and they are well aware of the fact that most of their members happen to be in the gap. They also know that all the successive promises of the speculative builders and prefabricators have miserably failed to date. They supported the General Housing Act, but they still want something more. And one of the things they are interested in is cooperatives.

There has been, in fact, a spontaneous burst of interest in cooperative housing all over the country ever since the war.[1] The National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association lists about a hundred such groups, of whom it has some direct knowledge. Nothing could be more important for the future of housing and community life in America than to implement this movement. But what has happened to all these hopeful ventures? Not much, except delay and frustration. A handful—hardly half a dozen—have actually started construction on a more or less cooperative basis. But these were the lucky ones, with solid financial resources of their own, a piece of land without zoning impediments or restrictive covenants, first-rate leadership and technical advice, and enough prestige and "influence" of one kind or another to induce the Federal Housing Administration and some lending institution to work with them.

What most groups interested in cooperative homes must have are:

Cheap over-all long-term financing, from a source which is seriously interested in promoting successful cooperative housing. In the United States this means a Federal agency, independent of the FHA.

Experienced guidance in organization and efficient coordination among separate local groups in the matter of planning, paper work, perhaps even construction and management. In Europe this is usually done by strong central housing-cooperative organizations, in collaboration with local public agencies.

First-rate technical aid all along the way, from site selection to design and operation.

Sympathetic encouragement from the local government, particularly planning and zoning agencies, in site acquisition and community lay-out, provision of utilities, etc. Most Swedish and Dutch cities actually acquire and plan the sites for cooperative projects, and this would even be possible in some cases in the United States under the new provisions of the General Housing Act.

This is not an unthinkable program for the United States. In fact a great many bills have been introduced in both Houses this term, with thoroughly bipartisan sponsorship, which would make a real start from the Federal end at least. These bills provide for direct Federal loans at around 3 percent to cooperative and other nonprofit housing corporations, to be administered by a new agency paralleling the FHA and the PHA. Most important of these proposals is the Sparkman-Spence bill, an omnibus private housing measure which includes substantial encouragement for cooperative housing (along with some dubious aids for speculative builders and veteran home purchasers).

None of the current congressional proposals will cover the whole gap: Under present conditions a large part of the middle group cannot be reached without a subsidy of some kind. But they would meet a healthy new demand in a hitherto untouched market. And something of the kind is imperative if only to solve the shortage, since speculative building is leveling off and public housing is still irrevocably tied to the direct replacement of an equivalent number of slums.

Some commercial building interests might be won over to such a program, now that the cream has been skimmed off the speculative market. Here is a whole new field of enterprise for an efficient home builder who would be satisfied with a modest profit on purely construction operations. Many prefabricators are already actively interested: This is just the sort of distribution system they need. Energetic and experimental cooperative leadership might (as it did in Scandinavia) set a new pace, in terms of design and management, for both speculative and public housing, and in any case more varied and better balanced neighborhood planning would be possible. And, finally, such a program should impose less risk on the taxpayers than that involved in much of the present FHA and VA operations.

What is the outlook for immediate enactment? The Sparkman-Spence bill was reported favorably, pretty much intact, by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. But the House committee finally eliminated the cooperative housing title while preserving all the more questionable features. This crucial defeat was mainly due to waning enthusiasm in the White House in the face of opposition by HHFA Administrator Raymond M. Foley, and it probably means that no cooperative program will be enacted this summer. But by next year the ground-swell of interest among veteran and labor groups may well push cooperative housing through Congress. And the interim will not be wasted if it produces some bona fide concrete analysis of the problems and possibilities of cooperative housing under American conditions. The Sparkman-Spence proposals can be seriously questioned in several administrative details, but the right answers will never be found at the abstract Washington level. They will only come from local groups who really want to get cooperative homes.

But in America we mainly learn in the doing, and this is one program we must start very soon, whether we know all the answers or not. It's needed not only to help solve the shortage, but for the most profound social and psychological reasons as well. Under the General Housing Act we shall be building thousands of homes for low-income families, because this is the one and only way to get rid of slums and rehouse slum dwellers. But it would be very wrong to carry out a vast program for the bottom group while totally neglecting the families of middle or average means. Hindsight now suggests, as HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS pointed out at the housing convention, that one of the mistakes made by the liberal democratic governments in Germany and Austria before the Fascists took over, a mistake which may even have fostered middle-class fascism, was a tendency to neglect the particular needs and wants of this group in housing reform and other social services.

[1] For example, an excellent recent series of articles in the American City, on "Ideas From Sweden for an American Cooperative Housing Program," by Donald and Astrid Monson, young Detroit city planners who helped to organize the United Auto Workers' venture in that city.

A Summary of Arizona's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there has lately come to hand what I regard as an excellent summary of the affirmative presentation by Arizona witnesses on the central Arizona project embedded in H. R. 934 and H. R. 935. The several hundred pages of hearings are so voluminous that I believe this capsule form will be found helpful to Members of Congress in their inquiry into this matter. This summary was prepared by J. Hubbard Moeur, of Phoenix, Ariz., who is one of the supporters of the legislation and well informed on its merits with an intimate knowledge of all the implications and of the facts involved. Mr.

Moeur is president of the Arizona Reclamation Association and also an official of the National Reclamation Association, of which his association is one of the 17 groups representing the 17 western reclamation States. The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, ON H. R. 934 AND H. R. 935—CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT BILL

This summary covers only part I of the hearings, that being the only portion in print at this date. This portion of the printed hearings has only been available for a short time; therefore, this is not intended as a complete analysis and summary, but rather as a brief outline of some of the pertinent testimony given in support of the project bill.

V. E. Larson, pages 399–467.

The investigation and report on this project was made and prepared under the immediate supervision of Mr. V. E. Larson, assistant regional planning engineer for region III of the Bureau of Reclamation. In his statement, Mr. Larson first outlines the features of the proposed project, using for that purpose a map showing that the project features extend beyond the borders of the State, into the States of Utah and New Mexico. He states:

"Relative to the prime purpose of the project, irrigation, the area embraced, as generally discussed, consists of approximately 672,000 acres of highly fertile and productive farm land on the flood plains and in the valleys of the Gila River system extending upstream from the vicinity of Gila Bend. These lands are represented by the shaded portions of the agricultural area map included in the report. This area represents 80 percent of the land irrigated in Arizona. Due to the existence of favorable temperatures, diversified cropping is practiced throughout the year" (p. 400).

Since the map mentioned may not at all times be available, it is, perhaps, first well to explain the various features of the project. These features are outlined by Mr. Larson as follows:

1. Bluff Dam.[1]
2. Coconino Dam.
3. Bridge Canyon Dam and power plant.
4. Havasu pumping plants.
5. Granite Reef aqueduct.
6. McDowell pumping plant and canal.
7. McDowell Dam and power plant.
8. Horseshoe Dam enlargement and power plant.
9. Salt-Gila aqueduct.
10. Buttes Dam and power plant.
11. Charleston Dam.
12. Tucson aqueduct.
13. Safford Valley improvements.
14. Hooker Dam.
15. Irrigation distribution system.
16. Drainage system for salinity control.
17. Power transmission system. Page 406.

It should be explained that Coconino Dam is for silt control, and Bridge Canyon Dam would create the reservoir that would supply the water for the power plant. Havasu pumping plants would lift the water to the Granite Reef aqueduct. The aqueduct would take the water to a large portion of the land involved, and part of the water to be stored in McDowell Dam, where another power plant would be installed. The present existing dam on the Verde River, known as the Horseshoe Dam, would be enlarged and a power plant installed. An aqueduct would be constructed from McDowell Dam to the Santa Cruz flood plain. A dam would be built on the Gila River below the confluence of that river and the San Pedro River, which would serve as flood control and regulation of Gila River water, and also generate additional power. Charleston Dam would be constructed on the San Pedro River and furnish storage for water for the Tucson aqueduct, which would be built from that dam to the city of Tucson to furnish needed additional water supply for that city. The Safford Valley improvements would consist of improvements in the distribution system of the existing facilities in that area. Hooker Dam, located in New Mexico on the Gila River would impound water for use in New Mexico and for use of the Duncan and Safford areas in Arizona. The other three features, to wit, irrigation distribution system, drainage system for salinity control, and power transmission system, are self-explanatory. The necessity for these features is explained by Larson on pages 406 to 416, inclusive.

Proceeding with his statement, Mr. Larson points out that the report involves the analysis of four fundamental elements. They are:

"(a) Need for the project;

"(b) Available water supply;

"(c) Plan of development to serve the needs;

"(d) Economic feasibility of the project" (p. 401).

He then discusses the need for the project, pointing out that farming in the area is impossible without irrigation; that the rainfall in the Phoenix area averages only about 8 inches annually, which, of course, is insufficient for the raising of crops without irrigation; that the irrigation requirement is an average, delivered to the farm, of 4 acre-feet of water per acre per year. Further emphasizing that irrigation of upstream lands, the pumping of water for that purpose, and the re-use of this water by additional pumping, has created a drainage problem that must be met. He summarizes this need for additional water as follows:

"The need of additional water for irrigation in the central Arizona project area is fourfold. Additional water is needed (1) to relieve the overdraft on the ground-water basins; (2) to provide a supplemental supply to lands now in production, but not adequately irrigated; (3) to permit the drainage of excess salts out of the area and maintain a salt balance; and (4) to provide water for land irrigated in the past but now idle for the lack of water" (p. 401).

He points out that the growth of the city of Tucson and adjacent residential areas has created a critical problem of domestic water supply; that the ground-water basin, now the source of that supply, is overdrawn and supplemental water supply must be developed; that an additional 12,000 acre-feet per year is required to furnish the city of Tucson an adequate municipal water supply.

He then comments on the electrical energy requirements, as follows:

"There is an urgent and measurable need for additional electrical energy in Arizona, southern California, southern Utah, and southern Nevada. This area has experienced a critical power shortage during recent years and appropriate indexes indicate a rapidly expanding demand in the future. The situation is illustrated by the chart labeled 'Estimated energy requirements and supply.' A copy of that chart is also attached.

"Present power developments in this power market area range from large hydroelectric and fuel-burning plants to small power plants in isolated camps and towns. Hoover and Parker plants on the Colorado River constitute a large source of low-cost power for southern California, southern Nevada, and Arizona. When generating units, in the area, now under construction or authorized have been completed, the total installed capacity available to the power market area will exceed 3,000,000 kilowatts" (p. 402).

The question of available water supply is discussed on page 403. The table presented for the period 1897 to 1943, inclusive, shows the estimated available annual virgin flow at Lee Ferry and other points to international boundary. These are:

		Acre-feet
Flow at Lee Ferry		16,270,000
Gain, Lee Ferry to Hoover Dam		1,060,000
Flow at Hoover Dam		17,330,000
Tributary inflow, Hoover Dam to international boundary	1,420,000	
Less natural main stream channel losses	1,030,000	
Gain, Hoover Dam to international boundary		390,000
Colorado River at international boundary		17,720,000

He points out that the report is predicated upon Arizona's interpretation of the so-called Law of the River, and that, if Arizona is correct in this interpretation, there is sufficient water in the river to supply the proposed project.

The economic feasibility of the project is discussed by Mr. Larson on pages 413 to 417, inclusive. The method of allocation of the costs of the various functions is explained, and the estimated direct returns to the project from the sale of irrigation water, municipal water, and electric energy are all set forth. The report is predicated upon water being sold to the farmer at $4.75 per acre-foot at the farm headgate. The rate to be charged for electric energy is determined at 4.65 mills per kilowatt-hour at load center. He then concludes as follows:

"As outlined above the project would pay out; and the returns would equal the costs in accordance with the repayment provisions of the bill under consideration" (p. 414).

Note.—In this connection, it is to be noted that the testimonies and studies indicate that by fixing the power rate at 4.65 mills per kilowatt-hour at load center, the cost of all reimbursable features would be repaid to the United States Government in a period of approximately 70 years (p. 442). These calculations were based on tables, designated A–5 and B–5, submitted by Mr. Larson. These tables are not included in part I of the printed hearings. Mr. Larson particularly pointed out that the subsidy from power for irrigation in the project was 0.72 mill; and comparing this to other projects, stated that in the Central Valley in California the subsidy is 0.68; in Colorado-Big Thompson, 0.89 mill; in the Columbia Basin, 0.36 mill; and in the Missouri Basin, 2.47 mills (p. 432).

The method of calculating direct benefits is carefully explained by Mr. Larson, and it is pointed out that such benefits are not limited to those arising out of irrigation and municipal water and the use of electric energy, but there are other benefits, such as flood control, fish and wild life service, etc. The allocation of each of these particular features is discussed in detail and the amounts set forth. It is pointed out that:

"In evaluating annual costs for determining a benefit-cost ratio, all contruction costs are assumed to be amortized with interest as a measure of the actual national cost, regardless of the legal aspects of reimbursability or interest-free allocations. Annual amortization costs have been computed on the basis of retiring all project construction costs over a 70-year period at an assumed national interest charge of 2 percent on the unpaid balance of the debt. This annual charge has been computed to be $19,691,600" (p. 416).

Mr. Larson plainly states the intangible benefits of the project, which are many, are so complex that they have not been evaluated in monetary terms. For the summary of the investigations, we quote:

[1] Under the provisions of the amendment adopted by the Insular and Interior Affairs Committee of the Senate, Bluff Dam would be eliminated.

"On the basis of the investigations completed on the central Arizona project by the Bureau of Reclamation, the analysis of the four fundamental elements can be summarized as follows:

"(a) There is a definite need for supplemental water for irrigation of lands now under cultivation within the project area. All of the potential supply of water is needed by lands that have been farmed. Unless supplemental water is made available approximately one-third of the productive capacity of the agricultural development will be lost resulting in a serious economic problem to the State of Arizona. The city of Tuscon is in need of a supplemental supply of water to meet the growing requirements. There is a critical power shortage in the southwest area at the present time. Unless hydropower potentialities are utilized, requirements must be met by expanding steam developments which will result in further consumption of limited irreplaceable natural resources. All of the potential power output of the project could be utilized immediately.

"(b) Practically all of the potential water supply for the project must come from the Colorado River. Compacts and contracts have been entered into by the States and the United States. There is a wide difference in the interpretation of these documents by officials of the States of Arizona and California. The project water supply from the Colorado River is dependent on the validity of the interpretations by officials of Arizona.

"(c) The potential development, as outlined, would serve the needs of the area to the full extent of Arizona's asserted entitlement. The supplemental irrigation water made available in Arizona would prevent a one-third loss of the productive capacity of the farm land that has been in cultivation. Domestic water supplies would be improved. The hydro power that could be made available would result in a saving of about 6,000,000 barrels of oil annually. Many other needs would be served or supplemented by the potential development.

"(d) Under provisions of the bill now under consideration the project would pay out. The benefits exceed the costs by a ratio of more than 1.59. Experience and history have proven that the strengthening of a weak unit of our national economy adds to the strength of the whole, both in normal times and in emergencies; the central Arizona project has been designated for such purpose" (p. 417).

A great portion of the testimony at the hearings was devoted to the question of the legal availability of this water. If the amendments adopted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are adopted by the House Public Lands Committee, the necessity for the consideration of this problem is removed, because the bill as amended by the Senate committee would not authorize appropriations for construction of the Havasu pumping plants and the Granite Reef aqueduct until ample opportunity was given to California or any other State who thought its rights were being jeopardized to bring a suit, in which the United States might be made a part defendant, to determine whether or not, legally, water was available for use in Arizona by the proposed project.

Mr. Larson's statement is substantiated by other witnesses on the various elements involved:

1. Barry M. Goldwater, pages 207–211.

The geographical description of the Colorado River is contained in the statement of Barry M. Goldwater. Mr. Goldwater is one of the few men who have been down the river in a boat several times.

2. (a) Wayne M. Akin, pages 63–79.

Mr. Akin gave a history of the development of central Arizona and the use of surface and underground water and the necessity of supplemental water. For specific reference as to the declining supply of underground water see page 68. Mr. Akin says:

"I am very conscious of the impending disaster, not only financial, but to social and human values which are painfully real to those of us who can see homes and whole towns facing desolation unless this problem is solved" (p. 69).

He further pointed out that the project is not a grant but is self-liquidating. Page 69. Then he summarizes his statement as follows:

"The Congress should enact H. R. 934 because—

"1. It will preserve nationally important existing agricultural values, both economic and social.

"2. It will provide development of great national power resources, important not only to the peacetime economy, but of real urgency from a military standpoint as we face the new atomic age.

"3. It will stabilize an already developed area which is capable of sustaining a large population and which is geographically located for defense.

"4. It is self-liquidating within the economic unit of the State of Arizona.

"5. It will create a permanent national asset of tremendous proportions and provide the base for a perpetual large source of Federal taxes" (pp. 69–70).

(b) D. L. Stapley, pages 79–86.

Mr. D. L. Stapley, vice president and general manager of the O. S. Stapley Co., a native of Arizona, recites the early history of the central Arizona development and tells what the project means from the standpoint of a businessman in Arizona and to the business of the Nation as a whole. Of particular interest is a table which he submits showing purchases by his company from firms outside the State. Page 83. These show purchases from October 1, 1945, to March 31, 1948, by this firm alone, to the total amount of $5,852,000. He points out that their business is largely with farmers, cattle ranchers, contractors, industrial organizations, and transportation concerns; that the shortage of water affects all these classes of business; that businessmen are now reluctant to make additional investments until the water problem is solved. He supplements this statement by including in the record communications from the Allison Steel Co. and Pratt-Gilbert Hardware Co., of like tenor.

(c) Francis I. Curtis, pages 95–98.

Francis I. Curtis, a farmer, residing in the Eloy area, gave an early history of the development in that section and the necessity of the project for saving it. His testimony concludes with the following statement:

"Without supplemental water for these lands, investments by individuals, businessmen, and farmers like myself, amounting to over $15,000,000 in this community alone, will revert to the picture which greeted me over 33 years ago when I first saw the Casa Grande Valley. In my own case it will mean the loss of the lifetime effort of two generations, my father's and mine.

"Now if we are unsuccessful in our mission here, it will be that same mule that will be taking our youngsters to school. Perhaps from him, this hybrid who boasts neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, our children may absorb enough of that stubborn determination, courage, and hardiness to enable them to start over again" (pp. 96–97).

(d) A. Van Wagenen, Jr., pages 98–103.

Mr. Van Wagenen further supplied and emphasized facts relating to the situation in the Casa Grande and Eloy area.

(e) Jesse A. Udall, pages 103–107.

Mr. Jesse A. Udal, attorney at law, of Thatcher, Ariz., testifying as a lay witness and property owner and farmer, explained the situation existing in the Safford and Duncan valleys, showing the shortage of water in those valleys. The fact that over 6,500 acres of land was idle and unproductive in the year 1948 on account of the shortage of water; and that the yield of some of the cultivated land was so small that operation was at a loss; and that the only salvation was the use of more Gila River water, which could only be accomplished by an exchange with downstream users which could only take place if Colorado River water was available.

(f) John M. Jacobs, pages 107–113.

Mr. John M. Jacobs, a farmer, of Phoenix, Ariz., outlined Arizona production of fruits and vegetables, showing the cash return last year in these items of $50,000,000, explaining that this resulted in a cash pay roll of eighteen to twenty million dollars and required the use of fertilizer imported from other States in the amount of approximately $1,250,000; that this industry represented an investment of approximately $5,000,000 in farm equipment, trucks, power equipment, etc., all of which is supplied by the major national equipment companies of the Midwest and East. He pointed out that:

"We rely entirely on irrigation, and even a slight shortage in our water supply can cut our yield so low that the high labor and other production costs make it prohibitive to maintain our present acreage of these essential crops. All acreage is planted according to the amount of water available per acre and full production cannot be made on less than 4 acre-feet of water per acre per year on this land. We have developed to its fullest extent the available water supply for land now in cultivation in central Arizona, and we have only one place to look for supplemental water to maintain our present production, and that is to the Colorado River.

"The vegetable industry, due to its intensive nature and the large amount of hand work necessary, employs more labor per acre than any other type of agriculture. A small vegetable farm will carry many employees and their families. During the housing shortage, scarcity of transportation, and rationing of gasoline and tires, most of the vegetable growers had to provide housing on their farms for a large percent of their employees. A water shortage, cutting down the production of these crops, is bound to cause displacement of many families now established either as operators or employees on these farms" (p. 109).

He emphasized the seriousness of the situation, the diminishing underground water supply, the present power shortage. He also commented on the production of sugar-beet seed in Arizona, a subject in which Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, was apparently very much interested. This subject was gone into more fully in a prepared statement submitted by Dean Stanley, of Phoenix.

(g) Dean Stanley (pp. 216–220).

In his statement, Mr. Stanley says:

"Since January 1, 1941, after which it was impossible to import sugar-beet seed from Europe, central Arizona has produced 53,434,450 pounds. Last year, in 1948, we produced 12,584,220 pounds, or nearly enough seed to meet the annual requirements of the entire sugar-beet industry of the Nation.

"We grow and supply practically all of the seed from which sugar beets are produced in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. We also ship our seed to California, Utah, Nebraska, and most of the beet-sugar producing areas of the United States and Canada. A large quantity of our seed has been exported to the European countries since the end of the war.

"In the production of sugar-beet seed a considerable amount of water is required, from 4 to 5 acre-feet, in order to produce a satisfactory crop. Since we have available, and are allotted only 2 acre-feet of water for the year 1949 in the Salt River project, it is necessary to abandon crop production of approximately 1½ acres for each acre of sugar-beet seed being produced.

"Central Arizona has the soil and climatic conditions particularly well adapted to the production of sugar-beet seed. Experimental crops have been grown in many other areas, but no other section of the United States has yet been found which can approach central Arizona in the number of pounds or the quality and vitality of seed produced on our farms.

"The sugar consumers of the entire country—and that means all of us—and our great sugar-beet industry would be placed in a very precarious position if we farmers in central Arizona are forced to discontinue the production of sugar-beet seed, because of insufficient water" (p. 217).

(h) Victor I. Corbell, pages 113–129.

Mr. Victor I. Corbell, a farmer and member of board of governors of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, presented a very comprehensive statement showing the development of the Salt River Water Users' Association, one of the oldest irrigation projects of the West, containing 242,000 acres of land, explaining that this project had probably the best water supply in the State, but were able to deliver both from surface and pumping about two-thirds the amount required for full irrigation, which he estimated at 4 acre-feet per acre per year. He explained that the use of water increased in the project during the last 25 years, that this was due in part to the change of crops grown and in part on account of more intensive cultivation. He pointed out the character of the crops grown in the project and stated there is a direct relation to the amount of crops and water available. He gave some interesting statistics on carload shipments of fruit and vegetables in Arizona and the amount of freight paid for such shipments, which was approximately $20,000,000 in 1947. He said:

"Unless a supplemental water supply is brought into the area, a large part of the land must go out of cultivation. Whenever that happens, the allied industries of necessity will have to wither and die. People in such communities try to hang on. They are unable to pay their taxes or to support the community. In fact, the community has to support them.

"It means the raising of taxes, the closing of schools, empty stores and houses, and everything else that goes with a decadent condition. The only things that increase under such conditions are poverty and crime. If that happens which must happen, namely, to permit a large part of the cultivated area to revert to desert in central Arizona, the loss to the United States Government each year in taxes would, in my opinion, be more than sufficient to service the debt on the cost of the central Arizona project" (p. 119).

On cross-examination, Mr. Corbell particularly emphasized that the average farm holding in the Salt River Valley water project was 18 acres per person (p. 128) and that there were very few cases where the holdings exceeded 160 acres; that this was a a Federal reclamation project and they were trying to enforce the 160-acre limitation. Mr. Corbell appears on pages 113–129.

Other witnesses testified concerning particular portions of the project:

(i) K. K. Henness, pages 129–142.

Mr. K. K. Henness, county agricultural agent, of Casa Grande, Ariz., illustrated his testimony with pictures of some farms in the Coolidge and Casa Grande area which were not being farmed because of lack of water. He stated that, since the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River was built, the San Carlos project, which was supposed to be supplied from that dam, had never received full water supply. That dam was finished and dedicated in 1930. Over a period of years since the project was completed, the average water delivered was about 2 acre-feet per acre, or about one-half the supply necessary.

(j) J. A. Roberts, pages 211–216.

The situation in the San Carlos project was given somewhat more in detail by the statement submitted by J. A. Roberts, farmer, of Coolidge, Ariz. He pointed out that gravity lands under the San Carlos project consisted of about 100,000 acres, 50,000 acres of privately owned land and 50,000 acres of Indian owned lands; that the project was operated and administered under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Office of Indian Affairs. He emphasized that the San Carlos Reservoir was almost dry, and that the only irrigation water received by land under that project at that time was pump water, and that this would not amount to more than 20 percent or 30 percent of an adequate supply. He showed the total yearly allotment of stored water in a table set forth on page 214. This table shows that the allotment for 1946 and 1947 was 1 acre-foot per acre, and in 1948, 0.80 of an acre-foot per acre. This was stored and pumped water. This project is a federally built project, and the water supply for the project has never been sufficient. This situation was further emphasized by the testimony of two full-blooded Pima Indians.

(k) David A. Johnson, Sr., pages 189–199.

(l) Alfred Jackson, pages 203–206.

The testimony of these two men who live and farm on the reservation discloses that the Indians on this reservation, numbering about 5,000, are trying desperately to make a living with an inadequate water supply. The average holdings are 10 acres per person. For the past two seasons, it has only been possible to farm approximately 30 percent of the 50,000 acres which can be farmed if an adequate supply of water is made available for the Indian reservation land.

Among the other witnesses testifying were:

(m) C. H. McKellips, of Mesa, pages 220–223.

(n) R. J. Hight, vice president of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, pages 223–225.

(o) Nat M. Dysart, vice president and manager, Arizona Milk Producers, Phoenix, Ariz., pages 225–226.

(p) A. T. Jones, pages 379–384.

Mr. A. T. Jones, of Buckeye, Ariz., testified with reference to the necessity of drainage and salt regulation in the lower end of the valley.

(q) W. W. Lane, pages 467–489.

Mr. W. W. Lane, consulting engineer, Phoenix, Ariz., presented full and complete data with respect to the irrigation development of central Arizona and its need for additional supply if the existing civilization is to be sustained. As a part of his testimony, he submitted several tables, showing the irrigation in the areas involved, the acreage of each, existing storage facilities, emphasizing the historically short water supply, analysis chart showing pumping and diversions. His testimony points out that the land in the area is owned by thousands of individuals and a supplemental water supply is needed or a considerable portion of this land must go out of cultivation. He then concludes with the following statement:

"As these lands go out for lack of water or because the cost exceeds the income, it means farm families become destitute, and the loss of business in the area is proportionate, causing more destitution. The lands will be foreclosed for mortgages or sold for taxes. In time, due to the lack of pumping under these conditions, the underground water will rise. This will encourage new people to take up the lands.

"They and business will prosper for a period, and the process of gradual failures will be repeated. Therefore, a supplemental water supply for this area is a must if the civilization as now exists is maintained and if tragic losses and experience are prevented for the generations to come.

"It is therefore evident that without additional water from the Colorado River, being the only remaining source and found feasible by the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the central Arizona project, and to which Arizona is justly entitled, the entire economy of the area must be seriously affected, and to the detriment of the national economy." Page 477.

Supplementing Mr. Larson's testimony with reference to physical availability of the water is the testimony of—

E. B. Debler, pages 489–517.

Mr. Debler is a consulting engineer for Arizona. His testimony is very complete and contains detailed data and information on which his conclusions are based. He shows clearly that the water is in the river for the project; that the only question is the legal right to use the water.

Supplementing Mr. Larson's statement for the necessity of additional hydroelectric power development, the statement of—

K. S. Wingfield, pages 228–235.

Mr. Wingfield is the engineering consultant to the Arizona Power Authority. He makes analysis of power markets, power sources, and probable costs; shows the cost of steam generation, which is far in excess of the proposed rate used for Bridge Canyon power. He submits a chart showing the result of a State-wide power survey, and observes that this report shows some provision must be made for energy requirement after 1952. He pointed out that the increased power demand in Arizona would enable Arizona to absorb all firm commercial energy likely to be available from Bridge Canyon Dam in its second year of operation, assuming four units installed; estimated that the demand would be greater by 1956, and by 1960 the Arizona market would be able to absorb the full estimated output of firm commercial power from Bridge Canyon Dam.

Supplementing Mr. Larson's testimony on the question of economic feasibility, are the statements of:

(a) Walter Bimson, president of the Valley National Bank, Phoenix, Ariz., pages 142–155.

(b) L. G. Galland, vice president of the Valley National Bank, Phoenix, Ariz., pages 156–158.

(c) A report of the Doane Agricultural Service, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., pages 554–574.

This report, made at the request of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, is very full and complete. It contains maps showing the area in question, pointing out that the area is a proven irrigation area; that the farmer can afford to pay $4.75 per acre foot for the water (558); showing the value of an additional acre-foot of water on alfalfa (560); demonstrating that Federal tax will repay much of the costs (560–561); pointing out that the project area is an important factor in the national economy (562); emphasizing that the proposed project is a national defense project (563); that the project will save existing productive capacity, save wealth, and be of permanent value (563–565). The report next proceeds with a detailed discussion of the facilities of the proposed project; and then with the kind and character of crops grown on the project, and the need for such crops as health foods (567–570, inclusive). It points out that the area will supply food deficits and not surpluses (570), and concludes with this statement:

"This appraisal of the economic feasibility of the central Arizona project for irrigation purposes has revealed only two major questions: Should the Federal Government make the investment? Will farmers be able to

pay $4.75 per acre-foot of water over a 78-year period?

"Although it is not possible to know what may be the conditions over such a long span of years, the economic trends of the past indicate that this project is a sound investment—both for the Government and for the farmers in the project area.

"The long-time upward trend in general price levels will lighten the repayment load for the farmers in the latter part of the period. The water costs are high. They are much higher than the average costs of irrigation water for the United States. The Colorado River water cannot be had at bargain rates for this project.

"But this is not bargain-counter land. It will be worth the cost. Those who own and farm such highly productive land can consistently pay high costs for the water that is necessary to farm the land.

"When the Louisiana Purchase was made 145 years ago, there was vigorous opposition to the high cost. The rapid progress of the Nation soon revealed how wise was the investment.

"This is another proposed long-time investment. The pressing need for health foods with which to feed our rapidly growing population may be such that long before the 78-year repayment period has elapsed, the wisdom of financing this development will have been justified many times," page 573.

The legal questions involved are discussed by:

(a) Cleon T. Knapp, pages 159–178.

(b) Charles A. Carson, pages 519, 618, 657, and 662.

As heretofore pointed out, the testimony involving the legal controversy will become moot if the House committee adopts the same amendment as the Senate committee has already adopted.

This analysis covers Arizona's presentation as a proponent of the bill, but does not cover rebuttal testimony offered by Arizona at the conclusion of California's case.

War Taxes Cut Employment, Sales—Congress Should Repeal Them Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by A. G. Mezerik appeared in the current issue of Sales Management. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WAR TAXES CUT EMPLOYMENT, SALES—CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL THEM NOW

(By A. G. Mezerik)

The President has said many times and from many platforms that he is dedicated to maintaining employment and purchasing power. Members of Congress have expressed equal determination. However, action speaks louder than words. Spot unemployment does exist in this country. It can be materially alleviated by the simple action of repealing the wartime excise taxes—an action which would be more than economic in its significance.

Those wartime taxes are causing unemployment right now. Go to Attleboro and Waltham, Mass., to Providence, R. I., to New York City, and to any number of other centers where are made jewelry, furs, luggage, cosmetics, and many other articles subject to wartime taxes. You will find large-scale unemployment. Businessmen, union leaders, State and city officials have streamed into Washington to tell Congress that their industries are closed down, that men are out of work, and that unemployment payments are mounting to unprecedented heights. They bring indisputable proof that this sorry and dangerous state of affairs is attributable in large part to the wartime taxes, which are responsible for doing much to price the products right out of the consumer's reach. No one in Washington argues against the proof. Treasury Secretary Snyder, as long ago as May 1947, said, "There are some areas of the excise tax which are oppressive now and ought to be relieved." Every Congressman who made any statement at all on these taxes has agreed, immediate relief is essential. But nothing has been done.

Though the President, back in 1946, said he was in favor of removing the wartime taxes, he has recently reversed himself, on the theory that the Government—operating at a deficit—needs all the income which it can get. Someone, perhaps in his Council of Economic Advisers, ought to tell the President about that tax revenue. It is behaving like an ice cube in the sun. The Bureau of Internal Revenue reported that in just 1 year, the last fiscal year, excise tax revenue from the fur business had dropped $36,000,000 over the previous highest year—a drop of more than 36 percent. The jewelry field registered a decline of $26,000,000. Cosmetics and luggage also produced less than before. That is not just handwriting on the wall, it is sign language that ought to be as legible as a neon light on Broadway.

Nor is this a matter which affects just a few people in only a few industries. Every sales executive can testify to that, since a large part of the transportation tax—one of the wartime taxes—is paid by salesmen. The average company subscribing to this magazine employs 40 salesmen. Each of these men spends an estimated $25 per each week for taxed transportation. On that basis the cost to each company for the tax alone is probably over $7,000 in a year. A sales manager, watching his rising costs, may well have to reduce the number of men he travels—which would not only lower national business activity but decrease the amount of taxes derived by the Government. Theaters and cabarets are another example involving upped wartime taxes, where the current effect on patronage, profits and employment is serious.

We submit that if it is tax revenue the President is looking for, he is flogging the wrong horse. It is true that the very industries which are now slumping because of these wartime taxes can be made to produce more revenue, but not the President's way. If the President and the Congress will repeal these taxes and enable these industries to attain maximum sales and production, the combined income taxes—paid by the corporations, stockholders, executives and workers—will probably equal the revenue gleaned from the wartime taxes. Meanwhile, both excise and income taxes are being lost—for reasons easy to understand.

"Ability to pay" is the first rule of taxation. The wartime excise taxes violate that rule. A man who feels able to pay $20 for a piece of luggage will often refuse to pay $24 for the same bag. A woman willing to spend $250 for a fur coat, is frequently unable to spend $300 for the same coat. The President and the Congress have constantly urged business to reduce its prices so consumers will be able and willing to buy. Why then does not the Government take this simple necessary step to reduce prices over this wide field of goods and services?

Even those more fortunate other consumers who are able to pay 20 percent more than the marked price for the things they want, are not buying—and for this too the Congress is largely responsible. Rumor after rumor that these wartime taxes will soon be removed emanates from Washington. With every rumor the trickle of sales dries up while the consumer waits—in vain. Manufacturers go without orders, stockholders without profits, workers without wages, and the Government without tax revenue. If that is a way either to tax revenue or to maintain employment we admit to being sockoed by the midsummer heat.

The delayed punch which adds as much as 20 percent to the marked price of a wide variety of goods is knocking out employment, as Governor Bowles, the New Deal Democrat, and Governor Dewey, the GOP standard bearer, can both testify. Towns and cities in Connecticut, Bowles' State, are in the doldrums. The fur business, centered in New York City, is fast approaching the window-jumping stage. For the governors of the affected States the issue cuts across party lines. Yet neither party takes any action. This evidence of politically induced unemployment has its grimly humorous side, since these are the very industries where the proportion of labor cost to total cost is highest. These are the handicraft industries where the worker is much more in evidence than the machine. More in evidence, that is, when he works, which he isn't doing now, nor is he likely to be doing in the near future unless these taxes are removed.

The public has a right to demand the repeal of these taxes. Plainly and unmistakably the 1943 law said that the newly imposed taxes would be removed 6 months after hostilities ceased. Not 6 years but 6 months. And at least one House of Congress did make an effort in the tax bill of 1945 to fulfill what Congressman DINGELL correctly described as "a pledge to the people." The House voted the repeal of all wartime taxes, but the pledge and the promise were abandoned in the conference of both Houses, and the public continued to pay.

WAR-TAX AIMS OUT OF DATE

We continue to pay taxes most of which were not imposed with the primary purpose of obtaining revenue. The tax on transportation was designed to discourage travel on trains needed for arms and troops. The tax on luggage was imposed to conserve leather, wood, brass, steel, and cotton, all of which were necessary to the war effort. On a good many other articles the idea was to divert the industry and its highly skilled workers to war work. On still others the main object was to counter inflation, to keep masses of consumers with plenty of money from bidding up the prices of scarce goods. Nor was the idea that of taxing luxuries. To settle that question just ask a traveling man whether his bag is a luxury that he can do without, or better yet, ask your wife why she does not give up her handbag, her face powder, and her cold cream.

On the record—and in comparison with a total budget of $40,000,000,000—the wartime taxes yield very little revenue. They are injurious to productive activity. They discriminate against certain products irrationally. They are difficult in their administration and compliance. They are obnoxious and unfair to consumers. They cause hardships and promote depression—yet there they stand. They stand in spite of consumer resistance evidenced at every retail counter. They stand while the number of unemployed in these affected industries mounts and while governors and city officials spend sleepless nights trying to figure out how they will carry vastly increased relief and unemployment compensation loads. They stand while many manufacturers in these industries helplessly look on—for there are grave limitations to what ingenuity and

sales effort can do until the tax is removed. And they stand as the retailer watches his dollar volume go down week after week.

OPPOSITION IS WIDESPREAD

Opposition to retaining the taxes is almost universal. Just this last week full-page ads appeared in the New York Times and other papers urgently appealing to the President to repeal these taxes at once. Documented by Beardsley Ruml and quoting a repeal resolution passed at the last CIO convention, the appeal was signed by a list more varied than has been seen working together on a proposition of this kind in a very long time. Not only the fur and jewelry merchants who have a direct interest in the repeal of the taxes, but the American Retail Federation, the associations of hardware, dry goods, furniture, shoes and almost every other kind of merchant were on that list, as were the gas appliance manufacturers and the trappers and farmers of the South. This was new proof that the issue affects everybody and is uniting them for action, no matter how great or how small were their areas of agreement and disagreement previously. America is feeling the burden and the injustice of this excessive taxation, and is expressing itself from left to right and back again.

Those who want the taxes repealed are from every walk of life, ranging from women's clubs and trade-unions to hundreds of trade organizations, almost every sales organization and the heads of businesses—big and little. Almost never has there been an issue on which so many Americans are in agreement. Yet their needs are not heeded. Instead, in a kind of double-talk familiar to humid Washington, legislators talk of the necessity of encouraging spending, of utilizing our plant capacity and of the abundance of materials.

You would think that the Congress and the President, with so many words and so many speeches on the dangers of depression to their credit, would remedy the situation at once and take the obvious course to repeal the onerous taxes now. But no, we are now told that action to repeal the wartime taxes will not be taken before Congress adjourns. Congress passes the buck to the President and he moves the day for action off to some future indefinite time. We are not of a highly suspicious nature, but we cannot help wondering in the face of the facts—if the reason for retaining this tax is perhaps less because it brings income (which incidentally might be sought with more success from tax-exempt universities and foundations who own and operate macaroni factories and many other competitive businesses) than because of the Washington temperament which seems to find it impossible to remove any tax once it is on the books.

Whatever the reasons for this failure to take a simple action necessary to maintaining a high level of prosperity and essential to fulfilling a long-standing promise—one thing is clear. In not removing the wartime excise taxes now, without further delay, the President and the Congress are shirking their responsibility. There is a penalty for this evasion of duty and unfortunately it must be paid. The citizens who work in and own the industries which are now in the doldrums are already paying it. It will be paid primarily by small business, for furs, jewelry, and luggage manufacturers are all part of that world of small business which gets so much political lip service and so little action from Washington. Finally the penalty will be paid by retailers and consumers everywhere in the 48 States.

It need not be that way. There is still time for Congress before this session adjourns to repeal this wartime expedient. That would be the thing to do to encourage spending, to provide more employment and more business and to stop local distress from becoming a creeping economic danger to the national economy. It would be the thing to do to provide more revenue. Most of all it would be the thing to do to show that the political leaders of this country do live up to their moral commitments.

On every count we believe that the Congress should heed the voices raised against these wartime taxes. We urge the Congress and the President to stop stalling—to make good on their pledge to the American people by taking a sound economic step. And we urge you—our reader—to say to your Congressman today by wire or phone—"Repeal the wartime taxes now—before Congress adjourns."

The World Is Crying for Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the call for good money echoes down through the corridors of time.

There is inserted herewith the plea of national leaders for a sound, adequate, workable money system, coming to us down through the ages:

A. D. 1949

Until the world is able to use one standard of exchange again, whether it be in gold alone or in gold and silver related to one another in specific proportions, there can be no economic stability in the United States or elsewhere.

—*David Lawrence.*

A. D. 1933

The United States seeks the kind of dollar which a generation hence will have the same purchasing and debt paying power as the dollar value we hope to attain in the near future.

—*Franklin D. Roosevelt.*

A. D. 1932

Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar, one just to debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power, preventing uncontrolled inflation or the disastrous effects of deflation.

—*National Grange platform.*

A. D. 1930

To show you what our smart men know they led us to believe that the world was coming to an end when England lost her gold standard.

Now we come to find out that things are picking up on what they thought was a calamity. Other nations are going to silver voluntarily.

Sure, use silver for money. Use as many things as you can for money and the more trading and business will be done. Astor made a fortune trading chewing tobacco for skunk skins.

Poor Bryan, he ran for President just 38 years too soon.

—*Will Rogers.*

A. D. 1928

Former Finance Minister Joseph Caillaux, who was largely responsible for planning what Raymond Poincare accomplished in stabilizing the franc on a new gold basis, has come out as an advocate of the rehabilitation of silver as monetary metal as the only right solution to the present disequilibrium of prices and money. M. Caillaux is among those of France who foresee great danger for French and other industries in the depreciation of sterling.

There is only one remedy. It is not that there should be any redistribution of gold, as is being childishly suggested. Gold has its own law which it obeys. What must be done is that another monetary metal should be joined to it.

Platinum has been suggested. I would prefer that silver, which was stupidly demonetized, should be rehabilitated.

—*Joseph Caillaux,*
French Minister of Finance.

A. D. 1896

By unlimited coinage of silver, we mean just such a coinage of silver as we now have of gold. We have unlimited coinage of gold. Any man in the world can have gold coined at our mints, no matter how little he brings, no matter how much he brings. They simply take his gold and stamp it and hand it back to him. That is what we want for silver. Today there is not an ounce of gold in all this world that is excluded from our mints. Any man in the world who has an ounce of gold can bring it to our mints and have it coined into money and use that money as he pleases. We want unlimited coinage of silver so that there will not be one ounce of silver in all this world that will be excluded from the mints of the United States.

* * * * *

If the use of gold alone is to make us slaves, let us use both metals and be free.

—*W. J. Bryan.*

A. D. 1893

Section 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

—*United States Congress.*

A. D. 1886

If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed, if it has been restricted, I am in favor of having it enlarged. The two metals have existed side by side in harmonious, honorable companionship as money ever since intelligent trade was known among men. It is well nigh 40 centuries since "Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, 400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant." Since that time nations have risen and fall-

en, races have disappeared, dialects and languages have been forgotten, arts have been lost, treasures have perished, continents have been sunk in the sea and through all these ages and through all these changes silver and gold rank supreme, as the representative of value, as the media of exchange. The dethronement of each has been attempted in turn and sometimes the dethronement of both, but always in vain and here we are today deliberating anew over the problem which comes down to us from Abraham's time, the weight of the silver—that shall be "current money with the merchant."

—*James G. Blaine.*

A. D. 30

And Jesus went into the temple of God and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple and overthrew the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold doves and said unto them "It is written My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

—*Jesus of Nazareth, The Bible, Matthew, 21: 12, 13.*

Decartelization Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the September-October 1949 edition Prevent world war III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.:

THE FARCE OF DECARTELIZATION

The American people's aversion to cartels and trusts is a historical fact. Some of our more popular politicians have climbed the ladder to success as trust busters. It would be hard to find a political aspirant publicly condoning cartels.

The knowledge that the people have always regarded cartel combinations as violating the democratic tradition was undoubtedly one of the major motives which impelled the former Secretary of War, Kenneth C. Royall, to appoint a three-man committee to investigate the cartel situation in Germany. That he had to take this action was quite a concession on his part, inasmuch as, in January 1947, he had publicly declared that the pernicious cartels in Germany were abolished.

It remained for his three-man committee, commonly known as the Ferguson committee, to shatter in 1949 the illusion created by Mr. Royall's boast in 1947. In a 129-page report, this committee examined in detail the decartelization program. It concluded that: "The decartelization program, despite uncontroverted policies and clear directives has not been effectively carried out. After almost 4 years of occupation and 2 years of operation under an adequate law, the program has not proceeded very far."

This was a remarkable example of understatement, for the contents of the report are far more explicit and revealing. Actually, the decartelization program was never implemented, nor has there been any significant progress in the breaking up of the huge German trusts.

Certainly the failure to carry out the Government's decartelization and deconcentration program cannot be charged to the inadequacies of the program itself. This is confirmed by the Ferguson report, which found that the Government's directives and laws were practicable and workable, as well as necessary. The cause for the pitiful performance, therefore, must be found elsewhere.

It is common knowledge that a good program can be ruined by unwilling hands, while a bad program can be made to work favorably, if it is managed by men who sincerely seek fruitful results. In the case of the decartelization program, we have a very clear picture of a perfectly practical program, allowed to go to pot by a handfull of willful men who arrogantly ignored, yes, and even sabotaged the directives which they were supposed to carry out.

The characters in this case are Messrs. William Draper (vice president of Dillon Read, which financed hundreds of millions to German heavy industry after World War I), Lawrence Wilkinson (Draper's successor as economic adviser to General Clay), Philip Hawkins (Wilkinson's deputy and son-in-law of General Draper), and Richardson Bronson (directly in charge of the decartelization branch of the American military government).

These men admittedly took it upon themselves to stymie decartelization and deconcentration of German industry. In testimony before the committee, Mr. Wilkinson admitted that he was opposed to Law No. 56, which called for the deconcentration of German industry. He further admitted that the important measures on demilitarization, reparations, restitution, denazification, and decartelization could not fail to have a most disruptive effect upon economic reconstruction of Germany.

He admitted that in numerous "conversations" with members of the decartelization branch and other officials of the military government, he had expressed "the fear that the blanket application of the antitrust doctrines of the United States to the German economy would not only be futile but would also retard German recovery."

Mr. Philip Hawkins also expressed his opposition to the deconcentration and decartelization program. Likewise, Mr. Bronson. These young men were General Draper's disciples and received their inspiration from him.

When the Ferguson committee asked Mr. Draper whether he opposed the decartelization policy, he replied with an air of challenge, "I certainly did." Elaborating, Draper remarked, "In a general way I certainly believe that reparations naturally reduced production and reduced economy; and denazification, by taking some of the management away, even though it was desirable, it certainly took some of the brains away. Decartelization, if carried to extremes, would do the same, and I held those views."

In this brief statement General Draper explained a great deal, not only with regard to decartelization, but to the general development of the occupation since the close of the war. Holding these views as General Clay's top economic adviser, is it any wonder that the basic principles for the treatment of Germany, as established by the Government and the President of the United States, were emasculated beyond recognition?

More than that, General Draper told the committee that he had expressed his opinions to General Clay. In short, General Clay was fully aware of the fact that his top adviser opposed the directives, which both were supposed to have carried out as coming from the Government of the United States and its elected officials.

Unfortunately, the Ferguson committee ignored this significant fact that shifted the responsibility to subordinate officials, when actually it was General Clay himself who should have been held responsible.

When General Eisenhower was confronted by officials who were trying to undermine American policies in Germany, he warned that such officials would be removed.

Apparently, General Clay preferred to retain outspoken opponents of American policy in Germany. By so doing he gave General Draper and his protégés carte blanche and they proceeded with diligence to tie up in knots the decartelization and deconcentration programs. They did so through many devious methods; they deliberately stalled; they tried to propagandize their views among other officials; they encouraged red tape in proceedings against German concerns that came under the regulations of decartelization and deconcentration.

In order to avoid being charged with dereliction of duty they began proceedings against the German Linoleum Trust. Whether they be in the consumer-goods industries or in the heavy industries, trusts are objectionable and should be broken up, but the shift of emphasis to the consumer-goods industries was only camouflage for dereliction of duty. The Linoleum Trust was indeed a monopoly in the consumer-goods industry, but, after all, Hitler didn't build his war machine with linoleum. The backbone of Germany's war potential cannot be found in the carpet factories of Germany but rather in the concentration and cartelization of the heavy industries. However, even in the case of this bold attack against linoleum, nothing resulted. Thus, in the consumer industry, as well as the heavy industries, the score was zero.

It is strange that so little was done when so much is known about the German cartels and their nefarious role in spawning wars and creating havoc among the economies of other nations. The decartelization branch itself had undertaken and made a thorough study of the German cartel network. It compiled a three-volume Report on German Cartels and Combines, and a companion volume, Germany's Major Industrial Combines. In addition, as the Ferguson committee shows, numerous other studies were made which provided a wealth of information upon which the American military government could act. These studies gather dust because the men who were charged with the task of breaking up the cartel network were too busy discrediting the program.

The Ferguson committee's report is replete with examples of gross failure to eliminate the cartels of Germany. As one reads the report it becomes evident that there is far more information which should be made known than is found in the report itself. Certainly the publication of the report has not disturbed Mr. Wilkinson and his colleagues.

Recently it was reported that the British and United States military governments authorized the creation of powerful cartels for the allocation of industrial goods and the control of imports. According to American antitrust lawyers, these cartels bear close resemblance to the "industrial groups" which ran the show for Hitler's Third Reich. One of General Clay's last acts was to approve this set-up. In contrast, another one of his final acts was to order the trial of Alexander Sacks, an American military government employee who had exposed the incredible sabotage of the decartelization program before the Ferguson committee. This was General Clay's answer to the Ferguson committee. Yet General Clay was given a hero's welcome when he returned, while Alexander Sacks was attacked as being disloyal.

Of course, it doesn't mean that the officials who helped undermine the cartelization program are not worried. Some want to hold on to their jobs even though the Ferguson report itself gives clear proof that new blood is needed. Thus, Mr. Richardson Bronson, the chief of the detcartelization program, has just announced that the United States military government is going to lecture the Germans on the Virtues of Smashing Economic Monopolies. This sounds like a fine project. Just picture Heinrich Kost, Heinrich Dinkelbach, Herman Abs, and the whole crew of Ruhr barons sitting in on these lectures. These Hitler supporters who are the flesh and blood of the German cartels are going to be educated in the democratic way. They are going to be taught the evils of their cartels, and it is probably expected that all of them will stand up, after the lecture series is concluded, and applaud, and say to Mr. Bronson and his staff, "Thank you for your splendid talks. What you have said was a revelation to us and we are going right back to help you liquidate our cartels."

How long will the American people permit sabotage and hypocrisy to squander their most vital interests?

Changes In Transmission Standards Looking Toward Color Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written today by C. B. Jolliffe, executive vice president in charge of RCA Laboratories Division, Radio Corp. of America, to Mr. T. J. Slowie, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission. This letter tells the simple story of a tremendous forward stride in the television art. The free-enterprise system has triumphed again. It has poured a vast sum of its own money into the gigantic problem of giving humanity color television. In doing this it took a great risk. As chairman of the Senate committee having jurisdiction of communications, I extend my sincere congratulations and hearty thanks. RCA is entitled to the gratitude of people everywhere. America has every reason to be proud of RCA and Mr. Jolliffe for this momentous accomplishment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1949.

Mr. T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

Re: Docket Nos. 8736, 8975, 9175, and 8976.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with paragraph 14 (a) of the notice of the Commission in the above proceedings issued July 11, 1949, Radio Corp. of America hereby submits the following comments:

1. Changes in transmission standards looking toward color television.

RCA has developed a new color television system which does not require any changes in present transmission standards.

This new color system is all electronic, has high definition, and operates entirely within a 6-megacycle band.

The system has standards of performance equivalent to the present black-and-white standards both for color and reproduction of the color signals in black-and-white. It accomplishes this in a 6-megacycle channel without any degradation of picture quality.

Our new system is a completely compatible system. It enables present television sets to receive color programs in monochrome without any modification whatever and without any converter or adapter.

Demonstrations will show that when a television transmitter shifts from black-and-white transmission to color transmission on this system, the viewer of an existing black-and-white receiver will be unaware of the shift. On the other hand, by means of this new system, a viewer of a color set receiving programs in color will, when the station changes from color to black-and-white transmission, see black-and-white pictures without making any changes in his receiver.

Thus, with this new RCA color system, the transmitting station can change at will, either from color to black-and-white or the reverse, without disturbing the viewers of either the existing receivers or color receivers, without requiring adjustments to either type of receiver, and therefore without any loss of audience.

Our new color system is also an adaptable system. Color programs can be viewed either on new color receivers or on existing receivers equipped with a color adapter.

This new RCA color system is the fruit of years of research and development. During the last decade RCA has carried on much research and development work looking toward a practical system of color television. During this period our engineers have investigated many systems and studied their advantages and disadvantages. It has been our objective to develop a high definition color system which could be integrated into the existing black-and-white system without obsoleting present transmitters and receivers.

During the hearing in Docket No. 7896, held in 1946–47, RCA demonstrated a simultaneous color system which the Federal Communications Commission recognized as having considerable merit. This system, however, needed further development, and the Commission has been informed at intervals of our progress.

The simultaneous system which we first demonstrated in 1946 requires a minimum of 12 megacycles for transmission and, because of problems of frequency allocation, it was necessary that that system be proposed for operation only at ultrahigh frequencies.

In 1947 and 1948 RCA conducted extensive transmission tests at UHF, among which were the UHF tests in Washington, D. C., during the fall of 1948. Full information on these tests is in the files of the Commission. The results of the UHF propagation tests showed that much more work was needed in the UHF band before reliable public service could be given in that band.

This necessarily involved delay in bringing high definition color television service to the public in the UHF band, not for reasons connected with color, but because of propagation difficulties. At that time we were also concerned because the VHF 6-megacycle channel did not provide color television without degrading the quality of the picture.

Therefore, even before our Washington UHF tests were finished, we began a concerted attack upon the widely accepted conclusion that high definition color television could not be provided in a 6-megacycle channel. The objective of this attack was to develop a method of transmitting color in a 6-megacycle channel without any degradation of the quality of the received picture. At the same time we retained our previous requirement that the system must be completely compatible, that is, present receiving sets would need no modification for reception of color transmissions in monochrome and existing transmitters would continue to be useful.

We are now glad to report the accomplishment of our objectives. We have created a new color television system which has the characteristics described above.

For the studio we utilize the same equipment as we have described in previous hearings for our wide-band simultaneous system. This equipment provides three signals, one for each primary color. Following this and preceding the transmitter modulator, the signals are rapidly sampled electronically in time order for each color and then combined. The resulting single-channel signal is transmitted in time multiplex fashion requiring a total modulation band width of only 4 megacycles.

The head-end radio and intermediate frequency circuits of the receiver are the same as for a current black-and-white receiver. The video signal is then fed to an electronic arrangement which is the inverse of the signal sampler at the transmitter. This results in restoring the three-color signal channels of green, red, and blue, and these are fed in simultaneous-system fashion to a three-color picture reproducing system to be viewed as a single picture.

This RCA color system has the following characteristics:

1. Six-megacycle channel.
2. Fully compatible.
3. Five hundred and twenty-five lines.
4. Sixty fields per second.
5. Field interlaced.
6. Picture dot interlaced.
7. Fifteen color pictures per second.
8. Time multiplex transmission.
9. All electronic.

The same transmitters as are presently used by television stations can be used for the transmission of the RCA color system. The changes required for transmission of the new system are in studio equipment to produce color pictures and the addition of the small amount of electronic equipment required to perform the sampling and time multiplexing.

It is our belief that this new system provides for the first time a sound basis for the bringing of color television service to the public, as well as full scope for the continuing development of color as the art progresses, without involving obsolescence of present-day black-and-white receivers.

During the month of September we will transfer the equipment from our Princeton laboratories to Washington, D. C., where it will be installed in the NBC station (WNBW) at the Wardman Park Hotel. RCA will submit testimony and demonstrations to the Commission regarding this RCA color television system.

This system is entirely consistent with the standards of good engineering practice concerning television broadcasting stations and can be broadcast without modification of these standards. Therefore, RCA does not propose any modification of existing transmission standards.

2. Field intensities, propagation, station separation, and service areas.

RCA will present evidence at the hearing regarding its experimental work on these subjects. This evidence will include the results of our work on carrier synchronization and

offset carrier methods of reducing cochannel interference. Exhibits containing this information will be submitted prior to the hearing. RCA believes that these methods can be effectively used in the public interest for increasing the number of television stations as well as enlarging and improving the service areas of those which the Commission proposes to allocate.

Very truly yours,

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
C. B. JOLLIFFE,
Executive Vice President in Charge of RCA Laboratories Division.

A Proposal for the Rehabilitation of the Sioux Tribes of Indians of North and South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there are 10 reservations in North and South Dakota occupied by Sioux Indians. The standard of living of most of these Indians is far below that of the rural non-Indians of the area. Generally, the resources available to these Indians are inadequate to provide a reasonable standard of living or the ownership of the resources, particularly of land, is in such a complicated status that use by the Indians is difficult where not impossible.

The enrolled population of the Sioux reservations is 34,004 comprising 6,299 family groups. These Indians are located on the following reservations:

	Population	Families
North Dakota:		
Devils Lake	1,142	243
Sisseton	59	(1)
Standing Rock	2,058	(1)
South Dakota:		
Cheyenne River	3,846	660
Crow Creek	1,071	[2] 316
Flandreau	281	45
Lower Brule	682	(2)
Pine Ridge	10,090	1,890
Rosebud	7,221	[3] 1,660
Sisseton	3,118	575
Standing Rock	2,266	910
Yankton	2,170	(3)
Total	34,004	6,299

[1] See South Dakota.
[2] Includes Lower Brule.
[3] Includes Yankton.

PROBLEMS IN LAND TITLES

The reservations occupied by these Indians contain 6,202,408 acres. Of this area, 4,821,416 acres are classed as trust allotted, 1,229,785 acres are in tribal ownership, and 151,207 acres are owned by the Government. Approximately two-thirds of the trust-allotted land is in heirship status.

Indian use of such land is made very difficult because of the large number of heirs to many tracts. Another barrier is the isolation of certain units which are entirely surrounded by non-Indian-owned land. Often plots are too far removed from other Indian-owned land to enable the owners to build up a sufficient acreage for an operating unit without leasing non-Indian-owned land or purchasing additional land.

The following table shows the land area of the various reservations, the ownership status, and the amount of land used by the Indians—1944 figures:

	Present area	Trust allotted	Tribal	Government owned	Area used by Indians
Cheyenne River	1,618,891	899,762	713,126	6,003	525,936
Crow Creek	180,492	158,185	958	21,349	34,539
Devils Lake	55,344	52,094		3,250	12,628
Flandreau	2,741		2,100	641	2,100
Lower Brule	146,695	101,523	30,881	14,291	64,940
Pine Ridge	1,874,611	1,559,305	250,987	64,319	665,371
Rosebud	1,095,667	995,870	71,067	28,730	265,007
Sisseton	119,094	117,900	80	1,114	5,533
Standing Rock	1,064,282	895,987	157,331	10,964	181,966
Yankton	44,591	40,790	3,255	546	8,470
Total	6,202,408	4,821,416	1,229,785	151,207	1,766,490

Income: In 1943 these Indians had an income of $4,708,367, as follows:

	Earned	Unearned	Total	Average per family
Cheyenne River	$251,422	$220,384	$471,806	$715
Crow Creek	102,215	69,613	[1] 171,828	544
Devils Lake	104,601	66,630	171,231	705
Flandreau	32,137	6,015	38,152	848
Pine Ridge	1,012,424	559,325	1,571,749	832
Rosebud	784,065	482,045	[2] 1,266,110	763
Sisseton	111,250	183,815	295,065	513
Standing Rock	368,927	353,499	722,426	794
Total	2,767,041	1,941,326	4,708,367	747

[1] Includes Lower Brule.
[2] Includes Yankton.

SIOUX BELOW AVERAGE INCOME

The average income of 68,640 Indian families in 1943 was $1,071. Low as this income was, it was considerably higher than that of the Sioux Indians.

Not a single Sioux reservation reached the national average Indian-family income.

For the service as a whole 69 percent of Indian income was classed as earned and 31 percent as unearned.

Only 59 percent of the individual Sioux Indian income was earned, and 41 percent was unearned. The unearned income came mainly from land rentals, relief, social-security benefits, and so forth.

This higher percentage of unearned income is traceable to the fact that these Indians do not use a large part of their lands themselves and depend too much for a living on rentals. Failure to use their lands is traceable to the complicated heirship status of so much of their lands which makes it difficult for them to make use thereof.

Although the average family income was $747, because of the distribution of income many families had far less than this amount. It is estimated that approximately half of these Indians had incomes of less than $500.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a tragic and unhealthy situation. It is not good for Mr. Indian, and it is not good for Uncle Sam. The record of the Sioux in our history proves them to be a brave and capable people. Their record of adjustment in the face of discouraging conditions is good. The repayment record on the limited rehabilitation loans that have been made speaks of their capacity and what they could and would do if given a real chance.

OFFERED HERE FOR STUDY

So, Mr. Speaker, noting what has recently been done to rehabilitate the Navajo and other Indians in the Southwest, I asked the Office of Indian Affairs to draft for me legislation which would be calculated to provide a program of rehabilitation to the Sioux Indians.

I have just received the draft of this legislation this afternoon. In view of the fact that the House is about to recess its legislative program and to have limited legislative sessions for the next 3 weeks, I have asked permission to include this tentative draft in my remarks in order that it might be available for study and discussion.

I am not formally introducing the draft as a bill today. It may be that important changes should be made in this draft and will be suggested by the Sioux people or others who are interested in this situation.

In fact, there is to be a great gathering of American Indians at Rapid City, S. Dak., September 21 to 24, at which the problems of the Sioux are to be a principal topic of discussion. I am very anxious that the people who will be there should have the opportunity to study the proposed draft of this bill. Therefore, I place it in these remarks at this point:

TENTATIVE DRAFT OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REHABILITATION OF THE SIOUX TRIBES OF INDIANS OF NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the sums from time to time appropriated under authority of this act, programs of basic economic and other improvements for the benefit of the Cheyenne River, Crow Creek, Devils Lake, Flandreau, Lower Brule, Pine Ridge, Rosebud, Sisseton, Standing Rock, and Yankton Sioux Tribes of Indians of North and South Dakota (hereinafter referred to as the "tribes"). Such programs shall include off-reservation employment and adjustments related to such employment. The purpose of such programs is the rehabilitation of such Indians and the conservation, development, and more efficient utilization of their resources, both physical and human, to the end that Federal services and supervision with respect to such Indians may be discontinued as no longer necessary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, as an addition to the revolving fund created by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), the sum of $50,000,000 to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

Amounts appropriated under the authority of this act shall be reimbursed to the general funds of the Treasury not later than June 30, 1989.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed under such act of June 18, 1934, as amended, is authorized to make loans from amounts appropriated under authority of this act to each of the respective tribes for the purpose of promoting the economic development of the tribe and its members, including loans for housing.

(b) Reimbursement to the United States for any loan made from amounts appropriated under authority of this act shall be made within 35 years from the date on which such loan is made, but in any event not later than June 30, 1989.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative is authorized to make loans to each of the respective tribes from amounts appropriated under authority of this act for the purchase of lands, surface rights, water rights, and interests in lands.

(b) The respective tribes are each authorized to acquire, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, by gift, purchase, relinquishment, exchange, or otherwise, within or without the boundaries of the reservations of the respective tribes, lands, surface rights, water rights, and interests in lands, including improvements thereon. Title to all lands, rights, and interests acquired within the boundaries of the reservations of the respective tribes, shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the particular tribe for which acquired, and shall be exempt from taxation so long as title is held by the United States. Title to all lands, rights, and interests acquired outside the boundaries of the reservations of the respective tribes shall be taken in the name of the particular tribe for which acquired and shall be subject to taxation.

(c) Any lands, rights, and interests in lands purchased or otherwise acquired by the respective tribes, and any other lands owned by the tribes, including lands title to which is in the United States in trust for the tribes, may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, be sold by the particular tribe involved. Such sales shall be made by a tribe only to its members of one-quarter or more degree of Indian blood, and may be made on a deferred-payment plan.

(d) All right, title, and interest of the United States and of the respective tribes in and to the lands, rights, and interests in lands sold shall be released to the purchaser upon final payment of the purchase price, and such land shall thereafter be subject to taxation.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative is authorized to make loans to each of the respective tribes from amounts appropriated under authority of this act (1) for the purchase by each of the respective tribes of livestock to be loaned or sold to members and (2) for cash loans by each of the tribes to its members for the purchase of livestock by such members.

(b) Settlement of obligations arising out of loans or sales of livestock by the tribes to members may be made in livestock or cash. Settlement of obligations arising out of cash loans made by the tribes to members shall be made in cash.

(c) Upon settlement by a member of a tribe of any obligation arising out of the loan or sale of livestock by a tribe to such member, or arising out of any cash loan made by a tribe to such member for the purchase of livestock, such livestock and increase therefrom (except livestock returned to the tribes in settlement of any such obligation) shall be subject to taxation and title thereto shall vest in such member.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative is authorized to use, on a nonreimbursable basis, not to exceed 10 percent of any amounts appropriated under authority of this act, to assist borrowers from the respective tribes during initial periods of operations, and to assist members of the tribes with their educational advancement. No amount authorized to be used under authority of this section shall be used to make payments of principal or interest, or any part thereof, on loans made under authority of this act.

SEC. 7. There shall be a lien against all future per capita payments or other distributions of tribal assets as security for loans made under authority of this act to borrowers from the respective tribes.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the tribal funds now on deposit, or hereafter deposited, in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective tribes, shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the tribe involved and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe such rules and regulations, in addition to the rules and regulations prescribed under the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended, with respect to loans made by him or his authorized representative to the respective tribes, and loans and sales by the respective tribes to members, as may be necessary to secure the United States against financial loss and to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 10. The officials and employees of the respective tribes and all Indians receiving loans under this act residing in the State of North Dakota shall be subject to the criminal laws of the State of North Dakota, and those residing in the State of South Dakota shall be subject to the criminal laws of the State of South Dakota, for misuse, misappropriation, or embezzlement of any of the funds or property provided for in this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

Mr. Speaker, that is the tentative draft prepared in response to my request for a bill that would provide an adequate and sound basis for rehabilitation of the Sioux Indians. It is designed to meet the discouraging rebuffs the Indian GI has found in his attempt to receive the glowing promises held out to veterans in the GI Act, as well as others.

The provisions of the tentative draft of the bill are explained as follows:

Section 1 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of basic economic and other improvements for the benefit of the Sioux Indians in North and South Dakota. Inasmuch as the main asset of these people is land, it is estimated that from 50 to 60 percent of these Indians probably will wish to engage in agricultural activities, including the raising of livestock. Probably an additional 10 percent can be started in various small industries on or near the reservations which will make them self-supporting.

An off-reservation employment program will have to be inaugurated for the balance of the population, with the exception of those which cannot be rehabilitated, such as old and indigent, and who will remain as permanent relief clients. Although statistics are not available, there probably is a much higher percentage of unemployables on the Sioux reservations than normally is found in most communities.

Section 2 authorizes an addition of $50,000,000 to the revolving credit fund created by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 198), to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. It is estimated that the $50,000,000 will be used approximately as follows:

Purchase of land	$20,000,000
Purchase of livestock	15,000,000
Cash loans	15,000,000
Total	50,000,000

Section 3, subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative to make loans to each of the respective Sioux Tribes from amounts appropriated under authority contained in this act. Appropriations made under such authority will be earmarked for loans to the Sioux Tribes. Appropriations, however, will be justified in conjunction with appropriations made under the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934. This procedure will make it unnecessary to establish a separate loan fund on the books of the Treasury Department and will simplify the administration of and accounting for these funds.

Subsection 3 (b) requires that any loans made to the tribes under authority of this act shall be repaid within 35 years from the date the loan is made. Section 2 requires that all funds appropriated under authority of this act shall be reimbursed to the Treasury not later than June 30, 1989. The additional 5-year period between the maturity of a 35-year loan—if such loan were made in 1949—and the outside limitation of June 30, 1989 is to allow time for appropriations to be made and still permit 35-year loans. Any loan made prior to June 30, 1954 would require reimbursement to the Treasury earlier than June 30, 1989. The maturity of any loans made subsequent to June 30, 1954, would, of course, have a shorter maturity than 35 years in order to conform to the over-all requirement that the funds must be reimbursed to the Treasury not later than June 30, 1989.

PAST LOANS HAVE BEEN REPAID WITH INTEREST

With the exception of Crow Creek, Devils Lake, and Sisseton, each of the Sioux Tribes has received a loan from the revolving credit fund created by the act of June 18, 1934. It has not been possible, however, to make loans in the amounts needed by the tribes to rehabilitate their members because of the limited size of the revolving credit fund. A total of $948,000 has been loaned to these tribes of which $216,000 has been repaid, leaving a balance owing of $732,000.

All of these tribes have met their obligations to the United States promptly. They have paid $33,563.71 interest to the United States on these loans.

It is estimated that the $50,000,000 will be used to make loans to the respective tribes as follows:

	Land	Livestock	Cash loans	Total
Cheyenne River	$3,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$5,000,000
Crow Creek	750,000	500,000	250,000	1,500,000
Devils Lake	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Flandreau			100,000	100,000
Lower Brule	250,000	250,000	250,000	750,000
Pine Ridge	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,650,000	14,650,000
Rosebud	3,750,000	3,250,000	3,000,000	10,000,000
Sisseton	1,600,000	500,000	900,000	3,000,000
Standing Rock	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	10,000,000
Yankton	1,150,000	500,000	1,350,000	3,000,000
Total	20,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	50,000,000

These estimates are subject to revision after detailed surveys of the reservations and the needs of the Indians are available.

Section 4, subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary to make loans to each of the respective Sioux Tribes from amounts appropriated under authority of this act for the purchase of lands, surface rights, water rights, and interests in land.

Subsection 4 (b) authorizes the various Sioux Tribes to acquire lands, surface rights, water rights, and interests in lands by various different means. Title to any lands and interests therein acquired within the boundaries of the existing reservations will be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the particular tribe acquiring the land and will be exempt from taxation so long as title is held in the United States. Title to lands, surface rights, water rights, and interests in lands acquired outside the boundaries of the various reservations will be taken in the name of the tribe involved and be subject to taxation.

RESPECTS QUARTER DEGREE OF BLOOD

Subsection 4 (c) authorizes the various tribes, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, to sell any lands, rights, and interests in lands acquired with loans or otherwise to members of the tribe of one-quarter or more degree of Indian blood on a deferred payment plan. The tribes also may sell any of the lands now held in tribal status. Sales of land to members will be made with maturities at the earliest practicable dates consistent with the purchaser's ability to repay.

Subsection 4 (c) provides that when a purchaser makes payment in full for land he shall receive unrestricted title thereto and the land shall then become subject to taxation. This provision looks forward to the discontinuance of Federal services and supervision as stated in section 1.

Section 5, subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary to make loans to the respective tribes for the purchase of livestock. The tribes may purchase livestock and either lend or sell the same to members or make cash loans to members to enable them to purchase livestock. Subsection 5 (b) provides that settlement of obligations resulting from loans or sales of livestock may be made either in kind or in cash but that cash loans may be settled only in cash.

The different procedures authorized for livestock loans in Section 5 are to enable the Indians to choose the type of loan best suited to their particular enterprise.

In most instances, the tribes probably will receive cash loans from the United States with which they will purchase livestock and lend the livestock to members on a repayment "in kind" basis.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and many tribes have been making repayment "in kind" loans for several years and they have proved to be well suited to the needs of the Indians.

Subsection 5 (c) provides that when loans of livestock are repaid to the tribes, either in kind or in cash title thereto shall vest in the borrower and the livestock will then become subject to taxation. This looks forward to the withdrawal of Federal services and supervision from the Sioux Indians.

After the individual members of the tribes repay their loans in full they will then operate their livestock enterprises in much the same manner as any other citizens and pay taxes thereon. In some instances, individual borrowers from the tribes will repay their livestock loans in as short a period as from 8 to 10 years. This will permit considerable "revolving" of livestock loans.

When Indians repay their loans, the repayments will be used to assist other Indians in becoming established. Release of the trust status of livestock will be a gradual process as the individual borrowers become self-supporting and repay their loans.

SIMILAR TO OTHER REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

Section 6 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative to use up to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under authority of this act to assist borrowers from the respective tribes during initial periods of operations and to assist members of the tribes with their educational advancement. Very few of the potential borrowers from the tribes have adequate working capital. They have little security to offer other than recoverable chattels purchased with loans or the land purchased from the tribes.

Generally, loans will have to be made on the basis of character, industry, and plans of the enterprise being financed. In many cases it will be necessary to furnish individuals with some subsistence during the initial periods of their loans. Nonrecoverable items such as feed and seed in many instances will constitute a higher percentage than could be considered a normal credit risk.

Experience has shown that in rehabilitating low-income groups it is impossible to expect borrowers to progress if they are loaded down with debts for unproductive expenses or if they have to leave the operation of their enterprises for extended periods of time to work for wages in order to supply themselves with subsistence. Such wage work usually is available only during the periods when their own enterprises need close attention.

It is very important, in inaugurating a program for the rehabilitation of the Sioux Indians, that they have a clear understanding that when a loan is made, or when they purchase land from the tribes, repayment therefor must be made. However, they should not be burdened with debts for the repayment of nonrecoverable items which will make repayment very difficult and in some cases impossible.

Rehabilitation has proved most successful where it has been possible to make small grants to borrowers for subsistence and operating expenses during initial periods of operation of their enterprises. In the long run, such grants will be less expensive than losses on loans occasioned by discouragement of borrowers when they are overloaded with debt, forcing them to abandon their enterprises and the resultant failure of the effort at rehabilitation.

These funds also will be used to assist Indians with educational expenses in conjunction with loans made for educational purposes.

Section 7 provides that borrowers from the respective tribes shall be required to give liens against any future per capita payments or other distributions of tribal assets as security for loans received from the tribes.

This provision will provide security for loans in addition to the property purchased with loans and will protect the interests of the tribes in loans to the members as well as the interests of the United States in loans to the tribes.

Section 8 provides that tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of any of the Sioux Tribes shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the respective tribes and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative. This provision will grant to the tribes greater responsibility than they now have and will avoid delays in obtaining their funds for use in enterprises which are economically sound.

The tribes may wish to use their own funds for purposes in connection with their economic development programs and to supplement the funds borrowed from the United States. If an appropriation of funds from the Treasury account of the respective tribes must be awaited each time such use is proposed discouragement and loss of opportunity for use of the funds in specific enterprises easily may result.

The following tabulation shows the funds of these tribes which are now on deposit in the United States Treasury:

Cheyenne River	$37,986.36
Crow Creek	7,865.66
Devils Lake	2,468.18
Flandreau	389.99
Lower Brule	5,254.35
Pine Ridge	18,528.31
Rosebud	81,264.94
Sisseton	10,980.89
Standing Rock	32,258.00
Yankton	3,498.97
Total	200,495.65

Section 9 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe rules and regulations in addition to those prescribed under the act of June 18, 1934, as amended, as authorized by section 3 (a) if operations with the particular funds appropriated under this act indicates it is advisable to do so. This section also authorizes the Secretary to prescribe rules and regulations for the sale of land by the tribes as authorized under section 4 (c) and loans and sales of livestock as authorized by section 5.

Section 10 provides that officials and employees of the tribes and Indians receiving loans from the tribes under authority of this act shall be subject to the criminal laws of the States of North and South Dakota, according to their place of residence, for misuse, misappropriation, or embezzlement of any of the funds or property provided for in this act where such offenses are not defined by the laws of the United States, committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations. This section will provide the United States additional protection for the loans made to the tribes as well as additional protection to the tribes for the loans made to their members.

TO PUT THEM ON THEIR FEET

The purpose of this bill is to rehabilitate the Indians, and to develop, conserve, and make more efficient use of their resources, looking forward to the withdrawal of Federal services and supervision.

In short, the objective is to place these Indians in a position where they can assume the full responsibilities of citizenship in their communities, and be an asset and not a liability to the States of North and South Dakota and the Nation as a whole.

I earnestly invite the study and comment of all interested persons.

Truman Plans To Raise, Then Take, the Workers' Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, it takes billions of dollars to operate a gravy train. Mr. Truman cannot buy ten or fifteen million votes with peanuts. He needs more money—billions more than the present national income can yield in taxes. The only way in sight is to raise the workers' wages 20 percent, and then take most of the increase right out of their hides by pulling it back in income taxes.

On August 10, Phelps Adams, one of the ablest Washington analysts, reported that a quadruple pay-roll tax is planned:

Pay-roll taxes on workers in the high-wage industries, such as coal, mining, automobile manufacturing, and steel, will be nearly quadrupled under the terms of the administration's drastically expanded social security law, which is being fashioned in the House Ways and Means Committee, it appeared today. Under the existing law, a worker earning $3,600 yearly must pay $30 annually in social-security taxes. Under the terms of the new bill, however, this tax would rise ultimately to $117 yearly.

The Department of Commerce reports that, in 1929, all income from interest—including that on Government bonds—and from corporate dividends amounted to $13,300,000,000. By 1948, this type of income had decreased to $11,800,000,000. The Treasury takes back a good part of this income now. So the opportunity of gaining revenue by taxing the rich has been exhausted. Even if Truman were to take every cent of all interest and dividends, the revenue would not be enough to pay for 4 months of his spending.

Farm income, with the help of subsidies, is up 200 percent, having risen from $5,700,000,000 to $17,100,000,000. But, even to take all this would not be nearly enough either. Besides, more taxes on farmers would only mean more subsidies. There is no blood in that turnip.

There appears to be nothing left big enough to tax but wages and salaries. Wages and salaries amounted to $50,800,000,000 in 1929. By last year, they had risen 160 percent to $133,100,000,000. That is what increased production, coupled with inflation, has done to date to create an amazing new source of taxes. So the solution of the fiscal problem is to use withholding taxes. The already big burden on the workers is not only to be kept but is to be increased by billions of more taxes that are expected to come from the fourth round of wage increases. The workers will think they are getting a wage raise, but they will find that, instead, they are getting a rise in living costs and in taxes that leaves them worse off than before.

Mr. Truman told us in his speech—House Document 252—that he plans to inflate the national income up to $300,000,000,000. He has started to do it. He has told the bankers to ease up on loans, and encourage spending so as to raise prices and permit a fourth round of wage increases. His program is well on the way.

He plans to give steel workers a substantial pay raise. Their union leaders demand 20 percent. Soon, other workers on a national scale will get a similar percentage. Of course, prices of the products thus turned out will go up at least 20 percent, because wages constitute about 80 percent of the net cost of production. A 20-percent pay increase is expected to raise wages and salaries some $27,000,000,000. That is 20 percent of the present $134,000,000,000 in wages and salaries. The tax collector should get about 25 percent of that in new income taxes. That is about $6,700,000,000—enough to balance the budget.

That is the big stake in the political game to raise steel wages. It is a scheme to get more taxes out of workers without telling them that while wages will be higher, taxes will automatically increase by a still higher rate. For some workers, a 20-percent wage increase will mean a 100-percent tax increase—for they will now be a higher bracket. Furthermore, the prices of houses and food and other services will also rise.

If Truman's inflationary plan goes through, left-wing propaganda will then blame liberty for the higher cost of living—more socialism will be justified because of the asserted selfishness and greed of private citizens, unfit for freedom. National planners will take over further the management of our economy. The one-party system will have still more money and power centralized in Washington, just as did Hitler in Berlin and as Stalin does in Moscow.

That is why some are calling Mr. Truman the "Typhoid Harry of statism." Like Typhoid Mary, he is a deadly germ carrier. Perhaps he is just as much opposed to statism as was Mary to typhoid fever. We must fight these germs with a good strong dose of incentive medicine. The strength of economic freedom has won wars. Managed economies, even when guarded by Maginot lines or iron curtains, have lost them. We should not cheat our workers in order to buy socialism and entrench the one-party system in America.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Willford I. King and a statement by Clarence B. Randall, president, Inland Steel Co.:

TOWNSEND PLAN SLIPPING IN THROUGH BACK DOOR

(By Willford I. King)

How many veterans have heard about the addition to their GI bill of rights which is gradually being appended thereto through the initiative of John L. Lewis, ably seconded and supported by Philip Murray and Walter Reuther? When this addition comes into full effect, it will probably give the average veteran the privilege of contributing (usually unwittingly) perhaps $50 per month to support someone of whose existence he is totally unaware. Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.

How is all this to be brought about? Merely by bringing in the Townsend plan skillfully disguised by new habiliments. For nearly a score of years, in one garb or another, it has been knocking for admittance, but the voters have repeatedly refused to open the door. What was probably the strongest appeal was made in California under the plea of "$30 every Thursday for everyone over 60," but the hard-hearted electorate barred the entrance. Now John L. Lewis has demonstrated that what the Townsendites lacked was ingenuity. They never thought to try the back door. That was proved to be the easy way to get in.

The arguments for the Townsend plan are as follows:

1. Many aged persons are poor and in distress.

2. They have worked hard and deserve consideration.

3. To accept charity is humiliating.

4. A regular pension from the Government preserves the self-respect of the recipients.

5. The pension money furnishes new purchasing power and stimulates business—hence it really costs no one anything.

Those opposing the Townsend plan answer these arguments thus:

1. In America, earnings of even unskilled workers are so high that, if people are thrifty and industrious, they can usually lay aside enough to provide for their declining years. Those who cannot, should be supported by their children—not by the public.

2. Many of the poverty-stricken aged have never been industrious. Most of them are poor because they have been happy-go-lucky and thriftless. They have no right now to ask the thrifty to support them in idleness. Treating thrifty and thriftless alike is a com-

munistic procedure, and has nothing in common with the American spirit of self-reliance.

3. The contention that the pensions create additional purchasing power is sheer demagogic clap-trap. Every dollar added to the pensioner's purchasing power is subtracted from the taxpayer's purchasing power; hence the total is not increased by one iota.

4. The expense of pensioning all persons over 60 would be prodigious, and would place an unwarranted burden upon the younger generation. Census Bureau estimates indicate that the 1950 United States census will record 17,220,000 people as being at least 60 years old. To give each of these a pension of $100 per month would amount to some $20,664,000,000 annually. If this total tax bill were divided equally among the 34,035,000 men between the ages of 25 and 60, it would cost each about $607 per year, or a little more than $50 per month. And most people think tax bills are already far too high.

5. The mere fact that a man has succeeded in living 60 years does not give him the shadow of a right to claim support for the rest of his days from the younger members of society. If he has failed to accumulate a competence, it is up to him to keep on working, at least part time, as long as he is physically and mentally able. Moreover, retirement is far more likely to make the aged worker miserable than to make him happy.

Townsendism has been turned down by the voters because they have found the arguments against the proposal far stronger than those in its favor. But John L. Lewis doesn't ask the voters—he tells the public—"This year, pay 20 cents per ton on all the coal you burn. Next year, I'll probably make you pay 40 cents per ton. This money will be used to pension any union mine worker, good or bad, if he has lived 60 years." Miss Josephine Roche, director of the United Mine Workers' Welfare Fund, testifying before the Senate Banking Committee, reports that the welfare fund during the fiscal year ending June 30 paid out $104,880,785.

And now the other labor leaders hasten to follow Mr. Lewis' lead. Soon, if Philip Murray has his way, everyone who buys any product of which steel is a component part will be paying a similar tax for pensions. And Walter Reuther will see that everyone who rides in an automobile or uses anything hauled in a truck will likewise pay a hidden tax to cover pensions to erstwhile automobile workers. Now that the pattern is set, union after union can be expected to copy it. Hundreds of these hidden taxes will add to the cost of everything offered for sale. And when, at last, the unions succeed in covering the entire field, back-door entry will put the Townsend plan in full operation, and the per capita tax on the men at work which, at first, may amount to no more than $20 or $30 per month will, of course, grow and grow and grow, year by year. Yes, Mr. Lewis has proved that "there are more ways to kill a dog than to choke him to death on butter." He is doing what Dr. Townsend could never accomplish. Do you appreciate his achievement, Mr. G. I.?

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE B. RANDALL, PRESIDENT, INLAND STEEL CO., BEFORE THE STEEL INDUSTRY BOARD

It is no exaggeration to say that the welfare of every citizen of the United States is at stake in the hearings before this board. And by this I mean not only the fact that you gentlemen are authorized to make recommendations that might affect the prosperity of the whole Nation, but the fact that you are here at all.

When the President announced the formation of this board he was in fact announcing an industrial revolution in America. By doing so he has declared himself as favoring a new social order, and one so different from that under which our magnificent production record has been achieved that unless the process is stopped, and stopped at once, there will be no possibility of turning back. Through this means, whether he knew it or not, he has proclaimed that wages shall be fixed by the Government. This step is always the first one taken by those who set out to establish a socialist or corporate state. The fixing of profits comes next, and then when incentive is killed and production falls, the final step of nationalization follows. Europe came close to starvation because of this tragic sequence, and was saved only by the dynamic quality of a free America. Yet here is the same pattern.

Review the sequence of events. Bargaining was undertaken by this union that turned out to be bargaining in name only. Take Inland Steel Co., for example. It is now quite clear that at no time did the union actually intend to come to an agreement with us. We were but an insignificant part in the working out of the global strategy by which the establishment of this board was to be forced upon the Government. The wage demand which was presented to you gentlemen was never brought to our bargaining table. We hear of it first here. It was pensions the union asked of us.

We made an offer on pensions. We were confident that our employees liked that offer, but the global strategy of the union required that it be rejected and that no single company be permitted to make an agreement. So we find ourselves pleading our cause before strangers, men of standing but men who are strangers to our company and to our employees. You have never seen our plant, and never talked with our men, and it isn't human to expect that in the few brief moments that we shall be before you you can understand our problems. Collective bargaining has been destroyed. It has been repealed by the President. And if this union strategy works this time, collective bargaining will never come back. The precedent here attempted, reflecting the similar attempt made in 1946, would commit us to boards and Government wage-fixing forever.

And no thoughtful person should be deceived by the naive suggestion that your findings are to be recommendations only. The moment your announcement is made every power of the Government will be brought to bear to compel both sides to accept your conclusions. If management in a particular steel company feels it must take exception to your findings, an attempt will be made to forget the word "recommendations," and to whip up public opinion to force company acceptance. This I say my company will resist.

I would hold this view with the same deep conviction even if I knew that you would deny each demand of the union, as statesmanship requires you to do. No increase in cost whatever should take place at this time. To increase cost in a falling market is to invite disaster. Rising costs inevitably bring lower volume and unemployment. War pressures are ended, and we are in a rapidly changing market. The battle now is to maintain production, and industry needs lower costs, not higher.

I cannot think but that you gentlemen see this as clearly as I do. But the system that brings you here is wrong, tragically wrong in my opinion. I repeat, that this is a revolution. It is a different America if three men are permitted to substitute their judgment for that of hundreds and thousands of managers of individual businesses all over the country. President Truman recently criticized the bigness of business. But the bigness which he has here created is a bigness so incalculable that it can destroy America. It is a bigness that no three men, gifted though you may be, ought to be asked to assume. It is a bigness that denies every American tradition, and that must be resisted if America is to remain free.

And in my opinion it will be resisted. This is America at the crossroads, and the steel industry cannot stand idly by. This is labor monopoly given its blessing by Government and by the same Government that cries monopoly at management.

Mr. Murray speaks with complete authority. His is the single voice for all unions in the steel business. He holds the power to suspend steel production in every steel plant in the country, and suspend it, too, in plants that use the production of that industry. Through political alliance with the Government he possesses the power to induce the President of the United States to take extra legal action at his request. Sarcastically in these hearings he scoffed at the fact that the various companies involved had difficulty in acting as a unit. Does he think that we have one single man who can dictate policy to hundreds of separate companies? Has he forgotten that steel plants are privately owned, and that the individual owners are entitled to run their businesses as they think best, and not as a steel czar might dictate? Has he forgotten competition? If so, the Attorney General might well instruct him on the point. He has operated within a labor monopoly for so long that by mental habit he associates the same pattern of monopoly with other institutions. He conceives it natural for the steel industry to form an opposing monopoly as complete and as gigantic as his.

This we will not do. See where it has brought us in these present hearings. The labor monopoly took half of the time of this Board. Some 63 companies are now before this Board. Many of them have asked to be heard on the management side. Yet there has been allotted to them 8 days—8 days to be divided among them, the same time given the labor monopoly. Many fine institutions must content themselves with a brief 15 minutes or half an hour in which to discuss a question on which the whole future of their enterprises may hinge. That is complete madness. No orderly discussion nor fair results can flow from such a process. I repeat—this is the repeal of collective bargaining—this is Government wage fixing, the inevitable consequence of labor monopoly.

In my judgment, the steel industry cannot by its presence here be deemed to consent that this process go on. It must protest to you and to the President, and to the American people, that this is a distortion of our economy. And I submit to you gentlemen that it lies fully within your province to protest likewise. You will hear our doubts as to the propriety of this political proceeding, and you are not the men I think you are if you have not already yourselves entertained similar doubts.

I ask you to be courageous. I ask you to be statesmen. I ask that in your recommendations you not only record our doubts, but that you express your own honest convictions to the effect that the very establishment of this steel fact-finding board is in itself a bad thing for the United States.

It is bad in principle—therefore it would be bad at any time, but today it is dangerous. Our country is now in a recession. Production is in the falling trend in industry after industry. Unemployment has reached its highest point in 7 years. You cannot safely pile new uncertainties on an already uncertain situation. You cannot safely discourage investment in private enterprise which, after all, is the source of all employment, all wages, all profits, all production—the livelihood of the American people.

You will do all of these things if you permit yourselves to be made an instrument through which Mr. Murray's union can impose increased cost on American industry and the American people. This is surely the time for management, for labor, and for Government to exercise genuine statesmanship for the common good. It is obviously

no time, in the face of the present situation throughout the world, for any interest to pursue a course which could precipitate a grave economic crisis in the United States.

Middle Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the speech delivered August 9, 1949, in Washington by Mr. Donald Monson. Mr. Monson is senior architectural planner for the Detroit City Planning Commission who has recently returned from Sweden where he made a study of cooperative housing programs, and I am sure that many of my colleagues will be interested in reading his speech.

STATEMENT MADE IN CONNECTION WITH MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING LEGISLATION, TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1949, WASHINGTON, D. C., BY DONALD MONSON

The national housing shortage, unrelieved by the concentration of postwar construction in the upper-income housing field and in nonhousing ventures, led to a tremendous interest in cooperative housing on the part of veteran, labor, and tenant groups throughout the United States. The National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association, in a partial list, reports that over 90 cooperative housing groups have been organized since the war in 30 States and Territories. These groups began in their own initiative, and those who have managed to survive have done so in spite of the opposition of real-estate groups and have received little encouragement from the FHA in their efforts to secure better housing for themselves as veterans and other moderate-income families at prices within their means.

Cooperative housing is not new in the United States. According to Elsie Danenberg's recently published book on the subject, some 30,000 American families have secured housing through cooperative effort. The Amalgamated Housing Corporation of New York City—whose story will be told later this evening by their own representative—is the best known of the successful societies. The amalgamated not only weathered the great depression but is now proceeding with new and large projects. This project has been a source of inspiration throughout the country and a model for many other groups.

The aids which New York State gives to cooperatives, and the backing which many prominent and public-spirited citizens have freely given in New York City, have given cooperatives there a more favorable climate than has prevailed elsewhere in the country. Behind the Amalgamated Homes was the powerful Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union under Sidney Hillman. Hillman had the support of such figures as the then Governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and of Herbert Lehmann. Nor is this public spirit lacking in the city today, for the Queensview cooperative development has Gerard Swope heading its board of directors, which includes Beardsley Ruml, Bernard F. Gimbel, David Sarnoff, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., etc.

Cooperative housing in the United States has taken two forms:

1. Coventure projects, in which the group builds cooperatively but gives title to the individual family, preferably with suitable safeguards to prevent speculation and insure the proper upkeep of the property. This form is generally found in small towns and in suburban areas, where it is possible and economical to build free-standing houses at a very low density.

2. Cooperative ownership projects, in which the construction and ownership are both on a cooperative basis. In these projects each member family is a part owner of the cooperative, and leases its home from the cooperative corporation, which holds title to the property. This form generally springs up in large cities, where high density and high land costs make it necessary to use the row house or apartment building to achieve economy. Such multiple housing is not suitable for individual ownership, since such an arrangement would make it impossible to maintain the common walls, heating systems, etc., which make multiple housing economical.

Through cooperative housing it is possible to extend the American ideal of home ownership to that large segment of our urban population which hitherto could look forward only to renting one hand-me-down flat after another.

Houses built speculatively since the war were getting 90 percent loans if they were for sale and even better terms if mortgage insurance was secured by the FHA under section 608. Any cooperative to be built outside of New York City, therefore, was faced with two alternatives if it was to secure financing:

1. It could obtain FHA approval and cooperation, and thereby also secure insurance on a 90 percent loan. With an FHA commitment, the lending institution would need to take no risk and it might be presumed that the co-op could arrange financing.

2. It could operate independently of the FHA, and be forced to ask very high down payments, which would in turn provide security for the lender in place of FHA insurance.

Some co-ops were able to operate with large down payments and did find sympathetic lenders. But these projects were either for higher income groups or were in New York City, where the long and excellent financial record of the Amalgamated, or the personal backing of powerful civic-minded individuals, stood back of the venture. Those projects outside New York City who tried to meet the needs of the middle-income veteran and wage earner found that, for the most part, they would have to secure FHA approval before they could expect financing. So far, to our knowledge, no group outside of New York City has received from FHA a definitive commitment.

The group with which I am associated in Detroit has come closest to such a commitment and may be taken as an example of the gauntlet which the FHA compels cooperative projects to run. The group is called Schoolcraft Gardens Cooperative and is responsible for the brochure being circulated here tonight entitled "Schoolcraft Gardens—a Cooperative Housing Development."

About 3 years ago a small group of Detroit housing and planning technicians, with labor and veteran backing, purchased a 70-acre tract of land in trust for a cooperative housing development. Plans were prepared to show what could be done, and costs calculated to show what savings might be accomplished through cooperative building and ownership. An advisory board was set up, consisting of representatives from the A. F. of L., the CIO, veteran, cooperative and community organizations. Finlay C. Allan, secretary of the Detroit Building Trades Council, A. F. of L.; Victor G. Reuther, educational director of the UAW-CIO; James H. Inglis, director-secretary of the Detroit Housing Commission; and the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, now Governor of Michigan, are among those who have served on the board from the beginning and endorse the project in the brochure.

In July 1947 the plans for the development were presented to the Detroit office of the FHA for mortgage insurance under section 608, there being then no way to submit them as a cooperative. At the time the FHA was asked to evaluate the site and make certain other preliminary determinations. After 8 months of negotiations we were finally able in March of the following year to apply formally for mortgage insurance on the first section of the development. Even though we had complied with every requirement the FHA had insisted upon, the agency accepted the application only with the greatest reluctance and after constant prodding by members of our advisory board.

The Detroit office of the FHA replied to this application with an offer to insure a 30-percent loan; the Washington FHA office raised this to 60 percent. This offer was given only 1 month before the power of the FHA to insure mortgages under section 608 ran out. At this time the Detroit FHA was granting commitments to speculative builders to insure 90-percent loans. Of course the 60-percent loan was tantamount to refusal, since we were determined to make this a moderate-income project, and down payments of $3,500 or more were out of the question.

The FHA justified their 60-percent top limit by claiming that only high-rental property would justify a high-percentage loan. According to the FHA argument, economically sound rental housing for moderate-income families was not a good risk, while high-rental property, which was even then showing signs of having been overbuilt, was a better and sounder risk.

On August 7, 1948, the Eightieth Congress passed a bill which gave bona fide cooperative housing groups the right to 90-percent mortgage insurance (95 percent, if the group was composed primarily of veterans). We at once took our project back to the FHA, only to find that the agency was not taking the act seriously and had again stacked its administrative procedures against us. However, on September 23 the Detroit FHA agreed to process our application as the law permitted, giving us a 95-percent loan under section 207e of the new act. However, there were no application blanks ready, and although we could therefore not prepare an application, a deadline was set for November 10, with forfeiture of the $1,362.75 filing fee threatened if this date were not met.

On November 2, Harry Truman was reelected President of the United States.

Our formal application was tendered the Detroit office of the FHA on November 8, but formal acceptance was refused and the application taken only under protest. At this time the FHA was formally granting time extensions to speculative builders.

It was not until members of our board had further protested to Raymond Foley as head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency that we were able to secure a ruling from Federal Housing Commissioner Richards that co-op housing would be considered as home ownership. Because we were set up as a home ownership co-op, we were able to eliminate such costs as vacancy reserves, reserves for stoves and refrigerators, and other costs which serve to raise rents but are not necessary under cooperative ownership. As long as we were considered a rental project, the agency refused to consider more than a 70 percent loan, our proposed rentals being considered too low for a higher rating.

Finally, on January 26, 1949, a new application was filed in Detroit. Further haggling

continued until we were suddenly given a "letter of intent" granting us the exact amount of the mortgage we had asked for. The sudden reversal took place the Friday before the Monday that Walter Reuther was scheduled to testify on housing before a Senate committee. However, this letter of intent did enable us to precise the plans of our organization and draw up all our legal papers for submission to the agency before incorporation under Michigan law.

On May 3, 1949 our articles of incorporation, bylaws, subscription agreement, and lease forms were submitted to FHA, and as of now are about to be approved by FHA's Washington office, but only after our attorney, in desperation and in order to avoid our losing another building year, began proceedings to incorporate under the Michigan nonprofit corporation laws even without FHA approval.

As soon as we are incorporated, we will begin collecting the equivalent of "down payments" from our members. Thus we will finally be able to move ahead. But without the continuous support of the people and organizations represented on our advisory board, we obviously could not have secured the necessary FHA mortgage insurance. The other projects throughout the country, which did not have the active support of the two labor organizations, the veterans' groups, and of powerful figures in their home communities, were unable to survive, in many cases. Those groups who depended for financial support, throughout the prolonged negotiations, from families in urgent need of housing, were unable to survive; their members had to find housing immediately, and the money was needed toward solution of family problems.

The cost data we have prepared indicate what savings co-op housing can bring the middle-income family. The sheet also shows what additional help the proposed title III under S. 2246 and H. R. 5631 will bring. The figures speak for themselves.

The record of the Amalgamated and other New York co-ops proves that cooperative housing is a sound and American way of housing the moderate-income family, that with a sympathetic agency this method of building and owning homes can be successful throughout the country.

Therefore we suggest that the Congress enact legislation similar to S. 2246 and H. R. 5631, which:

1. Establishes a separate agency to encourage and administer a program of cooperative housing. Such an agency should be constituted within the Housing and Home Finance Agency and be of equal rank with the Federal Housing Administration.

2. Grants long-term loans to cooperatives and other nonprofit housing corporations, at the cost to the Government of the money plus insurance and administrative charges, and for between 95 percent and 100 percent of costs.

Philadelphia Authorities Imprison New Jersey Resident for Failure To Pay Iniquitous and Unjust Philadelphia Wage Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Philadelphia city authorities in causing the arrest and imprisonment of George Ross, a resident of New Jersey and an employee at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, is one of the most outrageous and unjust acts that has ever been perpetrated by the authorities of that city to compel workers, who reside outside of the State, to pay the iniquitous and unjust wage tax that has been levied on wages earned in that city.

Such a tax is unjust, inequitable and unconstitutional in its application to nonresidents. The thousands of workers residing in New Jersey who find daily employment in the city of Philadelphia are compelled to pay this tax to the city of Philadelphia. This is required of them although they do not utilize the facilities of that city now sustained by tax payments. They pay taxes in the several municipalities in New Jersey, where they now reside, to cover the cost of the usual facilities provided to citizens and their families. Consequently, by the payment of a Philadelphia wage tax they are being required to support facilities in the city of Philadelphia which they and their families do not use and have no use for. Nor, do they have any voice by vote or otherwise to determine how their tax payments should be used.

The city of Philadelphia claims that the revenue is needed to run the city. If the city of Philadelphia would conduct its affairs in a proper manner it would not need revenue from this tax in addition to the usual real-estate taxes. But, with hundreds of unnecessary employees, waste and extravagance of every kind, it is easy to realize the necessity of creating additional sources of revenue. And to make matters worse recent investigations have shown not only favoritism and inequities in the collection of the tax, but, what is even worse, it is alleged that some of the wage tax receipts have not even reached the city treasury. If the citizens of Philadelphia are contented to let these conditions exist that is no reason why the citizens of New Jersey and the outlying counties of Philadelphia, and even the State of Delaware, should be required to contribute to the expensive government foisted on the citizens of Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia Wage Tax Protest League has waged a long and hard fight against this unfair and unjust tax. Efforts have been made to have the legislature of Pennsylvania repeal this obnoxious tax and deny to Philadelphia the right to levy on the wages of its workers, both resident and nonresident. I am surprised that the citizens of Philadelphia and the surrounding counties have been willing to put up with this obnoxious tax. It is time they were aroused to the iniquity of it all and of the necessity of acting together to compel its repeal.

Bills have been introduced in Congress by myself, Senators HENDRICKSON, SMITH, and others, to correct the situation. Because of the complications that arise elsewhere in the country as a result of the application of general laws, it has not been possible as yet to get favorable consideration of the legislation. Bills have been introduced in this session of Congress in both Senate and House. These bills are now in the committee having jurisdiction awaiting action. However, although I am of the opinion that the more natural approach would be to the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, yet, no effort will be spared to get favorable action by Congress. The problem should be attacked in every conceivable way in the governing bodies of city, State, and Nation.

Although there have been many discouragements in this long fight that justice might prevail, yet there is every reason to continue the fight as vigorously as can be done by all standing together. For the accomplishment of our purpose my efforts will be continued without diminution.

Let's Exscind Some Excess Excises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of August 25, 1949:

LET'S EXSCIND SOME EXCESS EXCISES

"Exscind" means "cut off" and "excise" means a tax on a commodity—in plain English a sales tax. During the war, a flock of excises were clapped on such things as cosmetics, furs, jewelry, luggage, travel and entertainment.

The purpose was twofold—to raise some revenue, and to discourage indulgence in luxuries so that people would put more money into War bonds, the Red Cross, the USO, etc.

Four years after the shooting stopped, those Federal excises are still with us. In addition, many States now have general sales taxes, and all of them are believed to have excises of various kinds.

According to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, head of the Senate Finance Committee, in an interview in the current United States News and World Report, the general effect of the impact of the Federal excise taxes is equivalent to an additional sales tax of approximately 4½ percent upon all consumption expenditures for goods and services.

Senator GEORGE wants to get the wartime excises repealed as soon as possible. So do many other Members of Congress. Chairman ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Ways and Means Committee says there isn't time to accomplish repeal at this session.

To that, House Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, cracks back that there certainly is time—that if the Democrats on DOUGHTON'S committee would cooperate with their Republican colleagues, an excise-tax-reduction bill could be reported within a week and a vote taken before Congress adjourns.

If you ask us, JOE MARTIN and Senator GEORGE have the right idea from all points of view.

The wartime excises are bringing in about two billions a year in revenue, as against the six billions raised by such long-standing excises as those on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline. To these latter, there is little real objection, except that assorted taxes on liquor

have now snowballed so as to revive large-scale bootlegging in some areas.

But the sales taxes on all manner of consumer goods are bound to be a drag on trade. Many a housewife will gallop gladly after a bargain in luggage or cosmetics or what not, only to pull up short and turn away without buying when she finds a Federal tax tied to the purchase.

That clearly hampers business—meaning it is a damper on employment of people by industries making goods still liable to wartime excises. It seems a mathematical cinch that these taxes are a considerable factor in the recent increase in unemployment.

Let's get rid of them at this session of Congress, with the Government cutting its expenditures accordingly or tax experts finding new and less damaging sources of revenue. Otherwise, we'll be in increasing danger of seeing these levies become permanent, as emergency taxes have a habit of doing. Remember LaGuardia's emergency sales tax in New York City, which apparently will never be abolished?

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, when we think of the need for Federal aid to education, most of us think of the need to equalize educational opportunities for children in the poorer States. But one of the strongest arguments for Federal aid comes from one of the richest States, my own State of California.

Nearly one-third of the Nation's population increase since 1940 has been in California. The birth rate in California is still high. Thousands of families from other States are continuing to move to California. The result has been an unprecedented crisis for our schools, particularly in suburban areas in which huge populations of young families have grown up, but in which there is little or no industrial property to tax for the benefit of schools.

The problem is growing. Today there are as many preschool-age children—up to 4½ years old—in California as there are enrolled in all elementary schools. This means that by 1953, the number of children in school will have gone up by 50 percent.

California needs 15,000 classrooms now. By 1958 it will need 27,517 additional classrooms. Many schools this fall will be running in double shifts, and that means that children are going to be short-changed in getting an education.

The people of California are working to solve the problem of school buildings for themselves. To meet the need they must complete six new schools for an average of 500 pupils each and every week for the next 10 years. That is a stupendous task, but the people of California do not believe in rationing the education of their children.

Not only does California need school buildings, we shall need more teachers to man them. California children need Federal aid to education.

Sesquicentennial—District of Columbia's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Washington Post of August 24, 1949, wherein they rightfully complain of the treatment accorded the District of Columbia:

SESQUICENTENNIAL

On April 15, 1791, the cornerstone of the Federal City, as George Washington always called it, was laid in Alexandria. The seat of government then was temporarily in Philadelphia, but Congress had designated the first Monday in December 1800 as the day when it would convene in and transfer the seat of government to the Federal District on the Potomac. Actually it first met here in special session on November 22, 1800, though various offices of the executive branch—then totaling some 130 clerks plus a proportionate number of higher officers—had preceded it.

With these dates in mind the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission had thought to open its celebration of the Capital's one hundred and fiftieth birthday next April 15 and close it on November 22. That leaves less than 8 months for all preparations to be made—or would have left that period of time if the House had not knocked all plans into a cocked hat by refusing the three-million-dollar advance approved by its Appropriations Committee.

The economy argument of the House in defense of its negative vote simply does not hold water. For the Treasury stood a good chance of getting back more than $3,000,000. Nor is there any case for House action on the score of lack of precedent. Congress appropriated up to $10,000 for the expense of a 1-day celebration of the District's centennial in 1900. In more recent years it has handed out the following sums for purposes designated:

George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial (1929)	$1,796,000
Chicago World's Fair (1933)	1,375,000
New York World's Fair (1939)	3,275,000
Golden Gate Exposition (1939)	1,700,000
Texas Centennial Celebration (1936)	3,000,000
Celebration of the one thousandth anniversary of the Govment of Iceland (1930)	75,000

And these were outright grants, from which no return was expected, or, so far as we know, received. Economy, it seems, does not enter the picture when the historic celebration is in Texas or Iceland, or the commercial fair in New York, Chicago, or San Francisco. But then, it's an old story—millions for others but not 1 cent for the District of Columbia.

Shall we give up, then? There isn't much time, to be sure, before next April. And it would be better to have no celebration at all than one thrown together in last-minute haste. But while there is life there is hope, and the sesquicentennial project is not dead yet. Therefore we urge the Senate to repair the sad deficiency of the House in this respect as speedily as possible.

CVA Advocate—Let's Recognize the Position of Both Sides of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, at page A5276 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the heading "CVA opponent tells half the story," Mr. MITCHELL, of Washington, sets himself up as a public critic of things that appear in the RECORD in saying that my insertion of August 9 was intemperate and lacking in objectivity.

Mr. MITCHELL, by inference conveys the impression that he always presents both sides of a question. Nothing could be further from the truth. For the information of the Members, Mr. MITCHELL has more than 25 inserts in the RECORD for this session of Congress on CVA—all favorable to his position in support of the legislation. I believe the gentleman from Washington will admit there is some opposition to his plan. If so, why should he object to my setting forth some points of the opposition.

The gentleman from Washington has in one insert given such one-sided information that it properly amounts to a smear campaign by inference. In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3728, the gentleman from Washington presents only one side of the picture and does it in such a way as to discredit the Idaho State Reclamation Association—an association that has done much to build Idaho and the entire Northwest.

In this article Mr. MITCHELL shows the Washington Power Co. as a contributor to the Idaho State Reclamation Association. What he does not show is that the irrigators' and water users' organizations contributed also and did so in much larger amounts. This has been the usual practice of the advocates of a CVA in trying to discredit an organization that opposes their plan to dominate the Northwest.

Mr. MITCHELL also failed to include in this insert that only irrigators' and water users' organizations of the Idaho State Reclamation Association have a vote in the association. The private utilities have no vote in the association, but the gentleman from Washington failed to mention this little item.

Of course, one can be so biased that he accuses the opposition of doing the very things he himself has been getting away with.

Golden Jubilee of the VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht and appearing in the New York Journal American of August 22, 1949:

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE VFW

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

All honor and glory to the sons of liberty—the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—on the auspicious occasion of its golden jubilee convention.

Today VFW delegates from all parts of the Nation have gathered in Miami for this celebration.

Today they will be addressed by the President of our Nation.

The VFW has raised a standard for all the world to see. The VFW has fought to uphold our cherished democracy. When the Goddess of Liberty was in danger, when ruthless enemies were seeking to dethrone her it was VFW members' heroism, it was their blood, it was their faith that brought victory for our God, for our country, and for humanity.

The VFW is composed of overseas veterans. It was born at the close of the Spanish-American War. It was headed at its inception by Gen. Arthur MacArthur, the father of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The VFW seeks to build good citizenship. It crusades against subversive and un-American activities. It stresses the theme that American citizenship is both a privilege and a responsibility. It fosters observance of patriotic holidays.

Americanism is the unfailing love of country, loyalty to its institutions and ideals, eagerness to defend it against all enemies, undivided allegiance to our flag, and a sincere desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Fulfillment of this ideal reflects the purposes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Hearst newspapers have spearheaded the drive to root out the menacing growth. They are fighting for universal military training. They are fighting for a highly trained Regular Army and Navy. They are fighting for a well-organized civilian Reserve. They are fighting for the best and strongest Air Force. These, too, are the ideals and the aspirations of the VFW organization.

As history goes we are a young Nation. But there are events in the glory of our story which exceed in achievements the evolution of the ages.

A nation is like a chain. Its strongest interests are interwoven. Let one clasp break and its security is endangered. Today we hear the voices of our saintly sires rising from the theaters of their valor admonishing us to preserve our blood-bought freedom. It is thus that we exhibit our veneration for the past. It is thus that we shall preserve to the ages the noblest experiment of human freedom. It is thus that we shall adorn our country with a virtue and dignity which time shall not efface. The world looks to us for leadership. We did not seek the role, but we must not fail.

Hear ye, Veterans of Foreign Wars! You are the warriors of liberty. You are the sinews of our Nation. You are the guardians of our security. You have stormed the bloody beachheads in hundreds of operations. You have manned the naval task forces defending the seven seas. You have stood amid flak and fire as your planes screamed toward their targets. You have seen your buddies fall at your side, crimsoning the soil of devastated no-man's land. You have stood in silent requiem as you watched your comrades lowered into the bivouac of the dead.

Hear ye, the still voices of your martyred buddies. They challenge you to beware of freedom's foes. They challenge you to preserve our American ideals for which they died. They challenge you to protect our American way of life.

As long as you Veterans of Foreign Wars are the guardians of our liberty, as long as liberty is enshrined in your hearts, Americans know that the beacon light of liberty will ever be held high, shining forth its rays of hope, of inspiration and spirtual fulfillment to those who have suffered and died that mankind may remain free.

May we rededicate ourselves to America. May we face the crucial days ahead, secure in the righteousness of our democracy, secure in the unconquered spirit of a free people.

Let us today voice a prayer in loving tribute to our deathless dead, whose snow-white crosses and stars of David cover the military cemeteries like morning dew.

All is quiet on the western front, for there sleeps the flower of our American youth. The Stars and Stripes flutter in the crisp air. Not a sound is heard except for the silent sentinel keeping vigil on the sacred soil. Yet one other walks there among the crosses and stars. He lifts His holy voice in benevolent benediction:

"My peace I give unto you. Well done, good and faithful servants."

So shall they rest in peace.

The Late Wilbur B. Driver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that the residents of New Jersey, especially those of the Eleventh Congressional District, learned of the death of one of its most illustrious citizens, Mr. Wilbur B. Driver, of East Orange. Mr. Driver was founder and board chairman of the Wilbur B. Driver Co., of Newark, and founder and former president of the Driver-Harris Co., Harrison. Despite his numerous business activities, he found the time to engage in numerous philanthropies. He was particularly interested in relieving the housing shortage among needy veterans with large families, and this interest took the practical form of remodeling old houses into apartments and offering them to rent only to veterans with children. My personal knowledge of the great good accomplished by Mr. Driver was gained through the United Citizens Housing Committee of the Oranges and Maplewood which has been engaged in a long campaign for low-cost housing for both veterans and others in the area.

Mr. Driver strove to make this a better, a more abundant, and a more beautiful world. His good deeds will live after him. He has left a noble example to those of us who are too busy with our workaday lives to enlarge our understanding and enrich our own characters by wholeheartedly giving of ourselves in sincere friendship to our fellow men.

The esteem in which Mr. Driver was held is fittingly expressed in the following editorial in the Newark Evening News of August 24:

WILBUR B. DRIVER

Death has ended the long career of Wilbur B. Driver, of East Orange, who bore one of the most familiar names in New Jersey industry. It was a name to which he added luster by a generosity which took direct and unusual forms.

There was, for example, his interest in the housing problems of veterans. He gave practical expression to his sympathy by acquiring old houses, remodeling them into apartments, and offering them for rent only to veterans with children.

As a businessman he was alert to the benefits of publicity, but he concealed his philanthropies. In his role as the model landlord he would permit newspapers to refer to him only as Mr. X, a whimsicality which they respected until his death.

Mr. Driver was a friendly, modest and approachful man who liked people and hoped they would like him, who worked harder than any of his employees, and who was conscious of his obligations to society.

Address at Diamond Jubilee Convention, WCTU

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union concluded its diamond jubilee convention at Philadelphia, Pa., last night.

The officers of this great organization are as follows: President, Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin; vice president-at-large, Miss Mary B. Ervin; corresponding secretary, Miss Elizabeth A. Smart; treasurer, Miss Violet T. Black; recording secretary, Mrs. Glenn G. Hayes; honorary presidents, Mrs. Ella A. Boole and Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith; hostess president, Mrs. Ella Boucher Black.

Among those who addressed this historical convention were Senator Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker, of Washington, and myself.

This noteworthy organization, sponsoring and teaching the cause of temperance, has continued to grow in its influence for good through 75 eventful years.

Following is the speech I delivered to the convention last night in Philadelphia:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to have the honor and privilege of addressing this group. Your group and similar ones are the most potent forces in our country today for combating the widespread evil

which the overindulgence of alcohol causes. I am in hearty accord with your motives.

I should like to discuss a bill which I introduced in the House of Representatives several weeks ago. This bill was originally introduced in the Senate by Senator CAPPER of Kansas before he left that body. I introduced it in the House at his request.

The measure concerns the advertising of alcoholic liquors. It would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of all advertisements of alcoholic liquor. In effect this would prohibit radio stations from carrying liquor advertisements on their broadcasts and bar newspapers and magazines which move in interstate commerce from carrying such ads.

There is definitely a need for such a law. Liquor advertising is out of hand. Since the repeal of prohibition the liquor interests have attempted to foist the liquor habit upon the entire population of this country. They have gone about this scientifically and cleverly. Millions upon millions are spent each year to gain this end. The best advertising men and the best artists in the land are hired to make full-page advertisements in the leading magazines and newspapers soliciting the public who read those publications to use the advertised products. It is hardly possible to pick any large, national publication without running across half a dozen or more liquor ads. With great skill and subtleness these ads have emphasized the point that drinking is in the American tradition and has been throughout the history of our country. In my opinion they go far beyond good taste. Let me cite an example. The National Distillers Corp. advertises a whisky called Old Crow. To demonstrate that this whisky is an American tradition and almost an institution they run a series depicting a famous American or some historical event. Daniel Webster is depicted at the supposed site of the original distillery and is unhesitatingly pronouncing it the finest whisky in the world to use the words of the advertisement. Now I doubt whether Daniel Webster ever visited such a distillery and am of the firm opinion that if he did, he made no praise of the whisky in question. Whether he did or not, however, is beside the point. The thing which I wish to get across is that impressionable boys and girls study about this great statesman and orator in school—perhaps even learn some of his speeches—then are told in full-page ads that he gave his unqualified blessing to certain brands of whisky.

That is the type of thing which I mean when I state that the liquor advertisers are attempting to put across the idea that liquor is traditional in the American way of life. The implication is that if whisky was good enough for Webster it should be good enough for the rest of us. I have no particular quarrel with the brand I just mentioned. Other brands are using similar means to expand their business. The brand emphasized the hypothetical fact that whisky and success go hand in hand—"Men of Distinction" is the theme of these ads. The scheme behind this type of advertising is to promote the idea that the American way of life is intimately connected with the use of alcohol. I consider these methods far beyond the scope of legitimate advertising and believe that they should be stopped.

At present advertising in the liquor industry is covered by the Federal Alcohol Administration Act. Any statements or representations which are misleading in any material particulars are supposedly barred. The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury Department has charge of the enforcement of this regulation. When hearings were held a year ago on Senator Capper's bill, an official from the Alcohol Tax Unit testified before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which conducted the hearings. It was his testimony that this Unit can take advertisers to court who violate the advertising regulations. He also testified, however, that the courts have held in a number of cases that when general statements are made that the statement does not have to be exactly accurate. That fact is proof enough that we need a law which outlaws liquor advertising in its present form.

The Alcohol Tax Unit takes the position that if liquor ads give the alcoholic content and the proof of the product being advertised their requirements have been met. This information supposedly offsets the build-up in the main theme of the ad. That is obviously fallacious reasoning. One line of small print is not likely to change the effect of the whole page even if the reader happens to notice it. The average person who is being solicited to buy liquor neither knows nor cares about the meaning of such terms as "proof" and "neutral spirits." The advertisers realize this and concentrate upon the over-all effect of the ad. That effect is to give the impression that liquor, success, and happiness go hand in hand. A casual glance at any of the full-page solicitations in color certainly gives that impression. To any person who analyzes the situation concerning liquor advertisements from a logical viewpoint the question must inevitably arise, "Who wants these ads?" The heavy drinker, the social drinker, or the abstainer? The answer is that none of these groups want them. Only the liquor manufacturers who profit financially are in favor thereof. To them every nondrinker is an untapped market. The only way to reach him is to shout at him over the air, catch his eye with colorful pages in publications, and emphasize again and again the advantages of drinking liquor. Those who brought about the repeal of prohibition used as one of their main arguments the point that liquor should be brought back only for those who wanted it. Now big dealers are trying to make everyone want it.

Young people are the largest potential source for new customers. Most boys love sports. Knowing this, the beer manufacturers have made it a practice to specialize in the broadcast of sports activities such as baseball, football, and basketball. Again and again during the broadcast the listening audience is urged to drink some kind of beer. They are told how good it is and by implication how healthful. Radio knows no boundaries. Numerous counties in various sections of the country have adopted prohibition, but anyone listening to his radio is likely to be urged to buy alcohol no matter where he lives. That condition is not at all desirable. Many a youngster who would not come in contact with alcoholic beverages is exposed to them constantly over the radio.

In this country there are an estimated 3,000,000 people who are considered chronic alcoholics. It would be interesting to know how many of them first acquired the habit as a result of high pressure advertising. There is no denying that advertising has played a tremendous role in raising the rate of liquor consumption. As advertising has increased, so has the amount of liquor sold and consumed. The annual cost of which now exceeds $9,000,000,000.

The opponents of this bill to ban liquor advertising have repeatedly made reference to freedom of the press in their arguments. I shall point out why this line of reasoning does not apply in regard to the liquor question or in any other phase of advertising for that matter. There are two sides to every question. Advertising presents only one side. After reading the liquor ads one would not think it possible that excessive drinking is one of the greatest problems in our country today. Modern advertising has reached the propaganda level. The public is notoriously subject to psychological appeal. When they are continually subjected to allegations which are untrue or at least highly misleading, they are likely to be led into an alcoholic trap from which there is no return. Alcoholism is a disease, and once the habit is formed, it is difficult to break. There is no hint of such a danger in the ads. The real insidiousness of the situation, however, goes far beyond this. If the other side of the picture could be presented, some of the glamour which the liquor dealers build up might be destroyed. On numerous occasions various broadcasting companies and independent radio stations have declined to give the dry force radio time although they do not hesitate to carry programs sponsored by breweries and distilleries. In one particular case according to testimony before last year's committee hearings a member of a broadcasting company's board of directors also was a public-relations counsel for a large distilling corporation. In view of that fact it is not difficult to understand why the broadcasting company opposed any attempt to refute the arguments on behalf of the liquor trade. That practice amounts to censorship.

The same type of censorship used in a somewhat different fashion is exercised by numerous publications. All stories no matter how meritorious, are rejected if they make reference to alcohol in any terms which might offend the advertisers. That fact is further proof that the advertising of alcoholic beverages has gotten out of hand. The liquor interests are able indirectly and in some cases directly to ban any material which could have an adverse effect upon the sales of their product.

Those who are opposed to the outlawing of alcoholic advertising have attacked my bill from three particular points. I shall discuss them all.

The first objection raised is that since the sale of liquor is legal it would be discrimination against the industry if the bill should become law. The answer to that is that because of their very nature alcoholic beverages are already subject to discrimination. The owners of stores and restaurants where liquor is on sale must have special licenses to sell such liquor. In certain States the distribution is through the control of the State. Certain hours in which alcoholic beverages may be sold are prescribed. They may not be sold to minors; and there are many other restrictions upon their sale.

All of this is true because liquor is recognized as a dangerous agent which can cause society at large much grief if it is not properly controlled. Even the liquor people recognize the need for selling liquor only at prescribed hours. That is discrimination, but it is not unfair discrimination. The same logic should apply to the advertising of liquor. It may be somewhat discriminatory, but it is neither unfair nor illogical.

The second type of argument which I wish to answer is that liquor advertising is primarily for the purpose of educating the user and not for the purpose of securing new customers. The beer and wine manufacturers, especially the latter, have advanced this type of argument. They have claimed that the consumers are entitled to know the proper uses of wine, and they must advertise to tell that story. Their ads are supposed to promote moderation and temperance in the use of wine. The ads which I have seen have not left me with that impression. Rather they convey the impression that the advertiser wishes to make known the quality of his product and increase his sales. After all, that is the primary purpose of advertising. If they wish to educate their customers, there is nothing to prevent them from printing up material for distribution with the sale of their product. That should prove as cheap as their advertising campaigns.

The third argument is the most controversial of all. It is that if such a law as proposed is enacted it will be a step toward prohibition. Since the majority of people have demonstrated that they are opposed to prohibition, the law would mean that the will of a minority is being imposed upon the great majority of our citizens.

That line of attack is completely and utterly fallacious. The drys of this country do not wish to impose their will upon the majority. It is their earnest hope that some day the majority may become dry in their sentiments and restore prohibition, this time with teeth in the law. Until that time they are content to follow the law, always working toward their ultimate goal. Nevertheless this bill is not a step toward prohibition. It is a step to keep the liquor manufacturers from getting a firmer grasp than they already have upon our people. The people are not opposed to such a bill; it is in their own interests. What man wishes his wife and children to be constantly bombarded with requests to buy certain brands of liquor? The heavy drinker? Most of them regard liquor as a curse which they would give a great deal to be rid of. They do not wish to see others become a victim of this habit.

Does the social drinker desire this advertising? He drinks only on occasion and is wary of the effects of alcohol. None wishes members of their families to become addicted to the liquor habit.

It hardly seems necessary to say that the dry forces are opposed to liquor in any form. Those three groups make up the population which is subjected to these liquor advertisements.

No; the only ones who want the advertising are the liquor dealers and manufacturers. They want new customers as the old ones die off, and the easiest way to reach them is through clever advertising. Tell them that liquor is part of the American tradition, that most distinguished people are users, that one must use it to belong. Don't mention, however, that liquor is as dangerous as dynamite, that it goes hand in hand with crime, that thousands of accidents are the direct result of its use. That is the object of the manufacturers and dealers in alcoholic beverages: To play up the advantages—all supposed advantages, that is—without once giving a hint of the danger and disadvantages.

Even some of the liquor dealers feel that the advertising has gone too far and that steps should be taken to curb this outrageous situation which is steadily growing worse. Two years ago at the hearings conducted on a bill similar to the one under discussion the Capital District Liquor Stores, with headquarters in Albany, N. Y., went on record as favoring such a measure. Even though they are directly engaged in the sale of alcoholic beverages, they felt that the high-pressure advertising techniques currently in use are not conducive to temperance or the well-being of the country in general, including the liquor trade.

In view of all these facts I earnestly ask your support of my bill, H. R. 2428. It is in the interest of all. Our country as a whole will be benefited by it. Liquor advertising has grown into something which can damage the moderate and temperate habits of our country. It has already made great strides in that direction. It is my solemn hope and firm intention to take steps which will check those strides.

Our International Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast to be delivered over WCFL, American Federation of Labor Station, Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, August 28, 1949, at 4 p. m.:

Mr. O'HARA. My friends, as Labor Day of 1949 approaches, with the end of summer in sight, there is reflected in the mail received by the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois an increasing interest in our international relationships. It was not easy for any of us the day we were called upon to vote on the matter of military aid to Europe. Each member of our delegation voted according to his conscience and his convictions. On the one hand was the fear that what was being done might be construed by a nation with which we are having misunderstandings as a gesture toward war. On the other hand was a great and human President whose life in the White House is being dedicated to clearing and safeguarding the path to a permanent peace. I think the folks back home should appreciate how very sincerely President Truman is working to build constructively the foundations upon which an enduring peace can rest. Never forget, my friends, that President Truman was a combat soldier on the battlefields of France in World War I, and that no man who has ever seen the shed of blood on battlefields can ever wish the horrors of war to be visted upon his sons and the sons of his sons. Nine of our Democratic Congressmen from Illinois voted for the military aid to Europe bill because of their firm conviction that it was a measure which would best advance the cause of peace. Two of us, Congressman A. J. SABATH and myself, voted against it for reasons equally sincere. The decision was left for determination to the individual judgments of the members. This in the Eighty-first Congress is something to be remarked upon. There is an absolute independence of action accorded to the representatives of the people. We all have and feel the obligation to the people of adhering to the pledges of the platform upon which we were elected, but interpretation is left to individual consciences when the details of specific legislation are before us on the floor of the House. This, I think, emphasizes the quality of greatness in the Democratic Party. It is the party of the people because in all that it does it accords to the representatives of the people the right of freedom of speech and of freedom of action which all free men prize above all else.

Because there is so much interest in international relationship we 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois are today gathered in this radio studio in the Old House Office Building here in Washington to talk things over with you, the folks back home, in the informality of our family circle. Our own Congressman THOMAS S. GORDON is the No. 4 man on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. There are 25 members on the committee. The chairman comes from West Virginia, the No. 2 member comes from South Carolina, the No. 3 member from New York, then Congressman GORDON, of Chicago, and the No. 5 member is the gentlewoman from California, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS. Seniority counts for everything here in Washington and the fact that Congressman GORDON is the No. 4 member, only three standing between him and the chairmanship. should serve to emphasize his importance at this period when the foreign policy of the United States in a new and a rebuilding world is being determined.

Congressman GORDON, what in a general way, after all these years that you have been on this committee, is your approach to the subject of international relations?

Mr. GORDON. International relations are no longer confined to relations between one nation and another, or between one group of nations and some other group. Today, international relations are global relations, world-wide in scope and world-wide in concept. We in the United States now realize through bitter experience that what happens in Europe, what happens in the Far East, or elsewhere, affects very deeply the destiny of our own country, our own economy, and even our lives. World War II was a global war such as never before witnessed by mankind. Today the fight to win the peace is equally global. It is my understanding that international relations exist to maintain international peace and security, not to fight wars. And in that connection, I must emphasize the great role our country is playing in bringing about that peace and security through the United Nations, the European recovery program, assistance to Greece and Turkey, the North Atlantic Pact, and the military-assistance program.

Mr. O'HARA. But, Congressman GORDON, it is all very well to talk about peace, but when we are spending billions of dollars on defense some people wonder if the international situation is—to put it mildly—not at least critical.

Mr. GORDON. The President of the United States, in addressing the Congress on March 17, 1948, reported on the critical nature of the situation in Europe and recommended action to cure that situation. No one with a sense of realism can deny that the situation is still critical. It is critical in the sense that we still have serious and complicated and global problems to solve. I think I can demonstrate that under the leadership which history has placed on our shoulders the United States is taking measures, together with other freedom-loving nations, to solve these problems and solve them effectively.

Mr. O'HARA. Just what is our basic foreign policy? Surely we must have a blueprint of peace—something that charts a definite program. What is that blueprint of peace, Congressman GORDON?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; we do have a definite plan. I think General Marshall, our former Secretary of State, stated it very accurately when he said on August 15, 1947:

"Americans want a prosperous world. * * * Americans want a free world. We want the people of every nation to be free to choose the form of government and economic organization which they desire. We know that hunger and insecurity are the worst enemies of freedom and democracy. * * * Wars are bred by poverty and oppression. Continued peace is possible only in a relatively free and prosperous world."

Mr. O'HARA. That does make sense, Congressman GORDON. "Wars are bred by poverty and oppression; continued peace is possible only in a relatively free and prosperous world." And that, of course, was what President Truman had in mind when he made his thrillingly inspiring inaugural address. We assure peace by fighting poverty everywhere, and by helping other peoples develop their resources we are making them our effective allies in a world-round war on poverty. Yes, Congressman GORDON, that makes sense. But I can see where meanwhile we have to establish world stability after a great war which has destroyed the foundations upon which the world rested. How are we going about that?

Mr. GORDON. The United Nations is the international organization created specifically to maintain international peace and security. And the United States, I am happy to say, has taken the leadership in that organization. The other member nations of the United Nations look to us for guidance. That guidance we are providing in many ways and in a wide variety of subjects—economic, social, and political. Further, we are supporting the United Nations and its specialized agencies— such as the World Health Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and others—in a monetary way. The appropriations for this country's participation amounted, in the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, to $12,500,000, $80,000,000, and a little

over $98,000,000, respectively. We are thus making the major financial contribution to the United Nations and its agencies.

The record of the United Nations is not perfect, but tremendous progress has been made, despite Russian tactics, in improving the conditions of peoples throughout the entire world. If the United States maintains the leadership and its record in the United Nations, I feel confident that the United Nations will continue to prove worthy of our support.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, Congressman GORDON, I think I follow you on the purpose of the United Nations, and I must compliment you on the fair manner in which you have presented the accomplishments of the United Nations to date. You say its record is not perfect—nothing is—but its actual batting average is high. Now how does the European relief program hook in?

Mr. GORDON. As we have seen, the foreign policy of our Government is directed toward creating a world of enduring peace, a world of nations rich in the four freedoms. As part of this policy, the United States favors, encourages, and assists economic development in foreign areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of defense. For millions of these people, real income per person is lower now than it was 50 years ago. Economic development, heretofore, is essential to rebuild a world dedicated to democratic and peaceful ideals. Hungry stomachs have no patience with democratic forces and, in despair, turn to antidemocratic forms of government. Recognizing these facts, the United States has undertaken the European recovery program, or the Marshall plan, for which a total of about $5,000,000,000 has been obligated during fiscal year 1949. As a result of this program, not even 1 of the 16 countries participating has fallen to totalitarianism. Further, there has been a rebirth of hope and confidence in Europe, production and trade have increased, and these countries are learning for the first time to cooperate for mutual benefits of all.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that makes sense, Congressman GORDON. Hungry stomachs have no patience with democratic forces. Then, what we are doing is following the good old rule of throwing bread on the waters and having it returned to us manyfold. But what about the program that we hear spoken of so often as assistance to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. GORDON. During the period from January to March 1949, for which latest figures are available, the Greek Government, with United States military assistance, made solid progress in its efforts to restore internal security in Greece. The results of improved Greek leadership, and accelerated United States military supplies have begun to be demonstrated in the increasing military effectiveness of and growing confidence in the Greek Government. There has also taken place a great improvement in the morale of the Greek people. As a result of American assistance, the political, economic, or military collapse of Greece is now more remote than at any time since the liberation of Greece in 1944. Truly, Greece has earned the right to continuing moral and material support of the free nations of the world.

In the Turkish Republic—again through United States help—outstanding progress has been made, which contributes to the stability and security of the Near and Middle East. The Turkish people are unified and they are determined to resist at all costs any aggression against their country.

Mr. O'HARA. Now, Congressman GORDON, will you tell us just what the North Atlantic Pact is and how it fits in with the other parts of the program? We hear a lot about the North Atlantic Pact but some of us would like to understand it a little better.

Mr. GORDON. No discussion of international relations today would be complete without mention of the North Atlantic Pact, of course. The pact was signed at Washington on April 4, 1949 by the twelve nations which make up the North Atlantic community, and came into force on Wednesday, August 3rd. The pact is carefully designed to conform in every particular with the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, it is designed to assist the United Nations in its major task, namely, substitution of peaceful settlement for armed conflict. Specifically, the pact is a collective self-defense arrangement among the countries of the North Atlantic area. It is aimed at coordinating the exercise of the right of self-defense specifically recognized in article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

It may be said that the North Atlantic Pact is the product of at least three hundred and fifty years of history. It is no accident or plan thought up in a hurry. It is only natural that people with common institutions and moral and ethical beliefs should join together for their common defense and the defense of civilization. This they have done in the pact.

No thorough analysis of the provisions and purposes of the pact is possible during these brief remarks. But I wish to point out that already the pact has begun to clear the air of insecurity and fear which has prevailed throughout the world. Here, too, the United States has shown its leadership and here, too, we shall continue our policy of helping free peoples to maintain their integrity and independence.

Mr. O'HARA. Now, Congressman GORDON, we come to the part of the program where even our own 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois are not quite unanimous. What about this military assistance program?

Mr. GORDON. The United States military assistance program, commonly known as MAP, is based on the solid principle that helping free nations to acquire the means of defending themselves not only helps the United States, but is an obligation of United States leadership in world affairs—an obligation which I spoke of earlier in my remarks. In a world of suspicion and distrust peace can be secured only when backed by military strength to resist aggression. MAP recognizes this very realistically and proposes to supply free nations friendly to the United States with the military means of withstanding the threat of Soviet aggression. It is intended that the greater part of the specific military aid proposed under MAP for fiscal year 1950 will go to the North Atlantic Pact countries of western Europe, which is an area of critical importance for the national defense of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Thank you, Congressman GORDON, for your fine presentment of the entire picture of our plans, our hopes and our actual accomplishments in the domain of foreign affairs. I know that the folks back home have found most interesting your observations, coming from one so thoroughly familiar with the subject. Do you wish in conclusion, Congressman GORDON, to sum up the conclusions you have reached after your long experience and study as a high ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. GORDON. I can sum up the progress in international, global relations by pointing out that the keynote is United States leadership in assuming its responsibilities. If we should fail in those responsibilities and in the role that history has ordained for us, the greatest power on earth, a sick world may very well be forced to look to the Soviet. That would be a tragedy for all mankind from which it probably never would recover. The United States is not, however, shirking those responsibilities. In our traditional American way, we will continue to assist, to aid and to encourage freedom-loving peoples everywhere and anytime. Only in this way will international peace and security be maintained for the world which so desperately wants to live freely.

The Acid Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 25, 1949:

THE ACID TEST

Many businessmen, many business organizations, many Members of Congress, and many newspapers have been demanding drastic action to cut the cost of government.

Drastic action has been taken in one of the most costly branches of the Federal Government.

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has ordered the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to dismiss 135,000 civilian employees and 12,000 Reserve officers now drawing active-duty pay. He says:

"A lot of people in the armed services aren't doing a nickel's worth of work. There is terrific waste and extravagance and, so help me God, I will stop it."

Secretary Johnson's order acid tests the sincerity of those businessmen and business organizations, those Members of Congress and those editors who have been denouncing Government extravagance and waste and calling for economy.

He estimates that it will save $200,000,000 in the balance of the current fiscal year and $500,000,000 a year thereafter.

He says that it will not handicap programs essential to national defense and security. But it will do other things.

It will close a Navy shipyard in California and several Army camps and air bases in various States. It will curtail activities and reduce forces at many other military, naval, and air installations throughout the country. It will take a large number of voting citizens off the Federal pay roll. It will cut down Federal spending in many localities.

And already, it is bringing cries that business will be hurt, unemployment will be increased, local interests will suffer.

For one, we refuse to add our voice to those cries. We agree with Secretary Johnson that there is terrific waste and extravagance in the services, and applaud his determination to stop it.

We hope Mr. Johnson will plow straight ahead with other measures which he says can produce still more important savings.

Any economy shoe is bound to pinch in some places. Businessmen, Congressmen, and editors should remember that. If they want economy they should not yell when their toes get pinched.

Ship Construction on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Maritime Affairs of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has had under consideration H. R. 4190, a bill to provide for the allocation of ship construction contracts. The hearings were recently concluded. A number of endorsements requesting

favorable consideration of H. R. 4190 were forwarded to the committee and appear in the record of its hearings. There were, however, a great number of similar endorsements which were not forwarded in time to receive such consideration. Accordingly, in order that they may appear as a part of the records of the House, I am extending my remarks in the RECORD and including the telegrams, letters, and resolutions which follow. They are the following:

Resolution 4270

Whereas H. R. 4190 providing for the allocation of shipbuilding work is now pending before Congress by reference through the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and

Whereas the enactment of such legislation would redound to the benefit of the Pacific coast area, as well as to the national defense: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, does hereby go on record as approving and urging the adoption of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be authorized and directed to forward copies hereof to Representative JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Seventh District, California, and to the chairman of the foregoing-mentioned committee of the House of Representatives.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of August 1949.

Ayes and in favor of said resolution: Supervisors—M. A. Poss, Henry W. Edmonds, Alvin S. Hatch, E. R. McDonald.

Noes and against said resolution: Supervisors—None.

Absent: Supervisor T. L. Hickey.

HENRY W. EDMONDS,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors, County of San Mateo, State of California.

Attest:
[SEAL] W. H. AUGUSTUS,
Clerk of the Board.

CHEHALIS CITY COMMISSION,
CHEHALIS, WASH., *August 9, 1949.*

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

We request you pass H. R. 4190.

CITY OF PASADENA,
PASADENA, CALIF., *August 10, 1949.*

Mr. R. J. BRENNAN,
Chairman, Labor's League for Political Education of Shipyard Laborers, Local 886, Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. BRENNAN: Your letter of August 3 addressed to the Pasadena City Council, Pasadena, Calif. was presented to the board of city directors at its meeting held Aug. 9, 1949, and motion was unanimously adopted that your request for support of H. R. Bill 4190 be granted. This date the following message was sent as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The Board of Directors of the City of Pasadena, Calif., by official action requests a "Do pass" on H. R. bill 4190 feeling that such action is vital to the west coast.

A. RAY BENEDICT, *Chairman.*

A copy of this letter is being sent to Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR. of the Seventh Congressional District as you requested.

Yours truly,
CLARA B. MACLELLAN,
City Clerk, City of Pasadena.

Copy to Committee Chairman Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Seventh Congressional District.

CITY OF SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
August 4, 1949.

The Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
Representative, Seventh Congressional District, Oakland, Calif.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Your support of H. R. 4190 is respectfully urged in order to allocate shipbuilding work to the west coast.

Very truly yours,
DANIEL J. CREEDON, *Mayor.*

CITY OF BELLINGHAM,
Bellingham, Wash., August 11, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Seventh Congressional District, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MR. ALLEN: At the request of R. J. Brennan, chairman of Labor's League for Political Education of Shipyard Laborers, the city council has endorsed H. R. 4190, and I enclose herewith a copy of the wire sent to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, Washington, D. C.

Very truly yours,
ALFRED B. LOOP.
City Comptroller.

AUGUST 11, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES
COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.:

At the regular council meeting August 8 "do pass" H. R. 4190 was endorsed.

ALFRED B. LOOP,
City Comptroller.

CITY OF SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
August 9, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Oakland, Calif.

DEAR SIR: A wire has been sent to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, Washington, D. C., which reads: "City Council of Santa Cruz, Calif., requests 'do pass' on H. R. 4190."

Very truly yours,
A. J. MILLER, *City Clerk.*

AUGUST 15, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be advised that the board of supervisors of San Diego County wishes to take this opportunity to express their favorable endorsement of H. R. 4190.

A. H. CAMPION,
Chief Administrative Officer, San Diego County.

Copies to Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., and Congressman MCKINNON, House of Representatives, and the honorable Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

AUGUST 13, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Niles Chamber of Commerce endorses H. R. 4190 as vital to the economy of the State of California, as well as the shipbuilding industries.

Yours very truly,
NILES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
VERNON ELLSWORTH, *Secretary.*

Copy to JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Labor's League for Political Education.

In the board of supervisors, County of San Luis Obispo, State of California, Monday, August 15, 1949, in the matter of H. R. 4190 (allocating shipbuilding work to west coast), the following resolution is now offered and read:

"Resolved, That this board of supervisors does hereby endorse H. R. 4190, a bill to allocate shipbuilding work to the west coast; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives and to the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Representative from the Seventh Congressional District."

On motion of Supervisor Erhart, seconded by Supervisor Peters, and on the following roll call vote, to wit: Ayes—Supervisors Erhart, Peters, Merrick, Willett, and Chairman Ruskovich; noes, none; absent, none; the foregoing resolution is hereby adopted.

CITY OF DALLAS,
Polk County, Oreg., August 16, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: For your information I wish to advise you the Common Council of the City of Dallas, Polk County, Oreg., at a regular meeting held on Monday, August 15, 1949, endorsed H. R. 4190.

Acting under their instructions a telegram was dispatched on the morning of August 16 to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee advising it of the endorsement and recommending its passage.

Yours very truly,
W. BLACKLEY,
Auditor and Police Judge.

CITY OF SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO,
San Mateo County, Calif., August 15, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The city council went on record endorsing H. R. 4190 and request you do all possible to have this bill passed.

D. J. HYLAND,
City Clerk, South San Francisco.

Copy to Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 19, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Enclosed please find copy of resolution 24232, adopted by the city council August 17, 1949, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on H. R. 4190, which provides for allocation of shipbuilding work on a basis of equality between the Atlantic Coast and the Pacific Coast areas.

Yours very truly,
WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

Resolution 24232

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of Congress H. R. 4190 which provides for allocation of shipbuilding work on a basis of equality between the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast areas and such allocation is based upon strategic needs for national defense as well as equality and distribution of Federal shipbuilding work to the various coastal areas of the United States; and

Whereas the community of Portland and the State of Oregon would for the reasons above set forth greatly benefit from the passage of H. R. 4190; and such bill is now in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives;

Now, therefore, said committee and the Congress of the United States is memorialized by the city council of Portland, Oreg., to take favorable action on said H. R. 4190 and it is

directed that a copy of this resolution be sent to the author of the bill, the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., from the Seventh Congressional District of California, and that a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith to the said Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives and a copy thereof to each of the Congressmen of the State of Oregon. The auditor is further directed to send an official telegram from the city of Portland informing the said committee that the city has taken the action contained in this resolution.

Adopted by the council August 17, 1949.

WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

AUGUST 16, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND
FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Tacoma's city council respectfully requests your favorable consideration of H. R. 4190 and joins other Pacific coast cities in requesting a "do pass" recommendation and action.

C. V. FAWCETT,
Mayor of the City of Tacoma.

AUGUST 16, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES
COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: At the regular meeting of the city council Monday, August 15, 1949, H. R 4190, amended by Mr. ALLEN of California, section 502 was read before the council, and by motion the clerk was instructed to write a letter in regard to the passage of this bill.

The city council of the city of Kent urges this bill be passed that it will be a great boon to the Pacific Coast, by having a percent of the shipbuilding allocated here.

Hoping your committee will concur with this request for a "do pass" on H. R. 4190.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. BRIDGES, *City Clerk.*

Copies to Hon. J. J. ALLEN, JR.; R. J. Brennan.

AUGUST 13, 1949.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES
COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of Supervisors of Stanislaus County, Calif., urge passage of H. R. 4190, bill to allocate shipbuilding work to the west coast.

LEO C. HAMMETT,
Chairman.

Resolution 532-A

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Antioch, That said city council go on record as favoring the pasage of H. R. bill 4190, a bill to allocate shipbuilding work to the west coast; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., of the Seventh Congressional District.

Ayes: Councilmen Beasley, Fleming, Bruce, and Mayor Meyers.

Noes: Councilman Van Voorhis.

Absent: Councilmen, None.

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed, and adopted by the City Council of the City of Antioch, County of Contra Costa, State of California, at an adjourned regular meeting of the city council held on the 8th day of August 1949.

C. V. HAMMONS,
City Clerk, City of Antioch.

Britain's Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, these are the illuminating articles from the London Economist referred to in my remarks in the House yesterday:

[From the Economist, London, England, of July 9, 1949]

TERMINUS OR TURNING POINT?

Sir Stafford Cripps' anxiously awaited statement on Wednesday afternoon provided little information about the country's reserves that had not already leaked out and revealed almost equally little about the course that the Government proposed to adopt. With his eye on the foreign reaction, he tried to play down the gravity of the tale he had to tell. It was a crisis, but not as bad as some others the country had been through. It is doubtful whether this would have taken anybody in, even if the Minister of Fuel and Power had not simultaneously been telling the miners in South Wales that it was a moment of supreme crisis. "The position," said Mr. Gaitskell, "is far too serious for just depression." This is the true note. The position is one of very great gravity. It is not just another awkward corner to be turned on a road whose destination is certain. It calls in question the whole course on which the nation has been steered. For if there is one thing that is certain in a medley of uncertainties it is that the economic policy pursued hitherto has reached full stop.

To the general public there cannot be any doubt that the return of acute crisis is infinitely depressing. It seemed to be only the other day that ministers were congratulating themselves and the country on the encouraging results of 1948, and that Mr. Mayhew was saying in New York that Britain's recovery was completed. The sudden set-back, leading to an increase in the dollar deficit from £82,000,000 in the first quarter to £157,000,000 in the second, has been due to two factors. The first is the growing difficulty of selling the exports of the sterling area in America, now that American prices and demand, though both still immensely high, are beginning to fall. This was certainly foreseen by all but the most sanguine. The other, which could have been foreseen, was that, as soon as the economic climate turned, the world would have grave doubts about the British Government's ability to hold sterling at its present overvalued level, and would express these doubts by an unwillingness to hold stering, by haste in requiring payment for goods sold to Britain and by delay in making payment for goods bought from Britain. It is this lack of confidence that makes this particular crisis difficult to deal with. It cannot be put right by further application of existing policies, because it is these existing policies themselves that give rise to distrust. At home as well as abroad, public opinion has come to the belief that the present policies of the British Government will not work. Whether they are socially desirable or not is, therefore, unfortunately beside the point. The crisis will go on until something that will work is put in their place.

There is a tendency among some of the left-wing partisans to say that it is an unnecessary crisis that need never have happened if it were not for the chronic and incorrigible instability of American capitalism. This is an attempt to establish an excuse. It is a smoke screen of poison gas. It is not true that the American economy is slumping. The level both of general demand and of economic activity in America is still a long way above any definition of normal that the world has ever before known, and if British socialism cannot adjust itself to as minor a quaver as this, then it is too delicate for the real world. Labor members of Parliament would do well to remember that their government would have been out of office in collapse and chaos years ago if American capitalism had not been willing to subsidize it. The next few months will be difficult enough in any event. To start up a chorus of anti-Americanism will make the necessary hardships no easier to bear, while removing the chief reason for hoping that they will not have to be borne forever. And it will also bring crashing down the painfully built edifice of political security in the west. Nobody could at this juncture do his country a worse disservice than to indulge in this conspiracy of envy and malice.

The truth is that what is now happening, though it has come rather more quickly than might have been expected, was bound to happen sometime. Changing economic conditions throughout the world are exposing what it has long been evident is the chief weakness of the present British economy. What is happening is that the war, in the economic sense, is coming to an end. In war conditions, which have prevailed hitherto, the test of any economy is how much, in quantity, it can produce, irrespective of cost. Judged by that test, the British economy has done well. The quantitative output of the British economy is now higher, relatively to the prewar level, than any other that was as close to the fires of war. So long as the world was dominated by universal shortages, the British achievement was one in which pride could be taken.

But now peace is returning, and peace imposes other tests. The world is moving into a period when it will avail a country or an individual very little to produce enormous volumes of goods if they cannot be sold. The great defect of the British economy is its very high costs of production. It is not that British productivity is not high, but that the remuneration the British people exact for their production is still higher. It is very important to realize that this is not just a trick of international comparisons, due to foreigners stealing a march on us, and susceptible of being put right by an appropriate manipulation of the exchanges. British costs of production are too high not merely for the dollar market, or for overseas markets in general; they are too high for the British market itself. To give a simple illustration of this, an attempt has been made to estimate roughly how many weeks the average British wage earner would have to work for his wages (after tax) to equal the price of five standard British-made objects before the war and now. These are the results: [1]

	Prewar weeks	*Now weeks*
Standard council house	112	213
Cheapest British car	39	55
Cheapest motorcycle	11½	17½
Cheapest man's suit	5	7
Cheapest radio set	3½	4½

These figures can be used to show that the standard of living has fallen. But that is merely the inverse way of saying that the real cost of production—the number of weeks' work necessary to produce something—has risen. This is a real and fundamental ratio. Until it is put right, no amount of juggling

[1] The calculation has been done on the Ministry of Labour's figures for average wages of adult males, adjusted for direct taxation as shown in the national income white paper.

with prices and exchange rates will enable the British people to earn as good a living as they did before the war. If the British people cannot afford to buy their own goods, how can they expect foreigners to do so? It is in this real sense that costs of production must—imperatively must—come down before there can be any salvation. Possibly it is true that it is events in America that are now forcing this truth upon the British people. But any policy that does not face it is built on illusion.

Mr. Paul Hoffman is reported as saying that whatever happens there is no course open to Britain except greater austerity. Unfortunately that is true. With the reserves running out and with no means of replenishing them, there is no immediate alternative but to cut down imports further. But the British people are immensely weary of austerity. It is very doubtful whether they will quietly accept another bout of it if it is presented to them as merely one more installment in a series of cuts that leads nowhere and has no hope of ending. Ministers will find that the only way they can get acceptance of further austerity (for which they must ask, since it is cruelly necessary) is to convince the ordinary man and woman that it forms part of a fresh policy which has a real hope of working. It is not only abroad but at home that ministers have to rebuild the confidence of public opinion that they know what they are doing.

Manifestly the policies pursued hitherto have failed. But it would be unfair to turn this into a stick to beat the Labor government as such. Doubtless their policy has exaggerated all the defects in the national habit of mind that has been growing up in the past two decades—the national habit of mind that spends the fruits of production before they are earned, that acts as if the world had an obligation to keep Britain, that piles security on security and protection on protection, that loads on ever new overheads and starves the productive machine that can alone carry them, that throttles enterprise while requiring ever more of it. But it is the national habit of mind that is basically at fault, and it would have pushed any government that had been in power in these years into very much the same courses of action. And in the construction of that state of mind the Tories, with the protection they lavished on restrictive practices and the encouragement they gave to cartels, played fully as large a part as the Socialists. It will serve no useful purpose to exploit a crisis in which every citizen bears his share of responsibility simply to make party capital. The thing that matters is not what was done in the past but what is to be done now.

The simple test of all policy now must be whether or not it serves the purpose of reducing costs of production. To anybody who considers the matter impartially it must be clear that the present policy—the core of which is to subordinate everything else to full employment and social security—will not serve this purpose. Whatever else this variety of planning can do, it cannot reduce costs.

The reason for this is not very far to seek. Cutting costs is a painful operation; it will not be undertaken simply because ministers make radio speeches saying the national interest requires it; it will be undertaken only when the individual manager or the individual worker finds himself under individual pressure to cut the costs for which he is responsible as the only means of avoiding something he dislikes even more. To argue in this way is not to favor the extreme pressure of outright deflation. But it is to argue that results cannot be expected until the pressures that bear upon the community as a whole are reproduced in some degree in the pressures that bear upon the individual. At present the individual, if he follows his self-interest, will be led to do the opposite of what the national interest requires him to do—as the dockers and the railwaymen are exploiting their opportunities of doing. It is really naive in the extreme to expect them to act in any other way until it is made at least not contrary to their self-interest to do so. The obvious task of economic statesmanship is to make the pressures that form self-interest push in the same direction as those that form national interest.

What sort of a policy would a government adopt that put the reduction of costs of production above everything else? Here again, the answer is not very difficult to give. It would aim at creating the greatest possible measure of competitive conditions in every sort of industry and market. (The authority of Labor Believes in Britain can be cited for saying that there is nothing in this that is inconsistent with Socialist doctrine.) It would initiate a great loosening-up in every department of the national life. It would show the way itself by cutting the biggest item in national costs, the burden of taxation, since it is absurd to hold that a budget of £3,300 million cannot be slashed if there is a will to do it. Wherever it possibly could—outside a narrow range of strict necessaries—it would remove controls and allocation quotas and allow prices to be determined competitively. (Even higher prices may be a means to cut costs if they enable the efficient to get ahead.) In every possible way, it would make businessmen once again work for their livings. It would abandon the cheap money fetish and let interest rates also find their level. It would bring in legislation against all forms of restrictive practice. It would insist on payment by results in every industry where a scheme could possibly be introduced. And if there were no other way of persuading the unions and their members to give value for money, it would welcome the therapeutic effect of a moderate degree of unemployment.

All this, of course, would be very reactionary. But it would get costs down. And nobody has any other, and equally effective, program for achieving this essential object. Yet, if costs are not got down, much more dreadful things than these will happen—very soon now. To such a program of invoking the aid of competition to restore economic efficiency there is really no alternative. One must hope that the Labor Party will screw up its courage to undertake something of this order—for if anybody else has to do it, there is a risk of serious civil commotion. But by Labor or by others, it must be done. It is the duty of all honest citizens to give their support to any political body that will make a beginning and to withhold it from those who hesitate. This, till the crisis is over, should be the supreme touchstone of politics.

But though the British people have no alternative, the world still has a choice of courses. If the onset of peacetime conditions is going to lead to every country, with Britain in the van, cutting down its imports and seeking by any means to undercut its competitors, then the American recession will indeed be turned into a world depression. That such a possibility should exist in 1949 will be loudly trumpeted by all the enemies of the Marshall plan as evidence of its failure. Nothing could be more mistaken. The evidence for the success of the Marshall plan can be seen by imagining how much worse off the world would be if it had never existed. What is now a risk would have been a certainty 2 years ago. It is true that the task of restoring the fabric of the world economy is now seen to be larger and longer than was thought. It would be a major tragedy if the resources of American patience and generosity were now to be exhausted when, for the first time, the conditions for a genuine loosening and expansion of world trade are beginning to appear.

Hitherto, the world has been ruled by shortages, and the volume of trade that could be done was limited by the volume of goods that could be produced. The Marshall plan has helped materially in securing a really astonishing revival of production in the participating countries. But now, in one line after another, the limiting factor on the volume of trade is ceasing to be material and becoming financial. The supplies are there and, inside each country, the demand, backed by local currency, is there. What stands in the way is the maze of exchange controls which governments impose because they are under the imperative necessity of balancing their accounts. It has not been true hitherto that the major obstacle to trade has been the inconvertibility of currencies; but it is becoming true now.

This means that it is also becoming true, for the first time, that a great operation of international credit could do more than merely keep the debtor countries alive in a world of scarcities; it could unlock the doors that lead to real balance and expansion. The onset of the buyers' market is bringing trouble to Britain; but it also announces the time when normal methods of trading can go ahead. What the world needs now is not more subsidies to stay alive—in Britain's case they might do positive harm—but a gigantic banking operation, the imaginative use of international credit on a scale huge enough to overcome the balance-of-payments blockage and free the channels of trade.

There is some evidence that this line of thought might stand just a chance of acceptance in America, even at this very late stage, provided it could be presented in such a form as did not require further congressional appropriations to what can easily be made to look like recalcitrant debtors and incorrigible insolvents. But for any such order of ideas to have even a chance of acceptance, there is one absolutely unavoidable precondition. That is, that the British people should first, and in no bargaining spirit, give unmistakable proof that they are determined to put themselves back into a position in which they can support themselves in a competitive world, be the cost to them in the abandonment of cherished illusions what it may. Without such proof that solvency will be restored, a banking operation becomes indistinguishable from a permanent subsidy. And of that there is, and should be, no question whatever.

Britain's duty to the world at this moment thus coincides exactly with its duty to itself. Can the present government be persuaded to make that most painful of all sacrifices, an acknowledgment of intellectual error? It will not be easy. There is a real risk that they will simply put off decisions. Even that might be better than the other possibility, that they will make another positive attempt to make the unworkable work by retreating into still more bilateralism and still more discrimination, backed by export subsidies, fancy exchange rates and all manner of Schachtian controls. Such an attempt would certainly fail, and it would exhaust the world's patience as well as the British reserves.

We must, therefore, hope that the cabinet will find the courage to be patriots. If there is courage, there can also be hope. For the adjustments that the British economy requires are not large. Once the decision is taken to meet the challenge of competitive

efficiency, the British people will be surprised to discover how comparatively little of what they now dread will be needed to get them back on an even keel. And if there is equal courage in the world at large, what now looks to be a terminus could become a decisive turning point.

[From the Economist, London, England, of August 13, 1949]

BRITAIN IN THE PILLORY

The decision of His Majesty's Government to put the dollar crisis into cold storage for the time being has been successful insofar as they themselves and the country at large are concerned. Ministers have dispersed to various centers of rest and recuperation and John Bull has gone to the seaside. But the decision to leave the country apparently without a policy to utter or spokesmen to utter it has had much less success abroad. In Europe and in the United States the silence has been filled by a steady swelling chorus of criticism and attack. Britain's partners in the Marshall plan have been quick to pin upon their neighbor sole responsibility for the refusal of Europe's trading deficit to shrink. It is British bilateralism, British nonconvertibility, the overvaluation of British sterling that has brought Europe to its present plight, and these policies in their turn—here the criticisms are taken up with even greater emphasis in the United States—spring not from any economic necessity but from a blind doctrinaire preference for socialism, planning and control.

The change in the climate of opinion has been sudden enough to disturb the British. Only 6 months ago they were taking their bow for a balanced budget, both at home and in trade overseas, and were using the occasion for a little lecturing to their more frivolous neighbors on the virtues of thrift and planning. Today, the roles are reversed and the British have shot to the bottom of the Marshall class. This in itself is not a cause for serious alarm. Gusts of irritation and criticism have swept across the Atlantic partnership before now without doing it irreparable damage. On the contrary, past criticism has often provided healthy reminders of the way in which the nation should not go. There is, indeed, plenty to criticise in the policies of His Majesty's Government and there would be no possible course for complaint, if it were not that the critics seem, with some consistency, to be laying hold of the wrong end of the stick. They say (the American critics in particular) that Britain's woes have a simple origin in the Socialist doctrines of the Labor Government—which is untrue. They say (the European critics in particular) that the British people are making less effort to get out of their troubles than the other peoples of western Europe—which is not only untrue, but unfair and grossly insulting.

One difficulty in countering the anti-Socialist type of criticism lies in finding exactly what the critics have in mind. Some mean socialism in the narrow sense of particular Socialist policies practiced by the Labor Government. For instance, Senator KEM and those who join with him mean that Britain's balance-of-payments difficulties—or more accurately perhaps, Britain's slowness in emerging from them—are due in large part to the scientifically Socialist measures that the present Government has taken and that a non-Socialist government would not have taken. This is not true. The most clearly "Socialist" of the Labor government's measures are the nationalization schemes, and whatever they may do to the national economy in the long run, they have certainly not yet had time to exert any effect on the ratio between imports and exports. Indeed, in the two largest cases it may even be that things would have been worse without nationalization. Coal would have been scarcer and quite possibly dearer; and it is almost certain that railway rates would be higher than they are now.

The doctrinaire socialism of the present Government is also sometimes said to show itself in the trade policies pursued in Britain, the careful control of commodities by licensing, the bilateralism dominating all commercial exchanges save those in the sterling area. These policies are certainly unpleasant, but they are not the avoidable aberrations of doctrinaire Socialists. British commercial policies, with a few exceptions, are imposed by the facts of the case. Perhaps the best proof of that is to point out that when the United States Government comes up against comparable problems, as in Germany and Austria, it reacts in much the same way. The Joint Export-Import Agency—which is virtually western Germany's board of trade—has been under predominantly American influence for the last two and a half years. No agency has pursued a more rigorous bilateralism. The various "offset agreements" which regulated German trade have proved to be as near barter deals as any made since Dr. Schacht and American policy in relation to nonessential imports has made Mr. Harold Wilson look an apostle of liberalism; and American insistence upon the exact balancing of accounts has been complicated by the fact that the currency used for settling trade deficits has been the scarcest of all currencies, the dollar. If this is socialism, it can only be said that the United States has been as much its practitioner as Britain.

It may be, however, that when they speak of socialism the critics have in mind, more vaguely, the policies of the welfare state. If so, their criticisms have much more substance. Not that there is anything wrong in principle with the welfare state. It is a universal and praiseworthy humanitarian ambition to protect individual human beings against suffering caused by economic misfortunes. Every modern state is a welfare state; as Mr. Bevin said the other day, there are few clearer examples than the way American legislation has protected the farmers of the United States against the rigors of the economic climate. What can justly be held against the British welfare state is only that it has chosen the wrong time to take such long strides forward. Every manifestation of the welfare state—both by the benefits it confers and by the taxation it levies to pay for them—necessarily weakens the link between a man's own output and the material reward he receives and therefore has repercussions on the efficiency of the national economy. What can be alleged against the British welfare state is that it has ignored these repercussions just at a time when the situation of the country required that more attention than usual should be paid to them.

If this is the criticism, then it is justified. But this is not socialism—not, at least, in any sense in which socialism is a controversial term. The welfare state is not controversial; it is accepted by everybody, including the United States Senate. There is no disagreement between the political parties in Britain on it—as the Conservatives are at great pains to insist. If a retreat is now obviously necessary in Britain, it is only a retreat, and a temporary one at that, and not an abandonment.

It is not merely misleading to use language suggestive of some cardinal difference of principle when what is meant is only a difference of judgment about degree—it is also dangerous and obstructive. What is necessary for the full restoration of economic health to Britain is nothing as simple as the mere supersession of one political party by another; it requires the reshaping of a national frame of mind that governs all parties. This task is not impossible, and has already made some progress. The facts of the case are so cogent and so compelling that once they are allowed to emerge clearly, a sensible, level-headed people like the British will certainly pay them heed. There is a distinct possibility of the whole British people, with some unanimity, turning on to a new course and pursuing it in agreement— provided that the argument is logically based upon concrete facts. After all, there is nothing in what is needed that would be impossible for a farsighted and realist Labor Party to swallow. But if the attempt is made to put all the blame on one party to the exclusion of the others—which is not true—and to find the remedy in a complete abandonment and r· ersal of everything that it has ever stood for—which is not necessary—then the only result will be to solidify in resentful opposition what is bound, at the lowest, to be a large minority of the British people.

It is reported that the critics of Britain sometimes use quotations from the Economist—which has certainly been critical enough of His Majesty's Government—to support their arguments. It is always flattering to find oneself quoted abroad. But those who pay this journal the compliment of setting any store by its views might care to note that, in its opinion, Britain's present difficulties are not due to anything that can properly be called socialism; they are not due, save in a minor degree, to policies of the Labor government that would have been substantially differently applied if another party had been in power; and to make the present crisis the excuse for an anti-Socialist campaign will hinder rather than help toward its solution.

The second fashionable line of criticism suffers from as much loose use of words at the first. This is the criticism which is being heard with such emphasis in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in Paris and taken up with such enthusiasm in Belgium, Italy, and France. Britain, so the line of argument runs, has by its low production, its regid controls, its bilateralism and its overvalued sterling ruined the expansion of either European or world trade and is thus primarily responsible for the fact that the Marshall countries cannot cover their dollar deficits and that the shadow of the dollar shortage lies darkly across all hopes of further European recovery. The best answer to this is to quote the facts, as set out, for example, in the Economic Bulletin for Europe, published by the United Nations' Economic Commission for Europe. The figures of industrial production in the chief Marshall-plan countries are as follows:

I. Indexes of industrial production

FIRST QUARTER OF 1949, AS PERCENTAGE OF 1938

Belgium	122
Denmark	135
France	124
Italy	90
Netherlands	122
Norway	130
Sweden	147
United Kingdom	131

There is nothing here of which Britain need be ashamed. But total industrial production, though it is a fair measure of aggregate effort, is only indirectly relevant to the major problem of postwar Europe, which is the balance of payments. The best way of testing what has been done to overcome that is to set out the figures of exports and of imports by volume. That country might perhaps be thought to have done most to master its problems which had most sharply reduced imports and most sharply increased exports. The third column of the following table

therefore shows the ratio of exports to imports:

2. Exports and imports by volume, first quarter of 1949

	Exports	Imports	Export index divided by import index
Belgium-Luxemburg	114	97	118
Denmark	84	107	79
France	127	106	118
Norway	91	109	84
Sweden	65	103	63
Switzerland	113	121	94
United Kingdom	156	82	190

Does this look like slacking? Or perhaps an even closer test is to show what percentage of its dollar requirements each country is earning by its own exports to dollar markets. Not every country, of course, should be expected to cover the whole, or even the same proportion, of its dollar requirements. But each country might reasonably be expected to show some improvement in the ratio since the prewar position; the last column of the following table is therefore the most significant:

3. Imports from and exports to the dollar area

	Trade with Canada and United States, April 1948 to March 1949		Proportion of dollar imports covered by dollar exports		Change from 1938 to 1948–49
	Imports	Exports	1948–49	1938	
	Millions	*Millions*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	
Belgium-Luxemburg*	$355	$138	39	55	−16
Denmark	125	15	12	18	−6
France	594	82	14	39	−25
Italy	595	95	16	73	−57
Netherlands	355	39	11	42	−31
Norway	120	35	29	46	−17
Sweden	160	74	46	64	−18
Switzerland	231	114	49	80	−31
United Kingdom	1,565	559	36	27	+9

*

There could hardly be a more triumphant statistical vindication of the commercial efforts that Britain has been making. So far from "dragging its feet," Britain is the only one of the Marshall countries that is earning a higher proportion of its dollar requirements than before the war. Nor has the relative position changed significantly since March; the fall in European exports to the dollar area has been as universal as it has been severe. The pound sterling may, indeed, be overvalued, and British prices may be too high; but it is very difficult, in the light of these figures, to believe that other European countries are any less at fault in this respect.

Why, then, does the British crisis appear to be so much more severe than that of other countries? Part of the reason is simply that it is more fully discussed. The practice of economic analysis and criticism has been carried much further in Britain than in other European countries, and if anything is wrong here, it emerges very quickly into a very bright light of publicity. In point of fact, there are very few criticisms about the economic position of this country that could not be made, if the materials for criticism were equally available, of many, if not of all, the other western European nations. Another part of the reason is to be found in the fact that Britain is far more dependent on international trade than most other nations, and any sickness in international commerce therefore has a more immediate and profound effect here than elsewhere. Again, Britain is affected by the fact that it is banker to the whole sterling area, a function whose value is beginning to be appreciated even in Washington. And finally, since frank speaking is the order of the day, it may be mentioned that Britain for 6 years spent its financial and commercial assets in the common cause. Other European nations, though they suffered in other ways, were able through neutrality or occupation to preserve their assets.

The economic difficulties which are besetting the Atlantic world and which threaten, if they are left unchecked, to undermine all the work of political and economic consolidation achieved in the first year of the Marshall plan, cannot be solved by the action of any one power. To concentrate so great a barrage of criticism on Britain may leave in Government and business circles in the United States and in Europe the illusion that all that needs to be done is to modify this or that defect of British policy and then once again all the pieces on the economic chessboard will fall back into place. Nothing could be further from the truth. The change in the relationhip between the old industrial nations of Europe and the new industrial giant in the New World has been on the way for the last 30 years. The wars have accentuated but not caused the trend. It has been masked since the end of the conflict in part by American generosity, in part by the world's desire to buy anything it could at whatever price. Now, in 1949, the underlying maladjustment between Europe and America is emerging like a reef hidden for a time under a spring tide. To choose this moment to pin all blame for a vast shift in the world's economic surface to the actions of one power not only shows a quite distorted sense of proportion. It makes virtually certain that none of the right solutions will be applied. There is a month to go before Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Bevin pay their fateful visit to Washington. It is to be hoped that in the interval calmer tempers and saner judgments will prevail.

The Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago our Federal Government had 300 bureaus and commissions. Today there are 1,818. Twenty years ago there were 570,000 employees on the Federal pay roll, not counting those in the armed forces. Today there are more than 2,111,000. Twenty years ago, the cost of the Federal Government was less than $4,000,000,000 a year. This year the cost of the Federal Government probably will exceed $45,000,000,000.

Twenty years ago the total of all Federal taxes paid by the people of the United States was less than $3,000,000,000 a year. This year their Federal tax load will be about $40,000,000,000.

Why have all these increases occurred? There are many reasons. One of those reasons is bureaucracy.

During the past 20 years, our Government has piled bureau upon bureau, and commission on commission, adding enormously to the taxes of the average American family.

The General Accounting Office of the Federal Government about a year ago, reported that we then had no less than 29 Federal agencies engaged in loaning money, 3 in insuring bank deposits, 34 engaged in acquiring land, 16 in wild life preservation, 10 in Government finance and credit, 12 in home and community planning, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in handling our Federal forests, 4 in bank examinations and 65 in gathering statistics. No citizen, surely, can believe such duplication and overlapping of Federal agencies is either necessary or wise.

The duplication, confusion, and financial waste of our great, sprawling Federal bureaucracy is enormous. Unless this waste and extravagance is curtailed, the Nation, now loaded with a $255,000,000,000 debt and confronted with expenditures for the Federal Government alone totalling $45,000,000,000 a year, the Nation faces eventual bankruptcy.

Should such a disaster undermine our national economy just as waste, inefficiency and extravagance have sapped the financial structures of other nations, we might lose our free enterprise system.

Too many people, too often, point disparaging fingers at our American economy and urge that we abandon it for some newly-hatched, largely experimental European system. Yet the facts are that our American system, despite some weaknesses that should be corrected, produces a higher standard of living for the American people than any other system yet devised by man. And, while producing these highest in the world living standards, it has preserved for us Americans a fuller measure of liberty than man ever has enjoyed anywhere, anytime.

HOOVER REPORT

The Hoover Commission report recommendations, if carried out, we are told, will eliminate $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 of the waste that is now occurring through duplication and overlapping bureaus and other Government inefficiencies.

The Hoover report recommendations, if adopted, will correct situations such as now exist where it requires as long as 17 months to separate from the Federal pay rolls, an employee held as incompetent by the department in which he or she works.

The Hoover recommendations will help alleviate conditions under which about 500,000 employees, for one reason or another, drop out of Federal employment each year. No private employer could stand such an enormous and costly turn-over in his employees.

The Hoover recommendations, if adopted, will bring business methods and business management to many departments which lack these.

I am for carrying out as many as possible of the Hoover report recommendations, as soon as possible. The quicker and more completely this is done, the larger the savings of the taxpayers will

be and the sooner they will get these savings.

Our national debt is now $255,000,000,000. It increased during the past 60 days by more than $1,500,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1948, the Federal Government spent $33,791,000,000. In the fiscal year 1949, which ended last June 30, the Federal Government's expenditures were $40,057,000,000. Appropriations already made this year or pending, indicate the cost of the Federal Government for the year which started last July 1, will be $45,000,000,000. We cannot spend more and more without getting closer and closer to the brink of disaster.

It is time to stop and calculate how much longer we can continue extravagant and wasteful spending without encountering serious financial dangers.

Political Shenanigans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, business has been stunned and those walking the streets out of work, discouraged by the announcement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that no relief from the Federal sales taxes could be expected at this session of Congress.

Yet he is only voicing the settled policy of the administration leaders who have indicated clearly their determination to fight every effort to remove from the backs of consumers these wartime levies.

It is widely rumored that they expect to wait on taking action in this regard until next year in order to have the "relief" fresh in the minds of the voters in an election year. In other words, they plan the same policies with this issue as in the case of refunds to veterans of overcharges on insurance premiums.

In the meantime, the American public is asked to put up with all the hardship and suffering such a stubborn, politically inspired policy entails.

One who signs herself "Disgusted Shopper" has written a letter to the editor of the Rochester Times-Union revealing the effect of these taxes in discouraging retail purchases in the stores. She says:

> A few weeks ago I needed a purse for small change. I picked up one marked $3.94, which I laid down. I was told it would be $4.74 with tax. I felt it ought to have been marked $4.74 in the first place, so left without it.

This experience has been repeated throughout the country in recent weeks thousands and thousands of times.

The responsibility for refusing to correct it rests squarely on the shoulders of the administration leaders.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on the subject from the Mobile Register, of Mobile, Ala.:

EXCISE TAXES KEPT UNDER HEAVY FIRE AS PEOPLE BEAR FULL WARTIME BURDEN

Lack of prospect that Congress will grant any relief from wartime excise taxes at this session is not causing any let-up in the wave of protest against maintaining these taxes in full force 4 years after the war.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York State, is among the latest Members of the House to renew criticism of the excise-tax situation.

"Administration leaders have indicated that it is not possible at this session to touch the subject of reduction or elimination in excise taxes," he said. "I must enter a most vigorous protest. * * *

"A few of these taxes may properly be said to be imposed on luxuries. Most of them, however, add to the cost of the necessities of life. * * *

"Aside from the breach of faith with the American people who were told that these taxes would be removed 6 months after the war was over; aside from their adverse effect on our entire national economy through stifling business and throwing thousands out of work * * * there is very serious question whether, even from the dollars-and-cents standpoint, they add 1 cent more to the Federal Treasury than it would gain if most of them were eliminated.

"The increased income taxes which corporations and individuals, both employers and employees, would pay, through the spur to business activity at all levels which would ensue from their elimination, seem to be completely lost to view in the planning of the administration leaders who so vigorously insist upon continuing these * * * taxes."

Congressman Keating observed that in spite of "repeated and insistent requests," the authors of House bills to provide relief from wartime excise taxes have "not even been granted a hearing on these measures."

Washington's taxers and spenders are hostile to the thought of reducing or repealing wartime excise taxes. Of course they try to conceal their hostility. But the truth is that excise-tax relief would have been granted long ago except for the eagerness of the taxers and spenders to see the taxes remain in full force as a source of money to spend.

If Washington's taxers and spenders were so inclined, it would be an easy task to cut the cost of Federal Government enough to offset any loss of revenues from excise-tax relief.

Propaganda that wartime excise taxes are kept in full effect out of necessity is nonsense.

Sentiment Into Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal:

SENTIMENT INTO ACTION

Sentiment in Congresss seems to be in favor of cutting the cost of the Federal Government. There are several contributing factors, among them the decline in business and employment, a heavy Federal deficit, and the reluctance of Congress to increase taxes because of complaints from back home which gained impetus when the findings of the Hoover Commission were revealed.

However, sentiment in favor of cuts in spending and practical action toward that end are two different things. Actually, in the long run, the decisive factor will be the wishes of the people as regards fiscal policy. Increasingly, those who were previously unaware of the fact are realizing that the Federal Government hasn't a cent except what it takes from all of us in taxes. The Hoover Commission reports have given Congress what it long lacked, namely, a detailed blueprint for eliminating waste, duplication, and overlapping. Now it remains to be seen whether the people will demand that Congress translate lip service to the findings of the report into action resulting in savings and greater efficiency.

Resurvey of Navy Patients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 24, 1949.

SURGEON GENERAL UNITED STATES NAVY.

DEAR ADMIRAL SWANSON: Confirming my conference with Admiral Pugh yesterday, I am writing to request that action be taken to resurvey Navy patients who have been diagnosed as multiple sclerosis. At least five cases, from my own personal observation, which have been previously diagnosed as multiple sclerosis prior to Navy diagnosis have definitely been shown not to have the ailment. This is an intolerable situation, when the Navy has such excellent diagnosticians in the neurosurgery field as Capt. Frank Wildebush, of the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, Lt. John Knud-Hansen, formerly of the Philadelphia Naval Hospital and now stationed in Memphis, Tenn., as well as Dr. Temple Fay, civilian consultant.

My secretary, A. S. F. Imber, a World War II Navy veteran, had been discharged as having multiple sclerosis by many outstanding doctors and institutions. When Imber was in the last stages of complete paralysis, involving the whole body even into the pulmonary muscles, Dr. Wildebush operated upon him in June, and the patient while still hospitalized at Philadelphia, is on the road to complete recovery. The completely shocking point to me is that he never had multiple sclerosis. Three other patients of the same diagnosis whom I have sent or recommended to Dr. Wildebush, were found not to have M. S. In addition, the man who was recommended to Dr. Wildebush by Congressman WEICHEL, of Ohio, was found not to have M. S. after 12 years in a wheel chair with such a diagnosis by a prominent clinic.

The neurosurgical field is so important to the Navy and the services, that I strongly recommend the establishment of a neuro-

surgery center at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital as discussed with Admiral Pugh.

The necessity for accurate diagnosis of so-called multiple sclerosis cases, which are causing so much paralysis to young veterans, as well as much expense for the services, is now clearly evident.

The term "multiple sclerosis" is a lazy doctor's diagnosis, and the Navy should be the first to take steps to meet this problem.

With my great respect for the fine medical men of the United States Navy, who have been in the forefront of medical advances.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. FULTON.

Views of Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and at the suggestion of the Honorable Addison T. Smith, former Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Idaho, who served my State admirably for 20 years, I include the following tribute to former President Herbert Hoover by the Nampa Free Press and reproduced in the Twin Falls Times News of August 16, 1949:

VIEWS OF OTHERS

MR. HOOVER'S BIRTHDAY

This newspaper is happy to join in the Nation-wide congratulation of Herbert Hoover, who is 75 years of age today.

Mr. Hoover, as most readers will recall, was born to Quaker parents at West Branch, Iowa. His father, a blacksmith, died when the boy was six, leaving a widow, three children, the other two younger than Herbert, and an estate of about $2,000. It was a discouraging outlook, particularly since the widow died 4 years later. Here were underprivileged people who are supposed to become public charges nowadays.

But those were old deal days and relatives took the children, Herbert going out to Newberg, Oreg., and later to Salem. He was one of the early students of Pacific Academy at Newberg, now Pacific College. After finishing high school he went to Palo Alto, Calif., where Stanford was being readied for opening, worked on the buildings during the summer and more or less by accident was the first student ever registered at that institution.

Hoover worked his way through college, operating a laundry route. So well had he mastered the mining engineering course that within four years after graduation the Chinese government employed him at a salary of $15,000 a year to take charge of its mining activities. Somebody had forgotten to tell him his early poverty would be an insurmountable handicap.

When Hoover became an internationally known figure right after the outbreak of World War I just 35 years ago, he had at the age of 40 become a millionaire through his mining operations. Much of his fortune came out of a mine in Burma.

Hoover volunteered his services to the United States Embassy in London at the outbreak of war, helped get the American tourists back home in the confusion of war and was then placed in charge of the Belgian relief, which made him famous. President Wilson then made him United States food administrator during our participation in the war. After that he had charge of European food relief, during which his organization saved the lives of millions of Europeans.

Out of mining by this time, and his genius finally recognized in his own country, Hoover became Secretary of Commerce for 8 years, then President. During this period disaster overtook the country and Hoover as President got the blame. He didn't fight back or try to shift it, only to remedy what was wrong. His RFC was so helpful it has been continued to this day. A smooth politician might easily have shifted the blame for our declining fortunes to the opposition Congress elected in 1930, as Truman did in 1948, but Hoover wasn't wise in the wiles of politics and probably wouldn't have done so had he known how. He never lost the Quaker imprint.

Since Hoover left the White House in 1933, discredited, he has so conducted himself that the country has reversed its opinion of him. Now he is universally regarded as a very great American whose services will probably continue to the very end of his life, though he has said the work of the Hoover Commission will be his final public act.

Herbert Hoover is a fine product of American civilization, both in his rise in his professon and in his unselfish public service, in which he has refused to allow himself to be soured by the calumny that greets all who serve their fellows. It is extremely fortunate that he has been allowed these last remaining years to reap a harvest of public approval that was so long denied him. It is to be hoped he will have many more.

Federal Minerals Coordination Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, on August 22 I introduced H. R. 6082, the Federal Minerals Coordination Act of 1949, and I wish to urge upon my colleagues that they procure copies of the bill and give it some study. During my time as a Member of this House and of the Public Lands Committee, if there is one thing I have discovered it is that this country has no established mineral policy, either domestic or foreign that one can point to and say, firmly, this is the way we should go. Also there is a multiplicity of executive agencies, bureaus, administrations, boards, and interdepartmental committees dealing with metals and minerals, some with diverse points of view, some jealous of each other and trying to poach on each other's territory, and some apparently just doing nothing constructive. The situation reminds me somewhat of the famous quotation of Stephen Leacock, "The man dashed out of the house, jumped on his horse, and galloped off in all directions." Mr. Speaker, it is high time that this condition be brought to the attention of Congress and the public and rectified.

The policy outlined in H. R. 6082 is short but sweeping in its scope. It states:

It is the policy of Congress that coordination of mineral resources is essential to the safety of the United States and that the functions of the various agencies dealing with mineral resources should be subject to central direction in order to prevent costly duplications of effort and to bring them together into an integrated plan designed to effect the most efficient mobilization of such resources for both peace and war.

I do not like to concentrate power in the hands of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, and my new bill is not designed to do so. It gathers in the hands of one person, responsible to the President, authority to direct and coordinate to a specific end, functions now scattered throughout the Government.

If my bill should become law, it would for the first time give us a controlling policy for handling our domestic and foreign aid and procurement in the minerals field. The Federal Minerals Coordinator created by the act would be authorized to integrate, so far as is practicable, the mineral wealth of the rest of the world with that of the United States, but, Mr. Speaker, and this is of the utmost importance, preference is to be given to development of sources of minerals and metals—and under the term "minerals" is included oil—in the following geographical order: First, within the United States, its Territories and possessions; second, within the rest of the Western Hemisphere; and third, within the Eastern Hemisphere. In doing his planning the Coordinator is directed to pay due regard to transportation problems and the possibility of seizure of developed sources and plans by an enemy.

This last seems to me to be of great importance. I fear we are spending money abroad to develop production which will come in only too handy for the use of our enemies. Testimony before the Public Lands Committee indicates that we suffered great losses of foreign sources of minerals as well as losses in transportation. Now, while we are in a sort of uneasy peace, is the time to lay our plans. The monumental report of John Davis Morgan, Jr., entitled "The Domestic Mining Industry of the United States in World War II," printed by the National Security Resources Board, states, "The work must be planned and executed years in advance of any contemplated future M-day or D-day." The central idea of an Office of Federal Minerals Coordinator is outlined in the Morgan report.

I do not anticipate action on my bill at this session, Mr. Speaker, but I am prepared to press for action at the earliest possible date. I feel sure the members of the Public Lands Committee, to which the bill has been referred, will have valuable suggestions after the subject is developed at hearings. Even though I am moving along the lines of coordination suggested by Mr. Hoover's activities, I know there will be opposition from various bureaus and boards which wish to be left alone to rule their own bailiwicks in peace and quiet, but this Congress always must expect it.

I emphasize again that the stress in my bill is laid on domestic procurement and cooperation between Federal and State agencies to that end. I hope in the near future this House will have the opportunity to vote on H. R. 6082 and that

it will pass. A settled world mineral policy interrelated to our domestic mineral economy is essential to national security and I feel this bill is a long step in the right direction.

Shattuck School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, since all Members of Congress are concerned about our national defense, it is noteworthy that I call your attention to the contributions made to the security of our country by Shattuck School for boys of Faribault, Minn. Shattuck School is, this year, observing its eightieth anniversary of the establishment of military training under the supervision of the United States Government.

Public Law 181 was enacted by Congress and approved on July 28, 1866, to increase and fix the military peace establishment of the United States. Shattuck School for boys was the first secondary school to apply for supervised Government military training under the provisions of section 26 of the act, which reads as follows:

SEC. 26. *And be it further enacted,* That for the purpose of promoting knowledge of military science among the young of the United States the President may upon the application of an established college or university within the United States, with sufficient capacity to educate at one time not less than 150 male students, detail an officer of the Army to act as president, superintendent, or professor of such college or university; that the number of officers so detailed shall not exceed 20 at any time, and shall be apportioned through the United States, as nearly as practicable, according to population, and shall be governed by general rules, to be prescribed from time to time by the President.

From this beginning at Shattuck, the Federal Government has extended its supervision of military training in 144 secondary schools. The first military drill at Shattuck in 1860 was directed by Thomas Crump, then a student at Seabury Seminary who had been a sergeant in the Union Army during the war between the States. The Rt. Rev. Henry Benjamin Whipple, bishop of Minnesota, approved military drill as part of the Shattuck curriculum. Shattuck has been from that time to this a church preparatory school with military training, but never a military school.

Shattuck School is the oldest nonproprietary boys school west of the Alleghany Mountains. It was founded in 1858 by Dr. James Lloyd Breck, a priest of the Episcopal Church. From the day of its founding, Shattuck has devoted itself to the building of spiritual, mental, and physical values in its boys, with special appreciation for the American way of life.

In 1860, the Rt. Rev. Henry Benjamin Whipple came to Faribault as the first Episcopal bishop of Minnesota. He did much to give Shattuck permanent buildings and endowment funds. Through his missonary work among the Indians in Minnesota, Bishop Whipple gained national recognition. He was frequently consulted either in Minnesota or in Washington by Government officials on Indian affairs. It was undoubtedly this reputation which gave the bishop's request for a Regular Army officer as professor of military science and tactics the prompt attention that it received in 1868.

Acting on the provisions of Public Act No. 181, Bishop Whipple arranged for Maj. A. E. Latimer, Nineteenth United States Infantry, to be detailed to Shattuck as professor of military science and tactics on November 4, 1868.

Major Latimer was the first Regular Army officer to be detailed by the War Department for this purpose to a secondary school. From this beginning 80 years ago has developed the present program of Federal supervised military training in 144 secondary schools—32 military institutes, 16 military schools, 96 public and parochial high schools.

SHATTUCK'S CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Shattuck, with an enrollment of 200, is one of the smaller of these schools, but in World War II 1,100 graduates served in the armed forces. This represents 40 percent of all living alumni. Of the 1,100, 65 percent were officers—7 of general rank.

War with Spain: Total, 165—68 percent officers.

World War I: Total, 620—60 percent officers.

One out of seventy-three alumni are listed in Who's Who in America. From Shattuck have gone clergymen, educators, diplomats, physicians, surgeons, dentists, editors, authors, actors, musicians, artists, financiers, railroad and business executives, and engineers.

The present enrollment includes boys from 26 States and Canada.

Shattuck is one of the outstanding educational institutions of its kind in the United States. For 91 years it has pursued a policy of training its students in accordance with the best traditions and ideals of the American way of life. The part that Shattuck has played in building our Republic and providing for its security is worthy of recognition by Congress and the Government on this eightieth anniversary of supervised military training as a part of its curriculum.

President Domingo Diaz Arosemena

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were very deeply grieved to read in yesterday's papers the news of the passing of President Domingo Diaz Arosemena, of the Republic of Panama.

To a group of my colleagues who visited our sister Republic on official business last spring, the President's death comes as a personal shock and loss. President Diaz, with a charm and hospitality typical of the proud nation which he served, invited us into his home. He met with us and mingled with us in a manner most gracious and democratic. None of us realized that even then he was plagued with the early stages of the illness which has now taken him from us.

We join with the democratic nations of the world in extending our sympathy to our bereaved neighbors of the sister Republic of Panama.

An editorial in this morning's Washington Post paying tribute to the late President follows:

DOMINGO DIAZ

A stanch friend of the United States has just died in the person of President Domingo Diaz Arosemena, of Panama. President Diaz has been chief executive of his country for too short a period—only 9 months—to permit any detailed appraisal of his administration. Nonetheless, the government in his regime did conclude a civil air treaty with the United States which resulted in the use of Panama's new national airport by American carriers. Before he became President, Señor Diaz also showed his friendship for the United States during the unrest late in 1947 when Panama declined to grant air bases to this country. He remained an outstanding calm figure in the prevailing anti-Americanism.

A lifelong member of the Liberal Party, Señor Diaz was elected President of Panama last summer in a campaign against former President Arnulfo Arias, who was a notorious pro-Nazi at the time of Pearl Harbor. President Diaz was a welcome contrast to his opponent. His political attachment was to the small farmers, and he liked to think of himself as a rural president, even to the extent of indulging his fondness for country dancing up to the time of his death. Señor Diaz also was an enthusiastic devotee of baseball, a taste picked up, perhaps, during his education in the United States. Although he lacked dynamic qualities and did not occupy precisely the position of an elder statesman, President Diaz was a veteran of Panama's struggle for independence and consistently retained the respect of his countrymen. We extend condolences to our Panamanian neighbors on their loss.

Safety for the Mines Is Not Yet Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Louisville Courier-Journal of August 23, 1949:

SAFETY IN THE MINES IS NOT YET HERE

Bills proposed by West Virginia's Senator NEELY and Representative PRICE of Illinois would give Federal mine inspectors authority to close mines they consider unsafe for operation. They do not have this authority now.

They can only report to mine owners the existence of dangerous conditions, and recommend their correction. If the owner wishes to ignore the report, continue operations and risk the lives of his employees, he is free to do so.

Many owners choose to ignore the inspectors' reports rather than effect expensive remedies. Conditions which caused the Centralia disaster, in which 111 miners were killed, had been repeatedly criticized in the inspector's report. Inspection reports had also criticized several aspects of the operation at Straight Creek mine near Four Mile, Ky., before it exploded and killed 25 miners.

John L. Lewis spoke the grisly truth when he declared, with charactetristic grandiloquence, that American coal is stained with the blood of miners. And in the lives of coal miners Kentucky pays a grimmer toll than most States. Of the 1,015 miners killed at their work last year, 104 were Kentuckians, a larger total than that of either West Virginia or Illinois. We have a personal stake in hoping that Congress, in its closing rush, will find time to pass this suggested mine safety law.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to call the attention of the Congress to an editorial in today's issue of the Washington Post titled "Absentee Obstruction" which deals with some of the reasons why the Committee on Education and Labor has ceased to carry on its work and which deals with the general subject of Federal aid to education.

This is an issue of such national importance that I feel the people of America are entitled to know all the facts dealing with this problem. For those millions of Americans who are so deeply concerned about the education of their children, I think the real truth about why this relief is not forthcoming is a matter that should be given the widest publicity.

The editorial follows:

ABSENTEE OBSTRUCTION

The House Labor and Education Committee met in two sections on Wednesday morning. One section convened in accordance with the Sims petition, signed by 12 Democratic and 1 Republican members of the committee, to override Chairman LESINSKI's stubborn refusal to call such a meeting. Its purpose was to consider and if possible move out for floor vote some Federal aid to education bill.

But only 11 signers of the petition showed up. Representatives MORTON, Republican, and POWELL, Democrat, stayed away—which strikes us as a curious performance for anyone who so wanted the meeting as to defy its chairman—a performance that calls for explanation. Consequently, there was no quorum, and the group could take no action at all. At least there was no quorum until after 12 o'clock, when the House convened and a legal committee session could not be held.

For at that time the other section of the committee arrived from its place of assemblage in a neighboring room. These were the nonsigners of the petition, mostly Republican minority members, plus Chairman LESINSKI. They had been sitting around a few feet down the hall, sending emissaries once in awhile to see whether the Sims group had a quorum, and suggesting terms of agreement on legislation as the price of their own appearance.

Representative SIMS was willing to agree not on the terms of a bill but on a guaranty of regular meetings of the committee after the House recess to consider aid-to-education legislation. To this the hold-outs would not consent. So there was no quorum until after the 12 o'clock bell rang. Then they trooped in for an informal discussion of the subject—which likewise was fruitless.

These shenanigans make it pretty evident that the forces in the House opposed to any kind of Federal aid to education, or to any kind that does not satisfy their particular sectarian appetite, are determined to block any kind of action. The neat display of bipartisan obstructionism Wednesday morning prompts us to ask if the leaders on both sides of the House have not reached a secret agreement to keep the House from ever having a chance to vote on the subject.

The important thing, of course, is to get a bill to the floor. Our own feeling is that the Thomas bill, which has passed the Senate, should be accepted and probably would be accepted if the House had the chance to vote. But a compromise within constitutional limits would be preferable to no bill at all. And an opportunity for the House to vote on the matter is not only preferable but essential.

China White Paper: An Excuse for Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial which appeared in the Christian Century for August 24, 1949.

The State Department's long promised white paper on China has finally appeared. It is so long—1,054 pages, of which about 600 are in small type—that few will read it. It contains so conglomerate a mixture of documentary materials that both sides in the interminable argument over America's China policy can find ammunition. As a paper which has never found it possible to be either completely pro or anti-State Department, pro- or anti-Chiang Kai-shek, the Christian Century ventures these comments on this document: (1) American policy in China, to encourage the building of a liberal democratic and genuinely independent government there, is an acknowledged failure. (2) The white paper is too sweeping a lawyer's argument exculpating the United States from all blame to be convincing. If, as Mr. Acheson says, nothing the United States of America could have done would have changed the outcome, and nothing we did contributed to it, then how can the expenditure of thousands of lives and billions of dollars in the Pacific war be justified? On the other hand, the picture of Chiang as a villain who wrecked his own cause by his military folly and moral weakness, is also too one-sided to be convincing. It takes no account of the vastness of the problems faced by Chiang in the devastation left by the Japanese invasion, in the shadowy nature of his authority over many of his civil and military subordinates, and in the sprawling geographical nature of the country. (3) A policy of containing communism in Europe while letting it have a free hand in Asia makes no sense. The long-range future depends on what happens to Asia's newly stirring billions, not Europe's exhausted millions. (4) Our only hope to keep communism from overrunning Asia is to help liberal democratic governments in India, southeast Asia, and Indonesia attain solidity and lift the living levels of the poverty-stricken masses. (5) A military Pacific pact is as unpromising a method of starting the constructive program required by point 4 as would be pouring more millions down the Kuomintang rat hole.

Treatment of Veterans by Drugless Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, this letter received by me from a group of United States veterans who are being deprived of a health service which is so sadly needed by every veteran throughout this Nation because the Veterans' Administration refuses to allow them the use of chiropractic, osteopathy or any other drugless health science. If the veteran resorts to any of these methods the Veterans' Administration will not allow payments for the service.

There are thousands of veterans in and out of hospitals who could be made well by these methods and thus save the taxpayer millions of dollars, but are deprived of these health services because of the medical control and monopoly of the veterans hospitals and precluding the veteran from using any other health service.

In my opinion the veteran should be allowed to use any health service he wants. He should have the same right to select his own doctor as he has the right to select his own church.

The Veterans' Administration should immediately change its policy and allow the veterans to select his own doctor or health service. There are thousands of veterans laying in our hospitals ill who could be made well and usefu! citizens once again through these drugless health services and thus save the Government millions of dollars.

The letter follows:

WEST SIDE CHAPTER,
THE AMERICAN
VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., August 24, 1949.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your copy of "Chiropractic and the Nation's Health," as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We veterans have been aided beyond our fondest dreams by chiropractic, for injuries and ailments sustained during our service. We have organized a group of chiropractors

in the New York area who serve our members, gratis if you please, since our Government does not see fit to make this wonderful service available to us at Government expense.

We would very much like to circularize your remarks to our membership (220), if you will kindly send us sufficient copies, or we can furnish you with the names and have them sent direct.

We veterans who feel that our sacrifices were to serve freedom, including the right to choose the type of doctor and the type of treatment, are grateful to you for your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

AARON H. STEINBERG,
Chairman.

Keeping Alive Shipbuilding Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the people in the Pacific coast area are probably more conscious of the falling off in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry than are the people in most other areas. Shipbuilding in our area has been down to zero for a number of months. The problem is not limited to the west coast. Shipbuilding facilities on all coasts are deteriorating and becoming obsolete.

I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Oakland Post Enquirer on August 18, 1949, which is as follows:

SHIPBUILDING FACILITIES VITAL TO SECURITY AND PROSPERITY OF NATION

The National Federation of American Shipping has urgently recommended to the Federal Government that the shipbuilding facilities of the country be restored and utilized, in order that the prosperity as well as the security of the country be assured.

This proposal is particularly timely, as President Truman is reported to have alerted various Federal agencies to an anticipated business recession and accompanying periods of widespread unemployment, his intention being that public works projects be in readiness to take up the slack.

A far better way to provide employment on a wide scale and at the same time avoid the wasteful evils of a political make-work program, as the association emphasizes, would be to rehabilitate the neglected shipbuilding enterprises which are essential to peacetime prosperity and are indispensable to national security in the event of war.

In the last two great wars involving the United States, the American Government has created maritime establishments superior to the combined competing facilities of all the rest of the world, and America was victorious in these conflicts primarily because of the maritime superiority thus attained.

But between these two great wars, the American Government let its maritime establishment fall into neglect and decay, and there was not only a blighting economic depression largely in consequence of this policy but there was ultimately another great war in large part attributable to that foolish policy.

Now, after winning the second of the two great wars with a superior maritime establishment as one of the decisive factors, the American Government has again let its splendid ships and shipbuilding facilities deteriorate and become obsolete.

So we are not only courting another blighting depression, but another devastating war as well.

The National Federation of American Shipping cites the fact that at least 12 of the key industrial areas of the United States depend in a major way upon shipbuilding and other maritime enterprises for major support of their employment and productive economy.

Naming them as Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Hampton Roads, Mobile, New Orleans, Seattle, Portland, Oreg., the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles, the federation asserted:

"The areas are substantial shipbuilding centers, looking to the construction of merchant and naval vessels for a good proportion of their economic livelihood.

"In addition to shipbuilding, a number of the yards have facilities to repair and convert ships, which would employ thousands."

But ever since the last war, the great shipyards in all these areas have been mostly idle, and are fast becoming obsolete in all cases and in many cases have fallen into total disintegration.

Surely a sensible thing to do in the face of increasing unemployment, as the federation urges, would be to revitalize our maritime establishments which would contribute so much to our prosperity and which are so utterly essential to our peace and security.

Subsidy for Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal:

SUBSIDY FOR TAXPAYERS

We read about the times, even if we are not old enough to recall them, when subsidies given corporations to build rail lines or to maintain steamship lines were regarded by many as pandering to wealthy monopolies. But those days are gone forever. We no longer subsidize utilities; we seek to tax and regulate them out of the hands of private enterprise.

But the rage for subsidies now is greater than ever, and these subsidies may be direct or indirect. Support prices for farm products, whether essential or not, are virtually subsidies the payment for which is made by the consumer and the taxpayer. The potato price support for the past few years is a case in point. The Government bought potatoes with our tax money, thereby keeping the price high to the producer and the price high to the person who had to buy the potatoes.

Now, with prices slumping, the Government may soon have to start indirect subsidies to the producers of grain and livestock. This inevitably will flatten the pocketbook of the taxpayer because he must raise the money to pay for the subsidy and then pay higher prices for food.

This fact is becoming so well known that Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is now advocating a plan which would let farm commodities go to the free market level and pay to the farmers a direct subsidy to make up the difference between the free market price and the politically fixed price. This plan has the virtue at least of being honest in that it provides for direct, uncamouflaged subsidies.

But speaking of subsidies, why not a taxpayers' subsidy? The taxpayer needs one, too, judging from the calls that are made on him to pay subsidies to other folks. If he got a subsidy to help him pay taxes to furnish subsidies for other folks, then we all ought to be happy until we wake up in the ashcan together.

The Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Bibliographical List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States, including many related questions raised by recent interoceanic-canal proposals, have become issues of national and international significance. These proposals include the practical and economical plan for the operational refinement of the present Panama Canal known as the Terminal Lake plan, the construction—at vastly greater cost—of a new canal at Panama at sea level, and the building of canals at other locations. These issues were formally presented to the Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, when he forwarded the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, without recommendation.

The first major step in the congressional consideration of this subject was the passage of House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, authorizing a full and complete study by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the financial operation of the Panama Canal. For that purpose its distinguished chairman, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia, designated a special subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and Representatives TOM B. FUGATE and EDWARD T. MILLER are members.

When the subcommittee's studies first started, it immediately became apparent that this investigation, of necessity, could not be limited to statistical studies of tolls but would touch upon the entire Panama Canal problem, and require a general familiarity with associated matters of considerable complexity and magnitude. To secure an adequate background of knowledge the subcommittee, in addition to formal hearings and consultations with many authorities of eminence, has examined an extensive canal literature and, during the period April 18–22, 1949, visited the Canal Zone to confer with Canal officials and to observe the operation of the Panama Canal at first hand.

To the end that some of its sources may be made more readily available to the Congress and better known to the country at large, I have prepared a selected bibliography on the Isthmian Canal question, using a similar compila-

tion by Representative Willis W. Bradley, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15, 1948, volume 94, part 11 Appendix, page A3890, as a base. This bibliography includes books, Government documents, recently published articles, and extensions of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Among the recognized authoritative works on the Panama Canal are:

Abbott, Henry L., Problems of the Panama Canal (2d ed.) New York. Macmillan Co., 1907.

DuVal, Miles P., Cadiz to Cathay. The story of the long diplomatic struggle for the Panama Canal. (2d ed.) Stanford University Press, 1947.

DuVal, Miles P., And the Mountains Will Move. The story of the building of the Panama Canal. Stanford University Press, 1947.

DuVal, Miles P., The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution. Paper presented before the Panama Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, on May 20, 1943. ASCE Proceedings, February 1947, volume 73, No. 2, page 161; reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, Appendix, page A1176, and Marine News, August 1947, XXXIV, 41.

Goethals, George W., The Panama Canal: An Engineering Treatise. New York. McGraw-Hill Co., 1916 (2 vols.).

Johnson, Emory R. The Panama Canal and Commerce. New York and London. D. Appleton & Co., 1916.

Sibert, William L., and Stevens, John F., The Construction of the Panama Canal. New York and London. D. Appleton & Co., 1915.

The great constructive engineering contributions of the late Generals Abbot and Sibert, the late John F. Stevens, who was chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–7, and the late General Goethals, who was chairman and chief engineer of the Commission, 1907–14, and the first Governor of the Panama Canal; the well-known historical and basic marine operational studies of Captain DuVal; and the original and fundamental studies of interoceanic commerce by Prof. Emory R. Johnson, formerly a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, entitle the works of these authorities to universal consideration by both professional interests and the general public.

The principal governmental documentation of the Panama Canal, 1901–49, is as follows:

LAWS AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF THE CANAL ZONE, CONSTRUCTION, AND OPERATION

Act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Approved June 28, 1902 (the Spooner Act).

Act to provide for the construction of a lock canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the method of construction. Approved June 29, 1906.

Act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone. Approved August 24, 1912 (Panama Canal Act).

CANAL TREATIES AND CONVENTIONS

Treaty between the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal of November 18, 1901 (Hay-Pauncefote Treaty). Treaty Series, No. 401.

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama of November 18, 1903 (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty). Treaty Series, No. 431.

Boundary convention between the United States and Panama of September 2, 1914 (Price-LeFevre Treaty). Treaty Series, No. 610.

General treaty of friendship and cooperation between the United States of America and Panama of March 2, 1936 (Hull-Alfaro Treaty). Treaty Series, No. 945.

UNITED STATES ARMY INTEROCEANIC CANAL BOARD, INVESTIGATION AND SURVEY, 1929–31

Public Resolution No. 99 (S. J. Res. 117), Seventieth Congress. Approved March 2, 1929.

Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the United States Army Interoceanic Canal Board (H. Doc. No. 139, 72d Cong.).

THIRD LOCKS PROJECT, 1939

Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Governor of the Panama Canal to investigate the means of increasing its capacity. Public Resolution No. 85, Seventy-fourth Congress. Approved May 1, 1936.

Report on the Panama Canal for the future need of interoceanic commerce (H. Doc. No. 210, 76th Cong.).

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Hearings on H. R. 180, H. R. 201, H. R. 202, H. R. 2667, and House Joint Resolution 112, Seventy-sixth Congress, on March 14, 15, and 16, 1939, concerning additional interoceanic canal facilities.

Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals: Hearings on S. 2229 and H. R. 5129, Seventy-sixth Congress, on July 20 and August 3, 1939, concerning additional facilities for the Panama Canal Zone.

Public Law 391, Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizing the construction of additional facilities for the Panama Canal. Approved August 11, 1939.

ISTHMIAN CANAL STUDIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 280, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Executive hearings on H. R. 4480, Seventy-ninth Congress, on November 15, 1945, concerning investigation of additional Panama Canal facilities.

Study of Additional Panama Canal Facilities (H. Rept. No. 1213, 79th Cong.).

Study of Additional Panama Canal Facilities (S. Rept. No. 862, 79th Cong.).

Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress. Approved December 28, 1945.

House Resolution 36, Eightieth Congress.

Report on the Panama Canal (H. Rept. No. 781, 80th Cong.).

Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress.

House Resolution 215, Eighty-first Congress, authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate various matters affecting the merchant marine, including the proposals for the future Panama Canal.

House Resolution 233, Eighty-first Congress, appropriating funds for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations under House Resolution 215, Eighty-first Congress.

PANAMA CANAL TOLL INVESTIGATION, 1949

House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, authorizing a full and complete study and analysis of the financial operation of the Panama Canal and requiring its submission to the House of Representatives by June 30, 1949.

House Resolution 245, Eighty-first Congress, extending the time for submission of the report under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, to September 1, 1949.

House Resolution 337, Eighty-first Congress, extending the time for submission of the report under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, until January 31, 1950.

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Hearings before Special Subcommittee To Investigate Panama Canal Tolls under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, on March 14, April 6, 19, May 23, and June 6, 14, 1949.

Investigation of Panama Canal Tolls—Interim Report (H. Rept. No. 1304, 81st Cong.).

The principal published articles of recent date applicable or pertinent to the Panama Canal specifically and Interoceanic Canal projects generally, some of which have been included in extensions of remarks by distinguished Members of the Congress, are likewise listed in a form convenient for reference, as follows:

ATOMIC BOMB, SECURITY, AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Baldwin, Hanson W., What Kind of War? Atlantic Monthly, July 1949, volume 184, No. 1, page 22. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A4627.

Betts, Lt. Col., A. W., Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Nuclear Weapons. The Military Engineer, March-April 1949, volume XLI, No. 280, page 104. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1713.

Bradley, Gen. Omar N., A Balanced Military Establishment. The Military Engineers, March-April, 1949, volume XLI, No. 280, page 101. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A5402.

Groves, Lt. Gen. Leslie R., United States Army (retired). Can New York Hide From the Atomic Bomb? Cosmopolitan, January 1949, volume 126, No. 1, page 41. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A169.

Hopkins, Frederick W., Security of the Panama Transit in the War. United States Naval Institute Proceedings, March 1949, volume 75, No. 553, page 321. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A5085.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., The Atomic Bomb and the Isthmian Canals. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, United States Army (retired) entitled "Can New York Hide From the Atomic Bomb?" published in Cosmopolitan January 1949. Reprinted, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A169.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., The Atomic Bomb and the Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, United States Army, published in the Military Engineer, January–February 1949. Reprinted, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A775.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., The Panama Canal and Nuclear Weapons. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, published in the Military Engineer, March–April 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1713.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., Panama Canal Security Against Atomic Attack. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Lt. Comdr. H. B. Seim, United States Navy, published in the USNI Proceedings, April 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2639.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., Isthmian Canals and National Defense. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, published in Atlantic Monthly, July 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A4627.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., A Balanced Military Policy for the United States. Extension of remarks quoting an address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, published in the Military Engineer, March–April 1949. Reprinted, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A5402.

Hon. David M. Potts. The Panama Canal in the Atomic Age. Radio address over the

American Broadcasting Co. network on December 8, 1947. Printed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 13, Appendix, page A4682.

Hon. David M. Potts, Defense of the Panama Canal. Radio address over Station WMCA in New York City on December 27, 1947. Printed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 9, Appendix, page A23.

Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, United States Army. Industrial Vulnerability to Bombing. The Military Engineer, January-February 1949, volume XLI, No. 279, page 1. Reprinted in the extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A755.

Lieutenant Commander H. B. Seim, United States Navy Atomic Bomb—The X-Factor of Military Policy. USNI Proceedings, April 1949, volume 75, No. 4, page 387. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2639.

Sidney Shalett. Can We Defend the Panama Canal? The Saturday Evening Post, October 9, 1948, volume 221, No. 15, page 15.

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON. Security of the Panama Transit in the War. Extension of Remarks quoting an article by Frederick W. Hopkins, published in the USNI Proceedings, March 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A5085.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

Association of American Ship Owners. Our National Investment in the Panama Canal. Shipping Survey, April 1948, volume 4, No. 4.

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS. The Case Against Present Panama Canal Tolls. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Charles L. Wheeler, published in the Pacific Marine Review, April 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2306.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W. What's Ahead for the Merchant Marine. Address before the Rotary Club, Baltimore, Md., January 11, 1948. Printed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A395.

HAND, Hon. T. MILLET. What's Ahead For the Merchant Marine. Extension of remarks quoting an address by Hon. Willis W. Bradley on January 11, 1949, before the Rotary Club, Baltimore, Md. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A395.

Morse, Murray, editor. Who Pays for the Panama Canal. The Log, July 1947, volume 42, No. 7, page 36.

RANKIN, Hon. JOHN E. Restoring the Panama Canal Toll Exemption for Coastwise Trade. Extension of remarks quoting a statement by Hon. Charles L. Wheeler. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2163.

Riggs, Commander Arthur Stanley, USNR (Retired). What Panama Canal Proposals Mean to Tanker Operators. The Oil Forum, April 1948, volume 2, No. 4, page 151.

Wheeler, Hon. Charles L. The Case Against Present Panama Canal Tolls. Pacific Marine Review, April 1949, page 60. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2306; and of Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2163.

TERMINAL LAKE PLAN

ALLEN, JOHN, JR., The Panama Canal and Theodore Roosevelt Inseparable in History. Extension of remarks quoting an address by Hon. Willis W. Bradley on May 3, 1947, in Washington, D. C., before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2127.

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS, The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, USN, published in the ASCE Proceedings, February 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 10, Appendix, page A1176.

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS, The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering? Extension of remarks quoting an article by Com. Arthur Stanley Riggs, published in USNI Proceedings, December 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 9, Appendix, page A19.

Bradley, Hon. Fred, The Panama Canal, radio address of March 24, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2597.

Bradley, Hon. Fred, The Panama Canal, radio address dated March 31, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2632.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W., The Panama Canal and Theodore Roosevelt Inseparable in History. Address before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States on May 3, 1947, in Washington, D. C. Printed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2127.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting a radio address of the late Hon. Fred Bradley of March 24, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2597.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting a radio address of the late Hon. Fred Bradley of March 31, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2632.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W., What of the Panama Canal? Address of April 19, 1948, before the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2449.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W., The Whys of the Panama Canal. Address before the Engineers' Club of Washington, D. C., February 24, 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1304.

Cole, Harry O., consulting engineer. What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2743.

Cole, Harry O., consulting engineer. Tribute to the late Sydney B. Williamson. Address of May 8, 1948, in Washington, D. C., before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, Appendix, page A3191. Summary of same. Engineering News-Record, May 13, 1948, volume 140, No. 20, page 60.

Cole, Harry O., consulting engineer. Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, January 1949, volume 75, No. 1, page 143. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A662.

Cole, Harry O., consulting engineer. Panama Canal. Letter to the editor. Marine Progress, January 1949, volume 17, No. 1, page 22. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A760.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. The Panama Canal Modernization. Marine Progress, April 1946, volume 14, page 16. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 11, Appendix, page A2563.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. Panama Canal. Marine Progress, September 1946, column 14, page 16.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. Ship Operation—The Panama Canal. Marine Progress, January 1947, volume 15, No. 1, page 18.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. The Canal Question and Shipping (editorial). Marine Progress, June 1947, volume 15, page 7.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. The Panama Canal Modernization. Marine Progress, June 1947, volume 15, page 22.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. Isthmian Plan. Marine Progress, August 1948, volume 16, No. 8, page 18. Reprinted in the extension of remarks of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2169.

Godsoe, Charles H., editor. Panama Viewpoint. Article quoting a letter by Consulting Engineer Harry O. Cole. Marine Progress, January 1949, volume 17, No. 1, page 22. Reprinted in the extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A760.

KEOGH, Hon. EUGENE J., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an editorial on the Panama Canal modernization published in Marine Progress, April 1946. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 11, Appendix, page A2563.

Kirkpatrick, Ralph Z., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings January 1949, volume 75, No. 1, page 151. Reprinted in the extension of remarks of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A3331.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., The Panama Canal Problem. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs published in Shipmate, May 1948. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, Appendix, page A3399.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., Panama Boondoggling. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs published in the Work Boat, November 1948. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A44.

MARTIN, Hon. THOMAS E., Waterway Improvements. Extension of remarks quoting a letter of Consulting Engineer Harry O. Cole, published in Marine Progress, January 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A760.

Pepperburg, Roy L. The Battle of the Levels. Sea Power, spring 1947, volume 7, No. 4, page 18.

Pepperburg, Roy L. The Panama Canal. Our Navy, mid-November 1948, volume XLIII, No. 12, page 4.

Pepperburg, Roy L. Bottleneck at Panama. The Rotarian, March 1949, volume LXXIV, No. 3, page 26.

Potts, Hon. David M. Alternative Canal Routes. Extension of remarks quoting letter of consulting engineer W. G. B. Thompson published in the Wall Street Journal, June 4, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2826.

Revercomb, Hon. Chapman. Tribute to the late Sydney B. Williamson. Extension of remarks quoting address of consulting engineer Harry O. Cole of May 8, 1948, before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, Appendix, page A3190.

Riggs, Arthur Stanley, commander, United States Navy (retired). The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering? USNI Proceedings December 1947, volume 73, No. 538, page 1455. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 9, Appendix, page A19.

Riggs Arthur Stanley. The Panama Question. Shipmate, May 1948, volume 11, No. 5, page 7. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, Appendix, page A3399.

Riggs, Arthur Stanley. Panama Boondoggling. The Work Boat, November 1948, volume V, No. 11, page 46. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A44.

Snyder, Hon. Melvin C., What Should Be Done to Improve the Panama Canal? Extension of remarks quoting articles by Consulting Engineer Harry O. Cole. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2743.

STAGGERS, Hon. HARLEY O., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project. Extension of remarks quoting a technical discussion by Con-

sulting Engineer Harry O. Cole, published in the ASCE Proceedings, January 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A662.

THOMPSON, Hon. CLARK W., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting the entire procedings of Engineers' Club of Washington on February 24, 1949, including the address of the Honorable Willis W. Bradley on the "Whys of the Panama Canal." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1303.

THOMPSON, Hon. CLARK W., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting a technical engineering discussion by Maj. Ralph Z. Kirkpatrick, ASCE Proceedings, January 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A3331.

THOMPSON, Hon. CLARK W., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an editorial in Marine Progress, August 1948. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2169.

SEA-LEVEL PROPOSAL

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS, A Sea Level Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Brig. Gen. Hans Kramer, USA (retired), published in the Pacific Marine Review, March 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1864. Extension of remarks quoting an editorial published in the Pacific Marine Review, February 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2018.

Bowman, Waldo G., Puzzle in Panama. Engineering News-Record, May 1, 1947, volume 138, No. 18, page 74 (vol. p. 740). Reprinted in Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1947, page 407.

Claybourn, John G. Sea-Level Plan for Panama Canal. ASCE Proceedings, February 1947, volume 73, No. 2, page 175. Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, May 1949, volume 75, No. 5, page 618.

Department of the Army, The Panama Canal—Vital Link in Hemisphere Defense. Armed Forces Talk No. 253. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1948.

King, Donald D., editor, Sea-Level Panama Canal Dictated by New Weapon Dangers. Civil Engineering, February 1948, volume 18, No. 2, page 17.

Kramer, Hans, and Stratton, James H., Sea-Level Plan for Panama Canal. Discussion, ASCE Proceedings, June 1948, volume 74, No. 6, page 921.

Kramer, Hans, and Nichols, Philip G., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project. Discussion, ASCE Proceedings, June 1948, volume 74, No. 6, page 1015.

Kramer, Brig. Gen. Hans., United States Navy (retired), A Sea-Level Panama Canal, Pacific Marine Review, March 1949, page 49. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1864.

MacMullen, T. Douglas, editor, A Sea-Level Panama Canal (editorial), Pacific Marine Review, February 1949, page 51. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2018.

Stratton, Col. James H., et al., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project. A Symposium, ASCE Proceedings, April 1948, volume 74, No. 4, page 443.

Stratton, Col. James H., et al. Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project. Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, May 1919, volume 75, No. 5, page 625.

COST ESTIMATE RELIABILITY

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS, Slide Problems of the Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Prof. A. Casagrande, published in the ASCE Proceedings, March 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2228.

BLAND, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS, Panama Canal—Symposium Discussion. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Capt. H. H. Little, United States Navy (retired), published in the ASCE Proceedings, March 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1887.

LITTLE, H. H., and CASAGRANDE, A., Panama Canal—The Sea Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, March 1949, volume 75, No. 3, pages 417–426. Reprinted in extensions of remarks of Representative S. O. BLAND, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1887 and page A2328, respectively.

SPECIAL

Bradley, Hon. Fred. The Panama Canal. Press release dated April 10, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2674.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W. The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting a press release of the late Hon. Fred Bradley of April 10, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2674.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W. Let's Have an Interoceanic Canals Commission. Extension of remarks quoting a resolution of the American Coalition. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 9, Appendix, page A451.

Bradley, Hon. Willis W. The Panama Canal Question—Bibliographical List. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, Appendix, page A3890.

Cole, Harry O., consulting engineer et al. Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, January 1949, volume 75, No. 1, page 143.

Davies Wallace, editor. Something's Going To Happen to the Canal—But What? Army Transportation Journal, May–June 1947, volume 3, No. 3, page 20.

Freeland, Stephan L. New Plans for Panama. Popular Science, July 1947, volume 151, page 66.

Fucik, E. Montford; Romanowitz, Charles M.; and Kazmann, Raphael G. Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, October 1948, volume 74, No. 8, page 1384.

Kent, John L. Have We Outgrown the Panama Canal? Popular Mechanics, June 1946, volume 85, No. 6, page 120.

Lavis, Fred, and Kazmann, Raphael G. Sea Level Plan for Panama Canal—Discussion, ASCE Proceedings, February 1943, volume 74, No. 2, page 236.

Lisle, B. Orchard, editor. Panama Canal Losing Major Oil Artery Status. The Oil Forum, May 1947, volume 1, No. 4, page 138.

Little, Capt. H. H., United States Navy (retired). Let Us Build the Best Canal at Panama. Journal of the American Society of Naval Engineers, November 1946, volume 58, No. 4, page 560.

Little, H. H.; Riggs, Arthur Stanley; and Small, E. B. The Panama Canal: Operations or Engineering?—Discussion. USNI Proceedings, July 1948, volume 74, No. 545, page 894.

Massey, George B.; Allan, William; and Bakhmeteff, Boris A. Panama Canal—the Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, November 1948, volume 74, No. 9, page 1509.

O'Neill, J. J., Planning the New Panama Canal. Condensed from the New York Herald Tribune, March 16, 1947. Science Digest, June 1947, volume 21, No. 6, page 6.

Pillsbury, George B., et al. Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, September 1948, volume 74, No. 7, page 1228.

Potts, Hon. David M., The Panama Canal. Extension of remarks quoting an article by S. H. Scheibla in the Wall Street Journal, May 27, 1947. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, Appendix, page A2516.

Riggs, Commander Arthur Stanley, USNR (retired), Panama Futility. Catholic World, January 1947, volume CLXIV, No. 982, page 298.

Riggs, Commander Arthur Stanley, USNR (retired), Panama Railroad. Railway Progress, April 1949, volume III, No. 2, page 25. Reprinted in extension of remarks of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2706.

Shankland, Ernest, and McNown, John S., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, February 1949, volume 75, No. 2, page 259.

Sheldon, Robert C.; Edwards, F. W.; and Cedergren, H. R., Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project—Discussion. ASCE Proceedings, December 1948, volume 74, No. 10, page 1642.

Steese, Col. James G., United States Army (retired), The Panama Canal in World War II. The Military Engineer, January 1948, volume XL, No. 267, page 20.

Thatcher, Hon. Maurice H., remarks introducing the Honorable Willis W. Bradley before the Engineers Club of Washington. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A1304.

THOMPSON, Hon. CLARK W., The Panama Railroad: A Historic and Epoch-Making Institution. Extension of remarks quoting an article by Arthur Stanley Riggs published in Railway Progress, April 1949. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A2706.

From the foregoing it is clear that the proper determination of the Isthmian Canal policy presents major issues affecting the national defense and foreign policy of the United States including important diplomatic and treaty situations, international and domestic shipping, maritime and engineering agencies, and involving vast expenditures of public funds.

The implications of these issues are so grave that they cannot be taken lightly but require the most deliberate and careful consideration by the Congress.

Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a message by C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, dated August 17, 1949, in reference to the passage in the House of the O'Mahoney-Kefauver antimonopoly merger bill.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, today congratulated Members of the House for their overwhelming favorable vote on the O'Mahoney-Kefauver antimonopoly merger bill. In identical messages to Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, and to Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, Massachusetts, Mr. Harder said that passage of the legislation "is a definite step in the direction of promoting independent and small business welfare." At the same time Mr. Harder called on Senate Majority Leader SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, Minority Leader KENNETH WHERRY, Republican, Nebraska, and Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman

PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada, for immediate Senate action on the legislation. Mr. Harder told the Senators that independent and small-business men have been very worried over the threat posed to their welfare by the current gigantic business merger trend. He said that delay on the matter might be fatal. Following is the text of these messages:

To Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Minority Leader MARTIN:

"We congratulate Members of the House for their overwhelming favorable vote on the O'Mahoney-Kefauver antimonopoly merger bill, H. R. 2734. Passage of this legislation is a definite step in the direction of promoting independent and small business welfare. We have watched with great anxiety the growing trend toward greater and yet greater giant business concentration brought about in great part by monopolistic mergers of competing businesses. Action by the House at this time comes as a much-needed stimulus to our members and to all independent and small firms. As you know since 1945 we of the federation have sought passage of this legislation. We have done so because of repeated demands by our Nation-wide independent and small-business and professional man membership. We have today called on Senate leaders for immediate action on this bill."

To Senators SCOTT LUCAS, KENNETH WHERRY, and PAT MCCARRAN:

"As you know, the House passed yesterday the O'Mahoney-Kefauver antimonopoly merger bill, H. R. 2734. Passage of this legislation is a definite step in the direction of promoting independent and small business welfare. The Senate should lose no time in following the House lead on this matter. The threat to independent and small business inherent in the present giant business merger trend is so immediate and so vital that delay on this legislation may well be fatal. Our Nation-wide independent and small-business and professional man membership has demanded since 1945 that Congress adopt this bar to monopoly-producing mergers. We hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on this legislation without delay and that it will report the measure favorably to the Senate for vote. We are depending on you for action on this matter."

Statement by Assistant Secretary of Labor Philip Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a fine American and an outstanding young man this week took the oath of Assistant Secretary of Labor. Present at the ceremonies were many distinguished Government officials, labor leaders, and businessmen. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Philip Kaiser, made at the time he assumed his office.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Justice Black, Members of Congress, colleagues, and friends, I would not be human if I didn't say that this is one of the happiest and proudest days of my life. To be given an opportunity to serve under the able leadership of President Truman and Secretary Tobin is as much as any man can ask. I assume this assignment with humility; I hope that I shall not be found wanting.

As I see it, our Government today has two basic objectives: Strengthening and expanding our democracy at home and achieving a democratic peace abroad—a peace which will frustrate totalitarianism in all its forms. These objectives are inextricably interwoven; each sustains and buttresses the other, and the achievement of both is essential if the great potential of the American way of life is to be realized.

In waging this battle for democracy and peace, our Government must have the full and active support of all of our people and their free institutions; the genius of our way of life has enabled us to achieve great things through the voluntary efforts of an enlightened citizenry. And so it must continue.

Accordingly, Mr. Secretary, it is most appropriate, I think, at the swearing-in of an Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Labor Affairs, to say a few words about the work of American trade-unions in the foreign field. Since the end of the war, particularly, American labor has played a crucial role in the fight for democracy abroad. It has supplied men, money, and inspiration to help free trade-unionists all over the world. It has preached the true gospel that communism imprisons and destroys labor organizations, and that totalitarianism and free trade-unionism are utterly irreconcilable. This work American trade-unions have done freely and voluntarily—as an expression of their boundless faith that free trade-unionism is a constructive, democratic alternative to totalitarianism. This work represents democratic idealism operating at its best. I venture to say that only our American system could have nurtured it.

I would also say, Mr. Secretary, that the international work of this Department could not be successful without the generous and sincere support of the American businessman. As the United States representative at ILO meetings, I have had the very good fortune of collaborating with our employer as well as our worker representatives. These employer representatives carry the banner of free America with dignity, intelligence, and courage. Several times at Geneva last June, all of us—Government, employer, and worker delegates—observed that we of the United States had one very important advantage over many other countries. We are in fundamental agreement as to our objectives, though we may sometimes disagree on details. All of us agree as to the validity of our way of doing things and as to the soundness of our common aims—and this amity is a blessing we must never lose sight of.

I can't help but note with pleasure, Mr. Secretary, that many of my Government colleagues within and outside of the Labor Department are here today. I have had the privilege of working with them for many years. They are men and women devoted to the public weal; not interested in pressing the special interests of any one group, but rather in serving the common welfare. I look forward to many more years of close collaboration with this distinguished group of public servants.

And now, Mr. Secretary, may I close on a personal note. There are here today many of my close relatives, including, I am proud to say, my father, 76 years young. He came to this country almost 50 years ago, fleeing social and economic oppression and religious persecution. He came here seeking an opportunity to live in a free society—where men could earn their bread by honest toil and worship God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience; where children of immigrants were provided opportunities commensurate with their abilities. He found these things. He found a life-giving spirit of freedom, for to him the basic concept of life has been the inviolability of the individual personality. He toiled hard in this vineyard and inculcated in his 35 children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren a sense of deep devotion to a country where his aspirations have become a reality. If he feels proud today, I am most happy for him.

Mr. Secretary, it will be a privilege and an honor to serve President Truman and yourself loyally and faithfully, and with all the energy and ability at my disposal.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of August 24, 1949.

This editorial quotes Senator LUCAS of Illinois in regard to farm price supports.

The greatest enemy of industry is its own spokesmen in the various newspapers and magazines. They do not realize their dependence on agriculture.

I am inserting a tabulation showing the income of the State of New York and the per capita income for comparative years:

Year	State income	Per capita income
1929	$14,479,000,000	$1,125
1932	8,840,000,000	671
1939	11,391,000,000	825
1941	13,384,000,000	989
1948	[1] 28,000,000,000	1,850

[1] Estimated.

I wonder if the Wall Street Journal knew that the State of New York would lose approximately $14,000,000,000 if farm income drops back to 1941 levels? This happens to be the case and as a Member of Congress from the farm areas, I would like to warn them that the attitude of the Wall Street Journal toward farm prices and its influence on the public, may force farm prices back to 1941 levels and that if it does, the State of New York will lose $14,000,000,000 of annual income that it now has.

There is no escape for the State of New York if they insist that farm prices are too high and must come down. The income of their State will ratio downward with gross farm income. Then instead of having cheap food, they will have unemployment and relief rolls. Then our Nation will find itself in a state of bankruptcy.

The Wall Street Journal and some public servants had best remember that the prosperity of the Nation is almost wholly dependent on the prosperity of the farmer who is the producer of our wealth which annually springs from mother earth. The national income is year after year almost exactly seven times the farm income. Let us not forget that fact for a moment.

The editorial from the Wall Street Journal follows:

WHERE IS TOO FAR?

Senator LUCAS, who speaks for the administration in Congress, said the other day that the Government has gone too far in its farm price-support program. Unless it is trimmed people will be so bitter that we'll break the whole Federal farm program down."

The bitterness to which the Senator refers comes from the fact that people find themselves paying high prices for food whilst great quantities of grain, butter, potatoes, and the like lie useless in Government warehouses. It is to assuage this bitterness that Congress is debating a host of suggested new farm programs.

All these plans have one thing in common. All are designed to give to one segment of the economy, the farmers, a guaranteed income to be paid for if necessary by taxing the rest of the economy.

The problem, as Mr. LUCAS so realistically notes, is to select the farm price-support level, or the subsidy level, which will give the farmer his guaranties but will not create any of the absurdities that make for this bitterness.

That is a problem that makes easy the question of how many angels can dance on a pinhead.

At the present price-support level the Government is buying carloads of nearly everything because the set price is higher than the going market price. To take one case, the Government now holds many million bushels of grain and is currently buying new grain at the rate of more than a million bushels a week. That is grain that does not go into bread, meat, or milk. And it means that the housewife pays more for and uses less of these things than need be.

It should not surprise Mr. LUCAS that this breeds bitterness among housewives. For it has even begun to raise questions in the Grain Belt; we printed here recently a warning from the Des Moines Register that corn price supports are too high.

Let us suppose the support levels were reduced. If they were put below the free market price, the absurdity would be ended. The Government would not longer have to absorb great surpluses; there would be no surplus. The world's stomach is big enough to absorb it all at the right price. Europe alone would eat vastly more if it could get more for its scarce dollars.

But if the support price were below the free price, the support price would be meaningless. The support program then would hurt no one nor help anyone; it might as well not exist.

To have any meaning the support price must be above the free price. And if it is above the free price, by however so little, then the absurdities Mr. LUCAS fears come to pass—many housewives crimp while Government warehouses bulge.

So it boils down to this: If free prices are high enough to satisfy the farmers there is no need for any support program. If they are not, any selected support level above the market price will create the absurdities, and hence the bitterness.

Nor is this done away with by adopting Secretary Brannan's production controls with cash subsidies to farmers. For here again is the same old dilemma.

As the quotas are shrunk to avoid surpluses and high subsidies, we have the absurdity of shortages and high prices while great acres lie fallow. Yet if the quotas are not shrunk, there is the bitterness of endless subsidies from the taxpayer. The more that pours from the fields the greater would be the burden of these subsidies.

It is not in fact a question, as Senator LUCAS would persuade us, of the tinkerers having gone too far. Once you accept the principle that any group is entitled to any fixed and arbitrary share of the proceeds of the world's work you walk head-on into absurdities and bitterness. Once you start that way, anywhere is too far.

Dedicatory Address by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson at Yeshiva University

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the enlightening and understanding address delivered by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson recently at the dedicatory exercises at Yeshiva University in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the pharmacy at the Pentagon in the Capital of our Nation there is a poster which gives strength and confidence to every patient who stops at the window to get his prescription filled. It is the prayer of a doctor who addresses himself first to his God and reads as follows:

"Thy eternal providence has appointed me to watch over the life and health of Thy creatures. May the love for my art actuate me at all times; may neither avarice nor miserliness, nor thirst for glory, or for a great reputation engage my mind; for the enemies of truth and philanthropy could easily deceive me and make me forgetful of my lofty aim of doing good to Thy children. May I never see in the patient anything but a fellow creature in pain. Grant me strength, time, and opportunity always to correct what I have acquired, always to extend its domain; for knowledge is immense and the spirit of man can extend infinitely to enrich itself daily with new requirements. Today he can discover his errors of yesterday and tomorrow he may obtain a new light on what he thinks himself sure of today. O God, Thou has appointed me to watch over the life and health of Thy creatures; here am I ready for my vocation, and now I turn unto Thy calling."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the prayer of Dr. Maimonides. I am sure many of you recognize it.

Today you are dedicating a number of buildings, all of which will promote learning and improve the facilities of this university. A great university such as Yeshiva, with its high standards of scholarship, has many needs. It needs libraries and recitation halls, dormitories and recreation facilities. Thanks to the traditional philanthropy of the Jewish people, and thanks especially to you, Mr. Charles Silver, many of Yeshiva's fondest hopes have already been realized. I have every confidence in the future of this great university.

What interests me particularly as Secretary of Defense at this time is that you are including an administration foundation for a medical school.

It would be most fitting to predicate the dedication of a medical school at Yeshiva University on the name and fame of Maimonides, the great Jewish medieval philosopher who matched his worldly wisdom with his medical skill and his interest in man with his faith in God.

The doctor is a tradition in the life of the Jew. Healers, as distinguished from medicine men or sorcerers, appear on the Jewish scene in Biblical times. Stories of their skill in their profession come down to us through the ages. Physicians to kings and queens, caliphs, sultans, and popes, these skillful Jewish scholars never lost touch with the healing needs of the common man. They have served all mankind, even foes as well as friends.

Like Maimonides, the great Jewish doctors were learned men, men who knew the history and the culture of their people. Many of them would have qualified as rabbis as well as physicians. Indeed, Maimonides, as you so well know, did himself make original monumental contributions to Jewish rabbinical scholarship and in fact promulgated a religious creed which appears in the prayer books of your liturgy for daily recital.

It is no chance coincidence, therefore, that out of the Yeshiva Theological School there should now emerge a medical school. In this new development, moreover, Yeshiva University is following in that tradition well established in our country. For some of our most distinguished universities began as schools for ministers of the gospel—Harvard, Yale, Brown, Cornell, Catholic University, Duke—to name but a few.

The Yeshiva has its roots in antiquity. It was an established educational institution in Palestine and Babylon long before the modern university was developed. And it always was something more than a school for rabbis. It was always the center for education of laymen as well as spiritual leaders. As far back as the fifth century, it was offering a variety of courses covering many subjects of general interest. Manual training, music, even athletics found place in the life and curriculum of the Yeshiva. While the basic education concentrated on the Talmud and the Commentaries upon the Texts, more worldly subjects were not ignored. Moreover, there has always been an interchange of cultures between the Jews and the peoples with whom they came in contact. The Greek, the Arabic, and other cultures have had their impact on Jewish learning and have in turn been influenced by Jewish scholars.

Now, here in the United States, we have a great Yeshiva University, and it is truly a part of our American culture.

America is a great pattern; though woven of many varied faiths and customs, still it is of one cloth—of a cloth that is one in the basic ideals of the Bill of Rights—of tolerance, of individual dignity, of fair play, and of justice.

On this very day, June 12, 1776, thirteen long years before the Federal Constitution was adopted, the people of Virginia set up the first bill of rights as the foundation of government. That bill of rights was destined to serve as the guide for other States. Moreover, it was the model for that Bill of Rights which was incorporated in the first ten amendments of the Federal Constitution. It is fortuitous, indeed, that the day of the laying of a cornerstone of this great Jewish university should coincide with the anniversary of the adoption by Virginia of the bill of rights.

The fact that this Jewish university, Yeshiva University, equipped and maintained as it is almost wholly by funds donated by members of the Jewish faith, holds it doors wide open to Jew and gentile alike, would have pleased our founding fathers, the great liberals of our early history.

There is additional significance to this occasion. The establishment by the Jewish community of a medical school at this time, is a great public service. The country is badly in need of doctors, and no one feels the shortage more acutely than do our armed forces. Part of this shortage is traceable to

faulty distribution in the past of the medical talent we had, to a failure to get maximum efficient use of the doctors we had on duty, and to the absence of unified policies among the three services of our national defense. Many of these faults we now are hoping to correct. In my office in Washington we have set up a Director of Medical Services for the National Military Establishment. He is being assigned with the responsibility and equipped with the authority to establish, control, and supervise policies, standards, and programs to govern all the medical services of the three military departments.

When the Yeshiva Medical School begins to send out graduates, I hope the military services will attract a number of them. A medical career in the Army, Navy, or Air Force has its rewards and satisfactions beyond and above the fees of civilian practice. We shall strive constantly to make the military medical career professionally attractive to the young graduate.

The national defense calls for a wide variety of talents. And medicine stands high on our priority lists. To be well defended, planes and ships and bombs and tanks are not enough. We still must have men, good men, strong men, men who can stand up under the rigors of modern battle, beat back an aggressor's blow, and then rout him completely. To do that successfully calls for efficient and adequate medical support of the fighting team.

For our country to be prepared to meet any emergency calls for the united effort of all Americans. A united America, a prepared America, will mean a strong America; and a strong America means an America no aggressor would dare attack.

Inherent in the fundamental strength is the respect of Americans for each other, a faith of all in the dignity of each. So, in closing, as in opening, I go back to the Jewish tradition of learning and read you the credo of the teachers at Jabneh 1,900 years ago. Jabneh was probably one of the earliest prototypes of the present Yeshiva. It was saved from the sword of Vespasian by the special plea of its founder, Rabban Jocanan, and the story is undoubtedly fully familiar to most of you.

Here is the credo:

"I am a creature of God and so is my fellow man. I go early to my work and he to his. He does not boast of his labor nor I of mine. * * * Whether a man accomplish great things or small, his rewards are the same if only his heart be set upon Heaven."

I commend this lofty spirit of that simple belief to Americans everywhere. A school such as this Yeshiva University that teaches such a doctrine as the credo of Jabneh is indeed a national asset and a stirring symbol of the American ideal.

Borrowed Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of August 25, 1949:

"BORROWED" PROPERTY

The low moral tone in Washington, illustrated most graphically in the Vaughan case, seems to be contagious. Now we have an example in Cambria County of a similar absence of political morals.

The other day Republican County Chairman Edkins charged that furniture had been removed from the courthouse at Ebensburg, loaded on a truck, and taken to Democratic headquarters in Johnstown. Now, Democratic Chairman Torquato retorts that the furniture consisted of only two tables and two chairs, and that in any event it was merely "borrowed."

We doubt whether that defense would stand up in court. Borrowing county property, regardless of its value, is not to be considered so lightly. It discloses a disregard for the rights of the taxpayers which is amazing. And the fact that it was borrowed for the purposes of a political organization aggravates, rather than lessens, the offense. In winning control of the courthouse, the Democratic organization did not win the right to dispose furtively of the property of taxpayers of this county.

Republican County Commissioner Cyrus W. Davis said there was no record in the minutes of the commissioners of the sale or rental of furniture, and as a member of the board he proposes to ask an investigation by the district attorney. As this is written, we have not heard from the two Democratic members of the board of commissioners, Mr. Farrell and Mr. Owens. As it stands, however, this episode indicates a high-handed contempt for their authority over the courthouse which the board of commissioners can hardly condone.

Apart from the stupidity involved in this case, in which the risk of discovery so greatly overshadowed the apparently small value of the borrowed furniture, it reveals an arrogance that is almost incredible. But even worse than stupidity and arrogance is the fact that Mr. Torquato, chairman of the majority party in Cambria County, seems to see nothing morally wrong about it—just as the President's military aide, Major General Vaughan, saw nothing wrong about accepting presents from a businessman with an ax to grind, or intervening to relax for his friends the impartial operation of Federal regulations.

If these things are symbolic, and the public accepts them as a matter of course, then we have gone a long way on the course of political corruption. The case of the "borrowed" county furniture should be pursued to its conclusion, so that no one will be tempted to make free with the property of the taxpayers again.

Friends Who Are Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the August 1949 issue of the Kiwanis magazine, which should be interesting to all Members of Congress and instructive to all critics of Congress.

Entitled "Friends Who Are Enemies," it speaks a word in behalf of our representative government and points out the need for more responsible criticism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIENDS WHO ARE ENEMIES

(By Thomas W. Christopher)

THE GADFLIES WHO ARE ALWAYS LAMPOONING CONGRESS ARE TEARING DOWN DEMOCRACY—INSTEAD THEY SHOULD BE OFFERING INTELLIGENT CRITICISM

I wonder, sometimes, if some people might be led into thinking that the institution of Congress should be abolished. Nobody speaks a good word for it. Newspaper columnists make a comfortable living, or better, by pointing with scorn and anger at its failings and faults. The comics constantly picture Congressmen as big, fat buffoons who never give a thought to the welfare of the country, and children grow into men and women with this image indelibly stamped in their minds—and some become Congressmen. College professors talk of the science of Government and scoff at the art of politics and "politicking."

Yet, it is pretty safe to assume that these critics do not favor the abolition of the institution, for a goodly number of them have shown that they would jump at the opportunity to sit as a Member of the body. Their criticism, then, is not aimed at destroying the institution, but, at best, at improving the product—and all of us must subscribe to that. But we need to evaluate not only the product, but also the effect of the criticism, for it seems never to occur to some of our columnists and comic writers that medicine intended to cure a fever sometimes kills the patient. And none of us want this patient to die.

We all believe that Congress as an instrument performs a vital function in our democratic way of life, and many of us believe that it is the best, and, in the last analysis, the only mechanism we have whereby the people may control their destinies.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote that "the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army" he was summing up the philosophy lying behind the American adventure, and, in a national sense, the people speak and act primarily through their representatives in Congress. When we have a Government of bureaucrats instead of Congressmen the people will lose their control and their freedom.

One of the things which should be kept in mind as we read the day-by-day denunciations of Congress and Congressmen is that less than perfect men often render valuable service. A case in point is the founding fathers, many of whom were vain and selfish, and some of whom profited materially by the rebellion against England. Yet these same men helped in making real the dreams and yearnings which had been in the hearts of men for centuries past. Charles A. Beard was one of the scholars who exposed the defects of character and conduct of these early leaders, and yet Beard consistently pointed to their achievements.

Another thing is that the "politicking" which we profess to despise is of the very essence of the American way. Abraham Lincoln, for example, was a master "politicker." The handshaking is a device by which we force the politician to bow to us, the people, and, instead of reducing the necessity for it, we would be wiser to take steps to insure more. Thus the remedy for inept and crooked politicians is not to remove control over them from the people, as by bureaus, but to make them truly answerable to the citizenry.

Of course, the trend now is toward experts—men free of the necessity of "politicking" for their jobs. But experts also can be inept and dishonest. The real solution is in more people-control, not less, and when we have this we shall have a higher caliber Congress.

In thinking of ways to insure greater people-control, we usually turn first to education, and our schools and colleges can participate by making greater efforts to create

an understanding among students of the practical workings of our political system. It is a fine thing for a college graduate to be conversant with Lord Bacon's New Atlantis, but it is essential that he comprehend the actual way our political system is carried on, the method by which progress is brought about in our democracy. Yet, our schools and colleges often do more here to befuddle than to enlighten. All too often, the more one goes to school, the less he understands and appreciates practical politics, and it is practical politics, largely, that determine our welfare as a people. With exceptions, of course, the average college professor has a poorer conception of the human factors that have made for political progress and national greatness in the United States than the average laborer, and it is no accident, I think, that so many of our Communists are recruited from the so-called "intellectual" class.

But the schools are no more important than the press. We must have a vigorous, fearless, free press which reaches down to the branchheads and informs and advises the citizenry. Public criticism is the best sort of insurance, and, if anything, we need more of it. But we also need more responsible criticism, more criticism from critics who comprehend the functions of a democratic society, from critics who realize that political scientists and politicians operate differently. It would be helpful, for example, if some of our Washington political newsmen would realize that they use the same sensational methods in their columns as the congressional investigating committees they are constantly condemning.

One of my all-time favorites among Washington commentators is the late Raymond Clapper. The result of his careful, constructive criticism was a stronger America. On the other hand, the sensational type of reporting, with its constant denunciation, results in a little correction and a big loss of faith in the institution of Congress. It's like burning down the house to get rid of the rats.

Dangerous Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a splendid editorial entitled "Dangerous Economy," which appeared in the August 24 issue of the Woodbury Daily Times. Since it treats with the administration's new policy of reducing our defense activities at home, while we expend large sums abroad, its theme merits careful study and consideration on the part of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS ECONOMY

There are so many ways in which the Federal Government can cut down its expenses that we wonder why they pick out a dangerous way of doing it. While we are planning to arm any and every nation that gives us the least hint it might be against the Soviet, we plan to close three navy yards and reduce activities in others. A total slash of $1,500,000,000 in our 1950–51 budget for the armed forces is contemplated and from present indications our naval bases are going to be hard hit.

We believe that one of the best methods to invite another Pearl Harbor is to let our defenses crumble away while we spend our money giving people of other lands arms to fight our battles. The important role the Navy played in the last war should ever remind us that this fighting arm of our armed forces should be well taken care of. Closing our naval bases to save and then giving General Franco and Marshal Tito anything to strengthen their arms is too much for the average American to stomach. However, unless the signs soon change, that is exactly what is going to happen.

In our section of the country we are particularly interested in the Philadelphia base, for it has provided the livelihood of many of our residents for years and years. It has served the Nation well and we believe it to be worth every nickle the Nation has spent on it. There seems to be a certain group in Washington that is bent on crippling this mighty defense unit as much as possible to favor some other section of the country. Without taking into consideration the grave economic blow it would deal our people, the closing of the Philadelphia base would be poor economy, for it is already in existence and has enormous potentialities for carrying on the vigorous requirements of such a plant in times of war. To replace such a naval base would take years and years and while that is going on anything could happen because the base was not there and operating when it was needed.

We sincerely hope that our Congressmen and those of nearby States will be up in arms about any contemplated closing of the Philadelphia base. It not only means much to the defense of the Nation, but it also means a great deal to our economic prosperity in this section of the country. If nations all over the world were closing down their naval bases then we would think there was a sane reason for closing them down in this country. But every day we hear about the gravity of the situation and how other world powers are looking toward their armed might if the shooting war comes. So, in view of this fact, what an awful bit of folly for us to let any of our home naval bases shut down at this time.

If we are not very careful we will find that we have emptied our Nation's purse for the arming of other nations to fight our battles and have nothing left to keep ourselves armed and in fighting trim. Somehow we seem to think other nations will fight and see their sons die for us because we loaned them billions. Nothing could be more misleading and nothing could be more dangerous than to get such an idea firmly fixed in our national mind. When the fighting comes it will be the boys of the United States of America who will again carry the big burden and we should see that nothing is left undone to give them the best possible tools in the struggle they will have to face.

Reorganization of the Executive Branch—Comment From Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented previously on:

A. The urgent necessity of adoption of the Hoover Commission reports on an over-all basis.

B. The fact that the President is unfortunately only selecting those items in the Hoover reports which suit his own fancy, rather than fulfilling the spirit of the Hoover recommendations for $3,000,000,000 economy.

C. The fact that "reorganization" is a much-abused word, which means more than "transferitis" and paper-shifting of bureaus. Reorganization means streamlining for purposes of efficiency and economy. It means cutting out unnecessary bureau divisions, units, and offices, including the personnel attached thereto.

Last week we killed Reorganization Plan No. 1, which, if it had been passed, would have provided tremendous incentive to advocates of socialized medicine. At the same time we registered strong opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2, which, unfortunately, however, was enacted into public law.

THE MEANING OF OUR OPPOSITION TO PLANS 1 AND 2

Many of our colleagues must have wondered, as I did, whether our people would follow this issue sufficiently closely to note this fact: That because many Senators cast their votes in opposition to Reorganization Plans Nos. 1 and 2, this did not mean that we were actually against the Hoover Commission as such. On the contrary, to have voted against these two insidious plans meant that we had a heightened devotion to the over-all Hoover recommendations, but that we simply could not stand to have plans foisted on us under the guise of reorganization, which actually, however, did not reorganize.

WISCONSINITES KEENLY ANALYZED ISSUE

I am glad to report that, as usual, our people have been most perceptive and discerning in their analysis of these two votes. Innumerable letters and telegrams to me, for example, showed that the people of Wisconsin have indicated that they, too, believe a vote against Reorganization Plans Nos. 1 and 2 was a vote for real Government reorganization and against phony or baloney reorganization.

I should like at this time to quote from a few communications received by myself endorsing our vote against plans 1 and 2. I am humbly grateful for the gracious comments made in these various quotations regarding my own efforts. However, the important point is, that in these quotations, thinking citizens of Wisconsin are commending not just one individual, but all Senators who voted for true Government streamlining.

GRASS ROOTS ENDORSE SENATE VOTES

I am particularly grateful for a fine editorial which appeared in the August 23 issue of the Record-Herald published in Wausau, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial, as well as the text of various comments received from my State be printed in the RECORD. I believe that these views represent grass-roots newspaper and individual opinion not only in the Badger State, but throughout our Nation. Out of respect for the confidence in which

these various folks in Wisconsin have written to me, I have, of course, refrained from quoting their actual names.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of August 23, 1949]

TRICKY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY last week voted twice against Truman's reorganization plans, Nos. 1 and 2. They were submitted to the Congress presumably as part of the Hoover Commission's plan for reorganization of the Government. But the Wisconsin senior Senator says that they were deceptively so labeled, and would actually increase instead of decreasing the Federal overhead.

Said Senator WILEY:

"We succeeded in killing Reorganization Plan No. 1, under which the advocates of socialized medicine would have had a field day in a new Cabinet Department of Welfare * * *. However, our effort to kill Reorganization Plan No. 2 was defeated, and so this plan will go into public law. Under it, certain vital functions will be shifted to the United States Department of Labor. Unfortunately, Wisconsin's vital experience rating system (designed to encourage employment stability) is very much endangered by this new plan No. 2. * * *

"It is important to remember that these two plans, the second of which succeeded, are at variance with the original Hoover task force recommendations * * *. As I previously pointed out, the Congress is strongly for enactment of the over-all Hoover recommendations into public law. It is an unfortunate fact, however, that the President more and more is selecting only those items of the Hoover reports which suit his own fancy. But these selected plans aren't calculated to save the taxpayer money but, as a matter of fact, will result in an increased tax burden and mere paper shifting of bureaus. 'If this is reorganization, we will take baloney' Congress feels."

WILEY is certainly justified in this stand. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission are an indivisible whole, and should be. To choose particular parts of them for action without the compensating balance provided by other adjustments is just plain deceptive.

And what's worse, if true, is that WILEY says these two plans against which he voted are at variance with the original Hoover recommendations. Again the White House is playing politics—Pendergast politics—with the national welfare and the Treasury.

A businessman in Kenosha writes:

"I appreciate and thank you for your vote to reject the Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 (Res. No. 151), and while your thinking and mine stands defeated, I am glad to know that you went along trying to accomplish what seems proper."

A businessman in Stoughton says:

"I was very happy to see your vote against the transfer of the United States Employment Service Department to the Department of Labor, even though the transfer was consummated. I know that it must be discouraging at times to try to battle some of this legislation, but you may be assured that we at home do appreciate your efforts. Keep it up."

A physician in Marshfield states:

"I am very pleased to get your letter of August 19, and in behalf of the medical profession in this area, I wish to thank you very much for your vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1.

"I am also glad to see that you are putting up a good fight to try to hold down Government spending and boost the Hoover Commission recommendations. I imagine it is a very discouraging situation, at least it looks that way to us back home, but we are pulling for you very hard."

An official in Menasha of the Wisconsin chapter of the American Academy of General Practice writes:

"I wish to thank you on behalf of all the general practitioners in the State of Wisconsin for your efforts in achieving a victory over the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

"We are all extremely grateful to you for your efforts in behalf of the defeat of this plan and we feel that it is a milestone in the fight against Government control of health programs.

"Again let me express our deep appreciation to you for your efforts."

A leader in the Wisconsin State Medical Society writes:

"Thank you very much for your part in rejecting Mr. Truman's Reorganization Plan No. 1. We are mighty proud of the fact that you have such a fine understanding of matters pertaining to public health and I know that the officers and members of the Wisconsin State Medical Society join me in this expression of appreciation."

A doctor in La Crosse writes: "I am merely writing to you to express my personal and sincere appreciation for the efforts you put forth in defeating the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. All liberty-loving Americans I believe are encouraged over the trend things are taking in respect to the President's apparent desire to create a welfare state which in turn will ultimately result in statism and encroachment upon the freedom of every citizen. I hope that by the time another election comes around the citizenry of this country will rebel against greater and greater centralization of authority and get back at least partly to its senses."

The Treaty Is Half the Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial which appeared in the July 22, 1949, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TREATY IS HALF THE PROGRAM

The Senate's approval of the North Atlantic Treaty has pledged the United States to support law and order in the whole Atlantic area, by widening the principle of the Monroe Doctrine to include western Europe.

France and Italy are expected to approve the treaty today, followed by Portugal and the Netherlands. Then 12 nations will have banded together in a mutual-aid agreement to prevent aggression if possible, but to resist it if necessary.

This will be an important step on the long, uphill road toward universal peace.

However, such good intentions still must be backed by arms if aggression is to be discouraged. And our friends in Europe will not have the arms they need to defend themselves unless we help supply them. That we should do, without undue delay.

Our ratification of the North Atlantic Defense Pact is a recognition that the freedom and security of America are dependent upon the freedom and security of western Europe, as we learned by the cruel lessons of two world wars. That being the case, the United States would be foolish, indeed, not to furnish our allies sufficient arms to hold off Soviet aggression.

The arms-for-Europe program has not been formally presented to Congress, and action on this appropriation can hardly be expected during the closing days of the present session. That is unfortunate, because any delay in carrying out this program is risky. Moreover, there is considerable evidence that the arms appropriation might be defeated if brought to a vote at the present time.

Both this measure and the Atlantic Treaty have been badly handled by the President and the State Department, and have been subject to demagogic attack in Congress. Partisanship on foreign-policy issues has been revived, along with prewar isolationism.

A delay in acting on the arms bill may be worth the risk, if Members of Congress get back on the beam after talking to their constituents between sessions. We believe the people want real security, not half measures, and will not be impressed by a program which has nothing to back it up but words on paper. And doubt that they will approve of partisanship when it becomes a threat to national safety.

Arms For Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a radio address delivered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] over the American Broadcasting System on August 5. The address follows:

Since last July 25, when the President transmitted to the Congress a request for legislative authority to send to Europe and elsewhere a total of a billion and a half dollars of military aid, the American people have been greatly disturbed. Not only does the proposal reverse the traditional policy of this country with respect to our international relations outside the Western Hemisphere, but the President's proposals have brought up many another problem.

Will the arms program be a provocation which may lead to overt acts by the Soviet Union against the nations of western Europe?

Will the program precipitate in an arms race in Europe and elsewhere?

Do the peoples of the treaty nations have the will to fight, which is so essential in any conflict-at-arms?

Will the proposals of the President put added emphasis on the production of arms and munitions at the expense of economic stability?

Can the United States afford this vast new expenditure at this time?

Will our own Military Establishment suffer as a result of the program, and do we have a sufficient supply of surplus equipment to furnish western Europe without crippling our own defenses?

Is there any assurance that the nations of western Europe will use the arms provided for true collective security wherever needed, and not hoard them within their own

countries for protection of their own frontiers against attack?

Will the highly nationalistic nations concerned put aside traditional concepts of defense in the interests of the security of the entire North Atlantic area?

Is there a better alternative plan of action than the one proposed by the President, the State Department, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Quite obviously, time does not permit more than a most cursory examination of the many questions and of the possible answers, and considerations of the national security do not permit full discussion of other aspects of the program. However, there are some questions that can be answered and I hope that in the few minutes available to me I can explore with you some of the complexities confronting the Congress and the American people at this time.

The arms for Europe program is an outgrowth of the recently ratified North Atlantic Treaty, in the signing of which this Nation has joined with 10 other countries of the North Atlantic area in a mutual pledge of aid in case of aggression against any one or more of the signatory nations. There is little doubt that in ratifying the treaty this country has pledged itself to the use of American armed forces in the event of aggression against our treaty allies. This is a most important consideration and one which should be kept in mind at all times when contemplating the proposals of the arms legislation. If the Soviet Union moves against the frontiers of any treaty nation, the United States is obligated to come to the defense of that country and will unquestionably do so.

Inasmuch as the bulk of the aid provided under the terms of the pending legislation would be made available to western Europe, there is little need of discussing Greece, Turkey, the Philippines, and Korea, which countries also will be beneficiaries in a lesser degree under the terms of the President's proposals.

Broadly speaking, there are two schools of opinion on the question of providing armaments to western Europe—those who approve the sending of arms and munitions and those who do not. The latter group, which doubtless includes many millions of Americans in all walks of life, can be broken down into three subdivisions. In the first, the Communists, the fellow travelers, and the professional apologists for the world-wide Red aggression. They are opposed to the program on philosophical grounds and because it might represent a new obstacle to world revolution. In the second group are many sincere liberals, antiwar organizations, the usual number of fuzzy thinkers, some fifth columnists, many sincere church members, a lot of professional do-gooders, and a not inconsiderable number of people who wouldn't follow a State Department recommendation on as simple a subject as climbing steps.

It is to a third group that I should like to address myself tonight. This group, by and large, consists of solid and sound thinkers of both great political parties. They want to do all they can for the rest of the world without handicapping our ability to protect ourselves. They are truly the group which makes up the great and strong backbone of these United States, and it is with them in their homes, on their farms, on their jobs, or just sitting around tonight, that I should like to discuss this great problem. We have reached a point in our international relatons where we are confronted wth ths most significant decision; a decision more far reaching, more important, and vastly more perplexing than were the decisions reached by the United States Senate some days ago during debate on the ratification of the treaty itself.

It appears to me that there are four principal considerations with respect to the arms-implementation program. First of all, is aid needed? Secondly, what type of assistance, if any, will best serve the purpose of maintaining the peace? Thirdly, can our domestic economy stand additional strains on the full faith and credit of the United States; and last, but by no means least, is there a practical and workable alternative to the program now under consideration?

With respect to the need for the arms program, there is an essential and honest difference of opinion. Many feel that we have, in our ratification of the Atlantic Treaty, served adequate notice on possible aggressors that we will brook no overt acts against the lands and the lives of our allies. The other group feels that a climate conducive to economic recovery in western Europe can only be created when the peoples of those countries feel that they are militarily equipped to resist outside aggression with their own forces.

There are, however, serious problems to be considered with respect to the sending of American arms abroad. We have, in recent years and months, seen our own military equipment in the hands of aggressors turned against the forces of freedom. Sudden political and military successes have overturned constitutional governments, and the guns, the ammunition, and the trucks intended to preserve the freedom of our friends have been wrested from them. As the Japanese forces in Malaya sped onward to new conquests in south Asia, they were greatly strengthened by the capture of American supplies at Singapore. Today the forces of militant communism drive southward through China in possession of great quantities of American material and supplies. Some of the shells which are being pumped by the Communists into Chinese cities were turned out by American workmen, and the mouths of the cannon from which they come were turned on American lathes in American factories.

Europe today is achieving a great measure of economic recovery, but the political situation in several of the treaty nations is far from stable. Political fifth columns are active everywhere, and agitation by the Communists continues in every land. We must remember that the death of the Czechoslovakian Republic came, not as the result of pitched battles in the street, but as the result of a bloodless political victory. Had this Nation given military aid to the democratic government which preceded the Communists in power, the weapons and the vehicles so provided would today be a feature of Communist parades in Prague as they are across the world in Shanghai.

Our ability to serve as the arsenal of democracy is unchallenged, but to move a portion of that arsenal to the banks of the Rhine, or to the Brenner Pass in Italy is, to the minds of many, a tragic mistake. Whether there is a greater will to fight today in western Europe than existed in some countries during the war, is an unknown factor of prime importance.

The President and the State Department insist that military aid is needed and needed now in order to bolster the morale of the peoples of western Europe, but is that insistence sufficient to overcome the very real and sincere objections of those who doubt that arms for Europe is the answer to the problem. Rifles on the Rhine is only one solution. Is there another?

A matter of grave concern to many Members of Congress is the problem of obtaining firm commitments from the nations of western Europe that an all-out effort will be made to wisely utilize the weapons obtained in the common defense of the North Atlantic area. As usual, the Congress is told by the administration and the State Department that we must not infringe upon the sovereign rights of free countries by making unreasonable demands in advance of the granting of aid. To many of us this attitude seems more unreasonable than any conditions we might establish so far as Europe is concerned. There must be an over-all strategic plan of operation for the defense of the area, and the details of that plan should be completed before the shipments of arms commence. There is no firm assurance at the moment that any one of the nations will accept the directions and commands of a top military leader from another of the countries. Without unity of command, without common purpose, and without a previously agreed upon strategic concept, it is doubtful if any quantity of military aid would help in the defense of the North Atlantic region.

Yet the Congress is told that it should grant more than a billion dollars for military assistance, solely on the assumption that these vital matters will be taken care of in due time. Unfortunately, in the course of our foreign economic-assistance programs, we have not met with much success in obtaining agreements after the program has been approved and the funds made available. In many instances we have met with an obvious unwillingness on the part of some countries to make tariff and customs concessions to each other; in other instances suggestions made subsequent to the signing of agreements have met with outright hositility. In the field of international negotiations it is the lesson of history that unless mutual agreement can be obtained on basic and fundamental issues in contention before the contract is signed, it is very unlikely that agreement will be reached after the aid has been granted.

When an individual signs an insurance policy he agrees to certain conditions and stipulations in advance. He does not feel that the insurance company invades his privacy or violates his constitutional rights by providing that no benefits are to be paid if he commits suicide or injures himself by leaping off the barn with an umbrella. Conditions designed to further collective security in western Europe, and to insure prompt and coordinated action by the treaty nations are not unreasonable and should certainly be made a part of any agreement entered into between this country and those whom we seek to help. True collective security or workable economic cooperation, unless obtained in advance of any international agreement, is likely to become individual insecuity and unworkable noncooperation after the insurance policy has been signed and the initial premiums paid. Nations are like people, and no one, to my knowledge, has ever called the banker's attention to an oversight after the beneficiary has left the teller's window with a loan in hand.

Unless absolute guaranties of coordinated action are obtained in advance of the granting of military aid, there can be no hope of collective security in western Europe. The American taxpayer is being asked to provide over a billion dollars. He has every right to ask and to demand that those in Washington charged with the conduct of his affairs do so in a businesslike and realistic fashion.

Whatever action is taken with respect to the arms program, the yardstick of our domestic economy should be used in measuring carefully our financial capacity to do the job. In a period when the weather vane of our economy swings aimlessly in all directions, at a time when the accepted indices of economic stability are in a state of constant change, in an hour when unemployment figures mount at an alarming rate, at a time when the Government has again resorted to deficit financing and is already in the red to the extent of $1,800,000,000, in times such as these we should study well any programs

which may result in an additional tax burden. For the world is as strong as the American dollar today, and if that island of financial refuge sinks beneath the waters of unsound fiscal policies, not only will chaos engulf this great land as it already has engulfed so many others, but communism will have achieved another bloodless victory.

Is military assistance to our allies necessary? Or is there a moral alternative, a psychological factor which has been entirely overlooked in the maze of bayonets and machine guns? Isn't the logical and sensible way to peace through the air and not through the mud? Have our military leaders and the State Department forgotten that the Red Army is stronger and better equipped on the ground today that it was when it drove the panzer divisions of Adolf Hitler back from the gates of Moscow?

To my mind, there is an alternative, and it consists of two parts, the one physical and the other moral. It seems to me that a much greater deterrent to aggression in Europe or anywhere else on the face of the earth is an alert and ever-ready armada of the air, armed with the most destructive weapon known to man—the atom bomb.

The air weapons should be retained in our own possession, for we have found to our sorrow that possession by others may mean misuse or eventual loss. The Eightieth Congress wisely approved a 70-group air force, which figure has been reduced by the Eighty-first Congress to something more than half that number. The original figure should be restored, and no nation on earth should be permitted to outstrip this country in the air.

Bows and arrows, catapults, machine guns, and rifles will not stop an aggressive and determined attack in western Europe, and the only possible aggressor nation can reach the English Channel against ground forces in a matter of a few short days. What about the rifles, the machine guns, the trucks, and the jeeps at that time? But many of us feel certain that the armored divisions will not roll, and that the threat of offensive action in the North Atlantic region can and will be reduced if this great Nation will enunciate a policy of conduct that the American people, our allies, and the Soviet Union can understand. Nor need that statement be couched in any obscure or diplomatic language. Together with our wings, the statement can be the most potent force for peace in the world today, in a world which appears to be drifting aimlessly into a conflagration that will burn out our civilization and leave atomic dust to mark its remains.

I am not facile in the use of diplomatic double talk, and I dislike the word "whereas" and the phrase, "Now, therefore, be it resolved." I would suggest instead a simple and straightforward statement to this effect:

"We, the people of the United States of America, desire more than any other thing, a world at peace. We have sacrificed thousands of our Nation's youths, our physical resources, and our national wealth in a sincere and wholehearted effort to outlaw aggression in international relations. Following the last war we demobilized our armies, our fleets of the sea and air in order to establish a climate of international harmony and to serve as an example and an invitation to the other nations of the earth.

"In spite of our best efforts, aggression has continued throughout the earth. In a last and great effort to maintain peace and reinstill a hope in the hearts of men, we have reversed a policy that has stood our Nation in good stead through the years of its existence, and we have joined with other free and democratic nations in signing an instrument of mutual aid and assistance—the North Atlantic Treaty. We recognize that our allies are of themselves unable to individually meet and repel the aggressive tactics of the Soviet Union and the nations which are satellite to it. We do not propose to see them subjugated one by one, for want of action on our part, and it is our firm intention to see that this does not happen.

"If any one or more of the treaty nations of western Europe is attacked by military force, it is our intention to resist that aggression with every weapon at our command, and in the first hours of the aggression. We shall meet force with force, while deploring the necessity for it, and we shall not cease in our wholehearted efforts to defend our allies and restore peace and a universal respect for the rights of man and of international law."

Those words may never be written, ladies and gentlemen, but they should be. If an honest and straightforward expression of that kind would not stop the forces of aggression, then we had all best prepare for an inevitable conflict. For my part, I believe that peace can be maintained in western Europe, and that the climate of fear can be dispelled in the countries under the shadow of the Red army. Better than rifles on the Rhine, better than the shuttling of guns and ammunition across the Atlantic, better than the smoke rolling from the smokestacks of a rearming Europe, would be an expression of strength and of determination on our part to defend the dignity of man and the freedom of democratic states. Let us not, in our ardent search for peace, bury our heads in the sands of unreality. Let us remember that if the Red tide engulfs western Europe, there can be no escape for us in an imagined isolation from the field of conflict. Our destiny, whether we like it or not, is hopelessly intertwined with the individual destinies of the countries of western Europe, and it is dangerous to presume that our way of life, our institutions, or our national ideals can exist as an island of refuge in a sea of red.

Our national utterances today with respect to our future conduct carry far more weight than could any amount of guns and ammunition shipped across the Atlantic to others. Let us speak now, or we may forever lose the peace.

Walter Trohan Analyzes Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, on psychological warfare which I know will be of interest to all the Members of this House:

For 6 nights, now, I have been reporting to you on world strategy as seen by our top military. You have been patient in your attention, kind in your judgments, and flattering in your response. I am happy to tell you that a number of Members of Congress have asked for transcripts of these broadcasts so that something may come from what you and I have been talking about.

And now I am asking you to bear with me a little longer, because I am going to report on what I consider the most important phase of our security and world peace. This is a bloodless war. It is a war of ideas against the Kremlin which will set the Russian people free of their power-mad masters. Military leaders know that they cannot win this war without you. They permit me to report on this campaign, as it is now drawn. Merely to emphasize the importance of what I have to say and not to build myself up, I believe I can truthfully say that no reporter has spent more time in exploring thought war against Stalin than I have.

As far as I know this is the first comprehensive report on the subject, at least over the air. As you know, we are pitted against Russia in a clash which is generally known as the cold war. In this war ours has been the passive role. Stalin attacks and we try to block his moves. Now, you know that defense doesn't win wars—hot or cold. Defense is not the American way. To us, the defense is dull and unimaginative. In fact we regard it as faint-hearted, if not cowardly.

At length, defense cannot win wars; it usually does no more than postpone defeat. Military leaders consider this true of the cold war. They believe that if we are to head off a hot war we must take the initiative. We must shift to the offensive. And, they are convinced the way to the offensive is to launch a psychological war. Any people under despotism are ripe for psychological war. The Russian people have known two despotisms—the czars and communism. They throw off one despotism only to fall under a worse enslavement.

The iron curtain, as you know, is designed by Stalin to keep the Russians from learning about the outside world, rather than to keep the outside world from learning about Russia. Military men say the iron curtain is vulnerable. They say it can be penetrated. They say we can win if we take the offensive in the thought war. They say victory in the thought war will prevent World War III—a war which could mean defeat for the victor as well as for the vanquished.

Military leaders would aim the war of ideas at the chink in communism's armor. This weakness is the conflict between the Soviet people and their Communist masters. Stalin has good reason to fear that the Russian people might tire of passive resistance and flare into revolt. Military leaders say Hitler might have won the campaign against Russia if he had capitalized on anti-Soviet feeling in the Ukraine. Ukrainians welcomed Nazis as deliverers. Hitler handled them arrogantly. Soon the Ukrainians began to look on Nazis as even worse than Communists. They turned on the invaders.

You know the Soviets have the world's largest police system, the terrible MVD. This police system is vastly larger than that of the Czars, which was considered huge. The history of this force is one of terrorism and purges. Millions of Russians have been jailed or sent to detention camps, many more millions than suffered from Hitler's terrorism. The Soviets have sent more men to Siberia in 32 years than the Czars did in hundreds of years. Russians are subjected to tight-fisted censorship as well as to police spying. Communists take amazing measures to keep foreigners and foreign ideas from the Russian people.

In the early stages of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers deserted. They surrendered to the Germans without resistance. At least a million Russians joined the German Army to fight against communism. They hoped for liberation. Military leaders regard the enslaved Russian people and the frightened populations of satellite states as potential allies. If those allies can be organized, Stalin will be driven to take the defensive. He will not be able to attack, if he is frightened by the threat of resistance and revolt at home.

Military leaders believe that is the objective in thought warfare. They recognize the task is a challenging one, but they feel that American imagination and American ability can do the trick. We have the greatest advertising brains in the world. No people can plan a selling campaign like the American people. Military leaders believe American brains and initiative can sell the Russian people truth and freedom.

Military leaders believe the time has come to extend sympathy and friendship to the Russian people. The Russian people must be made to understand that America is not bent on conquest. Military experts say they must be taught that the American people hope for their liberation from their Communist despots. Military leaders say the Russian people must be educated to realization that we are not against Russia or the Russian people, but against communism. Many Russians consider their Communist masters their worst enemy, according to intelligence information in military hands. Thought warfare can lift the morale of these people.

It will be remembered that American sympathy with those who were fighting the czars, did much toward ending their reign. American sympathy and support helped the underground movement against the czars. Military minds are aware psychological warfare could encourage formation of a freedom-loving underground under the millions of eyes and ears of the Red Fascist police system.

Our military leaders have had experience in conducting psychological warfare. Thought warfare is recognized as one of the most important factors in our victory against Japan. Japan was no easy target for psychological warfare. The task seemed to be impossible when it began. Yet it was successful. Japan, as you know, was the oldest empire in the world. It's Emperor had the status of a God. The ruling class formed a despotism. The Japanese people were blindly devoted to Emperor Hirohito, not only as the symbol of national destiny, but as a Deity. The Japs felt sure they were destined to rule the world. They were patriotic, courageous, and skilled in war. Yet psychological warfare wore the Japs down. Japan was ripe for surrender, even before the atomic bombs fell on Hiroshima.

I can tell you that General MacArthur advised President Roosevelt of this surrender consciousness before Mr. Roosevelt went to Yalta in January of 1945. General MacArthur, in a long telegram—which has never been made public—called on Mr. Roosevelt not to let Soviet Russia into the war against Japan, holding that the consequences would be disastrous. Mr. Roosevelt brushed the telegram aside, saying of General MacArthur "our most brilliant general and our poorest diplomat."

Mr. Roosevelt, as you know, went to Yalta and made secret deals extending Soviet influence in return for the Soviet declaration of war against Japan. Today Soviets are claiming they won the Pacific war in 3 days. They say they won a war in hours that we couldn't win in almost 4 years.

The thought war against Japan was directed by General MacArthur. The chief weapons in this were radio broadcasts and leaflets. I am authorized to tell you of an unknown incident of this campaign. Intelligence units under General MacArthur gathered much material from Japanese officers. In order to get these prisoners to talk more freely, they were told what American bombers were doing to Japan. When those officers realized the destruction, they asked to be permitted to drop by parachute on Japan to urge the people to surrender. These prisoners knew they would be killed, but said they could spread the message and help save their country and its people from total destruction. They were convinced surrender was the only course and wanted a chance to convince their people.

General MacArthur and his men did not know how successful this psychological warfare was until the end of the war. When intelligence officers penetrated Japan they learned that their ideas had taken root in the Japanese mind. Emperor Hirohito himself said that American leaflets dropped from the sky had convinced his subjects—long before the atom bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki—that the war was lost. General Tojo, the Japanese war lord, told American interviewers of the power of American propaganda. He said, and I quote, "Sinkings and bombings had their effect, but there was no doubt that the Allied leaflets weakened the people's will to fight and thus shortened the war."

Military leaders believe we can accomplish in Russia what was accomplished in Japan. They recognize that we were at war with Japan and we are ostensibly at peace with Russia. Techniques will, therefore, be different. I propose to discuss the techniques in the concluding report on this military series tomorrow night. Experts on psychological war are certain that the thought war can be won. They say it can be done at only a fraction of the cost of the proposed $1,450,000,000 assistance program.

Military leaders emphasize that we have the tremendous advantage of truth. The truth, they say, will prevail against the Soviet weapon of lies. Military leaders emphasize that we have every moral right to embark on thought warfare. For three decades the Soviets have employed every device of propaganda to spread their lies. Infiltration and subversion are Soviet tactics known to all. Our military leaders believe the time has come to draw the sword of truth to help the Russians out of bondage and to lead the world to lasting peace.

You Can Help With the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert into the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "You Can Help With the Mail." It was published in the March 1949 issue of Country Gentleman, an outstanding monthly farm publication published by the Curtis Publishing Co. at Philadelphia, Pa.

The article was written by Josh M. Drake, Jr., who is a one-armed veteran of World War II and a comparative newcomer to the rural mail service, but "I love my work," he says, "and love the people I serve."

In this excellent article a rural letter carrier drops a few hints that explain why he has made special friends of the farm families along his route.

I am sure that my colleagues, and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will find the article worth reading. It follows:

Do you like your rural mail carrier? Is he courteous and efficient? Does he cheerfully wait a few minutes while you address a letter or package? Does he drive off his route to deliver live bees, chickens, or packages too big for your mail box on rainy days? Is he willing to do more for his patrons than the postal laws require of him? If the answer is "no" to most of these questions, my advice to you is not to go to the trouble to read this article, for such a carrier doesn't deserve your cooperation.

Rural mail carriers are appointed for 30 years and the Civil Service Commission investigates an applicant thoroughly before he is appointed. Because of the careful search for high-caliber men, I will venture to say that 99 percent of the Nation's rural carriers are well liked and respected by the patrons on their routes. Yet, in spite of every effort, a few inferior men receive appointments.

Assuming that your rural carrier is one of the 99 good ones out of 100, I will attempt to tell you how you can help to make his job easier and more enjoyable.

First of all, buy stamps and stamp your letters instead of putting a letter in your box and laying pennies on it. It takes a great deal of time and effort for a carrier to reach in a mail box and grope for pennies. And it takes longer if he drops them on the ground and has to get out and scratch in the sand or snow for them. If a carrier serves 300 boxes and half his patrons leave pennies in their boxes it causes him to be 30 minutes to an hour late. This throws a hardship on patrons near the end of the route if they are waiting to buy a money order from him or to insure a package.

If you are out of stamps simply clip your pennies and the letter to be stamped with a clothespin. This will keep the carrier from dropping them as he takes them from the box.

On the daily trip to your mail box be careful not to slam the lid too hard if your box is the type that is hard to pull open. (Most of them are.) Rural carriers are never without torn and skinned knuckles, sprung wrists, and broken nails caused by tugging at mailbox lids that finally fly open to smash their hands against the sides of their vehicles.

When you put up a box a great deal of care should be exercised in choosing a location. If it is put up on a slant, the chances are good that in rainy weather the carrier's car will slide into the box. If he is lucky, he escapes only with a scratched door. Sometimes a window is broken or a fender is bent. A box should not be located at the bottom of a hill, for it causes undue wear on brakes to apply them while going downhill. A box should not be located in deep sand or in a place where water or snow stands after a storm. If your box is in a low place and it isn't practical for you to move it, a pick-up load of gravel or cinders will make the mudhole passable.

A few may say, "Why humor the rural carrier? After all, it only takes him 3 or 4 hours to drive his route."

True, but did you know that a rural carrier works from 2 to 5 hours a day sorting his mail and getting it ready to deliver? In order to be efficient he must take plenty of time in preparing his mail or he will scatter it from one end of his route to the other.

On rainy or cold winter days he exposes himself and abuses his vehicle to get your mail to you. If he sticks in the mud or sand and tears up his car, he must pay to have it fixed. The car he drives is his own and not furnished by the Government.

I grew up on a farm and used to meet our rural carrier quite often. At that time I thought he was a moody person, for some days he would stop for a few minutes' chat and on other days he hurried away after a curt "Good morning." Now that I carry the mail I understand. A carrier likes to stop and talk about the crops and the weather, but he also has a schedule he tries to stay on. If he is late or has heavy mail, he doesn't stop for a visit, because he is afraid someone farther down his route is standing in the heat or cold waiting for him. If your carrier seems to be in a hurry, for the sake of your neighbors, don't detain him.

When he is late don't blame him too much, because there are hundreds of things that can throw him off schedule. Maybe he had a flat. A bridge or culvert could have washed out, causing him to detour. Most carriers try to drive good cars, but no vehicle, old or new, is immune to break-downs. Just be patient He may be an hour or even 5 hours late, but he will get your mail to you before the day is out, if he has to deliver part of it on horseback.

Unless your carrier has all hard-surfaced roads you can expect him to be late every time it rains. Usually a carrier is a few minutes late on Monday; on that day he has 2 days' mail. He also has more c. o. d. packages, special-delivery letters, and insured packages that must be delivered to the patron's house if the patron doesn't meet him at the box to sign for them. If you are expecting an insured or c. o. d. parcel why not have some member of your family meet him at your mail box. It will save him the time of driving to your house.

If your carrier accidentally leaves someone else's letter in your box just put it back with a note saying, "Doesn't belong here." He will pick it up the next day and see that it reaches the rightful owner. Remember, nobody is perfect. An average route has 300 boxes and serves 1,500 people. Many routes have almost a dozen families of Smiths, Joneses, or Jacksons. All carriers make a few mistakes, no matter how conscientious they are. Many letters come through with names misspelled, initials wrong, and others are almost illegible. The carrier is forced to try several boxes in an effort to deliver the mail to whom it is addressed.

Most carriers would prefer that you simply put misplaced mail back in your box or give it to him in person rather than take it to the post office. He would prefer the post-office clerks didn't know of the mistakes he makes.

If a carrier continues to put the wrong mail in your box meet him and tactfully give him a list of the members of your family. If he is doing something wrong tell him about it in a nice way. Most carriers appreciate constructive criticism. If he refuses to take your helpful hints it is time for you to report him to his postmaster. If he continues to be grouchy and unreasonable simply circulate a petition around your route to get him transferred. If most of the patrons feel that their carrier isn't honest or efficient they can get rid of him—and they should. However, few carriers fail to please a majority of their patrons. It's almost impossible to serve the same people month after month and year after year without growing to like them. When a carrier likes his patrons, serving them is a pleasure instead of work. Day by day he finds himself striving to give them better and better service because they are all special friends of his.

On a route of 1,500 patrons a carrier serves all sorts of people. He learns to like them and understand their little whims, peculiarities, and virtues that make them different from every other person.

When a new carrier takes over your route talk to him and get to know him and, chances are, you will like him and he will like you. And if he likes you he will make an extra effort to please you. If he is a beginner or if he is a veteran of 30 years' service, he likes to be told when he is doing a good job. Nothing helps a rural carrier more than to know that the people like him and are pleased with the service he gives them. Courtesy is the cheapest thing in the world but it is the most contagious.

Dr. Felix J. Underwood

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members seem to get socialized medicine confused with our public health system.

I rise today to pay my humble tribute to one of the great public health men of America, Dr. Felix J. Underwood, head of the public health department of the State of Mississippi.

Dr. Underwood has done more to teach the people of Mississippi how to keep well and eliminate malaria, typhoid, tuberculosis, pellagra, and so forth, than anyone dreamed could be done a few years ago.

I am inserting a table showing the number of people who died from various diseases in Mississippi in the year 1900, and also in the year 1905, and then in the year 1913, and every year from that date down through 1948.

The table referred to follows:

Mississippi State Board of Health—Deaths from selected causes, with rates, 1900 and 1905, and from 1913 to 1948

Rate=deaths per 100,000 population.

Year	Typhoid fever		Malaria		Pellagra		Scarlet fever		Diphtheria		Smallpox		Tuberculosis		Whooping cough		Measles		Diarrhea (minus 2 years)	
	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
1900	1,000	-------	1,900	-------	1,850	-------	-------	-------	321	-------	-------	-------	3,450	-------	500	-------	860	-------	1,150	-------
1905	900	-------	1,700	-------	1,740	-------	-------	-------	247	-------	-------	-------	3,265	-------	415	-------	615	-------	930	-------
1913	659	35.0	1,264	67.1	795	42.4	6	0.3	158	8.4	2	0.1	2,565	136.7	330	17.6	46	2.5	678	36.1
1914	625	32.9	1,030	54.2	1,192	62.7	4	.2	193	10.2	8	.4	2,490	131.0	252	13.3	329	17.3	647	34.0
1915	620	32.2	1,492	77.4	1,535	79.6	2	.1	152	7.9	9	.4	2,706	140.4	173	8.9	30	1.6	537	27.9
1916	668	34.2	1,426	73.1	840	42.9	13	.7	141	7.2	10	.5	2,625	134.5	171	8.8	13	.7	621	31.8
1917	554	28.0	999	50.5	1,086	54.9	9	.5	157	7.9	3	.2	2,743	138.7	288	14.6	546	27.6	786	39.8
1918	599	29.9	791	39.5	746	37.3	7	.3	137	6.8	16	.8	2,798	139.8	453	22.6	732	35.6	813	40.6
1919	364	20.3	653	36.5	495	27.6	13	.7	131	7.3	8	.4	2,436	136.1	156	8.7	42	2.3	518	28.9
1920	342	19.1	722	40.3	554	30.9	20	1.1	282	15.7	44	2.5	2,271	126.8	153	8.5	18	1.0	629	35.1
1921	348	19.4	963	53.8	684	38.2	12	.7	364	20.3	15	.8	1,956	109.2	229	12.8	29	1.6	612	34.2
1922	337	18.8	720	40.2	448	25.0	7	.4	296	16.5	6	.3	1,879	105.0	181	10.1	6	.3	503	28.1
1923	252	14.1	581	32.4	413	23.1	8	.4	173	9.7	4	.2	1,748	97.6	252	14.1	233	13.0	522	29.2
1924	330	18.4	365	20.4	413	23.1	10	.6	89	5.0	6	.3	1,840	102.7	205	11.4	211	11.8	545	30.4
1925	470	26.2	411	23.0	561	31.3	10	.6	130	7.3	4	.2	1,855	103.6	127	7.1	21	1.2	586	32.7
1926	390	21.8	409	22.8	564	31.5	5	.3	122	6.8	4	.2	1,862	104.0	251	14.0	61	3.4	491	27.4
1927	255	14.2	427	23.8	689	38.5	16	.9	177	9.9	4	.2	1,772	99.0	276	15.4	163	9.1	568	31.7
1928	237	13.0	521	29.0	747	41.7	15	.8	158	8.8	1	.1	1,797	100.4	195	10.9	298	16.6	565	31.6
1929	197	9.9	355	17.9	727	36.6	8	.4	162	8.1	0	-------	1,649	83.6	203	10.2	95	4.8	466	23.4
1930	238	11.8	281	14.0	573	28.5	16	.8	156	7.8	2	.1	1,750	87.0	160	8.0	30	1.5	476	23.7
1931	211	10.4	211	10.4	541	26.6	11	.5	225	11.1	2	.1	1,588	78.1	71	3.5	9	.4	326	16.0
1932	145	7.1	341	16.6	308	15.0	12	.6	138	6.7	5	.2	1,396	68.0	110	5.4	3	.1	241	11.7
1933	135	6.5	695	33.6	267	12.9	9	.4	116	5.6	0	-------	1,314	63.6	244	11.8	65	3.1	325	15.7
1934	66	3.2	647	31.0	211	10.1	15	.7	98	4.7	0	-------	1,199	57.5	318	15.3	318	15.3	430	20.6
1935	61	2.9	521	24.8	222	10.6	11	.5	93	4.4	1	0	1,135	54.0	112	5.3	22	1.0	232	11.0
1936	95	4.5	352	16.6	264	12.5	5	.2	73	3.4	0	-------	1,258	59.4	55	2.6	26	1.2	414	19.5
1937	77	3.6	301	14.1	236	11.0	3	.1	52	2.4	1	0	1,300	60.9	114	5.3	60	2.8	416	19.5
1938	65	3.0	268	12.4	266	12.4	7	.3	79	3.7	0	-------	1,164	54.0	150	7.0	78	3.6	344	16.0
1939	48	2.2	221	10.2	199	9.2	1	0	57	2.6	0	-------	1,097	50.5	158	7.3	84	3.9	302	13.9
1940	31	1.4	168	7.7	162	7.4	2	.1	61	2.8	0	-------	1,057	48.3	144	6.6	12	.5	300	13.7
1941	36	1.6	146	6.7	121	5.6	5	.2	40	1.8	0	-------	1,016	46.7	138	6.3	66	3.0	276	12.7
1942	22	1.0	84	4.0	115	5.4	5	.2	44	2.1	0	-------	1,092	51.6	102	4.8	56	2.6	235	11.1
1943	21	1.0	74	3.6	84	4.1	6	.3	24	1.2	1	0	887	43.2	90	4.4	19	.9	206	10.0
1944	15	.7	61	3.1	67	3.4	4	.2	34	1.7	2	.1	813	40.7	96	4.8	29	1.4	207	10.4
1945	21	1.1	39	2.0	53	2.7	3	.2	41	2.1	1	0	687	34.5	45	2.3	28	1.4	152	7.6
1946	9	.4	29	1.3	46	2.0	3	.1	31	1.4	0	-------	694	30.2	33	1.4	42	1.8	45	2.0
1947 [1]	7	.3	23	1.0	29	1.2	0	-------	14	.6	0	-------	735	31.8	85	3.7	10	.4	63	2.7
1948 [1]	1	.04	12	.5	30	1.3	1	.04	17	.7	0	-------	668	28.6	29	1.2	25	1.1	76	3.2

[1] On basis of place of residence.

I call attention to the fact that in 1900 approximately 1,000 people died of typhoid fever in Mississippi, and 668 died of that malady in 1916.

Last year the record shows that only one person died of typhoid in the State during the entire year.

In 1900 there were approximately 1,900 people died of malaria in Mississippi and 1,492 died of that malady in 1915. You will notice from this table I am inserting that only 12 people died of malaria in the entire State during the year 1948.

In 1900 there were 1,850 died of pellagra in Mississippi, and 1,535 died of that malady as late as 1915, yet, during the year 1948 only 30 people died of pellagra throughout the entire State.

You will note that similar reductions have been made in the casualties from other diseases.

For instance, in 1900 3,450 people died of tuberculosis in Mississippi, and, as late as 1918, 2,798 died of tuberculosis in the State.

During the year 1948 only 668 died of tuberculosis in Mississippi—less than

one-fourth of the number who succumbed to that disease in the State in 1918 and less than one-fifth of the number who died of that malady in 1900.

Back at the turn of the century, Mississippi was not only teeming with typhoid fever, malaria, pellagra, and tuberculosis, but our Gulf coast was swept with yellow fever, which, thanks to the genius of Walter Reed, has now been virtually driven from the face of the earth. And thanks to the work of Dr. Underwood, and the medical profession throughout the State, typhoid, malaria, and pellagra have virtually disappeared; and casualties from tuberculosis are gradually being reduced to the vanishing point.

In his fight on tuberculosis, Dr. Underwood has been greatly assisted by Dr. Henry Boswell, head of our tubercular sanatorium at Magee, Miss., as well as by the entire medical profession of the State.

I know of no man who has rendered a greater service in helping to conquer the disease of tuberculosis than has Dr. Henry Boswell.

It is impossible to exaggerate in extolling the great work which Dr. Underwood and his associates have rendered in teaching the people of Mississippi how to keep well.

I hope that other States may follow the example of Mississippi which has become one of the most healthful States in the Union, and not embark upon a socialistic program, or, I might say a communistic program, of socialized medicine, such as we now see plaguing the peoples of other countries.

Progress on the DP Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Progress on the DP Bill," published in the New York Times of August 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS ON THE DP BILL

Prospects for passage of H. R. 4567, the bill to liberalize our present restrictive DP legislation, have brightened. Although many pitfalls may still lie ahead, the action this week of the majority leader in moving to discharge the bill from the Judiciary Committee is as heartening as it is it unusual.

H. R. 4567 was introduced by Mr. CELLER of New York on May 9, after hearings had been held by the House Judiciary Committee on the pressing need to change the unwarranted, small-minded provisions of the 1948 law. The new bill was passed by the House on June 2, referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 6 and has been buried in a subcommittee ever since. It is true that, after much pressure on Chairman MCCARRAN, sporadic hearings on the legislation have been held by the subcommittee (the latest of them yesterday) but it became increasingly evident through the summer that Mr. MCCARRAN had no intention of allowing the Senate to consider the bill. A vote of the committee on August 19 supported its chairman in this position; but meanwhile Senator LUCAS had taken the extraordinary step of joining forces with Republican leaders in deciding to move to discharge the bill from a major committee headed by a patriarch of his own party. The discharge resolution bears an impressive list of Democratic and Republican names, including those of both Senators from New York. A simple majority of the Senate is all that is now needed to approve the discharge resolution, which will permit H. R. 4567 to be fairly and freely debated.

But the Senate should move quickly in order to forestall any further obstructionist tactics to prevent enactment of this legislation which will redeem the honor of the United States in its treatment of the victims of Nazi and Communist persecution.

Report of the Activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the able leadership of Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, has been given, among other responsibilities, the grave responsibility of handling legislation reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government, with a view to increased efficiency and economy.

In this connection, in July 1947, the Congress authorized the establishment of a commission, composed of outstanding citizens drawn from public and private life, to study the avenues requiring improvement in services, and the full scope of needs of the Federal Government. This Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has come to be associated in press and periodical as the Hoover Commission, taking its name from that of the Chairman, the distinguished former President. The reports prepared by this Commission on Organization on almost all phases of Government operations and activities have now been submitted and lie before the Congress. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has the duty of analyzing and evaluating the major share of these reports. From these studies and reports must be evolved the legislative drafts which will result in the accomplishment of the objectives recommended to the Congress. This legislation must be attuned to the mounting desire from all sides for increased efficiency and economy in the conduct of our affairs of government.

Of the reports of the Commission on Organization in the 17 designated fields of study, the Committee on Expenditures has been assigned the greater share, or 12 areas of concentration. The committee set as an immediate goal for their attention all phases of governmental activity where the greatest amount of savings could be effected at once. Bureau of the Budget sources indicated these areas are:

The National Military Establishment.
Civil Service Commission.
Procurement and Supply Activities.
Post Office Department.

Proceeding first to procurement and supply activities, the committee held long and extensive hearings and drafted legislation directed toward the organization and establishment of a General Services Administration. This new body, based on the recommendations and studies of the Commission on Organization, was developed in final form by pooling the National Archives, the affairs of the War Assets Administration, the Federal Work Agency, the contract settlement functions of the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Federal Supply. Thus in this very comprehensive agency, termed the General Services Administration, we see a civilian entity with jurisdiction over procurement, utilization, and disposal of a staggering amount of the total Federal property available to governmental agencies. Every precaution possible was taken to avert inconsistencies of the past in the drafting of this legislation. Arising out of this monumental property program, and of keystone importance in its ultimate success, is the presently developed plan and practice in which all property in the control of the Federal Government, with all speed and dispatch, will be cataloged for uniform use by every Government agency by 1952.

The inclusion of the National Archives is the first step into the field of records management. Together with further exploratory work being marshaled in the field of traffic management, it is not difficult to realize why authorities in the field of reorganization have hailed the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as the greatest consolidation in the annals of the history of government. Over the next decade, with the simplification of buying practices, specifications, and the surveying of agencies for excess goods and surplus property, it is readily apparent that the savings from this phase of Government operations alone will approximate over a billion dollars. As a result of this legislation, we see the culmination of over 2½ years' preparation, conferences, studies, and hearings, all redounding immediately to the benefit of the taxpayers.

In this field of reorganization, but attacking the problem from another point, the committee was successful in guiding through the Congress the Reorganization Act of 1949. This measure, beginning as H. R. 1569, is of landmark importance, and was only enacted after stormy sessions in the House and Senate. After almost 6 weeks of constant meetings by the conferees of the House and Senate, the committee was able to achieve a singular victory for the House version of this bill. In this way, under the powers of delegation vested in the President, he

was able, by virtue of this Reorganization Act, to send to the Congress his carefully designed plans for reorganization in the many divisions of the executive branch.

On June 20, 1949, President Truman dispatched the first seven of these plans to the Congress, where they were referred to the Committee on Expenditures. The plans covered a multitude of subjects:

Plan No. 1: Establishment of a new Department of Welfare;

Plan No. 2: Transfers the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor;

Plan No. 3: Constitutes a first step in the reorganization of the Post Office Department;

Plan No. 4: Transfers the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President;

Plan No. 5: Provides unified direction of the Civil Service Commission by its Chairman;

Plan No. 6: Strengthens the authority of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission;

Plan No. 7: Transfers the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce.

Under the Reorganization Act alluded to, when these plans have laid before the Congress for 60 calendar days, while it is in session, without objection from any of the membership of either House, they become the law. Shortly after the foregoing seven plans, the President followed them with plan No. 8, which was aimed at improving the unification of the armed services. This plan was superseded before enactment by a measure now known as Public Law 216. Of the seven remaining plans, the committee is able to report that no House action against any of them was sustained. Although action by another body checkmated plan No. 1, which involved the creation of a Department of Welfare, the other six as listed in the foregoing became the law as of midnight August 19, 1949. An objection petition was filed to plan No. 2, which transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Labor Department. After adequate hearings of the issues appertaining, plan No. 2 was upheld and the objection to it was overcome by an overwhelming vote of the House.

With this enthusiasm by the membership of the House toward the Presidential efforts to reorganize the executive branch, it is patent that tremendous strides have been made in a short time in pursuit of the accomplishment of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It would be well at this point to state that the studies of the Commission were only completed and concluded as recently as June 1949. Moreover, it is anticipated that the President will, during the period from now until the first of January with its opening of the second session, draft for submission to the Congress many more reorganization plans dealing with various regions of governmental activity. In connection with the Department of Welfare, it might be stated here that a bill (H. R. 782) sponsored by Chairman DAWSON, paralleled in objective and scope the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1. This bill was favorably reported out of the committee to the floor of the House, and a rule obtained. However, the President's plan No. 1 was substituted as a better means to achieve the same goal.

Another measure of basic importance to all civilian employees of the Federal Government was reported out of the Committee on Expenditures this session and has subsequently become Public Law No. 92. This bill, H. R. 3005, increased the subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government. After much study on the subject, the committee became convinced that those employees who were required by their duties to travel on behalf of the Government, were not receiving a per diem allowance equal to actual out-of-the-pocket expenses. As we all know, no one can travel today, obtain a hotel room, and pay for meals, and so forth, from a $6 per day allowance. The new figure agreed upon raised this allowance for travel on official business away from designated posts of duty up to a maximum of $9 per day; while at the same time the mileage allowance was increased from 5 cents to 7 cents per mile, when privately owned automobiles are used for official business. This law has the salutary effect since, at the insistence of the committee, it was drawn so as to allow a per diem "up to a maximum of $9 a day."

The committee was forthright in admonishing all agency and department heads to reimburse the employees at less than the $9 maximum where circumstances are such as to enable an official duty trip to be accomplished for less than the maximum. Recently the committee favorably reported to the House an amendment to this basic act to allow an employee to continue on per diem when the following situation obtained: In H. R. 5951, should an employee become incapacitated by illness or injury, not due to misconduct, while in travel status on official business away from his designated post of duty, he would continue to receive per diem and transportation expenses. This new section was designed to correct existing inequities, since a sick or injured employee in travel status lost his per diem until he recovered. This often proved a great financial strain when ill or injured in a distant city, with bills for medical and nursing care, and should a return be necessary, it was undertaken only at the employee's personal expense.

Another milestone piece of legislation reported out by the Committee on Expenditures and subsequently enacted into law is H. R. 3549, Public Law No. 159. This law permits the Comptroller General of the United States to pay claims chargeable against lapsed appropriations and to provide for the return of unexpended balances of such appropriations to the surplus fund. This complex bill has been of the greatest interest and importance to the General Accounting Office. The new consolidated appropriation account which it establishes will save the Congress much duplicative and repetitive work. For instance, during the Eightieth Congress, some 3,537 such claims, aggregating over $96,000,000 required the attention of Congress, although they had once previously been appropriated for. However, it appears that many claimants wait until the last moment before asserting their rights. Thus, while an appropriation remains valid and alive for a period of 2 years, the law on the other hand gives all claimants 3 years in which to make application. Coming in as was their wont, on the third year after the lapsing of the initial appropriation, it became necessary for the Congress to repeat the same process of reestablishing these funds already once justified and appropriated for. In the meantime, hardship was worked since the claimants were unduly deprived of the amounts due them. Since the difficulties as uncovered by this law involve huge amounts of money and necessitate much paper work and interest and attention by agency and department officials and the Congress, a very sizable reduction in the costs of Government has been achieved through its enactment.

In order that no due advantage should be lost for the benefit of the Government, the committee favorably reported a bill which was responsible for extending the office of the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. This stop-gap measure was able to tide over this agency until it could be absorbed for liquidation by the newly created General Services Administration. The action of the committee in this regard was directly responsible for conserving and protecting the interests of the Government in the field of surplus property disposal.

Of interest especially is H. R. 5526, which recently passed the House, after favorable consideration by the committee. This bill authorized the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes. Under the sponsorship of the distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, the committee, after extensive deliberation and recognizing the extremely heavy work load of the President of the United States, endorsed the performance of certain of his lesser duties by others so delegated, while retaining in the President the responsibility for their acts in office. In this way, it assures to the President relief from the smaller, and often most onerous tasks of his office, and affords him more adequate opportunity for engaging of his attention in more important tasks and duties.

In a number of other measures, the committee directed its attention to the legislation which became ultimately:

Public Law 101, to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

Public Law 122, authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commis-

sion, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown, at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement.

Both of these measures, of intense interest to the localities in Texas in which the conveyances of land were involved, have met with enthusiastic public interest and endorsement.

Also of interest are two other pieces of legislation: Public Law 225, which arose as H. R. 4442, authorizing the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system. During the course of the consideration of this transfer, the committee membership made site studies and analyses, having due regard for the needs of the penal institution involved and the desires and assurances to the people of the surrounding communities.

The remaining bill is known as H. R. 3851, amending Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress with respect to surplus airport property and to provide for the transfer of compliance functions with relation to such property.

This deals with resolving the jurisdiction of this property between the War Assets Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and its return of such surplus airport property to local municipalities when declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. This bill, issuing from the Committee on Expenditures, passed the House on April 7, 1949, and is currently pending action in the other body.

Thus, looking back for a moment, we can see that the President and the Congress have been most successful in achieving worth-while legislation in the regions averred to be the most fruitful of immediate returns in efficiency and economy. This session has seen the accomplishment of this series of objectives:

National Military Establishment: Reorganization Plan No. 8, superseded by Public Law 216.

Civil Service Commission: Reorganization Plan No. 5, effective August 19, 1949.

Procurement and Supply Activities: Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, effective July 1, 1949.

Post Office Department: Reorganization Plan No. 3, effective August 19, 1949.

Of course, there have been many other bills pending before the committee. However, they have found their way into paralleling legislation, dealing in the same subject matter. By way of illustration, it would be well to cite the following dispositions:

H. R. 184: Embodied in H. R. 782, and Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Welfare.

H. R. 478: Included in H. R. 3005, Public Law No. 92, Travel and Expense Act of 1949.

H. R. 782: Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Welfare.

H. R. 828: Included in H. R. 3005, Public Law No. 92, Travel and Expense Act of 1949.

H. R. 1402: Included in H. R. 782, and Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Welfare.

H. R. 1745: Carried into Public Law No. 152, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

H. R. 1774: Included in H. R. 3851, passed House May 16, 1949; pending in Senate.

H. R. 2204: Included in H. R. 4754, Public Law No. 152, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

H. R. 2361: Clean bill on H. R. 1569, Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law No. 109.

H. R. 2641: Included in Public Law No. 152, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

H. R. 2781: H. R. 4754 reported in lieu, Public Law 152.

H. R. 3447: H. R. 4754 reported in lieu, Public Law 152.

H. R. 3585: H. R. 3005 reported in lieu, Public Law 92.

H. R. 4396: Included in H. R. 4754, Public Law 152.

H. R. 4760: Included in H. R. 4754, Public Law 152.

H. R. 5868: Included in S. 2085, which was reported in lieu.

The committee has in its present planning made provision for the employment of full attention to the drafting of new substantive legislation, the study of the many spheres whereby existing legislation may be implemented, and concentration in the fields most likely to be affected by future Presidential reorganizational planning. For instance, in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, a number of fields are left for future abetting legislation, records management, traffic management, and others. Work is going forward at this time to explore the further potential therein for fruitful fields aimed at increased efficiency and reduction of governmental costs. These analyses, together with the culling of the reports submitted to the Congress and this committee by the Commission on Organization, can be instrumental in achieving a goal of worth-while benefit to the entire Government and the Nation.

The membership of the committee is to be congratulated on the excellent work performed by the committee during this session, and it is felt that merit of its past and present record will prove a spur to its future endeavors.

Let America Be Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 1949 issue of Judy's magazine.

I wish to call to your attention this article which points out forcefully, the fallacies of the administration's proposition to increase postal rates, which is now being considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate. The House measure is H. R. 2945.

The postal service is one service which should be provided at the lowest possible cost to all users. The Congress has never been stingy in its treatment of the Post Office Department. In fact, we have not been stingy with anyone, lately, that I can see. We have appropriated billions for every conceivable purpose and will be called upon for more.

Is it reasonable then that we should penalize ourselves just to satisfy the desires of some one to say in the next campaign that "We put the post office on a self-sustaining basis?"

Hundreds of millions can easily be cut out of the budget by common-sense methods of administration. I commend to you the article, Let America Be Informed:

LET AMERICA BE INFORMED

There is a great ado in Washington at the moment over the post-office deficit, estimated at about $200,000,000 a year. That a private organization might do this entire job and at a profit, that economies be effected in post-office routine, that the $100,000,000 cost of franking, Government postage, and floods of propaganda and self-touting, etc., be reduced considerably—these have not been put forth as solutions.

As usual, the master minds, our noble statesmen, come forth with their usual formula: "we must raise taxes, raise rates," and the public and business must cough up the extra costs.

The post-office service was established originally as exactly that—a service to the public in order that the people may keep in communication with one another; and above all, that through the mails, the exchange of ideas, the transmission of knowledge and information, and the enlightenment of the people on what is taking place in their own country and government, may be accomplished.

Now it is proposed that magazines be penalized, newspapers limited in circulation, fewer books be sent and read, catalogs and circulars to stimulate trade, production and employment be heavily charged, that the printing industries be choked with unemployment, that reading by the people, their sources of information, and to a great extent, their entertainment by way of reading, be lessened and interfered with.

Nothing is so vital in a democracy, in the government of a free people by themselves, as that they know what is going on, that they have opportunity to learn the facts and issues before making up their minds accordingly as voters and taxpayers.

Further, the easy and wide distribution of newspapers and magazines increases the ability to check up on officeholders, to expose dishonesty and bungling, and to throw the light of publicity on scheming politicians. This protection against their own government a people constantly need, especially in a democracy.

"The Post Office Department is here to serve all the people in any way it can, to make life more happy," said a post-office official. Increased post-office rates, which in turn will cause business and the public to

reduce its mailings, will not make life more happy nor pay post-office deficits.

If the post-office service had to be performed without a penny of income, it still should be rendered free to the public. Here is one department of the Government which actually renders a direct vital service and gives the great and small something for their $40,000,000,000 annual taxes.

Now it is proposed to cripple this service through increasing all postal rates tremendously, as brought forward in the hearings now before the Senate Post Office Committee, and the House Post Office Committee at Washington.

If you believe in free speech and the expression of opinion, in an intelligent electorate, a people who should be informed rather than kept in the dark, particularly concerning the activities of public officials, write your Congressman and both of your Senators at once to the effect that postal rates remain as they are or even be lowered. Don't shirk behind the usual alibi that somebody else will fight the battle. (Will Judy, editor of Judy's magazine.)

The Basing-Point System Contributed Greatly to the Shortage of Automobiles—Automobile Production Slowed Down Because Steel Companies Refused To Absorb Freight Into Detroit Area—Senate Small Business Report No. 44 Reveals Absence of Freight Absorption in Critical Steel-Shortage Period—S. 1008 Should Not Be Passed, Thereby Legalizing the Basing-Point System of Pricing

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the particular attention of the Members of the House to one of the salient facts as to why automobiles were scarce during the 2-year production period following the cessation of hostilities in World War II. In the year 1940, the Detroit area received shipments of hot-rolled sheets of 1,170,172 tons. In the year 1947 the Detroit area received 1,174,858 tons. This is a change of four-tenths of 1 percent between the 2 years, which, for all practical purposes, was no increase at all.

At the time, in 1947, when Detroit was receiving approximately the same tonnage of hot-rolled sheets it received in 1940, other areas were receiving as much as 300 percent more hot-rolled sheets in 1947 as such areas received in 1940.

The surplus and deficit-producing areas are set forth in table 7 on page 36 of report No. 44 of the Eighty-first Congress, which was in the nature of a special report on Changes in Distribution of Steel, 1940–47, made by the Senate Small Business Committee of the Eightieth Congress. For the information of the Members this table is included in full at this point:

TABLE 7.—*Shipments of hot-rolled sheets in 1940 and 1947: Comparing changes in distribution to producing areas and nonproducing areas*

	1940	1947	Percent change
Surplus-producing areas:			
New York (excluding New York City)	131,956	123,299	−6.6
Cleveland	283,305	298,100	5.2
Other Ohio	394,262	486,315	23.3
Canton-Massillon-Mansfield	52,553	65,285	24.2
Indiana	181,796	236,945	30.3
Pennsylvania (excluding Philadelphia)	232,357	372,810	60.4
Chicago	281,274	470,388	67.2
Alabama	24,651	46,778	89.8
Maryland	105,466	223,899	112.3
Kentucky	9,063	22,874	152.4
West Virginia	39,352	157,506	300.2
Subtotal	1,736,035	2,504,199	44.2
Deficit-producing areas:			
Philadelphia	227,358	186,288	−18.1
Detroit	1,170,172	1,174,858	0.4
Missouri	78,329	80,158	2.3
Illinois (excluding Chicago)	103,092	130,076	26.2
California	130,274	194,542	49.3
Subtotal	1,709,225	1,765,922	3.3
All other areas	1,032,197	1,049,737	1.7
Total all areas	4,477,457	5,319,858	18.8

AUTOMOBILE SHORTAGE LARGELY CAUSED BY REFUSAL OF STEEL BARONS TO ABSORB FREIGHT

The report on page 34 has this to say with respect to shipment of hot-rolled sheets into the Detroit area and to other Michigan points:

Detroit, the greatest single consuming area of hot-rolled sheets, received almost exactly the same tonnages in 1947 as in 1940. That local production is not nearly adequate to meet the demands of this area, together with the fact that substantial freight absorption was required on any imports into the area, would be sufficient to account for the failure of Detroit to share in the larger supply of hot-rolled sheets in 1947.

The basing-point system, which was used in the steel industry at that time, has two factors which are always present. One is freight absorption, and the other is phantom freight. At will, the steel industry, or any other industry using the basing-point system, can manipulate shipments so as to either avoid freight absorption and thereby collect phantom freight, or, on the other hand, forego phantom freight by the process of dumping into other surplus areas. Usually this dumping process takes place when the supply of steel is plentiful or when punitive measures are desired against a small and weaker competitor. It is significant, as the report sets forth, that all of the producing areas of hot-rolled steel sheets were plentifully supplied, thus avoiding freight absorption and aiding in the collection of phantom freight.

We are all familiar with the scarcity of automobiles and the unfair sales practices that arose as a result of the scarcity. The automobile shortage was far worse than it would have been, or should have been, had the steel companies not desired to artificially manipulate the supply of steel shipments to the freight absorption areas, such as Detroit. Many times during the steel shortage the steel barons stated publicly and privately that there were sufficient facilities for the manufacture of steel and that no new plants were needed—particularly no new plants in the deficit steel-producing areas of our country.

It may have been that there was something to this argument, but the facts contained in the Senate small-business report of the Eightieth Congress point in the other direction. No private passenger automobiles were manufactured between the years 1941 and 1946, and, of course when the war ended the demand was tremendous. The automobile companies could have met this demand and avoided a great many of the unfair and malicious practices which grew up in the sale and distribution of automobiles had the distribution of the steel supplies been on an up-and-up basis during the so-called shortage period. However, as the Senate small-business report conclusively shows, steel distribution of hot-rolled sheets and other steel products were on a manipulated basis. The manipulation came about through the use of freight absorption in the application of the basing-point system, which accrued only to the benefit of the large integrated steel companies.

FREIGHT ABSORPTION OR PHANTOM FREIGHT—WHICH TWIN IS THE PHONY?

I sincerely trust that the Members will continue to be alerted to the proposition that freight absorption is only one end of the artificial pricing system in the artificial-pricing system used in the steel industry, in the cement industry, and in many other industries. The other end of the system is phantom freight. In the middle of the system are the manipulators who shift distribution at will in short- and long-supply markets to the detriment of the consumer and to the peril of small business. At this point I would like to include the recommendations and conclusions of the Senate Small Business Committee which are to be found on pages 1 and 2 of the Senate Small Business Report No. 44. The chairman of the steel subcommittee was the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the chairman of the full Small Business Committee of the Senate, it will be recalled, was the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The report does not show that in their recommendations and conclusions there was any lack of unanimity on the part of the distinguished members of either the steel subcommittee or the full Senate Committee on Small Business. The recommendations and conclusions—pages 1 and 2, Senate Report No. 44, Eighty-first Congress—follows:

SPECIAL REPORT

(Pursuant to S. Res. 20)

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

If the experience in hot-rolled-steel-sheet distribution is typical of most other steel products covered by the committee's survey—and a rapid and admittedly cursory comparison indicates that it is—then the Steel Subcommittee feels that this distribution pattern is alarming.

The power to govern the distribution of steel is the power of life and death in the economic world. The way in which it is exercised determines which businesses grow

and which do not, which industries expand and which do not, which States and regions prosper and which do not. Yet, despite its overwhelming importance, the power appears to have been exercised, for example, so that the 12 areas which happened to be the major centers of steel production received nearly half as much again as their prewar shipments of hot-rolled-steel sheets, while the amount flowing into the entire remainder of the country stood practically unchanged, rising only 2.7 percent.

This means that in these other parts of the country which comprise by far the vast majority of our States and cities, their expanded steel-consuming facilities either had to be closed down or operated at considerably less than their full capacity. It means that in these areas both small and large firms were unable to secure their fair share of postwar market expansion. It means a further centralization of productive activities in a few greatly congested industrial centers.

Such trends, which have serious economic implications, are also dangerous from a strategic-defense standpoint.

The committee recognizes that the managers of private industry have a responsibility to the stockholders of their individual companies to earn a maximum profit. But the committee also recognizes that the managers of industry have a responsibility to the people of the country as a whole, especially when corporate decisions have such a far-reaching effect as they have in the case of steel.

These two areas of decision sometimes conflict. Unless a proper balance is struck between them, the very existence of our private enterprise system is endangered.

In the light of the facts developed by this committee, detailed in this and other reports, the committee urges a reevaluation by the steel-company managements of their distribution policies so as to strike this proper balance between the interests of private profit and national welfare.

The steel subcommittee is still opposed to the imposition of mandatory distribution or allocation controls upon the steel industry, or any other industry. However, the results of this survey, which are based strictly upon the facts and figures furnished by the major steel companies themselves, are irrefutable. There can be no further side-stepping by the steel industry as to its responsibility in correcting inequities of distribution.

The steel industry should give grave consideration to the growing sentiment inside and outside Government towards socialization of major industries. The steel subcommittee realizes the seriousness of such pressures, which will mean death to free, competitive enterprise—whether large or small. The steel industry has been repeatedly warned that it must put its house in order, or face inevitable regimentation. This report furnishes the information and the means for action.

BIG STEEL HAS POWER OF LIFE AND DEATH IN OUR ECONOMIC WORLD

"The power to govern the distribution of steel is the power of life and death in the economic world." Those are not my words. They are the words of the Senate Small Business Committee of the Eightieth Congress. They are words included in the recommendations and conclusions of that very effective select committee of the Senate. I subscribe to the conclusion that the power to govern the distribution of steel, or for that matter any other product, is the power of life and death not only in the economic world as such but in the small-business world, an important segment in our economic world. The situation described in the Senate report brought about shameful conditions not only in the automobile industry but in many other consumer goods industries. Manipulation, price fixing, restricted production, and a whole mass of evils in our trade and commerce are discovered when an industry has the power to fix its own prices without the benefit of competition. I do not condemn any industry as a whole as a price-fixing industry, for in each industry, whether it be steel, cement, lumber, sugar, or any other industry, there are many smaller units which would like to be free of the onerous controls laid upon them by the Big Three, the Big Four, or the Big Five. I have a feeling, in which I am joined by many others, that the moment we pass permissive legislation legalizing any part or parcel of an artificial pricing system, we shall have surrendered to the monopolists, the price fixers, and the manipulators.

REMEMBER AUTOMOBILE SHORTAGE AND THINK OF EFFECTS OF S. 1008

I do not doubt after a complete and careful reading of the Senate report on the changes in distribution of steel that not only was the automobile shortage a byproduct of the steel industry's avoidance of freight absorption, but that it had the same effect on hundreds of other scarce items in great demand during the 3 years following World War II. Please keep this phrase "freight absorption" in mind and remember that it is used as a manipulating device to control markets and prices in our big basic industries and is not used primarily for the innocent purposes necessary to fair and free markets. Under the present court decisions, and under the decisions of the Federal Trade Commission, there is no need for fear by small business if it desires to use any fair method of competition. As I see it, there is no need for anybody to fear meeting competition in a fair and free market. This country was built on free markets and free enterprise, and so long as a business practice or method of pricing does not tend to destroy or restrain competition and to create a monopoly, I cannot see any difficulty ahead for any small-business institution under present law and court decisions. To the contrary, when markets are free small business can stand up and slug it out with the best of them.

Remember well the automobile shortage and remember it was not caused by a shortage of steel particularly, but by the distribution of the available supply of steel—an unfair distribution which enabled the steel companies to avoid the very thing that they are now asking be incorporated in S. 1008, namely, the right to absorb freight. A right which the steel companies, or any other form of business enterprise, already have; no new law is needed to reaffirm that right.

Glacier View Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the construction of the Glacier View Dam on the north fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana and for other purposes.

Glacier View, when built, will be another Hungry Horse and because of its location 25 miles to the northwest it will form a part of a dual project which will be of inestimable value to the people of Montana and the Northwest. It will cause very little economic dislocation; it would provide storage of 4,800,000 acre-feet; and it would have an installed capacity of 210,000 kilowatts.

The Army engineers have recommended the building of Glacier View but the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior has voiced its opposition because the reservoir would extend partly into Glacier Park.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter I have written to Secretary Krug on Glacier View and his reply and also a copy of a letter written to me on January 17, 1949, by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of December 27, 1948, enclosing correspondence which you have received from the Flathead Valley Flood Control Association and asking for a report on this matter.

The Corps of Engineers is familiar with the flood-control problem on the Flathead to which the petitioners refer. In accordance with congressional authority contained in a resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate dated September 24, 1943, the Corps of Engineers has been engaged in a comprehensive study on flood and related problems in the Columbia River Basin. As a result of that study a comprehensive review report on the Columbia River and its tributaries is now approaching completion, and the flood problem on the Flathead River has been given careful consideration in that report. Flood damages to lands in this area, including the flood of 1948, have been serious. Upon completion by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River a substantial reduction in flooding in this area will be accomplished, but much of the land in the area above Flathead Lake will still be subject to damage from larger floods. After careful study of all practicable methods of flood control, it has been found that construction and operation of a dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River at the Glacier View site would in conjunction with Hungry Horse Dam completely eliminate all flood damage suffered in this area.

Accordingly, a reservoir on the North Fork of the Flathead River has been included by the division engineer, North Pacific Division, as an element in his major plan for control of floods and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin. A public hearing was held at Kalispell, Mont., on May 25, 1948, to obtain the views of all concerned with this project. Representatives of the Flathead Valley Citizens Committee and of the Kalispell Chamber of Commerce were present and spoke in favor of the Glacier View project. The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, however, presented objections to this project and opposition was also expressed by individuals and organizations interested from the viewpoint of the National Park Service. As a result, the division engineer has included the project in his plan for consideration pending concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior with a view of its definite recommendation at such time as the

Secretary of the Interior may concur. In the event that the Glacier View project cannot be recommended definitely, some alternative measure for flood protection must be sought. It appears that a lesser degree of flood protection can be obtained by local works in this area which may be found economically justifiable, and if so these could be undertaken under provisions for such work which are contained in the comprehensive Columbia River report.

At the present time the report on the Columbia River and tributaries, which includes the Glacier View project, is now being reviewed by the Board of Engneers for Rivers and Harbors prior to its transmission to Congress. In order that interested parties may present additional views regarding the plan and projects recommended, that Board is holding a series of public hearings in the Columbia River Basin in the near future. One of these hearings will be held at Spokane, Wash., at the Davenport Hotel, at 9:30 a. m. on 31 January 1949, and it is believed that this hearing will afford an opportunity to the people of the Flathead River Valley to express their views to the Board on this matter.

In the event that your constituents desire to examine the comprehensive report on the Columbia River in order to determine the provisions thereof with respect to the Flathead River, you are advised that a copy of that report has been placed on file for public inspection with Mr. A. S. Shaw, clerk and recorder, Flathead County Courthouse, Kalispell, Mont.

The review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the report of the Chief of Engineers will be completed after the further consideration of the views of local interests, and the report will then be transmitted to the Congress through the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with established procedure. At the present time the Corps of Engineers does not have the authority or necessary funds to proceed with essential flood-control improvements on the Flathead River and congressional action will be required before this work can be accomplished. The report now being completed will form a sound basis for consideration and authorization by the Congress of measures for control of floods in the Flathead River Valley and in the Columbia River Basin generally.

The inclosures to your letter are returned herewith.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1949.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you to urge that you review your letter in opposition to the building of the proposed Glacier View Dam in northwest Montana. I feel that because of your position as Secretary of the Interior you may have bowed to the wishes of one of your departments—the National Park Service, in this matter. You have recommended the reconsideration, by the Army engineers, of the proposed Paradise Dam even though that project was not included in the recommended list of sites by the engineers in their report.

To my way of thinking there is no comparison between the worthiness of these two sites. In the first place, Glacier View would be of much more immediate benefit; it would not disturb the economy of the region in which it would be located but would, as a matter of fact, add to it; it would be economical and feasible to build Glacier View immediately upon completion of Hungry Horse so that, together, they could furnish in excess of 500,000 kilowatts of electricity, form a complete flood-control unit, and bring opportunity and security to the people of northwest Montana.

Furthermore, the proposed Paradise Dam would be more expensive, take longer to build, disrupt the economy of the area through the flooding of towns and by the raising of Kerr Dam and thence the level of Flathead Lake. This would once again bring up the fight we had in 1943 over the raising and lowering of the level of that lake. It would create a problem of adjudicating losses which would be entailed by the Flathead Tribe on their reservation in the immediate area. I do not doubt that at some future time the feasibility of considering the Paradise Dam would be both necessary and worth while. At that time all the factors inherent in this proposal would have to be gone into thoroughly so that the interests of all the people in that area would be protected to the greatest possible extent.

I do believe, however, that as a natural follow-up to Hungry Horse that the Glacier View Dam should be built first. It would tie in with the development of Montana and then, in order, other sites suggested by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation could be considered. I want to see Montana developed for the benefit of its people, and, in my opinion, that development depends upon the use of our water for low-cost hydroelectric power, for irrigation and reclamation, and for flood control. In all these respects, Montana must have a prior use of its waters through the building of multiple-purpose dams to aid in the development of our economy.

The Army engineers' investigation of the Glacier View project resulted in summary recommendations for its construction, subject to approval by the Governor of Montana and other State interests, approval of the engineering designs, and authorization for construction by Congress, accompanied by appropriation.

A public hearing was held at Kalispell, Mont., on May 25, 1948, to permit consideration of the views of all interested persons and organizations. Due to severe flood conditions in the Flathead Valley, there was a very small attendance, and a majority of those present recorded themselves in favor of the project. The reasons given by those who opposed it coincided generally with those expressed by the National Park Service of the Interior Department. These are as follows:

1. The reservoir would inundate about 19,840 acres of land within the western boundary of Glacier National Park; and (a) would destroy approximately 8,000 acres of virgin timber (ponderosa pine) about to be acquired with lands presently owned by the State of Montana; (b) would require destruction of about 56 percent of the white-tailed deer, 30 percent of the mule deer and elk, over 50 percent of the moose, due to flooding of winter-feeding area, and would flood out over 70 percent of the beaver; (c) would impair the natural beauty of the valley, with an attendant loss of interest of park visitors who come for stream fishing.

2. Would violate policy established under the act of August 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 699), accepting Federal jurisdiction over Glacier National Park, which specifically requires the Park Service to afford protection against any attempted action affecting adversely the natural wildlife, growth, or beauty of the park.

In presenting its recommendations, the Corps of Engineers attempted no rebuttal of statements made in opposition to the project. However, the contents of the report reveal that field studies and investigation reports differ in some major points with statements of the opposing groups.

For instance, the report states that only about 1 percent of the total area of Glacier National Park would be required for reservoir use, all of it in a little used valley on the westerly fringe, and completely outside the rugged, glacier-covered areas for which the park is famous. The report of the Corps of Engineers states that nearly all the reservoir area is covered with second-growth brushy fir and lodge-pole pine, and that flowage costs will be relatively low. The engineers report goes on to recognize the responsibilities of the Park Service under basic park legislation, but to point out that the same act acknowledges "the fact that provision for beneficial uses of water resources has a higher priority than 'preservation of all timber—natural curiosities—and for the protection of the animals—' ".

In summarizing his conclusions and recommendations, the Division Engineer takes into account all the various factors bearing on feasibility and desirability of the Glacier View project, but states that "the Glacier View project is an element of the main control plan because of its many benefits and advantages over other sites in the entire Columbia River Basin. Its location high in a sparsely populated, undeveloped area at a point controlling considerable runoff; its engineering feasibility for development of cyclic storage for both stream regulation and flood control, as well as substantial at-site power; and the additional power benefits from this storage to existing and authorized downstream power installations, all combine to give the project a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.84 to 1. In addition, there are other benefits not capable of monetary evaluation but which are, nonetheless, important and substantial, such as helping to prevent loss of life and devastation caused by the disastrous floods in this basin. Although included as a part of the recommended main control plan for the above reasons, the Glacier View project was conditionally recommended for construction at this time in view of the objections raised by the National Park Service.

On April 27, 1948, Col. L. H. Hewitt, Seattle district engineer, states in his notice of public hearing on the proposed Glacier View project that:

"The economic reservoir level for this development is at elevation 3,725 feet above mean sea level, providing 3,160,000 acre-feet of usable storage which would be impounded from the spring flood flow and retained as a stable lake adjoining the Park throughout the summer recreational period. Use of a part of the stored water would begin in the fall and continue through the winter until capacity was available for retention of spring floodwaters and a repetition of the cycle. This operation, together with similar operation of the Hungry Horse Reservoir now under construction on the South Fork of Flathead River, would control completely the floods that cause damage in the vicinity of Kalispell and at other points along Flathead River, and assist in the control of damaging floods throughout the Columbia River system downstream. The release of floodwaters as needed through the winter season of low stream-flow would generate power at the site and increase the power available at all public and private power plants downstream. By interconnection with other elements of the Northwest power pool, the project would provide abundant and economical power throughout the year locally, and assist in relieving a critical power shortage which now is hampering the economic development of the entire region. Recreational and conservational possibilities of the reservoir will be developed in the manner and to the extent considered desirable and justifiable by the private and Government agencies concerned."

Under date of January 17, 1949, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler stated in a letter to me that:

"After careful study of all practicable methods of flood control, it has been found that construction and operation of a dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River at the Glacier View site would, in conjunction with Hungry Horse Dam, completely eliminate all flood damage suffered in this area."

I am familiar with the Glacier View area, and I believe it would make an ideal dam site. It would flood no towns, and what little agricultural land involved has little value. In terms of loss of tax revenue the loss would amount to but $500 a year.

The main objection is that on the east side of the river it would flood land now included in Glacier Park. This is mostly bottom land of no value except for a small band of moose that range in there, together with some deer. This was the main objection brought out by the park superintendent at the Kalispell hearing and the fact that when the water was let out of the dam there would be considerable areas of mud flats exposed. I do not believe that very much of the water would be let out of this dam until the park tourist season is over. Furthermore, this is separated from the rest of the park by a divide with very poor roads leading into it, and it is my opinion that very few of the park visitors ever go into this area. Some sportsmen claim that it would ruin the fishing in the north fork of the Flathead River. The fishing here is poor at its best, and I contend that in the lake created by the dam the fishing would be better than ever. As a matter of fact, only 12,000 acres of park land—not 19,000—would be flooded, and the net result would not affect the beauty of the park in any way but would make it more beautiful by creating a large lake over ground that now has no scenic attraction, largely an unsightly burn. As to the wild game now occupying this area, there are vast areas just as good nearby that the game could move into.

The park authorities take the attitude that nothing can be changed in the park, no matter how senseless the attitude or whether any scenic beauty is destroyed or not.

This project, in my opinion, is a very laudable one, since a minimum of private property will be damaged and because it compares favorably with and fits into the Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River.

Because the Glacier View project is economically feasible and because it will benefit the people of Montana and because they approve its construction, I want to go on record as being wholeheartedly in favor of this proposal. I again urge that you reconsider your previous action and approve that part of the 308 report recommending the construction of the Glacier View Dam.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1949.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have considered carefully the points outlined at some length in your letter of February 25, in which you urge me to reconsider and withdraw my opposition to the Glacier View Dam.

The Corps of Engineers' 308 review report on the Columbia River and tributaries includes this project for consideration pending concurrence of this Department, with a view to its definite recommendation when such concurrence had been obtained. For reasons given below, I regret that I cannot agree that I should concur in the Glacier View Dam proposal.

With respect to the relative merits of the Paradise and Glacier View sites, I should like to have you read the following excerpts from the Corps of Engineers' report (ch. V, pp. 50–51, pars. 85 and 86), wherein the district engineer refers to the superiority of the Paradise site:

"85. Glacier View project: This project on Flathead River was vigorously opposed by the National Park Service and by many local and recreational interests. The Governor of Montana withheld approval pending assurance that the proposed plan was coordinated with that of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Paradise project in this same basin, but downstream on the Clark Fork, would accomplish more in the main-control plan than Glacier View, and was originally included, but local opposition to Paradise was more extensive and concerted because of the developed lands and Indian interests involved. As one or the other of these projects is essential to serve the local interests as well as those of the rest of the Columbia River Basin, the Glacier View project is given preference at this time.

"86. * * * However, since the project is apparently not presently favored by the Secretary of the Interior, its recommendation for authorization is deferred until such time as the Secretary of the Interior may concur as to its justification. Since no other project with comparable functions, as required in the main control plan, is immediately available, Glacier View is tentatively included in the plan. Should this dam not be constructed, consideration must be given to alternative sites in order to obtain the storage essential for regional flood control and power."

As you know, I visited Glacier National Park last September and toured the area that would be flooded by the Glacier View Dam. That inspection and my subsequent study of the project convinced me that the area involved is an essential part of the park. The losses in wildlife resources, in forested wilderness, in scenic beauty, and in recreational value to our whole Nation, in my opinion, are far greater than pictured by the dam's proponents. We can ill afford to invade and thus impair Glacier, or any national park. Every great national park is in jeopardy if we allow any one to be violated when their is any other course open to us. I am sure you will agree that the national parks are not now too numerous or extensive to serve the peoples' present and future recreational needs.

As to the acreage that would be flooded, the corps' figures are misleading. Approximately 19,840 acres would be flooded within the park boundary which the Congress established. The fact that about one-third of the lands are not now all in Federal ownership would not keep them from being under water if the dam should be built. The 8,000 acres of virgin forest in this area would be destroyed.

It is significant to note also from the corps' estimates of annual benefits for Glacier View that approximately 91 percent of these relate to power, 3.2 percent and 4.3 percent relate respectively to local and regional flood control and the remaining small percentages to navigation and recreation.

I therefore hope that you will understand my position and why I cannot alter my opposition to the Glacier View project. I do not deny the need for water control on the Clark Fork, but we must find some way to do it without sacrificing Glacier National Park.

With my personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CAP,
Secretary of the Interior.

H. R. 3838, Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed H. R. 3838, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the present fiscal year, late yesterday afternoon. The Senate saw fit to hold up the construction of the Glendo unit on the Platte River in Wyoming and the Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, proposed to be constructed on the State line between Wyoming and Montana, by the following amendments commencing on page 53 of the Senate bill:

That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress.

Provided further, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

All of the water to be stored in the proposed Glendo unit originates in the State of Wyoming. There is an acute shortage of power in that area and the people of Wyoming would like to see the Glendo Unit constructed so that additional power can be generated from the water stored in the proposed Glendo Dam. In addition, the Glendo Dam will afford substantial sediment control on the Platte River and will extend the life of Guernsey Dam a few miles below. The States of Nebraska and Colorado have objected to the construction of the Glendo project because no agreement has been entered into by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming and Colorado respecting the rights to the water to be stored in the Glendo Dam. Because of the fact that there is a dispute between those States, the Senate, in its wisdom, has held up the construction of this Wyoming project until the States affected enter into a binding agreement for the disposition of the water involved. If it is sound, Mr. Speaker, to hold up the construction of the Glendo project until the States of Nebraska and Wyoming settle the dispute over the waters involved, then, surely, by the same token, the construction of the Moorhead Dam should also be held up until the States of Wyoming and Montana enter into an agreement over a division of the waters to be stored at the Moorhead Dam. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment affecting the Moorhead

Dam and Reservoir was adopted in the Senate unanimously and without objection of any kind.

The Moorhead Dam, with a large number of other projects in the Missouri Basin, was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Under that authorization, it was proposed to build a dam at Moorhead 150 feet high, with a capacity to store 390,000 acre-feet of water and estimated to cost $4,000,000. But, Mr. Speaker, without specific authorization by the Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation disclosed at the hearings this year before the House Committee on Interior Appropriations that it now proposes to build a dam at Moorhead 174 feet high, storing 80,000 acre-feet of water and costing $15,850,000.

All of the water proposed to be stored at the Moorhead Dam originates along the 200-mile course of the Powder River in Wyoming. There is no compact or agreement between Wyoming and Montana over the division of the waters involved. Dams of this character on interstate streams should not be constructed until there is a compact for a division of the waters between the affected States.

Compact commissioners have been appointed by the States of Wyoming and Montana to agree upon the division of these waters, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, it would be eminently unfair to endanger Wyoming's right to the use of that water by the construction of this project before a compact has been concluded. Inasmuch as it is proposed to irrigate some 42,600 acres of land in Montana by this project, the people of my State contend that their rights to a fair portion of this water will be endangered by this appropriation until such time as a compact has been negotiated. In that connection, I wish to quote from a recent letter from Wyoming's state engineer, L. C. Bishop:

If Moorhead Reservoir development is completed to include any irrigation capacity, there should be a compact or agreement with Montana with reference to the division of the waters of Powder River and tributaries. If this is not done, any irrigation under this reservoir in Montana will establish a right that will in all probability be considered by the Supreme Court as prior and superior to any right of use in Wyoming hereafter established.

In any event, the 42,000 acres of irrigable land in Montana, if and when irrigated, will require more water than the flow of Powder River on a dry year, and as I have repeated many times, it will have a priority which they will certainly assert if a series of dry years come along. We should not take a chance on such a situation.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the Sheridan Press, of Sheridan, Wyo., carried the following significant editorial:

NOT ENOUGH FOR ALL

In his column headed Oh, yeah, Ashton Jones, editor of the Powder River County Examiner, Broadus, Mont., in a recent issue pointed out that one rancher in the Broadus vicinity was able to pump the Powder River dry.

"In order to get enough water to operate his pump on Powder River last week, Doug Randall threw a dam across Powder River with a bulldozer and pumped the complete flow of the river into his ditches," Jones wrote. "Those big-hearted boys in Wyoming have diverted practically all of the flow of the river into their irrigation ditches."

We want to thank Mr. Jones for his observations about the amount of water on the Powder in Montana at this season of year, particularly in a dry year. Ever since the controversy about the Moorhead Dam began, Wyoming water users on the upper Powder have attempted to show the Bureau of Reclamation engineers and Members of Congress that Wyoming would suffer if Montana gets a priority on Wyoming water by virtue of an earlier appropriation. Some of the experts with the Government have attempted to show that there is water enough for everyone.

It would seem that Mr. Jones confirms Wyoming convictions that there isn't enough water for everyone in a dry season. Present and prospective Wyoming water users want to insure sufficient water for the upstream areas by the development of projects in the upper basin prior to the construction of any reservoirs at or near the Montana line.

Mr. Jones certainly can't blame Wyoming users for wanting to keep at least a fair portion of the water which originates in the Wyoming mountains. We wonder if Montana people would be so generous as to will all of their water to Wyoming if the tables were reversed?

We thank Mr. Jones for helping us to show that there isn't water enough for everyone every season.

At the meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, on July 21 of this year, with W. G. Sloan, Department of the Interior, chairman, presiding, and attended by the governors, and many other interested officials, of the Missouri Basin States, the question of the Moorhead Dam was fully discussed, and the minutes of the meeting disclosed the following:

At the conclusion of the presentations regarding Moorhead, the chairman stated that the committee urges Wyoming and Montana and the Bureau of Reclamation to get together as soon as possible so that an agreement may be reached on the division of the waters of the Powder River, and that he will ask for a report to the Interagency Committee each month on the progress attained until a settlement is reached.

I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that since construction of the Glendo project on the Platte River in Wyoming is to be held up until the States of Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado agree on the disposition of the waters along the Platte River, under the same rule, the construction of the Moorhead Dam should be held up until the States of Wyoming and Montana enter into an agreement on the disposition of the waters of the Powder River. Several months ago, the State of Wyoming appointed Compact Commissioners on this stream and my State has repeatedly urged that negotiations proceed with dispatch to bring about a compact. The conclusion is irresistible, Mr. Speaker, that the restrictive language respecting the Moorhead Dam is entirely proper for the following reasons:

First. The only water to be stored at Moorhead Dam is Wyoming water and that dam should not be constructed until a compact has been negotiated between Wyoming and Montana for the division of these waters.

Second. The Moorhead Dam will destroy 20,000 acres, including several thousand acres presently irrigated in Wyoming in order to provide irrigation for lands in Montana for which there is little or no demand.

Third. The appropriation is requested to build a dam more than twice as large as that authorized by law. The dam was estimated to cost $4,000,000, but now the Bureau of Reclamation discloses the cost has risen to nearly $16,000,000.

Fourth. The sound principle of the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires that the States affected agree to the plans for projects on streams arising in one State and flowing into another. Wyoming has never agreed to the proposed Moorhead Dam and insists upon a compact before funds are appropriated for the construction of that project.

Fifth. The State of Wyoming contends that instead of providing millions to store silt at the Moorhead Dam that a sound land-conservation program should be instituted which will hold much of the water where it falls and the soil in place. Such a program will not only substantially assist in the problem of flood control but will certainly reduce sediment production by at least 40 percent.

Look to Your Own, Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Preston B. Waterbury, entitled "Look to Your Own, Americans."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK TO YOUR OWN, AMERICANS

(By Preston B. Waterbury, colonel, U. S. Army, retired)

"If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too."

—*W. Somerset Maugham.*

True words. The world now looks to America for leadership, for food, for supplies. If we are to hold our hard-won gains, we shall have to go forward. We shall have to be a strong, healthy, and fearless people. We must stop the ever-increasing moral and physical deterioration of so many of our own boys and girls.

For more than 30 years I have been closely associated with young Americans in and out of the Army, in all sections of the country. I am still at it.

The unpalatable truth is that we are not giving our own kids a chance. Actually a youngster has a hard time to find a place in which he or she can find decent recreation in too many of our communities. Physical training is mostly limited to a few team members. Like any good seed planted in poor soil and not tended right, they grow crooked and unhealthy.

If you doubt this, look around a bit or read the papers.

We need a new outlook on these problems, the old days of home chores and vacant lots are past; no more one o' cat in the street. The old swimmin' hole is full of germs, no mumble-the-peg, no duck on the rock, run

sheep run, or stink base. These and a thousand others are gone forever. Now we have the movies, and the comic books, and big grandstands where multitudes watch a few selected stars perform, pinball machines, jive joints, and filthy alleys.

We have some truly fine things too, Scouts, the Y, 4–H, Salvation Army summer camps, etc. They are doing wonderful work, but they can only scratch the surface.

You won't like this, gentle reader, perhaps. But as the old sergeant used to say, "It's the truth, right on."

We need a new concept, a real and proper training scheme, based on tested and proven methods, suitable to the American way of thinking.

Our goal, the full and orderly development of every child—mentally, morally, physically.

Strong, healthy children are most likely to grow up to be good citizens, assets to the Nation, contributing to, and not detracting from, its wealth. Proper physical training is the keystone upon which the entire training structure depends. Healthy boys and girls make the best students, and seldom go wrong morally.

When seen in true perspective, the final total cost of a weak sickly youngster is far greater than the cost of proper training during childhood.

Physical training must not be made more, or less, important than mental or moral training. We must use every effort to know about and to correct faults in the individual during the grade-school years, not waiting for the verdict of the Army doctors. Then it is too late for correction.

World War II showed that almost half of our young men were not fit for service in combat units. This is an alarming increase over 1917–18 figures. If we ever have to go to war again, which God forbid, we will need strong men and women—quick. This talk of machines replacing men is pure bunk.

I make bold to suggest a plan for the training of the youth of the United States of America. I do this in the hope that some one community will take this plan, or something close to it, and carry it out. Such a community will stand out like a lighthouse in a fog, and serve as a beacon, a warning light on our present wavering course.

THE PLAN

During grade school, every boy and every girl should be given a thorough physical examination, annually, by competent doctors, including a psychiatric survey in cases where unstable temperamental or moral tendencies are suspected. Complete reports covering these examinations will be made the basis for future corrective training, and copies furnished the parents. Wherever a change of diet is recommended, detailed proper instructions should be included with the report. (Like we do now for cattle.) This annual physical examination should not be a routine, line-up affair. It should be a real physical examination, and parents permitted to be present.

At school the child will be given one 1-hour period of physical training each school day. This instruction to be presented in the same thorough manner now employed for academic subjects, and a similar and proper credit required for a passing grade. The student to be encouraged to attain definite standards and to progress very much the same as in spelling, arithmetic, etc. The program to be easy at first, harder as the student progresses. Training to be in the basic physical skills—posture (now badly neglected), walking, running, jumping, vaulting, swimming, balancing, breathing, climbing, throwing, etc. Training in hygiene and proper health habits will be included. Special classes to be held where necessary for backward individuals. And most important, by precept and example, teachers must inspire our boys and girls and encourage them to be strong and healthy.

The full cooperation of all teachers, parents, welfare workers, police officers, religious leaders, civic planners, and leaders will be striven for and utilized. All shall benefit by proper living.

We must recognize that decent play is as necessary for the proper training of youngsters as is the right food for proper growth. Games and sports are very definitely a part of the American way of life. Every child, without exception, should have a place to play that is clean, decent, and safe. Beautiful stadiums cannot erase or offset filthy alleys. Training the big team is not enough—fine as it is.

Every city must provide adequate playgrounds for all its boys and girls. Playgrounds are better than jails; cheaper, too. Who knows the cost of one case of venereal disease, of one lad in jail—the whole cost?

Competent physical-education teachers will be required in the same ratio as teachers in other subjects. This type of instruction cannot be passed over, slighted, handled by old ladies or the school janitor. Nor can it be saddled onto already overworked teachers of other subjects. (All of which I've seen recently.) Coaches cannot do it, either; their hands are full with regular teams.

Youth demands, needs, and must have, good leadership. The business of being a physical-education instructor takes a high type of teacher—a trained specialist. It must be "Do as I do" and not always "Do as I say."

The services of these leaders and all facilities should be available 6 days a week, the year round.

During high school physical education should be required of all students, 1 hour daily, out of doors as much as possible. Grades or credits should not be given solely for ability to play games.

Military training as given in the prewar Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps should be included in high-school curriculums. This program followed in hundreds of American cities before Pearl Harbor is of definite and proven value. It would, indeed, be a mistake not to reestablish this fine activity Nation-wide now. It included marching, manual of arms, field sanitation, first aid, map reading, use of compass, etc. The course should be enlarged to include elements of the civilian defense—just in case.

Suitable courses should be arranged for both boys and girls. These should include hiking, camping, bicycle riding, and weekend activities wherever feasible.

Dancing and singing are fine for young and old alike. Give the youngsters decent places to dance and close up the dives and joints or make 'em clean up.

We must avoid strain and injury in team athletics. Tournaments and games requiring adolescent boys to overdo must not be permitted. Thousands of our boys are hurt every year by this practice, some of them permanently. If there is a question of the boy's fitness, he should be examined by a doctor, and not permitted to play if the doctor so recommends.

Winning tournaments, getting publicity, building school spirit (and the stadium fund), entertaining the alumni, getting the coach a better job next season, are all of questionable value when paid for by weakened hearts, broken knees, flat noses, and wracked bodies. We can have our games without this. Have larger squads, use more players by frequent substitutions. Stop this business of draining the last bit of effort from the star player.

Making heroes of the same boys every Saturday ruins many a fine lad.

When a boy reaches the age of 16 he may volunteer to spend his 3-month school vacation with the colors. Working at scientifically planned tasks under Army living conditions and discipline, and directed by competently trained leaders. The work to be planned by engineers with no thought but the good of the Nation in mind.

All Government agencies to collaborate wherever needed.

Soil-conservation methods, flood control, reforestation, public parks, fish and wildlife propagation, etc. This program will effect many millions of dollars in savings to the country, now being wasted. The cost of the program will be more than repaid in the true values gained, and in the real savings effected—values and savings to our land and to our men. The ability to work hard, a vital need for all good citizens, will be developed to the utmost.

Nor will the work be all; these boys will be trained for democratic living, they will have the joy and pride that comes only from doing a worth-while job well. The boys who go out to the woods in the spring will return home at fall, fine, clean, strong, young men. They will be good citizens, better fitted in every way to be real Americans. Fancy imported "isms" will find hard going in such a company.

The products of this system will be sufficient proof of its value. They will be able to carry on in the traditions of Davy Crockett, of Eddie Rickenbacker, and the others. Straight-dealing, hard-hitting men. Woods-trained, with the know-how of living in the open, with respect for others, with a knowledge and knack of handling tools acquired from experts. Every man Jack of them "fit and ready, peace or war."

Never again shall we bear the disgrace of being a Nation unprepared, soft, weak, flabby. Never again the shame of having to abandon to their fate American soldiers doing their duty over the seas, because we were unable to go to their rescue or relief. We know now that there will be no England or France to hold back the invader while we take months to get ready to fight. Two wars should have taught us something.

There can be little doubt as to the aggressor's objective in the future—or our obligation in the matter.

Men trained to our plan will not be foolish. They will not be juvenile delinquents, contract venereal disease, or run afoul of the law. Strong, healthy men are the very foundation stones on which nations are built. Without such men nations disappear.

We in America must take stock, appraise our methods, hold onto and improve the good, throw out and discard the bad. We must compose our differences and pull together. We must have the courage to admit error and the willingness and desire to make corrections, whatever the cost. We are a brave people. Let us be intelligent as well. A nation that can finance a Marshall plan can certainly afford to give its own youngsters every opportunity for full development.

There is no sane reason why the resources of our land should be wasted, with millions of tons of good topsoil washed to the sea every month, or for this terrible drift to crime of our youth. Democracy can be made to work and to win out over the forces that are now seeking to destroy us and our way of life.

Juvenile delinquency need not be. Wholesale venereal disease need not be. Youngsters in jails, or running around the streets aimlessly, or in dives with nothing better to do.

THESE THINGS NEED NOT BE

World war III need not be fought. The matter is in our hands. We, and only we, can make democracy live.

Eventual ruin—failure—marks the path of the individual who long continues to be weak, sickly, wasteful, and foolish. So with a nation.

We Americans face a crisis, make no mistake about that.

The day of passing the buck has gone. We must act now. We have a job to do—a big job. We have been avoiding this job a long time now. The job gets bigger daily.

Our biggest job is to adequately train our youth for citizenship in the United States of America.

Let's face up to it and get at it.

Address by Hon. Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include one of the finest speeches that I have had the privilege of hearing in many years. It was made by the new Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Francis P. Matthews, at the golden jubilee banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Miami on August 22.

This talk was delivered in a most inspiring manner by the Secretary, and it thrilled the audience of 500 people who were in attendance at the banquet and who came from all over the United States. At the conclusion of the speech the Secretary received a standing ovation, and it seemed to me that all those present were unanimous in their praise of this most penetrating speech which evidenced a statesmanship of the highest caliber.

The speech and the man who made it are eloquent evidence of the fact that the President of the United States is continuing the policy of finding the best man for the biggest jobs and is drawing into this Government the ablest men in the country.

The address follows:

Few occasions on the calendar of any year's events in America compare in importance with the annual meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Your organization enjoys a very special place in the esteem of your countrymen. Your membership comprises a substantial portion of the men who in the lifetime of great numbers of our present-day population have trod the unfamiliar, battle-scarred soil of alien lands in defense of the ideas and ideals that have always made life seem worth living here at home.

No more valiant services to the Nation are recorded in our beloved country's comparatively brief but nevertheless brilliantly glorious history than are the services of you men who comprise the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. No more ennobling sacrifices have been endured in behalf of our country by any generation of Americans than you are privileged to recall in the memory of your own, and your comrades' patriotic service in the overseas ranks of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force.

By the nobility of your contribution to the Nation's defense efforts in the wars in which you and your comrades served, you have merited and you enjoy in generous measure the Nation's gratitude and admiration.

It is with fitting propriety, therefore, that your countrymen rejoice with you on the occasion of your golden jubilee national convention, and that, in their name, the civilian heads of the three military departments of the Department of Defense welcome the privilege you have accorded us of officially attending your sessions so that we may pay heartfelt tribute to you and to what your organization represents. In fulfilling such a mission, Secretary Gray, Secretary Symington, and I, by presuming to address you, are but following the edifying example of our Commander in Chief, President Truman, who so forcefully and eloquently emphasized your importance as an organization by attending your opening session here in Miami this morning.

It should be obvious to the world, as it is to all of us, that this Nation of ours is not a militaristic nation. For approximately 150 years after the Revolutionary War, we existed in a world seething with international rivalries and hatreds, a world at times rocked to its very foundations by the impact of international conflicts which were too often the foul fruit of an ambitious aggressor's unworthy purpose to appropriate lands and subjugate peoples for the selfish enhancement of his own power and wealth.

It is sad to remember now that even in such a world and under such circumstances, our military might in peacetime was always woefully weak.

While contemplating the state of the world at present, it seems almost inconceivable that, as late as 1937, our standing Army numbered only 170,000 men; that our Navy ranked a poor third in international importance, and that our Air Force was largely a cherished dream, far from the comforting and reassuring reality of strength and effectiveness that it is today.

Always in the past, the Nation's peacetime policy has been to keep the military personnel at an irreducible minimum. In the emergencies of wars, when they were forced upon us, we resorted to voluntary enlistment and the universal draft to supply the necessary military personnel. As a result, our fighting forces have always been a direct and immediate product of our own homes. They came from the bosoms of the families of America, from your domestic fireside and mine. They were nonprofessional soldiers and navy men. They cherished no thoughts of aggression in their civilian hearts. They entertained no hopes of conquest, and dreamed no dreams of dictatorial power. Their emotions were the reflections of the peaceful inclinations of every generation of our American population. It is from the ranks of such citizenship that your membership is recruited. It is from that background that the record of your fifty golden years of inspiring achievements is so brilliantly reflected.

In the few moments that it is my privilege to speak to you this evening, there is no need for me to recount the details of the many accomplishments recorded to the credit of the organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Those vital events, no doubt, will be enumerated and their challenging outlines will be appropriately perpetuated in the reports submitted for your consideration by your officers and committee chairmen during the course of this fiftieth anniversary meeting. By their very nature, they bespeak and emphasize the exalted character of the purposes of your society.

They tell with what impressive fidelity you have realized the meritorious objectives for the attainment of which your society was originally instituted. In the large fulfillment of your founders' dreams and aspirations which you have brought about in the short space of half a century, you have justified their faith in the unfaltering loyalty of their comrades-in-arms of 1899 and of the successors who in turn seized the torch of patriotic service from their failing hands as your new members have come from the ranks of the veterans of each subsequent war.

It is a wholesome and subduing influence that emanates from the language of that paragraph in your congressional charter which embodies the reasons why this organization came into being. Listen, while I quote that language to you as President Truman did this morning:

"The purpose of this corporation," your charter says, "shall be to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory of our dead, and assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States, and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever."

Your congressional franchise imposed solemn obligations of a high order upon your members. Never in our country's history was there so great a need as now prevails for the exalted objectives proclaimed in that significant language from your charter: Greater mutual understanding among men; augmented fraternal considerateness in your ranks; reverence for the dead and solicitude for their survivors; loyalty to the Government and faithfulness to its laws and Constitution; more enlightened patriotism, enhanced freedoms, defense of the homeland. Those are the virtues reflected in the citizenship of the worthy veteran of Foreign Wars. Their practice provides an edifying example of true Americanism, worthy of the emulation of every citizen of this Nation. The present necessity for such lofty citizenship has never been equaled.

Times have changed. In a world where the process of living has been so fantastically enriched by a fabulous intellectual progress and the miraculous productions of man's inventive genius, the danger of losing our national soul has become the greatest menace of the hour. Two world wars have been fought and won by you veterans in the space of a single generation to prevent the happening of such a catastrophe.

In your military service, you were impelled to endure the sacrifice it involved—you faced the risk of death, and you were sustained as you witnessed the supreme sacrifice of the comrades who did not return—by your faith in America and the free institutions to which she has given birth. It was to preserve, to foster and to impart to your children the same blessings of liberty and freedom with which each of us in turn, on attaining the age of rational citizenship, has found America so abundantly endowed that you became, as it were, one of the bricks used in the building of our national defense structure.

It requires an exalted motive, indeed, to impel any American to face the unparalleled horrors of modern battlefields. The tortures of such experience could only be endured or justified because of the yearning of the human heart for a sublime objective, such as the uninterrupted enjoyment of the inalienable rights intended for free men under the natural law of God.

Will it be possible for us, and for our children, to continue to enjoy the freedom and liberty that has been ours up to this time, and which, according to our American philosophy of life, is our God-given right? I believe it will be, notwithstanding the challenge of atheistic communism, the one great factor now menacing the peace of the world. The outcome of the new conflict of ideologies depends upon us. We can favorably resolve even that issue if we so desire, and are ready to pay the price for so precious a victory.

The Secretary of Defense, in his historic address at the War College graduation exercises on June 21, has named the price and

charted the way for achieving national security. Those of you who have heard or read that memorable address know the answers to questions of how and at what cost our freedom is to be defended and our sacred liberties preserved.

The solution of the problems which changing world conditions have posed for us, as the strongest power in the family of democratic nations, is found in a unified defense establishment functioning economically in sympathy with and in full support of the domestic and foreign policies of the Administration in power.

Even as the strongest military force in the world today, we recognize our undeniable need for friendly association with other governments whose confidence we may expect to enjoy in peacetime, and upon whose support we can unquestionably rely in the event of future world conflict.

Secretary of Defense Johnson, in his War College pronouncement, with penetrating analysis, evaluates the significance of the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact, and estimates their advantage in the effort to establish a peaceful world. He warns us that their diminishing effect upon the threat of war dare not be permitted to lull us into a false feeling of security, and altogether, in approximately 2,500 words, gives to you and to me a simple and easily understandable appraisal of the present critical situation of the world as it affects America, and the manner in which the crisis can be successfully met. If, by chance, you have not heard or read that speech of the Secretary of Defense, you owe it to yourself to do so. Until you have acquired such first-hand information about present top thinking on the close interrelationship between foreign affairs and our national security, you can hardly appreciate what is transpiring with reference to our domestic problems of major importance.

We have many reasons to be confident and grateful, as Americans, even in this chilly international atmosphere of the present cold war era.

First of all, there is an evident consciousness on the part of our people of the grave national and international difficulties which beset us. It is reassuring to see our fellow citizens willing to look the stern realities of the present squarely in the face. Only a few will fail to admit that the world's problems and our problems emanate from Soviet Russia's conviction that communism must enfold the world in its smothering embrace through the realization of its dream of world conquest. It is that concept of her own destiny that the Politburo's obvious purpose to pursue the necessary course to attain it that prescribes the national and international program which we have been compelled reluctantly to adopt, with the resulting disturbance of our normal way of life and terrific strain on our economic resources.

It is from the fact that our people have knowledge of the cloud hanging over the future, and are willing to assume the cost of avoiding its fatal influence, that we can have confidence in the ultimate outcome of the ideological contest in progress in the world. We can be grateful because—to meet the test—the Military Establishment has been reorganized with unified authority sufficient to assure efficiency, effectiveness and economy in operation.

We in the Navy rejoice with our teammates, the Army and the Air Force, in the ever-increasing smoothness with which unification is functioning. It is violating no confidence to say that there is a new and better spirit abroad in the Pentagon. It reflects a high capacity for able leadership in the person of the Secretary of Defense. It is producing the cooperation and mutual helpfulness among the three Departments of the Defense Establishment so essential for realizing the maximum output of national security for every tax dollar in the huge military budget. It promises the ultimate attainment of the final goal of effective unification, first conceived by former Secretary of War Patterson and the late Secretary Forrestal. It means the maintenance of our country's preeminence in peace and in war.

As I close, I wonder if you would agree with me in the thought that the Veterans of Foreign Wars as an organization is singularly fortunate in the challenge which confronts it in this, its golden-anniversary year.

Fifty years is a long time in the life of any organization. It is a long time even in the life of such an organization as yours. The passing of such a period necessarily has brought many changes from the conditions and environment prevailing the day your organization was instituted. The telephone and electric lights have been greatly developed and refined; the movies, radio, television, airplanes, the automobile, are just a few of the new products of the intervening years. They represent tremendous changes in transportation and communication. Other fields have felt the effects of radical transformation. Climaxing all other changes is the epoch-making miracle of atomic energy.

Greater changes could not be found in recorded history. And yet your organization has not changed. Its fundamental purposes are as sound today and as appropriate as they were when written into your charter 50 years ago. That is true, because they are basically rooted in the supernatural soil of God's justice. They are founded, as were the Declaration of Independence and our Federal Constitution, on the eternal verities which, in the providence of God, should govern men's relations with one another and with their creator.

Fifty golden years have proven the merit of the concept of unselfish service to comrade, to country, and to humanity which inspired your founders. The need of 50 years ago for what you had to offer then has grown as the problems of that day have been complicated and magnified by the complexity which modern conditions have assumed.

The world, America, mankind, are calling for men of strong will, of high courage, of unselfish hearts, of great patriotism. That is your challenge tonight as it was in 1899. Heed it. Your wholehearted response to that demand will keep your organization young and vigorous, regardless of the flight of time. In some measure, at least, it will make you and all your fellow citizens worthy of America's soldier dead.

Forest Access Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Remove the Handcuffs," published in the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review, and a news item published in the same newspaper, with reference to forest access roads.

There being no objection, the editorial and news item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMOVE THE HANDCUFFS

(By Charles V. Stanton)

Two Roseburg men are entitled to a lot more credit than they are receiving. In fact, few people know or appreciate the work they are doing. But future generations will have occasion to be very grateful.

M. M. "Red" Nelson, supervisor of the Umpqua National Forest, and James E. Slattery, district forester for the Bureau of Land Management, in our opinion are outstanding among Federal forest officials in the field of conservation. Their management of public domain has been conducted with full consideration to the future and this principle has guided them in preservation of scenic and recreational resources, protection of watersheds, reforestation, and other conservation practices.

We're going out on a limb with the declaration that no other section of public domain in this country is more efficiently managed along sound conservation lines, within the limits of Federal regulations, than right here in Douglas County.

Timber removal is being managed with a minimum of damage to either scenic or recreational values. Logged-off areas adjacent to public highways, for instance, are kept screened by a forest fringe. Land bordering fishing streams is set aside for public recreational use. Watershed protection is considered in connection with every timber sale. Slattery has prepared the first timber sale which, insofar as we have been able to learn, requires as a part of the contract that the operator must prevent siltation in any of the streams leading from the logging show. Both Slattery and Nelson are, with cooperation from loggers, experimenting in controlling erosion. Operators are assisted by both men in locating logging roads in such manner that the roads, when no longer needed for logging purposes, will fit into a public-use program.

Nelson and Slattery are undertaking much more work in the field of conservation than required from them by the respective agencies they serve. But they would go a great deal further if given opportunity.

Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Department of the Interior has adequate regulations to afford complete protection for natural resources. Considerable progress has been made in this direction in recent years, but much remains to be done before fully adequate management of the public domain becomes possible.

An important step in the direction of better conservation was taken several years ago through passage by Congress of the Knutson-Vandenberg Act. This law was aimed at improving policies of reforestation. It permits withholding a small amount of money from eact timber sale to be used for rehabilitation of land, planting, stand improvement, such as pruning and thinning, etc. Application of authority granted by this act has resulted in much improvement in forest management.

The K-V law, however, in our opinion, could be made far more effective with a few simple amendments.

There should, we believe, be created the office of conservation engineer for each national forest and each bureau of land management master unit.

This engineer should be a man trained in watershed protection, erosion control, water retention, flood control, cover crops, reforestation, etc.

As timber was sold from the public domain the engineer would write into the contract specifications for construction of siltation basins, filter dams, upland ponds, antierosion factors, land rehabilitation, and other essentials. The cost of doing this work could then be considered in bidding for the timber. The logger would be required to do the necessary work before leaving the show, but, as he perhaps would not have equipment for some

types of work, would be permitted to obtain cooperation from the Federal agency which he would pay for its labor. The operator would have no additional expense, as he would deduct his costs from the price bid for the timber. Thus the land would pay for its own protection and restoration.

When a farmer removes a crop from his land, he immediately puts the land back in shape for another crop. We should be doing the same with our forests.

By building water retention into logged-off lands, we would be speeding the growth of a new crop, while protecting the water table on the lowlands. Furthermore, contrary to current policies of the Army engineers in trying to control floods by lowland reservoirs, we would be properly handling flood control by slowing the progress of run-off water in the uplands, before it comes down to the valley floors with its load of silt.

While our own forest supervisors have made outstanding records in conservation practices, we believe they are typical of virtually all men in like positions and that supervisors everywhere would welcome laws permitting more complete conservation management.

Certainly congressional stewardship of the public domain is totally inadequate at present. Congress displays vast ignorance of the needs of our western forests, particularly in the matter of access roads, waste utilization, experimentation, water management, wildlife protection, and conservation in general.

Until Congress gains better understanding of public-domain management and passes comprehensive conservation laws, our forestry officials, no matter how much they may desire to do the job properly, are definitely handcuffed.

OPPOSITION TO ACCESS ROADS COMES FROM LARGE TIMBER FIRMS, SENATOR MORSE CHARGES

WASHINGTON, July 12.—Senator MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, unsuccessful in his effort to win Senate approval of an appropriation of $30,000,000 a year for access roads to timber tracts, asserted in the Senate the only opposition was from large timber companies.

MORSE's bill was called up when the Senate was considering bills to which there was no opposition. He said he was willing to accept a committee amendment cutting the amount to $12,500,000 this year which would be added to $17,500,000 provided for in legislation previously passed.

MORSE told the Senate that if the timber companies build the proposed roads to timber tracts it would be necessary to permit bids on large tracts which in effect would freeze out the small timber companies.

Senator CAIN, Republican, of Washington, objected to the bill on the grounds that it is more than the Government departments have estimated is needed per year and because he wanted to know where the roads are to be constructed before the money is appropriated. He raised a number of other questions.

"I know where the opposition to my bill is coming from in my State," MORSE said. "It is coming from some of the large timber operators, because they know I stand for real conservation of the national forests. They know that I know the difference between their talk about sustained yield and their actual cutting practices."

He said it was unfortunate that some of the operators "have raped our national forests to the devastating extent that has occurred in the Pacific Northwest." He said his proposal would help check such operators.

"Let those who oppose me in my State on this bill get ready for a fight," MORSE said, "because I will take it to them in the campaign of 1950."

The bill finally was laid aside on motion of Senator THYE, Republican, of Minnesota.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I call attention to the attached text of a radio interview conducted over Station WWDC on August 7 by Ed Hart with Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, co-president of the World Council of Churches, on the subject of Federal aid to education.

In view of the existing deadlock over Federal aid to education legislation, I think these remarks are pertinent:

Mr. HART. This is Ed Hart, speaking from Laconia, N. H., on the shores of beautiful Lake Winnipesaukee. It is cool, restful places such as this, which must be in the minds of those Senators and Representatives who want the Congress to adjourn—to adjourn, even though very little Fair Deal legislation, such as Federal aid to education, has been passed.

To discuss Federal aid to education, our guest is Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the New York area of the Methodist Church, and copresident of the World Council of Churches.

Many Protestant leaders throughout the world look upon Bishop Oxnam as the principal spokesman for Protestantism in the United States. It is significant that he is one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches.

Bishop Oxnam, we are here to discuss Federal aid to our schools. Legislation concerning this matter has not done well in the Congress. May we have your views on the issue?

Bishop OXNAM. The American people have recently learned that Federal aid to education for this session of Congress, Mr. Hart, is dead. Most of our citizens deplore this fact. The Roman Catholic hierarchy is responsible for killing the bills that might have brought Federal aid to our public-school system. Far more children from Roman Catholic homes attend public school than parochial school. It will come as a shock to these parents when they learn the hierarchy is responsible for denying their children higher education standards. Thousands of loyal and able Roman Catholics are teachers in the public schools. They will not forget that the much-needed salary increase was denied them by the action of the hierarchy. The blind may lead, but the eyes of their followers will be opened.

Mr. HART. Whether you are right or wrong, Bishop Oxnam, one could hardly accuse you of employing weasel words in making your charges.

Bishop OXNAM. We dare not speak in pleasantries, Mr. Hart, when the American principle of the separation of church and state is in jeopardy. The hierarchy has launched a full-scale attack upon this principle. Cardinal Spellman's personal attack upon one of the greatest women of American history, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, reveals the methods that we may expect from men determined to master American life. Congressman GRAHAM BARDEN was also attacked viciously. He refused to bow to clerical intimidation. He refused, and is called blackguard and bigot.

Mr. HART. You feel, Bishop Oxnam, that the attacks upon Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. BARDEN are part of a general plan to kill Federal school aid legislation?

Bishop OXNAM. It is a coldly calculated plan, Mr. HART, designed to deny Federal aid to public schools, unless the hierarchy can get its hands into the Public Treasury and secure millions for the support of parochial education.

Mr. HART. Do you have any facts to offer, or is this conjecture on your part, Bishop Oxnam?

Bishop OXNAM. The Roman Catholic hierarchy itself is my authority. In 1943, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is the hierarchy, addressed a letter to Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS during Senate hearings, involving Federal aid to education. That letter stated, "The Catholic position is one of opposition to any measures for education that would * * * fail to make mandatory the inclusion of Catholic schools in its benefits."

Mr. HART. But, Bishop Oxnam, the Roman Catholic position was expressed by Cardinal Spellman when he said that Catholics "must oppose unequivocally any bill that fails to guarantee at least nonreligious textbooks, bus rides, and health services for all the children of all Americans." In his opinion, a bill which would not take those three matters into consideration would be discriminatory and un-American, and thus promote prejudice against Catholic children.

Bishop OXNAM. One could wish the Cardinal were more candid and less crafty. It is not milk and medicine, books and busses. What he wants is the support of parochial schools by taxes levied on all the people. In a word, he seeks public funds for sectarian education. The church not only wants public funds for private purposes, but must know that to drain off vast sums from public education is so to weaken it as eventually to destroy it. Our public educational system is a bulwark of democracy. It is hard to understand how the Roman Catholic Church can espouse democracy, when it rejects democracy in its own totalitarian and autocratic organization. The blunt fact is, that the Roman Catholic Church does not believe in our public-school system.

Mr. HART. Again I ask, Bishop Oxnam, do you have any facts to support your statement?

Bishop OXNAM. Pope Pius XI wrote the most authoritative encyclical on education, in January 1930. You may draw your own conclusions from the following quotation: "Attendance at non-Catholic, neutral, or mixed schools—schools, that is to say, indifferently open to Catholics and non-Catholics without distinction—is forbidden to Catholic children and can only be tolerated at the discretion of bishops in special circumstances * * * neither is it admissible for Catholics to attend mixed schools * * * where religious instruction is provided and pupils receive the rest of their teaching from non-Catholic masters, together with non-Catholic children * * * For a school to be acceptable it is necessary that the whole teaching and organization of the school, namely, the teachers, the curriculum, and the books—is governed by the Christian spirit, under the maternal direction and vigilance of the church."

Mr. HART. But you are quoting the Pope's encyclical. He may have been talking merely to Italians, or Europeans, and not to Americans.

Bishop OXNAM. Mr. Hart, when the Pope speaks, he speaks to all Roman Catholics. His authority is absolute. He speaks to all Roman Catholics just as Stalin speaks to all Communists. Mr. Hart, there is one central fact that every American must understand. The Roman Catholic Church insists upon being both a state and a church. The Pope is not only the head of a church, but also the head of a state. He speaks as the head of a world church with spiritual interests, and also speaks as the head of a state

with political and financial interests. Unfortunately, this set-up means that the Roman Catholic Church seeks to advance its political interests as a state and the Roman Catholic state seeks to further its ecclesiastical interests as a church. Thus Roman Catholic political parties in European nations follow the Vatican line just as Communist parties follow the Moscow line. We want neither the Vatican political line nor the Moscow political line in America. We do not appreciate the interference of Pacelli, the head of the Vatican state, nor of Stalin the head of the Communist state in our affairs.

Many people do not know that the Roman Catholic Church is fighting for its life in Europe. It has become so interlocked in political affairs of state, so encumbered with vast land holdings, and so allied with military and feudal reaction, that the common people are turning from it. It appears to have abandoned hope of winning by the weapons of the spirit, and seems ready to summon the world to holy war to salvage its power, its property, and its prestige.

Mr. HART. And in such a war?

Bishop OXNAM. Mr. Hart, the Kingdom of God cannot be established by the methods of war, nor can we destroy the Communist challenge to liberty by war. Roman Catholicism in conditioning the mind to authoritarianism in religion conditions that mind to authoritarianism in politics and economics. How do you account for Communist strength in Italy itself, where we are told 99 percent of the people are Roman Catholics? Mr. Hart, when the American people realize how far the world political organization of the Roman Catholic Church has moved into American life, there will be a reaction that will astound men who have the audacity to announce an attempt at excommunication of Protestants—what was it Cardinal Spellman wrote to Mrs. Roosevelt, "I shall not again publicly acknowledge you"? Read his almost unforgivable attack and her dignified and tolerant reply, and ask, Who represents the American spirit?

Mr. HART. I have a notion, Bishop Oxnam, that you want this entire controversy resolved in rational American fashion.

Bishop OXNAM. Those of us who have fought the Ku Klux Klan, who deplored the whispering campaign of the Al Smith-Hoover Presidential election, who want every freedom for our Roman Catholic brother we want for ourselves, insist that this whole matter shall be faced in firm but friendly fashion. But we shall not ignore the central issue, the separation of church and state. Here the state does not play religious favorites. We intend to maintain it.

Mr. HART. But, Bishop Oxnam, in stating their case, Roman Catholics contend that they present truth, and they are sincere in this belief.

Bishop OXNAM. No one church has an absolute monopoly upon truth. The Communists, like the Roman Catholic hierarchy, claim a monopoly on truth. That brings us to another interesting point.

Mr. HART. What is that, Bishop Oxnam?

Bishop OXNAM. The striking parallel between the organizational structure and method of the world-wide Communist political party and the world-wide Roman Catholic political party. Both are totalitarian. Both seek control of the minds of men everywhere. Both practice excommunication, character assassination, and economic reprisals. Neither Rome nor Moscow knows what tolerance means. Both demand blind, unthinking loyalty. Neither Moscow nor Rome believe in the separation of church and state. Both Moscow and Rome interfere in the affairs of other states. Both Moscow and Rome seek to shackle the minds of those they control by telling them what they can read, what movies they can see, what newspapers they must take. Neither Rome nor Moscow can brook opposition. And both Moscow and Rome have perfected the Hitler technique of repeating prevarications often enough and big enough to insure their acceptance. Both seek to divide and rule, they create separatism.

Mr. HART. Just what do you mean by that term "separatism," Bishop Oxnam?

Bishop OXNAM. Why should there be Roman Catholic veterans, Roman Catholic trade unions, Roman Catholic firemen, Roman Catholic policemen. After all, my sons sat beside their Roman Catholic friends in the public schools, and they learned to respect each other. My sons fought side by side with Roman Catholic soldiers. Why not American veterans? American workers? Sometimes this division of American life raises a serious question.

Mr. HART. And that question, Bishop Oxnam?

Bishop OXNAM. Is all this separatism but preparation for building a Roman Catholic political party in the United States? Are we to have a political party here that follows the dictates of the Vatican line? Bear in mind there are official Roman Catholic parties in European countries. And even now similar attempts are being made by the Roman Catholic Church to form such a party in the west German state.

Mr. HART. Bishop Oxnam, a few moments ago, you said that Congressman BARDEN refused to bow to Catholic intimidation. How would you propose to meet what you regard as intimidation?

Bishop OXNAM. Mr. Hart, every American, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Jew and gentile, all have a stake in this. Clerical control has cursed many lands, has destroyed religious freedom and led to conflict. We are resolved that clericalism shall not take root here. But this means that every newspaper owner must have courage to print the story the church seeks to kill. I know of a paper that was ordered not to print a story that a priest was leaving the church to marry. The editor said that was news and would run. He was threatened but saw that the freedom of the press was involved. He ran it. What happened? Despite many threats nothing happened. He called the bluff. The motion-picture industry should face Roman Catholic boycott and make its own decisions, refusing to debase a great art at the dictation of a hierarchy. Let radio executives make their decisions, too, and talk straight to callers who demand, and telephones that threaten. Let all of us read Paul Blanshard's remarkable book American Freedom and Catholic Power, paying particular attention to interference in medicine.

Mr. HART. Bishop Oxnam, there is a Japanese story you told me before the broadcast that seems to me would make an excellent closing expression of this discussion.

Bishop OXNAM. Yea, Mr. Hart. It was in Hokkaido, the northern island of Japan. I learned that extraordinary work had been done in Sapporo by the Roman Catholic Church. I wished to meet those who had led in this service. I met a Roman Catholic sister, a beautiful woman. She was a German. After we had talked for a time, I said, "Sister, when will you return to Germany?" Then tears came into her eyes. Finally, she said, "I shall never return." I said, "I do not understand you." She answered, "We Catholics, when we go to fulfill a mission, we go to stay forever. In my order, we never return." I bow in respectful homage before my Roman Catholic friends who have revealed in deeds of mercy the spirit of Jesus in lives of service round the world.

Mr. HART. In that spirit, Bishop Oxnam, we'll close this program. This is Ed Hart, saying good-by from Laconia, N. H.

Good Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two interesting letters on good roads.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) News of January 28, 1949]

THE VOICE OF OUR READERS

COUNT THE COSTS

To the EDITOR:

As one learns more about the effect of destruction of our natural resources he is not simply amazed but increasingly alarmed at what has happened and is still being done right here in our home State. To illustrate—in Georgia every year 163,000,000 tons of topsoil are lost by erosion. Now get this one. In the one flood of last May and June, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho lost 160,500,000 tons of topsoil, with $250,000,000 property loss—and an unknown number of human lives lost in the Vanport inundation. Oregon's share of this erosion was 80,500,000 tons of topsoil, more than half of the above.

For 3 years 100 Georgia farm projects embracing 130,000,000 acres of ruined land were worked on by an army of engineers, planners and workmen to redeem a part of that land from which the 163,000,000 tons of topsoil is lost each year. Each of the 700 promoters of the project put up $1,000 to start it. Whatever it costs it will doubtless be a hundred times what it would have cost to have kept the area in production during the 100 years its forests, soil, water, wildlife, and scenic beauty have been exploited—liquidated. Food, shelter, clothing, schools could have been maintained all that time for thousands of Georgia people. Georgia farmers are rated as the fourth lowest farm group in the United States.

What do you reckon 'twil cost the citizens of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho to redeem the millions of acres from whence came that one last-spring flood? Before that flood it was estimated that $5,250,000 will be needed to check erosion in Oregon where more than 3,750,000 acres have been ruined and 4,500,000 more are eroding too fast. What do you think the present waste and destruction of our second-growth timber will cost the people of Oregon?

Every one of these losses is traceable back to individuals and corporations whose only consideration was immediate big profits. Often the "boss" was a nonresident, lavishly living in some far-away city spending the profits in riotous living, as "Wine Charley" for instance, a big lumberman residing in Chicago. He had no interest in the workers, nor the forest—and probably never heard of such a thing as forest conservation, and had he, would have cared no more than some current exploiters.

Close observation and realization of these unnecessary wastes of our fast-diminishing natural resources drives home to us the exceedingly great need for increased regulations as well as vast educational changes.

J. E. GRIEBLE.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) News of February 11, 1949]

To the EDITOR, MEDFORD NEWS:

Referring to your editorial on January 7, 1949, Good roads cost money. Yes, any roads cost money. But roads we must have, and we, the people must pay for them, eventually. If eventually, why not with some of the profits from the natural resources being taken from our lands—and before those resources are all liquidated? Proposed roads here referred to are especially forest roads. Others could be helped by using some of the profits from our same natural resources. The need for this kind of thinking is more and more evident. Populations are increasing and expanding.

In early days the nearer, handiest farm lands were occupied first. The nearest or handiest fencing materials, poles for barns, sheds, corrals, were taken first; trees for fuel, buildings, bridges, and finally, trees for the sawmills were taken from the nearest at hand or easiest to take out. By doing these things the forest edges were hacked through to get the best first. Practically always all else was wasted in breakage or destroyed in slash burnings—the latter often (and sometimes intentionally) destroying evidence of the former. Hundreds of millions of acres were thus left as scorched earth where only scattering brush or weeds have grown or can grow in decades. The slash burns included millions of board-feet of good but carelessly broken tree trunks, not profitable to log under the high-grade methods being practiced because of inexhaustible forests.

As forests became farther from the arteries of transportation roads have been forged through what seemed impossible terrain and forest denseness of brush, windfalls, and rocks, and the destruction of good standing trees to reach more profitable stands. Slash on cut-over areas is burned (probably in accordance with the State forestry law) many times when it is too dry and the fires consume not only the slash brush, tree tops, and limbs, but every living thing, so the land is barren as though an uncontrolled forest fire had swept it in July or August.

So, by the time the farthest away forest has been cut, roads have been built across all of the area. The wealth of the forest has been exploited, much or all of it destroyed. Roads were built to get the last profit-producing tree. The resources from which the roads could have been built, extended, and maintained, have been liquidated. By building roads through the forest area first and taking out the decadent, over-ripe, dead, and windfall trees, thinning only where necessary to open up the forest to let in more light which encourages faster growth of young trees, we would build the roads while we have resources with which to do it, and we would have perpetual forests of wealth. By this method we would protect the watershed, wildlife, and fish, prevent erosion of topsoil, pollution of streams and lakes, and preserve the scenic beauty of the landscapes. We, and our children would have our cake and eat it as needed, indefinitely, on through the ages.

Otherwise the forests will mighty soon be gone and the profits on the resources from which the roads should have been built, squandered. So, if eventually, why not now? Just why should a few greedy individuals be permitted to waste and destroy the country's resources which actually belong to all of the people, sap the profits through hi-grading, and leave the people holding the empty sack? The 25-cents-a-thousand-board-feet severance tax on timber cut in Oregon, proposed 2 years ago, could have made a good start if directed into that channel.

It is not too soon to begin thinking and planning for 100, 500, and more years ahead if America's civilization is not to tramp the hot and cold desert sands and rocks as the teeming millions of desolate, destitute, hungry humans are doing in China, on the desertlike areas surrounding the Mediterranean, and elsewhere where the early inhabitants thought and cared not for any future generations.

JOHN E. GRIBBLE.

Here's Furniture Democrats Hauled Out of Courthouse for Party Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Johnstown Tribune of August 25, 1949:

HERE'S FURNITURE DEMOCRATS HAULED OUT OF COURTHOUSE FOR PARTY USE—TWO OAK TABLES AND TWO CHAIRS SOURCE OF POLITICAL FIRE—DEMOCRATS ADMIT TAKING THEM FROM COURTHOUSE, BUT ONLY AS A LOAN

Two oak tables and two chairs today snatched the political spotlight from the candidates in the 1949 campaign here.

The furniture was hauled from the courthouse in Ebensburg last month to the Young Men's Democratic Club, 411 Main Street, for use in the Cambria County Democratic Party's headquarters.

This both major political parties agree to. But that is all.

John R. Torquato, county Democratic chairman, was furious about the newspapers "making so much ado about some old furniture that we borrowed." He angrily told the Tribune that "this thing is getting to be ridiculous."

George J. Edkins, Jr., county Republican chairman, says it "doesn't matter whether the furniture is old or worth only 5 cents, they (the Democrats) had no right to carry it away from the courthouse."

SAYS WAS GATHERING DUST

"If we had taken furniture out of an office, it would have been different," declared Torquato. "But we got it out of the basement, where it had been gathering dust for years."

Asked from whom he had received approval to borrow the furniture, he replied that "one of our fellows at the courthouse had gotten permission."

Torquato denies that a county-owned truck was used to haul the furniture to Johnstown. Edkins had said that it was a county truck and that a Republican, who watched the furniture being loaded, followed the truck to Johnstown to see where it went.

"After the Republicans said we stole it (the furniture), I asked the truck driver if he had noticed anyone following him," said Torquato. "He (the truck driver) said the only car that followed him was a brown State car."

"It probably was some assistant highway superintendent. It's too bad that the Republicans have to burn up the taxpayers' gasoline just to follow our truck around."

SUPPLIES LICENSE NUMBER

Edkins today stated emphatically that it was a county truck. He supplied the license number and the names of the occupants. A check at the courthouse disclosed that the county has a truck with the license number given by Edkins and that the two persons he named are county employees.

As for the brown State car the truck driver said he saw following him, Edkins commented:

"The only place the truck driver saw a brown State car was at the State highway shed property, where he tried to duck his pursuer. The car that followed the truck was a private one owned by the Republican who witnessed the loading of the furniture on the truck."

Torquato had originally talked about the Democrats borrowing only an old slant-top table and invited the Tribune to take a picture of it.

When a photographer and a reporter went to Democratic headquarters party workers identified two oak tables and two chairs as the furniture borrowed from the courthouse.

The commissioners are the custodians of county property. Commissioners Pat Farrell and Thomas Owens are in Philadelphia.

Commissioner Cyrus Davis said, however, that there is no record in the minutes of any sale or rental of furniture by the commissioners.

Davis said that he will ask the board of commissioners to move for an investigation by the district attorney's office.

WHILE CAPITAL IS AGOG OVER DEEP FREEZE, CAMBRIA COUNTY IN FUROR OVER FURNITURE

Down in Washington it takes a deep freeze to frost up politics, but up here in Cambria County it's the courthouse furniture that's in the public eye.

The Republicans are shouting they (the Democrats) stole it. The Democrats are saying they (the Democrats) borrowed it.

The rumpus is all over a "flittin" of furniture that was trucked down from the Ebensburg Courthouse to headquarters in the Young Men's Democratic Clubrooms, 411 Main Street, late in July.

George J. Edkins, Jr., county GOP chairman, said the Democrats removed office furniture from the courthouse to furnish their own quarters before the courthouse officially opened the morning of July 27.

A good Republican was said to have been passing the courthouse by chance and spotted the furniture being hauled out. He followed the truck to Johnstown and watched the delivery. A county-owned truck was said to have been used.

John R. Torquato, county Democratic chairman, has a different version:

"Sure, we borrowed an old table. It was an old slant-top table that had been down in the basement gathering dust and dirt for years. We needed a table to put literature on and asked to borrow it. If the Republicans are as poor as we are and need a table, I'm sure they can borrow one, too."

Torquato, however, denied that a county-owned truck was used.

"We had a kid bring it down in a truck. Later, after the Republicans said we 'stole' it, I asked the truck driver if he had noticed anyone following him. He said the only car that followed him was a brown State car.

"It probably was some assistant highway superintendent. It's too bad that the Republicans have to burn up the taxpayers' gasoline just to follow our truck around."

Meanwhile, County Commissioner Cyrus W. Davis plans to get to the bottom of the furniture transfer. He said there is no record in the minutes of any sale or rental of furniture by the commissioners, the custodians of county property.

"As a member of the board of commissioners I plan to make a motion for an investigation by the district attorney's office," said Commissioner Davis.

"I would be derelict in my duties not to take this step especially since it has been made public."

This Is Not a Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Owego (N. Y.) Times:

THIS IS NOT A GIFT

The Government is preparing to distribute to veterans of the recent war who carried GI insurance approximately $2,800,000,000, which should prove a decided aid to business generally. Unfortunately the administration is also trying to convey the impression that this is some kind of a "gift" made possible by the astute financing of the Federal agency handling the wartime insurance.

As a matter of fact, all that the distribution of money indicates is that the veterans were overcharged for their insurance and are receiving not a gift nor a dividend but a return of the excess payments. That the distribution of cash will give business a "shot in the arm" there is no question, and that the veterans are fortunate in having this amount of savings goes without question.

It is estimated that each insured veteran will receive $175, more or less, although this figure is open to question, and distribution will begin next January. Republican Representative KEATING has demanded that the distribution be made not later than next October. He said that "the money should be refunded immediately. It belongs to the veterans and not to the Government. The soldiers have been overcharged and should have this money returned now, and not a year from now."

The American Legion Opposes Any Modification of Veterans' Preference Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including herewith a carefully prepared and comprehensive statement of Director John Thomas Taylor, the very able director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, being a statement submitted by General Taylor before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives:

THE AMERICAN LEGION OPPOSES ANY MODIFICATION OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE LAWS

(Statement of John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the American Legion, an organization of more than 3,000,000 men and women who served their country honorably during the World Wars, and the American Legion Auxiliary, with approximately 1,000,000 members, are unalterably opposed to the so-called Klein bill, H. R. 2446, or any other legislative action which would in any manner or form modify or weaken the Veterans' Preference Act. We are opposed to any such legislation, not only because we feel its enactment would break faith with veterans, but we are positive that complaints registered by proponents of such legislation can, without exception, be handled administratively without amending the Preference Act.

The American Legion at its national convention, held at Miami in 1948, reiterated its stand in support of veterans' preference, and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, has promulgated regulations whereby veterans with permanent civil-service status and efficiency ratings of "good" or better, are accorded preference over nonveteran employees for retention in Government service when reductions in force are effected; and

"Whereas a change is being urged by nonveterans in the regulations so as to place so-called career nonveteran employees of 10 or more years of creditable Government service in the same category as veteran employees for retention purposes; and

"Whereas favorable consideration by the Civil Service Commission of such action would deprive veterans of preference heretofore accorded by acts of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at Miami, Fla., October 18–21, 1948, go on record as being unalterably opposed to the proposed change of any congressional act which would deprive veterans of preference provided in section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, or any other rules or regulations which would deprive veterans employed by the United States Government of preference to which they are now entitled by law and regulations."

Since the beginning of our country, the Congress from time to time has granted different benefits to men and women who served in our armed forces during wartime. In some instances, in addition to fighting to preserve our country, it has been necessary for veterans and veterans organizations to fight to obtain necessary and well deserved benefits for disabled and other veterans and their dependents.

Immediately upon the enactment of any law beneficial to veterans and their dependents, it has been necessary for veterans and their organizations to fight the efforts of those who, for selfish or other reasons, are opposed to such benefits, and who have conducted aggressive campaigns to amend or repeal veterans laws.

Since its inception, the American Legion, together with the American Legion Auxiliary, has assumed a major role in propagating necessary legislation on behalf of veterans and their dependents, as well as defending veterans laws against attacks of the opposition. It is, therefore, not a new experience that we are again called on to defend Federal employment and retention preference granted to war veterans by a grateful Congress.

What is veterans' preference? "Veterans' preference refers to the benefits to which men and women who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States may be entitled in connection with employment in the Federal Government and in the government of the District of Columbia. It also refers to such benefits when they are extended to veterans' widows, wives and mothers." This is the language contained in pamphlet No. 12, dated December 1948, entitled "Veterans' Preference in Federal Employment," issued by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Veterans' preference has been granted over the years to assist veterans in rehabilitating themselves and in assuring their future security, as well as a reward for their services during wartime. As stated by the Civil Service Commission: "Congress, recognizing that an economic loss is suffered by persons who serve their country in the armed forces, has enacted the preference law as a means of preventing veterans who seek Federal employment from being penalized by the fact that the months or years they spent in the service of their country isolated them from the civilian world during that period. Preference does not have as its goal the placement of a veteran in every Federal job in which a vacancy occurs; this would be incompatible with the very principle of public employment. Preference provides a uniform method by which special consideration is given to qualified veterans seeking Federal employment."

Veterans' preference in civil employment is not limited to the Federal Government. Practically all of the 48 States have laws providing veterans' preference not only for State, but local government positions. Nor is veterans' preference exclusively an American policy—the Canadian Government, for instance, has very liberal preference laws for veterans in government employment.

Opposition to veterans' preference has placed much stress on career employees, maintaining that such employees had entered and remained in the Government service since before the enactment of the Veterans' Preference Act in June 1944, and were not aware of veterans' preference. In this connection, I quote again from the civil-service pamphlet:

"Since just before the end of the Civil War, Congress has provided, in various statutes, for the granting of preference to veterans in connection with Federal employment.

"The first such statute, enacted in March 1865, granted preference in appointment to 'civil offices' to qualified persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service because of service-incurred disabilities.

"In 1876, a law was enacted which required the granting of retention preference to veterans, and to veterans' widows and orphans, in reductions in force in Federal agencies. An act of August 23, 1912, provided that no honorably discharged soldier or sailor employed in any of the executive departments whose efficiency rating was 'good' should be discharged from his position or reduced in rank or salary in a reduction in force.

"The Census Act of March 3, 1919, contained a rider granting preference in appointments in Washington, D. C., to honorably discharged veterans and to veterans' widows. On July 11, 1919, Congress amended this portion of the act, extending preference in appointments to 'the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere' and providing that preference should also be granted to the wives of disabled veterans who themselves were unable to qualify for appointment because of their disabilities.

"The act of March 3, 1919, as amended, was repealed June 18, 1929, but the provision relating to veteran preference was reenacted the same day.

"The act of June 18, 1929, was the basis for the granting of veteran preference in appointments to positions in the Government service up to June 27, 1944, when the President approved the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. The latter act brought together various statutes, executive orders, and Civil Service Commission regulations under which preference in Federal employment had been given to honorably discharged veterans and their widows, and to the wives of disabled veterans who themselves were not qualified for Federal employment. An amendment to the act provides for the granting of veteran-preference benefits to widowed, divorced, or

separated mothers of certain deceased or disabled veterans."

It is our contention that veterans' preference laws have been well known to all Federal employees and, with the continuous agitation by opponents of veterans' preference, all Federal employees should have been fully aware of competition by veterans in lieu of veterans' preference laws.

Proponents of legislation to modify the Veterans' Preference Act have made much use of the word "discrimination" against nonveteran Federal employees. It is difficult to reconcile this claim with the following facts. Many men who have been in the Federal service 15 or 20 years received repeated deferments during the war. They not only did not have military service, but they received repeated increases in salaries due to promotions from one grade to another, while their fellow employees were in the service. These deferred men, as well as women, who were not eligible for selective service, are now, in many cases, in positions which are three to six grades higher than their coworkers who served in the armed forces during wartime. In a reduction in force, the start is made in the lower grades. The grade 4, 5, 6, etc., veteran is getting his reduction-in-force notice, while his more fortunate deferred coworker, who has been promoted to higher grades, is not touched by a reduction in force; or, if reached, merely is reduced to the next lower grade, while the veteran in the grade usually much lower, gets his reduction in force. In addition, in some agencies registers have been so manipulated to protect nonveterans, that some of these employees are on separate specialist registers.

If this is discrimination, then we bespeak such discrimination so far as veterans are concerned. Is there any justification for protecting the high-salaried men and women by approving legislation which would set any limitation, so far as career employees are concerned, when these employees are where they are in higher positions because veterans went in the military service and came back at low grades, receiving reduction in force notices because there are more employees on lower-grade registers?

We insist that such real discrimination as there has been in the Federal service, has been directed at veterans. Members of this committee, in fact, most Members of Congress, are well aware of the thousands of cases whereby administrative officers in Government agencies have taken advantage of every loophole and used every manner of means to circumvent the intent of Congress as expressed in the veterans' preference law.

The American Legion, through its national, State, and local organizations, and thousands of service officers, have handled innumerable cases of veterans who were subjects of real discrimination in their Federal employment. Administrative officers have given many veterans lower efficiency ratings than those to which they were entitled. In reductions in force, they have laid off veterans in lower grades before reducing nonveterans from higher grades, thereby preventing these nonveterans from being in competition with veterans.

In view of these flagrant abuses of veterans' preference, the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary petitioned Congress on several occasions to amend the veterans' preference law not to take any benefit out of the law, but to strengthen it. This the Congress has done. In this connection I might add that the only amendments Congress has ever made to veterans' preference laws have been to strengthen the laws. Regardless of the many attempts made by opponents of veterans' preference, for many years, to sabotage Federal employment benefits of veterans, no single benefit has been removed from the law, while on the contrary it has been greatly strengthened.

In their desperate attempt to modify veterans' preference, opponents have stated that the efficiency of the Government service will be impaired unless the veterans' preference law is amended, that at least by inference, veterans are not efficient employees. Congressman KLEIN, testifying before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, stated he had been told by some official of the Veterans' Administration that if one particular female employee was separated by reduction in force, it would require 10 veterans to do her work. We challenge and resent these ridiculous, unjustified and obnoxious statements, which are unquestionably intended only to smear and create sentiment against veterans' preference. They are a reflection not only on veterans in the Federal employ, but all war veterans.

The law requires that any veteran must be qualified and must have a rating of "good" or better to be retained in the Government service. The American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary will certainly not defend incompetent Federal employees, whether they are veterans or not. We feel all employees should be absolutely competent to fulfill their jobs. We have never asked that veterans receive any different compensation for their services than is received by nonveteran employee. The veterans' preference law does not cost the Government anything, because every veteran on the Federal pay roll must be qualified to do any job for the same pay received by a nonveteran. By providing security for many veterans, it will save the Government the cost of carrying some of those veterans and their dependents.

With the threat of curtailed appropriations, which would result in a reduction in the number of Federal employees, the drive to modify veterans' preference laws has gained unprecedented proportions. The same elements which have always opposed veterans' preference are exerting every effort to have Congress enact into law amendments which would weaken the Veterans' Preference Act. Their goal is to secure some amendment to the act, no matter how minor it may be, in order that they may have an opening wedge whereby they could eventually completely sabotage veterans' preference. They say that failure to adopt legislation similar to the Klein bill would break faith with career employees. The real fact is, that the adoption of any amendment to the law which would take a single employment or retention preference away from veterans, would be a definite breach of faith.

Veterans have long had preference in Federal employment. When men and women went off to the wars to the tune of martial airs, they were told that they would be taken care of, that their jobs would be secure and that those interested in entering the Government service upon their discharge, would receive these employment and retention benefits. Before the end of World War II the President on June 27, 1944, approved the Veterans' Preference Act which "brought together various statutes, executive orders and Civil Service Commission regulations, under which preference in Federal employment had been given to honorably discharged veterans and their widows, and to the wives of disabled veterans who, themselves, were not qualified for Federal employment."

When these men and women left the armed forces, employment counselors advised them as to their opportunities and benefits as Federal employees. Many veterans of World War II particularly, took advantage of the GI bill to obtain education and training which would fit them for civil employment by their Government. Thousand of these veterans are even now taking such education and training, pointing to career in the Federal Service.

Can the Congress now say to these veterans, not only the approximate million who are now on the Federal pay roll, but the thousands who are preparing themselves for Federal employment, that the granting of preference benefits was merely an Indian gift, and now that their service in the armed services is completed, the veterans' preference law really did not mean what it said? That is exactly what the opponents of veterans' preference want the Congress to do.

The Klein bill is a definite slap at veterans. It would eliminate from competition with veterans in reduction in force, all nonveterans with 7 years or more service. This would protect thousands of nonveterans who entered the Federal employ during the war, many of whom, in the great expansion of Government agencies, were appointed to positions of high salaries and received many promotions.

The Government has already failed to keep its promises to men and women who went into the armed services, that they would have an opportunity to compete for all jobs set up under war service regulations. President Roosevelt, in his Executive order of February 16, 1942, said:

"Whereas millions of the citizens of this country are engaged in war industries or have been or expect to be called to duty with the armed forces of the United States, which militates against their competing for employment in the Federal service, and greatly diminishes the number of persons available for competitive positions in the Federal service; and

"Whereas it is essential that there be no delay during the present emergency in filling positions in the Federal service with qualified persons;

"Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 404), it is hereby ordered as follows."

The annual report of the Civil Service Commission dated June 30, 1943, stated:

"Following are the Government's policies—established by law, Executive orders, and Commission regulations—and the Commission's recommendations, relative to placement of veterans:

"1. Veterans shall have the opportunity of competing for, and shall be given preference for, the career civil-service positions for which they had no opportunity to compete because of their service in the armed forces. This will be possible because, as a result of recommendations by the Commission to the President, all appointments to positions under the Commission's jurisdiction, except in the field service of the Post Office Department, since March 16, 1942, have been for not to exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. The Post Office field positions, other than postmaster positions, were placed in this category as a result of an Executive order dated September 23, 1943."

There are still many thousands of these war-service employees. If steps were taken now to hold examinations for these positions and fill them with status employees, not only would the Government keep its promise to veterans and permit them to compete for these positions, but there would be ample opportunity for the Government to place all career employees, who might otherwise be subjects of a reduction in force.

Figures as to the number of career employees who would lose their positions by reduction in force, have been greatly exaggerated. Also, a large number of career employees separated, have been veterans. In March 1947, the Veterans' Administration had a total of 221,347 employees. On April 29, 1948, the Veterans' Administration sent a report to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the effect that a total of 57 career employees had been released because of replacement by preference status employes through reduction in force. These

57 career employees had an average Federal employment service of 9.39 years.

The Civil Service Commission has a program calling for Federal agencies to take care of career employees who were reduced in force by other agencies. The normal turn-over of Federal personnel by separation and by the more liberalized civil-service retirement, together with the elimination of war service positions, should easily permit the retention of all capable career employees in the Government service. This can be done without any further legislation by the Congress and without taking back benefits heretofore granted in the veterans' preference law.

If those who would break down veterans' preference are sincere in their announced desires to take care of worthy career employees, would use their time and talent to see that career employees are taken care of administratively, they would not only succeed in retaining career employees on the Government pay roll, but they would save the time and expense of Congress in holding repeated hearings when stereotyped statements and arguments are presented to amend the veterans' preference law. We are sure, however, that this procedure will not be followed, because we are firmly convinced that caring for the limited number of career employees who might be separated, is secondary to the real purpose behind the drive to modify veterans' preference. The real purpose is, by securing some amendment to the veterans' preference law, to start the snowball rolling down the hill to completely wipe out veterans' preference.

The American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary are opposed to the Klein bill, no matter how it may be amended. There has been some suggestion that the bill be amended to increase from seven to a larger number of years whereby nonveteran employees would not be in competition with veterans. There, again, no matter what figure might be arrived at, it would merely be a start on further extension of the time limit. If you make it 20 years, just as soon as you do, a person who has 19 years and 6 months of service will be calling on the Congress, wanting to know why it was not made 19 years. If you make it 15 years, persons who have only 14 or 13 years of service will want to know why they are not taken care of.

In the final analysis, the real question involved is whether or not we are going to have veterans' preference in Federal employment. If it is the intent of Congress to retain veterans' preference, and we firmly believe this to be the case, then the Klein bill and all other legislative proposals to modify the veterans' preference law must receive the positive and firm rejection of this committee and the Congress. The problems of career employees can and should be handled administratively. The Veterans' Preference Act cannot and should not be modified in any manner or form.

We are confident this committee and the Congress will not let veterans down and will reject all attempts to deprive veterans of any Federal employment benefit which the Congress itself has heretofore provided for veterans.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial recently published in the Washington Post with reference to the Mundt bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNDT BILL

What used to be called the Mundt-Nixon bill has had its face slightly washed and is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee under the sponsorship of Senators MUNDT, FERGUSON, and JOHNSTON. It remains in its essentials as objectionable and as repugnant to American traditions as when it was first spawned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities more than a year ago. Styled the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1949," it is an outright sedition bill, comparable to nothing ever enacted by the Congress of the United States since the odious Sedition Act of 1798.

The Mundt bill would create a Subversive Activities Control Board with powers of life and death over minority political parties and voluntary associations of American citizens. It would be the function of this three-man board to determine whether any organization is a "Communist political organization" or a "Communist front organization" as defined in the vague language of the bill and to determine whether any individual is a member of any group which it has designated as a "Communist political organization."

Under the terms of the bill, Communist political organizations would be required to register with the Attorney General, disclosing the names of all their members; Communist-front organizations would be required to register and make public the names of their officers. All material emanating from either, addressed to the public by mail or by radio, would have to be identified as coming from a Communist source. Members of Communist political organizations would be forbidden to hold any nonelective Government job or to secure a passport and, in addition, we surmise, would automatically become guilty by mere membership in the organization of a new crime established by the act—the crime of knowingly conspiring or agreeing "with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship."

Thus, a governmental agency, would, in effect, be authorized to tell American citizens what organizations they may join and what organizations they may not join. For the board's designation of an organization as Communist, while not actually outlawing it, would result either in destroying it outright or in so handicapping it as to render it impotent. And, of course, severe deprivations and penalties would be entailed by membership. A very apt observation was made about this not long ago by Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, the author of Free Speech in the United States, commonly acknowledged to be the definitive work in its field.

"By the American tradition, sifting bad parties from good parties is the job of the voters, and not the job of Congress or Government officials. We have had confidence that most of the voters would recognize a bad party when they saw it and keep away from it. The fate of the Know-Nothing Party, which incited prejudice against recent immigrants, and the failure of the Communist Party to win any important office anywhere or even a single Presidential elector, show that this confidence in the voters is amply justified."

Apart from its dubious constitutionality and its indubitable violation of long-settled American principles, the Mundt bill is a stupid bill because it entirely misconceives the danger it is intended to meet. The danger does not lie in the propaganda of the Communist Party or of so-called Communist-front organizations. There is a security danger in this country, but not a political danger, and the security danger most probably comes from agents who are not allowed to be formal Communists.

There is quite enough patriotism and good sense in the American people to cope with Communist propaganda. Error of opinion, however odious the opinion may seem, is not a danger to the United States unless it be translated into unlawful action. And there is abundant legislation already to deal with such action. The Mundt bill is aimed at opinion and expression. It would punish men, strictly on the doctrine of guilt by association, for their sympathies and their affiliations. It would strike, therefore, at the fundamental premises of American life—the premises that error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it and that the Government may never prescribe to a free people what is orthodox in social or political or religious belief.

Judo-Christianity Bar to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 1, 1949, will prove of considerable interest to my colleagues:

JUDO-CHRISTIANITY BAR TO COMMUNISM, SAYS DR. ADAMS

(By William Juengst)

Militant practice of the Christian and Jewish religions in social life will be the best bulwark against communism, the Reverend Dr. Carlyle Adams, of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, Albany, told the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church, Henry Street near Hicks Street, in a guest sermon.

Well known to the congregation whom he once served as assistant to the Reverend Dr. Phillips Packer Elliott, and as editor of the Presbyterian Tribune, Dr. Adams stressed the point that communism is particularly dangerous, nowadays, because it uses the terminology of high idealism for destructive ends.

Dr. Adams said in part:

"Modern communism, with its false utopia and its denial of the spiritual value of the human individual, is incompatible with Christianity and a Christian cannot be a Communist.

"Revolutions against authority, whether the authority is good or bad, do not accomplish any lasting good. Some revolutions in history have paved the way for a good work to be done but the work had to be done after the revolution and must be done out of constructive rather than destructive motives.

"Today's world is torn apart by selfishness, despotism, and greed. The alarming thing about our age is the large number of people who believe that wrong can be made right simply by destroying the wrong. That evil has crept into politics and even into the church. It is also a fundamental fallacy of communism.

"Christianity is not destructive, so it cannot even destroy communism. But communism can be removed from the political scene if enough Jewish and Christian people together begin a positive militant practice of their faiths in the social life of the world. Communism is especially dangerous because it uses the terminology of high idealism for destructive ends. It speaks in terms of the dream of universal brotherhood without any

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

social controls. In actual practice, of course, it is totalitarian. It has no regard for the worth of the human individual.

"The challenge of the Christian church is to engage actively in the healing of broken spirits, the torn bodies, the crushed hopes of the world's people. The church must affirm the great fact of the sovereignty of God and the universal brotherhood of mankind committed to God.

"The world and its down-trodden people, who are being led down the path of slavery under communism, will listen to the call of Christian leadership if it is truly Christian. Western civilization, imperfect though it is, has achieved its best heights under the way of life that came forth from the spiritual foundations of Judaism and Christianity. Christianity is not a cause to exploit but a gospel of good news to proclaim.

"We could have a spiritual nation in which communism would not have a chance, if all our citizens were to pray before they voted, if all public officials were to pray before they acted on any issue concerning the body politic.

"The answer of Christianity to communism is a recognition that the civilization under which we live will collapse unless there is a rise of Christian leadership in all walks of life—inside the church and in the secular life. It must be the sort of leadership which represents a commitment to the dominance of God in social life and a will to love that makes men care about their neighbors enough to share their money, their prayers, and their work for the rebuilding of society."

Is Minority Legislation Given Administration Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, certain so-called minority groups in this country have been, I am sure, wondering why it was that for the past 16 years they have been promised everything and have received nothing. Some of us who have been in favor of legislation desired by such groups have sought from time to time to explain this phenomena. Now, however, we have an explanation from a source which cannot be questioned as to what went on in the White House during most of this period. I quote from an article in the August 1949 issue of McCall's magazine by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, as follows:

When an administration bill was up before Congress we learned to expect an increase in the number of Congressmen coming to his study in the evenings. I had to learn very early that I must make an evaluation of the bills on which he had to get support. He calculated votes very closely on what were known as administration policies which had to be "must" legislation.

Only bills that were "must" legislation got full administration support. In the first years these were largely economic or relief measures; in later years they were measures for defense. I remember wanting to get all-out support for the antilynching bill and the removal of the poll tax, but though Franklin was in favor of both measures they never became "must" legislation.

Franklin would simply say: "First things come first, and I can't alienate certain votes I need for measures that are more important at the moment by pushing for any other measure."

Often people came to me to enlist Franklin's support for some idea. Although I would present a situation to him I never urged on him a specific course of action, because he knew of factors in the situation as a whole of which I might be ignorant. While I felt strongly on certain subjects, he often refrained from supporting causes in which he believed because of political realities. There were times when this annoyed me very much. I would do all I could for the people who came to me short of stating what my husband might think or feel, and he never asked me to refrain from speaking my own mind. For that very reason, I suppose, in spite of my protests to him I frequently was more careful than I might otherwise have been. I felt he was in a position to evaluate the essentials of his program and that I had no right to endanger that program by any action of mine.

Mr. Speaker, now at long last it can be told. The measures sought by the minority groups were not given "full administration support" because they were not deemed as important as some other measures. They were all right to trot out at election time and to talk about, but they were not important enough to be pushed at the risk of alienating the votes of Dixiecrats. I wonder how long it will take to bring about a realization that this situation will always prevail so long as there is a Democratic administration in power—an administration which knows full well it could not remain in power, or have come into power in the first place without support from the South. An administration willing to bargain with the most reactionary elements in our national life today cannot, if it is honest, deny the charge that it is willing to continue reactionary policies as the price of votes. Sometimes I wonder if, after all, Mr. Lincoln was right when he said you can't fool all of the people all of the time. Sixteen years isn't "all of the time," but it is an awful long time.

Supreme Court Justices Should Not Act as Character Witnesses for Criminal Defendants in Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press and Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal, dealing with H. R. 5671, to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from acting as character or reputation witnesses in criminal trials in the Federal courts:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of July 25, 1949]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Rochester Republican, sponsors a bill which would bar United States Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses in any court in the United States. This bill should pass.

The bill comes as a sequel to the appearance of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses in the Alger Hiss perjury trial in New York City. In this instance charges were made that the presence of the two high jurists tended to have the effect of influencing the jury in favor of the defendant. Furthermore, should the Hiss case reach the Supreme Court, the question of the qualifications of two former character witnesses to hear it would be raised.

The impropriety of the two justices' testimony in behalf of a person being tried on a criminal charge would seem to be beyond doubt.

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of July 19, 1949]

NOT EASILY EXPLAINED

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of Rochester, has introduced a bill to prevent Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses in any court of the United States.

His move was prompted by the (he understood unsubpenaed) appearance in the Alger Hiss perjury trial by Associate Justices Frankfurter and Reed to testify as character witnesses for Hiss. This he characterized as against the propriety considered proper for members of the Supreme Court and an action in which reliance on judicial proprieties seemed to have failed.

Representative VELDE, Illinois Republican, commented that any such appearance by any Supreme Court Justice would necessitate their disqualifying themselves if the case in which they appeared came before them on appeal.

Mr. KEATING is justified in being perturbed about Supreme Court proprieties. The unusual, in fact unprecedented, appearance of the two Justices in the Hiss case shocked the country and well might prove embarrassing in the performance of their duties.

The more we read of the Hiss case the more mystified we are. Certainly the antics of Chambers are unexplainable, and we still are loath to believe that Hiss was crassly guilty of betraying State Department secrets. An explanation that has not yet been given and which for security reasons it may be impossible to give suggests itself.

Address of Hon. John C. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania, on the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State Department's white paper on China listed the incredible series of mistakes made by our State Department in respect to our policy in the Far East. So far none of the objectives sought through the Anglo-American financial agreement, known as the British loan, the International Bank and Monetary Fund, nor the Marshall plan have been attained. Indeed, they are much further away today than they were in 1945 at the war's end.

Of course, Members of Congress cannot have the specialized knowledge of foreign problems at the disposal of those who spend all their time studying those specific conditions. Frequently, harsh criticisms are leveled at Members of

Congress because they venture to assert their views in contradiction to those allegedly better informed. Those Members who study the facts and give impartial analyses frequently make far better and more accurate analyses of the future than do the so-called experts.

In this connection, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech made on July 12, 1946 by my colleague the Honorable JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, on the British loan. Practically everything outlined by Mr. KUNKEL in this speech has come to pass. At that time, few would have predicted the dissolution of the British Empire, the bilateral trading methods adopted by England, and other conditions which have now come to pass. The speech is almost uncanny in its predictions of the future.

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REJECT THE ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AGREEMENT, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE BRITISH LOAN

(Speech of Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, July 12, 1946)

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, there is no shred of isolationism involved in rejecting the financial agreement with the United Kingdom. Undoubtedly, there is a strong desire in the hearts and minds of many Americans to draw away from the strife and quarrels pervading all part of the world. This is only natural. Indeed, we come by it by heredity. The original founding fathers left Europe in order to create a new world wherein they could pursue their own destinies unhampered by the discord of the Old World. They sought freedom—not only freedom to create a nation according to their own thought and image, but also freedom from eternal bickerings of Europe with its oppression and its archaic social order. And countless thousands have come to these shores from various European countries since then with these same thoughts deeply embedded in their minds. Millions of Americans devoutly pray that we could follow such a course today. Unfortunately, this cannot be done. Time and space have been annihilated by man's inventions. No matter how deep the desires of any modern group to remove themselves from the harshness and the impacts of the rough and treacherous modern world might be, they could find no spot anywhere free from the shadow of the events happening in areas far distant. The Himalayas blend into the Ozarks.

Isolationism is dead. It is dead not because no one seeks it, but because it is unattainable. Let us recognize the fact without castigating the impulse. We must play our part. Since we cannot avoid involvement not only in Europe, but also in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, our role must be to reduce those quarrels to a minimum, and at all cost prevent the outbreak of another war. We must act with intelligence and caution. Entering to the full in the world arena does not mean the blind acceptance of every international commitment laid before us by every Fred, Bill, and Harry for our approval. We must use discrimination, judgment, and common sense. We cannot accept blindly any more than we can reject blindly. If our general objective is to evolve a world of free and prosperous peoples, living under conditions unlikely to cause the frictions productive of war, trading with each other with growing freedom, then we should not embark upon any proposal the consequences of which are to continue a status quo proven by history and experience to result inevitably in wars. Nor should we bring to life a situation causing deep-seated ill feeling. To attempt to do so would be to waste our substance in fruitless effort. We must use our assets wisely. It is not enough to accept international commitments just because they are international commitments and then to beat our breasts and cry, "See, see, I am not an isolationist." It is not how much we do, but the wisdom of what we do. An international commitment, as such, is no sacred cow. Each one must be weighed in the balance.

Personally, no one feels more keenly than I the importance of a close association between the English-speaking peoples of the world. We must and should for our own interests support the United Kingdom, the British Isles. Our interests in western Europe—perhaps in all Europe—are somewhat identical to those of the United Kingdom. Our legal system, and many of our customs, even our language, are derived in large part from this group of islands. For many sound reasons we must give the United Kingdom support, but it should not be done so as to commit us to a policy against our vital interests in other areas of the world. We have already overlooked great opportunities to help British policy where it coincides completely with our own through the neglect and errors of our President and our executive departments in this postwar period. We cannot pay off for those mistakes just by an ill-advised loan. We should have supplied more food and materials to help build a sound western Europe starting early in 1945. We should watch for occasions when we can use our strength to support mutual interests. But it should be in accord with our own policy for world betterment.

The British loan or financial agreement is neither a loan in the true sense of the word nor is it a financial agreement. Even its most ardent proponents admit it is not a true loan. It is not a financial agreement for several reasons. First, it only arranges future agreements through consultations to be worked out in the future for most of the problems supposed to be decided. Secondly, changed conditions in the United Kingdom prevent us from securing the consideration or quid pro quo which the Treasury and State Departments claim we will receive thereunder. Therefore, it must be justified upon the ground of international policy. If there is a policy involved, I contend it is a bad policy. It is a policy designed to promote, and likely to cause, those things we least desire. It is a policy which will block off the objectives we devoutly seek to attain.

We must not be confused by names. We must not be blinded by the word "loan" or the phrase "financial agreement." Shortly before the war this Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act. I voted for it, although it was clear to me that we were not lending and we were not leasing. This has become clear to everyone since the settlements of lend-lease. What we did do at that time was to adopt a policy. That policy was the defense of the British Isles and western Europe against nazism and Hitler Germany. By doing this we held a shield before us—we protected our own security. There were other advantages to the Lend-Lease Act, but this was the central idea. It was one of international policy.

Under the Lend-Lease Act our actual commitments were confined to financial aid and to supplying the sinews of war to our friends. Circumstances were such as to force us later to use military force in order to follow through on the policy. Inasmuch as the policy was sound, the results were good. It was a wise decision fully justified by subsequent events. We won the war, aided by our allies. But the implications were apparent in the original Lend-Lease Act.

If the British loan is essentially in the nature of a policy, then we must examine, microscopically, the implications of the policy. We must see how it may affect us in the future. We must see how it will reverberate throughout this little world in which we live. In my judgment, what we do is to make, indirectly, more or less substantial commitments to the maintenance of the British Colonial Empire. Hence the question arises as to whether the British have a sound colonial policy. Also, the further question, Can the British Colonial Empire and that system be maintained over a period of time? If it cannot be maintained, the repayment of the loan becomes less likely, and we have little chance to receive any long-range benefits not otherwise available in the ordinary course of events from the financial agreements. All are inextricably intertwined.

British foreign policy has the merit of being clear-cut and well known in its broad outlines. It has continued in a straight line for many decades. It is based upon essentials. It is a wise policy for the United Kingdom. It is rooted in the geography and the population and in the nature of the industrial development of the British Isles.

The British Isles are small in area. They contain a population of approximately 45,000,000 people, far more than can be supported by the land area of the isles themselves. Only about 6 percent of the population produce from the land itself. Coal is the only major natural resource, and the coal-mining industry in England is on its last legs. For many years it has been necessary for the United Kingdom to import well over 50 percent of what it consumes and uses. In 1842 England repealed the corn laws; let agriculture disintegrate. It went all out for urbanization and industrialization. We should study with care the history of England from the end of the Napoleonic wars up to 1842. It gives us scope and background to use in meeting problems already arising here in the United States in the years before us. We will be called upon to make somewhat analogous decisions. We require all knowledge available. Much more, we will require divine guidance from on high.

The fundamentals of British foreign policy are the freedom of the seas, an assured access to raw materials in lands frequently far distant, plus controlled markets in which the finished product can be sold. Throughout the years, the United Kingdom has steadfastly pursued the program of keeping its dominions and colonial territories as completely agrarian as possible in order to force them to sell their raw materials to the British Isles for manufacture, and to compel the masses in those lands to buy the finished products from the mother country.

From the broad view of general world economics, this is basically unsound. Increased costs are sure to arise from shipping raw cotton produced in India across the seas to England, then unloading and processing it in Liverpool and Manchester, and finally reloading and reshipment of the finished cotton product back to India for resale. The construction of cotton mills in India would destroy this competition in short order.

Hence India has never been permitted to industrialize. As I understand it, India is the only nation which has deindustrialized since the industrial revolution in Europe in the early nineteenth century. Fewer Indians make their living in manufacturing plants than when England first took control of that vast subcontinent. The only exception to this is the period during the last war when the exigencies of the military situation absolutely required an increase in the industrial production of India.

Just how long the United Kingdom can continue this policy successfully is an open question. It is unlikely to be able to do so permanently. It would be cheaper and better business, from the standpoint of everyone except those in the British Isles, to build the industrial and manufacturing plants at the site of the raw material and then turn the raw material into finished cloth where it is grown and where much of it is used. Yet British policy continues exactly the same as it has during the past century.

A striking illustration of this is the type of control assumed by the United Kingdom over Siam during the past year. The United Kingdom imposed on that country the general colonial policy previously in effect in India, Egypt, the Malay Peninsula and other dependencies. This indicated the intention to extend, as well as to continue, the same on and on into the future. Just how England could do otherwise and support her present overurbanized population is difficult to see. How she can win and keep a large export trade under any other system is not at all obvious. We should not criticize the British for this but we should recognize the inherent fallacies, so that, no matter what our admiration and affection for the British may be, we will not become involved in their vagaries of empire.

Many people who support the loan feel such a course will strengthen us against possible future Russian aggression. We might as well take notice of this argument. My own considered judgment is that support of the British colonial system and empire will enable communism to spread throughout China, India, and Asia. My reason for that judgment is that the British colonial system offers the people of those nations far less than the promises now being given them by the Russian propagandists. Britain maintains an economic, political, and military vacuum, so to speak, throughout these areas. A vacuum is bound to be filled—sooner or later. Studying the geographical situation, it is quite clear that as long as these areas continue as economic and political and military vacuums they will be filled eventually with communism or controlled by a nation offering something better. The Communists promise industrialization, better standards of living, preservation of native cultures, and everything which might be desirable. Russia cannot fulfill these promises. Russia will exact regimented control in return for what she does. Our policy should be to create strong states composed of contented people if we are to establish resistance barriers to a philosophy of thought and government which admittedly seeks world domination as its ultimate goal. We are in position to fulfill our promises—to their advantage and to our own. We can give freedom and prosperity.

My thought on this is reinforced by the lack of opposition given to the British loan by the Communist press in the United States. Naturally Russia wishes to see continued a world situation under which its politburo feels the great land areas of the world will in the course of time fall into their grasp as overripe apples drop from a tree. I do not want to see communism spread. Therefore, the soil in which it grows should not be fertilized. Freedom, and liberty, and opportunities are the antidotes.

We can and must adopt a policy of building strong and independent states throughout the world. States which can develop their own culture and which can protect themselves. We cannot afford to create a condition throughout the world where British weakness is backed by our strength. We cannot back a declining empire in its adventures in Asia and Africa and in its efforts to hold back the hand of time. Our interests in the Far East are opposed in many ways to those of the United Kingdom. Singapore and Burma prove the truth of these statements. There is a complete disagreement in our basic objectives. We cannot afford to allow British policy to dominate our own. Under the loan agreement it is implicit that we will do so.

We must and should, from our own interest, support the United Kingdom. The British Isles are our bulwark against Europe. Our interests in western Europe are almost identical to those of the British. For many sound reasons we must give the British Isles our support, but it should not be done in a manner which commits us to a policy against our own vital interest in other areas of the world.

There has been a great deal of confusion concerning the issues actually involved in the so-called British loan. "Loan" is an inaccurate term. It has many aspects of a commercial loan. Yet it could never be justified on that basis. Perhaps we should speak of it as the Anglo-American financial agreement. The promises made by the British Government as part consideration for the use of this money constitute the only ground on which it can be justified to the American people. The ultimate question is whether the advantages secured to the United States through these British commitments is sufficient to compensate for the great risks of loss involved in the loan. Indeed, unless these undertakings are in themselves advantageous enough to compensate us to the extent of $3,750,000,000, irrespective of whether or not the principal and interest of the loan is repaid, in my judgment we cannot afford to make the loan.

The loan bears an interest rate of 2 percent, starting in 1951. While the nominal interest rate is 2 percent, the actual yield would be only 1.63 percent if all the money were withdrawn at once. Assuming it is withdrawn at a slower rate, as would probably be the case, then the yield would increase possibly to as high as 1.83 percent. But there are escape clauses which permit the nonpayment of any interest whatever during those years in which the British balance of trade is sufficiently adverse, based on prewar standards, to jeopardize the British trade equilibrium. Consequently, we can expect many omissions of the interest payments. And it probably would be just as well to disregard the interest rate and possible interest payments entirely from our calculations and judgments as to the value of the loan.

I said before that the loan must be justified by demonstrating an on-balance benefit to this country, even assuming the loan is not repaid. The chances are strongly against its repayment. This is said with no disrespect for the British intentions, nor as to their willingness to repay if at all possible. This thought prevails in the United Kingdom also. Otherwise, the British would never have suggested a grant rather than a loan. It is not on the basis of any lack of willingness to pay, but rather on the ground of inability to pay that I doubt its ultimate repayment.

Britain has been forced to sell most of its overseas investment. Other sources of income, such as insurance, shipping, and tourist trade, have greatly lessened. The British frankly admit this. Indeed, they advance these figures to prove the necessity for outside financing to maintain and regain their trade position. In addition, there is a manpower shortage in the British Isles. The precarious world situation throughout so many vast areas, either in or adjacent to integral parts of the British Empire, forces the United Kingdom to maintain a large Army and Navy. This is an expense, both in pounds and in manpower. The British Government is committed to a gigantic housing program—an undoubted necessity if the entire 45,000,000 are to remain on the islands, not only because of bomb damage, but also because of the complete stoppage of all building during the war. Four hundred and sixty thousand houses were destroyed; 3,500,000 were damaged. You should also take into account the normal increase in population and in the number of families. So this is something the British must do at the very same time they are seeking to expand their foreign trade and their exports. To the extent men and materials are diverted into this building program, to that extent they must be withdrawn from the industries manufacturing goods for export. Their plant and equipment are in general, obsolete and inferior, judged by standards prevailing in this more fortunate land of ours.

The most reliable minimum estimates of what Britain must do in the way of increasing exports sufficiently to bring her own balance of trade into equilibrium and, at the same time, to service and repay this loan is to reach 150 percent of the 1938 volume. This is the minimum. To be safe, it should be at least 175 percent. Conservative estimators all give the latter figure. Before the war, British exports of coal had been declining. The best veins of coal have been mined; the equipment in the mines is old and obsolete. It was a difficult problem to secure labor for the mines. To put it frankly, coal mining in England was on the rocks. It would have been nationalized, in any event whether the Conservatives or the Labor Party had won the last election, because it had reached a state where it was just impossible to make a go of it. Coal exports will fall further, so the United Kingdom will have to look elsewhere to regain its trade. During the war British industries turned almost totally to war production. No peacetime factories were built. Consequently, the plant and equipment in the great majority of industries is at least relatively old and obsolete.

Possibly the most important factor of all is the present standard of living in the United Kingdom. Britain has increased its exports tremendously since VJ-day. This is a remarkable achievement. We must recognize, however, that there is a world-wide "sellers' market" existing today. Also it has been done by the squeezing of the people in the British Isles. The already rigorous standard of living existing during the war is lower now than it was before VJ-day in England, Scotland, and Wales. Food allowances are lower. Bread rationing has been imposed. The British have found goods for export by zealously keeping them away from their own people. They have been living off their substance. If the British Government can continue to impose this, if the English people are willing to continue this austere living, or perhaps a more austere diet, then perhaps the British can continue to increase their exports. But the English have been through a lot. They look forward to better times after victory, just as do people in this country. How long they will be content to see the fruits of their toil taken from them and sent overseas to lands of plenty, is a question no one can answer. By the inexorable laws of human nature they will eventually feel these valued articles are being taken from them to satisfy a grasping creditor. This is something with which we must reckon. Will they not resent more and more this continually lowered standard of living to meet what they undoubtedly regard as our exactions? Will this make for good will or good feeling in the postwar world? I do not see how we can expect the British to do this indefinitely. They would have to do it for a long time if they were to maintain the present population on the British Isles, if they were to export enough to pay for the food and raw materials needed, and if, on top of that, they were to pay the interest and principal on this loan.

If the loan is made and not repaid, it will not be a good thing for Anglo-American friendship. The failure of the United Kingdom to settle in full its debts after the last war was an unending source of strife and irritation between the United States and the United Kingdom during the entire period between the two wars. In England all too many called us "Uncle Shylock." In the United States of America the English were regarded as dead beats. It aroused animosity and hostility; it gave rise to charges and countercharges by those seeking to stir up trouble between these two great Nations whose interests and background should lend themselves to friendship and cooperation.

I voted for lend-lease in great measure influenced by the desire to avoid this problem after this war. I had seen how disturbing and incessant it could be by personal observation during the 1920's and 1930's. We advanced $25,000,000,000 net in lend-lease materials. We avoided war debts. The American people have accepted the lend-lease settlements and are not worrying unduly about the advantageous terms granted. Having invested this huge sum to avoid a war-debt problem, is it wise to create the problem now, after having avoided it, for a relative pittance compared to what we have spent? By lend-lease we avoided the war-debt problem not only for ourselves but also for the British.

There is much less chance of repayment now than there was then because the length and scope of this second war, its closer contact with the British Isles, its ramifications in the Far East, and other factors have caused it to weaken the British position far more than did the First World War.

In his broadcast to the British on the 1946-47 budget the Right Honorable Hugh Dalton, Chancelor of the Exchequer, said:

"In the next 12 months we shall spend £3,800,000,000—a big drop on last year. But the make-up of this expenditure will be quite different. In this first full year of peace and of the labor government in power, we shall spend much less, naturally enough, on the armed forces and munitions; but we shall spend much more on the things the people voted for in the last general election. On the great social program which is long overdue, on education, on preparations to raise the school-leaving age next year, on providing free milk for all the children in the schools next August, on providing free meals in all the schools as soon as possible, on important developments in the universities.

"We shall spend many millions more on building new houses, on family allowances to help mothers of large families, on more generous pensions for disabled ex-servicemen, and the dependents of those who lost their lives in the war."

He also referred to the cost of increased pay for the armed forces and for higher old-age pensions which are to begin in the autumn of 1946.

I quote this because it is open recognition by the British Government itself of some of the domestic problems it must solve and which react unfavorably on its export trade, irrespective of how worthy and desirable the projects are in themselves. Raising the school-leaving age is fine, but it does reduce available manpower. The housing program is a necessity, but it does take manpower. The cradle-to-the-grave social security program may be a worthy objective, but it will lower the number of workers in the United Kingdom. It will decrease the output.

Perhaps I should mention the probable loss of the United States as a market for the rubber of the Malayan Straits. Perhaps I should mention the increasing competition from the industrialization now going on in many South American countries and, to a lesser degree, in other parts of the world. All in all, no matter how willing and eager the British are to pay this debt, the ability to pay is doubtful. The present government was elected on a program pledging the carrying out of most of the domestic policies outlined above. I do not see how this Government can avoid its responsibility for so doing without loss of office. Most of the members of the Conservative Party either refrained from voting, or voted against, the acceptance of this loan, and the Bretton Woods agreement. Any time the burdens become too onerous and impinge too directly upon the standard of living of the average Englishman, the Conservative Party is in a thoroughly sound position to go to the polls on this issue.

The nonrepayment of the loan, if it is not repaid, will be an unending source of trouble between the two countries. It will enable the Anglophobes and the Communists and all those who have an antipathy to the United Kingdom and the British Empire to have made-to-order ammunition at their disposal at all times. The same will be true on the other side of the Atlantic. Constant disputes between these two great English-speaking nations will pose problems for our northern neighbor, Canada. Canada has her economic, social, and friendship relations almost equally divided between the two countries. Friendship between the two is the cornerstone of Canadian policy. Viewed from this angle, the loan phase of the financial agreement may be a source of disaster to the group of nations whose natural inclinations, both economic and social, should draw them together.

The purpose of advancing this money is to enable the United Kingdom to recapture and expand its export trade. Obviously, the United Kingdom will be forced to use every means at its disposal to win markets for itself. This will bring England into direct competition with the United States in all parts of the world not tied up by bilateral agreements. We should not criticize the British for this competition. We accept and promote its occurrence when we make the loan. It is the very purpose of the loan. It will occur whether the loan is made or whether it is not made. There should be no resentment. This is logically true and sound common sense. However, human nature being what it is, it is inevitable that there will be resentment by many people in this country if and when the British do win markets from us as a result of their own efforts, and perhaps aided and abetted by our financial assistance.

Let us bring all this down to the individual human beings in the United Kingdom and the individual human beings in the United States of America. It has been pointed out that this means $35 for each individual in the United States. That is $35 they have to pay in sweat, labor, and goods. And some of our resources are used up forever also. But if you take that idea across the ocean and look at Great Britain, it means $105 each for every British subject in the United Kingdom. It is $105 each one will have to sweat and toil to repay to this country until the year 2000 and some odd. And while they are doing that during the course of the efforts required for repayment it seems to me that, looking over here and knowing from watching Americans during the war and watching American tourists, they are going to feel unavoidably that the goods that are taken away from them to be sent into the export trade in order to get dollars to pay this loan—they are going to feel that Uncle Shylock is exacting the pound of flesh. It is just human nature. You cannot avoid it. Here is something which impinges on the feelings of 138,000,000 people in the United States of America and then impinges directly on the 45,000,000 people in the British Isles. It hits in a way not calculated to promote love and affection.

This is the type of loan, if it is a loan, which will cause trouble. I firmly believe any arrangements made with the United Kingdom definitely must not involve the creation of a debt beyond the probable ability of the debtor to repay. This reason alone, based upon high policy, is sufficient for rejection of this present proposal.

The chief collateral benefit urged by the proponents of the British loan is the restoration of multilateral trading between the various nations of the world. They point to the fact that the United Kingdom, including other nations in close association with the United Kingdom, was the largest unit of such trading in the world. It was this type of trading upon which American prosperity had been based. It consisted mainly in the freedom of individuals and corporations to sell their goods in any market in the world on the basis of price and quality and without undue interference from restrictions of all kinds, with the exception of tariffs. The picture painted for the future is the resumption of this prewar method. Consequently, under Bretton Woods, preliminary steps toward this end are undertaken by the various signatory countries in the field of currency. The Anglo-American financial agreement contemplates shortening the time when these agreements are to be made effective in respect to the United States and the United Kingdom. The theory is that this free flow of commerce will be resumed on the prewar basis just as if nothing had happened in the meantime. Tariffs are to be treated later under separate negotiations. An agreement to do this is entered into by both the contracting parties.

However, great changes have occurred in the United Kingdom, as well as in western Europe. In western Europe every nation is taking steps to nationalize many of its major industries, including those making goods for export. The devastation of the war and the wholesale and immediate effort needed to reconstruct, combined with the scrambling of private property through Nazi manipulations during Nazi occupation, no doubt rendered this necessary on the continent of Europe. The fact remains, it is going on, and it is progressing rapidly. The same is true in England.

There have been three events during the past 3 months indicative of this trend. These three events have forced me to examine carefully the premise advanced by the State and Treasury Departments and the proponents of the financial agreement. Can there ever be a resumption of the type of multilateral trading which existed in the spheres dominated by the United Kingdom and the United States, where individuals and individual units competed in the markets of the world on the basis of price and quality? Where individuals competed against other individuals more or less similarly situated financially and competitively with themselves? I seriously doubt it.

England started in by nationalizing the central bank and by placing investments under control of the British Government. These were the first steps taken by the Labor or Socialist government. I do not think these had any great impact internationally. Neither did the nationalization of the coal industry because that was bound to occur. England will probably never be a great coal exporting country again. The third step, the nationalization of Britain's 16,000,000-ton iron and steel industry, will necessarily have a great effect on future business outside of the United Kingdom. If the government owns the iron and steel industry, the government will sell the products of that industry. In brief, the Government of the United Kingdom, either itself or through a Government-controlled agency, will be the selling unit for all iron and steel produced in the British Isles. It will compete in the markets of the world against individual producers and sellers from other nations where the capitalistic system of free enterprise survives. This is far from prewar multilateral trading. It will be much more closely akin to bilateral agreements between governments.

On March 18 the Government announced its decision to continue the wartime centralized purchase of raw cotton by the cotton control in preparation for the establishment of a permanent cotton-purchasing commission. Cotton is stated to be a special case, where bulk purchase is preferable. You will note the statement presumes bulk purchasing—the purchase by the Government as a buying unit—is preferable in the case of cotton.

In April the bill to abolish the Liverpool Cotton Exchange passed the House of Commons by a large majority. The Liverpool Cotton Exchange is one of the oldest and largest cotton exchanges in the world. Through its abolition, the seller of cotton is deprived of the opportunity to sell his cotton in the British Isles. He will have to deal with the tremendous force of the British Government. Here again, on the selling end, the arrangement is much more closely akin to the bilateral trade agreements which the Treasury claims the financial agreement will avoid than it is to the multilateral system of free trading, which the proponents of the loan assert it will establish or make possible.

Recently the papers have carried accounts of an agreement about to be entered into between the British and the Canadians. Under this, Britain would have bought Canadian wheat at $1.25 Canadian per bushel, or $1.13 United States. The current Canadian price is $1.55. The American and world price is approximately $2 Canadian or around $1.80 United States. Hence, the proposed contract would have been at a little more than one-half the American price. This lower price is usually obtained by a huge buyer who agrees to take a large amount and agrees to take that large amount over an extended period of time. The agreement was to have run for 10 years.

On June 26 this was abandoned. The reason for its abandonment was American opposition to a bilateral agreement. Yet, the British Government was ready to enter into this agreement for a period of 10 years. Since the British Government is an honorable government, we must assume it intended to carry it out during that 10-year period. While Canada has the announced policy of favoring multilateral trading and a strong general world trade, yet, in the case of this huge sale of one of her main exports and chief money-makers, she was tempted into making this favorable arrangement.

The British Trade Minister announced that "negotiations will be resumed in respect of the terms of the proposed contract" as soon as certain important considerations have been dealt with by the two governments. On the same day, Food Minister John Strachey gave out an interview in London that there were good prospects of signing a long-term wheat contract with Canada.

Controls are now pending by the United Kingdom on petroleum, iron and steel, chemicals, fishing, and agriculture. In addition, the Government is studying controls, or nationalization, of cotton textiles, pottery, hosiery, furniture, shoes, linoleum, carpets, jute, wool, china, clay, cutlery, lace, clothing, glassware, jewelry, and silverware. The Labor government has certainly made rapid progress in its program of socialization or nationalization, and its announcements indicate that the future pace will be more rapid, rather than less.

The British Government can control exports by nationalizing any industry and then deciding how much to sell and to whom. It can control imports by establishing a Government purchasing unit. The latter can buy what it wants, as much as it wants, and from whomever it wants to buy. There is nothing in the agreement to forbid this. It is a question of domestic policy. By nationalizing an industry, the British can legitimately and at once nullify the promises they have given us as part consideration for this money.

I do not see how we can expect to secure in any major degree the restoration of the type of multilateral trading in existence prior to 1939 when on both the buying and selling side the United Kingdom, through its steady process of nationalization, is entering into buying or selling as a Government unit. Therefore, it seems clear to me that the quid pro quo or consideration which the administration alleges for the chief one and the real basic reason for this loan fails in large measure. I have already pointed out the extreme probability of nonpayment of interest and of nonrepayment of the loan.

I feel the coming trade-agreement conference can be dismissed lightly. All the United Kingdom does is agree to negotiate. It makes no comments whatever as to what it will do. Statements by leading Government officials of the United Kingdom indicate quite clearly that concessions at least commensurate with those granted by the United Kingdom will be expected. Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking for the British Government, in Parliament, in support of the loan agreement said:

"The peculiarity about our trade, as the House knows, is that it is a very widespread and diversified trade. We do not sell large quantities of goods of particular lines to particular countries; we sell goods all over the world in what might be considered comparatively small lines. Therefore, it is not enough for us to get, as against a preference, the reduction of merely one person's tariff; we might want 26 countries to reduce their tariff before we were prepared to drop a preference. Therefore, the whole matter is completely at large and no one is bound at all.

"All we say is that we are prepared to enter upon this process; we are prepared to consider that bargaining of preference against tariffs. If we can get an advantage which appears to us to make it worth while and another country can get an advantage which appears to make it worth while, then we can come to an agreement. It is an attempt to try and bring down tariff barriers on all sides to a great extent, and it is clear that it must be to a great extent. A mere nominal reduction of a few percentages is not going to make anyone enter into a bargain and that, of course, our American friends understand perfectly well." (Parliamentary debate, December 12, 1945, pp. 490–491.)

This opens up the whole question of the American tariff.

Mr. Clayton stated to our committee that this agreement could be negotiated within the scope of the existing trade agreements. While I do not claim to be an expert on the tariff, I have grave doubts as to whether Mr. Clayton's judgment will prove correct in this respect. If the United States is to become a creditor nation through financing many other nations and through a large and continuing export trade, reciprocal trade agreements will be relatively useless. The problem will be import more than we export. Hence, we will be required to lower our tariffs to the point where other countries can send in goods at will, relying on interest, services, and our own exports to make up the balance. In other words, a nonreciprocal tariff policy, as distinguished from a reciprocal trade-agreement policy will be required to meet this condition. Our position in world trade today is analogous to that of Great Britain after the Napoleonic Wars. During the next several decades, probably the major economic decision we will have to face will be the same as that resolved in favor of manufacturing and exporting by the United Kingdom when the British repealed the corn laws in 1942. Will we become an almost entirely industrial nation, abandoning our agriculture and permitting imports from areas with lower standards of living, or will we attempt to maintain a well-rounded economy, preserving the home market for ourselves and using it as a basis for our economy? I do not intend to go into this question except to emphasize its importance. Already the lines are being drawn to fight out this battle.

One of the arguments in favor of the financial agreement is that it will slow up nationalism and socialism in the United Kingdom and perhaps pave the way for a return to private enterprise. I cannot see the soundness of this contention. Some claim the English will use this money to purchase the banks and industries of England from their present owners. Past practice proves this to be contrary to the facts. England can buy whatever she wishes in England from English people by issuing her currency—pound sterling—or by Government bonds. This will depreciate her currency, but it certainly does not require the use of dollars essential to her export trade. In addition to her pledges, Britain's own economy requires her to use these dollars for the purchase of the food needed to sustain her subjects, and for the raw materials out of which to create the finished products, from the sale of which she will receive foreign exchange essential to further purchases. Both by agreement and by economic necessity the United Kingdom is certain to use the credits or dollars so acquired for the stated purposes. However, the present use of these funds will lessen the burdens imposed upon her own population. The less the burden imposed on her own population, the more the Government in power is strengthened. The present government is a Socialist government, committed to a rapid policy of nationalization. The consummation of the agreement will undoubtedly strengthen the position of this government with its electorate. To that extent, the loan will hasten nationalization. I do not see how it can retard it.

Since nationalization involves Government unit buying, and since this is closely akin to bilateral trading, and since it has a strong tendency to evolve into bilateral trading, the loan will probably, in the long run, defeat the avowed purpose of establishing multilateral trading between individuals in the world markets on any prewar basis. To the extent that Government buying and selling develops, just to that degree will it be easier and more natural for the Government of the United Kingdom to establish trading relations with other governmental units operating under the same system and methods than it will be for its Government to deal with individuals in the United States and other nations where freedom of individual trade and business exists. In other words, the logical development to be expected would be the commencement of large-scale trading with Russia, also a political alliance like Germany and the Balkans before World War II as soon as the Russian economic situation permits, rather than with the United States and Allied countries. Far from being disadvantageous to Russia, as many Members feel it will be, I believe the loan will redound to the ultimate advantage of that country.

This is merely an analysis of the future. It is not given as an argument pro or con. Yet it does seem unwise to make a loan which will probably not be repaid in return for a consideration which existing circumstances make it most unlikely we will receive, in order to transfer that very consideration—trade relations and dealings—to a far-distant country which may well be our greatest trade rival in the future.

In general, nations are unwilling to forego long-range objectives for interim financial advantages. A foreign policy based on gifts and economic pressures will only last until the gift is received and until the pressure is removed. This does not mean we should attempt to control British policy permanently. It does stress that we cannot successfully do so and that we are merely deluding ourselves if we expect any tangible long-range economic benefits from an interim financial arrangement.

Britain has depended on the sterling area for many years. During the war, it was depending on the sterling area and it cannot abandon the controls added to it in order to make the sterling area more effective. We must keep in mind that Britain's export trade is the lifeblood of the nation. Britain cannot exist without its export trade. To us here in the United States, our export trade has always been the cream on the top of the milk bottle. It gave added prosperity, but we could live on the milk; in other words, on our own market. For the British Isles,

their export trade was the whole bottle of milk—cream and milk. If they did not have this trade, then they did not live. If they did not have it, they could not buy food or raw materials. If Britain gives up the sterling area and its controls, if it agrees to cut itself off from all these things, then it has left itself without any effective economic weapon at all. Consequently, I do not believe the United Kingdom has done this in this agreement. It could not afford to do so. No British Government would give away the nation's birthright.

We can afford to lose $3,750,000,000, injurious as that would be to our economy, particularly at this time. We could go ahead and support our population despite that loss without any compensating gain. England could not destroy the sterling area and its power to maintain exports and imports and still support its population at home. The British know this far better than we do. But we should keep it in mind in evaluating just what we receive under this agreement.

On the theory the administration has put forward by the State and Treasury Departments, what this country thinks it is buying with the $3,750,000,000 is the active assistance of the British in opening up their own territory and international trade generally, outside of Russia, on a free-trade basis. The evidence is quite conclusive that the British cannot afford to do this at the risk of their own export trade. Also, the British have no confidence in freedom of trade. They are doing their best to extend their present system of artificial restrictions—cartels, quotas, preference tariffs, price fixing, and so forth—which they have gradually developed in the period before the war and which were put into full force after the start of the war and during it.

For these reasons, I urge the rejection of the loan.

An Engineer's Appraisal of the Missouri Basin Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to put in the RECORD an address by John A. Short, hydraulic engineer and an important official of Missouri's resources and development agency, which he made at a recent meeting of the American Farm Economic Association in Laramie, Wyo.

Mr. Short's address is "An Engineer's Appraisal of the Missouri Basin Development Program" and, I must say, it is not a reassuring appraisal.

In his address, this engineer bluntly questions the feasibility of the open navigation channel in the lower Missouri River on which we have already expended more than $350,000,000 of public funds and have recently appropriated many more millions of dollars.

Mr. Short tells us just as bluntly that the Missouri Basin development has never been properly planned, but that the program on which we are making enormous expenditures was authorized by Congress hastily as the result of a wave of hysteria resulting from the floods of 1943 and 1944 and the rising tide of sentiment for a Missouri Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Basin development project involved a proposed expenditure, including the new agricultural plan, of more than $9,000,000,000 of Federal money.

We have been repeatedly warned by Valley Authority advocates, by the Hoover Commission, by Members of Congress and citizens that much of this expenditure will be sheer waste. This address by Mr. Short is another warning, from a State official, an engineer, whose State is directly involved, that the program we are following is not prudent. Every Member of Congress who has concern for the wise and prudent expenditure of public funds will read this speech. It follows:

In considering the Missouri Basin development program from an engineering aspect, it seems almost impossible not to touch upon certain other aspects such as economic, political, and social considerations. I hope, therefore, I will be pardoned if I stray somewhat afield from the subject assigned to me. In a program such as we have under discussion here, purely technical engineering seldom completely determines the course of events. Engineering considerations must always take into account various other influences. Any good engineer will recognize these influences and temper his engineering decisions to some degree in accordance with those outside influences. However, these outside influences should never be allowed to predominate to the point where good engineering becomes secondary.

It would naturally be expected that I would express pleasure at appearing before a group of this kind and that I would take advantage of the opportunity to impress upon you the importance of engineering in the Missouri River Basin development program. In this particular instance, it is indeed a rare opportunity for a layman such as myself to appear before a group of economists. It affords me a chance, not only to learn something about economics in general, but also to throw out some ideas and questions on certain economic features of the Missouri River Basin development program. These thoughts and questions perhaps will seem quite elementary to a group of economists, but to a layman, they often become quite perplexing.

The Missouri Basin program is certainly of national importance in many ways. The economy of the area will always be a vital factor in the economy of the Nation. The bulk of the expenditures being made for development come from the Federal Government, yet has any economic analysis of the program, from a national point of view, ever been made? Is it desirable to carry on the program at such an accelerated pace during this particular national economic level? Do we need increased production, in some cases costing hundreds of dollars per acre, at this particular time when we find it necessary to have price supports on farm products at a high level? Perhaps something is wrong on the distribution end rather than on the production end. Do we need an increase in the production of sugar beets largely at the expense of the national taxpayer when we must retain a high tariff to protect the domestic beet production we already have? Do we need an increase in the production of potatoes when it is costing the national taxpayer several hundred million dollars to support the price of potatoes? Do we need an increase in grain and livestock production when it is almost certain that exports of commodities will decrease rather rapidly in the next few years, especially, if we should decrease the amount of money we provide for other nations to buy from us? If increased production of food and fiber is necessary, or will become necessary because of population increase, could it not be obtained more cheaply through soil conservation and land improvement in the lower part of the basin than by irrigation in the upper part of the basin?

Soil erosion is depleting the productive capacity of the Basin at a rather alarming rate. In order to maintain and increase the productive capacity, it seems logical that soil conservation measures should occupy a high priority in any development program for the Basin. Strange to say, this matter has received serious consideration only in recent months and very litle work has been done to accelerate the program of soil conservation. On the other hand, irrigable land represents a potential productive capacity that does not deteriorate when not in use and can be brought into use at the proper time to bolster national production when it is most needed.

It seems that the first requirement for the Missouri River Basin is to enhance the economy of the region to the point where it becomes a national asset rather than a national liability. I seriously question whether the development program, as it is now being carried out, will of itself accomplish this. I see very little attention being given to industrial development. Industry is certainly one important factor in developing the potential economy of the Basin. Power produced from the development program may constitute some inducement to industry but, of far greater importance are transportation costs, markets, capital, labor, and industrial know-how. I see nothing in the present program that gives serious consideration to any of these factors. There are many other resources such as minerals and forests which are not receiving the attention they should in the program.

One must conclude that, from an engineering standpoint, the planning and execution of the Missouri Basin program is almost entirely backward. The reasons for this are many in number and varied in character. In the first place, this Nation continues to grope blindly for want of a suitable comprehensive, national policy with respect to resources development. Hence, as a Nation, we are totally unprepared to squarely face a problem of the magnitude of the Missouri Basin program. The engineering features contained in the program were planned by various agencies which by law are restricted to narrow objectives. The program was authorized by Congress hastily as the result of a wave of hysteria resulting from the floods of 1943 and 1944 and of the rising tide of sentiment for a Missouri Valley authority. It is true that the projects authorized had been under consideration and analysis for a number of years, but always with limited objectives in mind.

The first logical step in planning a river basin development program is to take an inventory of the resources and problems and then list them in the order of their relative importance. Planning should then proceed as nearly in accordance with this listing as practicable. This has not been done to date in the Missouri River Basin.

Engineering for the Missouri River Basin development may be divided into four phases. The first phase is the engineering planning. The second phase is the design of engineering structures. The third phase is the construction and the fourth and last phase is the operation of the completed structures. A large part of the planning has been done, although I expect some of it may have to be redone. Considerable design of specific structures has been accomplished and we are in the process of carrying on the construction at a rather high rate. Operational problems to date have not been encountered in major proportions, but they will surely come. In my opinion, the planning phase

is the most important of all the engineering tasks presented. I think, perhaps, this has been the weakest of all the engineering work.

Engineering design has become a rather set mathematical science. Construction under American engineering direction is something that the whole Nation can well be proud of. Operation becomes a matter of making the most of the physical conditions at hand. Operations problems can become extremely difficult if the planning and designing phases have not been properly carried out. For instance, if a flood-control reservoir has not been properly planned for use with other reservoirs in a system or if the design capacity is insufficient, certainly operation of that reservoir becomes an extremely difficult matter. If irrigation storage is not properly placed, or is inadequate because of insufficient data on available water, the oper ting engineer again takes a beating. Certainly, if irrigation storage is constructed without a thorough knowledge of the soil to be irrigated, considerable difficulty may be encountered. Likewise, if drainage problems are ignored on land to be protected by flood-control reservoirs, or a system of reservoirs, release from the reservoir may well cause trouble. If a stream flows from three-fourths to bank full for a long period of time as a result of release from a flood-control reservoir, or a stream of reservoirs, the land adjacent to the stream cannot be properly drained and the crops will die just as surely as if they had been covered for a lesser period of time by flood water. I am firmly convinced that some of the land which is now considered to be irrigable and on the basis of which irrigation storage is being considered, may later prove to be unsuitable for irrigation. I am also convinced that insufficient attention has been given to land drainage in general and especially on land below flood-control reservoirs.

Some $350,000,000 has been spent on the Missouri River under the name of river navigation. Yet to date there is no appreciable navigation on the river—certainly no amount commensurate with the expenditure of funds that has been made during the last 20 years. I am "from Missouri" on the question of navigation on the Missouri River. I think it would be a fine thing if it would develop to the point where it would completely pay its way. I question whether this point will be reached and I question the engineering feasibility of producing a navigable channel that will encourage the use necessary to offset the cost. I especially question the open-channel methods now in use.

From strictly an engineering point of view, the present laws pertaining to power distribution are not satisfactory. The shortest possible transmission distance from the point of power production to the point of consumption is the situation which the engineer likes to see. Distribution losses can thereby be kept to a minimum, and the maximum amount of power reaches the consumer. Under existing law, public bodies such as municipal distributing bodies and power cooperatives receive first priority in the purchase of federally produced power. Hence, in order to reach these public bodies, longer transmission distances than would otherwise be necessary will frequently be encountered. I further question the adequacy of these laws from a political and social standpoint.

I am amazed at the popular misconception as to what the Missouri Basin development program will accomplish. There appears to be a feeling that a huge expenditure of Federal money in the basin will automatically insure prosperity regardless of how the money is spent. Some people pretend to believe that the program will eliminate droughts, floods, blizzards, and grasshoppers. People of high standing have been led to believe that construction of reservoirs in the upper part of the basin will almost entirely eliminate floods in the lower river. They consider that the upper States are making considerable sacrifice for States in the lower part of the basin. As a matter of fact, if all the reservoirs planned outside of Missouri and Kansas were constructed, the people in the lower part of the basin would find it difficult to notice any difference in floods. I say this in spite of the large flood reductions that have been accredited to the Fort Peck Reservoir. Any honest engineer who knows anything about the hydraulic characteristics of floods would not claim that a given reduction of peak flow at a certain reservoir site would carry undiminished for hundreds of miles downstream.

There is widespread misunderstanding as to what a soil-conservation and improved land-management program in the basin can accomplish. The major physical benefit from a good land-management program accrues to the land on which the program is placed and not from any offsite benefits.

I wish to repeat that statement. The major physical benefit from a good land-management program accrues to the land on which the program is placed and not from any off-site benefits. If there were 100-percent participation in an optimum land management program throughout the basin, the effect on floods in the lower main stem of the Missouri River and its major tributaries would be so small as to not be measurable. There are technical computations and results of research which will verify this but which I do not have time to elaborate on here. Please do not get the impression that I am opposed to such a program. I strongly recommend that an improved land use program be initiated, or perhaps I should say accelerated at the earliest possible date. I urge this because of the great benefit such a program would be to the land on which it is placed and not primarily for any off-site benefits it would bestow.

Some experts, in their enthusiasm for "holding the water where it falls," may run head-on into State water laws in the upper States of the basin. Some of the water they expect to trap and use where it falls may already be allocated by law to downstream users.

The destructive effect of silt on some of the large reservoirs planned and under construction should not be minimized. However, I find that the seriousness of this problem is frequently very much exaggerated. As far as possible, soil should be retained in its original position on the land. Beyond this point it is frequently more economical from every point of view to trap it in large reservoirs than it is to install costly supplemental works to keep it out of the reservoirs.

Perhaps this paper has been pointed too much toward criticism of the Missouri Basin development program without much of a constructive nature. However, the magnitude and economic implications of the program seems to call for all the honest and straightforward thinking of everyone. I feel that we have not done enough of this. The Missouri River Basin program, if properly planned and executed, can be of tremendous benefit to the national economy. The mere expenditure of Federal money will not insure its success. Unless the States and the people of the basin recognize and assume their responsibilities rather than depend entirely on the Federal Government, the program will be a miserable and costly failure. The economy of a region depends on the resources of that region and how fully and wisely the people use those resources. Government can provide some stimuli and assistance, but beyond certain limits it is ineffective. It is ultimately up to the people of the basin to "carry the ball."

Socialism in Britain at Crisis Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain entitled "The Crisis of British Socialism," which appears in Human Events for August 24. This is a challenging article and I commend it to all Members of the House:

The next parliamentary election in Great Britain will be one of the most interesting in the long constitutional history of that country. The verdict of the British people at the polls will either accelerate, or retard, the peaceful social revolution that has been taking place since the Labor Party won its sweeping majority in the House of Commons by the election of 1945. More than that, the election will almost certainly take place in the shadow of a major financial crisis.

On the outcome of this crisis may depend the feasibility of the middle way represented by democratic socialism, of which Britain is the outstanding example today. American experience proves that economic individualism works, in the sense of providing a rising standard of living for people living under government by consent. How far can this individualism safely be adulterated with collectivist innovations?

The ability of the Soviet regime to survive civil war, famine, and an extremely destructive foreign invasion also indicates that communism, with its combination of one-party political dictatorship and all-out economic collectivism, is a tough and durable system. Whatever may be the moral verdict on the Communist method of rule by terrorism and propaganda, that method has yielded practical results.

British socialism, as practiced by the present Labor government, stands between the American and Soviet models. It has administered a fairly large dose of nationalization to coal mines, the Bank of England, gas and electricity, railways and road transport, with the iron and steel industry next on the list. But more important than these nationalization moves, some of which the Conservatives would not undo if they were returned to office, are two other aspects of British socialism: (1) Government planning and (2) social and economic leveling. A British economist with a sense of history, Honor Croome, sums it up in a recent issue of Lloyd's Bank Review:

"The economic life of the citizen is less under his own control than in the days of the Tudors. Even Tudor officialdom is not recorded to have ordered the ploughing-in of a crop ready for harvest, because its sowing had not been sanctioned, nor made it an offense for a man to give a neighbor a pitcher of milk, nor forbidden him to repair his own house with his own hands. No guild tyranny was tighter than that of the officially encouraged closed shop, no sumptuary law more explicit than many prohibitions of nonutility—and no official debasement of coinage more effective, as a barrier against the winning of independence through personal savings, than the fiscal policies of today."

II

A tremendous economic leveling has taken place as a result of British fiscal and social policies. In a budget of a little over $13,-

000,000,000 about $1,800,000,000 goes for food subsidies. This means a big transfer of money from the pockets of the well-to-do, who pay a higher share of the taxes, to those of the poor, who benefit most by the policy of keeping the price of rationed foodstuffs to the consumer well below the cost of production.

Appropriations for social services, including the much publicized free medical treatment, amount to about $2,500,000,000. Here again the industrial working class benefits at the expense of the middle and well-to-do classes. It is the poor who get the advantage of free dentures, spectacles, and operations. Those who were accustomed to pay for their own medical care in the past find that under the new scheme they often receive more cursory and less satisfactory treatment.

One could cite many other examples of the tendency to favor the industrial workers at the expense of the rest of the population. Factory canteens receive twice the meat allowance of ordinary restaurants. Rationing, enforced severely and generally, cuts far more into the living standard of the middle than of the working class.

A friend in London tells me that the one-third of Britain's population in the top economic brackets has lost a good deal, that the bottom one-third has gained a good deal, and that the middle one-third has lost a little. I have tried out this estimate on a number of Englishmen of varying political and economic viewpoints. All of them agree that it is a pretty fair summary of the situation.

It is easy to go astray in judging British political prospects by listening only to the grievances of the top one-third. From the standpoint of the average industrial worker, the labor government, up to the present time, has done a pretty good job. There is extremely little unemployment. In fact, there is a conspicious labor shortage in mining, textiles, and agriculture. The wage earner knows that no matter how slack he may be, or how many days he may take off to attend football games and dog races, he is not likely to be fired.

He is the main beneficiary of an ambitious and expensive program of social welfare measures. The restrictions which are so galling to people in the middle- and upper-income brackets do not affect the wage earner very much. He is seldom interested in traveling abroad, or in building or repairing his own house or in starting his own business. Like everyone else, the wage earner (and his wife) would appreciate fewer queues, more meat and sugar, and a wider variety of goods in the shops. But the Labor Party slogan, "Fair shares" has an alluring sound. If the average man does not get everything he wants, he has the satisfaction of knowing that rationing puts everyone in the same boat.

Up to recently, therefore, the Labor Party, in looking ahead to the next election, could count with reasonable confidence on holding the majority of the industrial working-class vote. This vote is very important in highly urbanized Britain. One still finds in labor circles a disposition to claim victory at the polls, though by a much more modest majority than the party won in 1945.

III

But now a new factor has entered the British political picture. It may confound all political calculations of the moment and it certainly poses some very searching questions as to the viability of British socialism as an economic system.

This new factor, of course, is the crisis in balance of payments between Britain and the sterling area, on the one side, and the dollar area, represented by the United States and Canada, on the other. Despite the post-war credit of $3,750,000,000 from the United States, and a similar smaller advance from Canada; despite the $1,250,000,000 of ERP aid given to Britain in the first year of the Marshall plan and the prospect of $940,000,000 more in the second year, the British financial cupboard has become extremely bare of dollars and gold. The deficit with the dollar area has been running at the rate of $2,400,000,000 a year, which is not nearly covered by present emergency economies.

Already the situation is proving far more grave than the British Government has as yet brought itself to admit. For a currency in a weak position, as sterling obviously is now, is like a bank of doubtful solvency. Everyone tries to get his money out. Under present conditions every firm, and every individual who can avoid or delay taking payment in sterling, will do so. Of course, that aggravates the strain.

If the depletion of British reserves goes on, even at the present rate, some of the trump cards of Labor Party propaganda will be canceled out. A low standard of living will become lower if and as purchases of North American wheat, tobacco, and oil are further curtailed. Full employment will be threatened if purchases of cotton and other essential raw materials cannot be financed.

IV

It is significant that the British financial crisis was first reflected in a dispute over the functioning of inter-European payments. Sir Stafford Cripps was on one side. The United States and most of the continental governments were on the other. It would take too long to explain all the technical points involved in the dispute. But the central issue was simple. It was whether the sterling grants which Great Britain, in consideration of much larger dollar aid from America, would make to France and some other European countries, should or should not be transferable. The prospective recipients of the grants wanted to use the sterling where they could buy most advantageously. Cripps insisted that the sterling should be spent in Britain.

Back of this argument lay the grim fact that British goods, in many cases, are selling above competitive prices. High taxation, expensive social services, slack labor discipline, easy-going management, have all contributed to this situation. Hence the British tendency to shy away from all proposals to make sterling more convertible and to shelter behind bilateral trade deals.

Now if Britain were a self-sufficient country it could redistribute wealth and carry out social experiments without worrying too much about its level of costs. But Britain is very far from being self-sufficient. A quarter of its production must be sold abroad. Neither empire preference nor precarious barter arrangements offer an effective substitute for ability to buy freely in dollar markets.

And so one is brought squarely to the most important question confronting Britain today. Does national socialism offer sufficient incentives, positive and negative, to enable Britain to hold its own, and pay its way, even on a reduced standard of living, in a competitive world? Under the individualistic system there is the positive incentive of a higher standard of living for hard and efficient work. There is the negative pressure of fear and unemployment.

The Soviet Union uses the piecework and bonus system, confers titles of industrial distinction, and puts slackers in concentration camps. In Britain these incentives and pressures do not exist, or have been greatly weakened. Everyone is assured a low minimum standard of living. No one can hope to rise much above that standard. Can British socialism work out adequate emotional and material incentives that will make for stronger labor discipline and more effective work? It is not the sort of question that can be answered by an election.

When Is Good Behavior?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial by Isaac Don Levine which appeared in the August issue of the magazine Plain Talk. In this editorial, Mr. Levine endorses the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], which would bar Supreme Court Judges from acting as character witnesses in criminal cases. The editorial follows:

WHEN IS GOOD BEHAVIOR?

The United States Constitution provides that "the judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts shall hold their offices during good behavior." When Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley F. Reed appeared as character witnesses for Alger Hiss at his recent trial before a lower court, the propriety of their conduct was widely questioned. In the Congress, Representative KENNETH B. KEATING introduced a bill barring Supreme Court Justices from testifying in the future on the reputation of any individual.

There is little doubt that the American people overwhelmingly share the apprehensions of Mr. KEATING that the behavior of Messrs. Frankfurter and Reed set a precedent for the denigration of the Supreme Court in the Nation's eyes. But even more momentous is the question whether the action of the two judges had not been designed to influence the course of justice by overawing both the jury and the presiding judge with their presence.

And that raises a profound constitutional question, which has never been fully resolved. Did Justices Frankfurter and Reed violate the good-behavior clause?

In a remarkable article on the Impeachment of John Pickering, which appeared in the American Historical Review last April, the author, Prof. Lynn W. Turner, poses this problem:

"How can a Federal judge be removed from the bench for disabilities which do not warrant impeachment but which render him unfit to perform his duties?"

Judge Pickering, one of the great patriots of the Revolution, was removed from office on the ground of habitual drunkenness and mental derangement, as conduct contravening good behavior.

It should be clear that when a Supreme Court Justice happens to be the witness to a crime or an accident, his testimony in subsequent court proceedings would be vital to the dispensation of justice. It could be maintained with equal force that when a Supreme Court Justice happens to be the sole witness as to the reputation of a defendant, his testimony would be indispensable to a just verdict.

No such conditions entered into the strange conduct of Justices Frankfurter and Reed when they rushed to the aid of Alger Hiss. The defendant had had as character witnesses a former Presidential candidate, John W. Davis, and a galaxy of other notables.

Far be it from us to suggest anything like impeachment proceedings against the two Supreme Court Justices for their quixotic act. Professor Turner, however, cites the case of Judge Ritter in 1936, who was convicted on the ground that he had brought his court into scandal and disrepute. And the late Senator Hiram Johnson claimed that

the decision made misbehavior an impeachable offense.

To the lay mind, the constitutional provision of good behavior seems immensely elastic. To define "good behavior" legally would be an immense task for great jurists.

But in the court of public opinion good behavior is easily registered. When members of an institution hallowed by tradition behave in a manner which outrages the best sentiments of the people, then it is manifest that the spirit of the constitutional injunction has been violated by Justices Frankfurter and Reed.

The Hawaiian Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the Hawaiian strike situation. I asked to have the name of the writer withheld.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You may have received protesting letters from these islands, as to your stand in the matter of our waterfront strike, but let me hasten to say that here is at least one letter of great appreciation for the strong and sensible position you hold in the premises.

I am not a union man (government employed), and I hold no ill-feeling toward employers, generally. But the employer situation here in the islands is something else. There is a strong hangover of paternalism bordering on feudalism plus a lot of British influence. Many of our big business leaders still speak with the drawl of England. They are British-minded; some are not even naturalized citizens, and most of them hold to the old English attitude of the caste system. Do you think they would dignify the laboring man by allowing him equal rights in good American arbitration practices? Oh no. That wouldn't be cricket, don't-cha-know. A lot of old British common law is mixed in with Territorial law, so that legal practices here sometimes are astonishing. And invariably they favor certain classes of citizenry—the so-called upper-crust. A poor, illiterate native was recently given 20 years in prison for stealing some sardines and crackers (being hungry) from a grocery store; another local native received similar sentence for forging a $25 check. (What was stolen and the amounts may not be exact, but they are indicative. I have forgotten the exact details.) But the point is that poor fellows get it in the neck while big-shot offenders get off lightly. Recently a large surplus sales store went broke and the owners were hauled into court by the referee in bankruptcy. It was proved that the business was crooked to the core—books were doctored, accounts juggled unmercifully, transferred accounts—in short more than one-half million dollars was milked—stolen—to be blunt Nothing as yet has been done to the culprits. They are free—on the mainland enjoying life. While poor devils here are serving 20 years for stealing $25.

But to get back to the waterfront strike. It is more than a mere disagreement between employers and stevedores. It is a concerted effort to bust or cripple unionism in the islands. The stevedoring firms are being helped by the pineapple, sugar, Matson interests—all have ganged up to smash unionism or deal it a crippling blow. While this is possibly an opinion (on my part) I am sure investigation will show that (through the employers' council) all the big companies and many small outfits are joined in a master effort to break the union.

Hence, no matter whether we may like the ILWU or Harry Bridges, we must overlook personal factors and be alert to what is going on toward destroying unionism—as a defense weapon of the common worker. Cleverly and in a foul manner, the employers are playing up communism and hatred for Bridges to gain their end. The principle involved is far greater than Bridges or the trumped-up cry of communism. And you may be sure that there are many people here who are thankful that you see through the smoke screen and that you have the courage to tell the employers and Mr. Steele facts which are so true that they burn like a branding iron. The employers do not want to settle—yet. They intend to drag it out to greater lengths—sickening the people, winning local support—while all the time protesting how they abhor the situation. The employers could have employed mediation or arbitration the first few days—and things could have been settled. But that wouldn't achieve their purpose. They intend to utilize special laws (passed by bootlicking legislators)—laws which patently are intended to break the union. (Recently passed Territorial laws.)

Pardon this lengthy chat—but I felt impelled to let you know that many of us are grateful for your fine stand in this fight. It is satisfying to know that we have men in Congress who have the courage to stand up for what is right—even if it entails a fight with big interests.

This letter need not be acknowledged or answered. You are too busy. Simply accept it as a pat on the back or a hearty handshake from Hawaii.

Most sincerely yours.

Echoes of Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, now that we have temporarily embarked upon financial imperialism—dollar diplomacy—it may be well to pause before it is too late.

The path that we are now traveling will end in national suicide. It is a path strewn with the wreckage of nations. It is a beaten path that has in the past and will again lead to destruction. I pray that we may still recover our better sense and judgment.

I include in my remarks a poem that should appeal to all intelligent and thinking people. Here is the poem:

ECHOES OF EMPIRE—GLASGOW FORWARD

"Behold our progress!" the Assyrian cried,
viewing beneath the brilliant blazing sky
The lofty towers, the walls of sun-baked brick, the brazen gates, the ponderous ramparts high,
The roll of chariots in the narrow ways; the glittering crowd close thronging mart and street,
The gleaming flash of spears beneath the sun, the shaking tread of conquering legions' feet—
"Behold our progress and enlightenment! We are the people! We shall surely stand."
—And speaking thus they passed.

The moon shines cold above the desert sands,
The thin winds whimper lone across the waste;
The shifting dunes long since have rolled and closed
Above dead cities ages-long effaced.
The monuments and towers are overthrown,
The tablets moulder in the sword blade's rust,
And all the glory that the past has known
Has crumbled, like the builders—into dust.

"Behold our progress!" Hear proud Egypt's boast: temples and pyramids and painted stone;
Column on column reared beside the Nile; throughout the world for wealth and science known;
Rich galleys clustering on the river's flood; learning and wisdom sheltered in the halls,
Vast monuments of power on every hand; ranked gods of stone and massive sculptured walls—
"Behold our progress and enlightenment! We are the people! We shall surely stand."
—And speaking thus they passed.

The jackal whines among the fallen stones,
The painted tombs no longer guard their dead;
The desert winds disport with mummy dust;
The gods are fallen and their glory fled.
The bats at even flitter forth from holes
Wherein aged shreds of human clay are thrust;
The silken sails and gilded glory poles
Have crumbled, like the builders—into dust.

"Behold our progress!" Hear the tramp of Rome: legion on legion on the stone-paved ways,
Clatter of chariots; tread of marching feet; standards ablaze beneath the morning rays;
Mistress of all the world, from pine to palm; art and adornment filched from every land;
Monarchs in chains behind her chariot wheels; states that pay tribute to a conqueror's hand—
"Behold our progress and enlightenment! We are the people! We shall surely stand."
—And speaking thus they passed.

The broken pillars in the Forum lie,
And shattered fragments strew the Circus floor.
The loathsome beggars cluster in the shade
Of walls whose echoes legions wake no more.

The brazen bucklers turn no foeman's steel.
The short, keen sword no longer makes its thrust,
And all the empire that hailed Caesar lord
Has crumbled, like its builders—into dust.

"Behold our progress!" Emperor, King, and Czar: navies far flung and battle flags unfurled;
Europe a checkerboard of blood and flame; their legions mustering throughout the world.
Hear once again, while red the ruin roars, the puny voices shouting each to each,
Each on the other shouldering the blame; hear once again the weary, age-old speech—
"Behold our progress and enlightenment! We are the people! We shall surely stand."
—And as they speak they pass.

The dreadnaughts fade beneath the Channel tide,
The cities flame; the fields are black with dead.
The highways shake beneath the tread of hosts
Pouring to meet the flame-shot storm of lead.
Women, sad-eyed, the hushing hamlets fill;
The needy seek in vain starvation's crust;
And all the gain of hard-wrought centuries
Is crumbling, with its builders—into dust.

Zionism and American Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Alfred M. Lilienthal is a Washington lawyer. In the September issue of Reader's Digest he has an article entitled "Zionism and American Jews." He is a Jew and proud of it, and his article presents a different view than that of the American Zionist. I am extending his article in the RECORD at this point in order that his view may be presented to the Members of Congress and the people of this country:

ZIONISM AND AMERICAN JEWS

I—ISRAEL'S FLAG IS NOT MINE

(By Alfred M. Lilienthal)

DEAR MOTHER: I brought you my hurts and troubles when both they and I were little: in that same spirit I bring them to you today.

Only last year a new white flag with single blue six-pointed star was hoisted to a mast many thousands of miles away on the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea. This flag of Israel is the symbol of a new nationalist state, with its own government, army, foreign policy, language, national anthem, and oath of allegiance.

And this new flag has brought every one of us 5,000,000 American citizens of the ancient faith of Judah to a parting in the road.

Judaism, I have felt, was a religious faith which knew no national boundaries, to which a loyal citizen of any country could adhere.

By contrast zionism was and is a nationalist movement organized to reconstitute Jews as a nation with a separate homeland. Now that such a state exists, what am I? Am I still only an American who believes in judaism? Or am I—as extreme Zionists and anti-Semites alike argue—a backsliding member of an Oriental tribe whose loyalty belongs to that group?

Let us start, Mother, with how I feel about this new State of Israel. I wish it well. I hope that several hundred thousand suffering displaced persons will find in it a happy home. I hope it will prosper as a center of democracy in the Middle East. But—

When its flag was first raised on May 14, 1948, I had no impulse to dance in the street with hysterical joy, as did so many in New York and London. For I was born and remain an American. I have no ties with, no longings for, and feel no responsibilities to Israel. And I believe that the future happiness of the Jews in America depends on their complete integration as citizens of this—our true—country.

I am sure that if we Jews as a group are persuaded to divide that love which people normally give to their native land, it can lead only to disaster.

The Irish? They are a nation and judaism is a religion. Irishmen here have left Ireland only in recent generations. The Jews left Palestine in Roman times, and have come here from every European country.

My one and only homeland is America. I am proud of my belief in the age-old Judiac concept of one God in Heaven and one humanity here below. But my faith does not pull me into a feeling of narrowly tribal kinship with all others who worship God in this way. Whenever I read of Americans singing the Hatikvah, Israel's national anthem, or see youth groups raising Israel's flag beside the Stars and Stripes, I am outraged. For Israel's flag and anthem are symbols of a foreign state; they are not mine.

The most powerful weapon which Zionism is using on Americans of Jewish faith is its outward cloak of humanitarianism. The argument runs that Israel was set up primarily as a haven for the persecuted, the homeless, so why should we be critical?

Mother, the truth is that Israel was not created primarily for displaced persons. Instead, article 3 of its proposed constitution proclaims it to be "the national home of the Jewish people." Meaning, Mother, you and me. As early as 1917 Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first President, was proclaiming: "We have never based the Zionist movement on Jewish suffering in Russia or any other land. These sufferings have never been the mainspring of zionism."

Rabbi Abba H. Silver, a recent head of the American Zionists, declared: "We must stand foursquare on the proposition that zionism is not an immigration or a refugee movement, but a movement to rebuild the Jewish state for the Jewish nation in the land of Israel."

And what is the attitude of Israel toward those who adhere to the faith of judaism but are citizens of other countries? Our "nationality" they insist is Jewish, no matter under what flags we were born; and, since we are not in Israel, we live "in the Diaspora," which is to say in exile, And their plans for us?

"We must," explained Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, in his first speech after the Israeli elections, "save the remnants of Israel in the Diaspora. We must also save their possessions. Without these two things, we shall not build this country."

So the vast Zionist propaganda machine strives to cement national ties between Israel and all persons of Jewish faith. And sending money to Israel is only a small part of our supposed obligation. The deeper objectives are given by Dr. Margoshes, an executive of the American section of the Jewish Agency, as being:

"—to Zionize world Jewry * * * to establish Zionist hegemony over the developing Jewish communities throughout the world."

Daniel Frisch, newly elected president of the American Zionist, feels that "the American Jewish community will soon arrive at the inevitable conclusion that the all-day school plus a chain of summer camps is the only solution to the problem," and that "we ought to be able to send to Israel American-bred young people who want to live as Jews minus the hyphen under the smiling skies of the reborn Israel. Our task has not ended with the birth of the Jewish state. It has but begun."

Have these misguided zealots forgotten the indignation which was aroused in America in the thirties, when the Bundists tried to tell Americans of German ancestry that they owed loyalty to Germany, and set up in America youth camps dedicated to German culture?

Today we see Zionists boasting of Jewish political strength. Zionist picket lines around British consulates, Zionists demonstrating against Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin when he arrives here to sign the Atlantic Pact, New York stores plastered with posters screaming "Do not buy British-made goods."

Are these people acting as Americans? Europe's recovery through the Marshall plan is the keystone of our bipartisan foreign policy, which the Communists are trying to sabotage. Any boycott of British goods, organized or unorganized, helps this destruction. Now I know these Zionists were not consciously trying to tear down American foreign policy, but their actions were the inevitable result of living under the discipline of two nationalisms. Were Hitler alive today, how he would laugh.

The plain fact is that we Jews are not a race and we should not let the Zionists persuade us that we are. Proof to the contrary lies in Palestine, plain for all to see.

You had my letter, mother, from my Army furlough there. I was second to none in my enthusiasm for what my coreligionists had done—for a desert brought to bloom, for clean new cities rising out of age-old sand dunes. All of these wonders had come to pass while only a few fanatics talked of statehood. One evening I went to see a performance of an opera in Jerusalem. In that theater lobby you could distinguish almost at a glance the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazic Jew from Poland, the Spanish-speaking Sephardic Jew from north Africa or Turkey, the German Jew, Jews from a score of countries—all differing in dress, language, manners, and mental attitudes. I had visual proof of the arguments of anthropologists who laugh at the notion of a distinct Jewish race.

Anyone who tells me those foreign Jews are exclusively my people—that I should be closer to them than to Bob McCormick, the kid on the block with whom I used to play ball; or to Nick Galbraith, who roomed next to me at Cornell; or Dave DuVivier with whom I studied in law school—that man is talking dangerous nonsense.

I have also learned, Mother, that segregation is not solely the fault of the other guy. Part of the responsibility is on our shoulders. True, the Jew is sometimes segregated by Christians, but it is also true that the Jew sometimes sets himself apart from Christians.

We have moved out of the ghetto, but sometimes scars of the long imprisonment remain. This is why many Jews even today feel at home only with other Jews. Many carry their Jewishness on their sleeves and are extremely self-conscious and sensitive to their separateness.

All of this I understand: most of it I forgive. After all, 6,000,000 Jews were wiped out by Hitler and anti-semitism does exist, even in America. Why should each of us not be at least a little sensitive? This I think most non-Jews understand. But when anyone criticizes, however mildly, either Zionism, the State of Israel or the hysterical behavior of some groups of Jews, we have no right to shout antisemitism.

In any religion one can find a small group of fanatics who hate those of other faiths. Such fanatics are not numerous or important. It is semitism—the constant effort of some Jews to assert themselves as Jews—and not their religion of judaism which feeds antisemitism.

No one knows better than you, mother, that I, too, suffered humiliation from being a Jew. I have felt the arrows of discrimination. In my deep hurt I have cried out. But when something goes wrong in my relations with non-Jews, I avoid the habit of thinking that it happened just because I am a Jew. Such self-pity is comforting, but it is usually wrong and therefore dangerous.

There is today a deep split among Americans of the Jewish faith. The Zionists are the more vocal; they have more organized political power. But they do not speak for all of us, and I hope not for most. On the other side there is, for instance, the American Council for Judaism, which insists that

the nationalism of Israel must be confined to the boundaries of that state. There are also countless other Jews without any affiliation who revere judaism as a religion and scorn to degrade it into a cheap racial nationalism which competes with their Americanism.

But when we protest the right of the Zionists to speak as American Jewry on the question of Palestine, we are told that Jews should not be disunited, must not fight among themselves on Palestine or any other issue. And if we still speak out against what we feel is a dangerous trend, we find ourselves reviled and ostracized as traitors. Coercion, often economic, frequently silences the freethinker.

But why should Americans of Jewish faith be any more united on questions of American foreign policy than are Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists?

Have we forgotten the words of Woodrow Wilson in 1915 when he warned all Americans: "You cannot become true Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American. And a man who goes among you to trade on your nationality is not worthy to live under the stars and stripes."

Politicians of both parties who in the last election played to the Jewish vote in connection with Israel will do well to reread those words.

The answer to bigotry and antisemitism does not lie in fanatical Jewish nationalism. Of course, the blowing up of the King David Hotel, the hanging of the two British sergeants, the assassination of Bernadotte, the massacre of Arab women and children at Dier Yasin were all acts of tiny groups. But they have weakened the moral and spiritual stature of the world's oldest religion. Israel's terrorist Beigin and Hollywood's Ben Hecht, who encouraged such lawlessness by saying, "Every time you let go with your guns at the British betrayers of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts"—such people are doing the Jews more harm than any words which Goebbels spoke.

There was no holiday in my heart, nor in that of the late Rabbi J. L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who said sadly, following that Hecht statement: "We had always thought that zionism would diminish antisemitism in the world. We are witness to the opposite."

All too many Christians have supported zionism because they felt that Jews, having been persecuted, should now have what they want—whether it is good or bad for them. Christian leaders can help us greatly. But Christian sympathy for Jews should be measured not in terms of support for Jewish nationalism in distant Israel but in accepting us as friends, neighbors, and first-class citizens of this our country. That is true liberal Christianity, and also, Mother, good judaism, that fine, old faith which you taught me as a little child.

Our Gold and Our Money and the Chinese Imbroglio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while the controversy concerning the Government program in China and the white paper is running through the press consideration should be given to just who we are dealing with in China and the "mysterious ways of the wily Chinee." It appears that things have turned out for us in China just about as we could expect when we entrusted our gold and money to the manipulation of the notorious Soong family of Chinese bankers and financiers who have annexed the Chinese military leader, Chiang Kai-shek, who married a Soong.

Doubtless the American taxpayer will be interested in the facts concerning China presented in the issue of the United States News and World Report for August 26, from which the following is taken:

United States gold worth $220,000,000 at the United States price of $35 per ounce was sent to China under the 1942 agreement. The Chinese Government announced that the gold would be sold to the public to check inflation. On the basis of information given to United States officials, what happened was this:

When the gold went on sale at a date and for a price secretly decided upon by high officials, the insiders and their agents were first in line. They carried suitcases full of inflated Chinese currency. They bought most of the gold, keeping it in the hands of a few while gold prices soared.

How much the insiders made out of this gold is a matter of guesswork. United States Treasury officials in China were told that about $100,000,000 worth of gold was sold to the public up to June 30, 1945, but they do not know what was sold after that date. In any event, the gold buyers did not take their gold out of the country immediately. Most of them used it as security for loans of cash which they used to speculate in rice and other foodstuffs, thus increasing inflation, defeating the very purpose for which the gold was intended. Gold prices in China recently reached $75 an ounce, while Chinese currency used to buy the gold vanished in runaway inflation. By the time the insiders realized their profits and left the country, the money they had made based on the original gold purchases ran into hundreds of millions of United States dollars.

United States dollars, actual currency totaling $200,000,000, were another source of private profit. The money was delivered to the Chinese Government as a fund for the eventual redemption in United States dollars of savings certificates and 10-year bonds issued by the Chinese Government. These were to be sold to the public.

American officials watching these securities found that they attracted few purchasers at first, though they sold at one-fifth the price of United States dollars on the free market. Apparently Chinese doubted that the securities would really be honored in United States currency when they matured. In addition, these securities drew only 4 percent interest while Chinese money lenders got as much as 40 percent.

Suddenly, however, the Government announced that the savings certificates, $100,000,000 worth of them redeemable within 3 years in United States dollars, had been oversubscribed. Informers told American officials that insiders had taken over the issue. As the insiders had known, these certificates were in fact redeemed in United States currency, while the provision for United States dollar redemption of the 10-year bonds was revoked in 1946.

Again, wealthy Chinese with connections in the Government had profited. Insiders who held bonds unloaded them before 1946. And again most of the profits in United States dollars remained inside the country, working against the Government's effort to stabilize China's currency.

Where Does Madness End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee are now holding hearings and are considering H. R. 5594, an administration bill. This bill would authorize the Export-Import Bank to guarantee loans for international profiteers in any venture that they may go into in foreign lands.

It is part of the disastrous policy—and I say disastrous deliberately—of our State Department to extend financial imperialism, to control the world by American dollars for our one-worlders.

It is unfortunate that the American people as a whole have no opportunity to become fully acquainted with these un-American proposals—proposals that will mean death to our Republic if not halted. It is unfortunate that these proposals were not made the issue in the 1948 Presidential campaign. It is regretted that the Republican Party did not make this the issue by selecting a candidate who believed in our Republic rather than in capitalistic imperialism of the world.

I shall close my remarks by inserting herein a statement submitted to the House Banking and Currency Committee by Harry S. Barger on behalf of the National Economic Council in opposition to H. R. 5594.

Here is the statement:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE BY HARRY S. BARGER ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 5594

This statement is submitted for and on behalf of the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y., in opposition to H. R. 5594.

The National Economic Council, Inc., is a nonprofit, private organization supported by contributions of its members and friends for the promotion of sound, economical, and constitutional government in the United States.

The broad, unusual policy proposed by the bill is "That it is the policy of the United States, in the interest of its people as well as that of other peoples, to promote the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world," and, if enacted into law, the Export-Import Bank of Washington will be empowered to guarantee United States private capital invested in productive enterprises abroad which contribute to economic development in foreign countries against risks peculiar to such investments.

The policy declared, and the objectives thereof, are most unusual; and a mere consideration of them may well be likened unto this Government guaranteeing the payment of a Mexican lottery ticket to every American who invests in one. The bill, undoubtedly designed to launch the President's bold, new plan for assisting the undeveloped areas of the world, is astounding in its provisions and implications. One must wonder why these things proposed for the Export-Import Bank (financed wholly with American dollars) might not well have been proposed for

handling by the World Bank for Reconstruction, which is financed with contributions of many nations, including the United States.

The National Economic Council, Inc., regards the objects and purposes of H. R. 5594 as extremely dangerous. In the very nature of things, as the bill recites—"risks peculiar to such investments"—the provisions will add immeasurably to the more than $425,368,000,000 of national debt and contingent liabilities which our people must pay and discharge. If the proposed foreign investments are good enough to make at all, why should not American investors in them be left to their own judgment and devices, as they have invariably been in the past? Why should all the American people, through the Government, guarantee them or any part of them, if they are worthy of American risk capital?

It is well known that Marshall-plan dollars have been, and are being, used to underwrite and finance the nationalization and socialization of the British economy, and perhaps the economies of other Marshall-plan nations. Marshall-plan dollars have also been used to finance the establishment of American business concerns which have found it necessary and expedient to move their factories abroad to avoid the ill effects of the State Department-negotiated reciprocal-trade agreements.

A leading economist of United Nations recently said that the United States has used its public funds in the establishment of industries for keen competition in foreign countries; and that the United States will be compelled, for a long time, to make up dollar shortages of foreign nations, and otherwise to finance such nations. A prominent European recently said, in substance: "Give me control of the finances of any foreign nation, and promise to make good any dollar shortages it has, and I will always be able to show you the dollar shortages."

H. R. 4495 names no countries in which the Export-Import Bank shall guarantee American investments; nor does it specify or limit the amounts of such investments the bank may guarantee—the sky appears to be the limit.

If enacted into law, H. R. 5594 may well become a vehicle to facilitate the further use of American capital for the nationalization, socialization, or communization of the industries and economies of other nations, and for building up a foreign-trade competition which cannot possibly be met by American capital and labor. The bill, along with other plans and schemes, past, present, and proposed, may well completely wreck our entire American economy and bankrupt this Nation.

Mrs. J. Preston Irwin, of Cleveland, Ohio, a member of the League of Women Voters and of the United Council of Church Women, favored and supported the Marshall plan and loans to Great Britain; but, after spending 6 months in observing the operations of the British labor government, she recently wrote:

"Could anything be more stupid than capitalism subsidizing socialism to prevent communism?"

That good lady's remarks seem most appropriate, inasmuch as there is little difference between making and guaranteeing American investments in foreign countries. It seems inevitable that any such guaranties will have to be paid by our taxpayers, since neither the Government nor the Export-Import Bank has funds other than those taken from our people.

It is high time that Congress begin to consider the interests of the people of the United States, and forget about foreign financial adventures which, of necessity, can but injure American industry and labor.

We respectfully urge that this committee report adversely on H. R. 5594.

HARRY S. BARGER.

National Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "National Farm Policy," which I delivered at the twenty-first annual session of the American Institute of Cooperation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Friday, August 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have wanted to discuss with you today national farm policy. Surely the events of the last few weeks indicate how widely the thinking of Members of Congress and farm leaders is apart and that fact should indicate to us the necessity for continued discussion of what a long-range agricultural policy and program should be.

The history of the development of agricultural thinking in this country could be carried back to those plantations established earliest on this continent. George Washington, one of the most progressive farmers of his day, in his last message to Congress advocated the use of public funds in aid of agriculture and urged the establishment of boards to collect and diffuse agricultural information.

We have traveled far since that early recommendation. The first steps were not too close together. Perhaps the most significant was the law of May 15, 1862, establishing a Department of Agriculture. The Morrill Land Grant College Act followed in about 2 weeks, granting to each of the States an amount of public land equal to 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative they had in the Congress.

There was a jump of 25 years before the passage of the Hatch Agricultural Experiment Stations Act and then another generation before the passage of the Smith-Lever Act to carry the knowledge developed by the Department, the land-grant colleges and the experiment stations into the farm home.

These are not all the bits and parcels of agricultural legislation, but they are parts and probably the most important parts in the development of our national farm policy. I mention them again so that in these days when prices of agricultural products and levels of agriculture supports seem to be of overwhelming interest we may remember that price is only one of the parts and sometimes one of the least significant parts of a real national program for the long-range welfare of the farmers of this land.

We have developed a great agriculture in America. We boast the most alert, democratic, progressive, and widely understood agricultural programs of any country on the earth. Our great agricultural plant developed without price support mechanisms. We built it by good farming practices, by the diffusion of sound agricultural theories which had already been tested in experimental plots under the direction of the land-grant colleges. We sent scientists into the far corners of the earth searching for varieties of wheat that could withstand rust, for breeds of livestock that would be thriftier than those developed on the broad pastures of our less populated land. We did it to a great degree by faith in our own strength, and in the days when agriculture was sick, by a reliance on the therapeutic value of hard work.

Yes, these were great steps in the development of a farm policy. The land-grant colleges, the experiment stations, the Extension Service—they served the country with extreme success as long as there was an abundance of land and fairly easy homesteading laws by which it could be obtained. A few policy refinements were added, such as the act of 1926 with reference to cooperative marketing, but in the main this great foundation of agricultural policy stayed fairly intact until the years of depression following the crash of 1929. There had been attempts to produce permanent price legislation. Twice the McNary-Haugen bills were passed by Congress only to receive a Presidential veto. It was not until the early thirties that substantial additions were made to the agricultural program. In quick succession there was passed the Farm Credit and the Federal Farm Mortgage Acts of 1933, the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Federal Crop Insurance Act, both of 1938.

Under the great charter of these progressive steps in farm legislation we began the creation of action agencies—the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration. We established four regional research laboratories which have proved their worth in pointing ahead to the utilization of science in the development of better varieties, in the prevention of disease and in the discovery of new uses for the output of our agricultural lands. In those 5 years we moved ahead several generations. We erected new structures on the foundations of earlier endeavor. We completed fairly well the blueprints for an agricultural program to be permanent in character and widespread in its application. We had almost all the basic legislation we thought we would need.

When we entered World War II we moved into new complications. For the first time agricultural policy became intermingled with the general economic policy of our country and agricultural prices got caught in the over-all pattern of price-control legislation. The country determined that there would be controls on inflationary pressures of the Second World War. I remember that the first day I was elected to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives I carried home with me a new national budget for the coming fiscal year and it totaled $109,000,000,000. The American Congress and the American people generally recognized that we could not spend money at the great rate implicit in those gigantic budgets without stirring up a velocity of trade that would set off cycles of inflation and, therefore, the Congress passed in the early days of the war price-control legislation.

The farmers of this Nation know that they do not get a very good break out of our economic system except in periods of war and the postwar years that follow. They saw their chance to pull themselves out of economic difficulties if prices could respond to the great stimulus of war orders, war production, high employment, and high wages, aided by a situation where consumer goods other than food would be difficult to obtain and hence the circulation of food dollars would be greatly accelerated. It would be the farmer's chance to reap a rich financial harvest, but to their credit it should be said that they allowed themselves to be put under controls in return for certain specific guaranties of postwar treatment.

You and I call those guaranties the Steagall legislation. It brought price supports to new commodities other than the basics. It provided those supports not only for the

war but for a period of 2 years following the termination of hostilities. That meant that until December 31, 1948, most agricultural products were guaranteed reasonably high levels of price support at a time when world food needs made possible and profitable almost unlimited production.

It was in that atmosphere that I began to have some responsibility for the development of national farm policy. There had been established within the Department of Agriculture a committee of postwar policy through whose studies it was hoped that we would be ready for the end of the war when it came and that we would have ready to lay before the Congress and the people of this country a blueprint which would show exactly how agriculture should perform in the years immediately following the war. Yet the weeks that followed VJ-day showed how futile that hope had been. We spent the crowded hours of long days in the Department of Agriculture answering questions as to why we did not remove all controls from this or that commodity. We wrestled with consumer subsidies on milk and feeder subsidies on cattle. We had to rush missions into conquered countries to estimate the need for food. The victor in a modern war does not rush in to seize the large booty that his conquest has brought him. He marches soberly into a devastated land whose industries and whose agriculture have both gone to pot, whose people are emaciated by the starvation and privation of war and whose governments are weak and unimaginative for the task of rebuilding their stricken lands. The victor suffers along with the vanquished at the end of the struggle, and our country was no exception to that rule. We were so busy trying to find food for hungry mouths that all of our well-laid schemes for shrinking American agriculture to the point where it had been prewar had to be laid on the shelf and virtually forgotten.

While we were busy with the burdens of trying to supplement the diets of several hundred million people and supply all the food to much of the population of many lands, there was one compensating factor and that was that we did not have to wrestle with the surpluses that could have quickly developed from the expanded output of our agriculture machine had it not been for extensive exports to other lands both to feed our expeditionary forces who still remained there and to discharge the responsibilities that came to us when our flag flew over such widely separated capitals as Rome, Italy, and Tokyo, Japan.

But the problem was there, even though temporarily crowded into the background. In those hours we reconstituted within the Department of Agriculture a committee on postwar program planning. We began to survey again our experience and to concern ourselves not so much with questions of price as with those programs for utilization of the soil and its products. Out of those studies came the Department's testimony before the congressional Committees on Agriculture on April 21 and October 6, 7, and 8, 1947.

It is not my purpose here to repeat the testimony I gave as Secretary of Agriculture at the opening of those hearings. But briefly I tried to evaluate (1) how much food and fiber we needed or could reasonably expect to use, (2) what those needs meant in terms of farm acreage and types of farming, and (3) what programs might be needed to help in the balance between commodity requirements and production.

I have reviewed that testimony recently and I am not too displeased with it. I suggested then that we needed to modernize the parity formula, that we should be careful not to establish a rigid system of price relationships, and that we needed to find means of encouragement for changes in production.

We had developed in the Department a chart that represented weeks of study. We had calculated the estimated utilization of American food. We had multiplied an assumed per capita food consumption against the millions who would be using that food. We tried to divide the total farm acreage of this country into the various types of soil and tried to calculate how many acres could use intertilled crops, how many could be planted to close-growing crops and summer fallow, how much should be in fruits, how much in pasture, how much in grazing lands and in forests, and we came out with the belief that if all the land of the United States was farmed as well as we knew how so that the soil might be conserved, so that there might be forests on the slopes of hills to hold back the run-off and prevent erosion—that if we did the best job of farming that we could for this generation and the generations yet to come, we had just about enough soil to do the job properly and we would have very little surplus for export to other lands.

I still think that the best national farm program is the steady effort to put into operation in this country is a pattern for agriculture that will achieve this balance between nutritional needs and efficient farming. With all the farm gadgets we have devised and with all the special price programs we can operate, I know of no program as useful and as satisfactory as one that conserves our soil and thereby brings into balance the production of food we need and the best use of the acres on which we grow it. That is our true national farm policy.

I know that there will be people who will say that such talk is all very good but that we have a problem. That is a problem of mounting surpluses. I know that those surpluses exist and that some of them, particularly those in cotton, corn, wheat, and probably potatoes, will be worse in 1950 than they have been in 1949. But I remember also that the continued high level of agriculture supports during the years following the termination of hostilities under the Steagall legislation was designed to give farmers a chance without excessive financial loss to readjust their production patterns and get back into a more realistic schedule for the cultivation of their lands.

It hasn't worked out that way. During the war and under the spur of high incentive prices, the farmers of this country increased their wheat plantings 11,000,000 acres over the prewar figures. We thought acreage would shrink in the year which followed the termination of Steagall supports but they haven't. Here are the figures: The average wheat acreage for the 10 years ending 1945 was 57,036,000; for 1948 the acreage was 71,904,000 and for 1949 the figure is 75,481,000. Those figures show the period of high rigid supports.

The story of corn is not quite so bad but the supply situation is discouraging. The average of corn plantings for the 10 years ending in 1945 was 90,083,000 acres; in 1948 the acreage was 85,439,000 and in 1949 it is 85,780,000. The size of this year's corn crop will doubtless boost the carry-over to 131 percent of normal.

The inevitable result of such plantings is that the chart we had prepared to show how there might be a balance between a high level of nutrition intake in this country and a high degree of conservation farming to provide the best utilization of land just didn't work out. We have a problem in surpluses and, as those surpluses mount, we have a definite problem in the development of the price-support program.

Farmers see the carry-over of cotton reaching 5,500,000 bales on August 1 of this year and threatening to be up to nine or ten million bales next year. They ask themselves if cotton prices will crash again as after the last war.

Only a few weeks ago representatives of livestock associations testifying before a Senate subcommittee predicted that regardless of what price-support program we have the price of hogs will break through the floors yet this fall. The result has been a steady and persistent discussion of price-support policies in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and over the country, and we seem to be little nearer a solution this week end than we have been for the past 8 months.

Therefore, I hope I may be excused if I devote a few minutes of this talk to farm-price supports. The very first question I want to put to you is this: Have we a policy in this country on price supports? Have we ever had a meeting of minds? I submit to you that we have not and that it is about time the farm leaders of this country, the farmers themselves and all of their friends try to get together in the achievement of some definiteness in that field.

The Department of Agriculture, as I have indicated, has been working on that problem steadily since the termination of the war. It was studied by congressional committees in hearings during 1947. The congressional committees themselves traveled over the country and interviewed farmers in every corner of the land during the summer of 1947. Both Senate and House committees tried to find out what the farmer was thinking about and what he wanted. As near as I can tell, the answer they brought back to Washington was that the farmers wanted 90 percent supports and few if any controls.

Well, that just won't work out. Of course every farmer in this land would like to have 90 percent and no controls if he thought it could go on forever and there would never be a day of reckoning. But it won't go on and it can't go on because by the very nature of things high rigid agricultural prices become in themselves incentives to production. You have great crops of cotton because the price is good. Land that would otherwise lie out of production stays in cotton and new areas are added every year. That story goes on in every crop all over the land.

So I say we should reach some decisions. Do we want rigid 90 percent supports? If we do, the Senate should pass the Gore bill and send it to the President for signature. I don't think we do. I don't think we can afford to pass a bill that does what the Gore bill attempts to do, namely, repeal the permanent Aiken legislation and provide a program for only 1 year, leaving us with another battle next year which just happens to be an election year. The plea will be made to continue it one more year and thus avoid election controversies. Then we will be close to a Presidential election and we can put it off for a couple of more years and by that time the surpluses built up by high rigid supports which become incentives to production will have swamped us and agriculture will be in trouble.

Do we want flexible price supports? I think we do. If we do, then we ought not to repeal the Aiken bill but we ought to try to improve it and we ought to use the work that we do on it to strengthen the tendency toward the enactment of farm price legislation on a permanent basis.

What ought we to do to the Aiken bill? I have tried to give my answer in the bill now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. We have retained a modernized parity formula from the Agricultural Act of 1948 but we have added a new scale of supports that start at 75 percent rather than 60 percent and go to a like 90 percent maximum. We have tried to build upon what the Congress has already enacted and in that fashion to set a precedent so that each new Congress will not try to undo what another

Congress has done except as experience proves the need for amendment or alteration.

I would like to go on but this is a meeting of the American Institute of Cooperation and you may expect me to say a word or two about your programs. However, it seems to me that this week you have covered that subject very well and as I go back over the talks that I made as Secretary of Agriculture, particularly one in Chicago and one at Everett, Wash., I think I have said everything that I need to say.

Briefly, I have said in plain English that I favor farmer cooperatives. I said at Everett with the full approval of President Truman that the Truman administration was for farmer cooperatives. I belong to the party which in the 1948 election won the Presidency and a clear majority of both Houses of Congress and that party said in its 1948 platform:

"We will encourage farm cooperatives and oppose any revision of Federal law designed to curtail their most effective functioning as a means of achieving economy, stability, and security for American agriculture."

The foundation for my belief in farmer cooperatives is that I am deeply devoted to the American system of free enterprise. In this whole Nation there are only 10,000,000 individual enterprises apart from corporations, and more than half of these individual enterprisers are farmers. So it is that the farmers are the very backbone of our individual free-enterprise system. That's the way we want it. That is America.

But there may be one note of warning that could be sounded which you would not misunderstand since it comes from a person who has many times shown himself a supporter of cooperative endeavor. I believe the time has come when it would be well to study carefully all the legislation now on the statute books of this country and see if the many laws of the Federal Government dealing with cooperatives should not be brought together in a single cohesive code.

For months now I have been suggesting to cooperative groups that they should insist upon a revision of the laws dealing with cooperatives. I know the dangers. You fear that someone will write into that legislation a restriction on your right to expand. You fear that someone is going to say to you that savings to your members must be paid out in dividends if you are to retain your tax-exempt status, that you cannot keep them and use them to build a capital structure. I suggest that therein is an issue which you and the Congress should solve at the earliest possible date.

I was surprised not long ago, after a talk to a group of farmers, to have numbers of them come to me and ask if I could not sponsor a law to make their cooperative pay them what they had coming. They pointed out that they had joined the cooperative to get dividends, but that the management was keeping all the money to build new plants. They asked me if there wasn't some law that said they had a right to the earnings and that these earnings should flow back to them from their own business.

In all seriousness let me suggest that you do not gain any ground by avoiding a legislative determination on the question of your right to use earnings for expansion. I cannot believe that the Congress would have much trouble with that problem, but I think you are jeopardizing the cooperative movement if you do not meet head-on this persistent clamor.

I think I know who finances it. I think I know who would like to see you out of business. When they try to put you out of business I am going to be on your side; but I say to you that if you are afraid the Congress and the courts will not sustain you in your position, then you should reexamine that position with great care. I only want in life what I can hold openly with the full knowledge of my friends and neighbors. If I have to have a tommy gun to protect it, someone else can have it, and the quicker he takes it, the safer my life will be.

The cooperative movement in this country should live, should prosper, and should expand. It must do that because the cooperative movement is a part of our national farm policy. Any farm policy worthy of discussion in America starts on the basis of promoting the welfare and continuance of the family-sized farm. The operation of cooperatives in this world of economic giants helps make possible the continuance of family-type farming. It is out of my deep concern for the establishment of that principle that I urge you today to take stock of where you are going, what the Congress is doing, and what the farmer himself will eventually be thinking and saying.

If the suggestion that I have made for redrafting the code under which cooperatives may operate strikes you as being extreme and illogical because it might reopen active warfare and might bring to a head many smoldering quarrels, let me remind you as I did a graduating class a few months ago that a very wise person once said, "If there be trouble, let it be in my time, that my children shall have peace."

General Dawes at 84

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, former Vice President Charles Gates Dawes celebrated his eighty-fourth birthday last Saturday. General Dawes and the Senator from Illinois have been friends for the past 25 years. A very interesting article, entitled "General Dawes at 84," was written by Bascom N. Timmons, and published in the New Orleans States of recent date. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL DAWES AT 84

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

The man who entered the American political scene longer ago than any living man is 84 years old today. Former Vice President Charles Gates Dawes, quietly observing the day at his suburban Chicago home, is in excellent health. He goes to his desk in his big Chicago bank every day, presides over the meetings of its board, of which he is chairman, and engages in a multiplicity of other activities.

The man who was Comptroller of the Currency—then a one-man Federal Reserve System—at 31, went on to be a general and purchasing agent for the AEF in the First World War, as first Budget Director established the budget system in the United States Government, was Chairman of the Reparations Commission and originator of the Dawes plan for reparations, Vice President of the United States, Ambassador to Great Britain, and first President of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He declined Cabinet posts on several occasions and but for the fact he deferred to a friend probably would have been the Republican Presidential nominee in 1928.

Dawes came into the political arena at 29 and in a hot spot. He was picked by Mark Hanna to bring in the Illinois delegates for William McKinley as the Republican Presidential candidate. The importance of Illinois was due to the fact not only that it had the third largest number of delegates of any States, but psychologically it was more important, because first of all the States it elected delegates and the early bird winner there would have vast advertising.

Dawes faced obstacles. He had come to Illinois from Nebraska less than a year before and had never voted there. Moreover the State machine was behind Senator Shelby M. Cullom as a favorite son Presidential candidate. Dawes whipped an organization of amateurs and outsiders into shape and wound up with 46 of the 48 Illinois delegates.

Hanna gave Dawes all the help possible in Illinois. But Hanna had his hands full elsewhere. McKinley was a long shot opposed by Platt, Quay, and all the bosses.

Two weeks after McKinley's nomination Dawes sat in a seat in the Democratic National Convention and heard his old friend, William Jennings Bryan, make his cross of gold speech and stampede the convention into nominating him. Dawes had called the second nomination right. Weeks before when all the speculation was that the Democrats would choose Bland, of Missouri; Boies, of Iowa; or Stevenson, of Illinois; Dawes had declared:

"If Bryan gets a chance to make a speech he'll win the nomination."

Dawes had been Bryan's earliest opponent in silver debates and knew what Bryan could do with an audience. Then as a top lieutenant in the Republican organization he did all he could to elect McKinley and defeat Bryan. When the victorious McKinley asked Dawes what place he preferred in the new administration he chose Comptroller of the Currency, the office having most to do with the subjects he had so often debated with Bryan.

Dawes became closer to McKinley than any man in Washington. He sat in the room with the family when McKinley died, the victim of an assassin's shot in Buffalo. His account of McKinley's death written at that time has never been printed. It is one of the finest pieces of writing I have ever seen. It is an entry General Dawes made in a diary he kept for many years.

Dawes left Washington at the death of his friend, the President, organized his bank and many other businesses and did not return here until he came to set up the budget in 1921. One of his close friends, Lt. John J. Pershing, had been another close friend at Lincoln and when 25 years later Pershing led the American Army overseas he had made Dawes its purchasing agent.

Another close friend of the late Gov. Frank O. Lowden, of Illinois, Dawes in 1928 stepped out of the race for the Republican Presidential nomination when he appeared the most likely nominee. Lowden had entered the race and Dawes would not oppose his friend.

Like his old Democratic friend, former Vice President John Nance Garner, Dawes had made few public statements in recent years. When this writer visited him for several days recently, General Dawes said he had been out of the limelight so long that many persons thought he was no longer living. He chuckled as he showed me a letter addressed, "To the executor of the estate of Charles G. Dawes."

Dawes cherishes his friendships. Some of his friends, like Bryan, were Democrats. When Dawes was Vice President and 2 months before the Commoner's death he attended a dinner to him in Washington and delivered a tribute to Bryan. Other close Democratic friends were the late Senator Atlee Pomerene, of Ohio, a schoolmate, and

Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas. He keeps in pretty close touch with Jesse H. Jones, one of his associates on the original RFC, and Owen D. Young, with whom he worked out the reparations plan.

Dawes, at 84, will have to live 12 more years to equal the life record of former Vice President Levi P. Morton, who died in 1920 at 96.

Former Vice President Garner will be 81 on November 22.

Former Vice President Stevenson lived to be 79 and died in 1914.

Former Vice President Fairbanks died in 1918 at the age of 66.

Former Vice President Marshall died in 1925 at 71.

State Department Criticism of Texas Railroad Commission on Reduction of Crude Oil Production Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter from the Honorable Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission, on the reduction of crude-oil production in answer to a criticism of the Department of State. This letter contains interesting information concerning oil.

Mr. Thompson is the outstanding petroleum expert in our Nation, and doubtless in the world.

Texas produces approximately one-fourth of all the oil in the entire world and one-half of the production in the United States. Our oil problem is different from any other State. The people of our State have confidence in the railroad commission and approve of the way production has been regulated by the commission.

The letter is as follows:

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., August 24, 1949.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: I notice that the State Department issued a statement in which they claim that Texas has arbitrarily reduced our production inordinately.

The Texas law requires that the railroad commission consider market demand in setting the allowable production in Texas. The statute specifically says that production in excess of transportation facilities or market demand is waste. This statute is solidly backed up by the facts, because crude unnecessarily in production, crude in excess storage quantities evaporates, and causes very real physical waste.

When the east Texas field was discovered and got into heavy production, the amount of oil that was produced from that field in the nature of a million barrels per day was so great that oil was stored everywhere in open earthen pits, and the market was deluged to such an extent that fields all over Texas were threatened with the necessity of premature abandonment and consequent total loss of the oil in those fields, because there was no market for the oil from these fields, and the realization for the oil was so small that it would not pay for cost of production.

The Texas oil industry was threatened therefore with staggering physical waste, and marginal production was doomed to premature abandonment, and total loss of the oil in wells producing, say, 10 barrels or less per day, which are in the majority.

The Legislature of Texas was called into a special session to deal with this problem, and passed the market-demand statute which I have referred to above. The law charges the Railroad Commission of Texas with the duty of ascertaining the market demand for Texas crude, which we do each month.

We find out what the market demand for the total State is, and then we allocate ratably and fairly to each of the fields of the State that field's proper proportion of the market demand for crude for the ensuing month, and then the oil that is allocated to each particular field is, in turn, prorated among the wells of that particular field under a formula which has been arrived at in each field by evidence adduced at a hearing called for that purpose, at which the operators, with their engineers, show the commission by sworn testimony how best fairly to prorate the oil among the wells of the field. This process has worked so well in practice that there are no unconnected wells in the State of Texas where the distance to major pipe lines is not so great for the amount of oil available, and even in the rare instances where there is no pipe line, there is market for the oil from these unconnected wells by trust to a pipe line.

This was one of the major problems in conservation of oil; namely, to give each well its fair share of the market so that every producer, large and small alike, could have some outlet each day for his oil as it was produced.

Under this method since the law was passed, Texas market demand has increased steadily from 870,000 barrels per day to around 2,000,000 barrels per day, and we have had a healthy, expanding, profitable oil producing industry in this State which, in a large measure, as you know, supports the economy of our State.

By reason of 10 years of strict conservation and proration of oil before Pearl Harbor, Texas was able, by reason of her reserve daily producing ability, to furnish 80 percent of the war oil. There was never a call made upon Texas for oil but what we fulfilled it in full. As a matter of fact, we were criticized by PAW for producing more oil than they—PAW—asked for. We did this intentionally so that we would never be caught short on oil, feeling that we knew full well that if we ever were short in filling our requirements as indicated by PAW, that under the war powers they would take over the production control of oil in this country. I believe we were able to forestall that unfortunate contingency.

The States proved, through the war, that State conservation officials could properly conserve and prorate oil production for the protection of our Nation in time of emergency. We have it on General Marshall's authority that the oil producers and the oil industry fulfilled its mission during the war.

When VJ-day came, the Texas Railroad Commission felt that the enormous requirements for war oil would drop off sharply, and we accordingly reduced Texas production promptly, so as not to be deluged in a sea of unwanted oil. Then later when the storage figures indicated that more oil was needed, we promptly increased the oil allowable month by month, until it reached 2,500,000 barrels per day. This resulted in the year 1948 of storage increasing in the United States, crude and products, by more than 250,000 barrels per day, until along in December 1948 the crude-storage figures reached 274,000,000 barrels, and products figures correspondingly high.

The winter of 1948–49 proved to be exceedingly mild and accumulated stocks did not move out for heating purposes as was normally expected. The buyers of crude were demanding that less crude be produced and were telling us in open hearing, called for the purpose each month, that unless production were reduced, they would be compelled to prorate their pipe-line take. In other words, they would not buy, and oil producers do not keep oil on hand, and in fact, they have no facilities for keeping oil on hand. The producers simply have stock-tank facilities on their leases to handle current production. They depend upon the pipeline buyers to take their oil daily as produced.

The Railroad Commission of Texas, according to evidence which we took each month, successively reduced the allowable in Texas each and every month from December until August 1949, always supplying all the oil that anyone would buy, provided the spread is ratable. It must be remembered that the buyers of crude always would prefer to buy from those fields in which they themselves have major interests or they prefer to buy from those fields in which they have nearby refineries or from those fields which give them the most desirable crude from a refining standpoint. This is called selective buying which, if permitted, would give all the market to certain fields and leave other fields with no market at all, which would not be legal—it would not be fair proration. The Railroad Commission of Texas has insisted that the buyers spread their demands over the entire State so that every oil field in Texas can share ratably in the market demand.

We held a hearing for the specific purpose of ascertaining what was the proper amount of crude oil to have on hand for adequate working stocks and the highest figure that anyone indicated for crude oil was 268,000,000 barrels. Many operators and buyers indicated a much smaller figure, but the point is there was always more oil on hand in storage than the highest figure indicated.

The latest figures which I have from the Bureau of Mines is their release of August 19, 1949, Weekly Crude Oil Stock Report No. 826, which shows that stocks of domestic and foreign crude petroleum at the close of the week ending August 13 totaled 268,730,000 barrels, compared with a total of 267,714,000 barrels of the preceding week. This represents an increase of 1,016,000 barrels of oil in storage, comprising an increase of 871,000 barrels of stocks of domestic crude, and is an increase of 145,000 barrels of stocks of foreign crude.

During that week east Texas crude decreased in storage 149,000 barrels. West Texas crude increased 533,000 barrels. The total State of Texas increased in storage 523,000 barrels. The latter figure shows that we may have perhaps made a mistake on August 18, when we held our last and latest State-wide hearing, by increasing the daily production of Texas by 132,000 barrels per day.

Certainly when crude stocks are at the figure that the experts in the industry figure is the largest possible figure that they could handle for crude working stocks, no one could say that we were short of oil when stocks increased more than a million barrels in a week, and in the face of that, the Texas Railroad Commission increased the daily production of the 114,000 oil wells of Texas by 132,000 barrels each and every day for the month of September 1949. We are certainly on the long side rather than the short.

We went through this summer with gasoline stocks at an enormously high figure and are ending up the summer consuming season with 108,444,000 barrels of gasoline on hand as of August 6, 1949. Everyone knows the heavy gasoline consuming season drops off after Labor Day and when people come home from their vacations and school starts.

Inventories are 36,000,000 barrels over last year for products in storage west of the Rocky Mountains, and crude inventories are about 40,000,000 barrels above those of last

year. Kerosene stocks are about 30 percent in excess of those a year ago, and distillates stocks about 45 percent above those stocks of a year ago.

There is plenty of crude above ground. As a matter of fact, a superabundance of crude and products are on hand in the producers' hands and in the refiners' hands.

One of the great troubles today is that the buyers of heating oil, both wholesale and retail, and in many instances, the users of home heating oil themselves, have held off buying their winter supply, and it may be that they will wait so long to fill their winter's requirements that they might get caught short from a transportation standpoint. That is, if everybody wants oil the same day when the first cold snap hits, they may be in the same position as those who wait to fill their coal bin until the norther hits.

Touching on cut-backs in oil allowable production by State regulatory agencies, I wish to state they have been made because storage was full and the oil would not move to market and oil stored above ground unnecessarily wastes through evaporation. Therefore we store only the maximum needed working stocks.

The reductions in crude oil production in the United States during 1949 have been accomplished in large measure through the control over production exercised by regulatory agencies in the oil-producing States. These reductions have been necessary in the interest of conservation to avoid wasteful oversupplies.

Production of crude oil has been reduced substantially from about 5,665,000 barrels daily during the closing months of 1948 to about 4,750,000 barrels daily by July 1949. This has not been a reduction below the demand for oil. Every demand has been met under these reduced rates. Over and above this meeting of current demand, the stocks of crude oil and refined products were at the following levels at the end of July:

	Stocks on July 30, 1949	Increase over year ago
	Barrels	*Barrels*
Gasoline	109,964,000	+10,763,000
Kerosene	24,547,000	+3,621,000
Distillate fuel oils	70,767,000	+18,338,000
Residual fuel oils	67,166,000	[1]+18,548,000
Total principal products	272,444,000	+51,270,000
Crude petroleum	271,999,000	+41,044,00
Grand total	544,443,000	+92,314,000

[1] This excess is located in California. For the area east of California, stocks of residual fuel have not increased because increased imports have demoralized prices thereby discouraging domestic production of this fuel and, at the same time, encouraging uneconomic conversions from coal to oil.

Source: Products stocks from American Petroleum Institute Crude Oil Stocks from U. S. Bureau of Mines.

These figures show that inventories at the end of July 1949 were 92,000,000 barrels greater than at the same time in 1948. These stocks are in excess of adequate working levels.

These facts, that every demand has been met plus an accumulation of over 90,000,000 barrels in storage, show clearly that there has been no excessive or artificial curtailment of production. Greater production would have meant even further wasteful additions to inventories to the point where existing storage facilities might have been physically unable to handle the supply.

The last cut in Texas allowables was made following inauguration of pipe line proration by the purchasers in the neighboring States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and following the testimony of Mr. Neath, of the Humble, our largest purchaser, that unless reductions were made, they would be forced to inaugurate pipe line proration in Texas, which they thought they ought not be forced to do when the law of Texas made it the duty of the Texas Commission to limit production to market demand. We follow the law of Texas. We have an abundance of oil in storage.

It seems crystal clear to me that imports in excessive quantities supplant domestic production. No one objects to a reasonable amount of imports, but there does come a time when it becomes the duty of our Government to protect our own home folks.

I feel that imports should not have more than, say 5 percent, of our market demand for petroleum and its products.

The Bureau of Mines figures on estimated market demand were high. They are a reflection of past trends. When we reduce production, the Bureau figures reflect less demand. When we increase production and stocks of Texas origin decrease, then the Bureau of Mines figures reflect the change.

There is an unavoidable lag in the Bureau of Mines figures on forecast of crude demand.

It should be always remembered that in addition to crude, Texas produces over 200,000 barrels daily of other liquid hydrocarbons and their crude equivalent in over 400,000 barrels per day. These fruits of conservation should not be overlooked when unfairly criticizing Texas for not flooding the market.

We know from long experience that the purchasers' nominations are always much higher than the real demand for crude. This is unavoidably occasioned by duplication in nomination for oil.

One purchaser desires, say, 10,000 barrels of oil daily which he expects to get from one of three or four suppliers. He nominates his intention to take that much crude daily, and each of the others nominate the amount also expecting to sell him the crude. We simply allow for this normal puff in the nominations.

The proof that we produced enough oil is that we have 268,000,000 barrels of oil on hand as of August 13, 1949, and all needs have been amply met.

There is not much good in criticizing a proven technique which supplies the oil when, where, and as needed.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
Member, Texas Railroad Commission.

Total stocks of crude petroleum

(From Bureau of Mines)

	Stocks of crude petroleum	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
	Barrels	*Barrels*
1948—Nov. 30	250,066,000	
Dec. 31	256,254,000	+6,188,000
1949—Jan. 31	258,230,000	+1,976,000
Feb. 28	265,216,000	+6,986,000
Mar. 31	269,341,000	+4,125,000
Apr. 30	272,520,000	+3,179,000
May 31	273,912,000	+1,392,000
July 2	274,213,000	+301,000
July 23	272,107,000	−2,106,000
July 30	271,999,000	−108,000
Aug. 13	268,730,000	−3,269,000

New Concept of Stockholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Wilma Soss, dated August 16, 1949, on the subject New Concept of Stockholders, which appeared in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THE TIMES

NEW CONCEPT OF STOCKHOLDERS—GREATER EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THEIR ROLE, IT IS FELT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Stockholders have followed with some perturbation the course of the steel dispute in which the corporate citizens are represented solely by management, heir, and heiress to old fueds between management and labor, industry and government, despite the evolution of the modern stockholder.

Consider the emotional impasse alone of the pension question, which is the most contentious issue. The steel industry contends that an employee's retirement is not a general and uniform change in rates of pay, while management comes to the arbitration with its own pensions long since provided under management incentive, all properly voted by the stockholders on a management-directed (vote for or against) ballot with unmarked proxies habitually cast for management's proposals. Most stockholders are inclined to take a dim view of upper-bracket pensions when they are high. More and more, stockholders are beginning to realize that the stockholder is the employer of both management and labor and that management, too, is labor assigned to the job for administrating.

Economic clashes

What is the solution, then, in the economic clashes between management and labor when the fact-finding board appointed by the President has been publicly suspect of being saddled with a political debt to labor? In 1945 the administration named such a committee and it brought in a finding that the steel industry could "afford" to raise wages without affecting prices. Experience proved this to be the initial impulse for a wage-price spiral. No wonder the public, as well as steel stockholders, are jittery.

Before the Government steps in should not the facts be laid in the American way before the owners of industry? As it is, the steel case has been conducted much like an orderly court trial in which the union has been acting as a prosecutor and steel as the defendant. Why not a panel of stockholders to serve as jury and the fact-finding board or a judge appointed to give the charge to such a jury, which shall bring in the verdict?

Members of a stockholder jury would be challengeable by counsel for either side; composed of small and large shareholders including women and employee stockholders and minority stockholder leaders to give a true cross section of investors, but otherwise drawn much as jury panels are from lists of corporate citizens in the industries affected. To relieve the President from embarrassment in which an elected Executive might find himself, the judge might be appointed by a congressional committee representing both parties.

Ownership of stock

Stockholders, like labor, are also political voters. They do not belong to one party, as Government and management sometimes would appear to suppose. More and more stock is coming into the hands of "little people." Almost 70 percent of all interest and dividend payments to individuals are said to go to those with incomes under $5,000 per year. Employee stockholders, with stock-purchase plans now the mode, are increasingly among minority stockholders. Before splitting United States Steel stock this spring three for one for wider distribution, 75 percent of the stockholders owned

25 shares or less, 3 out of 10 stockholders owned less than 10 shares; many owned 1.

Labor has begun to recognize that management's view is not necessarily that of the public stockholders or it would not bring stalemated problems before the stockholders at the annual meetings. That this procedure has been so far ineffective does not mean that it will continue to be so as the public stockholder movement grows in strength and experience.

Big business is financed by the people's capital, and management may have to choose between a labor Government or encouraging private enterprise to become in reality the people's enterprise system in which the corporate vote is cherished and deemed a civilian duty equal to that of casting the political ballot.

It is time for a new national concept of the stockholder if we are not to be caught in the impasse which will commit industry to Government boards and wage fixing that may well be the turn in the road to American socialism.

WILMA SOSS,
President, Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc.
NEW YORK, *August 16, 1949.*

British Jets Reported Bridging 10-Year Lag in Research by Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "British Jets Reported Bridging 10-year Lag in Research by Soviet," from the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH JETS REPORTED BRIDGING 10-YEAR LAG IN RESEARCH BY SOVIET

LONDON, August 26.—A refugee Russian air expert said today that Britain has handed the Soviet Union a chance to recoup a 10-year lag in jet aircraft research.

Lt. Col. G. A. Tokaev, former head of the U. S. S. P. Military-Scientific Academy, said he referred to British shipment of Rolls-Royce Nene jet power units to Moscow in 1946 and 1947.

"It is not an exaggeration to say that the U. S. S. R. was probably 10 years behind the world's foremost exponents of jet development," Tokaev wrote in the British aeronautical magazine Flight.

"Having awakened from their slumbers, those responsible suddenly realized they had strayed into a dangerous blind alley."

EXCELLENT PLANES FORECAST

"But the way out appeared quite unexpectedly. The British authorities sold to the Soviet Government a certain number of British jet units—the excellent Nenes. * * *

"We need not doubt that very soon their studies of the Nene will allow Soviet constructors to create excellent combat aircraft, for which they will be awarded many a Stalin prize."

Development of new British aircraft and weapons is under direction of the Ministry of Supply.

George Strauss, who heads the ministry, told Parliament last November 8 that Britain had shipped a total of 174 jet engines abroad and that an unspecified number went to Russia.

A spokesman for the Air Ministry said today he doubted that Russia was given "anything very recent."

A spokesman for the Ministry of Supply said the Nene jets were shipped to Russia after they had been taken off the secret list.

He recalled that John Freeman, parliamentary secretary for Mr. Strauss, told the House of Commons last November "refusal of an export license would have been contrary to the general export policy prevailing at that time."

ASSURANCES GIVEN

The shipments were made in August 1946, and March 1947. That was before the cold war between Russia and the Western allies reached its present status.

Mr. Strauss assured the House of Commons in February that no shipments of new model jet engines have been or will be made "to Russia or any other country in eastern Europe."

Both Rolls Royce itself and the De Havilland Aircraft Co. have developed a series of new types capable of driving planes faster than sound. All of these are still on the secret list.

Tokaev fled from the Russian zone of Germany last year and was granted haven in England as a political refugee.

He said he had spent 2 years studying German aviation and rocket techniques for the Russian Government.

President Truman Makes Speech to Group of Key Democrats Outlining Party's Duty, Responsibility, and Accomplishments—New National Chairman of Democratic National Committee in Acceptance Speech Keynoted Democratic National Committee Activity in the Vital 1950 Congressional Campaign—These Speeches Contain Information Every Democrat Should Have

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith excerpts from Capital Comment, prepared by the staff of the Democratic National Committee for release, August 20, 1949.

It is as follows:

William M. Boyle, Jr., who started in politics 30 years ago as a voteless, teen-age precinct worker, was unanimously named chairman of the Democratic National Committee on August 24.

Boyle, 46-year-old close friend and longtime associate of President Truman, immediately set the committee's sights on a thumping Democratic victory in the 1950 elections.

The new chairman made it plain that his main weapon for victory in 1950 will be hard work by Democratic precinct workers.

Boyle calls them the door-to-door salesmen of democracy.

The day's events were climaxed by a hard-hitting speech in which the President told national committee members, high Federal officials, and Democratic Senators and Representatives that the Democratic Party would win a great congressional victory in 1950.

Other highlights of the day:

Tom C. Clark, retiring as Attorney General, was sworn in as a Justice of the Supreme Court.

J. Howard McGrath, retiring as Senator from Rhode Island and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was sworn in as Attorney General.

The Democratic National Committee expunged six names from its rolls for failure to support the Truman-Barkley ticket in 1948.

Loyal Democrats in so-called Dixiecrat States were given special praise for their loyalty and courage.

President Truman's speech to a cheering group of key Democrats at the end of the eventful Wednesday made it plain that he fully supported the Democratic National Committee's firm stand on party bolters. The President welcomed dissident Democrats back, but only as loyal supporters of the party's program.

The President said:

"I don't think the Democratic Party in the history of the Nation has ever been in better condition to carry the battle to the foe.

"Our platform at Philadelphia was specific. It was explained by the National Chairman, Howard McGrath, by the Vice President, and by me, and by all the workers in the trenches.

"It was explained in words of one syllable, written so that everybody understood the things for which we stood.

"The Republicans were so thoroughly depressed at what happened to them on November 2 last, that they have carried on a continuous filibuster in the House and the Senate of the United States in an effort to defeat the platform that the people wanted carried out.

"They will not succeed!

"That platform is in the interest of the people. The Democratic Party is the party of the people. The Democratic Party is a national party, and not a sectional party any more. The tail no longer wags the dog. We won the election last November without New York, without the industrial East, and without the solid South. And I am prouder of that than anything that has ever happened to me.

"And that doesn't mean that we are not inviting the industrial East and the solid South and all the rest of the country to join the party of the people, and help the country go forward. That is exactly what we want, and that is exactly what we are going to accomplish in the next 2 years.

"We have brought in a number of able and distinguished young Congressmen, a number of able and distinguished young Senators, and next year we will bring in a large number of new Congressmen and new Senators and we will carry out that platform—don't think we won't! * * *

"We are represented here from every section of this great United States, and I invite all those people who are interested in the welfare of this great Republic of ours, who are interested in the peace of the world, for which we are striving, to get into the Democratic Party and help us go forward with it."

Boyle's acceptance speech keynoted Democratic National Committee activity in the vital 1950 congressional campaign.

The new chairman told the committee:

"In this year of 1949 I don't know anything I would rather be than an American and a Democrat. * * * On the Democratic Party rests, in large measure, the hope of mankind for a peaceful and a better world.

"It is now perfectly clear to the people of this country that the Democratic Party stands for the principle that the powers of Government can be, and should be, used in the interest of the people. In every compaign since 1932 the Democratic Party has gone before the country to tell the voters that the power of the Government could be used to promote the general welfare. And in every interval between campaigns, the Democratic Party has used the authority and the power of Government to establish conditions in which the people can achieve a better life for themselves and their children. The Democratic Party has shown the people that it can be done.

"The Republican Party, on the other hand, has devoted its energies to explaining to the people that it can't be done. The Republican Party has labored mightily to prove that the people cannot, and should not expect, the powers of the Government to be exercised in their interests. * * * We belong to the many—they belong to the few.

"The Democratic Party is energetic, it is vital, it is turbulent. Some of us at times may wish that it were more peaceful internally, but we must remember that these are the symptoms of a living, growing organism. The Democratic Party is alive because it is an instrument through which the American people are making their decisions. The Democratic Party is the weapon that the American people are using to decide their tremendous destiny in the history of the world.

"In the great task that lies ahead of us there are two things which I would like to underline.

"The first of these is the role of our party in understanding and explaining the issues to the people. Our party workers should understand the program of the party and what it means in the lives of all the citizens. More and more our party workers become the channel through which our message reaches the people. In the past four Presidential campaigns over 90 percent of the press were opposed to our party. We have to rely on word-of-mouth transmission of our messages, to be delivered at the voters' doors by an informed and intelligent group of party workers.

"The next aspect of our activity which I would like to emphasize is closely joined with the first. It is the necessity of precinct work.

"Our candidates—platforms—programs—issues—do not become politically effective until a loyal precinct worker stirs himself to call upon his neighbor—rings the doorbell—persuades his neighbor to register and to vote.

"The precinct workers of the Democratic Party are the door-to-door salesmen of democracy. * * * On their shoulders rests the fate of the program which was endorsed by the voters of America last November. The elections of 1950 will be won or lost in the precinct. The victory of 1948 provided the opportunity to go forward. The elections of 1950 will either strengthen and consolidate the gains of 1948 or will destroy and scatter those gains to the delight of the forces of reaction.

"The congressional elections of 1950 are of the greatest importance not only to this country but to the world. They come at the halfway mark of the twentieth century. Twice in the first half of this century the whole world has been thrown into war. Now, under the leadership of President Truman, and as a result of his courage and decisiveness, the world has a chance to live out the rest of this century in peace. The great elements of President Truman's foreign policy, support for the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the Atlantic Pact and the Rio Pact, taken together offer the world a foundation for building a permanent peace * * *

"The people of this country want and expect President Truman to have a Congress in 1950 that will support him in his efforts for prosperity at home and peace abroad."

"One of the signs of the vigor of the Democratic Party is the way it produces great national leaders. No group of special interests, no conspiracy of the representatives of great wealth will ever turn out a leader who can inspire and rally the people in their hours of crisis.

"The greatest proof of the power of the Democratic Party today, and its greatest asset, is President Harry S. Truman. * * *

"The victory of President Truman has a tremendous lesson for us and for all succeeding generations of Americans. It is a very simple lesson. The American people have grown up.

"Victory in American politics now depends not on propaganda or advertising, not on a winning voice or a movie personality, not on extravagant promises or pledges, but purely and simply on having a program for the good of the people.

"This is one of the great contributions that President Truman has made to American political life. * * * He has made the American political system a means of deciding the issues that confront the people.

"If we have truly learned this lesson, we know that it means we must carry out the program which the people elected the Democratic administration to carry out. What counts most is a record of faithful performance.

"Faith in democracy will perish unless our party carries out its program.

"And we are carrying it out. It is true that we face some difficulties. But we are going to solve those difficulties as we have solved them in the past—by the votes of the people.

"The great job before us is the congressional elections of 1950!

"The people of America, yes, the people of the world know that the direction in which Harry Truman is traveling is toward peace and human welfare with human dignity. It is in the direction of progress. You and I, together with the members of the Democratic Party and the forward-looking people of America are traveling with President Truman in the direction of progress. I believe that the Democratic Party is strong enough and flexible enough to have room for honest differences of opinion, but once those differences have been aired and discussed, I further believe that we are bound together by strong enough ties of common sense and friendship that we can join hands in common accord and good will to travel the road of progress with President Truman.

"Abraham Lincoln once said, 'I will go along with a man as long as he is going in my direction.' I here and now invite and solicit all men and women of good will to join in this forward march of progress."

PRESIDENTIAL PRAISE

What President Truman said about three friends who took new offices this week:

Bill Boyle: "I am as happy as I can be, of course, that my lifetime friend—I have known him ever since he was a kid—I knew his mother before him, and she was one of the best Democrats that Missouri ever produced—is the national chairman of the Democratic Party."

Howard McGrath: " * * * a great national chairman. I thought he was a great national chairman because I made him Attorney General of the United States, the supreme law officer of the land."

Tom Clark: "Tom Clark was an able and distinguished Attorney General and he will make a great and distinguished Justice on the greatest court in the country."

An Atlantic Union?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a splendid editorial, which appeared in the July 29, 1949, issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The editorial sets forth the urgent necessity of further steps in our foreign policy looking forward to an Atlantic union.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ATLANTIC UNION?

A nation cannot effectively conduct its affairs abroad unless it has some clear idea of just what it hopes eventually to accomplish. Without goals—and we are speaking here of long-range ones—foreign policy is simply another name for expediency. And expediency just won't work against an opponent who knows precisely what he wants. The chess player who moves his pieces with no plan other than to foil his opponent's attack is almost certain to lose. He has no direction, no force—and very little chance of victory.

At times since the war this country has acted like such a foolish chess player. Often America's foreign policy has not been Washington's creation so much as Moscow's. The Kremlin has initiated the moves, and then the United States has reacted defensively against them.

With the Marshall plan, however, this negative pattern began to give way to a more purposeful program. Now the Nation has, for the short-term at least, a general idea of what it hopes to do in Europe. But the need for long-term goals continues and will become even more urgent when 1952—the cut-off date for Marshall aid—rolls around.

In an attempt to help meet that need, two proposed resolutions were introduced in Congress this week, both of them designed to fix goals for American foreign policy. The one, sponsored by some 14 Senators and endorsed by the World Federalists organization, would declare that the United States hopes to strengthen the United Nations with a view to transforming it into a world federation open to all nations. In our opinion, this is just as laudable and would be just about as effective as a solemn congressional denouncement of sin.

It is pleasant to think how easy the big problems of the world, such as disarmament and control of atomic energy, could be solved if all the nations were bound in one family. But to enjoy these speculations you must ignore or minimize the bigger problem of how you are going to get the nations voluntarily to give up that measure of sovereignty needed to realize this global family. Indeed, as of now the UN is not open to certain deserving nations simply because Russia will not agree to even that small limitation of the sovereign veto which would deny its use to bar the admission of a nation acceptable to a majority of the members.

The second resolution introduced Tuesday, however, is worth serious consideration. This bill, sponsored by 18 Senators and prepared by former Justice Owen J. Roberts' Atlantic Union Committee, would request the President to call a convention of the democracies sponsoring the Atlantic Pact so that they might explore the chances for federal union among themselves.

Certainly the essential conditions for practical federation exist here. Such nations as the United States, Canada, Britain, France, and the Benelux countries have a common tradition of freedom, a similar view of what constitutes social and political order, and mutual economic interests. What's more, they have now begun to work together in a military sense, thanks to the Atlantic Pact.

It is not too early, then, to undertake something along the lines of this second resolution before Congress. The United States, no doubt largely as a result of the cold war with Russia, has been continually moving toward close association with the free nations of Europe. Whether this association should become organic is, of course, open to debate. But the sooner it is settled the more clearly defined our long-term policy can be. And a meeting such as this resolution proposes should help considerably in deciding the issue.

Hot Days on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the New York Times of July 31, 1949, which I think contains some informative and interesting comments on our practice of putting legislative riders on appropriation bills, irrelevancy in debate, and the great need we now find for a legislative timetable.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT DAYS ON THE POTOMAC

As the week end approached our national legislators seemed to be in something of a dither. An unexpected parliamentary explosion in the Senate had temporarily removed the foreign-aid programs from action on the floor. They will be back again presently, but in the meanwhile valuable time has been lost. Worse yet, the delay was due to an attempt sponsored by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, to reduce a considerable part of ECA to the level of a logrolling rivers and harbors bill. The majority of the Senate certainly did not wish this to happen, but the mere fact that it had to be discussed on a hot July day was appalling. One result of these moves and countermoves was that final approval of some $30,000,000,000 of Federal appropriations was held up. Special action then had to be taken to provide interim funds. The spectacle offered was one of Congress stepping on its own toes.

It may well be said that in these days there is more than the unseasonal heat to upset the Members of Congress and slow them down. World events have forced them to move into new fields, in which there are few precedents to guide them. There is a routine for dealing with domestic appropriations or farm legislation. We have been there before. There is no corresponding routine when our legislators have to legislate—as in effect they do to the extent that they provide money and advice—for Denmark, Britain, or Italy. The public ought to understand this problem, though it is not called upon to condone a failure to grapple with it.

These great international questions are, of course, only part of the work imposed on Congress. It has had to deal, and has dealt, with export controls, rent controls, a long-range housing bill, and the reorganization of the administrative branch of the Federal Government. It has had to provide for the national defense and for the normal and emergency needs of the budget. It has had to consider labor legislation, if only to abandon it for this session. The House has authorized an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program. The House has considered and passed a liberalized Displaced Persons Act. There has been a great deal of activity in committees on subjects that have not reached the floor of either House. One cannot say that our Senators and Representatives have been idle.

What does appear, as one looks back over the nearly 7 months' record of the present session—which in many respects resembles other sessions—is an absence of legislative planning and legislative control. Ideas on Capitol Hill as to what measures should have priority seem to differ as between the two Houses and in each House seem to change almost as often as the wind changes. For all its hard work Congress does not present an appearance of efficiency. We would not want to have efficiency purchased at the cost of arbitrarily limited debate or of the old-fashioned sort of boss rule. It does seem, however, that some thought might be given, not exactly to the reorganization of the legislative branch of the Government, but to an overhauling of its still too numerous committees and a revamping of its procedure.

This is not likely to take place in the middle of a hot summer. Yet sooner or later the men and women on Capitol Hill will have to face the fact that their duties are steadily growing more complicated and that some thinking and some planning will be required to meet the resulting demands. The burdens of half the world are now upon us. Congress, like the rest of us, has to grow up. The free and easy ways of bygone years when the principal issues were solely domestic will no longer suffice.

Reckless Lending the Greatest Threat to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reckless Lending the Greatest Threat to United States," by Louis Bromfield, from the Kansas City Star of August 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECKLESS LENDING THE GREATEST THREAT TO UNITED STATES

(By Louis Bromfield)

Much of this column has been written before, even as far back as 1939, when the writer published a pamphlet called "England, A Dying Oligarchy" which created considerable unpleasantness and considerable abuse in England. Recently the press of England has referred to it as a remarkable and truthful document.

I am inclined to repeat myself because of the prediction Lenin made in the early 1920's to the effect that "Germany would arm herself out of existence, the British Empire would expand herself out of existence and that the United States would loan herself out of existence." The first two predictions have come true and the third, it seems to me, is well on the way to fulfillment.

One of the most remarkable facts of our times, when history is finally written, will be the fact that this Nation somehow acquired an inferiority complex about its way of doing things at a time when other economic and social philosophies, plus adverse conditions, had reduced all the other nations of the world to crisis, disaster, and lower and lower living standards. It would seem that the proof lay in the pudding, but in this country a large group of liberals sought constantly to set new patterns and emulate plans which had, under their very eyes, reduced other nations to shocking economic and sociological levels and actually promoted and invited in the whole evil pattern of national socialism whether it was called nazism, fascism, communism, or simply national socialism.

By now it has become clear that the practice of any of these philosophies leads inevitably into bureaucratic and oligarchic dictatorships in which freedoms are lost, taxes rise, bureaucracy goes wild, living standards decline, and wars and the causes of war increase. Yet we still have throughout the country and even in White House circles, numbers of men and women who would exchange our security (infinitely greater at its worst than that of inhabitants of the Socialist-indoctrinated countries) for a perilous experimentation which, as Great Britain is proving before our very eyes, leads only into crisis and disaster.

When Lenin spoke of our loaning ourselves out of existence, he was thinking not only of the vast foreign loans in money and goods which we have made without any hope of return but also of the deficit spending within our own borders. It is grotesque that this Government cannot be carried on with the incredible budget of $44,000,000,000. It is grotesque that we should be asked today to spend three times as much for military purposes as it cost to run the whole Government only 10 years ago.

Undoubtedly the liberal elements became intoxicated during the last 16 years with throwing about incredible sums of money all the way from giant aircraft carriers to Department of Agriculture pamphlets on how to make a bed. At the same time the American people became benumbed by this astronomical spending so that a billion or two this way or that meant little to them. The people of the individual States were trained to believe that large grants of Federal funds were gifts out of the air when all the time they were paying for them not only in direct taxes but in the hidden taxes on gasoline, on diapers, and on plumbing, which are always the delight of slimy bureaucratic government.

By now it must be evident, even to the most fanatic of do-gooders, that we cannot save the whole of the world, either with money or, what is more important, by spreading wholesale about the world our real wealth in the form of food, of timber, of iron and steel, and all our other natural resources. The latest cries for spending more money come from the military who threaten us with the perils of a Soviet tyranny which is bankrupt and saddled with incredible economic and political difficulties in the Balkans, in Poland, in China, and elsewhere. Great Britain wants more money to pour down the rat hole of Socialist experimentation and Mr. Truman advocates more and more lending, more and more spending, principally, it becomes clearer, for the same reasons of political power which led Hitler and his friends into the trap which destroyed them.

Out of all of this, one fact remains clear—that if the world, freedom, and civilization are to be saved, it will not be by our destroying ourselves but by maintaining in this country a political philosophy which, even in the worst depths of the great depression, provided a status for most of its citizens that was far better than anything known by nine-tenths of the human race.

We must somehow remain a rock of security about which a shattered and disintegrating world may one day rebuild itself. The greatest allies of Moscow in this country are, as Lenin well knew, not the Communist Party members but those who advocate more and more spending and lending.

Polish-American Congress of Eastern Massachusetts and Americans for Poland Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on September 1, 1939, Hitler unleashed his legions against innocent Poland. There are meetings being held throughout the Nation this week for the purpose of discussing what can be done in this country in connection with Poland's situation. Yesterday, at a meeting sponsored by the Polish-American Congress of Eastern Massachusetts and Americans for Poland Relief I was privileged to make a few remarks. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ten years ago on September 1, 1939, Hitler unleashed his legions against innocent Poland. He breached every covenant and understanding as he marched. In marching he sank the hopes of freedom and of peace for the thousands of home-loving people of Poland.

Just this week I read in the Boston Herald that a high Polish official named Adam Gubrinowincz, former chief of protocol of the Polish Foreign Office, crossed the border into Switzerland. He wants to come to the United States the press report said. I quote: "All sources agreed that Gubrinowincz's flight was motivated entirely by his inability as a practicing Catholic to accept the Polish Government's anti-church policies."

Freedom of speech—freedom to worship as we choose—liberty—opportunity are what America stands for today in the eyes of the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Those freedoms have made America the greatest nation in history. Those freedoms are why millions of men and women have crossed the seas to become United States citizens. It is why so many in various parts of the world wish to come to our country today. Gubrinowincz' flight emphasizes, symbolizes and makes crystal-clear the duty that we owe to our citizens and to the peace-loving peoples of the world—the ever-lasting maintenance of those freedoms.

Now Poland is behind the iron curtain. But, the steps that we take in this country today, the steps we take in our Government tomorrow are continually planned with the hope that the day will come when they will make it possible to roll back the iron curtain and permit the people of Poland and other enslaved nations once again to be free to worship, to speak and to live as they choose. They want too the opportunity that we have in this country to meet with other peoples in other free nations of the world.

Since Congress met last January and listened to the President of the United States there have been many sessions. At some period or other in the lengthy debates at those sessions there has always been some discussion, some statement concerning the basic desire that is in all our minds today—the desire for peace in the world—the desire for more security of life for ourselves and for our children. If that hope is to become a reality we know that the United States of America must be strong. We know we must make it clear to the only potential enemy we have that we will not tolerate a lasting iron curtain pulled permanently in front of the eyes and lives of the peace-loving peoples of the world.

While we may differ among each other on the methods of gaining peace, there is no difference among us that peace is our objective. For a second time in this century we have learned the bitter lesson that peace is not easily attained. We have learned that unless we are willing to work for peace day in and day out, month in and month out, and unless we are willing to assume our responsibilities each day of every month, peace and security can easily slip from our grasp. By letting them slip we who fought in the First World War saw our sons and daughters fight again in our lifetime in an even bigger and more disastrous world struggle.

We want to remember in our struggles for peace in the world that it took us here in the United States thirteen long years from the signing of the Declaration of Independence before our Government under our present Constitution became a going concern. Yet it is now only a little over 4 years since VJ-day and the signing of an armistice with Japan. In those 4 years we have worked steadily and made progress—small as it seems—toward a more peaceful world.

We first formed a pact with the South American countries. That pact supersedes the Monroe Doctrine.

We have helped to organize the United Nations. Never will I forget the day when all but two Members of the United States Senate, with a crowded gallery above us, voted for the United States of America to take part in that new union for world peace. We have been disappointed with its accomplishments. But, it has come quite a way in the 3 years of its existence. It has helped enormously to give each nation a greater understanding of the problems of other peoples in the world; it has shown us the necessity for our exercising patience, an understanding of others' points of view, and a willingness to assume our responsibilities in world affairs.

We must keep our faith in the United Nations and pray for the ultimate achievement of its objectives. If we lose our faith in our ability to accomplish our objective of peace, then we have lost the most vital asset in our hopes for the future.

While working for the achievement of the objective of the United Nations, we have sponsored the Marshall plan for Europe. We hope in doing so to achieve a greater spirit of unity among the nations of Europe to work together and through their mutual self-help again become economically sound and strong.

We have made this move in the interest of the security and future of our own citizens. We have realized that unless the economy of these nations who wish to join us in a peaceful solution of the world's problems becomes strong, we can never hope for security for ourselves. Hungry people and people in distress can think little beyond themselves and their own difficulties. Only with a strong economy among the other freedom-loving peoples of the world can we ever expect to gear our own people and our own industries to peaceful production. Only in this way can we gradually expect to cut down and eliminate the production of our war matériel and equipment.

In the past few months I have attended long debates in the United States Senate about the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact. It was finally ratified by us and 11 other nations. Only last Wednesday President Truman solemnly proclaimed at a historic ceremony in the White House that the pact was finally in force. The President stated in proclaiming the pact and I quote: "By this treaty we are not only seeking to establish freedom from aggression and from the use of force in the North Atlantic community, but we are also actively striving to promote and preserve peace throughout the world."

I pray, as do you, that by the defensive alliance it sets up it will help to prevent another Hitler—another Kaiser Wilhelm—from arising to plunge the world on the road to complete disaster. I pray, as do you, that this alliance may prevent another struggle between freedom and tyranny in Europe.

By it terms the North Atlantic Pact is specifically tied to the United Nations Organization. When the police force of the United Nations becomes a working reality strong enough to carry out its responsibilities, the North Atlantic Pact ceases to be significant. So in this way we seek to give the United Nations the time it needs to become a practical instrument for peace.

But there is even another step preliminary to the North Atlantic Pact that President Truman asks the Congress to undertake. At the moment as a member of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the United States Senate, sitting jointly, I am helping to draft a measure that will give immediate military aid to the nations of Europe to help them protect themselves until the North Atlantic Pact countries can organize. We have certain types of military equipment that are at the moment in excess of our military needs. This bill contemplates that some of this equipment be sent to the nations which include not only some of the countries in the North Atlantic Pact but also Greece, Turkey, the Philippines, and Korea. The President also asks us to make available funds that will permit this purchase of more military equipment in order to help these other nations. This plan does not contemplate that we weaken ourselves but rather it seeks to help other nations in order that their strength will make our security greater. In this way we are contributing arms and equipment to these nations while they themselves contribute not only the other seven-eighths of the arms but much more—they are contributing their young men to bear these arms. Their boys thus help our boys. It is for our own security and safety that we are asked to undertake this aid. We do so in the common cause of maintaining peace. We do so in the hope that it will be one more step in rolling back the iron curtain from Poland and other nations.

During the war I was the Governor of our State, and one day three Polish fliers who had been training in Canada called on me. Today two of those Polish fliers are still alive. I have kept up a correspondence with one of them. He told me on that visit that he had been a prisoner, first of the Russians and then of the Nazis. He had escaped from both those tyrannical forces. Later he joined the independent air force in England and fought his former jailors—the Nazis. Now he is an English citizen, with a farm of his own in

Scotland. He is married and has two children. He cannot possibly return to Poland under the conditions that now exist. We want to help that man who fought to keep us alive and safe from danger during the war, who helped to keep us free to speak and to worship as we see fit, to carry on his own life as a freedom-loving citizen in his native country, if he so desires.

But on an anniversary such as brings us here together today we must never forget that there is a strong force that underlies our economic strength that underlies this military force of which our sons have been a part. That greater underlying force is simply this: That our way of life here in the United States is the best and happiest that man has yet conceived for himself; that peace and liberty are desired by every human being, no matter what race, creed, or color. The great duty of each one of us here in this auditorium is to try our utmost to make our own people understand that it is his or her responsibility to make others see the benefits of our way of life.

Today in this country, as in other countries of the world, there are people whom we call Communists who are forever on the job trying to sell their panaceas to those of our friends who may be for the moment unhappy with their lot or bereft of the feeling that they have no future under our system of life. Sometimes these clever Communists make their panaceas sound as though they were a cure-all.

Many countries have found out too late that once they started to swallow the pill of communism they had lost their freedom—they had become completely impotent, they had become slaves and puppets dictated to, bossed and whipped into line. They have seen their leaders liquidated in one form or another. Thus they have lost their freedom. They have lost their liberty. We in the United States want them to be able to have the opportunity to live as they desire to live. We do not want to dictate to them but we do want to seek to inspire them to understand what freedom and liberty have meant to us, so that they will not listen to this other line, so that they will not become converts to a system of life that can only lead them away from their true desires. To do so we must set an example here in the United States that is a worthy one. We must continue in this country to be sure that we are building at home a sound nation, a sound economy under liberty, justice and freedom for all. I have always felt and as I grow older feel more strongly than ever that our way of life begins with a good home in a good community where there is an opportunity for an adequate education, desirable housing, and proper opportunities for a healthy life with a job that gives opportunity to get ahead.

You Americans of Polish extraction present the finest type of our American citizenship. You people love your children and your homes. You are proud of what you have accomplished here in the United States. You want your relations who are still in Poland to live more safely, more comfortably, freely, and happily. So, today as we meet on the tenth anniversary of Hitler's unprovoked attack on Poland, let us turn our thoughts for a few moments to optimistic channels that mean so much to all of us; but let us not stop with just thinking about them. Let us dedicate ourselves to continue unrelenting efforts to seek peace with, above all, the very keystones of life—freedom to worship as we choose and freedom to speak and write and think as we choose. Let us hope and pray that with our help the people of Poland may again become free and be in front of and not behind the iron curtain.

Two thousand years ago Persius said: "Is freedom anything but the right to live as we wish? Nothing else." And, in closing let me add to what Persius said and remind you that "Freedom is everybody's job."

Health Freedom in the National Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to discrimination of any kind, toward any person, is so well-known that my friends and enemies alike can understand that I have a considerable sympathy with the chiropractors, as their views are expressed by the National Chiropractic Association, in their long and consistent opposition to the failure of the national health bill to guard against discrimination against chiropractors and chiropractic patients.

While the National Chiropractic Association has maintained a sympathetic attitude toward efforts to extend and coordinate public-health facilities, the NCA has consistently demanded that positive and substantive language should be written into the bill to insure that chiropractors and chiropractic patients should be treated on a basis of equality and impartiality in the administration of the measure, when and if enacted.

For almost a full decade this careful attitude has been preserved by the spokesmen for the National Chiropractic Association, which is the principal international organization of qualified practicing chiropractors.

TESTIMONY REPEATEDLY OFFERED

Repeatedly testimony has been offered to that effect in both House and Senate by the NCA.

Most Members are familiar with the struggle of chiropractic against medical politics. It is no reflection on the ethical practicing physician to say that the political arm of organized medicine has attempted to maintain an effective monopoly over the Nation's health, while the National Chiropractic Association has carried on an effective and increasingly effective battle against that monopoly.

The National Chiropractic Association, among other legislative efforts, obtained introduction of the Murdock-Tolan bill to amend the Federal employees compensation act; the Pepper-Huber bill to create chiropractic service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; and has repeatedly brought about definite legislative prohibitions against discrimination toward chiropractic in reports on appropriation bills.

Usually, Mr. Speaker, Dr. John J. Nugent of New Haven, Conn., director of education of the National Chiropractic Association, is the authorized spokesman of the National Chiropractic Association, and, under consent, I include in my remarks the testimony he offered to the Murray subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 21, 1949:

HEARINGS ON THE NATIONAL HEALTH BILL—DR. JOHN J. NUGENT, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION OF THE NCA, TESTIFIES BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE IN WASHINGTON

My name is John J. Nugent and I am director of education of the National Chiropractic Association. My residence is in New Haven, Conn. I wish to express on behalf of the chiropractic profession and its institutions our profound appreciation for this opportunity of contributing to your consideration of Senate bills 1679, 1581, 1456, and 1106.

Unfortunately the convention of our house of delegates will not be held until July and our association has not had an opportunity to pass on these bills. However, our association has expressed itself on a bill similar to S. 1679 as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the executive board of directors of the National Chiropractic Association go on record as favoring the efforts of the President's Committee To Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, and recommend to our agencies and affiliated organizations that they give every cooperation to this committee in its efforts to bring about a better health service to our Nation.

"We further recommend that the committee always keep in mind the right of a citizen to choose his own doctor and method of healing and urge that the committee include doctors of chiropractic in the Federal health program."

The high purpose of these bills to assure adequate health services must inspire the support of everyone. It is, however, my purpose to urge upon you the desirability of considering such amendments to these bills as are necessary to insure real freedom of choice of doctor by the public.

Senate bill 1679, section 3, guarantees to the public the "assured full freedom to choose their physicians and to change their choice as they may desire."

In numerous press releases sent out by Senators, Congressmen and others favoring this bill statements are made that the patient's freedom in choosing his own doctor is guaranteed. The words "doctor" and "physician" are used synonymously, and thus tend to confuse—if not mislead—the public.

Under existing State statutes regulating the healing arts there are several kinds of doctors—medical doctors, chiropractic doctors, and osteopathic doctors. In some States these practitioners are also referred to as physicians.

It is obvious in this bill that the words "physician," "medical doctor" and "medical service" indicate that the framers of the bills were not using these terms in their generic meaning. It is also obvious that the intent of the bill is to restrict the choice of doctor to that of a medical doctor. The public, therefore, will not have, in fact, real freedom of choice of doctors. It will have only the freedom of choice between medical doctors and medical services.

The States by legislative acts and referendums have given their citizens freedom of choice of doctors by recognizing the professions of chiropractic and osteopathy. If this bill precludes the service of chiropractic and osteopathic doctors, if it restricts its benefits to medical services, it directly curtails by economic device the peoples' freedom of choice. By the same device it nullifies the privileges granted the professions of chiropractic and osteopathy by the States.

It may be argued academically that the bill does not do this, but actually it does. If a worker whose income is already taxed for medical care, desires the services of a chiropractic or osteopathic doctor he will be compelled to pay again. This amounts to double taxation. Faced with this predicament it will not take him long to reach the conclusion that the economics of the situation leaves him no freedom of choice of doctor and that the freedom of choice which his

State laws had granted him has been abolished.

I am not a lawyer nor an authority on constitutional law, but I believe there is a fundamental question of citizen rights here. I feel that the right of control over my own body and its care is somehow closely allied to those other freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. I believe that, subject to the reasonable exercise of the police power of the State, I should have the right to choose my own doctor and method of healing.

This bill by its very emphasis on freedom of choice of doctors recognizes that right. The States which, after careful consideration by the people, have licensed chiropractors and osteopaths also recognize that right. Are we then to have a complete negation of this principle by indirect legislation? Is this bill when passed to be a rescinding of those State rights by Federal legislation—by indirection—by Federal taxation?

We are in favor of the high objectives of this bill as set forth in its declaration of purpose. However, if the American Medical Association had written this bill it could not have drawn more effectively or with greater finesse a measure to destroy the professions of chiropractic and osteopathy.

As written, the bill will positively and inevitably destroy the property rights of some 30,000 men and women licensed to practice chiropractic and osteopathy.

Surveys have shown that some 30,000,000 people consult nonmedical doctors for their health needs. This bill would not only destroy the freedom of choice of this group but would deny that choice to the rest of our population.

Medicine, dentistry, dental hygienists, nurses, hospital administrators and their auxiliary services are included in this bill. All the medical and allied professions are covered. Why is it that the framers of the bill omitted the nonmedical professions?

The nonmedical professions of chiropractic and osteopathy are licensed by the States under regulations similar to the licensure of the medical professions. They are subject to the same public health regulations. The osteopathic profession is licensed in all States, the chiropractic profession in 44 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska, and in all the Canadian provinces except Quebec and the Maritimes. There are approximately 30,000 chiropractic and osteopathic practitioners, and there are approximately 6,000 students enrolled in 25 colleges at this date.

Who is responsible and what is the reason for the omission of these two internationally accepted and legally recognized professions? Is it because we constitute a minority group?

As I read the declaration of the exalted purposes of this bill I am impressed by the statements that the bill will "assist qualified students * * * without regard to race, color, or creed"; and that "qualified individuals, particularly members of minority population groups" shall be able to obtain adequate professional training. It is evident that the purpose is to remove the economic obstacles, the class distinctions, and the prejudices which have heretofore restricted entrance to the medical profession. Why then perpetrate a gross discrimination against two minority groups who through the years have struggled against the prejudice, discrimination, and open antagonism of the American Medical Association?

It is asserted that there is a critical shortage of physicians. Why then create a further shortage by wiping out some 30,000 qualified and licensed doctors of chiropractic and osteopathy?

What consistency is there in a measure which states that its purpose is to make available to all the public "the great promise of modern scientific knowledge and techniques" if it does not also make available the already acknowledged and established sciences and techniques of chiropractic and osteopathy?

The Federal Government at this moment is educating at its expense, under the Veterans' Administration, some 5,000 chiropractic and osteopathic students who after 4 to 6 years of study will be licensed as doctors by their respective States. They have a right to look forward to a life of service in their communities and their communities have a right to their services.

What is to become of these veterans educated at Government expense if the professions for which they are trained are eliminated by the economics of this bill?

What is to become of some 25 chiropractic and osteopathic schools with their faculties and equipment painfully built up through the years—not to mention the financial loss running into the millions of dollars?

The answers to these questions are important to a minority group.

Thirty million people who believe in the efficacy of chiropractic and osteopathy constitute no mean minority, which is just as important as any other minority group in the country.

A preliminary survey for the Committee on the Cost of Medical Care made in 1928 showed that while citizens of the United States spent some $850,000,000 for medical care, $105,000,000 was spent by this minority group for nonmedical care. If these amounts were paid in 1928 it is no exaggeration to estimate that they can be doubled or trebled for 1949.

The exclusion of chiropractic and osteopathic services from this bill ignores the contribution to public health by the nonmedical professions. This bill, if passed, will fix the pattern of health care for a nation. It will by taxation and its resultant economic pressure impose its restricted form of treatment upon a large segment of the population.

I do not believe that the Federal Government may properly violate the convictions of its citizens in this respect or take away by indirect legislation their freedom of choice of doctor or form of healing guaranteed to them by State laws.

The Federal Government might just as well tell the people of the United States that they should have more and better spiritual guidance; that they shall pay for it out of their own pockets but that they may have only the kind prescribed by the Federal Government.

All that I have stated concerning Senate bill 1679 applies with equal force to Senate bills 1581, 1456, and 1106.

Therefore, gentlemen, for all these reasons we respectfully urge upon you the necessity of spelling out by affirmative language in the bills the intent of Congress as to freedom of choice of doctor beyond any possibility of future error or administrative caprice.

DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY TESTIFIES

On some occasions Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, the director of public relations, also has testified on behalf of NCA, and I am including also generous quotations from Dr. Murphy's testimony on S. 1320 and S. 545 in the Eightieth Congress:

STATEMENT OF EMMETT J. MURPHY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D. C. I am a chiropractor licensed in the District of Columbia, and director of public relations of the National Chiropractic Association. It is my purpose to express to you the general support of the National Chiropractic Association for the objectives of the two bills, S. 1320 and S. 545, presently before you for consideration, and to urge upon you the desirability of such amendments as are necessary to insure preservation of free choice of doctor by the patient in the event that either of these bills, or other bills having the same end, become law.

The National Chiropractic Association is formed on democratic principles, under which control of policy is vested in the house of delegates. There has been no meeting of the house of delegates since the introduction of these bills, and therefore there has been no opportunity for a declaration of policy.

The National Chiropractic Association promotes the public health, the standards of chiropractic education and research, and the art and science of chiropractic.

In the light of these professional aims of the National Chiropractic Association, a resolution was adopted in 1939 in support of legislation having the same objectives and similar in form and content to S. 1320. The resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the executive board of directors of the National Chiropractic Association go on record as favoring the efforts of the President's committee to coordinate health and welfare activities, and recommend to our agencies and affiliated organizations that they give every cooperation to this committee in their efforts to bring about a better health service to our Nation.

"We further recommend that the committee always keep in mind the right of a citizen to choose his own doctor and method of healing and urge that the committee include doctors of chiropractic in the Federal health program."

Although the methods prescribed vary substantially between the two measures now before you, both bills appear to have as their primary purpose the removal or reduction of the economic barriers which prevent resort to timely and adequate health care on the part of the people generally.

Both bills would tend to promote a more widely diffused means of furnishing health care to individuals, regardless of the sparseness of population or lack of financial resources of individuals. There can be no controversy regarding the social desirability of such objectives.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress testimony was offered by the National Chiropractic Association in regard to S. 1606, and the principles then enunciated are reiterated in regard to S. 1320.

I wish particularly to offer again to the committee and to stress the need of the proposed amendments to S. 1606, Seventy-ninth Congress, which are equally applicable to S. 1320 and, if anything, are more urgently needed at the present time.

If the program to be authorized by S. 1320 is to succeed, it will require the services and the entire resources of all the healing arts. Chiropractic will inevitably play no inconsiderable part in the formulation and execution of the program. In every State and Territory, except four, chiropractors are licensed by law and serve the public health and interest in all those jurisdictions. Millions of people look to chiropractic practitioners for ministrations to their health needs.

The bill, S. 1320, is replete with such terms as "physician," "general medical and family practitioner," "medical practitioner," "qualified specialists and consultants," and "professional advisory committees."

It is of compelling importance to the patient and to the doctor that there be no possible misunderstanding, now or in the future, as to the precise meaning of these terms. They should expressly include chiropractic in consonance with State practice acts.

We must urge upon you the necessity of spelling out by affirmative language in the bill and in the committee report the intent of the Congress as to freedom of choice of practitioner beyond any possibility of future error or administrative caprice.

Whether in the language we suggest, or in other words of the same import, the National

Chiropractic Association believes that positive safeguards must be provided to guard against monopoly and against the dead hand of vested interests in research, in administration, and in practice.

The principle that it is a function of the several States to prescribe the conditions of the practice of the healing arts is not only generally accepted but has been affirmatively stated by the Congress in major legislation of recent years. The Congress should meticulously refrain from infringing upon the regulatory domain of the States in establishing standards of preparation for practitioners of the healing arts and in defining the scope of practice.

Any broad national health program will necessarily operate within the practice regulations of the various States. The Federal program could not enlarge the legal license of a practitioner; whether it can operate to devalue or destroy his license is another question.

Nor should a private organization be given the power of sanctions against an economic rival through lack of clarity in the law.

I reiterate our belief that it was and is the intent of the framers of this beneficent legislation that chiropractic is included in the scope of the health benefits provided for, and that legally qualified chiropractic physicians are eligible for furnishing those benefits; but there is nothing in this bill to insure against a contrary interpretation by the administrative authority.

The inclusion of our amendments can but strengthen that intent; their exclusion could in the future be interpreted by an administrator as license virtually to confiscate the practice of 20,000 chiropractic physicians.

Such an eventuality would be an unworthy deception of the people by leading them to believe that their contributions guarantee them complete health coverage when in fact they would be denied recourse to chiropractic within the benefits of this legislation.

It would further constitute a fraud on chiropractic patients contributing to the Federal plan, for they would be doubly taxed, first for the maintenance of conventional medical services, which in many cases they do not desire, and again for their own direct payment for chiropractic treatment which they do desire.

On the chiropractors themselves it would be an ironic double tax for which they would pay without even being included in the operation of the program which ultimately would be bound to destroy their profession unless protected by positive declaration of Congress.

Such a course is manifestly unfair and defeats the purpose of the legislation, since it exacerbates rather than ameliorates the economic inequities this bill is designed to overcome.

It would also tend sharply to channel medical practice to narrowly constricted schools of medicine and of healing, to the exclusion of other established and reputable systems of the medical arts. This can easily and quickly degenerate into state medicine, as repugnant to the free institutions of America as state religion.

Everything I have said, Mr. Chairman, in urging modification of S. 1320 to provide positive and clear safeguards against discriminatory administration applies with greater vigor to S. 545. The National Chiropractic Association must and does object to statutory enthronement of conventional medicine as a czar of a Federal health program. The statutory qualification of the administrator of the proposed National Health Agency as a medical doctor is utterly incompatible with the American philosophy of government.

Baldly, this is the corporative state.

It is foreign to the concepts of American free enterprise, contrary to public interest, and opposed to enlightened development of medical research and progress. Such a provision is retrogressive and inimical to democratic principles. It would virtually establish a state monopoly of health service leading swiftly and inevitably to overt discrimination and ultimate suppression of every dissenting school of therapy.

We are confident that the Congress will not knowingly encourage the further growth of monopolistic autocracy.

We are equally confident that, out of the long and careful consideration of the various proposals looking to the ultimate extension of health benefits to the entire population of the United States, highly desirable legislation ultimately will be enacted.

To that purpose we pledge our cooperation, asking only that a policy of nondiscrimination be spelled out in the act, to help preserve our American way of life.

The Intent of Congress and the Future of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action taken by the Senate on Thursday, July 28, 1949, and by the House on August 2, 1949, whereby both bodies agreed to the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5632) to reorganize the fiscal management in the Military Establishment, to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes, I am compiling a list of statements and questions asked by Members of the Senate of the distinguished chairman, Mr. TYDINGS, of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and also a list of questions asked by the Members of the House of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, and the ranking minority member, Mr. SHORT, as they relate to the functions and duties of the Marine Corps. I am doing this with the purpose in mind of showing very clearly what the intent of Congress is, insofar as the duties of the Marine Corps are concerned. While the conference report on H. R. 5632 was not all that many of us wanted, nevertheless it was the best possible bill we could get under the circumstances and I am of the belief, in view of the authoritative statements made, that the future of the Marine Corps is secure. On the basis of this measure, it is well to point out that the only way possible to abolish, reduce, or transfer the duties of the Marine Corps would be through a Presidential reorganization plan. Should such a plan be offered to the Congress, it would have to be vetoed within 60 days to keep it from becoming a law. I am quite certain that on this basis no law would stand the remotest chance of passing the Congress which would, in any way, affect the standing of the Marine Corps. I am equally certain, and many of my colleagues have concurred in this position, that the Congress will not permit the Marine Corps to be emasculated as a combatant unit by budgetary processes or disproportionate curtailment of its appropriations. We mean to see that the Marine Corps is maintained as a balanced combatant organization capable of carrying out the functions assigned to it in the basic Unification Act.

The following questions and answers are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 28, 1949, and cover the debate in the Senate on the conference report on the bill, H. R. 5632, pages 10347–10349:

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to yield because I know it is in the public interest to allay any fears as to these matters.

I understand that some steps have been taken so as to allay any fears that the Marine Corps can be abolished.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Marine Corps cannot be abolished, either under this measure or under any other measure which has been passed, without an act of Congress directing or authorizing that to be done.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Maryland know of any person anywhere in the National Defense Establishment who would wish to abolish the Marine Corps?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland, so long as he is in the Congress, will resist any attempt to abolish the Marine Corps, because it has been of tremendously valuable assistance to the United States and is worth millions or billions of dollars to our country.

Mr. LODGE. To my mind the talk of abolishing the Marine Corps is one of the wonders of the age, for it is completely without justification.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree entirely.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to hear the statement the Senator from Maryland has made regarding the Marine Corps, for, as he will recall, when the debate was in progress on the bill, there was a proposal in which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon joined, which would have had the effect of making it possible to transfer, for special detail, military personnel, including Marine Corps personnel, and also making possible the joint use of military property. But the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon made perfectly clear that the amendment did not affect the roles and missions of the Marine Corps, because, as the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, the only way the roles and missions of any branch of the service, including the Marine Corps, can be affected is by a special act of Congress. The Senator from Maryland will recall that both Senators made as clear as the English language will permit it to be made clear that under the amendment there was no intention to transfer the Marine Corps, and that furthermore that would be impossible because a specific act of Congress would be required, if that were to be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I may say, in furtherance of trying to put this ghost to sleep for all time, that I do not think there is a single member of the House Armed Services Committee or of the Senate Armed Services Committee, or, so far as I know, any single Member of Congress, who contemplates any legislation, or the support of any legislation, which would abolish the Marine Corps. Why this bugaboo keeps rising up, when nobody has offered a bill or is suggesting doing it, I am at a loss to know.

* * * * *

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I compliment the Senator from Maryland upon his assurance there is

no danger that the Marine Corps will be dissolved.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is not the slightest danger of that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what friends of the Marine Corps feared. We were not afraid the Corps would be abolished, but we were afraid the functions of the Corps would be stripped from it, and that it would be reduced merely to guard and housekeeping duties. I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland could give us any assurance on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can rest assured. We shared his apprehension, but did not share all the fears we heard expressed. So, whether they were sound or unsound, we said we would write into this bill certain language which would make impossible even an indirect approach to the fear and apprehension the Senator has expressed that there might be a means whereby the Marine Corps' function could gradually be sapped away, so that it would be only a deck-duty or deck-guard outfit. We have specifically provided that its roles and its missions cannot be affected in any way, even by transfer on a temporary basis. The Senator may take my word for it that we have gone out of our way by additional language to reemphasize everything I told him before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator consider the possibility of establishing the strength of the Marine Corps at 6 percent of the combined strength of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy?

Mr. TYDINGS. That would have to come up in a separate bill, which we have before our committee, and is not properly, if I may say so, a part of this bill. The strength of the unit is not considered in this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But will the Senator give assurance the Marine Corps will not be reduced to mere guard and housekeeping duties?

Mr. TYDINGS. Valuing my word, I may say to the Senator in answer to his question, I foresee not the slightest diminution in the glory, the traditions, and the future of the United States Marine Corps. I am proud to make that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. Speaker, the following statements, questions, and answers are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1949, and cover the debate in the House of Representatives on the conference report on the bill, H. R. 5632, pages 10598–10610:

Mr. VINSON. * * * Our first limitation on the Secretary's power is this: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated."

* * * * *

So he cannot abolish the Marine Corps. He cannot transfer Marine aviation to the Air Force. He cannot put naval aviation into the Air Force. He cannot put the Marines in the Army.

* * * * *

Next, we provide that military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions. This means that the Secretary cannot do indirectly what we have prohibited him from doing directly. In other words, the Secretary cannot detail all Marines to the Army, because that would violate the restriction we imposed in the limitation I have just discussed. But he can detail military personnel to perform activities with other services when this does not impair the combatant functions.

* * * * *

Next, we specifically provide that the Secretary shall not use the funds of the Department to effect the results we have prohibited otherwise. In other words, he is prevented from starving the Marines to death, or by withholding funds, from putting naval aviation out of business.

* * * * *

Next, we tell the Secretary that he cannot substantially transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate any function of the Department of Defense which has been or is hereatfer authorized by law until after the reports thereon to the Committees on Armed Services of the Congress.

* * * * *

Its purpose is to keep the Congress in the picture.

* * * * *

* * * he must first tell the Armed Services Committees what he is going to do.

* * * * *

It is our intent that the Congress should be brought in on some of these matters before the Members read about them in the press or hear about them over the radio.

* * * * *

Moreover, we require the Secretary to submit separate reports from the military departments. And then we require that he itemize the savings made under unification and explain what duplications and overlappings have been eliminated within the Department of Defense under the Unification Act.

* * * * *

By savings we do not mean a reduction in the strength of military personnel or civilian personnel unless it leaves the armed forces capable of performing the same military missions they could support previous to such reductions.

* * * * *

Now let me tell you about the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

* * * * *

Our idea here was to make it certain that not the Chairman alone, as the Senate bill provided in substance, but all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall be the principal military advisers. By this device we are trying as nearly as we can to prevent a single Chief of Staff concept from developing in the Pentagon or in the White House.

* * * * *

Now, as I have said, having given him that blanket authority to run the three military establishments we impose by law certain limitations on that power, one of which is this:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by section 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated."

In the act of 1947 there was set out in the sections I have just cited the combatant functions of the Army, the combatant functions of the Navy, the combatant functions of the Marine Corps, and the combatant functions of the Air Force. So we have said that those combatant functions shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated.

* * * * *

So, I repeat: He cannot abolish the Marine Corps, he cannot transfer marine aviation to the Air Force; he cannot put naval aviation in the Air Force, he cannot put the Marines in the Army. The House is very much concerned, and the country is very much concerned about that.

* * * * *

Mr. COLE of New York. * * * The gentleman has assured the Congress that the Marine Corps will not be transferred, that naval aviation will not be transferred by virtue of this act. Is it not correct that those very things may be done by the President under existing authority of law?

Mr. VINSON. The Members of the House should, of course, recognize the fact that this act ties only the hands of the Secretary of Defense.. Under the Reorganization Act that Congress has passed, the President tomorrow morning or at any other time, notwithstanding this law, can send to the Congress a reorganization plan which would and could transfer these functions if the House did not disapprove the plan.

* * * * *

I am sorry that the House conferees could not prevail upon the Senate conferees also to fix the law so that there would be no danger of the President doing tomorrow what we are prohibiting his doing today; but the Senate conferees refused to go along with the House conferees, and it takes two to make a bargain.

* * * * *

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to have heard the statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia. In connection with the combatant functions I wonder if the gentleman will clarify the intent of the law particularly for the friends of the Marine Corps who have insisted that certainly this Congress does not intend in any way to reduce the combatant ability or functions of the Marines? For this reason I assume that there is no intent to alter those functions of the Marine Corps concerning their responsibility in the amphibious operations, and that training and development for landing and shore operations continues to be a Marine function. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on those characteristics?

Mr. VINSON. The act of 1947 gives to the Marine Corps amphibious operations. Under this law they cannot be transferred. I may say that I inserted in the RECORD a statement some months ago from Secretary Johnson to the effect that he had no intention of transferring the marines or Marine aviation, and in addition to that, we have written as tight language on this point in this legislation as can be contrived.

In regard to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], under the Reorganization Act the President can come in here with Reorganization Plan No. 10, 15, or 20, and he may set aside what we say here that the Secretary of Defense cannot do, but I do not think the House for one moment would concur with the President if he set up such a reorganization plan.

* * * * *

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. While the gentleman is speaking about the limitations and the powers of the Secretary of National Defense, let me say this: First I want to commend my former distinguishd chairman for his statement—

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will recall that I talked to him about this subject. The Marines in my district are interested in not limiting the number by percentage of Marines, and I call attention——

Mr. VINSON. I cannot go into that. That is not involved in the conference report. The Marine Corps is fixed at 20 percent of the strength of the Navy.

Mr. CHURCH. Is this better for them than 6 percent of all of the armed services or as provided in the Mansfield bill?

Mr. VINSON. Just a moment. Let met get this off my mind. Somebody has tried to get the Marines to talk about having 6 percent of the combatant strength of all three services. It will take legislation to do that, and I do not think the Congress will do it.

* * * * *

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Although there are safeguards in this bill, as the gentleman has pointed out, what is there to prevent, when the 1951 fiscal budget comes before us, a reduction in force of the Marine Corps or naval aviation, for example?

Mr. VINSON. To do that the Congress must do it. He cannot take a block of people in the Army and put them in the Navy. He cannot take a group of naval officers or personnel and put them into the Army. He cannot transfer, because under the law today it cannot be done and we do not give him that authority.

* * * * *

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in my assumption after listening to the gentleman and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that under this legislation the functions and duties of the Marine Corps are absolutely assured and, I might also say, insured insofar as it is possible for this Congress to do so?

Mr. SHORT. I can answer that positively in the affirmative. I asked Secretary Johnson repeatedly when he first appeared before our committee whether or not he could guarantee that the Marine Corps would not be swallowed up by the Navy or the Army and that the air arm of the Navy would not be consumed by the Air Force, and his answer was "Yes." Of course, we are going to maintain the identity and integrity of each branch of the services. I do not think any Member need worry about that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the only way in which anything could happen to the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the Marine Corps would be through a reorganization plan placed before this Congress by the President, which this Congress would have to veto within 60 days or it becomes effective. If that assumption is correct, and I believe it is, then I am certain that no Congress would ever stand for a revision or a lessening of the functions and duties of the Corps.

Mr. SHORT. That is right. And, under the present legislation the Secretary of National Defense must report to the Committee on Armed Services of both Houses if any fundamental changes are to take place.

* * * * *

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] apply also to the percentage of strength of the Marines. I have talked to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and he informs me that the strength of the Marine Corps is now over 6 percent of the over-all armed forces and that it has a statutory strength of 20 percent of the naval personnel.

Mr. SHORT. That is carried out under existing law. That is already established law, and I do not think any Secretary of Defense, I do not care who he is, would ever attempt or dare to try to abolish the Marine Corps. He would have all the American people on his neck. The Marines have proved their worth and they are here to stay. We will see to that.

* * * * *

Mr. HÉBERT. I am sure that the gentleman does not want to leave the impression with the House that the fact that the Secretary has to make a report first to the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that that is a stopgap as far as carrying out any intended plan that he may have?

In other words, he can submit a report to the House today and accomplish that intent tomorrow morning?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, if he hands in a report to the Armed Services Committee today and says it will go into effect tomorrow—well, we are pretty active, and I think we know our rights.

* * * * *

Mr. SHORT. * * * I do not like the vast powers granted to one man.

But as for the over-all, we have an excellent piece of legislation, one designed to clarify the authority and power relationships in the National Military Establishment, one calculated to bring economies in the armed forces where possible without injury to our readiness in time of emergency, one which will expedite Chiefs of Staff, our highest military body. In its totality the bill is good.

* * * * *

I much prefer this legislation to the President's plan.

* * * * *

I still believe in unification—not merger.

* * * * *

Nevertheless, I think the House should know and that the armed forces should know that our extensive and detailed hearings on this legislation for a month and a half have made it far less clear to me as to the value to be derived from unification than it ever was before. I am filled with doubts.

* * * * *

And as to savings under the law, I hope for them like all of you do. I am skeptical as to their achievement. Let me make it absolutely clear to the House that despite repeated efforts on the part of many of the members of the Armed Services Committee, we were never able to obtain an iota of evidence, not one shred of substance, that such savings would actually occur or in what areas such savings could be made. Reductions are not savings. The vast powers granted to a single individual under this act frighten me. Let us hope these powers are exercised wisely and never abused.

Mr. HOFFMAN. * * * Two years ago we were told by the administration spokesmen, the heads of the departments, that a unification bill was necessary if our national security was to be preserved.

Until near the close of the hearings, which were held on that bill, the high-ranking officers of the Navy who served throughout the war on the high seas were denied the opportunity to present their views and, even when permitted to speak, it was quite evident that they were under restraint.

Officers representing the marines were subjected to similar treatment, which became, in at least one instance, so offensive that General Edson, commanding the Marines, resigned from the service.

* * * * *

I have a distinct recollection of listening to General Eisenhower, when we were considering the Unification Act of 1947, give testimony designed to create the impression that no attempt was being made to lessen the functions or reduce the size or activities of the Marine Corps. His testimony created the impression that no one had ever had such a thought in mind.

At the very time he was testifying, I had before me a copy of the correspondence carried on on that subject between General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz and from that correspondence it was apparent that the Army made a sustained effort to reduce the size of the Marine Corps, to limit its missions.

* * * * *

Notwithstanding the restrictions written into this bill in conference, it is my prediction that those in the armed services, seeking more power for themselves or for the branches of the services which they represent, will attempt, through a reduction of appropriations in the 1951 budget, to curtail the activities of the marines and the Navy's Air Force.

* * * * *

The Congress of the United States has gone on record repeatedly ever since 1903 against the Prussian-type national general staff and against an all-powerful Chief of Staff of our armed forces, and the Congress went on record in 1947 against absolute merger of our armed forces. The Eighty-first Congress now proposed to go on record, again, against these dangers to our American way of life.

In the preamble of the National Security Act Amendments of 1949, Congress states its intention not to establish a single Chief of Staff over the armed forces nor an armed forces general staff.

The preamble also states that it does not intend to merge the three services, but only to provide for their coordination and unified control.

These are splendid sentiments, but are they enough?

Are they enough when we know that there is a small but powerful group of our military men who want one of their clique to wield the power of a single Chief of Staff? And when we have even within our Congress, a few misguided men who have already proclaimed publicly that next year they will have a new bill before Congress for complete merger of our armed forces?

As much as we respect the purely military ability of men like General Bradley and General Vandenberg, I am shocked to hear them say before a congressional committee that they believe in a single Chief of Staff of all the armed forces. General Gruenther, Director of the Joint Staff, has given his opinion before the House Armed Services Committee that we would have a single Chief of Staff in 5 years.

Forewarned should be forearmed.

* * * * *

* * * Ex-President Hoover testified before the House Armed Services Committee that the expanded power of a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would in practice amount to the constitution of a single Chief of Staff.

* * * * *

Yet in spite of Eberstadt's warning the bill now before the House abolishes the three military executive departments and by conversion actually merges them into a single executive Department of National Defense.

Here in this bill are cleverly inserted, under attractive but misleading titles, the entering wedges for a vast consolidation of military power so greatly desired by the ambitious few and so hazardous to the people of this Nation.

* * * * *

Mr. COLE of New York. * * * I wonder if you realized and noted that when the chairman of the committee recommended that this bill, as reported in the conference report, be adopted by the Congress, he concluded in very emphatic and definite expressions by declaring it as being his opinion that this bill was not needed in order to clarify the powers of the Secretary of Defense or in order to accomplish the purposes of unification and effect the dollar savings claimed to be possible.

* * * * *

* * * I am not yet ready to place my stamp of approval upon this bill, which places far too great a power in the hands of any one man as Secretary of Defense and which has the seeds of undermining our national defense, even though the golden apple of aphemeral economy is held out before us.

* * * * *

Is this conference report "unification"? Of course not. It is merger. The very thing its preamble says we will not allow. We are merging the three services into a corporate monster of a single executive department. This is not my opinion alone, it is also the considered opinion of Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt. Why are we doing this? Why are we playing this game with words? It is a simple answer. This holy word "unification" is supposed to mean economy.

* * * * *

Because it sounds so good to our ears we are going to put complete control of $15,000,000,000 in the hands of one man.

* * * * *

* * * Where is the businessman who is insane enough to want to have one-man responsibility for a business whose annual operating expenses are $15,000,000,000 a year? What businessman would claim that he could economically manage a business whose plants, property, and equipment, scattered all around the world, are worth dozens of billions?

* * * * *

* * * Show me a man who would claim efficiency from making one man responsible for a merger of United States Steel, General Motors, du Pont, General Electric, Sears, Roebuck, and Ford into one organization, and I will show you a man no bank would loan a dime.

How will these savings be made? The simplest way, of course, by chopping out a few things.

I do not have to tell any newspaper reader where the chopping will be done. The targets will be the Marine Corps and naval aviation. Oh, I know there will be a few symbolic cuts, mostly on paper, at the Army and the Air Force. But the real whacks will come from the Marine Corps and naval aviation.

* * * * *

I challenge the Pentagon to produce their figures for the 1951 budget. There is not a doubt in my mind but what we will find that the Marine Corps and naval aviation are taking the biggest reductions of all.

* * * * *

Mr. SASSCER. * * * In the unification Mr. Forrestal, with his knowledge and appreciation of the Navy's importance, was made Secretary of Defense. He was present at the Key West meeting. He realized the importance of retaining the autonomy of the Navy which was protected under the terms of that agreement; and he saw what the forces, under the guise of unification but aimed at merger and subjugation, were doing to our national defense, and this great American was indeed a war casualty. He was as concerned as many of us over the plight of our Navy and Marine Corps.

* * * * *

* * * The scuttling of the carrier is not an economy measure but a further projection of the plans to strip the Navy and Marine Corps and their air arms.

* * * * *

* * * It is ironical that their first Navy Day observance falls but a few months after the abolition of Navy Day in America, which had been celebrated each year since 1922 on October 27. It is probably trivial to mention this, but I refer to it merely as an example of one of the links in the chain that is aimed at the eradication of the autonomy of the Navy and Marine Corps.

* * * * *

* * * I am not arguing against a unification of the armed services as directed to savings, but I am attempting to show that the present Unification Act provides the necessary means to accomplish this economy. At the same time, I wish to caution against the dangers of the determined philosophy of this long-range program to strip down and eventually destroy the Navy and Marine Corps aviation, and to protest against a program that would reduce those proud services below an executive department to mere agencies in one big military bureau, and which would leave them in a status somewhat similar to the prewar Army Transport Service.

* * * * *

Mr. THOMPSON. * * * It is known to all who care to interest themselves that I am a United States marine of some 30 years of service either on active duty in two wars or as a reservist—a militiaman.

* * * mind of the Secretary of Defense to do away with the Marine Corps. This, he has denied. There is no choice but to accept his denial and to assume that anyone who may have gathered from conversations with him that he planned the effective disposal of the Marine Corps as a vital fighting unit, evidently misunderstood him.

In his explanation a few moments ago, the gentleman from Georgia reassured me somewhat. I still wonder if in the back of some people's minds there is not the idea that the mission of the corps may be gradually restricted until it becomes merely the force to guard the navy yards and other naval establishments and to man the marine detachments on board ship. It will be interesting to watch from the sidelines for this development.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as finally adopted made it clear in the law itself and not subject to interpretation that the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 F, 206 B, 206 C, and 208 F of the original Unification Act should not be transferred, assigned, abolished, or consolidated. The inferences in back of this language are perfectly clear, particularly when taken in connection with section 202 C (3) of the act. The Congress fully intended that the Secretary of Defense could not disturb the basic combat roles and missions assigned under the quoted sections. This apparently was specific and to the point. Furthermore, as set out in the law he could not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to effect the results prohibited by the specific prohibitions against the transfer of roles and missions or military personnel.

I think it is important that the Congress clearly note that this letter subsection which I have just referred to was added by the conferees and was not originally contained in the drafts of the bill as it passed the two Houses. The President in his wisdom had seen fit to place similar language in the legislative Reorganization Plan No. 8 which covered this subject. The conferees apparently felt that it was proper that it be included in the basic law on this subject. In substance, the conferees of both Houses of Congress have said that it would be illegal for the Secretary of Defense through budgetary process to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate the combatant functions as assigned to the various services by the basic Unification Act. If the military budget is set up by direction of the Secretary of Defense in such a way as to force changes in the fundamental concepts of the combatant functions assigned, then it will be in clear violation of the letter of the law and the intent as contained in the amendments to the National Security Act.

Veterans and Veterans' Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy regarding a bill I have introduced, H. R. 2446, which is designed to modify the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. This bill is not intended to destroy the principle of preference for veterans in the civil service; nor is it my aim to create dissension and discontent among Federal civilian employees.

This measure is intended primarily to correct gross inequities, provide greater security, and to promote a more efficient service. It is my belief that the adoption of this measure will, in the long run, benefit not only civilian employees, but also veterans and the Nation as large.

I have learned with considerable disappointment that some of my friends among the veterans have misconstrued this bill as a measure aimed at veterans and designed, as one of my more vehement correspondents put it, "to rob the veteran of all his rights."

It is true that H. R. 2446 would slightly modify the Veterans' Preference Act, but certainly it would not rob the veteran, nor substantially reduce even the small area of preference in retention in Federal employment.

I voted for the Veterans' Preference Act in its present form. Now I am convinced, and I am certain that thoughtful veterans familiar with the principles of merit appointment and promotion in Government service will agree with me, that the law was so sweeping in its conferral of retention rights that it threatens the merit system, and it also threatens to set veterans in government off in a special category, breeding ill will and resentment.

There is nothing new in the idea of special rights to veterans in Government employment. Some such law has been passed by Congress after each major war since career Government service began.

But never has the United States been engaged in a war which so completely absorbed the energies of the civilian population, and never has the Congress passed so broad and sweeping an act, affecting so many individuals.

World War II was a total war, in which men and women did as they were told by the Government, and without any back talk.

Whether a man—or a woman—was in uniform fighting, or chained to a machine in a war plant, was not a matter of his choosing. I am excluding now the negligible number of deliberate draft dodgers, who are probably pretty poor citizens anyway.

There are thousands of faithful and patriotic Federal workers who were willing and even anxious to serve in the armed forces but who were sternly told

by their draft boards to stick to their jobs. There are other thousands, many thousands, of women, who served that men might be released; and other thousands of men who were overage or otherwise unacceptable to the armed services.

But they served.

They served in peace and in war, each in his way.

I believe, on careful and fair consideration, that you cannot fail to agree with me that the superseniority of the Veterans' Preference Act is so sweeping as to be unfair to these thousands. Of course, there are some among them unworthy of our sympathy; but too, there are some among the veterans claiming the full benefits of the act who did little to earn those benefits.

My own correspondence, and testimony offered at the hearings on S. 660 and H. R. 2446 has developed many instances in which loyal, conscientious, hard-working Government employees, most of them past their prime, have been displaced under veteran seniority rights by new employees who had not been 6 months on the job.

You have to bear in mind that veterans already have a vested preference in consideration for employment.

By long-standing law, every veteran and every veteran's survivor is entitled to a five-point preference on his eligibility rating, and in case of disability he is entitled to a 10-point preference.

When absolute preference in retention rights is added, the result is rather overwhelming.

My bill would only modify this preference in retention rights to the extent that absolute preference would extend through a 7-year period. After that, veterans and nonveterans would compete on an equal basis. This seems to me a small concession. I intend, nevertheless, to amend my bill in order to provide 10, and possibly 12 years of preference for veterans rather than merely 7.

But my bill goes even further in protecting the disabled, who actually suffered more than dislocation from the ravages of war. To every veteran, regardless of status, granted a disability rating of 60 percent or more, my bill would guarantee absolute preference in retention rights.

This, too, seems to me eminently fair.

Let me return for a minute to my position on veterans' affairs generally.

Veterans and their families know of my deep, sincere, and proved interest in the welfare of veterans, both as individuals and as organized groups.

My files will show—and I will cheerfully open them to inspection—scores of cases in which I have gone all out to aid individual veterans and servicemen in their relations with the Veterans' Administration, with the armed services, with their housing problems, and in their domestic and financial and employment problems.

My voting record will stand the most searching scrutiny.

You will remember the fight we made here last year for increased allowances to veterans for educational benefits—and I was in the forefront of that.

You remember my bill in the Eightieth Congress to exempt disability payments for service-connected injuries or sickness from computation of rent in low-rent housing. This was a provision I attempted to write into the National Housing Act.

In this Congress I have four major bills compelling the support of all veterans, in addition to H. R. 2446:

H. R. 1233, to provide a bonus for service in World War II by residents of the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4517, to provide Federal loans for moderate-income families, with special provisions for veterans.

H. R. 5824, to extend and liberalize the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act commonly known as 52–20, by providing for payment of unemployment benefits of $30 a week for 104 weeks, plus $5 a week for dependents.

H. R. 5762, to extend the 52–20 provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The purpose of this bill is to continue unemployment benefits for veterans until these benefits can be liberalized in accordance with my bill, H. R. 5824, or some similar measure. The 52–20 provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act have now expired and I might mention that I was the first Member to introduce an extension for the protection of veterans who are currently having difficulty finding employment.

I hope that all veterans will carefully study all that I have said in these remarks, will examine my bill H. R. 2446, and will compare what I have said with the Veterans' Preference Act and with testimony offered to the various committees which have considered similar bills.

For your information, my good friend, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, of California, one of the wisest and fairest men in Congress, has been appointed chairman of a special subcommittee on the bill; and I know that he will be glad to hear your views now that hearings have commenced.

Freedom of Expression in New Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested in the real implications of a Communist domination of the new democracies. It is a travesty of justice that the enlightened Czech people who have such a heritage of independence and love for freedom to be subjected to the primitive and totalitarian ideas which dictated the policy indicated by the following news report:

GOTTWALD REPLACES PRINCES IN NEW CZECH FAIRY TALES

CZECHSLOVAKIA, August 24.—The school children of Czechoslovakia will not read about fairy tale princes any more. Instead, they will read about Communist leader Klement Gottwald, president of the country.

Purging of the princes and the elevation of M. Gottwald to the role of a school-book hero was announced today by Bohumir Kujal, chairman of the government's editorial committee. The committee's job is to prepare new text books to speed Czechoslovakia's education system along the road to communism.

"Our children shall no longer find their examples in the princes of fairy stories, but in the shock workers and heroes of work," said M. Kujal. "The first duty of the teachers is to deepen and intensify the education of your youth toward socialism." ("Shock-worker" is Czechoslovakia's equivalent to Russia's "stakhanovite," or above-quota producer.)

Ninth District Voters Are Asked To Give Their Opinions on Important Questions Before the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Member of Congress should solicit and secure the opinions of the people he represents in the United States Congress. After all, he represents the people of the district which he serves in the United States Congress.

He should by all means, if possible, secure the opinions and views of these good citizens on questions of the day which confront the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, I have asked a number of my personal friends throughout the district to contact as many citizens as possible to secure their opinions on the issues confronting the United States Congress during this, the Eighty-first Congress.

These citizens of the Ninth District of Minnesota are being requested to voice their views and give their comments on several important questions which concern the American people at this time. Therefore, I am distributing a questionnaire which is entitled "How Do You Feel About—."

	For	*Against*
A straight 10-percent cut in all Federal expenditures that can be cut	———	———
Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's farm plan	———	———
The so-called national health plan	———	———
Federal aid to education, costing $300,000,000 the first year	———	———
Expansion of coverage and increase of benefits under social security	———	———
The ECA program, costing $5,500,000,000 for the coming year (this is chiefly aid to Europe under the so-called Marshall plan)	———	———

	For	Against
Arms for Europe under the North Atlantic Pact, to cost something over $1,000,000,000 in the coming year	———	———
Increased income and payroll taxes that will be necessary to carry out the President's many recommendations for more spending	———	———
Adoption of Hoover Commission reorganization plan	———	———

Name _____
Street or R. F. D. No. _____
City _____

Chatham County Negro Holds Ph. D. at Age of 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial written by Jim Parker and appearing in the Greensboro Daily News of August 28, 1949:

CHATHAM COUNTY NEGRO HOLDS PH. D. AT AGE OF 19

(By Jim Parker)

SILER CITY, August 27.—Every now and then one picks up the papers and reads of a 14-year-old boy finishing high school or of a 9-year-old kid conducting a symphony orchestra. The newspapers usually refer to these children as child prodigies.

But from Siler City comes the story of a child prodigy that will end all discussion of prodigies and geniuses. The person in question, 19-year-old Joseph Clemont Paige of Siler City star route, is the youngest Negro ever to be granted a Ph. D. degree by any American university.

A. AND T. GRADUATE

Young Paige, or Dr. Paige, received his doctorate last January from McGill University in Canada. His degree was in the field of physiological psychology. He received his master's degree in bacteriology from the City College of New York in 1947 and his B. S. in biological sciences in 1945 from A. and T. College in Greensboro.

Not only is Dr. Paige the youngest American Negro to receive a doctor's degree, but he is the first Negro ever to be invited to address the sessions of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. He will leave New York by plane on August 29 to deliver a paper before the association of Britain's foremost scientists at Newcastle-on-Tyne. His paper is titled "An Exploratory Investigation of the Commensality of the Sea Anemone and Hermit Crab With Comparative Reference to the Existing Symbiotic Relationship Among Mankind."

EXPRESSES GRATITUDE

Speaking of this great honor which the British scientists have bestowed upon him. Dr. Paige said, "I am deeply gratified that I am the first person of my race to have this great honor. I shall do my best to live up to it and to discharge my commission to the best of my ability."

Paige, a soft-spoken young man who looks no older than his 19 years, is spending a few days with his parents, the Benny Paiges of Siler City star route. He has eight brothers and sisters, none of whom have finished college. "I intend to see that my younger brothers and sisters go to college," he said. His mother is a former school teacher.

HARDSHIP AND COURAGE

Paige's story is the story of hardship and courage and of great determination. Benny Paige is not a wealthy man and he could not afford to send his son to college and give him the expensive graduate study that he desired. So the boy worked after school and on Saturdays and saved his money. Finally his aunt took him to New York to live with her and go to school up there.

He finished high school in New York and came back south to enter college in his home State. He worked his way through college—A. and T., City College, and McGill University. Dr. Mary Bethune, noted Negro educator, became interested in him and helped find work and scholarships to aid his quest for an education.

At the age of 19 he obtained his doctor's degree and became professor of psychoanalytical techniques at Americus Institute of Psychoanalysis. From Americus he went to Bethune-Cockman College at Daytona Beach, Fla., where he became head of the department of biology.

TEACHES COURSES IN MARRIAGE

A teacher as young as Dr. Paige naturally finds it rather tough sometimes in trying to teach pupils that may be as old or even older than he is. Dr. Paige said he found his first year of teaching very hard for this reason. At Bethune-Cockman he teaches courses in family and marriage, hardly a course that the average 19-year-old is qualified to teach.

Next year he is to be head of the biology department of the Fort Valley State College, at Fort Valley, Ga., but he won't be able to take over his duties because of a new honor that has just been bestowed upon him. He has just been announced as the winner of the Americus Institute of Psychoanalysts' Elizabeth Crompton memorial medal for 1949–50. With the medal goes $4,000 for advanced study in France and Europe. He has also been named director of the institute's research committee on European studies, with headquarters in England, France, and Switzerland. The job will keep him in Europe for the next 4 years.

GETS AHEAD BY HARD WORK

In order to take this research job, he has obtained a leave of absence from Fort Valley State College. The new job will begin in January.

The story of Dr. Paige's rapid rise from a Chatham County farm boy to a position of international prominence among scientists is an intriguing one. It is illustrative of the old American belief that a man through hard work and determination can get ahead regardless of his race or creed.

Address of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, at Democratic Outing Near Hamilton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], at the annual Democratic outing at LeSourdsville Lake, north of Hamilton, Ohio, on August 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to see how many loyal and enthusiastic Democrats there are here in southern Ohio. I knew from the election returns of last November that there were quite a few Democrats in Ohio—more in fact than the Republicans realized. But your distinguished Republican Senator from Hamilton County has never mentioned to me that there were so many fine flowers of the Democratic Party blooming right in his own back yard.

Maybe he does not know that you are here. If that is the case it becomes my duty, as chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee of the Democratic Party, to urge you to make your presence known to my distinguished Republican colleague in November of 1950—and I am sure you will.

Today I want to talk to you about a very serious subject—the future of the two-party system of government in America. In the United States we have two major political parties—the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

Both are fighting parties.

The Republicans are fighting each other.

The Democrats are fighting for a better America, for a better labor law, a better farm program, better social security, better education, a better health program.

When the Republicans get tired of fighting each other they bind up their wounds and start fighting the progress which the Democratic Party has brought about since 1932. That fight hasn't been much of a success in recent elections.

It is difficult to give everyone the credit he deserves in apportioning responsibility for the fact that the GOP is a fighting party.

Certainly Congressman HUGH SCOTT, the former chairman of the Republican National Committee, has made a clear record in that field. Congressman SCOTT said he would make the Republican Party a fighting party. How well he succeeded. In June of 1948 he took a party with glowing promises, wonderful prospects. It was at the very top of popular support.

The political columnists said the party would win. So did even those shrewd gentlemen who lay odds on sporting events.

So did the political pollsters, those astute gentlemen who talk to the residents of Indian Hills to find out how the folks in the basin are going to vote in Cincinnati. Every poll said SCOTT's party was a shoo-in.

Here are what the pollsters said about SCOTT's prospects:

On September 9, 1948, Elmo Roper made up his mind that Dewey had won the election, and that from that day on he would devote his time and efforts to other things. He gave Mr. Dewey 44.2 percent and Mr. Truman 31.4 percent.

Among other things, he made the statement that Mr. Truman's campaign was not likely to evoke any electoral miracles and that Mr. Dewey was not rash, so this wasn't a hare-and-tortoise race; it was a very ordinary horse race—a race in which one horse had a commanding lead over the other horse; that being so, he said, "I can think of nothing duller or more intellectually barren than acting like a sports announcer who feels he must pretend he is witnessing a neck-and-neck race that will end in a photo finish or a dramatic upset for the favorite, and then finally have to announce that the horse which

was eight lengths ahead at the turn is still eight lengths ahead."

You people live so close to Kentucky that you know he wasn't much of a hand at picking race horses.

On election eve Mr. Roper made a final statement that "the political hourglass will turn upside down this Tuesday and the Republicans will ascend to the White House for the first time in 16 years." They did—but they came to dance at Harry Truman's party.

August 1, 1948, the Gallup poll gave Dewey 48 percent and Mr. Truman 37 percent. This was the first poll after the two major party conventions. Again on August 22 Gallup predicted that Dewey would win, with Dewey receiving 48 percent and Truman 37 percent. In early September Gallup showed Dewey still leading with 48½ percent and Truman with 36½. Late in the same month the Gallup poll showed Truman trimming Dewey lead, with Dewey 46½ percent and Truman 39.

The middle of October found Gallup giving Dewey a lead in 30 States and Truman in 13 States, and giving Dewey 2½ times as many electorial votes as Truman. The figures on the popular vote were: Dewey 46 percent and Truman 40 percent. In the final roundup of October 29, Gallup showed Dewey holding a long lead in 19 States—a smaller lead in 12 States, 16 States designated as battlegrounds and Thurmond leading in 3 States.

And the pollsters sneered when Democrats said it just wasn't so.

There is no doubt of it—the elephant was looking at the world through rose-colored glasses.

But underneath the surface, unnoticed like the bottom part of the iceberg, was that fighting Republican Party that Congressman SCOTT had promised.

The Republican Party was preaching unity, harmony, mother-love and upholstered seats on the fish ladders on western dams. But while preaching unity the Republicans were doing a solid job of fighting. They were divided—divided over principles and over division of the spoils.

In every State they were in conflict over who was to be United States Marshal or Collector of Revenue.

They were in conflict over their labor policy—would it be the policy of Taft or Ives or Morse or Dewey? Of course they were busy telling workingmen, "We'll take care of labor," in a friendly tone of voice, while they told big business contributors, in a tone that sucked dollars into their campaign coffers: "Don't worry, we'll take care of labor." But how to do this? The Republicans didn't know.

Then there was the farm program. Would CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, be the Secretary of Agriculture with the ideas which he had incorporated into a House bill and into his portion of the Hope-Aiken bill which was high, rigid 90 percent price supports, or would the job go to someone from New York State who liked the ideas of the Senate and the lower flexible supports of the AIKEN part of the Agricultural Act of 1948. Governor Stassen clarified the issue when he announced after a news conference with Dewey that agricultural prices should be shaken down. Along came September and October and agricultural prices were shaken down, so much so that the fighting party began biting at itself all over again.

Then came election day with the history-making scenes at a New York hotel. Cordons of New York State troopers and State policemen were stretched around the hotel so that the great Governor of New York would not be disturbed while he read the news of his victory. Secret Service men from the White House anxious to have a front seat while they guarded the next President were reported to be there and the calm, rarified atmosphere in which the little man with the big dog had conducted his unifying campaign was to be unbroken in his hotel suite during the hour of victory.

If you called Governor Dewey's suite at seven or eight that evening and asked for the Governor, you would be told, "The President is brushing his hair." The next time, "The President is brushing his teeth," and the next time, "The President is writing his acceptance speech," but along about 3 o'clock in the morning after the country precincts began to report, that hotel suite changed tunes a little bit and reported, "The Governor has gone to bed."

When he got up the next morning in time to concede the election of Harry Truman, the Republican Party was a fighting party sure enough. Dewey was snapping at SCOTT, TAFT was scoffing at Stassen, fat purse contributors were biting at the experts who told them Dewey couldn't lose and every man who could shoulder a club was looking for a fellow Republican at whom he could swing it.

It would be nice to record that the tragedy of that adversity bound the Republicans together. But the Republicans took all the old adages and twisted them into reverse.

Sour were the uses of adversity. Divided they stood, divided they fell. In Dewey's unity (as a campaign issue) there was weakness. Experience (what Dewey should have learned in the 1944 me-too campaign) was the worst teacher. The elephant never remembers (his past mistakes).

The only adage the Republicans left inviolate was this saying: You can't make a cake rise twice. If you slam the oven door and it falls, it stays flat.

Not even if you substitute Warren for BRICKER, it still stays flat, looks flat, and tastes flat.

The Republicans had even more explaining to do than the pollsters. They were full of theories involved explanations, and you frequently heard the same morning-after resolution that the elephant made in November of 1932, in November of 1936, in November of 1940, and in November of 1944—never again. Not one drop of that old reaction. When you used smooth "me too" as a mixer it left an awful hangover.

In the city of Washington Republicans paraded past the office of the national chairman singing, "We've got you under our skin." The great scheme was set on foot to rid the party of its millstone. Dewey had traded with Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania had given the party SCOTT. It was sure of one thing—to succeed it must go forward "Scott free." The great parade to send SCOTT to the Antartic was under way.

They met at Omaha. Peace, it was wonderful. The East was against the West, the North was against the South, and every man was against Dewey. They reviled their national chairman, they hanged him from a thousand limbs, but they were stuck with him, and they couldn't get rid of him. Let me read from the account of this meeting in the Republican bible, the New York Herald Tribune. I quote:

"Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania, held fast to the Republican national chairmanship today by a 54-to-50 vote after 3 days of recrimination and name calling which left the Republican National Committee split down the middle.

"The committee's action spelled defeat for a Taft-Stassen coalition which failed by only four votes in its attempt to wrest control of the party from supporters of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, Republican Presidential nominee in 1944 and 1948.

"The Taft-Stassen forces, however, won a major concession as Mr. SCOTT agreed to appoint a new executive committee giving representation to all groups and elements in the party to replace the one dominated by Dewey supporters he named last week.

"The committee's action on the chairmanship was hardly a Dewey triumph, however, since Mr. SCOTT's victory was won at the price of a savage attack on the New York Governor such as Republicans have never before aimed at a former Presidential candidate."

Oh, what a fighting party was there, my countrymen. It was an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a kick for the national chairman. Where was Dewey? Like the general, he was far, far away, preaching love, talking unity, telling them that he never again would carry the party to defeat.

And so everybody came back home, resolved to keep up the fight to oust SCOTT until unity was fully achieved.

In July the SCOTT foes had a meeting at Pittsburgh in his home State. His team could play better on its own field—only it wasn't his team. It was a collection of butchers sharpening their knives in the interest of love and unity. Eventually it dawned upon Chairman SCOTT that there were some in the Republican Party who did not like him. Chairman SCOTT defied his enemies in these ringing words:

"I was elected chairman of the Republican National Committee in June 1948 for a 4-year term. In January 1949 an attempt was made to declare the chairmanship vacant. It failed.

"A small group is reported to be seeking to stir up party dissension at a time when all of us should be working our heads off in combating the ruinous policies of the Truman administration's Treasury-busting welfare state.

"I do not intend to resign the chairmanship of the committee unless, and until, a man can be found who can bring the desired harmony and cohesiveness to the party organization. I would welcome the appearance of such a person. I do not believe any responsible group in the committee desires me to resign unless such a successor is available."

But there came a day when the SCOTT foes had enough votes. Everyone had agreed that the time had come to walk him through the slaughter house past their sharpened knives and into an open political grave. SCOTT yielded; he surrendered to the dead hand; he called the meeting at which his resignation would be accepted and the great new leader would be picked in unity.

That meeting was held in Washington on August 4. Every good Republican swallowed his pride and his personal convictions and all joined in a common effort to find someone with a bankroll who could float a loan for the hopeless 1950 campaign. They found him. They raised high his hand, the multitudes shouted "Hosanna" and when the votes were counted he didn't have a majority of the committee. One man had to change his vote in order that the unanimous selection of the committee could win by a vote of 53-48. Peace had come upon the party, but HUGH SCOTT had put his mark upon it. It was a fighting party determined to fight it out within its own ranks if it didn't elect a single candidate in 1950.

The leader stepped forward. He was a new prophet of a new day. No longer would Republicans be allowed to say "Me, too" to the New Deal principles. No longer would they have candidates who surrendered blindly to such socialistic, communistic ideas as social security, Federal insurance of bank deposits and all the social gains from the days of Woodrow Wilson, through the glories of Franklin Roosevelt, to the Fair Deal of Harry Truman. No indeed, the chairman made it plain that the only men he wanted were not the weaklings who could say "Me, too," but the strong, vigorous, determined Republicans who could rise up in the councils of Government and when confronted with the question as to whether they would follow the policies that Wilson, Roosevelt and Truman had launched, they would have the courage to say "Not me." So we pass from the "Me, too" days of Dewey in 1944 and the sweet unity

campaign of 1948 to the slogan of 1950, "Not me."

I'm not sure that it is a wise change. At least the old mating call—and it was used by both the Tafts and the Deweys—the old Republican mating call to the wary voters was "me too, me too, me too," uttered in the soothing notes of a titwillow.

The new mating call, "Not me, not me, not me," is not so soothing, not so alluring. It sounds like the clipped tones of a big business executive denying all in a breach of promise suit.

But will the Republicans really have the courage to use this new mating call? Can't you see these courageous Republican crusaders facing the voters about election time in November of 1950 in a great outpouring of oratory against the Fair Deal?

Watch them as they stand up to recite how the iniquitous social security tax was saddled on the backs of the American employers. They will tell how the workers were forced to give up a portion of their pay so that there might be old-age and survivors benefits, so that there might be aid to the blind and to the children, so that there might be unemployment compensation and a guaranty to tide the worker over a period of economic uncertainty, and they will thunder out their dislike and defiance of such legislation. They will repeat the ancient wheeze that it should be stricken from the statute books and they will ask, "When such a bill to strike it from the law of this land comes before the Congress of the United States who will vote to abolish social security?" And their answer will be "Not me."

Time was when the Republicans would say "not me" to the farmer—not once but twice. That was in the days of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations when the farmer really needed a friend.

He had lots of Republican friends in the Congress. The McNary-Haugen bill was voted twice. Who would vote against the American farmer? "Not me," said the Republican Congressman.

But who would sign such a bill? Who would let such a bill become law? "Not me," the Republican Presidents told the farmers, "not me."

The farmers got a real farm program when the Democrats came in. Last summer Stassen and Dewey made it plain they wanted to shake down the farm economy—and they meant down—for the farmer's own good. And when the Republicans asked who would entrust our farm economy to the GOP, the farmer got in the last words. "Not me," he said, "not me."

There are a lot of interesting angles to the "not me" slogan.

Let's look at the Republican record.

Vote for better labor laws. The Republicans are set on that one. Their record is, "Not me."

Who would vote for a higher minimum wage? The Republican record is "not me."

How about economy? Who would vote against appropriations for his own district? Listen to the Republican chorus, "not me."

Recently in the Senate we voted on a reorganization plan. Its aim was efficiency and economy. It was backed by former President Hoover. Who would vote for efficiency and economy? Four Republicans voted "me, too." But they were drowned out by 37 Republican voices rising loud and clear, "not me." Not even for Herbert Hoover.

On the other hand, the Republicans get pretty tangled up between their "me too's" and their "not me's" on many issues.

Who will not say "me, too" to Federal deposit insurance? "Not me," say the Republicans.

Who will not say "me, too" to the SEC ban on stock-market gambling. "Not me," is the answer again.

Who won't say "me too" on rural electrification. "Not me," again.

And finally, if some Republican gets up on the question of RFC loans to business and says, "not me," who will refuse to go along on the attack against the RFC.

The new Republican Chairman Guy G. Gabrielson, will say to his fellow Republicans, "Not me."

For Chairman Gabrielson is the big wheel in a corporation which has borrowed more than $18,000,000 from the RFC. Abolish Government loans to business? The Gabrielson reply is sure to be, "Not me."

Now, while the Republicans have been not-meeing and mee-tooing in a confused and confusing manner, the Democrats have been busy working on sound, progressive legislation for the benefit of all Americans.

We haven't moved as fast as some of you might want, but let me tell you this, my friends, we are moving forward a lot faster than the Republicans want us to.

Perhaps the Senate is moving less rapidly than the House, and so I will deal chiefly with the legislative program in the Senate. We have ratified the North Atlantic Pact and amended the Economic Cooperation Act. We have passed the reorganization bill, the national science foundation bill, the important military bill for the construction of wind tunnels to test supersonic planes, the amendment to the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and the bill for Federal aid to education. If you want to know why we move slowly you have only to realize that it took us longer to pass the Federal aid to education bill in this Congress than it did 2 years ago even though the bills were almost identical. If you want to know who took the time, you can check the record.

In the campaign of 1948, farmers were aroused over two issues: they lacked storage for their grain and they did not like the low price-support levels in the Aiken bill. The Congress has passed and the President has signed the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which corrects the storage difficulty. That is half of the program. The other half is a revision of the Aiken support levels and we are moving ahead in that field. This session of Congress will not adjourn until the farm program has been completed.

We have passed nearly all of the appropriation bills, even if disputes still remain between the Senate and the House. We have passed legislation to continue import controls and export controls required by maladjustments in fats and oils that still exist around the world. The public housing bill has been passed, as has the bill for military rental housing.

I haven't the time and you have not the patience to listen to an individual recital of the problems that have arisen in connection with all this legislation. Appropriation bills that once required a few hours and sometimes only a few minutes have taken days in this session. At the proper time and place, which will probably be the congressional elections of 1950, we will be prepared to review who took the time and which party has been slowing down the legislative program of the Congress of the United States. But the brief review I have given you shows that we are making progress in spite of delaying tactics.

Finally, let me touch for a moment on a subject that seems to be emerging as a political issue. We get new words and new slogans in political campaigns. One time it is "54-40 or Fight." Another time it is "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion." These last few months you have been hearing a lot of talk about "collectivism," and a word that is new to me, "statism." You hear scholarly references to the "welfare state," and steady charges that bit by bit the liberties of the American people are being whittled away.

Here in BOB TAFT'S home district, I want to ask you what liberties you have lost? Liberty has been under attack all over the world and it has been lost in many lands, but what liberty have we lost in America? Do we not have liberty of free speech, the right of peaceful assemblage, the right of religious freedom? The citizens of these United States are not only in possession of all the liberties they have ever enjoyed but I came away from the Wednesday night party for the Democratic National Committee convinced that we are on the threshold of even an expansion of the liberties we have thus far enjoyed.

To a wonderful crowd of Democrats assembled to greet our new and able chairman, Bill Boyle, and to pay their respects to our successful retiring leader, HOWARD MCGRATH, the President of the United States and the Vice President repeated what they said many times during the campaign, namely, that they stood by the Democratic platform, that they intended to see it succeed, and that they would strive to bring it to full accomplishment.

We were all thrilled as President Truman indicated that new and liberal Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate had come in great numbers through the election of 1948. True they are not yet sufficient in numbers to carry out every part of the Democratic platform on which Harry Truman and ALBEN BARKLEY were elected, but the President looks forward with hope to 1950. He sees possibilities in many States and while I would not want to tell any secrets, I can tell you in the bosom of the family that his eyes twinkle when he surveys the prospects in the State of Ohio.

We will enter the 1950 campaign in the best shape the Democratic Party has experienced throughout its long history. We have strong candidates and effective issues, and we are ready for the fight.

So I bring you the challenge that the President brought to the national committee members earlier this week:

That you dedicate again your party as the party of the people;

That you stand by its program and principles as carried in the platform upon which its candidates were nominated and elected;

That you devote it to the cause of security for the people of America and peace for the nations of the earth.

Under that standard, we can all go forward to victory in 1950.

There Must Be a Right and a Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial entitled "There Must Be a Right and a Wrong," published in the Dyersville Commercial, of Dyersville, Iowa, on July 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE MUST BE A RIGHT AND A WRONG

Your conscience, which God instituted as a part of your faculty, is a very sacred principle and an association in your daily routine of life.

God has given this same conscience to all mankind, so all would have the ability to act with prudence, with caution, to give careful consideration to the many problems—in other words to do what is right—not wrong.

We all have our affiliations or relationships—some of which are deep in affection with ties that are hard to break, where your conscience is put to a test in order to come to a decision, which naturally has to be right, not wrong, regardless of the relationships.

In our family relationship we all know that very unpleasant conditions arise when a member of the family has ignored the red light and gone on through, causing violations, whatever the act may be. We know that this member of our relationship has committed an error which brings us to a point of making a decision—our conscience.

This same example can be applied to many other existing conditions today in our general run of life—our own way of living; in our associations; in our appearance in public (a subject that Pope Pius discussed on the radio last Sunday); in our own political life; and so on down the line.

It appears that our affiliations and our conscience do not seem to understand each other. Our conscience should rule the conditions which enter into our affiliation as to what is right and wrong and not let our affiliation rule our conscience.

In many phases of public life today—men and women in public office seem to ignore the sacred principles of their conscience. They seem to lack the backbone when it comes to making a decision. They, for selfish or party reasons, leave their affiliations rule instead of their conscience when the party they belong to may be wrong.

Regardless of our political connections, or any affiliations that we may have, there are times when there is a wrong and right side of the issues up for consideration. That is the time when principle should rule in our decision—not because of our connections.

We believe that the time has come for members of both major political parties to make an accounting—make use of their sacred principles and not allow their affiliations to rule those principles. We believe that this same condition is applicable, too, probably to many of us in our daily routine of life—to also make an accounting.

The Pope in his brief address Sunday stated, "Unfortunately, today, morality is in retreat, not only in the city but also in the country, where there is a desire for luxury and pleasure."

According to dispatches appearing in the metropolitan papers Sunday, Winston Churchill stated that England is on the verge of a crash due to communism and their socialistic government. He stated: "They have squandered the reserves and resources which have been gathered in the past and have darkened and narrowed the future of every man, woman, and child in this famous island." Socialism is showing its dangerous outcomes.

This country is rapidly drifting into the same chaos. We are losing our independent state of mind; we are losing the initiative to do things that we can do ourselves; we are drifting along the line of least resistance; we are asking agencies of the Government to do things that our grandparents did themselves. We are losing our stamina; we are not laying a stalwart foundation; we are getting away from the American traditions of our forefathers.

The plan of Government spending has all the earmarks of socialism, which is a political and economic theory of social organization, the essential features of which is Government control of economic activities, to the end that competition shall give way to cooperation and that the opportunities of life and the reward of labor shall be equitably apportioned. Socialism also advocates a powerful central government.

Remember: the agencies of our Government derive their revenues from taxation. The more appropriations you receive or ask for the higher the taxes, more Federal control, and this condition lessens your liberties.

Chairman Boyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address delivered by Hon. William M. Boyle, Jr., on the occasion of his inauguration as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Wednesday, August 24, 1949, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

I wish to thank you for the faith and confidence you have shown in me by electing me chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I accept the honor and I pledge all my efforts to carry out the great responsibilities that go with it. I promise to render the best service of which I am capable. My objective is to exercise the functions of chairman in your interest, in the interest of every member of the Democratic Party, in the interest of our great leader, President Harry S. Truman; his stalwart, team mate, ALBEN W. BARKLEY; and the other distinguished leaders of our party.

I am keenly aware of the challenge presented to me in carrying on the work of my distinguished predecessors in this office. Their achievements constitute some of the brightest chapters in the history of our party. High on the honor roll of political leaders will always be the name of J. Howard McGrath. I can pay him no higher tribute than the honors that he has so well earned, and the affection and loyalty he has inspired among all who know him. He has distinguished himself as Solicitor General, as Governor of Rhode Island, as Senator, and as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Now he advances to new fields of public service as Attorney General of the United States. The people of this country have reason to be grateful for so faithful and so capable a public servant. I predict that many additional honors will come to him.

As chairman of the national committee of this party, Howard McGrath was, above all else, a loyal worker and a true friend. As one who has shared in his friendship, and long admired him, I would like him to know that we regret having to lose him as our chairman. His successful career will always be a source of pride and inspiration to all of us.

In this year of 1949 I don't know anything I would rather be than an American and a Democrat. I don't know of any political organization in this or any other country that has a prouder record of achievement than the Democratic Party. I don't know of any political organization that has a bigger job to do. On the Democratic Party rests, in large measure, the hope of mankind for a peaceful and a better world.

It is now perfectly clear to the people of this country that the Democratic Party stands for the principle that the powers of Government can be, and should be, used in the interest of the people. In every campaign since 1932 the Democratic Party has gone before the country to tell the voters that the power of the Government could be used to promote the general welfare. And in every interval between campaigns, the Democratic Party has used the authority and the power of Government to establish conditions in which the people can achieve a better life for themselves and their children. The Democratic Party has shown the people that it can be done.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, has devoted its energies to explaining to the people that it can't be done. The Republican Party has labored mightily to prove that the people cannot, and should not, expect the powers of the Government to be exercised in their interests. In every campaign they have tried to tell the people that they cannot do those things for themselves which the people, through the Democratic Party, have already done. They have raised innumerable bogeyman and scare-words to frighten the people away from the concept of a Government devoted to the public welfare. First they called it radicalism. Then they moaned about the dead hand of bureaucracy. And now they are trotting out the jack o'lanterns of collectivism and a welfare state. But in spite of these wild cries of alarm, in spite of these frightening fairy tales, the national income has increased, the standard of living has risen, and the enjoyment of fundamental liberties has spread throughout the land.

The Democratic Party is now more than ever before the party of the people of America. The welfare of the people can best be served by a strong, well-organized Democratic Party. Under these conditions the elected Democratic representatives of the people are beholden only to the people, while those of the opposition party are more often beholden to those special interests which dominate and control their party. We belong to the many; they belong to the few.

The Democratic Party is energetic; it is vital; it is turbulent. Some of us at times may wish that it were more peaceful internally, but we must remember that these are the symptoms of a living, growing organism. The Democratic Party is alive because it is an instrument through which the American people are making their decisions. The Democratic Party is the weapon that the American people are using to decide their tremendous destiny in the history of the world.

One of the signs of the vigor of the Democratic Party is the way it produces great national leaders. No group of special interests, no conspiracy of the representatives of great wealth will ever turn out a leader who can inspire and rally the people in their hours of crisis.

The greatest proof of the power of the Democratic Party today and its greatest asset is President Harry S. Truman.

It was not so very long ago that the pleaders for special privilege had decided among themselves that the Democratic Party was finished. The leaders of the press and radio, the paid commentators and columnists were eagerly writing the epitaph of the Democratic Party.

But the man at the helm of the Democratic Party was a very wise man, a very honest man, and a very determined man. He knew that the press and the commentators did not speak for the people. He knew that only the people can speak for themselves.

He asked himself whether the policies and plans which the Democratic Party had been advocating and putting into practice were the right ones. He concluded that they were. He asked whether they had been successful. He concluded that they had been. He asked whether they should be continued. He concluded that they should be.

And then President Truman shouldered the burden of his candidacy and went out to tell the people these things. He did not straddle issues. He did not try to fool anybody. He knew where he stood, and he knew where his party stood, and he put it all simply and clearly to the people.

He had faith in the ability of the people to decide the issues wisely. The result of the election may have amazed the public relations experts, and the pollsters, and all those who think that the American people believe the propaganda to which they are

constantly exposed by the special interests, but it did not amaze President Truman. It was just about what he had expected.

The victory of President Truman has a tremendous lesson for us and for all succeeding generations of Americans. It is a very simple lesson. The American people have grown up. Victory in American politics now depends not on propaganda or advertising, not on a winning voice or a movie personality, not on extravagant promises or pledges, but purely and simply on having a program for the good of the people.

This is one of the great contributions that President Truman has made to American political life. He has brought the Democratic Party to a full realization of what it means to be the party of the people. He has made the American political system a means of deciding the issues that confront the people.

If we have truly learned this lesson, we know that it means we must carry out the program which the people elected the Democratic administration to carry out. What counts most is a record of faithful performance.

Faith in democracy will perish unless our party carries out its program.

And we are carrying it out. It is true that we face some difficulties. But we are going to solve those difficulties as we have solved them in the past—by the votes of the people.

The great job before us is the congressional elections of 1950.

The people of America, yes, the people of the world know that the direction in which Harry Truman is traveling is toward peace and human welfare with human dignity. It is in the direction of progress. You and I, together with the members of the Democratic Party and the forward-looking people of America are traveling with President Truman in the direction of progress. I believe that the Democratic Party is strong enough and flexible enough to have room for honest differences of opinion, but once those differences have been aired and discussed, I further believe that we are bound together by strong enough ties of common sense and friendship that we can join hands in common accord and good will to travel the road of progress with President Truman. Abraham Lincoln once said, "I will go along with a man as long as he is going in my direction." I here and now invite and solicit all men and women of good will to join in this forward march of progress.

In the task of the elections of 1950 the Democratic National Committee is an essential element. You are the elected leaders of the faithful members of our party. Those party members and the people of America depend upon you to carry out and to make effective the principles to which the party is pledged. They look to your leadership to provide the political defenses for our program of advancing the general welfare.

We wish to pay tribute to the women of America who have contributed so splendidly to the program and success of the Democratic Party. The women know that in the program of the Democratic Party lies the future happiness and welfare of their families, and the security of their homes.

In the great task that lies ahead of us there are two things which I would like to underline.

The first of these is the role of our party in understanding and explaining the issues to the people. Our party workers should understand the program of the party and what it means in the lives of all the citizens. More and more of our party workers become the channel through which our message reaches the people. In the past four Presidential campaigns over 90 percent of the press were opposed to our party. We have to rely on word-of-mouth transmission of our message, to be delivered at the voters' door by an informed and intelligent group of party workers.

The next aspect of our activity which I would like to emphasize is closely joined with the first. It is the necessity and the value of precinct work.

Our candidates—platforms—programs—issues—do not become politically effective until a loyal precinct worker stirs himself to call upon his neighbor—ring the doorbell—persuades his neighbor to register and to vote. The precinct workers of the Democratic Party are the door-to-door salesmen of democracy. They need and deserve all of the encouragement and assistance that we can provide to them. On their shoulders rests the fate of the program which was endorsed by the voters of America last November. The elections of 1950 will be won or lost in the precinct. The victory of 1948 provided the opportunity to go forward. The elections of 1950 will either strengthen and consolidate the gains of 1948 or will destroy and scatter those gains to the delight of the forces of reaction.

The congressional elections of 1950 are of the greatest importance not only to this country but to the world. They come at the halfway mark of the twentieth century. Twice in the first half of this century the whole world has been thrown into war. Now, under the leadership of President Truman, and as a result of his courage and decisiveness, the world has a chance to live out the rest of this century in peace. The great elements of President Truman's foreign policy, support for the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the Atlantic Pact, and the Rio Pact, taken together offer the world a foundation for building a permanent peace. We must have a Congress that will support these far-seeing measures. We must have a Congress that will support the programs of the President at home and abroad.

The people of this country want and expect President Truman to have a Congress in 1950 that will support him in his efforts for prosperity at home and peace abroad.

It was my good fortune to have the pleasure and privilege and truly wonderful experience of knowing Harry Truman's mother. Having known that remarkable woman I can see in her son the reflection of her strength and character and of her belief in the right and of her unwavering faith in God. It was she who said, "Harry plowed the straightest furrow in Jackson County." I want to say today that Harry Truman still plows a straight furrow and, paraphrasing the words of the Holy Bible, having put his hand to the plow he will not look back.

Appeal by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, for Continued Use of Butter by the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the oleomargarine lobby has won the first round against us in our battle to protect the foundations of American agriculture. The Senate unfortunately defeated yesterday 45 to 31 my amendment to assure continued sales of butter to our armed forces.

If the oleomargarine lobby and its high-pressure supersalesmen think that their initial victory is a forerunner of a similar vote to come in the future on the main oleomargarine bill, they have another think coming. I am confident that the dairy forces will mobilize many votes of hitherto absent Senators on behalf of our dairy amendment to the oleomargarine bill, H. R. 2023. Moreover, I believe that many of my colleagues who unfortunately voted against the butter amendment will be on our side when and if the show-down fight comes on the main oleomargarine bill.

There has unfortunately been much misrepresentation of the issue at stake in this fight. We are not seeking only to protect 2,500,000 dairy farmers, but to protect the very system of American agriculture on which we depend—a system based upon the milk cow and its enrichment of the soil by fertilizer, a system based upon the wholesome, nutritious dairy products—milk, cheese, butter, evaporated and condensed milk, powdered milk, and so forth.

The big question now is whether the oleomargarine lobby will succeed in inveigling the armed forces procurement leaders into buying oleomargarine exclusively or in a great proportion. I have accordingly today written to the Acting Quartermaster General, appealing for continued purchases of butter, and I want to point out this would mean procurement out of Government stocks. To do otherwise, will be to kick the American taxpayer in the pants because the taxpayer has already paid to buy this butter which is now in Government stocks in accordance with our price-support law.

I repeat, Mr. President, the dairy forces are not disenheartened about this temporary set-back. We hope that the Quartermaster General will continue to feed butter to our troops, and we confidently predict that when and if the main butter versus synthetic products battle arises, we will succeed in defeating the oleomargarine lobby and in protecting the right of the American consumer to eat natural products without fear of fraudulent misrepresentation and imitation in interstate commerce shipments.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed by me to the Acting Quartermaster General urging the continued purchase of butter for the use of the armed services be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 30, 1949.

The ACTING QUARTERMASTER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Department of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

Re urgent suggestion for continued use of butter from Government stocks in armed forces feeding.

DEAR MR. QUARTERMASTER GENERAL: I am writing to you to present my urgent suggestion that our armed services continue to feed butter to our troops except where specific circumstances require otherwise. May I sum up the points backing up this suggestion as originally made on the floor of the Senate prior to the vote on the armed services funds bill:

1. There are now 54,500,000 pounds of butter in Government stocks, bought up by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This supply was bought pursuant to price support title I of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948.

2. It would be absolutely absurd and ridiculous if our United States Government were to ignore these stocks and were to attempt to buy oleomargarine and foist it on our troops.

3. Only Army, Air Force, and Marine feeding is involved. The Navy will buy butter in accordance with its ration law. Total procurement of butter each year for our troops is around 42,000,000 pounds (12,000,000 pounds less than our CCC butter reserve, it should be noted).

Thirty-five percent of the 42,000,000 pounds is used by the Navy. Now, let us assume that in addition to this Navy 35 percent, the Army, Air Force, and Marines only buy an additional 15 percent—or 21,000,000 pounds of butter bought by the Services and 21,000,000 pounds of oleo—50–50.

What would this mean in turn? It would mean that—

(a) The taxpayer would foot the bill for all the oleo that is bought.

(b) Most of the CCC stock of butter would remain in storage unused.

(c) The Government would have to buy 21,000,000 pounds of price-supported butter at the parity price of 62 cents a pound. This would cost $13,020,000.

Is it not therefore wise to continue to buy butter alone except when circumstances require otherwise?

4. The evidence which I showed in the Senate is that an average of 84.82 percent of our servicemen expressed preference for butter, 2.79 percent expressed preference for oleomargarine and 13.51 percent had no preference.

Let the 3 percent of our troops who want oleomargarine eat oleomargarine, but let the 85 percent of our troops who definitely prefer butter continue to eat the natural product.

5. The Senate has unfortunately decided not to adopt my amendment. Let me, however, reiterate and clarify what that amendment was. It would have reasonably prohibited purchases of oleomargarine for feeding to our armed forces except where oleomargarine was necessary for:

(a) Cooking purposes.

(b) Wherever there was an expressed preference therefor.

(c) For use where climatic or other conditions render the use of butter impracticable.

6. Undoubtedly, the oleomargarine lobby will now be encouraged to use the seductive influences of newspaper, magazine, and radio advertisements to a greater extent than before, in order to pawn off the synthetic product in place of the natural product in armed forces as well as civilian feeding.

7. I am making this appeal to you not only in the interest of the 2,500,000 dairy farmers (for whom butter serves as an indispensable balance wheel especially in flush seasons), but for the 10,000,000 individuals engaged in dairying directly and indirectly, for American agriculture and husbandry which requires the milk cow in order to assume continued richness of the soil. I am writing for America's housewives and consumers who need wholesome, nutritious dairy products (particularly for youngsters) but who will not get them if the balance wheel, butter, loses its market. Twenty-seven percent of the milk produced in the Nation goes into butter especially in the summer. If that market is impaired, all of the remaining uses of milk will feel the harmful impact. I am writing in the interests of city folks, businessmen, laboring men, who need the dairy farmer as a customer and as a seller.

Let not the 5-percent boys succeed in seducing our armed forces into buying oleomargarine at the very time we could save money for our Federal Treasury by using existing stocks of butter.

I would appreciate a report as soon as possible as to the intentions of your office in assuring continued butter for our troops.

Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Dollar and the Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and interesting article entitled "Dollar and Pound for Better or Worse," published in the New Republic magazine for August 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DOLLAR AND POUND FOR BETTER OR WORSE

Great Britain, the home of a great free people, the center of the one international society in the free world, the acknowledged ally and the unacknowledged partner of America for 10 hard years, is moving into a major economic crisis. Her gold and dollar reserves, almost exhausted by losses of $260,000,000 in the second quarter of 1949, may fall by $400,000,000 in the third quarter. At this rate Britain will be bankrupt within a year.

Bold and courageous action by Britain, and broad and generous support by America, alone can save the sterling system. No such action or support is yet in sight. In the Anglo-American-Canadian financial talks that begin this week, an unimaginative agenda will be pored over by unimaginative men. They are embattled and discouraged men on the British delegation; unsympathetic and conservative men on the American side. And they meet under the worst of circumstances. Britain is close to a general election. Our Congress is deadlocked and unwilling to consider any major new program. Conservative American newspapers have been belaboring British socialism in order to defeat the Fair Deal. Conservative British newspapers have given banner headlines to these attacks in order to defeat the Labor Party. These special interests have sown confusion among Americans and created in England a mood of smarting nationalism.

For these reasons there is every chance that the sterling crisis will become a crisis in Anglo-American relations, and that efforts to resolve this crisis will end in break-down.

The bitterness and recrimination which may follow will not break up the free world. But they may well make impossible the coordinated actions necessary for its preservation.

Too many Americans are indifferent to Britain's problem in the belief that its cause is socialism.

Yet Britain's threatened break-down is almost entirely unrelated to the nationalization of coal and transportation, the enactment of family allotments and health insurance, and other domestic reforms of the Labor Government. And talk of increasing the productivity of British workers, while very important, is today beside the point. The crisis is not a British crisis but a sterling one. And the immediate cause of the exhaustion of sterling reserves is not in Britain at all. British exports to America have fallen to one-half of last year's rate, but this decline accounts for only 15 percent of the fall in the sterling reserves. One-half of our total sterling imports consists of rubber and tin from Malaya, jute from India and Pakistan, wool from Australia and New Zealand, and cocoa from the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

The sharp decline in our imports of these goods and in their prices was the initial cause of the crisis. It became almost unmanageable when John Snyder's assurances to American bankers that devaluation of sterling was "in the bag" set off a flight from the pound.

At any time but this, these losses would be within the capacity of the sterling system to absorb. But the system, already weakened, was overtaxed by the commitments made by Britain, in the winning of the war. To induce a reluctant India to fight the Axis, Britain undertook to pay the entire cost of the British Army in India and the entire cost of the Indian Army inside and outside India. She paid pro-Axis Egyptian laborers to build the earthworks for Egypt's defense against Rommel. She paid further huge sums to Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan. In a cause in which we later accepted an unlimited commitment, Britain gave up the inheritance of centuries of effort and committed herself to sterling debts of $12,000,000,000, a sum which would have taken her labor force, working on exports, 50 years to repay.

The impossibility of repaying these sterling balances in a few years alone made rigid exchange controls and bilateral agreements inevitable in postwar Britain. For Britain has been paying out hard-earned dollars to the Near East, Africa, and Asia. South Africa has gone on a terrific buying spree on British dollars. India has drained $720,000,000 from the sterling reserves, more than one-half of Britain's ERP aid, partly to finance an armaments race with Pakistan.

The British people have worked far harder than any other nation in Europe to meet their commitments. France and Benelux, the next most successful countries, have raised the ratio of their exports to their imports by 18 percent over prewar levels; Britain's ratio of exports to imports has been lifted by 90 percent. But this reflects effort rather than result. Britain's total trade is balanced but her trade with the dollar area is desperately unbalanced. The relative unbalance of the pound and the dollar has been made far worse because sterling has been sold by exchange controls at its prewar rate of $4.03, while its parity, in purchasing power, has fallen to little over $3. The result has been to encourage sterling purchases here and to discourage sterling sales.

After World War II a Conservative Government might have attempted to restore the sterling system by classical Tory methods of smashing controls and reducing consumption, by unemployment and lowered living standards. But the British people had another vision: one of lasting full employment and social justice. It meant giving first priority to domestic programs. And, in the sense that these required the continuation of national controls and the raising of domestic living standards, the ambitions of Labor Britain conflicted with the restoration of the sterling system. The conflict was inevitable, but its cost is high.

R. F. Harrod, the British economist, wrote to the London Times:

"For three centuries the word sterling has meant a claim which * * * could be converted into gold at a recognized par or * * * bartered * * * in a free and legal exchange market. Sterling now means neither of these things. * * * When one thinks of their [the Govern-

ment's] complete failure to grapple with this problem, words about dissipating and ruining our inheritance do not seem too strong."

Two major and immediate decisions face the British.

The first is devaluation. It is necessary at once in order to encourage sterling exports to America and to discourage sterling purchases here. It is necessary as a long-term solution because until the price levels of the two areas are brought into a sensible relation no common economic system can be organized.

The second necessary step is a settlement of the sterling balances. "Unless we reach a definitive solution of the problems of the balances," Harrod writes, "the sterling area will be broken up within 5 years."

These two decisions are costly gambles for Britain. The first threatens the living standards of the British people; the second the continuation of the Commonwealth.

The British Government is unwilling to act unless we share some measure of the responsibility for these actions. And this, our Government is refusing to do.

It argues that devaluation cannot be regarded as a service to America which entitles Britain to support in return, since its purpose is to reduce the market for American exports and to increase Britain's means of competing with American manufacturers.

And—as long as we regard the two nations as competitors and not partners—this narrow and sterile financial viewpoint is logical.

Our Government argues further that Britain must take full political responsibility for her necessary and too long deferred decisions; for if on election eve America should seem to force Britain's hand, then this country would be intervening in the election, earning unwarranted resentment, and perhaps unwarranted blame and hatred later on.

And—as long as we regard the two nations as politically unattached—this narrow political approach is also logical, although, by refusing to support any action the Labor Government takes, we are actually intervening on the Conservative side.

There are many ways in which we could support the sterling area. We could reduce tariffs, abolish customs regulations, sign commodity agreements guaranteeing the prices and markets of the Commonwealth's raw materials. We could revalue gold and use the $12,000,000,000 profits as a new currency stabilization fund. We could finance Britain's purchases of Canadian wheat in ECA dollars and expand the system of financing offshore purchases with dollars under ECA.

The best program which we can offer would be the rapid extension of point 4 from a technical assistance program to a major financial program of economic development. It would be financed by greatly increasing the lending power of the Export-Import Bank through the use of American gold reserves. The bank would make direct loans, and it would underwrite the profitability and the convertibility of private loans. This program could overcome the world shortage of dollars without additional appropriations; it would offer alternative dollar sources to Britain's creditors and even permit Britain to repay part of the balances as contributions to the development projects.

Yet we are not considering any major long-range action to support Britain. In strictly economic terms, in the view of Congress and the Treasury, it is not worth while. It is not worth while in any terms as long as our mutual interdependence with the British Commonwealth is not honestly and openly recognized by both sides.

The issue in the coming negotiations is not simply financial. The real problems involved are long-range problems that no short-term solution such as devaluation can solve. The British Government recognizes this and if the American Government does not it may simply force Britain into a further cycle of economic and political nationalism by which her contribution to world stability and world democracy will be diminished. The barrier to further progress in Anglo-American relations is certainly a short-term financial barrier. But it may never be crossed without some vision of what lies beyond.

We need liberation from economic equations, in a bold, long-range approach.

We have long since established a silent but effective union with the British Commonwealth on joint defense. We should now move on to union on the joint management of a banking and currency system. A key currency is a necessary part of the operation of the World Bank and the Monetary Fund, and of expanding world trade. Sterling in the past has played an invaluable role, extending far beyond finance to the economic management of an international society. That role, which unsupported sterling is fast losing, can never be played by the dollar. For America, with its wealth of natural resources and its unique productivity, will never accept the level of imports that the creditor nation of a world system must accept. But America and Britain together, once their currencies are in proper relation to each other, can jointly manage an international sterling-dollar currency that can fulfill sterling's historic role in continued world economic development.

Yet, financial union, like military union, is irresponsible unless it is part of a wider system by which peoples are joined. This wider union is a natural step. Our ties to Britain are closer than to any nation, and Britain's ties to us are as real as her ties to the Commonwealth. We have a vital interest in unity. We cannot afford to fall apart. Both sides know this at heart and both should recognize it.

Full recognition of this partnership is not only economically unavoidable, it is politically necessary to provide the inspiration that a new effort requires. The British people feel the need of an ultimate objective; the peoples of the Commonwealth are apparently unwilling to give their system as presently constituted adequate support, and Americans are tired of continued hand-outs to carry other, separate nations over from one short-term crisis to another in a negative anti-Communist cause.

We are not recommending immediate union. We are advocating an immediate agreement on principle that union is the goal. We see no other clear way beyond the present difficulties. For this seems to be one of those rare moments when timidity can make a passing crisis permanent, while daring can transform it into a new opportunity. If, as we anticipate, the talks fail to reach agreement on limited action, then instead of retreating the governments should advance: They should declare in a joint statement that union is the ultimate aim. They should declare that from now on our common actions will be directed to that end.

Flood Control Hit Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very timely editorial which appeared in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, entitled "Flood Control Hit Hard."

There is no disposition to be critical of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. He is doing a courageous and most effective work as a member of the Cabinet. Attention is called, however, to the seriousness which attaches to a substantial reduction in employees doing necessary flood-control work on the Mississippi River. Especially is this important because the work season is naturally very short due to the inability of workmen to perform their labors during high water. Specific money is provided under the civil functions appropriations bill to take care of this work, and it is reasoned that this money is not a part of the general funds set aside for the Department of Defense.

The editorial follows:

FLOOD CONTROL HIT HARD

Defense Secretary Johnson's drastic economy order will result in a reduction of 135,000 civilian employees and lead to the closure of 50 defense installations, including 18 air force bases. He proposes, thereby, to save something in the neighborhood of $200,000,000 during the current fiscal year, and lay a predicate for a much smaller defense budget in the following year.

As to the wisdom of the over-all cuts and closures when viewed in the light of a continuing cold war we are not prepared to say. No doubt there is a great deal of fat which can be cut away but, unfortunately, and as is generally the case with an order as far-reaching as this, the innocent get hit, too. In this instance, it is flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley—the perennial political football for anybody at Washington who feels like kicking it around.

Severe personnel reductions have been ordered for the Mississippi River Commission and its three districts—Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans. How far they will affect the work under way is yet to be determined.

The ceilings set for the Mississippi River Commission and its districts are apparently based on June 30 employment totals. Since then, as the flood-control working season has advanced, totals have been greatly increased. It can well be that the reductions will be far greater than the number actually shown in the defense department break-down. If they are, a great deal of flood-control work will be crippled, contracts will be terminated, and floating equipment will tie up at the banks.

An effective date of November 1 for ceilings would come with several more weeks of a normal working season remaining. In some of its potentials then, the economy order, as it affects flood-control operations, could be as disastrous as was the short-sighted Presidential "freeze" order on funds in 1946.

Secretary Johnson's order is designed to effect economies in the Defense Establishment, but flood-control operations are only related indirectly to defense, and that because they are part of the Army's civil functions.

In contrast to that indirect relationship is the direct bearing they have on the national economy and on the immediate economy and safety of this vast and rich area.

The personnel to be affected are paid out of specific flood-control appropriations and not out of general defense funds. Flood-control operations are carried on under a specific directive of the Congress, and with moneys appropriated for specific purpose. When there is executive interference with those operations the will of the Congress is being circumvented and the executive branch of Government is exercising the prerogatives of the legislative branch.

We said that when flood funds were frozen in 1946, and we say it again as Secretary Johnson's order brings interference with flood-control construction in this and other valleys.

Any extensive flood force reduction represents a gamble, so far as the lower Mississippi River is concerned, with the safety of the main-line levee system and thus with the lives and economy of the people dependent upon maintenance of its integrity. We hope that will be kept in mind by any who may seek a modification of the order.

And we think modification should be sought, and without lost time or motion, by the president of the Mississippi River Commission, by the Chief of Engineers, and by the valley's representatives in the Congress.

The conditions under which flood-control planning and construction are being done have become chaotic. The current fiscal year's appropriations are long overdue, and now the personnel reduction order further complicates and confuses a dangerous situation. The net result will be not dollar savings but tremendous waste and, perhaps, invitation to disaster.

If that should come, accountability on the part of those responsible for the condition will be inescapable.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in part 16 of the Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak., published in the McLean County Independent, there appears an exchange of views between the Corps of Army Engineers and Mr. Neal.

As is too often true, not only of the Army engineers but of the bureaucrats generally, the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

I am sure the readers will be interested in reading part 16. Here it is:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XVI

If any of my readers have felt that the policy of the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps, as demonstrated here in the Valley of the Missouri, is something temporary or accidental or merely the work of some overzealous field employee—or if they have felt that I have become hysterical and have overstated my case—I suggest that they read the following letter:

MISSOURI DIVISION OF
RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT,
Jefferson City, Mo., August 12, 1949.

Mr. BIGELOW NEAL,
Care of McLean County Independent,
Garrison, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. NEAL: I have read with considerable interest your series of articles which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title of "Valley of the Dammed." I find these articles quite informative, particularly in view of some work which we are engaged in in this State.

We are making a study of the Wappapello Reservoir, located in this State and constructed by the Corps of Engineers some 7 or 8 years ago. The purpose of this study is to determine the local effects of a flood-control reservoir through the initiation stages, construction, and the period of actual operation. The study includes a considerable amount of investigation into the very things covered by your series of articles. The field work on this study is completed, and we are in the process of preparing a report on the study. We find that many of the findings and recommendations which are included in our report as a result of our rather exhaustive study are borne out by your finds in North Dakota. This shows that certain undesirable practices in connection with land acquisition as far back as 10 years ago have not been corrected and are still going on.

We should like to obtain your permission to refer to your articles in our report and possibly to quote portions of the articles directly (with proper credit to you) in order to show that these practices are still in existence and to substantiate certain recommendations which will appear in our report. We expect to have our report completed within the next 2 months and will be pleased to furnish you with one or more copies if you would be interested in it.

Yours very truly,

JOHN A. SHORT,
Engineer in Charge,
Water Section.

There is an old adage which reads: "The leopard cannot change his spots." That is true to a great degree but it is also true that the animal can do a little exterior decorating if someone gives him a little help with a sharp prod.

Late in the fall of 1948 I asked Col. John S. Seybold if he couldn't do something toward taking the uncertainty from these leases. Up to that time—and until the date of the letter below—the policy had been to keep the landowner on pins and needles regarding a second year's lease as a part of that war of nerves calculated to drive these valley people into the hills to take up their abode among the jack rabbits. When I told Colonel Seybold of it and that no man dared to summerfallow a foot of ground under such a doubtful set-up, the Colonel saw the point and was very nice about it. He said he would see that the policy was changed in that regard.

I believe he made an attempt to get this by his unruly real-estate division during the winter of 1948–49 but he was not too successful because in the very late spring of 1949, the real-estate division did make the change but only in certain isolated instances which suited their own purposes. But now comes a letter below which I submit to you readers with a word of caution. While it is a long step in the right direction and probably shows Colonel Seybold, at least, partly in command of his own ship, I have one of these plaguing notions that there is still a colored gentleman in the wood pile. I'll make a report on this little "piccaninny" later. Meanwhile here's the letter:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
Bismarck, N. Dak., August 10, 1949.

Mr. WILLIAM BIGELOW NEAL,
Garrison, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. NEAL: It is advisable at this time to give consideration to the leasing of lands within the Garrison Dam and Reservoir area for the year 1950 as all current 1-year leases in this district expire December 31, 1949. In many cases operators will wish to do fall plowing or other preparatory work and it will be to the advantage of both the Government and the tenant to reach a decision on the matter of a lease before too late in the year to do such work.

If you are interested in a renewal of your lease it is suggested you call at the real estate office in Riverdale, N. Dak., at your early convenience to discuss the matter, or advise by mail of your plans regarding use of the land for next year. It will be the Government's policy, as in the past, to give the former owner or tenant first opportunity to renew his lease providing requirements of the current lease have been met.

Leases for a period of from 1 to 3 years will be granted. Upon the termination of such lease consideration will be given to a further extension if conditions warrant.

For the district engineer:

Very truly yours,

ROY DORY,
Real Estate Officer.

Next week I shall bring this section of the Valley of the Dammed to a close. Thereafter—from time to time—I may revive it to bring you the latest developments. As a matter of fact, I know there will be two installments to come because I have two charges of high explosive to set off under this land-acquisition policy before I stop. At that time I'll be able to tell you why I haven't used the material here.

Already I have thanked the many men and women in the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps and in other governmental agencies for the fine cooperation they have given me. I repeat those thanks. And I call your attention to the fact that I have violated no confidences to date.

Or can I close this series without a word about the people who have been even more closely associated with me. Many people have told me that I was a brave man. As for my part, I can't see the bravery. As far as I know there is no law against telling the simple truth and especially when it is capable of proof. But I'll tell you where there is a brave, young man and that is Mr. Herbert Callies, editor of the McLean County Independent. He took all of the risks that I took and the greater one—that I might slip and let him down. I believe the hundred-thousand, or so, people affected by this land acquisition program owe him a monument of some sort for offering the one medium through which these facts could be brought to Congress and to the public. And this applies also to thousands upon thousands of people in all parts of the United States who are facing this same destructive policy. When you write me, don't forget that the editor and his paper deserve fully half of all the credit that comes to me.

Then I mustn't forget the editor's assistant, Miss Louise Smith, or the foreman of the Independent, Mr. Jerome Allers or Mr. Mummert or Mr. Frederick or Mr. Falstad. Handling, as they have, nearly 30,000 words of highly explosive material without a single error is an achievement above ordinary praise. It puts them in a class with the best in the land.

Then to the men and women in the Government Printing Office in Washington. To you also are due my very real thanks. You have handled this copy so far with only one error. It may seem small of me to mention a single error but I'm doing so because it will give these men and women in the Independent printing office a chance to feel real pride in knowing that they have done as well—and even a tiny wee bit better than you professionals down there. * * * If my old friend, Harrison French, is still among you, would some of you be good enough to transmit my best wishes? Again my sincere thanks to you.

Col. JOHN S. SEYBOLD,
District Engineer, Garrison District,
Fort Lincoln, N. Dak.

MY DEAR COLONEL SEYBOLD: In your letter of July 20, 1948, in answer of mine of an earlier date in which I asked permission for Mr. Engel to mine coal which he had uncovered at the time your negotiator appeared on the scene, I find the following paragraph:

"The coal referred to is not on Mr. Engel's land but on land formerly owned by Marie H. Fix, tract No. H–706, Garrison Reservoir, for which an option was obtained on October 28, 1947, and accepted by the United States November 10, 1947. The option was mailed to the owner on that date. This option reserved to Mrs. Fix the right to remove

coal until December 31, 1948. It is therefore apparent that over 1 year was allowed for the removal of this coal, which work, as stated in your letter, required about 10 days for accomplishment, and the statement in your letter that permission had run out before he (Mr. Engel) received his copy of the option is quite incorrect."

Later in your letter you ask me to correct this error on the theory that I had made the statement public. Now, as a matter of fact, Colonel Seybold, I can't find that I ever made the statement except in my letter to you, and I can't see any good reason why I should correct publicly a statement that I made privately. But I am going to correct it just to be sure I am in the right. In this connection I should suggest that unless my errors are very bad, indeed—that before you ask for a retraction you pause to consider that my truths are usually worse than my errors. I'll illustrate:

Disregarding the first two lines of your ghost writer's paragraph which are pure quibbling, I shall restate the matter and this time it will contain no error:

Your negotiator obtained this option on October 28, 1947, from Mrs. Fix. Mrs. Fix asked permission to mine some 2,700 tons of coal already mostly uncovered and in which Mr. Engel owned a half interest.

Your negotiator told her she must not mine the coal without permission of your Fort Lincoln office but that he would try to get permission for her to mine until December 31, 1947. And he wrote a paragraph to that effect in the option with an indelible pencil and showed it to Mrs. Fix and to her father, Mr. Amos House.

Don't tell me I am in error, Colonel Seybold, because this same negotiator under oath in United States district court, *Maria Fix* v. *United States of America*, civil No. 13892, record, page 40, line 5, swore as follows, quoting lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9: "On the following day, after consideration of their request, I told them that we would take the option, reserving the right to remove coal from this open pit up to the end of the calendar year which I believe was December 31, 1947."

Out of this came the belief of Mrs. Fix and Mr. Engel that they could, even with permission, mine coal only after the option was signed and returned by the Fort Lincoln office and before December 31, 1947.

As you state, the envelope returning the accepted option bears the postmark of November 10. Probably it was received around November 15. Allowing a possible 2 weeks to finish uncovering the coal, they would have 30 days left in which to mine and sell 2,700 tons of coal, 30 days at a time so late in the season as to make their type of mining exceedingly difficult.

Thus we have the proposition as the negotiator first understood it and as he swore to it, as Mr. Engel and Mrs. Fix understood it and, as I understood it when I wrote the letter you mention.

But now, Colonel Seybold, comes a curious fact. While the option was in Fort Lincoln, before its final mailing, someone changed the date of 1947 to 1948 and, when the option was returned to Mrs. Fix, she glanced at the clause and did not notice the change in date. Accordingly, they mined no coal even during the 30 days or so left to them—as they understood it.

Now is the time to say they should have read the option. That is technically correct, but it is not humanly correct. They had seen the clause as the "negotiator" wrote it and they thought they knew it by heart. From their viewpoint—why read it again? How would they know that what may have been a mistake in your real-estate office would correct a cruelty by the same office?

At this point the old question comes up again. Why question their mining the coal at all? Why not let them get every cent possible out of these lands before they are forced to abandon them? It wouldn't cost the Government a cent. In some cases it would mean the difference between a degree of independence and poverty.

In correcting my "error," Colonel, there remains but one more thing to say: In April 1948 your real-estate division—under the implied threat of eviction always present in such a case—had Mrs. Fix sign a lease of this land which absolutely forbade her to dig any coal at all. Thus, you disqualified your own earlier agreement even if Mrs. Fix had been astute enough to have read the clause a second time.

I have leaned far over backward, Colonel Seybold, in a sincere effort to be fair, not only to the Army Engineer Corps but to this cruel thing you have hatched and brooded under your wing. I don't want to hurt you or any of your people. If I say anything that is untrue, I shall not only be deeply ashamed but I shall do everything in my power to see that the real truth is told.

In the future, Colonel Seybold, when you have occasion to write me, be yourself. Don't sign letters written in your real estate division. They are not only liable to lead you into troubled waters, as they have done in this instance, but they do not command the respect which is due to a man of your character, ability, and rank.

Very sincerely yours,

BIGELOW NEAL.

The Need for Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed that the House has not to date taken any action on Federal aid to education. The need is great. The educational, economic, political, and social welfare of this country is involved. Our failure to act, indeed our failure to even debate the issue is disappointing.

I realize that there are some controversial viewpoints with regard to Federal aid to education. But, I believe those viewpoints can be resolved in such a manner as to reach the desired result without any sacrifice of principle.

This is human legislation. It deals with the lives of our boys and girls. It is entitled to early consideration. It is not a sectional matter. The shifts of population over this country make it a matter of national interest.

As a part of my remarks I include a letter from Hon. R. E. Moore, superintendent of schools of Cullman County, Ala., one of the counties that I have the honor to represent here. Mr. Moore describes the need for Federal aid to education with special reference to Cullman County:

CULLMAN COUNTY SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT,
Cullman, Ala., January 29, 1949.

The Honorable CARL ELLIOTT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: May I take this opportunity to write you with regard to the question of Federal aid to education which it seems will be before Congress in a short time.

This question, as you are well aware, has been widely discussed for a number of years and our people generally are quite familiar with the many questions involved. In my contacts with them, I find that the people of this county are almost solidly in favor of Federal aid without Federal control. There would be very strong opposition to any form of Federal control.

The need for Federal aid is just as great now as it has ever been during the 20 years which I have served as a county superintendent. In Cullman County we are at present employing 310 teachers. The number is much smaller than that needed. Consequently, these teachers must carry entirely too great a load for the most effective work. Furthermore, we are able to offer only a very restricted instructional program. Some 40 or 50 additional teachers are needed in order to offer instruction in such fields as physical education, music, manual training, public speaking, vocational guidance, and many others which are necessary to a well-balanced and adequate program.

Of the 310 teachers employed, 179 are below the level of college graduation in their professional training; 83 have had only 2 years of college training; and 72 have had no professional training whatever. The most significant fact about this situation is that it has changed very little since the end of the war. Trained people are not entering the teaching profession in the rural schools. This is because the salaries are entirely inadequate; the school plants are very poor and very poorly maintained; and very little provision is made for materials of instruction and other helps necessary to effective work.

The salary scale in Cullman County begins with a minimum of $1,000 for teachers without professional training and rises through five ranks to a maximum of $2,600 for teachers who hold masters' or doctors' degrees and have seven or more years of teaching experience. With Federal aid as it has been proposed this salary scale could be increased by approximately 33⅓ percent. This in my opinion would make it possible for many of our young people to go through college and enter the teaching profession with some assurance that they would be able to live and pay their college debts.

Figures just released by the State department of education show that in the State of Alabama as a whole a total of 21,297 teachers are at present employed and that 728 additional teachers are needed to relieve the overloaded conditions.

Of the total number now employed, 9,026 have had less than 4 years of college training; 3,334 have had only 2 years of college training; and 3,186 have had less than 2 years of college training.

The State of Alabama has increased its support of schools many times over during the last 15 or 20 years. While it is not fair to say that the State cannot do more, it is fair to say that the State cannot carry the whole load if the children in rural Alabama are to enjoy educational opportunties approximating those represented by the average situation throughout the country. It seems that Federal aid is the only hope for this to be done now.

We in this county deeply appreciate your keen interest in this whole matter and we will be happy at any time to cooperate with you in working toward the desired end.

Yours sincerely,

R. E. MOORE,
Superintendent.

The Polish People Demand Freedom and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, September 1 marks the tenth anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Hitler and his rapist hordes. On that late summer day in 1939, while the peaceful, industrious peasants of that great land were busy harvesting their crops, and the factory workers were engaged in the normal production of goods, one of the truly great tragedies of all history was being enacted against a noble race. Hitler had sent his armored legions rolling over the fair soil of Poland.

That was 10 years ago. On Thursday, September 1, Polish people throughout Chicago will give mournful observance to the tenth anniversary of that infamous day. Polish church bells will again toll out the message that "Poland is not yet free." The observance will be a quiet one, for Polish-American leaders agree there is little reason to rejoice. However, they will rally their people in special church services and a public program to keep faith in the rebirth of their native land.

This foul conspiracy to despoil and subjugate a peace-loving, thrifty and trustful nation was the criminal work of two powerful nations—led by two of the world's most hated individuals—Hitler and Stalin. The plan was to partition this historic land to suit their purposes for world domination—to break the spirit and destroy the freedom, democracy and individuality of the Polish people, which has, through all history, been their guiding light and determined right.

After a hundred years or more of struggle and strife, the Polish people finally gained their independence, freedom and liberty after World War I, for which they had never given up their hopes and aspirations, their dreams and prayers, only to be robbed again of these sacred rights when the Nazi arch-criminals again attacked 10 years ago. Naturally, I shall always be grateful for having been able to convince President Wilson not to approve a separate peace treaty with Austria-Hungary after World War I, because that would have prevented the aspirations of Poland, Czechoslovakia and other small nations in gaining their freedom from the oppressive heel of the powerful Hapsburg dynasty.

In 1939 they were ravished and robbed by these Nazi hordes without justification, after having labored for a generation with a greater degree of success than any other nation, to strengthen and improve their economic position. The unholy, criminal conspiracy hatched in the minds of these soulless beings 10 years ago was again designed to break the spirit of an indomitable people—to place them under the iron yoke of tyrants, the like of which the world has never seen. But they failed again to reckon with those God-given attributes—the most powerful force with which man is endowed—the determination and resolution to live as freemen in a free world—with which the Polish race has been so richly blessed.

Steel and armament, concentration camps, and slave labor imprisonment take their toll from human flesh, but they never reach the souls, the hearts, and the minds of a determined people.

The light of freedom can never be extinguished. That light, kindled by a deep religious faith in the triumph of right over might, will ever burn in the Polish mind and heart, and the day is not far off when Poland will rise again to its full stature as a nation of free democracy, holding its head high and contributing, as it has through all history, to the arts, the sciences, and to the productive betterment of a peaceful world.

I feel that American democracy is deeply indebted to the brave Polish people. We must never forget the great aid and contribution of those two outstanding Polish citizens—General Pulaski and General Kosciusko—to our struggle for independence during the dark days of the Revolution, so that we could obtain our freedom and liberty.

The iron yoke of Communist domination must be broken. Poland must be freed from its oppressors. Foreign control and domination must forever be banished from its fair land. In the spirit of humanity—in the spirit of justice to a great people—it is our solemn duty today to give all the encouragement and assistance we possibly can to accomplish this purpose.

On this tenth anniversary of the rape of Poland, I raise my voice in bitter condemnation of the brutality and injustice heaped upon the Polish people by Soviet Russia and its Communist dictatorship, and I call upon our Government to exert every possible influence toward the restoration of independence, actual freedom, and liberty to the courageous and peace-loving people of that great land.

Communism and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address which I delivered over WREC in Memphis, Tenn., on the subject of communism and religion.

The address follows:

My fellow citizens, when I began this series of humble talks on communism several weeks ago, little did I think that there would be so many current disclosures revealing the infiltration of this false and antireligious philosophy in so many places. It is somewhat disheartening, but the information which continues to come to light should excite our patriotism.

We must know what communism is, we must know how it works. Communism makes traitors of its members. They must be considered as agents of a foreign power, but apart from spies, they do most of their damage through deceit and trickery. They mislead innocent liberals and capture labor and other organizations. They have sought to capitalize in our own country upon an interpretation of the social gospel. They would have minority groups believe that only through communism—which means the overthrow and destruction of our free form of government—are they to have happiness and security in life.

I would not mention the name of Paul Robeson, the Negro singer, but for the fact that he has become a well-known voice and would have the world believe that he is speaking for the Negro people of this country. Fortunately, the Negroes within the sound of my voice, with but few exceptions, are not proud of his position. Nationally known Negro leaders have denied that Robeson speaks the mind, or the philosophy, of the great number of those minority citizens in the United States.

On the occasion of his son's marriage to a white woman, who formerly attended Cornell University, the senior Robeson continued his role as an actor to bring this young woman to tears when he created a scene with news photographers and others. He took occasion to again express his deep love for the Soviet Union, to which he has traveled so many times and where his son spent some years in school. The Lord gave Robeson a very fine voice, just as he has given so many Negroes you and I know unbelieveable talent in song. Would that he had been able to lift that voice to honor a great, free country which has provided him with unusual opportunities and brought him substantial, great riches. He is doing the Negroes in this country a great disservice in professing his love for communism. As one prominent in that group, he continues to take the position that the Soviet Union, which practices everything antisocial and antireligious, is the promised land.

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim—
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The Wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonour'd, and unsung."

A year ago a good man, one of my constituents in Memphis, was anxious to visit his aged mother for a brief time in the Russian-occupied zone in Germany. We took the matter up with the Russian Embassy, and, after repeated telephone calls and formal communications, we finally were sent a number of questionnaires. I recall that they wanted to know my constituent's profession, his financial condition, his political affiliation, his religion, and a great deal about his personal life. We got all of this in order, but I tell you now that not one further reply did we get from the Russians. At that time a high representative of the State Department told us that they did not know of anyone who was permitted to travel in the Russian zone. If the Government had any heart, and if the Communists had any soul, they would have permitted this son to see, possibly for the last time, an old and ill mother. But not so.

John Fischer, writing recently, pointed out more adequately than anyone else the ana-

logs of communism with religion: "The Russian party member is a dedicated zealot whose body and mind belong to the Kremlin. Lenin is god. Stalin is the son. Marx is the holy ghost. The 13 in the Politburo are the apostles. The replicas of desks and hats and notebooks belonging to Lenin which are displayed everywhere in Russian museums are the holy relics. The Communist doctrine is the faith. It is absolute. It is taught even to children. It must follow that the Kremlin, which is the church and therefore the repository of instinct, administers it also. Communism is atheistic. A member must have no god at all. The state owns the private conscience. The state is therefore compelled to institute a general espionage, for whenever an archetype opposed to the Communist religion rises even in one man, the state must learn of it before it is spread. The secret NKVD is thus the conscience of 180,000,000 human beings—secretly alive amidst them and working to protect the state archetypes. Communism is an intellectual system for the management of objectivity, and it considers man as an object. All instinctual motivation outside that premise is heresy. An inquisition—fear and constant intimidation—must therefore be maintained to keep the instinctual man firm in his artificial belief and behaving according to it. Yalta is thus heaven, and Siberia, hell—and the firing squads represent a constant judgment day on earth. The people have given up conscience itself. No individual is secure, so the orientation must be transposed in such a way as to make the individual believe, in his remaining conscious mind, that his future security impinges upon the present security of the system and the state."

The antireligious attitude of modern communism cannot be ascribed to the corruption of the former Russian state church. It must be remembered that the most prominent and authoritative writer on communism, Karl Marx, born in 1818 and who died in 1883, passed on a number of decades before the rise of modern communism in Russia. Karl Marx is recognized by modern Communists as their greatest apostle. Modern Communists, in their militantly antireligious attitude simply follow the principles and teachings of Marx. He intended and planned communism to be what it is today—the greatest menace to religion, the most determined and the most deadly foe of Christianity.

Red communism existed in concept and theory for more than a generation before any attempt was made to carry it into practice.

There are countless expressions of the hatred of the Communists for Christianity.

Recently the Commissar of education of the Soviet Republics, wrote: "We hate Christians. Even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love to one's neighbor, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is a hindrance to the development of the revolution. Down with love for one's neighbor. What we want is hatred. We must know how to hate, for only at this price can we conquer the universe. We have done with kings of the earth; let us now deal with the kings of the skies. All religions are poison. They intoxicate and deaden the mind, the will, and the conscience. A fight to the death must be declared upon religion. Our task is to destroy all kinds of religion, all kinds of morality."

As late as 1937, Stalin, the present head of the Russian dictatorship, issued the following manifesto concerning the fight of communism against religion. Now I quote: "We regard religion as one of the greatest enemies of communism and sovietism. The fight will be carried on further and with great energy. We want no compromise with the religious world; for the religious aims and our aims are fundamentally hostile to each other. For the moment we will change our fighting tactics against the church. During the past 20 years (nearly) we have used every sort of force in our fight against religion. This period is at an end. The new period will witness a spiritual fight against religion. This fight will call for even greater efforts than violence. Above all we shall need a large number of highly trained and cultured propagandists. When this second period shall be closed, then a third and last period will be entered upon, in which religion in the Soviet Union will exist only as a historical memory. This, in short, is the goal set for our party, for the godless, for the Young Communists, and for the Soviet Government."

Now, let me quote finally Earl Browder, the well-known American Communist leader, following this caution to restraint. He wrote in his book, What Is Communism, as follows:

"Communists do not consider religion to be a private matter insofar as it concerns members in our revolutionary party. We stand, without any reservation, for education that will root out beliefs in the supernatural; that will remove the religious prejudices which stand in the way of organizing the masses for socialism."

Communists, therefore, believe there is no God. They believe that life is a product of materialistic forces and elements combining by accident, conditioned by their environment, producing current and constant even if imperceptible, changes through a struggle for existence and survival.

This concept they call empirical materialism, which is the essence of their philosophy. There is no supreme intelligence, no over-all wisdom. Life is an accident, a result of chance.

In such a system God has no place. He is a superstition, a myth, a concept created by man with the object of giving the dominant minority in any civilization control over the masses of the people.

The dominant minority is always right and establishes the morality of its era, because in the struggle for power it has survived. Therefore, whenever the Communists come into control they attack first all organized forms of religion, all churches, all religious schools, all systems of worship.

I say with all of the sincerity of my being that I respect the religion of all of my fellow citizens when that religion carries with it a love of God, a Divine Creator. Most of you know that my faith is simple, though my works are imperfect.

In 1944, while at Casablanca, I was given a shocking lesson in intolerance. I am not proud of what I am about to say to you, but I am proud of the lesson I learned, though it brought me a heartache not noticed by many because only a few of my colleagues in the House of Representatives witnessed it.

We were returning from the European theater of war and landed at Casablanca for refueling and a further check upon the weather. A military driver was in charge of the car in which I was riding to visit the headquarters of the commanding officer of that base. When we returned to the plane, I did not notice that the driver had been changed and that an Arab, who spoke fairly good English, was at the wheel. Looking out of the car as we were about to turn a corner, I saw a man clothed in the long, white, but considerably soiled, garment of those people, standing erect, when, as quickly as a flash, he bent over with his hands upraised, and kissed the ground. He did it as easily as a well-conditioned athlete.

I asked, "What on earth is that crazy fellow doing?" Thereupon, the Arab driver took his hands from the wheel and I shall never forget his voice because it carried a shrieking tone of fear and anxiety. With that, the commanding general slapped him on the neck rather vigorously and he continued on the way.

Turning to Bolívar Pagán, the delegate from Puerto Rico, and to JOHN ROONEY from Brooklyn, N. Y., I said, "What have I done, now?" Pagán said, "I am not too sure, but I believe the Arab was facing the setting sun and praying to Allah." He was correct. I had offended the faith of the driver, for which I apologized.

I know the Jew believes in immortality. He has given me, as an humble follower of the Christian religion, the early prophecy for my belief. The story of the Creation, the Proverbs, the beautiful Psalms, the Ten Commandments, make me know that his religion, if followed, makes a man love his neighbor as himself.

I know, too, that the Catholic religion holds comfort and promise to millions of followers throughout the world. Monsignor Kearney wrote Archbishop Stritch, now Cardinal Stritch, a letter of introduction to the Holy Father when I went to Rome several years ago. The Pope received me and others in the privacy of his study. He is a frail man physically, but possesses a profound mind and is devoted to the spiritual leadership of his church.

In those days he recognized that throughout the world the Communists were seeking the overthrow of all religions. It has interested me of late to observe that the most dramatic attacks recently have been made by the Communists against Roman Catholics—Archbishop Stepinac, Cardinal Mindszenty, and now Archbishop Beran.

Despite the fact that the Roman Catholic Church has long taken a very positive and vigorous position against this false ideology, we are wrong if we assume that the Communists oppose only Roman Catholics. They oppose Protestants, Jews, Moslems, and any other people who believe in God, in the revelation of truth by God, in testaments describing God's truth, in a moral law based upon God's revelation, in any immutable, eternal, moral, and ethical way of life not subject to the fatalities of environment and not constantly changing in a never-ending struggle for survival. Those who believe in God's truth are enemies of Marxism and are to be destroyed. Communists can no more depart from this concept and remain Communists than a Jew can reject the Torah and remain a Jew, or a Christian can reject Jesus and remain a Christian.

So, is it any surprise to you, my good friends, that I should seek your patience as your Representative in the Congress, to report to you the dangers of the Communists as they seek by all means of trickery and deception, and with skilled devices, to get into the churches of our country just as they have successfully gotten into the methods of some of the professors of our schools of higher learning, in labor organizations, and in other places where public opinion is formed and disseminated?

Without calling any names, I ask you to watch the words and the actions of certain church leaders in the country who are speaking out against our form of government, for the destruction of capitalism and against stewardship which we find in Holy Writ.

Do not be surprised if you see occasional articles in church literature which will amaze you. Unfortunately, many of these well-meaning, good people have been influenced by those who seek to destroy them and the high ministry to which they have been called.

I know that this country is great because we have an abiding belief in God and morality. Let us rededicate ourselves to a more faithful understanding of these influences which seek to undermine our spiritual concepts which have permitted the country to become so great, so powerful, and which are so necessary in this hour of world trouble. But I tell you again unless we continue to be on guard, the inroads of communism will bring the country much sorrow.

Regional System Is Seen as Great Advance in Higher Education in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 24, by Benjamin Fine, discussing the regional education system recently inaugurated in the South:

In a move expected to have vast educational implications, 11 Southern States have entered upon a mutual plan to aid one another in developing a sound program of higher education. For the first time in the history of this country, a regional system of education has been established. It will go into effect this fall.

For the time being the plan will cover only the fields of medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. Under this project, the colleges and universities that now maintain such graduate schools will admit students from other States. They will be accepted on the same basis as residents of the States where these regional centers are situated. In this way, it is hoped, the South will be able to develop strong professional schools on a regional basis. Because of the tremendous expense involved in setting up a medical school, for example, it will be cheaper for a State to send its students to a medical school that already exists in a nearby State.

Last month a board of control for southern regional education was created by action of 10 State legislatures—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Virginia has been admitted pending removal of certain legal objections. Alabama, Texas, and West Virginia are expected to join soon.

Various reasons prompted the creation of this board. For some time southern educators have recognized the fact that they could not hope to set up all the educational facilities needed on a State-wide basis. They knew that if they were to offer their students an adequate program of higher education, they would have to cooperate and pool their resources.

COMPOSITION OF BOARD

The operation of the plan is simple. The board of control membership will include the Governor and three members, one a Negro, for each participating State.

Four institutions will provide services in veterinary medicine—Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Tuskegee Institute, the University of Georgia, and Oklahoma A. and M. College. They will accept 119 first-year students under the regional arrangements, and will receive $1,000 per student from the States. Seven universities—Duke, Emory, Louisiana State, Meharry Medical College, Tennessee, Tulane, and Vanderbilt—will admit 187 medical students, at $1,500 per student. Six institutions will provide services in dentistry—Emory, Loyola of Louisiana, Maryland, Medical College of Virginia, Meharry, and Tennessee. They will accept 210 students, and the States will pay them $1,500 per student.

Under the pooling arrangements, the universities will select the students according to their own admission policies and standards. However, the States will certify students as eligible, based on criteria that they establish. Under present plans, 233 white students and 231 Negro students will receive training in 1949–50 at a cost of $1,500,000 to the States. The plan will have no effect on present segregation policies: white and Negro students will continue to attend their own respective schools.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT EXPECTED

Other fields are now under consideration. Regional arrangements may ultimately be adopted in graduate studies, social work, architecture, forestry, engineering, agricultural, and professional education. Moreover, according to the sponsors of the regional plan, other methods through which the institutions of higher learning can jointly serve the needs of the South might include joint use of research facilities, exchange of faculty members, and voluntary specialization.

According to Dr. John E. Ivey, Jr., director of the regional board, the widespread support that has been received from the South indicates that the new project will expand. He points out that by planning as a region the South can provide itself with the leadership, the imagination and the skills which it needs.

Southern educators point out that the South has been dependent upon institutions in other regions for the training of leaders in many fields. In many southern States no institution offers courses at the doctor of philosophy level in any field.

Regionalism in education, the university officials hold, is a way to improve both the quality and quantity of advanced college training at a minimum cost. For example, there are five veterinary medical schools within the region. To provide plant facilities and develop a first-class veterinary college would cost close to $3,000,000. Thus the savings to a State under the regional plan will be considerable. Besides, it will help existing institutions strengthen their programs, rather than add other possibly second-rate ones to compete with the universities that now serve the South.

Enthusiastic support for the regional plan was expressed last week by Millard F. Caldwell, former Governor of Florida, chairman of the board of control. Mr. Caldwell said that the Southern States, working together, could build the finest system of higher education in the United States or the world. He said the alternative, on a State-wide rather than regional basis would mean that southern education would continue to limp along, unable to meet the total needs of the region.

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

It is obvious, Mr. Caldwell went on, that many States are duplicating what others are doing and in many fields none is doing a first-rate job. Various fields are wholly ignored. No State, he pointed out, can supply the best in every phase of education, because of lack of money or because of insufficient students to create an adequate school. Regional planning and cooperation appear to be the answer.

Other sections of the country have manifested an interest in similar programs for their own needs. Dr. John Dale Russell, director of the division of higher education, United States Office of Education, believes that the pattern of cooperative support now being developed on a regional basis in the South can be extended ultimately to all the States and Territories. In fact, the American Council on Education is planning to call together representatives from various groups some time this fall to see if the regional plan can be put into practice elsewhere.

According to President Colgate W. Darden, of the University of Virginia, the southern regional program will measurably stimulate and improve college and university facilities for both white and colored students. This plan, he stressed, is not in any way a racial one, as it will improve educational facilities for both whites and Negroes.

Tulane University, participating in the regional program in medicine, is confident that the plan will strengthen higher education as it will eliminate duplication of facilities. Similarly, the president of Louisiana State University sees two strengthening effects on educational facilities in the South: (1) It will provide immediately some expansion of professional education, and (2) the agitation and planning in connection with regional education will add to the general concern about education in the South.

LOW-COST SPECIALIZED TRAINING

The University of Tennessee, an ardent supporter of the regional plan since its inception, considers regional education a sensible method of giving southern youth the highest quality of specialized training at a minimum cost. The plan enables each participating institution to build exceptionally strong staffs in selected specialized fields instead of spreading its financial resources too thinly over a greater area of advanced studies.

From the standpoint of a privately endowed institution, the immediate effect of the regional plan, Emory University notes, will be to provide financial support in extremely expensive fields of professional education.

Meharry Medical College, where Negro students are trained, has signed a contract with the regional council to enroll competent students of the States in this region. President M. Don Clawson observes that it costs about $2,000 a year to educate a medical student. The tuition is $500, and now with the $1,500 that will be received from the State sending a student, the college will be in a sounder financial condition.

It is clear that the project is exceedingly significant. It can help the South build and develop a sound system of graduate and professional schools that will be the equal of any in the country. The implications not only for the South but for the rest of the country are far-reaching. A new pattern has appeared in higher education that will have a profound influence on colleges and universities everywhere.

Repeal of Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, all but regulatory Federal excise taxes should be immediately repealed.

The Democratic Party is unequivocally committed to a program of taxation on the basis of ability to pay. The 1948 Democratic platform pledges:

> We are opposed to the imposition of a general Federal sales tax.

With the exception of the taxes on liquor and tobacco, the manufacturers' excise taxes ranging from electric light bulbs to automobiles, and the retailers' excise taxes upon articles ranging from baby oil and handbags to fur coats, have such a broad application as to be incompatible with the party platform. Moreover, the tax on transportation of property is imposed upon the transportation charges on food, clothing, and all other necessities of life, as well as upon luxuries, and cannot be distinguished in effect from a general sales tax.

The excise taxes upon transportation of both persons and property, and upon long distance telephone and telegraph bills, are discriminatory against the sections of our country, especially the South and West, which are far removed from the established industrial centers.

These excise taxes are regressive and fall hardest on the poor. They increase in their burden with the number of children in the family regardless of the size of the family income. They are not based upon ability to pay.

Many of the excise taxes, such as the tax on automobiles and busses, business and store machines, electric energy and electric light bulbs, enter into the cost of production and have an adverse effect upon the businesses using such articles. The manufacturers' excise taxes are frequently pyramided so that the consumer pays several times the actual amount of the tax paid by the manufacturer.

In a period of uncertainty as to the future strength and stability of the economy, it is of the greatest importance that the buying power of consumers not be diluted through the exaction of excise taxes. The effect of the repeal of the excise taxes is bound to be a terrific stimulant to business because the result is the same—in some cases—as a 20- to 25-percent slash in prices. The increased volume of business will result in increased revenue from income taxes from such businesses and from the workers employed in those industries, and will reduce unemployment insurance payments.

All in all, it is entirely probable that the estimated budget receipts of approximately $4,000,000,000 that might be expected from these repealed excise taxes, if they were retained in effect, would be more than offset by the increased income-tax revenues and by the reduction in unemployment benefits. Certainly any net loss in revenue can be obtained more equitably and soundly from other sources. The contribution made by complete repeal of the excise taxes upon the morale of businessmen and consumers alike can hardly be overestimated. The Congress should, therefore, repeal these taxes at the earliest possible date.

On Friday, August 26, I introduced the following bill upon which I shall urge the Committee on Ways and Means and the House to take favorable action yet at this session of Congress:

H. R. 6151

A bill to repeal all Federal excise taxes, except those of a regulatory character

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Excise Tax Repeal Act of 1949."

REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES AND WARTIME EXCISE TAX RATES

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is hereby amended by striking out everything after the colon and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Section	Description of tax	Old rate	War tax rate
"2800 (a) (1)	Distilled Spirits	$6 per gallon	$9 per gallon.
"2800 (a) (3)	Imported Perfumes Containing Distilled Spirits.	$6 per gallon	$9 per gallon.
"3030 (a) (1)	Still Wines:		
	(1) Not over 14% of Alcohol	10 cents per gallon	15 cents per gallon.
	(2) Over 14% and not over 21% of Alcohol.	40 cents per gallon	60 cents per gallon.
	(3) Over 21% and not over 24% of Alcohol.	$1 per gallon	$2 per gallon.
"3030 (a) (2)	Sparkling Wines, Liqueurs and Cordials:		
	(1) Champagne or Sparkling Wine	10 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.	15 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.
	(2) Artificially Carbonated Wine	5 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.	10 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.
	(3) Liqueurs, Cordials, etc	5 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.	10 cents per half-pint or fraction thereof.
"3150	Fermented Malt Liquors	$7 per barrel	$8 per barrel."

(b) Sections 1651, 1652, and 1653 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war taxes and war tax rates) are hereby repealed.

(c) Section 302 (b) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1943, as amended (period applicable to increase of tax with respect to billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and continuing through June 30, 1950."

(d) The term "rate reduction date" as used in chapter 9A of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war taxes and war-tax rates) means the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this act.

REPEAL OF TAXES ON ADMISSIONS, CLUB DUES, CABARETS, ETC.

SEC. 3. Chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code (excise taxes on admissions and dues) is hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF RETAILERS' EXCISE TAXES ON JEWELRY, FURS, AND TOILET PREPARATIONS

SEC. 4. Chapter 19 of the Internal Revenue Code (retailers' excise taxes) is hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF MANUFACTURERS' TAXES ON TIRES AND INNER TUBES, AUTOMOBILES, RADIO RECEIVING SETS, PHONOGRAPHS, PHONOGRAPH RECORDS, AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, MECHANICAL REFRIGERATORS, SPORTING GOODS, LUGGAGE, ELECTRIC, GAS, AND OIL APPLIANCES, PHOTOGRAPHIC APPARATUS, BUSINESS AND STORE MACHINES, ELECTRIC LIGHT BULBS AND TUBES, MATCHES, ELECTRICAL ENERGY, GASOLINE, AND LUBRICATING OILS

SEC. 5. Section 3400 (tax on tires and inner tubes); section 3401 (tax on toilet preparations, etc.); section 3403 (tax on automobiles, etc.); section 3404 (tax on radio receiving sets, phonographs, phonograph records, and musical instruments); section 3405 (tax on mechanical refrigerators and self-contained air-conditioning units); section 3406 (excise taxes imposed by the Revenue Act of 1941, including taxes on sporting goods, luggage, electric, gas, and oil appliances, photographic apparatus, business and store machines, and electric-light bulbs and tubes); section 3409 (tax on matches); section 3411 (tax on electrical energy for domestic or commercial consumption); section 3412 (tax on gasoline); and section 3413 (tax on lubricating oils) of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 6. Subchapter A (tax on transportation of oil by pipe line), subchapter C (tax on transportation of persons), and subchapter E (tax on transportation of property) of chapter 30 of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

SEC. 7. Subchapter B (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities) of chapter 30 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

SEC. 8. (a) Repeal of tax on oleomargarine:

(1) Section 2301 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is hereby repealed.

(2) Subchapter A of chapter 16 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the manufacture, sale, marketing, branding, identification, exportation, and importation of oleomargarine after the effective date of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be effective on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) Occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesale dealers, and retail dealers of oleomargarine: Effective with respect to the period after June 30, 1950, part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesale dealers, and retail dealers of oleomargarine) is hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF TAXES ON BOWLING ALLEYS, AND BILLIARD AND POOL TABLES

SEC. 9. Section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code (taxes on bowling alleys, and billiard and pool tables) is hereby repealed, effective with respect to years beginning after June 30, 1950.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. (a) The amendments made by sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 shall be effective on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) The amendments made by section 6 shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation on or after such first day.

(c) The amendments made by section 7 shall apply in the case of amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act for services for which no previous bill was rendered, except that such an amendment shall not apply with respect to such services as were rendered more than 2 months before the first day of the first month which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD I include a radio address which I delivered over WREC at Memphis, Tenn., on the subject of communism.

The address follows:

My fellow citizens, in two preceding broadcasts in this Sunday night series of informal talks, I have sought to analyze communism. Tonight, I want to discuss further with you this menace, this disease, this totalitarian philosophy that threatens our American way of life and that of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Less than 30 years ago, communism was in its infancy. Today it has grown up in Russia and has spread over wide areas of Europe and Asia. In recent years, it has infiltrated into our own United States.

The Communist International, with general headquarters in Moscow, is a world-wide organization. More recently this organization has been called the Cominform. It advocates the overthrow of all democratic institutions and governments by force and violence and dreams ultimately of the creation of a slave state throughout the world. Under such a system the people exist, as they do today in the Soviet Union, behind an iron curtain where truth and freedom are not known and real human progress is at a standstill. In the economic field, communism is the most exploitive form of slavery in this modern age. Every movement of one's daily life is watched, regulated, and controlled by the party. The state is the supreme law of the land.

The daring and dramatic story of a single man, known to all of you through the press and radio, personifies the fact that the Communists are internationally organized. I refer to Gerhart Eisler. Perhaps at some future time I may have an opportunity to report further to you on this infamous character.

You recall that only this spring the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace met in New York City. It was sponsored by a Communist-front organization known as the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and was widely attended by Communists from all over the world. The true purpose of the meeting was to provide propaganda to oppose the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, to promote support for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, and to discredit American culture and everything American.

Unquestionably it has been proved that the Communist Party of the United States of America is an agent of a foreign power, a vital link in the Red network. The American Communists and their fellow travelers are quietly and systematically about their work in this country in almost every phase of our national life—the churches, the schools, youth and women's organizations, political parties, Negro groups, on farms and in industries, in the theater, and in numerous clubs and societies of every kind. You have only to read the Commercial Appeal or the Press-Scimitar to find how they have made their way into important positions in our own State Department and in other high Government offices concerned with our national safety and security.

An early inroad communism made was in our labor unions, and it is chiefly this activity of communism in America that I am anxious to develop this evening.

The Communist tactic of infiltrating labor unions stems from the earliest teachings of Marx, which have been reiterated by party spokesmen down through the years. They resort to all means to gain their point and often succeed in penetrating and literally taking over labor unions before the rank and file members are aware of what has occurred.

But, first, how can you tell a Communist? Get him in an argument about the United States. He can tell you plenty of things wrong with this country. Ask him to tell you what is wrong with Russia. Even the slickest Communist will sooner or later give himself away on that. Particularly watch what he says about Stalin. Certainly, everybody who criticizes the United States is not a Communist, but Communists and their dupes make a career of it. On the other hand, everybody who defends Russia is not necessarily a Communist. However, some of the loudest Russia lovers are fellow travelers and members of Communist fronts. I might explain, though perhaps many of you know, that a fellow traveler is someone who does the work of the Communist Party without carrying a membership card. A Communist-front organization is one that promotes Communist causes, always under the heading of a respectable sounding name. The Department of Justice, as well as the Un-American Activities Committee, from time to time issues lists of Communist-front organizations. Following are a few typical ones which are now or have been particularly trying to influence the ranks of American labor:

American Committee for European Workers' Relief.

American Polish Labor Council.

Labor Research Association.

Workers Party of America.

Where do Communists come from in America? Contrary to what you may have heard, the record shows that relatively few Communists spring directly from the people who work at hard labor. Mainly, Communists come from the so-called middle class—doctors, lawyers, teachers, actors, writers, accountants, other white-collar workers, and even at times among the clergy. Most Communists have never worked with their hands, except where and when directed by the party.

How do the Communists get into a union in the first place? Here is a description by David Dubinsky, a very successful union leader who has had to slap the Communists down, first-hand: "The Communist technique is simple. The party agent forms acquaintance of a member of a union which is marked for capture. They form a "cell" or "fraction" of a few like-minded members. With the help of the party agent a program is prepared. Naturally, it follows the Communist Party line. The innocent is introduced to an important party functionary or well-known party speaker; he is taken to cocktail parties and dances and no time is lost in introducing him to attractive partners. The next scene is at the union meeting."

One of their operating forms is called a "Communist diamond." They look at a union hall as a battlefield. One Communist unit takes the front row, center. One sits halfway back on the right side. One, halfway back on the left side. The fourth unit takes the back row, center. They actually form a four-point diamond that way, covering the hall. The four units work on signals just like a baseball team. They hiss, boo, make motions, shout down opposition, start fights, yell "fire," or do whatever their boss on the scene directs. A small number of disciplined rioters can make a lot of trouble.

Well, you may ask don't the Communists do labor some good just the same? A labor leader testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated: "The Communists refer to themselves as the 'vanguard of labor.' Nothing could be further from the truth. They have disrupted many unions with their factional quarrels and have left in their wake many saddened and disillusioned members, destroyed businesses, and blasted hopes. Far from being 'progressives' as they claim, they are really 'dynamic reactionaries.'"

Now, why are the Communists so interested in labor unions and what is it they really want? Their aim is to control the workingman's job, his working conditions, pay, union membership, and they want to dominate his life from the cradle to the grave, in every detail. They won't ask your approval if they get control of your union and they plan to get control of it by fraud, trick, or in any way at all. They know that control of unions will provide a main key to take control of a country.

Does Russia have labor unions. Yes; but listen to the words of an escaped Russian Government official and author of the book, I Chose Freedom, Victor Kravchenko, who stated in sworn testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities that "the union's job is to see that strict discipline is maintained, that there will be no strikes, that the workers work for wages established by the central government, that the workers carry out all the decisions and resolutions of the party." The witness continued: "Every citizen in the Soviet Union has a passport. On the passport is his photograph. There is also a special page on which a stamp is put which indicates the place, date, the type of employment. If you leave your job in one factory and go to another without the permission of your director, you will be prosecuted under the law for violation of the law prohibiting unauthorized change of employment. This refers not only to laborers but to any kind of employee."

In 1944, the Committee on Un-American Activities listed 21 big labor unions as having Communist leadership strongly entrenched. Among them was the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, of which Harry Bridges is president. At that time this union had 75,000 members. They have effective control of many ports in the United States and more than once have used it to paralyze shipping. Communist domination of this union in wartime could wreck the whole United States fighting power.

For years the case of Harry Bridges has been discussed. With Bridges as the acknowledged leader, the great San Francisco general strike of 1934 was planned and directed by the Communist Party of the United States of America. He won the unanimous endorsement of the Communists as the result of his activity in the San Francisco strike. A Communist organizer in California, who reported on the strike before the Communist International in Moscow, called Bridges, "the accepted leader of the longshoremen" whose proposals were carried out by the militant strike committee in every instance.

You remember the prolonged Allis-Chalmers strike by local 248 of the United Automobile Workers. The vice president of the local charged that local 248 was in the main dominated by Communists. He applauded the UAW refusal to seat local 248 delegates at its national convention as a "good kick in the teeth for communism." This is a good example of labor endeavoring to keep its ranks clear of Communists.

In New York City this week nearly 2,000 longshoremen from Hudson River piers joined their fellows in one picket line and charged a group of rival demonstrators. The demonstrations interrupted loading and unloading operations on 19 ships at New York piers. Passersby caught in the melee were knocked down as mounted police rode onto the sidewalks. Many longshoremen were felled and several policemen were struck by fists and sticks. The first group of pickets took up positions early in protest against what they termed discrimination in hiring practices on Brooklyn piers. Their demonstrations followed a sit-down of 38 Negroes in the offices of the AFL International Longshoremen's Association. The Associated Press reported within a short time rival group of pickets appeared in demonstration termed by longshoremen officials as an answer by loyal members to the Communist-inspired picket line.

The Transport Workers Union was also listed by the Un-American Activities Committee. What could happen if the Communists got control in time of national emergency? They could paralyze bus, subway, and trolley transportation in some of our largest cities. Without transportation, life in these cities would come to a standstill. This union, which claims 100,000 members, could also tie up some of our most important air lines.

Another example is the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America. The leading electrical and machine plants, manufacturing important parts for guns, tanks, torpedoes, range finders, sound detectors, altimeters, gyroscopes, aerial cameras, and other vital equipment are at its mercy. This union, claiming 600,000 members, is banned from representing our Nation's atomic workers.

Surely the United Public Workers of America would be a menace under Communist control. There are 15,000 members of this union in the Panama Canal Zone, alone. Many of the other 71,000 members are stationed at navy yards, arsenals, experimental stations, the State Department, and throughout our Government agencies.

The House Un-American Activities Committee issued a special report on the CIO Political Action Committee. Joseph P. Selly was listed as potentially one of the most dangerous individuals in the country by reason of the position he holds as international president of the American Communications Association and his Communist connections. He controls strategic sections of American industry which are recognized as the very nerve system of our country. Selly's union claims more than 20,000 members in local unions with contracts in Western Union, RCA Communications, Mackay Radio, French Cables, Press Wireless, Glove Wireless, some radio stations, and several air lines. Its jurisdiction reached to Hawaii and, in Selly's words, to "almost every ship carrying the American flag." Just before the war Selly made a Nation-wide tour in behalf of the American Communications Association. From a report he made to the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization, however, it was obvious that he did not travel in behalf of the members of his union but in behalf of the traitorous policies of the American Peace Mobilization. Selly declared:

"America speaks, and here's what it says: We don't want any part of war. Don't give us any baloney about 'patriotism' and 'national defense' being reasons for dropping our demands. We know plenty about patriotism—a lot of our fathers, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts went to the last war 'to make the world safe for democracy,' and what did they get? We hear a lot of words spoken about 'necessary sacrifices' and national unity. * * * But we want to know what for."

Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, under oath before the Un-American Activities Committee, stated: "It is the duty of every Communist to belong to a trade-union, even a most reactionary one, provided it is a mass organization.

Concerning trade-unions, Stalin wrote in one of his many books published by the Communist Party in the United States that "they constitute a school of communism."

Lenin's word is sacred to Communists. He laid down the rule to agree to any sacrifices and even if need be to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade-unions, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work within them at all costs.

It is not an easy job to throw the Communists out of control once they have wormed into a union, but they can be defeated by hard work on the part of loyal Americans. Communists are not honest. They work under cover. They lie and scheme and deceive. At the same time they are clever, and well-informed. Oftentimes brilliantly educated, they prepare their work with care and effectiveness.

Unions can refuse membership or office to a Communist by making Communist Party membership contrary to the union constitution and by enforcing that clause.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor tells us "no labor organization can be free under communism because it is compelled to subordinate the interests of the workers to those of the Communist Party."

Communism, as evidenced by its own works in the Soviet Union and her satellites, grinds down the workingman. It does not lift him up. It does not free him. It is a revolutionary movement that seeks to destroy things as they are, with the aim to seize power and put it in the hands of one political party—the Communist Party.

Americans love freedom. The Communists seek to use our freedom of speech to overthrow freedom of speech, and they suppress freedom in every form. Americans believe that a man should be free to work where he chooses, to open an office or a business, to improve his position. He may speak his mind without fear. He may worship as his conscience tells him. His home is sacred. He may read and vote freely. The law, the courts, and the police will protect him, not make him a slave.

We do not fear that Americans will choose communism. But we do want to make doubly sure that it does not come upon him by trickery or force.

We must ever be true to America. We must ever be on guard to protect her from those enemies, whether they be called Communist or by another name, who would seek to take from us our freedom and destroy the fundamental democratic principles that have made us such a great Nation.

Eighty-first Congress Has Moved Toward Goals of Peace, Security, and Prosperity

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-first Congress in nearly 8 months of its first session has made long strides in the direction of our goals of international peace and of security and prosperity at home.

As the House of Representatives begins a series of 3-day recesses until September 21, a review of the record of its major actions shows that the Members of this body are deserving of congratulations and a brief vacation well earned.

INTERNATIONAL RECOVERY AND PEACE

The first aim of the United States was to restore the economy of western Europe, to help those nations become self-supporting. The Congress enacted Public Law No. 47 authorizing continuance of the European recovery program. To finance this program both the House and Senate approved a foreign-aid appropriation bill and their differences are being ironed out in conference.

The House has approved a program of military assistance to the signatory nations of the North Atlantic Pact—which is already in effect—and the Senate is nearing final action on this program.

The House has also approved, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has reported, legislation revising the United Nations Participation Act to strengthen our representation in that body with delegates of ambassador status.

The House has passed a bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements law for another 3 years. This bill is on the Senate Calendar for early action.

And to further strengthen the facilities for world recovery, this Congress has enacted Public Law No. 142 to permit member banks of the Federal Reserve System to deal in the securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

We know that peace in the world cannot be achieved if its economy is unstable, if the democracies are too weak to defend themselves against aggression, and if we cannot act within the framework of the United Nations.

Thus the House of Representatives has moved in all three fields—economic, military, and diplomatic—to strengthen the cause of peace.

In the wake of the ravages of war Congress enacted a law extending for another year America's contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund. Also, both branches passed and the President has signed a law for payment of war-damage claims to neutrals. The House has passed and the Senate has on its calendar a bill authorizing settlement of claims with former enemies.

The House has passed a bill amending the Displaced Persons Act to remove discriminatory provisions enacted in the Eightieth Congress. This is still in the Senate Judiciary Committee, but a petition to discharge is under way.

The Congress, by joint resolution, provided for a special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations to aid the Arabs and Jews displaced in the Palestinian war.

The Congress has enacted a law providing that payments on old World War I debts by Finland be used for scholarships for its citizens here.

Both House and Senate have approved legislation to extend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to continue various cooperative projects to improve the health, education, agriculture, and general living standards of our good neighbors in South America. This bill is in conference.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

In the present state of world affairs it has become increasingly apparent that the strength of our armed forces is not only a protection of our own security but a real deterrent to any would-be aggressor.

To help protect our land from possible sneak air attacks, the House and the Senate passed and the President signed into Public Law No. 30 a bill authorizing the construction of a series of land-based air-warning and control installations to form a radar network screen.

The Congress, in Public Law No. 60, authorized a joint long-range guided-missile proving ground to provide facilities for testing and perfecting modern rocket weapons.

The eyes and ears of our armed services throughout the world is the Central Intelligence Agency, and the House and Senate voted into Public Law No. 110 the measure defining the status and fixing the authority of this vital agency.

An historic step was the enactment of Public Law No. 216 which provided for unification of the armed services, defining the powers of the Secretary of Defense and generally streamlining for greater efficiency our whole defense set-up.

Both branches of the Congress have passed a bill fixing the composition and strength of the Army and the Air Force with Senate amendments remaining to be considered by the House.

The Congress has increased the authorization for an experimental submarine program.

The House has passed and the Senate Armed Services Committee has reported a bill increasing military pay.

A construction program for operations buildings and housing for personnel along the far-flung Alaska communications system is authorized in separate bills passed by the House and the Senate and remaining to be adjusted.

The House has received from the Senate a measure authorizing construction of supersonic wind tunnels and an engineering center, and the Senate has on its calendar a House-approved bill establishing a new uniform code of military justice for all branches of the armed services.

The problem of our internal defenses against the infiltration of enemy agents has been tackled in bills reported and on the calendars in both House and Senate to bolster our laws against espionage and sedition, to stiffen the penalties and extend the statute of limitations for such offenses.

The House has passed and the Senate has reported a bill which prohibits picketing of the courts—a favorite subversive device of the Communists in efforts to weaken the authority of our judiciary.

The House Judiciary Committee has reported a bill to tighten control and supervision over aliens awaiting deportation.

HOUSING AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The Eighty-first Congress took an epoch-making step for the welfare of the Nation when it enacted Public Law No. 171, a new national housing law providing for construction of 810,000 dwelling units in the next 6 years. This $308,000,000 program will be financed over 40 years. It also authorized $1,500,000,000 in Federal aid to communities for slum clearance, for a farm-housing program of direct loans and grants, and for housing research. The law gives preference to veterans and families of deceased veterans.

The House has also passed, and the Senate has on its calendar, H. R. 6070, to provide for financing of the housing program through the mortgage insurance authority of the FHA and the RFC. This bill also provides for disposal of temporary war housing and encourages housing construction at overcrowded educational institutions.

An additional 60,000 housing units will be constructed at Army, Navy, and Air Force bases throughout the United States under other legislation approved by the House and Senate and signed by the President as Public Law No. 211.

Pending final enactment of the Housing Finance Act, we have provided, by joint resolution, for authority of the agencies to continue to insure mortgages.

Earlier in the session the Congress had already provided for continuance of rent control with a local-option feature.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate H. R. 2203 providing for a decennial housing census to maintain a constant inventory of housing needs.

The House Committee on Ways and Means after long and careful study has reported a bill to extend the coverage and increase the benefits under the old-age survivors and public assistance programs.

Approximately 11,000,000 persons will become beneficiaries under this bill in addition to the 35,000,000 now covered by social security. The average old-age benefits would be increased from $26 to $40 per month. The bill also permits higher part-time earnings and provides for temporary and permanent disability insurance.

Both the House and Senate have passed a bill continuing for 1 year Federal aid for schools with war-swelled populations and for education of children on Federal reservations.

It is unfortunate that the House Labor Committee has been unable to agree on the $300,000,000 Senate-passed bill for Federal aid to schools, but we have every confidence that such a bill will be enacted into law before the Eighty-first Congress has terminated its service.

The Congress has provided a special appropriation of $1,500,000 for crippled children, in addition to regular annual grants to States, to meet emergency needs resulting from the polio epidemic and lack of hospital facilities.

Also, by House joint resolution, an appropriation was authorized for the President's Committee on National Employ the Handicapped Week.

A House committee has reported and the Senate has passed similar bills to expand the Federal aid program for hospital construction, and the House has received from the Senate a measure to provide Federal assistance in the development of local public-health units.

A long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Tribes has been approved by both the House and the Senate.

REORGANIZATION

A vast program of reorganization of the whole executive establishment of the Government in the interests of economy and efficiency is already under way as a result of the action of this Congress.

The House may well be proud of this momentous achievement which began with enactment of Public Law 109 granting the President authority to reorganize the various departments and agencies.

The program now on its way to reality is in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission to effect savings estimated at several billions of dollars annually, and to improve the operations of the Government by elimination of duplicative and overlapping functions.

Of the first seven plans submitted to the Congress, subject to rejection within 60 days by either branch, the House gave its tacit approval to all, the Senate rejecting one, that providing for creation of a Department of Welfare. The six plans which became effective August 19, will strengthen the Labor Department by transferring to it the Bureau of Employment Security, the Veterans' Placement Service Board, and the Federal Advisory Council. They will permit reorganization and modernization of the Post Office Department, the transfer of the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President. The functions of both the Civil Service Commission and the Maritime Commission will be overhauled and realined. And, the Public Roads agencies will be brought under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

Plan No. 8, to unify the armed forces under the Secretary of Defense, will become effective next month unless rejected by either House. The deadline is 60 days from July 18, when it was submitted, later than the other plans. But the substance of this plan has in effect already been authorized by specific legislation.

The House and the Senate by separate legislation had already authorized a reorganization of the State Department, establishing clearer lines of authority and integrating the Foreign Service more directly into the organizational structure of the Department. This is Public Law No. 73.

In another enactment, Public Law No. 152, the Congress has created the General Services Administration, merging into a single agency the functions of supply, records management, and the administration, operation, and maintenance of public buildings.

In addition, the House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill which will relieve the President of the United States of burdensome routine duties by authorizing him to delegate certain tasks to other officers of the Government.

The salaries of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House have been increased in conformity to the great responsibilities of their respective offices—this was provided for under Public Law No. 2. Increases for various other executives are provided in a bill passed by the House and reported in the Senate, in an effort to make the public service more attractive to able men and to lessen the competition of private industry for their services.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Millions of American families who rent their homes were afforded protection by the 15 months' extension of the rent-control law authorized by this Congress, and already mentioned in connection with the housing situation. At the same

time, provision was made for local governments to decontrol their own areas.

The export control authority of the President, which would otherwise have expired, was extended in legislation passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President as Public Law 11.

This Congress also renewed the authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living. The new law extends the President's power to enforce such voluntary agreements through September 30 of this year, and also continues the voluntary-agreement method of priority allocation of key materials in short supply.

The authority of the Government to control imports of fats, oils, rice, and rice products was continued in Public Law 155, and control over tin and tin products was extended in Public Law 153.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate H. R. 2734, which plugs a loophole in the antitrust laws by prohibiting acquisitions or mergers by purchase of assets of one corporation by another if it stifles competition or tends to create a monopoly.

Passed by the House and Senate and now in conference is a bill to legalize the basing-point pricing system in instances where it is not in conflict with the antitrust laws.

The House has on its calendar a bill to authorize Federal aid to States and local governments for advance planning of public works. This is intended to provide a shelf of projects for use in the event of a recession.

Serving that same purpose, the House and the Senate have already enacted into Public Law 105 authority for planning and purchase of sites for new Federal public buildings at a cost of $40,000,000, and, for modernization of existing structures at an additional cost of $30,000,000.

The House has passed and a Senate committee has reported a bill to suspend for another year import duties on scrap metal, except aluminum.

LABOR

The House has passed a fair labor standards bill increasing the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour and extending its provisions to cover additional groups of workers. This bill, H. R. 5856, is scheduled for early action in the Senate.

The House has passed and the Senate has reported a bill to liberalize compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in the course of duty.

Much-needed clarification of the overtime pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act has been accomplished in the bill passed by the House and the Senate and now Public Law No. 177.

For civilian Government employees, the Congress has increased the travel allowance in Public Law No. 92.

Sick leave, promotions, and other working conditions of postal employees are adjusted in H. R. 4495, which has been reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Also reported and now on the House calendar is H. R. 378 which requires railroads to install and maintain certain communication systems for the safety of employees and passengers.

This House was unable to agree on a satisfactory labor-management relations bill to replace the Taft-Hartley Act, to the regret of all who desire to see such relations stabilized for the benefit of the national economy as a whole.

AGRICULTURE

The farmers of the Nation are assured of adequate crop storage space as a result of the action of this Congress. Under the bill passed by this House, approved by the Senate, and signed into Public Law No. 85, the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation was revised to permit it to provide the necessary grain storage facilities and to exchange surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials.

The House has approved a bill for continuing present price-support levels for farm products for another year and this issue is before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The crop-insurance program has been continued and its provisions broadened to cover additional commodities under the terms of Public Law No. 268.

Disaster loans to farmers from a $44,000,000 revolving fund are authorized under another enactment of this Congress, Public Law No. 38.

Among the earliest actions of the House was the initiation of measures for emergency relief required as a result of western blizzards. These became Public Laws No. 3 and No. 5.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill authorizing the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines.

The House has also passed and sent to the Senate a bill repealing the tax on oleomargarine.

Both the House and Senate have passed and agreed in conference on the bill providing for national marketing quotas and acreage allotments for cotton production.

VETERANS

The House has voted to liberalize pensions to veterans, widows, and surviving children of veterans, and this bill, H. R. 4617, is in Senate committee.

Both the House and the Senate have passed a bill providing for the purchase by the Veterans' Administration of automobiles for crippled veterans.

The rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities would be increased to 100 percent under H. R. 5598, approved by the House and sent to the Senate.

Patent rights held by World War II veterans would be protected under another bill passed by the House and referred to the Senate.

A House committee has favorably reported a bill, H. R. 5965, authorizing construction of Veterans' Administration facilities to provide for an additional 16,000 beds.

This Congress has enacted and the President has signed a law permitting payment to veterans of retroactive benefits withheld during hospitalization—Public Law No. 194—and extending the time for filing, in certain cases, for pensions and compensation—Public Law No. 195.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The extension of regional power development and reclamation projects is provided in the regular appropriation bill of the Department of the Interior which has been enacted into law.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate the bill authorizing Nationwide improvements in rivers and harbors and flood-control projects.

Both Houses of Congress have approved and the President has signed Public Law No. 37, giving Federal approval to the compact between States along the Colorado River, and Public Law No. 82, the compact between States along the Arkansas River.

The House has approved and a Senate committee has reported a bill authorizing expansion of the Folsom Dam project as a step in the development of the American River Basin in California.

Similar action has been taken by the House on construction of irrigation canals to serve the Sacramento Valley as part of the Central Valley project in the same State.

Both the House and the Senate have approved a bill authorizing construction of the Weber Basin project, Utah, for irrigation, water supply, flood control, and hydroelectric power for that area.

The House has approved and sent to the Senate a bill authorizing construction of the Canadian River reclamation project in the Texas Panhandle.

Both branches of the Congress have approved a bill now in conference which increases Federal aid to the States in cooperative programs for prevention of forest fires.

The House has before it, reported from committee, bills to encourage production of strategic minerals and metals. Similar bills have been reported in the Senate.

A 5-year program of public works construction for development of the Territory of Alaska, involving an expenditure of $70,000,000, has been enacted into Public Law No. 264.

Construction of public and private housing in Alaska is encouraged in Public Law 52, which makes available $15,000,000 for FHA for this purpose, and the House approved H. R. 940 for construction of a $21,500,000 hydroelectric project at Eklutna, Alaska.

Carson Nomination and Committee Approval Heartening to Independent Business of Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has approved President Truman's nomination of John Carson to be

a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

I have known John Carson for 21 years. He is an American citizen of the highest type. I have never known a more unselfish, public-spirited person in my life. He is an intelligent, able man, and I do not know of any person who would make a better member of that Commission than he. It is my prediction that he will render outstanding service, and President Truman, the Congress, and the people will be proud of the way that he performs the duties of his office. He does not hate anybody. He will give big business, as well as little business, a square deal. He will perform the duties of his office fairly and impartially. At the same time he realizes the importance of independent business, particularly small business, and I do not believe that he will give any encouragement to monopolies and trusts; but on the other hand, will properly enforce the laws within the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, since I know that he believes in these laws.

In the Farmers Union Herald August 8, 1949, there was an article by Jerry Voorhis concerning John Carson. Jerry Voorhis is a former Member of the House of Representatives, where he served many terms from California. Mr. Voorhis was admired and respected by his colleagues for his intelligent efforts and ability. Mr. Voorhis has something to say about Mr. Carson in this statement that I believe Members of Congress would be interested in knowing.

The statement is as follows:

CARSON NOMINATION SHOWS POWER OF CO-OP OPPOSITION

(By Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary, Cooperative League)

In early April President Truman sent the nomination of John Carson to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission to the United States Senate for confirmation.

There has been no doubt in the mind of any unprejudiced student of government that John Carson is the very sort of man the FTC needs in its business. Carson knows his economics; he knows the danger of monopoly to any democratic nation; he has an innate devotion to the basic ideals of his country; he is a man of natural good will.

Had the Senate been left alone to make its own decision, John Carson would have been confirmed in short order. Generally speaking, the Senate is inclined to "go along" with Presidential appointments unless vigorous opposition arises.

Well, in this case vigorous opposition did arise, for the simple reason that some people were afraid Carson would make too effective a member of the FTC—from the standpoint of the big monopolies. Fulton Lewis led the attack, and the NTEA handled the campaign. A list of the witnesses appearing against Carson and a comparison with the list of anticooperative witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee in 1947 leaves no doubt that NTEA is the center and core of the opposition to this nomination.

The question was raised—or at least it was strongly implied—as to whether anyone connected with cooperatives ought to be considered for a position with the Federal Government. None of the Senators would, of course, admit this. But it was nonetheless the substance of a lot of arguments against confirmation of Mr. Carson.

We told the committee the story. Among other things we pointed out that a man who understands cooperatives is necessarily a man devoted to the general public interest of the United States, to true economic freedom and to democracy in every sense of that word.

If the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approves the nomination, a significant victory for the forces of genuine democracy will have been won. If they vote it down—or if the Senate itself defeats it later—we'll just have to score one more victory for the reactionary forces which have beaten the people's interest a good many times before.

But whichever way the vote goes there are some important lessons to be learned. The first is that Members of Congress are necessarily in the business of conforming. Few of them want to oppose cooperatives; and almost every one of them professes his belief in them. But neither do they want to be against other important groups in their districts—the little-business men, for example. This is why the one question in which the members of the committee were most interested was whether cooperatives were likely to, or whether they aimed to, take over all the business of the country.

We read the statement of purpose from the league's handbook, which says "the purpose and objective of the Cooperative League is the growth of cooperation and cooperative business enterprise to a point where the people's own business, accounting for perhaps 15 or 20 percent of important lines of commerce, can become an effective balance wheel of a just and truly free economy."

Open-minded Senators unquestionably understood that cooperatives stand for freedom for everybody and that they are good medicine—even for their competitors.

But the second lesson to be learned from the Carson hearings is that there are powerful enemies of cooperatives and of the plain people who are not open-minded. They will fight with every weapon to push cooperators into the category of second-class citizens, ineligible for public office or positions.

Against that sort of opposition, contrary as it is to every tenet of true American ideals, cooperatives of every sort and kind must close ranks—and fight back. Our enemies will have resources of money, position, and access to controlled channels of influencing public opinion which we cannot expect to match. But there is one resource which we can pit against them and beat them in the long run. That resource is people—people adequately informed as to where their own real interest lies; people armed with the truth.

Address by Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas, at the Oil Industry's Ninetieth Birthday Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] on the occasion of the oil industry's ninetieth anniversary celebration at the Drake Well Memorial Park, Titusville, Pa., on August 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be here today and share with you the pride and inspiration that one gets on such an occasion as this.

I see here at this luncheon gathering faces that I have had the pleasure of knowing in other years—men who have been associated with the oil business across this continent, many from my midcontinent area. You have come to pay tribute and participate in this inspiring event, the oil industry's ninetieth birthday, but more particularly to the memory of a man, Col. E. L. Drake, who dared to do what others failed to see or to comprehend at that time.

We are paying tribute to a man who was responsible for initiating a great industry, for, make no mistake about it, oil has played a vast, far-reaching role in the growth and development of the United States—a role that should be a source of pride and satisfaction to anyone working in this gigantic American enterprise.

I for one deem it a privilege to have participated in the ceremonies at the Drake shrine this morning, and to comment briefly at this luncheon. I come from Kansas, one of the oil-producing States of the midcontinent area and to many of you a part of the great Southwest. It has been my privilege through the past years to have worked with, and been associated with, oil men. I have come to learn of their hopes, some of their troubles, and aspirations.

That broad and mighty section of our country known as the Southwest is abundantly endowed with oil and gas. Its value in petroleum and petroleum products during 1948 alone was greater than all the gold and silver mined in these United States of ours since early colonial days.

The more you know about this oil industry of ours, its products and its operations, the more fascinating it becomes, and the more respect you have for its record of achievements.

All of us know that Col. Edwin L. Drake founded the industry in 1859 when he opened the first petroleum well not far from this spot where we now are gathered. The beautiful museum, the memorial park, the exact replica of which stands over the first well—all these bear tribute to his memory and his place in history.

What we did this morning, and what we are doing now, are further homage to this courageous man who came out of the East, and despite the ridicule of the frontiersmen, drilled the Nation's first commercial oil well.

To orient ourselves, to realize the full impact of the times, let's be retrospective for a moment and consider these historical data: In 1859 the United States was at best a third-class power of only 33 States and a population of approximately 30,000,000; for the most part life was an isolated affair for everyone beyond the confines of the larger cities; transportation was limited, erratic, and arduous at best; there were no highways or luxuries such as we have today.

The Morse telegraph system was still a comparatively new gadget; telephones were unheard of; the Civil War had not yet burst upon the struggling young American Republic, but the ominous clouds were gathering; Indians and buffalo still roamed the western plains, and the man whom the future was to know as Buffalo Bill was a small boy of 14; Custer's last stand at Little Big Horn was 17 years in the future; Titusville itself was virtually an outpost of civilization whose population consisted of only 125 assorted souls.

Drake's discovery here at Titusville, in a sparsely settled section of Pennsylvania, precipitated history's first oil boom and started a wave of exploration, discovery, and invention which literally catapulted the United States into the leadership of the world. The pioneers of the oil industry spread out from the Pennsylvania fields like a great wave. Within the next 10 years they had discovered oil in Ohio, New York, West Virginia, Kansas, Kentucky, Colorado, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

In far-away California the oil fever made itself felt in the early 1860's, but it was

not until 1875 that Pico No. 4 gave the State its first real commercial production. Wildcatting was on in earnest, and in the years that preceded the turn of the century big discoveries were made at such fields as Coalinga, Calif.; Nacogdoches, Tex.; Fredonia, Kans.; Lima, Ohio; Corsicana, Tex.; and Dewey-Bartlesville, Okla.

Courageous, adventurous oil men carried the torch of civilization north, east, south, and west. Gamblers for big stakes they were. In 1901 the granddaddy of the Titans came roaring in down Texas way. That was Spindletop, and the 75,000 to 100,000 barrels a day that gushed up from Captain Lucas' well electrified the country.

It is easy to see that the trail of exploration and development blazed by the men of oil contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of the United States. They opened new frontiers everywhere. They set up shop in even the most remote places, and civilization followed their train in. Their work and their activities inspired invention and creativeness.

The petroleum which they supplied in abundance provided the energy that this country needed for its physical growth. Ingenious Americans put oil to work in a thousand ways. From petroleum came the high quality lubricants which the inventors had needed for their machines; from petroleum came the compact fuel that was needed for the internal-combustion engines; from petroleum radiated a ceaseless supply of light, heat, and power for a lusty, growing America. In later years, as a base for chemistry, petroleum has opened up vistas whose horizons are limited only by the imagination of man.

Through the years petroleum and progress have become so inseparably intertwined that the words are virtually synonymous.

Like all men and industries, oil had an exuberant youth. Gushers sometimes were allowed to flow uncontrolled; fields were ravaged to get the most out of them in the shortest possible time; wasteful practices were disregarded in many places. But that's all over now. These things are all things of the past.

Special riggings like Christmas trees were developed to control wells before they came in; wells were spaced to give optimum drainage of a field; conservation codes and practices were adopted, and production allowables were set up to avoid the glutting of markets and the waste of petroleum products.

Many restraints were self-imposed by oil men, for they realized that oil was a vital resource, and that only by conservation and proper development would the muscles and sinews of a growing giant in America be strengthened with each passing year.

Unhampered by restrictive legislation, the oil men have shown over and over again that they can keep this Nation well supplied with all the products of petroleum that it needs. This is the American heritage—the freedom of initiative and enterprise. They have kept the faith through the years, and like all good public-spirited citizens they are constantly preparing for the future.

Today the petroleum industry is the product of American free economy. It is hedged, to be sure, by Federal and State law, but only to promote conservation and the welfare of small business and the long-term interest of the public. To a great extent it employs its own business methods and goes its own way.

Supported and encouraged by those oil-men who believed in conservation of resources and preservation of a great segment of American business, the States, rather than the Federal Government, have taken the lead in the field of proper regulation. This is as it should be.

The interstate oil compact has dramatized not only the fact of State sovereignty, but also its need and sufficiency. The willingness of the individual State to follow the Commission's lead and to work harmoniously with other States for conservation, apparently proves that Federal control is unnecessary.

A quick measuring stick of the effectiveness of the oilmen's credo and their rate of progress is the Nation's reservoir of proved reserves. Back at the end of World War I the Nation's proved reserves totaled 6,700,000,000 barrels; official reports came out of Washington that at the rate that petroleum was being consumed it would not be too far in the future when the reserves would be exhausted.

Statements like that didn't bother the Nation's oilmen. They just kept on working. Each year the production rose higher and higher. By 1948, production exceeded 2,000,000,000 barrels. And what of the reserves? Well, they went up, too. Despite the tremendous drain of World War II and the demands of the other years, the oilmen went ahead and discovered so much oil that currently the proven reserves are almost 28,000,000,000 barrels of liquid hydrocarbons.

And that, of course, doesn't even take in the new phase of offshore operations in the Gulf of Mexico and other places; nor the synthetic program through which great mountains of shale can be converted into oil for our wheels and wings.

Through the years the petroleum industry has grown tremendously, and why not? For progress begets progress and growth is inevitable.

From the single company which was in existence for the drilling of the Drake well have mushroomed up more than 24,000 companies employing approximately 1,500,000 workers.

You men in oil know these statistics fairly well, but it is still surprising to the average man to realize the scope of your operations.

To serve the American consumer, the industry has more than 150,000 miles of pipe line crisscrossing the Nation; more than 476 tankers and 2,400 barges; more than 100,000 railroad tank cars and 250,000 motor vehicles, including 147,000 tank trucks and tank trailers; and more than 250,000 service stations.

This is part of the American drama, the story of American success and progress being told over and again.

The story of oil is a powerful one, and it is one of the best examples of what we mean by free enterprise and what free enterprise means to us and to our country under a competitive system.

In the countries across the sea where many governments frown on initiative and independence; in the countries where the hand of state is heavy and restrictive, there is no parallel to the American story of oil; nor is there any parallel to the growth and development of the United States whose roots are firmly embedded in the rock of freedom.

The part that the oil industry has played in the winning of two world wars has been mentioned so frequently that it needs no elaboration today. Every thinking person realizes that our success depended upon the availability of unprecedented quantities of oil. Our victory was achieved because the oil industry of this country gave us that oil.

But, I wonder if we are not prone to lose sight of the contributions of petroleum in peacetime. Stop for a moment to reflect upon what kind of civilization we would have today if Colonel Drake had not made his great discovery here 90 years ago, and if we had never found oil in our Nation. We would find a strange picture indeed. Our standard of living and what we call our American way of life, is in a large degree built upon the availability of petroleum and its products. The motorcar, the truck, the tractor, and the Diesel engine loom large in our economy and in our society. Our cities could not attain their present size if it were not for oil. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles would all be, of necessity, smaller in an appreciable degree. Some of our cities, that oil has built, would disappear from the map entirely or would be only whistle stops.

Quite obviously our network of highways, which reach into every county in America, could not exist and would not be needed if we did not have an abundance of this important product. The whole structure of our society would be changed.

But even this doesn't give a full picture of what oil has done for us. How many schools and great universities have been built from the dollars which petroleum has produced? How many great medical centers and hospitals? How many churches and community buildings?

I do not know of any industry which can match the record of the petroleum industry in the amount of its proceeds which have found their way, through tax payments in part, but through voluntary charitable gifts in a great degree, into institutions and facilities dedicated to public enjoyment and public betterment. If these facilities which have been built by charitable donations from oil profits were to be wiped out overnight, our country would be immeasurably poorer.

Admittedly, the oil business has been one involving tremendous risks. It has received its black eyes. In some instances it has deserved them. But no man can seriously question that this industry has been a tremendous force for good and for the benefit of us all.

It is, perhaps, fitting that we are meeting here in Pennsylvania for another reason. Many States, including my own, have long since outstripped the maximum production that Pennsylvania ever attained, but when we turn from the quantitative to the qualitative aspects, the Keystone State looms large. It is, indeed, fitting that the oil industry has borrowed the name of this great Commonwealth to denominate the finest petroleum that nature gives.

We do not live in a static world. The last 90 years are but the prelude of many times 90 to come. As oil which was born here, and which has long since started its westward trek, continues into the future, we can have for it no greater hope than that it may continue to make the brilliant record which it has already started. I trust and I believe that the men of this industry will, if given the opportunity under our American system of free enterprise, nobly and progressively continue to serve the demands and the best interests of all Americans today and tomorrow.

In closing, may I say that today, from the original site of the Drake well, we have looked backward 90 years to a time when some thought that greasy, black oil which flowed from the earth would amount to very little because they had no vision.

Little did men of that day envision the 10,000 and more uses to which that fluid and its byproducts could be put: to make this world of ours a better and a more progressive place in which to live. We might say that it had to go through the crucible of fire and come out refined in its many rarefied forms. And so it has been with America in the last 90 years. Our country has moved from those perilous days. We have experienced growing pains, internal hates, hunger, and the privations and dislocations of wars. We have emerged into a new position of world leadership, whether we like it or not, and may we as trusted citizens of our beloved Nation lift ourselves above the petty, the sordid, and the discordant notes of the world, to newer horizons of greater responsibility.

Let us pattern our future upon the faith, resourcefulness, and energy of our pioneer forefathers, and remember that the God-fearing traditions upon which America has been built will be a good pattern to follow for our future tomorrows.

Accent on Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of August 30, 1949, entitled "Accent on Unity." The editorial is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCENT ON UNITY

The trial balloons that have filled the air since the British-American conference was announced are beginning to assume some substantiality. One is that political as well as economic difficulties will be discussed. Another is that these difficulties will not be discussed narrowly as between Britain and America but broadly as affecting the whole Atlantic community. These notions sound as if the conferees intend to have a thoroughgoing exploration instead of a look for poultices till the trading world settles down to a buyers' market.

There was a wrong accent in the administration of the Marshall plan which should be the object lesson to the September 7 conferees. What has been insured by the Marshall plan is not the recovery of Europe in the sense of the restoration of what former Secretary Marshall called "a working economy" for Europe but the subsidization and the building up of separate economies for the nations of Europe. They all want to be self-sufficient in agriculture; they all want their own oil refineries—their own steel industries; and Marshall money has helped to give the separate countries these paraphernalia of independence. In so doing it has promoted jealousy. Witness the intra-European argument in the OEEC, or Organization of European Economic Cooperation, the allocating agency in Paris for Marshall plan appropriations. Britain's implied request for a bigger slice of the pie has evoked some harsh words in continental Europe at the expense of Britain.

The development of autarchy, or separate economies, is not the bargain that was struck when the American people decided to finance the Marshall plan. It was certainly not the reason that this newspaper backed the Marshall plan. What has happened, in point of fact, is directly contrary to our hopes and expectations. The rush for self-containment has succeeded only too well, and Britain, in particular, appears to have been digging in behind what the London Observer calls it "siege economy"—an economy bristling with bilateral agreements, quotas, an inconvertible currency, and bulk purchases of Government agencies.

The same separatism is being invited in the arms program. If this country subsidizes a munitions industry in France, and the title is French, then there is bound to be envy elsewhere. Other countries will want the United States to subsidize an arms industry within their borders. This and like difficulties could be avoided if the United States were to pin its policy to principles instead of to nations. If, for instance, a firm stand had been taken for unity in Europe, the quest for autarchy would not have been allowed to run riot in Europe. If a similar stand were taken on the title to arms and arms factories in Europe—insisting they shall be international, not national—then the unification of the military defense of Europe might be expedited.

We trust that in the forthcoming discussions the American delegates will be so guided by these considerations. On the political level Europe needs to understand, for instance, that the American tradition, let alone prudence in this changing world, is dead set against colonialism—against subsidizing the mania for fighting rearguard battles against destiny. It is scandalous that American arms have hitherto been used in combating unrest in Europe's colonies. If the administration will not make it clear that this kind of cooperation is intolerable, Congress could insure that it will not happen again by attaching a declaration of intent to its vote for MAP. What is going on at Strasbourg, furthermore, should obtain what it has so far lacked—the enthusiastic approval of the United States. Though Strasbourg is a talk shop, the nations are talking of setting up, in place of or as an adjunct to the purely coordinating agency known as OEEC, a permanent economic commission of the Consultative Assembly, so as to consider a joint attack on Europe's dollar deficit, its tariffs, its inconvertible currencies.

Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which I wrote earlier this year for the law quarterly of my law school, Temple University at Philadelphia, Pa., and which was published today. In the article I sought to present an objective discussion of the issues and results of the filibuster in the Senate this year over proposed changes in our rule governing limitation of debate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITATION OF DEBATE IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE—A DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES AND RESULTS OF THE FATEFUL 1949 SENATE FILIBUSTER OVER FILIBUSTERING

(By Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS, United States Senator from Pennsylvania)

There are numerous dramatic incidents during the year which attract capacity crowds to the galleries of the United States Senate. But nothing is more consistently effective as a crowd gatherer than a Senate filibuster, particularly a one-man variety.

Whenever such a filibuster is launched in the Senate, thousands of tourists, and Washingtonians too, come streaming to the Capitol at all hours of the day and night, sometimes to stand in queues for hours before finally squeezing into the galleries for a glimpse of the great spectacle. The spectacle, most often, consists of a weary Senator, half leaning against the elbow-high stack of books on his desk, his feet obviously aching, while he talks and talks and talks. Usually, he talks to the Presiding Officer, the official reporters of debate, a few sleepy Senate page boys, and perhaps an occasional Senator.

What the filibusterer is saying may or may not be historic—or even relevant to the business before the Senate. Yet he has appeal to the audience. The appeal of his performance is somewhat akin to that of the marathan dance contests of bygone years.

Like the contestants in those events, he is engaged in a test of physical endurance. How long can he stand on his feet and talk?

Usually, not long enough.

One-man filibusters almost inevitably peter out in sheer physical exhaustion, their purpose unrealized. One Senator cannot delay the Senate very long. Therefore, for the simple reason that they are seldom very effective, they are not very frequent, and so there is always great public interest, particularly in Washington, in every such individual filibustering attempt when it does occur.

This is the public conception of the filibuster, but it is a misconception. The Senate is seldom very much inconvenienced or delayed or obstructed by an occasional one-man, or even two- or three-man filibuster, unless it occurs at the very end of a session with important bills still to be voted on. The Senate is, however, very much affected by filibusters of a kind which rarely bring crowds to the galleries—that is, by concerted, organized blocs of Senators taking advantage of the Senate's traditional rights of free and unlimited debate in order to paralyze the Senate completely and prevent it from acting on any pending proposal to which the particular bloc of Senators is violently opposed. It is that type of filibuster, and only that type, which has been giving most students of congressional machinery serious concern. It was in connection with an attempt to end that type of filibuster that the Senate experienced a fateful filibuster earlier this year.

I shall try, as objectively as I can in view of my very close identification with this most recent battle on the Senate floor, to discuss what was done—and why—in the weeks leading up to March 17, 1949, when the Senate bound itself to a new rule setting forth certain conditions under which the Senate's tradition of unlimited debate, of unlimited freedom for any Senator to discuss any matter, at any length, at any time during which the Senate is in session, can be abridged.

Under this new rule, adopted after weeks of debate, the Senate, by a voice vote, decreed that—after certain preliminaries—64 Senators (a constitutional two-thirds of the Senate) can limit, and thereby eventually end, debate on any issue—except one—which is before the Senate.

The one exception, on which no machinery is provided for cloture (limitation and ending of debate), involves any future attempt to change the rules of the Senate. This issue is placed in a separate category of sacredness, and no motion to limit debate, to apply cloture, can lie against it.

Under the newly revised rule XXII of the Senate, this is the procedure which must be followed in order to seek to limit, and thereby eventually end, debate on any—and these words are of vital importance—"measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or other unfinished business."

First, 16 Senators must sign a motion to invoke cloture.

One hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one—in other words, 2 days later—the Presiding Officer shall, at once, lay the motion before the Senate, and direct that the Secretary call the roll. If a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, lay before the Senate the following question for a yea and nay vote:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

If 64 Senators vote "yea" on this question, "then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business."

Thereafter, no Senator shall be allowed to speak for more than 1 hour on the question or issue before the Senate. After each Senator has been given an opportunity to speak for a maximum of 1 hour, all debate must end, and the Senate can then dispose of the matter before it.

This rule is substantially similar to the previous rule of the Senate on this question, a rule adopted 32 years earlier, on March 8, 1917, following an historic filibuster on the armed ship bill. The differences, however, are extremely significant.

The previous rule provided that cloture could be obtained in the Senate "upon any pending measure" through the affirmative votes of two-thirds of "those voting." I shall discuss in some detail the meaning of these changes, but first I want to discuss the additional revision in the rule that was adopted on March 17 of this year. This adds an entirely new subsection to rule XXII, providing that the rule itself shall not apply "to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the standing rules of the Senate."

Since the Senate cannot proceed to the consideration of any matter until it has first agreed to do so by motion, this subsection guarantees hereafter that any small, organized group of Senators who have the determination and the stamina to do so can prevent the Senate from further revising the rule on debate which was adopted on March 17, 1949. In other words, although there is now presumably machinery to end a filibuster on any other subject or matter—and many of us had insisted that the Senate had virtually that same power under the old rule—there is now, by decree of the Senate itself, no machinery whatsoever for ending a filibuster on future changes in the rules.

It must be remembered here that the filibuster of February and March of this year against proposed changes of the rules was not "broken"; it was voluntarily ended by those who participated in it after they became convinced they had sufficient votes to adopt a so-called compromise resolution to their liking. Had the Senate insisted upon breaking the filibuster by forcing it to be carried on to its ultimate end, it would have taken many, many months. And any further attempt now to revise the rules of the Senate in a manner objected to by any substantial group of Senators would run into a similar filibuster which similarly could not be ended except by endless months of debate, or by surrendering to the filibusterers.

That is one significant phase of the Senate's action earlier this year. The 63 Senators who voted for the so-called Wherry substitute resolution early on the night of March 17 thereby decreed first, that hereafter 64 Senators must vote for cloture in order to end debate in the Senate on any "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or other unfinished business," and second, that where this issue involves a change in the Senate rules, not 64 Senators, nor any number of Senators, can wield machinery to close off a filibuster.

For these reasons, primarily, many of us in the Senate, albeit a minority, believe that the action of the Senate on March 17 was a retrogressive step, an action designed to make it harder rather than easier to cut off debate when the debate is not for the purpose of persuasion or instruction, but rather for the sole purpose of obstructing and preventing the Senate from disposing—ever—of certain matters before it.

There are many types of filibustering tactics used frequently, not only in the Senate, but also in the House of Representatives. The word "filibuster" itself, one with rather a colorful background, was, I understand, first applied in its present American sense to alleged obstructive tactics in the House of Representatives, which may be a surprise to those who identify it only with attempted paralysis of the Senate. "Filibusterer" came into the English language from the Dutch, French, and Spanish—meaning "freebooter or buccaneer." Its first recorded application to obstructive legislative tactics in the United States—at least the first I have been able to find—apparently occurred in 1853 after Congressman Abraham W. Venable, of South Carolina, had made a rather lengthy speech in the House in connection with the Military Academy bill that year, a speech in which he denounced the actions of American filibusterers (freebooters) in Cuba.

In a bristling speech he attacked the policy of making the United States "the brigands of the world," the policy of "failing upon our weaker neighbors and appropriating their possessions." He referred frequently to "the filibusterers."

His speech incensed Congressman Arnold G. Brown, of Mississippi, who, in accusing the South Carolinian of siding on this issue with northern Whig sentiment, seems to have fathered the modern application of the word, saying:

"When I saw my friend standing on the other side of the House filibustering, as I thought, against the United States, surrounded, as he was, by admiring Whigs, I did not know what to think. It seemed to me he had taken formal leave of his old State-rights friends and gone over to the Whigs."

But, as Franklin L. Burdette said in his book, "Filibustering in the Senate," legislators knew how to employ the tactics of filibustering "long before they were favored with a satisfying name for them."

Parliamentary-wise Members of the House of Representatives have devised numerous strategems for delaying action by the House on a particular bill at a particular time, perhaps for a day or so, but the rules of debate in the House are so strict that where a majority of the Members is definitely determined to act it usually can act. Quorum calls and superfluous roll-call votes on meaningless motions can tie the House in knots for a certain number of hours, and perhaps overnight, and these are, of course, filibustering tactics. But they can always be overcome.

In the Senate also there are numerous techniques by which a single Senator, perhaps by invoking an obscure rule, can prevent the Senate from acting on a certain measure when all other Members of the Senate may perhaps be ready to act. Again any individual Senator can take the floor and hold it as long as he can stand on his feet and talk. If he can talk long enough and is careful to comply with all the rules of the Senate, including those involving references to other Senators, he can stave off a vote for at least a limited time. Most of us at one time or another have taken the floor and held it in order to prevent a vote at a particular hour or on a particular day, usually when some of our own supporters on a particular issue are absent and we fear a defeat which, under full attendance, could be changed into a victory. There are so many methods for achieving temporary delays in the Senate that I have no intention of going into them now. But as I said at the very beginning, although these are filibustering tactics in a pure sense, they are not the sort of filibusters which overly disturb us or which cause any serious delays.

A filibuster, to be effective, must have rather wide support. There must be enough Senators participating in it so that by taking turns in speaking, and speaking for extended periods in each case, and by taking advantage of their right to make two speeches on any pending question—and they can always raise new questions—they can immobilize the Senate entirely for not just a day or a week or a few weeks, but endlessly.

The civil-rights filibusters have always been effective because nearly every Senator from the South has felt impelled to join them, and speak for long periods and speak as often as necessary to keep the filibuster alive. Questions from sympathetic Senators are often helpful to the filibusterer because, although he must stay on his feet, his throat gets a rest, and the longer the question, the longer the rest.

With almost the entire South lined up solidly in support of the talking marathon, the Senate has learned that a civil-rights filibuster can never be broken unless by a cloture vote. Yet in the 32 years which have passed since the cloture provision of Rule XXII was put into effect, the Senators favoring anti-lynching, anti-poll-tax, or FEPC legislation—to name three hardy perennial civil-rights issues—have never succeeded in obtaining the support of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting in order to cut off debate.

For instance, in 1938 two attempts to obtain cloture on an anti-lynching bill were defeated numerically—37 to 51 in the first instance, and 42 to 46 in the second. Not only were the proponents of the legislation unable to get a two-thirds vote for cloture, they were not even able to get a simple majority. In 1942, an attempt to obtain cloture on an anti-poll-tax bill was also defeated numerically 37 to 41, and 2 years later, by a vote of 36 to 44. In 1946 an attempt to obtain cloture on an anti-poll-tax bill was supported by a majority of the Senators present and voting, 39 to 33, but the majority was not a two-thirds majority and the attempt failed. That same year, a cloture petition on the FEPC bill was supported by 48 Senators and opposed by 36, losing by failure to obtain a two-thirds vote of those present and voting.

In the 32-year history of cloture under Rule XXII, prior to its amendment on March 17 of this year, cloture petitions were successful in only 4 instances out of the 19 attempts which culminated in votes. The first time was in 1919, when debate on the Versailles Treaty was limited by a vote of 78 to 16. Again, in 1926 on the World Court issue, debate was limited on a vote of 68 to 26. The third successful attempt at invoking cloture was in 1927 on the branch banking bill, when the vote was 65 to 18, and the fourth, occurred that same year by a vote of 55 to 27 on a bill creating a Bureau of Customs and a Bureau of Prohibition. But for the last 22 years there has never been a successful cloture motion filed in the United States Senate.

One reason is that opponents of certain types of legislation, particularly of the civil rights variety, discovered in 1922 the technique of filibustering on the Journal. The Senate, on each new legislative day, must first act on the Journal of the previous day before it can proceed to anything else. In 1922, with an anti-lynching bill pending, opponents insisted on debating the Journal each day, all day long. The Senate adjourned each night, and the next day, a new filibuster developed on the Journal of the preceding day. It worked. The anti-lynching bill was never reached.

Thereafter, whenever a civil rights measure was about to be taken up—and this was usually known in advance—opponents of the legislation moved to amend the Journal of the previous day, and to debate that issue endlessly.

Since there are usually pressing issues on the Senate Calendar, including legislation renewing important acts about to expire, this technique had been devastatingly effective in forcing the proponents of civil rights measures to surrender in face of inevitable defeat.

Countermeasures were eventually developed. Instead of adjourning the Senate immediately prior to the taking up of a civil rights measure, majority leaders recessed the Senate from day to day, thus keeping the Senate in the same legislative

day, and thereby eliminating the Journal as an instrument for uncontrolled filibustering.

But a new technique was devised by the filibusterers, and up to March 17, it was successful. This technique involved a point of order over the application of a cloture petition to a motion to take up a bill. (Bills can come before the Senate for action only on motion to take them up.) The argument here was that Rule XXII, as adopted in 1917, did not apply to motions, since the language of the rule was that cloture could be obtained upon any pending measure. It was contended that a motion was not a measure.

There was a test of this technique in August 1948, when Senator VANDENBERG was President Pro Tempore. A cloture petition was filed to cut off debate on a motion to take up an anti-poll-tax bill. Senator VANDENBERG ruled that it did not apply because the actual pending measure before the Senate, he said, was not the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, but rather a civilian transport aircraft bill which the Senate had been discussing at the time the motion was made to take up the anti-poll-tax bill.

At the same time, however, Senator VANDENBERG expressed the belief that the Senate had no machinery to invoke cloture on a motion to take up a bill.

His position was vigorously opposed by the then minority leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, who maintained in a speech from the floor that Rule XXII did indeed apply to motions to take up legislation.

In view of the Vandenberg ruling, many Senators, including Senator VANDENBERG himself, became interested in revising Rule XXII to apply to any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or other unfinished business, rather than merely to a pending measure so that it could not be left to presiding officers to determine the applicability of that term. As a matter of fact, a resolution to accomplish that very purpose had been approved by the Senate Rules Committee early in the Eightieth Congress, but it lay dormant on the Calendar of the Senate and was never called up for debate.

When the Eighty-first Congress convened, renewed interest developed in this issue because most proponents of civil-rights legislation believed that unless they clearly defined the applicability of cloture to motions, every civil-rights bill promised in both the Democratic and Republican 1948 platforms would be filibustered to death on the motion to take it up. There was, however, one difference in the circumstances: Senator BARKLEY on January 20 became Vice President BARKLEY, and thus was in a position to interpret Rule XXII as applying to motions to take up, in line with arguments he had advanced on the Senate floor the previous August in protesting the Vandenberg ruling.

No one knew whether the Vice President, as judge of this issue, would follow the same logic he had expounded as minority leader, and therefore, as advocate of civil-rights legislation placed before the Congress in a Presidential election year. No Senator dared to ask the Vice President how he would rule, and newspapermen who did ask were turned away with a polite response that he would announce his position when, as, and if he was required to make a ruling—and not before. This lent a dramatic element of uncertainty to the issue.

Meanwhile, beginning on January 5 when the first bills were introduced in the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, one resolution after another was thrown into the hopper to amend Rule XXII.

They ranged on the one extreme from my resolution, which would permit a simple majority of the Senate to invoke cloture on any measure, motion, or other matter—and allowing each Senator 1 hour of debate after cloture was invoked, to one by Senator MORSE of Oregon, which would also permit cloture by a majority vote, but would allow each Senator 2 hours of debate and permit him to farm out his time to other Senators so that they could speak longer than 2 hours, to the Hayden-Wherry resolution, sponsored by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, which would merely rewrite the words "pending measure" in Rule XXII into the phrase "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or other unfinished business." Other Senators submitted substantially similar resolutions.

The issue was debated in the Rules Committee for several weeks. The committee finally voted out the Hayden-Wherry resolution without amendment. In the Rules Committee I submitted my resolution as an amendment to the Hayden-Wherry resolution, changing its terms, however, to provide for a cloture by a constitutional majority of the Senate—that is, by 49 Senators—rather than by a simple majority of those present and voting. My amendment was strongly supported by civil-rights advocates who felt certain Vice President BARKLEY would interpret the Senate rules to mean what the Hayden-Wherry resolution would define them to mean, and in view of the great difficulties experienced in recent years—the failures, actually—in obtaining a two-thirds vote for cloture on a civil-rights issue, the only certain way of enacting civil-rights legislation would be through such an amendment, giving a majority of the Senate a right to invoke cloture. (The record shows, however, that in only 7 instances have 49 or more Senators voted for cloture, and at no time was this on a civil-rights issue. Four of these, as I said above, successfully resulted in cloture, and three of those four were by votes of 64 or more Senators. However, since both the Democratic and Republican platforms unequivocally endorsed the major civil-rights bills, it was generally believed by proponents of this legislation that our chances of getting 49 cloture votes on a civil-rights issue were much brighter than the chances of getting 64 votes as now required.) In any event, the amendment was voted down in committee by a vote of 11 to 2.

On the last session of the Senate prior to taking up of the Hayden-Wherry resolution, the Senate was recessed rather than adjourned, so that there could be no filibuster on the Journal. When the Senate again convened, and with no unfinished business before it—with a fresh slate—the motion was made to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution. Anti-civil-rights Senators thereupon launched into a filibuster to talk the proposal to death.

The debate in its early stages was not obstructive. Most of it was to the point. The arguments were thoughtful and germane. Some Senators interrupted with long speeches on other issues, since there is no rule of germaneness on Senate debate, but for the first few weeks at least, there was every reason for extended debate on so important an issue—and no attempts were made to invoke cloture. Finally, however, as a debate dragged on toward mid-March, a cloture petition was filed, and Vice President BARKLEY was finally faced with the necessity to rule on its applicability to a motion to take up a bill or a resolution.

He ruled that the cloture petition did apply. He said, that unlike the issue which faced Senator VANDENBERG in 1948, there was no unfinished business before the Senate which this motion sought to displace. He declared that the framers of Rule XXII in 1917 intended it to apply by its term "pending measure" to any matter before the Senate, and discussed at some length, the meaning of the word "measure."

Had his ruling been sustained, the filibuster would have been broken, cloture would have been applied, and the Senate would have come to a vote on the motion to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution. On an appeal from the Vice President's ruling, however, the Senate voted, 46 to 41, to overrule him. A change of 3 votes would have sustained the ruling and would have made it possible for the Senate then to debate, and ultimately vote upon, the proposed change in Rule XXII as recommended by the Senate Rules Committee. Twenty-three Republicans and 23 Democrats voted to overrule the Vice President, and thus to allow the filibuster to continue. Almost without exception, the 23 Republicans who so voted expressed themselves as favoring civil-rights legislation, which this proposed change in the rule was intended to expedite. Almost without exception, the 23 Democrats who voted to overrule the Vice President had expressed themselves as opposing civil-rights legislation. Of the 41 who voted to sustain the Vice President's ruling, 16 were Republicans and 25 were Democrats, including 2 who expressed serious doubts about certain civil-rights bills, but who said they had no doubts about the necessity for giving the Senate the machinery with which to stave off the paralysis of filibustering. With a vacancy in the Senate due to death, there were 8 Senators not voting, and they paired off—3 Democrats and 1 Republican for the ruling and 2 Democrats and 2 Republicans against.

Those who opposed the Vice President's ruling said they did so for one of two reasons. Either they opposed civil-rights legislation and regarded such a ruling as fatal to future attempts to filibuster civil-rights bills or else, in the case of most of the Republicans, and a few of the Democrats, they maintained that the Vice President's ruling constituted amending rather than interpreting the rules by the Vice President in violation of the Constitution. They maintained further that although the rule should be changed, it must be done through orderly process—meaning through the breaking of the filibuster, regardless of how long that should take.

Many who had opposed the Vice President's ruling urged that we could hasten this orderly process by holding the Senate in continuous, 24-hour-a-day sessions. These suggested round-the-clock sessions work the greatest hardship on those trying to break the filibuster, not on the filibusterers. The filibusterers need to keep only one member on the floor to speak, and one or two others simply serving as watchdogs. The others simply stay away and rest, deliberately avoiding quorum calls.

The antifilibusterers, on the other hand, had to be available for a quorum call since the Senate would be adjourned if a quorum could not be rounded up. Once adjourned, a brand new filibuster could start on the following day over a motion to amend the Journal of the previous day—and there had never been a clear-cut ruling on the applicability of cloture to a filibuster on the amending of the Journal. So the whole thing could start all over again from scratch.

The filibuster was already weeks old, and most of the Members of the Senate were exhausted from the sessions, which had frequently lasted 12 hours or more. Should the decision have been made to go into continuous session, there would have been a strong likelihood that a quorum call would simply fail to rouse enough tired Members to block adjournment. And even in continuous session, no one knew how long it would take in terms of weeks—and more likely, months—to talk down 18 or 20 determined Senators.

Committee work had been brought to a stop, since committees cannot meet during Senate sessions except by unanimous consent—and it was part of the filibusterers' strategy to stop the legislative process altogether in their efforts to block the change in the rules. Important legislation, soon to expire, piled up. The administration leadership decided to let the filibuster run for several days to demonstrate its potential

endlessness, then to adjourn the Senate, drop the issue—for the time being—and turn its attention to rent control and other legislation of pressing nature, by then on the Senate Calendar and awaiting action.

The intention was to return to the filibuster issue later in the session. The initiative, however, was taken away from the majority leadership by a bipartisan movement led largely by Republicans who had voted to overrule the Vice President, and who were seeking to reach a compromise solution. The majority leadership agreed to wait several days for such a compromise to be brought forward. Several attempts were made, but no compromise was found acceptable to the leadership and to most of those Senators on both sides of the aisle who had supported the Vice President's ruling.

Those who were waging the filibuster primarily against civil rights refused to consider any two-thirds cloture rule applying to motions to take up. They further refused to agree to any cloture rule which would prevent future filibusters on changes in the rules, fearing, of course, that if cloture could be applied to a motion to take up a change in the rules, it would be only a matter of time before a sufficient number of Senators could be enlisted in a drive to tighten progressively the Senate's rules on debate.

The compromise which was finally brought forward was one which was satisfactory to the anti-civil-rights bloc. It was introduced on March 15, sponsored by 52 Senators, a clear majority of the Senate, all of them pledged to support this rule, and no other. Secure in the knowledge that no rule distasteful to them could possibly be enacted under the circumstances, and that a rule they could support was sure of passing because of the unequivocal commitment made by the 52 sponsors, the group of Senators who had been filibustering the motion to take up the proposed resolution abruptly ended their talking, and the Senate finally came to a vote on the motion to take up the Hayden-Wherry resolution late in the evening of March 15. The motion carried 78 to 0. The Hayden-Wherry resolution thereby became the unfinished business of the Senate. Senator WHERRY thereupon called up the substitute resolution as an amendment.

With 52 Senators committed to it, it was a foregone conclusion it would be adopted.

Nevertheless, it was discussed for 2 days, defended, and denounced, and on March 17, finally approved as an amendment to the Hayden-Wherry resolution by a vote of 63 to 23. Passage of the resolution as amended quickly followed by a voice vote.

This is the story of what happened in the Senate as a climax to years of effort on the part of many Senators and many students of political science, to reform the Rules of the Senate so that a willful minority could no longer tie it up and paralyze it by the simple means of talking endlessly. Until the new rule has had a real test on a highly controversial issue its effectiveness will remain unknown.

The Lesinski Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address which I delivered over WREC at Memphis, Tenn., on the Lesinski labor bill.

The address follows:

My fellow citizens, if there ever was a time in the history of our great country for sound thinking, it is today. I wish I knew where we were headed.

Our public debt now amounts to more than $250,000,000,000. At the rate we are appropriating money, we stand to close this fiscal year with a possible deficit of a billion dollars. At that rate we may end next year with a deficit of $2,000,000,000 or more. It must be admitted that much of these funds will be expended for very laudable purposes. We must maintain strong defenses of the country. Already we have voted $16,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps. It is expected that another billion and more will be required for the implementation of the Atlantic Pact. The air lift which was necessary to serve our sector of Berlin for almost a year cost a tremendous amount of money. During the war years we were not able to spend money, save in minimum amounts, for roads, rivers, and reclamation. We have not built a post office since 1939. Because of the increased cost of living, it has been necessary to authorize additional allowances for necessary travel and living expenses for Federal employees which in the next fiscal year will require in round figures $52,000,000. During 1950, we will take the expensive 10-year census. This program has been in existence since 1790. Recognizing that there are those in military service who are not adequately paid, a bill will be considered in the House very shortly which will add $360,000,000 annually to the cost of Federal Government. Other Federal employees are seeking additional compensation. Should the social-security program be enacted into law, it is thought by the students closest to the proposal that more than a trillion dollars will be spent in the next 50 years. I mention but a few of the items which will add to our over-all national debt. Our national income has been dropping rapidly in the last few months.

We have but three alternatives left in approaching this problem. We must reduce the cost of government, raise additional taxes which are now burdensome to so many, or resort to deficit spending which is bad in any man's language.

In England there is a school of thought which holds under the Socialist Government that the government, itself, can better expend an individual's wages than the individual himself. The government says you work under controls and we will take your wages in taxes and provide you with medical care, false teeth, eyeglasses, compensation when you reach the age of inactivity, allow you living expenses when you become ill, and provide your every need from cradle to the grave. In the stifling atmosphere of security nations like Caesar's have slid to dissolution. In an atmosphere of challenge and freedom, nations like ours reached noble heights of achievements.

Much is expected of our great country today. We are called upon to rehabilitate a torn, confused and troubled world. We are withdrawing our natural resources at a proportionately high rate. It is my considered judgment that the time has come when we must reason together, unite as never before and be fair one to the other. I hope it shall never be said of me that I am unfair to any group of my constituents.

In the consideration of the labor bill offered by Mr. LESINSKI of Michigan, designed to repeal outright the Taft-Hartley labor law, my approach was one of sincerity, deliberateness, soundness, and I trust fairness. Some intemperate language has been directed to me since my vote. A number of telegrams have been received in the same language which said, "We demand that you vote for the Lesinski bill without amendments." The Chattanooga Times, a newspaper of wide circulation, has taken me severely to task and has demanded my defeat. In all calmness, I shall not reply intemperately.

The House committee which considers labor legislation is composed of 25 members. At the beginning of this Congress, great care was exercised in the assignment of members of all committees. I have no argument with the leadership but new Members having partisan leanings toward labor were assigned without exception to the Committee on Education and Labor. That committee on February 3, 1949, voted to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, without hearing the testimony of the people or considering any of the facts concerning the working of the Labor-Management Relations Act. Nine of the members voting in this sort of session were not Members of the Eightieth Congress. They had not participated in the months of hearings and debate which led up to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act in 1947. Finally, the Education and Labor Committee, consisting of 25 members, by a majority of 1 sent the Lesinski repealer bill to the House of Representatives, without even a reading or discussion of the bill. No opportunity to change or to amend it was afforded members of the committee. Never before in 170 years of the history of Congress had a committee, whose very function is to take the facts and deliberate and reason together, done such a high-handed thing. This is the way freedom is buried.

When the bill reached the floor for debate, the committee insisted that they recognize no good provisions at all in the Taft-Hartley law. This was the position of the administration for four long days. The debate attracted more Members to the floor than any other debate since we passed the draft law or voted to declare war against our enemies. I took the position that, difficult as it was, a bill should be written on the floor which would remove bad features of the Taft-Hartley law and would represent the will of the House expressed by its membership coming from every State in the Union. For that reason, I was willing to accept the Wood substitute as a vehicle on which those improvements could be made. The administration leadership, I am advised, consulted with certain high labor leaders and brought in at the last moment the so-called Sims substitute to the Lesinski bill which immediately brought differences among the active supporters of the labor movement.

But the Labor Committee, which had heretofore insisted that they would not have any hearings on the bill, would not read the bill in committee, would not permit amendments in the committee, and would not agree to amendments on the floor of the House, agreed to seven amendments. At this late hour they included a provision providing a non-Communist affidavit; a provision for the use of injunctions in national emergency strikes; a provision recognizing the right of free speech for employers; a provision requiring unions to make financial reports to their membership; and a provision that both union and management should bargain in good faith.

The Sims' substitute contradicted a provision of the Lesinski bill which invalidated State laws and which was not in conformity with a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, which held in effect that the States, themselves, had certain rights in the making of labor legislation. There was no provision against political contributions by unions, while corporations were prohibited from making political contributions. Unions were left free to contribute any amount they liked, without regard to the opinions their individual members may have

in a particular political contest. There was no provision requiring that union members must sign a check-off agreement before union dues and assessments can be taken from their pay by employers. There was no provision protecting the right of union members in the welfare funds to which they contributed. There were no restrictions on feather-bedding, none on mass picketing, and there was no provision in the substitute bill prohibiting strikes by Federal employees. There was no provision that both employers and unions should be responsible for their contracts.

The House had a choice to select either the Wood amendment or the Sims substitute bill as a basis from which to write an adequate piece of legislation. The Sims substitute was defeated. The Wood bill was approved, but this was while the House of Representatives was sitting as a Committee of the Whole. Under the parliamentary procedure, the Committee rises, goes back into session of the House, and the final vote is then taken. When that moment was reached, Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York, so well known for his record in Congress, demanded an engrossed copy of the bill. I hope I am not boring you. This may seem like a lesson in government—perhaps it is for many. It could hardly be expected that all of our citizens would know all of the details involved in the legislative processes. An engrossed bill is a final draft of the bill, accurate to the very last degree, reading smoothly, containing all of the changes made since its original introduction. Obviously, that required time. Those in charge of the details worked most of the night, and at noon the following day we were ready for the final vote. When that moment came, the leadership had changed 10 southern votes, and 10 of my colleagues who marched up the hill one way the day before marched down the hill that noontime.

By MARCANTONIO'S strategy he gave the Democratic leadership a night and a morning to bring great pressure to bear in every sort of way upon fine, upstanding Members of the House to change their votes and to save face on a position so narrow as to preclude any amendments to the original Lesinski bill until the very last minute.

Benjamin Franklin said a long time ago, "He who surrenders his liberty for temporary security deserves neither and will soon lose both." And then a member of the House from Arkansas, once commenting upon the inconsistent voting record of one of his colleagues, compared his position to that of the Snake Railroad: "It wobbled in and wobbled out, and left the people in doubt; whether in its zig-zag track it was going west or coming back."

My distinguished colleague, "TOOK" GATHINGS, of Arkansas, maintained a consistent position. All of our neighbors in Mississippi voted with us and only three from Tennessee felt that the Wood bill was the starting place for improved labor legislation.

MARCANTONIO goes on the theory that there is a class war on in this country. He proceeds also on the theory that confusion would weaken the adversary. Indeed, he thought the thing that would accomplish that more quickly and probably more adequately than anything else was the return of the National Labor Relations Act, and he offered such an amendment. Under our form of government, he had that right. He has a right to his opinion, but I want to say now that he is consistent day in and day out. He was a great supporter of Henry Wallace. He never voted for any defense measure until Russia became our ally. I know him intimately and well. He is as smart as he can be, but I cannot agree with his philosophy of government. He wants to divide the wealth of this country, and when I asked him on one occasion how he would do it, he said that he would nationalize banks, railroads, transportation, mines, utilities, and everything in the country so that the Government would be the owner and all of us would be equally benefited. I cannot dwell on this further, but I am throwing this out to give you a thought. Where are we headed?

Now let me list some of the liberalizing improvements contained in the Wood substitute. They are the result of honest attempts to meet legitimate criticism that has been made by organized labor and others.

First of all, elections for a union shop were eliminated so that union-shop contracts can be made by voluntary agreement between an employer and a union without election by employees.

The prohibitions on the closed shop were clarified so as to make clear that the union hiring hall will be an available channel for securing applicants for employment.

The secondary-boycott provisions were substantially liberalized to permit unions to strike against work that is farmed out.

Provisions for the reopening of contracts was recognized.

Economic strikers were specifically given the right to vote in representation elections.

Unions were given substantially greater latitude in the time for filing their financial statements.

Non-Communist affidavits were made applicable to employers as well as employees, to meet the criticism that the existing law was one-sided in this regard.

The ballot, at the end of a national emergency injunction was done away with, to meet the criticism that this ballot sought to undermine the union's authority as a representative of the employees.

Other liberalizing amendments of a substantial nature were adopted. The Ford amendment extending from 90 days to 6 months the time within which economic strikers remain eligible to vote in representation elections was agreed to. This amendment will prevent any posisbility of union busting by employers.

The Morton amendment was agreed to, permitting secondary strikes against farmed-out work even where the same local union is not involved in the primary strike.

The Bentsen amendment was agreed to, prohibiting applications for injunctions before there has been complete investigation, issuance of a complaint, and a finding of irreparable injury—these injunctions to be obtainable only by the Government itself and not by any private employer. This amendment meets all of the criticism here on the floor and elsewhere about the injunction provision of the Wood bill.

The Lodge amendment was agreed to, recognizing the rights of unions to secure the discharge of members who violate union loyalties by disclosing secret union information, members who may have embezzled union funds, or subjected the union to damages or penalties.

Then the Lodge amendment, correcting the effects of the evidence rule in the free speech provisions of existing law was agreed to.

These are all very helpful and liberal amendments which improved the bill.

My friends, I have not questioned the motives of any one in and out of Congress, either in or out of labor in connection with this legislation. Too many people in the labor movement follow the leader and are against any labor legislation just because the labor politicians tell them it is bad, call it a slave labor bill and that any Member of Congress who votes for it is an enemy of democracy. Likewise many in management by the same token get on the other side without knowing the facts. The time has come, however, when the welfare of our people demands that our citizens know what they are talking about and be fair.

I have confidence in the great majority of those who belong to the labor movement to do the right thing when they know all the facts.

The President of the United States did not scare me when he said that a vote against the Lesinski bill without amendments would deny me patronage. I am disturbed, however, at the results of this challenge which frightened many of my colleagues. That same demand, along with his campaign promises, means that I would have to vote in the future for FEPC. I am not going to do it. I would have to vote for socialized medicine. I would have to vote for all of the civil-rights program. I would have to vote for an antilynching law, absolutely unnecessary in the South. We had only two lynchings last year. This is directed solely as a political issue to confuse us. I would have to vote for the Brannan farm plan on which there is not too much known. In the judgment of many it would regiment agriculture for all time to come and absolutely control the farmers of our country. In other words, I would have to vote not my conscience, not what I believed to be the will of my fellow citizens, but I would have to be a rubber stamp and jump every time the whip was applied.

As it now stands, the Taft-Hartley law remains on the statute books. Many of us tried to improve it. We are ready to start all over again. It is too bad that a stubborn leadership in labor and in the administration stopped our efforts. They now realize that many amendments which they refused to consider in the beginning will have to be made to their own bill. Let us hope that the politicians will not delay bringing this issue to the floor of both Houses at the earliest possible date. Those of us who are genuinely sincere are ready to write the fairest possible labor-management law.

I have spoken to you very frankly. I shall be glad to have you write me in care of the House of Representatives in Washington, should you feel that I may be helped by a message from you. These are times when representatives in Congress should have the wise counsel, the good judgment, and the help of all the people. This I crave. This I ask. In return, I can promise only a faithful stewardship in the high office to which you have assigned me.

America—The Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1949

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a portion of the remarks made by me on the occasion of the grand annual outing of the Suffolk County Republican Committee on the afternoon of Saturday, August 27, at Timber Point, Great River, N. Y., at which there were about 4,000 in attendance:

While I know we are gathered here today for good-natured acquaintanceship and reacquaintanceship among our Suffolk County Republicans, including an occasional friendly Democrat, and to greet distinguished Republicans from other counties who honor us by their presence this afternoon, I want to emphasize, and I will do so as briefly as possible, a more serious side of our party duties, which certainly merit consideration and action at this portentous juncture of our county's and our country's affairs. No one but must have deep in his or her heart misgivings, despite the beauty of the day, our attractive surroundings and the fine people assembled here

for enjoyment and fun, as to just where we are now headed.

You have heard the question raised, I dare say frequently, that there is no transcending issue, and that therefore the two great parties have in large measure lost meaning for the average citizen. I say to you, and it is with all the conviction I can muster, that the issue for us Republicans is the greatest ever offered to either party, and that issue is America itself. No one has to tell a group of citizens such as this what America is and what it has stood for since it was first conceived by those who embarked it upon its independence and gave to it its Constitution and Bill of Rights, under which no nation on the face of the globe has ever achieved so large a share of this earth's good things nor commanded such powerful influence. What I am about to say is not new, for I have expressed these views in the past, and to many of you upon occasions such as this in previous years. This is nothing more than what John Philpot Curran stated so succinctly a century and a half ago when he said:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition, if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

This passage is usually more tersely phrased "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," but the full quotation is both meaningful and prophetic. Indolence or indifference to what is going on around us is dangerous, more so than most of us realize.

When we have evidence at every hand that greed is a greater motivating factor than sacrifice, when popularity displaces merit and there are no longer those prepared to fight for principle and the right, we can well afford to stop, look, and listen. A great Republican and the only living ex-President gave us only this month a warning across this continent from California upon the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. He told us how we were sliding silently into a state of socialism which has never succeeded anywhere.

Who is it who tempts and beguiles and panders always to superficial public sentiment? That has never been in all history the way of any great leader who has accomplished anything constructive for the people. Rather has this called for effort in the right and sacrifice to that end, for there is no easy road to real success. It is clear that the citizens who are able to do so should contribute their share in support of this country and not look to their country to support them. The answer to my question as to who it is who comes with easy wiles and false ideas is, of course, none other than the Devil himself. You will recall how in the Scriptures he took the Lord to a high mountaintop and showed him possessions all about which would be His, but was given the curt answer, "Get thee hence." So should we say to all those who would cozen us with fine promises impossible of fulfillment and these baneful schemes that only lure to disaster. Momentary benefits pass and are soon forgotten, depriving rather than benefiting posterity.

While our opponents adopt the easy course, does not that give us a magnificent opportunity to stand out stanchily for the right with Lincoln when he said "Let us have faith that right makes might and let us in that faith dare to do our duty as we understand it"? He dared. Should we do less? I firmly believe that there is still in America a rallying cry for Republicans who would make of their party an instrumentality for good government, and good government can never be government that strays from the right or the sound fundamentals which have brought us to our present state of well being—the envy of the modern world.

The reason I have used the occasion this afternoon to point up this warning is because great nations in history have disintegrated after reaching their zenith, not from frontal attack from without, but from insidious attack from within, and it is to the prevention of the latter that I would address each and every one of you in our local organization through this earnest plea to keep our Republican Party here strong by never failing to be vigilant in detecting and scotching weakening influences infiltrating from without and developing within. Divide and conquer is an accepted method of attack, so let us be on guard and stand solidly together, for in unity there is strength.

Address by President Truman at American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at the National Convention of the American Legion, at Philadelphia, Pa., on Monday, August 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, members of the Auxiliary, comrades of the American Legion, I am happy to be here with the Legion again at their annual convention.

At the Legion convention last year I talked to you about your Government's efforts to achieve world peace based on freedom and justice. Today, I am going to talk to you again about peace, because I think that is the most important thing in the world, and I know you agree with me.

Last week at Miami, before another convention of veterans, I discussed our efforts to protect nations against aggression and to preserve the principles of the United Nations. I talked about our collective security agreements and the necessity of providing military aid to other countries to support those agreements.

Today, I would like to talk about another equally important aspect of our efforts to achieve a lasting peace—that is, our international economic policy.

FINDS CONFUSION ON ECONOMICS

I find that there is a good deal of misunderstanding and misinformation about our international economic policy.

Some of this is deliberately stirred up by certain newspapers and politicians strictly for political reasons. Some of it is due to the fact that the economic problems of the world seem to be distant from our daily lives and hard to understand.

World economic problems are undoubtedly complex. But their importance to us is very clear. World prosperity is necessary to world peace. Furthermore, world prosperity is necessary to our own prosperity here in the United States. If these facts are kept in mind, it will be easier to understand what this country is trying to do.

In working for prosperity in the postwar world, the nations of the world face new problems—and greater ones than they have ever faced before. They are suffering from the terrible after-effects of the war, which caused an almost complete break-down of European industry and of world trade.

There is also the rising demand of men all over the world for independence, and for a greater share of the good things of life which only a restored and expanding economic system can bring. Added to these two problems there is a third. This is the attempt of organized Communists to achieve economic and political domination of the world through the misuse of the desires and aspirations of mankind.

CHALLENGE TO FREE NATIONS

These problems require the combined efforts of the free nations, Together, we must repair the damage of war, complete the restoration of the economy of Europe and revive world trade. We must go forward to establish an expanding world economy in which men everywhere can work to satisfy their desire for freedom and a better life. We must demonstrate that the economic system of the free nations is better than the system of communism.

The free nations are determined to avoid the mistakes of the past. The roots of the present economic problems go back to the First World War. After that war the nations of the world made the mistake of following narrow and short-sighted policies of economic nationalism. Each country, working for its own selfish interest, tried to get the best of the others. Each nation erected trade barriers to keep out the products of other nations. We all remember Hawley-Smoot and what it did to this country eventually. Each nation tried to dump its own products in foreign markets.

These policies were self-defeating. They achieved neither national nor international prosperity. Instead, they helped to bring on the worst depression the world has ever seen.

Factories closed down all over the world. Ships lay idle in harbors. Surplus crops rotted in the fields. Unemployment grew and hunger became widespread.

In every country there were hundreds of thousands of young men and women without jobs and without hope for the future. Many of these young people became the prey of unscrupulous demagogs. They joined the black shirts of Italy and the storm troopers of Germany. They were the tools of the Japanese militarists. In the end they marched to war under the bloody banners of those dictatorships.

ORDERLY WORLD SOUGHT

Before the end of World War II, we resolved that the international economic chaos which had led to war should not occur again. We knew that permanent peace could not exist if the nations of the world resumed the policy of dog eat dog.

Consequently, the United States joined with other nations to prepare for a peaceful economic world. The International Monetary Fund was set up to deal with the exchange and monetary problems among nations. The International Bank was established to provide investment capital for reconstruction and development. In our proposals for a world trade organization, the United States outlined a method for breaking down the trade barriers which had strangled world commerce in the period between the two wars. As the war ended, we made billions of dollars available to relieve suffering and repair the damage of war. We are proud of that accomplishment.

These were good beginnings. Never before in history had nations made such careful, long-range plans for a better economic future. For the first time in the history of the world the victors attempted to bring the vanquished back to life and prevent their people from starving to death. It never before had been done in the history of the world and I am proud we did it.

Shortly after the war ended, however, it became apparent that the economic life of

the world was more badly disrupted than anyone had expected.

Still further difficulties were created when it became clear that the Soviet Union would not join in working for world economic recovery. Russia was hostile to European economic cooperation. Russia refused to join in the European recovery program and prevented its satellites from joining.

Russia's aggressive foreign policy created alarms and fears that hampered recovery. On every hand, there was evidence that the policy of the Soviet Union was aimed at prolonging the distress and suffering of the free nations.

If we had been discouraged by these difficulties and had abandoned our efforts, the results would have been disastrous. Once again the streets of Europe would have been filled with crowds of hungry and hopeless men and women. Once again unscrupulous agitators would have used these angry millions to create tyranny and slavery.

PRAISES RECOVERY EFFORTS

But the nations did not let this happen. The free nations went ahead with our recovery programs. As a result, production has risen greatly in Europe. Men and women there have jobs and food and a hope for the future. They know that the democratic way is the way of hope.

The free nations have overcome the danger of immediate postwar collapse, but we have yet to achieve the sound and expanding world economy that is necessary for lasting prosperity and peace.

This larger task is the one that now confronts us.

The free nations have the resources and the means to accomplish this task.

Together, they have most of the industrial capacity of the world. They have vast supplies of raw materials. They have industrious and skillful populations. The free nations together have all the elements necessary to provide a better way of life for mankind. What is needed is to draw these elements together into a continually expanding and productive international economy.

Such a world economy is vital, not only to the cause of world peace, but also to our own national prosperity and security. We, in the United States, depend upon foreign countries for many vital minerals and other raw materials. Without foreign trade, many of our industries would suffer. Without foreign trade, for example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for us to develop atomic energy. Moreover, we need to sell many things abroad. Our cotton, our wheat, our tobacco, for example, must have foreign markets. Our prosperity would be seriously damaged if the export of our products were cut off.

COOPERATION ON TRADE URGED

We cannot, therefore, fall back into economic isolationism. Instead, we must take every action we can to bring about more trade, expanding markets, and growth and development in other countries as well as our own.

One of the most serious difficulties we face is the fact that, at present, foreign nations need to buy more things from us than we need to buy from them. They have called upon us for food and raw materials in unprecedented amounts. Furthermore, many countries need equipment and machinery, which only we can supply, if they are to develop their own resources and raise their own standards of living.

The urgent demand which foreign countries have for these things far exceeds their present ability to pay for them. As a result, world trade is now seriously out of balance.

We have both short-range and long-range plans for meeting these difficulties. We will continue the European Recovery Program as our principal means of meeting emergency needs in the next 3 years. At the same time, we are moving ahead with long-range measures.

We're encouraging American business to make productive investments abroad in increasing volume. Through such investments, foreign countries—especially under-developed areas—will be able to obtain the equipment they so desperately need.

We are also planning to help the people in under-developed areas to learn modern industrial and agricultural methods. By this means, they will be able to double and redouble their production. By this means, they will be able to make an increased contribution to an expanding world economy and a balanced world trade.

In addition, we must continue our well-established policy of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements in order to reduce barriers to international trade. These agreements enable us to buy more from other nations at the same time that they help to maintain markets abroad for our own products. We must increase our buying abroad if we are to achieve a balanced world trade.

COMMERCE BARRIERS SCORED

Furthermore, we are encouraging closer regional ties among nations in order to lower trade barriers and increase production.

The nations of Europe, under the stimulus of our aid, are working toward closer ties of economic union. Already, through the Organization for European Economic Cooperatives, they have begun to make joint decisions that affect their basic economic policies. In the Council of Europe, now meeting at Strasbourg, more far-reaching measures of European union are being considered.

A closer economic union means a difficult period of transition for the countries that enter into it, but it is essential for a better world. The United States will do what it can to aid European nations to achieve greater unity.

As we go ahead with these long-range measures for a stable and growing world economy, we shall have to adjust our actions to changing conditions. We shall need to be alert to new developments, and turn to advantage every possible resource.

We shall be concerned in the months immediately ahead with certain special and urgent problems arising out of the present unbalanced state of world trade. Representatives of the United Kingdom and Canada will soon be here to discuss some of these problems. We look upon these talks as discussions among friends about problems which affect us all, and in the solution of which we all have a common interest.

The people of this country are well aware of what the war meant to Great Britain and of the stresses and strains which have been laid upon the British people in recent years. The representatives of the United Kingdom will find here a warm personal welcome and may be assured that these mutual problems will be examined by us in a spirit of friendliness and helpfulness.

PATTERN FOR THE CONFERENCE

In our discussions with the representatives of the United Kingdom and Canada, as in our approach to problems with other nations, we must keep clearly in mind the basic underlying principles upon which the economic policy of free nations must be based.

The first principle which we should clearly understand is that a sound and expanding world economy is essential to world peace. International economic discussions revolve around such prosaic things as tobacco and rubber and rates of interest and the value of currencies. But, behind all these, lie the great objectives of satisfying the material and spiritual needs of mankind and preserving democratic freedom.

The second principle which should be clearly understood is that we are trying to expand the exchange of goods and services among nations. Sound and prosperous relations among nations rest upon the exchange of goods and services on a business basis. We're not engaged in a charitable enterprise. We're not looking for trick solutions to deep-seated problems.

The third principle is that we cannot succeed in creating a sound and expanding world economy unless we keep everlastingly at it. There are times, no doubt, when we shall become impatient or annoyed by delays and obstacles. But we cannot throw in our hand and walk out of the game. Nor can any other nation afford to do that. The path of mutual adjustment and combined economic effort is not an easy one. The economic interests of nations are not easily reconciled. No group can get all it wants. But there is no other way to the solution of our difficulties than the way of mutual concession and cooperation.

INTERNAL POLITICS RESPECTED

The fourth principle is that the democratic nations are not proposing to interfere in one another's internal politics. We know very well how we would feel if some foreign nation tried to tell us how to vote. We recognize that each nation has its own political problems and that it uses different political labels and different slogans from those we use at home. In the same way, nations have different business practices and different governmental devices for achieving the same economic ends.

A community of democratic nations cannot insist on uniformity in matters of politics or business. The only uniformity on which they can insist—and this is what binds us together as free nations—is a firm adherence to democracy, true democracy, not the fake kind put out by the Communists, coupled with a common desire to improve the standard of living of all our citizens.

On the basis of these four principles, the free nations of the world can solve the difficulties which confront them. On the basis of these principles, they can achieve their goal of a sound and expanding world economy.

There's one more thing for us, as Americans, to remember. Our country is the most important economic unit in the world today. The future of the world depends upon the continuation of our own economic growth and development. If we can continue to increase our national income, and raise our standards of living, the solution of international economic problems will be far less difficult.

Every one of us has a responsibility in building a peaceful world, and I'm very certain there's not a man or a woman who does not want to see a peaceful world in the future. We can contribute to that cause in our daily lives, in our jobs, in our thinking. We contribute to peace when we work for the prosperity and growth of the United States. We contribute to peace when we reject the claims of the selfish interests, here and abroad, that would turn us against the cause of international cooperation. We contribute to peace when we ask for Divine guidance and help for the efforts of mankind to establish understanding and good will among the nations of the world.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 6," delivered by me on August 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—PROGRAM NO. 6

(Text of broadcast by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

For the past few weeks you have been reading the newspapers and hearing on the radio about the activities of the "5 percenters" down here in Washington.

No doubt you have been shocked by the disclosure that certain racketeers and chiselers have been collecting large sums of money in exchange for their influence with high Government officials.

This disgraceful situation has been brought out into the open by the investigation now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures.

The chairman of this subcommittee is the able and distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the Honorable CLYDE R. HOEY.

Senator HOEY is one of the most courteous and fair-minded members of the Senate. I am confident that under his direction the investigation will be vigorous and thorough.

The question that naturally arises is why do we have these "5 percenters" in Washington?

It is because the Federal Government has grown so big and so complicated that the average businessman, trying to do business with the Government agencies, soon finds himself hopelessly entangled in a jungle of red tape.

Of course, there can be no complaint against the reputable business representative or attorney who operates on an honest and ethical basis.

It is the crooked dealer in influence that Senator HOEY's subcommittee is investigating. The investigation is aimed at those who claim they can get results, not available to others, because of friendship, political association or other influence with persons holding high office in the Government.

It is directed against the fakers, the fixers, and the influence peddlers, who run around Washington bragging of their connections and selling influence to the bewildered businessman.

Every person engaged in such disgraceful practices and every official who conspires with them is a menace to our form of government. They destroy public faith and confidence in the integrity of thousands of Government officials who are honest and trustworthy.

In this discussion I shall not attempt to review the testimony that has been presented before the committee. No doubt you have been following it closely and you are familiar with its dangerous implications.

One interesting disclosure has been proof of the old saying that "it pays to be ignorant."

Three years ago the law provided that building materials must be saved for homes. None could be diverted for such nonessential construction as race tracks.

Yet a race track in California got permission to go ahead and build grandstands. True it took some intensive pushing by Gen. Harry Vaughan, the President's military aide. But it was a rather cute loophole in the law which finally cleared the way.

The law provided that, if someone had innocently started to build a nonessential project, in ignorance of the law, then the Federal Housing Expediter had discretionary power to permit the work to continue.

The race-track people appeared thoroughly advised on this loophole. They just went ahead and built. When the housing authorities moved in to stop them they looked innocently bewildered. They pointed to their started project and yelled for help. They knew where to get it.

Immediately John F. Maragon and James V. Hunt, two 5 percenters, with the influence of General Vaughan, went to work.

Thereupon the Federal Housing Expediter exercised his discretion to give the race track the green light to finish the project.

Well, you see it pays to be ignorant, even if you have to buy that ignorance from a Washington 5 percenter.

When the testimony is completed and corruption is established, everyone involved in these scandals should be prosecuted promptly and vigorously and to the full extent of the law.

As citizens interested in good government we should give serious thought to the conditions that made this investigation necessary.

Experience has shown that the bigger government becomes and the farther its functions are removed from the people the greater are the opportunities for graft and corruption.

In recent years the Federal Government has grown by leaps and bounds without the slightest semblance of systematic planning. It has become a hodge-podge—a crazy quilt of duplication and overlapping.

Many of the same functions are carried on in different agencies, boards, and commissions, each acting independently of the other and frequently at cross purposes.

It is no wonder that the average businessman who comes to Washington is pushed around from pillar to post trying to find the right official to talk to about his particular problem.

The larger corporations have established offices, manned by full-time staffs, to expedite the handling of their business with the Government.

But the little fellow—the small-business man—cannot afford to maintain permanent representation in Washington.

When he comes to the Capital he finds himself confused and bewildered, trying to grope his way through the mysteries of Federal bureaucracy. He searches for someone who knows the ropes—and that is where the 5-percenter comes in.

Frequently the businessman falls into the hands of one who pretends that nothing can be accomplished without influence, and that influence can be had at a price.

He is handed the same old line, so often repeated here in Washington.

"It's not what you know, but who you know" that gets results.

That alone should serve as a warning, but too often, I regret to say, it is accepted by men who should know better.

Because the Government has grown so big every Senator and every Congressman is swamped with requests from constituents seeking advice and guidance in Government matters.

That grows out of the fact that the United States Government has become the biggest business corporation in the world.

Just 10 years ago we were greatly alarmed because Federal Government spending had reached $10,000,000,000 a year. In the present fiscal year the Government will spend approximately forty-six and a half billions.

In order to visualize this enormous increase in government and its spending, let me make a few comparisons.

During President Roosevelt's three terms the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000, including most of the military cost of World War II.

In the four postwar years of the Truman administration, in peacetime, the average yearly spending has jumped to $45,000,000,000, an increase of almost 50 percent.

Mr. Truman has collected and spent more money than all the other 31 Presidents put together down to the beginning of World War II.

In 152½ years they spent a little less than $180,000,000,000.

Now, mark this.

In the 4 years from July 1, 1945, to July 1 of this year the present administration has spent more than $180,000,000,000.

Let me make another comparison.

Taxes went up in the Roosevelt administration. They were increased 16 times to the highest levels in the history of our country.

During that period the average yearly tax collection by the Federal Government was $14,000,000,000.

The Truman administration has collected three times that amount in taxes each year and last January recommended further tax increases. However, that recommendation has since been withdrawn.

In 1940, $3,000,000,000 of the Government spending went directly to the business concerns of our country. But this year, only 9 years late, more than twenty billions of Government money will flow directly into the business concerns.

From those figures you can readily understand that our Government is the biggest single customer in the world.

It is no wonder that hundreds of businessmen troop into Washington every day seeking Government orders or contracts.

With the confusion that now exists the small-business man is forced to employ someone who represents himself as an expert.

The present investigation of the 5-percenters has already resulted in one decided improvement that will be helpful to the small-business man.

The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, has directed the establishment of a new information center for military procurement. Offices have been set up in the Pentagon Building staffed by Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel.

Here complete information is available to all prospective bidders without the assistance of the influence peddler or the professional fixer.

That is a step in the right direction. It should be adopted by all other departments.

During the Eightieth Congress I was a member of the Senate Small Business Committee which performed a valuable service for small business in America.

It was created to help the little fellow with his business problems. Thousands of them called upon the committee for guidance and assistance in their dealings with the Government.

They did not need the help of 5-percenters, but I regret to report that the majority party in the Senate has refused to continue the Small Business Committee. It no longer exists.

The 5-percenter is a parasite of big government. The denser the jungle in Washington becomes, the more he thrives.

The real way to eliminate the 5-percenter is to hack away the thicket of red tape, confusion, and duplication.

The great need today is to streamline the Government and do away with the zigzag ramifications that have developed through the years of mismanagement.

If we do this the average citizen will not have to pay a guide to take him through the jungle of government.

In conclusion let me say with all the emphasis at my command that if our Government is not streamlined—if spending is not curtailed—if waste and extravagance is not eliminated—if we do not return to sound fiscal policies—the 5-percenter will be the least of our worries.

This is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Utah Arrives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared by me, entitled "Utah Arrives," which will be broadcast over radio station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH ARRIVES

Since last talking to you a new task has been imposed upon me, a task which may become very significant and one in which, as time goes on, I may take great pride. Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has appointed me chairman of a subcommittee to consider all resolutions relating to the strengthening of the United Nations and world federation which are introduced in the Senate. This does not mean that the world is going to be changed or made over overnight. It means quite the opposite. All great advancements are a long time evolving. To date, more than a half dozen different resolutions have been introduced in the Senate dealing with these two subjects.

I, of course, welcome this task. As an almost lifelong believer in the idea that we can work out a substitute for war if we will put our minds, hearts, and attention to it, I welcome the task as an opportunity to contribute to world betterment. As a man who has been so close to two world wars that he has seen at first hand the suffering, the waste, and the destruction of property, I can conceive of nothing finer to do for my neighbors than to make it possible for them to live in a spirit of freedom from the fear of war.

For many years I have been an officer of the American Society of International Law. And as a young man in that society I thought how fine it would be to be able to contribute to the law of nations. But that I have already done. Two great international organizations are functioning under constitutions which I helped to frame and which I helped to get adopted by the nations of the world. You must forgive me for taking pride in these. But as a very small youngster when they were building the Brigham Young monument at home the people who came and plead for funds for that great undertaking told us that we ought to donate what we could because some day we would want to be able to say: I own part of that monument. Well, I really do not know which part is mine, but I have never passed that monument, and I went past it every day for many years, but that I felt in some way or another it belonged to me. I feel that way about the Jefferson Memorial which I helped to build in Washington. It is a good feeling and while it means a fellow is taking himself seriously you cannot blame him and I do not blame myself for having those childhood enthusiasms. The big would-be-great laugh at us, but if we cease to have childhood aspirations and enthusiasms we cease to live.

I do not know whether anything will come from this committee assignment or not because I do not know how many great men will appear before us and give us ideas which will be lasting. But I do know that those men who are interested in these subjects are going to have a hearing and that we are going to seriously give to the people of our country an opportunity to express their hopes and their ideas. If, out of this committee, we can bring about a resolution which will do for our country and the world what the Connally resolution and the Vandenberg resolution have done for our country and the world it will mark a great step forward. We must remember that out of the Connally resolution came Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco conference. And out of them came the United Nations. As a result of the Vandenberg resolution, the Atlantic Pact has come. What will happen to these great instruments in the future we do not know, but I am awfully proud that I had a part to do with both the Connally resolution and the Vandenberg resolution.

The idea behind the Connally resolution when presented to the committee the first time received only one vote. That vote was mine. When the committee finally reported the Connally resolution it received the support of all members of the committee excepting one. That shows us how ideas change and how men grow in their understanding of things.

There is something else which is going to take place in the Capitol very soon in which I am going to take a lot of pride. It is a State undertaking and I will be associated with many others in its fulfillment. The guides at the Capitol will soon have to change their speeches. For years they have said: "Every State in the Union but Utah is represented in Statuary Hall in the Capitol." Well, we Utah people know why our State has not been represented. We had to wait until people changed their minds, but in the waiting the greatness and the worthiness of Utah's founder, Brigham Young, grew in the minds and appreciation of the American people. While if a generation or so ago we had tried to put up Brigham Young's statue we would have been criticized from all sides. But today, Brigham Young is welcomed among those whom his country and State honor. That is something very, very great for us to contemplate. The statue is now in a packing case standing in Statuary Hall unplaced, of course. Years ago I saw in the Louvre in Paris more people looking at the place where Mona Lisa hung at the time that famous painting was stolen than ever looked at the picture itself. So today, everyone asks what's in that big box. We have had a glimpse but the statue is nailed up again waiting to be placed.

It is interesting to observe that those books about Brigham Young which our people at home have not liked because they did not show our traditional past as we like it shown have contributed more toward the building up of the great contribution which Brigham Young made for his country than all the books of praise put together. It is strange how men become great in the minds of future generations. Who was it said: "I wish mine enemy had written a book instead of me." I remember as a youngster in my Greek student days reading about a rival of Demosthenes who read Demosthenes' orations to his pupils and when they applauded at its greatness the rival remarked: "Do not applaud me. You should hear the beast himself deliver his own orations." Thus it goes. But isn't it fine that in a travelog on Vermont they announced Brigham Young as a native son of that State.

An editorial in one of America's largest and greatest newspapers ends with these two sentences: "Despite his faults and his disappointments, however, Brigham Young left a permanent and definite constructive mark upon this continent. No other representative of Utah can be preferred for the Hall of Statuary in the National Capitol."

Since we have talked about Brigham Young, let me tell this story out of experiences of members of my own family. It shows how men impress themselves on others. And it shows how we develop our own loyalties. One of my uncles who suffered more than my own mother and father in coming across the plains and who is read in the history books and whose writings are quoted in the books about Utah arrived in Salt Lake a devout believer. He looked at Brigham Young and became completely disillusioned. His sufferings and his journey seemed to have been all in vain. My own father, however, came and looked at Brigham Young and thought he was the greatest man he ever saw, and always honored him as such. Later on when the Salt Lake Temple was dedicated and my father with Henry Dinwoody was appointed a committee to furnish the temple he brought an artist from New York to paint a picture of Brigham Young and gave that picture as a personal addition to temple furnishings. You can see how these events call to my mind not only history but hopes and aspirations. It will be a great honor to be in Washington when the statue is placed.

Utah has been a long time in planning for her first representative in Statuary Hall. Over a year ago a representative of our State legislature, Mrs. E. E. Ericksen, came to Washington as head of a committee to plan for the ceremonies and to choose the spot where the statue will be put. Mr. Mahonri Young, a grandson of Brigham Young, is the sculptor. He selected the marble in Italy and, of course, will direct the placing of the statue. When final arrangements are made we shall introduce the formal resolutions providing for the official acceptance of the statue on the part of the Government of the United States.

To be connected with a resolution which carries hopes for a stronger United Nations and which may advance world organization with the ultimate end of eliminating fear of war from the world, and to be connected with an undertaking which gives national honor to the founder of my State are two things I am going to tell my grandchildren about just as I am talking to you tonight. Forgive me for being proud. But Utah and America have been and are my life.

A Free Church in a Free State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech delivered by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] over the Presbyterian Radio Hour, July 14, 1949, on the subject, A Free Church in a Free State.

The Senator from Mississippi is well known in this body for his splendid legal attainments and for his characteristics as an outstanding statesman. It is not so well known that he is a leader in the De Kalb, Miss., Presbyterian Church, and an outstanding Christian layman worker in the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our subject A Free Church in a Free State is both timely and challenging.

The command given by Jesus to render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things which are God's, finds its finest fulfillment here in our United States, a free church and a free state, with free citizens rendering unto the Government the things that belong to the Government and freely rendering unto God the things that belong to God. Of all of our hard-won political inheritances the most cherished and the most valuable one is our religious freedom which comes through our wise separation of church and state. This principle has far exceeded all others in its contribution to our spiritual strength, our material growth, and our happiness.

From the earliest colonial times until this very hour the Presbyterian Church and its individual members have always been at the very forefront in the battle for establishing and perpetuating the complete separation of the church and the state insofar as power for one over the other is concerned, but at the same time favoring the course of cooperation between the two.

The first clause of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States has these reassuring words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Let us briefly examine its history. Prior to the settlement of America, men in Europe dared to think, talk, and even write of a free conscience, a free church in a free state. Some suffered martyrdom for the idea. Still it remained largely a dream. The powers of the church and the powers of the state had been so completely interwoven and intermingled that there was no point where one ended and the other began. Persecution and intolerance were the order of the day.

Then the scene quickly shifts to colonial America; here was the chance for man to free himself from the entanglements of the old order.

The struggle was long and hard. A few names should be mentioned: Roger Williams; William Penn; Lord Baltimore; Thomas Jefferson; James Madison.

As late as 1789 only two States, Rhode Island, and Virginia, conceded by law full religious freedom. Five States adhered to an established religion.

The people of New England came to America expressly searching for religious freedom and then denied it to their minorities. But the people of Virginia deliberately brought with them and officially set up the Established Church. The struggle for separation was at times bitter and fierce. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, and some others, were always strong for independence and separation of church and state and took a leading part therein. Many people sincerely argued that the movement was merely an attempt to destroy the church; others thought that a godless state would result. Finally, the quoted clause in our Constitution was adopted. It has been the crowning achievement of that matchless document. Since that day freedom in state and freedom in religion have gone hand in hand down the decades of time for almost 160 years, each supporting and sustaining the other, but each independent of the other. It is the happiest relation of its kind in all the history of the world and a great source of our strength as a Christian Nation.

But what is a free church? It is a church of the Almighty God that stands without fear of man or government, with a positive program supplying the spiritual food whereby every individual can, in his own way, find his true relation to, and directly approach his Maker. There is no blinding fear, no coercion, no intimidation, no threat of reprisal Still the church, even though independent, is not secluded from everyday affairs. It enjoys a happy role in training and supplying leadership in all of our affairs, defining and teaching the basic morals of our people. It may even criticize the policies of the Government. Let us pause here to say that the most powerful influence in our Government has always been our free churches. The feared and predicted godless state did not develop. On the contrary, the church has molded our public affairs. Operating not directly, but through the training it has given our people, and particularly our policy makers and our political leaders, the Christian influence of the church has largely patterned the course of our government. It is a happy example of leadership and direction, without control. God forbid that we ever have godless leaders because when we do, we shall have a godless state.

We have also had the blessings of a free government—a state independent of all churches, and may it ever be thus; we have produced a state which is under a duty to protect, and which does protect, all sects in their religious beliefs. It also protects individual citizens in their spiritual and political rights and beliefs. Our State respects and protects all citizens for their own worth, and more, it gives them a political soul.

Let us thank God for the founding of our Nation on a spiritual base. We are thankful that the first sentence of the Mayflower Compact was "In the name of God, Amen." We are thankful that our every coin attests and reaffirms our profound belief, "In God We Trust." Each morning each House of our Congress opens with prayer; one of the leading Members of the United States Senate in a recent speech supporting the Atlantic Pact closed with a plea for "continuing faith in our dependence upon Almighty God and His guidance in the affairs of men and nations." The American school, American ethics, traditions, philosophy, folklore, and our way of life have been built around this new American freedom in both church and state that has been an inspiration and strength to both. The American church and the American Government have marched hand in hand and side by side for decades, but independent. This relation is man's crowning achievement, through God, in the field of religious-political relations. But let us always remember that our real freedom does not come from the Constitution. Freedom in church and in state comes from God, and is attained by us through faith in Him, and in following His course.

Our role is to partly earn it, and fully protect it. As citizens, and as members of our church, we must never yield one bit from our unalterable position over the years that has demanded freedom for both. The slightest exception in whatever guise will be an opening wedge; the contest between church and state would be renewed; and soon, both religious and political liberty will be lost. A free church teaching Christian principles, and a free state protecting all, are inseparable. One cannot exist without the sustaining influence and protection of the other.

But we cannot rest upon past achievements, glorious as they may be. Our era brings a new and far-reaching challenge. The free church faces a new challenge. The free state faces a new challenge. Our physical existence faces a new challenge. Our great Nation, steeped heretofore for more than 160 years in the traditional policies of isolationism, recently completely reversed itself and approved the Atlantic Pact, thereby entering a military alliance with nations in far away western Europe. Such a move, until recently, was unthinkable and comes now only from deep and strong causes. It came only because our leaders and our people know that we are already at war—not a physical war (and I do not believe that type of war will come soon)—but a war on the spiritual and on the political front.

Russia has stated her terms. She has said, first to her own people but now to the world: "The free state must go. Religion is an opiate for the masses; there is no God; the state is everything; not only the free church must be destroyed, but all churches must be destroyed." That is her message, unmistakably.

This is not theory. It was first practised on her own people; it was then extended to eastern Europe. Then followed the attempt to extend it over all of Europe. Now they come to our very doors. They plant insidious poisons in the minds of various groups; they are eternally knocking at, and sometimes entering through, the very doors of our governmental departments.

This is a war of the spiritual—a fight between our ideas and ideals of a free church in a free state, and a doctrine that man is nothing, that the state is all, and that God is not.

What shall we do? Shall we ignore this challenge to our free state and to our free church? Shall these fountain springs of our spiritual and political freedom be deserted? I think not. To whom shall we turn? To God, II Corinthians 3: 17, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Do we really believe that message?

I believe that as a people we recognize the challenge, at home and abroad. Still we are vaguely searching for a materialistic formula with which to solve our problems. First we send great sums of money to Europe, then shiploads of goods and machinery, and now we are talking about sending guns. For every domestic problem we appropriate money. Granting that these materialistic things are necessary as a part of the solution, they nevertheless represent merely the material part of the formula. We are searching for something that we cannot and shall not find—a solution to our problems based on materialism alone. We must look also to the spiritual.

May God call us back to the fundamentals, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." We shall not find it elsewhere. May He enable us to go forward to even nobler achievements in broader fields through a free church in a free state, and eventually in a free world.

Our Father, we are thankful for Thy grace, Thy love, Thy Son, Thy word, Thy church. And for our country, which is first Thine. We are thankful that we have a free church and a free state and we pray that through us, and by Thy guidance and help, they will ever be thus. Amen.

Our Road to Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent address by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of Memphis, Tenn., which he delivered on August 15, 1949, before the Memphis Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ROAD TO ATLANTIC UNION

(Address of Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar at dinner of the Memphis Chapter, Atlantic Union Committee, given in honor of Miss Frances Greer, Gov. Sidney McMath, of Arkansas, and Gov. Gordon Browning, of Tennessee, at Parkview Hotel, Monday, August 15, 1949)

Those who have gathered in this room tonight are people who have made history.

The fighting governors of two American States, Sid McMath, of Arkansas, and Gordon Browning, of Tennessee, have made history.

They served with distinction in World Wars, Governor McMath in one World War, Governor Browning in two. Each of them came home from foreign wars to fight and to stand for the right as he saw it in our democracy, and even those who oppose them in politics, as it is the American citizen's invaluable privilege to do, respect them as courageous and formidable antagonists.

The lovely daughter of Arkansas, who has graced us with her presence this evening, has made history by adding luster to that galaxy of unprecedented brilliance, the modern Metropolitan Opera. Frances Greer, the pride of Helena, is one of those who have proved that free America is the land of opportunity, and of individual and collective achievement in the highest of the arts—music.

The members of the Memphis Chapter of Atlantic Union Committee, your hosts tonight, will proudly admit to having made history also. They will admit to having contributed largely to the introduction of the resolution now pending in Congress requesting the President "to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union."

That is our simple objective, Governor McMath. That is our cautious program, Governor Browning. Note the words, "explore how far."

Contained in it is another objective. We want to keep you at home. We don't want you going off to a third world war. Two is enough, we think. We want you to stay here and devote your energies to the peaceful tasks of developing the great natural and human resources, as governors and citizens, of the volunteer State and the wonder State.

Memphis has played a large and decisive part in bringing about the introduction of this resolution, with the substantial backing that it has all over America.

That is because of the imagination, determination, and persistence of Edmund Orgill, Lucius Burch, and other Memphisans.

It was these Memphisans who brought the proposal of Atlantic union to the attention of ESTES KEFAUVER. Not only did he embrace it, but he has become a national leader of the movement, surpassed by none, not only in enthusiasm for the idea, but in his profound understanding of the problem involved, and his practical sense in dealing with the difficulties to be overcome.

The idea of Atlantic union has been before the people of this country since the thirties when Clarence Streit brought out Union Now. It was the book of the month, it received warm, friendly criticisms, and the idea that the free nations should join in a permanent federation was accepted by leading minds in many countries of the Western World.

This idea, the product of genius, is the greatest idea of our time. Yet, throughout the whole World War—a war which might have been averted and would certainly have been shortened if the idea had been adopted—and throughout the attempt to make a peace afterward, this idea remained academic. The idea was fostered through the organization, Federal Union, Inc., and its excellent magazine, Freedom and Union.

The idea became a political issue, thrown into the field of action only this year. It happened this way: Lucius Burch and Edmund Orgill went to Washington. Early one Sunday morning Senator ESTES KEFAUVER came in his car and picked them up at their hotel, and with them Clarence Street, and together the four of them drove to the farm home of Justice Owen J. Roberts near Philadelphia.

Justice Roberts, moved by a deep conviction, had resigned from the United States Supreme Court some years before, in order that he might devote all his time to promoting the Union of the Free. Justice Roberts had long been chairman of Federal Union, Inc. At that meeting on Justice Roberts' farm it was decided to form the Atlantic Union Committee. The committee was organized shortly thereafter at a meeting in New York City with Justice Roberts as chairman; Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, and W. L. Clayton, the great cotton merchant, as vice chairmen; and such well-known men as Gardner Cowles, publisher of Look magazine; Herbert Agar, Elmo Roper, and our own Edmund Orgill, as directors. Orgill became a member of the executive committee, and the driving force back of the entire operation.

It is safe to say that without the statesmanship of Lucius Burch and the leadership of Edmund Orgill, Atlantic Union would not now be the national issue it has become. It would be absurd to say that Edmund Orgill converted the leading Americans who constitute the board of the Atlantic Union Committee to the idea of federal union of the democracies. Doubtless, many of them were sold on this idea before Edmund Orgill was. But it was his determination which brought them together to form the committee. It was his boundless energy, his unsparing devotion of himself, his time, and his money which led the committee from success to success, climaxed by the introduction of the resolution under the most favorable auspices.

Meanwhile Senator KEFAUVER had been working in Washington. He studied the question deeply and became an informed and masterly advocate of Union of the Free. As a member of the House of Representatives for many years, he had become so well known for his disinterested, broad, and thorough application to public problems that he had won many friends, not only in the lower House, but in the upper Chamber as well. When he entered the Senate this year, he did not have the disadvantages which inure to the position of freshman Senator. When he introduced the Atlantic Union resolution on July 26, there were associated with him such veterans as Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and GILLETTE, of Iowa, as well as such rising figures as Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas and Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. In the House the resolution was sponsored by the distinguished and veteran New York Republican Congressman, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, as well as by our own personable and eloquent Congressman CLIFF DAVIS.

Let me read you that resolution:

"Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have declared themselves determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law, and resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security; and

"Whereas they have agreed in article 2 of that treaty to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being and to seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them; and

"Whereas the principles on which our American freedom is founded are those of federal union, which were applied for the first time in history in the United States Constitution; and

"Whereas our Federal Convention of 1787 worked out these principles of union as a means of safeguarding the individual liberty and common heritage of the people of 13 sovereign States, strengthening their free institutions, uniting their defensive efforts, encouraging their economic collaboration, and severally attaining the aims that the democracies of the North Atlantic have set for themselves in the aforesaid treaty; and

"Whereas these federal-union principles have succeeded impressively in advancing such aims in the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and wherever other free peoples have applied them; and

"Whereas the United States, together with the other signatories of the treaty, has promised to bring about a better understanding of these federal principles and has, as their most extensive practitioner and greatest beneficiary, a unique moral obligation to make this contribution to peace; and

"Whereas the United States and the other six democracies (the resolution does not name them but they are Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Holland) which sponsored the treaty have, by their success in drafting it and extending it to others, established a precedent for united action toward the attainment of these aims, and the creation of a free and lasting union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union."

This resolution is now before Congress and the American people. We urge its adoption for these reasons:

The resolution is its own best argument for its adoption. The very language of the Atlantic Pact, which was adopted by the Senate and is quoted in this resolution, promises to do something more. If these free peoples have a "common heritage and civilization * * * founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law," is it not logical that they should associate themselves permanently? If these Atlantic peoples are "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of their peace and security," how can we be satisfied with a mere temporary union? For if the present danger of aggression should pass, would not another rise unless the free peoples had made themselves so strong as to deter it? Yesterday it was the danger of German aggression; today the danger is from Communist Russia—what might it be tomorrow?

The free peoples which twice firmly united in war to successfully repel aggression, have a way of falling apart in peace into disarmament and disunion, and thus to invite another aggression. We cannot afford another

such prodigal spending of blood and treasure as such victory has twice led us to. We cannot afford the costly winning back of island after island, country after country, which we have lost by our peacetime folly.

We have learned enough from our past mistakes to have taken two realistic steps: We have rearmed. We have signed the Atlantic Pact which provides that if any free people is attacked the others will consider it an attack upon all.

But a military alliance is not enough. We need a permanent federation of the free. For no alliance has ever endured; no federation has ever been broken.

The Atlantic Pact, which, with encouraging swiftness, is being adopted by the Atlantic democracies, one after another, itself envisioned that association of the free peoples in a sterile military alliance would not be enough.

In article II of that treaty the democracies have agreed to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" and to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

We say that those objectives can be accomplished only in the "parliament of man," the parliament of free western man—a federal convention which will explore how far these free peoples can apply among them the principles of free federal union. Could such a convention go at least as far as to form a permanent union for common defense and a common foreign policy? Could such a convention go farther and provide for common free trade and a common currency among the free peoples? Note the word "explore." It would be up to the convention to decide, and then its findings would have to be ratified by the participating nations.

We have before us the examples of our own federation, the United States of America, which through the principle of federal union, has created the widest area of prosperity the world has ever seen. We see the example of Canada, where peoples of two different languages and two different religions live in peace together. We see the more striking example of Switzerland, where French, Germans, and Italians are never tempted to join the quarrels of France, Germany, and Italy, but unite in a fierce, common defense of the freedom and peace which they have long enjoyed in the Swiss federal union.

In the 35 years from the start of World War I to the present day, freedom has been retreating, confused and baffled, in both war and peace. The start of World War I ended a century in which freedom was constantly advancing—a century of peace and progress.

As we look back from today's confusion and fear, that nineteenth century seems like a golden age. Men of learning freely exchanged ideas across national boundary lines. You could travel from one end of Europe to another freely and safely; there was no iron curtain. You could travel freely and safely almost to any part of the world.

That happy condition was due to the fact that there was a preponderant power devoted to freedom and law. With the final defeat of Napoleon in 1815, Britain became the undisputed first power of the globe. Until her power was challenged by imperial Germany in 1914, Britain was the powerful guardian of the free world, including our own country. We lay safe behind the might of the British Navy.

The power of Britain was weakened by the exhausting victory of World War I and all but broken by the victory in World War II.

If when we see that existence of a preponderant power in the free world once made freedom safe and gave it the opportunity to grow, we see what we have to do if we want to make freedom again safe and restore to it the opportunity to grow. It is to erect a new power in our century which can do what the British Commonwealth was able to do in the nineteenth century.

The United States alone cannot be that preponderant power. We are not—cannot be—strong enough to protect the free world alone. We cannot be strong enough alone to protect even ourselves.

That preponderant power can be created only by a permanent union of all the democracies. But once such a union was formed, it would have overwhelming power. It would be so strong that no aggressor would dare attack.

As Clarence Streit has so graphically stated, it would hold the four aces: the ace of clubs, preponderant military power; the ace of spades, preponderant productive power; the ace of diamonds, preponderant natural resources; the ace of hearts, preponderant moral power, through its heritage of centuries of classic, Hebrew, Christian, and European, and American democratic civilizations.

Let us erect that preponderant power now.

We recognize that there are obstacles in the road to Atlantic Union. They are:

1. Isolationism.
2. The dream of world government.
3. The conflict between communism, socialism, and statism, on the one hand, and individualism and free enterprise on the other.

As to American isolationists, they consist of two groups—first those who were always isolationists, and those internationalists who have been disillusioned by our disappointments in the peacemaking following our victories in World War I and II, and the ingratitude and unresponsiveness of the foreign nations we have tried to help. All I have to say to the isolationists is this: You may make an excellent case that America ought to go isolationist, but we are not going to do it. As a fledgling Nation we landed on the coast of Tripoli and laid down the law to the pirates there. We had scarcely freed ourselves from England until we went to war with her again. We invaded Mexico. We liberated Cuba and the Philippines. When World War I broke out we congratulated ourselves that an ocean separated us from it, but we were in it in its last 2 years with everything we had. We said that same in World War II, but we were soon fighting a two-front war. We just won't stay at home. Is it not time that we recognized that we insist on having a hand in affairs outside our borders—if there is a war we are going to get into the act? So the thing to do is to get into the act in peacetime and prevent the war.

The second obstacle is the dream of world government. Sincere idealists dream that the globe is one world, and that therefore Federal Government should be a world government. It is true that the Atlantic world is one world. Western Europe and the United States are as parent and child. We are bound by ties of blood, religion, political institutions. Even much of our language is common. But there is a vast gulf between West and East, even apart from current differences.

Let us mark one inescapable truth. Free peoples can never, never, permanently unite their armed forces with the armed forces of unfree peoples, because there would always be the danger that the free peoples would be outvoted in such a government and the very international armed forces which they had created to defend them would be turned against them by some world dictator. The free peoples can make agreements with the nonfree nations, yes, for the joint use of armed forces against an aggressor, for all nonfree peoples do not stand for aggression. But they can form a permanent union only with nations which have established democratic control.

The eminent British historian, Lord Acton, said:

"The pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates the imagination by its splendor and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just."

World government is remote and ideal—it captivates the imagination by its claim to end all wars and remove the threat of the atom bomb. It captivates the reason by its simplicity—one law to be enforced all over the one world. But it is not rational or possible at this time.

On the other hand Atlantic union is not remote—it is the immediate step which can be taken. It is not ideal; it faces the fact that we do not actually have one world, but at least two worlds and probably more. But it is a rational, possible end. It is the next step toward the ideal. It is confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just.

In traveling our road to Atlantic union we shall have to resolve many antagonistic claims—the claims of rival nations and rival ideologies within the free world.

It is pleasant to escape into the dream world of planning a world government now, an attempt to mix the water of freedom with the oil of tyranny, but it is only a diversion from the real task at hand, which is to organize freedom. When freedom is organized it will be safe and powerful, and in a position to work effectively with such of the unfree as will join in a compact against aggression.

We can have a true world government only after the free nations, by federation, have given freedom such prestige—prestige such as it had in the nineteenth century—that freedom and democracy can again resume their march around the globe, and one nation after another, as each qualifies by firmly establishing the practice of democracy, can obtain admittance to the great union. In the meantime we shall have to depend on the United Nations as the only world-wide organization, for whatever it will be able to do. It will be able to do more when there is functioning within it a great union of the free.

As realists, we must recognize that there is not only a division between the free world and the Communist world, but that the free world itself is divided by conflicting beliefs—if socialism, in the welfare state of varying degrees, and in individualism and private initiative.

How can we resolve those conflicting views? Here I cannot speak as a member of the Atlantic Union Committee but express only my own views. There are various economic forms—self-employment, the partnership, the cooperative, the corporation, government ownership. Let these various forms exist side by side, in competition with each other. Let us make no final decision as to how much of one of these we shall have. If a government operation is not satisfactory, let us not hesitate to sell it to a private operator.

If we think that a private operation would serve the public better under public ownership, do not hesitate to buy it, paying a fair price without confiscation. Meanwhile let us increase the amount of individual private property. Let us have more property owners. Let us have more profit-sharing, more ownership of corporation stocks by workers. Let's make the workers owners, even as the owners become workers. Let's encourage more people to build their own security by an increase of private savings, made secure by laws that enforce common honesty. Thus we would remove some of these economic conflicts from the field of ideology and handle them on the basis of practical experience.

The individual asks what can I do to advance Atlantic Union? Every individual can

help promote unity within the free world by helping, in his own life, to resolve some of the economic conflicts that now divide us. He can promote the program by speaking, or by correspondence, as John W. Apperson has done so effectively. Hardly a week passes that some influential person in Washington or New York or London does not get a letter from John, intelligently stirring his interest in Atlantic Union. Or one can do what Mrs. Fred Howard did, spend part of her vacation time promoting Atlantic Union in the place where she was staying.

To every individual there will occur something he can do.

The Case for Zionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "The Case for Zionism," written by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, and published in the September 1949 issue of the Readers' Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

II. THE CASE FOR ZIONISM

(By Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver)

(Dr. Abba Hillel Silver has served since 1917 as rabbi of the Temple in Cleveland, Ohio. For many years a leading Zionist spokesman, he represented the Jewish Agency for Palestine during the United Nations' deliberations over partition of the Holy Land. He was chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council and president of the Zionist Organization of America.)

The establishment of the state of Israel last year has raised, quite properly, the question of the future of the Zionist movement. Some have urged its prompt liquidation now that its objectives have been achieved. Anti-Zionists who have been confounded and frustrated by the triumph of Zionism have been clamorous in demanding the immediate dissolution of the Zionist movement.

But most anti-Zionists have reconciled themselves to the new situation. They have gracefully withdrawn from a controversy which life has finally resolved. Some of them, out of a sense of fair play and pride in Jewish achievement, have been helping in the political defense and the economic support of the new state.

Unfortunately, some irreconcilables among the anti-Zionists insist upon keeping their propaganda motor racing although their car is definitely and permanently stalled. They are shrewd enough to avoid a frontal attack upon the newly established state, but they continue their attacks upon American Zionists who helped to bring it about. They repeat the well-known innuendoes of dual allegiance. They charge Zionists with constituting an unholy pressure group in American public life in behalf of a foreign state, and with fostering a spirit of Jewish nationalism among the Jews of the world. They would like to see the Jewish state isolated as far as possible from the rest of world Jewry, and an iron curtain erected between it and the great Jewish community of the United States.

The fears and wild imaginings of these perennially shell-shocked Jews and their few non-Jewish sympathizers will influence the attitude of American Jews as little in the future as in the past.

But Zionists themselves have been studying the possible implications of their epochal achievement. The Zionist Organization of America appointed, soon after the establishment of the State of Israel, a commission to study the future program of the Zionist movement. A report of this commission was recently made public. Zionism's continuing aims, according to the report, are to safeguard the integrity and independence of the State of Israel, to promote the speedy migration to Israel of Jews desirous of settling there, to assist in the organization of all Jewry for these purposes, and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity.

These conclusions are based on the realization that the political objectives of the Zionist movement have not yet been made secure and that the economic objectives are actually only in the early stages of attainment. One can readily understand that the Jews of the United States, for example, who did so much to establish the State of Israel and who have for many years been so deeply concerned in the plight of their homeless refugees for whom the world offered no sanctuary, would wish to continue their assistance to fellow Jews who are now coming to the blessed refuge of Israel in the tens of thousands monthly. One can readily understand also that they would resolve to remain on the alert in order to protect as far as they can that little country which is still beset with so many political dangers. No fair-minded man will impute to these American Jews, who have demonstrated time and again in war and in peace their unfailing loyalty to their beloved country, any sinister or unpatriotic motives when they appeal to their Government for helpful cooperation in these tasks.

Our foreign policies are clearly not made in a vacuum. They must be responsive to public opinion. Americans who seek to influence the foreign policies of their Government are not, because of it, to be condemned. The test is whether they are motivated by patriotism and humanity or by selfish interests detrimental to their country.

American Zionists have always believed that the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine was in complete consonance with the highest American interests in the Middle East. They believed that such a state would become a friendly outpost for legitimate American interests and for American ideals of democracy and freedom in that vast undeveloped and socially backward part of the world. Fundamentally, this conviction, coupled with the conviction that zionism was morally justified, was behind the endorsement which has been given to the Zionist movement by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson and twice by resolutions of the Congress of the United States.

When American Zionists, therefore, appealed to the Government in the past to assist in the establishment of the state of Israel, or when they turned to it more recently to help the established state economically and politically, they were not working in opposition to any basic American foreign policy, but definitely for the fulfillment of such a policy.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this policy suffered most baffling and contradictory fluctuations at the hands of our State Department. Other influences were at work emanating from such "disinterested" sources as the oil interests in the Middle East, the missionary educational circles, Arab quarters and the British Foreign Office, which frequently succeeded in deflecting American foreign policy on Palestine from its clear and steady course.

Thus, our Government voted in November 1947 with the overwhelming majority of the United Nations for partition and the setting up of independent Jewish and Arab states; then in March 1948 it suddenly reversed itself and produced unutterable chaos in the United Nations. Similarly in September of last year our Government gave hasty endorsement to the Bernadotte plan, which was rejected by the United Nations Assembly. This would have cut away two-thirds of the territory from the state of Israel. In both instances the protest of American Zionists and an aroused public opinion prevented these colossal political blunders which would have done irreparable hurt to the basic American policy on Palestine.

The new state of Israel will be in need of political defense for a long time to come. There is as yet no stability in Palestine. No peace treaties have been signed. The boundaries of the country have not been fixed. The status of Jerusalem has not been determined. The explosive Arab refugee problem has not been solved. American Zionists must, therefore, remain organized to try to make secure what was achieved with so much effort and sacrifice.

As far as the economic problems of Israel are concerned, their solution has in a sense only just begun. Zionism aims at the ingathering of all Jews who wish to go to the state of Israel or who must go there. Their numbers will reach into the millions. It will take years to achieve this goal. It will require a sustained and costly effort on the part of the Jews of the world to make this possible. No group in American Jewry is better equipped to perform this historic task than the Zionists, who so magnificently helped in the completion of the first task—the creation of the state. A strong organization with a solid core of tried and experienced Zionists, augmented by all who, as friends of Israel, are ready to join in the work, is essential in order to sustain a long-range program.

What basically will be the relationship of the Jews of the United States to the new state of Israel? Here history may offer some guidance. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the Jews of the world will, in the days to come, continue to live outside of the state of Israel.

This was the case also during the six centuries before the Common Era, during which period a Jewish State existed in Palestine. Jews were dispersed over the whole area from the borders of Persia in the east to Spain in the west and from Ethiopia to the Black Sea. It has been estimated that during the latter part of that era about 2,500,000 Jews lived in Palestine and about 5,500,000 lived outside. This dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. Jews emigrated from Palestine for economic reasons and because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of these Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish State? They owed no political allegiance to the Jewish State and the Jewish State exercised no political control over them. The famous Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt 2,000 years ago, wrote:

"No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the countries of Europe and Asia, looking indeed upon the Holy City as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions in which they have been born and brought up as their country.

The country in which they lived was their country. The existence of the Jewish State did not diminish by one iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. There was no dual allegiance. Dual alle-

giance was never a fact in Jewish experience. Jews make good citizens. This is the testament of history.

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days looked upon Palestine as the nonpolitical spiritual center of world Jewry. It was to them the Holy Land. Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to it.

If history is any guide, the Jews of today will, by and large, maintain the same attitude toward the state of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic spiritual relationship toward it. They will help it to absorb as many Jews as wish to go there or may have to go there. They will support its cultural, scientific, and religious institutions as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere will be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews as a people can accomplish on their own.

But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands. They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries, and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done.

It was Voltaire who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands—his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally nonpolitical, this may be applied to the Jews of the world and to the state of Israel. In this connection it may be well to recall the words of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so."

As far as the future of Judaism is concerned, the reestablishment of the state of Israel represents the fulfillment of only one of its tenets. It does not represent the fulfillment of the eternal spiritual mandates of prophetic Judaism. Zionism sought to normalize the status of the Jewish people in the world, to give it what other peoples possess and what the Jewish people once possessed—a national center and an internationally recognized status in the family of nations.

But the profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in a reestablished state but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked with the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God, of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual teachings of our prophets and seers. The mandates and privileges of a covenanted mission remain valid for the Jews in the future as in the past, and for Jews outside of Israel as well as inside: To battle for the spiritual vision of human life and to join with men of good will everywhere for the removal of all barriers which bar the way of man to his divine patrimony.

The establishment of the state of Israel has contributed a large measure of dignity and confidence to Jewish life, and therefore has brightened the prospects for a spiritual renascence among our people. That which has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the long, weary centuries—national homelessness—has now been providentially normalized. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of tomorrow, inside and outside of Israel, will be able to build a more affirmative religious life and recapture perhaps that revolutionary religious leadership which twice in the past molded the civilization of mankind.

Is Bankruptcy Our Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article I have written entitled "Is Bankruptcy Our Goal?" which appears in the September issue of the Country Gentleman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS BANKRUPTCY OUR GOAL?

IF YOU BORROWED AND BORROWED UNTIL THAT $5,000 MORTGAGE AGAINST YOUR FARM GREW TO $65,000, YOU HAVE MARCHED THE SAME FINANCIAL ROAD AS UNCLE SAM

(By HARRY FLOOD BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia)

The average man on the farm or in the city has a family, and he has his nose to the grindstone. In trying to maintain and improve the circumstances of his family, he usually has debts. Often he contracts debts as a means of getting ahead—borrowing, then paying off. Many a farmer has started like that, as I did myself. In this way much of a man's sweat goes to the payment of debt, or payment of interest until he can pay the debt. Therefore I want to talk about the mortgages on American farms.

I see two kinds of mortgages on a farm. One the farmer signed in the bank, and he may, if he is able and lucky, pay it off. The other he will always pay interest against. It is national debt, a mortgage that has climbed like a jet plane, and in 1949 it amounts to $1,740 for each American man, woman, and child. Thus, if your family numbers five, you have a mortgage of $8,700 in addition to any other mortgage which you personally signed and blotted.

What about the payments you make on this United States mortgage? They are hidden somewhat, but the payments come out of your pocket just as surely as you have to pay for a gallon of paint. You are paying interest on that mortgage not only when you pay your income tax but also when you buy a gallon of gasoline, a package of cigarettes, a month's rent or a sandwich, a piece of machinery, a piece of clothing—there is, I suppose, nothing we buy for which part of the price is not a tax bill. On the national debt alone (forgetting the Government's current expenses) the average family man pays possibly $200 or so interest a year. Government debt takes from him the cost of a shingle roof, a hot-water system, an automatic washer, or television set. By that much his standard of living is lowered. Also lowered is the standard of living of the man who would have put on the shingles or made the washer.

In 1932 our national debt was $19,000,000,000. Now it is $252,000,000,000—a little more than a quarter of a trillion, a word I found necessary to use in a recent speech in the Senate. The increase is over 13 times. If you used to have a $5,000 mortgage against your farm but have borrowed and borrowed until the mortgage is now $65,000, you have marched the same financial road as Uncle Sam.

True, increase could hardly be helped when a war had to be fought and won. Also, some good improvements and services have come about. So have many silly and extravagant ones. For whatever pain it brings us, we are now in debt $252,000,000,000 and must face the payments. The great point to be decided this year is whether our Government now plans to live within its enormous income, or outspend the income to sink further into debt.

Do you realize how fast taxes have climbed? Since the year before Pearl Harbor, our national income has doubled. But taxes raced much faster. The Federal Government collects five to six times what it did. Federal taxes take 17 cents out of every dollar earned by the American people. State and local taxes take 8 cents more, for a total of 25 cents. The $4,000,000,000 in new taxes on income which the President requested in his budget message last January would have increased the tax take up toward 30 cents; but now he has withdrawn the request for new taxes this year.

Just before the war, our Government collected six to seven billions a year in Federal taxes. In the year which ended June 30 the Government set out to collect about $40,000,000,000, exclusive of social-security taxes. Actually, Federal tax collections and receipts totaled about $38,250,000,000, despite a sharp drop in withholding taxes on personal income, which started going down during the second half of the year. The full impact of the business recession to date will be reflected even more in Federal tax collections this year and next. Under our present Federal tax structure the Government's income goes down at the rate of about $1 for each $4 drop in our combined personal income.

On the spending side of the budget, the President in his January budget message requested expenditures in the current year, which ends next June 30, totaling nearly $42,000,000,000, and this did not include any social-security payments, or any expenditures incident to his proposals for a western European military alliance and aid to remote areas. And, of course, it did not include any of the increased expenditures for pump priming which he advocated in his Midyear Economic Report, which was submitted July 1. The New Deal, in its most lavish year, spent less than $10,000,000,000.

With the Government's tax revenue coming down and the expenditure recommendations by the President going up, it would appear now that unless Congress can reduce expenditures the Federal deficit this year will be 5 to 6 billions and that next year it will approach $10,000,000,000.

Federal deficits mean increasing the Federal debt; increasing the Federal debt means added mortgages on us all. Democrats and Republicans alike—all of us—should fear continued deficit spending in peacetime. It will wreck our credit and destroy our system of government.

The President himself attempted in January to avoid deficit spending by proposing new taxes. He has now found that this must not be done for many reasons, including the certainty that additional taxes at this time would accelerate business recession and create unemployment.

The simple way out is to swing the axe on wasteful expenditures. All family men and housewives have faced this common reality. Yet the President has not recommended the elimination of any of the thousands of functions, services, and activities of the Government. Instead he has proposed to open up brand new fields for Government spending.

In politics, one tries to please everybody, and votes can be lost by courage. Our Senate and House of Representatives hold some men who never in their legislative lives have cast one vote for economy. They have built public careers on spending and more spending. (Parenthetically, they like to be out of town on the day the tax bills are mailed.) To displease a group by cutting an appropriation is to these men a torture like being dragged through a keyhole.

Where can cuts be made? In this discussion we must set aside the great and regretted costs of the cold war, because the course of this dispute can hardly be predicted. We can watch those costs most sharply, remembering that our State Department does not feel a war with Russia is imminent. We can take some bleak comfort, perhaps, in the fact that all kinds of warfare are temporary, not permanent.

But what about the Government costs that are strictly within our own control and that are with us always? These are the costs of conducting our domestic affairs.

The Federal Government is permeated with waste and inefficiency. A blindfolded man could reach out with a pin and stick a good place to cut. Except for the interest on the debt and a few other similar commitments, every expenditure for administration in the budget can be cut 10 percent without harm to the essential functions.

Let us note a few key spots. As the Hoover Commission informs us, a billion a year can be saved by a real unification of the armed services. Also, the armed services now engage in an extraordinary amount of routine and record keeping; for although many of the 1,600,000 in uniform act as clerks, 800,000 civilians are employed to help them. Altogether, two billions can be saved in the armed services.

In all departments, for more than a year, 285 employees have been added to Federal pay roll every day. Why? I have asked in many places, and I get no clear answer. With the salaries averaging over $3,000, the pay roll has been swelling three-quarters of $1,000,000 more every day. Yet, as suggested by the Hoover report, correction can be painless: Merely stop filling the places of employees who quit, for there is a large turnover in Government offices.

Adding Federal, State, and local government employees, one worker out of nine in our country is on public pay roll. This means, of course, that eight workers in private industry pay in taxes the salary of one other.

For those who want to see the Government live within its income the confused and archaic methods of appropriation are an obstacle. As a farmer you might estimate your probable income for the next year and decide to spend so much on your home, so much on buildings, so much on machinery, so much on better livestock, and so on. I regret to say that the Senate and the House of Representatives work just the opposite. Over a period of 6 months a dozen subcommittees will bring in appropriation bills. Each bill is passed into law without knowing the extent of the others. As the last bill is passed a total can be struck and compared with how much the Government takes in. But even this comparison is baffling, because appropriations usually do not specify in what year they shall be spent. Thus, in a year when the Government takes in least its expenditures may suddenly be the heaviest. So confused is our handling of vast sums that I have frequently heard sincere colleagues in the United States Senate differ by as much as from four to six billions in their estimates of how much we are spending.

Other Senators and I are working for a single appropriations bill. It has been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and is now on the Senate calendar. This would specify the total amount to be obligated each year and let us see it in relation to income, and let it be divided according to needs. This would take fantasy out of our financing and shed a clear light. Old fixed procedures are hard to change, but Representative CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, leads a drive in the House for a consolidated appropriations bill that gives us all new hope. The bill will give our Senators and Representatives a clear picture of our finances. It will enable the public to see what we are doing. I am hopeful that when the public knows it will help us to reduce the cost of government.

It is known that when government enters a new field of spending it seldom or never withdraws. Once the foot is inside the door, the door is opened wider. A small expenditure swells into a great one. A temporary measure becomes permanent. The Truman budget opens up such new fields. A major one is socialized medicine, which involves a long-range commitment to the spending of—how much? Not known, that sum, except that it is vast. We are asked to sign a blank note and let time and circumstances fill in the amount. I know of no business that can proceed that way. It costs $260,000,000 to put the toe inside the door for socialized medicine, but the plan in full operation is estimated at from six to ten billion dollars. Between those two figures is what the Government spent on all of its activities a few years before the war, and they were New Deal activities at that.

Even more in the blank-check class is the Brannan plan for socialized farming. How many millions and billions of taxes will be used to finance this producer-distributor-consumer utopia, Mr. Brannan does not know. We have no estimates. But it is a rosy plan to help everyone, out of everyone's taxes and cost of living, where all Government help must come from. The farmer will pay to help the city man, while the city man will pay to help the farmer. The plan is like trying to give the same pie to two men without cutting the pie in half. I think Mr. Brannan's plan would cost stupendously before it crashed as an impractical scheme.

If the plan is tried, controls over the farmer will go beyond anything yet seen. The more unwieldy and unworkable a plan, the more controls and regimentation are needed to try to make it work. The first sign of this is that the Brannan bill as introduced in the Senate contains 123 dictatorial new powers for the Secretary of Agriculture over production and marketing and the farmer's business.

The end of the Brannan plan would be to leave our markets demoralized. The farmer would need an aspirin and another notch in his belt. The mortgage on his farm and the national debt would meanwhile have taken another big jump. It is fine to know that an organization like the Farm Bureau looks sanely ahead and takes a courageous stand against the Brannan plan.

The socialization of farming in England is a warning to Americans. There the farmer reports every egg, and needs permission to kill his pig for his own use, and if he mistakes an order and plants a field to the wrong crop he must plow it under and plant as directed. If he disobeys his farm will be taken from him.

We men who are in our fifties and sixties observe that it is harder for a young man to start a little business, or to buy a farm, than it was when we were young. As he works to save, income tax and other taxes hidden in the high cost of living dissipate his money. And does the young man realize, as he saves for a tractor, that he must save hundreds of dollars of its price to pay the heavy taxes against mine and steel mill, factory and transportation—on through an almost endless list of taxes that his father did not have to pay?

The budget of the United States is 1,500 heavy pages, and few read it. For 16 years I have studied it. This is my duty as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The American budget is the most important current publication in the world, because it decides whether the one leading Nation in the world's history that was built on freedom will endure or will collapse in bankruptcy.

Thomas Jefferson said, "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

To me the fiscal picture of our Government is bleak. Let us remember, while our ideology contends with that of Russia, that the real danger is not of a military blow, or spies and plotters within. The Russians fear us because private enterprise lets our 6 percent of the world's population produce more goods and materials than all the rest of the world combined. The grave threat to our democracy is headlong spending and taxing by our own Government or long-range deficit spending, and this course will certainly end in disaster.

Atlantic Union Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from a recent issue of the Meriden Daily Journal, and also an article from the July 28, 1949, issue of the Meriden (Conn.) Record. Since the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], is a capable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the distinguished junior Senator [Mr. BALDWIN] is one of the sponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution, these articles are especially pertinent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Daily Journal]

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

The Atlantic Union Committee, headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, has at last succeeded in bringing to the attention of both Houses of Congress a resolution preparing the ground for a far-reaching international project. The resolution, carefully timed by its sponsors to follow the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, would ask the President to call a Federal convention of delegates from the seven democracies, including the United States, which initially sponsored the pact. Purpose of the convention would be to explore the possibilities of uniting these democracies in an Atlantic Federal Union of the Free. If deemed advisable, the convention would invite participation by delegates from the other democracies.

This is the program long urged by Clarence K. Streit and his followers in Federal Union, Inc. It is a program replete with possibilities deserving careful study, not only by Congress but by the public at large. If the resolution is brought to debate, information about the plan will be widely disseminated throughout the Nation.

There are numerous formulas for world union, but Streit's original plan has kept its shape and stood up well among the contenders—and it now appears to have a chance to receive serious consideration. That is the most its adherents can ask for it at present.

Among the supporters of Atlantic Federal Union of the Free are men who have occu-

pied high posts in our Government and who are known as influential leaders of opinion. They would not have embraced unthinkingly a program in which they could not wholly believe. They like it especially because it follows so closely the scheme on which our own Federal Union was founded. The Atlantic Union Committee, in soliciting support for its objectives in this State, reminds us that "back in 1787, when men were distraught and almost hopeless that our 13 sovereign States could ever really unite, it was through the inspired, courageous foresight of these great Connecticut citizens, Roger Sherman, Oliver Ellsworth, and William Johnson, that the seemingly insoluble was solved by adoption of the Connecticut Compromise, thus rendering possible our own great Federal Union with its profound influence on later world history."

Practicable or not, the project brought forward through the Atlantic Union resolution should have an unbiased hearing in Congress. Its history gives it that right, at least, for it is no inconsequential proposal, brought up overnight. It is the product of intelligent thought and disinterested devotion to an ideal: the ideal of permanent world peace to be attained through a harmoniously working government of democratic states which believe in the fundamental rights and liberties of man.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record of July 28, 1949]

FEDERAL UNION RESOLUTION IS WIDELY HAILED

Eleven distinguished Americans today joined former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee in hailing the bipartisan introduction in both Houses of Congress, Tuesday, of the Atlantic Union resolution which urged President Truman to call a convention of the democracies that sponsored the Atlantic Pact "to explore how far their peoples can apply, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free Federal union."

Today, Margaret Culkin Banning, author; Harry Bullis, chairman of board of General Mills; Struthers Burt, novelist; Charles Farnsley, mayor of Louisville, Ky.; P. W. Litchfield, chairman of the board of Goodyear Rubber Co.; Clare Booth Luce, former Congresswoman; James A. MacLachlan, Harvard Law School; John W. Nason, president of Swarthmore College; Kim Sigler, ex-Governor of Michigan; and Walter Wanger, issued statements calling for passage of the resolution.

"This positive action must be taken by the democracies that sponsored the past," Sigler declared. Litchfield said that action on the resolution could offer "a solution to the world's troubles," while Bullis called it "a bright new star in the firmament of world security." MacLachlan stated that it would permit us to plan for the future with assurance, while Sidney Hook described the resolution's proposal for a convention of democracies as "the only hope for peace."

Struthers Burt said that anyone who opposed the resolution "is, whether he knows it or not, a potential murderer of his children and grandchildren."

Nason declared that the resolution "opens the way to the next stage in the development of law and order in the world, and deserves the support of everyone interested in peace." Wanger called it "of vital importance" and Mrs. Banning said there could be no better time to call a convention of the democracies, while Mayor Farnsley stated that such a convention is basic to peace and security.

"All men," Clare Boothe Luce emphasized, "should welcome passage of this resolution. Every practical politician must wish to see it debated in the open. The exploration of how far the free nations of the west are willing to go in forming a federal union for the protection of the basic liberties of their citizens will be a great forward step in history."

Roberts said that the introduction of the resolution was only the first step in the Atlantic Union Committee's program to federate the democracies. "The next step," he stated, "will be for local Atlantic Union Emergency Committees throughout the United States to urge Senators and Congressmen to support passage of this resolution."

Congressmen Can't Be Specialists in Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Congressmen Can't Be Specialists in Everything," published in the Baltimore Sun of August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMEN CAN'T BE SPECIALISTS IN EVERYTHING

The Federal Government closed its books on June 30 with a deficit for the fiscal year of $1,800,000,000. The prospect is that the deficit for the current year will be much larger than that—perhaps four times as much.

It is this fact that we are slipping back into the bad habit of deficit financing which gives special point and urgency to a proposal made in the Senate. This is that the President be required to cut all congressional appropriations to a level 5 to 10 percent below his budget estimates.

That proposal reached the floor of the Senate on Monday in the form of a rider to the big Department of Defense appropriation bill. But this rider was defeated.

The defeat of the rider came only after a sharp debate during which both proponents and opponents of it based their arguments on constitutional grounds.

Opponents of the amendment argued that, if Congress were to issue any such blanket directive to the President it would in effect be abdicating to the Executive its constitutional power over the purse strings. If Congress seeks to cut appropriations, they argued, it should face up to its responsibilities and make specific cuts at specific places and not pursue the "cowardly" (as well as unconstitutional) course of passing the buck to the Executive.

Those who urged that the rider be approved made the point—and the Sun concurs in this argument—that though Congress must make the closest scrutiny of which it is capable of appropriations details, it cannot as a practical matter in this day of astronomical budgets be sure that it has actually done a thorough job. The Members of Congress cannot hope to be specialists in all the ramifications of government. Their primary concern is with general policy. So far as the fiscal side of the task is concerned, their first duty is to see that expenditures are tailored to fit revenue.

The proposed directive to the President to cut down appropriations is thus a legitimate exercise of their constitutional power over the purse strings which is dictated by the magnitude and complexity of contemporary governmental activities.

The proposal is in accordance with common sense and experience. For it is a good general rule of government that the men charged with spending the money know better than anyone else where cuts can be made, know better than anyone else what personnel and what details of function can be dispensed with safely. Everyone knows this to be true in the realm of local government. In Baltimore, for instance, everyone knows that the men best able to trim departmental budgets are the department heads themselves. What is true of municipal administration is likewise true of Federal administration.

It is a safe general rule, too, that all appropriations contain a certain amount of "water." To direct the President, then, to make a blanket cut of 5 to 10 percent is in effect to require him to squeeze out the water, with the help of the men who know where the water has accumulated—the administrators.

Proponents of this sensible amendment lost their fight in the Senate on Monday. But they lost it by very few votes—and would in fact have gained it had the whole membership of the Senate been present. They should not bow to Monday's verdict.

Poland: A Forgotten Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1949, we will mark the tenth anniversary of the brutal attack on Poland by the Nazi legions—to be followed a short 16 days later by the cruel overrunning by the hordes of Soviet Russia. This anniversary should be commemorated in our country for it signaled the advent of World War II, and at once sounded the death knell for a most ancient and noble people.

Our ties with Poland are of long standing, rooted deeply in the spirit which produced our own independence of government and thought. Today, we have among us hundreds of thousands of fellow citizens of Polish extraction. They have continued to give much of themselves since our earliest times toward the building of the United States. They have proved to be fine citizens, devoted to the highest principles, and anxious to live in peace and harmony in a free society. In them breathes the spark which inspired Thaddeus Kosciusko to ally himself with our founding fathers in our struggle to throw off the Old World and strike out anew.

No one need recite the role Poland played as a gallant and loyal ally of the Western Powers. Her military effort in defense of the homeland proved an altar of sacrifice. She persisted to a gored and mutilated end in a hopeless and helpless conflict—deserted by friends; exposed by her enemies. Who can forget the will-to-live of their homeland, expressed in Chopin themes on Warsaw's broadcasts? So long as they continued,

Poland lived. Who but must remember the blatant Nazi and Soviet martial music that announced the fall of Warsaw, and the end of free Poland.

And what of Poland today? Ten years have passed—Allied victory prevailed, but the country first promised aid, lies imprisoned behind a curtain of silence, fear, and lost identity. Never before in its harassed existence has Poland been so completely subjugated; the partitions of the past were merely preludes.

We should direct our attention to this loss of Poland from the concourse of nations. Religion, culture, and traditions dictate that this land can make valuable contributions to our world; indeed, be of incalculable aid to the west. In these days we see the tragedy that is Poland; forgotten by those it loved; represented in world affairs by men who can never be the voice of the Polish people; yet clinging to the hopes and dreams of free men, secure in their faith, and still disdaining communism and its yoke. The Poles are no strangers to adversity. Their pages of history are crimson with repeated invasions, conquests, and partitions. Time after time they have had to bend the knee to alien tyrants, but always they have survived to witness their own triumph. They live on even now, confident in the hope that the liberal forces in our world will accomplish their deserved liberation.

The Western World, under the leadership of our own great country, must reach out an encouraging hand to the oppressed of the peoples of the earth, to fight on and live to the end that there shall be found means of reestablishing liberty with justice. For Poland shall never die.

An Easy Way To Get Your Tax Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Allegan Gazette published in my home town of Allegan, Mich., shows the editor's friend is thinking and has a plan which will make the tax and spend program work though it may cause a little pain.

Here it is—try it if you wish—no charge:

MR. GAY REACTS

Uncle Enos tottered into the Gazette office yesterday and without speaking swayed into our inner room and sank onto a chair. We revived him with a glass of ice water and asked if he wished us to call in Dr. Burdick who was passing by. He gave us a baleful look and said, "No, there's nothing the matter with me that a little food won't cure." We tempted him with a sandwich Joe had purchased at the Cupboard but after a moment's hesitation, licking his lips, he refused. We expressed our astonishment at his refusal to eat when he admitted that he was practically starving to death. Our well-fed editor, said "Why, Uncle Enos, won't you eat? Why are you starving yourself? What is the matter?"

Uncle Enos in a weak and faltering voice but with grim determination replied, "Well you see it is this way. I listened to Herbert Hoover's speech the other night and a right good speech it was, too. But he said, and I believe him, that the average taxpayer worked about 1 week out of every 4 for the Government. Now this is the week I am working for the Government, and naturally I can't spend this week's wages for groceries, because, you see, I am not earning any grocery money, just money for the Government. So I am practicing not eating. If I tried to spread my 3 weeks' wages out to cover eating money for the fourth week I just don't have any good meals. This way I can eat good for 3 weeks and go without the fourth."

We complimented him on his stand and he admitted that he cheated a little, "You may have noticed," he said, "that I am not wearing my teeth. Helps me to resist temptation and also saves my teeth. Might grind them when I get real hungry."

Then with tears in his eyes, he added, "But what makes me so d—— mad, is that while I'm working and not eating some political pensioner or professional benefiter is eating and not working, and on my money."

With a muttered curse he remarked, "Why don't them d—— social planners figure out a way so we could get by without eating that fourth week? Don't they know expenses go on just the same even if we are working for the Government?"

With that he walked out of our office and down the street.

Uncle Enos' visit left us slightly confused. We could see that he was trying to prove a point and at first it wasn't quite clear. We knew that it was something more than the fact that the Government took about one-fourth of a man's income, so we resorted to paper and pencil.

If a man earns $60 a week or $240 every 4 weeks, and then has to pay $40 a week for groceries, rent, fuel, meat, and the bare necessities, that leaves him with $20 a week or $80 every 4 weeks to spend on an automobile, save toward a home, buy insurance, in other words use to realize his ambition. Then the social planners enter the picture. They take 1 week's wages or $60. The man and his family still have to eat and live so he still pays out $40 a week or $160 for the 4-week period for the bare essentials of life, groceries, meat, rent, fuel, etc. Thus, for the 4-week period, instead of having $80 to go onto the market and buy an automobile, save toward a farm, put in the bank or to use in some way so he can realize his ambition, he only has $20 for the 4-week period or $5 a week.

Thus, even though the Government has taken only 25 percent of his income, they have decreased his chance to realize his ambition, yes and his chance to be free and independent by 75 percent.

If High Tax Harry and his social planners increase taxes as they wish to do, by say 10 percent, they will have lessened the average man's chance to save, and support himself in his old age by an additional 30 percent or a total of 105 percent, or a minus 5 percent. In other words, the average man will have to economize to buy his groceries and there will be nothing left over to save toward a home or a farm. He will never be able to realize his ambition and will be no longer a free, independent citizen, but will be totally dependent upon what Hoover referred to as the collective state.

Now Truman is spending more than the National Government receives and wants to increase taxes to take care of the deficit. So when Hoover said we are spending our way down the back road to a collective or what Byrnes referred to as a welfare state he was speaking the truth. If Truman can't see it then he doesn't exhibit the intelligence of an eighth-grade student.

Uncle Enos has the only solution to the problem of making the social plan workable. When Truman and his gang figure out a way for the average citizen to work that fourth week without eating then they will have proved the social government feasible.

L. W. H.

Financing Our Foreign Policy Huge Task for House Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column released by the General Features Corp. The column was written by Charles Burton Marshall, consultant to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Marshall, in writing this column, substituted for Edgar Ansel Mowrer. Mr. Mowrer is currently on vacation. The column was carried on August 29, 1949, in various newspapers in the space usually assigned to Mr. Mowrer.

FINANCING OUR FOREIGN POLICY HUGE TASK FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Charles Burton Marshall)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Charles Burton Marshall, known familiarly as Burt, is one of the most widely read and widely quoted writers on foreign affairs in all the United States. If you do not recognize his name, it is because as consultant to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives he is "strictly anonymous." Yet his nonpartisan reports on foreign policy are read with equal confidence by Republicans and Democrats throughout the country. Marshall, a Texan born in New York, was a newspaperman, a teacher at Harvard, a soldier, and an expert on transportation before becoming consultant to the committee during the Eightieth Congress.)

The Executive withheld the military-assistance program until the waning days of an exhaustive session. In the press of time the Committee on Foreign Affairs could not resolve its will. The bill produced four minority reports subscribed 12 times by a total of 10 Members. This was no simple rupture of bipartisanism. The difference cut four ways—not just straight down the middle. The result in the House—the halving of the authorization for military assistance for western Europe—was inevitable, given the differences within the committee.

The differences were as to means, not ends. Too often bipartisan foreign policy is discussed only in terms of the latter. But the rubs develop in the questions of means. Those are the questions that take time. It is of the factor of time in legislation that I write. I shall pose the problem. I don't know the answer.

Let us take the time factor in the work of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which I serve.

You may get some idea of the scope of its tasks by a comparison with 15 years ago.

In the Seventy-third Congress this committee got around to legislation only in the second regular session. It handled nine minor public bills and a few private relief measures. None of these bills even remotely resembled an issue. The money involved in the public bills was a mere $102,000.

BIG LEAGUE ISSUES

At this session of the Eighty-first Congress—only this session—the committee has reported 25 public bills. A dozen of them lie at the heart of foreign policy. Nine have involved strenuous floor fights. Eleven were of such consequence or controversy as to require special rules—the parliamentary device for giving exigent measures priority.

The sharpest illustration pertains to money. The total of authorizations in committee bills so far this session is $7,391,760,598. Dollarwise, the job of public policy in the committee has multiplied by 145,000 in 15 years, comparing this session with a whole Congress of 1933–34.

And consider the matter of variety. In general, the bills before this committee have only one common quality—their relation to foreign affairs. They may differ completely in substance. The committee must study a question of an en bloc settlement of international claims or legal immunity of international organizations as if it were the Judiciary Committee. It must study a question of power development on an international river as if it were the Committee on Public Works. It must study military assistance as if it were the Armed Services Committee. And so on through a list in its way almost as diverse as the legislative task of the entire House.

DITTO NEXT SESSION

No let-up is in sight. The issue of the International Trade Organization—a tremendous one—must lie over to the next session. The so-called point IV legislation will have to wait. Stringency of time may compel its deferment. These two measures alone constitute enough unfinished business for a whole session. But they are not all. The European recovery program must come up again next spring. So much military assistance. Aid to China will be back. Perhaps also aid to Korea. And a dozen or more issues whose importance we call secondary only because the importance of others is so vast.

This huge job falls on a committee of 25. Fourteen are Democrats and eleven Republicans. Twenty-three are men and two are women. The average age is 50, but the oldest among them was 45 when the youngest was born. On an average they are in their fourth term in Congress, but the oldest was here 24 years before the newest arrived. Eleven are lawyers, three are doctors. Two have had careers on stage and screen. The list includes teachers, local government officials, a minister, a public relations man, a sociologist, and an engineer. Nine come from the Northeast, eight from the Midwest, five from the South, and three from the Far West.

MAKING HASTE SLOWLY

They are a heterogeneous group. They cannot resolve their will by fiat. There is no question of rubber-stamping. Even if they were willing—which they aren't—there would be no percentage in it. Most of them would not fight for legislation that was not a product of their own work. A bill which the committee sends to the floor must reflect its own will and be in a fundamental sense its own creation if the committee is to stand up for it.

If the mechanism is overloaded by trying to do too much too soon, the result is division and subdivision such as in the military assistance issue. Yet adequate deliberation and creation in every legislative task in the foreign affairs field impose demands in time and intellectual diversification quite beyond anything in legislative experience.

A year ago a report of the committee noted: "The reponsibility for the purse as it relates to foreign policy cannot be separated from the roots and substance of foreign policy." That means full legislative participation in the making of foreign policy. How to make that work is a central constitutional problem of our day.

The President's Labor Day Speech at Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Labor Day speech delivered by the President of the United States at Pittsburgh.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be here today at the Allegheny County Free Fair.

I notice that this is called the world's largest county fair. I have attended county fairs for 60 years, and I'm glad to be a guest at the biggest one of all.

I am particularly impressed by this fair, because it is both a farm show and an industrial exposition. Farmers and industrial workers together are showing their best products here today.

Farmers and industrial workers—agriculture and industry—ought to show their products together. For these two groups depend on each other. Together, they are responsible for the tremendous production of this country's economic system. No program for the prosperity of the country can ignore the interests of either group.

In recent years, some people have been telling farmers, out of one corner of their mouths, that the labor unions are bad for the farmers. Out of the other corner of their mouths, these same people have been telling industrial workers that programs to benefit farmers are bad for labor. If you ever meet anybody like that, you can be sure he is not interested in the welfare of either the farmer or the industrial worker. Those who are trying to set these two great groups against each other have axes of their own to grind.

About this time last year, the county was engaged in a great political campaign. I covered a good deal of the United States in the course of that campaign, and I put the plain facts, as I saw them, before the people. I also offered a program to meet the needs of all groups in this country for growth and prosperity. The votes of the people showed that they wanted that kind of program. They were not misled by the newspapers and magazines and experts who tried to convince them they did not want that kind of program.

CITES RESULT OF ELECTION

The people knew what they wanted. Their votes showed that the farmers and the the workers stand together in demanding a government that works for the benefit of all our citizens.

It is now almost a year since that campaign, and I think it is time to take stock of the situation and see what progress we have made in carrying out the program the people voted for.

I am happy to be able to report to you that we have made progress; and we are continuing to make progress.

As a result of last fall's election, we have a new Congress in Washington. And this new Eighty-first Congress has an entirely different approach to the needs and desires of the people from that of the Eightieth Congress.

The Eightieth Congress was a threat to almost every bit of the forward-looking legislation passed during recent years. For example, it repealed the Wagner Labor Relations Act and replaced it with the unfair and restrictive Taft-Hartley law. It took social-security benefits from hundreds of thousands of people. It weakened our farm programs. It attacked our national policy for making the benefits of electric power available to the public instead of the privileged few.

If the Eightieth Congress had not been repudiated, this tearing down process would have gone on and on. But now the new Eighty-first Congress has reversed this backward trend.

The Eighty-first Congress has put a stop to the piecemeal destruction of the hard-won protections and benefits that the people have built for themselves. It has done more than that. It has moved forward.

Some people are trying to make you believe that the Eighty-first Congress has been a do-nothing Congress. That is simply not true. The fact is the Eighty-first Congress has already passed many important measures for the good of the people—and it will pass many more progressive laws.

POINTS TO ERP AND PACT

The Eighty-first Congress has taken wise and important steps in foreign policy by extending the European recovery program and ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty. It has enacted a far-reaching housing program that will benefit millions of our citizens. It has extended rent control. It has taken action to make low-cost electricity available to more of our people. It has strengthened the soil conservation and reclamation programs. This Congress has restored the Government's power to acquire grain-storage facilities necessary to carry out the farm-price support program. This Congress has approved an international wheat agreement which will give our farmers a fair share of the world wheat market at fair prices. This Congress has strengthened and improved our organization for national defense.

This is real progress. And this session is not yet over. Other important measures, such as those raising the minimum wage and extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, are well on their way to final passage.

The Eighty-first Congress has taken these actions over the fierce opposition of the selfish interests. The organized conspiracy of the selfish interests has gone right on working against the common good, in spite of the election returns.

One of the things that the special interests have managed to do up until this time is to prevent the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. But that issue is far from settled. We are going to continue to fight for the repeal of that repressive law until it is wiped off the statute books.

The selfish interests have always been working against the common good, since the beginning of our history. Our fathers and our grandfathers had to fight against them every step of the way to make progress. They had to fight for a free public-school system. They had to fight for the right of homesteaders to settle the public lands. They had to fight for laws to protect the health and safety

of industrial workers. They had to fight for labor's right to organize.

SAYS FIGHT GOES ON

We face the same situation today. We still have a fight on our hands.

The special interests always fail to see that the way of progress, the way of greater prosperity for themselves, as well as others, lies in the direction of a fuller and happier life for all.

Too many people who can afford big insurance policies for themselves are not concerned over the need of expanding social security. Too many who are making money out of the rents from slums are not in favor of expanding public housing to provide decent shelter for low-income families. Too many with big incomes are not interested in raising minimum wages. Too many who can freely organize themselves in business associations or employers' groups are not anxious to protect the same right to organize among industrial workers.

It is hard, perhaps, for people in comfortable circumstances to see the need for improving the well-being of the less fortunate. Furthermore, they are always being stirred up and misled by the spokesmen and lobbyists for organized selfish interests. There are a lot of paid agitators, promoters, and publicity experts who make a fat living by frightening the people in the higher income groups about forward-looking legislation, and by organizing campaigns against it.

Ever since the election, those spokesmen have been very busy stirring up opposition to our legislative program. The hue and cry that has resulted, in the press, and on the air, and through the mail, has been deafening.

These propagandists do not argue the the merits of our program. They know that the American people will always decide against the selfish interests if all the facts are before them. So they have adopted an age-old device to hide the weakness of their case.

NOTES USE OF SCARE WORDS

This is the device of the scare-word campaign.

It is a device that has been used in every country and every age by the propagandists for the selfish interests. They invent slogans in an effort to scare the people. They apply frightening labels to anything they happen to oppose. These scare words are intended to confuse the people and turn them against their own best interests.

Scare words change with the times. When Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal saved our country from the great depression, the selfish interests raised the scare words of "socialism" and "regimentation." But the American people didn't scare.

Year after year the selfish interests kept up their refrain. They tried new words—"bureaucracy" and "bankruptcy." But the American people still didn't scare.

Last November the people gave the selfish interests the surprise of their lives. The people just didn't believe that programs designed to assure them decent housing, adequate wages, improved medical care, and better education were socialism or regimentation.

So the selfish interests retired to a back room with their high-priced advertising experts and thought things over. They decided that the old set of scare words had become a little mildewed. Maybe it was time for a change.

So they came up with a new set of scare words. Now they're talking about collectivism, statism, and the welfare state.

The selfish interests don't know—they don't care—what these words mean. They are using those words only because they want to turn the American people against the programs which the people want, and need, and voted for.

SAYS PEOPLE WANT HOUSING

Let's see how the selfish interests are using these scare words.

The people want public housing for low-income families. The selfish interests are opposed to this because they think it will cut down their own income so they call it collectivism.

We don't care what they call it. We are for public housing because it is the democratic way to provide decent homes in place of slums.

The people want fair laws for labor. The selfish interests are against these laws because they mistakenly fear that their profits will be reduced; so they call that statism.

We don't care what they call it. We believe that the workers in this country have a fundamental right to square treatment from employers.

The people want a fair program for the farmers, including an effective price-support program. The selfish interests fight against this because it keeps them from profiteering at the farmers' expense; so they call this socialism.

We don't care what they call it. We know that the well-being of the country depends upon the well-being of the farmers, and that farm prosperity must be protected in the interest of all of us.

The people want a better social security system, improved education, and a national health program. The selfish interests are trying to sabotage these programs because they have no concern about helping the little fellow; so they call this the welfare state.

We don't care what they call it. We know that the little fellow is the backbone of this country, and we are predicated to the principle that the Government should promote the welfare of all the people.

SEE FREEDOM ADVANCED

The spokesmen for the special interests say that these programs make the Government too powerful and cause the people to lose their freedom. That isn't so. Programs like these make the people more independent—independent of the Government and independent of big business and corporate power.

People who have opportunity to work and earn, and who have an assured income in their old age, are free. They are free of the fear of poverty. They are free of public or private charity.

They can live happier, more useful lives. That's real freedom. And that is something we should be proud of—that's not something to be slandered by trumped-up slogans.

Along with this campaign of scare words, we hear another argument against adopting any forward-looking legislation. It is to the effect that even if these programs are good things, we can't adopt them now, because they cost too much and we can't afford them.

The selfish interests say we can't afford these programs during a boom because that would be inflationary. They say we can't afford them during a recession because that would be deflationary. They say we can't afford them during a war because we are too busy with defense, and we can't afford them in time of peace because that would discourage business. And so, according to the selfish interests, we never can afford them.

But the truth is—we can't afford not to put these programs into effect. We can afford them, we ought to have them, and we will have them. The sooner we do have them the more we will save.

Take our programs for resource development, for example. If we fail to conserve our soil, we lose our most valuable resource. If we fail to build electric-power facilities, we hamper the development of industry.

Take our social-security system. Shall we force our old people to turn to charity? Or shall we let them have an independent and self-respecting existence through an up-to-date old-age-insurance system, paid for during their working years?

CITES COST OF NEGLECT

Take housing. If we do not go forward with our housing and slum-clearance programs, we shall have to pay the rising costs of disease, immorality and crime bred in slums.

Consider our schools. The hidden costs of poor education, lost opportunity and poverty resulting from inadequate schools are costs the Nation can no longer afford. Federal aid to education will be a lot less expensive than ignorance and illiteracy.

If we are to have a healthy and prosperous United States, we must have better schools, better housing, better medical care, better use of our resources, stronger social security and the other improvements in our democracy that the people need.

Those who oppose these improvements refuse to face the facts of today's world. They don't understand the overriding urgency of proving the value of the democratic way of life, not just with words, but with deeds. They don't see that the very survival of free enterprise depends upon a rising standard of living and an expanding economy. They don't recognize that to work for the increasing security and liberty of the people of the United States is the key not only to our own prosperity, but to the prosperity and peace of the world.

But the people of the United States do understand these things. When they have the facts before them, they always choose progress—not reaction.

They made this clear again last fall. They chose the very same programs that are now being attacked by the selfish interests with their campaign of scare words. The people were not misled about those programs then. They will not be misled about them now.

The people know that the second half of the twentieth century is going to be a time of challenge to the way of freedom and progress that our democracy represents. As we meet that challenge we shall have to fight, as we have always fought, the selfish forces of reaction and special privilege.

The people of the United States have been winning that fight for 160 years. I am convinced that we will continue to win it through the years to come.

The President's Labor Day Speech at Des Moines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Labor Day speech delivered by the President of the United States at Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here today with the American Veterans of World War II.

This is the third time I have met with veterans in the last 3 weeks. In Miami and in Philadelphia, I had the pleasure of addressing two of the other veterans' organizations.

Today in Des Moines you have given me the welcome opportunity to speak to this association which has grown up since the last war. Judging by this meeting, your group has a long, vigorous and useful life ahead of it.

I have found that veterans generally carry over into civilian life their strong interest in national and international affairs. They are determined to do everything they can to see that the United States grows in strength and prosperity and exerts its full influence for peace in the world. A veterans' organization like yours can do much to aid our progress toward peace and prosperity. I am sure all of you will do your part.

Earlier today, in Pittsburgh, I discussed the effort we are making to achieve a better future for our country. One of the most important elements in our country's future is agricultural prosperity. And there is no better place to talk about that than right here, in the heart of the Nation's farm belt.

Some people seem to think that nobody but the farmers ought to be concerned with farm prosperity. Some people claim that programs to improve the welfare of farmers are just pressure-group politics. The selfish interests would like to have us believe this because they want to divide the people and set one group against another.

PROSPERITY INDIVISIBLE

The plain fact is that everyone should be interested in the welfare of farmers. The prosperity of this Nation is indivisible. The economic future of the whole country depends upon the growing welfare of every group in the country. If we want a healthy and prosperous economy, there must be economic opportunity, not just for the fortunate few, but for all of us—workers, businessmen and farmers, without regard to race, creed, or color.

It's just plain common sense that good incomes for farmers are good for the workers who make the things farmers buy. Farmers this year will have more than $27,000,000,000 to spend. That means employment for more than 9,000,000 workers in factories and stores and other business enterprises.

All of us need the things farmers produce. When farmers adopt new and more efficient methods, and produce more at lower cost, that raises the standard of living of everybody in the country.

That's why it is just as important to the future of our country for farmers to be well off as it is for workers or businessmen. That's why I believe the Government of this country must work for the welfare of farm people.

Let's look at some of the things the Government should do to help achieve continued and growing farm prosperity. It is not always easy for city folks to understand the conditions the farmer faces, and the need for the particular programs the Government has developed.

FARMERS' PROBLEMS

First of all, the farmer faces the uncertainties of nature. He is in a constant battle with insects, weeds, weather, and erosion. He needs to learn and apply the best methods of soil conservation, weed killing, crop rotation, and all the other scientific advances in agriculture. One of the outstanding accomplishments of our Government has been its research and educational programs to help farmers do these things.

Furthermore, the farmer is confronted with special problems because he lives in the country. Too often in the past, good schools and modern health facilities and electricity and the other advantages of modern living were not available to our farm population. In recent years, however, our Government has helped to make it possible for many of our farmers to obtain these things.

In addition, the farmer faces a market which he can't control. Years ago, it often happened that a whole year's hard work went for nothing because there were unexpected crop surpluses or sudden drops in demand. In the past 16 years, however, with the help of the Government, farmers have been making much headway in achieving economic stability. Farm cooperatives have been greatly strengthened. Cheaper, more abundant farm credit has been made available. Price supports, marketing agreements, and other special programs have been developed and steadily improved.

GREAT PROGRESS CITED

In all these ways farmers, with the help of the Government, have been meeting and overcoming the special difficulties they face. They have been making great progress toward the steadily growing farm prosperity they need and the Nation needs.

None of these advances came easily. They were all opposed by selfish and narrow-minded men who didn't understand what the farmer was up against—and didn't care whether or not he was well off. Sometimes these interests have managed to reverse the course of progress, though, fortunately, not for long.

It was just about a year ago, a few miles from here at Dexter, that I talked to another audience about farm prosperity and opportunity for the farmer.

At that time the outlook was pretty black. The Eightieth Congress had been hitting sledge-hammer blows at the very foundations of farm opportunity. The Eightieth Congress had cut the soil-conservation program. In doing this it had threatened the existence of the farmer-committee system, through which conservation, price-support, and other programs are administered.

The Eightieth Congress had killed the international wheat agreement, which was negotiated to assure farmers a reasonable share of the world wheat market and help maintain stability of grain prices. It had caused farmer cooperatives to fear for their lives. It had restricted the reclamation program and cut down our efforts to bring low-cost electricity to farmers and other people.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS' RECORD

And on top of all that the Eightieth Congress had started to tear down one of our strongest bulwarks against depression—the farm-price-support program. It had done this in a sly and underhanded way—by eliminating the Government's power to provide grain-storage facilities. As you know, we can't support grain prices without adequate storage.

I reminded the people at Dexter a year ago, just as I am reminding you today, that the welfare of the entire Nation depends upon the welfare of the farmer. I reminded them that they could express their opinion of the Eightieth Congress at the polls in November.

Well, you know what happened last November. As a result, there are a lot of new Members in the Eighty-first Congress. With these new Members there has been a big improvement. Of course, there are still many reactionary Senators and Representatives in Congress, but they are no longer in control as they were last year and the year before. They are still doing all they can to slow up our Congress, but they are not able to stop it. The majority of the Eighty-first Congress are going ahead building for the future.

The new Congress has already repaired most of the damage done to farmers by the Eightieth Congress, and it is going forward with new measures for a growing and prosperous agriculture.

The Eighty-first Congress understands the fundamental importance of soil conservation. It has restored and expanded this program and given a new lease on life to the farmer-committee system.

WHEAT PACT IN EFFECT

The Eighty-first Congress understands the importance to American farmers of a balanced and expanding world trade. A new international wheat agreement has been negotiated and is now in effect. By this agreement American farmers are assured a fair share of the world wheat market at fair prices for the next 4 years. Furthermore, this Congress is going to extend and improve the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This will mean more world trade.

The Eighty-first Congress is interested in building up farm cooperatives, not tearing them down. It understands that cooperatives are as necessary for the welfare of farmers as unions are for the welfare of workers. Both cooperatives and unions are means whereby men who are weak economically can become strong enough by uniting to bargain on a basis of equality.

This Congress will not listen to those who want to tax cooperatives out of existence. Furthermore, before this Congress adjourns I think we shall have a cooperative telephone program similar to the highly successful rural-electrification program.

This Congress has already taken important steps to meet the serious need for more low-cost electricity and to revitalize the reclamation program in our Western States.

The Eighty-first Congress has restored the Government's authority to provide storage for grain under the price-support program, and the difficult storage problem is being met. Farmers are building new bins, and the Government is preparing to take care of the overflow that cannot be handled by farmers and grain elevators. With the biggest supply of corn in history now in sight, the corn-loan program is especially important; the Government is helping farmers get every bushel in storage.

DAMAGE REPAIRED

In all these ways the Eighty-first Congress has repaired past damage and is making new gains.

However, there is one important part of our farm program on which the Eighty-first Congress has not yet completed its work. That is the farm-price-support system.

The Congress needs to modernize our farm-price-support system, and the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the Administration, has made recommendations to the Congress for this purpose.

An immense amount of confusion has been stirred up about these proposals in recent months. Some people are going around telling industrial workers that our attempt to improve the price-support system will mean higher food prices and heavier taxes. Some people are telling farmers that an improved price-support system will take away the protection they now have and regiment the farmer. Much of this talk is deliberately intended to mislead and divide farmers and workers.

But it will not succeed. Farmers and workers have learned to cut through the fog of misrepresentation and propaganda and look at the facts. And when that is done there is no reason for confusion about the kind of farm-price-support program we ought to have.

First, we need a farm-price-support system that will afford farmers an opportunity to secure a fair return for their production. Too often in the past we have seen farm prices at give-away levels because temporary surpluses resulted in distress selling. That was bad for farmers and bad for the Nation. Our system of price supports, therefore, must protect farm income from collapsing and injuring the whole economy.

PRICE-SUPPORT PLAN

Second, price supports must be so organized and administered that they will give consumers the benefit of our abundant farm production. Our people want to buy more milk and meat, more fruit and vegetables, and all the things that go into a better diet. We must have a price-support system that will encourage farmers to shift their production to meet the demand for more and better foods at reasonable prices.

Present price-support legislation is not adequate to accomplish these objectives. It

encourages surplus production of some commodities, such as potatoes, and not enough of other products, such as meat. The worst thing about the present program is that it takes food away from consumers instead of enabling them to eat better. The Government has had to buy tremendous quantities of potatoes and take them off the market at great expense. The Government has had to build up big stocks of dried eggs and is wondering how to get rid of them.

Some people say that we ought to cut down support prices, but that would not meet the problem. The record shows that in the past, when prices dropped, farmers produced bigger and bigger surpluses in a hopeless effort to make up for low prices.

Instead of cutting down support prices we need to adjust our price-support system so that it will encourage farmers to grow what is needed and encourage consumers to use what is produced.

Our farm-price-support system, therefore, first of all should aid farmers to adjust production to demand. Farmers are under the same economic necessity to adjust supply to demand as are the producers of automobiles or washing machines or any other product. And by and large they are willing to do it, if they have assurance they can shift their land to other uses without economic disaster.

SURPLUS PROBLEM

But no matter how willing farmers may be to adjust their production and to change from one crop to another, they cannot eliminate the possibility of surplus. Weather, world conditions, market fluctuations are all things beyond their control. So even under the best circumstances, we shall always have some surpluses.

In the case of storable crops, like corn, tobacco, or cotton, we can and should store up a good part of the surpluses as reserves against emergency. In the case of perishable products, such as meat and milk, we cannot store them very long. These perishable products must be used to avoid waste.

This presents a problem that is not easy to solve. We know that we shall have to adopt a new method of price support. The most promising method yet suggested is the production payment. Under this method, the prices of certain farm commodities would be allowed to seek their own level in the market, and the farmer would be paid the difference between the support price and the average market price. Production payments thus would safeguard farm returns, and at the same time our entire production of perishable foods would be available to consumers on the regular markets.

This method, or any other means of accomplishing the same purpose, would go a long way toward overcoming the defects of present legislation and giving us a modern price-support system.

It is urgent that we modernize our price-support laws or we shall face unmanageable surpluses. Startling progress has been made in increasing agricultural production in this country in recent years. This has enabled farmers to double and triple their production of many crops at lower costs.

This new productive ability must be used for the good of our people; it must not be allowed to destroy the prosperity of our farmers and the stability of our economy. This is the essential purpose that we should seek to achieve by our new farm-price-support legislation. A price-support system that fulfills this purpose will be good for the farmer, good for the worker, good for the whole Nation.

RELATION TO WORLD

I am convinced that the Eighty-first Congress will enact this kind of farm-price-support legislation. I am convinced that it will not be led astray by the loud opposition of those who oppose any change in our price-support system.

The stability and progress of our agriculture is important not only to ourselves, but to the whole world. Over the last few years, our farmers have taken a leading part in the struggle to feed a hungry world. In the future, foreign markets will be essential for many of our farm products.

But we must remember that we cannot maintain foreign markets for our agriculture, over the long run, unless we buy in return the products of foreign countries. Foreign trade is not a one-way street. There will be tremendous benefits to this country, in rising living standards, in reduced appropriations for foreign aid, in a more prosperous world economy, and in closer ties between the free nations, if we buy more from other nations.

Our country has been endowed with the ability to produce the good things of the earth in abundance. I am sure we have the wisdom to use this gift as a blessing of all our people. We know much more about our economy and how it works than we used to. We have profited by experience.

We must keep our eyes on our main objectives. We must not be led astray by the false arguments and the loud clamor of the special interests. They are only trying to set up against one another. They are using slogans and scare words to frighten us away from the programs and policies that are good for us all.

But we will not be frightened. Too much depends on our ability to handle our common problems in a spirit of cooperation. It is not only our own future progress that is at stake. It is the future peace and prosperity of the world. That is our goal, and we shall continue to work toward it with all our strength and all our faith.

Address by Hon. John Foster Dulles, of New York, at Watertown, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DULLES] at the First Presbyterian Church, Watertown, N. Y., on August 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To you who listen, this is just another Sunday. To me it is an eventful day. This is the pulpit from which my father preached for many years, and from which he radiated an influence that is still felt here and elsewhere. Before me is the pew where I sat as a boy, little dreaming that this day would come when I would be speaking from his pulpit.

Those were times when Sunday was really set apart as God's day. There were then three church services, morning, afternoon, and evening, and Sunday school besides. The minister's family regularly attended all four services. Also, on each Sunday, we memorized about 10 verses from the Psalms or the New Testament and in addition two verses of a hymn. Sunday, then was a holy day, but hardly one of rest.

I cannot say that my mind never wandered during the church services. During the morning service there was the distracting prospect of licking the dasher with which I was to freeze the Sunday dinner ice cream. And during the afternoon service my thoughts returned to the woods and fields which I had roamed, while bird-watching the Saturday before. But by the time I left Watertown in my seventeenth year I had accumulated a considerable knowledge of the Bible and of Christian writings.

During the same time, I had developed a great interest in international affairs. That came from my grandfather, John W. Foster, who used to spend his summers in these parts and with whom I used to fish regularly at Henderson Harbor. As we sat together in a fishing skiff he would tell me of his diplomatic experiences in Mexico, Russia, Spain, and China. Also, he told of his experiences as a soldier in the Civil War—experiences that made him hate war and devote himself to the cause of peace. It became my ambition to go forward in that way.

I started as law clerk in an international law firm and came to work on many international problems and to attend many international conferences. During that period it did not seem to me that what I had learned here in church had much to do with the practical problems of war and peace. That was indeed my state of mind for 30 years, from 1907 when I attended with my grandfather the Second Hague Peace Conference, until 1937. In that year I presided at an international conference held at Paris under the auspices of the League of Nations, and then went on to attend the Oxford conference on church and state. That was a great Christian conference, with representatives of almost all the nations and all the races of the world. We discussed there the same critical problems that diplomats were discussing futilely at the League of Nations. But at Oxford we approached those problems with the guidance of a common standard—the moral law as revealed by Jesus Christ; and we dealt with each other as brothers irrespective of national or racial differences. Under those conditions we could see how to solve problems that could not be solved in the distrustful atmosphere of national competition.

Then I began to understand the profound significance of the spiritual values that my father and mother had taught, and by which they had lived, here at Watertown. From then on I began to work closely with religious groups—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—for I had come to believe that, of all groups, they could make the greatest contribution to world order. Most of all I worked with the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. During these same years I helped organize the United Nations and attended its meetings and those of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Serving at the same time in both religious and political groups made ever clearer the relationship between the two. I saw that there could be no just and durable peace except as men held in common certain simple and elementary religious beliefs; belief that there is a God, that He is the author of a moral law which they can know and that He imparts to each human being a spiritual dignity and worth which all others should respect. Wherever these elementary truths are widely rejected there is both spiritual and social disorder.

That fact is illustrated by fascism and communism. These are, in the main, atheistic and antireligious creeds. Orthodox Communists believe that there is neither God nor moral law; that there is no such thing as universal and equal justice; and that human beings are without soul or sacred personality. They are free of the moral restraints and compulsions which prevail in a religious society and they think it quite right to use force and violence to make their way prevail.

In Russia Communists have designed a form of society which they call "the dicta-

torship of the proletariat." They believe that their mission is to press all mankind into that precise mold and to do so by any and all means that are available.

Communists are, of course, entitled to have their own belief as to what is best for men, and they are entitled to try peacefully to bring their ideals into reality. That is the privilege of every human being. But since there is a God, since there is a moral law, since human personality is sacred, no human rulers can rightly use ruthless and violent methods and pitilessly crush all within their power who do not conform to their particular dictation.

At the first session of the United Nations Assembly at London Mr. Vishinsky spoke about refugees—poor, wretched creatures who had fled Russia to escape liquidation. In words that were powered with deep hatred and that struck like bullets from a machine gun, Mr. Vishinsky proclaimed the resolve of the Soviet government to scour the face of the earth to find these refugees, to seize them, and bring them back.

It was a cruel and frightening speech. It typified the fanaticism of Soviet communism and its total denial of tolerance toward any who disagreed. Terrorism, which breaks men's spirits, is, to Communists, a normal way to make their creed prevail, and to them it seems legitimate because they do not think of human beings as being brothers through the fatherhood of God.

If communism and fascism are hateful, because of the consequences of their godlessness, it is equally true that they can be successfully resisted only by societies imbued with strong spiritual convictions. In Washington these days Congress is working on great plans to halt communism by giving economic and military aid to those who, we hope, will resist. It is, however, perfectly clear that these plans will not succeed if they merely put material things into the hands of men who do not have a spiritual faith and who do not feel a sense of human brotherhood and of social responsibility.

There has been good progress in checking communism in western Europe. There, spiritual loyalties provide a cement that binds people together to resist Communist infiltration. The situation is somewhat different in the east. In China, for example, many lead individual lives centered on the material welfare of their family. The highly organized and collective materialism of Soviet communism can always prevail where it encounters nothing more formidable than a disorganized and individualistic brand of materialism.

But the situation is far from hopeless, for there are millions in China and throughout Asia who recognize the dignity of the human personality and who want a free society within which the individual can develop. Our people can and should make common cause with them. I am glad that Secretary Acheson has pledged that. The United States, he said, is prepared to work with the people of China, and other countries of Asia, to help them develop as they choose, not as dictated by foreign imperialism. Today, as many in Asia hesitate between resistance and resignation, it is important that our resolve be known. Even if we cannot at the moment help greatly with material aid we can give moral aid by making clear that our nation has the kind of will that resourcefully finds a way, and that we are determined to support the cause of freedom, in Asia as well as Europe, until that cause prevails.

I have during these last few days been talking with some of our officials from Germany. They are greatly concerned about the state of mind of the German people. Under the Fascist doctrines of Hitler the Germans developed a fanatical belief which glorified force and which was contemptuous of religion. It conditioned the Germans for the Second World War. Now it seems that that fanaticism is, for the moment, largely burned out. But it is replaced by a cynical disbelief in all spiritual values. "Nihilism"—nothingness—they call it. That, if it persists, will lead Germans to calculate coldly how to capitalize upon their strategic position between the democracies of the west and Soviet Russia. The only effective barrier between Germany and Russia is a moral barrier, and if that crumbles there could readily come another Soviet-German offensive alliance such as that which was entered into almost exactly 10 years ago today and which touched off World War II.

Officials of our War Department say that the great need is to send to Germany some of our young people imbued with a faith so dynamic that it will be contagious and restore to the German youth a sense of spiritual values. Have we those young people, and can we spare them for Germany? The War Department has stock piles of strategic materials with which to win a war, but it is at a loss to find the spiritual reserves which might now make the difference between future war and peace.

Napoleon said that in time of war the moral is to the material as 3 is to 1. I suppose that, in waging peace, the ratio is at least as high. We are apt to forget that and to think that the struggle on which we are now engaged can be won by material things alone. That is totally wrong. Wherever one looks around the world, one sees disorder that can only be cured by drawing on sources of moral power.

The western democracies have had great prestige and authority in the world. That is because their practices developed under the dominating influence of religious beliefs. Their laws came, more and more, to protect the individual and to provide more equal justice. They found ways for bringing about social improvements peacefully, without class wars or the crushing of the weaker by the stronger. They encouraged men to develop their individual talents and to experiment along diverse and competitive lines of their own choosing. Under those stimulating conditions there developed material, intellectual, and spiritual richness; and to some degree at least that richness was shared with other peoples of the world. For 1,000 years western civilization grew in power and influence and was not seriously challenged. There was such a challenge by Islam 1,000 years ago, and now we have the challenge of Soviet communism. Whether or not we peacefully surmount the present challenge depends on basic things and, most of all, on whether our people love the Lord, their God, and their neighbors, and act accordingly.

The hope of America and the hope of the world does not lie in our economic and military might. We have a duty to be materially strong and to share that strength with others who are in peril. But that is only a defensive, holding operation. The role of material power, as Admiral Mahan said, is to give moral ideals the opportunity to take root. Our basic strength is our capacity to propagate these moral ideals which must prevail if there is to be peace and justice in the world.

I am not, of course, suggesting that men and women should become Christians because that is the way for them to get peace. Such an argument would reverse the proper order of values. What I do say is that those who are Christians should see more clearly the possibilities that reside in the life and work of the churches.

There are millions in the world who want to do something for peace. They know the indescribable horror that another war would be and they are eager to dedicate themselves to the preservation, in peace, of the freedoms that are our heritage. They are quite willing to give time and money to attain those ends. Many of them feel frustrated because they cannot find a channel through which to work. I suppose that, in sum total, thousands have asked me personally to suggest what they might do to help the cause of peace. Many in their worthy zeal become faddists, joining organizations that would stop war by paper slogans. After the First World War many of our finest people sought to end war by working for a treaty that would, as they put it, "outlaw war." They got what they asked for in the form of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, but it did not stop World War II by a single day. Many today are engaged in similar futilities. It is tragic that so much good intention goes for naught.

Men and women who have spiritual faith and who want also to do something practical to preserve peace and to meet the challenge of communism have, in their local church, the most effective medium that exists. It is the churches that dependably keep alive and pass on, from generation to generation, belief in God, in moral law, and in the spiritual nature of man. It is the churches that provide recruitment for the ministry. It is the churches that have missionary affiliations that spread great spiritual truths throughout the world. They have central agencies, like the Federal Council of Churches, that provide studies of world problems by qualified Christian statesmen. These, if used, can create an enlightened public opinion that will directly influence the acts of government and of the United Nations. That has been proved. Yet today such studies barely trickle into local congregations.

Many who are zealous for peace seem to feel that all this is remote from reality. They want a more direct and obvious role.

That mood will never bring lasting peace. Peace is won, as victory is won, by cumulative efforts, no one of which alone is decisive. In time of war men and women labor in munition plants and feel that they are contributing to victory; and so they are, although no single effort appreciably affects the outcome. But the outcome would be defeat if no one worked unless he was confident that the bullet he made would kill an enemy general.

The struggle for peace will never be won without the cumulative efforts of millions of individuals working in ways that develop moral power and organize it as mobile force. If believers would direct their zeal for peace more into church and missionary channels, the prospect of war would steadily recede.

Today our Nation is relying greatly on material and military might. That is dangerous. A nation that possesses a great military establishment is apt to be influenced by the counsel of persons who believe in the inevitability of war or who believe that good ends can be gained by violent means. Our present course skirts, dangerously, the road to war. Our leaders take that risk because they feel that there is no adequate alternative. Policy makers work with the tools that, it seems, can be made available. Economic and military power can be developed under the spur of laws and appropriations. But moral power does not derive from any act of Congress. It depends on the relations of a people to their God. It is the churches to which we must look to develop the resources for the great moral offensive that is required to make human rights secure and to win a just and lasting peace.

Nearly 2,000 years ago Christ said, "The truth shall make you free." Every one of the intervening years sustains that utterance. We meet here beneath a spire that points upward. That is symbolic. It points to the power above us from which we derive our spiritual strength, and it marks this building as the place where men can gather and draw that strength which alone enables those on earth to have the power to be free.

The Taft-Hartley Law and Pennsylvania Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Old 'Slave Chain' Blather in Special Congress Fight," written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD "SLAVE CHAIN" BLATHER IN SPECIAL CONGRESS FIGHT

(By John M. Cummings)

Labor Day in this year of grace found professional labor leaders in the Cambria-Indiana-Armstrong congressional district striving mightily to accomplish what they failed to do in the Lehigh-Bucks district some 2 years ago.

They are trying to win a seat in the House on the threadbare nonsense that the Taft-Hartley Act is slave legislation, that its purpose is to crush organized labor. To this end they are supporting on the Democratic ticket Mrs. Curry E. Coffey, mother of Representative Robert E. Coffey, who, as a Reserve officer in the Air Corps, lost his life in the crash of a jet plane.

Now it may be doubted that Mrs. Coffey herself, for all her fine qualities, feels the Taft-Hartley Act has enslaved anyone in the congressional district in question. It may further be doubted that any worker in the steel mills or in the mines of the district feels the ominous weight of Taft-Hartley chains as he goes about his daily task.

Finally, it may be doubted that the former Communists and other lugs sent into the district by the CIO to fast-talk the voters are in a position to fortify their gab by exhibiting the bruises of their Taft-Hartley shackles.

The Republican candidate in the special election to be held a week from today is John Philip Saylor, a war veteran.

If Mr. Saylor is alert to his opportunity, he will accept the challenge of the invading agitators and insist that they produce the slaves and display the marks of their bondage.

This is exactly what was done by Representative FRANK LICHTENWALTER, former speaker of the State house of representatives, in the Lehigh-Bucks fight. As the Republican candidate he carried both counties by a rousing majority.

It will be recalled that the Lichtenwalter campaign was dragging a bit until the candidate came to grips with the professional laborites sent into the district to do a job on the electorate. Once their absurdities had been laid bare the result was inevitable.

Among the propagandizers sent into the steel-coal district you find the name of Arthur Riordan, a scholar who once gulped the Communist bait and seemed to like it. At length it soured his stomach and he gave it up. Riordan was one of the more prominent of the leaders in the strike which ended the career of the Roosevelt-loving, New Dealish Philadelphia Record. When the Record folded he moved on to Washington to join the staff of the CIO News.

The political charlatans, demagogs, and fakers now doing business in Johnstown will find it difficult to sell their tripe to the citizens of the district if the opposition has the courage to lay the truth on the line.

You even find Czar Petrillo, of the American Federation of Musicians, grinding out a tune for the Democratic candidate. The issue, he wants the voters of the district to understand, is repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

President Truman, no less, has yet to convince the Democratic Congress that outright repeal of the act is either necessary or desirable. He campaigned for repeal last year and promised something resembling Utopia if the voters would be good enough to return him to office and give him a Democratic Congress with which to work.

He was returned to office. He was given a Democratic Congress. But on the Taft-Hartley issue, among others, the Democratic Congress refused and still refuses to bow to the demands of the administration. But he told Labor Day audiences yesterday that he's going to go on and on for repeal.

Now it's all right to say that a Democratic-Republican coalition in Congress is responsible for the failure of the President to get what he wanted. This sounds like a good argument until you recall that from a hundred stumps the President called for a Democratic Congress and got it. In spite of this it refused to see eye to eye with the White House.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed by the Eightieth Congress. This was a Republican Congress. It would be worthwhile for the good folks in the Cambria-Armstrong-Indiana district to keep in mind that it became law over the veto of President Truman. It took the vote of Democrats in both Chambers of Congress to enact it over the veto, or better than a two-thirds majority.

For nearly 3 years it has been the law of the land. The President himself on six occasions has availed himself of its provisions. No worker, no member of any union, has been enslaved. Most of its provisions are disliked by the leaders of labor. But this is because one of the intents of the act is to give the men in the ranks a larger voice in their own affairs. The law has, in a way, made one slave. It has made Harry Truman the slave of the big shot labor bosses.

Progress of the Transit Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement with reference to the progress of the transit industry, together with an article entitled "Transit Companies Completing Their Plans for 'Progress Day'" published in the Passenger Transport, the weekly newspaper of the transit industry, for September 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA

It has come to my attention that Monday, September 12, will be observed throughout the United States as Transit Progress Day. The more than 300,000 citizens of our country who are engaged in the transit business have stated their desire to report on the progress the transit industry has made in serving the best interests of the public.

Transit Progress Day will direct the attention of the public to the contribution of service the transit men and women who live among us, and their industry, make to our public, social, business and private life. The supplying of low cost public transportation to all our citizens benefits the public welfare. It is fitting, then, that Transit Progress Day, September 12, be set aside as the day upon which the transit industry will highlight the ingenuity, research, and pioneering spirit that has brought about the modern methods and vehicles of today's transit systems.

I think it worth the while of my colleagues to study some of the facts and figures of this industry whose components are so important to our local communities. In 1948, this industry carried more than 21,000,000,000 passengers over 3,000,000,000 miles. They carried their possengers safely and efficiently and at low cost. The annual payroll of the transit industry is over $830,000,000. This is a significant sum in the economy of our country and in our communities. The industry also spends more than $236,000,000 for materials of which more than $111,000,000 goes for gasoline and electric power.

While these figures are impressive, perhaps of greater interest is the efficiency of transit vehicles in relation to the use of street space which is so important to the traffic patterns in our growing urban communities. On an average, each transit vehicle carries as many passengers as 30 private automobiles. Transit vehicles require no valuable parking space. They bring more customers to more businesses. Public transit vehicles ease traffic congestion. Their increased use by our citizens save time, money and troubles for all of us. Without good public transportation our cities would wither and die.

I think it is commendatory therefore that the transit industry has taken advantage of September 12th to direct the public's attention to the progress they have made in serving the public.

[From Passenger Transport for September 2, 1949]

TRANSIT COMPANIES COMPLETING THEIR PLANS FOR PROGRESS DAY—OBSERVANCES TO RANGE FROM MANY SPECIAL EVENTS TO SIMPLE ADVERTISEMENTS OR SPEECHES; MANUFACTURING COMPANIES COOPERATING ENTHUSIASTICALLY

NEW YORK, September 2.—Dozens of transit companies in every section of the United States, and a number in Canada, too, during the next few days, will be putting the finishing touches on their plans for observance of transit progress day on Monday, September 12.

Proposed by the American Transit Association's public relations divisions and endorsed by the ATA board of directors, transit progress day is designed, in the words of ATA President Warren R. Pollard, "to let our friends and neighbors know how public transit intimately benefits them in their daily lives. A fully informed public is an understanding public."

VARIED OBSERVANCES PLANNED

On a number of properties elaborate observances are being arranged including, in some cases, a half dozen or more special events to mark the occasion. Other companies are contemplating more modest activities, such as a special advertisement in the local newspaper pointing out the vital role which transit occupies in the life of the community.

Among the more ambitious programs are such undertakings as the selection of the oldest regular transit riders and the bestowing of honors upon them; displays of transit

equipment of earlier eras to demonstrate the progress that has been made in vehicle design and operation over the years; talks by company representatives before local business, civic, and service organizations; open-house tours for the public; employee family days; billboard posters, etc. The plans of several representative companies have been outlined in more detail in recent issues of Passenger Transport.

Manufacturers of transit vehicles and supplies also will take an active part in the event. Many are saluting the transit industry in their newspaper and magazine advertising and several will call attention on Nation-wide radio programs to the indispensable service rendered by urban transportation systems.

For example, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. announced this week that it would feature a transit progress day tie-in on its Voice of Firestone program on television as well as radio.

Transit progress day will be featured in the national transit safety conference at Chicago, September 12–14, with Morris Edwards, ATA vice president, and Ned H. Dearborn, National Safety Council president, scheduled to speak on the subject Transit Progress Day and the National Transit Safety Conference.

The ATA public relations department, which many weeks ago distributed to ATA member companies a package of publicity releases for use in connection with the event, today urged again that maximum use be made of the material. It also reminded that mats of suitable newspaper advertisements are available to member companies at a nominal charge.

Statement by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, Relative to the President's Labor Day Speeches at Pittsburgh, Pa., and Des Moines, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have made today relative to the observations made by the President of the United States at Pittsburgh, Pa., and at Des Moines, Iowa, on Labor Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman preaches freedom of choice and competitive enterprise, but he practices socialism, and all his disclaimers cannot erase the fact that the measures he has submitted to the Congress would inevitably make the Government master and not servant of the people.

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not socialism, what is it?

If the President's bill before Congress to give him—one man—absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages and floors under prices and wages is not regimentation, what is it?

If federally subsidized education is not in the direction of federally dictated philosophies of education—thought control—what is it?

If the Government—all the taxpayers—paying part of the cost and rent of homes for some of the people is not socialism, what is it?

If manipulation of the personal income-tax structure to level off the people is not resort to the power of taxation to destroy, what is it?

If resort by the President to secrecy in making foreign trade agreements under any formula he desires is not robbing American industry, agriculture, and labor of their rights as citizens, what is it?

If the President's proposal that he—one man—be given power to build and supervise steel and other plants in direct competition with private enterprise is not socialism, what is it?

If the Brannan farm plan to have farmers, in effect, produce for the Government under controls prescribed by the Government is not socialism, what is it?

In one breath the President supports the so-called Anderson farm plan, which bars Brannanism, and in the next breath the President tells the farmers he is for the Brannan plan. The President's constant harping upon what he calls "selfish interests," without naming them, is getting a bit shopworn. It smacks of demagoguery. If it is selfish to fight for preservation of the freedoms of the people and to oppose spoilers who guide the President's spendthrift, socialistic policies, then I take the epithet as a compliment.

The President calls them "scare words," but his actions speak louder than his words.

Tribute by Hon. Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia, to Hon. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, on His Departure From the Senate to Become United States Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farewell to a Senator," being the remarks on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] in reference to our distinguished former colleague, Howard McGrath.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAREWELL TO A SENATOR

Wide attention has been attracted by the recent eloquent farewell address of United States Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, of West Virginia, on the occasion of United States Senator McGrath's departure from the Senate to become Attorney General of the United States. Mr. NEELY's statement on the floor of the Senate was as follows:

"Mr. President, Plato thanked the gods for permitting him to live in the age of Socrates. I thank the benign fate or destiny that permits me to live in the age of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. McGrath), work with him in the Senate and serve with him as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia over which he presides as chairman with a degree of dignity, grace, and efficiency as rare as a day in June.

"The incomparable hero of the famous Peter B. Kyne's delightful inspirational story The Go-Getter must have been the illustrious Senator McGrath under the nom de plume of Pvt. Bill Peck. The Senator's accomplishments are much more than were those of the immortalized young veteran who, in this gripping story, demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that nothing earthly is impossible of achievement by one of lofty ambition, tireless energy, ceaseless industry, and never-ending determination.

"For example, the Senator has had conferred upon him so many earned and honorary college degrees such as bachelor of philosophy and doctor of laws that an adding machine would be required to determine their number. The high official honors which the Senator has won are fully as numerous as the university degrees that troop after his name. He has held more high offices than anyone else in the United States of his age has ever attained.

"IN PRIME OF LIFE

"Please remember that this eminent man is only in the middle forties—in the very prime of life—with every door in the world of infinite opportunity still wide open to receive him.

"He began his rapid ascent on the ladder of fame by serving as city solicitor of the city of Central Falls, R. I. Thereafter he served as United States district attorney for his native State. Subsequently, he was three times elected Governor of Rhode Island. From his gubernatorial office he was promoted to Solicitor General of the United States. He thereby achieved the distinction of being one of the youngest men upon whom the appointment to that office was ever bestowed. The people of Rhode Island next made him a Member of the United States Senate. For 4 years he was chairman of the Democratic State Executive Committee of Rhode Island. In 1947 he was made the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and under his leadership his party last year won the most unexpected, and one of the most brilliant political victories in the annals of time.

"The President recently nominated Senator McGrath for Attorney General of the United States. The Senate has unanimously confirmed him, and tomorrow the Senate will grow much poorer and the Department of Justice will grow much richer when the Senator's resignation from this body becomes effective and he, as a member of the President's Cabinet, enters upon the discharge of his new duties. He will be among the youngest who have ever held the exalted office he is about to honor.

"Senator McGrath, as Governor of Rhode Island, was great. His greatness increased when he became one of the 96 Senators who help to make the laws that govern 145,000,000 people and largely determine the fate of all mankind. If humanly possible, he will become still greater as the highest law-enforcement officer of the Nation at the most momentous time in the history of the world.

"RUGGED ROAD OF RIGHT

"Throughout his official life Senator McGrath has known no dictator but his conscience, no guide but his judgment, and no purpose but to serve his country. He has walked the rugged road of right. He has never for a moment wandered from the way to loiter in alluring shade, or drink the bacchanalian draught, or pick the idle flowers that fringe the banks wherein temptation's wooing tide forever flows.

"Where duty has beckoned he has unhesitatingly, courageously, and faithfully followed on, unseduced by flattery, unawed by opposition, and unspoiled by such unusual

success as only one in many, many millions ever achieves. Upon every official trial of his life, he has conclusively proved that—

" 'His heart is as stout as the Irish oak
And as pure as the Lakes of Killarney.'

"The record of his service shines with the splendor of the bright and morning star. It is my fervent hope and my confident prediction that as the result of Senator McGrath's great service in the past and the great service he will render as Attorney General, he will eventually be made a member of the Supreme Court of the United States—the greatest judicial tribunal on the globe.

"WAR ON SUBVERSIVES

"Senator McGrath, distinguished statesman, beloved colleague and cherished friend, our regrets caused by your leaving the Senate are greater than it is possible for us with words or deeds to portray. As you, among many, many other important things, assume the herculean task of protecting the American people and the American way of life against all the blighting subversive activities that may be launched against them, be assured that—

" 'Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears, are all with thee—are all with thee.'

"We wish for you unlimited happiness and an unbroken continuation of that brilliant success—in the mastery of which you have demonstrated again and again that you have no superiors and few, if any, peers. As you say good night to the Senate and good morning to the Department of Justice, rest assured that we shall never remember you but to love you; we shall never name you but to praise; and our fond recollections of the delightful companionship and friendship with which you have so generously blessed us will be—

" '* * * the rainbow to our storms of life,
The evening beam that smiles the clouds away,
And tints tomorrow with prophetic ray!' "

[Applause.]

Oil Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Can Push Oil Prices Down by Demanding End of Quota System" published in the League Reporter for August 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS CAN PUSH OIL PRICES DOWN BY DEMANDING END OF QUOTA SYSTEM

The American Automobile Association, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Representative SIDNEY R. YATES (Democrat, Illinois) are trying to find out why the law of supply and demand doesn't work in the oil industry.

At the time that OPA was scuttled, the National Association of Manufacturers said the "law" would decrease prices. But gasoline prices have gone up 50 percent since 1946. Oil-company profits in 1948 shot up 140 percent over 1946. And this spring, oil companies reported that the United States had an overproduction. Supply was greater than demand. Did prices drop? No. This spring, gasoline went up 1 cent a gallon.

What went wrong with the NAM argument? The answer is that free supply and demand are not allowed to function in the oil industry. Production is restricted by State governments in direct violation of the will of Congress. The American Automobile Association pointed out resulting excessive prices cost motorists $1,300,000,000 a year.

If the banking committeemen want to know how production is restricted and why supply and demand does not work in the petroleum industry, LLPE suggests they check these facts:

HOW IS OIL PRODUCTION RESTRICTED?

A little history:

Unrestricted pumping operations ruin oil fields. Proper methods result in three times as much yield. Conservation is necessary to the public interest.

CONSERVATION COMPACT

The Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas was created in 1935 by major oil-producing States to safeguard petroleum resources. In the words of the compact:

"The purpose * * * is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause."

Signatory States agreed to enact laws and to police the oil industry to prevent drowning oil stratum with water, waste, or flaring of gas, creating fire hazards and other improper procedures, the most important of which is "the operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio."

The compact expressly forbids restriction of production so as to keep prices high. The compact says:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly."

In other words, the compact has a laudable conservation purpose. But only a conservation purpose. Nowhere in the compact is there authority to restrict production except for conservation purposes.

COMPACT UNLAWFULLY USES MARKET PRICE, NOT CONSERVATION, AS YARDSTICK

But how has this compact worked in operation? The States have properly enforced sound conservation laws as required. However, in open violation of the words of the compact, market demand has become the yardstick for determining maximum production.

In short, the compact States decide how much oil will be purchased at prevailing price on the basis of market forecasts. The Commission then sets this as the maximum production allowable and divides among the States the share each will be permitted to produce. State conservation commissions in turn divide up their production quotas among the various fields within each State.

Thus the oil industry has all the advantages of a monopoly.

Official documents of the compact prove that market demand, rather than conservation, is the prime yardstick in restricting production.

ORDER REDUCED PRODUCTION

Here is just one sample from the July 1 issue of Compact Comments, published by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Concerning the June 15 order reducing production, it said:

"The reduction was made (Arkansas conservation commissioner) Digby explained, after a State-wide hearing in mid-June showed reduced market demands."

IS CONGRESS TO BLAME?

How does Congress get into the picture? The Constitution says, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State. * * *"

It was Congress which consented to the oil compact. It was Congress which later passed the Connally Hot Oil Act that put the Federal Government in the business of policing and punishing violators of the compact.

Labor Relations: A Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by Emmet Arthur Hinkelman, Chicago, Ill.:

LABOR RELATIONS: A REVIEW

(By Emmet Arthur Hinkelman)

There are, or until recently, were some 60,000,000 jobholders in America constituting almost one-half the adult population of our country. And although only about one-fourth of these are organized, labor is now an established force which everybody recognizes, some with fear and trembling, and some with high expectation. The long, long struggle of the American workingman to measure his strength against the man of industry is no pleasant story. It is the story of grim, relentless warfare. Labor's recognition and such benefits as it now enjoys it had to achieve the hard way. Again and again labor resorted to force because the way of reasonableness and persuasion was almost always closed. It is only now that the avenues of arbitration, of mutual understanding and bargaining around the table are being opened up.

The program of labor has through all these years been very simple and very direct. It has been a struggle for a bigger pay envelop, for shorter hours, for better working conditions. And constantly overarching this struggle, and involved in it, is the struggle for the right to struggle at all. The struggle for better wages and better working conditions is of course a struggle for immediate necessities, short-range objectives. It has been only during the last 16 years that labor has been in a position to lay its plans for the achievement of that extra margin of security against sickness and unemployment and old age.

No other country in the world has a tradition quite comparable with our own; and no other country a similar economic and industrial situation. Our situation is unique, and unique, also, our opportunity. And what we are today is what 300 years of history have made us. As long ago as 163 years we had our first strike. That was in the year 1786, barely 3 years after we won our freedom as a Nation. Picketing started in 1800, and there has been picketing ever since. Andrew Carnegie's steelworkers in 1892 were the first to ask for "a look at the company's books." World War I ended in 1918, and the next year one-fifth of all American workers, organized and unorganized went on some kind of strike. Baseball players and social workers and policemen and school teachers, and many other workers have either seriously considered going on strike, or having actually

done so. About the only kind of strike we are said to have escaped since the end of World War II was experienced by the British in Malaya when the Buddhist priests in the Penang association refused to conduct further prayers without a 50-percent increase in wages.

What we have today, therefore, in the way of legislation, solid achievement and attitudes in labor-industry relations is the fruit and flowering of long years of discontent and struggle. In the course of the struggle there are a number of solutions which have been attempted on a large scale in our industrial relations. There is, for example, the powerful International Ladies Garment Workers Union, with its 355,000 members concentrated primarily in a relatively small section of New York City. With its hundreds of small factories and slum flats scattered around as it were, indiscriminately in apartment buildings, this industrial center was a haven for immigrants from Russia and Poland and other peoples of central and east Europe back in the 1880's and the 1890's. Sweatshops, cold in winter and hot in summer, always unfit for human habitation, engulfed them as they arrived. They worked from 60 to 75 hours per week, and for as little as $5 in wages. In those days the workers, locked into their rooms, were fined 25 cents for laughing, and 50 cents for looking out of windows. There were strikes, protests, demonstrations; but for years they came to nothing.

After 1900 these uprisings increased in violence, and women gave their wedding rings when they had nothing else to contribute to the struggle. There were disastrous fires, and police beatings, and secret conferences; and eventually the feeble beginnings of an organization were effectuated. It was not until 1933 when a third generation of these refugees from Europe began to feel their power. Sustained by a friendly President and a National Congress they grew strong and powerful. Nor did they hesitate to use their new-found strength. The ILGWU is now for all practical purposes in control of the industry at whose hands its members endured such long and bitter oppression. It is the union which takes the initiative with every new development, and which lays down the conditions. As a result there are union cooperatives, recreation centers, night schools, art, music, and drama classes, libraries and clubs. There are health and vacation benefits, and far-sighted provisions for old age. Along with these advantages to which the ILGWU has virtually helped itself, it has developed also a strong sense of responsibility toward the industry, knowing full well that each needs the other if either is to survive.

One must agree that this is neither a typical nor a model situation; and that, of course, is true as well of a second attempted "solution." Across the Hudson River from the ILGWU we have a development in which industry conferred benefits easily on a par with those which in the ladies garment industry labor was able to demand. It is the company union of Standard Oil, developed after more than a generation of bitter labor struggles. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., outstanding Christian layman found himself before World War I under bitter attack from many quarters because of the violence engendered by the unhappy labor-industry relations in his New Jersey company. There were violent outbursts, one after the other; and editorials, both secular and religious, asked whether it would not be possible for a "Christian industrialist" to set up working conditions and wages which would eliminate or at least minimize the labor conflict.

That was the challenge, and Mr. Rockefeller invited representatives of workers to air their grievances and to suggest remedies. That first step set the pattern until the 1930's when the NIRA and the Wagner Act made the organization of unions possible. To satisfy the workers Standard Oil introduced benefits which have set a standard for the Nation. These benefits sustain the workers against every possible form of insecurity. Not only have excellent wages, working conditions, safety, health, and old-age provisions been established, but the company's services extend to the home itself, in many and varied ways. A conclusion one might draw from the experiences of Standard Oil of New Jersey and the ILGWU is that where there is sufficient urgency and purpose, one can get at grievances and misunderstandings from either end: the industrial end, or the labor end. Real progress, however, cannot be achieved unless the problem is approached from both ends; and today, for the first time in American labor history, through governmental intervention and slightly improved public opinion, this is a definite possibility.

Another solution to the warlike and chaotic industrial relations offered itself when a Harvard professor, by the name of Elton Mayo, was invited by the Hawthorne division of the Western Electric Co. to discover, if he could, the motives and reasons for efficient workmanship and high morale. He was also asked to determine, if possible, the secrets of high and low production. Why do workers work well or indifferently? How to explain absenteeism? How to bring about greater efficiency and higher production? These were his goals.

Dr. Mayo laid his plans, enlisted the cooperation of a group of workers and went to work. He improved the lighting system, and introduced better ventilation; he experimented with varying degrees of temperature and humidity; and almost immediately production improved measurably. He thereupon pushed temperature and humidity above normal and below normal, and was surprised that that did not seem to make any difference in morale and production. He thereupon initiated refreshments, more frequent rest periods, better pay, shorter hours. Invariably production went up or was maintained at the achieved levels. It was thus that the experiment completely baffled the experimenters. There were no conclusions which they could draw from all their bulky records. At last it occurred to them to resume the old conditions of wages and work which prevailed before their task was undertaken; but the high production which had been achieved was maintained.

The experiment was obviously a failure, and Professor Mayo was forced to start all over. He abandoned the line of approach which he had been following, and proceeded to interview some 20,000 workers, asking them a varied assortment of direct and indirect questions about themselves, their work, their fellow workers and their home and family life. It soon became clear that the total life situation of the worker influenced his usefulness for better or worse. A happy home, a family catastrophe, a quarrel at breakfast time, worry over a mortgage, or some other disappointment or frustration—all these counted heavily for or against the morale and efficiency of the worker, as did his likes and dislikes of his fellows in the factory itself.

At last it became clear that production in the previous experiments invariably went up the moment the worker felt that his importance was recognized and his cooperation sought. Better temperature, light and ventilation, better pay, shorter hours were all important, but most important was esprit de corps. Nothing could keep production down when the worker felt that as a person in the total situation he counted. People living in a social void, and without a social function of which they are aware, may respond temporarily to better wages and other such inducements; but their response will not endure. The dignity and social significance of personality must be recognized if the total usefulness of the person is to be achieved. What he does must be done in cooperative relationship with others, and it must make sense. Drudgery itself, when it thus makes sense, can be borne, and even enjoyed. Where men are treated like slaves, even though they have streamlined factories, good wages, and other benefits, they work indifferently; where they are treated like fellow human beings they can endure discomforts and still produce at high levels of efficiency. Scientific progress has separated us from group relationships. We have been atomized and separated, each from the rest. The factory operates for profits and for mechanical efficiency. It reduces costs of production, but it overlooks the human being at the beltline. Inasmuch as he does not count for much, why should he try? The economists talk of rates and prices, the psychologist talks of vocational guidance, and the physiologist thinks in terms of nutrition and light and fatigue. All this is unavoidable and therefore important, but in the process the significance of groups, large and small, and of the individual, has been overlooked.

Such are the reflections of Elton Mayo. We need to communicate with each other and to develop a new status of human personality. As things are, it is the profit motive which is our basic drive when other motives ought to be allowed to operate. Men do not work just for profit, or just for power. And this is true of capitalists and workers alike. Men work for prestige, for deep and enduring inner satisfactions, for intangible loves and enthusiasms which cannot very easily be put into words, or bought with money. Often, however, profit is the only outlet men know, the gaining of money and power, the only means of achieving these other satisfactions until at last they have lost their capacity of recognizing any other means. In our best moments we are nevertheless haunted by the fact that recognition, mutual appreciation, a sense of responsibility fulfilled, friendship rooted in common tasks and responsibilities—these are the values which are strived for under the guise of striving for wages and profits. These we have lost, these must be regained.

Tribute to Hon. Matthew M. Neely From West Virginia Intelligencer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Eloquent Senator," published in the Wheeling Intelligencer on September 3, 1949. The editorial refers to our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ELOQUENT SENATOR

The newspaper which never has anything good to say of those with whom it may differ politically soon forfeits the esteem of the general public because of such rank partisanship. There are many political principles on

which we differ, for example, with United States Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, of West Virginia, and we have so stated from time to time. We recognize, however, that eloquent and forceful public speaking is one of the gentleman's virtues, even though some may regard some of his classical allusions as "outmoded."

A similar comment has not infrequently been made about the somewhat old-fashioned oratory of Winston Churchill. However, we notice that the whole of a recent article in the magazine Atlantic Monthly was devoted to an analysis of Churchill's histrionic effectiveness. In other words, the writer concluded that Mr. Churchill had proved a considerably better orator than his critics thought he was.

So with Mr. NEELY. Some kinds of classical allusions by skilled speakers are deathless, and those who prefer evanescent slang or the cheaper argot of the hour are apt to find, as time marches on, that the classical format has a way of holding its own. While perhaps, from a political viewpoint, we might differ with Mr. NEELY's enthusiasm over the outlook ahead of Senator McGrath in his new role as Attorney General of the United States, we nevertheless felt that Senator NEELY's farewell, as Mr. McGrath left those illustrious Halls of the Senate Chamber was something of a literary classic worth preserving for the present and posterity. So we ungrudgingly give it in full elsewhere on this page.

Senator NEELY is now approaching the sunset years of a lifetime devoted to public service. Whatever may have been the exigencies of practical politics in the past, Senator NEELY is now free of all such encumbrances, and charts his course by his own free spirit, which surely has looked upon the realities of human existence from an extraordinary vantage point. This does not mean that should Senator NEELY run again at the expiration of his term in 1955 we would not oppose him—more than likely we would—but signifies only that in the meanwhile we give the gentleman his due, in as gracious a manner, we trust, as is customarily his own.

Congress, Its Committees, and Its Power To Protect Our Basic Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time when Congress and its committees should function to preserve and protect the stability of our basic industries, it is now. When our Nation is over $250,000,000,000 in debt, and money is being drained from the Treasury to be spent all over the world, the Government needs every tax dollar that it can obtain from the profitable operation of all its domestic industries.

In these critical times the Congress and its duly constituted committees must not stand idly by and see our basic industries ruined by the misdirected effort and wasteful spending of the administrative departments. In considering Government policies there is inserted herewith a part of the record made at a hearing of a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee:

H. R. 4755, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1949.

This bill is H. R. 4755, authorizing the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs, and reads as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint a committee of not to exceed 11 members, to be known as the Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs, to consult and advise with him on matters pertaining to Indian affairs."

Without objection, further reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLE. What is the pleasure of the committee?

Mr. WHITE. I am going to ask more questions here. That I may be informed I would like to address my request to the chairman or acting chairman of the committee. In my uncertain state of mind at the moment I would like to have him enlighten me, if he will, in answer to a few questions.

Mr. ENGLE. Proceed; and I will do the best I can.

Mr. WHITE. I will say that I would like to know if this legislation confers any authority on this Commission we are establishing in respect to their findings or recommendations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ENGLE. The answer is "No." All this bill would do would be to make the advisory committee legal so that expenses and per diem can be collected while they are doing their work. At the present time the advisory committee is operating, but in a wholly unofficial capacity, which does not give them the right to ask for mileage and per diem, under existing law.

Mr. WHITE. Will this bill extend their authority any further than now?

Mr. ENGLE. No, sir; it will not. All this bill does is to pay them for their mileage and per diem. Some of them live great distances from the Capital.

Mr. WHITE. Then, actually, what the bill does is to pay them for expenses incurred——

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. In performing the functions to which they have been assigned?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. All this bill would do is to put them in a position to claim mileage and per diem in connection with their duties in their advisory capacity, which is solely advisory to the Indian service and has no binding effect either on the Indian service or on a committee of Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to explore that issue a little further, but I think the questions I have in mind can best be answered by some authority from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. However, I want to ask the chairman, in pursuing the policy to be undertaken in this bill, and extending it to other departments, why shouldn't we have such an advisory committee to the Department of the Interior, with proper authority, in some divisions of mining, for instance?

Mr. ENGLE. We do.

Mr. WHITE. There are advisory committees now in existence and authorized by law dealing with giving advice, according to the same plan as followed here, on the subject of mining, in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. What is the nature of that?

Mr. ENGLE. I referred to it before the gentleman came in. It is a committee which is called, I believe, the National Resources Advisory Board, or something of that sort. It advises the Department of the Interior with respect to mining matters.

Mr. WHITE. Do they make trips at the instigation or request of the Department of the Interior and come back and make reports, the same as the plan to be followed here?

Mr. ENGLE. I believe they do, and, as a matter of fact, they were here recently.

Mr. WHITE. And they are advisers in a semiofficial capacity?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Do they take any recognition of the policy of the Government in dealing with the mining industry and having a munitions board in foreign countries buying critical materials and such things as copper, lead, and zinc? Have they taken any recognition of the ECA program and its effect on the economic situation, where we are going into the Marshall plan countries and buying these metals? Are they doing anything about it? Are they getting any results from what they are doing?

Mr. ENGLE. I don't know, Mr. WHITE.

Mr. WHITE. Do you think it is of any interest to this committee or to this subcommittee?

Mr ENGLE. Not to this subcommittee.

Mr. WHITE. Not to this subcommittee? We are just here to pass bills?

Mr. ENGLE. I didn't say that. It comes under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. WHITE. Going to the program or policy of the Advisory Board with reference to the established agencies of the Government, or the departments, is there any such commission established, and would you favor it in the lumber and timber industries in the administration of our forest resources? Is there anything of that kind? Would that not be more relevant and more important that we have such advisory committees concerning lumber and timber resources of the United States and the utilization of those timber resources. What is your idea on that?

Mr. ENGLE. I believe there is such a committee, and in addition to that the Bureau of Land Management in connection with the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, does have advisory committees.

Mr. WHITE. Is there any way of sounding out the policies and views of that committee on the proposition, as Judge Franklin calls it, whereby the ECA has authorized the allocation of $10,000,000 of United States taxpayers' money for the purchase of timber of the United Kingdom, and the money is being distributed to Canada, to the detriment of the lumber industry in this country? Have we any way at all to protect our national economy in that situation? Does this gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. ENGLE. I think the problem with reference to the ECA would fall in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and not this committee.

Mr. WHITE. You think the welfare of our domestic industries and our lumbering and mining industries are dependent on the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. ENGLE. No, I didn't say that. I said with reference to that particular problem, that the actions of the ECA are not within the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. WHITE. Do you not think the authority of Congress, as represented by this committee, is such, that if there is a need anywhere, at any time, for an advisory committee to obtain the facts and give it to the Congress and to the Government departments and the people of the United States, that the hour is here now when $10,000,000 of our taxpayers' money are being handed over for the control of the lumber industry in the United Kingdom, and when United States taxpayers' money is being spent in Canada? Do you not think we have arrived at the hour when we should

have an advisory committee when somehow, this committee, in doing its duty, is unable to reach that situation?

Mr. ENGLE. I have been working on it, but not in connection with this committee.

Mr. WHITE. I am not talking about timber now. What about mining? What has happened to our mining industry? It is our income taxes that are supporting all this spending. Do you not think, if there is an advisory committee needed anywhere in the contacts between the Government and industry, that the time is now?

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman address himself to the matter before the committee? The matter before the committee is an Advisory Committee for the Indian Service. The gentleman has been all over the lot. Let us get down to this advisory committee.

What is the pleasure of the committee?

Mr. WHITE. In response to your question as to what is the plesaure of the committee, I would like to ask the Commissioner on Indian Affairs a few questions on this bill.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech prepared and delivered by the Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Representative in Congress from Milwaukee, Wis. His speech is entitled "The Welfare State," and it gives a very pertinent review of the development and growth of the concept of the welfare state, pointing out its thorough Americanism and its sound constitutionality.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is an especially appropriate occasion on which to lay a ghost which seems to be haunting some fearful men. This apparition has been variously hinted at, whispered about, denounced, decried. The tone of voice has had an interesting correlation with the wealth or industrial interests of the man who has spoken of it, but benighted or bigoted, frightened or frightening, the ghost story remains basically the same. Beware the welfare state. Beware. Beware.

Personally, I don't believe in ghosts. In fact, such legends usually arouse my curiosity and skepticism. So I decided to investigate this shadowy haunt and to determine what was really behind the fluttering sheets and clanking chains that frightened men were using to try to frighten others more.

It was a simple exorcism. When I had pulled up the blinds and let a little light into the corners of the room there wasn't any ghost at all. All that was left were the slightly ridiculous trappings of fear, looking more like a scarecrow than a menace.

But underneath this pale disguise I did make an important discovery. I found the welfare state all right, but it didn't frighten me. It made me proud. Here was a theory of government that was as American as our Constitution, as democratic as Lincoln, as forward looking as Roosevelt. It was a state that took seriously its responsibilities toward all its citizens and that had developed organizations, techniques, and means for making democracy effective in the unequal places.

I found the welfare state consistent with Lincoln's statement that "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well for themselves."

The ghost raisers mutter that the welfare state is a dangerous—an un-American—theory. The implication—sometimes the open charge—is made that it is synonymous with foreign communism—with Stalinism. Well, let us look at that, without its masquerade.

The concept of the welfare state started with the inception of our country. It began with the Constitution of the United States, which charges the Government with the responsibility of the general welfare of its people. That was one of the great differences between this new country and the tired nations of Europe in the eighteenth century. It was then perhaps a new and revolutionary idea for a government to be established, not only by the people but for the people. I expect that in that sense I, too, am a revolutionary. I still believe in our Constitution.

On the basis of that clause in our Constitution, the Government has done many things for the welfare of its people. As early as 1806, Thomas Jefferson, as President of the United States, asked Congress to approve a donation of lands for a national establishment for education. Remember, in those days the grant of lands was not merely a method of providing free rent but was actually used as a financial asset—an asset, indeed, much more valuable than the grant of a specific sum of money would have been. Jefferson pointed out that such a land grant should, in fact, be land that will be among the earliest to produce the necessary income. Thus, in the earliest years of our Republic we were not only thinking of the general welfare of the people but we were already implementing that concept with subsidies granted by the Government.

The grants for education were among the first that could be considered as fitting even the narrow definition of "welfare." But the Government continued granting eventually 250,000,000 acres of land for various purposes. For education, for wagon roads, so that everyone, not only the rich, could travel more easily; for canals and levees, for public buildings, for railroads. And for those who were not able to make an adequate living in the industrial areas of the east, the Homestead Act of 1862 gave vast areas of public lands, apportioned into individual units. Surely, this act, planned and carried out as a Government bounty to individuals, can hardly be considered as anything but a public welfare program. Here the State was "meddling" with a program that was directly and purely in the interest of hundreds of thousands of its less successful citizens.

In 1949 the Federal Government no longer gave land grants to help the unemployed. The method of payment has changed. But land or money, income or income-producing property, there is no change in principle. And even a Federal grant of money is far from a new idea for Americans.

As early as 1887, Congress provided money grants to the States for agricultural experiments—in order to benefit farmers and the general public who consumed farm products. In 1890 money grants were given for instruction in land-grant colleges. As early as 1911 grants were provided for the forest service, and long before anything so dangerous to the status quo—or should I say the status quo-ers—as the New Deal, the Government was already giving subsidies to States for 15 major purposes.

It is, therefore, not alien to our American traditions or to our patriotism for our Government to be interested in the welfare of its people. On the contrary, our Congress and our statesmen, throughout our history, have always assumed the responsibility for trying to meet the needs of our citizens. All our citizens. Even those who are now complaining so bitterly that the Government is threatening our way of life because it doesn't "let business alone."

I wonder whether they really mean they want to be let alone. Does business honestly not want to continue getting the help the Government has been giving it ever since 1791? It was in that year that our then Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, a gentleman our most convinced conservatives have established as a symbol of "free enterprise"—addressed the House of Representatives to make an impassioned plea for Federal subsidies to manufacturers. He argued that,

"The propriety of stimulating by rewards the invention and introduction of useful improvements, is admitted without difficulty."

And yet what a cry of terror arose when in 1949 the administration talked of granting loans to small manufacturers.

During the nineteenth century the Government gave to the railroads a total of 179,000,000 acres of land. And now the railroad companies think it unfair they should pay property taxes.

More recently the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank have assisted industry at least as much as other legislation has assisted industrial workers. And at the moment, even the Republican Party, in the person of its new chairman, Mr. Guy Gabrielson, must be willing, even anxious, that the Government continue at least one aspect of its welfare program, since the Carthage Hydrocol Corp., which Mr. Gabrielson heads, has received a total of more than $18,000,000 in loans from the RFC.

So the specter of the welfare state as a sort of foreign agent threatening American institutions can hardly be accepted by even the most credulous.

But our believers in ghosts warn us that there are other dangers. The "long arm of the Federal Government", they weep, is choking the life out of private enterprise. Government controls are depriving Horatio Alger's bootblacks of their right to become millionaires. They do not mention that even in the infinitely less complicated economy of the nineteenth century these heroes worked at sweatshop wages and only in books did very many of them become kings of industry. The real-life workers remained in the sweatshops until the Government got that antisocial aspect of our life eliminated.

They passionately insist that a welfare state "cannot exist side by side with capitalism" because it is based on the necessity of Government regulation. And Government regulation means the death of free enterprise.

All right. Let's conjure up their sort of genii. What would this country be like with no Government regulations?

We would, of course, have almost no corporation taxes. We would have no control of wages and hours, and working conditions. We would have no—heavens, no—protection of labor unions. We would have no control of farm prices. We would have no protection of small business against monopolies. We would have no protection of workers against unemployment, against industrial accidents, against old age, against illness.

Up to this point, this type of ghost does not frighten them. Indeed, this is what they mean by their "let-us-alone" policy. This is what they are fighting to obtain. In the first 6 months of the Eighty-first Congress, business interests have carried on this fight to the tune of about $4,000,000 expended in lobbying activities. Let me itemize some of the things for which this money was spent.

More than half a million dollars was paid to fight against a health program that would

give to the working man the possibility of getting medical care without mortgaging his future.

More than $300,000 was spent by big business—and this does not include the National Association of Manufacturers with their $5,000,000 budget—to preserve the Taft-Hartley Act. More than that, to push for infinitely more suffocating controls on labor. Did you know, for example, that big business had two of its spokesmen appear recently before a Senate investigating committee to advocate the outlawing of all industry-wide bargaining, the legal abolition of union shop, the repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, the elimination of all national unions?

Around a quarter of a million was spent by various real-estate groups and apartment-house owners in a vain attempt to prevent any public-housing legislation. Another quarter million was cheerfully paid by groups fighting against public power and the subversive consequences of low consumer rates.

Money was spent combating every measure that was planned in the interests of the general public. Whenever possible issues were muddled so that even in Congress many representatives of the people became confused. An unfortunate case in point is a bill which I'm sure is very close to the interests of our union. I'm speaking of the pending legislation on Federal aid to education, where the waters have been so muddied that it may now be in danger of not passing at all. Let me remind you that there are really only two main issues involved. After the sound and the fury the only questions that remain are, First, do we want teachers' salaries to be raised? And second, are auxiliary services, such as the health services proposed in a bill I introduced, to be available to every child? But the Chamber of Commerce would have you believe that the passage of a Federal aid to education bill would create a Frankenstein monster which would regulate the thinking of all American children. That is sheer nonsense.

The casualness with which these people have spent such huge sums to try to stem the tide of progress shows that they would be in delighted agreement if it was proposed to abolish this sort of Government regulation. This is the sort they dress up as the scarecrow of nationalization or socialization. This is what they mean by the welfare state.

But let us carry out their proposal to its logical conclusion. No Government control would also mean no controls over labor. Is that what they want? It would mean the shutting down of the RFC. Would Mr. Gabrielson like that? It would involve stopping guaranteed home builders' loans as well as stopping low-cost housing. Ah, this sounds like a different story. That is not what they meant at all. Of course, the Government should protect their interests.

In other words, they are not really against Government control. They're against Government control of the powerful for the sake of the weak. What business and industry fear is the state that is concerned with the welfare of all its people.

Perhaps, after all, it is not a ghost they see, but an hallucination. Certainly, they show many other symptoms of a confusion bordering upon insanity.

They say: We want no Government controls—on us. Please may we have as much Government control as possible—on the workers.

They say: We want free enterprise it is the basis of capitalism. But we must not do anything to control monopolies, which will swallow up free enterprise.

They say: We must maintain a democratic way of life. But don't by any means be guided by the mandate of the majority of the people.

They say: Economic security is a dreadful thing, it kills incentive. But please, may we have another loan to industry.

They not only sound confused. This schizophrenic attitude has almost confused me. What is dangerous about a government that directs its energies toward helping its people? What is subversive about the elected official who works for the people who elected him?

Are we supposed to pass housing legislation to put more millions into the pockets of the apartment-house owners and building contractors—or to enable the average American citizen to live decently? Are we to reduce taxes so that the monster corporations can make more fantastic profits—so that their gilded youth may buy an extra yacht, a second Cadillac—or are we to use tax money to enable the man and woman who have grown old on the job to die in the poorhouse? Are we to break the back of organized labor, so that monopolies can cut wages and raise prices?

What those few criers in the night are opposing sounds suspiciously like democracy. They seem to be talking about the interest of the few instead of the many. Their bogy, or hallucination—or could it possibly after all be merely double talk—seems to be used only to protect self-interest, not the country. The goals of the detractors become strangely like the targets against which our forefathers fought in 1776. They sound terribly similar to the smoke-screen tactics against which we fought in 1941.

To me, the only safeguard against real annihilation, the only positive approach to the proven dangers of communism and fascism, is the welfare state. A state which is concerned with real protection of free enterprise—to the point of controlling monopolies——but also with the protection of its citizens from government by corporation. We must have a government which wants to raise the standard of living for everyone—not just increase the wealth of the industrialists and financiers. We must have recognition of man's right to work at a living wage—not just his right to starve.

Our opponents try to make the name become a sneer by their tone of voice. They scoff at those of us who believe in the welfare state, giving an intonation to the word "welfare" that suggests something that has just crawled out from under a stone, that implies at the best an incompetent dreamer, at the worst a dangerous revolutionary They snicker at the reformers and the "do-gooders."

This kind of war on words make little sense to me. Perhaps because of my own academic background, I prefer to learn through a dictionary what words mean. I see nothing wrong in expecting a government to do good. I find nothing incompetent or unrealistic about attempting reforms of known evils. I consider the welfare state as a realistic, twentieth century bulwark for democracy.

And since I do believe in democracy, I think that even those who apparently lost their faith in it have a right to state their case and to try to achieve the ends in which they believe. This is the way they can do it. Let them elect to the next Congress men who will carry out their wishes. Let them repeal all the social-security legislation, cancel unemployment compensation, stop old-age insurance, and workmen's compensation, abolish the minimum-wage laws, and cease public-health measures. Let them abolish all Federal controls on monopolies and end farm subsidies. Let them herald the return of the slums and the sweatshops of illiteracy and superstitution.

Then and only then will they be able to abolish the welfare state.

How many Americans do you think will vote for that? How many Americans do you think will support the persons who want it? How many Americans do you think are afraid of the welfare state?

The Wright Morrow Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, in order that my fellow Members of Congress may be fully informed, I am inserting with these remarks an editorial from the Corpus Christi Voice-Chronicle entitled "The Wright Morrow Controversy," which was written by Judge Warren B. Phillips, one of our oustanding Texas Democrats. As in every great and growing organization, the Democratic Party in Texas has suffered from disagreements which have not promoted the harmony which all Democrats ardently desire. Judge Phillips very clearly proves the wisdom of the National Democratic Committee in its action regarding our Texas committeeman, Mr. Wright Morrow, who has worked so unselfishly and tirelessly for unity within the party in Texas.

Now that any cause for controversy has been dispelled, all earnest Democrats will join together in support of the man who has done more than any other to rebuild a cohesive, aggressive Democratic Party in Texas, Mr. Wright Morrow.

The editorial follows:

THE WRIGHT MORROW CONTROVERSY

(By Warren B. Phillips)

Monday, August 22, late in the afternoon I received a long-distance call from Wright Morrow in Washington requesting that I come to Washington immediately and appear for him before the credentials committee of the Democratic National Committee the following day. I was pleased and felt highly honored that he would make this request and I made hurried arrangements, taking from my library such books as I would need to present the legal questions involved, made an all-night plane trip and reached Washington early Tuesday morning. I checked in at the Mayflower Hotel and managed to get a few hours' sleep before the meeting of the committee at 2 p. m. This meeting lasted until the early hours of Wednesday morning.

I was permitted to make the closing argument in favor of Wright Morrow and presented a discussion of the legal questions as well as such questions of fact as I thought would be worth mentioning. Knowing the committee was tired and the hour very late we made our arguments short but the importance of the matter was so great that we did present fully and carefully what we thought were the most important.

Briefly stated, Wright Morrow was selected by the May convention, 1948, at Brownwood to replace Hon. Myron Blalock who had served with distinction for several years but did not seek reelection. Morrow was opposed by Hon. Tom Miller of Austin, an outstanding and distinguished Democrat and only these two names were offered. Long before the roll call was finished and at a time when Morrow had a substantial lead and the Miller supporters realized they had no chance his name was withdrawn and a motion made and carried to make the nomination unanimous. Thereafter Morrow was elected as national committeeman for Texas for a 4-year term by the Democratic National Convention. Provision is made for contests but none was offered. He took his seat at the meeting of the National Committee im-

mediately after the adjournment of the convention and was then in office for a 4-year term and subject to removal by no power on earth save and except the Democratic National Committee itself and then only under section 11 for disloyalty to the party.

Thereafter the September convention in Fort Worth attempted to remove Wright Morrow from his office and substitute another in his place. That effort having produced no results in November the State Democratic Executive Committee attempted to remove him and similar efforts were made by the Association of Precinct Chairmen and the Association of County Chairmen. All of these efforts failed and eventually Byron Skelton appeared before the meeting of the national committee seeking to contest Morrow's right to a place on the committee.

The Skelton forces were well represented by Mr. Skelton himself, Mrs. Marion Storm, of Austin; Mrs. J. Edwin Smith, of Houston; Mr. Murphy, a county chairman from San Angelo; Hon. Gilbert Adams, of Beaumont; and Wright Patman, J. M. Combs, and W. R. Poage, the three last named being Members of Congress from Texas. Their case was presented at great length and Mr. Morrow appeared in his own behalf and in addition, Raymond Buck, of Fort Worth, and the writer appeared as his representatives with O. C. Christie, of Mineral Wells; Travis Bryan, of Bryan; Forrest Kyle, of Bangs; and Mrs. H. H. Weinert, the national committeewoman for Texas who stated to the committee that she had worked with Mr. Morrow and found him a faithful and willing worker. WINGATE LUCAS, a Texas Congressman, testified for Mr. Morrow as a character witness.

The credentials committee ruled that the action of the State convention, State committee, and the other bodies attempting to remove Mr. Morrow were illegal and of no force and effect for any purpose and the only question they had to pass on was whether he had been disloyal to the party. While this ruling is undoubtedly the law and was the correct and proper ruling, one out of nine members of the committee wanted to follow the action of the September convention. Eight out of the nine members voted as ruled by the chairman of the committee and the report of the credentials committee was made to the Democratic National Committee itself on Wednesday to the effect that no action be taken in the matter whatever. This ruling of course in substance denied the contest and left Mr. Morrow a member of the committee. I might add in this connection that while one out of the nine members wanted to follow the action of the State convention regardless of its invalidity, no member of the committee wanted to find Morrow guilty of any charges of disloyal conduct.

When the report was read to the national committee (around 100 members were present) Hon. Byron C. Allen, of Minnesota moved that the report be disapproved and that Mr. Morrow be denied his seat. Thereafter Hon. J. Howard McGrath, the national chairman and who was then presiding, stated to the members of the committee that he could say of his own personal knowledge that Wright Morrow had rendered valuable service. Mr. McGrath had not appeared before the credentials committee, had not been called as a witness, and he made this statement voluntarily so the membership of the committee would be properly informed. Then Mr. McHale, of Indiana, chairman of the credentials committee, moved that the motion be laid on the table. There had been some delay before Mr. Allen was able to secure a second for his motion, but eventually it was seconded by the committeeman from the District of Columbia. By a voice vote the motion to table carried by a tremendous majority and apparently only the man who made the motion and the one who seconded it voted against the motion to table. There the controversy finally ended. It is worthy of note that the one member of the credentials committee who had not agreed to the report because of his desire to go along with the recommendation of the September convention did not vote against the motion to table.

The testimony before the credentials committee brought out that Wright Morrow had either raised or contributed around $200,000 for the campaign at a time when the outlook was gloomy and it was extremely difficult to raise money; that he had devoted his entire time for 6 months to the work of the party; that he had worked in the New York City office of the national committee and that it was due to his efforts that the money was raised to put President Truman's famous Pittsburgh speech on the air; as one fellow said, they could not have done the job without his help and that statement was made by the one in charge of the fund raising for the radio program. Some of us did some work for the party last fall. I did a little myself. I have been told by high officials of the party that my small efforts were outstanding. I did help raise $3,000 but it was under Wright Morrow's direction. I know this, it was hard to get money. We had a hard time securing one in this district to act as chairman of the Truman-Barkley Club. I took the job after several others had been offered a chance at it. We know it takes money to run a campaign, and it takes money to put speeches on the radio. I personally believe that Mr. Truman's various trips and his radio speeches turned the tide and I know that the raising of the money which made these radio speeches possible was the greatest contribution any man could ever make to the Democratic cause.

Last winter when in Washington for the inauguration I talked to quite a number of employees of the Democratic National Committee and I talked to some of them on this trip. Regardless of the unfavorable statements made against Wright Morrow by his enemies, I have never yet found a worker of the national headquarters who did not believe in him and have not found a member of the national committee who knew him but was his friend. I firmly believe that he was a true and faithful supporter of the Truman-Barkley ticket at all times, that he rendered a greater service and contributed more to winning the election than any one in his position had ever done before and I also believe that his work was the contributing cause of the turning of the tide which resulted in a great Democratic victory when all signs pointed to a disastrous defeat. All Texas Democrats should be proud of the work of their national committeeman.

Many good Democrats were misled. I do not doubt that many good Democrats have opposed Wright Morrow and that they were sincere in their opposition. However, it is hard for me to understand why any real Democrat who was informed as to the true facts could be against him. His defense was conducted along sound, ethical lines with no attempt to slander or belittle the opposition. Whatever the motives I am convinced that this controversy has greatly injured the cause of liberal democracy in Texas and that efforts, tremendous efforts, which have been utterly wasted in this foolish squabble could have been used and with success to secure more liberal legislation which had been promised and which the people are entitled to.

I found universal approval of the promotion of Tom Clark to the Supreme Court, for the selection of McGrath as Attorney General and of Bill Boyle as national chairman. Members of the committee who had supported some other political party were removed from their places. The Democratic National Committee did a fine job last fall. I believe it is thoroughly competent and thoroughly loyal and no Texas Democrat should ever worry about this committee allowing anyone to serve who it not deserving of a place on it.

Wright Morrow had a chance to dodge this contest and take a position of great honor in the service of his country. He declined the promotion and stood his ground. He deserves the commendation and support of all loyal Democrats and I believe as time goes by he will have their complete and unanimous support. I am very proud that I had a part in defending this faithful Democrat.

World Federation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent statements which I have read in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 64, introduced by me and endorsed by 100 Members of the House, was recently made by Mr. W. T. Holliday, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio. House Concurrent Resolution 64, which would place the Congress on record as favoring the development of the United Nations into a limited world federation with powers to preserve and enforce the peace, has attracted strong editorial support throughout the country.

Mr. Holliday's statement appeared in the August edition of the American Bar Association Journal. It was prepared from a speech which he delivered to the Texas bar in Houston. Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include Mr. Holliday's article from the Bar Association Journal:

Even lawyers may sometimes forget that law and courts are the bedrock of our domestic society. The late John Chipman Gray, of Harvard, used to admonish his students every year, at an early point in his course on evidence, that they should bear in mind that the fundamental purpose of the courts is to keep the peace. Improvement of law and justice is a corollary purpose, but the fundamental function of courts is to keep the peace.

From their earliest, most primitive days, men found that they could not live in a state of anarchy. When they first came out of the caves or down from the trees to live with other men, they found they could have no security, no freedom, no peace, except under a rule of law, some kind of government. Outside the tribe or clan was anarchy, and this resulted in continual intertribal wars until, by force or agreement, tribes combined. This process of expansion of the group and removal of intergroup anarchy, continued over the ages until nations removed the no man's land of anarchy between baronies and principalities and provincial states, and nations became the units of law and order.

But this expansion of the area of law and order stopped at national borders. Today we still have the no man's land between nations, in which there is nothing but anarchy so crude that people would not endure it for one moment within the borders of their nations.

POLITICAL UNITY WILL FOLLOW WORLD'S PHYSICAL UNITY

We are in the midst of a world revolution which makes the continuance of such international anarchy inconsistent, to put it

mildly, with civilization's survival. The industrial revolution brought the world closer together through interdependence for raw materials and manufactured products. The rapid technological and scientific developments of more recent years have reduced the world to a single unit physically and economically, although not socially, culturally or politically. Social and cultural differences can continue without essential danger to the world, but a world which has physically become one cannot have peace and security except through a political unity which removes the no man's land of anarchy between nations. The physical unity of the world will inevitably produce some sort of political unity.

It is frequently said, however, that men are so pugnacious that they like war, and so there is no hope of ending war until human nature changes. History shows that this is just not true. Men continually fight when they are in a state of anarchy; they cannot help it. But when the area of anarchy is removed and law and order take its place, the resort to force and violence becomes so rare that it is news, and in modern society gets headlines in the newspapers.

It has been a peculiar quality of man that when law requires him to settle his disputes in courts of law he accepts as a matter of course the decisions of the courts, even though they be against him. Not so many centuries ago in England there was a rather formalized trial by combat. If a dispute arose, the contestants put on armor, took up weapons, and gave God a chance to decide. If you were killed, you were wrong and you lost your lawsuit. Trial by combat ceased, not because government stepped in with its coercive power, but because it also provided justice and courts which people found to be a satisfactory—in fact, a more satisfactory—substitute for decision by force.

International disputes are as inevitable as disputes among individuals. Disputes, whether legitimate or the challenge of brigands and gangsters, have to be resolved and disposed of. If no other method is available, human disputes will be decided by force. The essence of law and order is the prevention of decision of disputes by force and the substitution of decision by courts.

From the point of view of sheer logic, therefore, the problem of prevention of war is very simple. All we have to do is duplicate what has been done within the borders of nations and require all international disputes to be decided under law by judicial tribunals that are instruments of a world government.

APPLICATION OF WORLD FEDERATION WILL NOT BE SIMPLE

Because of the simplicity of the fundamental principle, advocates of world federation have been accused of the sin of oversimplification. But I know of no world federalist who claims that the application of the principle is simple. It is very complicated and difficult.

Sheer logic does not take us very far in this world. Emotions are a far stronger driving power than logic. Yet I venture to suggest that in the present crisis men's deepest emotions are moving in the same direction as logic. The people of the world are frightened at the ghastly possibilities of modern war. They yearn for peace as never before. They cannot muster much patriotic enthusiasm for an armament race that threatens to make each nation a garrison state, involving regimentation and a crushing financial burden which can lead only to economic ruin.

It is sometimes said that fear is not an enduring and sustaining force. But in that statement the word "fear" is used in the sense of panic. Fear, in the sense of an intelligent recognition of consequences, is as sustaining a power in human life as is the hope of reward. The fear of the consequences of modern scientific war can be as sustaining a force as the many other fears of consequences which control human behavior.

The problems of creating and maintaining a world juridical order are very complex and difficult indeed. But the alternative is suicide.

War has become obsolete as a method of deciding international disputes. No one can win a modern war. As General Arnold has said, modern war is like fire. You can prevent a fire, but no one can win a fire.

PRESENT WORLD REVOLUTION WILL BRING WORLD GOVERNMENT

We are living in the midst of a world revolution. The character and quality of war have become revolutionized. Instead of being considered exempt, noncombatants and civilians have become the prime object of attack. To accomplish wholesale destruction of civilians, we have developed atomic, chemical, and biological weapons whose power dwarfs the imagination. At long last man has developed instruments with which he can destroy his world. And he will try to do it—unless the power to do so is taken from him.

Make no mistake about it, there is going to be a world government. The only question is what kind of government it will be and how it will be achieved. There will either be a Russian-dominated world or an American-dominated world, or a reasonable, limited federal world government arrived at intelligently and cooperatively, under which the forces of science can be diverted from destruction to providing a richer life for mankind.

At present our Government apparently sees only the threat of a Russian-dominated world. But in seeking to prevent that disaster by concentration upon the policy of "Stop Russia," our policy makers are thinking in purely negative terms and are considering only the alternative possibilities of a Russian- or an American-dominated world. Evidently no thought is being given to the possibility of a world federation peacefully and cooperatively arrived at. Our policy makers are cold, if not contemptuous, toward any suggestion of world federation.

Probably no one should blame them for this. It is hardly to be expected that government officials in a democracy would consider the transfer of the slightest bit of our sovereignty to a world federation except under the pressure of public opinion.

UNITED STATES MUST LEAD THE WAY TO PEACE AND SECURITY

The urgent need in the world today is the development of public opinion in the United States in support of the substitution of an international system of security for the war-making power of individual nations. The first question today is not what about Russia, or what about the difficulties of attaining a world federation, because those questions are academic until the people of the United States make up their minds as to what they want. Only when the United States, under the pressure of public opinion, offers to lead the way down the only road to peace and security will the Soviet Union have its first chance to relieve its people of the burdens of armament and the fear of modern war, and to demonstrate whether its intentions are peaceful or otherwise.

There is little question of what would be the choice of the peoples of western Europe. The leading statesmen in France, Belgium, and Great Britain, including both Bevin and Churchill, have clearly stated that the only reasonable solution is world law and order. The recent constitutions of Italy and France expressly provide for entry into a world organization.

In corroboration of my statement that this critical decision rests upon the people, I would like to quote the following statement of Sir Stafford Cripps:

"World federation has hitherto been looked upon as a very long-term objective, but the atomic bomb has telescoped history and made it impossible for us to await long years of acute danger of war, because from that war civilization and mankind cannot survive. We must therefore approach the problem as if we have lived through a long preparatory stage, and are now confronted with the ultimate solution. This is a matter which must be taken up by everyone and not merely by a few overworked statesmen. It is essentially a job in which the driving power must come from the common men and women all over the world. I do not doubt the willingness of statesmen, but the task is so great and so urgent that we cannot hope to get it carried through unless we have the driving power of world public opinion behind it."

No advocate of world federation, therefore, should be discouraged by cynical remarks that there are too many practical impediments to the realization of the goal. The first hurdle is not Russia but public opinion in the free states. The difficulties which lie in the way of achieving a reasonable and limited world federation can only be dissolved when public opinion understands the problem. We must realize that there can be no peace and no security except under a rule of law, and we must understand the present deficiencies of the United Nations and what corrections are needed in order to strengthen it into a real juridical order, and enable it to offer any hope of preventing war.

REAL PROBLEM IS NOT RUSSIA'S VETO POWER

Too much emphasis has been placed upon the veto power, so that too many people have the feeling that if the veto power were removed the UN could function as a real governmental organization.

If the veto power were entirely removed, the UN would still be nothing but a league, a multilateral treaty. That device has been tried time and time again, from the leagues of Greece to the League of Nations. Every league was set up to prevent war, and every one ended in war. A league, for its successful operation, is dependent upon the unanimous agreement of the most powerful members, and any member can back out shooting at any time it desires.

The United Nations has no lawmaking power, and this was the inevitable consequence of the one-nation one-vote representation in the General Assembly. This is a distorted conception of sovereignty. It places a premium upon political subdivision. The 20 nations south of the Rio Grande, with a population of about 140,000,000, have 20 votes, as against 1 vote for the same population in the United States. Clearly the General Assembly could not be given legislative authority without an equitable representation of the constituent states. This could not be upon a mere basis of population, because under that rule the backward peoples of the world would control the legislature. Before the General Assembly could be given legislative power there would have to be some weighted representation, taking into account not only population but the economic and social and political development of the respective nations.

Under the present United Nations Charter, however, changing the voting rules, together with elimination of the veto, would gain nothing. The UN is provided with no power to make, administer, and enforce laws binding both on individuals and national governments. Enforcement action by the Security Council can only be taken against an entire nation, and the armed forces for such action must be furnished by constituent members. As Walter Lippmann has pointed out, this presents the anomaly of asking the people of constituent nations to go cold-bloodedly to war against an aggressor nation for the avowed purpose of preventing war. The United Nations only remedy for war is war itself.

Furthermore, the International Court of Justice established by the UN Charter is a wholly inadequate instrument for the judicial settlement of disputes or for the trial of individuals initiating aggression. Only governments can appeal to this court, and they are free to ignore the decision of the court if they see fit to do so.

Furthermore, the UN lacks any police force of its own. It has to rely on the willingness of member nations to furnish the necessary armed forces. Under the Charter, each nation is free to indulge in an armament race, and the decision as to whether such armed forces will be used to support or oppose a recommendation of the UN is entirely within the discretion of the individual nations. It is clear that the UN does not have any power of its own and therefore it can offer no security to its members. It can only debate and consider and recommend.

These deficiencies make it rather clear as to what powers a world federation should have. There must be a constitution, clearly stating and limiting the federation's powers. There must be a legislative body, with equitable representation of the members, with power to enact laws within the constitutional limitations which shall be binding not only upon the constituent states but upon the individual citizens. There must be an executive department to administer and enforce the laws. There must be a judicial department, having jurisdiction over disputes not only between nations but between citizens of different nations, with authority to interpret both the constitution and the laws enacted thereunder. And finally, there must be a police force, to which are surrendered all the instruments of mass destruction, leaving to the constituent states only sufficient armed forces for internal policing.

This world organization should be federal in form. Only a federal government is adaptable to a great area containing varieties of economic and social and cultural conditions.

I think that federalism, which was first implemented on any extended scale in the United States, is one of man's greatest inventions. It contains two essential ideas. First, there is delegated to the federal government exclusive jurisdiction only over those matters as to which the component states are powerless to deal by themselves. On the world scene nations are powerless by themselves to deal with the problem of the prevention of war.

The second characteristic is that the federal government, within its limited jurisdiction, has authority not only over the constituent states but over the individual citizens of those states. It is not necessary for the federal government to go to war against a constituent state in order to enforce its laws. It can proceed, through courts and marshals within the state, against the individuals who are breaking the law. In the United States, for example, our Federal Government does not have to ask the States to enforce its antitrust laws, and it does not have to go to war against a State if there is a failure to comply with that request. It proceeds directly against the individual lawbreakers.

This principle of individual liability has already been recognized in the Nuermberg trials. Under a federal world government, fomentors of aggressive war could be tried before instead of after a devastating war.

The foregoing, of course, is a mere rudimentary outline. In any constitutional convention to create a world order there would have to be hammered out by debate and compromise the basic jurisdiction which would be given to such an organization. It is idle at this time to try to go into details, because such details would obscure the fundamental project.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS WOULD NEED WIDER JURISDICTION THAN OUR COURTS

Undoubtedly, however, the federal jurisdiction would have to go beyond the mere prevention of war by force. That would be only a police state. As I pointed out before, if decision of disputes by force is to be prevented, some other method of decision must be provided. Disputes have to be disposed of. This probably would require judicial tribunals having a wider jurisdiction than that to which we are accustomed in countries with Anglo-Saxon legal traditions.

I can hear some legal critics say that most of the international disputes are political in nature, and that political questions are not justiciable. All that phrase means is that the courts to which we are accustomed do not have jurisdiction over political disputes. These are left to the control of the political part of the government.

However, any judicial tribunal can operate upon any dispute that falls within its jurisdiction, and it probably would be necessary, in a world organization, to have tribunals with jurisdiction over political disputes. The decisions, however, would be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the World. This undoubtedly would require some invasion of internal sovereignty of constituent states, but we ought not to be afraid to face that issue.

There is one bugaboo that should be disposed of. Some people fear that the creation of a world organization would involve giving it control over immigration. I see no such necessity. One of the purposes of national governments is to protect the cultural, social, and political standards of their people, and that function and right of nations must be preserved else there is no hope for world organization. These are not matters pertinent to the prevention of war.

UN IS BEST VEHICLE FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

Weak as it is, the UN must be preserved. It is the vehicle which offers the best means for achieving a world organization with sufficient power to enact, interpret, and enforce laws for the prevention of war.

Article 109 of the UN Charter furnishes a method for a review and reconstruction of the Charter.

It provides that a general conference for reviewing the Charter may be called by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council. There is no veto on the calling of such a conference.

Article 109 further provides that any alteration of the Charter may be recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference. At this time there is no veto.

Article 109 then provides that such recommended alteration shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. In other words, there is no veto power until the new constitution has gone to the constituent nations for ratification.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION FACED SAME PROBLEMS

Now, it is an interesting fact that the framers of our own United States Constitution were confronted with the same limitation. The Articles of Confederation required any amendment to be ratified by all of the 13 States, and the Continental Congress, in calling the Constitutional Convention, imposed the same requirement. Yet it seemed obvious to our founding fathers that those stringent conditions could not be complied with. Rhode Island did not even send delegates to the Convention, and it seemed almost certain that the great State of New York would not ratify. The Convention met the problem by inserting in their proposed Constitution its own ratification provision: to wit, that it should go into effect as to ratifying States when 9 of the 13 States had ratified. The great States of New York and Virginia did not ratify until after the Constitution had thus gone into effect. They soon joined, however. Rhode Island, on the other hand, stayed out for over a year.

It has been suggested by a good many people that that procedure might be followed in amending or altering the Charter of the United Nations. This would result in two worlds instead of one if Russia stayed out, but at least the issue between the east and the west would be clearly joined, and it would be on a single moral issue instead of the myriad sordid issues that now confront the world.

However, for the present, at least, it is questionable whether the risk should be run that Russia might thus withdraw from the UN. General Marshall appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in the first part of May 1947 to testify in regard to a group of joint resolutions urging the President to take the initiative in the calling of a conference for review of the UN Charter for the purpose of strengthening it. General Marshall stated that it was imperative to try to keep Russia in the UN and thus preserve it as a forum for discussion. He added that in his opinion, if the United States Government attempted to call such a conference under article 109 at this time, not only would Russia decline to go along but many of the other nations outside Russia's orbit would likewise decline because of their fear of its effect upon Russian action.

To meet this situation some of the world federalists who appeared before the committee advocated that negotiations be promptly opened up with Russia on the highest diplomatic levels, offering to proceed under article 109 to develop a world organization which could offer real security in place of the present struggle of power politics. Never yet has the world been told that the United States would be willing to take such high ground.

In regard to this proposal Thomas K. Finletter, of the New York bar, said to the Foreign Affairs Committee: "I believe that the time has come for us to make the great offer under article 109 which I have referred to. Such an offer, far from being taken amiss by Russia, should reassure her. For us to make this offer now should create a new atmosphere in our relations with the Soviets." Mr. Finletter emphasized that even if there were only one chance in a million that Russia would accept, we ought to try.

If Russia should refuse, it was then suggested to the House committee that the free nations should proceed under article 51 to form a regional federation of a type which, upon enlargement, could serve as a real world juridical order and which would be open to other nations to join as they desired. This would leave the UN still in existence as a general forum.

NEED OF A FUNDAMENTAL POLICY IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

It is indeed noteworthy, although the fact was pretty well ignored by the newspapers, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee acted upon the foregoing suggestions to the extent that it reported out a bill, H. R. 6802, containing the following language:

"It is the policy of the people of the United States * * * to strengthen the United Nations by * * * initiating consultations with other members concerning the need for and possibility of so amending the Charter as to enable the United Nations more effectively to prohibit and prevent aggression or other breaches of the peace."

This is the first official recognition by any branch of the Government that it should be the policy of the United States to take the lead in strengthening the UN to give it sufficient power to prevent war.

In the present session of Congess 91 Members of the House, including representatives of both parties and a majority of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, have introduced a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) which states that—

"It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Here is a statement of fundamental policy which strips away the tactical questions of when and how (whether by revision of the United Nations Charter under article 109 or through a regional approach under article 51 or 52, or otherwise) and lays down a fundamental objective for our foreign policy. Until our Nation has adopted for strategical objective it is too early to answer the tactical questions of how and when. When, however, a strategical objective is adopted the tactical questions will be answered more quickly and easily than we anticipate.

So far our Government has offered to the world nothing but a continuation of the same old out-worn devices of leagues, treaties and preponderance of power. Although we have protested that we want peace, we have expressed no willingness to follow the only road which can lead to peace and security. If the United States clearly announced to the world that its fundamental objective in international affairs is the elimination of international anarchy and the achievement of world law and order, the whole world would be inspirited, and I believe world federation, limited to the prevention of war, would be achieved much more quickly than we think.

It is fitting and appropriate that our Congress should take the lead in this matter. It is inevitable that the government of a democracy such as ours can have no strategy, no fundamental objectives in its foreign policy unless those objectives are determined and impressed upon it by public opinion. In a democracy such as ours the responsibility for fundamental foreign policy rests squarely upon the people, and the spokesmen of the people are their elected representatives in Congress. The executive department of our Government needs the assurance offered in the proposed concurrent resolution if it is to have the confidence and the courage to stop opposing world federation and to take its accomplishment as the fundamental objective of our foreign policy.

I feel that there is a special obligation upon the members of the legal profession to take the lead in every possible way in the education of public opinion. In every public crisis of the past upon this subject our lawyers have been leaders of public thought and action, and they must once again assume that great obligation today. No other group of people understands so well as the lawyers that peace and security can only be secured through law and order, that there can be no peace or security without justice, and that there can be no justice without government. It is the obligation of the lawyers to preach that doctrine constantly.

Corrections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, August 26, 1949.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: When I disagree with you, I always like the fact and the reason to be plain. I suppose that our different points of view may sometimes result from our respective positions This time I am emphasizing something which may seem to you to be unimportant, but the fact is this: In a statement on June 20 last, you said "The Continental Can Co. borrowed $20,000,000 from the Equitable, the Mutual, and a Canadian company." The fact is we did not participate in that loan and Continental Can did not and has not borrowed anything from the Equitable. A few days later, aroused to reply, I made a public statement to the effect tnat the Equitable had not participated in that Continental loan.

Now comes the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27 wherein you have repeated your statement of June 20 and again state that Continental Can borrowed from the Equitable. You may have thought that I was too critical when I termed your original statement "inaccurate and irresponsible" but now, really, Judge, since it does make a difference to us, won't you refrain from further statement to the effect that the Equitable participated in that loan, and isn't it possible that you could correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I'd appreciate it.

Otherwise, with best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
THOMAS I. PARKINSON,
President.

How We Got Our Dollar Facts Every Schoolboy Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important and interesting than the history of money. The reference to the origin of our dollar inserted here is taken from an illuminating article by the eminent mining engineer, John Hayes Hammond, appearing in the October 1930 issue of the Nation's Business.

The early history of money is taken from an exhaustive treatise by the Honorable J. K. Upton, First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under three administrations.

The recital of the Nation's first money law is taken from the historical speech delivered in the Senate of the United States by Senator F. M. Cockrell, on October 9, 1893.

The section of the law establishing the value of the dollar is taken from the United States Code, section 314.

The name "dollar" is due to the influence of silver. Back in the Dark Ages which, by the way, were dark largely because there was no medium of exchange that would permit development, a landholder in Bohemia found a silver mine. He realized that the need of the times was a circulating medium so he made his silver into coin. The valley where he lived was known as St. Joachim's Dale. After it he named his coin, somewhat awkwardly, a Joachimsthaler. Passing on to Germany this name was shortened to thaler, which in the Low Countries became a daler and crossing to England, a dollar. England called a piece of eight a dollar and so we got both the coin and the term.

—*John Hayes Hammond.*

The early settlers of this country, coming from England, were accustomed to reckon values in pounds, shillings, and pence, and to use the shillings of that country as current money. These pieces have a history worthy to be related: William I, the Norman King, placed in the tower a bar of silver eleven-twelfths fine, containing three-fourths of an ounce troy more than the troy pound of 5,760 grains, and declared it to be the standard, both of weights and values, for his newly acquired realm. As a standard of value, this tower pound was divided into 240 parts, each part to be known as a penny, and for many years only pennies were coined; but as trade increased, out of the pound were coined 20 pieces known as shillings, each necessarily containing 12 pence. As a standard of weight, the same pound was also divided into 240 parts, each part to be known as a pennyweight, being of the same weight as a penny; but for some reason the relation of weight and value was then abandoned and the pound was divided into 12 parts, to be known as ounces, each part, of course, containing 20 pennyweights.

This ingenious and admirable combination of two standards was not permitted to continue long, for Edward III, finding his crown debts pressing, directed that 22 shillings be coined from a pound instead of 20, and by making the new pieces a legal tender for the same purpose as those previously issued he cheated his creditors out of 2 shillings on every pound of debt, as the new pieces had no value in the market except what their weight for bullion gave them.

DEBASING THE MONEY

The successors of this monarch repeatedly worked this silent and sleek scheme for replenishing their depleted coffers at the expense of their debtors, until Queen Elizabeth, by royal proclamation, declared that out of the troy pound, which Henry VIII had substituted for the tower pound, there should be coined 62 of these pieces. By this time the shilling contained only about one-third of its original amount of silver, and even the dunderheaded Englishmen began to see there was cheating somewhere around the board, and that royalty alone was winning the stakes. So a great clamor was raised, and since then no debasement of the full legal-tender coins has taken place in merrie England.

The colonists, who brought these pieces with them to this country, were doubtless familiar with this process of debasing coins and the gain that would come therefrom to the State, for as early as 1652 the Massachusetts Colony set up a mint and commenced the coinage of shilling pieces avowedly containing but 10 pence worth of silver. The mintmaster, however, took 15 pence out of every 20 shillings coined, and then the English mint declared the silver in the coins was not of an even weight or fineness, and so the pieces circulated at 25-percent discount, though, being a legal tender at their face value, they were worth par in payment of debt. These shillings, however, became the standard by which values were reckoned from that time on, though but few were coined, and those were hoarded or shipped abroad, notwithstanding such shipment was forbidden by severe penalties, for there existed in the Colonies a cheaper way of paying debts than that afforded even by

debased coins. Clamshells, cattle, corn, and beaver had been made legal tender, and the principle laid down by Sir Thomas Gresham, of Queen Elizabeth's time, that no two currencies of unequal value would circulate together—the poorer driving out the better—was the secret of the deportation of the coin. To protect the treasury against the operations of this law, in 1658 it was ordered that taxes should not be paid in "lank cattle." Of clamshells, also, it was found that only the broken and lusterless ones remained in circulation—the poorer currency driving out the better, whether of cattle or of clamshells.

THE SPANISH PILLAR SILVER DOLLAR

At this opportune moment the Spanish pillar silver dollar, brought to this country mainly by buccaneers, began to circulate throughout the Colonies, with its pieces of eight, or reals. This dollar was a stranger in a strange land, and had nothing to recommend it to favor except that it bore the device of a nation whose commercial integrity had never been questioned. But the colonists reckoned in shillings and pence, and the relation in value between the strange piece and a shilling must necessarily be fixed in some way. The English Mint declared the piece contained 4 shillings and 6 pence of sterling silver, and this became the established rate in South Carolina, but the Massachusetts Colony declared it contained 6 shillings, and of the shillings of that colony this was about right. Virginia adopted the same rating. New York declared that the piece contained 8 shillings, though that colony never had a shilling piece of any kind, and nowhere in the world was there one of that value. Pennsylvania, for no reason stated, said it contained 7 shillings and 6 pence; Maryland adopted the rating of New York. Thus in New England and Virginia the real became a 9 pence, in New York and Maryland a shilling, and in Pennsylvania it was called 11 pence, or levy; and by these names it was known for nearly two centuries. The dollar having taken the place of the pound in reckonings, to a certain extent, it was subdivided into shillings and pence for purposes of accounts, those being the lower denominations in use, and accordingly in Virginia and New England accounts were kept frequently in dollars and seventy-seconds; in New York and Maryland in dollars and ninety-sixths; in Pennsylvania in dollars and ninetieths, as seen in the Treasury books of the Confederation; while in South Carolina they were kept in dollars and fifty-fourths, for in every case a shilling still contained 12 pence, and these fractional divisions of the dollar represented the number of pence the several colonies alleged this piece contained.

DIVERSE VALUATION OF THE SHILLING

The accounts of Washington, as he traveled from Mount Vernon to Boston, filed in the Treasury, show the changes rendered necessary in the reckonings as he passed through the several States, sometimes the local pound, sometimes the dollar, being the unit, but in the end the distinguished traveler reduced the currencies to one standard and determined how much was due him in Spanish dollars and reals, a feat in computation for which the Father of his Country has never received due credit.

Of course, these diverse valuations of the shilling gave to the pounds corresponding variations in values, and as trade was mainly with the mother country, exchanges were conducted with endless confusions in the reckonings. Had the colonists kept the pound sterling for their unit, used the English shillings and pence for their coins, as they were accustomed, all these complications would have been avoided. But contracts were out calling for shillings, and the finding of more shillings in a dollar by law than existed in fact defrauded the creditor to that extent of his just dues, the result if not the purpose of the legal-tender quality given these coins, whose existence even was to a certain extent fictitious. The use of silver as a circulating medium was, however, soon abandoned for paper issues.

PAPER MONEY

The Massachusetts Colony was the first to issue paper money. In 1690, to satisfy the claims of her soldiers who had been on an expedition to Canada and came back without booty, 7,000 pounds were issued, but being made receivable in payment of taxes, did not suffer great depreciation, though, according to Sumner, the soldiers disposed of it at 33 percent discount. Other limited issues followed in anticipation of taxes, but in 1709, to pay for another expedition against Canada, 50,000 pounds were issued. Other Colonies joined in the expedition and all issued paper to pay expenses. The issues were made a legal tender and the acceptance of the notes enforced from time to time by stringent enactments. Notwithstanding this, they continued to depreciate. Industries at first stimulated lagged, and a great demand arising for additional issues to make business brisk, the colonial governments or their chartered banks issued bills upon almost any pretext—as in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, upon real-estate mortgages, family silver, and other securities. In the latter State interest was made payable in flax and hemp, to encourage those industries, but very few of its loans were ever paid, and the titles to lands fell into inextricable confusion. New loans were issued by the Colonies with which to pay off the old ones, until the issues of the Massachusetts Colony were depreciated to 11 for 1, at which rate the notes were redeemed. The notes of other Colonies were also retired upon various scales until 1751, when Parliament prohibited, in most of the Colonies, the further issue of legal-tender notes. The depreciated bills out of the way, silver returned, and even some gold appeared in circulation, also brought in by buccaneers.

BIMETALLISM

The colonists tried a great many commodities for a standard of value, but only twice did they undertake to have two standards in circulation at once, their values to be kept equal by the force of law.

Exploring parties of the Massachusetts Colony found on the shores of Long Island a partially civilized community of Indians. Some of those living along the shores were engaged in polishing the shells of the clam and of the periwinkle, which they traded off for ornaments at a pretty well-established rate. The shells were called Peag, and they served every purpose of money among the simple natives. One black shell was about equal to two white ones, but in the absence of any law fixing a parity of value both shells circulated, each for what it was worth, the white at about six, the black about three for a penny. The colonists, however, made Peag a legal tender for 12 pence, and immediately their deterioration commenced—lusterless and half polished shells being as good as any in payment of debt. Again the law came to its rescue, and, in 1648, provided that only such Peag as was unbroken and of good color should pass as money. A little later it provided that Peag should be a legal tender for 40 shillings, the white at eight, the black at six for a penny. Peag was now not only a legal tender in payment of debt in a modest way, but a fixed relation was established between the value of the white and the black shells. The law did all it could to extend the circulation of these shells, but Peag was perverse, and just as great results were expected from it, it wholly disappeared from circulation, having become so utterly worthless nobody would accept it.

THE EXPERIMENT OF 1762

The next colonial experiment of the kind was in 1762. The gold which followed in the channels of the depreciated paper, as above mentioned, circulated at its own value and was very useful, but it soon attracted the attention of the General Court of Massachusetts, and with the declared purpose to facilitate trade, this court, in that year, made gold a legal tender at 2½ pence silver per grain. At this rating gold was the cheaper metal for paying debts, and, in conformity with the Gresham law, silver promptly disappeared from circulation, leaving gold to circulate alone. The colonists were surprised at the result and were at a loss to know what caused it, but silver would not return to associate with gold on the terms fixed by law, and the colonists had to get along as best they could for a few years, when the necessities of war brought about other forms of currency.

In September 1774 the first Congress of the Colonies assembled in Philadelphia with a view to obtain a redress of grievances, not a separation from the mother country. It was composed of delegates from every colony, and had no clearly defined powers. The conflict at Lexington, in April 1775, while this Congress was holding its second session, dispelled all hopes of a pacific settlement of the difficulties, and preparations for war were promptly begun. To meet expenses money was necessary, but this body had no power to levy a tax. The members, however, were accustomed to the issue of bills as a substitute for money, and to such issue they naturally turned. On the 10th of May 1775, an act was passed authorizing the issue of $3,000,000 on the faith of the Continent, by which the bills became known as Continental money. They were in form as follows:

"CONTINENTAL CURRENCY

"No. ------ ---------- Dollars.

"This bill entitles the bearer to receive ---------- Spanish milled dollars, or the value thereof in gold or silver, according to the resolutions of the Congress held at Philadelphia, on the 10th day of May A. D. 1775."

Nothing appears on the face of the bill as to its redemption, but the law imposed upon the several colonies the duty to redeem the issue within 3 years, at a stated amount for each, based upon their population. This was probably as far as this Congress had power to go, but the several colonies, instead of levying a tax to meet the redemption of the notes, set up their own printing presses and entered into competition with each other and Congress in the issue of additional notes of their own. Within a year Congress, having issued $9,000,000 of its notes, and their value depreciating, took prompt and harsh measures to force their circulation and maintain their value, imposing severe penalties upon anyone refusing to accept them at par in exchange for commodities.

"NOT WORTH A CONTINENTAL"

In 1777 the Colonies, at the urgent request of Congress, stopped their issues, but not until they had put into circulation about $210,000,000. The exact amount was never known, the issue having been so hurried that no count of it was made. How far they ever went in contracting or redeeming their issue it is impossible to discover. Of the Continental issues the limit of $200,000,000 was reached in 1779, of which $65,500,000 were issued the year previous. This was the good-sized straw which broke the back of the patient camel. The next year the notes were worth only 2 cents on the dollar, practically disappearing from circulation. In Philadelphia they were then used for wallpaper, and a dog covered with tar, stuck full of the bills, was chased through the streets amid the jeers of the crowd. The utter lack of value in these notes gave rise to the expression, "Not worth a continental."

For the ruinous policy pursued, the local colonial governments alone were responsible. To meet the expenses of the war they would neither levy a tax themselves nor authorize their Congress to do so. That in the end the bills were repudiated does not signify that the war to that extent cost the Colonies nothing. The amount of the depreciation was only a form of a tax paid by everyone in proportion to the amount of money he held and the time he held it, thus imposing upon the officers and soldiers who fought the battles, and upon their families, the patriotic and the helpless, the main cost of the war, leaving to the Tories, and those who stayed at home, comparative exemption from its burdens. But the forced issue of such legal-tender bills worked more than pecuniary hardship. Says a prominent writer of the period: "We have suffered more from this cause [paper money] than from any other cause or calamity. It has killed more men, pervaded and corrupted the choicest interests of our country more, and done more injustice than even the arms and artifices of our enemy."

—Hon. J. K. Upton, First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Congress, by an act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States, approved April 2, 1792, exercised its constitutional power by establishing a mint and authorizing the coinage of gold, silver, and copper coins, and placed gold and silver upon a perfect equality, and gave to each unlimited coinage, and to the coins of each full legal tender in all payments, the gold coins to be eagles, half eagles and quarter eagles of the declared value of 10, 5, and 2½ dollars, respectively, 11 parts pure gold to 1 of alloy; and the silver coin to be dollars or unts—half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes—and made them all a full legal tender in payment of any and all sums.

The weight of the gold in $1, if coined, would have been 27 grains standard and 24.75 pure, and the weight of the silver in the dollar or unit was 416 grains standard and 371¼ grains pure and the value of this silver dollar was to be that of the Spanish-milled dollar as then current.

—Senator F. M. Cockrell.

Section 314. Standard unit of value: The dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity.

—United States Code.

We Must Aid Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the current Anglo-American Conference, as well as an article which appeared in the Economist of August 13, 1949. This magazine is published in London, England.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST AID BRITAIN

(Statement of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY on Anglo-American economic discussions)

Today representatives of the United States, England, and Canada meet in the most important international conference held here in Washington since the end of the war. Great Britain, our valuable, friendly ally, is facing a severe financial crisis. Unless the United States expresses itself this week, and sets about materially to help solve this crisis with the British, totalitarianism will have won an important victory. The cause of freedom and of liberty demands a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Make no mistake about it. Britain is our one and only powerful ally. An insolvent and impoverished Britain will be a liability. A solvent, productive Britain can act as our outer fortress. A break-down in Anglo-American relations at this time would be a victory for Joe Stalin second only to the conquering of all of western Europe. Those in America who are today sniping and destructively criticizing Britain and her policies are actually performing a service for international communism and are, for all practical purposes, fellow travelers.

This is no time for irresponsible, partisan political attacks. Recent statements by spokesmen for the Republican Party in the United States Senate indicate a blind doctrinaire obedience to slogans and economic prejudices rather than a mature, realistic understanding of what we mean by democracy. We have no right to impose our economic views or our economic system on our friends. The British Government is a duly elected one responsible to its own citizens. It is a democratic one thoroughly committed to the preservation of civil liberties and to the expression of the majority will.

The choice in Europe, and particularly in Great Britain, is not between the National Association of Manufacturers and the Socialist Party. The choice is between a continent dominated and ruled by ruthless communism or a western Europe striving to maintain the fundamentals of political democracy while it redirects and redefines its economic system to fit its own pattern.

Criticism of the British Labor Government and its domestic economic policies is not only irrelevant, but it is internationally hazardous. An eminent British conservative critic of the British Labor Government has stated categorically that "Britain's present difficulties are not due to anything that can properly be called socialism; they are not due, save in a minor degree, to policies of the labor government * * * and to make the present crisis the excuse for an anti-socialistic campaign will hinder rather than help toward its solution." This statement came from a recent issue of the Economist, a responsible, respected conservative journal of economic opinion.

The severity of the British crisis is similar in pattern, to the economic crises facing other European countries. In a nutshell, it is this: She needs to import more than she can now export. We want to export more than we are willing to import. Britain has only two ways of getting dollars—either by exporting her goods to the dollar area, or by obtaining dollars in subsidies, grants, or loans from the dollar area. The question is what are we willing to do about it.

I know that those who do the negotiating for the United States Government understand the importance of further American assistance in this crisis. Her economic difficulties, if left unchecked, will be but a forerunner of a much more severe economic collapse in the North Atlantic area. This, by the way, is the same area that we have bound ourselves to by solemn treaty obligation. These are our allies by the vote of our Government. Britain is the keystone to our North Atlantic defense system. It is military stupidity and economic madness to permit the major power in our system of alliance to become imperiled because of a dollar crisis. In the event of war, we would not tolerate such a situation for a moment. In the cold war, to tolerate such a situation is but to reveal a political adolescence.

Here is the situation: We are joined together with Great Britain in the North Atlantic Alliance. We are soon to commit ourselves to arms aid in order to implement that alliance. We find our ally economically sick because of a dollar shortage, due not only to her own internal problems, but to our own trade policies. An economically sick Britain does not make for a strong ally. On the basis of military and diplomatic logic, and in view of our commitments and in view of our foreign policy, we can do but one thing: Come to the aid of our partner in western Europe.

[From the Economist, London, England, of August 13, 1949]

BRITAIN IN THE PILLORY

The decision of His Majesty's Government to put the dollar crisis into cold storage for the time being has been successful insofar as they themselves and the country at large are concerned. Ministers have dispersed to various centers of rest and recuperation and John Bull has gone to the seaside. But the decision to leave the country apparently without a policy to utter or spokesmen to utter it has had much less success abroad. In Europe and in the United States the silence has been filled by a steadily swelling chorus of criticism and attack. Britain's partners in the Marshall plan have been quick to pin upon their neighbor sole responsibility for the refusal of Europe's trading deficit to shrink. It is British bilateralism, British nonconvertibility, the overvaluation of British sterling that has brought Europe to its present plight, and these policies in their turn—here the criticisms are taken up with even greater emphasis in the United States—spring not from any economic necessity but from a blind doctrinaire preference for socialism, planning, and control.

The change in the climate of opinion has been sudden enough to disturb the British. Only 6 months ago they were taking their bow for a balanced budget, both at home and in trade overseas, and were using the occasion for a little lecturing to their more frivolous neighbors on the virtues of thrift and planning. Today, the roles are reversed and the British have shot to the bottom of the Marshall class. This in itself is not a cause for serious alarm. Gusts of irritation and criticism have swept across the Atlantic partnership before now without doing it irreparable damage. On the contrary, past criticism has often provided healthy reminders of the way in which the Nation should not go. There is, indeed, plenty to criticize in the policies of His Majesty's Government and there would be no possible course for complaint, if it were not that the critics seem, with some consistency, to be laying hold of the wrong end of the stick. They say (the American critics in particular) that Britain's woes have a simple origin in the socialist doctrines of the Labor Government—which is untrue. They say (the European critics in particular) that the British people are making less effort to get out of their troubles than the other peoples of western Europe—which is not only untrue but unfair and grossly insulting.

One difficulty in countering the anti-Socialist type of criticism lies in finding exactly what the critics have in mind. Some mean socialism in the narrow sense of particular

Socialist policies practiced by the Labor government. For instance, Senator KEM and those who join with him mean that Britain's balance of payments difficulties—or, more accurately perhaps, Britain's slowness in emerging from them—are due in large part to the specifically Socialist measures that the present Government has taken and that a non-Socialist government would not have taken. This is not true. The most clearly Socialist of the Labor government's measures are the nationalization schemes, and whatever they may do to the national economy in the long run, they have certainly not yet had time to exert any effect on the ratio between imports and exports. Indeed, in the two largest cases it may even be that things would have been worse without nationalization. Coal would have been scarcer and quite possibly dearer; and it is almost certain that railway rates would be higher than they are now.

The doctrinaire socialism of the present Government is also sometimes said to show itself in the trade policies pursued in Britain, the careful control of commodities by licensing, the bilateralism dominating all commercial exchanges save those in the sterling area. These policies are certainly unpleasant; but they are not the avoidable aberrations of doctrinaire Socialists. British commercial policies, with a few exceptions, are imposed by the facts of the case. Perhaps the best proof of that is to point out that when the United States Government comes up against comparable problems, as in Germany and Austria, it reacts in much the same way. The Joint Export-Import Agency—which is virtually western Germany's board of trade—has been under predominantly American influence for the last 2½ years. No agency has pursued a more rigorous bilateralism. The various offset agreements which regulated German trade have proved to be as near barter deals as any made since Dr. Schacht and American policy in relation to nonessential imports has made Mr. Harold Wilson look an apostle of liberalism, and American insistence upon the exact balancing of accounts has been complicated by the fact that the currency used for settling trade deficits has been the scarcest of all currencies, the dollar. If this is socialism, it can only be said that the United States has been as much its practitioner as Britain.

It may be, however, that when they speak of socialism, the critics have in mind, more vaguely, the policies of the welfare state. If so, their criticisms have much more substance. Not that there is anything wrong in principle with the welfare state. It is a universal and praiseworthy humanitarian ambition to protect individual human beings against suffering caused by economic misfortunes. Every modern state is a welfare state; as Mr. Bevin said the other day, there are few clearer examples than the way American legislation has protected the farmers of the United States against the rigors of the economic climate. What can justly be held against the British welfare state is only that it has chosen the wrong time to take such long strides forward. Every manifestation of the welfare state—both by the benefits it confers and by the taxation it levies to pay for them—necessarily weakens the link between a man's own output and the material reward he receives and therefore has repercussions on the efficiency of the national economy. What can be alleged against the British welfare state is that it has ignored these repercussions just at a time when the situation of the country required that more attention than usual should be paid to them.

If this is the criticism, then it is justified. But this is not socialism—not, at least, in any sense in which socialism is a controversial term. The welfare state is not controversial; it is accepted by everybody, including the United States Senate. There is no disagreement between the political parties in Britain on it—as the Conservatives are at great pains to insist. If a retreat is now obviously necessary in Britain, it is only a retreat, and a temporary one at that, and not an abandonment.

It is not merely misleading to use language suggestive of some cardinal difference of principle when what is meant is only a difference of judgment about degree—it is also dangerous and obstructive. What is necessary for the full restoration of economic health to Britain is nothing as simple as the mere suppression of one political party by another; it requires the reshaping of a national frame of mind that governs all parties. This task is not impossible, and has already made some progress. The facts of the case are so cogent and so compelling that once they are allowed to emerge clearly, a sensible, level-headed people like the British wil certainly pay them heed. There is a distinct possibility of the whole British people, with some unanimity, turning on to a new course and pursuing it in agreement—provided that the argument is logically based upon concrete facts. After all, there is nothing in what is needed that would be impossible for a far-sighted and realist Labor Party to swallow. But if the attempt is made to put all the blame on one party to the exclusion of others—which is not true—and to find the remedy in a complete abandonment and reversal of everything that it has ever stood for—which is not necessary—then the only result will be to solidify in resentful opposition what is bound, at the lowest, to be a large minority of the British people.

It is reported that the critics of Britain sometimes use quotations from the Economist, which has certaily been critical enough of His Majesty's Government, to support their arguments. It is always flattering to find oneself quoted abroad. But those who pay this journal the compliment of setting any store by its views might care to note that, in its opinion, Britain's present difficulties are not due to anything that can properly be called socialism; they are not due, save in a minor degree, to policies of the Labor government that would have been substantially differently applied if another party had been in power; and to make the present crisis the excuse for an anti-Socialist campaign will hinder rather than help toward its solution.

The second fashionable line of criticism suffers from as much loose use of words as the first. This is the criticism which is being heard with such emphasis in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in Paris and taken up with such enthusiasm in Belgium, Italy, and France. Britain, so the line of argument runs, has by its low production, its rigid controls, its bilateralism, and its overvalued sterling ruined the expansion of either European or world trade, and is thus primarily responsible for the fact that the Marshall countries cannot cover their dollar deficits and that the shadow of the dollar shortage lies darkly across all hopes of further European recovery. The best answer to this is to quote the facts as set out, for example, in the Economic Bulletin for Europe, published by the United Nations' Economic Commission for Europe. The figures of industrial production in the chief Marshall plan countries are as follows:

1. Indexes of industrial production

FIRST QUARTER OF 1949, AS PERCENTAGE OF 1938

Belgium	122
Denmark	135
France	124
Italy	90
Netherlands	122
Norway	130
Sweden	147
United Kingdom	131

There is nothing here of which Britain need be ashamed. But total industrial production, though it is a fair measure of aggregate "effort," is only indirectly relevant to the major problem of postwar Europe, which is the balance of payments. The best way of testing what has been done to overcome that is to set out the figures of exports and of imports by volume. That country might perhaps be thought to have done most to master its problems which had most sharply reduced imports and most sharply increased exports. The third column of the following table therefore shows the ratio of exports to imports:

2. Exports and imports by volume

FIRST QUARTER OF 1949

	Exports	Imports	Export index divided by import index
Belgium-Luxemburg	114	97	118
Denmark	84	107	79
France	127	106	118
Norway	91	109	84
Sweden	65	103	63
Switzerland	113	121	94
United Kingdom	156	82	190

Does this look like slacking? Or perhaps an even closer test is to show what percentage of its dollar requirements each country is earning by its own exports to dollar markets. Not every country, of course, should be expected to cover the whole, or even the same proportion, of its dollar requirements. But each country might reasonably be expected to show some improvement in the ratio since the prewar position; the last column of the following table is therefore the most significant:

3. Imports from and exports to the dollar area

	Trade with Canada and United States of America, April 1948–March 1949		Proportion of dollar imports covered by dollar exports		Change from 1938 to 1948–49
	Imports	Exports	1948–49	1938	
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Belgium-Luxemburg	355	138	39	55	−16
Denmark	125	15	12	18	−6
France	594	82	14	39	−25
Italy	595	95	16	73	−57
Netherlands	355	39	11	42	−31
Norway	120	35	29	46	−17
Sweden	160	74	46	64	−18
Switzerland	231	114	49	80	−31
United Kingdom	1,565	559	36	27	+9

There could hardly be a more triumphant statistical vindication of the commercial efforts that Britain has been making. So far from "dragging its feet," Britain is the only one of the Marshall countries that is earning a higher proportion of its dollar requirements than before the war. Nor has the relative position changed significantly since March; the fall in European exports to the dollar area has been as universal as it has been severe. The pound sterling may, indeed, be overvalued, and British prices may be too high; but it is very difficult, in the light of these figures, to believe that other European countries are any less at fault in this respect.

Why, then, does the British crisis appear to be so much more severe than that of other countries? Part of the reason is simply that it is more fully discussed. The practice of

economic analysis and criticism has been carried much further in Britain than in other European countries, and if anything is wrong here, it emerges very quickly into a very bright light of publicity. In point of fact, there are very few criticisms about the economic position of this country that could not be made, if the materials for criticism were equally available, of many, if not of all, the other western European nations. Another part of the reason is to be found in the fact that Britain is far more dependent on international trade than most other nations, and any sickness in international commerce therefore has a more immediate and profound effect here than elsewhere. Again, Britain is affected by the fact that it is banker to the whole sterling area, a function whose value is beginning to be appreciated even in Washington. And finally, since frank speaking is the order of the day, it may be mentioned that Britain for 6 years spent its financial and commercial assets in the common cause. Other European nations, though they suffered in other ways, were able through neutrality or occupation to preserve their assets.

The economic difficulties which are besetting the Atlantic world and which threaten, if they are left unchecked, to undermine all the work of political and economic consolidation achieved in the first year of the Marshall plan cannot be solved by the action of any one power. To concentrate so great a barrage of criticism on Britain may leave in Government and business circles in the United States and in Europe the illusion that all that needs to be done is to modify this or that defect of British policy and then once again all the pieces on the economic chessboard will fall back into place. Nothing could be further from the truth. The change in the relationship between the old industrial nations of Europe and the new industrial giant in the New World has been on the way for the last 30 years. The wars have accentuated but not caused the trend. It has been masked since the end of the conflict in part by American generosity, in part by the world's desire to buy anything it could at whatever price. Now, in 1949, the underlying maladjustment between Europe and America is emerging like a reef hidden for a time under a spring tide. To choose this moment to pin all blame for a vast shift in the world's economic surface to the actions of one power not only shows a quite distorted sense of proportion, it makes virtually certain that none of the right solutions will be applied. There is a month to go before Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Bevin pay their fateful visit to Washington. It is to be hoped that in the interval calmer tempers and saner judgments will prevail.

Money Versus Barter in International Trade and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the confused state of money and international exchange existing today, it is impossible to determine the extent of the impairment of the stability of international trade and business.

The whole world seems hopelessly enmeshed in a problem that stems from the abandonment of the automatically controlled system of money of ultimate redemption based on the coinage of the precious metals gold and silver, money good in all countries, for managed paper currency systems based on the national credit of the governments of the several individual nations of the world.

The arch exponent of this unstable monetary plan—the British Empire—with all of its unmined gold, diamonds, and supplies of raw materials, in an empire stretching around the globe, is in financial difficulties and has come to us for assistance.

The problem confronting our Government and the British Empire is ably presented in an illuminating and analytic article by the noted financial writer, Herbert Bratter, appearing in the Sunday, September 4, issue of the Washington Star, from which the following is taken:

NEW PRESCRIPTION NEEDED TO CURE BRITAIN'S AILMENTS—UNITED STATES FINANCIAL TRANSFUSIONS BENEFICIAL BUT PATIENT DECIDES RECOMMENDED TRADE EXERCISE TOO VIGOROUS

(By Herbert Bratter)

Britain is suffering from still another crisis, which the London government has brought here for diagnosis and possible treatment by Uncle Sam, economic physician to the world at large. On earlier and not dissimilar occasions since the war Uncle Sam has treated gouty John Bull with liberal transfusions of dollars and recommended to the patient plenty of exercise in the fields of freely competitive world trade and what is known in banking circles as convertible currency, meaning a pound sterling exchangeable at the holder's will into any other currency and no questions asked. The transfusions certainly helped Britain greatly although not permanently; while the exercise proved too strenuous and had to be abandoned.

The crisis which brings Britain's top officials to Washington to confer with our Government is not readily apparent to the man in the street, not even in London. You can't see many signs of it in the shop windows of Oxford Circus or Piccadilly as yet. Recently a Canadian financial official visiting London asked his cab driver what he thought of the crisis. "Crisis?" the old fellow replied; "If this is a crisis, may it never end." What he meant was that he had never felt any better off than now. The war and the Labor government have brought to Britain's lower-paid workers, along with rationing and price control, more and better food and greater security than they could count on previously, even though for the nation as a whole "austerity" is the motto.

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM

While the United States billions have been financing the British Government in the balancing of its international operations, internally the cradle-to-grave security and all that are accompanied by income taxes much higher than our own. The British worker, being assured of the necessary food and clothes, has no great inducement to increase his taxable pay envelope. In some ways, very important to Britain's present inability to pay its way abroad, the worker is a very conservative fellow indeed. He wants to keep on doing his job in the accustomed way and in the accustomed place. Therefore, he has a strong antipathy to modern labor-saving machinery, which would reduce costs of production, and so enable Britain to compete for more foreign markets, including the American market. And he strenuously objects to moving from one part of the country to another, insisting instead that the work be brought to him. If not, the Government will take care of him.

Because of the workers' attitude and for other reasons, Britain's industrial plant and productivity per worker lag far behind this country's. Since Britain was the leader in the industrial revolution of the last century, it is natural to find many of its factories obsolete and antiquated. Costs of production are so far out of line as to impede not only the country's sales in competitive markets abroad, but even domestic trade. Before the war the average British wage earner had to work 5 days for enough money, after taxes, to pay for the cheapest man's suit. Now he must work 7 days. Similarly, the standard workman's house took 112 weeks of work before the war and take 213 weeks now. The Economist editorially asks: "If the British people cannot afford to buy their own goods, how can they expect foreigners to do so?"

PRODUCTION UP

The British have been striving, much more so than some other ERP countries, to overcome the drag of high-production costs and a pound sterling which the authorities stubbornly have pegged at $4.03 for international trade purposes, when its home purchasing power is far less. British industry is now turning out goods at a rate 36 percent above prewar. But an insufficient part of the product is finding a market in the world's dollar areas, where Britain obtains so much of the import goods that cannot be bought elsewhere. What the British desire from here, Canada and neighboring hard-currency countries far exceeds what they can pay for with British goods and services sold in these same countries, even—it now appears—after the $3,750,000,000 loan which the Congress granted in 1946 and the more generous help which the ECA is giving to Britain and many of its trading partners. Both the loan and ERP have failed to put Britain and the rest of the world back on the road to the cherished American goal of multilateral trade—open competition among businessmen of all countries in any market, without discrimination.

This has been a persistent feature of American negotiations for many years. At our insistence, it has been written into a long list of international agreements as an ultimate objective. The United Kingdom, however reluctantly and with whatever misgivings, signed its promise of ultimate nondiscrimination in trade when it became a party to the Atlantic Charter, the Bretton Woods agreements, the Anglo-American loan agreement, and the ERP. The as yet unratified ITO charter contains the same promise. In the loan agreement, article 9 gives solemn assurance that if the United Kingdom imposes quantitative import restrictions for any particular import commodities, the restrictions will be so administered as not to put American exporters at a disadvantage as compared with other countries' exporters.

NEEDS ARGENTINE HELP

It is quite clear that the above provision can no more be observed by the British than the loan agreement's other important condition: That the pound sterling be made freely convertible into dollars within a year. Britain tried to live up to that promise, but the attempt quickly failed and was abandoned, with the unavoidable consent of the United States Government. Yet, when Britain this year negotiated an agreement to buy from Argentina a large quantity of meat and wheat, strong complaints were heard in American business and congressional circles. The fact that Britain badly needs Argentine meat and wheat, which we won't buy, and must make payment to Argentina in some form, seems not to impress otherwise intelligent Americans.

The Anglo-Argentine agreement is one of those bilateral trade and payments agreements which have criss-crossed Europe and the world since the war. Their ancestry may be traced to the Schachtian policies of pre-

war Germany. For example, under this agreement Argentina will receive British currency for its meat and grains. Naturally, Argentina will want to use that currency to buy whatever it can to fill its needs for manufactured goods in Britain. If the prices of British goods are higher than American goods, that is not too important, since Argentina hasn't the dollars to buy all it needs here anyway. Thus, trade between two soft-currency countries, Britain and Argentina, is expanded while Americans must look elsewhere for business.

BLOW TO BRETTON WOODS

In view of the dwindling gold reserves of Britain and the sterling area, unless the United States gives still larger subsidies to London the British will continue to practice in their foreign trade the sort of bilateralism which discriminates against American goods. In view of the limited means in the Truman administration's hands to alleviate the fundamental weakness in the British Commonwealth's economy, the chances are that Uncle Sam must now agree to call article 9 of the Anglo-American financial agreement a dead letter, just as the requirement in the same agreement that the pound sterling be made convertible was perforce allowed to lapse into desuetude. If thus willy-nilly we bow to bilateralism for Britain's sake, it will be another blow to the frail Bretton Woods and ITO dream houses.

The British have the idea that the United States one way or another must give away its surplus products of farm and factory, something the United States has been doing in one form or another since World War I. ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman took sharp exception to this European view the other day. He called it "one great illusion" and added: "American surpluses can be turned to very good advantage in America, if it comes to a mere matter of giving things away." Mr. Hoffman is entirely right in theory, but American farmers, manufacturers, and organized labor do not act that way in times like these. They prefer to have the American Government give goods away abroad, rather than at home, strange as it may seem; and the British delegation now here know this quite well.

If Britain devalues the pound, as American experts think must be done, to a level well below the present $4.03, that will help; but of itself the action won't be enough. Its effects will be far-reaching in the world of currencies and trade, and it will be interesting to watch how American businessmen and workers react when "cheap foreign goods" start coming in on even a fraction of the scale which Paul Hoffman has been so strongly urging in Europe.

The British must both buy less abroad and earn more hard money abroad. To do this they must compete on a price and quality basis, giving more value for less price. That is something easier said than done. And what can we do for Britain, short of more gifts which Congress at the moment contemplates with no appetite? One thing is sure: The administration is not in favor of paying a higher price for gold. Another thing "out of the window" is economic union with Britain. Lower United States import duties would help.

A marriage between the dollar and the British pound has not today the remotest chance of adoption, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has made clear. Increased United States stock piling of strategic and critical materials produced in the sterling area is being urged as an aid to Britain. This would be of some assistance, and from our standpoint makes a great deal of sense, provided the program does not conceal subsidies in the form of above-market prices. But there is some question whether it can be stepped up fast enough and on a large enough scale to put Britain on its feet.

Britain in the last century became the greatest empire in history. The pillars of that great structure have been greatly weakened by two tremendous wars and some of them have fallen. Doubtless Messrs. Bevin and Cripps feel that, with the help of American brawn, their political know-how can yet make this a safer and better world.

Palestine and the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Palestine Shift," appearing in the Washington Post for August 27, and the other entitled "Mission to the Near East," appearing in the New York Times for September 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 27, 1949]

PALESTINE SHIFT

Israeli and Arab representatives at Lausanne have agreed with the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission to the dispatch of a commission to the Middle East which will survey possibilities of starting one or more schemes of economic development. This may seem like an adroit way of saying that peacemaking is hopeless. Peacemaking, however, is not hopeless, it is premature. Aside from the particular difficulties besetting the path of the peacemaker over Palestine, history shows that peace does not follow an armistice automatically. Hostilities with Japan, for instance, ended in 1945, yet the prospect of a peace treaty is still remote.

There can be no understanding of the problem posed by peacemaking over Palestine without the realization that the conflict in Palestine was a full-sized war. This may induce a little more charity in the prevailing view of Israel as hard-hearted over the Arab refugees. To be sure, Israel has an obligation in respect of the refugees, but she would be courting a fifth-column problem if she opened her doors to the refugees en masse while peace is still unachievable. Moreover, the Arab nations which precipitated the war also have an obligation to the refugees. They incited the Arabs in Palestine and they encouraged the scoundrelly Mufti—the man whose representative at Lake Success was taken so seriously, even though the Mufti himself could scarcely raise more than a corporal's guard in behalf of his pretensions.

The new proposal seems to have been American in origin. The American representative, Mr. Paul Porter, appears quickly to have grasped the psychological obstacles in the quest for peace at Lausanne. Israel is one, the Arabs are half a dozen, all with diverse aims. Nor are the Arabs, with populations which still have to learn and digest the actual facts about the war in Palestine, at all anxious to sign any document which will enshrine those facts and then close the book. Their countries are run on the old Oriental principle of "nonaction," whereas Israel is anxious to have peace in order to pursue reconstruction. It is a conflict between past and present on the one hand and the future on the other, and a real fear of Israeli dynamism released from the restraints of war also disturbs the Arabs.

Thus the reason for the new lack is a pretty persuasive one. Here is an opportunity for engaging right away in a sort of pilot plant of point IV, say, on the Litany River dividing Israel from Lebanon. More than one bird would be killed by this device. It would provide a diversion, and, if properly handled, could employ a number of the dispossessed Arabs, and establish conditions of resettlement. The refugee problem is, indeed, urgent. Soon, if something is not done, the refugees may be unemployable, fit for nothing except a position on the receiving line of a soup kitchen, if not of Communist propaganda. Thus the proposed diversion may be fruitful, and it may be possible after showing the peoples of the Middle East a way to cooperate functionally to back them into peace.

[From the New York Times of September 3, 1949]

MISSION TO THE NEAR EAST

The appointment of Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA, to head a mission to the Near East, marks a significant turn of policy in the efforts of the United Nations and the United States to bring permanent peace to that troubled area.

For months, the UN conciliation commission at Lausanne has been attempting to find a basis for settlement of the bitter disputes between Israel on the one hand, and the several Arab states on the other. There have been three major points at issue, none of them yet resolved; (a) Territorial boundaries; (b) control of Jerusalem; and (c) disposition of the 700,000 Arab refugees who fled what is now Israel when hostilities began and most of whom the Israeli Government is unwilling to readmit. At first, it was hoped that all of these problems could be solved with relative ease once the military situation had been stabilized. But the last of the armistice agreements between Israel and her neighbors was reached in July, and the negotiations at Lausanne have dragged on without visible result, until this week the Commission decided to suspend its efforts.

It has come to be realized with increasing force that a new approach, based on the economic needs of the Near East, might be necessary to achieve the political settlement for which the world has been waiting. The Clapp mission is the expression of that new approach. Technically under the sponsorship of the conciliation commission, it will primarily endeavor to establish, on a scientific nonpolitical basis, a correlated economic plan to rectify the dislocations caused by the Arab-Israeli war.

Naturally, the refugee problem is the most immediate; and this survey will attempt to determine the most economically practicable disposition of the refugees in terms of the entire region's resources and their potential development. A very large proportion of the refugees cannot be put to any useful work of importance in the areas—such as the Gaza strip—where they are now herded. But there are areas—in Syria, for example—where many of them could be resettled with considerable economic advantage to the countries involved as well as to their own self-respect. It is expected that the Clapp mission will sketch out a resettlement program along those lines.

But the study will by no means be limited to the refugee problem. It will survey the possibilities of increased trade among the countries concerned, of improved transportation facilities, of development of pipe line, power, and, of course, irrigation projects. Obviously, the decision as to where the refugees might best be resettled is closely linked

with the possibilities of any given area for agricultural or even industrial development.

Of course, sizable public works, such as power or irrigation projects, cannot be achieved overnight. But it is believed—or at least hoped—that if the countries of the Near East can be induced to cooperate in promoting such developments, they will be more amenable to compromise in respect to the acute political questions—of which the refugees constitute the thorniest—now dividing them. As our correspondent in Lausanne, Michael L. Hoffman, reported some days ago: "The new theory is that a political settlement, if possible at all, must be induced by demonstrating to both sides that the pressure of the refugees can be removed only by cooperation in some such program."

Financing of these projects is going to pose a complex problem. Funds merely to keep the refugees alive are expected to run out by the end of the year. The UN will have to raise more millions on a straight relief basis to tide over this human crisis until the political and economic crises can be worked out. The long-range projects are a different matter. The International Bank, large-scale loans from the United States and other western countries and the operation of the point 4 program may all enter the picture. The nations of the Near East apparently have no funds for such purposes, but at least they can be expected to cooperate in a manner to which they have thus far not been accustomed.

The Clapp mission should materially contribute to that end. If the economic approach which it represents succeeds in breaking the Near Eastern political log jam, the State Department and the UN will have achieved a triumph of the first importance.

Business and Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Business and Fiscal Policy," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 29, 1949. I wish to commend the editorial to the reading of my colleagues. It deals with the national budget and gives the official pronouncement of the Committee for Economic Development in regard to the nature of the budget of the Federal Government and the desirability of having a balanced budget each and every year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND FISCAL POLICY

Representing a wide cross section of American industry, the Committee for Economic Development is an authoritative spokesman of its kind for our private-enterprise system. Accordingly, when it expresses its views on Federal fiscal policy, it commands attention, particularly so when those views constitute a marked departure from the position held by most businessmen 20 years ago.

As explained in a recent speech at Laramie, Wyo., by W. Walter Williams, chairman of the CED, the departure is one in which a majority of American business leaders have abandoned the orthodox belief that the Federal budget should be balanced at all times. Their attitude now, as indicated by a Fortune magazine poll of 25,000 executives, is that in periods of recession or depression deficits should be accepted as an active device to bolster the economy.

For its own part, according to Mr. Williams, the CED advocates what it calls a "stabilizing budget policy." It holds that efforts to balance the budget, regardless of over-all economic conditions, would tend to accentuate depressions. It holds, too, that the "managed compensatory budget" (under which taxes would be cut and spending increased in times of recession, and vice versa in times of prosperity) probably would not work because of the difficulty of forecasting economic conditions. So the CED favors a middle course, which would keep tax rates stable in the recessionary period and allow for some rise in Federal expenditures, such as in the fields of unemployment compensation and farm price supports.

In other words, although Mr. Williams has explained that the present "rising trend of expenditures for various purposes" is not called for by the CED's principles, the CED supports the general nature of the budget policy now being followed by the administration. It is a policy in line with the idea of a "stabilizing budget." As Mr. Williams has put it, that idea is based on the belief that it would be undesirable for the Government to try balancing income with outgo during economic declines, that the way to reduce the debt is to assure large surpluses to be used for debt retirement in good times, and that if depression were our normal state a growing debt would be only one of our worries.

As set forth by Mr. Williams, the CED's viewpoint is that under certain economic conditions deficits can be more wholesome than balanced budgets. Twenty years ago, Federal spending was only a minor thing, but today it is the largest single factor in our economy, and there is no sign that it will decrease in the near future. In Mr. Williams' words, since we must live with it, we should use it to the best advantage. This means that in periods of decline, we ought to employ it as a stabilizing influence, for any drastic turning off of the spigot would deepen the decline.

The CED, judging from Mr. Williams' speech, is not overly worried by the size of the Federal debt. For one thing, it points out that private debt is strikingly less today than in 1929 and that the economic position of individuals and businesses is much sounder. Further, it takes the view that "changes in our money and banking system in the last 20 years have greatly increased our ability" to employ fiscal policy as a weapon against sharp inflation and severe depression.

This is an attitude similar to that of the President and his Council of Economic Advisers. It does not mean, of course, that the CED is in accord with all or most of the administration's 1950 spending proposals, but it does serve as an interesting measure of how thinking has changed in that section of the business community represented by the CED. Whether for good or ill, the change is obviously a significant one.

Codification and Revision of Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past 10 years the Congress and the general public—and particularly the bench and bar of the Nation—have become aware of the extremely important problem of codifying and revising our Federal statutory laws. My own interest in this worth-while project dates back almost to my first days as a Member of the House. I was immensely gratified, a number of years ago, upon being assigned as a Member of the standing Committee on Revision of the Laws, because of the opportunity it presented to me to have a part in that work.

For some time prior to the Seventy-sixth Congress, that committee was engaged in preparing and editing annual supplements to the United States Code, with the capable assistance of two law-book publishing companies. That was the extent and limit of its work and nothing was being done or considered toward a comprehensive revision of all the Federal statutes.

At the beginning of the Seventy-sixth Congress, when I was starting my first term as a Member of the House, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, was designated as chairman of that committee. Almost immediately his legal talent and scholarly attainments put new life and meaning into the committee's functions.

In order to present a clear picture of those functions it will be necessary for me at this point to review briefly the history of Federal statutory law and to describe the form in which those laws have generally been drafted.

For the first three-quarters of a century of our national existence there was absolutely no attempt made to codify our laws. All the statutes enacted up to the year 1873 were published after some time in 17 volumes of the Statutes at Large which were printed by private publishers. These 17 volumes consisted of a strictly chronological arrangement of the statutes with no attempt whatsoever to classify them according to subject matter. Since there was no orderly arrangement of the laws in force, new bills were drafted as independent laws without regard to what had previously been enacted.

During the latter part of the 1860's the President appointed a Commission to revise and codify the general and permanent laws then in force, and shortly thereafter the House Committee on Revision of the Laws was created. The work of the Presidential Commission resulted in the Revised Statutes of 1873, which were enacted by the Congress and which contained all the general and permanent laws in effect at that time arranged in 70 titles according to subject matter. A new edition was adopted in 1878, and there were one or two supplements thereafter, but no systematic effort was made to keep the Revised Statutes up to date by direct amendment.

The situation, with respect to finding the law, deteriorated rapidly with the almost complete abandonment of the Revised Statutes as the basis of new legislation. Shortly before the end of the nineteenth century, another commission was appointed by the President to revise and codify all the general and permanent laws which were growing at an unprecedented rate. The work of this com-

mission resulted only in the enactment of the criminal code of 1909 and the judicial code of 1911, although it had been contemplated that all the laws would be codified.

For sometime thereafter, the Congress, judges and lawyers had at their disposal only the Statutes at Large. It was manifestly an impossible task to trace a statute through these numerous volumes, in the face of laws which superseded—without repealing or specifically amending—earlier statutes. Several of the lawbook companies published their own compilations or codes which were most useful but there was no official publication, to which recourse could be had, for the existing status of the laws.

Finally the House Committee on Revision of the Laws and a select committee of the other body, after several attempts to prepare a complete up-to-date code, secured the services of two of the publishing companies and the 1925 edition of the United States Code was enacted—but only after the bill was amended to provide that the code should be only prima facie evidence of the law. A new edition was published by the House committee in 1935 with annual supplements keeping it current thereafter.

Such was the situation at the beginning of the Seventy-sixth Congress when the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] became chairman of the committee. Under his dynamic leadership, the committee sought and received an authorization to prepare a new edition of the code to contain the laws through the Seventy-ninth Congress. Upon completion of this task, in which marked improvements were made in the code by way of additional cross-reference and amendment notes, a complete new index, and improved typography, the committee turned to the program of actual revision—inasmuch as the 1940 edition, like its predecessors, was only prima facie evidence of the laws. The new edition had been well received but the lack of interest in codification on the part of busy Members, in trying times, was not easily dispelled.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, the committee sought an appropriation to revise and codify all the laws relating to our armed forces—title 10, Army; title 14, Coast Guard; title 32, National Guard; title 34, Navy; and title 50, War. The appropriation was not granted on the ground that these particular laws would be in a state of change and growth during the immediate future and the time did not seem propitious for their codification. Apparently, the fact that a comprehensive code, which could be amended directly, would facilitate such change and growth was not sufficiently appreciated at that time.

Meanwhile, the committee secured the invaluable services of Charles J. Zinn. As counsel, he supervised and carried out the program. The committee had the constant help and assistance of the two lawbook publishers. Bills were prepared to enact into law 4 of the 50 titles of the code, namely: Title 1, General Provisions; title 4, Flag, Seal, Seat of the Government and the States; title 6, Official and Penal Bonds; and title 9, Arbitration. These bills passed the House unanimously in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses but were not reported out of committee in the other body.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress the committee again sought an appropriation to enact into law additional titles of code—this time title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, and title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure. An amendment to the legislative appropriation bill, 1944, for this purpose was offered in the Committee of the Whole and was carried, but on reporting back to the House it was defeated by seven votes, apparently on the ground that this work was not part of the war effort. The amendment, however, was adopted by the other body and accepted by the House by an overwhelming vote after disagreement in the conference committee. I am proud to have played a role in securing the approval of this appropriation. It was the turning point.

Work was immediately started on a complete codification and revision of titles 18 and 28, and in the Seventy-ninth Congress the House passed bills to enact into law titles 1, 4, 6, and 9—as in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses—and, in addition, title 17, Copyrights, and title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure. Everyone of these bills, however, again died in committee in the other body. The committee also unanimously reported to the House a bill to enact title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure. Furthermore, work was commenced in the Seventy-ninth Congress on the 1946 edition of the code and on the preparation of bills to enact titles 38 and 46.

During these years the efforts of the Committee on Revision of the Laws was entirely nonpartisan, complete support and cooperation being accorded to its chairman by members of the majority and minority alike. It was a matter of extreme regret to me that, with the taking effect of the Legislative Reorganization Act at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on Revision of the Laws was abolished, and my part in this vital work, as well as my close association with the able chairman of the committee, terminated.

Today, the Congress—which 10 years ago was almost completely unaware of the existence and meaning of the United States Code—is deeply interested in the subject of revising our statutes. The painstaking and often apparently unappreciated efforts of the committee have borne fruit at last. To date, nine titles of the United States Code, including the seven which were prepared by the Committee on Revision of the Laws, have been enacted into law. It is no longer necessary for the legislator, the judge, the lawyer, or the layman to turn to scores of volumes of the Statutes at Large to discover the present status of any law embraced in those nine titles. The guiding principle of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, as pronounced by its chairman—"Making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws"—has resulted in a simplified comprehensive code, with respect to the laws contained in those nine titles.

I am proud and happy to have had a part in that great work and I believe that the deep gratitude of the Congress is due to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the able chairman of the committee which initiated and advanced that tremendous task, now being so ably carried to completion by the great Committee on the Judiciary.

The State Department's White Paper on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio speech made by me on August 14, 1949, over Station WHP in Harrisburg and Station WLRB in Lebanon. The speech gives the high points of our Chinese policy during the past 5 years. I further include an editorial from the Harrisburg Patriot of August 6, 1949. This editorial points up some of the distressing facts, not only in our policy, but of the effect the white paper will undoubtedly have.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S WHITE PAPER ON CHINA

On Friday, the 5th of August, the State Department released its white paper on our relations with China during the past 5 years. It is the most fantastic and amazing story I have ever read. The volume is 1,095 pages long. It is not indexed, and it is hard work to dig out the facts from it. I am not at all sure that it was ever intended to be read. That is why I have digested and briefed it for you. Every citizen of this country should know about it. A great deal of the following consists of direct quotes. We have lost most of our influence in a continent through incompetence, and it is about time to demand and require a change of personnel in the Far East section of our State Department and the formulation of an effective policy.

As the Harrisburg Patriot remarked editorially, "It is the story of failure—almost irremediable and irredeemable failure." Our policy has been shaky, vacillating, and changeable. Indeed it has amounted to no policy at all. Even when the State Department did pursue a definite purpose the objective sought to be gained was a bad one because it was based upon a false promise. Certainly the pattern is a confused and chaotic one, if any pattern can be said to have existed at all. No one can accuse me of too great sympathy nor any delusions about the Nationalist Government of China. I have pointed out its failings many times and the necessity of the United States requiring it to be more democratic, more liberal, and more responsive to the yearnings of the rank and file of Chinese, more honest and more competent. But why should our State Department suddenly attack this Government vitriolically at a time when it is slipping fast and when the only other effective force in China is the Communist Party? And, incidentally, right after Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist leader, has stated publicly and definitely that he is an orthodox Communist of the Stalin type, acting under the direction of Moscow. Certainly this statement at this time gives aid and comfort to the Communists and pulls any support still remaining from under the Nationalist Government.

We are tossing over our erstwhile friends while leading others to believe that the only reason for doing so is the State Department and President Truman's judgment (and this is set out in detail in this white paper) that this friend is no longer worth anything at all to us. Such actions are not only immoral but also inexpedient and impractical. The Asiatic peoples fronting on China, being able to think for themselves and to reason, are forced to ask themselves whether the Chinese people, in making the choice between what the State Department calls the "corrupt" Kuomintang and what it calls the "crusading" Communists, have not made the right choice in choosing the Communists. They will probably also ask themselves whether the American Government has not left its ally to her fate after stomping on her when she was down, in order to shift over to the side the State Department probably feels is the better one. As the New York Times states editorially, "The State Department has made clear that in its opinion the Nationalists are now all but washed up, with the Communists in a position to win control everywhere in China."

At Tehran, both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill pledged themselves and the nations for which they spoke to guarantee the territorial integrity of China and, in particular, the return of Manchuria to Chinese sovereignty. Yet at Yalta, in 1945, the Governments of the United States and Great Britain promised to give Marshal Stalin the privileged position in Manchuria which Russia had occupied there prior to 1904. This meant ceding to Russia control of Port Arthur, control of the Manchurian Railways and Manchuria's major port, Darien, thereby giving Russia a predominant influence in this vital region and making it most difficult, thereafter, ever to dislodge Russia from that area against her will. While this property at that time belonged to the Chinese Government and not to Britain nor to the United States, the Chinese Government was never notified of the arrangement until June 15, 1945, 4 months later. What was the reason given for this? "That there was grave risk that secret information transmitted to the Nationalist capital at this time would become available to the Japanese." In Manchuria was the greatest concentration of industrial power and plants in Asia outside of Japan. If the Chinese had secured and retained control of Manchuria, subsequent history might well have been different. In fact, the Russians wrecked these plants, taking what they wanted for themselves and turning over to the Chinese Communist Army the vast stores of equipment relinquished by the defeated Japanese.

In 1944 General Hurley was sent to the Chinese Nationalist Government to persuade that Government "to arrive at a working agreement with the Communists." In other words, he was to try to bring the Communists into the Chinese Government. In 1944 the war was still continuing. Russia and the United States were on the same side. So there was some excuse for such a policy. Subsequent experience has indicated that the course urged upon the Chinese was absolutely fatal to any government adopting it. In every European country where Communists have been taken into the government and given cabinet positions they have used their positions to take over ultimate, absolute control and to set up a totalitarian police state. The Balkan countries, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia are but a few illustrations.

General Marshall left on his mission to China in 1945. Most people think General Marshall was sent with full powers to use his own best judgment and try to work out a solution to the problem. This was not so. General Marshall was under instruction to force our ally, the legal Government of China, to agree to a coalition by which Communists would be taken into the Government. President Truman's own signed letters (pp. 652–654) bear this out. In other words, General Marshall was told to continue the Hurley policy but to make it tougher. For the purpose of forcing the Chinese Government to agree, American financial assistance was withheld and an embargo placed on arms shipment to China.

Whatever justification there may have been for all of this, it is clear now that it was based on a wrong premise; and that Chiang Kai-shek was right in refusing to take the Communists into his Government, and that the State Department was wrong. This is correct unless we ignore all that has happened in Europe. If Chiang had complied with these demands, comparing other European countries, the Communists would have gained control of China sooner, under conditions making it rather difficult for the United States to refuse to recognize their government.

Many months later, we began to supply arms to the Chinese Government again, another reversal of policy. Then it was much too late. The Communists had the vast stores of Japanese arms; they also had industrial Manchuria and North China. Since VJ-day, we contributed over $3,000,000,000 to the Chinese Nationalists. As soon as our contributions were made, our policy was reversed, thereby the money and goods were wasted and any benefit to us from them destroyed.

In 1947 Lieutenant General Wedemeyer was sent to survey the Chinese scene and make recommendations. He was familiar with the Chinese picture. He was to study conditions from every angle. He submitted his report on September 14, 1947, but it was never published until its sudden appearance in the present white paper. It was withheld from the American people completely. For withholding it there can be no justification whatever. Asia is a matter of supreme importance to the American people. An important policy report such as this must not be kept from the people by a deliberate policy of concealment or because it conflicts with the desires, aims, or whims of a ruling clique. General Wedemeyer's report makes sense. Whether or not it should have been adopted I do not claim to be qualified to judge. I do contend there can be no argument that it should have been made public and discussed. Neither the ability nor integrity of General Wedemeyer has ever been questioned.

The general recommended that the United States continue and expand its policy of aid to Nationalist China. He recognized that there was a great deal of corruption and incompetence within the legal Chinese Government, but he adds criticism of results achieved by the National Government in efforts at improvement should be tempered by a recognition of the handicaps imposed on China by 8 years of war, the burden of her opposition to communism, and her sacrifices for the allied cause. He saw a crying need for immediate reform within the Chinese Nationalist ranks. At no point did he ever urge or even suggest a coalition government with the Communists. Instead he declared, "Events of the past 2 years demonstrated the futility of appeasement based on the hope that the strongly consolidated forces of the Soviet Union will adopt either a conciliatory or a cooperative attitude, except as tactical expedients."

General Wedemeyer then proposed that China should inform the United Nations officially of her request to the United States for material assistance and advisory aid in order to facilitate China's postwar rehabilitation and economic recovery. Thus the battle against Communist aggression would have taken place within the framework of the United Nations. Here again is another instance where our State Department ignored the international organization which it had been instrumental in creating. In respect to Manchuria he said: "The situation in Manchuria has deteriorated to such a degree that prompt action is necessary to prevent that area from becoming a Soviet satellite," and he suggested the establishment of a trusteeship in which all the great states of the world might participate.

He based this latter idea on the premise that Manchuria was already all but lost to China and could be saved only in this way. He added, "If these steps are not taken by China, Manchuria may be thrown into the Soviet orbit, despite United States aid, and lost perhaps permanently to China." That is what did happen. He emphasized that the policy of no assistance to China—the so-called wait-and-see policy—would be equivalent to cutting the ground from under the feet of the Chinese Government, and that removal of American assistance would certainly lay the country open to eventual Communist domination. He asserted definitely that assurances were given him by Chiang Kai-shek that China would support to the limit of her ability an American program for stabilization in the Far East and that he would make sweeping reformation in government, including the removal of corrupt and incompetent officials. However, Wedemeyer was shrewd enough to insist that anything we did for China should be under American advisers as responsible representatives of the United States Government in specified military and economic fields to assist China in utilizing United States aid for the manner in which it was intended instead of turning it directly over to the Nationalist leaders without strings.

The State Department now implies that we are through with China. Studying the present situation, there is a good deal to be said for this position, especially since the publication of the white paper. Even so, there are a number of important questions raised in connection with United States policy toward China and Asia.

Are we to recognize Communist China? There have been rumors that the State Department thinks of doing this at some fairly distant future time. If we do not recognize Communist China, are we to start trade relations with it? If we do, we will undoubtedly help the Communists to organize China and build it up as a real asset to the Soviet Union. If the Communists are forced to do it on their own, it will be a gigantic problem for them to carry out even a small part of the promises they have made to the Chinese. What are we to do about Korea? Korea is a tiny pimple on the face of Asia. Southern Korea is one-half of a peninsula jutting out from that continent. Congress is now being requested to supply more aid to Korea. Can we hold one-half of one peninsula when the State Department in effect, declares the United States must step out of the Asiatic Continent to which that peninsula is attached? Can we have an aggressive policy in Southern Korea and have no policy at all in Asia? There are many other subsidiary questions.

The State Department has appointed a board to formulate an Asiatic policy. This is a second admission of its past lack of any coherent policy at all. If we had had one, it would not be necessary to originate one now. This board is composed of many of the same people in the Far Eastern section of the State Department who are responsible for the present terrific failure. If their judgment and methods have been so fruitless in the past, how can we expect anything better in the future? In my judgment, General MacArthur and General Wedemeyer should be two of the consultants, yet they have not been appointed. General MacArthur has spent most of his life in the Far East. He has been steadily in Japan for the past few

years, in touch with the whole situation because of the close interrelation of Japan to the Asiatic Continent. General Wedemeyer spent much time in China and made the intensive study and report discussed previously. To omit these two men would be to overlook two of our best assets. General Chennault's advice should also be sought. In any event, it is high time for this subject to be brought out in the open. The American people must insist upon the immediate development of an intelligent course and insist upon it being justified publicly. It is not easy to find the right answer. That is only another reason why immediate steps must be taken to seek for it.

[From the Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa., August 6, 1949]

WHITE PAPER ON CHINA

The white paper on China issued yesterday by the State Department is a depressing document. It is a story of failure, almost irremediable and irredeemable failure. And while the blame is placed squarely on the shoulders of that Christian General Chiang Kai-shek, it is not certain that all the blame belongs there. Some of the responsibility may haunt this country's Government.

The Chinese puzzle is not easily solved. It is complicated. It is criss-crossed with factionalism, with selfishness, with corruption, with inefficiency. It would seem to be also marked by the inability of America to diagnose the Chinese ailment and to prescribe a remedy. Our own specialists who went there to be helpful could not be. They disagreed among themselves.

As great as is the tragedy of a China overrun by the Reds is the breaking hearts of both Chinese and Americans over the present state of affairs. China for generations has looked to the United States in times of famine, in times of flood, in times of invasion and attack, and for help in finding a better way of life. No nationals were more beloved by the Chinese than were the Americans.

The white paper is now reported to have taken the heart out of the Chinese. These folks of the Orient may not all feel that their great friend of the West has betrayed them but most will think that the long-time dependable aid has vanished. These spiritual losses can be as costly to a nation's morale as the loss of arms and similar aid.

Persons familiar with the facts know that however proud our State Department may be of the effectiveness of its negotiations and policies elsewhere in the world, it is not proud of its work in China. Causes for this deplorable failure will not all be found in the Far East.

Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUNDT BILL

A revised version of the Mundt-Nixon bill "to protect the United States against subversive activities" is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee, after approval by a subcommittee. This measure, S. 2311, is akin to the one that passed the House last year but died in the Senate. Although the new bill attempts to meet certain constitutional objections raised last year, it still is so far-reaching a proposal that it legitimately arouses very grave question as to its desirability, not to mention its constitutionality.

While the bill rightly denounces communism as a "world-wide revolutionary political movement," it is highly doubtful if the method it would follow in protecting the United States from the Communist conspiracy is either wise or effective. In its present form, the bill would impose severe restrictions on organizations found to be Communist or Communist-front, would penalize individuals for belonging to Communist organizations and would make it unlawful for anyone to agree to perform any act substantially contributing to establishment here of a foreign-controlled dictatorship.

The basic difficulty in this bill, as in others of the type, lies in the fact that it does not require an overt act in the usual sense of the words, to bring its sanctions into effect. No matter how carefully drawn it may be, any bill that endeavors to strike at a political philosophy will almost inevitably be so broad in its terms as to infringe the basic liberty of freedom of thought that is and, we hope, always will be the American birthright. In this connection, the American Civil Liberties Union points out that "our whole constitutional development shows that actions, not beliefs or ultimate goals, must be the sole tests of legality."

Furthermore, it is highly probable that enactment of such a bill as this would merely drive the Communists underground while penalizing a great many law-abiding non-Communists. In any case, measures that impute guilt by association, that resemble bills of attainder, that smack of thought control are likely to defeat their own purpose. In defending itself against the internal threat of communism our country can ill afford to curtail its own precious and hard-won liberties.

Military Assistance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address on the military assistance bill delivered by me Sunday, August 21, 1949, over WHP-WLRB:

By a vote of 238 to 122, the House passed the military assistance bill. No doubt, the Senate will do likewise. Though the amount was cut in half, the argument on this being that it was the part of wisdom to wait and find out the facts before acting—to me, that was a minor consideration. The bill is a commitment on our part, no matter what the program may turn out to be. It gives the European nations some justification for reliance on us and some grounds for future demands upon us.

The nub of the question was whether we should go into any such program at all. My theory has always been: Don't start in on anything unless you are sure that you can carry it through to a final conclusion. That is always a sound precaution. But I do not see how you can decide this without knowing what the conclusion is intended to be.

The primary purpose is to arm the nations of western Europe and the Middle East. But in principle and thought, the arming covers the world. The original request by the President indicated this idea quite clearly. Theoretically, these arms are being supplied to these nations for them to use in fighting our enemies. But after the arms are given, we cannot possibly tell against whom they are ultimately to be used. If Communists can succeed, by infiltration, in taking over the governments of these countries so armed by us, then clearly these governments will use those weapons and those munition plants against us. Our problem will then be: How can we destroy what we have given? We have had many experiences in the past where this has happened. In most cases, there was less likelihood of it happening then than there is in the present one.

Isn't this a far cry from the days when the United States was taking the lead in arms reduction throughout the world? Now, we are to go into the business of supplying them with arms, even building munitions plants in France, England, and elsewhere, starting what will no doubt, become an endless armament race. Worst of all, it is an arms race in which the odds are against our winning because we seek to compete in land and ground forces with a nation whose population is larger than ours, and one in which the chances of those guns and bullets of our being used against us are 10 to 1. That will not be a new experience—indeed, it has happened many, many times in the past through arrangements entered into by many of the same advisers urging this. Representative JACOBS, Democrat, of Indiana, asked whether it was true that some of the economic aid sent to Europe under the Marshall plan had been sent on to other countries behind the iron curtain. No one was able to deny this specifically. Several Members stated that engines had been sent to some of those countries at one time but they understood the practice had been stopped. Representative JACOBS voted against the bill, so apparently was not convinced on this point.

Many of the high Government officials and military testified in behalf of this idea. The strength of their evidence was diminished a good deal because they could not tell what the plan was. They admitted there was none, as of this date, and that the European nations had not yet been able to agree among themselves upon what they wanted. So we are in the ridiculous position of approving a policy without knowing what the policy is or might turn out to be. When I asked one of the most ardent proponents this specific question, his reply was: "That is not quite correct." This struck me as being a virtual admission. If for no other reason, the bill should have been defeated now in order to defer the final decision until the Congress was told exactly what was to be decided.

I don't like to disagree with all the bigwigs. It is much easier to go along and cite them as authorities. I am somewhat fortified in my opposition because they have been so consistently wrong in the past. We might as well frankly face the facts. So far not one single objective of American foreign policy has been obtained since the war. Our objectives are further away now than they were in 1945. The white paper on China was a full confession of complete failure in the Far East. The United Nations has not worked. We have at least two worlds—certainly not one. The British loan was wasted and the British admitted frankly to me in the spring of 1947 that, if it had not been made at that time, Britain would have been forced to retrench and would have started on the path to recovery quicker. There are more trade barriers now, more import

quotas, more restrictions of all kinds than there ever were. The Marshall plan has aided the European nations toward economic recovery, but it certainly has not provided the benefits promised to this country as yet.

When people, no matter who they are, argue for something which seems to me to be utterly barren and devoid of common sense, on any grounds whatever, I have no hesitancy in following my own judgment, conviction and conscience, and ignoring their advice. That is my duty. So I voted against this bill. Furthermore, when these differences of opinion occurred in the past, I have usually been right and they have been wrong. In support of this, I will be glad to mail anyone a copy of my speech, back in July 1946, opposing the British loan.

When President Truman and many of these same advisers were over in Potsdam they divided up Berlin and cut the United States off from all means of access to our part except by air. That seemed to me devoid of common sense and it turned out to be that way. There isn't a man or woman listening to my voice now who whould buy an acre of ground in the center of a 40-acre field without any means of getting into it and out from it, over the surrounding property. Yet, that is exactly what President Truman and these same people did at Potsdam.

The primary purpose of this program is to insure the nations of western Europe against invasion and occupation. If this is so, then the program must be sufficient to keep the Russian armies at bay until American forces have time to go over. Implicit in the whole idea is the thought of using American troops in Europe. If we do less than enough to restrain the Russians, then anything we do will be completely money and goods thrown down a rat hole. Worse than that, it will be taken over and used by our enemies. For this purpose, they ask $1,500,000,000 for a 2-year period. Compare this trifling sum with the cost of lend-lease, with the cost of our defense program prior to the war, with the cost of our war effort. The administration must be planning to supply the western European countries with popguns, toy pistols, and firecrackers. Certainly they cannot expect to give them expensive, modern instruments of war. The minimum estimate of the cost of equipping (not staffing) one army division is $250,000,000. General Fellers, former aide to General MacArthur, estimates that the whole force would need to be 60 divisions. He places its cost at $24,000,000,000 and he implies that even this amount would be wasted if we could not send additional troops to Europe within 60 days after the assault started. So, if you take it on assumption, then the whole thing is absolutely ridiculous because what we have proposed to do amounts to nothing at all. Will Russians wait until there is a real threat before moving to prevent it? Don't the western European nations know that the proposed amount of aid sent will provide practically no protection at all? Will not this knowledge influence them, and will they fight? Last of all and most important, will these European nations have the will to fight in any event? If not, the best Russian tactic and maneuver will be to secure control through infiltration rather than armed aggression. If they secure control by infiltration and control the cabinets of any of these governments, then won't they take our equipment for the benefit of the Russian-dominated Communist Parties?

Here is another question no one was able to answer to my satisfaction. Russia now has millions of men on its western front. If Russia begins increasing the amount of those men, would we then have to add to our program? If so, there you have your armament race. Three of the most eloquent pleas were made by three World War veterans, Mr. Potter, Mr. Sutton, and Mr. Williams. Representative SHORT, of Missouri, made an appeal emphasizing the main arguments. For many years he has been a member of the Armed Services Committee. I now quote from his speech:

"Mr. Chairman, the appropriation contained in this bill is far too little for Europe's defense; it is too much for our economy to carry. We are nigh bankrupt and do not know it. All of us well realize that if this measure is enacted into law, even with the original amount cut in two, the administration will come back next year and the year following and ask for further funds, perhaps even larger sums of money, just as they have done in the economic aid that we have voted to Europe.

"This is only the beginning. The camel is getting his nose under the tent. Anyone who is at all realistic knows that the original amount is only a drop in the barrel; that it cannot prevent Russia from overrunning all of Europe and the Middle East in 3 months should she so desire.

"I fear that this bill will denude our own armed forces. It will sap the strength of our Army and Air Force. Only yesterday as chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee I heard representatives of our Regular Military Establishments, our Reserves, and the National Guard plead for additional armories, equipment, weapons, and personnel for adequate training. What is going to happen if we take arms from our present stock and send them abroad? I fear that this measure will sharpen the razor to cut our own throats. I never believed in putting a pistol in the hands of an enemy to destroy me and while ostensibly we are sending it to our friends no one can rest assured that war-torn, weary Europe, where most of the flower of Europe's manhood is sleeping today beneath the sod, can or would fight a long-sustained war. Some of these countries put forth little effort last time and a continent of widows cannot be expected to fight.

"Certainly you would not furnish a weak neighbor a lot of ammunition which would be in grave danger of falling into the hands of a much larger and more powerful enemy. That would be both cowardly and stupid.

"Man lives so long but learns so little. History has a queer, stubborn, and cruel way of repeating itself.

"I fear, Mr. Chairman, that much of this current war fever is being artificially engendered to continue a war economy in order to avoid a depression and keep the present administration in power. Military goods produced from depleting the natural resources of this country will never bring prosperity to the American people. We will never become rich or grow strong by sending our money abroad for people to buy our goods. All that we get back is the money that we send them, and they get the fruits of our own labor, as we continue to pump our oil wells dry, dig up the iron, lead, zinc, copper, and coal of this country, hew down our forests, and consume the wealth of this Nation. We cannot make the rest of the world rich by making ourselves poor."

Foreign transactions of the United States Government, as reflected by appropriation acts, July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1948, total $101,369,606,706.

If this is carried to its natural conclusion, with any idea of making it really effective, the cost will run five to fifteen billion dollars a year. Can our Government stand this strain? If we do not keep the domestic economy of this country sound, then the free world will collapse along with us, and this is one point on which both Russia and the United States agree. The basic theory of the Kremlin, since the time of Lenin, has been to promote overextension and a crisis in the United States on the theory that then the world will be in their laps, and practically every sound thinker in the United States and Europe fears the same consequence. This is not a case of too little and too late. This is a case of too much and too little. Too much for our domestic economy and too little to accomplish the alleged and intended purpose.

Planned River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planned River Development," published in the New York Times of August 30, 1949, dealing with the Columbia Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority, with pertinent comments as to the desirability of the present program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNED RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Army's Corps of Engineers is the Nation's No. 1 flood-control and navigation agency. The Bureau of Reclamation is primarily concerned with western irrigation projects. Between them, the two agencies are responsible for many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of past and projected dams and levees and other works that are changing the face of the Nation.

But in recent years, as the millions pour out and the dams are raised and the channels deepened, a question has been rising with increasing intensity in the minds of many of the most disinterested and qualified observers. The question is this: Are these mighty works being planned in relation to the area which they affect, or are they promoted and sold and built as individual units without too much regard for the secondary effects which flow from them? And back of this question lies another: Is there adequate study and planning for the development of these vast regions as a whole—specifically, the great river valleys—so that all of the enormous construction work fits into a pattern of maximum use and minimum destruction of the resources already available?

Speaking of the Missouri Basin, an official of the Budget Bureau said just last week that the agencies now planning the eventual expenditure there of $5,000,000,000 are basing their plans on not more than one-tenth of the fundamentally needed basic data in geological, soil and hydrologic surveys, and in topographic mapping.

Unfortunately, the evidence is becoming increasingly clear that in their desire to get things done, and incidentally, to build up the prestige, personnel and power of their own organizations, the Government agencies most directly concerned tend to overlook the potential multiple-purpose use of the regions where they operate, and concentrate instead on their own limited field. Sometimes this results in inefficiency, sometimes in downright destructiveness. To take a simple example, dams may be constructed at great expense to control floods, when a much smaller expenditure for protection and reforestation of watersheds far above the dam sites might result in preventing them.

The piecemeal method of attacking such a profoundly important project as, for ex-

ample, the development of the Missouri or the Columbia Basin is obviously unjustified in view of the enormous expense and is also contrary to the national interest. Flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, forest, soil, and wildlife conservation and recreation are all involved. The basic facts concerning these areas must first be established, and then these various needs must be weighed one against the other, conflicts reconciled, compromises made.

Two years ago we observed that the spending of money on rivers for single purposes, such as the control of floods, has been rendered obsolete by the success of the TVA. If the problem is handled by several agencies, competition and friction are bound to result. Over-all authority, on the TVA model, as frequently advocated by the President, seems clearly to be the solution to the problem of our great untamed rivers and undeveloped river valleys.

American Legion Convention Address by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, at the American Legion convention in Philadelphia, Pa., on August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, fellow Legionnaires, Americans listening in everywhere: First, Commander, I would like to put in the record that this has been a great convention. Secondly, I would like to say to you, sir, you have been a great commander in a great year. Through the years ahead the time and effort you have given this year will be a matter of great satisfaction to you.

This is my first public address as head of the new Department of Defense. Until 3 weeks ago today, the Department with which I was entrusted was known as the National Military Establishment. But by an act of Congress signed by the President on that day, a new designation was adopted—the Department of Defense.

These changes in words are not matters of chance. They are of utmost significance. When first I took office in the Military Establishment in Washington, I became a member of the Department of War. Today I am the Secretary of a Department of Defense. And now, with your cooperation and support, men and women of the Legion, it is our purpose to convert our Department of Defense in effect into a department of peace. [Applause.]

We shall build our ramparts so strong that no aggressor will dare attack us. We must achieve peace, and we will achieve it. We will achieve it, my comrades, in the only way possible in this world of today—affirmatively—by unmistakable strength on land and sea and in the air. [Applause.]

So far, peace has been something elusive. Twice in our own lifetime you and I had it in our hands. Twice you and I let it slip away. Now we have it again in our grasp and this time I believe you are as determined as I am not to let it go.

There may have been some excuse, my comrades of World War I, for the first error. After all, in 1918 we were somewhat novices in the ways of the world and quite a bit naive about the method of the aggressor. We reasoned then, following World War I, somewhat as follows: We had won a great war. Germany and Austria had been crushed. Their military forces had been routed. The myth that an invincible German Army had been betrayed on the home front but had not really lost the battle had not yet been advanced by the Nazis. In fact, there then were no Nazis. We said Japan was our ally. It had helped expel the Germans out of the Orient. And as for Russia, we said internal chaos was so great it would be years and years before it could muster an army of sufficient strength to quell even domestic disturbances. So we said why not relax and enjoy life? And that, my comrades of World War I, is exactly what we proceeded to do.

Yet at that very moment of the Armistice, on November 11, 1918, when the guns were stilled on the western front and many of us were scrambling out of the trenches to breathe freely again under the canopy of heaven, our wartime ally, Japan, already was plotting aggression. Into every political vacuum of the Far East—in Siberia, Manchuria, and China—Japan proceeded to pour her military forces. She flooded the East with her anti-Western propaganda. We did nothing to stop her. Not only, my comrades, had we fallen asleep, but we seemed to have left orders not to be disturbed.

Almost alone in those days, the American Legion stood forth in that postwar period as the champion of preparedness. At first ours might have been a still small voice in the wilderness, but we persisted in our duty as we saw it, and gradually it was becoming clearer that not all ears were deaf to our pleas. By 1941 we had made some degree of progress toward establishing more adequate national defense. But for our insistence, our armed forces might not have had even that small nucleus of trained men, that sound core around which we were able to build in time that superb body of armed forces that so brilliantly conquered in World War II; and in which so many of you present played so gallant a part.

And so it was 4 years ago, on this very day, in fact, 4 years ago, that we were again waiting for the dawn of a day of peace. All of us were looking toward the East, toward the rise of the sun that would shine again on a world without strife. The Nazis had been crushed in Europe. Japan's treachery had been avenged. Her rising sun had set. Within 24 hours aboard our own good ship the *Missouri* the unconditional surrender of Nippon's war lords would be tendered to General MacArthur.

VJ-day came. We rushed headlong for home. Our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force, which no enemy could defeat in battle, we ourselves demobilized. My comrades, we dozed off in dreams of the same stuff that betrayed us once before. And again, after World War II, we argued naively: Had we not licked the Nazis and the Japs? Had we not proved our superiority on land and sea and in the air? Is there anywhere any power that could challenge us? Do any people have the needed resources and industrial capacity to wage war against Uncle Sam? Look at our enemies, we said, wholly crushed. Look at our allies, we said—who among them would wish to rise against us? Why Russia is on our side—our own ally. And as for China, she is so torn with internal dissension that no threat could possibly come out of that troubled land in our lifetime.

And the parallel with the end of World War I continues, my comrades. For at that very moment, on VJ-day, our wartime ally, Russia, was already on the move, with her own plans. Into the military void among the peoples on her borders, she pushed in her own troops; into every political vacuum anywhere in the world she began to pour in her vicious propaganda against her erstwhile allies.

But here the parallel between the two postwar eras suddenly stops. You and I may have been dozing all right, but we had not yet fallen completely asleep. We caught ourselves in time. Now we of America are fully awake, grimly determined, God grant it, that history shall not repeat itself. Already we have gone a long way to correct the mistakes of our demobilization stampede.

Again, I am happy to report to you, we have an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force worthy of our country and of the pride of every American citizen; and they are getting better every day—stronger and more efficient. [Applause.]

Moreover, they are rounding themselves into one team—a team that will make all enemies stop, look, and listen before attempting aggression across the tracks of the United States.

That ever-closer unification of that team is the responsibility now of the Department of Defense, imposed upon it by the will of the people.

The path has not been easy, my comrades. During the past 5 months the going has been rough at times. But we are now well on our way. When I became Secretary of the National Military Establishment, less than 6 months ago, there were still some die-hards who would not see or would not think in terms other than that of their own particular service. But now even they are coming around. I am happy to report to you that 80 percent of the problems that beset unification immediately disappeared when the President signed the bill increasing the authority and the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense.

The job goes on apace. I wish I had the time to discuss each constructive step that so far has been taken toward unification. In preparation for this speech, I asked a member of my staff to compile a list of the steps that have been taken. It ran to more than 26 closely typewritten pages. The job is not completed in any sense. It has but begun.

Let me therefore, and briefly, touch only upon a few of those acts of unification we have effected—acts that I hope will appeal to you not only as citizens interested in the over-all defense of our country, not only as veterans intimately concerned with the discipline, the training, and the morale of those who wear your uniform today, but also as American taxpayers out of whose pockets the Military Establishment must be supported.

The cost of our armed forces comes high—too high in fact—and we are determined to cut it at the rate of about a billion this year. That reduction in cost I know you will be pleased to learn will not come at the expense of the men in the service. On the contrary, they deserve a raise, and we have urged Congress to give it to them. To recruit and keep men of high quality they must be paid as adequately as possible bearing in mind that the kind of men we need, both commissioned and enlisted, can get in civil life salaries far in excess of what we could hope to pay them in the defense department.

Nor do we plan to save money at the expense of quality in weapons or equipment. I pledge you our ships, our planes, our tanks, our rifles, our radio sets—every item on our shopping list, will be superior to what any other nation can put into the hands of its fighting men. The goal of high-quality weapons in the hands of high-quality men,

let me assure you, is the aim of all the agencies of the Department of Defense.

We are going to make that saving, therefore, not on pay, not on quality, but by eliminating waste and duplication. We have declared war on these two enemies of efficiency, and we shall, with your support, continue to wage it with vigor and determination. Every one of you who served in the armed forces in World War II has seen somewhere some evidence of waste, duplication, and mismanagement—perhaps a Navy hospital overflowing with patients with an Army installation nearby relatively empty; or an Army airdrome, its capacity overloaded, with a Navy field adjacent hardly in use; a ship's store loaded with tobacco, chocolate, and beer, and a nearby post exchange with empty shelves—these and other evidences of inefficiency and mismanagement we are determined to correct.

Here are just a few of the things we have done already:

We have defined the military roles and missions of the three services and assigned to each what it is best organized and trained and equipped to do.

Secondly, we have established unified commands around the world. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are under an Army general in the Caribbean, an Air Force general in Alaska, and an admiral in the Pacific.

We are educating officers of the three services in combined courses at the National War College, the Industrial College, and the other schools of the service. We are working on changes in the curriculum both at West Point and at Annapolis which will provide more uniform education in the service academies and will stress the goal of unification. Every year West Point cadets and Annapolis midshipmen take training courses together. This year we are holding joint maneuvers in which all three services take part.

We are simplifying procedures. When we come before Congress today our budget represents a coordinated integrated estimate of the needs of the Department of Defense as a whole. We appreciate, as you do, that there is not enough taxpayers' money available to give each of the three services everything that each of them feels it may need. Since we cannot have everything we want we figure out what we need most and trust that our experience and our knowledge of conditions all over the world will lead us to the proper decision. At best we are engaging in a calculated risk, but the kind of risk that all prudent men must take when they venture into the unknown.

When we ask for legislation or when Congress refers bills to us to report, one agency in my office acts for all of us.

Next we have hired a group of preeminent civilian consultants in business management to show us where and how to effect economies and obtain increased efficiency in operation.

Next, we have abolished a total of 134 committees and boards, and that job has but begun. Of course, there are needs for both committees and boards in good business administration, but government by committee too often means an excuse for delay and a lack of responsibility. And I believe that boards usually live up to the reputation given them by an Army wit who once said that a board is something long, narrow, and wooden.

Next, we are evaluating the weapons and the systems of attack and defense of the three services, and we are bringing them all into one cohesive whole.

We are determined, my comrades, to maintain our margin of superiority in production and development of weapons and equipment. To that end we have a Research and Development Board to integrate the efforts of all.

We are combining facilities and services wherever possible and taking advantage of specialized abilities and techniques developed in the respective services. As an instance, the Army buys the food and the trucks for all. The Navy gets the coal and the oil and roasts the coffee for all. The Air Force obtains photographic material for the Army and the Navy, and so it goes.

Another instance. In the field of air transportation, we combined at a most opportune time the operations of the Air Transport Command of the United States Air Force and the Naval Air Transport Services. We set up the consolidated Military Air Transport Service under the Air Force Chief of Staff, fortunately just before the need for extensive operation had arisen. The success of the Berlin Airlift would never have been possible without the combined Military Air Transport Service.

Today we are effecting the same kind of consolidation in the field of sea transport where we have turned the job over to the Navy. The Army will have the responsibility for land transport.

Progress of unification in the medical field has been most reassuring. We have set up uniform standards and programs to improve the services and to attract promising civilian doctors. We have arranged for more equitable distribution of medical personnel by transferring officers from the Army and Navy to the United States Air Force. We have closed, after careful consideration, some hospitals, reduced the scope of others, and in many cases have arranged for joint staffs when joint use of facilities was being made. Much is yet to be done.

We have set up a Civilian Components Policy Board to develop over-all policies and assign clearly defined missions for the National Guard and the Reserve and among all the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, including the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

Here are a few more things we are working on:

A personnel policy which will assure equal treatment and equal opportunities for all men in uniform;

A job classification system for all services which will result in better assignment of men to duties for which they are particularly qualified. with pay and rank commensurate to the job and its responsibilities;

A study of better use of the chaplains of all three services is underway. I believe that when men of God are needed to administer to men's souls, there should be no occasion to ascertain the color of the chaplain's uniform.

I shall not burden you with any more details of unification at this time. But in the list, on page 17 of the 26 pages, there is a reference to the fact that there will be no more Army Days or Navy Days or Air Force Days. I am happy to say to you that probably this afternoon the President is issuing a proclamation fixing the third Saturday in May of each year as Armed Forces Day in lieu of all other service days.

I trust I have given you enough to convince you that to me, as I want it to be to you, unification is something real, something definite, and that with your backing we are making considerable progress on the program.

By saving money on defense expenditures, unification will serve to strengthen the national economic structure, which is still one of the two primary bulwarks of peace. By increasing service efficiency, unification will make us better prepared for the next emergency.

Only if we of America are strongly prepared can we hope to have peace in the atmosphere of the world of today. When I say we, I mean not only the United States, but also our friends and possible allies among the nations of the world. We are not alone in our quest for peace. Nor will America be alone if a crisis develops.

Both in World War I and World War II we had allies, allies that held the line while we got ready. But we know that if war comes again with the increased tempo of the atomic age there will be no time for them to hold the line for us. That is why we are a party to the North Atlantic Treaty. That is why we are trying to strengthen the will and the ability of our friends abroad. That is why we so strongly urged the military-assistance program for them.

There are other factors besides our own armed strength and that of our friends that help maintain the peace today. We have, of course, the United Nations. The United Nations, not yet as potent or persuasive a factor for peace as our own military strength, it is nevertheless a body that we should cherish and support. We in America have placed great faith in the United Nations. We believe in its ultimate success as an instrument of peace. Already it has proved of great value as a forum for frank and free discussion. My comrades, it will be worth a great deal to all people everywhere on that day when all nations will be ready to park not only their physical but also their psychological weapons outside the door and come to the council table in a spirit of good will and compromise. But until such manifestations become crystal clear, we in the United States have no alternative as a free nation but to be—

"Strong in will,
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Only by adhering to such a code can we keep out of war. Only by keeping awake to reality and preparing accordingly, can we reach the ideal goal which in the inception of our Republic was set for the Military Establishment by George Washington. George Washington wanted to call the Military Establishment of our Nation a peace department—and it is this aspiration which inspires our policies today.

And now, my comrades, I have 2 minutes left on the air. Let me be personal with you. This Department of Defense is a sacred trust and I am honored to serve as its first Secretary. You helped train me for this job. My service on American Legion committees and my duties as your national commander were my conditioning for this job. You have honored me greatly.

I say to you my job is tough. The task is great. There are still bumps ahead. In doing what my conscience tells me to do and what the people of America want me to do—in the doing of that—I shall make thousands of enemies.

In the days gone by, during the recent months when the attacks came, I have paid no attention to them nor have I answered them. I have gone along with the same job for which you have associated yourselves, the job of serving our country, the job of guiding our people.

In the days ahead, as I preach the gospel of a sufficiency of defense for America first, and along with it, of equal importance, a strong and vital economy, they will call me ruthless. They will call me names. I promise you here in this sacred gathering that I shall not be distracted by the name-calling, but I shall move on to do the job of unification—of attaining a sufficiency of defense within the economy of America.

A failure in our economy is what Russia banks on. That must not happen. When unfavorable things are said about me, I ask you to give me then as you have in the past of your strength. Give me of your determination. I shall do my best with all my might and power and vigor and soul to serve America as you would have it served.

God bless America.

(After presentation of flags of the several States to the Secretary, the following statement was made:)

Secretary JOHNSON. They say you should not make a speech when your heart's overflowing. Paul tells me there are 52 flags here and 4 more will make 56.

Someone has written that collecting memories is a difficult thing, that some people collect old pictures, some old china, some old prints—all fine, but all perishable—that the only imperishable values of life are memories.

You have given me many, many fine memories, you of the Legion and its Auxiliary, but for the rest of my life I will have these 56 flags around me as evidence of the happiest memory page in all the book. When we talk for a safe and sound America militarily and economically, these flags will be a symbol. It will mean that you and I are fighting in the ranks for the same cause.

God bless you, everyone.

Insurance and the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Insurance and the Welfare State, delivered by me at the American Bar Association Convention in St. Louis, Mo., September 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURANCE AND THE WELFARE STATE

I. INTRODUCTION

It is good to be in St. Louis again—away from the supercharged political atmosphere of Washington. It is particularly pleasant to mingle again among my brethren of the bar.

When I left Washington, tempers were short in the Senate. The Congress has been in continuous session for 8 months now—almost a peacetime record. In the field of accomplishments, it has been quite a different story. Sometimes we hear the present Congress referred to as the Eighty-Worst.

I am reminded of the young writer who once asked Will Rogers, "Is the field of humor crowded?" Will's reply was: "Only when Congress is in session."

The Congress faces many problems. There is one issue that—like Banquo's ghost—will not down. It haunts the Nation's Capital. This issue permeates most of the others. Simply stated it is this: Is the United States destined to become a "welfare state?" The ultimate question is: Will the free people of America continue to control their Federal Government, or will the Central Government gain control of the people themselves?

What is this "welfare state" about which we hear so much? Approached on a practical basis the answer is not difficult.

The welfare state has its roots in the idea that the Government can spend your money for you better than you can spend it yourselves. Government bureaucrats offer cradle-to-grave security to the people—in return for the progressive surrender of their liberties.

The issue is really one of freedom versus slavery. It is a question of whether a free people shall retain their fundamental liberties and human rights, or permit an all-powerful Central Government to tell them what to do, when to do it, and how to do it.

With your indulgence I should like to discuss three aspects of the welfare state—first as a threat to all business enterprise, second, as a threat to the business of insurance, and, third, as a threat to the future of America.

II. THE WELFARE STATE AS A THREAT TO ALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

(a) *Developments abroad*

Russia has a welfare state. The idea there has been carried to the nth degree. Long ago the light of freedom flickered out behind the iron curtain. Now all is communism.

In the Western World the threat to freedom goes under a different name—socialism. Let no one be confused—a stinkweed under any other name smells the same. Socialism and communism are fruit of the same tree, and the roots of that tree are the theories of Karl Marx. There is this distinction between the two: The Communist would establish government ownership of the means of production by overthrowing governments with force and violence. The Socialist wants to accomplish exactly the same result. He prefers to proceed, without violence, by peaceful processes of infiltration.

Several of the countries of western Europe are far down the road toward a completely socialized welfare state. France has socialized 23 of her important industries, or about two-fifths of her total economy. In 1946, France nationalized 34 insurance companies and transferred their assets to state ownership.

Great Britain, too, has been rushing headlong into socialism since the Socialist Party came into power in 1945. England has already nationalized nine of her most important industries, or approximately one-fifth of her total economy. The coal mines, civil aviation, cable and radio communications, railroads—these and a number of other basic industries in Britain are now government owned and operated. A bill to nationalize the all-important steel industry has passed the House of Commons. The British are also spending billions of dollars on such internal welfare state schemes as socialized medicine, under which free false teeth and wigs are available for all who want them. Under the national-health scheme some few have done very well indeed. For instance, a dentist in Lanarkshire, England, was paid, out of government funds, more than $100,000 in 11 months as fees for his services.

The Socialist Party in Britain recently announced a vast new program for socialization. In addition to the activities already socialized, the Government now proposes to take over the cement industry, all suitable mineral deposits, and two great industrial life insurance companies—the Pearl and the Prudential, both of which have vast investments in other business enterprises.

(b) *American dollars for European socialism*

I am particularly concerned about the fact that American dollars—I mean your money—are now being used under the Marshall plan to finance these experiments in European socialism.

I shall discuss the case of Great Britain—not because of any dislike for the British, but because Britain is by far the largest beneficiary under the Marshall plan. The American taxpayers have already contributed over $44,000,000,000 to Great Britain, under various plans—most of them now unhonored and unsung. Six billion dollars of that has gone out to her since VJ-day.

If the United States had not financed the British Socialist program, it could not have been carried out. Had it not been for the Marshall plan and the ill-fated British loan, of lamented memory, Britain's "welfare state" would have brought a standard of living to the British people they would not have been willing to accept. The Socialist politicians have been able to say to their constituents: "You get more money for less work than ever before in the history of the island." American dollars have been used as a slush fund to keep these Socialist politicians in power.

We have Mr. Churchill's word for it that: "The Socialist government and Socialist policy are living on the United States from month to month and from hand to mouth."

Britain's Socialist leaders—and some of the apologists for the Marshall plan—seek to evade the fact that American dollars are being used to further the socialism program. But as one on-the-spot observer puts it, "It seems to be largely a matter of how you keep books. Or, to try for the simplest example, it's like giving a relative $20 provided he spends none of it for booze. So he spends $5 of his own for liquor, and uses $5 of your money to buy what he otherwise could have bought with his own."

Dollars enter into the socialization process in a number of ways. For example, over $400,000,000 of Marshall plan counterpart funds have been used for payment on Britain's internal debts—inflated by experiments in socialism. While these payments were being made the national debt of the people of the United States was increasing from $252,000,000,000 to $254,000,000,000.

To the heavily burdened people of the United States, to adopt Winston Churchill's sympathetic description of us, the British are coming again. They want further aid to bolster their faltering Socialist government. Mr. Ernest Bevin and Sir Stafford Cripps are on their way to Washington in an effort to tap again the United States Treasury—as they have tapped it so frequently, so successfully, in the past. The gold rush of 1949 is on.

Why is it that Britain's economy is sliding even nearer to the brink of disaster? Britain lacks dollars because she cannot produce sufficiently low-priced goods to meet the competition of the free-enterprise system.

Her "welfare state" expects the foreign markets to pay for some of her expensive experiments, like socialized medicine. But, more important, this welfare system lacks the ingenuity, the efficiency, and the flexibility to get out the types and styles of goods that foreign buyers want. High production means more than hard work; it means skillful and resourceful management. Socialism usually means leisurely labor. The evidence indicates that in present-day England socialism means management dead on its feet.

As a result, the British have failed to produce sufficient goods for export at prices the buyers in the foreign markets are ready and willing to pay. This has interfered with the recovery of Britain from the very beginning of the Socialist regime.

When the Marshall plan appropriation bill was before the Senate earlier in the session, I proposed an amendment providing that no money appropriated from the United States Treasury for recovery and relief in Europe should go to any country that insisted on continuing the nationalization of basic industries. The amendment was not designed to "unscramble the eggs," but its adoption would have prevented further use of American money in new socialistic schemes.

The antisocialism amendment barely failed of adoption by the Senate Appropriations Committee by a 9 to 9 tie vote. Later, on the Senate floor, on a motion to suspend the rules, it was turned down by a vote of 49 to 24.

I do not regard the battle as over. The Marshall plan still has 3 years to go. The disastrous effects of Britain's experiments with the "welfare state" are becoming more

apparent each day. I cannot avoid the conclusion that when we think this thing through—at long last—we shall decide not to permit our money, earned under the American system of free enterprise and personal initiative, to be frittered away in European experiments in socialism.

I am not violating any confidence when I say there are indications that some Members of the Congress are about ready to change their position. This reminds me of the story of the hillbilly in Tennessee. He came into the doctor's office one Saturday morning with a tall, gangling boy, and he said: "Doc, I wish you would fix up my son-in-law."

The doctor said, "What's the matter with him?"

"Oh," the hillbilly said, "I shot him in the leg yesterday and lamed him up a mite."

The doctor said, "Why, shame on you, shooting your own son-in-law."

"Aw, Doc," he said, "he warn't my son-in-law 'til I shot him."

III. THE WELFARE STATE AS A THREAT TO THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

Meanwhile, the advocates of a welfare state here at home have been active indeed. The Eighty-first Congress has been under a barrage of proposals to strengthen and extend the grip on our daily lives of the great Federal octopus on the banks of the Potomac. Some of these proposals, if enacted into law, would have a profound effect upon the business of insurance as it exists today in America.

Time will not permit me to discuss these proposals in detail and their possible effects on the insurance industry. I would like to mention two or three of them which I submit are indicative of the general trend.

(a) Compulsory health insurance

The Congress has been under repeated and heavy pressure from the Truman Administration to approve a program of compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine. Insurance companies offering disability and hospitalization insurance naturally take a dim view of the proposal. Furthermore, it would be the death knell for such voluntary insurance plans as the Blue Cross.

(b) Mortgage lending field

The Federal Government is becoming more active in another area of business activity—the housing and mortgage lending field. This development has not escaped the notice of insurance companies, for here is normally an important investment outlet for policyholders' funds. Federal activity in the mortgage lending field has been accelerated by the postwar easy-money program.

We have learned by experience that each act of interference with the mechanism of a free market brings about the need for further Government intervention.

(c) Workmen's compensation insurance

Workmen's compensation insurance is another field which the advocates of the welfare state are surveying with interest. In the United States workmen's compensation has been handled, for the most part, by private insurance companies for more than 30 years, with varying degrees of regulation by the States. Certain Government officials would like the Federal Government either to monopolize the field, or to subject it to extensive Federal regulation.

A bill introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota (S. 1992), and a companion bill in the House, introduced by Congressman BURKE, of Ohio (H. R. 4997), may be a trial balloon. These measures provide for creating in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Accident Prevention for the stated purpose of promoting and maintaining safe and healthful conditions in hazardous industries affecting commerce.

While this measure deals with the authority and powers of the proposed new Bureau of Accident Prevention, there are indications that the sponsors contemplate further steps in the workmen's compensation field.

Congressman BURKE said in the House at the time he introduced the bill on June 6, 1949: "I intend to propose to the Committee on Education and Labor a special investigation and study of the * * * subject of workmen's compensation.

"Today we have in the United States, its Territories and possessions, a crazy quilt of health and safety provisions and workmen's compensation which," he said, "not only lacks rhyme, reason, or uniformity but is half full of holes."

IV. THE WELFARE STATE AS A THREAT TO THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

Former Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes recently jolted Washington with a stern warning against the drift toward socialism. He left no doubt that, in his opinion, the road we are now traveling leads to economic slavery for us all. Mr. Byrnes pointed out that—

"Some of the proposals now suggested which would curtail the liberties of the people are offered in the name of public welfare and are to be made possible by Federal aid. That phrase is an opiate. It is deceptive.

"It leads people to believe that Federal aid funds come from a Christmas tree."

Mr. Justice Byrnes then said: "Too many people are trying to transfer power to Government. * * * Power once transferred to Government is difficult to recover. Power intoxicates men. When a man is intoxicated by alcohol, he can recover, but when intoxicated by power, he seldom recovers."

Finally, Mr. Justice Byrnes solemnly warned us:

"Beware of those who promise you something which does not belong to them, and which can be given to you only at your own expense."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now president of Columbia University, recently had this to say:

"I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury, are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us."

We have tried bureaucratic government from Washington. We have learned the hard way that it is always expensive, often inefficient, and, above all, that it is steadily creeping upon us with the intent to destroy our most cherished liberties.

I think it is time to stop coddling socialism—both at home and abroad. You hear it said: "It can't happen here," and "we'll never see a socialistic United States of America." Well, it was once said that it could not happen in England. But it did happen.

I hope you will not think me an alarmist when I tell you with all the earnestness of which I am capable that the Republic is in danger. It is endangered by those who would substitute for our free enterprise system, a socialized planned economy. Radicals who call themselves liberals without knowing the real meaning of the word, would replace Americanism with statism. They would weaken and impair the liberties which we have enjoyed under the Bill of Rights and replace them with bureaucratic regulations and dictatorial interpretations flowing out with monotonous regularity from Washington. Their purpose is as plain as their arithmetic is simple. They would subtract from the political and economic freedoms of the people. They would add to the size and power of the Federal Government.

And so my brethren of the bar, let us be on guard. Let us man the ramparts of our American way of life. We are on warning to withstand the beginnings of encroachment "For the saddest epitaph," Mr. Justice Sutherland said, "which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

The Mexican Oil Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on Tuesday, August 30, by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], entitled "The Mexican Oil Loan."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEXICAN OIL LOAN

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to discuss our relations with Mexico, our most immediate neighbor to the south, and the loan which she applied for through the State Department in order to modernize and expand the petroleum industry.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this subject because I consider our relations with Mexico to be the key to successful relations with the 150,000,000 people who live in Latin America and who are, with the Canadians, our most immediate neighbors. Further, I realize that I am speaking to an audience which welcomed and warmly applauded the good-neighbor policy which superseded the policy of armed intervention, dollar diplomacy and Yankee imperialism, which caused us to be so hated south of the border prior to 1933.

I am sure that my listeners will agree that the national security, the preservation of our democracy and way of life is intimately linked with strong and effective inter-America system. Assistance for the western European democracies in the common struggle against Soviet expansion is well, but to concentrate our attention solely on Europe and to neglect our southern neighbors is a complete reversal of the good-neighbor policy of Franklin Roosevelt and embarks us on a dangerous course which we must reverse immediately.

Before discussing the Mexican oil situation and the loan, permit me to tell you about the man who directs the petroleum industry in Mexico. The oil industry has been operated by the Government of Mexico since 1938. Under her constitution all subsoil rights belong to the Government. The production and sale of petroleum and its products are conducted by a Government agency called Petroleos Mexicanos or Pemex. Pemex is like our Commodity Credit Corporation or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Senator Bermudez, who directs this vast operation, is the Senator from Chihuahua, the state south of my home, New Mexico. He lives in Juarez across the border from El Paso. He is a businessman in the finest sense of the word and is known to countless thousands in the Southwest as Troy. Senator Bermudez enjoys a reputation for honesty and responsi-

bility seldom equaled anywhere and the job of running Pemex could not be in better hands.

Under Senator Bermudez the petroleum industry has made remarkable progress. In 1937, production amounted to 47,000,000 barrels; 10 years later in 1947 production rose to 56,000,000 and last year, 1948, it was close to 60,000,000 barrels. Eighty-two percent of the production is being consumed internally by the rapidly expanding industries and mechanized agriculture of Mexico. Natural gas is now being used in Mexico supplied by pipe lines. Mexico has done a remarkable job overcoming handicaps that at times seemed insurmountable including boycotts in markets, shipping and critical supplies imposed by the private oil companies. Mexico conducts a well-managed and efficient operation.

Congressman CROSSER, the chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, and the committee visited Mexico last year for the purpose of studying the petroleum situation. He was aware of the statement of the Secretary of National Defense that in times of national crisis—that is, in event of war—we would have a petroleum deficiency of 2,000,000 barrels a day in the United States and that development of additional sources of oil is of serious concern, so he invited Senator Bermudez to come to Washington and see what could be done.

Mr. Bermudez arrived prepared to outline the needs of Pemex for the next 5 years. But after a series of conferences, which lasted for a period of 4 months negotiations ended and nothing was accomplished.

The reasons why the loan has been denied in the face of the obvious necessity for acquiring immediate supplies of petroleum and petroleum products must be brought out into the open. The American people must be told the shameful story how the big oil companies whose properties were expropriated in 1938 are unduly influencing the State Department by not permitting a loan which would put the petroleum industry in Mexico on its feet. The machinations of the big oil companies present one of the most sordid pictures in the history of American relations with Mexico; and they represent a threat to our national security for they are thereby arming the Communists, not only in Latin America, but throughout the world with a powerful propaganda weapon.

The Communists are meeting in Mexico City on September 4, for their Third International Peace Congress. The first was held in New York City, the second in Paris, and now they are turning their attention to Latin America. "Pinkos" will flock to Mexico City from all parts of the world; and I predict that they will sing a tune of American imperialism and neglect of Latin America; they know only too well that a policy which ignores Latin America is dangerous for us because it augers the break-down of inter-American cooperation.

Mexico is the key to Latin America. Every Latin-American country watches carefully how we treat our closest neighbor. They remember how we welcomed her raw materials, her labor, and her troops in time of war but how callously we thus far have neglected her since fighting is over.

Mexico has a potential and strategic value that cannot be exaggerated. Her oil reserves are estimated from 2 to 20 times as great as our own proven reserves.

We are in a cold war and we may be in a hot one soon, so why in heaven's name are we concerning ourselves with the development of fields and refineries in far-off Arabia, which are easily accessible to the armies of our only potential enemy, when we have a potential reserve accessible by land in Mexico?

Mexico has been a friend to the United States. We received products and materials from her without which the war might have been prolonged many months. Mexican combat units fought alongside our own troops. Thousands of Mexican laborers came to work in our factories, on our farms and on our railroads, releasing the manpower that was needed to fight in Europe and in the Pacific.

It is vital that we assist Mexico by strengthening her economically. We are pouring billions into Europe to halt communism. Mr. Cripps and Mr. Snyder will soon meet to discuss the financial crisis which confronts Great Britain. Mexico, too, faces a financial crisis. She imports from us the products of our farms and factories to the extent of $500,000,000 a year. She is one of our best customers. To continue doing this, Mexico must export products in an equal amount in dollars. Mexico cannot do this since the products of her mines, her factories, and her farms are not sufficient to balance this trade. Consequently, the only course available for Mexico is to export greater amounts of petroleum and this she cannot do without increased production, which will come about only if we grant her the loan. Three hundred million would raise the capacity of Pemex from the 60,000,000 barrels of oil it is producing today to an estimated 164,000,000 barrels and would provide Mexico with the dollars needed to balance her trade and to place her in an economically healthy condition.

We have been generous to our friends and allies in Europe. We have been generous to our former enemies. Why, then, can we not be at least businesslike with Mexico, our closest friend and ally. During the war we loaned the Mexican Government $10,000,000 to build a refinery outside of Mexico City. Payments on that loan have been met religiously. Senator Bermudez, who is as shrewd a businessman as any Yankee, assured our Government that the loans which he sought were for specific projects which Mexico wanted examined on the basis of merit alone, and which could amortize themselves. In other words, we would get back our money. That sounds strange in an era of pouring out billions which we call loans but which we know will never be repaid. By contrast the loan to Mexico makes sense economically as well as politically.

The world's demand for oil is extremely acute and precious reserves which we are depleting now because we have to export oil to the entire world, might well be preserved if we would develop the available Mexican source of supply. We have every reason to go ahead with the loan.

President Aleman of Mexico is a great friend of our own President Truman. They have exchanged visits and each received the friendliest of receptions. Due to this friendly relationship, and because of my confidence in President Truman, I am positive that he will see the situation purely from the standpoint of national interest. I predict that the oil crowd and their friends in the State Department will not succeed in stopping the loan.

Economic help to Mexico and to Latin America must be more than a thought, it must be a reality. It can be an instrument for making a better American Continent for all of us to enjoy.

Trade between the United States and Latin America has declined. The reason for this decline is a dollar shortage. These countries require our assistance in raising their standards of living and in supporting their economies. The case of Mexico should be the model for economic and political cooperation for all of Latin America. The hemisphere eyes the oil loan to Mexico as a test case. Our profession of friendship and our sincerity is at stake and there is always the threat of communism if we don't help. Communism is strong wherever poverty and low standards of living exist. We cannot afford to have the menace of communism at our very doorstep.

When the peace congress meets in Mexico City on the 4th of September let us be prepared to refute the charge that the United States desires the imperialistic domination of the world. That we seek to maintain a servile standard of living in South America, so that we will have a perpetual and cheap source of raw material for our own industry.

By granting the loan, we can prove the sincerity of our foreign policy and I appeal to the President and to the State Department and to the American people to give Mexico the economic help that it so badly needs. Let us see that this help is given, now, when it is needed most and when it is most important in order to fight communism at home. Why not use President Truman's famous point IV, and use American economic strength and technical know-how to raise the living standards of the backward areas in our own backyard?

The way we have dropped our Latin-American friends would lead one to believe that the Western Hemisphere and the American people are the victims of a diabolical plot to destroy the inter-American system. I don't believe that our President would ever be a party to such a policy, but I do believe that there are elements in the State Department who follow such a course, perhaps unknowingly, which, if not halted, will kill the good-neighbor policy, if it is not dead already. The good-neighbor policy was sound in principal and was sound in results. It paid dividends in sympathy, in essential raw materials, in manpower when we were fighting the Axis, and now that we are engaged in a cold war, it might be well for us to stop and evaluate the consequences if that friendship is destroyed and that cooperation is no longer available. I insist that the security and national defense of the United States depends on a free and prosperous Latin America and a live, active, and efficient system of inter-American cooperation.

In the case of Mexico I feel certain that the development of an immediate source of supply of oil close to home is strategically more important to us than the development of vulnerable fields in far-off Arabia, that a prosperous and healthy and independent Mexico would contribute much to our national safety and prosperity and that conversely, a Mexico whose economy is being wrecked by the selfish attitude of the oil companies could well become a breeding ground for communism and certainly would offer a perfect working ground for agitation and disorder which would affect the entire hemisphere.

I believe that, so why not give Mexico the opportunity to get on her feet? Why not extend the hand of friendship southward as well as eastward? Let us prove ourselves good neighbors. Let us grant Mexico the loan.

Open Letter to Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan from the Racine Journal-Times, dated August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE GENERAL

Maj. Gen. HARRY VAUGHAN,
Military Aide, White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We don't want to be disrespectful toward your high rank, particularly since you are so close to the President of the United States himself. But you'll pardon us, General, if we can't quite swallow many of the things you told the Senate Investigating Committee Tuesday. To put it more bluntly, sir, we don't believe you.

For instance, when you were asked about helping a New Jersey company that stood accused of violating sugar rationing rules, you denied threatening to use your influence against an Agriculture Department official. You said perhaps somebody impersonated you over the telephone. This, General, is about the thinnest excuse ever concocted by the mind of man.

You admitted accepting political campaign contributions from John Maragon, among others. You know, your friend John, whom you helped to obtain materials to build a California race track at a time when people couldn't get material to build homes. Yes, and the same John for whom you interceded with the State Department, to get a passport to he could go on a perfume-buying trip to a part of northern Italy where "ordinary" Americans couldn't travel in 1945. But though the investigating committee has documentary evidence, in the form of a letter from you from the White House, you told the Senators yesterday that you didn't use any pressure in this case. That is, didn't give the State Department to understand that the President himself was interested in the trip of your friend, John. Really, General, you would stretch a person's credulity all out of shape.

Then there's the matter of seven deep freezers, sent to you for distribution to some of your friends in high places. They were sent by one David A. Bennett, the boss of the perfume company for whom your friend Maragon was then working. But yesterday you said the freezers were a gift from two old friends, and had absolutely nothing to do with the help you had given these old friends. Actually, General, you flabbergast us with your effrontery in expecting the American people to believe that. You insult the intelligence of a lot of citizens.

We could cite several other "explanations" of yours that had a hollow ring, indeed. But you capped the climax by assuming a righteous air and declaring that in peddling favors as a man of influence you only did your duty. The whitewash with which you painted yourself as a man who had done nothing improper, seems to us to have some very dark spots.

It was loyal of you, General, to insist that President Truman knew nothing of any of your activities. But you and Mr. Truman will both have to excuse us for saying that if he didn't know what you were doing, he should have known. It seems hardly possible that anyone as close to him as you have been, both officially and as a personal friend, could have done all those things without the President having at least an inkling of what was going on.

When the charges were first filed against you, the President asked the people of this country to "withhold their judgment." Probably many of them did. But we can't see how they could be expected to withhold it any longer. Not after the fiasco of your "defense" before the investigators.

Why don't you resign, General, without delay, for the good of the country and the President himself?

Yours truly,

THE RACINE JOURNAL-TIMES.

Another Blunder Shows Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 19, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on incident after incident is coming to light which emphasizes the fact that no man is indispensable or his judgment infallible.

The following editorial from the September 1 issue of the Ohio State Journal clearly depicts the situation which many of us prophesied would result if the administration continued the policy it then was following with regard to Russia. We were branded by every left-wing group and also by well-meaning but ill-informed others, as being isolationists and reactionaries. It is my honest opinion that time will eventually show that the American people were being led by an emotional appeal rather than by practical common sense. The fact that we won in spite of it attests to the ingenuity of our American system. The editorial follows:

THE WAR IN RETROSPECT, AND THE AFTERMATH

Ten years ago today, the German Army, under the exhortation of Adolf Hitler "to insure the future of the Reich for the next 1,000 years," invaded Poland, Danzig was declared annexed to Germany and Warsaw was bombed. Two days later, Britain and France kept their pledge and declared war on Germany. World War II, long-dreaded and long-threatened, had become an actuality, although 2 years would elapse before it would in fact encircle the globe.

Before the fighting was to stop 6 years later, battles would be fought in Norway, France, Egypt, China, Burma, Russia, Italy, Syria, and Somaliland. Pinpoint places on the map, such as El Alamein, Narvik, Guadalcanal, Bataan, Buna, and Bastogne, would become vital points in global strategy and boys from Ohio cities and towns would fight in many of them, die, and be buried there.

In the fury unloosed that day 10 years ago, millions of civilians would die in unprecedented horrors in concentration camps and bombings that reached from Coventry to Hiroshima. In the end, Germany would be crushed, Hitler would be a suicide, Mussolini would be trussed up in public, vast areas would be laid waste, and Japan would be brought to its knees by the awful power of the atom bomb.

Nominally, now, the war is over, but after 10 years the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse still ride over the face of the earth, armies face each other across thin barriers, many lands lie subservient or seething in restlessness under alien rulers, and in China an ancilliary war still rages which may in itself have far-reaching and lasting effects on the world's future.

Today there can be no actual doubt of the war guilt of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Warlord Japan. All three have been crushed and penalized, and yet tyranny of the most virulent and insidious sort still threatens the world. The source of the trouble is Soviet Russia, which has played the villain so cunningly that it may, in the history books of the future, turn out to be the champion of them all.

Let's take a brief look back. Three days before Hitler moved into Poland the Soviet Union and the Reich signed a nonaggression pact. This gave Hitler the ultimate assurance that he would not be attacked by Russia on the one frontier, though Britain and France would make war against him on the other. Hitler gratefully accepted the pact, despite all the bitter assaults he had made on communism in the past, and went to war.

No sooner had the Nazi legions started rolling than a Russian military mission arrived in Berlin for further collaboration and the results were all too swift in coming. In a few days, Russia, from her side, also moved into Poland and the two warlords for the time divided the country between them.

When, some months later, Hitler plunged into the Balkans on the pretext of going to Italy's aid against Greece, Stalin sat by, although that area long had been looked upon as the Russian sphere of infuence. Russia for the moment was content to pick up a few crumbs by way of small areas in Rumania.

Heady with his conquest of Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and France in the west in the spring of 1940, Hitler, after he had overrun the Balkans, made the biggest plunge of all. Scrapping all of his pacts and agreements, he sent his panzers into Russia, rained bombs upon its cities, pushed to the gates of Moscow and Stalingrad and made plans on India and the east.

Though it suffered horribly in loss of lives and property from the German invasion and though it, in return, took a terrible toll from the Germans, Russia got the greatest windfall of the war when President Roosevelt announced forthwith that the United States would extend lend-lease and all types of similar aid to the Soviet Union. This was done on the pretext that we had promised to help any nation that was attacked by an aggressor. No doubt the help thus extended went a long way to defeat Germany and may have shortened the war. Where we made our official mistake was in assuming, and then pursuing to its ultimate the fallacy that Russia, suddenly changed from an ally to an enemy of Germany—through the overt act of Germany—had become the friend of the democracies, that she was, in fact, a democracy herself. We assumed with amazing naïveté that all things equal to the same thing are equal to each other and that the Soviet Union was our partner in the world of the future.

This assumption gave Russia, even in the midst of the battle for her life, the opportunity to spread her propaganda over the world, to infiltrate into nations close to her borders, and even make inroads in the body politic of the United States itself.

It is obvious, in retrospect, that we did everything just the way Russia wanted us to do it. After Pearl Harbor, when we were engaged in war in almost every other section of the world, we did not move into the Balkans against Germany because Russia didn't want us to. We kept our distance, except to bomb the oil fields of Ploesti. Thus, eventually, the Balkans fell into Communist hands. When our armies got well into Germany, their progress was slowed to a halt to permit the Russians to get further to the heart of the crumbling Reich and into Czechoslovakia. The results are too well known to discuss here.

Meanwhile, at the tragic conference in Yalta, we opened the door to subsequent Communist armed aggression in Manchuria, with the result that China today is overrun by Red armies. And all the while, Russia remained aloof from our war against Japan, declaring war only in its final days, when victory was assured and more plums were ready to drop in Stalin's lap.

The culminating tragedy occurred at the Potsdam Conference, when areas of influence were agreed upon.

On this tenth anniversary of the beginning of World War II, it is our bungling with regard to Russia that plagues ourselves and all

the world. Surrounded by Stalin apologists and worshippers, as they were, President Roosevelt, and later President Truman, listened gullibly to their scheming advice. Instead of dealing with Stalin on a basis of cautious expediency, both pursued a course of misplaced confidence and foolish romancing. We are now paying for the mistake. What the cost will be no one knows.

Federal Aid Uplift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, entitled "Federal Aid Uplift." Mr. Jefferson Jones, one of the publishers and owners of the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, used to be a member of the Senate Press Gallery. I am sure that his comments are very pertinent on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID UPLIFT

There are some things which only the Federal Government can do right. Things like regulating coastal shipping, chasing spies, parceling out radio channels, and making dimes.

But a very great many of the activities in which the Washington politicos delight to dabble could be handled more satisfactorily by local communities. And a lot of them fall in the realm of social uplift, a field which the Federal Government is steadily preempting as a matter of supposedly divine right.

There are no questions for which there are fewer dependable answers in the back of the book than those dealing with how to go about lifting a socially debilitated family or individual up to somewhere near par. Nor are they any questions that are harder to answer intelligently sight unseen, through directives-in-triplicate, from an office two or three thousand miles away.

There are a thousand-and-one reasons why a given family may have become ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed or just plain ill. And there are at least a thousand-and-one remedies in the social-uplift pharmacopeia that might conceivably do the family some good.

None of them is a cure-all. What works fine on one patient may poison another, and vice versa. One victim of circumstances may need only a small loan and a pat on the back. Another may need liver shots or a gall-bladder operation or bifocals. Still another may need nothing so much as a kick in the pants.

Practically none of the potential beneficiaries of social welfare legislation is likely to do best on just what some government flunkey's handbook says he can get by filling out the proper forms.

Deciding which remedy a given patient needs is clearly a job for the home-town doctor. He has the edge on the remote specialist because he can size up the patient personally and thump his chest by hand. Besides, in the field of social welfare there are no infallible specialists. Everybody is a potential expert, only some have had more experience than others.

Social uplift is not an exact science. All its practitioners are really groping for answers, no matter how impressive a front they put up. The right answers are likely to be found sooner under a system that has thousands of gropers experimenting independent'y all over the country than under one that sticks everybody with the guesses of a few gropers.

But the trouble is that local gropers have shown a discouraging disinclination to grope for satisfactory answers to these social problems. They are too ready to shrug off the responsibility with the excuse that they don't know enough about such things. Ignoring the fact that nobody else does, either, they prefer to let George do it.

George lives in Washington, but he uses their checking account.

Conditions in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nothing Wrong With John Bull That Real Work Won't Cure," by Bob Considine, from the Washington Times-Herald of September 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTHING WRONG WITH JOHN BULL THAT REAL WORK WON'T CURE

(By Bob Considine)

On the eve of the talks here between the custodians of our leaking Treasury and England's ascetic fancier of shaved carrots and yogurt, Sir Stafford Cripps, the British would like us to know how much good we're getting out of underwriting them.

If the pound is permitted to go bust, they say, the effect will shake much more than England, Scotland, and Wales.

It will jar Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Southern Rhodesia, Cyprus, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Nigeria, Northern Rhodesia, Gambia, the Gold Coast, Federation of Malaya, British West Indies, upper and lower Ireland, Burma, Iraq, and Iceland.

These countries make up the so-called sterling area, with currencies pegged to the pound. Then there are the transferable account countries, which are permitted to go through the hocus-pocus of sterling transfers. These are Russia, Sweden, Egypt, Chile, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Sudan, Ethiopia, Finland, Iran, Italy, Norway, Poland, Siam, and a few others.

The lot of them embrace 45 percent of the world's population whose trade, the British say, rises or sinks on what's in the kitty in Threadneedle Street.

If we fail to keep hoisting the sagging pound with fresh shots of adrenalin in the way of increased imports from sterling area regions and other favors, sterling would cease to be a reliable currency for this vast portion of the world.

Which is a new high in British restraint.

"Their vast mutual trade would be disrupted, the sterling countries would have only erratic supplies of dollars for daily use, and the result would be that a large part of all the trade of the world would suffer upset and restriction," warns a British friend. "You wouldn't want that to happen, would you?"

Well, naturally, we wouldn't want to hurt such good friends as Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Iraq, and Gambia in any way. Naturally. But just a minute, Cecil.

I know it's very crude to open our yaps on anything having to do with British economy in general—as a member of Parliament whose salary we're helping to pay told us the other day.

But isn't it time for your man Cripps to do a little listening instead of telling? We're going bust ourselves trying to keep you from going ditto. The Treasury said so last Friday when it announced that during the first 2 months of the current fiscal year we were $2,000,000,000 overdrawn at our bank.

We're really shooting that stuff out of a cannon these days, as the late great Babe Ruth used to say. And a pretty fair percentage of the $3,000,000,000 we're blowing every month (that much used to keep us going a full year back in the spendthrift days of 1927–29) is being spent to keep the sterling area from going down the drain.

Just a year ago when we offered to send England some of our fellows from Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and the other production centers that made us tops, some of the more influential circles as merrie olde raised eyebrows and called it the gesture of an upstart.

So we backed off with our usual mumbled apology, and went back to the tedious task of priming our pump of a type of government we wouldn't have if it were presented to us on a platter. Even a sterling one.

Talked to a man in Detroit the other night who heads the greatest production force in history. He came up the hard way, learned his profession by trial and error, and now sits atop an industrial empire 50 times vaster than anything the British decided—in the course of nationalizing—was too big to be privately owned.

The man said he knew a simple way for England to get itself off the backs of the American taxpayer and, by doing so, help all the others on the sterling line. He said:

"All the Labor Government needs is courage enough to tell the British people they're losing a war, and that the only way to win it will be to work as unselfishly as they did in the last one: forget the 40-hour week and time and a half for overtime, and produce; we'll buy."

What Is a Bipartisan Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by the Honorable Ernest A. Gross, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. Mr. Gross was substituting for Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, the columnist, while the latter was on vacation. The article was released by General Features Corp. on August 22:

WHAT IS A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Ernest A. Gross)

Foreign policy, like navigation, requires steering the best course to a known objective. Informed men usually will not differ in defining the major objectives of our foreign

policy, but, rather, in choosing the most effective of the available alternative courses. In democracy this choice rests on enlightened common consent.

There is general agreement that we wish to see the maintenance of international peace and security in a world of free nations dedicated to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We are not now living in that sort of a world. As the leader of that part of the world which is free we require a clear, continuous, and consistent foreign policy. National security demands that continuity and consistency survive changes in administration. The obligation of leadership requires that our foreign commitments stay afloat on all political tides. These are the reasons for a bipartisan foreign policy.

Although conflicts attend the separation of powers decreed by the Constitution, the principles of collaboration in foreign affairs between the Executive and the Congress is accepted as the rule. Procedures have been developed to make collaboration systematic and the Department of State has designated officials to carry this out as their primary responsibility.

Since the Congress operates largely through its committees composed of members of the two major parties, successful collaboration in foreign policy matters requires a sound relationship not only between the Executive and the congressional majority, but with the minority party as well. This is all the more necessary when serious differences of opinion exist within congressional parties.

UNITY WHIPS CRISES

The evolution of a successful foreign policy is better assured if it is founded upon the support of like-minded statesmen, whatever their party affiliation. Indeed, Viscount Bryce noted 50 years ago that differences may exist without breaking party unity, since all that was needed was "that a solid front should be presented on the occasions, few in each session, when a momentous division arises."

Are such "momentous divisions" inescapable in the development of United States foreign policy?

The majority party bears the responsibilities which go with "administration." The minority party owes the duty of "loyal opposition." A bipartisan foreign policy, however, presumes that neither party will seek to derive party advantage through the manner in which it discharges its responsibilities and duties.

The administration should refrain from making foreign-policy proposals for partisan reasons or from seeking partisan advantage in the execution of foreign policy. The minority party should refrain from opposition based upon partisan considerations. Criticism would be "on the merits" and always welcome.

DISINTEREST ESSENTIAL

Obviously, the decisive element in such an arrangement is good faith. An action or attitude is colored by the motive which breeds it. Suspicion of partisan motive has often choked off collaboration like a jungle vine. Inasmuch as basic objectives are rarely in dispute, the duty of the executive and of the legislature is to clarify the alternatives. A proposed course of action must rest upon the argument which supports it. Opposition, to be constructive, must similarly assert the justified alternative. There is no other way to develop and maintain an enlightened public opinion. There is no other satisfactory way in which a democracy can conduct its foreign affairs.

The necessary working conditions for a bipartisan foreign policy are these: (1) An understanding among respective party leaders implying common readiness to collaborate; (2) full sharing of information; (3) timely consultation.

The last element—timely consultation—offers the greatest challenge to good faith. Either the "administration" or the minority may be asked by the other to modify or abandon carefully considered foreign-policy proposals.

Public interest then requires sincere efforts to clarify the alternative courses. The executive, having a constitutional responsibility it can neither share nor avoid, should present its proposals in a manner which permits the minority to fulfill its public duty of weighing the alternatives.

SUCCEED WE MUST

The attitude with which both sides approach the problem affects the outcome. Wisdom may call for compromise. But the end in view is to achieve agreement on a sound and publicly supported policy. Compromise is a means to that end, not an end in itself.

Bispartisan foreign policy exists when there is a sustained sincere effort to reach agreement on objectives and on courses of action. It is not destroyed merely because agreement is not always reached.

When disagreements persist despite full and timely consultation, the issues are often drawn between persons rather than between parties. Such differences are unavoidable in any society. They are relevant to the problem of a bipartisan foreign policy only to the extent that they reveal a desire to obtain partisan advantage. Party discipline may rally adherents to one side or the other. But a successful bipartisan foreign policy will make it virtually impossible for "momentous divisions" to occur in our foreign affairs.

The world in which we live does not leave us much room for failure.

Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President May Not Care, But—" from the Racine Journal-Times of September 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT MAY NOT CARE, BUT—

Does President Truman care that Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan stands convicted before all intelligent Americans of using his White House position to get Government favors for his friends?

Does Mr. Truman care that Vaughan, his military aide, offered a weak and sometimes downright silly defense when he appeared before United States Senate investigators this week?

Apparently not. The President said yesterday that he did not contemplate any change in the Vaughan status.

Three alternatives present themselves. Either Mr. Truman is so blindly prejudiced that he can't see the obvious truth; or he sees the truth, but is willing to lay down his life (political) for his friend; or he feels so secure in his position that he thinks corruptness around him cannot tarnish him.

But, as the general's stature shrunk while he offered ridiculous excuses this week, so has the President's standing among Americans who like integrity and above-board dealing in government.

Union Label—Keynote for Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the union label by I. M. Ornburn, secretary-treasurer of the union label trades department, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Ornburn is very well qualified to discuss labor-management relations. This is partially because he is director of the Union Industries Shows, which have become so popular during the last decade. They are superb examples of cooperation between union workers and their fair employers. For that reason, our eminent and able Vice President has termed I. M. Ornburn as "Ambassador of Good Relations." Mr. Ornburn is a former member of the United States Tariff Commission and has always been a strong advocate of adequate protection for American labor, industry, and agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION LABEL—KEYNOTE FOR PROSPERITY

Eighteen seventy-four was a stormy year. Congressional investigations and political squabbles over Government contracts swept our Nation's Capital. This stormy period of President Grant's administration, especially between 1873 and 1875, was marked with accusations that Congressmen were accepting bribes and those investigations failed to clear even the Vice President of our country.

In this same year the Tweed Ring ruled New York elections and Tammany Hall boasted of its ability to buy the ignorant foreign vote and built personal fortunes from public money.

Our Secretary of War was impeached for selling Army supplies contracts and appointments to frontier trading posts and only escaped trial by resigning from his high position.

Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota were plagued by hordes of grasshoppers and crop damage was disastrous.

The national debt was little more than $2,000,000,000 as compared to today's debt of over two hundred and twenty-five billions.

Income-tax revenue for the year was less than $150,000.

Alexander Graham Bell began the research which resulted, 2 years later, in the invention which made the human voice heard miles from its origin.

So you see, that was a busy year in our history. Something far more important was taking place the same year—a discovery that was to make life more worthwhile for every citizen of the United States and Canada—something that was later to be the means

of lengthening the average life span of all wage earners. It was to be directly responsible for the shorter workweek, thus making it possible for children and adults to enjoy more sunshine and give more time and thought to the affairs of home and church. This event took place in the city of San Francisco, Calif. The old adage, "Necessity is the mother of invention," was brought into reality by a group of skilled artisans in the cigar industry who were enjoying excellent conditions of employment when suddenly their jobs began to slip away. Upon examination, it was found that smokers were changing from the brand of cigars those workers were making to a cheaper product.

What was the reason for the inception of the less expensive cigar? Was it improved methods of production? Not at all. Technological improvements were unheard of at that time. Then, could it be that manufacturers of the cheaper cigars had discovered a way to purchase raw materials at reduced costs? No. That was not the answer. The workers were becoming discouraged when one among them suggested that as individuals they were helpless. Then for days there were meetings where the unemployed would join with the more fortunate workers on street corners and any other suitable meeting places. They were desperate. With no unemployment benefits to fall back on what was to be the solution to their problem? Should they appeal to charitable organizations for aid? No. They were too proud to seek charity. Finally, the workers at one of the street corner meetings came to the unanimous conclusion concerning the reason for their plight. It was the competition of employers who were operating in unsanitary tenement houses and basements with coolie labor. Now, what was to be the workers' means of aiding their fair employers in recovering their business? An idea was born. Some visible mark of identification must be created so the public could be informed and thereby be able to discriminate between the cigars of the fair manufacturer and the product of nonunion employers who were gradually getting all the trade. This group of cigar makers went to their employers with the proposition to attach a white label to each box of cigars, thus indicating that the cigars were produced under good working conditions. The public soon realized that if the package did not bear the union label it was made in an unclean place by coolie labor.

Necessity had brought about an invention that was to protect the employment opportunities of workers everywhere. The idea of the union label spread like a forest fire. Workers in other industries adopted this same method of protecting their jobs. This same device was soon used by workers in other industries to protect their fair employers against firms which engaged in cheap, sweatshop labor in a reign of unfair competition.

As this practice began to unfold, the Federal Government explored the possibility of protecting the public from the sale of questionable goods by unscrupulous manufacturers. And today we have a Fair Trade Practices Act, Pure Food and Drugs Act, and safety regulations for transportation companies. But in none of these legislative measures are the interests of the workers who produce the goods and perform the services properly protected. Nor can legislation alone protect the workers' rights. For example, the Federal and State Governments failed to outlaw the sweatshop that flourished for a generation in the garment industry. It remained for unions to follow the invention of the band of cigar makers on the Pacific coast and adopt an emblem in order that the consumer could aid in stamping out such undesirable practices as homework.

This homework system had been in effect since the beginning of time. Manufacturers would send work to the homes of some poor unfortunates, regardless of conditions and surroundings. Many times merchandise was processed in a filthy hovel where contagious disease was raging. But the greedy employer was not concerned with that. He was interested only in profit. It did not concern him if the defenseless wage earner passed away, the worker could be replaced. But replacing a piece of equipment would cost money and reduce the manufacturer's ill-gained margin of profit.

Do we still have sweatshops with unsanitary conditions? Do you know that the bread you eat is baked in light, sanitary bakeries by workers who receive adequate wages? Do you know that the person who made the chinaware you place on your table earned enough money to properly feed his own children? Even today, cities and States find it necessary to employ competent health inspectors to keep constant check on sanitary conditions in factories where food is handled. Your best guaranty that these good conditions of employment and sanitation exist—your best assurance of high-quality craftsmanship is the union label on the bread wrapper and all other products you purchase.

Today, September 3, marks the beginning of Union Label Week. This week is designated by unions, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which have adopted a trade-mark in the form of a union label, shop card, or button. Frankly, we want the consumer, whether he be a member of a union or not, to purchase union-made-in-America goods and patronize only service establishments which operate under union conditions. The only assurance you have that any product you buy is made under these conditions is for the article to bear the union label—the trade-mark of the organized labor movement. No American who values his own standards should buy the goods of underpaid labor from any land lest the structure of American spending power be undermined and the benefits of our way of life be lost to the world, as well as to ourselves.

The Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor is dedicated to the idea that free trade should be only among fairly paid workers. We in the American Federation of Labor have no traffic with any isms—aside from Americanism. Americanism thrives on free enterprise. The secret of keeping free enterprise strong is to keep each element of free enterprise strong. Preference for union-made goods will make certain the continuation of our American way of life.

Tomorrow is regarded by labor unionists as Labor Sunday. We have many friends in the clergy who will, I am certain, support our contention that the only guaranty that goods and services are performed under fair labor standards is that the union label be attached to the merchandise and that service establishments display the shop card and union button. Man's right to earn his wages under proper conditions and to better his position in life is a God-given one. All thinking Americans respect and uphold these principles of living.

The first Monday in September is set aside each year by an act of Congress to celebrate the part labor played in making America the best country in the world. The first observance of Labor Day came during the life of Samuel Gompers, the first president of the American Federation of Labor, who declared: "We want the public to know that the product which our union label covers is the best of its character and kind that can be had; our union-label goods are made under better conditions for workers as to wages and sanitary conditions than nonunion products. That our hallmarks, the union labels of our organizations, stand for higher and better things than a mere trade-mark."

Labor Day finds our free American workers still enjoying the best living standards in all the world. Let's try to raise the conditions of toilers in other lands up to our level. We must be on guard against dragging our own citizens down to the low labor standards of Europe and Asia. The best way to do that is to buy union-label goods. We cannot maintain our superb economic system if we buy nonunion goods made by workers who receive hardly enough to keep a spark of life in their bodies. In some instances that merchandise is even made by slave labor.

William Green, who ascended to the presidency of the American Federation of Labor upon the death of Mr. Gompers in 1924, has consistently subscribed to the policy of the founders of our great labor movement. He has said: "Management and labor cooperation is the American way applied to industry and the class warfare is the Communist way and it takes a heavy toll of human life in suffering and misery."

A splendid example of labor-management cooperation is found in our outstanding annual exhibition—the Union Industries Show—which is the biggest show of its kind held anywhere in the world. Each year we have a greater number of elaborate booth displays. The entire expense is borne equally by A. F. of L. unions and employers. Admission is free. It is sponsored by the Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor. Our 1950 Union Industries Show will be held, May 6–13, in the famous Convention Hall at Philadelphia.

I urge all union members to become salesmen as well as consumers. Learn to sell the products of every fair manufacturer. Few Americans will cross a picket line, but little do they realize that the purchase of nonunion articles has the same effect in destroying good labor relations. The goal for which the American Federation of Labor yearns is peaceful, profitable, harmonious relations between labor and its employers.

Now a word to the women of our country. I plead with you to interest yourself in our future economy. You control the purse strings of the family budget. You have equal political rights. So, in addition to your family and religious responsibilities, why not familiarize yourselves with the trade-mark of organized workers—the union label? I promise you that when you understand that your purchases have a direct bearing upon the labor policy of the manufacturers of our Nation you will want to discriminate between the fair and the unfair employer.

What a wonderful feeling it is to know that you have purchased an article that was made under fair labor standards. You know that the worker who produced that article has enjoyed clean, sanitary conditions; that he has had something to say about the number of hours he is employed; that he has a right to bargain with his employer for wages and other conditions of employment. On the other hand, by making a purchase of nonunion goods you may be furthering the interest of some greedy employer who is concerned with profits only.

Labor has always played a major role in the progress of this Nation. Labor will always take its place in the history which America is writing daily. And justly so, since labor is made up of that great mass of the people who long ago decided their Goverment should be "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Intelligent planning and honest effort have brought about our present high living standards. Consistent purchasing of goods that bear the union label and the use of union services identified by the union shop card and union button will protect and preserve these standards.

Patronizing firms that display the union label, shop card, and button is the best method of preserving our American system

of free enterprise which has brought the highest standard of living of all times to the greatest number of people in any nation on the face of the globe. The union label is truly the emblem of freedom in action.

Compensation for War Damage to Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 8 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 17, 1949, entitled "Israel To Compensate Christians for War's Damage to Churches."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL TO COMPENSATE CHRISTIANS FOR WAR'S DAMAGE TO CHURCHES—JOINT COMMISSION ASSESSING COST; SECTS AGREE FULL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IS PREVAILING

(By Kenneth Bilby)

TEL AVIV.—Of all the issues confronting Israel today, none is more delicate than that concerning the status of Christianity in the new nation. The subject of much murky discussion, both here and abroad, it has strained relations between two faiths which have a vital stake in the holy land.

With cooperation from the Catholic Church and the Israel Ministry of Religious Affairs, this correspondent has examined Christian holy places and church properties throughout Israel. The Catholic hierarchy and the Israel ministry, upon request, compiled their own statistics on the extent of damage on Christian church buildings occupied by the military and on the condition of holy places.

Israel's ranking Catholic — Archbishop George Hakim, bishop of Acre, Haifa, Nazareth, and all of Galilee for the Greek Catholic Church—and a high Israeli Government official met at the Ministry of Religion headquarters and for 2 hours answered questions put by this reporter.

(The Greek Catholic Church, under the direct spiritual and administrative control of the Vatican, has certain oriental rites which differentiate it from the Latin (Roman) Catholic. The church is called Latin rather than Roman in Israel to differentiate it ritually from the Greek Catholic. There is no connection between the Greek Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Churches.)

DOZEN SECTS FUNCTION

More than a dozen sects function within Israel. The largest are the Greek Catholics, with 15,000 members; the Greek Orthodox, with 15,000; and the Latin Catholics, with 8,000 to 10,000. They have over 200 church buildings and own about 50,000 dunams of land. (The dunam is 0.22 of an acre.) Their total investment is nearly $250,000,000.

Christians own large sections of Jerusalem, Haifa, and Jaffa; Russian Orthodox Church holdings alone, in Jerusalem, are worth more than $60,000,000. There are between thirty-five and forty thousand Arab Christians in Israel and from 700 to 1,000 priests, nuns, and religious workers.

On the question of damage to church property in Israel since May 1943, Christians are now pressing for reparations and the Israeli Government has promised special consideration when the parliament brings up a bill for the settlement of all war damages.

Both sides agree, unequivocably, that much of this damage was the result of vandalism and looting by irresponsible elements and cannot be classed as battle damage. Archbishop Hakim also conceded that 90 percent of the desecration and destruction of Christian churches occurred in the first 2 months of battle, when the Israeli Army had not developed normal officer discipline.

Approximately 45 Christian convents, churches, schools, and monasteries were occupied by the Israeli army during the war. The majority have been returned but eight church properties in Jerusalem, seven in Haifa, and a few in Nazareth, Galilee, and the south are retained by the militia. The government has guaranteed to return them when the military situation permits.

JOINT EFFORT BEGUN

The joint Catholic-Israeli Commission has begun inspection of damages to the Church of the Dormition, on Mount Zion. This is the first joint effort to reach agreement on reparations and it is no exaggeration to say that future relations between the Catholic Church and Israel will rest on the outcome. It would be a mistake to imply that the Catholics are now satisfied with conditions. Their estimate of damages is steadily increasing as churches are released from army control. The figure is now close to $2,000,000.

Meanwhile the Russian Orthodox Church is becoming increasingly important in church struggle for religious control of Jerusalem. Its head, the Archimandrite Leonid, works hand in glove with the Soviet ministry here. It is reported that Russia is now pressuring Israel to grant it title to White Russian property in Jerusalem and other church properties long owned by the Russian Orthodox hierarchy.

In exchange for support on these requests, the Soviets are reportedly ready to approve the Israeli wish for partition of Jerusalem instead of internationalization. The struggle for Christian dominance in Jerusalem is thus liable to produce a conflict between the Russian Orthodox and the Catholics—the two largest property holders.

OFFERS RETURN OF CHURCH

Israel has offered to return the famed Church of the Dormition. But at Haifa Msgr. Antonio Vergani, vicar general of the Latin Patriarch in Galilee and the representative of the apostolic delegate of all Israel, has said that the Catholics would not accept the return before the joint commission has finally assessed damages. He asserted—and Israeli officials agreed—that the church had been stripped of its crucifixes, bronze candelabra, statuaries, priests' vestments, stock of holy dressings, and part of its library of ancient church manuscripts. All movable fixtures had disappeared.

Three other prominent Jerusalem churches which have been damaged include the Hospice Notre Dame, the Franciscan Chapel of the Cenacle, and St. James Chapel in lower Baqa. Similar conditions prevail in the Church of St. Jacques of Malul in Galilee, in the Greek Catholic Church of St. Peter in Tiberias, and in a few other churches in Haifa and Galilee.

Of 55 Greek Catholic churches in Israeli jurisdiction, Archbishop Hakim says five have suffered from vandalism. Services are being held now in all but 19 of these churches. Those closed no longer have congregations (they left in the Arab exodus) or are in vacated and restricted areas. A few have been occupied by homeless Jewish immigrants in Haifa and the Israelis are now trying to find homes for them elsewhere.

Before detailing their difficulties, Archbishop Hakim, Monsignor Vergani, and Msgr. Basil Samman, vicar of Nazareth and the Galilee district, stressed one point: the friendly attitude of the Israeli Government toward Christians here and the effectiveness of the liaison which has been established between the two groups.

ISRAELIS ADMIT DAMAGE

Responsible Israeli officials frankly admit that desecration and theft of Christian property has occurred. A high government official gave this explanation: "There were some much-regretted incidents in the first 2 months of the war. These occurred before our army had been properly organized and when we were totally occupied with fighting for our life. It shoved guns into immigrant hands and sent them to the front.

"Until we were able to establish normal control of officers over men, all abandoned property suffered. Looting was not confined to churches. Scores of vacant Jewish homes in the Talpiot and Sanhedria quarters of Jerusalem were broken into and stripped of all their belongings. (A mass of claims for war reparations has been submitted to the Government by Jewish residents of Jerusalem.)

"At that time, Army authorities were too occupied to investigate many offenses and punish offenders. Since this first undisciplined period the Army has taken drastic steps to enforce the security of church property. The Chief of Staff has warned all commanders that he holds them personally responsible for protecting churches. In Jaffa, a soldier has been court-martialed and sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment for stealing church property."

TESTIMONIALS RECEIVED

In support of their contention that Israel respects Christian property, religious officials have impressive files of Catholic and Protestant testimonials. There is a copy of a letter from Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, to the United Nations' Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, which testifies to "the genuine desire of the Government of Israel to repair damage done and to maintain proper relations with religious institutions within its boundares.

Statements are on file at the ministry from Greek Orthodox, Maronite, and Anglican officials attesting to the efforts of Israel to maintain cordial relations with Christians. Letters have been received from nuns of the communities of St. Claire of Jerusalem and St. Claire of Nazareth expressing gratitude for the friendliness of the government toward them.

Similarly, Christians agree with one fundamental Israeli contention:

Full religious liberty is enjoyed by Christian sects in Israel. Churches, religious schools, and ecclesiastical courts operate unmolested. Priests are permitted to move freely, except in and out of restricted military zones where they require the same permits as secular personnel.

No priest has been killed or wounded inside Israel territory. In one or two rare instances, according to church reports, priests have been detained. In one case, several nuns were reportedly threatened by guns for brief periods, by unauthorized military personnel. Yet religious leaders were accorded the unusual privilege of passing back and forth across battle line in Jerusalem.

The Interstate Oil Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me with reference to an article or editorial from the League Reporter, which was printed in the RECORD of September 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the RECORD of September 7, pages A5680–A5681, an article or editorial from the League Reporter was reproduced. I do not know the publication, nor who owns or edits it. My interest is in replying to certain assertions concerning the interstate oil compact. It is my hope that the editors of the publication will spend a little time on the subject and not be misled again into repeating ill-founded statements.

As a former chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which functions under authority given by the signatory States to the compact and the formal approval of Congress, I resent deeply such reckless charges as the following:

"In short, the compact States decide how much oil will be purchased at prevailing prices on the basis of market forecasts." There is much more in the same vein, but the foregoing quotation suffices to indicate the tone of the lengthy article.

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission meets each quarter. The meetings are open to all who wish to attend. The proceedings are published. I challenge anyone to find in the 14 years since the compact was formed that any decision was ever taken, or any discussion designed to lead to a decision, as to quotas of oil to be produced. The individual States, in their sovereign capacity, acting through their conservation boards and commissions, make their separate determinations of production rates which will meet conservation standards.

The compact provides a form for discussion on the numerous engineering questions which enter into the production of crude petroleum and natural gas. It studies through its several committees the problems of production. It makes public the reports of the committees and all its resolutions. Each member State is free to accept or reject any or all recommendations.

In the same article there was a criticism of congressional action in providing the Connally Hot Oil Act, which, it was said, "put the Federal Government in the business of policing and punishing violators of the compact."

The Connally law, which bears the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, provides merely that interstate transportation facilities shall not be used to carry oil produced in violation of valid State orders. It has nothing to do with the compact. It was passed before the compact was approved by Congress and there cannot possibly be a violator of the compact for there is nothing in it to violate.

The present chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, Gov. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, in a statement to a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, August 17, referred to the compact's activities. A portion of his statement follows:

"Assertions have previously been made to your committee, particularly in the New York hearing, indicating that conservation programs in oil-producing States are used in collusion to artificially control production. These assertions are untrue.

"As Governor of Kansas, with direct responsibility for its conservation policies, I can deny these charges without reservation. My experience as a member of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, of which I am now chairman, enables me to know that such statements are not true with regard to the action of such officials in the other oil-producing States.

"The oil and gas conservation officials of the producing States are duly elected or appointed and there is no reason to presume them unfaithful to their trust. Their acts are subject to the review and interpretation of proper courts of the land. If their acts were contrary to the laws under which they must operate, they would be immediately subject to court action. This procedure is at all times available. Many of the orders and regulations have been reviewed by State and Federal courts and have often been carried to the highest tribunal of our land.

"There is no basis for statements tending to suggest improper administration of State conservation laws.

"As to the administration of conservation laws in other States, it might be amiss for me to comment except for the fact that I am privileged to have some acquaintance with their programs and policies. Kansas is one of the 20 oil-producing States that are members of the interstate oil compact. The commission which was established under that compact is a forum of discussion and a clearing house of ideas on conservation. It has nothing to do with setting production rates, although loose assertions have been made by a few uninformed persons to that effect. Each State acts under the authority of its legislative body. Each State, I believe, has gained much in the knowledge of broad principles of conservation because of its membership in the compact.

"Through my participation in the compact commission's work and studies I believe that the assertion which I have repudiated as to Kansas is equally false as to the other oil-producing States. The State of Texas has been referred to as having made unjustifiable reductions in their production allowables. The officials of Texas are perfectly capable of refuting such statements themselves. However, sufficient facts are available to enable anyone to judge for himself."

Settlement of International Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter under date of September 9, 1949, addressed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, relative to the settlement of international economic problems on a sound basis.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1949.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to congratulate you on your courageous stand against perpetuating the administration's continuing practice of forcing the American people to underwrite the predatory, tax-devouring, self-defeating, economic lunacies which underlie the whole sordid series of postwar, political settlements, and international programs to which we have thus far been committed.

It is my understanding that you are struggling against heavy odds to put an end to this "throw away the dollar sign, share the poverty of a permanent police state program" which in the name of international cooperation has been peddled to the American people during recent years.

It is my humble opinion you were never more right in your life than in your insistence that the British now reestablish some semblance of sanity to their economic system by restoring a realistic value to the pound sterling, in its relation to the American dollar.

In assuring you of my wholehearted support of your efforts, I plead with you not to be dissuaded from your purpose, and not to yield to the persuasive guiles or to be frightened by the crisis bogies which are being conjured up by those who continue to propagandize political cures for the basic financial economic ills of others, to be underwritten at the continuing suicidal expense of the American taxpayer.

While you may find it strange that I have directed such an appeal to you, I trust you will find the following reasons sufficiently impelling:

In the first place, our present Secretary of State has long since gone on record as ridiculing as "globaloney" such a position as you hold, namely, that America cannot permanently bail other nations out of their bankruptcy, but that other nations must tighten their belts and earn their own way back, restoring a sound basis for their economic well-being by attaching an honest value to honest effort.

In the second place, the record also shows that for years the Senate leaders of our alleged bipartisan foreign policy have dutifully rubber-stamped the requests of our Secretary of State, no matter how ridiculous, fantastic, or fallacious those requests have been. Obviously it would be useless to direct an appeal to them.

In the third place, as Secretary of the Treasury, you must know better than anyone else the staggering price the American people already have had to pay to bail this administration out of the predicaments into which it has plunged us by subjecting financial, economic, and moral values to the dictates of political expediency?

I am confident you are also aware that the day is coming when those who have been holding these international political dances are going to have to pay the economic fiddlers.

The British crisis is the most convincing case in point. Is it not time the American people were honestly told the real causes for Britain's dilemma? Is it not also true that unless this is done there is little hope that the American people will be sufficiently aroused in time to forestall the threat to their own survival as a free people which this crisis constitutes?

I assure you my plea to restore our relations with Britain to a realistic foundation and to tell the American people honestly what this crisis means to them, is not the product of an anti-British bias. As an American who

is sworn to defend the constitutional rights and vital interests of my own constituency in Indiana, as well as the American people as a whole, my concern is to keep America sound, strong, and free.

If I read history aright, England's greatness prior to the First World War derived from four historic developments. First, she emerged at the end of the nineteenth century as the greatest industrial nation on earth, the products of which found their way into markets in the four corners of the earth. Second, as the cradle of liberty under law, the British capitalized on the advantages of the vital, adventurous, and ingenious spirit of her people which was the full fruit of a system based on personal liberty and private enterprise. Third, England had succeeded in establishing control over colonial areas to such an extent that by the ruthless exploitation of nearly one-half the world's population, the riches of the Middle East, Africa, and the Orient, flowed into the British treasury. Fourth, British statesmen, who through centuries of training had become past masters in the art of power politics, had been able to devise a system of balances of power of sufficient strength to threaten these financial, economic, and political controls which she had succeeded in establishing around the world.

Yet, in spite of these advantages, ever since the end of the First World War the British crisis we now confront has been in the making. The Second World War has only hastened the processes of disintegration of these four historical developments upon which Britain had been absolutely dependent to provide even a minimum of her people's needs. When they see that these four basic props to the British economy are crumbling beneath her, the American people can get a better picture of the utter futility of trying to solve the British crisis by the continued squandering of American billions in the form of political hand-outs, particularly when they realize how much we have already poured out to date.

In July 1944, 44 nations met at Bretton Woods to set up two international agencies designed to pave the way primarily for Britain and the sterling-bloc area to return to a sound economic and financial basis as partners in a cooperative world program. The United States pledged $5,925,000,000 to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Although the sterling-bloc area was to derive the greatest benefits from these funds, we were told Britain was in such desperate straits that the British loan was imperative. So, on December 7, 1945, under the British Loan Agreement, the United States canceled the British $25,000,000,000 lend-lease debt and agreed to lend Britain an additional $3,750,000,000. We were told this loan would meet Britain's dollar needs for the next 5 years. But, instead, before this agreement was a year old Britain informed us she could no longer carry out the burdens of the Greek-Turkey sphere of influence, so the United States advanced another $400,000,000 to underwrite these British commitments. Then when the Italian Treaty was signed, Britain reneged on her commitments in the Mediterranean, so we have continued to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into Italy to underwrite British commitments there.

Then the British informed us they could no longer pay the cost of occupation even in their own zone in western Germany, and so we took over that additional burden, raising our present cost of occupation to over $1,000,000,000 per year.

By the end of the second year of the 5-year loan agreement Britain's dollar credits were gone, and so the United States underwrote the Marshall plan, involving some $17,500,000,000 to forestall not only the British crisis, but also the direct effects which the collapse of Britain's economic and financial system would have on the other European economies.

Now it is generally conceded there is no real hope whatever that when the Marshall plan has been completed in 1952 either Britain or Europe will have overcome their deficits. It is patently clear that the mere continued transfusion of American tax dollars will not restore health to the British economy nor solve the British crisis. What is becoming increasingly clear, instead, Mr. Secretary, is that a continued outpouring of American dollars in the future, as it has up to the present moment, will continue to aggravate, strengthen, and extend those very forces of economic conflict, restrictions, and controls which we have been attempting to remove.

I am sure you will agree with me that our actions would not be so lamentable if we were only throwing our money down a rat hole. When, however, we are now confronted with overwhelming evidence to prove that we have been pouring out our billions to finance the perpetuation of those very forces we are seeking to destroy such a course of action is suicidal.

Yet, there are those in this administration who are so blind they will not see these fantastic facts. First, we are financing not only the expansion and modernization of British industrial potential, we are doing the same for British competitors all over the world at the same time we are financing the contraction of the potential markets upon which the success of the industrial expansion is dependent. In Britain itself, as Churchill has charged, we have poured over $8,000,000,000 which the present Labor Government has squandered for political support of its socialistic experiment. What more futile way could we seek to aid the British out of their dilemma than by keeping in power a political party and political philosophy which cannot compete in an increasingly competitive world economy because of its strangulation of individual effort, its destruction of incentive and the waste and inefficiency of bureaucratic red tape and control? Second, we are continuing to pour out billions of dollars to enable Britain to destroy the industrial potential of her traditionally best customer in central Europe, namely, Germany. Yet, I have not seen a single, authoritative discussion of the effects of this program on the part of a single, responsible government representative, which points out the fact that by destroying this industrial potential Britain is destroying the largest single market on the European Continent. Third, Britain's continued financial control over the sterling area and her continued exploitation of colonial peoples makes it impossible for them ever to earn enough to increase their standard of living to the point where they could buy the finished products that Britain manufactures from the raw materials which she wrests from them at slave labor wages and disastrously low prices.

In spite of the futility of pursuing our present course of action, it is apparent that the pressure being exerted on you comes from those who are determined to get us in even deeper, even into an economic, financial, and customs union with the sterling-bloc area, by opening American markets to the influx of British manufactured and agricultural goods.

It is perfectly obvious, Mr. Secretary, that unless you win your present struggle the American people will become unwilling slaves under the jurisdiction of an international, semisuper state, with controls vested in the hands of a body, the major interests of which will be alien to our own. Under this system our standard of living and our personal freedoms will be subjected to the dictations of policy makers determined to set up an international allocation of raw materials, of industrial potential, of markets, and of manpower, with American taxpayers footing the deficits so long as our money holds out.

In conclusion, may I again commend you for your insistence, as chairman of the present conference, that this time the British speak first, and answer the questions arising from these historic facts underlying her present crisis. It is obvious that the British have spoken first, but that, in speaking, they continue their refusal to recognize these facts for what they are.

I sincerely trust that if British representatives continue their refusal to discuss a solution of the British crisis on the basis of bedrock realities, you will continue to stand your ground.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM E. JENNER.

Historic American Institutions and National Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which is to be made on September 11, 1949, by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on the Voices and Events program, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network, relative to the conflict between historic American institutions and national socialism.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, before you is the clean-cut issue of whether historic American institutions shall endure or whether there shall be substituted national socialism, which has never worked anywhere.

President Truman preaches freedom and independence for the individual, but he practices socialism, and all his disclaimers cannot erase the fact that the measures he has submitted to the Congress inevitably would make your Government your master and not your servant, as it should be.

Do you know that President Truman has submitted proposals under the label of social welfare that would cost over a 50-year period $1,250,000,000,000?

Do you know your Federal Government is now spending over $1,000,000,000 each month more than it takes in from taxes?

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not socialism, what is it?

If the President's bill before Congress to give him—one man—absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages and floors under prices and wages is not regimentation, what is it?

If federally subsidized education is not in the direction of federally dictated philosophies of education—thought control—what is it?

If the Government—all the taxpayers—paying part of the cost and rent of homes for some of the people is not socialism, what is it?

If manipulation of the personal income-tax structure to level off the people is not resort to the power of taxation to destroy, what is it?

If resort by the President to secrecy in making foreign trade agreements under any formula he desires is not robbing American industry, agriculture, and labor of their rights as citizens, what is it?

If the President's proposal that he—one man—be given power to build and supervise steel and other plants in direct competition with private enterprise is not socialism, what is it?

If the Brannan farm plan to have farmers, in effect, produce for the Government under controls prescribed by the Government is not socialism, what is it?

The President calls attacks upon his spendthrift, socialistic proposals "scare words," but his actions speak louder than his words.

What are you going to do about it?

Minneapolis FEPC Lists 2-Year Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "City FEPC Lists 2-Year Gains," written by Richard P. Kleeman, and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE JOBS OPEN TO MINORITY GROUPS—CITY FEPC LISTS 2-YEAR GAINS

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

The mere existence of a Minneapolis fair employment practices commission and its statement of policy have expanded the number of jobs open to workers of minority racial and religious groups.

And the threat of a public hearing on alleged discriminatory practices has been enough to cause an alleged violator of the city fair employment practices ordinance to make an adjustment.

BUDGET OF $9,927 SOUGHT

These two claims stand out in the report of the first 2 years of operation of the FEPC created by the city council in 1947 at the urging of former Mayor HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Wilfred C. Leland, Jr., executive secretary of the commission presented the 2-year summary to the city council ways and means committee last week to support the FEPC 1950 budget request for $9,927.

This represents an increase of more than $3,000 from what the council appropriated for 1949.

The increase is to permit hiring of the executive director and a secretary on a full-time basis, to handle what is expected to be an increased flow of complaints.

The commission gives two reasons for the expected increase: its work is becoming more widely known, and 1950, which probably will be a year of employment fluctuations, is likely to expose more people to employment discrimination.

The commission reported the following data about the 75 cases it handled during its first 25 months of operation (June 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949):

Eight were dismissed because the commission lacked jurisdiction and 17 because no discrimination was found.

Six were settled by some method satisfactory to the person who complained—either he got the job or was satisfied with a pledge that a no-discrimination policy would be followed in the future by the agency complained against.

Twenty-eight were settled by a commitment by the alleged violator that he would follow a no-discrimination policy in the future.

Action still is pending on 16.

Of the 75 cases, 51 were started because of alleged discrimination against a Negro; 3 against an American Indian; 17 against a person of the Jewish faith; 1 against a Japanese-American, and 1 each because the applicant for work was not a Lutheran, a Jew, or a Catholic.

Sixty-two of the charges were against private employers, 10 against Government agencies, 2 against labor unions, and 1 against an employment agency.

FEAR CAUSES HESITATION

Frequently a conversation with an FEP commissioner or the executive director results in an approach to a satisfactory adjustment, the report states.

Some reluctance to comply with the ordinance banning discrimination in employment has been found because an employer fears an unfavorable reaction, either from his other employees or from his customers.

These cases usually are handled by an informal discussion with all five commissioners and the employer taking part.

Where initial efforts at conciliation fail, the report continues, the question of a public hearing, as provided in the ordinance, is raised.

"The prospect of such a hearing has proved to be a powerful instrument through which to persuade the party charged to take the steps necessary to satisfactorily adjust the complaint," the report states.

NO HEARINGS NEEDED

"The commission has not yet found it necessary to hold a single public hearing or to refer any case to the city attorney.

"It is the judgment of the commission that the threat of a public hearing is a more powerful enforcement weapon than are the penalties of fine and imprisonment which could be applied through court action.

"However, these penalties are essential in order to make sure that the party charged will give serious attention to the complaint," the report continues.

Looking toward the future, the FEPC plans not only to handle an increased case load, but also to broaden its program of public relations to acquaint the community more widely with its work.

Summarizing, the FEPC report declares that "the most important effect of the passage of the ordinance and the establishment of the commission has been to focus the attention of major employers in Minneapolis on their employment practices in regard to the members of different racial, religious, and nationality groups.

OPPORTUNITIES EXPAND

"Employment opportunities in retail and wholesale trade, in manufacturing and in office and clerical jobs have been significantly expanded for minority workers by voluntary changes in policy by a great number of important employers, entirely apart from any specific complaints of discrimination handled by the commission."

Present members of the commission are Amos S. Deinard, chairman, and Raymond W. Cannon, Howard F. Fortier, Lawrence E. Kelley, and Abbott Washburn.

Kelley, however, has moved from the city. An FEPC meeting to discuss recommending his successor to Mayor Eric G. Hoyer has been tentatively set for 4 p. m. Wednesday.

Address by Roy C. McKenna to Employees of Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Roy C. McKenna, chairman of the board, to employees of the Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co., of Latrobe, Pa., at the annual picnic of the employees, on August 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow workers, my observations of worker-management relations will be confined to France and Italy, as I visited no plants in either Belgium or Switzerland on my trip to Europe this summer.

Both France and Italy have socialistic governments. Some plants are government-controlled and others are privately owned and operated. Visitors can notice little difference. In each case the management appears to have the interest of the workers at heart. Top management is working long hours. The governments are socialistic and inclined toward theoretical planning, but they are cooperating with management and workers to increase production. It is realized that this can be done only by restoring competition.

By restoring competition, I do not mean the elimination of trade customs or standardization of trade practices within an industry, such as are necessary for the orderly conduct of business. Abolishment by court decision of the sale of products of the iron and steel industry upon basing-point delivery, is an illustration of interference by government that benefits no one and only causes disorder.

America's capacity to produce is held in high esteem and American industry is given credit for the winning of World War II. The memory of the great depression in 1932 is vivid, and the great fear is that the present recession in business in America may lead to another world-wide depression. A prosperous America is more important to world recovery than any promises of financial or military aid.

European businessmen cannot believe that any nation in the world would dare attack America in war. The friendship of America and their confidence that America will defend free nations is the keystone of world recovery. Our financial aid as a token of friendship is more important than its actual economic value. That the American people are believed to be willing to provide food and substance to any distressed area is the assurance they need. Peasants and workers are doing their full share for recovery.

There is certainly no restriction of freedom of speech. Twenty-five percent of the voters select the Communist Party. This vote is largely a protest vote against the low standard of living. Management and rank-and-file workers are attacking the low standard of living by increasing production. Management is liberal in providing cafeterias and excellent recreational facilities for workers.

Business executives have little confidence in the soundness of the judgment of American politicians. They associate the New Deal in America with the welfare state of Britain, which they look upon as a failure. Many believe that one of the principal purposes of the Marshall plan is to support the

British Labor Government and to delay the devaluation of the British pound. The devaluation of the British pound and the defeat of the Labor Party would help to restore world trade.

American military aid to Europe is not necessary, but our financial aid is appreciated. Our Department of State's campaign to eliminate trade barriers between the nations of Europe is not realistic. As production is increased, and as each nation becomes more prosperous, it becomes more nationalistic. Each country will strive to produce within its borders any commodity for which it has, or can secure the material, the equipment, the mechanics, and the know-how.

European plants have well equipped physical and research laboratories; their technicians are well educated and well trained. The management is receptive to new ideas and is willing to carry on experimental work. Wages are low. Business executives recognize that a higher standard of living would mean more customers for their manufactured products. Management and workers agree that improved living conditions depend upon increased production.

To secure increased production, incentives are necessary and an equitable division of increased production between owners, management, and workers would be helpful. To my mind, the best incentive for increased production is profit sharing. In Europe it may be many years before the economy becomes stable. Profits of business will be erratic. Profit sharing may present difficulties.

Plans based upon production rather than upon profits may present less difficulty in practice. Production sharing plans have been successful in America. There is no doubt as to their fairness and workability. Production sharing is more simple than profit sharing and it eliminates factors over which workers have little control.

Property owners will always be fearful of devaluation. They do not have complete confidence that America will not arbitrarily increase the price of gold and take advantage of a bookkeeping profit. Sound money is essential to recovery. An act by Congress making American currency convertible into gold at $35 an ounce would not solve all problems, but it would do much to restore confidence. It would place more "power in the people," which, by the way, happens to be the title of a book by Felix Morley which I recommend that you read.

Under present economic conditions, each nation in Europe will import as little as possible and concentrate on exports. We are faced with a period of intense world-wide competition. America provides the great market. As production in Europe increases and costs decline, the American market becomes more attractive.

In many lines, America, with a higher standard of living, will not be able to compete with the lower standard of living and longer working hours in Europe. America should maintain equitable tariffs to offset in part the lower wages of European workers and to make our own manufactured articles competitive in our own market.

All's Not Lost in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "All Is Not Lost in Europe," which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn., September 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL IS NOT LOST IN EUROPE

Western Europe's open confession that it is not yet on the way to self-support, despite the receipt of more than $5,000,000,000 in American aid, is having the repercussions that would be expected from such an admission.

Those who oppose foreign aid in principle are saying "We told you so." The candid statement by the chairman and secretary of the 19-nation Organization for European Economic Cooperation that the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan aid will not be able to earn the dollars required for survival when United States aid ceases in 1952 prompts opponents of such aid to urge its immediate discontinuance.

This admission of relative failure and proposals to abandon American attempts to make western Europe self-supporting are enthusiastically received in Communist circles.

The Communists also shout "we told you so." They predicted that western Europe could not recover through American aid and that American aid would be cut off when the going got tough. They anticipate great gains for the Soviets from the disillusionment and the debacle which they are sure will ensue.

What are those who believe European recovery to be essential to the peace, freedom, and security of the non-Soviet world to think of this unhappy state of affairs? Has the recovery effort failed utterly and is there nothing ahead but disintegration and deterioration?

In our opinion such extreme pessimism and such defeatism are not yet warranted.

We did not expect and did not claim ERP would achieve miracles. We had hoped, however, that the Marshall-plan countries would make more progress toward working as an economic unit than they thus far have managed to do.

Appreciating the powerful nationalistic forces operating in western Europe, we nevertheless hoped that their common peril would lead to greater economic cooperation between the member governments than thus far has been achieved. We hoped the realization that United States aid would not be continued beyond 1952 would make them lower national barriers more rapidly than thus far has been done.

Each nation has been more concerned with trying to get itself into a position to survive economically, come what may, than with taking steps to insure mutual survival economically, politically, and militarily. ERP countries have taken the short rather than the long-term view of their best interests. Each has tried to become a small economic fortress instead of trying to create a western European community independent of American dollar aid and immune to Soviet domination.

We shall not discuss here what additional measures the United States might have taken to promote a larger measure of self-support in western Europe. We shall not go into what may yet be done to save western Europe in the interest of free institutions and peace. We prefer to emphasize now the vital consideration that all is not lost, all has not been in vain. There is no reason to assume that western Europe cannot be saved because its feet have yet to advance very far on the road to self-help.

Free societies, our own included, sometimes have to be on the edge of the abyss before they can bring themselves to do what must be done to avoid total disaster. When things grow more desperate measures often are taken which previously were shied away from. If western Europeans see that they must hang together or hang separately they may do what the American colonists did in a similar exigency. It is to our and their interest to keep the way open for the kind of cooperation which will enable western Europe to survive in freedom.

Instead of assuming that the $5,000,000,000 thus far spent for ERP has been wasted because western Europe is still dependent on American aid, Americans should consider what would have happened to western Europe had there not been a Marshall plan.

William H. Stoneman, probably the most experienced observer reporting from Europe today for the American press, gives this terse answer:

"Economic chaos accompanied by political desperation, possibly in the form of communism."

Thanks to ERP, the British crisis has failed to cause real turmoil in the whole of western Europe. France and Italy face the crisis with moderate, middle-of-the-road governments cooperating with the United States and Britain for peace and recovery instead of with Russia for world sovietization. The smaller European countries have moderate governments and are on our side of the cold war.

While $5,000,000,000 has been taken out of the pockets of American taxpayers for this investment in peace and recovery most of it has been spent for American goods. American producers have had markets they otherwise probably would not have had. ERP has provided employment and better prices for some as well as taxes for all.

The sum spent for ERP to date is what we spent in 30 days of World War II.

To abandon the effort at this stage would be like stopping efforts to get crab grass out of a good lawn because there is still crab grass there after several years hard work to get rid of it. All the previous effort would be wasted if the effort is not continued at the critical seeding stage.

River Basin Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No One 'Right' Plan for River Basins," published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO ONE "RIGHT" PLAN FOR RIVER BASINS

The argument over river valley development in the United States waxes hotter year by year. Hardly anyone any more disputes the premise that the Federal Government is the proper agency to carry on development work which crosses State lines and which involves navigation, irrigation, electric power, flood control, and conservation of natural resources.

But there is a wide range of opinion on how the Government should go about it.

At the one extreme are the valley authority advocates who believe each of the major river valleys should be developed under the single guidance of one agency responsible to Congress and the President.

At the other extreme are those who believe development should be handled by separate functional agencies—like the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service.

In-between these extremes are those who think functional agencies should do the work but should be coordinated in a particular area by some overhead, cooperative group.

Except for the Tennessee Valley, most of the rather limited river development that has been carried on in the last half century has been on a functional basis. Unquestionably this has resulted in some overlapping, some bureaucratic quarreling, and some serving of special interests to the detriment of other special interests and of the general public.

On the other hand critics of TVA fear such autonomous agencies could become super states, subject to little control by the people in the areas served. They say that there is no logic in having a Federal bureau to handle soil-conservation work, for example, if you are going to have a dozen TVA's doing conservation work in different ways in their own areas. Why not unify soil-conservation work for the whole country? The same goes for public power and other functions.

The shape of this argument suggests that it never will be or can be settled for all time and for all river valleys.

The Hoover Commission task force on natural resources expressed some fears of the TVA idea, yet it felt river basins should be developed as entities. Senators MURRAY, of Montana, and GILLETTE, of Iowa, have looked at the Missouri River Basin problems and concluded that only a Missouri Valley Authority will work there. Other sincere and disinterested students of the Missouri conclude that it is too large for an MVA.

There is nothing to be alarmed about in all this disagreement. It is a healthy sign of a working democracy that we have not settled on a rigid plan for all river valley development.

One needs only to travel over different areas of this broad country to realize that what works one place may not work in another. There is no right plan that will achieve perfect results in the Columbia River Basin, in the valley of the Arkansas, and on the Missouri's wide plains.

The TVA has worked well in flood control, navigation, and power development. It has developed some weaknesses, naturally, especially in conflicts over soil conservation. We can learn much from the TVA experiment. We can also learn from more modest projects carried on by functional bureaus in other areas.

Let us study every river basin as a problem in itself—without trying to make one scheme of Government organization fit everywhere.

The Taft-Hartley Act and Organized Labor in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ohio's 'Slave' Labor," published in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of August 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OHIO'S "SLAVE" LABOR

The crack of the bull whip and the clanking of chains seemed to reverberate in Columbus this week as the aristocracy of Ohio's organized "slave" labor met to denounce the Taft-Hartley Act and to plan ways and means of defeating Senator ROBERT A. TAFT for reelection next year.

To hear the labor bosses tell it, the Taft-Hartley Act, which has been in effect for 2 years, has shackled the working men and women of the Nation, has compelled them to toil long hours for low wages, and has all but destroyed the organized labor movement in the United States.

This was the cry of the Ohio Federation of Labor, which is planning to raise $1,000,000 from its "slave" members in Ohio alone to help finance the campaign to beat TAFT.

The complaint of the labor bosses against the Taft-Hartley Act is an old story and one which they continue to repeat despite plain evidence that their fantastic charges are completely false. How long can they continue to insult the intelligence of the members of their organizations by making such absurd claims?

Labor has not been enslaved by the Taft-Hartley Act. No labor union has been prevented from striking when it had a grievance, except unions of public employees who cannot be permitted to strike against the Government if orderly government is to be maintained.

No strikes have been delayed through use of the injunction except those which the President of the United States has determined would be injurious to the public health and safety.

No recognition has been withheld from labor unions and no impediments to collective bargaining have been raised, except in the cases of unions whose officers have refused to swear that they are not Communists.

With the Taft-Hartley law in effect, labor unions have been able to negotiate the best contracts they ever had and many of them are currently engaging in negotiations to obtain even better ones.

So what is the shouting all about? Is this campaign against Taft and the Taft-Hartley Act a campaign to permit public workers to strike against Government, to permit labor unions to engage in national emergency strikes and to permit Communists to regain the control over labor unions which they have lost in the past 2 years?

So it would seem. But the real gripe of the labor bosses is that they lost the dictatorial powers which they formerly exercised over the members of their unions when the old Wagner law was in effect. They can no longer get a man fired from his job because he doesn't like the way they run the union or because he refuses to kick in with a political assessment.

The labor bosses themselves have demonstrated the insincerity of their claims that they are concerned about the welfare of their members. If they were sincere, why didn't they accept the revised labor bill which the Senate passed 2 months ago? This bill made 28 changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, all designed to meet the reasonable objections of organized labor to the present act and to facilitate its administration.

But no, the labor bosses didn't want a reasonable bill. They wanted no restrictions put upon their activities, either to protect the public or to protect the rights of their own members. When they discovered that Congress would not restore the dictatorial powers they had under the Wagner Act, they chose deliberately to keep the Taft-Hartley Act in effect, rather than to obtain a more favorable measure, so that they would have a political issue in 1950 and an excuse for shaking down their members for political contributions. In this maneuver they had, of course, the wholehearted and subservient cooperation of the Truman administration.

"Beat TAFT" was the watchword of the Ohio Federation of Labor's convention. This is a challenge to the voters of Ohio. "Reelect TAFT and Beat the Labor Bosses" must be the slogan of those who are opposed to labor dictatorship.

Tribute to Thrift and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on September 8 I received an unusually good letter from Miss Florence Robinson, of Ottawa, Kans., who admits being about 80 years of age. This woman draws attention to the fact that a person should be entitled to the wages which his ability, training, and industry enable him to earn, but should not expect everything from the Government regardless of his own efforts. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTTAWA, KANS., *September 5, 1949.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the Washington Merry-Go-Round column, in this morning's Kansas City Times, appears the following: "Service was slow in the Senate dining room the night the Chamber debated the increased minimum-wage bill. Reason: Pay of Senate waiters is so low that a number of them have to do outside work to make a living." Well, what of it, if they have time to work elsewhere?

I am living now on an income approximately what Allen states they are receiving, but with no tips. I get no pensions from any source and no other assistance, and what is more, expect to get along until I die without assistance, as I am one of the few who resent charity, no matter what its disguise may be.

I am about 80 years old. Have supported myself since I graduated from high school in 1887, first by teaching, but found I could not live on what they paid teachers then. Got an office job, was one of the few women in office work then, continued office work until 1939. At first, earned $35 per month, lived at home. Later, when earning a little more, supported my mother until she died in 1896. Began by saving 25 cents per week in Ottawa Building & Loan Association. All during my working years, I saved regularly. I inherited insurance, $1,500, and from an uncle, $3,000.

This continual harping on higher pay is getting my goat. Excepting teachers, people who are trained and educated are getting big pay these days. Those not trained and educated are often getting much more than they are worth. I think it is about time to call attention to the fact that just because a human being is born and continues to live, he is not necessarily entitled to big wages and

all sorts of luxuries, expensive food and clothing, autos, and electrical appliances. The truth is, he is entitled to what his ability, training, and industry entitle him to earn, and if he gets more, then people like myself are taxed in some way, to pay for his luxuries and what he does not earn.

People who did not fit themselves during youth to do some one thing well, or who are not industrious and frugal, should expect to receive just what they are worth, for their labor. No one wants to see anyone starve. When a person is physically or mentally unable to earn his food and clothes and a place to live, he must be cared for by a welfare organization, which is a public charity for that purpose. But this thing of showing boys and girls that they do not have to make sacrifices, and work, and save, is not good for them. I learned shorthand and typing at night classes while I was earning my living. Giving everything to people, from cradle to grave, with no effort or saving on their part, and at the expense of those who have worked and saved, sounds well politically, and gets applause from people who don't use their heads, but it is ruining the American people and, incidentally, the United States.

I hope you will do all you can against a greatly increased minimum wage, and also do all you can to stop the United States from spending like a drunken sailor.

This may have bored you, but if you have taken time to read it through to the end, I thank you.

Very sincerely,

FLORENCE ROBINSON.

Peril Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peril Point," from the New York Times of September 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERIL POINT

Seven months ago, almost to the day, the House of Representatives approved by an overwhelming majority a bill restoring to the President the full powers of negotiation which he had enjoyed under the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act sponsored by Secretary Cordell Hull. Now, after many interruptions and postponements, the Senate is at last getting around to a discussion of this measure. It is of key importance to the present problem of dollar shortages and international payments.

The chief question at issue in the Senate debate is whether there shall remain in existing law a provision put there last year by a Republican Congress requiring the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the peril point beyond which proposed tariff concessions by this country cannot go without endangering the interests of American producers. This provision stems, of course, from the protectionist philosophy which so long dominated American thinking in tariff matters and for which there was something to be said in the days when the United States was a debtor Nation, needing to export more than it imported in order to settle its international balances. But this earlier reasoning has lost its force in a day when we have become far and away the world's greatest creditor and when there is no practicable way of achieving payment on our vast loans abroad except in terms of foreign goods. Taken literally and rigidly pursued, the peril-point philosophy would limit imports essentially to noncompetitive goods, thus depriving American consumers of the benefit of wholesome competition and whittling away to the vanishing point all hope of repayment on our foreign loans. It is a serious question whether, in these circumstances, the real peril point for the United States does not lie in stubborn allegiance to this outdated protectionist thinking.

The 20 or more tariff agreements which have been negotiated under the original Hull Act have all been carefully drawn. There is no evidence that they have injured vital American interests. There is, on the contrary, much evidence that they have helped to stimulate a healthy and essential two-way trade. The Hull program has, in fact, become, as former Secretary of State Marshall said of it, "the cornerstone and keystone of our foreign economic policy." We hope that the Senate, at last getting around to this important piece of public business, will now join with the House in restoring the President's full powers of negotiation.

Planned River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, ever since the publication of the Hoover Commission findings a great deal has been written about the costly conflicts and duplications among the Federal agencies competing for congressional and public approval of their separate projects for development of the resources of our great river basins. On August 30 the New York Times printed an editorial which, to my mind, is a sound and thoughtful commentary on this unfortunate situation. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, entitled "Planned River Development," printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that many more people can benefit from reading it.

In this connection it is encouraging to note that one of these long-time river basin conflicts between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers has now been to some extent resolved. The President has now sent to Congress a plan for the Central Valley project in California which clarifies the responsibilities of the two agencies and makes possible unified planning and operation. It is useful to note that this plan came to the Congress after thorough review and analysis by the President's office and the Bureau of the Budget, which is the proper procedure. I think it may truly be said that this thoroughgoing analysis contributed much to the rational and unified character of the plan.

In contrast to this comprehensive, thoughtful approach, we have the present situation in the Columbia River Basin where Congress is being pressured to authorize plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers which have not yet had the benefit of thorough study by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. Desirable as these plans may be, there is still no reason for unseemly haste in trying to crowd their enactment into the last remaining days of this session. Construction of these projects will call for several billions of dollars over a number of years. If we are concerned with economy and planned river development, certainly we cannot authorize this expenditure without thorough review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNED RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Army Corps of Engineers is the Nation's No. 1 flood-control and navigation agency. The Bureau of Reclamation is primarily concerned with western irrigation projects. Between them, the two agencies are responsible for many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of past and projected dams and levees and other works that are changing the face of the Nation.

But in recent years, as the millions pour out and the dams are raised and the channels deepened, a question has been rising with increasing intensity in the minds of many of the most disinterested and qualified observers. The question is this: Are these mighty works being planned in relation to the area which they affect, or are they promoted and sold and built as individual units without too much regard for the secondary effects which flow from them? And back of this question lies another: Is there adequate study and planning for the development of these vast regions as a whole—specifically, the great river valleys—so that all of the enormous construction work fits into a pattern of maximum use and minimum destruction of the resources already available?

Speaking of the Missouri Basin, an official of the Budget Bureau said just last week that the agencies now planning the eventual expenditure there of $5,000,000,000 are basing their plans on not more than one-tenth of the fundamentally needed basic data in geological, soil and hydrologic surveys, and in topographic mapping.

Unfortunately, the evidence is becoming increasingly clear that in their desire to get things done, and incidentally, to build up the prestige, personnel and power of their own organizations, the Government agencies most directly concerned tend to overlook the potential multiple-purpose use of the regions where they operate, and concentrate instead on their own limited field. Sometimes this results in inefficiency, sometimes in downright destructiveness. To take a simple example, dams may be constructed at great expense to control floods, when a much smaller expenditure for protection and reforestation of watersheds far above the dam sites might result in preventing them.

The piecemeal method of attacking such a profoundly important project as, for example, the development of the Missouri or the Columbia Basin is obviously unjustified in view of the enormous expense and is also contrary to the national interest. Flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, forest, soil and wildlife conservation and recreation are all involved. The basic facts concerning these areas must first be established, and then these various needs must be weighed one against the other, conflicts reconciled, compromises made.

Two years ago we observed that the spending of money on rivers for single purposes,

such as the control of floods, has been rendered obsolete by the success of the TVA. If the problem is handled by several agencies, competition and friction are bound to result. Over-all authority, on the TVA model, as frequently advocated by the President, seems clearly to be the solution to the problem of our great untamed rivers and undeveloped river valleys.

Antitrust Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a radio address which I made on Friday, September 2, 1949, over the National Broadcasting Co. network in New York on the subject of monopoly.

I hope that as wide an audience as possible will be able, by reading my remarks, to acquaint themselves with the problems and purposes of the Subcommittee on Study of Monpoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee which is making a broad inquiry into the antitrust laws.

The address follows:

The House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, is the committee responsible for antitrust legislation. This year we have set up a subcommittee to study the present operation of the antitrust laws, and to see if the laws can be made to serve their purpose more effectively. The purpose of the antitrust laws is to prevent unhealthy concentration in American business.

There are two main reasons why I am concerned about concentration of economic power in the United States. One is that concentration of business unavoidably leads to some kind of socialism, which is not the desire of the American people. The other is that a concentrated system is inefficient, compared with a system of free competition.

We have seen what happened in the other industrial countries of the Western World. They allowed a free growth of monopolies and cartels, until these private concentrations grew so strong that either big business would own the government or the government would have to seize control of big business. The most extreme case was in Germany, where the big business men thought they could take over the government by using Adolf Hitler as their puppet. So Germany passed from private monopoly to dictatorship and disaster.

In a report of experts sent to our Secretary of the Army we find this significant statement:

"Germany under the Nazi set-up built up a great series of industrial monopolies in steel, rubber, coal, and other materials. The monopolies soon got control of Germany, brought Hitler to power, and forced virtually the whole world into war."

We must deplore the weaving in this country of the pattern that gave us in Nazi Germany the Krug, Thyssen and I. G. Farben industrial empires.

There are clearest indications that unless checked our economy will become more and more controlled by a handful of giant corporations. The Federal Trade Commission just reported that 46 percent of the total capital assets of all manufacturing corporations in the United States as of 1947 was concentrated in the 113 largest manufacturers, which in turn owned our 16 billions of net capital assets. Three companies already control 100 percent of our aluminum output, three companies make more than 90 percent of all our soap, three companies make over 95 percent of all tin cans and tinware, three make over 90 percent of all linoleum, three huge oligopolies control cigarettes, three control whisky, three control autos. It is time we stopped, looked, and listened.

The American people have accepted the fact that our Government has to control natural monopolies like telephones and electric power. But monopolies that are not natural or necessary are pushing us in the same direction toward more Government controls against our will. While many other nations are marching into socialism, the United States, with its face pointed toward free enterprise, is sliding backwards toward socialism by neglecting the growth of concentration. I believe we can stop slipping if we pay attention to what is going on.

The second main reason for antitrust laws is that we believe the competitive system is more efficient than monopoly.

In the words of the great Justice Learned Hand: "Many people believe that the possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift, and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic and rivalry is a stimulant to industrial progress." I am one of the many people who believe that. I believe that the antitrust laws of the United States, imperfect though they may be, have helped to make American industry more productive than the industry of European countries where monopoly has not been discouraged by law. I believe that the great increase of antitrust enforcement in the past 10 years is one reason for the spectacular performance of American industry in the war. If we can find practical ways to get still more real competition, I believe the effect will be to stimulate still more progress and prosperity, as well as to prevent an unnecessary growth of Government controls.

With these reasons for reinforcing our antitrust laws, what do we propose to do about them? Our subcommittee held 4 weeks of hearings from July 11 to August 5, at which the witnesses brought up many questions that call for further study.

One of the most important features of a healthy competitive situation is that new men can come in and set up shop with new ideas and new methods, and with a reasonable chance of success if they really have something to show. It is this feature that makes the free competitive economic system as a whole so productive and moreover it is what the American people have always wanted. They are not getting as much of it as they want. It is true that we have still a large amount of free opportunity in this country in some lines of activity. But too many of our industries are being sewed up by mergers into closed systems where only a powerful maverick like Kaiser or Reynolds can occasionally break in. When an industry is concentrated to the point where a Big Three or Big Four can dominate the field, administer the prices, control production, and interfere with new entries into the industry, it is not a healthy situation. Some of the smaller independents may be efficient and well able to cut their prices and take business away from the leaders, especially in their own locality. But they are afraid of retaliation by the big concerns that have financial resources to pay the costs of a price war. The public does not get the benefits of free competition, and the field of new opportunity is posted with no-trespassing signs.

I realize, of course, that, in order to work efficiently, some operations have to be so big that there can never be room for many competitors, or the field itself may be limited like the number of bands in radio. In such cases we have to have Government regulation. When regulation does not seem to be practical, we may have to have public ownership, as we do in the Post Office, river valley development, and public works. There is no harm in these public enterprises provided we keep enough free enterprise to give real alternatives to our people. That is why any industry that does not absolutely have to be concentrated into a few hands must be kept as free of monopoly as possible.

We have just passed in the House the Celler bill, an amendment to the Clayton Act, to stiffen the law against mergers that undermine competition. The Department of Justice is proceeding with suits to break up some of the established concentrations that have hardened the arteries of one industry or another. We shall have to see whether any more legislation is needed to open up the opportunity for free enterprise in fields where it has been too much monopolized. I do not presently know all the answers. That's what the inquiry is for. Let us get all the facts and maybe the facts will help point a remedy.

Another factor that has been raised in our hearings is the complaint that the Government itself often gives an unfair advantage to big business and leaves small business out in the cold. We shall have to look into the Government buying of military and civilian supplies. It is usually easier to buy from a big company than from a lot of smaller ones, but the intention of Congress is to buy from small companies whenever it is feasible to do so. To carry out that intention may call for some new legislation. The tax laws also are reported to favor mergers and big concerns. We propose to look into the effects of the tax laws and regulations, for it has not been the intention of Congress to have the taxes bear most heavily on little business.

A feature that has been plainly shown by many witnesses is that small and medium-sized business depends on many large-scale services that may be monopolized. Most of the risk capital, for instance, is in the hands of large companies in the form of profits that are not distributed to the stockholders. These corporate savings are usually available only for expanding the plant of the big company or buying up independent small companies. Some way to loosen up a supply of risk capital for smaller enterprises is badly needed in this country.

At the same time, small savings go mainly into life insurance or other institutions. These funds can be loaned, but there are complaints that too much of the loan money is out of reach of small-business men, because the size of some of these institutions is too big to deal practicably with anyone but large borrowers. There are similar complaints about raw material supplies being available only to the big buyers, who sometimes have bought up the mines, the forests, and the mills that supply their raw material. There are also complaints about concentrated ownership of market outlets, that give the small manufacturer no chance to get into the stores and put his product in the hands of consumers.

We expect to find ways to let small- and middle-sized-business men have a better chance to compete and show what they can do. This is the old-fashioned American way of doing business. All it needs is to keep the rules up to date. I believe we have every prospect of overcoming the unhealthy concentration that has appeared in some parts of our American business system, and of maintaining the economic freedom that underpins the other free institutions of America.

We shall keep ever in mind Thomas Jefferson's admonition against monopolies. You know he was so hostile to bigness verging on monopoly that he demanded that restraints against same be included in the Bill of Rights. The conservatives of his day defeated his proposal. Just so the die-hard

conservatives of today will battle me in my efforts to plug all loopholes in our antitrust laws.

This much is certain. If we fail to scotch the growth of these mammoth entities and allow them to get control of most of our industries and business, your children and mine and their grandchildren and those who follow will be deprived of entering these industries save as employees, and there will be a few masters holding sway over myriads of robots.

I want competition to be as free as possible so that my children and yours can enter any industry and/or business they see fit to enter. I don't want them barred by the sheer power of the giants. I don't want a situation developing where it would be like, "Every man for himself," said the elephant as he danced among the chickens.

I deprecate the idea that efficiency and lower prices only come with bigness. We now know that in many lines, the middle-sized concerns are either more efficient than the big ones—or else there is no positive difference. And lower prices do not always accompany bigness. Nor should it be essential for colossal concerns to grow bigger for purposes of research. Du Pont, with all its efficient research, did not have to grow even bigger by acquiring controlling interests in General Motors and United States Rubber, and as a result eliminate many independents and horribly weaken those that survive.

I shall strive to give a new answer to an old and difficult problem.

Louis Johnson, the Tough-Minded Secretary of Defense, Showed a Rare Talent for Handling a Buzz Saw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Tris Coffin in his Daybook wrote a very interesting item which was in the Washington Times-Herald of Friday, September 2.

The scene of the story was laid in the auditorium of the Pentagon Building where the Members of Congress last week gathered to learn of the personnel reduction and other economies now being effected in the armed services.

What started—and had long continued to be—a very rough session ended happily when our colleague, FRANK BOYKIN, took the floor.

Secretary Johnson had outlined his program in great detail and, after telling his congressional audience that these economies would affect Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel and installations in practically every congressional district represented by those in the audience, he sat back and, as Tris Coffin expresses it—"waited for the tempers to start popping."

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that they did pop. When the oratorical fireworks were finished, FRANK BOYKIN, a colleague from my own State of Alabama, took the floor. He took exception to much of the criticism that had been leveled at Secretary Johnson for having to do the things that the "economy bloc" in Congress wanted him to do. "Apparently," said Congressman BOYKIN, "everybody in this auditorium wants Louis Johnson to save these billions so long as it does not affect any of their own constituency."

Everyone, myself included—

Continued FRANK BOYKIN—

likes to do pleasant things * * * but we equally dislike to do any unpleasant things to anybody anywhere or at any time. It takes a lot of courage—

He continued—

to face this body of Senators and Representatives and frankly tell them that the job is one that ought to be done. As Secretary of Defense it is Louis Johnson's job to do * * * and as a man both of word and action, he is going to get it done.

Mr. Speaker, in order that such of the Members of the House as were not present in the Pentagon last week may read of what happened at that momentous meeting, I am asking unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a few excerpts from Tris Coffin's Daybook of September 2, as follows:

THE DAYBOOK
(By Tris Coffin)

Louis Johnson, the tough-minded Secretary of Defense, showed a rare talent for handling a buzz saw.

It was at the meeting he called to break the news to Congressmen about economy moves in the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. He concluded firmly, "I personally will tolerate no WPA in the administration of defense," and waited for the tempers to start popping in the audience.

CHARLES TOBEY, the New Hampshire Senator, bounced up like a cork out of a champagne bottle. He howled, "Is this a fait accompli? Has the oracle spoken and his colors fallen? Is it accomplished as of noon today?" (TOBEY didn't mention that his reason for objecting was that the economy ax hit his State hard.)

Johnson replied gently, "I don't like the word 'oracle.' This is the result of an impartial and fair study."

TOBEY snorted defiantly, "So we are here to listen to it?" He put on a big act about "creating commiseration and misery and adding to unemployment."

Johnson just said quietly, "I am not arguing with you. I am saying defense must be defense and not WPA."

Next man to bat was Senator BILL KNOWLAND, of California, screaming about the cuts at the Long Beach shipyard. He was followed by Representative CLYDE DOYLE, of the same State, who sneered about the "alleged logic" of the board which decided on the cut.

Also lining up to complain at the economy were Representative BOB SIKES, of Florida; JACK KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire; GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida; THOMAS LANE, of Massachusetts; FRANCK HAVENNER, of California; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Masachusetts; Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; WILLIAM BARRETT, of Pennsylvania; and spokesmen for Senators TOM CONNALLY and OLIN JOHNSTON.

The tactics varied. Mrs. ROGERS warned the Secretary of a battle over some cuts. PEPPER made a smooth palaver about "impairing defense." LANE revealed that both Majority House Leader JOHN MCCORMACK and Minority Chief JOE MARTIN have come to the Pentagon lobbying for the Boston shipyard.

Johnson was serene and smiling to them all. To Mrs. ROGERS' threats of a battle he said, gently remonstrating:

"I think the American people will not support you in a battle. They know there've been people employed in defense who didn't give a nickel's worth of service for the defense dollar. That I will defend before America and the world."

An unexpected bit of clowning and shrewd sense came from FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, who said, "I know you are right and you are trying; you are the only one with the guts to do such a thing and I am going to back you up, except to God I wish you could leave me alone. You damn near ruined me in Alabama.

"What we've kind of got to get over to our people—you just can't do the same thing all the time. If you are not needed on the job, you can go out and do something else. We have the greatest land you can develop. We've got to quit expecting something for nothing."

Power-Hungry Men in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, United States Marine Corps, retired, which appeared in Collier's magazine under date of August 27, 1949.

The man who takes aim at what he calls Washington's brass curtain is a hero, even by the proud standards of the Marine Corps. The general holds the Congressional Medal of Honor, won on Guadalcanal.

Retired in 1947 after 30 years' service with the corps, Maj. Gen. "Red Mike" Edson currently is director of the Vermont State police. His interest in things military continues, and today he is considered one of the country's most outstanding fighters. His article in Collier's outlines his arguments against further centralization of military authority.

MARINE HERO "RED MIKE" EDSON SPEAKS OUT AGAINST "POWER-HUNGRY MEN IN UNIFORM"
(By Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, U. S. Marine Corps, retired)

While the attention of most Americans has been focused on Europe's iron curtain, the shadow of another curtain—a brass curtain raised in Washington's Pentagon Building—is spreading over the Nation. Behind it, continuing efforts are being exerted to fashion an American replica of the Prussian general staff system which destroyed all vestiges of democracy in the German nation, which plunged that country into four wars within three-quarters of a century, and which has left Europe devastated, police-ridden, and bankrupt.

Scarcely was the ink dry on the Japanese surrender document before a propaganda campaign began. It was designed to convince the people that the United States could never win another war unless we discarded immediately the very military organization which had just carried us through to victory. In its stead we were urged to adopt a system identical to that of the enemies we had just defeated—in the name of unification and economy, of course.

The first move in this direction had been made as early as November 2, 1943. The Chief of Staff of the Army on that date produced a "top secret" paper concocted by the

Army General Staff. This paper recommended that all of our armed forces be consolidated in a single Department of War, headed by a single civilian Secretary of War. The Secretary's proposed duties were so limited, however, that he actually would have been "head of the Department" in name only. A supreme military Chief of Staff was to have direct access to the President in nearly all matters.

This supreme Chief of Staff was to take precedence over all other military and naval officers. He was to be a Chief of Staff for a National General Staff.

The armed forces themselves were to be cartelized in Prussian-type "trielemental" groups—ground forces, air forces, and naval forces. A general supply department would furnish each force as the supreme commander dictated.

Earlier in the war, on February 28, 1942, the Army General Staff had secured White House approval to reorganize the War Department alone along these lines. The Army Staff officers surveyed their handiwork and found it good. Then they announced to the press: "The reorganization follows very closely that of the German supreme command, which much credit is given for the achievements and success of the German military machine." In 1943 they were ready to try setting up the same type of over-all high command for all the armed forces.

I have used the phrase "over-all high command" advisedly. It is, of course, a parallel translation of "Oberkommando der Wehrmacht," the name for the military group which gripped Nazi Germany. It describes accurately the military organization being urged on the United States.

The proposal ran into opposition and was dropped for the duration of the war. Then, in October 1945, the Senate Military Affairs Committee commenced hearings on a "merger" bill based on the General Staff's scheme.

When it became evident that Congress would not accept the proposition, the Army brass tried to get the "trielemental" theory approved by the separate services. If all the military could agree to it among themselves, the single-department system might be assured of a favorable reception by Congress.

In plain language, the "trielemental" theory is this: Everything that fights on land belongs in the "land forces"; everything that flies through the air belongs in the "air forces"; everything that floats on the water belongs in the "naval forces"; and all three groups are dependent on a single supply service. Under such an organization, the need for a National General Staff, or over-all high command, is self-evident.

A new bill was introduced in Congress 2 years ago as the National Security Act of 1947. Since the term "merger" had fallen into disrepute and was repugnant to Congress, this bill was called a "unification" measure. Its leading proponent was Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, who represented the Air Force and the Army General Staff. It fell short of what the General Staff wanted, but it was weighted heavily in the Army's favor. After a thorough amending by Congress, it was finally enacted into law.

It was, in the main, a constructive and workable measure. It still is. Perhaps its greatest weakness lies in the ease with which it can be juggled to bring about the plan originally proposed by the Army in 1943.

Now, less than 2 years after the 1947 National Security Act actually became effective, those who advocate a military Utopia in terms of an over-all high command want to strengthen it. Their proposals were contained in the so-called Tydings bill, introduced in the Senate last March.

Spurred on by President Truman's reorganization plan, the Tydings bill, as passed by the Senate, and a much milder House-approved measure, went to conference committee late in July.

The Tydings bill represents the goal of the brass hats. They will continue to strive for it, step by step, one session after another. Let us see what the bill would do.

First. It would convert the present National Military Establishment into a single Department of Defense, headed by a Secretary of Defense, who would have authority to transfer personnel, with mild limitations, and to consolidate or eliminate altogether any existing agency, when or how the Secretary saw fit. He could simply label any act elimination of duplication. Even the President does not have a blank check like that.

Second. It would establish the post of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which means a chief of staff of the armed forces.

Third. It would remove existing restrictions on the number of officers assigned to the Joint Staff. As passed by the Senate, it raises the number to 210. This innocuous-sounding agency would, in fact, serve as a national general staff. It was a similar provision for an unlimited number of staff officers, who compounded their power with a lifelong permanency of office, that permitted the German General Staff to gain its tremendous influence over the German Nation.

Fourth. The Tydings bill would reduce the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to the status of mere figureheads.

Finally, it would authorize the supersecretary to transfer all supply functions to the munitions board. That might eliminate duplication, but it also suggests an overgrown replica of Gen. Brehon B. Somervell's unwieldy wartime command.

All these changes are proposed in the name of unification. They are, however, the cardinal features of the same type of merger plan which was repudiated by Congress in 1947. They would, if passed, set up the very military organization recommended by the Army General Staff in 1943.

If this is accomplished we will have the military organization that has been publicized as something new and necessary in this atomic age. Certainly it would be something new for a peace-loving, maritime democracy such as the United States of America.

It is no novelty elsewhere. Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, before their defeat, were quite familiar with just such general staff unification. So is Stalin's Russia.

Wherever this type of military organization has appeared the result has been the same. As night follows day, its adoption has been followed by the loss of individual freedom, the destruction of democracy, and poverty for the people who are stripped to meet the ever-mounting costs of armament. It seems to work well in the early days of a war. But within the era of the generation which creates it, there have always come ignominious defeat and national disaster. History is full of stories like this. It contains no record of final victory in world conflict for a nation operating under such a military system.

Only the maritime nations of Great Britain and the United States, which traditionally employ balanced independent military forces, have been ultimately successful in waging war. Why, then, the clamor to discard our winning combination and adopt that of the losers?

Last March the late Secretary of Defense Forrestal pointed with pride to the $56,000,000 saved by eliminating certain duplications in operations during the first year of unification under the present National Security Act. Actually, the savings must have been rather theoretical. Neither he nor anyone else explained that, during the same period, our over-all expenditures for national defense increased from $10,400,000,000 to more than $14,000,000,000; or that Congress before it is through will probably appropriate a total approximating $16,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Military enthusiasts were asking for more than $20,000,000,000.

One very high-ranking Army general had this to say about economies to be effected by unification when a similar project was under consideration some years ago:

"Small and trivial concrete cases have been cited of possible overlapping and from these trivialities an opinion has been expressed that great economies may be accomplished by their elimination. The contrary would result * * * rather than economy this amalgamation would, in my opinion, represent one of the greatest debauches of extravagance that any nation has ever known." This statement by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is just as true today as when it was written in 1932.

Monopoly has never resulted in economy. In the Sherman Antitrust Act, Congress has carefully guarded against the dangers inherent in a business monopoly.

Yet Congress is now being asked to create the greatest cartel of all time—a monopoly which will control almost 40 percent of the Nation's annual appropriations, and eventually reach into every segment of our way of life.

If economy is not the answer, perhaps we still need an all-powerful Secretary, and a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to bring about harmony among the armed services? The answer, obviously, is no.

The Tydings bill will serve only to hide the "bickering" from the public view. It will go on just the same behind the brass curtain. The struggle among the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy for dominant position in the over-all high command will be intensified. It happened in Nazi Germany. There is every reason to believe it could happen here.

The Army generals and the Air Force generals are both confident that their branch will come out on top—and even some admirals are not without hope. The creation of the over-all high command is, of course, the first requisite. Without it, none of them can achieve the control each wants.

This struggle for power is at the bottom of the demand for unification. Whether the Army or the Air Force or the Navy gains ultimate control, the other two branches are bound to suffer. The inevitable result will be to weaken, rather than strengthen, our national security.

This in itself is bad enough. But there is another danger that reaches far beyond the mere weakening of our security structure; a danger that has always gone hand in hand with the creation of an over-all high command of the military forces. Its nature is so subtle, so insidious, that few people recognize its presence, or will admit it if they do. Our forefathers recognized it for what it is—the veiled, but nonetheless potent, threat to our form of government.

The concept of military control always has been diametrically opposed to the principles of democracy. A society which gives too much power to a unified armed force creates, in ultimate effect, a military dictator—the single commander whose decision, whether right or wrong, is final and whose orders must be obeyed. As each officer steps up the ladder from one echelon to the next, he acquires more and more authority. He controls more and more people, and more and more things, until he becomes obsessed with his own power and his own infallibility.

So does the staff which he gathers round him, for it takes unto itself many of the attributes of the chief. The men who compose the staff may, as individuals, believe in the fundamental principles of democracy. But they become enmeshed willy-nilly in the evils of the system. This command structure is necessary on the battlefield, or in a theater of operations. Its use can be justified even in the Pentagon, so long as it confines itself to control of one branch of the armed forces.

But when a national general staff—the over-all high command with its single commander—is superimposed over all the armed services, it can begin to reach out and control the Nation. Why not? Isn't war the soldier's business? Who is better qualified to run a nation-in-arms? Surely the over-all high command—trained to handle huge numbers of personnel, to carry on gigantic operations, to figure out logistics to the nth degree, and to reach quick and sound decisions—can do a better job at it than a lot of bumbling politicians, or business tycoons, or plain civilians.

AN UNSOUND THEORY OF DEFENSE

In these days of armed neutrality, a country must be prepared for war at any moment. Only if the military are in full control—in time of peace while preparing for war, as well as in time of war itself—can the national security be assured.

It is this sort of thinking which leads to propaganda like the following:

"The one big item * * * was lack of an over-all high command to coordinate Air Forces, Army, Navy, Intelligence, research, production and supply, manpower, and diplomacy as the General Staff coordinates the War Department. At the height of our war effort, we still lacked a proper over-all high command."

That sounds like a passage from Hitler's Mein Kampf. But it isn't. It is an excerpt from a lecture delivered by Brig. Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Commandant of the United States Army Information School at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., in 1946. Read it carefully, for it is all there: An over-all high command to coordinate not just the Air Force and the Army and the Navy; but research, production and supply, manpower, and diplomacy as well. In short, it suggests an over-all high command composed of military people to control the Nation.

Senators and Congressmen have asked: "What can we do? How can we achieve economy in the armed forces, or stop the endless jealousy between them? Who is right, the Army, or the Navy, or the Air Force? Must we—can we—assume the responsibility for determining how much money is needed for national security, or how strong or how organized our defense forces should be? Isn't it better to set up this supreme military commander over all the services, and let him tell us what to do?"

The answer, again, is no. Congress must assume that responsibility.

MUST CURB MILITARY AMBITION

Congress would not think of adopting a labor bill drafted by John L. Lewis until after the closest examination. It does not hesitate to exercise its own good judgment in respect to such legislation. It must be at least equally vigilant in the military field. There are men in uniform who are ambitious and power-hungry.

Let's get at the facts behind every proposal that originates behind the brass curtain. It is getting more and more difficult. Defense Secretary Johnson's original Consolidation Directive No. 1—since withdrawn under fire—said in effect: Once the over-all high command has decided upon a policy, no person in the Military Establishment—Regular, retired, Reserve, National Guard, civilian employee, or what not—can publicly express a contrary opinion, even to Congress. It made no difference what that policy might cover: drill regulations, or the transfer of naval aviation to the Air Force, or the Tydings bill, or the weather.

To require a citizen to obey the law is one thing. To tell him that the law should be such and such is something else again. It seems that the prohibition of free speech can be the price for harmony and unification.

Should we deny to Congress the information which it needs to maintain its civilian control over the men in uniform? Under the original consolidation directive, once policy had been predetermined behind the brass curtain, every military man who appeared as a witness before a congressional committee would have had to say the same thing. There was nothing else he could do, regardless of his personal opinion.

If Congress eventually creates the over-all high command, can the military "be kept under strict subordination to and governed by the civil power?"

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on the Armed Forces on March 29 of this year Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, chairman of the Committee on the National Security Organization of the Hoover Reorganization Commission, said, in substance, that there is nothing materially wrong with the National Security Act of 1947. He said further that "in the absence of clear proof of need, we should, therefore, be very deliberate about making drastic changes in this essentially sound statute."

Why then is Congress being continually pressed into this preposterous scheme for revision? The answer lies behind the brass curtain.

A Plan for Sustained Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a stable national economy is an essential to security of America and to the prosperity of the entire world. Unfortunately, there are conflicting views of how this stable national economy can best be achieved.

Those of us who recognize, and value at its true worth, the opportunity afforded by America's free-enterprise system to the people of our land to better their own condition and, by so much, further the prosperity of our Nation as a whole, will find a great deal of value in the attached plan for sustained prosperity.

Prepared by Lewis S. Rosenstiel, and published in the United States News and World Report of July 29, 1949, it reflects, I am convinced, the best type of American thinking on business planning, which, incidentally, means the best type of world thinking on this important matter.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article by Mr. Rosenstiel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN FOR SUSTAINED PROSPERITY

(By Lewis S. Rosenstiel, chairman of the board, Schenley Industries, Inc., New York)

RISE IN WAGES AND PRODUCTIVITY IS PROJECTED—DEFICIT FINANCING UNTIL NATIONAL INCOME IS $300,000,000,000, THEN BUDGET BALANCE AT $50,000,000,000—AID ABROAD FROM STRONG UNITED STATES ADVOCATED TO WIN THE PEACE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is not often that a businessman of large responsibility takes time out to formulate a program of such far-reaching implications as are contained in the plan presented here this week. For several months, Lewis S. Rosenstiel, author of the plan, has been discussing it with top-level persons in Government and business. He has conferred with five members of the President's Cabinet, several of the Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate, labor leaders, bankers, and businessmen. He speaks of it not as a perfected plan but as one that he hopes will stimulate discussion along broader lines than have heretofore been considered in viewing the present-day economic situation. Mr. Rosenstiel's companies range from the manufacture of pharmaceutical products, principally penicillin, to the making and sale of distilled spirits. United States News & World Report asked Mr. Rosenstiel for permission to make the first publication of his plan, which is given below.)

Only a prosperous America can win the peace. This means a nation at full production recapturing its great salesmanship of the past, and clearing the channels of distribution—a nation progressing, and continuously creating new wealth.

For continued prosperity, we must have a $300,000,000,000 national income by 1954. To achieve this essential goal we propose a nine-pronged program to create the markets while we create the output:

1. Tax reduction to provide the incentives essential to expanding business investment.
2. Temporary deficit financing until national income reaches $300,000,000,000. At that level the budget should be balanced with taxes taking no more than one-sixth of the national income.
3. A 5-percent increase in wages in conjunction with a 4-percent increase in production per man-hour every year for the next 5 years, increasing the standard of living one-third by 1954. This would be accomplished by labor-management conferences and voluntary cooperation.
4. Continuation of a flexible farm-support program until industrial uses of farm surpluses can be developed.
5. Refunding the national debt.
6. A program to stimulate American private foreign investment.
7. Increased United States financial assistance to friendly nations, conditional upon prompt action toward realistic adjustment of exchange rates, convertibility of currencies, and reduction of trade restrictions. Terms of trade agreements should be renegotiated following any adjustment of exchange rates.
8. A foreign economic policy designed to encourage friendly nations to raise wages and provide incentives for investment.
9. Establishment of thousands of new businesses under local and regional management and capital, by amending tax laws to permit business to cut off subsidiaries without incurring tax liability.

DOMESTIC PROGRAM

I. Incentives to business: The burden of taxes on individuals and corporations is now so heavy as to provide a major obstacle to economic expansion. To achieve a $300,000,000,000 national income, the tax burden must be reduced and the tax structure streamlined. The short-term loss of some immediate tax money is nothing as compared to the big continuous long-term Government profit. It is a low price to pay for economic health. Consideration should be given to:

A. A tax credit to the individual taxpayer on dividends received, equal to the tax which the corporation has already paid. This would eliminate the double taxation now imposed on dividend income and help revive the equity markets.

B. Better treatment for earned income. This is the income resulting from initiative and effort. Adequate incentives to ambitious young men are a must if we are to have an expanding economy.

C. Present tax provisions are grossly unfair to professional groups, including actors, authors, lawyers, doctors, athletes, etc. We

amortize bricks, mortar, and machines, but capital put into training the human brain and mind is not permitted in amortization. This inequity can be handled by credits for earned income.

D. Encouragement of long-term research by permitting funds set up for this purpose to be tax deductible in the year in which they are set up. This would permit industry to plan long-term research from the conception of an idea to the assembly-line stage instead of operating on an uncertain year-to-year basis.

E. Revision of internal-revenue regulations to permit business to amortize plant and equipment as it sees fit. This would be particularly helpful in inducing business to embark on risk-capital investments.

F. The elimination of wartime excise taxes which have pushed prices beyond the reach of consumers, cut production and employment and smothered investment. These taxes have gone beyond the point of diminishing returns.

II. The Federal Budget: We must have the greatest possible efficiency in the use of Government funds so that we get the most for our money. Every unnecessary expenditure must be curtailed. To that end we hope the Hoover Commission recommendations will be put into effect promptly.

However, we must realistically recognize that our commitments throughout the world and our program at home make an increase in expenditures inescapable and we must also recognize that taxes need to be cut to revive the equity markets and to stimulate investment and consumption.

A bridge to economic health, therefore, means temporary deficit financing until the Nation has passed through the recession and raised the national income to an appropriate level. Our aim should be balancing the budget at a national income of $300,000,000,000, with taxes taking no more than one-sixth of the national income.

* * * * *

III. Increased wages: The world is not overproduced. It is underinvested and underconsumed.

Continuous expansion of our national income requires not only rising investment but also increasing consumption. That is why we propose, for the next 5 years, a 5 percent increase in wages in return for a 4 percent increase in production per man-hour. We must create the markets at the same time that we create the output.

Attention is called to the fact that the proposal involves wage increases which run somewhat ahead of the increased output per man-hour. * * *

IV. Farm program—bring industry to the farm: A flexible farm-price-support program should be continued until such time as a better plan can be developed. By that we mean a program which does not entail interference with the farmer's production, or involve too large subsidies.

* * * * *

The investment required to develop these new industrial uses of farm products would be quickly forthcoming if business were permitted to amortize its investment rapidly and keep itself, its management, and its shareholders financially healthy, as recommended in section I.

* * * * *

Another example: The use of quick-freezing and juice-squeezing facilities for bulbous and citrus fruits can provide a year-round market for these products at prices far above those the farmer has received on the average for these products in the past, while at the same time remaining far below the price the consumer has had to pay during the off season.

V. Refunding the debt: Consideration should be given to refunding the national debt. The debt might be divided into three groups of issues: 125-year maturity, 75 to 100 years, and 50 years and under. If certain inducements, such as tax exemptions, are required to find a real home for the bonds in the hands of individuals and institutions, the cost would be well worth incurring. This would put the Treasury in a position to meet any future contingency.

* * * * *

WORLD PROGRAM

VI. Private foreign investment: Three quarters of the world is denied the level of income it could produce if it had access to American know-how and American private investment. Providing this is the greatest single contribution we can make to world economic expansion. A program to stimulate private foreign investment would not only increase the world's productive capacity, wage and living standards, but, in the process, increase the markets for American exports, both visible and invisible. * * *

Tax incentives for private foreign investment. Taxes on income from American private investments anywhere in the world should not exceed the 25 percent tax rate levied under our Western Hemisphere tax statute. Our Government should negotiate with the foreign governments involved regarding the division of this tax rate between the two governments. Agreements should cover a period sufficient for business to feel safe in asking American investors to put up their money.

A realistic amortization policy as suggested in section I, part E.

A tax credit for individuals on dividends received from corporations investing abroad, equal to the full amount of foreign and domestic corporation income taxes paid.

Establishment of machinery in the Export-Import Bank for insurance, at a premium, against loss through (a) foreign political upheaval and (b) inconvertibility of currencies. See section VII, part A.

Measures to protect American private investors abroad against discriminatory treatment.

* * * * *

VII. Increased American financial aid: American financial aid to the western world, culminating in the ECA program, is without precedent in magnitude and generosity. This aid has apparently turned the tide against political and economic chaos and has started the free world on the road to recovery.

* * * * *

The current crisis of the pound, which may spread to other currencies, dramatizes the difficulties which still confront us. We face these difficulties because, on the one hand, our aid, great as it has been, has not measured up to the actual necessities of the situation. And, on the other hand, we have failed to insist upon the fulfillment of agreements to establish convertibility at realistic exchange rates, to remove restrictions on world trade, and to move toward balanced national budgets.

Measures to remedy these serious defects in our foreign-aid program should include:

A. Increase of the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $10,000,000,000. Of this amount, $5,000,000,000 should be used to guarantee loans made by American banks to foreign banks and/or to American business investing abroad. * * *

The other $5,000,000,000 should be used as a revolving fund to guarantee American business making investments abroad against the risk of loss through (a) political upheaval and (b) inconvertibility of currencies. * * *

B. An offer by our Government to lease $3,000,000,000 of gold to the International Monetary Fund, with proper safeguards to protect our total investment in the fund, at a charge no greater than twice the cost of storing the gold underground. This would bring the gold and dollar resources of the International Monetary Fund to a level of about $6,000,000,000. As a condition of this lease, we should require the prompt and realistic adjustment of exchange rates, free convertibility, and the holding of increased reserves against note issues.

C. Completion of the ECA program: In this connection, we should insist upon fulfillment of commitments to reduce trade restrictions, to open up the channels of trade on a nondiscriminatory basis, to move toward balanced budgets, as well as to restore convertibility of currencies. All trade agreements should be renegotiated following any adjustment of exchange rates. * * *

VIII. Foreign economic policy: Creation of a healthy and prosperous and expanding economy here at home will send out a wave that will spread throughout the world, benefiting other nations. However, they must follow the same course we take: expanding production, increasing wages, and providing incentives for investment. Wages in other countries must rise relatively to ours so as gradually to close the gap between us. It is the obligation of our Government in negotiating with other nations to include conditions which would raise wages and standards of living in those nations as part and parcel of the agreement. Let any backward nation label this policy "imperialistic." The people will understand.

IX. An incentive for decentralization of business: Our tax laws should be amended to permit every type of business to avail itself of the present provisions permitting divestiture of subsidiaries by public-utility holding companies without incurring tax liability to the corporation or the stockholder. * * *

Foreign markets, effectively used, a price stabilizer: Under the ideas for developing markets abroad, we visualize the United States as operating an export gate by which we can increase or decrease our export trade. If we find we are depleting ourselves at any time, and prices begin to move upward, we can close the gate a little, thereby increasing the supply of goods at home and so stopping any rise of prices. * * *

Why a $300,000,000,000 national income by 1954 is feasible: Only men of little faith in America would doubt the feasibility of reaching a $300,000,000,000 income by 1954. If the national production is increased 5 percent every year for the next 5 years, the goal will be achieved.

Our Nation stands today on the edge of greatness. In moving ahead we must realize that at the rate population is growing, every 4½ years sees a city the size of New York born in the United States, and a nation the size of our own born in the world. Our skill, know-how, and production genius must keep pace with the world's needs and desires to turn in the formula of success.

Records shows that during the past three-quarters of a century, the average output of American workers has increased approximately 3 percent annually. Give the American workingman the incentive of a 5-percent wage increase every year and let him know that another boost will follow next year if he increases his productivity by 4 percent, and you will find productivity rising at an astonishing rate. With an annual increase of 1 percent (about 600,000) in the number of workers seeking jobs, an increase of 5 percent in total production is well within our capacity.

The national pay roll during the peak year of 1948 was $140,000,000,000. The suggested 5-percent increase in wages, cumulated for 5 years, would increase the pay roll one-third by 1954, giving the Nation's workers $47,000,000,000 more to spend. Simultaneously, other incomes would go up in the same proportion. Increased production would throw off $16,000,000,000 more income for

farmers, business and professional men—and $10,000,000,000 more in corporation profits before taxes.

CONCLUSION

Bold measures must be taken to restore and strengthen confidence in the future of our economy and to eliminate the depression psychology of retreating when an advance is indicated. The way out of every difficulty is to work to raise the national income.

We must set our course to achieve a $300,000,000,000 national income by 1954. To reach this attainable end Government must act now in concert with labor, investors, management, and the Nation's farmers.

Building greater national prosperity requires the enlargement not only of purchasing power, including wages and farm income, but of market opportunities abroad. Our aim is to keep the foreign market healthy, which includes raising wages and purchasing power abroad, and opening the world to commerce.

The peace of the world will never be made secure by military force alone. Armies may win battles, but the people must be won over when the fighting is ended. This means that economic contentment throughout the world is essential to world peace. * * * An expanding world economy that offers a better standard of living everywhere can fight off any insidious infiltration by the Communists. * * *

The way to win the peace is by making the whole world outside of Russia so strong that the Russian people themselves will see the folly of war and question their own system as inadequate and insecure.

It is the goal in an international sense which we attain only by strengthening ourselves in a domestic sense.

It is the way to win the peace.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What America Means to Me," written by Louis R. Bruce, Jr., and published in the American magazine for September 1949.

My reason for making this request is that Mr. Bruce is an American Indian, a Mohawk, and a neighbor of mine, who has performed a remarkable service not only for the Indians but for Americans generally in that section of the State. He is one of our distinguished citizens, and his article contains such an inspiring message, not only to Indians and farmers, but to all Americans, that I feel it is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Louis R. Bruce, Jr.)

My father is, to my mind, the essence of good Americanism. Throughout his career he maintained that the opportunities of America are unlimited for any person, regardless of origin, who has the energy and persistence to pursue them. It was dad who showed me the trail any Indian can take to become a successful, well-rounded citizen in an atomic-age America.

Dad was a full-blooded Mohawk Indian. He was slated to become chief of the Mohawks, as his father had been. But, instead, he chose to "leave the blanket." He became a Christian minister and a baseball pitcher.

When I was a youngster I felt—like most Indians—pretty apprehensive because I was an Indian. I couldn't help but feel that I belonged to a persecuted, underprivileged group. Dad kept telling me to stop being disturbed about the fact that I was an Indian. He said that in modern America everything would depend on what I made of myself and that I would have just exactly as much opportunity as the next person. "Your obstacles," he kept saying, "are mainly in your own mind."

Today I know he is right, and I know that what he taught me about America made up the most valuable lesson of my life.

Many of America's 400,000 Indians haven't had the benefit of a pep talk from my dad and mother. They are still skeptical about their chances of getting ahead in a modern America. They feel that any person who is known to be an Indian is excluded from America's opportunities and handicapped in many insuperable ways. Consequently, some of them are ashamed of their Indian heritage. They try to hide it.

The other day I was talking to a United States Congressman from a western State about Indian legislation. Suddenly he gave me some man-to-man advice.

"Bruce, you ought to know better than to go around admitting you're an Indian," he said. "You know as well as I do that most Indians are low-down good-for-nothing savages, and you will just mess up your business career if you identify yourself with them."

The interesting point of that story is that I happen to know the Congressman himself is part Indian, though he has never publicly admitted it.

I am an Indian, all right, and am proud of it, thanks to my father and mother. I come from a long ancestral line of aboriginal savages, as the textbooks phrase it. Not only was my dad a Mohawk, but my mother was a Sioux, a relative of Sitting Bull.

The Mohawks and Sioux, you may remember, resisted the white invasion of their native lands with ferocity and cunning. In fact, they probably made it hotter for the white man than any other two tribes on the continent.

Today the white man is paying me off for the lands he took from my ancestors. Each year I get two checks. My check from the Mohawk annuity fund this year came to $2.38. And my last annual check from the Sioux Reservation in South Dakota was for $32. That covered the profits the reservation made on 160 acres of very poor grazing land allotted to me. The two checks keep me in chewing gum, one of the white man's products I like very much.

My Indian name is Agwelias, which was given me by Grandfather Bruce. I was born and raised on New York reservations, and most of my relatives still live on reservations.

During my boyhood I heard a lot of bitter talk about the raw deal Indians have gotten in their native land. Although I had two swell white friends, Kenneth McKinnon and Bill Hamilton, in Hogansburg, I heard repeatedly from some neighboring whites that Indians were no-good trash. And I heard from Indians that it was hopeless for an Indian to leave the blanket and try to improve his position in America, because of deep prejudice against Indians.

Today I know better. And I don't have to look far to prove my point. I just go up on the hill at the farm. I was up there last night after I had finished milking. The reason I went up was that I wanted to think about this article, and I can think better up there.

From the hilltop I could look out over the breath-takingly beautiful Mohawk Valley of central New York. Nestled below at the edge of our property was Lake Canadarago (an old Mohawk name). Hundreds of years ago Mohawk Indians used to camp down in the pasture by the lake. About a year ago my uncle dug up some old arrowheads down there. He found them near the old Indian mounds which scientists have come from Colgate University to examine. The road that winds down past our house, now Route 28, used to be an old Mohawk trail.

In the dusk last night I saw a line of animals trailing single file toward the old camping ground. They were our herd of heifers and milk cows going out to pasture, but for one chilling second I imagined they were Indian ponies.

For centuries before the white man came to drive away the Mohawks, these rolling hills were the happy hunting ground of my ancestors. Now they form the heart of the richest dairy country in North America. And I, an Indian, am able to call 450 acres of this land (or almost a square mile) my home.

From those cows in the pasture we drained many thousands of quarts of milk last year, as well as selling many calves. In addition to the cows, we have 600 chickens, 12 hogs, and 13 horses. Some people claim I'm old-fashioned to stick to horses instead of using tractors. But, being an Indian, I'm a sentimental fool about horses.

Except for the horses, however, we are fully mechanized, and our 22-room house has a streamlined, electrified kitchen. We raise every bit of our own grain. The farm has been called one of the best worked in Otsego County. It's market value, I've been told, would exceed $100,000.

As I stood on the hill last night I could see, farther down the lake, Richfield Springs, one of the finest communities in America. I am fortunate to be a member of the local Rotary, the Masons, the Grange. And until 2 months ago, I was superintendent of the Sunday school and I still am a trustee of the Methodist Church, whose spire I could see.

Also, from the hill, I saw the farms of my many wonderful neighbors, men who have helped me become an executive of the National Milk Producers Federation and of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association.

At the age of 41 I believe I am as rich in friends as almost any American. And friendship is the only wealth that the average Indian values.

I don't wear a headdress, but throughout my career I have always made it clear to people that I am an Indian, to prevent any possible embarrassment. And since I left the reservation I have invariably been treated as just another typical American guy, which is the way I like it. As I stood on the hill last night I felt pretty proud to be a citizen of modern America.

Most of America's 400,000 Indians today suffer from an enormous inferiority complex brought on by centuries of humiliation and callous treatment by the whites. Because of this inferiority feeling it is not easy to leave the blanket and go the white way. It afflicted me, too. I would still be on the reservation if it were not for my dad, Awananeu, or Louis Bruce, Sr. (Almost all the older Mohawks and Onondagas still refer to me as Little Louie.)

As a boy, my father was sent to an Indian school in Philadelphia, where he became a fervent convert to Christianity—and a baseball pitcher.

One day, while he was pitching, a man named Cornelius McGillicuddy dropped by to watch. Mr. McGillicuddy, who later became better known as Connie Mack, was deeply impressed by dad's smoke ball. The

upshot was that dad was able to earn his way through college pitching for the Philadelphia Athletics and other teams.

Dad never went to the mound without spending a few minutes in prayer. A few years ago the Associated Press interviewed Ed Barrows, Yankee manager, on Barrows' long career. The article said: "Though Babe Ruth and Honus Wagner were the greatest ballplayers he ever saw, Ed named an Indian as the greatest natural ballplayer of them all. 'His name is Louis Bruce,' said Ed."

Today dad is 70 and a retired minister. Last Saturday I caught some of his pitches, as I have for years. This may seem incredible, but I honestly believe his arm is in the best condition I've ever seen it. He had real steam, curves, and drops.

Dad quit pitching professionally when he became New York State's first Indian dentist. As a dentist he made good money, but he became imbued with a great thought. He wanted to go back to his native Indians as a Christian missionary. Only through Christianity, he felt, could they find the resources to become respected citizens of a modern America.

For 16 years he served as a missionary on the Onondaga and St. Regis reservations in upstate New York. Then he tackled a still greater challenge and became a Methodist minister to white congregations. He served successfully in Evans Mills, Depauville, Plessis, and North Columbia, N. Y., where he retired.

The great battle of dad's life was for Indian citizenship, in 1924. Indians were wary. They thought citizenship was another white trick, to make them lose what little they felt they had left. Dad campaigned all the reservations in the State to build up support among Indians for United States citizenship. He argued that he was anxious to take the responsibility for the kind of government we have in America, and the kind of schools we have for Indian children.

The happiest day of dad's life was the day he and mother were able to vote.

Dad felt no resentment whatever toward the whites. He recognized full well that a lot of injustice had been done to Indians, but he argued, "It's not going to help our progress to keep harping on old grievances. Instead, let's build for the future."

Mother and dad were almost never well off financially. He rarely earned more than $600 a year, during those early days of the ministry. Yet every summer dad and mother had fresh-air youngsters out from New York City, kids of all nationalities, races, and backgrounds. They wanted my sister, Noresta, and me to learn how to understand and get on with all the kinds of people you find in America.

Despite everything that dad told me, I was still concerned about the future because I was an Indian. I still kept hearing on every side that Indians were lazy, good-for-nothing trash. When you kept hearing it day after day you began to say to yourself, "Look; you're one of them." I was obsessed by a really bad inferiority complex.

Dad decided to take drastic action—to throw me into the American stream of life and let me sink or swim. He arranged for me to go to Cazenovia Seminary, a Methodist school, where he could get me a reduction in tuition because he was a preacher.

The 300 boys and girls there had apparently never seen an Indian before. They expected me to say, "Ugh, heap big school" every time I opened my mouth. And they seemed greatly puzzled because I wasn't wearing buckskins. In a sense, my dress was unusual. I wore slacks and sweater rather than a suit, and we were supposed to wear suit coats in chapel and dining room.

During those first weeks at Cazenovia I was terribly conscious of being watched, not only by the students but by my parents and the other Indians back at the reservation. (Many had predicted I would come out on my ear.) I felt like Jackie Robinson must have felt when he started playing for the Dodgers.

If I had failed that first test, I'm not sure where I would have ended. Maybe I would have crawled back into my shell. Happily, the lessons my father had drilled into me about getting along with all kinds of people paid off. I became captain of Cazenovia's football, basketball, and track teams, and became president of my senior class.

One role I had I shall never forget. I had the male lead in the junior play, and I played opposite the leading lady, a white girl named Ann ("Charlie") Wikoff. I tumbled for Ann, and am still in love with her. Eventually she saw some merit in me. She was the daughter of a wise, prosperous, Cornell-educated farmer, Charles Wikoff, who, it turned out, was a prominent Methodist layman and an old friend of my father.

Ann and I went on to Syracuse University together. During several summers I earned my college tuition, or most of it, for the coming year by working as a hired man on her father's farm.

Each month at school was "touch and go" financially. I waited on table every single day that I was at both Cazenovia and Syracuse. I mowed lawns, dug postholes, cracked rock, wrassled logs at a paper-pulp mill, operated a pick and shovel. I never saw a college football game, because I had to work Saturdays. And although I was Syracuse's star pole vaulter, I was never able to take an out-of-town trip with the team because of my urgent need to make money.

Most Indians who have a chance shine in athletics, and I guess I was no exception. I never lost a major meet in high school. And today, at 41, I can pole vault better than I could in college. I had a pole-vaulting pit by the barn. A few months ago I cleared 14 feet. The Olympic championship last year was won by a vault of 13 feet, 8 inches. I mention this only because I know that having one outstanding skill played a big part in helping me overcome my haunting sense of inferiority.

At college I majored in psychology, mainly to learn more about this inferiority complex that plagues my race. I found that it afflicts all sorts of people, not only Indians, and for all sorts of reasons. As I studied the psychology of typical Americans I concluded they are far more assertive, competitive, and aggressive than Indians. I, like most Indians, tended to be diffident, reserved, close-mouthed. The hardest thing in the world for an Indian to do is to be aggressive, to put himself across. That's probably why so few Indians have ever attained notable success in business.

Whatever career I might select, I still felt a deep need to prove to myself that I could succeed vocationally in a typically American way. What is the talent Americans seem to admire most? What is the talent that sets them apart in the world? I decided it was salesmanship. Americans unquestionably are the greatest salesmen on earth.

So I set out, grimly, to become a salesman. I signed up for merchandising courses and got myself a spare-time job selling on commission at Peck & Vinney, a men's clothing store in Syracuse.

Each night I practiced putting myself across in front of my mirror. What a ridiculous Indian, I thought. Sometimes I felt like slinking back to the reservation. At the store each customer looked like an unassailable monster. I would clinch my fists and wade into him with my most practiced smile.

My dad's training in getting on with all sorts of people came to my rescue again. When, in the third week, I managed to sell to a traveling salesman, who wanted "something around $35," a $60 suit, I decided that maybe even an Indian could learn to sell.

I wrote my final college thesis on the manufacture of men's clothing. In my research I visited the Stein-Bloch factories, corresponded with officials of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and interviewed officers of the Hickey-Freeman Co.

Then I was graduated into the cold, cold world of 1930, year 2 of the great depression. College graduates were a nickel a dozen, not to mention Indians. When I finally heard that a big Rogers Peet store in New York City was hiring a salesman, I borrowed train fare and hurried down. There were numerous applicants, many of them Harvard, Yale, and Princeton graduates. I got the job. Why? Because I knew the men's clothing business inside out, knew the lingo.

Ann, who was now my wife, came down and got a job selling women's sports wear at McCreery's. We managed to get along well in New York. Soon I became a department head, with five assistants. I was headed up. But actually I wasn't enthusiastic about a business career. I was still too much of an Indian to be really interested in making money. I had gotten into selling to develop the peculiarly American talent of assertiveness.

What was much closer to my heart was the plight of hundreds of Indian youngsters back on the reservations. Perhaps I felt guilty. At any rate, the depression had frozen them out of contact with the white world. There were no jobs, and absolutely nothing to occupy them. They were drifting back to the reservation. In my visits I had found them demoralized and more ashamed than ever that they were Indians. Many fine boys I knew had become hoodlums.

Here was a challenge that fascinated me. But what to do? I got a clue one day from a customer. He was director of a boys' camp in the Adirondacks. When he learned I was an Indian he began telling me about his camp's big "Indian" program. It taught its youngsters Indian dancing, Indian legends, Indian ceremonials, archery, canoeing, tracking, Indian arts and crafts, mask making.

Who taught the courses? I asked. "Oh, anybody," he replied. "We have some counselors who boned up on Indian stuff at the library. They're not so hot, but they're the best we can get."

Suddenly I was dazzled by a brainstorm. I couldn't sleep nights thinking about it. Every night after work I did research on camp programs. There were thousands of camps between Maine and Indiana that had "Indian" programs, but not a single one used real, live Indians.

I went to Indian chiefs back on the Onondaga Reservation. They agreed that "Little Louie" had a wonderful idea. Their eyes blazed with excitement. But then they sighed. The trouble was that all the young Indians were not interested in their Indian background and the elders had not been able to pass on to them Indian skills and lore. It would take at least a year to train them properly.

We were licked. As we sat gloomily in the tribal council house I came up with another idea: The Great White Father in Washington was then shoveling out billions of dollars for leaf-raking projects. Perhaps he could spare a few thousand to help get this started. The hunch was correct. I sold an agency director on the idea, and quit the Rogers Peet Co.

Soon I was putting my selling talents to work in persuading hundreds of summer camps to hire Indian counselors. Altogether, in 5 years, I helped put 600 Indian boys on camp staffs, where they made good money, where they came in contact with fine, educated white boys, and where they were able to feel proud of their Indian background.

It was a real inspiration to see these Indian boys come back from the camps, transformed by the experience. For the first time many felt they were Americans, not tolerated second-class citizens. Several hundred were

inspired to resume their effort to get a high-school education. Many of them went on to college. Though Federal funds were withdrawn long ago, our New York reservations today are still supplying many camps with Indian counselors.

In 1940, I felt my job was done. Besides, both Ann and I were tired of traveling around and living in cities, because we now had two children. I felt a need to get out where I could sweat and use my muscles again. More important, I felt a yearning to get back to the land, to settle down in a small American community and sink roots.

I wanted to succeed in a typical American community, and in a way where I could feel I was rendering service to my fellowmen, as my father had done all his life. For years I had wanted to become a farmer in a small farming community. To me the farmer is the most enviable man in the world. He has freedom, independence, and—like Indians—he lives in close harmony with nature.

So I began shopping for farms. One day, when Ann and I came back to the home of Ann's parents for Sunday dinner, Mr. Wikoff mentioned that he was getting along in years and was eager for an opportunity to withdraw gradually from active interest in his fine farm.

We bit hard. In a few days we made a deal with Mr. Wikoff. I was in the farming business.

In a few years I took on a 160-acre farm across the lake as an additional project. Since then I have bought and sold other property. Eventually I hope to have 150 head of cattle.

Ann and I were soon having the time of our lives getting into PTA, Boy Scouts, church work, and other community activities in Richfield Springs. I have a Sunday-school class of teen-age boys. With them, I suspect, my Indian background is an asset.

It wasn't long before I noticed that the young folks of Richfield Springs were up against much the same discouraging problem that faced Indian youngsters on the reservations. Richfield Springs had become a dead resort town. Many years ago it had 16 tourist trains daily and a flock of fine tourist hotels. But most of the tourists stopped coming. And the enterprising young people of town, facing a grim future, were starting to leave. There was nothing to hold them.

With the assistance of our school principal, Everitt Lane, and others, I got several of the young people who were left together. We began holding town meetings on the theme, "Does our town have a future?" You may have read in the newspapers about the results. The young people, with the backing of the village fathers, inspired many new ideas, and new industries were brought to Richfield Springs. Several younsters have become top leaders in the community.

Meanwhile, as a farmer, I became a member of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association. Through the sponsorship of Dairymen's League director and New York State Assemblyman Paul Talbot, I was elected president of the Otsego County League. And with the support of Mr. Talbot and the members we developed an active youth program in the county.

Ann looks after things when I am away from the farm. We have four hired boys, including a talented Indian orphan. Also, we are teaching the two oldest of our three kids to shoulder responsibility for the farm. They have regular chores. Katie, 9, feeds the calves, drives the cows to pasture at night, gathers the eggs. Chuck, 12, throws down the hay, weeds beets, and does our hand milking. And Donnie, 3, runs errands to the best of his ability.

Katie is happy to be considered an Indian. But when people ask Chuck, he usually hesitates and says, "Nope, I'm not. But my dad is."

Yes, I'm an Indian and I'm awfully proud of the recent accomplishments of my race. After a century of crushed humiliation as wards of a paternalistic United States Government, Indians today are demanding the right to have a voice in their own future as Americans.

I think it is wonderful that so many leading Indians today are impatient to guide their own destiny and "get things done." We are becoming competively assertive in the best American sense. One spectacular result of this assertiveness is that we have formed a National Congress of American Indians, the first national all-Indian organization in American history.

Already we have 100,000 Indian members. Each pays dues, and tribes are members as units. I am proud that I can put my selling ability to work by serving as the NCAI's unpaid legislative contact man in Washington and as a member of the executive committee. Also helpful in this cause is the fact that I am vice chairman of Secretary Krug's National Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs.

Our Indians by the hundreds are learning the intricacies of parliamentary procedure, corporate structure, and other modern American techniques. And we are training ourselves some good lawyers. If a century ago, we had had some good lawyers you can bet that Federal agents would not have soft-talked us into signing away our lands for a few yards of calico.

Still more encouraging than this new assertiveness, I believe, is the fact that most young Indians today are really eager to become self-reliant. They will accept all the assistance they can get from group action, but they know that in the last analysis it will be up to each individual Indian to become a competent responsible American citizen.

I hope and believe I have become a modern American citizen. My father is satisfied. Of that I'm proud. But I am even more proud that I am a modern American of Indian ancestry.

Another Needed Installment on the National Housing Program Destroyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, after a great deal of legislative hanky-panky we succeeded in passing and sending to the Senate a bobtailed version of a very good bill, H. R. 6070, which was designed to make it easier for American citizens of moderate income, just below the average, to own their own homes.

As originally reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, this was a splendid piece of legislation which reflected the enlightened leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], who is chairman of the committee, and of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. It was a bill hammered out by individuals with an intelligent grasp of the problem on the anvil of public discussion and compromise.

Beginning with the remarkable action of the Committee on Rules, this legislation suffered strange vicissitudes in its journey toward enactment.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the objection time and time again that injecting the civil-rights issue into good legislation will kill the legislation; it has been interminably argued that only the opponents of housing, the opponents of rent control, the opponents of foreign aid, the opponents of the minimum wage, and the opponents of scores of other liberal measures introduce civil-rights amendments in order to kill those measures. Of course this is entirely true; there are many who will support amendments with which they disagree in order to prevent the passage of a pending bill. But, Mr. Speaker, is this same, hackneyed argument to be used against civil rights forever? Will discrimination be permitted to ravage our democracy indefinitely merely in order to secure the passage of other legislation? Surely this can not be tolerated.

The time has finally arrived when the issue must be faced, and must be faced squarely; and this is an excellent time to start. H. R. 6070 is a bill to develop private housing for the benefit of moderate-income families. It is not public housing but the Government will nevertheless be directly concerned through loans, mortgages, and various administrative provisions; the United States Government should not be permitted to subsidize discrimination. Civil rights is not a false issue this time, it is not a Communist plot nor Fascist intrigue; this time it is a sincere effort to improve democracy. The civil-rights amendment was introduced by my able colleague from New York, Congressman DOLLINGER. I voted for that amendment but it was defeated by 24 votes because "it would have killed the bill." I do not believe that it would have killed the bill. I believe that if an honest fight had been put up by those who profess to abhor discrimination, the bill could have been passed. But once again the majority of Members have succumbed to the pressures of expediency.

That is not all, Mr. Speaker, that was accomplished to deprive American families of the full and deserved benefits this bill could have bestowed. They rage in favor of veterans bonuses, and a great roar of approval meets a veterans pension, but here is a measure that is designed to really aid the veteran, effectively and substantially, and what happened? It was defeated by 27 votes. The amendment was offered by my friend and colleague, Congressman MULTER, from New York; it provided loans at low interest rates to veterans so that they might have built decent homes for themselves and their families. I voted for this, too, but the real-estate interests are still too strong.

But that, Mr. Speaker, is still not all that happened during the disembodiment of H. R. 6070. Mr. MULTER introduced another amendment which I supported; this was designed to encourage cooperative housing projects for moderate income families—projects which are sorely needed to provide decent housing facilities for these families quickly and in adequate amounts. Cooperative housing has been proven to be successful in many sections of the country be-

cause it can be developed rapidly and at reasonable cost. Nevertheless, this measure too was defeated in the name of expediency.

Mr. Speaker, each of these necessary amendments was adopted by the House when it sat in the Committee of the Whole, but each was defeated in the House itself, in the name of expediency, or some other thinly veiled excuse.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when expediency destroys good legislation, it ceases to be expedient. I can only express the profound and fervent hope that the Senate will retain these provisions, and that the conferees will bring back a complete bill to the House. I pledge myself to do everything in my power to have a decent bill enacted into law.

Future Program Report, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the future program report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee. This report, which has been carefully prepared by our subcommittee, presents in general terms the nature of the future activities of this committee for the balance of this year and part of the following year. Because of the great interest evidenced throughout the country in our program, I believe that many people will want to be informed of our future plans.

FUTURE PROGRAM REPORT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CELLER, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on the Study of Monopoly Power, announced today that his subcommittee will hold another series of hearings, beginning late in October, on various proposals for strengthening the antitrust laws. The hearings already held, from July 11 to August 5, 1949, have outlined many features of the monopoly problem and have supplied material for planning the next stages of the subcommittee's program. Before the October hearings, reports of findings of fact and recommendations will be submitted to the subcommittee by groups made up from the staff of the subcommittee and experts of the Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Departments of Justice, Treasury, Commerce, Defense, and Agriculture. These findings and recommendations, addressed to the subcommittee, will be the subject of hearings at which representatives of commerce and industry, labor, agriculture, institutions of learning, consumer groups, and Government agencies will be invited to testify in favor or in opposition. The subcommittee, after obtaining the benefit of all shades of opinion, will consider the framing of legislative measures to be reported to the full House Judiciary Committee for appropriate action. In situations where it may appear that the economy would be more healthy if big business were to divest itself of unnecessary subsidiaries, the subcommittee will consider tax and other incentives that may facilitate voluntary deintegration.

The penalties for criminal violation of antitrust laws have been much criticized as being too small to have a deterrent effect. The subcommittee has asked the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to supply information that will help it to decide whether to propose new legislation, especially on the amount of fines and the procedure for triple-damage suits.

The antitrust agencies and the census have been requested to supply up-to-date facts bearing on integration in American industry. The subcommittee will consider proposals for new legislation on combinations of previously competing firms, or monopoly of supplies by the larger users of raw materials, on control of distribution and retail outlets by producers, and on the squeezing of specialized processers by integrated concerns controlling the price of their material and their product. There will also be a study of conglomerate mergers, by which a strong concern can invade a specialized field with concentrated competitive power aimed at destroying the specialized producers in the field.

Information is also being sought from the Departments of Justice and Commerce on the uses of patents to promote or sustain monopolies contrary to the public interest.

The subcommittee will take up conflicts of law and policy within the Government, especially the methods of procurement that favor monopoly, and the tax laws that penalize conformity with the purposes of the antitrust laws. Much valuable material on procurement has already been gathered by the Small Business Committee of the House. If new legislation appears to be needed in these fields, the subcommittee will suggest its consideration by the appropriate committees of the House.

The enforcement agencies have been asked to report on whether the Webb-Pomerene Act, permitting combinations of American firms for the export trade, and the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, exempting railroad rate-making from the antitrust laws, are operating in the public interest or require amendment.

Witnesses from outside the Government will be invited to testify on these various topics. As soon as any proposals for new legislation are ready for serious consideration, notice will be given in time to bring the subcommittee the benefit of testimony by opponents, as well as by advocates of such proposals, before actual bills are considered. Many of the problems of concentrations are complex, and solutions are not expected at an early date.

Testimony will be sought from both American and foreign experts in the historic relationship between heavy concentration of private industry, in European countries and Japan, and the development of various forms of concentrated or totalitarian government. The subcommittee desires to gain light on the belief, frequently expressed by witnesses, that business concentration is an important cause of socialism in government, since this belief underlies much of the present-day support for antitrust enforcement in the United States.

The most difficult or obscure of the questions that have come before the subcommittee will be considered more at length in hearings to be scheduled next year. It is anticipated that special attention may be directed to the concentration of equity capital funds in the hands of large commercial or industrial companies, and the corresponding concentration of loan funds in the largest life insurance companies.

The subcommittee has also been challenged by various witnesses to attempt a more accurate definition of legitimate union activities exempted from question under the antitrust laws; and to define the forms of administered price conditions that may call for either widespread dissolution or a utility status with price regulation. Such questions may require extensive hearings and study of various points of view, before legislation can be proposed that will represent the actual will of the American people.

Sterling Devaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sterling Devaluation," from the New York Times of September 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STERLING DEVALUATION

Sir Stafford Cripps, asked on his arrival here about the prospects for devaluation of the pound sterling, told newsmen that he would stand on his recent statement in the House of Commons. At that time he declared his firm opposition to such a course. Meanwhile, American fiscal officials are reported to hold the view that devaluation is a necessary prerequisite to any constructive action by this country.

In the years since the end of the First World War two generalizations concerning currency devaluation have attained widespread acceptance. One of these is that the fiscal authorities of a country which is considering inflation do not, and cannot, admit the fact until the very moment when official action is taken. This explains why, in this particular area, rumors invariably persist even in the face of the most emphatic denials in official quarters.

The second of these generalizations is that if sufficient doubt is permitted to arise about the future value of a currency this fact itself tends frequently to make devaluation inevitable. This is because such expectations create a short interest in the currency, in the broader meaning of that term. The currency is sold by persons who see in the prospect of devaluation an opportunity to buy it back at a lower price; at the same time potential buyers of the country's goods postpone their purchases in the expectation of buying more cheaply later on. There is no doubt that the position of the pound sterling has been made to look much worse in recent months than it actually is because of the very existence of such doubts concerning its future value. It is therefore undoubtedly true that there can be no permanent change for the better in Britain's dollar position unless and until such doubts are resolved.

But to say this is not to say that the present uncertainty can be removed only by sterling devaluation. For, as it happens, neither of the generalizations noted above can be said to be completely applicable. In the first place, where countries formerly acted unilaterally in the matter of devaluation, today this is no longer the case. Today the individual nation proposes, the Monetary Fund disposes. A country may alter the official

value of its currency by as much as 10 percent without consulting the Fund, but any change greater than that can be introduced only with the formal approval of that organization, which is to say, with the consent of the other member nations. One may choose to ignore a government's official statements about its currency, but one cannot ignore the official action of the Monetary Fund, which is now the court of last resort. The whole question of a possible multilateral realinement of Europe's currencies is expected to come before the Fund before the end of this month, and it is to be hoped that at that time the question of the gold value of the pound, as well as its neighboring currencies, will be settled for some time to come.

As to the generalization about devaluation's inevitability, that, too, is largely an anachronism so far as the present situation in sterling is concerned. When devaluation has cast its shadow ahead of it clearly in the past this has usually been because inflation had got out of hand, and governments have more often than not found it easier to adjust the currency to the new price level than to bring prices into line with the currency. No one, we think, would seriously contend that that is the pattern of Britain's exchange problem at the present time, to the extent that devaluation is being urged, it is being urged on the theory that it will stimulate British exports to the dollar area sufficiently to eliminate or reduce substantially that country's dollar deficit.

We have said here before, and we see no reason to change our view at this time, that this is an extremely dubious assumption on which to advocate a deliberate reduction in a nation's standard of living—which, in the absence of compensating benefits, is what devaluation amounts to. It has been estimated that with the pound at its present level of slightly more than $4 an increase of 40 percent in British exports to the dollar area would be required to redress that country's balance of payments. Should the pound be reduced in value to $3, it would be necessary to increase such exports by 87 percent to achieve the same objective. But that is only part of the story. The sterling cost of imports from the dollar area would rise in inverse ratio to the decline in the value of the pound—and Britain imports twice as much from this area as she exports to it. Since her dollar imports constitute a very important element in her domestic production costs and her living costs, the result of such a policy would obviously be inflationary with respect to Britain's domestic economy, thus tending inevitably to nullify the benefits of devaluation as a trade stimulant—providing there were any such benefits to be nullified.

How Not To Make Friends and Influence People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 9 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a consequence of the effectiveness of Voice of America broadcasts reaching into Russia despite the frantic efforts of the Communists to jam these programs, two young Russian flyers left the U. S. S. R. and made their way to the United States. One of these flyers has now returned to his native land, and out of this experience it is to be hoped that our Government has learned a lesson which will enable us in the future to deal more realistically and rationally with political refugees of this type.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and informative article from the September 12 issue of Newsweek. The article discloses the pauper-to-riches-and back-to-pauperism technique utilized by this Government in greeting these young Russian flyers and in helping them to achieve the very difficult task of orienting themselves to life in a strange country. Serious blunders were made and a reading of this article indicates that some of these blunders were almost inexcusably bad.

Mr. President, I hope that this Government will develop a pattern of performance whereby future political refugees from Russia and other Communist areas will not first be taken up on a mountain and next shoved off a cliff to fare for themselves. Surely we have the ability and capacity in America to develop methods for giving such refugees an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the real America and to learn by slow and easy lessons the economic, social, and political facts which have made us the envy of the entire world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALE OF A UNITED STATES BUNGLE

Anatole Barsoff was a moody Russian, a character out of Chekhov or Dostoevski. He liked to play sad songs on his guitar and read romantic poetry. A great war had made a junior lieutenant out of him, a pilot in Stalin's air force. But he really wanted to be a farmer.

Peter Pirogoff was also an air-force lieutenant. But he had been a school teacher; he had lived in Moscow and mingled with the theatrical people there. He was eager and ambitious. The pall of bureaucracy and police terror which lay over the Soviet Union stifled him.

But unlike as they were, the two fliers had one thing in common: They secretly listened to the Voice of America and discussed that dim but wonderful land which the broadcasts described. One day, with their radio tuned low to avoid detection, they heard how Mme. Oksana Kasenkina had jumped from the third-story window of the Soviet Consulate in New York, just to escape the Russians.

If a mere woman could do it, Pirogoff reasoned, why couldn't they? He was a navigator and Barsoff was a pilot. They could borrow a plane and make a hop for American-occupied territory. Barsoff was doubtful; he had a wife and small baby who would suffer for his desertion. It was a wild idea. It wouldn't work. But Pirogoff persuaded his fellow officer.

ESCAPE

On October 8, 1948, their moment came. They grabbed a bomber and took off. When they had 2 minutes of flying time left in the tank, they decided to crash-land. If Russians appeared, they agreed, Pirogoff was to shoot Barsoff and then commit suicide.

"I knew I didn't have to use the gun when I saw the automobiles coming down the road toward us," Pirogoff said happily. "Automobiles mean Americans." They had hit Camp McCauley, near Linz, in the American zone of Austria.

"I is pilot," Pirogoff told the American soldiers who surrounded the plane. "Where Linz?" Barsoff asked.

"I would do anything they want me to do in the United States provided I am not forced to do so," Barsoff told Army interpreters eagerly. They had heard about Virginia on Voice of America broadcasts, they said, and that's where they wanted to go.

This was the beginning of the honeymoon for the two Russian fliers. Everything was a delight to them in the American sector, even the bathroom fixtures. After close questioning by Air Force intelligence to determine whether they might be Russian spies, they were classified as political refugees and treated like visiting foreign officers.

Last February they were permitted to enter the United States, as guests of the Virginia Chamber of Commerce. It was a triumphal week's tour. They were most impressed by a Richmond department store.

"This is state-owned?" Barsoff asked incredulously.

When they were asked to select a shirt as a gift, the salesgirl remarked to reporters: "They may not speak English, but they found the $10 shirts."

Air Force intelligence in Washington opened its arms to the two Russians. Any man from the dark Russian sphere had valuable information to give. But Barsoff and Pirogoff were not merely questioned. American intelligence procedures were revealed to them; American tactics were discussed in their presence. Barsoff may have learned something of the personnel and activities of the American underground in Germany.

In the early days of their stay in the United States, the fliers were a 9-day wonder. Their story was wonderful propaganda. They were taken on tours of Ford factories, Rockefeller Center, and the Voice of America studios. They were wined and dined by the anti-Communist Russian colony in New York. Then, when their value as celebrities slumped, they were dropped.

The two men began to drift apart. When Pirogoff sold a piece to Life for $3,000, collecting an advance, Barsoff killed the deal by selling an "as told to" article to True. The incident created bad blood between Barsoff and Pirogoff.

FRIENDS NO LONGER

The root of this disagreement went deeper. Even during the Virginia junket they had quarreled noisily. Pirogoff considered Barsoff a fool and told him so.

Pirogoff, the shrewder of the two, quickly adjusted himself to the life of the émigré colony in New York. Through his intellectual friends he made contact with a publisher and began working on a book. But the quick change from hero to nonentity was too much for Barsoff. He couldn't write a book and he didn't want to. With no one to look after him, the only job he could find was one pressing women's dresses in Brooklyn.

The pay, $35 a week, thrust him into the great despondent class of furnished-room dwellers. He began to drink heavily. To console himself, he would play his guitar at all hours of the night. And he got moodier and moodier, muttering of suicide or a return to Russia. But no one took him seriously.

Unable to stand the pressing job, Barsoff returned to New York. Igor Sikorsky, the plane designer, found something for him to do—tearing down a house in Bridgeport, Conn., at $8 a day.

This was no cure for a nostalgic Russian, worrying about his wife and child. The old Communist clichés he had heard all his life began popping into his speech again. He was being exploited, he would say. One day a friend suggested that he visit the New York branch of the Soviet Embassy. If he repented, perhaps he would be forgiven.

For the Soviet officials here, Barsoff's change of heart was a windfall. Get Pirogoff to come back with you, they told him, and you will be treated well. If you return to

Russia alone, you will be imprisoned for 8 years and then released.

Seeking out his ex-comrade, Barsoff pleaded with him to return. Pirogoff refused. "I'll see you swing in the air in Red Square," Barsoff predicted angrily when they parted. "Within a year you'll be dead," Pirogoff retorted. Still determined, Barsoff applied to the Soviet Embassy in Washington for a passport. A month ago he dropped out of sight.

A worried Pirogoff reported the disappearance to State Department security officers. They advised him to call Barsoff at the Soviet Embassy. Eager to lure him, the Embassy put Pirogoff through to Barsoff, and the two agreed to meet at the Aux Trois Mousquetaires restaurant in Washington.

LAST MEETING

On the night of August 17 the two men met. According to the State Department account, immigration officials closed in on Barsoff, informed him that his visitor's permit had expired, and took him into custody. A group of Soviet agents, on hand to grab Pirogoff, watched in frustration as the two fliers were taken away.

But there was another account of the meeting. Friends of the two Russians claimed that the Soviet agents seized Pirogoff, hit him with a gun butt, and were about to drag him off when immigration and counter-intelligence corps agents intervened. There was a struggle and the Russian retired hastily.

With Barsoff safely on ice, a belated attempt was made to convince him that his worm's-eye view of America was not a true picture. But all efforts to dissuade him to remain were futile.

In the room he had occupied at the Alturas Hotel in Washington while waiting for his passport, reporters found evidence of his change of heart: a diary and a notebook. The diary was a simple account of his trip to America, his reception in Virginia, and his growing loneliness. The notebook contained a long diatribe against the American way of life.

Barsoff, the hero, was now Barsoff, the problem child. The intelligence services were dead set against handing him over to the Russians. The State Department insisted that if he wanted to go, that was his right. For 5 days they argued. Then Barsoff was whisked off to Austria.

For another week the bitter argument continued. Wires sizzled as the American command there pleaded that the Russian flier knew too much about our intelligence set-up. If he were allowed to go back, the Army howled, our intelligence machinery in Germany would have to be reshuffled. They also argued that Barsoff could be traded for Americans held captive by Russia.

The State Department stood by principle. "We don't do that sort of thing," said Secretary Dean Acheson.

REPATRIATION

At 7 a. m. last Wednesday, Barsoff was duly handed over to Soviet officers. Three times before he left American custody, he was asked if he wanted to change his mind. Three times he shook his head vigorously.

With him Barsoff took no baggage, only $33.03 in American currency and a book of Russian poetry. The man who had chosen freedom, American-style, was trading it in for Russian totalitarianism. He was just one individual, against the thousands making the trip in the other direction.

But perhaps Barsoff's return would dent American smugness. Certainly it had called into question the efficiency of American intelligence agencies. In Barsoff's case they failed to keep an adequate check on an informant, permitted themselves to be overruled by the State Department in a matter involving military security, and generally bungled their job.

Ecuador Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State, on Thursday, September 8, 1949, entitled "Ecuador Relief." In his capacity as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin-American affairs, Mr. Miller has just completed an extended tour of the devastated areas in Ecuador, and he graphically describes the destruction and the heroic efforts which are being made in combating this catastrophe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall never forget my trip to the stricken area of Ecuador. Like other Americans, when news of the earthquake first reached this country I was shocked. But, in spite of the eye witness and other accounts of the disaster, the newsreels and the many pictures that our press published, it was impossible for me to visualize conditions as they actually are. I could not comprehend the extent and the completeness of the devastation and the untold misery that was visited in a few hours' time on the people of that unfortunate country.

I went to Ecuador in an official capacity, to express personally the sympathy of our Government to the government and to the people of our neighbor Republic. I have returned to Washington appalled by what I saw and by the tremendous job of reconstruction and rehabilitation that must be done. But I returned inspired, at the same time, by the spirit and the determination of the survivors, the courage with which they are struggling out of the wreckage not only of their cities and towns, their homes, but of their family life as well.

I made an extended tour of the devastated area to survey conditions and bring back a report to our Government. After a brief stay in Quito to confer with government officials, my tour began with Ambato, the capital of Tungurahua Province. This was an important industrial center with close to 40,000 inhabitants. It is 80 percent destroyed. Fortunately, the quake occurred in the early afternoon and the loss of life, though considerable, was proportionately small. After 2½ weeks of toil, however, we saw rescue parties still digging corpses from the rubble of the beautiful stone cathedral, which was completely razed.

We walked over what once had been the town of Pelileo, located in the center of the earthquake zone. This had been a town of 6,000 people, the thriving capital of a rich agricultural region. Today one lone wall remains partially standing there and an estimated 4,000 bodies still lay buried in the ruins. The death toll would have been considerably larger had not a great number of the inhabitants been at their work in the surrounding countryside.

In the area surrounding Pelileo sections of the countryside, including settlements of various sizes, completely disappeared from the face of the earth. As the angle of rest of the sloping land was disturbed by the quake, thousands of acres of the mountainside caved in and settled. Here the loss of life was especially great as there was no escape.

Wherever I went—to the towns of Patate, Pillaro, and Guano—the story was the same—death, destruction, and desolation. Tales of individual horror and grief were repeated over and over again. In one locality I saw a child still digging in the ruins looking for his mother. In another, a disconsolate father unwilling to accept the obvious as true, hoping against hope to find his wife and children still among the living.

But if the catastrophe was a horrible thing to contemplate, it served at the same time to renew man's faith in his fellowmen, in the principles of democratic government that are cherished in the Americas and in the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

For one thing, the government of President Galo Plaza, who was chosen only 14 months ago in an election that represented the free will of the people, responded in a most courageous manner to the emergency. With sureness and dispatch relief measures were taken and put into effect, reducing considerably the sufferings of the survivors. Like their government, the survivors themselves rose to the occasion with great heart and a display of spirit that is truly an inspiration. The courage of the people and the self-reliance of their government are, to me, striking evidences of the real worth and dignity of the individual human being and of the fundamental strength of democracy.

Another fact that my survey brought forcefully home to me is the compassion that the disaster evoked from Ecuador's sister republics. There was an immediate and generous reaction among them to help the victim nation. If there remain any who question inter-American solidarity, and the concepts of interdependence and cooperation which are its rock-bed, let them take note of the swiftness with which response to the emergency came.

The facts are that within a few hours of the disaster virtually every country in the Western Hemisphere was taking measures to come to the immediate assistance of the stricken nation. When I arrived in Ambato we saw Ecuadoran and American doctors and nurses working side by side with a team of nurses from Colombia and a team of doctors from Venezuela. Their joint efforts succeeded in eliminating fears of epidemic from typhus and typhoid.

Response from the family of American nations has not been limited to sending emergency relief supplies and personnel. Several substantial contributions of funds have been made as well. The Government of Venezuela showed the way with a donation of $1,000,000. The Uruguayan Congress has approved an allocation of 1,000,000 pesos, more than $500,000, from its foreign-exchange fund as a gift to Ecuador. Similar gifts have been made or are under consideration by other governments and agencies. Among the latter, the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations proposes to allocate $200,000 for the specific purpose of taking care of the needs of children. The Council of the Organization of American States has made a gift of $250,000 to cover the cost of survey of reconstruction problems of the area.

The amounts of contributions from sister republics do not at first glance reflect their magnitude. If we consider that each of the nations to the south is facing domestic problems of its own and devoting as much of its income as possible to economic development, we will get a more accurate appraisal of the sacrifices these nations are making.

I was gratified to see the effects of United States aid to Ecuador. The American Red Cross alone has extended emergency relief amounting to $135,000 in the form of cash, medical supplies, sanitation equipment, blankets, and large supplies of tents for

temporary shelter against the rainy season which has already begun.

In addition, the Red Cross sent to Ecuador two of its most experienced disaster-relief technicians, Maurice Reddy, of Washington, D. C., and H. Edward Russell, of St. Louis, Mo., who did able and creditable work in organizing and directing relief measures. On my trip to Ecuador I was accompanied by Mr. Frank T. Cleverly, of Alexandria, Va., administrator for foreign operations of the Red Cross.

The United States Department of Defense likewise made an important contribution in the form of air transportation of the supplies it made available to the Red Cross and participation in emergency operations. For the 2 weeks after the quake a veritable air-lift was in operation between the Canal Zone, Quito, and Ambato.

United States representatives of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs who were on the scene and other sanitary engineers of that organization sent from Peru and Bolivia contributed measurably to the success of anti-epidemic activities and other work in the stricken area. Within 48 hours after the quake, for example, a portable water-supply system had been installed in Ambato and is in full operation.

Dr. C. Glenn Curtis, of Pasadena, Calif., chief of the Institute's mission to Ecuador, was designated by President Plaza to be in charge of all medical and anti-epidemic activities, testifying to Ecuadoran confidence in Dr. Curtis and in the ability of his mission. Within a few hours of the news of the earthquake Mr. Preston Blanks, formerly of Meridian, Miss., was sent to the disaster area by Dr. Curtis along with a group of assistants. They have been hard at work ever since. When I arrived at the town of Ambato I found Mr. Blanks to be the most popular man there.

I cannot let this occasion go by without a mention of the personal devotion of Mrs. Betty Bernbaum, of Chicago, Ill., the wife of the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States Embassy, in Quito, Mr. Maurice M. Bernbaum. For 6 days and 6 nights, without let-up, Mrs. Bernbaum operated a portable hand radio transmitting set, relaying to the Canal Zone information about relief supplies that were most urgently needed. Her performance was outstanding, but at the same time typical of the reaction of the entire United States mission to Ecuador.

All in all, immediate relief measures that were taken in Ecuador were spectacular, and they have more than amply met the requirements of the situation. Present physical needs are adequately taken care of and other emergency measures to prevent post-disaster epidemics have been effectively taken. Supplies of food and clothing appear ample.

The basic problem that now confronts the Ecuadoran nation is one of reconstruction, especially in housing. No more than a passing survey of the situation is sufficient to demonstrate that the extent of the disaster is far out of proportion to the capacity of Ecuador to cope with it. Essentially Ecuador is an agricultural country. It has some manufacturing capacity, but much of that in the earthquake region is inoperative now.

In the disaster area more than 100,000 people are homeless. In various localities from 80 to 100 percent of the housing, schools, churches, hospital facilities, transportation systems, and sanitation installations were destroyed. This applies to the rural areas as well as to the cities and towns.

Consider the housing problem alone. In the destroyed area the homes had been handicrafted over hundreds of years. Compare a situation where 80 percent of the living quarters were almost instantly wiped out with our own housing problem in this country.

The Government of Ecuador estimated that on the basis of present national income it would take more than 25 years to bring about adequate restoration. While the emergency has passed, the present situation cannot be allowed to persist. Misery is the prevalent condition. The unemployment problem resulting from destruction of industrial establishments will become more and more serious. Coupled with other after-effects of the earthquake it threatens to present a dangerous political situation, breeding unrest and discontent.

The Eucadoran Government looks to us in this country for assistance. We as individuals, as groups, as a nation must do whatever is in our power to help. Our relations with Ecuador have always been close and friendly. When war came in 1941 Ecuador was prompt to join on our side and made an important contribution to the war effort by making available bases on its territory at Salinas and in the Galapagos Islands.

The Export-Import Bank is sending a technical mission to Ecuador to consider extending a loan for reconstruction purposes. Such a loan would be an important contribution to the problem, but we must remember, too, that the Ecuadoran Government is limited in its ability to service foreign loans.

I note with interest, too, that a bill has been introduced in Congress calling for assistance to Ecuador. I am sure that action along this line would be deeply appreciated in that country.

There has also been considerable interest shown in Ecuador by private United States citizens and groups. Some national organizations such as the American Legion have taken cognizance of the situation and passed resolutions urging help. Others like the National War Relief Service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Free Trade Union Committee of the Labor League for Human Rights of the American Federation of Labor have made substantial donations of funds.

Some private industries have added contributions in the form of foodstuffs and sanitation equipment and services which were transported free of charge by public carriers. Several cities have taken the initiative and launched fund-raising campaigns. Among them are Miami, New Orleans, San Francisco and New York. In addition numerous private contributions are being made to the Ecuador Relief Fund of the Pan American Union.

I wish to extend to all private contributors the thanks and the appreciation of the Department of State.

I am confident that this report I have given you tonight will spur you as individuals and as organizations to a greater effort. The subsequent turn of events in Ecuador may well depend upon United States generosity. A helping hand to our stricken neighbor will serve the cause of humanity strengthen the bonds of Western Hemisphere cooperation and help preserve the free institutions that we cherish.

Excerpts From Statement of C. M. White, Before the Presidential Steel Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Nation has been following the deliberations of the Presidential Steel Board with keen and continuing interest. I believe that the substance of the testimony which was given by both the United Steelworkers of America and the several steel companies ought to be offered for the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the statement of Mr. C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., which was given on August 19, 1949. During the remaining days of this week I shall offer portions of the testimony submitted by other steel companies.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF C. M. WHITE, PRESIDENT OF REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The demands which the United Steelworkers of America have made upon Republic Steel Corp. are staggering. Even on the wholly inadequate basis used by the union, the cost of these demands to Republic would amount to more than $38,000,000 a year. A realistic approach to the cost of the union's demands would bring this total substantially higher. In the first place, any wage increase granted to steelworkers will immediately spread to the workers of our suppliers and carriers and will be reflected in higher costs to us in materials and transportation charges. In the second place, the union's estimate of the cost of its proposed pension plan is grossly insufficient to provide the benefits requested on an actuarially sound basis.

Moreover, while the effect which the granting of the union's demands would have on Republic is important, the impact which the granting of any part of these demands would have on the national economy is of even greater importance.

Furthermore, since the vast majority of the American people are not unionized, the Board faces another problem. It is whether the bulk of the people of the country, the self-employed, farmers, professional people, and the fixed-income groups, such as annuitants, widows, and pensioners, who as a result of any wage increase recommended here, may be forced to pay higher prices for the goods they purchase without a corresponding increase in their income, shall be discriminated against so that an organized minority shall benefit unfairly. Shall a part of our population enjoy a better standard of living at the expense of all the rest of our population? I am opposed to any such discrimination.

II. PRODUCTIVITY HAS NOT INCREASED EITHER TO THE EXTENT OR FOR THE REASONS ADVANCED BY NATHAN

During the past decade, Republic has spent $173,000,000 on the tools of production. In this period 54 percent of Republic's net earnings have been plowed back into the business. These expenditures have been made to acquire many new plants and mills, such as the pipe facilities at Gadsden, Ala., and the continuous skelp operation at Youngstown, Ohio, and to modernize many of our facilities by the introduction of pressure blowing in blast furnaces, the replacement of coke ovens, use of oxygen in open hearths, and similar measures. It has been the acquisition of these new plants and the program of modernization that has been primarily responsible for such increases in productivity as have developed during that decade and not, as Nathan clearly implies, increased effort on the part of the worker. I should like to submit to this Board several illustrations of, first, how investment in and the introduction of new machinery has resulted in an increase in productivity, i. e., output per man-hour, and, second, how productivity has decreased

in operations where no new investment has been made.

As examples of the first category, I cite the following:

1. One of the most revolutionary developments in the processing of steel was the advent of the continuous strip mill which replaced the hand sheet mill. Republic built a 98-inch strip mill in its Cleveland, Ohio, plant costing millions of dollars. This installation effected an increase in productivity of more than 400 percent over that attainable with the old-style hand-operated sheet mills. Moreover, the product, though superior to that of the old hand mill, requires a great deal less effort on the part of the worker than that put forth in the hand-mill operation.

2. In its Gadsden, Ala., plant Republic spent $122,715 to install a mechanical means to drag hot billets from one rolling stand to another. The old method required men to pull this material across the floor with tongs. The new method increased productivity of this operation by 80 percent.

As examples of the second category, that is to say, those operations in which no investment was made for improvements—although large sums have been expended to keep such units in efficient operating condition—I cite the following, all of which cover periods during which the amount of production and type of product are comparable:

1. An analysis of production per man-hour of the four blast furnaces in Republic's Cleveland, Ohio, plant shows a decrease of 41 percent in 1948 compared to 1940. The man-hours per ton of pig iron in these furnaces were 0.72 in 1948 and 0.51 in 1940.

2. Republic's coke plant at Canton, Ohio, dropped 50 percent in productivity in the year 1948 when compared to 1940. The man-hours per ton of coke were 0.892 in 1948 and 0.595 in 1940.

Nathan claims that productivity in the steel industry has increased by 49.5 percent from 1939 to the first quarter of 1949. Our total gain in productivity in this period does not even begin to approach this figure and by far the greater part of the increase that has taken place has been due, not to increased effort on the part of our workers, but to tremendous sums aggregating $173,000,000 invested in plant and equipment.

Nathan takes advantage of a temporary change in product mix in order to show an unusually high increase in productivity. He does this by overemphasizing the importance of alloy steels. At page 5 of his steel report, he referred particularly to the increase in the relative importance of alloy steels from approximately 6 percent of steel ingots produced in 1939 to 11 to 12 percent now—July 1949. Republic did experience an increase in the relative importance of alloy steels to total shipments from 1939 to 1948. But there has been a reversal in this situation during the past few months—as the following tabulation shows.

The ratio of alloy steels to total shipments had fallen to the prewar proportion by June.

From 1939 to date, average hourly earnings for Republic's workers have increased by 97 percent ($0.85 to $1.674) which is many times greater than the gain in productivity during the same period.

The experience during the past year is of particular interest. We estimate that output per man-hour in the first half of 1949 was approximately 2 percent greater than in the corresponding period of 1948. Yet during that same period, the hourly earnings of our employees increased from $1.543 to $1.68 or 9 percent. In terms of dollars, this means that our potential saving on labor costs due to rising productivity was $3,400,000 while our increase in labor costs due to higher wages was over $14,000,000. Republic's workers not only received all of the savings from gains in productivity but an additional $10,600,000.

A similar calculation for the entire decade shows that we are now paying approximately $85,000,000 more on an annual basis than we would have had to pay for the same volume of work in 1939. Even if we had had the 49.5 percent increase in productivity claimed by Nathan for the entire industry, then our workers would still have received on an annual basis almost $40,000,000 more due to wage increases than is justified on the basis of productivity alone.

In light of these figures, it just is not true to say that our workers have received little benefit from the rise in productivity. They have received increases equal to the entire savings in productivity—plus.

III. REPUBLIC'S MATERIALS COSTS HAVE NOT DECREASED, BUT ON THE CONTRARY HAVE INCREASED, IN THE FIRST HALF OF 1949

Nathan has given considerable emphasis to an alleged sharp decline in materials costs out of which he says we could pay all of the increase in labor costs resulting from the demands of this union. According to his estimates shown at page 22 of his steel report, it would be possible to pay a 32 cents an hour increase in wages, insurance, and pensions because of lower materials costs, without reduction of profits. Because of the crucial importance of this point, it is vital that this Board understand how inaccurate this assumption is.

The outlook for profits would be much brighter if we could believe Nathan's computations on materials costs which, incidentally, played a vital role in his estimates of break-even point and earnings. Unfortunately, we cannot operate on his assumptions. Two comparisons from our own operating conditions will drive home this point.

In the first quarter of 1949, Nathan shows an average materials cost index of 115.3 percent (1947=100) as compared with the average of 118.6 percent for 1948 (Nathan Steel Report, p. 22). Thus, on the basis of his index, materials costs should have declined by 2.8 percent. In the first quarter of 1949, we find that our actual materials costs per ton wer 5 percent higher than the average in 1948. We derived this figure by dividing the shipments of finished steel into the total cost of raw materials, freight, power and light, water, gas, and other expenditures.

Similarly, on the basis of Nathan's estimates, the index of materials costs in the second quarter of 1949 was 95.5 percent or a decline of 19.5 percent from the average level prevailing in 1948. We find in contrast to this allegation that our total materials costs per ton in the second quarter of 1949 were 7 percent higher than our average for 1948.

Let me turn first to Nathan's assumptions. What he has done is this. He has taken nine selected items, which he considers important to steelmaking, ascertained their market prices and given them a weight of 60 percent in a materials costs index which he has constructed. For the other 40 percent of his index, he uses the changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' index on nonfood, nonfarm wholesale prices.

An examination of our actual expenditures shows that these nine items account for only 38.6 percent, not 60 percent, of our total materials costs. Two items included in Nathan's index, namely, lead and copper, are not purchased in the form of raw materials by Republic except to an insignificant extent.

Even more significant in demonstrating the inaccuracy of Nathan's assumptions is the fact that he has ignored a number of very important materials in his index of costs. For example, he has failed to include in his index coal, ore, manganese, molds and stools, refractories, limestone and fluxes, aluminum, chrome, kegs, tar, silicon, molybdenum, acid for pickling, and oxygen. These 14 items account for 50 percent of our total cost of materials. In other words, they are more important than the nine items which Nathan includes in his index.

Giving effect to the actual prices we had to pay, not only for Nathan's nine items but for all the other materials we use in steelmaking, it is an undeniable fact that in the case of Republic there has been an increase in our total costs of materials of 7 percent. This is, indeed, a far cry from Nathan's theoretical decrease of 20 percent.

In light of the various data I have presented, it is abundantly clear that the savings in materials costs which Nathan claims the industry is realizing, are not available to Republic to offset any increase in labor costs such as the union proposes.

IV. REPUBLIC'S PROFITS PICTURE HAS BEEN GROSSLY DISTORTED BY NATHAN

There has been presented to this Board by the union a picture of steel profits which is completely distorted and misleading. It is true, of course, that under the impact of the highest rate of operations in our history dollar profits reported reached a high level in the first quarter of 1949. But surely this fact constitutes no sound basis for the predictions made by Nathan. In the first place, a quarter of a year or even a year is much too short a time upon which to make an accurate prediction for the future. In the second place, past profits cannot be used to pay future wages. They just aren't there in the form of cash. Profits, in these days of rising construction costs, must go immediately into plant replacement or rehabilitation. As another of our witnesses will clearly show you, even our so-called huge first-quarter profits are not sufficient to maintain our plant facilities based upon past replacement experience and upon today's replacement costs. In the third place, the first-quarter profits were the result of an abnormally high rate of shipments and did not in any sense represent the true economic picture for the future, as the second quarter has unmistakably shown (with a decline of 33 percent in profits as compared with the first quarter) and as the third quarter will undoubtedly prove. In fact the July rate of earnings shows a decline of 70 percent under the first quarter.

Moreover, the projections shown by Nathan unfairly reflect what the profit picture for 1949 would be even if the first-quarter level were to hold for the balance of the year. I have already pointed out that he grossly miscalculated our material-cost picture and misinterpreted the productivity situation through failure to recognize the change taking place in product mix, including the decrease in alloy sales.

Actually, our reported earnings in the first quarter were approximately $15,000,000. In the second quarter they fell off to approximately $10,000,000, a reduction, as I have said, of 33 percent. Even assuming that the second quarter were used as the yardstick, Republic's 1949 profits would be $40,000,000 instead of Nathan's fanciful figure. This, however, would not tell the true story. The true probabilities can only be appraised by a look at our order experience and at our rate of operations thus far this year.

I digress here for a moment to explain to you that I attribute the apparent pick-up in August over July, mostly to forward buying generated by this very controversy you are considering and in anticipation of a possible strike on September 16. If that is true, and in the event there is no strike, we can expect another decline the latter part of September and in October while the inventories now being accumulated are used up.

What all this means in terms of profits can readily be seen in our July earnings which were a little over $1,500,000 as against Nathan's predicted monthly rate of between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000.

In the face of this unmistakable evidence of what the immediate future holds in store for us, it seems to me that it is the height of irresponsibility for a man who purports to be an economist to come before this Board and seriously defend the predictions made in the Nathan steel report that Republic's profits for the year 1949 will be over $68,000,000 unadjusted and over $72,000,000 if adjusted in Nathan's misleading fashion.

The big lesson we have learned during Republic's relatively short business life is the necessity of profits to survival and progress. That lesson is firmly fixed in our minds.

Therefore, profit is our only source of revenue today to keep our plant capacity in efficient operating condition under high construction costs. And we must earn this profit in the face of a presently declining demand for the products we make. In consequence, we think it is absolutely essential that we consider the union's demands, not in the light of unrealistic predictions based on an unusual quarter or even an unusual period such as we have had since the war ended, but rather in the stern realities of the record we have made, profitwise, in all of Republic's brief history.

Moreover, the growth of Republic's facilities has meant more capital investment upon which some return must be paid. It has created the necessity for greater sums of working capital to carry receivables and inventory. For example, $10,300,000 were required in 1930 to carry our receivables. In March of this year $57,000,000 were required for that same purpose. On December 31, 1930, Republic's inventory amounted to about $39,000,000. At the end of the first quarter of this year our inventory totaled more than $100,000,000.

At this very moment we have plans on paper for replacements and improvements which may run into more than $100,000,000. The completion of these projects would give our employees a greater assurance of steady, profitable employment. Failure to carry out this program would mean that our shipments of steel would inevitably fall. Our costs would be higher. The number of jobs which we would have available would be seriously decreased.

The matter of depreciation and property replacement is more than theories and assumptions. Republic is now confronted with the problem of replacing worn-out and obsolete equipment at a cost five to six times the original cost. In the years 1946–48 we spent for property $27,000,000 more than we provided by depreciation charges, and the program for the present and immediate future is even greater. The carrying out of such a program will be possible only because the so-called high paper profits provided the money. Any reduction in these high paper profits because of higher wages, lower prices, or other causes will have a direct effect on what we can spend for tools for the workingmen.

There is another factor I wish to call to your attention. Our export market, a mainstay of the steel business during the past few years, is shrinking rapidly. There are two reasons for this. First, there is a shortage of dollars abroad which makes it difficult for other countries to buy goods in this country. Second, the foreign steel capacity is being rapidly rebuilt. Ironically, the cost of rebuilding the European steel industry comes from the pockets of American taxpayers. A benevolent government is taking taxes from the American steel industry to build up competitive steel capacity abroad. We are subsidizing future foreign competition which will eventually reduce our operations and throw our employees out of work.

While the steel industry faces these difficult problems, union officials and their economists talk blithely about high steel profits. If these profits are as high as the union officials and their economists say, they are the only ones who seem to be aware of that fact. Even the investors—the people with risk capital—who are, in a major part, responsible for the growth of Republic and other companies in this and other industries, the people who help supply the tools with which these steelworkers are equipped, appear to view the future with alarm. In the face of these "high" profits on the part of Republic, and the rest of the steel industry, in fact most other industries, the prices at which the stocks of these companies can be purchased in the market have gone steadily downward. Republic's common stock has a book value of $54 per share. Today that stock is selling at about $20 per share. Evidentally the American investor does not believe you can appraise the future on the basis of these profits.

Someone must be wrong about the outlook for the future. Personally, I think it's Nathan and in the teeth of the grim operating conditions we are now experiencing we firmly believe that Republic cannot grant a wage or other cost increase. To do so would, I believe, in the long run harm those who seek it.

How to Win Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How to Win Elections," written by Bert Andrews, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN ELECTIONS—MR. PHATHE ADVISES REPUBLICANS ON WAY, IN 10 EASY LESSONS

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—A man named Phathe gave the Republican Party some advice last week.

He said the Republicans lost the last election because of poor speech making and because they failed to get the facts across to the people.

He offered the party a sure-fire formula. Mr. Phathe, clearly a Republican, wrote a letter to the Washington Evening Star.

He said that all Republican speech makers had to do was to memorize 10 little items. He said they were the facts that must be put over before the people. He said he had compiled the list without reference to any printed matter. He said he had been able to do so because the facts had been drummed into his head and would stay there. His list of items for the Republican speakers follows:

1. Do-nothing Eightieth Congress: For this, Eighty-first may be substituted. Why it is do-nothing does not matter. It is the bad name that sticks.

2. Special interests: Sometimes called selfish interests of some people. Do not name them; the group to whom you are speaking will use the term as a symbol for whatever group they especially hate. It is important to regard the group to which you are speaking as having no special interests at all—only the well-being of all America. The trick is to denounce special interests at the same time that you appeal to the listening group's special interests.

3. Taft-Hartley slave labor law: A way to appeal to a large group. That the audience probably never has read the law means nothing; you may make them shudder and hate the very name if you repeat it with distaste 40 or 50 times during each speech. Republicans could find, of course, another way to berate. The idea is to find one that affects many voters. The notorious highway traffic regulations, for instance, would stir up a lot of feeling.

4. "Men of little faith": These are any persons who take exception to any measure you propose. They are also part of the villainous gang of "self-interests." They are not only Machiavellian but stupid and nearsighted to boot. Since you are always right, it is unnecessary to consider anything they suggest.

5. "We will go forward": At this point set your jaw, extend palm, and saw hand up and down. Crowd won't know where "forward" is, but will identify it as support of its interests.

6. "The people knew what they wanted": The people in this case consist of those who voted for you. The greater millions who voted against you presumably are not people. They are either dupes of, or actually themselves the "special interests" of, item 2.

7. "Plain facts before the people": The 10 items in this list are known as plain facts. Any other facts will be distrusted by the people as intellectual city-slicker tricks.

8. "Forward-looking legislation": Anything you are concerned with is "forward-looking." Be careful not to say what it is looking forward to.

9. "But it will not succeed": Some sly trick of those "special interests" (i. e., any proposed legislation of the other party).

10. "As you farmers well know," "As you workers well know," "As you Catholics well know," etc.: Makes them feel as though they knew it all the time. Appeal to their special interests, which are in some mysterious way not the "special interests" of item 2.

Mr. Phathe concluded his sermon with these words for Republicans:

"Gentlemen, I have done as much as modern science can for you. Now, go out and write those speeches. I would ghost write for you, but conscience forbids me to take money for such an elementary task."

This writer looked Mr. Phathe up in the telephone book on the theory that Mr. Phathe might have some additional points to suggest.

Mr. Phathe couldn't be found.

Probably because he signed his full name to the letter. It was D. Clining Phathe.

Economic Conditions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "The Future: It Will Be Good Providing All Work Hard and Use Common Sense," published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent, of September 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE: IT WILL BE GOOD PROVIDING ALL WORK HARD AND USE COMMON SENSE

The old saying to the effect that we can't see the forest for the trees holds good in this era of general prosperity when scattered talk of hard times and of the inevitability of a future depression makes us forget our many blessings.

The most of us fail to see the higher, new ground of economic improvement to which we have moved in the last 10 years because we are concerned over certain recessions and rumors of dire things to come.

To be sure, some things have settled down from the frenzied high peaks of war times, when the utmost in artificial stimulation was needed to keep them that way. We knew then full well that such an economic state would settle down with the resumption of a more nearly normal national life.

There has been such a great amount of mass expectancy of depression, such trembling for fear it would come that there has been a condition of mind that borders almost on disappointment that such depression is not here.

Our great country, without parallel in production of the things that man needs, has risen to undreamed of heights of production. This has held employment almost to that magic mark of 60,000,000 which was regarded as an impossibility a decade ago.

We heard a lot about a depression, a recession, or disinflation as some called it last winter and spring. It was more a state of mind than of fact. But many manufacturers, merchants, and others held up buying, cut their inventories. The big depression did not materialize, but like the mists of early morning, was driven away by the sun.

The fact is that recession, which is only natural, so far has affected men's thinking more than it has their pocketbooks. Most companies in the United States show profits today. Most people are gainfully at work, and employment is still high.

Farm incomes are down somewhat from former peaks but farmers as a whole are in good shape, tremendously good shape if we compare their status today to that of 1940 and 1930.

Savings in banks and elsewhere are at a high peak. Insurance is also at a high mark. This constitutes a great reservoir of spending which will inevitably be used in building homes, starting business, buying the things that create jobs, provide employment. People are spending money now, proof of which requires only a brief look around.

We have been speaking about the country as a whole. What about our own Southeast, what about South Carolina?

In seven Southeastern States, workers earned 82 percent more last year than they did in 1942. The $11,317,000,000 in wages and salaries in the Southeast last year was nearly 63 percent of the total income received by residents of those States.

Those figures show the steady trend toward industrialization in this region. The Southeast is coming along faster than the national average in turning to industry. There is more opportunity here for industrialization than there is in most sections of the country. We have many factors in our favor.

In South Carolina alone, wages and salaries totaled $1,097,000,000 in 1948. This does not take into account the added hundreds of millions earned by farmers, business and professional men, and others.

This staggering sum has gone into living expenses, savings, building of homes and businesses, education, travel, entertainment, and all the broad fields of modern living. A big slice of it has been paid back into taxes, which keep up our local, country, State, and Federal Governments. As citizens we are expecting and demanding more Government service than ever before.

The future will be only as good as we individually and collectively work hard, keep our common sense, observe the spirit of brotherhood and forever keep in mind the Golden Rule.

Whither Western Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very important article dealing with the German problem, entitled "Whither Western Europe?" by Jean Pajus. This is one of a series of articles being published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER WESTERN EUROPE?

(By Jean Pajus)

SECTION I

What are the results of the last conference of foreign ministers on Germany? Are we nearer a solution of the German problem? The consensus of those who have been following the conference with dispassionate interest is that there is no cause for exultation or jubilation for either East or West. If anything, the conference has decidedly proved that not only are East and West not in the position to bridge the gap, but the Western front seems to have developed new cracks. Old wounds have opened up again. The nearer the West comes to tackling the problem of unification of Germany, the greater the fears of the Western European countries of a renascent nationalistic and dominant Germany.

So long as Germany was not unified, so long as France was afraid of communism more than of a weak Germany, France was willing to join the Western front. But this is no longer true. France is becoming more and more afraid of the rising German power, political as well as industrial.

Nor does the prospect of an economically strong Germany seem to please the British. After the war Britain seemed anxious to see Germany contribute to the recovery of Western Europe. Western Europe was short of goods which Germany used to supply before the war. Britain was not then in a position to supply all Europe wanted. Apparently she was not afraid of competition. But that was in 1946 and 1947. Today the problem facing Europe, Britain in particular, is primarily what to do with the goods they are now able to produce. For Britain it is a case of being confronted with growing German competition in dwindling markets. Today Britain realizes that intra-European trade does not particularly need the German contribution and that western Europe has, practically speaking, freed itself from dependence on Germany.

The economic realities of Western Europe are such that it can get along without German manufactured goods. Indeed, it has finally dawned upon the Western European countries that Germany's contribution to Europe is not complementary but competitive, and the question now is, can a shrinking European market absorb an additional two and one-half billion dollars worth of German goods?

The dilemma for Western Europe is: Either the Western nations again recognize Germany's industrial supremacy over the Continent, which means granting her priority in organizing Europe's postwar economy, or these nations try to find a market for Germany's goods—and that market presently can only be Eastern Europe.

In any case, Germany is emerging as the victor in this tug of war between East and West.

Economically, Germany is bolstered by the ECA. She is receiving ample supplies of raw materials. In an effort to bring about a maximum industrial expansion, she will increase her electric power to 47,000,000 kilowatt-hours by 1952 against 22,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1936—the so-called normal year.

Her heavy industry is expanding rapidly and although Germany's steel production is still theoretically limited to 11,100,000 tons, special interests are working to raise this ceiling. Meanwhile Western Europe's steel industry is already wrestling with the problem of surpluses.

Still other sectors of Western Europe's economy show the same danger signals—nitrogenous fertilizers, phosphates and dyestuffs. Whereas up to recently there was the cry that Europe must increase its fertilizer production in order to raise its food supply, the latest reports from the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) in Paris reveal a great fear of overproduction by 1952. The OEEC experts anticipate a surplus of 135,000 tons of fertilizers and are now thinking in terms of expanding production programs over a period of 8 to 10 years instead of 4 as originally planned. Since Germany before the war was a heavy producer of fertilizers and dyestuffs, the problem of where to cut production is assuming an ever greater significance.

Politically postwar Germany is coming of age. Her Western neighbors must now listen to her more and more and that in turn means fitting a nationalistic Germany into a Council of Europe. How can Western Europe do this, while the plan calls, theoretically, for the incorporation of a truly democratic Germany? Above all, how can Western Europe achieve economic and political security?

But—was this result totally unexpected?

How Germany used her industrial power

During the past year outstanding experts on international affairs, both at home and abroad, have shown grave concern regarding our policy toward Germany. For instance, on November 16, 1948, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles wrote: "Fear that British and American policy is now directed toward the immediate establishment of a strong and autonomous Western Germany is casting a deep shadow over Western Europe * * * the specter of German rearmament is arousing much anxiety in the Low Countries, in Scandinavia, and among the democratic elements in Poland and in Czechoslovakia as in France."

Back of these fears is the fact that Germany has always used her industrial power to the detriment of these nations. In the past Germany has used her strategic location in the center of Europe to dominate the course of European economy. The industrial heart of Germany is centered in the Ruhr, where coal, Europe's most important source of power, is mined. Whereas prior to World War II, approximately 50 percent of the energy used by the United States industry came from coal, fully 90 percent of German

power in pre-world-war days came from its coal mines. Germany's byproduct, coke-oven plants, furnished the principal raw materials for her important chemical industry. Prior to World War I, Germany's iron and steel industry was in Lorraine where central Europe's most important source of iron ore is located. With the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France, after World War I, German industrialists developed Europe's largest iron and steel industry in the Ruhr and supplied it by ore imports, principally from Sweden and Lorraine, France.

Short of many basic raw materials and financial resources, the German industrialists have shrewdly and purposefully set out to monopolize the flow of technological information and thus achieve international power. While realistically evaluating her own limitations (relative poverty in natural resources, gold and foreign exchange) Germany overcame this defect by concentrating on a strategy of obtaining domination and control over the methods and means of converting other people's natural resources and money into machines and goods in greatest demand, whether they be high-speed steels, pharmaceuticals, dyestuffs, cameras, synthetic fibres, or weapons of war.

Two years ago the constituent members of the Marshall plan met in Paris and formulated their views about Germany in the following terms:

"The German economy must not be allowed to develop to the detriment of other European countries as it was done in the past, but if European cooperation is to be effective, the German economy must be fitted into the European economy so that it may contribute to a general improvement in the standard of living. In particular, the output of the Ruhr coal fields which is essential to the European economy as a whole must not again be used by Germany in such a way as to constitute a threat to European security, but must contribute to the rehabilitation of economic stability of the whole of Europe including Germany herself. The increased production and export of Ruhr coal is, in fact, essential for European recovery and both coal and coke should be fairly distributed between these countries, including Germany, which depend upon the Ruhr for their supplies."

A new Germany?

The efforts to implement these safeguards have failed thus far, because of obstructionist policies from various sources:

1. As early as the spring of 1942 the geopolitical division of the United States War Department which consisted of a group of industrialists recommended that a powerful Germany be rebuilt after the conclusion of the war. (P. 8, Report on Germany, by Lewis A. Brown.)

2. The beginning of World War II saw some Americans with German tie-ups assuring their German friends that they would hold the bag for them in the United States during American neutrality, and would resume their pleasant and profitable business associations as soon as hostilities ended. (New York Herald Tribune, July 31, 1945.)

We are told that a new Germany has arisen. Our High Commissioner in Germany, Mr. John J. McCloy, stated that he had new ideas for making Germany a more substantial participant in the ERP. Similarly, French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman has been talking about bringing Germany into Western Europe.

No doubt the idea of welding Germany into Western Europe is, theoretically, sound, but, what can we expect from the new Germany? Recent events in that country will shed some light on the character of Germany's present leaders. Not so long ago, Jack Raymond reported in the New York Times that "Robert H. Estill, American chairman of the U. S.-U. K. Control Group, agreed, in response to a question today, that the German mine management was sabotaging production of Ruhr coal on which so much of Europe's economy depends." The administration of the German coal industry has been under General Director Heinrich Kost. He formerly was general director of Rheinpreussen—one of the largest of the Ruhr's coal companies—from 1932 until the end of the war. During World War II Dr. Kost held directorships in several other major industries and cartels. He was a member of the Nazi Party for over 11 years and joined it years before the Nazis put pressure on businessmen to take out membership. The cartels with which he was associated helped finance Hitler's rise to power and later armed Germany for aggressive war. (World Report, December 16, 1947.)

Military government spokesmen have repeatedly expressed confidence in the new leaders of western Germany. But have these Germans played fair with their neighbors? A quick glance at the "1948–49 plan for economic reconstruction of the German bizonal area" will show that the experts who prepared the plan have greatly inflated the German requirements and badly underestimated the bizonal area's capacity to export to Western Europe. When the plan was examined by the ECE experts, the latter discovered that—

(1) The Germans overestimated by 30 percent the amount of coke for the iron ores used in German industry. Had the proper ratio been used, 800,000 tons of coke could have been available for export to France, Belgium, etc., thus enabling them to overcome the main obstacle to their production of steel. It is clear that the purpose was to restrict the steel production of Germany's neighbors.

(2) The German experts have underestimated by 500,000 tons the steel output by using an abnormal crude steel-rolled steel ratio.

(3) The German experts have deliberately underestimated the wagon-turn-around—the time taken to reload an empty freight car and to put it back into use. Had the correct factors been used, Germany would have shown—over the period stipulated—a surplus of 24,000 cars instead of a deficit of 22,000 cars, as claimed by the German experts.

Secretary Royall and Commissioner Ferguson

On January 8, 1948, former Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall stated:

"We have removed from positions of influence most of the top leaders who have fomented and conducted the cruel war of oppression; we have abolished the pernicious cartels." (New York Times, January 9, 1948.)

More than a year later, on January 24, 1949, the New York Times reported from Frankfurt that "the Ruhr area is again a first-class industrial center, and most of the former managers in factories, mines, and banks are again in positions of influence." And speaking of the political climate of Germany, the New York Times quoted Allied officials as follows: "We shall never democratize Germany, and the former bosses and managers are back, and we don't trust them at all." Four days later Drew Middleton, of the New York Times, wrote a lengthy article, which began with the following words: "German nationalism is on the march again."

As regards Secretary Royall's statement of 20 months ago "that we have abolished the pernicious cartels," the facts are that on March 1, 1948, 19 members of the decartelization division resigned in protest against an oral order issued by the United States commander in Germany to emasculate the whole decartelization program. On April 30, 1949, the Ferguson committee, appointed by President Truman to investigate our decartelization policy in Germany, reported that the "United States occupation officials have failed to smash a single one of Germany's giant monopolies under a crack-down law now 2 years old." (New York Times, April 30, 1949.)

On that date, April 30, 1949, 1 day after the Ferguson report was released, General Clay was quoted in the official Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes, as saying, "Germany's largest industrial combination, the I. G. Farben enterprise, has been broken into separate units, of which there are 50 in the United States zone alone."

General Clay told the Ferguson investigating committee that "I. G. Farben as such no longer exists." (P. 24, Ferguson report.)

On June 1, 1949, 30 days after General Clay's statement, an Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, said: "The major step toward breaking up the I. G. Farben chemical empire will be taken soon by offering one of its units for sale, Maj. Gen. George P. Hays said today. Hays estimated it would take 5 or 6 weeks to work out technical procedures and advertise for bids. He said Farben stockholders would be invited to sit in consultation before the sale."

Asked if this action was a result of the Ferguson committee's criticism, General Hays replied: "It might be and it might not."

The Hawaiian Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Honolulu Advertiser of August 27, 1949, together with a letter to the editor of that newspaper, dealing with the Hawaiian strike situation.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNBRIDLED CRITICS OF LAW AND GOVERNMENT

Respect for law and the courts that uphold the law has been violated repeatedly during Hawaii's interminable longshore blockade.

Territorial dock seizure legislation, passed by the representatives of the people to relieve their plight, has been scoffed at and violated. The Governor, legislators, and other Territorial officials have been vilified and sued because of it.

A circuit court judge seeking to enforce the law has had his restraining order publicly defied and ridiculed by Harry Bridges and Arthur Rutledge. Of this judge, a union attorney later alleged in Federal court, "He has stepped out of his role of judge and become a prosecutor."

In the Federal court, the union challenged the right of yet another judge to hear its petition for a restraining order, alleging that the judge in question should be disqualified because he was acquainted with the Governor and a member of the University of Hawaii board of regents.

Latest incident in this unabashed scorn for legal authority and ethics came when an ILWU radio commentator publicly predicted that two Federal judges subsequently would hand down a decision favorable to the union and that a lot of people would be sorry they had opposed the union's campaign for conquest.

This may be just speculation on the part of the union, but it is ethically in bad taste.

Many a newspaper has been rebuked for similar speculation.

To challenge the law in the courts is one thing; but to publicly scoff and violate the laws is another. Someday the Nation and Hawaii may become fed up with this new left-wing technique of mocking law and order.

BRIDGES' ECONOMIC WEAPON

Bondage of the people of Hawaii under Harry Bridges' dictatorship at last is beginning to arouse some constructive thinking at Washington. News that the Senate Banking Committee is considering sending a subcommittee here is hopeful. Virginia's Democratic Senator A. W. ROBERTSON, announcing the plan, said it would be the subcommittee's duty to investigate the economic power exercised here by ILWU, which at this time is synonymous with Bridges. The public will welcome an investigation of that kind for it must inevitably lead to a clearer view of the island situation than seems commonly to be held at the National Capital.

HAWAII LETTERS SWAMP TAFT

So widespread is public interest on the mainland in the blockade of Hawaii, that Members of the Congress are compelled to issue form letters stating their position with relation to it. Mr. and Mrs. E. R. Comer, 391 Auwinala Street, Lanikai, have just received one of these from Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. "I have received so many similar letters from persons interested in this matter that I find it impossible to write a personal reply to each correspondent as I usually do," the letter said. "I hope, therefore, that you will excuse the use of this form letter."

Senator TAFT went on to say "there is no question that this strike threatens the economic life of Hawaii. * * * It is intolerable that one man can bring about this condition. The President could have acted * * * but he refused to do so." Senator TAFT expresses the hope that Hawaii's Legislature will solve the problem, and to promise that if this is not done Congress will pass some kind of legislation. He doubts if the administration will permit any bill to pass that strikes at the heart of the difficulty—the monopoly permitted to labor which is prohibited in the case of capital.

Hawaii's Legislature has made a good start toward fulfilling Senator TAFT's hope. The job will be completed when the special session is resumed. But it will still be up to Congress to do its part by making Hawaii's self-protection effective on the mainland.

PHONY UNION LEADER PROPAGANDA

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

The ILWU has been so blinded by its violent, unreasoning opposition to Hawaii's Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, that the union seems to have completely missed the point of the Territory's new temporary stevedoring seizure law.

By a devious piece of illogical reasoning the union alleges that the governor is behind the new labor legislation and implies that it is a part of some mysterious Stainback plot.

The truth of the matter is that the people of Hawaii are solidly behind the dock seizure program. If ever legislation was the will of the people, this has been the time. The vast majority of the citizens of Hawaii have had more than enough of the ILWU blockade of island ports. After 4 months of it they have struck back through their duly elected legislators in the hope of putting an end to an intolerable situation.

If the ILWU would pause to consider the facts the union could not help but be convinced that in continuing to strike it is ignoring the will of the people.

Act 2 and its subsidiary legislation was passed 24 to 6 by a Republican-dominated house and 14 to 0 by a GOP-controlled senate. And it took Democratic Governor Stainback to dissuade the Legislature from passing a bill that would have penalized the ILWU by barring its strikers from government employment. It took two special messages and a conference at which the governor brought senate and house members around to a more conciliatory attitude to give the ILWU the chance to "get off the hook."

Since the ILWU has chosen to declare war on the law, it has chosen to declare war on the people of Hawaii. The union now is openly fighting the President of the United States, the Attorney General, the Federal courts, the territorial government, and the people of Hawaii—not to mention the British Commonwealth, which seems to be Louie Goldblatt's private war.

The ILWU may discover shortly, as did Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Hitler, that biting off more than you can chew is almost always fatal.

FOURTH ESTATE.

AUGUST 25.

Great Britain's Financial Exigencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Honorable Arthur Capper, of Kansas, was elected to the United States Senate for five consecutive terms of 6 years each. When he retired of his own volition at the conclusion of a distinguished Senate career, he was the ranking Republican, next to the chairman, on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement made by Senator Capper, as printed in the Los Angeles Examiner. The article is entitled "Simplifying a Problem," and has to do with the financial exigencies of Great Britain.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMPLIFYING A PROBLEM

(By Arthur Capper, former United States Senator from Kansas)

I wouldn't want to try to oversimplify a very complex problem.

But it does seem to me that the forthcoming discussions between Britain's financial experts and our own financial experts, on what to do about the American dollar and the British pound, boil down to something like this:

Suppose an individual named John Bull, already badly in debt, can count on an income of say $5,000 a year.

But he is spending, and feels as if he has to continue spending, at the rate of $8,000 a year.

He borrows $2,000, and assures himself and his creditor that he will earn more.

But instead, at the end of the year, he finds all the help that $2,000 has been is to increase his spending to $10,000 a year.

The creditor tries the same thing for him the next year—only to discover that John Bull is getting further and further into the red.

What to do about it?

They slate a conference.

It will be interesting to see what comes of it, particularly as the great American taxpayer probably will have to foot the bill, whatever it is.

We are not through with the gold at Fort Knox. Not by a long sight.

Just watch the maneuverings in the coming months, perhaps over several years, to persuade America that the gold is valueless at Fort Knox—but would help save the world if placed in the proper hands.

And the proper hands will be extended to us as the right hand of fellowship—palms up.

You just wait and see.

Public Versus Private Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, Inc., on the problem of public versus private power. This article portrays the struggle in the West of the REA cooperatives to expand rural electrification.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER

LIVE AND LET LIVE

(By Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash.)

During the August 15–25 Senate debate on Federal transmission lines much ado was made by private power companies about their inability to compete with their sovereign. They pleaded for a live-and-let-live policy.

During the past 5 years the Idaho Power Co. killed three REA cooperatives by virtue of its monopoly of Bureau of Reclamation power in southern Idaho. This was not a live-and-let-live policy. The latest victim was the Malheur Electric Cooperative at Vale, Oreg., which ended its 10-year struggle in June 1949 because the Idaho Power Co. clubbed it to death with a high wholesale-power rate.

The Montana Power Co. in like manner buys Fort Peck power at 2½ mills and sells to Montana REA cooperatives at 9 mills. Furthermore, that company refuses to make sufficient power available to the REA cooperatives for serving the industrial load.

The Vigilante Electric Cooperative at Dillon, Mont., recently was denied energy to serve a new mine.

Ninety percent of the Montana Power Co. is owned by the American Power & Light Co., an old subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. A. P. & L. continues to delay dissolution under the 1935 Holding Company Act despite SEC orders and Supreme Court decisions. This flagrant flouting of United States law should hardly give the Montana Power Co. much of a standing in the court of American public opinion.

The 23 Montana REA cooperatives have raised rural electrification from 5 percent to 55 percent and in 2 years will reach 80 percent. But the rates are inflated because of Montana Power Co.'s 9-mill rate.

For decades Montana has had an electrified railroad (C. M. & St. P. R.) while entire villages along the tracks burned kerosene lamps. Is it surprising that that great State

with its fabulous resources has been losing population?

It is the old story of an unchallenged monopoly. The company has never known anything but a silver-spoon life of monopoly. Now, when REA's and Federal power lines attempt to bring electricity to the neglected and benighted rural areas, the company exhibits a dog-in-the-manger attitude and complains about its inability to compete with its sovereign.

To that company we say, "The people are sovereign, and they are hacking at the chains of Montana Power Co. enslavement."

The Missouri River Basin Program, 5 Years After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in Loveland, Colo., on August 18, Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne spoke before a meeting of the service clubs and of the Missouri River Basin Interagency Committee on the Missouri Basin program, 5 years after. The progress that has been made in the largest river-development program in our history was sketched by Mr. Warne and he noted that the debate which reached its climax in 1944 with the passage of the Missouri Basin project authorization was continuing along the same lines today. The decision made by the Senate on the power-transmission lines in the Interior Department bill for 1950 marks another milestone in the decisions that are shaping the Missouri Basin project.

I join with Mr. Warne in the hope that the progress of the project will not be impeded by restrictive interpretations and that, where necessary, it can be made truly comprehensive by the inclusion through legislation of the older projects in the plan.

I call particular attention of the Senate and of the country to the suggestion that Secretary Warne has made that serious consideration be given now to the needs of supplementing the hydroelectric capacity of the Missouri Basin development with energy generated through the use of the lignite fuels of the Dakotas, the gas fields of Kansas, or other sources in the basin. This important suggestion will require much study and thorough review, but if the project is to attain its greatest objective, it may be necessary to expand its power and capacity.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Warne's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The physical improvement of one-sixth of the United States, the Missouri River Basin, is the object of the Federal, State, and local agencies that are represented here in Loveland today at the regular August meeting of the Missouri River Basin Interagency Committee.

I am here because of the deep interest of the Interior Department through seven of its constituent agencies in the Missouri Basin development project.

I am particularly happy to attend this meeting for it has been my privilege, along with a few others such as Glen Sloan, General Pick, and Judge Stone, to have had an active part in the great drama of the fashioning of the project since its inception in 1943 and 1944. Also, I have long been connected with the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee, the parent of this Missouri Basin coordinating committee, and I, therefore, have a special interest and pride in the splendid work that the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee has done as it pioneered on its way in wholly new fields of Federal, State, and local cooperation.

The meeting here in Loveland this month is especially significant because it is considering a coordinated 6-year program for all agencies interested in the development of the Missouri Basin. Last year for the first time this was tried by the same committee for the first time anywhere. With a year's experience, the work this year, I understand, has been broadened and deepened. This field coordination of program, I predict, is destined to become a contribution to good Government planning and operation as significant in its way as the Pick-Sloan plan itself. It is a product of the adventure in joint action that has been undertaken in the Missouri Basin.

At this time but 5 years ago, the debate was raging on the question of whether there should be a Missouri Basin project, and if so, what its nature should be.

Today, 5 years after, hundreds of millions of dollars have already been invested by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in a score of major facilities of the approved comprehensive plan, and this year additional vast programs are going forward.

The problem of the Missouri Basin was recognized more than 55 years ago, but for half a century nothing very much was done about it, except in an inadequate, piecemeal way. The great drought of the 1930's that decimated the high plains, including eastern Colorado; the great floods of 1943 that ripped vital sections of great States; the census figures of 1940 that showed retrogression rather than progress in much of the Missouri Basin; and such statistics as those compiled on rural electrification that showed 3 of the 10 Missouri Basin States at the bottom of the national list; all of these showed the price that was being paid for that half a century of inaction. All of these argued loudly for the comprehensive development program that we now have.

To correct these deficiencies and reverse these trends the Pick-Sloan plan was conceived and the program for the development of the water and related resources of the Missouri River Basin was launched.

I am well aware that the debate I mentioned that was in progress at this time in 1944 did not cease with the authorization of the Pick-Sloan plan in December of that year. Nor do I advocate its termination until everyone is sure that we have the best program that anyone can devise for the development of so important an area. But we have the plan, in 5 years we have devised a program that matches the plan in breadth and scope, new means of coordination of agencies at all levels of government have been devised and are being strengthened and improved, there is no reason now to hesitate or falter in our program along the road that has been chosen. Let us move ahead doing what we have started to do.

Because I feel as I do on this score I would like to turn now to a brief consideration of one of the steps immediately before us.

Great dams are being built and great power plants are being installed.

The Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation is now ready to begin its task of marketing the power from the Missouri River project facilities.

As this work is approached a number of new problems are faced.

In addition we now realize that, instead of having difficulties finding markets for even so large a block of energy as will be added by the Missouri River development, our major concern must be with finding power enough to meet even the basic requirements of the area, which are rapidly expanding.

I shall discuss these two matters a little later, but now I should like to present the principles that will guide us in the marketing of the power.

Parenthetically I consider Loveland, Colo., an especially good place for this discussion, because you here are pioneers in municipal power, and the Missouri Basin program, by law, gives a preference in the sale of the power to be developed to cities such as yours and to rural cooperatives. Since there will not be enough power to satisfy all demands to Loveland and other communities so prepared, the whole program has especial significance, for they have the right to demand that their needs be taken care of on a priority basis.

The following are the principles that will guide the marketing of Missouri Basin power. They were stated by Secretary Krug this month.

1. The preference rights of public bodies and cooperatives are to be fully observed.

2. The transmission system within the initial marketing area is to be developed as part of the basin-wide transmission system, and the marketing of power within this area is to be guided by the principle that the transmission system should develop on the most effective and economical basis consistent with the objectives of the Missouri Basin program.

3. The secondary and dump energy will be marketed to preferred and nonpreferred customers in substitution for fuel generation in order to achieve the maximum conservation of fuel and in order to yield revenues which will assist to the maximum in meeting the costs of the Missouri Basin power system. This will assist in assuring the continual maintenance, for firm power marketed under long-term contract, of the lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

4. The marketing program within the area is part of the broad resources development program of the Federal Government for the Missouri Basin and should contribute to the maximum extent to the resources development objectives of that broad program.

Because only 300,000 kilowatts are being installed at dams that will be ready in 4 years, the power which will be generated at Garrison and Fort Randall Dam on the main stem of the river, will be marketed in North and South Dakota and within the portions of Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa lying within a 150-mile radius of the Fort Randall power plant.

Under these principles the initial firm power, it can be said, can serve the preference customers that are within the designated area and that have applied for power to meet these present and anticipated needs.

Now for some of the problems that are facing us.

The power from the Missouri Basin development must be pooled as planned by the Bureau of Reclamation if the area is to obtain maximum benefits.

This means that a backbone grid of transmission lines must interconnect all of the power plants. Otherwise the benefits of integrated operation will be denied, and much less than the maximum amount of firm and total energy will be made available. A restricted program would not be consonant

with the ideals and purposes of the Missouri Basin project.

By the same token a satisfactory means of integrating the power generation of the Colorado-Big Thompson, the Kendrick, and other projects within the Missouri River Basin area must be worked out and adopted. Only in this way can maximum benefits be obtained from the total generating capacity. To do so will enhance the power phases of the separate and older projects and of the Missouri Basin project, provide a greater total amount of firm power, and greater returns to the individual projects. By transmission lines from the Shoshone project in Wyoming to the Colorado-Big Thompson area in northern Colorado, physical integration of the older projects is under way, but they must be tied in with Fort Peck and with the Missouri Basin project plants. It will require Federal legislation to obtain adequate financial and operating integration of these projects. We hope to propose such legislation in the near future in order that the advantages to all, to the individual projects, to the people of the whole basin, may be realized.

Good progress has been made so far on the basic transmission facilities in some areas, but in others apparently there has not been an acceptance of the need, and some lines have been denied by the Congress or at least delayed. This is one phase of the debate that I have mentioned that is still going and that may be settled by the action in the next few days of the Senate and the House on the 1950 Interior appropriation bill. Transmission lines are the major issue in controversy in the bill. The point I would make is that every area within the Missouri Basin is vitally concerned with the outcome of this controversy since the power program is affected and it is vital to the whole.

There are other issues and problems before us, most of them not so well developed nor so well defined as that concerning power, but some of them, like the power issue, also are basic to the fulfilment of the purposes of the Missouri Basin development program.

One of these I shall mention as an illustration. It revolves around ways and means of effectuating the very significant language that underlies the Missouri Basin project and that gives it the unique character that it possesses.

I refer to the language that establishes the basin-wide and comprehensive character of the program. Section 9 of the 1944 Flood Control Act sets for that "the general comprehensive plans set forth * * * are hereby approved," and that the reclamation and power developments shall be "subject to the basin-wide findings and recommendations regarding the benefits, the allocations of costs, and the repayments by water users made" in the Pick-Sloan plan.

Under this broad language a uniform power rate will be established for power from the project transmission network, and the irrigation water users will pay in accordance with their determined repayment ability, rather than in ratio to the cost of the specific unit of the project that serves them.

The method of equalization of the costs and repayments on a project that is so diversified and will require so many years in the construction as will the Missouri Basin project, is certain to raise questions of interpretation and application of the law that we can hardly anticipate so early in our experience.

Here is a field wherein all of us may labor. The loss for just an instant of sight of the ultimate objective of the Congress in passing the law—the full and comprehensive use of the water and related resources in strengthening the economy of the Missouri River Basin might bring the whole project down to the level of the plodding programs that we struggled with inadequately for 50 previous years. We must guard against smallbored and restrictive decisions.

The Missouri Basin project 5 years after its adoption is well underway. It gives great promise of fulfillment of the hopes and aspiration of its sponsors. It needs to continue to grow and develop. For example, since the total hydroelectric capacity of the project is inadequate to the basin's needs, could the lignite beds of the Dakotas and the gas fields of Kansas effectively be used through steam generation by the project to supplement the power of the river and complete the project's work? I think there is a good possibility of an affirmative answer to that question, and believe that serious consideration must be given to it in the immediate future.

Again, I am glad to be here with the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, which is carrying an increasing load in the guidance of the great project. I commend the work of the committee to its members and know that they will seek ways and means of fostering its progress.

The whole Nation has its eyes on the Missouri Basin program. I know all of those connected with it will continue to give a good account of themselves, and I hope the largest project that we have ever undertaken in these United States—the Missouri Basin project—will continue to prosper so that 10 years and 20 years after, it can be said again, "So far, so good."

Shadow of Coming Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shadow of Coming Events," appearing in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., on Tuesday, September 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHADOW OF COMING EVENTS

In two political speeches yesterday President Truman trotted out some old and valuable friends—the so-called "special interests." They are, of course, not friends in the ordinary meaning of the word but only in the sense that they provide Mr. Truman with a campaign issue he can use to get the votes of the unthinking. Without them to belabor and hold up to ridicule he would have little to talk about.

The President never identifies these special interests but we can safely assume that they are not the same kind of special interests that General Vaughan helped to put over shady transactions at the expense of the public. Unlike the Vaughan-Truman special interests they don't give away deep freezers or contribute to the Democratic campaign funds. They are just people who believe in decency in government and think enough of their country to want it to remain solvent.

Well, anyway, we know now what sort of campaign we will have in the 1950 congressional elections. The President set the tempo for it yesterday. His smear tactics worked well enough to get him elected in 1948 and obviously he is going to rely on them to obtain a House and Senate next year which will do his every bidding and even let him lead them down the road to the collective state. If this strategy works, it will be the Republicans' own fault. They have had early warning of what is ahead and should act now to meet it head-on. It's time to pick up a me-too policy or anything resembling it and deposit it neatly and permanently in the trash barrel.

The Dollar Shortage in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a penetrating article by Felix Morley dealing with the so-called dollar shortage in Great Britain, appearing in the current issue of Nation's Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE NATION

On May 12, shortly before the British financial crisis began to make the headlines, the United States council of the International Chamber of Commerce published a report on the future prospects of the Marshall plan.

Entitled "The Specter of 1953," this well-reasoned analysis foreshadowed the failure of the European Recovery program unless supplemented by much more cooperative and vigorous effort on the part of the beneficiary governments. To point its moral the report included some "fictitious headlines" which, it said, "exist today only in the nightmares of responsible American businessmen."

Some of these headlines, at the time imaginary, were: "Exchange controls, import restrictions extended," "United States exports to be excluded from European markets," "European standard of living declines," "Senators object to continued drain on American economy."

Only one major criticism is likely to occur to those who read this International Chamber of Commerce report 4 months after its publication. Its authors may properly be accused of understatement. The situation "which might be reported sometime in 1953" actually took shape in Britain almost before the report could be circulated there in 1949.

There is no mystery, but there is a great deal of confusion, as to just what has gone wrong in Britain. The English themselves call it a dollar shortage, which is an accurate description of the economic symptoms. But the real trouble is only reflected in the shortage of dollars available to the British treasury. It can be said with equal accuracy that Britain has priced its wares out of the American market.

This fact is reflected in the way the British crisis developed. As long as the postwar price level remained high in the United States, the British, with North American credits and Marshall plan aid, had a sufficiency of dollars. Indeed, as recently as last May, the Chancelor of the Exchequer figured that he could manage with less American assistance for the second year of the European recovery program. For its first year, ending June 30, the British share had been $1,239,000,000. For the current fiscal year $940,000,000 was allotted to Britain.

Then, before the end of July, London's estimate of British needs for this fiscal year was suddenly pushed up to $1,500,000,000.

These unreliable figures indicate the futility, and the even more dangerous deceptiveness, of governmental economic planning. Any business organization as far out in calculations of its essential needs as the British Socialist government has been would soon be liquidated by its own incompetence. But a political administration can only be dissolved by an electoral mandate from the voters. And if it can hold out sufficient bait to a sufficient number of voters, it may remain in power regardless of demonstrated incapacity.

The political stability of Prime Minister Attlee's majority in the House of Commons is not, however, enough. This support would soon evaporate if it were not maintained by subsidized food and clothing; by free medical care; by state-aided housing programs and cradle-to-grave allowances, pensions, and benefits of every conceivable kind. And these hand-outs, in the last analysis, can only be given to the British voters because of the heretofore inexhaustible generosity of the American taxpayer.

American, rather than British, voters are actually keeping the British Labor Government in office. For if American subsidies were withdrawn the average Briton would soon be forced to realize that his own Government is wholly unable to care for him out of its own resources. With that realization, the political appeal of British socialism would probably lose much of its glamor.

For several reasons Americans have been loath to give close analysis to this anomalous situation. It isn't merely sympathy for what England has recently endured. Our cultural, intellectual, and political ties with what was once the mother country are all deep-rooted and any British Government—Tory, Liberal, or Socialist—can be sure of widespread American sympathy. Twice in recent years we have gone to Britain's aid in time of war, and ratification of the North Atlantic Pact was made much easier by an underlying identity in Anglo-American political interests.

But it is equally obvious that this identity of interest does not extend to economic matters. Fundamentally, Americans believe in free enterprise. Regardless of the party in power, and regardless of presidential blandishments, it is difficult to lure our representative Congress into any open indorsement of obviously socialistic legislation. In this field the essential conservatism of the Eighty-first Congress has been as pronounced as was that of the Eightieth. And it is in Congress, during this past summer, that irritation over the seemingly bottomless sink of aid to Britain has been most forcibly expressed.

The British have contributed to this irritation. To solve the problem which they like to call the dollar shortage, Britain would have to cut its production costs so that more dollars can be earned by competitive entrance into the American and Canadian markets. There has been real effort to do this, and until the American consumer went on strike against high prices the British exports to this country were substantial. But as American demand slackened, and the price level began to fall, British producers did not cut their costs as our own have done.

Instead, the Labor Government announced a policy of reducing purchases from this country, successfully pressuring its colonies and dominions—except Canada—to follow suit. Certainly that is one way to conserve the dollars the British Treasury still has. But it is a negative policy.

To cut British production costs effectively would require measures of many kinds, but all of them similar to the extent that they would run counter to socialistic policy. For instance, the crushing burden of British taxation would have to be eased somewhat. This would run counter to costly experimentation in nationalizing industry. Furthermore, taxes cannot be lowered unless the swollen English bureaucracy is cut down; and unless charges on industry to provide so-called social insurance for British workers are eased.

The Labor government simply refuses to take these steps, and as long as the United States in effect foots a large part of the bill, Prime Minister Attlee can carry on. His parliamentary strength is not yet seriously weakened by his economic difficulties, since these are to a considerable extent carried on American shoulders.

During the past summer, however, it has become steadily more apparent that our representative Congress will not subsidize British socialism indefinitely. Though political cooperation with Britain has been strengthened through ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, economic antagonism has increased. There is now a very definite campaign to counter British quotas on American exports by raising our own tariff barriers.

The developing stalemate is potentially very dangerous. Anglo-American recriminations at this time are helpful only to the Kremlin, which is obviously delighted by every bit of evidence that the Marshall plan is in difficulties.

On the other hand, it is too much to expect that Americans will indefinitely subsidize a British economic policy regarded by most of us as thoroughly pernicious. The American people disapproved strongly of national socialism in Germany. They cannot be expected to support, in Britain, a system which in every economic particular appears to be patterned on that developed by Dr. Schacht.

If a solution is to be found, something must give way. It may be the stubbornly maintained principles of the British Socialists—or it may be the long-suffering patience of the American taxpayer. At present the strain is heavy on both.

FELIX MORLEY.

Minnesota's Rank in Production, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table under the heading "Minnesota's rank in production among the States, 1948," from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of August 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Minnesota's rank in production among the States, 1948

Item	Rank	Production
Butter	1	223,540,000 pounds.
Flax	1	19,102,000 bushels.
Oats	2	206,338,000 pounds.
Eggs	2	3,885,000,000 eggs.
Milk	2	7,987,000,000 pounds.
Turkeys	3	2,759,000 birds.
Rye	3	3,446,000 bushels.
American cheese	3	51,635,000 pounds.
All corn	4	272,000,000 bushels
All hay	4	5,145,000 tons.
Chickens	6	29,904,000 birds.
Soybeans, grain	6	15,614,000 bushels.
Potatoes	8	16,740,000 bushels.
Wheat, all	16	18,509,000 bushels.

Source: State-Federal crop and livestock reporting service, St. Paul.

The Coal Industry in Walker County, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, my home county of Walker has been recently classified by the Government as a critical area, because of the very high unemployment existing there. Our unemployment runs about 25 percent of the total available working people.

The economy of Walker County is, and has been for more than 60 years, based upon coal mining. Our production of coal has at times run to almost 5,500,000 tons annually.

But our coal industry in Walker County, and also the smaller coal industry in Marion, Winston, Cullman, and Blount counties, is now beset with many problems. Some reports recently issued have described our coal industry as a dying industry.

It is hard to believe that a section that has the plentiful coal deposits of the type contained in the soil of Walker County can be completely written off and no solution found for the problem that exists. Many citizens from all walks of life in Walker County are putting forth every effort to solve the existing problem.

Some of the problems which face the coal industry in Walker County are set forth in a speech made by A. W. Vogtle, vice president of the DeBardeleben Coal Corp., before the Rotary Club of Jasper, Ala., on June 28, 1949.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Vogtle's speech:

SALES PROSPECTS FOR WALKER COUNTY COAL

(By A. W. Vogtle, vice president, sales, DeBardeleben Coal Corp., Birmingham, Ala.)

The major resource of Walker County is its extensive coal measures, and coal mining has been highly important in the economy of this county for nearly three-quarters of a century.

The latest published report of the State department of industrial relations is that for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1947, and in that 12 months' period of good coal demand the Walker County coal production was:

	Tons
Railroad-connected mines (19 in number)	4,017,656
Truck mines (209 in number of which 99 produced less than 1,000 tons for the year)	1,406,778
Total	5,424,434

The foregoing tonnage was 30 percent of Alabama's total coal production and in terms of money at the Alabama average for wages and purchases of supplies and electric power, viz, $5.29 per ton, the tonnage represents $28,700,000—and largely in Walker County business channels.

The recent several years, 1942 through 1948, have been relatively prosperous ones in the ups and downs of our industry, but the period ahead is gloomy.

There has been a slump in business activity, except in a few lines, and, in addition, coal has been adversely affected by conditions peculiar to our industry, namely, continued railroad dieselization, greater availability of natural gas through new pipe-line construction, alleviation of fuel-oil shortage, the mild-

ness of last winter, the large inventories of coal in the hands of industry, and the loss of the temporary export markets.

In this period of growing uncertainty, your interest and, of course, the interest of our own company (because all our coal properties and our business destiny are in this county), is in the market outlets for Walker County coal.

And as a backdrop for this market discussion we first submit certain basic data:

Our average production for the State is less than 4 tons of coal per man per day, whereas competing fields average up to 8, 12, and more tons per man per day; and this is at the root of Alabama's loss of competitive position under the national wage policy since complete unionization of the coal fields of the country in the mid-1930's.

This national wage policy is that each wage increase for coal miners shall be uniform for the Nation. If, for example, the increase is $1 per man per day, then Alabama—with less than 4 tons per man-day average—has a cost increase in excess of 25 cents per ton. On the other hand, the field with 8 tons average is 12½ cents per ton, and the field with 12 tons average is 8⅓ cents per ton.

This has been repeated again and again with each wage contract over the past 15 years until today Alabama's coal markets are limited almost entirely to our own State, and coals from Kentucky and Tennessee can successfully compete with our own coal all over our own State.

We have realized that the prices for Alabama coals were getting more and more out of relationship with prices from competitive coal fields related to their lower costs. We have realized that these high prices have been an invitation to natural gas, fuel oil, butane gas, and the Diesel engine to make further inroads in the territory historically served by our mines. And, finally, we have known that, with the return of normal conditions, we would be at the mercy of out-of-State coals and other fuels selling at prices below our cost of production.

The reason for Alabama's low per man-day production and high cost as compared to coals from competing districts is no fault of the mine workers of Alabama and no fault of the mine operators. The mine workers compare favorably with any mine workers in the country; the mine operators have been diligent in improving their methods of mining, in mechanizing their mines to the extent possible in Alabama coal seams, and in the installation of equipment to better prepare their product. The trouble is basic. It is the character of our coal seams. Our coal of high quality comes from extremely thin seams, requiring the handling of much rock to get working height. The somewhat thicker seams often have poor roofs, slate partings, faults, and rolls. The thicker seams are generally the lower quality coals, usually with very thick partings, which require the rejection and disposal of a large part of the seam loaded by the miner. Practically all of the smaller sizes of coal require washing in order to obtain a marketable product. In fact, Alabama washes a far greater percentage of its product than any other field.

To repeat, our production costs have finally become so much higher than these other fields that Kentucky and Tennessee coals move freely into Alabama. In a comparison of our Empire coal with an equal quality East Kentucky coal, we are undersold today in Anniston and Gadsden on steam and egg coal, in Opelika, Montgomery, and Dotham on lump coal, even though the full freight-rate increases of the last 3 years have been added on the Kentucky coal but not on the Alabama coal to Alabama destinations, because of the legal maneuvering and delaying tactics of our Alabama Public Service Commission. But these increases of 50 cents to 70 cents per ton will be added before long to our Alabama freight rates, and then we will be at this additional handicap in delivered cost throughout Alabama, including the points just mentioned as examples.

The heretofore outlets for Alabama coal may be conveniently subdivided into:

	Percent
Byproduct	50
Railroad	23
Domestic (home heating)	8
Industrial and Tidewater	19
Total	100

But as to the most important sales classification, byproduct or coking coal, we remind you that as you come west through Jefferson County and enter Walker the character of the coal seams change. The volatile increases with all seams. And the ash increases and the heat decreases with many of the seams, especially the Mary Lee or Big Seam. And the coking quality practically disappears. In short, the coals of Walker County, other than Empire, Hull, Summit, and Colta, are barred from the important byproduct trade, limiting these coals to heating and steam-production outlets. Fortunately the coal hardens as we enter Walker County, which is an advantage in the retail dealer trade.

Consequently the sales for Walker County coal have been almost entirely with industries, principally railroads and power companies, and with retail dealers for home heating.

It will be illuminating to you, I think, to discuss the former substantial outlets for Walker County coal, the railroads, and power companies:

Southern Railway: The Alabama fuel takings of this road, principally from Walker County and including the production of their own mine at Parrish, are:

	Tons
1948	1,004,657
1949:	
First half	317,710
Second half (estimated)	120,000
Total	437,710

And some of you know that beginning July 1 there will be no commercial purchase of fuel coal at all by Southern Railway in Alabama, and that their own Parrish mine will operate only at 20,000 tons monthly, which is half capacity. This is due to the recent accelerated dieselization of this railroad; and I think it should be added in fairness that the president of the Southern Railway, Mr. Ernest Norris, estimates that without dieselization their road would have sufferred a $6,000,000 loss in 1948, instead of the $19,000,000 profit actually enjoyed.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway: The Alabama fuel takings of this road, which are almost exclusively from Walker County, are:

	Tons
1947	273,800
1948	123,800
1949:	
First half	24,000
Second half (estimate)	24,000
Total	48,000

This road likewise is rapidly completing its dieselization program.

Alabama Power Co.: The takings of the power company from Walker County, including their own mine at Gorgas, are:

	Tons
1948	1,200,000
1949:	
First half	435,000
Second half (estimate)	200,000
Total	635,000

Naturally, the coal requirements of the power company fluctuate with rainfall, availability of natural gas, and general business; but it is most gratifying and comforting to know, particularly in these tough times, that the Alabama Power Co. confines its purchase of coal to Alabama and is not influenced to out-of-State coals by lower-delivered costs at such plants as Gadsden and elsewhere. And we may count on a year-by-year increase in their coal requirements in step with the steady industrial expansion of Alabama.

Tennessee Valley Authority: The steam plant at Wilson Dam, Sheffield, is maintained as a stand-by facility and this fuel supply is purchased either in Alabama or southern Tennessee—and sometimes in west Kentucky. The transportation from southern Tennessee and west Kentucky is by river.

Georgia Power Co.: We include this large steam coal user as an example of our inability to compete beyond State lines. The total coal purchases of this utility are:

	Tons
1948	770,000
1949:	
First half	235,000
Second half (estimate)	100,000
	335,000

These purchases are about half from east Kentucky—east Tennessee and half from west Kentucky—the latter transportation being all the way through the State of Tennessee, and via northeast Alabama into Georgia, which is an extremely long haul as compared with Alabama. But west Kentucky has a cost sheet enabling it to undersell us.

I am sorry I cannot paint a bright picture or propose a happy solution but the simple truth is that our commercial coal industry, including Walker County, is in the throes of a painful readjustment. I can tell you in a general way what our own company has done and is planning:

Our management fully realized that the additional coal production created by war demand would eventually represent a surplus. We sought to face this situation realistically. We long ago withdrew from the diminishing railroad-fuel market, because the handwriting was on the wall. Our higher-cost operations, while serving a valuable purpose in wartime production, could not be economical under keen competition of the postwar period, and these operations have been abandoned and dismantled. At the same time, though, we sought a compensating increase in the tonnage of our lower-cost mechanized operations, some of which is maintained as stand-by tonnage to be quickly brought into production if there should be a seasonal or emergency need. Also, we completed progressive developments long in mind—but theretofore deferred by wartime and postwar shortages of equipment.

No. 1 is our new Empire processed household stoker coal, a product of long experimentation, which in 2 years has become so popular and so widely established as to now account for 25 percent of our total Empire production. And we go far beyond our normal-trade zone with this superior product, such as to Atlanta, Ga., Chattanooga and Nashville, Tenn., etc.

No. 2 is our new Coyle blended steam coal, also developed through experimentation and practical tests, which is a combination of Empire and Hull in such proportions as to give a moderate ash exactly balanced to protect stokers and grates from heat damage, a high heat to meet the peaks and overloads, a quick pick-up to permit close draft control, and nonclinkering to assure uniform firebed without raking for clinker removal from stokers and grates—and complete freedom from furnace wall slagging in pulverizer use.

We have recognized the facts of life by largely concentrating our sales in Alabama,

the market of maximum freight-rate protection.

A substantial tonnage of our Empire and Hull coals are coked in our byproduct plant at Holt (near Tuscaloosa), which we reach by low-cost river transportation, and we also barge coal to other trade on the river and gulf. Our river loading port at Coyle, between Empire and Sipsey, is equipped with modern large tonnage facilities.

This navigable Warrior River system, an asset of inestimable value to Walker County, is a lasting tribute to the constructive vision and perseverance of two generations of your noted Bankhead family, the late Senator John H. Bankhead, Sr., and the late Senator John H. Bankhead, Jr.

Also, we provide expert engineering service, which is especially valuable to the smaller plants, and we sell and install stokers, stoves, and coal-handling equipment for dealers and small industries, all to the end of promoting the sale of coal through better service to the coal user. And we are promoting the sale of the Alabama manufactured smokeless heater, soon to be in large-scale production, which is a revolutionary development for the elimination of smoke, and with reduction in fuel consumption by at least a third.

And finally I am sure you will be interested to know that our president, Mr. H. F. DeBardeleben, who makes his home at Sipsey, is also going forward with plans for the utilization of our extensive surface ownership in this county through planting of pine seedlings—by the way, the pine does extremely well in worked out stripping areas—and in developing pasture for beef cattle production, both of which should be of increasing value to Walker County through the years ahead.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARRETT L. WITHERS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address favoring extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] over Station WGN, Chicago, September 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate is now engaged in an extremely important debate. The debate concerns extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act another 3 years. This act has been on the statute books since 1934. Its purpose is, broadly speaking, to keep the channels of international trade as free of man-made obstacles as possible.

This debate is focusing the attention of the American people on one of the most critical problems of our day: What shall be the proper role of our country in the world's economy? What shall be our Nation's foreign economic policy?

Shall we go forward along the road toward freer international trade, the road we have followed since the start of the trade-agreements program 15 years ago, or shall we cast aside this flexible instrument for international economic bargaining and turn back to the age of rigid, skyscraping tariff walls and harsh economic warfare among nations?

Our country is the world's outstanding example—perhaps the only example today—of a democratic and capitalist society. Where others have sought solutions of their economic and social problems in ever-greater government control and regimentation of their economic life, we in America have sought to uphold the ideal of competitive, privately owned and privately operated enterprises. Our standard of living has risen far above that of any other land; our wage earners are paid higher than those in any part of the world; the productivity of our land and of our factories is unsurpassed, and our economy gives employment to greater numbers of people than ever before in its history. These are some of the many tangible proofs that our free, competitive ideal works out in practice.

Within the borders of our country, we have found that any barrier to the free exchange of goods and services is a barrier to the economic progress of our people. We seek continually to tear down the obstructions that prevent the most efficient distribution of the fruits of industry to the greatest possible number of our people. We oppose these barriers and these obstructions whether they are created by private combinations in restraint of trade or whether they result from misguided Government policies restricting the movement of money, manpower, and goods throughout our land.

In all this, our idealism and our practical interest coincide.

The lesson we are gradually learning is this: We cannot throw a dam across the stream of trade in our home economy without either forcing the stream to back up into pools of business stagnation or else having it burst out in a disastrous flood of inflation and subsequent ruin for everybody. This is a lesson which we shall have to apply to our dealings with other countries in the world economy.

The question raised by the debate on the reciprocal trade agreements, then, is this: In our international economic relations, will we have the intelligence and forethought to put into practice the principles which have made us so successful at home? Or, turning backward, will we repeat the mistakes of the past by promoting economic nationalism throughout the world?

It is a curious fact, worth thinking about, that many who talk loudest against Government intervention and controls over domestic business are at the same time the strongest advocates of Government intervention and controls at our ocean shore line. Yet, logically, those who want freedom of enterprise should be the first to demand that Government intervention and controls be ended where they first began: at the water's edge, where the tariff walls were built.

When in the last century the Federal Government put tariffs on the importation of foreign products, it was interfering with the free exchange of goods. It was setting up political control over a part of our economy.

Erecting high tariff walls around this country led other countries quickly to follow suit. The result has been a world cut up and segmented like a honeycomb.

The trade agreements of recent years have attempted to undo the damage done by the high tariff schedules of the past. A recent study made by the United States Tariff Commission shows that, while tariffs went to their highest point in the period just after the Smoot-Hawley Act, today they are down again to an over-all level almost equal that of 1919, 30 years ago. Yet, no one can pretend that our economy has suffered from these tariff reductions. On the contrary, we enjoy the highest employment in our history, the greatest production and consumption in our history, the highest wage level ever attained by any country.

If, at this point in history, America should revert to the old policy of almost insurmountable tariff barriers, we would certainly wreck forever any hope of a world-wide free society. We would again be damming up the stream of trade instead of progressively clearing the channel.

If we in America really mean what we say, when we declare that we want a free society based on competitive enterprise, then we have to meet competition from wherever it comes—meet it, not abolish it or try to protect ourselves from it by artificial barriers. In fact, one of the surest ways to reduce the Government controls over private trade and commerce that plague our planet would be to remove every possible barrier to international trade everywhere in the world.

I shall vote to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I shall oppose any crippling amendment to it. I shall do so with the conviction that it is the best instrument so far discovered to eliminate obstructions from world trade and to expand the area of free society.

Prestige of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Grand Forks Herald, Grand Forks, N. Dak., under date of September 1, 1949.

This excellent editorial by Mr. M. M. Oppegard is not only well written and to the point, but I believe it represents the thinking of the vast majority of the people in the Midwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESTIGE OF PRESIDENT'S OFFICE USED IMPROPERLY

During the past 16 or 17 years we have become accustomed to an open peddling of White House prestige for personal profit or some other gain.

The whole Roosevelt family, from the late President down through the wife and sons, used the prestige of the White House to make questionable loans or sell their services.

It was a disgusting performance that brought comparatively little public criticism, for the Nation had become so accustomed to holding out its own hand for Washington favors that it seemed reasonable to expect the occupants of the White House to cash in wherever they could.

It cheapened the prestige of the high office of President beyond any stage in recent history, and it was hardly to the credit of the country as a whole that it showed such little resentment.

Now we find the administration of President Truman continuing the practice, although there is no evidence that the President himself has had a direct hand in any petty grafting.

His military aide, however, Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, has admitted practices that smell to the high heaven, and Mr. Truman has shown a disposition to condone Vaughan's petty grafting, which is hardly to his credit.

The President has the peculiar philosophy that keeps him loyal to his friends, even if they land in the penitentiary for grievous misdeeds, such as was the case when the po-

litical crook, Tom Pendergast, was sent to prison.

Now the President pats Vaughan on the back, even though he is fully aware that his military aide has been peddling White House favors in a manner that should bring rebuke from any man with a smattering of respect for the high office.

While housing was a problem that caused great suffering among all citizens newly in need of a home, including thousands of veterans, Vaughan used the White House influence to get critical building materials for a California race track.

He has admitted to a Senate committee that he got $2,000 or $3,000 from the race track owner as campaign money, and another $2,000 from John Maragon, one-time employee of a Chicago perfume company, for helping him get abroad. Peanut money for a peanut mind, it would seem.

It is conceivable that Vaughan did not profit directly from this graft, but presumably it helped him keep his job in the White House.

Vaughan was a petty politician back in Missouri, attached to Truman's political strings, and had his political training in the same sort of sordid alley politics that produced his mentor.

If a political party or anyone else may properly sell the prestige of the White House to the highest bidder, why not put the Presidency itself on the same sort of auction block?

It is unthinkable, of course, that such a thing should be possible. Apparently there is nothing criminal in what Vaughan has done, even if it is the sort of thing that reflects on the intelligence and honestry of any citizen.

Politics, however, which never is completely honest, probably invites that sort of thing and may even give it an appearance of glamor to the man who has high political influence for sale. To us, it stinks.

The Economic Future of Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the most challenging and complicated problems with which our Nation has to grapple in the immediate future has to do with the economic future of Great Britain. While there are divergent views as to the prime causes for the financial difficulties of this onetime world financial leader, the stark fact remains that, if British finances were to fall into chaos, America's economy would be seriously and most adversely affected.

In such a situation anything that would help the leaders of our country, and the Members of the Senate, to a more thorough understanding of the many factors involved is to be desired. In this classification I would place the article in the Washington Post of September 13 by Walter Lippmann entitled "On Liquidating the British Crisis."

In the belief that this article would contribute to a more realistic understanding of the situation facing Great Britain, and confronting the people of America with regard to that nation, and in the hope that, on the basis of the considerations so well outlined, it may be possible to develop some program of cooperation, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ON LIQUIDATING THE BRITISH CRISIS

In the maze of tangled problems, which we are calling the British crisis, there is a main thread which we can pick up and follow. It is the story of the British war debts, known when they were incurred here as lend-lease and when incurred in the commonwealth and empire as the sterling balances. We do not, I think, oversimplify the problem, in the sense of misleading ourselves, if we take what happened to these war debts as main clue to the crisis and to what may be expected in the near future.

We may begin by fixing it in our minds that in her enormous and heroic performance in the war Britain not only sacrificed a very large part of all her accumulated foreign assets but also went deeply into foreign debt. American lend-lease was about $30,000,000,000; the war debts to the empire and commonwealth and some other related countries were—if we count the pound sterling at $4—over $14,000,000,000 more.

We had realized here, even before the war was over, that with her losses and her debts Britain alone and unaided could not achieve a tolerable standard of life and maintain her position as a great power in the world. American aid began with the British loan which was negotiated in Washington in 1945. In that loan agreement there were three main points. We canceled $30,000,000,000 of lend-lease war debt. We loaned Britain nearly $4,000,000,000 of new money. And we obtained an understanding that Britain would also negotiate a war debt settlement with her creditors in the commonwealth and empire.

We took the view that Britain could not recover even with American aid, if she had to repay all these war debts. In the 1945 loan agreement it was understood that a large part of the war debts (or sterling balances) were to be canceled, that another part was to be funded over a long term, and that only a small part—at the rate of about $170,000,000 a year—was to be paid back immediately.

This understanding has not been carried out. Before we look at the reasons why the British Government did not carry out the understanding about the Empire war debts, it will be useful to take a measure of the burden they have been and still are. In the 12 months which ended last June the British Government released from the blocked sterling balances—that is to say, repaid war debt—to India, Pakistan, Egypt, Iraq, and Ceylon to the tune of about 210,000,000 pounds. If the pound is figured at $4, this was a burden of about $800,000,000 a year. In other words, the British have been paying out of their current earnings and dwindling reserves this large sum to the countries of the Middle East and of southern Asia. They have, also, it should be added, been supplying to Europe another $300,000,000 of goods for which they do not receive goods in return.

The present crisis, which has brought Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Bevin to Washington, turns on the fact that the British people cannot, even with Marshall aid, earn their own living, maintain their own social services, keep up a big military establishment, and give away to Asia and to Europe what they are now giving away.

When we ask why the British Government did not carry out the 1945 understanding about the Empire war debts, we come upon the really difficult issues of this crisis. There were two main reasons. The one was that if Britain had not financed the needs of India, Pakistan, and Egypt, they would have been in great trouble. They had to be helped somehow. But there was another reason. When the British Government helped these countries by letting them spend from their sterling balances, it created a protected market which was very profitable for British industry and maintained full employment for British labor.

Thus the enlightened political interest in supporting the countries of southern Asia has been fused with British private vested interests, which in regard to British international solvency are not enlightened. As one Englishman put it to me recently: When the question has arisen of releasing sterling balances the Treasury, thinking of the solvency of Britain, said "No"; the board of trade, thinking of trade and employment, said "Yes," reluctantly, and the foreign office, thinking of the British and the world political interest, said "Yes" emphatically.

This diagnosis indicates what will be, in fact, however, presently disguised and withheld, the main lines along which the British crisis will be liquidated. The British Government will be compelled to reduce to the vanishing point its contributions in the former Asiatic empire. The United States by one means or another will have to take over the responsibilities for their financial needs—particularly those of India, which is the largest of the British creditors. When and as this happens, the British protected market in that part of the world will be opened to American and world competition, and this will compel a deep readjustment, probably accompanied for a time by some unemployment in the British Isles.

But Britain will be relieved of a burden she cannot carry, and she will be deprived of a protection which renders her industry uncompetitive. Then with American aid continued for some years beyond 1952, she may be in a position where her currency at a new rate of exchange can be supported by the United States and made convertible for current trade.

Here, it seems to me, in the barest and crudest form are the bones of the problem. They will demand many complicated measures over long periods of time. But the great essentials might as well be put in focus:

That the United States will have to assume a financial responsibility in southern Asia, particularly in India, which unavoidably has immense political consequences;

That Britain will be liquidating many of the remaining ties which have survived the political disestablishment of the Asiatic empire;

And that in Britain this historic change will compel a momentous readjustment of the British industrial economy.

This is indeed a very big crisis. We must not imagine that it is not a very big crisis just because for the time being the talks in Washington have been so tentative and so quiet.

The Decatur Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered a few days ago before the United Nations Scientific Conference on Conservation and Utilization of Resources, by Mr. Barrett Shelton, editor and publisher of the Decatur Daily, of Decatur, Ala. The speech is entitled "The Decatur Story."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECATUR STORY

(By Barrett Shelton, editor and publisher, the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala.)

Ladies and gentlemen of the United Nations Conference, I am privileged to tell you the story of Decatur, Ala., a town that has come from "nothin' to somethin'" in 15 years of a working partnership between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the people of my town.

It has happened to us, it can happen to you, if you have the courage, the intelligent determination and make the most of your opportunities. For TVA is not a magic wand. TVA would be helpless to activate community progress without the brains and the energies of a free people.

In the beginning I opposed TVA. I didn't know what it intended. I knew I wanted no Government control of my life, nor over the lives of my people.

Throughout much of our lives the progressive citizens of Decatur had tried to better conditions. And it appeared that no matter in what direction they turned, the result was far from producing lasting good.

Then 1933. Economic depression settled down on the United States, more pronounced if possible in the Tennessee Valley and in Decatur.

The one major industry we had, which had kept 2,000 men at work, closed. This railroad shop gave way to the truck and the bus and economic conditions. Decatur lost this industry completely. Another industry which in earlier years we had brought from New England with considerable subsidy in money, went bankrupt. A third industry, manufacturer of full-fashioned hosiery, went to the wall from poor management and bad times. Seven of eight banks in our county closed.

Our farm situation. We had only one crop in the Decatur area—cotton—and cotton was 5 cents a pound. Lands were selling for taxes, the people were ill-housed, ill-clothed, and out of hope.

So you can see that we were not interested in saving a dollar or so on our power bill. That would solve little or nothing. We needed jobs and opportunities for our people.

Into this dismal, perplexed economic setting one late midwinter afternoon came David Lilienthal, then a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Four of our citizens who had long been hopeful of improving conditions generally met him in conference. We were almost frankly hostile, for he represented to us another way of thought and another way of life. And our conversation might be summarized in this fashion, "All right, you're here, you were not invited, but you're here. You are in command, now what are you going to do?"

Dave leaned his chair back against the wall and the twinkle of a smile came into his eyes, as he said gently and firmly, "I'm not going to do anything. You're going to do it."

He went on to tell us something we never knew before. He went on to say that TVA would provide the tools of opportunity—flood control, malaria control, navigation on the river, low-cost power, test-demonstration farming to show how our soils could be returned to fertility, a fertility lost through land erosion, another wayward child of a one-crop system. He told us the river would no longer defeat man, but would become the servant of man. "What you do with these tools," he said, "is up to you."

Dave Lilienthal had passed the task right back to us, right back to local control. He let us know that simple economics could be applied in the Tennessee Valley and that the faith, determination, and sweat of the people would bring about the result we had eagerly sought for so many years.

Later, Dr. Harcourt Morgan, another member of the TVA Board of Directors, came to us and talked to us about lime and phosphate and legumes, and the relationship of people and land. He did not speak of great industry. Rather did he speak of the need for farm markets and farm-processing plants and of increasing the value of our farm products through manufacturing processes. He opposed the tearing down of other sections of the United States by seeking their industry with subsidy, the promise of cheap electricity and poorly paid labor. He told our people the simple story of making the most of what we had, of developing our own natural resources, of putting to work the little capital that we owned, of growing our own industry based upon the resources of the land.

What was this? Dave Lilienthal and Dr. Harcourt Morgan had promised us nothing beyond the tools which were to come from the waters of the Tennessee River and the land-building and health-building practices which were included in TVA at the direction of a wise Congress when this independent corporation of the Government was created in the Nation's darkest economic hour.

We decided then and there that the economic system we had followed had to be improved upon, and to improve it we had to pioneer an entirely new plan of economics.

Our townspeople needed jobs, our farm people needed month-by-month pay rolls, rather than a once-a-year income secured from the harvesting of one crop.

The old order, the old way of doing things had to change, or our people could never have the opportunities to which their efforts entitled them.

First, we had to adopt this new thought given to us by the two members of the TVA board. We had to quit thinking of reaching into other sections of the United States and subsidizing industry to come into our section. Second, we had to begin in a small way to build toward a diversified agriculture and a diversified industry. We could never again, if our people were to survive, allow ourselves to be dependent upon a one-industry and a one-crop system.

Our first step was to form our own chamber of commerce, formed at a time when most people didn't believe it could be done. There was very little money. So, with considerable struggle, we got together some cash and more pledges amounting to $3,000 for the budget the first year. A man who had lost all he had in the crash of one of the industries we had brought to Decatur with subsidy, became the first secretary at a salary of $100 a month.

We then decided we were going to develop a cash market every day in the year for every farm product grown in the Decatur area. We were going to welcome industry, but not wait for it. We were going to develop our own farm processing plants.

We decided a packing plant would be the first venture and persuaded the local ice company to put in packing plant facilities when there wasn't as much as one wagonload of hogs in our whole county. We are now producing our own livestock to meet the demands of this market.

We then turned to milk, formed a little corporation with paid-in capital of $15,000, telling every stockholder to forget his investment, that he would never receive any return from his money anyway. What we were trying to do was establish a pay roll every 2 weeks for the farm families of our section. The first day that plant went into operation there was a total supply of 1,800 pounds of milk. Today the production of milk pouring into this one plant peaks at 60,000 pounds and we have just started in this agricultural industry. What happened to the stockholders? Well, they never failed to receive 6 percent annually on their money and about 2 months ago that little plant paid stockholders a 100-percent dividend.

Along about that time we got some help from the outside. Navigation on the Tennessee River made it possible. Here you see is an exciting example of what can happen when a liability is changed into an asset. The Tennessee wasn't navigable before the creation of TVA, there was no opportunity for a successful flour mill operation. Low-cost power didn't attract Nebraska Consolidated Mills Co. to establish the Alabama Flour Mills at Decatur. Navigable water did it, plus the possibilities that flour could be produced at a cheaper cost per barrel owing to savings on freight. The impact of this industry on our section was tremendous. Farmers could grow grains because there was now a daily cash market. They could produce corn and wheat and all the grains with assurance that they would sell their production. They could get cash for products for which previously there had been no market.

Tennessee Valley Fertilizer Cooperative, a fertilizer mixing plant serving 10 counties, was established by the people. Later, when we saw the possibility of selling seed commercially, this same organization put up a modern and efficient seed-cleaning plant.

An alfalfa-drying plant has been built, another way of keeping our pledge that markets would be established every day in the year for every product grown in the Decatur area.

These are specific illustrations of the forward-looking change which has taken place in the minds of our people. These industries, land-builders and man-builders, could never have been pictured in the minds of a defeated people, of a people who in the year before TVA saw an uncontrolled river flood and wash away the best soil, erode the back lands, wash crops, houses, and barns down an angry stream.

You can see by now that the opportunities which were at hand in the development of the river and the region were being seized upon by our people with renewed courage and confidence. We now knew that we couldn't be licked again, that what had been preached to us by TVA was the economic truth.

A resident of a nearby town came into Decatur with an idea that he could build a market for poultry. We agreed with him and encouraged him to go forward. Today that market, though no more than 3 years old, in our area is doing a $3,000,000 business.

Today there is a market for cotton, corn, wheat, livestock, milk, timber, small grains, truck crops. Fifteen years ago we were dozing in the sunshine waiting for that once-a-year pay roll brought by cotton and wearing out our second finest resource, the land. Today the cash income from all farm products in the area surrounding Decatur is $43,000,000. Land building did it. Flood control did it. Navigation did it. Malaria control did it. TVA, with the other State and Federal agricultural and health agencies, their teachings activated by an intelligent and determined people, did it.

Let's stop here for an illustration of the value of malaria control. Did you ever have malaria? I have; the majority of my people have. Do you know what you want to do when you have malaria? Nothing. You want to prop your feet on your desk, or if you are not an office man, perhaps you'll take a day or two off from your job in industry or take out of the fields, just to get a rest. Malaria is restful—and nonproductive. Soon after

the creation of TVA a nationally known manufacturer of full-fashioned hosiery bought a bankrupt hosiery plant in our community. The new company introduced physical examinations for all employees and found that 35 percent of all employees had malaria. Ten years later, after the TVA malaria-control program had been in action, the figure had dropped below 1 percent. Today, because malaria is completely controlled, this hosiery firm does not even require the malaria test in physical examination. And what happened to the people in that plant? Why they outproduce the employees of three other plants of this same company. That's what defeating malaria has meant just in this one illustration of how government can be helpful to people by making it possible for them to help themselves.

Industrywise, our people have not been sleeping. Here again the pledge has been kept to never again be dependent upon any one major industry, or to seek after big industry alone. By the year 1940, there were 61 firms manufacturing a product in Decatur, Ala., employing 2,834 people with an annual pay roll of $3,159,000. By 1944 the number of industries was 68, employing 6,908 people with an annual pay roll of $12,927,000. In 1948 the number of firms making a product had reached 87 and employment, off from the war peak, was 5,204, but the annual pay roll was $12,605,000, just a quarter of a million short of the pay roll total during the war. You see, through the years we have been putting together the industrial picture in sound fashion. We had sought after diversity of industry rather than bigness.

Keeping soundness ahead of bigness in industry, you will be interested in a partial list of products now processed or manufactured in Decatur. These include: flour, brick, tile, meats, furniture, boxes, baskets, structural and ornamental iron products, tanks, skids, septic and grease traps, poultry processing, felt hats, crude cottonseed and oil, steel ships and barges, dairy products, aluminum fabricating, steel nuts and screws, concrete pipe, copper tubing fabrication, cotton and rayon tire fabric. Once, a short time ago, we were dependent on one industry.

Down through the years we have never hesitated to use the technical opportunities within TVA. In our considerations of types of industry needed in our community, we have gone to TVA repeatedly to ask that the facts concerning such projected industry be assembled. I have said before and I say now that TVA has the most capable personnel with which I have ever come in contact, either in private or public service. No matter what department we sought out for advice on industrial or agricultural matters, we have always received willing and dependable factual assistance. The people in TVA have worked weeks and months on some of our requests, and never once has there been any directive issued to us. They have always told us, "now here are the facts, the decision on what you do with them is up to you." The decision was our own, this Government corporation believes and practices community development at the local level.

Just a moment on the electric picture. Have the benefits of electricity been made widespread? In 1939 there were 3,800 customers in Decatur; in 1949 there are 6,933; in 1938 they burned 12,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, now they burn 120,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually; in 1938 the average sales price to the residential customer was 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. Today it is just above 1 cent—and our electric department made $182,000 net for the year closing June 30,1949. You ask if the electric department pays any taxes. Well, the private company paid $7,500 annually in 1938. The municipal operations pays to the city of Decatur $28,000. Yet we have the second lowest residential rate in the United States.

What has happened in these 15 years in the spirit of our people? Are we confident without being overconfident? Do we look toward the future with assurance?

Let me give you three illustrations. Recently a copper-processing plant decided to build a branch plant in the South. Two hundred and seventy-four communities in 11 States were contacted. Do you know where that plant was located—an investment of $12,000,000? In Decatur, Ala. Do you know what the difference was between that valued plant locating with us or elsewhere? The difference was in the spirit of the people; our confidence, our friendliness, and our genuine interest in working with them on their problem was the difference.

Or let's look at this figure to prove what's happening in Decatur, Ala., in this partnership between the people and an independent corporation of the Government. In 1933 there were 7,000 property owners listed on the tax books of our country; today there are 11,000. The assessed valuation has grown from $15,000,000 to $22,000,000. The population of our town has grown from 12,000 to 24,000, and yet the most significant change has been in the thinking of our people. We have come from the status of a wellnigh beaten citizenship, merely existing, to a hopeful, exuberant, smilingly confident people, secure in the belief that given the opportunities afforded through making the forces of nature the servant of man, and with intelligent determination and sound application of the principles of economics, that we could rise to heights of good citizenship, limited only by our own imposed limitations.

Decatur today is a community of 35 churches, all instruments of a kindly Father above, who guides and directs our every step, a young city whose people recently taxed themselves to build a new $1,500,000 high school for our boys and girls, where the hand of the future has already shown us the necessity for doubling the capacity of our water system at a cost of $1,100,000, where our electric department is just completing a $400,000 expansion program to be ready for the future, where our people are constantly at work on new plans to perfect a soundly begun economic system so that our people might have opportunities to earn better things of life.

I would like to close with this summary. Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, who came to the Tennessee Valley to see for himself what had been accomplished since the creation of TVA, returned to tell Congress that TVA was the greatest boon to private enterprise he ever saw. Or in the words of Dr. Sen, a visitor in Decatur from the Embassy of India, who viewed TVA as an improvement in an ever-improving democracy, or in my own way of answering visitors who come into our section of the valley and ask, "Wouldn't this all have happened without a TVA?" And my answer to one and all is, "It didn't."

For Arab-Israeli Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 13 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Friday, September 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ARAB-ISRAELI STABILITY

In sponsoring the creation of a special group to survey the economic problems of the Middle East, the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission has taken a potentially important step toward working out a lasting Arab-Jewish peace settlement in the Holy Land. The project seems the more promising because it will be headed by Gordon R. Clapp, the able and energetic Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As head of the survey group, Mr. Clapp, who will be on a relatively brief leave from the TVA, will have the responsibility of directing an over-all study of the economic potentials of Palestine and the neighboring Arab countries. On the basis of the study, he will then supervise the drafting of a report to the United Nations, with recommendations for a program of action designed to encourage the whole region—regardless of political differences—to cooperate as a unit in an effort to bring about a joint increase in living standards and lay the foundations for mutual, long-term prosperity.

Few areas of the world are as much in need of such an undertaking. A study just completed by one of the State Department's Near East experts shows, for example, that one out of five children in the Arab states dies before its first birthday, that a third are gone before the age of 10, and that the average life expectancy is only 35 years, as against our American average of 66.8. In addition, the ordinary individual there can look forward to earning an annual income of no more than $41. These and similar factors, coupled with the additional strains and stresses caused by the recent Palestine war, clearly call for far-reaching corrective action.

Such action, however, cannot be had unless the Israeli and Arab governments put aside bitterness and work together in the only way that can insure either side a peaceful and reasonably prosperous future. As President Truman has put it, unrest and the threat of recurrent war in this strategically vital region can be eliminated only through "the initiative and cooperation" of the states located there; not unless they themselves act wisely and affirmatively together can real progress be made "toward the solution of their own grave problems."

The Clapp survey, of course, can do much to encourage that kind of progress. It can prepare the ground for a systematic effort to improve the utilization of the Near East's actual and potential resources. It can set up such objectives, for instance, as the development of hydroelectric power—along TVA lines—to improve agricultural output and promote industry. With objectives of that sort before them, and with American technical assistance under the President's evolving point-four program, the peoples in that part of the world could begin to make real headway toward a far brighter existence than they lead now.

But this promise is dependent fundamentally on action by the Israelis and the Arabs to subordinate their deep political animosities to a constructive cooperative undertaking for their mutual material enrichment. If they do that, then they will be able to make good economic progress in common, and that progress in turn will tend to persuade them to live together as friends in an enduring peace. In its potentials, therefore, the projected Clapp survey is significant. If it leads to an effective program, the crucial Middle East will have a chance to stabilize itself in a way that will benefit the whole world.

There Must Not Be a Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, under unanimous consent, the text of a statement which I have released to the press and with it the text of an article soon to be published in the September-October issue, No. 31, of the magazine, Prevent World War III, which is the official organ of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

This article opens up to view the terrifying vision of a military alliance between a renascent supernationalist Germany and Russia, leading to ultimate world empire by a ruthless authoritarianism having the worst features of nazism, fascism, and communism, unmitigated by any humanitarian feeling.

America must be on the alert against this danger.

Americans must realize that in our government of democratic processes, of recognition of the dignity of the individual, our safety lies in making democracy work in the tradition of Jefferson and Jackson, of Lincoln, and Wilson, and Roosevelt.

More and more democracy, as embodied in the legislative program of President Truman, is the American answer to the cowardly and materialistic philosophy of Hitler and his successors. In a truly democratic world, in a world of freedom, there will be no fear and the threat of un-American isms will have no soil in which to take root and flourish.

The matter referred to follows:

GERMANY LOOKS TO THE EAST

AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE YOUNG SOCIALIST FORCES AGAINST THE OLD ROTTEN ENTRENCHED POWERS OF THE WEST

There is a definite trend among Germany's policymakers these days indicating more or less openly that they believe the future of the Reich can be secured only by close cooperation and alliance with the Soviet Union. In the pages of Prevent World War III, we have frequently pointed to the growing pro-eastern orientation of leading German diplomats, political leaders, military men, intellectuals, and industrialists. In our previous issue, we explained in detail the trend toward a new Rapallo, a repeat performance of the Russo-German Pact signed at Rapallo in 1922.

The political and ideological concept that Germany must ally with the East against the West is a very old and deeply rooted tradition of German foreign policy. It played a great role in Frederick the Great's diplomatic schemes 200 years ago; it dominated the Iron Chancellor Bismarck's policy during the second part of the last century, and it again became a leitmotif of the Pan-German policymakers of the Weimar Republic.

Main supporter of the idea of an eastern orientation for Germany at that time was Reichswehr Minister General Hans von Seeckt, who laid the groundwork in building up the modern German Army. Seeckt sent to Soviet Russia a great number of German officers who could not find places in the Reichswehr, not only to be trained on Russian soil but also to train the Soviet army. Von Seeckt's helpers were Count Brockdorff-Rantzau, the first Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic, who later became German Ambassador to Moscow; Count von Maltzahn, a very influential diplomat, and the geopolitician, Gen. Karl Haushofer.

The idea of approaching Soviet Russia came up immediately after Germany's defeat in the First World War, and significantly it originated in the minds of the Prussian militarists. We know today what happened in the first years of the Weimar Republic. We know that Soviet Russia greatly helped the rearmament of vanquished Germany after 1918. At the Nuremberg trials it became known, for instance, that the famous T-34 tank which enabled the Russians to make their break-through at Stalingrad was developed from a model which previously had been built by the Germans in one of Krupp's factories in Soviet Russia in the early twenties.

From captured German documents, we are today able to throw the spotlight on some hitherto unknown facts dealing with the close cooperation between German generals of the Weimar Republic and Soviet Russia. Back in 1921, even before the Rapallo Pact, a secret agreement for the production of armaments was concluded between the Weimar Republic and Soviet Russia. Ten years later, in 1931, General von Blomberg, then Chief of T-4, the blueprint department of the staff of the head of the German Army (the secret general staff) met with a group of German General Staff officers to celebrate the tenth anniversary of Russo-German cooperation. The honorary guest was Soviet Marshal Tuchatchewsky, who was later executed. Toasting the Russian Marshal, General von Blomberg said: "We Germans will never forget what the Soviet Army has accomplished for Germany during the past 10 years. I hope that in spite of all presently existing difficulties our thanks will be expressed in deed. I drink a toast to the well-being and the future of the great and glorious Soviet Army and of loyal comradeship in arms of today and in the future."

As is well known, the Versailles Treaty had prohibited the Reichswehr from having any Panzer or air forces. It was the Soviet Union which helped the Reichswehr. German officers were accepted in the Panzer school of Kazan in Russia and there they received the training and experience they later used as generals of Hitler.

Together with the secret General Staff in Berlin, German big industrialists worked for the same goal. For instance, the airplane manufacturer, Junkers, was permitted to build a factory for fighter planes at Charkow.

This eastern orientation of Germany was confirmed on April 24, 1926, when the Russo-German Treaty was signed at Berlin. This treaty was a direct predecessor of the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 23, 1939.

Writing in the Washington Post, Lt. Col. William R. Kintner, instructor at the General Staff School of Fort Leavenworth in Kansas, one of the leading American experts on this matter, recently stated:

"Germany used Russia as a full-scale training ground and as a factory to build military weapons forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles. Russia used Wehrmacht personnel as instructors for its enthusiastic but untrained officers of the Red army."

Seen against this background, insiders were not surprised that the Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939 was greeted with the greatest enthusiasm in Prussian officers' circles. These were the very same German officers who later in 1941 decidedly were opposed to Hitler's attack against Soviet Russia.

The goal of these Prussian military circles was—and probably still is—the destruction of the western powers, above all of Britain and the United States. This was the road they had prescribed to Hitler. The fact that Hitler failed, convinced these Prussian militarists even more of the correctness of their original concept.

No wonder, therefore, that German militarists, diplomats, and geopoliticians of today follow closely the red line of their old masters. To show the duplicity of German militarists it might be very timely to quote excerpts from two highly important and practically unknown German documents.

The first document is a secret memorandum written in longhand and initialed by Gen. Hans von Seeckt. It is dated September 11, 1922, and addressed to the then Reich Chancellor, Dr. Joseph Wirth, leader of the Catholic Center Party. The memorandum bears the title "Germany's Position on the Russian Problem" and its main argument runs as follows:

"With Poland we arrived at the core of the eastern problem. Poland's existence is intolerable, incompatible with Germany's conditions essential to life. It must disappear by its own internal weakness and by Russia—with our help; no Russia ever puts up with Poland. With Poland falls one of the strongest pillars of the peace of Versailles, the hegemony of France. To attain this goal must be one of the firmest points of direction of German policy because it is an attainable one. Attainable only through Russia or with her help.

"The restoration of the old frontier between Russia and Germany is the prerequisite of any reciprocal recuperation. Russia and Germany in the frontiers of 1914 should be the basis of a mutual understanding.

"What do we want from, in, and with Russia? What does the dreaded east-orientation consist of? We pursue a twofold purpose. First, Russia's economic and political strengthening. By that we shall achieve our own strengthening, because we shall strengthen a future possible ally. Furthermore, we want to achieve—for the time being in a cautious and trying way—our own immediate strengthening by developing a Russian armament industry which will serve our own purpose in case of need.

"This armament industry will naturally further the first purpose in a direct way. It has to be done by private German firms which have to follow our orders. The extent of this armament industry depends on the development of the whole Russian situation and on the willingness and efficiency of the German private industry. Russian wishes for further support in the military-technical field can materially and personally be met as far as it appears feasible and advantageous. To that end mutual military representations are desirable."

Let us remember that the foreign policy of the Weimar Republic was strictly carried out according to this blueprint, dated September 11, 1922.

The second document was written in April 1945, a few weeks before Germany's surrender. This amazing document bears the initials of the Chief of the High Command of Hitler's Wehrmacht, Field Marshal Keitel, and of Grand Admiral Doenitz, who after the collapse became the immediate successors of Hitler. This document, entitled "The Overcoming of the Catastrophe," stresses the point that Germany's final comeback can be made only in close cooperation with the Soviet Union. Here are some excerpts from it:

"While practically nothing can be offered to the Western Powers and while therefore discussions are not possible, a vital necessary development can be pointed out to the Soviet Union.

"A German defeat by the Western Powers means for the Soviet Union only the prolongation of the war through a third world war.

"The partition of Germany will be considered in the Soviet Union, too, only as tem-

porary and as unbearable. While Yalta gives Russia only a limited and even more and more contested influence in eastern and southern Europe, the influence of the Soviet Union in all of Europe can be made only possible through cooperation with Germany.

"A separate peace with Germany and Japan would mean relief of Russia in the East and an elimination of Anglo-American influence in China.

"While Anglo-American deliveries to Russia probably will be stopped despite the granted credits at the end of the war, there will be considerable opportunities for a length of time for the Soviet Union through economic cooperation with Europe and eastern Asia.

"While, to remain in the coalition of the enemy would mean for the Soviet Union continuous friction with Great Britain and America in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Near East—a coalition with Germany would free for the Soviet Union the road from the Persian Gulf to the oil fields of Kirkuk and to the Mediterranean. Such a separate peace is possible only by considerable mutual assurances and it can be built up, as things now are, only on the following lines:

"(a) Germany and the present Soviet Union join together in creating a 'Socialist Union.' Tying in with independence of 16 Soviet Republics in 1943, the European peoples form nationally defined, self-governing states, allied through a defense and economic union. Internal forms within the states are to be decided by the people.

"(b) Germany recognizes the Soviet Republics of Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Macedonia, Greece, and perhaps Turkey.

"(c) The western part of Upper Silesia and all the parts of the Warthegau and western Prussia which were parts of Prussia until 1918 remain German territory. Furthermore, Germany gets a stronger influence in old Bohemia and in the southeast.

"(d) Mutual exchange of prisoners of war and civilians (East workers) including all the deported Germans from Transylvania, Banat, Pommern, Silesia, east Prussia, etc.

"(e) Germany gets a free hand in northern and western Europe, especially against Great Britain.

"(f) The whole 'Socialistic Union' supports Germany, especially through deliveries of raw materials.

"(g) Germany supports Soviet Russia in the reconstruction of the war-devastated areas.

"Out of these developments the following perspectives for the future can be drawn:

"A colossal bloc of world-dominating greatness, economic power, energy, and numbers of population would be created from ocean to ocean.

"Not only would the danger of future wars for generations be eliminated from Europe but also from the double continent of Eurasia.

"The two great peoples, the Russians and the Germans, have extraordinary possibilities for development without collision of their interests.

"The chief emphasis in this bloc will shift more and more to the racially superior, intellectually more active, and more energetic (people), that means to Europe.

"Thus, would be formed an alliance between the young Socialist forces against the old rotten entrenched powers of the West."

The parallel between Seeckt's 1922 memorandum and the one of Keitel and Doenitz written in 1945 is striking. Here is the clear program that the Germans will follow in the future. The present mysterious activities of Hitler's former Ambassador in Moscow, Rudolf Nadolny, his cooperation with the political and industrial leaders at Godesberg, adds up to: How and when will the new German-Russian Alliance proceed with the burial of "the old rotten entrenched powers of the West."

Germany looks toward the east and the day will come when our diplomats in Washington will have a rude awakening. We had better face the facts now before it is too late. We should realize that despite all our coddling of Germany; despite our billions poured into the rat hole, and despite our support of former stanch Nazis, Germany, in the end, would rather go with Russia than with the West. We should keep in mind that the Germans always have been and will be most unreliable.

The handwriting on the wall is clear.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 7," recently delivered by me.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO. 7

(Text of broadcast by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of "Happenings in Washington."

In my broadcast 2 weeks ago I discussed with you the 5 percenters whose tricky dealings in influence have been exposed by a Senate investigating committee.

In my remarks I warned that if we fail to return to sound fiscal policies; if we fail to curtail Government spending; if we do not eliminate waste and extravagance, the 5-per centers, bad as they are, would be the least of our worries.

I had in mind the disasters that our country cannot possibly escape if we continue to spend billions beyond our income and thus pile up more debt on the present burden of a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Since I last talked with you I was in Philadelphia for a few days attending the meetings of the National Security Commission of the American Legion, of which I am a member.

That was just before the opening of the Legion's national convention. Thousands of Legionnaires were pouring into the city of William Penn and Benjamin Franklin. They represented every walk of American life—every business, every profession, every trade, every occupation, every religious faith, and every race.

Those veterans were truly a cross section of the best in American citizenship—intensely interested in maintaining a strong, dynamic America and in preserving the individual freedom that is the foundation of American progress.

I talked with men from almost every State in the Union, individually and in groups. I talked with delegates from the farms and men who work in the mills and the mines. I talked with National and State officers of the Legion, with former Senators and governors, with small-business men and the heads of large industrial corporations.

I am glad to report to you that without exception they are deeply concerned over the future of America. They expressed sincere anxiety over the tremendous increase in Government spending. They are seriously worried by the so-called welfare and security programs that would throw self-reliance and initiative into the junk pile and substitute a system of state socialism.

Let me tell you that I was deeply impressed and tremendously encouraged. From my talks with my comrades of the Legion I gained new assurance and increased determination to continue the fight to put our country back on a sound financial basis.

Those talks strengthened my determination to oppose every proposal, no matter how attractive, that would result in a planned, regimented or controlled economy, or would restrict individual freedom.

On the day of the official opening of the Legion convention I received word that an important vote would be taken that day in the Senate.

It was hard for me to leave my comrades of the Legion. I was on a committee to receive the President of the United States and was to attend a luncheon given in his honor.

But since the question coming up on the Senate floor at 2 o'clock that afternoon was of such great importance I felt it was my duty to cancel all engagements and return to the Capital.

The matter that I deemed so important was one that I have been advocating and fighting for ever since I took my seat in the Senate—economy in Government.

It was an amendment to the armed services appropriation bill offered by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. If adopted it would have directed the President to cut every appropriation, except those made for fixed charges, by not less than 5 percent or more than 10 percent.

In other words the amendment would have required a cut of from two to four billion dollars in Government spending during the present fiscal year. It would have given the President latitude to distribute the cuts among individual departments and agencies so as not to impair essential Government services.

Now, Senator MCCLELLAN'S economy proposal was already on the Senate calendar. It was contained in Senate Joint Resolution 103 which had been reported out of committee on June 13 with a favorable recommendation.

But in spite of the fact that 63 of the 96 Senators had signed a petition requesting that this resolution be brought before the Senate for debate and final action, the administration and its leadership in the Senate ignored the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Members.

It became apparent to all economy-minded Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, that they would be refused an opportunity to vote on the resolution.

It was for that reason that Senator MCCLELLAN proposed an amendment to the armed services appropriation bill, containing the full text of his resolution, in the hope of bringing the matter to a decision.

When the amendment came before the Senate certain parliamentary questions were raised by its opponents. I will not take time to discuss the merits of those questions but Vice President BARKLEY, who was presiding, decided that the amendment could be considered only by suspending the rules. That required a two-thirds vote.

A vigorous fight was made against this decision but when the final vote to suspend the rules was taken it fell short of the required two-thirds by the narrow margin of three votes.

Forty-nine Senators voted to suspend the rules, 28 voted in the negative, and 19 Members were absent.

So you see that an overwhelming majority of the Senators present favored the proposed cut in Government spending. But a parliamentary ruling, and the absence of a few

Senators, prevented putting into effect a policy which I am sure meets with the approval of the great majority of the American people.

I know that the average citizen has little time or opportunity to study the Nation's financial condition. But to me it was a real shock to learn from an official Treasury statement that since July 1, when the 1950 fiscal year began, we have gone in the red nearly $1,750,000,000.

And that's only a beginning.

It was just as shocking to realize that instead of reducing the national debt we are pushing it higher and higher. The figure has now passed beyond $255,000,000,000 and it's still on the way up—apparently without any limit.

Just a few weeks ago there came the first break in the solid spending front of the Truman administration. It was most encouraging.

It came from the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, who put into effect a program of economies that will mean an immediate saving of $500,000,000 a year, with more to come.

Secretary Johnson did not mince any words when he declared bluntly that there has been "terrific waste and extravagance" in the defense establishment and that "a lot of its people aren't doing a nickel's worth of work."

"So help me God, I'll stop it," he pledged.

I have quoted his exact words. I have known Louis Johnson well since he was national commander of the Legion. I know he means exactly what he says.

I am happy to salute Secretary Johnson and to congratulate him on this courageous step in the Nation's interest. I am hopeful that the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government will heed the growing demand of the people and will follow his splendid example.

That demand for more efficient government at lower cost is not inspired by political considerations. It is not Republican or Democratic—it is the voice of the American people.

In recent months two outstanding American statesmen, out of their wisdom and experience, have sounded warnings of the grave perils that are hidden in the present rate of Government spending.

They have turned the light of truth on the false promise that the Government can provide everything needed to make the people happy and prosperous.

They have torn away the mask of socialism and have warned that liberty and independence will be destroyed if we surrender the American heritage of self-reliance and individual freedom.

A distinguished Democratic leader, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former United States Senator, former assistant to President Roosevelt, former Justice of the Supreme Court, and former Secretary of State, speaking at the bicentennial celebration of Washington and Lee University, made a stirring plea for the reduction of expenditures.

In that address he said:

"Congress should authorize and direct the President to make the reduction necessary to bring expenditures within our income.

"Some of the proposals now suggested which would curtail the liberties of the people are offered in the name of public welfare and are to be made possible by Federal aid. That phrase is an opiate. It is deceptive. It leads people to believe that Federal funds come from a Christmas tree.

"The truth is there are no Federal funds except those taken from your pockets. If the people generally will ever come to understand this there will be less demand for Federal aid."

Here is another quotation from Mr. Byrnes' speech:

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be an economic slave, pulling an oar in the galley of the State."

Let me quote briefly from the inspiring address delivered by our only living ex-President, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday anniversary.

Discussing the growth of spending by government—Federal, State and local—he said:

"Twenty years ago all varieties of government, omitting Federal debt service, cost the average family less than $200 annually. Today, also omitting debt service, it costs an average family about $1,300 annually.

"That is bad enough. But beyond this is the alarming fact that at this moment executives and legislatures are seriously proposing projects which, if enacted, would add one-third more to our spending. Add to these the debt services and the average family may be paying $1,900 yearly in taxes."

And here is Mr. Hoover's warning. I quote again from his speech:

"Along this road of spending the government either takes over, which is socialism, or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism.

"Most Americans do not believe in these compromises with collectivism. But they do not realize that through governmental spending and taxes our Nation is blissfully driving down the back road to it at top speed."

I could continue quoting along the same line from other great Americans but time does not permit.

I hope every American will take these warnings to heart. Remember that they were spoken, not in the spirit of partisan politics, but in the hope that they would inspire better Americanism and a deeper devotion to the task of preserving our Republic.

While I was in Philadelphia I took occasion to revisit many of the sacred shrines of American patriotism. These visits are always inspiring. They create a stronger determination to preserve the principles which they commemorate.

As I stood before the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall I could not help picturing the scene enacted there on September 17, 1787, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

I refer to the incident that took place when the throng gathered outside Independence Hall greeted Benjamin Franklin with these words:

"What kind of government have you given us?"

Dr. Franklin replied:

"A republic, if you can keep it."

That is still our problem and our foremost responsibility today. Can we keep our Republic?

My answer is "Yes"—if we are imbued with the same plain common sense and the courage of our forefathers.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Our Eyes on India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Eyes on India," written by John W. Love and published in the Washington Daily News of September 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR EYES ON INDIA

(By John W. Love)

A large American interest in India, financially, industrially, and strategically, is slowly coming into view as one project behind the complex economic discussions going on here in Washington.

The program is still only exploratory, as diplomats say, but it begins to be taken here as an answer to a number of perplexing international problems, among them:

Britain's liability of upward of a billion pounds in sterling balances to India and Pakistan, chiefly India.

America's interest in seeing that the Indian subcontinent and what remains of east Asia do not fall into Communist hands; or, put another way, its search for an alternate to the policy which failed China.

Indian and Pakistan desires for equipment which the British have been furnishing in part, but with strain on their industrial capacity.

Britain's desire to see that the old eastern trade routes continue in friendly hands with less financial burden.

Ideas of the United States Government joining with the British in a triangular undertaking with India have been in the background here for several weeks. Some observers had looked for a proposal last week or this that the British financial load be lightened by the United States Government's taking over certain posts of the old British Empire.

Similarly it had been expected a proposition would be brought out for dealing with the sterling balances which more than 20 countries have to their credit in London, to a total of about $3,300,000,000, but which cannot be liquidated except as the British fill orders for goods.

Nothing developed openly in these directions except that Monday's communique said the sterling balances had been discussed and would be studied further. These balances, practically due bills, resulted mainly from British purchases of supplies during the war. Various countries got credits for goods they furnished but they could use them for goods in return only as the British released pounds for the purpose.

The balances remain about as high as ever, but such shipments as have been made help to maintain the British industrial boom and some of the inefficiencies of which British and others alike are critical. If Americans joined in an Indian program of investment it would relieve this strain.

If Americans took over part of what the British owe the Indians, or made loans, they would find a large market for United States machinery. And at the same time, in the opinion of proponents of such a policy, it would help maintain India against communism.

One reason the British have advanced for filling orders for India against the threat of inflation at home has been the fear of Indian collapse, with Russia moving into the vacuum.

The question of the sterling balances remains academic because the chief creditor, India, has not been represented at the economic sessions here. Prime Minister Pandit Nehru will spend most of October in this country, however, and the opportunity then will arise for discussing these and other matters.

Americans have long been impatient over these accumulated British liabilities, but there are British who hope that America will

see its way clear to helping out the Indians with a large-scale program of investment that would take the pressure off the British.

Within the last month, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has made its first loan to India, of $34,000,000 for railroad equipment. Reporting to the board of directors in session here this week, Eugene R. Black, president of the bank, expressed his opinion that this financing would be followed by other such transactions in that part of the world.

Excerpts From Certain Testimony Before the Presidential Steel Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on yesterday I offered for the RECORD excerpts from the testimony which was submitted to the Presidential Steel Board by Mr. C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., on August 19, 1949. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the testimony with respect to insurance and pensions of the Republic Steel Corp. which was given before the Presidential Steel Board on August 19, 1949. There is reason to believe that readers of the RECORD will have a keen interest in the data and points of view of the witnesses who appeared before the Presidential Steel Board. On Thursday and Friday of this week, I shall offer excerpts from the testimony offered by United States Steel and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPUBLIC STEEL CORP. WITH RESPECT TO INSURANCE AND PENSIONS

(Before the Presidential Steel Board, Carroll R. Daugherty, chairman; Samuel I. Rosenman; David L. Cole; in the matter of United Steelworkers of America–CIO and Republic Steel Corp., et al.)

INSURANCE

I. Comparison of Republic's plan with union's demand

Republic Steel Corp. (hereinafter referred to as "Republic") has had in effect for many years a contributory group insurance plan covering the employees involved in this dispute. The plan provides for insurance at death and for weekly sickness and nonoccupational accident benefits. It also has had in effect for several years a group hospitalization plan. Both of these plans are underwritten with Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Republic's plan and the union's proposal both provide for $1,250 in life insurance for retired employees. However, the Republic plan, except in cases of occupational disability, has an age and service requirement of not less than 60 years of age at retirement and 15 years of service with the company, while the union's proposal has no service requirement and apparently no age requirement. In addition under Republic's plan if a retired employee resumes employment with another company his insurance is canceled.

Republic's plan pays benefits beginning on the 8th day of disability in both accident and sickness cases for a maximum period of 13 weeks. The union proposes that benefits should begin on the first day of disability in accident cases and the 8th day in sickness cases for maximum periods of 26 weeks.

Under Republic's plan, the employee pays the monthly contribution, including the applicable amount after retirement on the $1,250 policy involved. Republic pays the balance of the cost and the expense of administration. The union proposes that Republic pay the entire cost of this plan.

Hospitalization

Republic's plan provides $7 per day for employees and $5 per day for dependents for a maximum period of 31 days, except employee pregnancy cases which are limited to 14 days and, except dependent pregnancy cases where there is a maximum benefit, including daily and special benefits of $50. The plan provides for special hospital services up to a maximum amount of $35.

The union is proposing semiprivate room service for a maximum period of 70 days, general nursing service and a comprehensive list of other specified hospital services with no maximum limitation and surgical benefits in specified amount for various operations up to a maximum of $200 for employees and dependents. The union proposes that Republic pay the entire cost of this plan.

II. Discussion of Republic's plans

It is our position that our present group insurance and hospitalization plans are adequate, that they compare favorably with similar plans throughout industry and that no changes in them are required or should be made at this time.

General discussion of group insurance plan

Our life and sickness and accident insurance plan has been in effect since 1935 and has been eminently satisfactory. It is a voluntary plan under which approximately 80 percent of the eligible employees have elected to participate. It is a contributory plan for which the employees pay certain amounts, the company paying the balance of the cost of the plan and the expense of administering it. In our opinion the fact that the employee pays his part of the premium is to a large degree responsible for the success of our plan. Because of his financial interest in the plan he and other members have a common interest to see that claims are kept within legitimate bounds.

Much has been said about the relatively small portion of the premium which is paid by the employer for group-insurance programs. Such talk is based upon a misconception of the intention and purpose of the employer. Over a number of years it was observed that an alarming number of employees did not carry any insurance, and that in many instances a worker's family was left destitute. It was felt that making available to employees without the requirement of a medical examination a group-insurance plan which provided moderate benefits at reasonable rates would be part of the answer to this situation.

As an inducement to the employees to subscribe to such a plan, the employer agreed to share in its cost in a general way and to handle its administration. In order that the employees' premium would be stable and not fluctuate with the actuarial experience the employees' contribution to the premium rate was fixed, with the balance of the cost which does fluctuate with experience being paid by the employer.

Contributory group-insurance plans were never intended to take over the obligation which an employee has to provide some measure of financial support for himself or his family in the event of his illness or death. Such plans were designed to make easier the employee's accomplishment of that duty.

While Republic has been glad of its own accord to set up its present group-insurance program and contribute to its cost, there is no more reason why it should be required to furnish to its employees gratis, group insurance than that it should be required to purchase fire insurance for their homes, or liability, property damage, and collision insurance for their automobiles.

It is our position that any group-insurance plan should be on a contributory basis. Experience shows that by far the greater number of insurance plans which have been set up in industry are on this basis.

A recent survey by the National Industrial Conference Board, July 1949, entitled "Contributory versus Noncontributory Plans" has this to say in part:

Proportion on contributory basis: "* * * While the trend was definitely toward noncontributory plans during the war years, the pendulum has again swung back to jointly supported plans. Contrasted with the 1945 survey, in which nearly half the plans were paid for entirely by the employer, more than three-quarters of the group-insurance plans included in the 1949 survey require employee contributions.

"Table 4 classifies the plans according to whether they provide insurance for the employee only or whether the employees' dependents are included for hospital, medical, or surgical benefits. Most plans with dependents' coverage require employees' contributions for that part of the insurance program. In only 11 companies, or 4 percent, is dependents' coverage paid for entirely by the employer. In 15 additional companies, the employee's insurance is on a noncontributory basis, but the individual is required to pay part or all of his dependents' coverage."

Another survey, made by our insurance carrier of 100 of its largest clients, which includes many of the largest corporations of the country, showed that in 86 percent of these cases the life insurance was on a contributory basis; that of the 100 companies 69 have weekly benefits or hospitalization or a combination of similar coverages for employees and 37 have coverage for dependents, and that of these 88 percent are contributory for the personal coverage and over 92 percent are contributory for dependent coverage.

Adequacy of weekly sickness and accident benefits provided by Republic plan

1. Republic's plan provides weekly sickness and nonoccupational accident benefits ranging from a low of $8 (of which there are only two employees) per week to a high of $30 per week with the average benefit being $20 per week.

According to a survey made by the Life Insurance Association of America, covering all of the Continental United States representing group-insurance coverage for 9,498,000 employees—$194,400,000 of weekly indemnity and yearly premiums of $170,700,000—the average weekly benefit provided for is $20 for the year 1948. A similarly acquired figure for 1947 is $19.

2. Republic's plan provides for nonoccupational accident benefits to start on the eighth day. The union proposes that they start on the first day. Benefits of this kind should not start on the first day. They are not, and should not be designed to "make whole" an injured person for all wages lost by reason of his injury. They are designed to "tide over" a person who has lost wages for a long enough period of time as to require a "cushion" from such loss. The administrative expense of handling claims of short duration is all out of proportion to the benefits received by the employee. The cost of processing a claim of 1 or 2 days would probably exceed the amount of the benefit paid.

The additional cost that would be incurred if this 7-day waiting period were to be eliminated is a burden which should not be placed on all participants in the plan.

* * * * *

3. The provision in Republic's plan for benefits to run for 13 weeks is adequate. Actuarial studies show that 86 percent of claims terminate in 13 weeks or less. The

tendency toward malingering which any extension beyond 13 weeks would create is not justified by the 14 percent of claims which might run over the 13-week period. The 100 company survey shows that 44 of the 60 companies having sickness and accident plans or about 75 percent, have a maximum period of not more than 13 weeks.

Adequacy of death benefits on retirement provided by Republic plan

Republic's provision whereby a retired employee may be paying his portion of the premium, continue insurance under the plan in an amount of $1,250 is reasonable and coincides with the amount proposed by the union. There are 643 Republic employees now being carried for $1,250 life insurance on a monthly contribution basis. To purchase 643 paid-up life-insurance policies for $1,250 each, at an estimated cost of $1,000 each, would require an immediate cash expenditure of $643,000.

* * * * *

It is unreasonable and extremely costly to provide for this insurance on a paid-up policy basis wholly at the expense of Republic. The insurance should be continued on a joint contributory regular monthly payment basis just as it was carried before retirement.

* * * * *

Adequacy of Republic's hospitalization plan

Republic's hospitalization benefit is $7 per day for the employee and $5 per day for a dependent.

The Life Insurance Association of America survey shows that the average daily benefit of all insured plans covering 7,902,000 employees was $5.50 for employees and $5 for dependents.

PENSIONS

As the Board knows, this country has been for the past 12 years and is now committed to the principle that the pension problem of a large segment of our population, including steelworkers, comes within the domain of, and should be handled by, the Federal Government, at least to the extent of the first $3,000 of their annual earnings.

Moreover, since this pension question involves long-range planning, it should be pointed out to the Board that the present benefits under the Social Security Act, which the union feels are inadequate, may shortly be substantially increased. In fact, as this Board is well aware, the present administration is firmly committed to doing just that, and, it may be helpful to call to your attention what is now before Congress on this subject.

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 141 (80th Cong., 1st sess., July 23, 1947), the Advisory Council on Social Security recommended, among other things, changes in the benefit formula as follows:

"14. Benefit formula: To provide adequate benefits immediately and to remove the present penalty imposed on workers who lack a lifetime of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance, the primary insurance benefit should be 50 percent of the first $75 of the average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the remainder up to $275. Present beneficiaries, as well as those who become entitled in the future, should receive benefits computed according to this new formula for all months after the effective date of the amendments."

This would produce in the case of Republic steelworkers average monthly maximum primary benefits of over $65 for a single man, $100 for man and wife, and monthly family benefits which could run as high as $200 since the average earnings of our steelworkers during 1949 exceed $3,200 per year putting them well over the $250 per month class.

* * * * *

With respect to the contributory nature of the payments for these benefits the Advisory Council recommended as follows:

"The Council favors as the foundation of the Social Security System the method of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and awarded without a needs test. Differential benefits based on a work record are a reward for protective effort and are consistent with general economic incentives, while the knowledge that benefits will be paid—irrespective of whether the individual is in need—supports and stimulates his drive to add his personal savings to the basic security he has acquired through the insurance system. Under such a social insurance system, the individual earns a right to a benefit that is related to his contribution to production. This earned right is his best guaranty that he will receive the benefits promised and that they will not be conditioned on his accepting either scrutiny of his personal affairs or restrictions from which others are free."

It added that there were compelling reasons why the Government should eventually make some contribution but that "it is unrealistic to decide now on the exact timing or proportion of that contribution."

The Advisory Council consisted of outstanding representatives of labor, insurance companies, and other employers, as well as the public generally. And there is no doubt that its findings and recommendations are at this moment exercising a tremendous influence on the Members of Congress who are considering this question as a result of the introduction of H. R. 2893 early this spring. This bill proposes somewhat similar changes, which, if adopted, would largely meet the demands of the union for old-age security for its members and their dependents. The bill, as introduced, proposed changes in the benefit formula as follows:

Fifty percent of first $75 of average monthly wage plus 15 percent of next $325, increased by 1 percent for each year of coverage, the average monthly wage to be based on the highest five consecutive years of coverage.

This, the committee early in its hearings estimated, would nearly double present benefits

Moreover, as recently as last week, the House Ways and Means Committee announced that its members were in agreement on major issues of the pending legislation, including according to press reports, an increase in old-age benefit payments of "50 to 150 percent over those in the current law" (New York Times, August 9, 1949, p. 1). On Tuesday of this week, August 16, 1949, it was announced through the press that this House committee had given final approval on social-security revisions which change the benefit formula as follows:

Fifty percent of first $100 average monthly wage plus 10 percent of the next $200 increased by one-half percent for each year of coverage.

This is reported to result in a 70- to 80-percent increase in benefits, but, of course, in many cases would result in a much greater increase than that.

In short, we now find ourselves facing the very real possibility within the next few months that Congress might act favorably on this or similar legislation thus establishing a program which, in large part, will meet the demands of the union, except that it will be on a contributory basis, as it clearly should be. In that eventuality industry, including the companies represented here, will be called upon to assume for an indefinite period an obligation to make a substantially greater contribution to the security of their employees, including, of course, the members of the union.

III. How will this affect Republic?

Some idea of the cost of so-called security benefits taxes to Republic and the other steel companies can be gathered when it is realized that Republic has already paid out $50,000,000, of which $17,000,000 was for social-security taxes and the balance for unemployment compensation taxes. We are currently paying social-security taxes at the rate of over $2,000,000 per year. And, of course, if the legislation under consideration is passed our annual costs for this item alone, based upon the estimates of the Advisory Council, may be over $3,000,000 in 1955, over $4,000,000 in 1960, and finally reaching the sum of $10,000,000 in the year 2000.

It is no idle gesture, therefore, to say that we feel a very real concern that the demands now made by the union, involving as they do no contribution by union members nor any deduction for benefits received under the Social Security Act, will create a cost problem which will be unbearable.

For this reason as well as for the reason heretofore mentioned on the bargainability question, we strongly urge that this Board refrain from making any findings or recommendations on the pension question.

Respectfully submitted.

T. F. PATTON,
Vice President and General Counsel, Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding Federal FEPC legislation, from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA POLL—FIFTY-FOUR PERCENT IN STATE FAVOR FEDERAL FEPC LEGISLATION

Minnesotans are in favor of the broad principles of equality in job opportunities for people of all races, religions, and nationalities, a State-wide survey by the Minnesota poll indicates. But they are less strongly in favor of specific legislation that would restrain employers from rejecting job applicants on account of race, religion, or nationality.

Proposals for fair employment practices legislation that would bar discrimination in employment have been made to Congress by President Truman on a number of occasions. Little headway has been made by supporters in Congress thus far. A bill in the State legislature to equalize employment opportunities failed at the last session.

Minnesota-poll interviewers asked a representative cross section of the State's voting-age men and women two questions about their views on that kind of legislation, but one question was couched in very general terms, and the second was specific in referring to a prohibition against discrimination by employers in the kinds of people they hired. The first question was:

"Do you believe that Congress should pass a law that would guarantee everyone in the United States an equal chance to get a job

according to his abilities, regardless of his race, religion, or nationality?"

The replies:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes; should	76	74	82	76
No; should not	19	21	15	15
Qualified	1	1	1	2
No opinion	4	4	2	7
Total	100	100	100	100

Some people contended "we don't need any such law; it's already in the Constitution." Several giving qualified answers said there should be a guaranty "for people who are citizens." Eighty-four percent of the women, 83 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 83 percent of the people with grade-school educations, and 83 percent of the voters who supported Truman last November, are agreed that such a law should be passed.

The second question was:

"How about a Federal law that would say to employers: 'You cannot turn down job seekers because of their race, religion, or nationality, would you be in favor of, or against, that kind of law?"

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
In favor	54	50	56	61
Against	34	36	37	27
Qualified	4	5	4	3
No opinion	8	9	3	9
Total	100	100	100	100

(It is likely that the first question influenced some persons to say they are in favor to the second question. Several earlier Minnesota poll studies on State attitudes toward FEPC legislation showed less than half of the adults supporting such measures.)

Looking Backward and Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate had the pleasure of working with Hon. Edward A. O'Neal when he was president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. We know the great work he did for the American farmer and for American agriculture. Last Thursday evening, when the Alabama Farm Bureau was holding its annual convention at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, at Auburn, Ala., a testimonial dinner was held in honor of Mr. O'Neal. At the dinner Mr. O'Neal delivered an address which was carried on a special radio broadcast and recorded for posterity. I know that the address will be of interest to Mr. O'Neal's many friends and admirers throughout the Nation, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Draughon, my friends of this convention, and my friends of the radio audience, to me this broadcast is a timely climax to my career. I accept it, with deep appreciation, as a personal endorsement and as a tribute to whatever success I may have attained.

I attribute this success to my coworkers and friends, and to the fact that I have adhered to scientific truth in all that I've done, or tried to do, in behalf of American farmers.

Half a century ago I graduated from Washington and Lee University. I studied law there. The legal profession had been traditional in my family. It was one reason why my grandfather served Alabama two terms as governor, and why an uncle served later in the same capacity. The first was Edward Asbury O'Neal, who was governor from 1882 to 1886, and the second was Emmett O'Neal, who was governor from 1911 to 1915.

Knowledge of the law was paramount with them. Each was well trained and each worked diligently in the application of his knowledge. I was expected to do likewise as a lawyer, but I strayed from the profession.

My first year after graduation from Washington and Lee was spent in traveling over Europe. There, as here, I observed and studied the land. I was like my ancestors, who loved the land the same as they loved the law and its practice.

An outstanding example of land devotion was my maternal great-grandfather, Gen. John Coffee, who was a companion in arms of Gen. Andrew Jackson during the War of 1812. He was made in 1817, surveyor general of the Mississippi Territory, which covered the upper half of the present States of Mississippi and Alabama.

These two associates in war were friends in peace, and in the ownership and operation of land. Both bought farms in the Tennessee Valley. They loved the old red land and saw its great possibilities. I am now farming on one of those farms.

A major decision for me immediately after returning from Europe was a choice between law and land. My decision is a matter of record. I've spend my life as a farmer, near Florence, Ala., and in agricultural leadership in my home county of Lauderdale, my State of Alabama, and my country.

My record is an open book, for which I again acknowledge appreciation to my coworkers, especially the land-grant colleges and the farmers of America.

As a young farmer I soon discovered many handicaps, first of which was a lack of adequate scientific information about farming. Science had not come to farming as it had come into other occupations and professions.

Farmers then knew, for example, very little about fertilizer, and animal husbandry was a mystery. It was based more upon devotion to animals than upon science in feeding and management. The land upon which we lived, and from which our living came, was a puzzle to us.

It was there as a young farmer, struggling to succeed, that I came to grips with the realization that farming needed more brains. Ever since then I've recognized the great need for brains on the farm, and I've been an ardent advocate of science about land, science about crops, science about animals, science about fertilizer, and both science and economics about people.

There were schools and colleges back then to teach people about the law and medicine and other professions. Some of them were old. All of our nine colonial colleges prepared men for the ministry. Schools of law and medicine followed.

But it was not until 1872 that my State of Alabama established here at Auburn, with the help of the Federal Government, a school to teach agriculture, the mechanical arts, and other related subjects. This was only 3 years before I was born.

It was, of course, a humble beginning with very little money and less background of information to guide the teachers. Next came, in 1887, the establishment of our experiment station to conduct research and find facts for use by farmers.

Then came, in 1914, the Extension Service, which put farm people as near to their land-grant college as they are to their county agent and home agent. This was, and is, a marvelous achievement.

In all history we find no counterpart to the land-grant colleges of the United States with their threefold mission. I agree with my good friend, P. O. Davis, in his tribute:

"To the land-grant colleges of the United States * * * conceived in democracy, based upon science, operated for humanity and dedicated to the principle that there is true culture and genuine value in all that improves the ways of life and the art of living."

This is the essence of the ambition of my dear friend, the late Dr. Luther N. Duncan to whom I shall ever be indebted and grateful.

Naturally I was anxious for a county agent in my home county of Lauderdale; and I hastened to make use of him when he came.

It was those pioneer county agents who introduced scientific information to American farmers which enabled them to become the most efficient producers of farm products in all the world.

So well did all of us succeed that the time came when we had great surpluses of foods and fats and fibers in the warehouses, in our barns, in our smokehouses, and in the granaries of the Nation.

But we had little or no money in our pockets, or in banks. We produced abundantly, but big production meant little income in cash.

As a farmer I had not failed as an individual, as was true of other farmers, but we had failed collectively; and our economy finally collapsed under us, bringing bankruptcy to almost everybody.

There was distress in the midst of abundance of farm products. Too much had brought farmers too little; and everybody was broke.

This caused me to turn to the Farm Bureau as an organization. I had observed its early activities and operations in other States. I saw that we needed it in Alabama; and that farmers of all States needed to work together.

I could see that such an organization was essential to the economic welfare of farmers as a group, and also to the economic welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Without the farm bureau I could see no equality for agriculture. Instead there would be disparity, distress, suffering, bankruptcy again and again; not merely for farmers, but for bankers, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and others.

It was with this realization that I took advantage of my first opportunity to become a member of the farm bureau. My county organization honored me by electing me their first president. About the same time I was elected first vice president of my State farm bureau; and I was made president in 1923.

Things happened rapidly in those days, and I soon found myself as a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Then I became vice president, and in 1931 I was elected president, in which capacity I served continuously until 1948, a period of over 16 years.

Basically, the farm bureau to me is an organized expression of scientific information from the land-grant college in each State. A cardinal principle of the farm bureau is to stick to, work with, and support vigorously the land-grant college collectively the same as each member does individually on his farm and in his home by working closely with his county agent; and his family working in the same way with their home demonstration agent.

Underneath our parity principle, for example, is information from these land-grant

institutions; and also from the United States Department of Agriculture. This and other principles have been enacted into laws—not selfish laws for farmers only, but for public good and national safety.

In all of our battles, in all of our struggles, and in all of our achievements the Farm Bureau has fulfilled all expectations. The most optimistic of us have never been disappointed and the doubting Thomases have become convinced.

It is organized democracy in action by farm people and for farm people where they live and work as well as in the State and national centers of legislation. Its record is a bright spot in American history of our time; and I now predict that it will become bigger and brighter. It is the sound, the safe, the constructive, the eloquent, and the powerful voice of organized American agriculture.

And so we now have in this country the best and most efficient system of farming in all the world. We have also laws for a sound economic balance between groups and interests, provided we keep our laws and our economic forces in proper balance as intended.

Our standard of living is second to no other nation. Our social and economic life are at a new high level; and we still believe profoundly in the divine.

We know to pray for bread as well as to think, study, and work for it. Our Nation, the United States, is No. 1 in the world in achievements, in wealth, in capacity to produce, in capacity to use, and in capacity for world peace. Real science at work through the processes of democracy has demonstrated its superior value to all other forms of government.

Now, as heretofore, the challenge to leaders in agriculture, in business, in industry, in finance, in education, and in Government is in behalf of a sound and prosperous Nation in a sound and prosperous world at peace.

Here in the United States, as elsewhere, there is a right and there is a left in viewpoint, in ideology, and in philosophy. But there is also in between these two extremes the big middle group, the great balancing group, the group that includes most farmers and their associates; all of whom believe in and work for a sound national economy with economic justice and full opportunity for all.

We seek not favors but opportunity—the kind of opportunity that is both fair and wholesome to one and to all regardless of occupation or position in life.

It is in behalf of such an ideal and ambition that I have lived and worked; and for which I make this recording for whatever it may be worth to my family, to my friends, to my State, to my country, and to posterity.

The Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times of yesterday, September 13, on the Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIGHT SESSIONS IN THE SENATE

The Senate is scheduled to meet tonight in the first of several night sessions intended to speed up action on the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The question at issue here is whether to restore the full bargaining powers (in the negotiation of new agreements) which Presidents Truman and Roosevelt enjoyed under the original plan sponsored by Cordell Hull and subsequently approved five times by Congress. To do this will involve repealing certain unwise, unnecessary and outdated restrictions imposed on the President's powers at the last session.

At the present session this particular piece of legislation has run a curious course. The need for encouraging American export-import trade (especially at this time) is so clear and strong, the benefits of the earlier agreements negotiated by Mr. Hull have been so substantial, and the philosophy of tariff protectionism is so much at variance with the present creditor position of the United States, that when this bill was brought before the House of Representatives last February it was approved by an overwhelming majority after a comparatively short debate. More than half the Republicans, as well as nearly every Democrat, voted for it. Among the Republicans to vote for it (though he had favored certain amendments) was Republican leader and former Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN of Massachusetts. It looked, at last, as if the Republicans in Congress were ready to make the Hull program a part of the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States.

Unfortunately, however, it is Republican opposition that has blocked action in the Senate. The chief sticking-point is whether the Tariff Commission shall be authorized to advise the President of peril-points beyond which tariff concessions cannot go without injuring American interests. We submit that the Hull program, with its escape clauses, is already amply protected in this respect and that the record achieved by this program over a decade and a half entitles it to a new vote of confidence.

Air Supremacy as Key to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "World War II Ace Sees Air Supremacy as Key to Peace," written by Robert S. Johnson, president of the Air Force Association, and published in the Savanna (Okla.) Morning Journal of August 7, 1949. Mr. Johnson happens to come from my home town in Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD WAR II ACE SEES AIR SUPREMACY AS KEY TO PEACE

(By Robert S. Johnson, president, Air Force Association)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Maj. Bob Johnson, who shot down 28 Nazi planes and is now an executive with a United States jet warplane company, believes that only American supremacy in the skies can protect this country against attack and insure eventual permanent peace.)

WASHINGTON, August 6.—The last battle of World War II is still going on. It is the battle to keep the peace we all thought we had won when the armistice papers were signed in the red schoolhouse in Germany and on the battleship *Missouri* lying off Japan.

The campaigns leading up to the signing of those peace agreements had taken place on opposite sides of the world and had cost millions of lives and hundreds of billions in dollars. The United States alone spent well over $310,000,000,000 for the materials of war; for guns and tanks and ships and airplanes and the tens of thousands of other items necessary to fight and win a war.

One weapon, used only twice, cost $2,000,000,000. Yet those two atomic bombs dropped from B–29's over Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought prompt acceptance by Japan to the terms of the Potsdam Declaration, without a single allied soldier, sailor, or marine having to land on Japanese home soil.

These facts of life and death lead to somber conclusions. Each major war, in its turn, has been more destructive than the one which preceded it. We are rapidly arriving at a point where war is no longer fought merely by the man who carries a gun, whether he carries it on a plane, a ship, or on his shoulder. It is fought by civilians unable to defend themselves against a high-flying enemy. As such, it means total devastation of homes, industries, farmlands, schools, and churches, as well as the lives of women and children.

No airman who has flown over enemy territory in a plane loaded down with bombs, rockets, incendiaries, and other explosives ever forgets that he is doing so to protect his own family and fellow citizens from having the same thing happen to them. That's why he wants permanent peace more than anyone else. No airman with combat experience believes that war can be won without the grim, daily fighting contributions of the foot soldier, or without the maintenance of supply lines by the man aboard ship. We made a good team in World War II, and we must keep that team alive and ready.

One thing the airman does believe, and he is joined heartily in that belief by nearly all of his comrades on the defense team. Without air superiority over those combat and supply areas, we all must lose. In peacetime, without air superiority, we must also lose that all-important last battle to maintain the peace. We cannot succeed diplomatically unless those who oppose us respect our air power and its ability to make the diplomatic decisions stick.

My plane during the war was a Republic P–47 fighter. It enabled me to go after the enemy wherever they were and eliminate some of them. It helped me get back more than once when my chances didn't look good. We have progressed a great deal in American airplane development since we flew our last combat missions in the P–47's, P–51's, B–17's, and B–29's, and the other planes devolped for World War II.

Now our pilots are flying jet fighters and six-engine bombers that carry more bombs farther and faster than anything we had 4 years ago. In my case, I'm now learning about all the intricacies of jet flying with the F–84 Thunderjet, Republic's 600-mile-per-hour successor to my old P–47 Thunderbolt. To a fighter pilot accustomed to 450-mile-an-hour speeds, the jet is really a sensational eye opener.

Tomorrow, of course, with the new planes coming along, we'll wonder how we were ever satisfied without rocket power such as is being developed now in the XF–91. Those new planes, however, don't just come along, they

require hundreds of thousands of man-hours of engineering and millions of dollars for research.

We don't have a monopoly on aeronautical brain power. The recent Soviet aviation day caused our representatives in Moscow to write home startling reports about Russian progress in jet aircraft. There is every evidence that the Russians are advancing swiftly in power plants and in airplane design, maybe even faster than we think they are.

This can lead to only one conclusion. If we agree, as we must, that superiority in air power is vital to this Nation not merely as a defense against attack, but also as a means of implementing our attempts to reach a permanent peace settlement, it is imperative that we continue to give our pilots and crewmen airplanes which are better and more effective than those of our enemies, and in sufficient quantities to enable them to have a compact force in being. To do otherwise would be national and perhaps, world, suicide.

Results of Special Election in Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 14 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on September 13, 1949, a special election was held in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania for the House of Representatives. A year ago this district was carried by the Democratic candidate by 12,056. This year the Republican candidate in 280 out of 325 districts shows a lead of 11,041. I believe that Members of the Senate may be interested in the tabulation. I ask unanimous consent to have the complete tabulation by counties printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Results, special election, Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Congressional District, held Sept. 13, 1949

1949 ELECTION (280 OF 325 PRECINCTS REPORTED)

County	Precincts	Saylor	Coffey	Republican plus or minus
Armstrong	64-70	10,844	6,204	+4,640
Cambria	157-178	30,004	29,382	+622
Indiana	59-77	10,612	4,833	+5,779
Total		51,460	40,419	+11,041

1948 ELECTION

County	Precincts	Tibbitt	Coffey	Republican plus or minus
Armstrong		11,306	10,138	+1,168
Cambria		26,637	42,926	−16,289
Indiana		12,062	8,997	+3,065
Total		50,005	62,061	−12,056

A Community Is No Better Than Its Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on September 1, 1949, Dr. Paul D. Sanders, editor of the Southern Planter, published at Richmond, Va., addressed a State meeting of the Farmers Home Administration at Roanoke, Va., on the subject of the importance of farms to a community.

In this address Dr. Sanders warned of evil days to come if this Nation makes the same mistakes it made after World War I in allowing farmers to lose their purchasing power and drag the whole economy into depression with them. Dr. Sanders also pointed out that the farm always has been and always will be the seedbed of the Nation's population and that it is the Nation's responsibility to preserve it.

I commend these observations to the thoughtful consideration of the Senate and ask that the address in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If I were called upon to name the most humanitarian program of the entire New Deal for agriculture, I would unhesitatingly point to the Farmers Home Administration. This agency came into being during a period of grave national emergency to rebuild and dignify the underprivileged farm homes of the United States. And you have done a magnificent job.

While the Federal Government, during that emergency, was ladling out billions of dollars to resuscitate business and industry, the Farmers Home Administration was set up to lend money to small, low-income farmers. This lending program was in recognition of the fact that farmers did not covet charity; instead, they were willing to borrow money to pull themselves up by their own boot straps. Much of this money could not be repaid and it was never intended that it should be, any more than the huge relief expenditures in our cities and industries were repaid by their unfortunate clients. Yet, your agency has borne the brunt of caustic criticism by men and women in high public office for failure to make those early loans liquid.

But out of the smoldering embers of that tragic era, the brave men and women of FHA have risen to build in this agency a sound and successful program to help the small, family-size farm to become a powerful force in the economic and social life of rural America. But I see evil signs on the economic horizon today. Powerful forces would deny credit to low income families and knock the props from under agricultural prosperity.

We are riding today on the greatest wave of agricultural and industrial prosperity the world has ever known. It cannot last. Changes must come. And they will come. I am here today to warn you now of the evil days that draw nigh.

I say this because our price structure and our governmental policy are following precisely the same pattern they followed after the First World War, which led us into the great boom and bust of the late twenties and the great depression of the early thirties.

But I don't think we need to make the same mistakes this time we made after World War I. If we can keep buying power in the hands of farmers—keep agriculture profitable—we can have sustained prosperity in this country.

In the First World War farmers went heavily into debt to enlarge operations and expand production; to produce the food to win the war. Two years after hostilities ceased—1920—farmers found themselves strapped with a land-mortgage debt of $11,000,000,000. Farm prices, in 1920, dropped 51 percent in 9 months. Four thousand country banks had come into existence during the war period and they found themselves immediately in distress. Many of them closed their doors within the next few years sweeping away the savings of farm people. Foreign markets for farm products vanished.

Farmers struggled during the twenties with low incomes and deflated prices attempting to service this huge debt and hold on to their farms, while rearing and educating their large families. Farm boys and girls by the millions left the farms and moved to town in quest of opportunity. The cost of rearing these migrants consumed one-third of the farm income of that period. Agriculture during the twenties was bankrupt and every business dependent upon the farmer was in distress.

Because farmers lost their buying power, small-town business dried up and by 1929 our entire economic structure collapsed. Agriculture spearheaded the Nation into the great depression of the early thirties.

Now look at the farmer's position today—4 years after World War II. The land mortgage debt is only $5,000,000,000. Only 530 country banks came into existance during this war and they are all insured by the Government. The banks are sound as the rock of Gibraltar. Farm income is at a record level and farm prices are still near their peak. In addition, farmers have in United States savings bonds and other liquid assets a total of $22,000,000,000. Our farmers are in a very strong financial position and are buying every conceivable type of manufactured product. And our Nation is prosperous.

Much of the prosperity which we call inflation today stems from the fact that for the first time in the history of America our farmers and our working people have decent incomes; money to buy and time to enjoy some of the good things of life which the wealth of our great country should generously endow us all.

But this grass-roots prosperity will continue only so long as business and labor and government are willing to give the farmer a fair return for his labor. I contend that a prosperous agriculture is the key to sustained prosperity in this country.

I say this because 20 percent of the people of America live on farms. If you add to this another 25 percent, living in small towns and villages close to the land, handling the farmer's produce, selling him goods and services, and absolutely dependent upon farm income for their existence, you have a total agricultural population aggregating 45 percent of the people of this country. This figure is 66 percent in Virginia.

It is here we have the lowest incomes and the lowest level of living. This is a new frontier for business in the United States. If we are to maintain our present rate of industrial activity, or even expand the American economy, we must look for markets in rural areas. I contend that the mechanization and modernization of rural America is a back-log of business big enough to keep the economic machine running full blast for years to come.

We cannot afford, as a Nation, to commit the crime to agriculture which we condoned after the First World War. We cannot permit the farmer's willingness to work and his ability to produce to pile up huge surpluses that will depress prices and destroy him. And then stand idly by and permit an impoverished agriculture to wreck our entire national economy.

Agriculture is not only the biggest privately owned business in America, made up of 6,000,000 individual, competitive small businesses, farmers are the great creators of wealth; the producers of the essentials of life—food, fiber for clothing, and wood for homes, offices and fixtures. They are the custodians of the Nation's basic resource, the soil. Soil fertility is the farmer's capital. If the farmer is to build up his soil, or even maintain its present fertility, he must first make a profit from his operations and then "plow it back into his land."

Between the two great wars we failed to create an economic atmosphere in this country that permitted the farmer to earn a profit. The farmer sold his stuff below the cost of production. He underwrote the consumer's food bill. He impoverished himself, his soil, and his institutions. Soil erosion became a grave national problem. But we have at long last realized, I hope, that a rich soil builds a rich civilization; that an impoverished soil means an impoverished people; that a nation cannot rise above its soil resources.

Between the two wars farmers were unable financially to improve their homes or build new ones. Farm dwellings today lack many of the conveniences we associate with good housing in the city. It is estimated that Virginia farm homes need $300,000,000 worth of repair. Think what that work means in employment and business volume to the commonwealth.

The farm, once the most healthful place to live, no longer enjoys this distinction. Doctors, dentists and nurses, following the trend of civilization, have moved to cities and clustered around hospitals and population centers to practice their professions, leaving large segments of our rural population stranded without adequate health and medical care facilities. It is gratifying to see our public officials and in Virginia our general assembly recognizing this situation and adopting measures to meet it. The type citizen we have in our cities of the future is dependent upon the type of boy or girl we rear on farms today.

The farm always has been and it always will be the seedbed of the Nation's population. And I say to you: It is the Nation's responsibility to preserve it. The farmer cannot continue to spend one-third of his annual income feeding, clothing, and educating children that are to leave the farm just as they reach productive age and move without cost to the city. And when they grow old and gray and lose their jobs in industry, they return once more to the peaceful countryside often to spend the evening years of life as a burden on the rural community.

If we are to remain strong, economically and socially, in time of peace and invincible in time of war we must maintain on the farms of America a large and dignified farm population.

I shudder to think what would have happened in the tragic conflict just ended had it not been for that rich reservoir of underemployed farm boys and girls who hurried off to war plants and the armed services to add the winning punch to the all-out effort. Farm youth made the best defense workers. They made the best soldiers. And I say they make the best citizens. I have often said in my work, and I believe sincerely that it is true: That the strength, conservatism, and solidarity of Virginia—in which we are all so proud—stem directly from the resourcefulness, dogged determination, and Christian character of our country people.

And if we, as leaders in the agricultural and educational structure of this State, should fail to place within the grasp of farm youth an opportunity to succeed, and live well on the land, we stand as a State and as a Nation to lose some of those sturdy virtues that have made Virginia and America great.

Matters Affecting Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials appearing recently in the Honolulu Advertiser, of Honolulu, T. H. The editorials are entitled, respectively, "What Is a Democrat in Hawaii?", "Two-Timing the Longshoremen," and "Practical Senator CAIN."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu (T. H.) Advertiser of September 3, 1949]

WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT IN HAWAII?

Island residents who believe in the political principles of Jefferson and Jackson cannot be blamed when they ask, "Just what is a Democrat in Hawaii today?"

Lau Ah Chew, who was made Oahu County chairman when ILWU left-wingers seized control of the 1948 Democratic territorial convention, has his own definition of a Hawaii Democrat. Old-line Democrats, who were upholding the principles of their party before Lau Ah Chew, Jack Hall, Robert McElrath, and Harriet Bouslog were heard of in island politics, disagree with him. Lau Ah Chew's edict is:

1. Democrats, including National Committeewoman Victoria K. Holt, cannot attend county committee meetings unless they behave themselves;

2. Applications for membership in the Democratic Party are not acceptable if they include a statement that the aspirant has no present connection with any Communist or other organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

While it may be natural that Lau Ah Chew should feel grateful to the left wingers who placed him in political office, the responsibilities of the position itself do not countenance his service as a puppet for them or any other special interest faction of the Democratic Party. When he undertakes to rewrite the principles of that party he assumes a totalitarian authority that does not exist in fact. When he presumes to give orders to his party's elected national committeewoman he goes beyond all bounds of reason.

True Democrats have good cause to feel genuine apprehension over the ways into which their party organization has fallen in Hawaii. So have Republicans and the public generally. The establishment of a machine dictatorship in either party is a matter for public concern. And when that dictatorship gives aid and comfort to communism the situation is grave.

TWO-TIMING THE LONGSHOREMEN

When Harry Bridges and his lieutenants talk to Hawaii's longshoremen they tell one story. When they talk to longshoremen on the mainland, who don't know the facts, they tell another. This was evidenced by two bulletins they issued to dock workers on August 11. The contempt in which they hold the intelligence of island longshoremen was shown when they sent both bulletins to local ILWU members. Apparently, they thought Hawaii's dock workers would be too dumb to notice the contradictions in the two statements. But in this they were mistaken. Local longshoremen did discover this double-talk and were not pleased. Among other misstatements in Bridges' bulletin to mainlanders, he said:

"And now today we hear that the Governor and his 'Big Five' controlled legislature are really dreaming up a Nazi nightmare. Believe it not, they plan to set up a special section of the National Guard to man and sail the ships in place of union seamen that refuse to stay on ships when the Government puts its longshore scabs aboard.

"I know, sitting here in Hawaii, that you fellows on the coast will think a group of shipowners and employers are nuts trying to put such things over, but anything can happen here.

"They really mean it. They really believe, that with Governor Stainback calling the shots and using his power, they can actually man and sail ships to the coast with scabs that have been recruited temporarily from the National Guard, and to have these scabs take rifles and bayonets with them to go to work on any union longshoreman or seaman on the coast who would try to do something about such Stainback scabs taking their jobs."

Henry Schmidt, lieutenant of Bridges and international representative of ILWU who also was imported from San Francisco, apparently knows Hawaii better than his boss. Here is his view on the "scare" story of which Bridges made so much:

"Representative Hiram Fong's announced plan to man the ships with National Guard men is the fantastic dream of a man who knows nothing about the stevedoring business, the steamship business, and certainly knows nothing about trade-union tradition. His plan to have the Territory charter ships and then man them will not materialize at all. In fact, such a scheme will die before it is born."

This is what Henry Schmidt told Hawaii's longshoremen when he sent them copies of Bridges' letter to mainlanders. While denying Bridges' fantastic tale of "scabs with guns and bayonets," he did not take the trouble to attempt to explain it away. Hawaii's dock workers were not flattered by this implication they are too dumb to know the difference.

PRACTICAL SENATOR CAIN

Washington State's United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN promises to be a friend of Hawaii worth having at Washington, D. C. He came to the Territory to tell the people news many of them did not like to hear; that he would oppose statehood for Hawaii now. He gave his reasons without giving offense, pledged his fealty to statehood for Hawaii as soon as it could give positive assurance that there would be no Communist threat in the forty-ninth State.

Having made his position on that issue plain, the Washington Senator looked around him to see what assistance he could give Hawaii right now. He found that the Territory, engrossed in statehood ambitions, has not driven hard enough for postwar Federal works to which it is entitled. Now he has gone on to the National Capital to press for congressional approval of a $6,000,000 program of Federal improvements at Kawaihae and Honolulu Harbors, Ala Moana Basin, and Kawainui swamp.

Senator CAIN takes the practical view. He knows that Congress will not act at once on

statehood and has told the people of Hawaii what to do about that in the interim. But Federal public works can be got under way without delay, so he turns his attention to them. That is good representation by a national lawmaker who holds that Hawaii, as a Territory, is the responsibility of every Member of Congress.

Excerpts From Statement of Frank Purnell Before the Presidential Steel Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, I submitted for the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from testimony which was submitted to the Presidential Steel Board on August 19, 1949, by C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., and by the Republic Steel Corp., with respect to insurance and pensions. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the statement of Frank Purnell, president of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., which was made before the Presidential Steel Board on August 19, 1949. All of this testimony covers a problem of prime importance throughout America. We ought to be currently posted on the reasons which cause the steel industry to resist a wage increase at this time. Our opinions may vary as to the validity of the steel industry's position.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRANK PURNELL, PRESIDENT, THE YOUNGSTOWN SHEET & TUBE CO., BEFORE THE PRESIDENTIAL STEEL BOARD

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, my name is Frank Purnell. I reside in Youngstown, Ohio, and I am president of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. I have been connected with that company since 1902, and I am now in my forty-eighth year in the steel business.

* * * * *

The negotiations between our company and the union consumed several days' time. Throughout the negotiations their position was that of demanding a package of a wage increase, insurance benefits and pension benefits, substantially as recited by their representatives during this hearing, except that they never at that time presented their estimate of the total cost of their package, and never stated the amount of the wage raise demanded. They refused to negotiate as to the separate items in their package.

The company's position was as follows:

As to insurance benefits we offered the plan which has already been presented to this Board. We offered to negotiate further with the union representatives about any details of that program which they might wish to discuss.

As to pensions, as we have already informed the Board, we took the position that the matter was not bargainable before April 1950.

As to increased rates of pay we refused the union's abstract request for reasons which I will outline to you and which are as applicable to the indirect cost of the so-called fringe items as well.

We approached the matter from various points of view. In the first place, we felt that to make an increase in wages in face of a receding demand was not only unsound economics but that such an increase in wages in the steel industry would affect the entire wage and price structure of the country. The union in the past, for instance in 1942 and 1944, has argued for wage increases on the ground that we were in an expanding economy which could sustain a higher wage level. But the opposite economic position is now upon us and the union apparently takes the view that we should have a fourth round of wage increases because of a receding volume of business. When the question was raised in a newspaper interview, "Would not this spread to all other branches of industry and national life?" one of the witnesses for the union stated that he thought it "could be contained." In my opinion, a steel wage increase could not be contained within the industry, but of necessity similar increases would immediately be demanded by other CIO unions and other organized groups. People in all walks of life are saying, "It must stop sometime." I submit that during this period of recession is the time when it ought to be stopped, and must be stopped, if it is ever to be stopped.

In the face of well-established forecasts of lower volume of operations it is, in my opinion, inadvisable to increase costs in advance of actual experience obtained under such conditions. It might be said that the way to meet a lower volume of business would be to reduce both costs and selling prices, but I believe it would be unwise to do this too soon. We must go through the experience of operating under the anticipated conditions before we have enough information to know the right thing to do under all circumstances. To anticipate on either side, advancing or lowering wages, would be a mistake until all the factors have been developed and the picture becomes clearer as to the proper policy to pursue.

It must be recognized that for the last few years we have been operating in an abnormal market in which demand far exceeded the supply. It was very understandable why such a demand existed. Shortages which had accumulated before and during the war period had to be made up in a relatively short time. Now that the urgency for many lines has subsided, naturally there is going to be a period of transition until people readjust themselves. In the period of short supply competition was practically eliminated, and many consumers of steel paid many premium dollars a ton in the so-called black or gray market for their supplies. I am proud to say, however, that our company, and the steel industry generally, did not participate in premium markets. We are now at a point where supply exceeds demand, but no one at this time can tell what the competition will be under the pressure of reduced volume and other changed conditions.

* * * * *

In their negotiations with us the union representatives laid great stress on our present "ability to pay." I do not believe in such a principle, as in the first place it penalizes efficiency; in the second place wages are future costs which must be paid out of future operations and not out of a backlog earned in any limited period of past prosperity; in the next place this is always a one-way street with the union and they will not apply the same philosophy to cases of "inability to pay"; and, in any event, "ability to pay" cannot be measured and applied industry-wise, for it would force weak companies, even those which may be losing money, to pay just as high wages as those that have reasonable and fair profits. Conditions are different for almost every company within the industry and conditions vary from time to time as to each company itself. In consideration of "ability to pay" there is also a failure by the union to give due consideration to differing sources of income of many companies within the industry. Profits, as reflected in consolidated statements of some companies, have included income not derived directly from the manufacture of steel, and those companies which depend on steel-producing income alone would be unfairly dealt with, if compelled to meet the "ability to pay" of other companies having profitable operations in other fields.

Profit comparisons have been made by the union in two ways: on the percentage of sales, and also on the percentage of investment. It seems at the moment that emphasis on the percentage of net investment suits the purpose of the union better than does percentage of sales and their representatives have commented in colorful adjectives on the unfairness of the profits based on these comparisons. To consider profits strictly on the basis of net investment, without careful consideration of the replacement value of existing properties is certainly unfair, in these days when current reconstruction cost may be several times the original cost.

I should like to give one example of what I mean. At our Campbell Works in 1918 we constructed 306 coke ovens at a cost of $3,000,000. These coke ovens are 31 years old, and I know of many coke ovens built at the same time which have already been replaced. In the not distant future our company will be compelled to make replacements. Duplicating these ovens today of the same design and specifications, would involve an investment of at least $18,000,000. Incidentally, replacing them now with new-type ovens of modern design would at current prices cost us between forty and forty-five million dollars. But in any event the $18,000,000 cost of duplicating the present ovens is, of course, $15,000,000 more than the depreciation reserves which we have accumulated for their replacement on the basis allowed by the Internal Revenue Department. This illustration clearly shows that our profits, as reported during those later years in which we did not make adequate allowances for replacing these coke ovens when worn out, were not real profits, in the same sense that the union speaks of real wages. Rather, they were illusory and fictitious profits to the degree that the reserves were an inadequate provision.

* * * * *

And, it is as much in the interest of our employees as of our stockholders that management should make adequate provision for capital expenditures, whether the provision be called a reserve or be called profits. It is only in that way that present jobs may be made secure or that new jobs can be created. No matter what theorizing may be done on the subject, it remains a fact that investment will not occur except when and to the extent that a fair return can reasonably be anticipated. The imposition of added costs of production in a receding market is bound to bring about great hesitancy in making not merely plant expansions, but even necessary replacements. In many cases, desirable capital expenditures simply could not and would not be made. In the case of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., capital expenditures in excess of $100,000,000 are reasonably necessary and contemplated over the next 5 years. Whether these expenditures will be made will have to be decided in the light of all relevant factors. One thing, however, is certain—any additional costs imposed on our operations at this time, in the face of present uncertainties as to the business trend and as to the character of our competition,

will be a serious deterrent to capital expenditures.

* * * * *

One of the factors, among others, in the future of the steel industry which has not received any consideration from Mr. Nathan in his discussion of raw materials is the situation we face because of the depletion of natural resources such as ore, coal, etc. These properties cannot be replaced, as you well know, and the natural ores left in this country are of limited supply. Many companies, including ourselves, will be compelled to create new sources of ore supply by processing low-grade ores in the nearby future, and this will require new capital, which will run into millions of dollars. It is estimated that cost of facilities for such reclamation of the lower grade ores will run anywhere from $10,000,000 to $18,000,000 to beneficiate a million tons of ore per year. These capital expenditures will not add to profits. As a matter of fact they will detract from profits, because after the reclaiming facilities are acquired, the mining and processing of this low grade ore is more costly, of course, than mining the natural ore which is now being used.

* * * * *

In my judgment, a fourth round of wage increases by my company cannot be justified in face of a declining market and in the face of untried conditions brought about through recent construction of large producing capacity in consuming areas, taken in conjunction with revolutionary court decisions affecting the ability of distant companies to compete in these areas. No one is able to predict with any assurance what the final effect of these changes will be upon the steel industry, or upon the future of any particular company in the industry. In my judgment decision of such a question must in good sense be deferred until the picture has become clearer as to just what the future will develop from these really fundamental changes.

I am not interested solely in my stockholders. I am interested in the welfare of our employees, and their communities, and of this country.

I cannot believe that such a fourth-round increase in the steel industry under present conditions can be anything but disastrous to our national economy. I know from experience that it cannot be "contained" within the industry and, if these rounds of the inflationary spiral are not stopped when the economy is declining, I believe they never will be stopped and that we will continue to climb the spiral until we have washed out the value of all property owned by citizens of this country. In my opinion, this Board is faced with a question, the answer to which may well mark one of the real milestones in the future of the United States.

Distinguished Virginians in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of Virginians who have served in the Navy with distinction. This list was furnished to me by Rear Adm. John B. Heffernan, Director of Naval Records and History, Navy Department.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1949.

J. L. HALL, Jr.,
Armed Forces Staff College,
Office of the Commandant,
Norfolk, Va.

MY DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of August 9, I am pleased to send you the following data relative to a number of Virginians who have distinguished themselves in the naval service of their country.

In a State which has furnished so many famous men it is impossible to mention all, but in the list which follows we have tried to include those best known realizing that the name of many worthy men have been omitted. Many officers served in two, some in three wars. Many performed important peacetime service. So far as possible, each man's name will be placed on the list belonging to the first war in which he served. Exception is made of the men who went south during the Civil War. Their Confederate States naval service will be found in a register of Confederate States officers sent to you under separate cover.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR

During the Revolutionary War Virginia had a very active navy of her own. The first officers appointed to it were James Barron, Richard Barron, Richard Taylor, Thomas Lilly, Edward Travis, and Walter Brooke. Brooke, who seems to have been the son of a Marylander, was the first commodore in command of the Virginia Navy from April 1777 to September 1778. He was followed by James Barron who held the post from 1780 to his death in 1787.

Another Revolutionary War officer from Virginia was Richard Dale, who distinguished himself during the famous battle between the *Bonhomme Richard* and the *Serapis* in September 1779, and was twice a prisoner. When the United States Navy was organized in 1794 his name was one of the first on the list of captains appointed, and he served during the quasi-war with France and in command of the first squadron sent to the Mediterranean against the Barbary powers in 1801.

QUASI WAR WITH FRANCE AND WARS WITH THE BARBARY POWERS

James Barron, of Virginia (service 1798–1851), served during both these wars in command of various vessels, including the frigates *President, New York, Chesapeake,* and *Essex.*

Samuel Barron (1798–1810): As a captain in the United States Navy he participated in the quasi war with France and the Barbary wars, first in command of the *Richmond, Baltimore, Constellation,* and *Chesapeake,* 1798–1801, then in command of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia* blockading the Tripolitan admiral, and finally in command of a squadron in the Mediterranean.

WAR OF 1812

Samuel Barron III (in service 1812–61): Appointed a midshipman in the United States Navy when less than 3½ years old, the youngest midshipman on record. Active on various ships and stations from 1817 to 1861. Lieutenant on the U. S. S. *Perry* during the Mexican War.

William E. Edwards, midshipman, 1811: Killed in action between U. S. S. *Argus* and H. M. S. *Pelican* August 14, 1813. Commended by his superior officer.

Robert Henley, whose services extended from 1799 to 1828: In command of the U. S. brig *Eagle* during the Battle of Lake Champlain. Received the thanks of Congress and voted a gold medal by the Legislature of Virginia. Participated in the suppression of piracy in the West Indies.

Elie A. F. Lavalette, service from 1812 to 1862: One of the first officers to be appointed a rear admiral. Took part in the Battle of Lake Champlain, for which he was awarded a medal. A destroyer was named for him in 1919.

Foxhall A. Parker, Sr., service from 1808 to 1857: On U. S. S. *Nautilus* during the War of 1812; captured. Commanded the navy yard at Boston during the Mexican War.

Arthur Sinclare, service 1778-1831: Took active part in quasi war with France, the Barbary wars, and the War of 1812. Commanding U. S. S. *Niagara* and a squadron consisting of five ships, led a successful expedition against Machilimacinac, August 4, 1814.

Lewis Warrington, served from 1800 to 1851: In Barbary wars, War of 1812, and Mexican War. In command of the West India squadron for suppression of piracy, 1825–26. One of the Navy commissioners, 1840–42. Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography, 1846 until his death, 1851.

Thomas ap Catesby Jones, service 1805–58: Served valorously on the New Orleans station during the War of 1812, and later in the Mediterranean and at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1825 he was first appointed to the command of the Pacific squadron, and later served as inspector of ordnance, following which he was appointed to the command of the South Seas exploring expedition, from which he resigned in 1837 before it got under way. In 1842, in command of the frigate *United States,* he sailed from Hampton Roads to take command of the Pacific squadron. Finding the British frigate *Dublin* maneuvering suspiciously at Callao, Commodore Jones believed war had begun between the United States and Mexico, and hastened north with two ships, the *United States,* Capt. James Armstrong, and the *Cyane,* Capt. C. K. Stribling, and on October 20, 1942, took possession of Monterey, Calif., for the United States. On October 22, learning from reliable sources that there was no war between the two countries, Commodore Jones restored Monterey to the Mexican authorities and there appears to have been comparatively little feeling on the coast. To conciliate Mexico, however, the United States Government could do no less than detach Jones from the command of the squadron. Nothing further was ever done about it.

VIRGINIANS IN THE MEXICAN WAR

George P. Upshur, served from 1818 to 1852: Superintendent of the Naval School at Annapolis during most of the Mexican War.

John H. Upshur, served from 1841. Died, 1917. In Gulf of Mexico during Mexican War. One of the officers commanding a battery on shore which helped in the capture of Vera Cruz. December 24, 25, 1864, took part in the attacks on Fort Fisher; employed in landing Army stores and guns and covering troops from Confederate troops outside of the Union lines.

Henry Walke (1827–96), artist: Took part in the Mexican War at Vera Cruz, Tobasco, Tuspan, and Alvarado. During the Civil War took part in the defense of Fort Pickens, September 6, 1861. Active on the Mississippi and other western waters from 1861 to 1863. Special service blockading Confederate cruisers, 1863–65.

William Lewis Herndon, service 1828–57: In charge of an expedition to explore the Amazon River thereby opening it to commerce. In command of the Pacific mail steamer *Central America.* Lost at sea when it foundered in a gale off Cape Hatteras in 1857. A monument was erected in his memory at the Naval Academy by his brother officers. Destroyer *Herndon* named in his honor in 1919.

Thornton A. Jenkins, service 1828–93: Distinguished service on the Gulf coast during the Mexican War. Took part in operations on James and Potomac Rivers, 1861-

62; West Gulf blockading squadron, off Mobile, 1852; fleet captain and chief-of-staff of Farragut's squadron; active operations in the lower Mississippi; commanding U. S. S. *Richmond* at Battle of Mobile Bay August 5, 1864. Highly commended by Farragut.

Matthew F. Maury, in service 1825–61: On a cruise in the U. S. S. *Vincennes,* the first United States naval ship to circumnavigate the globe, 1827–30; on the *Falmouth, Dolphin,* and *Potomac* in the Pacific, 1831–34; engaged in surveying southern harbors, 1838. Because of a serious accident in 1839 he did not perform further sea duty. Superintendent of the Depot of Charts and Naval Observatory at Washington, D. C., from 1844 to 1861. Maury's fame rests on his record as a scientist and a writer rather than as a naval officer. For his contributions to science and literature he received many honors at home and abroad, being knighted by a number of European powers, made a member of five academies of science, and given the degree of LL. D. by Harvard University and by Columbian University of Washington, D. C.

Napoleon B. Harrison, service 1838–70: Mexican War service. Commended for gallantry in the Civil War. After the passage of Forts Jackson and St. Philip with the U. S. S. *Cayuga,* Captain Bailey, his superior officer, wrote, "From first to last Lt. Comdr. N. B. Harrison displayed a masterly ability in steering his vessel past the forts under a hurricane of shot and shell, and afterwards in maneuvering and fighting her among the gunboats."

Samuel Phillips Lee, in service from 1825 to 1873: Almost continuous service throughout his entire career. In command of sloop-of-war *Oneida,* took part in attacks on and passage of Forts Jackson and St. Philip and various battles on the Mississippi from New Orleans to Vicksburg winning high reputation for gallantry and devotion to duty; 1862–64, in command of North Atlantic blockading squadron. In summer of 1864 he was transferred to the command of the Mississippi Squadron where he performed service of great value to his country. Received the thanks of Congress for his service on western waters, 1864–65.

Sidney Smith Lee, service 1820–61: Served on the U. S. S. *Mississippi* in the Gulf of Mexico during the Mexican War, part of the time as acting captain. Highly commended twice by Commodore M. C. Perry under whom he served. Employed at the Naval School at Annapolis, 1848–50. Commanded the *Mississippi,* Perry's flagship during his famous expedition to Japan, 1852–55. One of the officers in attendance on the first Japanese Embassy to visit this country in 1860.

Richard L. Page, served 1824–61: Served in the West India squadron in the suppression of piracy, 1824–25. On the razee *Independence,* flagship of Commodore William B. Shunrick on the Pacific coast during the Mexican War. Participated in the capture of Guaymas and Mazatlan and two vessels of the enemy on May 16, 1847.

Thomas Jefferson Page served in the United States Navy from 1827 to 1861. With the United States Coast Survey, 1834–42. Attached to Depot of Charts and Nautical Instruments (Naval Observatory) during the Mexican War. In 1852, after returning from duty in the East Indies, he recommended that the waters of the North Pacific, so much used by whaling ships, be surveyed by the United States Government. This was done a few years later, but Page did not have enough rank to command the expedition. In charge of an expedition for the survey of the La Plata River and its tributaries and a study of the bordering land areas. It was during this expedition that the *Water Witch* was fired upon, February 1, 1855, by one of the forts on the Paraguayan shore. Further survey in the same area, 1858–60.

Civil War officers, United States Navy: See Mexican War list.

Civil War officers, Confederate States Navy: See register of Confederate States officers mailed under separate cover.

The following men from Virginia have served as Secretaries of the Navy:

Abel P. Upshur under John Tyler, 1841–43.

Thomas W. Gilmer, February 1844, killed in office.

John Y. Mason, 1844–45 and 1846–49.

William B. Preston, 1849.

Claude A. Swanson, 1933–39.

MISCELLANEOUS LIST

Beverley Kennon, a distinguished officer in the United States Navy from 1809 to 1844: Attained the rank of captain, the highest possible at that time, in 1837. Served on board the U. S. S. *Congress* on the Atlantic and the flagship *Superior* on Lake Ontario during the War of 1812 and in the squadron sent to the Mediterranean under Commodore Decatur in 1815, to force peace with the Barbary powers. Subsequent service included cruises in the West Indies, to the Mediterranean, the coast of Brazil, and the Pacific, as well as important shore assignments. Chief of the Bureau of Construction, Equipment, and Repair, 1843–44. Killed February 28, 1844, during a cruise down the Potomac, on board the U. S. S. *Princeton,* by the explosion of a large gun called the "Peacemaker" being introduced into the Navy by Capt. R. F. Stockton.

French E. Chadwick, in service, 1861–1919: Rear admiral at death. Chief of Staff to Rear Admiral Sampson during the Spanish-American War in operations in Cuban waters. Took active part in operations at Santiago, Cuba, at time of victory. Advanced five numbers for eminent and conspicuous conduct.

Hilary P. Jones: Born in Virginia. Naval service from 1880 to 1938. On the active list of the Navy for almost a half century. As a young naval officer he served aboard the U. S. S. *Nipsic* during the famous Samoan hurricane in 1889. His conduct in that trying period evoked the commendation of his superior officer. During the Spanish-American War he served on the *Dorothea,* a converted yacht, on patrol duty with Admiral Sampson's fleet. Commander of the Newport News Division of the Cruiser and Transport Force which delivered thousands of troops to France during World War I. Director of Naval Overseas Transportation Service in 1919. In July 1919 given the rank of vice admiral in command of Battleship Squadron 2, Division 3, Atlantic Fleet, and in August 1920, placed in command of the battleship force of the Atlantic Fleet. In 1921 he became commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet with the rank of admiral and in December 1922, his title was changed to commander in chief, United States Fleet. His next assignment was to the General Board of the Navy Department, 1923. In 1926–27 Admiral Jones was naval adviser on the American delegation to the Preparatory Commission for Limitation of Armaments in Geneva. In 1927 he served as a delegate to the Conference on the Limitation of Naval Armaments. The studies he made during this period formed the basis for the London Arms Conference in 1930 and subsequent deliberations.

Robley D. Evans: Born in Virginia. Appointed from Utah. Naval service from 1860 to 1912. During the second attack on Fort Fisher in January 1865 Ensign Evans, then serving on the U. S. S. *Powhatan,* volunteered for duty with a landing party during which he was wounded in the leg just after reaching the palisade. He bound up the wound with his handkerchief and pressed on until he fell with a second wound in the knee joint. One of his superior officers wrote: "From all I can learn his bravery and determination to enter the fort were equaled by few and excelled by none." In 1891–92, while commanding the U. S. S. *Yorktown,* he won for himself the name of "Fighting Bob" by his vigorous activities while cruising on the coast of Chile, between which country and the United States relations were much strained because of an unprovoked attack on a liberty party from the United States cruiser *Baltimore* in Valparaiso a short time previous. In command of the U. S. S. *Iowa* during the Spanish-American War. His vessel participated in seven engagements beginning with an attack on San Juan, P. R., May 12 and ending with the capture of the Spanish fleet at Santiago, Cuba, July 4. Appointed commander in chief of a fleet which was sent on a cruise around the world, 1907. Overtaken by illness, he was relieved at San Francisco.

Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, cadet midshipman, 1887: Drowned, 1897. Made his first cruise on board the U. S. S. *Texas* where on several occasions he displayed remarkable coolness and ability in times of peril in storms and in controlling the turret machinery at the peril of his life, especially on the occasion when the ammunition hoist gave way and the shot was falling into the powder, he sprang to the rescue and by his presence of mind saved the ship from probably instant destruction. His rescues of persons from drowning were many, and it is sad to remember that he was washed overboard from the deck of the *Cushing* when that vessel gave a sudden heavy roll, and the life lines parted, his feet slipped from under him on the wet deck; he lost his hold of the ridge rope, and without a cry went overboard.

Archibald Henderson, United States Marine Corp; in service from 1806 to 1859 when he died with the rank of brevet brigadier-general. Served in the War of 1812 on the *Constitution;* commended for gallantry in engagements with enemy. Commanded Marines in Florida War, 1836-1837; promoted for services in checking Indian hostilities. Commandant of the Marine Corps from 1820 to 1859, the date of his death.

Littleton W. T. Waller: Served from 1880 to 1926. Retired with rank of major general, 1920. During his military career, General Waller participated in practically every campaign in which the Marine Corps took part. Served with landing force in Egypt; all the fleet operations during the Spanish-American War; the Philippines; China; Island of Samar; Panama; Cuba; Haiti; Vera Cruz, Mexico.

Other names which should be mentioned are:

Richard E. Byrd, world famous flyer and explorer.

Presley Marion Rixey, medical inspector, 1900.

Presley Marion Rixey, Jr., in the Navy during the war with Spain after which he joined the Marine Corps.

Lucien G. Heneberger, surgeon on United States ships *St. Paul* and *Indiana* during the Spanish-American War.

John C. Wise, medical director, 1900.

William E. Taylor, medical inspector, 1877.

Cumberland G. Herndon, medical inspector, 1901.

Otway C. Berryman, captain, United States Marine Corps, on the *Baltimore* under Dewey during the Manila campaign.

In addition to the register of Confederate officers already sent to you the following sources which will probably be available to you are suggested:

The History of Virginia's Navy of the Revolution, by Robert Armistead Stewart, published by Mitchell & Hotchkiss, Richmond, Va., 1933.

Records of Living Officers of the United States Navy, by Lewis R. Hamersly. There are seven editions of this between 1870 and 1902.

A Naval History of the American Revolution, by Gardner W. Allen, published by Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1913.

The Navy of the American Revolution, by Oscar C. Paulin, published by the Burrows Brothers Co., Cleveland, 1906.

A History of the United States Marine Corps, by Clyde H. Metcalf, published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1939.

A History of the United States Navy, by D. W. Knox, published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1936 and 1948.

Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion, published and distributed by the Navy Department. Thirty volumes.

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Navy.

Navy Registers.

Hoping this will give you sufficient material to prepare a speech from, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. HEFFERNAN,
Rear Admiral, USN (Retired),
Director of Naval Records and History
(Op-29).

More American Goods to Britain for the Same Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relative to the transportation of exports through the port of Hampton Roads, Va.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE AMERICAN GOODS TO BRITAIN FOR THE SAME DOLLARS—MILLIONS OF DOLLARS CAN BE SAVED IN TRANSPORTATION OF EXPORTS

A study of the movement of world trade all through the centuries indicates that in times of peace no port has ever been a great world port if it had to offer to ships cargoes consisting only of farm products and coal from mines.

Those who, ever since the days of Capt. John Smith or of George Washington, have been wondering why Hampton Roads has not been in peacetime one of the very greatest of world ports, have overlooked this fact. For Hampton Roads has had practically nothing to load aboard ships except farm products and coal.

Now conditions have changed.

Hundreds of millions of people all over the world are amazed at the unprecedented increase in the industrial production of the United States, but there are few who know that the industrial production in the South and in the Midwest, particularly in the South, within the past decade, since the war, has been greater than in any other section of the United States.

If one divides the entire United States into three sections; one out of which export shipments may move to Hampton Roads at less cost than to New York; a second out of which export shipments may move to New York at less cost than to Hampton Roads, and a third out of which export shipments may move to either port at the same cost, it will be found that, according to an official report issued by the United States Bureau of the Census on May 13, 1949, the values added by manufacturing in 1947 in the three sections were as follows:

Hampton Roads section	$35,027,000,000
New York section	32,375,000,000
Equality section	6,962,000,000

In spite of the greater production in the Hampton Roads section, unofficial estimates are to the effect that the values of exports out of the port of New York are 20 times as great as the values of exports out of Hampton Roads and that it has been costing millions of dollars more each year to deliver to New York goods produced in the Hampton Roads section than if they had been delivered to Hampton Roads.

During the war, Hampton Roads was the third largest shipping point in all the world. Since the war, millions have been spent, more than has been spent in the port of New York, to construct new terminals and improve old terminals, and the port is now prepared to handle five times its prewar volume of export business.

In 1948, manufactured goods accounted for 77 percent of the values of all United States exports as follows:

All exports	$12,529,000,000
Manufactures and semi-manufactures	9,675,000,000

It is a matter of world importance that exporters of manufactured and other goods shall reduce the cost of deliveries to foreign ports as much as possible. In the present world crisis it not not just a private matter for individual exporters.

While American and British officials are conferring as to how to make the dollars go further in supplying the needs of the world, let the manufacturers get together and do their part.

WILLIAM HOLMES DAVIS.

NORFOLK, VA., *September 12, 1949.*

Tribute to Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld paying tribute to the late Commodore John Barry, in Philadelphia, Pa., September 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, I am deeply grateful for the privilege of being with you here in this our Independence Square. The ground on which we have assembled is venerated, as a shrine to all people believing in religious and in political freedom.

Today, as in past years, we honor the memory of Commodore John Barry, valiant seaman and one of our first naval heroes. Nothing I can say will add to the luster of John Barry.

I am, however, inspired and encouraged by the tribute that you and thousands of Americans elsewhere pay Commodore Barry by meeting on this day. Your presence is of great significance to me in these troubled times. Although we live in peace, it is an uncertain peace, for ominous rumblings from evil forces cry for the destruction of our Christian way of life. The answer to that is the magnificent manner in which you have come forth to be counted in public as defenders of the faith, religiously and politically.

I shall never have any doubt as to the future of our Nation so long as my countrymen continue with such high resolve.

As a people we have much to guide us. No government was ever so blessed with founders who by precept and example left a rich inheritance. Such earthly treasures as were passed on by those sturdy patriots have counted for little in the sum total of of our Nation's progress. The wealth that has counted most, the inheritance that has made us a powerful force the world over, has been and still is the spiritual character of America.

John Barry contributed much to this new land. Born in Ireland of extremely poor but stalwart Catholic parentage, he sought very early in life a freedom not enjoyed in his own country. Under the crown, at that time, a Catholic was not permitted to own land, and as the Barry family steadily increased in number its economic situation became more miserable.

But it was not privation alone which impelled young Barry to ship as a cabin boy at the age of 10. Rather it was an urge even stronger. The love of the sea, which had sent men on their course from the beginning of time, was early manifested by this Irish lad and it continued to flow through his veins until the day of his death.

The courage and valor which prompted John Barry to seek the New World was to sustain him all the days of his life. He rose from cabin boy to master in the merchant marine; he became one of the first officers of the Revolutionary Navy; he won for the struggling Colonies the first naval victory at sea; through two wars and many sea victories he emerged to become the first captain in the United States Navy.

By the time of his death, September 13, 1803, he had won honor and fortune unrestricted by his religious beliefs. It is fitting that John Barry found his last resting place at old St. Mary's churchyard, in the very shadow of the shrine he fought so hard to establish.

Surrounding this tiny but historical spot of freedom's birth are many other monuments to the cause for which Commodore Barry risked his all. Many are time hallowed, like old St. Mary's and Christ Episcopal, but there are others of the Quakers, the Jews, the Presbyterians, the Greek Orthodox, all free to worship within the shadow of this cenotaph, offering conclusive evidence that the victory, won at such great cost, has been sustained.

Little could one guess in those trying days that this symbol of truth and freedom would later cast its benign shadow into the remote corners of the earth. But there can be no shadow without substance. They are in direct relation, each to the other. And today, it is our solemn task as a nation, as individuals, to insure that the substance of the ideals upon which our land was founded shall not be adulterated or poisoned.

Like the mariner at sea, we must keep a vigilant lookout for the shoals that would wreck us.

Since that day when we first took our place among the nations of the world, we have been called upon six times to defend our principles against a foreign foe. In each conflict the Navy has performed its allotted and inevitable part. To quote from an early log of Barry's the Navy has displayed "the determined resolution of distressing the enemy as much as in our power."

This resolution has never faltered, although there have been times when, as immediately following Pearl Harbor, resolution perforce was compelled to take the place of action against the enemy. This indomitable will of our seamen, from admiral to gunner, irrespective of difficulties which often seemed insurmountable, has resulted in feats of skill, tactics, and bravery unsurpassed by any navy of any country.

As citizens, you are justly proud of the past victories of your Navy and of the other armed forces. You have called upon them in time of war and they have never failed, nor shall they ever.

But all wars are not fought upon the battlefield, or on the sea, or in the air. Nor is treason an offense perpetrated solely in war time.

Today we are confronted with another kind of conflict. A conflict in which each of us as a citizen must participate if we are to preserve the principles for which our blood has been shed all too many times.

There are among us people who are engaged in spreading a doctrine opposed to our way of life. They would discredit our beliefs and deny us our God. They question our freedoms and they would confound our courts. And yet, it is significant to note, in the parts of the world where these false doctrines have been forced upon people too weak to resist, there is no freedom and justice hangs her head.

These are the lands shrouded in the shadows of fear and want—where terror grips misery by the hand.

The acts of vigilance necessary for the preservation of our country are not exclusively the task of the man in uniform any more than the worship of God is confined solely to the priest in his chapel. They are both the Christian duty and the inalienable right of us all.

John Barry believed that the true destiny of this Nation rested in its own hands. The dangers to our country are as great today as they were then. If anything, those of today are more sinister. They are often disguised and appear in many roles. They are found in high places and among the lowly. But I charge you: Be not deceived by them. Recognize them for what they are. Examine closely those who profess no belief in God. Evaluate the person who cries for tolerance and freedom by saying we have no tolerance or freedom. And beware of the intellectual who masquerades behind the pompous mouthings of liberality. Such individuals are neither liberal nor intellectual. They are merchants of madness. They are destroyers, not builders.

It was said of Barry that "He was more than loyal—he was God-given."

Let it be said of us that we too are loyal citizens of this beautiful land. And may our wisdom and strength be God-given.

As we are gathered here today on this sacred ground, let us pledge ourselves anew to the maintenance of all these things we hold so dearly. These buildings, the land on which they stand, are a part of our glorious past. They are no less ours today, and if they are to be ours tomorrow the solemn responsibility falls upon each one of us.

It is imperative in times like these that there be no doubt in the minds of anyone about the principles for which we stand. In the words of the psalmist I say to you: "Hold not thy tongue, for yea, the mouths of the ungodly and deceitful are upon us, but through God we shall do great acts."

Missouri River Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College, at the annual meeting of the American Farm Economics Association, held at Laramie, Wyo., August 20, 1949.

From time to time Congress has been warned that the enormous sums which we have been appropriating for Missouri River projects may eventually prove to be wasteful and based upon unsound planning. Mr. John A. Short, engineer of the Missouri State Resources Development Commission, recently expressed extreme doubt about the flowing navigation channel advocated under the Pick-Sloan plan, on which millions of dollars are now being spent. His statement was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 26, 1949, by Mr. RICHARD BOLLING, Member of Congress from the State of Missouri, and is entitled "An Engineer's Appraisal of the Missouri River Development Program." Dr. Renne likewise warns that before we can be certain that the $8,000,000,000 we are spending for Missouri River projects will be a good investment, much sound thinking must be done on other phases of the over-all development program. I hope that every Member of the Senate will read Dr. Renne's address, because it contains vitally important advice on this important subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ECONOMIST'S APPRAISAL OF THE MISSOURI RIVER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By R. R. Renne, Montana State College)

The magnitude of the Missouri River Valley in physical area and the variety and complexity of its resource use problems are such as to cause proposed resource development programs for the area to have general appeal and interest throughout the Nation. In appraising the proposed developments which have been presented in the preceding paper it would be wise for us to keep two things in mind: (1) The great importance of agriculture in the basin; (2) the strategic role of water.

The Missouri River Basin is primarily agricultural and promises to remain so for a great many years. Therefore, any sound or complete development program must, of necessity, include a sound agricultural development program, including land management and soil conservation, and give primary emphasis to all aspects of the over-all program which will improve and help stabilize the farm and ranch operations of the basin.

In the upper Missouri Basin States, normal rainfall is relatively low and extremely variable with recurring droughts. In this semiarid part of the basin, the conservation of water through sound watershed management, storage, and wise use, is of primary importance, while in the lower part of the basin a humid climate exists and flood damage is considerable. Because of these conditions maximum economic development and use of water in the basin is a key to maximum human welfare in the area. Control and use of water in the main stream channels through big construction projects is only a part of an adequate water use program. Sound land management and cropping practices to control run-off, sound forest and range management practices to achieve maximum water-holding capacities, and stabilization of water courses to reinforce land use practices in order to hold water on the land and ease it to the main stream channels without flood or overflow damage, are all highly significant parts of a complete water-use program along with large dams or construction projects.

WHY A SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE MISSOURI BASIN?

Unwise management of land and poor land and cropping practices are common throughout the Missouri Basin. This in itself does not justify an extensive agricultural program of the nature proposed however, because similar conditions exist in other river basins of the country. What justification is there for a special agricultural development program for the Missouri Basin? Is this a mere starting point for similar programs to be proposed and urged for other river basins in the Nation? Or is the need in the Missouri Basin for such a program particularly acute and timely?

The Food Control Act of 1944 places irrigation in the front rank of priority uses of water in the West. The Pick-Sloan plan, developed by the Corps of Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proposing construction of some 150 large reservoirs and for which Congress has already authorized a total of $700,000,000, makes a complete agricultural program essential. The scope of the Pick-Sloan plan is such that unless other programs are designed and carried out for the area which will make available the information necessary for sound over-all development, a great waste of public funds as well as incomplete and unsound development may result. Moreover, the uncertain growing conditions in the upper Missouri States because of the semiarid climate make it imperative that this large agricultural area of the Nation be developed in such a way as to stabilize its production and contributions to the national welfare as quickly and as completely as possible. Large public expenditures for relief and feed and seed loans in the upper basin States were necessary in past years when adverse weather and business conditions and severe insect pest ravages occurred. Development programs that will help stabilize farming and ranching operations in these States will relieve the Government of future relief and emergency expenditures. More important, sound agricultural development programs will permit the Missouri Valley with its great grain and meat production capacities to make its maximum contribution to the national welfare. We should not forget that one-fourth of the Nation's farm land lies in the Missouri Basin. Farm output in the basin during the past decade under favorable weather conditions has been a very significant factor in making it possible for us to improve our level of living at home at the same time that we carried out a major war and its attendant postwar reconstruction and rehabilitation programs.

The question immediately arises as to whether an agricultural-development program such as that which has been explained in the preceding paper should precede a major engineering or construction program such as the Pick-Sloan plan, or whether it should be carried out concurrently with such a program, or whether it should follow the construction program. The facts are, of course, that the large engineering and dam-construction program is already under way, while the detailed agricultural-development program is merely in the proposal stage. Some contend that construction planned in the Pick-Sloan program will not only needlessly flood hundreds of thousands of acres of land but will create huge silt traps, without at the same time checking serious floodwater damage in the small water courses and farming areas generally. To carry out the agricultural program concurrently with the dam-construction program may result in our discovering that the basically sound agricultural program will leave us with many large reservoirs which will never operate as now planned. Hence some suggest that the research and educational phases of the agricultural-development program together with the land-management phases should be pushed rapidly now, before any further work is done in the construction of large dams as contemplated by the Pick-Sloan plan. The Department's agricultural program as presented indicates that what might normally be

undertaken over a 100-year period, has been telescoped into a 30-year-project proposal, but perhaps it should be telescoped still further into a 15- or 20-year proposition, particularly since much of the information and resulting developments are essential for a future sound system of major dams in the valley.

This should not be interpreted to mean that agricultural development as proposed in the five-point program should be complete in 15 to 20 years. As a matter of fact, full agricultural development will probably never be complete. The educational and research phases of the program, however, need to be greatly speeded up. The next 5 to 10 years should reflect tremendous expansion along these lines.

IS THE MISSOURI DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NEEDED?

Currently we are faced with the threat of great surpluses in several farm products including wheat, one of the major products of the Missouri Basin. Acreage limitations are being worked out to reduce wheat acreage. Under these conditions, what economic justification is there for undertaking the five-point agricultural-development program proposed? It is said that the development program will ultimately result in increasing the irrigated farm land of the basin two and a half times from the present 5,000,000 acres to some 12,500,000 acres. This more than doubling of present irrigated acreage would mean a great increase in the agricultural production of the Missouri Basin, but it is estimated it would increase the total farm production of the United States by only a small amount. For example, the increased irrigated acreage contemplated under the Pick-Sloan plan would result in a 70-percent increase in the crop output in the upper Missouri Basin States and a 40-percent increase in crop output for the entire basin, but would result in an increase of only about 5 percent in the total United States crop output.

Part 1 of the five-point agricultural-development program, Conservation and Improvement Measures on Grasslands and Croplands, is designed to achieve good land management and conservation practices on all the 582,000 farms and ranches of the basin. More than a third of the approximate $3,000,000,000 proposed for the agricultural-development program—$1,189,630,000—is proposed to be spent on part 1. Certainly this part of the program should result in increasing the farm output of the basin as well as to make the output more certain, consistent, or stable year in and year out. The prospective increase in the country's population for the next 30 years does not seem sufficient in and of itself, to warrant any large increase in farm production. Present prospects for large exports of farm products at profitable prices also do not appear bright. But, if the management and conservation practices result in increased livestock and meat production through better forage, hay, and feed production, rather than increased cash grain farming, the basin agricultural-development program should fit in well with national needs for the next few decades.

The major objective of increased irrigated acreage in the Missouri Basin through large dam construction should be the stabilization of existing agricultural operations, primarily the range livestock industry through the production of more hay and feed supplies. It is generally agreed that increased numbers of livestock will be needed in the United States to maintain a satisfactory standard of living, particularly in view of prospective population increase during the next 30 years. The stabilization of the livestock industry in the Missouri Basin can best be brought about by integration of irrigated lands with the surrounding dry benchlands and grazing areas. Development of additional irrigated farms for the production of cash crops will not contribute to the welfare of the basin population or to the national welfare as much as will a program in which the newly irrigated lands are primarily used to stabilize operation of existing dry farm and ranch units. If ways can be worked out whereby the new irrigated acreages can be made a part of existing units and used primarily for the production of hay and feed supplies, maximum beneficial production and the most satisfactory and stabilized agriculture for the basin can be achieved. For example, if a limited acreage, say 40 or 80 acres of irrigated land could be made available for the individual operator where he could have his home and his operating headquarters, he could, in addition to having a satisfactory garden, produce adequate hay and feed supplies for his livestock. He might also have allotments in grazing districts for summer range of his beef cattle and produce grain on nearby benchlands. If, on the other hand, newly developed irrigated areas are developed to be complete operating units alone, and are used primarily for the production of cash crops, such as wheat, beans, etc., the lands will not contribute to the further stabilization of output of existing farm and ranch units. There is no assurance in programs already under way or being proposed that such integrated use of irrig ted lands will be achieved. Much good thinking and administrative action needs to be done along these lines and now.

When one ponders the scope of some of the proposed developments, he is likely to conclude that it is some bureaucrat's idle day-dreaming. For instance, 500,000 new ponds seems like an excessive number, but the Missouri Basin covers a large area and anyone who has traversed the Plains knows it is big in every sense of the word. The proposed 14,000 to 16,000 small upstream dams and 400 to 600 desilting and debris basins may sound excessive, but careful study of the many small streams and water courses of the basin will show that the number may be an underestimate, rather than the reverse. The $1,000,000,000 proposed for this phase of development is absolutely essential if we are to get value received from the $5,000,000,000 proposed to be spent by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, in constructing 150 large dams or reservoirs.

Experience with heavy silting of large reservoirs already constructed in the West should emphasize that point 3 of the five-point agricultural-development program, stabilization of small watercourses, is not competitive with the Pick-Sloan large-reservoir construction program, but complementary and absolutely essential for its successful operation. Point 1, conservation and improvement measures on grasslands and croplands, including terracing, grassing of waterways, reseeding depleted ranges, strip cropping, and contour farming is likewise basic and complementary. It would appear that the tentative allocation of two-thirds of the total of $3,000,000,000 proposed to be spent on the agricultural-development program for these two phases is justified.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the agricultural development phase of the Missouri development program does not have the dramatic or glamour appeal to the public imagination of the big reservoir construction phase, it nevertheless, over the long pull, promises equal if not greater advantages to the basin and to the Nation. The estimated total cost of somewhat over $8,000,000,000 for the entire program is a large sum, but in terms of modern Federal fiscal accounts does not loom as excessive. Before we can be certain that this $8,000,000,000 will be a good investment, much sound thinking must be done on other phases of over-all development in the basin, compared with that which has been done by the Department of Agriculture staff members, in developing the proposed Missouri River Basin agricultural program. Reference is made to power development and utilization including rural electrification and industrialization and to navigation. These two enterprises are emphasized in the large-dam construction phase of Missouri Basin development along with irrigation and flood control, but much heat and little light has resulted from the discussions of these two enterprises to date. There are many phases of public-power development which need to be studied and an adequate program mapped out, but the navigation aspects particularly should be subject to very careful scrutiny from the standpoint of possible economic benefits before any further steps are taken to allocate water for this use in achieving a 9-foot channel, etc. Water is a very precious thing in the upper Missouri Basin, and while the agricultural development program, if adequately carried out, would go a long way to conserve and make possible maximum availability of water in the upper basin, it will be of little local or national avail if the resulting water is not put to its most important and best uses. Whether navigation can qualify as a claimant in this category has certainly not been established on any sound basis. It would seem that, in the long run, basin, national, and world interests would dictate that wise conservation and utilization of water for stable and maximum production of food and fiber would be a better use of such waters, if not the best.

This writer concludes that the proposed $8,000,000,000 expenditure in the Missouri Basin can be a very good investment for the Nation in the years ahead. Because they lack the glamour and appeal to the public imagination which some other phases of the program possess, there is grave danger that the agricultural phase and similar detailed information and proposals needed on other phases of the over-all program will be sidetracked or carried out inadequately. They are basic, however, to a sound over-all development program and should take a position of priority rather than a second- or third-rank position.

For the next few years it would seem highly desirable to emphasize the five-point agricultural program and to speed up work, particularly on the educational and research aspects, especially soil surveys and land management before we proceed too far with construction of large dams and reservoirs. The agricultural development program is essentially a grass-roots program. To be fully effective it will require adequate support for its educational and research phases. If such support is forthcoming and the land-grant colleges and universities staffs are equal to the challenge, a long step will have been taken toward assurance of sound over-all development of the Missouri Basin for the years to come. Complete development will take many, many years, but it's high time that we put first things first in the Missouri Basin. The proposed agricultural development program presents an important challenge to land-grant institutions, particularly to agricultural departments and more especially to departments of agricultural economics and rural sociology.

Free Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Overseas Writers of Washington last

night entertained 50 distinguished visiting journalists from Europe. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address I made to them on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am indebted to the Overseas Writers Club for this privilege of briefly presenting my compliments to free journalism, at home and abroad, upon this friendly, fraternal occasion.

We and our overseas guests have a common heritage, a common bond, and a common responsibility. Wherever printer's ink flows freely—to register the aspirations of freemen—liberty will never perish. It will survive every tyranny—left or right. It will march on and on toward the triumphant achievement of a free world. Honest, independent journalism is bone and sinew to its hopes.

This free world of which I speak is still in a state of restless flux tonight. Anxiety continues to be an unwelcome guest at every hearthstone in your lands and mine. But mounting hope is also there. The momentum of honorable peace is in high gear. Despite all the discouragements, which it would be silly to minimize, we can say with calculated confidence that our free and independent nations are winning the cold war which has sought to sap their freedoms and enslave their consciences. The free world has made amazing progress, all things considered, toward stabilized security. This is a thrilling fact which encourages all of us to see things through.

I reassert my faith that the free world, in reasonable unity, is invincible. The classic formula of aggression is to divide and conquer. The classic American tradition: United we stand, divided we fall. That admonition continues to blaze across the skies of every free capital on earth. Unless we blindly drop our own iron curtain upon this truth, freemen will win their salvation in the dependable peace of a live-and-let-live world.

But these things are easier said than done. That makes them none the less imperative. Though we act together in the best of faith, still the inherent obstacles are tremendous, as we have already found. We speak different languages. We stem from different environments. We have divergent needs and ways of meeting them. We are separate sovereignties. Each of us, than Heaven, has the right of self-determination. These facts of life enjoin us mutually to practice patience, tolerance, and good will as we each consult our own intelligent self-interest in relation to our common objectives. Mutual recriminations are music to the ears of any potential aggressor who licks his chops in hungry anticipation of our mutual disintegration. But friendly candor is equally indispensable. We must frankly face all the facts of life for the sake of their warnings as well as their encouragements.

I presume that our distinguished visitors are wondering what the people of the United States think about these things. Well, Mr. Chairman, it would be a rash adventurer who would undertake to speak for them. They really exercise freedom in their own vigorous and often startling expression of their own views, and for that I am glad. I certainly do not pretend to speak for them tonight. I speak only for myself.

It seems to me that our basic pattern is clear. The Senate of the United States ratified the United Nations Charter by a vote of 89 to 2. It ratified the Inter-American Rio Treaty by a vote of 72 to 1. It approved the initial Marshall plan by a vote of 69 to 17. It adopted Senate Resolution 239 15 months ago, demanding more effective strengths for all these faiths, by a vote of 64 to 4. It ratified the North Atlantic Pact by a vote of 82 to 13. Last Monday the Joint Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services reported an arms bill to implement the North Altantic Pact by a vote of 22 to 3.

There is powerful consistency in these attitudes. They are basic attitudes. I would not disguise my opinion that as a result of some intervening disappointments and cumulative apprehensions, these earlier majorities would be less eloquent today. But I believe they would still be there. They asserted—and I believe they still assert—our general and very deep conviction that the free world must work together for its common interest in collective peace and that no other character of peace can be dependable in this foreshortened world. I believe they asserted, and still assert, our relentless purpose to stop another war before it starts, and to avoid appeasements which, as I have said before, are but surrender on the installment plan. I believe they asserted, and still assert, our disposition to render every rational, economic aid within our prudent power, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of intelligent self-interest, to help build a sound as well as a peaceful society in which the hopes of men may thrive.

With all humility, Mr. Chairman, I express my pride in the record which the United States of America has thus written into the annals of humane history, and I have no fears that it will suffer from any of the self-serving libels flung at its motives by angry, alien critics who have been thwarted by these policies and who have good reason to know exactly why they are mad.

To our guests from other nations, which, let America never forget, bore the brunt of travail and destruction in the war, I hasten also to express my pride in the many effective evidences of wholehearted cooperation with which they have vigorously responded and without which it would have been impossible to achieve the relative recuperation and the relative security which you and we enjoy tonight. And then, in most earnest friendliness, I further say this to them.

The task is well begun—but, gentlemen, it is only just begun. The testing time must now be met and time is of the essence. Successive stopgaps will not do. I repeat, let us face all the facts.

No matter what our cooperative disposition or our self-interest, there are definite limits to the American resources which we can safely invest in foreign aid. Recognition of this fact is as important to you as it is to us because our unweakened strength is a common asset for us all. These limits must not and will not be overreached.

Even though this were not true, there are definite limits to the practical utility and wisdom of external aid because it must not drift into a permanent reliance. You who come to us tonight from brave nations overseas will be the first to recognize this fact because your nations have incomparably demonstrated your love of your own independence, no matter what the cost in blood and sweat and tears.

You will not misunderstand me—certainly I speak as a proven friend—when I say that, no matter what our disposition, there are critically vital things which rest exclusively in your hands. They must be done before it is too late. Our partnership is based upon self-help and mutual aid. That requires the earliest possible self-sufficiency within each of your magnificent nations by your own courageously effective work and efforts. It inevitably means the swiftest, maximum gearing of all these western European efforts, each with the other, on your own enlightened initiative.

The intensified achievement of these indispensable results necessarily is in your hands. We give you every encouragement; and, believe me, my friends, your self-help success is our most fervent prayer for you.

Mr. Chairman, we are joined together in a crusade for honorable peace. We grip friendly hands across the sea. We have no enemies unless aggressors nominate themselves as such. Our common cause is human rights and fundamental liberties in a free world of free men. So long as we preserve and strengthen and expand this fraternity, we labor in the vineyard of the Lord and I dare to believe He will bless our dedications.

What Price Protection?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject What Price Protection? delivered by Henry W. Nichols, at the banquet of the seventy-third annual convention of the Illinois State Bar Association, at Rockford, Ill., June 9, 1949. I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the cost of printing the address is $205. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the address will be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

WHAT PRICE PROTECTION?

It is a distinct privilege to appear before the Illinois Bar Association. The honor extended is greatly appreciated. I bring you greetings from the American Bar Association and particularly its insurance law section.

To many members of the Illinois Bar Association the American bar is no stranger. Yet, as I travel about the country, I find that there are a surprising number of lawyers, some of whom are active in local and State bar associations, who know very little about the American Bar Association. This great association has a membership of nearly 42,000. Its activities run the whole gamut of the law and shed their beneficial influence into nearly every nook and cranny of both the substantive law and its application. It aims to improve the administration of justice and it upholds the American way of life by supporting innumerable measures for the public good.

Because it is national in scope, with members from every State of the Union, the American Bar Association is peculiarly fitted to support those basic principles upon which our great Republic was founded. I consider it important to mention this in the light of my subject tonight, for the American bar and our State bars are among the greatest sources of leadership in this country.

The United States is a young Nation that is faced with the heavy responsibility of world leadership. Tired and despairing countries the world around are drawing upon our financial and industrial strength. They are looking to this powerful young Nation for leadership that will bring hope and order out of an impoverished and disorganized world. There was never a time when the people of our country needed more to understand our history; when we needed more to take a firm hold of our great traditions.

In our 160 years, the American people have been so busy with industrial and agricultural developments that we have been overlooking

developments in government—particularly national government. We have been forgetting the basic ideals upon which our form of government was founded. When the historical perspective of great ideals is lost, men are apt to depart from tested principles with too little thought of the steps leading to our greatness. We forget the blood shed by brave men and the tears shed by patriotic wives and mothers.

One hundred sixty years may be a long time in the life of a nation, and it has been for some nations. Our Republic, with its freedom, will not go on and on like "Old Man River." Proven ideals must be constantly guarded. Each generation in America must preserve freedom in its own time and in its own way. Our citizens must understand our greatness if we are to keep for another 160 years those ideals that good peoples the world over are hoping and praying that we will be able to maintain.

Until recently in our history we have been so fortunate in leadership that it seems we have been favored by a kind providence. Now we see less enthusiasm for the American way of life and a leaning toward foreign social and economic theories. We of the bar should be more than just deeply concerned as we note the trend away from American institutions. Times are changing but good leadership can and must mold the change for the better, if America is to survive.

It cannot be expected that each individual in this vast Nation will do the spade work necessary to arrive at sound conclusions. Where individuals cannot explore present trends, it must be done by sound, patriotic leadership. People look to leaders and they have a way of following leadership which is determined, persistent, and vociferous even though it may not be the best. All cannot be left to Government leaders who constantly have their eyes on votes. We, the members of the bar of this Nation, must make our contribution to meet the needs of sound, patriotic leadership.

We are pressed from every side by a communistic ideology which opposes every basic principle for which our Republic stands. Its advocates will crush us from without unless we remain strong. Like termites they will undermine us from within if we are not alert. Besides, we are faced with an increasing demand for Government control of our social and economic life. In a changing world, too many people have taken the road of least resistance until one country after another has succumbed to communism or creeping socialism, whether it be known by these names or something else. There is a need for clear thinking by all our citizens. They must fight insidious influences on every front.

We are at long last becoming aware of the communistic threat, particularly from within; we are beginning to see where it is and how it works. Whether we can keep it from absorbing these United States is a question that will not be answered in our generation. But our generation has a grave responsibility to preserve and strengthen our form of government at every opportunity. Our people must see that our strength lies in the power of a great collection of individuals as such—not in social collectivism.

We should be concerned over reasons why so many of our voters do not appreciate the traditional American concepts of government; why in the congressional election of 1946 only 39 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls; why so many are willing to follow controllist measures that are foreign to all that has made this country great. No more fundamental topic could be considered by us here. It goes to the question of how each individual citizen of the United States enjoys his freedoms and opportunities and considers the question of whether this most powerful Nation on earth can continue to maintain the ideals of a true republic.

Our people need to be warned repeatedly against what can happen if they continue to surrender their individual responsibilities and drift toward centralized bureaucratic government. The apathy of majorities must be dispelled to prevent highly organized and secret minorities from undermining our free institutions. Failure to appreciate and guard what we have may result in such ownership and controls in a vast bureaucracy that dictatorship will follow as the only means of making it function.

I do not have to define our American way of life to lawyers or to lawyers' wives. Since the creation of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, lawyers have taken a leading part in public problems. Lawyers, perhaps more than any other group, understand the functioning of a true republic. They, perhaps as much as any other group, have the facilities and ability for making themselves heard. Lawyers can lead the fight against centralized, bureaucratic government. They can appeal to the public for support of time-honored American institutions. For lawyers to fail in this is to sell America short.

There are, and always will be, problems that must be solved. Our needs can be met in the democratic ways of a true republic if the people who make up public opinion are informed by good leaders. Government will follow an informed public opinion. In a democracy people think and act as individuals. Sound leadership is necessary to keep out of the United States the collectivism that has spread to the far corners of the earth. It may be easier, in our country, to watch those who would overthrow the forces of democracy with violence, than to stop the influence of the millions of uninformed voters who are imbued with creeping socialism in its many phases. Free institutions thrive on sound public opinion. We members of the bar must help to build it.

These are serious times. Our citizens have demonstrated time and again their readiness to lay down their lives to stem aggression. We are in a war now, not of tanks and planes, but a war of aggression upon our established principles of government. Our people must be awake to this war between diametrically opposed philosophies of government. The greatest catastrophe which could fall upon the world today would be a fundamental change in the form of the Government of these United States. The world needs America. Government for the people and by the people must not become just government of the people.

Cynicism concerning the better things of life is widespread. Our ideals and aims are being distorted and misrepresented by the opposition at home and abroad. Strange pressures and unusual irritations are generating confusion in all phases of human endeavor. Confusion breeds indifference. These things make it necessary that talented and well-balanced citizens prevent temporary strains from causing permanent harm.

Out of these circumstances there rests a responsibility upon the shoulders of those of us who have benefited most from the blessings of liberty. If the lawyers of this country will but take the brave and determined stand that the situation demands they can have a profound influence upon the future of this Nation. We must have determined leaders with a burning faith in our institutions and the courage to keep them constantly in the proper perspective before all our people. Ideals must be translated into action.

Time brings growth, progress, and change. It would be a dull world in which time slipped by without any break in the even continuity of things. In our country the people have accepted the automobile, the airplane, radio, and television with a sophistication that might indicate they were invented and delivered in response to orders placed in advance. How readily will the majority of our people accept social and political changes that may not be so advantageous? Herein is our danger.

United States Government has grown from little to big government and no one can or would push it back entirely. Big government has become big business both in itself and in its relationship to all the big and little businesses of the country. Our problem is to keep Government within its proper bounds. Today, Federal, State, and local government either absorbs or controls more than a quarter of the country's income and employs a staff of more than 4,000,000 civilians to administer it. Each succeeding year the taxpayer is left less of his earnings to do with as he will. The Federal civilian pay roll alone now amounts to $5,600,000,000 annually. In the year 1947, to pay the cost of Federal Government it took all the income of all the people in 25 of our States or $42,500,000,000. No one escapes the burden of taxes; all pay either directly or in higher costs for goods and services. The waste of the taxpayer's earnings by thousands of inefficient Government agencies and bureaus is appalling. High taxes throttle the individual's incentive to work; to earn; to save and to venture with a portion of his savings. More important than the dollars taxed away from us is the fact that taxes can be a device for social revolution. Taxes can turn freemen into instruments of government.

Social planners both within and without Government are not concerned with the burdens of the taxpayer. Let me read you a paragraph from one of the official reports[1] of the Federal Social Security Administration which illustrates what I mean:

"If, as public assistance administrators, we have genuine conviction as to the applicant's rightful claim on society in time of need, if our feelings about this principle are not divided, we will be inclined to think and feel in terms of the applicant's needs and be less protective of the taxpayer."

The danger is in this kind of thinking and the extent to which the Government is crowding into our social and economic way of life with the concurrent decay of individual self-reliance. Consorting with ideologies alien to our historic concepts of individual freedom under government, these planners have adopted a host of theories to relieve the individual from the need of developing initiative and self-reliance. The danger is that our people in increasing numbers are accepting the sugar-coated pills while ignorant of the fact that the end result may be the loss of the American form of government and with it our freedom. We do not want Government responsible for the all abundant life.

Certainly, there must be change. Let us be as certain as we can that the change spells progress and not a change that would destroy our Government and retard the individual dignity of man for more years than anyone here can estimate. Progress must be made within our time. Let us see to it that it is also made within the framework of the timeless principles of our Constitution.

That the United States has progressed well the past 160 years is self-evident. No nation has surpassed us. Nowhere on the face of the earth has the individual enjoyed such freedom and opportunity. Yet, from every corner of our land social and economic planners are misleading untold thousands of our people. These visionaries would have us believe that a higher standard of living may be had, without regard to individual initiative or contribution, by allowing the central Gov-

[1] Public Assistance Report No. 8, Common Needs, Social Security Board (Administration), Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, D. C., 1945.

ernment to plan our existence. Perhaps we should stop more often to compare our present living standards with those in other parts of the world. Half the population of the earth knows no luxuries and lives constantly in the face of hunger and disease. Half the people of the world still live in ignorance. Our living standards are the envy of the world. The wonder of it is that so many people in this land of the free can be misled.

We grant that more enlightened people are constantly striving for freedom and economic security. In the light of history the gains made in America have been rapid. Economic improvements can and will continue under our American system. But thinking people should seek these improvements by means of their own initiative and self-reliance, not as wards of government. Domination of life by government is not security.

Millions are being squeezed between theories and taxes because they are unorganized and lack leadership. Current developments in our Federal Government suggest that the time is at hand when the brakes should be applied to our gigantic spending program. The spotlight of true perspective should be thrown upon this tax-and-spend philosophy before our free economy disappears altogether and with it our freedom of action in nearly every walk of life. We do not want bankrupting bureaucratic collectivism that substitutes controllist measures for representative government. We prefer the dignity of the individual.

It is not the function of government to produce for us all the needs of life. There isn't a thing that government can do as economically and efficiently as private industry can do it. The Government has not proven that it can spend our earnings as efficiently as we can do it for ourselves. You cannot spend either a home or a government into lasting prosperity.

We are promised rent controls, low cost housing; easy mortgage money, increased social security benefits, including higher old-age pensions for more people; socialized medicine and health and disability insurance for all, unemployment pay with higher compensation covering more workers; Federal aid to education and free lunches for all school children; more farm price supports; more Federal developments; increased minimum wages; competition with steel and other industries when Government planners find it in short supply; floors under falling prices and ceilings over rising prices, and incidentally, the collection of $4,000,000,000, in additional taxes and $2,000,000,000 more for social security.

Take for example the several major bills to provide national health insurance and a public health program. They sound very nice. But for all practical purposes they bring medical services under Federal Government control and put most doctors on the Federal pay roll to provide free service to a large percentage of our people. It is estimated that this service would cost the taxpayers $4,000,000,000 to start and we are told that eventually it would cost ten to fourteen billion dollars annually.

In England, where socialized medicine is now a reality, when you need a corn or an appendix removed, a new set of teeth or eyeglasses, a headache powder, or treatment for bee stings a Government doctor prescribes and the Government provides. If you need simple dental work your dentist may do it, but before a dentist can do an extensive job he must get authority from the Government dental board involving much paper work and delay. Filling in and signing forms of many colors and sizes has become a major part of the English doctor's life. Most British doctors are overworked and many claim they cannot make ends meet on their income. The British Government estimates that a doctor treating 4,000 patients should earn about $8,500 after expenses. Cost estimates to care for the 41,000,000 English people under the plan run to $2,000,000,000 annually. That isn't exactly "free" treatment. And we are told that both the quality and efficiency of medical care has deteriorated in the effort to meet the demands for greater quantity.

Not only has the Government regimented the doctors of Great Britain but a cynical eye has been cast upon the doctors by the Socialists who consider the medical profession a capitalistic class. In leveling the income of doctors the Socialists are driving away from the medical profession some of England's best young men. Ultimately, the English people may find that they have less, not more, expert treatment. I wonder if this invasion of the home by government appeals to the wives and mothers of America.

There is need in some sections of the United States for more doctors and nurses and hospitals. Determined efforts should be made to prove that voluntary methods are adequate. Strong leadership will recognize weaknesses and work for improvements. We don't have to follow foreign measures. Let us hope that our needs can be met in the American way and thereby avoid compulsion under social legislation that would destroy freedom of choice and adequate reward for merit. Bureaucratic compulsion only cheats the people of a free democracy.

Features as interesting and dramatic could be pointed out in connection with nearly every one of the many plans that go to make up the welfare state. Farmers are beginning to worry about the extent to which government is controlling their efforts and lawyers have been concerned about a growing practice before government bureaus instead of courts. But let me touch upon one other subject and if what I say is sound, the ladies present may possibly find a point of view to bring before their parent-teachers association.

In a large sense, principals and teachers of our public schools in the United States are woefully underpaid. School children in some sections of the country are inadequately housed and textbooks and other school materials are in scant supply. The public and the teachers organizations are demanding improvements and they will not be denied. If adequate educational facilities are not provided on the state, county, and local level, then we will have no one but ourselves to blame if Central Government takes over.

The Federal Government in 1949 will spend nearly a billion dollars for educational purposes through some 200 programs sponsored by various Federal departments and agencies. This does not include about $2,500,000,000 which will be spent for education through the Veterans' Administration.

According to the Hoover report: "We have overlapping an independent curricular promotion on the Federal level. It has no semblance of the over-all curricular coordination considered essential at State and local educational levels. As other agencies of the Government realize the potency of the public schools of the country in promoting their individual causes, this situation could easily become chaotic."

In addition, Federal aid to public schools in every State is now a very live topic. A bill recently passed by the Senate calls for a $300,000,000 annual expenditure for public schools. This would be only the beginning. The amount contributed by the Federal Government will increase rapidly. But the immediate issue at stake is not whether the Federal taxpayers will be loaded with another $300,000,000 burden, the real issue is whether we shall maintain a locally supported and controlled public school system. Upon this decision may hang the future of our way of life in America.

Communistic trends have been filtering into our public-school system ever since the end of the First World War. Subtly worded textbooks have been introduced that gradually, but surely, would poison the minds of our children. Other nations have given us adequate examples of what happens when the youth of the land is indoctrinated by government. American representatives aiding in the administration of affairs in Germany since the end of World War II have sent back ample evidence of the Hitler youth movement and what it did to the minds of the children of Germany. The generation under Hitler, in large part, has become a lost generation and the hope of thinking as free men in Germany lies not in the impossible task of reconditioning the youth of Hitler, but rather in the proper training of the coming generations.

We are told that the present school aid bill does all that words can do to assure the public of no Federal control. Legislation, however, may last only from one Congress to the next and as the amount of Federal aid increases under congressional authority there would be demand and opportunity for revised legislation.

With Federal contribution there is always some Federal control and grave danger of an all powerful control. Within a generation, under a federalized school system, if the welfare state has not been extended over our entire social and economic life there will be grave danger of it. A subsidized people is not a free people.

Dr. Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, has declared that he wants no part of Federal grants for educational purposes. He believes that with proper leadership any State in this Union can adequately take care of the education of its children.

Nicholas Murray Butler has written that: "There is not enough money in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce through Federal authority or what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have been already reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us.

"Unless the school is both the work and pride of the community it serves it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the Federal Treasury, accompanied by Federal regulations, Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities."

Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, speaking before the House of Representatives some time ago stated: "Modern history proves with tragic clarity that where a nation's education is placed under a federally controlled system, freedom dies out. May the Federal Bureau of Education never become the Federal Commissar of Education in America."

I could go on but I would tire you with needless repetition. We must watch these planners and dreamers for the welfare state. Whether their aims be borne of ignorance of history and free men's inheritance, or be spawned through frustration and cynicism, they are dangerous. We, in this generation, have no right to saddle our grandchildren with tax burdens born of our indifference and extravagance.

Samuel Gompers, after studying conditions in Europe, warned in an address given more than 30 years ago: "I bid you have a care in all these attempts to regulate the personal relations and the normal activities of the citizenship of our country ere it be too late. * * * For a mess of pottage, under the pretense of compulsory social insurance, let us not voluntarily surrender the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom."

The danger is inherent in the socialistic doctrine and also in the all too many zealots scattered here and there throughout the millions of Government officials. Let me call

your attention to one more quotation from the bulletin of the Federal Social Security Administration. Here the writer says:

"Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Would the gentleman who wrote that paragraph like India where laborers make as little as 5 cents a day; or Russia where life is molded by the state?

What we need in this country is not more public assistance programs under Government regulation and interference but a keener realization that we owe ourselves a free opportunity to earn and retain a decent living in the good old American way.

Henry Bastiat, the celebrated French economist, who lived in the times of Karl Marx, wrote a hundred years ago:

"Cast your eye over the globe. Which are the happiest, the most moral, and the most peaceable nations? Those where the law interferes least with private activity; where the government is the least felt; where individuality has the most scope, and public opinion the most influence; where the machinery of the administration is the least important and the least complicated; where taxation is lightest and least unequal, popular discontent the least excited and the least justifiable; where the responsibility of individuals and classes is the most active, and where, consequently, if morals are not in a perfect state, at any rate they tend incessantly to correct themselves; where transactions, associations, and meetings are the least fettered; where labor, capital, and production suffer the least from artificial displacements; where mankind follows most completely its own natural course."

Developments reported from Washington since I prepared this paper indicate that Congress is beginning to hear from the people back home. Congress will probably adjourn next month and the Eighty-second Congress will soon convene. What happens in the Eighty-second Congress may be the turning point for the United States. We need to build a strong opposition now to those planners in and out of government who may seize upon a temporary business recession to drive ahead their plans for permanent social and economic controls.

In facing our problems and providing leadership let us keep in mind the words of the immortal Lincoln:

"There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual; the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his government and yet opposed to the peculiar principles and methods of the administration."

We must oppose vigorously the peculiar theories so contrary to the basic principles upon which our great Republic rests. We lawyers should accept our responsibilities enthusiastically. We should meet these challenges to our American institutions through wholehearted and devoted leadership.

Louisiana's State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 15 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Louisiana's State Rights," written by Frank J. Looney and published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of August 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISIANA'S STATE RIGHTS

(By Frank J. Looney)

Due to a want of full understanding the Louisiana State administration is "accepting" a compromise on what is commonly called the "Tide Land Matter."

It is in reality a question which involves the extent of territory within Louisiana's boundaries and the right to the Marine League at sea.

History shows that France, as far back as 1683 claimed "possession of the lands, coasts and islands which are situated in the Gulf of Mexico between Carolina on the east and Old and New Mexico on the west."

In 1803 France ceded to the United States "the colony or province of Louisiana with the same extent as it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it"; and declared in the next article of the treaty: "In the cession made by the preceding article are included the adjacent islands belonging to Louisiana."

In 1804, Congress formed the territory of Orleans out of "all that portion of country ceded by France under the name of Louisiana, which lies south of the Mississippi Territory and of an east and west line to commence on the Mississippi River, at the 33d degree of north latitude and to extend west to the western boundary of said cession."

In 1811 an act was passed to enable the people of the territory of Orleans to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union, on an equal footing with the original states.

The French treaty of cession stipulated article 3: The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, etc.

Returning to the act of 1811; it reads in part "After the admission of said territory of Orleans as a State, the laws which such State may pass shall be promulgated, etc." It further particularly describes the limits of the new State and concludes the description: "Along the middle of the said river (Iberville) and Lake Maurepas and Pontchartrain to the Gulf of Mexico, thence bounded by the said gulf to the place of beginning; (the mouth of the Sabine river) including all islands within 3 leagues of the coast."

In 1812, Congress admitted the State of Louisiana by the same description, repeating the title given to the act of 1811.

For the purpose of comparison we quote pertinent parts of the acts admitting Mississippi and Alabama.

Mississippi * * * "thence due south to the Gulf of Mexico, thence westwardly including all the islands within 6 leagues of the shore, acts of March 1, 1817 and December 10, 1817."

Alabama * * * "thence due south to the Gulf of Mexico, thence, eastwardly, including all islands within 6 leagues of the shore."

Comparing these boundaries we find, first, that the Gulf of Mexico is specifically named as the southern boundary of Louisiana; second, that the word coast is used in the Louisiana act, and shore in both of the other acts.

It was during Jefferson's administration that Louisiana was purchased, and during that of his immediate successor Madison, who had been his Secretary of State, that the proceedings for and the admission of Louisiana took place.

One of these men wrote the Declaration of Independence; the other was the father of the Constitution. Their choice of words was, as to precision of meaning, seldom equaled and never excelled.

Later there will be found herein an explanation of coast as distinguished from shore. But, first, we must locate the Gulf of Mexico.

The United States Supreme Court in a case which will be discussed more fully hereafter said:

"Whenever we are considering the matter of boundary we naturally turn to the words by which the boundary is described, and accept the words as controlling." See *Lowndes* v. *Huntington* (153 U. S. at p. 22), and at the end of that page: "The northern boundary in all these charters is given as 'the sound.' It opens into the Atlantic Ocean, but is separate and distinct therefrom. Into it flow many rivers, and open many bays, harbors, and inlets; but the fact of a connection between them and it does not make them a part of the sound."

One of the departments maintained by the United States Government is the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It has an office in the city of New Orleans, where maps showing a situation such as above described but relating to the Gulf of Mexico, may be easily obtained at a small cost.

On these maps you will find Chandeleur Sound, Breton Sound, Mississippi Sound, the bays adjacent to the Mississippi Delta, and so on to the west many bays, including Atchafalaya and Vermillion Bays. Practically all of these are skirted by islands, reefs, and marshland, but ultimately in many places their waters reach the Gulf of Mexico. But no more than Long Island Sound is the Atlantic Ocean, or the waters opening into it are the sound, are any of these waters a part of the Gulf of Mexico, the southern boundary of the State of Louisiana.

The chain of islands on the east include Chandeleur, Breton, and Bird; on the west we find large islands such as Marsh Island and Point au Fer, and closer in Timbalier and Grand Island—and mark this—all of these islands are within the 3-fathom zone, which also contains the land and water area described in the boundary suit of Louisiana and Mississippi as the "Louisiana marshes" by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the soundings on all sides of the larger islands and island chains are strictly comparable to those passed on in the Louisiana-Mississippi case. There are other factors that can be offered in evidence to show that the State of Louisiana extends to the Gulf of Mexico and that all of the islands named and those similarly situated are well within the boundaries of Louisiana and have been long so recognized.

In the treaty of cession France included the adjacent islands belonging to Louisiana. The word "adjacent" was indefinite. In fact, the language of the French treaty was not precise.

Jefferson, in a letter written to Congress in October 1803, said, "The precise boundaries of Louisiana, westward of the Mississippi, though very extensive, are at present involved in some obscurity." In November 1803 he wrote that body, "Of the Province of Louisiana no general map sufficiently correct to be depended upon has been published, nor has any been yet procured from any private source."

Speaking of the French treaty, Chief Justice Marshall said: "The phrase on which the controversy mainly depends, that Spain retrocedes Louisiana with the same extent that it had when France possessed it, might so readily have been expressed in plain language, that it is difficult to resist the persuasion that the ambiguity was unintentional" (*Foster* v. *Nielson*, 2 Peters, pp. 306–307). In the same case the Chief Justice said, "In Octo-

ber 1810 the President (James Madison) issued his proclamation directing the Governor of the Orleans Territory to take possession of the country as far east as Perdido, and to hold it for the United States." * * * "In April 1812 Congress passed an act to enlarge the limits of the State of Louisiana." Anyone can see that there was never any intention to constrict the country ceded by France, but on the contrary, to stretch it as far as possible. The reason is that by this method the expanse of the limits of the United States was increased, namely, by increasing the limits of the States.

The case of *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* was decided by the United States Supreme Court, which said (12 Peters 729):

"No fact was more prominent in our history, none could have been more strongly impressed on the general and State conventions than that the contests for the vacant lands of the Crown long threatened the dissolution of the Confederation, which existed practically and by common consent from 1774 to 1781; when after 5 years of discussion it was ratified by the legislatures of all of the States. This Court has attested the fact—6 Cranch 142; 5 Wheaton 376. Similar danger was imminent from controversies about boundaries between the States till a provision was made for their decision with a proviso that no State should be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United States" (1 Laws U. S. 17). These two provisions taken in connection put an end to any fears of convulsion by the contests of States about boundary and jurisdiction, when any State could by appeal bring the powers of Congress and a judicial tribunal into activity, and the United States could not take any land within the boundary of a State. Hence resulted the principles laid down by this Court in *Harcourt* v. *Gaillard* (12 Wheaton 526), that the boundaries of the United States were the external boundaries of the several States; and that the United States did not acquire any territory by the treaty of peace in 1783."

That was the treaty with Great Britain after the Revolution, and the language quoted as 1 laws United States 17, was also article IX of the Articles of Confederation.

The equality of the States as expressed in the act for the formation of the State of Louisiana, made, ipso facto, the external boundary of Louisiana the boundary of the United States.

THE COAST

The external boundary of the United States was fixed at the Gulf of Mexico and the islands vested in Louisiana are measured from the coast, since various inland waters have been shown to lie north of, and, in many instances, to open into the Gulf of Mexico, the meaning of "coast" in the act becomes important.

An entirely disinterested authority, the Encyclopedia Brittanica, eleventh edition, under the title "Geography," reads: "It is usual to distinguish between the general coast line measured from point to point of the headlands disregarding the smaller bays and the detailed coast line which takes account of every inflection shown by the map employed."

This distinction has been recognized by the courts of the United States in many instances, and it has been made into law of the United States by act of February 19, 1895, 28 Statutes at Large 672, wherein the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to fix the dividing line between the inland waters and the high seas.

This act is now section 151 of title 33 of the United States Code, chapter 102.

The Supreme Court of the United States more than half a century ago in a case entitled "The Delaware" adopted the line fixed by the Secretary outside of New York Harbor, and accepted his points, although they included lighthouses, light vessels, and whistling buoys, in between headlands. Of this designation the Court said: "This, of course, must be taken as the dividing line as to all future cases; but as the Secretary of the Treasury was merely directed to carry out the existing law upon the subject, we think it should be treated as cogent evidence of what the law has been before."

In this case, reported in 161 United States 459, as in the Lowndes case cited supra, a map is given and a scale of nautical miles, and this map clearly shows that the light vessel and the whistling buoy are many miles out from the landlocked harbor.

This marking by the Secretary (now it is confided to the commandant of the Coast Guard) effectually fixes a coast line for the Atlantic Ocean.

Thus it is seen that a coast line may be established on the water while a "shore" according to that best known legal dictionary, Bouvier's, is defined as: "Land on the side of the sea, a lake, or a river."

The Coast and Geodetic Survey map before referred to gives a colored area within the three-fathom zone, then, without color, the Gulf of Mexico, as beyond the 10-fathom zone.

This may be a good place to call attention to a statement in the case which has caused all the trouble, namely, *"The United States* v. *California"* reported in 332 U. S. 19, where on page 26, it says: "We may assume that location of the exact coastal line will involve many complexities and difficulties. Despite difficulties this Court has previously adjudicated controversies concerning submerged land boundaries." And the Court cites another recent decision in a suit between New Jersey and Delaware, where the line was run "to the limits of New Jersey and Delaware, in the Atlantic Ocean, such course passing through a point located south 65°54', west true, 1,303 yards from Brandywine shoal light," and it refers throughout to United States Coast and Geodetic Surveys and to range lights, ledge lights, and shoal lights. The coast line of the Gulf of Mexico has been and can be definitely located and it is the boundary of Louisiana, beyond dispute.

We have no controversy with Texas, but as a matter of fact she was admitted on December 29, 1845, "into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

These identical words were in the act admitting Louisiana.

THE MARINE LEAGUE

It has been said that bad cases make bad laws. Sometimes bad handling makes bad decisions.

The California case was never tried on its merits and many pertinent authorities seem to have been ignored by the Court, or, otherwise, were not presented by counsel.

One of the most important of these was the *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* case; The Delaware was not mentioned, nor was the Lowndes case. The significance of the Delaware can better be understood by considering *Carlson* v. *United New York Sandy Hook Pilot's Association* (98 Fed. 468), and *United States* v. *Newark Meadows Implement Co.* (173 Fed. 426).

In the first case the Court said:

"The Secretary drew a line extending from Navesink Lighthouse * * * to the Scotland light vessel, which is 3 miles from the nearest shore on Sandy Hook, and thence * * * through the Gedney Channel whistling buoy to Rockaway Point life-saving station on the Long Island shore. * * * I doubt whether in fixing the line indicated, the Secretary of the Treasury intended to pass beyond the limit of a marine league, the usually accepted boundary. The Scotland Lightship does not exceed that distance from the shore, and if from that vessel a line be drawn to a point one marine league south of the western end of Rockaway Beach that line would pass through the whistling buoy; so that the Secretary's line seems to agree accurately with the old rule of jurisdiction, and the accident would be found to be within the State limits."

The Newark Meadows case follows the same line and on page 428, it uses this language: "It is obviously beyond the power of Congress directly or indirectly to enlarge or narrow the territorial limits of New Jersey." That of course means, without that State's consent in the manner provided in the Constitution of the United States. Justice McKenna of the United States Supreme Court, while sitting as a circuit justice, quoted Chancellor Kent as holding that the "current of modern authority * * * extends territorial jurisdiction * * * a marine league." Kent's commentaries were written before 1830. In his opinion reported in 73 Federal at page 245, Justice McKenna quotes Sir William Scott as holding "the sea within 3 miles of Friedland as waters belonging to Prussia."

Since the quoted case was decided in 1803, the year Louisiana was ceded by France, the Marine League Doctrine was clearly established then.

In 1805, in an English case entitled "The Anna," Sir William Scott wrote "We all know that the rule of law on this subject is (we translate his Latin phrase) 'ownership of land ends where the force of arms ends,' and since the introduction of firearms, this distance has usually been recognized to be about 3 miles from the shore."

In the same case he held "certain mud islands at the mouth of the Mississippi to be 'natural appendages of the coast on which they border, and from which, indeed, they are formed'."

He further held that these islands were American territory from which the marine zone was to be reckoned.

Justice Story in 1812, in *The Ann,* held, "all the writers on public law agree that every nation has exclusive jurisdiction to the distance of a cannon shot or marine league over the waters adjacent to its shores (citing Bynkershoek and Azzuni—the same who were misquoted by Justice Black on this subject, as noted above) and this doctrine has been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States (*Church* v. *Hubbart* (2 Cranch, 6 U. S. 187, 231)). Indeed such waters are considered as part of the territory of the sovereign."

In 1825 Chief Justice Marshall held, "No principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations."

In 1850 an undivided Court held, "When this country achieved its independence the prerogatives of the Crown devolved upon the people of the States. And this power still remains with them, except insofar as they have delegated a portion of it to the Federal Government" (9 Howard, at p. 78).

Since the only right to submerged soil under the open sea belonged to England as a Crown prerogative and in 1776 became the property of each several original State, and since Louisiana has equal rights to all the Crown prerogatives of France, a nation in equality with England, since the Supreme Court of the United States admits, in the California case, page 35, that "the very oil about which the State and the Nation here contend might well become the subject of international dispute"; how much better, more just, and safer would it be to track the law and concede the marine league to Louisiana throughout the length of her southern boundary, and to exercise the right of eminent domain, when necessary, rather than to place the United States in Azzuni's category of "a nation of robbers."

Whither Western Europe?—Section II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very important article dealing with the German problem entitled "Whither Western Europe?" by Jean Pajus. This is the second of a series of articles being published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER WESTERN EUROPE?

(By Jean Pajus)

SECTION II

The new German trustees

Perhaps the most significant item to come out of Germany in recent times has been the selection of a group of 12 Germans as managerial trustees of the Ruhr iron and steel works. This selection was made by the German bizonal economic administration and is pursuant to Law No. 75 which was promulgated November 10, 1948, by Generals Clay and Robertson. Under this law, the Ruhr industry will be managed by legal entities and supervised by German trustees who will exercise, with but few exceptions, the normal duties of ownership pending a final settlement of the ownership question. (British Zone Review, February 19, 1949.)

The list of the new German trustees is headed by the notorious Nazi industrialist, Heinrich Dinkelbach of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke (United German Steel Works). Reporting the selection of Dinkelbach and his friends, the New York Times, February 2, 1949, said that it "has incensed the German Socialists and trade-union leaders."

This statement appeared in the influential London weekly, Statesman and Nation, of January 22, 1949: "Mr. Flick, principal owner of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke (the biggest Ruhr steel trust) was sent to prison for 7 years for plundering foreign countries and importing slaves; one of his closest associates since 1930, Mr. Dinkelbach, was declared by a denazification tribunal to have: 'no mental relations with nazism' and was appointed German trustee of the Ruhr iron and steel industry by the British military government. What is the difference between Flick and Dinkelbach? The Germans at least have never been able to find out."

Although some of the original names submitted by Dr. Herman Puender, chief executive of the bizonal economic administration, were finally eliminated, nevertheless the spirit of the German heavy industry is quite apparent. In characterizing the final selection of the trustees the New York Times made the following observation: "With the exception of Dr. Dinkelbach the trustees were regarded by many occupation authorities as innocuous" (March 21, 1949).

It was perhaps no accident that Dr. Herman Puender was given the task of selecting the administrators of the Ruhr industries. Dr. Puender's record speaks for itself. Throughout World War II he rendered outstanding service to the Nazi cause. For his services he was promoted to lieutenant colonel during World War II and placed in charge of advancing Nazi ideology in Division 3–H, Abwehr of OKW. His role was equivalent to that of a party commissar in the Russian Army. His special task was to fight American and British psychological warfare. Faithful to his ideology, Dr. Puender, when asked to select the German officials to operate the giant steel industry of the Ruhr turned to the real masters of the Ruhr—the Nazi economic war lords. The original list submitted by Dr. Puender was headed by Heinrich Dinkelbach, of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, and Hermann Abs, of the notorious Deutsche Bank. However, the list was changed somewhat in order to placate criticism emanating from the German trade unions. The final list accepted by the allied authorities includes six names originally submitted by Dr. Puender, including Dr. Heinrich Dinkelbach. The latter, for a period of 30 years was the financial director of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke (United Steel Works), the mightiest steel concern in Germany. Dr. Dinkelbach was a sponsor and financial contributor to the Nazi SS. In the fall of 1946 he was selected by the British as leader of the trustees administration of the North German Iron and Steel Control. The London News Review, October 7, 1947, had this to say about him: "Herr Heinrich Dinkelbach holds in Germany today the place once occupied by such powerful figures as Alfred Krupp, Hugo Stinnes, and August Thyssen. He is the Ruhr industrial magnate, model 1947." The London News Review of that date also reported that in selecting him as chief trustee, the British overlooked his Nazi membership card.

No less significant is the selection of Herbert Monden, formerly a prominent member of the Hermann Goering combine. Dr. Monden was vice president of the Iron and Steel Association of Germany whose task it was to coordinate Germany's heavy industry for war.

The United States Steel Corp.'s interest in Germany

On February 26, when the final list of trustees of the Ruhr industry was announced, the New York Times reported that these trustees would be operating under the supervision of a steel commission, the United States members of which would be William J. Brinkerhoff, Werner P. Naumann, Ronald Clark, and I. F. L. Elliott, all of the United States Steel Corp. The selection of four United States Steel directors as supervisors is no accident. In the summer of 1948, the London Tribune discussed the strange activities of American steel interests in Germany and reported the following: "In July of this year came the first unilateral American intervention. Officially unrecognized by the British authorities, eight directors of the United States Steel Corp. accompanied by a Representative of the Congress Committee for Marshall Aid toured the Ruhr for 3 weeks in Goering's special train. The United States Steel Corp. is the largest horizontal steel trust in the world employing 175,000 workers. Thus it is hardly surprising that a recartelization of that part of the steel industry already decartelized was recommended. The military governors are expected shortly to implement the United States Commission's recommendations, in a plan providing for the recartelization of the 28 new companies into 12 larger concerns."

The London Tribune then went on to discuss the activities of the prewar German Ruhr magnates. It drew attention to the fact that "more significant than the elaborate maneuvers of the German Ruhr magnates, in league with American businessmen, is the speedy German line-up which has taken place within the heavy industries. Hermann Kost, one of Hitler's war economy leaders and former managing director of Rheinpreussen, is in charge of the coal administration; W. Zangen is back on the board of Mannesmann; Rohland, one of Speer's right-hand men in the armament ministry and a member of the Schutz Staffel has returned from internment to the board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. So have Sohl and Schwede, also wartime directors. Hugo Stinnes has been acquitted of all political guilt by a German denazification court, and is active behind the scenes. H. Reusch has emerged with enhanced prestige from his battles with the unions and the British authorities. Henle of Kloeckner together with Pferdmenges, the Frankfurt banker, are faithful representatives of the combines in the Frankfurt Economic Council."

Since the United States Steel Corp. is playing such a prominent role in the new setup in the Ruhr, it is worthy of mention that it had close ties with the German-dominated International Steel Cartel of Luxemburg. In addition to the activities of its directors in the summer of 1948, it must also be stated that George Wolf, president of the United States Steel Export Corp., acted as the brains behind the Humphrey Committee which was sent to Germany by ERP Administrator Paul Hoffman in the fall of 1948 to make a report on the reparation problem.

Mr. Wolf recommended a drastic revision of the original reparations program. His findings were subsequently adopted, almost in their entirety, by the Humphrey Committee. The agreement reached on April 14, 1949, left Germany with the equipment from 159 important plants previously scheduled for removal as reparations. This equipment is located in 32 plants in the steel industry, 88 metalworking plants, 32 chemical plants and 7 plants in the nonferrous metal industry. The allied agreement to this detrimental decision was only obtained through tremendous pressure upon the French and British Governments. The agreement constitutes a victory for the United States Steel Corp., and especially Mr. Wolf. However, it might be more accurate to ascribe the victory to the tremendous propaganda in high Government circles in Washington, unleashed by the Germany heavy industry. Special mention must be made of a splendidly prepared brochure by Dinkelbach's combine, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. This brochure was circulated in the United States Senate. Its main theme was that Europe cannot recover without the final contribution of the German heavy industry. Its concluding sentence was: "Let our warning not fall upon deaf ears."

(See Prevent World War III, No. 29, p. 2, A New Lobby on the Hill.)

Another German who can rightly claim credit for the victory of the German heavy industry is G. V. L. Loesch, managing director of the Deutsche Edelstahl Werke whose plants are on the reparations list. His business was to explain to Mr. Wolf why the German plants must remain in Germany. At first he tried all sorts of ways to prove the correctness of the German view. He used the argument that technically it would be very costly to dismantle and ship the plants to Germany's neighbors. Then he pleaded the case of the loss of the badly needed German technicians to dismantle the plants, thus retarding the recovery of Germany and Western Europe. Mr. Wolf was unimpressed. Finally, Mr. Loesch brought out the import-export statistics of Germany's trade to bolster his thesis. He produced an analysis prepared by the German experts of the JEIA. Then he proceeded to tell Mr. Wolf how the reparations program would adversely affect the German exports, which in turn would reduce Germany's imports.

Mr. Wolf began to show a great interest in these arguments. After several hours of discussion, Mr. Wolf finally agreed that Germany must increase her exports in order to ease the burden of the United States taxpayers. Mr. Wolf was convinced that the only way to increase Germany's exports was to leave the German heavy industry intact.

Mr. Loesch proved quite a persuasive advocate for the German industry, it appears. In the course of his discussion he brought out the argument that traditionally both the United States steel industry and the German

steel industry have always been on very friendly terms. Mr. Loesch was very complimentary to the United States steel industry for its innate civic behavior in the past. He pointed out to Mr. Wolf that the steel industry had no investments in Germany. He suggested, therefore, that Germany would welcome American investments. Mr. Loesch also flattered Mr. Wolf by reminding him that the United States steel industry was opposed to the FEA and Morgenthau plans of 1944. Would it not be very illogical for the American steel industry to subscribe to the discredited Morgenthau reparation policy, Mr. Loesch asked? Then the story goes that Loesch suggested that there was no reason on earth why the American and German steel industries could not straighten out any difficulties regarding future markets by entering into private agreement, as was the case in the past. Mr. Wolf, it seems, found nothing wrong with Loesch's plans and, according to Mr. Loesch himself, "showed keen interest in my argument." The rest is history now. What we do not know, however, is what other agreements Mr. Loesch and Mr. Wolf entered into.

Mr. Loesch, who was recently in Washington, spoke with the highest praise of Mr. Wolf and the American steel industry. His comment was, "The American steel industry has always been very decent toward Germany."

Mr. Loesch did not elaborate on the purpose of his recent visit to the United States. It appears, however, that he had a specific mission to perform—to kill completely the last and definitive reparations program. The German heavy industry would like to retain in Germany 8 large steel plants and the 214 other plants which are slated to be, totally or in part, taken out of Germany as reparations. The fight is now concentrated around the Thyssen works, located at Hambron, with a capacity of 2,400,000 tons, the Heinrichshutte, located at Attingen, the Niederrheinischhutte at Duisburg, Hochfield and the Klockner plants at Dusseldorf. The German steel masters claim all these are indispensable for their country.

German steel magnates' intrigues

During his recent visit to Washington, D. C., this German cartelist, Mr. Loesch, enjoyed the splendid cooperation of Senator MALONE, who probably made his acquaintance while visiting Germany last year, at taxpayers' expense. It was Senator MALONE who introduced Mr. Loesch to Under Secretary of State James Webb, to Paul Hoffman, and others. Mr. Loesch also enlisted Senator MCCARRAN'S help for the preservation of Germany's war potential, which in effect means the betrayal of western Europe.

While Mr. Loesch was busy in the United States with his mission of selling his ideas, his colleagues in Germany were working overtime on the Belgian, French, Dutch, and Luxemburg industrialists to convince them that their national interests would be better served by retaining in Germany the plants slated for reparations—for the benefit of the receiving countries. The German steel masters know that they have nothing to lose in any case. If the reparations deliveries—i. e., what is left after the April 13, 1949, agreement—are carried out according to plan, the Germans lose their plants to their foreign competitors. On the other hand, if the plants remain in Germany, the German steel industry will still be afraid of nationalization by a future German government. The strategy, therefore, is simplicity itself: make a deal with their neighbors whereby the plants scheduled for reparations remain in Germany, but the ownership would be turned over to the Western allies. Thus, if the French own a large plant in the Ruhr they can make money, supervise the production, and satisfy their craving for security at the same time. If the western allies accept this proposition, the Germans would be in a position to circumvent the Social-Democrat demands for socialization, retain the industrial potential in Germany, and hope for better times. The spokesman for this plan has been Gunther Sohl, of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, and chief lieutenant of Dr. Dinkelbach.

Still another approach is being made by Wilhelm Zangen, head of the notorious Mannesman Trust, which controls the tube cartel in Europe. Instead of being tried for spoliation, looting, and slave labor, as Friedrich Flick was, he is now engaged in discussions with the representatives of the French, Belgian, Dutch, Luxemburg heavy industries for the purpose of establishing a new cartel. The essence of Zangen's plan is that the Germans acquire a substantial share in the Western European steel industry. Conversely, the German neighbors would acquire a substantial share in the German steel industry. Zangen claims this would mean a full integration of Western Europe's economy. Zangen also claims that this cartel system is the basis of the Marshall plan. One wonders what Mr. Hoffman thinks of Zangen's interpretation of the ERP.

A note must be added about Mr. Elliott. Since one of the four United States Steel directors appointed to supervise the German trustees administration is Mr. I. F. L. Elliott, it is worthy of note that in 1939 he was the chief go-between for the British, American, and German steel cartels. It is recalled that in 1939, just prior to the occupation of Czechoslovakia, the Federation of British Industries and the German group made an agreement known as the Duesseldorf agreement which was highly unfavorable to the interests of the United States. Mr. Elliott played a prominent role in these negotiations. He is a British subject and is United States Steel Corp. representative in Europe.

Battle of Lake Champlain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Battle of Lake Champlain," delivered over the radio by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, on September 9, 1949, and published in the Chicago Tribune of September 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and thirty-five years ago tomorrow—on September 11, 1814—a young American naval officer, Thomas Macdonough, made final preparations for the crucial engagement destined to turn back a British fleet charged with clearing the path of invasions for a powerful British army moving down from Montreal by way of Lake Champlain.

The army of invasion, under Gen. Sir George Prevost, numbered some 12,000 of Wellington's veterans newly released from European service by Napoleon's abdication and withdrawal to Elba. Its objective was to separate New England from the United States by carrying the war inland along the line of Lake Champlain to the Hudson Valley (basically the strategy of Burgoyne's foray a generation earlier).

Thomas Macdonough of Delaware had gone to sea as a midshipman under the incomparable Preble, distinguished himself under Decatur in Tripoli. Thirty-one years of age, he had wearied out 2 years of idleness on Lake Champlain awaiting an enemy offensive which now moved down upon his station in all but overwhelming force.

The British thrust was carefully prepared and skillfully timed. Launched against a weak link in America's chain of northern defenses, the stroke was delivered with a view toward taking political as well as military advantage of New England's disaffection from the American cause. Throughout the War of 1812, many New Englanders believed that the Union was fated to be dissolved. The feeling in ultra-Federalist circles was that the sooner the United States disintegrated into regional confederacies the better. A proposed British-Canadian-New England rapprochement was blandly considered.

The British were, of course, fully aware of New England's attitude. Making use of ships and men released from the European theater, British landing parties had easily destroyed American shipping on the Connecticut River as early as April.

In June royal seamen and marines burned vessels at Wareham, Mass. Still others harassed the coast of Maine. By July and August a British naval task force operating out of Halifax had seized Eastport, Maine, meeting only the feeblest kind of opposition. The same task force menaced Boston and was barely warded off by the people of Stonington, Conn.

Still later in August another and a larger task force actually reconquered Maine from Passamaquoddy to the Penobscot River. Perhaps two-thirds of the inhabitants thus brought under British rule made no objection. Taking the required oath of allegiance to the crown, they relinquished American citizenship.

Nevertheless, Boston bankers continued to lend money to British interests. New England farmers continued to supply British land forces with beef and grain. Finally, as though to round out the prologue to a complete national disaster, the Ross-Cockburn expedition from Bermuda took and burned Washington on August 24. On the very day that Macdonough's little fleet awaited the enemy flotilla on Lake Champlain, the destroyers of Washington stood in Chesapeake Bay. The ringing of church bells summoned Baltimore to arms.

We know now what the imperiled Nation of 1814 did not know. For all their frightfulness, the British descents upon Washington and Baltimore and their naval demonstrations against the eastern seaboard were diversionary raids to draw American attention away from the main expedition. That expedition, as we have seen, was well under way from Canada.

It was not only the largest army of invasion to be launched against the United States during the war, but its success also threatened the gravest consequences. Once Lake Champlain was secured to British arms, then supplies and reinforcements for the invading army could come directly down from the St. Lawrence River. The military and political results of an iron wedge shattering New York and dividing the Nation can only have been disastrous.

On board his flagship, the 26-gun *Saratoga*, Thomas Macdonough led a short prayer before sending his men to battle stations. His naval force was little. It had been made ready late.

Ashore, the American Army, charged with the defense of Plattsburg as the land key to Lake Champlain, was well commanded in a strongly fortified position. Yet, incredibly, it had been greatly weakened on orders from Washington. The armchair generals who so consistently bungled American strategy seem to have believed that Commodore Perry's desperately won victory on Lake Erie in 1813 had ended all northern naval campaigns. General Harrison's recapture of Detroit had seemingly won in the West. Washington's attention remained fixed on the stalemate at

Niagara. Disregarding the most dangerous British incursion of the entire war, obstinate old General Armstrong, the Secretary of War who had refused to believe the National Capitol menaced until the day of its capture and burning, ordered 4,000 Americans of the Plattsburg garrison to march to the Niagara front.

Only at the last moment was General Macomb, in charge of the skeleton force remaining at Plattsburg, hastily reinforced by some 800 New York militiamen from Essex and Clinton Counties, and by 2,500 Vermonters who stoutly volunteered for duty when their Governor felt qualms about ordering them to serve outside the home State. In the crisis, Macomb mustered about 4,700 half-trained effectives to meet the attack of ten or eleven thousand regulars amply supplied with artillery.

A series of savage little skirmishes fought on broken ground slowed the British advance. But with both land armies at last deployed and the British heavy guns in position, the weaker Americans faced nearly hopeless odds. Even so, General Prevost prudently held off the crucial assault for 5 days until the British Fleet, under Capt. George Downie, should make victory certain by sweeping the American flotilla from Plattsburg Bay. The appearance of Downie's armada as it bore into action around Cumberland head was to send the British Army into action along the entire land front.

Thomas Macdonough had placed his little fleet in a well-chosen defensive position. His four major vessels, the *Saratoga*, the *Eagle*, the *Ticonderoga*, and the *Preble*, rode at anchor on spring cables so that they could be readily turned to bring fresh broadsides to bear. His 10 row-gunboats filled the gaps in the line between the ships of war. All in all, Macdonough commanded about 800 men, most of them landsmen turned sailor within a few weeks, but some of them Army-artillery men converted to naval gunners. The British flotilla, also consisting of four principal vessels, was better fitted and manned by experienced seamen.

The weight of rival broadsides was about equal. The principal American advantage lay in Macdonough's choice of position. His seamanship forced the British to enter the bay and deploy into line of battle before bringing their armament to bear.

The day of September 11, 1814, was calm, the wind light on Lake Champlain. Prayer finished, the American commander had his crews at quarters as the first gun spoke over the placid water. The first British salvo to be received aboard the American flagship did little damage but it shattered the coop in which less devout sailors than Thomas Macdonough kept a cherished gamecock. For a century and longer, men have remembered how the golden cockerel sprang to a gunslide and crowed defiance. Then all the guns roared out in a close and deadly cannonade.

The battle was bitterly fought. Captain Downie died on the deck of his flagship within the first 15 minutes. Thomas Macdonough was three times felled and given up for dead, yet each time he pulled himself erect to direct the combat. Two British ships went out of action. Then two American vessels faltered in distress. The row gunboats fought a bloody draw. After 2 hours of stubborn conflict both flagships were badly hurt. Aboard the *Saratoga*, the entire starboard battery was pounded out of action and the ship was subjected to a raking fire as she held her station against the main British attack. In the end, victory was decided by seamanship. That seamanship was Thomas Macdonough's.

His starboard battery out of action, his decks a slaughter pen, much of his rigging trailing over side, Macdonough wound his ship around on her spring cables, bringing his larboard battery to bear. The British flagship tried to improvise the same maneuver, but failed to effect a complete turn. She went dead in the water under a merciless raking from the *Saratoga*. Even after the British flagship surrendered, her remaining consort kept up a hopeless fight for another quarter hour.

The last British vessel struck her colors 2 hours and 20 minutes after the start of the combat.

The naval insignia is an anchor. This may be justified on the basis that it is the only naval instrument which has remained constant from galley to aircraft carrier. The anchor, of course, is the negation of mobility, which is the soul of naval warfare. Many land battles have been won by armies in trenches. The Battle of Lake Champlain is, I believe, the only naval victory won by a fleet at anchor. The armada in Calais Harbor, and the French at the Battle of the Nile come to mind as fleets destroyed at anchor. Macdonough was unique in knowing when to fight at anchor, and how to deploy his ships.

It is pleasant to be able to record that the victorious American commander received the surviving foemen with marked courtesy aboard his flagship, refusing to accept their swords in acknowledgment of valiant conduct.

Ashore, the American Army meanwhile had made a stubborn defense against superior numbers. The land battle still wavered in the balance when news of his fleet's surrender reached General Prevost. The Britisher called off what might have been the decisive land assault. With naval supremacy on Lake Champlain gone, a further land campaign had become useless.

Thomas Macdonough fought brilliantly. He wrote an indifferent letter. "Sir," he reported to Washington, "the Almighty has been pleased to grant us a signal victory on Lake Champlain in the capture of one frigate, one brig, and two sloops of war of the enemy." There is nothing here of Perry's ringing phrase announcing victory on Lake Erie. "We have met the enemy and they are ours. Two ships, two brigs, one schooner, and one sloop." Yet the forces engaged on Lakes Erie and Champlain were approximately equal. The danger averted by Macdonough's victory was far greater and its results altogether more decisive.

Macdonough, of course, could not know that the British assault on Baltimore was to be beaten off the day following his triumph. No Francis Scott Key has immortalized his victory by a Star-Spangled Banner. The final British disaster at New Orleans was to happen beyond the war's end, months away.

And so tonight may I renew a suggestion I made 2 years ago during the course of these broadcasts. The victories of Lake Erie, Lake Champlain, Baltimore, and Fort Erie all took place in September. The campaign of the Thames began in the same month. I propose, therefore, to the Society of the War of 1812 that we commemorate the American triumph on a day in September. September 10 or 11 may well be dedicated to the memories of Perry on Lake Erie, Macdonough on Lake Champlain. Let us, let all Americans, honor the men and the deeds whereby they won America's Second War of Independence.

Whither Western Europe?—Section III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very important article dealing with the German problem, entitled "Whither Western Europe?" by Jean Pajus. This is the third of a series of articles being published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER WESTERN EUROPE?

(By Jean Pajus)

SECTION III

Law No. 75

A most serious view must be taken of Law No. 75 of November 10, 1948, which provides for the German trusteeship of the Ruhr plants. This decision was protested vigorously by France and the Benelux countries. Their protests went unheeded.

Ostensibly, Law No. 75 calls for a prohibition of excessive concentration of the German industry. Yet that very same law will result in a greater concentration of the industrial potential of the Ruhr in the hands of a single powerful group consisting of the very same forces which backed Hitler in his adventures. For, as the law now stands, the trustees can create a greater concentration of industrial power than existed under Hitler.

What can we expect from the German trustees selected to administer the Ruhr properties? Two historical events must be pointed out:

1. In 1939, a few months before the outbreak of World War II, a conference of British and German industrialists was held in Duesseldorf at which it was agreed that the British industrialists would deliver important quantities of steel to the Nazi industries. One of the leading negotiators in this conference was Dr. Heinrich Dinkelbach of the German United Steel Works.

2. At the beginning of 1949, a series of conferences again took place at Duesseldorf for the purpose of obtaining the consent of the foreign participants in the matter of raising the level of industry of 1947. The spokesman for the German industrialists was Dr. Heinrich Dinkelbach again.

These two examples clearly show what we can expect if we leave the German properties in the hands of trustees such as Dinkelbach. Under those circumstances it is difficult to see how the return to the most dangerous prewar practices can satisfy the Western nations in their craving for security from German aggression; nor is it easy to see how America can enroll the cooperation of Germany's neighbors in the cold war.

The International Ruhr Authority

At the end of 1948, the creation of an International Authority for the Ruhr was announced. Ostensibly, this International Authority is aimed at meeting the necessary safeguards against renewed German aggression and calls for:

1. The creation of a military security board which will be responsible for the demilitarization and the industrial and scientific disarmament of Germany.

2. The creation of an International Authority which will be responsible for the distribution among the different countries of the Ruhr coal, coke, and steel.

An analysis of the London agreement shows that it is totally inadequate, because it is not precise in its text, because its very foundations are undermined by law No. 75 discussed above, and because it contains many political contradictions. The London agreement does not give adequate guaranties that the control of the Ruhr will be efficiently exercised.

As regards the military security board, the weakest point is that which calls for measures to be undertaken in case Germany is in default. Part VI of article 24, for instance, declares that, "if Germany is declared in default, the powers, members of the author-

ity, will decide by vote of the absolute majority whether steps shall be taken against Germany and if so, which." It is clear that this becomes a political problem and its solution will depend upon the good will of the powers involved. In other words, the military authority program does not contain any safe military guaranty against German rearmament or preparation for aggression.

In essence, the control of the export of coke and steel from the Ruhr and the decisions regarding excessive concentration of industrial power remain in the present hands—the prewar industrial lords of Germany.

Another weakness of the December 28, 1948, agreement is the fact that it does not stipulate which powers actually retained by the military authority will be finally transferred to the authority.

Perhaps the most important weakness in the December 28, 1948, agreement is the fact that German companies with over 50 percent of foreign capital will be excluded from this arrangement. Considering the fact that the present trend is to favor the investment of foreign capital in Germany, many Ruhr companies will inevitably become foreign. Should this happen, a sizable proportion of the Ruhr industries will escape the control of the International Authority and will thus constitute a real danger.

Politically, the day it feels sufficiently strong this new German heavy industry will attempt to free itself from the international control and will not agree to enter any economic organization of the European countries unless it can dictate its policies. Thus Germany will decidedly be in a position to break the Western European powers or acquire the domination of them.

Is it necessary to wait long to see the weakness of the International Ruhr Authority? The latest developments are at hand already. The French newspaper Le Monde, which has been plugging for the idea that Germany must be brought into the concept of Western Europe, was very perturbed on June 1, 1949, because, "the preliminary discussions now going on in London reveal striking disagreement regarding the role to be played by the International Authority. The heart of this argument is the budget to be granted to the Control Authority. Since the whole plan depends largely on the amount of money available to the control body, the experts have been moving slowly." What Le Monde did not tell its readers, was that the French Government had been badly disappointed by the Anglo-American experts which have been trying to set up the International Control Authority.

Up to the present the Allied forces have been in control of the German coal and steel industries. When the International Authority is finally established, it will take over the control of the German coal and steel industries, as well as other industries. A quick glance at the budget proposed by the representatives of Britain and the United States will suffice to realize what we can expect. These experts have recommended that the total budget must not exceed the sum of 1,200,000 marks to cover all its expenses. Is it enough? The best way to answer this query is to cite that the budget of the Coal Board alone amounted to 3,500,000 marks. We will let the reader judge for himself how many technicians, experts, statisticians, and others the International Authority will be able to hire with the low budget of 1,200,000 marks. Worse yet, the experts in London claim that the Authority does not need a large budget, since they have complete confidence in the voluntary cooperation of the Germans (sic).

Back to coal politics

What is the attitude of the German industrialists toward the International Authority? There is abundant evidence to show that the Germans influential in politics and industry have united in a carefully wrought program to frustrate non-German control of the Ruhr. On January 13, 1949, the New York Times reported that "the ultimate goal is to modify the Ruhr statute. The Germans hope to regain de facto control of the vital steel and coal enterprises, while the international de jure body is credited with nominal supervision." The article reported several methods proposed by the Germans for regaining that control and singled out "the possibility of using the internationalization of several industrial complexes for the reestablishment of the old German steel cartel."

A few days later, the first shot of the new German economic warfare was fired. On January 16, 1949, the New York Times reported that the German coal administration has asked for an increase of $5 a ton for the coal exported from Germany to her neighbors. The purpose of this increase was to establish a highly discriminative price structure for Europe's basic commodity. Considering that in the past the German industrialists have used coal as a means of controlling the production of steel products in the neighboring countries, it is obvious that the latest movement to increase the export price of coal will be highly discriminatory against Germany's neighbors and can only work to the advantage of the German industry. Moreover, if this proposal goes through, it will seriously affect the European recovery program.

New investments in Germany?

Extensive discussions have been held in Germany, France, and the United States for the purpose of investing private money in the German heavy industries. On January 24, 1949, the Wall Street Journal reported that, "American and other foreign capital will soon be allowed to invest in Western Germany, said Norman Collison, ECA Administrator for Trizonia—the American, British, and French zone." On January 26, 1949, the New York Herald Tribune reported the result of a survey of American observers in the Ruhr regarding the German industrialists' plans to develop their industries. The Herald Tribune summarized its findings as follows: "Ruhr industrialists are looking at the moment to the United States as the best prospect for new private funds." The amount of money mentioned was 2,000,000,000 western marks. A few days later, on February 23, 1949, the Herald Tribune reported that Hermann Reusch, head of one of the great Ruhr combines, the Gutehoffnungshuette, was warmly received in Paris in the highest French circles. Dr. Reusch had a deal to offer—to give the French steel industry, the Comite des Forges, a 30-percent stock interest in the Ruhr. According to this report, the Ruhr industry would then be firmly reestablished with no danger of future interference. In addition, the deal was supposed to cement the new Franco-German friendship and thus eliminate the talk about internationalization of the Ruhr. Dr. Conrad Adenauer, the leader of the Christian-Democratic Party, was reported to be in favor of the idea. It must be mentioned that Dr. Adenauer is the personal representative of the owners and managers of the heavy industry in the Ruhr.

How do the Germans envisage the future of the Ruhr? A preview was given by Dr. Walter Strauss in a speech delivered January 7, 1949, to the Parliamentary Council meeting at Bonn, Germany, called for the purpose of framing the constitution for Western Germany. Dr. Walter Strauss is a member of the Christian-Democratic Union and is very close to Dr. Adenauer. His main thesis was that Germany must be given priority in order to reconstruct her economy without which there can be no reconstruction of the the European economy. Speaking of the question of the ownership of the Ruhr industries, Dr. Strauss said: "I do not take such a somber view of this—I believe that the determination of ownership question in coal mining and iron and steel industries will be left entirely in German hands, and I do not see any reason why we should call into doubt the pledge given by the military government authorities." Dr. Strauss did not elaborate on the pledge.

Dr. Strauss stressed the desirability of international cooperation along the proven path of the twenties. This is how Dr. Strauss envisages the future of international cooperation: "When, in 1925 German sovereignty over tariffs was restored, several agreements between the French and the German economies came into force at the same time, and a close collaboration, particularly with regard to steel and iron products, was started within European limits. This was effected through the existing facilities of those times, by way of international agreements, the so-called international cartels. In other countries such questions are still settled through international cartel agreements, and on this point I would even go so far as to see in the Ruhr statute a favorable starting point. If that goal can be attained, essential functions of the Ruhr authority will become superfluous."

Since Dr. Strauss speaks for the largest political party in Germany, no comments are needed to explain what the world can expect from the new German political administration.

What the American people are entitled to know, however, are the details of the far-reaching pledge given by the American Military Government, according to Dr. Strauss, and if the American Military Government had authority to make such a pledge.

Moreover, since President Truman stated on December 2, 1948, that he would never tolerate the revival of German cartels, the American people are entitled to know what he proposes to do to safeguard our security and to block the activities of the special interests, both in the United States and in Germany.

A clear statement by President Truman would clarify the air.

How the peoples of Europe will ultimately react when they learn how their vital security interests are being betrayed—for the sake of power and profits for a few—is anybody's guess.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What the American people, for their own security, are also entitled to know, is if our Commander in Chief, President Truman, is in favor of maintaining Germany's industrial war potential, if he sanctions the sabotage of the decartelization policy perpetrated by the American military government officials, and if he will condone the sell-out of our security by the special interests who, through their connections in the Government, have vitiated our German policy by preserving the might of the prewar industrial lords in their efforts to rebuild the Frankenstein monster we were pledged to destroy.)

Delay in Handling Appropriation Bills in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Associated Press has a columnist named

James Marlow. My home-town newspaper in Kansas uses his column. In one of those columns appeared this sentence:

The Senate, which talks so much it can't get its work done on time, is snarling up the Government again.

A very intelligent woman, a citizen of my home town of Parsons, Kans., wrote me a very interesting letter and asked me for an explanation of my part, if any, in the delay. I have written to her an explanation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD her letter to me and my reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARSONS, KANS., *August 24, 1949.*

Senator CLYDE REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: A column by James Marlow which appeared in the Parsons Sun, August 17, leaves many citizens bewildered.

Am sure there must be some plausible reasons for the Senate's delay in making appropriations, but the only persons who have the answer are Congressmen, particularly Senators, themselves.

Most people, I think, realize that Members of the Senate are very busy with their various committee assignments, investigations, etc., but is it not possible to put first things first, get the appropriations out of the way in the required time and then go on with the investigations and speech making on other legislation that has no time limit, instead of using extra time repeatedly voting emergency appropriations?

From my limited observations, am convinced that more people—average citizens—are taking an interest in State and national affairs than formerly.

It has occurred to me that if you were to permit an article in the Sun, answering Mr. Marlow's accusation, it would clarify a confusing matter in the minds of many in this part of the country, at least.

I believe every Senator owes an explanation to his constituents.

Thank you for any consideration you may give to this suggestion.

Sincerely,

MRS. M. F. O'CONNOR.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1949.

MRS. M. F. O'CONNOR,
Parsons, Kans.

DEAR MRS. O'CONNOR: Your letter of August 24 regarding the situation in the Senate this year is as sincere and intelligent a letter as I have ever received from a Kansas citizen during my public life.

You refer to statements made in a newspaper column written by James Marlow which appeared in the Parsons Sun of August 17. Mr. Marlow severely criticizes the delay in the handling of appropriation bills in the Senate.

Mr. Marlow made this statement:

"The Senate, which talks so much it can't get its work done on time, is snarling up the Government again."

I agree with Mr. Marlow that the Senate talks too much and consequently delays consideration and action on important legislation. I have long held the opinion that the Senate should revise its rules so as to apply some common-sense limitation upon the time taken for debate. One would infer from Mr. Marlow's statement that this is the first time that all appropriation bills have not passed by June 30. That would be in error. The situation this year is worse than in any previous year, but there have been similar delays in the handling of appropriation bills heretofore. The Seventy-ninth (Democratic) Congress, in making appropriations for 1947 fiscal year, had not passed 10 of the major appropriation bills by June 30. One of them was not passed until August 8, 1946.

The present situation in the Senate is the most extraordinary one that any citizen of this country has ever seen. The causes of this situation require a long story. I shall be as brief as possible in attempting to explain them.

The roots of this situation begin with the extraordinary campaign for election made by President Truman in 1948. In that year he campaigned the country, making the most reckless promises ever made by any candidate of a major party. The character of this campaign is more extraordinary because it was made by the man currently holding the office of President.

The campaign promises made were for vote-getting purposes. They were appeals to minority groups of all kinds and characters and included a great many things that all practical citizens knew were impossible of fulfillment. President Truman condemned the Eightieth Congress with a Republican majority in both Houses and asked for a Congress with a Democratic majority in both Houses. The people responded by electing Mr. Truman and electing a majority of Democrats to both Houses of Congress.

The result of the election astounded the country. It is the most astonishing result of a national election in the memory of man. If the campaign had been in earnest and the campaign promises made in good faith, the Congress, especially the Senate, should have promptly prepared for early action.

Among the important promises made by President Truman were:

1. Civil-rights program.
2. Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act.
3. Increase of 10 percent in taxes.
4. Social Security expansion.
5. Public housing program.
6. Aid to education.
7. Health insurance.
8. Revival of controls over prices, wages, and business operation.

Did President Truman, the Democratic Party, and especially the Democratic majority in the Senate act as though they meant to fulfill all the promises President Truman made? They certainly did not.

Anybody familiar with the history of legislation knows that the enactment of a civil-rights program would meet with determined opposition from Democratic Members of Congress, particularly from the Southern States. In my own experience in the Senate, time after time bills of this character have been laid before the Senate and met with long delay which is properly called a filibuster. Under the Senate rules—up to this year—there is no practical way to limit debate. All previous efforts to limit debate have failed.

It is a matter of more or less common knowledge that any new Congress is slow in getting started, but no Congress was ever as slow as the Eighty-first Congress which met this year, and no other Congress was ever faced with such an array of irresponsible promises impossible of fulfillment as this one.

From January 3, on which day the Senate met, through and including February 28, there were 8 weeks. There is nothing that prevents it from holding sessions on Saturday. Between these dates, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, there were 48 days on which the Senate could have met, deducting February 22, a holiday. That would have been 47 possible legislative sessions. Assuming that 6 hours is a fair average for a Senate day, there were 282 hours in the 47 days available for legislative session.

From January 3, 1949, through February 28, 1949, the Senate was in session on 21 instead of 47 days. The Senate was actually in session 70 hours and 29 minutes which is 25 percent of the time available for legislative session.

If Saturdays were included, the number of days on which sessions of the Senate could have been held would be increased to 55; the number of hours available for legislative session would have been increased to 330; the actual sessions of 70.5 hours would be 21 percent of the available time.

The truth is that there is a condition of chaos and confusion in the legislative bodies, especially in the Senate. There is a lack of leadership, of intelligent programing, and of common-sense planning. For example, the civil-rights program was embodied in four bills, which were introduced by Senator McGrath of Rhode Island, also at that time chairman of the Democratic National Committee. These bills were introduced on April 28, at the end of the fourth month following the meeting of the Senate on January 3. These bills went to the usual committees and have not been reported by any one of the committees holding them. They are still buried in the committees. There is a Democratic majority on all of these committees.

It was understood that an effort would be made to amend the Senate rules so as to provide a better method of cloture with which to limit debate. Senate Resolution 15 was introduced by Senator HAYDEN of Arizona, a Democrat, and Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, minority leader, on January 5. That was reported out on January 17. Debate began on February 28. The final vote was taken in the Senate on March 17.

President Truman promised repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. A bill to do that was introduced by Senator THOMAS of Utah, on January 6. It was reported out of the Labor Committee on March 8. A minority report was filed on March 28. The Senate began debate on this bill on June 6. The Taft-Hartley Act was not repealed. On June 30, 24 days later, the Senate passed S. 249, the bill revised on the Senate floor largely through the efforts of Senator TAFT.

This is a brief history of a legislative program, if it can be dignified by the name "program," which President Truman, in calling the Eightieth Congress into special session, said could be passed in 15 days.

The Eighty-first Congress has been in session nearly 8 months and has only passed two or three important measures. At that, he had the full assistance of Senator TAFT in getting his housing bill passed by the Senate. Perhaps Senator TAFT was more influential on this point than President Truman.

None of the so-called civil-rights bills have ever reached the Senate floor. When these bills do reach the Senate floor, their controversial nature, especially the FEPC, will probably occupy the Senate for 60 days. As I have already pointed out, Senator McGrath, of Rhode Island, introduced four of these bills on April 28. The Senate had then been in session 4 months.

Bills that have been given lengthy consideration are:

Senate Resolution 15 (cloture): 15 days.
Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act: 24 days.
ECA amendment: 13 days.
North Atlantic Charter: 12 days.
Foreign aid appropriation: 8 days.

For the Truman program to have even a long chance at partial passage, bills like the Taft-Hartley repeal, civil-rights bills, and cloture resolution should have been ready and introduced into the Senate on the first day it met, January 3, 1949—certainly not later than the latter part of that week. Then, advantage could have been taken of the time wasted through Senate idleness and lack of work for the committees through January and February of this year.

Experienced legislators have been shocked with the utter lack of planning and confusion that has characterized the entire session of the Eighty-first Congres.

We all sympathize with Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, the majority leader. His trouble is

that he is majority leader in name only. A majority of the Senate does not agree with him on many of the important points of the Truman program. The membership of the Senate will be the same in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, beginning in 1950, as it is now, except, of course, for changes occurring through resignation or death.

This country has never seen as much chaos, confusion, and lack of responsible leadership throughout an entire administration as that which is present now. This is most unfortunate for the country. The time of the Senate since January has, in the main, been consumed by feeble attempts on the part of the administration leaders in the Senate to put into effect some of the careless campaign promises of Mr. Truman to gain the votes of organized minorities. Fortunately, for the welfare of the Nation, Congress has not seen fit to enact many of these promises into law.

With my best wishes, I am
Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED.

Impressions of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 2 years ago the Little Rock Rotary Club initiated a program which may well be a forerunner to one of the most effective methods of promoting world understanding. The club each year is bringing to the United States two young men from a European country for a 6-week visit in Little Rock. The youths live in the homes of Little Rock Rotarians, visit the schools, churches, and businesses of the area, and, in general, are shown the typical phases of life in America.

This year, the club has as its guests two Italian students, Guido Jacobacci and Pietro Marzoli. On their return to Italy, these young men reported on their visits to the local Rotary Clubs. Their speeches were translated and condensed for publication in the Arkansas Gazette early this month.

Because the reactions of these young men are such a contrast to the sensationalism in the news and the Communist propaganda about our country, I believe that they will be of interest to many Members of the Senate. It is obvious that programs in this field—both those sponsored by our Government and those undertaken by private groups—will have lasting significance in our international relations. Private groups who wish to contribute to world peace might well study this Little Rock plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the speeches be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS TO ITALIAN EYES—I

A TRADITION OF COURTESY REMAINS INTACT

(NOTE.—Two Italian youths, Guido Jacobacci, 22, a law student from Turin, and Pietro Marzoli, 23, a civil engineering student from Varese, left Arkansas June 9 after a 50-day visit here as guests of the Little Rock Rotary Club. The club underwrote the expenses of the two visitors as its contribution to a program of Rotary International to spread the true story of democracy and belie the propaganda of communism. The impression which the program had on the two Italians was indicated in their addresses before their home town Rotary Clubs. In the following article, the first of a series condensed from the speeches, Guido Jacobacci reports on Arkansas.—EDITOR.)

The State of Arkansas is one of the less rich among the States of America, but it has the characteristics of two of the States (sections) which are the least known in Europe, i. e., the Middle West and the South, with their privileges and their faults.

If the Middle West can be considered as the backbone of the actual capacity of production in the States, the South has a tradition of courtesy that entwines back to the semicolonial climate of the plantations, a tradition which perhaps in the years has lost that fascinating perfume of romanticism, but which has remained intact, and has been renewed for us in the cordial, spontaneous, and generous hospitality in the reception they gave us.

The object of the Rotarians was to make known through a personal experience, American people and institutions, hiding nothing and trying to give an exact impression of the political and economical systems. Little Rock is the best town for that purpose, because it is a typical medium central city.

Our stay there had been perfectly scheduled since our arrival. We began with a radio interview, which took us by surprise, and naturally enough soon afterward local newspapermen with their unfailing cameras came and interviewed us, too. We are introduced to all authorities from the local ones to the Federal chiefs and I practically was able to see a legislation system work which as a law student I have studied on my books of constitutional right. The lord mayor made us honorary citizens of the town. I do not have the document with me on account of its being rather voluminous. The sheriff of the county did not want to do anything less and made us ad honorem of the police. The fire brigade received us as honorary firemen, and the Governor of the State kindly gave us an honorary certificate proving his sympathy for our country.

I owe special thanks to Dr. Fay Jones, Mr. Gus Ottenheimer, Mr. Jay Hill, Mr. Sid Brooks; all of them members of the club, who kindly dedicated a great deal of their precious time to us, and who accompanied us with fatherly kindness and gave us a welcome check when we two, alone, left Little Rock for Washington. Then we received very nice telegraphic messages of greetings, from them, to the LaGuardia Airport at the moment we were to board the plane.

We owe Senator FULBRIGHT our special expressions of thanks for having received us as his guests in Washington. Senator FULBRIGHT is one of the most prominent Members of the Senate. He is a member of some of the most important senatorial commissions, among them the Commission (Committee) for International Relations. He is a sincere friend of our country.

My cultural studies and observations have been alternated with very pleasant week ends; we were taken to see immense practical virgin lands; to the shores of beautiful lakes surrounded by miles of thick forests; those lakes so peopled by fishes, that they came and bit even at my very green fisherman's hook.

Among the most important industries we visited I remember the bauxite mines, situated in the neighborhood of the town which from these mines takes its name. The bauxite mines produce 90 percent of all the needed bauxite by the American industries; enormous deposits of a low-aluminum substance have been exhausted during the war, and are now abandoned; they still prove the warlike effort of this country. From a 446,000 tons in 1940, production was raised to 6,000,000 in 1943, representing a 1,500-percent increase. We were invited to visit the big refineries of bauxite of Aluminum Co. of America, and the ultra modern ones of the Reynolds Metals Co. where mechanization pushed to such extreme limit, beyond which I could only think of a mechanized man. Another industry worth mention indeed and which I visited was the one for paper production, combined with a lumber industry. The company owns 10,000 acres of pine forests, and paper mills.

The Westinghouse Co. in Little Rock has just finished a building where they produce electric bulbs. The current production is 250,000 bulbs daily, of bulbs and flashing lights. They expect production to be doubled as soon as the corporation of tradesmen (workers and their teachers) can be able to specialize in such production. Here, too, we could admire the wonderful modern equipment and automatic machinery. Until now the discarded percentage for bulbs has proved rather high. Still, directors and managers did not worry at all. Several women were at work breaking the bulbs the control discarded.

The Westinghouse Co. is one of 1,500 industries which in these last 3 years have built and started new. They have established themselves in the State, contributing to raise [per capita] buying power 100 percent. The raising possibilities have been even more among the farmers. This category has so improved above others as to bring a revolution in their way of living in these last 10 years. Naturally enough, enthusiasms are by now sobered. The wheat producers are somehow preoccupied about their disposing of their new harvest. The same threat could, for the future, present itself to the cotton planters should the worldly conditions relax.

The same considerations could be applied to the revenue from [income of] the colored farmers in the South. It was augmented by 85 percent between 1931 and 1945. Their social conditions are now better too. In the State of Arkansas the Ku Klux Klan's macabre processions of hooded men and their flaming crosses are things of the past. The segregation between the two races, white and colored, is still absolute, but the Negroes enjoy now the same political rights as the white. Emigration of colored people toward Northern and Eastern States has by now almost stopped, in consequence of an evolution in white men's conscience toward more liberality and a reasonable tolerance.

ARKANSAS TO ITALIAN EYES—II

LIFE ON THE CAMPUS IS SIMPLY "FEROCIOUS"

(NOTE.—This is the second installment of a speech before the Rotary Club of Turin, Italy, delivered by Guido Jacobacci, one of the two Italian students who were guests of the Little Rock Rotary Club from April 25 to June 9.—EDITOR.)

The Little Rock special committee for the Rotary Club which was to organize our sojourn in this town, had prepared a special schedule—dividing our time between the Rotarians or anybody else in town to meet us or to have us as their guests. We were questioned, interviewed, asked to make speeches. We were even asked to sing, and here it was we completely disappointed our audience—and all that in the presence of private people, club members (women, too), schools, institutions of every kind and denomination, as well as authorities of every degree. I believe I have never before in my life shaken so many hands. Neither had I before made so many sincere friends in so short a time: from the man who in charge of a special mission, discovered and recovered the gold of the Bank of Italy hidden by the

Germans, and delivered it to the Italian Government (Lieutenant Colonel Penick then, now simply Mr. Penick, bank president) to the anonymous post office employee who confessed to having bombed my native town several times. "Do not grudge it to me, friend," he said, using an almost classic sentence. "I was obeying orders." A photo he gave me, documents a bombing. Luckily they missed their aim at the F. I. A. T. (Fabbrica Italiana Automobili Torino) in Mirafiori.

One of the most interesting subjects for me was naturally to be able to observe the youth of America. It is very difficult to try and understand the people of a country only from the soldiers that country sends out either as invaders or as liberators, to bring war into another country. Extremely interesting it has been for me to be able to visit the many universities and colleges and see how the educational system is applied here, which method or system is, at least, 1,000 miles far from ours. Their system or method is based on pragmatism or utilitarism as one wishes to name it.

However, this method must have some good in itself, if only for the following statement. On the day boys and girls get their maturity diploma, they come out of the hall visibly moved after the long, fatuous, and (what I thought) rather tiresome ceremony of the handing and receiving of diplomas. Many of the girls (and beautiful girls they were) could not hide their tears. We Italian students come out of school with a sense of relief and with feelings to have been freed of an unbearable weight.

Of course these are my personal impressions. Of one thing I am sure, though: the most important part of their universitarian life develops outside its halls, although in the university ambient. As an example I shall speak of the Arkansas University. It is one of the richest in the country. It owns vast property of land, has its own stadium, football and baseball; very modern dormitories, and is richly furnished and equipped. There are special buildings for students' meetings and recreation. Social life for boy-and-girl students—who, far away from their families, are either guests in the dormitories or in the campus, as the veterans are (who receive their university classes at the Government's expense)—develops itself entirely around the university campus. And very intense that social life is. Everybody must take part in it; nobody should live apart from it. A spirit of competition predominates, either in the cultural field or in what concerns sport. Life in this campus is simply ferocious. The result is the half of the 'merican students after their graduation are better prepared for the battle of life, and well ready to occupy the place assigned to them among their similars (among the social mass).

Little Rock has 150,000 inhabitants. The population was augmented as to be nearly double in these last years, thanks to war industries and to progressive industrialization of the whole country which has been previously agricultural. The Rotary Club of Little Rock has about 250 members, which is considered a high percentage, and which is easily explained considering how broad-minded the American clubs are. There are several categories. For example, religion is represented by a Catholic monsignor, by a rabbi, and by a Methodist minister. Meetings are weekly and take place in the best hotel in Little Rock.

The Rotarians' meeting seemed to me to last longer than our meetings over here. Lunch is very simple, almost spartan: a dish of meat served with two vegetables and potatoes and dessert. As beverages they served iced tea or coffee.

Nearly all the clubs use the microphone. Programs vary and are always accompanied by some music. A man pianist or a girl, very pretty, play very softly during dinner, and a trio sings songs or players play and sing. The president of the club reads out the guest list (guests are always numerous) and informs the members about matters interesting the club. One of the managers (sub-editors) of one of the five radio stations in town gives a short résumé of the latest political, and economic-financial news, with special mention of the latest quotations for the cotton market. Soon afterward he gives an anecdote, a funny or comical communication, or a witty remark, as it is almost the rule for all speakers over here.

Then comes the turn for the songleader to lead in a popular song and everybody joins in the singing, standing up. Every time the song leader is a different one, among the members. It is not a difficult task because these songs, dating from the secession war (either songs from the plantations, or ballads) are very beautiful and suggestive.

The lecturer now begins his oratory. Among the many lectures I heard, I especially remember a very interesting one. The lecturer was the leader of the State forestry department. He spoke about the life of quails. His lecture was illustrated by a splendid movie-picture in technicolor.

The State of Arkansas is a real paradise for fishers and hunters. There are the ducks in the section of the State where the rice plantations are and the bears in the thick immense forests where nobody lives, and which cover a notable part of its surface. These bears are very sociable fellows and are tame.

It was during my stay in Little Rock that the yearly lecture convention for the one hundred and thirty-eighth district was organized. This district practically comprises the State of Arkansas. It was the first time that the conference was held in Little Rock, as its customary seat is in Hot Springs with its national park of the same name. A great center for the hydrothermal care of rheumatisms and arthritis and to which thermosbaths and springs the sick come from all parts of the country and from abroad. During the season for horse races the fans of that sport crowd the town. Hot Springs has splendid equipment for what concerns hotels and hospitals. But Little Rock did not disappoint and received in a magnificent way for 3 days the thousand delegates of the clubs.

These meetings are always enthusiastically welcomed by the members. They are considered a very pleasant diversion from everyday family life, which as I have been able to see with my own eyes, is based on sound affection. America is neither Hollywood nor New York.

The meeting was to take place in the morning at 7 a. m. They honored us to be at the center of the assembly and, after a short exposition, we were seized by questions on the most varied arguments and we tried to be ready in answering the best we could. Many questioned us about the organization of the Italian Rotary Clubs; and our audience was indeed very much surprised on hearing that in Italy the Rotarians have no choirs, do not sing at the meetings and do not call each other by their first name.

Concluding: I am very thankful to the Turin Rotary Club, to the Italian district, and to the Little Rock Rotary Club for the splendid opportunity they offered me to visit the United States, to have known so many good persons who have done what was in their power in order to give me a total, complete vision of American life, to tie again those friendly links between two countries and their people, so different and so far away—all this according to the Rotarian ideal.

Arkansas to Italian Eyes—III

America has deep respect for young people

(Note.—This is the third and last in a series of articles reporting the impressions of two Italian students who visited Arkansas this summer as guests of the Little Rock Rotary Club. Below is a condensed version of a speech made by Pierguido Marzola before the Rotary Club in his home town of Varese.—Editor.)

Little Rock, capital of Arkansas, is very different from Broadway's or Hollywood's America, that we more frequently see and that sometimes we think is a real America. The town is very pretty, surrounded by hills and woods, where very intelligently each inhabitant has built his own home with its little garden. The center of the town is intended only for offices, stores, banks, and cinemas.

The residential districts grew up around the center. Here everybody, rich and poor people, has his home, his garden, his car, and his dog. I was astonished by the absolute absence of gates or dividing walls between streets and gardens and between gardens and gardens. The next-door neighbor is considered a dear friend with whom we can always have a friendly chat or combine an outside dinner during hot evenings. The interest and the knowledge of the others is typically American.

From here the proverbial American cordiality derives, which is often confused with superficiality. But if we open our hearts, our minds, our homes to the others in order to understand them and to let them understand us, can we speak again of superficiality? The Americans are in a way more simple and superficial, but, under another point of view, that is our European way of thinking.

Schools (and I have visited several of them, from grammar ones to universities) are used more for a social purpose than for a cultural one. At school, a boy must first of all learn how to live—that is, to behave, to respect others, the nature that surrounds him and things that do not belong to him. He must then learn to be always easy in life and to smile off its facts, because life is considered, in America, too short for being afflicted by small or big troubles. This way the pupil of every school is able, when 14 years old, to find out some job if necessity compels him to work. At school they very often teach psychology that teaches to understand and to appreciate others. Every school has its sports grounds. They take much care in America of the body's health, as they think that from it soul's and mind's health derives, an old belief of the Greeks and the Romans that we seem to have entirely forgotten.

When they come out of school the Americans have a uniform education. The education of a workman is not very different from the education of a businessman. So there is not a big difference of life. The house where the workman lives is very similar to the one where the businessman lives. In the latter one sometimes sees an old picture or piece of furniture that shows a certain refinement of taste. But the workman, too, has his own home, his garden, his car, his refrigerator that contains food that is the same in quantity and quality as the food that the owner of the factory had for dinner that very night.

I noticed how every American family has a deep religious feeling. I never happened, when guest at somebody's house, not to say a prayer before meals. When young people of 18 years leave school and enter life they get into life with the same moral rights of a man 60 years. America is a country that has a deep respect for young people, for their liveliness, for their desire of experiences and innovations. So it happens that even old people feel young or, at least, follow young people. I happened to meet some grandmothers who have almost the same life of their granddaughters. They are members of a club where they make speeches. They drive a car. They dress and make themselves up more or less like a girl of 20 years.

And when grandmothers happen to die, then they are taken to the funeral house,

where they are dressed up with lively colors, and their mouths are made up so they look smiling. They remain for 3 days at the funeral house and all relations visit them there. If these relations want to relax, they can go to another room and get a drink or a hot dog, and they immediately feel that life's going on. In America they live smiling, and we can almost think that they are buried smiling.

I also met many emigrated Italians. They were poor people who had left misery in Italy and who now own farms or small estates and trucks to bring vegetables downtown. Their welcome to us was touching. We were for them the symbol of a home country that's now too far to be clearly remembered.

The reception that Guido Jacobacci and I received from all the Rotarians was beyond every expectation. Everywhere, in their houses and in their work places, we have been received like two of them.

Everywhere we were welcome as those two fine Italians who are visiting Arkansas. My special thanks to Mr. Jay Hill, who took care of our daily programs, to Dr. Jones, president of the club, to Mr. Brooks, its secretary, who explained to us the essence of American life, and to Mr. Ottenheimer, promoter of their international exchanges of young people and generous of assistance and advice.

After our visit in Little Rock, we went to Washington, a town with classical lines, big parks, and with all the gorgeous dignity of the Capital of a great Nation.

From Washington we passed to New York for 10 days.

It should be wrong to make our idea of America through New York.

A different, great America exists beyond big cities. It's a less whirling and frantic America, but I can assure you that it is a good, cordial, friendly, and generous country. It's a country that enraptures so much that I, even here in my dear Italy and with my dear parents, deeply feel homesick for it, because in my short visit I was welcomed by all the people I met with such a spontaneous and sincere cordiality to believe that the way of understanding other men and of reaching a better agreement among nations really exists.

National Science Foundation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article pertaining to proposed science legislation before the Congress, from last month's Science magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS AND NOTES

The Rules Committee failed to place the National Science Foundation bill (H. R. 4846) on the House Calendar before that body declared a recess until September 21, and it has been learned from reliable sources that no action of any kind will be taken until the House reconvenes. Scientists may profitably utilize this period to interview their Representatives, many of whom will be at home. Most vigorous opposition to the bill has come from Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Forty-first District, New York, who has announced to the press that the Rules Committee will take no action on the bill this session, notwithstanding the fact that it has been proposed to limit appropriations for the Foundation to the modest sum required for organization and administration during the first year of its existence. This proposal has been accepted by J. PERCY PRIEST, author of H. R. 4846, and, it is reported, by the President. Under the circumstances it is difficult for Representatives WADSWORTH; HERTER, Massachusetts; and SABATH, Illinois, to justify their opposition to the Foundation on the grounds of economy, but no other reason has been given.

Congressional action on the medical sciences during the week of August 22, as summarized by Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, included a favorable report by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 5903, the hospital construction aid bill, which is substantially the same as S. 614, passed by the Senate on August 9. The House also passed H. R. 6022, which authorizes liberal salary increases for physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Veterans' Administration Medical Department. The Murray subcommittee of the Senate on health legislation approved a completely revised S. 1651, which would add two new research institutes to the Federal establishment—one on rheumatic and metabolic diseases and another on neurological diseases and blindness. The Murray subcommittee is also considering S. 2211, directing the Public Health Service to conduct a sampling survey of chronic and degenerative illness.

American Aid to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very-well-thought-out and well-reasoned editorial from the Marion Sentinel, of Marion, Iowa, of a few days ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACING THE FACTS

(By Ross Young)

The British have been and are a wonderful people. No nation has made any greater contributions to personal liberty, law, and literature. She suffered terribly in the two world wars, but not so severely in men or money as some other nations. It has been said that the two wars have resulted in giving Britain a dollar shortage. This is not true. They gave her a pound shortage.

Britain has developed during the last three centuries a superiority complex. She was good, and she knew it. But, like others who coast on their reputations and past glories, she failed in many ways to keep step with competition. Even before the First World War, Germany was beating Britain in the world markets. Japan and the textile mills of India proved stiff competition.

When one is losing a game too often he can quit, he can improve his game, or he can cheat. To quit is not in the British character. No people have displayed sterner stuff. Unfortunately, the old snooty feeling of superiority lulled many British to sleep. Instead of paying the price for improvement, Britain became the arch conniver of all time.

Labor connived to get more for doing less and to oppose modern methods and machines. Labor attempted to substitute coercion and political action for increased productivity. Nowhere in the world has the trade union been so strong for so long as in Britain, and therein lies a lesson for American labor.

Business and ownership connived to protect themselves from the rigors of competition. Cartels, agreements, and what not were used in place of the improvements that are so necessary to competition.

British Government connived, working with the connivers of labor and management. Britain has always tried to get others to fight her wars. Now she wants others to bail her out and pay for her follies.

When Britain lives beyond her means, as she is doing with socialism, she thereby depreciates her money. Britain says her pound is worth $4.03. Actually, it is worth less than $3. That means her goods are overpriced in the world market by almost 40 percent. Of course, she can't compete.

So Britain connives with socialism, controls, cartels, agreements, schemes, anything but an honest currency. She can get all the dollars she needs for trade by letting her currency go to its actual value. Her exports then would buy dollars not only in America but in many markets.

What the people of Britain want to do is their own business. But what they do with our money is our business. To continue pouring in money to support a cheating currency is to make America a party to the fraud.

California's Central Valley Complete Development Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1949, President Truman transmitted to Congress a report for the development of the resources of the Central Valley of California. This action by the President provides for a united approach to the problems of development in the Central Valley by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of the Army. It is true that many engineering and economic difficulties remain to be solved before this vast undertaking is completed. The President's plan clears away the uncertainties that may have existed in our minds up to now and provides a basis upon which actual construction can proceed. American engineering skill and experience will complete the job.

Central Valley is the heart of California. Complete development ultimately will bring into cultivation 3,040,000 acres of waste land, will protect other acres from destruction by salt-water intrusion, and provide adequate supplies to still other lands now suffering damage in dry years. Effective flood control will be provided and hydroelectric energy in the amount of 8,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours now wasted annually will be put to use to maintain high standard of

living for the people of California. The President's plan for accomplishing this tremendous task is contained in his letter to you, Mr. Speaker, dated August 29, 1949, and his appraisal of the plan is contained in his letter of August 15, 1949, to the Secretary of the Interior. I wish to include both of these letters in the extension of my remarks as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 15, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY
OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your report on the Central Valley Basin, Calif., submitted to me through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on July 29, 1948, as well as the related report of the Chief of Engineers on the same basin, have been thoroughly reviewed in the Executive Offices and I have reached the following conclusions:

(a) The reports do not contain sufficient information with respect to engineering and economic feasibility to justify their approval as a comprehensive valley plan.

(b) There would be no objection to the transmission of the reports to the Congress provided it is made clear in the transmittal letter that, aside from the authorizations for the projects specified in (c) below, the other projects proposed are to be considered as an inventory of possible future work to be thoroughly investigated to justify construction authorization.

(c) The reports demonstrate the need for the authorization and construction of (1) the New Melones, Tulloch, and Pine Flat hydroelectric power plants by the Bureau of Reclamation as adjuncts to authorized dam and reservoir projects, and (2) a number of miscellaneous levee and channel improvement projects for flood-control purposes by the Corps of Engineers.

(d) The existing construction authorizations of the Corps of Engineers for the New Melones, Black Butte, and New Hogan multiple-purpose reservoir projects, and the Pine Flat, Isabella, Folsom, Terminus, and Success multiple-purpose reservoir projects after completion of construction by the Corps of Engineers, should be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation.

(e) As additional individual proposed projects not now authorized are found feasible on the basis of detailed project reports, they will be approved for authorization in accordance with the Folsom formula, that is, multiple-purpose dams are the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation, and dams and other works exclusively for flood control are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

I believe that cooperative effort by your Department and the Department of the Army under the functional division of responsibility outlined above will not only facilitate the development and attainment of a sound comprehensive valley plan without duplication of effort and overlapping of jurisdiction, but will provide for unified administration and operation of the completed works which are essential to the best utilization of the benefits from the project as set forth in my message to the Congress on January 12, 1948, House Document No. 496.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

AUGUST 29, 1949.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith, pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, the report and findings of the Department of the Interior on a comprehensive plan for development of the water and related resources of the Central Valley of California. This report and comprehensive plan, which the President in his letter of August 15, 1949, to the Secretary of the Interior, copy of which is attached, authorized this Department to transmit to the Congress, provide a sound basis for the development of an immediate and a long-range program of water control and conservation works as an integrated part of the Central Valley project by extending and supplementing the existing project to assure full utilization of the natural resources of the Central Valley area upon which its economic future is dependent.

The plan represents the culmination of many years of intensive investigation of the water and related resources of the Central Valley. It embraces a Presidential formula to attain full integrated development of these resources under reclamation laws through definition of Federal agency responsibilities which will avoid future questions of agency jurisdiction.

Without additional utilization of its water resources, the economic development of the Central Valley will be limited to its present level, so far as agriculture and its related services and industries are concerned. The ultimate, comprehensive plan proposed herein provides for the framework on which California can build for the future through the orderly development of water-conservation works in the Central Valley Basin. It encompasses 38 major reservoirs, hundreds of miles of main canals, thousands of miles of laterals and drains, 28 hydroelectric power plants with necessary supplementing fuel-electric plants, and electric transmission and feeder lines and substations as may be required to transmit the electric power generated to the various markets, and other related works essential for the control and use of the water resources of the basin. It includes:

1. Provision of water for:

(a) Nearly 2,000,000 acres of land now irrigated from inadequate ground-water supplies and about 400,000 acres which suffer damaging shortages in occasional dry years;

(b) Three hundred and sixty thousand acres of land in the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta needing protection from detrimental intrusions of salt water from San Francisco Bay;

(c) Three million forty thousand acres of land not now irrigated; and

(d) Municipal and miscellaneous purposes within the basin, including use by cities, towns, duck clubs, and game refuges to the extent of 300,000 acre-feet annually.

2. The generation of 8,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually, not including the large additional amounts of hydroelectric power which will be rendered feasible in the mountain and foothill areas through construction of the large multiple-purpose and conservation reservoirs on main streams at the edge of the valley floor.

3. Almost complete control of floods through addition of reservoir storage to supplement the important existing and future system of levees, channels, and cut-offs on the main valley floor.

4. Facilities for recreation, fish and wildlife conservation and propagation, silt and sediment control, and other associated functions.

In its essentials, the engineering plan outlined in the report is substantially the same as that presented for the Central Valley by the California State engineer in his report to the California Legislature in 1931 and adopted by the State legislature in 1941 as part of the State water plan.

In this Department's report to the President of July 29, 1948, the Secretary concurred in the recommendations of the Commissioner of Reclamation contained in his letter to the Secretary of July 26, 1948. These recommendations, among other things, contemplated the authorization of several new projects as the next stage of development of the Central Valley project and the transfer of certain authorizations and projects from the Corps of Engineers to the Department of the Interior, consistent with the formula prescribed by the President in his message of January 12, 1948, in the case of the Folsom Dam on the American River in the Central Valley Basin. Following the desires of the President, I hereby amend the previous recommendations of this Department to limit the provisions for authorization of initial new projects to the following: Pine Flat power plant; Folsom power plant, afterbays, and afterbay power plants; New Melones power plant; Tulloch afterbay and power plant, which the President has specifically recommended for authorization and construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. Accordingly, while the balance of the recommendations in the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation of July 26, 1948, remain in effect, recommendation No. 3 in that report is hereby revised to be consistent with the President's recommendation, as follows:

"3. That the Bureau of Reclamation be authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the following principal features and such related works as may be incidental thereto, to wit: Pine Flat power plant; Folsom power plant, afterbays, and afterbay power plants; New Melones power plant; Tulloch afterbay and power plant: related electric transmission system; fuel electric-generating plants required to firm hydroelectric plants included herein; irrigation-lateral distribution systems required in conjunction with features included herein; and the following features previously authorized for construction by the Department of the Army under the Flood Control Act of 1944, to wit: New Melones Reservoir, New Hogan Reservoir, Black Butte Reservoir, all in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, and substantially in accordance with the plans set forth in the attached substantiating materials for the regional director's report as modified herein and with such further modifications, omissions, or additions to the works as the Commissioner of Reclamation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior may find proper for carrying out the projects listed in this recommendation, provided that such local, State, and Federal agencies as may be affected shall have opportunity to cooperate in the investigations and preparation of final plans."

Thus, the plan, with the full endorsement of the President, provides for application throughout the area of the Folsom formula under which the irrigation and conservation features of development and multiple-purpose reservoir projects are the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation and flood-control functions are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. In this respect the President in his letter of August 15 stated:

"I believe that cooperative effort by your Department and the Department of the Army under the functional division of responsibility outlined above will not only facilitate the development and attainment of a sound comprehensive valley plan without duplication of effort and overlapping of jurisdiction, but will provide for unified administration and operation of the completed works which are essential to the best utilization of the benefits from the project as set forth in my message to the Congress on January 12, 1948, House Document No. 496."

In lieu of approval for authorization of other new projects at this time, the President stated that "as additional individual proposed projects not now authorized are found feasible on the basis of detailed project reports, they will be approved for authorization in accordance with the Folsom formula, i. e., multiple-purpose dams are the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation, and dams and other works exclusively for flood control are the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers." This procedure is already under

way and detailed reports on a number of individual and subbasin projects and developments are well along toward completion. In fact, the report on one project which was recommended in the July 29, 1948, comprehensive report, the Solano County project, was completed and sent to Congress on January 28, 1949, and the project is now authorized. Other reports that are being readied for submission to the State of California and other Federal agencies prior to their transmittal to the President and the Congress include those concerning the North Fork Kings River development, the Feather River Basin, the American River Basin, the Sacramento Valley canals, and the Upper Sacramento River tributary plan.

Enclosed with the report transmitted herewith are the comments which have been received from the State of California and from the Secretary of War pursuant to the provisions of section I of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887). In addition, there are enclosed copies of comments which have been obtained from the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Power Commission.

I recommend that the Congress approve the comprehensive plan of development as an inventory of possible future work to be carried out consistent with the formula proposed by the President in his January 12, 1948, message and his letter to me dated August 15, 1949, and that the Congress authorize the construction of the new works proposed, all as set forth in the recommendations of the Commissioner of Reclamation, as modified herein.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 provides that, after a report has been duly circularized as therein required and transmitted to the Congress, the letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document. It is earnestly suggested that, in view of the widespread interest therein, arrangements for printing this letter and its attachments as a House or Senate document be made as promptly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Rebuke to Truman Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Stiff Rebuke to Truman Fair Deal," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STIFF REBUKE TO TRUMAN FAIR DEAL

Most spectacular feature of Tuesday's balloting in Pennsylvania—completely overshadowing the cut-and-dried affair of this city's primary—was the repudiation of Truman Fair Deal policies and CIO high-pressure tactics in the special election to fill a congressional vacancy in the Twenty-sixth District.

Voters of the three counties comprising the district, Cambria, Armstrong, and Indiana, delivered an impressive plurality for the Republican nominee, JOHN P. SAYLOR, despite tremendous efforts made by the Truman administration, the Democratic Party, and organized labor on behalf of the Democratic candidate, Mrs. Robert L. Coffey, Sr.

Mrs. Coffey was seeking the seat formerly held by her son, Robert L. Coffey, Jr., who was killed in a jet plane crash last April. Congressman Coffey, largely with the aid of union votes in the industrial communities of Cambria County, had swept the district in last year's elections.

To maintain their hold on the seat, the Democrats and the CIO went all out in support of Mr. Coffey's mother. She in turn gave blanket endorsement to the Truman administration's Fair Deal program, including the proposed "welfare state" and pledged herself to fight for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Billboards and posters spread throughout the district proclaimed that "President Truman wants Mrs. Coffey in Congress." By sound truck, the voice of Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., supported Mrs. Coffey's candidacy.

The bulk of the Coffey campaign drive was directed by labor's Political Action Committee and seasoned operatives of the CIO's political storm-troops were thrown into the district to get out the labor vote for the Fair Deal candidate.

The issue was clearly drawn by these forces. It was complete subservience to the Truman-CIO policies, as represented by Mrs. Coffey.

The CIO board of strategy relied upon its carpetbag goons imported from outside the district to convince the miners and steelworkers that the Democratic victory of last year should be repeated.

With Congressman Coffey's majorities in Cambria County as a starter, the Democratic-CIO bosses believed they need only hold their own in the farm areas of Armstrong and Indiana Counties to defeat Saylor.

They were proved wrong, not only by the farmers but by the industrial workers. In the city of Johnstown, for instance, Mrs. Coffey received 2,346 votes less than her son had polled in 1948.

The voters, regardless of their union affiliations, refused in huge numbers to back the CIO combination that wanted to make the Congress seat their own. They delivered a stinging rebuke to the Truman policies. They hit back via the ballot box at the imported bunch of CIO stump speakers who were supposed to tell them how to vote.

To say that the result in the Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania District indicates a Nation-wide trend would be taking too much for granted. But when the Democrats and the CIO bosses make an issue of the Fair Deal in a district where they won overwhelmingly the last time out, and the result is a decisive defeat for them and the program they stand for, we are faced with something that cannot be dismissed as unimportant.

Elsewhere in Pennsylvania, as in Philadelphia, primary results contained few surprises. Here the candidates of the regular Republican and Democratic organizations were endorsed in routine fashion. The lack of serious opposition and the bad weather combined to bring the turn-out of voters to a near record low.

There had been little campaigning in advance of the primary, as there was no occasion for any. But from now on the story will be different. The nominees for controller, treasurer, register of wills, and coroner will be called upon to show the voters why they should be elected to these offices in November. The voters will insist on being shown.

Meanwhile Mr. Truman and the CIO high command can chew over the Republican victory in the Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania District and, if they are wise, realize that Americans may not, after all, want to be led down the back road to statism.

Tribute to John E. Peurifoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of August 27, 1949, entitled "He Is Desnobbing the State Department." This article very properly and appropriately gives credit to an unusual American, Mr. John E. Peurifoy. As is the case with many great Americans, he has worked his way from a routine job such as an elevator boy in the Senate Office Building to one of the highest and most important positions in the United States Government.

For years, Mr. President, I have been concerned about the type of individuals we have representing the United States Government in our embassies around the world. Later, after visiting with many representatives in United States Embassies in many parts of the world, I confirmed my belief about the stuffy and snobby sort of people who are representing our great Government.

It has always been my belief that an average American could do a far better job of selling America to other countries of the world than many who have been purposely educated to fit into the elite or stuffy society of the various countries where our embassies are located. It would be far more advantageous from the American viewpoint to sell America to other countries through representatives who are themselves typical Americans. It would seem to me that there could exist, through this type of representation, a far better and more friendly understanding of America's people and its purposes.

Jack, as most Members of Congress affectionately like to call him, not only is a common, average American in his ways but far more shrewd, in my opinion, in dealing with tough international problems, than the snobby type of individual now all too often in our embassies. His straightforward, honest, and common approach with the Members of Congress has made him, as this article points out, one of the most valuable men the State Department has ever had.

I am in hopes that some day the John Peurifoy type will be predominant in all departments of the Government.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will make 2½ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $184.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE'S DESNOBBING THE STATE DEPARTMENT
(By Hugh Morrow)

(John E. Peurifoy, who ran an elevator before he began running the Department of State, is injecting some efficiency into our

least efficient branch of government. Meanwhile, he is making striped pants and the old-school tie very unpopular items of diplomatic haberdashery.)

In the Congress of the United States, where "bureaucrat" is a swear word, a bureaucrat named John Emil Peurifoy holds a unique and happy distinction. Instead of being regarded as one of the lower forms of animal life, he is looked upon with favor, even affection, by both Republicans and Democrats. This is more than a matter of personal gratification to Peurifoy; it has a positive bearing upon the effectiveness of this Nation's foreign policy.

Peurifoy is an easygoing former farm boy from South Carolina who only 11 years ago was shoveling snow in a menial job on Capitol Hill. Today, he is the third-ranking official of the State Department. His rise to prominence is no more astonishing than his ability to win friends and influence Congressmen. "Jack Peurifoy," a Republican Senator remarked recently, "is the best lobbyist Harry Truman has."

Peurifoy's title is Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. He is the quartermaster of diplomacy's army in the cold war. Peurifoy is in charge of hiring, firing, promotions, demotions, communications, passports, and the elimination of Communists and other dubious characters, to mention only some of his duties. For practical purposes, in day-to-day operations, he runs the State Department. His biggest job at the moment is to bring order out of moss-grown chaos by reorganizing the entire Department, an institution which has been called a loose confederation of tribal chieftains. He is doing this under legislation which he planned and lobbied to unanimous approval by both Houses of Congress.

Most important of all, Peurifoy bears the main burden of wheedling State Department funds from a suspicious and critical Congress. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee puts it, "If it weren't for Jack, I imagine we'd cut the State Department to ribbons; as it is, we let 'em off with a few major lacerations."

No casual passer-by would suspect Jack Peurifoy of being a State Department official. He has appeared at the Department for a bit of week-end work in slacks, old shoes, and a lumberjacket. On weekdays he wears an ordinary business suit, but his neckties would blind a prairie dog at 50 paces. He ventures into cocktail-party society only when his position compels it; he is more apt to be found at a baseball game, sitting in the bleachers with his shirt off.

Peurifoy is a handsome man of average height, with jet-black hair, brown eyes, and an easy smile. He has lost so much of his South Carolina accent that he is comprehensible to most Americans and even many Englishmen. Once, however, when he was testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a South Carolina Congressman queried him about career employees of the State Department.

"What about careeah?" the Congressman asked.

"Well," Peurifoy began, "you know we are pulling the Army out of Korea, and we'll have to send State Department people in."

This threw the committee into an uproar, and an Ohio Congressman whooped joyously, "Oh, boy, I've heard of Georgians who couldn't understand South Carolinians, but this is the first time I ever heard of two South Carolinians who couldn't understand each other."

This was unusual, for Peurifoy rarely is confused about anything. Since he hit his stride in the State Department, he has been confused least of all about where Jack Peurifoy is going. At 42, he not only holds an important position in the Federal Government but has his choice of at least eight jobs in private industries at salaries many times the $12,000 a year which he is now paid. Peurifoy may eventually succumb to the lure of high pay, but his wife is doubtful. "It would take a whip to get Jack out of the Government," she says. "He feels that he has a job to do."

For years Peurifoy was a hard-luck boy. He had to leave West Point in his second year because of illness and his father's death. He wanted to be an aviator, but got no closer to it than operating an elevator. Peurifoy worked, successively, as a private tutor and a bank clerk in Kansas City, Mo., and as an insurance salesman and night cashier of a chain restaurant in New York. Once, in New York, he stood in line an hour and a half to deposit $20 in a bank. Later he discovered why the line was so long. There was a run on the bank.

Peurifoy came to Washington in 1935 looking for work, and wound up on an elevator in the Senate Office Building at $90 a month. A few months later he landed a $1,620-a-year job in the Treasury Department, married a pretty fellow employee named Betty Jane Cox, of Oklahoma, in October of the following year, and settled down in a one-room apartment in one of the worst sections of Washington while his pay moved upward with the inexorable lassitude of the civil service to $2,000 per annum. Mrs. Peurifoy, whose parents had been well to do, dreamed of an apartment in the suburbs. In November 1937 she rented one and called Peurifoy at his office.

"Hold everything, honey," he said. "They've just abolished my division and I'm out of a job."

The Peurifoys found work in a department store for the Christmas season. After the holiday rush, however, Mrs. Peurifoy was employed only on a part-time basis, and Peurifoy not at all. There was, he was told, a chance to get a job as a floorwalker. He spruced himself for the interview and, although he had never smoked, carried an unlighted cigar to bolster his confidence. The employment manager turned him down cold; the cigar annoyed him.

Jack returned to Capitol Hill and found a job in the Botanical Garden. He washed flowerpots, mixed manure, cleared snow from sidewalks, and did manual labor on a small park near the Capitol. Late in 1938, after a month at the Labor Department, Peurifoy finally landed a $2,000-a-year job in the State Department. He not only needed the money; diplomacy had always seemed glamorous to him. Mrs. Peurifoy finally got her suburban apartment—although they had to sell their jalopy to buy furniture—and the hard-luck period was over.

In 7 years Peurifoy rose from the bottom to the top of the civil-service ratings, or from $2,000 a year to $10,300. This is not an unparalleled feat, but it takes about 20 years for most of the comparatively few who achieve it. When Gen. George C. Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, one of his first official acts was to name Peurifoy Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration, substantially the job he holds today with higher rank. This event scarcely rocked the world, but it did attract attention within the Department.

"Isn't it a pity," an American diplomat remarked in Paris, "that we should have as Assistant Secretary a man who used to run an elevator?"

When the remark got back to Peurifoy, he boiled, then he cooled off. Ultimately, he approved his detractor's promotion to Ambassador. "He was qualified," Peurifoy says. "Besides, I'm proud of having run an elevator."

The incident confirmed Peurifoy's suspicion that it was time to do something about snobbery in the Foreign Service, that elite corps of diplomats who at times seemed to be operating entirely outside the State Department itself. Peurifoy had his first brush with this attitude back in 1942 during an inspection tour in Latin America. In the American Embassy at Buenos Aires, upon entering the men's lavatory, he found four booths, three accessible, the other locked and bearing a sign, For Foreign Service Officers Only. Though not then a Foreign Service officer, Peurifoy demanded the key so vehemently that he got it, then dispatched a scathing report to Washington.

The Foreign Service is only a symptom, however, not the basic problem. In the past 10 years there have been five Secretaries of State and seven Assistant Secretaries for Administration. Administering the State Department is not easy; one of Peurifoy's predecessors had a nervous break-down. With each new Secretary, there has been a new plan of reorganization. But not until the Peurifoy plan became law this year, with the Hoover Commission generally supporting it, was there an opportunity to correct the fundamental inefficiency—parallelism, which might better be described as paralysis.

Formerly, the State Department was organized horizontally. To solve one problem, perhaps four different sections would have to agree. Major questions could be resolved only by the Secretary himself. Minor ones might never be solved. Peurifoy told the House Appropriations Committee, "A telegram might come out of one office and, if a man in another office did not like it, he might hold it indefinitely."

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, a Minnesota Republican, adds a footnote. "When I first knew Washington officialdom 10 years ago, everybody called the State Department the least efficient Department in Washington. It was commonly said that there were at least five major factions, no two of which spoke to each other except on state occasions."

Peurifoy, undertaking to clean up the situation, provided for a vertical instead of horizontal set-up. Now there is a clear line of authority from top to bottom. And no longer does the Foreign Service recruit its own personnel, handle its own budget, or do its own management planning; in effect, it has joined the State Department. The old-school tie has become unfashionable.

Peurifoy's success in persuading Congress to pass the reorganization bill was, essentially, an easy victory. The need was painfully obvious. The real test of his skill as a lobbyist—and lobbying is one of the most important jobs of the executive branch of the Government—comes when he faces the hard-boiled Appropriations Committees. Any member of these committees who is worth his salt becomes a watchdog of the Treasury, usually with distemper. For example, the record of this year's hearings on the State Department appropriation, before a House subcommittee, fills 1,004 printed, book-sized pages, only 33 pages less than in Gone With the Wind. While of lesser literary merit, the hearings at least suggest where the wind may have gone. Peurifoy sat through the hearings, testifying himself and acting as a one-man rescue squad when others from the State Department got into trouble, until he was stricken with pleurisy. The subcommittee sent him flowers at the hospital—an incident still regarded in Washington with dazed unbelief. "The only bouquet those babies ever sent me," one bureaucrat commented, "was deadly nightshade and rue."

The secret of Peurifoy's success with Congressmen is the utterly preposterous notion that he ought to tell them the truth. The average bureaucrat facing an appropriations committee is conditioned to reject the idea that anything could be wrong in the department he represents. Usually he fails to realize that the Congressmen are likely to assume in advance that hardly anything could be right. There is something depressingly fascinating about a quick tour through the Government of the United States with JOHN TABER, the wittily splenetic Congressman from upper New York State

who headed the House Appropriations Committee when the Republicans controlled Congress and who is presently its ranking minority member.

"The State Department," TABER says, "probably is the most demoralized set-up in the Government. Commerce is bad and Interior is terrible—it might be the worst. Agriculture is awful, and Treasury is bad enough. The Atomic Energy Commission is an outstanding example of bad administration, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force arrangement is no good, although the Navy is not quite so bad as the Army and Air Force."

However, he is willing to say this about Peurifoy: "He is a fellow of quite a little ability; generally he will give us the correct information; he probably knows as much about the details of the State Department as any of them."

A Republican Senator who has dealt with TABER in House-Senate conferences on appropriations quotes TABER more colorfully: "I don't like any of those ——— from the State Department," he'll say. "They come up here, and they lie, and they hedge, and they don't know what they're talking about. All except Jack Peurifoy."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, TABER's opposite number in the Senate, has become a warm friend of Peurifoy's. "He'll sit there with the Appropriations Committee for hours," the Senator reports, "and sooner or later a State Department witness will talk himself into a box. Then Jack will go into action. 'Senator,' he'll say, 'I don't believe the witness meant to say so and so. I imagine that what he intended to convey was as follows.' The witness will flash him a look of undying gratitude, and the whole thing will be straightened out."

Peurifoy's success as a lobbyist must be measured against the prejudices he must combat. Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the Senator from Maine, summed it up in her United Feature column in these words: "Congress doesn't like the State Department. Congress loves the Air Force. State Department proposals are argued almost endlessly, with the Department taking a verbal thrashing. Air Force proposals breeze through Congress by almost unanimous votes. The State Department has brought upon itself much of the bad feeling that exists toward it. It has lived too much within itself. It has done nothing to combat the tea-parties-and-striped-pants reputation that it unfairly has."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, pointed up another of the Department's congressional headaches when he told Secretary of State Acheson recently, "I am not in favor of your policy with reference to Spain, and until that policy is changed I am going to examine your appropriations with a fine-tooth comb."

Against the ancient prejudices, Peurifoy pits frankness, calmness, and an ingratiating personality. Louis B. Mayer, the movie magnate, observed recently, "He wears terribly well."

Peurifoy comes from a politically active family. The Peurifoy name is of French origin, but the family migrated to England in the eleventh century in the wake of William the Conqueror. The first Peurifoy to come to America established a plantation in Virginia in 1919 and became a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses. Jack's great-grandfather married a Byrd, of Virginia, and was a circuit-riding preacher in Florida. One day he returned from his round of soul saving to discover that Seminole Indians had burned his home and slaughtered his three children. Mrs. Peurifoy had escaped by hiding in a swamp. They rebuilt their home and raised a new family, from which Jack is descended.

In Walterboro, S. C., Jack's home town, his father was a prosecuting attorney, one uncle was a judge and another uncle a plain lawyer. Once there was a mule-stealing case in Walterboro, with one of the Peurifoy brothers on the bench, another prosecuting the case, and the third acting as counsel for the defense. The case ordinarily would have been settled in 30 minutes, but this one required a week; old-timers at the courthouse say they never heard such a wonderful display of legal forensics wasted on one scrawny mule. "Never knew a Peurifoy who wasn't a silver-tongued orator," Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, testifies.

Peurifoy's recollections of his boyhood are nostalgic. He would get up at 2 o'clock in the morning and ride in a wagonload of cotton from the family plantation to the gin, dozing while the old Negro driver sang softly in the warm Southern night. There were ponies to ride, and water moccasins to shoot with his .22 rifle on the way to the swimming hole. There was the high hilarity of butchering time, and Peurifoy smacks his lips as he recalls the home-cured hams and a wonderful southern concoction known as sirup pie. But there was also tragedy. Jack's mother died, when he was 6, of heart disease, and his father was stricken in his prime with tuberculosis. Illness and bad crops gradually depleted the once considerable family fortunes.

Walterboro is a quiet Southern town of about 5,000 population, its streets lined with giant oaks hung with Spanish moss. A one-block walk from the main street is like stepping back 100 years in time. Jack, as a school boy, literally grew up on the town, living with various families during the week and returning to the plantation on week ends. He started reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the age of 12, and became so authoritative on national issues that he was admitted to the endless discussions which took place beneath the sycamores lining the courthouse square. His father and the other men treated him as an adult. It was perfect training for a future lobbyist * * * or politician.

In high school, Jack played football and outtalked his teachers. Friends called him by his middle name, Emil, which he detests, or by his nickname, Sonny Boy, which is best forgotten. He always had at least two girl friends on the string. Barely passing subjects which bored him, he led the field in subjects which intrigued him. He shone, particularly, in Mrs. Ruth Thomas' history class; Jack and one brilliant girl would get into such protracted and heated arguments, with members of the class taking sides, that Mrs. Thomas found herself a moderator rather than a teacher. "I learned a lot of history myself," she recalls.

Peurifoy set out from Walterboro for West Point when a high-school classmate who had priority for the congressional appointment to the Military Academy decided, instead, to get married. Jack regrets, today, that he was unable to complete his education at West Point, but for years after he joined the State Department he took night-school courses. "I didn't earn a college degree," he says, "but neither did Secretary Byrnes or Secretary Stettinius."

The difficult years prior to his entering the State Department taught Peurifoy lessons he never forgot. In high school, he was a bit of an acid-tongued wise guy, and as a young man he had a quick temper. One old friend was with Peurifoy when he was arrested for speeding; Jack gave the cop a piece of his mind and also gave up $10. Eight years later the same friend was with him when Jack was again arrested for a traffic violation. This time Jack was so affable and pleasant about the whole business that the incident wound up with the cop shaking his hand and tearing up the ticket. "My," his friend remarked, "how Jack has mellowed."

Peurifoy's rapid rise in the State Department was due in part to assiduous practice of the ambitious young man's standard virtues. He didn't watch the clock, got along well with everybody, kept the boss happy, and studied to improve himself. But he also saw to it that he was always working in a division in which there was plenty of activity and a chance to get ahead. First he was in munitions control, then liaison with the Board of Economic Warfare, then liaison with the War Production Board. He was not afraid to speak his mind, either. In the Government, where so much is done by rote, where security becomes such a shibboleth that men degenerate into mice, an outspoken and vigorous operator naturally stands out. "To tell the truth," Peurifoy says, "the State Department was ripe for guys like me."

Furthermore, he was not afraid to take a chance. Early in 1945 he took on an assignment which could easily have marked him for oblivion if he had botched it. The citizens of Bedford Springs, Pa., were up in arms because Japanese diplomats were quartered in a local hotel, and there were dark mutterings about burning down the hotel, Japanese and all. Peurifoy went there for the State Department, quietly lined up the support of a few key civic leaders, then held a mass meeting in the hotel that was attended by 500 irate citizens. He took off his coat, then his necktie, sat on a desk, and dished up a blunt patois which would have horrified an old-school diplomat into apoplexy. If the citizens of Bedford Springs had a low opinion of the Japanese, it seemed that the man from the State Department had an even lower one. With that established, Peurifoy slipped in the gimmick. One American boy was worth more than the 200 Japanese designated for roasting alive. If anything happened to them, there would be reprisals against Americans imprisoned in Japan. After talking and answering questions for three hours, Peurifoy got a big round of applause. Next day the local newspaper published an editorial supporting him, and nothing more was heard about fricasseeing the Japs.

Soon afterward, Peurifoy got the biggest break of his career—again with an unparalleled opportunity to make a total mess of it. He was sent to San Francisco to arrange for the conference at which the United Nations was born. All he had to do was to find 5,600 hotel rooms in our most crowded wartime embarkation port, set up world-wide communications, arrange for the feeding, transportation, and diversion of the delegates, provide for translation services in five official languages, smooth ruffled feelings every few minutes, and handle the Russians.

Peurifoy went to considerable pains to arrange for the Molotov suite at the St. Francis Hotel. The Russian Foreign Minister showed up and announced that he was staying, instead, at the Soviet consulate. Late one night a Russian delegation arrived at Peurifoy's office and demanded four Russian typewriters * * * instantly. Peurifoy preserved the honor of the United States; he sent men to steal four Russian typewriters from a State Department translation office until replacements could be flown from New York. The Russians wouldn't use the communications we arranged; they steamed a communications ship; the *Smolny*, into San Francisco Harbor. Peurifoy spent hours on his direct telephone to Washington straightening that out, for wartime regulations prohibited ship messages from the harbor.

Then the Russians invited Peurifoy and several others to a party aboard the *Smolny*, at which beautiful Russian stewardesses kept filling the guests' glasses with vodka, or wine, or champagne, the moment they were empty. Peurifoy worked out a technique; he would engage a Rusian in earnest conversation near a deck rail, then dump his vodka overboard while the Russian was talking. Peurifoy is a very moderate bourbon-and-branch-water man himself; besides, it rather offended his sense of technique as a handler of people to observe the Russians' extremely unsubtle

efforts to get the Americans drunk and babbling.

There were others who made problems for Peurifoy in San Francisco. An eminent United States jurist arrived to mediate a labor dispute and was shunted to a fifth-rate hotel. He threatened to telephone President Roosevelt. Peurifoy had, by then, established such friendly relations with the manager of the Mark Hopkins that he was able to arrange a room commensurate with the judge's conception of his dignity.

As usual, Peurifoy made many friends. Roger D. Lapham, the ebullient mayor of San Francisco, called upon Jack at his hotel and was greeted by the State Department's representative clad only in a towel—Peurifoy had been taking a shower. Thus started a beautiful friendship which gave Peurifoy the loud-tie habit. Until then, Jack had always worn ultraconservative neckwear. Lapham, noted for his own gay ties, presented Jack with a few gaudy numbers, and he hasn't worn a quiet one since. Gov. Earl Warren, of California, became a close friend. Hollywood celebrities, including Louis Mayer, joined the Peurifoy circle. Peurifoy may have left San Francisco utterly exhausted, but he also left with two motion-picture company offers as a personnel man, the suggestion that he should be president of a San Francisco bank, a proposal that he join a major automobile-manufacturing company, and a feeling that it was a job well done.

More important, Peurifoy attracted the attention of Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary of State. Acheson made Peurifoy his assistant, and later advised General Marshall to place him in charge of State Department administration. Marshall agreed, brushing aside Peurifoy's suggestions that four other men, whom Peurifoy named, might be better qualified. He did, however, accept Peurifoy's suggestion that the job be taken on a 6-week-trial basis. When the 6 weeks ended, Marshall sent Peurifoy's nomination to the White House and left for Europe without a further word.

Success has not changed the man who used to shovel snow on Capitol Hill. The Peurifoys' friends are still the friends of leaner times. Little more than a year ago, Jack drove to work in his battered old car and returned that night to their $80-a-month apartment in an expensive new one.

"Hah!" Mrs. Peurifoy snorted. "Talk about your southern aristocracy. You're just like all the white trash; you spend all your money on a car and leave me living in a barn."

Jack made amends by purchasing a three-bedroom house, with three and one-half baths, he points out proudly—near the Washington Golf and Country Club in Arlington, Va., across the Potomac River from Washington. Mrs. Peurifoy still has no maid, just a cleaning woman twice a week, and Peurifoy figures he can't afford to join the country club yet, although the swimming pool would be nice for their two small sons. Peurifoy has learned to wait—if not too long. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, eyeing the Peurifoy influence with Congress, has wooed him flatteringly but unsuccessfully. There are all those offers from private industry. And no one who knows Jack doubts that he will go even higher in the Government, if he stays.

Back in 1926, when he was graduated from Walterboro High School, a classmate was summing up Sonny Boy Peurifoy for the senior yearbook. He mentioned that "Emil" was the handsomest boy in the class, was the most sarcastic, that his favorite saying was "I object," and that his ambition, naturally, was to be President of the United States. And then, with the prescience and candor vouchsafed only to the very young, the biographer added: "Idea of misery—to meet his match."

The Steel Board's Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Iron Age of September 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STEEL BOARD'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Presidential steel fact-finding board's report was neither as bad as steel people expected nor as good as the union had hoped. It was remarkable for its simplicity—and for its bluntness. It put to rest a lot of union fairy tales about steel and it gave its idea of the steel industry's responsibility on social insurance and pensions in strong words.

The report ought to be "must" reading. It says that social insurance and pensions paid for by industry should be considered as insurance to take care of temporary and permanent depreciation of the "human machine" the same as plant equipment is provided for. The ability to pay was considered but was not the board's primary argument. The board said that steel was up and coming on wages but was backward on insurance and pension plans.

In a nutshell the board recommended: that there be no fourth-wage round; that an insurance plan costing about 4 cents an hour—with credit for existing plans—be adopted and that a pension plan amounting to 6 cents an hour—with credit for existing plans—be established after a commission studies the problem so that intelligent collective bargaining can proceed to an agreement.

The board rejected all the union's loose arguments on productivity, ability to pay, excessive profits, the need for a wage increase, high-priced social insurance plans, and a $125 to $150 pension per month over and above the Government old-age benefits. The rejections were blunt and short.

A big surprise was the rejection of a wage increase demand on the basis that it was not justified and that if granted it would upset the apple cart for industry as a whole. No inequities were found in steel wages. The board said that stockholders' dividends were but a minor fraction of profits. And it said that maybe profits spent for expansion should have gone to stockholders and funds for social insurance and pensions with long-term financing supplying money for expansions.

Steel management now has a tremendous responsibility. It went into the steel hearings saying that it would not be bound by recommendations of the board. The board's findings were a surprise to steel people. No wage increase is involved. Recommended social insurance and pension plans would be a part of wage costs. But credit would be available for plans in existence. The costs could be as low as 8 cents an hour.

If steel firms do not agree to the board's findings there will be a strike. Such a strike might ruin the budding zephyr of better business.

Steel chose 60 days ago not to fight but to submit to the board under protest. Now it does not have much to fight about—or at least not enough to plunge the country into a steel strike. It is a ticklish decision to make. We don't believe there will be a strike.

But we do believe that this steel board drama should be a lesson to the union and to steel. Together they could not settle their differences. The Government stepped in. Government through its board has made recommendations which carry weight. Management and the union had better take another look before either again seeks Government guidance. Some day recommendations might become "orders" with both management and labor in a governmental straitjacket.

TOM C. CAMPBELL, *Editor.*

Paint College Chimney Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Paint College Chimney Tops," written by Richard Lloyd Jones, and published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of August 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAINT COLLEGE CHIMNEY TOPS

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Already a group of faculty leaders at Columbia University is demanding that President Eisenhower resign. They do not like his American leadership. Those professors again raise the question: Whose college is it?

Ezra Cornell gave his fortune to endow a college whose buildings he erected on his farm "high above Cayuga's waters."

No college was ever founded on a broader intellectual basis than Cornell. But Mr. Cornell did not tell his teachers that the college was theirs to tamper with. He put that truth-revealing enterprise in the hands of a board of trustees which, with its selected president, had the sole power to hire and fire. And any teacher who attempts to tamper with freedom does harm to both the college and the State and should be fired.

As with Cornell, so with Leland Stanford. So with every private college created either by church conferences or by private benevolence. In every case the administration of the college was put in the hands of a governing board. Trustees or regents elected a president. It was his business to be president.

Every State university and teachers college is, by specific law, entrusted to a board of regents who select the institution's president, and it is the combined duty of the president and his regents to run the State's educational institutions and to see that teachers are hired who can and will perform efficiently in classroom.

Nobody ever heard of a college professor being fired because he was a scholar and a gentleman. But in recent years college professors have gone union and in that union they have developed an autocracy that presumes to take over and manage properties they have no legal or moral right to meddle with.

Eisenhower is making Columbia University American-minded. The overwhelming majority of Columbia's teachers, as of every college in the country, are rational intellectually and as patriotic as any teacher at Annapolis or West Point. But there is a fringe of nuts who question the integrities

of America's constitutional foundations. They bring their cynicism and their shallow intellects into the classroom to weaken rather than to strengthen the highest civilization the world has ever known. They don't like the highest culture they have been hired to serve.

When any college president or board of regents or trustees cracks down on these shallow-minded foes of freedom the crackpots in our teaching forces rise to shriek, "The freedom of speech is being denied." These poor crackpots have no speech for freedom. They are too dull to comprehend freedom.

Dr. Allen, the president of the University of Washington, at Seattle, joined issue with these professional nuts last winter when he fired some teachers for being Communists. These professors rushed to the professorial union, the American Association of University Professors, shouting their defiance of the laws of the commonwealth that bears the name of the Father of our Country. But neither those fired professors, nor the imperious blackmailing outfit of university professors, was able to make the State of Washington back down.

Recently this American Association of University Professors, speaking through its leaders, proclaimed that no college in this country has the right to deny a Communist the right to teach. That is a threat. They propose to pick any college that fires a teacher who disseminates contempt for our country. The American Association of University Professors is a disgrace to the teaching profession.

Our colleges were once called the fortresses of our freedom. But now the American Association of University Professors, by piracy practices, attempts to take over and manage properties they did not create and do not maintain. They are dishonest.

The country now owes General Eisenhower a debt of gratitude for a great peace service. He has made all the college presidents and all the regent and trustees, who yield to this imperial dictation of piratical professors, look pretty fragile, weak, and anemic. Every college president should now enlist with Eisenhower and cause our colleges to save our country.

Our college presidents need backbone. It is not enough to be an abstract scientist. It is not enough for trustees and regents to worry over dormitory budgets. The college is a waste of commonwealth money and of American benevolence that does not find its first duty in being a fortress of this Republic.

A Communist is one who believes in the overthrow by force and by violence of the Government of the United States.

Under the influence of technically perfected but spiritually barren professors our colleges have gone a long way from rendering to this country the service which is their first duty and our country's first need.

Much of this spiritual disintegration in our colleges came along with a professorial insistence upon the doctor of philosophy degree. For the most part doctor of philosophy degrees are earned by chaps who are good at going to school and good for nothing else. So they just keep going until they become wards of the college. Then, because they tell college kids what they know, some of them think they are telling the world. The greatest minds the world has produced never had Ph. D.'s.

Psychologists, in the ramifications of their researches, have developed some simple kindergarten tricks to measure the I. Q. One of the elemental tricks is to put before the child square and round blocks. A board with square and round holes. If the child automatically fills the holes, he is a hopeful. But if the child insistently tries to put square blocks into round holes, he is pegged as deficient.

Now that is what is the matter with a lot of our doctor of philosophy teachers. They are intellectual misfits.

In a recent speech before a thousand Yale alumni the president of Yale, Dr. Seymour, said: "None of us can afford to minimize the Communist threat to America." He insisted that we must now offset the effects of organized and insistent communism. Our constitutional Bill of Rights and our Republic are under attack.

Acquaintance with Latin ablatives, convertible hydra cells, and measured light rays makes no contribution to either our culture or security unless back of technical teaching there is a cultivated comprehension and appreciation of American civilization and how it came to be.

The fellow who thinks patriotism is clothed only in military uniforms is a fool. And 40 doctor of philosophy hoods can't make him look either smart or respectable. Our professors would improve the public's respect for them if they clean out their own house.

When our country was in the making our English sympathizers were called Tories. Our Tories painted a black belt around their chimney tops. This was the high sign that in every such house the redcoat soldiers would find not only security but hospitality.

Now that the American Association of University Professors has demanded that every college in this country condone and keep any Communists who may be on its faculty, we should paint a black belt around the chimney tops of any college that yields to this infamous, un-American, and treacherous demand.

Irrigation of Arab Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter written by Prof. A. Reifenberg, of the Hebrew University, as it appeared in the New York Times of September 12, 1949:

IRRIGATION OF ARAB LANDS—PLAN OUTLINED TO UTILIZE WATERS OF EUPHRATES AND TIGRIS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

An article in the New York Times of August 28 has the caption "Arab States seek wide Israeli area" and says that one justification for the large claims, in the Arabs' view, is that they will have to undertake the resettlement of the refugee populations and need territory on which to do it.

The writer of these lines is not concerned with politics, but such irresponsible statements should receive an answer. Neither the unhappy Arab refugees nor the cause of peace is served if the real facts of the situation remain unknown.

It is well known that Syria and Iraq sustained a far greater population in ancient times and it is due to human mismanagement only that the ancient irrigation works of the Euphrates and Tigris region have decayed. In the Syrian Jezirah, the Aram Naharaim of the Bible, only about 20 percent out of an area of a million hectares (two and a half million acres) are cultivated today—and this on a most primitive scale. The writer, when serving as an officer in the British Army, had ample opportunity to study the fertile soils and immense irrigation possibilities of just this region.

PAPER ON CONSERVATION

But now let us hear what a competent Arab authority has to say on the subject. Vahe J. Sevian, head of the hydraulic section, Directorate General of Irrigation at Baghdad, has just submitted a paper to the United Nations Scientific Conference on the conservation and utilization of world resources. The author, presenting a sort of TVA for the twin rivers of the east, rightly states that "the restoration of fertility to vast areas of desert land, the generation of power for new industries, the electrification of rural centers, the development of economic and social institutions, depend on the effective conservation and judicial utilization of the water resources of the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers."

Mr. Sevian outlines the action for regulating the flow by building reservoirs and conveying the waters under control to arable land. With the execution of such a plan agricultural production will increase, rural life will be stabilized and economic conditions will improve as control of the rivers becomes more and more effective. The present shortage of manpower will be overcome by greater mechanization of agriculture. At the same time, navigation throughout the entire basin will become of great importance, and one of Mr. Sevian's most interesting projects is the building of a canal from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean.

It is impossible to describe here in detail the plans presented. Suffice it to say that the irrigable area in Syria could be increased to 1,000,000 hectares (2,500,000 acres), and in Iraq to over 10,000,000 hectares (25,000,000 acres). At the same time vast irrigation possibilities will be created in Turkey and Iran. To understand the magnitude of these figures it may be pointed out that the total cultivated area of prewar Palestine was less than 1,000,000 hectares (2,500,000 acres) and the irrigated area was approximately 40,000 hectares (100,000 acres).

POSSIBILITIES STATED

Once the waters of the Euphrates and Tigris are utilized, 8,000,000 tons of wheat and barley could be obtained annually in the basin, in addition to some 1,500,000 tons of summer crops. A population of over 40,000,000 would find sustenance in a healthy environment of improvement and progress. The present agricultural population of Iraq of about 2,500,000 souls is only sufficient to supply labor for the irrigation of about 4,000,000 hectares. If full advantage is taken of irrigation possibilities in Iraq this country alone would be able to absorb about 3,500,000 new agricultural workers, according to the estimates of Mr. Sevian. Hydroelectric power could at the same time be developed to the extent of over 1,000,000 kilowatts in Iraq alone.

It should be emphasized that Mr. Sevian's plans are based on studies made by the most competent authorities, but it is for the first time, as far as the author of these lines is aware, that such a comprehensive study of all the problems involved has been presented.

Let us hope that the day will soon come when the leaders of the peoples in the Middle East will realize that only by cooperation can peace be restored to this important part of the world. Unwarranted statements made for political expediency will only do further harm to the populations of the Arab states and Israel.

A. REIFENBERG,
Associate Professor at the Hebrew University.

NEW YORK, *September 1, 1949.*

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Bradley Morison, which appeared in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Spokesman of Friday, August 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMOST ABOUT EVERYTHING

(By Percy Villa)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—While Percy Villa is taking a vacation a number of well-known citizens have pinch hit for him in this column. This week's column is by Bradley Morison, associate editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune. Self-effacing Bradley Morison is one of the Nation's top editorial writers.)

WHEREIN PAPA EXPLAINS FEPC

(By Bradley Morison)

Question. Papa, what does FEPC mean?

Answer. Why, that means Fair Employment Practice Commission, Sonny.

Question. What does that mean, Papa?

Answer. It means, Sonny, that everybody gets an equal chance at jobs, whether he is white or——

Question. Is that good, Papa?

Answer. Heavens no, dear; it's very bad.

Question. Why is it bad, Papa?

Answer. Because a lot of radicals and troublemakers are behind it. They want to——

Question. You mean like Communists, Papa?

Answer. Yes; that's it, exactly; like Communists. They want to——

Question. Papa, it says here that Governor Dewey, of New York, is for FEPC. Is he a Communist, Papa?

Answer. Of course not, Sonny. Don't be a fool——

Question. It also says, Papa, that Nelson A. Rockefeller, Paul G. Hoffman, Eric Johnston, and Beardsley Ruml have all supported FEPC legislation. Are they radicals and troublemakers, Papa?

Answer. Don't be silly, my dear child. Why they are some of our most highly respected——

Question. Papa, it says here that the Republican Party approved the principles of FEPC at its 1948 convention. Is the Republican Party awfully radical, Papa?

Answer. No, indeed, my son. As a matter of fact, it's quite——

Question. And, Papa, it says here that the American Legion Department of Minnesota passed a resolution favoring FEPC at its last State convention. Is the American Legion terribly radical, Papa?

Answer. Why, of all the absurd ideas. The American Legion is one of the most patriotic and——

Question. Papa, it says here in the New York Herald Tribune that the FEPC has been a big success in New York State. Is the New York Herald Tribune a Communist newspaper, Papa?

Answer. Well, I should say not. I can't imagine a more——

Question. Papa, it says here in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Is that communism, Papa?

Answer. Now, don't be a silly goose. Why, it's the very opposite of——

Question. But, Papa, if all men are created equal and are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, why shouldn't they have an equal chance at jobs?

Answer. Because, sonny. That means interfering in other people's business, and in this country every man has a right to do exactly as he pleases without some bumbling bureaucrat——

Question. You mean that we can drive down Nicollet Avenue 80 miles an hour if we want to, Papa?

Answer. Oh, heavens, no, dear. You see, the law says we can't do that because we might seriously injure someone if we——

Question. Papa, does it seriously injure a man when he can't get a job just because he's the wrong color or religion or——

Answer. Of course it does, but——

Question. Well, Papa, if it's O. K. to have speed laws to keep people from getting hurt, I don't see why FEPC is so awfully, terribly——

Answer. Oh, shush, son! Be still. Can't you see I'm trying to help your sister Mary write her theme on Our American Heritage of Freedom?

Excerpts From Testimony of R. Conrad Cooper Before Presidential Steel Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 16 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD excerpts from the testimony which was offered to the Presidential Steel Board on August 22, 1949, by Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, vice president, United States Steel Corp. of Delaware. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week there was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from testimony which was given before the Presidential Steel Board on August 19, 1949, by the Republic Steel Corp., with respect to insurance and pensions, by Mr. C. M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., and by Mr. Frank Purnell, president of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. In my first request on Tuesday, I suggested that all Senators and the public generally ought to have an opportunity to consider and reflect upon the testimony which was recently offered to the Presidential Steel Board by the steel companies and by the United Steel Workers of America. Every segment of American society will be affected by the solution which is to be reached by the parties to the fourth round of wage increases question. As I have contributed the management point of view to the Appendix of the RECORD, I want to think that others may wish to offer the position maintained by the United Steel Workers for our consideration and study.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE STEEL-PRODUCING SUBSIDIARIES OF UNITED STATES STEEL

(By R. Conrad Cooper)

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In recent years organized labor leaned heavily upon increased cost of living in its successive campaigns for higher wages. Unsound wage increases, secured by one device or another, may satisfy expediences of the moment, but they raise the cost of living to higher levels, and provide new grounds upon which union leaders can claim further wage increase ad infinitum.

The United Steelworkers of America, CIO, rode far on its trusted horse, "Cost of Living." Now, however, because that horse is played out and staggers on the downhill run, the union becomes uneasy and attempts to stand up and ride Roman style both this jaded nag and a new horse "Productivity," with still a third horse "Ability to Pay" in the middle. "Productivity," a term of great complexity and little common understanding, appears as the union's favorite in the new "Public Purse Sweepstakes."

Were the stakes in this contest not of such serious importance to the people of this country, it would be diverting to observe the union's attempt simultaneously to stand up on these two horses, "Cost of Living" and "Productivity," which normally should run in opposite directions. Cost-of-living increases ultimately narrow the distribution of products, whereas productivity gains do the opposite.

Productivity in its broad implications is of fundamental importance to all of our people. As applied to steel production it is the effective rate at which the combined forces of men, machines, and materials are utilized to convert raw materials of natural resource into articles of basic necessity as required by the consuming public. It is not a term to be used lightly or loosely.

Representatives of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, use the term both lightly and loosely, and for a purpose. They speak of the vast gains that have been made in productivity. They mention some of the factors involved therein. They engage in statistical gymnastics and produce erroneous figures which psychologically assign to the workers the credit for all of the improvements that increased demand, capital investment in more efficient facilities, and managerial skill and ingenuity have contributed. The United Steelworkers of America, CIO, would have this board and the public at large believe that productivity of the steel industry in 1949 is 50 percent higher than in 1939. The union representatives infer that productivity of the steel industry and employee performance are the same thing; and consequently that employees of the steel industry are performing at a 50 percent higher level in 1949 than in 1939. They allege that the real wages of these employees have not kept pace with such increase in performance and therefore assert that the employees are entitled to an increase in compensation in return for such higher performance.

These conjectures of the union representatives are not the facts. In the steel-producing subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp., the facts are that—

1. Current productivity in United States Steel, as measured by the results of 1948, is nowhere near 50 percent higher than in 1939, and is only slightly higher than the earliest prior year of comparable business volume.

2. Such productivity gains as have been realized in recent years in United States Steel result from increased demand for steel, large capital investment in new and improved facilities, and managerial skill and ingenuity.

3. Productivity of the enterprise and the average rate at which employees perform the available work are two entirely different, although related, subjects.

4. The current average employee performance rate, as measured by the results of 1948, is no higher in the steel-producing subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp. than in 1941, the earliest prior year of comparable business volume.

5. The real wages of employees of United States Steel have increased, but the average employee performance rate has not increased during recent years.

6. The employees of United States Steel are not entitled to a further wage-rate increase on the basis of alleged performance rate improvements which in fact have never materialized.

7. The real need in the interest of the employees, the owners, and the consuming public is not a wage-rate increase but is to achieve and thereafter maintain the highest level of employee performance that is consistent with safety, good health, and sustained effort.

The foundations of fact and the analysis from which the foregoing conclusions emerge are set forth below for the assistance of the Board.

II. THE FACTORS OF PRODUCTIVITY

As previously noted, the term "productivity" when applied to steel production relates to the effective rate at which the combined forces of men, machines, and materials are utilized to convert raw materials of natural resource into articles of basic necessity as required by the consuming public.

It follows, of course, that the effectiveness with which each of the forces of men, machines, and materials is used has consequent bearing upon the over-all effective rate of the several forces. Thus productivity in steel is the over-all consequence of such principal factors as:

1. The rate at which the users of steel seek to satisfy their needs, called demand.

2. The nature, condition, and amount of producing facilities, commonly called tools of production and made available by owner investments, called capital investment.

3. The availability of suitable and sufficient quantities of raw materials.

4. The availability of suitable goods and services to be purchased from others; qualified managing and technical personnel; and skilled, semiskilled, and nonskilled work forces.

5. The degree to which raw materials are conserved in the conversion to steel products, called yield.

6. The degree to which the available tools of production are utilized, commonly expressed in percent of rated capacity of operations.

7. The rate at which the employees perform the available work, called employee performance rate.

8. The supervisory, directing, and technical skills with which the available men, machines, and materials are used to produce maximum product of suitable quality at minimum cost, called management.

Appreciation of the magnitude of these factors in the steel-producing subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp. can be acquired most readily by knowledge of the following principal facts relative to their operations in 1948.

The release of peak backlog demands for steel, following termination of World War II, produced abnormal requirements for steel in 1948. Consequently, the companies' public shipments of steel products in 1948 amounted to 20,700,000 tons, exceeding the prior peacetime record.

The tools of production in use in 1948 by the companies, owned by their 228,000 different stockholders, represented almost $2,000,000,000 of gross property capital investment.

Expenditures by the companies in 1948 for improvement of the tools of production amounted to $187,000,000, the highest for this purpose in any of the last 10 years.

The principal items of raw materials used in the production of steel are iron ore, iron and steel scrap, coal, limestone, and dolomite; 102,500,000 tons of such raw materials were used by the companies in 1948 to produce the 20,700,000 tons of steel products shipped to the consuming public in that year. This represents a principal raw material yield of 20.1 percent. In round numbers, 5 tons of the principal raw materials were required for the production of 1 ton of steel product, which is about the condition that has prevailed during the last 10 years.

As measured by the steel-producing operations of the companies, the available tools of production were operated in 1948 at an average of 93.8 percent of rated capacity.

One hundred and eighty-one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five employees of the companies devoted 368,100,000 man-hours of faithful, loyal service to the 1948 accomplishment, for which they were paid $623,000,000.

These are the significant factors, the effectiveness of each factor contributing to the over-all productivity of the companies and in one way or another depending upon the contribution of each other factor.

III. PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENTS

The ingenuity of mankind to date has not devised a measure or index of productivity in steel production which at one and the same time can express: (a) The over-all effectiveness of the combined factors of productivity; and (b) the specific contributions of the individual factors of productivity.

The difficulties involved in such endeavors, relative to steel production, become readily apparent when one considers the simple fact that the several productivity factors do not lend themselves to measurement by one common term. Men, machines, and materials are different things. Their physical beings, their influences, and their respective contributions to productivity are not measurable by a common denominator.

A few illustrations will suffice to establish the point:

1. In steel production the raw materials and resulting steel products are generally expressed in terms of tons or other units of weight. The effectiveness with which the raw materials are used is commonly measured in terms of percentage yield, meaning the percentage relationship between the weight of finished product and the weight of raw materials. Yield figures themselves are not a full measure of the effectiveness as to the use of the raw materials, except as judged in relation to the quality of specific raw materials used and the particular steel produced therefrom. Such matters alone are the subject of an entire field of metallurgical study.

2. The tools of production in steel constitute large acreages of land, expansive buildings, huge converting structures, massive pieces of equipment both stationary and movable, and almost every known kind of smaller tool and facility. The effectiveness with which such items are used relates to the proportion of their usable time that is employed in the production of steel and the rate of speed at which the facilities are operated by the employees.

3. The effective use of manpower involves two separate factors, namely: (a) The determination by management of the methods of operation to be employed, which in turn regulates the amount of work required in the production of a unit of product; and (b) the rate at which the employees perform the work. The former is measurable in terms of standards, which reflect the kinds and amounts of human effort and time required to perform each function in the production of a unit of product under stated conditions. The latter item, the rate at which the employees perform the work, is measurable as a percentage relationship between the standard amount of work performed and the actual man-hours expended in such accomplishment.

Obviously the effective uses of such widely divergent components do not lend themselves to single index measurements.

Efforts to develop sound yardsticks to measure productivity have involved extensive study and research by many people. The chairman of this Board is fully conversant with such endeavors. There is no need to touch upon the results therefrom, except to note two points, namely, that—

1. The system of productivity indexing most commonly encountered is that which reflects the relationship between output in units of product and input in units of man-hours.

2. The index reflecting product output per man-hour input discloses only a result and of itself sheds no light on the causes that produced such result.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, has the following to say with respect to the productivity index that reflects output, in physical units, per man-hour of work:

"It is a measure of the relationship between the volume of goods produced and one factor of input—labor time. Productivity data do not measure the specific contribution of labor or of capital or of any other factors of production. Changes in the ratio between output and man-hours of work show the joint effect of a large number of separate, though interrelated, influences." (Monthly Labor Review, vol. 63, No. 6, p. 893, par. 4.)

We hold no brief for the system of productivity indices that expresses production per man-hour, nor do we quarrel with its use where applicable and when used intelligently. Such use however requires thorough understanding of its limitations. In some situations it may serve useful purposes. In other situations it may produce erroneous conclusions and resultant harm. This is particularly true in steel production which involves so many variable factors.

In the words of the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics:

"Changes in the ratio between output and labor input reflect the joint effect of a large number of separate, though interrelated, influences such as technical improvements, the rate of operations, the relative contributions to production of plants at different levels of efficiency, the flow of materials and components, the skill and effort of the work force, the efficiency of management, the state of labor relations, and many other factors." (Major Sources of Productivity Information, June 1949, p. 1, par. 2.)

The significance of such matters in an appraisal of the product output per man-hour in the companies is illustrated best by the examination of the actual effects of such matters as—

(a) Volume and customer requirements.

(b) Capital improvements of facilities.

(c) Product variations as to grade of steel, size, shape, etc.

(d) Improved methods and practices.

(e) Quality of raw materials.

(f) Purchased goods and services.

(g) Employee performance rates.

Such illustrations are set forth below. Each illustration describes matters of established fact with respect to operations in and among the companies.

(a) *The effects of volume and customer requirements upon product output per man-hour*

At any given time with a given complement of the tools of production, the total volume of production required to meet the public demand for steel becomes the most significant factor in the index of product output per man-hour. Two principal conditions account for this fact—one inherent in the nature of steel plant operations and the other inherent in the system of indexing.

Steel plant operation involves a high percentage of jobs that must be filled regardless of whether the plant is running at high or low rate. Also, it takes as many man-hours to start up furnaces and condition the equipment for 1 day of operation as for 5 or 6 days of operation.

In an arithmetical problem of simple division, if the number to be divided fluctuates widely but the number used as the base of the division remains constant, the results of the divisions likewise fluctuate widely. For example, let us consider a hypothetical case of a railroad-crossing watchman who sits at his station and pushes a lever to lower a grade-crossing barrier when a train is approaching. Let us suppose that his production output is to be measured in terms of trains per man-hour. If one train passes during his 8-hour shift, his output is one train divided by 8 hours, which is 0.125 train per man-hour. If 100 trains pass in another 8-hour shift, the watchman's output is 100 trains divided by 8 hours, equaling 12.5 trains per man-hour.

Thus the combination of large amounts of fixed man-hours in steel-plant operation and the mathematical characteristic of the product output per man-hour index combine at any given time with a given complement of the tools of production to make volume of total steel output the most significant factor in figures showing the tons of product output per man-hour.

* * * * *

(b) *The effects of capital improvements of facilities upon product output per man-hour*

The effects of capital improvements of facilities upon the product output per man-hour in steel production cannot be overemphasized. Speaking with respect to industry generally the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, states that—

"The long-term upward trend of output per man-hour is due mainly to technical improvements in industry." (Monthly Labor Review, vol. 63, No. 6, p. 893, par. 4.)

Such technical improvements in the companies require the expenditure of tremendous sums of money, the specific extent of which will be mentioned at a later point in this statement. Suffice it for the moment and the purpose at hand to note that these capital improvements of facilities tend generally to: (1) Increase productive capacity; (2) reduce the required man-hours per unit of product; (3) improve quality of product; and (4) make easier the jobs of operation.

* * * * *

(d) *The effects of improved methods and practices upon product output per man-hour*

It is the never-ending daily business of executive, engineering, metallurgical, technical, and other management personnel in the companies to search out and to perfect ways and means to improve operating methods and practices.

* * * * *

Naturally the burdens of organization, coordination, and direction of the workings of steel-plant operation fall upon management and the records of technological progress in steel stand as testimonials to the ingenuity of those engaged therein. Daily progress is made in the development of things which increase total product output per man-hour.

This is not to say, however, that the improvement of methods and practices is a field unto management alone. The employees generally, from those in the bottom to the highest class job, can and do contribute to these matters.

* * * * *

(g) *The effects of employee-performance rates upon product output per man-hour*

We come now to the all-important matter of employee-performance rates.

In one way or another the human equation is involved at the core of every operation in steel and that equation includes both those who direct and those who are directed. The machines and processes do not operate themselves. They must be regulated by people.

The owners of the enterprise can supply the tools of production; the management can acquire the raw materials, employ the people, and plan the operations; but at that point, under the given circumstances at the given time, the product output per man-hour depends entirely upon the rate at which the employees perform the available work, in other words "the employee-performance rate."

* * * * *

With these ever-increasing amounts of the tools of production, made available and acquired by use of the investors' money, it becomes increasingly important that such tools be operated at their most productive rates. This can be accomplished only if the employees increase their performance rates to the highest attainable level consistent with safety, good health, and sustained effort. The attainment of this objective is as much in the long-term interest of the employees as of the owners. Only by the most effective use of the tools of production can investment in them be justified, and only by such justification can new tools and the related jobs of their operation be supplied.

With the ever-changing conditions resulting from constant improvement of the tools of production, obviously the total product output per man-hour can and regularly does increase without involving any more, if as much, work per hour on the part of the employee. Thus it follows that product output per man-hour cannot be relied upon as a measure of the performance rate of the employee.

The United Steelworkers of America—CIO—are fully aware of that fact, as is evidenced by the following labor-agreement provision currently in effect.

* * * * *

Clearly, therefore, productivity of the enterprise, which reflects the combined contributions of men, machines, and materials, and the rate at which the employees perform the available work are two entirely different, although related, subjects.

The latter subject, employee performance, takes us into a separate and distinct field of study in which the performance rates of employees must be measured by special devices other than mere product output per man-hour figures.

In the companies the index of measurement now being employed for this all-important subject is the percentage relationship between: (a) The standard amount of work accomplished in a given period of time, as measured by standards established in accordance with the labor-agreement provision just quoted; and (b) the actual man-hours expended in such accomplishment.

Progress in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Wednesday, September 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN STEEL

There is genuine industrial statesmanship in the response of the CIO's United Steelworkers Union and four steel companies to the recommendations of the President's fact-finding board for settlement of the steel dispute. Acceptance of the recommendations entails relinquishment of a major aim on the part of the union. However unwise it may have been from the point of view of the national economy—and the fact-finding board concluded that it would have had most undesirable consequences—a fourth-round wage increase was deemed feasible and justified by the steelworkers. In agreeing not to seek the increase by means of a strike, the union deserves high credit for recognition of the public interest in this dispute which it gave as one of the principal reasons for its acquiescence in the board's report. The same is true of the four major companies that yesterday agreed to accept the board's findings.

A strike at this time would, of course, be costly and hazardous for the steelworkers. It would also be damaging, perhaps disastrously, to the Nation. For steel production is so basic to this country's industrialized economy that a stoppage of it would be likely to arrest and even reverse the heartening economic readjustment which has lately taken place. This, in turn, would be likely to have an extremely unfortunate impact on the assistance the United States is trying to render to recovery abroad. The maintenance of American economic stability is undoubtedly the key to contemporary containment and restraint of aggressive communism.

It is by no means to be supposed that the possibility of a steel strike has been precluded by the union's action. All but four of the steel companies are still to be heard from. They have been asked by the fact-finding board to relinquish for their part what they considered a justified refusal to discuss pension and welfare proposals. Furthermore, if they follow the union's lead in acceding to the board's recommendations, the details of social insurance and pension plans will have to be hammered out through collective-bargaining negotiations. Although the board's report stipulated a maximum cost for such benefits, declaring that this should be borne exclusively by the employers but fixing the limit far below what the union had sought, it left a great many difficult questions to be resolved through the bargaining process.

The board pointed out, moreover, that "the findings and recommendations herein contained are based largely on evidence relating to 19 leading steel-producing companies as a group, and do not necessarily reflect the circumstances of any individual company. * * * With respect to companies which are not included in the group of 19

leading steel-producing companies, there should be bargaining between the union and each company to ascertain what deviations, if any, should be made from the general recommendations." Thus there remains a lively danger of continuing disagreement in individual cases. This breaks down the industry-wide pattern of negotiation upon which the union has long insisted and calls for continuing discipline and coherence in local situations. There is a good ground to hope, however, that with a spirit of accommodation and reasonableness on both sides, a general settlement fair to both can be effected.

Tribute to Justice Alexander G. Burr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 19 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most excellent editorial which appeared in the Bismarck Tribune, Bismarck, N. Dak., on September 10, 1949.

The occasion for the editorial was the retirement of Justice Alexander G. Burr from the North Dakota Supreme Court after 41 years of service on the bench. Early in life, Justice Burr chose high goals for his attainment. Through devotion to duty, honesty of purpose, and integrity in application, these ambitions were richly attained by this respected jurist.

As a lawyer he was soon considered among the ablest in his profession, and became a district judge at the age of 37. Later, in further recognition of his fine qualities, he was elevated to the North Dakota Supreme Court, where he served creditably and well until his retirement a few days ago.

I should like also to pay my respects to the author of this fine editorial, Mr. John Hjelle, editor of the Bismarck Tribune. For more than 3 years Mr. Hjelle was my able and admired administrative assistant.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ON JUDGE BURR'S RETIREMENT

Many men attain a certain distinction in life, but to few is reserved the rare privilege of achieving both high distinction and the virtually complete fulfillment of ambition conceived in youth.

Such was the privilege of Justice Alexander G. Burr, who retired from the Supreme Court of North Dakota last Saturday after 41 consecutive years of service to his State as a jurist.

When he was just 14 years old, Alexander Burr decided that he wanted to become a lawyer. Momentarily, the decision was the cause of some slight concern in the Burr family. The elder Burr was a member of the Presbyterian clergy, and there had been thought that the son might follow in his footsteps.

But a lawyer the young man became, and so his first ambition was realized. But he early conceived another, and a greater, goal to seek.

About the time he began the practice of law at Bottineau, N. Dak., an older friend asked him what he eventually intended to do. "I'm going to be a judge before I am 50," the young lawyer replied. He became a district judge when he was 37, and so his second major ambition was fulfilled.

Then, presumably, the youthful judge had another consuming ambition—to be a good judge. How well he succeeded in this is written in the records of the district and supreme courts in which he served. To him now must come the enviable satisfaction that is saved for the unusual man who can look back upon his life's record and feel no deep pangs of regret at what he sees there.

Perhaps the thing that distinguished Judge Burr most during his 41 years on the North Dakota bench was his capacity to grow, and to keep growing. Like all big men, he was never too big to learn, to change, to broaden.

Those who have worked with him, and who perhaps know him best, remark particularly upon the compassion toward people which Judge Burr brought to his work with the law.

Basically, law governs the relationships of men and women with one another. Cold though it may appear to be, it nevertheless deals in human elements.

As a judge charged with the responsibility of interpreting and applying the law, Judge Burr realized this. Therefore, he sought to make the application of law fit the needs of life. In the human problems brought before him for judicial determination, he brought to bear his understanding that human beings must be dealt with as they are, not as the law or idealism might think they should be.

It was in this spirit that he remarked to a fellow justice just before his retirement that he doubtless had made mistakes, but took pride in being able to feel that he had never been tyrannical or dictatorial in his methods. To err is human; but not many in high authority could honestly make the latter claim.

Like all men and women of more than usual stature, Judge Burr has been a man of many capacities and of such industrious nature that he has been able to make his influence felt in many regions.

Chiefly, it has been the Presbyterian church, of which he has been a lifelong member, that has benefited from his activities outside the legal profession. It is significant that in his Who's Who biographical sketch, he thought to list himself as an elder of the church—one of the few to do so—indicating the importance he attached to this aspect of his life.

North Dakota has always been fortunate in the type of men it has had on its supreme court bench. Men like Judge Burr have made this true.

His services will be missed there, of course. But he has made his contribution, and for that the people of the State can be thankful. He has earned his retirement; and the best wishes of North Dakotans go with him as he sits back to let younger hands take up the work he did so well.

Exemption of Small Newspapers From Provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a question has been raised by certain interests relative to the propriety of exempting small local newspapers of 5,000 circulation or less from the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which was clearly indicated as the intent of Congress in action taken by the House and in the debate in the Senate on H. R. 5856.

Mr. Ed M. Anderson, chairman of the legislative committee of the National Editorial Association, has written me as to the constitutional aspects of such protection to small-town newspapers, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Anderson's letter be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1949.
Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: We are informed that a question has been raised as to the validity of that section of H. R. 5856 which relates to the exemption for weekly and semiweekly newspapers. Our association, with several thousand weekly and semiweekly newspapers in its membership, is keenly interested in the exemption issue recently revived as an attempt to classify the press.

Section 13 (b) (5) of H. R. 5856 raised the present statutory exemption circulation ceiling from 3,000 to 5,000 for small local newspapers. This original exclusion for weekly and semiweekly newspapers of 3,000 circulation or less has been challenged at various times since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. It was not until 1946 that the question was specifically settled in *Mabee* v. *White Plains Publishing Co., Inc.* Some of those opposed to the small newspaper exemption in H. R. 5856 have cited a case arising in the Louisiana Legislature (*Grosjean* v. *American Press Co.*) as an illustration of alleged discriminatory classification frowned upon by the highest tribunal. The identical point was presented in *Mabee* v. *White Plains Publishing Co.* Here the United States Supreme Court drew a distinction between principles of the Louisiana law and their application to section 13 (a) (8) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It was held:

"Volume of circulation, frequency of issue, and area of distribution are said to be an improper basis of classification. Moreover, it is said that the act lays a direct burden on the press in violation of the first amendment. The Grosjean case is not in point here. There the press was singled out for special taxation and the tax was graduated in accordance with volume of circulation. No such vice inheres in this legislation. As the press has business aspects, it has no special immunity from laws applicable to business in general. *Associated Press* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (301 U. S. 103, 132–133). And the exemption of small weeklies and semiweeklies is not a 'deliberate and calculated device' to penalize a certain group of newspapers. (*Grosjean* v. *American Press Co., supra,* p. 250.) As we have seen, it was inserted to put those papers more on a parity with other small-town enterprises. (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7445.) The fifth amendment does not require full and uniform exercise of the commerce power. Congress may weigh relative needs and restrict the application of a legislative policy to less than the entire field."

It seems to our association that Congress should have no hesitancy in merely raising the statutory exemption circulation ceiling (so clearly upheld in the Mabee opinion) from 3,000 to 5,000 as contemplated in the

pending amendment approved by the House in H. R. 5856.

In its tax and other laws, the Congress applies the principles of small exemption and graduation as to size and volume. If free enterprise is to survive in America, small business must be protected. Weekly and semiweekly newspapers definitely represent small business. They are very important but they are small.

Sincerely,

ED M. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Legislative Committee,
National Editorial Association.

Making Peace in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "Making Peace in the Americas," delivered by the Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, before the Pan-American Society of the United States, on Monday, September 20, 1949, and also the remarks made before that society on the same date by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Hon. Edward G. Miller, Jr.

There being no objection, the address and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE DEAN ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE PAN-AMERICAN SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1949

WAGING PEACE IN THE AMERICAS

I am grateful to the Pan-American Society for this welcome opportunity to meet with its distinguished membership and with so many friends from throughout the Western Hemisphere. It is a most appropriate setting in which to discuss the relations within our community of American Republics. There are two reasons in particular why I am glad to be able to discuss this subject tonight. The first is so obvious that we tend to take it for granted. It is that our countries are close neighbors, bound together by a common heritage of struggles for liberty and freedom.

The second reason is that the community between our countries presents us with a unique opportunity to press forward toward the positive objectives of our foreign policy. Much of our effort in other parts of the world has had to be devoted to repairing the destruction caused by war and to strengthening the free nations against aggression. We in this hemisphere have fortunately been spared the terrible destruction of war, and we are relatively remote from any direct threat against our independence. The prospects are, therefore, bright that we can continue to work together in an atmosphere of relative peace and stability. We are in a real sense waging peace in the Americas.

Basic principles

Before discussing specific policies, it seems well to restate once more the basic principles on which our policy in this hemisphere must rest. They are:

Our essential faith in the worth of the individual.

The preservation of our way of life without trying to impose it on others.

The observance by all governments of ethical standards based on justice and respect for freely accepted international obligations.

Protection of the legitimate interests of our people and government, together with respect for the legitimate interests of all other peoples and governments.

The juridical equality of all the American Republics.

Nonintervention in the internal or external affairs of any American Republic.

The stimulation of private effort as the most important factor in political, economic, and social purposes.

Freedom of information and the development of free exchanges in all fields.

The perfection, with the other American countries, of regional and universal arrangements for maintaining international peace.

The promotion of the economic, social, and political welfare of the people of the American Republics.

These, then, are our guiding principles. A statement of the specific policies which rest on these principles can best be made in conjunction with a review of our long-term objective.

National and hemisphere security

The primary objective of any government is necessarily the security of its territory and people. The Monroe Doctrine is an acknowledgment that the security of this hemisphere is indivisible. With the development of the inter-American system our countries have jointly created an effective security organization consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Rio de Janeiro Treaty of 1947 provides that in case of armed attack on an American Republic, each party pledges itself to assist in meeting the attack. One of the foremost policies of our country in foreign affairs is to fulfill its obligations under the Rio treaty and to seek the maximum cooperation among the American nations in achieving the objective of a secure and peaceful continent.

I stress this point because the security system which has culminated in the Rio Treaty is now facing a crucial test.

For more than 2 years the Caribbean area has been disturbed by plots and counterplots. These plots have in themselves been inconsistent with our common commitments not to intervene in each other's affairs. Increasingly, however, denunciations have been succeeded by overt attempts at military adventure. Since 1945 few nations in the Caribbean area have escaped involvement and at times the entire area has approached a state of political turmoil.

This situation is repugnant to the entire fabric of the inter-American system. The United States could not be faithful to its international obligations if it did not condemn it in the strongest terms. The energies spent in these adventures could much better have been put to use for peaceful purposes and improving the lot of the ordinary citizen. Aggression or plotting against any nation of this hemisphere is of concern to us. Wherever it occurs, or may be threatened, we shall use our strongest efforts, in keeping with our international commitments, to oppose it and to defend the peace of the hemisphere.

Only last Wednesday the Inter-American Peace Committee, meeting at the Pan American Union, set forth the principles and standards that bear on this situation. It is my hope that rigorous adherence to these principles and standards by all American governments will assure peace, not only in the Caribbean area, but throughout the hemisphere.

We, the nations of this hemisphere, have a responsibility not only to ourselves but to the rest of the world to live together in peace and harmony. Together we have played an important part in creating the United Nations. We must live up to the responsibilities which we have thus assumed toward the other member nations. This means, among other things, that we must abide by our regional commitments and maintain peace in our own midst. If all of the countries of the hemisphere proceed along these lines, as we in this country intend to do, there is no reason why any nation in the hemisphere should fear aggression.

Development of representative democracy

What I have said, however, should not be construed as blind adherence to the status quo. We oppose aggression; we do not oppose change. Indeed, we welcome and encourage change where it is in the direction of liberty and democracy. We have worked long and persistently in common with our neighbors toward this end.

We would like to see a world in which each citizen participates freely in determining periodically the identity of the members of his government. This is an objective for which we will continue to work, subject always to our common policy of nonintervention.

In the Americas we have had periods of high hope and periods of bitter discouragement as we have seen democratic institutions flourish in some countries, only to see them subverted in others. We always deplore the action of any group in substituting its judgment for that of the electorate. We especially deplore the overthrow by force of a freely elected government. In such situations we do not cease to hope that the people will regain the right to choose their leaders.

We realize, however, that the attainment of the democratic ideal in any country depends fundamentally upon the desires and efforts of the people of that country. The nature of democracy is such that it can be achieved only from within.

Democracy, as we endeavor to practice it, is a continuing development toward political maturity—not a formula to be imposed upon a nation by a self-appointed ruling class, as is the case with certain other forms of government. Its attainment is essentially a spiritual and personal problem to be solved by the people of each country for themselves.

We are encouraged in our purpose by the realization that the strength of democratic institutions throughout the hemisphere today is measurably greater than a generation ago. In spite of occasional disappointments, we note a steady forward progress. The spirit of democracy is alive and bearing fruit.

Recognition

Our policy with respect to recognizing new governments in the hemisphere is not inconsistent with our encouragement of democracy. We maintain diplomatic relations with other countries primarily because we are all on the same planet and must do business with each other. We do not establish an embassy or legation in a foreign country to show approval of its government. We do so to have a channel through which to conduct essential governmental relations and to protect legitimate United States interests.

When a freely elected government is overthrown and a new and perhaps militaristic government takes over, we do not need to recognize the new government automatically and immediately. We can wait to see if it really controls its territory and intends to live up to its international commitments. We can consult with other governments, as we have often done.

But if and when we do recognize a government under these circumstances, our act of recognition need not be taken to imply

approval of it or its policies. It is recognition of a set of facts, nothing more. We may have the gravest reservations as to the manner in which it has come into power. We may deplore its attitude toward civil liberties. Yet our long-range objectives in the promotion of democratic institutions may, in fact, be best served by recognizing it and thus maintaining a channel of communication with the country involved. In this way we are also able to discharge our basic function of protecting the interests of our Government and our citizens there. Since recognition is not synonymous with approval, however, our act of recognition need not necessarily be understood as the forerunner of a policy of intimate cooperation with the government concerned.

Economic policy

The economic field offers the greatest opportunity for constructive action. Two sets of problems arise. The first are derived largely from the disruptions of the war, and we hope may be described as short-run problems. The second result from the fact that in wide areas the standard of living is still miserably low. This is a long-run problem, although no less urgent.

It was apparent that the war would be followed by a period of economic stress. In some areas the effectiveness of the economic machine had been destroyed. The effect of the war on various relationships which previously had been the basis of world trade—for example, the reduction in earnings on overseas investment by European countries—raised new issues with respect to achieving equilibrium. Although the heaviest initial impact of this problem fell on Europe, the fundamental disequilibrium has now extended around the world so that for every country the maintenance of trade and the balance of payments has become a major problem of foreign relations. It was obvious in its initial stage that there could be no real recovery in trade without the revival of production in Europe. Therefore, the European recovery program must be regarded not merely as a program to meet the individual problems of the European countries but also to revive the flow of goods to and from Europe. We are all aware of the serious character of the present balance-of-payments problem and it is one to which we must direct our thoughts in the most constructive way possible.

While material well-being is no guaranty that democracy will flourish, a healthy and prosperous people is a far more fertile field for the development of democracy than one which is undernourished and unproductive. That is why we are and must be preoccupied with the long-term problem of economic development.

The record of our economic cooperation in this hemisphere is substantial. It is one of such proven soundness that it forms the precedent and the basis for the more constructive labor ahead.

For 10 years past a large work of technical cooperation has been under way throughout our countries. Our Government participates in this work through many of its agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Service. Our Institute of Inter-American Affairs is cooperating with agencies of the other governments in outstandingly successful programs to improve basic living conditions. Technicians and administrators from the United States and from the host countries work side by side in partnership with each other. They work among the peoples in the remote countryside as well as in the cities. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs has now been authorized by Congress to continue and to expand this work. These programs have furnished the inspiration and the proving ground for the world-wide program of technical cooperation envisaged in point four of President Truman's inaugural address.

In 1935, we created the Export-Import Bank which has become a uniquely successful institution in the field of economic development. The steel mill at Volta Redonda in Brazil is in full operation and a lifelong desire of many Brazilian statesmen and businessmen has become a reality with a plentiful supply of steel products to complement the vigorous growth of industry in that country. At Concepcion in Chile we shall soon see the realization of another project which has been brought about by the combination of energy on the part of Chilean leaders and cooperation by the Export-Import Bank in supplying the material needs to bring the idea into fruit. There are constructive evidences throughout the Americas of the good use to which Export-Import credits have been put—in the Artibonite Valley in Haiti, in meat-packing plants in Mexico—in highways in many countries, in ships, power systems, public works, agricultural projects, large and small industrial undertakings. The total amount of loans advanced by the bank to the other American Republics is over $700,000,000. Defaults on these loans are insignificant.

The International Bank and the International Monetary Fund created at Bretton Woods in 1944 largely on the initiative of the United States, today are actively contributing to economic development and fiscal stability in this hemisphere. The bank already has made loans to several American nations for basic development and the fund has assisted in the solution of currency problems. Through our representation in both institutions, we shall continue our vigorous support of these constructive policies.

These specific programs represent actual deeds—not merely words. Nor are they isolated examples but rather parts of a broad program of economic cooperation which, while reflecting our national self-interest, can leave no doubt as to our deep and lasting concern with the economic welfare of the other American Republics.

Private capital and public funds

Loans of public funds, however, can only be supplementary to the efforts of private capital, both local and foreign. This country has been built by private initiative and it remains a land of private initiative. The preponderance of our economic strength depends today as in the past upon the technical and financial resources and, even more, upon the abilities and morale of private citizens. I venture to say that the same thing is true of the other American nations.

In providing assistance for economic development, it would be contrary to our traditions to place our Government's public funds in direct and wasteful competition with private funds. Therefore, it will be our policy, in general, not to extend loans of public funds for projects for which private capital is available. It is our purpose, also, to emphasize the desirability of loans which increase productivity.

Nor do we necessarily believe that rapid industrialization is good per se. Industrial development is an important factor in raising living standards and therefore we have cooperated actively to this end. However, we feel that a balance should be achieved between industry, agriculture, and other elements of economic life. In many countries, large and small, the greatest immediate progress toward material well-being may be made through modern and diversified cultivation of the land. Irrigation projects, the use of agricultural machinery, the restoration of old land through fertilizers—these simple measures may do more to raise the standard of living than a dozen new industries.

We have had these principles in mind in elaborating the point 4 program. Because we believe that the job ahead should be done primarily through private initiative, we have requested Congress to authorize the Export-Import Bank to offer certain guaranties against risks peculiar to foreign private investment.

We hope that the flow of private capital can be stimulated also by the negotiation of treaties to create an atmosphere favorable to increased private investment abroad. We are concerned with two types of treaties: First, treaties to avoid double taxation; second, treaties to define our economic relations and give reasonable assurances to our investors while safeguarding the interests and integrity of the other country.

Special needs of countries

We believe that this general program can best be developed in full consideration of the special needs of individual countries. The conditions of the various nations of the hemisphere differ widely. Nor can all of our international problems be dealt with in the same way. In the field of economic development we have a common goal of high living standards and increased trade—just as in the political field we have a common goal of security and individual freedom. However, the process of economic development depends upon the efforts and resources of each individual country. There is no common formula. To be sure, the process can be facilitated in various ways by international organizations, such as the United Nations and its specialized agencies and the Organization of American States. But, in the last analysis, it depends upon the energy and resources of the individual countries themselves. The United States is prepared to lend its assistance, both directly and through international bodies, to working out specific programs with individual countries. Possibly this principle might be expanded to the working out of regional programs if two or more countries should seek to plan jointly for economic development.

I cannot stress too strongly that progress will come most rapidly in countries that help themselves vigorously. Economic development, like democracy, cannot be imposed from outside. Positive self-help is also essential to establishing conditions of economic stability and of fair treatment for private investment and the rights of labor. In countries where such conditions are provided, it will follow that we can collaborate more effectively in working out development programs. Public and private capital will be attracted more readily to such countries. While this is dictated by logic rather than emotion, it has been our experience that these conditions are generally founded in countries where constitutional and political democracy exists.

Conclusion

These then are our three major objectives—the security of our Nation and of the hemisphere; the encouragement of democratic representative institutions; and positive cooperation in the economic field to help in the attainment of our first two objectives.

If I have said nothing new tonight, it may well be because, in a family of nations as in families of individuals we should expect nothing more sensational than growth.

We can take satisfaction in the stability of our policy in the hemisphere. The good-neighbor policy as we practice it today is, for us, an historic, bipartisan, national policy. It has been wrought by Democrats at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and Senator Connally, and also by Republicans at both ends of the avenue—President Hoover, Secretary Stimson, and Senator Vandenberg. And this by no means exhausts the distinguished list who have contributed to this great policy.

It is the firm intention of President Truman, as it is of myself as Secretary of State—of the entire personnel of my Department and, I believe, of the people of my country—to work for ever closer relations between the nations of this hemisphere. We seek by

positive good will and effort to strengthen the Organization of American States, within the more extensive design of the United Nations, as the most effective expression of law and order in this hemisphere.

We and the other American republics have determined and pledged ourselves to carry on our common policy of the good neighbor as a living and constantly growing reality.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD G. MILLER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE PAN-AMERICAN SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1949

Judge Schoenrich, Mr. Secretary, Your Excellencies, and distinguished guests, members of the Pan-American Society of the United States, I am delighted that my first return trip to New York since taking office in June should be to foregather with my fellow members of the Pan-American Society. The good works of the society in promoting understanding between the peoples of this hemisphere are widely recognized and appreciated.

This is an outstanding occasion for anyone who is interested in inter-American affairs. It occurs in the midst of a momentous period in the development of our country's foreign policy, as a symbol of our country's unflagging interest in our inter-American relations. During this period, the financial discussions with Great Britain and Canada have been going on and have demonstrated again the common purpose of the governments concerned to surmount problems of postwar readjustment which are of concern to all of the world. The meetings of the Governors of the International Bank and Fund have shown the strength and the continuing progress of these two great examples of international economic cooperation. Only last week in Washington there was created the organization which will give effect to the understanding set forth in the North Atlantic Treaty. Tomorrow, the General Assembly of the United Nations opens its fourth session at Lake Success. For the next few weeks the hopes of free people everywhere will be focused on its deliberations.

That all of these great events should take place in this country during such a brief period is, in perspective, dramatic proof of the deep interest and the active participation of the United States in the solution of international problems. This interest and this desire to participate would not be nearly as pronounced, however, if we had not behind us already an encouraging record of accomplishment in the field of international cooperation. We have no more inspiring single example of effective international cooperation than our inter-American system with its Organization of American States, for which all of the nations represented here tonight have worked with zeal and persistence. This vigorous, functioning Organization is a source of pride for all of us.

It is entirely fitting therefore that during this series of international events which have been taking place, we from the Department of State should be privileged to meet here tonight with this distinguished company to mark the deep and continuing interest which we all have in the welfare of our inter-American system. I wish to thank the Pan American Society for this opportunity to join in welcoming the distinguished representatives of our fellow American republics who have met with us here tonight. It is pleasant to see here this evening many of the permanent representatives of those countries who live in our midst. A special welcome is felt by all of us for those who have newly come for the meeting of the General Assembly. We also are glad to have in our midst the governors and executive directors on the International Fund and the International Bank. Finally, Dr. Alberto Lleras, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, occupies a unique position in that he represents our entire community of 21 nations.

An assemblage such as this of friends from throughout the hemisphere is in itself an inspiring event. It is an expression of our common faith in inter-American cooperation. We shall all, I am sure, leave here tonight with a renewed sense of dedication to press forward for the realization of our common purpose.

Young Republicans: A Creative Force To Be Reckoned With

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of Young Republicans as a vital political force in modern America.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG REPUBLICANS: A CREATIVE FORCE TO BE RECKONED WITH

The GOP is the party for American youth.

The policy of the Republican Party has always been to establish conditions in our country which would lead to maximum initiative and incentive. That policy spells opportunity for young men and women, to start businesses, create jobs, develop resources, promote our standard of living. It is only natural that the Republican Party—the free enterprise party—should, therefore, win the overwhelming support of the younger elements in the Nation.

The Democratic Party has, on the other hand, followed a policy of promoting defeatism. It has built itself on promoting fears of depression, on promoting chaotic grounds for Government intervention in the economic life of the nation. The Democratic Party thrives therefore not on conditions of individual initiative and incentive, but on conditions of gloom, despair, instability, in which men and women turn with trembling to the Great White Father in Washington for all possible aid—grants, gifts, loans, spoon-feeding.

That is why the Democratic Party cannot win the allegiance of the Nation's youth. Our independent young people have always been our most spirited, energetic, enthusiastic believers in a free enterprise system. They do not accept the Democrats' morbid defeatism.

The young man and woman of college level, or younger or older, believes in hitching his or her wagon to a star, believes in the future, believes in himself and herself, and in the ability of able folks to make their mark in a free system.

THE IMPORTANCE OF YOUTH'S VOTE

Today, there are some 46,000,000 persons of voting age in their twenties and thirties. They constitute over 50 percent of the eligible voters. In addition, there are over 2,500,000 college students of whom over 65 percent are eligible to vote.

The primary instrument for these young people to exercise their initiative in political life is the Young Republican National Federation which was founded in 1935. Today there are 47 Young Republican State associations and associations in the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. There are 2,400 Young Republican Clubs, over 400 college clubs, and some 75 teen-age groups.

The federation is an autonomous organization, responsible ultimately to the State associations and their component membership.

PRESENT AND FORMER YOUNG REPUBLICAN CHAIRMEN

This last June at Salt Lake City a splendid convention of these Young Republicans was held at which Mr. John M. Tope, of Michigan, was elected new national chairman, succeeding Ralph Becker, of Port Chester, N. Y., who had served in that capacity for 3 years.

RELATIONS WITH SENIOR PARTY

Young folks like John Tope and Ralph Becker, Cochairman O. Louise Replogle, and Loyal Eddy of my State—national treasurer—they symbolize the new leadership that is developing in the Republican Party. They and their colleagues—young men and women throughout the Nation—will furnish the nucleus for Republican leadership of today and tomorrow. They believe in cooperating completely with the senior members of the party—benefiting from the experience, the wisdom, the judgment, which senior members have gained through years of political battles, and yet reinforcing those senior members with the enthusiasm, the vital energy, the do-or-die spirit, which is so characteristic of American youth.

YOUTH IS NOT JUST MATTER OF CHRONOLOGICAL AGE

I invite the attention of the Congress to the Young Republican National Federation, because I believe in it, not only from a standpoint of sincere devotion to my own party and its auxiliaries, but because I believe in youth and youthful leadership. Youth, we recognize, of course, is not just a matter of chronological age. I have met young people who are "old," even though they were 22 or 23. They were dispirited defeatists, resigned to staying at the same job or in the same rut. These "old" youngsters are not, however, symbolic of American youth. On the other hand, I have met men and women 70 and 80 years of age who were full of the pep and vim and vigor of youth.

SPIRITED WISCONSIN YOUNG REPUBLICANS

In my own State, we have a fine Republican organization whose present chairman is Mr. Lloyd Tegge, of Waukesha. Mr. Tegge won this important office at a spirited Young Republican convention which it was my privilege to address, in Portage in May 1949. Lloyd Tegge, 25 years old, who succeeded another able leader, Richard C. Smith, of Jefferson, is a veteran of World War II and of numerous Republican campaigns. Vice chairman of the Young Republican group in our State is Jack Mills, of Beloit. The college vice chairman is Thomas Ziebarth, of Milwaukee. Mrs. Cody Splitt, Appleton, is secretary. John Cattanach, of Owen, Wis., is treasurer. Chester G. Roberts, of Milwaukee, is national committeeman, and Lorraine Schuffler, Milwaukee, national committeewoman. Anita Smith, of Port Washington, is delegate to the senior executive committee along with Dick Smith.

On the University of Wisconsin campus (under Club Chairman Roland W. Vieth) and on other campuses throughout the Badger State, in the cities and towns and vil-

lages, the young men and women of Wisconsin are making the Young Republican Clubs a vital force in Wisconsin politics, a force to be reckoned with, a force to be heeded, a force to be utilized for the good of our party, our State, and Nation.

In each of the Badger State's 10 congressional districts, Young Republican leadership is emerging to the fore. Space would not, unfortunately, permit me to mention all of the names of our Wisconsin Young Republican leaders.

RALPH BECKER, FORMER NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

On a national basis, much of the credit for making the Young Republican National Federation a powerful force goes to its immediate past chairman. Attorney Ralph Becker came up from the ranks of grassroots Young Republicans. He was one of the original founders of the Association of New York Young Republican Clubs. He served as its president in 1940–42. He was one of the founders of the Young Republican National Federation in 1935.

During the Second World War, he gained distinction as a captain of infantry. Returning from the global conflict, he was elected chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, becoming the first chairman to receive recognition as an ex-officio member of the executive committee of the Republican National Committee. His able cochairman was Mrs. Ruth S. Stockton, of Colorado. During these 3 years, in which he helped weld a strong federation, he traveled over 160,000 miles on behalf of the federation, helping to activate groups, giving suggestions, and receiving them for the good of the party and the Nation. Today, he is taking a continuing active part among Young Republican alumni, while tending to his private practice of law in Washington.

YOUNG REPUBLICAN HEADQUARTERS IN WASHINGTON

Today, too, the national headquarters at 1337 Connecticut Avenue of the Young Republican National Federation is functioning in full steam. Its executive secretary is Mr. Charles Richey, of Ohio. It utilizes splendid volunteer services of many loyal Young Republicans in the District of Columbia. Throughout the Nation, the thousands of young folks in the affiliated Young Republican groups with their unending enthusiasm and energy and strong faith in the future of the Republican Party, have set themselves the difficult but practical goal of getting out into the wards and precincts and knocking on doors and ringing telephone bells—the goal of strengthening and reinforcing our party from the ground up. They have the will and the drive to help us senior Republicans to start at the bottom—to excavate and build the foundation strong and unshakeable at the grassroots level so that our efforts must inevitably be crowned by victory in 1950 and in 1952. These courageous young people don't believe in windy words, in sophomore soft soap. They believe in action. Many were schooled in the hard university of global war.

It is not an easy task for, let us say, a young veteran (with a wife and child trying to make ends meet on small subsistence allowances while going to college)—it is not easy for this young veteran to take time out for Republican organization meetings. The fact, however, that more and more students—veterans and nonveterans—are swinging to the GOP colors evidences their deep interest in Republican activity in spite of personal obstacles which may limit their time.

YOUNG REPUBLICAN PAMPHLET

As evidence of the down-to-earth approach of the Young Republican Federation, it has an excellent campaign book entitled "How To Plan and Win a Political Campaign." This is a well-illustrated, well-prepared, down-to-earth treatise covering every phase of an election campaign whether it would be for the local alderman or for a United States President.

THE YOUTHFUL GOP

The young men and women of the Nation are not looking for hand-outs, for spoon-feeding. They do not seek to lean on the Federal Government. On the contrary, they have the same independence, initiative, and resourcefulness which characterized their forefathers who blazed paths through the western wilderness.

Its opponents like to smear the Republican Party as a group of ancient, tired fossils, dreaming only of yesteryear and of the good old days. On the contrary, however, our Republican Party is a youthful, fighting party, which is building for the future and which seeks to create a greater freedom and a higher standard of living for this Nation than we have ever before known.

THE REACTIONARY DEMOCRATIC PARTY

It is the Democratic Party which can aptly be termed "a reactionary, backward-looking machine—an organization which is thinking of returning to the days of statism and slavery characteristic of Old World countries."

This Democratic Party has invariably teamed up with the most radical of groups which in turn have sought to snare our youth in un-American, alien-minded movements. Forces like the Young Republicans are, however, holding up a beacon of Americanism for our young men and women.

CONCLUSION

This vital Young Republican force, then, is a harbinger of Republican victory in the 1950 congressional elections and in the 1952 Presidential elections. It is up to the Republican Party to pay not mere lip service to the Young Republicans but to give them true recognition. It is up to the party to tap the enormous reservoir of talent that is available in Young Republican circles. More and more, Young Republican organization is spreading. It is organized here on Capitol Hill—in the offices of Senators and Representatives. It is being increasingly organized among the Nation's veterans of World War II. It is a marching, challenging, creative force which augurs well for the future of our party and our Nation.

To Chairman John Tope and his federation the party and the Nation look with confidence, faith, and hope for strong and vital leadership.

Conference of National Commission of UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, distinguished writer on foreign affairs, appearing in her column in the New York Times of September 12, 1949. This article deals with the recent conference of the National Commission of UNESCO, held in Washington September 10 and 11, 1949, and presided over by Hon. Milton Eisenhower, its Chairman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROAD—SEARCH FOR NEW INSTRUMENTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—The seventh conference of the United States National Commission of UNESCO, held in Washington over the week end suggested the same question that was raised last week by the Council of Europe. The Strasbourg Congress was a novel mixture of the official and the unofficial; it consisted of an assembly of people's delegates from 12 countries, with authority to debate and recommend but not to act, and a steering committee of the foreign ministers of the participating states, whose power to restrict the agenda was frequently overruled by the delegates.

The National Commission of UNESCO is a body of 100 members, of whom 60 percent are representatives of organizations working in the field of education, science, the arts, mass communication, cultural activities in the broadest and most popular sense. Besides stimulating interest in UNESCO and carrying its program to the vast membership of these organizations, the function of the Commission is to advise the Government on UNESCO matters. Constant liaison with the State Department is maintained through a very busy Secretariat in the Public Affairs Division. The purpose of the current meeting was to discuss questions to be brought up at the general conference, which opens in Paris September 19, and instruct the United States delegation on the American position on these questions.

Here is an unofficial body officially designated to advise the Government on policy. The limited field in which it works does not alter its unique character or detract from its interest as an experiment. When a proposal was made at the Washington meeting that members of the American Commission meet with representatives of other national commissions, with the aim of holding a completely unofficial UNESCO conference, it was objected that the American delegation might be unofficial but all the others would certainly be appointed by governments.

A SINGULAR STRAW

Yet Strasbourg was a straw pointing in the opposite direction. The mixture of official and unofficial in the Council of Europe may foreshadow a new pattern in international relations. Certainly it brought into the European picture the outline of something like an organized people's lobby—an apparition which governments cannot ignore, as was proved by the presence of the foreign ministers.

In its smaller way the UNESCO National Commission points up a similar trend in the domestic field. The Commission stands out among other groups set up on occasion to advise the Government in that it is permanent and deals with foreign affairs. In his valedictory address Chairman Milton Eisenhower described it as an instrument of democratic foreign policy, which has not only justified itself but put up a signpost on a new road.

The results, he went on, "may well add up to a recommendation that the device be extended into other specific areas of foreign-policy determination. It is my conviction that our Commission, uniquely mingling nationalism with internationalism and individual freedom with governmental responsibility, may well serve as one solid bridge of transition between the assertive state authority of the past, knowing no law but its own, and that future federation of the world

which is, I think, the goal toward which the United Nations must tend.

"Certainly the Commission's operations have been remarkable for their fusion of private initiative and governmental effectiveness. So perfect has the fusion been that we cannot precisely distinguish the Commission's private function, as a kind of forum for the free expression of ideas, from its legal governmental function as adviser of the State Department and implementer of the Nation's UNESCO commitments."

A SIGN OF EVOLUTION

Mr. Eisenhower, president of Kansas State College, has headed the Commission during its three formative years and with his successor, Dr. George Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois, has had most to do with operating a hitherto untried mechanism for establishing a working partnership between Government and special groups of people. The United States Commission in its turn, is not only the trail-blazer of the international organization but the model for national commissions everywhere.

All this is noteworthy as a sign of evolution in the democratic process. The one thing driven home by the challenge of totalitarianism, and the terrifying tendency of people to take refuge in it from problems they cannot solve, is that the forms and methods of democracy cannot remain static. New ways have to be invented to give people more participation in government. A vote for representatives is not enough. Full and free information on public questions is not enough, although that is the proof, the hallmark, and the guardian of democracy. There is room and need for continuous consultation between government and people in the areas in which they live not as political partisans or economic units but as many-sided human beings. Today more than ever the difference between a government which decides everything apart from the people and a government which is the people has to be emphasized, illustrated and, above all, felt. Any device which helps citizens to share official responsibilities helps government, too, and vitalizes institutions which will fall only if they are never renovated.

Address by O. C. Schorp on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Carter Oil Co. Refinery at Billings, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, out in America's West, where the rolling plains bend suddenly upward to meet the sky above the Rockies, man has labored since the middle of the nineteenth century to find and develop the rich mineral resources of this majestic region.

The first prospectors came to dig for gold and silver and later for copper. Now, however, there is a new kind of prospector—the trained petroleum geologist—probing our western lands in search of oil.

One of the pioneers of the oil industry in the Northwest is the Carter Oil Co., which has just marked an important step in a long and successful career by building a new refinery at Billings, Mont. The Carter Co. was started in May 1893 in Sistersville, W. Va. It was named for its founder, John J. Carter, of Titusville, Pa., where oil was first discovered by drilling just 90 years ago.

The Carter Oil Co. became an important organization in West Virginia and eastern Ohio, building and operating 30 natural gasoline plants, among the first in the country, in those States.

But that section of America, well developed as it was, did not offer enough room for such an up-and-coming company. In 1913 the Carter, looking for new opportunities, began operations in Oklahoma. It grew rapidly as new fields were discovered there, and expanded its operations into Kansas, Wyoming, and Montana. There, and in other midwestern States, the Carter has actively participated in the development of many new oil fields, contributing to the wealth and security of our Nation.

Within a few years the Carter's midcontinent properties had increased to such an extent that the company's main office was moved to the West, and after a while the eastern holdings were sold. The company now maintains divisional offices in Denver and Billings, as well as a main office in Tulsa.

Today the Carter Oil Co. is one of the leading crude oil producers in the great and growing midcontinent and Northwest areas of our Nation. The company's main laboratory specializes in the study of underground oil reservoirs. From research there has come knowledge not only of how oil behaves under the earth, but how best to recover it. This has led to many of the principles of modern oil conservation, so important to the continued strength and prosperity of the American people.

The Carter is also a large-volume marketer of crude oil and its products. Then, too, in addition to being a leading crude oil producer, it is one of the largest crude oil buyers, purchasing petroleum from many smaller operators throughout its territory. The money it spends for crude oil, together with the royalties it pays to hundreds of lease owners, are vital economic factors in that area.

Latest manifestation of the Carter's progress is its new refinery, which was officially dedicated in August 1949 at Billings, Mont. There, close to the Montana oil fields, the company has built one of the most modern and up-to-date refineries in the United States. From this plant of tall towers and interlaced steel pipes, as well as from its other refinery at Cut Bank, are coming products that will contribute to the welfare of a large section of the Northwest. And, in addition to the products it will make, the refinery offers good jobs and good livings, not only to the workers in the plant but to all those who stand to profit by a new industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. O. C. Schorp, president of the Carter Oil Co., upon the occasion of the formal opening of the new Carter plant at Billings on Friday, August 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Corbett, Governor Bonner, gentlemen, this is a great day in the 56-year history of our company. We in Carter feel honored, beyond our ability to tell you, by the presence here of so distinguished a group of guests—from the oil industry, from the press, from our parent company—the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), our friends from the community of Billings, and those representing the industrial, educational, and governmental leadership of Montana and the Northwest.

We cannot adequately express our feeling of appreciation for this great honor. We hope that your experience of this afternoon has in part repaid you for the time and the effort you have made in coming here.

Carter's completion of its new Billings refinery is but a part of the great program the American oil industry is engaged in to provide greater facilities and new and improved products and services to the Nation.

In the past 4 years alone, the oil companies of this country have devoted millions of hours of labor and planning, and some 10 billions of dollars of capital derived from earnings, and from credit to be repaid out of earnings, to expand plants and operations to meet the greatest demand for its products in history—an increase in demand of more than 60 percent since 1940.

The industry has been successful in its effort to adequately serve because every unit in it from the individual operators to the largest companies put their shoulders to the task. And in speaking of large companies, I think we should remember that they are nothing more nor less than collections of individuals—composed of tens of thousands of Americans who are stockholders in these enterprises. In our own instance, through our parent company, some 200,000 individual owners are represented.

This is the eve of the celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of the drilling-in of the Drake well in 1859, America's first oil producer, which brought into existence this great industry, and we would like to have you consider this new plant as being typical of the tremendous progress that American private enterprise has made in service to the Nation during that comparatively short period.

Improved services and products have been the constant aim of the industry. Continuing research by oil companies, costing $100,000,000 a year, provides more and better products.

So we would like to have you think of this refinery, not as just one company's plant, or as so many tons of steel, and so many thousands hours of labor and planning, but rather as another example that a free oil industry operating under the private enterprise system is the best guarantee for the development of the Nation's petroleum resources and of improved products and services to the people of this country.

Not only do we feel honored by the presence here tonight of so many distinguished guests, but it is a high privilege that on this occasion we have with us the Honorable John W. Bonner, Governor of the State of Montana, a leader of the highest distinction in the field of public service.

His talents and his unselfish services to his Government and to the people of Montana are well known to all of you; to Carter's personnel here, and to the hundreds of thousands of citizens of the State.

A graduate of the University of Montana, he has devoted his life to public service. Our honored guest has spent more than 20 years in service of the State of Montana and the Government of the United States.

In these busy years, he has distinguished himself as attorney for the Montana State

Highway Commission, the State Board of Railroad Commissioners, the Public Service Commission, and the Montana Trade Commission. He took office as attorney general of Montana in 1941, served in the Judge Advocate General's Department with the United States First Army, and in April 1945 was appointed to the War Crimes Commission. In December 1945 he returned to the State with rank of colonel in the United States Army.

The people of Montana recognized this outstanding record of public service and last January he became the Governor of this, the third largest State in the Union.

Address by the Governor of Montana on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Carter Oil Co. Refinery at Billings, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 20 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have asked and received consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. O. C. Schorp, president of the Carter Oil Co., on the occasion of the formal dedication of the company's new oil refinery at Billings, Mont. I now ask unanimous consent that the address delivered on the same occasion by Hon. John W. Bonner, Governor of Montana, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Montanans, I have been given an opportunity tonight to speak to you on a subject more dear to my heart than any other—one that concerns you and me most deeply, a subject that bears vitally upon the success and happiness of our children—that subject is the progress and development of Montana. The Carter Oil Co. has given me this opportunity on the eve of the completion, at Billings, of its modern 20,000-barrel-a-day refinery—and I am very happy to have the privilege of participating in its radio program in salute to this momentous event.

It is momentous. It is worthy enough to warrant the studied attention of every citizen in this State. It is an event which already has drawn comment from the editors and publishers of petroleum-industry journals. And, as the weeks go by, more and more people throughout the Northwest and America will be reading the legend on Carter Co. crude-oil barrels: "Processed at Billings, Mont." Thus, part of the significance of this event lies in the fact that the rest of the Nation will be made increasingly aware that finished products are manufactured in Montana.

But let's start at the beginning. The Rocky Mountain and Great Plains regions of the Northwest, in which the Carter Oil Co. operates, embraces an area of approximately 860,000 square miles. Montana alone represents almost one-third of this area. This broad expanse comprises about 57 percent of the total area in which Carter currently is operating and represents 28.5 percent of the total area of the United States. Carter first became active in the Northwest in 1916 with drilling operations near the Wyoming-Montana line. In the intervening 33 years, the northwestern section of the United States has developed to a position of major importance in the petroleum industry. This is particularly true of Montana. More than $2,000,000 annually—or a total of $12,500,000 in the 6 years ending January 1, 1949, has been spent by the Carter Co. in exploration work alone in the Northwest. The Northwest is considered favorable for drilling of wildcat wells because, of the 228 wildcats drilled in 1948 by the industry in this section, 29—or 12.6 percent—were successful producers of petroleum. At the present time, production by all operators in the Northwest area approximates 210,000 barrels daily. One of the biggest producing areas is the Elk Basin field, which straddles the Montana-Wyoming line. To lower operating costs and increase petroleum yields, owners of wells in the Elk Basin field formed a unit with a single operator in charge. By pressure maintenance methods, the ultimate recovery of oil from Elk Basin Reservoir will be increased an estimated 49,000,000 barrels.

Barely a year had passed after the end of World War II when the Carter Co. announced plans for building a refinery at Billings, capable of processing 20,000 barrels of crude oil a day. The company's existing refinery at Billings was in need of modernization when acquired. While it was improved for operation at peak capacities during war years, the company sensed the need for establishment of a completely new manufacturing plant to meet ever-increasing marketing demands for improved products in the great Northwest. Major construction work on the refinery was begun. Between 700 and 1,000 Montana laborers and craftsmen were employed in the construction work—a significant contribution to Montana's level of employment. Even more significant, these workers spent their pay checks for food, clothing and shelter in Montana. Here was money being invested in Montana, providing Montana people with an opportunity to buy new homes, new automobiles, send children to school and college and to afford a few of life's luxuries. Here is an industrial firm whose faith in Montana is measured by the millions of dollars it has spent and the additional millions it will continue to spend—in taxes, in maintenance, in pay roll dollars—right here in Montana.

I derive considerable pleasure in recognizing this faith in our State displayed by the Carter Co. because, as I have pointed out in talks before several Montana organizations—too many industrial groups, too many business leaders in the East and Middle West think of Montana only as a bridge to the west coast. Too many manufacturing concerns on the eastern and western seaboards transport Montana's raw materials to their factories, process and label them and ship their finished products back to this area. They will soon begin to realize, I hope, as the Carter Oil Co. has recognized, that it is more economical and far wiser to establish at the site, to manufacture in Montana and to pay only one-way transportation costs. Carter Oil has provided, in the establishment of its Billings refinery—a vivid example that industry can come to Montana. It seems to me that this display of faith by an industrial firm should provide an apt lesson to Montana citizens; the fact that industries must be encouraged to establish in a State by the attractions and inducements that State has to offer. As Governor, I have had an opportunity to travel into other States. When people ask me where I am from and I say "Montana" a kind of dreamy look comes into their eyes, and I know exactly what they are thinking about. They are thinking about our towering mountains—our vast praries, our wilderness areas and our curious Indian place names. They are thinking about the copper and gold and silver we mine, the livestock and wheat we raise and the lumber we export. We have all of these and more.

Let's look at this State of Montana and determine what encouraged Carter Oil to establish its 20,000-barrels-a-day refinery at Billings. Montana stretches 700 miles in length, 500 in width. The towering Continental Divide has provided us with two great watersheds. Western Montana is noted for its beautiful virgin timber stands, snow crested mountains and clear streams. Here wild game abounds and here the tourist can easily become lost in the weirdly beautiful primitive areas. Glacier Park, in northwestern Montana, is visited by thousands of tourists annually. Income from tourist travel alone last year was between 60 and 75 million dollars. In western Montana is beautiful Flathead Lake, largest inland freshwater lake west of the Mississippi. This is the hub of Montana's lumber-producing empire. The forests of Montana constitute one of the State's greatest natural resources. Over 20,500,000 acres, or more than 1/5 of the State's total area, are classified as forest lands. Of these 20,000,000 acres more than 8,000,000 contain timber of commercial size and quality. More than 7,000,000 are cut-over and producing young growth. Of all the manufacturing industries of Montana, lumbering ranks high in total value of finished products amounting to better than $20,000,000. This industry ranks second in number of persons employed—about 6,500 in all. Since 1864 the value of lumber cut has amounted to $217,000,000.

It was in western Montana, to the Bitterroot Valley, that Father DeSmet brought his Black-Robe Missionaries. In fact, one of the significant things about Montana was this: it was not really started by hunters or trappers or miners or soldiers. The first enduring settlement of white men was made by missionaries of the cross and beneath that cross were erected Montana's first dwellings. Perhaps to no other man does Montana owe a greater debt of gratitude than to Father Peter DeSmet—a Belgian by birth, an American by adoption, a tireless missionary of the Jesuit order and the first man to bring to Montana not only the Christian religion but its first experiments in agriculture and in industry. In western Montana is Hungry Horse Dam and the head waters of the great Columbia River. Of the potential total water power of the 48 States, Montana contains more than 10 percent or 4,000,000 horsepower. It is little wonder that Montanans regard their water equally as valuable as the gold dust and nuggets found in their mountains and panned in their streams.

Montana's eastern slope of the Rockies provides an interesting contrast to the western half of the State. Here are miles and miles of broken prairie, of waving wheat and of valuable herds of cattle and sheep. Here rise the headwaters of the Missouri River. During its flow through the State the mighty Missouri falls approximately 2,000 feet before it crosses the eastern boundary. This great river, fed by innumerable tributaries, offers natural opportunities for the economical development of power in a State still industrially young. Today, a unified Montana is beginning to conserve its valuable water and soil resources. Our farmers are fortified by thousands of dams for the storage of run-off water for livestock needs, and to supply irrigation for feed and hay crops. Eastern Montana provides a marked improvement in tillage practices. We are not only conserving moisture but we are protecting ourselves against a blowing-off of the soil. Across the path of prevailing winds we oppose alternate strips of fallow and crop or grass. Contour listing on sloping fields prevents excessive washing-down of valuable Montana top soil. Farming in Montana is

intelligently planned and efficiently conducted.

I have mentioned two great sources of income to Montana—agriculture and lumbering. There is another in which the very history of Montana is interwoven. That is the production of copper. Butte is the home of Montana copper production. Here in the lap of the Continental Divide hard-rock miners tunnel thousands of feet under the earth to mine the ore which is smelted and refined at other Montana cities—Helena, Anaconda, and Great Falls—into telephone wire, kitchen utensils, and a score of other copper products for use throughout the world. Montana produces many other minerals—gold, silver, and lead. President Hoover was asked whether a young mining engineer looking for advancement would find great opportunity in the Soviet Republic. The reply was crisp: "There are more minerals in Montana than in the whole of Soviet Russia." Such an assertion coming from the President of the United States and a mining engineer at that, is impressive indeed. Montana has gold produced in 21 counties; coal, including three varieties besides lignite; platinum, manganese, tungsten, uranium, zinc, and a score of others. Montana's coal-measure is an estimated 381,000,000,000 tons. Only two States have more. Practically the entire world's supply of sapphires is derived from Siam, from Australia and from the State of Montana. In round figures Montana has to date yielded almost $5,000,000,000 in mineral wealth.

If Montana were walled in and cut off from the world, she could support herself. Her half million people would lack none of the necessities and but few of the luxuries of life. Outside of tea, coffee and bananas she has about everything. For food she grows all the grains, fruits and vegetables of the North Temperate Zone. Her cattle, sheep, swine, and poultry number millions. Her wilds abound with game and her waters teem with fish. For clothing, there is wool from 3,000,000 sheep. Linen from 700,000 acres of flax. Leather from 350,000 horse hides and pelts from 20 kinds of fur-bearing animals. For shelter there is lumber from 30,000,000 acres of forests, limestone and shale for cement, clay for brick and tile, granite, sandstone and marble. For fuel, her coal mines, natural gas and oil deposits are of undetermined richness. To industry, her streams offer 4,000,000 horsepower for hydroelectric energy. For luxuries, her resources range from gold, silver and sapphires to bees for honey, sugar beets for candy, phosphate for matches or fertilizer and tungsten for incandescent lamps. Truly it means much to be a Montanan and more and more industries are beginning to realize that Montana, with her wealth of natural resources and a growing population is an ideal place to locate.

The Bureau of the Census has recently released a preliminary report on the 1947 census of manufacturers for Montana. The number of manufacturing establishments in Montana rose 18 percent—from 552 in 1939 to 652 in 1947. The average annual number of production workers employed in these establishments rose 55 percent. Value added by manufacture (which equals the value of shipments minus the cost of materials and supplies and therefore includes wages and salaries) expanded 138 percent—from $38,500,000 in 1939 to $92,500,000 in 1947. A preliminary tabulation of industry reports showed increases in establishments manufacturing lumber products, stone, clay and glass products, fabricated metals, non-electrical machinery and chemicals and allied products. The 1950 census now under way in Montana will undoubtedly furnish gratifying evidence of the State's fundamental economic progress on a still more current basis.

The sectionalism which has divided so many States—pitting the interests of one community or area against another—is nowhere apparent in Montana. There is rivalry between cities in Montana—yes—but it is friendly, sportsmanlike competition without rancor or bitterness. It is this spirit which prompts our people to answer the question, "Where are you from?" with Montana and not eastern Montana or western Montana. It is a realization that it is not one community versus another that makes our State great but that Great Falls and Billings and Butte and Missoula and Helena, and the hundreds of other communities together within our borders that makes us great.

To illustrate, I have recently returned with the State board of examiners from an inspection tour of sites proposed by various Montana cities for the location of Montana's new million-dollar home for the aged. We visited, or will visit, some 30 communities in the State to determine the best possible location for this home where our senior citizens may spend their declining years in peace and tranquillity. And although each community we have visited frankly and readily admits its desire to have the home located in its own municipality and presents organized evidence and data in support of that desire, I found the same general feeling predominating wherever the board stopped. Foremost in everyone's mind is the thought that no matter which site is ultimately selected Montana as a whole stands to benefit. It is to be an institution supported, after all, by all Montanans and was created initially by the desires of all our people. All our citizens will mutually share in its benefits and particularly our aged.

Another instance of Montana unity was manifested earlier this year when State and business officials sought to have the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed new atomic reactor plant located in Montana. At no time in my life have I ever witnessed a people more united on a single issue, and that issue not one of selfishness or personal gain but merely to see that justice was done and fair and impartial consideration given as promised. Montanans early realized during the atomic-reactor-plant discussions that this State had not been given fair treatment and our efforts to prolong and sustain discussions stemmed solely from the fact that we wanted the issue openly aired and honestly treated.

This same spirit of frankness and determination carries over into every Montana enterprise. I learned early as a public official that you must tell Montanans the truth; that they will have no part of, nor time for, an individual or organization that deals from the bottom of the deck. Honesty and fair play are prime requisites for success in Montana.

Here certainly is a moral climate which should encourage more industries to follow the vivid example set by the Carter Oil Co. in establishing in Montana. Here is a State where the resource wealth has barely been tapped, where civil organizations and planning groups stand ready with honest and reliable information about their localities, where the literacy rate is among the highest in the Nation, where there is no sectionalism, no racial problems, no towering tax barriers nor legislation designed to hamper or curtail manufacturing. Here is a State where per capita earnings consistently rank among the top seven in the Nation, where business conditions and bank debits remain relatively stable, and where the faith in its business future is reflected in increased building permits, bond issues to finance new schools, new hospitals, new highways and recreational areas. Industry and manufacturing are welcome in Montana because her people realize their value to the economy. If there is any doubt in your minds that industries, such as the new Billings refinery of the Carter Oil Co., are not beneficial, let me give you some illustrations. The figures I quote are on file with the State department of lands and investments in Helena. During the past year Montana has derived from oil and gas leases alone $400,500. Of that amount, the Carter Oil Co. contributed 31 percent, and at one time, contributed 49 percent of the total oil and gas lease revenue. Of that $400,000 received by the State last year, $145,000 went into the permanent school fund, the fund which bears interest earnings for Montana educational units. Two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars of that total amount went into the revolving fund—that which is distributed directly toward the education of our school children. There were 139,846 Montana school children last year between the ages of 6 and 20. Fifteen dollars and twelve cents was contributed by the Montana Department of State Lands and Investments toward each child's education. Of that $15, $2 was derived from oil and gas leases.

As a matter of fact, a lease in the Kevin-Sunburst Field, near Oilmont, was known for years as The Kiddies Well, because it was production from that well that opened the eyes of the people of Montana to what this new industry would mean to their school fund. This lease alone produced 403,000 barrels of royalty oil since 1925. As of June 30, 1948, $4,126,000 had accrued to the State's permanent and income funds from oil and gas rentals and royalties. Our children have received these benefits in better educational facilities. Let us carry the example further:

The Carter Oil Co.'s modern Billings refinery will convert crude oil produced in Montana, into energy for powering the industrial, home, farm, and transportation activities not only of the Billings area but of the entire Northwest. This refinery will provide regular jobs for approximately 350 Montana employees. These workers participate in employee-benefit plans, insurance, and death benefits and disability payments. Wherever and whenever practicable, it was the policy of this company to procure materials, supplies, and services locally in Montana. Among the manufacturers, suppliers, and contractors were more than 125 Billings firms and more than 50 other firms in the Rocky Mountain States.

Here indeed is a living example of the progress which can be made in encouraging new industries to establish in the Northwest. It is an expression of faith by the Carter Co. in the business future of Montana and the Northwest. I am positive that Montana and her sister States will justify that faith—that the scores of important organizations and groups from every community in Montana will unite in welcoming this new enterprise—and will continue to encourage others to establish among us.

To the officials and employees of the Carter Oil Co.—to its president, O. C. Schorp, I extend my warm good wishes and personal commendation on the completion of this splendid new refinery. I appreciate—and I know the people of Montana appreciate the faith you have displayed in investing millions of dollars in our State. Montanans, you may be sure will return that faith. Montana offers you a good climate, wise laws, unmatched oil potentials and a ready market for your goods and services. Montana's people offer you a warm welcome—a hospitable welcome that only people who live slowly enough to be always rich can give. Thank you, friends, for listening.

Charles E. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.

WILSON, OF GE

It was Horatio Alger who popularized the American saga of the poor boy who worked and won his way to fame and fortune over every obstacle. No Alger hero, however, achieved that dream more successfully than Charles E. Wilson, General Electric's president, who is being honored today on completion of 50 years of service in the electric industry.

The story of Charles E. Wilson is one that should warm the heart of even the most pessimistic cynic. It started exactly 50 years ago today, when 12-year-old Charlie Wilson went to work as a $3-a-week office boy for the Sprague Electric Co. in New York City to help his widowed mother.

Young Wilson, born in New York's Hell's Kitchen, had little of the advantages of formal schooling. He had to learn while he earned his own way and supported his mother. But learn he did and it wasn't very long before he started the steady climb from office boy to shipping clerk to factory accountant and up the ladder to plant manager.

When Sprague transferred its business to GE in 1918, Plant Manager Wilson was already nationally known in the growing industry. General Electric has never been loathe to recognize ability and by 1937 ex-Office Boy Wilson was GE's executive vice president and successor-designate to the great Gerard Swope as president.

Two years later, he took over as president and in the 10 years that followed he proved his mettle in guiding the destinies of GE through a vast expansion for the Nation's defense, through even greater production achievements in World War II and finally in the difficult period of postwar adjustment.

His wartime service as head of the War Production Board and as a leader in the fight for fair employment practices have placed the Nation in his debt.

Lynn's General Electric family will join wholeheartedly in the tributes that go to Mr. Wilson today on his anniversary. In the dozen years since he came here on his first visit, Lynn has come to know and appreciate him as an industrial leader of vision and courage.

How To End the Dollar Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 21 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to End the Dollar Crisis," by Robert K. Pepper, news editor of the News-Press, Fort Myers, Fla.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO END THE DOLLAR CRISIS
FOREIGN AID ON A PAYING BASIS
(By Robert K. Pepper)

There are two apparently irreconcilable forces active in America today. The internationalists would widen American markets for foreign goods in an effort to alleviate the dollar crisis abroad.

The protectionists, which include American manufacturers and labor unions, are already protesting the imports of "cheap foreign goods" and their healthy howls will increase if any measures are taken to threaten their livelihood seriously.

In the meantime the American shipbuilding industry, which scored magnificent feats in wartime, is practically dead and our modest volume of foreign trade is now being bolstered by dubious and temporary methods such as outright gifts abroad in the form of aid programs.

Even the widely heralded dickering with the British on the chronic shortage of dollars failed to produce any solution of a permanent nature, and the measures agreed to ignore the rest of the globe.

The entire problem can be stated this way: Production increases faster than markets, and the answer requires the orderly and continuous creation of new markets as production expands. The solution is beyond the power of farmers and manufacturers, for if the production of goods in itself created its own markets, output would expand indefinitely, and there would be no surprises. And the existence of surplus cannot be denied.

Likewise, regardless of how much production increases abroad, foreign nations cannot make dollars unless the goods can be sold to America.

So the following is proposed to solve these interlocking problems:

1. Each year the Department of Commerce estimates the volume of new foreign trade which would be most beneficial in our economy. Too much buying would tend to cause scarcities and increase domestic prices; too little would leave us with unsold goods, farm surpluses, and idle factories.

2. If this figure was estimated at $5,000,000,000—the amount should vary considerably from year to year—the United States Government would set up a world-trade fund and buy abroad foreign currencies up to the $5,000,000,000 limit. It would be agreed that the foreign nations use these dollars so acquired for the purchase of American goods. In this way we can create as much, or as little, foreign buying power as we desire and direct it into whatever hands we wish.

3. The United States Government, in turn, would agree to use part of these acquired foreign currencies for the stock piling of strategic goods and the purchase of materials useful in public works. In this way foreign trade will become a two-way affair, with freighters and air liners loaded both coming and going.

4. It is strongly advocated here that each year this foreign trade fund be created through the right granted Congress in the Constitution to issue new money.

Look at it this way: Suppose each year the British Empire, Brazil, France, and the rest had $5,000,000,000 to buy American goods. Would we refuse this money, which would be new in America, on the grounds that it would be inflationary? We would not. We would gladly take it and the money would assure the same favorable benefits that America enjoyed in former years as an exporting nation. The inflationary effect would be slight indeed if the amount, as suggested here, was limited each year to the dollar value of America's surpluses of grain and citrus and clothing and machinery.

The procedure could be as follows: Each year Congress would authorize the issuance of $5,000,000,000, or $8,000,000,000, or whatever figure was determined most advisable by America's production outlook. This fund would be deposited in the Treasury's foreign-trade account, and an exchange of bank credit effected with other nations.

How foreign governments raise these funds to be exchanged for dollars is not of particular importance. They could, if desired, use taxation, borrowing, direct issuance, or a combination of all three.

Our Government would actually put foreign aid on a paying basis. If created by legislation, the trade fund would neither add to the public debt nor be an obligation of the taxpayers, while the Government could sell some of these acquired currencies to importers, American firms doing business abroad, and outward-bound tourists. We would be actively assisting the whole world and making a profit at the same time.

The advantages of this proposal are many. The United States Government could not lose on the transaction. Our farmers, manufacturers, and shippers get good United States dollars for the products they send abroad while the rest of the world piles up no monetary debt to America which cannot be repaid.

The same principle might well be followed in providing public works and rebuilding loans for foreign nations, from private American bankers. Our Government might in effect guarantee the repayment of these loans by agreeing to buy each year enough currencies and goods so that Mexico or Sweden or India would be assured of enough dollars to service these loans.

This article takes no positive stand on effecting an agreement with Russia under the world trade fund. However, it might be that a cordial move on America's part to increase traffic with the Soviet Union would tend to temper the present political unpleasantness.

It is true that America would be at some apparent disadvantage in trading dollars for pounds, pesos, yen, etc. But it is certainly better to get something than nothing for an inflow of dollars abroad.

It is even possible that a stock pile of foreign currencies would prove extremely advantageous at some future era. It can be even envisioned that crop failures or domestic scarcities might make it desirable in some years to forego the creation of a trade fund, and instead use some of these acquired moneys to assure a plentiful supply of goods within America.

Although this proposal appears revolutionary, actually it is little different—but far more practical—than the revaluation-gold-buying program of the 1930's. Here the Government, by legislation, actually created new money, without the remotest resemblance to the wild inflation generally forecast.

The Government, by sharply increasing the buying price of gold, created new dollars abroad. But this failed to solve America's world trade problem, for when we collected practically all the gold, the buying necessarily stopped. And another revaluation would prove of little practical value. Gold stocks, above and underground, are extremely limited and many nations where we would like to create markets for American goods have no gold at all.

Actually, this proposal ignores both gold and silver, which have been identified with money since civilization began. But there is no need to alter the relatively minor part

these precious metals now play in the world's commerce.

The dollar, in fact, has assumed the place of gold as the international currency of the world. We have the power, if we but use it, to see that the dollar can help to bring continuous progress, peace, and prosperity to the entire globe.

Statement by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, on an International Understanding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 21 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on an international understanding program being sponsored by the Charleston (W. Va.) Junior Chamber of Commerce. I feel this program is of great importance and hope every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to read this statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

"Teach us better to understand other people, that we may view their shortcomings with charity, their virtues with appreciation, and their kindness to us with gratitude." These are the words of Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, voicing a problem of deep concern to all of us today. It is the problem of finding a way that different people can come together and explain to each other their mutual concerns.

Man fears what he does not understand. His small knowledge of his neighbors in foreign lands has bred suspicion and even hatred. That hatred can be dispelled and our goal, so ably expressed by President Truman, "Not peace in our time, but peace for all time," can be achieved only if we are able to bring about a greater measure of international understanding.

There is no doubt it is easier to talk about mutual understanding between nations than to accomplish it. Every man realizes its necessity but few are able to do anything about it. It is the kind of goal that can be achieved only if we start putting our emphasis on the human element, instead of concentrating entirely on the economic and political facts of life.

Our Government is working toward that goal and it is with great pride that I call attention to an experiment of world significance being undertaken in my own home State of West Virginia by a group of young men—the Charleston Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Charleston Junior Chamber of Commerce has been working on an idea that is to be developed in all the different Jaycee chapters throughout the United States. In broad terms, the idea is to arrange an interchange program with a number of different countries whereby one young person will be sent to each country, to live in a private home and to work in a position similar to that held by him in the United States, and to have one young person from each of these participating countries sent to the States under the same circumstances.

The interchange would be for 1 year. It would be supported not by government but by private industry, labor, community organizations, and interested individuals, who would be encouraged to help in this great undertaking for the sake of turning large and splendid concepts into immediate and valuable practice.

Charleston, W. Va., is to be the first place in the United States to put this program into operation, because it is there that it has been developed, but it is envisaged that 2,000 different Jaycee chapters and 50 nations will work on this idea and coordinate it into a program that will ultimately involve an interchange of about 50,000 persons a year.

Nineteen countries have thus far expressed great interest in the undertaking. This year, young men and women from Charleston, W. Va., will go to live and work in all the following countries: In Europe—England, France, Belgium, Spain, Norway, Finland, Switzerland, Austria, and Italy. In the Middle East—Turkey. In Asia—India, China, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia. In Central America—Panama. In South America—Argentina and Brazil. In Africa—Liberia.

Charleston will receive from each of these countries this year one young person who will live in an American home, work in an American enterprise, and learn in the most basic ways possible what we mean when we talk of "the American way of life."

The idea of achieving better understanding through direct interchange of people is not new, of course. Under the Fulbright Act, our Government is promoting the interchange of students, teachers, and advanced research workers. At present, there are 13 countries participating in the program made possible by the Fulbright Act and although the program has been under way for too short a time to draw conclusions, its operation thus far has been watched with great interest by far more people than are actually involved in the interchange, which in 1949 will amount to 1,112 Americans and 1,050 from foreign lands.

The junior chambe of commerce program will be broader and deeper in its effects, since it will cover all types of workers and will take a more direct hand in their living as well as working experience. Handled as a community project and sponsored by community organizations, this Jaycee project will receive the interest and attention of a wider audience, and will have greater meaning to the whole community as a result.

This international understanding program should be encouraged with all our energy and good will. It comes to grips with a high-sounding ideal and makes it a practical possibility. All the fine ideals we profess will come alive in human relationships.

The international understanding program makes good sense today, better world citizens tomorrow, and will bring us nearer our goal:

"Earth shall be fair and all her people one;
Not 'til that hour shall God's whole will be done."

Dedication of the Memorial City Hall and Auditorium of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following dedication address I delivered at the new Memorial City Hall and Auditorium, Lynn, Mass., on Wednesday, September 7, 1949:

In the anatomy of any community, the building that houses local government is the very heart of civil life.

As the churches represent its spirit the educational institutions symbolize its mind, the newspaper and radio stations its nervelines of communication, the highways its veins and arteries carrying the lifeblood of economic activity, the city hall is the great coordinator of circulation.

It gathers and spends the minimum funds necessary to build and maintain schools, public parks and properties, streets and sewers; to safeguard the public health; to provide police and fire protection; and many other services in behalf of the general welfare.

Ours is a Nation of travelers. In our spare time we like to get about by car to see other communities and how the people in them live. No doubt this is a sign of the healthy and competitive American spirit. If one city does something good we want our city to do it better.

How often in traveling through strange cities have we looked for the city hall by which to gage the city's progress? From it we form an impression of the whole. If the city hall is very old and run down at the heels we label that community as one which is not keeping up with the times. Conversely, if the main office building of city government is neat, clean, and modern in appearance, it is a sign that the city is prosperous, happy, and progressive.

From studies made by experts, we know that a building which has proper light and air, which is easy to heat and to keep clean, and is designed to promote the efficiency of the worker and the convenience of those who visit it on business has a double value.

In the long run, it cuts administrative costs, and it has a functional beauty which is both pleasing and practical. It makes for better all-around service.

Lynn is one of the oldest settlements in the New World, established on the basis of self-government, and incorporating within its people a rich heritage in democracy.

From the time when the Ingalls brothers put their oxen out to graze on that last day of June in 1629, there began that long and brilliant experience in the management of their own affairs, which finds its high point of accomplishment in the dedication of this new civic center.

For 173 years, the problems and the policies of town government had been solved at the meetinghouse of the first parish. During the first 50 years, in a humble building which stood on a site corresponding to the junction of Summer and Shepard Streets the people met to decide the direction of public business. From 1682 until 1805 they assembled in the Old Tunnel Meetinghouse on the common. It was there that the early religious zeal of the pioneers joined with their growing demand for civil freedom. For years, the parish meeting and the town meeting were almost one. And although we have since drawn a distinction between church and state, in justice to the variety of minority viewpoints in our society, the fruits of that early association have not been lost. The character-building implicit in religious training of any kind is a guaranty of integrity in the men and women we choose to represent us in government.

In 1805 the town of Lynn withdrew from the Old Tunnel Meetinghouse and repaired to the First Methodist Meetinghouse for its deliberations. The sale of the latter forced it to move to the Second Methodist Church at Woodend. But this was so remote from the center of population that only one meeting was held there and for the purpose of voting to erect a townhouse. Pending its construction, the town met twice in the room above the old corner drugstore at the junction of

Market and Essex Streets. The place of meeting was described in the warrant as the Hall of Paul and Ellis Newhall, but it was properly known as the war office, because it had been used as headquarters of the party which supported the war against England. The new townhouse occupied in 1814 was a very modest and inexpensive structure and remained for many years the first and only municipal building. Fittingly enough, it was originally located in the center of the common, but in 1832 it was removed to South Common Street near Blossom.

But the town was growing faster than it had planned. The pace of industrial progress picked up, attracting more people, and with it the need for an expanded municipal service. On February 18, 1863, an order was introduced in the common council calling for the erection of a new—and this time, a city hall. On July 15 of that same year an appropriation was made to purchase the old Johnson lot at the corner of North Common and Essex Streets. In his inaugural address of January 4, 1864, Mayor Neal stressed the fact that while the community was engaged in a great war demanding stern sacrifices from its wealth and from the services of its citizens, the problems of its growth could not be ignored. He urged the local government to build a city hall that would be adequate, not only for the present, but to anticipate every possible need of the future.

Then fate stepped in.

On October 6, 1864, the old townhouse was destroyed by fire, involving the loss of a man's life.

As the War of 1812 forced the community to build its first townhouse, and the Civil War marked the beginnings of the first city hall, the close of World War II brought to the attention of the people of Lynn the fact that its community is still growing and in need of a new municipal office building to service its development.

The day when the first city hall was dedicated—November 30, 1867—was one of great rejoicing. The Civil War was over. Lynn was throbbing to the beat of the industrial revolution. There was unity in the Nation, and the faith that it was on the threshold of immense expansion.

You and I have lived in succeeding generations which have witnessed such progress, not without cost, which even the high hopes of those who attended the dedication of 1867 could not visualize.

Eighty-two years have passed since then, and into them have been crowded centuries of experience. The world has moved so fast that we find it difficult to keep up with the problems which accompany the blessings of technology. By the yardstick of those 82 years we try to measure ahead into the future in order to be ready for it or, better, to lead it so that it will not lead us.

But wait. Let us look upon the past before it is shrouded in history and learn something from the past. It is so easy to see its faults and overlook its virtues. It was a very human period, one of hard work and adventure and self-reliance, in which there was no thought that man might have to compete against a machine age beyond his individual control.

We have come here to dedicate a new home for the municipal government of the city of Lynn and to trace, in retrospect, some of the happenings along the evolutionary road from meeting house to civic center.

Some of the labels and some of the issues which concerned the people of Lynn "in the old days" seem strange to us now, but we should realize that they played their part in compromising those differences which had to be solved so that we of today might enjoy the unity and progress which is ours.

The old town hall, built in 1814, was so many times larger than any of the shoemaker's shops that were seen in all the streets of the town at that time, that it must have been pointed to with pride by the citizens who furnished the money for its construction which cost $2,082,690.

A considerable part of the ground floor was taken up with a wide passageway, running its 100-foot length, and having wide doors at each end. Through this passage the military marched, on "training day," coming out at the west end near the old gun house before they broke ranks. On the right of this passage were rooms used as armories by the military companies. On the left was a room used for general purposes, and next, the selectmen's room, which was also the office of the town clerk and the collector of taxes. The hall occupied the entire second floor. At the rear end of the hall was a low platform, surrounded by a railing. Three feet in front of this railing was a fence and the space between constituted a passageway through which voters passed to deposit their ballots in a box which was situated midway. Voters also passed through this passage when the important parliamentary procedure of polling the House was resorted to.

In early times, when towns lived much unto themselves, the town meeting was an outstanding event of the year. It had a social and domestic significance, as well as a public and political meaning. Not only friends and neighbors gathered here twice a year but distant acquaintances who came all the way from Nahant and Swampscott, and the far boundaries separating Lynn from the territories of Salem, Danvers, Saugus, and Lynnfield. It was a day of personal reunions, in which information concerning crops, business, politics, and plain gossip was exchanged. There were heated discussions about President Jackson's bank veto and on the local issue as to whether or not John Blank should be elected as overseer of the poor for another year.

On important election days, the old hall was crowded all day long. When a voice vote seemed close and the show of hands which was then called for did not settle the issue it was decided to poll the house. Then the clerk would order that those in favor of the motion should walk through the passageway between railing and fence near the platform that they might be counted. Young men, exercising their proud franchise for the first time, would march through as if the fate of the Nation depended upon them. The "wags," who occupied strategic positions on the high seats at both sides of the hall, had an enjoyable opportunity to pass miscellaneous comments on each voter as he was polled.

The outskirts of the town were then rural districts, and some of the fashions could hardly be called the new look. And so the wits of the town had a field day commenting upon the dress, size, and general appearance of each individual, as well as more detailed observations as to the length of nose, color of their hair, shape of the head, or any other difference which could be used for making small talk.

At this stage the Swampscott delegation had not yet arrived, but when it did, it was accompanied by martial drum and piercing fife. The sturdy fishermen in nonrubber boots were united. The cry would go up: "Make way for Swampscott," and the hundred or more men who came from the suburb of Lynn marched as one man to have their opinion on the issue at hand recorded. The men of Swampscott exercised considerable weight because they knew what they wanted and they never wavered in their choice.

The technique of politics on election day has not changed too much in its fundamentals. Almost a century and a half ago it was necessary even as today to get out the vote. A horse and wagon was the means of transport used to bring in voters from distant parts of the town, as well as the aged or feeble who lived nearby. Every now and then a team would dash up to the door of the town house to discharge its reinforcement of voters. The opposition, to discourage such mounting strength, was not above sending in calls for transportation to the polls from some nonexistent address out in the woods.

The March meeting was the climax in public interest. In those days particularly, due to lack of major issues and the time lag in communications, National and State elections were of secondary interest. Even in 1949 this intimate concern about local problems is the foundation of a healthy democracy. Here is the training ground where we familiarize ourselves with the ever-present questions of taxation and the objects to which public money shall be applied that are duplicated on a larger scale as we progress through local, State, and National Governments to a consideration of world problems.

The March meeting, therefore, was usually the signal for a full house. The advisability of a new fire pump, a new schoolhouse, the purchase of some property by the town, or any extra expenditure whatever, were questions which touched everyone's pocketbook in a way that all could understand. And everyone had a chance to be heard on the issue, which was democracy in its purest form.

In 1850 the new city form of government was established, and it was apparent that, with the growth of the community and with the increased responsibilities of local government, the years of the old town hall were numbered.

From 1850 to 1863, at which time the building of a city hall was authorized, municipal expenditures increased more than five times, even though the population did not increase twice in that same period. Lynn was anticipating and preparing for the future and for the great industrial expansion which came later.

Lynn had foresight then. She has the foresight now to provide, through this superbly modern municipal building the streamlined and efficient service necessary for the progress of an industrial city.

From 1867 to 1949 Lynn has seen many changes. Three times her sons and daughters have gone forth to war. Great industries have taken the place of the handicraft trades. The horse and carriage, once the hallmark of worldly success, have disappeared. Today even the humblest worker owns a motorcar. In 1867, the young man or woman who graduated from high school was distinguished by that fact alone. Now a college education is regarded as a right and as a necessity. Nearly every home has the comforts, conveniences, and labor-saving devices which the wealthy few of 1867 did not possess. The news from all over the world comes to the homes with incredible speed, the finest minds and the most engaging talent enter millions of living rooms through the magic of radio and television. These and so many other proofs of a higher standard of living are available to the average home at shorter hours of work and less physical exertion than was required of our forefathers for their hard-earned existence relieved only by a few and simple pleasures.

So far have we advanced along the road of material progress.

But with this progress have come complex problems which demand greater participation from the spirit and the mind of man.

Not the least of these problems is the one concerning government, whether national, State, or local government.

It is our business, and it is a big business.

The municipal administration of any city costs millions of dollars each year.

Consider these few comparisons.

Eighty-two years ago, most city streets were nothing but dirt roads, requiring but little upkeep. Today we take it for granted that all streets should have a hot-top cover.

The hand tub and volunteer firemen were expected to save our property from damage and destruction. That they couldn't do the job is written in the tragic records of the

many cities that were gutted by fire. Today we have building codes designed to eliminate fire hazards, extensive inspection and preventive programs, a skilled force of paid fire fighters on a round-the-clock alert, a network of signal boxes, and a fleet of pump and ladder trucks each of which costs many thousands of dollars.

Parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, an elaborate educational plant, these add to the tax levies.

The underground of water supply and waste disposal, the collection of rubbish, the various health and charities programs, the keeping of public records, the assessment of property and the collection of taxes, all these are far more extensive than they ever were.

Eighty-two years ago, there was no traffic to speak of. In 1949, it is a problem child. And the police force of today needs patrol cars and two-way radios.

More and more, local government must seek assistance from the State and Federal Governments to handle projects like veterans' housing.

The administration of municipal affairs requires a high degree of ability, character, and work. To do the job right, your city fathers must have the right plant and equipment. The people of Lynn are to be commended for their understanding and their vision in providing a modern and efficient structure to serve as the executive center of local government. I am sure that it will pay dividends in greater convenience and satisfaction to all the citizens of Lynn.

On Friday, November 30, 1917, a program to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the dedication was held in the auditorium of Classical High School. Again the pattern of coincidence holds true. The Nation was deep in crisis, but involved for the first time in a war where the major battles took place on European soil. The United States was coming of age and, like the little boy who cannot grow up fast enough to become a policeman or fireman or cowboy, he suddenly finds that he has grown up and it's quite a shock. Perhaps there are moments when he wishes that he could reverse the process and return to the happy, carefree days of boyhood again. It is a sobering thought in any young person's life when the realization dawns that life is a one-way street. From time to time we may glance back through the misty haze of memory, trying to see the faces of those whom we once knew, trying to rekindle the high idealism of lost youth and to reinspire ourselves with its great faith and its will to improve.

And then we face forward again, heartened by recollections of the past, to face those responsibilities in our time which cannot be avoided.

It is so with nations as with individuals.

On that 30th day of November 1917 there were many homes in this city which were burdened with anxiety for their boys who were overseas.

As a consequence, there were not many people in attendance at the exercises commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Lynn City Hall.

Mayor George Newhall, however, was quite pleased with the program which brought forth facts showing the growth of Lynn in half a century.

The total valuation had increased from $15,000,000 to $89,000,000. The number of polls had risen from 5,000 to 29,000, and the population had jumped from 20,000 to 100,000.

The first city hall was planned during the Civil War, and its fiftieth anniversary was observed during World War I. The cycle of years in between was notable for the industrial revolution in the shoe industry and for the introduction of electricity.

The first six-story brick building was erected in 1877 on Munroe Street.

In 1862 the McKay stitching machine came into use. Men left their little shops beside their homes and went into the new, large factories where hundreds of them worked together. The age of individual craftsmanship was giving way to that of mass production, which would give tremendous impetus to the development of the United States as the greatest industrial power in history.

In the year 1882, the Lynn Electric Lighting Co. was incorporated. The year 1883 is an historic date. Through the foresight and aggressive efforts of a group of local citizens, the Thomson-Houston Co. was induced to move its works from a community in Connecticut to the city of Lynn. At the moment, although it reflected credit on the enterprising spirit of civic-minded leaders, the full import of this gain could not be measured in terms of its true worth.

The Lynn Hospital first opened its doors to patients in 1883.

The year 1889 was a year of great trial. A disastrous fire swept the center of the city, destroying more than $5,000,000 worth of property. The ashes had hardly cooled, however, before a determined citizenry set to work to clear them away. They turned this loss to their advantage, for as they rebuilt they provided for straight, wide streets to provide better arteries for trade and transport. The year 1892 stands out in the history of Lynn. It marks the consolidation of the Thomson-Houston Co., and the Edison Electric Co., in the General Electric which has since become one of the giants of American industry, conspicuous for its valuable services to the Nation in war as well as peace. This parent plant, together with its far-flung subsidiaries, now had hundreds of millions of dollars in assets, owned by the millions of Americans who invested their earnings in this enterprise. It employs many thousands of workers at wages which are a credit to the developing teamwork between capital and labor which is the foundation of our dynamic progress as a nation.

To my mind, this is the most significant fact in the many which make up the history of Lynn.

Even in 1917 it was on the threshold of its remarkable growth.

Into the 32 years since then, history has recorded an earth-shaking series of events, pregnant with challenge, from which far-reaching adjustments are being born.

The men and women who attended the commemoration exercises in 1917 could not foresee the stern tests, the remarkable accomplishments, and the more insistent call for mankind to rise above its weaknesses, as were jam-packed into the 32 years since 1917 when the world exceeded itself in foolishness, in cruelty, and in genius.

But they did not ask for complete security to shield them from the adventure that is life. Fortified by the character and the intelligence which they inherited from their fathers and mothers, the generation of 1917 faced the unknown future. They did not turn away from it. Come what may, they were determined to go ahead. They were sure that out of experience with all of its hard knocks would come true progress. They knew that life could not be lived in a vacuum.

And so they made mistakes. They stumbled and fell and bruised themselves but the point is that they were determined on learning how to live in the strange new world which science was thrusting upon them.

Many of them died in the prime of their youth in 1917 and 1918. Perhaps many of them did not know the reason why they were called upon for sudden death or prolonged suffering. But somehow they believed that things would be better for the folks back home.

The old city hall looked out on the victory parades of 1918, and it welcomed back the boys from France. And then it saw the people turn their backs on the war as soon as it was over, forgetting the lessons which should have been learned and seeking escape in a wild era of speculation and self-indulgence.

Then came the tragic reckoning in the collapse of 1929, the failures, the foreclosures, and the wandering men for whom there was no work. City hall became very important in those days, in a way which became a burden and a heartache to the men in government at that time. As work relief projects were set up in each community with funds rushed in by the Federal Government because cities were threatened with bankruptcy city hall became the court of last appeal for the unemployed.

Many were helped, but many others who also needed an opportunity to work and earn and save their self-respect were left out of a program which could not provide for all of the employed. The limitations of such projects—helping some and excluding others—led to favoritism, frustration, and bitterness. The over-all result was to save the Nation from collapse, in spite of the forgotten men. But it was no solution of the basic problem of creating opportunities for all.

Ironically enough, the outbreak of war in Europe stimulated the economic recovery of the United States. On the surface, this would appear to be a temporary and unreliable cure. If this were so, it would indicate that we have no constructive solution to our economic problems. This, I reject. I believe that the war in this respect revealed to us the folly of our fears. It opened our eyes to the productive capacities inherent in our system in which all should have the chance to share according to the effort and skill contributed by each individual.

Applied to the tasks of peace, the energy, courage, and cooperative spirit demonstrated by our people in time of war can solve in due time any problem that may arise.

They say that the greatest problem is man himself and his relations with his fellow men. This is profoundly true.

War, speculation, depression, these problems are man made. In that same period of time when dealing with things as distinguished from human relations we have made tremendous progress. The mass production of automobiles, radio, television, travel by air, the harnessing of atomic energy, and notable advances in the fields of medicine, physics, chemistry, all these represent impressive steps forward if we learn to use them for the good of society as a whole.

As we meet to dedicate a new city hall for Lynn, we have the expectant feeling that we pause for a moment at the door to a new age. It marks a fresh beginning, at which we pledge ourselves not to repeat the mistakes of the past.

I shall not dwell on the details concerning the beauty and utility of this new building which is the home of your city government.

It is not simply a structure of stone and steel to house the administration of the public business of your community.

It is a civic center where you will meet on many occasions of a social and cultural nature to promote greater understanding and cooperation with one another as fellow citizens of the alert and progressive city of Lynn.

From 1629 to 1949 the people of this locality have built with strength of hand and mind and spirit, a tradition which is their greatest asset as they face the future. During or immediately after every crisis, as if spurred by their sacrifices, they have set to work with a will on plans for municipal improvements.

Such a spirit is unconquerable.

In the presence of the Gold Star Mothers who still bear the cross of the supreme sacrifice which their sons and daughters made to preserve our freedoms we name this bright and shining building.

I know that this living memorial will inspire all the people of Lynn to work together for the greater prosperity and happiness of the city whose fine record in the past merits every blessing in the future.

In dedicating this imposing city hall and auditorium to the heroes of all wars we honor that form of government to which they gave devotion beyond the claims of life itself.

This building is a reminder of their trust in you as guardians of democracy. May it help you and those you choose as your representatives to achieve the highest standard of public service for the city of Lynn which has already won a distinguished position among the progressive cities of our beloved Nation.

Justice Douglas Pays Tribute to Israeli Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Douglas recently visited Israel and was particularly inspired by the activities of the Israeli Supreme Court. I herewith insert an extract from the Jewish Agency's Digest concerning Justice Douglas' visit to Israel:

Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, member of the United States Supreme Court, was present on the bench with Dr. Moshe Smoira, the president of the Israel Supreme Court, at the ceremony in Jerusalem on July 22, 1949, admitting 13 new lawyers to the Israel bar.

The ceremony, which fell on the first anniversary of the appointment of Israel's first supreme court, was opened by the president. In welcoming Mr. Justice Douglas, Dr. Smoira paid tribute to the late Mr. Justice Murphy, of the United States Supreme Court, who died some days ago in the United States.

Dr. Smoira then gave an outline of the law and procedure, stressing the duties and functions of advocates, and quoted at some length from the writings of Mr. Justice Benjamin Cardozo. "Last year," said the president, "when I opened the supreme court, I said we are an ancient people and that our judicial inheritance, particularly in the field of justice, is great and rich. But we are a young state and our institutions are young, and we wish to learn from others. We want to absorb all that is good in the judicial ways of all the countries of the world."

Dr. Smoira referred to the ingathering of exiles, as symbolized by the group of 13 lawyers, who had come from all over the globe. In the same way, he added, the laws of the State of Israel contained the laws of various democracies. In conclusion, he said that only if advocates were good advisers to the court would the courts be able to fulfill their functions.

Mr. Justice Douglas said:

"This is indeed for me a very happy and honorable occasion, to be the guest of the court of this session this morning. I will always remember this occasion especially by reason of the fact that it is the anniversary of the court.

"As I walked in this morning to the court I felt a slight wave of sadness because at the last session in the United States of America, I sat with my brother, Mr. Justice Frank Murphy, who has now passed away. He devoted his life largely to the protection of the rights of minorities in our country and was very active especially for the Jews.

"He was, among other things, a very devoted advocate of the Zionist movement in the days of great trouble when you started to build your State. I was very happy when your Chief Justice paid him the very warm and glowing tribute today.

"Many Jews have served our Supreme Court and we have today the very brilliant Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Your Chief Justice has spoken of Mr. Justice Cardozo, who served our Court with great distinction. Mr. Justice Cardozo probably was one of the most loved, admired, and respected men in this century in the United States. He had the look of greatness on his face just as Einstein has today, and his prose was very very close to poetry.

"I personally was a very close friend of Mr. Justice Brandeis. Mr. Justice Brandeis, 15 years ago, converted me into a friend of Zionism, and as time went on and the wheel of fortune turned, it so happened that I took the place of Mr. Justice Brandeis in the Supreme Court. The highest compliment that was ever paid to me was paid by Mr. Justice Brandeis, who said that I was his choice as his successor.

"Your Court has attracted a lot of attention in the United States of America, young as it is. I am sure that your Court will follow the great tradition of liberty and justice in the future as you have followed it heretofore.

"As my son and I have traveled throughout the Middle East during the last month we have seen some courts which do not deserve even the name of court. Corruption and influence reaches the highest quarters in some places, as you know, and destroys the concept of the court as you know it and as we know it in America.

"I had a Chinese friend who visited the Supreme Court of the United States of America, who tried to do in China many of the things you have done in Israel. On one occasion when visiting the Supreme Court of the United States of America, he said something which I wish to repeat. He looked around the courtroom, the bench, the furnishings, and decorations, and he then turned to me and with tears running down his face he said: "If China could only have a court like this, all its problems could be solved." What he meant was that if China reached the stage of maturity that would give it such a court then freedom and liberty would be given to China."

"A true court is the guardian of the people. There is a sign of real independence in a court, too, when judges dissent. My hope is that your future will be eminently one of the realization of liberty, as an institution of justice.

"I thank you for the great honor which you have done me this morning."

Mr. Haim Cohen, the state attorney, presented the candidates.

Later in the day, Justice Douglas crossed the lines into the Old City, returning later to Tel Aviv.

LEAGUE OF FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, was the guest speaker at the first public meeting of the League for Friendly Relations with the United States at the Museum Hall in Tel Aviv on July 25, 1949.

The meeting was greeted by Miss Esther Herlitz, acting director of the North American division of the foreign ministry. Rabbi M. Nurock presided. Mr. James McDonald, the American ambassador, was present.

The aim of the league, Dr. Ephraim Katchalsky, of the Weizmann Institute, said in a short address, was to bring about closer relations in science, culture, and the arts between the peoples of the two countries.

A club and a library would be opened soon, he said, and a program providing for the exchange of students undertaken by the league.

Judge S. Kassan introduced Mr. Justice Douglas, who summed up his impressions of his visit to Israel. He was reminded greatly of California, where residents were sure there was no other place that equalled their own.

He compared the exploitation of state domain by the United States Government—leaving small tracts to farmers—as "something approaching the Jewish National Fund."

"However, I believe that our students will shortly come here to learn how you work in the Negev, in order to repeat the experiment in our wilderness in the years to come."

What's To Be Done About Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 21 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], which appeared in the New York Times magazine of September 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S TO BE DONE ABOUT CONGRESS?

(By ESTES KEFAUVER)

WASHINGTON.—On Capitol Hill today many an honest and earnest legislator is a study in frustration. These men, though they have shown no lack of energy or intelligence, find themselves with an anthology of alibis rather than a satisfactory list of accomplishments. The program that these men set out to achieve was a simple one, and they had a fairly clear mandate from the people to put it into effect.

The day after election most people (including not a few veteran legislators) thought this task would be as easy as winding a watch. But winding a watch can be a rather cumbersome business if one's hands are encased in boxing gloves—and that is a fair analogy for the position in which Members of the thwarted majority find themselves as the current session of the Eighty-first Congress draws to its close.

The typical end-of-the-season jam of appropriation bills, the disappointing record of major legislation enacted by recent sessions, the general functioning of Congress as an institution, are all matters of grave concern to those who believe, as I do, in our representative form of government.

For many years, despite changes in party control, Congress has been the object of severe public criticism and stout defense. A growing literature of protest and proposed reforms reflects the anxiety of serious students of our legislature.

Political scientists tell us that Congress is "at the crossroads" and "on trial." Plans for "strengthening the Congress" and making it a "twentieth century body" are put forth by civic groups and Members of Congress itself. Under all these circumstances, many people feel that there must be something basically wrong with Congress as an institution. I do not think so.

After 10 years as a Member of the House of Representatives and one session in the

Senate, my observations have led me to believe that the troubles of Congress are fourfold: (1) its huge nonlegislative work load, (2) certain procedural defects, (3) the failure fully to enforce the Reform Act of 1946, and (4) the need to make our two-party system work better.

I. ERRAND RUNNING

The heaviest handicap of Congress today arises, as I see it, from our nonlegislative work load.

There are few Representatives or Senators who do not spend from 50 to 60 percent of their time serving as Washington Representatives of their individual constituents. Correspondence, personal interviews, and errand-running for the folks back home leave us all too little time to consider the critical national and international problems of our age. We are happy, of course, to help our constituents in every possible way. That is part of our representative function. The provision for administrative assistants for each Senator has helped, but it will be some while before our constituency can be weaned away from demanding the personal attention of the man it sent to Washington. Our errand-boy work gives us too meager a chance to study or think about the larger issues or the common welfare.

Congress is also heavily burdened by the volume of its private business. The ban upon the introduction of four categories of private bills, which Congress imposed in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, effected some reduction in this private-bill work load. But through loopholes in the law a flood of private legislation still engulfs the Judiciary Committees of both Houses and consumes much of our time. I refer to private claims bills granting relief for property damage or personal injury, and to private immigration and naturalization bills relating to the residence, citizenship, and deportation of aliens. Almost one-half of the laws enacted to date by the Eighty-first Congress have been in this private-bill category. The settlement of these minor matters should be delegated to appropriate administrative agencies.

Since 1874 Congress has functioned after a fashion as a city council for the District of Columbia. Fifty-three Members serve on the District committees and the House devotes 2 days a month to District affairs. Congressmen spend more than 3,000 man-hours each session deciding such weighty matters as the destruction of weeds and starlings in Washington. We can no longer afford the luxury of having our national legislature perform these comparatively trivial duties. Congress should lighten its work load by letting the people of Washington govern themselves in their purely local affairs, as the people of every other American city do. On May 31 the Senate passed my home-rule bill for the District of Columbia by an overwhelming vote, but this bill has been shelved by the House District Committee for this session.

II. METHODS OF WORK

Several congressional procedures are inefficient and undemocratic in their consequences. Taken together, they go far to account for the prolonging of the present session beyond the July 31 deadline set by the Reorganization Act. I have in mind the time-consuming roll and quorum calls.

At present, when either House votes, the roll is called, which takes about 15 minutes in the Senate and 45 minutes in the House. Moreover, whenever anyone suggests the absence of a quorum, unless the House adjourns, the roll has to be called, and quorum calls can be used as a delaying tactic. During the war years the House wasted a month on roll calls alone each year. I have introduced a resolution to provide for the installation of electric voting equipment in the Senate and House Chambers. A dozen of our State legislatures vote by electricity and save countless days thereby.

If debate in the House is unduly restricted by its rules, debate in the Senate is too free and unlimited for the expeditious conduct of its business.

The Senate lost 3 weeks last March in a bitter and futile effort to liberalize its cloture rule. Since then the entire session has been marked by signs of a deliberate slow down. This slow down has taken the form of almost unlimited debate and irrelevant speeches upon every subject but the pending business. On August 11 Senator TYDINGS, chairman of Armed Services, asked in vain for limited and germane debate upon four vital military bills, but a single objection defeated this reasonable request.

A number of Senators have made varying proposals for expediting the business of the upper body. These range from making it possible for a majority to "put the previous question," to posting a tabulation of the time consumed by each Senator on the floor of the Senate. One member suggested that a closure petition be filed when a debate begins on a new measure.

The most usual proposal is a tightening up of the closure rule, but this could only be accomplished if the Senate at the same time adopted a rule requiring amendments to be germane to the bill under consideration. Germaneness is required in the House, but not in the Senate except as to appropriation bills, and even then it can be waived by a two-thirds vote.

The absence of such a rule also permits Senators to discuss any subject the members wish at any time. Thus, many members and the galleries are frequently disheartened when a quorum call has summoned the Members to vote on a highly controversial issue and then just before the final roll-call starts some Member begins a lengthy dissertation on conditions in Alaska or another unrelated subject.

Another frustrating procedure is that which requires executive officers to justify their program in quadruplicate. For example, Paul Hoffman and his aides spent most of the last 6 months defending their ECA estimates before four successive congressional committees—the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees plus their foreign aid subcommittees.

It has been a rule of the House since 1837 that appropriations must have been previously authorized by law, except for the continuation of public works in progress. Policy-making is split between the legislative committees, which authorize programs of action, and the appropriations committees, which furnish the necessary funds.

Under this split authority arrangement the appropriators have an annual veto over the authorizers. We saw a dramatic instance of this last year, when the House Appropriations Committee "Taberized" funds for the European recovery program after the bill authorizing that program had been overwhelmingly approved by both houses.

The appropriations committeemen may control policy not only by trimming and vetoing funds already authorized, but also by the detailed allocation of funds to various activities. Through careful scrutiny of the estimates and interim supervisory relationships, they also may intervene in the interstices of administration. Prior to 1921, the authority to authorize and appropriate was largely vested in the same committees of the House. From the point of view of unified control of appropriations probably it would be a regressive step to return to the pre-1921 procedure. But both Houses should strictly enforce the ban against legislation on money bills.

Many reforms have been suggested for the handling of appropriation bills. Some of these are good and should be adopted. They would save much money, lessen the burden of legislators and produce more efficiency and stability in the executive departments.

Senator BYRD and Representative BYRNES have proposed 1 consolidated appropriation bill in place of the 12 separate ones which Congress now customarily handles. A resolution for adoption of this plan was reported by Senator HUNT from the Committee on Rules and Administration, but it has not been acted upon. Representative CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, stated that the House committee would follow this course in the next session and indicated that no changes in rules were necessary.

The plan is for the House to report the omnibus bill by April 15 of each year. By that time an authoritative forecast of the national income will be available. The Senate should be in a position to act by June 1. The prime question in each body when the bill comes to a vote will be whether to hold expenditures within the national income. Congressman CANNON argues: "In the fierce light of publicity which will be concentrated on that final vote there will be no escape from responsibility. A clear unequivocal record must be made. And public opinion will do the rest. The embodiment of all annual expenditures in one compact bill, with all duplications and conflicts eliminated and with its impact on national credit clearly outlined, will serve to offset the pleas of pressure groups and high-powered lobbies, and should save vast sums of money and reduce waste and prodigality to a minimum."

Sound fiscal control probably requires that one committee of each House handle appropriation bills. However, the time consumed by four committees dealing with the same subject matter could be greatly shortened. The legislative committees of the House and Senate should on more frequent occasions have joint hearings or, in any event, use the same hearings, supplementing them when special inquiries arise. The appropriation committees could also use certain basic testimony given before the legislative committees in passing on the needs of funds. Refusal of either House to allow legislative riders on appropriation bills would shorten greatly the time consumed in hearings by the Appropriation Committees.

III. ENFORCING REFORM

Space is lacking here adequately to review the operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Suffice it to say that the provisions reforming the standing committee structure, for increased use of governmental experts, and for strengthening the oversight function, are, on the whole, working well. The provisions prohibiting private legislation and the regulation of lobbying are only partly effective owing to defects in their coverage and draftsmanship. But further reforms in private-bill procedure are under consideration, and the House has recently authorized a fresh investigation of lobbying activities.

One of my chief criticisms of the 1946 act has been the failure of its fiscal control provisions. The legislative budget provisions of the act failed in 1947; Congress complied with them in 1948, but it was merely a formal gesture, while this year the deadline for submitting the budget was postponed to May 1 and then disregarded.. Although the legislative budget idea is laudable, it has proved unworkable in practice because (1) the time allowed for preparing the budget, 6 weeks, is too short; (2) the joint budget committee is not adequately staffed to do the job; (3) unpredictable expenditure demands render it impossible to keep total appropriations below the ceiling agreed upon early in the session, and (4) there is lack of knowledge as to which items are to be cut and how much.

Sincere efforts are being made, however, to make the legislative budget workable; the proposal of Senator BYRD and Representative CANNON and others to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated supply bill is the most noteworthy.

IV. PARTY DISCIPLINE

Perhaps the basic reason why so many legislative roads lead to a dead end is the lack of efficient party discipline. Our system seems to put a premium on mugwumpery.

On the crucial issues antiadministration coalitions control the situation in committee and on the floor. Democratic chairmen either oppose or fail to support the President's legislative program with impunity. Several major administration measures were defeated during the session by hostile coalitions.

Under existing political conditions in Congress, strong party government and effective party leadership are virtually impossible. The majority party is deeply divided. It has both conservative and liberal members who wear the same party emblem but lack a common political philosophy. Under these circumstances, and with unlimited and irrelevant debate in the Senate, the task of the party leadership in planning and advancing its legislative program is almost impossible to accomplish. Who can lead where others will not follow? Thanks to stricter rules and more experienced leadership, party government has been more successful in the House than in the Senate, but even there it is a constant struggle.

The major problems of our time, as I see them, call for the formulation, adoption, and execution of comprehensive and consistent national policies. But the Federal structure, our inherited system of separated powers, and the piecemeal practices of American Government have created formidable obstacles to the making and administration of over-all plans of action. Every advantage is given to obstruction, while organized special interests are able to sabotage policy in its details.

A democratic solution of this problem of power is to be found, I believe, in the reconstruction of party government in the United States. The two major political parties can be converted into fit instruments for the intelligent planning, integration, and over-all management of public affairs. Party reconstruction calls for the consolidation of control in stronger central political organizations. The parties need to be transformed into more homogeneous agencies.

It would be helpful, I think, to make the congressional committees more truly representative, to have their chairmen chosen by the party leadership instead of by seniority, and to revive the party caucus and make its decisions binding on the party membership, upon pain of expulsion from the caucus.

Party responsibility and effective government would be enhanced by a better working arrangement between the Executive and the Congress. The honeymoon of a President and Congress is usually of very short duration, then bickering breaks out at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. A legislative-executive policy committee as suggested by Tom Finletter in his book, Can Representative Government Do the Job? would help toward reaching an agreement on a basic necessary legislative program. Provision for Cabinet members to appear on the floor of the Senate and House to give reports, present their points of view to the entire membership and answer germane questions would do much to bring better understanding between the Congress and the Executive.

As I take stock of the Eighty-first Congress to date, I am impressed by a series of dramatic contrasts—vast activity, but meager results; the most expeditious handling of appropriation bills by the House in the annals of Congress, coupled with the worst appropriation log jam in legislative history; efficient performance by the lower House and many appalling delays in the upper body; a Congress heavily handicapped by nonlegislative chores and serious procedural defects; parties lacking control and discipline; fair and unfair investigations; reforms only 50-percent operative and further drastic changes badly needed. Whether on net balance the credits outweigh the debits is a matter of individual judgment.

My own view is that Congress is functioning as well as could be expected, all things considered. In the aftermath of military victory, after the sustained efforts of the war years, there is a natural let down in pace and tension. In emergent times of depression and war, Congress has proved its capacity to act quickly on all necessary fronts. Now the sense of emergency has passed, although the cold war continues. The country's mood seems to be one of caution as regards new experiments. And this conservative attitude was reflected during the past session in the slow-motion treatment given by a majority of Congress to the program requested by the President.

With its contrasting performance and personalities, Congress today is both the hope of democracy and the despair of believers in representative government.

Personally, I am inclined to view the future with optimism. Congress went far to reform itself in 1946. I believe that the need of further improvements is more urgent now than ever before because of the responsibilities imposed upon us by the world crisis, and I am confident that the remaining roadblocks to reform can in time be removed.

As the next step I hope that the second session will adopt Senator MYER's excellent proposal to put Congress on a legislative timetable. The advance planning and monthly revision of the legislative program, which he suggests, would go far, I believe, to improve the efficient and expeditious conduct of the legislative business.

Despite their expressions of dissatisfaction with its recent performance, the American people still believe strongly in Congress. If we improve our efficiency and democratize our procedures, perhaps they will have more faith in Congressmen, too.

Daniel J. Murphy, Chief of Trial Division, Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following remarks of Daniel J. Murphy, Chief of Trial Division, Federal Trade Commission, before the 1949 annual convention of the National Mineral Feeds Association, Inc., on September 19, 1949, at the Bismarck Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:

THE LAW AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON ADVERTISING

It is a great pleasure to appear at this, the 1949 annual convention of the National Mineral Feeds Association, Inc., and to discuss with you The Law and Philosophy of the Federal Trade Commission on Advertising. May I preface my remarks with the explanation that any opinions and conclusions I may here express are not necessarily those of the Federal Trade Commission.

The jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission over advertising is by virtue of the provisions of sections 5 and 12 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Section 5 declares that unfair methods of competition in commerce are unlawful. This was a provision of the original act of 1914. However, as years passed, it became apparent that this provision, although it was of some value in protecting the public against the consequences of false advertising, was inadequate, since the Commission's jurisdiction was based upon injury, actual or potential, to a competitor, rather than to the public. In consequence, the act was amended in 1938—the so-called Wheeler-Lea amendment—to declare unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce to be unlawful. This amendment permits the Commission to proceed openly and directly for the protection of the public, rather than to have this as an indirect result of the protection of competitors.

"Unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce," of course, is sufficiently broad to cover false advertising of any commodity. Nevertheless, section 12 of the act, which was also added in 1938, specifically declares that the dissemination in interstate commerce of false advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, or devices is unlawful and is an unfair and deceptive act or practice in violation of section 5. It also has the same provisions as to the dissemination of false advertisements of such products by any means, for the purpose of inducing or which is likely to induce their purchase in interstate commerce.

Section 15 defines "food" as "articles used for food or drink for man or other animals," which, of course, includes the stock and poultry feeds in which you gentlemen are primarily interested.

Presumably any conscientious advertiser does not want to disseminate false advertisements of his wares, but nevertheless wants his advertisements to be effective. In consequence, he is vitally interested in what a false advertisement is. Section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act defines it as one "which is misleading in a material respect."

Of course, it is apparent that the lie direct is misleading—for example, to represent that the use of a particular food will insure against Bang's disease. But it does not follow that a statement which is 100 percent true is not misleading. In its decision in *Donaldson* v. *Read Magazine, Inc.* (October 1947), the Supreme Court of the United States said:

"Advertisements as a whole may be completely misleading although every sentence separately considered is literally true. This may be because things are omitted that should be said, or because advertisements are composed or purposefully printed in such a way as to mislead."

You will note that the Court referred to matters being omitted as rendering an advertisement misleading, even though every statement made was literally true. This makes good sense, and good sense is usually pretty good law. Suppose you were invited to invest in an oil property and it was represented to you that one-half mile to the north of it there was a well making 20,000 barrels of oil a day. There is such a well, but it is also a fact that 100 yards north of this property a well was drilled which was dry. I think we would all feel that this was a fact that should have been disclosed, and that in the absence of such a disclosure, the representation about the large producer was extremely misleading.

Perhaps you will recall that in Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn, when Huck and Tom Sawyer were floating down the Mississippi on their raft they were joined by a character who leaped on board just in time to escape from a large and angry crowd, bent on doing him serious bodily harm. It later developed that this individual had been selling a product positively guaranteed to remove tartar and the stains of eating tobacco from the teeth, and indeed it would do so with a speed that was little less than miraculous. There was, however, one other little fact which the seller had not deemed it necessary to disclose, namely that it also removed the teeth although not quite so rapidly. The local citizenry, who could no longer chomp

their pone and side meat with the verve and effectiveness to which they had been accustomed apparently felt that they had in some fashion been misled, and who shall say that they were wrong.

So bear in mind that literal truth may not be enough to prevent an advertisement from being misleading in some respect.

Congress recognized this in another provision of section 15 which says:

"In determining whether an advertisement is misleading there shall be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, sound or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the advertisement fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representation, or material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the commodity to which the advertisement relates under the conditions prescribed in such advertisement or under such conditions as are customary or usual."

You will note that in arriving at a determination, the Commission is to consider representations made or suggested, and this includes both representations made categorically and by innuendo and indirection. Of course neither the Congress nor the Commission can furnish the multifarious industries of the country with charts and blueprints for the things they may or may not say, and how they may or may not be said, about their myriad products. The individual advertiser must make his own determination in the first instance. Of course it is very easy for the advertiser to become querulous and say, "How in the world can I tell what to do or what I can say? I don't know about these things. Why doesn't Government tell us beforehand and not sock me when I have inadvertently done what they say is wrong?"

The answer is very simple, and any seller who will be intellectually honest with himself can find it. Start with the simple premise that it is unlawful to put false ideas in others' heads by direct statement, innuendo, or otherwise. Ask yourself the questions: "What will the reader of this advertisement think about this product? Is what he will think the truth? Is there anything else that he ought to know?"

The matters covered by advertising are matters within the peculiar knowledge of the advertiser. Who is in a position better than he for the making of an honest appraisal of his product or the framing of advertisements that honestly represent it?

The Commission feels keenly its statutory responsibility to eliminate false advertising. Some such matters are brought to its attention by complaints registered by members of the public; the names of such complainants are not divulged. In addition, the Commission's Division of Radio and Periodical Advertising maintains a continuous survey of advertisements by radio, newspaper, magazine, and other media. Several hundred thousands of radio continuities, magazines, newspapers, etc., are examined yearly.

In the Commission's work directed toward the stopping of false advertising or preventing its use, it follows three well-defined courses of procedure. One might somewhat descriptively refer to them as the consent method, the compulsory method, and the cooperative method.

The consent method may be used when the offender desires to agree voluntarily to discontinue the representations complained of, and to enter into an agreement, called a stipulation, to cease and desist from using them any more. When this procedure is initiated, the Commission's attorneys who prepare these agreements have before them the information which has been gathered by investigations of one sort or another. Since there is always the possibility that some of this may be incorrect or has been rendered out of date by advances in scientific knowledge, the advertiser is given the opportunity to come and discuss the matter with one of the attorneys of the Bureau of Stipulations and present his side of the matter. The procedure is quite informal, and if the advertiser can satisfactorily justify the representations he has made, he will be out of the woods. If he cannot do so, he may, if he elects, agree to cease and desist from their further use. If he continues to assert that his advertisements are not false, and the Commission is of the opinion that they are, the issuance of a complaint follows—the compulsory method.

This opportunity to dispose of a matter by stipulation is not a matter of right, but a privilege extended by the Commission. It is the policy of the Commission to extend it only in cases where it is of the opinion that under all the circumstances, such a disposition will effect a prompt correction and fully protect and satisfy the public interest. It is not extended when the Commission is of the opinion that the advertiser has undertaken to perpetrate a deliberate fraud or when danger from the use of the product is to be anticipated.

If the opportunity to stipulate is not given by the Commission, or if it is offered and refused, a complaint is issued.

The law provides that the Commission shall issue and serve complaints whenever it shall have reason to believe that false advertising has been disseminated and that a proceeding in respect thereof would be in the public interest. Of course, the Commission would have reason to believe both of these things before the opportunity to stipulate was extended.

The complaint states the charges against the advertiser, whom we call the respondent, and is served upon him. He may be represented by counsel and file an answer to the complaint. Thereafter hearings are held at which the testimony of witnesses is taken under oath. The proceeding is before an officer called a trial examiner, and the respondent has all the rights of any party to litigation in court. The case ultimately comes before the Commission for its decision upon the record, briefs by both sides, and oral argument if requested. If the complaint has not been sustained, it will be dismissed. If it has been sustained, the Commission will make its findings as to the facts and issue its order to cease and desist, which is reviewable by the United States circuit court of appeals or the United States Supreme Court if an appeal is taken from it.

A third procedure available for the elimination of false advertising and the consequent promotion of fair standards of business ethics is provided by the Commission in the trade practice conference plan. This is what I have referred to as the cooperative method. Such trade practice conference procedure has for its purpose the wholesale elimination of false advertising by industry-wide cooperation with the Commission and collaboration of all groups in interest in the formulation, establishment, and observance of fair-trade practice rules governing the conduct of the industry and trade in question. Under the plan, joint action among competitors with the supervision and aid of the Commission is possible, and experience has proved the efficacy of this method in more than 100 industries as an adjunct to the compulsory procedure which I have outlined. The Commission is now, with the sanction of the Congress, enlarging this method of procedure.

Conference proceedings are conducted on a basis of voluntary participation; though the Commission may initiate the conference, it cannot compel attendance or participation. Parties in interest are at all times free to advise and consult with the Commission's representatives in the matter. Where necessary or desirable, informal meetings or preliminary discussions may be arranged to formulate tentative drafts of rules or to develop, through an exchange of ideas, a clearer understanding of the problems involved and the assistance which can be rendered by the Commission in their solution. The conference considers and proposes rules for submission to the Commission for its approval. Before rules are finally approved or promulgated by the Commission, they are subjected to public hearings at which all interested or affected parties are afforded opportunity to present their views. They may submit such in writing or be heard orally as desired. Through such conferences and hearings, all groups in interest have the opportunity to be heard and to consult with us in the matter, even though they may not happen to be classed as members of the particular industry or trade involved.

In passing upon the rules proposed for approval, the Commission applies the test of law. In other words, the rules must not sanction practices which are contrary to law or which, when put into effect, may bring about a result which is illegal or opposed to the public interest. The purpose of this is, of course, obvious. It is not within our province to sanction violations of the law, but on the contrary we are directed to promote law observance, to the end that honest business may be liberated from the waste and fetters of unfair practices, and the rights of the public may be protected.

I believe that from what I have said, the philosophy of the Commission in its administration of the Federal Trade Commission Act is fairly clear. The purpose of the trade practice conference is to stop some false advertising before it starts, as well as to eliminate current bad advertising practices throughout an industry. The stipulation method in the individual case furnishes machinery for a relatively amicable disposition of a matter. The formal complaint is issued when necessary. The Commission does not go about flexing its muscles, flourishing a legal club, and issuing complaints on small justification. I believe that the Commission's basic philosophy is to stop or prevent as much false advertising as it can, and the result is more important than the employment of any particular method of attaining it.

The Incentive Income Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gwilym A. Price:

THE INCENTIVE INCOME TAX PLAN—THE WAY TO PROSPERITY LIES IN A MORE INTELLIGENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE TAX LOAD

(By Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse)

In this space last month John W. Hanes called for "a thorough overhauling of our tax structure." He restricted his discussion, however, to three basic areas of Federal tax policy where reform is most urgently needed in order to encourage investment in and by industry. He recommended (1) a reform of the depreciation policy, (2) a liberalization of the policy regarding retained earnings, and (3) elimination of double taxation of dividends. With these specific recommendations, as well as with Mr. Hanes' admirable general analysis of the current needs of our national economy, I agree.

As a further step toward formulating a new fiscal program for the Nation, I should like to direct attention to a proposal recently put forward by Frank Wilbur Main, M. C. Conick, and their partners in a widely known accounting firm. Admittedly this proposal and my comments fall considerably short of that "complete fiscal program" of which the editors of Fortune say they are in search. The reader will find here nothing relating to excises, customs, or capital gains and losses; to the overlapping of Federal, State, and local taxes, concerning which Roswell Magill has recently made some thoughtful suggestions; or to that fiscal change which is a paramount requirement, the substantial reduction of Government expenditures.

Nevertheless, the proposal in question, which the authors call the incentive income tax plan, strikes so directly at the heart of our tax problem that it merits consideration on its own account and as part of an overall program. In recent months, as on any occasion when there is a slowing of our economic machinery, the popular impulse has been to turn to government. There is a multiplied demand for extravagant expenditures of public money, and for the adoption of countless schemes to guarantee immunity and security to all. While this demand springs from perfectly normal instincts, it is contradictory and self-defeating. Government expenditures alone cannot put a solid and lasting foundation under production and employment. Indeed, contrary evidence is fairly recent and overwhelming.

Far better, I believe, that Government should adopt a program that will capitalize the energies and ambitions of the people, stimulate their initiative and imagination, reward their industry and thrift. Government can do very little, in and of itself, to increase the productive wealth of the Nation. But there is no perceivable limit to what the people themselves can accomplish, with wise leadership and encouragement from Government.

Naturally I do not mean that tax policy is the only thing that determines the degree of our national prosperity; but certainly it is a major factor, and never more so than now. For, whatever the danger that we are headed toward slump or recession, a principal contributing cause is the burden of taxation on producer, investor, and consumer. Taxes have made investment thoroughly unattractive, and slowed the stream of venture capital to a trickle. Taxes have been largely responsible for pricing millions of consumers out of the market for products they need and want. Taxes have prevented the birth and growth of new enterprises, done their utmost to stifle the energies of the inventor and the manager, and impaired the living standards of a large part of our people.

Many Americans seems to believe that it makes little difference just how and where the Government extracts its huge taxes. That is a dangerous and costly error. Actually, it is of incalculable importance that taxes be so assessed as to do the least possible harm to our economic structure. Taxes may be levied in such a way as to discourage initiative and enterprise, reduce the taxpayer's income, and thus reduce the Government's revenues. But taxes may also be levied so as to furnish incentive to the taxpayer, encourage commerce and industry, and ultimately enlarge the Government's revenues. It seems to me to be entirely feasible for our income-tax law to be rewritten, not alone with the obvious purpose of raising sufficient Government revenue, but also with a view to spurring and rewarding human intelligence and energy.

THE PROPOSAL

The central theme of the incentive tax plan was best set forth by its authors before the Ways and Means Committee.

"The word 'incentive' may seem incompatible with the regressive power of taxation. But since everything is relative, it is still possible to levy the high tax rates which are now necessary and at the same time provide a high degree of stimulation to the productivity and advancemenet of all our people.

"A new approach to Federal income taxation can furnish all the incentives that are essential in our present situation and in the immediate future—incentive to imagination and to physical labor, incentive to business enterprise and investment, incentive to intelligent saving, incentive to the sort of intelligent spending that results in better living."

The following six points constitute the basis of the proposal:

1. Income should be taxed as income, regardless of whether received by individual, partnership, or corporation. This would be accomplished through identical rates for individuals and corporations, with the same exemptions and deductions, the same graduations, the same ceiling.

2. Through this concept of taxation on income, eliminate the tax on undistributed surplus and other common causes of controversy and litigation.

3. Eliminate the double taxation of dividends, through freeing the stockholder of tax liability.

4. Raise exemptions: $1,000 for a single person; $2,000 for a married couple. Also $2,000 for a corporation.

5. Establish a graduated rate structure for all net taxable income, beginning at 15 percent on the first $2,500 and rising to 50 percent at the $50,000 level. This ceiling rate would apply to all net taxable income in excess of $50,000.

6. Greatly simplify the whole process of tax reporting for the citizen, and of tax administration for the Government.

The accompanying condensed chart shows the surprising effects of this new approach. At all income levels, individuals would pay less in taxes than under existing law. Moreover, the lowest income groups would be freed from income taxes entirely. In the calendar year 1948, with personal income taxes totaling about $213,000,000,000, there were some 54,000,000 income taxpayers. Under the incentive plan these would be reduced to about thirty-four million.

The Federal incentive income tax plan

EXEMPTIONS AND DEDUCTIONS

Single person	$1,000
Married couple	2,000
Each dependent	600
Corporation	2,000

Stockholders pay no taxes on dividends. Deductions for contributions, interest, taxes, etc., remain as at present. No taxes on undistributed profits.

INCENTIVE TAX RATES

The incentive income tax plan provides for the taxation of income as such—instead of one tax rate for individuals and another for corporations.

Therefore, after all allowable deductions and exemptions are subtracted from gross income received from wages, sale of goods, services rendered, etc., the resulting net taxable income of individuals and corporations would be taxed as indicated below:

If net taxable income is—	The tax will be—	Maximum tax
Not over $2,500	15 percent	$375.00
Over $2,500 but not over $5,000	$375.00 plus 17½ over $2,500	812.50
Over $5,000 but not over $7,500	$812.50 plus 20 over $5,000	1,312.50
Over $7,500 but not over $10,000	$1,312.50 plus 22½ over $7,500	1,875.00
Over $10,000 but not over $12,500	$1,875.00 plus 25 over $10,000	2,500.00
Over $12,500 but not over $15,000	$2,500.00 plus 27½ over $12,500	3,187.50
Over $15,000 but not over $17,500	$3,187.50 plus 30 over $15,000	3,937.50
Over $17,500 but not over $20,000	$3,937.50 plus 32½ over $17,500	4,750.00
Over $20,000 but not over $22,500	$4,750.00 plus 35 over $20,000	5,625.00
Over $22,500 but not over $25,000	$5,625.00 plus 37½ over $22,500	6,562.50
Over $25,000 but not over $30,000	$6,562.50 plus 40 over $25,000	8,562.50
Over $30,000 but not over $35,000	$8,562.50 plus 42½ over $30,000	10,687.50
Over $35,000 but not over $40,000	$10,687.50 plus 45 over $35,000	12,937.50
Over $40,000 but not over $50,000	$12,937.50 plus 47½ over $40,000	17,687.50

All net taxable income exceeding initial $50,000 is to be taxed 50 percent.

Taxes cannot be so greatly reduced for so many without cutting Government revenues below presently practicable levels or shifting the tax burden to others. Mr. Main and his associates would partially offset the relief granted to individual taxpayers by a heavier impact on corporations, the weight falling almost entirely on that relatively small number of businesses whose net taxable income reaches or passes the $100,000 level. So-called small business would not be affected adversely because the rates on taxable income of less than $100,000 would not be markedly different from those now prevailing.

There will be substantial opposition to the enactment of a progressive rate of tax on corporate income, but it should not be too difficult to reconcile differences of opinion on that. As to the projected increase of twelve points in the tax rate, no corporate manager will find that palatable—or even supportable—unless he sees a satisfactory contra-account of benefits.

On that score, say the plan's authors:

"On first consideration, this may be regarded as an undue hardship on the corporate taxpayer. More careful study, however, will reveal that there are clear-cut advantages in this plan for corporations, for their managements, and particularly for their stockholders.

"For many corporations, this plan will do away with previously vexatious questions as to undistributed profits. In most cases, eliminating the double taxation of dividends will bring to the owners of corporations larger net returns than they now receive from their corporate investments. This same elimination of double taxation will encourage and enable corporate managements to substitute capital stock for bonds and other indebtedness, whose heavy fixed charges so often slow down commercial expansion, stagnate business, hasten and deepen depression. Corporations will gain, even more than individual taxpayers, through simplification of the law and administrative regulations, and elimination of the major causes of dispute between Government and taxpayer.

"All these benefits to corporations will be fortified by the fact that a tax program which helps to expand the national economy and the national income will naturally lead to the enlargement and enrichment of markets. It is fairly elementary that a 50-percent tax on an enlarged income will be less burdensome than a 38-percent tax on shrunken earnings.

"Finally, a corporation exists only for the benefit of individual human beings—the stockholders, management, and employees. We have stressed the importance of incentive. You cannot furnish incentive to an impersonal corporate entity; but you can give abundant incentive to all those persons—stockholders, management, employees—who comprise the corporation and whose welfare

is mutually reciprocal with that of the corporation. A tax plan which is in the interest of all those groups, and of the corporation's customers, will spell automatic and certain progress for the corporation itself."

Rather paradoxically, as it appears to me, some objectors to the increase of the corporate tax rate will say that nothing is to be gained by it, since such taxes are simply passed on to the consumer by inclusion in the prices of the corporation's products. Most corporation managers know that this is not necessarily so. The ability of a corporation to pass on increases in its costs depends on numerous factors. The most efficient company in a particular industry may prefer, for competitive reasons, to absorb all or part of the increase out of profits. If so, all others must do likewise or be priced out of business. In a period of intensified competition and consequent instability of prices, increases in taxes or other costs cannot be passed on.

Furthermore, this argument overlooks the fact that individual taxpayers try to do exactly the same thing. There is something more than coincidence in the fact that demands for wage and salary increases became more universal than ever after withholding taxes had made millions of our citizens acutely tax conscious for the first time. The plan is not based on anyone's desire to make corporations pay higher taxes. When it was first published, corporation rates went well beyond 50 percent. The reasons for what is now a proposed increase are (1) that all classes of taxpayers should be required to pay comparable rates of tax; (2) that the surest way to keep our national economy moving forward is to reduce the tax load on all our individual citizens; and (3) that, unfortunately, the only way partly to compensate for such lost revenue is to raise corporation taxes.

Still other critics will say that the effect of a 50-percent ceiling, when combined with the total elimination of double taxation on dividends, will be to make the rich richer and to perpetuate wealth and power. This will be true only as to any current generation—and surely the Nation will gain, as in the past, through the profitable risks taken in future by enterprising and successful businessmen. One premise of the plan is that wealth should be put to work for the purpose of providing new investments and more jobs; an enterprise system can survive in no other way. As for the perpetuation of wealth and power, gift and death taxes make that utterly impossible.

As to the 50 percent ceiling per se, there is a feeling throughout the country that every man should get at least an even break with the tax collector. Opinion polls show that this belief has popular support; its more distinguished proponents include Senator CLAUDE PEPPER and ex-Governor, now university president, Harold Stassen. Though no legislative body can bind its successors, the Congress that establishes a 50 percent peacetime limitation on income taxes ought to state its convictions and intent so strongly as to make it unlikely that later Congresses will disregard this opinion regarding equity between Government and taxpayer.

One certain criticism is that the raising of exemptions, freeing millions of citizens of income-tax liability, will thereby relieve them of their proper concern for how the Government spends its money. However, I feel sure no one really believes that tax-paying and good citizenship are inherently synonymous, or that in these recent years, with more than one-third of all Americans on the tax rolls, we have had great gains in governmental efficiency and economy. Mr. Hanes has preceded me in urging the relief from income tax of those in the lower income brackets. The excise taxes, of which they pay a large share, are already burdensome enough. And, in economic terms, we cannot have full production and stable employment without mass consumption, which depends on spendable money in the hands of the largest possible number of people.

Perhaps we are only now beginning to realize the human effects of excessive taxation. A man cannot be as good a citizen if taxes are cutting down his standard of living. His family cannot have as fair an opportunity for life and growth if taxes are eating into their grocery bill and their rent money. The country whose living standards are continually moving up is a better country. When taxes interfere with the improvement of living standards for millions of our people, the effect is bad for all the rest of the Nation as well.

Messrs. Main and Conick estimate that if their incentive plan had been in effect throughout 1948, when personal income amounted to $213,000,000,000, the Government's total take from income taxes would have been in the neighborhood of $25,000,000,000 instead of the approximate $29,000,000,000 anticipated under existing law. In other words, even after such a reduction, an amount equal to nearly 12 percent of all personal income in the Nation's all-time-high year would have gone to pay this form of tax. The $4,000,000,000 deficiency resulting from their estimates, I think, should be made up by cutting Government expenditures. This agrees closely with the budgetary recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The incentive plan's authors also point out that the additional billions their plan would leave in the pockets of individual taxpayers would result in such stimulation of business activity that personal income soon would go far beyond present totals, and that this in turn would result in higher tax yields. We would then have a free democratic choice as to whether to cut taxes, pay back our debt at a faster rate, or spend money on social and other goals.

Undoubtedly the incentive income-tax plan falls short of perfection. Certainly I am myself reluctant to applaud any proposal to increase taxes on corporations, when I am so conscious of corporate needs for modernization and improvement, for reduction of debt, and for increased working capital. I could not join in support of any such tax rise, and indeed would actively oppose it, unless that disadvantage were overbalanced by positive advantages to stockholders and to society generally.

But all those who study this proposal should recognize the basic merit of its affirmative, positive approach. The plan's designers have assumed that America's future can be greater than its past, and that, if normal human ambitions and energies are given scope, it certainly will be.

If their thesis is correct, tax revision can be made the medium for assuring continuance of industry's capital-expenditure program, which has been the prime ingredient in postwar prosperity. If they are correct, millions of consumers who have been starved or scared out of the markets can be brought back. Mr. Hanes, it will be recalled, specified restoration of capital expansion and of public buying power as the Nation's primary economic needs.

Anyone with a hopeful view of his country and his fellow men will find it altogether reasonable that a recasting of our tax structure to accommodate a positive approach rather than a defeatist one can give our economy a mighty push in the direction of increased investment, production, and employment. In this, it seems to me, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives carries a great responsibility and an equal opportunity. Those 25 gentlemen need the sympathetic cooperation of the other Members of both Houses of Congress, and of the President of the United States. But since tax legislation originates in their committee, they can do more to lead us toward sound and healthy prosperity than any other agency of Government.

The essential thing is to provide the people with incentives that will lead them to take legitimate risks, of effort as well as money, with a reasonable hope that they can retain for themselves an appropriate share of the wealth they have earned or created. A tax proposal with these objectives deserves painstaking and thoughtful consideration.

Fitting Tribute to GE President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lynn Telegram-News of Sunday, September 11, 1949:

Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., completed 50 years with the General Electric on September 1 and the event was noted with appropriate ceremonies. The story of Charles E. Wilson was told in the press and radio. The New York Daily News commented on the event in the following editorial which we reprint from the News:

"THE CASE OF CHARLES E. WILSON

"This newspaper has never made it a practice to go around patting industrial tycoons on the back. We don't believe in it as a general thing. The case of Charles E. Wilson, however, strikes us as meat for an editorial in anybody's newspaper, so here goes:

"The man we are speaking of is the president of the huge General Electric Co., with its headquarters at Schenectady, N. Y. General Electric's activities spread far and wide, furnish jobs for about 200,000 persons, and dig up dividends for some 250,000 stockholders.

"Mr. Wilson on September 1 finished his fiftieth year with General Electric, and is currently enjoying various social and company ceremonies in honor of that event. The story of how he got where he is today is what interests us.

"Born in New York City November 18, 1886, he had to wind up his formal education at the age of 12 and rustle some kind of job to help his widowed mother take care of the rest of the family. Wilson made his business debut in 1899 as an office boy ($3 a week, and not bad pay for that work in those days) with the Sprague Works of General Electric. General Electric itself was then only 7 years old.

"Wilson literally grew up with the company. He worked successively in the shipping, accounting, production, engineering, manufacturing, and marketing departments. He was made merchandising manager and vice president in 1930, executive vice president in '37, and president of the corporation January 1, 1940.

"His greatest achievements have been in the electrical appliance line—developing and merchandising many of the innumerable gadgets which run on electric current and make life at home and elsewhere a great deal easier and more varied than it ever was for our ancestors.

"He has always been a terrific worker. Maybe he was shot with luck at birth; but if so, he never depended on luck to advance his career or carry him through difficult situations."

Well, there we have a real-life story in the old American tradition—the man who started out as poor as Job's turkey and wound up at the top by virtue of his own driving energy, courage, and willingness to work. Horatio

Alger used to write this story, with minor variations, two or three times a year, making himself wealthy and famous in the process.

There is only one thing that worries us about the Wilson story and various others like it. That is the danger that the United States may be coming to the end of the era in which such things can happen in real life.

These lives have been lived, these inspiring careers carved out, because this country's economic and social climate, so to speak, has been friendly to the hard-working and enterprising person.

The American theory has been that if you gave such people all possible leeway to better themselves they would contribute much more to society in general than they took from it. Certainly it has proved out that way in the cases of Wilson, Henry Ford, the once-hated Rockefellers, and numerous other builders and developers of American industries.

Ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt first entered the White House, there has been a powerful inclination on the part of many politicians to make life tougher and tougher for enterprising, industrious, inventive people. Left-wingers hate that kind of person. They want to reduce all human life to a level of mediocrity and plain laziness, under the pretense that they are building security and plenty for everybody.

Roosevelt was greatly influenced by left-wingers. So is President Truman, though sometimes you wonder whether he realizes it or not.

From whatever motive, Harry consistently favors taxes and legislation which hamper free enterprise and frighten risk capital—though he takes care once in a while to throw a friendly word at business and industry out of the side of his face.

It's hard to believe that the American people will ever be so blind as to let the era of the big builders and industrial adventurers come to an end. Crazier things have happened in world history, though not many of them.

Anyway, ladies and gents, we give you the career of Charles F. Wilson, a typical American of his time and, we devoutly hope, a typical American of all time.

Senator Morse's Position on the Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 21 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper items relative to the position of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the Columbia Valley Administration, appearing in the Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg., of September 13, 1949]

MORSE OUTLINES ATTITUDE ON CVA AS NONPOLITICAL—SENATOR IN HOSPITAL BED SAYS ECONOMIC ISSUES ONLY INTEREST

(By Marian Lowry Fischer)

"A thorough study of the economic factors involved and of the needs and welfare of the people of the Northwest should be the first considerations in discussing the controversial CVA issue—leave the partisan politics to the politicians."

So declared Senator WAYNE L. MORSE in giving out his first official statement on the controversial Columbia Valley Authority issue Tuesday morning while in his sick bed at Salem General Hospital where he is a patient following an accident at the State Fair horse show Saturday night.

"I am not interested in the political issue, it is the economic angle that is vital to the welfare of the people of the Pacific Northwest," the Oregon junior Senator said in continuing his comments regarding CVA.

LET POLITICIANS PLAY POLITICS

"I am going to let the politicians play politics with the CVA issue if they want to, but I intend to keep my eyes on the economic facts of the river development program and not become embroiled in a partisan controversy over how we are going to administer a program when what we need first is to get the projects built so we have something to administer.

"I have delayed and shall continue to delay any final commitments on the CVA issue until we have all the facts. I believe in handling first things first—and the first thing we need is completion of the blueprints for the construction of these Northwest river development projects," he added.

ADVICE TO REPUBLICANS

Senator MORSE made the statement on CVA in giving out his views on the fight ahead for Republicans in the 1950 election.

"I repeat something I have said many times—the Republicans must stand for a constructive program on various issues that concern the voters, rather than always being against something," and from there on came his complete statement on the CVA issue, part of which follows:

"Take for example the CVA issue—what the Republicans should do is come forward with a constructive program for handling the administration of the river development projects of the Northwest, rather than just taking a negative attitude to be against everything that the Democrats propose.

"My position on CVA will be determined after the congressional hearings have been held in the Pacific Northwest and I have had time to study thoroughly all economic angles of the issue."

COORDINATION NEEDED

"I am not interested in the political issues, it is the economic angle that is vital to the welfare of the people of the Pacific Northwest.

"I believe there is need for some form of legislation which will bring about a greater coordination and improvement in efficiency and will bring the elimination of waste and duplication which are bound to exist if we have multijurisdiction trying to administer multipurpose power dams.

"However, there are certain basic principles that ought to be recognized in working out any coordinated program:

"1. All of us should recognize, as the late Senator Charles L. McNary always pointed out, that the biggest stake the people of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest have in the development of the rivers is the earliest possible completion of the multipurpose dams themselves."

UNITY HELD ESSENTIAL

Cheap power, flood control, soil conservation, and atomic energy development will require that we remain a united people behind a constructive program of completion of the dams at the earliest possible time.

"For that reason I have deplored what I consider an unfair and unnecessary split in public support for our Northwest river development projects caused, for the most part, by the emotional debates over a CVA.

"Important as a long time coordinated administrative program may be there is no denying the fact that for the next 3 or 4 years the thing that is most important for the people of Oregon and the northwest is to get the multipurpose dams built and avoid as much as possible the dissension among us as to how these projects are to be administered, once they are built."

SPLITS WEAKEN NORTHWEST

"Every time public opinion in the Pacific Northwest splits over any issue involving development of the river resources we weaken our position as far as support is concerned among eastern Senators for the actual construction of the projects.

"After all the proposed CVA bill has nothing to do with building the dams, but involves only the problem of administering the operations once they are built.

"Therefore, I have delayed and shall continue to delay any final commitment on the CVA until I get all the facts. I believe in handling first things first, and the first thing we need is completion of the blue prints for the construction of these Northwest development projects."

DAMS A NECESSITY

"There is no dispute of any serious degree concerning the necessity for these dams. The economic prosperity of the Northwest and of the rest of the country demands completion of them at the earliest possible date.

"Our national defense makes their completion imperative. As a member of the Armed Services Committee in the Senate I am satisfied that the maximum development of American power resources is recognized by Russia as our most important defense weapon because of the atomic age in which we now live.

"2. We should remember that whenever it comes to working out a coordinated program for administering the river development projects we need to apply the same pattern of reorganization of government as characterizes the Hoover reports in connection with other governmental activities. There is no doubt about the fact that the Hoover recommendations constitute sharp-cropping shears which if adopted will cut out of our present governmental practice a great deal of waste and unnecessary duplication of governmental activity."

EFFECTS OF HOOVER PLAN

"I have seen the effects of the Hoover recommendations on the armed services, and I have no doubt in every other branch of government many millions of dollars, totaling several billions when added all together, can be saved the taxpayers if the politicians have the courage to use the Hoover recommendations on expenditure pruning.

"Therefore, amid all the extreme charges and counter charges concerning the CVA issue, I would suggest to the thoughtful citizens that they study the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in respect to administering those governmental agencies that have some jurisdiction over river development and see if they can not select from those recommendations some very helpful suggestions for a more efficient administration on a coordinated basis for our river resources development."

PROTECT LOCAL, STATE INTERESTS

"Before we are through the study of the CVA proposals we need see to it that local and State interests are protected in the determination of both over-all economic policies and administrative practices. After all, most of the money that will go into these self-liquidating projects will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the Pacific Northwest.

"I think it is possible to work out in whatever legislation is finally adopted an administrative system which will give to the governors of the respective States and through them the people of these States an

active participation in the determination of regional policies.

"It is my intention to sift the facts from the fallacies in this entire CVA issue and try to help the Republicans find a constructive answer to the question: What sort of an administration should be developed for the handling of this project which will give to the people an abundance of cheap power, adequate flood control, soil conservation, irrigation and reclamation.

"That question calls for a positive, constructive answer on the part of the Republicans of Oregon, and for the Nation, for that matter. It calls for being for something, rather than always being against something.

"It calls for the elimination of a partisan political approach to a problem which can be answered for the people's interest only by placing sound principles of government administration above political advantage.

'It is in that spirit that I intend to conduct my campaign during the primary and general election in Oregon next year. I am confident the overwhelming majority of the voters will agree with my approach."

[From the Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg., of Sept. 15, 1949]

FORCING OF CVA BY PRESIDENT HIT BY MORSE—SIDETRACKING OF $1,000,000,000 BILL HELD POLITICAL BOOMERANG

(By Marian Lowry Fischer)

The administration "will find such a course of action will be a political boomerang" was the terse come-back from Senator WAYNE L. MORSE in reading that President Truman has asked Congress to defer approval of a $1,000,000,000 Army Engineer-Reclamation Bureau program for development of the Columbia River basin and has proposed instead that the Columbia Valley Administration be set up first.

"The President is putting the cart before the horse when he talks about passing legislation for the administration of projects before they are even completed," Senator MORSE added.

REITERATES STAND

MORSE reiterated his stand given in a statement to the Capital Journal Tuesday regarding CVA when he said: "I am not interested in the political issue, it is the economic angle that is vital. * * * I intend to keep my eyes on the economic facts of the river-development program and not become embroiled in a partisan controversy over how we are going to administer a program when what we need first is to get the projects built so we have something to administer."

In further comments regarding the Truman request, Senator MORSE said:

TESTIFIED FOR BILL

"Some weeks ago I testified in favor of the Magnuson bill S. 2180. I consider it a very sound bill. Its basic soundness is to be found in the fact that those of us who are sponsoring it with Senator MAGNUSON as chief author recognize the No. 1 problem as far as the Pacific Northwest development is concerned is early completion of the power, reclamation, flood control, and soil-conservation projects provided in the bill.

"There is no disagreement as to either the need of these projects or as to the blueprints for these projects, therefore, it doesn't make sense to postpone their building until the administration can carry on a political fight over how they are to be administered."

PUBLIC POLICY NOT INVOLVED

"There is no question of the fundamental public policy involved in building these projects but there are many questions of fundamental public policy in respect to the governmental organizations to be used in administering the policy.

"I think it very important that all of us in the Pacific Northwest think through very clearly just how the public can be served best in the administration of these multipurpose dams once they are completed.

"I certainly will oppose turning them over to any private utility monopoly and I am just as much opposed to any Washington, D. C., bureaucratic monopoly."

BELONG TO THE PEOPLE

"These projects will belong to all of the people and we must insist that they be administered in accordance with a plan which takes into account the rights and interest of not only the Federal Government but of the States and local communities affected by them.

"I am afraid the President's suggestion that S. 2180 be postponed is subject to the criticism it is a political move whereby he proposed to insist that unless his proposal for administering major projects that are yet to be built is approved he will prevent the construction of these projects until he is allowed to have his way. I am sure that if President Truman thoroughly understood both the needs for these projects and the attitude of the people of the Pacific Northwest concerning their desire to work out with the Federal Government a reasonable Federal-State coordinated program for administering them he would not recommend postponement of construction of these projects as called for by S. 2180."

Mr. Nejelski Writes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Polish-American Journal of September 3, 1949:

MR. NEJELSKI WRITES

Occasionally a newspaper receives a letter from one of its subscribers which exactly expresses the publication's viewpoints, purposes, ideals, and goals.

Such a letter was sent to the Journal recently by Leo Nejelski, of Monclair, N. J. Mr. Nejelski, who is president of Nejelski & Co., Inc., of New York, a widely known firm of management counsels, has been identified with many civic and humanitarian movements. Originator of the Montclair Civil Rights Audit, after which many communities have patterned similar studies, Mr. Nejelski is a member of the adult education panel of UNESCO, the board of directors of the National Citizens' Council on Civil Rights, and a number of other similar organizations.

Because Mr. Nejelski's communication has such a universal appeal and carries such a high philosophy, the Journal herewith reprints it.

The letter in part, follows:

"Mere contact with fellow persons of Polish descent through the Journal brought a rush of memories to my mind. * * * Two- and three-day Polish weddings I had attended in early years, characterized by huge dishes of food, the gay music of violins and clarinets, swirling skirts, laughter. * * * The July 4th and Labor Day celebrations at Pulaski Hall with the never-failing Polish band led by my father always present.

"I read the first few issues from the first column on the first page through to the end. As I did so, I realized more clearly than ever before that I had lost contact with persons of Polish descent, not because I have been busy, but because no role had been carved out in our Polish-American groups for second and third generation men and women like myself which challenged and gratified them.

"It seems to me that the Polish-American Journal is ideally equipped to broaden its leadership in this direction. There is one main show going on in the world—the struggle between the democracies and Soviet Russia. Only if we demonstrate and prove America's superiority will our way of life survive. Propagandizing and slandering alone will not do it.

"I have great faith in the American way, with all its shortcomings, because I see nothing that matches its potentialities for enhancing the dignity of man or for providing the means that can contribute richly to the good life. Caught up in the industrial revolution, we have grossly overemphasized material values. But the hope of tempering the cold, crass wind with moral and ethical values is completely erased from Soviet policies and practices; its flame is still flickering here, however. Our challenge is to brighten the flame.

"No society in history has achieved the perfection that will gratify idealists. The upward struggle of man has been a long, too slow process. But idealism that is harnessed to knowledge and skill will speed up considerably the developments we all desire.

"Philosopher Alfred North Whitehead has said: '* * * we are at the beginning of a great age, or whether civilization for a thousand years will sink into mere welter of minor excitements.'

"Americans of Polish descent, along with other groups, can attend importantly at the birth of this great age. We have a long, persistent tradition of working and fighting for the right of man to fulfill himself. The history of Poland and the biographies of Poles throughout the world give ample evidence of this. Polish culture is rich in courage and daring. We also have a long history of cohesiveness, a vital quality in a highly individualistic world. These assets, and more, can be brought to bear on the problem.

"These are the qualities which Poles have enriched the American way. By encouraging their full flowering, we can make an even greater contribution to the American side of the world struggle.

"Does this mean a revival of nationalism and factionalism? Not at all. Even a world citizen has a unique heritage. He can encompass the entire world only if he respects, knows, and utilizes the culture that helped shape him. Only by recognizing and accepting our diversities can we achieve unity. I am an American, but I am proud of my Polish heritage; that is the spirit that will help all of us Americans of Polish descent to find the particular part each can best fill in resolving the confusion of our times.

"With these objectives in mind, the Journal can take a stronger leadership role. It can do so in many ways: Encouraging and fostering more skilled leadership in every phase of American life. Deploring the petty squabbles and limited objectives that characterize so many Polish-American groups. Reinforcing the pride of persons of Polish descent in their heritage. Strengthening the arms of those who are making the good fight. Providing a philosophy for the many persons of Polish extraction who feel lost because they apologize for being Polish and do not see themselves as Americans. Fighting for

perpetuation of Polish cultural traditions through good Polish restaurants, through the reading of Polish literature, through teaching the Polish language. Giving persons of Polish descent in America insights into how they can achieve success and happiness."

Establishment of Permanent Exhibit of Christian Science in Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 21 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in viewing the problems of this sorely troubled world at home and abroad, we all realize that material remedies alone will not suffice to meet present-day challenges. On the contrary, as I have indicated in previous comments in the Senate and as many of my colleagues have also shown, adequacy can only be ours if we realize our spiritual rebirth and tap the Divine power that is within each of us.

Fortunately, there are many guideposts to us toward finding the right path.

Recently there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and the Christian Science Sentinel certain articles describing the permanent exhibit of the Christian Science movement at Sixteenth and I Streets, Washington, D. C. I believe that these articles will be of interest to my associates and to members of all religious faiths. Regardless of our separate creeds, regardless of church or temple in which we worship, we all have a common spiritual heritage. We all know that "God is spirit, and that they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth."

Never before in the history of the world has it been so important that we apply the spirit of the Master's teachings as our various creeds enable us to determine that spirit. The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are still the only enduring foundations on which the temple of peace can be built by all men of good will, regardless of their race, their creed, or their national origin.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these materials be printed at this point in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., August 26, 1949]

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PICTURED IN WASHINGTON EXHIBIT—TWO HISTORIES LINK HANDS IN FRIENDLY SCENE—ACTIVITIES HUM AT NEW HOME IN UNITED STATES CAPITAL

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—"The most important of Washington's numbered thoroughfares," is the official guidebook's prosaic way of describing dignified Sixteenth Street running straight north from the White House in the old elm-shaded northwest sector of the Nation's tourist-teeming Capital.

"It is a street of fine embassy and legation buildings," our guidebook tells us, "of impressive churches, of national organization headquarters, of hotels and apartment houses, with a sprinkling of fine homes along its lower half. Its course borders one of the most interesting small, formal parks and one of the most beautiful natural parks in the country."

Here in this quiet, friendly neighborhood at the corner of Sixteenth and I Streets, just one block north of Lafayette Square, stands a hospitable three-story brick and brownstone building. It is a building with a history and a purpose, a past and a future.

HARBORS TWO HISTORIES

In fact, you might say the inviting, woodbine-swept Christian Science Building at 1601 I Street harbors two histories—its own modest one as well as the exhibits it houses which call attention to the origin of Christian Science and its position in the world today.

Here in the former home of Supreme Court Associate Justice Horace Gray and later of John Barton Payne, Secretary of the Interior under President Wilson and afterward head of the American Red Cross, the Christian Science board of directors has developed a site that gives the Christian Science movement appropriate representation in this world capital.

The newly remodeled air-conditioned building also provides quarters for certain local Christian Science activities. These include the city's first joint reading room, the Washington branches of the mother church. The First Church of Christ Scientist in Boston, Mass., have rented the first floor for this purpose.

Its nearness to many of the larger Washington hotels—the modern Statler, the fashionable Carlton, the Hay Adams, and the Lafayette, diagonally opposite—and only 2 blocks from the White House—makes the location convenient for visitors.

The top floor is given over to the Washington offices of the committee on publication of the mother church. The basement has been done over for use of the Christian Science Monitor Youth Forum in Washington.

The design and decoration of the exhibit, the lighting and color tones, are becoming something of an exhibit in themselves. Receptionists report that a number of visitors have come because of their specialized interest in architecture and displays.

The lighting is by Rudolph Wendel, a New York expert, who designed the lighting for Admiral Viscount Mountbatten's London town house. Mr. Wendel has done lighting arrangements for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the National Cathedral in Washington. The simulated candlelight in the restored Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, Va., is another example of Mr. Wendel's special handiwork.

COSMOPOLITAN ASPECT

There is a cosmopolitan aspect to the making of the exhibit, too. The marble fireplace on the portrait wall is from an old English mansion. The two carpets were woven on Scottish looms each in one solid piece and are a soft gray tone.

The exhibit's official coming into a neighborhood where once dwelt such famous figures as Admiral Dewey, William Howard Taft, and Theodore Roosevelt was as informally friendly as an Oklahoma housewarming. And the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., headed by Eric A. Johnston was not too corporately busy to send an armful of flowers for the new neighbors across the street.

Thanks to the good taste of architects, decorators, artists, and consultants on lighting and display, the new Christian Science exhibit blends modern museum techniques into a quiet, restful sort of living-room background.

The exhibit unfolds with a natural chronological sequence, which one might best sum up with the familiar title "Bow to Boston"—meaning that as one steps into the main exhibit room the very first exhibit, logically enough, is an appealing little diorama of the Baker homestead at Bow, N. H., where Mary Baker Eddy, discoverer and founder of Christian Science, was born.

The three-dimensional dooryard scene—the trim salt-box house, the neat farmyard, the sun-flooded fieldscape—is like a deep breath of New England when dooryards are adrift with lilac or fields are simmering with new-cocked hay.

PUBLISHING WORK DEPICTED

Next in this moving sequence is a companion diorama of the little attic room in Lynn, Mass., where Mrs. Eddy finished writing the first edition of the Christian Science textbook, Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures.

Its exact scale-drawn proportions project the viewer into sparsely simple surroundings, the Victorian rocker, the little walnut sidedraw desk, the oil lamp, the Bible, the skylight, the plain wallpaper—hand-copied to scale, too.

Among the achievements summed up in this modest exposition are the publishing activities of the Christian Science movement, including the Christian Science Monitor.

Heroic-sized photographic murals, scale models, and other display techniques project the visitor into the exciting clamor of the shop as process by process—through news, composing room, and stereotype—your tomorrow's Monitor goes to press.

Where there are ways of publishing words, naturally there are purposes, too—redemptive, healing purposes such as the exhibit explains in a series of "listening chairs" where the visitor selects an expository topic on Christian Science linked to a series of push buttons and listens to a radiophonic voice concealed in the headrest of the chair.

The "listening chairs" were designed to add a new hearing dimension to the exposition scope. The tone of the "listening chairs" is modulated so that no one but the person sitting in the chair can hear the sound.

This permits use of the same room simultaneously for the continuous sound-linked vitarmic showing of world-wide activities of the mother church and its 3,000 world-flung branches.

Howard Chandler Christy's new full-length portrait of Mrs. Eddy, and the builder's scale model of the mother church and the extension placed before a mural depicting in perspective buildings adjacent to the church and its park are other features of the exhibit. It now is open daily free to the public in the tastefully remodeled building here on what the guidebook calls Washington's most important numbered thoroughfare.

OPEN EVERY DAY

(By a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—Christian Science, World Activities on Display is the official name of the newest Christian Science activity in the Nation's Capital.

The exhibit hall is open daily, including holidays, from 10 a. m. to 7 p. m.; Sundays from 2 to 6 p. m., Sixteenth and I Streets NW.

[From the Christian Science Sentinel of September 3, 1949]

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE EXHIBIT IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

A building designed to give the Christian Science movement suitable representation in the Capital of the United States, the country of its origin, and to house some of

its customary activities there, is now in service at Sixteenth and I Streets, Washington, D. C. The exhibit rooms, the last portion of the building arrangements to be completed, were opened to the public July 15.

The building was purchased about a year ago by the Christian Science board of directors for the mother church, the First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass. It is a distinguished old residence, two blocks from the White House, which has been extensively remodeled for its present use and is known as the Christian Science Building.

The first floor was rented by the branches of the mother church in Washington for a jointly maintained reading room, which has been open several months.

On the third floor are the Washington offices of the committee on publication of the mother church.

On the second floor are the carefully prepared exhibits opened July 15, which represent the history and present status of the Christian Science movement and also something of its practical meaning for mankind.

In restful living-room atmosphere, the exhibit halls on the second floor provide the visitor with glimpses of the origin, scope, and healing ministry of Christian Science.

Featured in the larger of the two halls are a new full-length portrait of Mary Baker Eddy, the discoverer and founder of Christian Science, by Howard Chandler Christy, and a large-scale model of the mother church and the extension placed before a mural by Prentiss Taylor, depicting in perspective the group of buildings adjacent to the church and its park. Here also are two dioramas showing the modest beginnings of Christian Science, one, a miniature replica of Mrs. Eddy's birthplace and childhood home at Bow, N. H., and the other showing the simple attic room in the house in Lynn, Mass., where Mrs. Eddy completed the recording of her relevation in the inspired pages of the Christian Science textbook, Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures.

Among the many other objects of interest in this room is an equisitely carved glass map indicating by pinpoints of mirrowed light the location of the approximately 3,000 branches of the mother church throughout the world.

In the smaller exhibition room one can see a continuous unfoldment of pictures on a vitarama screen illustrating the world-wide activities of our church, accompanied by running commentary. A 12-minute showing of the Christian Science Monitor's contribution follows upon the screen.

And since the visitor may indeed wish to know something about the religion, he may sit down in specially constructed listening chairs and through automatic control and selection hear, without earphones, voices from the chair wing giving questions and answers on Christian Science, and testimonies of healing. No sound is audible outside each chair. He may hear the same thing in English, French, German, or Spanish.

The significant ideas which the visitor may carry away with him epitomize themselves in the bold classical frieze of lettering around the main exhibit hall, quoted from Science and Health (p. 340), "One infinite God, good, unifies men and nations; constitutes the brotherhood of man; ends wars; fulfills the Scripture, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself'; annihilates pagan and Christian idolatry—whatever is wrong in social, civil, criminal, political, and religious codes; equalizes the sexes; annuls the curse on man, and leaves nothing that can sin, suffer, be punished, or destroyed."

The exhibit is open free to the public daily, including holidays, Monday through Saturday, from 10 a. m. to 7 p. m., and Sunday from 2 to 6 p. m.

The China Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD two articles on the China white paper by Walter Lippmann. These articles appeared in the Washington Post under date of September 8 and 12, 1949. I am also including with my remarks an editorial on China which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of September 10, 1949.

It has always been my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the China question should be approached and considered in the light of the facts and a decision reached based on the best interests of the United States. It is my hope that the Congress will carefully consider the following articles and that any decisions we arrive at will be based on logic and an understanding of all that the question entails and not on emotionalism or short-sightedness. The times call for careful and deliberate judgment; not hasty, and perhaps rash, improvisation.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of September 8, 1949]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WHITE PAPER—WEDEMEYER, MARSHALL

The Wedemeyer proposals and the decision of Secretary Marshall to reject them are still of the first importance to an understanding of the American problem in China, and indeed in many other countries as well. To assist Chiang's Nationalist Government in the war with Japan and in the civil war with the Chinese Communists, the United States has sent five missions headed by distinguished soldiers. First there was General Stilwell, who was recalled at Chiang's request and replaced by General Wedemeyer. Then there was General Marshall, who was recalled at his own request. Then there was a second Wedemeyer mission in the summer of 1947. This produced the report and the recommendations which were suppressed until they were published in the white paper. And after Wedemeyer there was General Barr.

On the prospects of Chiang and his government, the judgment of all the generals was the same. None thought that Chiang would win, all were convinced that Chiang was losing the civil war. Marshall's estimate supported Stilwell's and Wedemeyer's supported Marshall's and Barr's report confirmed the estimate. The generals differed, however, on what to do about Chiang. Stilwell's conclusion was that we should abandon him if he continued to refuse to take our advice. Wedemeyer's conclusion—which we must examine more fully—was that we should take charge of the Chinese Government and of the civil war. Marshall's decision, made as Secretary of State, was that we could not abandon Chiang but that neither could we take over his powers, his responsibilities, and his liabilities.

Thus Chiang's defeat, which we could not prevent, from which we could not disentangle ourselves, became an American defeat. For more than 2 years we have been lashed to the mast of a ship which we could not steer, which was headed for the rocks.

There has been much misunderstanding of the Wedemeyer report. It was supposed to be a plan for giving Chiang some, but not an enormous amount of, arms and money and some friendly military and technical advice. But now that the report is available, and with it a summary of the tremendous indictment of Chiang's government which General Wedemeyer delivered at a secret meeting of the Nationalist leaders, there is no further excuse for thinking that General Wedemeyer thought that China could be saved from communism by any of the small and well-intentioned measures which Chiang's partisans in Congress have advocated.

The Wedemeyer proposals rested on three postulates: First, that a Communist China would threaten the strategic security of the United States; second, that the Nationalist Government, though anti-Communist, was so corrupt, reactionary, and inefficient that it could not hope to win the civil war; and third, that, nevertheless, the only working basis on which national Chinese resistance could be revitalized is through the presently corrupt, reactionary, and inefficient government of Chiang Kai-shek.

How then, did General Wedemeyer propose to make this incompetent and hated government the chosen instrument, or as he put it, the only working basis, of opposition to the Chinese Communists and their Soviet allies? Not by voting some more money and sending another military mission to do what General Stilwell and General Wedemeyer himself had tried and had failed to do.

General Wedemeyer's answer to the question was couched in the traditional language of diplomacy. But though the words do not call a spade a spade, the meaning—as Secretary Marshall testified later—was plain enough. General Wedemeyer advised the President not merely to underwrite but to take charge of the Nationalist Government and of the civil war. The United States was to offer unlimited aid if and when Chiang invited the United States to send American advisers to run his government to purge it, to reform it, to manage the Chinese economy, and to equip and to lead his armies.

General Wedemeyer's estimate of Chiang's government was so low that he wished that government openly to confess its bankruptcy as a sovereign power by accepting a partition of its territory and by asking for an American protectorate. So low was his estimate of the capacity of the Chiang regime to exercise Chinese sovereignty that he recommended the abandonment of Manchuria to "a five power guardianship" with Soviet Russia one of the guardians, and the assumption by the United States, through the euphemistic formula of advisers, of the paramount power in the rest of China. Then he wished to use the bits and pieces of Chiang's regime to put together a new Chinese government which, as our chosen instrument, was to make Chinese reconstruction an American responsibility and the Chinese civil war an American war.

Secretary Marshall understood well enough what the Wedemeyer proposal really meant and where it led. At an executive session of the congressional committees in February 1948, he made formal statement which is now published for the first time in the white paper (p. 380). Without mentioning the Wedemeyer report by name he talked about the proposal, saying that "the present government evidently cannot reduce the Chinese Communists to a completely negligible factor in China. To achieve that objective in the immediate future, it would be necessary for the United States to underwrite the Chinese Government's military effort, on a wide and probably increasing scale, as well as the Chinese economy. The United States would have to be prepared virtually to take over the Chinese Government and administer its economic, military, and governmental affairs." This would represent a burden on the United States economy and a military responsibility which I cannot recom-

mend as a course of action for this Government.

The abiding significance of the Wedemeyer-Marshall chapter is in the disclosure that the conduct of our foreign policy had led us—in China at any rate—into a tragic predicament. We were left with a choice between the Wedemeyer partition plus protectorate and a posture of humiliating impotence. These had become, in Mr. Acheson's words, the only alternative.

We are bound to say, I think that when he was faced with the intolerable choice, Secretary Marshall chose the lesser of the two evils. Though he could not save China or save American interests and prestige in China, he did save this country from a hopeless, a reckless, and an indefinitely dangerous adventure.

But there remains the question of the highest significance for our whole foreign policy—the question of how and why we were trapped in this awful dilemma.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of September 12, 1949]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WHITE PAPER: CHIANG'S STRANGLEHOLD

In his introductory letter and his subsequent press conferences, Mr. Acheson has been answering the partisans of Chiang who contend that we did not give the Nationalists enough help. He would clarify the issue if he addressed himself to the fact, as disclosed from one end of the white paper to the other, that while Chiang was calling for American help he was always ignoring American advice.

On this point all the soldiers and all the diplomats—Stilwell, Marshall, Wedemeyer, and Barr on the one hand, Gauss and Stuart and our Foreign Service officers on the other—were agreed. They were unanimous that until and unless Chiang could be induced or impelled to use American aid a little more honestly, a little more faithfully, and somewhat more efficiently, our help was not only certain to be wasted but worse than that, to entangle us disastrously in Chiang's inevitable defeat. It is a fair conclusion that in the judgment of all the highest and most responsible Americans who have dealt with China during and since the war that without Chiang's faithful cooperation, American aid was not only operation rathole but also operation boobytrap.

The Wedemeyer report is the answer to the Americans who say that we abandoned Chiang and betrayed him when we could have saved him. General Wedemeyer is supposed to have justified these critics. Yet it was he who concluded that Chiang was quite unable, even with large-scale American aid, to unify China, and that, therefore, he must abandon Manchuria; that in the remainder of China the Nationalists under Chiang could not defeat the Communists or even maintain themselves unless Chiang was put under what amounted to an American protectorate.

There is no support whatever, quite the contrary in fact, in General Wedemeyer's recommendations for the view that all would now be different and better had a few more hundreds of millions of dollars been voted, had some military and financial technicians been sent out, and, let us say, had General MacArthur been put where General Stilwell, General Wedemeyer, General Marshall, and General Barr had been before. For General Wedemeyer, whether or not he was fully aware of it, was recommending the "solution" which has always in the past marked the end of a state—that is to say its partition and then the rule by foreign powers of the dismembered parts.

From the beginning of lend-lease in June 1941, to the white paper of August 1949, which marks the break with Chiang, the overriding element in our relations was that while we supplied the aid, we had no power to bargain with Chiang about what he did with it. Our aid, whether it was given to fight Japan or later to pacify and stabilize China, was always in fact unconditional. We could do nothing to prevent its being stolen, wasted, or misused. We could plead with Chiang but we could not bargain with him, much less compel him, to use it as repeatedly he promised to use it and as we thought it necessary or wise to use it.

This is the crucial point when we inquire into the American disaster in China—that we could not negotiate with the government which we were trying to save and to support. The crucial question is why we lost all power to bargain with Chiang. The answer, for which I think the white paper contains abundant evidence, is that we could not bargain because we had become so irrevocably and so exclusively committed to Chiang. We had allowed him to feel certain that he was the only Chinese leader we could support, and that we must continue to support him because his enemies were our enemies. As long as he was sure that we could not withhold our support, he had a free hand and could brush off our advice.

Chiang's belief that we were tied to him so that we could impose no conditions was tested and proved in the Stilwell affair. In July 1944 the decisive campaigns in the Pacific and in Asia had still to be fought and Chiang's military position in China was becoming rapidly worse. At that time President Roosevelt asked him to appoint General Stilwell to command the Chinese troops, and Chiang agreed that he would. But he did not carry out the agreement and, instead, he maneuvered until he persuaded President Roosevelt to recall General Stilwell.

The President may have felt that he was merely resolving a personal difficulty, caused by the fierce and tactless honesty of Vinegar Joe. But in fact the recall of the American general who had been nominated for the Chinese command by the President on the advice of General Marshall and Admiral King and with—I believe—the approval of Mr. Churchill, was an act of appeasement which fixed the pattern of our subsequent relations. When Chiang had learned how to get rid of Stilwell, he had learned the formula for getting unconditional American aid.

The formula was to make himself the one and only Chinese opponent of our principal opponent—of Japan during the World War and of communism in the cold war. The formula worked. During the World War he got rid of Stilwell and his unwelcome advice to use our supplies to fight Japan. Chiang was able to do this because President Roosevelt could not risk an open break with him. The President felt that he must appease Chiang as he felt that he must appease Stalin—in order to preserve the alliance. For Chiang was saying that if we withheld support, he would withdraw from the war.

After the war we made it easy for Chiang to continue using his formula. We did this by making ourselves the sole champions of China and by telling the world that Chiang was our only hope in waging the cold war against Russia as he had been our only hope in the war against Japan.

The white paper has, so far is I can find by a diligent search, no indication that we ever consulted any other friendly ally, not even Great Britain, though her material interests in China are much greater than our own. There is no indication that it ever occurred to us that the responsibility for China's future might prudently have been shared and the risks spread out.

Only now when the ignominious failure of our policy is upon us, are we undertaking to consult with our allies. Now that Chiang has collapsed we are firmly withholding support with a view to recovering our independence of action in the Far East. But until the disaster had occurred, we treated China exclusively as an American sphere of influence and we treated Chiang as exclusively the steward of Chinese sovereignty. Thus our diplomacy became constricted to the narrow and hopeless task of trying to persuade Chiang to reform and become worthy of the mission we had assigned to him.

No elbowroom was left for bargaining with Chiang or for making contact with other leaders of the Chinese nation, or for regulating the consequences of the Chinese civil war within an international system, or for disentangling ourselves from the disaster which we knew was to come. The narrowness, the sterility, and the exclusiveness of our China policy brought it about that Chiang's destiny became our destiny in China.

And so, when he went down, he took us down with him, like a drowning man who has a stranglehold upon his rescuer.

If we are to learn something useful for the future from this painful history, we cannot accept readily, we shall at least have to examine critically, Mr. Acheson's claim that our China policy was essentially right, and that the result was beyond our control. A disastrous failure of this magnitude calls for inquiry and it should be pursued in the manner of statesmen forming a policy rather than of a lawyer seeking a verdict for his client.

The inquiry might well begin with a study of the causes and the remedies for Chiang's stranglehold on American policy. For China may not be the only country where we shall find ourselves in the predicament of Secretary Marshall.

He and all his predecessors in China had learned that they could not lead or influence effectively the government we were supporting.

As a matter of principle and also because the costs were exorbitant and the risks were incalculable, Secretary Marshall could not intervene in order to take control of that government.

Yet he felt he could not detach the American interest in China from Chiang's government.

He had to wait, knowing the disaster which was coming, until the connection was severed by the total defeat and collapse of Chiang's government.

Thus we had lost our power, our influence, and our independence in the land we had championed and befriended.

And we were irretrievably entangled with the inglorious fate of a government which had succeeded only in making anticommunism and Americanism synonymous in China with its own incompetence, corruption, and reaction.

Inquiry into the American predicament will not undo the disaster which has followed it. But were the full story developed with a view to learning its lessons, it might teach us something, something worth keeping very much in mind in say, western Germany, Japan, and in the weak and disorderly countries where, it is being said, we must hurry to intervene.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of September 10, 1949]

FRANK WORDS ABOUT CHINA

For over 3 years top American military men have been convinced that the government of Chiang Kai-shek faced defeat through its own inefficiency, corruption, and lack of popular support.

During that time the State Department has felt itself unable to justify publicly its reluctance to aid Chiang—or even to admit such reluctance—because to do so would pull an already threadbare rug from under the generalissimo's stubborn feet. To have tried to educate the American public in the true and deplorable facts about the Nationalist government would have been interpreted as playing the Communist game—and it would, in fact, have undoubtedly hastened the Communist triumph.

As a result of this dilemma, debate about China in the United States has been carried on in an air of curious unreality. And as a further consequence, American "policy" has been to give half-hearted aid to a cause the policy makers believed doomed and to a government they believed would waste any aid it received.

The recent white paper ended all this. It is at last possible to speak frankly of the rottenness in the Nationalist camp which has made it so easy a prey to Communist dynamism armed with bright promises of reform.

This paper's chief far eastern correspondent, Gordon Walker, has disclosed at this timely moment a story that bears startling witness to the moral bankruptcy of the Nationalist regime. It is the story of Chiang's hiring of Japanese officers as mercenaries to fight the battle his own generals and troops increasingly refuse to wage. This is the plan suggested to him by high-ranking Japanese officers at the end of the war as part of their strategy for the eventual revival of militarism in Japan—a plan foiled at that time by General Marshall's insistence on repatriating all Japanese troops from China.

The story is startling only in the particularity with which Mr. Walker has uncovered facts which have long been a matter of rumor. To those who look at the Far East without blinders it cannot be surprising that the discredited militarists of Japan and the discredited Nationalist leaders of China should join hands for their mutual benefit. Congressmen who would make a happy third in the party had better look to their reputations.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has just been given an estimate of the China situation by Vice Adm. Oscar C. Badger, naval commander in the Far East. Apparently his testimony paralleled that of other top military men who have reported on the military and political bankruptcy of present Nationalist leadership. If he held out hope of America's reversing the tide of battle, it could only be—as General Wedemeyer made clear in his famous report—by virtually taking over non-Communist China and running it for the Chinese.

A military writer in the United Nations World for August argued that Chiang can fight his way back, but proceeded to stipulate that American aid to Chiang must take a form by which all Chinese should be excluded from controlling influence in its administration. Let us be frank. Chiang is no longer able to hold a dwindling non-Communist China against the Reds. Unless the United States is prepared to take over the stupendous job of running China with American personnel, it can only look for the rise of more vital Chinese leadership with which to cooperate.

Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, Deplores Rejection of Genocide Pact by American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, but speaking for myself, I am amazed at the action taken by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association yesterday in St. Louis, in recommending rejection by the United States Senate of the United Nations Genocide Pact which condemns the mass killing of races or peoples.

This pact has already been approved by a number of nations. The house of delegates disregarded the advice of its committee of experts on international law. The house of delegates disapproved the treaty on the erroneous belief that international tribunals could override and supersede American court decisions and thereby the rule of our States in their internal affairs might be interfered with.

As one familiar with the Genocide Pact and who attended the sessions of the general assembly in Paris and heard the arguments both pro and con when the treaty was considered and promulgated, I challenge and deny the assertions made at St. Louis that the treaty in any respect can be made to override and supersede American law or American courts.

The treaty specifically states that it cannot be implemented, save as our Congress sees fit. While it is true that any treaty under our Constitution is the supreme law of the land, equal with any enactments of Congress signed by the President as law, the Genocide Pact has section 5, which should dissipate all fears of the American Bar Association. That section reads as follows:

> The contracting parties undertake to enact in accordance with their respective constitutions the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention.

In other words, the terms of the Genocide Pact are not binding unless implemented by the enactments of Congress. The terms thereof must be consistent with our law. Congress could pass, under the terms of the aforesaid section 5, any and all conditions. Furthermore, the Senate can ratify with any reservation that it sees fit. Our history is filled with the ratifications of treaties by our Senate with many reservations.

Thus there is a double safeguard. Congress can impose any and all conditions. The ratifying Senate can approve with any and all reservations.

LaGuardia Memorial Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk delivered by me on the second anniversary of F. H. LaGuardia's death:

Two years ago today Fiorello LaGuardia died. The people everywhere in the world felt his loss. His funeral was attended by the great in all walks of life. However, that was not what impressed me. The line of thousands upon thousands of common people who came to pay their respects during the 2 days while he lay in state in St. John's Cathedral was the most impressive tribute given to any man since Lincoln. The people who stood in line were workers, storekeepers, and of the professions. They were New York City. The New York City that LaGuardia loved, that LaGuardia served, that LaGuardia helped make great.

From everywhere in the world came messages of condolence and sympathy. Some of these messages were from the great, but the genuine grieving came from the poor people of Europe and Asia to whom LaGuardia had devoted so much of his energies during the last remaining years of his life.

I first met LaGuardia in 1921 when I was attending DeWitt Clinton High School. He addressed the school assembly the same day when I made a speech. I shall never forget it. I spoke in favor of old-age pensions and social security. LaGuardia made that the theme of his speech to the students.

The next time I met him was the summer of 1924 when both of the two old parties had ganged up on him. That year LaGuardia decided to support Senator Robert LaFollette for President on the Progressive Party ticket. The Republican Party refused LaGuardia the Republican nomination. The Democratic Party, as usual, sought to defeat him. LaGuardia asked me to actively participate in that campaign, and together with a handful of our friends and neighbors in East Harlem, we conducted a successful campaign for him and for LaFollette in our congressional district.

Since then my association with the "Major," as we affectionately called LaGuardia, became close. I was very close to him in every single one of his political endeavors, and I learned a great deal from him.

My knowledge of the precepts of parliamentary procedure in the House of Representatives I learned from LaGuardia. The foundation of my knowledge of New York City politics I gathered from him.

There are very few honors that one in public life really cherishes. The one I prize most highly is that I represented his old district before it was gerrymandered, and I still do represent it now after the gerrymandering.

LaGuardia was a progressive—his main interest was the welfare of the common people. This was his motivation which impressed all of us who were closely associated with him.

I shall never forget how in 1924 they called him a Socialist, and how in 1941 those who now occupy the seats of the mighty in our city government red-baited him. I never knew LaGuardia to falter in the face of name calling. Like a war aviator he never took his eye off the target. He kept after the objective. He was not frightened by the attacks. He fought and he fought hard, and that is why he won so many of his battles.

He battled on the people's side. The Norris-LaGuardia Act which he put through the House, and which Senator NORRIS carried in the Senate, became the workingman's defense against the ruthless rule over labor by the notorious injunction. Government by injunction was repugnant to LaGuardia. He knew the operations of judicial tyranny against the men and women who work for a living. He knew how the press and the courts were used against labor. He was cognizant of the trickery that was used by big industrialists of the country against their employees.

LaGuardia, together with Senator Norris, fought the battle against all this, and established the safeguard which now has been destroyed by the Taft-Hartley law.

Fiorello LaGuardia did not fear the powerful. In the days when one risked his political life when taking on the power trusts, LaGuardia did not hesitate to strenuously fight for public power. He was a pioneer in the field of public power. President Roosevelt's victories to bring cheap power to the people, and to curb the avarice of private utilities, were made possible by the pioneering of Fiorello LaGuardia in the House of Representatives.

LaGuardia was a bitter foe of racial discrimination. I recall when Oscar DePriest was elected to Congress from Illinois—unless I am greatly mistaken he was the first Congressman of the Negro race to be elected since the days of Reconstruction—Jim Crow, segregation, and discrimination was invoked on the very site from which the war had been successfully won against slavery. Capitol Hill had no room for this Congressman. He was told that no office could be found for him. LaGuardia did not hesitate—he invited Oscar DePriest to share his office with him, and then took up the fight which resulted in the granting of an office to DePriest.

LaGuardia never lost an opportunity in the House to denounce discrimination—nor did he as mayor of the city of New York.

LaGuardia despised anti-Semitism in any form. You folks all remember the World's Fair, and you remember how LaGuardia announced that it was his wish to relegate Hitler to the Hall of Horrors.

We can all sit back now and say LaGuardia was right. Then it was another story. LaGuardia was accused by our so-called respectable press of having used intemperate language. The same people who today would rebuild another Hitler Germany, demanded that LaGuardia apologize. Our State Department did apologize. Who was right? The press? The State Department? or Fiorello LaGuardia?

LaGuardia knew the slums. Time and time again he would say to me, "if I could only wipe them all out and build cheerful homes for everybody." Since the National Housing program became law, LaGuardia built 17,000 units in just a few years.

How the real-estate interests hated LaGuardia—public housing meant the beginning of the end of their monopoly. LaGuardia began the beginning of that end, and if he were alive today the end would be near. Instead, the trend has been reversed. Oh, how the people of New York City do miss LaGuardia in City Hall.

After LaGuardia left City Hall, he realized that the peace that the people had won at so much sacrifice was in danger. He knew that it might be taken away from them. Refusing to take a well-earned rest and enjoy the fruits of private life, LaGuardia plunged into the fight to preserve the peace and freedom of the world.

As Director of UNRRA he traveled all over the world. In a manner that was characteristic of LaGuardia, he smashed through red tape and overcame obstacles that were thrown in his way by reactionaries who never did believe in the principles for which the last war was fought. Those who hated Roosevelt had begun to take over. The Nazis and Fascists were being placed back in power all over Europe. Displaced persons once again began to feel the whiplash of anti-Semitism. All this took place under the benign rule of our own administrators. LaGuardia fought them; he exposed them. He managed alone to bring some measure of relief to these victims of fascism.

Here in the United States, and in Congress, UNRRA was called communistic. The maneuverings against it had been put in motion. LaGuardia beat them back until he was betrayed by our own State Department.

I have heard LaGuardia make many speeches—the greatest and most historic speech was that made in defense of UNRRA before the United Nations. The striped-pants gentlemen of the State Department sneered at UNRRA. They had abandoned the Roosevelt blueprint for peace based on world collaboration. They had begun to follow the course of unilateral action, and the great issue of this day was on that occasion fully delineated. On that occasion the gage of battle was laid down between those who sought to extend Wall Street's control and exploitation of the people of the world through the utilization of the dollars and now the arms—and unless we stop it, later on the lives of Americans—and those of us who believed in the United Nations way, of which Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the architect, aid to the world without exploitation, not through unilateral action, but through the United Nations.

That is the great issue today—that is the issue involved in the Atlantic Pact, the arms program, in the Turk-Greek-Truman doctrine—in the Marshall plan. Here is what LaGuardia said, and bear these words in mind so that we can better understand the nature of the contest which is being fought today between the men of peace and freedom and security, and the men of war and exploitation. LaGuardia said, and I quote him:

"Now, gentlemen, there are many ways of dealing with this problem: The first, that aid should be given on a national basis. Each rich nation should choose the recipient and make its own conditions. This is the old-fashioned imperialist way. This method of making one country dependent upon another was discarded by the world—I hope forever. That isn't why the United Nations was formed. That is not the spirit of the Atlantic Charter or the San Francisco charter—not as I understand it.

"The second possible arrangement—and look out for this one, please—is for a group of big nations to join together and select recipients of their charity. This arrangement would only be a false front. It is not in keeping with international cooperation. Let us be honest. It is just plain, ordinary, old-time power politics, and the world has had war after war because of power politics.

"The third way is to create an international authority operating under the control of the United Nations and meeting the relief need, without any consideration of race, creed, or political belief, being guided only by the existence of true need. This is what is known as the new way of the United Nations. But it really is not a new way. It is a way brought to this world nearly 2,000 years ago in the teachings of the Prince of Peace. And a wicked world has, to date, refused to learn the lesson."

Those were LaGuardia's words.

LaGuardia also applied this test to the Truman doctrine and opposed it in an article which he wrote for the newspaper PM.

Can anyone have any doubt as to where LaGuardia would have stood today against the program of boom, bust, and war? He would have fought it from every forum in the Nation.

LaGuardia hated tyranny. He felt that it was never in the best interest of America to use the funds, the arms, and the lives of this Nation in the defense of tyranny. It was his belief that a policy of empire abroad meant only retrogression at home.

Fiorello LaGuardia, the progressive Congressman, the greatest mayor of our city, today would have been the great gladiator for peace and freedom everywhere in the world. Good night.

Is Tito a Good Risk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forceful editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Record on Monday, August 29, 1949:

IS TITO A GOOD RISK?

The American State Department, with the support of President Truman—in fact, on the acknowledged responsibility of the President—has frankly taken sides with Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia in his "cold war" with Soviet Russia.

It is a logical assumption that if his quarrel with Russia brings on a war the American policy will be to support him in that.

However that may be, for the time being—and still short of war—the American Government has definitely obligated itself to supply the Tito regime with steel processing facilities and has taken his formal application for other economic aid and financial credits under advisement.

All this is being done, the State Department explains, on the theory that while the Tito brand of communism is just as objectionable to the United States as the Russian type, we stand to gain from the quarrel that has developed between them and should encourage it.

The State Department further admits that, in the event of war between Yugoslavia and Russia, the former will be most likely overrun in short order and any American supplies given to Tito would thus fall into the hands of the Russians, but it calls this a "calculated risk" worth taking.

Aside from the questionable morals involved in a policy which seeks to foment trouble between two foreign powers which are unfriendly to us as well as to each other, there are certain questions to be asked concerning the basic wisdom of such a policy and its ultimate value.

Why, for instance, is it a calculated risk worth taking to support Communist Tito against Communist Russia, when we have not only refused to support but have abandoned or ostracized other nations which have been menaced by Russia and which are our friends and allies or are potentially indispensable to us in a military sense if we ourselves ever become involved in a war with Russia?

Why is it a poorer risk to extend formal diplomatic recognition to Spain, which has been an actively anticommunistic nation longer than any other country in Europe, than it is to support Tito, who is nothing more than a little Communist with big ideas?

What is there about the Tito brand of communism that makes it so much more palatable to the American State Department and to President Truman than the Stalin brand?

It was on the direct responsibility of Marshal Tito that American airplanes were ruthlessly and treacherously shot down over Yugoslavia in 1946 and their crews wantonly murdered, when their only offense was that they had become lost in bad weather and had sought refuge in a supposedly friendly country.

It was the sole responsibility of Marshal Tito that the reward of Gen. Draja Mihailovich for his leadership of the Yugoslavian resistance during the German occupation was execution by a Communist firing squad.

This is the type of man the American State Department considers a calculated risk worth taking.

Widows' and Children's Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my

remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and a copy of a bill I introduced today:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1949.
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We of the DAV are anxious to have a bill introduced for reference to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs which would amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to equalize pensions payable to widows and children of World War I and World War II veterans. As you know, the widows and children of World War II veterans are not on a parity with those of World War I.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a draft of the proposed bill and would appreciate it if you would introduce it for us.

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN.

A bill to amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, to equalize pensions payable to dependents of World War I and II veterans

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, December 14, 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by repealing section 6 thereof and substituting the following:

"SEC. 6. The widow, child, or children of any deceased persons who served in World War II and who was discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after having served 90 days or more, or for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, or who at time of death was receiving or entitled to receive compensation, pension, or retirement pay for service-connected disability, shall, upon filing an application and such proofs in the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, be entitled to receive pension as provided by this act: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section the definition of the terms 'veteran,' 'widow,' 'child or children,' shall be those applicable to World War II as provided in Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended: *And provided further*, That section 4, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended accordingly."

Repeal of Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Gardner (Mass.) News of August 24, 1949:

CHAMBER ADOPTS RESOLUTION URGING EXCISE TAX REPEAL—NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF BODY ASKS WASHINGTON SOLONS TO ACT—WAR IMPOSTS ADD 20 PERCENT TO COSTS

"Increased employment and stimulated business activity can result from immediate repeal of all wartime so-called 'emergency' excise taxes now being levied on many consumer daily necessities," said Howard D. Ferguson, president of the Gardner Trust Co. and chairman of the national affairs committee of the chamber of commerce. "Four years have passed since the cessation of hostilities," continued Mr. Ferguson, "yet these taxes are still in effect and there is no question but that they are restricting public buying of items affected."

Urging immediate congressional action on pending bills to remove these taxes, the chamber of commerce yesterday sent a resolution to President Truman, Senators Saltonstall and Lodge, and Congressman Philbin. The resolution specifically endorsed the purpose of H. R. 2100, a bill submitted last February by Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, to repeal all wartime excise taxes. These taxes increase the retail price from 10 to 20 percent of such things as furs, refrigerators, cooking stoves, jewelry, electric light bulbs, railroad and bus fares, cosmetics, luggage and handbags, telephone and telegraph messages, cameras, films and movies, theater and sports events tickets.

"The President has called for limited repeal of excise taxes, but because of his desire to maintain or increase Federal revenues in order to finance what many say is a socialistic program like that of England, he has not urged his congressional leaders to repeal all excise taxes. For this reason, it is important that local communities make known to their Washington delegations their views on this vital problem," Mr. Ferguson states.

That is why the local chamber of commerce, through the initiative of Mr. Ferguson and O. B. Denison, secretary-manager of the local chapter, has sponsored the following resolution which was formally adopted yesterday:

"Whereas many so-called wartime excise taxes were imposed primarily to restrict production and consumer purchases of certain products during the war; and

"Whereas such taxes are acting as an effective restraining influence on the production and sale of such products today, thus greatly restricting the employment in the affected industries; and

"Whereas unemployment in the Gardner area has become a serious problem, to a large extent due to the excise tax upon products of some of the principal industries in said area; and

"Whereas immediate repeal of such taxes would act as a powerful stimulant to these industries, thereby encouraging greater production and employment; and

"Whereas such stimulated business activity and increased employment would undoubtedly increase the Government's income—thus offsetting to a considerable extent, if not entirely, the immediate loss of revenue from abandoned excise taxes: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Gardner, Mass., through its national affairs committee and with the approval of its officers and directors, recommends to Congress and the administration the immediate repeal of wartime excise taxes as provided in H. R. 2100; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congressman PHILBIN, Senator SALTONSTALL, and Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, be urged to work earnestly in support of such repeal; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, earnestly requesting his approval of such action."

Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, Offers Bill Limiting Sessions of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the periods of congressional adjournment. A copy of this bill follows:

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

SEC. 132. Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses (1) shall adjourn for the month of April and for the months of August and September in each odd-numbered year, and (2) shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each even-numbered year.

The logic of this change will be readily recognized by those familiar with the multiplicity of duties. The intricacies of the problems now facing Congress, and the incessant pressures placed upon Members of Congress demand that the unworkable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relating to adjournment be changed. The bill provides that in the year when no national elections pend, the Congress will adjourn for the month of April and for the months of August and September. In election years adjournment is to take place on the last day of July. During an election year it is obvious that the Members must be permitted to return to their respective constituencies to make themselves familiar with prevailing sentiment and be given an opportunity to campaign for reelection. Moreover, it would be a bad political risk for Congress to be in session, unless the emergencies so required, after the national elections have taken place—that would enable defeated Members to vote without regard for the wishes of their constituencies, or against the policy of the victorious power. However, in the year when no national elections are to take place, the work of the Congress demands that it be in session for 9 months of the year. What has happened during the present session of Congress amply illustrates this.

I believe it would be to the best interests of the country for Congress to adopt this change.

Antimonopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Prof. Milton Handler, of Columbia University Law School, before the House Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, August 5, 1949:

The Sherman Act has been aptly described by the Supreme Court as a charter of freedom.[1] It is the economic counterpart of the Bill of Rights. Though enacted less than 60 years ago, its roots are deeply embedded in ancient common-law doctrines announced by English courts even before the discovery of the New World. We often think of the

[1] Hughes, C. J., in *Appalachian Coals, Inc. v. U. S.* (288 U. S. 344 (1933)).

progression of economic activity from freedom to regimentation—from competition to monopoly. The reverse is the fact. The competitive system as we know it was preceded in English economic history by the authoritarian and monopolistic controls of the medieval guilds and the centralized regulation of trade by the British Crown. It took centuries before English law sanctioned the freedom of the individual to engage in the calling of his choice. It took centuries before private groups were shorn of their quasi-governmental powers of regulating prices, production, and even entry into various fields of economic activity. The few terse words of the Sherman law, thus, epitomize a voluminous history. Though not technically a part of our written Constitution, its significance is no less than the great constitutional safeguards of human freedom. It is not to be wondered, therefore, that some of the States have incorporated their condemnation of monopoly into their written constitution.[2] Nor is it surprising to find in the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee the statement that no witness in the course of its comprehensive and exhaustive investigation into the monopoly problem questioned the underlying philosophy of our antitrust laws.[3]

Antitrust is the minimum regulation possible in a free society. The self-regulating force of competition obviates the need for the pervasive control of industry which monopoly inevitably compels. The alternatives to antitrust would ultimately transform our way of life and carry us down paths which we have up to now resolutely avoided.

There have been numerous legislative inquiries into the monopoly problem. I trust you will not deem me presumptuous if I assert that what is needed today is not more investigation but more action. The facts are well known. The need for corrective measures is widely recognized. The main question today is how can the salutary objectives of antitrust be more effectively achieved. It is to that question that I shall address myself.

While the Sherman law is one of the principal bulwarks of our democracy, it, of course, does not provide the answer to all of our economic ills. It is but one of our regulatory instruments. My concentration on the implementation of our Sherman Act policy does not imply any lack of recognition or sympathy for measures dealing with other important economic problems which are beyond the purview of antitrust.

The deficiencies of the antitrust laws can be divided into two categories: (a) substantive, and (b) procedural.

The intensification of antitrust enforcement during the past decade has led to a vast outpouring of judicial decision. Appraisals of the law made in the early forties are completely out of date. This is true of the monograph I prepared for the TNEC on the judicial construction of the antitrust laws. The statute in recent years has received a friendly interpretation by all the courts, and notably the United States Supreme Court. Obscurities in the law have been largely eliminated, although at times only to be replaced with new perplexities. The Supreme Court, to use a homely phrase, has performed a face-lifting operation upon our antitrust laws. It has in case after case plugged important loopholes. The ambit of the statutory prohibition has been enlarged to embrace every conceivable collusive restraint. Antitrust has fared well in its hands. That does not mean, however, that there no longer is any need for remedial legislation. There are certain substantive problems which still require corrective action.

[2] 32 Col. L. Rev. 347 (1932).

[3] "* * * it is significant that in all the hearings held before this committee no witness so much as suggested any substantive change in the basic philosophy of those laws" (p. 35).

As I have been requested by your chairman to revise and bring my monograph up to date, and as the matters I am discussing are quite technical, I shall deal with them summarily, leaving for my written report the necessary amplification and documentation.

The substantive doctrines of antitrust relate to four main fields:

1. Collusive restraints among competitors;
2. Concentration of economic power through corporate integration;
3. Misuse of patents;
4. Elimination of commercial competition by labor.

Collusive arrangements among competitors—technically known as loose-knit combinations—have received the principal attention of enforcement officials and the courts since the statute was enacted. Typical of such restraints are price-fixing, production control, division of territories, apportionment of business, and allocation of customers. Human ingenuity can devise innumerable variants of these classic types of restraints, but the variations do not alter their essential character. The courts have consistently in recent years denounced such restrictive arrangements as unreasonable per se and hence unlawful.

The concept of conspiracy has been extended so as to make it unnecessary for the Government to prove the existence of an actual agreement among the alleged conspirators. It had long been regarded as a fatal weakness of antitrust that the forbidden fruits of restrictive conduct could be garnered so long as the parties refrained from entering into any overt agreement. Price uniformity, price leadership, and identity of business practice were regarded as immune from legal attack in the absence of some explicit proof of an agreement or combination. Beginning with the decision of Mr. Justice Stone in the Interstate Circuit case,[4] and running right down to date, the Court has eliminated the element of agreement from its concept of conspiracy, and holds unlawful the participation of businessmen in a common course of action with knowledge of the parallel and similar conduct of their competitors. This broadened concept of conspiracy is technically denominated conscious parallelism. This doctrine can be productive of great injustice if recklessly invoked by enforcement officials. To date, in most of the reported cases in which the doctrine has been applied, there has been adequate proof from which the triers of the facts might properly and reasonably infer collusion. A narrow, rigid, and precise definition of conspiracy would provide an easy avenue of escape. On the other hand, overzealous application of the new formula could enmesh in antitrust charges businessmen who have acted entirely independently and are innocent of any collusion. A fair balance must be struck. I know of no way by which the balance can be achieved through legislative prescription. We must rely on the good sense and judgment of the courts. Yet the matter will bear careful watching lest injustice result from overzealous use of the new formula.

My conclusion, therefore, is that this phase of antitrust requires no legislative action at this time.

We encounter a totally different situation when we turn to the application of antitrust to the concentration of economic power through corporate integration. Manifestly there is no more important field upon which antitrust can operate. The competition eliminated by a loose-knit combination can be restored by effectively outlawing the conspiracy. On the other hand, the fusion of competing companies permanently eliminates the competition that therefore existed between them and only by the drastic process of dissolution and divestiture can competition be reestablished. Without effective control over the process of industrial concentration, our antitrust laws are doomed to utter futility.

One might rightfully expect the most stringent enforcement and the severest application of antitrust in the case of corporate integration. Yet it is in this field that the courts have shown the greatest toleration and enforcement officials the least vigor. From 1890 to 1927, there were only 14 reported decisions of the Supreme Court dealing with corporate mergers and consolidations. The recent Columbia Steel ruling in 1948[5] provided the Court with its first real opportunity in 21 years to deal again with this problem. During the same period the Court passed upon a host of questions relating to collusive restraints among businessmen, small and large. Of what moment is it to prevent the temporary elimination of competition by conspiratorial action if the permanent elimination of competition by the fusion of companies is countenanced?

In my TNEC study I reviewed all of the important Court rulings on close-knit corporations up to 1940. I pointed out that the law was in hopeless confusion, the authorities in irreconcilable conflict, and the course of decision erratic and unpredictable. There has been the sharpest oscillation in the Court's views and there are precedents both ways on virtually every proposition. I stated that there was then as much doubt and uncertainty regarding the permissive limits of capital combinations as there had been in 1890.

The same observations can be made today despite the notable advances in the other branches of antitrust jurisprudence.

The recent decision in Columbia Steel by a Court divided 5 to 4 has not substantially dissipated the prevailing confusion. The Court there sustained the acquisition of the largest west coast fabricator by the largest steel producing company in the country.

The case involved both vertical and horizontal integration. United States Steel is both a producer of steel ingot and rolled steel and a fabricator of steel products. Consolidated Steel is a fabricator of structural and plate steel. Through this acquisition, United States Steel's competitors were deprived of an important customer whose requirements amounted to about 3 percent of the total rolled steel consumed in the western steel market. By the purchase United States Steel enlarged its share of the business in structural steel in the western area from about 13 to 24 percent—taking the figures for the year 1946 (which differ from those of earlier years).

The Court holds that the same tests measuring the legality of horizontal corporate fusions are applicable to vertical integrations.

What are those tests?

The Court suggests a dual standard in Columbia Steel, both subjective and objective.

It holds that if the purpose of the acquisition is improper—if there is a specific intent to restrain trade unreasonably—the statute is violated even though no unreasonable restraint may be achieved. How far the Court is prepared to carry this view is hard to say. It borders on the absurd to rule that a combination of two pygmies doing less than 1 percent of the business of an industry is unlawful because the parties cherish a Napoleonic ambition to dominate the entire field. Perhaps all the Court means is that in a border-line case the element of intent may tip the scale in favor of illegality.

Apart from the theoretical difficulty with the subjective tests, it does not meet the actualities of antitrust. Antitrust should be concerned with economic realities and not with ambiguous states of mind. It would be a retrogression for the discredited distinction between good and bad trusts to be revived. This is not to say that intent is not a relevant consideration. But it clearly is not entitled to controlling weight.

[4] *Interstate Circuit, Inc.* v. *U. S.* (306 U. S. 208 (1939)).

[5] *U. S.* v. *Columbia Steel Co.* (334 U. S. 495 (1948)).

As to the objective test of unreasonable restraint, the Court states:

(a) "In determining what constitutes unreasonable restraint, we do not think the dollar volume is in itself of compelling significance" (p. 527).

By this the Court means that it is going to impose no fetters upon further acquisitions by our huge corporate giants merely because they possess vast capitalizations, or do business in the billions rather than the millions. It does not, it is to be noted, say that dollar volume is of no signficance; it merely states that it is not of compelling significance.

(b) "* * * we look rather to the percentage of business controlled" (p. 527).

(c) "* * * the strength of the remaining competition" (p. 527).

(d) "* * * whether the action springs from business requirements or purpose to monopolize" (p. 527).

(e) "* * * The probable development of the industry" (p. 527).

(f) "* * * consumer demands, and other characteristics of the market" (p. 527).

It is to be noted that even in stating the objective test of restraint, the Court included certain subjective elements.

With regard to the element of percentages, the Court hastens to add:

"We do not undertake to prescribe any set of percentage figures by which to measure the reasonableness of a corporation's enlargement of its activities by the purchase of the assets of a competitor. The relative effect of percentage command of a market varies with the setting in which that factor is placed" (pp. 527–528).

Superficially there appears to be an inconsistency in the two statements made by the Court. What it had in mind, probably, is that the percentage of business controlled is a relevant factor, but it is unwilling to formulate the standards of legality in rigid percentage terms.

In essence the Court's standard for measuring the legality of corporate integrations is the effect of the acquisition on the competitive texture of the market. The economic strength of the defendants and the strength of the remaining competition are pertinent factors. If the combine is surrounded by vigorous and active competition and does not dominate the industry, the fusion is to be upheld no matter how big or powerful the acquiring corporation may be. Each case is to be determined on its own facts.

The Court regards as material whether the action springs from business requirements or purpose to monopolize (p. 527). The Court in this connection quotes from the Reading case (*U. S.* v. *Reading Co.* (253 U. S. 26, 57)), where the standard is phrased in terms of whether the acquisition was obtained by normal expansion to meet the demands of a business growing as a result of superior and enterprising management or was a deliberate, calculated purchase for control.

What kind of proof can be adduced to establish that the acquisition was the result of a normal expansion? What is the standard of normality—the fact that others are doing likewise?

Is it enough that the management of two companies feel that more money would be made if they are put together? Or must the defendants show some specific economies resulting from the fusion?

What is the meaning of a deliberate, calculated purchase for control? Does such purpose differ from the intent to monopolize?

A study of this and prior decisions of the Court makes it abundantly clear that there can be no substantial progress in curbing the alarming and ever-increasing concentration of corporate power without clarification and strengthening of our antitrust law.

This involves first and foremost the legislative formulation of new standards by which the legality of corporate acquisitions are to be measured.

The courts having failed in 59 years to prescribe clear, understandable, workable, and administrable criteria, it is time for the legislative branch of the Government to take over. I do not intend to be unduly critical of the courts. The tools with which they have had to work have been the vague and undefined concepts of restraint and monopoly. They have never been given the guidance by Congress to which they were entitled in respect of matters which pertain more to policy than to law. If they have floundered, it is because public opinion on these questions has never crystallized.

How much bigness in industry are we as a Nation prepared to tolerate?

Under what circumstances may competing businesses be combined?

Neither the statute nor the construction given it by the courts has retarded the process of industrial concentration. The Federal Trade Commission tells us in a recent report that over 1,800 companies in the manufacturing and mining industries disappeared as a result of mergers and acquisitions since 1940.

Is this trend toward concentrated power to be accepted supinely as an inevitable development of the modern business system? Or can something be done about it?

The Federal Trade Commission has repeatedly advocated amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act to confer jurisdiction upon it to prevent property as well as stock acquisitions. This is at best but a partial answer with which I have no serious quarrel. Jurisdiction over property acquisitions now rests in the courts in suits brought by the Department of Justice. If the Federal Trade Commission functions under the same standards as are applied by the courts, the reform, frankly, is hardly worth the candle. What difference does it make whether the Federal Trade Commission or the Department of Justice is unsuccessful in a particular suit? No governmental agency can do a satisfactory job if our substantive law remains unchanged.

I tried my hand at the formulation of a new set of standards in my monograph. These recommendations were adopted and included in the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. I beg leave to insert in the RECORD at this point pages 88 to 90 of my monograph where these standards are set out and discussed:

"For 50 years we have sought to curb undue concentration of economic power by attacking capital combinations after, rather than before, their formation. This has given rise to the vexing problem of unscrambling the eggs, and has created a psychological barrier to the vigorous enforcement and the sound interpretation of the law.

"We believe that no combination of competing companies should be permitted without the advance approval of an administrative agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission, operating under a new legislative standard. In a field such as this, it is impossible to formulate a standard which will be free of all uncertainty, unless some inflexible limitation on the size of corporate enterprise or the degree of permitted concentration in any industry is imposed. Limitations on corporate size, however, confuse bigness with monopoly. The adoption of any mathematical standard in respect of the permissible degree of control of any industry would strait-jacket our economy and would achieve certainty only at the expense of that flexibility without which the legal control of economic life cannot succeed. More general and less precise standards are to be preferred.

"We accordingly recommend the enactment of legislation—

"1. Prohibiting the acquisition of stock in and holding-company control of competing companies, in the case of corporations of a net worth of $1,000,000 or more, with suitable exceptions for bona fide investments and the control of true subsidiaries by parent corporations;

"2. Subjecting the acquisition of the assets and property of competing companies to administrative supervision in the case of corporations with a net worth of $5,000,000, or more, no such acquisition to be permitted without the advance approval of the Commission. The approval of a merger, consolidation, or property acquisition should only be granted if the Commission finds after investigation and hearing—

"(a) That the acquisition is in the public interest and will be promotive of greater efficiency and economy of production, distribution, and management;

"(b) That it will not substantially lessen competition, restrain trade, or tend to create a monopoly in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which such corporations are engaged;

"(c) That the corporations involved in such acquisition do not include one or more of the 10 leading companies in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which they are engaged as determined by plant capacity, output, or volume of sales of the goods or services as to which such corporations compete;

"(d) That the size of the acquiring company after the acquisition will not be incompatible with the existence and maintenance of vigorous and effective competition in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which it is engaged;

"(e) That the acquisition will not so reduce the number of competing companies in the trade, industry, or line of commerce as materially to lessen the effectiveness and vigor of competition in such trade, industry, or line of commerce;

"(f) That the size, strength, and position of the acquiring company after the acquisition will not be such as to enable it, by reason of its own administrative action, apart from the forces of competition, to fix and maintain the prices of the goods or services which it sells;

"(g) That the acquiring company has not, to induce the acquisition, indulged in any unfair or deceptive methods of competition or has not otherwise violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended.

"No merger should be approved which does not satisfy all of the standards. We have been content here to express merely the principles of this method of regulation; the standards themselves must be carefully drafted so as to be administrable and workable. The Commission should have the power in exceptional cases, notwithstanding noncompliance with the above-enumerated standards, to approve a proposed corporate acquisition where the public interest so requires as in the case of bankruptcy or threatened insolvency or where the combining companies are engaged in an industry dominated by a larger company and the integration is designed to remove or reduce the disparity of power between the combining and the dominant corporation.

"To facilitate the administration of the new law, a statutory presumption should be adopted making any acquisition or fusion presumptively unlawful when the acquiring company after the acquisition will control more than 15 percent of either capacity, output or volume of sales in the trade, industry, or line of commerce in which such company is engaged. This presumption should be subject to rebuttal by competent proof showing satisfaction of the statutory standards.

"Full judicial review should be permitted in cases where administrative approval of a contemplated acquisition is withheld.

"These tentative proposals would (1) outlaw the stock acquisition and holding com-

pany as methods of combining competing corporations without disturbing the legitimate use of the holding-company device in the relations between parent and subsidiary companies, (2) strengthen the administrative authority of the agencies entrusted with the administration of the new law thus avoiding the vexatious limitations upon the powers of enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission, (3) would clarify to a degree the substantive standards governing the legality of the combinations of competitors, (4) would employ the administrative rather than the judiciary in the initial application of standards which are as much economic as legal, and (5) would substitute prevention for punishment by requiring approval in advance of any integration rather than compulsory dissolution after the evils of concentration have been suffered by the public."

Legislation to carry out these suggestions has been introduced and is pending in the Congress. I have no pride of authorship. My proposals may be impractical and open to serious objection. I can conceive, however, of no more important task for this committee to undertake than the study of new legislative standards in respect of corporate integrations. This problem merits extensive examination when hearings are resumed.

Certainly there is enough wisdom in the country to enable fair, just, and administrable rules to be formulated. I am satisfied that unless effective standards are adopted, we must write off this phase of antitrust as a failure and anticipate an ever-growing concentration of economic power.

Whatever substantive changes are made in the law, it is vital that mergers and acquisitions be scrutinized before and not after they occur. As I previously indicated, prior administrative approval should be required under defined circumstances. There should, of course, be adqeuate court review of the administrative determination. This is one field of antitrust where declaratory rulings are possible without prejudicing antitrust enforcement. I agree with the Department of Justice in its opposition to the use of declaratory rulings in the case of agreements among independent competitors. The facts there are too fluid and ever-changing to enable an administrative body to act in advance of the actual execution of the arrangement. This is not true in the merger field where the facts are readily ascertainable and the effect of the proposed acquisition can be determined as effectively in advance of as after the event.

New standards will apply principally to future absorptions. This may leave untouched the concentration already existing. There would be a great social gain if the new law were to have prospective application only. The committee will want to give anxious consideration as to what should be done in regard to past acquisitions. There is obviously an element of unfairness in applying new rules retroactively. But there is an equal element of unfairness in depriving the American people of the benefits of competition in those fields where it has disappeared, become attenuated, or completely transformed.

Here again the committee will want all the wisdom that can be furnished by competent witnesses who have given thought to these problems. Out of its hearings may emerge a program commanding the support of all men of good will. Perhaps the committee will want the present law to be applied to past accretions of power. Perhaps it will want to set up special rules for the past. Or perhaps it will provide a long period of grace enabling voluntary reorganizations before the new standards become operative.

Likewise meriting full consideration by this committee is the problem of vertical integration. It would be utterly unworkable to hold that all vertical integration is unlawful and the Court properly rejected the Government's contention to this effect in the Columbia Steel case. It would be equally improper to sanction all vertical integrations solely because there is no elimination of competition between the combining parties. Where the line is to be drawn requires considerable study and factual investigation.

It is clear that vertical integration should not be permitted where the acquiring company already dominates one of the fields in which it operates. Through vertical expansion it can employ its power in one field as a leverage to dominate either prior or succeeding stages of the industry. Similarly, vertical integration ought not to be allowed where its effect is to withhold from competitors needed supplies or markets. It is utterly inconsistent with the competitive texture of our society for competitors to deal with one another as customers, as in the motion-picture industry, where producers operate their own theaters and license films of their rivals.

Vertical integration should likewise be prohibited where a company is the sole source for important supplies or is the principal user of raw materials produced by others. Such integrated concerns are in a position to engage in a squeeze play upon nonintegrated competitors by manipulating prices at various levels of the industry. There doubtless are other types of vertical integrations which should be prohibited. Rather than leave this matter to the courts for determination through the painful and lengthy process of case by case adjudication, it would appear wise for this committee to make a comprehensive study of the problem and to draft new legislation defining the limits of allowable vertical combination.

The third great branch of substantive antitrust doctrine has to do with the use of patents as a means of suppressing competition. A vast body of case law has been fashioned by the courts in recent years. Many recent antitrust prosecutions have been concerned with the misuse of patents. By and large, as I shall endeavor to demonstrate in my written memorandum, the courts have stalwartly refused to permit the patent monopoly to be projected beyond the precise boundaries of the grant. The job already done has been so spectacularly successful that I doubt whether any legislative change is presently indicated save in one regard.

In 1927 the Supreme Court in the General Electric case [6] upheld the right of a patentee to set the prices of his manufacturing licensees. The Department of Justice has repeatedly sought to have this precedent set aside by the Supreme Court. Four of the Justices in the recent Line Material case [7] were in favor of overruling the General Electric case. Three felt that the doctrine was sound and should be retained. One Justice was disqualified. Mr. Justice Reed, who handed down the judgment of the Court, wrote an opinion in which no other member of the Court concurred, and in which the General Electric case was limited to its precise facts. Unless legislative action is taken, we are in for a long period of uncertainty. In my judgment, the General Electric rule ought to be overturned and patentees inhibited from controlling the prices of their manufacturing licensees.

There may be other minor respects in which the relationship between the antitrust and patent laws merits legislative clarification. I would recommend that this entire problem be explored by the committee, and I shall endeavor to review the important authorities in my written report.

I come finally to the fourth branch of antitrust doctrine, namely, the elimination of business competition by combinations in which labor participates.

While the Supreme Court has narrowly restricted the application of antitrust to labor combinations, it has not granted labor a complete immunity. Before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Apex Hosiery case,[8] the antitrust laws were used to police labor disputes in interstate commerce. This led to great injustice as the antitrust laws are ill-suited for this purpose. Many legitimate activities of unions were improperly condemned as unlawful conspiracies. The Apex and kindred rulings provided the necessary corrective. Labor relations should be governed by statutes dealing specifically with that important subject. Antitrust has a big enough job in preserving the freedom of business competition. I should be unalterably opposed to any legislation which would endeavor to employ antitrust as an instrument for curbing alleged abuses on the part of labor unions.

There is no reason why labor should be free to combine with industry in curbing commercial competition in the goods and services produced or sold by employers. The Supreme Court has properly held that combinations between labor and industry which restrain business competition or lead to monopoly are interdicted by the statute.

As stated by Mr. Justice Black in *Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Local Union No. 3:* [9]

"We think Congress never intended that unions could, consistently with the Sherman Act, aid nonlabor groups to create business monopolies and to control the marketing of goods and services. * * *

"For if business groups, by combining with labor unions, can fix prices and divide up markets, it was little more than a futile gesture for Congress to prohibit price-fixing by business groups themselves. * * *

"A business monopoly is no less such because a union participates, and such participation is a violation of the act."

However, the Court has held that injunctions which may issue where labor combines with capital in suppressing business competition must reserve labor's freedom to engage in activities sheltered by the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia acts. This opens the door to a continuation of the improper restraints by labor acting alone. This hardly appears defensible to me. In the analogous field of the misuse of patents, the Court has not merely restrained the abuse but has deprived patentees of privileges which are inherent in the patent grant. Participation in an illegal scheme may result in a forfeiture of rights and privileges. The principle is even broader. As expressed in *U. S.* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc.:* [10]

"For equity has the power to uproot all parts of an illegal scheme—the valid as well as the invalid—in order to rid the trade or commerce of all taint of the conspiracy."

Where a union has improperly participated in an illegal scheme, it is appropriate in proper cases for it to lose privileges which it otherwise would possess in order that the court may enter an effective decree preventing recurrence of the wrongful acts. It is not a legitimate activity of a union to conspire with industry in stifling business competition, and when it steps out of role it must, like every other wrongdoer, accept the consequences.

While there is not the time nor am I now prepared to discuss the construction and administration of the Robinson-Patman Act, I should respectfully urge that the committee include the clarification of that obscure and difficult law on its agenda of legislative revision.

---

[6] *U. S.* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476 (1926)).

[7] *U. S.* v. *Line Material Co.* (334 U. S. 287 (1948)).

[8] *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader* (310 U. S. 469 (1940)).

[9] 325 U. S. 797 (1945).

[10] 334 U. S. 131 (1948).

I should like now to address myself to the need for reform in the procedural and enforcement aspects of antitrust.

The striking weakness of our antitrust laws is that they do not adequately deter wrongdoing. Without adequate deterrents, no law can be enforced, particularly a law applicable to most American industries. Enforcement breaks down when litigation is necessary in most instances to obtain compliance.

The principal deterrent today is the cost in time and money of defending antitrust actions. The importance of this factor is not to be underestimated. Yet we will all agree that it is unsound in the administration of the law to rely on the cost of defense as a preventive of infraction. Such costs may be a small price to pay for the fruits of violation. And it may prevent the small-business man from defending himself against groundless charges.

The criminal sanctions are notoriously ineffective. Jail sentences are virtually never imposed. A fine of $5,000 is a picayune penalty for the grandiose schemes involved in many prosecutions.

Antitrust suits generally commence with the blaring of trumpets. Years are spent in pre-trial maneuvers. Trials are protracted and complex. Guilty defendants are excoriated in bristling opinions. As a feeble anticlimax, moderate fines are assessed. The decrees in equity suits, even though they have become more and more drastic over the years, do not always dissipate all the effects of wrongdoing.

It is not easy to appraise the efficacy of consent judgments by which a large proportion of antitrust litigation is terminated. These judgments are the product of negotiation. Court approval is little more than an empty gesture. The decrees are cast in stereotyped language. The facts upon which they are based are not revealed. The reasons prompting the inclusion of various provisions are unexplained. The public is completely in the dark as to the rationale and effect of these consent decrees. Some provisions on their face appear harsh and oppressive. Their actual effect may be nugatory. Others which look innocuous may seriously fetter the future legitimate operations of the defendants. There being no disclosure of the underlying facts and no explanation of the reasons for particular provisions, it is utterly impossible to determine whether the decrees follow a consistent pattern of enforcement, not merely from one administration to another, but within limited periods of time.

Hit-and-miss prosecutions scattered over the economic scene may result in impressive victories and subject the losing defendants to severe restrictions, without any substantial over-all effect in ridding an industry or the economy of serious restraints. Where improper practices are rife throughout a single industry or in all industries, the public can only begin to receive the benefits of vigorous prosecution when the practice is widely suppressed. The fact that a few businessmen are curbed by court decree may be of slight public significance, and, indeed, may place the restrained defendants at a serious disadvantage in competing with those against whom the Government has not as yet proceeded. The antitrust division in the past 15 years has become very much alive to this fact and has moved in the direction of concentrating its energies on particular practices occurring in many industries and in launching suit against all or most of the members of particular industries.

Both the Sherman and Clayton Acts authorize private suits for treble damages by the victims of monopoly and collusive restraints. These victims typically are small-business men. They rarely have the financial resources for expensive litigation.

They sue after they have been driven out of business or after their enterprises have been weakened. The reported cases indicate that such private suits are rarely successful. They founder because of inability to marshal the facts of substantive violation, because of procedural obstacles or inability to establish legal damage.

In 1914 Congress provided in the Clayton Act that prima facie effect be given in such private actions to final judgments in decrees rendered in governmental suits. The theory of this provision was that the private action would be greatly facilitated by simplifying the proofs necessary to establish a substantive violation and by the avoidance of a retrial of issues that had already been fully litigated in the Government proceeding. This purpose has not been fully achieved. Firstly, the private suitor must await the entry of final judgment and this may be a matter of years. Secondly, the judgment is only prima facie proof, and if the defendants endeavor to repel the presumption, the plaintiffs must be prepared to meet such rebutting testimony. It is an egregious waste of time of the litigants and of the courts to compel the retrial of complex substantive issues each time a private suit is brought.

I would suggest, therefore, the following administrative and procedural reforms:

1. Substantial increases in the appropriations of the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission.

Even the most skeptical must now admit that it has been abundantly demonstrated in the past 20 years that the anitrust laws can be enforced. Each appropriation dollar wisely spent can be translated into vast savings to the public.

2. The maximum fine for each antitrust violation should be substantially increased. Transgression should be made unprofitable.

3. It should no longer be necessary for injured parties to bring separate suits. After the court has determined in a Government proceding that the antitrust laws have been violated, it should be authorized by new legislation to designate a special master to hear and determine the claims of those injured by the violation. The only issue before the special master should be the casual relation between the violation and the claimant's injury and the amount of damage sustained. There should be no necessity to reprove the substantive violation itself. Appeals from the determination of the special master should go directly to the circuit courts of appeal. The imminent prospect of actually compensating aggrieved parties would be a potent deterrent to future antitrust violation. With a suitable and effective procedure for the redress of private injury, it might no longer be necessary to treble the damages. The power to do so might be left in the discretion of the master, to be exercised in flagrant cases of wrongdoing.

4. Declaratory rulings by the Federal Trade Commission in cases of mergers and other acquisitions will greatly facilitate antitrust enforcement. With this new and heavy responsibility assigned to the Federal Trade Commission, there would be no need for overlapping jurisdiction over collusive restraints by both the Commission and the Department of Justice. That task could be assigned exclusively to the Department.

5. The reluctance of courts to impose prison sentences might be overcome by a declaration in the report of this committee favoring such sentences in cases of flagrant and deliberate violation. Criminal prosecutions are not suitable vehicles for testing out novel questions of law. These should be reserved for equity proceedings.

6. The Department should be encouraged to ban every effort at the simplification of antitrust proceedings. The complexity of the facts makes protracted litigation sometimes inevitable. But there are numerous cases which can be scaled down to reasonable limits. It is a common comment that antitrust cases are frequently overtried. This is an administrative matter which must be left to the good judgment of the Department.

7. Procedures should be developed for prompt, informal disposition of minor complaints without the necessity for the formal institution of suit.

8. The Department should be required to present to the Court in every case where litigation is terminated by consent decree a full statement of the underlying facts and the reasons which have led to its insistence or acceptance of each provision of the decree. These statements should be published. In this way the administrative jurisprudence of antitrust would be collated and made available to the public. Even-handed justice requires such full disclosures.

9. This committee should set up a permanent watchdog subcommittee to keep itself informed on all current developments in antitrust enforcement. It should be alert to recommend legislative changes as shortcomings in our laws are exposed. Its principal task, however, should be to review all pending legislation and governmental action to determine whether they are consistent with our fundamental antitrust policies. Such coordination is manifestly desirable and necessary.

Antitrust is not and never has been a partisan issue. It was enacted during a Republican administration. Its major revisions were adopted during Democratic administrations. Its most vigorous enforcement has occurred in both Democratic and Republican administrations alike. Both major parties have included antitrust planks in their platforms in virtually every presidential election since the enactment of the statute. It should therefore be possible to find common ground for a program of reform which will command bipartisan support.

Address of Hon. Clifford Davis, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 last I had the pleasure of speaking to the soil conservation supervisors, representing the 21 counties located in the western division of the State of Tennessee at the Shelby County penal farm. These gentlemen met at this farm, which is a show place in the South. Operated by the county and using prison labor, it serves as a model for the demonstration of up-to-date and scientific farm procedures. The fundamentals and refinements of soil conservation have been demonstrated on the large acreage operated by the county government. It seemed most appropriate to me that we should have held this meeting under such an advantageous setting.

Because of an ever-increasing interest in the protection of the land, that the greatest possible use of it may be employed, substantial interest was manifested in this important meeting. At the request of the representatives in attendance, I transcribed for a later broadcast my remarks over Station WMC. In asking that this be done, those most active in leadership in soil conservation were anxious that a great many of the listening public should be informed about the

importance of this program. In addition, they requested that I place these remarks in the RECORD, in order that copies might be made available for wide distribution to those throughout Tennessee who feel the necessity of increasing all efforts to make the program of soil conservation, the care of erosion, and the development of our streams more effective.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you have honored me by this invitation to speak to this splendid group of men so interested in the protection of land in western Tennessee. Our section of the country is blossoming like a rose. All of western Tennessee is situated on or near the great Mississippi River, which gives us an entree to the foreign ports of the world through the Panama Canal, and which extends our shipping possibilities to the Great Lakes, to the Midwest, through Chicago, and to the East as we are able to ship by barge up that great river and through the Ohio to great industrial centers of that section of our country. We have a fine system of highways, radiating to every part of the United States. Served by 13 trunk-line railroads and enjoying most adequate transportation by airlines, we are conveniently located to participate in the development of a nation commanding world leadership. The establishment of cheap TVA electricity has enabled us to go forward greatly in industrial development.

With this very brief statement of some of our basic, fundamental advantages, I shall confine myself to the subject which prompts your presence here.

Of all the domestic issues confronting the political, economic, and social leaders of our country, none are more urgent than those dealing with agriculture and our farmers. The Nation and our farmers are on the brink of serious trouble. During World War II, our country asked our farmers to produce at an unprecedented level—one-third more than they had ever before. We had to have that much more—especially in grains and oils—to win the war. Our farmers produced it. They did their part in winning the war. But in doing it, the Nation's agricultural plant was thrown out of gear. Genuine, long-range legislation that would help farmers put our Nation's agriculture into a peacetime gear and provide for the welfare of our farmers is badly needed. And the urgency for wise action is increasing every day.

Yet, unfortunately, no issues have created more controversy. Pressure groups from every economic area of agriculture are pulling wires, manipulating facts, and circumstances in an effort to protect their individual interests. The result is a hesitancy or indecision that shrouds the legislative attempts of Congress to provide for our farmers.

Our Nation and the Democratic Party are dedicated to various programs for the welfare of our farmers—such as soil and water conservation, price support, better farm housing, research, farm loans at inexpensive rates of interest, and rural electrification.

Yet with all of this, many in Congress and many others at the head of pressure groups still fail to recognize the basic problem confronting agriculture. Many of those who have a smattering of this basic problem have not as yet recognized its many tangents and the subproblems that are attached.

What is this basic problem? This problem is land use—how every farmer in our country is using each acre of his land and what that acre is capable of producing safely and economically. All of you know this problem because you are very close to it. Maladjustment in agricultural production—some may refer to it as surplus crops—is not the problem itself but is a major result. Another result is the tremendous rate and expense of soil erosion and the loss of the natural productive capacity of our once rich crop, pasture, and wood lands.

We did not have part of these problems during the war years because there was one urgency in agriculture at that time—to produce food and fiber. If the land could be protected and guarded against erosion in the process, so much the better. Fortunately, during this period we discovered that good soil- and water-conservation measures not only helped to protect the land but enabled farmers to obtain greater yields. There was no problem of producing too much. If we produced too much of one crop and it could not be shipped, we ate more of that crop and less of another that could be shipped to needy countries who were our allies in a world war.

Even after the war while many peoples were still suffering from the ravages and shock of war close at hand, the productive genius of our agriculture was still needed, even though we were still robbing much of our cropland of its basic productive capacity.

We are now in a new era. Agricultural production can no longer continue along a topsy-turvy road. Agriculture must be shifted into a peacetime gear. Many will say that's what we are doing—with our acreage allotments and marketing quotas and price supports. Unfortunately, however, these economic and control methods which should be used merely as temporary or stopgap methods are being accepted without much thought toward the basic problem—that of proper land use. They curtail production while the productive genius of our agriculture should be encouraged, helped, and directed toward a higher standard of living for all of our people. If we will develop a long-range agricultural program that will provide this, we will accomplish two worthy objectives: (1) We will open a new, rich world for the farmers of our country; and (2) we will enable our farmers to use their land without destroying its basic productive capacity, and control the costly processes of soil erosion that will eventually destroy our high standard of living if left unchecked.

I have been quoted as saying that entirely too little genuine soil and water conservation is being practiced here in western Tennessee. I did say that, and I repeat it today. There is far too little in western Tennessee, central Tennessee, and eastern Tennessee. There is far too little in every one of the other 47 States of our Nation. And there will be far too little until the Nation awakens to the seriousness of this problem, and everyone—city man and farmer alike—join hands to control this needless waste of our agricultural wealth.

Let me ask you three questions:

1. In 1948 nearly 351,000,000 acres of cropland were harvested. Of this, 148,500,000 acres were in intertilled or row crops, 129,000,000 acres in close-growing or small-grain crops, and 73,500,000 acres in meadow or hay crops. Considering the capabilities of the land for safe, economic production, and the necessity for soil-conserving and soil-building rotations, at least one-third of the land in row crops and one-fourth of the land in small grain in 1948 should have been in meadow or hay crops for minimum good land use. Does that not prove that there is far too little soil and water conservation?

2. At the present time, around 25 percent of the cropland of our country is being damaged at a rapid rate by erosion. This is an area of approximately 110,000,000 acres of cropland. The productive capacity of much of this land will be permanently damaged and some 500,000 acres a year ruined for further cultivation, unless it is placed under a sound conservation farming system within the next 10 to 15 years. On another large area—around 110,000,000 to 120,000,000 acres of cropland—erosion is proceeding at a less rapid but still serious rate. If we are to protect and save the natural productive capacity of these lands, they must be safeguarded by conservation treatment within the next 15 to 30 years. Is that doing enough soil conservation?

3. Erosion has removed more than three-fourths of the topsoil from 41 percent of the land in Tennessee. Additionally, 23 percent of the land has lost between one-fourth and three-fourths of its original topsoil. Thus, 64 out of every 100 Tennessee acres are being damaged seriously by erosion. Is that enough soil conservation?

Studies of the capability of the more than six and a half million acres of land in the 21 western Tennessee counties reveals that there are about 28,000 acres than can be considered class I land, very good land that can be safely cultivated with ordinary good farming practices. There are nearly 800,000 acres of class II land. This is land that can be cultivated safely with easily applied conservation practices. However, nearly half of this land is wet, and badly in need of drainage to make it productive. There are about 1,939,000 acres of class III land. This is moderately good land that can be used regularly for cultivated crops in a good rotation but needs intensive conservation treatment. About half of this land also needs drainage work. Class IV land is fairly good land that is best suited to pasture and hay but can be cultivated if handled with great care. A recapitulation of these facts shows that for safe production not more than 1,550,000 (approximately) should be planted to row crops or small grain in any 1 year on the average. This would allow for a minimum soil-conserving and soil-building rotation that would help to protect the land against erosion and help to maintain its fertility.

How much of this land is now being used for row crops and small grain? These 21 western counties are harvesting on the average nearly 3,000,000 acres of row crops and small grain annually. Compare this again with the slightly more than a million and a half that is actually safely available for such production.

Apply that same situation in varying degrees on the cropland throughout the Nation and we find the same basic problem—that of improper land use.

Can you say that there is enough soil conservation being done?

But you've already answered that question. The answer is obvious. Your answer is reflected in your readiness to comply with your soil conservation programs and in the soil conservation districts that have been organized in more than half of our western Tennessee counties. There are now soil conservation districts in Lauderdale, Obion, Weakly, Gibson, Madison, Hardeman, Crockett, Dyer, Haywood, and Shelby counties. Others are in the process of being organized in other western Tennessee counties.

Much of the credit for conservation progress should be directed to the supervisors of our soil conservation districts and to the committeemen of the agricultural conservation program for the sincerity with which they are assuming responsibility and leadership in agricultural matters of concern to every farmer.

The soil conservation district is a part of our State government, organized into being by the farmers themselves and operated by those same farmers. In Tennessee, farmers have organized 31 soil conservation districts which cover a third of our State. Nationwide, farmers have organized 2,200 districts which embrace more than three-fourths of our farmland. As of January 1 of this year, these same districts with the help of Soil Conservation Service technicians had completed the acre-by-acre farm planning of nearly 190,000,000 acres, with treatment completed on more than half of that acreage. This is real democracy in action. The United States Department of Agriculture through its Soil Conservation Service, one of the finest

agencies in the Department, places its technicians in soil conservation districts to be of service to the farmers cooperating with these districts, to help them develop their district conservation programs and their farm conservation plans which enable them to use every acre of their land wisely and profitably, and protect each acre with the conservation practices it needs.

The agricultural conservation program, sometimes referred to as the old AAA program, or the PMA program, is another example of the Department of Agriculture helping farmers with their agricultural problems. The conservation payments made available to farmers for them to apply simple conservation practices to their land has returned the Nation many benefits.

Add to these farmer conservation movements the help being given by business, farm organizations, ministers, school teachers, garden clubs, and sportsmen's groups, the press and radio, contractor and machinery companies, bankers, railroad institutions, manufacturers, and a great many others and you have a force that cannot fail.

Nor should we forget the support given by such specific programs as your plant-to-prosper campaign, initiated by the Commercial Appeal, your save-enrich-our-soil contest, sponsored by the Friends of the Land, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, and the State Bankers Association. Likewise, we should recognize such conservation leaders as our commissioners of agriculture, conservation, and education, for the help they are giving our farmers in their conservation efforts. The result is teamwork that cannot fail.

In many ways, soil conservation is a good-neighbor policy. The conservation work you do not only reaps you many benefits—such as cheaper costs of production and greater security—but passes many others on to your neighbors. Good conservation is a basic need of any flood-control program. Here in western Tennessee, erosion and loss of water resources contribute heavily to flood and sedimentation damages.

It is alarming when we recognize that on the average 3,500 acres of crops are destroyed annually in the Wolf River watershed as a result of floods. The agricultural loss alone totals $72,000. In the past 4 years, the Corps of Army Engineers has removed 420,000 cubic yards of silt from the Memphis Harbor at an annual cost of $62,000. At least 40 percent of this silt was deposited by Wolf River, robbed from the thin layer of topsoil left on the agricultural land in the watershed. In the Wolf River watershed, 45 percent of the land has lost more than 75 percent of its original topsoil. In periods of high water, the cost of sediment damage is much greater. In 1935, 2,210,000 cubic yards of silt had to be removed at a cost of $300,000. The estimated annual flood and sediment damage in Wolf River watershed alone is $97,000. And remember, all of us pay taxes which help pay for these damages. Other rivers also contribute their share of damage. The annual flood and sediment damage on the Hatchie River is estimated at more than $400,000.

Teamwork among city and rural people is necessary to put modern soil conservation on land—and only through teamwork can the job be done.

What is this modern soil-conservation job? Besides being based on sound land use and the treatment of land with certain conservation measures to keep that land forever productive while in use, modern soil conservation means terracing land that needs terracing. It means contouring and strip-cropping the land as needed, along with supporting practices of crop rotations, cover crops, etc., wherever needed. It means gully control, stabilizing water outlets, building farm ponds, locating farm roads and fences on the contour, and planting steep, erodible lands to grass or trees. Where the land is too wet, modern soil conservation calls for drainage; if it is too dry, it calls for irrigation; if plant nutrients have been depleted, it calls for fertilization. And modern soil conservation calls also for the use of the best of the most adaptable varieties of crops, as well as the most efficient tools available to farmers.

Each measure is applied to meet a specific need, as determined by actual physical analysis of the land through soil conservation surveys, wherein each individual parcel of land is classified according to kind and need. Combinations of mutually supporting measures are very often used to safeguard the more hazardous types of land and what is done in one place is adjusted to the needs of adjacent land.

There is no other way to carry out a successful job of lasting soil conservation, the kind that can be maintained on the land permanently. That must be our goal. When we achieve it, many of the agricultural and land use problems plaguing the American farmer and the Nation will have vanished.

National Committee for Free Europe, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent and close friend of mine recently recalled to me the fact that September 1 marked the tenth anniversary of the unexpected beginning of tragic World War II. She suggested that I invite the attention of the House to the significance of that date, and told me that a committee with which she is connected, the National Committee for Free Europe, Inc., of which the Honorable Joseph C. Grew is chairman, had taken some initiative in bringing home to as many people as the committee could reach, the events of these 10 years, in order that our people may be more awakened than they were in 1939 to the very close relationship between this country and other parts of the world. I think I need not dwell at length on this. Much of the time of this House has been devoted during this session to many of the problems which have grown out of that war, and more particularly, out of the so-called peace in which all intelligent people are so interested.

The committee which she mentioned impressed me greatly and prompted me to make inquiry about it. The results of my inquiry I should like to record for all to read.

It is heartening to know that a group of most distinguished citizens have organized themselves and are giving of their time to an intelligent program aimed at supporting what we do here in Washington. They are private citizens and, therefore, they can freely do many things which we cannot do in Washington.

Their chairman is the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, who was for 10 years our Ambassador in Japan, and before that Ambassador to Turkey, and Minister in a variety of posts. He, in fact, has spent all his life in diplomatic service. He is a man, therefore, of a full experience in international affairs, and in personal character is a most distinguished representative of the United States. He is a career diplomat and a hard-working public spirited citizen.

Associated with the chairman, who follows and discusses with his organization every move and every detail of their activity, are, among others: The Honorable Adolf A. Berle, Jr., whose forceful character and intellectual qualities are widely and favorably known. Another member is Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose name alone lends significance, prestige and courage to this effort. I found that the committee reaches out to a variety of groups in the country and I cite, for instance, James B. Carey, whose fight in the CIO to rid it of the Communist taint is known to all of us; William Green, president, and Matthew Woll, vice president, of the American Federation of Labor, whose organization is playing a strong and useful role in this general cause; the Honorable James A. Farley, whose vast experience in the political life of this country and in problems concerning the security and happiness of the peoples of all countries will be most constructively helpful. There are publishers, such as DeWitt Wallace, of the Reader's Digest, and Henry R. Luce, of Life, Time, and Fortune; distinguished lawyers, as former Attorney General Francis Biddle, Allen W. Dulles, Joseph V. McKee, and Charles M. Spofford, and others equally prominent in their fields.

They organized themselves in June of this year. Reference to that was made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the date of June 6, and their declaration of policy was published. They have had only 3 months in which to function, but from what I have learned, they have already done some very worth while and helpful things. They will be moving ahead into wider fields of activity. Their principal task is to give opportunty to exiled political and intellectual leaders of the countries behind the iron curtain. They have given these leaders a welcoming hand and have aided a number of them to find activity useful for themselves, their native countries, and for this country. I could mention, for instance, that a group of 12 experts are now at work classifying and making available to the public and to Government departments the new laws, proclamations, and edicts emanating from their homelands and collected in the Library of Congress. This material is of no use until it is translated, cataloged, digested, analyzed, and studied. This is what they are doing so that we may know and they may know the details of the new and sometimes fantastic regimes which are being set up by the Communist minority ruthlessly oppressing the countries dominated.

I asked whether steps were being taken to make these men better known to us and to give us a chance to hear their own actual experiences. I learned that indeed this is already in increasing operation. Qualified speakers from among them will address interested groups anywhere in the country. I suggest that

Members of the House might submit suggestions to the National Committee for Free Europe, indicating groups of their own constituents who would like to hear at first hand what it means to be face to face with or imprisoned by a Communist totalitarian police government.

I learned, too, that this committee will afford opportunities on radio to the exiled leaders so that their followers at home may actually hear well-known and sympathetic voices. This will not supplant the Voice of America, but rather it will supplement it.

The nature of this whole effort won my interest. It became apparent to me that the National Committee for Free Europe is not another of those much needed, wholly laudable groups of kindly intentioned fellow-citizens, whose sympathy goes to persons in distress. It is rather a type of effort with a very real and practical purpose; advantageous, of course, to the exiled individuals concerned, but preeminently directed toward the ultimate goal for which we and they are striving—the goal of permanent peace in an enlightened and free world. Their work is, therefore, political—political in an international sense and only incidentally humanitarian.

I predict we shall hear more of this National Committee for Free Europe, and I believe that it would be useful and proper to bring it to the attention of good citizens who might wish to aid it in its great work.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, among my remarks I include part 17 of the Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak. In this part Mr. Neal describes the gyrations that some members of the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineers Corps go through every time one of his articles appear in the local paper. Part 17 is not only interesting and amusing, but enlightening. It shows just how the little autocrats and bureaucrats try to lord it over the men and women who made this Nation what it is. Here is part 17:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XVII

When I began this series of articles, I was talking through the medium of a country newspaper with a circulation of almost three thousand; to an audience made up wholly of my neighbors. In 3 months I was startled to find that my audience had grown to a figure several times the combined circulation of all the newspapers in North Dakota.

When I started, I spoke entirely in the language of the prairies because I wanted to be understood and listened to by a lot of people like myself, of very common clay. Suddenly I found I was talking to two Cabinet members, a small army of Congressmen and Senators, the president of the National Reclamation Association, about two dozen generals and a battalion of lawyers in nearly every State in the Union. In short, I had literally butted head first into the brain trust of the Nation.

Trying to talk on my own level, and to the heights at the same time, has produced a hodgepodge of literary composition. Out here on the prairies, the most inflammable thing we have is the over-ripe Russian thistle. You pile them up and touch a match to them. But before you can clamp your hat over your face, the light and the heat have gone, the smoke has drifted away and the ground is gray with trembling ashes.

And so my writing has flared and dimmed into a mess that is neither light, nor heat, nor ashes, until I have sat here staring at farmers and statesmen, German-Russians, and three-starred generals, alternately sticking their heads up between the keys of my typewriter. If it is true that confession is good for the soul, I hasten to admit that this document comes as near to being pure junk from a literary standpoint as any I ever saw. And yet this very junk has reached and is being read by people numbering thousands upon thousands.

Not only is it a puzzling thing but it is something that makes me feel very humble indeed. It makes me wonder about what I said early in my narrative. Some of you will remember that I said I knew my cause was just, and I hoped Almighty God would give me strength to correct at least some of these wrongs done to my neighbors. Judging from past experience, I didn't expect that prayer to go very high. But—well, I have gone 10 times farther than I ever expected, and I hope God will remember that my cause is great, though my literary ability may be small.

In the beginning I told you that when I armed myself with a dishpan for a shield, a pole for a lance, mounted on a balky mule, and set out to joust with the windmill that was the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps, I was fighting the policy of that organization. Now I know that this policy is nothing more than a manifestation. It is a slender tentacle, reaching out through the lymphatics of our Government, tracing the path of the cancerous growth to come. In reality it is regimentation, autocracy, fascism, intolerance, and a lust for power, eating its way slowly but surely into the vitals of democracy.

Over in Riverdale there is a man who, every time an issue of this paper reaches him, goes right up the lamp cord above his desk until he cracks his head on the ceiling. And when he comes down, his voice carries to many of his employees as he says with emphasis, "This man Neal must be stopped." When this issue reaches him, it will mark his seventeenth trip to the ceiling. Perhaps it is too much for me to hope that this trip will wear the insulation from his lamp cord.

But right here, I am going to adopt his phraseology, along with a silent prayer, that it may be more conspicuously successful for me than for him. To you of the Congress, to every citizen of this great land of ours, I say, "This thing must be stopped." If you and I are to maintain a shred of liberty in America, this damnable thing which manifests itself by driving men, women, and children from their homes without reasonable compensation, here in the valley of the Missouri and in almost every other State in the Union, must be rooted out of our governmental system. For once and for all.

I had thought this issue would bring to an end this series of articles. Finding that, while I had forced the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps to make a complete change in its tactics, I had thought of a vacation. But now, just in from a tour of investigation across the battle line in the valley of the upper Missouri, I find that my extremely able and resourceful opponents have concocted a fear-inspiring campaign, even more diabolical than they have used in the past. In the light of it there is nothing to do but to oil up my typewriter and spread this thing out for the public to read.

This brings to an end the first section of the Valley of the Dammed. At this point the Independent is again running short of type metal and they will have to print this pamphlet form to release the type. After that I'll tighten up my belt and set out again, riding as hard as I may on the trail of cruelty and injustice.

In closing, my heartfelt thanks to the Congress of the United States and the House of Representatives, in particular, for their hospitality. If any real and lasting good comes from my efforts, it will be through your generosity.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from Paul B. Lawson, dean of the college of liberal arts and sciences, Kansas University, Lawrence, Kans., in which Dean Lawson presented his reasons for opposing Federal aid to education.

The letter is informative, and presents a view which I think will be of interest to many of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for that reason I desire to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
AND SCIENCES,
Lawrence, August 26, 1949.

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: We have rarely written our Senator to express an opinion on a public matter. Occasionally, however, we feel too keenly about an issue to keep still without having the feeling of being derelict in our responsibility as citizens. Such a matter is now before the Congress, hence this letter.

We wish to urge you to do all you can to prevent the Federal Government from going into the business of supporting education by any such grants as are proposed in current bills. We should like to present our reasons for opposing Federal aid for education:

1. No evidence has been presented to show that the Federal Government needs to subsidize education. As long as the people can afford to spend the enormous sums they do for liquor, tobacco, soft drinks, cosmetics, gambling, and a host of other luxuries, they can spend a lot more for education in every State of the Union. So long as the people of our country have billions to spend for the luxuries of life, why should they go begging to the Federal Government for support of anything as essential as education?

2. Such subsidies must inevitably lead to governmental control of education in spite of all protestations to the contrary. This is only too obvious from past and present experiences with governmental subsidies.

3. Why set up a system which must take from the States more money than it can possibly return to the States? Under any such

system millions of tax dollars collected ostensibly for education must go for administrative expenses, and will not be used for educational purposes at all.

4. America was built by people who supported the Government; not by people whom the Government had to support. Surely the time has come for all Americans to get their feet out of the public trough, and we should like to see education and educators take the lead in getting off the "gravy train." If we school people do not have the ability to sell education to the people, we do not deserve additional support from any source.

Many of the country's leading educators are opposed to Federal subsidies for education, and certainly they take their stand because of the conviction that Federal aid would be detrimental rather than beneficial. We are sure that they are not such fools, or such haters of money, that they would refuse Federal funds if they felt such funds would really help the cause of education.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. LAWSON,
Dean.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Playing a Leader's Part," wherein it is pointed out that the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the Senate without the protectionist peril-point amendment is proof of our awareness of the responsibilities which are now ours because of America's new position in the world.

It further sets forth that the lowering of tariff barriers will contribute to prosperity and peace. In a few short paragraphs this editorial tells the whole story of the Hull program, and I recommend it to the Senate and to the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING A LEADER'S PART

Americans are almost daily showing more awareness of the responsibilities the United States' new world position thrusts upon them. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the latest evidence.

While there were close votes in the Senate on minor amendments, the peril-point plan lost by a larger margin and the final vote was 62 to 19. Combined with a big majority in the House, this gives the Hull program a stronger backing than it has had in peacetime.

The decision means that the United States will assert a more vigorous leadership in the development of world trade. America can now press for mutual lowering of trade barriers without appearing to act in bad faith by then itself suddenly raising a peril-point blockade. It can escape from the ridiculous position of saying, "We want to help Britain earn more dollars by selling more goods in the United States—but not if they are going to compete with American goods."

The whole spirit of the peril-point approach was protectionist. Its machinery would have tended to forestall any trade that spelled effective competition for American producers, no matter how much that trade benefited American consumers by holding down prices or American exporters by opening markets abroad. The spirit of the Hull program was to seek these benefits for Americans—plus a healthier world economy—without destroying any domestic industry.

The procedures set up under the Trade Agreements Act provide hearings for American producers who feel they will be endangered. Also there are in all the later agreements escape clauses in case proven peril points actually develop from the operation of the trade pacts. This plan did not promise automatic protection to inefficient producers, but there is no persuasive evidence that under it any efficient industry has been greatly damaged. Indeed it promotes efficiency—and higher living standards.

In fact the results of nearly 15 years' experience with this program are very much on the credit side. But it is natural that domestic producers should seek protection, and politically they often exert much power—as was shown in the Senate votes on furs and oil. There is reason to believe that the American people as a whole sense advantages—both for prosperity and peace—in lowering tariff barriers. But there is need for more understanding of the value of greater freedom in world trade relations. For the full benefits of the law will be achieved only when it is more intelligently and actively supported by public opinion.

Speech by Carroll B. Huntress at Annual Banquet of New England Fuels Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, at the annual banquet of the New England Fuels Institute, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., on September 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

However hackneyed this phrase, I use it because it expresses my feelings perfectly—I am mighty glad to be here tonight. Pleasure lies in the fact that you constitute a group of men that really represents that dynamic principle of American life, free enterprise. Certainly, if you did not stand for that principle you would not be in the fuels business; for I can conceive of no activity that calls for a greater degree of enterprise. In too many places, these days, there is too much tendency to give lip service to free enterprise and, in the same breath, to accept glittering proposals, one after another, that lead step by step to the so-called welfare state.

This welfare state resembles a barnyard. The food and shelter might be pretty good when the head man is O. K.; that is, a beneficent dictator. But when he goes berserk or runs out of money, life gets rough and tough. Anyhow, most of us don't relish the role of contented cow. We favor the life of freeman, risks and all.

Notice, please, I do not say, "private enterprise." That is a term to which the Socialists can readily give a cynical implication of something counter to public interest. Of course, nearly all American business is based on the public interest. Business serves the needs of the public. That is its main function and its only possible channel of success. The much-talked-about incompatibility between private interest and public interest is a false issue, a mirage that lures us away from the path of true progress. The issue we face is between free enterprise and fettered enterprise under big government. More and more the freedom of the citizen is being restricted. He is being enticed and bribed into subservience to a bunch of eager beavers; those uninhibited seekers after power, not only to run the country but also to run our lives.

You are to be commended for the constructive program of your 3-day meeting and the splendid representation here from each of the six New England States. All benefit from attendance. No major matter relating to your business is missing from the interesting agenda. So it seems not amiss to mention this over-all subject of current debate, referred to as the welfare state, in which direction we are drifting. To reverse that trend is the No. 1 job of every enterpriser; for should the trend continue, the United States would cease to be fertile soil for their talents. What would it profit an enterpriser to live in a country where toupees were freely distributed and also washed, at government expense, four times a year? The only course left for the enterpriser would be to challenge the eager beavers and wrestle in the political arena, no holds barred. Perhaps it's later than we think and 12 o'clock is about to strike.

These observations are introductory to a discussion of the legislative proposal for the St. Lawrence canal and power project, which is nearly but not quite as ancient as the hills of this Granite State. Because of the significance which this proposal has lately assumed in the gigantic chess game being played in this country over the issue of the so-called welfare state, it is important that every advocate of the free-enterprise system be apprised of the fallacies inherent in the St. Lawrence scheme. It is urgent that New Englanders be alerted to the danger of the body blow which the navigation phase of the project aims at the economy of this section of the country.

Prefatory to an examination of the St. Lawrence plan, it is helpful to remember that the river has a turbulent flow in its 175 miles from Lake Ontario to Montreal, dropping 225 feet in a succession of rapids. The Canadians have long maintained navigation past the rapids by a series of side canals and locks, which have a depth of 14 feet. The river is heavily ice covered for about 5 months, when no navigation is possible.

The plan for changing the ways of this old river—and I can vouch for a few of its years because I was born on its bank, Amerisan side—includes the construction of dams at three points, to transform its downhill tumble into a series of three, long, politely descending steps. Hydroelectric power plants would be built at each of the three dam sites. New canals and locks would be built to carry ships past the dams. And the river bottom would be dredged and blasted out, where necessary, to provide the desired channel dimensions.

As to the depth of the proposed channel, most of the planning has been for 27 feet, but consideration has been given to both a 30-foot and a 35-foot channel. Some work would be required on the channels connecting the Great Lakes, so that the greater depth would be available all the way from Lake Superior. The latest construction cost estimates published by the United States Army Corps of Engineers are:

With 27-foot channel, $802,000,000.

With 30-foot channel, $1,048,000,000 (tentatively).

With 35-foot channel, $1,755,000,000 (if guessing is good).

These figures cover only future construction—nothing already finished, such as Canada's Welland Canal or our own MacArthur Lock at Sault Ste. Marie. No harbor work is included in these figures, even for channels and turning basins, let alone docks and cargo-handling facilities, which, to serve a 27-foot canal for the 80 United States lake ports alone, would cost well over $200,000,000.

The only powerhouse work included in the figures is at the single site on the international section of the river near Massena, N. Y., where the two countries would have practically identical power plants. The powerhouses farther downstream, in wholly Canadian territory, have been left out of these cost figures, although the dams and river work have been included. Canada would enlarge the development at Beauharnois, some 20 miles upstream from Montreal, and would build an entirely new power plant at the Lachine Rapids, adjacent to the city of Montreal.

Analysis of the legislative proposal now before the Congress—Senate Joint Resolution 99 and its counterpart in the House—shows that the bill calls for a 27-foot channel and speaks of making the new navigation works self-liquidating by charging tolls. It also speaks of selling to the State of New York the power plant to be built on the United States side of the border. Thus, the bill presents an appearance of being easy on the Federal Treasury. However, a second look discloses that the bill offers no reasonable assurance that such high intentions would be carried out. In fact, it leaves the way wide open for their easy defeat. The real provision of the bill is merely for construction at Uncle Sam's expense.

The 27-foot channel depth can be regarded as merely a starter. If it were built, the people of the Great Lakes area would soon discover that only 8.7 percent of the United States flag tonnage could use it; that it wasn't deep enough for modern ocean-going cargo ships. There would be an uproar to deepen it to 35 feet. And who can say they wouldn't have their way? It would be the familiar story of the camel getting his head under the tent.

Tolls are not required by this legislative measure. They are only suggested. Under its provisions, no tolls would actually be imposed until a schedule of tolls had been approved by both the Parliament of Canada and our own Congress. There is formidable sentiment in both countries against any tolls whatever. The objectors do not need to speak up now. They need only to prevent any later agreement on tolls. The tolls proposal was first advanced over 2 years ago. There has been ample time to reduce it to definite and realistic terms if the governments of the two countries had any desire to do so.

Perhaps the most vulnerable feature of the bill is that it provides for construction in the international section of the river without making any effective provision for construction of the parts of the canal that lie elsewhere in Canada. If it turned out to be a good many years before the Canadians got around to put in the required dams, locks, and canals farther downstream, the United States would have no grounds for complaint and, in the meantime, no seaway.

This odd situation comes about because the executive agreement of 1941 between the two countries, which is proposed to be ratified by legislation in both, specifies the Canadian completion date to be December 31, 1948. As that date is already past, its lingering presence in an agreement ratified at some future time could only mean that the United States is not asking Canada to make any promises as to how soon the work would be done. And furthermore, there remains the primary question whether, in the absence of a specific provision by treaty, an agreement of this type would be binding on the future action of either country.

Even the arrangements for the sale of the power plant to the State of New York are decidedly nebulous in this bill. This matter has been under negotiation between New York and the Federal Government for 18 years. Yet the terms of transfer are not present in this bill, for ratification. Indeed, the bill would have the negotiations concluded after the construction had started. This bill even fails to answer the question whether New York, should it acquire the plant, would share the power with neighboring States, although it voices some vague generalities about the interests of other States.

In short, about the only dependable result of this bill, if enacted by the Congress and the President, and if concurred in by Canada, would be the construction of the power plants near Massena. The plant on the United States side, if not sold to the State of New York, would remain the property of the Federal Government. That is the development on which the public-power crowd in Washington is counting. That accounts for the persistent pressure of the public-power crowd for the project.

The present Senate bill, which was introduced in the spring of 1949, is the same as its predecessor, introduced 2 years earlier. In the main, the flaws I have just reviewed with you were pointed out in congressional committee hearings and in Senate debate. This resulted in adoption of a motion by the Senate, by a vote of 57 to 30, in February 1948 to refer the bill back to the Foreign Relations Committee. In the last 19 months, there has been ample opportunity to repair those flaws and their reappearance in the present bill, the same measure the Senate referred back to the committee last year, is an affront to the people of the United States and does no credit to the sponsors of the bill.

The proponents, in all these years, have never given us an over-all evaluation of the navigation benefits they claim for the project. They have just played around the fringes of the subject. They have used bales of statistics to show the Great Lakes region is important in agriculture, industry, commerce. So what? They have given imposing statistics of the reduction in transportion charges that shippers would gain by using the St. Lawrence instead of other routes. If true, this would be pleasant for the shippers, of course. But would their gain outweigh the costs and the losses to other people? The proponents have not faced up to that question. The closest approach they have made to the central problem of proving the navigation features to be worth their cost has been the attempt to show self-liquidation. They have published estimates purporting to show that tolls charged on traffic through the proposed canals would be enough to recover the capital outlay in addition to upkeep and interest.

Time does not permit of a detailed discussion of the traffic estimates, prepared by a group within the United States Department of Commerce that has become adept in grinding out propaganda in the form of fancy studies and reports. Those estimates reveal what a weak foundation there is for the talk of self-liquidation. It is amazing to note what little basis the public asks nowadays for a billion-dollar-plus project.

In arriving at the estimates, assumptions of two sorts had to be made: First, as to the rate of tools to be charged; second, as to the volume of traffic. About the toll rates there doesn't seem to be much logic. The ceiling rate stipulated in the pending bill, $1.25 per ton, was used in the estimate as the toll rate for such varied cargoes as automobiles and unrefined copper; coffee, and newsprint paper; general cargo and unmanufactured wool. Petroleum, however, was figured at 25 cents per ton; only one-fifth of the ceiling rate. Grain and coal were listed at 25 cents to 35 cents; and iron ore at 50 cents.

The traffic estimates are fantastic—up to 84,000,000 tons per year. When the self-liquidating proposal came along the Commerce Department had to estimate either high tolls or high traffic in order to come up with a showing of sufficient revenue. High traffic estimates were then obligingly produced, thereby avoiding the embarrassment of talking about high rates of tolls on cargoes, which would have alienated many supporters of the project. The most conspicuous item in the traffic estimates is iron ore. In order not to have the locks cluttered up unnecessarily with other boats, the grain traffic would be carried downstream in the same boats that brought up the ore. Question might be raised about how to arrange an economical return-load program for picking up grain at Duluth after delivering ore at Cleveland. But that is a detail left to be worked out.

A recent Canadian Government estimate sets 10,000,000 tons as the probable annual movement of iron ore from Labrador and Quebec through the St. Lawrence canals. Our Department of Commerce estimates a total iron-ore traffic of from 30,000,000 to 37,500,000 tons. This can only mean that unless we regard the Canadian Government as an undependable estimator of the prospects for Canadian ore, we must view our Department of Commerce estimate as representing mostly sea-borne ore, between two-thirds and three-fourths of it from sources largely undetermined and undeveloped, just a nebulous somewhere, away from the continent of North America. And this is the kind of prospect for iron-ore traffic which the proponents have offered as a principal reason for their project and a mainstay of their alleged self-liquidating tolls.

Arguments for the power phase of the project fail to conceal the subsidy involved in the scheme, conducive to Government ownership of Northeastern utilities; for private electric power companies, as well as railroads, cannot compete with Government-subsidized operations. Some segments of labor are aware of this and they don't like it. Of course, coal miners and railroad workers are opposed. They're ranked by proponents among the selfish interests. But I wonder just how the proponents would classify the members of local 18, United Auto Workers, CIO, employees of the Murray plant in Pennsylvania. In a resolution against the proposal recently adopted by that local, it was stated that the hidden purpose behind the St. Lawrence project is not to provide cheaper electricity and cheaper transportation but to bring about Federal ownership. Mind you, that is not a utility man speaking. That is local 18, United Auto Workers, CIO. Concluding, the resolution says, and I quote, "This is not just a step in the direction of socialism; this is socialism."

Proponents contend there is a power shortage. That is just rubbish. Both New York State and New England utilities may have had to get along with less equipment than they wanted, but their general public has

suffered no limitation in power use, unless for some very local and temporary emergency. These utilities set about taking care of their own construction needs as soon after the war as materials and manpower were available. They neither sought nor waited for Federal aid. Their construction program has moved along much faster than their load has grown; so their reserve margins of generating capacity are on the increase. It is plain they will have restored their margins to comfortable proportions long before the St. Lawrence development could possibly give any help.

Look at the Pacific Northwest, where the Federal Government has acquired practically a monopoly on major power-plant construction. The whole region waits for Uncle Sam; his projects are ponderous and slow in construction. In consequence, that area is undergoing a seriously disturbing power shortage, the worst in the history of the United States; and there is no prospect it will be cured in less than 6 or 7 years. Fortunately, the power supply of our entire Northeast is predominantly in the hands of enterprises that can respond quickly to the needs of the public for more power. They are quick to recognize a trend in growth because power supply is their main business in life. They are quick to meet such needs because their governing bodies are not preoccupied with other matters. And they are free to use whatever type of engineering development may best fit the circumstances because they are not committed to spectacular projects. They are free and solvent companies. The result has been that the postwar growth of power demands in the Northeast has been met principally by the relatively quick construction of fuel-burning, steam-driven, power-generating facilities. All this adds up to the fact that no good purpose could be served by building this Government power project—and certainly it should not be built as an expensive toy for politicians.

The weakness of the case of the proponents, both as to navigation and power, should not blind us to their political strength. That they are arming for an all-out fight is indicated by their employment last month of professional fund-raisers, American City Bureau of Chicago, to build a war chest, the reported goal being $250,000. In other words, this is no tea party. And we must score every time. The proponents need win only once. So it's imperative that we leave no stone unturned every time the plan rears its head. In the light of the disaster which the plan would wreak on New England ports and industries, and the foothold it would furnish in this area for the welfare state, no expenditure of energy, no effort to defeat, it is too great. No Paul Revere alarm will be sounded until there is warrant for it. When it is sounded, we are counting upon you to energize every force at your command—again and again, if necessary.

In conclusion, may I recapitulate my declaration that, with the self-liquidation of both the navigation and the power phases of the project deep in the limbo of uncertainty, there can be no valid claim that the St. Lawrence project is economically sound. But, could it be proven a dollar-paying project, I still would not favor it under Government ownership. Men surrender to socialism when they say that they would favor a project if it could be done in the black of the profit and loss account. In my personal conception of free institutions and free men, and I emphasize personal, neither it, nor any other truly economic enterprise is a permissible function of the State. If it were, there would be no reason why anything that colorably could be done at a profit by government should not be taken over; the end result being a Nation of dependent creatures who would look to the great central dispensary for everything—even, it might be, their ideas and their God.

Award to Wyalusing (Pa.) Rocket of Prize for Community Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that a weekly newspaper in northern Pennsylvania, the Wyalusing Rocket, has won first prize for community action in the annual press leadership competition sponsored by Cornell University radio station WHCU. The Rocket won over 67 other weekly papers in the New York-Pennsylvania regional area.

The award certificate cited the well-planned and consistent campaign for broad community improvement conducted by the Wyalusing Rocket and for the results it achieved.

I said in a statement on this matter:

I am not a bit surprised by the actions of the judges in the WHCU press leadership competition in awarding first prize in the community action field to the Wyalusing Rocket. I have consistently been impressed by the alertness and initiative of this newspaper in promoting community betterment. To my mind, that is still the best kind of newspapering we have in America. As long as we have newspapers like this which work unceasingly for the advancement of their communities, our democracy is safe and secure. I certainly want to congratulate copublishers John and William Keeler for this well-deserved honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two news articles in the Wyalusing Rocket for September 15 containing the details of this award be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORNELL RADIO STATION WHCU AWARDS ROCKET FIRST PRIZE—WINS OVER 68 PAPERS IN STATES

The Wyalusing Rocket was honored last Saturday evening at the third annual Cornell University press-radio dinner when it was awarded first prize and $500 in the press leadership competition comprising 68 weekly newspapers of New York State and northern Pennsylvania.

The award was presented to Editor John Keeler by Michael R. Hanna, general manager of Cornell Station WHCU, which sponsors the competition.

The judging committee was headed by Irwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, who personally congratulated co-publishers John and William Keeler when he said, "It's the freshest and most spirited weekly newspaper I have ever read—you are doing a wonderful job."

The Rocket received its award for various campaigns it has conducted during the past year in the promotion of civic, State, and regional improvements. The first prize certificate presented to the Rocket reads as follows:

"For its well-planned and consistent campaign for broad community improvement, ranging from organization of a new industries drive, through major campaigns for county roadbuilding, hospitalization and State investigation of local 'relief spending'; and for its initiation and aggressive promotion of a variety of civic beautification projects and local 'campaigns'—and for the results it has achieved—we the Board of Judges of the WHCU press leadership competition do award to the Wyalusing Rocket, the field of community action, the first prize and $500, for its entry based on the broadcast series, 'Radio Editor of the Weekly Press,' for 1948–49."

The presentation was among the six cash awards totaling $1,700 and three special citations.

The Corning News of Corning, N. Y., also won first prize for the second consecutive year for its editorial leadership.

Second prize of $250 for editorial leadership went to the Ontario County Times-Journal, of Canadaigua, and third prize of $100 was awarded the Dundee Observer. The Mid-York Weekly, of Hamilton, received a special citation.

Second and third prizes of $250 and $200 in the community progress classification were awarded the Moravia Republican and the Candor Courier, respectively. The Waverly Sun and Valley News, of Waverly, and the Bee-Journal, of Canastota, received citations.

The entry material exhibited by the Rocket in the competition is now on display at the Wyalusing Public Library.

CITY DAILIES CARRY STORY OF ROCKET'S FIRST-PRIZE AWARD AND CHECK FOR $500

The Rocket was scooped in the announcement of its own achievement this week when many of the city daily newspapers carried the Associated Press dispatch telling the story. Besides appearing on the front page of the Sayre Evening Times and in the Towanda Daily Review, the article received considerable attention in Buffalo, Ithaca, Syracuse, Rochester, and Albany papers.

The Coming Election in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of July I made plans to visit the Philippines in September, and accepted an invitation to attend a dinner given in my honor by some friends in Manila.

On account of Congress remaining in session, and the death of my mother on August 31, I canceled my plans to go to Manila.

Under permission granted by the House on September 21, I wish to extend in the RECORD the remarks which I would have made at the dinner if I had been able to go to Manila.

COMING ELECTION IN PHILIPPINES

As a Member of Congress who is interested in the Philippines and the problems in the Philippines, and as one who has studied the careers of some of the great men of those islands, I wish to protest against the more than usual interest now being manifested in behalf of one of the candidates for the office of president of the Republic of Philippines in the coming election on November 8, 1949.

I have never uttered one word against President Quirino, who succeeded to his

office upon the death of the late President Roxas. However, during the past 10 weeks I have read so much carefully prepared material in behalf of President Quirino, I have decided, in the interest of fair play, to make my voice heard on this occasion in behalf of the candidacy of another great man of the Islands—Hon. José P. Laurel.

As a Member of Congress I witnessed the fight against President Peron of Argentina which was carried on for several years by Assistant Secretary of State Braden. Members of Congress received "white papers" and various documents from Assistant Secretary Braden in his effort to smear and belittle and undermine the Péron government. We have seen propaganda in action against Franco. Now we are witnessing the propaganda employed to help President Quirino in the Philippines in November. I noted on President Quirino's recent visit to America that many dinners, cocktail parties, and receptions were given in honor of President Quirino. A group of rich Wall Streeters, headed by the president of Chase National Bank, New York, tendered a luncheon in honor of President Quirino in New York City. It is my belief that the American people should not stir up animosities in foreign lands. We should strive to make friends with all the world in our fight against a common enemy, communism.

I have read many Associated Press articles, United Press articles, magazine articles, all referring to Dr. José P. Laurel as Japan's puppet president during the days of occupation in the Philippines. Other dispatches referred to Laurel as the Filipino Quisling. Other inspired articles referred to Laurel as the man who collaborated with the Japanese. Still other articles referred to Laurel as the man who was charged with treason. Also a regularly issued release entitled "Philippine Affairs" is sent out from New York each week to Members of Congress, leading magazines, and leading newspapers in America. This release is 100 percent for Quirino and 1,000 percent against Laurel.

In America we should be fair. We should not try to dictate affairs in foreign lands. Some of the articles I have read are very unfair to Dr. Laurel and the facts have been grossly misstated. He has been pictured as favoring communism. Another recent article informed the American people that the Communists in the Philippines are supporting Dr. Laurel. Every person in the Philippines and every person outside of the Philippines who has studied the career of Dr. Laurel knows that Dr. Laurel's greatest obsession is his unrelenting opposition and uncompromising hatred of communism and all that communism stands for. Time magazine of August 8, 1949, printed an article about the Philippines and carried a picture of Dr. Laurel by the side of a picture of Luis Taruc, leader of the Communist-led Huks. Recently I noted a question in a quiz contest about Dr. Laurel. The answer given was that Dr. Laurel was the puppet president in the Philippines who collaborated with the Japanese. Thus it can be seen that a large amount of money is being spent in America to discredit and smear this great man, Laurel.

Laurel has been pictured as anti-American in all the articles I have read about him. I happened to see a letter which a friend of mine received from Dr. Laurel. The letter was dated October 21, 1948, and from that letter I wish to quote the following:

> I wonder why certain persons are bent on discrediting me before the American people. America has been our benefactor in many ways and I am grateful to America for her sincere and altruistic spirit in the rehabilitation of our country after the ravages of the last war. It is an insult to our intelligence to say that we dislike America. What would we have done without America's help? We were a conquered people and our homes and all of our business had been destroyed by the Japanese. America came to our rescue and liberated us. I have always been grateful to America for the help given to us before the Japanese came; and I shall always be grateful to America for liberating us and making us a free people, as well as for the wonderful aid given to our country and our people since the war.

I read an editorial in the Washington Post on August 9, 1949. I quote the following from that editorial:

> The statement issued after the meeting in Baguio suggesting a Pacific union to fight communism completely ignored the tragic weakness of the forces that Chiang once represented in China, a weakness now fully exposed by the State Department's white paper. * * * It must be evident in Washington, even if it is not in Manila, that no program can be built upon the quicksand on which Chiang Kai-shek is now trying to stand.

Much has been said and written in America during the past 6 or 7 weeks about the pact which President Quirino entered into with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to create an anti-Communist Pacific union. A large-size book was issued recently by our own State Department charging Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek with inefficiency, negligence, and blaming him for the fall of China to the Communists. One press dispatch sent from Manila on July 18, 1949, by the Associated Press, quoted Dr. Laurel as follows:

> Dr. Laurel said today the President of the Philippines has a big job to do at home before the Government can effectively back the proposed anti-Communist Pacific union.

And, as an afterthought, Dr. Laurel added:

> We must first solve our own problems of peace and order and restore the faith of the people in their Government before the Republic will be able to render effective help to this bloc.

Dr. Laurel's statement about cleaning up affairs in the Philippines before undertaking a tie-up with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to clean up the entire Pacific area reminds me of an article which I read in the Evening Star, published in Washington, D. C., on August 3, 1949. This article was written by Mr. W. R. Mathews of the North American Newspaper Alliance, with a date line Manila, July 22, 1949, and from which I quote the following:

> "A sign at one of the gates to Malacanan Palace, the Philippine equivalent of our White House, reads "Firearms forbidden inside, deposit them here." * * * Along with Philippine independence has come a wave of lawlessness. And the government is barely able to cope with it. Manila newspapers almost every day print stories of hold-ups in broad daylight. Employment of private guards for homes has become a necessity for those who can afford it. The Communist-led guerrilla Huks are merely one aspect of the widespread break-down of law and order. Lawlessness also prevails in public life. Former Senator Avelino was expelled from the Senate for corruption. He does not deny it. Another top Philippine politico was able to get a bill through the Philippine Congress giving him tax exemption. Despite the fact that the law deprived the Government of 2,000,000 pesos annually—$1,000,000—all to this man's benefit, the heat turned on was strong enough to compel President Quirino to sign the bill into law. The days of good government in the Philippines are over."

The estimated population in the Philippines in 1939 was about 18,000,000 people. Today the estimate for the total population is about 19,500,000. The total following of Communist-led Huk leader Luis Taruc is estimated to be about 10,000. Thus it can be easily seen that no man with sound politicial judgment would espouse the cause of 10,000 against 19,500,000 people.

I happened to read a recent interview given by Dr. Laurel to a newspaper reporter in Manila. Dr. Laurel's statements follow:

> "This is a year of decision for our people. More than 3 years after the present administration assumed the trusteeship of public affairs, the republic is confronted today with a government paralyzed by factional squabbles while grave problems are clamoring for vigorous and urgent solution. Never in the last half century has our country been cursed with an administration as corrupt, as full of selfseekers, as cynically indifferent to the people's welfare as the one we are tolerating now. Instead of a stable government and a happy and progressive community life, the spectacle presented to us is the tragic comedy of one group of high government officials of the Liberal Party trying to prove before the world that the rival group in the Liberal Party is more corrupt, the more venal, and the more licentious in the exercise of power. Public moneys are squandered recklessly, constitutional provisions are flagrantly ignored and civil liberties are crushed by naked force while our industries lie unrehabilitated. The ranks of the jobless are swelling every day, the cost of living rising steadily, our dollar reserves are dwindling fast and thousands of children who should be in school find no accommodation. We are almost on the brink of disaster and bankruptcy. The people will not tolerate this state of things much longer. There can be no compromise with evil and evildoers or further incompetence and mismanagement of the people's affairs."

Many Filipinos with whom I have talked and from whom I have received letters acclaim Dr. Laurel as their savior. They all admit that Dr. Laurel ruled fairly, justly and honestly during the days of occupation by the Japanese. At all times he had the welfare of the Filipino people uppermost in his mind. Filipinos will tell you that Dr. Laurel saved thousands and thousands of lives by his courageous acts. The Filipinos trusted Dr. Laurel and I contend that the Filipinos are better able to pass judgment on Dr. Laurel than a small group of power-seeking politicians and a few Americans who have an ax to grind.

Many of those who are challenging the patriotism of Dr. Laurel indict themselves by their accusations. When Dr. Laurel was selected president by the Japanese he insisted—over the protests of the Japanese—on naming his own choices for cabinet positions and others named to high places. President Quirino was called into service by Dr. Laurel. Also Senator Tirona, Jose Yulo, Mr. Abello and others who are now opposing Dr. Laurel were named to cabinet positions and other high places by Dr. Laurel. It was the late President Quezon who asked Dr. Laurel to remain in Manila and do all he could to protect the Filipino people.

The cleverest act in the entire life of Dr. Laurel was his proclamation that a state of war exists with America but at the same time he assured his people there would be no conscription of manpower. Without conscription there could be no fighting. Laurel's clever mind was too much for the cunning Japs. When the Japs insisted on an army made up of Filipinos to fight the approaching Americans, Dr. Laurel told the Japanese Premier that he had assured his people there would be no conscription of manpower, and he told the Premier that he could not disavow that promise to his people. In all his life he had never failed to keep a promise which he made to his people. When the Americans under General MacArthur arrived on the outskirts of Manila they faced 300,000 Filipinos waving American flags instead of having guns and bayonets.

One Filipino wrote to me that Dr. Laurel never committed any act detrimental to a Filipino. And Dr. Laurel asked a reporter on one occasion who was interviewing him: "Have I ever humiliated the Philippines or committed an act not for the best interest of the Filipinos?"

In 1942 the voters of my district elected me to Congress. Since becoming a Member of Congress I have taken an unusual interest in the Philippines. Perhaps my interest was intensified because it was my good fortune to know two of the former Presidents of the Philippines, the late Manuel Quezon and Hon. Sergio Osmena. Also, perhaps my interest in the Philippines was increased because of the fact that I served on the Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. Another good Filipino friend of mine was General Romulo, with whom I became intimately acquainted when he served in the House as Resident Commissioner from the Philippines. Shortly after the termination of the late war. General Romulu made a few speeches in the United States. I obtained General Romulo's permission and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD four or five of the General's speeches, all grouped together. My insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was entitled "The Plight of the Philippines." Again in April 1945, a friend of mine wrote a beautiful eulogy of the late Manuel Quezon, a great patriot and statesman. I inserted that eulogy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Washington. Again in June 1947, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some illuminating facts about the wonderful opportunities in the Philippines. In 1939 when Hon. Sergio Osmena was Vice President he came to Washington on a special mission to the United States. I was interested in the objectives which Mr. Osmena had in mind and I tried to help him and his country. I have never lost an opportunity to try to be helpful to the Philippines. My actions and deeds in Washington, my work in committees of the House of Representatives, and my votes in Congress are ample proof that I have been a friend of the Philippines.

About 2 months ago I received an invitation to visit the Philippines. I made plans to go there, and I so advised those who invited me to visit their country. My friends in the Philippines wrote me that they had planned a dinner in September in my honor. I regret that my plans had to be changed and I cannot make the trip to Manila this year. My opinion at the time I accepted the invitation was that Congress would not be in session later than August 1.

If I had made the trip to Manila, I would have made the following remarks at the dinner which was to be given in my honor:

My dear friends, I have studied the lives of some of your greatest men—Bonifacio, Mabini, General Luna, Manuel Quezon, Rizal, and yes, I should like to add one more name to this group—the name of Dr. Jose P. Laurel. I searched the record of this great man. I have read statements attributed to him since he was cleared and granted his freedom. I am convinced that he was and is a great patriot.

This man has served his people in every crisis. He served in the Cabinet of our illustrious Leonard Wood. He helped write the constitution for the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and I understand the Republic of the Philippines adopted the same constitution. He was appointed by President Quezon to be associate justice of the supreme court. And in 1941, after war was declared, President Quezon appointed Dr. Laurel to the post of secretary of justice. It was not strange, therefore, to us in America that the Japanese selected Dr. Laurel to serve as President during the period of occupation. I have talked with many Filipinos in my country. I have not found a Filipino who has said one word against Dr. Laurel or the service he rendered during the cruel and nervous times during the occupation.

One Filipino wrote to me and asked how America feels about Dr. Laurel. I replied that we in America feel that the Filipinos are capable of handling their own affairs and electing their President without interference or suggestions from America. The Filipinos should be the sole judges as to the men they wish to elevate to high places. We in America would not for a moment tolerate interference in our elections by people from foreign lands. Another Filipino wrote to me and asked what effect Dr. Laurel's election would have in America insofar as getting further aid from America. My answer to that Filipino was that the United States of America would continue to help the Philippines and the Filipinos no matter who is elected President of the Philippines in November.

Just a few days ago I read an interesting letter from Dr. Laurel. I know that that letter came from his great heart. For the benefit of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I wish to quote the following from Dr. Laurel's letter:

"God knows I am not anti-American. I regard the United States as my second motherland and I shall continue to work for the maintenance and strengthening of a close and mutually advantageous relationship between the Philippines and the United States. We in the Philippines need America, as the entire world needs America. What would we have done in the Philippines without America's help? We were conquered but not subdued. America liberated us. I as well as every member of my family will always be grateful to America for making us a free people."

Yes, the Filipinos have every right to be proud of their great patriot and statesman, Jose P. Laurel. He fought for his people before the commonwealth was established. He is one of the fathers of the constitution under which Filipinos live. He fought for Philippine independence. He fed, he clothed, and he protected the Filipinos during the long period of occupation by the barbarous Japs. In his eventful life he has faced one crisis after another. He has never failed to show the true steel in his make-up. In all the hardest times which have been visited upon the Filipino people he has not hesitated to serve when called upon to do so. He has never failed his people—and in my opinion he never will.

My opinion of this great man Laurel is that he stood four-square to every wind that blew. He never faltered. He never compromised with the truth. He never surrendered his convictions. Laurel has just reason to feel proud of the faithful service he has rendered to his people throughout his wonderful life. Whatever verdict is rendered on November 8 by the Filipino people cannot disturb Laurel's conscience. Justice cannot fail this man whose sacrificial service now shines in the fullness of its grandeur within the contemplation of a grateful people. Laurel thinks that what he did during Japanese occupation was for the best interests of his people and he has publicly stated that he would do it all over again. Such a man of steel will always remain in the hearts of his people.

I say, "Long live Laurel."

Veto of H. R. 3589

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter regarding the veto of H. R. 3589:

MILES CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Miles City, Mont., September 20, 1949.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'EWART: With regard to H. R. 3589 which would have conveyed certain lands to the city of Miles City for industrial purposes. A similar bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator ZALES N. ECTON. Both Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD concurred on the bills.

We have received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1949, and find that the President has vetoed this bill. In reading the President's veto message to Congress, we find that we cannot agree with the statements set forth therein and we regret that the President based his decision on incorrect information.

The United States Range Livestock Experiment Station operates on approximately 57,000 acres which lies immediately adjacent to Miles City almost on the west end of its

main business street. The area requested is as close to the city's business district as it is to the cattle corrals at the station headquarters.

The beef cattle experiments carried on at the station are beneficial to the livestock operators in Montana but the 426.88 acres requested by the city will not cripple the operations of the experiment station. The industries that have expressed an interest in locating at Miles City such as a packing plant, sugar-beet factory, and feed-processing plant would all be beneficial to the livestock interests of southeastern Montana and Montana. If such plants were established, it would make it possible for the experiment station to complete their tests and experiments locally rather than to transport animals to other points in order to obtain final information. Station officials have concurred in this fact.

The statement that the loss of this land may require relocation of the station headquarters is utterly ridiculous as the station headquarters is at least two-thirds of a mile from the land the city would like to acquire.

Assembly pastures could be provided by the changing of a few fence lines. In fact, corrals for working cattle are maintained at other locations on the approximate 10-mile-square block of Government range. Many cattle are now worked at these outlying corrals.

Many a rancher has suffered inconveniences by the demand placed on them for highway rights-of-way through their holdings but readjustments in their operations came about. Highways are important to the public interest just as this area is important to the welfare of the citizens of Miles City. We feel that the changes necessary in the experiment station's operations will be minor and that adjustments can be made with the minimum of inconvenience.

It is true that the city did receive 37.26 acres in 1946. The city leased the land with the understanding that a livestock salesyard would be constructed there. Because of unforeseen circumstances, the lessee could not proceed with its plans. Only recently was the land returned to the city. The city council has now entered into leases for approximately three-fourths of the land to three different concerns one of which has already started construction work and the others are in the process of preparing their plans.

The tract of 133 acres which the Department of Agriculture is willing to make available to the city and which could be transferred by legislation is commonly called the Indian Camp and was a former community garden. These 133 acres are separated from the city by a slough of the Tongue River. During high water periods, the slough is full of water and much of the 133 acres is subject to flooding. No bridge or grade connects the area to the city. It is not transversed by any railroad nor is it readily accessible by both or either of the two transcontinental railroads running through Miles City. If this area was given to the city, it no doubt would be accepted. It possibly could be used as a recreational area and later perhaps as a residential area but only after the construction of a flood dike along the Tongue River.

The reason the city of Miles City requested the acreage that it did is that this is the only land adjacent to Miles City in any direction that can be served by the two transcontinental railroads serving Miles City. Railroads and accessibility are certainly logical requirements of an industrial area.

The Montana Stockgrowers' Association which has over 4,300 members and which is vitally interested in the welfare of the experiment station did not think that the transfer proposed by H. R. 3589 would hamper the operations of the station. In fact, at the last annual convention of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association they went on record in support of the bill.

The State of Montana owns all the experimental cattle run at the station. Dr. R. R. Renne, president of the Montana State College under whose supervision these cattle come, advised the Senate committee that he had no objection to the transfer.

With respect to the last paragraph of the President's veto message, when the industrial needs of the city of Miles City were realized, every effort was made to secure the cooperation of the experiment station officials without success. When the bills were first introduced, they called for the transfer of approximately 671 acres. Following this, a meeting was arranged between representatives of the experiment station, Montana Stockgrowers' Association, city officials, businessmen, and railroad representatives at which a compromise acreage of 426.88 was arrived at. The compromise agreement was signed by all except the experiment station representatives. However, at no time were the officials of the experiment station willing to relinquish even one single acre of their 100-square-mile domain other than to intimate that a tract on the east side of the Tongue River used as a city dump might be made available. Later the matter was discussed in Washington with officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, but they showed no apparent interest in working out the problem.

If, as suggested by the President, representatives of the Department of Agriculture will come to Miles City and sincerely investigate this problem, we are satisfied that they will find that the proposal will not interfere with the experiments carried on nor will it require the relocation of the station headquarters which will justify the city's request.

Very truly yours,

MILES CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ROY W. CARLSON, *President.*
CITY OF MILES CITY,
PRESCOTT BOUTELLE, *Mayor.*

Navy's Morale Shaken By Fear Aviation Unit Will Be Emasculated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Navy's Morale Shaken By Fear Aviation Unit Will Be Emasculated." This article appeared during the recess period of the House.

Entirely aside from the question of the value of the B–36 as against the aircraft carrier, the article makes a point which I consider of major importance. There is a grave danger that the Air Force will relegate naval aviation to a position of unimportance, if not oblivion, in our national defense set-up. It is generally known that for some time the Air Force has been attempting, and quite deliberately, to undermine the status of naval aviation.

For a number of years it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Naval Affairs, before that committee was united with the Military Affairs Committee to form the present Committee on Armed Services. There were several of us on that committee at that time who took a keen interest in naval aviation. We insisted that it be enlarged when there were those, even in the Navy itself, who questioned our judgment. The war has, however, vindicated our position. Naval aviation has demonstrated its value; and I, for one, am greatly disturbed about what is an apparent attempt by the Air Force and the Army to undermine it.

I shall perhaps have more to say about this whole matter after the court of inquiry, now holding its investigation, has concluded its work. But I should like to take this opportunity to urge that the Members give some thought to what is taking place. There is more to this whole matter than appears on the surface.

According to an article which appears on the front page of the Washington Times-Herald of this morning, which I am also inserting in the RECORD as part of my remarks, Secretary of Air Symington turned down the request of the naval court of inquiry to testify. He based his refusal on the fact that he would be out of town on the day he was asked to appear.

I was pleased to note that Secretary Symington is in town today. I saw him at breakfast this morning at the Shoreham. And I am most hopeful that he will see fit to appear personally before the court of inquiry. His appearance will help eliminate much of the tension and will serve measurably to clarify the existing situation. His personal appearance will serve to create an atmosphere of cooperation between the various arms of our respective services. We cannot legislate cooperation, but here is an opportunity for Secretary Symington to set the badly needed pattern of actual cooperation.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

NAVY'S MORALE SHAKEN BY FEAR AVIATION UNIT WILL BE EMASCULATED—CAPTAIN CROMMELIN VOICED SERVICE'S DEEP UNREST OVER FUND-CUT ORDER

(By David Lawrence)

The morale of the United States Navy has been shaken badly. Inside the Navy discouragement and despair have spread ever since Secretary of Defense Johnson refused to grant a hearing to the then Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan, and abruptly canceled further construction on the large aircraft carrier, *The United States.*

It was not this cancellation, but what Navy men feared would result as a consequence, that caused dismay. The fear was that America's superb naval aviation force would be emasculated. These fears have now materialized because the Navy has been requested to consider cuts in naval aviation out of proportion to other divisions of the armed services. In fact, land-based aviation is to have the same or even larger funds in the next fiscal year.

The outburst by Capt. John Crommelin, naval hero, which has been backed up now by Admiral Halsey and other high officers, is symptomatic of the deep unrest that has swept the Navy. Secretary of Defense Johnson has failed to allay that unrest and, indeed, has given Navy men the impression that he intends to continue his partisanship in behalf of the Air Force.

MISTAKES BY OVERZEALOUS

The controversy over the B–36 is, of course, a direct sequel to the controversy over the status of naval aviation. It was a grievous mistake for overzealous naval supporters to

become involved in demands for a congressional investigation. But when the inquiry was ordered and the House Armed Services Committee undertook it, an even greater mistake was made in refusing to let the Navy men present their side of the dispute. Instead the House committee adopted recently a resolution implying that everything about the procurement of the B–36 was regular and that the placing of a billion dollars' worth of contracts on one type of plane was fully endorsed.

Admiral Radford, chief exponent of naval aviation and now commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, has flown to Washington twice to testify but has not been permitted to do so. Likewise, Admiral Blandy, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, has been ready to testify.

These men presumably have information tending to raise questions about the B–36. The American people do not like efforts to squelch testimony or to whitewash those who have been charged with deviations from accustomed procedures in spending public money.

The top civilians in the Navy have been silenced or effectively prevented from speaking forthrightly in behalf of the Navy. That is why men like Captain Crommelin are speaking out. They have lost hope that the Navy's side will be permitted to come out and hence unusual measures are being adopted to get a hearing. The rumor afloat in Washington is that the House Armed Services Committee is finished with its inquiry and is only interested in finding out who in the Navy has the temerity to question Air Force claims. The whole thing has turned into a witch hunt to discover who accused the Air Force of irregularities. No attention has been paid to ascertaining who in the Air Force is responsible for the attacks on naval aviation which have been repeatedly fed to the public by Air Force officials.

WORTH'S RECANT SEEN ODD

It is very odd that the only thing the House committee and the naval board have been interested in is the source of the Cedric Worth memorandum. They have not been interested in hearing about the B–36 except from Air Force proponents.

It is very odd also that Mr. Worth, between the morning and afternoon sessions at the last day of the hearings, recanted and said he had been mistaken. Why did he so testify about a document on which he had spent months and which contained many statements that have not yet been thoroughly investigated? What was said to Mr. Worth at the recess, and who talked with him? The mystery should be cleared up.

The Air Force is a great institution and deserves widespread recognition as equal in potentiality to any other armed service. But there are many things that need explaining, including the neglect of air support for ground armies.

These controversies are to be deplored, but it is never healthy in our democracy to squelch debate or threaten punishment to American citizens, whether or not in uniform, just because they prepare memoranda at the request of Members of Congress or because they venture to speak to Members of Congress about their work and their future.

The demand of the people is for unification of our armed services. Legislation cannot do it. Fairness and equitable treatment of the different services will do it. This, to date, the Navy men feel they have been denied. As long as such an impression prevails, unification will not be achieved and more and more discord and disruption of morale will develop.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of September 22, 1949]

NAVY'S B–36 QUIZ REBUFFED BY SYMINGTON—AIR SECRETARY WILL BE OUT OF TOWN

Secretary of Air Symington last night politely rebuffed a naval court of inquiry which asked him to testify in an investigation of the now-discredited B–36 memorandum.

His office issued a statement saying he would be out-of-town today, the day he was asked to appear. He suggested that the court submit questions to him in writing and he would take them under consideration.

LONG STRUGGLE INVOLVED

The memo in question grew out of the long struggle between the Navy and Air Force for appropriations and strategic air assignments. Written by Cedric Worth, civilian naval aide, it questioned the value of the B–36, on which the Government is spending a billion dollars, and hinted at political conniving by Symington and others.

The charges blew up when Worth recanted before a congressional committee. Symington and the others mentioned were cleared.

Now the naval court is conducting an inquiry of its own into the origin of the Worth memo and other matters. Yesterday it heard Navy Capt. John G. Crommelin defend Worth as patriotic and predict that eventually he would be vindicated.

PROMISES TO COOPERATE

Symington is known to have been angry about the charges in the memo, and his action last night was interpreted as a rebuff to the Navy, although he said he desired to "cooperate with the court to the fullest extent possible."

The terse statement issued by the Air Force on behalf of Symington took about 2 hours to prepare. It was rewritten and revised several times at the Air Force offices.

It said the court's request in the morning was transmitted to Symington just before the secretary left town on an already scheduled trip. Symington assured Capt. Sanford B. D. Wood, judge advocate of the court, of his desire to cooperate, the statement said.

WILL RETURN TODAY

"He asked that the court transmit to him questions it would like to have answered and said that he would take these questions under consideration when he returned sometime tomorrow," the statement continued. "His office indicated his schedule would not permit him to appear before the court at the time originally requested, Thursday morning."

Asked where Symington had gone, an Air Force representative replied "to New York."

At yesterday's session of the court, Worth testified that plane maker Glenn L. Martin asked him "in a sense" to write the memo about the B–36 superbombers.

CONTRADICTS MARTIN

Worth flatly contradicted Martin's previous testimony before the court in which the Baltimore plane builder said he contributed none of the information in the document but simply verified one minor fact in it.

Under questioning by Captain Wood, Worth said that at a Baltimore meeting last April 13 he picked up from Martin at least seven items of fact or rumor which he included in the B–36 memorandum.

He said he later gave the document to Representative DEANE, Democrat, of North Carolina, and made some revisions when DEANE told him he wanted to give the document to Chairman VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, of the House Armed Services Committee.

The National Security Resources Board and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Richard C. Cooke, assistant to the director of production, National Security Resources Board, before the Smaller Business Association of America, in the Hotel Statler, Cleveland, Ohio, on Tuesday, September 20, 1949. Mr. Cooke is a fine citizen of Massachusetts who has taken a great deal of interest in the subject of small business. I am confident that this address is worthy of note.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Small business is recognized by the people of the United States as one of the foundations of our American way of life and of democracy itself. This Nation cannot afford the risk of depending for its security on limited and dangerously concentrated facilities. The full utilization of the more generally dispersed facilities of small plants would help to achieve the decentralization of production that will be so vital should another devastating war be forced upon us. The broadening of the base of war production would afford greater flexibility in procurement and production and thereby serve to increase and speed over-all output. At the same time, it would insure the wartime preservation and postwar growth of a healthy, competitive small-business economy.

About a year and a half ago, the Congress created the National Security Resources Board—a civilian staff agency of the President. It is the Board's responsibility to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. The act lists six specific areas for the Board, but for the purposes of our discussion today, I am going to talk about two. The Board is required to make recommendations to the President on—

1. "Programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions."

2. "The strategic relocation of industries, services, government and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security."

Obviously, planning in these two areas must take cognizance of the productive potential of small plants. Experience has proved that effective mobilization requires a broad production base utilizing small as well as large plants. Undue concentration of war production in large plants would breed economic and social evils that would constitute a threat both to the war effort and to free enterprise systems in the postwar period. Furthermore, full utilization of the generally dispersed facilities of small plants would help to achieve the decentrali-

zation of production that is so vital in an atomic age.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SMALL-BUSINESS PROGRAM

Recognizing the vital role of small plants in a war economy, the National Security Resources Board initiated a small-business program in November 1948, to provide for the maximum utilization of the average-size factory to meet a possible emergency. I am going to tell you of the progress on that program as of today.

First, we defined "small business" as independently owned concerns, employing 500 or less workers, and ones that are not a dominant part of their industry. There are, as you know, numerous definitions. The Reconversion Act defines small business as concerns employing 250 or less; the Department of Commerce in the manufacturing field has a definition of small business as 100 or less employees. The Department of Defense takes its definition from the definition by the Congress in the National Security Act, or one that is identical with ours.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEES

Considerable thought was given to the most effective machinery for initiating and carrying forward a planning program on small business. It was decided to draw on the best talent available in Government and industry to build a program. We established two working committees: One, known as the Small Business Interagency Committee, comprises representatives from the following Government agencies: The Munitions Board, Department of Commerce, Federal Trade Commission, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Department of Justice, and House and Senate Small Business Committees. This committee has met at intervals of 2 to 3 weeks under the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board and has aided in the development of our small-plants readiness program.

A second committee was drawn from industry and is made up of industrialists considered to be familiar from background and experience with many of the problems of small business. Your own vice president, Ralph R. West, of Cleveland, has been from the outset a valuable and faithful member of this task group. I think you will be interested in others who are also serving on this group—men who are giving their time and money to assist in the formulation of policies that will benefit the entire Nation.

They are S. Abbot Smith, president of the Smaller Business Association of New England; Fred C. Virkus, chairman of the conference of the American Small Business Organizations, Chicago, Ill.; George Burger, vice president of the American Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif.; and Lyle W. Jones, Washington representative of the National Small Businessmen's Association.

This group has held nine meetings since November 1948, and has contributed to the formation of our small plants readiness program. I want to make it clear that this program is still in the development stage. Some parts of the program have already been accomplished. Others require much more detailed planning before they can possibly be recommended to the chairman of the board.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT INFORMATION CENTER

I should like also to talk about a recent accomplishment through industry and Government cooperation. That is the creation of a unified information office in the Munitions Board of the Department of Defense. This idea came directly from members of our task group who were asked several months ago to visit field procurement planning offices in their industrial areas, to view conditions from the standpoint of small business. They found the same conditions generally. Previously the small-business man had to go to several agencies in order to find out what the Department of Defense was buying. There were different ways of getting on the bidders list; even in a single agency the physical difficulty of examining the bid invitations was beyond the time limitations of the average small-business man. Such were a few of the conditions which men on our task group found.

At earlier meetings a subcommittee developed an idea for central educational and information offices to be created in the Department of Defense not only in Washington but in the major industrial centers of the Nation. It was recommended that these offices be headed by competent civilians, assisted by staff experts from Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Covering all the services, there would be advance notices of bids, bid invitations, so arranged that a manufacturer could view for the entire Department of Defense invitations that logically fell in his general category; abstracts of awards so that the small manufacturer would know in general industrial areas the prime contractor whom he could solicit for subcontracts. Also at these offices would be experts who could give sound advice on the preparation of bids and guide the manufacturer so that he could save a great deal of time and effort.

OPENING OF CENTRAL INFORMATION OFFICE

The Central Military Procurement Information Office was opened on Monday, August 8, at the Pentagon Building in Washington. Mr. D'Alton B. Myers, a civilian with a long record of interest in small business problems, was placed in charge of the office. To show that the office filed a real need, during the first 10 days of operation the office handled approximately 2,300 phone calls, letters, and visitors, all seeking information not previously available in any single location in the Military Establishment. It is contemplated that eventually the office for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, where bid invitations and abstracts of awards will be available, will be located nearby, so that the most important information can be secured in one location. This is a major accomplishment, but it is only part of the objective, because in order to serve small business adequately, similar offices must be set up in the major industrial areas of the country. Most small-business men cannot afford to visit Washington frequently, and this operation must be decentralized.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS CONCERNING SMALL BUSINESS

I have mentioned already the small plants readiness program of the National Security Resources Board's staff. This program, as you know, was developed with the assistance of our interagency small business committee and our small business task group. Let me outline a few of the problems all of us are trying to solve.

SURVEY OF CAPACITY OF SMALL PLANTS

The first problem is to determine the capacity of small plants for military production. The natural tendency in planning for military production is to consider large plants first. The larger corporations have financial stability, ample engineering and research facilities, and it is only logical that considerable detailed planning should be done with these organizations to lay a sound foundation for rapid expansion of output in the event of an emergency.

NSRB's production office is well aware that, in this planning, the capacity of small plants should not be overlooked. Many of you may recall that before the outbreak of World War II, it was generally believed that the facilities of only 10,000 to 20,000 manufacturers would be needed to wage a successful war. This estimate turned out to be very low, because eventually more than 60,000 plants became prime contractors and subcontractors.

All of us want to make sure that this does not happen again. We cannot afford again to build new plants and manufacture machines when there are capable small plants with idle capacity. It is vital that we find the method for quick mobilization of small plants in the event of a war.

We are at work developing a method for surveying this capacity and to have it ready and available for procurement officers and prime contractors in the event of trouble. Our thinking now is opposed to surveys involving long lists of machinery and tools. World War II experience demonstrated that they were practically useless. Before award of any contract, engineers had to make plant visits—ability to produce could not and cannot be evaluated from a survey form alone.

In a short time the Bureau of the Census figures for 1947 will be available. There is considerable usable data which is being gathered by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in Baltimore. For broad planning and without an appreciable additional cost, we can obtain some helpful data from these two sources. More will be needed and we have several plans in this direction.

PROCUREMENT POLICIES

Today the Department of Defense has dispersed several procurement agencies into major industrial areas. However, these agencies buy on a centralized basis. Our committees recommended partial decentralization as a readiness measure, but this will not take place immediately due to added cost to the military. It should be noted that when the procurement agency is buying on a centralized basis, the small-business man manifestly does not have an equal opportunity with big business. One large corporation maintains offices in Washington with 59 men on its pay roll to call on procurement agencies. No small plant can match that set-up.

The man-to-man relationship which is the foundation of successful selling is open now to large companies that deal with the Government. The objective today is to make possible similar opportunities for smaller companies.

PUBLIC LAW 413

There is a national policy which has a direct bearing on the role of small business in the war economy. This is the policy established by the Congress in February 1948 when they passed the Armed Services Procurement Act, Public Law 413. This policy was stated very clearly in section 2 (b), "It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns." The armed services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—are regulated in the procurement of supplies and services by Public Law 413. The law requires public advertising and "that awards shall be made to that responsible bidder whose bid will be more advantageous to the Government—price and other factors considered." There are 17 specified exemptions where advertising is not required. Section (16) is important. This gives the agency head the authority to negotiate "in order to keep a plant or facility available in the interest of national defense." All of you, I am sure, are concerned therefore with the manner in which Public Law 413 is interpreted.

CHANGES IN PUBLIC LAW 413

Some changes may be needed in Public Law 413. They are under consideration in

many quarters. Let me give you an example. In December 1948, a group of small shoe manufacturers found themselves unable to compete with big shoe manufacturers in procurements for black, navy, calfskin shoes. An appeal was made to their Congressman who discussed the matter in detail with the House Armed Services Committee and with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Kenney. Those companies were being underbid consistently by 15 to 25 cents a pair by large companies with integrated operations. Mr. Kenney issued orders to hold up a procurement for 700,000 pairs which was due to close on January 7, 1949, and issued instructions that bids would be reissued with the procurement broken into smaller quantities.

The smaller companies were urged to "sharpen their pencils" but when bids were opened they were still 15 to 20 cents a pair higher than two or three large integrated companies. After considerable study and consideration, Mr. Kenney awarded one-sixth of the contracts to the two low bidders among the small business concerns, the balance going to the low bidder, which was a larger company. This was done by relating the intent of Congress to assist small business with the instructions that awards shall be made to "that responsible bidder whose bid is most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered." On May 20, 1949, in a detailed report, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren advised the Secretary of the Navy that, under the law, this action could not be taken.

SUBCONTRACTING TO SMALL PLANTS

Subcontracting affords a promising field for the utilization of small plants. In World War II, subcontracting, though substantial, did not reach small plants to the degree that it might have. Many experts feel, however, that subcontracting should not necessarily be the main role of small plants, as there are thousands of capable small companies that should have prime contracts. However, we are still studying this entire problem and believe that subcontracting should be fostered whenever possible so that production may be spread as widely as is practical. Mandatory subcontracting, we know, raises difficult problems. If regulations are too confining, production may be delayed unnecessarily. Generally speaking, the matter of subcontracting cannot be left entirely to the discretion of the prime contractor, who will certainly manufacture in his own plant as long as he has or can obtain the manpower and other facilities. We are studying various policies in subcontracting developed during World War II with a view toward determining patterns of action that will prove most effective in spreading the work.

GROUP ACTION

In World War II, pooling was only partially successful. The War Production Board and the procurement agencies did not look with favor on pooling. Manufacturing pools often tend to be loosely organized; they lack funds, definite objectives, and sometimes are unable to work together well enough to maintain engineering and management that could justify the award of military contracts.

The York, Pa.; San Jose, Calif.; and the Kansas City, Mo., plans in the recent war, however, were indicative of the possibilities that pooling affords for mobilizing for war production the effective facilities of small plants. Basic to successful pooling are the suitable grouping of machine capacity for the work to be undertaken, efficient administrative control, and adequate financing, engineering, and management.

The NSRB staff is giving thought to the best policies which should be recommended to develop pooling possibilities in a wartime economy. From a readiness viewpoint we are following with keen interest the progress of two groups. One in New England is known as the Manufacturing Associates of New England, Inc. The other is the Smaller Industries of Northern California, Inc. Both are young, but they have found a way of working together to their mutual benefit. Such groups afford one method for equalizing the opportunities to obtain Government contracts for small concerns.

DISPERSION OF MILITARY PRODUCTION

Facing the possibility of atomic warfare, it is national policy to work toward industrial dispersion. Thus, there is a close relationship between planning and current procurement policies. There will be no time to warfare if it should strike. As a readiness make needed changes to conform with atomic measure, we must see that we have a broad base of military production now, with contracts for many critical items in the hands of factories in cities of less than 50,000 population. Should it be found that Public Law 413 is restricting the military procurement agencies from carrying out the policies of a fair share to small business and industrial dispersion, then some clarifying amendments may be necessary.

TWO IMPORTANT NATIONAL POLICIES

There are two national policies which have a direct bearing upon the role of small business in a war economy. First, the policy established by the Congress in February 1948 when it passed the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413. This was stated very clearly in section 2 (b): "It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for the supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns." Second, the policy of industrial dispersion which was established in 1948 by the National Security Resources Board. The Board, as indicated in the act, is responsible for advising the President on industrial relocation. After careful study the Board published in September 1948 a clear and concise statement in a booklet called National Security Factors in Industrial Location.

IMPLEMENTING NATIONAL POLICY

You gentlemen can readily appreciate how those two national policies affect the role of small business in wartime economy. Yet the impact does not wait for an emergency because, in planning for mobilization, there are readiness measures which have to be undertaken now. There will not be time to disperse our military production should an enemy's atomic bombs hit our big industrial centers. No, there must be action before that happens, if the Nation is to build a sound defense against atomic warfare. Space is the only known defense against atomic warfare. It has been recommended, for example, that cities of less than 50,000 population are relatively safe from bombing.

It is well for industry to recognize a basic difference in these two national policies. The first, calling for a fair share of Government contracts for small business, places a burden on the military procurement offices and other buying agencies of the Government. Of course, small industry must cooperate fully, but the burden of implementing this policy rests on government.

The second national policy is that of industrial dispersion, and the burden rests in normal peacetime on industry itself with the cooperation and aid of the Government. However, far-sighted industrial leaders, familiar with the history of implementing national policies, realize that the many branches and departments of the national Government, sooner or later will lend their full support toward the national objectives. It is hoped and believed that industrial leaders, city and State officials will do everything within their power to implement the policy of industrial dispersion, for only through this sort of cooperation will our Nation be safe in the event of an attack.

COMMUNITY ACTION

Our Nation is too big and our industrial capacities too diversified to attempt to achieve all of this from Washington. There is a burden upon you and your community now. Please note what is taking place in those critical unemployment cities today. Under Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman, who incidentally is also Acting Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, there is a 20-man committee that is setting national policy for dealing with the unemployment in those cities, but the real action is right in the communities, as it should be.

CONCLUSION

The National Security Resources Board is acutely aware of the problems of small business in mobilization planning and its staff has taken the leadership in building some workable programs. There will be continuous study and planning to make sure that the capacities of small plants are utilized to the maximum in the event of a war. This work cannot be done alone by a group of planners in Washington. It can only be accomplished with the cooperation of industry from all sections of the Nation. Your own association is represented on our small-business task group, and we are counting on all of you to bring us suggestions which will make our plans realistic and workable. One of our military leaders recently predicted that any future war will not be a comfortable one, but will be a war of survival. Facing such a possibility, all of us in Government and industry together must share the responsibility for keeping our Nation strong and in a constant state of readiness.

State Department's Policy in Indonesia a Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, will be remiss in his duties if he does not do something positive and affirmative about the fading cause of democracy in Asia.

We have all read his white paper. It was an apologetic document, and moreover it showed that his instinct is to be a lawyer instead of a statesman.

Perhaps none of the persons whose efforts went to make up the white paper could have saved China from communism, Mr. Acheson included, but that is no excuse for letting the situation deteriorate in other countries when we should have had so much warning as to the intentions of the Communists in Asia and elsewhere in the world.

It has been said of Mr. Acheson that he was a member of the Russian clique in the State Department which did nothing about halting the surge of communism in China. Paradoxically it is pointed out in other sections of the country that he is violently pro-British and that the British agitated to get the Secretary of the Treasury out of the way in the recent dollar conference because they think they will fare better with Mr. Acheson.

How can one be pro-British and pro-Russian at the same time?

Perhaps it is explainable by the fact that in the British House of Commons there are reputed to be between 50 and 80 fellow travelers who are spearheading the confiscation of private industry and the elimination of competition in that country.

I noticed a report in the press the other day to the effect that Britain might want us to shoulder their burdens in India which, of course, means the huge debt incurred by Britain during the war.

I do not know what Mr. Acheson is going to decide on that score, but I do know that if his record in handling the Indonesian situation is any criterion, he will botch and bungle the job so that nobody can unravel it.

The policy of the State Department in Indonesia is a scandal.

Twelve of America's greatest journalists went to Indonesia and were unanimous in asserting, rather than encouraging a revolutionary movement spawned in fascism and tolerant of communism, this Government should serve warning that the peace must be preserved in vital areas of the world and, in addition, governments of integrity must be offered to the western world in exchange for their help and support against the Communist blight.

These journalists unfortunately died in the performance of their duty and are not able to be present so that Congress, or any other body can look into the terrible state of affairs which has gone on in one of the richest areas known to man.

Through the support of the State Department the United Nations was able to send an arbiter to Indonesia in their recent trouble, Mr. Merle Cochran, and I understand at present that our State Department has delegated to him all of its authority in the Indonesian dispute.

We apparently here are willing to give over a stable government of high integrity, in an area vital to our security, into the hands of very Fascist-minded natives who have never been dignified by one single vote cast in their favor in any democratic election or plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker, our State Department is supporting and recognizing a regime which, according to the American journalists on the spot—and Pulitzer Prize winners at that—could not get 10 percent of the vote in one-third of the island of Java to sustain themselves in power.

The Dutch people took a terrible beating from the Germans twice in the last war and suffered the rigors of an occupation for 4 years. There were billions of dollars in assets confiscated by the Germans, and in addition another billion and a half in damage was done to the agriculture of that little country when sea water was let in upon the land.

At present the Dutch have one and a half billion dollars in assets in Germany which the Allied military occupation refuses to let them recover.

The great port of Rotterdam is operating at less than one-tenth of its capacity because the British want to use their own facilities at Hamburg, which port they will probably never give up. Preference has been given to the purchases of farm produce from Italy, a former enemy, over Holland, formerly and presently our ally, for use in Germany.

The Dutch, I am told, are getting sick and tired of this continual discrimination, and I wonder how they have the patience to go through with the high and idealistic plan of creating a United States of Indonesia at the present Hague Conference.

This Secretary of State, I am told, flies into nervous rages when people suggest that loans be made to Spain, which fought a very good fight against communism a few years ago, and is just as impatient to loan money to Tito, Communist dictator of Yugoslavia.

In do not believe in a government by investigation, although I think a great many of them have done much good, but I know I am reflecting and voicing the opinions of a great many Americans who ought to know just what is going on in the State Department to warrant these results.

On the Senate side our Senators have the responsibility of examining the qualifications for confirmation as Assistant Secretary of State Mr. Walton Butterworth, whose record has been one of grim failure in reporting and delineating our policy in the Far East.

I think President Truman appointed Mr. Acheson in good faith despite Mr. Acheson's almost daily association with Justice Felix Frankfurter who, in turn, was associated in the past with several Americans of questionable loyalty, including the one who was recently on trial in New York.

If Mr. Acheson dislikes dictators—as he apparently does in the case of the Spaniard—how can he expect us to believe he is sincere when he champions the cause of loans to another of this stripe in Yugoslavia?

How can he support and embolden these sly orientals masquerading under the guise of the Indonesian Republic against our long-time friends, the Dutch, who did so much to settle and civilize this country, and who threw their weight on our side along with the French and the Spanish at the time of the American Revolution?

I have spoken about the subject matter of the address that I have just made to Americans in my district, to Members of both parties in Congress, and reputable journalists, and I do say that continuation of the frivolous, paradoxical Acheson policy, is going to be ruinous for this country and I for one am going to demand an investigation by a proper congressional committee of this official and his whole Department unless these tactics change.

I insist that the Indonesians be told that they will not be supported in their plots to open the door for communism in the Southwest Pacific.

I insist that the British be told we will not assume the burdens of India.

I insist that Yugoslavia's intentions be regarded with suspicion until some decent act proves she is on her way to democracy.

Time is sliding by, and this is the hour for us to take action.

Military Aid Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a very thoughtful letter which I have received from a Pennsylvania constituent on the military aid legislation which is now before the Senate. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which points out why the amendment to cut or reduce the amount recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee should be defeated.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERKELEY BAGS, INC.,
Mauch Chunk, Pa., September 20, 1949.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to strongly urge upon you the importance of supporting President Truman's military aid measure to implement the Marshall plan. I believe and agree with Senator TOM CONNALLY that those nations who are in the path of the Soviet plan of penetration should be given sufficient military equipment to defend themselves and to help bolster their morale in their daily battle against Communist pressure.

I am convinced that now is the time to demonstrate our unequivocal and unhesitating support to these countries on the battle line to convince them that we are all united in this struggle and that they can count on our unwavering support to the end.

Very truly yours,
MILTON SAMUELSON,
President.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 13, 1949]

ECONOMY IN THE ARMS PROGRAM

Head hardly bloodied and definitely unbowed, the European military-aid program has emerged from the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees in good shape for its global assignment. That task is to put teeth into the Atlantic Pact, but more importantly to put backbone into western European morale.

The version of arms aid now before the Senate deserves support. Debate should not be further clouded by the merits or demerits of China's Nationalist Government, or by questions whether or not any China aid belongs in this essentially European project.

Aid to China in this bill represents an effort by the administration to appease forces, strong among the opposing party, that demanded aid to China as part of the arms program. Inclusion of China aid is thus an effort to keep the Atlantic Pact and the arms program sailing under the bipartisan foreign-policy banner.

Let it rest at that. The vital thing is to get a realistic arms-aid program over the political hurdles soon, and to do this with as little damage as possible to psychological bulwarks already erected against communism. These sprang from American sponsorship of European political and military unity, to be backed by American strength.

The Senate version of arms aid puts up $1,000,000,000 for Europe in addition to the

$289,000,000 already agreed upon by House and Senate for Greek-Turkish aid and Korean, Iranian, and Philippine commitments. Obviously any figure so near the administration's original request for an arms bill totaling $1,450,000,000 would be welcomed by the President. But the House has cut European arms aid to $580,495. Some adjustments will have to be made in House-Senate conferences.

It is our hope, and we are convinced it is the hope of most Americans, that the military-aid program will come nearer to the Senate figures than those of the House. Washington reports indicate fair prospects for this hope.

But in a situation where foreign policy has become tangled with party politics a victory for wisdom can never be assured without clear public demand that the national interest supersede the partisan interest. Economy-minded legislators may have to be reminded that national security and international peace never come cheap, but that to ignore them in the name of immediate economy is to risk future economy along with them.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times Herald of August 31, 1949:

SHOULD NOT BE STINTED

Many proposed governmental expenditures could and should be postponed until a more propitious time; but there will be general agreement with the contention that money spent for adequate flood control in those sections which need it is money well invested.

Here in Olean and vicinity we know full well the devastation a flood can cause; so that most of our citizens will agree cordially with the declaration in the House of Representatives last week by Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of Binghamton, that "if Congress can spend $16,000,000 on dikes for the Netherlands, we can do the same to protect Americans in my district by giving them flood walls."

The Binghamton area is particularly susceptible to floods.

In fact, the area—which includes the important industrial communities of Johnson City, Endicott, and Vestal—has been flooded no fewer than 19 times since the Civil War—or about twice in every 10 years.

"The people of my district," Representative HALL declared to his colleagues, "ought to enjoy priority over Holland or any other foreign country in flood protection from our Government."

Flood control for the Binghamton area would involve expenditure of around $4,000,000.

Just one bad flood would cause that amount of damage.

There are many items, doubtless, that could be eliminated from the pending rivers and harbors bill without any harm resulting, but flood control is one that should not.

The Binghamton area should have adequate protection.

Military Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Bernard Weitzer, national legislative representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the military aid program:

On behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, I am happy to express our appreciation to your committee for the privilege of presenting the reasons for our support of the military-aid program which you are considering to protect peace and our security.

The basis for our interest in this program is clearly expressed in what I said last May before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the North Atlantic Pact.

"As a veterans' organization, we believe that we have a special interest in peace. Our members have had first-hand experience of war. Our membership includes veterans of wars dating back to the Spanish-American War. The last surviving member of our organization who served in the War Between the States died only 4 years ago. Our members know war. They want no more war, for themselves nor for their children. And above all, they desire that the destruction of war be kept away from our country.

"The North Atlantic Pact now before you will serve as a deterrent to war and we believe that it will prevent war and safeguard our country from war. Essentially, it is a pact for peace, a pact in which 12 peace-loving nations have joined to deter aggression. And so long as an aggressor is deterred, there is opportunity to prevent war."

Our national executive committee meeting in New York, July 23-24, in conformity with the logic which led our organization to support the European recovery program the North Atlantic Pact, authorized me to appear before your committee in support of the military-aid program now before you.

It is our feeling that it is urgent that action should be taken by the Congress, at once, to provide the appropriations of $1,450,000,000 as proposed in the bill which you are considering. According to the explanation by the Department of State in its booklet, The Military Assistance Program, $940,000,000 is for the military equipment, technical and training assistance to the North Atlantic Pact countries, and $155,000,000 to assist these countries in increasing their military production. The remainder of the total appropriation is largely for the continuation of military aid to Greece, Turkey, the Philippines, Iran, and Korea with a small sum as an emergency fund and for administrative expenses.

We are keenly aware that this is a large sum of money and in view of the requirements of our national budget, it is vital that the Congress give it most careful consideration. However, the urgent need for this stopgap program of military aid is so pressing that we hope you will vote favorably for the authorization of the full amount.

Fortunately, our national resources, our production capacity, and our financial strength are such that we can extend this aid. Our European partners in the North Atlantic Pact are not so fortunate for it was on their soil World War II was fought, theirs were the cities, the plants, and the farms on which bombs fell with such terrific destruction results. Although they have made wonderful strides in restoring their production as a consequence of our aid through the European recovery program, and their own efforts, it would still be for them a question of "defense or butter" to paraphrase Herr Goering's ominous remark if our partners in the North Atlantic Pact were called upon to assume the entire burden of adequate defense—even sufficient defense to slow up any sudden onslaught.

I am confident that this stopgap program of aid before you, is no pop-up program. The officials of our State Department and our Defense Department would be indeed derelict if they had not carefully and thoroughly been preparing this program during the past 10 or 11 months while the final form of the North Atlantic Pact was under discussion and more recently, the subject of debate in our Senate.

The reasoning which has resulted in the proposed program for military aid undoubtedly paralleled our reasoning in negotiating the North Atlantic Pact—collective defense.

Surely, our responsible officials have gone as far or further in planning than have the five powers which signed the Brussels Treaty regarding whom Ambassador Douglas recently reported.

"The defense organization has also achieved very considerable progress in the combined training of western union forces. Naval, air, and army field exercises involving forces of different countries have already been held. These measures, plus the progress in harmonizing the organization of the five powers, are unprecedented in the history of international relations. These training accomplishments have the effect of enabling the western union forces to work jointly under a single control in all phases of warfare, and thus a foundation has been laid for complete integration."

The dollar figure suggested for military aid to the North Atlantic Pact countries must have been arrived at by calculating in detail, and most carefully, the costs of the minimum amounts needed now in military items and in equipment for increasing military production to piece out the gaps in the military organizations of our friends. The full facts have probably been disclosed to you in executive session by the topmen of the Department of Defense.

Our prompt action will invigorate the efforts of the pact signatories, bring assurance to them that our deeds are as certain as the spirit of the pact and will lift their morale to still higher levels. The threat of aggression will certainly be lessened and that, in itself, will be a help. Our prompt action will thus speed the day when our friends will have made their defenses adequate—and adequate defenses for them are our defenses as well.

On the other hand, any indication of vacillation, in delay, in a halfway appropriation now will spell to our friends and to those who are not our friends, a lack of determination to maintain and promote the trend toward economic and political stability which is progressing in Europe. Any slowdown will certainly encourage dangerous pressures against western European countries. To reinstate the current trend will be both difficult and costly and in that period the defenses of western Europe, our defenses, will not be what we want.

Delayed action, inadequate action, inaction can be more costly than the most ambitious program that could be proposed. The peace and security we want for our world neighbors, as well as for ourselves, are not the kind of goods to be sought by haggling about price or at basement bargain counters where the seconds, the slightly soiled, and irregulars are displayed.

Who can safely tell a man for how long he can postpone buying life insurance or

tell a factory owner how long he can delay installing a sprinkler system to protect his production capacity against possible fire?

These are not perfect analogies of the problem you must pass upon. But according to the news stories, General Marshall said this week that more adequate defense preparation by us in 1939 would have shortened World War II by 6 months, cut the casualties by hundreds by hundreds of thousands and reduced the dollar costs $50,000,000,000. Would we like to speculate on what might have happened had the vote on selective service, which carried in the House by a one-vote majority September 7, 1940, gone the other way by one vote?

Can we afford today to be lulled into delay or misled into a price-cutting effort because we are not being probed so sharply just now as a consequence of some initial successes achieved by the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, the European recovery program and our military aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran? Must we have another Czechoslovakian seizure to jolt us and energize our action?

Our resolves in concert with the other 11 signatories to the North Atlantic Pact have made known our intentions when aggressive action is taken against one or more of the signers. The pact, however, has not obviated the need for a military aid program which has long been recognized. Deeds must match the pact's heartening words.

My purpose is to urge, most respectfully, upon behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America that you make those deeds possible promptly and in full measure by approving the military aid program.

In the early 1930's when business was slumping, a top executive of one of the very big companies of our country said in a conference with his business associates, "I am not as concerned with the high cost of selling as I am with the high cost of not selling." In your consideration of the military program, I hope you will be more concerned with the high cost of not having as soon as possible, the strengthened defenses of western Europe which are our defenses, too.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Mr. A. D. Quaintance, a well-known attorney of Denver, Colo., has written a statement with respect to equipping the United Nations with a sufficient police force to prevent world war III. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it may receive attention in connection with the debate on the program of arms for western Europe.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We must not fail to give to the world what God has given to us—liberty and freedom.

2. It will take a real union to win the third world war.

3. Who will help rebuild the United States from a mass of rubble if we aimlessly drift into the third world war?

We have here, meeting in our country, 59 nations under the title of the United Nations, but they have been prevented from effective action by the veto power and unless we can breathe life into the United Nations and have an active arm of the United Nations, authorized to maintain peace, stop aggression, and prevent a third world war we will just drift into the third world war and have visited upon us the same destruction and devastation that all the other great nations have suffered.

There has been introduced in Congress a resolution for a world federation with authority to stop aggression and to maintain and preserve peace and law and order in the world. This is not sufficient—it is like the Kellogg Pact after the First World War whereby each of the nations solemnly renounced war and almost before the ink was dry entered the Second World War because there was no law and order in the world and no police force to enforce it.

We have three-quarters of the United Nations with us and each nation, including the United States, should yield enough sovereignty to authorize and get behind and go all out for a police force for the United Nations organized to prevent aggression and to maintain law and order and preserve the peace in the world and specifically to use every force and power of the United Nations to prevent the third world war.

It would be a terrible mistake for any one nation or pact to drop a bomb or bombs on a nation or nations of another pact, but it would not be out of line for the authorized police force of the United Nations to drop any number of bombs to preserve the peace of the world, to prevent aggression of a powerful nation against a weaker foe, or to maintain law and order in the world.

My advice is to reconvoke immediately the United Nations, do away with the veto power and substitute a three-quarters vote of the Nations in the same fashion that our Continental Congress did under the Articles of Confederation. In other words, until we work out a constitution for the United Nations, the police force and enforcement branch will be governed and controlled by a three-quarters vote of the United Nations having chiefly in mind the prevention of the third world war, and the preservation of peace and the maintenance of law and order in the world.

There has never been any law and order in the world and hence no authorized police force—just laissez faire—and any nation could embroil the world in war. When the United Nations gets a police force its special instruction will be to prevent world war III, and with the help of the three-quarters now with us, world wars will be over. At last we shall have the Federation of the World and the Parliament of Man, and then, as Tennyson said, "The troubled earth will slumber, lapped in universal law."

Peekskill Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, vigorous action by the State of New York which has just resulted in the indictment of six participants in the Peekskill riot should be gratifying to Americans everywhere. The local authorities are now having their opportunity—as they should—to demonstrate their ability to enforce the law and bring about respect for the Constitution. The issue is also a much wider one affecting respect for constitutional guaranties to minorities throughout the United States, emphasizing that we expect it as much in the North as in the South.

Those of us in the Congress who opposed the Mundt-Nixon bill and similar legislation have a special duty to see that constitutional guaranties are neither flouted nor exploited. I hope that the grand jury action already inaugurated in New York will apply with equal weight to the hoodlums who participated in the riot as well as to any Communist or Communist sympathizers who incited it.

It reminds us that consideration of Federal antilynching legislation has been permitted to lag in a way which is a disservice to the American people. There should be an overriding power in the Federal Government to see that beyond considerations of community or even State the Constitution is honored by all.

Arab Refugees and DP Problem—Reply to Mark Ethridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1949.

Mr. MARK ETHRIDGE,
Publisher, the Louisville Times,
Louisville, Ky.

MY DEAR MR. ETHRIDGE: I have before me your editorial, Even Ear Muffs Will Not Silence the Case of the Homeless Arabs.

Despite your sentiment to the contrary, it is not my purpose to silence the case of the refugee Arabs. It would appear that you did not get the full import of my remarks before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, called to consider the Celler displaced-persons bill, which was passed by the House and has since been gathering dust in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It cannot be gainsaid that the Arab refugees constitute a problem which must be faced sincerely and honestly. I want to make it clear that I consider these Arab refugees as victims of the autocratic Arab effendi and rulers. You must be aware that these unfortunate Arabs were propagandized into fleeing from their homes. The atrocity tales were circulated by the Arab leaders to whip up enthusiasm for an aggressive war, which boomeranged. The Arabs fled in the thousands and created economic stress and social discomfort in the surrounding Arab areas. In short, Arab leadership itself is responsible for this unhappy situation, but has never acknowledged this publicly, seeking to place the problem they created upon the shoulders of Israel. We must keep this clearly in mind: The Israelis did not drive these Arabs out of Palestine. In truth and in fact, the Israelis urged them to stay. Many did stay and I saw them working peacefully side by side, with the Israelis when I was in Israel last year.

However, injecting the Arab refugee problem into the hearings on the displaced-persons bill, designed to help the victims of Hitler sadism and Stalin persecution, is another propaganda attempt to confuse the issue. It is likewise an obvious maneuver to so overload the proposed bill as to make its passage impractical. The argument runs something like this: "We have Arab refugees, Pakistani refugees, Hindustani refugees, Greek refugees, Chinese refugees—we can't take them all in, so why bother with the unfortunate displaced persons now in the displaced-persons camps of Europe?" Such argument, however, departs from the major purpose of the bill. The bill seeks primarily to dissipate the problem of maintaining the displaced-persons camps in Europe at a cost of $75,000,000 a year. The International Refugee Organization will soon fold up and these camps may have to be closed. I shudder to think what would happen if these displaced persons—Catholics, Jews, and Protestants—were thrown back into the shriveled German economy or attempts were made to return them to the iron-curtain countries from which they came.

The Celler displaced-persons bill has the support of 21 Governors, 32 State Displaced Persons Commissions, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, various agricultural organizations, and thousands of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. It was overwhelmingly passed by the House and, if blasted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it would be passed overwhelmingly by the Senate. It was prepared and passed in the House in pursuance of the Democratic platform. It has the unqualified support of the Senate leaders on both sides of the aisle. I believe it has your support.

The Arab refugee issue has no relation to this specific displaced-persons bill. If the problem is to be considered by the Congress it must be considered as immigration legislation, separate and apart from the Celler bill. The Arab refugee problem, it must be remembered, was not within the contemplation of interested governments which sought to arrive at some solution for displaced persons now under the care of the International Refugee Organization. This situation, it can now be told, was discussed at Potsdam long before the Arab refugee problem existed. We can see the distinction clearly if we keep in mind that the Celler bill is designed for a specific purpose and is not meant to embrace every immigration purpose.

You are very wrong when you say, "Even if he wears ear muffs Mr. CELLER cannot fail to hear the story of the Arab refugees." I have gone fully into this problem; all the facts are completely known to me. I would be the last one to state that this human suffering should be ignored. My sincere interest in Israel, particularly, is well known. I know that Israel cannot exist securely in a climate of animosity. There is a material need for the Arabs and the Israelis to live in harmony and cooperation to assure the stability of the Middle East. The Israeli leadership is fully aware of that need. The Israelis have offered to take back 100,000 of these Arab refugees; they have offered to make substantial financial contributions toward the resettlement of the remaining Arab refugees in underpopulated Arab countries. Moreover, the Israelis although in possession of Arab-owned land have not deemed it theirs by right of conquest; they have stated again and again that they will pay for this land (an act unprecedented in history). They are keeping detailed records of all moneys due the Arabonies, arising out of the operation of their land and undertaking, moneys which will eventually be turned over to the absent Arabs. Israel has made these offers despite the fact that the problem was not of their making. Israel is being asked to jeopardize her very existence, socially, economically, and politically by bearing the consequences of the Arabs' flagrant violation of the United Nations decision. The Arab leadership has done well indeed in creating a blanket of sympathy to cover their ulterior purpose. The logic behind the propaganda is quite apparent. To those familiar with the miserable treatment accorded the Arab peasants by their leaders, it is apparent that the plight of these refugees is not the pure humanitarian concern the leadership would have us believe. It would serve their purpose well to make Israel take back all the Arab refugees, for by doing so they would achieve by indirection what they could not achieve directly—that is a conquest of Israel from within. They know full well that an influx of Arab refugees would create an economic and social threat which could well lead to the collapse of the state. It would create chaos and confusion and multiply one hundredfold the problems already faced by the Republic. It would mean the cessation of immigration and bring with it the real possibility of an Arab population soon outnumbering the Israelis within their own territory, freezing the Israelis again into a minority group. Doubtlessly, it would mean the creation of a fifth column.

A solution must be found for this very present problem of Arab refugees, but it must be a solution in which all the factors are weighed and from which the least harmful of consequences will follow. To find such a solution is no easy task, involving as it does human suffering, political entanglements and confused motivation.

I have written at length because I am sure that you had no clear knowledge of my stand on the issue. I believe you will see from the above that you have rendered me a real disservice in placing your editorial strictures upon me, and I hope you will give publicity in your valuable paper to these words and give them the same prominence as your editorial.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

British Pay for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier for September 21, 1949:

BRITISH PAY FOR SOCIALISM

The British people probably haven't found out about it yet, but their Socialist Government has now presented them with their first real bill for socialism.

Up to now, the American people (that includes you) have been paying the bills. We've given them many billions, all of which we really needed in this country. We've balanced their budgets, meeting their deficits, supporting their currency, giving them food and merchandise when they couldn't pay for it.

Every time the British Government bought a toupee for a bald head, and then bought him another to wear while the first was being cleaned (on the theory that embarrassment over baldness was a detriment to health)—who do you think really paid for such nonsense? You did.

far, has been in continued poverty. They

The main way in which the British have had to pay for the folly of socialism, thus have been underfed, underclothed, underhoused. They have had the lowest standard of living of any so-called civilized country since the Dark Ages.

But now they are going to pay financially as well—and pay through the nose.

Most Americans have put their emphasis, in discussing British devaluation, on the impact of this action in the international field.

Let's take a good look at what the Socialist dictatorship has done to its own people.

The value of the British pound has been slashed 30 percent.

To the British workingman or woman, that means this: If he has been earning $20 a week, which is somewhat near the average British pay after deductions for this and that, the buying value of his earnings was cut to $14.

If he had a hundred dollars in the bank, it is now worth $70.

If he had insurance worth $1,000, it is now worth $700.

If he was one of the great majority who got an assistance check from the government, it's value was reduced accordingly. The mother who had been getting $10 a month, say, to help diaper and feed her baby, now gets a check reading the same amount, but worth only $7.

Broadly speaking, the Socialists who now hold the British people in a dictatorship almost as tight as those of Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin, slashed away a third of the income of the British people at one swoop.

Moreover, they not only did this without a referendum or other consent of the governed; they did it after promising flatly, no less than twelve times, never to do it.

If that's not dictatorship, what is?

In a broader sense, what devaluation means to the British people is a 30-percent slash in their standards of living.

They thought they were on the bottom—that they were getting barely enough food to keep them alive, barely enough clothing to keep them covered.

Now their government has shoved them through the floor.

Take another side of this high-handed swindle. For 4 years the British Socialists have been nationalizing. This has been done through the enforced purchase of industrial and other securities in exchange for interest-bearing government bonds.

Many economists and others have pointed out that these bonds, having nothing but the faith and good intentions of the British Government back of them, were fiat bonds. They have warned that the government, whenever it suited its purpose, would not hesitate to break its promise to maintain the interest payments on them.

Through devaluation, the British Socialists have slashed the interest rate on their securities 30 percent.

That is not honest. It is not democratic. It is nothing less than tyranny and despotism at work.

A government which won't keep its promises regarding its credit and its currency is a crooked government. And a government which has so completely forgotten its basic obligation of keeping faith with its people is far along on the road to dictatorship.

There is no more sacred duty of any government than that of protecting the integrity of its credit and its money. And the first step of any power-drunk government, trying to stay in power and to increase its power, is to abuse public credit and debase national currency.

Americans, please note.

What the British Government did was to repudiate 30 percent of its currency. It also repudiated 30 percent of its national debt.

It covered up ahead of time with a series of lies to its own people and the rest of the world, and is trying to cover up after the fact with a string of equally untruthful

statements minimizing the effect of what it has done.

Think it over.

Do you feel that such a government is a good risk for billions more of your money? Do you think that methods such as this are building for a secure, peaceful, and happy world in the future?

Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the partition of Palestine according to the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947, was one of the UN's most signal triumphs in the maintenance of world peace and security. It is again challenged in respect of the administration of Jerusalem, a situation made acute by aggression by forces of the Arab States outside of Palestine.

The consequences of endeavoring to sever Jerusalem from Israel, 95 percent of whose population is Jewish, could undo much of which has been accomplished for the peace and security of this area and in respect of the stability of the governmental structure of Israel.

The appended editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 15, 1949, demonstrates clearly that the holy places can be fully protected under international auspices without a completely impractical severance of the new city of Jerusalem from the whole of Israel, with which it is inextricably tied and which tie is essential to the national life of Israel as well as to the life of Jerusalem:

JERUSALEM AND THE UN

The proposal of the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission for permanent internationalization of Jerusalem, whatever its theoretical attractiveness may be, appears to have been far outrun both by time and events. It is not merely a question of the Israelis' refusal to cede their rights in Jewish Jerusalem, although this alone would make the UN's task of taking over the entire city a formidable one, but also of the practicability and effectiveness of the Conciliation Commission's proposal. There was a time, perhaps, when internationalization, which was suggested in the UN's original partition resolution of 1947, might have been imposed; but it was the Israeli Army and not the UN which saw to it that the partition of Palestine became a reality. The fighting for Jerusalem proper left the Israelis in possession of the new city and King Abdullah's Arab Legion in control of the old city, and the complete acquiescence of both sides would be a prerequisite to any plan for treating the city as a whole.

The Commission's plan, as a matter of fact, envisages the internationalization not only of Jerusalem but of a 60-square-mile enclave around the city, including Bethlehem. Although many of the city's administrative functions would be reserved to the UN, each side would police its own zone, and the holy places, which constitute the crux of the entire Jerusalem question, would be open to all. But the important question of what kind of citizenship the residents of the area would hold is left untouched, and there is, as yet, no UN police force powerful enough to make internationalization effective on all levels, or even to guarantee access to the holy places in case they should be threatened. Furthermore, enclaves of this sort have a way of creating problems rather than settling them, and the Jerusalem area is lacking in the natural advantages that sometimes enable a port, for example, to exist as an entity.

That the United Nations, as the representative of the world community, has a rightful place in Jerusalem, is denied by none. The Israeli Government has repeatedly and consistently expressed its willingness to have the UN supervise the holy places, not only in Jerusalem but elsewhere, and there is no reason to doubt that both the letter and spirit of such an agreement would be rigidly adhered to. It is conceivable, also, that the UN could perform valuable service as a mediator in the city and as a guardian of the rights of outside parties. There is no reason why a satisfactory compromise along the lines set forth by the Israeli Government should not be worked out and, in time, become acceptable to all interested parties. But stability in Palestine scarcely seems likely if the UN persists in a now outdated plan of setting up a third state in a country that is barely large enough for two.

H. R. 3224

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 3224, to which I invite the attention of my colleagues. Its introduction has excited the very deep interest of a great many people in the country. I believe that it is sound thinking. If you have a moment, will you please examine the bill and read this short statement in explanation of it. It is not long. In any event, should you have the opportunity, I should like to have your reaction.

STATEMENT ON H. R. 3224

High-income taxes are here to stay. It is possible to argue that some reduction should be made or that the necessity to balance the budget may even require an increase. But the reduction—if any—will not be pronounced. Any return to the prewar level of taxation seems out of the question. It is all the more important, therefore, that the burden of Federal income taxes should be made as equitable as possible. For it is a burden that we will have to carry for many years.

The taxpayer whose source of income is highly fluctuating, whose total annual income may be less than zero in bad years, should be enabled to save something for these lean years. As a matter of common fairness one might think that his total tax load, over a period of years, should be less than that of the more fortunate taxpayer who enjoys a steady income—who needs merely to make ends meet each year, including taxes, in order to remain solvent. Under our present laws, however, the taxpayer with a highly fluctuating income pays more in taxes than the more fortunate taxpayer who, over the same period of years, has earned the same total amount but in equal yearly earnings.

Doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, and most other professional men must spend many years in acquiring their education. They then face many more years in acquiring the experience, the training, and the clients, that will permit them to earn an adequate income. If they are competent, and fortunate, they may begin to earn a good income by the time they are 45 or 50. As prudent men, however, they must realize that in another 15 or 20 years their income will begin going down again and that it behooves them to set aside something for their old age. But they are not able to do so because of high taxes. These men are at a definite disadvantage as compared with taxpayers whose total income during their lifetime has been the same but spread more uniformily over the years. For the latter will pay a smaller total amount of income taxes and will, in addition, be able to start saving for their old age at an earlier date.

The purpose of H. R. 3224 is to partially remove the inequities of the Federal income tax described in the two preceding paragraphs. It proposes that taxpayers may buy a special class of United States bonds with the money they receive as earned income. The maximum purchase of such bonds by a taxpayer within 1 year is limited to $10,000 or 15 percent of the taxpayer's earned net income, whichever is the lesser figure. The bonds bear interest at 2 percent per annum (payable at redemption) when, and only when, held for at least 5 years from date of redemption. Bonds shall have no fixed maturity and shall be nonnegotiable.

In computing his total net income for Federal tax purposes the taxpayer may deduct from net income the full amount paid during the year for the special bonds described in the preceding paragraph. His net income during that year is, therefore, correspondingly reduced for the purpose of computing Federal income taxes. He may keep the bonds less than 5 years (in which case they earn no interest) or he may save them for more than 5 years (in which case they earn 2 percent interest per year). In either event he must add the full face value of the bonds cashed during any one year to his net income for that year for the purpose of computing Federal income taxes.

The taxpayer (or his estate, in the event of his death) does not escape taxation as a result of buying these bonds. The total life income on which he pays taxes will be the same. The purchase of bonds will, however, enable him to partially overcome the disadvantage of a highly fluctuating income or a relatively short period of high-earning years. His total burden of taxation will be brought closer to that of the more fortunate taxpayer whose total life income is the same but spread more equally over a longer period of years.

It is a matter of simple justice that the burden of taxation for persons having the same total life income should be more nearly equalized. We have used the yearly interval for computing taxes as a matter of convenience. It is time to rectify some of the inequalities caused by this arbitrary—and necessary—basis of computing income for tax purposes. H. R. 3224 is a simple and practicable means of doing so.

Another great advantage of H. R. 3224 is that it enables taxpayers to build up some reserve for lean years. If there should be a business depression its shock will be cushioned. It is far better for the Nation to permit individuals with highly fluctuating incomes such as architects, for instance, to survive through their own efforts than it is to make them immediate recipients of a dole in case there should be an acute depression. In the last great depression the construction industry dropped to a level of scarcely more than 10 percent of its 1929 peak. Many architects and engineers engaged in the construction of industry lost their life savings

and were never able to reestablish themselves. A greater number just managed to survive because their savings—accumulated during the twenties, a period of low-income taxes—enabled them to ride the storm. How many such men would survive after a long period of high taxes?

To sum up: H. R. 3224 will tend to equalize the yearly tax burden of taxpayers having the same life income and it will help taxpayers with highly fluctuating incomes to survive individual misfortunes or loss of income in Nation-wide depressions.

All-Faith Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the matters before us which should be acted upon before we adjourn is the joint resolution for an All-Faith Memorial. In the city of Chicago, as elsewhere in the Nation, is a strong public sentiment supportive of this resolution.

As indicative of the universal support of the proposal for an All-Faith Memorial, I wish to call attention to two editorials which have recently appeared in two newspapers of Chicago. Marshall Field is the publisher of the Chicago Sun-Times. He is an outstanding leader in the liberal thought of the Nation and his newspaper is held by the people of Chicago in the highest esteem. Mr. Field is a member of the National All-Faith Memorial Committee which is sponsoring the resolution now before us. In his newspaper, the Chicago Sun-Times, of September 3, 1949, appeared the following editorial:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

In World War II, American members of many faiths fought shoulder to shoulder against nations whose leaders decreed that mankind should have scant freedom of choice in worship or anything else.

Certainly, therefore, an interfaith memorial would be an appropriate American monument to that conflict, as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, commemorating anonymous and total sacrifice, is appropriate to World War I.

As the National All-Faith Memorial Committee says, such a memorial should "serve as a reminder of the strength of popular government as opposed to the tyranny represented by the Axis Powers, and of religious and civil liberty as opposed to bigotry and race idolatry."

This should not be misunderstood to mean a tribute to only one segment of our citizens; as, say, church members who served in the armed forces. Nor is it meant to be a tribute to religion as such. It would be, rather, a tribute to the American idea of freedom which includes the freedom to worship in one's own way, or, for that matter, the freedom not to worship at all.

A joint resolution looking toward such a memorial is before a Senate subcommittee. The resolution would set up a commission of 12 members. They would decide what kind of memorial should be established, and select a site. Funds for the memorial would be raised by national, popular subscription—gifts from the people.

Suggestions as to the kind of memorial are various. One is that it be a tribute to the four chaplains who went down with the U. S. S. *Dorchester*. It could be a civic center, or a national theater, or a forest or a park.

The idea deserves widespread public discussion.

Mr. John S. Knight is the publisher and editor of the Chicago Daily News. He is one of the truly great journalists of America. He is a Republican who has been mentioned frequently as a possible presidential nominee of his party in 1952. Mr. Knight is the distinguished son of a distinguished father, who, as a Republican, served with honor to himself and his constituency in the Congress a number of years ago. Mr. Knight, like Mr. Field, is a member of the National All-Faith Memorial Committee. In his newspaper of September 7, 1949, appeared the following editorial:

INEXCUSABLE DELAY

The joint resolution to create a commission to select a site and design for an All-Faith Memorial to men of all the creeds who gave their lives in the last war has been before Congress since it was introduced by Senator LUCAS last January 31.

There is no vocal opposition. There can hardly be any other opposition from any responsible citizen or group. The project has been under discussion since first mooted by Senator, now Vice President, BARKLEY during the war.

But it still reposes in a Senate subcommittee. The measure may be sidetracked for a longer period if Congress adjourns before action is taken on it.

It should be reported by the committee and passed, if for no other reason, to show that the Eighty-first Congress is not suffering from total paralysis.

In view of the fact that two of the great daily newspapers of Chicago, one representing outstandingly the liberal thought of the community, and the other representing brilliantly a more conservative school of thought, unite in the support of the All-Faith Memorial resolution, and in the closing days of this session give generous editorial space to its support, it would seem clear that there would be no political differences to prevent the quick passage of this resolution when brought from committee onto the floor.

I respectfully bring these two editorials to the attention of my colleagues, and especially of those serving on the Committee on House Administration.

Republican Farm Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the national farm conference to be held at Sioux City, Iowa, September 23 and 24 under the sponsorship of the Republican National Committee, in cooperation with the Republican Senators and Representatives, represents a serious and sincere effort to solve the problems of agriculture which must be solved if our national economy is to avoid serious dislocation. A stable and profitable farm economy is the basis of national prosperity.

With the objective of evolving a legislative program which will insure such an economy, the Sioux City conference has been called. I am assured that full opportunity will be given during the conference for the presentation of views and recommendations by representatives of farm organizations and by individual farmers. I am confident that the information which will be obtained in this manner will be of great assistance to Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike.

This is an opportunity for all farmers to aid in the solution of a problem which is important not only to themselves, but to the Nation as well. I am sure the farmers will take full advantage of this opportunity. We are trying to produce a farm program which will have the full acceptance and support of the American farmer. To do that we must know what he wants and how he proposes that we should go about it. We are not going to the farmer with a predigested package and telling him this is what you need and this is what you are going to get. We are asking him what he wants and he may be sure that his views will be determining, if not completely, at least to a very great degree. I congratulate the Republican National Committee for holding this very important conference to hear the "voice of the farmers of America" for I am sure that from this conference will come much good to our farmers over the long pull, and hence to all the people in our fair land.

Antisegregation Policy in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following news report speaks eloquently for itself and refutes completely the fears expressed in connection with the adoption of a nonsegregation policy by the armed forces:

[From the New York Times of September 18, 1949]

MIXED RACES TRAIN WELL IN AIR FORCE—WHITE AND NEGRO RECRUITS ARE HARMONIOUS IN RELATIONS AT TEXAS BASE, SAYS HEAD

(By B. K. Thorne)

SAN ANTONIO, September 17.—The first 10 weeks of the integration of the white and Negro Air Force enlistees taking their initial training, has been completed without discord, it was stated today by Maj. Gen. Charles W. Lawrence, commanding general of the indoctrination division of the Air Force air training command.

All the recruits at vast Lackland Air Force base here, the largest installation in the whole Air Force, live, eat, and study as a

body, and the grouping together of Negro and white personnel has not caused any incidents.

"The integration of the base was accomplished with complete harmony," General Lawrence stated. "Orders went through to completely end segregation among the trainees on a certain date and when that date arrived the segregation was ended. No unpleasant incidents resulted and the white boys and the Negro boys in the training are getting along well together. And, of course, the same applies to the WAFS [members of the Women's Air Force.]"

There is no discrimination in picking the leaders and Negroes often lead the mixed flights. The trainees are divided into flights of 60, who are commanded by other enlistee airmen, who have proved their leadership. There is keen competition among the many flights and awards are made to those who keep the neatest barracks and perform best at drilling.

TWENTY-SIX THOUSAND PERSONS AT BASE

There are almost 26,000 persons based at Lackland, which covers 9 square miles, and most of them are enlistees taking a 13-week basic training course. The great air base which adjoins famed Kelly Field, is known as the gateway to the Air Force, and all Air Force recruits from all over the United States are sent here for their initial training.

As soon as the new airmen arrive here they are put through a complete processing period, which lasts only 50 minutes. It includes a brief physical examination, and the administration of "shots," the issue of basic uniforms and haircuts.

After several weeks training the airmen receive extensive aptitude tests and interviews to determine which technical schools they will attend after their indoctrination, then reexamined by a group of the country's leading psychologists, who are there on leave from their duties at many medical schools.

Although the airmen are examined at the time of their enlistment, some are rejected after the complete physical examination is given here and are returned to civilian life. A few others, through the complex aptitude test, are found to be unfit for the technical training required of airmen and are also rejected and sent home.

Most of the recruits enlist following high-school graduation and their average age is 18. The gateway to the Air Force is this building known as Grand Central Station. The airmen receive a 10-day furlough between the completion of their basic training and the time they report to the technical schools scattered across the country.

Part of the airmen's pay is withheld during the training here and they make full use of it at Grand Central Station, the last building they enter on this base. The airlines and railroads and bus companys maintain ticket agencies, and travel reservations of all types are made immediately. The station generally has hundreds of young men and women passing through it, all on their way home.

The airmen are promoted from private to private first class when they complete the basic training. Recently a brand new private first class with a noticeable foreign accent rushed up to one of the ticket counters and said that his would have to be an airline reservation, because during his brief furlough he wanted to go home to get married. Asked where his home town was he replied, "Belgium." He flew there in 36 hours, was married, and returned to duty in the United States, all within the 10-day period.

The young airmen get plenty of exercise during their 13 weeks of training, but there is a much greater emphasis on citizenship, religion, morality, and responsibility to the Government than there was in the wartime course. The caliber of training compares to that formerly given to aviation cadets.

Only Jerusalem's Shrines Should Be UN's Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely editorial entitled "Only Jerusalem's Shrines Should Be UN's Concern," which appeared in the September 20, 1949, issue of the Washington News. The editorial follows:

ONLY JERUSALEM'S SHRINES SHOULD BE UN'S CONCERN

I have just read the report of the plans for the internationalization of Jerusalem proposed by the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Committee, and I cannot rid my mind of the memory of two phrases deep-rooted in Christian thought and tradition: "The Earthly Jerusalem" and "The Heavenly Jerusalem."

Ancient as these phrases are, they have, it seems to me, a very direct bearing on the present tangled political situation in the Middle East.

The Earthly Jerusalem of our time—the workaday cities of Arabs and Jews—is no concern of the international community. Those cities are the specific abiding places of men and women who have as much right as any of us anywhere to live normal lives as citizens of normal national states. It is the Heavenly Jerusalem—as conjured up by the shrines and memories that evoke Bible past and Bible truths—that must be the possession of all mankind. To me, at least, it seems obvious that the best and most desirable way out of the Jerusalem tangle is to have the Arab-inhabited Old City become an integral part of whatever state will be set up in the non-Israeli parts of Palestine; to have the new Jewish city of Jerusalem an integral part—as it already actually is, both spiritually and economically—of the State of Israel; and to have the shrines and holy places in both cities of Jerusalem under careful responsible United Nations authority.

Let us not confuse eternal and abstract values with the problems of every-day citizenship.

DANIEL A. POLING.

Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, Before the Kiwanis Club, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Kiwanis Club luncheon, Albuquerque, N. Mex., on Wednesday, September 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to be with you, gentlemen, to enjoy your hospitality and to have the opportunity of discussing a subject which I know you realize is very important. This has been a very pleasant visit for me—apart from Albuquerque being my home, and where I have many friends, it is doubly pleasant because the last time I was here I was not feeling too chipper, but thanks to my good friends, the two Doctors Lovelace and the best climate in the world, I feel much better now, rumors and wishful thinking to the contrary.

There has been no end of misinformation and misunderstanding of the application of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. for a certificate of convenience and necessity permitting them to build a 30-inch natural gas pipe line from San Juan County, N. Mex., to a point in Arizona connecting with the pipe line which the company now operates from west Texas and eastern New Mexico via El Paso to California.

In regard to my position, I have never changed it one iota. At the outset I made the following position clear to the Federal Power Commission: one, that I was not opposed to the granting of the certificate and construction of the pipe line which would permit our natural gas sources to be developed and utilized to the maximum; two, that I was opposed to the application of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. in its present form, because it made no provision for the future needs of New Mexico; three, that I would continue my opposition until adequately assured that New Mexico's present and future needs were protected.

I am not, and never have been, opposed to the construction of the pipe line. I want them to build the line, I want the owners, the leaseholders, the operators, the firms doing business in San Juan County, and the applicant company to enjoy all the good that will come from the development, but I do not want them to enjoy this at the expense of future generations of New Mexico. My only demand is that adequate assurance be given in the application and the certificate itself that in the event New Mexico develops and additional natural gas is needed, that the company will sell us that gas rather than pipe it hundreds of miles away to California. I believe that this position is a fair one.

It is true that many communities in New Mexico, including Albuquerque, are now being served with natural gas from that area, but who can say what the future needs of Albuquerque, Santa Fe, or this valley might be. Those who are opposed to my position in this matter argue that there are adequate reserves and that the future needs of New Mexico can well be taken care of; if that is so, why not provide for that contingency in the application and in the certificate, then our future interest would beyond doubt be protected.

A case in point is that of the State of Tennessee. The Tennessee Natural Gas Co. operates through Tennessee but gets its gas from Texas and from Louisiana; their pipe line only runs through Tennessee. As a condition to obtaining their certificate the Tennessee Natural Gas Co. had to assure the Federal Power Commission that they would take care of all Tennessee's future needs. At the time the certificate was issued Tennessee was not in a position to use natural gas since pipe lines had to be constructed. Now that they are building pipe lines into eastern Tennessee the Tennessee Natural Gas Co. is reluctant to furnish them with gas because it is more profitable to sell it in markets at a greater distance, that is, they make money by transporting gas. But they will have no

choice because farsighted Tennessee governors and city officials saw to it that Tennessee interests were protected.

So what about our case in New Mexico? What if we enjoy continued growth and have unusual demands for natural gas, say in 10 or 20 years? The El Paso Natural Gas Co. would naturally prefer to sell gas in far off California rather than in nearby New Mexico. In such event I would like to see our own rights to buy the natural gas if we need it spelled out in the certificate and not left up to the management of a private utility company.

I regret that our State government and our municipalities did not intervene in this case since our future growth and industrial progress may well be at stake. If there is as much gas as is claimed, let it be established by competent geological and engineering data.

I have been charged with interfering in a technical and scientific matter about which I know nothing, but I fail to see how our State Geologist is contributing any intelligence to the controversy, since the only engineering data ever referred to in his opinions and recommendations has been that furnished by the geologists hired by the company and this is the same data on which the company bases its case. Because of this same data the Federal Power Commission itself denied the original application; it was faulty and the case was badly prepared.

I am not here to argue with anyone. Dudly Cornell, chairman of the San Juan Basin Operators' Committee, has been my friend for many years. Many of the operators and many of those owning wells in the area are personal friends and I want them to make money by selling the gas but I want New Mexico protected first.

I despair of State officials who fail to interest themselves in these situations. It is the telephone hike all over again. Our public officials are elected to serve the people of the telephone company, and not the railroads who are checking all advancement with the most outrageous rates in the United States.

That has been one of our troubles in New Mexico—there seems to be no interest in the public and too much interest in the utilities, and special interest.

I have been criticized for injecting myself into a controversy which is strictly technical and scientific—that's the point exactly—I insist that the question of adequate natural-gas reserves is also a social and political problem—that the people of New Mexico have a right to prevent the depletion of those reserves and to insist that the State be protected in the event it should need additional gas in the future.

I have been questioned why similar safeguarding of natural resources was not insisted on in the case of the original application of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. to pipe gas from west Texas and eastern New Mexico to California. Prorationing, conservation, proper use of our natural resources have come slowly and were generally forced upon industry by the State. Unfortunately, they were unknown in the early days and I wish now that a safeguard, such as stipulated in the Tennessee case could have been agreed to in the original pipe-line application of the El Paso Natural Gas Co. so that in the event that eastern New Mexico and other parts of the State need gas, that we would have a right to buy it.

Albuquerque is growing every day. You, as business and professional men realize it better than anyone else. This growth is based on unprecedented expenditures by the Federal Government in the various military and specialized projects which we have in the State. Albuquerque will know even greater growth when we have adequate flood protection and greater utilization of our valley farm lands.

The possibilities are unlimited once the Rio Grande project is realized. You and I will see it to its full completion. There seems to be no end to where Albuquerque can go. I have not touched on the influx of new industries each one of which will need cheap sources of power and there is none more accessible, nor more easy to utilize than natural gas. I am sure you have all heard of the insistence of the Military Establishments on the dispersal of defense industries. What more natural location for industry, away from the coast, than a mountainous region which is close to a source of natural gas.

It seems ridiculous now to think of the Jemez Mountains, the Sangre de Cristo, or the Manzanos as potential markets for natural gas, but the Communists have not been fools in moving their heavy industry to the Ural Mountains. You have read in the papers that two New Mexico sites are being considered for a $300,000,000 air-engineering development center. These are Placitas at the north tip of the Sandias and Manzano Peak east of Belen. There is one hitch and that is power. I do not agree that natural gas is not acceptable. What a blow it would be to New Mexico if industries and defense projects could not come here because our natural gas was contracted for elsewhere. That is why I have interested myself in the subject. Apparently the El Paso Gas Co. and others consider me a meddlesome interloper. I hope I have been, for I am convinced that only if an alert and aroused public prods our officials our rights and the rights of future generations of New Mexico will not be protected.

I wonder if you gentlemen saw the moving picture "Tulsa"? Mrs. Chavez and I saw it last month in Washington. It describes the story of the early oil operators in Oklahoma. They were venturesome, industrious, and imaginative men but they were shortsighted and ruthless in their exploitation of the oil fields they discovered. They wanted immediate profits and to hell with what they did to the field or what they did to the future development of the State; they had no thought of conservation, no thought of Oklahoma, no thought of the future, just of the dollars they would get from every barrel of oil that gushed out of their wells. Is it too much then for us to insist on the safeguarding of New Mexico's future possibilities? I personally don't think this is too much to ask of a foreign corporation.

It should not be difficult to estimate what our future needs might be. I think any competent economist or engineer could get the figure without a slide rule, basing the amount on present utilization, the rate of increase in population of the State, the rate of influx of industry and by adding a safe margin for possible defense industries and military projects that might be established in New Mexico. Someone figured it out for Tennessee. We should be able to do the same for New Mexico, and why not?

Does anyone here believe that New Mexico's growth will be arrested? I am not one who believes so. But if New Mexico doesn't grow then we couldn't use the gas and therefore the company has nothing to worry about if it entertains a pessimistic view of New Mexico's future.

I insist that our rights must be protected in the original certificate then we will know how we stand as long as that certificate is in effect, and there will be no arguments in the future should we want to use the gas and find that the company is selling it more profitably in California.

I doubt if it is commonly known that at the hearings on the original application the Atomic Energy Commission intervened opposing the granting of the certificate because it might deplete natural gas reserves needed at Los Alamos and thereby jeopardize the defense of our Nation. As a result it was stipulated at the hearing, on the part of the company, that it would in any event furnish the natural gas reqiurement of the Los Alamos project. This was only a demonstration of common sense, on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission, and I think it makes adequate sense for us in New Mexico to be similarly protected. The company has until October 1 to apply for a rehearing. If it does, it will devolve on the people of New Mexico to insist that their city and State officials take a position opposing the granting of a certificate until the public is protected.

I thank you for your courteous attention. It has been a real pleasure to be with you and I sincerely appreciate the opportunity of making my views clear on the subject of the San Juan pipe line. I do not look on this as a fight with San Juan County, not in any way; as a matter of fact, the operators in every election have been my best friends; and I think they can, in this case, have their cake and eat it too. In other words, let the company stipulate that all the future calculable needs of New Mexico will be taken care of and then let the line be built.

I hope that you will agree with me and that you will join in asking the Governor of our State, the city officials of Albuquerque and other New Mexico communities to intervene and insist on such a stipulation.

Thank you.

The Steel Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 22 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the steel dispute which I made yesterday together with various editorials and articles on the same subject.

I am advised that the cost of printing the editorials and articles will be $300.68, but I regard them as of sufficient importance to justify the cost.

There being no objection, the statement and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON STEEL DISPUTE

The most significant and the most delicate problem confronting our Nation today is the situation involved in the negotiations between the steel industry and the United Steel Workers. The implications go far beyond the question of wages or pensions or of Government intervention in bargaining. The issue at stake is one of the whole economic security of our country, not alone from the point of view of the chain of domestic unemployment, recession, and economic unbalance which would inevitably follow a long strike in one of our basic industries, but from the point of view of the equally disastrous effects on our foreign policy and our foreign commitments. The major aims of our Marshall-plan aid to European countries is to help these countries rebuild their own domestic production and economic stability and to halt the march of communism which thrives on internal disruption. A minor recession in the United States a few months ago, while not resulting in any serious or lasting hardship here, did cause a crisis in western Europe and, had it continued, would have provided a further wedge for communism.

Failure to achieve a satisfactory agreement in the steel negotiations at the present time will be to advertise to the world at large that we are not big enough, not mature enough, not steadfast enough in our professed desire to achieve peace in the world, to solve our own problems peaceably. Therefore, we cannot expect to occupy a position of world leadership and offer guidance and aid to other countries. No one and no group stands to profit by such a failure except the Communists and those who, with the Communists, have long been predicting that America will be torn by industrial strife and plunged into economic turmoil. And the Communists can certainly be counted upon to seize this opportunity and use it in every open and insidious way in which they are well versed, to further their own propaganda and discredit democracy.

On Saturday, September 10, the fact-finding board which had been appointed by President Truman to go into the question of the steel dispute, made its report.

Initially Big Steel was unwilling to go along with an unnamed board, giving as their reason the possibility that the board would be stacked against them. When the President suggested that they would not be bound by the findings of that board, public opinion immediately swung wholeheartedly behind this obviously fair proposal, and Big Steel, albeitly reluctantly, did agree to go along. When the findings were made public steel management exercised its reserved right not to be bound by the findings, but I think it is significant to note that Big Steel has not once raised its voice to challenge the integrity and fairness with which the board treated the problem. It simply didn't like what was recommended.

Elsewhere the report was hailed as a triumph for the results which can be achieved by impartial inquiry. Headlines and editorial columns stated—and I am quoting directly from papers and columnists of every political stripe, except, of course, the Communists—that the "steel report could usher in an era of prosperity," that the steel report was "a portal to peace."

Two days after the report appeared David Lawrence, the long-time Washington observer, had this to say:

"If investigating boards of the disinterested type and caliber of Messrs. Rosenman, Daugherty, and Cole could always be found who would bring to their final recommendations the penetrating insight and fairness which these men did, America could look forward to a triumphant achievement in human relations."

Editorial comment generally adopted this same view.

For myself, I certainly feel that anyone who has read and studied the report, whether or not he is in complete and entire agreement with all the conclusions reached and recommendations made, must concede that it demonstrates not only thoroughness and technical competence but a penetrating insight and concern for the welfare of our Nation as a whole.

The recommendations, of course, were not what labor had asked for in its negotiations. Labor had demanded pensions, insurance benefits, and a wage increase together with the insistence that there be no price increase in steel. Labor contended that their three demands would cost the companies about 30 cents an hour per worker, and in the negotiations steel rejected this estimate as far, far below what they thought it would actually cost to meet those demands. In other words, that labor was asking for far more than 30 cents an hour.

Now just what was it that the fact-finding board recommended? First, it recommended that labor withdraw its demand for a wage increase at this time. This was certainly a blow to labor, and there was immediate concern that labor would reject the recommendations altogether on this account. The second recommendation called for pension and insurance benefits to be paid for wholly by the companies and this practice was referred to by the board as the present trend in pension plans. The board limited the pension and insurance benefits to a maximum of 10 cents an hour. But it was pointed out that the steel insurance plans already in existence amounted to about 2 cents an hour, thereby reducing labor's net gain to about 8 cents.

So, as labor viewed it, their demands were cut from 30 cents to 10 cents an hour. Since it had been steel's contention that the union demands would have cost much more than 30 cents an hour, the reduction was, from management's viewpoint, considerably greater.

It is understandable that labor would have been disappointed and angry but in accepting the report and swallowing their disappointment, they demonstrated dignity and a farsighted awareness of the grave public interest involved. They agreed. They agreed to accept the findings as a basis of negotiating their contract.

President Truman immediately asked for an 11-day truce and urged both industry and the union to give the greatest weight and most earnest consideration to the findings and recommendations of the board as a basis for prompt settlement of the dispute.

Nevertheless, United States Steel rejected the findings and condemned the board's recommendation of noncontributory pensions as a revolutionary doctrine of far-reaching and serious consequences to the whole Nation.

This stand by United States Steel appears completely defenseless in view of the fact that United States Steel itself, as an owner of captive coal mines, along with certain other northern mine operators, set the pattern for what it terms a "revolutionary doctrine" by agreeing to set up a noncontributory plan for coal miners. Whatever case Mr. Fairless may make for his contention that employees as well as employers should be required to contribute to the cost of insurance-pension plans, the fact remains that this argument came too late. The issue was already decided, not by the President's fact-finding board, but by Steel itself back in June 1947. Since this is so, the steelworkers are not likely to settle for less than what is already considered a great concession on their part. If the steelworkers strike, the people of our country are aroused to such an extent that they have made it abundantly clear they will hold management, not labor, responsible for injuries to our country's welfare resulting from such a strike.

There has been a development in the news within the past few hours of such great significance that I feel steel management is now forced to reconsider its flat-footed rejection of noncontributory pensions for steelworkers. In the midst of heated negotiations over their new contracts with automobile workers, the Ford Motor Co. announced last night its willingness to carry out contract negotiations on the basis of the recommendations submitted by the steel fact-finding board. A statement by the company at that time referred to having reviewed "our situation in the light of the board's recommendations and their inescapable national effect, whether we agree with them or not." The only conclusion which I think it is possible to draw from this action by the Ford Motor Co. is that here, on the part of one of the largest manufacturers in the world, is a recognition of the fundamental soundness and justice of the findings made by the President's board. At the present stage of negotiations over the Ford contract, the issue is not noncontributory pensions. That question has been settled peaceably in adopting the fact-finding board's recommendations. And the only issue remaining is one of negotiating the value of the pension to be established. So I suggest again that steel management take a second look at their position in view of the Ford action.

Shortly after noon today, it was announced that President Truman has asked for a new 6-day extension of the present truce in the steel dispute. At the same time, the President threw out the suggestion that management and labor resume collective bargaining on their own, saying Federal mediators would be available to assist them. Up to the present moment, there has been no reply from either side. In the light of serious consequences which would result from a strike, it is imperative that both labor and management demonstrate their awareness of the larger public interests involved and either reach an agreement by the strike dead line on Saturday, or show that they are willing and anxious to reach an agreement short of a strike by following the President's suggestion.

I have said many times, and I firmly believe, that most labor leaders are increasingly alert in recognizing their responsibility, not only to their membership, but to the security and economic well-being of America and the free world.

This is a crisis. But out of all the confusion and recriminations, three uncontestable facts emerge. First, labor, though bitterly disappointed in seeing its wage demands set aside, has agreed to go along with the recommendations. Second, the Ford Motor Co. has agreed to adopt the noncontributory pension plan as a basis for conducting contract negotiations. Third, United States Steel went along with noncontributory pensions more than 2 years ago in concluding its contracts with mine workers in captive mines.

Public opinion recognizes these facts and the heat is on Big Steel to show convincingly their willingness to settle the dispute without recourse to injunction or seizure, without demanding that the Government intercede on their side to safeguard our country from industrial paralysis.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of September 11, 1949]

THE STEEL REPORT—A PORTAL TO PEACE

The steel fact finders have made a report which seems to clear the way for industrial peace.

It can, and should, avert two deadly perils, either of which could cause a major depression. First of these dangers was a wave of inflation, touched off by a race between wages and prices which finally would lead to a business bust. The second peril was a series of vast strikes, not only in steel but in other big industries in which the steel demands would establish a pattern.

While neither side has accepted the findings announced yesterday, the report is a careful document written after hearings of unprecedented length and detail, and is certain to carry great weight. As always happens in such cases, it will not fully satisfy either side. But it seems to provide a sane approach to negotiations leading to a settlement not too obnoxious to either party.

There will be a vast responsibility on both the unions and the companies to get together now and settle their dispute.

The report may prove of much historic importance. It can have great immediate and long-term effects on American business.

The immediate effect can be that of averting a new wave of runaway inflation. The board held against a wage increase because general conditions in the steel industry and outside it do not justify one.

"The cost of living has remained stable within the last year; in fact, it has slowly declined," the fact finders pointed out. "The postwar race between rising wage rates and rising costs of living has been called off by economic forces."

So the board found that there is no reason for redress in the form of higher wages. It pointed out that a wage increase in steel would set a pattern for other industries. This could cause rising prices and have bad economic results. What the board clearly had in mind was the sort of boom that finally leads to a bust.

From a long-term standpoint, the findings in behalf of social-insurance benefits and pensions also can have tremendous importance. These are proper charges against management, the fact-finders declared. They also held that the steel industry "could well afford to pay" the cost of the programs it recommended. It fixed the bill for the social insurance and pension plans favored by it at 2½ percent of the operating costs of the 53 basic steel companies involved in the hearing.

"Social insurance and pensions should be considered a part of normal business cost to take care of temporary and permanent depreciation in the human machine, in much the same way as provision is made for depreciation and insurance of plant and machinery," the board said.

Total cost of the insurance and pension benefits recommended is estimated at around 10 cents an hour—a considerable gain for the unions if they settle at that price.

President Truman immediately asked an 11-day delay in any strike action. During that period of truce—which certainly should be granted—will come the troublesome period of reaction to the board's recommendations.

Both the steel companies—which employ a majority of the nearly 1,000,000 steel workers—and the union must take a position.

In doing so, they are under vast responsibility to the American people. A steel strike could touch off a chain reaction of bad effects which would in the end bring depression and suffering.

The welfare of the whole Nation is at stake. It is far more important than the welfare of either a single union or a single industry.

Both sides will now have on them the burden of thinking of America as a whole.

Fortunately, the fact-finder's report seems to be a statesmanlike and intelligent document, arrived at after a patriotic display of care and study. It should open the way to a peaceful settlement in steel and other industries.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of September 13, 1949]

A WISE DECISION

The CIO United Steelworkers' wage-policy committee acted wisely in accepting the recommendations of President Truman's fact-finding board as a basis for renewed negotiations with the steel industry.

The union committee also agreed, as leading steel companies already had, to Mr. Truman's request for an 11-day extension of the strike truce which had been scheduled to end at midnight tonight.

So, although the danger of a costly steel strike has not been entirely removed, there are good grounds for hope. This, of course, assumes that the steel companies will agree, as the union has, to bargaining within the limits of the fact-finding board's report.

Some of the recommendations in that report are, for different reasons, distasteful to each side.

The companies are pleased by the board's stand against a fourth-round wage increase. But they don't like the idea of social insurance and pension plans financed entirely by employers, without contributions from workers.

The union wins a considerable victory in the board's support for employer-financed insurance and pension systems. But the benefits proposed by the board are much smaller than the union had demanded. And the finding that a wage increase is not justified at this time disappoints workers who have been hoping for more pay.

Altogether, it wasn't an easy decision for Philip Murray and his wage-policy committee to make.

Mr. Murray is president, not only of the steelworkers' union, but also of the CIO. In foregoing a steel wage rise he was reversing the pattern which, since the war ended, had meant round after round of increases throughout industry. And he risked bitter criticism from within his own organization.

For instance, the left-wing CIO union of mine, mill, and smelter workers, in convention yesterday at Chicago, denounced the steel board's recommendations as "miserable and inadequate." It called on Mr. Murray to mobilize all CIO unions for a fight to "guarantee fourth-round wage advances this year for all workers."

Mr. Murray may well have concluded that such a fight would be almost certain to cost CIO members, and everybody else, more than anybody could hope to gain from it. If his decision helps to insure industrial peace, as it should, he will deserve the country's gratitude.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of September 14, 1949]

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

"The concept of providing social insurance and pensions for workers in industry has become an accepted part of modern American thinking."

That observation, in the report of President Truman's steel fact-finding board, is true. There is wide agreement with the board's statement that provision for temporary and permanent depreciation of the "human machine," as well as for depreciation and insurance of plant and machinery, should be considered a part of normal business costs.

And the start recommended for steel industry insurance and pension systems is comparatively small.

But Philip Murray, president of the steelworkers' union and the CIO, who calls this recommendation "the most constructive thing in the history of our union," obviously considers it only a start.

Whatever the steelworkers may get now, other unions will want at least that much. And, year by year, the steelworkers and others will want more—especially if they are encouraged to believe that the insurance and pension systems give them something for nothing.

The fact-finding board held, despite vigorous opposition by the steel companies, that these systems should be financed entirely by employers. That may prove to have been a serious mistake. It seems certain to promote the dangerous delusion that such systems do give union members something for nothing.

The principle of sharing by employers and employees in the costs is embodied in the Government's social-security program, in the Federal workers' retirement plans and in the railroad retirement law. It's a sounder, safer principle than the one advocated by the steel fact finders.

For private employers must pay their business costs with money they get from their customers. They will pass along to their customers—including union members—whatever is added to their business costs by insurance and pension plans.

If insurance-pension costs are forced too high by the bargaining power of unions, prices can get too high for many customers—including union members. And if the employers can't pay their business costs, they'll go broke and union members will lose jobs and insurance and pensions.

John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers provide an example. They started their welfare and pension fund with a levy of 10 cents, paid by the mine owners, on each ton of coal mined. Later they forced that to 20 cents a ton. Yet, month after month, even when the mines were operating full blast, revenue to the fund has fallen short of meeting the cost of miners' pensions and other benefits on the scale Mr. Lewis considers necessary.

Perhaps Mr. Lewis can force the levy per ton of coal higher still. But if he does the price of coal also will go higher. And higher coal prices will drive more and more coal buyers to the use of other fuels, which will mean fewer jobs for miners and less production upon which the union can levy for support of its fund.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of September 14, 1949]

HOW'S THAT AGAIN?

When Philip Murray announced the United Steelworkers' acceptance of the recommendations of the fact-finding board in the steel wage dispute, it was a foregone conclusion that he would be the target for criticism from left-wing unions of the CIO, of which he also is president.

The left-wingers performed exactly according to schedule. The Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers' convention in Chicago called on Mr. Murray to reject the recommendations and renew the drive for higher wages.

John Clark, president of the Smelter Workers, called the board's program "a puny, piddling, pension, and welfare program."

On the same day, last Monday, a dispatch from Houghton, Mich., announced that the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers settled their labor dispute with a copper company with a reduction in pay for miners of 15 cents an hour.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of September 12, 1949]

THE REPORT ON STEEL

The report of the President's steel fact-finding board provides a reasonable basis for settlement of the dispute between the industry and the United Steelworkers. Parties to the dispute should accept Mr. Truman's appeal for a 10-day extension of the strike deadline so as to provide time for study of the board's recommendations.

The board found that there is no reason why the steelworkers should have a general wage increase. The position of the workers, it concluded, is not inequitable. During the last year, the cost of living has gradually declined. As compared with workers in other industries, steelworkers have fared very well in getting increases since 1939.

We must agree with the board's conclusion that an increase of wages in the steel industry would establish an inflationary pattern dangerous to the present leveling-out process of the national economy.

While recommending against an immediate wage increase, however, the fact finders left the door open for subsequent wage demands—"if continued high profits do not result in benefit to the consumer of steel in the form of lower prices, there would be a justification for the union to renew its demand for increase of wage rates in order to participate in the industry's prosperity."

The pension issue involves a fundamental question: Who should bear the responsibility of social security, Government or industry?

The board leaves a definite implication that the primary responsibility rests with Government, but it also advances a logical belief that until such time as Government makes adequate provision, industry should fill the gap. Still, it is clear that the board does not favor a duplication of social-security functions as between Government and industry.

The board also supports the industry's contention that pension discussions are not now a contractual obligation. But, adds the

board, they are permissible under the Taft-Hartley law. At the same time, the board urges long and thorough study which would have the practical effect of delaying negotiation of a pension until next year.

One of the board's most interesting findings involves the industry's just complaint against industry-wide bargaining. It declares that the habit of turning to Government instead of arguing issues out in collective bargaining has become too entrenched. Parties to bargaining give up too easily, the board believes, and not without cause. The original concept of collective bargaining on a plant-by-plant basis "has hardly been observed in the steel industry," the board found, adding that a desire to return to normal collective bargaining on the part of the companies is completely justified.

There has, of course, been much discussion as to who is responsible for industry-wide bargaining, the industry or the steelworkers It is pertinent to point out, in this connection, that only a lack of unity among the steel companies permitted the current dispute to go to fact finding.

United States Steel, it will be recalled, wanted to hold out for bargaining without Government intervention. But when the smaller companies capitulated, making it plain that there was no industry-wide agreement, Big Steel, accounting for only 30 percent of the industry, had to go along.

Now, if the union is not responsible for industry-wide bargaining, as it firmly insists, Mr. Murray should announce that each local will be permitted to negotiate its own contract with the individual steel companies without review by the international union's policy-making board.

The fact-finding board's slap at those who are quick to run to Government with their negotiating difficulties is not without a certain wry humor. Federal intervention and its quick acceptance by the union was widely interpreted as Mr. Truman's effort to take his labor friends off a spot. It was generally supposed that labor would get a substantial portion of what it asked, as it did under similar circumstances in 1946, even at the risk of a new round of inflation.

But not only has the board refused to give the union substantially what it asked, it has also repudiated the notion of governmental paternalism, a development we welcome heartily.

Thus it is clear that those who expected a one-sided report have been disappointed, if not shocked. On the whole, the report appears to be thorough and broad-minded. Let us hope that its consideration by both industry and the steelworkers will now be equally as painstaking and farsighted, so that the tragedy of a strike may be averted.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of September 13, 1949]

STEEL REPORT COULD USHER IN AN ERA OF PROSPERITY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—An epoch-making report which should have far-reaching effects in the handling of labor-management relations in all industries in America has just been handed down by the fact-finding board of three men appointed by President Truman to make recommendations to employers and unions in the steel industry.

For the general principles used in the approach to this complex controversy can be applied in settling other major disputes and thus render less and less necessary the restrictive features of both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

If investigating boards of the disinterested type and caliber of Messrs. Rosenman, Daugherty, and Cole could always be found who would bring to their final recommendations the penetrating insight and fairness which these men did, America could look forward to a triumphant achievement in human relations.

While one may disagree with the detailed argument here and there, realizing that these three men in just a few weeks could not possibly understand all phases of the dispute and the background so much more familiar to both the unions and the management, even this imperfect method, after all, is better than costly strikes.

Such Nation-wide work stoppages affect disastrously the innocent bystander—the public. Hence it is desirable that a board representing the public shall make recommendations which, while not binding, do have an immense force of public opinion behind them when they are fair and just, as is true in the present instance.

Unfortunately there is a tendency after examining such a well-balanced report to say it is a victory for one side or the other. Actually it is a victory for the public.

In rejecting as inopportune and inequitable the fourth round of wage increases demanded by the steel unions, the Board gave to the companies sympathetic support for their contention that 1 year's earnings do not warrant changes in fixed charges that may continue over a period of years. The unions, on the other hand, won approval for social insurance—hospitalization, death, and disability benefits—as a current expense that does mean an increase in wage expenses for management. Likewise the union won support for the principle of a company-contributed pension plan which is to be bargained for when next year's agreement is negotiated. This is progress on all fronts.

To call the report a compromise is a misnomer. It merely selects what is right or wrong in each contention and frankly says so. The net effect is to give each side what it deserves. The correct word, therefore, is not "compromise" but honest, objective, and judicial determination of issues that are economic and social.

The report will be read and reread in the coming months by all who must deal with the vexing phases of the labor problem.

For it recites a philosophy of reasoning that inevitably must hearten all who believe that the major factors in our economic life—unions and management—can, with the outside stimulus and support, find basic solutions without recourse to strikes.

More than this, the report has a meaning for everybody in business or industry or the professions.

It means that a high-level board with Presidential prestige behind it bespeaks and urges an era of stability in wages and a hope that out of such stabilization may come lower prices and hence an increased buying activity. To use a stock-market term, the steel report is "bullish" for everybody. If taken to heart on all sides, the report can usher in an era of stabilized prosperity for America.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of September 13, 1949]

THE GHOST OF LORD KEYNES HOVERS OVER STEEL REPORT

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—Just as with an insurance policy, you have to read the fine print in the report of the President's steel fact-finding board. The fine print, in this instance, is in a lengthy footnote dealing with a ghost.

It is a ghost that haunts American policy makers and those who would influence that policy. In a footnote, Chairman Carroll R. Daugherty deals with the theories of the late Lord Keynes. Keynes urged deficit spending by government for public works as a cure for depression.

Credited with greatly influencing the course of the New Deal, the Keynesian theory is championed still by many former CIO New Dealers. The root of the argument presented to the board for the CIO Steelworkers Union was that only by a wage increase could the recession be prevented from becoming a depression. With steel leading the way, this would be an increase throughout industry.

The board rejected that argument. This is certain to have a marked effect on the status of ardent Keynesians within the Truman Fair Deal, conspicuously Leon Keyserling, one of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It can also have important political consequences.

While rejecting any wage increase, the other two board members leave the delicate task of interpreting Keynes entirely to Daugherty. Far from being scornful of the brilliant British economist, he refers to him as "the master."

Nor does he reject outright Keynes' basic theory. Rather, in a discussion that reads like an interpretation of holy writ, he declares that Keynes never approved the idea of a wage increase to offset the threat of a depression.

"The error," Daugherty writes, "appears to lie in carrying too dogmatically and rigidly the view of Keynes that wage rates in general are not only an element of firms' cost but also an element in the demand for firms' products Many American Keynesians stress the demand side of wage-rate changes much more than the cost side. The businessman, thinking mainly of his own enterprise and not much about the economy as a whole, emphasizes the cost element of such changes."

In the argument before the fact-finding board, the union insisted that more dollars would have to go in wages into the pockets of workers if they were to be able to to keep on buying the products of America's vast industrial machine.

On the other side, the companies stoutly maintained that a boost in wages would mean a corresponding boost in prices. And with higher prices, the average citizen would be able to buy fewer goods. Therefore the economic picture would grow darker.

Chairman Daugherty goes on to say that no one can really be sure of which of these two consequences would flow out of an increase. Daugherty concludes:

"The long-term need is for steady economic expansion. Because the effects of a wage-rate change under present conditions are unpredictable, it seems best not to tamper now with the general level of wage rates."

There is a slight sop to the Keynesians in the board's emphasis that its decision on wages applies only "under present conditions." If the companies' cost of manufacturing steel declines as a result of the modernization of plant and technique now going forward, then the companies will be faced with the necessity of a choice. They will either have to lower the prices of their product or increase the wages of their workers. Social insurance and pensions, in the board's interpretation, contribute to the stability of the economy at a high level of employment.

Lord Keynes' last visit to Washington before his death was in November of 1945. He was then helping to carry on negotiations for a loan to Britain.

His gloomy prophecies made privately at that time seem to have been correct. It was too little, if not also too late. But, nevertheless, as this latest instance shows, the Keynesian theory is a powerful force in contemporary life. The brilliant, witty ghost of an extraordinary prophet looks down on our time.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of September 13, 1949]

LABOR'S NEW GOAL

Organized labor is doubtless disappointed that a fourth round of wage increases has been declared unjustified. But it can find solid satisfaction in the fact that it now has the weight of a Presidential fact-finding

board behind its new goal—security for the worker.

Thus the recommendations of the fact finders may prove to be a historic turning point in labor-management relations. In accepting the recommendations, the United Steelworkers wisely seize an opportunity to strengthen the concept of management responsibility for the welfare of the worker.

If wages can be stabilized now at a reasonable level, as appears likely, and labor can obtain industry-financed social welfare benefits, labor will be making a substantial net gain.

The united steelworkers will provide the big test for security, just as in the past they have carried the ball in labor's fight for wage increases.

However, the steelworkers are not the trail blazers in the security field. The principle of management-financed security programs has already been established in such diverse fields as coal mining, the needle trades and recording.

But if the steelworkers obtain security benefits on the basis of the report of the Presidential fact finders, they will establish a new security pattern for other great mass-production industries, like automobiles and electrical equipment, and, inevitably, for industry generally.

Management insists, and the Presidential fact finders agree, that security for workers is primarily a matter for a governmental social-security program to which workers contribute.

But, say the fact finders, the present social-security system is inadequate and it is up to industry to fill the gap and thus take care of the temporary and permanent depreciation in the human machine just as it makes provision for the depreciation and insurance of plant and machinery.

The gap between what the worker now receives through the Government's social-security program and what the fact finders feel would be adequate is considerable.

The fact finders think that the steel worker should have an old-age pension of $100 a month. The average monthly benefit paid to a retired worker under old-age and survivors insurance last April was $29.59; if he had a wife over 65, she received $13.54, making a total of $39.13 a month for the couple. The maximum any worker and his family can draw is fixed by law at $85 a month. Thus many retired workers drawing old-age pensions must also appeal for public assistance in order to subsist.

Relatively few aged people are participating in the social-security program. As of April, only about 1,700,000 of the Nation's 10,600,000 persons over 65 were receiving Federal annuities. About two out of every five jobs are not covered by old-age insurance. Small wonder that nearly one-fourth of all persons in the United States aged 65 or over are on old-age assistance rolls, receiving assistance payments larger than insurance benefits. The implications of this situation are underlined by the steady growth in the proportion of older people in this country.

Gradually, it is to be assumed, the gap between what the aged worker can now expect and what he needs to exist will be narrowed by government. The Truman administration has asked Congress to remedy the principal defects in the social-security system by extending coverage and increasing benefits. But there is no indication that this will be done soon or that congressional action will provide as much as the Presidential fact finders feel is adequate.

Thus the burden of worker security is being tossed to industry. And it is quite a burden when one considers that most workers are not now covered by private pension plans. Bureau of Labor statistics for 1947 showed that only about 5 percent of manufacturing companies surveyed had retirement pensions.

It is clear, then, that the area affected by labor's new security goal is tremendous. And there is no turning back. An extension of social security, now an accepted principle of American life, is inevitable. It has become simply a question as to how the burden will be borne, by Government or by industry. But certainly there should be no overlapping, and industry should enjoy tax exemption on those expenditures it makes toward filling the gap.

[From the Iron Age of September 15, 1949]

THE STEEL BOARD'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Presidential steel fact-finding board's report was neither as bad as steel people expected nor as good as the union had hoped. It was remarkable for its simplicity and for its bluntness. It put to rest a lot of union fairy tales about steel and it gave its idea of the steel industry's responsibility on social insurance and pensions in strong words.

The report ought to be must reading. It says that social insurance and pensions paid for by industry should be considered as insurance to take care of temporary and permanent depreciation of the human machine the same as plant equipment is provided for. The ability to pay was considered but was not the board's primary argument. The board said that steel was up and coming on wages but was backward on insurance and pension plans.

In a nutshell the board recommended: That there be no fourth wage round; that an insurance plan costing about 4 cents an hour—with credit for existing plans—be adopted and that a pension plan amounting to 6 cents an hour—with credit for existing plans—be established after a commission studies the problem so that intelligent collective bargaining can proceed to an agreement.

The board rejected all the union's loose arguments on productivity, ability to pay, excessive profits, the need for a wage increase, high-priced social-insurance plans, and a $125 to $150 pension per month over and above the Government old-age benefits. The rejections were blunt and short.

A big surprise was the rejection of a wage-increase demand on the basis that it was not justified and that if granted it would upset the apple cart for industry as a whole. No inequities were found in steel wages. The board said that stockholders' dividends were but a minor fraction of profits. And it said that maybe profits spent for expansion should have gone to stockholders and funds for social insurance and pensions with long-term financing supplying money for expansions.

Steel management now has a tremendous responsibility. It went into the steel hearings saying that it would not be bound by recommendations of the board. The board's findings were a surprise to steel people. No wage increase is involved. Recommended social insurance and pension plans would be a part of wage costs. But credit would be available for plans in existence. The costs could be as low as 8 cents an hour.

If steel firms do not agree to the board's findings there will be a strike. Such a strike might ruin the budding zephyr of better business.

Steel chose 60 days ago not to fight but to submit to the board under protest. Now it does not have much to fight about—or at least not enough to plunge the country into a steel strike. It is a ticklish decision to make. We don't believe there will be a strike.

But we do believe that this steel board drama should be a lesson to the union and to steel. Together they could not settle their differences. The Government stepped in. Government through its board has made recommendations which carry weight. Management and the union had better take another look before either again seeks Government guidance. Someday recommendations might become orders with both management and labor in a governmental strait-jacket.

TOM C. CAMPBELL,
Editor.

Northwesterners Hold Round-Table Discussion on CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Pacific Northwest the plan for a Columbia Valley Administration is being discussed in community forums, round-tabl discussions, and programs of all types. I believe the recent round-table talk held in Moses Lake, Wash., is typical of the manner in which this problem is being considered. The discussion was reported by Mr. Howard Ordway in the Wenatchee World. It follows:

CVA DISCUSSED AT ROUND-TABLE TALKS

(By Howard Ordway)

MOSES LAKE, July 18.—It didn't go according to plan.

That's about the way you could sum up the quarterly north central Washington round-table meeting at the local grade-school building here Saturday.

The agenda called for discussion of roads, schools, and a new panel, employment, along with CVA. But the meeting never got beyong a lively search for a little wisdom on how we can best handle the development of the Columbia and its tributaries.

Lars Langloe, assistant supervisor of hydraulics, State department of conservation and development, the State representative, and principal speaker didn't have a prepared speech.

But it wouldn't have made much difference for in the meeting there were several who have lived and worked with the basin program. They opened up the lively discussion and this is a record of what they had to say.

Langloe had but started on his "off the cuff" speech when he asked Ed Southard, pioneer Grant County citizen and Grand Coulee booster, "Ed, you know what the Federal Government has done out here and how much control they have—do you want more aid and control over the State's resources?"

Ed Southard, despite his advancing years, leaped to the floor with agility and bounce. "I've been willing to take Federal aid whenever we can get it. There's no lack of faith on our part, Lars. I don't know if you opposed Coulee Dam, but you were sleeping with the boys who did."

This brought a quick response and considerable laughter from the delegates. From then on, Lars Langloe was on the defensive in the discussion of the CVA program.

Frank Bell, Ephrata hotel owner and basin commissioner, raised the question to Langloe, "Isn't the CVA board responsible to Congress, Mr. Langloe? Did I understand you to say it could operate on its own without regard for Congress?"

Langloe's reply was, "Yes, in a way."

Harold Tipton, executive secretary of the CVA league then took the floor. He reminded Langloe, the TVA Act was amended six times and the Administration was investigated twice. It is very responsive and accountable to Congress. There is no control over the economic life of private business contemplated in CVA.

Bill Raugust, representative from Odessa, a wheat warehouse and implement store owner then came to Langloe's aid. "I am opposed to CVA—just as I am to the Federal control over the storage of wheat. The Federal Government is telling us where and how we must store wheat. They tell us too, what wheat must be shipped—insisting on wheat not wheat from elevators but that on the ground. They sent us expensive storage bins we had to assemble to store 15,000 bushels of wheat, but they're no good.

"The CVA would supersede the legislature and just like the Brannan program, ruin our farm production. It's too much centralization when we need decentralization."

Frank Bell countered quickly to Raugust with, "I suppose Mr. Raugust opposes the Federal program for support of the wheat prices and assistance in loans to wheat ranchers."

Raugust failed to comment.

Nat Washington, Ephrata attorney and State representative chided Langl e for his remark that TVA is socialistic.

"It's the same old gospel of spreading fear and hysteria among the people we went through on Grand Coulee Dam," Nat, whose father was one of the leaders for the dam, commented.

"Mr. Langloe, how do you reconcile these statements by Senators VANDENBERG and BILL KNOWLAND of California?

"VANDENBERG hails TVA with this comment: 'TVA is one of the most successful institutions on this earth.' Senator SALTONSTALL, a Massachusetts blueblood, commented: 'TVA has benefited a large section of this country.' KNOWLAND said after an 18-month study and visit to the valley it was strengthening private enterprise and local government.

"Do you still think TVA is socialistic, Mr. Langloe?" Washington asked.

"I would remind you Mr. Langloe, that Washington Water Power called Grand Coulee socialization. The Spokane papers in editorial said the bed rock was rotten—that anybody who could see a market for power should have his head examined and placed in an institution. Both have regretted these comments since," Washington commented.

"The Bureau has a tough problem. We recognize that. We also recognize that despite working agreements there was a 2-year delay on Foster Creek Dam, when we need the power and it will delay the program. There's been too much sniping from the side lines which adds up to delay and confusion. CVA will take care of this."

When Nat Washington left off, Frank Bell made one of his very rare public talks.

"I never knew a man to steal second base and keep one foot on first," Bell led off.

"All the CVA does is to bring the part of the Federal Administration we must deal with back there to our own Northwest.

"I've had a little experience in dealing with the Interior, Army, and Agriculture Departments. You have to deal with all and sometimes when you finally get an agreement, an official is replaced. Then you start all over again. It's time consuming and wasteful."

"There's nothing in the CVA bill which gives authority to go outside the existing Federal agencies. Every action taken must be reported to Congress.

"Let's look at it this way: Is the CVA more efficient and economical? If it is, then it's good for Republicans as well as Democrats. And it's good for business, too. We can let our own State power commission, whenever it's appointed, deal with the board, right at home base, not back in Washington. We can eliminate this vicious circle and save time and money."

Ed Southard came back with: "Lars, all I want to know is this: Is there anything in the bill which delegates power that the agencies cannot do now?"

Langloe came back reluctantly "No."

Ed Southard then said: "Well, I am a States' rights man from Arkansas. But I think we have no reason to fear we wouldn't get a good board—no more than we would fear we couldn't get a good Defense Secretary, Secretary of Interior, or Agriculture.

"I would be more impressed with what you see than hear. If this board is on the ground out here it can be dealt with by the people who know something about the project.

"I remember the Spokesman-Review editorial saying the dam foundation was rotten. A little bunch of men in Ephrata headed by Nat Washington got D. C. Henning, Portland enginer, to look into this. He was told by Osborne at the dam, that the 'report must read the dam is rotten and unsound.' For a time I went along with that gang, but I learned better and ended up supporting the dam."

W. Lee Harrison, president of the commercial club, a former resident of Williferesbro, Ky., in TVA country, told the group: "We didn't know much about the Bureau of Army Engineers down there but we did get the job done and it was a good job for the people and country. It was so good that the Midwest supporters are now thinking about a Missouri Valley Authority (MVA).

"Tipton said the basic difference between CVA and TVA was in the condition which prevailed in the South. They needed flood control, the land was eroded, and unemployment mounting made it the poorest section in the country. It took a highly centralized agency to get the job done at once.

"The CVA board would not be given the broad powers which were required in the TVA emergency. We have the serious defects of the present river-development programs pointed out to us by the Hoover Commission. We can go on from there," Tipton concluded.

Jim Dodson, Grant County engineer, spoke briefly, saying the county was surveying 100 miles of road in the area which will be brought under water in 1952. "We need Federal aid to the highways and hope the other 38 counties will let us have one-third of the million dollars PRA money to build roads to within a mile or two of the farm units."

Russel M. Esvelt, newly elected superintendent of schools in Quincy, said the school program must be given prior planning and much attention. "We must take care of the job now and not wait 2 years and the heavy influx of school population once water is on the land in our district. We will need the support of the Landers Act and all available Federal funds."

Those attending the meeting and communities represented included:

Moses Lake: R. M. Trask, George E. Dougherty, Ned Thomas, J. H. Powers, Frederick English, Roland G. Kessler, Clinton E. Sinclair, Howard D. Olson, Otis E. Mayer, Russell Smith, Evelun McInnis.

Ephrata: Frank T. Bell, Nat Washington, Frank E. Buckley, Mr. and Mrs. E. Roy Mundy, E. A. Southard, Knute Hill, and Jim Dodson.

Seattle: Joe Gluck and Harold G. Tipton.

Quincy: Lyle E. Brand, W. E. Johnson, Arnold Westover, and Russell Esvelt.

Wenatchee: Don Isenhart, Chester Kimm, Mayor Art Pohlman, and Joe Hamilton.

Waterville: John R. Jones.

Bridgeport: Wade Troutman.

Brewster: Tom Welborn.

Okanogan: J. Lee Harrison and Dugan Grant.

Soap Lake: A. C. Carothers.

Odessa: W. C. Raugust.

SHALL WE HAVE A CVA PROGRAM?

MOSES LAKE, July 18.—Shall we have a CVA? This was the subject of the quarterly north central Washington round-table forum here Saturday.

Here is a summary of the principal speakers on the forum.

YES

Yes—Harold G. Tipton, executive secretary, League for CVA:

This round-table discussion of CVA, in the heart of the Columbia Basin, is a splendid project. It affords us an opportunity to discuss a bill which is of the utmost interest to you people in the grass roots.

There are some communities, forums, and I might say, county commissioners who won't even discuss the CVA, let alone, be open-minded and objective. I am reminded by this clipping in the Seattle Times telling of a meeting of the King County commissioners.

The commissioners had been invited to a hearing on Army engineers hearing on the revised 308 report. As you know this had nothing to do with CVA. One of the commissioners discussing the invitation commented, "This is the CVA. I don't know much about it but I am against it." Another commissioner was quoted as saying, "Well, I have heard about it but don't know all the details, but I am against it."

So I am happy your group does not share this less objective viewpoint on CVA—at least, you are giving it a hearing.

Proponents of CVA have no quarrel with the Bureau or the Army engineers. We think they are doing a pretty good job with the difficult problems they have to face. But just as the Hoover Commission report has stated, they are not doing a good over-all job and their work is not coordinated.

I would like to discuss the Hoover Commission report and the task force which worked on natural resources and river development. The task force was independent of the Hoover Commission. They were hired technicians and experts who made an independent study of the Columbia River development, including a thorough study of the administration of the Bureau and the Army engineers.

They recommended to the Hoover Commission, and this is important, that all water resources development be placed under one Department of Resources.

This meant the centralization and consolidation in one department of the Bureau of Reclamation, Army engineers, Bonneville Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

If this were done they saw no reason and were opposed to the extension of the valley-authority program into other regions. This was made very clear in their report. They also said if this recommendation were not carried out it would be necessary to establish a valley authority.

But the Hoover Commission did not accept the recommendation of the task force.

There is not one word in the Hoover Commission report for or against the idea of a valley authority. As a matter of fact, however, on page 28 the Hoover report makes it clear that the function of river development is of necessity a multiple-purpose program. It stresses that varied and conflicting purposes must be put together in a single integrated plan of resource development.

This is the program of the CVA.

The Administrators and Board will be appointed by the President, upon approval of Congress. Their action will be reviewed by Congress. There is nothing new in the way of acquired powers other than the right to acquire private transmission facilities by negotiation for sale to public agencies.

The administration and authority must remain in the Northwest.

We who favor CVA are opposed to any interstate agreement where the boards are appointed by governors. This is placing it in politics and in a short time we would be fighting among States for control of the river. The Administrators must have the broad view of the whole Northwest.

Our bill is subject to amendment by groups—but let's not oppose basic principles of the bill with general or even isolated criticisms.

NO

Lars Langloe, assistant supervisor and engineer, hydraulics division, State department of conservation and development.

I feel like an errand boy who has been sent out to speak for the boss.

When I think of CVA I continually remind myself we don't need gauleiters to run our Government.

I am not going to discuss the details of CVA, but rather its principles, which I am opposed to.

Let's analyze who would be on this CVA Commission. Two of the three local or regional residents must subscribe to the underlying principles of authority. They must be Socialists to begin with to get on the commission for the authority only leads to socialism

I am opposed to three CVA administrators selecting the advisory board. They will pick the type of citizen they can use. The State or some agency of the State should select the advisory committee. How else can they represent the people? Does it inspire confidence to have it done any other way?

I defy anyone to pick any flaws with the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers working agreement. What are the shortcomings of the agreement the opposition refers to? I don't think the set-up is perfect, but it can be changed.

For instance, I think Army engineers on river or power projects should be civilian status and not Army. Many Army engineers involved think so, too.

I would go along with the CVA if it was limited to water, land, and power resources connected with Columbia River and tributaries, but when it takes in recreation, fishing, game, forests, and entire State, I think it is contrary to our system and form of government.

The CVA would be turned loose to develop any projects specifically authorized by Congress.

TVA is socialistic. The only thing left for the State of Washington would be to keep the peace and support the school systems.

You people would be sitting around and they would tell you what to do and how to do it. I don't want to be a gauleiter or do I want them to give me orders.

I have faith in this basin. I have left a lot of shoe leather out here in your basin on surveys I have made. I have been connected with irrigation and reclamation work for 45 years, too.

I think we can write a bill amending CVA so as to protect individual ownership. I am not fighting development, but I am opposed to losing control of development as we would under CVA.

Why must we discard agencies and working agreements? I think we can improve them and work out a solution. I am, however, opposed to all valley authorities and interstate commission bills.

Economy in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Honorable Failure, Senator," published in the Arkansas Democrat of August 31, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN HONORABLE FAILURE, SENATOR

Anyway, President Truman knows now what most of the Senators think about his bigger and better spending program. They spoke their minds in voting on Senator MCCLELLAN'S proposal that the President be required to trim 5 to 10 percent off his spending estimates.

Forty-nine of the solons lined up for this measure, which was offered as an amendment to the nearly $15,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Only 28 were against it. But Vice President BARKLEY ruled that a two-thirds majority was required to carry, so the attempt lost by 3 votes.

And there goes your economy for the next fiscal year. Some savings in military outlays seem likely from Defense Secretary Louis Johnson's heroic efforts to put the brakes on in his Department. This the Senate has O. K.'d. There may be other minor savings from the portion of the Hoover Commission's reorganization plan which has been adopted.

But no general reduction of your Uncle Sammy's spending jamboree is in sight. Whoopee, lads, we're off on another deficit binge! Forget all of that old tripe about the folly of spending yourself headlong into bigger and bigger debt. Never mind the taxpayer's squirming and flinching. He's just too dumb to know what's good for him, as a starry-eyed New Dealer once remarked.

Yes, it's sickening. And a repugnant feature of it is the argument against Senator MCCLELLAN'S amendment. The opposition said it was "politically unfair" to ask the President to economize—that this is the duty of Congress. There's just a grain of truth in that. The whole truth is that the President shares with Congress the responsibility for thrifty use of tax funds.

Without the President's cooperation, Congress is handicapped in economy efforts; and the President has not cooperated. So, apparently, Senator MCCLELLAN and his supporters would have put the job squarely up to him.

Well, you failed, boys. But such a failure is far more honorable than a success in flinging the people's money to the political winds.

Employment in the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "One Million Eight Hundred and Eighty Thousand Are Employed by Oil Industry in United States." Twenty-eight States of the Union are concerned with this subject. I think all Senators will be interested in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of September 22, 1949]

ONE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND ARE EMPLOYED BY OIL INDUSTRY IN UNITED STATES—DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION OF API ENDS SURVEY IN UNITED STATES

NEW YORK.—The petroleum industry in the United States employs directly 1,880,000 men and women, but for each oil worker there are additional jobs for 4.2 workers in other industries that exist because of their direct dependence upon petroleum and its products.

A survey just completed by the department of information of the American Petroleum Institute shows that a total of 9,795,000 workers in the United States are employed by industries that are directly related to the petroleum industry. These workers and their families account for 34,282,000 men, women, and children that are directly dependent upon these industries, and these comprise 23.3 percent of the total population of the United States.

Employment figures of the petroleum industry combined with the number employed in directly related industries comprise 17 percent of all persons gainfully employed in the United States. Not considered in this total are additional thousands of workers, such as Diesel engine and locomotive operators, officers and crews of oil-burning ships, workers in chemical and plastics plants, and many other jobs related in one way or another to the use of petroleum and its products. The figures are highly significant, since they emphasize the vastly important place in the Nation's economy occupied by petroleum. Here are the figures on employment developed by the survey:

Industry and number employed	
Petroleum and its products	1,880,000
Petroleum equipment	120,000
Automotive manufacturers	757,000
Automotive services	1,311,000
Aircraft manufacturers	183,000
Commercial air lines	61,300
Oil-burner manufacturers	15,000
Oil-burner dealers and services	28,500
Motorboats and outboard motors	8,000
Motorcycle manufacturers	6,000
Tractors and power-driven farm machinery	135,600
Motortruck transportation	5,014,000
Bus transportation	232,000
Other directly related services	43,600
Grand total	9,795,000

The combined annual pay rolls of those who work in petroleum and related industries aggregate $27,471,586,000 or 20.3 percent of the total annual pay rolls of all workers in the United States. Total employer payments in all wages and salaries in the United States aggregate about $135,000,000,000 a year. Workers engaged in petroleum production and refining, which includes many highly skilled technicians, are among the highest paid in the Nation, with average annual wages and salaries of $3,700. The average annual pay of 1,880,000 oil-industry workers, including filling-station attendants, is $3,077. By comparison, the average annual pay of all gainfully employed persons in the United States, including agricultural workers, is about $2,368. The combined average annual wage of the 9,795,000 workers in petroleum and its related industries is $2,804.

The buying power of the vast army of men and women who work in the industries that are directly identified with petroleum may be appreciated readily by the more than $27,000,000,000 pay roll received by this group. Their spendable income redounds to the benefit of practically everyone living in the United States today. These 34,000,000 people pay directly more than $3,300,000,000 in Federal, State, and local taxes, in addition to the corporate taxes paid by their employers. They spend annually $10,400,000 for food; $3,000,000,000 for housing; $3,000,000,000 for clothing; $1,200,000,000 for fuel and lighting; $6,500,000,000 for other necessities, insurance, and savings. They own 7,300,000 automobiles; drive over 75,000,000,000 miles a year; heat their homes with 889,000 oil burners; use 1,400,000 telephones in their homes.

The importance of petroleum to the economy of the Nation cannot begin to be measured by statistics alone. Today petroleum and its more than 1,200 useful products reach into practically every phase of life on land, on the seas, and in the air. The fact that over 23 percent of the population of the United States is directly dependent upon petroleum for a living is highly significant of the direct influence of this vital natural resource upon every man, woman, and child living in the United States today.

Reduction of Governmental Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article taken from the Kingman Journal, Kingman, Kans., a representative Kansas weekly newspaper. This article expresses a sensible attitude toward reducing Government expenditures.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ENTERING WEDGE OF SOCIALISM

A shining example of why it is so difficult to cut Government expenses was shown recently when Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson ordered a reduction in the number of civilian employees in the Department and the closing down of a number of military camps over the country. The ink was hardly dry on the order until a howl went up over the country from chambers of commerce, city and State officials, and Congressmen from the States affected, Republicans and Democrats alike. They all want to cut expenses but they want it done in some other place.

One of the fundamental principles of those who would foist a Socialist form of government on us is first to make the people believe that the Government is giving them something; that it is going to save them from something; that the Government can do for them what they cannot do for themselves, and to scatter the swag over enough territory and in enough different places to create a pressure group sufficiently large to keep it from being changed. That is exactly the procedure used in England 4 years ago and the tight little isle has a delegation in Washington this week begging for United States dollars to get it out of the mess it is in.

That is the formula back of the agricultural benefit payments, social security, proposed health insurance, pensions, and all other forms of so-called Government aid, and people are suckers enough to fall for it, never stopping to realize that it is a delusion and a snare; that we are becoming a nation of softies who think more of ease and security than we do of liberty and independence.

In spite of the hue and cry going up to reduce Government spending, right now there are a number of towns in southern Kansas trying to reach into the United States Treasury for money with which to build hospitals, airports, irrigation projects, or some other thing which should be paid for by the local communities. They not only pay the cost in increased taxes but they also pay the administrative expenses, which are plenty. Taxes will never be cut so long as people go around like a blind beggar with a tin cup asking for help. The Government will always help you—at your expense.

It is refreshing to note that Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL of Kansas created quite a sensation in Washington political circles when he stated that while Secretary Johnson's order affected a number of communities in his State, he was for it and that Kansas should take its cut along with the rest of the country. Senator CLYDE M. REED also backed up the economy move when he received a protest from Salina citizens, stated that all he could or would do was to see that the reduction was fair and equitable and that there was no discrimination.

What the country needs to save it from socialism is an organized pressure group of those who are not receiving hand-outs from the Government.

F. J. C.

The Taft-Hartley Act and Pennsylvania Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Taft-Hartley Act 'Chains' Just Didn't Worry Voters," published in the Philadelphia Enquirer of September 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT "CHAINS" JUST DIDN'T WORRY VOTERS

(By John M. Cummings)

HARRISBURG, September 15.—In the weeks immediately preceding the special election billboard advertising all over the Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania District proclaimed a vote for the Democratic candidate for Congress would be a vote for President Truman and the policies of the Truman administration. Conversely a vote for the Republican nominee would be a vote against the President and the things for which he stands—especially repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

For those who preferred the spoken to the printed word there was oratory. From a hundred stumps the electors were informed that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, late President of the Republic, was looking down on the counties of Cambria, Indiana, and Armstrong and hoping for the best—the best being a sweeping Democratic victory.

Along the sluggish Conemaugh River, which once, at raging floodtide almost wiped out the city of Johnstown, the voice of Congressman FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR. (right off the sound track) appealed to the industrialized burghers in behalf of the Democratic candidate—and the Truman administration.

Trained propagandists sent into the district by the political agencies of the CIO and A. F. of L. announced the labor-relations law as slave legislation.

The result: JOHN P. SAYLOR, the Republican nominee, defeated Mrs. Robert L. Coffey by a majority which almost reversed the lead the loser's son rolled up last November.

Here was a district made to order for the type of campaign planned and waged by the political field workers of the labor bosses. Here you have in Johnstown great steel mills which stretch along the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks for miles. In all three counties of the Twenty-sixth District you have bituminous coal and in two—Armstrong and Indiana—bountiful harvests bespeak the work of the farming areas.

Here were steel and coal—basic industries, highly unionized—and agriculture, which according to no less an authority than the President, combined last fall to upset the Presidential election dope and confound the experts.

In this district, where the labor leaders would have you know the clank of Taft-Hartley shackles could be heard above the roar of the steel mills and the earth-shaking rumble in the mines, the slaves, tiring of the nonsense, voted for the Republican candidate.

For Republicans—and for Democrats—there are lessons to be learned from this election. JOHN SAYLOR, in his discussions of the Taft-Hartley law, said he was ready to consider amendments wherever necessary in the interest of fairness to all concerned. This is precisely the position taken by Senator TAFT, one of the sponsors of the law.

But Mr. Truman and the labor bosses want no amendments. They want complete repeal. It was on this issue that the Truman forces were defeated in Congress. But the President persists in asserting it will be repealed by the present Congress.

Two weeks or so ago, at Pittsburgh, the President repeated the attack on the labor law and again predicted its outright repeal. And now from the highly industrialized Twenty-sixth Congressional District comes the first answer.

For Republicans the lesson is simple: Don't dodge the Taft-Hartley issue or handle it with kid gloves. Generally speaking the forthright candidate is the guy who cashes in on election day.

For the Democrats the issue is just as simple: The average union man is not taken in by the bunk that he was chained and shackled by the Taft-Hartley law. The labor mugs have stepped into the councils of the Democrats because they have made the Democratic leadership believe they can deliver the "slaves" on the hoof and no questions asked.

They know different now. The same sort of forthright handling of this issue won for FRANKLIN LICHTENWALTER in the Bucks-Lehigh contest 2 years ago. Republicans who treat it as a hot potato don't deserve to be elected.

Another lesson for both Republicans and Democrats: Wise up to the folly of trying to crystallize on the misfortune of a citizen.

The Democrats and labor lords did not place Mrs. Coffey on the ticket because of her knowledge of government and the work expected of a Congressman. They picked her because her son, the late Congressman, was killed last spring in a jet plane crash. They picked her because another son—also an aviator—was killed in the war.

It has become the fashion in both parties to nominate grief-stricken widows and daughters and, in the current case, a mother, for a vacancy in office occasioned by death. There ought to be some other way of expressing sympathy.

Mrs. Coffey was lugged into this contest because of the desire on the part of political and labor lugs to make capital of her misery. No doubt she would be the first to concede her ineptitude as a campaigner and her lack of capacity for the office to which she aspired.

Well, the lords of labor made the issue. They decided the twenty-sixth district was the place to set the pattern for next year. Having made their bed—

Proposed Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from Hon. Dennis Dellwo, appearing in the Ronan Pioneer, Ronan, Mont., September 8, 1949, on the aspects of a proposed Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. Dellwo is a former Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Montana Legislature, a successful farmer and one of the leading citizens of northwestern Montana. This section of Montana would be under any proposed Columbia Authority plan and, therefore, I believe Mr. Dellwo's comments are particularly pertinent on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS

DEAR EDITOR: The following aspects of proposed Columbia Valley Authority legislation should be seriously considered while there is still time.

Under existing agencies of the Government, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of public utilities have been constructed where it was seen that the jobs were too large or too risky for private enterprise.

In all the debates which I have heard, as well as in the sales stories which I have read, favoring a CVA, much time and space was used in stressing the value of extensive public works in this region. Then they assume that we cannot have those public works without an authority scheme of some kind. Extensive public works have been completed and numerous others are in process of construction without the enactment of dangerous autocratic legislation—without Congress yielding up a large part of the management of its business to a commission with almost unlimited powers.

Bold statements have been made concerning what will be done under CVA legislation, and exactly how a CVA commission will operate if one should be set up. All such statements are purest prophecy. There is no way of accurately forecasting what would be done by a commission with the powers which this proposed commission will have and which is designed to be virtually unaccountable to any department of the Government.

There is no telling what changes will be made in the CVA law itself after once the wedge will have been entered. The TVA law has been amended 13 times.

The Hoover Commission did not recommend valley authorities. The subcommittee of the Hoover Commission, which had the job of looking over the Government's land and water resources development, recommended one unifying agency which would administer all Government activities in resources development. They most certainly did not recommend nine new agencies in the form of valley authorities. In fact they warned against the danger of valley authorities.

The promoters of CVA seem inclined to brand everyone who dares speak out against this thing as a paid propagandist. Still they seem to think it is perfectly all right for an assistant to a Cabinet officer to go around the country at great expense promoting the valley authority idea.

Remember, the forces of our Government have never started an enterprise. They only take over after someone with drive and initiative has developed something. The thousands of processes, mechanical and chemical, involved in present-day industry, the things which we use every day, and which go to make up our vaunted American standard of living would have remained dormant for many eons if it were left to Government agencies to search them out.

I am opposed to these valley authorities because I am afraid to yield up so much of our sovereign power to a small body of frail men over whom we, as voters and citizens, will have no control.

I am opposed to them because history records that, whenever men have been given autocratic powers, they have begun immediately to build empires for themselves.

I am opposed to them because I can see, lurking in their shadows, sinister and insidious forces resolved to maneuver us into a totalitarian state just as rapidly as that can be done without waking us up.

DENNIS DELLWO.

Results of Election in Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Spare the Cheers," published in the Oil City Derrick of September 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPARE THE CHEERS

A Republican congressional victory in a Pennsylvania race (Twenty-sixth District, Cambria-Indiana-Armstrong) today was hailed jubiliantly as a defeat for the Tru-Deal.

Let's spare those cheers. We're still only on our own 10-yard line.

Now for a look-see into what all the shouting is about.

Electorally Navy veteran JOHN P. SAYLOR won a special election against Gold Star Mother Mrs. Robert L. Coffey, Sr., for the seat left vacant by the death of her son, a war hero, in a plane crash.

The late Colonel Coffey scored a Democratic upset in a normally Republican district last year to unseat Republican Harve Tibbott.

The Demos and labor organizations joined forces in a determined fight to put over Mrs. Coffey. Even the so-called magic of the Roosevelt name (young Franklin) was used via records to whip up enthusiasm.

From where we sit, SAYLOR won on three main factors:

1. He made a determined, all-out ceaseless fight.

2. The workingman still votes as he pleases.

3. Mrs. Coffey, a mild, motherly political tyro was an ineffectual personality.

Mr. SAYLOR did prove that a transfusion of hard, two-fisted aggressiveness can lift the Republican party out of its defeatism.

But this isolated victory in an off-year election gives us no reason to wallow in complacent thought of big touchdowns to come.

Mr. SAYLOR showed us the way.

It's up to us to drill ceaselessly on these fundamentals before we can spring more ball-carriers into the clear.

For Navajo Knowledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "For Navajo Knowledge," under its department of education, published in Newsweek of September 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR NAVAJO KNOWLEDGE

On January 1, 1950, about 600 scared, wide-eyed kids will arrive here. Aged 6 to 16, they'll be more than 500 miles from home. Nearly 100 percent of them will never have slept in a bed, climbed a stairway, or turned a faucet, much less used a lavatory. Show me another educator in the country with anything like our problems.

But Dr. George A. Boyce of the Bureau of Indian Affairs smiles when he makes such remarks about his new school at Brigham City, Utah. For, with the finishing touches being put on the Intermountain Indian School, the Navajo youngsters of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah will finally have their first sizable, modern boarding school. By 1951, Department of the Interior officials expect it to expand to its capacity of 2,000.

THE UNTUTORED

The urgent need for Navajo educational facilities dates back to the Indian treaty of 1868. Then the Federal Government agreed to provide adequate schools for the youngsters of the tribe if it would settle on a 5,460-square-mile desert reservation on the border of New Mexico and Arizona. But the facilities the Government has provided can hardly be called adequate. An estimated 9,000 Navajo youngsters received some education in 1948. But some 15,000 didn't see the inside of a classroom.

Last May, United States Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, succeeded in pushing through Congress an appropriation for $3,750,000 to remodel the $12,000,000 wartime Bushnell General Hospital at Brigham City and finance it as a school for the Indian children. Dr. Boyce, then director of all Navajo schools, was chosen as general superintendent of the new project.

Dr. Boyce' first job was to change the 40 buildings on Bushnell's 300 acres to a semblance of livability instead of Army utility. The rooms, some for two, some for four, are being redone in pleasant pastel shades. There are large classrooms, a swimming pool, heated screened porches, and a baseball diamond.

The young Indians will learn the basic three R's, plus practical trades. The girls, for example, will be taught to cook on three kinds of stoves—electric, in case they find work in homes with such ranges, and coal and oil for their own home use. The vocational program for boys will be tailored according to demand. If openings seem plen-

tiful in plumbing or carpentry, boys will be urged to take up such occupations.

By last week, Dr. Boyce had not yet found the 70 teachers who will start with the first group of 600 children. The salary of $2,500 a year is not too appealing, but he is sure he will get interested prospects.

School Bells To Ring for Young Navajos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "School Bells To Ring for Young Navajos," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of September 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL BELLS TO RING FOR YOUNG NAVAJOS

School bells have been ringing regularly now for some 2 weeks for most youngsters of the country, but next January 3 is the opening date set for one of the Nation's most interesting and important educational enterprises. On that date some 600 Navajo Indians who know only the most primitive life on the reservation will enter the Indian school at Brigham City in the modern buildings which formerly housed the wartime Bushnell General Hospital.

The brick hospital buildings are now being remodeled and renovated for the school and Dr. George A. Boyce, of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Superintendent, faces the tremendous task of lining up a qualified group of 70 teachers. The project is highly significant and its success will be watched not only by the first Americans and others in this country, but by other nationals all over the world who are aware of the plight of the American Indian and the broken promises to them. The project is so significant that the current issue of the magazine Newsweek devotes practically all its section on education to it. It is chiefly to the credit of Senator WATKINS, of Utah, that the facilities will serve to educate young red men. By some means an estimated 40,000 Navajos must learn to sustain themselves off the reservation. After 80 years the country is becoming aware of the importance of education in solving the problem of the American Indian.

By 1951 the school is expected to have 2,000 children, all from homes hundreds of miles away. The aim will be to teach not only the three R's (most Navajo adults do not speak the English language), but to prepare the young people to take their place in the white man's society and to get a job. Actually the school will only make a dent in the over-all problem. Despite a treaty guaranteeing the Navajos an education, some 15,000 children of the reservation have never been inside a school, and 9,000 others have had inadequate schooling.

Children who have lived in primitive hogans likely will be overwhelmed by the shiny, clean rooms, some with adjoining baths; the swimming pool and athletic facilities. If plans of Dr. Boyce and the Indian Service materialize, they will be able to matriculate in high schools after completing their schooling at the new Intermountain School. Others will be prepared for employment.

Said Dr. Boyce recently: "As educators for the first time in the Nation's history we are asked to change the culture of an entire people—enable them to cope with a foreign language, to change tribal methods of cooking, housing, dress, and diet. We've got to solve our graduates' problems for the rest of their lives by making them problem solvers for themselves and their tribe. We want to do the job right."

The Navajo school is a challenge to the Indian Service, to the community of Brigham City, and to the people of Utah. It is a most commendable endeavor.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks today I shall include part 18 of the article, Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak. In part 18, Mr. Neal sets forth the procedure in court by which these farmers are deprived of their farms—their livelihood—and their homes.

You will note that these procedures are not that each individual has a fair and impartial trial. They are driven in in droves and their cases are taken up en bloc. Personally, I do not know how many cases they try before the same jury and altogether in a lump in North Dakota. In the case where I had some connection, before I was again elected to Congress, at Wahoo, Nebr., there were somewhere between 20 and 30 cases thrown in together and tried as 1 case. Can you imagine being a juror in that case and remembering all the details of each of those 30 individual farms? Thirty individual farms, some with orchards, all with some improvements, some with splendid homes and barns, and others not so good. Could you do justice to each individual case? If you could, you can do much more than I could. The fact is that when the case was all through and the charge of the jury was given to you, that you would try to arrive at the average value and forget all about the particular farms with their particular improvements, orchards, and homes.

There are many abuses and erroneous policies in connection with the taking of private property for public use. There can be no just compensation under this kind of procedure.

Mr. Neal gives you a vivid picture of the procedure. Here is part 18:

[From the McLean County (N. Dak.) Independent]

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XVIII

Somehow, through the years, a custom has grown up in the United States district courts of trying these land condemnation cases in groups. Accordingly, it can be no reflection on the United States District Court for North Dakota if I enter here a mild protest. Certainly our court is not to blame for a Nation-wide custom.

I should like to enter this protest on two counts:

First, the American home is the highest and most important unit of our society. To the men and women and children who occupy it, its value is second only to the lives of the individual members of the family. To them it is sacred. Therefore, as an institution, it achieves a dignity of its own, it follows that to herd homes into our courts in droves, or flocks, or groups is a violation of that sacred dignity. It is not a truly American way of doing things.

Of course, you may argue that to try these cases in any other way would cost the Government a tremendous amount of money. That is true. Also it is true that the owner of the home loses it at a tremendous sacrifice. And it is equally true that our Government has no right to undertake public works until it is willing to make full restitution for the losses suffered by the landowners in a legal, a just, and a morally honorable way. To herd them into court like a flock of sheep is repugnant to a reasonable sense of justice.

Second, it is absolutely impossible for any jury, no matter how intelligent, to do justice where they are confronted with masses of figures, names, and unknown places, tossed at them in this manner. No matter how they may try to take and to keep notes, by the time they have listened to the last case, all the cases which have gone before become a hopeless muddle in their minds. Not for the life of them can they remember which witness testified for whom or which farm had spring water and which had to pump against a 200-foot lift to produce a stream the size of a lead pencil.

As a professional writer in the creative field, human character is the greater part of my business. If I could not make people think what I want them to think, I might as well quit trying to write. If I can't tell approximately what is going on in the other fellow's mind, as he reacts to stimuli that is known to me, I'd better abandon my typewriter for a shovel. I studied the jury which tried the group, of which my case was a part, with considerable interest. Nine out of 12 had abandoned taking notes and they were nowhere near through with the group. More than half of them were obviously drugged into a mathematical and factual coma.

When, after days and days of listening, the members of this jury came to make their decisions, they did all in their power to be fair. They saw clearly that a wrong was being done, and, as best they could, they tried to rectify it. But the result was astonishing. In one case they actually paid a man all that his home was worth by any standard. In another, and more deserving case, they paid much less. If you were to ask them why, they couldn't, in honesty, tell you. All they can say today is that they did the best they could and gave every man several thousand dollars more than the Government claimed his land was worth.

Here I am reproducing one page from the United States District Court Calendar, Bismarck, term of March 8, 1949. Bearing in mind the hours and days and even weeks of testimony, see if you think you, acting as a juror, could have kept these cases unscrambled to the point of rendering a verdict fair and just and based exactly on the testimony offered in each case. If you feel that you could, it follows that Einstein might as well go back to the old country and leave the field of mathematics to you.

Here then is an exact replica, except that I am moving the tract numbers over to the second column to fit the needs of the paper's composing room:

CIVIL NO. 1613

United States of America v. *8,480.29 Acres of Land, More or Less, in McLean County, N. Dak., et al.:* P. W. Lanier, United States

attorney; P. J. Stevens, assistant United States attorney.

GROUP I

Tract G–606, William B. Neal: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Tract G–617, William J. Reuter, Jacob Reuter, Susanna Krzmarzick, Mary Krzmarzick, heirs of Joseph Reuter, Sr., deceased: Robert Vogel, Garrison, N. Dak.; Strutz & Jansonius, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Tract G–622, Fred E. Krueger: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Tract G–624, Andrew and Mary Welsh: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Tract G–626, E. C. Stucke and Agnes Stucke: Robert Vogel, Garrison, N. Dak.; Strutz & Jansonius, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Tract G–628, Mary Krzmarzick: Williams & Higgins, Washburn, N. Dak.

Tract G–637, Arlee C. Hanson: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Tract G–657, J. R. Crouse: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Federal Land Bank of St. Paul: Stanley F. Casey, St. Paul, Minn.

Tract G–609, J. R. Crouse and R. B. Willoughby: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

Tract G–641, J. R. Crouse: Halvorson & Halvorson, Minot, N. Dak.

The Communist Military Raid on Peekskill

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House yesterday to help clean up business so that we might go home, I found the House engaged in a debate over Peekskill, which is in my district. It would be bad for the RECORD to remain as it is. I propose to correct the RECORD to show there is no racial feeling in Peekskill. Robeson, himself, has been there three times conducting concerts. What happened in Peekskill was the formation of a Communist military action from New York City and other places with 2,500 people armed with baseball bats—only no baseball and no gloves—tire irons, scrap iron, wrenches, and regular dumps of pop bottles piled in formation along the banks of a brook.

Peekskill in my district is a typical peaceful American country community of about 20,000 people, situated 50 miles north of New York City. It was invaded on September 4, and I use the word "invaded" intentionally, by 15,000 outsiders. They came up in busses from Brooklyn, Manhattan, Newark, the Bronx, and other places, accompanied by an armed force of 2,500 men operating in military formation under military orders.

Twelve bus loads of invaders were sent out from the headquarters of the Fur and Leather Workers Union, CIO.

The "skirmish line" of Robeson followers ringed the grove, to "protect" the people who came to the concert—although there were 900 police officers from the town and city, including 250 State troopers, the regularly constituted law-enforcement authorities.

The New York Times report says:

The Robeson skirmish forces, well organized, with their own captains, and wearing tan overseas caps and committee buttons rose to the challenge when the rioting began.

We will pass over the way this report was obviously slanted to favor the invaders, against the rights of the local people.

Gentlemen, do you see the pattern? What we are being told in sober newspaper reports is that the Robeson concert was plain military action. It was a clear case of private citizens attempting to exercise military and police functions, in the streets of our towns and the lanes of our countryside.

We know that Hitler organized military outbreaks in the streets of Berlin, and we know that Stalin has ordered military organization and fighting in Italy, France, China, Germany. But this is the United States. We have here an act of military aggression or the soil of the United States.

There cannot be two sovereigns. If our States and cities are sovereign, they are solely responsible for police and military activity. Whoever challenges that, challenges our sovereignty and is in fact engaged in military insurrection.

Let us follow the events of this day, again in the words of the Times. The skirmish line "operated in a strictly military manner under the overall command of Leon Strauss, vice president of the Furriers International Union, a lieutenant in the last war, who wore five combat stars. They had an outside cordon of men who did not hear Mr. Robeson sing, as they were too far away, and they were there for protection.

"Then there was an inside cordon to keep the crowd away from the truck used as a concert stage." The 15,000 people were crowded between these two rings. This pressure on the crowd was a deliberate technique of the Communist leaders, an incitement to mob psychology.

The concert audience made no effort to conceal the fact that they were armed for trouble, should it come. Clubs made of brooksticks were passed out on the skirmish line inside the concert grove. They drew on the neat ammunition piles that were placed every few paces along a brook that served as a natural defense line. The field itself was a hollow with only two narrow lanes for exits. It was obviously selected by an experienced military organizer. The owner of the field, a sympathizer with the group, kept talking about the "danger of Fascists," the familiar party line.

The American people are waking up to the fact that pop bottles especially after they are broken make very dangerous weapons in the hands of Communists with military training. They can be used to crush a man's head or even to cut his throat. Broom handles are used by their trained saboteurs to push one's eyes out.

Another reporter said "the concert crowd was strictly disciplined and obeyed almost without exception the orders of their committeemen who ran the encampment as if they were setting up a headquarters post in an enemy area."

The district attorney, George M. Fanelli, reported to Governor Dewey that, as one of the automobiles carrying the guards passed through the police lines, one guard swung at a State trooper with a baseball bat. The police then searched the buses for weapons. They found 200 baseball bats, a number of golf clubs, monkey wrenches and tire irons wrapped in newspapers, glass bottles and other weapons. The men who were thus heavily armed were all permitted to leave without charges being made against them.

The Communists call this a local riot instigated by the people of Peekskill but it is estimated that not more than 400 people were present from Peekskill, together with 1,500 veterans some distance away, against 15,000 in the encampment. We do not know who was trying to instigate a riot. Knowing the Communist techniques, it is reasonable to assume the Communists were working both sides of the street. But it is absurd to refer to this event as a riot. We had a Communist military demonstration on the European pattern. The owner of the busses which carried the invaders said that his drivers reported no evidence of Communist charges that the State troopers beat concert goers and condoned the stoning of busses and private cars. "My drivers and dispatchers agree," he said, "that, if it hadn't been for the presence of the troopers, some people would have been killed."

The failure of the military demonstration and collapse of the whole project is due to the fact that the Communists were not able to carry away with them any of their martyred dead. The willing martyrs were there. To be martyred by the Fascists is the religion instilled into them by their cynical leaders.

The pattern of violence spread curiously over the whole countryside. Attempts to start local disorders showed up over an area of over 20 square miles. This was obviously part of the military preparations. It was another bitter disappointment to the Communists when these little disorders failed to ignite.

The total disorder, even with the armed invasion and provocation, was very small. There was no interference with the concert. After the concert was over 4 persons were injured seriously—by whom we do not know—and 70 suffered minor injuries. Eight of the troopers were injured. One local veteran was stabbed, without provocation, by one of the armed invaders, and is dangerously ill in the hospital.

It is unjust to refer to this Communist military outbreak as a riot by the law-abiding people of Peekskill. Actually the absence of any serious disorder under such provocation is evidence of the fine local spirit and the most careful police work.

Neither is there even the smallest evidence of any anti-Negro sentiment. Robeson had sung in the vicinity three times before. Singers from Hampton Institute and Tuskegee had sung for years in the churches.

Neither is the issue in any way connected with the rights of freedom of

speech or of assembly. The 15,000 people who invaded a small community did not need to come to Peekskill to enjoy free speech or the right of assembly. They can assemble in Union Square and other favorite haunts every day.

Our veterans have been severely criticized for taking any part, even a strictly peaceful part, in protesting against the appearance of hordes of armed men in their communities. Perhaps it would have been better if the veterans had given the meeting no publicity, but we are now indebted to them, because they have aroused the attention of the whole country to the danger that faces any peaceful, law-abiding community if the Communists decide to use their town for an armed demonstration.

The Communists are now trying to make the veterans the scapegoat for their own violence, and the failure of their attempts to cause bloodshed. But instead they only prove that, in spite of the provocation of having one of their number knifed without the slightest excuse, the veterans' protest was orderly and law-abiding and without a single evidence of violence. Our veterans are citizens first, upholders of discipline in the service of peace and law.

Three of the ten people arrested were under 19. The law-enforcement officers leaned over backward in arresting the local people, including the son of the police chief, who showed a natural resentment at the violence started from the other side. And they let 23 busses of armed gangsters, who had come up from the New York City area to create violence, escape without a single arrest.

You have to see these people in a mass invasion to understand how totally different it is from anything we are familiar with in American communities.

Let us go back and trace the preparations which led to this military demonstration in a peaceful American community on a Sunday afternoon.

The crowd included members of the National Maritime Union and the Fur Workers Union, armed with sticks and pop bottles. The armed guards were led, according to the Times and the Daily Worker, by Leon Strauss of the fur workers. Mr. Strauss has a record and so does the Fur Workers Union. The details are on file in the reports of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Strauss is a member of the National Veterans Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America. He was mentioned by the Daily Worker as a leader of the American Youth for Democracy. He was a contributor to the Young Communist Review. Before Russia entered the war he called for resistance to military training.

When Hitler invaded Russia, the objective of the Communist planners was to send their active workers into the armed forces, to push their subversive activities there. Now these graduates of the cells in the Army and Navy are ready and trained to organize military action in strikes and concerts.

A. Losovsky, head of the Red International of Trade Unions, explains in his pamphlet, Lenin, the Great Strategist of Class War, that the proletariat must be constantly energized by their leaders through a combination of strikes and armed demonstrations. He adds, the general strike "must be conducted according to the rules of military science, it presupposse a plan of campaign, offensive fighting preparations, and unbounded devotion and heroism on the part of the proletariat."

Every move by the Communists is a military move, every act is carefully designed as an act of war against our peaceful institutions.

We need only one more link in the chain. The Fur Workers Union has long been known for its work in providing the Communist with strong-arm squads. But the Fur Workers Union is equally prominent in that particular arm of Communist service. Ben Gitlow tells in I Confess how the fur union organized its strong-arm men in New York for the strike of 1926, 20 years ago. The backbone of the strike, he says, "were fearless and able fighters, who were exemplary in wielding the knife, the blackjack, and other weapons." He says their picket committees were a "wild and audacious lot who went into action like ferocious wild beasts." They also maintained what they called "the butcher shop," where their gorillas administered a lesson to those who dared to oppose Communist control of the union. This is what they have been doing in one American city for over 20 years.

We know that military violence is an essential part of the Communist teaching. Gitlow explains how the use of violence gradually corrupted the American Communists who used it, until violence became in practice an end in itself.

Wherever they operate, the Communists form Red guards which are military forces answerable to a foreign power. World War II added greatly to the number of their trained and indoctrinated followers, as well as of their officer class.

In an editorial on September 15, the Putnam County News and Recorder asks the pertinent question:

> Recently, on an aftermath of the Robeson "concert" held at Peekskill, N. Y., Mr. Truman, the President of the United States, made the statement "Laugh the Communists out of existence."

This is a reply to the President and an open letter to all Americans. How long do we, the people of the United States, have to wait for adequate protection from these Communists? Continually we hear the cry "freedom of speech." Does that phrase give our enemies the right to engage in the overthrow of our Government? Is freedom of speech license to foment class hatred, racial and religious prejudices?

Do we, Mr. President, continue to protect and aid these foreign ideologies by our laws and our sense of honor?

Do we develop into a nation of laughing hyenas, chuckling our way into oblivion?

We have just received word from the President that the high command in Russia has the atom bomb. Shall we laugh that off, too?

This Peekskill invasion is no local issue. Paul Robeson did not plan this meeting. He is only the cultural front. We are concerned with those who work behind that front. They are planning a series of these local "concerts," in every section of the United States. They will be carefully spaced, so that the reverberations from one will not have died down before the next one begins. They are planning to hold a meeting in Washington about October 13.

Their purpose everywhere will be to arouse violence, to stir up bloodshed, and to make propaganda. They are drilling their military leaders in hundreds of American communities today. They are planning how to build up news stories of violence to get public attention for their attacks on our laws and our law-enforcement officers, to bring our form of government into disrepute.

Our veterans in Peekskill were well aware of the trap that had been laid for them. They carefully avoided mass action and violence. The Communists were bitterly disappointed that they did not get the response they planned for. But there was not the slightest possibility that spontaneous action by armed groups of our citizens, veterans or non-veterans, could win against military strategy carefully planned for 20 years by the Communist general staff.

Our veterans and the citizens are deeply concerned over a problem that confronts the whole country. How can citizens of peaceful law-abiding communities protect themselves against armed invasion of thousands of strangers, with their squads of trained guerrillas.

We need a new type of civil defense by which our law-abiding communities can protect themselves against armed invaders who use the cloak of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. We need a defense but a defense within the framework of our own laws.

Our people need to awake to the danger in their own midst, from soft shilly-shallying compromises, in the name of tolerance. We stopped the bunds. Now we must stop all military demonstrations and military organizations by the Communists on American soil.

Middle Income Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief résumé of excerpts from a radio interview with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the subject of the middle income housing bill, recently heard on the American Federation of Labor radio program, As We See It, reprinted in the weekly news service of the A. F. of L., September 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT

(By JOHN J. SPARKMAN, United States Senator from Alabama)

There are six different titles in the middle-income housing bill. Briefly, they are:

1. The first title extends what we know as FHA insurance of home mortgage loans.

2. The second title provides for the disposal of permanent and temporary war and veteran housing.

3. The third title provides for loans to nonprofit cooperatives for building housing.

4. The fourth title liberalizes the present GI home-loan program.

5. The fifth title makes available to educational institutions of higher learning loans for the purpose of building housing for faculty and students.

6. The sixth title contains miscellaneous provisions, one of which makes $25,000,000 available for the handling or the mass distribution of prefabricated housing.

Where a group of people, primarily veterans, band themselves together in a nonprofit organization and agree to set up a plan for building their own housing, the bill provides that the Government may make loans to that cooperative, very much like the Government now makes loans to farmers' cooperatives for different purposes, rural electric cooperatives, and cooperatives of many different kinds.

People opposed to the direct loan system talk about it being something new, about our changing our method of doing business, when as a matter of fact, throughout the years the Government has made direct loans.

I suppose one of the most popular programs in this country is the rural electrification cooperative program. That program has been built up on direct loans from the Government to nonprofit cooperatives of farmers and other people who wanted to band themselves together for the purpose of obtaining electric current.

We lend the money to those farm cooperatives for electric purposes at 2 percent interest. In the housing bill we propose to charge cooperatives 3 percent interest.

I want to make two points clear—the plan is self-liquidating and involves no subsidy whatsoever from the Government.

Many of the papers in the country have editorialized against the plan and referred to it as socialized credit, but I don't remember any such attack as that on farm cooperatives or RFC loans to business.

I don't remember that businessmen ever objected to those loans when they needed them. Yet, the American Bankers Association came and testified before the Senate committee in objection to these direct housing loans.

I think it is just easier for them to say that it is socialistic than it is to really think it out on its merits. They said, of course, we have provided direct loans for other activities but not for housing.

As a matter of fact, in 1944 when we passed the GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, we specifically provided that every farm veteran returning from service might make application to the Federal Government for a loan directly, for the purpose of building a home on a farm or helping him to acquire a farm.

Nobody ever charged that with being socialistic, yet we certainly were providing direct loans to the farm veterans for housing purposes. But when it is proposed "let's make the same kind of arrangement for the veteran in town," the idea immediately becomes socialistic. It just simply doesn't stand up, to my way of thinking.

All of our Government loan programs have proved successful, far beyond expectation. For example, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, which is liquidating now, is showing a profit to the United States Government.

In this bill we are trying to provide an adequate housing program for everybody with incomes above the level that would entitle them to public housing. That is, for veterans and nonveterans alike, with incomes insufficient to enable them either to rent or buy the housing built under present high cost circumstances.

Our reason for writing in the title 3 provision for loans to cooperatives is because about a third of our people in this country, about a third of our families, have incomes between $2,000 and $3,750.

Families with that income just simply can't afford to buy or to rent a house under present high cost conditions. So, we are providing this low-rate interest, 3 percent, a long period of amortization, not to exceed 50 years. We are making it possible for them through cooperative action to work out some kind of program of self-maintenance to cut down the cost and save money every place possible so we can cut rent or mortgage payments down to about $45 to $55 a month, an amount which they can afford to pay.

By 1960, we shall need anywhere from fifteen to eighteen million new home units in this country; in other words, about a million and a half units a year. We hope that this program plus the program that will be put into effect under the recently enacted Housing Act of 1949, which provides for public housing, slum clearance, and rural farm housing, will produce the million and a half units a year that we need in order to catch up by 1960.

I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to pass the bill which the committee reported out and that in conference with the House we shall be able to work out a good bill.

Kansas Answers Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Kansas Answers Socialized Medicine," by Alvin S. McCoy and Ralph H. Major, Jr., which appeared in the September issue of Coronet.

The article analyzes the method by which the medical profession, hospitals, and the public health authorities of Kansas are successfully meeting an important problem within our own State. It further points the way to discharge local responsibility in this most important field.

As Governor of Kansas I met in conference many times with these groups and know their sincerity, hard work, and their desire to be of service which has met with more than ordinary success. I commend the Kansas plan to Senators as an answer to the health problem of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS ANSWERS SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

A GREAT FARM STATE IS MAKING MEDICAL HISTORY WITH ITS AMAZING NEW HEALTH PROGRAM

(By Alvin S. McCoy and Ralph H. Major, Jr.)

No public issue in recent years has stirred more controversy than proposed Government control of medicine. From forum platforms, over radio networks, and in lurid headlines, socialized medicine has been alternately condemned and praised. Congressmen, doctors, public-health officials, educators, and welfare workers have combined to fill the air with a barrage of charges and countercharges.

Amidst all this discordant wrangling, the farm State of Kansas has quietly launched an amazing program which points the way to a solution of our public-health problems. Modestly and without fanfare, the heart of America has demonstrated that private and civic enterprise, when guided by farseeing doctors, can provide enough general practitioners to assure medical care for its people. Moreover, these medical and lay pioneers have blazed a trail which any State may follow, without forsaking our free-enterprise system.

The Kansas program of today is a far cry from the conditions that prevailed only yesterday. Not long ago, events like these occurred with frightening regularity:

Philip Johnston had swung his giant combine into the last row of waving grain on his 450-acre farm. Another hour and he would be back with Mary and 2-year-old Don in their white-painted home. Suddenly, the huge machine jolted to a stop. Johnston stepped down to examine the long, sharp blades. For a moment he tugged at the wheat; the machine was clogged. Then, without warning, the tractor's idling clutch accidentally slipped into gear. With a sickening grind, the machine lurched forward. And Phil Johnston's right arm was caught in the blades.

When neighbors carried Phil home, Mary dashed to the phone. The nearest physician, Dr. Sampson, lived 50 miles away. Mrs. Sampson said he was delivering a baby. Another call. Old Dr. Seymour was in bed with the flu.

Mary phoned doctor after doctor. Finally one agreed to come. He arrived just in time to pull a sheet over Johnston's blood-drained face.

Just last year, the Ben Emersons were awakened at midnight by their baby's screams. A severe throat infection threatened to choke her. Ben jumped into his car and rattled off into the dark. He drove through three villages before he found a doctor. When the Ford bumped down the rutted road to the Emerson homestead, Ben's wife was standing in the doorway.

"It's too late, Ben," she sobbed. "Ethel's gone."

Horrible? Yes. Preventable? Yes. But tragedies like these are common throughout rural Kansas. People in hundreds of communities live in fear of accidents or sickness. For they know there is seldom much help or hope for the stricken. Their "family doctor"—also "family doctor" to several hundred other families—may live 40, 50, even 75 miles away. Often he is old, overworked, and unequal to the rigors of prairie practice.

Kansas is only one of many States suffering from America's most acute national health problem: a shortage of general practitioners in small communities. And, according to the United States Public Health Service, the situation is worsening. Yet today, amid the barren desert that is rural

medicine, Kansas is fast becoming an oasis of healthy citizens protected by well-equipped, well-trained doctors. This ruggedly individualistic State is well on the way to solving its own medical problems—with remarkably little outside assistance.

No longer are people like the Johnstons and the Emersons dismayed when accidents or disease occur. Early this year, Dr. Daniel S. Roccaforte, 26, hung out his shingle in Hanover, a town not far from the Johnston farm. Now he is on call 24 hours a day.

West of Hanover, in north central Kansas, the almost 1,500 inhabitants of Mankato are eagerly watching a modern clinic and office building rise. A doctor is ready to move in as soon as the builders finish. Between Hanover and Mankato, near the Emerson home, lies the village of Glasco. This year, Dr. L. F. Wallace started practicing there on a round-the-clock schedule.

It was no accident that Hanover, Mankato, and Glasco acquired their own physicians. All three towns worked long and hard before they brought the promise of health to their doorsteps. Meanwhile, 67 other Kansas communities have tacked up "Doctor Wanted" signs. And they expect their requests to be gratified within a year or two.

Just what is going on in Kansas? The answer lies in the State's brilliantly conceived rural health program—a practical demonstration of what enlightened medical knowledge, combined with civic enterprise, can accomplish. Its father is Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, dean of the University of Kansas Medical Center. At 33, he is one of America's youngest medical-school deans. Son of a pioneer Kansas City physician, Dr. Murphy has long been familiar with the dilemma of small-town medicine. To him, doctor shortage was an old story; he decided it needed a new ending.

Was the situation as bad as he thought? It was worse. In 1906, Kansas boasted 1,544,968 inhabitants and 2,732 physicians. Today, its population grown to 1,914,000, Kansas is served by only 1,900 doctors. Within that 43-year period, the number of physicians fell off 30 percent, while the population rose by one-fourth

In farm areas, the picture was even more grim. One study showed that 77 percent of all rural doctors were more than 50 years old, compared with 43 percent in cities.

The big question puzzling Dr. Murphy was this: Why didn't graduates of Kansas' own medical school practice in rural areas? He was sure scholarships were no solution. Of 142 medical students winning Commonwealth Fund fellowships on condition that they practice 3 years in small towns, only two stuck it out.

How about income? That was no drawback. Dr. Murphy knew that active rural practices often net doctors $10,000 to $12,000 a year. Also, he knew from talking with students that many preferred country life to the tension of big-city existence.

Something else was wrong. So Dr. Murphy assembled his senior and junior students and asked a blunt question: "Why won't you fellows take up general practice in a small town?"

The replies were revealing. Most graduates, heavily in debt after years in medical school, could not afford to practice the way they had been taught. Up-to-date equipment alone costs up to $10,000. It was more practical, and much simpler, to share the office of a well-established metropolitan doctor.

There was a second reason: students feared medical isolation if they settled in small communities. None wanted to be cut off from news of medical advances.

His questions answered, Murphy turned next to developing a remedy. Armed with reports, statistics, and a headful of ideas, he began to canvas the State. He talked with members of the Kansas State Board of Health and the Kansas Medical Society. Officials of the American Medical Association, happy to see a private individual urging health improvements without Washington sponsorship, contributed suggestions. Then Murphy sat down and drafted a three-point program:

1. More doctors can be produced only if medical school facilities are expanded. The number of doctors graduated each year then could be increased by 30 percent, plus twice as many nurses, technicians and other medical personnel.

2. To attract doctors, small towns must collect by popular subscription enough funds to build and equip a suitable clinic. This office then could either be bought by the doctor from his earnings or remain the property of the community.

3. In order that small-town practitioners would not go stale, intensive postgraduate training and refresher courses should be set up to keep the rural doctor informed on medical progress.

With his Kansas plan only a dream on paper, Murphy set out to find a guinea pig on which to experiment. To his pleasant surprise, the "guinea pig" found him.

Last fall, O. K. Fearing, a banker from a farm community, walked into Murphy's Medical Center office in Kansas City, Kans. "Doctor," he said, "we need a physician in Mankato. How can we get one?"

Drawing a pad toward him, Murphy began jotting down data about Mankato. A county seat. Heart of a wheat-farming region. Only two doctors. Both over 70. Few years ago had two young doctors. Both grew dissatisfied—no facilities, an old upstairs office—so they quit. Civic leaders tried a hospital bond election. It failed. Situation, bad.

"What you ought to do," said Dr. Murphy, "is finance a clinic. Collect some money, build an office—with home attached—for a doctor. Buy him good equipment. And your doctor will show up."

On the banker's recommendation, Mankato decided to give the clinic idea a try. The Commercial Club's hospital committee became the clinic finance committee. F. W. Boyd, Jr., energetic young newspaperman, spearheaded the drive.

No sooner had the campaign started than money began to pour in from businessmen, farmers, housewives, laborers, mechanics, merchants, and feed salesmen. Within days, $13,000 had been subscribed.

Then, as Murphy had prophesied, a doctor materialized. He was R. M. Owensby, graduate of Hahnemann Medical School in Philadelphia, who stopped in Mankato to visit relatives. He had hardly removed his hat before the doorbell began to ring. Curious Mankato citizens, some asking medical attention, wanted to see what this doctor looked like. The committee came along too and scrutinized Owensby. Finally they invited him to take over their proposed clinic. Owensby accepted.

Next day the new doctor and Commercial Club officers studied blueprints drawn free of charge by an architect who once lived in Mankato. When Owensby nodded approval, building started. Contractors are providing materials at cost. A block from Main Street a modern structure is nearing completion. Within its 32-by-28-foot area will be waiting, consultation, treatment, surgical, and X-ray rooms, as well as a laboratory and heating plant.

With Mankato as his model, Dr. Murphy set out to spread its story throughout Kansas. Dr. Haddon Peck, president of the Kansas Medical Society, joined him and soon became an indefatigable salesman for community action. The efforts of Murphy and Peck produced fast results; dozens of towns launched clinic campaigns.

Bird City announced it had $25,000 pledged and could even dig up $50,000 if a doctor would volunteer his services. Even before Murphy's rural health pr gram was launched, the town of McLouth pioneered in securing a doctor by offering a clinic.

Hanover won a doctor from Omaha's Creighton Medical School and has voted a bond issue for a hospital and clinic. When the village of Glasco advertised for a doctor, it received more than 50 inquiries. And a dozen more towns, including Overbrook, Hartford, Ransom and others, promised Murphy they could raise $10,000 to $15,000 by popular subscription on short notice. In all, more than 25 communities are now working on clinic projects.

To handle the ballooning application file, Dr. R. M. Heilman, 34-year-old director of the State board of health hospital committee, set up a clearing house to process requests for doctors. Also, he charts each town on the basis of its potential trade area, possible facilities, schools, churches and number of physicians now in practice. Likewise, information on Federal aid available to small towns is passed on to civic leaders. Under the Hill-Burton law, the United States Government will share the cost of hospital construction with local communities.

As the demand for doctors, coupled with offers of facilities, mounted daily, Dr. Murphy approached a new problem. How could he fill these requests? Best hope was his own school. So Dean Murphy expounded the Kansas plan to medical students. Of the first 10 with whom he talked, 8 said they would become general practitioners. Finally, 60 percent of the senior class showed an interest in practicing in rural areas.

Meanwhile, candidates from outside the State began clamoring for an opportunity to practice in Kansas. Word of the plan had spread literally throughout the world. An Army doctor, a former Kansan, wrote from the Canal Zone that he wanted to return to Kansas to practice. Which would be a good town to investigate? Another Kansan, in Montana, penned a similar inquiry.

From his Topeka office, Dr. Heilman sends copies of the letters to each of the 67 doctorless towns. His advice, in effect, is: "Here's a prospective doctor for you. Size him up. If you like him, try and get him."

After Kansas became doctor-conscious almost overnight, Dr. Murphy proceeded to fulfill point 1 of the plan—expansion of medical training facilities. His building program called for 200 additional beds at the center, a new unit for psychiatric cases, another for chronic chest diseases, and still another for Negro patients, plus more laboratories, service buildings, and nurses' quarters. The total cost: more than $4,000,000—an outlay larger than any Kansas Legislature had ever authorized at one time.

Inexperienced in politics, Murphy nevertheless began lining up votes for the battle. He talked with Gov. Frank Carlson, with senators and repfesentatives. More important, the potent Kansas State Farm Bureau gave his plan enthusiastic endorsement. So did the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce and other influential groups.

When the legislature convened last January, Murphy's Kansas plan was the first major bill passed and signed by the Governor. Also, in another unprecedented step, the legislature increased grants for mental hospitals from $8,000,000 to $16,000,000 for the 2-year period.

On the center's huge campus in Kansas City new buildings are taking shape. But future medical students will not spend all their 4 years in the efficiently planned units

now under construction. For the next school term will stress instruction in the art and technique of rural practice. To get first-hand experience, all seniors may spend 9 weeks in doctors' offices throughout farm-dotted Kansas. Thus, each student will know what to expect when he opens his own office.

Dean Murphy next tackled the old problem of how to help country physicians keep pace with up-to-date medicine. The solution was to take the facts to the doctor, and vice versa. Encouraging progress has already been made. Last year short refresher courses at the center were attended by 583 doctors as well as 211 nurses and technicians.

This year, medical science has literally gone on the road. Teams of faculty members and practicing physicians, are barnstorming the State, lecturing doctors assembled at 6 strategically located towns on 12 medical and surgical subjects. Still in the planning stage is a project to bring the rural doctor himself back to the center every 3 to 5 years for bedside instruction, clinics, lectures and conferences.

Dr. Murphy's Kansas plan is receiving intelligent appraisal by doctors and public-health experts throughout the Nation. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, cosponsor of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill to place medicine under Federal control, has expressed interest in Murphy's activities. Oscar R. Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency, recently wrote the Kansas dean to visit him the next time he was in Washington, so Government health planners could learn about the program. Also, doctors and State officials from coast to coast have asked Murphy to share his secrets with them.

In each case, he has been happy to comply. For, to Murphy, the Kansas plan is definitely patterned for export. He hopes as many States as possible will set up machinery to solve their own medical problems, as local situations dictate.

"We know our program will work," says Dr. Murphy. "This is medicine's real opportunity to put its own house in order. In Kansas we have proved that the medical profession, in cooperation with the public, can meet the current challenge to improve and safeguard America's health."

Congress the Last Free Parliament—Its Role Is To Protect the Unarmed Citizen Against the Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Edna Lonigan, in the current issue of Human Events, points out that the real role of this Congress, or any other, is to impose effective restraints upon Presidential spending programs. This Congress has failed to do this since 1933, except for the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress. Blank-check authorizations and reckless spending at home and abroad are washing away the principle of liberty and freedom. There is no great difference between Hitler's Reichstag when its members parroted "Ya" to every demand he made, and our own subservience to Presidential requests for huge appropriations and greater and greater powers.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the exceptional article by Miss Lonigan so all Members may read it:

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

(By Edna Lonigan)

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress is slowly dragging to its end. President Truman denounced the "do nothing" Eightieth Congress in what was perhaps the bitterest verbal attack ever made by an American President against the legislative process. Whether the President really likes the Eighty-first Congress better is not our concern here. The one important question for the citizen in regard to Congress is: What is the role of this representative organ in the fight to save the Republic?

Our political textbooks (following Montesquieu) have given us a picture of government as divided into three parts, legislative, executive, and judicial. Popular usage tends more and more to refer to the executive power alone as "government."

Actually popular usage here is the more accurate. The executive power is profoundly different from the legislative power. The elected Representatives of the people speak for the people in opposition to appointed officials responsible primarily to the Executive. It is therefore the duty of Congress to restrain the "government" to do nothing that will improperly increase its power at public expense.

Montesquieu emphasized the English separation of legislative and executive powers because he clearly saw that this separation was necessary for freedom. If the French would deprive their absolute monarchy of the power to make its own laws, they could also enjoy the liberty for which the English so resolutely fought. The men who wrote our Constitution fully realized the importance of balanced powers.

Today that realization greatly needs to be revived. Our legislative agencies are still visibly separate from the executive arm, but under the surface the separation of powers is disappearing. The executive is regaining the power to make its own law, and to control the courts, although the structure outwardly appears unchanged.

There is no need for Congress if its function is merely to write laws conveying to the President in pleasing language the power to do what he likes. Clark Clifford or any other clever appointee could do that. The role of Congress is to do what the White House naturally resents: to lay down restraints on the executive, to define the channels through which the executive power is to flow.

Since 1935, as a result of "must legislation," lump-sum appropriations, manufactured emergencies, and foreign entanglements, the President has been arrogating to himself the power to decide the restraints which he will heed, and to define the channels through which he will dispose of the vast resources at his command.

II

We tend to forget that executive power is physical and substantial. It is the power of the military leader or Commander in Chief. All the elaborate developments of the executive arm partake of the nature of the Army. Whether a Government agent is arresting dope peddlers, or promising Federal subsidies to all and sundry, he is not acting in his own person, but exercising an authority derived from the ability of the Government back of him to seize persons and property by force.

Legislative power, on the other hand, is not physical. It is legal and abstract. Executive power can be wielded by a strong and ruthless individual and his henchmen. But legislative power requires the voluntary support of a sophisticated and self-disciplined people.

Every city-state and nation, as it grew strong, was forced to realize that the chief could use the physical power at his command against unarmed citizens who displeased him. The history of parliaments is essentially the story of how the people, after their chief had created an army, learned how to impose restraints on the force under his control.

The great forward step was made when the English-speaking people turned from the council or mass meeting to a small body of "representatives," to keep watch over the chief and his personal aides. These representatives of the people stumbled on the all-important factor, in protecting the citizens, when they learned that the ruler would be very reasonable if he needed money, and only if he needed money. The political problem of the Republic today is still as simple as that. It is to insure that the ruler is curtailed for money.

We call the parliamentary protection of our liberties "the power of the purse." It used to be called, more accurately, "the separation of the purse from the sword." Our forefathers knew, what we forget, that the chief of state always possesses the sword. The people can control the sword only if they keep control of the purse, which is the power to supply the ruler's armies, or, in our more refined age, to vote the salaries of the bureaucracy.

So it should be realized that Congress is not really so much a part of "government" as a defense against government. It is a wall which the people have built to insure that the chief cannot send his armies to punish their leaders, or to take their property, except as they decree. When the colonists said, "No taxation without representation" they knew the score. They meant that the head of the state should not collect a penny in taxes unless their own elected agents were in full control, with power to decide where and how all taxes should be spent.

III

The twentieth century has witnessed a world-wide abdication by the people of their dearly bought right to control the sword. The people have everywhere surrendered to the personal government of the commander in chief. They have forgotten that any party which accepts personal government thereby undermines the Congressional wall protecting the unarmed people against the government's arbitrary will. But no modern dictator has been rash enough openly to abolish the legislature.

Mussolini said: "I will not take from the people their legislative toy." Hitler made the Reichstag what was well called "the world's most expensive male singing society." Stalin appears at the pageants that mark the meeting of the Soviet Congress. But in all these cases the leaders themselves usurped the power of the purse.

Similarly, our different programs for big spending, since 1933, have been variants of one central plan, to give the President free money. In WPA, PWA, lend-lease, ECA, MAP and all the rest of the always emergency legislation, Congress was never allowed to say just how the money should be spent, or to define the exact powers and duties of the spending agencies. That discretion is all the President needs. For if the law is not precise, Congress will never know whether or not the President obeys the law. Generalities are not law, no matter how legally they may be dressed up in sections and articles. Keeping the traditional form of law is merely part of the deceptive process. It is through vague and general language, cast in legal form, that the Executive has regained the power to decide what laws it will observe.

When appropriations grow large enough, Congress has no hope of knowing what is really done with the money. And nowadays Congress is confronted by the Executive with

a budget deliberately made so huge and complex that it cannot be analyzed. Our representatives have been driven to the expedient of suggesting that Congress tell the Executive to make its own cut of 5 or 10 percent of the amounts appropriated. But this, as Senator STYLES BRIDGES has virtually admitted, is open abdication by Congress of the power of the purse.

While Congress was deliberately immobilized by the pressure of real or fake emergencies, the Executive has been using the people's money to deluge their representatives with vials of ridicule. When ridicule was not enough, the factions which we call the party in power have turned to purging those Members of Congress who have fought valiantly to keep the purse separate from the sword.

IV

It is tragic to hear Americans speak of contests between the President and Congress as though we were mere bystanders at a prize fight. The Congress has no army, no bureaucracy, no courts, no jails, no propaganda arm. Its one real power, the power to withhold money from the bureaucracy, has meaning only to the extent that people support the representatives who guard the purse.

When President Truman denounced the Eightieth Congress as a "do nothing" Congress, he was really calling it a great Congress, one which held the line against executive aggression. What an opportunity the Republicans missed. How richly their last candidate deserved defeat.

When President Roosevelt tried to purge Senator GEORGE he was logical. When President Truman recently attacked Senator BYRD, he was consistent. These Executives merely sought to punish independent thinking in their own party, as everyone who seeks power must do. It is encouraging that among Democrats, rather than among Republicans, the plain people have risen to defend their defenders, as the colonists did.

The world-wide political crisis is in every country a struggle between the unarmed citizens and the chief, with his personal following, who directs the armed forces. It make no real difference whether the head man is from the Left or from the Right, whether he is called a leader or a dictator or a President. In each case he and his personal aides have the all-essential physical power, and, if they can shake off the restraining influence of the people's representatives, they have power as absolute as that of Louis XIV. In almost every country, except the United States, this battle for the people is now definitely lost.

The people depend for their liberty on the strength with which Congress can impose restraints on their spending. Otherwise the sword and the purse are reunited in the hands of the ruler and his following. Then all the gains the unarmed citizenry have made in 300 years will be lost. Our Congress is the last free parliament. It contains wise and valiant men who have been fighting for 15 years to hold the line, in the hope that the people will realize in time what is at stake.

Forced Labor in Communist Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the principle portions of a report of Gen. Nicolae Radescu, former Prime Minister of Rumania, on forced labor in Communist Rumania, made under the auspices of the Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor. The report shows the need of the Atlantic Pact against such a possible fate befalling the surviving free nations of Europe.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCED LABOR IN COMMUNIST RUMANIA

(By Gen. Nicolae Radescu, former Prime Minister of Rumania)

(The Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor: Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, chairman; Morris L. Cooke; Dr. George S. Counts; Max Delson; Mrs. Ethel S. Epstein; John F. Finerty; Dr. Frank P. Graham; John Green; Donald Harrington; Francis Heisler; Dr. Sidney Hook; Emil Mazey; Frank McCulloch; A. Philip Randolph; Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.; Max Sherover; Dr. George N. Shuster; Norman Thomas; Matthew Woll; Dr. Ralph Gilbert Ross, secretary; Albert Konrad Herling, asssitant to the chairman; Thomas L. Parsonnet, general counsel; Ernest Fleischman, Carl Rachlin, associate counsel.)

I

Allow me in the first place to pay tribute to the free workers of the United States. Their well-being and prosperity have been achieved within a regime of economic and democratic freedom. They have created thus a powerful moral platform for themselves from which to raise their voices and to protest against the treatment to which are subjected their less-privileged comrades in the countries that suffer under the yoke of the totalitarian tyrannies.

The general picture of the worker

Rumania is today a political and an economic prison as well as a physical prison for its people. Not only leaving, but even the intention to leave Rumania is punished as a crime.

The free circulation of goods, free enterprises and unregimented labor have been suppressed. Economic initiative belongs only to the Bucharest Soviets, which act under the imperious and direct orders of Moscow.

Rumania has already been impoverished because of the war and especially on account of the predatory exactions of the Soviet Union, which continues through reparation claims, through the medium of onerous trade pacts and through joint Rumanian-Soviet concerns, to claim for itself a considerable portion of the production of the country. If we add to this circumstance the artificially created economic barriers and the fact that within the economic Soviet Empire industrial equipment is practically impossible to replace, the conditions which govern the field of labor are easy to assess.

Under the dictatorship of the Communist Party, the Rumanian working class is deprived of its legitimate rights to strike, of its right to enter into collective agreements freely negotiated; it is underpaid to a degree inconceivable by American standards; it is being coerced by the Communist state into slave labor, doing the work of outworn or unreplaced machinery, or making up for other deficiencies resulting from an economic system which has broken with civilization.

* * * * *

At the top of a society thus established, there is a Communist bureaucracy which possesses not only the material privileges of a tyrannical oligarchy, but also the power to dispose of the lives of the majority—to whom nothing is left but their eyes to weep.

* * * * *

II

Mass deportations—Genocide?

The most inhuman form under which present-day slavery appears is that of the deportations of great masses of people from the Soviet-occupied countries, which are forcibly rounded up and sent into the interior of Russia.

A part of the working population of Rumania is in this way kept in captivity, in the mines and forests beyond the Urals, in the dreaded Gulags, where the life of the prisoners is a nightmare and death means deliverance. Although 4½ years have passed since the cessation of hostilities between Rumania and the Soviet Union, at least 180,000 Rumania prisoners of war and peace (because the Soviet Army continued to take prisoners after the acceptance of the armistice on the part of Rumania) still remain to be repatriated. * * *

Within a short lapse of time, beginning with January 5, 1945, a total of 36,590 men and 32,748 women, Rumanian subjects of German origin, have been taken from their homes by Soviet troops and MVD agents in the middle of the night and deported to the Soviet Union. They were transported to Russia huddled in unheated cattle cars without food and without being permitted to take any luggage. My repeated protests, in my capacity as Prime Minister, which I held at that time, were completely ignored by the Soviet occupying power. Subsequently, the number of almost 70,000 deported Rumanian nationals of German origin has grown to at least the figure of 107,000. According to carefully checked information, a considerable part of these people have died during their journey, or as a result of the barbarous treatment to which they were subjected in the camps situated in the Stalino region (Ukraine) where women were forced to draw ox wagons or to work in mines.

In addition to the approximately 107,000 Rumanian subjects of German origin, there also were deported, under similar conditions, from August 1944 until the end of January 1948, about 20,000 Rumanians from Moldavia and northern Transylvania (taken from their homes until March 1945); approximately 50,000, who were formally inhabitants of Bessarabia and northern Bukovina, and between sixty to seventy thousand persons deported to Russia for political reasons. The majority of the last two categories have been sent to the labor camps of central Asia and Siberia.

* * * * *

According to a most conservative estimate, the number of people taken into captivity up to the beginning of 1948, under the conditions described above, total at least 240,000 inhabitants of Rumania—in its present frontiers But the Rumanian people is justified in accusing the Soviet Union before the civilized world of a crime of even greater proportions—a crime which assumes the form of an authentic genocide, because the deportations in this case are but a means for the extermination of a whole branch of a people. * * *

In June 1940, when in agreement with Hitler, the Soviet troops occupied these provinces, there were slightly over 2,000,000 Rumanians living in this region. A year later, when they were reunited to Rumania (which has never given up de jure sovereignty over them), almost 300,000 of these people were missing. * * *

In August 1944, the Soviet Union had again taken possession of the two provinces and in the four years and a half which have passed since then, more than half of the remaining 1,700,000 people of Rumanian stock were deported beyond the Urals. The process is still continuing. This time, as confirmed by various sources, the manner in which the deportations were carried out surpasses the savage methods used in 1940: the children

were taken from their parents, and interned in Soviet orphanages in order to be forcibly Russianized. The other nationalities from the same provinces were subjected to similar treatment. The Soviet Government seems to plan the replacement of the native population from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea with elements of Mongolian stock.

In conclusion, there are at present engaged at forced labor in the Soviet Union the survivors of the unrepatriated 180,000 Rumanian prisoners of war together with those among the over 240,000 people deported from the civil population of Rumania and among the more than a million people of Rumanian and other nationalities deported from Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina who have not yet perished.

III

The concentration camps

The degradation and wretchedness prevailing in the Soviet camps for deportees has an equivalent in the concentration camps and prisons of Communist Rumania—in which men and women representing the popular resistance to communism and the nation's will to independence are being liquidated by death and slavery.

Over 100,000 patriotic Rumanians are held in these prisons and camps because of their political beliefs, while about 50,000 more are imprisoned for economic sabotage, a crime invented to punish those who are considered representatives of the economic and social order which the Communist regime is set to destroy. Only a few thousands of all these have undergone even a mock trial.

* * * * *

IV

Voluntary brigades of forced labor

In addition to the concentration camps, the Communist government established about 2 years ago a chain of organizations for forced labor, which passes under the name of voluntary labor. The youth section of the Communist Party, the Young Workers' Union, was entrusted with the organization of the schools for the instruction of brigadiers, in charge of directing the so-called voluntary brigades—the future Rumanian version of the Soviet GULAG's.

Information published in the Rumanian press indicates that in 1948 over 200,000 youths were mobilized for voluntary labor. In checking published information with reports received from more trustworthy sources, it appears that actually under the label of voluntary labor the regime had laid the basis of a comprehensive system of forced labor. This form of labor is being applied by means of four types of brigades, under the direction of the Communist Party and its subsidiary organizations and agencies, such as the Young Workers' Union (recently transformed into the United Youth Organization) and the General Confederation of Labor.

The first type of these brigades originally established has its membership exclusively recruited from among the youth of the nation and comprises permanent and temporary brigades. The permanent brigades are manned by unemployed or union-designated manual, office or intellectual workers. Their program is a full-time daily job for which they are given subsistence and a nominal pay. To this permanent brigade temporary ones are attached into which students, young magistrates, teachers, public officials, and workers are drafted for the whole period of their summer vacations. The volunteers receive no pay; the food they receive barely differs from that on which the inmates of the concentration camps have to subsist.

* * * * *

Two other types of brigades are organized on a nonpermanent basis and are employed locally for so-called spare-time jobs, either in the rural or urban area. In the rural brigades peasants are compelled to toil without pay either at village projects or at national public work projects that happen to be carried out in the region where they live. In the urban brigades all salary and wage earners, jobless and retired people, students (and, generally, any man, woman, or child receiving a special summons) are compelled to work voluntarily at such jobs as street paving, tree planting, etc. They are summoned to their tasks by representatives of the Communist Party, the labor unions, or school authorities, and absence at roll call is punished with withdrawal of the ration card, loss of job, or expulsion from school. The supplementary unpaid labor which an individual is forced to contribute through these nonpermanent brigades during his spare time, which should be normally devoted to rest and leisure, averages 40 hours per month. To prevent church attendance and participation in other kinds of social activities that may escape the control of the Communist Party, these types of voluntary brigades usually work on Sundays or other religious holidays.

The labor brigades of the fourth type are reserved for public officials who were victims of the various political purges, dismissed army officers, and generally to anyone not usefully employed. The conditions in the labor camps to which these people are confined is practically the same as in the concentration camps:—starvation subsistence, harsh discipline, no pay, complete separation from families.

* * * * *

V

The plight of the free worker

When we turn from forced labor and from the fate of the victims of political persecution and pass to the field of normal labor, we find that the working masses outside the prisons, concentration and labor camps—are subjected to a regime of exploitation from which all trace of freedom has disappeared.

Public officials who in the past have enjoyed a status of stability and who were able to defend their rights before independent courts, may now be dismissed from one day to another, under the pretext that their attitude toward the regime is not favorable.

Professional people can be deprived of the right to exert their professions by a simple decision expelling them from the trade union which they had been compelled to join in order to be permitted to practice.

In addition to their normal, full-time duties, white collar workers, whether employed by the State or the few remaining private undertakings, or whether engaged in the free professions, are compelled to devote much time and effort to so-called "voluntary labor" and daily courses of Communist indoctrination; they are frequently forced to take part in public demonstrations to which their union summons them. The penalty for not complying with these unwritten obligations is loss of their job or of their right to practice a profession. * * *

As regards skilled or unskilled manual workers, we find that their standard of living has reached an unprecedented low level and that their rights and freedom of organization have been systematically curtailed.

1. The purchasing power, that is the real wages, of the Rumanian workers represented in 1948 at most half of the 1938 level. * * * According to calculations based on the price of articles of prime necessity, the present real wages represent less than a quarter of the real wages prevalent in 1938.

2. Before the war the Rumanian workers received a basic wage in relation with the time spent at work. To this, bonuses were added for above-average efficiency.

The speed-up

Beginning with January 1, 1949, a new type of collective agreement was imposed upon the workers, which has suppressed the time-work system and replaced it with the Soviet piecework system. * * *

Under the present system, fixed working schedules—called norms—are established for each worker, irrespective of the actual time needed to carry them out. Under the penalty of seeing their wages reduced, or in frequent cases of being sent to labor camps, industrial workers are required to work from 10 to 12 hours per day.

Parallel with piecework, the Soviet speed-up system, known under the name of Stakhanovism, has become the common practice as a means of compelling the individual worker to catch up with the most efficient of his colleagues. * * *

3. The advantages obtained by the workers before the nationalization of production—in June 1948—have been gradually withdrawn.

Thus, the coal miners had obtained before nationalization the portal-to-portal pay; in other words, the time spent going down in, and that spent coming up from, the pits, was included in the 8-hour working day and accordingly paid. Following the nationalization of coal mines, portal-to-portal pay was suppressed, with the result that in order to earn the same wages as before, coal miners have to spend 1 to 2 hours more at their work.

4. Before the war, in accordance with the law for collective labor agreements of 1929, collective agreements were concluded on the basis of direct negotiations between the workers, through their freely elected representatives, and the employers.

The end of free trade-unions

In virtue of the law No. 52 of 1945 for the organization of labor unions, the collective agreements are now negotiated and concluded by the federations and the confederation of labor, in other words, by the bodies through which the Communist Party exercises its dictatorship over the unions.

The leadership of the Confederation of Labor and of the Federations of Labor stems directly from the Communist Party. * * *

5. In prewar Rumania, the law of May 26, 1921, assured the workers complete freedom of association.

Law No. 52, 1945, to which I had already referred, provides that the unions which have not obtained juridical personality are to be automatically dissolved. Juridical personality being at present granted by the courts of justice only upon the advice of the ministry of labor, which is indispensable, it can be said that the freedom of association of the workers has actually been suppressed.

However, more important than the legal status of the labor unions is their de facto situation. Starting from February 1945, the Communist Party, through its shock troops, has gradually eliminated from the direction of the various labor unions the freely elected committees. * * *

Since the beginning of 1946, the entire organization of the labor unions has become an annex of the Communist Party, the cells of the party taking the place of the professional committees. The unions have thus been transformed from organizations designed to promote and defend the interest of the workers, first into instruments for the economic destruction of the private employer, and afterward, following the nationalization of industry, into instruments for the oppression of the working class. Immediately after the State had become practically the sole employer, the unions were confined to the tasks allotted to them in the Soviet Union. * * *

6. Before the war, in accordance with the Law on Labor Disputes of September 5, 1920, the right of the workers to strike was recognized—provided that it was preceded by an attempt at conciliation.

By law No. 30 brought into force on June 9, 1948, the Communist regime has introduced compulsory arbitration for all labor disputes.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that the form of arbitration provided by the above measure is merely a parody. The arbitration committees called to settle the disputes which arise between workers and the state employer consist of a magistrate appointed by the Ministry of Justice, of a representative of the specific enterprise which is involved in the dispute and of a delegate of the Confederation of Labor. The first is supposed to represent impartial justice, and the other two the disputing parties. However, all three are nothing but agents of the Communist Party and of the totalitarian state—which by its very nature does not tolerate impartial magistrates, or direct representatives of the workers in the position of actually supporting the interests of the latter against the state employer.

* * * * *

No freedom, no rest, no leisure

7. Under the constitution and other measures in force before the war, the worker was, of course, free to choose the place where he wanted to live and the enterprise where he wanted to work.

By law No. 314 of July 12, 1947, the Communist regime suppressed this elementary right The state, through the medium of a "commission for the rational distribution of labor," has assumed for itself the right "to distribute labor according to necessities."

8. Before the war the Rumanian worker was master of his free time and had the right to paid vacations every year.

Today, after he works over 10 hours per day, the worker is loaded with a whole series of obligations. At various political anniversaries he is compelled to hand over to the state "of his own accord," his wages for a day; on other occasions he is peremptorily invited to contribute in the same manner toward the support, for instance, of the French strikers or of the Greek rebels. Several days in each week he is coerced to attend Communist political meetings. * * *

The peasants' yoke

As regards the great mass of the Rumanian workers, those who work in the fields, their lot is hardly different from that of the serfs.

The peasantry has been impoverished by the so-called monetary stabilization in August 1947, which in fact was but a disguise for the brutal confiscation of their savings, the fruit of the thrift of entire generations. They are being held between poverty and bankruptcy by means of a graduated taxation whose purpose is the destruction of private property. The process by which the peasantry is being impoverished and gradually enslaved can briefly be described as follows:

The State establishes a theoretical minimum yield per hectare (1 hectare equals 2.2 acres) and on this basis, irrespective of the volume of his harvest the peasant is forced to deliver the required quotas of produce. Those who own less than 3 hectares—which are barely sufficient for the subsistence of a household—are compelled to deliver to the state 22 percent of their production—estimated to be at least 1,000 kilograms per hectare. The peasant who owns 20 hectares must surrender to the state 58 percent of the production. For the grain thus collected, the state pays to the producer 5.60 lei per kilogram, whereas the price on the free market is around 18 lei for the same quantity. The state resells to the peasant seed grain at 10 lei per kilogram.

Moreover, in order to exercise complete control over the landworkers the state has appropriated all agricultural machinery.

Such measures, combined with the effects of a newly introduced agricultural tax, five times higher than in the past, have produced the result sought by the Communist regime: (a) the disorganization of agricultural production (the average yield per hectare has decreased from 1,160 kilograms in 1944 to 750 kilograms in 1947)—which now is serving as a pretext for carrying out the long-projected collectivization of agriculture; (b) the spoliation of the peasant who, as a result of the measures directed against him, produces from 15 percent to 45 percent less than in 1938, is required to pay taxes that are five times higher than a decade ago and must surrender to the state up to 58 percent of his produce at the prices prevalent in 1938, while the finished goods needed for his family and household cost at least 2½ times more than in 1938.

To this picture should be added the threat of capital punishment recently introduced, which may actually take effect if the peasant or the industrial worker is found "guilty" of acts of sabotage or of the intention of committing such acts. * * *

Conclusion

The inevitable conclusion toward which we are led by this brief survey of prevailing conditions in Rumania is that between the Communist political regime and the servitude of labor there is a direct relation of cause and effect. The peasant is no longer an independent owner and worker of his land; he has been reduced to the status of a serf forced to work under the terror of the new feudal lord: the ruthless, totalitarian, Communist state. The independence of the industrial worker, his right to strike, his right to unrestricted association, his possibility for appeal to an objective justice, his freedom of movement, his right of free enjoyment of his leisure—are inconsistent with the totalitarian state organization, for the simple reason that such benefits are the fruits of free political democracy. With the disappearance of the latter, these rights and liberties are also destroyed, with the result that the workingman becomes a slave.

Federal Expenditure and Revenue Policy for Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 23 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday morning the Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report had presented to it two reports dealing with problems of utmost importance to every American, one on Federal expenditure and revenue policy for economic stability and the other on fiscal policy in the near future. The reports were prepared by a group of the Nation's leading economists who met at Princeton University on September 16, under the sponsorship of the National Planning Association.

It was the feeling of the entire subcommittee that the observations of this important group on Government taxing, spending, and debt-management policies were so worth while and so timely that they should be brought to the immediate attention of the Congress and the Nation through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, notwithstanding the estimated cost of this printing will be $218.68.

I ask unanimous consent that the two reports, together with the list of distinguished economists who have signed these reports, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the two reports and the list of economists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE POLICY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY

(Statement drafted and unanimously approved by the NPA Conference of University Economists September 16–18, 1949, Princeton, N. J.)

INTRODUCTION

Although our economic system accords a dominant role to private enterprise, Government expenditures and receipts have now reached a scale that make them crucially important factors in our national welfare. In 1949, with a gross national production of $250,000,000,000, the Federal Government is spending more than 40 billions, while Federal, State, and local governments together are spending around 60 billions.

Government programs of this size make it more than ever desirable that every dollar of Government expenditures be used as efficiently as possible. We are not rich enough to afford waste of resources by Government any more than by anyone else.

It is equally important that the expenditure and revenue programs of Government, in their formulation and execution, be consistent with the progress and stability of the private economy. The fiscal policy of the Government must make useful positive contributions to the maintenance of high levels of employment and income—the goals declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to be a national objective.

Government affects business through both sides of its budget. Payments to Government employees, bondholders, veterans, the aged, and the needy all constitute income that can be used to buy consumption goods from business; Government procurement affords a direct market for business. On the other side of the budget, taxes capture funds that consumers might have spent or that business firms might have invested in improved facilities. Taken by themselves, tax collections tend to shrink the market of private business, contract employment, and lower prices; just as, taken by themselves, Government expenditures tend to expand the market for business, increase employment, or raise prices.

It is not only the size of revenue and expenditure that counts; their composition must also be considered in any appraisal of the effects of Government policy. The economic effects of a billion dollars collected in the form of income taxes will be different from those of a billion dollars collected in excise taxes. Spending to build roads may stimulate private investment in automobiles, trucks, and garages; there are other forms of expenditure that may have adverse effects on private investment. Rationally or irrationally, Government spending and taxing may greatly affect the climate within which families and businesses make their decisions.

THE PRINCIPLE OF AN ANNUALLY BALANCED BUDGET

The traditional goal of fiscal policy was to secure a balanced budget in every single year. But that objective has now proved impracticable and, besides, has serious disadvantages in principle. There is not even a clear or unique concept of budget to which the requirement of balance could be applied. For instance, in the regular budget, bookkeeping transfers to the social security trust account are classified as expenditures. As a result of this, that budget may show a deficit at a time when the cash budget shows an excess of receipts over outgo. But even the cash budget may not be adequate to portray the effects of fiscal policy; taxes may

have their impact when tax liabilities are incurred rather than when payment is made; purchases may have their impact when contracts are entered into rather than when disbursements are made. However, where a single budget concept is used in economic analysis bearing on stabilization policy we prefer the cash budget to any available alternative.

Compared to the full span of the business cycle, a year is a short period of time. To insist upon a balance in every single year is certainly undesirable and to attain it is probably impossible. To attempt to raise tax rates every time there is a decrease in national income will only result in discouraging private consumption and investment at a time when these are most in need of expansion; on the other hand, to try to eliminate a tax surplus by cutting tax rates or expanding Government activities would serve to increase inflationary pressures at a time when they are already acute.

If the budget were balanced in good years as well as bad, there would have to be either big fluctuations in expenditure programs or severe and perverse changes in tax rates. To vary expenditures in this manner would disrupt the essential services provided by Government. Applied to military expenditures, it would mean a large defense program in boom years and a small defense program in depression years. This is both ineffective and wasteful. Government would be increasing its employment of resources when they were scarce and cutting down on their use when they were abundant. This, of course, would aggravate the fluctuations in private business.

THE PROBLEM OF CONTROLLING GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Annual budget balancing is, thus, both difficult in practice and unsound in principle. But one great merit it does have: It provides a yardstick by which legislators and the people can scrutinize each activity of Government, testing it both for efficiency of operation and for its worth whileness in terms of cost. Every Government program undertaken has to be paid for in a clear and unequivocal sense. The legislature and the Executive are required to justify additional taxes equal to the cost of any new program. This is a principle every citizen can understand. If dropping the principle of annual budget-balancing were to mean dropping all restraints to unwise and inefficient expenditure, grave damage would be done to our economic and political system.

Were expenditures divorced entirely from the need for taxation, political opposition to extension of the Government's expenditure programs would largely disappear. The scale on which the public sector absorbs resources would grow beyond what was really desired by the people as a whole; sooner or later the country would find itself in a state of chronic inflation. Such inflation is a sign of weak government and comes from eagerness to spend without a willingness to tax. Accordingly other general principles, other habits of thought and of action must be set forward to insure the standards of judgment and the self-discipline of Government's activities and to do better what the principle of annual budget policy attempted—though imperfectly—to accomplish.

Experience shows that business activity has its ups and downs. There is thus a strong case for countercyclical action—surpluses in good times and deficits in bad. If we do not adopt such a policy deliberately we are likely to be forced into an imperfect version of it through the pressure of events. One of the major questions for the future is how such a policy can be administered with the restraint and efficiency that is supposed to be achieved through the balanced-budget rule. If a flexible policy is to win acceptance, it must not be used as an excuse to introduce expenditure or tax programs that cannot be justified on their merits. Boondoggling should have no place in a rational fiscal program.

We doubt whether it would be possible, or even desirable, to rely exclusively on fiscal action to offset fluctuations in private business. That course could easily involve changes of impractical magnitudes in taxes and expenditures; it would mean placing excessive reliance on one measure for achieving economic stability and growth; it would involve problems in forecasting beyond the reach of present knowledge and techniques.

We can, however, reasonably expect that the budget be formulated in the light of economic judgment available that takes full account of the actual course of events and should contribute to economic stability rather than aggravate instability. In view of uncertainties, part of the planning process should be preparation for quick adaptation of fiscal operation to changing circumstances. Certain automatic devices for bringing remedial forces quickly into play are in a stage where they deserve consideration.

GUIDES TO FISCAL POLICY IN NORMAL TIMES

When the economy is prosperous and stable and there is no clear-cut reason to expect a change in any particular direction, the objective of policy should be to adapt the budget to changes in the Government's requirements but to leave its economic impact on total employment and purchasing power unchanged. This could be approximately achieved if newly planned increases or decreases in expenditures were to be matched with corresponding changes in planned tax receipts. The net expansionary or contractionary effect of the budget would then remain roughly the same. Thus, in conditions of continued prosperity, a modified version of the balanced budget rule could be used as a guide: taxes should grow or shrink corresponding to desired changes in expenditures. Thus proposed increases in expenditures would be exposed to the traditional test of whether they are worth their cost in terms of taxes.

However, if recent events and the outlook for the near future pointed, on balance, toward unemployment and deflation in the private sector of the economy, then budgetary changes should be made in the direction of producing a moderately expansionary effect. New Government expenditure programs should still be considered on their merits, but the additional taxation that in prosperous times would accompany them should now be deferred. Taxes that are deferred in these circumstances should be put into effect as soon as that can be done without impeding recovery. There should be no delay in making the tax reductions warranted by any reductions in Government expenditures; and if expenditure requirements are expected to decline in the future, anticipatory tax reductions could be enacted.

On the other hand, if the weight of the evidence appeared to be on the inflationary side, the opposite policy should be followed. The rule that increased expenditures should be accompanied by increased tax yields should be rigidly followed. Tax reductions that would normally be in order should be deferred; and tax increases should anticipate expected increases in expenditures.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN TIME OF ACUTE RECESSION OR BOOM

Where there is a definite expectation, justified by events, of serious recession or inflation, more strenuous fiscal measures would be called for, and the policies described above should be supplemented by emergency fiscal action.

In the event of severe recession, it is not only politically necessary but economically desirable to provide additional employment projects that can be started and ended quickly. Temporary tax relief should be given in order to stimulate private spending and employment. Other incentives for private investment, such as guaranties, should be considered. There can be no social or economic justification for allowing mass unemployment to persist for extended periods at a time when there is abundant need for roads, schools, hospitals, and other useful objects of public expenditures. However, we recognize that there are difficult questions of extent and timing connected with any such program. An overambitious Government program may impede the course of recovery in the private sectors of the economy by dislocating resources and delaying needed price adjustments. On the other hand, a program that was overcautious could needlessly fail to advance recovery by not stimulating the demand for the products of private industry. Much skill and judgment are required to move from depression to stable prosperity. We must not rely on the private economy, unaided by Government action, to perform that task. The Government must not shirk the responsibility placed on it by the Employment Act, and fiscal policy is one of the most promising instruments it possesses.

On any occasion when serious inflation is in prospect, emergency measures would be needed to curtail expenditures and increase taxation. Wartime and postwar experience provides convincing evidence that the political obstacles to a fiscal policy adequate to combat inflation are so great that there is little practical danger of going too far. The survival of a relatively free and stable price system depends heavily on our willingness to fight inflation by fiscal methods.

A policy that helps to maintain stable prosperity will be no more likely in practice to result in an upward trend in the national debt than one that does not. The course of events may in fact be such that stabilization requires steady reduction in the debt. Budgeting surpluses to fight inflation will provide for the reduction of the public debt in a helpful rather than a painful fashion. Surpluses are not feasible in times of depression. They are desirable where the private economy is strong enough for the Government to tax more than it spends without causing unemployment. The private economy is not likely to possess this strength if Government policies aggravate rather than offset business fluctuations.

ADDITIONAL POSSIBILITIES FOR A FLEXIBLE FISCAL POLICY

While we consider these guides for budget policy essential to a stabilization program, the annual budget cannot, in the nature of things, be based on precise forecasts; nor can it be expected to compensate for sudden and short-run fluctuations in business that occur within the period of its operation. Even though the budget can and should be amended in the light of changing circumstances, the legislative process is necessarily too cumbersome to make delicately timed adjustments in fiscal policy. Therefore, we consider whether further flexibility can be achieved by two devices which may be called automatic flexibility and formula flexibility.

"Automatic flexibility" means a tax system such that revenue under a given set of tax rates will fall sharply if unemployment develops, and rise sharply in the opposite case of inflation; and expenditure programs under which increased outlays arise from increased unemployment.

"Formula flexibility" means a system under which preannounced tax cuts and upward revisions of spending programs will come into force if unemployment exceeds a certain figure or production falls below a certain level, and preannounced changes in the opposite direction if price indexes rise at more than a certain speed.

AUTOMATIC FLEXIBILITY

Automatic flexibility is exemplified by the unemployment-compensation system. If unemployment increases, employers' contributions at once decline, while the unemployed begin almost immediately to draw more in

benefits. Thus the Government finds itself automatically taking less money out of the public's pockets and putting more in.

There are now many such flexible elements in Federal taxes and revenues; and they have greatly increased in importance with the growth of the budget. Besides the unemployment-compensation system, there is, for example, substantial automatic flexibility in personal and corporate income taxes.

Automatic flexibility can slow down and perhaps halt a decline of activity or a rise of prices; it can give time for restorative forces to come into play, but it will not, by itself, pull activity back to a full-employment level or restore prices to a preinflation level.

We feel strongly that the existing automatic flexibility makes an important contribution to economic stability, which should not be frittered away, as it would be, for instance, by rigid application of the annual balanced-budget rule. But we do not believe it prudent for policy to regard automatic flexibility as more than a first line of defense; more must be done to cope with serious economic fluctuations.

FORMULA FLEXIBILITY

The enactment by Congress of rules under which tax rates, and perhaps of rules under which expenditure programs, will shift in certain contingencies specified in advance is a possibility that deserves further exploration. For example, the period during which unemployed workers can draw unemployment compensation might be extended according to a flexible schedule based on the volume of unemployment. The withholding rate under the personal income tax for any calendar quarter might rise by a stated amount above a standard rate whenever, say, the index of retail prices has increased by over a certain amount in the preceding 6 months. The withholding rate might be lowered whenever standard indexes of production and employment drop below stated levels or trends.

The question of formula flexibility shades off into the question of granting to the Executive wider discretionary authority than it now possesses to initiate changes in the timing or extent of the fiscal program. This raises difficult issues of political principle and administrative responsibility. We can here do no more than call attention to them.

CONCLUSION

In this statement we have confined ourselves to fiscal policy of the Federal Government. But, while essential, that is only one element in a stabilization policy. The policies of State and local governments can make useful contributions within their more limited spheres. Monetary and credit policies, including debt management, must play an active role in their own right and must be properly coordinated with fiscal policy. All necessary measures must be taken to preserve and stimulate competition. Supported by such measures, Federal fiscal policy offers the best prospect of achieving sustained prosperity within the framework of our existing economic system.

FISCAL POLICY IN THE NEAR FUTURE

(Statement drafted and unanimously approved at the NPA Conference of University Economists, September 16–18, 1949, Princeton, N. J.)

At present (September 1949) the economy exhibits no clearly discernible swing—either toward a resumption of inflation or toward increasing unemployment—which would call for a major change in tax rates or expenditures. If any substantial change were made, it might accentuate an inflationary or deflationary movement in 1950 instead of countering it.

Past decisions on taxes and commitments on expenditures have resulted in a current deficit in the cash budget. We regard those decisions as unfortunate, in particular the decision in 1948 to reduce taxes; it would have been the course of sound policy to have revenues exceeding or, at the least, equaling expenditures at the present level of business activity. The latter, if lower than levels of a year ago, is still high and a modest cash surplus at the present time would probably be consistent with stability. But it is one thing to deplore past mistakes and another to correct them on short notice. It would be unwise to increase taxes at this time. Such action might in itself be unduly deflationary. There is a possibility that the step might soon have to be reversed to counter a business downturn. While we do not doubt that there are expenditures that can and should be reduced—and we do not regard those of any agency or department as sacred—this reduction must be part of a constant and continuing effort. Economy efforts cannot be turned on and off at will.

Although no major change in fiscal program is indicated for the immediate future, the country should have positive assurance that the Government will be prepared to act promptly either if prices should display a sharp and continuous upward swing, or if unemployment should increase substantially. Congress should plan ahead and announce the actions to be taken in either contingency. It should enact preliminary legislation to be effective when needed.

Congress should act in case of a decline in activity involving a genuine increase in unemployment of more than 1,500,000 persons above present levels. (This would mean total unemployment of about 5,000,000 according to present methods of computation.) The extent, combination, and sequence of its actions should depend upon the severity of the recession.

The appropriate steps include, first, the repeal of the special wartime excise taxes. These taxes were enacted for various special reasons during the war and are not appropriate to peacetime. A second step is the temporary abatement of the lower bracket rates or a temporary increase in the exemptions of the personal income tax. This should be done according to prearranged legislation to become effective when economic activity declines to a specific level. The revenues from other taxes would be allowed to decline, without a change in rates, as business activity fell off. If these actions were insufficient, additional measures should be taken.

The period of unemployment benefits might be temporarily lengthened, with appropriate provisions for Federal reinsurance of the emergency risks. The plan to do this should be arranged and announced in advance so that workers could count on this protection. By this measure, the system of unemployment compensation would be made adaptable to its differing role in times of prosperity and in times of depression.

Public works might be expanded. The Congress should already have arranged for a stand-by shelf of planned and ready-to-start projects, including Federal assistance for State and municipal projects. We approve the principle, expressed in pending legislation, of a shelf of public works. We recommend the prompt enactment of legislation to this end. On the shelf would be only projects that are economically desirable, and that can be started promptly when the need for additional governmental spending arises, and completed or stopped promptly when this is no longer needed. Examples of projects of this nature are: Road construction, residential housing, and construction and rehabilitation of public buildings.

Should there be a resumption of inflation, marked by a persistent upward surge of prices in general, Congress should be prepared to take effective counteraction. In this case increase of lower bracket rates or lowering of exemptions in the personal income tax would be in order. Repeal of the wartime excise taxes might appropriately be postponed. If these taxes were already repealed, or their repeal were deemed necessary for reasons of equity, they should be replaced by equivalent sources of revenue. Finally, such inflation would be an occasion for strong measures to reduce public expenditures. To cite specific examples, the starts of civil public works of all categories should be held to the practical minimum. The test should be whether there is serious economic loss from delay. Military construction should also be closely measured against the urgent present needs of the armed forces. Large farm benefits, either through support prices or in the guise of soil-conservation payments, should not be tolerated at a time when, in any case, farm income is likely to be high.

TAX REFORM

A time like the present when no emergency exists should not be allowed to go by without consideration of fundamental tax reform. This has two sorts of relation to stabilization policy: (1) Adjustment of the tax structure so as to make private business more nearly self-stabilizing—for instance, by providing more complete averaging of losses and gains. (2) Planning tax measures whose impact will be stimulating or depressing so that they can go into effect at times when short-term policy calls for additional stimulants or depressants. For example, if we are to move toward integration of corporate and individual income taxes in a way which would reduce revenue, the effective date would appropriately come in depression.

It is now, and doubtless always will be impossible to forecast, more than a year in advance, the revenue-expenditure policies best suited to varying economic conditions. It is our final recommendation that Congress be prepared both now and in the future to make prompt alterations in the policies adopted for any fiscal year. It must be recognized that this will involve important changes in the organization and procedures of Congress for fiscal management.

The economists participating in the National Planning Association Conference on Federal Expenditure and Revenue Policy for Economic Stability were:

Dr. Howard R. Bowen, dean College of Commerce, University of Illinois.

Dr. J. Kenneth Galbraith, economics department, Harvard University.

Dr. James K. Hall, professor of economics, University of Washington.

Dr. Albert G. Hart, professor of economics, faculty of political science, Columbia University.

Dr. Clarence Heer, professor of economics, University of North Carolina.

Dr. E. A. Kincaid, professor of finance, University of Virginia.

Dr. Simeon E. Leland, professor of economics and dean of College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University.

Dr. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Lawrence H. Seltzer, professor of economics and sociology, Wayne University.

Dr. Arthur Smithies, professor of economics, Harvard University.

Dr. Tipton R. Snavely, professor of economics, University of Virginia.

Mr. H. Christian Sonne, chairman of the board of trustees, National Planning Association.

Dr. Jacob Viner, professor of economics, Princeton University, and past president of the American Economic Association.

Dr. Donald H. Wallace, professor of economics, School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

All of the members listed above signed the two reports presented to the Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policy Subcommittee. In

addition to the group who met in Princeton, the report was submitted to Dr. Sumner Slichter, Lamont professor of economics at Harvard University, and a past president of the American Economic Association, and Dr. Howard S. Ellis, professor of economics, University of California, and currently president of the American Economic Association. Both added their signature to the report on Federal Expenditures and Revenue Policy for Economic Stability, and Dr. Ellis signed the report on Fiscal Policy in the Near Future.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks today I shall include part 19 of the Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak. You will note that since Mr. Neal's articles appeared, the Army engineers now admit that those who are being deprived of their farms and dispossessed of their homes in the Valley of the Dammed are human beings. They even admit that it is a natural dislike to give up one's home.

It is about time that the Army engineers and the Real Estate Division realize that under the Constitution private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that just compensation means putting the person dispossessed, as nearly as is possible, in the same position he would have been in if his land had not been taken for public use and his home destroyed.

You will also note by reading part 19 that the individuals whose property is taken are afraid of their Government—afraid of the Army engineers. This is a dangerous situation. The time has come that we arouse ourselves from sleeping at the switch and tell the Army engineers' Real Estate Division that they are not the people's boss but their servants. That unless they stop their illegal, cruel, and brutal methods in dealing with American citizens, Congress will do it for them. Ours is still a government of, for, and by the people. Here is part 19:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XIX

Because this week will see two, and perhaps three, additional newspapers joining the group of my publishers and because even others, who may join in the weeks to come, may elect to begin at this point, I am asking permission of my older readers to make a short survey of the field I have covered in the first 18 installments.

I have another reason: Often I have been asked, "What do you expect to accomplish where so many have failed?" The temptation is to reply, "I'll be doggoned if I know." But of late some things have come to light. On the theory that a snowball rolling downhill may grow into quite a healthy youngster, I'm going to show you some parts of my accomplishment and ask you to bear in mind that the greater items among my successes are as unmentionable as the kinds of underwear men don't wear.

The Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps came in here powered by a policy as cruel as any scene ever enacted on the crest of Golgotha. Of course, my greatest hope was that I might change that policy. Here I have failed. But I have put some crimps in it, and some of them will take a long time to pound out.

As I have showed you by the case method, in the past this policy came in here to buy our lands, not only at less than half of what just and fair policy would dictate, but to frighten many of us into signing away our property at prices even below the appraisal figures of the Real Estate Division itself. It seems to me that is a damning thing. So I repeat. They not only refused to pay what we thought the land was worth, but they also refused to pay what they admitted it was worth.

What have I accomplished here? Well, according to my grapevine, they have felt it necessary to increase their payments to the point where a whole lot of money is in the country today that they never intended to pay anybody. That would have sounded pretty good if it weren't for the fact that when these misguided people thought I had shot my wad, so to speak, they slumped again, and now they are back down to what they would call a more realistic figure.

Now, about these threats, suggestions to create fear, and innuendoes:

I have interviewed some dozens of farmers in the past 2 weeks and I can't find where any has been frightened by any fear of the United States district court through statements of agents of the Real Estate Division. That's a dead issue and I don't believe they will revive it again. You see many a good man has infected himself by handling bacteria.

As far as I can find, the eviction threat has been thrown out the same window, although I have found traces of it—which I shall be glad to give you later—in a modified form.

I can say in all honesty that I believe I have put a stop to all those methods as employed when I became interested.

So far so good. But now—well I never did underestimate this policy half as badly as it underestimated me. I am dealing here with a brilliant and resourceful aggregation and they have bounced up in a new place with some brand new tactics. If God helps me tomorrow as he did yesterday, I'll mow the thing down again. And then what? When the time comes, I'll cheerfully look into that matter also.

Colonel Seybold made a speech before the Fargo Kiwanis Club a few days ago. I don't know what's coming over my friend, the enemy. Is his heart softening or is he getting old ahead of his time? Anyway he admitted two things: One, that we who live in the valley of the Missouri are human beings and, another, that we have a natural dislike for giving up our homes.

It makes me think of that story about the minister who, after asking how many of his congregation wanted to go to heaven—turned to the one man who remained seated. "Is it possible you want to go to ——?" "Not at all," declared the uncooperative brother, "I like it here."

Of course, that story is a little old but there are so many things about this "land inquisition"—I mean acquisition—policy that smell to heaven that I thought one more wouldn't attract attention.

I want to talk a little bit about fear. You know some kinds of fear are common to us all. Fear of death, fear of poverty, fear of lightning, these things come often. But fear of an agency of one's own Government is something I never thought of in connection of a man with a clear conscience.

But of late I've run across so much of it that it is seriously interfering with the collection of this material. "For God's sake don't mention my name or they'll ——." Sometimes it seems to be fear of actual physical retaliation. More often it's fear that their rent will be raised, that they will be evicted or worst of all, that the Government will refuse to pay them anything at all for their lands.

Now these fears are very real. And they have caused me so much trouble that I have got to join the Real Estate Division in a change of tactics. Where, heretofore, I have freely mentioned names in presenting these cases to the public, I now will have to resort to different methods. I shall change names, localities, and figures so that they can't be identified. But all the time you may rest assured that I will have here on my desk all the evidence to prove any one of these cases.

And now a word to my own people. You need have no personal fear of these Real Estate Division men whatever. These men are perfectly conscientious in believing themselves to be gentlemen. While there are times when I am tempted to take issue with them, they are wholly above doing you any injury except through their rental policy and that policy seems to be to get all they can from everybody, so they can't single you out for special treatment. As to the fear that they will evict you, forget that also. They have no power to evict you, except through the United States district court. If they tried that, you would have a chance to appear and that—my very good friends—is exactly what they don't want you to do. Not for anything will these people take a chance of facing you in court. Every time these folks think of a jury, it gives them a violent attack of the "creeps."

Early in this series I told you that I had a very high admiration for Col. John S. Seybold, commanding officer of the Garrison district. Because of that there is a certain amount of correspondence that goes on behind the scenes. Some of these letters are marked "personal and confidential." That means that I will not publish either my letter or the answer thereto. But some of them, like the ones below, are, or were, marked "letter and answer for publication."

While this is no obvious part of the land-acquisition program, it could affect the children of some families who have been driven from their homes when there was no rhyme or reason in driving them out. So I have adopted their cause.

Now when you read the colonel's answer, don't be angry with him. Because he is a soldier, I'm sure that—if left to himself—he would reach out and take these kids under his wing. If he wouldn't—well, he wouldn't be a soldier. The real trouble here is something that the colonel can't help. It's a combination of selfishness and snobbery among a well-organized group of Government employees who never even lived at Riverdale.

Col. JOHN S. SEYBOLD,
District Engineer,
Fort Lincoln, N. Dak.

DEAR COLONEL SEYBOLD: It has come to my attention—and probably it is true—that over in Big Bend there are some youngsters who have got to go 12 miles to school at their own expense. That means that someone will have to drive 48 miles a day to get them there and back. That, in turn, means a great deal of risk on the highway, a certain amount of danger from cold and doubtless that some of these youngsters, especially of high-school age, will not be able to go to school at all.

In view of the fact that you have in Riverdale, built partly with my money, probably the finest school and high school in North Dakota with unlimited room and with a faculty of 1 teacher for approximately every 15 youngsters, I am calling this to your attention. I truly believe that the Congress of the United States and all the people thereof would be glad indeed to have you

open this fine institution of yours to these children. I hope you can find a way to accomplish this.

Very sincerely yours,

BIGELOW NEAL.

Mr. BIGELOW NEAL,
Garrison, N. Dak.

DEAR SIR: I am today in receipt of your letter concerning the matter of school attendance at Riverdale of students living in Big Bend whose parents or guardian do not work on the dam.

The enclosed letter is self-explanatory.

Very truly yours,

J. S. SEYBOLD,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

Mr. E. W. KLAUS,
Big Bend, N. Dak.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of August 18 containing a request for the enrollment of your daughter in the high school at Riverdale.

Please be advised that only dependents of persons working at Riverdale, either for the Government, contractors or concessionnaires, are authorized to attend the school at Riverdale. As you are probably aware, the school at Riverdale has been built in order to decrease the load on the public schools in the vicinity, and it is expected that the public schools will take all students outside whose parents are not directly engaged on the work of the dam. It is possible, however, that some arrangements may be made with the local school districts wherein exchange of students can be accommodated at the respective schools. This would be entirely dependent on the teaching load of the various classes and cannot be determined until final enrollment is taken this fall.

It is suggested that you enroll your daughter in the local high school and then we will see if satisfactory arrangements can be made between the school boards wherein certain students outside of Riverdale who are enrolled in their schools and whose tuition is paid by the Government can be exchanged for others who attend the high school at Riverdale. It should also be understood that such arrangements would be made for 1 year only inasmuch as the teaching load will probably be different the following year and no assurance could be given you that your daughter could attend the school in consecutive years.

Very truly yours,

J. S. SEYBOLD,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

Independent Retail Druggists Demand Defeat of S. 1008, the So-Called Basing-Point Bill That Would Greatly Weaken the Robinson-Patman Act That Is Now in Conference

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Retail Druggists is composed of independent businessmen. This association does not accept chain stores as members. It is composed of individuals who own their businesses locally. The association has about 40,000 members and is one of the most powerful trade groups in the United States. At its national convention recently, in New York City, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas S. 1008, which is now in conference, would in the opinion of this association destroy the effective use of the Robinson-Patman Act, a measure that has become the Rock of Gibraltar to the small-business men of this country; and

Whereas the tremendous gains made by business in general under the Robinson-Patman Act by establishing fair competition, and requiring all sellers to treat all buyers alike without discrimination; and

Whereas the proponents of S. 1008 assert that its purpose is to legalize delivered prices and freight absorption; and

Whereas there is nothing in the antitrust laws forbidding delivered pricing or forbidding freight absorption, provided buyers are treated equally and are not subjected to basic price or discount discrimination; and

Whereas the association asserts that S. 1008 was passed without due regard for proper hearings on the measure justified by its far-reaching importance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Retail Druggists in convention assembled go on record strongly opposing the measure now in conference and that because it was denied the privilege of doing so before hearings on the bill that it communicate its reasons for opposition to the conference committee.

This bill is now in conference, and regardless of the way it comes out of conference, it should be killed. There is really no need for the bill at this time. The basing-point decision, April 26, 1948, is now nearly a year and a half old. We were told by the lobbyist sponsors of S. 1008 that legislation was needed quickly after that decision, that business would be ruined unless something was done to correct the Supreme Court decision. This decision has not caused the trouble that the lobbyists claimed that it would cause. Instead of it being a basing-point bill, it is now known that it was intended by the main lobbyists who are supporting it to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act. This act helps small business more than any antitrust law that has been passed. It should not be weakened or destroyed in any way.

Memorial on Mount Tamalpais, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, when I was back in my congressional district during the short cessation of work in the House, Miss Alma Schulmerich conferred with me with reference to a proposed memorial on Mount Tamalpais, Calif., which is most meritorious.

On September 1, 1946, Miss Schulmerich wrote a letter to President Truman with respect to the matter and the case for the memorial as set forth in the letter is equally as cogent today as when the letter was written. I include the letter as part of these remarks:

PORTLAND, OREG., *September 1, 1946.*
President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Re Angel Island as a UN site, and memorial on Mount Tamalpais.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The radio announcement that Angel Island in San Francisco Bay was to be turned back to the Government by the Army brought back memories of a trip to Mount Tamalpais and the Muir Woods.

Last summer, as a member of the Secretariat of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, it was my pleasure to visit Mount Tamalpais. From the summit it was possible to see the entire bay area as well as far out to sea. At that time there was much discussion as to a location for the permanent home of the United Nations in or near San Francisco. Naturally, from this point the various proposed areas were scrutinized. Angel Island seemed to be an ideal spot for a permanent home, but it was not available.

I am well acquainted with the sites under consideration in the New York area. They do not seem inspiring. If we are to have the one world Wendell Willkie spoke of, we must all so conduct ourselves that others will be able to work with us. In this respect, there seemed to be more harmony in San Francisco than there has been in New York. In times like these when weighty problems must be worked out, solitude is essential and it becomes necessary to get away from man-made things. So, if a delegate feels like taking a walk, let him ponder his problems and the effect of his decisions on future generations amid the solitude of the nearby Muir Woods, or in the clear, fresh air atop Mount Tamalpais where it seems one is a bit closer to the Infinite. Franklin Roosevelt found it necessary to go to the mountaintop to think things out and get a clearer picture and a broader horizon for the problem before him. So must we have time to meditate.

While I watched from the mountaintop, formations of bombers thundered by on their way to the Pacific theater. Far below, ships, with capacity loads of our finest young men, were threading their way through the Golden Gate and on out to sea and distant combat areas.

Those boys did not know what was in store for them. Many of their buddies had already passed on, and they, too, knew that many of their number would not return. Therefore, I am sure that as they stood on deck watching the Golden Gate and the familiar landmarks disappear from view they felt they were leaving behind everything that stood for America and the things they were fighting for.

I well recall standing on the deck of the *Queen Mary* and watching the Statue of Liberty disappear from view. On my return journey, as she loomed through the fog, I thought she was the most beautiful lady I had ever seen. Therefore, as I watched the procession overhead and the ships far below I earnestly wished that there had been erected on top Mount Tamalpais, as our Pacific coast Statue of Liberty, a gigantic illuminated sign of the cross which would be visible far out at sea—the last thing those boys would see when they left America and the first thing that would greet those who returned. This cross would serve as a beacon for all who travel, be it by land, sea, or the air. It would be a constant reminder that those who gave their lives should not have died in vain and that if we are to remain the strong world power we now are we must work together for peace with the same energy we expended in war.

In this respect you will recall Mr. Jan Masaryk's, of Czechoslovakia, words on the closing day of the Conference at San Francisco:

"Please stop talking of the next world war. The language one hears in certain places is lamentably unconstructive; it arouses suspicions at a moment when mutual confidence is all-important. Not one of us * * * wants another war. None * * * of us wants the children of these selfless children of ours, whose graves are scattered as sacred mementos all over the face of the scarred earth—none of us want these children to die in another war in another generation—we want them to live and work for their respective countries in peace and security in a socially just and safe world. That's why we assembled here; that's why we drafted the Charter. It contains all the necessary safeguards against future wars. Let us see to it that our lofty aims are carried into deeds worthy of the memory of our heroic beloved youngsters."

Yours very truly,

Miss ALMA SCHULMERICH.

Statism and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address on statism and the farmer, delivered by me at the National Republican Farm Conference, in the Martin Hotel, Sioux City, Iowa, September 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, fellow Americans, this historic meeting in Sioux City—in the great State of Iowa, out here in the heart of the Nation's bread basket—is of vital importance to all farmers of America and to the entire country, because it is axiomatic that national prosperity is dependent upon a healthy, prosperous, and expanding agriculture.

You farmers have come from your dairy farms, grain farms, stock farms—yes, right from the feed lots of the Middle West, to offer suggestions gained from practical experience in farm production.

This is an inspiring gathering, for here at the grass roots you farmers speak, exchange views, and weigh courses of action for the development, the processing, and the distribution of your products in the truly American way—free of the barnacles of statism and all other "isms" that are being forced upon you.

STATISM HOG-TIES FARMERS

Fellow Americans, statism has never worked anywhere, and we don't want it here.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the preservation of freedom so that it may be handed down to our children pure and undefiled by the poison of statism in which the individual becomes a galley slave for Government bosses.

As they present bill after bill in Congress to hog-tie the farmers and other groups, as they hatch out global schemes to be paid for by the American taxpayers, and as they whittle down our tariff protections to a free-trade basis—as they thus determine our whole economic structure they piously chant, "You haven't been hurt yet, have you?"

You remember the story of the man who fell off a 10-story building. As he was plunging past the second floor a friend looking out the window recognized the falling man and yelled, "How are you, Bill?" Bill responded, "I am all right—so far."

Likewise the full, devastating impact of the incorrectly named reciprocal trade agreements upon the American economy has yet to be felt, but you farmers and some of our industries already are experiencing its ill effect.

The importation of cattle increased from only 76,000 in fiscal year 1947–48 to a half million in fiscal 1948–49. And this is only the beginning.

The same is true of fresh and frozen beef and veal, butter, eggs, tobacco, berries, and nuts.

The fishing industries are feeling the blows of rising imports.

The fur-farming industry that began to flourish in the late 1930's has been wrecked. Three quarters of a billion dollars' worth of furs have been imported since the war, chiefly from Russia and her satellites.

And, although we have had record crops of grains, imports of barley, oats, and rye sharply increased to over 36,000,000 bushels last year and have forced the Commodity Credit Corporation to support prices on the same quantity of domestic production.

The ultimate effect of such importation is to depress prices and to increase the tax burden. Carried forward, this ruinous policy means establishment of price-support levels for foreigners who ship their agricultural products into this country.

The Government bosses recently added another prize to their give-away show by authorizing Great Britain to use $175,000,000 of ECA money—your money—for purchase of Canadian wheat—while surplus grains are bursting our elevators and warehouses.

FARMERS NEED TARIFF PROTECTION

And right along with the American farmer, American industry, too, is being smothered by the give-away Government bosses in Washington.

Tariff cuts have distressed producers of textiles; copper, lead, zinc, and other metals; bicycles, chinaware, and scores of other commodities.

Independent oil companies are suffering from reduction of the import excise tax on crude petroleum. More than 600,000 barrels of crude oil are coming in daily.

Through ECA and other agencies, this administration is pouring billions of dollars into other countries to finance the manufacture and exportation of goods into the United States—right here in your own markets on virtually a free-trade basis. They would not even accept the peril-point amendment to protect the American farmer, labor, and American industry.

While the barriers have been cleared for sharp increases in imports, our roads to foreign markets have been blocked by embargoes, quotas, restrictions, and more than 300 trade agreements made by ECA countries.

Do you know we are financing a large part of our own exports? In order to obtain twelve and one-half billions of exports in 1948, the United States had to make available nearly $4,000,000,000 in grants; $1,500,000,000 in credits, and over $5,000,000,000 in miscellaneous distribution.

Then, there is the action of Great Britain and other countries in devaluing their currencies, which is a double-edged sword. It will result in a flash flood of imports and raise still higher the walls against our exports to those very same countries.

This will back up our commodities, and bring more unemployment.

Think of it—ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman has invited Great Britain to sell her goods in the (and I quote) "rich American market."

Great Britain and other ECA countries have eyes only to see the American dollar, when they should be developing other world markets—and manufacturing goods to fit the peculiar demands of those markets.

But, the Government bosses ask, "What about world trade?" Fellow Americans, of course, we believe in world trade.

We should buy from other countries what we need, and they should buy from us what they need. That is reciprocity. It is a two-way street in which both sides benefit.

But to destroy our tariff protection and finance other countries to take over American markets is unwise, unsound and sheer incompetence.

Such a policy will force wage cuts to meet lower wage scales abroad.

It will shut down American industry and especially agriculture.

Do we have to go bankrupt to prove America is generous and world-minded?

Since the war America, in 23 programs, has poured thirty-five billions in cash and goods abroad.

Your Government is operating in the red at the rate of $40,000,000 a day. Since July 1 the deficit has jumped to $3,300,000,000—the national debt has climbed to $5,000,000,000 more than the postwar low of last April 8. It is skyrocketing toward the wartime peak.

America cannot forever support half the world.

Fellow Americans: Are these "scare words"?

GOVERNMENT BOSSES SOW SOCIALISM

If the making of foreign-trade agreements in star chamber proceedings and the President's refusal to explain when he cuts tariff rates below peril point is not statism, what is it?

If the Spence bill to give the President—one man—absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages, and floors under prices and wages is not fascism, what is it?

If giving the President—one man—power to build and operate steel and other plants in competition with private industry is not socialism, what is it?

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not Government control of the lives of the people, what is it?

If federalized education—thought control—is not statism, what is it?

If government, all taxpayers, paying part of the cost and rental of homes for some of the people is not socialism, what is it?

If using the tax power to destroy initiative, thrift, and investment is not a blow to competitive free enterprise, what is it?

And worst of all in this parade of spoilers, is the so-called Brannan farm plan—a plan to sovietize the farmers.

Under it farmers would work for the Government, producing in such amounts as the Government determines will assure farm surpluses and cheap food prices for consumers below the cost of production. If that is not socialism, what is it?

The Brannan plan is not the answer.

Under it surpluses will pile up mountain high, or, production payments must be made in unbearable and intolerable amounts. Either will break down the entire farm economy. It will bury the whole farm support program and destroy the very help it has brought to the farmers and to all our people.

The Brannan plan is impracticable, unenforceable, an economic monstrosity.

It won't work.

There is a new approach for the solution of farm surpluses—an approach that maintains the independence and self-respect of the farmers—an approach that opens vistas for improvement and expansion of agriculture.

Utilization, not destruction, is the key.

A combination of many actions, all geared to production for use, is the answer.

Diversion of agricultural products to hundreds of industrial uses; diversification, and new crops; improvement in processing and marketing; new techniques to give agriculture more outlets in world markets; all of

these avenues are open for constructive action.

MUST PRESERVE FARMERS' INDEPENDENCE

Use of grains and other starchy commodities in the form of alcohol for use as motor fuel is not an idle dream.

Alcohol is being used in a dozen countries as a supplement to gasoline. The Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry recently reported that alcohol blended with low grade gasoline makes a premium grade of motor fuel, and injection of alcohol into automobile and truck motors develops greater power for quick starting, passing, and hill climbing.

G E. Hilbert, Chief of the Bureau, after making exhaustive road tests with alcohol-gasoline mixtures, reported:

"It is evident that through conversion to alcohol any grain surplus that might develop in the future could easily be absorbed in the market for motor fuels.

"This market is so tremendous that a surplus would disappear, figuratively speaking, practically overnight."

There should be Government stock piling of foods, feeds, and natural fibers for national security. A reserve of 1,000,000,000 bushels of feed grain could be a capital asset in times of need more precious than gold.

Greater utilization of farm surpluses can be developed through expansion of exports, under a two-price system, through which countries short of dollars may buy from our surpluses.

Loans of foods, feeds, and natural fibers to other countries could afford another outlet worth exploring.

Both of these outlets might be developed through cooperation with the United Nations and international monetary agencies.

Improvement of processing, storage, and distribution of foods, feeds, and natural fibers through cost-saving procedures would contribute tremendously to stability of farm income and lower prices to consumers. Farmers receive only 49 cents out of every dollar consumers spend for food.

In this affirmative approach there must be ample tariff protection for our farmers. They have the right of first call upon the American markets.

During the transition to utilization of maximum production of crops, and away from the defeatist approach of regimentation and Government doles, we should continue price supports for the stability of agriculture and in the national interest.

FULL UTILIZATION IS ANSWER

But for such a policy of full utilization to succeed there must be public servants in Government who believe in America and its miraculous ability to surmount difficulties, public servants who honor and respect the principles of the unbroken line of builders of America.

For such a forward-looking policy there must be public servants eager to foster and stimulate a healthy, competitive economic climate in which agriculture may share in providing the fruits of prosperity, happiness, and contentment.

This is the challenge to you who come from the farm homes of the great Middle West and to all Americans—to see to it that persons highly placed in Government will carry forward such a constructive, long-range agricultural policy.

The crucial test today is whether freedom shall endure.

In this contest you farmers have a vital stake. All Americans have—we are all partners.

Our interests and rights and aspirations are indivisible. Any person, or any political party that attempts to divide us into classes and foster selfish-interest pressure groups, does a disservice to all of us.

The United States is a republic.

We have a representative form of government—a republican government. The words "democrat" and "democracy" do not appear once in the Constitution, but "republic" and "republican" appear many times.

Fellow Americans, we will have representative republican government just as long as we keep off our backs regimentation and controls by Government bosses. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

We cannot survive half slave and half free. There is not room enough in the United States for both representative government and statism. One or the other will be destroyed.

The founding fathers made the right choice. What will be ours?

No clique of Government bosses can blueprint the lives of 150,000,000 free Americans. Their planning in the last 16 years has carried America toward the rocks of insolvency. They simply do not know the ingredients of solid prosperity.

Back in 1924, Russian dictator Lenin said: "Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

And, fellow Americans, unless we call a halt, this terrible prophecy will come true.

The cost of Government is going up and up, despite all the talk about Government reorganization.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING MUST BE CUT

The number of civilians on the Federal pay roll has passed the 2,000,000 mark, rising at the rate of 10,000 a month. Back in 1939 there were 920,000—in 1932 only 559,000 civilians on the pay roll.

The Census Bureau reports 6,083,000 Federal, State, and local employees on January 1, 1949. That's 1 out of every 10 persons in the Nation's working force, and it is still growing.

The Federal spending budget has reached a record peacetime high of forty-two billion. That's five times more than in 1939.

And while the cost of Government is going up our national income is going down. You farmers know how farm prices have dropped within the last year. This means smaller revenue for the Government.

There will be a deficit of at least $6,000,000,000 in the present fiscal year and double that amount in the next fiscal year.

Three roads were open to this administration at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress: Raise taxes, cut expenses, deficit spending.

Taxes are so heavy now that one who takes a risk and succeeds pays the Government a large proportion of his profit, whereas if he loses he loses his own money.

Personal taxes are already so high they have dried the wells of investment capital and companies are depending largely upon their own profits for plant renewal and expansion. To increase taxes further would cripple business and lead to financing of industries by the Government.

This would leave a smaller profit-earning base in the competitive-enterprise system upon which to levy taxes.

Plainly, my friends, excessive taxation is a device to pave the way for socialization of industry. That is what is happening in Great Britain—and it is the direction in which we are going.

Out of every dollar you spend 28 cents go to Federal, State, and local taxes.

The saturation point has been reached. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

The safe, sound, sensible course that should have been taken was to have cut the cost of Government. We Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress tried time and again to reduce expenditures, but we are, temporarily, in the minority. The battle for economy is not over. With your continuing support, we shall fight to balance the budget and put the Federal Treasury on a pay-as-you-go basis.

But the President chose the third course—deficit spending—let the debt go where it may, mortgaging the future of your sons and daughters.

The pages of history are strewn by governments that have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policies, and deficit spending is the most destructive of all.

On top of these record-breaking peacetime expenditures, we are now being high-pressured to adopt the President's social-welfare state.

The Government bosses would have you believe that medical attention, education, housing, high wages and low prices, lifetime security, and everything else that every individual yearns for are free.

But you frugal people know they are not free. You know they must be paid by higher taxes and in your cost of living.

President Truman has submitted to Congress, under the label of social welfare, recommendations that would cost over a 50-year period, $1,250,000,000,000.

Fantastic? Yes, but it is true.

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars in silver dollars would make seven stacks reaching to the moon, with enough left over to pay the present national debt of a quarter trillion dollars.

Some idea of what the burden of a trillion dollars is may be shown by the ECA appropriation of $5,580,000,000 asked by the President. Five billion five hundred and eighty million dollars are one hundred thousand more than the combined farm income of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas in 1945. It is more than twice as much as the total assessed valuation of all the property in my State of Nebraska. It would take 100,000 men, earning $100 a week, 10 years and 9 months to make that much money.

COMPLACENCY IS SUICIDAL

We, of course, know that such a program would bankrupt our country. It would wreck our wealth-producing dynamo of free, competitive enterprise.

To those of you who have paid off mortgages on your homes and farms with a sigh of relief, let me say that in place of those mortgages, there has been transferred to your backs a steadily rising national debt, which you and your children will have to pay off through toil and sweat—by high taxes—and in your cost of living.

Complacency in the face of such a threat to our Republic is suicidal.

It is in the face of these conditions that we are assembling at Sioux City to work out a long-range agriculture program within the framework of our constitutional, representative government.

You farmers who work with the soil must be puzzled, as I am—by the failure to recognize abundant crops as a blessing, to be fully utilized, and not to be destroyed by man.

Progress has been made in metallurgy and mineralogy, and in improvement of skills and techniques in manufacturing, and in medicine, but a blind, defeatist attitude blocks the way to obtaining the full benefits of maximum production from the soil.

Billions upon billions are being spent to harness the atom. Why not a few million for research by industrial chemists and dietitians into the possibilities that lie in those mountains of grain and other products of the soil?

The science of chemurgy has made great strides—but it needs to make more. It points the way to an expanding prosperity, and a better living for all.

Dr. George Washington Carver did with the lowly soybean and peanut what can be done with other agricultural products. He had no millions at his beck and call, but he had a good mind, and he had faith that nature put something in the soybean for man to use and enjoy. Scores of uses for the soybean were discovered by him to the enrichment of mankind.

And what Dr. Carver did with the soybean and peanut, American initiative, skill, and enterprise have done in thousands of other

directions. Just think of it: A half billion dollars is spent annually by private enterprise in industrial research.

AMERICA MUST BE STRONG

Here we are, a Nation with only one-sixteenths of the earth's population, and only 6 percent of the world's area, but America produces nearly seven-sixteenths of the world's goods. Her people own 46 percent of the world's electric power; 48 percent of its radios; 54 percent of the telephones; 59 percent of its steel capacity; 60 percent of its life insurance; 85 percent of its automobiles; with the most schools, the most churches, and the best health record.

America has made more progress in the 160 years of her dynamic, adventurous life than all the other countries have made in 6,000 years.

And yet, incredible as it may seem, there are among us agitators who would supplant our way of life with worthless, alien ideologies.

Naturally, we do not want to rest on our oars. We must go toward greater goals. We shall bend every effort toward still greater achievement of the good things of life, and for their greater diffusion among all the people.

Our job is to keep open the opportunities of freedom, freedom in agriculture, freedom in all walks of life. And above all, we must hold fast to the principles of our Republic. They guarantee to us "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

America is the best place on earth.

And under the guidance of God, let's keep it that way.

Measures Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from time to time I have reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the status of various pending bills of particular interest to the people of my State. I feel that it is an obligation of every Senator to report to his constituents on matters affecting their welfare, in a clear, terse manner which will enable them to evaluate issues for themselves. It is, naturally, hard for the average busy citizen to keep track of over 9,000 congressional bills. It is, therefore, up to Senators and Representatives to meet their responsibilities by getting across helpful information on exactly what Congress is doing.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief summary which I have prepared of some of the controversial bills which I feel are of interest to folks in all walks of life in the Badger State.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

PART I. SOME OF THE MAJOR BILLS PENDING BEFORE CONGRESS — THEIR DESCRIPTION, NUMBER, AND STATES

1. Taft-Hartley law modification, S. 249, passed the Senate and is now "sleeping" in the House Education Committee.

2. Social-security amendment, H. R. 6000, to cover self-employed persons under social security, increase old-age pensions, raise payroll taxes, etc. Passed House, pending in Senate Finance Committee.

3. Veterans' pension increase bill, H. R. 5598, to increase pensions for World War I veterans. Passed Congress; sent to President for signature.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH

4. Hospital construction amendment, S. 614, would enable Wisconsin communities to increase their hospital facilities. Passed Senate and House in different forms.

5. Medical scholarships, S. 1453, to provide grants and scholarships in medicine, dentistry, nursing. Passed Senate, pending in House Commerce Committee.

6. Socialized medicine bill, S. 1679, to blanket the Nation under a Federal compulsory health-insurance program. Pending in Senate Labor Committee. (I am, incidentally, completely opposed to this or any other socialized bill.)

7. Middle-income housing bill, S. 2246; designed to increase purchases of homes by folks in the middle-income brackets. Passed House in different form; reported from Senate Banking Committee.

8. Postage rate increase bill, S. 1103, increases business postal cards from 1 cent to 2 cents, increases weekly newspaper mailing charges, etc. Just approved by Senate Post Office Committee. (I had previously protested against drastic rate increases.)

ENGINEERING PLANS

9. Advance plans for engineering works, S. 2116, appropriates funds for study of a "shelf" of public works in Wisconsin and other States. Passed Senate and House in different forms.

10. Minimum wage bill, H. R. 5856, increases the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Passed Senate and House in different versions. Now pending in joint conference committee.

FARM AND OLEO BILLS

11. Farm price support, S. 2522, changes present law to 75 to 90 percent modernized flexible parity system. Pending in Senate in different form from that approved by House.

12. Oleomargarine tax repeal, H. R. 2023, repeals all Federal taxes on oleo. Passed House; pending in Senate (along with Wiley amendment to bar shipment of yellow-colored oleo in interstate commerce).

13. Federal aid to education, S. 246, for aid to equalize educational opportunities throughout the Nation. Passed Senate; pending in House Education Committee.

14. Antimerger bill, H. R. 2734, would prevent one corporation from acquiring the assets of another to eliminate competition. Passed House; pending in Senate Judiciary Committee.

PART II. SUMMARY OF SENATOR WILEY'S PRINCIPAL BILLS

The following are some of the bills which I have personally introduced or of which I am a cosponsor. (Only the major bills are listed):

1. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, S. J. Res. 99 (cosponsor), for completion of this vital artery to bring the Great Lakes States into direct, deep-channel communication with the ports of the world. Pending in Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.

2. Mitchell Air University, S. 2574, to construct a National Air Academy at Billy Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis. Pending in Senate Armed Services Committee.

3. Quartermaster research laboratory, S. 1438, to construct a new food research laboratory as a part of the University of Wisconsin campus at Madison. Also pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

TAX REPEAL AND REFORM

4. Excise tax repeal bill, S. 1029, to remove hundreds of nuisance taxes on furs, cosmetics, leather goods, jewelry, and miscellaneous items (in addition to H. R. 2023, to remove many other wartime taxes). A watered-down version of this tax-repeal legislation has been reported in the form of an amendment to H. R. 3905, now pending before the Senate and approved by the Senate Finance Committee.

5. National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, S. 1946 (cosponsor). Designed to set up a little Hoover Commission to analyze the overlapping of functions between Federal, State, and local government units, and, in particular, the soaking up by the Federal Government of all tax sources, thus making it difficult for our State government at Madison and for our municipalities to meet their own financial problems. Reported favorably from Senate Executive Expenditures Committee; now pending before full Senate.

6. Amendments to displaced-persons law, S. 1315, S. 1316, S. 1317, to liberalize present inadequate displaced-persons statute. A discharge petition to bring the displaced-persons bill to the floor of the Senate from the Judiciary Committee is expected to be offered shortly.

ANTIFOLLUTION

7. Antipollution bill, S. 1118, designed to encourage Wisconsin industries to develop facilities to treat wastes. Pending in Senate Finance Committee.

8. Patent reform, S. 2574, for comprehensive reform of America's obsolete, chaotic patent system—introduced at request of Milwaukee Patent Law Association. Pending in Senate Judiciary Committee.

CONCLUSION

The comments of Wisconsin folks on these bills are warmly invited. Moreover, if constituents would like to read any of these bills for themselves, they are cordially urged to write to me for a copy.

General Coal-Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the coal-mining industry in Kansas is limited but important. The capital of the coal area is Pittsburg, Kans. On Friday, September 23, a very sensible editorial expression concerning the whole coal-strike situation appeared in the Pittsburg Headlight, one of the important Kansas dailies. Its editor is one of the ablest writers in Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ISOLATED FIELD

It is a fair, forceful, and logical statement of their position that the Southwestern coal operators have just issued. Coal miners in the UMWA are not working, but it is denied by their leaders that there is a strike. If the present suspension of work by the miners is not a strike, it might as well be. It is a shut-down that affects not only the large fields of the East and South and the middle part of the country, but this Southwestern section and the Wyoming-Utah field as well. The statement issued in Pittsburg tries to set forth clearly what has happened. It

points out that the shut-down is in protest against "the failure of a few southern operators to pay the 20-cent-a-ton royalty under the so-called welfare plan." The operators say that the miners in this district are idle, conforming to the national union policy. That policy is designed, the operators allege, to cut down the coal pile and thus create an economic situation that would be helpful to the union in negotiating with the operators. Southwestern operators, the statement points out, have been working on a good-faith basis and have been carrying out conditions of the contract that expired last June 30, including full payment of the welfare fund. Payments to the welfare fund have been up to date. That is, the operators in this district are continuing to pay into the welfare fund, and no criticism for not paying into the welfare fund can apply to them.

The operators also go into another matter that should have the careful consideration of the general public. They assert that both employees and employers of this district, the miners and the operators, have suffered a rank injustice by being forced to lose wages and lose the benefits of operation and production because of being "forced into a situation that deprives the employee of his God-given right to work and earn the best wages paid by any industry" in this country. This sounds reasonable.

The Southwestern operators bring up still another point that ought to appeal not only to the general public but to those who depend for a livelihood on the industry. Every time the coal industry has a shut-down, when there is no production, more of the coal business goes over to competitive fuels. This must result in permanent loss of employment of miners and loss of investment for operators and others linked to the industry. Certainly it affects every community where there is much coal production.

The Southwestern operators and their employees are in a position of being penalized by measures that are applied nationally without having an appreciable voice in determining those measures. And on the opposite side they are not taken into consideration in benefits. The Southwestern field is almost entirely on its own except for the point of determining policies with respect to relations between employees and employers.

The statement of the operators commands sober contemplation not only by the employees involved but by the public, of which both the operators and the employees are a part.

Settlement of Alaska by Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Frank Hutchinson which appeared in the Lufkin (Tex.) Democrat on September 7, 1949, in regard to my bill, S. 2229.

Being a confirmed optimist, and having confidence that right must prevail eventually, I still hope for early action by the Senate on this important measure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A thunderous silence surrounds House bill 4424 and Senate bill 2229, by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, and WILLIAM LEMKE, Congressman from North Dakota, companion bills introduced into our national Congress with a view toward settling America's last frontier, Alaska, with war veterans.

The first time the writers' attention was drawn to the possibility of the opening of this great new land was just prior to release from the Army in 1946.

We pictured in our minds the huge Territory to the north, with its thousands of square miles of arable land and bountiful timberlands; its game-filled mountains, and its fish-filled streams and lakes. And we considered the possibility of joining a vast throng of homesteaders in a northward trek to a new land and new opportunities, a modern reenactment of the settlement of our Western States.

But provisions of settlement were prohibitive. For example, a maximum of 160 acres was stipulated in a land where, with a small area excepted, it was impossible to make a living on such an acreage.

Early in 1947, a new Alaska homestead bill was introduced in Congress by Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota. This bill was the result of a lot of research, hard work, and fearless opposition to powerful forces who wanted, for various reasons, to keep Alaska as it is.

The bill called for homesteads of not less than 320 acres at least 100 acres of which must be suitable for farming, and with a maximum of 640 acres. It said, "It is the intent and policy of Congress that the homesteads provided under this act shall be sufficient as an economic base to support a family of seven according to the American standard of living."

Grazing land claims and timber claims were provided for, including agricultural, grazing, and timberland, to range between 640 and 1,280 acres. This bill, which received the plaudits of Alaskans (we have documentary proof), and which was and is supported by most of those who have heard of it, is at present languishing in some dusty pigeonhole in Congress, as is its companion bill, introduced at a later date by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

You may ask, "Why all the excitement about a country of snow, ice, and wasteland?"

In the first place, the Territory of Alaska is a far cry from the too-common idea that it consists of tundras, glaciers, and Eskimos. The southeastern section of the Territory, which is the part outlined for prospective settlement, has a climate closely similar to that of Washington, D. C. The mean temperature of Sitka, located in the Alexander Archipelago, corresponds very closely with that of Meridian, Miss.

The Matanuska colony, about 50 miles from Anchorage, grows all kinds of grain, vegetables, and root crops, as would many other sections of the vast land. Maximum temperatures range up to 99 degrees, and in the area included in the Lemke-Johnson bills, many settled areas have no record of zero thermometer readings. The land is rich and unspoiled; the climate is agreeable.

But in the second place is where we find the reason for urgency in settling Alaska. In an area equal to one-fifth of the entire United States, a population of approximately 90,000 is located, half of whom are white, half aborigines.

Across the few short miles of the Bering Straits, Russian-owned Siberia is undergoing huge expansion and development.

Military authorities state that Alaska is now the strategic pivotal point of the world, as it is the shortest air route to Asia and three-quarters of the human race. Ranking military men point out that it is the most important stretch of geography in this age of atomic bombs and 10,000-mile planes.

The settlement of Alaska is an important question not only to Alaskans, but to every person who lives under the Stars and Stripes. The present situation constitutes an open door to possible aggression. It is a documented fact that the Russian people have been indoctrinated with the feeling that Alaska was not legally purchased by the United States in 1867, and will be returned to "the motherland" some day.

The bills, as reintroduced to Congress in the spring of 1949, asked enactment of the measure in these terms. "* * * That the national defense and the national interest requires the settlement and development of Alaska." These words were not used lightly, but in full recognition of the existing situation.

The State of Texas has been very liberal in helping Texas veterans secure farm homes through the veterans land program. The Nation should follow suit with such a program as the Lemke-Johnson plan. Such a program does not constitute a gift of land, but liberalizes purchase terms in such a manner as to make it possible for a veteran of any war to take part in this project for strengthening the national defense and opening a vast new territory.

About 30 days ago, the writer began trying to collect information regarding the settlement plan for Alaska. Letters were written to Members of Congress, Alaska newspapers, and to individuals interested one way or another in the program. Quite a bit of evasion was encountered in the replies, reasons for which will be brought out in another installment of "the Alaska Story."

Salaries of Government Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with the pay-increase bill for top executives of the Government scheduled for debate, the attitude of those who would be called upon to support, by their taxes, the proposed increases, is of major importance. A letter appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday puts the matter so intelligently and so succinctly that it deserves the attention of the Senate, particularly as it reflects, I am convinced, the reasoned judgment of a great many of our citizens. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE SALARIES

It has become increasingly apparent, due to the high cost of living, the proportionately high salaries paid executives in private business, and the disproportionately low salaries paid executives in Government, that we are fast approaching the point where only the independently wealthy will be able to afford acceptance of important posts in Government.

Thus, after a period of approximately 160 years, we are, willy-nilly turning toward that

form of government which Alexander Hamilton so vociferously espoused in the late eighteenth century, namely, government by the wealthy.

Two nominations have recently been rejected by the Congress for the most important planning positions which the President can offer. The first man was claimed to have been unqualified. He would have accepted the salary offered. The second man, an acknowledged expert, could not be classed as unqualified; however, not being able to afford the luxury of foregoing his salary as a business executive, he was also rejected.

The ardent advocates of economy should see by now that for the salary offered, they will only be able to obtain the brains and know-how which compare to the compensation, unless a brilliant man of independent means is nominated. As someone at one time so aptly put it, "They are attempting to buy champagne brains with beer money."

D. O.

WASHINGTON.

Tribute to Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ernest Lindley, appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle for Tuesday, September 20, paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Ernest Lindley)

LUCAS' STATURE IS GROWING AS SENATE MAJORITY LEADER

Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, who has received more than his share of brickbats from the press and his colleagues in his brief tenure as majority leader, gave a convincing demonstration last week that he has learned the art of good generalship.

With the issue often in doubt, LUCAS managed to persuade several colleagues to change their vote even as the roll calls on the Trade Agreements Act were under way. It was not easy for Democratic Senators from areas hard hit by competing imports to go along with the administration. The textile and watch industries of New England and the handmade pottery works in West Virginia, for instance, have been crying for protection. Nevertheless every crippling amendment was defeated and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act restored to the Roosevelt-Hull pattern.

In the early days of the session, when LUCAS was finding his way in the position of majority leader, the White House overrode his wishes frequently and altered his plans for legislative action. LUCAS failed to convince the President that the timing of major measures had to be determined by the legislative captains on Capitol Hill. Truman, anxious to prove his concern for the minority groups which had contributed so many votes to his election, insisted on early action on civil rights, despite LUCAS' doubts. Truman's decision resulted in a filibuster which threw the Senate off its stride for months.

A conscientious, sensitive Senator who was eager to prove his leadership, LUCAS was attacked on all sides. He was lashed by the liberals who expected him to drive civil rights through the Senate without having the necessary votes. He was blasted by right-wingers who accused him of being too much of a Fair Dealer.

The picture is changing. LUCAS is beginning to get a better press from the Washington correspondents. LUCAS himself, after recovering from the exhaustion that sent him to a hospital bed, has become much more relaxed and skillful in his job.

This has paid off in such important tests as the reversals of two Appropriations Committee actions, one of which would have hamstrung ECA, the other the public power program.

The President is now paying more attention to LUCAS' judgment of the Senate's temper and accepting the timetable of his majority leader instead of ramming one down his throat. It was on LUCAS' insistence that the President abandoned his plan to fight for the Brannan cash-subsidy program in the Senate. LUCAS told him bluntly it had no chance there.

Though the Senate has been criticized for its slowness, more of the Fair Deal program has been passed there than in the House. The Senate has enacted aid to education and a school-health program, both of which appear hopelessly bogged down in the other body. In the field of foreign policy, the Senate's version of the military assistance program is expected to approach the President's bill, which the House cut in half.

Statism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to President Truman's analysis of statism, and I have noted that he considers it a scare word and in the same category with the statement he made sometime ago when he considered communism was but a "red herring."

I am glad to incorporate at this point an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News which I think clearly defines the word "statism."

WHAT IS "STATISM"?

President Truman has been accused in a number of sources as advocating policies which would bring about statism in the United States.

After enduring this criticism in silence for a while the President made what he apparently believed to be a crushing rejoinder.

He declared that "statism" was a scare word being used by his critics to undermine his legislative program for the country.

He added that he had consulted several dictionaries which differed on the definition of the word.

While dictionaries may differ in their definitions of the word—and they do—there is no question in the minds of the American people what "statism" means.

It means, when employed in criticism of Mr. Truman's program, that his policies are leading the country into greater and greater centralization of power in Washington.

It means that the Federal Government, under these policies, is usurping fields which heretofore have been reserved to individuals and society.

It means that more and more of the people's income is being diverted into the Federal Treasury.

It means that the Federal Government is, year by year, having more to say about the everyday activities of the individual in the country.

It means that the freedoms of the American people are disappearing, one by one, as the Federal Government slaps on its controls and imposes its restrictions.

It means that the theory—upon which Americanism was founded—that the state exists for the people and not the people for the state—is being overturned.

The statism of which Mr. Truman's critics complain does not differ a whole lot from the various forms of totalitarianism which have been inflicted upon the peoples of some other countries.

Internationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to submit one viewpoint on the international situation at this time as expressed in an editorial in the Washington Times-Herald, of date September 26, 1949, as follows:

THE REWARD OF BEING MEDDLESOME

A considerable panic is sweeping the ranks of America's internationalists in the wake of the news that Russia has the atomic bomb. There are cries that President Truman hurry into conference with Stalin and cook up some deal to avert world calamity. There are plaintive appeals that the United Nations get a move on and adopt some convention for international regulation and control of atomic energy. The world government crowd says the United States has no alternative now but to liquidate its independent existence by submerging the Republic in the assumed safety of a herd of nations.

All of this agitation is dictated by the well-founded belief that if Russia has the atomic bomb there is only one adversary against which she will use it. That is the United States.

The American people ought to ask themselves how come. The answer will be readily found. It is that the United States, by pursuing a policy of intervention, has pushed itself to the front to absorb any shock from any nation's attempt to disturb the status quo anywhere in the world. The United States, because of its assumption of this preventive mission, stands out in naked confrontation of Russia.

Thanks to America's internationalists, the United States has been made the logical target of Russian military force. The internationalists have labored with might and main to bring this state of affairs about. Now that their aims have been crowned with success, they are panicked by the knowledge of what should have been apparent from the start: That the triumph of their internationalist cause carries with it the prospect for the United States of a self-destroying war.

For 35 years the internationalists have exerted every effort to destroy the historic American policy of nonintervention in foreign quarrels. For a century America re-

mained secure under that policy while it grew to greatness. The greatness gave it a power which enhanced its security. America enjoyed the friendship of a good part of the world, and not even the nations which envied us or distrusted us regarded us as their inevitable enemy in a forthcoming war.

Then all of these advantages were heedlessly thrown away. The gospel was promoted that the United States could not afford to stay out of the wars of Europe. On this theory our country provided the decisive power in the First World War. Later the internationalists promoted the notion that America was a guilty nation because it had refused to acknowledge any permanent responsibility to keep the peace in Europe.

Soon the internationalists got the United States into another world war which destroyed any semblance of the historic balance of power. Unable to confess that intervention had been a disastrous error, the internationalists sought to protect themselves from the consequences of their mistakes by saying now that America's interventionist obligation was greater and more inescapable than ever.

To balance the ascendant might of Russia, established as the result of America's decisive military exertions in World War II, the United States in the postwar world was hounded into a frantic expenditure of the national substance to provide the economic and military aid supposed to redress the balance. The Marshall plan, foreign loans, the Atlantic pact, arms for Europe, the containment of aggressive communism at the borders of Greece, Turkey, Iran, Korea, and the backbreaking burden of an enormous Military Establishment—these are part of the continuing drain upon America.

Now, at the last, we are pledged to defend a great part of Europe and the world against Soviet force. The commitment is automatic and allows no escape. We cannot hold back in the belief that Russia, with or without the atomic bomb, is incapable of repressing permanently the nationalist spirit of European states, even if it possessed the means of temporary conquest. Instead, we must fight. In the circumstances it is only natural to expect the Russians to use what atomic bombs they have in the effort to pulverize the chief among their enemies.

These are America's rewards for succumbing to the meddlesome gospel of the internationalists. The internationalists now wail over the consequences of their policy, while across the years comes an unheeded voice, counseling against "inveterate antipathies to particular nations and passionate attachments for others."

Point 4 Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 26 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point 4 Is a Must," which appeared in the New York Times on September 26, 1949. It calls attention to the great importance of setting into action President Truman's point 4 program now.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4 IS A MUST

After long and careful preparation the preliminary steps in President Truman's point 4 program will go to the House of Representatives tomorrow. The President is right in not allowing this measure, already unanimously approved in principle by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to go over to the next congressional session and Congress will be right to give it prompt consideration and firm approval. There are other imperative items on the congressional program, but this one, also, is a must.

In various recent statements of United States policy, such as those of Dr. Jessup and Secretary Acheson, there has been insistence upon the desire of this country to aid underprivileged peoples to attain a greater degree of political freedom and of material benefit. This, many Americans are convinced, is not mere evangelistic "do-goodism" but a constructive approach to the problems of peace and stability in the world through the employment of our own available skills and resources on behalf of those whose opportunities are more limited than ours. This does not mean, it has been pointed out, that we will sustain any independence movement in the world, regardless of its point of inspiration, nor does it mean that we will start writing blank checks on the American taxpayer to be scattered indiscriminately.

It does mean, however, that we aline ourselves and our resources on the side of progress, not reaction, with greater human freedoms, and not their restriction, with more good things, not fewer, for more and more persons. In speaking of some of these underdeveloped areas, particularly those in the Far East, General Romulo said, night before last, that "these peoples must be assured that they shall receive every possible aid and encouragement in their advance toward freedom and in their progress toward better standards of life." This is one of the functions of the point 4 program, and swift congressional action will help to give that needed assurance.

This is not essentially a political program, nor does it involve specific political commitments. It is not, on the other hand, solely an economic matter, another blueprint for better business. It is essentially humanitarian in its foundation, and the primary emphasis that has been given to work in the fields of public health and food supplies should make this plain. Nevertheless, it is not naive to believe that a great humanitarian enterprise may have far-reaching benefits, both political and economic. Of some of those benefits we ourselves can be the recipients. What is needed now is firmness of purpose as well as boldness of imagination.

Ohio Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us, especially we who are from the State of Ohio, appreciate the efforts of the dean of the Ohio congressional delegation, and my colleague, the Honorable THOMAS JENKINS, for his endeavors to have a street in the District of Columbia named for our great State. I am glad to incorporate in my extension of remarks an editorial which recently appeared in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

OHIO RECOGNIZED

There was a brief ceremony in Washington last Friday.

Representative TOM JENKINS, of Ironton, was the principal figure in the ceremony as he put up a street sign with the legend "Ohio Drive."

It was entirely fitting and proper that Congressman JENKINS should be the man to place the first sign, for he has waged an unrelenting and ofttimes lone-handed fight to win recognition for the Buckeye State in the Capital's streets and drives.

For many years Ohio has been the only State among the 48 with its name on no Washington thoroughfare. Probably it was just a matter which no one had bothered to take care of. And after all, it is hard to get a street name changed after it once has an established label.

Representative JENKINS rightly thought Ohio should be recognized and so he carried on his campaign until he finally won.

His victory—and Ohio's—is all the sweeter in that the new Ohio drive is one of the National Capital's most beautiful streets; a 5-mile scenic drive giving one a view of the Washington Monument, the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials, and the shores of the cherry tree rimmed tidal basin which draws thousands of visitors each spring. Across the Potomac is Arlington National Cemetery and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Ohioans can finally point with pride to Ohio Drive when they go to Washington—thanks to Representative JENKINS.

Honest Reviews Are Needed for Small Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since H. R. 3113 was presented before the Rules Committee as a noncontroversial bill, although I for one had asked to be heard in connection with this legislation, I think this editorial from the August 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post will prove that it is an undesirable piece of legislation, in that it is not in the interest of the small taxpayer but is for the purpose of creating a monopoly for a small group of attorneys:

HONEST REVIEWS ARE NEEDED FOR SMALL TAXPAYER

Suppose the Internal Revenue Bureau challenges your income-tax return. What could you do to protect your rights? Appeal to the tax-appeal court or a Federal district court is the right of all, but tax ligitation frequently costs even the rich more than the amount in dispute. Tax appeals are for the well-to-do, but this year the "revenooers" have turned the official gimlet eye on the little man, too. Analysis of thousands of 1948 returns, regardless of the amount involved, is now in progress.

We have created millions of new taxpayers in moderate-to-low-income brackets without gearing settlement machinery to their needs. In 1916, there were only 500,000 persons who paid income taxes, and fewer than one-half of 1 percent of those filing returns had net incomes of $5,000 or less; today, more than

50,000,000 Americans pay income taxes, and 95 percent of them have incomes of $5,000 or less. Yet, the resources of the dissatisfied taxpayer remain essentially the same as 33 years ago.

Last year only 1 out of 200 disputed cases was appealed to the Tax Court. Most of the 199 others were settled by agents of the Bureau or its technical staff. That doesn't mean these citizens are satisfied with the Bureau's decisions, because the Bureau cannot rise above suspicion of partiality in cases involving differences between itself and taxpayers. Many feel they are dealing with a judge who is also a prosecutor at a hearing from which there is no appeal.

Reporting last year to a congressional committee, following an investigation of the Internal Revenue Bureau, one tax expert observed: "There is too great an emphasis on 'protecting the revenue,' too little on protecting the taxpayer. * * * As taxpayers find enforcement a one-way street, they rationalize progressively lower levels of tax compliance."

In nonexpert language, they put themselves down for as little income as they think they can get away with. If taxpayers felt that their grievances would be fairly heard and adjusted without expensive procedures, the Government might get more revenue out of them. The bureau clerks involved in the original audit and investigation of returns are not in a position to give impartial answers to difficult questions on tax liability. Even assuming that the technical staff were wholly impartial, taxpayers will be dissatisfied as long as settlements are made by the same agency which audits and investigates returns.

Lawmakers on Capitol Hill report growing dissatisfaction among taxpayers. "My greatest complaint," says a typical letter from a small-business man in Oklahoma, "is when the tax examiner * * * in an endeavor to make a mark for himself, sets up a tax amount due of $100 to $200, knowing well that if I care to handle through the courts it will cost me more than to settle on his basis." An accountant and tax consultant charges that "deputy collectors (or revenue agents) work on a 'quota' basis. * * * They are allotted an approximate amount of tax to be recovered each year. This procedure places a premium on fraud."

Such complaints could be largely eliminated by an administrative tax-settlement board of independent experts, free of both the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Treasury Department, of which it is a part. If empowered to render prompt decisions informally, in the manner of small-claims courts, such a board could be operated at low cost. Legislation intended to achieve these objectives was introduced in the House at the current session by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas. The proposal merits more attention from taxpayers than it has received.

Atomic Explosion in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure by President Truman of an atomic explosion in Russia was frightening news to most American people, but it was not particularly surprising to hundreds of FBI agents, who, like myself, worked on the Communist apparatus espionage case during and subsequent to the war.

President Truman neglected to tell the American people the part Soviet espionage agents, Russian diplomats and officials, American Communists, and American fellow travelers operating in the United States contributed to this startling revelation.

The Russians undoubtedly gained 3 to 5 years in producing the atomic bomb, solely because the American Government for the last 15 years has had the official attitude, from the White House down, of being highly tolerant of, and at times even sympathetic to, the views of Communists and fellow travelers, with the result that the Federal Government has been infiltrated by a network of spies, as conclusively proven in the Hiss-Chambers and other cases.

It is an established fact that both President Truman and President Roosevelt had access to all FBI and military intelligence reports dealing with the subject, and although these documents were constantly crossing their desks, the record of American security is a disgraceful one. It has been estimated that there were at least 150 American Communist and Soviet agents directly and indirectly connected with the attempt of the Soviet Union to obtain the secret of the atomic bomb from scientists who worked on its development.

Mr. Truman's startling revelation cannot erase the fact from the minds of the American people that the many weaknesses and laxities in the executive branch of the Government permitted the escape of a number of these Soviet agents from the United States carrying information on the atomic bomb and other scientific developments. The American people will recall the escape of such Soviet agents as Arthur Adams, Ignace Zlotowski, André Schevschenko, and Gerhardt Eisler under the very noses of the State Department and immigration officials. The American people will also recall the untimely departure of certain Russian diplomatic officials including Peter Ivanov and Vassili Zubilin.

Even more disturbing is the fact that Soviet espionage agents are still highly active in the continental United States and that there are numerous cases where prosecution could be brought without the disclosure of secret information. For example, there is a complete and indictable case against so-called Scientist X, who was allegedly one of the original contributors of information concerning the atomic bomb to Steve Nelson, a top-level American Communist. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has a completely documented case against Scientist X which should be turned over by the Justice Department to a grand jury immediately.

One of the tragic factors in this espionage picture and in our own contribution to helping Russia get the atomic bomb, was our refusal to join with Canada in the prosecution of the entire spy ring 3 years ago. Canadian officials vigorously, efficiently, and promptly did their part, sending 10 people to prison including Dr. Alan May, the key scientist in the group.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the American end of the Soviet atomic spy ring was of such proportions as to dwarf the Canadian section. It is a fact that the samples of uranium 235, which Dr. May delivered to Russia, were obtained from our own laboratories right here in the United States. It is a fact that our own befuddled top officials of Government, over the stout resistance of the directing authorities of the Manhattan atomic bomb project, officially approved the shipment to Russia in 1943 of two consignments of uranium oxide; one, in the amount of 1,000 pounds; the other, totalling 2,000 pounds. These shipments, while far from sufficient to permit the construction of a bomb, were absolutely vital to Russia's own subsequent experiments to produce the bomb which exploded recently in Russia.

The protection from prosecution enjoyed by Soviet spies, American Communists, and American fellow travelers is made the more disgraceful by the official blessing which it receives. Overlooked generally was an official report by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, former Democratic national chairman, made the night before President Truman's announcement that Russia had exploded an atomic charge. Obviously timed as cover-up for past failures to vigorously prosecute Soviet spies and their American collaborators, many of whom were on the Government pay roll, Mr. McGrath's report, delivered to the Judicial Conference of the United States, declared that in many cases the Justice Department had been "compelled to refrain from prosecuting because the Government would have to divulge top-secret information" concerning atomic energy. What kind of an apology is that? Is the Government admitting that while our scientists and our great industrial engineers had the ingenuity to perform the titanic task of completing the bomb in 4 years, our inept and politically minded policy makers cannot perfect the necessary few lines of legal procedure to protect it?

The truth is that officials now making top-level security policy are so torn between defending their own past mistakes and meeting the grave situation we now face that they are no longer capable of decisive action. In addition, we are still cursed by having people in our Government with great influence in high places who hold the ridiculously unrealistic view that the Soviet Union can be courted, cajoled, and appeased into the position of dropping their whole sinister plot for world domination if we will only be nice to them and let them have their way on more matters. The resultant failure to tighten our security policies is appalling and a threat to our national existence.

We are at this very moment supplying the Soviet Union with an amazing amount of data and information concerning the United States and this hemisphere that would prove of top military value to any nation which chose to attack our shores. We supply it under a treaty arrangement with Russia, and the bulk of it can be bought right at the Government Printing Office, but the fact

is that all we get from Russia in exchange are documents that amount to little more than propaganda pamphlets containing information that is virtually valueless. The information given the U. S. S. R. ranges from data on harbor depths all the way to jet propulsion and atomic projects. It proves conclusively that we should reassess our whole security program and throw out of office those incompetents who regard their political lives as more important than our national security.

Among the things which we furnished Soviet Russia is the American Air Almanac, published by the United States Navy Department, which contains information regarding the navigational star chart, polar sky diagrams, the duration of twilight, corrections for height to times of sunrise, sunset, and twilight, and certain other information of value to aircraft flying over the United States; 1949.

We furnished a Flight Information Manual, published by the United States Department of Commerce, which contains information as to the latitude and longitude of every civilian and military airport and its location in the United States; 1949.

An Oak Ridge lecture series in nuclear physics, which has to do with the development of atomic energy was furnished by us in 1947.

We furnished a list of light and fog signals for the coast of North and South America, including the West Indies and the Hawaiian Islands; current.

We furnished statistics on the communications systems in the United States, including all data on power, wave lengths, and so forth; current.

We furnished a list of signal-light systems of the intracoastal waterways of the United States; current.

We furnished information regarding laboratories and plants for synthetics, together with aircraft photographs of some installations and their locations; 1949.

We furnished information regarding the surface-water supply of the United States, including drinking-water systems; 1945.

We furnished statistics pertaining to the merchant marine, including the name of every merchant vessel, its signal and radio call letters, its tonnage and its home port; 1947.

We furnished information concerning the production of metals in the United States and throughout the world. This book also lists those countries from which we must import strategic metals, including the kind and volume; 1948.

We furnished a list of signal-light systems of the Atlantic and Gulf coast, as well as the Pacific coast; current.

We furnished complete information regarding the coast line of Alaska, as well as the routes to be followed in entering numerous rivers and seaports of Alaska. This book describes, among numerous other things, the passages in the George and Carroll inlets into the city of Ketchikan. It also describes the Behn Canal, Kasaan Bay, Clarence Strait, and the southern entrance to Stephens Passage; current.

We furnished a list of the signal letters of the United States merchant marine; 1949.

We distributed maps of national forest areas of the United States; 1948.

We furnished a manual of the Bureau of Aeronautics which, while not restricted, contains information regarding the various organizations within the Bureau of Aeronautics, thus making it easy for a foreign government to know in what sections of the Bureau an agent should be planted; current.

We furnished information regarding the shipments of principal products to the United States from Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as well as from numerous European, Central, and South American countries; 1948.

We furnished information regarding the tide tables of the east coast, North and South America; current.

We furnished a report from the Chief of Staff of the United States to the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Manual of Organization of the Bureau of Aeronautics; 1948.

We furnished the Basic Field Manual on military training.

We furnished information regarding the procurement and training of ground combat troops; 1946.

We furnished the United States Coast Pilot for the Atlantic coast, describing the entrances to the Chesapeake Bay, the Delaware Bay and River, and certain other bodies of water; current.

We furnished information regarding radioactive isotopes; 1949.

We furnished information regarding plastics, magnesium castings, electronics, electrical machinery, equipment and supplies; 1949.

We furnished deterioration studies pertaining to tropical climates; 1949.

We furnished information regarding fuels and lubricants, including synthetics; current.

We furnished information regarding the ports of Galveston and Texas City, Tex.; 1949.

We furnished the Procedure Manual of the Bureau of Aeronautics; current.

We furnished navigational information regarding the Columbia River, Mississippi, and other principal rivers in the United States; current.

We furnished the tidal current charts for New York Harbor, together with the maps thereof; current.

We also furnished a technical manual on military explosives; 1945.

We received very little or no information of the type mentioned herein from Soviet Russia.

Of course some of the data on this list is of value to American enterprise, industry, and business, but I would like to point out that no other nation or earth goes to the lengths that we do in supplying information of military value free of charge to the world. A great deal of it is the product of self-perpetuating bureaucrats who are constantly dreaming up new governmental documents and pamphlets to further their own expansion and to propagandize the American people for more and more government. But the damage to our military security cannot possibly be calculated.

We need only recall that when we went to war with Japan, the Japs had every kind of data that their hearts could desire about the Philippines, Hawaii, and the continental United States, while our Government pitiably asked all Americans who had pictures or maps of any part of the Japanese Empire to please rush them to Washington for the military to scan.

While it is perhaps wise to press now for strict international control of the atom bomb, Congress should take a parallel step and make a thorough-going investigation of our entire security setup. It is evident that the executive branch has no intention of taking any corrective steps that will expose its past mistakes. Plainly, Congress must act unless we want to welcome a second Pearl Harbor with open arms.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1949.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached hereto is a copy of an editorial from the Greenville Piedmont, my home-town afternoon newspaper, written by Editor Wayne Freeman in response to some observations made by you in the House on the bill proposing Federal aid to education.

It occurred to me you would be interested in reading the editorial, as in my judgment the facts stated therein are true.

In order that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to read the editorial, I am inserting same in the Appendix of the RECORD along with a copy of my letter to you.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

LET'S STOP THIS INTERREGIONAL FEUDIN'

Thoughtful southerners have been greatly pleased and somewhat encouraged in the last few years over the fact that the light of the truth about the South has begun to penetrate the North. It even glimmers faintly in some parts of New England.

However, it seems that this new enlightenment is far from complete and that many northerners still have much to learn, not only about the South but about themselves.

Take, for instance, Representative PATTERSON, a Republican, of Connecticut. In a statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD opposing Federal aid to education he advised Southern States to spend their money on education at home instead of offering New England industry tax-free operations in the South. He said the Senate-approved bill "demonstrates further evidence of a Government beneficence to the Southern States."

He said further: "I have no desire to legislate or to debate issues on a regional basis, but I do feel that the preservation of a high

standard of living in New England is a substantial factor in the economic stability of America. * * * It is admitted that the Southern States have need for educational aid, as ignorance cannot be quarantined. * * * The argument lies not with that point, but with the continual raiding of established New England industry with the subsequent loss to its many citizens. We cannot long countenance this practice and continue to support purely State functions in other parts of the country."

Of course, this editorial will not be read by Mr. PATTERSON, nor is it likely to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but we'd like to set the record straight.

While it seems to be the common conception in New England, Mr. PATTERSON'S statement about Southern States offering tax-free operations to migrating industry is a half truth, or less.

The facts are these: South Carolina, and certain other Southern States, have offered new industries, whether they be home-grown or migratory, certain limited tax exemptions—on a strictly local basis. Many South Carolina counties, for instance, exempt new plants from all taxation, except taxes levied for the support of the schools, for a period of 5 years. The idea is to allow the plants a chance to start producing profitably before the full tax burden is placed on them.

Now, no manufacturer contemplating building a new plant or moving an old one is naive enough to think that such a tax-exemption will last forever. Indeed, he knows that as an urban community springs up around his plant, his taxes are going to rise to provide municipal services, to say nothing of his having to help support an expanding county government.

Furthermore, the manufacturers are not exempted from such taxes as income taxes. And a leading industrialist tells us that manufacturers are not worried about local taxation, but that they are worried about Federal income-tax policies, even as you and we.

We know of no States which have offered the tax-free operations of which Representative PATTERSON speaks so knowingly.

As for the Southern States spending more money on education, that is what they are trying to get into position to do. The small exemptions granted new plants do not subtract from the funds available for our schools. The South is undergoing an economic revolution of no small proportions. Perhaps it should be called an evolutionary process, but whatever called, it is increasing the South's wealth and, thereby, its ability to support its schools and its other public and private institutions.

The South has received beneficence from the Federal Government, but so has New England.

What does Representative PATTERSON call the protective tariffs which for decades protected New England's industry at the expense of the agricultural South? What does he call the freight-rate differentials which for years penalized the South and benefited New England? President Truman has directed Federal agencies to place contracts for goods and services in areas suffering from unemployment—a practice from which New England will benefit. No President ever directed the Government to abandon even temporarily its policy of letting contracts on a competitive basis in order to help the poverty-stricken South.

We could go on to cite the record of exploitation the South endured for decades after it was prostrated under the feet of the northern conquerors who moved in under Federal protection.

It is true that the South has acquired many industries which left New England in search of a more favorable location, but to say that the South has raided New England is an attempt to shift the blame for failure. The reasons for industry's locating in the South have before now been placed in the RECORD. These reasons do not include the things New England is trying to kid itself into thinking are the cause—tax preferment and cheap and exploitable labor.

The truth is that the South is becoming a vast market for finished goods as buying power increases; it has the raw materials and the other requirements of an industrial economy; and it is now reaching the point in its development where it can compete with other and heretofore more favored regions.

We agree with Representative PATTERSON that a prosperous New England is essential to the national welfare, and we believe that no region should be allowed to profit unfairly at the expense of another. We do not wish to indulge in debate on a regional basis, either, and we hope the North will soon quit bringing the regional fight to us.

New England should stop its caterwauling and spend the energies it is wasting in recriminations against the South in a close examination of the facts on why its economy is ailing and on a development program capable of succeeding in a competitive economy.

The South, New England, and the other "regions" of the United States should realize that all their economic and social problems are common to all regions and they should attack them on an interregional (national) basis.

The Road to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Biddle survey on the Lustron house. It is unbelievable and incredible that sane businessmen and Government representatives would indulge in loaning money to a corporation to build houses for $9,100, which the corporation sells for $5,600 to the dealers. This is subsidy in its most indefensible form. This kind of financing by the Government will ultimately lead to disaster. No one has ever conquered simple arithmetic.

The article follows:

LUSTRON IN WONDERLAND

The fabulous story of a fantastic venture of the Government into the field of free enterprise—a deal for which the taxpayers already have put up $37,500,000 in RFC loans, with more advances likely to follow—has appeared in the strange case of Lustron Corp., manufacturer of steel homes.

These houses, made of sheets of pastel-colored steel and put together with nuts and bolts, cost $9,100 to manufacture, but sell to dealers at the factory for $5,600. Lustron is finding it hard to make money that way, and, besides, the dealers do not have the working capital of $50,000 to $100,000 needed to carry on business. As a result, according to a detailed analysis by the Wall Street Journal, Lustron is tapping at the doors of the RFC for $12,500,000 more, and Congress is about to provide $25,000,000 to $75,000,000 more for working capital for its dealers. The House already has voted to give Lustron $75,000,000 to help the dealers along, and the Senate has voted $25,000,000. Out of conference probably will come aid of around $50,000,000.

Lustron embarked on making steel prefab houses in 1947 with a loan from the RFC, which the RFC at the time was opposed to making. Other Government officials, however, wanted Lustron to be given the money.

Said RFC Director Harvey J. Gunderson in 1947:

"I think the Lustron experiment even now has no better than a 50–50 chance of ever succeeding."

Dr. John R. Steelman, a White House assistant, at that same time said Lustron's houses "would make a real contribution toward meeting the housing shortage during the coming 2 years."

Lustron, according to the Wall Street Journal, produced its first house last November. To date it has turned out only 1,785 homes. This, plus a highly paid staff of executives, is one reason why Lustron today is losing $1,100,000 a month. Another is that dealers, once they have sold the home buyer on the idea of a steel house, do not have the capital necessary to finance the purchase and preparation of home sites.

Because Lustron's 3,000 workers, when turning out houses at the company's all-time high rate of 26 per day in August, were producing them faster than dealers could sell them, output has now been cut back to 15 a day. Lustron officials say production of 35 a day is necessary to get costs down to the break-even point. Stepping up sales to dispose of such a production, thus, hinges, say Lustron officials, on providing working capital for the cash-short dealers. Hence the request to Congress for more funds.

An additional stumbling block to larger sales is the fact that zoning ordinances in many localities do not permit the erection of steel homes, so dealers must concentrate their efforts in areas where there are few or no zoning barriers.

At the present, however, it looks as though Lustron has tapped an unlimited well of Government backing. To protect its original investment and try to make it pay off, both the RFC and Congress seem ready to provide the requested cash, which altogether may total as much as $100,000,000 to $125,000,000.

The money, of course, is taxpayer's money. Part of it is that tax that the Federal Government grabs from every pay envelope before it reaches the worker who earned it. Part of it comes from double taxation of dividends, from the 25 percent capital-gains levy, and from the 20-percent tax on the working girl's lipstick and facial cream.

When an individual businessman, or private corporation decides to make and market a new product, surveys are first conducted to determine the degree of consumer acceptance. A dealer organization is carefully planned. All possible pitfalls are minutely examined. Even after all these preliminary steps are completed, the individual does not go ahead on a vast production program. First, the private producer of a new product sets up a pilot operation. He produces a limited run of the product, picks one city, or maybe a single store to test actual marketing. From his pilot production run, he gets an idea of what his costs will be. From his pilot marketing project, he determines what consumer acceptance will be, and how much must be spent for promotion. When he has checked all angles, then, and then only, does he attempt to go into mass production.

If the case of Lustron is any criterion—and the case of the Tucker automobile company seems to support this theory—the procedure of the Government when it engages in free enterprise is to provide the money first and ask questions afterward.

The promoter working with the Government does not have to be wealthy. The president of Lustron, according to the Wall Street Journal, put only $1,000 into the company—$500 for himself and $500 for his wife. For this investment they received stock representing voting control.

All of which proves that the Government would be far better off confining its operations to the executive, legislative, and judicial fields, leaving to private business the job of producing and distributing industrial products, and underwriting private ventures.

But in these days of fact-finding boards, 5 percenters, and 3-day high jinks by John L. Lewis and his miners, everything continues relative in Washington wonderland.

The One Hundredth Birthday Story of Morgans Landing Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia River in the far Northwest, one of the great waterways of the Nation, has played an important role in the development of our Nation and the preservation of the Pacific Northwest as a part of the United States. For over 100 years it has borne the traffic of the pioneers and their successors and has furnished water and hydroelectric power for agricultural and industrial development of a great and prosperous community.

In the Columbia River a few miles below Portland, my home city, is situated Sauvies Island. It is a small island but one of the garden spots of this favored region. On Sauvies Island is located a farm known as Morgan's Landing farm which has been in the ownership of one family, the Morgans, for over 100 years. On July 4 last, the present owners, Omar C. Spencer and Laura Morgan Spencer, celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of their family's ownership of the farm. During this long span of years the farm has been occupied and cultivated and has contributed much to the economy of the region. It is an outstanding example of the benefits of wise farm practices, soil conservation, and utilization, and the values to be derived from sound flood control methods. The soil is the mother of progress and a rich heritage to be guarded and preserved.

As a part of the one hundredth anniversary celebration, Omar C. Spencer, Jr., manager of the farm and of the fourth generation in ownership, wrote an interesting and intriguing brochure on the history of this pioneer farm which I am sure will be of interest to all of our colleagues who are concerned here in the Congress with good farm practices, wise soil conservation, and effective flood control. I am including the brochure as part of these remarks.

THE ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY STORY OF MORGANS LANDING FARM ON SAUVIES ISLAND IN OREGON

INTRODUCTION BY OMAR C. SPENCER, JR.

Any land in the Pacific Northwest which has been in the same family ownership for at least 100 years has a story to tell. If Morgans Landing farm could speak, it could tell its own story better than anyone else. And so, as its manager and of the fourth generation since it was settled by my great-grandparents, I will assume it can speak; if so, here is part of the story it could tell.

ONCE I WAS WILD LAND

In the beginning, and as a part of Sauvies Island, I was wild land. For thousands of years I received from the Columbia and Willamette Rivers rich topsoil coming from the mountains, hills, and valleys above. Long before white men came I was possessed by Indians in their collective capacity, and I furnished them with fish, game, and the wappato, as well as a location for their tribal councils.

Situated on the Columbia River, I was witness from the year of its discovery in 1792 to all the coming and going up and down that great river. Through the years there passed along my shores explorers, fur traders, missionaries, scientists, and, finally, the pioneers. Before I came into private ownership the flags of the United States, England, Russia, and Spain claimed my allegiance. But by 1846, through peaceful international agreements, my salute was to one flag alone, and that was to the stars and stripes.

THEN I BECAME A RANCH

I came into private ownership as a donation land claim on July 4, 1849, through settlement by Edward and Mary Morgan who, with their family, were covered-wagon pioneers from Ohio in 1845. It should be explained that donation land claims were offered under an act passed by the United States to encourage pioneers to endure the hardships of a journey of thousands of miles and settle the West. I was a ranch from the date of my settlement because annual freshets from the Columbia River made my cultivation impracticable and required that most of my soil be used in a state of nature. My rich wild meadows furnished for livestock, pasture in summer and hay in winter. My lakes abounded with wild ducks, geese, and swan, producing revenue in earlier days from unregulated commercial hunting and later from lake rentals for regulated sportsmanship. No public road crossed my boundaries. Until the last few years of my existence as a ranch my only means of transportation to and from the outside world was by rowboat or steamboat on the Columbia River.

During my life as a ranch the big white house with green shutters was built. That was in 1883 and in order to give more security against annual high waters the house was constructed on a building site graded up to an elevation of 30 feet.

I went through the high water of 1894 which rose to 33 feet, covering all of my acres and 3 feet above the floor of the big white house. But the water came gradually and some in the family ownership stayed on; others moved away and returned in due course. Damages sustained, such as sediment in the house, wrecked buildings, torn-out fences, and logs and trash scattered over my surface, were repaired or cleared away and my operation as a ranch was soon resumed.

By 1930, a county road leading to a county ferry was built across my land. This means of transportation took the place of passenger steamboats of which Morgan's Landing was soon to see its last. In 1936 I was supplied with electric service.

NOW I AM A FARM

My transition from a ranch to a farm came in 1941. That was when my 750 acres were included in a 12,000-acre tract on Sauvies Island which was protected from annual high waters by a 32-foot levee. The cost was paid under the Flood Control Act of 1936 by the landowners and the Federal Government. My use as land was now to undergo a complete change. Sloughs and lakes were drained through improved ditches. Land was leveled. Wild meadows gave way to domestic clovers and grasses. New houses and barns took the place of old ones, but the big white house with green shutters still held its commanding position. During my change from ranch to farm some of the fields produced grains; in due time, however, all of my acres were returned to sod crops, but of a better quality than in earlier days. Moreover, with improved facilities and equipment, clovers and grasses are now cut and stored in silos and preserved as green feed for livestock during the winters. I have experienced great satisfaction in my long and continued use for livestock, particularly dairy and beef cattle. I am grateful that none of my owners have even been lured to land uses which would lessen my fertility and which would eventually destroy my life.

Two events occurred in 1948 which were outstanding in my existence as a farm; first, the coming of the telephone which has proven to be of great help and convenience in my operation; second, the 1948 high water which rose rapidly and threatened to break the levee. Because of this danger my owners called to their aid a river steamboat which, with a large sawdust barge, moved my 200 head of dairy cattle to a higher location on the mainland where my herdsmen and the cattle remained for 21 days while the 30-foot flood subsided. That was a close call, for a break in the levee could have taken the lives of my herdsmen and the cattle and would have destroyed many of my buildings and would have killed my fields of clover and grasses. But the levee held, thanks to the heroic work of civilians and soldiers.

Thus far I have told my story without reference, for the most part, to the persons involved. But since my appearance and character have been molded by people, this one hundredth birthday story would seem cold and ungracious if further mention of personalities were omitted. Edward and Mary Morgan, who settled and brought me into private ownership, have already been mentioned. The names of my present owners, who have developed me during my entire life as a farm, and of my present manager are shown on earlier pages. Three other names stand out and complete the list of owners and managers. These are W. H. H. Morgan and Sarah E. Morgan, who established and followed standards of management, land use, and home excellence during my long life as a ranch. Finally there was John A. Spencer, my manager from 1933 to 1936, whose youth and enthusiasm are still reflected in what I am today. It is a matter of deep regret that those three could not have lived to see my stature as a farm.

But whatever I am in appearance, character, and usefulness, I stand as a monument to the courage, vision, industry, plans, hopes, and dreams of all my owners and managers in the family chain, living and dead. For I am something more than mere land. I am green meadows; white buildings; ash and cottonwoods; herds of fine cattle; a mighty river; passing ships of all nations; a blue sky; and snow-capped mountains. Yes, I am all of these but more. I am life itself, because I produce the things which make and sustain life, made so by all my owners and managers and the men and women who have lived and worked with me.

Peace, Productivity, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD,

I include the address of former Representative Everett M. Dirksen delivered at Peoria, Ill., on September 18, at the time he announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination of United States Senator in the 1950 election.

The address follows:

PEACE, PRODUCTIVITY, AND FREEDOM

Three real problems confront our country. They are peace, productivity, and freedom.

Without peace there can be no peace of mind, no lasting progress and no full constructive use of the taxes we pay. Thirteen billion for weapons each year does not permanently enrich the Nation.

Productivity is the only credible way to lick poverty and create buying power. More goods for more people in more places at less cost is the secret weapon of prosperity.

Freedom is the great spiritual adventure of civilization.

On all of these, the present administration and those who speak for it, have failed.

PEACE

Let events tell the story of peace. The recent confession by the President that the United Nations cannot cope with aggression; the ominous troop movements in Europe; the engulfment of China; the stalemate on the Austrian and German treaties more than 4 years after VJ-day; the billions for armaments; our virtual eviction from Asia by a former ally; the costly airlift; and the mistakes at Yalta rise up to proclaim a peace that failed. Those now in power have mistaken motion for progress and words for accomplishment.

PRODUCTIVITY

In the field of encouragement for productivity and enterprise the administration has failed. Since the war's end we should have more to show for an expanding population. The reasons are obvious. Burdensome taxes; continuing budget deficits; the search for new ways to spend the public money; the cheese paring that goes for economy; the steady decline in funds for retooling industry; the constant and ill-tempered assaults on the whole business structure; the stubborn belief that thrift is good for the people but not for government; the encouragement of group cleavages; the new policy of pay-when-you-can; and careless irredeemable political promises have rocked confidence and retarded production. Instead of patience there has been petulance. Instead of wisdom there has been political opportunism.

FREEDOM

Those who now direct our affairs have endangered the very freedom which was assured us more than eight score years ago. Blandly do they assert that the right to speak, to print, to assemble, and to petition is still intact. They are also intact in Great Britain today but it is an offense to give your neighbor a pitcher of milk, repair your own house with your own hands, or grow a crop not approved by the Government. There, life is a blueprint from birth to death. Freedom has been planned away. Only the freedom to lament its passing left. In our own country the demands for more Federal power, more compulsions, and the penalties to go with them is an assault on freedom. The unrelenting effort to manage instead of govern the affairs of the people is an assault on freedom. The promotion of the welfare state, which we hear so much about, is an assault on freedom. The lures and hand-outs with controls attached, for the sake of votes, is an assault on freedom. Spending the Nation into a crisis which can serve as an excuse for more controls is an assault on freedom. These are some of the slow but deadly forces which will liquidate individual liberty just as surely as they have destroyed it in so many other parts of the world.

These forces which will carry us toward a crisis are not accidental. They are a product of defeatism, ineptness, incompetency, and bewilderment of those who now direct our affairs. They are the result of a leadership which doesn't lead but always trails behind.

WHAT ABOUT 1950?

Next spring the people of Illinois will have a chance to pass judgment on men and policies. Let it be a bold and clear-cut judgment. We should know now whether thousands of young men died in the late conflict to stem tyranny and preserve freedom or whether they died for the surrender of their country to a kind of political management which follows the pattern of socialism.

We should know now whether the wasting economic diseases and social failures of the Old World are to be our lot or whether we resume the real liberalism of common sense, pay as we go, share the sacrifice, equal justice, individual liberty, and government that governs and not manages.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

To make this test fairly and honestly the Republican Party must clearly draw the issue. This is no time for a thimbleful of gospel. The issue is not only economic but moral. The Republican Party sprang from the moral issue of freedom. It has endured for nearly a century. In the days of its stewardship this Nation made its greatest progress. Its concept was and is the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of freedom.

NEED A BANNER

There should be a banner to which people can repair, who believe that Government should conform to the spirit of the Constitution as well as to the letter; that social balance can be achieved without wasteful bureaucracy; that centralized government threatens not only freedom but the very existence of our Federal system; that the way to develop buying power is not to vote it but to produce it; that a taxpayer gets more for his dollar when he spends it himself than he does when it makes a wasteful journey to Washington and back; that you cannot outspend, outlure, and outpromise a party which places victory before country; that you cannot stem a Red tide with a chronically red budget; that communism within our own land is more than a fish or a fever and should be uprooted; that party vitally based on clear-cut issues is indispensable to our national destiny; that planned economy is a fancy name for economic enslavement; that a political party should not be the mouthpiece for any group but for the whole country; that freedom for the man in the street is the great issue before this generation; and that the promises by which men live are those which can be kept.

I am willing to present this issue to the people of Illinois. This is not inspired by narrow ambition or a desire for acclaim. What we are dealing with today is too serious, it is a crisis. At the end of the one road lies an epitaph for freedom. At the end of the other is the fulfillment of the American dream. I believe there is a wisdom and a faith at the grass roots which, if made vocal and active, will take the road marked "America."

To this end I shall submit my name for the Republican senatorial nomination.

The Labor Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, appearing on page A5365 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the first progress report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, which was inserted by Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Subcommittee which is making the study.

A constituent who has read this report has called my attention to an editorial appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram and urges that the labor monopoly be studied along with monopoly of other big business. As a member of this subcommittee and pursuant to permission given to me by the House, I am inserting that editorial, which is as follows:

THE LABOR MONOPOLY

Various governmental action has been taken over the years against big business to break up monopolies. Court actions have been started to make certain that the public receives the benefit of competitive enterprise. Some have been successful and the public has reaped the reward.

The latest monopoly case is against the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which the Government says must be split up into smaller units. This suit is aimed at protecting the thousands of smaller grocery firms that find it difficult to compete with the big chain store's mass buying and processing methods. The public probably will get few price benefits if the action is successful. The small operators, however, will find it advantageous.

The Government is persistent in the fight against alleged big-business monopoly. But at the same time the Government has permitted the biggest monopoly in the Nation, the labor monopoly, to run hog-wild. The coal strike is a case in point. The labor that produces the Nation's coal is at the beck and call of one man, John L. Lewis. Nearly 500,000 miners in 20 States think and act as their boss does. Lewis and his miners have it within their power to literally freeze the Nation to death this winter.

They are out on strike now as the result of an argument over pensions, contracts, and wages. The argument has been sputtering along since June. The climax was reached when some operators refused to pay royalties into the pension fund. "No contract, no royalty payments" was their decision.

"No pensions, no work" was the union answer. Pension payments were halted because funds are nearly exhausted. Miners over 60 years of age have been drawing pensions of $100 a month from the fund. About $104,000,000 has been paid them this year. Because of contract troubles miners east of the Mississippi have been working only 3 days a week.

The merits of the coal dispute are relatively unimportant to the public. The public is concerned only with the price of coal and the supply available. The family with a coal stove or a coal furnace wants to be sure that its house will be warm this winter. They are not sure today. The public can be caught once again in a terrific squeeze applied by organized labor. Coal shortages may result. The shortage may increase the price. Actual suffering and a general dislocation of business and the national economy are entirely possible.

A similar situation has developed in the Missouri Pacific railroad strike. Hundreds of communities are without railroad service. Thousands of persons who have no direct interest in the strike or its merits are penalized. The same conditions result from electric and transit strikes and the big telephone strikes. The public is made to pay for the troubles of worker and employer. In so many cases labor, because of its tight monopoly, holds the whip hand.

The Government has taken practically no action against this labor monopoly that is more vicious than anything yet devised by big business. At times the labor monopoly actually gets encouragement from the Truman administration. In the steel dispute

the regular channels provided by the Taft-Hartley Act were bypassed. An independent fact-finding board was appointed, without power or authority, to hand down a decision that was not binding. It was a means to mold public opinion on the side of labor. The Administration played directly into the hands of labor and it fully intended to do so.

It is time for the public to insist that the Government be as forthright in dealing with the labor monopoly as it is in checking business monopolies. One is just as bad as the other. And right now the labor monopoly is causing the public more concern than oig business. The health and welfare of millions of Americans now is threatened by the labor monopoly in the coal industry. No big corporation or trust ever held such a threat over the actual health and welfare of millions. The public has little faith that it will get much protection from the Government, but it has every right to expect it. It is time to call a halt.

Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter addressed by me on September 14, 1949, to Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and his reply of a later date.

Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1949, contains certain references to Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller, Jr., involving implications which should not go unanswered. I wrote the Secretary of State on September 14 for full information. His reply, which is contained in the following self-explanatory letter, is, in my judgment, a full and complete answer to the inferences that might be made from the statements about Assistant Secretary Miller which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26. In the interest of fair play and justice, the answer should be given the same publicity as the statement to which I have referred.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1949.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 20 certain comments were made in the House regarding the association of Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller, with the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell which has acted as counsel to the Sabalo Transportation Co. in connection with the latter's claim against the Mexican Government.

In view of the wide publicity apparently given to the above statement, I do not believe that these allegations should be allowed to stand unanswered. I would therefore appreciate having full information on this matter for inclusion in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN KEE, *Chairman.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1949.

Hon. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KEE: I appreciate your concern, as expressed in your letter of September 14, about the remarks made in the House on August 26 in regard to Assistant Secretary Edward G. Miller, Jr.

In Representative WOLVERTON'S remarks as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1949, under the caption "Case of Mexican oil development" he referred to the fact that the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell of which Mr. Miller had been a member, had acted as counsel to Sabalo Transportation Co. in connection with the latter's claim against the Mexican Government and that this firm had made representations to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives with respect to this claim. He also made a statement to the effect that shortly after Mr. Miller was sworn in as Assistant Secretary of State, a document was transmitted to Mexico setting forth the conditions under which the United States Government would proceed in the matter of an oil loan to Petroleos Mexicanos. He then stated: "There may be no connection between the events that I have stated, but it is interesting to note that although months elapsed without any formal answer being made to Mexico, that an answer was made so shortly after the appointment of Mr. Miller to the post of Assistant Secretary in charge of Latin-American affairs."

The implication that Mr. Miller has not acted properly in this matter is fully refuted by the facts. Mr. Miller had been until his nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary of State on May 27, 1949, a member of the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, New York. I understand that his firm was retained by the Sabalo Co. in early 1948 as counsel to present its claim against the Mexican Government to the Department of State. This department and the American Embassy in Mexico City have for many years been aware of the circumstances whereby the Mexican Government as early as 1937, and prior to the expropriation decree of 1938, interfered with the exploitation by the Sabalo Co. of valuable oil rights of Sabalo in the Poza Rica field. Although you will appreciate that I personally have not followed the Sabalo matter at first hand, the following represents in substance my understanding of the background of the case.

The Sabalo Co. (which I understand is wholly owned by United States citizens), beginning in 1937, endeavored to obtain redress against the Mexican Government through legal proceedings for the violation of its contractual rights. After the matter had been pending without action in the Supreme Court of Justice of Mexico for many years, the company through its legal counsel presented its claim to the Department based on a denial of justice. This Department agreed that a denial of justice had occurred and also agreed that the Sabalo Co. had a legally valid claim against the Mexican Government. As early as April 1948, the Department instructed the American Embassy at Mexico to make official representations about the matter to the Mexican Government. These representations were met with the assertion on the part of the Mexican Foreign Office that the claim of the Sabalo Co. had been expropriated by the 1938 expropriation decree. This contention which had also been made by Pemex in defending Sabalo's lawsuit, was finally rejected when the Supreme Court of Mexico eventually made an interim decision in the case last February when the court also upheld the contention of Sabalo that the Mexican petroleum laws did not grant Pemex a monopoly in the petroleum industry. No further action in this case has been taken by the Mexican Supreme Court although the Department is informed that recently (but prior to Mr. Miller's nomination) the executive branch of the Mexican Government has expressed its willingness to commence discussions with Sabalo looking to a settlement of the case.

In addition, there are a number of smaller claims of American nationals, primarily for royalties, which have been pending against the Mexican Government for many years and which this Department felt should properly be referred to before any final position could be taken on the application of Pemex for financial assistance.

When the Sabalo Co. learned of the proposed discussions with the Mexican Government concerning the possibility of financial assistance, it took the position with this Department that no such financial assistance should be granted except on terms that would protect the rights of bona fide American claimants against the Mexican Government in the petroleum industry. After considering these representations on the part of Sabalo and having in mind the position of the other American claimants against Mexico in the petroleum industry, this Department through Assistant Secretary of State Thorp and other officers mentioned several times informally to Senator Bermudez the matter of claims, pointing out that the fairness of the treatment which the Mexican Government might accord to private American claimants in the petroleum industry was one of the elements which this Government would take into account in evaluating the good faith of the Mexican Government in its efforts to create a satisfactory atmosphere toward private capital. These representations were made long before Mr. Miller was nominated or took office and, so far as this Department is aware, Senator Bermudez never objected to the action of the Department in bringing up the matter of claims during the loan discussions. The Department has not at any time, however, taken the position that the settlement of claims was a condition precedent to the granting of financial assistance. On the other hand, the officers of this Department were, in my opinion, entirely justified in having brought up during the loan discussions the subject of unsettled private claims in the petroleum industry since this Government might open itself to severe criticism if it should aid with public funds a foreign government to develop an industry in which the rights of our nationals are disregarded by such foreign government. Furthermore, the suspension of the loan discussions on the part of the Mexican Government appears to have been related entirely to questions other than the settlement of private claims and we are still hopeful of reaching agreement with Mexico on the basis upon which it will be possible for us to aid the Mexican oil industry financially.

On May 28, 1949, Mr. Miller was nominated for Assistant Secretary, it being my intention at that time to designate him, as I subsequently did, to be in charge of American Republic Affairs. He is a person of outstanding qualifications in his field and in both public and private life has earned the respect of Latin Americans throughout the hemisphere. Prior to accepting this nomination, Mr. Miller discussed with officers of the Department, including the Under Secretary, his private connections, including his firm's representation of the Sabalo Co., and we decided that these connections did not disqualify Mr. Miller from accepting the position any more than, for example, a nominee for Justice of the Supreme Court would be disqualified because he had in private practice represented clients who might be litigants before the Court. Immediately after being nominated, and without awaiting confirmation by the Senate of his appointment, Mr. Miller resigned as a member of his law firm and after May 28, 1949, earned no income whatever from that firm. A copy of his

agreement of resignation has been placed in the records of the Department. You may be interested in order to know the complete scrupulousness with which this resignation was effected that, although Mr. Miller's partnership agreement provided in the event of resignation for liquidation of his interest in the firm over a 3-year period, his agreement of resignation provided for one lump-sum payment to be made to him immediately upon his resignation despite the adverse consequences of such procedure from the standpoint of personal-income tax. Thus Mr. Miller, having had his interest in his former firm valued and paid to him in full, had no further interest in that firm as from May 28, 1949. It follows from this that he has no further personal interest whatever in the outcome of the Sabalo case.

Nevertheless, as further evidence of Mr. Miller's good faith, immediately after being nominated on May 28, he sent a message to the Department to the effect that upon assuming office he would not wish to participate in any manner whatever in the consideration of the Sabalo case. This position was reduced to writing by Mr. Miller immediately after his assuming office at the end of June in a memorandum which is placed on the file in this Department in which he disqualified himself from any further consideration of the Sabalo case.

Early in July the Department communicated to the Mexican Ambassador its final position in connection with the Mexican loan discussions. This position had been entirely cleared within the Department and elsewhere in the Government prior to Mr. Miller's assuming office and Mr. Miller did at no time participate to any extent whatever in the preparation thereof, nor was Mr. Miller present at the meeting at which Under Secretary of State Webb finally communicated to the Mexican Ambassador our conclusions with respect to the discussions. This position, including the suggestions which were made concerning the settlement of claims, was in any event the position taken by this Department as a whole after long study of all of the factors involved and I can assure you that this Department's decisions are not subject to influence according to the personal interests of any officer.

I have known Mr. Miller intimately since 1941 and during the period 1941 to 1946 he was a loyal subordinate of mine in numerous capacities. He is known to me to be a person of honor, and I believe that his conduct in connection with the Sabalo matter as outlined above more than justifies the confidence that I have placed in him in returning him to Government service.

I trust that this information will clarify the situation for you, and I appreciate your desire to make it available to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Legislative Program for the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, so that all Members of this House may be on notice as to the national legislative program for the American Legion, I am including as part of my remarks Bulletin No. 37, compiled by Gen. John Thomas Taylor, director, national legislative commission. General Taylor is well known and he has prepared an interesting bulletin. I commend it to all Members of this body.

[Bulletin No. 37, 81st Cong., 1st sess., September 21, 1949]

THE AMERICAN LEGION—SUMMARY OF MANDATES CALLING FOR NATIONAL LEGISLATION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL CONVENTION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AUGUST 29, 30, 31, AND SEPTEMBER 1, 1949

REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation resolutions adopted by the convention recommended:

1. Amendatory legislation which will provide award of death pension to widows and children of World War II veterans on the same basis as has been provided in World War I cases, and the elevation of annual income limitation of $1,000 and $2,500 to $1,800 and $3,000, respectively (Resolution 26).

2. Establish total rating for disability pension purposes when veteran of World War I or World War II is hospitalized, bedridden, or helpless for 6 months or longer (Resolution 31).

3. Legislation to define "misconduct" for compensation and pension purposes as limited to acts of a felonious nature (Resolution 36).

4. Minimum statutory ratings for disabling residuals of minimal, moderately advanced and far-advanced cases of service-connected tuberculosis upon attainment of arrest (Resolution 156).

5. Restore full compensation in presumptively service-connected cases (Resolution 157).

6. Amendment of section 302, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that no disabled officer released from active military or naval service shall be denied right of review of application for retirement benefits (Resolution 64).

7. Provision for award of death compensation in non-service-connected deaths of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of service (Resolution 526).

8. Amendatory legislation to provide for award of additional disability compensation for dependents when service-connected disabilities are rated 10 percent or more in degree (Resolution 527).

9. Increase in death pension rates payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of both World Wars (Resolution 528).

10. Increase in death compensation rates payable to widows, children, and parents of deceased veterans of both World Wars (Resolution 531).

11. Legislation to provide for tolling retroactively and prospectively, of any and all statutory time limitations for filing of claims and supporting evidence for benefits under laws administered by any agency of the Federal Government, if the claimant, whether veteran, dependent, or beneficiary, because of insanity or minority, would otherwise be deprived of any right, benefit, privilege, or service, until 1 year after approval of the mandatory enactment or removal of legal disability, whichever is the later (Resolution 532).

12. Amendatory legislation to assure establishment of service connection of a chronic disease or dental disability in every case in which there is an equitable basis for presuming origin in active wartime military or naval service (Resolution 582).

13. Amendatory legislation providing exclusion of all commercial insurance in computation of annual income in determining entitlement to death pension (Resolution 590).

14. Amendment of the National Service Life Insurance Act to eliminate requirement that a parent be dependent for award of gratuitous insurance (Resolution 139).

15. Amendatory legislation to overcome VA interpretation of Technical Bulletin 9–44, assuring waiver of good-health requirement of application for life or disability insurance or for reinstatement if such insurance is filed prior to January 1, 1952, if applicant is less than totally disabled and has a disability or disabilities for which compensation is payable or would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree under VA-administered laws (Resolution 153).

16. Legislation amending the first sentence of paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation 2 (a) to read: "All questions on applications or claims involving rights, privileges, and benefits of any and all kinds under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be subject to one review on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, decisions in such cases to be made by the Board of Veterans' Appeals" (Resolution 525).

17. Legislative extension of the date for completion of vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16 (Resolution 241).

18. Federal appropriations for extension of existing medical facilities to provide more doctors (Resolution 122).

19. Reaffirms the American Legion's quarter-century position that adequate hospital beds be made available so that no veteran, whether or not service-connected, shall be denied needed medical care (Resolution 171).

20. Legislation to make permanent the $500 per annum Federal-aid allotment for each veteran in State and Territorial homes (Resolution 529).

21. Reaffirms the position of the American Legion in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance (Resolution 551).

22. Declares policy of the American Legion regarding Veterans' Administration hospital construction program—requires that the American Legion concentrates its forces and advocacy toward the full restoration of all previously authorized new construction and additions to existing hospitals—also requires that the national rehabilitation commission continue its study of future needs of additional beds, especially in the tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric category, at stress points throughout the country, to the end that there will be sufficient beds for the service-connected disabled and for those veterans unable to reasonably pay for their required hospitalization (Resolution 586).

23. Opposes any reduction, directly or indirectly, in any monetary or other benefit or service to which war veterans are entitled (Resolution 9).

24. Legislation to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be deemed active military service in World War II for the purpose of any and all laws administered by any agency of the Federal Government or of its subdivisions, providing that there was subsequent active service in the Women's Army Corps (Resolution 152).

25. Calls on Congress to provide sufficient funds for restoration to active duty of VA contact representatives in all areas where they may be needed (Resolution 240).

26. Urges Congress to reject that portion of the report of the Hoover Commission which pertains to activities of the Veterans' Administration, and requires that the organization continue to oppose the centralization of all Federal hospitalization and the removal of the insurance program from the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 315).

27. Calls upon the President and Congress to reconsider the request and data submitted by the Veterans' Administration, to the end that adequate funds will be supplied for the administration of the veterans' program during fiscal year 1950 (Resolution 432).

28. Criticizes the Bureau of the Budget for its attitude toward the hospital construction program, and asks that the national commander call upon the President of the United States to take advantage of his discretionary power to provide added funds for needed increase in hospital beds (Resolution 413).

WORLD WAR PENSIONS

A resolution was adopted commending Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the World War pension bill, H. R. 4617, and urging that the bill be enacted into law (Resolution 174).

SOCIAL SECURITY

Enactment of suitable legislation allowing maximum social-security credit for active time served in the armed forces of the United States during the period of World War II, such legislation to provide for the maximum wage credits of $250 per month and "quarters of coverage" toward a fully insured status (Resolution 294).

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PENSIONS

A resolution adopted urges revision of private and public pension systems, including the old-age and survivors' provisions under social security, so as to provide that beneficiaries shall be entitled to an adequate pension upon reaching the age of 60, instead of 65 as now generally provided (Resolution 394).

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE

Because of mounting increased employment of World War II veterans, a resolution was adopted calling on Congress to extend the time during which readjustment allowances may be paid under the GI bill, until July 25, 1951 (Resolution 53).

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

1. Expressing alarm at present efforts being made to change the Veterans Preference Act, the national convention adopted a strong resolution demanding that the Civil Service Commission administer the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act and to see to it that the heads of departments and agencies follow the intent and letter of the law, and placing the Legion on record "as opposing and condemning in every particular and without compromise, the Langer bill, Klein bill, Hoover report, and all other similar measures as being antiveteran and disruptive of the Federal service" (Resolution 4).

2. Another resolution relative to veterans' preference recommends that all "special preferance lists or registers" heretofore set up in any Federal establishment be immediately abolished, that appointive officers be prohibited from establishing special preference lists or registers, and that any officers or employees of the Federal Government found guilty of resorting to any device or act, having for its effect the defeat of the intents and purposes of the act, shall be summarily dismissed from the service (Resolution 597).

3. Another resolution recommends amendment of the law providing for reimbursement for the period veterans were illegally separated from their positions to cover incidences where veterans are improperly reduced in rank, or their compensation cut, and later restored to their positions (Resolution 636).

4. Another resolution recommends that the President, Congress, and the Census Bureau be petitioned to grant unemployed veterans preference in the selection of personnel designated to conduct and enumerate the 1950 census (Resolution 494).

5. Urges that the veterans' service section and the regional veterans' employment representatives of the United States Civil Service Commission be maintained at a high level and strengthened, and that said veteran service be expanded to provide in each State for the necessary staff so as to assure the proper services for veterans, including counsel and aptitude tests (Resolution 109).

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

A resolution was adopted recommending that the Secretary of Labor and the Chief of Veterans' Placement Service be requested to ask for a supplemental appropriation to restore the field staff of the Veterans' Employment Service to the former number of assistant veterans' employment representatives to 350, plus necessary clerical staff (Resolution 5).

HOUSING

Declaring that the housing of veterans since the close of the last war has been an urgent problem, the national convention passed a resolution recommending to the Federal Government that continued efforts be made toward a solution of this problem (Resolution 43).

Other housing recommendations were contained in resolutions to—

1. Request the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and any and all other Government agencies and organizations to immediately construct, by the use of public funds, facilities within the Territory of Alaska for the manufacture of cement and to put said facilities into operation immediately upon the completion thereof (Resolution 182).

2. That the Public Housing Administration or any Federal agency offering for sale any housing properties built and operated by the Federal Government or its agencies be required to offer for a period of 6 months said properties offered for sale to any group of veterans formed for the purpose of purchasing the housing project at a purchase price at the governmental cost, less depreciation and obsolescence, or the fair market value, whichever of the two is less; and, in no event, shall the Public Housing Administration or any Federal agency sell such properties offered for sale at a price less than offered to the veterans group (Resolution 327).

3. That Congress be petitioned to make every effort to have the Federal Housing Act extended to the Virgin Islands to afford beter housing facilities for veterans and their families (Resolution 610).

4. Enactment of the Sparkman bill, S. 2246, which includes many Legion recommendations to solve the veterans' housing problem (Resolution 653).

5. Enactment of new Federal legislation (a) requiring the builders of a new home, federally financed, to file with the Federal Financing Agency complete plans and specifications for such home, and (b) requiring such builder to furnish to the purchaser of such home full warranty that it has been constructed in full conformity with the plans and specifications so filed, and (c) making the willful or fraudulent failure to construct such in accordance with such plans and specifications a crime (Resolution 654).

AGRICULTURE

A resolution was adopted urging Congress to supply ample funds to enable veterans to obtain necessary loans and supervision to assist them in becoming established on farms (Resolution 7).

TERMINAL LEAVE

A resolution was adopted recommending that the Armed Forces Leave Act be amended so as to provide that all terminal leave granted to the enlisted personnel be termed as active service and that enlisted personnel be entitled to all benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period of terminal leave as if such period of terminal leave was in active service (Resolution 334).

PRISONERS OF WAR

Referring to funds belonging to the Japanese Government which were impounded by the United States Government, a resolution was adopted to the effect "that the American Legion be wholeheartedly in favor and support of the legislation reimbursing said members of the armed forces and such members of their families, or their widows, orphans, or other rightful heirs, who had accounts on deposit with the Philippine Trust Co. or its branch banks, from said funds belonging to the Japanese Government which were impounded by the United States Government, with 2 percent compound interest to the date of payment on said accounts from the last date of payment of inteerst thereon; upon certification of these amounts by the said Philippine Trust Co. and its branch banks in which such accounts were on deposit" (Resolution 207).

WAR DEAD

Resolutions adopted recommend—

1. That Congress be petitioned to investigate the need for more national cemeteries, and, if shortage exists, that steps be taken to remedy the situation (Resolution 244).

2. Legislation providing an all-Government-expense pilgrimage for the nearest-of-kin relatives to visit the graves of their husbands, sons, and daughters who have given their last full measure of devotion to their country at time of war (Resolution 422).

3. That immediate steps be taken to secure the allocation of additional acreage for cemetery purposes in view of the fact that the present rate of utilization of the ground now allocated for burial purposes at Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery indicates that within 2 years no more space will be available (Resolution 534).

4. For the same reason, recommendation was made that similar action be taken in connection with the national cemetery at Cairo, Ill. (Resolution 420).

5. That Congress amend the present law to respond to the requests of next of kin by providing, at Government expense, memorial grave markers of the type and quality now provided by the Government for erection in the cemetery chosen by the next of kin (Resolution 419).

6. That Congress enact a law extending the time limit on applications for the refunding of income taxes to survivors of servicemen who lost their lives during World War II to at least December 31, 1950 (Resolution 576).

CHILD WELFARE

Appropriate Federal legislation making child desertion a criminal offense (Resolution 251).

THE AMERICAN LEGION CHARTER

Resolution was passed recommending that the American Legion charter be amended to provide a better control over the American Legion emblem, badge, and its seal (Resolution 188).

OPPOSE VETERANS BENEFITS TO NONVETERANS

A resolution was adopted expressing opposition to any legislation granting to former members of the merchant marine any benefits or any benefits akin to those normally granted veterans for their rehabilitation, and similarly opposes the granting of such benefits to former members of the American field service, Coast Guard temporary reservists (except those on full-time active duty), Civilian Air Patrol, American Red Cross, Office of Strategic Services (civilians), and other nonmilitary or quasi-military groups (Resolution 302).

POSTAGE RATES

The national convention unanimously went on record opposing pending legislation to increase postage rates, which increase would seriously affect 500 American Legion publications (Resolution 25).

AMERICANISM

1. Senate bill 1681, declaring the picketing of the courts of the United States an offense, was unanimously approved by the national convention (Resolution 286).

2. A resolution was adopted requesting Congress to amend naturalization laws so as to require all applicants for citizenship to declare on oath unequivocally to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America, the Government thereof, and its Constitution and laws, and to support and defend the same by force of arms, if required, against all enemies, foreign and domestic (Resolution 370).

3. The convention adopted a resolution recommending legislation favoring compulsory fingerprinting of all persons in the United States (Resolution 376).

4. Another resolution recommends that appropriate legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the various States, whereby employers shall be held free from all liability whatsoever for the discharge of any employee because—

(1) He is now a member of or prior to employment failed to discharge membership in the Communist Party, or any organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States; or

(2) That he has refused to state whether he is or has knowingly and willingly been a member of the Communist Party or affiliated organizations when questioned by a duly constituted legislative committee (Resolution 484).

5. The convention unanimously endorsed and urged speedy enactment of Senate bill 595 and House bill 2311, to strengthen present antispy laws, to assist law-enforcing agencies in their efforts to round up foreign spies and their collaborators (Resolution 372).

6. Taking cognizance of the communistic pattern to slander and publish libel concerning the legislative branch of our Government, which is composed for the most part of veterans of both world wars and other loyal Americans, the national convention adopted a resolution commending "Those distinguished and patriotic Members of Congress forming part of the Senate and House of Representatives, for their loyal and patriotic endeavors on behalf of the progress of our country and for their Americanism and support of our American ideals of life" (Resolution 379).

7. Another resolution urges Congress to pass legislation permitting honorably discharged veteran aliens of the military and naval forces of the United States, whose service was during World War II, to enter and remain in the United States for the purpose of acquiring citizenship, on the principle that a person who fights for the United States is good enough to live in the United States. The resolution further states that nothing contained therein should be deemed to extend this privilege to any person whose sole war service was in the merchant marine (Resolution 486).

8. Regarding displaced persons and other pending immigration legislation, the convention unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved,* That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 30, 31, and September 1, 1949, demand of our Government heads that they strictly adhere to the existing laws and quotas allowing immigration to the United States and particularly adhere to the laws now in force applying to displaced persons and rather than place any additional burden on the people of America by increasing the quotas of immigration; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we take steps to curtail as far as possible any further immigration to this country at the present time" (Resolution 554).

9. The convention adopted a resolution reiterating the stand of the American Legion in favor of the enactment of legislation to outlaw communism and Communists in the United States (Resolution 74).

10. The Legion also went on record as favoring legislation to deny and prohibit the granting of benefits under the GI bill of rights and scholarships from the Atomic Energy Commission to Communists or members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States (Resolution 389).

11. A strong resolution was adopted demanding that the House of Representatives continue the Un-American Activities Committee and that sufficient appropriations be promptly provided for its work (Resolution 373).

12. Referring to statements made by certain persons enjoying the rights and privileges of citizenship in the United States, the convention adopted a resolution urging Congress, the President, and the Attorney General to immediately begin proceedings against all who have openly expressed their disloyalty to the United States (Resolution 344).

13. The convention unanimously approved the so-called Mundt-Nixon bills, S. 2311 and H. R. 3342, to regulate and control activities of Communist and Communist-front organizations (Resolution 388).

14. Another resolution registers the protest of the American Legion against the readmission into the United States of aliens who have been deported, and persons whose citizenship has been revoked for proven disloyalty, whether such readmission be upon temporary visas or other means of entry into this country (Resolution 380).

15. A resolution adopted recommends "That section 406, paragraph (h), of the Nationality Act of 1940 be amended to include in the exceptions to the application of section 404, veterans of the Second World War, and it further recommended that the act be made retroactive to include those veterans of World War II, whose time has expired under the 3-year limitation of the present act" (Resolution 13).

The convention reaffirmed the policy of the American Legion that all persons receiving salaries, etc., in whole or in part from public funds, shall be required to take an oath of loyalty to the Government of the United States of America (Resolution 382).

NATIONAL SECURITY

A comprehensive policy of national security, in the interest of world peace, was adopted by the national convention, and includes the following recommendations (committee report adopted):

1. Military preparedness to the extent that our policy for peace can never again out-run our ability to enforce it. This national defense program may well mean the difference between survival or annihilation. There has never been a time in the world's history when science could so effectively destroy man and his institutions so completely as today. Positive action for peace of a long-term nature is therefore imperative.

2. That practical and effective unification of the Armed Services be made an actuality at the earliest possible time.

3. That the American Legion plan of national security training, based upon the findings of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, is reaffirmed as the foundation of our military manpower and security.

4. That the American Legion reexamine its historic sponsorship of the principle of universal service in time of war and that a sound and acceptable plan, safeguarded under congressional controls, be formulated as a coordinated part of national security in time of war.

5. That education for leadership be expanded through more efficient employment of civilian educational institutions to supplement the national academies, to the end that a federally sponsored and subsidized educational program of training for leadership in all of the armed services should be established by law.

Other national security resolutions adopted by the convention:

1. Support the military pay adjustment bill passed by the House of Representatives and now under consideration in the Senate, and urges passage of said bill during the present session of Congress (Resolution 656).

2. Reaffirms the American Legion policy that the atomic energy program be continued under civilian control, and that the atomic bomb be retained as the exclusive possession of the United States (Resolution 670).

3. Recommend that a United States Air Academy be established (Resolution 258).

4. Urge Congress to enact legislation for the development of prototype cargo and transport aircraft by an interdepartmental board of the Government primarily for commercial use, but suitable for military use in the event of an emergency (Resolution 663).

5. Recommend that the Civil Aeronautics Administration and other appropriate agencies of the Government be given adequate funds to continue to completion research and development in the field of all-weather flying devices (Resolution 664).

6. Reaffirm the American Legion long-held interest in the lighter-than-air branch of aeronautics, both military, naval, and commercial, and call upon the Secretary of Defense, the Navy Department, the Congress and all governmental agencies and activities to take realistic steps toward the expeditious accomplishment of adequate program for military, naval, and commercial airships (dirigibles) under our flag (Resolution 667).

7. Recommend legislation for the establishment of airships in our merchant marine (Resolution 667).

8. Recommend legislation to authorize a succession of 5-year programs, reviewable yearly, for research, development and procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and naval air arm for the purpose of maintaining the industry in a state of production capable of rapid expansion (Resolution 668).

9. Recommend that the financial support of the Civil Air Patrol from the Air Force be limited to surplus material and funds for administrative purposes only (Resolution 666).

10. Vigorously demand that immediate and effective action be taken at the Federal level to develop a sound and acceptable civil-defense plan (Resolution 203).

11. Recommend that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to implement the reserve program of the United States Coast Guard (Resolution 409).

12. Call upon Congress to provide necessary funds for erection of proper housing at bases where the need shall have been declared to exist by competent military authority (Resolution 519).

13. The following resolution relative to legislation for the merchant marine was adopted (Resolution 662):

"*Resolved,* That the American Legion request—

"(a) That the Congress enact legislation which will encourage private capital to construct, maintain, and operate merchant ships of sufficient numbers, sizes, and types to enable it to answer the demands of our national security and economy;

"(b) That such legislation enunciate a policy guaranteeing United States flag merchant vessels at least 50 percent of our overseas commerce;

"(c) That the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to maintain and keep in good preservation for immediate availability the number of vessels of the national defense Reserve fleet as requested by the Military Establishment;

"(d) That prompt and retaliatory legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States to protect United States shipping from discriminatory practices by any foreign country;

"(e) That the Congress of the United States enact legislation prohibiting the practice of charging noncompensatory rates by competing land carriers;

"(f) That the Congress provide a Panama Canal toll policy which will reflect fair and equitable charges, based upon the actual cost of transiting all vessels, including military ships;

"(g) That the Congress reactivate, with the necessary appropriations, the statement of policy contained in the Merchant Marine

Act of 1936, recognizing the equal importance of the American merchant marine to other components of our national security; and

"(h) That the Congress enact legislation effectuating a positive promotional campaign to educate the American public to the need for an adequate merchant marine."

14. The convention went on record as recommending that personnel of the armed forces presently in an inactive, retired, or limited physical disability status, be used to the maximum practical extent in all the manpower procurement agencies of the National Military Establishment (Resolution 202).

15. The convention also favored the granting of military leave with pay for substitute postal employees (Resolution 499).

16. Congress was urged to enact, without further delay, a long-range armory-construction program for the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps (Resolution 661).

17. The convention unanimously adopted a resolution urging the establishment of a simple, consolidated, and uniform code of justice for all branches of the armed forces of the United States, and that the uniform, consolidated system should, in addition to having full jurisdiction over all courts martial, also have full jurisdiction over all boards of review of discharges and dismissals and over all boards for the correction of military records (Resolution 652).

RETIREMENT OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

A resolution was adopted recommending that H. R. 5007 be amended by inserting the following new subsection (Resolution 512):

"(1) All members of the Reserve components heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retirement pay because of physical disability shall be entitled to the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges by law or regulation for retired members of the Regular services.'

ARMY EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS

A resolution was adopted recommending that the Army Emergency Relief Funds created during World War II, and now in approximately the amount of $13,000,000, be kept under their present control, direction, and restriction (Resolution 300).

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The convention adopted a resolution urging Congress to authorize the immediate release of the required funds as recommended by the Board of Trustees of the United States Soldiers' Home, in order that additional required facilities may be erected without any further delay (Resolution €02).

TERRITORIES

Stating that the Territories of Hawaii and and Alaska are necessary for our defense as our western outpost, the American Legion urges that the Congress of the United States take the necessary action to admit said Territories to statehood (Resolution 513).

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A comprehensive resolution on foreign affairs was unanimously adopted which (committee report adopted)—

1. Reasserts the allegiance of the American Legion to an American foreign policy which relentlessly defends the American ideals of liberty and independence, for which we fought and won two world wars.

2. Supports a positive program to stop the next war before it starts.

3. Opposes communism under any cloak and maintains that appeasement of the aggressor constitutes surrender of our freedom on the instalment plan.

4. Because a collapse of America's economy would end all hope of peace for ourselves and others, opposes overextension of our own resources.

5. Restates the Legion plan to strengthen the United Nations by limitation of the use of veto powers in matters of aggression, international control of scientific weapons, and the establishment of an effective international police force.

6. Expresses renewed hope in the economic gains in western Europe, which have been stimulated by the European recovery program.

7. States that to maintain and consolidate these economic gains is the purpose of our economic help through ECA to those who first helped themselves.

8. Wholeheartedly approves the North Atlantic Pact.

9. Recommends a realistic and adequate program of military assistance to Atlantic Pact countries to provide both an assurance of aid and the means to resist aggression.

10. Urges Atlantic Pact countries to help in the strengthening of the United Nations Charter so eventually it will be the United Nations, and not the North Atlantic countries, that will police world aggressors.

11. Commends all European countries who are combating the insidious forces of communism, and urges continued vigilance against the revival of nazism, fascism, or any form of totalitarianism.

12. Appeals to the Chinese people to throw out all foreign ideolcgies which are aimed at establishment of totalitarian domination of the Chinese people in the interest of a foreign power.

13. Urges our Government to lend its immediate aid in forming a regional pact, under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, composed of those freedom-loving countries of the Pacific and far eastern area who, through self-help and mutual aid, desire to guarantee their mutual defense and to preserve individual liberties.

14. Urges the State Department to use all practical means to get the truth of the American way of life throughout the world.

15. Approves in principle the scientific and technical assistance program of point 4 which is being developed to aid the economic recovery of war-torn and undeveloped areas of the world, as long as the projects coming within the scope of this program are developed through a system of free and private enterprise.

16. Recommends full governmental cooperation with our citizens who work or live abroad.

17. Favors the strengthening of our diplomatic service by the inclusion of a greater proportion of specially selected and trained nonpolitical personnel.

18. As any foreign policy is dependent upon the economic and military strength of the United States, proposes that our economy remain free and our armed forces strong.

In addition to the American Legion mandates listed above, there are a large number of active mandates of our two governing bodies, adopted at prior meetings of our national convention and national executive committee, on many of which action has been taken during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, information concerning same having been furnished you in our legislative bulletins.

A Resolution in Regard to Our Obligation to the Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, considering the inestimable sacrifice, courageous and militant fight waged by the Polish people in two hemispheres during the two world wars to preserve justice, humanitarian treatment, democracy, and peace for the world, I deem it expedient that our Government do everything within its power to restore a reasonable amount of the Polish homeland for the Polish people driven into exile that they may once again gain a new lease on life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and grow strong to help us further reenforce the cause of democracy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the M. R. Falcons Nest, No. 4, of Polish Falcons of America at South Bend, Ind.:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1949.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the heroic Polish Nation was the first to fight against the tyranny of a Nazi Fascist Germany with all its inherent evils; and

Whereas the Polish people for centuries past, and to this day, have done all that is in their power to promote democracy for all nations, even to the extent of deliberately sacrificing their own lands and lives so that we might enjoy our liberties; and

Whereas the lands granted to Poland on their western borders are historically and ethnically Polish and it is surely small compensation to offer the Polish Nation in return for the misery and sufferings that were their lot under the yoke of the most sadistic enemy of mankind that the world has ever seen; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and other Allied Powers decided to deprive Poland of approximately half of her territories in the east and to compensate Poland, our ally, with recovered territories from an enemy who has killed and maimed thousands upon thousands of our American boys who fought in two world wars under the impression that they were fighting for truth, liberty, and justice; and

Whereas millions of Poles were arbitrarily forced to leave their homes that had been occupied by their families for centuries when Russia was given Polish territory leaving them only the western lands to migrate to; and

Whereas Poland, who has never killed one American boy in the course of history, was never asked if she agreed to the rendering away from her of her territories in the east, who suffered more than did any nation in this last war, whether victor or vanquished, is now prostrate in the ruins of once beautiful cities and prosperous farm lands with her population decimated and suffering from malnutrition and disease; and

Whereas we watch with apprehension the sacrifice of American ideals of democracy and fair play wherein we see our Government playing into the bloody hands of the German imperialists, the very things our American boys gave their lives against: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the M. R. Falcons Nest, No. 4, of Polish Falcons of America, at South Bend, Ind., a national fraternal and gymnastic association, does hereby strongly decry the efforts of United States officials in Germany to appease these selfsame German imperialists by trying to return to them these historically and ethnically Polish lands now rightfully held by the gallant Polish people to "relieve the artificial overpopulation of western Germany"; the same plaint was made after the First World War, to these same Germans who thought nothing of crowding millions of innocent women and children into concentration camps under the most horrible conditions and then sending these millions to their deaths in the gas chambers; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That in view of the heroic deeds and the unswerving loyalty for which the

late Franklin D. Roosevelt called them the "inspiration of nations," we beg against any further abusing or mutilating of the boundaries or lives of Poland or her people who, after all, are also human beings, such as we; this should not be tolerated and certainly not advocated by United States officials either here or abroad.

M. R. FALCONS NEST, NO. 4, OF POLISH FALCONS OF AMERICA,
JOHN S. WALEWSKI, *President.*
ANTHONY KAPSA, *Recording Secretary.*

Pay Day for Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following monthly economic letter from the Northeast Farm Foundation, Ithaca, N. Y., August 1, 1949:

PAY DAY FOR JONES

Jones regarded his 2 weeks' pay check and the little accompanying slips thoughtfully. Slightly over $10 out for Federal income tax alone. Twenty dollars a month going to Washington to take care of big and little bureaucrats, big and little hand-outs, big and little countries overseas. Plus three-fifty out for this thing called social security. Plus the State income tax still to be piled on top of this.

"Could use some of that myself," mused Jones, as though the thought were a new one. He repeated the general thought aloud to his fellow worker, Smith.

"You're only smelling of the cork now," observed the other drily. "There's a lot more poison in the bottle."

"I s'pose so," agreed Jones rather vaguely.

"Ever take any note of the taxes you pay out in the course of a day?"

"No; I never did. Be happier not to, I guess."

"Yeah. But it might be smarter if we did." Smith spoke with a little edge in his voice. "I'm getting to the point where it's nip and tuck to make ends meet. This tax load is just simply getting bigger than we're equipped to handle."

Jones considered this. The more he considered it, the bigger and tougher it loomed. He recalled his own monthly struggle to get the bills paid, the annual battle to pay local taxes, school taxes, State and county taxes on his home, the annual bout with the income-tax bureaus. All of a sudden the burden of running this biggest and most expensive of governments seemed to weigh upon his particular shoulders. He felt oppressed by it.

At coffee time, he bought a carton of cigarettes, the price being 19 cents a pack. Slightly tax conscious by this time, Jones queried the clerk as he broke open a pack:

"How much of this 19 cents is tax?"

"Well," answered the tobacco man, "somewhere around 9 cents of it goes to the Federal Government and around 3 cents to the State. Roughly 12 cents of it is tax."

"You mean to say I could buy this pack for 7 cents instead of 19 cents if it weren't for the tax?"

"Yes, a little less than 7 cents right now."

"Sure," said his friend back in the office when Jones commented on the item. "Tobacco is loaded with taxes. Believe it or not, the Government collected almost twice as much taxes on tobacco last year as the farmers got for the whole crop. The farmers got about a billion dollars. Then the tax men piled on near two billion for you and me to squirm under. Saw the figures in a Government bulletin."[1]

"Fine thing," said Jones. This load on his daily smokes was insult added to injury.

It was this frame of mind which prompted him to eye the sign on the gasoline pump where he stopped to fill up at noon. "Price 17 cents per gallon, tax 7 cents."

"Gimme 10 gallons of high-tax," he said rather sourly. The filling station man had heard it before. He merely grunted sympathetically. He didn't like it, either.

"The Government take was plenty on this bus you're using it in," he commented.

"Right. Tax on this car was $120, come to think of it."

"Don't forget a $20-a-year license to run it, plus driver's license."

"Two billion a year motorists pay in taxes, so I've heard."

"Expensive country, ain't it?"

"You said it!" answered Jones.

He stopped to telephone Uncle Jim in New York. The girl at the switchboard handed him a slip that read, "toll charge 60 cents, tax 15 cents." Well, he had business in New York Monday and he had to make some plans by word of mouth, tax or no tax.

To get his transportation arranged, he drove around by the railroad station and bought a ticket. The ticket with berth, had an item on it, "tax $3.99." Jones crammed it in his wallet and while at the station went around to the freight office to see about the new sink he had ordered from the mail-order house. It was there. The clerk made out a bill and handed it to him. Yes, the inevitable trimming—"tax 35 cents."

"Doggone taxes jump out at you from everywhere. Sneak up on you," muttered Jones to himself as he paid the freight.

This being Saturday afternoon, Mary had come into town to do some shopping and they went about it together. His impending trip to New York caused a window full of leather luggage to catch Jones' eye.

"Could use a new bag like that," he remarked. But a second glance took the joy out of it. The sign said, "Price $30, tax $6, total $36."

"Sure, I see what that sign says. I could use a new fur coat, too," observed his wife in like vein, "but who's going to pay $40 tax on top of a $200 coat? Not the likes of us. If they want ordinary folks to buy things like this, let 'em take off those ridiculous taxes and get prices down to reason."

From which it appeared that the Jones family was becoming slightly resentful of the white man's burden. And somehow they had begun to feel rather uneasy about the whole thing, too, a vague feeling as though some giant octopus had them in its clutches and was applying the squeeze.

In a drug store Mary bought a roll of film, tax 15 percent, and some toilet preparations, tax 20 percent. In the window of the jeweler next door she regarded the tempting gems, tax 20 percent. They passed a bright-fronted movie and Jones read aloud the admissions price: 75 cents, tax 15 cents.

"A fifth of it is tax," he remarked as they passed by.

Mary bought a few household articles and some cloth to make dresses for the girls. The clerk made out the sales slip, adding the final item: "sales tax 12 cents." Jones regarded that meager item as though it might sting him, which, in fact, was not far from the effect.

They talked it over further as they finally entered a restaurant.

"Never realized what a racket this has got to be," observed Jones thoughtfully, "goes right on, day in and day out, not let-up."

"Why, it's terrible. Every single move you make, they snare you with a tax. Seems to me about time this thing ought to have something done about it."

Jones was beginning to be of that mind, too.

"Here is the light bill with a tax hitched on to it. Of course the gas bill does, too, and the phone bill. And notice of a tax to pay on the dog. License tax if I so much as go fishing. Can't have a cocktail even, without swallowing about three big taxes."

Jones' tone was that of a man slightly puzzled by it all. Somehow that high cost of being an American citizen seemed to have overtaken him all at once. He knew, however, that this wasn't so sudden. It had been going on quite a while.

They caught sight of Smith in the restaurant, and he came over and joined them. Evidently he had done some thinking on this subject.

Jones regaled him with some of the things they had been noticing.

"Can't maintain half the populace on a charity basis and on top of that support most of Europe and some of Asia, without taking it out of our hides," summed up Smith.

"Who's reaching into our pockets like this? Is it the city or the State or Washington?"

"Well, all of them, of course, but most especially Washington. Before the war (1940) the total State-and-local tax haul was 8½ billions, Federal Government 5½ billions But now that Potomac camel has grown till he's pushing everybody else out of the tent; now State and local alone take 14½ billions, but Washington takes $40,000,000,000 That's in 1 year, you understand. One year's bite out of the people."

"How can those Government boys spend it, with only 300 working days a year to write checks in?"

"Well, sir, believe it or not, they're actually spending more than that. Even more than they take away from us. The Government closed its books this year almost 2 billions in the red. And this coming year they're set to spend probably 5 billions more than they rake in, in taxes. They'll just have to go to the banks and borrow. Can you beat that? The fact is, the Government has spent more money these last 4 years than in all the preceding 169 years since the founding of the country. Talk about spenders——"

"What's the matter with those fellows down there? Are they insane?"

"No; they're about the same kind of folks as you and I. But there's a new philosophy floating around the last dozen years. A socialistic idea that the Government can support the people. The idea is to take property away from everyone who has any, by this taxation process, and give it to favored groups. Pass it out in pensions, subsidies, cheap food, free medical care, partly free housing, free college education, unemployment relief, social-security doles, and so on."

"Plus a big hand-out for Europe?"

"Oh, sure, a big piece of pie for Europe. Twenty-eight billions dished out to our friends overseas in the last 3 years. Eight billions more to be given to them this year."

"What do they do over there with all that money?"

"Oh, the most of it goes across, not in cash but in goods. What they take from us is more valuable than money. The money only serves as counters, like poker chips. What they take is our real wealth: Our steel, lumber, oil, coal, grain, meat, fertilizer, machinery, and the like. Yes; it's a mighty big piece of pie for Europe. And, of course, you and I have to pay for it. Let's hope it's a good investment."

Mary broke in to ask, "What's our biggest expense here at home?"

"Well, our military machine is the biggest single item. The Army, Navy, and Air Force take over a third of the whole budget. Costs money to keep up a good defense machine.

[1] The Agricultural Situation, USDA, June 1949, p. 10.

But the services waste a pile, too. Those brass hats spend money like water. They could tighten up on the waste a whole lot without hurting their efficiency the least bit. Every man who's been in the service knows that."

Jones nodded. He'd seen plenty of such waste at first hand.

"What about the ordinary cost of running the Government?"

"Twice what it should be. I've done considerable work in Government service. I know how it is. There isn't a civilian department in Washington but what could be cut in half and still perform its necessary functions."

"Yeah, but Congress keeps right on appropriating more and more money, not only for running the Government, but for all kinds of new things. How about that?"

"True. One socialistic project after another. This new housing law is a sample: 810,000 new houses to be built, financed with taxpayers' money. Will cost 10 to 20 billions, nobody can figure how much. Same idea I mentioned—theory that Government can support the people, instead of other way around. Takes some tall taxes out of us little fellows to play that kind of game."

"Well, they're tall, all right. Here's one—family named Carter moved into our block last week. Nice fellow. Told me the tax on his moving bill amounted to over $10. Had to pay taxes on his deed of course, and on the mortgage. Literally can't move without being taxed."

"Yes, taxes are piled on everything. These particular things are out where you can see them. But back of them are a whole jungle of hidden taxes that we are stuck with and can't even see. Take this margarine here on the table. We know that's taxed. But we don't think about the same taxes we have to eat in bread or cake or anything that has shortening in it.

"This bread, made probably from Dakota wheat, has some high railroad and corporation taxes in it, too, and these oranges from Florida are loaded down with special truck and highway taxes. Ditto the cream and the vegetables. The clothes we're wearing have got a lot of hidden taxes in them. My shirt cost $3 and somewhere around a dollar of that is taxes of one kind or another."

"That's an outrage!" interjected Mary.

"The politicians kid us along by piling taxes on the corporations," Smith went on. "The corporations don't really pay those high taxes, they just serve as tax collectors. The fact is that we working folks pay virtually every one of those corporation taxes. All these high charges levied on the manufacturers and processors and distributors actually come right out of you and me. They're passed right along to us in the price of the product."

Smith leveled a finger at his friend.

"Do you know there are six and a quarter million people on the public pay rolls? Six and a quarter million of those living off you and me? Do you know that you work every single Monday all day and Tuesday forenoon besides, just for them—that they eat up your and my and every other workingman's entire earnings for 1 day out of every 4? That's how it is. A year's taxes now amount to $1,450 levied on every average family of four people."

"Well, by George, this whole thing has reached the point where it scares me. You know it wouldn't be hard for a government operating like this to take away everything that we small fellows have. It isn't necessary for our people to be bled like this. Can't the expenses of government be cut?"

"Of course they can be cut."

"Where is the place to begin?"

"The way to cut is to cut. Say, 10 percent right across the board, for a starter. Of course every officeholder in the country will howl like a coyote, but let 'em howl. This thing is serious for you and me. We don't have to be complete suckers and do nothing about it. When our forefathers were taxed beyond endurance, they did something about it."

"How're you going to make that idea register?"

"By pressure on the politicians—on every one of them from the President down. Rise up or our hind legs and tell 'em so they understand it: Cut taxes or we'll defeat you next time up."

"The so-called have-nots, these folks on the receiving end—and there are a lot of them—they won't like it."

"Correct. They won't like it. So what? Let's have a showdown and see which side of the fence the people of this country are on. I think you'd find that the sane, sensible, hard-working people who pay the bills are in a majority. They have a cause, all right. They've got to have leadership. They've got to have the issue presented squarely. And after that, they've really got to fight for themselves."

Smith paused and regarded his plate thoughtfully.

"The one most direct and practical attack on this whole socialistic idea," he said slowly, "is to cut taxes. It's the unlimited power to tax you and me that gives these spenders their leverage. Clip their fantastic income once and we'll have a lot less socialism in this country."

"Well," said Jones, "that pay check I got this morning has got to last 2 weeks, and some besides. Either it actually does that or I'm sunk. But it spreads thinner every time. Pay day has gotten to be merely pay-out day."

He paused to buy a paper from a polite little newsboy. Spreading it out on the table, all three diners stared at the headline.

The bold, black letters that looked up at them read: "Washington thinks higher taxes are a must."

Jones regarded it a moment, then uncapping his fountain pen, scratched out the word "higher" and wrote in its place the word "lower."

"Natural mistake of the politicians, under present conditions," he observed gently. "We'll have to set them straight."

Progress of Federal Law Against False Advertisement of Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an address made by Hon. James W. Cassedy, of Brookhaven, Miss., associate general counsel, Federal Trade Commission, made before the division on food, drug, and cosmetic law, section of corporation banking and mercantile law, American Bar Association, at St. Louis, Mo., on September 7, 1949:

PROGRESS OF FEDERAL LAW AGAINST FALSE ADVERTISEMENT OF FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

(By James W. Cassedy [1])

As a fellow member of this association I deem it a pleasure to appear here today and, as the representative of the Federal Trade Commission, I consider it a privilege to discuss the progress of the Federal law against false advertisement of food, drugs, and cosmetics. While this subject may be familiar to many of you, there are, however, some important aspects of it which are quite generally overlooked and to these I invite your attention and consideration.

Advertising was conceived to advocate, promote, and aid the selling of goods and one of its chief objectives is to make known the merits of a commodity. It has been said that advertising is today the greatest living force in business; that every effort made to keep it clean and honest intensifies its power; and that the elimination of every doubtful and misleading word in a published advertisement creates greater confidence and increases sales.[2]

It was early recognized that false advertising would not only injure the purchaser, the competitor, and the public, but also would undermine the general credence given to published statements and would be detrimental to advertising as a whole. It has, therefore, not been questioned that the individual purchaser, the honest competitor, and the public generally are entitled to be protected from false advertising.

Advertising has been defined as an investment in public confidence.[3] Measured by the present cost of advertising volume for all commodities in the United States, advertisers are now expending nearly $4,000,000,000 a year. Advertising has thus become one of our largest industries, and, in my opinion, the protection which Federal law against false advertising has given this tremendous investment in public confidence has aided its growth and success.

The growth of advertising during the early part of the present century gave rise to many questions. To what extent should advertising be regulated? To what extent should the seller advertising his goods be held responsible for falsity? What protection should or could be given the honest competitor who truthfully advertises his products? These were but a few of the many questions that urgently required answers.

At the beginning of the present century little progress in regulating false advertising had been made. Old common-law concepts prevailed and their cornerstone was caveat emptor, let the buyer beware.

The common law remedies available to a purchaser through actions in tort based upon deceit and negligence, through actions in contract based upon breach of warranty, and available to a competitor through injunctive proceedings were of little value in the regulation of false advertising. An action in tort for deceit or negligence could be instituted only after an injury had been done, while an action in contract for breach of warranty would not lie against an advertiser unless he was in privity with the purchaser. Furthermore, neither tort nor contract actions would prevent repetition of the objectionable conduct.

In common law injunctive proceedings based upon unfair competition, false advertising calculated to deceive the public and to pass off the goods of one merchant as the goods of a competitor, would be enjoined if the competitor could prove such facts and either a direct injury therefrom or that an injury would probably be the direct result. Recourse to injunctive relief could not be had to prevent deception of the people generally, and the available common-public from false advertising.

As an illustration the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the American Washboard Company case,[4] decided in 1900 that a manufacturer of genuine aluminum-faced boards was not entitled to injunctive relief restraining use by a competitor of the word "aluminum" on a washboard which did not contain any of that

[1] Associate general counsel, Federal Trade Commission.

[2] Printers' Ink, February 24, 1921, p. 18.

[3] 61 Pitts, L. J. 221.

[4] *American Washboard Co.* v. *Saginaw Mfg. Co.* (103 Fed. 281, 285 (C. C. A. 6, 1900)).

metal, even though the public were deceived into buying it as a genuine aluminum washboard. In part the court said: "It is doubtless morally wrong and improper to impose upon the public by the sale of spurious goods, but this does not give rise to a private right of action, unless the property rights of the plaintiff are thereby invaded. * * * We * * * are clear in the opinion that, if * * * all persons [are] compelled to deal solely in goods which are exactly what they are represented to be, the remedy must come from the legislature, and not from the courts."

It was apparent that there was a wide gap in the law through which the public was and would continue to be injured until Congress provided a remedy. In this regard, however, it was also apparent that the law had lagged far behind the public conscience.

In August 1904 the Atlantic Monthly published an editorial stating in substance that "swindling in newspaper advertising * * * has grown to be a public menace."

In March and April 1905 the Ladies Home Journal published editorials by Edward Bok on the subject of patent-medicine advertising, pointing out the dangerous character of some medicines and the diabolical methods used to convince people that they had ailments for which the medicine was recommended as a cure.

In 1909 Collier's magazine published articles by Samuel Hopkins Adams on the subject of swindling through advertising. The same year Survey magazine published an article by E. D. Hulbert entitled "Advertising Ethics and General Welfare." In August 1911 the "truth" motto was adopted at the seventh annual convention of the Associated Advertising Clubs of America at Boston.

By 1911 there was a definite movement by leading business and advertising organizations for legislation to hold the advertiser responsible for falsity even in the absence of knowledge on his part or in the absence of direct injury to any particular individual.

In its issue of November 16, 1911, Printers' Ink, a journal for advertisers, published an article entitled "Legal Repression of Dishonest Advertising," in which it pointed out that a strong sentiment existed among advertising men for the suppression of fraudulent, misleading, exaggerated, and indecent advertising. The article proposed that this sentiment should be converted into action to eradicate dishonest advertising and proposed that a model statute [5] drawn by Harry D. Nims be adopted by State legislatures. This statute became known as the Printers' Ink model statute. By 1913 6 States had adopted it, and, largely due to the efforts of its sponsors, 14 States had passed other statutes against false advertising.

In September 1913 Good Housekeeping published an article by Dr. Harvey W. Wiley entitled "False Ads and Lying Labels," which dealt with foods and drugs.

In March 1914 Inland Printer published an article by Walter Olsen entitled "Death Knell of Untruthful Advertising," which stated that "A wave of reform is now sweeping the country—with the purpose of sweeping it of all dishonest advertising."

In its issue of February 13, 1915, Harper's Weekly published an article by Samuel Hopkins Adams which stated that "a quack with a million dollars to spend in advertising sugar pills to cure consumption will destroy as many lives as the worst morphine peddler in the trade," and that "the lie kills as surely as poison."

These articles and editorials were typical of many published during those years which indicated the strong sentiment for truthful advertising and the suppression of false advertising.

On September 26, 1914, the Federal Trade Commission Act was approved, and on March 16, 1915, the Federal Trade Commission was organized. Shortly thereafter, on November 23, 1915, the Association of Advertising Clubs of the World, represented by a committee, was given a hearing by the newly organized Commission. At this hearing the Commission was urged to take steps toward suppressing untrue advertising as being a form of "unfair competition."

It is interesting to note that the first two formal cases were decided by the Commission in 1916 and that they involved false advertising.[6] The first formal case involving false advertising of a drug was decided in 1918, when the Commission ordered the respondent, Block & Company (1 FTC, decision 154), to cease and desist using the name "Mentholanum" or any other name so similar to "mentholatum" as to be likely to deceive and mislead the purchasing public and cause purchasers to believe that it was the same as "mentholatum." It is also interesting to note that the first Commission case to reach the courts involved false advertising of food. This was the case of *Sears, Roebuck & Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission*,[7] in which the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in 1919 recognized that Congress intended the Commission to take action in such cases. In part, the court held that "the Commissioners * * * are to * * * stop all those trade practices that have a capacity or tendency to injure competitors directly or through deception of purchasers, quite irrespective of whether the specific practices in question have yet been denounced in common-law cases."

Again, in 1922, in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Winsted Hosiery Company*, the Supreme Court affirmed the duty of the Commission to proceed in false advertising cases.

Following these decisions, the Supreme Court discussed the intent of Congress in the Federal Trade Commission Act and the scope of the jurisdiction of the Commission in numerous other cases.

In substance, the Supreme Court has held that the expression "unfair methods of competition" which were declared to be unlawful in section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act has a broader meaning than the common law term "unfair competition"; that it does not admit of precise definition and its scope is left to judicial determination as controversies arise; [8] and further that "unfair methods of competition" are to be determined in particular instances, upon evidence in the light of particular competitive conditions and have what is found to be a specific and substantial public interest.[9]

In the Royal Baking Powder Co. case [10] decided in 1922 involving false advertising of food, it was contended before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that misrepresentation of the quality or ingredients of one's own goods is not "an unfair method of competition" within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Counsel for petitioner argued that no statute or decided case had declared that a trader owed to his competitors the duty of refraining from such misrepresentation, and that, on the contrary, it had been firmly held in the American Washboard Co. case [11] that no such duty exists; and it was argued that in making the order under review the Commission assumed, not only to create a new rule of substantive law but to destroy one of long standing and universal acceptance.

In response to this argument, the court of appeals stated that the American Washboard Co. case "* * * illustrates one of the reasons which led Congress to enact the statute creating the Federal Trade Commission * * *" and "By that statute the identical situation which the court in the * * * Washboard case said it was beyond its power to suppress has been brought within the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission—created to redress unfair methods of competition. * * *" The court of appeals in substance stated further that the answer to the contention of counsel for petitioner is found in the decision of the Supreme Court in the Winsted Hosiery Co. case [12] in which "* * * It is now made plain that the statute has invested the Commission with jurisdiction to order anyone who misrepresents the quality of his goods in his advertising to cease and desist from such unfair methods of competition."

Thus it was early established that the Commission's functions included proceedings against false advertising as unfair methods of competition where there was a capacity or tendency to injure competition either directly or indirectly through deception of consumers. Thereafter in many of these cases the United States courts of appeals and the Supreme Court repeatedly upheld the jurisdiction of the Commission to prohibit by cease-and-desist order unfair methods of competition in commerce, consisting of the dissemination of false and misleading representations in advertising and labeling of food, drugs, and cosmetics.[13]

In 1931 the jurisdiction of the Commission was limited by the decision of the Supreme

---

[5] Any person, firm, corporation or association who, with intent to sell or in anywise dispose of merchandise, securities, service, or anything offered by such person, firm, corporation, or association, directly or indirectly, to the public for sale or distribution, or with intent to increase the consumption thereof, or to induce the public in any manner to enter into any obligation relating thereto, or to acquire title thereto, or an interest therein, makes, publishes, disseminates, circulates, or places before the public, in this State, in a newspaper or other publication, or in the form of a book, notice, handbill, poster, bill, circular, pamphlet, or letter, or in any other way, an advertisement of any sort regarding merchandise, securities, service, or anything so offered to the public, which advertisement contains any assertion, representation, or statement of fact which is untrue, deceptive, or misleading, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

[6] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Circle Silk Co.* (1 F. T. C. Dec. 13); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. The Abbott & Co.* (1 F. T. C. Dec. 16).

[7] 258 Fed. 307, 311 (C. C. A. 7, 1919).

[8] *Schechter Corp.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 532 (1935)); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam Co.* (283 U. S. 643, 648, 649 (1931)); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Keppel & Bro., Inc.* (291 U. S. 304 (1934)).

[9] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Kleaner* (280 U. S. 19, 27, 28 (1929)); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam Co., supra; Federal Trade Commission* v. *Keppel & Bro., Inc., supra; Federal Trade Commission* v. *Algoma Lumber Co.* (291 U. S. 67, 73 (1934)).

[10] *Royal Baking Powder Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (281 Fed. 744 (C. C. A. 2, 1922)).

[11] *American Washboard Co.* v. *Saginaw Mfg. Co.* (103 Fed. 28).

[12] 258 U S. 483 (1922).

[13] These cases included: *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Good Grape Co.* (45 F. 2d 70 (CCA-6, 1930)) (food); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Kay* (35 F. 2d 160 (CCA-7, 1929)), cert. den. 1930 (drug); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morrissey* (47 F. 2d 101 (CCA-7, 1931)) (food); *Fioret Sales Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (100 F. 2d 358 (CCA-2, 1939)) (cosmetic); *Justin Haynes & Co., Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (105 F. 2d 988 (CCA-2, 1939), cert. den. 308 U. S. 616) (drug); *Dr. W. B. Caldwell, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (111 F. 2d 889 (CCA 7, 1940)) (drug); *Parfums Corday, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (120 F. 2d 808 (CCA-2, 1941)) (cosmetic; *Establissments Rigaud* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (125 F. 2d 590 (CCA-2, 1942)) (cosmetic); *Fresh Grown Preserve Corporation, et al.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (126 F. 2d 917 (CCA-2, 1942)) (food); *Houbigant, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (139 F. 2d 1019 (CCA-2, 1944)) (cosmetic); *Charles of the Ritz Distributors Corp.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (143 F. 2d 676 (CCA-2, 1944)) (cosmetics).

Court in the Raladam Co. case,[14] which held that false obesity cure advertisements must be shown by proof to threaten to injure or to injure present or potential competition to a substantial extent.

The Commission's established jurisdiction over false advertising which had been impaired by the Raladam decision was reestablished by the Wheeler-Lea amendments of 1938. These amendments wiped out the requirement of proof of injury to competition by making unlawful unfair or deceptive acts or practices. And in the enactment of new sections 12 through 16, Congress gave the Commission more effective and necessary control over false advertisements of food, drugs, and cosmetics. Thus the consuming public who might be deceived by false advertising was made of equal concern before the law with the merchant or manufacturer injure l by the unfair methods of a dishonest competitor. By these amendments Congress made it certain that it was the Commission's duty and responsibility to suppress false and misleading advertising of food, drugs, and cosmetics.

During the 11-year period following the passage of the Wheeler-Lea amendments, the Commission has endeavored to carry out this mandate of Congress by utilizing funds and personnel provided for this work in such a manner as to afford honest business and the public the greatest possible degree of protection against the harmful effects of deception in any of its many and varied forms, including false advertising. Its Division of Radio and Periodical Advertising maintains a current check upon advertisements in newspapers, magazines, farm and trade journals, as well as in radio and television broadcasts. Hundreds of thousands of advertisements including advertisements of food, drugs, and cosmetics are examined and appraised each year.

Among the procedures adopted by the Commission in an effort to expedite the handling of false advertising cases and other deceptive practice matters and to afford a maximum of protection to the public interest at a minimum expenditure of funds are its trade-practice conferences and stipulations. Under the trade-practice conference procedure, the Commission invites all members of an industry to attend a general conference for the consideration of unfair practices in the industry and propose rules for their elimination. Through the use of this procedure, the Commission has been successful in eliminating false advertising and other unfair practices from 160 industries without resorting to adversary proceedings. Through its stipulation procedure the Commission permits individual business concerns to enter into agreements with it, whereby they bind themselves to abandon the specific practices, and thereupon the file is closed subject, of course, to reopening if conditions warrant.

It is the policy of the Commission to utilize the trade-practice conference and stipulation procedures to encourage widespread observance of the law by enlisting the cooperation of members of industries and informing them more fully of the requirements of the law, so that wherever consistently possible the Commission may avoid the need for adversary proceedings against persons who, through misunderstanding or carelessness, may violate the law unintentionally. But the Commission does not grant the privilege of settling cases through trade practice conference or stipulation agreements to persons who have violated the law where such violations involve intent to defraud or mislead; or involve false advertisement of foods, drugs, devices, or cosmetics which are inherently dangerous or where injury is probable; nor will the privilege be granted where the Commission is of the opinion that such procedure will not be effective in preventing continued use of the unlawful methods, acts, or practices.

In my opinion, these cooperative procedures, which have been briefly outlined, are effective and will continue to be increasingly effective in limiting the Commission's formal adversary proceedings to more important and flagrant violations.

In addition to these procedures, false advertisements of food, drugs, and cosmetics may be dealt with by the Commission in formal adversary proceedings by order to cease and desist; by application to the Federal courts for temporary injunction where the public interest requires it; and by certification of the facts to the Attorney General with a view to criminal proceedings if use of the commodity advertised in accord with the advertisement might be injurious to health or if there is evidence of intent to defraud or mislead.

The Commission does not institute proceedings in matters such as the labeling or branding of commodities where the subject matter of the questioned portion of the labeling or branding used is, by specific legislation, made a direct responsibility of another Federal agency, and in proceedings involving false advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, as defined in section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, account is taken of the labeling requirements of the Food and Drug Administration in any corrective action applied to the advertising.

In the case of advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, or devices which are false because of failure to reveal facts material with respect to the consequences which may result from the use of the commodity, the Commission proceeds only when the resulting dangers may be serious or the public health may be impaired, and in such cases requires that appropriate disclosure of the facts be made in the advertising.

Milton Handler, associate professor of law at Columbia University and an outstanding scholar in the field of trade regulation, has evaluated the Commission's work of suppressing false advertising in his statements that "The Trade Commission has performed yeoman service, and, while it has attempted to stem a seeming Niagara, with proper judicial support additional prodigies are not beyond possibility."[15] "The condemnation of false advertising constitutes one of the signal achievements of the Commission * * *." "Despite the magnitude of the task, the Commission has made considerable progress in the elimination of false and misleading advertising. The fact that much still remains to be done does not detract from the importance of its achievement. * * * Though unhappily defective in some respects, the new [Wheeler-Lea] legislation, if sympathetically construed, should enable the Commission to elevate the standards of advertising practice * * *."[16]

[14] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Raladam Co.* (283 U. S. 643 (1931)).

[15] 39 Yale Law Journal 44 (1929).

[16] 8 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 399 (1940).

The Panama Canal—Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave accorded, I herewith extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a well-written and informative article from the pen of a well-known writer on Panama Canal topics, Arthur Stanley Riggs, which was published in the September 9, 1949, issue of the Commonweal:

PANAMA CANAL PROSPECT—A CASE FOR THE TERMINAL-LAKE PLAN IN OPPOSITION TO A SEA-LEVEL ROUTE

(By Arthur Stanley Riggs)

It would be extraordinarily difficult if not impossible to find any problem facing the United States today, short of hostilities, that is at once so simple yet so complex as the Panama Canal question. This review of it is no attempt to state technicalities except in the broadest sense.

The history of this great transisthmian ditch is vaguely familiar. Everyone knows we own and operate this canal for the ships of the world. Now we are told authoritatively that in 1960, 11 years hence, the normal growth of world trade and shipping will make the present canal inadequate, and we must either enlarge its capacity or build a second canal somewhere else.

Unfortunately, when we took over the project from the bankrupt French canal company at the turn of the century, the problems involved were considered as purely geological and engineering matters. The builders knew, of course, that the object of a canal is to pass vessels as safely and as expeditiously as possible between two points. It seems obvious that we should have asked the men who have to take the ships through to contribute their intimate knowledge of large and small, easy to handle and heavily awkward vessels so that engineers could grasp the necessities and make canal navigation practical. But the seamen were ignored and, for one reason and another, fundamental errors crept into the design.

The Canal, therefore, while it operates successfully, has never been the balanced and trouble-free enterprise it could have been. The engineers did not know what every sailor does: that every craft afloat has as much individuality as a human being. Some are docile and easy to handle, some so awkward and sluggish they are hard to manage in even open water, some tricky and waiting the slightest chance to get into trouble. At sea that does not matter so much. But in the restricted waters of a shallow canal the personality of the ship makes all the difference in the world.

First of all the points at issue is the old question of the type of canal most practical for all purposes. De Lesseps conceived the idea of a sea-level canal because of his experience with Suez. Not being either a ship handler or an engineer, he forgot that Suez was dredged for the most part between sand dunes in an arid country, while at Panama the canal must cross mountainous jungle country in one of the world's heaviest rainfall areas featured by turbulent rivers. Before matters at Panama got really under way, the French engineer, Godin de Lépinay, who had studied the problem, recognized that the idea of a sea-level waterway was impossible of fulfillment, and worked out a practical solution.

In their turn most of the American engineers who worked after Godin agreed with that decision for technical reasons. Moreover, every one of these engineers still living and in active practice—though none was consulted about the new plans—is vehement in asserting that there is as much reason today to outlaw a sea-level waterway as there was during the French régime.

The second point, the one emphasized by the sea-level advocates, is the hullabaloo about the atomic bomb and the impossibility of protecting the present type of high-level canal against bombing and contamination. It is quite true that a direct hit by an atomic bomb on any part of the canal itself or of its accessory works such as dams, diversion channels, lakes, and the like, could close it

for an undetermined time. The claim that such a hit on the sea-level waterway would result only in momentary closure easily remedied, is so obviously false it needs no detailed rebuttal. Examination of the plans discloses immediately that the sea-level canal affords a wider and far longer—31 miles compared to 8—restricted channel than the lake type. The so-called retractable gate and the tidal lock, both near the Pacific terminal, are not only quite as vulnerable as the locks of the high-level canal, but once smashed up, even if they could be pulled out and replaced, would leave a waterway through which strong tides would run—on the average as fast as a good walker can stride—for hours at a time, making the whole 31 miles of narrow channel more hazardous for navigation because of the ever-present menace of machinery failure requiring anchoring in a current.

Nothing is advanced by the sea-level advocates to answer other objections of a technical nature, but the facts have all been stated in scientific and shipping publications, with not a single rejoinder that will hold its own. Not a word has been said about the results of draining part of Gatun Lake and exposing thousands of acres of miasmatic swamps, all the way from Agua Clara on the Atlantic side to Gamboa, more than half way to the Pacific. The pestilential nature of the region makes this point of the gravest consideration, and one certain to make endless anxiety and trouble for the medical and hygienic authorities. What the Republic of Panama would say about such an exposure may be imagined.

Many other items enter the equation. Mile after mile of dams would be built in bottomless muck. Tremendous slides far larger than closed the old canal for varying periods, with the unbalancing of the valley floor by the dewatering in part of Gatun Lake on the Canal side of the dams, would probably result in tremendous disturbances of the ground structure. No one knows the effects of shock from the heavy blasting needed to hew the channel down to the required depth. And what of the attempts to dredge below water in some places at depths of more than 145 feet? The plan appalls by its disregard of scientific knowledge. It seems incontrovertible that instead of being an honest engineering project capable of fulfillment at a legitimate cost within a reasonable period of time, this is nothing less than a gigantic boondoggle which will keep machines and men occupied for many years at staggering expense.

In the meantime, as the sea-level works would cut or at least adjoin the line of the present Canal in three or more places, in case of mishap we should have no Canal at all. With such a plan for construction, how the present Canal is to continue operations at anything like capacity is difficult to understand. At least four of the engineers who built the Canal of today, all with years of experience on the Isthmus and in demand as consultants of the highest reputation and ability, hold these and even stronger views. It is not through jealousy that the present investigators did not consult them that they disagree so sharply with the report, but from an honest desire to see the American people benefit by any change that is made.

No one who has been in a position to know what the atomic bomb means is worried about its effect upon the Canal. Capt. Willis W. Bradley, United States Navy, the distinguished naval officer until recently a Member of Congress from California, disposed of that scare during the past summer. Captain Bradley is an ordnance engineering expert, a ship handler with a lifetime of experience behind him, has repeatedly traversed the Canal and studied its problems. He places the sea-level Canal in the same security classification with the present high-level lake type, and says no canal can be secure without adequate protection.

As if that were not enough, former Gov. J. C. Mehaffey, who conducted the studies for the sea-level project, when examined by Congress about his report, had to admit that its claim—that the sea-level canal would be safer than the existing type—was false because whatever canal we have must be competently protected.

Moreover, with a two-ocean Navy, the Canal's strategic importance has decreased. We control the sea lanes to both east and west without having to consider shifting the main elements of our fleets hastily. And the vastly improved land transportation systems of the territorial United States and the rail, port, and pipe-line facilities on the Isthmus itself place us in a sound position.

As for attack on the Canal by an enemy—who will attack it, and why? Neither Germany nor Japan, fighting desperately for their lives, risked doing so in World War II. Today such destruction would be wanton outrage, and would come probably from sabotage, against which we can guard effectively. And the focal point of attack is not the Isthmus. All that is necessary to do is to glance at a global map. Our potential enemies all lie over the peak. Panama is at the foot, at the farthest possible spot for effective hostile action. In the unlikely event that we should lose a war, the enemy would hardly be apt to smash up a vast utility which in victory it would need even more than we need it today.

All these considerations are, in a sense, minor difficulties. The greater issue is largely lost sight of by those now controlling the projects. No one seems seriously to have considered the initial step which must be taken before any canal can be constructed. You do not dig up your neighbor's back yard without his permission unless you wish to invoke immediate and vigorous reprisals. None of the plans thus far examined bothers itself with the inevitable preliminaries of consulting the neighbor through whose territory we might wish to carve a tremendous ditch, the existence of which would profoundly change the economic structure of his national life.

Panama is very much awake and exceedingly sensitive to anything involving her national integrity. Her government knows accurately the extent to which the present canal has affected her mode of life, her national income, her standing among her Latin and Indian neighbors. The Communist infiltration in both the Canal Zone and in the Republic has succeeded in planting suspicion, fear, even hatred for us, and the natural reactions of politicians and inflammable masses will make the tasks of our diplomatic representatives thorny, indeed, if we undertake any new enterprise in the region. A remark made by a Panamanian engineer is of the highest significance to us. The gentleman observed that it is precisely by what we do in Panama that our position and future in all of South America will be judged. If Central and South America believe we treat Panama badly, our effort of years to make friends in the southern half of the hemisphere will have gone for nothing, and even Europe will react to some extent. Whatever we try, whatever our motives, we must think of Panama first.

If the sea-level plan is to be considered seriously, before a cubic yard of earth can be moved, Panama will naturally want many things settled. Our treaty with her definitely specifies the extent and nature of our territorial rights. Since the sea-level plan changes the axis of the Canal by realining it considerably, it automatically changes the limits of our Canal Zone, which extend for 5 miles to each side of the central line of the Canal. Panamanian villages would be drowned out by the change, and the bed of the Chagres River shifted from its present location west of the Canal to an embouchure east of it, a trifle of some 10 miles. To fancy that these and other problems involved by the change will be simple to negotiate is to be unduly optimistic. In such case Panama would naturally demand further indemnity and probably a larger annuity than we pay now.

Thus far we have seen chiefly what should not be done about the improvement of the Canal, and the general picture looks black. There is, however, a happier view and a reasonable solution of several of the difficulties that will increase the Canal capacity to any now foreseeable demands. This plan has clearly visualized not only what needs correction, but what it is possible for us to do in a reasonable time at a reasonable cost without bankrupting the distinctly anemic American merchant marine or putting additional taxes upon the public. Moreover, no new treaty will be required; there will be no dislocation of Panamanian life, no indemnity to pay, no loss of prestige for ourselves in Central and South America. It is wise, too, in that it does not, in 1949, attempt to solve the possible but still unimaginable problems of the year 2000 and after. This plan is simply to build our improvements on the existing Canal.

The first flaw in the present Canal design to be remedied is that of the position of two of the three sets of locks. The result of that is operational lack of balance. Because of inadequate geological knowledge, the three-lift locks at the Pacific end were divided into two sets, one twinned two-lift at Miraflores, the other a twinned single-lift at Pedro Miguel, built squarely across the southern entrance to Gaillard cut. This made the mouth of the cut a bottleneck which delays traffic seriously, creates dangerous surges and currents in the channel every time the lock is filled, and has been the cause of more accidents than have occurred anywhere else in the entire length of the Canal.

Worst of all, the present location of both sets of locks was quite unnecessary. As long ago as August 1906, Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, the real genius of the Canal, prepared a detailed plan for a dam across the Rio Grande from Agua Dulce to Cerro de Puente, with a twin set of triple-lift locks intersecting and extending southward from it. That was the sound and obvious engineering procedure, which would have prevented the operational difficulties that now make the Canal hazardous. Had the Stevens plan been adopted the enlarged area of the summit lake would have provided safe and ample anchorage now lacking for the vessels waiting to go through to the north, and no bottleneck would have choked Gaillard Cut as it does now. The lock surges would never have existed, and vessels would not have to make two dangerous approaches to the Pacific locks as they do today. The two ends of the Canal would have been brought into perfect balance.

The Canal is a fact, and its improvement must work from that basis. Fifty years ago the French abandoned the sea-level scheme as hopeless of accomplishment. Their leading engineer, Godin de Lépinay, foresaw most of the present operational draw-backs and planned against them by balancing the two termini with an enlarged Miraflores Lake to shelter waiting ships. Today what is known as the Terminal Lake plan does much the same thing as Godin and Stevens had in mind. It removes the Pedro Miguel locks completely, builds new sets of triple-lift locks at a new Miraflores location, throws a dam across the present Miraflores locks, enlarging the lake and thus providing safe berthing for more ships than are likely ever to be on the spot at one time, dissipates the surges,

and raises the capacity of the Canal to meet any now foreseeable traffic demands.

These changes could be constructed for a fraction of the cost of any sea-level canal, and could be operative in from 4 to 6 years without interfering with the traffic except for a few hours. This compares happily with the preliminary estimates of $2,500,000,000 over 10 years to construct a sea-level canal plus whatever additional millions might be considered necessary to indemnify Panama for our encroachments. Moreover, the Terminal Lake plan calls for the construction of one set of large locks at each end, capable of holding vessels more than 1,000 feet long and 130 feet beam.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I would like to call attention to an inscription which I believe is appropriate in describing the work of the Post Office Department and its thousands of faithful employees. This was written by Charles William Eliot and edited by Woodrow Wilson for the east and west pavilions of the post office in Washington, D. C.

The inscription epitomizes the regard we all have for those who have anything to do with the handling of our mail—and perhaps may remind us how easy it is to make someone happy by writing a letter. Truly our lives are so much richer because we are able to exchange news and greetings at Christmas and on other occasions. The inscription was brought to my attention by one of my constituents. May of you may be familiar with it, but it was new to me:

Carrier of news and knowledge,
Instrument of trade and
Promoter of mutual acquaintance,
Of peace and good will
Among men and nations.
Messenger of sympathy and love,
Servant of parted friends,
Consoler of the lonely,
Bond of the scattered family,
Enlarger of the common life.

Brazil Sends an Ambassador to Madrid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the explanation of the United States of Brazil with reference to the recent appointment of a Brazilian Ambassador to Madrid, Spain. As everybody knows, Brazil is outstanding in its friendship for the people of the United States of America. Under the leadership of the Brazilian delegation in the spring General Assembly of the United Nations, a majority of the nations—26 to 15—voted for the repeal of the unjust resolution recommending the retirement of chiefs of diplomatic mission from Madrid. At the same time, by an overwhelming vote—40 to 6—the United Nations General Assembly agreed that it was wrong to describe the present Spanish Government as totalitarian. Consequently, more than a two-thirds vote eliminated the principal charge against Spain.

As a result, we have the current juridical position of Brazil elucidated by her gifted Foreign Minister, Dr. Raul Fernándes. His reasoning, it must be emphasized, is valid for all members of the United Nations, including the United States. Consequently, we, too, should act.

The explanation follows:

APPOINTMENT OF BRAZILIAN AMBASSADOR TO MADRID

His Excellency the President of the Republic decided to appoint an Ambassador to the Spanish Government, thus filling a post vacant since 1946. The President's decision was taken in view of the fact presented by Foreign Minister Raul Fernándes. The latter pointed out the traditional diplomatic and economic relations which Brazil has had with the Madrid Government, where we have had an Embassy since 1936, but which, however, since 1946 and, owing to the recommendation of the General Assembly of the UNO, we only have a chargé d'affaires. We voted for this recommendation, although we considered it useless and even self-defeating for the desired end of bringing to power a democratic regime in Spain, and to avoid a greater evil such as the complete breaking off of relations. Under the statute the recommendations of the Assembly are not compelling, they are perhaps a moral force to determine the attitude of the groups to which it is directed under the Charter of the United Nations.

This was the practice admitted by the doctrine.

In the last edition of Oppenheim's International Law, it is stated that "although the recommendations are not legally obliging they are considered important instruments so that the weight of world public opinion influences the members of the United Nations." The Brazilian Government accepted this moral force but understood that it was weakened and finally annulled by successive acts of the Assemblies, believes that nothing stands in our way to being represented in Madrid according to the mission there established. Everything counsels this move for to have this mission headed by only a chargé d'affaires causes us injury.

In 1947 the Assembly voted down the proposal which was to confirm the 1946 recommendation. Last May only 15 out of 59 member nations continued to favor it. Technically the 1946 recommendation stands; but the Brazilian Government is authorized and does not consider itself bound by the 1949 minority which continued to deny it the exercise of a sovereign right. The 15 nations which voted against and many who abstained believed expressly not to give prestige to the Spanish regime. This point of view runs counter to the traditional practice of the Brazilian Government, which does not subordinate its relations with other States to considerations of their political form of government. It would be unjustifiable to make an exception to this rule in our relations with Spain, specially because we would be doing it to the detriment of our own interests; thus ended the explanation of Minister Raul Fernándes.

The Rio press of this morning publishes this news with great interest and the editorials of the Jornal do Comércio, Correio da Manha, Jornal do Brasil, and A Manha approve the President's statement.

This confirms the scholarly judgment of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, asociate editor of World Affairs, Washington, D. C., September 9, 1949.

Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, few men have had a more distinguished career of real public service than Mr. Leland Olds, of the Federal Power Commission. Here is a man who takes his public duties to heart, and without fear or equivocation enforces the law in the public interest. It is to be hoped that the American public will long have the benefit of his continued service. The following editorial from the Kansas City Times of September 9, 1949, emphasizes his abilities:

PUNISHING PUBLIC SERVICE

Human memory and gratitude are short, but a few persons in this area have reason to remember Leland Olds. He is the strong man of the Federal Power Commission who stepped into the 15-year-old battle for lower gas rates in this region and won.

Since last June his reappointment to the Commission has been held up by a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas. It so happens that Texas is one of the gas-producing States leading the fight to undermine the authority of the Federal Power Commission. JOHNSON, who went into the Senate as a liberal (Texas version) has appeared to be very much on the side of the pipe-line companies.

This looks like a drive to get at the Power Commission one way or the other. If its control can't be weakened by a new law then the next best thing (for the big companies) is to block the man who has been carrying out the intentions of the present law.

We have heard of no case that could be made against Olds except vigorous action under the present law which was written by Congress. His sin is doing his duty as he saw it.

One of his greatest sins, no doubt, came in this area. When the authority of the Federal Power Commission came into the old gas-rate fight the public saw results in an amazingly short time.

From impounded funds out of that case the Kansas City gas users received checks totaling nearly $8,000,000. Throughout the Cities Service system the refunds aggregated $24,000,000, most of it in western Missouri and Kansas.

Since that time the Kansas City public has continued to receive the benefit of the rate reduction to the tune of more than $2,000,000 a year (four and one-half million for the system).

After all this saving for the public the pipeline company has continued to make a good income by utility standards. The only complaints come from the fact that the pipe-line companies in general think they should make a speculative profit from the increased real value of their own wells.

The real issue is in the Kerr bill which would remove the authority of the Commission from the producing end of the pipe lines. We believe the bill would be very expensive to gas users, but if the natural gas Senators can win in an open fight that's that.

The sneak play against Olds is entirely different. The Senate subcommittee probably knows that it doesn't have a single honest reason to justify holding up his appointment. It hasn't risked bringing the name out on the floor of the Senate. The play is to do absolutely nothing and thereby punish a man for the sin of working in the public interest—as the present law provides.

The United States Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the United States Constitution, delivered by me at Salem, Ill., September 16, under the auspices of the Daughters of the American Revolution and other patriotic organizations:

Throughout the Nation, this is known as Constitution Week. We commemorate the completion and signing of the Constitution for the United States by the members of the Constitutional Convention at Independence Hall in Philadelphia on the 17th of September 1787—162 years ago Saturday of this week, September 17.

It is impossible for me to give you, in my limited time, more than some of the high lights contained in this, the greatest charter of government ever to come from the mind and pen of men.

It is a living and dynamic charter of government founded upon the Golden Rule of Christianity, recognizing and preserving the dignity and freedom of the individual, which is as indispensable and as pulsating with life today as when adopted 162 years ago.

We shall have to look back into the history of the Colonies just preceding the adoption of the Constitution to determine the necessity for such a new charter of government.

The Colonies had grown into prosperous states containing a population of 3,000,000 people living under the constant persecution of the British Government.

The British Government imposed taxes upon the Colonies without representation; it appointed governors that made a mockery of the courts; threw men in jail without any semblance of trial by juries; compelled them to ship all of their exports to Britain where, in many instances, they were charged export fees and Britain set the price of the merchandise it bought.

They were compelled to support an army of tax gatherers appointed by the Crown, and to furnish quarters and support the British military.

Out of this persecution came the Continental Congress in 1774 selected by the various Colonies to try to protect their own interests.

Following this came the Battles of Lexington and Concord, on April 19, 1775, when the first blood was shed in the War of Independence.

And in 1776 came the Declaration of Independence.

Then 8 years of the Revolutionary War followed under the government of the Continental Congress, strengthened by the Articles of Confederation.

After Britain was defeated, it was found that the Articles of Confederation did not provide a central government strong enough to hold the States together. With the war over, many States neglected to send their delegates to the Constitutional Convention and set up shop and government in their own way. It became obvious to many leaders that a stronger central government, binding the States together, must be formed because a proud United States of America that had won the war had become a laughing stock in its dealings with other nations.

Consequently, a Constitutional Convention was called asking the 13 States to send delegates to Philadelphia on May 14, 1787, for the purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation into a stronger central government that would meet the problems of government facing the new Nation.

BACKGROUND OF THE DELEGATES

It is well to look into the personalities and background of the men who wrote this great document. We are likely to look upon them as rather rugged frontiersmen blazing a new trail of government. This is far from the facts.

In thinking back to those early years in the formation of our Government, we overlook the fact that the United States was then 150 years old; that it contained 3,000,000 people; that Harvard College, William and Mary, Yale, Kings College in New York, and other colleges had been in existence from 50 to 85 years.

We overlook the fact that a majority of these men were graduates from colleges in England, Scotland, and in the Colonies; that all of them were outstanding citizens from the various States, many of them members of State legislatures; and many of them great constitutional lawyers.

For the past many years these men had been schooled in government because they were in a constant fight against the oppression of England.

Never in preceding history had there been a body of men so well fitted by heritage, tradition, education, experience, training, and environment to solve the problems facing the members of the Constitutional Convention as those who met in the East Room of the Pennsylvania State House in Philadelphia that Monday morning in May 1787.

Leaders of this great effort were Benjamin Franklin, regarded as one of the ablest philosophers and statesmen in the world; Gen. George Washington, who was unanimously elected president of the Convention; James Madison, of Virginia, a member of the Constitutional Convention, a member of the Legislature of Virginia, and one of the ablest men in the Nation who afterward was elected President. Madison kept the records of the Convention and had as much to do with the writing of the Constitution as any other delegate.

Alexander Hamilton, of New York, one of the ablest men in the Nation, and regarded as an expert on government financing, was one of the powerful forces in drafting the Constitution. It was he who later, as Secretary of the Treasury under Washington, drew up the plans for its organization and operation which, in the main, has been followed to this day.

There were about 55 delegates who gave their time almost constantly for over 4 months in writing the Constitution.

James Madison later wrote, "I feel it a duty to give my solemn conviction, derived from my intimate observations, that there was never an assembly of men charged with a great trust who were more able, more pure in their motives, or more anxiously devoted to the task before them than the members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787."

CONVENTION HELD BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Delegates were pledged not to give any information to the press or the people until the final Constitution was completed. Madison kept the record that was finally published 50 years later at his death as to the debates and proceedings of the Convention. He was the last surviving member of the Convention. His wife sold the manuscript to the publishers for $30,000.

No written record was kept of the votes of the various members which made it possible for them, as the debates surged back and forth, to change their position without being confronted with a previous record vote. They felt that if the Convention was opened to the public the problems they were dealing with were so important that the people, only partially informed, would begin to take sides and exert political pressure that would make it impossible for a Constitution to be written and adopted by the various States. The great work was accomplished behind closed doors.

After 4 months of constant effort and debate, and after many compromises of opinion, this group of men who were solely striving to form a charter of government that would best meet the needs of the Nation and its posterity, were finally able to agree by a substantial majority on a new Constitution to govern the United States of America.

The Constitution was referred to the Continental Congress, which referred it to the various State governments for ratification by the people through State constitutional conventions.

The Constitution provided that 9 States out of the 13 were necessary to its adoption. In June 1788 a sufficient number of States had approved to put it into effect.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution, when adopted, became the supreme law of the land. For 162 years, and up to this very time, it is still the supreme law of the land.

Many people do not realize today that the main purpose of the Constitution from that time to this day is to guard and protect the liberty, the property rights, and the religious rights and the freedom of every man, woman, and child in America.

It is as dynamic and effective today in protecting the liberty and the rights of the people as it was when first adopted. It is more necessary today to protect the rights and liberty of the people, if possible, with the growth of the Nation, than it was when adopted. So long as the people guard and protect the Constitution they will protect and preserve their liberties in this Republic.

The Constitution laid down the over-all plan under which this great Nation has been developed. It took no liberties away from the people, but preserved them all. Thousands of laws have been enacted during the growth of this Nation; all States have set up their State constitutions; thousands of State laws have been enacted; however, all of them within the broad framework of the Constitution. No State constitution, and no State or Federal laws which violate the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—can be enacted and remain on the statute books. When such laws have been enacted they have been declared unconstitutional, null and void.

by the judicial department of the Government—the United States Supreme Court.

THE PREAMBLE

A reading of the first paragraph, or the Preamble, will immediately impress upon you the broad purpose of the Constitution—

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

BILL OF RIGHTS

After the Constitution was adopted, there were immediately proposed 10 amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights, which were ratified by the various States. The amendments contained in the Bill of Rights spell out more in detail the protection of the liberties of the people. I will quote a few of them:

Article I: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the rights of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Because of this protection, the execution, imprisonment of Catholic and Protestant church leaders as in Russia and satellite countries cannot happen here.

Article 4: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches, and seizures, shall not be violated and no warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

No officer of the Government can enter your home without a search warrant. No one can knock on your door at night, call you out, and send you to a prison or a slave camp as is done in other countries.

Article 5: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on indictment of a grand jury; nor shall any person be subject to the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, or to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

In fact, the liberty of the accused criminal is so protected under the Constitution that if he does not have the money to hire a lawyer the court must appoint a lawyer to defend him.

Then there is another section which provides that: Excessive bail, nor excessive fines shall be imposed, nor cruel or unusual punishment inflicted.

What a relief this would be to innocent people in Russia and the satellite nations who are being imprisoned and murdered.

I shall not go further into the Bill of Rights, because I think the illustrations I have given are sufficient to impress upon you that the Constitution is the bulwark and shield protecting every legitimate right and liberty of all of the people.

CHECKS AND BALANCES

The Constitution provided for a government of checks and balances. It established three great departments of Government—the legislative, executive, and judicial—and specifically attempted to provide in clear language that none of these departments was given the power, or was expected to try to exert any power to usurp the control of another department of Government.

The legislative branch of the Government was regarded by the framers of the Constitution as the most important branch of Government. In fact, the first paragraph of the Constitution starts with the legislative branch, and then takes up the branch they regarded as second in importance—the executive branch—and then the judicial branch.

So that you may understand the thinking and the purpose of those who framed the Constitution, we must only look back to 1774 to the formation of the Continental Congress. It was a one-body government. There was no Senate, and no President included in that first government of the Colonies. It consisted only of the legislative branch.

Then when the Articles of Confederation were later developed, there was no provision for the executive or judicial branch of Government. They were afraid of the power of a Chief Executive.

The framers of the Constitution, some of them, had fled from European countries because of the abuse of power of the chief executives—the kings and the monarchs. They knew that the only branch of government defending the liberties of the people in England had been the legislative House of Commons. They wanted to, and did place the great powers of Government in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate. They did not intend to set up a government which gave the President too great power. The executive department was set up more as an administrative department of Government.

Let's examine and compare the power given the three branches of Government. Let's see what was the intent of those who wrote the Constitution.

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Article I of the Constitution says:

"All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and the House of Representatives."

President Monroe said: "The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest on the powers granted to this branch. They mark the limit within which, with few exceptions, all the branches must move in the discharge of their respective functions."

In the Constitution, the House of Representatives alone has the power to refuse a Member to be seated for good and sufficient reasons; it has the power to expel a Member from that body; and Congress is given the power to impeach the President, any judge of the Supreme Court, or Federal courts, or any constitutional officer serving under the executive department.

The Congress was given the power to set their own salaries, the salary of the President, and of all the employees of the Government. And may I point out that with this power in their own hands and with the great expense attached to being a Congressman, the Congress in 162 years has only raised their salary to $12,500 per annum.

Section 8 of the Constitution gives the Congress the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; to borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations; to establish uniform rules of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies.

"To coin money and regulate the value thereof.

"To establish post offices and post roads.

"To provide for Federal judges throughout the Nation, and to fix their salaries.

"To declare war; to raise and support armies. To provide and maintain a Navy. To provide for State militia, and to provide for the organization and discipline of the military," and many other powers.

The final section says: "And to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof."

Provision was also made that the Constitution could be amended in the future on a resolution referred to the States for such amendment, by a favorable vote of three-fourths of the State legislatures.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In fact, the men who wrote the Constitution set up provisions by which we now have 435 Members in the House of Representatives.

They wanted to keep the Government close to the people so that it could be controlled by the people, and for that reason they provided that all of the Members of the lower House should be elected every 2 years, which would give the people a chance to observe their work and to retire or reelect them.

As a further evidence of the importance of the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, the Constitution provides that all money bills, meaning all tax measures, must originate in the House of Representatives. The Senate cannot initiate a tax bill, much less the President. Note how the power of the President is limited in the Constitution.

THE PRESIDENT

Article II of the Constitution says: "The executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term."

Section 2 says: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States.

"That he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

"He shall have power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senate concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law."

The greatest power given the President is the right to veto legislation, but the Constitution provides that the Congress can overrule that power by a two-thirds vote. It often does it.

Section 3 says: "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed and shall commission all of the officers of the United States." This covers the principal powers granted the President in the Constitution. Of course, he has tremendous additional power now, due to the fact that he has the appointive power of over 2,000,000 people in the departments and bureaus of Government.

Jefferson said: "I can visualize the Government growing so big under these appointive powers that an administration could perpetuate itself indefinitely in office."

Section 3 as I have just quoted, says the President may recommend to the Congress measures he shall judge necessary and expedient. It is then up to the Congress to act as it sees fit on his recommendations. It does not say he shall demand or attempt to coerce the Congress to enact the legislation he suggests. It does not provide that the bureaus and the President shall prepare bills

and send them to the legislature demanding they be passed as "must" legislation.

JUDICIAL

Then we come to the third department of Government—the judicial.

Article III of the Constitution says: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

The purpose of the Supreme Court is to overrule all laws not in line with the Constitution, and to make final decision on all litigation carried up to that body.

Blackstone, the greatest English jurist of his time, a member of the House of Commons, and lecturer on jurisprudence at Oxford University, pointed out the advantages of our system of checks and balances, dividing our power of government into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and judicial—when he said, "When the right of making and enforcing the laws is vested in one man or one body, there can be no public liberty. The magistrate (or chief executive) may enact tyrannical laws, and execute them in a tyrannical manner, since he is then possessed as a dispenser of justice, with all the power which he has as a legislator."

Our Constitution in establishing "the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of Government and defining their powers, provided for a government by laws, and protected the people against a government by men."

In the constitutional debates fixing the power of the executive department, Sherman of Connecticut urged "that the office of President was merely an instrumentality for carrying out the will of the legislative department." He said, "The Legislature should therefore appoint him."

Wilson of Pennsylvania urged "that the duties of the Executive were merely to execute the laws and appoint officers not pertaining to the Legislature."

Randolph of Virginia strenuously opposed a single Executive, saying "that was too much like a monarchy."

Franklin proposed that the Executive serve without pay. He said, "Though we may set out in the beginning with moderate salaries, we shall find that such will not be of long continuance. There will always be those who favor giving more to the rulers, that the rulers may be able to return to give more to them."

Franklin that day looked 162 years into the future, to the opening of the Eighty-first Congress when the Congress on January 17, 1949, raised the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year and gave him an additional $50,000 a year tax-exempt plus many other benefits.

Hamilton took the same position.

Dickinson offered a motion that the Executive be removable by a majority of the legislatures of the States. Sherman contended that the National Legislature should have the power to remove the Executive at its pleasure. This was voted down.

It was then voted that the Executive should be removable by the Congress through impeachment proceedings as now set out in the Constitution.

PRESENT THREATS TO THE CONSTITUTION

There are greater threats to constitutional government here in the United States and throughout the world today than ever before.

There is a world-wide trend toward socialism and communism. Socialism or statism is now taking our Government down that road.

There are many forces working in the United States today to weaken and destroy the Constitution.

The Communists are in the open with such an effort. Their numbers are not great, but they are skillful planners and workers. Millions of left wingers and fellow travelers in the many front organizations working with the Communists have a tremendous power. They work through the schools, colleges, and universities, yes, and through some churches; through the motion-picture houses, and in hundreds of ways to deceive and mislead the people.

They permeate some labor unions. They have infiltrated into many departments of Government.

The attempt and power of the Chief Executive, combined with the great bureaus of Government, with millions of employees, with their propaganda machines constantly trying to usurp the legislative power of Government, constantly trying to convince the people that the legislative department of the Government is failing in its representation of the people, is one of the greatest threats to constitutional government today.

The actions of the Chief Executive in touring the country berating the elected representatives of the people in attempting to usurp the legislative power is known to every thinking American citizen. The Constitution never intended the executive department should take over control of the legislative department. When it does, liberty and freedom will be lost. The first sentence in article I of the Constitution reads:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Members of the Constitutional Convention argued that if the right to make, and to enforce the laws was vested in one department of the Government, there could be no public liberty.

DEBTS AND TAXES

Debts and taxes are a threat to the Constitution. Unless Federal spending is reduced and deficit financing is stopped, this Government will be wrecked financially, and with it will go the Constitution and the freedom and liberty of the American people it has protected for the past 162 years.

Socialism, communism, or some sort of a dictatorial government will follow in its wake.

The pressure groups, composed in one way or another of nearly all of the good people of this Nation, demanding more and more from the Federal Government today, is a dangerous threat to the preservation of representative government. The people must understand that all of their requests cannot be met if we are to preserve the financial solvency of the Government.

The big labor leaders of the Nation, drunk with power, who to a great extent control the executive department of Government today, and who are raising funds to defeat 20 Congressmen who refuse to carry out their orders, which will give them control of the Congress of the United States, is the greatest threat to representative constitutional government today.

They are raising millions of dollars, and will spend millions to take over this Government.

What the labor leaders have done to the Government of England will be tame to what they will do to this Government if they succeed.

The present debt of $256,000,000,000 and the world obligations we have assumed, with a cost of $45,000,000,000 to run the Government for the coming year, has burdened the people with extreme high taxes. The great mass of the people must understand and cooperate with their elected representatives to reduce the cost of Government, thereby reducing the heavy tax load.

The little-business men, the farmers, the professional men and women of the Nation, and the great rank and file of labor all have an equal stake in the future of our country. They must, and I believe they will, increase their interest in Government, and continue to protect the Constitution and maintain representative government, which is the American way of life.

Let us defend and preserve the ancient landmarks set by our forefathers, the bulwark and shield protecting our liberties—the Constitution.

FRANKLIN'S SPEECH

In closing, I believe you will be interested in listening to the words spoken on the last day of that Convention when Benjamin Franklin, then 81 years of age, made the last speech urging its adoption. I believe his philosophy will be helpful to all of us in approaching problems of the future, as it was to the members of that Convention 162 years ago. I quote:

"Mr. President, I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure I shall never approve them. For, having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information, or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise. It is therefore that, the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and pay more respect to the judgment of others.

"I doubt, too, whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution. For when you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you invariably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It, therefore, astonished me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does; and I think it will astonish our enemies, who are waiting with confidence to hear that our counsels are confounded, like those of the builders of Babel.

"On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me, on this occasion, doubt a little of his own infallibility, and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument."

World Federation and the DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "World Federation and the DAR" appearing in a recent issue of the San Francisco Chronicle which is informative and worthy of consideration and study.

The editorial is as follows:

WORLD FEDERATION AND THE DAR

An official of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Lola Lee Bruington, discloses the formation of a Patriots' Executive Committee to combat "the present trend in world-government thought." As head of the new committee, Mrs. Bruington says:

"Since 22 States have already passed resolutions asking for some form of world government, and with many legislators accepting the views of small groups of idealists, we believe it is time for an organized campaign to educate the American people and let them know the real facts about such federation."

We suggest that a valuable function of the committee could be to assess the various

forms of world government and world federation which have been put forward, especially with relation to the practical aspects of the particular Government which was launched by the revolution from which the DAR stems.

There are (Mrs. Bruington will find) varying degrees of world government conceptions.

Those who believe in the possibility of world federation would retain sovereignty in the individual states in the same manner in which the American Constitution retains sovereignty in the individual States of the Union.

Still following the pattern set by Mrs. Bruington's ancestors, they would relieve the individual states of their war-making power and vest that power in a federal government. If the members of the patriots' committee have studied the United Nations organization, they have observed that the United Nations seeks to curtail the war-making powers of the several states through agreement and the expression of mutual ideals. The aim of the federalists is to implement these ideals by developing a world body functioning under a world constitution. This body would be assigned those practical police powers enabling it to keep the federation together even over the express and violent objection of a subordinate member or group—as the United States was held together in 1861-65. It would, in other words, have the power to prevent a nation from making war against the world, even if the preventive process constituted war.

Mrs. Bruington, we believe, has erred in dismissing these advocates as idealists. The idealists—as always—are those who would eat their cake and have it too. They are those who would have maximum security with unlimited sovereignty for the individual states, except that such an arrangement is a contradiction of terms. The practical ones are those who have recognized this contradiction and struck out for a compromise which would retain as much sovereignty as possible while minimizing the risk of a world explosion.

Ambassador for Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 3, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: You will remember some time ago I discussed with you my suggestions that the Government of the United States consider the feasibility of raising our offices in Ireland to the rank of Embassy.

In view of the long period of harmonious relations between the Irish Government and the Government of the United States, as well as the strong bond of friendship and kinship between the two peoples, I believe the designation of our representative to Ireland with the rank of Ambassador would be most fitting and proper at this time.

The magnificent contributions to the progress of the United States made by the early settlers of our country who migrated from Ireland down through our Colonial and Constitutional Government has been a bright page in our country's history. Too, the magnanimous support and aid the people of the United States have given the people of Ireland in their long fight for independence has served to strengthen the common bond between our two great countries. Although Ireland is a small country in size its contributions to our welfare have been tremendous.

It is my considered opinion that the recognition of Ireland by sending abroad our representative with the rank of Ambassador would serve to strengthen the ties of friendship and harmonious relations which have existed throughout the years. The Government of Ireland is one of the few governments in the world with which the United States does not have a representative with ambassadorial status. I believe that we have such a status between representatives of many nations of lesser significance and world importance than is Ireland. It is my opinion that such recognition on the part of our Government would be most pleasing to the peoples of both countries, Ireland and the United States, at this time.

I trust you will give this matter your most sympathetic and early favorable consideration.

With kind personal regards, I am
Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress, Majority Leader.

Small Business, Fair Trade, and the Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the 22d of the month I addressed the fifty-first annual convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists on the subject Small Business, Fair Trade, and the Fair Deal. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our Nation and our national philosophy are under attack as never before in our history. I do not refer at this time only to dangers arising through threats of force. I refer to something equally important—survival of the spiritual factors which go to the essence of the basic political and economic philosophy of our people.

Ours was originally a land where each one of us, our sons and our grandchildren faced a world full of invitations. Until the industrial revolution hit the United States toward the end of the last century, there was practically no business or economic activity which an American citizen could not enter with courage and with hope. The industrial revolution carried with it the dynamic movement of technology and further opportunity for economic man. Yet, with the industrial revolution there also came that which we call big business, concentration of economic power and deep problems associated with antisocial economic institutions called trusts and monopolies.

It is in this perspective that I view the problems which small business faces today. I approach this problem not only from an academic viewpoint, but also from the viewpoint of a practicing small-business man. I was brought up in a small-town drug store. My youth was spent working along with my brother and father in what we now think is the best drug store to be found on Main Street of Huron, S. Dak. I maintain my interest in that business and in the problems faced by that drug store and the many hundreds of thousands of small businesses like it in our economy.

I therefore have an intimate knowledge of what we mean by capital, fair trade, and fair-trade laws. I remember vividly the terrible days of the depression when I worked behind the counter of our store and saw and felt the effects on our community when large price-cutting organizations moved in on the independent businessman struggling to keep his head above water. I know the bitter miseries of predatory price competition. It is against this background of experience that I speak of the independent business enterprise.

I suppose it was the depression and the economic repercussions of the late 1920's and 1930's that molded my economic and political philosophy. It gave me a respect for hard work, ingenuity, and determination. It brought into sharp focus the reality of suffering that comes from unemployment, mortgage indebtedness, irresponsible financial power, wildcat market speculation, and ruinous low prices and degrading low wages.

I learned by experience—cruel, sickening experience—the interdependence of our economy; the relationship between farmer, worker, retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer. I know by experience and not by theory, that a depressed agriculture, an unemployed labor force spell debt and bankruptcy for business. I know, by experience and not by theory, the dangers that are ever-present in concentration of economic power, in monopoly.

I know what it means to have banks close their doors, and have no Federal deposit insurance to protect the bank account. I know what it means to have unemployed people stand around in a drug store and not to have even an unemployment-compensation check.

I know what it means to have farmers without price supports, fair trade, for their products. I know what it means to see merchant after merchant close his doors only to see the big chain or corporate enterprise survive and preempt the field. Yes, I thing I know what it means to see a nation prostrate and dying while a government of the people, by the people, and for the people does nothing but talk of confidence and prosperity around the corner. That is why I support a policy of government that seeks to protect the welfare of the people, that joins hands with the people in preserving the institutions of political and economic freedom.

I support a policy of Government that believes in fair trade for all parts of the American economy. To me, fair trade means a fair body of rules and regulations that preserves the competitive-enterprise system but removes competition from the realm of unprincipled and vicious practices either by Government or by business enterprise.

I think my philosophy was well expressed by the late Edward S. Rogers, chairman of the board of Sterling Drug Co., in his argument submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States testing the constitutionality of the California Fair Trade Act. Here's what Mr. Rogers had to say:

"The whole process of civilization has consisted largely of the gradual surrender of the individual's right of liberty to make himself harmful or obnoxious to his fellowmen. The liberty secured by the Constitution of the United States is a liberty tempered by restraint. In his business as well as in his personal relationships, every individual is subject to restraints imposed by law for the purpose of promoting the general welfare, comfort, health, morals, or prosperity of the community."

In other words, what Mr. Rogers was saying is that with liberty and freedom come responsibility for moral and principled action. Free enterprise—yes, individual private enterprise—cannot be based upon the philosophy of greed and selfishness or have as its rules the law of the jungle. Business enterprise has a responsibility not only to itself but to the rest of the community. It is through Government—a free and democratic Government—that a just and fair body of rules for the conduct of society is appropriately designed and fairly enforced.

Fair trade in the broader sense is what we are seeking in our relationships with the rest of the world. That is, fair trade may well be a simplified statement of the aims and purposes of the United Nations. Fair trade in essence means respect for individual rights, the preservation of competition between responsible people and institutions, a society based upon law and order. These should be the objectives of all freedom-loving people in all aspects of our political, social, and economic life.

Let me just develop the concept of fair trade in a broader sense. The Securities Exchange Act, regulating the stock market, was fair trade for the market and the stock purchaser.

The Holding Company Act, regulating the financial operations of public utilities, was a body of fair trade law in the field of public-utility service.

The abolition of child labor was fair trade in the field of employment. The establishment of a minimum wage was fair trade for the unorganized worker. The guaranty of the right of collective bargaining was fair trade for organized labor.

The establishment of price supports, agricultural credit, soil conservation was a body of fair trade law for the American farmer.

The insurance of bank depositors through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was fair trade for the banker and the depositor.

The passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act set up principles of fair trade in the American enterprise system. The establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank System guaranteed fair trade in the banking field.

The Social Security Act was but a recognition of the principle of fair trade for those who were the victims of unemployment, old age, and physical incapacity.

The creation of a Federal housing program was but fair trade for those who wanted to buy their own homes at reasonable rates of interest. Slum clearance and low-cost public housing represent, in my mind, a fair break—or should we say, fair trade—for the underprivileged and the victims of our mechanized industrial society.

The development of our natural resources, our rivers and our harbors, is a fundamental guaranty of the opportunity for fair trade in the underdeveloped areas of our Nation.

Yes; this principle of fair trade is much broader in its meaning than just in the retail field. The basic purpose of American democratic government has been the guaranty of equality of opportunity and the preservation of individual liberty. In simpler terms this is, in the language of the businessman, fair trade—a guaranty of the opportunity to do business with, to associate with other persons on a basis of fairness and equality, but at all times preserving the differences that come with individual initiative and the development of individual capacity.

There has been a great hue and cry these last few years about the loss of our liberty. Many of those who today oppose fair-trade laws such as the Miller-Tydings Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, say that these laws threaten liberty and freedom. Unfortunately, some people look upon liberty and freedom as a license to exploit and to destroy. The American philosophy of liberty is not merely absence of restraint. More basically, it is the establishment of conditions of fair play and of equality of opportunity that permits an orderly development of society and a development of individual ability for the benefit of the individual as well as the community.

It is for these reasons that we have laws that regulate zoning in cities, that control traffic, that set up standards of public-health protection and sanitary codes.

It is because we look upon liberty as a privilege but also as a responsibility that we have developed laws which regulate our finance, which control and direct our commerce, which protect and develop our natural resources, and which guarantee to the individual citizen his basic rights of free speech, free press, freedom to worship, and freedom to assemble.

Now, some people may call this "statism" or they may even call it "the welfare state." I call it "democracy." I call it responsible government and an orderly society.

It is my observation that the sure path to "statism," the sure road to collectivism is the failure to recognize the basic needs for our people and the failure to protect and guard the free flow of commerce in an economic system that is based not only upon free enterprise but upon individual enterprise.

I repeat—the heart and core of the American economic system is individual enterprise—the small independent businessman. The threat to that economic system is the ever-growing concentration of economic power and that threat is a real one.

This was testified to by a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission which showed that 113 companies, all with assets of more than $100,000,000, owned almost half of the manufacturing plant and equipment in this country. Other alarming testimony is the fact that from 1940 to 1946, more than 1,800 independent firms, in manufacturing and mining alone, disappeared as a result of mergers. I have seen statistics that show that in 124 commodities, four or less companies control 75 percent of the sales.

These are facts that the small-business men should study and understand. These are facts that represent economic atomic bombs to a free economic society. It is only through your Government—a resourceful, responsible government of the people—that the ever-growing power of economic concentration can be curbed.

It is only through vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws and vigorous action on the part of the Federal Trade Commission that a free competitive system can be preserved.

Statism will come to us when business gets so big that it can only be managed and controlled by a government that is even bigger. Just as big business becomes intoxicated with its own power and loses its sense of initiative and imagination and its respect for individual rights, so big government that is designed to check big business can become inefficient, inconsiderate, unimaginative and unconcerned as to individual rights.

Statism in simple terms is absolute power—power has many manifestations. There is political power but the essence of political power is economic power, and it is my considered judgment that if statism comes to this great nation, it will come because those who cry out the most against it at this day are often unaware of the menace of economic concentration and the destruction of free competition.

Let us get down to the fair-trade laws that every retail druggist is so deeply concerned with. I know you will forgive me for having developed the concept of fair trade in its broader sense. From here on out, I want to talk to you about the fair-trade laws that have done so much to preserve and protect the retailer, the small independent businessman.

You see, I believe with a deep conviction in property rights and in private property. I believe in private property so much that I think everybody ought to have some of it and not a few people have most of it. It is in this frame of thought that I rise to defend the fair-trade laws and state categorically that they are a fundamental part of our political and economic freedom.

Fair trade as we know it today came into existence in California in 1931. Today we have fair trade in 45 States. The Federal Miller-Tydings enabling act legalizes fair trade as a matter of interstate commerce. It doesn't impose fair trade over the entire Nation, but it merely legalizes fair trade in those States whose legislatures wish to adopt it for their own States.

I suspect fair trade would not have gone very far without the famous section 1½—popularly known as the nonsigner clause of the State laws. This clause simply makes the terms of a fair-trade contract apply uniformly to every retailer in a State. Without such uniform application, fair trade would have worked a competitive disadvantage against the retailer who signed the contract and in favor of the one who didn't—if the latter was clever enough to obtain stocks of fair-traded goods despite all efforts to prevent this from occurring. They're the kind of dealers whose predatory price cutting and exploitation of loss-leader merchandise made fair trade necessary.

This section 1½ of the standard State fair-trade laws reads as follows:

"Willful and knowingly advertising, offering for sale or selling any commodity at less than the price stipulated in any contract entered into pursuant to the provision of section 1 of this act, whether the person so advertising, offering for sale or selling is or is not a party to such a contract, is unfair competition and is actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby."

From the standpoint of the broad national interest, fair trade simply amounts to this—as a matter of public policy, the Nation has reached the conclusion that the existence of hundreds of thousands of independent retailers is in the best long-range interest of the general welfare. To back up this public policy, the Federal and State fair-trade laws provide a means of elevating the level of competition between the independent local merchant and the large predatory organizations.

The late Justice Brandeis, with his clear, logical, and incisive mind, demonstrated for us the threat of unfair competition and the effect of ruinous price cutting.

"America should be under no illusions as to the value or effect of price cutting. It has been a most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rivals to which the great trusts have resorted most frequently. It is so simple, so effective. Far-seeing organized capital secures by this means the cooperation of the short-sighted unorganized consumer to his own undoing."

Fair trade doesn't give the independent any monopoly. Nor does it stop the offering of bargains. Any retailer—independent or big—can still sell non-fair-traded merchandise at any price he chooses, and there is a wide variety of such goods available to anyone who wants to merchandise on this basis. In fact, there can be no fair trade on any product which is not in competition with other similar products.

Fair trade has demonstrated, without peradventure of doubt, over the years of our depression, war, and postwar periods, that it serves a useful social and economic purpose in the public interest in our free-enterprise economy. Fair trade has proved itself one of the keystones of our antimonopoly structure; for it has stimulated competition while, at

the same time, setting down just rules of competition which eliminated the vicious practices of those who want only free-for-all enterprise and whose textbook is jungle economics.

Under fair trade, the independent retailer has been given the opportunity to earn a livelihood. I say opportunity advisedly; because that is all he has been given. The independent retailer must still earn his living—fair trade does not guarantee it to him. He must know how to keep store, how to buy, how to sell, how to serve his customers. Those who fail in these and in other essentials of retail distribution will surely fall by the wayside; and, indeed, they have. At the same time, larger retail units have become even larger. Yes, here in the United States, we have witnessed in less than a generation a simultaneous strengthening of the position of the independent retailer—and his number is legion—and a remarkable growth in the size of retail distributors. Some of them have, in fact, become bigger than most of the manufacturers who serve them.

Can you imagine the chaotic condition of retailing today if the fair-trade laws were not in force? Those of you who were in business during the terrible depression can, but I fear that many of our good citizens across the land have either forgotten the fantastic practices of those days, or never knew them. Retailers are a curious lot. They go by last year's figures. And, in 1949 for the first time in a decade at least, those figures don't compare favorably with last year's sales. In their drive to make the 1949 figures look better than those for 1948, some retailers would have reverted to the primitive, savage, unconscionable price-cutting tactics which we knew during the depression when some 300,000 retailers were forced into bankruptcy. Without fair trade, this country would today be witnessing the unhappy spectacle of jungle economics at its worst.

But not for long, in my view. I have confidence in the good sense of the American people. And I am sure they would soon see through the deceit, fraud, and excess of the price cutter, however beguiling his surface appeal or impressive his financial resources. Instead, they would join with businessmen, with social philosophers and economists deeply and rightly concerned about monopoly, and with public officials in developing an irresistible pressure to enact the very fair-trade laws which, fortunately, are on our books. We have come a long way in enlightenment, in a sense of social responsibility, since the black Friday of October 1929. The retailer who would like to lure customers into his store through predatory price-cutting practices has simply had to find other, and fairer means of winning trade; and, if the truth be realized, fair trade has made him a better merchant by forcing him to find those means.

In the circumstances, one might well ask why presumably intelligent people oppose the fair-trade laws. And do not let us delude ourselves into believing that the only opposition comes from the confirmed price cutter or the chronic crackpot. Let me assure you that among the opposition are sound, intellectually honest citizens.

These citizens cannot have had first-hand experience with the fantastic price orgies of the depression era. Somewhere along the line, they have swallowed the price-cutter's propaganda; or they have developed misconceptions concerning fair trade on their own account. What are some of these misconceptions?

First and foremost is the misconception that consumers are penalized under fair trade, whereas consumers in non-fair-trade States are able to buy things cheaper. This is positively not so. Oh yes, the price cutter in the non-fair-trade State offers loss-leader bargains which have high visibility and give the impression of similar bargains throughout the price cutter's store. The fact is, however, that operating margins are as high or higher in non-fair-trade States; so that, taking all the items which the price cutter sells—instead of selecting only the comparatively few bargains—he is charging the consumer as much or more than the fair-trade retailer charges. It cannot be otherwise. He must charge more for some items to make up the loss he incurs on those price-cut products which are used to lure unwary customers into his store.

Another misconception is that fair trade gives the manufacturer full and uncontrolled opportunity to fix the price at which he sells to the distributor and to fix the price at which the distributor sells to the consumer. That's wrong, on both counts. In the first place, fair trade does not give the manufacturer any rights, as regards establishing his own selling price, that he doesn't already enjoy. The owner of the product and of the trade-mark which identifies it has always had, and has today, the right to say what he will charge for his product. Fair trade does give the manufacturer the right to protect the property value of his trademark, if he chooses, by establishing the minimum resale price of the product.

Right here in this great State of New York, a very significant statement about fair trade was made by the former Governor of this State, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman. In signing the New York State fair-trade law in 1937, Governor Lehman said:

"This bill in no way sanctions monopoly, monopoly prices or combinations in restraint of free competition between commodities. This is true because the provisions of the bill are applicable only to a commodity which is in fair and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced by others. The prices of commodities that are sold in fair and open competition with other commodities of the same general class will always be subject to control by the powerful forces of competition. If a manufacturer markets his products at a price which the consumer deems too high, the consumer will naturally purchase a commodity of the same type produced by another manufacturer who is willing and able to market at a lower price."

In this statement the economic application and the philosophy of fair trade is clearly stated.

But the real and only effective and legal price fixer in America's competitive economy is the consumer, and this is as it should be. She can buy what she likes among a wide assortment of articles of a given class, and pay what she likes because the price range generally is as broad as the assortment. She can buy an article under fair-trade, or one that is not fair-traded. In these circumstances, the price which she and the millions of other consumers are willing to pay definitely determines the price at which the particular article can be, and is sold.

How does she happen to have such free choice? The answer is simple. The fair-trade laws specifically provide that a trade-marked product may not be put under fair trade unless it is in free and open competition with products of similar class produced by others. Further, they state that the manufacturer may protect the property value of his trademark, if he chooses; but he doesn't have to do so, and many manufacturers do not. Again, the fair-trade laws do not repeal the antitrust laws. Any conspiracy among manufacturers to fix prices among competing products would bring a quick visit from the Antitrust Department or the Department of Justice and, I hope, speedy indictment. In fact, it is this competition among fair-trade merchandise—as well as between fair-trade and non-fair-trade merchandise—that serves to keep prices of all products within the range of consumer acceptance.

Then there is the now ancient complaint about the Government meddling too much in the affairs of business. We heard that complaint back in the last century when the Interstate Commerce Commission was being established. We heard it again when the first Food and Drug laws were enacted in 1906; again when the SEC was formed, and many times before and since. The fair trade laws do not put the Government in business. They simply lay down a few rules of business competition—which is the obligation and responsibility of government in a free enterprise society. They are no more restrictive on the individual than wise traffic laws.

Well, maybe we've satisfied the critic this far, but he is a resourceful and persistent fellow. Says he, with an air of earnestness, "The trouble with fair trade is that it does not permit economies of distribution to be passed on to the public in the form of lower prices." Of course, this assertion is sheer bunk. Inefficient retailers, like inefficient wholesalers and inefficient manufacturers, do not last long—fair trade or no fair trade. As for the others, everybody recognizes that there will be small variations in operating efficiency; but the resulting consumer price variations will generally be so inconsequential as to have little effect on the consumer's purchasing power. What is so strange about this particular objection to fair trade is that it is most frequently advanced by the very price cutters whose operating costs are notoriously among the highest among retail establishments. If he were ultimately successful in driving out all other distributors, costs of distribution to the manufacturer and consumer would really go up, and we would lose thousands of independent merchants in the process.

The objector keeps on objecting, however, and you've got to meet his every argument. He'll tell you that in our kind of free enterprise the man who owns the product has the right to charge anything he pleases for it, and to give it away, if he wants to. This is true. But what the objector fails or refuses to understand is that a retailer, while owning the product when he buys it from the manufacturer, does not simultaneously own the manufacturer's trade-mark which identifies the product. That remains in the manufacturer's possession all the time, as the United States Supreme Court so clearly stated. If the retailer wants to take the trade-mark, or label, off the package, he can sell it at any price he wants to, fair trade won't interfere with him. Fair trade just doesn't let him feed, like a parasite, on the good will which the trade-mark symbolizes. Fair trade does not permit him to damage the trade-mark by making a price football out of the product.

Finally, there are some good citizens who read an editorial inveighing against fair trade without realizing that the principle behind it, namely, resale price maintenance to protect the property value of a trade-mark, can be, and is applied without benefit of a fair-trade contract in such fields as automobiles, gasoline, newspapers, magazines, and electrical products. These are among the examples of resale price maintenance which we find in our economic life. The maintenance of the resale price of commodities that are in open competition, as you can therefore see, is neither novel nor is it confined to fair trade laws. I often wonder what would happen if news dealers would cut the price of the very newspapers and magazines which have editorially opposed fair trade.

We can go on with the objections and the misconceptions, for there are, unfortunately, many. I urge you to be patient with those who raise the former or hold the latter. As I have indicated, some opposition comes from the selfish few who would profit by the repeal of fair trade at the expense both of their competitors and of society; but the larger numbers among the opposition are those who do not have a selfish interest. It is your job to develop among them a real understanding of the economic and social significance of

fair trade so that, in good time, the only opponents will be the price-cutters. By themselves, the price-cutters will have neither conviction nor effect.

Fair trade helps to give free enterprise validity. The late chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Col. Charles H. March, summarized the importance of fair-trade legislation and its effect upon competition by these words:

"These Fair Trade Acts, supplemented by the Federal Fair Trade Enabling Act, are deliberately designed to keep competition in American business. Those who opposed these acts, on the other hand, sought to destroy competition. They knew—and it is the settled rule of economics—that competition destroys price fixing and gives products to the public at the lowest possible cost.

"If the people of the United States want monopoly, if they want all the avenues of production and distribution in a community controlled by one or a few, then loss-leader selling is a way to obtain this. If, on the other hand, they do not want to put all the production and distribution of the necessities of life into one or a few hands, then the competition of the small-business man must be present and unfair trade practices must be prohibited. Loss-leader selling is one of the most remorseless enemies of healthy competition."

Let us made no mistake about it, our free-enterprise system cannot long endure if economic power is concentrated in relatively few hands. We must have large numbers of businesses, and we must make it possible for men to have a fair chance of success in business enterprise, if we are to avoid the statism about which there is so much fear. Accordingly, fair trade, which protects trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices, should have the support of every American citizen who believes in free enterprise.

A sister piece of legislation to the fair-trade program was the Robinson-Patman Act. This is presently under attack from the monopolists and from big business. The principle of this legislation is also very simple and likewise stemmed from the dreams and thoughts of Louis D. Brandeis. In effect, that legislation merely says that power shall not be arbitrarily used in the market place. You know better than I do that a big company can fight its way into the market place either by the superiority of its merchandise or by the use of mere, sheer, naked power. The use of such power is bad for economic and political democracy.

The Congress of the United States has declared under the Robinson-Patman Act that a particular kind of power shall be banned in the future. In brief, the power referred to in this legislation, related to the prices at which the manufacturer sold his output to large or small, or favored or disfavored, distributors or retailers. Congress did not lay down a rule that there could be no variation in price or discount between the smallest buyer of the commodity and the largest. All the Congress said, in laymen's language, was that the difference in discount, for example, should have a direct relationship to the economic costs involved. If the packing of the article, or the shipping expenses, or any other element that went into the actual cost of the transaction, varied between the large order and the small order, such variations can be translated into the price. Unfortunately, we went through decades under which large companies had the power to decide which of the customers for their commodities should be allowed, in effect, to survive, which should hang on as a matter of grace, and which, above all should be allowed to make a real profit at resale.

This particular legislation is being subjected to increased litigation and only recently the United States Supreme Court has spoken well, if not too clearly, on this subject. We are now at the point where, as I read the decisions, the burden of proof for discrimination in price or discount is on the manufacturer-distributor who wishes to vary his terms in such a way that an agency of the Government, or, if you please, an outside potential buyer can be heard to say that competition has been lessened.

Once again Congress has not said anything about price-fixing. All that your national legislature has indicated is that power is a dangerous thing in the market place and particularly evil if used to eliminate small business. I have laid particular stress on the price-maintenance laws because there is a growing lobby and campaign to wipe out the Federal legislation. But I am frank to say that the two brain children of Louis Brandeis must go hand in hand with the continued preservation of decent competition in American economic life. We need this type of legislation and much more, in order to prevent further concentration of power.

Our entire tax structure, as well as our postal rates, are designed as if consciously to discriminate against small business. As a result, we have had more mergers during the past year than in any other year of the past decade, and we are only now realizing that every merger creates a problem not only for industry and not only for the consumer but also even for organized labor. Some time ago I saw figures which indicated that after a study of several hundred mergers, it was found that in no single case did the merged companies in the year after the merger make as much net profit as in the preceding year when the various companies merged were operating as separate units. It took 10 years before profits equalled the sum total of the individual companies.

You have no vital, active spokesman in your behalf in the Government of the United States. I think the suggestion made by Morris Ernst, in his recent testimony before congressional committees, is worthy of your consideration. Labor has its advocate in the Secretary of Labor. The farmers have a spokesman in the Secretary of Agriculture. The Department of Commerce might well be reorganized so that the Secretary of Commerce would be a battling, forceful advocate for individual free enterprise. The 400 big giants of American industry scarcely need a spokesman. They have their lobbies with the highest-priced public relations and legal talent in America. It is small business that should be the particular concern of the Department of Commerce. I know that the Department is making serious efforts along these lines, but what we need now is a dramatization of the dangers that affect all of you and all of the freedom-loving Americans who hope that their children may have a chance to go into any business on the American scene.

It is not too difficult to get laboring men together. They are in the same factory. They are not fighting for the same nickels. Farmers can be organized because they can meet at meetings of the Grange, Farm Bureau, or Farm Union; or they know each other fairly intimately within wide areas. The task of getting small-business men together is of a different nature. The grocer in Minneapolis has little in common, he feels, with the little grocer in New York City. And the druggist in St. Paul feels little kinship with the druggist in Buffalo. It is, therefore, all the more important that these businessmen, operating through brains rather than power, have a spokesman and advocate in Washington, in the Cabinet, not only in their own behalf but in behalf of consumers, decency and freedom for all of the people of our Nation.

Who is helping the small independent businessman? Although you may not agree with me, I say that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are of real assistance. In enforcing the Antitrust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Acts, they at least inhibit the growth of economic power to the extent that judicial decree will permit, and I am sure that their mere existence keeps raw materials flowing to small competitors of big suppliers. They challenge full line forcing and exclusive dealer contract and have broken up combinations in restraint of trade in many industries. However, the efforts of these Government agencies that work for freedom cannot save the American system of free enterprise. If American businessmen seek the easy road to a sure thing—if they prefer participation in a racket to participation in competitive enterprise—if the spirit of competition dies, then the American economy will be regimented either by big Government bureaus or by big business. Freedom of opportunity will be destroyed.

Can the independent turn elsewhere for assistance in maintaining his independence? He can join with other independents in organizing a sound American institution—a trade association.

Trade associations can help the independent by raising the business and accounting standards of his industry; by keeping him informed on Government regulations and supplying him with trade statistics; by representing his interest before governmental bodies; by keeping him informed on technical developments; by sponsoring research and public-relations programs, and by many other means consistent with the principles of a competitive economy.

But his trade association and he, as a member, must resist the temptation to become a closed corporation or a guild. The trade association must make competition more effective, not less effective.

Experience shows, I believe, that the misuse of a trade association ultimately destroys the association by killing the spirit that made it and produces disastrous results in the industry and the society that relies upon it as a bulwark of individual freedom. To you, independent businessmen, it must be obvious that:

The American heritage of freedom is yours. To perpetuate that heritage by keeping alive a vigorous competitive spirit is your responsibility and the responsibility of every American citizen. Only the will to maintain this spirit can keep it alive. No amount of law enforcement can preserve this spirit or, without it, maintain a system of free enterprise. Only if you and the American business community are true in act as well as in word to your tradition of freedom, will that freedom be a reality. Eternal vigilance is said to be the price of political freedom. It can with equal force be said that competition is the price of economic freedom. Without economic freedom the other freedoms, including political freedom, are lost. This, I submit, is your stake in the competitive system.

Address by Senator Martin at Annual Convention of National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the annual conven-

tion of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers at Atlantic City, N. J., on September 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Away back in 1932—it seems almost a century ago—I had the honor of being president of your association. In addressing the annual meeting of that year I said:

"Economy and efficiency in government are demanded by the taxpayers * * *"

That statement was sound and self-evident in 1932 when the gross expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments were less than $13,000,000,000.

I wish to repeat and reemphasize that same sound and self-evident truth today when the gross expenditures of Federal, State, and local governments have gone beyond $65,000,000,000 a year.

Today, even more than then, economy and efficiency should be demanded by the taxpayers.

Let us look back to 1932 and make a few comparisons.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, the Federal Government expended nearly $4,000,000,000. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, the Federal expenditures were approximately $42,000,000,000.

In 1933 the States spent $2,500,000,000 and in 1947 the figure had climbed to nine and one-half billions.

In the same period spending by local government advanced from nine and one-half billions to thirteen billions.

Bringing the figures down to date, the most conservative estimates place over-all Federal spending for fiscal 1950 at approximately $46,500,000,000 and State and local government spending at $22,000,000,000—a total cost of government for a single peacetime year of $68,500,000,000.

That situation is made more frightening when we realize that already, in the first 10 weeks of the current fiscal year, the Federal Government has incurred a deficit of $3,333,000,000.

Let us translate this development in other terms. At the end of fiscal 1932 the gross indebtedness of all levels of government was a little more than $59,000,000,000. In 1947 it was $271,000,000,000. And, again, in 1933 all levels of government had 3,230,000 employees. Today they far exceed 6,000,000.

I use these figures because this group is at home with figures. Perhaps more than any other group, you are capable of translating figures into developments, into trends, and into effects—developments and trends and effects that are having, and if unchecked will have, a profound effect upon our structure of government and upon the life and living standard of every American.

Government in 1932 was one thing—and I contend, and the figures emphasize, that government in 1949 is quite another.

How has this come about? Where are we, and where are we going? What can we do about it? Those are the questions I should like to discuss with you.

I believe we can say, with a considerable degree of accuracy, that there are three reasons for the startling increase in expenditures by the National Government: First—past wars and fear of wars; second—depressions and the aftermath of depressions; and, third—demands of the people.

I well remember those days of peace and quiet around 1910 when the Federal budget was less than $1,000,000,000. We still believed, and, to a large extent practiced, that old Jeffersonian theory that "That government is best which governs least."

We also believed in the axiom of Chief Justice John Marshall "That the power to tax is the power to destroy."

In those days we went about our business with little concern about what was happening beyond our shores. And then, almost without warning, the world burst into flames. Most reluctantly America went into World War I. The United States, whether we liked it or not, assumed a position of foremost importance in world affairs.

World War I was not, as we had hoped, a war to end all wars. It did not make the world safe for democracy. In the course of human events, it proved to be but the beginning of a period of unrest and confusion. It was but the prelude to the tragic conditions of world-wide depression and World War II.

These circumstances—these happenings on a global scale—and these existing conditions, translated into fiscal terms, were responsible to a large extent for the difference between public expenditures on the national level as they were a generation ago and as they are now.

More than $30,000,000,000 a year in the national budget is the measure of our interest in and concern with international affairs.

While all this has been happening, what have been the developments here at home—in our localities, in the States, and in the domestic affairs of our National Government?

Expenditures at all levels have rapidly increased from year to year for purely domestic activities and services. And why? Because the American people—all of us—have insisted that Government do for us more and more of the things which we used to do for ourselves as individuals or as communities, and which we should still do.

Too many of our citizens have been misled into believing that what they get from the Government costs them nothing.

Too many have given their support to demagogues who offered the people benefits to be purchased with their own money.

Too many otherwise well-meaning and intelligent citizens have combined into pressure groups demanding that Government money be spent for special regional or sectional advantage.

Even some of those who profess to advocate economy want that economy practiced on the other fellow—their own pet project must be granted the funds they demand.

The pressure for new functions, new services, and new frills in Government is continuous and grows stronger with each passing year.

With established branches of Government the cry is always for more, more, more. Great propaganda machines, operated at Government expense, back up these demands with the warning that a most desirable and necessary Government function will be completely destroyed unless more millions of dollars are poured into it for increased pay rolls and expanded services.

In practically all of our legislatures during recent years, we appropriated more and more for education. That was right and proper—but no one has ever found an educator who thinks we are appropriating enough.

Highways are another large expenditure of Government. Through highways and farm-to-market roads have been of inestimable value in strengthening the American economy. But the fact remains that the expansion of our highway system to meet modern needs is one of the large elements in the cost of Government.

Nowhere has the change been greater, and in no activity has our public expenditure increased so rapidly, as in the field of welfare. Because of our changing economic and social conditions, because of the trend away from "the house and the garden" to "the apartment and the tin can," and because of our failure to do more things for ourselves, welfare has become a major problem and a major expense of government.

Accelerated by industrialization on the one hand, and dramatically focussed by depressions and the results of war on the other, government has embarked upon many new programs.

Public assistance is provided on a vastly increased scale. We have programs of made work to care for unemployment, educational facilities for veterans, vocational and rehabilitation programs, and many varieties of public projects.

In passing it should be noted that made work by government does not eliminate unemployment. The Federal Government spent billions, but there were from 10 to 12 million unemployed at the beginning of World War II.

How have all of these things affected our ideas of government and our structure of government? In view of these developments, governmentally speaking, where are we going?

I repeat, where are we, and where are we going?

Today, we have in America what is well called big government. We have it largely for the reasons I have outlined all too briefly.

Where is big government taking us? Where are we going with it?

The answers to these questions stem largely from what has happened in the fiscal field—what has happened in the area of government with which you gentlemen are most familiar.

There was a time when local government—county, city, and the borough—was the public agency that provided almost all of what we call public service. But there came a time when local governments, under the pressure of more and more demands upon their available revenue, derived largely from the property tax, began to go to the States for help. They urged the States to levy additional taxes, collect additional State revenue, and to grant funds derived therefrom to the localities for expanding public services.

This was an intriguing practice. From many points of view it was a pleasant idea in that one level of government was able to expand its services, its activities, and its expenditures—at the expense of another.

And so began the governmental practice which today we call the grant-in-aid system. The idea spread. It was an extremely agreeable idea—"getting something for nothing." From the localities and the States it spread to the States and the Federal Government.

Beginning in 1914, with the first large-scale continuing grant-in-aid program from the Federal Government to the States—the agricultural county-agent program—it has spread until today practically every important governmental service is financed through grants-in-aid.

We have grants-in-aid from the States to localities, and grants-in-aid from the Federal Government to the States. It has spread to such an extent that almost one-third of the total revenue expended by local government is supplied by the States from State taxes and State-collected revenue—and almost 18 percent of all the moneys expended by State governments come from federally collected taxes.

What are the figures? In 1915, Federal funds granted to the States for public services totaled $5,488,000. By June 30, 1949, the sum exceeded $2,000,000,000. This domestic development is not connected directly with wars. For instance, Federal grants to the States in 1945 were $585,000,000. In just 4 years—peacetime years—they have almost quadrupled.

There is another angle involved in these Federal grants that is costly to the taxpayers.

I wonder how many of our people realize that every dollar appropriated for distribution to the States shrinks down to 60 cents?

That is a high price to pay for bureaucracy and inefficiency—especially since the money came from the States in the first place.

I am indebted to the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Alfred E.

Driscoll, for a clear, concise summary of that situation.

Here in his own State, I want to say that there is no man in American public life with a more thorough knowledge of the science of government than Governor Driscoll.

He is an outstanding expert on taxation and fiscal affairs and his views are held in the highest regard by State and national leaders.

I have had many opportunities to observe his broad and comprehensive grasp of the proper relations among the three levels of government. He has fought vigorously against the growing centralization of authority at Washington and the encroachment of the Federal Government upon areas of taxation and functions which properly belong to the States. He believes in local control of local affairs and his influence carries great weight far beyond the borders of New Jersey.

Here is what Governor Driscoll said in a recent statement, and I quote:

"Out of $525,000,000 authorized and appropriated in 1945 for grants-in-aid, only $314,000,000 got back to the States. The remainder went down the bureaucratic drain."

In other words, it costs the taxpayers $1 for 60 cents worth of work when they use Federal funds to build highways or to improve their schools or airports.

What becomes of the other 40 cents? Why, that goes to pay the salaries and other expenses of the bureaucratic agencies collecting the taxes and administering the various Federal-aid programs.

Bureaucracy comes high these days.

One might well say, "Why be concerned about this? Wherever it is collected, the money comes from the same people—the citizens of this country."

But we must bear in mind that this financial development has a profound effect upon our structure of government—and this must give us concern.

With money goes power. With power goes control. And in increasing central control lies grave danger to the American system of government—a system based upon local self-government, local control, and direct civilian participation.

More than 100 years ago, in a message to the Congress, President Jackson said:

"If the necessity of levying the taxes be taken from those who make the appropriations and thrown upon a more distant set of public agents, there is reason to fear that prodigality will soon supersede those characteristics which have thus far made us look with so much pride and confidence to the State governments as the mainstay of our Union and our liberties."

Please do not misunderstand me—we all recognize that changes that have taken place in our economic society have made it both necessary and inevitable that Government expand its activities and increase its expenditures. But I do contend that what Jackson said many, many years ago was true then and is equally true today.

If we are to have efficiency and, especially, economy in government today, that area which renders the service and performs the activity should levy and collect the revenue to support them. The trend is not in that direction. More and more our individual citizens are bypassing their borough buildings, city halls, county courthouses, and State capitols as they hurriedly rush to Washington.

Now what can we do about it?

It is not enough to "view with alarm." In Harrisburg and in Washington, time and again I have had an interesting experience. I have listened to certain people expound at great length on the virtues of home rule, and State rights while at the same time, they urged that the State take over their local duties and responsibilities or urged large Federal appropriations to support activities which could and should be maintained by the State.

The time is coming, and coming rapidly, when we must make a decision as to what type of government we wish to maintain and preserve here in America.

We already are collecting in taxes and expending through Government approximately 25 percent of the productive income of all of our people.

If our way of life is to survive, we must have less government. We must have more efficient government. To get this all people must be concerned. It must transcend every political consideration. It should not be Democratic or Republican—it should be the voice of an aroused American people.

In recent months two outstanding American statesmen, out of their wisdom and experience, have sounded warnings of the grave perils that are hidden in the present rate of Government spending.

They have turned the light of truth on the false promise that the Government can provide everything needed to make the people happy and prosperous.

They have torn away the mask of socialism and have warned that liberty and independence will be destroyed if we surrender the American heritage of self-reliance and individual freedom.

A distinguished Democratic leader, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former United State. Senator, former assistant to President Roosevelt, former Justice of the Supreme Court, and former Secretary of State, speaking at the bicentennial celebration of Washington and Lee University, made a stirring plea for the reduction of expenditures.

In that address he said:

"Congress should authorize and direct the President to make the reduction necessary to bring expenditures within our income.

"Some of the proposals now suggested which would curtail the liberties of the people are offered in the name of public welfare and are to be made possible by Federal aid. That phrase is an opiate. It is deceptive. It leads people to believe that Federal funds come from a Christmas tree.

"The truth is there are no Federal funds except those taken from your pockets. If the people generally will ever come to understand this, there will be less demand for Federal aid."

Here is another quotation from Mr. Byrnes' speech.

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer or doctor, soon will be an economic slave, pulling an oar in the galley of the State."

Let me quote briefly from the inspiring address delivered by our only living ex-President, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday anniversary.

Discussing the growth of spending by Government—Federal, State, and local—he said:

"Twenty years ago all varieties of Government, omitting Federal debt service, cost the average family less than $200 annually. Today, also omitting debt service, it costs an average family about $1,300 annually.

"That is bad enough. But beyond this is the alarming fact that at this moment executives and legislatures are seriously proposing projects which, if enacted, would add one-third more to our spending. Add to these the debt services and the average family may be paying $1,900 yearly in taxes."

And here is Mr. Hoover's warning. I quote again from his speech:

"Along this road of spending the Government either takes over, which is socialism or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism.

"Most Americans do not believe in these compromises with collectivism. But they do not realize that through governmental spending and taxes our Nation is blissfully driving down the back road to it at top speed."

I could continue quoting along the same line from other great Americans but time does not permit.

I hope every American will take these warnings to heart. Remember that they were spoken, not in the spirit of partisan politics, but in the hope that they would inspire better Americanism and a deeper devotion to the task of preserving our Republic.

Is there anything we can do about it? I think there is and I would like to humbly suggest the following:

1. We can reestablish the influence, the integrity, and the prestige of local government.

We can do this by making available to the localities—counties and cities—sources of revenue through which, to a much greater extent, they can collect their own revenues to provide the public services and activities which they desire.

2. Give each level of government its functions to perform and sufficient taxes to perform those duties.

The Federal Government has the great duty involving national security international relations, the currency, the improvement of rivers and harbors and certain other matters which cross State lines.

State governments have the duty of conservation, higher education, public health, mental hospitals, and through roads.

Local government should have control of elections, the public schools, police power, local roads, and the local courts.

3. Let us streamline State and local governments and not be niggardly in giving them the taxes to perform their functions. This particularly applies to local government—which is self-government. Overlapping and duplication in government must be eliminated.

4. If we are to have complete control of our Government all the people must take a part in that Government. We must not advocate the expendiure of any public money unless we agree we can afford it, and we must all oppose the demagog who seeks public office by promising the people to expend their own money.

5. Peacetime spending by the Federal Government must be cut to the bone. Every department of the Federal Government is now larger than it was before the war and so many people are demanding that the services they have enjoyed shall remain.

In 14 years $43,000,000,000 of subsidies and grants have been made to States, local governments, corporations, and individuals.

A strongly entrenched central government is the arch enemy of freedom. It will destroy the initiative and opportunity of the individual.

You are now near Philadelphia. I wish you would all make a pilgrimage to that city. Visit Independence Hall, the Betsy Ross House, Old Christ Church, Franklin's grave, and Valley Forge.

While I was in Philadelphia attending the American Legion convention I took occasion to revisit many of the sacred shrines of American patriotism. They are always inspiring. They create a stronger determination to preserve the principles which they commemorate.

As I stood before the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall I could not help picturing the scene enacted there on September 17, 1787, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

I refer to the incident that took place when the throng gathered outside Independence Hall greeted Benjamin Franklin with these words:

"What kind of government have you given us?"

Dr. Franklin replied:

"A Republic, if you can keep it."

That is still our problem and our foremost responsibility today. Can we keep our Republic?

My answer is yes—if we are imbued with the same plain common sense and the patriotic courage of our forefathers.

United States, a Christian Nation, Should Make Another Bid for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "United States, a Christian Nation, Should Make Another Bid for Peace," delivered by me on September 25, 1949, over Station WWDC in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, first let me thank Ed Hart and cooperating radio stations for this opportunity to speak to you, and then to my theme.

Over and over again across America these awesome words are being repeated, "Russia has the atomic bomb. Now, what shall we do?" Suddenly we are shocked into the realization we cannot put off much longer a fateful decision.

What shall be our future course in view of this crisis? Shall we follow our present policy of defensive measures designed to meet the offensives of Russia in the cold war, or shall we call for an immediate show-down before Russia consolidates her gains in Asia and the Far East, and before she accumulates a stock pile of bombs?

Are there any other possible moves we might make which would give some prospects of peace? Are we in a position to approach such a decision with the limited facts at our disposal?

Only last Thursday the Senate acted on the military-assistance program for our allies. We did so without knowing of Russia's development of the atom bomb. The President has been in possession of the information for some time. Its importance cannot be overemphasized, yet it was not given to Congress and the American people until the next day, Friday. It might have affected seriously the Senate's action.

During the debate Thursday on the military-assistance program I made a short speech in the Senate in which I discussed some phases of the questions I have raised tonight. I doubt that I can improve on that discussion, and I believe it is appropriate. The speech was made before the eventful news was made public and is not open to the criticism of being an afterthought. I quote:

"Mr. President, it has been difficult for many Members of the Senate to get the real truth about the threat of a third world war from our State and Defense Departments. We are given only generalities here in the Senate. * * *

"It is unfortunate that we have not been given the facts. Oh, yes, we have been advised we can go to the confidential records of executive sessions of the committees which considered this measure and there get the facts. Members of this body have gone to that record and have been sadly disappointed. When it comes to any real facts, the record discloses that statements were made off the record and the space for the real information is left blank. * * * It seems to me that we are being asked to take entirely too much on faith.

"During the war members of the Foreign Relations Committee excused themselves from knowing what was going on by explaining that the President of the United States could not enlighten them because he was too busy winning the war and for the further reason that the information was such that he could not reveal it. As a result of that policy, many mistakes were made which might have been corrected had the Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House been able to function as they should have done.

"Altogether, it seems to me what we now have is a case of the blind leading the blind. It will be a miracle if out of this situation we can make the right decisions. It is said that we should have full faith and confidence in our officials in the State and Defense Departments, and in the President. For one, I would like to have that confidence, but as one who has read at least a part of the record of the past years, I am completely disillusioned. The record as I now read it is one colossal blunder after another in the field of diplomacy and global long-range strategy; blunders which have brought us to the critical situation in which we now find ourselves. * * *

"No one can point with pride, in my opinion, to our diplomatic record in World War II and since that date. One of the best tests of diplomacy is its ability to keep us out of war and from the threats of war, and at the same time, preserve our liberties and our institutions. Judged by this standard, the past 16 years have not been very successful.

"Mr. President, it is said repeatedly that we should not criticize unless we have a better program. There is some truth in this, but how can Members of the Congress suggest a better program unless they have more of the facts about our present situation? Since we cannot get all the facts, we can only act and plan in the light of the information we do have.

"From the available record as I see it, there should be a decided change in our foreign policy. For too long a time now, Russia has been dictating to America its foreign policy. We have had to accommodate our foreign policy to whatever strategy the Kremlin has decided upon.

"Over 2 years ago during the debate on the first Greek-Turkish loan, I made a statement on foreign policy, which I would like to review for a moment. That speech was made April 22, 1947. At that time I said in part:

" 'Mr. President, I am voting for this bill in the belief and the hope that this is only the first step; and that we shall now come back to the first principles as set forth in the Atlantic Charter not only in Greece and Turkey but in China; that we will reverse the action we took in that nation recently when we decided not to take sides as between the Nationalists and the Communists, but decided to get out; that we will redeem our promises made to the Koreans that they shall have their independence; that we shall refuse to make any more agreements with Russia until she gives some evidence that she is willing to honor and respect the agreements she has already made from the days of the Atlantic Charter down to the present time; that as a logical outgrowth of that stand we shall not ratify the treaty with Italy which renders Italy defenseless for a long time to come against a constant threat of the Communist Tito and his government, which is a satellite of Russia; that with respect to Germany we make no further agreements of any kind with Russia respecting that nation until such time as Russia honors her past agreements; that we lay all of the facts on the table before the United Nations.

" 'Let us also declare it as our policy that we expect to honor all our agreements and expect other nations to do likewise; that we shall be glad to help Russia attain any of her legitimate ambitions and her necessities by peaceful means. In fact, let us declare to her that we are a Christian nation, we shall be willing to abide by the doctrine of the Christ, known as the Golden Rule.

" 'By taking this stand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe we can stop the present ideological war and prevent a shooting war of world war III. Half-way measures, in my opinion, will not do. We must go the full distance. This is a case which requires the boldest of action. By any other methods I believe we court disaster, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we have the atom bomb. It should be clear that we cannot in any warfare in Europe use the bomb indiscriminately against any nation because we may in doing so have to destroy millions of innocent people who have had no part in the bringing on of the struggle.' "

And now I continue the speech made to the Senate last Thursday:

"Reviewing the events of the last 2½ years, it should be remembered we did not reverse our position in China. We withdrew, leaving China to her fate, and that is true even though we did provide nominal assistance, but in effect it was not an all-out support such as should have been given if we expected to hold China in the list of free nations of the world. China is now lost to the freedom-loving nations of the world.

"We have taken other steps, it is true, but they have not been effective in meeting the over-all global strategy of the Communists.

"We think we are winning the cold war, but we are now discovering that the cold war was only a holding operation while the Communists were taking over China and becoming a threat to the rest of Asia and the Far East, and our defenses of the west coast of America.

"We are preparing to defend our frontiers in Europe and are leaving undefended our frontiers in the Far East. Communism is growing stronger as viewed from an over-all point of view. Given time, Russia and the Communists will consolidate the gains made in Asia. She will find a way to make use of the economic resources she now has at her command. She will be able to make the atomic bomb in large numbers, and then when war comes, and the way things are going now it seems to me war is inevitable, it will be so destructive that there will not be any winners. This is the gloomy prospect we face if we follow our present course.

"It is late now to make the bold move we could have made, in my humble opinion, very effectively 2½ years ago, but I still believe it is worth trying, and if it should not succeed, then we will have to make the difficult choice, whether to go on, whether to follow the road we are now traveling to inevitable war when our enemies are stronger than they are now, or whether to take the offensive now and make the best use of the advantages which we now possess."

This is the end of my quote from my speech delivered in the Senate last Thursday, the day before the President made his startling revelation. That revelation hasn't changed my views; on the contrary, I am more convinced than ever that our present course can only result in war.

The United Nations Assembly is now in session; our opportunity is before us for a show-down. We can frankly state our case, what we expect and what we are willing to do. We can invite Russia to tell us what her

needs are, what she wants, and what she thinks she is entitled to, and then as a Christian nation, and with the help of other Christian nations, and in the spirit of true Christianity, we should be able to help her get what she really needs and what she is equitably entitled to. There is a chance we may succeed.

And as a consideration we can insist upon disarmament. We can require cooperation backed with guarantees. If Russia and her satellites in this show-down are not willing to cooperate, are not willing to agree to disarmament, then we can decide whether to go on with our present policy or to take advantage of the strength that is ours before Russia and her allies can reach the same stage on preparation. Still other policies may suggest themselves.

We and our allies can become the world's police force with a clear conscience after this last effort to bring about disarmament and the peace of the world. But if we fail to make every effort for a peaceful settlement, then we have not lived up to the principles of Christianity which have been the guide of our national existence from the beginning.

There is another power we should not overlook. It comes to individuals and nations alike in actual living the way of life that comes to the world through the Man of Nazareth. We should not overlook this fact. We should look to the strengthening of our spiritual forces. We should remember that it has been said "That all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

We should make it abundantly clear that we are not attempting to survive by the sword alone.

Repentance as individuals and as a nation will greatly strengthen us. Of this I testify.

From an ancient American prophet who spoke of the future of this land of ours, we have a solemn warning and a great assurance; I quote:

"And now, we can behold the decrees of God concerning this land, that it is a land of promise; and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall serve God, or they shall be swept off when the fullness of His wrath shall come upon them. And the fullness of His wrath cometh upon them when they are ripened in iniquity.

"Behold, this is a choice land, and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under heaven, if they will but serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ, Who hath been manifested by the things which we have written."

May we heed the warning and receive the Divine protection it assures.

It Is Not Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 26, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Colonel McCormick-controlled Washington Times-Herald of this morning, September 26, comes an editorial, printed herewith, which quite accurately explains why those in power in Russia may regard us as their foremost enemy.

Under the czars and traditionally, Russia, as in the Civil War, was our stanch friend, but international statesmen and propaganda have changed that situation, and one without previous knowledge, reading the press, might logically assume that, speaking figuratively, the Soviet Union and the United States of America were ready to fly at each other's throat and that war was inevitable.

The editorial, under the title of, "The Reward of Being Meddlesome," explains how and why this situation exists.

But I do not agree with one of the editorial's conclusions, which is thus stated:

> Now, at the last, we are pledged to defend a great part of Europe and the world against Soviet force. The commitment is automatic and allows no escape.

I cannot agree that we have no better message for our young people than to tell them that, in order to insure peace throughout the world, they must forever hereafter stand ready to go abroad and fight in every war, no matter where nor for what purpose it may be waged.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature and it applies to nations as well as to individuals.

If our people wish to continue to follow the so-called statesmen who got us into our present dilemma into a world police force, that is their privilege. But I cannot believe that these international statesmen who have created this situation ever had the backing of a majority of the American people.

In my opinion, the people were negligent and the so-called statesmen followed their own policies without adequate protest from a people who should have spoken.

I do not believe that our people ever wanted, nor now want, to assume the position of dictating to other nations the policies which they shall follow, nor of accepting an obligation to fight in any and every war in which other nations might become involved—a policy which would commit us to ever-recurring world wars.

But, say the internationalists, they intend by force of arms to impose peace upon the world. That is, they will start a war to bring under subjugation any nation or group which anywhere in the world refuses to accept domination by an international organization in which we will have but one vote.

As Christ and Christianity, in almost two thousand years, have not brought peace on earth, good will toward men, it is unlikely the internationalists or one-worlders will be able to do so.

But if they should accomplish their object, then with it would go our obligation to feed, house, and clothe, and insure equal rights to, the multitudes of China and India who, down through the centuries, have reproduced so rapidly that millions are always starving.

Can we meet such a responsibility? The answer is obvious.

What is the alternative, you ask? The only safe and sane course is for the United States of America to accept Washington's admonition to avoid entanglements with foreign nations. Speaking in the language of the common man, to keep our nose out of other nations' quarrels; to quit being meddlesome and, of vital importance, conserve our resources, retain the means of defending ourselves; devote all necessary effort to retaining and building up our production and military might so that we may defend ourselves against any enemy, any combination of enemies, who may be so foolhardy as to attack us.

We have nothing to fear except our own stupidity, our own inclination to trust and rely upon others for our national defense, our lack of self-reliance.

The editorial to which I refer is as follows:

THE REWARD OF BEING MEDDLESOME

A considerable panic is sweeping the ranks of America's internationalists in the wake of the news that Russia has the atomic bomb. There are cries that President Truman hurry into conference with Stalin and cook up some deal to avert world calamity. There are plaintive appeals that the United Nations get a move on and adopt some convention for international regulation and control of atomic energy. The world government crowd says the United States has no alternative now but to liquidate its independent existence by submerging the Republic in the assumed safety of a herd of nations.

All of this agitation is dictated by the well-founded belief that if Russia has the atomic bomb there is only one adversary against which she will use it. That is the United States.

The American people ought to ask themselves how come. The answer will be readily found. It is that the United States, by pursuing a policy of intervention, has pushed itself to the front to absorb any shock from any nation's attempt to disturb the status quo anywhere in the world. The United States, because of its assumption of this preventive mission, stands out in naked confrontation of Russia.

Thanks to America's internationalists, the United States has been made the logical target of Russian military force. The internationalists have labored with might and main to bring this state of affairs about. Now that their aims have been crowned with success, they are panicked by the knowledge of what should have been apparent from the start: That the triumph of their internationalist cause carries with it the prospect for the United States of a self-destroying war.

For 35 years the internationalists have exerted every effort to destroy the historic American policy of nonintervention in foreign quarrels. For a century America remained secure under that policy while it grew to greatness. The greatness gave it a power which enhanced its security. America enjoyed the friendship of a good part of the world and not even the nations which envied us or distrusted us regarded us as their inevitable enemy in a forthcoming war.

Then all of these advantages were heedlessly thrown away. The gospel was promoted that the United States could not afford to stay out of the wars of Europe. On this theory, our country provided the decisive power in the First World War. Later the internationalists promoted the notion that America was a guilty nation because it had refused to acknowledge any permanent responsibility to keep the peace in Europe.

Soon the internationalists got the United States into another world war which destroyed any semblance of the historic balance of power. Unable to confess that intervention had been a disastrous error, the internationalists sought to protect themselves from the consequences of their mistakes by saying now that America's interventionist obligation was greater and more inescapable than ever.

To balance the ascendant might of Russia, established as the result of America's decisive military exertions in World War II, the United States in the postwar world was hounded into

a frantic expenditure of the national substance to provide the economic and military aid supposed to redress the balance. The Marshall plan, foreign loans, the Atlantic pact, arms for Europe, the containment of aggressive communism at the borders of Greece, Turkey, Iran, Korea, and the back-breaking burden of an enormous military establishment—these are part of the continuing drain upon America.

Now, at the last, we are pledged to defend a great part of Europe and the world against Soviet force. The commitment is automatic and allows no escape. We cannot hold back in the belief that Russia, with or without the atomic bomb, is incapable of repressing permanently the nationalist spirit of European states, even if it possessed the means of temporary conquest. Instead, we must fight. In the circumstances it is only natural to expect the Russians to use what atomic bombs they have in the effort to pulverize the chief among their enemies.

These are America's rewards for succumbing to the meddlesome gospel of the internationalists. The internationalists now wail over the consequences of their policy, while across the years comes an unheeded voice, counseling against "inveterate antipathies to particular nations and passionate attachments for others."

Why Did Steel Industry Suddenly Balk on Pensions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and informative article written by Blair Moody, entitled "Why Did Steel Industry Suddenly Balk on Pensions?" appearing in the Boston Globe of September 18, 1949.

WHY DID STEEL INDUSTRY SUDDENLY BALK ON PENSIONS?

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Top Government officials will tell United States Steel and the unions when they meet here Monday that if either side forces a steel strike it will be doing an almost criminal disservice to the American people.

After 8 months of dropping industrial indexes and alternately gloomy and hopeful jitters, business and employment are just beginning to head upward again. It looks—but by no means is yet sure—that the inevitable postwar readjustment is passing, and that the great mass of buying power in consumers' hands is about to carry the country into a sustained period of greater prosperity.

But a steel strike, now slated to start a week from Monday, might wreck it. Steel is in many ways the heart of the economy. A shut-down of its basic suppliers would close plants on which millions of families and scores of communities depend, all over the country.

A bitter deadlock over the pension issue, instead of a new negotiated national pattern which could keep production rolling everywhere, would be likely to spread to other industries, including automobiles. Detroit could be hard hit.

Philip Murray and Walter Reuther have been working in the closest sort of teamwork on the pension issue, which was picked by Reuther months ago (in an exclusive interview in the Globe) as the soundest, strongest gain labor could make in 1949. They are not likely to split now.

The amazing thing about the flood of mutual telegraphic invective that passed between Benjamin F. Fairless, Big Steel president, and Murray before cool-headed Federal Moderator Cyrus S. Ching stepped into the picture late Friday, was that it broke out after what had seemed general acceptance and almost relief at the statesman-like report of the President's fact-finding board.

ATTACKS RAINY-DAY THEORY

The New York Times quoted the industry's leaders in Pittsburgh as being surprised that such a report had come from a board dominated by New Dealers. Its proposals, reported the Times, were a good deal better than the industry had expected. The union's whole argument for a fourth round of wage increases was rejected. The board had suggested, as an alternative, price reductions, which are entirely in the hands of industrial leaders, who have refused direct Presidential pleas to lower prices.

But the board also attacked the rainy-day theory of security for the American family. It pointed out that there is little sense of justice in a scheme that lays away hundreds of millions of tax-free dollars per year as sacred fixed charges for depreciation and obsolescence of machinery, but casts off the human machinery, just as necessary to production, without obligation.

The industry, the panel said, should set up an adequate system of pensions and social insurance as one of the fixed costs of doing business—one of the first charges on revenues before profits.

Overwhelming public opinion, it added, has rejected the theory that aged workers should live on the bounty of their children or in the county poorhouse. Should the job be left to Government, under such a welfare state as industry opposes.

DOUBLE TALK 24 HOURS LATER

In a sort of double talk, 24 hours after it was generally declared that a steel strike had been averted and a new national pattern was in the offing, the industry suddenly balked. It would bargain with Murray, but not with the panel's report as the basis for negotiations. It did not oppose pensions, but did oppose noncontributors' pensions as an idea that could undermine private enterprise.

This was perhaps the most amazing development of all. For while a good case can be made for a pension system to which both employer and worker contribute, it was strange to hear this argument coming from, of all people, Big Steel and Mr. Fairless.

For steel helped set a precedent for noncontributory pensions by reaching an agreement for its captive coal mines with John L. Lewis. Steel already has in effect a plan for some of its employees, noncontributory, that augments slightly (average $4 a month) the inadequate government social security pensions.

Steel also has adequate pension systems for some of its employees. Fairless, for example, can retire at 65 on $76,537 a year.

Irving M. Olds, chairman of the Big Steel board, has a pension waiting of $63,815 a year. Enders M. Voorhees, the third member of its top triumvirate, can quit with a cozy annual nest egg of $70,323.

The first $50,000 of these executive pensions are noncontributory. Fairless, Olds, and Voorhees do not seem to think free enterprise is threatened when the pension goes to Fairless, Olds, or Voorhees.

There are, incidentally, few Americans in better position to follow the rainy day system of saving for one's own use than these three steel executives. Fairless' salary in 1948 was $207,900 (before taxes.) Olds' was $161,300. Voorhees' $160,700.

They also were in sufficiently influential positions to increase their own salaries in 1948—Voorhees by $21,567, Fairless by $20,167 and Olds by $22,367.

If they can't squeak through without an old-age pension, why should the plant worker be eager to try, even at his lofty pay of $66 for a 40-hour week.

These are some of the questions that are likely to be asked, beginning Monday, not only by Murray, but by the former United States Rubber vice president who will play man-in-the-middle in trying to avert this strike—huge (6-foot-7) inexhaustibly good-natured, uncannily resourceful Cy Ching.

British Farming as an Economic Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "British Farming as an Economic Asset," written by Harry Ferguson and published in the Washington Post of September 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 10, 1949]

BRITISH FARMING AS AN ECONOMIC ASSET

(By Harry Ferguson, chairman of the board, Harry Ferguson, Ltd.)

COVENTRY, ENGLAND.—As the American, British, and Canadian representatives assemble to discuss Britains grave financial problems, it is desirable to review what Britain ought to be doing to help herself.

Like most British subjects, I have an intense feeling of gratitude for the deep and abiding friendship Americans have shown us in the past. We are most appreciative of America's desires to help us out of our present troubles.

Britain is facing economic disaster. Every sensible man can see it. At all costs, she must increase home production and conserve dollars. She is spending at present over £800,000,000 on foodstuffs of which all, if necessary, with the exception of citrus fruits, tea, coffee, etc., could be grown in the British Isles.

The British economy was built up on cheap imported food, which will never return. Imported food in 1948 cost our nation nearly half the value of our total imports and over half the value of our total exports. Under the present regime, imported food and feeding stuffs cost us, on the average, £16 a head plus £5 a head in income tax to keep down the over-the-counter price.

As one who has been active for more than 30 years in agricultural improvements and in the development in the British Isles and in America of modern farm machinery for efficient and low-cost production of food, I would be neglecting my duty to both America and Britain if I did not attempt to point the way out of our problem.

It is being said that for our economic ills the only cure is to export a lot more. This is not so. The real remedy lies in our escaping from the assumption that to import over half our food is to obey a natural economic law.

By growing a lot more of our own food, we could drastically reduce our imports with the same effect on our trade balance as increasing exports.

To maintain, let alone increase, our exports we must reduce prices, as Mr. Paul Hoffman and other leading Americans have so wisely and strongly urged. Basically, this is the objective of the entire ECA program. Only as our industries reduce costs and prices can we hope to get back rapidly on our feet.

Efficient food production methods here at home are the key to reduced prices because that is the most effective way to cut the cost of living.

A 20 percent fall in the cost of living, which I believe is quickly and easily possible, means that after taxation a £5 wage will purchase what £7 now does

Assured of a progressive fall in the cost of living, workers could afford to accept wage stabilization. Freed from the threat of increases in the cost of coal, or steel, or electricity, or transportation, or wages, or something else, manufacturers could reduce their prices. Reduced prices would lead to increased demand and further price reductions. Manufacturers would be encouraged to modernize their factories and work hard on new manufacturing methods.

By thus substituting a price reducing system for a price increasing system, we could stop Britain's slide to ruin and make her strong again.

The obstacles to this development are our failure to use all the millions of acres which are capable of efficient production, and the continued use of hand labor and animal power on our farms. Replacement of these ancient methods of production on the farm by modern machinery can save the country but is being fatally slowed by prejudice and inertia.

The application of mechanization and better husbandry methods to all our farms—particularly the small farms—could make us independent of imported foodstuffs to whatever degree was considered economically desirable.

Equally important would be the beneficial effects on employment, business, and industry, all the way from the smallest farm to our greatest cities. Raising the efficiency of production of our farmers would increase their purchasing power which, in turn, becomes of real service to industry. The first to benefit would be the small rural shops, then the village shops and right back through the town and city shops to the factories supplying them.

A chain of new jobs would be created in processing food materials and transportation of them to consumers. Similarly, the establishment on our farms of the machines required for the production of this food would create another chain of new jobs and new home markets for our industries all the way from the central factories down to the local machinery dealers and fuel suppliers.

I have urged the Governments of Britain, Eire, and Northern Ireland to get together and proceed with the utmost vigor on a program of land reclamation and farm modernization. The action required is, I suggest:

1. Concerted action by the governments, press, agricultural and educational bodies to convince farmers of the benefit to the nation and themselves of using modern methods and modern machinery.

2. Granting by the governments of loan facilities which will enable farmers to equip their farms efficiently.

3. Careful planning and organization to insure that the advantages of lowered production costs on the farm will be passed on to the public.

It is imperative that we all recognize that the one industry upon which our lives literally depend, in peace and in war, is agriculture. America has the right to know that we are safeguarding ourselves in war and in peace, and the people of your great country should understand that the power animal is our greatest potential danger in any future war.

The more we mechanize the less food we will have to import for ourselves and our power animals. One tanker load of tractor fuel will enable us to grow here food that would take, on the average, 40 ships of the same tonnage to transport from abroad. By clinging to the power animal on the farm, we are needlessly exposing valuable shipping and our very existence to attack from the new, fast submarine at sea, and to the threat of the atom bomb on our ports.

It is time we put first things first and put the modernization of agriculture at the top of the priority list. Mr. Hoffman recently impressed on us the urgent need for action. I have been impressing this upon our Government for about 4 years without result. We can be saved and become an asset to the free world instead of a liability. What we need is planning and action on the grand scale that stirs the imagination. We need all the drive and vision that made possible the magnificent achievement of the Berlin air lift.

By taking energetic steps to save our own country, Britain would set an example which could be followed by all the free countries. Only thus can we merit further help from your generous people.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 8," recently delivered by me.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In this broadcast I want to tell you about two measures of vital importance to all Pennsylvanians, particularly the workers of our Commonwealth.

The first is the Taft-Hartley labor relations law.

Recently administration leaders announced they would insist upon outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law before they would permit Congress to adjourn.

You will remember that, earlier this year, the administration failed to have its repeal bill adopted in the House. As amended on the floor the bill retained the principal provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, although the Democrats have a majority of 90 votes in the House.

The administration leaders promptly pigeonholed the bill. Then they made another move.

They started a repeal bill through the Senate but before it was finally approved it had been completely revised. Twenty-two of the principal provisions of the Taft-Hartley law had been retained and 28 changes were made.

Let me remind you, again, that this was done by a Senate in which the Democratic Party has a clear majority of 10 votes.

Amendments that were put into the administration bill were proposed by Senator TAFT. They were changes that 2 years of experience with the Taft-Hartley law had shown to be necessary.

This bill, with the Taft amendments, passed the Senate but administration leaders pigeonholded it, the same as the House bill.

Until recently it looked as though the administration had abandoned its fight against the Taft-Hartley Act, at least for this session.

Yet, on Labor Day in Pittsburgh—and I was present on the platform—the President of the United States told a large rally that it was repressive, restrictive, and unfair; that he was going to fight until it was wiped off the statute books.

His speech indicated his determination to strike what he has called the "shackles of slavery" from the workers.

Let me say now that the Taft-Hartley law is the most talked about, but least read, measure of recent years. I have met few people in or out of organized labor who have a clear understanding of what it is. Some of those who attack it have not even read it casually. They merely parrot the cry—slave labor law, slave labor law, slave labor law.

I wonder how many of you have ever received a balanced, factual explanation of what the law does? Probably all that most of you have heard has been the voice of the labor bosses who shout slave labor law from the rooftops.

Now, there are labor unions today in almost every community of Pennsylvania. Many of them have been organized during the 2 years that the Taft-Hartley bill has been in effect.

Have you seen any member of any union in chains, or shackles in that time?

Have you seen any union leader or member enslaved, or imprisoned, or deprived of any of his rights because of that law?

Have you seen any union broken or destroyed by the operation of that Taft-Hartley law?

Remember, it has been in effect 2 years.

Let me point out that only once in American history has there been a proposal that would have meant slavery for the American worker. That proposal came from President Truman himself when he proposed drafting railroad workers into the Army in order to smash a strike.

It was the courageous leadership of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT, that prevented this un-American and truly slave labor bill from being enacted into law.

The cold record shows that we have had fewer strikes, and by far less man-hours have been lost, since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. The record discloses that there are more and stronger unions today and that union membership has increased since this act went into effect. The record also shows that there is more money in the union treasuries than ever before.

How then can this honestly be described as a slave labor law?

The changes voted by the Senate would have improved the law, all for the benefit of labor.

Yet the administration refuses to permit the Senate bill, with these amendments beneficial to labor, to become law. Many observers here in the Capital point out that the strategy of the administration is to keep this alive as a political issue for the 1950 and 1952 elections.

In the meantime the workers of Pennsylvania are deprived of the benefits of an improved Taft-Hartley Act.

Surely the rank and file member of organized labor wants to retain his right to know how his union dues are spent, the salaries and expenses of his officers, whether any of his officers are Communists.

He wants to be protected in his right of free speech in union meetings and his right to a secret vote on union affairs.

The Taft-Hartley law is not perfect but it is the American worker's guarantee of his rights against the selfish employer as well as the unscrupulous labor boss.

Within the next few weeks the Taft-Hartley Act will again be a red-hot issue in Congress.

That brings me to my second topic, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. At first glance there appears to be no connection between these two bills. But when you take a careful look, you discover a substantial link between them—a link of striking conflict.

Nearly all those who demand repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act profess to be the great protectors and benefactors of American labor. Yet, they opposed amendments to the Trade Agreements Act designed to protect the jobs of the American worker from unfair and damaging foreign competition.

During the Eightieth Congress I voted for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress had direct assurance from the President that no agreements would be made with foreign countries which would in any way (and I quote) "endanger or trade out segments of the American industry, American agriculture, or American labor."

Yet we in Pennsylvania know that agreements have been entered into which have seriously damaged our workers.

Ask the men who work in the glass factories, or the china and pottery workers. Ask the men and women who work in the carpet and rug mills. Ask the textile workers, the watchmakers, the fabricators of leather goods, the coal miners, or those in the oil industry. These are only a few.

They will tell you what is happening to their jobs. They will tell you that thousands have been put out of work and more thousands are working part time. Why?

They will tell you that the flood of imported goods produced by the cheap labor of Europe and Asia is crowding out the goods that they produce here. They will tell you that their jobs are being bartered away in these trade agreements.

Last week, while this bill was being debated in the Senate, I received hundreds of telegrams from officers and members of organized labor. They urged me to vote for amendments that would give them some degree of protection.

I received telegrams from four of the five district presidents of the United Mine Workers of America in Pennsylvania. They complained that the flood of imported crude oil was destroying the market for thousands of tons of coal per day. This meant throwing many thousands of coal miners out of work in all the coal-producing States.

I am glad to report that I voted to protect the American worker from this unfair competition of cheap labor. Now let me explain.

The Trade Agreement Act authorizes the President to make agreements with foreign countries and to cut tariff rates so as to stimulate international trade.

We make concessions to the foreign countries, and they are supposed to make concessions to our country. That is the theory. I have no quarrel with this principle.

The fact remains, however, that we have made most of the concessions at the expense of the American worker and his family. In many instances, concessions by foreign countries were immediately withdrawn.

Licensing systems and quotas were set up, and other trade barriers were invoked, which, in fact, nullified all of the concessions they had made. We have continued to live up to our end of the agreement in spite of those violations.

Now many of us in Congress, in view of past experience, supported the peril-point amendment offered by Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado. The President and administration leaders violently opposed it.

They charged it would restrict the power and authority of the President. There was absolutely no basis for such a contention.

This amendment simply provides that before the President enters into any agreement, the Tariff Commission shall make a study of the particular commodities covered. After the study is completed the Commission would indicate tariff rates below which there would be danger to American workers, business, or agriculture.

These peril-point rates would be certified to the President. If he established rates below the levels fixed by the Commission, he would be required to tell Congress and the American people his reasons.

It did not prevent him in any way from making the agreement or cutting the rates. It simply required him to tell Congress why he had done so.

That is all the peril-point amendment provided.

Can anyone tell me why the Congress of the United States should not know why a tariff is cut below the peril point?

Can you tell me why the workers in the industry affected should not know the reasons and the justification for such action when their jobs are in danger?

Have we gotten to the point when the Congress and the American people are not entitled, in peacetime, to know why their Government makes international commitments of this kind?

I fully intended to vote for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act if this amendment had been adopted. But when an administration seeks to prevent Congress from knowing why tariff rates are cut below the peril point, I feel that it should not be given this great responsibility and authority.

I, therefore, voted against final passage. When I voted against it, I knew that trade agreements had already been drawn up which still further cut the tariff rates, and will seriously affect thousands of workers in Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

As the act now stands, the President is not required to make any explanation to anyone.

Now, let me make myself clear. I am not against reciprocal trade agreements so long as they are truly reciprocal. I think our Government should help to rebuild the economy of other countries to the best of our ability. We should make every effort to improve their conditions and raise their standard of living somewhere comparable to our own.

I have demonstrated that stand in many votes on the Senate floor. But I am unalterably opposed to any effort to stabilize the economy of any foreign nation if it means unemployment in America, lower wage scales, and a lower standard of living for the American people.

It is hard to understand why those who shout the loudest about protecting the rights of the American worker should vote for something which would destroy or lower the living of millions of Americans.

I contend that the greatest security for the American worker is a steady job at good wages. I shall continue to vote in accordance with that principle.

This is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

State of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have just read with considerable interest, and, I must say, a deep sense of pride, an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, in which he discusses some of the significant effects of the Marshall plan in Europe. Mr. Drummond, now on leave from the Christian Science Monitor and serving as Director, European Information Division, of the Economic Cooperation Administration, is certainly in a position to measure objectively some of the results which have been achieved by our economic aid to European countries.

Mr. Drummond discusses the set-back to communism in several European countries as a direct result of our Marshall-plan aid, and he concludes:

Communism not only has been stopped; it has been put on the defensive in western Europe. Communist propaganda is being forced to shift its tactics. The Communists no longer are able to argue that the Marshall plan is not doing any good—which was one of their principal lines—but rather that the Marshall plan is working so well that it is dragging the participating countries into the arms of the American imperialists. * * * The Communists, in saying this, make little headway with the thesis that the Marshall plan is not helping Europe, so they are shifting to the argument that its benefits cannot last because of a depression they are constantly predicting for the United States.

All this means that the economic recovery thus far achieved in western Europe, in large part as a result of the Marshall plan, has provided the conditions and the climate in which democratic government has been able to function and gather strength. The march of communism has been checked and its specious appeal to the masses of Europeans substantially undercut.

Mr. President, I think this is a signficant report and one that should be heartening to all of us who hold fast to our faith in democracy as a way of life. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Drummond's article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF EUROPE—COMMUNIST BUGABOO DEFLATED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—Whatever the uncertainties over the pace of European recovery, there are two visible and significant facts in Europe today which are amply supported by the evidence. They are:

1. Across the whole canvass of the free nations stable, democratic governments, with a broad parliamentary basis, have been brought into being or decisively strengthened during the past 18 months.

2. There are increasing signs that both politically and propagandistically the Communists are appreciably losing power and

appeal—are weaker in Europe now than at any time since the end of the war.

These are the most evident and salutary developments which strike any correspondent who has the opportunity to look at events at first-hand from Paris to Athens.

A year and a half ago a mood of hopelessness dominated the peoples and the governments of the free nations of western Europe—nations which were faced with such staggering postwar problems that they saw little chance for their solution.

In France, middle-road democracy seemed about to be crushed between an oncoming de Gaullism and aggressive communism. Smart—supposedly smart—people were predicting that the French had no alternative but to choose between the twin evils of a dictatorship of the right or a dictatorship of the left. In Italy, the de Gasperi government was uncertain and it appeared unlikely that it could carry through the stern measures of fiscal reform and retain the support of the country. In Greece, the talk of dictatorship was common and there were not a few Americans who were suggesting that some strong man would have to be found to rule the country at least until the guerrilla war was won.

The outlook is today vastly improved; it is still improving.

The government of Premier Henri Queuille has just observed its first year's anniversary and that is a milestone in the life of French Cabinets which historically have had the habit of moving in and out of office with the speed of a revolving door. Until a year ago the latest average was a new Cabinet every 5 months. From the time of 1946, to the 351–196 vote of confidence which the National Assembly gave M. Queuille last September there were seven different French Governments.

France has its inflation under control; prices generally are being held; the franc has recovered almost one-third of the exchange value it lost in the inflation; production has been raised to 30 percent above prewar levels, and in light of these events, Premier Queuille is able to say: "I am certain today that the orders of the Communist Party are being followed less and less by the French workers."

This political trend is similarly evident in last month's German election. Here the Communists suffered another set-back. The new German Parliament has only 15 Communists, and these only because of the proportional system of selecting 40 percent of the parliamentary membership. Not a single Communist member was elected in direct district voting, not even Max Reimann, Communist Party leader, who ran third in a constituency in the Ruhr city of Dortmund. More than 6,000,000 more Germans in the western zones voted than in the state elections of 1947, yet the total Communist vote went down—from 1,636,000 to 1,360,000, from 9.5 to 5.7 percent.

The de Gasperi regime in Italy is stronger than ever. The Greek Government is winning its harsh struggle against the Communists both from within and from without while retaining the basic democratic freedom of its people.

Behind these developments is the fact that dread of collapse is being widely replaced by a new faith in the future.

Communism not only has been stopped; it has been put on the defensive in western Europe, Communist propaganda is being forced to shift its tactics. The Communists no longer are able to argue that the Marshall plan is not doing any good—which was one of their principal lines—but rather that the Marshall plan is working so well that it is dragging the participating countries into the arms of the American imperialists. (Note that Moscow now also is applying the imperial epithet to Tito.) The Communists, in saying this, make little headway with the thesis that the Marshall plan is not helping Europe, so they are shifting to the argument that its benefits cannot last because of a depression they are constantly predicting for the United States.

All this means that the economic recovery thus far achieved in western Europe, in large part as a result of the Marshall plan, has provided the conditions and the climate in which democratic government has been able to function and gather strength. The march of communism has been checked its specious appeal to the masses of Europeans substantially undercut.

It is the degree of European economic recovery which has brought these favorable political developments into being.

Democracy and the Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a fine address entitled "Democracy and the Modern World" delivered by Miss Marion B. Hoar, a student, on June 6, 1949, at the commencement exercises of the College of Our Lady of the Elms in Chicopee, Mass.:

The records stamped upon the immortal pages of our civilization behold a struggle which involves the nations of the world—a struggle in which we see the supernatural that lifts to heaven, battling the natural that seeks only the things of earth. We see the doctrine of national selfishness making strife against that generosity, which would give to every defined group its inborn right of freedom. It is the stand of the absolute state against the rights of the people to rule themselves, and to develop their own powers to their fullness. It is a battle against men who would bring our modern world under the domination of their autocratic power.

We have espoused the cause of freedom, the cause of democracy, and we must transmit our inheritance of liberty which has come to us across the ages to our present-day world, and to the children of future generations. But we cannot pass on to others our cherished hopes, our boasted liberties, unless we feel in ourselves all that is good and true in our freedom, all that is great in our institutions—unless there is developed in us those ideals which spring from religion, and the religion which is from Christ. For in the development of Christian democracy, religion has been and must be supreme.

Democracy, as we understand it, came into the world with Christianity itself. The so-called democratic states of antiquity know nothing of the doctrine of inalienable rights, of the equality of citizens, or of common welfare as a basis of government. But Christianity furnished both the reason and the motive for democracy. The church taught then, as she teaches now, that our nature was of such dignity, that the Son of God Himself assumed it, and that He gave up His life for every man, for the upbuilding and the restoration of humanity. Thus, Christ the reviled, the man of sorrows, taught us man's dignity; Christ the meek, taught us man's power; Christ the willing sacrifice, taught us man's rights; Christ the all-giving, taught us man's duty. And at this new conception of man, this right of man as Son of God, as destined for eternity, to be a sharer in infinity, men lifted up their heads and shook the shackles from their hands. They gave their lives to keep the freedom Christ had given them. As Christianity furnished the minds of men with a rational basis for democracy, so did organized Christianity the church, become the great school for democracy, its exponent and the upholder of its principles. And down through the years the rulers of successive generations had the fact that their governments were democratic, brought home to them again and again, with a force that arrested attention. When Henry of Germany was in the snows of Canossa, when Henry of England was in sackcloth and ashes, when Philip of France was trembling in terror, they shuddered because they knew there was a voice in Christendom, greater and mightier than the voice of the United Nations today, that could say to them—because you have destroyed the natural rights of the people, because you have not governed for the common welfare, then your subjects are no longer bound in their allegiance to you, and loyalty to you may become a crime against the people.

To many of the leaders of the modern world, these things indeed sound strange. To them religion seems to have no place in advancing the people's cause, for they have abandoned the God of their fathers; they have forgotten that laws made by man, must reflect the truth and the justice which are of God Himself. They have, by asserting too great freedom, thrown aside the yoke of authority which is from God, or they have robbed man of his individual dignity, by making him a slave of the state. And, forgetting that one day they must render to God an account of their gifts, they have used the vast opportunities of freedom for selfish gain, and for imposing upon their fellow men unbearable burdens.

Against this despotism the church has ever been the safeguard and the upholder of true democracy. The modern world has seen the mighty figure of a Leo supporting society with his perennial principles in labor, in government, and in the social order. It has seen Pius the Tenth quenching the false light of modernism and exposing the gilded corruption of its boasted principles. It has seen Benedict, intrepid and calm before the reddened storm, bringing added power to democracy in dark and difficult days. It has seen Pius the Eleventh with zeal recalling the glory of the struggle for true liberty, by constantly raising his voice in defense of the rights of man. And, today, it beholds the reigning pontiff fearlessly exposing the errors of the modern world, as he issues his clarion call to men, pleading for the reign of Christ in the family, in the school, in the nation, in the world.

Thus, against the rising tide of modern ideologies, stand Christian principles and Christian ideals of true democracy, as upheld by the church under the leadership of Christ. And if our modern world is to be free from the power of corrupting governments, its freedom must be in Christ. He alone is the light which can dispel the darkness that seems to envelop it.

We know not what the years may bring; we know not what vicissitudes may be in store for the social order under which we live. We only know that the modern world with Christ an outcast, is built upon sand, and the accomplished godlessness which threatens to supplant Him will blaze a new trail of misery and woe.

The only hope for the world in pain is loyalty to the democracy brought to earth by the Poor Man of Nazareth. Through its mighty force it will place the modern world on a foundation so strong and so deep, that it will rise majestic through the years and be to all men a home of peace.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the keenly informative and intelligent manner that is so characteristic of her timely analyses, Josephine Ripley, of the Christian Science Monitor, has written an article on the importance and the progress of UNESCO. It is something worthy of the close attention of every Member of the Senate.

I commend it to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that Miss Ripley's article, Keep Your Eye on the Turtle, appearing in the September 14, 1949, issue of the Christian Science Monitor be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE TURTLE—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Josephine Ripley)

The hare, no doubt, was more interesting to watch than the turtle in that fabled race.

And perhaps that explains why the general public is less interested and less informed about UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—than it is about some of the more spectacular UN bodies.

But don't forget, it was the turtle that won. And it's not impossible that UNESCO, in the end, may be the organization which will open up the facets of world understanding and make it possible for nations to get along together—peacefully.

UNESCO today is embarked on a pilgrim's progress over barriers of language and custom, past the formidable front of diplomats and the tangled red tape of protocol to the man in the street, the woman in the home, and the child in the school.

Its purpose is eventually to bring the countries of the world as close in common knowledge and understanding as the States of the Union.

This hope is not as far-fetched as it may seem. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs George V. Allen recently described UNESCO's task as that of "mobilizing, fostering, and encouraging the sentiment for friendship, peace, and international understanding which exists everywhere, among all peoples—even those behind the iron curtain."

It is that basic sentiment for peace and friendship within men's hearts that UNESCO seeks to bring to expression through acquaintance—through introducing men to each other through an understanding of each other's way of life.

It sounds simple; it is unbelievably complex. UNESCO is perhaps making but turtle's pace toward that objective. Public attention is concentrated on the swift-moving day-to-day events, on diplomatic tensions and the double-talk of political leaders.

But UNESCO, despite problems within and without, is pushing determinedly on in the effort to get through the lines and past the barriers, as it prepares for its fourth session of the general conference in Paris this month. Pilot educational experiments have been started in Haiti, China, and East Africa. An exciting thing happened in the Marbial Valley of Haiti. It was found that there even the most basic educational work was impossible without better roads and sanitation. Encouraged by UNESCO experts, the natives themselves went into action. They built the first all-year road to the nearest town and dug wells, with the result that the Haitian Government qualified for help from the UN Technical Mission, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the American-Haitian Food Production Service.

Today the valley has better, if still primitive, agricultural methods, health is reported improved, and educational classes are now being held.

UNESCO seminars have helped teachers make up for lost years. Educational missions have been sent to Siam, the Philippines, and Afghanistan at the request of these governments in a campaign against illiteracy.

Books are being translated and exchanged in libraries throughout the world on the UNESCO circuit. UNESCO offers 175 fellowships. It has begun issuance of a weekly radio script, UNESCO World Review.

In the field of science, the best known venture is the research project in the valley of the Amazon. The purpose of this experiment is to determine what one of the great uncharted areas of the earth can yield for the benefit of mankind. Field stations have been established in Uruguay, China, India, and Egypt.

UNESCO has given grants to a dozen war-devastated countries. It has spent $50,000 to help establish 31 schools for destitute Arab refugees. It has provided services to nearly 30 organizations sponsoring 200 work camps in Europe and sponsored an international federation of children's villages.

All this may seem dull and slow, and perhaps even trivial in comparison with the excitement of currency talks and the more quickly tangible results of economic aid. But currency agreements and Marshall-plan aid are admittedly temporary expedients. For a man to understand his neighbor and his neighbor's ways that he and this neighbor may dwell together peacefully is the more important thing in the long run.

So it is always well to keep an eye on the turtle just to see how he's getting along.

Leakage of Atomic Energy Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a formal statement by the American Legion National Public Relations Commission, containing a statement by National Commander George N. Craig, regarding possible leakage of atomic secrets, will be of interest to Members of the Senate, I feel sure.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Leakage of our atomic secrets may well have speeded up by at least 2 years the reported atomic explosion in Russia, National Commander George N. Craig, of the American Legion, charged in Washington today.

"If Russia has developed the A-bomb by 1949 instead of 1951," Commander Craig said, "it can reasonably be assumed that her success has been hastened by the success of her Communist spies and Communist-minded traitors in this country and in Canada. Our foremost scientists did not think that Russia could develop the formula on her own for another 2 years.

"We have been too lax, too tolerant, and too inclined to be unsuspicious in the past in dealing with the enemies of our country who were operating freely within our land. The American Legion has long been demanding a policy of toughness by our Government in enforcing our laws against treason and against foreign espionage. We have sponsored legislation to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States. We have urged that the privilege of our mails be barred to the dissemination of Communist propaganda. Now is the time to stamp out these traitorous elements."

Commander Craig called for a calm analysis by the American Government and its people of the significance of the reported Russian success.

"Of course," he said, "it comes as a shock if we have lost our immunity to atomic attack. The British pound is not the only thing that has been devaluated. Our ace in the hole in national security, the A-bomb, has also been devaluated. But we must not entertain thoughts of fear. We still have a sizable lead in atomic science and in the stock piling of atomic weapons.

"Ten Russian 'Bikinis' could not alter the will of the American Legion and the American people to continue working for enduring world peace, particularly through strengthening of the United Nations.

"We now face a twofold course of action.

"We must redouble our efforts through the United Nations for effective international control of atomic weapons. This is a difficult and slow course because it requires unanimous action and common good will by all nations.

"We must be practical at the same time. We must look to our own preparedness against any eventuality.

"Our plans for civil defense must be speeded up. This is only common sense. We must start implementing immediately our blueprints for a Nation-wide civilian-defense program. We have been complacent about this because the need for it was believed to belong to 1951 at the earliest. But the yardstick by which we have been measuring our national security needs and their progress has been suddenly changed. Two years have been cut from it.

"We must get serious now about national-security training for our youth. The American Legion has a practical and sound program of national-security training. It is now before Congress in legislative form. Now is the time to give it the highest priority."

Independence National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

by James M. Myles, vice president of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association of the United States and Canada, urging the full appropriation of $4,435,000 authorized to be appropriated for Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPERATIVE PLASTERERS' AND CEMENT FINISHERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Cleveland, Ohio, September 23, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND FRANCIS: Attached is a statement I was mailing up to 1 a. m. this morning to the House Appropriation members, which you will find self-explanatory. The boys in the federation sure wasted plenty of paper.

With this statement I also mailed all that I had of your June 7 statement you made before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Most cordially yours,

JAMES M. MYLES.

[Statement by James M. Myles, vice president, Operative Plasterers' and Cement Finishers' International Association of the United States and Canada, and representative of legislative council of American Federation of Labor, urging the full appropriation of $4,435,000 authorized to be appropriated by Public Law 795, Eightieth Congress for Independence National Historical Park, to House Appropriations Committee]

It is a great honor to submit to your committee on behalf of President Green and the American Federation of Labor our contribution in participating for the early consummation by the Federal Government of Independence Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa. We appeal to you, honorable gentlemen, the necessity of seriously considering approval of the authorized appropriation of $4,435,000 as provided for by Public Law 795, Eightieth Congress.

The United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session, in considering H. R. 3838, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, took the following action:

Page 84, lines 12 to 21—

"Independence National Historical Park, Pa.:

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1948 (Public Law 795), for establishing a National Historical Park in Philadelphia, Pa., including printing and binding and expenditures authorized in section 6 of said act, $500,000 to remain available until expended (162) and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $3,935,000, for the acquisition of lands for purposes of the Independence National Historical Park."

It is most fitting that we convey to your Appropriations Committee and Members of Congress our deep concern and interest in the preservation for posterity of the birthplace of our Nation. The only shrine of liberty that stands in the world today.

In that famous shrine of liberty, Independence Hall, our forefathers, on July 4, 1776, adopted the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson. That sacred document made clear to you and me, and all the world that the citizens of these United States of America, were guaranteed the right of freedom, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Under the Bill of Rights we are permitted to assemble to formulate rules and regulations to govern our conditions of labor throughout the United States of America.

Construction on Independence Hall was started in 1732 for the Pennsylvania State House. The beauty and splendor of the shrine of liberty was created by the hands and brains of building craftsmen who made this structure possible for our forefathers to asemble in convention and proclaim liberty throughout our land. You find there Congress Hall, the old Supreme Court House, and many other historical buildings and edifices, as living monuments to our craftsmen down through the decades. A close study by men who understand building can see that the craftsmen who built these early American structures were most concerned with the stability and quality of both workmanship and materials, and from these principles came the inspiration and creation of the architectural beauty and splendor of buildings throughout our Nation. I bring these facts to your attention in order that those within and without the building and construction industry will understand that our craftsmen have been an important part in building our great Nation.

There is one important point I bring to your attention. The State of Pennsylvania, in 1816, sold to the city of Philadelphia, Independence Hall, Congress Hall, and the old Supreme Court House, and adjacent land. The taxpayers of Philadelphia of which I am proud to be one have paid for the maintenance and preservation of these historical shrines. I know you representatives of all cross-sections of our Nation want to feel that these shrines are a part of you. However, the fact remains that since the Capital of the United States was moved to Washington, D. C., in 1800, the Government of the United States has not contributed 1 cent for the preservation of this shrine of liberty in all these 149 years.

The provisions of Public Law 795, Eightieth Congress, and the action of the Eighty-first Congress in authorizing the full appropriation of the $4,435,000 will create a new national historical park in the area of the first Capital of these United States and eliminate dilapidated firetrap structures that now endanger the cradle of liberty and other historical shrines.

It is most important to know that when President Harry Truman signed Public Law 795 on June 28, 1948, he became the first President of the United States to recognize the necessity for a national historical park at Philadelphia for the protection and preservation of our first shrine of independence.

We will appreciate the good offices of all Members of Congress in approving the Senate appropriation and your favorable action will be remembered by posterity as a symbol of your devotion in making possible a national environment in the Independence Hall area after 149 years.

The Meaning of Statism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there is no doubt that statism has now become a most important political term, even though there is no very clear definition available as to what it means. While we are waiting, however, for the dictionaries to become current on this matter, I think perhaps a little contribution might be made toward the discussions on the subject by Mr. Joe Henry, who writes a regular column for the Machinist the stimulating and attractive newspaper published by the International Association of Machinists.

Mr. Henry, according to an amusing column he has written in the September 22 edition of the paper, took his family on vacation recently to a State park in, by the way, New York State. There he was provided with very comfortable accommodations and excellent facilities and service at what appears to have been most reasonable costs. He wonders if that could perhaps be called a "statist" vacation.

In any event, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in the hope that it might perhaps stimulate further profound thought and discussion toward the achievement of political terms which mean the same thing to all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Machinist of September 22, 1949]

STATISM

(By Joe Henry)

A GOOD TIME WAS ENJOYED BY ALL

The Henry family has just had a liberal sample of this new thing they call statism. As long as statism is getting to be the big political issue for 1950, we thought you'd like to hear about our experience. After all, if we're going to be asked to vote for or against a candidate because he is for or against statism, we certainly ought to know what it means.

We think we know because the word was coined up in New York State where we had our sample of statism. The word is being used by a man named DULLES who is running against a man named Lehman for United States Senator. DULLES is a Republican, Lehman a Democrat. DULLES, apparently, is all against statism, although he doesn't say what it means.

It so happened that statism got into the newspapers just after the Henry family finished its vacation. Not being rich folk, we like to take our vacation in State parks. We pick New York because that's where both sides of our family come from.

We rented from the State a three-bedroom cabin in the woods on a lake. We had an oil stove, furnished by the State, a fireplace built by the State, running cold water and flush toilet installed by the State. There's swimming with lifeguards whom the State pays, and there are boats which the State rents, and there are fish which the State has stocked in the lake. There is also a wonderfully pleasant staff whom the State hires to take care of everyone. All this cost us $42.50 for 2 weeks for the whole family—not counting our food, of course.

After reading Mr. DULLES' attack on statism we came to the conclusion that certainly the State parks in New York must be part of this statism. It might even be socialism—the kind that Herbert Hoover is biting his fingernails about. Maybe Mr. DULLES feels that there shouldn't be State parks where families can have a good time for little money. Maybe it was wrong for us to enjoy a statist vacation like we did.

Of course, New York's Governor Tom Dewey is a member of the same party as Mr. DULLES. They're both Republicans. Maybe Mr. DULLES doesn't mean to attack statism in New York, only in Washington.

We don't know the answer. But, confidentially, statism gave us a wonderful vacation. If Mr. DULLES doesn't shut down the State parks we would recommend them for your vacation next year.

Government Suit Against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, numerous persons have written to me concerning the suit of the Government against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one from the Boston Herald of September 19 and the other from the Washington Post of September 26 setting forth certain views on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of September 19, 1949]

SIN OF LOW PRICES

Bigness, it seems, is so bad that it cannot be tolerated even if it brings blessings to the people in the form of low food prices. So the Department of Justice proceeds against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. to compel its division into seven companies. The administration that has shouted so for low prices is now attempting to break up the company that grew big by low prices. What nonsense have we here?

Trust-busting is supposed to be the Government's defense of the little people. These are the people who save a cent on soap or 3 cents on butter by trading at the neighborhood chain store or the big supermarket. The Government is now disposed to reduce or wipe out those savings. Obviously the A & P suit is not serving the little people. Actually it is serving the wholesalers who are bypassed by the A & P's direct purchases, the producers and processors who have been compelled to cut their prices by A & P pressure and the corner-market owner who has had to trim his own profits and adopt efficient merchandising methods to stay in business.

Trust-busting is also supposed to be designed to maintain competition. Yet the things the A & P has been blamed for doing have been examples of more, not less, competition.

When the A & P defended the antitrust action in 1946, it quoted John Hartford, one of the two brothers who largely own the company, on how meat sales had been increased sixfold in certain markets: "This was accomplished by reducing the gross profit rate until the volume was built up to a point where the expense rate was low enough to permit the store to operate at a profit." To which the Government replied, "We know of no more clear and concise words with which to express the Government's charge relative to the A & P's use of its gross profit rates in forcing volume."

So the A & P stands convicted under the antitrust laws of selling too low and engaging in too much competition.

The cry of bigness can have no sense until bigness is dangerous. The A & P is the largest food chain in the world. Yet its share of the Nation's grocery business has declined from 11.6 percent in 1933 to 6.4 percent in 1947, so it is not getting out of hand. Nor is there the slightest doubt that it is engaged in one of the keenest competitions anywhere.

Monopoly has its crimes. It has suppressed patents, choked out competitors by indefensible practices, forced up prices by artificial restraints on production. But bigness is not evil, and efficiency and low prices are not evil. We err greatly if to correct the bad we destroy the good also.

The A & P suit brings the issue frankly before the Nation. Are we going to enjoy the advantages of vertical integration of business, such as savings in production and distribution, greater stability, more efficiency, the blessings of research? Or are we timorously to condemn our economy to smallness?

[From the Washington Post of September 26, 1949]

A & P SUIT

The civil antitrust suit brought by the Department of Justice against the A & P food chain asks for the dissolution of its retail business into seven separate parts under independent ownership and control, and complete divorce of A & P's manufacturing and processing business from the business of buying and selling food products. The Government also seeks dissolution of the Atlantic Commission Co., which buys fresh fruits and vegetables for A & P retail stores, and acts as selling broker for growers and buying broker for produce dealers, who in turn sell to competitors of A & P stores.

In a preceding criminal suit the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., and a large number of officials, and subsidiary companies, were found guilty by a Federal district court of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. That decision was upheld by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago, the decision being written by Judge Minton, recently nominated to the Supreme Court. Department of Justice officials explain that the present civil suit is designed to prevent a repetition of practices found in the criminal proceedings to be illegal. Among such practices are: coercion of suppliers to obtain discriminatory preferences, unreasonable interference with the buying opportunities of competing retailers; suppression of competition by crediting to A & P retail operators savings resulting from discriminatory buying; and selling below cost in some areas while recouping losses by selling at higher prices in less competitive areas.

The antisocial practices of which A & P was convicted in the criminal case cannot be excused on the ground that the public has benefited from A & P's low prices. Nor can they be defended by pointing out that A & P controls only a small percentage of the Nation's food business. For the short run, unfair competitive practices banned by the antitrust laws may benefit consumers by lowering prices charged by the offender. But in the long run these temporary and restricted consumer benefits are likely to be dearly paid for by suppression of healthy competition and the ruin of small businesses, leaving consumers at the mercy of a few dominant enterprises wielding monopolistic power.

In the criminal case, however, the Government insisted that its attack was not directed against A & P's size or against integration per se, but against the abuse of the power resulting from size and integration. Why, then, should the Government try to break up an efficient, closely knit organization in order to prevent continuing abuse of power? Vigorous enforcement of the law, not dissolution, seems to us the proper remedy in this case, and the remedy that best serves the public interest. For if the separate regional retail groups that the Government wants to set up were to be divorced from manufacturing and processing organizations, and deprived of the services of a buying agency that insures ready access to tested sources of supply, the quality of the products sold would probably deteriorate. And legitimate operating economies of the present integrated system that make lower prices possible would also be lost. Moreover, although seven separate retail groups would be much less powerful than the existing unified system, they would still be in a position to put pressure on suppliers and retail competitors.

If the A & P abandons the unfair practices that have brought it into conflict with the law—and constant vigilance will be required to make sure that it does—we see no good reason for breaking up the existing organization, thereby depriving the public of the shared benefits of an economical, integrated system of buying and selling.

Republican Appeal to the Farmers

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, are you old enough to remember the Republican slumberbund during the administration of former President Hoover? I am sure that everyone but a reactionary Republican does. Do you also remember that ex-President Hoover was also the great engineer who drained off everyone's surplus money and ditched the farmers? To stop the depression Republicans invented the slogan "Spend till it hurts—prosperity is just around the corner," but no one was told how far away the corner was behind which prosperity was hiding. I have observed that neither Mr. Hoover nor his associates followed out the directive of the foregoing slogan. Now Mr. Hoover says if spending does not stop our Government is on its last mile. But as usual when Mr. Hoover gets away from his blueprints, plans, and specifications he is wrong. What he should have said was that the Republican Party is on its last mile if it does not become less big-business-minded and more people-minded. The Republicans during President Hoover's regime did not know what to do or how to do anything to relieve the situation and the same "we don't know how" is alerted today, and the Republican leadership must rush to the farmers today for ideas, and again hoot out the parrot-like words "We don't know how—please tell us what to do and how to do it."

Elephant clinics were recently held in various places in Nebraska, and all of the elephant doctors were there to participate in the farmer-public servant symposium. It never occurred to these professionals that what was needed was not a clinic for the elephant but deep surgery to remove the malignancy from his interior. Everyone but reactionary Republicans knows that until the monstrous, malignant tumor of extreme right-winged, bad, big business is removed from the bowels of the elephant

he will continue to be sick and grow progressively worse, too, but the elephant doctors do not know that. If deep surgery is not performed at once on the elephant, he will not need a clinic, diagnosis, nor an operation, but a solemn post mortem. These so-called clinics, from what I learned, were not well received by the farmers. They reasoned thusly:

That when they elected their high-salaried public servants they were led to believe that they were the best specialists money could hire, and when these high-salaried men come back to the farmers and ask them how to do it—how to fix up a farm program—then the farmers lose faith in them and their claimed ability. The reasoning of the farmers is absolutely correct, as the following illustrations will demonstrate:

If a farmer hired a doctor to operate on him, and as soon as the farmer got up on the operating table the doctor would ask the farmer how to give the ether and what he, the farmer, thought his trouble was, and where he, the farmer, thought he should make the incision, well, do you not think the farmer, or anybody else for that matter under like circumstances, would not have much faith in that doctor, and certainly he would not hire him again, I hope.

Or supposing a farmer hired a lawyer to try his case, and the lawyer finally asked the farmer what kind of pleadings he should file and how to try the case, and when to parry and when to thrust, and asked the farmer how to conduct the trial, and compelled the farmer to make the closing arguments to the jury, and argue all the points of law, do you think that farmer would hire the lawyer again?

Or supposing a farmer hired an undertaker to bury a deceased member of the farmer's family, and the undertaker required the farmer to lay out the corpse and do the embalming and conduct the funeral, do you think that that farmer is going to hire that undertaker again?

No, I am sure that that farmer is going to get a man who can generate his own ideas, who can make up his own mind what to do, and how to do it.

We Democrats know what to do and how to do it. The Democrats went to the farmers with a program. The Republicans went to the farmers in an effort to untie the Gordian Knot which has kept them safely out of national public office, lo, these many years. They went with empty heads and came back more empty-headed than when they went, and pulled nothing constructive—just "boners" while they were in Iowa and Nebraska.

My father always told me that the empty wagon makes the most noise going over the bridge and the comings and goings of the Republicans to the farm belt and back during the recent 21-day recess sounded like prewar, west coast, eastbound, silk express trains highballing it through a "jerk-water" town at midnight. Some people thought it sounded like a Russian atomic bomb but no harm was really done except the wear and tear on everything but the heads of the Republican leadership. I guess they are saving their heads for the 1980 comeback.

American Investments Abroad

REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought that nothing that this administration could do or say would surprise me, but I was wrong. The President's program, announced yesterday by the State Department, to stimulate business in friendly foreign countries has left me dumbfounded.

I am not criticizing the plan—it may be a good one, but the amazing thing about it is that in it the President recommends that the tax on American investments abroad be lightened "to stimulate business and encourage investment" in those countries.

Every time that Republicans in Congress have urged the lightening of taxes to stimulate business and encourage investment at home we have been branded as a bunch of economic Tories and called the mouthpieces of big business. The administration not only resists the lifting of war excise taxes and any lightening of the tax burden but is demanding that we crack down more and more on profits, both corporate and personal. The President has scoffed at the idea that a lifting of the tax burden would mean more business and in the end a greater revenue to the Government as well as benefit to the worker, the farmer, and every other person in the land.

Now, in his desire to aid and strengthen the Western Powers, he or his advisers come forth with the declaration that it should be done by lifting taxes on Americans investing abroad and thus encourage foreign investments.

If this policy is good for Americans doing business in England and France and Italy, it is good for Americans doing business at home. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I am not one of those who have constantly shouted against the administration. I have tried to be fair, and I am frank to state that sometimes I have wondered if I were too old-fashioned and conservative in my thinking. I am not worrying any more. If anything were needed to demonstrate the utter insincerity and inconsistency of the President's program, this is it.

By this pronouncement the President admits that the policy of the tax-reducing Eightieth Congress was sound and proclaims his desire to aid business abroad and choke it to death at home so that the American people may become utterly dependent upon a welfare Government.

I have said frequently that I thought the President's economic advisers were well meaning but mistaken. After yesterday's announcement I can no longer give them credit for good intentions. They know what they are doing, and they are trying deliberately to replace representative government by a socialistic dictatorship.

Our Obligation to the Institution of Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following timely and interesting address by Charles G. Taylor, Jr., executive vice president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., before the spring conference of the Agency Management Association at Virginia Beach on May 25, 1949:

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE INSTITUTION OF LIFE INSURANCE

At a meeting of life-insurance men sometime ago, one of my friends, in a vein which seemed partly humorous and partly cynical, remarked, "This must have been a very good business 25 years ago." This observation, prompted, no doubt, by the many problems under discussion at the time, started a train of thought which led to the selection of the title for this talk. It appeared that it might be profitable to make a brief survey of the past as a means of evaluating our present situation.

Thinking back 25 years, it seems to me that we are fortunate to be in the life-insurance business in this day and hour. Some of us date back as far as 45 years, so that period was taken as the point from which to start this rather sketchy survey.

Forty-five years ago the general business "climate," if I may coin an adaption of that word, was far different from that of today, and that fact no doubt had its influence upon our business. No one ever spoke of the institution of life insurance. There were then about 101 legal-reserve life-insurance companies in the United States, but no institutional concept. Those were the days of the rugged individualists. Outside, I believe, of a few professional organizations, there were no organizations devoted to the exchange of ideas for the betterment of the business as a whole. The words "public relations" were not on every tongue as they are today, though we certainly had public-relations problems.

GOOD OLD DAYS NOT TOO GOOD

Various forms of assessment insurance, with the lure of present low cost and promise of ultimate disappointment, were, in many areas, important factors of competition. Even legal-reserve life-insurance companies had to sell not only the need of coverage but the soundness of the company, and, in some sections of the country, the moral justification of life insurance. Sermons by some great preachers giving moral and religious justification for life insurance were part of the sales kits of many life-insurance agents.

Modern concepts of selection and training of agents had not yet evolved. The functions of life insurance, as we know them today, were just beginning to develop. Competition was vigorous but not constructive. The use of ratios and comparisons, noted more for their ineptness than their value in judging a company's merits, were the order of the day. Tontine and deferred dividends, on their way out, had not been a healthy influence in the business. Rebating was not uncommon, and some hardy souls even attempted to justify it. Commission rates were high, but, if reliable data concerning agents' incomes were available, I am certain that their incomes, after making an allowance for economic adjustments, would not

compare favorably with agents' incomes of the present day.

The idea of monthly premium policies, monthly income payments, and the designation "combination companies" had not been thought of. In fact, agents selling industrial insurance were not generally accepted as members of the Life Underwriters Association.

The period of rapid organization of new life-insurance companies was just beginning. Many of the field people and some home office men were so short-sighted as to regard as a rude interloper anyone undertaking to start or represent a new life-insurance company.

The trade press was in tune with the times and did not represent the standards of insurance journalism which we find today.

The daily press was not furnished with reliable news about life insurance, and hence paid little or no attention to the business, except when news such as that produced by the Armstrong investigation was available.

Insurance supervision was devoted almost solely to the determination of solvency. It did not concern itself with the many angles of company management which come under its observation today.

A business depression in the making added to the other problems of the time.

The business was sound financially, and there were many companies which had the courage to attempt to stem the tides of the day.

The executives of those days probably compared their situation with some previous era and longed for the "good old days." It was not an altogether happy time for life insurance.

FORWARD STRIDES BEGIN

But conditions were soon "on the mend." The so-called Armstrong laws of the State of New York and the recommendations of the Committee of Fifteen appointed by the conference of governors, attorneys general, and insurance commissioners had set new standards for the conduct of the business and for broadening the scope of supervision by the States. These laws laid emphasis not only upon the character of the policy contract and the rights of policyholders, but on the importance of cost of insurance to policyholders and, in the case of the Armstrong laws, on the acquisition cost and over-all expenses of management. Tontine and deferred-dividend policies were prohibited, and other salutary laws were enacted. This was the beginning of a new era in life insurance. Legislation and supervision were to be of increasing importance in the business and to demand growing consideration by life-insurance management.

The improvement in State supervision and the spread of public knowledge concerning the extent to which the affairs of life-insurance companies are supervised by the States and open to examination and inspection by State officials has increased public consciousness of the activity of our State governments in this field.

Associations devoted to the study of company problems and improvement of company management began to be formed. These associations have made many significant contributions to the welfare of the business. Techniques in all phases of management have improved. Particularly in the field, increasing attention to selection and training of agents has increased the stature of the agent in the public mind and the character of the service rendered by him to policyholders.

A DESERVED GOOD PRESS

There has been an ever-increasing dissemination to the public by the companies and the associations of information regarding the business and its services. It is fair to say that we have a good press today, and it is deserved.

The problems of 45 years ago have vanished, and life insurance today stands at the peak of its esteem in the public mind. At no time in the history of the business, in my opinion, has life insurance had wider public acceptance of its service and value. At no time in the history of this country has there been greater need of the service afforded by life insurance. No longer do we have to be concerned about a prospective applicant's acceptance of the soundness or justification of life insurance. No longer do we have to sell the necessity for life insurance. Our problem today is to fit the life-insurance program to the needs of the individual applicant and try to sell him an adequate amount of life insurance.

To paraphrase the title of a play that had great popularity a few years ago, "Seventy-eight Million Americans Can't Be Wrong." We would not have 78,000,000 policyholders if they did not believe in the business of life insurance and did not feel the need of its service.

INSTITUTIONAL CONCEPT

Emphasis on the over-all service of life insurance and its place in our economic affairs led to the coinage of the phrase "The institution of life insurance." This institutional concept has led the public to consider all life-insurance companies in much the same class. They have been sold on the idea that life insurance is sound and well conducted and, therefore, all life-insurance companies are sound and well conducted. This fact points up our responsibility to the institution. It places upon each individual, as well as each company in the business, the obligation to maintain those high standards which the public now believes are characteristic of the business, and to use all their influence to see that such standards are observed by all. Departure from the accepted standards of the business by a few companies or a few agents in the community is more dangerous than if the public did not hold our business in such high esteem.

Our challenge is not only to preserve the good name of life insurance in our own institutions but to exercise all possible influence toward assisting in the maintenance of the highest standards of service in all organizations and all activities connected with the business.

We must encourage and support every effort to improve and strengthen State supervision.

NO TENDENCY TOWARD MONOPOLY

One revolutionary change in the legal status of life insurance was recently effected by the SEUA decision declaring insurance to be commerce, but it necessitated no revolutionary changes in the conduct of the business. Public Law 15 cleared the atmosphere and removed one of the undesirable possibilities of the decision—the threat to State supervision. The business believes, and has frequently asserted its position, that State supervision will prove in the best interests of policyholders and result in the soundest development of life insurance.

The antitrust laws, whether State or Federal, have no fears for us in life insurance, for there has been at no time, in the period under review, nor at any other time, as far as I know, the slightest tendency to monopoly in our business. Our lawyers, however, have been supplied with a new phrase with which to frighten the layman. It is "conscious parallelism" and lends itself to all sorts of fanciful suggestions. We do have to be more careful about what we may say or do that might lend itself to misconstruction by an antitruster looking for material, and we may have to curb some ideas that seemed to be in the interest of the policyholder. I have, however, no fear of the life-insurance business consciously violating the antitrust laws—"conscious parallelism" or not. I am convinced that the sincere antitruster will find that it will be a waste of time to fish in the life insurance pond.

As against the 101 companies 45 years ago, there are now over 500 legal-reserve life-insurance companies in the United States. Over the years, there have been some consolidations and reinsurances, but none involving large life-insurance companies. I know of no large company today which does not desire the greatest measure of success to be achieved by all companies, regardless of size. I know of no leader in the life-insurance business today who does not recognize that the development of sound life-insurance companies in every section of the Nation—yes, in every State of the Union—is desirable and for the good of the business.

A WEALTH OF COMPETITION

As for competition. Has any business a more complete pattern of competition? We have large companies and small companies in active and vigorous competition for the patronage of policyholders, and a sufficient number of large companies so that no one dominates the field nor has any opportunity to dominate if its executives were foolish enough to have any such idea. We have stock companies and mutual companies and what are termed "mixed companies," which though having capital stock, sell both participating and nonparticipating policies. We have companies which seek a select clientele in the strictly ordinary field and the combination companies which seek to serve every segment of the population and various gradations in between these extremes. Of the three leading companies 45 years ago, only one is now in that group.

A considerable volume of the business of the country is done by companies which are licensed to do business in New York, and those must live within the limitations as to expenses provided by its laws. They must compete with companies whose only restraint as to their expenditures is the soundness of their managerial judgment. Could there be a more complete pattern of full and free competition?

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

Another one of the new questions of the day is the spread of laws which in effect supplement unemployment-compensation benefits by making provision for benefits for employees in the event of loss of wages or salaries due to sickness. This type of legislation has taken several different forms and may be destined to spread rather rapidly in the near future. If this type of legislation is to be enacted, and it is certainly in the public mind today, there is no doubt that it is best administered at the State level. The position of most life insurance companies has been not to oppose this type of legislation, but, if it is to be enacted, to advocate the granting of the right to the employer to contract with an insurance company to furnish the benefits he is required to provide for his employees. (Rhode Island enacted a monopolistic State scheme, but it is the only State to do so.)

The most recent enactment of this type is the New York law, which gives the employer three ways in which to provide the required benefits. He may become a self-insurer, he may contract with an insurance company to furnish the benefits, or he may secure the coverage through the State insurance fund, which also offers insurance for the workmen's compensation risks. The State insurance fund is now subject to the same premium taxes imposed upon insurance companies, so that there is fair competition in this field. This law preserves to the employer freedom to make one of three

decisions. It obviates the necessity for any form of rate supervision or control and avoids the necessity for a device for assigning to carriers undesirable risks. These laws afford an opportunity to life companies to perform a public service in furnishing the required benefits, and, when they provide for the coverage of employers with a small number of employees, particularly to companies of the combination-company type. The New York law includes all employers having four or more employees. This being a compulsory requirement, it is incumbent on the business to render the best possible service at the lowest possible cost. This will require us to exercise every ingenuity we possess to the end that we will render an acceptable service at an acceptable expense ratio.

INVESTIGATIONS

Another question which is receiving attention today is the possibility of two congressional investigations that will be concerned with life insurance. The Senate has authorized an investigation by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which Senator O'MAHONEY is chairman. Senator O'MAHONEY has said that his investigation, which will be concerned with broad economic questions, will not be an investigation of the life-insurance business. It may, of necessity, be concerned with some aspects of the life-insurance business. Then there is the McCarran-Celler resolution, now in the Senate Rules Committee, which, if approved by the Senate and House, would authorize an investigation of the life-insurance business. Naturally, either of these investigations will divert a considerable amount of the time of responsible executives from their normal duties. It should be emphasized that neither of the organizations authorized to speak for the companies has made any effort to persuade the Members of Congress that they should not undertake these investigations and have made it plain to their members that they will not do so. It is my earnest hope that no one in his individual capacity will undertake to do so, either. To do so results only in arousing the suspicion that we have some reason to fear an impartial inquiry into the affairs of this business. We need have no fear of the outcome of any such investigation. It will be recalled that at the conclusion of the TNEC investigation Senator O'MAHONEY said that the life-insurance companies came off with flying colors.

HIGH MANAGERIAL STANDARDS

The great achievement of the business during the past 45 years has been the attainment of the high standards of ethics and managerial capacity which have characterized it and the high esteem in which it is held by the public.

We have a rich heritage, but that only emphasizes our obligation to cherish and protect it. We must go forward—we cannot stand still. We must concentrate our energies today on still better management—on cost, service to our policyholders, and continuing education of the public.

Cost is an important factor today, because we are in what appears to be a declining market, and the public is questioning all costs. As you well know, improvement in mortality has been more than offset by the declining investment earnings, and there is no present prospect of a material increase in those earnings. They will be affected by many factors beyond the control of management. There is a limit beyond which it is not wise to restrict our underwriting, and there are factors affecting the mortality which are entirely beyond our control. The one factor of cost over which we have control to a greater extent than in any other aspect of our business is management expenses.

While we must maintain adequate service to policyholders, we must critically examine all of our services to be sure that they are needed and fully justified and be prepared to sacrifice those proven to be unnecessary. The days of adding frills and trusting to the margins to take care of their cost are gone.

EXPENSE CONTROL NECESSARY

In the matter of expense control, we face pressures never before in existence. Our people must be adequately compensated, or we will not be able to attract and hold the requisite personnel both in home office and field. This will require critical study of all of our procedures to develop methods which will increase efficiency and productiveness of personnel without increasing costs and thus enable us to provide adequate income for our people within the limits of business can afford.

In the field, this is more important than ever before. It is easy to suggest an increase in commission schedules as a means of meeting some of the situations that we face. On the other hand, this easy approach to the problem may not be the solution. It might have just the opposite effect, for it is easily seen that there is a natural limit to the commission schedule even if there are no legal restrictions. In other industries we hear talk of being priced out of the market. We cannot afford to take an it-can't-happen-here attitude.

We have, in the main, accomplished over the past 45 years the results needed today. Without the use of mechanical devices and the improved techniques adapted to our business, its vastly expanded clerical operation would not have been successfully performed without greatly increased expense rates. Without the development of better methods of selection and training in the field, we would not have been able to attract the greatly improved personnel now constituting our field forces and would not have enabled them to earn the incomes which have held them in this business. But we have for some years past been in a period of somewhat easy production. We may be entering a period when production will be more difficult. That only emphasizes the challenge.

We must be careful not to resist innovations in the interest of policyholders, even though they may be inconvenient to us personally or not suited to our individual company situation. We cannot afford to take the selfish or parochial view. At various times in the past years such innovations as substandard, wholesale, and group underwriting, and new and scientific methods of selecting and training agents and personnel have been the subject of criticism by some "stand-patters." Yet, the public and the business today have been benefited by these advances. Many of the former opponents of these advances are now enthusiastic advocates and practitioners. There is ample room within the business for the display of individual initiative without departure from sound principles or disregard of our obligation to maintain the good will of the public.

AT THE PEAK OF PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

The business stands today at the peak of its performance and at the peak of public acceptance. The problems we face in maintaining and enhancing this position are a challenge which should lend zest to our tasks. I would rather be in the business today than at any other period in its history. We have never had better or more conservative management in the business as a whole. We have never observed higher ethical standards in home office and field.

We owe much to our predecessors who have brought the business to its present high state. I believe the men and women in it today will hold the great gains we have made and move on to greater achievements. This is our obligation to the institution of life insurance.

Naval Reserves—H. R. 6186

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which provides for the relief of officers of the Naval Reserve who served as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy prior to 1913. At present such service of Regular naval officers is credited in computing their retirement pay and this bill would apply a similar rule to Reserve officers.

I understand that from the beginning of the Naval Reserve until the year 1925, midshipmen's service of Naval Reserve officers prior to 1913 was counted in computing longevity pay.

Under the Naval Reserve pay bill enacted in 1925, no provision was made to allow service in the above period prior to 1913 to be counted except for officers who were on active duty in the year 1922.

It would seem that this exception was made to cover Reserve officers then on active duty and it would also seem that this provision was and is discriminatory as against other Reserve officers in this class.

The fact that an officer resigns from the service should not be a bar to extending him credit for midshipmen's service in view of the fact that as to Regular officers all service, even though not continuous, is counted for a commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person.

Prior to 1913 it should be pointed out that graduates of the Naval Academy served at sea for 2 years with low pay before they were commissioned as ensigns and all midshipmen's service was counted in computing longevity. Since 1913 graduates of the Naval Academy are given commissions as ensigns immediately and their midshipmen's service is not counted. It would seem that Public Law 810 of the Eightieth Congress failed to take into account the foregoing situation.

In a specific case I cite a man graduated from the Naval Academy in 1906 who served as a midshipman until 1910, at which time he was compelled to resign because of defective vision. Though his vision has not improved, the Navy has been glad to have his services from 1917 to date, and he is rated as fit for general service, afloat or ashore. The sorry fact is, however, that under existing law he may not count the time he served as midshipman in computing his longevity pay, although all Regular personnel of the Navy is permitted to do so.

I am of the opinion that this situation constitutes a serious discrimination against men who served as midshipmen prior to 1913 and are in a Naval Reserve status, and I hope that this bill which seeks to end this discrimination and provide just consideration for a faithful

class of naval personnel will be favorably considered and acted upon by the House at an early date.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 27 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the demand by American public opinion for drastic economy in Government. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ECONOMY

(Statement by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin)

Mr. President, I have commented before on the floor of the Senate on the urgent need for Federal economy. Unfortunately, our previous efforts in the Senate to direct the President to cut from $2,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 from the Federal budget—these efforts have been defeated, I am sorry to say. Nevertheless, we who believe in the urgent necessity for Federal retrenchment will continue to fight with all our strength for drastic reduction in expenditures right down the line.

There is no question but that we must make financial sacrifices in our $44,000,000,000 budget in order to avoid a staggering deficit of from $4,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000.

The demand for economy is a bipartisan demand. It is not voiced simply here in Washington—it comes rather from the grassroots of our Nation. I could quote, as I have quoted in the past, from innumerable letters urging that Uncle Sam cut back his reckless spending.

A LETTER FROM MERRILL

Just yesterday, I received a letter from Merrill, Wis., stating:

"We just have to have economy in Government, now so more than at any other time. Let's forget about a lot of expenditures now that are not necessary. * * * Let's start to run our Government like a businessman would run his business. Let's do without things until we can afford them."

This gentleman knows, as the rest of us do, that nothing can come out of the Federal Treasury unless taxes go in, or unless we simply want to print paper money and thus threaten the integrity of our dollars, our bonds, our insurance policies, our bank deposits.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL EDITORIAL

Recently the Milwaukee Journal discussed this problem from the standpoint of the Wisconsin economy. Wisconsin's tax problem in 1951, the Journal reported, will be to get about $40,000,000 more than current taxes provide. But, said the Journal, "Since the Federal Government now takes nearly $800,000,000 a year out of Wisconsin in taxes, a 5 percent reduction would reduce the Federal 'take' by just about the needed amount."

JANESVILLE GAZETTE COMMENTS

The Janesville Gazette reported in a recent editorial how in 1928 Uncle Sam's tax slice of the total Federal, State, local tax pie was a modest 34 percent, the States getting 16 percent, localities getting 50 percent. But, says the Janesville Gazette, "Of last year's record peacetime tax pie of nearly $60,000,000,000, Uncle Sam took a gargantuan slice of 74 percent. The State and local portions had dwindled to a meager 13 percent each. As a result of Uncle's growing appetite, the sources of revenue still open to State and local taxing bodies are so few that to tap them would set up a chain of reaction so potentially violent that almost no one wants to talk about it for the record."

Mr. President, there, we have the picture. The tax pie was $9,000,000,000 in 1928, $60,000,000,000 in 1948, and Uncle Sam is gobbling more and more of it.

ALGOMA URGES HIDDEN TAXES BE REVEALED

To quote from another recent grassroots editorial, recently the Algoma (Wis.) Record-Herald stated: "If all the hidden taxes were exposed probably we would be more conscious of Government waste and spending." The Record-Herald added: "The suggestion has been made that every product sold at retail carry a stamp showing the amount of taxes or the part that is a Government 'take' in the retail price; for instance, on a loaf of bread the tax stamp could read: 'Bread 10 cents; tax 5 cents; total 15 cents.'"

When it reprinted this editorial, the Brillion (Wis.) News added its own question to Mr. Average Taxpayer: "How much of your taxes did you get back in subsidy or governmental service last year—if you know how much taxes you paid?"

OSHKOSH PAPER BACKS HOOVER REPORTS

Another newspaper in my State, the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern, editorialized: "That there are numerous channels of high spending in the Federal Government that could be eliminated without any loss of essential Government service to the taxpaying public is generally admitted and easily proven. Various examples of extravagance and waste have been brought into the limelight, and others undoubtedly will be revealed.

"These cases not only demonstrate the need for substantial economy, but also give positive point to the recommendations of the Herbert Hoover Commission that emphasized that the reforms this group recommended and urged Congress to adopt would save billions of dollars for the taxpayers."

TAXPAYER GROUPS AND WISCONSIN COMMERCE CHAMBERS ARE IN THE FIGHT

Mr. President, taxpayers' organizations throughout the Nation are leading the fight for economy. In my own State, for example, the Wisconsin Tax News, published by the Wisconsin Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, is fighting along with many other editorial organs for economy at both the Federal and State level. For example, the Wisconsin Tax News editorialized:

"Call it politics, but, nevertheless, it is highly inconsistent to deplore the waste and extravagance and high expenditures at the Federal level of government, while ignoring the same trend on a State and local basis."

Mr. President, I have invited attention to these grassroots editorials because I think that these local editors and the local chambers of commerce which are in touch with the thinking of the average man in Wisconsin know far better than we do here in Washington how insistent the taxpayer is that we retrench. They insist that we adopt more of the Hoover recommendation reports which will really achieve savings.

Budget cuts hurt, but a deficit will hurt even more.

Reciprocal Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein very thoughtful recent editorials from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel, the Leominster (Mass.) Enterprise, and an article from the Clinton Daily Item.

In my opinion, these editorials are a very impressive analysis of devaluation, reciprocal trade, and some related questions. As I have stated heretofore, I have great misgivings concerning the current devaluation policy. Whether it will relieve the British situation at home remains to be seen. Clearly, it threatens American industry not only by attacking our markets at home, but also by setting up an extreme competitive disadvantage to American exporters abroad.

The Reciprocal Trade Treaties law has been adopted without the essential safeguard of a "peril point" amendment. In its net effect, from an economic standpoint, devaluation is almost certain to promote undesirable competition from abroad and give impetus to recessionary and deflationary cross trends. I am in complete agreement with the principle that trade cannot be a "one-way street." There must be a certain amount of "give and take" in our trade relations with other nations, but I do not conceive it to be in the national interest to allow an influx of cheaply produced foreign goods, and this prospect is all the more disturbing when these goods come from nations with deflated currencies.

The debasement of the value of money can, in general, never serve in my judgment as a basis for national or international prosperity and it usually results in most harmful inflationary effects.

I think that my own position regarding these policies are fairly well known to my constituency. It is also well known that I am an advocate of free enterprise and free representative government, an unregimented economic system, and political institutions which derive their validity and strength from the will of a free people, and not from the arbitrary dictates of bureaucracy. The effort to eliminate our peerless American system which has been responsible for the great advancement of our Nation and to substitute a regimented economy and a collective state in any form or shape can never redound to the interest of the American people. It can wreak great havoc with the basic patterns of our democracy and must in the end be repudiated as destructive of every worthwhile value in American live, or it will bring down upon our country the same economic stalemate, social inertia and political slavery which have characterized authoritarian techniques in other nations.

I am exceedingly grateful to the very able editors of the following publications for their penetrating observations on these timely and vital questions:

[From the Worcester Telegram of September 23, 1949]

POUND AND TARIFF

Congressman PHILBIN is not in any sense making a partisan move in asking President Truman to guard American industry against bad effects from the devaluation of the pound sterling. He is a Democrat, and not an anti-Truman one. He certainly is not trying to oppose or outwit the Republicans, for on this issue he and a large number of Republicans agree. He was one of the few Democrats voting against the recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act, under which the President makes reciprocal tariff bargains with foreign governments.

The devaluation of the pound means that Americans can buy the same quantities of British goods with fewer dollars than formerly, for a time at least. Thus it has the same effect, in some cases, as a cut in our tariff. Representative PHILBIN wants the President to take prompt steps to adjust tariff rates "to prevent the flooding of American markets with cheaply produced goods and commodities."

The tariff-and-currency question is an old one. Ever since the Trade Agreements Act was first passed in 1934, former President Hoover from time to time argued that foreign governments could nullify our protective tariff by depreciating their currencies.

"While we are eager to help England," Mr. PHILBIN says, "we must be careful in the process that we do not hurt ourselves and thus bring our own Nation into some of the very difficulties which Britain itself is facing." That, surely, is sound advice. It is exactly in line with Senator VANDENBERG'S address of last week, when he declared that "our unweakened strength is a common asset" for all the western nations.

Perhaps it wouldn't make sense to raise our tariff rates quickly and so try to nullify the devaluation of the pound. But, perhaps it did not make complete sense to devalue the pound in order to nullify our tariff—so far as some American producers are concerned.

We cannot, of course, expect to do a lot of exporting without doing a lot of importing. We need imports anyway, at all times. Indeed Mr. Hoover in his first Presidential campaign, in 1928, pointed out that we "could not run an automobile, we could not operate a dynamo, or use a telephone, were we without imported raw materials from the tropics."

The problem now is to help England in a sound way. That means giving her aid which is real, and not transient, and which will not harm or dislocate our own economy. We do not want to lose our ability to help.

America cannot aid England and make no sacrifices whatever herself. But the sacrifices should, so far as possible, be fairly spread out. We should make the sacrifices mainly as a nation, not as groups or individuals.

Mr. PHILBIN and others may be unduly alarmed about what the devalued pound will do to our tariff and to our industry. But they are not unreasonable in wanting to know just what's what.

[From the Leominster Daily Enterprise of September 24, 1949]

PHILBIN MOVES ON THE TARIFF

Congressman PHILBIN, of Clinton, has asked President Truman to take immediate steps in tariff adjustments to provide protection for American-made goods.

The Congressman, in a letter to the President, expressed concern over the possible effect devaluation of the pound might have in this country.

The action of Congressman PHILBIN will be noted with keen attention and the developments in connection with the tariff rates as they may affect New England will be followed with deep interest.

There is much at stake for the American producer and the American workmen in tariff rates, in how they may be fixed so as to allow competition by products turned out under standards of wages and other conditions not comparable to those of the United States.

The step taken by Congressman PHILBIN, his call for protection of industry—a call of deep interest and concern to Massachusetts and other New England States, will be greeted with satisfaction by the many in whose interest it was made.

[From the Fitchburg Sentinel of September 23, 1949]

DEVALUATION AND POTATOES

If all the pieces that have been written about devaluation of moneys were placed end to end they would encircle the globe. The tumultuous spat of stuff that preceded and followed the recent devaluation of the pound has added another library full of clippings to the age-old accumulation. But after all is said and done the previous conclusion of the Sentinel still remains sound; namely, that no deep-seated basic economic troubles are ever remedied by tinkering with currencies.

In the present instance devaluation of the pound is calculated to bring short-term relief to Britain in its crisis produced by an excess of import values over export values. But no permanent remedy is at hand for several causes of the British trade's being out of balance. Devaluation in itself does not wipe out the effects of:

1. Britain's low productivity.
2. Loss of empire.
3. Loss of markets destroyed by war.
4. Continued emigration of English workers.
5. War's drain upon the physical, mental, and spiritual reserves of the British people.
6. Innumerable social, economic and political consequences of the war everywhere.

But a matter of continuing debate is what the short-term effects of devaluation will be in this country and abroad.

Massachusetts State Planning Board's weekly release, Do You Know Massachusetts?, gets down to brass tacks:

"Since devaluation of foreign currencies operates somewhat as a reduction in United States tariffs, Massachusetts industries likely to feel a tightening in competition may include woolens and worsteds, cotton goods, leather manufactures and canned fish, whereas others that should find somewhat lower priced raw materials include the Commonwealth's industries manufacturing rubber goods, soaps, and other vegetable-oil products, chocolate, jute products, chromium plate, Egyptian cotton goods and Mediterranean fruits."

The relation between devaluation and tariffs is, of course, plain. It has led Congressman PHILBIN of this, the Third Massachusetts District to write President Truman asking that he have the State and Commerce Departments and the Tariff Commission study the effects of devaluation upon American economy, and especially New England. Expressing sympathy for Britain's economic troubles, Mr. PHILBIN urged the Government to seek ways of aiding the British which will not accelerate certain observable recessionary trends in some sections and cause our own workers to be thrown out of jobs.

"If," the Congressman wrote, "our tariffs on textiles, woolen and cotton, boots and shoes, fabricated steel products and related items, and many other products which are manufactured so largely in New England are not adjusted to meet the effects of the devaluation of money in the sterling area, a flow of cheaply produced goods and commodities will flood our markets and create widespread unemployment. This we cannot permit and this we cannot tolerate."

Those are strong words indicating the depth of the Congressman's feelings on the subject which he had previously revealed in another way by being one of the two Democratic New England Congressmen to vote against extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The Sentinel believes that the reciprocal trade treaties are sound in principle, that trade cannot be a one-way street, that we must buy other nations' goods if we wish to sell our goods abroad. There must be "give and take," and in any program of reciprocity some measure of damage to domestic industries must be expected.

But we see no harm in the provision of the Reciprocal Act passed by the Eightieth Congress, known as the "peril point" clause, which called upon the President to make a public explanation to Congress if he cut tariffs below levels which the Federal Trade Commission believed threatened serious damage to domestic producers. This provision was omitted when the Senate and House passed extension of the reciprocal program recently.

Congressman LANE, of Lawrence, the other Democratic New England Congressman to vote against the act, speaking on the effects of devaluation in the House Wednesday, recalled that he and others had warned against omission of the "peril point" clause. He and Mr. PHILBIN had fought to retain the clause. Mr. LANE was as blunt as Mr. PHILBIN in his remarks. "Whenever," he told the House, "sacrifices are called for, in the name of war, peace, or world trade, Washington officials look to the textile industry first, last, and always. The textile cities of New England have already suffered too much. We have only two alternatives, either to cut wages or to go out of business. I cannot believe that the Government in its right mind would force us to these extremities."

Of course, if the Government did for the textile and other industries in this situation what it does for the farmers, it would subsidize the industries adversely affected by the reciprocal trade treaties, or devaluation, or both. Subsidization of British industries unfavorably affected by devaluation has already been suggested in London.

When governments start to monkey with money, or fiddle with the law of supply and demand, they get deeper and deeper into complications. Congressman Lane had pointed out some of those complications last month in comparing the idle and neglected textile workers in Lawrence with the fat bounties the Government was giving to the Aroostook County, Maine, potato growers. Last year, he noted, the Government paid those Aroostook County farmers $67,000,000 and spent another $25,000,000 disposing of the potatoes it had taken off the market.

"This wasteful program," he said, "is creating a fortune for a handful of growers at the expense of millions of consumers. Every man, woman and child in Lawrence is being taxed 40 cents to keep the price of tubers at a peak where they cannot afford to buy them. * * * In my own greater Lawrence district 22,000 out of 125,000 are unemployed. This potato support program is keeping what was once a poor man's food out of the reach of many of my people. * * * The failures and abuse which are part and parcel of the price-support program for potatoes may well open up the whole broad program of subsidies for agriculture to a searching overhaul."

Democratic Congressmen PHILBIN and LANE seem to be talking more like anti-statism Republicans every day.

[From the Clinton Daily Item of September 23, 1949]

TEXT OF PHILBIN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS IS PROVIDED THE ITEM

The Item is in receipt of the text of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S letter of Septem-

ber 21, to President Harry S. Truman, copies of which went also to Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer and Chairman Oscar B. Ryder, of the United States Tariff Commission, reading as follows:

"I am constrained in view of devaluation of sterling-bloc currencies most respectfully to present the following views for your consideration and possible action:

"The devaluation of the pound affecting as it does not only the value of British currency but the value of currency in all sterling bloc countries, is an epochal economic event which in its first impact has severely shaken the economic stability of most of the nations involved and has had repercussions even in our own Nation. It was inevitable that temporary loss of equilibrium should attend this striking change in the value of world-wide monetary units. At present it is not possible to predict how long resulting disturbed conditions will endure. Let us hope it will be temporary.

"Neither can we speculate upon the efficacy of devaluation in redeeming the deplorable industrial and economic plight of Great Britain. So many factors enter into the situation of the British at the present time that it is questionable indeed whether this drastic move will prove a panacea for her economic ills. Again we can only hope that the results will be immediate, beneficial, and salutary in bringing about an invigorated industrial system, expansion of trade, and the solution of the dollar shortage which has been causing such serious dislocation and adding to current problems of the British Socialist Government.

"The current unfavorable situation of the British evokes great sympathy among the American people. It is doubtlessly desired by a very large number of our citizens that our Government not only take a sympathetic attitude but join in the formulation of constructive cooperative measures designed to ease and relieve stringent conditions in Great Britain without, of course, causing or producing unfavorable conditions here in our own country. I mean by unfavorable conditions, further grants or gifts which would increase already onerous tax burdens and increased unemployment which might accelerate certain observable recessionary trends in some sections and cause our own workers to be thrown out of their jobs, with consequent diminishing purchasing power and reduced demands for agricultural products and other goods and services and a general reduction in the standard of living.

"In a word, while we are eager to help England, we must be careful in the process that we do not hurt ourselves and thus bring our own Nation into some of the very difficulties which Britain itself is facing.

"I also urge that the Commerce Department and other proper Government agencies be directed to start an immediate study of the Nation-wide effects of devaluation in relation to our tariff rates and imports and all other related factors.

"If our tariffs on textiles, woolen and cotton, boots and shoes, fabricated steel products and related items, and many other products which are manufactured so largely in New England, are not adjusted to meet the effects of the devaluation of money in the sterling area, a flow of cheaply produced goods and commodities will flood our markets and create widespread unemployment. Practically every other section of the Nation will also be adversely affected. This we cannot permit and this we cannot tolerate.

"Let us be helpful by all means to England and other nations struggling with economic problems. But we cannot afford to undermine our high American standards of living and the employment of our citizens by permitting products from devaluated areas to glut the United States. This would indeed bring tragic and deplorable results which would far outweigh any advantages that might redound to sterling bloc countries.

"I am sure that you will give very careful consideration to these matters and that you will indicate your anxiety to guard American industry and protect American workers by urging upon appropriate officials of the Government every possible readjustment of our tariff rates immediately necessary to prevent the flooding of American markets and consequent stagnation of our industrial structure. Let us make sure that, in seeking to help other nations out of their current difficulties, we do not bring our economy to prostration and disaster."

Can We Save Others if We Can't Save Ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there was a time, not too many months ago, when the Detroit Free Press, a great newspaper, stood for everything the New Deal and Franklin D. Roosevelt wanted. The editor has apparently awakened with other Rip Van Winkles. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published Sunday, September 25, in the Detroit Free Press:

CAN WE SAVE OTHERS IF WE CAN'T SAVE OURSELVES?

The past fortnight witnessed a large-scale invasion of Washington by top-level European officials.

Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Bevin came over to discuss the "dollar gap" and other matters.

The International Bank and Monetary Fund meetings attracted representatives of 48 countries.

The Atlantic Pact Council was attended by the Foreign Ministers of our 10 European Allies.

The fact that the United States was host to all these conferences is interpreted in some quarters as emphasizing "the importance of our new role in international affairs."

Another fact noted is that a lot of projects are being cooked up without recourse to the United Nations stove.

The United States was not only host to these European invaders but is also their banker.

Americans had better restrain their celebration of our world leadership until we have discovered whether we are leading or being led.

The shooting stopped in Germany in May 1945 and in the Pacific in August 1945.

After more than 4 years we are still technically at war with Germany and Japan and will remain so until formal peace treaties with those former enemy countries have been signed, sealed, and ratified.

We are still engaged in a cold war with Soviet Russia.

We have lost China to the Communists.

We blame Stalin for all these things. The world would be bathed in sweetness and light today if only he had kept the promises he made at Yalta. That's the appeaser's apology.

Were not President Roosevelt and his advisers at the Crimea conference equally to blame for expecting Stalin to keep any pledge which it did not suit him to keep? Wasn't President Truman and his advisers at Potsdam guilty of criminal negligence in falling into the same trap?

The appalling fact today is that the conduct of our foreign relations reveals no more intelligence or honesty than it did at Yalta and Potsdam.

The United Nations has turned out to be merely a screen behind which the ancient game of power politics goes furiously on. While denouncing international gambling, we are sitting in with a stack of blue chips in front of us.

American idealism is being pushed out of the picture by that Old World realism which has never led to anything in the past but war.

We started out with the Truman doctrine of containing communism in Greece and Turkey when Great Britain found the job too expensive. Then all western Europe was brought under our wing. The Marshall plan, we were told, would cure Europe's economic ailments and make its people so happy that they wouldn't touch communism with a 10-foot pole.

After that had been gulped down we were informed, as a Nation, that dollars were not enough. The United States and Canada must enter into a 20-year military alliance with western European countries. Then we must arm them. That is the final step on a road that in the past has inevitably led to war.

We now learn that all the billions that we have poured into Great Britain and continental countries since VJ-day and all the billions we are committed to pour into them by 1952 will not get them off what Winston Churchill calls "the American dole."

Are we being taken for a ride by our European friends and their partisans in Washington?

As soon as the "dollar talks" were over, Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Mr. Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, went into a huddle on the political state of the world and what is to be done about it.

After their first brief session, the New York Times reported that they had "arrived at 'a community of views on most of the issues' and 'a similarity of opinion toward objectives' even when their Governments differed."

Among the areas they explored were China and the Far East generally. Will anybody be surprised if shortly a new "American" policy toward Asia is announced by the State Department? Certainly no one will be who is familiar with the history of "Anglo-American parallelism" during the past half century.

The British are adept at sowing seeds which suddenly flower in Washington.

The French have long had a saying that when they team up with Great Britain they do the pulling and John Bull does the driving.

After the First World War a French publicist, Andre Siegfried, applied this saying to the United States. The British, Siegfried wrote, would encourage this country to take a larger and larger share in world events, as long as they held the reins.

The road down which they are now obviously trying to steer us leads back into the empire from which we withdrew in 1776. Again in that empire, we would foot the bills, while they made the decisions.

Again, we can't blame the British for looking out for themselves. We can only blame ourselves for tolerating an administration so preoccupied in saving England from its own follies that it has opened our backdoor in Asia to communism and is leaving our side door in Latin America exposed to the same menace.

What is needed in Washington is a global view of the global responsibilities we have assumed.

The hopes now pinned on Tito to save the world from Stalin show how far from such a view our leaders are.

The "globalmania" that is attaining epidemic proportions in this country threatens our own institutions right here at home.

While we are encouraged to look overseas and see what terrible conditions exist there and what we must do to alleviate them, we should not overlook what is happening right under our own eyes.

We have sent abroad in the last 10 years more than $71,700,000,000. We have gotten back $7,200,000,000. We are already committed or are in the process of being committed to staking other countries to additional untold billions.

We are told we must do this because we are a great creditor Nation. We are, with respect to other nations.

The fact must be remembered, though, that Uncle Sam is also the world's biggest debtor.

The gross national debt, which is what Uncle Sam owes, stood last Wednesday at $256,000,000,000 plus, as against $251,000,000,000 plus a year ago. As we go on with Mr. Truman's deficit financing that debt will continue to rise.

Add to this Federal debt some $20,000,000,000 of State and local debts and the total public debt is around $276,000,000,000. That is equivalent to upward of $1,800 per capita or approximately $7,500 per family of four. The carrying charge alone aproximate $7,000,000,000 a year.

The possibility of ever paying off this astronomical debt without devaluing our currency is now widely questioned, and devaluation, if it did not throw our entire economy into chaos, would bring disaster to tens of millions of people in this country.

Yet the Truman administration goes blithely along spending more and more abroad and at home, subsidizing special interests, and thinking of nothing but winning the next election.

We are great people for giving others advice, without practicing what we preach.

We insisted upon a loose federal government for Germany, as a means of "safeguarding democracy." Yet we ourselves are permitting more and more power to be transferred from the States and local subdivisions to the Government in Washington.

The recent white paper on China demanded that the Chinese Government "clarify * * * the fields open to private enterprise without government intrusion." Yet our own Government is already engaged in approximately 100 important business enterprises and is itching to take on more. There is no clarification of what fields are safe from its socialistic aspirations.

We lift our eyebrows at England's experiment with the welfare state. Yet we are being pushed toward the same goal steadily and insidiously on the installment plan.

As Senator DULLES says:

"It is neither fair nor honest to ask the people to buy the (Truman) package when the price tag is concealed or when only the first down payment is disclosed. It is not fair to talk about only what the people will get and not tell them about what they will have to give."

Whether honest or not that is the kind of salesmanship that is being used to sell us the welfare state at the ultimate price of collectivism.

The time has come for the American people to think a little about what is happening to them, as well as to what is happening to other peoples.

We either will do that or find ourselves in the same predicament as the rest of the world.

While democracy is not on trial in the United States it is very manifestly in danger.

A revolt against "globalmania" and "squandermania" alone can save it.

Harnessing the Wind for Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Percy H. Thomas:

HARNESSING THE WIND FOR ELECTRIC POWER

(By Percy H. Thomas, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.)

Among nature's many generous sources of energy the wind stands unique. It is delivered free, and in all countries; it is unlimited in extent; when utilized it leaves no ashes or poison gases; it is not subject to interruption, and its price does not change. But providence has teased would-be users by making the energy content of the wind exceedingly lean and the supply uneven. Thus nature's offer of wind power is a challenge to the engineer, and has been for some thousands of years.

It is necessary on this occasion to resist the temptation to recount the many ingenious and often surprisingly successful windpower projects of the past; implementing the world's commerce on the seas for thousands of years and even to our time; driving Holland's famous drainage pumps until the advent of cheap electric power; also Britain's 10,000 windmills, grinding grain and doing chores for Englishmen, even grinding sugarcane on a large scale in Barbados. The outstanding present fact is that now, at long last, engineers are ready to harness the wind and to force it to contribute its due share to the supply of electric power for all.

Few achievements of research in solving the many and varied riddles offered by nature to engineers are more intriguing than that of securing for man the mastery of this familiar but elusive agent. We may be thankful that the new supply of energy has become available at a time when our mounting demands for power promise, within the foreseeable future, to absorb all of our most available hydro power, and when our reserves of petroleum and natural gas may be needed for preferential uses.

Countries not favored with an abundance of coal or other fuel may well look hopefully to this source of low-cost energy to build up their supplies of industrial power. This situation is found in many important areas, notably in the Southern Hemisphere.

The purpose of this paper is to present a realistic view of the ways and means by which bulk electric power may be obtained from the wind. It is believed that engineers other than aerodynamic experts will be interested to have some understanding of this new development.

At the outset, the author would like to point out that the statement that wind energy is now available for electric utility service is intended to be taken literally, the only reservation being the allowance of a reasonable amount of time and of a sufficient preliminary design effort to produce the first full-sized physical structures. The appropriate design procedures, both aerodynamic and constructional, are now known. There remains, however, for designing and operating engineers, the inevitable educational stage so characteristic of all new developments. No untried types of structures or mysterious aerodynamic principles are involved.

Three principal significant steps have led to the feasibility of the designing of wind turbines for electric utility supply—all previously familiar to engineers in other fields of activity.

First, the use of the principle of impact is essential to the effective operation of the wind turbine. This principle makes use of the same force of inertia that enables the hammer to drive the nail, the projectile to pierce the armor plate, and that enables the hydraulic ram to pump water higher than its source.

To get a concept of the nature of this inertia action in a wind turbine, picture the wind as made up of many, many small parallel filaments of moving air, taken together constituting the complete wind stream. These filaments would be somewhat similar to the straws in a sheaf of wheat, or to individual rods lying side by side in a bundle. Each filament moves in its own path and has its own inertia. The wind turbine wheel is rimless and consists of a hub and two or three spokes spaced wide apart, known as blades, similar in form to the familiar airplane propeller. With this wheel revolving at very high speed, a blade cuts across the path of one of these filaments in a small fraction of a second and the filament is brought to an abrupt stop, its inertia simultaneously developing a high momentary shock pressure on the blade.

As the blade proceeds, it cuts across the paths of other filaments at a uniform rate and so has a steady, high pressure impressed upon it. A component of this pressure in the direction of the blade motion drives the wheel. When the blade has passed completely across the path of any filament of air, that filament is stagnated, but the unlimited stream of oncoming air immediately proceeds to reestablish its velocity, ready for the next blade. The time required for this reestablishment of the filament velocity explains the wide spaces provided between blades.

The second step relates to the intermittency and other vagaries of the wind. The difficulty with this unevenness of velocity is overcome by treating wind energy as an auxiliary to the power supply of the present far-flung, highly developed, mixed steam and hydro systems. In such systems difficulties with failing supply are no novelty; for example, in the very familiar case of hydro plants, where dry years are proverbial. This difficulty with dry years is overcome, wherever feasible, by installing seasonal storage reservoirs in the rivers, as is well understood. Energy from these storages is available for bridging low-wind periods, as well as low-water periods. Naturally, such use of its storage to firm wind power would limit the capacity of a reservoir for supporting hydro. On examination, however, the surprising and very favorable situation develops that the vagaries of the wind are of such shorter duration than those of river stream flow, so that by setting up the effective capacity of an aerogenerator as the average output, whatever energy is borrowed from the reservoir in one period to firm the wind, is paid back by the taking over of a portion of the hydro load by the wind turbine at periods of supply above the average. This is not the place to enter into a study of this operation, but an analysis will show that when wind energy is used as an auxiliary in a large, mixed system of steam and hydro, the use of seasonal hydro storage to firm the wind energy puts only a very slight limitation on the ability of the reservoir to serve its normal function.

These large systems have many other difficulties with local supply failure, and reserves of appropriate types are provided. This is routine. Such reserves will often be available for assistance also to the wind supply in emergencies and with little detriment to its other functions. Naturally this superimposed use of hydro and other reserves is not without its costs and these must be added to the cost of wind power. According to the

studies of the author, they will not ordinarily be found burdensome.

The third step in advance, paving the way for an effective design of the aerogenerator, is based upon the painstaking and exhaustive study of the aerodynamics of the airfoil and of the airplane propeller. The impact nature of the turbine action has already been pointed out, and the fact that the reaction of this shock on the blade, set at an angle to the plane of the wheel, causes the rotary torque force which delivers the power to the wheel shaft. This impact action is characteristic of only the high speed turbine with wide spaces between the blades, leading to the intermittent stagnation and respeeding of the air filaments. It is dominating in the design of effective wind turbines.

It does not take an engineer to understand that the determination of the effect upon the impact forces on the blade produced by the many variable factors—the blade speed, the wind velocity, the shape, thickness, and width of blade, its angular setting, the width of the open space between blades, etc.—is too complicated for any purely mathematical analyses to solve. There further must be included as disturbing factors uncertain air friction and other wastages. To bring the performance of the wind turbine within the control of the designer required not only careful analysis but also a vast accumulation of adequate, empirical test material.

The long series of experimental and analytical researches on this subject matter during the last 20 or 30 years has finally provided sufficient data so that, with the now available laboratory techniques for tests on model airfoils and turbine wheels in wind tunnels, a definite turbine design may be made with assurance that the result will conform reasonably to expectation, subject only to this model test of the wheel. As a word of caution it may be stated that while there is much in common between the two, the optimus designs of turbine and propeller wheels are far apart.

Economical and ready installation of the huge constructions required for tower and wind wheels to secure effective wind turbine performance has been greatly forwarded by the development in recent years of greatly improved construction equipments.

The somewhat startling dimensions of these large capacity turbines are rendered necessary by the leanness of the energy in the wind. Obviously the wind turbine profits greatly from its capacity to tap a cylinder of air far larger than its own diameter.

With few exceptions, each of the highly specialized technical advances that have contributed so conspicuously to the high standards of our modern life, has had to deal with some unique and difficult design problems, representing the price to be paid for their high efficiency. The hydro plant has its vast bulk, uncertain foundations, and 1,000-year floods; the steam boiler, exceedingly high temperatures and pressures, as well as feed water corrosion and combustion difficulties; the steam turbine, very high speeds, uneven expansion, and vibration troubles; the gas engine, high speed, high temperature, low natural efficiency, combustion air, and so on. The special price to be paid for an effective wind turbine seems to be limited to the problem of economically constructing giant wheels set on a turntable supported on a high tower—certainly not a staggering task.

By their personal experiences inventors and promoters are well aware of the inborn skepticism of engineers toward new technical ideas. This attitude on the part of engineers is proper and normal enough, in view of the great predominance of impracticable and crackpot schemes that are pressed upon them. But once in a long while a sound innovation comes along and it usually receives the same cold shoulder treatment and may be held back until long overdue. There are many such examples, not always without justification, however. This gives an opportunity for some keen and foresighted engineer to recognize the value of the new project and do the industry a favor by giving it a demonstration.

Something of this sort seems to have happened in the case of the wind turbine. After one or two expensive and conspicuous failures with experimental large-capacity wind devices within the last generation, interest seemed to die down, until some 10 years ago, when Mr. Palmer Cosslett Putnam, of Boston, Mass., determined to build a large-capacity wind turbine adapted for utility power. He was able to interest several of the best known of our large engineering concerns, under the sponsorship of the S. Morgan Smith Co., to build a wind turbine of 1,000 to 1,250-kilowatt capacity on a small mountain in Vermont, United States of America, called Grandpa's Knob. The services of well-known experts in several related lines were obtained, aerodynamic, meterological, structural, etc., and the installation was completed in 1941. This was known as the Smith-Putnam turbine and was connected to an operating utility as a source of auxiliary power. It is reported to have been able easily to supply 1,000 kilowatts to the utility system at the rated wind velocity of 30 miles per hour, and to generate even up to 1,400 kilowatts in favorable winds.

However, this unit was unfortunate, and had a checkered career. Completed during the war, certain necessary repair parts could be obtained only after extraordinary long delay, and finally certain fatigue cracks developed in the blade shell and in the internal framing, as reported, leading to structural failure. This unit was then abandoned, apparently as the feasibility of the operation had been established and redesign of the structure to eliminate the defective parts of the original unit would have been unreasonably expensive.

Mr. Putnam reports that this unit was turned over to the utility staff for regular operation early in March 1945, and that it ran continuously on load, night and day, whenever the velocity of the wind permitted, for 3 weeks, and that it ran uneventfully until the occurrence of this fatigue failure, under a light load, closed its career.

Space will not permit further discussion of this very notable experiment, but the fact that a wind turbine could be designed and built to successfully deliver 1,000 kilowatts and operate continuously for hundreds of hours in routine service seems to establish at least the feasibility of wind power for utility supply. It has served to break the ice and pave the way for further development.

If large capacity aerogenerators are feasible, it is pertinent to ask, "What are they like?" As engineers are wont to say, "That depends." It is too early to state with finality what type of structure or what regime of operation will in the end be found most effective. Two distinct designs have so far been proposed: (a) The Smith-Putnam turbine offers one model; a single 30-ton, 175-foot wheel with two blades, mounted on a slightly inclined shaft on the top of a 125-foot tower, and adapted to be revolved automatically to face the wind. On the same revolving platform with the wheel are the generator and all auxiliaries. Gears are required to speed up the slow wheel rotation to a proper speed for the generator which runs in synchronism with the utility. The blades feather to the wind, under governor control, to vary the load. This turbine installation is shown in plate I, supplied by the S. Morgan Smith Co. (b) After studying this Smith-Putnam turbine and its performance, the author undertook to make a study-design for an aerogenerator of very much larger capacity (7,500 kilowatts) and one that would avoid some of the difficulties shown by the experience of Grandpa's Knob. The work by the author was done as a member of the staff of the Federal Power Commission of the United States of America and for its information. A photograph of a model of this aerogenerator is shown in plate II, reproduced from reference 3. The artist's concept of a battery of three in open country is illustrated in plate III, from the same reference.

A brief description of this lay-out will be given. To tap as large a body of wind as possible, two wheels are provided, each 200 feet in diameter, located on the two ends of a 235-foot bridge, revolving on a turntable located on the top of a 475-foot tower. These wheels have three blades each, fixed in position in the hub, but without the feathering feature. On account of the terrific aerodynamic thrust upon these blades, due to their very high speed, 550 feet per second at the tip, a tension brace leading from the hub is provided for each blade to give it sufficient strength.

This very high tower is desirable for two principal reasons: First, the wheel of a high speed, impact-type turbine like this, draws upon a cylinder of the wind several times as great in diameter as the wheel itself, and so should be given a sufficient clearance from the ground for this air cylinder. Second, the velocity of the wind and its smooth streamline character are definitely more favorable several hundred feet above the surface. As a sufficiently high average wind velocity is very important for economy in the wind turbine, the more favorable velocity high above the ground assumes an almost dominating importance. This will be realized when it is remembered that, while over level ground, the wind velocity may increase some 40 percent in the first 500-foot rise in elevation, the energy content of the wind would then increase as the cube of this velocity, that is, by 275 percent. It is surprising to note that according to estimates, the cost of this 500-foot tower is less than 25 percent of the whole aerogenerator cost.

In this study-design, the two wind wheels are connected to a single shaft through step-up gears and jointly drive a direct current generator. This generator thus runs synchronously with the turbine which operates at a speed proportional to the wind velocity. The direct current energy is transformed to alternating in an inverted rotary converter, which runs in synchronism with the delivery power circuit. This flexible arrangement permits the most favorable extraction of the wind energy and offers an opportunity for a very simple automatic control of the wheel speed. It has the obvious disadvantage of a double conversion of energy and the addition of the cost of the inverted rotary.

Time will not permit descriptive detail of this carefully prepared study-design, but additional information may be obtained in reference 4.

Of greatest interest to prospective exploiters of wind power is the choice and availability of win turbine sites, since the low cost and abundant wind energy is of no value without a suitable site. Looking at the problem from a realistic and practical point of view, the present position at first sight seems quite disappointing. It is not that suitable and adequate sites are not believed to be available, but that so little research has been done as to their characteristics and the locale. As far as the author knows, with the exception of certain local research work by the Smith-Putnam experts, there are no adequate studies made of the patterns of the wind at points suitable for the location of a large capacity turbine. The main researches and conclusions from the studies of these Smith-Putnam experts are fully described in reference 1, but are of interest to the meteorologist rather than to the utility engineer.

As it is incumbent on somebody to offer the best information available on this all-important subject, the author will outline the results of his own studies.

Some assistance in the search for turbine sites may be obtained by studying the physiographic characteristics of the area selected, which should be one in which there is an observed tendency to windiness. It is helpful to imagine the wind as a vast stream of water flowing over the surface of the country like a river. Looking at a brook or rapid river, the fast water is seen to run between stones and over obstructions on the bottom, and where the slope is the steepest. It is the same way with the wind. It may be assumed that several of the following tendencies may be acting simultaneously.

1. The highest average wind will occur when there is the least surface obstruction, considered over a wide area, as the ocean or a large lake.

2. Velocity of wind will tend to be high on down slopes due to gravity, as with water.

3. Where there are many houses, trees and unevennesses in the ground surface, the wind will tend to be slowed down, this effect extending to elevations above the ground many times the height of the obstruction.

4. A single isolated obstruction tends to cause an increase in the velocity of the air locally without greatly affecting the overall stream velocity. Such isolated obstructions are favorable to fringes of high wind velocities. If the obstruction be narrow and high, the wind will go around both sides of it. If it be long and low, like a rolling hill, the wind will speed up over the top.

5. Streamline flow, as distinguished from turbulence, is very important, and difficult to find in the wind near the ground.

6. On account of the resistance at the surface of the ground, the velocity of the wind is greater at higher and higher levels, more or less in what is known as a "logarithm" ratio. In open, flat country, balloon measurements in the United States of America have shown an average increase in velocity of some 40 percent at about 500 feet above the ground, with further increase still higher.

Reference 6 gives the results of extensive studies of air currents in Germany as affecting glider operation.

Even if no field data is available for individual turbine sites, some valuable conclusions may be drawn from the patterns of the wind at other points where adequate observations have been systematically made. With the reasonable assumption that the most general of these patterns will apply also at favorable turbine sites, this data will be seen to be very helpful and of real value to utility engineers.

In a number of the larger countries regular wind velocity measurements have been made at many selected stations for long periods of time. Several millions of such readings have been recorded by the Weather Bureau of the United States of America and carefully analyzed. An examination of data from some of the most important of these Weather Bureau stations shows the following characteristics covering the observations for 30 consecutive years and for 50 stations scattered over the United States of America.

At least for the United States of America, the annual average of the hourly wind velocities at any station is quite constant, with the minimum annual average of hourly readings never dropping more than 20 percent below the long-time annual average.

In the same way the monthly averages of the hourly velocities are found to be surprisingly constant, never droppping below half the annual average for that station. Even the weekly averages have a rather stable value.

The variations of the monthly averages within the year show velocities in the months July–September some 15 percent lower, on the average, than the annual average, as shown in plate V, from reference 3.

Plate IV, also from reference 3, shows charts of the variations through the years of the annual averages of the hourly velocities and, also, the maximum and minimum monthly averages of the hourly velocities for the same years. The gaps in these curves occur when the location of the measuring instrument was changed, breaking the continuity of the record. The monthly incidence of the minimums is found at the right of the chart.

In appraising these values of velocity it must be remembered that the energy in the wind varies much more widely than the velocity, since the energy is proportional to the cube of the velocity. There are important compensating considerations, however, which cannot be covered here.

Based on the examination of some 7,000 hourly readings, selected to cover typical days of the year 1941 and some 20 separated stations, there was a very important diversity value in the wind energy. The lowest hourly total energy value of the group as a whole was nearly half the average hourly energy of the whole. When the fact that this diversity minimum holds through the 24 hours of the day, while peak loads are limited to from 6 to 10 hours a day, the potentialities of diversity in firming the wind are obvious. These diversity figures are for energy, not velocity. Further studies covering many more stations and far more readings, and for other countries, are required before any definite general conclusions can be drawn.

While this glimpse at the patterns of the wind is informative and, it may be said, quite favorable, they are no substitute to the designer for exact data applying definitely to the particular site chosen. The designer's requirements are few and simple, but very specific. The information he requires is reliable values for the range of wind velocities at the actual location of the wind wheel circle, extending over one or more years, and the aggregate number of hours per month, or other convenient unit of time, during which each such value of the wind velocity may be expected to exist. The designer himself will set the minimum useful value of wind velocity which will no doubt lie between one-third and one-half of the rated wind velocity with units of the type of the study-design.

The nominal rated velocity for the wind turbine is that value at which the generator will be fully loaded by the energy in the wind. The turbine will be expected to operate at higher wind velocities, up to "half a gale," but means will be provided to prevent overloading of the generator. In the Smith-Putnam turbine this was accomplished by feathering the blades; in the study-design, by slowing down the wind wheel.

The curve showing the aggregate time of the continuance of each value of wind velocity as a percent of any period of time under consideration, as, for example, a month, is called a "duration" curve. Such curves are commonly used in hydro and other studies. The designer will accept velocity values in such a curve for his design work only because he can derive corresponding energy quantities therefrom by the cubing operation. Three typical duration curves are shown in plate VI, reproduced from reference 3.

It may be pointed out that duration curve data for the turbine designer can be gotten at any elevation chosen by means of a suitable anemometer supported by a balloon and sending electric impulses representing the momentary wind velocity down to the ground to a suitable impulse distributing and summating instrument. Such an anemometer should measure only horizontal components of the wind, not the actual wind velocity where up-currents are involved.

The prosaic and stubborn matter of cost must arise in the study of the economics of any new undertaking. If there were a successful full-sized windmill in operation, its cost could be determined, but without one, reliance must be upon estimate. For the purpose of furnishing as useful a guide as was feasible, the author turned designer and made structural drawings of all the essential elements of a 7,500-kilowatt twin-wheel aerogenerator, with the stresses for each element computed and a suitable cross section selected for each structural member. From this was made up an installation cost estimate covering all features, electrical and mechanical, with allowances for contingencies, interest, overhead, indirect, profit, etc. This study-design has already been referred to and, together with this cost estimate, is found in reference 4. This estimate was based on prewar costs to have a reasonably definite basis of comparison.

These prewar costs are of course now too low, but the general conclusion was drawn that the installation cost of such an aerogenerator, when constructed as routine, would be somewhat below that of a low cost steam plant. Presumably the comparison is now still at least as favorable to the aerogenerator, as its operating costs are very low, both in labor and maintenance. They compare with the operating costs of installed hydro. Under prewar conditions, the total annual costs, including all fixed charges, were estimated at from 1.34 to 2.04 mills per kilowatt-hour according to the rate of interest allowed on capital. These costs would be higher now, but the cost of the wind energy per se will be unchanged.

For reasons of space, it is not feasible to go into the highly important and very interesting subject of the aerodynamics of the wind turbine—a field at present practically untreated in any form useful to the power engineer. The writer has prepared a monograph covering this subject in a manner especially adapted to such engineers, see reference 5. The aerogenerator should be considered from still another point of view. What is the aerogenerator to the engineer operating an extensive electric utility system? What are its characteristics? How does it fit into present operation? What does he get from it? Here are some of the answers.

The aerogenerator will be a source of energy at whatever point it may be installed. It will also be a line stabilizing point. The power will be accepted by the system as it is provided by nature, intermittently. No one unit can be counted upon for energy at any particular moment. On the other hand, as has been elsewhere explained briefly, and as may be seen by careful examination of the possibilities of the large network system, the average wind power delivery over the system can be made firm for the system as a whole at a reasonable cost by relying upon temporary support from hydro storage.

With the wide dispersion of wind units and their small individual capacity, the shifting of local supply from place to place with the vagaries of the wind is not likely to be important.

The limitation imposed upon operation by the reliance upon hydro storage for firm capacity from wind power means that not more than a certain optimum portion of the total energy and capacity of the system can be expected to be conveniently obtained from wind energy. It is the impression of the author, after consideration of this question for some years, that between 25 percent and 40 percent of the system energy and between 20 and 30 percent of the firm capacity in the peak may well turn out ultimately to be this optimum utilization in a large, widespread utility network. This statement is made on an economic and operational basis, and applies only to such large interconnected utilities for the general supply of electric power. When used in other situations, wind power may still be very useful, but careful study must be given to its special application.

The English technical magazines in January 1948 announced the formation of a new section of the British Electrical and Allied Industries Research Association under Mr. T. G. N. Haldane, to study the technical and economic problems of large-scale aerodynamic generation in Great Britain. Notes on the organization and activities of the body have been reported in the press from time to time. The results of their investigation will be awaited with the keenest interest.

Considering wind energy from a broader point of view, it has a much wider significance than as an auxiliary to hydro. Only a few areas are fortunate enough to be so well supplied with habitable land, a suitable population, and the necessary natural resources as to permit a dense industrial development, where electric power is very low cost and where a minimum cost is vital. Many other types of areas exist, well favored in special ways, where electric power is not expected to be of low cost, but nevertheless should be essential. Each such situation must be examined on its own merits. Some examples may be suggested.

Where water has to be pumped to storage for irrigation or municipal supply in the absence of cheap power, wind energy on a "when available" basis may be quite satisfactory. Since the water is pumped to storage, intermittency offers no great difficulty. In some such cases it may well be that a modest general supply of electric power can be secured for the local area at the same time by making the wind turbine an aerogenerator and thus getting a minimum continuous electric service for domestic use and for street lighting, firming through drawing down a certain amount of the stored water through hydroelectric units as necessary. This is an entirely practical scheme, the chief limitation being that the electric power would be somewhat more expensive than in the large-scale industrial networks. In such cases no doubt domestic users would be glad to pay much higher prices rather than to go without electricity.

It has occasionally been found economical to install what are called pumped-storage plants, which serve to supply large peak capacity from water lifted to high reservoirs by secondary power off peak. There are two large capacity plants of this type in Germany. Wind energy will often be a very helpful auxiliary in such cases and may render a project feasible, which, on account of the load curve or otherwise, would not be economical without the energy from the wind.

Certain specially favored locations may be found where winds seem to be practically continuous, as sometimes happens in mountain country. In such cases wind power is almost firm automatically.

In mining and other mass production undertakings, especially in mountain country, local transportation may be an important and expensive operation. With a reasonable average power in the wind, large tonnages might be handled, as by an aerial tramway, on a "when available" basis without disturbing either production or processing. Such cases depend upon local conditions.

In isolated locations where a limited amount of electric power is very desirable for comfort and health reasons, if winds are favorable, aerogenerators, with stand-by Diesel engines, would be entirely suitable. The economic justification of the aerogenerator is the reduction in the cost of transportation and storage of fuel, and in the great simplicity of the installation and its operation. Military posts on distant islands might well fall in this class. It may develop that thermal storage in flash boilers, using steam or some more favorable fluid, will be feasible in certain cases.

In some heavily industrialized areas, using vast and growing quantities of power, the available hydro will eventually be exhausted. If cheap coal is scarce and if natural gas and petroleum are reserved for preferential uses, wind power may ultimately enable such areas to continue to compete with other areas more favored with steam and hydro power. This is a condition not seriously on engineers' minds at the present time, but likely in some places to become something of a headache in the future.

It is always possible, where a community is determined to have electric power and where no fuel or hydro sites are to be had, to install aerogenerators and pump water to secure continuity of supply. For this purpose a suitable, high reservoir is necessary, but no great quantity of water, since it can be repumped and used again and again. There are few locations where some small storage at a suitable elevation cannot be found. A relatively very modest reservoir will stabilize wind energy for most small communities.

In this necessarily rather brief treatment of this subject, an effort has been made to give the power engineer, and others who have an interest in the vital matter of power supply, an insight into what to expect in utilizing the wind in wholesale quantities. Also to indicate the ways and means by which its exploitation is likely to be brought about. No doubt others will devise different methods and types of structures, according to their own ideas, as is proper, but, by and large, the utilization of the wind is likely to develop generally along the lines here outlined on account of the unique limitations inherent in its characteristic behavior.

In closing, the author again calls attention to the hitherto unrealized potentialities in the use of wind power for those countries handicapped industrially in the vital matter of low-cost power. Realization in such cases, however, calls for energetic research, resourcefulness, and sound engineering, as well as a high order of intelligent planning.

GI Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lockport (N. Y.) Union Sun Journal:

GI FUNDS

Because the drain on the system was not as heavy as forecast, the veterans' insurance fund has a surplus. The idea, then, and a fair one, is to cut down the premiums charged the ex-soldiers who paid them in. But here arises a political angle which is as blatant as we've seen in some time, even in Washington.

Early this year it was known that refunds would be made to veterans on their insurance premiums. But when the talk had circulated around a while, Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray said in June that he "hoped" distribution of checks could start by next January and be "substantially completed" a year from now.

Frankly, these $2,800,000,000 in overcharges belong to the veterans now. It was excess money paid in and should be returned without delay. Even Washington should move fast enough to get this money back to its owners by October 1949, as Representative KEATING, of Rochester, has demanded.

But the $2,800,000,000 appear slated to stay in the Federal coffers until next year, when they will roll out and payments will be "substantially completed" by the time voters are going to the polls in the 1950 congressional elections. If veterans look that one over they'll be insulted and also sore that they've been held up a year on money that's rightfully theirs now.

Silver Jubilee Program of Congregation Agudas Achim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the account recently appearing in the Leominster (Mass.) Enterprise of the outstanding silver jubilee program of Congregation Agudas Achim of that city:

SILVER JUBILEE PROGRAM OF CONGREGATION AGUDAS ACHIM HELD LAST NIGHT—TRIBUTE PAID TO MEMBERS BY SPEAKERS—NEARLY 1,000 ATTEND PUBLIC PROGRAM MARKING END OF 3-DAY OBSERVANCE

Nearly 1,000 persons attended the closing program of the 3-day silver jubilee observance of the laying of the cornerstone of the Congregation Agudas Achim synagogue, held in city hall auditorium last night and featured by the appearance of the first Israeli ambassador to the United States, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, and representatives of the clergy of all faiths in Leominster.

The program was a fitting climax to a celebration which opened Friday night with services and continued in a festive manner throughout Friday, all day Saturday and Sunday.

The audience heard glowing tribute paid to the Jewish people of Leominster and to the Jewish race, they heard the religious teachings of the Jew extolled, they heard congratulations pouring in to them from all sides, and they heard and witnessed the paying of a tribute to the founders of the Leominster Synagogue who strove so hard to bring about the actual realization of a long cherished dream—the construction of a building in which to worship.

The founders were each presented with a copy of the Holy Scripture with their names engraved on the cover and bound in leather as a momento of their hard work in bringing about their cherished desire for a house of worship for their people. (Full text of Ambassador Elath's address may be found on p. 4.)

"My government is resolved to protect and safeguard our organic connection with Jerusalem the lives and safety of its population, with the same vigor and determination with which we defended Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Negba," Eliahu Elath, Israeli Ambassador to the United States told the gathering in his address which was a high light of the evening program. "The integration of the Jewish part of Jerusalem into the life of the State of Israel has taken place as a natural historical process arising from the conditions of war, from the vacum of authority created by the termination of the mandate, and from the refusal of the United Nations to assume any direct administrative responsibilities on the same. This integration is not incompatible with the establishment of an international regime charged with full authority for the effective protection of the holy places. Let me say here and now as my government has said in the past, and has reiterated only

the other day, we have no intention of relinquishing what our history and our blood have made so much of our own body as Jewish Jerusalem."

THE ENSEMBLE

The city hall program opened at 8 o'clock with a selection by the Wellington Ensemble followed by the singing of the national anthem. The Jewish State of Israel song, Hatikvoh was then played with Cantor Leon Gold of Boston singing it and the Jewish members of the audience participating.

Harry Levine was the master of ceremonies and in his opening remarks he told of the 3-day program which opened on Friday and its continuation on through last night. He sketched briefly the progress made in the 25 years since the cornerstone of the synagogue was laid and likened the progress to a small, but important and small link in a chain of Jewish life which, through the years would grow and grow. He told of the earnestness of the Jewish people, to carry on the tradition and history so long identified with the Jewish faith and expressed his thanks at such a large audience attending to join with the Jewish people of Leominster in their celebration.

Mr. Levine then, in a very fitting manner, presented Rabbi Eric I. Lowenthal, whom he described as a man deep in background and the profound knowledge of the Jewish people who has through his interpretations done so much to aid the members of Congregation Agudas Achim.

RABBI LOWENTHAL

Rabbi Lowenthal spoke briefly on the history of the synagogue and traced the existence of synagogues to some 500 years before Jesus. He told of the raising of the banner whenever 10 Jewish men settled in a community to bring about their place of worship and said that the Jewish people believe in unity and diversity and true democracy. He cited three examples which, he said, should be used as yardsticks: "(1) to learn to see ourselves as others see us; (2) to learn to see others as they see themselves; (3) to learn to see ourselves as we are seen by God."

Mr. Levine then presented Mayor Ralph W. Crossman who brought the greetings of the city of Leominster and who paid a glowing tribute to the Jewish people of Leominster, many of whom he described as being his personal friends, of their industriousness, their business foresight, and their willingness to cooperate and be a part of the community life of Leominster.

Rev. Edmund G. Haddad, curate at St. Leo's Church, representing the pastor, Rev. John A. Martin, was next and he brought the greetings of the Roman Catholic people of Leominster and gave a very stirring address to the group. "No one has any more to look back upon than the Jewish people. Their history, in this our day even, continues to be a best seller among best sellers. We look to the Greeks for culture, to the Romans for laws but for religion we look to the Jews." Rev. Fr. Haddad then paid his respects to the founders of the synagogue who made it possible as a place of worship.

Rev. John Rae Chapman, pastor of the Pilgrim Congregational Church and president of the Leominster Council of Churches, brought the greetings of the Protestant churches of Leominster to the people of the synagogue and their spiritual leader, Rabbi Lowenthal, to whom he paid a special tribute. He expressed a welcome and a sense of deep brotherhood feeling "to the neighbors and associates of ours—the Jewish people—and for the completion of their first 25 years of honorable work in their city and their continuing work throughout the entire world." He spoke of the needs for brotherhood in the world today and of the need of not only talking brotherhood but also of living it as well.

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, next speaker, extolled the principles of freedom, the treatment of equality of all races, and paid a special tribute to the members of the Congregation Agudas Achim on their twenty-fifth anniversary saying "During the 25 years of your existence as a separate congregation you have made enviable progress. The activities of the congregation so ably carried out by your distinguished spiritual leaders, and so generously supported by your people have exerted profound influence upon the affairs of this progressive community. During that time you have seen the congregation grow from relatively humble beginnings to its present impressive size, you have seen its members taking increasingly important part not only in the spiritual life but in the industrial, business, and civic affairs of this beautiful city. Tonight you may well be proud of your achievements and you may well be proud of your contributions to Leominster, to the commonwealth, and to the Nation. Your zeal in advancing noble causes has been unexcelled. Your leaders and members have been in the vanguard of every worthy civic endeavor, every fine worthy civic endeavor, every fine effort to better the lot of the weak and the unfortunate and make this city a better place in which to live.

He continued, "One in public position must also be deeply impressed in these troubled days by the spirit of toleration and consideration for others which you have helped so much to engender. I am proud, beyond measure, to assert that in Leominster and throughout the Third Congressional District there is a complete absence of these abominable forms of racial and religious hatred which so unfortunately afflict other sections of the Nation and the world. Because you have demonstrated such sterling Americanism and such loyal citizenship and such magnanimous charity and such a happy understanding of the purposes and problems of other groups, this community is the richer for your presence, this Nation is more honored for your devotion. I hope the day will come soon when here in America we can fulfill in even larger measure the promise of our Constitution and free way of life to eliminate intolerance and bigotry from the body politic wherever they may exist and guarantee to all our citizens without regard to race, color, creed, or station in life the fullest measure of their constitutional heritage as free-born American citizens enjoying equality of opportunity, equality of toleration, and equality of freedom under the law."

IN CLOSING

In closing he said "Members of the congregation, it has been through your sacrifices and unabating loyalty that the accomplishments of the past 25 years have been made possible. I know that you will not be found wanting in time to come, that just as heretofore you will build upon these solid foundations of your past accomplishments this shrine of loyalty to your own faith and to the faith of our beloved America. I know that I speak for the people as well as myself as your warm, admiring friend when I wish you well for the future. May the next 25 years bring you even greater success and achievement. May the Almighty God guide and protect his choicest blessings of health, happiness, good fortune, peace, love of fellowman and service to His great and omniscient purpose."

Joseph C. Foster, president of the congregation then spoke outlining the history of the Agudas Achim Congregation, paying a special tribute to the early founders and their hard work to bring about the progress which was noted by the passing of the quarter century mark last night. He told of the work done and he expressed gratification to those who made the 3-day observance one which was so successful. A moment's tribute was paid to those members of the congregation who have passed on and then he expressed his thanks to the general public. In presenting the Holy Scripture to the founders he said that reference was made in the leaflet to the 11th Psalm. The founders then rose and the presentation were made.

Following this Ambassador Elath delivered his very inspiring address.

Cantor Gold sang two Jewish songs which were exceptionally well received by the audience.

The closing number on the program was the singing by the entire assembly of God Bless America, and the 3-day program was brought to a very successful and historic close.

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ELIAHU ELATH, ISRAELI AMBASSADOR TO UNITED STATES, GIVEN HERE LAST NIGHT

Ambassador Eliahu Elath's address delivered at the jubilee observance of the Congregation Agudas Achim last night in city hall before a large audience, follows:

"It is a privilege and a pleasure to be present with you tonight in celebrating an occasion which in importance far transcends local interest. Witnessing the twenty-fifth anniversary of the dedication of a house of worship is an experience which has implications not only for those who have prayed in it during those years, but for the community at large.

"The synagogue of the Agudas Achim and its congregation form an integral part of the spiritual life of Leominster. As a group bound together by their Jewish faith, your congregation is a part of that larger community of the American people which ties together citizens of different religions and beliefs. As believers in the Jewish religion, you also form a part of that other community which links all Jews by their common ideals and moral convictions. The fact that for the past 25 years you have been able to pray here regularly and undisturbed according to the dictates of your faith is a glowing proof of the liberty of conscience and the freedom of worship that exists in this great democracy. That your ancient faith has proved strong enough to unite you during that quarter of a century in our age is evidence of the great spiritual vigor of Judaism, which irrespective of time or place gives meaning to the lives of Jews. On this great occasion, we, therefore, pay tribute both to the country in which you dwell and to the faith in which you believe."

GREETINGS

"May I, as the representative of Israel, a state which, though but recently established, is founded on those same age-old moral and spiritual values which you express in your worship, bring you the greetings of my people and extend to you best wishes for many more years of fruitful and ever-expanding activity within your synagogue and within your community. May I use this pleasant opportunity of paying tribute to my good friend and distinguished leader of your community, Harry Levine, who has rendered invaluable services to our young state both before and after its creation, with the greatest devotion and readiness for sacrifice.

"May I now be permitted to say a word about what we believe an occasion such as this, although celebrated far from our shores, means for us in Israel.

"The Israel of old, our teachers tell us, was given its identity and was molded into a nation by an act of faith. As the Bible describes it, it was the giving of the Torah that made of Israel an entity differing from other nomadic tribes by being pledged to a new and richer ideal. It was in the service of that ideal that Israel matured and became

the great spiritual influence not only of the ancient world but also of our own day. This spiritual force continued to be exerted even after the destruction of the ancient State of Israel. One of the great phenomena of the history of our people is this singular unbroken thread of spiritual force that has united Jews within and that influenced the outside world even at times when the material and physical condition of Jews was at its lowest ebb."

PARAMOUNT PART

"In that process the synagogue has played a paramount part. It was within the synagogue and around it that Jews in the days of early Christianity, in the days of the Middle Ages, and even in our own day find spiritual unison. It is the synagogue that for centuries has symbolized to the non-Jewish world the essence of Judaism. Had it not been for groups such as yours, who faithfully through periods of darkest oppression kept their faith, were proudly devoted to it and ready to die for it, little trace would have been left of the Jewish people today, and certainly no basis would have remained for the national renaissance that found its climax in the establishment of the new State of Israel just a little over a year ago.

"Let no one make the mistake though and draw from this historic fact the conclusion that the Jewish religion is identical with a spirit of narrow nationalism that would be meaningless for other nations. On the contrary, through the fact that today a separate state exists under the name of Israel and that at the same time there continue to live throughout the world Jews who owe no political allegiance to that state, but are full citizens of the community in which they live, only shows that the spiritual force that is Judaism is not confined in its expression to any particular form. It also demonstrates that the new State of Israel derives inspiration from those very same values which motivate you in your private lives as believers in the doctrines of Judaism and as custodians of our Jewish heritage.

"We in Israel are pledged to show in the life of our nation that these ideals which motivate you as individuals and congregations can be applied even in our modern world to the life of a nation as a whole. Just as you in your individual lives as good Americans can also be good Jews and find your highest form of spiritual happiness in being both, so we as the state of Israel will find our greatest reward in being allowed to develop and to grow both as a distinct entity built on the Jewish heritage and at the same time be a responsible and valuable member of the world family of nations.

"And just as difficulties facing individual Jews in that struggle throughout the ages have never deterred them from striving and struggling for perfection, we as a state today will not allow the many obstacles and difficulties that lie in our path to deflect us from that high purpose."

BURNING ISSUE

"Let me take you for a brief moment away from the immediate occasion that we are commemorating and refer to one of the most burning issues that now face Israel. It is the question of the future of Jerusalem,

"It is fitting that we should speak here where we celebrate an anniversary of a sacred building of the place that is most sacred to us all. Jerusalem has always meant to the Jew the embodiment of everything Jewish. That has been so throughout the ages. But today Jerusalem in addition to being a symbol, is a reality. The new city of Jerusalem is as much a part of Israel as Tel Aviv because it was built up by Israelis. The United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission has now come out with a proposal for the internationalization of the entire city of Jerusalem and its environs. Shorn of its embellishments, such a proposal means that the Jews would not be masters of their own fate in Jewish Jerusalem.

"The November 29 resolution of the United Nations envisaged the establishment of a special regime for Jerusalem designed primarily 'to protect and preserve the unique spirit and religious interests located in the city.' In establishing such a regime the United Nations pledged itself 'to insure that peace and order reign in Jerusalem.' This regime did not come into being, though there was complete Jewish compliance and cooperation. After May 15, 1948, the armed forces of Transjordan, Iraq, and Egypt joined in a concerted attack on Jerusalem, attempting to force the Jewish population of 100,000 to surrender. While the town together with its holy places was indiscriminately bombed and shelled and the besieged Jewish community faced starvation, the United Nations failed to assume its responsibility.

"The Jewish population of Jerusalem was saved solely by its own heroic defense and the break-through of the Israel Army. Those months of siege taught the Jews of Jerusalem the bitter lesson that for them there can be no security except by linking their fate with the state of Israel. Nor can there be any economic future and administrative stability for a Jewish Jerusalem cut off from Israel. The sentimental attachment of Israel and world Jewry to Jerusalem and the importance of its cultural and medical centers, the Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital, need only be emphasized."

HOLY PLACES

"Only about 5 percent of the holy places in Jerusalem are located in the Israel held parts of the town. Approximately 95 percent are controlled by Jordanian forces in the Old City. Such major incidents of desecration of holy places as occurred were almost entirely confined to the period of actual fighting. As a matter of fact, the only places of worship deliberately destroyed after the battle were the Jewish synagogues in the Old City, while the Israel authorities have promised full protection of the holy places within their territory and have insured their accessibility. The only holy site to which there is no access is the Jewish Wailing Wall.

"The Government of Israel does not believe that there exists any fundamental clash of interests between the Christian world and Israel as to the safeguarding of the holy places. In this most recent pronouncement, President Weizmann reaffirmed our position on this point. 'We fully accept the position that to other religions too, Jerusalem is a holy city but it is our contention that all legitimate interests of these religions can be safeguarded by international arrangements governing the holy places.'

"The integration of the Jewish part of Jerusalem into the life of the state of Israel has taken place as a natural historical process arising from the conditions of war, from the vacuum of authority created by the termination of the mandate, and from the refusal of the United Nations to assume any direct administrative responsibilities on the scene. This integration is not incompatible with the establishment of an international regime charged with full authority for the effective protection of the holy places. Let me say here and now as my Government has said it in the past, and has reiterated it only the other day, we have no intention of relinquishing what our history and our blood have made so much of our own body as Jewish Jerusalem.

"May I emphatically state here tonight that my Government is resolved to protect and safeguard our organic connection with Jerusalem, the lives and safety of its population, with the same vigor and determination with which we defended Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Negba.

"Let us hope that the strength of our own determination, joined with the help of our fellow Jews all over the world and with the assistance of men of good faith everywhere, will enable us to achieve that goal, so that it may reflect credit not only on the state of Israel, but on the Jewish people everywhere in a world of brotherhood, peace, and international cooperation for which we all strive."

Large Newspapers Invite Opposition by Improper News Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the large newspapers and magazines of this country are, in many cases, influencing large segments of the population against them by prejudiced, narrow, and short-sighted editorial and news policies. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter Mr. James M. Witherow of Moorhead, Minn., has sent to the editor of one of our national news magazines. Mr. Witherow has given me permission to use his letter:

GRAHAM PATTERSON, Esq.,
Publisher, Pathfinder,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I wish to compliment you on your magazine which I have read with interest for several years. Your coverage of the country as a whole is more unbiased than any of the other publications of the large eastern cities. During the last 30 years, I have covered a large portion of the United States and noted the commercial and political opinions and conditions prevailing. I am going to give you some of the criticisms I have heard and commercial observations which I have made in the hope that they will prove of some interest and value to you in the conduct of your publication.

Strange as it may seem, I have found more provincialism and sophistication in the large cities like New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and New Orleans, than I find in the smaller cities and in the rural communities.

This is due largely to two factors: The larger businessmen do not live in the cities from which their business investments are conducted. Second, the working classes are inclined to work in groups, and their political interests are largely confined to the wards where they vote and which are usually under control of local bosses, who have the vote cast in accordance with their private interests.

From a press standpoint, the managing editors are usually governed by the wishes of their advertisers and the local prejudices of their readers. Very few reason out the problems on their merits. In the large cities, they are sincerely convinced that the country readers are ignorant and incapable of forming sound judgments on the questions of the day. Therefore, they present national issues from the standpoint of the cities rather than the interests of the Nation as a whole. The fallacy of this standpoint has been shown in the recent election, and unless the party leaders will wake up, it will undoubtedly result in the defeat of many of the present leaders of both parties.

In your commercial reports, which I find accurate in the subjects covered but you omit the basic production which furnish a market for the subjects which you cover. You overlook the fact that it is the production of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, livestock, dairy products, and fruit which produces the money to buy the manufactured products of the cities and that when the production money diminishes, the output of the factories, the bank deposits and clearances decline and we have a depression. Then you fail to give the conditions in the different sections, particularly in the agricultural areas, so that they feel that they are discriminated against and use their prejudices, thus created against the cities, in the ballot boxes.

If you would publish the substance of the reports of the nine Federal Reserve banks, your readers would have a better knowledge of the economic affairs of the entire country. Then you give special attention to the results of department stores, forgetting that it is grocery stores which are the best index of the spending upon the necessities of life and the general welfare of the country.

In banking, you are too much inclined to accept the dictation of the large banks of New York, who are too much confined to special trades and large business concerns, therefore lack knowledge of the basic industries of the country. In addition with the development of hydroelectric power, the smaller manufacturing industries are no longer confined to coal and steam power, this with the saving of freights, employment of local labor and capital is gradually decentralizing the manufacturing interests of the country. In the Pacific Coast States, this progress is very rapid and when the next reapportionment bill is passed, you must expect California and Texas to take their places in the larger congressional representation of the country. The industrial east can no longer control the political destinies of the country. In the Middle and Western States, the bank credits have become available to the smaller industries who are getting into a position to compete successfully with the large industries of the east.

These are matters which the large newspapers and magazines fail to realize, therefore, their neglect to give proper news representation to the rest of the country is centralizing prejudice and collective effort of the majorities against them. Therefore, common sense would dictate that the press and business of the East ought to realize that their trade territory in the West has increased to a stage where its interests must be either recognized or eastern interests excluded.

Think these things over and let me hear from you intelligently on the problems set forth herein.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. WITHEROW.

Propriety Offended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo (N. Y.) News:

PROPRIETY OFFENDED

Though legislation may be an inappropriate remedy, the bill by Representative KEATING, of Rochester, to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from appearing as character witnesses in criminal cases must certainly be regarded as a proper rebuke for the two who did it in the Alger Hiss perjury trial.

Regardless of the other controversial aspects of this case, the impropriety of the appearance of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses for the defendant seems scarcely open to question. Their testimony contained no scrap of factual evidence; they were simply giving their opinion as to the character of the defendant.

Their very presence in such a role was demeaning to the judiciary, for their testimony was not entitled to greater credence than that of any other witness, yet they robed it with the prestige of the highest court. They asked for the rebuke they received from the eight jurors who, voting for conviction, thereby expressed their low regard for the ability of Messrs. Frankfurter and Reed to judge character in this instance.

Since the trial, it has been noted that we may one day face a situation where a majority of the Supreme Court might be called to testify in similar vein, thus disqualifying the entire Court from sitting in final review. But this is a very remote contingency at most. It is enough to ask that the conduct of Justices Reed and Frankfurter be not repeated for the simple reason that it damages irreparably the prestige of the Supreme Court. Propriety cannot be legislated, but the American people have a right to insist on a full measure of it from the members of their highest judicial tribunal. That goes for the Justices who doff their robes to make political stump speeches no less than these who took the stand as character witnesses in an ordinary criminal trial.

Keynesian Economics and the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the weekly financial service, Economic Trend Line Studies:

KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS AND THE PUBLIC DEBT

In the past 20 years public debt has assumed an ever increasing role in economic affairs, particularly Federal Government debt. There is considerable confusion in thinking on the subject of Federal debt, and we hear various vague references to national bankruptcy, ruinous inflation, etc. Unfortunately, remarks are made from time to time on the subject by politicians or public officials which reveal that they have little real insight into the problem. It may be helpful to review some of the basic principles of public debt management, especially the modification in viewpoint which has developed since the mid-1930's, in an attempt to establish a foundation for sound thinking.

In 1936 the late J. M. Keynes published his famous book entitled "The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money." This book, together with the writings of the Keynesian school of economists, has dominated economic theories and public policies in this country for 14 years. Keynes set forth a rational theory of economic behavior which differed substantially from the so-called neoclassical doctrines previously in vogue. Although he developed an integrated system encompassing total economic activity, here we are concerned only with the evolution of his ideas on public debt.

In general, Keynes and his followers held that the violent fluctuations in business activity were caused by a periodic disequilibrium which developed between the flow of money savings and investment. During times of prosperity, the rate of savings is stimulated to such high levels that it is impossible to find sufficient outlets for investments and this leads to a contraction in economic activity and unemployment. This latter development serves to depress investment opportunities and may further exaggerate the unbalance. Under this approach, the primary problem to be solved in order to avoid depressions and maintain high employment is to keep the level of investment as nearly equal as possible to the level of savings. Since it is assumed private enterprise (under these conditions) cannot provide adequate investment opportunities, it is a brief step to the recommendation that the Federal Government expand investment activities.

This is the route by which the Keynesian school arrived at the theory of the "compensatory fiscal policy." Prof. Alvin Hansen has been one of the foremost disciples of this idea. The proposal is that the Federal Government should spend money on public works and investment projects during depression periods in order to stimulate employment and incomes. This will create deficits and have an inflationary effect on the economy. Subsequently, when business activity recovers, increased taxes should be imposed and the surplus used to retire debt. Thus, under this plan a fiscal policy would be managed in such a way as to maintain high incomes and employment, and the dangers of long-term rises in the national debt would be avoided by balancing, over a period of years, the deficits and surpluses.

This is a very brief and inadequate exposition of a few of the salient features of the Keynesian thesis. There has been a great volume of literature written on the subject, much of it highly technical and of little interest except to professional economists. We do not wish to burden the reader with these discussions.

EVALUATING KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

There is little doubt that the Keynesian ideas have had a permanent impact on economic thinking. Many of his critics have shown themselves to be completely unfamiliar with his views. Indeed, it is likely that not more than one out of ten of the Keynesian critics (outside the realm of professional economists) have thoroughly read the General Theory and been able to understand the exposition.

Several valuable contributions have been made by the Keynesian school. The theory presented the first rational explanation of the economic system as a whole, rather than concentrating on a simple buyer and seller relationship. It laid the groundwork for significant refinements in the determination of national income data. It established, more clearly than had ever been done before, the positive influence of the national debt and government fiscal policy on the economic life of the country. It represents the first really scientific approach to the problem of avoiding depressions in a free economy. These and many other contributions insure the fact that several of the original Keynesian ideas will outlive their critics.

Despite all his brilliance and insight into economic problems, Keynes had certain very human faults. He was primarily a thinker and often tended to be impatient with the practical details of administration and executive functioning. He looked upon his work as merely an extension in existing economic

theory and generally failed to realize how revolutionary it seemed to others. Upon occasions Keynes would tend to become somewhat emotional and make statements which he undoubtedly later regretted. This accounts for a certain disparity between his speeches and interviews and his more scholarly writing. For example, in informal discussions he was often quoted as saying that if a choice had to be made, it was by all means more desirable to have inflation rather than deflation. Although subsequently the remark was usually qualified, it nevertheless stamped him as a radical and gave rise to charges that he favored perpetual deficit spending and a progressive cheapening in the value of money.

Keynes and his more thoughful followers were disappointed that his ideas were not more readily accepted by the business community, but, on the contrary, often generated hostility. He proclaimed himself a champion of free enterprise and sincerely opposed all forms of socialism or collectivism. He believed that private capitalism was being greatly weakened by the violence of business fluctuations and clearly saw the destruction which came about through unemployment and depression. He believed his solution offered a practical way to maintain high levels of business, employment, and profits, and as such, he failed to understand why it was not acceptable to large segments of the business community.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF APPLYING A COMPENSATORY FISCAL POLICY

The theory of the compensatory fiscal policy, it would seem, can be accepted as sound. But to date little progress has been made in fashioning it into an efficient tool for stabilizing the economy. Those who oppose the idea on the grounds that it is impractical have certainly had experience on their side. Not only have Government agencies shown a lack of foresight in applying appropriate economic policies designed to aid stability but there has also been little disposition on the part of the general voting population to insist on a realistic fiscal program. A compensatory fiscal policy demands the highest degree of unselfish devotion to the general welfare. Instead of achieving this, Keynesian economics has been perverted, with the approval of the mass of voters, into an excuse for unbridled, and in many instances, irresponsible spending. The first hurdle (but by no means the last) in making such a scheme work is the development of popular support for a program of heavy taxes and debt retirement in times of prosperity. In our present society this means a very real and personal sacrifice on the part of every citizen which has not been in evidence to date.

There are many implied assumptions in the notion of the compensatory fiscal policy which are naive in the extreme. First of all, it is assumed that some superhuman agency can know in advance the course of the economy and that this group will be able to have appropriate policies ready, approved by Congress, and in operation in time to prevent sharp dislocations in the economy. The period immediately following the war provides a case in point. The best minds in the administrative branch of the Government forecast huge unemployment and deflation in 1946. Domestic programs were built on this foundation with the result that the natural inflationary pressures were greatly intensified through encouragement of wage raises, public spending, and tax reduction. We have had another treatment more recently. As late as 4 or 5 months ago public spokesmen were warning against further inflationary dangers when actually the postwar inflation began to subside a year ago.

Secondly, there is the assumption that the national budget can be reduced or increased at wi'l within a very broad range. However, this is not true. The necessities of international politics since the end of the war, for example, have demanded heavy military expenditures. Thus it would have been almost impossible to have cut the budget drastically in recent years, even though such action would have been indicated. It is almost impossible to outline a comprehensive long-range fiscal program without having it impaired by unexpected events.

Finally, the theory of employing fiscal management to stabilize the economy ignores the enormously complex questions of where and how Federal money is to be spent and who will benefit, as well as the counterpart of who is to be taxed and what form the tax structure should take. Fundamentally, this involves decisions regarding the redistribution of wealth and income. While the strongest advocates of the compensatory fiscal policy have talked at length about stabilizing the economy, they have not devoted a great deal of thought or presented a clear agreement as to how wealth and income should be redistributed. Here the Marxists have supplied their own answer to the Keynesians. Thus, Keynes, an avowed anti-Communist and anti-Socialist, has provided a strong tool to these groups.

CONCLUSION

The economics of public debt is relatively simple. Either we adopt a true compensatory fiscal policy and try to maintain, over a period of time, balanced budgets, or we continue to create large deficits. These deficits may not cause immediate difficulty, but whenever a demand is made on national resources which is greater than can be met (as in time of war, or in the future when we seriously deplete mineral reserves) the groundwork is laid for skyrocketing inflation.

This is merely one aspect of the truism that economic relationships are universal. There is no such thing as New Deal economics, Socialist economics, Communist economics, or capitalist economics. Basically, when these terms are used they mean varying political systems, but not different economics. A true compensatory fiscal program is actually the same as the former ideal of a balanced budget every year, except under this concept the balancing process is for a period of years. The fact that it has been perverted into an excuse for accumulating even larger deficits does not suspend economic laws. The homely proverb of "not being able to eat your cake and have it too" has been revised in some quarters to "You may eat your cake and have it too, provided you can grab another piece from someone else."

Religious Front Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of August 31, 1949, entitled "Religious Front Line," commenting on the dignified and strong position taken by the Vatican in an exchange of diplomatic messages prior to World War II.

RELIGIOUS FRONT LINE

It is still very fashionable in some uninformed circles to speak of a Vatican attitude of friendliness toward the Nazi government. This makes a kind of logic with unthinking liberals because it is well known how strongly the church has opposed communism, which the Nazis also opposed, in somewhat wobbly fashion. The State Department has recently published official documents which throw an instructive light on this situation. They are contained in Documents on German Foreign Policy, Series D, containing official documents of the German Foreign Office for the years 1937 to 1938. Included are all of the documents bearing upon relations between the Holy See and Germany in the tense period from March 1937 to September 1938. No one who takes the trouble to read them can have any doubts as to the firm anti-nazism of the Vatican. What particularly interested us, however, were the strong communications addressed to the German Government by the then Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli, now Pope Pius XII.

The communication which seemed most significant was a note from the Papal Secretary to the German Ambassador dated April 30, 1937, in which he replied to a German note of April 12 attributing political motives to the Vatican in giving world-wide distribution to the encyclical, Mit brennender Sorge, which was read from Catholic pulpits throughout Germany on March 21, 1937.

One could only be reminded of the current Kremlin, as he must again and again in reading these papers, when the Germans charged that the customary circulation of the encyclical to bishops of the church everywhere constituted an attempt "to arouse the world against the new Germany."

The Nazis also craftily used the old anti-Communist gag to embarrass the church, stating that the encyclical had "destroyed the effect of the papal encyclical against communism issued just previously, and dealt a dangerous blow to the defense front against the world menace of bolshevism, so very desirable for the Catholic Church in particular."

The then Cardinal Pacelli proved himself more than adequate to deal with the Berlin phrase-makers. What is most interesting and timely was what he had to say in reply to that well calculated jab regarding communism:

"The Holy Father owes it to the dignity and essential impartiality of his Supreme Pontificate, however, while condemning the Bolshevistic system of delusion and revolution, not to close his eyes to errors that are beginning to insinuate themselves into other political and ideological movements and are pressing for supremacy. The fact that such errors are also found within political defensive fronts which have a general anti-Bolshevist orientation cannot constitute a justification for tolerating or ignoring them on the part of the highest authority on religious teaching. * * *

"Nothing would be more disastrous to the internal and external cohesiveness and to the continued existence, despite great strain, of a strong defensive front against the world danger of atheistic communism, then the erroneous belief that this defense can be based solely upon external power and that the spiritual powers can be denied their rightful place in it. There is nothing more misguided than to restrict, among the spiritual powers of the world, the field of operations of Christianity and of its inherent values of truth and life, and to prevent the church from fully utilizing the powers latent in it and ready for action to overcome spiritually, as a blessing of the nations, the errors and misconceptions inherent in bolshevism. It is precisely to this error and to the false attitude resulting from it that leading circles in present-day Germany have to an alarming extent succumbed."

This, it seems to us, is a timely clarification of the confusion so often exhibited about the extremes of totalitarianism which actually approximate the same evil thing. This, the Vatican saw more clearly than some of our contemporaries. Moreover,

nothing needs more vigorous statement than that the weakness of the west is not so much physical as moral. Phony as the Communist dogma may be it is a dogma which seems to incite some men to amazing deeds.

Religion never had a challenge so great as to help the people of western civilization back, or forward to a crystal clear sense of moral purpose. As several of the nation's leading Liberals have recently admitted, our current order in America leaves us without very much worth fighting for except our own materialism. It is, indeed, a moral crisis.

Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a most splendid editorial from the Palm Beach Post Times in which the editor, Charles Francis Coe, an outstanding editorial writer and profound thinker, discusses the necessity of American citizens having a platform. I commend the 10 planks of this platform for the serious consideration of the ever-true American who believes in the imperishable principle ordained by the Nation's founding fathers.

The editorial follows:

PLATFORMS

Platforms have long been a part of political campaigns. Candidates have them. Parties have them. All too often, they have been used solely for campaign purposes, then forgotten.

It is not about time that the American citizen has a platform? Should not every citizen, cognizant of his liberties, devoted to our homeland, conscious of his duties to posterity, adopt a platform and enforce it? We think so. What sort of a platform should that be? May we presume to suggest?

1. Freedom of every individual to work where and at what he pleases; to marry only by individual choice and to worship as he he sees fit.

2. Freedom of the individual independently to contract for lawful purposes without interference from Government.

3. Freedom of any person to engage in commerce or industry, to perfect ways and means of profitable public service, to grow in his affairs in proportion to his competitive capacity.

4. Freedom for the individual to think for himself, speak for himself and openly to discuss problems affecting his affairs.

5. Freedom for all, to join in common effort to defend the public welfare against invasions of the common right; disaster; oppression by governmental agencies; and to perfect and indulge such measures as will promote the majority interest, while defending minority interest.

7. Freedom to join the parade of production which is the foundation of this free Nation. Freedom to produce oneself and to require that one's neighbor bear a fair and just share of the burdens of ordered society.

8. Freedom to pursue happiness in rightful application of one's ambitions, ideals, inventions, creations, and earning power.

9. Freedom to preserve and defend human dignity, to find in man the instrumentality of God in the earth, and to achieve ever-increasing identity with God's plan for peace, evolution, and mounting purpose of life.

10. Freedom to vote and, even more important, determination to exercise that freedom on appropriate occasions where the settlement of public issues or the establishment of public policy lies at bar.

That, we suggest, is a good platform.

If adopted by every citizen the estate of citizenship would divest itself of the dross of politics; it would rear itself to the status of world dominion in equity. It would develop the crafts of men, as well as their avarice. It would fortify the bulwarks of freedom by providing the spiritual munitions without which freedom must perish. It would remove from the affrighted thinking of business fear of the political crack-downs of governing powers, and would inspire in artisans, pride of workmanship, and faith in the imperishable principle ordained by our founding fathers. These things it would do.

What things will you do?

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Failure of Federal Departments To Disclose Known Irregularities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the September 8, 1949, issue of the Delmarva News, published at Selbyville, Del., an excellent and timely editorial entitled "Congressional Investigations".

This editorial deals with a very serious matter—the failure of Federal Departments to disclose information concerning known irregularities within Government agencies. Evidence substantiating the existence of this situation was recently presented on the floor of the Senate by Delaware's distinguished senior Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

I am confident that all Members of the Congress and all citizens will agree that such failures by Government officials to carry out properly their responsibilities must be discontinued. The editorial to which I referred follows:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

We suspect that at one time or another most everyone has felt that the rash of congressional investigations of the past years has been overdone, and perhaps it has.

But one thing which seems to be common of most all investigations is that some department or other of the Federal Government has apparently known about the irregularities long before Congress got around to investigating the matter, and for one reason or another chose to keep the matter quiet until our elected representatives ferreted it out.

The recent revelations by Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, of Millsboro, in connection with the black-market operations on broilers during the war, like others, revealed that documents which would have exonerated the poultrymen of the peninsula and shown up Federal Government department irregularities were kept on file away from the public eye.

This common practice of hiding departmental irregularities from the public which supports the departments is malpractice and to our way of thinking malfeasance of office by the department heads.

True, they are not elected by the people, but they are appointed by the peoples' elected representatives and just as responsible to the American public as any Congressman. It would seem that any department head who knows of an irregularity in his department is morally obligated to reveal that irregularity to the public and immediately set about rectifying the situation.

However, the practice seems to be just the opposite. The department heads apparently not only hide the irregularities, but continue the offenders in office.

All this would seem that the administration which has been in power since 1932 has been there so long that they believe themselves to be demigods, responsible not to the people, but only unto themselves. They are apparently in the groove of government for themselves, and not for the people.

History is replete with such cases of long-term administrations which have ultimately become corrupt and cocky. Others have even assumed all the powers of the people, holding power by decree rather than by the will of the people.

Could it be that the present Democratic, or rather Fair Deal administration in Washington has reached this point? Certainly corruptness has been revealed. Certainly the involvement of high officials in irregularities has not been rare. Certainly the top-kicks of the administration have not been inclined to oust the offenders and replace them with other men. They have, quite to the contrary, put up a false face of loyalty to their comrades involved, defied Congress, and thereby the public, and gone along their merry way, figuratively thumbing their noses at the people.

If this is their attitude, and conditions would seem to substantiate this assumption, then it is high time to turn the rascals out of office, and 1950 offers the American people their first and excellent opportunity to return to government of the people, by the people, and for the people, not government by decree and corporation.

Freedom of Economic Handicaps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement made by Orville S. Poland, economic adviser to Governor Dever, to the League Reporter summarizing the new spirit that is at work to provide more jobs and revive industry in New England:

At the Quoddy hearing before the International Joint Commission in Eastport, Maine, to determine the practicality of harnessing ocean tides at Passamaquoddy Bay for public power, three important engineering statements stood out uncontradicted:

1. Quoddy will be the most dependable source of electric power in the world. Neither ice nor drought nor flood will interrupt it.

2. Quoddy power, now proposed, will develop 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, or enough to change the New England power situation from one of famine to one of plenty.

3. Quoddy power will be cheap power. No estimate of cost was over 3 mills per kilowatt, as against a cost for coal alone, in steam-generated power, of 6 mills per kilowatt.

VITAL IMPORTANCE

These facts are of vital importance to New England because the New England economy is in a period of transition. The days of unchallenged industrial supremacy of New England are gone. The changes which are taking place now are deeper and more meaningful than the relatively superficial change from the horse and buggy to the automobile.

The similarity between the British economy and the New England economy is striking. England is a country without raw materials, which has been sustained by its world commerce in goods fabricated and processed in England. New England has no raw materials; New England cannot feed itself; New England does not produce the cotton, the wool or the leather to clothe itself; New England cannot even house itself. Our leading raw materials are cranberries and fish.

YANKEE KNOW-HOW

Yet New England has prospered because of its unrivaled genius for getting things done. We have had Yankee know-how, mechanical skill and financial statesmanship. And we have been, and are, nearest to the greatest market in the world.

So long as the South was the land of cotton and New England was the home of the cotton mills, so long as the West produced the raw materials and we processed them and sold the finished goods back to the West, all was well in New England.

More than anything else we need power. We have no coal. We have no oil. We have no gas. But we do have rivers and we do have tides.

Power costs in New England today are the highest in the United States. Last year, the electric power used in New England cost $176,000,000 more than the same power would have cost in the TVA. This is a yearly drain of the life-blood of our industry which the most robust cannot endure—and it would pay for Quoddy.

This expense to the New England economy would be doubled if we used as much electricity as the United States average, but present rates are so exorbitant that instead of 2,000 kilowatts per year per capita we use only 1,067 kilowatts—or just about the same as England, so frequently cited as a backward country, in its use of electricity.

The richest iron deposits in the world will soon be opened in Labrador to take the place of the nearly exhausted Mesabi Range. New England is the industrial area nearest Labrador; New England is nearest the market for steel products; New England offers every facility for the satellite industries which cluster about steel mills. But New England cannot today furnish cheap power.

The Quoddy project offers that power—power to make New England ready for steel—power to bring new industry to New England—and power to keep the industries which have made New England great.

The Late Emil Diebitsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, too often in our daily haste men of merit pass from this scene unnoticed, unheralded, and unsung.

In mourning the passing of, and paying deserving tribute to Emil Diebitsch, a great citizen, the writer of an editorial which appeared in the Nutley Sun of September 23, 1949, is himself deserving of an accolade of praise. For he has not forgotten that though commentaries may not sparkle with the name of Emil Diebitsch, nonetheless without him, and such as he, on the American scene, democracy would have no meaning.

Taking a leaf out of Thomas Gray's Elegy in a Country Churchyard—

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,
Their homely joys, and destiny obscure;
Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile
The short and simple annals of the poor.

We can well say that Emil Diebitsch marked his days with useful toil. And though the citizenry of the town of Nutley may not find him among them, the deeds and accomplishments of Emil Diebitsch will long live with them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the editorial:

A GREAT CITIZEN PASSES

Nutley mourns a great mayor, a splendid citizen, an able man whose devotion to the community was expressed in such admirable accomplishments as his creation and leadership of the Nutley patriotic committee and fund during World War I. The death of Emil Diebitsch is a loss for the entire community.

Few men have left a more indelible imprint upon the history of our town, in their passage on this earth, than did Mayor Diebitsch. In his term from May 1916 to May 1920, he served during the difficult period when America engaged in her first great foreign war and hundreds of our sons were sent overseas.

His creation of the patriotic committee was a forerunner of the many community chests for which his fund was an inspiration. He created, also, the Nutley home guards which did such valiant service on the home front during the war. He pulled together the loose ends and set up the town's first engineering bureau.

For all those accomplishments, as well as for his keen interest in the community and his neighbors, Emil Diebitsch has earned the deep gratitude of the town and his death provokes, among us, only profound sorrow and universal admiration.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an essay which was awarded first prize in a contest sponsored by the Altrusa Club of New York on the subject Our American Heritage.

The winner of this contest was announced at the convention of Altrusa International at Banff, Canada, June 25, 1949.

Altrusa International is the first classified service club for business and professional women in the United States.

Miss Elizabeth C. Crable is the winner of this contest and her essay follows:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

"I am an American." Those glorious words should be spoken with the utmost pride and deepest humility by those of us fortunate enough to be able to make such a statement. Millions of people in other parts of the world, with due respect and love for their own homelands, nevertheless must feel a pang of envy for those of us born in this land of the free.

By accident of birth, we are Americans. But it was not by accident that your ancestors, and mine, arrived in this country. They came on purpose, not knowing what the future would bring in an unknown land. They came unafraid and with hearts filled with hope—hope that on a new continent might be born the ideal world—a community in which all persons would be equal, as they are equal in the eyes of God; a community in which all persons would have an equal right to own property and provide for their families the necessities and comforts of life, to the extent of their individual needs and desires, and limited only by their individual abilities and willingness to work; a community in which all persons might be free to worship God in their own manner and according to their own conscience, and where religious leadership would come from the souls of men, rather than from the dictates of the state; a community in which all persons would be free to speak their own minds without fear of reprisal; and where all persons would be free from the fear of physical danger from wars not of their making.

But your ancestors and mine were realistic people, as well as idealistic. They knew that to achieve such an ideal world would take work and struggle against all the natural and man-made forces which would be arrayed against them. They knew it could not be achieved overnight. Their sights were set far ahead to a future which only their children or grandchildren might see. They faced the present as well as the future unafraid and dauntless, knowing the future would be what they themselves would create.

Thus, the foundation upon which our Nation and its Government is laid is firm and solid. But just as the most earthquake-proof building may fall apart in places where there is not sufficient strength, so may a government be unable to withstand devastating forces from within or without. The forces which are arrayed today against this Nation are powerful and as dangerous as a tidal wave or demolishing earthquake. The building which is our Government is only as strong as we, the people, make it.

Upon this strong and impenetrable foundation, constructed by our forefathers, has been erected a building, the bricks and mortar laid by the executive branch of our Government, from plans carefully laid out by the legislative and supervised by the judiciary, to make sure that no weak places endanger the security of those who dwell within the structure. But the building now standing, tall and impressive to the outside world, upon closer inspection, reveals some termite-ridden beams not apparent to those giving only a passing glance, but which, if given an impetus from an outside force, may break and cause the structure to weaken and fall apart in places. A weakened spot draws an unnecessary strain upon the rest of the building, threatening its whole security. This building, too, has attached to its outer walls ornamental cornices which cling precariously to the sides of the building, and which threaten, in a good earthquake, to crumble and rain down upon the passerby with death-dealing force.

Our Government, like this imaginative structure, must be made even more safe and secure. The work and struggle of our ancestors is not over, but must be continued with resolute determination. The building,

which is our Government, must be rid of its termite-infested beams and boards which threaten to topple over the entire building. The ornate cornices, like the groups and organizations with impressive names which append themselves to our Government for support but which in reality seek to tear down that which is supporting them, must be removed for the greater safety of those who occupy the building and who pass beside it.

Only when the building stands straight and unwavering, without the dangerous termites and weighty cornices, will it be safe from attack from the world-shaking forces which might otherwise destroy it.

Are we strong enough to meet this challenge?

Only by the concerted action of all is our Government, like the building, going to be maintained strong and immune from attack. Never have the words "United we stand, divided we fall" had a deeper meaning than they have today. Only by eternal vigilance, coupled with the determined will to protect, strengthen, and make permanent our American way of life, in which all will be secure in their person, in their property and in their religion, will we be able to preserve our form of government which in the words of Abraham Lincoln is "The last best hope on earth."

This is the challenge which we as Altrusans must meet, and are meeting, to preserve that which is our most valuable asset, that which no money can buy but which is more valuable than all the money in the world, our American heritage.

Dedication of Clarence Hancock Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dedication ceremonies at Clarence Hancock Airport, Syracuse, September 17, 1947:

Upon this occasion I believe it is appropriate to sketch, briefly, the events which have preceded it and which account for our gathering here today.

In the summer of 1944 it had become apparent that we were making marked progress toward ultimate victory in the Great War. Our progress across the Pacific was impressive; our constant and successful pressure against the enemy in Italy, preceded as it was by the successful campaigns in north Africa was known to everyone. And of supreme importance were the successful landings upon the Normandy beaches. In fact we and the British were on the way toward the Rhine and the heart of Germany. There was still much bitter fighting ahead in Europe and the Pacific. But certainly the prospect was favorable. During the progress of the war the Federal Government of necessity acquired an enormous amount of property. It had done this in order to train and equip our armed forces with every necessary weapon. The production schedule was going full blast in 1944. Indeed, it was increasing from day to day until, finally, by the spring of 1945 our production of trained men with their weapons and equipment had become so great as to crown our efforts with a smashing victory against both Germany and Japan. As I have already indicated a degree of optimism prevailed throughout the country in the summer of 1944 with the result that the question arose in the Congress as to how the enormous amount of property which would be found in the hands of the Government at the conclusion of hostilities could be handled. It was in that summer that legislation was introduced into the Congress looking toward the setting up of a Federal agency which at the conclusion of hostilities should take jurisdiction of all property declared to be surplus and no longer needed by the war-making agencies when their big job was over. Early in the consideration of this legislation, the late Congressman Hancock, then representing this congressional district in the House of Representatives, displayed his acumen and foresight. He knew, as did many others, that included in property which would be declared surplus, eventually, there were many military airfields which would have to be disposed of one way or the other and that one of them, in all probability, was the military airfield near Syracuse. In cooperation with the then mayor of Syracuse and with the heads of important local public organizations, Mr. Hancock, in July of 1944, proceeded to explore in Washington the possibility of having the airfield near Syracuse turned over, eventually, to the city to be used for commercial aviation. His correspondence with the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Lovett, shows clearly his true conception of what might best be done with this property when the war was over. It was impossible at that time for the military command in Washington to give any definite assurance as to just when the airfield near Syracuse could be made available for civilian use; the war was still going on and this airfield was being used to the limit for military purposes. Moreover, no official of the executive branch of the Government could give any assurance, actual or implied, as to what would happen to a property like this until the Congress could legislate on the subject, generally.

The so-called surplus property bill was pending before the House of Representatives at that time and Congressman Hancock noted that in its first draft it provided with respect to military airfields that the Surplus Property Administration could, if it was deemed wise, turn over surplus airfields to other Government agencies who might use them for appropriate governmental purposes. Obviously, the term "governmental agencies" might well be construed to apply solely to agencies of the Federal Government. Congressman Hancock sensed at once that under the language of the pending bill it might be impossible for the city of Syracuse, a non-Federal Government agency, to acquire the use of this airport for commercial purposes. It was he who, in a debate upon the floor of the House, first called attention to this situation and it is interesting to note that following his suggestions the legislation was later amended so as to authorize the Surplus Property Administration to offer an airport for sale or lease to a State or municipality in which it is situated and to all municipalities in the vicinity. It was this amendment inserted in the legislation and finally approved which made it possible for the city of Syracuse to obtain the use of this airport in accordance with an agreement with the Surplus Property Administration. In brief we are here today as a result of that action, and while Congressman Hancock, were he alive, would be the last to claim sole credit for this result, it cannot be denied that he was influential in bringing it about. And let me add at this point that Mayor Costello, commissioner of parks, Mr. Barry, and others associated with them, officially, are to be congratulated on the good work they have done in connection with the taking over the airport and making it available for commercial traffic.

Upon an occasion like this and before a gathering of this sort I cannot refrain from saying something about Clarence Hancock—his character and his achievements. I realize of course that in saying these words before a gathering composed very largely of Syracuse people, I may be bringing coals to Newcastle. Nevertheless, I shall do so because it may be that a goodly number of his neighbors do not as yet fully comprehend the services which he performed in Washington. To begin with, his antecedents were of the very best—good American stock. He was born here in Syracuse on February 13, 1885. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1906. Intent upon the practice of law he attended and graduated from the New York Law School in 1908 and shortly thereafter was admitted to the bar. He practiced his profession industriously and efficiently, making an excellent name for himself in this great community. So much so, that he served as corporation counsel in 1926 and 1927. This very briefly is the story of his record as a lawyer in his home town, but his service did not stop by any means in his law office or in the courtroom. Clarence Hancock liked intimate association with men of his age; he liked to participate in a well-organized effort; moreover, he had a deep sense of responsibility to his country. These elements in his character account in large measure for the fact that he enlisted as a private in troop D the local National Guard Cavalry unit and served continuously with that outfit and its succeeding units for many years. He served in the troop on the Mexican Border for many months during 1916. World War I followed very shortly upon that Mexican Border service and Clarence Hancock trained with his men in this country during all the summer and autumn of 1917 and finally went with them to France as a lieutenant in the One Hundred and Fourth Machine Gun Battalion of the Twenty-seventh Division New York National Guard. There in many engagements, including the historic smashing of the Hindenberg line by the Twenty-seventh Division and the Thirtieth Division, he proved himself to be a fine soldier and a splendid leader of men.

Returning to his home in 1919 with the rank of captain, after an absence of 3 years or more he was released from military duty and resumed his law practice. And this should be remembered about him in connection with his military service—not only was he a fine and gallant soldier but as the result of his long military service at home and abroad, in peace and in war, he gained a clear and sound conception of the problem of our national defense which proved exceedingly useful when later, as a Member of the House of Representatives he and his colleagues, faced with the possibility of another war, were called upon to legislate soundly in the interest of our defense. Time and again I heard him discussing those vital problems in the late 1930's and the early 1940's, prior to the attack upon Pearl Harbor, and actually, it was startling to note his vision, the clarity of his statements, and the influence he exercised. It came not only from his native intelligence, but from the keen observations he made during his active service as a soldier. This same talent was conspicuous in all his activities as a Member of the House of Representatives where, as you know, he served from 1927 until 1947 at which time he did not seek reelection due to a persistent illness. Congressman Hancock did not speak frequently upon the floor of the House. Some of us used to urge him to speak more frequently, knowing that his words carried great weight. However, he followed a policy to the effect that he would speak only upon those measures in the preparation of which he had taken an active part and about which he knew everything there was to be known. We all came to realize that underlying this policy was his modesty. He never pushed himself forward in pursuit of applause in the House or headlines in the newspapers. He shrank from such tactics. Quietly he worked day after day, mastering the subjects which he was called upon to

consider, with the result that when he spoke, the whole House listened. You could hear a pin drop.

It should be understood that at least three-fourths of the constructive work done in the House of Representatives is done in the committee room, where hearings are held, witnesses heard, and where, finally, the members of the committee sit around the table, as it were, in executive session and decide what should be done with a certain proposed piece of legislation. It is in that committee room that bills are drafted in their final form, and from that room are sent to the House, accompanied by a report describing the bill in detail and presenting arguments favoring its passage. A refusal, outright, on the part of the House to confirm the judgment of a standing committee is comparatively rare. In other words, the conscientious member does most of his work in that committee room, not on the floor of the House itself. A perfect demonstration of this is found in the work which Congressman Hancock did for many years as a member of the exceedingly important Committee on the Judiciary. Invariably, that committee is made up of Members who are lawyers. This is as it should be, for the committee is called upon to consider legislation relating to the civil and criminal codes, the powers and duties of the judicial branch of the Government and a multitude of other questions involving, predominantly, constitutional and other legal problems. It was as a member of that committee that Congressman Hancock did his really great work. He was well grounded in the law in its very fundamentals. He knew how our laws had evolved from simple beginnings, how their development has been guided by certain sound principals set forth and interpreted in judicial decisions. Brushing aside extraneous matters, ignoring cobwebs, his keen mind would pierce down to the very essence of the problem and bring it to light. In doing this he not only displayed his ability as a lawyer, but upon many occasions he showed a degree of courage greatly to his credit. Not always did his exposure of the fundamental principles involved meet the approval of those who had a special objective in view, but once he brought the truth to light, popular or unpopular, he never hesitated to stand by it. It is not surprising, therefore, that he wielded a great and continuous influence in that committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary. Never in my experience, lasting over many years, have I known a legislator who commanded more respect than did Clarence Hanock. And I should not confine my observations concerning him merely to his service in committee and on the floor, all important as it was; rather, I feel justified in reminding you that Clarence Hancock possessed a delightful sense of humor, displayed time and again, not only in the committee room but in those informal gatherings of Members which occur almost daily in the cloak rooms and in which all sorts of subjects, serious or less serious, are discussed in running conversations. It was always a delight to witness Clarence Hancock's participation in those running conversations. He always threw some light on the subject and often in a good humored and witty manner. Actually (and you may find it difficult to believe this), his performance in those cloak-room talks had a decided influence in connection with measures then pending on the floor of the House and with respect to which some Members were puzzled. I do not mean to be unkind to the members of the press who report the proceedings of the House, but I think it fair to say that seldom did they understand or appreciate the influence which Clarence Hancock wielded. Come to think of it, his modesty accounts very largely for the fact that his achievements were not heralded far and wide. Incidentally, I may add that had he been able to continue his service in the House of Representatives he would have been chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Eightieth Congress. His withdrawal caused universal regret in the House. Very, very often did I hear Members say when his withdrawal was announced, "I wish we had more men like Clarence Hancock in public life."

As you all know, Congressman Hancock suffered long and seriously during that illness which finally proved fatal. His courage, however, never failed him. Despite his suffering, which at times was distressing, he remained cool, brave, and cheerful to the very end. A clear conscience must have been a great consolation to him, and the realization that he enjoyed not only the undying love and affection of his family but the respect of those with whom and for whom he served must have contributed beyond measure to that peace of mind in which he passed away.

Truly, the constituted authorities of this beautiful city have done a just and appropriate thing in naming this airport after Clarence Hancock and dedicating it to his memory.

Establishment of a Steel Industry in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., September 25, 1949:

STEEL PLANTS VITAL TO AREA—ALL ESSENTIALS FOR PROFITABLE INDUSTRY IN NEW ENGLAND—OLD PROPOSAL OF POST WRITER REVIVED

(By Lester Allen)

Exactly 21 months ago in one of the cubbyholes inhabited by bright young lawyers in the Justice Department in Washington, a young man named Harold H. Wein, who a few months before had flabbergasted Benjamin Fairless of United States Steel with his knowledge of the inner workings of the steel industry, said casually, "Yes, it is perfectly possible, logical, and profitable to build a steel industry in New England."

For 3 days in the Boston Post, January 28 to January 30, 1948, I explained at length how a New England steel industry could be built, what it would cost, what it should produce, and why it would be profitable. I took some pains to bring the information to the attention of the New England Council. I suggested that Mr. Wein should be consulted about his somewhat startling findings and dropped the information that the steel titans had been trying to woo Mr. Wein away from his Justice Department job because of his knowledge of the industry displayed at the hearings on the sale of Geneva Steel. It all came to nothing.

IDEA SPIKED

Soothing sounds were made. I was assured that the Econometric Institute which had been hired to make a survey for the New England Council, was far more capable than some unknown in the Justice Department, and that the New England Council would await the report of Econometric Institute.

I pointed out then that Econometric Institute had been seeking the figures that Mr. Wein had in his files and that the Justice Department had refused to give them out for reasons best known to the Justice Department. When the report was finally received, the Econometric Institute threw cold water all over the idea of establishing a New England steel industry, which was exactly what had been expected. Why?

DRUM BEATING NOW

Now, 21 months later there is loud drum beating and hoopla about establishment of a New England steel industry. Mr. John Kelly, a mining engineer retained by the iron and steel supply committee of New England Council, declares New England offers the best location for a steel plant in the United States among regions not already served by such plants.

Frederick S. Blackall, Jr., chairman of the iron and steel supply committee, asserts flatly, "Not only is it possible to produce steel competitively in New England but it is possible to do even better than that." He goes on to explain that the committee has been in touch with substantial interests.

Yes, sir, that's what I said 21 months ago.

The purpose is not to prove how smart newspapers and newspapermen are, but to show that in 21 months nothing new has been discovered about the feasibility of a steel plant here, and that nothing has been done to have it located where it should be—in the Greater Boston area.

Let's take a look at the arguments presented by Mr. Wein, who took part in the studies by the Cole Commission of the University of Chicago in addition to becoming the Justice Department steel expert. He said 21 months ago that a New England steel industry would cost between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 depending upon whether it produced high grade tool and specialty steels in electric furnaces or went in for structural steel plates and strip.

SUPPLY OF ORE HANDY

He pointed out that coal and iron ore were closer together for New England than for other steel-producing centers of the country, and the scrap of which there is always an immense New England surplus, was closer to New England in quantity than it was to any other steel-producing center.

The ore bodies he used for demonstration purposes are at Conception Bay, Newfoundland, where there is a developed reserve of 1,250,000,000 tons of 40-percent ore. A second reserve, he pointed out, is in Labrador, 360 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and hooked up by railroad with a port that is ice-free 10 months of the year. There are 350,000,000 tons of iron ore there richer in iron content than the Mesabi Range.

A third possible source of ore for a New England steel industry, Mr. Wein said, is at Minaes Geraes in Brazil, 400 miles from the ocean. It is a 5,000,000,000-ton lode of iron ore with a content as high as 70 percent iron, the richest deposit in the world. A rail line must be built to work it—but it's there and it's an easy water haul to Boston, which is much nearer to Brazil than Sparrows Point, Md. The Sparrows Point plant of Bethlehem Steel hauls its ore from Peru.

This is all Mr. Wein's information, not my own. New England Council gives a round figure of 2,000,000 tons of steel used annually by New England industry. Not to quibble, but the right figure is 1,994,272 tons. The present potential market for steel in New England is 2,500,000 tons annually, without considering export of steel.

MORE ECONOMICAL

Mr. Wein pointed out then that New England's use of steel leans very heavily to the fine processed steels, tool steels and specialty steels which command a higher price and require more advanced technology than the run-of-the-mill steel of mass producers.

Even if New England used coal, coke, scrap and ore to produce its steel, the haul for the ingredients is still shorter and more economical than any other steel-producing center can show, including Pittsburgh, which has a long rail and water haul of its iron ore from Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

Virtually everything that has been dredged up by the New England Council and the Federal Reserve Bank about the possibilities of a steel industry in New England since January 1948, was in the form of a complete study in the files of the Justice Department or the Commerce Department.

Why this information was not used by New England boosters is a mystery. They knew it was there. Perhaps there was a suspicion that it might make the bureaucrats or the Truman administration look good if it were used.

Mr. Wein pointed out that a steel plant would attract other metal-working plants and would provide steady jobs for about 1,000,000 people. It would break the ruinous freight rates that New England steel users must pay, ranging from $7 to $14 a ton more than other parts of the Nation.

The argument presented by Mr. Wein was that a steamship company hauling coal from the tidewater docks of West Virginia fields operated into Boston with enough shipping tonnage to service a steel mill with all the fuel it required at a competitive price, that water transport of ore from proven fields would be much cheaper and more consistent than transit of ore through the Great Lakes, which are ice-locked from December to late April, and that a backlog of labor experienced in heavy industries was available.

The big ace in the hole, he pointed out, was New England's possession of adequate supplies of high-grade scrap for the steel mill, scrap accumulated by metal-working industries which employ 36 percent of all the workers in New England. At present this scrap is shipped to steel mills outside of New England. It is available here at low freight costs and on short hauls.

Just what brought about this change of heart in 21 months? When the series about the feasibility of steel industry was written it was received with blank silence. About the only people who were interested were the officials of the coal transportation company and they were interested for the obvious reason that such an industry would give them the best customer they could hope to have.

What accomplished the about-face is the plain fact that the high-grade ore of the Mesabi Range is running out. There is plenty of magnetite and hematite iron ore left there, but the extraction process is ruinously expensive. If a steel mill is built in New England it will be one or more units of big steel, who build it not because they love New England, but because they have only Hobson's choice.

PLENTY OF WATER NEAR

Much has been made of the fact that for ever. ton of steel produced 17,000 gallons of fresh water are required, or, for a mill producing 1,000,000 tons of steel a year about 1,700,000,000 gallons a year. Mr. Wein debunked that, too. Sparrows Point, Md., uses water that is little better than sewage. The only requisite is fresh water as distinguished from salt water. It wouldn't be the metropolitan water supply that provided the water, but the Charles or Mystic Rivers.

The fact is that if hydroelectric power were developed to supply the steel mill in New England, the New England steel industry could use electric furnaces which are the very latest thing and produce a more uniform grade of steel.

All this information has been available for months and even years to anyone who could ask questions, regardless of whether they knew a steel bodkin from a wooden knitting needle. It was accumulated in the course of Government studies of the basing-point system of fixing freight rates on steel and in the course of presenting the Government's case in the sale of the Geneva plant in Utah.

It isn't the kind of information you pick up sitting around banquet tables toying with a piece of chicken smothered in white sauce, but it was dug out by ill-paid bureaucrats who, by and large do a much better job than all the high-priced economists peddling mumbo-jumbo to gullible businessmen.

The interests which have announced a plan to spend $100,000,000 for a railroad to tap the Labrador deposits are not doing it to supply a New England steel industry with ore. They are doing it to assure their Great Lakes steel plants of an adequate supply of ore now that Mesabi Range is scraped down to its bottom. It would be far wiser to go after the Brazilian ore—the richest in the world—or Venezuelan ore, which is already developed and available.

The ace in the hole, it must be remembered, is New England's supply of scrap. Without scrap a steel industry cannot operate, not and produce a high grade of steel. What New England needs is a quality steel plant.

The automobile industry, for example, will take its auto-body steel from strip mills located conveniently near the automobile plants. But, to a large extent, the automobile industry gets its machine tools from New England and its immediate neighbors.

Thus, New England needs a high-grade steel. industry, but, before anything else, a few men of vision who will accept ideas of authentic information.

The Six Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Holy Name Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith a résumé of the history of the Holy Name Society, which is celebrating its six hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary:

THE HOLY NAME SOCIETY

This society of Catholic men has for its primary object the promotion of love and reverence for the holy name of God and Jesus Christ. A correlated aim is to suppress blasphemy, perjury, profanity, and all indecent language.

The Holy Name Society traces its origin to the Council of Lyons in the year 1274, although individual efforts to further its principles had not been lacking before that time. For example, St. Peter, martyr (d. 1252) is said to have propagated devotion to the name of Jesus. The Council of Lyons, May 7 to July 17, 1274, was attended by 500 bishops and more than twice as many prelates or procurators. The Emporer Michael Palaeologus and the Greek clergy, the khan of Tatary, and the Kings of France and England had ambassadors at the council. James I, King of Aragon, attended in person. This great council took action against blasphemy and blasphemers by prescribing devotion to the holy name of Jesus.

Pope Gregory X, who presided at the Council of Lyons, wrote on September 20, 1274, to John of Vercelli, the master general of the Dominican Order, suggesting the promotion of special regard and reverence for the holy name of Jesus. The master general, in turn, wrote an encyclical letter to all the superiors of his order conveying Pope Gregory's desire and enjoining appropriate action. The friars preachers undertook this devotion with their customary zeal. To stabilize the effort, altars of the Holy Name were erected in Dominican churches, and societies of the Holy Name were established. Ambrose of Siena (d. 1286) earnestly aided the movement.

In those earlier days the society was not so thoroughly organized as it came to be later; but even during the obscure fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there were those who were outstanding in zeal for Christ and His holy name. Among them were Henry Suso, the mystic, who tattooed the name of Jesus on his breast; the Franciscan, St. Bernardine of Siena; Vincent Ferrer; and the Bishop of Lisbon, Andrew Diaz, who, in 1432, directed the city of Lisbon to the Holy Name devotion in order to obtain relief from the plague which was ravaging the city. The deliverance seemed so marvelous that the people gave thanks by joining in what was probably the first mammoth rally procession in honor of the Holy Name.

The Spanish Dominican Didacus of Victoria (d. 1450) was both preacher and organizer; he founded a Society of the Holy Name of God and wrote a constitution for it. About a century later Pope Pius IV recognized this society as a confraternity and favored it with unusual privileges and indulgences. Later Popes continued to aid the society, branches of which were variously called Confraternity of the Holy Name of God and of Jesus, Confraternity Against Oaths, and Confraternity of the Holy Name of Jesus, with the last title tending to supplant the others.

Pope Innocent XI did much to promote the movement, and in 1571 Pope Pius V gave the master general of the Dominican Friars a monopoly on the granting of charters for Holy Name Societies. The Dominican Order, however, has never had a monopoly on devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus. From the days of St. Bernardine of Siena and St. John Capistran many Franciscans have promoted reverance for the Holy Name. This was particularly true of St. Leonard of Port Maurice (1676–1751). And in recent times in America members of the Society of Jesus have held high positions of spiritual leadership in the Holy Name Society.

The Spanish sovereigns Charles V and Philip II, as rulers of wide empire in two hemispheres, bestowed royal favor on the Holy Name Society, and by the end of the sixteenth century there were such societies in every European country. In 1580 Pope Gregory XIII granted special indulgence to the Confraternity at Cusco, Peru. The common use of the color blue in Holy Name banners and representations of the babe Christ displayed by the society seem to date from these early days.

The society also entered Fukien Province, China, but the Dominican Friars, led by Francis J. Capillas were beheaded in an uprising against Christians.

A few holy name societies were established in the Spanish and French American Colonies—in San Francisco and New Orleans, for instance—and it seems that there was one started by Father Nerinx in Kentucky early in the nineteenth century. But the real development in America was later and owes much to three prominent leaders: Rev. Stephen Byrne, Rev. P. A. Dinahan, and Very Rev. Charles H. McKenna, who for his outstanding service has been called the apostle of the holy name.

In 1868 Rev. Stephen Byrne established a holy name society at the Church of St. Vincent Ferrer in New York City. Three years later, in 1871, this society obtained a charter granting it formal recognition—the first such charter obtained in New York City.

By 1882 the five regularly authorized holy name societies in New York City were joined in the first diocesan union. This new organizational plan was the special contribution of Rev. P. A. Dinahan. Branches soon sprung up and before long there was a diocesan union in Brooklyn and another in Newark, N. J. This plan of organization is now common throughout the country.

In the early centuries of the society scores of holy name manuals appeared in French, Italian, and Spanish, but the first manual in English was written by Father McKenna in 1871—the same year that the first chartered society was launched in New York. New societies started up so rapidly—often without awaiting the formal charter or diploma—that problems of proper organization were increased. Father McKenna did much to correct these defects, even securing special privileges from Rome for that purpose. The free growth of the society in America was hampered by a very old constitution, the papal bull of Clement VIII, limiting the number of societies to one in a city. In 1895 Father McKenna went to Rome in an effort to modify this rule and he succeeded in freeing the society in America from undesirable restrictions. Pope Leo XIII accomplished this by special rescript from the sacred congregation of indulgences May 20, 1896. Now every church or public chapel may have its own holy name society. In the year 1900 Father McKenna was appointed to give his full time to propagating the Holy Name Society.

The Catholic bishops of America encouraged the establishment of societies in their dioceses, but Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, was the first who made the formation of a society obligatory upon the pastor of every parish. A little later the late Cardinal Farley urged his clergy to establish the Holy Name Society in every parish of the archdiocese of New York.

Such growth had been made by 1907 that an unofficial publication seemed advisable. In that year the Holy Name Journal began publication, with the Reverend E. C. Fitzgerald, O. P., S. T. L., as editor.

By 1909 a national headquarters was needed, and was established in New York City as the bureau of the holy name society. The Right Reverend John T. McNicholas, D. D., was its founder and first national director. Charters for new societies are issued through the national headquarters.

The first national congress of the Holy Name Society was held at Baltimore in 1911 in connection with the golden jubilee in the episcopacy of the late Cardinal Gibbons.

Pope Benedict XV, recognizing the progress, growth, and value of the society, in 1917 appointed His Eminence Thomas Pius Cardinal Boggiani, O. P., as cardinal protector over the whole Holy Name Society.

At about that same time there began a great development in the organization of Junior Holy Name Societies, first started in 1875, enrolling boys who are in school from the seventh grade through high school, or in some localities up to 18 years of age, whether in school or not. Furthermore, the Big Brother movement has been well fostered by the Holy Name Societies in many cities.

The typical demonstration, now common in American cities, is the gigantic Holy Name rally parade. One of the most spectacular of these great rally parades was held in Washington, D. C., in September 1924.

The present national headquarters address is 141 East Sixty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. The national director is the Very Reverend Harry C. Graham, O. P. The membership of the society is 3,500,000, making it the largest religious society of men in the world.

Candidate Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Peoria Journal entitled "Candidate Dirksen":

CANDIDATE DIRKSEN

It has been known for some time that Everett Dirksen, the former Congressman from this district, was going to be a candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator in the 1950 election.

His entry into the race was not official, however, until he made announcement of it at a rally held Sunday at Exposition Gardens which was attended by several thousand residents of this area.

It is not yet known what opposition Mr. Dirksen will have for the nomination but he will be the outstanding candidate, and the Republican party can make no better choice than to decide upon him for its standard bearer.

During his 16 years of service in the House of Representatives, Mr. Dirksen rose head and shoulders above the membership of that body. He gained national recognition as a leader of his party and as an efficient servant of the people.

His retirement from the House, for reasons of health now overcome, was greeted with expressions of regret from leaders of both parties in the Congress. His removal from the national scene has indeed been a loss to the Nation and the prospects of his return to Washington in an even higher capacity than the one he formerly held have been greeted enthusiastically by many of his former associates.

The Dirksen candidacy gives the Republicans of Illinois an opportunity to present the voters of the state an outstanding candidate in the elections next fall, a man who will reflect great honor upon the party and the State which he represents.

We are pleased that Mr. Dirksen is to be a candidate for the high office of United States senator. He is the kind of man who is vitally needed at Washington in these days when the future of the Nation and the world is at stake. The Journal wishes him success in the conduct of his campaign.

Inequities in Pay Scale and Leave of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is charged with legislation affecting the Post Office employees and those of the classified civil service, have given considerable thought as well as devoted a great deal of time for public hearings on the pending bill, and while it may not be perfect in every respect, in my opinion, it will go far to correct the inequities in the pay scale and leave of the postal employees as compared with those in the classified civil service.

I would like to mention some of the provisions in the bill which I think are meritorious and long overdue. First, with respect to annual and sick leave. For several years, Federal employees have enjoyed 26 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave, while the postal employees have received only 15 days annual leave and 10 days sick leave. Secondly, the Seventy-ninth Congress increased the basic salary rates for all grades under the Classification Act of 1923, however, the postal employees were not given an increase in their entrance salary. Only the regular employees then on the rolls benefited by the $400 increase granted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, thus the fact remains that postal employees who enter the service at this time, enter at a salary of $400 a year under that compared to certain other employees or when compared with employees in other departments and agencies coming within the purview of the Classification Act.

In a great many of the Federal agencies, uniforms are provided for certain employees whose duties require them to be worn. In the Post Office Department, letter carriers, special delivery messengers, guards, elevator operators, and watchmen are required to furnish their own uniforms. It is merely simple justice to these employees for the Federal Government to afford them equal treatment. Many of the postal employees, such as postmasters, supervisors, and employees coming within certain classifications, do not receive any meritorious grades. The pending measure extends the principle of longevity to such groups and as they remain in the service the longevity advantage received will place them on practically the same footing as those employees who enjoy the in-grade raises. Though the bill may need additional provisions in some ways, I believe that it should be passed and become law.

End of the Atomic Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Walter Lippmann appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning. Mr. Lippmann's remarks are

always stimulating, often enlightening, and never more so than today.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

END OF THE ATOMIC MONOPOLY

The President's decision to break the news of the Soviet success in atomic weapons has done much to calm men's nerves and to clear their minds. Had he waited to let the Soviet Government announce the news, or to let it leak out, there might well have been a panicky agitation. Many would have refused to believe it now, as they refused to believe M. Molotov when he predicted it 2 years ago. They would have argued excitedly with those who did believe it but were frightened because our own intelligence services had not detected the big news.

Short of a public demonstration by the Russians themselves, like our own at Bikini, the fact that our atomic monopoly has ended could not have been established more conclusively. Certainly about the facts even when they are disagreeable makes for clearer thinking.

It is not so easy, however, to follow the President's declaration, which Secretary Acheson emphasized in his own comment, that "this event mak[e] no change in our own policy." It would have been truer and wiser to say that there will be no change in our policy until we have had time to think out how this event compels us to change our policy. For it cannot be true that an event which changes the balance of strategic military power in the world leaves unchanged the policies which were related to the old balance of power. While it was known and predicted that some day, say in 1952, the American monopoly would be broken, the fact is that it is now broken in 1949. That must have consequences which policies, based on the 1952 timetable, did not anticipate. Moreover, even if the 1952 timetable had proved to be correct, our policies in 1952 would certainly have had to be readjusted in 1952. They now have to be readjusted in 1949.

Even if we assume, as probably we may, that the Soviet Government has not yet a stock pile of bombs comparable with our own, much less the planes which could deliver them into the United States, the military position in Europe is radically altered. The countries which are nearest to the Soviet Union, including Germany, were already vulnerable to the Red Army. They must now take into account the atomic bomb as well. The strategical idea that defenses on the ground could gradually be built up behind the shield of the American atomic monopoly will have to be modified even if the Russians can acquire only a very few atomic bombs during the period of European rearmament.

An important consequence of the event may well be to harden the military stalemate. For when both possess atomic weapons, these weapons are no longer strategically decisive. They are now weapons of retaliation and not of decision. No one can now contemplate being the first to use the atomic bomb. If the United States used the bombs against Russia, the Russians would retaliate against Europe. If the Russians used them against Europe, the United States would retaliate against the Soviet Union. Neither could expect to win a decision and both would suffer frightful injuries—the Russians in their own country, we in the countries we have promised to guarantee and to protect.

While the American monopoly existed, the balance of power rested on the fact that the United States was itself invulnerable and yet could strike devastating blows—whereas the Russians had an army which could overrun Europe but could not surely protect the Soviet Union against atomic devastation. The United States is still essentially invulnerable. It can still strike devastating blows. The Russian Army is still a mighty force. But now the Russian homeland is less vulnerable to the American blows. It is now more secure because the Russians have acquired the power to take reprisals in Europe.

This alteration in the balance of power will change the attitude of the nations, including that of the Soviet Union and of the United States. There is no reason to think that the Soviet government is more likely now than it was before to precipitate a world war. But there is every reason to think that the disposition of the western world to negotiate, in order to settle the more dangerous conflicts, will become greater. For the nations which have become more vulnerable, foremost among them Germany, because it is at the center of the conflict, are almost certain to insist on, and to adopt on their own initiative, an attitude which is less reconcilable.

We may well find ourselves regretting that during the short time when our diplomatic bargaining power was stronger than it is likely to be now, we did not use it to strike bargains which, though unsatisfactory, might well have been better than can now be traded for in the diplomatic market. In any event the phantom policy, under which the Soviet regime was suppose to break-down by containment all around the periphery, is now blown away—first by its total collapse in the Far East, and then by the Soviet achievement of the bomb. There is no alternative to the negotiation of a modus vivendi based on the balance of power and of reciprocal advantages.

The news has been followed by many statements which seem to say that we must proceed with the American plan which is more or less the United Nations plan for the control of atomic weapons. That idea needs to be reexamined. For the American plan, the original Acheson-Lilienthal proposals, with or without the Baruch addition to them, had as their major premise an American monopoly of the bomb and of the technological knowledge and measures to make the bomb. It was a plan for the regulated sharing of the monopoly. All the conditions we asked for assumed that the Russians must pay a price—in the form of inspection and control—to get their share of our monopoly.

Now that the Russians have broken the monopoly, the basic premise of the American policy has disappeared. A totally different policy, based on the radically new condition, will have to be formulated. It would be a good idea to find new men, who do not have too much to unlearn, whose personal prestige is not involved in proving how right they have always been, to make a fresh study of the whole problem.

Democratic Theme for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democratic Theme for 1950" which appeared in the Peoria Star, September 20, 1949:

DEMOCRATIC THEME FOR 1950

President Truman is blaming Republicans in Congress for the failure of his legislative program. He succeeded in fastening blame on the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican, and apparently believes that he can do the same with the Eighty-first, although both Houses are now controlled by the Democratic Party.

We shall never again underestimate the ability of Harry Truman to perform what appear to be political miracles, but we cannot see how he can sell the people of the United States the idea that Republican minorities in the Senate and House have wrecked his program. He tried to blame the scuttling of OPA on Congress in 1946, when the Democrats were in control, and failed. If he can pin his current legislative failures on the minority party, he will indeed surpass all his astonishing political achievements.

It is true, of course, that Republicans have generally opposed the measures of the Truman Fair Deal, and rightly so. Some Republicans have tried the "me, too" policy and have come to disaster. It is the function of the opposition to oppose. The Republican minority in Congress is functioning properly.

But it is also the function of the majority to deal effectively with a program under recognized leadership. The failure is in the inability of the majority party to perform this function, and this inability may be traced largely to President Truman's failure in leadership.

The division within the ranks of the Democrats is such an old story that any attempt to throw a smoke screen around it is surprising. As long as the well-defined split continues to exist, the Democratic Party will not function as an effective instrument of government. No matter how President Truman may rant against the alleged obstructionism of Republicans in Congress, he cannot execute with his own party what he promises in campaign speeches.

The President's maneuvering at this time is convincing evidence that his predicament is clear enough to him. He and his advisers are working frantically to build a workable farmer-labor coalition in the North in order that they may safely scuttle the Democratic malcontents of the South.

Wouldn't the President command greater public respect by acknowledging publicly what everyone already knows, that his legislative failure is due to the split in his own party rather than to the Republicans, and that unless peace is made in the Democratic ranks, campaign promises by this party in 1950 will not be worth the breath required to utter them?

Pros and Cons of the Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Women Lawyers Journal, by Elizabeth C. Crable entitled "Pros and Cons of the Equal Rights Amendment."

The article follows:

PROS AND CONS OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Elizabeth C. Crable)

It seems to be generally agreed that women are here to stay. If it is true that the first 100 years are the hardest, then we women in the United States have survived the first critical period in our political history. For it was in July of 1848 that the first woman's rights convention was held in the United States, at Seneca Falls, N. Y. The news-

papers and those critical of the whole idea called it the Hen Convention.

SUFFRAGE A REALITY

It was not until 72 years later, however, that woman suffrage became a reality, and the goal for full equality has yet to be reached. Last year saw the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Seneca Falls convention. Women's organizations held special commemorative programs; the Post Office Department issued a special commemorative stamp.

Now we are beginning a new century and what the next 100 years will bring, not only to women but to all citizens, will depend to a great extent upon what the women of the United States will do.

EQUALITY NOT ACHIEVED

It was thought that passage of the nineteenth amendment in 1920, giving women the vote, would achieve full equality, but it was soon found this was not the case. Actually the nineteenth amendment guarantees to women nothing except the right to vote. The rights which women now have won for themselves are only due to State legislatures which have seen fit to remove some of women's common law disabilities. Some States are far ahead of others in this regard, and even the community property States, which are considered to be more favorable to women, still have many discriminatory laws.

DISCRIMINATORY LAWS

The discriminatory laws which still exist are varied, but in general fall into three classes:

1. Those which discriminate against married women.

Among these laws are those which say a married woman may not contract in her own name, may not control her own property or her own earnings; may not engage in business in her own name.

These and other laws have resulted in the expression "disabilities of a married woman." They give notice to the world that married women are not legally or financially responsible, and place women in the same status as children and insane persons, whose civil rights are limited. Obviously, this is a barrier to women in business and professions, and a handicap to their economic status.

2. Those which discriminate against women as employees.

Under this category come all the so-called protective labor laws for women. These laws fix minimum wages, maximum hours, and limit type and time of employment. Actually, most of these protective laws were enacted not so much for the protection of women as for the protection of men against the competition of women. The first protective legislation came as a result of a resolution passed in 1836 by the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics, and Other Workingmen, which read as follows: "Whereas labor is a physical and moral injury to women and a competitive menace to men, we recommend legislation to restrict women in industry." This was at the beginning of the factory system in the United States. The result of much of this legislation is to protect women out of employment.

3. Those which discriminate against women as citizens.

Some of these laws are those which bar women from jury service, from public office, either elected or appointed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

It is to remove these discriminatory laws from the books once and for all, and to give women an equal status under law as citizens and as persons, that the proposed amendment is now before Congress.

The present text of the proposed equal-rights amendment is as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex, Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification." It has been called a bill of rights for women.

A proposed equal-rights amendment has been introduced in every Congress since 1923, but has been voted on only once, and that was in the Senate in July 1946. At that time it was brought on for a vote without any advance notice, when many of those known to be favorable to the bill were absent. The vote was 38 in favor, 35 against—a majority in favor, but not the necessary two-thirds. It is interesting to note that the suffrage amendment was voted on five times in the Senate over the 41-year period that it was before that body.

The arguments for and against the equal-rights amendment sound very much like the ones that were made for and against the suffrage amendment. Here are some of the arguments now being used against the equal-rights amendment, and possible answers to those arguments:

STATES' RIGHTS

1. That the amendment would violate States' rights; that each State should be left to correct its own abuses.

The reply to this argument is that the amendment would not violate States' rights. Nothing in the amendment would require uniformity of laws. Each State would still make its own laws as it sees fit. The only restriction would be that such laws must treat men and women equally. Actually, the amendment is a bill of rights for women, guaranteeing them the full protection of the Constitution, and full citizenship, which they are not guaranteed under the Constitution as it has been interpreted by the Supreme Court. Only the equal-rights amendment can free women from the common law and guarantee them equal protection of law under the Constitution. Further, if it is left up to the individual States to make the necessary corrections, it would take a long time to correct all the abuses.

CONFUSION AND LITIGATION

2. That the amendment would cause confusion and clutter up the courts with litigation.

A reply to this is that there would be 1 year between the ratification of the amendment and its effective date, in which State legislatures would review their laws and bring them into harmony with the amendment. Probably the best reply to this argument is that Missouri, North Carolina, and New Jersey, the three States which now have an equal rights provision in their law, are not in confusion nor are their courts crowded with litigation as a result of the law.

PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION

3. That the amendment might deprive States of the power to legislate for the protection of the health, safety, morals and welfare of the community.

The reply to this is that the amendment would not prevent States from enacting protective laws which benefit all citizens, but no law could set up sex alone as a classification. In 1941, in the Darby Lumber Co. case, the Supreme Court ruled that protective legislation is constitutional for men as well as women.

WIVES' RIGHTS

4. That the amendment might affect a wife's right to support and alimony.

The answer to this is that some States already make no distinction as to right of alimony, and make a wife equally responsible with her husband for the support of the family, on the assumption that there is a mutual responsibility. In these States, a wife may be required to pay alimony, where she is financially able to do so, and the husband by reason of illness or other incapacity is incapable of self-support. The women of these States have found no reason to complain of these laws.

WIDOWS' RIGHTS

5. That the amendment might affect the right to a widow's allowance during probate of her husband's estate.

Here again some States already permit such an allowance to either spouse. In California several years ago the laws giving "widow's" benefits were changed in that the word "widow" was stricken out and the word "spouse" substituted, so that such laws now apply to either spouse.

AGE LAWS

6. That the amendment would change the age of majority and the age of consent to marriage.

Under the amendment, each State would determine the age of majority and age when a person may marry without a parent's consent, but the age would have to be the same for both sexes. In many States the age of majority now is 21 for both male and female. A change would have to be made in most marriage laws, however, since it is usual that a female may marry at an earlier age than a male.

MATERNITY LEGISLATION

7. That the amendment might affect maternity legislation.

The reply to this is that such legislation would not be affected any more than would soldiers' benefits. Not all women are mothers, neither are all men soldiers. There is nothing to prevent class legislation, extending benefits to certain groups of persons.

LABOR LAWS

8. That the amendment might do away with so-called protective labor laws for women.

This is the argument that brings forth the greatest hue and cry from opponents of the equal-rights amendment. The answer to this objection is to point out that often such labor legislation keeps employers from hiring women even though they may be just as capable of performing the duties of the job. When legislators enacted such legislation, why did they not also think of the welfare of their male constituents? Don't men get tired from overwork? Should men have to gobble their lunch in less time than women? Why shouldn't men be entitled to a few minutes of rest during the day—to insure better work and fewer accidents? Are unsanitary conditions any more desirable where men are concerned than women? And isn't impure air just as dangerous for men as for women? Should the amendment become law, then such legislation would be corrected to apply to men as well as women, which should be the goal of all socially minded legislators. Public opinion would not allow the removal of laws which are genuinely good for the community, but would insist that they be retained and made to apply equally to men and women. The amendment would open the way to fairer labor legislation, based on the nature of the work, rather than on the sex of the worker.

Actually, most factories and industries are now covered either by the National Fair Labor Standards Act, which fixes minimum wages, hours, and working conditions for industries in interstate commerce and which applies equally to men and women, or by labor-union contracts which usually call for better wages, hours, and working conditions than those required by minimum State laws, and which apply to all workers, regardless of sex.

THE OPPOSITION

9. That many outstanding citizens and organizations are opposed to the amendment.

Many outstanding citizens and organizations were opposed to the woman-suffrage amendment. But they were soon reconciled after its passage. Many of those who are now opposed to the amendment sincerely

feel that women should be in a class apart and must be protected. Those who favor the amendment claim that women want no special privileges, but only want equality under the law and equal opportunity to achieve according to ability. Many women today are heads of families. They work for the same reason that men do—because they have to. A recent Government survey shows that 2,000,000 families in the United States are supported solely by women. There should be no artificial barrier of sex in earning a living. Women share the responsibility of citizenship with men, and they should be entitled to share the same civil and legal rights.

Of course, passage of the equal-rights amendment does not mean that it will automatically do away with all prejudice against women—only time and the action of women themselves will cure this. Eventual passage of the amendment is certain, but let us hope that the Eighty-first Congress, even if it cannot agree on anything else, will pass the equal-rights amendment which both parties in their 1948 platforms claimed to favor. Then, with equality under the law, women in the United States may go forward into the next century, as full partners and citizens.

The Navy in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Commodore Denig Post, No. 83, of the American Legion, there was a great public gathering at Sandusky, Ohio, on September 15, 1949, and I want to commend Admiral C. B. Momsen, United States Navy, for his excellent address covering the Navy's part of national defense, and I am including his speech herewith:

Good evening, gentlemen. It gives me a very comfortable feeling to stand before a group of fighting men, for I know that you will understand the logic and reasoning of a man who has spent his life in the service. I feel particularly fortunate to have been chosen to address members of the American Legion because you have all been there and realize fully that war is a dangerous and dirty business, something to be avoided at all costs short of loss of honor, dignity, and freedom.

Among the family of nations of the world there are two extremes of foreign policy. First is isolationism, and the second is internationalism. The division between these two is not always clear-cut since a great many nations pursue a combination of the two.

Isolationist nations nurture the live and let live idea. They may accept a standard of living somewhat below the highest levels. They trade with other countries in a limited way and maintain armed forces of sufficient strength to defend themselves against invasion. In general they do not concern themselves with the doings of nations in the far-reaching corners of the world. Except to express opinions and exert such political pressure as they can through combinations such as the United Nations, Pan American Union, Western Union, etc., these nations make every effort to remain neutral when conflicts arise between other nations.

On the other hand, the international type nations have interests of vital importance to their economic systems spread all over the surface of the globe. Commerce is a necessary part of their system. They are playing for much higher stakes in the game of economics. The returns from their efforts must of course exceed the investment if they are to succeed in such a policy. Marketing their produce in widely distributed foreign areas may result in high economic standards and high standards of living at home. Through the centuries we find the pages in history describing the exploits of internationalist nations, such as Spain, Portugal, Holland, Germany, England, and Japan.

The United States has emerged from a quasi-isolationist position which it held before the twentieth century to a full-fledged internationalist position.

Today, there is no spot in the world in which we do not have interests. Our own economy requires huge exports of such items as foodstuffs and manufactured goods. We control the world's gold supply. Every civilized country in the world looks to us for assistance. We have assumed this position of world leadership primarily because it has been thrust upon us. At present we are in no position to consider whether or not it is profitable for us to exercise this leadership—it is ours. We may have a mad bull by the tail and cannot let go, but at least for the present we must plan on holding on. Since internationalism is upon us, let us examine the responsibilities which are associated with this power, and how best to make it pay.

The blood stream of our industrial and agricultural life lies in our commerce. The merchant ship moves in any and all directions carrying millions of tons of cargo to remote ports. This cargo consists of foodstuff, refined petroleum products and finished goods which are in excess to our needs. This export of overflow products permits us to employ a maximum number of our population and in turn to hold up high standards of living. It seems strange that we who live by high standards are able to market our excess products in competition with other countries. This is made possible by our highly developed manufacturing processes and by our mechanized farming; and of course, by agreements of assistance to and protection for the smaller nations.

The merchant ships returning to this country are laden with raw materials, not obtainable in this country, with luxury items form all over the world, with spices and tropical foods and with other basic materials needed for our population and industrial plants. The importation of raw materials from abroad in many instances serves to preserve our dwindling natural resources.

With our vast interests outside of our geographical boundaries, we find it necessary always to be on guard to protect them. We are continually negotiating, making treaties, arranging loans, beating off wrongdoers. Envious eyes are watching us looking for signs of weakness. The expressions "following the flag" and "showing the flag" have important meanings. They mean displaying our strength in the form of a man-of-war. The stabilizing influence of the presence of a cruiser is understood all over the world. A policeman may patrol a beat for 10 years and never make an arrest. His mere presence nevertheless has prevented crime. It is ever necessary to continue a show of strength.

There is a vast difference between the military strength required to defend an isolationist nation and that strength required by an internationalistic nation. Being in the worldwide business today we require the military strength to carry it on. To use a well-known and pithy statement "Go first class or stay at home." This applies so aptly to our present world trade position as related to our military strength. If we reduce our military strength to excess, we had better stay at home. The day may come when a rich nation sitting on top of the international heap can trust the rest of the world, but it is not here now and we must make sure that we do not test this out at a time when our foreign investments are at the highest level in our history.

As a member of the Nation's defense team the Navy is charged with guarding the bloodstreams which energize our far-flung interests. It is further charged with exercising or showing a force highly trained and modernly equipped to act as a deterrent to any unscrupulous nation or group of nations who seek to destroy us. The Navy must be prepared, with a reasonable degree of effectiveness, to meet a sudden challenge by aggressive-minded nations.

There is one important chip in our stack as we sit in on this vast international poker game. This chip concerns the nations which are completely dominated by dictators. There is little chance that such a nation would be stampeded into a war by mass hysteria or foolish mistakes. Its leaders are cool calculators—devoid of emotion and will be very unlikely to shove in a stack of blue chips if they stand to lose.

Insofar as these unscrupulous types are concerned, we must not attempt a bluff. We must make it plain and unmistakable that the chances of overpowering us are very small. The role of the United States Navy in supporting our foreign policy is clear. To reduce our Navy to an insignificant size is to invite national disaster.

During peacetime the Navy's primary role is to develop the scientific aspects of naval warfare and to train personnel in the use of the most modern type of ships, and the latest weapons and equipment. This should be done with sufficient numbers to be able to deploy forces of such strength as to insure that any sudden attack upon our interests would be met with decisive retaliation.

Within the Military Establishment, the Navy's share of responsibility has been assigned for very definite and logical reasons. Right now we as a nation have certain overseas commitments for which we must provide military support and which we must be ready to defend in emergency. These overseas forces could not long be counted upon without secure lines of supply, and, if an emergency arises, we must be capable either or reinforcing them in adequate strength, or of evacuating them. The greatest part of any movement of men and supplies overseas must be by water. For exercising necessary control over these water highways we need naval power.

Except for our traditionally friendly neighbors to our north and to our south, we are an island nation. We are not self-sufficient in resources for either our military or domestic economy, and must therefore import large percentages of materials. We must under all conditions be able to secure free travel on the seas for our own and our allies' transport. Without this ability we could not long survive in a major conflict.

Advance bases—overseas bases—will be necessary. If we don't actually need them ourselves for offensive operations, we still cannot afford to let a possible enemy have them. Imagine bases in Greenland, Iceland, Alaska, Berumda, Lower California, and South America in the hands of an enemy bent on our destruction and you'll see what I mean.

Control of the seas requires balanced fleets. Of particular concern to us today is the possible threat of submarines. The submarine is the poor man's ideal weapon. The submarine is the cheapest type of combat ship to operate. By themselves they cannot control the seas, but they can prevent another nation from doing so. New developments in submarine characteristics impose serious problems. Anti-submarine-warfare techniques are receiving the highest priority in

research and development and training. The World War II antisubmarine techniques are still sound, but may have to be radically changed for the future. The submarine itself may become the most effective destroyer of submarines. It will always be essential to have aircraft patrol the sea lanes in order to keep enemy submarines down, for a submarine that is forced to remain submerged continuously is considerably restricted in its ability to carry out its mission.

For our offensive operations against an enemy, both in projecting naval power against him directly and in the seizure and support of overseas bases, we require fleet task forces of multiple purposes. The carrier task force is a powerhouse capable of going anywhere there is deep water—and it is not, as has sometimes been stated, extremely vulnerable to attack by an atomic bomb. In its disposition no ship is closer than 2 miles to another. An atomic bomb, even if accurately delivered, could not sink more than one ship of the force.

An amphibious task force provides for landing a force of troops at an advance base against opposition. Carriers for local air superiority and task forces consisting of heavy units to control the immediate sea areas are essential to the support of the transports, supply ships, and attack ships. Amphibious landings are highly complicated operations.

In addition to these forces, we need submarines, antisubmarine types, and convoy escorts in order to maintain our general sea supremacy, so vital to the very life of the country economically and militarily. In the event of a war we expect to have allies and these allies require supplies of many categories. Control of the seas is essential for their support. The support of allies by retaining forceful control of the seas will also serve to prevent an enemy from expanding his holdings to other continents and possibly accomplishing a flanking movement against us.

It is for these reasons and for these responsibilities that we have a navy. The size and composition of the Navy and its forces is designed specifically to meet the requirements of actual, physical control of the seas, to impose naval force of arms against an enemy, and to support, in every way possible, the offensive and defensive efforts of the Army and the Air Force.

Naval force requirements are established jointly and collectively with the requirements for Army and Air Forces by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who together formulate the strategic plans for their employment. Based upon a military estimate of the situation, these needs are translated into costs for budgetary requirements and then, if necessary, scaled down according to Joint Chiefs of Staff priorities to stay within the military budget ceiling.

Within the existing financial limitations, which rising costs of labor and materials has made severe, the Navy is proceeding with every improvement and development possible. Every new weapon and type of ship needs to be evaluated from the standpoint of its operational use in the fleet. This evaluation is done by the operational development force of the Atlantic Fleet.

The Marine Corps has under continued study the doctrines, tactics, and equipment for amphibious operations, and, together with the Army, is steadily improving our capacities in this line. Guided-missile and rocket development, under coordination and allocation of the Research and Development Board, is progressing satisfactorily, as is the improvement of launching equipment and methods. We have successfully launched V-1 pilotless aircraft from a submarine, which may point the way toward new offensive capabilities.

As is usually the case with peacetime naval forces, training requires our primary effort. With the Army and the Air Force we have scheduled joint exercises and operations, and are engaged in joint-staff and command studies at most of the service staff schools. Within the active and reserve fleets, type units conduct practically continuous training, and with other types, engage in frequent combined tactical exercises. The Naval Reserves are sufficiently ready that by the time we can get the reserve fleet ships out of moth balls and ready for sea, Naval Reserve personnel will have been given enough refresher training to take their places in the ships' crews. We are practically ready for mobilization now if it were required.

The Marine Corps is at a high state of readiness right now, and its reserves are in as good or better state of readiness for mobilization as the Naval Reserves. In fact, all fleet Marine force units are as usual on a standby readiness date measured in days.

In our preparation for possible military emergencies there are many problems of economics, policy, and organization which require decision. The Navy as a member of the armed forces team is vitally interested in each problem. We believe the country should not be brought to a state of bankruptcy to pay for excessive armaments. Yet we need strong forces in every service to maintain our security. It is necessary that we as a nation have adequate air forces. It is also necessary that our Army be sufficiently supplied with manpower, the need for naval forces I have already described. The Navy feels strongly that the Air Force must have the aircraft required to meet its responsibilities—that the Army must have its manpower.

Yet I would emphasize that national defense is a three-service job—no one organization, method, or service provides it alone. Our security and our future success in war depend on the maintenance of that balance of strength among the services which derives from the Joint Chiefs of Staff strategy and which insures that no avenue of attack or defense remains unguarded.

The Navy believes that within the framework of our existing Military Establishment all these things can be done and will be done as the people, the Congress, and the law intended. We spare ourselves no effort to be certain that all our duties and responsibilities under that law are properly discharged.

In a large measure, the organization and adaptation within the Navy of those elements essential to the successful prosecution of a naval campaign, are in themselves an expression of our will to fight any enemy and of the Navy's determination to contribute as much as possible toward national security. Into our Navy of today and tomorrow, we have integrated not the separate elements of land and air warfare, but the essential ingredients of sea power. The small ready forces of marines are parts of our operating fleets. In the same way and for very similar reasons as the Army developed and used the tank, the Navy has used and developed the aircraft as an integrated naval weapon. Its uses and operational doctrines have been coordinated within the Navy's structure of education, training, and procedures. As it takes tanks and infantry to make an army, as it takes fighters and bombers to make an air force, so it takes destroyers, submarines, and aircraft to make a navy.

The Navy is responsible to see that you have high quality in your naval forces. This I can assure you have. The people of this country through its civilian public servants are responsible for the quantity. You provide the quantity in accordance with the size of the national purse.

Let us all hope that we are providing a sufficient quantity to enable us to support our world-wide role in international affairs.

President Backs General Welfare Legislation—Says "General Welfare" Is Duty of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a speech made by the President of the United States on Democratic Women's Day, September 27.

I am glad to speak to the women of the United States on Democratic Women's Day.

As President, I know that women have an interest in the affairs of Government that goes far beyond the job-holding or partisanship. I know that women are not misled by political slogans. They have learned that the real issues in political activity are the well-being of the country and the future of their families. Women look beneath the labels to see the facts.

It is my firm conviction that the Democratic Party offers more for the welfare of the country—and therefore more for the women of the country—than any other party or political group.

The Democratic Party has a program.

It is a program of practical measures. It is not a blueprint imposed from on high by a little group of theorists. Neither is it a set of platitudes concocted by a group of corporation lawyers in a smoke-filled room. Our program is an expression of the desires of the people.

The Democratic Party does not dodge issues or seek to gloss them over. We state them boldly. We propose concrete and practical action to solve them.

Our program consists of measures which have come up from the grass roots—of ideas and proposals that have been discussed and hammered out among unions, in farm groups, in city councils, in county boards, and in State legislatures. Our program is as American as the soil we walk on.

It is a program unshakably founded on the principle that the power of government should be used to promote the general welfare. It is a program based upon the experience of the Democratic Party in using the power of government to establish actual conditions in which the people can achieve a better life for themselves and their children. It is a program of what should be done and what our experience tells us can be done.

We have just heard, from the ladies present here, the viewpoints of the farmer, the worker, and the businessman. It is interesting to see how these three points of view fit together. Each of these groups depends on the others. Farmers cannot be prosperous unless industrial workers have good wages and steady employment so they can buy the products that farmers raise. Workers cannot be prosperous unless farmers have good incomes and can buy the things that industrial workers make. Businessmen cannot be prosperous unless both farmers and workers have the money to buy the things they sell.

All groups in our Nation depend on one another. That is what the term "general welfare" means. The general welfare is the sum total of the welfare of all the groups in our country.

The Constitution was established to "promote the general welfare." Those are the words of its preamble. And that is the duty of our Government.

The Democratic Party proposes to see that the Federal Government carries out this constitutional responsibility. We will do so in spite of the outcries of certain people who say there is something alien or dangerous in the idea of a government that works for the welfare of all our citizens. Those people are just about 160 years behind the times. They want us to forget the language of the Constitution.

We have some serious problems in this country today. If we are to continue to promote the general welfare, we must devise modern methods to solve these modern problems.

One of our serious problems today is the fact that there are not enough good houses for our rapidly growing population. The Democratic Party is pledged to work for good housing. The Eighty-first Congress has just passed a public housing bill to provide assistance in building homes for low-income groups. The Eighty-first Congress and the administration are working out solutions for the home-building problems of other groups. Since the 1948 election, and in spite of determined opposition, we have made great progress in the field of housing. We are going to keep right on making progress.

We are just as interested in good schools as we are in good houses. I think all of you know that many boys and girls are not getting the right kind of schooling. There are not enough teachers and there are not enough school buildings. Our schools are getting steadily more crowded. Women who serve on school boards and women who teach know that in many parts of the country better schools cannot be obtained unless there is financial assistance from the Federal Government.

This administration has pledged Federal aid to the States to help them improve their schools. A bill providing such aid has already passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House of Representatives. I shall continue to urge Congress to pass this legislation.

We must also act promptly to improve the health of our Nation. The women of the country, particularly, know that in many areas there are not enough doctors or hospitals and that many families cannot afford the medical care they need. This administration has proposed a program of improved medical care. Some parts of this program, such as expanded health services for school children and additional aid for hospital construction, have already passed the Senate. Our medical program will mean happier homes, healthier children, and greater opportunity for useful lives for all our people.

A good system of social security is also essential to our welfare. We established the principle a long time ago that the people of this country can protect themselves against the hazards of life and the burdens of old age by a system of social insurance. We need to make improvements in our social-insurance system at this time because its benefits are entirely too low to meet current living costs. We should bring this system up to date by increasing its benefits and extending its protection to more people. This is part of the program to which the Democratic Party is firmly committed. The Eighty-first Congress is going to improve our social-security system.

Another part of the Democratic program is to increase the minimum wage for industrial workers from 40 to 75 cents an hour. A bill for this purpose is well along toward final passage in the Congress, and I am confident that it will become law very shortly.

Minimum wages and social security together protect our working people against disastrously low incomes. Farmers need safeguards against low incomes, too. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in working for a program for lasting farm prosperity, for we know that the welfare of the country depends upon the welfare of our farmers.

We are determined to see that our economy continues to grow and expand. That is why we are enacting laws to provide for better use of our abundant natural resources, to develop more electric power, and to bring water to areas in need of it.

Above all else, we want to keep the United States prosperous and strong because we know that our prosperity is the best guaranty of peace. Every measure to promote the general welfare in this country is a measure to promote peace in the world.

The program of the Democratic Party is a program for prosperity and peace. It can be made effective only through the united efforts of our citizens.

It is not enough for the Congress to pass these measures. They have to be brought to life by the citizens of this country, and by our State and local governments. Our public-housing program will not be effective unless local authorities, backed by alert citizens, are active in building and operating local housing projects. Our program of aid to education will not be effective unless there is efficient and public-spirited home-town and home-State administration. Our farm program depends upon the joint effort of our farmers in county committees and rural cooperatives.

Only the people, working together, can make our program a success.

I ask you to bear that in mind when you hear people saying that measures for the general welfare are merely Federal handouts to the shiftless or the incompetent. I ask you to bear it in mind when you hear our opponents saying that our program is undermining local government and the moral character of our citizens.

The facts are just the opposite. Our program increases opportunity and incentive among our citizens. It increases the responsibilities and activities of local government.

The American people are not afraid of their Government, because they know it belongs to them and they control it. Now, more than ever before, the people realize that they can use their Government to help achieve wider opportunity and greater security—to help achieve real independence for themselves and their children.

This concept of government has been greatly advanced by the increasing participation of women in our political life, with their straightforward approach to public affairs. I am confident that the women of the United States will continue to exercise their democratic rights in order to build a happier and more prosperous Nation.

Freedom and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 28 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Freedom and the Farmer, delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on the Mutual network, September 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND THE FARMER

(Radio broadcast of Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT on the Mutual network, September 16, 1949)

On Labor Day the President of the United States made two speeches, opening the campaign for 1950. They are worth studying, because they carry the art of demagoguery to its highest point. Every feature of the Truman program is for the benefit of all our citizens. Everyone who is on the President's side, including—rather questionably—the Eighty-first Congress, is progressive and a friend of the people. Anyone who opposes any feature of the program is denounced as a selfish interest working against the common good. Mr. Truman attacked the selfish interests no fewer than 21 times without identifying them. The most selfish interest I know in Washington are the 5-percenters and the groups so ably represented by the 5-percenters and their friends, General Vaughan and John Maragon.

Throughout the speech, special appeals are made to the farmer and the President has promised him almost anything if he will join up with the labor-union bosses and accept their Socialist philosophy. Louis Bromfield says that no farmer's vote is for sale and that actually if the farmer could be bought off, he would only be sold out to organized labor. But Mr. Truman says that anyone who says there is a conflict in interest is a selfish interest grinding its own axe.

The chief devil, of course, is the Eightieth Congress whose actions are completely misrepresented. However, all newspaper and magazine editors are also characterized as selfish interests who tried to mislead the people in 1948 regarding the danger of the Truman program.

The Eightieth Congress did not weaken the farm program as Mr. Truman charges. It enacted a new program far more helpful to the farmer than anything we had before the war under Roosevelt, a program supported by the Farm Bureau and the Grange, by Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Agricultural Committee, by Mr. Brannan and Mr. Truman himself in 1948. The Eightieth Congress did not take social-security benefits from anybody as the President alleges. It provided more money for public power projects and reclamation than any previous Congress. The President praises the Eighty-first Congress for extending the European recovery program. It was the Eightieth Congress which originated it. He praises the present Congress for extending rent control and reciprocal trade agreements. The Eightieth Congress did both. He praises the Eighty-first Congress for strengthening and improving our organization for national defense. The Eightieth Congress passed the first unification bill for unification of the armed forces which the prior Democratic Congresses had failed to do ever since Pearl Harbor when the need was made so clear. The truth is the Eighty-first Congress is just as much opposed to the President's basic program for setting up a labor-Socialist government in this country as the Eightieth Congress ever was, and both Congresses represent the real views of the people of the United States. Mr. Truman says that paid propagandists are using the "scare-word campaign * * * a device that has been used in every country by the propagandists for the selfish interests. They invent slogans to scare the people. They apply frightening labels to anything they happen to oppose."

Why, when it comes to propaganda and scare words, the New Deal and the Fair Deal have been experts for years. All other propagandists in this country are rank amateurs

and neophytes by comparison. Every branch of the executive department has its press agents, promoters, and ballyhoo artists whose one job is to promote the New Deal philosophy. The latest available figures show there were 3,602 men and women on the Federal pay roll engaged in publicity and public-relations work in all the Federal bureaus, agencies, and departments. Of these, 2,485 were on a full-time basis and 1,117 part time. Total cost to the taxpayers for salaries alone was in excess of $11,000,000 in 1947.

The whole record of the New Deal administration has been one of government by slogans. The campaign of Mr. Truman and his friends and advisers, the labor-union bosses, against the Taft-Hartley law was based on vilification and abuse and slogans without an argument. Fortunately, they overdid it. Today the country only laughs at the idea that the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor law when, under its provisions, a million members have been added to the labor unions and employees in this country are enjoying the highest wages, the best working conditions, and the highest social services and pensions which anyone has ever received.

Why, the use of the term "selfish interests" is itself a scare-word campaign to divert attention from the real character of the program the President is urging. Of course, there are lots of selfish interests. Every group in the population has organized and each one has paid representatives down in Washington to protect their interests. Some of them undoubtedly lose sight of the public interest and put the selfish interest of their group ahead of the public. The biggest special interest in Washington is the organized labor lobby. There are various business groups and various farm groups. Veterans are represented and school teachers and doctors. All of them have a perfect right to present their case, and no one of them that I can see is any more selfish than the others, though some are more farsighted as to their real interest.

One of the difficult jobs for Senators and Congressmen is to weigh their various claims, but no selfish interest dominates Congress or any party in Congress. Everyone I know is concerned with adopting that legislation that will promote the greatest good of the greatest number of the American people while protecting the equal rights of the minorities. There is no one so stupid today that he does not realize the principle that the welfare of all groups is closely tied together. Full employment depends on a good market for agricultural products. The prosperity of the farmer depends on high employment and good wages in the city. The success of every business group depends on the purchasing power of the great American consumer. These things are fundamental and were not invented by Mr. Truman or the CIO-PAC. The $64 question is what measures are going to bring about good farm prices, good wages, steady employment, and reasonable profits.

The reason the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress opposed President Truman's program is that they think it will mean an end of liberty and therefore of prosperity and high standards of living. He objects to the terms "collectivism" and "statism," but that is what his program is. He has advocated the Spence bill giving him the power to fix prices, fix wages, ration commodities, and interfere in any industry where he thinks there ought to be more expansion by Government loans or even Government operation.

He proposes not only to socialize, but also to nationalize all medical care. Six billion dollars more taxes are to be levied to be paid into a Federal bureau which will pay all the doctors and hospitals in the United States to give medical care to 140,000,000 people, including all those who are fully able to pay their own way. He would discard the present system which gives free medical care for those who cannot afford to pay for it and which has given us the best health of any large country in the world, taking over the State and local institutions and making every doctor an employee of the Federal Government. Federal regulations would govern every feature of medical service in every home in America. I have favored many bills to improve the present system of preventive medicine and medical care. I have favored Federal aid to education and to housing for those who cannot otherwise obtain it, but let's not throw away our present system and begin all over again on a government model.

He would impose on us compulsory military training taking a million boys out of their homes for a year, interrupting their education, upsetting their plans and interfering with their occupations, incidentally subjecting them to the kind of ideology some Government bureau would like to teach them while the Federal Government had them under its control.

In his Pittsburgh speech, the President scoffs at the theory that any program could cost too much, or that we couldn't afford it now. He shows clearly that he has no sense whatever of the danger of deficit financing, increase of debt and a heavy tax burden discouraging the development of new plants, new machinery, new methods, and new products. He insists on expenditures of forty-two billion. If the other programs he has proposed were enacted, we would have sixteen billion more taxes.

He insists on the Brannan plan under which the Government would pay the farmer the high prices he would like to have, and sell the products to the consumer at the low prices he would like to pay, the difference to be made up by the taxpayer. This plan is not only expensive. It is a misrepresentation, because in the last analysis the farmer and consumer are the taxpayers. If we adopted this subsidy on the same scale on which it is now practiced in England, it would cost the Nation about $6,000,000,000 a year.

If the Brannan plan were fully carried out at the high support price recommended, it would, of course, require the Government to limit the total amount the farmer can raise. That means in the end that the Government would have to tell every farmer every year just what he can plant and just what he can't plant. The farmer is the last man in America to approve of detailed regulation and control of his daily life.

If this whole Truman program were enacted, collectivism or statism is a mild term for what we would have. The Government would direct every detail of the operations of agriculture, commerce, and industry. It would undertake to pay every family for every possible contingency or increase in normal expense. There would be no advantage to anyone working more than enough to pay for his current food, clothing, and lodging. And so the American people would lose not only their initiative and progress, but they would lose their character.

Frankly, I don't think the President understands the measures which he is recommending or the necessary effect they would have. Surely, no reasonable man who clearly understands the situation would advocate at this time throwing away the American system of freedom which has brought this country to the highest production and the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen. Surely, no reasonable man would advocate our following the British—and nearly every measure proposed has been enacted in England—at a time when their system has proved to be a complete failure, and when they are here begging for additional help. Our success has been due to the freedom of every man to run his own farm, his own business or his own occupation the way he thinks it ought to be run as long as he doesn't interfere with the right of others to do the same. That has given the incentive and reward for hard work, ability, and the willingness of a man to risk his time and his money for success. It has resulted here as nowhere else in the steady increase of production, in new methods, in new machinery, in new products, and in that dynamic economy which alone can assure full employment at high wages and high prices for full farm production.

The American farmer is as far ahead in tools and methods of the farmer abroad as American industry is ahead of British industry. He has reached that point through the incentive given to him by freedom and equality. He should not be limited in his production. It is our job to find more markets for that which he can produce without exhausting his land. Those markets can be found in new industrial uses and in the greater consumption of animal products, of meat, dairy products, and poultry products. A small increase in such consumption will soon take care of the grain surplus.

The Truman program is now being rejected by the Eighty-first Congress as it was by the Eightieth Congress because it means a destruction of the liberty and equality and justice which have made the American people the most fortunate and the happiest in the history of the world.

Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 28 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee Daily World of Wenatchee, Wash., has won national attention over a period of years as a fighting newspaperman who has devoted a great part of his career to development of natural resources. His record of service to his State and Nation, with particular emphasis on the role he has played in development of the Columbia Basin, needs no elaboration; it is well known in the Pacific Northwest.

Recently he published two provocative editorials, one from his own pen, the other written in 1911 by another Northwest editor, Mr. Harvey Scott.

The latter wrote on the subject of Socialism, and now, nearly four decades later, those thoughts are reviewed incisively by Mr. Woods in the light of what has occurred in that interval. Mr. Woods speaks of Europe from the standpoint of first-hand impressions gained in his own travels. What he has to say is pertinent to our times, and I commend this comment to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Down in Portland there once lived a great editor by the name of Harvey Scott. He was the editor in chief of the Daily Oregonian. The articles from his pen were copied far and wide. We are including one which ran in the

Philistine in August 1911. His article applies generally to this subject of socialism. So we are quoting it in full.—R. W.

"HARMONIZATION

"Socialism is in the air. It has conquered the ranks of labor and permeated the schools of learning, and now it marches on the erstwhile citadel of individualism, the clear-eyed and iron-hearted band of the great captains of industry. The brainy organizers of finance, trade and manufacture, who have denounced trades-unionism and scoffed at the sentimental utterances of pulpit and fiction and pedagog—these, at last, are tired of competition, and set themselves to kicking down the ladder on which al' achievement, rung by rung, in pain and loss and strife, has come up.

"They may not succeed; but if they succeed they will fail, and in the crash of that failure will go down the most colossal ruin of human history. One civilization after another has failed—Egypt, Nineveh, Babylon, Carthage, Greece, Rome –and this great Teutonic-Celtic fabric of mechanical industry may crumble to the dust as prone as any. In the day that the competitive system is thrown away, our doom is sealed. Without rivalry, exertion loses its point. Without competition, improvement becomes needless and impossible. Without struggle, the very faculties atrophy, purpose flags, nerve fails, and muscles are enfeebled with disuse.

"When our 'harmonizations' become complete, nobody will need to build new railroads, or improve facilities, or invent new machinery, or study economy, or reward exceptional fidelity or energy. We shall fall to a dead level of mediocrity, stagnation, and then decay. The agencies that have built us up will be destroyed, the props will be withdrawn. The great machine will revolve awhile of its own accumulated momentum, and then it will stop. And upon the ruins of what is left the survivors will erect another system, still imperfect no doubt, but purged of this insidious error of socialism. Through some such dread experience as this we may have to pass, for Nature will make her lessons understood, at whatever cost is necessary to those who would set her at defiance. The process of creation is not to be reversed because some of the participants are tired of the struggle."

Now the great question before us is: Where do we go from here? This word "socialism" was used as a fetish in an attempt to break down efforts for and in behalf of an orderly and sane development of the Columbia. But the Columbia was too big and too important for private enterprise. And the Grand Coulee has proven to be the greatest thing ever done for private enterprise in the West.

We are having an overdose of socialism. And we need to watch the trend of events as they are happening in Europe. But this trend must be guided by common sense.

What about our fruit situation? What about price support on wheat and potatoes? That is an experiment yet. But the situation is still in the hands of the grass-roots population of America. The people of the country, we think, have a right to utilize the machinery of Government in handling situations such as we have at the present time.

When the time comes when the people of the country are being controlled by the machinery of government instead of the machinery of government being controlled and utilized by the people of a state or nation, then look out for trouble.

When the machinery of government once kills or limits the efforts of willing men, men like Edison, Ford, Kettering—men of initiative and action such as we have in every community—we can expect the things to come true as outlined by Harvey Scott.

If the machinery of government can continue to be used without the machine itself or an autocratic group in control of that machine taking over the powers of the great electorate, we can perhaps continue to use such organization.

British Welcome Fulbright Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 28 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "British Welcome Fulbright Students," written by Melita Spraggs, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, from London, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH WELCOME FULBRIGHT STUDENTS

(By Melita Spraggs, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

LONDON.—Parts of this city have taken on the air of an American college campus this week with groups of Americans in palm beach suits, bow ties and crew cuts doing some sightseeing en route to British universities.

They are the advance guard of the American Fulbright students whose presence heralds an important extension of wartime lend-lease for peacetime educational exchange.

Some 160 American professors, graduate students, and research scholars are here for a year's study at British universities. Their expenses are paid for by the sale of American surplus war material in this country.

The farsighted program was conceived by a former Rhodes scholar. He was Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and his program was enacted by the United States Congress in 1946 as an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Many nations wished to purchase the vast quantities of United States materials which became surplus at end of war. They could not pay in dollars. So Nissen huts, GI clothing, scrap metal, and so forth were sold and the Fulbright amendment authorized that this foreign currency be spent on educational exchanges.

FUNDS FOR BRITISH STUDENTS, TOO

Such American funds in foreign countries are being spent not only for the benefit of American students. A number of British and colonial students already are being given similar privileges in the United States—140 Britons so far have received round-trip travel grants for study, research, or teaching in American institutions.

Eventually it is hoped that 1,300 Americans will study in 20 different countries under this United States sponsored student-exchange program at ultimate cost of something like $140,000,000 in foreign currencies.

British universities, though overcrowded in some departments, are able to welcome Fulbright students, since by far the larger number are those who have graduated from United States institutions and are continuing their academic work in such subjects as English literature, history, law, economics, and the natural sciences.

LIKE RETURNING HOME

Of the 160, some 35 are to serve as visiting lecturers at British universities in fields as varied as United States history, political science, literature, geology, mechanical engineering, and chemistry. Nineteen are here as research scholars. They are pursuing studies in English literature and history, medicine, economics, nuclear physics, engineering, and chemistry.

For some Americans, coming to Britain is like returning home. Two at least of the Fulbright students say they regard it so. William A. Gaines, of Lima, Ohio, six-foot-two M. A. of Yale University, has come back to study for his doctor of philosophy degree at Oxford University by writing a thesis on nineteenth century English law. He was in Lancashire with the United States Army in 1944 and went over to France just after D-day.

Helen Green, from Washington, who comes to Oxford University to study Arabic and Islamic religions, also was in Britain during the war.

The Fulbright educational exchange program is unique in that it deals exclusively with university exchanges of individual applicants. It is the only project of its kind carried out at the government level.

The program also may help by grants, some exchange schemes already working.

NO ALLOWANCE FOR WIVES

For instance, there is the officially sponsored Anglo-American teacher-exchange scheme by which English and American teachers spend 1 year in each other's schools. British exchange teachers in the United States found it difficult to live on their allowances because British salaries did not cover the cost of living in the United States. So the Fulbright plan gives them an extra $2,000 a year grant to help out. This was decided after a census of comparative salaries showed that the average American teacher earns about $800 a year more than the British teacher.

British teachers who have gone to the United States usually earn from $1,400 to $2,400 a year. Even if their salary is more than $2,400 a year they can't spend it in the United States, since the Bank of England set this as the limit to the dollar allowance which they can take out of the country.

Incidentally, if Americans wonder why they don't get many men teachers, it's because the men can't get an allowance to take their wives. Currency for wives was cut off this year as a measure of dollar economy.

American exchange teachers to whom I have talked have been most enthusiastic about their stay in Britain—even in the past 2 years, when living conditions lagged considerably behind those in the United States. There is no limit on the dollars Americans may bring to Britain.

HOMES OPENED TO VISITORS

The scheme for exchange of English public schoolboys with American private schoolboys celebrated its twenty-first anniversary with a party at the English-Speaking Union here this week.

Then there is the exchange of technicians—coal miners, builders, textile workers, and others—who are crossing the Atlantic to gather know-how.

In British suburbia, too, there has been an upsurge of desire to show Americans how Britain really lives. Ordinary persons are despairing of newspapers as being able to tell other countries what English people really like and how they live. So they are trying to take things into their own hands—or rather trying to take Americans into their own homes.

Real Federal Economies Call for Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 28 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Real Federal Economies Call for Public Support," written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirier of September 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL FEDERAL ECONOMIES CALL FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, September 9.—A popular wall decoration in congressional offices is a cartoon which appeared in the Inquirer and other newspapers about 2 years ago. Its first picture shows a group of irate constituents demanding that their Congressman crack down on Government spending and force economies. In the second picture, the Congressman is receiving blue blazes from the same irate constituents because their local Federal project has been eliminated as part of the economy drive.

There, in a nutshell, is the story of what happens to Federal economy drives. It is happening today. Once more, with a chance to save some real money, the constituents—the same folks who have been calling for economy and elimination of waste in Government—are turning on the heat to balk the savings.

A fortnight ago, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson announced that he was going to save money by dropping 135,000 civilians and 12,703 Reserve officers from the pay rolls of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. He said the cuts would be completed by December 1. And he declared very bluntly at a meeting with Members of Congress:

"A lot of people in the armed services aren't doing a nickel's worth of work. There is terrible waste and extravagance and, so help me, I will stop it. I'm not running a defense WPA."

Here is the kind of a bureaucrat the public and the Congress have been clamoring for. Here is that unique individual—a high official of the Truman administration who admits publicly that there is waste and extravagance in his own Department and that he means to end it. Here is a man who is trying to eliminate the drones and save the taxpayers some money.

Do they acclaim him? Do they say this is a good public servant and there ought to be more Louis Johnsons in Washington? Do they rally behind him and set him up as a shining example for other Government officials to emulate?

You know the answer. They do not.

They are jumping up and down on Louis Johnson these days, trying to soften him so that he will weaken and sharply curtail the amount of the economies he has proposed.

Members of Congress are demanding that he keep his dirty economies out of their districts and that he economize somewhere else instead. People who live in the affected areas are insisting that there be no reductions of what Johnson has characterized as "terrible waste and extravagance."

They are turning the heat on the first genuine effort in years to economize in the National Government, despite the fact that—

The Federal debt today is more than $3,500,000,000 greater than it was a year ago and is growing every day;

The Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures asserts "the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government could be reduced by 500,000 without impairment of Government efficiency."

In Washington, officials are carefully watching the Louis Johnson economy move.

If he makes good and if the public rallies to his support, then a lot of other bureaucrats are going to follow suit. The country will be well on the way to that reduction of 500,000 pay-rollers. But if Johnson is balked at every turn, those who have been building up their staffs and pay rolls will know they are on the right track.

They will know that Congress and the public talk economy—but that it is just a lot of hot air.

A lot of people down here admire Louis Johnson. They say he is a man with guts. He's trying to do something about the overloaded pay rolls.

The reverse side of the coin is Congress which has failed to make real cuts in the appropriations requests. The nearest Congress came to it was when the Senate tried—unsuccessfully—the other day to direct President Truman to cut from 5 to 10 percent from the various appropriations bills.

They tried to get him to do what they did not have the courage to do. Only Louis Johnson is doing it for Congress, so far. And Congress does not even have the grace to say "thanks" to the guy.

The Golden Road to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 28 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking article written by Walter Winchell dealing with the monetary situation and published in the New York Daily Mirror of September 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of September 22, 1949]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MEMOS TO THE EDITORS—THE GOLDEN ROAD TO INFLATION

Last year this reporter was heckled (in Collier's) for saying in 1946: "Here it comes, the most devastating of all notes on inflation: The price of gold is expected to be pegged at $52 an ounce."

Since world markets have been at the $55 level, a move to $52 would be a recognition of open market conditions * * * United States $20 gold pieces sold at $60 recently in Paris.

Nine out of every 10 people will be quick to say, as they were in 1933 (but perhaps with less certainty), that changing the price of gold or altering the gold content of the United States dollar does not affect them. * * * In 1933 almost everyone (except students of free gold markets and currency) asserted their paper dollar, devalued to 59 cents, purchased just as much as it always did.

For 650 years the price of gold has gone steadily upward. When local chieftains, feudal barons or countries incurred more debt than the productivity of the land would support they called in their hard money, chipped a piece off and returned the devalued coin to circulation. * * * Devaluing the currency and raising the price of gold long has been the most expedient way of canceling off excessive spending. * * * At first glance the operation appears to be so painless that the vast majority of the people have no immediate concern.

In 1933 currency in circulation in the United States exceeded gold on hand to a degree that there was only 85 cents in gold to meet each dollar of currency outstanding. * * * Since they were interchangeable, the public could call on more gold than the banks had available. * * * A national bank holiday was the immediate expedient.

World currencies were collapsing around us, and devaluation of the United States dollar was resorted to by the method of calling in all legal tender exchangeable for gold, calling in all gold and raising its price gradually from $20.67 per ounce to $35. The United States dollar was correspondingly depreciated to 59 cents.

In order to understand the relationship of gold and worldly goods it must be understood that hard money—gold, silver, and precious jewels—are the only mediums of exchange for goods and services that a large part of the world population understands. It is only by accident of birth that we happen to be born in a portion of the world (northern United States) that has not suffered from total destruction of its currency.

Gold is the measuring stick, inch, foot, pound, or quart, if you will, which has been accepted throughout the world as a symbol of a given quantity of grain, labor, or worldly goods. When this equilibrium is disturbed by the arbitrary action of devaluation—which in reality changes the measuring stick—unbalance is created.

At the time the change is made there is very little perceptible disturbance, except in foreign exchange. The dollars in your pocket, in the bank, or in your endowment policy, your dividends, salary, or fixed income have the same purchasing power they had the day before devaluation. But the balance has been disturbed; the supply of gold and goods are reasonably the same, but the measurement unit has been changed without actually altering the amount of gold. Economic laws work slowly but with deadly certainty. Eventually that balance must be restored. There may be wars, famines, and overproduction during the readjustment period, but eventually the increase in the price of gold and the devaluation of the dollar will be reflected in the price of the things you buy.

The dollar, which in 1933 appeared to have the same purchasing power, now buys about one-half of what it did then. The cost-of-living index stands at 164 percent, compared with prewar years (1939), and devaluation was 41 percent. This is more than happenstance; it is the return to balance from a change in the measuring unit made in 1933. It is now quite evident that those who suffer are those who put aside for the rainy day. But those who saved and those who depend on fixed return are in the minority and not politically vocal, hence devaluation still remains the most expedient method of paying off excessive spending.

Like the man who makes his first profit in Wall Street, at cards, or at the races, he is quick to ask how long has this been going

on? But manipulation of currency is not quite so easy to stop once started. The first move is always so easy that another step is urged when pressure again appears. And it can be shown to yield a paper profit. We now have 24,000,000,000 in gold at an average cost of $27 per ounce against a Treasury price of $35 for minting purposes and an open market price of $55. How easy and attractive then to mark up the price to $52 and use the paper profit to pay off public debt. And who will complain? Surely not the producers of gold.

The United States, England, Canada, and Russia now own and produce well over three-fourths of the world's gold, and the United States owns most of the gold held above ground. It is these nations that will have to loan gold credits to the other nations of the world when they again reestablish their currencies on a firm basis backed by a gold reserve. These borrowing nations need gold credits as a base for their currencies, but they are not immediately concerned with the book price at which their credit is established. So every one is happy, even the owner of a gold mine or gold securities.

Yes, everyone except those who depend on fixed income, endowments, insurance policies, and savings bank deposits. Their income buys less and less as the spiral of inflation takes hold.

The little man in the street has worked and saved through two wars is truly the forgotten man when nations resort to devaluation to bolster a declining economy or excessive spending. His purchasing power is diminishing, and time does not allow for a new start in life. His cries for relief are unheard above the demands of labor, who sell their services for cash, and the wealthy, who enjoy mobility of action even in a rapidly changing economy.

The higher price for gold seems inevitable and with it eventually a higher price level for consumers' goods, unless the world's productive machinery is allowed to operate freely at capacity.

The public debt of the United States is now 256,000,000,000, having increased 3,500,000,000 since July 1, 1949. We labor 1 day out of 5 to support the cost of Government. Deficit spending is the handmaiden of inflation, whose spiral will continue until income and expenditures are balanced and production operates at capacity to supply better American goods in a competitive world market.

Address at Republican Farm Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address which I delivered at the Republican Farm Conference at Sioux City, Iowa, on Friday, September 23, 1949:

As one whose home has always been in rural communities in the Middle West, it gives me a thrill to come to Sioux City in my native State of Iowa for this Republican Farm Conference. You folks are my kind of people. Here above all other places I feel at home. And I feel at home as a Republican because the area which is represented at this meeting is the great Republican stronghold of America. It was here that the party had its beginning, and here it has always shown its greatest strength. Republicanism and rural America are synonymous and have been since the founding of our party almost a hundred years ago.

What is more natural then than for the Republican Party through its official representatives to come to Sioux City to counsel with the farmers of mid-America in respect to Government policies on agriculture; policies which vitally affect not only those who live in this great farming section but which concern the future of the Nation itself and to a great extent the future of the whole world.

We who live in mid-America have always known that nowhere else in the world is there an area which can compare with it in the extent and character of its agricultural resources. We've even been guilty of bragging about it on occasion. But it took a great world war and its aftermath to prove to the world how indispensable was this area and its farmers in winning both the war and the peace. Don't misunderstand me. The peace isn't won yet but we are making progress. And the food production of the farmers of the Middle West is the weapon which we have used to defeat communism in western Europe. It has done more than arms could do, more than diplomacy could do. It has helped undo many of the mistakes made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Almighty God has been good to this area. He has given us a combination of rich soil, topography, and climate such as is possessed by no area of comparable size on the globe. But it is the genius of the American farmer which has brought this great resource to its full fruition. It is the combination of the best soil and climate and the best farmers in the world which enabled us to increase our food production more than a third during the war years.

You are the best farmers in the world for several reasons. You have the ability and the know-how which enable you to make the most efficient use of improved machinery. You have the education and the training which enable you to put to practical use the great scientific discoveries which have been brought about through governmental and private research in recent years. But perhaps over and above everything else our outstanding agricultural progress has occurred because you have been living under a Government and an economic system which gave you freedom of opportunity to develop to the very limit your resources and abilities as farmers. Nowhere in the world save in America have farmers had such an opportunity.

And yet, notwithstanding your achievements in the field of agricultural production, all has not been well on the farm. We have found that abundant production, if not properly handled and distributed, can become a curse instead of a blessing not only to the farmers who produce it but to the Nation and the world. We do not have to go very far back to find examples of where full production of agricultural commodities combined with poor marketing and distribution has brought about depression and want and has actually produced bread lines in the midst of plenty. In other words, we have not yet solved the great problem of translating abundance on the farm into healthful diets and well-being on the part of our people generally.

We Republicans believe that the way to solve these problems is to go first to farmers themselves. And so we are here today not to give you advice but to ask for your help in our efforts to work out an agricultural program which will be helpful to the farmer and to the Nation as a whole. You have been invited to come here not as spectators but as participants. With us are Republican members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, many of whom have come from great distances to hear your views. And in order to stimulate thinking and discussion we have invited as speakers a number of men and women who will discuss various questions which we feel are of interest and importance to you.

If this meeting should in any way remind you of a meeting held in Des Moines last June it will be because of its differences rather than its similarities. In fact, we are trying to make it as different as possible. The Des Moines meeting was advertised and ballyhooed as a great farm meeting. There were farmers there all right, but they were there as spectators. They listened to many speeches. The newspaper accounts gave the idea that the meeting was a great rally of the CIO, the A. F. of L., and the railroad labor organizations. In an article of the CIO News for June 20, 1949, I read as follows:

"Among those taking part were 30 CIO and CIO-PAC officials from Texas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and Minnesota."

There were speeches extolling the Brannan plan by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO; by Jack Kroll, director of the CIO Political Action Committee; by the late A. F. Whitney, then president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and by Joseph Keenan, of the Labor League for Political Education. In addition there were speeches by Vice President BARKLEY and Secretary Brannan, but if farmers were allowed to say anything, all of the newspaper accounts which I have seen of the meeting failed to mention the fact. This meeting will be different.

I believe that I can best use the time which has been given to me on this program by briefly discussing farm legislation in recent years, including some of the pending proposals, and by pointing out to you particularly the Republican record and viewpoint on these questions.

Beginning with the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 and coming right down to the Agricultural Act of 1948, most farm legislation has had bipartisan support. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture during all of the time, I can testify that there has been splendid cooperation between Members of Congress from farm States irrespective of party. I know that this has been most gratifying to the farmers of America, as it has been to me.

I believe that everyone will agree that most of our prewar agricultural legislation failed to come up to expectations. The Farm Board set-up under the Agricultural Marketing Act held prices up temporarily. It gave a great impetus to cooperative marketing, but it could not stabilize prices in the face of a world depression.

During the period from 1933 to 1938 a tremendous volume of agricultural legislation was enacted. It covered a broad field including credit, marketing, soil conservation, and price supports. It afforded relief in a desperate situation but from the standpoint of permanent benefits it was disappointing. This is especially true with respect to price supports. For instance, in 1940, the last year before our entrance into the war, farm prices were only 78 percent of what they were in 1930. They were 87 percent of the average 1920–29 prices and only 93 percent even of the average prices from 1935–39. And by 1940, in spite of rigid control programs on the basic commodities, we were confronted with serious surpluses—surpluses which did not disappear until the war was well along.

It is somewhat startling to look back and see what actual prices were in 1940. For instance, the average price for hogs was $5.39 per hundred; eggs were 18 cents a dozen; corn 62 cents a bushel; wheat 68

cents; potatoes 54 cents; chickens 13 cents a pound; milk $1.82 a hundred; cattle $7.56 a hundred. All of these prices were far below the goal of parity.

All of this makes it necessary to reluctantly admit that the only period of real agricultural prosperity this country has known since World War I was during and since World War II. War accomplished what legislation could not. Perhaps that's an indictment of civilization. Certainly it indicates something is radically wrong with the world. Perhaps we can get some clue as to what our agricultural policy should be if we give consideration to what brought about agricultural prosperity during the war. Philosophers and moralists, noting that in spite of its slaughter and destruction, war brings out some of the highest qualities in human nature, have speculated on a moral equivalent for war. Economists might well consider an economic substitute for war, but that is a broader subject than we are now discussing.

During the war period Congress adopted what became known as the Steagall amendment. This provided that the basic commodities, excepting cotton, should be supported at 90 percent of parity; cotton at 92½ percent. The War Food Administrator was authorized to support the prices of other commodities at a level which would expand production as needed. It was also provided that in the case of the basic commodities and all other commodities where the War Food Administrator had issued a proclamation, price supports should continue at not less than 90 percent of parity until 2 years after the President proclaimed the end of hostilities. Late in 1946 the President issued a proclamation declaring hostilities at an end as of December 31, 1946, so that wartime support prices continued in effect until December 31, 1948. However, except where they were held down by price ceilings from prices during the war period and until December 31, 1948, were fixed by supply and demand.

The Eightieth Congress, as a part of the Agricultural Act of 1948, extended the Steagall guaranties with some modifications for the 1949 crop year and it is this extension which is now in effect.

This brings us up to the announcement of one of the most controversial proposals ever made in the field of agricultural legislation—the Brannan plan. Some people have wondered where this plan originated. There is no particular mystery about that. Everyone will remember the many promises which the President made in the course of the campaign last fall. He had something for everybody. He said, among other things, he was going to support farm prices at high levels and at the same time bring down the cost of living. That sounded like nice work if you could do it—something like the pyramid clubs we heard so much about a few weeks ago. In any event the Brannan plan would seem to be a direct effort to carry out the President's impossible campaign promises.

The early steps to sell it to the country were made by the CIO and other labor organizations. In fact the Brannan plan was first specifically outlined in the resolutions adopted in the national convention of the CIO at Portland, Oreg., last November. In the meantime other labor organizations have gotten behind the idea enthusiastically. Almost every labor paper in the country has given it a big boost.

For instance, there is the Machinist, a magazine published by the National Machinists Union. In its issue of May 12, it had to say, and I quote:

"It is urgent that unions give immediate determined support to the new program proposed by Agriculture Secretary Brannan. It would let prices fall as low as demand allows and pay farmers directly for the difference between their production and living costs and the prices they receive for their products."

The Trainmen News, official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in an editorial by its president, the late A. F. Whitney, compared the Brannan plan in importance with the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. He said, and I quote:

"Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act will enable labor to cope with giant financial and monopoly interests and stabilize prosperity for the masses of the workers. The Brannan plan will accomplish the same purpose for the great agricultural industry. These two legislative proposals are indispensable to the continued prosperity and progress of our industry. I urge every officer and member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to write or wire their Senators and Congressmen to support S. 1882, the Brannan agricultural plan."

Yes, labor organizations are enthusiastic for the Brannan plan. But what of farmers? They were not consulted before the plan was brought out. They haven't been consulted since. Their role simply seems to be to have the idea crammed down their throats. I know that many farmers have given careful study to the proposal. Farm organizations, although not consulted before the plan was announced, have studied it intensively, and I am sure, sympathetically. Yet with one exception all of the national farm organizations have announced their opposition. This is not surprising because the more one studies the Brannan plan the more clearly it appears that if enacted and carried out as proposed by its organized labor sponsors, it would utterly destroy the kind of agriculture we have heretofore had in this country.

In the first place, the program deliberately undertakes to lower farm prices. It's hard enough to keep farm prices at a fair level under the best of conditions but would there be any chance at all with the Government manipulating them downward?

In the second place, it does away entirely with the concept of parity prices as fair prices, which has been accepted for years by farmers and nonfarmers alike. Under the Brannan plan parity prices would no longer be considered as fair prices to consumers and thus we would undo the work of years on the part of farmers and farm organizations.

Third, it would provide that a farmer must receive part of his income as a dole from the Government; that is, he would receive it if Congress appropriated the money.

Fourth, under the Brannan plan a part of everybody's grocery bill, millionaires included, would be paid by the Federal Government. Why shouldn't people living in a Nation which is by far the richest in the world pay their own grocery bills, especially since no one is suggesting price supports higher than parity which has been accepted as a fair price level?

Fifth, the Brannan plan is a conscious effort to throw farm legislation into partisan politics. The whole history of the proposal shows it to be an effort on the part of the organized labor political machines to enlist the farmer as an ally in carrying out labor's political program. Farmers are too smart to be caught in a trap like that.

Sixth, supporters of the Brannan plan have never submitted figures as to its ultimate cost. Instead they express irritation that anyone should be concerned about that question. Economists and others who have studied the matter estimate the cost at from three to ten billion dollars per year.

And finally, there is the price that every farmer must pay if the plan goes into full effect—namely, absolute Government control of his farming operations. How many of you have read Senate bill No. 1971, which puts the Brannan plan into legislative form? This bill was written in the Department of Agriculture and sent to Congress for introduction. It is 86 pages long and 15 pages relate to penalties imposed on farmers. Let me read to you the provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79, one of the penalty sections, which will give you a little hint of what is in store for farmers when the Brannan plan goes into effect. It reads as follows:

"Farmers engaged in the production of any agricultural commodity shall furnish such proof of their acreage, production units, production, yield, storage, and marketing of the commodity in the form of records, marketing cards, reports, storage or sale receipts, or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe as necessary for the administration of this title. Any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 and any such person making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

There it is in black and white. You shall keep whatever books and records the Secretary prescribes and if you fail to do so you can be hauled into court and fined $500. And if you happen to make a false report or record then it is $1,000 or a year in jail. So if there is any likelihood of the Brannan plan going into effect you'd better start looking now for an extra hand to be used as bookkeeper. It'll be cheaper than paying the fine and it will at least be a little more comfortable than spending a year in jail. Remember this is just one of the penalty sections. Ask your Senator or Congressman to send you a copy of the entire bill and see what some of the others are.

My friends, is it any wonder that farmers who have studied the Brannan plan are almost universally against it? The wonder is that anyone who knows farmers would have expected them to be for it. I am afraid the labor politicians who concocted the plan have gotten their idea of the farmer from the funny papers and are laboring under the delusion that he would buy the Brooklyn Bridge if a sufficiently clever line of sales talk were used.

One thing which has given me some little surprise is why the labor leaders who have sponsored the Brannan plan haven't taken steps toward putting it into effect for labor. Every reason which can be urged for applying it to agriculture is equally applicable as far as labor is concerned. If high incomes and low prices are a good thing for the farmer and the country, why aren't high incomes and low wages a good thing for working people and the country? Advocates of the Brannan plan say low prices would mean greater consumption, and if that is so, low wages would certainly mean more jobs and more goods for consumers. Think how many more houses we could construct at prices people could afford to pay if the Federal Government would adopt a low-wage policy; and of the additional demand for automobiles if reduced wages made them cheaper. And if the Brannan plan advocates are right, workers couldn't lose because the Government would give them a check every so often to make up the difference between actual wages and a fair wage rate to be determined by the Government.

So why not let labor in on this good thing and even give them priority in trying it out? If it works there, then we can start thinking about it for farmers.

What has been said is not all that can be said about the Brannan plan by any means.

But I want to proceed now to tell you something of the Republican record and the Republican attitude on farm legislation.

Let me begin by giving you the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress in the field of agriculture. This is more necessary than would otherwise be the case, because the record of no Congress in history has been so deliberately misrepresented and smeared as that of the Eightieth. This is true of farm legislation as well as that relating to labor and fiscal policies. Farmers were told without the slightest basis of fact that the Eightieth Congress had passed legislation which prevented the Federal Government from furnishing grain storage to farmers. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government never has furnished grain storage to farmers. They have always had to provide their own storage and do now, as everyone here knows. However, there was nothing in the legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress which would have prevented the Commodity Credit Corporation from furnishing storage to farmers had it so desired, or which changed the previous authority of the Corporation in that regard.

Likewise the long-range bill, the Aiken bill, was thoroughly misrepresented and distorted during the campaign—all of this in spite of the fact that the bill very closely followed the suggestions of the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson; that it had strong bipartisan support in the Senate and was approved either wholly or in part by all of the leading farm organizations. I do not say it was a perfect bill. I said when it was accepted a year ago that it would need to be reconsidered and amended this year before going into effect on January 1, 1950. It is being reconsidered and amended now but no bill, unless it is the Taft-Hartley bill, has been so smeared and misrepresented for political purposes during the past year as has the Aiken bill.

But now to list the positive accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress in the field of agriculture. Time will permit me to hit only the high points, but I believe that I can safely say that in the field of agricultural legislation the Eightieth Congress has a record of accomplishment which is surpassed by none.

In the first place, in addition to enacting the long-range program to go into effect in 1950, it extended the existing price-support program for a year. Had this not been done there would have been no provision for support prices on nonbasic commodities during the present year, and price supports on the basic commodities would have gone back to the flexible level which prevailed before the war of from 52 to 75 percent of parity. The mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities, upon milk and hogs, eggs and chickens, are in effect today because of this legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress. Likewise the mandatory price supports at from 60 to 90 percent of parity on many other commodities are in effect this year solely because of this legislation. And with respect to the long-range part of the legislation—and mark this well—price supports are authorized up to 90 percent of parity upon the basic commodities and upon all other commodities excepting support is limited on those which are extremely perishable. In the case of the basic commodities the Secretary has full authority at his discretion to make the rate 90 percent and in the case of other commodities he can do so upon making certain findings.

What were some of the other important measures which should be enumerated? Let me mention first the legislation giving a permanent charter and status to the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus ending the uncertainty of its operations on a year-to-year basis.

The Eightieth Congress also enacted an entirely new and sound crop insurance act to take the place of the defunct program which had accumulated an operating deficit of over $70,000,000.

It extended the marketing agreement program. It increased appropriations for agricultural research. It amended that part of the Farm Tenant Act which provides for Government reinsurance of private mortgage loans to enable tenants to purchase farms. It passed a new sugar bill. It set up a program and appropriated the funds to provide for the cooperation of this country with Mexico in stamping out the foot-and-mouth disease. It passed a new and badly needed insecticide act. It authorized campaigns of eradication against insect pests. It added safeguards against the importation of pests and plant diseases from abroad. It appropriated vast sums for soil conservation and increased the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service.

It passed legislation to save the three industrial alcohol plants at Omaha, Kansas City, and Muscatine, all of which would otherwise have been disposed of as surplus war property. These plants are now available for research purposes and for use in disposing of agricultural surpluses.

It conducted investigations of the shortages of fertilizer and farm machinery which contributed to bringing about substantial relief.

It expanded appropriations for rural roads and authorized even greater appropriations for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951.

No Congress in history provided so generously for rural electrification. It approved $800,000,000 in loan authorizations for the extension of REA electric lines to farm homes, about as much as had been provided by all previous Congresses.

And finally—and this is something of greatest importance—it cut the President's budget recommendations for the 2-year period by over $6,000,000,000 and made other cuts and savings amounting to billions more. It reduced taxes and balanced the Federal budget for the first time in many years. And judging by the way things are going now, it will be the last time until we get another Republican Congress. I mention this particularly because the basis for any sound farm program in this country is necessarily a Government in sound fiscal condition. Likewise there is no other group more interested in taxation and tax reduction than are the farmers of this country.

So much for the record of the Eightieth Congress. But Republicans are not resting on that. You are entitled to know the basic policies of the Republican Party with respect to agriculture as shown by party platforms, by statements of its spokesmen, and by the record of its Members in Congress.

We have not considered and do not now consider agricultural legislation as a partisan question. We will continue to work with farmers, farm organizations, and all friends of agriculture in an effort to develop the soundest and most satisfactory solution of the many problems confronting the farmers of this country. We recognize agriculture as a growing dynamic industry undergoing constant change and improvements. In order to maintain this growth and development we favor continued and enlarged programs of research and education with especial efforts to expand education among our farm boys and girls through vocational agriculture in our schools, 4-H Club work, and our unsurpassed land-grant colleges.

We believe that marketing is the greatest problem confronting agriculture today. We support the principles of the research and marketing act with its emphasis upon the more effective marketing of agricultural products. We support the idea of cooperative marketing of agricultural products so as to give the greatest possible return to the farmer.

We subscribe to the idea that our export markets must be developed to the greatest possible extent. We believe that as long as there are hungry people in the world and threatened or actual surpluses in this country some method can and must be found to reconcile those conditions which are so incompatible with modern progress in other lines. Our objective is to bring hungry people and food together.

We believe in the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products. We realize that such a program is in its infancy. We do not delude ourselves that this offers an all-out remedy for agricultural surpluses, but we believe that through continued research industrial uses at profitable levels will be developed for some agricultural products. We believe that such a program is in the nature of conservation because agricultural resources are replaceable while mineral resources for which they may be substituted are not.

We urge the expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing agricultural surpluses and conserving our soil. Animal agriculture means better diets and better health for the American people. It means better utilization of our surpluses because it takes from 5 to 7 pounds of grain or its forage equivalent consumed as dairy products or meat to equal 1 pound consumed as grain.

We regard soil conservation as one of the greatest problems confronting our country today. We advocate a continuation and expansion of present programs for the preservation of our soil and its fertility.

We believe that consideration should be given to expanding the consumption of good, healthful food by people whose financial means do not enable them to purchase it at fair prices. We have in mind a program based in principle but perhaps not in detail upon the stamp plan used before the war and embodied in a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. Such a program makes sense. It would increase consumption among those who need better diets, whereas the Brannan plan would subsidize the food of the millionaire to the same extent as that of the very poor.

We realize that some parts of this program can only be developed and carried out over a considerable period of time. Until such a program results in fair prices to farmers we shall insist upon a program of price supports. We do not regard price supports as a controversial question. They have been accepted by our party, the Democratic Party, and by the American public for many years. We do not believe that prices which are made through Government supports are as desirable or as satisfactory to the farmer, or as profitable or as much in accord with our philosophy of American life as are fair prices in the market place brought about by the operation of the law of supply and demand. We accept supports as an alternative to such prices when, by reason of economic maladjustments or the failure of our system to function effectively, farmers are placed at a disadvantage. We further believe that when price supports are in effect they should be price supports in the market place and the farmer should receive a fair price for his products from those who purchase and consume them.

We realize that there are difficulties in connection with any price-support program, especially in the case of perishable commodities. We realize also that the higher the support price on any commodity the greater the amount of control which will be necessary. We believe that the question as to

the level of price supports is one which must ultimately be determined by farmers because they are the ones who must live under such a program. As long as support prices do not exceed parity, nonfarmers and consumers cannot complain.

We believe that a prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We believe not only in fair farm prices but in good farm incomes—incomes that are commensurate with the great contribution which the farmer makes to society and which will enable him to have the same comforts and conveniences as those who live in the cities.

We regard the farm home as one of our fundamental social institutions. We believe that the future of America is tied up with the future of the farm homes of this country because our cities are not today replenishing themselves as far as population is concerned. The kind of a country we are going to have in the future will depend largely upon the environment in which our boys and girls grow up on the farm.

For this reason Republicans in Congress have given their hearty support to programs for rural roads, for rural electrification, for farm research and education, and for other measures which make for better living conditions. We not only believe in the conservation of the soil. We believe even more strongly in conserving the moral and spiritual values of rural life as we have known it in America.

These are our objectives. We believe they are your objectives. We are asking that you help us by telling us how you think they can best be accomplished.

Statement by President Truman Upon Signing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the President on September 26, 1949, upon signing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949, which extends until 1951 our trade-agreement program, free of the crippling restrictions imposed on it in 1948 by the Eightieth Congress. Through this wise and farseeing legislation, the United States reaffirms its intention of pressing forward toward expanded world trade at a time when such action is most urgently needed.

In the first phase of our postwar foreign economic policy, we gave our primary attention to restoring the productive capacity of our friendly neighbors in the world community. In this task we have already gone a long way. But the process of postwar readjustment brought an inevitable growth of restrictive trade and financial measures throughout the world. We cannot permit these barriers to remain and thus stifle a progressive rise in standards of living throughout the world, which would provide our best insurance of a peaceful future.

As we have carried out temporary programs of financial assistance, we have increasingly sought adjustments tending to break down artificial trade barriers and to lead toward the reestablishment of expanding and competitive world trade, the permanent objective of our international commercial policy. We envisage a reestablishment of economic balance in the world which will permit our neighbors now receiving our assistance in securing needed imports to become self-supporting through a liberal expansion of the international exchange of goods in competitive world markets. Only in such a world economy can we foresee the maintenance of adequate and rising standards of living when our programs of financial assistance terminate.

Earlier this month representatives of our Government came to agreement in Washington with British and Canadian representatives on certain courses of action which will be of considerable immediate assistance in easing international financial maladjustments. But it was recognized by all that further steps are needed to open the way for the sound expansion of international trade so essential to a lasting solution of basic international economic maladjustments. From the long-range standpoint, it is clear that only by a large expansion of our purchases of foreign goods will the needed readjustment in international economic relations be possible, on a basis consistent with a liberal world trading system and the richer world it offers. We must reduce our own barriers, wherever possible, to permit our people the freest access to the foreign goods they may want to buy. The maintenance and the enlargement of our export markets are impossible without a substantial expansion of our imports. As the world's greatest creditor nation, it is our special responsibility to welcome imports.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we negotiated and put into effect 2 years ago the general agreement on tariffs and trade, a comprehensive agreement by 23 countries for the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. By this agreement we made substantial reductions in our tariffs in return for commensurate tariff concessions by the other 22 countries. In the past several months the countries which are now parties to the general agreement have been negotiating with 10 additional countries at Annecy, France. The enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949 will make possible the early conclusion of these negotiations and the accession of these additional countries to the general agreement. Thirty-three countries, carrying on approximately 80 percent of the world's trade, will then be parties to a mutual undertaking to reduce trade barriers and expand international commerce. Beyond completing the Annecy negotiations, I intend to use the authority given me by this legislation to proceed with negotiations under the general agreement to make it an even more effective document.

The trade-agreements program has been carried forward by this Government since 1934 under authority of a series of temporary enactments. A year and a half ago we completed with representatives of over 50 other countries a text of a permanent charter for an International Trade Organization which will carry forward and elaborate the principles underlying the reciprocal-trade program into a permanent world economic policy. I have placed the charter before the Congress and urged our adherence. Prompt action by the Congress to carry out this recommendation will constitute the firmest assurance to the world that the United States recognizes its position of world economic leadership and is prepared to do its share in reestablishing world economic relations on a sound competitive basis for the mutual well-being of all peoples.

The Role of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Edna Lonigan appearing in Human Events of September 21:

[From Human Events of September 21, 1949]

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress is slowly dragging to its end. President Truman denounced the "do-nothing" Eightieth Congress in what was perhaps the bitterest verbal attack ever made by an American President against the legislative process. Whether the President really likes the Eighty-first Congress better is not our concern here. The one important question for the citizen in regard to Congress is: What is the role of this representative organ in the fight to save the Republic?

Our political textbooks (following Montesquieu) have given us a picture of government as divided into three parts, legislative, executive, and judicial. Popular usage tends more and more to refer to the executive power alone as government.

Actually popular usage here is the more accurate. The executive power is profoundly different from the legislative power. The elected representatives of the people speak for the people in opposition to appointed officials responsible primarily to the Executive. It is therefore the duty of Congress to restrain the Government to do nothing that will improperly increase its power at public expense.

Montesquieu emphasized the English separation of legislative and executive powers because he clearly saw that this separation was necessary for freedom. If the French would deprive their absolute monarchy of the power to make its own laws, they could also enjoy the liberty for which the English so resolutely fought. The men who wrote our Constitution fully realized the importance of balanced powers.

Today that realization greatly needs to be revived. Our legislative agencies are still visibly separate from the executive arm, but under the surface the separation of powers is disappearing. The executive is regaining the power to make its own law, and to control the courts, although the structure outwardly appears unchanged.

There is no need for Congress if its function is merely to write laws conveying to the President in pleasing language the power to do what he likes. Clark Clifford or any other clever appointee could do that. The role of Congress is to do what the White House naturally resents: To lay down restraints on the Executive, to define the channels through which the executive power is to flow.

Since 1935, as a result of "must" legislation, lump-sum appropriations, manufactured emergencies, and foreign entanglements, the President has been arrogating to himself the power to decide the restraints which he will heed, and to define the channels through which he will dispose of the vast resources at his command.

II

We tend to forget that executive power is physical and substantial. It is the power of the military leader or commander in

chief. All the elaborate developments of the executive arm partake of the nature of the Army. Whether a Government agent is arresting dope peddlers, or promising Federal subsidies to all and sundry, he is not acting in his own person, but exercising an authority derived from the ability of the Government back of him to seize persons and property by force.

Legislative power, on the other hand, is not physical. It is legal and abstract. Executive power can be wielded by a strong and ruthless individual and his henchmen. But legislative power requires the voluntary support of a sophisticated and self-disciplined people.

Every city, State, and nation, as it grew strong, was forced to realize that the chief could use the physical power at his command against unarmed citizens who displeased him. The history of parliaments is essentially the story of how the people, after their chief had created an army, learned how to impose restraints on the force under his control.

The great forward step was made when the English-speaking people turned from the council or mass meeting to a small body of "representatives," to keep watch over the chief and his personal aides. These "representatives" of the people stumbled on the all-important factor, in protecting the citizens, when they learned that the ruler would be very reasonable if he needed money, and only if he needed money. The political problem of the republic today is still as simple as that. It is to insure that the ruler is curtailed for money.

We call the parliamentary protection of our liberties the power of the purse. It used to be called, more accurately, the separation of the purse from the sword. Our forefathers knew, what we forget, that the chief of state always possesses the sword. The people can control the sword only if they keep control of the purse, which is the power to supply the ruler's armies, or, in our more refined age, to vote the salaries of the bureaucracy.

So it should be realized that Congress is not really so much a part of government as a defense against government. It is a wall which the people have built to insure that the chief cannot send his armies to punish their leaders, or to take their property, except as they decree. When the colonists said, "No taxation without representation" they knew the score. They meant that the head of the state should not collect a penny in taxes unless their own elected agents were in full control, with power to decide where and how all taxes should be spent.

III

The twentieth century has witnessed a world-wide abdication by the people of their dearly bought right to control the sword. The people have everywhere surrendered to the personal government of the commander in chief. They have forgotten that any party which accepts personal government thereby undermines the congressional wall protecting the unarmed people against the government's arbitrary will. But no modern dictator has been rash enough openly to abolish the legislature.

Mussolini said: "I will not take from the people their legislative toy." Hitler made the Reichstag what was well called "the world's most expensive male singing society." Stalin appears at the pageants that mark the meeting of the Soviet Congress. But in all these cases the leaders themselves usurped the power of the purse.

Similarly, our different programs for big spending, since 1933, have been variants of one central plan—to give the President free money. In WPA, PWA, Lend-Lease, ECA, MAP, and all the rest of the always "emergency" legislation, Congress was never allowed to say just how the money should be spent, or to define the exact powers and duties of the spending agencies. That discretion is all the President needs. For if the law is not precise, Congress will never know whether or not the President obeys the law. Generalities are not law, no matter how legally they may be dressed up in sections and articles. Keeping the traditional form of law is merely part of the deceptive process. It is through vague and general language, cast in legal form that the Executive has regained the power to decide what laws it will observe.

When appropriations grow large enough, Congress has no hope of knowing what is really done with the money. And nowadays Congress is confronted by the Executive with a budget deliberately made so huge and complex that it cannot be analyzed. Our representatives have been driven to the expedient of suggesting that Congress tell the Executive to make its own cut of 5 or 10 percent of the amounts appropriated. But this, as Senator STYLES BRIDGES has virtually admitted, is open abdication by Congress of the power of the purse.

While Congress was deliberately immobilized by the pressure of real or fake emergencies, the Executive has been using the people's money to deluge their representatives with vials of ridicule. When ridicule was not enough, the factions which we call the party in power have turned to "purging" those Members of Congress who have fought valiantly to keep the purse separate from the sword.

IV

It is tragic to hear Americans speak of contests between the President and Congress as though we were mere bystanders at a prize fight. The Congress has no army, no bureaucracy, no courts, no jails, no propaganda arm. Its one real power, the power to withhold money from the bureaucracy, has meaning only to the extent that people support the representatives who guard the purse.

When President Truman denounced the Eightieth Congress as a "do nothing" Congress, he was really calling it a great Congress, one which held the line against executive aggression. What an opportunity the Republicans missed. How richly their last candidate deserved defeat.

When President Roosevelt tried to purge Senator GEORGE he was logical. When President Truman recently attacked Senator BYRD, he was consistent. These Executives merely sought to punish independent thinking in their own party, as everyone who seeks power must do. It is encouraging that among Democrats, rather than among Republicans, the plain people have risen to defend their defenders, as the colonists did.

The world-wide political crisis is in every country a struggle between the unarmed citizens and the chief, with his personal following, who directs the armed forces. It makes no real difference whether the headman is from the left or from the right, whether he is called a leader or a dictator or a president. In each case he and his personal aides have the all-essential physical power, and, if they can shake off the restraining influence of the people's representatives, they have power as absolute as that of Louis XIV. In almost every country, except the United States, this battle for the people is now definitely lost.

The people depend for their liberty on the strength with which Congress can impose restraints on their spending. Otherwise the sword and the purse are reunited in the hands of the ruler and his following. Then all the gains the unarmed citizenry have made in 300 years will be lost. Our Congress is the last free parliament. It contains wise and valiant men who have been fighting for 15 years to hold the line, in the hope that the people will realize in time what is at stake.

The Story of Du Mont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of Dr. Allen B. Du Mont and the men and women employed by him in my area in the development of modern television which, I truly believe, will make a remarkable contribution toward better understanding among peoples and promote peace on earth.

Last Monday afternoon the Du Mont Co., which has factories in Passaic and Clifton, N. J., dedicated a new plant in East Paterson, N. J., in the presence of Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, Dr. Du Mont and his old friend, Dr. Lee DeForest.

There was presented at the dedication the Story of Du Mont, which I know will be of real interest to the House.

THE STORY OF DU MONT

Few inventions in history have had so long a period of development as television. Starting about 1875, a long series of inventors struggled with the problem; each making his contribution and bringing it a step nearer solution.

By 1930 it was becoming increasingly apparent that there was no prospect of success with mechanical scanning devices, and that the answer must be found in an all-electronic system based on a fabulous and little-known device called a cathode-ray tube.

Theoretically, that was the answer. Practically, it gave every manufacturing man the shudders. For at that time the cathode-ray tube was little more than a laboratory curiosity—intricate, unreliable, short-lived, and so costly that only a few had been made. How could such a device be mass-produced in quantity; at a price within reach of the average family; in a form which would permit it to be placed in any home?

That was where Allen B. Du Mont came into the picture.

A graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, he had made a brilliant record with Westinghouse as chief production engineer in the lamp division. His work there in simplifying the manufacture of radio tubes was a sound background for the greater task that lay ahead. In 1930, at the age of 30, he was vice president of the De Forest Radio Co. But the cathode-ray tube offered a challenge he could not resist.

With a borrowed $1,000, Du Mont started his experimental laboratory in the basement of his home. As work on the cathode-ray tube progressed, more and more uses for it were found. The struggling laboratory was able to grow and to extend its research by manufacturing cathode-ray instruments for colleges, scientific research laboratories, and then for industry.

From its basement, the business moved to an empty storeroom; it spread out into a whole row of stores. Then came the sale of its magic eye radio tuning indicator to RCA, and with the proceeds, Du Mont bought a modern factory building at 2 Main Avenue, Passaic. Things were looking up.

Not 'til 1939 was electronic television perfected to the point where it could be put on the market. It was shown to millions that year at the New York World's Fair. Du Mont started regular broadcasts from transmitters in Passaic and New York; and began the commercial manufacture of home receivers. Several thousand were built and sold in 1939 and early 1940. Most of these are still in

operation—some with their original cathode-ray picture tubes.

Then, in 1940, new-born television passed into a sudden eclipse. The web of destiny had picked up a thread which Dr. Du Mont himself had started spinning 7 years before.

Back in 1933, along with various other inventions, Dr. Du Mont had applied for a patent on one cathode ray tube application which keen eyes in the War Department were quick to catch. He was requested to withdraw it in the interests of national security. For this application covered the basic principles of radar.

In 1940, with the country preparing for war, radar was of the utmost importance and the entire resources of the Du Mont organization were thrown into the manufacture of wartime electronic devices. The public got its first inkling of this invention when radar gave timely but unheeded warning of the approaching Japs on December 7, 1941.

War over and its military contracts completed, the company turned again to television. The war years had not been wholly wasted. They had yielded invaluable experience in the techniques of precision electronic manufacture.

Postwar Du Mont receivers were announced in 1946. They were the first line of receivers shown; in appearance and performance they were far ahead of anything else that was to appear for a long time to come; they set a high standard for the industry and were in great demand.

At the same time the company was expanding its broadcasting operation into the first television network, with Du Mont-owned stations in New York, Washington, and Pittsburgh, and affiliate stations in most television cities.

The rapid growth of the television industry has led to a great expansion of the company's manufacturing facilities. The Passaic plant, which once housed all activities, is now the research division. The former receiver plant in Clifton, N. J., is now occupied by the transmitter and cathode ray oscillograph divisions. A large, modern plant devoted exclusively to cathode ray tube production is being completed in the Allwood section of Clifton. And now the company dedicates the new East Paterson plant—the largest television assembly plant in the world.

Through all this great expansion, the company has continued, by constant research and development, to hold its place in the front of television progress; and it has been careful to maintain the same rigid standard of manufacture and inspection that contributed so much to the development of the television industry.

The Imports and Exports of Agricultural Products in Relation to the Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to say the least to hear certain new Fair Dealers wax loudly and eloquently about the agriculture price-support program. Many of the vocal ones never had anything whatsoever to do with the legislative set-up of the price-support program. It has been a nonpartisian or a bipartisan program. Representatives HULL, WOLCOTT, TALLE, and CRAWFORD have made as great a contribution as any Members to the legislative formula.

The following is from table 1 of the Foreign Agriculture Trade of the United States Department of Agriculture. It shows the imports and exports for the fiscal years of 1947–48 and 1948–49:

TABLE 1.—*Summary table: Value of foreign trade for the years 1947–48 and 1948–49*

Commodity or commodity group	Year beginning July—	
	1947–48	1948–49
SUMMARY		
	1,000 dollars	*1,000 dollars*
Total exports, all commodities	13,800,507	12,555,662
Agricultural	3,504,574	3,817,060
Total imports, all commodities	6,306,630	6,973,432
Agricultural	2,861,791	3,002,576
Complementary	1,417,629	1,470,008
Supplementary	1,444,162	1,532,568
EXPORTS (DOMESTIC)		
Agricultural	3,504,574	3,817,060
Cotton and linters, unmanufactured	341,375	814,712
Agricultural, other than cotton	3,163,199	3,002,348
Dairy products	241,237	227,383
Eggs and egg products	87,295	23,026
Lard	89,866	85,957
Beef and veal	30,772	5,970
Pork	13,949	15,310
Other meats	31,367	24,709
Field and garden seeds	14,647	12,334
Fruits and preparations	138,385	100,178
Grains and preparations	1,746,211	1,705,616
Oil cake and oil-cake meal	5,744	20,511
Oils, expressed, vegetable	64,099	77,357
Sugar	20,810	7,088
Tobacco, unmanufactured	205,893	226,065
Vegetables and preparations	179,477	122,195
Other agricultural	293,447	348,649
IMPORTS (FOR CONSUMPTION)		
Agricultural	2,861,791	3,002,576
Supplementary	1,444,162	1,532,568
Beef, canned, including corned	23,316	37,715
Cattle	20,322	84,249
Cheese	8,521	14,297
Cotton and linters, unmanufactured	46,306	39,382
Feeds and fodders	8,440	15,621
Fruits and preparations	36,411	47,141
Grains and preparations	7,781	54,356
Hides and skins	110,396	72,363
Jute and jute butts	23,563	30,711
Molasses	40,346	25,181
Nuts and preparations	54,613	55,783
Oils, expressed, vegetable	78,383	78,444
Oilseeds	146,802	105,573
Sugar, excluding beet	358,547	367,437
Tobacco, unmanufactured	69,931	75,669
Vegetables and preparations	50,181	43,366
Wool, unmanufactured, excluding free for carpets	190,420	153,577
Other supplementary agricultural	169,883	231,703

What does this table show?

First. It shows that of the agriculture imports more than half of them are "supplementary" or the kind of agriculture produced in the United States. In fact, the fur imports of the United States should be added to the $1,532,568,000 worth of competitive agriculture imports as fur farming has now been designated an agricultural system of farming.

Second. It is evident that as more and more agricultural products are imported the cost of the support program will increase. Millions of dollars have already been spent in supporting imported competing agricultural products.

Third. In round numbers one-fourth of our exports are agricultural products and one-half of our imports are agricultural products.

Fourth. In pound, bushel, and tons the agricultural imports exceed the exports as the dollars in imports are based on the price at the point of origin.

Fifth. It must be noted that a large percentage of these exports are really Marshall gifts and farm products used by the Army civilian-supply program.

Sixth. The agricultural products are not being given away and exported as fast as agricultural products are dumped on to the American markets. Further duty reductions by the pound readjustment will more assuredly intensify the seriousness of this situation.

Seventh. There is nothing wrong about the present support program except its administration. Two facts are more evident each day. One is that it costs the American taxpayers untold millions because it is politically and uneconomically administered. The second fact is that if the Fair Deal is going to support all the agricultural products of the world untold millions will be needed. The world price of most agricultural products plus the present and proposed duties is less than 90 percent parity present support price.

Eighth. When anyone gets too exercised about the egg program or any livestock program, refer them to this table and show them $814,712,000 subsidized and gift exports of cotton. The $1,705,616,000 subsidized and gifts of wheat and grain and also the $226,000,000 worth of tobacco exports that went to feed the starving children of Europe last year. The New Deal, Fair Deal agricultural program is upside down. They subsidize and give protection to some minor crops on the grounds they are basic crops, and real agricultural products like eggs, milk, beef, and pork are treated like poor relatives.

Ninth. I would like to see the administration follow the present law on milk used for manufacturing purposes and not make more promises when the present law is not being followed.

Tenth. With all the demand for supporting domestic oil prices note the $105,573,000 oil-seed imports for the past fiscal year and the $78,444,000 worth of vegetable oil imported the past fiscal year. While the Eighty-first Congress provided a 60 to 90 percent parity support for the tung oil—a $4,000,000 crop of 16,000,000 pounds domestically produced there were 133,000,000 pounds imported last year. Is it surprising that the support program will cost untold millions?

Job Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in

the Journal of Commerce recently entitled "Hits at Consequences of Job Discrimination." I think it is rather pertinent at this time, because the fair employment practices bill is very much under discussion. It follows:

HITS AT CONSEQUENCES OF JOB DISCRIMINATION

(By Joseph J. Morrow)

Another possible consequence of discrimination—more dangerous to Government, industry, and the average citizen than any other—is being brought uncomfortably to our attention almost daily in our newspapers. We have been accustomed for some time to speak knowingly of the factors which have been gaining a foothold for communism in many European countries.

A foothold, as we know, is all it needs: because the Communist Party can take over very efficiently from there. But in the beginning communism must hunt for, or create, the unhealthy conditions without which it is unable to live. I seriously doubt that the Communist Party has any real expectation of seeing a Communist government in Washington within the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, it knows that a nation split by internal divisions and group resentments makes a weak enemy.

We aren't nearly so adept at advertising our virtues as the Communists are, nor do we hide our faults, as they do. Just the same, faults must be corrected as well as acknowledged, if our democratic frankness is to be a strength instead of a weakness. The enactment of fair employment practices legislation in a number of our States, to my mind, is a very desirable forerunner to positive management action in this respect. In 1948 such legislation was effective in 6 States, had been passed in New Jersey, proposed in 15 additional States, and adopted by a number of important municipalities. The law in my home State, Connecticut, has been functioning—and well—since 1947.

National All Faith Memorial Would Honor Those Who Made Victory Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 22, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, September 2 marked exactly 4 years since the Japanese Government officially surrendered to the United Nations, thus bringing the final phase of World War II to an end. This war was in every respect the most destructive in the annals of human history. In every way, it proved the most costly to the United States of America. This was true not only in terms of treasure, but of blood. In sheer magnitude, it far overshadowed all the other wars in which the people of America had participated since the origin of our Republic. More Americans toiled, fought, and laid down their lives in behalf of victory than in all the previous conflicts which have been waged. Back of the battle lines, more Americans toiled and sacrificed on the industrial and home front than in all the conflicts of the past combined.

The total American casualties of World War II have been computed as 977,991, of which number 292,728 represent our war dead—an appalling toll indeed.

And yet, although our Government has made ample provision for the education, training, hospitalization, and medical care, and for other aid for the gallant sons and daughters who left the normal pursuits of peace to risk their all for their country, so far no plan has been adopted by our Government fittingly to honor our war dead of the Second World War and to perpetuate their memory.

As we pass through the streets of Washington, we see about us, in every direction, magnificent monuments erected by past generations to honor the memory of those who sacrificed their lives and made victory possible in former conflicts. List the martial struggles of the past, which marked the birth of the United States, its expansion, its defense from foes within and without its borders, and you will find in every single case statue or tomb or memorial park or building erected to mark the Nation's gratitude to those who laid down their lives. Only the toil and sacrifices of our heroes in the greatest contest of all time remains without a national memorial to symbolize our Nation's thanks.

I know that events of tremendous national and international importance have intervened since VJ-day to divert our attention from this omission. I know that events of crucial importance present their demands on our time and energies today. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I interpret the thought and feeling of the people of America—of the fathers and mothers whose loved ones made the supreme sacrifice for their country, for the widows and orphans left behind, for the veterans who sacrificed their health and well-being, and for the vast majority who, in some way or other, in uniform and in civilian garb, contributed their best to victory. It is their thought that the sacrifices of our war heroes befittingly honored by a grateful Nation in accordance with a practice followed by custom since the American Revolution.

It is for this reason, and in behalf of these people that I speak in behalf of House Joint Resolution 301, which I had the privilege of introducing as one of the sponsors, and which has been referred to the House Administration Committee for consideration. This resolution is one of 17 identical resolutions already introduced in the House in behalf of the establishment of a war memorial, symbolizing the fact that Americans of all faiths and origins contributed alike to victory, just as Americans of diverse faiths and origins in the past had contributed to the building of America and our American way of life. These resolutions are companion measures to Senate Joint Resolution 43, introduced in the upper House of Congress by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois.

These resolutions provide for the creation of a national commission, consisting of three Members of the House of Representatives to be chosen by the Speaker of the House, three Members of the Senate, to be chosen by the Vice President and its presiding officer, and six citizens at large to be selected by the President of the United States. It is the intention of these resolutions, for which I seek support, that this national commission select an appropriate National All Faith Memorial.

Sponsoring this project are some of the most eminent citizens of our times—including the governors of 23 States of the Union, the city council of 25 leading American cities, and a citizens' committee headed by the Honorable Barnet Hodes, of Illinois, whose distinguished career includes positions of member of the State of Illinois Tax Commission, corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, president of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and chairman of the section on municipal law of the American Bar Association. Cochairman is Paul C. Clovis, president of the Twentieth Century Press, a prominent Chicago businessman for many years, identified with the community fund, and other civic, charitable, and welfare movements. The secretary is Maj. Edward Michael Egan, whose heroic wartime services earned him the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Combat Infantry Award, Purple Heart and Italian Blue Cross decorations.

In addition to these distinguished Americans, the committee includes among its members the following outstanding citizens: Marshall Field, publisher, Chicago Sun-Times; John S. Knight, publisher, Knight Publications, Akron, Ohio; Sid McMath, Governor, State of Arkansas; Paul R. Anderson, president, Pennsylvania College for Women; Charles L. Anspach, president, Central Michigan College of Education; Dr. Charles W. Armstrong, past president, Kiwanis International, Salisbury, N. C.; E. J. Ashbaugh, dean, Miami University, Ohio; Morgan Barnes, Committee on Participation of Rotarians in Postwar World, Grove City, Pa.; John W. Bonner, Governor, State of Montana; Louis Bromfield, author, Mansfield, Ohio; Henry Steele Commager, historian, Columbia University; the Right Reverend Wallace E. Conkling, bishop of Chicago; Michael V. Disalle, mayor, Toledo, Ohio; Mendell N. Fisher, executive director, Jewish National Fund, New York City; Martin Goldring, Goldring, Inc., New York City; Dr. S. Ralph Harlow; Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, bishop, Diocese of Southern Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio; A. A. Lemieux, S. J., president, Seattle University; Rev. N. D. Linder, St. Mark's Church, Islip, N. Y.; Leo Loeb, pathologist, St. Louis, Mo.; J. Hillis Miller, president, University of Florida; John S. Millis, president, University of Vermont; H. Clarence Nixon, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; John O. Pastore, Governor, State of Rhode Island; Harris F. Perlstein, president, Pabst Brewing Co., Chicago, Ill.; R. R. Renne, president, Montana State College; Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana; Roy L. Smith, the Methodist Publishing House, Chicago, Ill.; Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor, State of Illinois; Clarence K. Streit, editor, Washington, D. C.; Alva W. Taylor, Conference of Southern Mountain Workers, Nashville, Tenn.; Bradford Williams, secretary, American Society of

Landscape Architects; G. Mennen Williams, Governor, State of Michigan; James H. Wolfe, justice, supreme court, State of Utah; Carl R. Woodward, president, Rhode Island State College.

In behalf of these members, who represent every shade of religious belief and national origin, and who have all contributed in some particular way to America and the American way of life, as well as in behalf of the millions of other loyal Americans who share their faith in our national unity, it is a privilege for me to appeal for your support of House Joint Resolution 301.

Resolution on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wesnesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the National Baptist Convention, Inc., United States of America, which represents an estimated 4,000,000 Negro Baptists, recently met in Los Angeles, Calif., and adopted a resolution on the subject of civil-rights legislation. I believe the thinking of the Baptists gathered at Los Angeles in their national convention expresses generally the sentiment of the Negro people. For the information of the Members of the House, the text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has repeated, espoused, and championed the causes of the minority groups in a civil-rights program, FEPC, poll taxes, and other denied constitutional guaranties.

The President just recently declared before the National Democratic Committee that there are two things in his life of which he is more proud than anything else: that he was elected without the industrial East (New York), and the solid South (meaning the solid South opposed his human-rights program).

Whereas we have observed very closely the officeholders in the Senate, known as the Dixiecrats, who revolted the President's civil-rights program, and some Republicans of the Senate joined their efforts in defeating every effort to bring before Congress that which would lead to a vote for civil rights.

It is high time for the leaders of the Negro people, especially the ministers, who are the prophetic voices of God, charged by the spirit of God, to speak boldly in the defense of justice, and with the responsibility to resist all forms of oppression, and to preach universal good-will and global brotherhood.

We want the world to know that we have no sympathy for any movement to overthrow this, our Government of the United States of America, by violence. We have not even any foreign interest in any government outside of the United States of America, or in any other form of government, but we are determined that the democracy of the United States work the same for the Negro in every State of the Union, north, south, east, and west, with full and equal rights of the Negro.

We agree with Dr. Sandy Ray, chairman of our social-service commission of the National Baptist Convention:

"If calling for the practical application of the principles of the Constitution of the United States for all citizens, constitutes subversive activity, we are all guilty.

"If the claim that all of the benefits and privileges of a democratic society should be extended to all of the members of that society, constitutes subversive activity, then we are all guilty.

"If seeking to break down discrimination and segregation in housing, in education, in hotels, restaurants, travel, and employment, health facilities, and extend equal opportunities to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin, is a move to overthrow the Government, we are guilty, and we may add, doubly guilty.

"If our protest against police brutality, search, and seizure without warrants and injustice in courts constitute disloyalty, we are guilty."

We, therefore, feel that the civil-rights program which has been publicized and awaits an opportunity to be placed before Congress includes all of the above constitutional rights of minority people of the United States.

We further feel that now they are belated and hindered by filibusters and what not, and that further delay will hinder the progress of civilization and impose the condemnation of God, therefore it should have the immediate consideration of Congress, regardless of party affiliations.

We, the National Baptist Convention, Inc., of the United States, feel that the program of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is the program of God the Father and is none other than the program of civil rights as has been publicized before the nations and the United States of America.

We, therefore, commend the President of the United States and all Senators of any party of the Senate and Congress who have sought to present such legislation, and we pray God's blessing upon you that you may continue to carry on until victory has been won.

We want you to know that the National Baptist Convention represents over 4,000,000 votes that are behind your civil-rights program, and we shall use our influence to support for office only those who believe and pledge themselves to stand up for the civil-rights program as has been expressed in these statements, the civil-rights document now in your hand.

We urge the enactment of the following civil-rights legislation:

1. Establishment by the Government of an active aggressive campaign to defend and enforce civil rights and liberties: Housing education, enforcement of the abolition of discrimination in all branches of the armed forces.

2. Establishment of fair-employment practices.

3. Abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting.

4. Enactment of a Federal antilynching law.

5. Elimination of discrimination within civic and professional groups.

6. As a Christian group, we denounce the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, with or without hoods, and call upon our Attorney General to prosecute this and all other lawless groups which intimidate citizens without due process of law.

The major theme of our Nation is national security. We do not believe that security can be based purely upon economic, military, and statesmanship basis. We believe that moral and spiritual values must undergird our national security. It is a moral and spiritual responsibility of a democracy to extend the privileges of that democracy to all of its citizens.

A. Wendell Ross, Chairman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Sandy F. Ray, New York, N. Y.; George H. Crawley, Sr., Baltimore, Md.; John E. Nance, St. Louis, Mo.; W. H. Jerrngan, Washington, D. C.; S. D. Ross, Detroit, Mich.; James F. Wertz, Charlotte, N. C.; L. K. Jackson, Gary, Ind.; M. L. Ramsome, Charleston, Va.; E. Huntley, St. Louis, Mo.; Valley V. Stokes, Maryland; Alexander Gregory, West Virginia; Benjamin J. Perkins, Cleveland, Ohio; Simion Williamson, Maryland; Leroy Bowman, Annapolis, Md.; W. L. Clayton, Maryland; G. W. Reed, Kansas City, Mo.; N. W. Whitt, Selma, Ala.; R. C. Campbell, Boonville, Mo.; W. A. Sparks, Kansas City, Mo.; S. Y. Nelson, Texas; E. T. Brown, Tennessee; T. Moore King, Joliet, Ill.; M. K. Curry, Jr., Wichita Falls, Tex.; G. W. Lucas, Toledo, Ohio; Calvin Perkins, Birmingham, Ala.; D. A. Holmes, Kansas City, Mo.; George H. Sims, New York, N. Y.; J. Carl Mitchel, West Virginia; Attorney A. T. Walden, Atlanta, Ga.; J. R. Davis; Marshall A. Talley, Indianapolis, Ind.; J. Franklin Walker, Cincinnati, Ohio; Jonathan L. Caston, Los Angeles, Calif.; W. P. Whitfield, Edwards, Miss.; William H. Ballen, Louisville, Ky.; R. C. Woods, Hot Springs, Ark.; James M. Bracy, St. Louis, Mo.; W. Louis Petty, Chicago, Ill.; J. H. Jackson, Chicago, Ill.; L. A. Pinkston, Atlanta, Ga.; D. J. Benefield, New York, N. Y.; Robert L. Rollins; W. H. Thompson, Baltimore, Md.; Thomas J. Houston, Washington, D. C.; A. J. Payne, Baltimore, Md.; J. B. Reid; William Holmes, Atlanta, Ga.; J. L. Moore, Illinois; E. C. Smith, Washington, D. C.; Roland Smith, Little Rock, Ark.; S. C. Taylor, Pennsylvania.

Looking Into the Future With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address entitled "Looking Into the Future With America," which was delivered by the Rev. Robert J. Slavin, O. P., president of Providence College, Providence, R. I., at the annual convention of the New England Police Chiefs held in New Hampshire on September 10, 1949. It is one of the most enlightening, one of the most informative, and one of the most sensible talks I have ever had the pleasure of listening to. It would be well for every Member of Congress to take the time to read it.

The address follows:

LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE WITH AMERICA

When Manuel Quezon, former President of the Philippines, talked in Washington on his last visit to our country, he mentioned how surprised he was to find the people in the United States talking about their rights, for he said that in his country the stress was on the duties of citizens. Taking this theme as a stepping-off place, I have chosen to speak to you on the government of free people in relation to the future of these United States.

The delimitation of the function of the state in the modern world is perhaps the most critical issue which confronts mankind. The dislocations brought about by the rise of industrialism have had a shattering effect on all social institutions, the family in particular. It is increasingly apparent that we have need for more effective means of social

control. Individualism and free enterprise need to be restrained and disciplined if we are to spare ourselves confusion, insecurity, and misery. Society must find better instrumentalities for implementing its common will.

In these latter years there has emerged the totalitarian state, which offers itself as the solution of all our problems. It subjects every phase of human life and every form of human activity to political domination and makes government omnicompetent. It turns its back on the whole tradition of freedom and democratic self-government. According to its philosophy, the individual exists for the state, and all of his interests must be subordinated to the demands of government.

Totalitarianism at first produced results in the way of better social integration and a wider distribution of wealth that were striking and served to deceive the disillusioned the world over. Communism was widely hailed as the force that would save society. Fascism impressed many with its possibilities. Preoccupation with the problem of widening the area of social security led to a neglect of the claims of personal freedom. Dictatorship seemed to be able to get things done and to get them done without much waste of time. This fact recommended it to those who were growing impatient with the more cumbersome processes of democracy and who had not learned to labor and to wait.

Now totalitarianism by its very nature is contrary to the best interests of humanity. A totalitarian government could not possibly be a good government. Even if the individual or the class or the party that wields authority were highly enlightened and always acted on the promptings of virtue, the system would still involve a constant threat to human happiness, because it deprives men and women of that freedom of thought and action to which they have an inherent right.

Totalitarianism involves an excessive claim of authority on the part of government. It makes for bureaucratic dominations of the political, economic, social, and religions of a people. It denies freedom of consicence, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of education, freedom of property, freedom of the ballot, and freedom of assembly.

Totalitarianism is predicated on a concept of nationality that is false and contrary to Christian teaching concerning the unity of the race. It exalts a nation at the expense of its neighbors and justifies the domination and exploitation of other peoples. It is the foe of international amity and breeds war. In foreign relations as well as in domestic affairs it submits all things to the arbitration of force. As long as it continues to exist in the world under any guise, there can be no hope for an enduring peace.

THE AMERICAN SCENE

Here in the United States we have been witnessing a gradual sphere of government. Our efforts to arm ourselves against the threat of powers hostile to our institutions and our way of life have accelerated this expansion. More and more authority over a wider and wider range of activities has been vested in the Federal Government until the average citizen has become much more conscious of Washington than he is of his State capital or even of the authority that is local.

According to the minds of our Founding Fathers this was to be a nation of separate States possessed of a large measure of autonomy, united under a central government whose powers are enumerated in the Constitution. In other words, they intended to preserve as much local self-government as possible in order to keep the political power amenable to popular control. Under the Constitution the Federal Government does not possess a plenitude of power out of which it delegates authority to the States; on the contrary, it only possesses such powers as the States yield to it.

In the beginning we were an agricultural Nation, which means among other things that in the various sections of the country the people were economically self-sufficient in a very large degree. Their markets were close at hand, as were their sources of supply. Today we have become an industrial Nation and the area of our mutual interdependence has widened tremendously. The things we need for our daily existence are no longer produced in our immediate neighborhood, and if we have anything to sell, we must think in terms of distant markets. Commerce is overwhelmingly interstate, and very little manufacture is any longer purely local. Lobsters trapped off the Maine coast are marketed in Chicago the following morning. Fresh fruit from California enriches the New Yorkers' diet; ore mined in Minnesota is processed in Pittsburgh.

Improved means of communication make next-door neighbors out of people who live far away. Telephone, telegraph, and radio eliminate distance. An orchestra plays in New York and is listened to in Texas. By simply taking down the receiver, we can converse with a friend or business associate across the continent.

No longer is it a hardship to travel and to move from place to place. We can go almost anywhere with speed and marvelous comfort and are not compelled by the difficulties of transportation to stay at home. The railroad, the airplane, the automobile have wondrously increased our mobility, and they make it possible for us to roam far and wide over the land.

As a result of all this, we are forced more and more to think and to act in terms of the Nation at large. Our problems are no longer localized, and State boundaries have lost much of their significance. Social and economic problems refuse to be solved on a neighborhood basis, and we have recourse to the Federal Government.

The dangers to free institutions and to popular self-government in this centralizing trend are apparent. The further the control of the intimate details of everyday life is removed from the man on the street, the less chance there is that his point of view and his predilections will be consulted. Distant government becomes impersonal and entrenches itself in bureaucracy. It comes under the influence of the politically powerful and gets out of touch with the people. The ballot loses its effectiveness as a safeguard of personal liberty, for the issues become confused and are no longer understandable in terms of personal experience. People come to feel that government is something that belongs to someone else, and as their opportunities for direct participation dwindle, they gradually lose interest. The civil servant becomes a master and a law unto himself.

However, it is a fact that, contemporary conditions being what they are, the people of the United States must make a greater use of their Federal Government if they are to solve many of the problems that confront them. The economic life of the Nation has become highly centralized and will not respond to social controls that are local. Some cherish the dream of a decentralization of industry and business, but the chances of its realization are slight indeed. Meanwhile, men, women, and children are being deprived of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is their American birthright. Intransigence in the face of harsh realities is hard to justify.

The American people, for the preservation of their liberties and the perpetuation of their way of life, must find a way of utilizing their central government without at the same time losing anything that is vital of local self-rule. It is not an easy task that faces them, and it will call for statesmanship and intelligence of the highest order. There must be fostered an abiding sensitivity to encroachments on fundamental liberties and a vigilance that never nods. Proposals and projects must be scrutinized most minutely and the impulse to get quick results with little heed to ultimate consequences restrained. The political education of the common people will have to be vastly improved if they are to give direction to government and keep their hand on the controls.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE

The tardiness with which other agencies adjust themselves to the changing circumstances of the times and the inability of the normal processes of society to function amid abnormal conditions have been the occasion of an assumption on the part of the Government of a wide range of new responsibilities. Government has entered the fields of business and industry, has taken cognizance of the plight of agriculture, has broadened the control of education, has embarked on large-scale ventures in the domain of welfare and social service. As a consequence, its costs have increased tremendously, and the burden begins to weigh heavily on the taxpayer.

He would be presumptuous indeed who would attempt to define in any specific manner the proper limits of the Federal Government activity. In times like these when human values are at stake, doctrinaire quibbling is out of order. No one has summed it all up better than Pius XII in the following words taken from the Encyclical on the Function of the State in the Modern World:

"True courage and a heroism worthy in its degree of admiration and respect, are often necessary to support the hardships of life, the daily weight of misery, growing want, and restrictions on a scale never before experienced, whose reason and necessity are not always apparent. Whoever has the care of souls and can search hearts knows the hidden tears of mothers, the resigned sorrow of so many fathers, the countless bitterness of which no statistics tell or can tell. He sees with sad eyes the mass of sufferings ever on the increase; he knows how the powers of disorder and destruction stand on the alert ready to make use of all these things for their dark designs. No one of good will and vision will think of refusing government, in the exceptional conditions of the world of today, correspondingly wider and exceptional rights to meet the popular needs. But even in such emergencies, the moral law, established by God, demands that the lawfulness of each such measure and its real necessity be scrutinized with the greatest rigor according to the standards of the common good."

No matter what the crisis, the moral law is never suspended. Its authority will be vindicated if the American people move forward within the framework of their Constitution and hold fast to the principles that have kept them free ere now.

It is the function of the State so to order the affairs of temporal life as to facilitate the attainment on the part of the citizen of physical, intellectual, and moral perfection. Happiness results from living the good life, and the good life is the life of virtue. The State is always a means, never an end in itself, and it governs best when it fosters in the citizen the ability to govern himself.

Hence, the State should be solicitous to strengthen and improve those institutions which are prior to it in society and whose rights take precedence over its own, such as the family, the church, and economic groups. It should not attempt to supplant them and should never take any action that would weaken their effectiveness. Lasting social reforms can only be accomplished through voluntary cooperation. As a consequence, the State should stimulate its citizens to find the solution of their problem through free cooperation and not under compulsion. A democracy loses its soul when it loses faith in itself and becomes impatient of democratic processes.

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE

The American State has yet to reach a satisfactory solution of the issue of its relationship with organized religion. Under the Constitution, Congress is prohibted from passing any laws respecting the establishment of religion, and the fitness of any citizen to vote or to hold public office is not to be determined on the basis of any religious test. Church and State are separated by our fundamental law.

However, the importance of religion in the life of the Nation is recognized in numerous ways. Those who hold public office are required to take oath before God that they will live up to their responsibilities to the utmost of their powers. The sessions of the Congress are opened with prayer and ministers of religion have been appointed as Chaplains for this purpose. They have likewise been made commissioned officers in the Army and Navy in order that they may minister to the spiritual needs of soldiers and sailors. The religious rights of the people have been upheld by the courts. All in all, there is an abundant recognition of the fact that a man's relations with his God are sacrosanct and are to be safeguarded in the interest of the common welfare.

It is one thing to demand State support for religion, but quite another thing to insist that religion be supported in the State. Nothing bodes so ill for the future of a society as the decline of religion. When that bond disintegrates, no other bond will hold. Government needs religion more than it needs anything else on earth, for religion is the source of everything that makes life worth while and is the ultimate safeguard of liberty. A nation which fosters science and art and is lavish in its expenditures for the bread-and-butter phases of life but at the same time starves the soul of man is planting the seeds of its own destruction. It is building its house without the Lord, which means that it is building it in vain.

All that stands in the way of a solution of this problem is a precedent and a prejudice. The precedent is the result of a compromise effected 100 years ago when sectarian differences seemed irreconciliable. The compromise was the work of men of limited experience and vision. Perhaps wider experience and broader vision would discover that the differences can be reconciled as they have been in other free lands. As to the prejudice, it is essentially un-American and should not be permitted to exert any influence in a nation consecrated to the ideals of freedom and justice.

CIVIC VIRTUE

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of education, and freedom of assembly are vitally necessary for the preservation of a democratic government, because without them the people would be denied access to the facts that they must know if they are to reach intelligent decisions on public policy. In a dictatorship these decisions are made by the powers that be, and the ordinary citizen is told as little as possible. But in a nation where the authority of the state rests on the consent of the governed, it stands to reason that such consent must be free. It will be free only if it is enlightened, which means that there must be the widest possible diffusion of information.

Every citizen in a free country has the obligation of being intelligent about the public affairs. The decision he makes personally and which he registers when he casts his ballot affect the common welfare. In reaching them, he must proceed as a rational being; he must think clearly. It is important that he develop his powers of critical judgment lest he succumb to the blandishments of propaganda. He must become skillful in weighing issues carefully and in applying his own common sense. He must be able to appraise his own motives and be equipped with that measure of self-knowledge that will make him chary of choosing on the basis of personal or class interest and prejudice.

Rational behavior of this description requires more than mere knowledge; allied to an enlightened mind must be a strong will. The basic requirement for effective citizenship in a democracy is character.

It is of the highest importance that this fact be underscored at the present time when there is so much concern for the future of our democracy caused by the realization that we have failed largely to develop adequate education for citizenship. Our immediate impulse is to do things that are striking and dramatic, to wave the flag and roll the drums and in other ways to appeal to the emotions. Along with this there are hectic attempts to force the man on the street to think. By means of the radio, television, of forums, of discussion groups, as well as through the medium of pamphlets and brochures of all descriptions, information is poured into his mind. We are told it is necessary for him to hear all sides of every question and to have access to every shade of opinion

Now, all of this may be very good, but it is decidedly not enough. As a matter of fact, without something else it may serve only to confound confusion. Knowledge is definitely not virtue. Civic education is not acquired by listening. Discussion may bring about clarification of ideas, but of itself it does not translate ideas into dynamic action. It may result in nothing more than talk. Education for citizenship is acquired by living the life of a citizen. We learn to do by doing.

The local community offers opportunities for learning the ways of democracy through personal, active participation in its processes. That is why the preservation of local self-government is so vital to our national welfare. Our task it is to discover ways and means of bringing together the various religious, social, and economic groups in every community for the purpose of developing a common program to meet common needs. Committees of citizens representing different interests and shades of opinion may well be formed to give advice and direction to Government officials in the carrying out of measures that have been enacted into law. Out of the resulting personal experience, the people will come to a fuller realization of the fact that their Government belongs to them, that they must use it for their purposes and not allow it to use them. In a word, they will acquire the habits of democracy.

The right to vote carries with it a sacred responsibility. It dare not be exercised lightly and without full and adequate consideration of the issues that are involved. When we elect individuals to represent us in the Government we are, in large measure, responsible for the way in which public affairs are conducted. They have our mandate and they are acting in our stead. If because of our carelessness or our dereliction in the use of the ballot the wrong kind of people are elected, the blame is ours.

The voter who is motivated by any consideration short of the common welfare is a traitor to the trust committed to him. He is buying with his ballot privileges and advantages to which he has no right and is contributing to the breakdown of Government.

On the other hand, those who are elected to public office have the patriotic duty before God to labor conscientiously for the promotion of the common welfare and for the upholding of the principles of justice. Their authority is derived ultimately from God. If they use their office in the interest of personal, pecuniary gain, or if they are swept away by a lust for personal power, they are committing sin. There is no such thing as "honest graft." The fact that a dishonest public official uses his ill-gotten goods or his irresponsible power to help the poor and lowly or to advance this good cause or that does not make him anything else than what he is in the sight of God—namely, a betrayer of the public trust and a dangerous foe to good government.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The human family has not yet found the way to live together in peace and unity. May it soon find the way in reason, embodied in international legislation and adjudication. The world over men, women, and children are fundamentally alike. The same things make them gay or sad. They cherish the same hopes and dreams and hunger alike for contentment and security. They marry and give in marriage and feel the same glad exultation when things go right. National boundaries, differences of race or color, do not alter the fact that everywhere there are fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, sweethearts, friends, and neighbors. Everywhere they are human beings, warmed by the same sun, chilled by the same winter, fed by the same food, protected by the same shelter, eager for love, eager for happiness.

Yet, in spite of it all, they are hating one another and killing one another because of national differences. Because this man lives 5 miles to the east of an imaginary line and another 5 miles to the west, they are supposed to be enemies, and the welfare of one demands the destruction of the other. Nations do not seem to be able to grasp the fact that they are bound by reciprocal ties, that the human race is, in fact, a great commonwealth, and that the good of any people can be achieved only within the pattern of the common good of all. The great challenge to the nations is to find a substitute for war to adjudicate their differences.

The root of it all is that distortion and exaggeration of love of country that is false nationalism. It is the doctrine that holds that the welfare of a people demands that it develop power at all costs, no matter what happens to its neighbors; that the nation must be self-sufficient and strong enough to enforce all its demands.

False nationalism is nothing more than the application of the principles of individualism, with all that they imply of greed and ruthless competition, to a national economy. It makes a mockery of mutual trust and refuses to respect international agreements. It subscribes to the principle that might makes right and that the fittest alone should survive.

Because of the character of modern society and the economic interdependence of peoples the world over, it is next to impossible to localize a war. Neutrality becomes a fiction that is not respected and which cannot be maintained. No nation can isolate itself from the rest of the world, and because its interests are far-flung they are bound to become involved in any large-scale conflict.

After a second world war, we think of peace and try to get a glimpse at least of a world order that will square with the dignity of human nature and minister unto human happiness. As a nation, we have a profound obligation to cooperate in the fashioning of such an order. We are our brother's keeper, whether he be white or black or yellow; whether he is at home in Africa or on the plains of the Argentine; whether he be German, British, French, or Italian. Whatever he is, wherever he is, he belongs to us. He is a child of God, redeemed by Christ's precious blood, and we dare not pass by and leave him wounded by the roadside.

"One nation's will to live," says Pius XII, "must never be tantamount to a death sentence for another." We have no designs on any other people; nor have we any dream of conquest. Yet our desire to maintain peace for ourselves does not justify us in defaulting on our obligations to others. We would be sentencing other nations to die were we to isolate ourselves from them, banish them from our plans, and leave them to their fate.

Over the destinies of men and of nations rules the providence of God and so disposes of natural processes and human events that they are made to minister to supernatural purposes. There is, for example, the emergence of these United States of America. On this continent men of all races, of all nationalities, have been brought close together and have set up for themselves a society in which differences do not count. To be sure, this unity has been a long while in the making and it is still far from perfect. Distinctions are still observed. But, by and large, we have come a long, long way and have given evidence to the world that accident of birth and historical background really do not matter and that human beings who live close to one another, who mingle with one another, who meet one another constantly and intimately, gradually come to know and trust one another, to lose that fear of one another that is born of strangeness, and, bit by bit, achieve a sense of common interest and reach a community of ideals and aspirations. They learn to bear one another's burdens without favor or distinction and gradually create a great and powerful nation dedicated to the ideals of freedom and justice for all and increasingly zealous for the welfare of each and every one of its citizens.

There is not a man or a woman among us today, whether in high place or in low, who understands fully all that is involved in the present confusion or who can discern with any clarity the shape of things to come. Great changes are taking place in human society, and even greater changes will take place in the days that are ahead. We are in the midst of a world revolution, of which the war is just one phase that has passed.

Some things we can see and see clearly. Ideas and ideologies are being propagated and fought for that are false and dangerous. On these, political and economic structures have been reared that are evil. We know these must be destroyed if there is to be any hope for decent living under the sun.

The while we destroy what is evil, we dare not forget our responsibility for building what is good. At this point, we stand in vital need of guidance and help from the wisdom and power that is God. If we refuse to have God in our knowledge, if we banish Him from our deliberations the while we make our plans for a postwar world, then like all who in ages gone have made the same fatal mistake, we are sowing the seeds of our own destruction.

Unfortunately for us and for the world, this land of ours has become a bit strange to God and the things of God. Once we were a religious people. It was primarily because we understood the necessity of religion for human happiness and well-being that we established our schools and means of education. In the Declaration of Independence we claimed for ourselves the rights that belonged to us because God had created us, and we came forth free from His hands.

In recent years we have strained at our moorings to the Divine, and too frequently we have sundered them completely. Our education is no longer rooted and founded in religion; people no longer consider it an obligation to go to church; literally millions are utterly illiterate in matters religious. We do not know God and hence we do not glorify Him or give Him thanks. The visible things all around us bring to our foolish minds no meanings whatever of things that are invisible. We profess ourselves to be wise. Yet we are vain in our thoughts; and, if we but knew it, darkness broods over our hearts.

All of this must, of necessity, handicap us most seriously in the mission we have undertaken to bring about a universal acceptance of those fundamental principles of truth and justice that must govern the actions of individuals and nations if there is to be peace in the world.

For what America professes to stand for, what America strives for, what America fought for, what America dreams, has neither reality nor substance apart from belief in God. We talk of the brotherhood of man, but men are brothers only because there is a common Father in heaven. We dilate on the sacredness of the human personality; but human beings are sacred, not because we say so, but because they are creatures whom God has fashioned according to His image and likeness, redeemed by the precious blood of His Son, and destined for eternal union with Him. We make strong pronouncements in favor of religious freedom; but some are so befuddled in this thinking, so obtuse to the dictates of right reason, that they justify on this score the freedom of government to attempt to destroy religion. We would break asunder the shackles that tyranny has forged to enslave mankind; but we fail to take due cognizance of the fact that human liberty can be guaranteed only on the condition that we recognize the authority of God and submit our wills to the yoke of His Commandments. A nation that is forgetful of God, that pays Him but occasional lip service, could easily enough become a nation that is godless, and godlessness never created anything of lasting value. It is a deadly virus that enervates, debilitates, and eventually devastates all that is fine and decent and noble and sacred.

High time it is that we got down on our knees, made full confessions of our disloyalty to Our Maker, and acknowledged that we are not sufficient unto ourselves. If we have gotten off our course, it is because we have refused to steer according to the compass of His Holy Will. We must rediscover the America our fathers founded and in which their hopes were vested, the America of faith in God, the America of churches and church-going people, the America of men and women and children who pray and walk in the divine presence, the America that feeds its intellect on heavenly wisdom and not on the husks served up by shallow-minded teachers and writers who lack the education and the mental stamina to understand the American soul and to cling to the American tradition.

In conclusion may I offer to this distinguished body a creed of belief that must be put into action if America be truly great in the future.

THE CREED OF THE TRUE AMERICAN CITIZEN

I believe in a personal, provident God who made the world and all that it contains.

I believe in God, Who is my Father in God, who became my Brother, in God who purifies, sanctifies, and guides me.

I believe in the brotherhood of man wherein all men are free in will, immortal in destiny, redeemed in soul and therefore that moral failure is moral fault, social failure, moral fault.

I believe in man as created by God in a supernatural state with a supernatural destiny and that grace is the vital, imminent principle of this life which does not supplant but supplements natural life.

I believe in the divinely established existence of a world-wide visible body which calls all men to its membership and to social solidarity by love and service of fellow men.

I believe in the solidarity effected by the organism of the mystical body of Christ which unites us as members of that body so intimately that our smallest action is not an isolated action.

I believe in liberty to worship God and practice religion, to obey the dictates of conscience, to exercise natural rights.

I believe in the thoroughly good man as the thoroughly good citizen.

I believe in politics and economics which receive their sanction from morality, their motive force from morality and result in moral good or moral evil.

I believe in man's claim to the perfect life of rights enjoyed through the life of duties fulfilled.

I believe in the family as a natural society giving a fuller life to the individual with rights to exist, develop, and propagate.

I believe in the right to private property, to education, and to employment.

I believe in the state, as a natural institution, and that it gives a fuller life to the family even as the church gives a richer life to all nations.

I believe in the rights of the individual and the family as independent and prior to the state and that the duty of the state is to understand and safeguard these rights.

I believe in the state existing for the individual considered as a sovereign entity; as members of society and citizens, men exist for the state.

I believe in no sense is it detrimental to be considered a part of the state for civil society is a means whereby man attains individual and social perfection.

I believe that the greater the freedom of the citizens, the greater the nation.

I believe that service to my Nation even to the laying down of my life in her defense is no violation of freedom but a necessary duty of loyal citizens.

I believe that since the Nation has a right to call upon me to the extent of my life, she consequently has the right to call upon me for lesser services.

I believe that our Constitution fosters freedom and opposes all forms of permanent dictatorship whether of individuals, classes, minorities, or races.

I believe that workingmen have a right to a living wage; that management, labor, and consumer should work in harmony; that labor unions should strive for the interests of the workers, the industry, and the public.

I believe that social legislation should be adopted regarding wages, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, children and women in industry, and social security.

I believe that the welfare of city and country, industry and agriculture, is had by social cooperation and a harmonizing of all interests for the good of all.

I believe that international relations based on justice and charity demand the elimination of false nationalism and the substitutions of genuine patriotism and international striving for peace.

I believe that race prejudice and all forms of bigotry are foreign to the fundamental principle of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is the glorious heritage of every American citizen.

I believe that the United States will attain its high destiny by teaching men that although they regulate their actions by justice, justice is perfected only by charity.

I believe in the lasting glory of the flag of the United States and the republic for which it stands—one Nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

Third World War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again on the floor of this Chamber, that one man in the history of our great country above all others, had the proper philosophy and thinking on the subject of mutual defense assistance acts and the like. He was the man

who made our freedom and independence possible while in the throes of British subjugation. That individual was our President and former general, George Washington, who in his Farewell Address to the country advised friendship with all nations and entangling alliances with none. His advice was very sound then and I regret exceedingly that it is not being adhered to today.

The money appropriated in the military-assistance program before us today and all of the other billions upon billions of dollars that we appropriated for this purpose went mainly for the interest and benefit of the very country that kept our colonists under subjugation and who forced us to shed our blood in order to free ourselves from their oppressive yoke and obnoxious theory of taxation without representation.

I feel that history will record that these alliances and legislation designed to arm Europe and the other nations are all a grave mistake. Instead of tending toward peace and tranquility among the freedom-loving peoples of the world, we are aiding, assisting, and encouraging a war as sure as the night follows the day.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the press of this country, for the most part, the brass hats of the armed services, the international Wall Street bankers, and those who have vast interests in the I. G. Farben and other foreign holdings, have been and are conducting a propaganda campaign that even excels the propaganda of the British and the Nazis after the First World War attempting to convince the United States that we should forgive and forget their billions of dollars of obligations that they owe our country. It will be found further that the munition makers and war profiteers are behind this propaganda.

We are in fact aiding and coddling the Nazis today. Witness the propaganda that is currently being disseminated and which is contrary to the Potsdam agreement, which in effect directs the dismantling of the German plants, cartels, and war potentials. This propaganda states that we should not dismantle the German plants and willfully and deliberately overlooks the Potsdam agreement. Is not this the road to another war? With the information and knowledge that I possess I cannot bring myself or my conscience to condone this dangerous step. The Potsdam agreement should be enforced. I greatly fear that with all of our good intentions and with all of our wealth we cannot control the thinking and convictions of peoples of foreign nations who harbor jealousy and suspicion of each other, and to furnish them with arms will give them the means to war against each other.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I voted to aid the suffering, starving, and homeless people of Europe, and I will do so again, for rehabilitation purposes; I will vote to furnish these deserving people with bread, but not with lead, as we are doing today.

May I urge the American people, and especially the American mothers who I know fear another war, to make their views known to their Senators and Congressmen.

Support Price for Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while the milkshed producers have for years enjoyed the provisions of the milk marketing agreements the great volume of milk used for manufacturing purposes has been receiving the short end of the legislative stick.

The present law states that milk and its products shall be supported at 90 percent of parity. There are two questions then that should be answered. What is the parity price of milk used for manufacturing and what is the legal lawful support price for milk used for manufacturing purposes? The second question is how would the present support price compare with the support proposed under the Brannan plan?

Milk used for manufacturing purposes has been selling for less than the present law provides. No one can question this statement of fact because in July the Secretary of Agriculture announced a support for cheese that was 4 cents per pound above the 27 cents per pound cheese was bringing. I hereby submit the following letter from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as of August 2, 1949:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will acknowledge your letter of July 26, to Mr. O. V. Wells, requesting information on parity prices. Mr. Wells is out of the city at present.

This Bureau calculates and publishes parity prices for a list of major direct agricultural commodities each month. These parity prices pertain to the fifteenth of the month and are published about the twenty-ninth of the month. Heretofore the parity price concept has applied only to direct agricultural commodities as sold by farmers and has not applied to processed agricultural products. Parity prices as published by this bureau are national parity prices and are comparable to the national average prices received by farmers for all classes and grades of the commodities as sold by them in their local markets.

In answer to your direct question, if the United States average price received by farmers for a commodity during the period August 1909–July 1914 was $1.50 per bushel or per 100 pounds, the parity price as of July 15, 1949, would be $1.50 times 2.44, or $3.66 per bushel or per 100 pounds. If the United States average price received by farmers during the period August 1909–July 1914 averaged $1.45 per bushel or per 100 pounds, the parity price as of July 15, 1949, would be $1.45 times 2.44, or $3.54 per bushel or per 100 pounds.

I assume that your request for parity prices as of July 26 means that you want the latest parity prices available. Technically the parity price of a commodity on July 26 would be the latest published parity price at that time or the parity price as of June 15, since the July 15 parity price was not published until July 29.

In administering a support price program, it is possible to determine differentials for grade, location, season, and other factors which can be applied to the national parity price when it is necessary.

Despite the fact that the parity concept does not apply to processed agricultural products, it is, of course, possible in the administration of a support-price program to purchase processed products at prices which will reflect the support price to the producers of the direct agricultural commodity.

Sincerely yours,

F. F. ELLIOTT,
Acting Chief.

Since milk at evaporated milk plants brought $1.50 during the base period of 1909–14, the parity price for this milk as shown in the letter is $3.66 per hundredweight and 90 percent of $3.66 is $3.29 per hundredweight. Milk for this purpose has been selling for $2.80 so the producer has been receiving 40 to 50 cents per hundredweight less than the law provides.

Since cheese brought 14.5 cents per pound at Plymouth for the base 1909–14 period the parity price for milk for cheese would be $3.54 per hundredweight and the support based on Plymouth cheese at 32 cents per pound.

UNDER THE BRANNAN PLAN

Milk for manufacturing purposes has not been announced. A $4.22 per hundredweight figure has been used rather freely but this is the 10-year average of all milk.

All milk in the United States averaged $4.85 per hundredweight for the first 8 months of 1948 and only $3.92 for the first 8 months of 1949. If the $3.92 per hundredweight were used under the same formula the price would be $3.46 for $3.95 milk, which means a support of only $3.07 per hundredweight for 3.5 percent milk, which is the usual basis on which milk is purchased.

Under the present law producer is assured of $3.29 if the law were followed, he might get $3.35 under the CIO Brannan plan, if the Congress would appropriate the billions to pay the difference between what the producer received and the consumer paid for the product. That may be a big if. If the $4.22 should shrink down to $3.92, the 1949 United States price of milk under the Eighty-first Congress, the support would be only $3.07 per hundredweight and then the Congress would have to be depended on to appropriate the funds to make up the difference besides.

From every viewpoint the great majority of milk producers appear to insist on the present support. They appear to realize that if any plan forces these farm prices down, it may take years to get them up again.

The present law of $3.29 per hundredweight, if carried out, would provide a more satisfactory support than a promise of $3.35 per hundredweight that would depend on the appropriations of Congress. What assurance has the milk producer that a later Congress may not decide to eliminate the subsidy payments? The prices to the producer in Wisconsin have already dropped from $4.50 per hundredweight high to a 1949 price of $2.80, and these prices appear to

be going down fast enough so no new plan to increase the drop should be acceptable.

The following official letter indicates the approach:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of August 18 in which you ask what support price for manufacturing milk would correspond to the proposed United States average income support standard of $4.22 per 100 pounds for all milk.

In connection with the present support program the parity equivalent price of manufacturing milk is considered to be 88.5 percent of the average parity price for all milk sold at wholesale by farmers to manufacturing plants and fluid milk dealers. This percentage is based on the average relationship between prices of manufacturing milk and all milk in recent years and appears to represent about the normal situation under present conditions. On this basis 88.5 percent of $4.22 or $3.73, would represent the equivalent price support standard for manufacturing milk.

The prices mentioned above are for milk of yearly average butterfat test. The average for manufacturing milk in recent years has approximated 3.95 percent. Milk is bought on different bases with respect to adjustments for butterfat. Computed by simple ratio, $3.73 for 3.95 percent test milk would correspond to about $3.35 for 3.5 percent milk.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway the Missing Link in Our Great Inland Waterway System and in Our Program of National Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on yesterday to strike from the appropriation bill the amendment the Senate inserted for funds to begin construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway had been adopted, it would have been a great blow to our national defense.

It is absolutely stupid to be appropriating billions of dollars and giving it to foreign countries allegedly to build up their defense for our protection, and at the same time refuse to appropriate this small amount to begin the construction of a project that will probably mean more to the defense of this Nation than all the money we can pour into the coffers of foreign countries.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, which is the missing link in our slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, will shorten the distance from our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., to the Gulf at Mobile, Ala., by more than 800 miles, and will cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf into the Tennessee River by more than 75 percent.

It will cut the cost of a 14,000-ton barge going from Mobile to the Tennessee River on its way to Oak Ridge from $39,060 to $8,680, or a saving of $30,380, on its fuel bill alone.

If we ever have another war, it will be an atomic war, fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. Our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge is the greatest defense plant the world has ever known; and it is absolutely necessary that we do everything possible to develop, as rapidly as possible, every method of ingress and egress to that great plant without stint or limit.

Yet the railroad lobbyists, who would destroy all the water transportation in America if possible, are bringing all the pressure to bear they possibly can to try to block the building of this great waterway that will do more to promote the national defense than any other project that could possibly be developed.

Besides, it will provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes at Chicago, as well as to Cairo, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and St. Paul on the Mississippi River, to Cincinnati, Wheeling, and Pittsburgh on the Ohio, and to points along the Allegheny and Monongahela—as well as one to Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City on the Missouri.

If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to strike this item from the bill should carry, and be followed up by future Congresses, it will do the people of Missouri more harm than anything else that has occurred in your day and mine.

It would do the people of all that great western country drained by the Missouri and the Mississippi and its tributaries more harm than anything else that has occurred in a generation.

It would do the people of Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania more harm than anything else that has occurred since the War Between the States.

As I pointed out in my statement in the RECORD on September 26—which you will find on pages 13533 to 13537—this project will save untold millions of dollars to the people in every State that is drained by the Mississippi and its tributaries, from the Missouri to the Tennessee, and from the Ohio to the Arkansas.

This project is already authorized by Congress. It is written into the law of the land, and we are not going to permit a little group of men prevent its development.

If they should knock out of this appropriation, which the Senate has provided to begin this work, after all of the money spent by the Army engineers in their surveys and planning, we will carry on the fight when Congress reconvenes, and from now on, until this great project is finished to serve the people of this great Nation as no other project of its kind has ever done in all the history of the United States.

Alcoholism: Nature of the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Federal Probation magazine by Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., associate professor of sociology, Yale University:

ALCOHOLISM: NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

(By Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Sociology, Yale University)

Great social problems can be disregarded or responded to ineffectively if they have been carefully hidden, as in the case of venereal diseases, or if they are loudly and continuously talked about in distorted and misleading ways. This last has been the development in the field of alcoholism. As a result, new attempts to meet the problems of alcoholism are confronted with a task of uprooting old and fallacious conceptions in addition to the task of presenting new and more efficient responses to this age-old problem.

COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

To list some of the most common distortions: Alcohol is the cause of alcoholism; drunkenness and alcoholism are the same thing; alcoholism is often inherited and (completely incompatible with this and equally fallacious) alcoholism is due to lack of will power; alcohol is a stimulant; alcohol damages nervous tissue; alcohol causes 60 or 80 or 100 percent of crime; most alcoholics come from the lowest social stratum; "It never could happen to me"; and so on and so on. All these ideas are fallacious, and this can be proved by logic, by facts, and by experimentation. But to have people accept the proofs and act accordingly is far from easy.

To appreciate the nature and extent of alcoholism, it is necessary to realize that there is a large body of organized misinformation and that this and the accompanying misconceptions are a part of the casual, undefined thinking of many, many Americans. Unless this is realized, all that follows will be useless or misused. If one believes, for example, that alcoholism is a deviation from morality and that deviations from morality should be punished, then, no matter what other knowledge or conceptions are present, one is going to punish the alcoholic by attitude, words, imprisonment, or otherwise. Punishment, however, will not alleviate, cure, or prevent any sickness, whether mumps, mental disease, or alcoholism. To this the answer of the man with unconsciously distorted training is almost sure. He knows that Tom, Dick, or Harry, punished after being drunk, never got drunk again or never took a drink again. He does not realize that this observation is irrelevant because drunkenness and alcoholism are quite different things. Misconceptions pile upon misconceptions. It might have been better, for any ultimate solution, if this problem had been hidden rather than have been so loudly, so continuously, and so mistakenly talked about.

COMPULSIVE NATURE OF ALCOHOLIC'S DRINKING

What is an alcoholic? Alcoholics may be distinguished from other drinkers primarily by the purpose for which they drink. Some people drink to fulfill a religious ritual, others in order to be polite, still others for

a good time, or to make friends, to experiment, show off, get warm or cool, quench thirst, or because they like a particular alcoholic beverage as a condiment, or because they want to go on a spree. None of these is the purpose of the alcoholic, although he might claim any or all to satisfy some questioner. The alcoholic drinks because he has to if he is to go on living. He drinks compulsively; that is, a power greater than rational planning brings him to drinking and to excessive drinking. Most alcoholics hate liquor, hate drinking, hate the taste, hate the results, hate themselves for succumbng, but they can't stop. Their drinking is as compulsive as the stealing by a kleptomaniac or the continual hand washing of a person with a neurosis about cleanliness. It is useful to think of their drinking behavior as a symptom of some inner maladjustment which they do not understand and cannot control. The drinking may be the outward, obvious accompaniment of this more basic and hidden factor.

From this statement alone it can be seen that alcoholism and drunkenness are different phenomena. All alcoholics exhibit drunkenness, but many who get drunk are not alcoholics. For example, the college boy on a spree, or a member of a group which drinks regularly (and usually to excess) on specific occasions, such as holidays, reunions, Saturday nights, may or may not get drunk, but they are not alcoholics unless their drinking is compulsive, brought about by some inner need or unresolved conflict.

PROGRESSIVE NATURE OF ALCOHOLISM

Compulsive drinking is a progressive condition. Its course may be rapid or extremely slow. Some few persons exhibit wild drinking behavior and uncontrollable need for alcohol immediately following their introduction to drinking. These individuals are probably in the category of psychotics; their alcoholism may be very obvious, but in actuality it is only a minor symptom of a major disease.

A great many alcoholics have a history of 10 or 15 years of relatively controlled drinking. Sometimes in their career they may have experienced a few black-outs during drunkenness; they may have started sneaking a few drinks more than their companions. After a while it began to happen that on occasions when they "only intended to have a couple" they wound up drunk. They may have developed a need to rationalize their heavy drinking. Solitary drinking, morning drinking, and benders may appear as a regular practice anywhere from 4 to 7 years after the first black-outs. By this time the stage of alcoholism has been achieved, but it may not be recognized by the individual or by more than a few intimates. Attempts at control or at changing the pattern of drinking may follow. Feelings of remorse become persistent. The individual becomes socially isolated. He may develop deep anxieties, tremors, obvious physical symptoms. It may be 7 to 10 years from the time of his first black-out, 15 years since his first drink. By now, however, he is recognized by all, perhaps even by himself, as an alcoholic. Some may take only 3 years to reach the undoubted stage of alcoholism.[1]

CLINICAL PICTURE OF THE ALCOHOLIC

A clinical description of the alcoholic as he appears in the final stages may conclude this statement answering the question, "What is an alcoholic." No two alcoholics are identical. Some are sufficiently different to be labeled as different types. Nevertheless there are enough common characteristics in addition to the compulsive nature of the drinking and the progressive nature of the affliction to allow a general statement.

Physically, many alcoholics in the later stages of this condition are characterized by undernourishment, highly irregular routine, inadequate sleep, and an over-all atttitude of hopelessness, plus unrelieved tension. As a result they are highly susceptible to accidents and to other diseases. It should be carefully noted that these are not directly effects of alcohol. They follow upon the behavioral consequences of continued excessive drinking. Not all alcoholics present this picture since they may be closely protected by family, friends, or independent means.

Psychologically the alcoholic in the later and last stages of this illness is characterized (1) by being in continual and awful pain, (2) by a set of responses which may be summed up as immaturity, and (3) by an over-all attitude of extreme egocentricity.

The pain is not merely or even importantly related to the physical aspects of his condition or the inconveniences occasioned by his type of life. It is centered around his inner feelings of self-depreciation, self-hate, self-pity, guilt, and all-encompassing remorse. Since he cannot explain this, he often attempts to hide it. Pain, however, is the constant comrade of the alcoholic. And a dreadful (in the real meaning of the term) comrade it is.

The immaturity of the alcoholic may be illustrated by his rapid mood swings, superficially sly rationalizations, adolescent self-consciousness, magnificent ideals which are almost inevitably linked with minuscule accomplishments, and juvenile techniques of hiding bottles, lying about drinking, and wheedling pity and free drinks.

The alcoholic generally lacks interest in anything outside of himself and his problems. Such outside interests as he may manifest are usually temporary and directly and immediately related to a desire to show off or achieve some quick benefit. His continual comparison of all things to himself, easy cynicism about anything not connected to himself, self-pity, intense feelings of guilt and increasingly solitary existence, all bear witness to his egocentricity.

Socially, the alcoholic in the final stages tends to be isolated, undersocialized. An amazing proportion of alcoholic males have never married. Of those who have, the proportion of separated and divorced is many times that in the general population. The alcoholic frequently moves from place to place, from job to job. He has few if any close friends. Typically, the alcoholic does not do very much; he does not have hobbies, go to the movies, join in any group activities.

As a result of this undersocialization or desocialization the alcoholic is susceptible to fewer stimuli than people with friends and group membership. He receives fewer satisfactions and rewards. Punishment is less and less meaningful since the strength of punishment varies with its source; if a father or wife or friend punishes, the effect is far greater than if the action comes from an impersonal source. Since the alcoholic has given up these associations, he is less stimulated, and only with difficulty is rewarded or punished effectively. He becomes his own source of stimulation, reward, and punishment and thus he may vary greatly from the social norms, possess ridiculous ideals, vastly overpunish himself, and lapse into minimum activity.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALCOHOLISM

Why does one become an alcoholic? Since no final answer to this question is available, since the subject is complex and the size of this paper limited, a relatively brief and dogmatically phrased description will follow. In accord with the two essentials for the development of the condition, it will be divided into two parts: one, the habitual use of alcohol; two, certain personality types or structures. Neither of these can alone bring on alcoholism. There are many individuals with personalities similar to those found in alcoholics who never become alcoholics, who may never touch alcohol; there are tens of millions of individuals who use alcohol who never become alcoholics. The combination of the two factors is essential for the appearance of alcoholism.

Alcohol is a depressant, the direct opposite of a stimulant. Taken in sufficient quantities it produces sleep. Its depressant action is gradual, however; and as it depresses certain control functions of the brain it allows behavior and attitudes which are usually repressed. (It is this less-controlled behavior which makes people believe that it is a stimulant.) Alcohol, even in small quantities, lowers sensitivity, relieves tension, allows the forgetting of difficult and unpleasant conceptions and memories. It reduces accuracy of judgment and discrimination, especially about the self. With alcohol, then, one can temporarily escape worries and anxieties, temporarily ease tensions, feel as if one were happy, clever, witty, graceful or, at least, less unhappy, less inept, less dull, less awkward. And one can gain this temporary feeling without utilizing the effort and ability which real achievement of such feeling would demand.

Of the personality types significant for alcoholism only two will be mentioned. It should be recognized that there are psychotics and feeble-minded persons who are also alcoholics, that there are persons, apparently quite normal, who under extraordinary stress may become compulsive drinkers. The great bulk of the alcoholics, however, fit into the two classes to be described, the primary and the secondary compulsive-drinker types.

PRIMARY TYPE OF COMPULSORY DRINKER

The primary type may be likened to that category of persons labeled neurotic. This overused and little understood work in the present instance, at least, serves to point out that primary compulsive drinkers were definitely maladjusted before they began drinking. Here, for example, is the individual whose personality was warped, whose emotional development was unhealthy from infancy or childhood on. The maladjustment might be seen as an inability to compete with equals or superiors without feeling extreme anxiety or apprehension of undefined, future pain. Or it might be seen as an unusual fear of contact with those of the opposite sex, or as a general conception of the self as unworthy, inefficient, and socially awkward. These states of mind are fairly common though irregular occurrences among adolescents, but as continued attitudes in a young or middle-aged adult they are out of keeping with the demands of our society. In the early twenties, and certainly by the age of 30, there is great pressure on adults to be socially and economically competitive and appropriately self-assertive, to be married, and to have attained a relatively mature independence and self-control. As individuals of poor or no adjustment along these lines grow older the pressures upon them grow stronger and the maladjustment becomes increasingly harder to bear. No statement is presented to explain why or how these individuals come to be neurotics. It is a matter of common observation that there are many such persons.

If such persons are, like most Americans, introduced to the custom of drinking, and if anxieties about drinking are not too great and no other way out of their dilemma is

[1] This description is derived entirely from Jellinek, E. M., Phases in the Drinking History of Alcoholics, Analysis of a Survey Conducted by the Grapevine, Official Organ of Alcoholics Anonymous, No. 5 in Memoirs of the Section of Studies on Alcohol, Yale University, New Haven, 1946.

found, then they are likely candidates to start out on the road to alcoholism. Alcohol allows them to compete without anxiety, to mingle without or with less fear in mixed company, perhaps even to initiate courtship behavior, to forget their own interpretation of their personal inadequacies. It allows them relief from whatever their problem may be. Small wonder that they come to lean upon this crutch with increasing dependency. This development illustrates the conception that for the type of person described alcohol is an adjustment.

However, the alcohol wears off while the neurotic characteristics remain as before. Furthermore, the memory of having acted aggressively or assertively, of having shown interest in the opposite sex because of alcohol creates new anxieties; the knowledge of having been "out of control" also adds guilt and remorse. However, in the long run, the rewards of drinking for the incipient alcoholic are greater than these feelings. Later on he may use alcohol to get rid of the post alcoholic guilt and anxiety. Thus a vicious circle comes into operation.

The vicious circle is stimulated further by the inevitable extension and intensification of old problems and the rise of new ones due to increasing periods of inebriety. Family and friends, employers and neighbors, customers and strangers, all will punish the person who often gets drunk. With the increase in problems the relieving, soothing, encouraging effects of alcohol become all the more desirable. So, although alcohol is an adjustment, it is a short-run, temporary adjustment, and leads to further maladjustment.

SECONDARY TYPE OF COMPULSIVE DRINKER

Before his drinking starts the secondary compulsive type appears on the surface as a fairly well-adjusted person. He or she has utilized social customs, attitudes, and organizations with considerable ability. Certainly the label "neurotic" would never have been applied. Some of this type may be more extroverted than those around them, tending to be the leader in the group, the excessive practical joker, the most aggressive salesman. The implication from this is that they have to work harder than others to achieve a sense of personal adequacy, of being a significant member of their group. Whatever the case, it is noticeable that they can differ markedly from the earlier mentioned neurotic type, that they have utilized customs, associations, and attitudes which were socially acceptable; this plays an important role in the discussion of therapy which is to follow.

The prospective secondary type of compulsive drinker, when introduced to the drinking custom, appears to take to it with great satisfaction. He already belongs to a group which usually drinks a good deal or he shortly joins such a group and becomes a regular drinker, later perhaps a heavy drinker, but he is not yet an alcoholic; he is in control of the drinking, not the drinking in control of him. Many people can be so characterized, and they need not become alcoholics. For the individual in whom we are interested, however, a process sets in which has been called the pampering effect of alcohol.

Alcohol lowers sensitivity, discrimination, control, and efficiency. Unless counteracting forces arise, it allows the drinker to respond to stimuli less adequately and to follow personal inclinations in the face of contrary social demands with less notice and less care. As a result, the fairly constant heavy drinker may become a more careless worker, a more thoughtless father and husband, a more demanding friend, a more aggressive neighbor. Nor is this the only effect. On the negative side he may be seen as failing to exercise his social abilities and his intellectual techniques. Without practice the personality assets become dulled and more difficult to use. This process may take place by almost imperceptible steps.

The result of this process is inevitable—occupational, familial, financial, and neighborly problems are going to arise. Unfortunately, the individual has learned a simple response to avoid such problems—drinking. Again a vicious circle can be seen.

A second result of this process, a result which may confuse the therapist, is that the personality of the drinker seems to change. The change is not hard to explain. The individual finds himself losing the affection and regard of his wife, his boss, his friends; whereupon he loses affection and regard for them. He finds that he is less popular in his club, among fellow workers, or in community groups; whereupon he gives up these organizations. He can hardly help but realize that his work is not as good as it was; whereupon he talks it up, idealizes what he is going to do, what he has done; while realistic accomplishment continues downhill. He becomes increasingly isolated and consequently self-centered. As he loses friends and interests, he becomes cynical, self-conscious, and suspicious of others. He rationalizes his situation, and as his rationalizations are not subject to the discipline of realistic give-and-take, he becomes overly idealistic or overly optimistic or pessimistic. Gradually he takes on more and more of the characteristics of the primary type. When he has achieved the full status of an alcoholic he may seem not a whit different from the primary type. From the point of view of rehabilitation, however, he or she is a decidedly different person; the chances of recovery are far better than for those of the primary type.

These descriptions of the two largest categories of compulsive drinkers, categories based on the developmental nature of the disease, are not a full answer to the question, "Why does one become an alcoholic?" They may help, however, toward a better understanding of the sorts of processes, conditions, and factors involved in the development of that condition.

SUMMARY

It is important to reemphasize the probably obvious point that no problem is going to be solved or even adjusted to in any adequate or satisfactory manner until the nature of the problem is well defined. If, for example, drunkenness and drinking and alcoholism are indiscriminately regarded as a single problem, then efforts to meet such a problem will be doomed to failure. The first step, then, is evaluation of the problem, recognition of misleading definitions and assumptions, and a tolerant, even humble attempt to locate and describe and analyze the matter under consideration.

In dealing with alcoholism this report has first described the condition as one in which the drinking of the alcoholic differs from that of the usual public in its compulsiveness. The ordinary person may drink for a great variety of reasons, while the alcoholic drinks because he has to if he is going to face life and its usual or unusual problems. (This does not imply that the compulsion cannot be treated, it can. For the usual alcoholic, however, more than self-help is needed.)

Secondly, it was noted that alcoholism is a progressive condition, usually reaching its final stages only after years of development.

Thirdly, a clinical picture of the alcoholic was presented, describing the physical, psychological, and social characteristics manifested by many alcoholics in the later stages of the disease.

Fourthly, the functions of alcohol in its relation to the central nervous system were discussed, functions which operate for all persons whether large or small quantities are imbibed.

Fifthly, two types of alcoholics were described from the point of view of the onset and development of compulsive drinking.

With this background of understanding of the nature of alcoholism it is proposed as a next step to describe the extent of the problem in present American life, available methods of therapy, and possible steps for the achievement of prevention.

Playing Santa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Washington Daily News, of date September 27, 1949, as follows:

PLAYING SANTA

America's foreign give-away programs for the past fiscal year reached a record high of more than $5,000,000,000—almost double the sum sent abroad the year before.

Britain was not the biggest beneficiary. Germany was. Germany, where we are still dismantling industrial plants, some of which may be shipped to Russia.

Germany, Italy, and Japan, three former enemy countries, received more than one-third of this country's foreign outlay for fiscal 1949. Germany's total was only slightly under $1,000,000,000.

Our gifts and grants to foreign nations since the end of the war have amounted to $13,260,000,000. Adding to that figure $10,080,000,000 in foreign loans, and the total has been $23,340,000,000.

Yet, although we are in the red ourselves, official Washington is giving little, if any, serious thought to the necessity of scaling down these expenditures. Quite the contrary. Most of the planning has to do with new programs. An oil loan to Mexico. Aid to undeveloped areas in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The assumption of Britain's colonial obligations in India and the Middle East.

We'd better take a long hard look into all of these propositions before going further. These do-good projects have a way of starting small and growing big.

Take the Mexican oil deal. The Mexicans wanted $470,000,000 to revive and expand their production. This request was scaled down to slightly less than half that figure. Then some hitch developed in the negotiations. But the deal is by no means dead.

But why should American tax money be used to finance a foreign government-operated oil industry in competition with our own privately owned oil industry, which is one of our larger taxpayers? Surely we aren't out to destroy our private-enterprise system with its own hard-earned dollars.

We've been quite generous with Mexico. Since 1941 the Export-Import Bank alone has granted the Mexican Government more than $200,000,000 in loans for improvement of railroads, hydroelectric developments, and other industrial purposes. Henceforth, it would seem, Mexico could get what it wanted through private banking channels. But our Government seems to have forgotten that private banking channels exist.

Mexico is just one country in Latin America. If the oil loan is granted, our Government will be under pressure to make similar loans to Brazil and Chile. That will just be the beginning.

Because of the Mexican proposal, we can't help viewing President Truman's point 4 program with some suspicion. The initial appropriation of $45,000,000 requested is for technical assistance to underdeveloped coun-

tries, after which it is promised that private investment will be encouraged. But if that is the case, why isn't private investment being encouraged in Mexico?

Quite apart from the point 4 program, India is being advanced as the cornerstone around which certain State Department professors plan to build a new Far Eastern policy.

India's needs are colossal. No question about that. And India cannot be considered apart from the rest of the Far East, which had an over-all trade deficit of more than $1,000,000,000 last year. First of all, a food problem must be solved before serious attention can be given to industrialization, irrigation, and transport problems. An appealing case can be made for the teeming millions living in squalor in these long-neglected areas. But this problem can't be solved in a day.

When enthusiasts say that unless we act quickly and on an unprecedented scale we may not be given time to act at all, we suspect a hook in the bait because we've bit before. We're in so deep now on other deals like that that it will take bulldozers to dig us out.

Character Evidence by Supreme Court Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to include an editorial from the Bristol (Conn.) Press pointing up a bill introduced by our industrious colleague from New York. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I, too, have found agreement among many constituents, particularly members of the bar, with the thoughts expressed in this editorial. It follows:

POOR JUDGMENT

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, has introduced a bill in Congress as a result of an action that was in poor taste. The bill would provide that Justices from the United States Supreme Court should not be permitted to give character evidence or testify on matters of opinion in our courts.

KEATING brought the bill out after Associate Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed testified in the Alger Hiss trial as character witnesses for Hiss. In fact, it was largely through the good offices of Justice Frankfurter that Hiss held positions of high importance in Government circles.

It is one situation to testify as to facts. But the spectacle of members of our highest court testifying as to the character of a defendant who was later found guilty by an 8 to 4 count did not increase the respect for those Justices in the minds of the public.

Never before in history has a Justice of our Supreme Court gone into court as a character witness in a criminal trial.

Since the jury was split in its verdict, Hiss will stand trial again, probably some time in October. Let us suppose that he had been convicted and the Supreme Court were asked to review that judgment. Undoubtedly Justices Frankfurter and Reed would have disqualified themselves, leaving seven Justices to hear the review. It would have been embarrassing for the seven to uphold a conviction in the face of character-witness testimony of their own colleagues.

The mere presence of Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses was all out of proportion to their importance. Many persons with hitherto spotless reputations commit crimes. General evidence as to character is not of great value at best.

We are of the opinion that the Justices were exercising poor judgment in appearing in court during the Hiss trial.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following copy of an essay on Soil and Water Conservation, written by Miss Mary Davis Kline, of Broadway, Rockingham County, Va., which won first prize in a contest conducted by the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Chamber of Commerce among high school students of Rockingham County:

The soil—which all of us, city and country people alike, live from—is our Nation's most important resource. Industry and labor, and professional people as well as farmers, have a large stake in the country's land. Today they are all rightly concerned about America's productive soil and water resources; they realize as never before that these basic resources are linked directly to the United States future prosperity. These resources also have a real bearing on the future of civilization. Food—which comes from the soil—was an important weapon in the war and it is important in the peace. The land also gives us fiber for clothes to protect our bodies, wood to build shelter against the elements, and ore from which to fashion tools.

Land, therefore, is our base; for everything we do, all we share, even whatever we amount to as a great people, begins with and rests on the sustained productivity of our agricultural lands.

If, then, our land and water is so important must we not conserve it? How shall we do this you say? A complete soil conservation program on every farm is the answer.

What is a soil-conservation program? Soil conservation is proper use and care of the land. It means using the land to produce the greatest amounts of the things most needed, at the same time protecting it so it will not lose its productiveness. All land is not alike. Each field or acre must be used for things it is best suited to produce and protected according to its needs.

All measures that help keep the land productive are tools of conservation. Terraces, contouring, organic matter, grass, crop rotations, fertilizer, strip cropping, legumes, shrubs, trees, drainage if the land is too wet, and irrigation if it is too dry—all of those are conservation tools. It is conservation whether the practices are used separately or together. In other words, soil conservation includes any and all measures that will make the land produce more without damaging it.

Now let's take a few of these practices and study them.

The first in this list should be proper use of the land. The Soil Conservation Service has worked out a plan by which all land is classified as to the use for which it is best suited. There are eight classes in this plan.

Class I, II, and III lands are suitable for continuous cultivation. Class I is the best, requiring no special practices other than good farming. In classes II and III, in addition to good farming, special practices are needed as the land class number increases.

Class IV land is primarily pasture or meadowland, but with special practices and restrictions it can sometimes be used as cropland.

Class V, VI, and VII lands are suitable only for permanent vegetation such as grass or timber. Here, too, as in class I, II, and III lands, the number of special practices and limitations increases as the land number increases.

Class VIII land can properly be used only in a permanent type of vegetation which will not be harvested. Generally this land is best adapted for wildlife refuges. In some cases it may provide an excellent site for a farm pond.

This plan is the base of proper conservation methods.

"Since the achievement of our independence, he is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies." If this statement, made by Patrick Henry 150 years ago, was true then it is doubly true today. For gullies are now destroying land in every State. Preventing and controlling gullies is certainly an important part of soil conservation. Year after year they are destroying acres of good farm land. If proper methods were used this would not happen.

To prevent the formation of a gully is much better and easier than to control it once it has formed. It is easy to stop a gully when it has just begun to form, but if the gully is neglected for some time it can usually be checked only with considerable work and at no little expense. Constant vigilance is necessary to forestall gullying that starts from some practice that may seem of no consequence. The thoughtless driving of a wagon up or down a slope in a field made soft by rain leaves a deep rut that may develop into a large gully unless it is in some way filled immediately.

The first step in preventing gullies is to plan or replan the farm so as to get the best possible use of the land. This will include the retirement to permanent cover of such areas as are definitely too steep to farm; utilization of the better agricultural land for cultivated crops; the placing of moderately sloping and eroded areas in meadow or pasture, if such areas cannot be economically tilled. The best known methods of controlling erosion on those slopes that must be tilled are crop rotations, cover crops, strip cropping, contour cultivation, and terracing. The use of fertilizers and the conservative grazing of pasture or range also protect the land from erosion.

One of the most important considerations in land use that prevents gullies is the proper disposal of excess run-off water from the fields. Every farm has its own natural drainage pattern, which, in general, it is difficult to change. Except for minor variations it should be followed in planning fields.

Once the gullies have formed and prevention is too late, it is still possible to stop serious erosion in the gullies and cover most of them with vegetation. If a field is very badly eroded and gullied it should be planted in trees. Less seriously damaged areas may be used for permanent pasture or meadow. So, by preventing gullies we may still use the land for crops, where by letting them go we have to plant them in permanent pasture or trees.

The placing of farm land under terrace control is one of the major soil conserving practices needed throughout this country. It is estimated that there are 90,658,000 acres of land suitable for cultivation that need to be treated by this practice.

Terracing is ridging land on or nearly on the contour. The farmer builds up low barriers—ridges or embankments—of soil across sloping fields to intercept rainfall. Terraces

with slight grade slow down run-off water, guiding it to safe disposal at the sides of the fields. This controlled excess water runs off too slowly to cause erosion. Terracing should be practiced where crop rotations, contour farming, and strip cropping will not control erosion.

Contouring is another very important tool of conservation. Contouring is plowing, planting, cultivating, and harvesting sloping fields on the level; that is, farming on the contour, around hillsides with curving furrows to fit the lay of the land, instead of straight furrows up-and-down hill. The curved furrows catch rainfall and allow much of it to soak into the ground. This conserves water and reduces the amount of soil that is washed away. Part of the water that soaks into the soil is used later by crops. Another part is added to the underground water supply to feed springs, wells, streams, and ponds.

Contour farming is the sensible way of farming—it is level farming that saves power, prevents undue wear and strain on equipment, and increases crop yields. Recently farmers all over the country reported on the increase in production when contouring is used. Here are some of their reports. Contoured cornfields produced 23 bushels more corn per acre than adjacent noncontoured fields—Iowa farmers reported. Contouring boosted potato yields 44 bushels per acre—reported New York farmers. Wheat yields averaged 4 bushels per acre higher on the contoured than on noncontoured fields—reports from southern Great Plains showed. Cotton yields averaged 29 pounds more per acre on the contour than fields that were farmed up and down the hill—Texas farmers reported. These reports prove that we should certainly use contour farming as an implement of conservation.

Strip cropping—another conservation method—is planting strips of close-growing plants between alternate strips of clean-tilled row crops, on or nearly on the contour. The strips of close-growing plants hold water and keep it from eroding the cultivated strip below. They also catch soil picked up by water from the plowed strips above straining it out of the run-off. This is used in many sections where there are gentle slopes.

Crop rotation is an important conservation tool because it keeps the soil productive and improves it. Crop rotation is alternating production of various crops on a piece of land. In a good rotation, one crop, or series of crops helps the next crop. For example, nitrogen—needed for plant growth—is added to the soil by legumes, such as clover, alfalfa, and cowpeas. The plants have the power to take nitrogen out of the air and, through their roots, store it in the soil. After they have rotted, the nitrogen can be used for growth by plants that do not have the power to fix nitrogen, such as corn, cotton, and potatoes. Rotations often are used with strip cropping by shifting the close-growing strips and the tilled strips at fixed periods. In this way the sod is improved by the same cropping system used to stop erosion.

Many farms have good sites for ponds, where a suitable site exists, no better use can be made of such land than to develop it for the production of fish for the farm family. This is also a good conservation tool as it conserves rain and covers any badly rutted place which cannot be used for anything else.

The objectives of this essay are to bring to its readers the importance of soil and water conservation, thereby putting agricultural land to its most productive use according to classification, and then protecting the land from erosion by soil conserving practices. Conservation of the topsoil provides improved economic farming units. This not only affects a particular farm, but also the Nation as a whole. Moisture is induced to soak into the ground where it falls reducing floods to some extent and raising the local water table. Less silting and washing occurs, thus extending the life and decreasing the amount of required maintenance on all roads, fills, bridges, navigable waterways, and harbors. Food and cover are available for wildlife to help increase their population. All this contributes to improving the welfare and health of the people.

Soil conservation is good farm management and results in additional income with a minimum of effort and expense. Soil conservation provides security not only for farmers and others of this generation, but also for generations to come.

Army Fish-Purchase Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Humboldt Standard of September 19, 1949:

AT LEAST 25,000 FISHERMEN ARE EXPECTED TO LOSE JOBS UNDER PROPOSED BUYING PLAN CHANGE

SEATTLE, September 17.—A new Army Quartermaster Corps fish-purchase policy which may cost 25,000 jobs on the Pacific coast aroused fishing circles here tonight.

E. A. Rutherford, vice president of the San Juan Fish and Packing Co., said the Army had told him it intended to stop purchases in Seattle for the armed forces in Japan and the South Pacific, and transfer those purchases to the Japanese market October 10.

He said the tip on the Army's plans had come from San Francisco and that he personally contacted the Quartermaster General in Washington, D. C., who confirmed the report.

The fish purchases, up to now made by the Quartermaster Corps in Seattle, amount to from 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 pounds annually. The measurements all are on filleted fish, would mean from 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 fish.

Rutherford said that because packers already have laid in several million pounds in anticipation of the Army orders, this fish will have to be dumped on the local markets if the Army goes through with its "buy-Japanese" plans.

He said the order already has resulted in his San Juan company laying off 50 boats employing an average of 6 men each, and 50 shoreside employees.

He estimated the entire Puget Sound area would have to lay off a total of 3,000 to 4,000 men, and that on a coast-wide basis, unemployment will total 25,000, as the effect of such an order would be coast-wide, purchases being centralized here.

Rutherford said California, Oregon, and Washington packers are now contacting their congressional delegations in an effort to persuade the Army to rescind its projected order.

He said also the industry is trying to get a rider on the McCarran bill which would prohibit Army purchase of fish in Japan. The McCarran bill as written prohibits purchase of Japanese meats on the grounds it is subject to contamination.

Joe Jurich, secretary of the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America (CIO) said his union is cooperating closely with the industry and also is sending protests to Congress.

Naugatuck Gives Little League a Big Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut Industry in its September 1949 issue features an article relating to the organization of a little league in my home town of Naugatuck, Conn.

I was extremely pleased on June 5 to be present at the dedication ceremonies at the little league stadium and to note the great interest shown by citizens of Naugatuck in this venture. The first season has been successfully completed with boys from ages 8 to 12 competing for the trophy symbolic of league supremacy.

The lessons taught our youth through this medium could not be achieved by the expenditure of large sums of money by governmental agencies. Team play, sportsmanship, responsibility, and healthful exercise were all accomplished without recourse to sermons on juvenile delinquency. The young boys comported themselves in an admirable manner, and captured the hearts of the thousands who witnessed the season's play. A feeling of deep satisfaction was gained also by those who contributed so greatly of their time, efforts, and money to make this venture successful.

Having observed the fruits of this labor I can recommend to communities throughout the Nation this method of aiding our youngsters while at the same time experiencing a glow of satisfaction by contributing in some small way to a better world.

The article follows:

NAUGATUCK GIVES LITTLE LEAGUE A BIG HAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article reveals one of many effective methods which may be used by industry and business management to make worthy contributions to progressive community projects. By taking the active leadership in such projects, management can demonstrate that business organizations are interested in the advancement of human welfare as well as in business profits which make this advancement possible. Furthermore such demonstrations of interest in people pave the way for greater acceptance of all educational programs about the advantages of our American way of life.)

This is the story of how little-league baseball was introduced in Naugatuck, Conn., how it was encouraged and financed by an active community-service organization, and was parlayed into a $50,000 recreational activity for youth. It is the story of how the United States Rubber Co. footwear plant, located in the same town, enhanced its community-relations program through entire participation in the project.

The fastest growing thing in baseball today is the little-league set-up in which youngsters of 8 to 12 play with all the trappings of the major leagues. The idea was originally conceived by Carl Stotz, of Williamsport, Pa., and in the summer of 1938 his plan of a little league began taking shape. The plan was a good one which has quickly snowballed into a national movement.

In 1948 a total of 157 little leagues, mostly of 4 teams, operated in 6 different States.

This year, more than 300 leagues were ready to go in 11 States by April 1, and others were in the process of being organized. The 1948 season was climaxed by a national tournament in Williamsport, with all the glamour and fanfare of a real world series.

Naugatuck's little league was born at a meeting of the local Exchange Club. In his role as guest speaker at the club's September 14, 1948, meeting, Edward T. McGrath, public relations director of the United States Rubber Co.'s footwear plant, truly started the ball rolling. Speaking on the need for more recreational facilities in the borough, Mr. McGrath described the little-league program. He told of its purposes and operation. He also spoke of the national championship tournament, sponsored by the United States Rubber Co.

The reaction and enthusiam of the members of the Exchange Club was so spontaneous that they voted at that same meeting to sponsor a little league in Naugatuck. From all quarters veterans, fraternal, community, and religious organizations, industrial and business firms, and individuals evidenced their whole-hearted approval through substantial contributions of money, materials, equipment, and volunteer labor. Hopkins Park was chosen as the ideal spot, and now, just a year later, Naugatuck has a miniature big-league ball park built from scratch and tailored exclusively for little-leage play.

There is a complete outfield fence filled with ads paid for by local mercantile and industrial concerns, just like big-league ball parks. It is built roughly on a 180-foot arc from home plate, over which the boys can hit home runs. There are bleachers running the length of each foul line. There is an electric scoreboard on which balls, strikes, and outs are registered by a remote-control switch-panel in a press box behind home plate. A well-equipped clubhouse and cinder-block and roofed-in dugouts for the teams have been included. As each new batter comes to the plate his name and position are announced over a public-address system. Three umpires, qualified, but unpaid volunteers, run the games.

The boys have mastered the fundamentals of the game under the direction of qualified coaches. There are pitchers who can curve them across, fielders who can haul in long drives on the dead run, and hitters who can lay down perfect bunts or knock the ball over the outfield fence. League games are played three nights a week—on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays—drawing between 500 and 1,000 fans a night in a town with a total population of a little over 20,000.

Now fully a community project with more than a dozen organizations actively in back of it, the Little League continues to be important to the United States Rubber footwear plant. The company has contributed a substantial sum to the league treasury and has purchased billboard space on the fence enclosing the field. Just before the opening game they completely outfitted the four teams with United States Rubber special Keds infielder bal canvas shoes. However, the company's contributions have been planned so that they are in line with those of other merchants, organizations and industries and have been, in proportion, neither more nor less.

Personnel from the footwear plant who have been and continue to be active in the organization and administration of the Naugatuck Little League include Ralph Stotz of the purchasing department, brother of the Little League founder, vice president, and the following who are members of the Little League Board of Directors: Edward T. McGrath, Thomas Dillon and Thomas Scally of the company's department of public relations and employees services; Albert Benz from product development, James Nies from the mechanical department, and Arthur Vandeventer from the industrial engineering department. From its New York headquarters the United States Rubber Co., sponsors and gives financial backing to the Little League World Series held in Williamsport.

The league is guided by these officers: President Paul E. Buckmiller, Vice President Ralph Stotz, Secretary Frank D. Peaslee, Treasurer William F. Kelly, Head Coach James Sweetman and Umpire in Chief Russel Weaving.

It has been estimated that the Little League Stadium as it stands today could not have been constructed on a contract basis for less than $40,000 to $45,000. And yet, the enthusiastic response of public-spirited citizens has made it possible to accomplish the project at a cost of a little more than $1,000.

On Sunday, June 5, the new stadium was dedicated in impressive and touching ceremonies to the memory of Peter J. Foley, "the dean of Connecticut coaches," who served as sports coach of Naugatuck High School from 1908 until his death in 1946. A fitting memorial has been placed in right center field near the scoreboard as a lasting reminder of the man for whom the league and stadium were named. The memorial is inscribed: "Dedicated to the memory of Peter J. Foley, a man of vision, firmness, and depth of understanding, whose belief in American youth brought glory to them and to Naugatuck."

Community spirit of the finest type nurtured Naugatuck's Little League. It has given the borough not only a monument to one of its greatest citizens, but a living example of progressiveness.

Increase of Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I am happy to announce my support of the pending bill, H. R. 4495, to provide necessary salary increases and other benefits for postal employees. I have supported this bill in committee and believe its enactment at this time is only simple justice to the many thousands of loyal, faithful, and efficient postal employees. While I regret that it was not possible to do exact justice insofar as providing sick and annual leave for postal and Federal employees, it seems to me that the bill is at least a step in the right direction.

That additional salary legislation is necessary might perhaps best be shown from the results of a survey conducted by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks concerning the economic status of postal employees. This survey shows that approximately 30 percent of all postal employees in St. Louis either have their wives gainfully employed or must themselves resort to additional part-time work. I do not believe that this condition is healthy. It destroys a wholesome family life and contributes to juvenile delinquency. Approximately 76 percent of the employees of the St. Louis office have been forced either to go into debt or increase previous debts during the past year, and only about 3 percent of the employees surveyed have been able to decrease their debts. It is interesting in this connection to note that 55 percent of these employees were forced to cash in war savings bonds, and in addition a large percentage were compelled to borrow money on their insurance. To me these things indicate that the salaries presently being paid to these employees are entirely inadequate under present-day conditions.

I shall vote for the passage of this legislation and I hope that my colleagues will give it unanimous approval.

Alcoholism: Its Extent, Therapy, and Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., associate professor of sociology, Yale University:

ALCOHOLISM: ITS EXTENT, THERAPY, AND PREVENTION

(By Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., associated professor of sociology, Yale University)

I. EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

Alcoholism is one of the most prevalent diseases in America. Approximately 3,000,000 persons are afflicted; about a quarter of these, in the most advanced stages, have been termed chronic alcoholics; the other three-quarters have been called chronic excessive drinkers. As described in the first part of this report, all 3,000,000 are compulsive drinkers, are becoming progressively sicker, and are generally characterized in various degree by the physical, psychological, and social manifestations elaborated previously. The term alcoholic will be used to refer to all 3,000,000. It should be clearly understood that no adequate direct count of alcoholics exists. Even the scanty records available rarely are adequate and almost always enumerate nonrepresentative selections of alcoholics, such as those in mental hospitals, or persons recorded dying from alcoholism, etc. This lack of direct evidence is characteristic of social problems for which no adequate solution has been found and about which there has been a great deal of talk but little serious study.

Distribution by age and sex

The 3,000,000 alcoholics are not evenly scattered throughout the population. There are no alcoholics less than 15 years of age and almost none under 20. The great mass of alcoholics are between the ages of 30 and 55; about 95 percent are between 20 and 65. Furthermore, there is a marked contrast between the rates of alcoholism among men and women. About 85 percent of all cases in the United States are male. The implications of this distribution for the mental, moral, and physical health of our society are indeed great. The incidence of 3,000,000 alcoholics in a total population of 131,700,000 is serious enough, 2¼ percent of the whole. But the incidence of 2,423,000 male alcoholics between 20 and 65 in the total United States male population of the same age (38,745,000) is 6¼ percent. What this means to the industrial, commercial, military, religious, political, and parental categories of the society is not pleasant to consider. In relation to the total population

of drinkers, approximately 50,000,000, the alcoholics make up 6 percent.

Distribution by region and cultural origin

Alcoholism is found the country over, but it is noticeably greater in incidence in the urban areas. No direct causal significance can be attached to this. The strain of city life and the very imperfect structuring of social organization in urban areas may result in more individual maladjustment than does a possibly better adjusted rural society. It may be that the city attracts a high proportion of variant personalities from the rural areas. This does not in any way imply that the rural areas lack an alcoholism problem nor that some rural areas do not have a rate higher than some urban areas.

Alcoholism rates differ markedly in groups of different cultural background. Poles, Irish, and so-called native white Americans have high rates. Italians and Greeks have low rates, while among Jews alcoholism is rare. As assimilation to American culture patterns increases, the alcoholism rate tends to approach the average American rate; e. g., for Scandinavians, originally possessing high rates, the rate decreases; for Italians the rate increases.

Distribution by education, wealth, and occupation

It would appear that alcoholics come from all strata of the population insofar as family background, wealth, and education are concerned. It has been suggested that the highest and lowest strata produces greater numbers proportionately than the so-called middle class, but this has not been proved. The literature abounds with statements that this or that occupation has an abnormally high incidence of alcoholism, but the evidence is none too good. Naturally enough, after a certain phase of alcoholism has been reached, some occupations, because of skill requirements, are more unlikely for the chronic inebriate while others, such as casual laborer, are common. Contrary to at least one popular myth, bartenders show a high rate. Whether it be as cause or effect, it does seem that occupations which interfere with or disrupt participation in family and neighborhood life (as in the case of the traveling salesman, the actor, the migratory worker, and perhaps the newspaper reporter) show a rather high rate.

Impact of alcoholism

In the first part of this report it was indicated that in the later stages of alcoholism one would observe certain psychological, physical, and social concomitants. It should be pointed out here that these aspects of the condition are not only chronic and become progressively worse, but that they affect the individual's entire existence. The alcoholic's psychological state is not limited to benders, his deteriorating social adjustment is not merely affected during a spree. These are the dramatic moments, plainly observed by others. The physical condition need not always be bad and is usually susceptible to rapid improvement. The psychological and social factors, however, color all the individual's attitudes and activities, the daily routines and the unusual situations. In this sense the impact and extent of alcoholism are far greater than those of a cold, a broken leg, or measles. Alcoholism is a continuing, progressive disease of the entire personality.

Furthermore, the condition of alcoholism has the widest sort of impact on others, especially on family, friends, and economic associates. The inebriate is a cause of shame and a source of never-ending insecurity and anxiety. For every one of the 3,000,000 directly afflicted it is possible to add one, two, or more whose lives have been tragically affected by the disease.

Social consequences of alcoholism

Although there is no dearth of propagandistic literature explaining the social consequences of alcoholism, and although there have been a few serious attempts to reckon the cost to society, it is almost impossible to make a satisfactory analysis in quantitative terms. Perhaps the greatest cost is to be found in the loss of manpower due to the fact that more than 6 percent of the adult male population is affected. This loss to the morality, the economy, and the general strength and vitality of the society can hardly be estimated.

In addition to this loss is the expense entailed in chronic attempts at alleviation, restraint, and repair. Police, courts, jails, general hospitals, religious agencies, social agencies, public departments of welfare and charity, insurance companies, relief organizations, private charities, Federal hospitals, mental hospitals, visiting nurse associations, domestic relations bureaus, and so on, are constantly faced with the responsibility of doing something about the alcoholic, his activities, and his dependents. Beyond this sort of expenditure is the loss suffered by employers through absenteeism, personnel turnover, lowered morale, and accidents. Loss occasioned by the actions or nonactivity of alcoholics who hold professional or executive positions is hardly susceptible to accounting. Losses suffered by storekeepers, by those lending money to alcoholics, and by complete strangers who may be injured physically, morally, or financially, are also uncountable. For those who are unsatisfied unless costs can be defined in terms of dollars and cents, it has been estimated on the basis of 1940 data that alcoholism cost the American public about $1,000,000,000 for that year; this estimate probably was conservative.

II. TREATMENT OF ALCOHOLISM

In the last 100 years the American public has responded to this problem by denying it, by laughing at it, by cursing drinkers, drunks, and distillers, by putting alcoholics in jails, by charity, by a shaking of heads, by passing laws against drinking. One organization has made a steady, earnest attempt to help the inebriate, the Salvation Army; its accomplishments, however, are by their very nature not susceptible of scientific evaluation. All the other responses are, of course, escapist, ludicrous, or even vicious. This is not to deny that various individuals, including many physicians, have tried to help alcoholics, sometimes with fair success.

In the last 12 years, however, three developments give promise of more efficient reaction to this old, old problem: (1) The rise of Alcoholics Anonymous; (2) the vigorous renewal of research, especially at Yale University; and (3) a national program of public education and of establishment of facilities to aid alcoholics through the National Committee for Education on Alcoholism.

General principles of treatment

In the report on the general nature of alcoholism it was pointed out that the alcoholic (a) was a compulsive drinker, (b) was afflicted with a progressive condition, and (c) was affected psychologically, socially, and usually physically. To be effective, treatment must recognize and work with all these aspects. Treatment which is concerned only with alcohol intake or only with physical condition or only with the current economic problem will not affect alcoholism. The alcoholic presents a series of problems, some medical, some psychiatric, some psychological, some social, in the broadest meaning of that term. The disease is not any one of these; it is the combination of all of them with excessive, chronic, compulsive drinking.

With this general orientation as to the nature of the problem it is possible to turn to the purpose of the treatment. To use sharply defined terms, cure is not the purpose of treatment. It may be the purpose of future decades, but not at the present time. Cure would mean that the individual would break the progressive development, would become physically, psychologically, and socially adjusted, and could drink alcoholic beverages without compulsion, without reviving the alcoholic syndrome. No known treatment can or does claim such an accomplishment. Treatment today aims at physical, psychological, and social rehabilitation to the extent that the individual can live acceptably, in his own eyes and in the eyes of the community, without alcohol.

There is no single step, no specific medicine, no unique social measure for the achievement of this goal. A combination of techniques is required, a combination most readily achieved through the clinic approach. This calls for a facility for alcoholics maintaining in-patient and out-patient services, staffed by a medical man, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a psychiatric social worker, a recovered alcoholic (with special training) assisting in therapy, and the use of other specialists as required. Such a clinic should maintain the closest working relationships with Alcoholics Anonymous, with hospitals, with social agencies such as the family society, with the local medical society, with courts, probation and parole departments, and so on.

Therapeutic procedures

No set rule for procedures can be set down, nor does this report pretend to be a manual for clinic workers, but a statement of the sort of problem encountered and the type of solution available may help acquaint the reader with a broad picture of the treatment process. Two problems must be dealt with early in the procedure: (1) A decision as to the degree of cooperation present in the alcoholic; (2) a diagnosis of the type of alcoholism involved. It is commonly said that nothing can be done for the alcoholic unless he or she is willing to admit a drinking problem, is willing to try to do something about it, is willing to accept help in that trial. With this statement, which is partly true, goes the implicit assumption that a given alcoholic is or is not willing. The implicit assumption is quite misleading. John Jones may not be willing in 1943, but may be slightly or halfway or completely willing in 1944, may be unwilling at 10 o'clock, but willing at 11 o'clock. He may always be unwilling insofar as his wife is concerned, but quite amenable to the whole idea of rehabilitation on talking with a recovered alcoholic. The very idea of a psychiatrist may make him as stubborn as an alcoholic can be (and that is stubborn indeed), but the approach of a trained pastoral counselor may find him sincerely cooperative. Furthermore, the wall of defenses developed over many years as a protective mechanism may have become too great for the alcoholic himself to surmount without expert assistance. Willingness or unwillingness or uncertainty are the end results of the combination and development of many factors, such as basic personality, immediate anxieties and satisfactions, the personality of other persons involved, the individual's stock of knowledge (whether correct or fallacious), the most recent drinking experience, the immediate situation, and so on. The trained and experienced therapist makes a diagnosis as to the status of the potential client's desire to cooperate and also as to the factors involved: Why is this or that candidate more or less willing to cooperate in a therapeutic attempt; what is barring cooperation; what persons, activities, beliefs, programs will reinforce willingness; when should they be utilized, by whom, and under what conditions? Willingness, or unwillingness, or uncertainty in the alcoholic as to cooperation in a therapeutic attempt is not an all-or-nothing

proposition, is not an absolute factor; it is merely the end result of the combination of many factors.

Diagnosis of the type of alcoholism

Diagnosis of the type of alcoholism or of the major background factors involved is essential for determination of the type of therapy to be utilized. There are many types of therapy: psychoanalysis, social casework, conditioned reflex treatment, psychological training, various modes of group therapy, social reorientation, religious conversion, superficial and deep psychiatric treatment, counseling, Alcoholics Anonymous, vocational rehabilitation, hospitalization, and so on. To expect any one of these to effect rehabilitation for all individuals who present the alcoholic syndrome is as ridiculous as to expect all sorts of headaches to succumb to one pill, whether they are due to anxiety, infection, sinus, stomach, or dental troubles.

Some types of alcoholism seem to call for long, expensive treatment; others respond to much simpler, less expensive techniques. As research develops more accurate diagnosis and provides more certain links between types of alcoholism and types of therapy, rehabilitation will become more effective, less expensive, more available, less time consuming.

Diagnosis of the type of alcoholism involved would seem to depend primarily on the understanding of two sorts of phenomena: (1) The life history; (2) the drinking history, especially as it reflects personality factors. The first of these, subject of much study in the last 75 years, is usually undertaken by the psychiatrist and the psychiatric social caseworker. The second has received little or no scientific attention until the last 2 or 3 years, although empirical techniques have been worked out by recovered alcoholics and recently there has been a great increase in artistic description.

In the first part of this report a distinction was made between primary and secondary compulsive drinkers. It was pointed out that in the final stages of alcoholism the two types appeared to be the same. The distinction is to be achieved by analysis of the drinking history, the social history, and the emotional status and development of the alcoholic. For some types of primary drinkers the therapeutic prognosis is not particularly good; long and perhaps deep psychotherapy is often indicated; temporary separation from the patient's ordinary milieu may be needed. For the secondary type intensive psychiatric work may not be necessary; anything but the most brief institutionalization (unless other complications are involved) is probably unnecessary, perhaps unwise; counseling, social reorientation, or psychological retraining are more likely to be suggested; the prognosis is usually good.

More obvious need of medical and psychiatric diagnosis is seen in the fact that psychosis or feeble-mindedness may be the real problem in an individual whom the public might label an alcoholic. He or she might be an alcoholic, but the alcoholism would be merely a striking and obvious symptom, the important difficulty being of a very different nature. Furthermore, alcoholism may be accompanied by all manner of other conditions—heart disease, epilepsy, nutritional deficiency, etc. Diagnosis will locate these added problems and allow the alcoholism therapy to proceed with less danger and fewer obstacles.

Types of treatment

(a) Physical: Following diagnosis of the patient's willingness to cooperate and the type of alcoholism involved, treatment procedures are determined. Five different levels of treatment will be discussed in the following order: the physical, the psychological, the social, the immediate situation, and the control of drinking. In practice one cannot separate these approaches. Each case is unique and the therapist has to be aware of the possible complications in the case and of the special resources of the other types of therapists. Rehabilitation of the alcoholic calls for teamwork among specialists.

The patient may be in need of sedation if he is just coming out of a bender. He may even show the effects of delirium tremens. More significant in the long run, however, is his general condition, which may show the effects of inadequate diet, irregular and insufficient rest, and the harsh impact of real and imagined blows which are the common lot of many alcoholics. Again, the alcoholic may suffer from specific maladies of eyes, teeth, heart, etc. Whether the alcoholic be afflicted with another specific disease, be in a generally run-down condition, or be suffering from tremors of post-binge tensions, or manifest all three, he is a poor bet for rehabilitation until these conditions have been remedied. Any efficient therapy must meet these problems.

(b) Psychological: The psychological level of treatment may also be considered in relation to the immediate situation and in relation to the over-all development of the patient's personality. As a general rule the patient coming out of the bender shows excessive remorse, guilt, and anxiety; he may well have appeared at the clinic as a sort of last and hopeless gesture. This immediate situation calls for reduction of guilt and remorse (by means other than alcohol), calls for reestablishment of confidence in the self and realistic hope for a better life through the services of the clinic.

In addition to this immediate problem there is the personality structure and functioning of the individual as it has developed from earliest years. The pain, the egocentricity, and the immaturity of response of the alcoholic must be dealt with. This psychological aspect is always a major factor in alcoholism; in the rather rough category described previously as the primary compulsive type it is the major factor. The emotional imbalance, psychic conflicts, subjective maladjustments, neurotic anxieties, or whatever the psychological problem may be termed, must be defined and worked on. This is no place for a discussion of psychological therapies. It is appropriate here only to state that treatment on this level is essential for all types and is of many forms and varying degrees of intensity.

Through treatment on this level the patient is enabled better to understand himself, is given techniques by which he can better manage his life, by which he can attain self-respect and life satisfactions. The therapist is a friend, a guide, a protector, an instigator, a teacher, but the patient is the primary source of rehabilitation. As he continues with the therapy he becomes more self-reliant, less dependent on the therapist, and, along with therapy on the social level, he may hope to develop into an individual of sufficient independence, maturity, and ingenuity to achieve relatively secure life patterns, satisfactory to self and society, without the use of alcohol.

(c) Social: Treatment on the social level is directed not only at the patient but also at the milieu in which he lives. It has already been pointed out that the psychological maladjustment is inevitably accompanied by social maladjustment. These two aspects of behavior mutually reinforce each other. The break-down of emotionally significant personal relations allows ridiculous idealism, destructive cynicism, and nonactivity to play ever greater roles in the individual's life. Egocentricity can run riot in the isolated person. Ordinary rewards and punishments become less and less meaningful to the individual not belonging to such groups as the parental family, the marital family, the neighborhood or occupational clique, or the close reciprocating friendship. Therapy in alcoholism must include reorientation to a real social world along with psychological retraining. If not, the psychological changes are merely intellectual abstractions and will soon wither away. The patient, along with psychological changes, must start to practice reciprocating social relations, must start to use socially acceptable (contrasted to selfishly acceptable) ideas, and must start to act in socially acceptable ways (instead of just dreaming and suffering and escaping through alcohol).

In this process the recovering alcoholic needs help in adjusting to his environment. He cannot swing from extreme under-socialization to full participation in a competitive and insecure world by one swift step. He has to redirect, even reconstruct, parts of a personality structure which may have been years in developing. He has to revise, develop new control for, and even initiate new attitudes, habits, and relationships. He has to do this when he is probably just emerging from a condition of wretched physique. And he has to meet these problems in the shadow of the bottle. He is accustomed to meeting problems by the simple method of taking a drink, a technique which has almost always worked wonderfully and which is easily available. It is small wonder that there are many slips in the history of attempted recoveries.

Not only does the patient need help in finding, joining, and participating in a real social world, he also needs help in redefining and readjusting to those parts of his old drinking world which also will be part of his new social world. His wife, employer, neighbor, children, and embittered friends of the past all have to be integrated into his reformed way of life. Even with the best of intentions (and often the intentions are far from the best) these individuals may act, or talk or fail to act so that the projected recovery is efficiently blocked. Not infrequently the personalities of wife or family are themselves major sources of the patient's psychological problems. A large part of the rehabilitation of an alcoholic may be psychological therapy and education directed not at the patient but at the father or husband or wife or sister.

In concluding these remarks on therapy at the social level it may be worth while to point out the obvious limitations of therapy which is carried on solely in an institution. The recovered alcoholic has to live with himself in a real world, not with a psychiatrist in a hospital. Institutionalization may be necessary for the patient, but it can never be more than a first and incomplete step in therapy. It can be an antitherapeutic experience if the patient adjusts too happily and too dependently in the institution; he may be left with fewer assets and greater liabilities for recovery in the real world than he had before being institutionalized.

(d) The immediate situation: At the moment the alcoholic first appears at the clinic he may be without a cent; without sufficient clothing for health, to say nothing of clothes appropriate for looking for a job, without a bed to sleep in, without means for getting a meal. He may be facing a jail sentence. He may discover that his wife is bringing a divorce action, that he has lost his union membership or his tools, that his creditors are about to take violent measures, and so on and so on.

When the immediate situation is so drastically threatening, diagnosis of the patient's desire to cooperate, study of his drinking history, or probing into his emotional life may be utterly inappropriate. They may render future therapeutic endeavors far more difficult. They may eliminate the possibility of rapport between any member of the clinic

and the prospective patient. Freudian revelations, moral lecturing, and social case-work reporting are equally ridiculous and objectionable to the individual who is facing a night on a park bench or in the city lockup or who has inadequate clothing, a blazing headache, and the prospect of the last shreds of his social life being torn asunder. The first therapeutic step may have to be relief of the immediately pressing problem.

(e) Control of drinking: To the general public it might seem that the control of drinking is not one level of therapy but the whole purpose of therapy; also, it might seem the most difficult task which the therapist has to face. Both conceptions are fallacious. The purpose of therapy is to enable the alcoholic to live peacefully and constructively with himself and with his community without alcohol. The compulsive drinking is a symptom of his social and psychological maladjustment. Combating symptoms is hardly an efficient procedure. Unless the sources of the problem are controlled, the same or different symptoms will emerge. The experience of the hospitals which merely sober up the alcoholic (not touching the alcoholism) and of the jails is clear on this point.

Getting the alcoholic to give up alcohol is not usually very difficult. Without any outside help he or she has probably sworn off drinking innumerable times. The period of abstinence may have been a day, a week, or 6 months. Going on the wagon is necessary for rehabilitiation, but by itself it does not bring about rehabilitation. Since it is a measure concerned only with the symptom, not with the nature or structure or development of the condition, this is hardly a surprising conclusion. Alcoholics have been known to sit watching the clock until the magic hour of their self-imposed abstinence has terminated at which point, congratulating themselves on their will power, control, and victory over alcohol, they fill themselves with as much liquor as they can obtain.

It already has been pointed out that the process of recovery is difficult, that slips are common. Various techniques have been used to keep the alcoholic from drinking during the first days, weeks, or months of recovery. These vary from the limitation of pledges of abstinence to 24 hours Alcoholic Anonymous to the establishment of an automatic aversion to the taste of alcohol by the so-called conditioned reflex treatment. Sometimes a slip is considered to have a therapeutic value since it may prove to the recovering alcoholic that the impossibility of his ever using alcohol as a moderate drinker is no idle comment but a fact of harsh reality; sometimes the slip may allow a firmer foundation for both diagnosis and program of therapy.

Costs of the clinic approach

To conclude this report on therapy, a few statements on the cost and on the results of clinic treatment will be presented. A full time out-patient clinic for alcoholics with a staff consisting of a full-time psychiatrist, full-time psychiatric social worker, a full-time trained lay therapist, two full-time clerks, a part-time internist, and the services of a psychologist and of a laboratory on a fee basis, will cost approximately $25,000 a year. Such a clinic can accept about 300 new patients a year. To attain greater efficiency two such clinics might call for a convalescent center or hospital-like facility of 25 beds which might make the expense for each—aside from original purchase or construction cost—about $45,000 a year. The cost of this unit of two out-patient clinics and one in-patient facility would be $150 per patient. For an out-patient clinic alone the cost would be about $85. The increased efficiency of the larger unit, however, may make it a less expensive facility.

These costs must be compared with present costs to discover that additional expense or what saving may be entailed. Present costs per alcoholic must be based on the first measurable expenses stemming from his alcoholism and continue till his death or recovery. They will include costs of arrests, court appearances, jail sentences, hospital treatments, services of lodging houses, settlements, welfare departments, relief organizations, social agencies, and groups responsible for compensation. They will include costs of maintaining the alcoholic's dependents. They will include charges arising from his damaging other people and property. Perhaps the most significant single charge would be loss of earning power. Prior to his alcoholism the individual may have earned from $500 to $50,000 a year. As the condition progressed, this earning power decreased. The alcoholic may still hold occasional jobs during the year. In a survey of 1,200 arrested male inebriates made in the boom year of 1942, a total of 28 percent of the men were unemployed. Of all those employed, 54 percent had held their jobs less than 6 months. Only a third of these employed earned as much as $35 a week. Three-quarters of the men were between 25 and 60 years of age, and two-thirds of them between 30 and 50.

Without attempting to assess the loss to industry, it is worth noting that most of these men start downhill after 30 years of age. This means that in most instances they had spent more than 5 years in a given type of work, perhaps in a particular industry. It is after the first 3 to 5 years that the employee above the unskilled laborer class usually becomes a real asset to his company. Losing a green hand or newcomer cannot compare to the loss involved when an experienced man in whom the company has made, so to speak, a 5-year investment, drops out of the job, probably after a period of diminishing efficiency.

How does one evaluate such losses, particularly when the accounting may cover a period of 10 to 20 years? For purposes of discussion it may be assumed that of the 300 annually coming to a clinic one-fifth could earn on the average $1,000 a year, three-fifths $2,500, and the remainder $3,500. If on the average they are all earning $1,000 less because of their alcoholism, then an out-patient clinic costing $25,000 a year need help only 25 out of 300 patients in order to regain for the community earning power equivalent to the cost of the clinic. This concerns earning power for 1 year only. Those 25 should continue such recovered earning power for many years to come. In addition, those 25 should cease to be charges on relief, hospital, jails, courts, etc. In addition, they should take on part or full care of dependents, should pay taxes, stop panhandling, and so on. Finally, a clinic even without the in-patient facility may be expected to help more than half of its clients and should gain a large degree of recovery for at least a third. Using even these conservative proportions, 100 recoveries would be a more appropriate figure than 25. The conclusion is overwhelming that treatment of the sort proposed presents a huge saving to the community at rather small cost.

To conclude the subject of treatment a few words of warning should be presented. The sum of $25,000 will not by itself create a clinic. The presence of a clinic will not by itself guarantee such and such a proportion of recoveries. Neither will $250,000 or the opening of five clinics be particularly helpful. They may set the program of therapy 10 years backward. Before clinics can operate successfully there is need of public education, professional education, community agency education, all in the broadest sense of that term. Therapy for alcoholics cannot be inaugurated in a vacuum, nor will it survive if the environment is suspicious or aggressive, disinterested, or ignorant. A public-health program for alcoholism needs not only the financial support of the public, it needs planning, public-relations policy, trained personnel, knowledge of the local situation, cooperation of courts, social agencies, hospitals, and similar professional groups as well as constructive support from many sectors of the total community.

III. PREVENTION

The prevention of alcoholism is the most significant goal to be achieved. What is prevention and by what techniques may it be approached most efficiently? The prevention of alcoholism will be most nearly achieved when people do not use drinking as a means of regularly attaining emotional equilibrium, as a means of regularly attaining sense of personal and social adequacy and adjustment. Three millions of our population use it in this way at the present time. About forty-five to fifty million others drink alcoholic beverages but not for this purpose.

Although it is obvious that one means of preventing alcoholism would be the elimination or significant reduction of emotional disequilibrium and of personal and social maladjustment, this is such a vast and Utopian goal for the specific problem of alcoholism that it seems inappropriate to make it the particular aim of alcoholism prevention. It is a background purpose in this instance just as it is in the prevention programs of groups combating war, neuroses, economic strife, and many other of the major problems of our day.

More immediately appropriate as a major goal for alcoholism prevention would be a change in social patterns of behavior and of thought so that the use of alcohol for personality adjustment purposes would become an alternative so unattractive, would be recognized as a response so inefficient, and would be understood as a signal of maladjustment so important that the first steps in this direction would be almost automatically labeled and would be almost automatically stopped. How can our society achieve such a change in social behavior and thought?

Punishment, even severe punishment of alcoholics, will have little or no effect in this process. Formal education in the schools can help, but it can do so only if (a) the lesson to be taught is realistic, understandable, meaningful to the student, (b) the community is largely in agreement with what is taught, and (c) the teachers themselves are taught and properly equipped.

The changes needed to achieve prevention must arise from the public in general. The public is aware and is becoming more accurately aware of the problems of alcoholism. If the public can gain a realistic understanding of the nature of those problems and of the nature of alcoholism, if a technique of efficient action is available, if that technique is not strange, objectionable, or too expensive, then the public will avail itself of that technique.

How will the public learn of the techniques? Probably the most successful means of getting the public to notice is by the dramatic and successful saving of life, the dramatic and successful means of alleviating pain and misery. The logic of the schoolroom and the spellbinding of the orator have small influence compared to the experience of seeing a technique save a friend or relative from misery, disgrace, and death.

Prevention through therapy

Rather than explaining why prevention should follow logically upon therapy, let two cases be presented showing this process in operation. When Alcoholics Anonymous started, its members were almost entirely men who had gone through years of pain and degradation, who had long since lost family, friends, and job, and who knew all too well the jails and mental hospitals and flophouses not only in their home region but sometimes all over the country. When the Yale plan clinic first opened its doors, it was getting similar cases, men who had been alcoholics for 10, 15, or 20 years.

But as the name of Alcoholics Anonymous spread throughout the country and as word of the clinic spread in its region, a change was observable. Men and women of much shorter experience with alcoholism approached AA groups and came to the clinic. Some of the older members first thought that these "youngsters" wouldn't be helped much by AA; "they hadn't hit bottom yet." But AA helped beyond all expectation, and soon the "high-bottom" as well as "low-bottom" applicants were members in good standing.

And now a further change may be seen in both clinic and A. A. People are coming in for information and advice who aren't alcoholic by any definition. They're afraid they or their children or friends might in the future become alcoholics.

Why has this change occurred? It has occurred because a dramatic and successful technique has emerged to meet the very real problem of alcoholism. Just how the technique works may not be clear to the potential alcoholic or his or her friends and family and employers, but they learn a little, they gain in understanding, and they spread the news that something can be done. Formerly the person who was afraid of alcoholism or who had started along the alcoholic trail had nowhere to turn, nothing to do, nothing to hope for. He would get silly advice, scorn, and ridicule. Now there is someone to turn to, something to do, and well-founded hope. And as the public learns of this, they become willing to learn a little of the nature of alcoholism, its beginnings, its course of development, and its sure effects.

As this knowledge and understanding spreads, it becomes possible to utilize the more formal agencies of education, such as the school, with greater and greater efficiency. Just as the changes in behavior and ideas needed to bring about public sanitation waited until the dramatic cures and life-saving techniques of Pasteur and Lister, so may a more discriminating and alert understanding of alcoholism and consequently a more efficient mode of drinking behavior wait upon the public's realization of the therapy of alcoholism. As that therapy becomes more efficient and more available so will the understanding and behavior necessary for prevention be achieved, and alcoholism, perhaps in our time, will gradually come under control, will no longer be a major social and health problem in our society.

The Problem of Soil Erosion and How It Is Being Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of an essay entitled "The Problem of Soil Erosion and How It Is Being Overcome," written by Marion Wampler, of Singers Glen, Rockingham County, Va., which won first prize in a contest conducted by the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Chamber of Commerce among grade-school students of Rockingham County.

THE PROBLEM OF SOIL EROSION AND HOW IT IS BEING OVERCOME

(By Marion Wampler)

The soil is our Nation's most important resource. It is also the most important constituent of human life. All of the real essentials of life outside of air and water are more or less products of the soil. Food, clothing, and most everything are derived from the land. Industry and labor and professional people as well as farmers depend greatly upon the soil. Therefore, land is our base, for all we do, everything we share, even whatever we amount to as a great people, begins with and rests upon the continued productiveness of our farm lands.

This precious soil was formed very slowly. It was originally formed from rock. Natural sources crushing and grinding the rock slowly formed a mineral soil. It is estimated that from 400 to 1,000 years of natural soil building is required to form 1 inch of soil. However, this soil was not rich, but as plant life began to grow and then die and decay the soil became richer. Fertile topsoil now covers most of the world except where it has been allowed to erode away. If the topsoil is wasted the land cannot produce enough food and soon the people of the world would starve.

Down through the ages soil has been allowed to erode and deteriorate. In many selfish ways man has used the land at its hardest for himself never thinking of the coming generations. The lands around the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea are now mostly covered deeply with sand or leave only bare rocks where man once enjoyed flourishing agriculture from the then rich soil. Gradually as the earth's population spread out the soil in other countries began to deteriorate. In India and China and other countries of the Far East soil is continually eroding.

Although we may speak disdainfully of some of the countries of the Old World, we must remember that civilization thrived on their land for hundreds of years. Most Americans would be shocked by the fact that soil exploitation has been greater in our own country than in any other region or nation of the world. Here are some of the facts as we know them today.

Fifty million acres of once rich cropland have been ruined for further practical farming. Another 50,000,000 acres are near ruin. One hundred million more acres have lost from 25 to 75 percent of their topsoil. In all, this is 200,000,000 acres of once good cropland partially or completely ruined. On the average about 3 inches of the original 9 inches have been lost, leaving only 6 inches for cultivation. So, in from 100 to 200 years of cultivation about one-third of American soil has been removed.

Plant food is also lost in erosion. In an average year, erosion removes 21 times as much plant food as crops do. Erosion removes and loses about 90,000,000 tons of nitrogen potassium, magnesium, phosphorus, and calcium each year. This is what our Nation has lost and is losing in the way of erosion.

Today there are over 146,000,000 people in our country and about 460,000,000 acres of cropland. This is about 3½ acres per person. The way that land is used and cared for is important to every citizen of the United States especially those in the cities. If the land can produce only enough for the people in the country those in the cities will have nothing to eat. The soil is not deep and it should be strictly conserved.

Now, let us look at the personal loss. The records of a 7-year period show the following losses. An average of 27,580 pounds, or 13.79 tons of topsoil per acre were lost from a 25-percent slope each year that it appeared in corn, when a 3-year rotation was employed. This loss is equivalent to having a little over 2½ 5-ton truckloads of topsoil hauled away from each acre every year that it is in corn. Crops such as wheat and clover greatly reduce these losses. On the same slope, with the same rainfall, only 1,620 pounds, or 9.81 tons of soil were lost per acre from wheat. This is still a serious loss of fertile topsoil, but less than the loss under corn. Clover is a still greater soil-saver. It reduces the loss to 20 pounds per acre. It also helps to build up the soil. On these same plots the average yearly water losses were 69,530 gallons under corn, 27,975 gallons per acre from wheat, and 1,630 gallons under clover.

A yearly soil loss of nearly 14 tons per acre means that in 70 years the entire layer of productive soil would be washed away. Long before this the serious problems of having an unproductive soil would develop. But this need not happen. Modern conservation practices can aid in lengthening the life of our productive soil. Crop rotation alone can extend the life period of over 200 years. Use of cover crops, contour tillage, strip cropping, terracing, and planned land use will all help to further extend and protect the life of our fertile soils.

We can get along from now on with the good land we have, but we cannot keep our present standard of living if we lose much more. Actually, we need more good land for crops now. Too many farmers are working on poor land that should be turned back to grass or woodland. More waste of land would amount to a national crime on the part of those who are responsible—meaning ourselves. Yet we are allowing about 500,000 acres to go down to ruin each year. This shows why it is so necessary to fight erosion.

In the fight against erosion soil conservation takes its stand. Soil conservation is the proper use and care of the land. It means using the land to produce the greatest amounts of the things most needed, and at the same time protecting it so it will not lose its productiveness. All land is not alike. Each field or acre must be used for things it is best suited to produce and protected according to its needs. In short, soil conservation is treating the land according to its needs and using it according to its capabilities.

In the Nation's effort to produce adequate quantities of all agricultural products, conservation assumes added importance. Advancements which have come about in recent years as a result of experimentation and the experience of many farmers, in the management of croplands to conserve soil and moisture, show that conservation increases crop yields.

Some of the troubles that soil conservation helps prevent are topsoil blowing away, covering good land with erosion debris, exhaustion of plant food in the soil by overcropping and leaching, accumulation of toxic salts, too much water, lack of water, burning of organic soils, and improper cultivation. The basis of soil conservation is wise use and management of all land.

Some of the tools of conservation of soil are terraces, contouring, organic matter, grass, crop rotation, fertilizer, legumes, shrubs, trees, drainage, and irrigation. Soil conservation includes any and all measures that will make the land produce more without damaging it.

The following is a list of practical suggestions which farmers are urged to follow: (1) Use suitable erosion-control practices to stop soil washing and blowing; (2) hold the rain that falls on the land, for use of crops, trees, grass, livestock, and for other purposes; (3) use manure, fertilizer, and lime where needed, in the right amounts and at the right time; (4) use tillage, mulching, and cropping practices to protect the land and save rainfall; (5) drain waterlogged fields; (6) plant trees, grass, or legumes on areas too steep or shallow to plow; also on land too poor to grow field crops; (7) quit growing clean-tilled crops on land that washes or blows easily; (8) flood fields where toxic salts have accumulated, to leach out the salts; (9) where it is available, open up new land under conservation practices when needed to

increase cropland; (10) protect organic soils from fire by floods, or by raising the water table; (11) increase feed crops in safe grazing areas to eliminate overgrazing when grass is thin and short.

Different types of land need different methods of conservation. Where the slope of fields is steeper than 8, 10, or 12 percent, the land is not safe for regular plowing. Trees and grass are better crops for land of this sort because they hold the soil in place. In regions of heavy rainfall, terraces to control run-off should be built more sturdily than in areas of gentle rains. If yields drop off, manure, lime, soil-building legumes, rotations, and fertilizer will restore life to the soil. Grass, trees, or vines should be planted in raw gullies. If these are not growing well, small dams or other mechanical measures should be used to stop soil washing.

It is a common idea that gully control means planting trees, plugging gullies with brush, building check dams, or directly applying to a gully some other individual control measure. This centers attention on devices that stop gullies rather than on ways of farming that prevent them. A farmer who wishes to keep his fields free from gullies must give first consideration to proper conservation farming and land use on areas that provide run-off for the formation of gullies. He must make use of the above practices where needed, but prevention of gullies is also very important. If the land is managed carefully, no gullies should ever start.

Strip cropping is one of the most important conservation practices. In its various patterns it is applicable to a large area of the United States. It is an old conservation practice. Farmers all over the Nation are adopting it as one of the easiest ways to hold soil in place, increase crop yields, and conserve moisture. Strip cropping in different localities takes on various field patterns, and many methods and practices are used. Its effectiveness depends upon how well these practices are established and maintained.

An important part of soil and moisture conservation is making the best use of every acre on the farm. Some farms have land of which no better use can be made than to develop it as a farm fish pond. The fish provide food for the family, and the recreation the pond affords adds much to the pleasure of rural life. Ponds can be developed most anywhere especially in a hilly region. Their uses as a conservation measure are conservation of water and elimination of gully scars.

On a majority of the farms of the United States a woodland area will be found. If properly managed these woodlands can be as valuable as any other part of the farm. They can be cultivated on acres that are useless for any other crop. Woodlands are also an important part of the farm conservation plan. Where they are plentiful, water will not so easily run off the land. They check water run-off and conserve moisture, which later comes out in springs and can serve some useful purpose.

Soil-conservation districts now take a stand against erosion. They work to unite the farmers and help spread the adoption of improved practices on the land. Soil-conservation districts are local units of government operating under State laws. They are set up and run by farmers to protect farm and ranch land from erosion, to improve productivity, and to conserve rainfall. They have the authority to ask and receive help from Federal and State Governments. In these self-governed districts, farmers are cooperating to protect their land. They often work in groups, helping each other to apply good land use and conservation methods to their land. The work of each farmer on his own farm fits into a district-wide plan. The first of these districts was set up August 4, 1947. Now there are districts in all 48 States, and a total of 1,921 districts have been organized.

Soil-conservation districts are working with more than 530,000 farmers whose land covers about 148,000,000 acres. The districts furnish technical aid, and, in some cases, machinery, seeds, and other helps. A conservation plan based on the capacities and needs of the soil, and the means of the farmers, was made for each farm. The soil-conservation service did the technical planning for these farms and helped apply the plans to the land. The plans are very thorough. They provide for use of each field or other area according to its capability and treatment of each acre according to its needs. Many conservation measures are used. Each piece of land is different and needs different practices. There are eight classes of land and each class needs different types of conservation. Many plans are being made for the future of soil-conservation districts. They are blueprints for the future against soil erosion.

Soil erosion has been and is one of the most wasteful situations in the history of the world. If we face the problem squarely we can meet it and save our country from destruction. The only way to insure the prosperity of the people of our great Nation is to conserve its soil, its most important resource.

Outside America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Percy Winner published on September 19, 1949:

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Damascus is a long way from Washington but the phase of Middle Eastern politics which was begun with the murder of Syria's would-be dictator (and reformer) Hosni Zaim has a direct bearing on matters which brought Sir Stafford Cripps to the American Capital. And the troubled waters of Anglo-American economic relations are not likely to get any soothing from the oil of Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Qatar, and Bahrein.

The disappearance from the Syrian scene of Zaim was a great blow to James H. Keeley, the American Ambassador. It was no such thing to the British Ambassador or to the British Colonial Office. The French Ambassador, who had just presented Zaim with a sword that had once belonged to Napoleon III (in exchange for not inconsiderable favors to France), was deeply grieved.

Before Zaim was killed, President Truman's point 4—the promise of large-scale economic aid—was well on the way of becoming the successful instrument of American dominance in the Middle East. With Zaim's removal without benefit even of a drumhead trial, rather older methods at which Britons have excelled in the past seemed more likely to have a chance of success. King Abdullah el Hashemi of Transjordan, who owes his throne to Winston Churchill and the Colonial Office, hastened to recognize and congratulate Zaim's successor, the 84-year-old Hashem Atassi, an old-guard figurehead. Soon afterward Abdullah was in London talking to Ernest Bevin. Other leaders of the Hashemite faction also went to London, where a full-dress meeting of British diplomats in the Middle East considered methods of coping with point 4 while there still was time.

The stake in the Middle East is enormous. Strategically, it is one of the key places in the duel between the western world and Soviet Russia. But economically it is an area in which the inner contradictions of the western world are most serious. Washington and London are agreed that the Middle East must be defended along the line of the roof—the mountain frontiers of Greece, Turkey and Iran. But they are not agreed about the second line of defense—the home fronts of the Arab countries where communism might exploit dire poverty and social inequalities of long standing.

There is a simple reason for this disagreement—oil. If present plans work out, the production of the area will be about 156,000,000 tons in 1956 as compared with about 35,000,000 tons in 1946. The Americans and British agree that the Russians should not get this oil; that is about as far as they agree.

As the oil is extracted, there will be great benefits to the governments of the middle eastern countries, perhaps $6,000,000,000 in the next 10 years in oil-company royalties and local expenditures. But until the great increase in production takes place, only the Americans are able to buy their way into the favor of the local politicians; whatever point four may be strategically or altruistically, it is also an instrument by which the American oil companies can get advantages over their British competitors. The British have to use political means.

This they are doing. Before Zaim was murdered, he had signed an agreement with the Arabian-American Oil Co. to permit the construction of the American Trans-Arabian pipe line (TAPline) from Saudi Arabia through Syria to the Lebanese coast. Now that Zaim is gone, the British are busy helping the Anglo-Iranian and other British companies by additional political changes. The purpose of the conferences in London was to take quick advantage of the set-back to the Americans involved in Zaim's removal.

The goal is to create a pro-British Arab state, the Golden Crescent or Greater Syria, that will include Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and the Arab portions of Palestine. Egypt, which has thus far dominated the Arab League as the most important Moslem state in the Middle East, has been and is bitterly opposed. So are the Americans and French. The favorite instruments of the British are Abdullah and Nuri Pasha of Iraq, both representatives of the so-called Hashemite faction. Ibn Saud, of Arabia, seems willing to go along with Abdullah on the ground that only a Greater Syria can (to quote the London Times) "contain the expansionist policies of Israel."

While Nuri Pasha, visiting Egypt in an effort to conciliate King Farouk, denied that Iraq had any part in the Greater Syria plan, and while similar denials were coming from Damascus, Bagdad, and the Colonial Office, Abdullah frankly told a correspondent of Al Misri in London that all this was nonsense. Greater Syria would be created and the Hashemites would govern it, he said.

In Tel Aviv, the Israelis realized what was in the wind even before Ihsan el Sherif, Syria's Minister in Turkey, said after the death of Zaim that "the Damascus Government intends to change its policy toward Israel." Bevin, who (despite other qualities) clings to a passionate prejudice against Israel and to an equally passionate desire to cripple the new state, is now expected to turn Abdullah away from his previous mild friendliness toward the Israelis.

But there are larger issues involved. No matter what strategic bases the American and British military forces can hold in such places as Saudi Arabia, Cyrenaica, Transjordan, and Cyprus, the roof line cannot be protected without a base in the canal zone of Egypt. If the British Greater Syria policy alienates the Egyptians even more than it

has up to now, if the British fifth columns undo the work of point 4, the effect will be to give the Russians matches they can use on the oil of the Middle East.

Farm Storage: Facts Not Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusion relating to the farm storage and loan programs, due to untruths, half-truths, and misrepresentations of the 1948 campaign, the time has come to give the public—especially the American farmer—the facts.

Mr. Walter R. Scott, executive vice president of the Kansas City Board of Trade, a man of many years experience, recently made the following statement which appeared in the Kansas City Times, Thursday, September 15, 1949, which merits careful reading:

STRINGS ON CORN LOAN—THAT RATHER THAN STORAGE SITUATION BLAMED FOR DECLINE—MOISTURE AND GRADE REQUIREMENTS FORCED LARGE AMOUNT FROM BUMPER CROP ON MARKET, WALTER SCOTT SAYS

To the STAR:

In the Times of September 10 there appeared a story by Raymond Moley on the subject Corn Typifies Farm Problem, which, while in the main a good description, can stand a little clarification.

The story undertook to explain why the price of corn in the open market has been less than the support price offered to farmers by the Government.

PRICES PROPPED BY LOANS

This support price is available through a so-called loan, which is not a loan in the usual sense, because it is without recourse—if the market price advances to a point where the farmer can redeem his loan with a profit he does so, otherwise the Government takes the grain and the farmer is relieved of all liability. In fact, the loan is a guaranteed minimum price. The question in Mr. Moley's story is, Why do not all farmers take advantage of the loan?

His answer is that Commodity Credit Corporation specifies in offering the loan that the corn shall be of relatively high quality and that it shall be stored in safe and efficient facilities, and he is correct as far as he goes. Corn placed under loan must be held for a considerable period of time, and its keeping qualities must be assured.

For this reason a very large amount of corn, containing excessive moisture, is not eligible for the loan and must be sold in commercial channels to buyers who have the means of drying it and who are willing to carry it until a consumer can be found. Other reasons may be mentioned, such as conditions arising from the relationship of landlord and tenant, a disinclination on the part of many farmers to accept the loan or its attendant red tape.

PRODUCER ONLY IS PROTECTED

The result of these things is that a considerable amount of corn comes on the market to be sold. The Government does not protect the price of corn in the hands of buyers, therefore, it must bring what it is worth, in some instances less than the loan price, in other instances more.

Mr. Moley suggests that the corn coming on the market is the result of distressed selling by farmers because their storage facilities are overtaxed, and refers to the corn situation last year, which had much attention in the Presidential election campaign. The outstanding fact in that situation, however, was not the matter of storage facilities, although it was made to appear so, but it was the sharp drop in the price of corn.

By the middle of October, 2 weeks before the election, the price of corn had dropped 64 cents a bushel from the July price, and farmers apparently became panicky. But this decline in price was in no sense due to lack of storage facilities.

The falling price was perfectly natural in the circumstances. The previous crop was the smallest in many years, the oncoming crop was the largest ever produced. Great crops of the other feed grains were also coming on the market as well as unusually large supplies of other feedstuffs. In the face of record supplies the livestock population had been declining steadily since the early years of the war. An adjustment of price to these conditions was inevitable.

FARMERS WERE MISLED

Politicians took advantage of this situation and began to prey on farmers' fears. They charged the price decline to the action of the terrible Eightieth Congress in passing a bill which they said made it impossible for the Government to supply the necessary storage facilities to support the price of corn. There was no truth in these charges.

Government loans last year were made on corn on the farm—not in warehouses. The Government never in any year furnished farm storage facilities. However, the law referred to did not prevent Commodity Credit Corporation from making any provision for or spending any money for farm storage facilities that it desired. The law only prohibited the Corporation from buying or leasing real property and was designed to prevent it from acquiring commercial facilities such as grain elevators, cotton gins, and warehouses, tobacco warehouses, refrigerated warehouses, and so on by which it could engage in business.

So far as the loan went, and that was as far as the Government intended to support the price of corn, farmers knew in midsummer what the loan price would be, they could see an enormous crop coming on, and had only to provide fairly inexpensive cribs on their farms to be eligible for the loan.

STORAGE SPACE A POLITICAL ISSUE

Mr. Moley says "pressure on the farmer because of limited storage sank Dewey without trace." He should have said that the untruthful representations of the Democratic candidates and their speakers together with the fears of the farmer sank Dewey.

The law prohibiting the Commodity Credit Corporation from acquiring interests in real property was not just a Republican measure. It passed both Houses of Congress without a dissenting vote, and President Truman signed it. It was deliberate misrepresentation to charge the Republicans with responsibility for it or to pretend to farmers that it had anything to do with the price of corn. It was a smart trick to do so but definitely lacking in honesty. Mr. Dewey was aware of these things, but the smugness of the Republican leadership prevented the truth from appearing.

WALTER R. SCOTT,
Executive Vice President, the Kansas City Board of Trade.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped these facts will finally correct the political propaganda and fully advise the farmers of America.

Taft-Hartley Act Exposé by the Climax Machinery Co. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Metal Polisher, Buffer, and Plater:

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT EXPOSÉ BY THE CLIMAX MACHINERY CO. CASE

(By Robert A. Wilson, general counsel)

No labor case better illustrates the reprehensible antiunion purposes and the complete unfairness of the Taft-Hartley Act than the Climax Machinery Co. case involving our union. That case had its inception last November when the Adams Plating Co., a job plater, after negotiating a contract with local No. 171, refused to sign the contract and decided not to carry out the terms of the agreement. Local 171 called a strike at this plant and commenced peaceful, lawful picketing. The local union likewise filed charges of unfair labor practices against the company with the ninth regional office of the Labor Board.

It so happens that for approximately a year and a half the Adams Plating Co. had subcontracted its hard-chrome plating work to the Climax Machinery Co. which also did job plating. After the perfectly justifiable strike had been called against Adams by local 171, the members of that union employed by Climax raised the question of whether they were required to scab against their striking union brothers by performing Adams' work for him at Climax. Upon being advised by the union that they were not required to perform this work and that the union would stand behind them should Climax take disciplinary action against them, these employees refused to perform this work, but continued to perform all other work at Climax.

Climax thereupon, near the end of April, filed charges of unfair labor practices against local 171 and the international union alleging that we were engaged in a secondary boycott in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. These charges were filed with the same regional office of the Board, the ninth, which had had our charges against Adams pending before it for approximately a 4-month period.

Within a matter of days after Climax had filed its charges against us, those charges had been investigated, a complaint had been issued, and a petition for an injunction had been filed in the United States district court in Indianapolis. We were ordered to appear before that court almost immediately to show cause why an injunction should not be issued against us.

We appeared in court and fought the issuance of this injunction. While we held off the issuance of the injunction for a period of 2 months, the court eventually granted the injunction pending a decision by the Labor Board on the complaint it had issued against us.

Within 2 weeks after our appearance in court, the Board set a hearing on the company's complaint before a trial examiner and we, of course, appeared at that hearing and argued our case. In July the trial examiner issued his report in which he found a violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act. In his report the trial examiner agreed with many of our principles and basic arguments, however, on the basis of previous

Board decisions involving certain building-trades cases (which we did not and do not think are applicable) he held against us. His decision, however, was sympathetic in that he impliedly recognized the evils of a law that would require such a decision and suggested an appeal to Congress to eliminate that evil. We have filed exceptions to the trial examiner's report and the case is pending before the Board in Washington.

Approximately 8 months have now passed since we filed our charges of unfair labor practices against Adams. The ninth regional office of the Board is still sitting on our charges and has taken no action. Yet within 3 months after the Climax Machinery Co. filed its charges against us, growing out of the same basic labor dispute, the Board has secured an injunction against us, and has processed those charges to their final stages.

No one possessed of the slightest degree of intellectual honesty could contend that a law that demands the expeditious handling of cases against labor and encourages the dilatory handling of cases against employers is a fair law.

Nor could any honest person attempt to defend a law that requires the persecution of labor before the courts when it has been charged that a union has violated its provision, while employers can continue to violate that law for years before any effective court decree is sought, if ever.

And who but hypocrites and thoughtless fools would say that a law which requires a union member to "scab" against his fellow union members and perform services for an employer against whom a strike is pending is not an evil, reprehensible, un-American slave-labor law.

Organized labor in general, and our union in particular, has never sought unfair legislation which demands discrimination against employers and seeks their destruction. Yet the Taft-Hartley Act, as clearly demonstrated by the Climax Machinery Co. case, does command discrimination against unions by requiring the early and quick handling of cases against unions and use of the insidious weapon of injunctions against unions, while cases against employers go unprocessed and employers remain free from injunctive action. And the Taft-Hartley Act definitely seeks the destruction of unions by requiring union members to make their services and their skills available to those against whom they are striking, thus requiring men to work against their own interest in order that their adversaries in labor disputes may enjoy immunity from labor's only weapon, the strike.

We are going to fight the Climax Machinery Co. case before the Board and in the courts to the very end, but the only real safeguard against such patently unfair and un-American legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act lies in the voting booth and the ballot.

River Development in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from the Massachusetts CIO News, August 1949 issue:

CIO LOOKS TO THE RIVERS

(By Reg Zalles)

WHAT'S A RIVER?

A river is a big polluted sewer to the sea. A river is a raging torrent flooding its banks and spreading disaster to countless thousands of river-valley inhabitants. That's the million-dollar answer to, "What's a river?" in New England.

Navigation? Recreation? Flood control? Water power? Sure a river could mean all of those things. But does a river mean that in New England? Does it mean that right here in our own State of Massachusetts? Don't get me wrong. Our rivers are in part used for these purposes. But we are definitely failing to use and develop one of New England's biggest natural resources—our rivers.

OTHER RIVERS

What's happening to rivers in other parts of the country? The South, the Middle West, the far West. There's the giant Government developments of the Tennessee River Valley in the South, the Columbia River Valley in the far West, and the projected Missouri River Valley development in the Middle West. These areas by using and developing their natural river resources to the full are booming business and employment. The standard of living is rising as cheap electric power and controlled river waters make possible home comforts and outdoor recreation as well as eliminating destructive floods. Meanwhile New England is standing still.

Look at some facts. In 1909, Massachusetts produced 7.3 percent of all manufactured goods in the United States. In 1929, it had dropped to 4.9 percent and by 1939 to 4.4 percent. The 1949 figures are not available but who can doubt that they will show a further drop. This does not necessarily mean that Massachusetts is losing its industries. It does mean that it is not growing like the rest of the country. Massachusetts is standing still.

CHEAP WATER POWER

One of the important answers to why Massachusetts and the rest of New England industry is not growing is our failure to use our rivers. The failure to develop cheap electric water power (the engineers call it hydroelectric power). The rivers are here. The potential cheap electric power is here.

Right here in Massachusetts we have the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers with many tributaries. Only two-fifths of the potential power output has been developed by private utilities and municipal. To develop the large untapped remainder requires the development of the Connecticut River Valley as a regional whole for the four New England States through which the river flows. Just like the Federal TVA project. It cannot be done piecemeal. Transmission lines from the projected St. Lawrence seaway and power development could add another large volume of power for New England industries. Finally the big rivers of Maine as well as its tidal flow at Passamaquoddy have tremendous underdeveloped electric-power potentials of which Massachusetts could get its share.

RECREATION

The rivers of Massachusetts are used for sewage disposal by hundreds of towns and cities. Only 19 of them treat the sewage to prevent pollution of the waters. If you still feel like taking a swim in them, take a look at what happens in the hot, dry summer months when the rivers shrivel to slow streams. The pollution problem becomes most serious just when swimming is most desirable. Proper storage of spring floodwaters and release during the summer could correct this.

How about fishing? Pollution of Massachusetts rivers has all but exterminated the fish in the rivers. Sheer neglect has all but destroyed the abundant fish life of these rivers.

NAVIGATION

Water navigation is slow but for heavy bulk freight it is the cheapest form of transportation. New England as a manufacturing center (particularly Massachusetts) has heavy needs for bulk fuel and raw materials. The St. Lawrence seaway opening up a waterway from the Middle West to the New England ports would be of tremendous help to Massachusetts industries by reducing freight rates.

FLOOD CONTROL

If river development is carried on by a unified Government agency, the cost of flood controls which would save millions of dollars of life and property damage annually, could be spent in conjunction with recreation and power development so that the over-all expense for each purpose would be tremendously reduced. This requires a comprehensive plan such as the Federal Government has done for the Tennessee River and is projecting for the Columbia River and the Missouri River.

WHO IS THE OPPOSITION?

The opposition to this broad river development has been the big private utility companies. They exercise monopoly privileges in setting rates which regulatory legislation has failed completely to control. In other words, they're making plenty of money off the consumer and they don't want cheap public power.

They claim that Government would be taking their business away. Actually, in the South, in the TVA region, many have sold their properties to public agencies at a better than fair price and many have continued to operate with normal profits. Of course, they do not continue to get the fancy monopoly profits they were used to.

The main thing to remember is that cheap public power brings growth of demand.

More industries.

More employment.

Total: Higher standard of living for all the people.

Go down and look at your nearest river. How about it?

Nation and World Benefit by Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, sets out some enlightening facts and information regarding our reciprocal trade program. It reveals that the Congress has progressed a great deal since the thinking of the statesmen who handled our foreign relations back in the 1920's. Our country has set aside the thought that we can live wholly within our borders and enjoy prosperity. Our cooperation with other nations on the globe both on domestic and foreign matters are today paramount.

The editorial follows:

NATION AND WORLD BENEFIT BY RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

The United States Senate finally has put itself back in the scoring column after weeks of unprofitable dawdling. It has approved renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program which was allowed to lapse June 30, and there were heartening signs of statesmanship in its performance.

The Senate defeated eight proposed amendments aimed at limiting one way or another the State Department's power to lower United States tariffs in return for similar reductions by other countries.

Most important victory was that against the so-called peril-point proposal sponsored by Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado. This amendment would have required the United States Tariff Commission to determine points beyond which tariffs could not be lowered without danger to particuluar industries.

This feature was written into the law last year by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Supporters of the program argue, however, that it would deny trade negotiators the free hand they need in arranging tariff concessions. Earlier this year the House knocked the provision out of the renewal bill it approved.

The reciprocal trade program always has stirred bitter controversy since its beginnings in 1936. Many industries fight the plan because they fear that lowering barriers to foreign products will hurt them.

But the United States cannot turn its back on a program designed to increase the flow of world trade at the very time it is telling Marshall-plan countries and other nations that they must bend every effort to ease trade barriers.

For too long this country held to the selfish view that it ought to be able to sell freely in foreign lands while barring its own markets to commodities from abroad. Spurred by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, America courageously reversed its restrictive high-tariff policy. It must stick to its new course.

While the Senate acted in accord with the country's responsibility to show the way in bettering world trade, one cannot help but note that the margin by which it took this decision was often narrow.

For example, it defeated by a slim 41 to 40 an amendment designed to limit oil imports. Had not two Senators switched their votes at the last moment, the proposal would have carried.

It is hard to understand the reasoning of the men who backed this proposal. For years we have been hearing that our oil resources are dwindling, that we must do all we can to conserve them. Presumably, using other nations' oil is one way of saving our own. And yet many Senators voted to keep all but a small trickle of foreign oil out of America.

This same nearsighted economic nationalism was displayed by a large Senate group when not long ago it denied the full funds sought for the importing of critical materials under the foreign-aid program.

The devotion shown by most Senators for their home-district products is getting out of control when it comes close to doing serious damage to the vital effort to rebuild world trade. Fortunately for the Nation and the world, the reciprocal-trade program is now safe from their throttling hands for another 2 years.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program—A Tribute to Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 27, 1949:

RED LETTER DAY FOR MR. HULL

Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull will be 78 years old next Sunday. He may have felt that yesterday was a sort of prebirthday celebration as he watched President Truman sign the bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years. Reciprocity, which used to be a Republican baby, has been a Democratic baby since 1933, and its establishment and continuance have been the crowning achievement of Mr. Hull's career.

Looking back to 1934, when the executive branch received the power to lower import duties if other countries would correspondingly favor our exports, one may see the Hull program growing in significance. It was a breath of old-fashioned but not out-moded liberalism during the dismal days when the whole world seemed threatened by arbitrary controls. Now it has a more positive function. This Nation, by force of circumstances, has become an active propopent of greater freedom of trade—for and among other nations. If we were to start rebuilding a preposterous protectionism, as a strong minority in Congress has wished us to do, we would risk losing our battle for the economic unity of the free world.

The House last February voted 319 to 69 for the Hull program. The Senate Finance Committee approved the House measure in March by a straight party vote of 7 to 6. Then the bill lay dormant for 6 months, and, though the Senate finally passed it on September 15 by a 62-to-19 vote, the peril-point amendment which would have sabotaged it was killed by a close vote of 43 to 38. The administration can now proceed to validate the multilateral trade agreements recently negotiated at the Annecy Trade Conference. The economic principle that if we don't buy we can't sell and the moral principle that if we desire friends we must behave in a friendly fashion have been vindicated. And Mr. Hull, father of this program, can be proud.

Regulations for Operation of School Busses in the State of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harwell C. Ozburn, assistant general claim agent for the Central of Georgia Railway, who is serving with distinction as chairman of the grade-crossing committee of the Association of Railway Claim Agents, has brought to my attention the regulations issued by the director of the Georgia State Department of Public Safety for the operation of school buses within the State of Georgia. I wish to insert the regulations in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that they will be studied by the State authorities throughout America. If these regulations could be adopted in every State and strictly enforced it would result in the saving of thousands of lives in years to come.

The regulations follow:

[Georgia State Department of Public Safety, Safety Education Division]

TO ALL SCHOOL BUS DRIVERS—APPROACHING AND CROSSING RAILROAD CROSSINGS

1. All school busses must come to a complete stop before crossing a railroad.

2. Driver's vision must not be obscured to his right or left or front. Vision must not be obscured by students by paper or pasteboard or metal being used in lieu of broken glass. Cracked or discolored glass shall be replaced.

3. The bus should be stopped 25 to 30 feet from the nearest rail. The front school safety patrolman will be sent from the bus and will look in both directions to make sure the way is clear. He will then proceed to a safe distance beyond the fartherest rail and will signal the driver to proceed across the tracks. The driver should then shift into low gear and accelerate the motor sufficiently to guarantee that it will not choke down while crossing. Under no circumstances will the driver proceed until given the proper signal by the patrolman. He will then stop his bus 25 to 30 feet from the fartherest rail and pick up the patrolman. Under no circumstances will driver attempt to cross a crossing when a train can be seen approaching because of the chance of bus being stalled on track and the time involved to unload a bus loaded with children that might become frantic.

4. In the event a bus is stalled on a railroad crossing and cannot be cleared immediately, the driver must immediately unload his bus and see that all children are at a safe distance from track. He will send two of the larger children, one in each direction, with instructions to go at least one-fourth of a mile to flag any approaching train, and another to nearest station to notify railroad agent.

5. Never depend on any mechanical device of warning at any railroad crossing as any mechanical device is subject to failure.

6. Do not depend on your knowledge of schedules. A railroad has the right to run an extra train without your permission. Also any train is subject to being late without notifying anyone.

7. Each driver will please realize that his responsibility is great and his burden is precious.

We must not have a school-bus grade-crossing accident in our State.

GEORGE W. WILSON,
Colonel, Director,
State Department of Public Safety.
W. C. DOMINY,
Major, Commanding Officer,
Georgia State Patrol.
E. S. BURKE,
Lieutenant, Supervisor of Safety
Education, Georgia State Patrol.

P. S.—Two thousand nine hundred and fifty-six school-bus drivers haul 200,000 students to and from school daily in Georgia.

California Greets Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Senate of the California Legislature, on July 2, 1949:

Senate Resolution 177

Extending greetings and good wishes to the Republic of Ireland

Whereas the Irish people have contributed immeasurably to the cultural, social, economic, and political welfare of the people of the United States of America; and

Whereas, at long last, the Republic of Ireland has deservedly taken its rightful place among the family of sovereign nations; and

Whereas Senator George J. Hatfield, a distinguished citizen of the State of California, a former United States attorney, a former lieutenant governor of the State of California, and currently an esteemed member of the California State Senate, will soon leave the United States on a vacation tour of Europe, which will include a visit to the Republic of Ireland; and

Whereas the members of the California State Senate desire to take this opportunity to pay their respects to the people of the Republic of Ireland and to the Honorable John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate cause a properly engrossed copy of this resolution to be prepared and transmitted to Senator Hatfield; and be it further

Resolved, That Senator George J. Hatfield is requested to call upon the Honorable John A. Costello, Prime Minister of Ireland, and to present to him a copy of this resolution as an expression of the respect and the esteem of the California Senate for the people of the Republic of Ireland and for the Prime Minister.

Resolution was read, and on motion of Senator McBride, was unanimously adopted.

By Senators Jespersen, Collier, McBride, Mayo, and Judah.

Address by Crawford H. Greenewalt Before National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 29 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered this afternoon before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., by Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before I try to deal with the problems of bigness and monopoly—both very controversial subjects—let me see if I can define the economic area in which there is agreement.

I think we can all get together on the desire for economic progress. We all want a stronger America—a more prosperous America—an ever better place in which to live. We have won for ourselves the highest living standard in the world, and the benefits of our economy are spread among all our people, perhaps not so widely as we would like, but nevertheless more widely than in any other country.

As a nation we are not content to stay put. We are eager to push ahead—to reach ever higher—to spread the benefits of our productive genius even further.

The quarrel comes not in what we want to accomplish but how best we can get at it.

That is where the problem of bigness in business first rears its head. We have big business—we have always had it.

But many people now seem to regard big business as in some way inimical to the public interest. They look upon large corporations as "monopolies," "concentrations of economic power," selfish and heartless, seeking economic aggrandizement for themselves at the expense of the rest of the people. Believing that, it is a natural consequence to favor the use of political power to restrict corporate activities, to bring their operations under the control of the Government, and in some cases to break them up.

Anyone who has studied the economic problems of the Nation must know that these premises are wrong. A business, whether it be big or little, to be successful must serve the public interest; and if a business grows it does so because the quality and price of its products win public confidence. Its ultimate size is then dictated only by the aggregate demand of its satisfied customers. There is a clear difference between protecting competition and protecting competitors, and true and lasting economic progress lies in encouraging the most efficient producers so that all people may have more and better things for their money.

Actually growth in an industrial enterprise has only one connotation—and that is success in pleasing three groups of people—its customers, its employees, and its stockholders. That is no easy task. The record also shows that there is nothing static in that success once it is achieved. If you will look at the lists of the largest industrial corporations in this country year by year since the beginning of the century you will see that success in business, as in any other endeavor, is indeed a fugitive thing. Most of us have forgotten that some of the leaders of a generation ago ever existed, and that is because the decision that led to their downfall or shrinkage was taken, not by government, but by the most powerful body in this country—the customers with dollars in their hot hands searching eternally for lower costs and better quality.

The du Pont Co. is successful and it is big, and in saying that I am merely reciting cause and effect. Those of us who are responsible for its management are thoroughly and painfully aware that that success comes about through public acceptance of the goods and services we offer. Should we ever fail in maintaining that acceptance, we will lose business and someone else will gain it. And that, gentlemen, will bring about a break-up of what has been called the "du Pont industrial empire" far more quickly and far more devastatingly than any outside attack.

"Monopoly" is a word in the glossary of modern terminology which is much used and much abused. We now have a legal interpretation that says monopoly is the manufacture of a large share of any product by any one company regardless of how competitive that product may be with other materials doing the same job. To add to the legal confusion, the word "share" appears to mean anything between 30 percent and 100 percent, depending upon circumstances which are also as yet undefined.

The political interpretation of monopoly seems to be that anyone who is big has it, and very recently we have been given the concept that if as many as three or four companies have a majority of a market they are said to be monopolists, or oligopolists, as the erudite call it, regardless of how intense the competition be between them.

Actually monopoly means "one seller," and the test of monopoly is whether the buyer of any article has freedom of choice in fulfilling his requirements. If he can make his purchase from only one source, then a monopoly exists, even though that monopoly may be a perfectly legal one, such as the purchase of electric power in many of our communities. But if he can select from among several materials, each of which will to a greater or less extent relieve his need, then no monopoly in any real sense exists. The choice becomes that of the customer, and he can buy or refuse to buy without compulsion and according to his best judgment.

The term "monopoly" has also been given the implication that it is intended to smother or to exclude competition. The chemical industry is popularly depicted as a haven of monopoly, yet it is in fact one of the most competitive industries in the world.

There are something like 9,000 companies engaged in the manufacture of what the Census Bureau describes as chemical and allied products. As a corporation, the du Pont Co. is the largest of these and has roughly 8 percent of the trade in this segment of American industry. Individually, however, few of our products lead their fields. In most instances our leading competitors are more important factors than we in many of our markets.

In the paint field, Sherwin-Williams is bigger than du Pont and both of us fight for business among nearly 1,200 active competitors. American Viscose is larger than we in viscose rayon; Celanese in acetate rayon, and there are about 15 other important companies in those fields. Union Carbide is bigger than we in plastics; Allied Chemical in nitrogen products; Eastman Kodak in photographic film; Dow in chlorine products and also in insecticides.

I say that without shame—because it comes about as a matter of deliberate policy—a policy of diversification which I believe has operated in the interests of the consumer, of the du Pont Co., and of the public at large. With limited resources for capital expenditure, we have no wish to strive for a fixed percentage of any market. To do so would prevent us from exploiting to the full the new developments produced in our research laboratories, and that I think is our greatest challenge and our greatest responsibility. Any success we might have in excluding competition in viscose rayon, in paint, or in sulfuric acid might very probably make us miss a neoprene synthetic rubber, a cellophane, or a nylon, and that would be advantageous neither to us nor to the public.

For the du Pont Co., and I believe this is also true for the chemical industry, I can say categorically that our present size and our present success have not come about through a process of stifling competition by absorbing competitors.

It has come about through the new products and new processes that have been developed in our laboratories, and the proof of that statement is in our sales figures. Sixty percent of du Pont sales in 1948 consisted of products that were not in commercial production in 1928—just two decades ago.

Experience in other countries has shown that the hand of monopoly is a dead hand indeed. It profits no one, least of all the company that attempts to practice it.

The du Pont Co., has existed for nearly 150 years in an atmosphere of free and vigorous competition. We have done well under that system and we like it. Competition is a prod that keeps us continually on our toes. We think we are stronger because of it; we think we would be weaker without it. The opportunities for growth and service in our industry through the development of new things are limitless. It is utter foolishness to think that growth in any of its varied phases can be brought about only by the elimination of other manufacturers.

It should be obvious to anyone that big businesses are essential in the complex economy in which we live today. A business is simply a pool of people's resources—the resources of a group of employees, of a group of investors to accomplish a given task. Since there is a limit to what any one man will risk, the larger the task the bigger the pool must be. If we want low-priced automobiles, low-priced radios, low-priced television sets, we must have a large team of people to work and venture so that the bene-

fits of mass production can be applied to those products.

It follows also that big business has its own peculiar responsibility—that is to devote itself to those tasks that require its full resources of manpower, of finance, of talent. So far as du Pont is concerned we have endeavored over the years to tackle the difficult projects that make full use of the resources we enjoy. I would like to cite a few examples out of many in which that policy has been successfuly employed.

The United States had no dyestuffs industry worthy of the name prior to the First World War and was dependent on Germany even for the dyes with which to print stamps and money. Du Pont was one of the pioneers in instituting dyestuffs manufacture in this country. What that venture cost like-minded chemical manufacturers I do not know. I do know that for du Pont it was 18 years and $43,000,000 before profits offset losses.

In the early twenties we built a plant in West Virginia to manufacture ammonia and other chemicals by the application of pressures unheard of commercially up to that time. That was another long and expensive trip since it was more than 10 years and many millions of dollars before that department began to show black ink on its profit and loss statement.

Nylon is at the same time one of our greatest successes and one of our greatest gambles. Basic research leading to this development was started in 1928, but it was not until 1940 and the expenditure of about $27,000,000 that we were able to sell the first pound made in a commercial unit.

Some of you may have heard that we have a new textile fiber in the making which we have called "Orlon" acrylic fiber. We are building the first commercial unit for its manufacture at Camden, S. C. We have hopes for that new product, but I must admit that we do not yet know whether it will be a sheep or a goat. Before we find out, sometime in 1950 or 1951, we will have gambled $7,000,000 in research and $15,000,000 in plant investment.

Nylon, ammonia, dyestuffs have been profitable items for du Pont. But don't think for a minute that du Pont stockholders were the only gainers. There were thousands of men and women who got jobs that never existed before. There were millions of consumers whose standard of living was raised by each such success. There is the country itself, stronger both in peace and in war. When these gambles pay off, everybody benefits.

And research itself is perhaps the greatest gamble of all. You gentlemen see only the successes described in high-sounding releases from our public-relations department. What you do not see is the long list of failures—the brave new ideas that don't pan out. I speak with deep feeling because as a research man I had lots of those brave new ideas myself that ended in the trash can.

Statistics on failures are difficult to come by but it is a fair approximation to say that not more than one out of five research dollars pay off. That means simply that if the direct cost of nylon research is, say, $5,000,000, there is, perhaps, $25,000,000 worth of unsuccessful research that has to be paid for by that one successful development. We are playing with very blue chips, indeed.

And our success in the future, if we are fortunate enough to have it, will come not because we have taken business from someone else, but because we are able to keep that stream of new products and improved processes continually flowing.

On many of these developments we have for 17 years the sole right of manufacture by virtue of patents granted us under the laws of the United States. Nylon is one of those developments. But let me assure you that while we are the only manufacturer of nylon, we have in no sense a monopoly of the applications for that product. Nylon competes for the customer's dollar with every synthetic and natural textile fiber. Your wives may have their stockings, dresses, and lingerie made of nylon, but you may be very sure that if price and quality are not competitive, the ladies will turn to silk, rayon, or in fact anything that better suits their fancy and their purse. If we are not successful in meeting the competitive requirements of the market place we may continue to be the only manufacturer, but we will have nothing but red figures on the balance sheet to show for it. And that is cold comfort indeed.

With our new products it is essential that we strive for the largest market, not for the highest price or the highest profit. We introduced cellophane many years ago and costs of manufacture by the methods used then forced us to sell it at $2.65 a pound. It was used initially only in wrapping luxury items, such as perfumes, bath salts, and fancy candy boxes. Some purchasers even thought it valuable enough to keep in their safes. Today, as a result of technological improvements and increased volume, cellophane sells for around 50 cents a pound. Because of that low price, cellophane now protects the most commonplace articles and saves millions of dollars annually in eliminating waste and spoilage of food.

And so to strive for the largest market, at the lowest price that yields a reasonable return on our investment, is a policy which serves many ends. It is beneficial to the public in making available to them an ever-increasing flow of the goods and services they desire. It is beneficial also in creating new opportunities for employment, and finally, it is profitable to us as a corporation and so provides our 100,000 stockholders with a return on their capital.

There is much misconception also about the relationship between big and little businesses. The idea has been put forward that big businesses grow by swallowing little businesses or by limiting their growth. Nothing could be further from the truth. No little business could compete with us in nylon for the reason that no such business could bring together the capital and technical resources required for an efficient producing unit. We, on the other hand, have no interest in competing in spheres where we can make no substantial technical contribution, and there are many activities, particularly in fields of marketing and distribution, that small businesses can do better than we. It is, in addition, essential for us to pursue a cooperative relationship with those small businesses since they are the suppliers of our raw materials and the primary consumers of our finished products.

Let me cite an example. We make nylon yarn and sell it to whoever will buy. Your wife buys, let us say, a nylon blouse. Between the sale of that yarn and that blouse are the throwster who twists the yarn, the weaver who weaves it, the finisher who finishes and dyes it, the cutter who makes the garment, and the retail store that sells it. For the most part those are small businesses. They need us; we need them. We thrive together by virtue of a cooperative relationship. Perhaps I can put it for you quantitatively. Your wife pays about $1.50 for her nylon stockings. We get about 10 cents for the yarn that goes into them, and the difference represents the contribution, the opportunity, and the profit of the many smaller businesses that lie between us and the final consumer.

Had we the power and the desire—which we do not—to swallow these businesses or to drive them out of existence, we would indeed be killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

I have spoken about big business and about monopoly. Let me say a word about the laws that regulate them. We have had on our books for many years the Sherman antitrust law. The du Pont Co. is now and has always been heartily in favor of that law and the safeguards it provides for our system of free, competitive enterprise. Unfortunately that law states an objective and prescribes no rules so that the ideology of enforcement is left to the shifting winds of political thought. This had led to continuing changes in interpretation as one court decision succeeds another. Unfortunately also, no practical statute of limitations applies, so business frequently finds itself attacked for acts done many years ago in all good faith and with the best legal advice available.

I do not want to leave the impression that business, whether large or small, has never made mistakes. A business is a group of people, subject to the same human frailties as people in any sphere of activity. We must not let the occasional error blind us to the overriding benefits our industrial system has brought. That system has made America the strongest Nation on earth, and its free development will carry us to new heights.

The controversy which is rising to a climax in this country over so-called monopoly and big business is a matter of vital interest to all of its citizens.

This Nation has grown strong by allowing the forces of the market place to rule—the business laurels falling to whoever is able enough to win them, the law present to insure fair play. I do not see that there is any tenable alternative. In the national interest no steps must be taken that penalize success and efficiency. We dare not hobble the willingness of a business to venture by refusing it the fruits of its success or by holding out the doubtful privilege of Government regulation when that success has been achieved. We can preserve competition only by allowing it to operate, and so to make effective the votes of thousands of satisfied customers.

It is vital to the strength, happiness, and future standard of living of the people of this country that we permit the free growth and development of large businesses capable of taking the great risks involved in the difficult industrial tasks, for we cannot have what we do not produce.

I have spent many of my working years in the fields of science. I learned there a fundamental principle—never to discard the results of a well-demonstrated experiment in favor of an untried hypothesis. I would urge that that principle never be forgotten in dealing with these vital problems.

Death of a Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, August 25, 1949. I commend it to the attention of all those who are interested in the fate of the smaller, independent business enterprises in the United States. It follows:

DEATH OF A BUSINESS

Back in 1925 two young Cleveland businessmen went into the fuel-oil business. Their assets consisted of a lot of ambition and $30,000 in cash, three-fourths of it borrowed from friends.

Twenty-three years later, after weathering a war and a depression, the partners

were doing $50,000,000 worth of business annually. The road ahead, businesswise, looked bright and prosperous.

Yet, in August 1948, the two partners sold out to a larger oil company. It was one of those mergers of big and little businesses that Washington seems so concerned about; competition in the Nation's oil distribution business was reduced by one small part.

What happened? Was there a squeeze by big business? Was little business whipped by too tough competition? Was there a plot to monopolize oil in the Cleveland area?

W. W. Vandeveer, one of the partners, has written his story of what happened to one venture in private enterprise:

"While the Federal Government investigates, prosecutes, and holds hearings on how big business is growing bigger by gobbling up its smaller competitors, thousands of small businesses are being forced to seek refuge in mergers with other companies because of the Government's own regulations.

"Our company—Allied Oil Co., Inc., and its subsidiaries—were merged with the Ashland Oil & Refining Co. on August 3, 1948. On that day my partner and I were out of business—a business that we had built from scratch over a period of 23 years. On that day the number of competing oil companies in the United States was reduced by one.

"We were not the victims of unfair trade practices. We were not gobbled up by any private monopoly. We were not threatened by any of our competitors—big or little. We sought to merge because of the threats held over our heads by the Government that has been giving lip service to the encouragement of small business and to the preservation of competitive enterprise.

"We were ready, willing, and able to carry on for many more years of successful business life. We have faced the business hazards of depression years, war years, and years of postwar reconstruction. We were not a couple of doddering old men looking for a safe, quiet place to piece out the rest of our days. We knew we could continue to increase our service to our community—and do it profitably—but Uncle Sam's tax laws backed us into a corner where we had only one of two choices: Sell out or face the risk of personal bankruptcy at the time of our respective deaths.

"If our story were the story of only one small business, it would hardly be worth the telling. It is, however, the story of thousands of independent, closely held business concerns. The liquidation and merging of these thousands of small businesses is reducing the area of competition and threatening our system of individual enterprise.

"It is time to study the problem of mergeritis from the viewpoint of the small business that has been merged. It is time to determine the composite causes that make liquidation or the merger route such a popular road to business suicide. We do not need more road blocks on big business. We need an open road that will give small business the incentive and opportunity to stay independent.

"The story of the Allied merger shows how Government regulations encourage the sales of small business and reduce competition. Allied Oil was born, like thousands of American enterprises, on a shoestring. Its pattern of growth was that followed by many an American company.

"Except for the NRA code days and the years of the Petroleum Administration for War, the business grew outside the shadow of Government restrictions. We were free to compete for the fuel business of industrial consumers. In that competition with natural-gas suppliers, coal and oil companies, we had to show industrial plants how Allied Oil could help them reduce their operating and manufacturing costs. We did this by teaching their personnel more efficient fuel practices—by searching the country for lower-cost materials—and by devising new, lower-cost transportation methods.

"During these years of growth and diversification, we plowed back practically every cent of the company's earnings into new facilities, and in addition borrowed substantial sums from local banks and life insurance companies in order to further increase our service to the community and to tide us over many a tight spot. Our expanding facilities each year served more and more customers with lower-cost fuels and better service and provided more and more persons with employment on the Allied Oil pay roll.

"With such an apparent record of success, why were we forced to sell out? To begin with, the tax laws encourage small-business men to take their earnings in capital gains instead of paying taxes on current income. To do this you have to sell out. Amos and Andy were not the first to make this discovery. They were the first to get wide publicity for using the capital-gains route to hold on to a larger share of their earnings.

"The second impelling cause of our action grew heavier each passing year. The more earnings plowed back, the more the company grew, the greater its assets and earning value became, and estate taxes assumed increased importance. The value of the organization was in its nature as a going concern based on earning power. It wasn't the tons of steel, the ships, the storage terminals, and other physical properties, but the annual earning potential of a smoothly functioning unit that determined the value of the company.

"Each owner knew that the untimely death of the other would set in motion a series of events that could wipe out the earning power of the company and bankrupt the surviving owner as well as the kin of the deceased. There was no established market value of the shares of the company. They were substantially all held by the two chief owners. How would 'value' for inheritance and estate tax purposes be determined? Largely by capitalization of past and potential earnings.

"The value so determined could easily exceed the realization that could have been actually procured under market conditions such as we have experienced and, unless Government attitudes are changed, seem likely to experience for an indefinite time into the future. Inheritance and estate taxes, determined on such a basis, would have greatly exceeded the estate value (liquid assets) held outside of Allied by either owner. Having never been able to pay out much in the way of earnings, their eggs were all in one basket. To meet such taxes, the heirs of the deceased stockholder would have to find a purchaser for a minority stock interest in the company.

"Where and at what price could such a purchaser be found? The survivor might have to go into debt in order to buy such stock to protect himself. There might even have to be either a forced sale of the total properties or a liquidation of assets piecemeal. The effect on Allied Oil employees, customers, and loan makers, to say nothing of the two principals and their heirs, might have been disastrous. We could not escape the inevitability of putting our estates in order.

"There were several possible courses of action and all were studied carefully and thoroughly. One solution was to issue and sell common stock to the public. Allied properties were appraised by a capable firm of engineers in 1945 and a basis established for proper stock issue. The stock market turned down, however, and new issues could find a market only on the basis of bargain counter prices. Investors were not rushing to buy new issues of anybody's common stock.

"After working on the possibility of selling common stock to the public, we found it necessary to find another solution.

"We started a market survey of companies capable of buying Allied's little organization. Several oil companies were interested in making the deal. Our prime objective was to insure a continuation of the Allied organization on a sound and growing basis. That is why the exchange of assets for preferred and common stock of the Ashland Oil & Refining Co. was finally accepted.

"We were satisfied that Allied would continue to serve the market as it had in the past. We were satisfied that our customers would be taken care of. We were convinced that our employees would be treated with dignity and fairness as becomes their abilities.

"All in all, it seemed the best arrangement for everyone who had an interest in Allied. It was the only way out for two individuals who had conceived and built up a business and which in other times or under different circumstances they would have carried on for the rest of their business lives.

"That is the story of the Allied Oil merger and its contribution to the concentration of economic power in America.

"While Allied Oil was an independent, going concern, we did not ask for Government guaranties on prices, income, and profits. We would still be in business except for the unrealistic tax laws that forced us to sell our company.

"The owners of Allied Oil have been merged out of business. As one of the two owners, neither post facto investigations, decrees, nor edicts by a paternal government can bring me back to life as a competitive factor in the oil-marketing business."

Columbia Basin Irrigation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marshall N. Dana from the Oregon Journal of September 25, 1949:

AS HUGE COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION PROJECT COMES INTO BEING—IMMENSE UNDERTAKING IN CENTRAL WASHINGTON

(By Marshall N. Dana)

One looks for Paul Bunyan.

And the Blue Ox.

And he finds them both in the Columbia Basin as machines that do incredible things with incredible power on an incredible scale.

Reaching up the sheer basalt cliff above Grand Coulee Dam is a big steel pipe. Did I say big?

Greater New York consumes 997,000,000 gallons of water a day. This pipe will carry 1,000,000,000 gallons of electrically pumped water a day.

There are six of these pipes. Six times New York's water supply, climbing the cliff 280 feet high. Six billion gallons of water daily, fed into a million acres of land in order that the land may take on its load of helping to feed the Nation.

The Grand Coulee was the channel of a majestic river when the continental glacier, 1,200 miles long and 300 miles wide, began to melt at the end of the ice age. Along the way was a waterfall (Dry Falls) equal to 40 Niagaras. Through Grand Coulee poured the tremendous outflow until the Columbia cut its present channel 1,600 feet deep.

Grand Coulee will become a channel once more, an astronomical irrigation ditch, equalizing the water from Roosevelt Lake, holding it back of a 2-mile dam and feeding it through a man-made river.

Here is where the Blue Ox in steel goes to work. The tremendous machines cut the

artificial river channel at a rate that makes slow and feeble the accomplishments of the myriad legions of the Pyramids and the Roman roads. And one final feat in big machines stretches clear across the channel, smoothing it, banks and bottom, ready for its lining of concrete.

THIRTY YEARS AGO

But, let's see. It was almost 30 years ago. I made a first visit to the Columbia Basin, member of a party of public officials and newspapermen organized by the Spokane Chamber of Commerce. On this page will be reprinted part of an article I wrote at Yakima on the final day of the journey. It will speak for itself.

At that time, the idea was to reclaim 1,700,000 acres approximately of the central Washington desert. Water was to be brought from Albeni Falls near Newport on the Pend Oreille in a stream five times the size of the Spokane River. Constructon cost was estimated at $170 an acre. Identified in the memory of that journey are the late E. F. Blaine, Rufus Woods, of the Wenatchee World, and Lloyd Miller, of Sunnyside.

When we came to Grand Coulee a man was standing there whom I recall as Willis Batchelder, who said a dam should be built, power should be generated, and the water should be pumped down through the ancient channel and thus over the land.

We thought he was "nuts."

But the dam has been built, the mightiest mass of masonry and the greatest individual source of power ever erected by the skill and audacity of man. The water will be pumped over into the ice-age channel and held there by dams above and below until it is distributed over the reclaimable land.

And the estimated construction cost is $81 an acre.

A few days ago I traveled again over the Columbia Basin project. To the words "What hath God wrought" that one repeats confronting the titanic spread of nature, there are irresistibly added, "What have men done?"

Instead of traveling, as before, from the high water source over the desert and then to the reclaimed and beautiful Yakima valley where the demonstration of irrigation is impressive, we started with the Roza project, a new Yakima unit. Lloyd Miller was this time the guide. We went to the Miller ranch, only 4 years from sagebrush. One field was producing alfalfa seed at a rate of $1,000 an acre. The land used to sell as sagebrush for $2 to $10 an acre. Potatoes had yielded up to 700 bushels an acre. Lloyd Miller challenged the fattest acre of Illinois, his native State to produce half as much or as dependably.

THE OLD DESERT PASSES

The old time desert is changing as desert scenes change with mirage or with shifting light and shade. But this change is real. Land is being prepared for the first opening of 87,000 acres. Veterans have first call upon lands belonging to the Government. They are crowding for the opportunity. Civilians will have their chance at lands in private ownership, but, here, by agreement, speculation is forbidden, acres for single family occupation are limited.

The Federal Farmers Home Administration will aid in financing new farmers on the project, said Dillard B. Lesseter, national administrator, speaking at Ephrata.

Step by step, construction will go ahead, irrigated land will be widened, power will be increased. Somewhere in what was the burning desert, a modern city will rise to serve reclaimed areas that compare in size with eastern States. It will be one of the towns now in the project—Ephrata, Moses Lake (or these two joined), Quincy, Winchester, Cunningham—who knows?

This will occur without detriment to Spokane, Portland, Tacoma, Seattle—the metropolitan communities, or to Yakima or Wenatchee which live abundantly in exchanges with their own reclaimed valleys.

After water is pumped from 151-mile Roosevelt Lake back of Grand Coulee Dam, and has been stored in the 25-mile equalizing reservoir which is Grand Coulee itself, the flow will be carried in the comparatively short main canal to its bifurcation into east and west canals, thence by laterals over the land. The west canal will be carried under Soap Lake (the waters of which are soberly said to turn the hair red) in an enormous siphon.

This is in a region that already has highways, railroads, airways, and the nearby navigation channel of the Columbia. It is served by interior and coastal cities which will be principal initial markets as well as distributing centers.

To convey another idea of size, the construction cost for reclamation is running $200,000 a day.

The greatness of the project, the immensity of the region, the hundreds of millions of cost, the hordes of people who are actively interested in the development in one way or another, and the impact upon the imagination of everything from power to mountain peaks make this undertaking one of the most compelling in the 100-year history of the Reclamation Service.

The nearby Hanford plutonium project, concerned with mastering the power and the uses of the atom does not detract from the appeal.

Portland has, inevitably, a very big stake in the final accomplishment. No longer is it the dream of 30 years ago. It is financed, organized, partly built, electrically powered. Think of what will be done in another 30 years.

A BACKWARD LOOK OF 29 YEARS AT CENTRAL WASHINGTON REGION

YAKIMA, WASH., July 10, 1920.—Give me a drink. A long, wide, cool drink. Not soda or moonshine or near beer, but good, clear Bull Run, and then a second filling, with the thought that no matter how much one absorbs there is plenty left.

If there is a land on earth where Dives would beg for a drop to cool his parched tongue, this northwestern editors' excursion, ending at Yakima Saturday night, has discovered it—one hopes, for the rest of the United States. Dry, dry, desperately dry, long before there were laws to promulgate dryness or people to impose the laws upon.

Yet since Friday and in the span of a sleep and the ride of a day we have come from the valley of despair to the valley of delight. What made the difference? Simply the thing we so often in Portland fail to appreciate—water.

Never look at the Columbia again and see only liquid. See grapes and melons, apples and corn, paint on houses and curtains at windows, green lawns and happy mothers and children, adventurous, play-filled children.

Without water, see the miniature trees of sage, that alone with the dwarf cactus, survive the drought. With water see the divine miracle of abundant life redeemed from desolation and death.

As soon as the excursion reached Pasco Saturday morning, Friday's tragedy changed to triumph. Instead of Nelson saying, "I've not had a crop for 8 years and the wheat this year is burning up," it was Cox averring, "Here's a 25-acre strawberry patch, produced $1,000 worth an acre. Here's a man's farm that he cleared $100,000 from. Here's some alfalfa—9 tons to the acre—four cuttings."

Pasco has nearby the Pasco, Burbank, Richland, and Kenewick districts of 12,000, 10,000, 10,000, and 15,000 acres respectively, and the proposed 5-mile project from the Snake will redeem 80,000 acres in Franklin and 50,000 acres in Walla Walla County.

Pasco has $1,000,000 in bank deposits, a railroad monthly pay roll of $300,000 and 100 new families on irrigated lands. Pasco, consequently, is feeling her oats, is helping bridge the Snake for the Inland Empire Highway and is active. Water is the magic in the background.

At Prosser the first tale told was of Wells, who came in 5 years ago and has cleared $40,000 raising chickens. Nearly everybody from Prosser to Yakima during the afternoon's run by automobile had some story of success, some production record to boast of. Water did it.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Of course, it is clear that the excursion has had the effect which the Spokane Chamber of Commerce so ably planned for. The water that worked the miracle in the Yakima Valley, that transformed the 290,000 acres of land from sullen sagebrush, at a cost of $14,000,000, into a beautiful area that shipped out last year $42,000,000 of food products, and, best of all, established prosperous farm homes and a half a dozen towns, the water must have the chance to make dreams come true on the 1,750,000 acres of the Columbia Basin project.

No one will see the project and fail to give it support. The water supply of the Pend Oreille is tremendous. The canal and distribution system is excellently devised.

Nature laid out the land perfectly for irrigation. Already it has railroads, roads, schools, and the potentials of water transportation. One could wish to be better assured that in the development there was more certainty that the speculator will be banned, that the financing plan for an estimated cost of $300,000,000 could be more clearly devised, that water transportation was figured as a more important factor in capitalization, and that the settlement plans were available in greater details. Perhaps these things will be classified at the northwestern reclamation conference in Seattle, September 16 and 17.

From the viewpoint of Portland, Spokane, Tacoma, and Seattle, it is a project of tremendous appeal, fit to enlist the advocacy of selfish instinct as well as the ideal. The rest of the country ought to be able to understand the value of adding $250,000,000 in food products annually from one project.

Address by Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Seventh Ohio District, Before the Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania State Medical Society Pittsburgh, September 26, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, before the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania State Medical Society held at Pittsburgh, September 26, 1949:

It is not only a great honor to be invited to address the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania State Medical Society, but also a rare privilege which I welcome, for there is no group of leaders in American life who better understand that the body politic, like the

human body, can be killed by overmedication.

The great Sir William Osler, in conducting a class, once propounded a hypothetical question to his students as to how much of a certain drug should be given a patient. One student promptly answered "four grains," and none of the others dissented. Sir William went on discussing the case symptoms. A few minutes later the same student interrupted him and asked permission to change his answer. Sir William gravely consulted his watch and said brusquely, "Too late, young man, your patient has already been dead for 3 minutes."

The greatest problem in American political life today is what to do with the befuddled politicians, the half-baked theorists, the fuzzy-minded economic planners, and the rattle-brained socialistic schemers who think that because one grain has proven helpful, when injected into the body politic, four grains will bring us utopia. They proceed on the theory that if it is necessary for Government to perform a few essential services, then it would be still better if Government performed more and more services, until finally it would be attending to all our human wants and needs.

These beclouded disciples of "government by overdosage" are busily at work in every corner of the globe today. Their motives vary from "do-goodism" to outright lust for power, but wherever you find them you also find appalling wreckage in their wake. In Russia we call them Communists. In Germany they were Nazis. In Italy, Fascists. In Britain we call them Socialists. The labels and the dialectics vary, but the end is always the same—the loss of freedom. The price is always the destruction of the essential liberty and dignity of man. The formula is deadly. The greater the government prescription, the worse off those governed become.

The greatest weakness in American political thinking today is that too many of us have forgotten our most important possession is freedom. It is not until we have been in other lands that we fully appreciate what freedom really means.

It is the right for a man to live his own life, to speak his own mind, to worship as he pleases, to own property, to elect and control his own government. All these rights are the component parts of freedom—American style.

Freedom is the force which has made America the most productive nation in the history of the world. Americans have been free to develop their intellects, to let their minds have full play, and to unleash their inventive genius. The automobile, the aeroplane, the telephone, the radio, the automatic machine, the air conditioner—even the modern homes in which we live—are all the direct products of the free minds of free men.

One of the tragedies of our day is that so many people fail to understand this great force. Already a fourth of the world has become enslaved under an opposing philosophy of socialism labeled communism, while another fourth is embracing other forms of socialism, all at the expense of human freedom and human liberty.

Basically these various alien philosophies—call them communism, socialism, fascism, nazism, statism, collectivism, or totalitarianism—are the same nostrum—materialism or materialistic security. The individual must always surrender his freedom in exchange for the guaranty he will be housed and clothed and fed. But there is no assurance as to how well or how long he will be housed and clothed and fed, for once he has surrendered his freedom there is nothing he can do about it. He is trapped forever.

Let us take a look at the history of these alien philosophies. Let us see how the forces of materialism have gained their headway.

For 200 years the world has been struggling against the impact of the machine age. The machine age has had two effects on human beings. First, it has made them less reliant on themselves and more reliant on tools. Second, it has provided them with a fantastic assortment of physical luxuries.

As a consequence human beings have lost, to a great degree, their artisan and creative abilities. Furthermore, their desire to acquire the amazing products of the machine age has upset the balance between their physical and spiritual lives.

Freedom is an essential part of our spiritual existence. As people have been willing to give up freedom in exchange for the materialistic products of the machine age, the spiritual side of their lives has been the loser. As the moral and spiritual fiber in human beings has disintegrated, materialism has advanced at a rapid stride.

Demagogic politicians and governments have been trading on the materialistic desires of the people. Remember, it was the demagogs of Europe who produced communism, socialism, nazism, and fascism.

There is another aspect to this question of freedom versus materialism, developed by the materialists themselves. They have chosen to battle on the issue of who should control, not only the good produced by the tools and machines, but the very tools and machines themselves. The truly liberal theory, born out of the Magna Charta eight centuries ago, was that each individual should have the right to own land and his tools of production. Each individual might not exercise that right, but it was guaranteed him. Karl Marx, the father of the Socialist and Communist movements which exist today, wanted it otherwise. Marx was a foxy politician. He looked around him and counted the land and the machines, then he counted the people. He saw there were more people than land and machines. So he based his political creed on the theory that no individual should own machines and land—but that both should be owned by the State. He argued that no one could be secure so long as there was competition for the ownership of land and tools. Security was his key word. So it was Karl Marx, the father of communism and socialism, who launched the mad race for materialistic security which is reaching its peak today.

The tragedy of our age, however, has been the failure of most so-called liberals to distinguish between physical security and true security. In their efforts to match the wild promise of the Marxists, they have lost sight of the basic factor which made them liberal—the morality of human rights and liberties.

What we are witnessing today is the final complete surrender to materialism and amorality. It happend in Italy. It happened in Germany. It is today in full force in the Soviet sphere of influence. It is in control in England. It has invaded the United States.

Many of our American political leaders have abandoned all sense of true liberalism and public morality. They still proclaim themselves to be liberals, but they are now trying to sell the American people on the idea that if they have the physical necessities of life they will be secure and happy. Yet the fact is that today the American people feel neither secure or happy. Neither do the British people feel secure or happy.

In Russia, where materialism has reached its inevitable goal, the people have found the price of physical security is fear. The few who have some physical security are never free from the terrors of fear. What kind of security is that?

Most British and Americans sense this fatal weakness in the Godless materialism which is being offered them, though they do not thoroughly understand it. But many of our present day world leaders do understand it.

For example, Pope Pius XII, understands it. He has repeatedly called for a rebirth of morality and a proper understanding of materialism. As recently as last July, the Pope addressed the women of Rome, decrying materialism, and pointing out that the advocates of statism were destroying the fundamental moral force of the world—the home.

Wherever the Communists have control, one of the first steps is to remove the child from the home at an early age, because they know materialism is amoral, and the home moral. The one is the deadly enemy of the other.

The Pope sees this with great clarity. So does James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, who has twice warned—and I quote him—"We are going down the road to statism." Mr. Byrnes declares that if these new socialistic programs should be adopted here—and I quote him again—"There is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of state."

Former President Hoover sees this. Recently he said, and I quote: "There is a considerable group of fuzzy-minded people who are engineering a compromise with all these European infections. They fail to realize that our own American system has grown away from the systems of Europe for 250 years. They have a foolish notion that a collectivist economy can at the same time preserve personal liberty and constitutional government. * * * We have never had a great socialization of property but we are on the last mile to collectivism through governmental collection and spending of the savings of the people."

The terrifying thing about this journey toward state socialism is that we are traveling down both sides of the road. On one side is the White House sponsorship of open socialistic schemes, including socialized agriculture, socialized education, socialized housing, socialized medicine, and the proposals to put the Government into steel and other businesses and to expand Federal activities in the field of electric power. Down the other side of the road, traveling at a full gallop, goes the program to socialize America through taxation, as Mr. Hoover so eloquently stated.

May I give you some figures which I regard as a measurement of how far we have already gone down the dangerous road of socialism through taxation?

Today well over one-fourth of all our national income is paid out in taxes simply to support Government—Federal, State, and local. Let us go back a few years and examine how control has been more and more centralized in the Federal Government through the process of taxation.

Back in 1913, or only 36 years ago, the cost of all Government—Federal, State, and local—was only $2,500,000,000; 26 percent of this two and one-half billion was expended by the Federal Government, 14 percent by State governments, and—get this—60 percent by local governments.

By 1923, or 10 years later, the total annual cost of all Government—Federal, State, and local—had risen to slightly more than $8,000,000,000. Of this amount the Federal Government, by then, was spending 37 percent, State governments were still spending only 14 percent, while the percentage for local governments had dropped to 49 percent.

By 1940, or only 9 years ago, a remarkable transformation had taken place. The total yearly cost of all government had risen to approximately eighteen billions, with the Federal Government spending 49 percent, State governments 19 percent, and local governments spending only 32 percent.

By last year the total cost of Government had risen to approximately $60,000,000,000, annually, with the Federal Government spending 71 percent, State governments 15

percent, and local governments but 14 percent.

That is one measurement of how far we have gone toward socialism through taxation. Let us take a look at another.

Economic history teaches us that no people are long able to provide wholly or adequately for themselves when the cost of government takes as much as 20 percent of their income. As abundant proof you have only to look at Russia, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain.

In the United States, today, we are taxed approximately 27 percent of all our income, simply to support government. So we have already crossed the danger line and are seven percentage points beyond. The striking corollary fact is that 20 years ago the number of people directly or indirectly receiving money from the Government averaged one in every 40 of our population. Today one person out of every seven in America is a regular recipient of Government money.

That is another measurement of how far we have gone toward socialization through taxation. There are others.

In 1929, the cost of Federal Government alone was $33.12 per capita. Last year it was $305.19—over nine times as much. Twenty years ago, there was one government employee—Federal, State, or local—for approximately every 40 Americans. Today, there is one government employee for about every 22 of our population.

These facts cannot be disputed, nor the truth dodged any longer. The American people are being bled white, and into complete regimentation, through taxation alone.

Neither can any of us dodge the question, Is socialism through taxation likely to decrease or increase?

To answer we must take a look at the other side of the dangerous road we are traveling, and at the White House proposals to socialize agriculture, medicine, housing, and education. How much will they cost?

But first we must realize how bold the socialistic schemers and bureaucrats in Washington have become. They are so cocksure that the America as we have known it is gone, and that their battle has been won, that they no longer bother to even give the Congress any estimates of what their schemes will cost. The President himself refuses to say. Mr. Brannan refuses to say. Mr. Oscar Ewing ducks and dodges. They know that most Americans would be shocked into anger and action if they were told the true costs of their socialistic proposals.

But a few of us still can use pencil and paper, and figure a bit. It has been rather accurately estimated that the staggering costs of these new proposals, should they be adopted, would eventually bring the annual cost of Federal Government alone to the frightening figure of $84,000,000,000.

Back in 1933, when the New Deal first took over, the yearly cost of Federal Government was approximately $5,000,000,000. By 1940, it was $9,000,000,000. Today, it is approximately $46,000,000,000. If the spenders have their way, the annual cost will not only go to $84,000,000,000, but the socialization of America through taxation will have become an accomplished fact. Little wonder Herbert Hoover says—"We are on the last mile." Little wonder that Mr. Byrnes talks about us becoming "slaves in the galley of the state."

The appalling truth is that unless the present trend is stopped and reversed, the cost of Government will not only be 27 percent of our national income but it will probably be 50 percent—or higher. That, my friends is what we actually face.

Politically, the schemes being hatched in Washington are insidious in character. To the unthinking person it would appear that the Government was promising new services for nothing. This idea of something for nothing is deliberately fostered by the refusal of the bureaucrats in Washington to make any estimates of cost of their projected programs. They want it that way; they are planning it that way.

If those in control at Washington wanted to be honest, they would tell the American people the plain truth—that the Government can not and will not give them all of these proposed new benefits free of cost—that there is no magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money it spends—that every penny taken from the United States Treasury must first be paid in to it by the people in the form of taxes.

But I have no hope that the social planners in Washington are ever going to be that honest and forthright. I have no hope they will expose and make clear their own nefarious schemes. That is the job for every straight-thinking American. I know of no greater contribution that you, as members of the medical profession, can make to your neighbors and your country than to join in the task of exposing the dangers which lie ahead in the fantastic schemes now openly advocated by the demagogues of Washington. You have already taken up arms against the threat of socialized medicine. You were among the first to see the danger in that proposal to our American way of life. When the medals are struck for the heroes in this fight to preserve human freedom, yours should be among the first. And, if all thinking Americans can become as alert as you have been, we will win this struggle to save our beloved country from this form of state socialism.

I know workers, industrialists, farmers, housewives, merchants, lawyers, and professional people like yourselves, by the thousands. I appreciate there is no such thing as perfection in any single group. In my profession, I am a newspaper publisher, we have not always met all public needs the best we could, but over the long range of time the publishers of America have responded to the public weal more promptly and effectively than those in any other land on the face of the earth. Those in the medical profession likewise have had their sins of omission and commission. Some have been accused of selfishness at times, and perhaps rightly so. But the indisputable fact remains that the members of the American medical profession have raised the standards of medical care in this country to the highest level the world has ever known.

We lead the world in medical research and scientific development. We have more doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospital technicians per capita than any other nation. We have more hospital beds per person than any other country.

Our hospital facilities and laboratory equipment are without equal.

Today we have approximately 60,000,000 Americans participating in various voluntary medical care plans.

In addition, we have industrial, fraternal, and labor-health programs and private group-clinics in abundance.

Why, I ask you, does America need socialized medicine? Why must one of the most successful private endeavors in the world be turned over to the socialistic schemers in Washington who do not know the meaning of the words—economy, efficiency, or success?

The arguments advanced by Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, and his fellow bureaucrats, are so feeble that it is a wonder anyone can be convinced by them. He and his bureaucrats have blandly declared that 325,000 persons die needlessly each year, and imply that if their medical care were only turned over to the Government the figure would mysteriously be reduced to zero. Of course, they do not tell you their figure of 325,000 needless deaths is padded in a completely dishonest fashion. Neither do they tell you that 40,000 of these deaths are by accident, which no form of health insurance could prevent. They do not tell you that 115,000 of these deaths were due to cancer and heart disease, both of which are principally afflictions of old age. Or that 120,000 of these deaths were the result of communicable diseases, nor that illnesses and fatalities from these diseases have been dropping at a remarkably rapid rate down through the years, and are still being reduced every year. By whom? By the Government? No. By the work of private practitioners of the American medical profession.

But their official dishonesty does ont stop there. They make much of the number of draft rejections during the war. They do not tell you that the reasons for rejects ranged from color blindness, amputations, and deafness, to defective vision, mental deficiency, and illiteracy. The Brookings Institution exposed their fraudulent argument through an impartial survey which revealed that only 6 percent of all men examined had defects which might have been cured by medical treatment.

I would like to invite the attention of Mr. Ewing and all of his fellow bureaucrats and political propagandists to some testimony for socialized medicine which they have not seen fit to include. I think, in all fairness, they should use him as their No. 1 witness. His name was Nikolai Lenin—the father of modern communism—the creator of the police state. I quote Comrade Lenin: "Socialized medicine is the keystone of the arch of the socialistic state."

I think Comrade Lenin was right, because socialized medicine is the one scheme which rushes you down both sides of the road toward state socialism at the highest rate of speed.

Let us see how socialized medicine fits the formula of socialization through taxation. Mr. Ewing and his associates admit that their so-called compulsory health plan will cost at least $5,600,000,000 a year. But the fiscal experts who have examined the question thoroughly put the cost figure as high as $18,000,000,000 yearly.

These costs would be met by a tax levy of from 3 to 10 percent on every pay check up to $4,800 a year, half to be paid by the wage earner and half by his employer. Farmers and other self-employed persons would have to pay the entire amount themselves. Veterans of our wars, already guaranteed hospitalization, medical attention, and other benefits, to which they are certainly entitled, will pay like everybody else for the Ewing plan, even though they get no direct benefit.

The army of bureaucrats would be enormous. We would have a gigantic new governmental agency with regional administrators in every city, town, and village appointed like postmasters, while the political hacks would serve as local czars to whom the public would be compelled to bow and scrape even as they did before the OPA directors during the war period.

Of course, medical privacy would go right out the window in this country, as it already has in Britain. Patients' health records, which every member of the medical profession holds to be a sacred secret, would become governmental records, available to the prying eyes of ward heelers and petty politicians. The art of healing and the practice of medicine in this country would degenerate into a political pill mill, with every doctor, dentist, nurse, and technician inevitably forced on the public pay roll.

These dangers of socialized medicine are obvious to every thinking person. But not so obvious is the inevitable amount of governmental control over every individual.

The first to feel the long arm of Government control would naturally be the doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians. In England, where the Labor Government has imposed socialized medicine on the British people, the doctors are paid $3.40 cents per patient annually. Because the patient may call as often as he wishes for treatment for anything for hangnail to fallen arches, or for

other ailments—real or imagined—British doctors are forced to see, treat, and prescribe for as many as 75 to 100 patients each day. I will leave it up to you what kind of medical service British doctors are able to give the people under such an assembly-line system.

But when the doctor closes the office door in Britain, his day has actually only begun, for the number of government forms and records he must fill out is enormous. Can you envision such a situation in the United States? Do I hear some of you saying, "No, that couldn't happen here in America."

Well, my friends, I hold in my hand a form currently issued by the Veterans' Administration of our own United States Government. It deals with free dental care for veterans. This form, known as VA Form 10–2570, must be obtained from the Veterans' Administration before an ex-GI can go to a dentist. He is required to carry it with him, but the dentist must fill it out before he can get paid for his services.

Let's examine this Form 10–2570. Perhaps it will give us some idea of what the entire medical profession will be up against if socialized medicine becomes effective in our country. It is printed on fairly thin paper, 11¾ inches long by 8½ inches wide. There are a lot of carbons under this top sheet. Let me see—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Seven carbons and eight sheets of paper in all.

In the first 2¾ inches at the top of the front page are 17 blank spaces for the name, address, etc. Seventeen blanks altogether.

In the next 6¾ inches are blank spaces for "tooth number," "crowns," "fillings," etc., to the total of 510. Yes; 510 blank spaces to fill out.

Down here at the bottom of the form is a five-eighths of an inch section reserved for general remarks, believe it or not. That totals 528 blank spaces on the front page. Only 528. But, of course, we're not through, for there is a reverse side to Form 10–2570. Let's look at that.

In the first 2½ inches at the top are 12 blank spaces.

In the next 7 inches I have counted 126 more blank spaces. Yes; exactly 126.

Then, down at the bottom, I find a place for the dentist to certify that he personally rendered the services he has described in all the other blank spaces, and, finally, over here on the left-hand side are four more blank spaces which some bureaucrat will fill out when he gets Form 10–2570 back in the Veterans' Administration office.

So that makes a total of 143 blank spaces on the reverse side of the form. Only 143.

Well, let's see—143 added to 528 gives us the total of 671 blank spaces. Six hundred and seventy-one blank spaces on a single Government form for the busy dentist to fill out, and, of course, if he should make a mistake in filling out Form 10–2570, and catches it himself, he must make erasures and corrections on the original and each of the seven carbon copies. But if the dentist doesn't catch his error, some bureaucrat may, who will send it back to him to be filled out all over again, meantime holding up the dentist's payment until all the red tape is unsnarled.

This form intrigued me so much that I asked a dentist friend how long it would take to fill it out properly. He answered it would all depend on how much work he had done for the patient. I inquired, "How about a simple X-ray examination; how long would it take to fill out Government Form 10–2570 in that case?" He replied, "Fifteen minutes." "And how long would it take to give the X-ray examination?" I asked. "Oh," my dentist friend said, "why, that would take not over 10 minutes."

Now, folks, I ask you, with all the red tape the veteran has to go through to get a tooth filled under such Government regulations, do you wonder that thousands of ex-GI's never even bother to go to the Veterans' Administration for dental benefits—or at least never go more than once?

And is it any wonder many veterans would rather pay for dental work out of their own pockets?

Now, I ask you, when it takes a dentist 50 percent longer to fill out a Government form than it does to do the dental work, is it any wonder thousands of dentists now refuse to handle Government cases?

I ask you, is it any wonder British doctors complain bitterly of the time they must waste in meeting the red tape of the socialized medicine system? And is it any wonder our own American medical profession, almost to the last man, sees the dangers involved in socialized medicine so clearly and in such practical terms?

The plain truth is that the medical profession in England is already deteriorating. The plain truth is that our own medical profession would slowly disintegrate if socialized medicine is put into effect in the United States. The plain truth is that the incentive to become a doctor—one of our highest callings—would be gone.

Who would want to spend up to 9 years studying medicine to go on to the Government pay roll as a civil-service employee under any system of socialized medicine? What real medical man would rather devote more time to filling out Government forms than to treating his patients?

I have just shown you in Government Form 10–2570, a mere sample of what would happen to the medical profession in America if the President, Mr. Ewing, and the socialistic schemers have their way. Every American doctor would soon be reduced to the status of an ink-stained bookkeeper.

Oh, of course, they tell you that this proposed compulsory health program would not force the doctors into Government practice. They tell you every person could choose the doctor he wished. Yes, that's what they tell you.

But any fool knows—and I do include the sponsors of socialized medicine—what would actually happen. Every doctor, every dentist, every nurse, every medical technician would inevitably end up just a number on the Federal pay roll. Make no mistake about that.

My friends, in the battle against ever-encroaching state socialism time is running out. Time is not on our side. We have already lost more than 16 precious years. The economic planners, the socialistic schemers, and the pseudo liberals who began to infiltrate our Government years ago, have now risen to full power. We are witnessing the spectacle of their influence reaching so high into Government councils that our own President, a Missouri-born farm boy who ought to know better, is openly proposing we abandon our hallowed form of free government for free men, throw up our hands, and sink with the rest of the world into the mad whirlpool of statism.

We must meet the facts of life head-on.

Our Government today is in the hands of men whose lust for the power to control the life of every individual American is matched only by their counterparts overseas.

True, their words float in the cream of kindness. They talk much about forward-looking legislation. They prate loudly about the Government meeting human needs. They viciously smear anyone who opposes them as the "tool of the selfish interests."

Tonight there is only one thin wall standing between you, the American people, and statism. That thin wall is the Congress of the United States. There are not 20 men in the Congress—regardless of what they may say publicly—who do not know that if they vote for the White House program to socialize America, this land of ours is gone.

But Congress alone cannot hold out forever. The entire American public must be aroused to the dangers which confront our beloved country, and join in a mighty united action in its defense. And I want you to know I am aware of the great part many of you in this audience have been taking in the struggle to preserve our priceless heritage of freedom under our constitutional form of representative government. But I must, sadly and frankly, also say I am not sure each of you has done your full share in the great cause of good government.

The final battle is now at hand. In the next 12 months the entire legislative program of the socialistic schemers is scheduled to be voted up or voted down by the Congress. Every true American can contribute to the final outcome if he will let his Congressman know, in plain and unmistakable terms, that he wants no part of socialism, statism, communism, fascism, nazism, or any other ism. As citizens you still have a voice in your Government. But even that right is now being threatened.

I pray to God you may use that voice wisely and well before it is too late.

Should Labor Unions Be Subject to Antitrust Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 29 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks I have planned to make this evening in Richmond, Va., at the National Affairs Forum dinner under the auspices of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our form of government is built upon the concept of democratic principles and I, therefore, welcome the privilege of participating in a public forum which represents political freedom in action.

One of the questions submitted to us asks whether labor unions should be subject to the antitrust laws of this country. I feel somewhat qualified to answer that question because as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee it was my privilege to preside over a recent inquiry into the concentration of economic power in the hands of labor unions.

Our committee was concerned about this matter because it is charged with the duty of protecting small business and with looking after the interest of consumers. Our hearings lasted for a month. We heard more than 40 witnesses and took approximately 1,000 printed pages of testimony.

I am confident that anyone who attended those hearings or who will take the trouble to read the record we made will reach these conclusions:

1. The United Mine Workers has a labor monopoly and has used it to control the production of coal.

2. This use of economic power has been costly not only to the coal operators and the mine workers, but also to other segments of business and to consumers.

3. Labor monopolies in other industries can and may do similar damage to our economy.

4. Monopolistic actions of unions cannot be prevented by existing laws.

5. New legislation is needed which will curb abuse of power by big labor organizations just as existing antitrust laws forbid abuse of power by big business.

In making those statements I want to emphasize that I speak as a friend of labor and that such long acknowledged friends of labor as Thurmond Arnold and Donald R. Richberg indicated when they testified before our committee that they had come to similar conclusions.

During the more than 30 years I have spent in public life one of my primary concerns has been to guard the fundamental principle of balanced powers on which our form of government is based. Sometimes this has meant opposing legislation which would put too much power in the hands of the Federal Government. It has meant advocating tax systems not too burdensome on those least able to pay and supporting world-trade programs which would protect the independence of our farmers and small-business men. It has led me to support laws to restrict monopoly and protect the workingman from exploitation at the hands of his employer.

Exactly the same motive led me to ask the Banking and Currency Committee to make a study of the economic power of labor unions to see whether the policies adopted by some of their leaders were hurting small business, penalizing consumers and threatening the economic stability of our whole Nation.

When we started those hearings we invited testimony from anyone who cared to appear. We actually heard representatives of large and small coal mine operators, the railroads, the steel industry, the lumber industry, the electric equipment industry, economists, owners of small business enterprises and national associations of small business, and lawyers who are experts on the antitrust laws.

Labor representatives, including John L. Lewis, of the miners union; Philip Murray, of the CIO; and William Green, of the AFL, were specifically invited but I regret to say that none of them came. Mr. Lewis sent me a note saying he would let me know if anything developed at the hearings which seemed to call for his appearance.

We had witnesses who told us that Mr. Lewis had absolute control over the individual worker and through him over the coal industry as a whole. We were told that Mr. Lewis was responsible for the 3-day workweek (which has now been stepped up to a no-day workweek) and that the reduced production had increased the cost of coal from 40 to 75 cents a ton, was reducing miners wages at the rate of $100,000,000 a year, was cutting railroad revenues at the rate of $500,000,000 a year and had curtailed local business in mine towns from 13 to as much as 85 percent. If any of those statements are open to challenge it seems to me Mr. Lewis did a disservice to his union in failing to come before our committee to challenge them.

If, on the other hand, those statements are accepted as true, and if as the attorneys who came before us said, court decisions have indicated the impossibility of preventing such results by applying existing antimonopoly laws, it would seem that new legislation clearly is needed.

In 1914 the Congress recognized the inequalities which existed between management and labor and passed the Clayton Act exempting labor unions from the operation of the antitrust laws and extended the exemption in 1930 by the Norris-LaGuardia amendment. That was when the unions were weak and needed protection. But the position of labor has changed rapidly since 1935 when the Wagner Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the wage-and-hour law were passed. We must now face the realities of a situation in which labor unions dominate the economic field with Supreme Court decisions to the effect that labor monopolistic action is beyond its jurisdiction in the absence of collusion with management.

I firmly believe in labor organizations and collective bargaining, but I do not believe in labor dictatorship. In my opinion it is just as necessary today to prevent and restrict labor monopolies as it is to prevent business monopolies. Labor unions must not be allowed to remove competitive conditions in industry any more than business is allowed to do the same thing, nor to control production and prices.

My colleague, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, a recognized spokesman for labor, said on January 2, 1947: "If democracy is to survive, it must be vigilant, strong, and constantly able to defend itself against any force or organization which sets itself up to dictate to the Government. When rulers of industrial empires, when rulers of big unions, when any economic power grows so big and becomes so arrogant as to threaten the state, then indeed is the people's Government in jeopardy. This has become such a time." I agree with that statement.

Some of the arguments advanced by labor monopolists today are the same as those of the trust barons in the latter part of the last century. Both arguments are contrary to the American sense of competition, fair play, and equal opportunity. If we take effective steps to curb union monopolists we shall actually be adding strength to the true spirit of collective bargaining, preserving the freedom of labor as well as of management. Socialism in Great Britain is clearly the end product of labor monopolies and business cartels. Upon our productive capacity rests the hope of democracy at home and abroad. If it be maintained all monopolies that seek to control production must be subject to our antitrust laws.

Business Women's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 29 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Business Women's Week," published in a recent issue of the Kennebec Journal of Augusta, Maine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

"Boost your town—it boosts you," the National Business Women's Week, October 9–15, slogan packs a lot of food for thought and action. It can apply to the BPW member in the biggest city and the smallest hamlet. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., opened a new line of thought to many and reiterated what others have thought for some time.

Dr. K. Frances Scott, president of the National Federation, declares that "To women who work for their living in a community, that city or town is more than a place to earn money. Their community has offered them a chance for employment and for training for advancement in their chosen field of work. In return the businesswoman regards her community as her larger home and is concerned about its good housekeeping practices.

"Because their work keeps them long hours in store and office and factory, the women who work there are more conscious than other women of the well-being of that part of their community. They are interested in the appearance of Main Street, of the safety and convenience of transportation, of efficiency of police and fire departments, of good city planning and zoning. In common with their businessmen coworkers, they are conscious of the cleanliness and sanitation of the downtown restaurants where they take their meals."

Dr. Scott declares that the businesswoman is of necessity concerned over taxes and the local government that sets them. The children of the business world family, the young employees, are often the concern of the businesswomen. "In her efforts to improve her community home the businesswoman follows the good housekeeping practice of using volunteer help. How could any housewife manage a successful home without calling on husband and children for volunteer help? How can our larger home, our community, prosper without volunteer services? Banded together in civic, service, and professional organizations, businesswomen, like men, give of their time, skills, and money to improve their community home."

Divided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared a number of editorials in various papers throughout the country, usually entitled "Divided Ireland." Most of these editorials carry the same uniform remarks, as evidenced by the identical first paragraph, which I quote:

The Irish question is up again. It has been injected into a meeting of the new Council of Europe by a delegate from southern Ireland, William Norton, who denounced "the military occupation of Northern Ireland by Britain" and wanted the Council to intervene.

Although it appears quite proper that the Irish delegate to the Council has a perfect right to present the question of the partition of Ireland before the Council, the unknown author of the editorial seems to have a different view. Actually there is no better forum in which to bring to light the true facts regarding British control of the six counties of Northern Ireland than before this Council, whose primary aim is to effect a federation of the nations of Europe.

Surely Ireland can do no more than to request a hearing before the Council and thus seek out a peaceful solution of this question, which has been but newly created, one might say, since partition was an aftermath of the first World War. An act of the London Parliament first established the partition of Ireland, something that had never before been considered and certainly was not sought for by any spokesman for Ireland, either north or south. That was in 1920 and the partition has continued ever since, although originally it was stated to be but a temporary thing, to last not more than 4 or 5 years at most.

In the editorial two reasons are given explaining why Mr. Norton got nowhere with his request. The first reason is that the infant Council has enough

problems already to handle without taking on any more, particularly one that is not a pressing emergency. Surely the Council is not too busy to consider a question of this importance, one which can readily become the occasion of bloodshed and trouble along the Irish border if it is not promptly settled. Perhaps that is what is desired, namely that the Irish should take up arms, before this problem can be considered to be a pressing emergency. I hope that will not be required.

The second reason given—more fabulous than the first—is that northern Ireland is not subdued by force of British arms but clings to Great Britain through choice. Then the elections of last February are cited as proof of this novel contention.

The fact is that for seven centuries Britain dominated Ireland as a result of her military conquest. Never in all that time did the Irish willingly accept British rule. Instead they staged repeated revolts and uprisings in an effort to drive the conquerer out of their native land.

For Irish participation in the First World War, they were promised complete home rule. When the war was ended the promises were forgotten. Although the Irish elections of 1918 showed over 80 percent of all the voters favoring absolute independence, the British answer to this outspoken popular sentiment, was the Act of Partition passed by the British Parliament in London. This was the reward for the services of 300,000 Irish during that war.

After the act was passed in 1920, then a treaty was forced on the Irish leaders in 1921. At the time of signing this treaty, accepting partition, the Irish were told to sign or else war would be declared within 3 days. That was the basis of British statesmanship in this regard. Needless to say, in order to avert warfare, the treaty was agreed to—at the point of a gun.

It was on this basis that the six counties of northeastern Ireland were for the first time separated from the rest of the country. That this was done by force of arms cannot be questioned, in spite of the remarks contained in the editorial. Since then, Northern Ireland has been the camp of countless British troops, at times as many as 40,000 in peacetime. British customs guards patrol the border and collect the customs. That situation prevails even to this day.

It is clear that the people of the six counties had no choice in the matter of their union with Great Britain. Instead it was forced on them directly by an act of the London Parliament. Had an election been held in these counties and the decision made, county by county, certainly two and possibly three of these six counties would have voted to remain with the rest of Ireland. Yet, they were compelled to be a part of the British Commonwealth because Great Britain decreed it.

To prove the point that these people cling to Britain by choice, our writer of the editorial refers to the February elections, which were held in Northern Ireland for no particular reason other than to hold an election prior to the availability of a new register of voters, which would have been in effect after April 1. As a result of holding the elections in February, all persons who had come of voting age during the 3 years just past, were denied the right to vote.

I need not comment on the system of gerrymandering which is employed throughout the six counties, the viciousness to which practice is too well known. Under this system the Nationalist voters are grouped together into a single parliamentary district as far as possible, and the Unionist voters into another. Thus the election of one or the other party representative is assured in advance of the election. However twice as many Nationalists are combined into one district as there are Unionists in another. Thus in Fermanagh, where the Nationalists outnumber the Unionists, one Nationalist is elected by about half the voters, while the other half of the voters, divided into two districts, elect two Unionists. Thus control is kept in the hands of the Unionists without difficulty.

Yet it is this sort of scheming that is called an election of the people and the results of which are pointed to as a proof of the will of the people. In truth it no more represents popular will than an election under Hitler or Stalin, where one votes "Yes" and nothing else.

It is true that the Irish question is up again. Moreover I am sure that it will remain up until it is adequately settled and the sooner this is done, the better it will be for the peace of the world. A sore spot such as this cannot long remain uncared for without dire results. May the day be soon when the matter is but history, and if it be the Council of Europe which takes the lead in solving this problem, it will do nothing more worth while that can establish the Council as an effective force for the future of Europe.

A Positive Answer to the White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial published in the Chatham Press, Chatham, N. J., on Friday, August 12, 1949. The editorial is entitled "A Positive Answer to the White Paper" and stresses the need for a world federation, an idea to which I wholeheartedly subscribe. The editorial follows:

A POSITIVE ANSWER TO THE WHITE PAPER

Two events of historic moment took place last week. As so often is the case, the news about the past was headlined and the news about the future overlooked.

The State Department's white paper on China hit page 1 in every daily paper in the country, and every editor had his comment to add on the editorial page. Here was a summation of a tragic failure, which, no matter who was most at fault, had resulted in a tremendous Communist victory that threatened freedom and democracy throughout the Far East. This was proof positive that a status quo, containment policy is utterly inadequate in the face of the dynamic Communist movement that is seeking to dominate the world for Stalin.

And the authors, defenders, and critics of the white paper all agreed that positive action was imperative if democracy and freedom were to survive in the East and Far East, where colonialism has given way to a spirit of nationalism and independence that the Communists can first appeal to and then kill forever.

The appointment by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of a five-man subcommittee to study the world federation resolution (H. R. 64, S. C. R. 56) and related resolutions sponsored by the Atlantic Union Committee and Ely Culbertson was quite forgotten amidst the furore raised by the report on China. And yet subcommittee Chairman ELBERT D. THOMAS (Democrat, Utah) and his fellow Senators, THEODORE F. GREEN (Democrat, Rhode Island), BRIEN MCMAHON (Democrat, Connecticut), ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin), and our own H. ALEXANDER SMITH, have it in their power to call the attention of the free world to the one clear answer to the Soviet goal of world conquest.

That answer is world federation, which is not, as it may sound, a panacea, but a principle that is sound, practical, and offers real hope of achieving enduring peace with freedom for all nations to develop internally as they choose.

We are joined in a world struggle and, as the collapse of China should clearly teach us, we will make a fatal mistake if we attack the problem piecemeal. By declaring boldly that we recognized the truth that in one world our fate and our freedom are joined with those of every man, we would be seizing the initiative morally, as we have economically through the Marshall plan and militarily through the Atlantic Pact, and we should, furthermore, be suggesting a plan that would put our economic and military aid dollars to work on an efficient business basis.

At this time our offer to lead the world toward a federal government with power only to prevent aggression and keep the peace would almost certainly bring Russian denunciation. She would recognize that here was the one true idea that could successfully compete with her false promises to the Asiatics and the other newly independent peoples of the world. But, in the long run, she, herself, might well accept the fact that the world would not allow her conquests, and in the face of our preponderant economic, military, and moral strength join the rest of the world in constructively working toward peace.

Of Russia's reaction, we cannot be sure. This we do know: That it is time for the United States of America to act positively. For too long we have merely reacted to Soviet initiative. We urge Senator THOMAS, his subcommittee, and particularly our Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, to recognize the heavy responsibility and great opportunity that is theirs to state to our Congress and to the world that the federal principle of law and order can lead the world to peace and freedom as it led this country in 1787 to the position we now hold as leader of the free world in the struggle against tyranny.

Here, indeed, is a postive answer to the white paper.

Administration of Government Price-Support Program for 1948 Corn Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, while at home this month conferring with many farmers and businessmen in the Second Congressional District of Missouri, I was fully informed of a serious misunderstanding and problem affecting the farmers in connection with the Government's program of price support of the 1948 corn crop.

As I understand the Government support program for the 1948 corn crop, there were two ways in which farmers could participate in this program and obtain price supports for corn. Each corn producer had the option prior to June 30, 1949, to enter into one of two types of support arrangements.

Under the first arrangement the corn producer could obtain a loan upon his corn crop at $1.41 per bushel. If he decided to take advantage of the loan arrangement he gave a note and chattel mortgage on his corn for the amount of the loan, and his corn was inspected to see if it graded No. 3 or better. It had to grade No. 3 or better at the time the inspection was made in order to obtain the loan. The corn was then placed in a crib on the farmers' premises and sealed, and the Government had the right to inspect the corn every 60 days. The loan matured on September 1, and the farmer was then obligated to repay the loan with interest if he wanted to keep the corn, or deliver the corn in satisfaction of the loan. If the corn graded No. 3 the delivery constituted satisfaction of the loan. If the corn graded better than No. 3 the farmer received an additional premium. If the corn graded less than No. 3 discounts were applied and the farmer was obliged to pay the difference to the Government in the support price and the discount price. Under the loan arrangement, however, the Government agreed to take the corn even though it was damaged up to 40 percent, in which event a discount of only 10 cents per bushel was applied against the support price.

Now, the second arrangement which the corn producer could enter into with the Government was to sign a purchase agreement prior to June 30, 1949. Under the purchase agreement the farmer paid a service fee of one-half cent per bushel and was given the right to sell his corn at the support price to the Government by giving notice during the period of 30 days after September 1, 1949. However, it appears that if the farmer entered into the purchase arrangement the corn was not inspected at the time the agreement was signed, nor was the corn required to be cribbed and sealed, and no periodic inspections were made by the Government. Under this arrangement the corn producer had a right to use his corn and feed it out or sell it at any time he wanted to without notice to the Government. This differed from the loan arrangement in that he could not feed his corn out or dispose of it unless he paid off the loan, but he had a right to obtain a partial release of any of the corn by paying off part of the loan. The other great difference and the objectionable part, is that under the purchase agreement arrangement if at the time of delivery, that is, after September 1, 1949, the corn did not grade No. 3 or better the Government refuses to take the corn under the support program. In other words, discounts are not applied for corn grading less than No. 3 as are applied in the case of the loan agreement.

To take a specific example, a farmer who took a loan arrangement on his 1948 corn crop received $1.41, and if his corn at the time of delivery was damaged even as much as 40 percent by moth or insect, then the Government discounted the corn only 10 cents a bushel and the farmer received a net of $1.31 per bushel for his corn. However, the same farmer entering into a purchase agreement, whose corn at the time of delivery—after the 1st of September 1949—did not grade No. 3 or better, would not have the privilege of selling his corn to the Government under the price-support program and would be forced to sell it on the open market, which is from 85 to 95 cents a bushel at this time.

Laying aside for the moment the argument that such a difference in the loan program and purchase program is essentially discriminatory, as it enables some farmers to participate in and have the benefits of the price-support program and denies these benefits to other farmers who do not need their money early, there are other factors which should be reviewed and taken into consideration, especially in Missouri.

The local PMA committeemen who dealt with the farmers on this program apparently did not understand the difference in the two programs. They told the corn producer that he had the right to obtain a loan or a right to enter into a purchase agreement with the Government, and told him that the only difference between the two programs was that under one he received his money at the time the arrangement was made, which was prior to June 30, 1949, and that under the other program he did not receive his money until he delivered the corn. There was no indication given in many, many cases to the corn producer that he would have the right under the loan program to obtain the benefit of the price-support program if his corn graded less than No. 3 at the time of delivery, whereas, under the purchase-agreement program, he would not have the right to sell his corn to the Government and obtain the benefits of the price-support program if his corn graded No. 3 or less.

Therefore, it seems to me that due to a lack of understanding of the agents of the Government who administered this program direct with the farmers, there does exist an obligation, even though it may not be a legal one, to permit the farmers entering into the purchase agreement to benefit under the price-support program on the same basis as farmers who obtained a loan on their corn. We must all recognize that farmers did not have copies of the law or the bulletins issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in many cases did not read the agreement forms, but relied on the information given them by the country PMA committeemen.

However, even the county PMA committeemen are not especially to be blamed, as most of them did not ever have copies of the bulletins and regulations and did not fully understand the nature of the differences in the two programs.

Furthermore, even if a farmer had read in full the purchase agreement which he signed, there is nothing therein to indicate that he would not have the right to sell his corn to the Government at support price less discounts if it graded No. 3 or less, other than the blanket statement that the agreement is subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the applicable CCC Bulletin 1 and supplements thereto. The farmer was not furnished or even offered a copy of CCC Bulletin No. 1. As you know, this is the bulletin issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation and published in the Federal Register, which defines the Government's 1948 corn program. It would not have been asking too much for the Government to have prepared a purchase agreement for the farmer to receive, which set forth in plain, simple, concise language, and in full the Government's obligations and the farmer's rights and obligations so that no reference need be made to any bulletin or supplement which the farmer does not have, is not furnished, and of course, does not have ready access to.

The situation has been greatly aggravated in many parts of Missouri due to the fact that there has been an unusual and unexpected infestation, of the 1948 corn crop stored on the farms, by moths. As I understand it, moth infestation can be expected in the southern regions of the United States and in those areas the Government designated them as "moth infestation areas" and took delivery on the corn at an earlier time than September 1, 1949, and before the damage could become very great. However, I have been told that in most areas of Missouri moth damage is not usually expected and, of course, they were not defined as "moth infestation areas." Due to the unusual moth infestation, much of the corn in Missouri has been damaged to such an extent that it will not grade No. 3 or better, as I understand the breaking point between No. 3 and lower grades of corn is approximately 7 percent damage. Much of the corn in Missouri has been damaged as much as 40 percent and will be damaged further the longer it stays on the farm.

The only solution which I know of that the Department of Agriculture can take at this time is to issue an amendment to Corn Bulletin 1 which is issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide that damaged corn grading less than No. 3 will be accepted under the purchase agreement on the same basis as corn is accepted under the loan agreement. In other words, the Government should accept the damaged corn under the purchase agreement and apply discounts on the same basis as discounts are applied

on corn accepted under the loan agreement. Inasmuch as the Government's price-support program for corn is based upon the idea of giving the farmer a fair return for his corn and not on the basis of technical or legalistic instruments, it seems to me that every farmer who desires to participate in this program and has so indicated his desire at the proper time and prior to June 30, 1949, should certainly have the benefits of the support prices.

Yesterday, I discussed this problem with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, and requested such action as may be necessary for an equitable adjustment of this situation, and permit farmers who signed purchase agreements the benefits of the corn price support program on the same basis as the farmers who signed the loan agreements. Mr. Brannan assured me that he would give my request careful consideration and advise me of his decision as soon as possible.

"Blessings on Thee, Little Man"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, what are we doing in America to protect the future of our 25,000,000 little children?

What will be their heritage when they come of age? What are we doing to guarantee to them the most priceless of all possessions, personal freedom, the right to be self-dependent, and the freedom to decide their own futures?

Most Americans past 40 can remember the day when they were free to save, free to provide their own security, free to build a business and enjoy the profits of their labors without excessive taxation.

Today we have a Government debt of $250,000,000,000 in the United States, and talk of a $500,000,000,000 Federal debt is heard. Global commitments have been made for the United States which may call for unprecedented foreign spending in the future. Taxes have been added to taxes until the American citizen is paying about 30 percent of his income to the Government.

Our 25,000,000 children will find their birthright of personal freedom and liberty seriously threatened when they come of age unless we take steps now to protect their heritage.

The following parody on a famous poem is all too true. It is time for us to think about the next generation.

Blessings on thee, little man,
Barefoot boy with cheek of tan;
Trudging down a dusty lane
With no thought of future pain;
You're our one and only bet
To absorb our national debt.
Little man with cares so few,
We've got lots of faith in you;
Guard each merry whistled tune,
You are apt to need it soon,
Have your fun while you can,
You may be a barefoot man.

—*The X-change.*

Our Forest Resources and Reforestation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to be slightly sentimental about trees and forestry, about particular trees, and about more trees. All of us, I dare say, have spent some of the happier and more refreshing days and weeks of our lives "in the woods." As children trees were a favorite place of play and the forest a wondrous hunting ground. The green shade of summer and the moaning windbreak of winter in its maturity becomes protection against the elements, for ourselves and our livestock—the lumber of commerce, our dwellings, and our barns Trees provide our furniture and our daily newspaper, timbers for our mines, ties for our railroads, viscose for rayon, and sometimes, even yet, the fuel for the warmth and cheer of evening. In the Northland it is not uncommon to mark the final resting place of a dear one with a green and growing remembrance. From the delicate pastel greens of spring to the full blown flames of autumn our forests are with us, to remind us pleasantly and gently of the round of the seasons and the eternal cycle of life itself. Yet, it is not without good cause that the poet and the song maker have so frequently paid loving tribute to our trees.

But there is a less sentimental, more hardheaded, businesslike manner of looking at our forest resources. That point of view we sometimes refer to as conservation, which in its broadest sense means merely "wise use." It means wise use not only of the forest still standing, but of these areas, now deforested or half forested, which are better adapted to wood production than to other uses.

By virtue of fortuitous circumstances, when this Nation came into being a large portion of what is now the land estate of the United States was clothed in virgin forests unequaled elsewhere in the world in point of volume and species adapted to man's use. These original forests of the United States are estimated to have covered at least 822,000,000 acres, or more than 40 percent of our total area. Large areas have been essentially denuded of this original cover. Slightly more than 600,000,000 acres, a little less than one-third of our total area, are still classed as forest land. In Michigan, as you know, wonderful forests of hardwoods and softwoods covered nearly the whole of the State. The stands of the lordly white pine were particularly fabulous. Their ghosts only remain. But even today one-half of the State is classed as forest land.

In some areas, as in parts of our own State, the high fertility of the soil stimulated the early clearing of the forest so that crops might be grown. Though some deforestation may have been done too fast and accompanied by too much outright destruction of timber which would have been valuable a few years later it did make some rich crop land available. But other areas, not really of agricultural promise, were denuded with equal abandon and either did not become farm land at all or proved to be marginal or submarginal for such uses. In Michigan, today, only one-fourth of our area is classed as crop land and one-half as forest. If only that forest half were well stocked, growing, productive forest we would be fortunate indeed. Needless to say, for you have been places and have seen things for yourselves, much of the poorer area has not, through natural processes or otherwise, been adequately reforested. Large areas stand there as stark denuded burns, raspberry jungle partially reseeding with species mostly of low commercial value, vivid testimony of man's colossal destructiveness and seemingly utter lack of wisdom in using nature's gifts.

Nation-wide, three-quarters of the remaining forest lands are in private hands of some 4,500,000 owners, including more than half the farmers. Many of us like to own a little woods—the average holding is only 62 acres. The East, with three-quarters of all forest lands, contains only one-third of the saw timber supply. The reserve of some 1,600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber is being depleted at a net rate of about 18,500,000,000 board feet per year—that much more is being cut than is growing. Moreover, the remaining reserves are increasingly disadvantageously located in respect to major markets. Excluding the far Western States, the forest lands of the United States are in a generally rundown, poorly stocked condition and are growing only about 50 percent of the amount of wood they could produce under intensive protection and forest management.

A summary of the situation is as follows:

(a) Except in the West, virtually all of the lands have been cut-over one or more times. In large measure, cutting methods have been of a destructive character with the result that the lands were left either denuded or poorly stocked in point of number and quality of trees for future growth. This is particularly true throughout the East, where the bulk of the country's forest lands are located.

(b) Although forest lands are well distributed regionally, the present supply of saw timber is dislocated in respect to regional requirements of local industries and public need for forest cover for protection of inland water supplies and food croplands. More than one-half of the current supply of saw timber is in the West, two to three thousand miles distance from the great industries and populations of the East. For the country as a whole, the saw-timber supply is being reduced 50 percent faster than it is being replaced by the growth and eastern industries are having increasing difficulty in obtaining the quality material needed.

(c) The portion of the United States east of the Great Plains is now dependent on second-growth timber which has progressively declined in quality and volume availability. Some 150,000,000 acres, which once yielded saw timber are so poorly stocked with trees that they either are growing no commercial trees

at all or a very small percent of what they might produce by better care and management. In this acreage, there are some 75,000,000 acres so badly deforested that they can be brought back to commercial forests only by planting. Such lands contributed little or nothing to the local communities in which they are located in support of schools, roads, employment, and other community benefits or in easing the tax burdens of the people. On the contrary, hundreds of thousands of acres of forest land in all sections of the country have reverted to States and counties in lieu of taxes. In Michigan large tracts of such land are now included in the 13 State forests, covering in total more than 2,000,000 acres.

(d) Considering the acreage of lands available for timber growing, forest land management in the United States is still in its infancy. Though our problems are somewhat different, there is much we might learn from the intensive experience of several of the west European countries. But we have not been doing nearly as well as we already know how.

The most promising aspect of the situation is the increasing concern and somewhat stepped-up action on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and citizens' groups. World War II with its aftermath of economic dislocations and world problems has intensified this public concern by throwing into clearer relief than ever before the importance of productive forests as an essential national resource. It is no longer necessary to debate the need of forest conservation and development.

But postwar studies of forest conditions do point up the need of must faster progress in providing adequate management of the Nation's forest estate if its lands are to provide the timber and other forest benefits which the Nation will require in the future. Here in Michigan the seeding and planting programs which were stopped during the war, have been renewed, but need to move forward much more rapidly.

Major proposals for accomplishing this Nation-wide call for accelerated action in (a) protection of the resource from fire, insects, and disease; (b) assistance to small forest-land owners in the management of their woodlands; (c) a large-scale program of tree planting to reforest some seventy-five to one hundred million acres (d) extension of good forest management as rapidly as possible to all commercial forest lands, public and private. Several aspects are included in bills before the present Congress.

The proposals involve a long-range program and much larger expenditures than in the past on the part of the Federal Government, the States, the industries dependent upon wood, and the owners of forest land.

The stage is well set for such a program. There is in the United States all the forest land needed to provide forests equal to the requirements of the future. Public sentiment for their conservation and development is greater and more widespread than at any time in the history of the country. Forestry agencies, both public and private, are ready to go forward and have the know-how of carrying forward a large-scale program. What we need especially now is additional activation, more speed forward toward making our forest empire what it can be and ought to be.

Was the Republicans' Sioux City Farm Conference a "Dud" or Live Ammunition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since so much controversy has arisen as to whether or not the Republican's Sioux City farm gathering was constructive or obstructive, was a success or a failure, bore real farm fruit or was as barren as a eunuch, it might be well to ascertain what Republican farmers and standcut Republican newspapers have to say about it instead of relying upon hearsay for the correct evaluation.

Since I made my talks before the House of Representatives about the reactionary Republican's efforts to win back the farm vote and effect a reconciliation with the farm voters, I received a message from a Republican farmer who attended this "tongue in cheek" farm conference, and, in part, he said this:

You say in your speech that the Republican Party cannot longer take the pulse of farmers because it lost both hands, its heart, and a part of its head in the last national election, but my observation is that it also lost another unmentionable part of its anatomy.

You also say that the Republican Party was the first political amputee in the United States. This is a decided understatement. If you had been at the Sioux City conference you would have observed that it is now in much worse condition than a political amputee. It is a bad "basket case" as far as a farm program is concerned. It was a 4-plus boner party and a flop in great big billboard letters. It lacked all of the rhythm and glamor of the song "Sioux City Sue," which put Sioux City on the night-club map. They should pass an ordinance in Sioux City barring political honky-tonks and carnivals such as the recent Republican farm conference proved to be.

The leading and outstanding Republican newspaper in Nebraska, the Lincoln Journal of Lincoln, Nebr., on September 27 last, had this to say about the Sioux City conference, in an editorial written by its distinguished editor, Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., who was named a Pulitzer Prize winner in 1948 for the fairest political reporting in the year 1948, and whose opinion for all the more reason should be entitled to greater respect than that of some other newspapers in the area who have never had the faintest desire, let alone intention, to operate a fair press and report the news instead of, over the counter for cash propaganda, in its place and stead:

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL—A CHAT WITH THE EDITOR

When all was said and done—mostly said—at the Republican Party's farm policy meeting last week at Sioux City, one farmer commented, "If words were votes, the next election would be in the bag."

THE TROUBLE AT SIOUX CITY

But words aren't votes. And words don't always mean what they say. And one fundamental trouble with the Republican Party, and one major reason why it lost the last election and will continue to lose elections until it finds a remedy, is that too many people, when they get around to voting, simply do not believe that as a party it really stands for the things to which its Presidential candidates and its platform committees give lip service.

If the candidate and the platform said the party was not isolationist, voters who knew the futility of isolation simply could look to Congress and find there, under the Republican label, a string of isolationist voting records as blatant and hair-raising as a [naming a person] speech.

If the candidate and the platform said there could be such a thing, for America, as a middle way of conservatism between the extremes of right and left simply could look to Congress and see old [naming a person] effectively frustrating the moderate counsels of the party's [naming three persons] and even its unique [naming a person.]

If the candidate and the platform said that the Republican Party was the best qualified for leadership in an atomic age, there was generally some [naming a man] around to refuse to believe, in effect, that there was an atomic age.

It was this same weakness in the field of farm policy that proved critical, and, probably more than any other single weakness, cost the party the 1948 election.

When the candidate and the platform said the party favored a long-term program in the interest of agriculture and the consumer which should include effective protection of reasonable market prices through flexible support prices, commodity loans, and marketing agreements, together with such other means as may be necessary, farmers in critical numbers did not believe it.

If the Sioux City meeting proved anything, it is that the farmers have scant basis for believing it yet.

According to the reporters who were present, there was almost universal lip service to a program of farm price supports. Virtually every speaker opened up with some such assurance as, "We need not question the need for farm price supports—they have become a vital part of our farm economy." But these assurances, the reporters noted, got no applause from the party people. The organization Republicans cheered loud and long when someone like Dan Casement, elderly stockman from Kansas, lambasted all farm programs as "immoral" and "an insult to God," and cried out, "We don't want any g—— d—— farm program, we just want to be left alone."

Our own observer, Stan Matzke, Journal farm editor, sums up the meeting as one where party speaker after party speaker assured the audience, "We want to be buddies with the farmer and give him the kind of program he wants," while imperfectly concealing that not too deep down in their hearts they would vastly prefer no farm program at all.

Conspicuous in almost every speech was blanket denunciation of Secretary Brannan's proposed farm program, and the regimentation and socialization it implies. And

conspicuously missing from the list of invited speakers was the Republican Party's own [naming a person], coauthor of the Hope-Aiken Act, passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, from which according to [naming a person] himself, most of the Brannan program, including fines, penalties, and controls, was lifted bodily, and which had Brannan's own endorsement when it was before Congress.

In other words, one trouble with the Republican Party is that its campaign promises are belied too often by its action in Congress; and its actions, as on farm policy, are denied by too many of its more vocal spokesmen.

Many of the several farmers who attended the Sioux City meeting were aware of this, and will show this skepticism that the party says what it means or means what it says, again and again when they vote.

As one farmer remarked about [naming a person] "That old boy sure knows what he's talking about, but he don't really speak for the party."

RAYMOND A. MCCONNELL, Jr.

Postal Pay and Reclassification Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, before Subcommittee of House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on postal pay and reclassification legislation:

Mr. Chairman, my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers which represents approximately 100,000 city, rural, and village delivery letter carriers in the field service of the Post Office Department.

I desire to compliment the chairman and members of this subcommittee for holding these hearings; I also want to assure you that I deeply appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you.

There are numerous measures on the subject of salary and reclassification pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. However, due to the lateness in this first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I will confine my testimony to one subject; namely, postal reclassification. The officers and members of the National Association of Letter Carriers wholeheartedly endorse the Lyle bill, H. R. 4395; the Miller bill, H. R. 4495; and the Hagen bill, H. R. 4595. We pray that any one of these identical reclassification measures will be enacted before the current session adjourns.

Briefly stated, these proposals provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion, and for other purposes. The measures are designed to correct many of the inequities existing in the act of July 6, 1945, which is probably better known as Public Law 134.

Section 1 provides for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for field service postal workers. It is passing strange, indeed, that practically all of the employees in the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government receive 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave while the field service postal worker is restricted to 15 days' annual leave and 10 days' sick leave. This is a most glaring discrimination and should by all means be corrected at the earliest possible moment. It might be well to mention that employees in the departmental service of the post office receive 26 days' annual and 15 days' sick leave. The restriction applies solely to the field service postal employees. I contend that letter carriers work as hard as, if not harder than, any other employees in the Federal Government. Accordingly, they should be given equal rights and privileges by way of annual and sick leave.

Section 2 provides for full credit for past service in the longevity or meritorious grades. It would extend these meritorious grades to all employees who have sufficient service at the present time to be entitled to the grade increases. Four longevity grades are incorporated in the measure with $100 being awarded at the completion of 10 years' service; a second $100 at 13 years'; a similar amount for 17 years', with the maximum of $400 for an employee with 22 years' service. These longevity awards are particularly desirable in employment such as you find in the Federal service where there are dead-end streets after reaching the top automatic grade. A genuine system of longevity would definitely serve as an incentive for a young man to make the postal service a career.

Section 3 of the bill provides for the complete elimination of the four lower grades and places all employees entering the service since July 1, 1945, who have not reached grade 5 automatically in that grade.

The present law provides an entrance salary of $2,550 per annum; the next grade is, of course, $2,650; the third, $2,750; and the fourth, $2,850—it is these four lower grades that would be completely eliminated. The entrance salary would then become $2,950 per annum.

Much has been said about the "distortions" in horizontal pay increases and that such wage adjustments greatly benefit those in the lower pay brackets. I want to point out that prior to July 6, 1945, grade 1 in the letter carrier service was $1,700 per annum. As previously stated, grade 1 today is $2,550 per annum, an increase of $850, or 50 percent.

Most of the men in the four lower grades are young men discharged honorably from the military. They are anxious to establish homes, raise families, contribute their share to the development of their communities, live on equal terms with their neighbors—but it is impossible for them to do anything but eke out an existence on an inadequate sum of $2,550 per year.

Section 4 of the proposal grants a flat $150 annual increase to all regular employees, however, it does not make provisions for hourly or part-time employees. Nor does it make provision for increasing the pay of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class. Therefore, I suggest that section 4 be amended by inserting a colon and adding the following language after the word "annum," in line 7, page 5: *"Provided,* That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 5 cents per hour: *"Provided further,* That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 5 percent of their basic annual compensation."

During the hearings held before the House Appropriations Committee on H. R. 3083—the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950—the distinguished Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, stated: "I would like to say that I feel very strongly that every salary increase voted by this Congress was fully justified. As a matter of fact, I believe that if this last salary increase of July 1, 1948, had been for $600 instead of $450, you would not have the salary question in front of you now."

This association favored an $800 horizontal pay raise for all Federal employees in the second session of the Eightieth Congress. Apparently, the Postmaster General feels that the amount granted in the previous Congress should have been at least $600. Section 4 would authorize the additional $150 suggested by Postmaster General Donaldson's testimony.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the consumers' price index for May 15, 1949, had risen to 169.2 over the August 1939 level. A grade 1 carrier in 1939 received $1,700 per annum. A grade 1 carrier in 1949 receives $2,550 per annum. In order to place grade 1 on a parity with the present consumers' price index an increase of approximately 19.2 percent over the 50-percent increase previously mentioned in this testimony should be granted. However, I wish to make a comparison between salary allocations in each grade and actual take-home pay. It will be argued that the top-grade carrier received $2,100 in 1939, that he receives $3,550 today, which is an increase of approximately 69 percent. Admittedly, the grade 11 carrier has been given that increase insofar as the actual grade is concerned, but it must be remembered that there were no withholding taxes in 1939 and moreover, the retirement deduction was 3½ percent in lieu of the present 6 percent. I have prepared a special chart showing the paymaster's figures on withholding tax and retirement deductions from the individual carrier in each grade—money never seen by the employee. It will be noted that the carrier in every grade category is confronted with a tremendous deficiency in 1949 take-home pay as compared with the consumers' price index for May 15 this year.

Section 5 provides for a $100 uniform allowance. This amount would be granted all employees in the postal service who are required to wear a uniform in the performance of their duties. It is assumed that the Postmaster General would continue to designate those employees required to wear a distinctive uniform. There is ample precedent for this type of legislation.

Without any ready reference at hand, I think it is safe to say that letter carriers are one of the few, if not the only, Government employee groups required to wear a uniform to be furnished by the employee himself out of his own funds. It is my understanding that most of the guards in public buildings and many others right here in the Nation's Capital receive their uniforms through Federal appropriations.

I would like to cite at this time that the Governor of Indiana earlier this year signed a bill which requires Indiana cities to furnish policemen and firemen with uniforms and other equipment. Surely our great Federal Government ought to be able to grant similar concessions to the men in the blue-gray uniform of the postal service—the letter carriers. Moreover, the Postmaster General is of the firm conviction that the Government should furnish carriers with uniforms. General Donaldson attended the thirty-sixth biennial convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers which was held at Miami, Fla., during October 1948. The following excerpt is taken from the speech which he delivered on that occasion:

"But I want you folks to know that so far as I am concerned I have long been a believer in the proposition that the Post Office Department and the Government should furnish carriers with uniforms."

The sixth and final section would eliminate the present efficiency rating system operating in the postal service. The present method of evaluating an employee's competence and ability has nothing to recommend it to any officer or agency engaged exclusively in personnel matters. The elimination of this system which serves no good purpose either to the Government or to the employee,

would bring about a considerable savings by reason of elimination of the administrative overhead and printing of useless forms necessary to comply with the law.

Letter carriers are still hopeful that something will be done to expedite the passage of a postal reclassification measure in the present session of Congress. In our opinion, the proposal is thoroughly justified and should be written on the statute books at the earliest possible moment.

Let me again thank you for your kind consideration.

American Security and American Progress Need Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, American security and American progress need point 4. The following is evidence of its bipartisan support from the leading newspapers in New York City:

[From the New York Times of September 28, 1949]

THE POINT 4 PROGRAM AND THE ATOM BOMB

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

It is reported from Washington that President Truman's proposal to implement his famous point 4, aimed at the development of backward areas, will run into stiff opposition in Congress because of the disclosure that Russia is able to produce atom bombs. When Acting Secretary of State Webb appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday to present the plan, which ranks high in the administration's world recovery program, he met some opposition and a good deal of indifference, the latter due in large part to the fact that the thoughts of his audience were centered on the new development in the military picture. Since the news of Russia's bomb was released Congress is in a mood to go ahead with the arms program, and especially to speed up atomic research, but at the expense of political and economic defense measures.

Mr. Webb and Assistant Secretary Willard Thorp were the first of a line of administration spokesmen who will appeal for action on point 4 before Congress adjourns. Mr. Webb described the program as a modest start toward "an enlightened businesslike attempt to solve one of the most crucial problems with which our world is confronted." It calls for $45,000,000 to initiate work to develop resources and raise living standards in underdeveloped countries, part of the money to be the United States contribution to a United Nations fund for the same purpose and part to be spent directly on projects sponsored by this country.

Point 4 is the core of the bold new program which Mr. Truman presented in his inaugural address as a necessity of world security. It was hailed at the time as a kind of long-term sequel to the Marshall plan, designed to increase available stocks of raw materials while laying the foundations for a democratic order among hitherto exploited peoples. But now, judging by the first reactions of some Republican members, the Foreign Affairs Committee is engrossed in other means of security. There is little likelihood, it is said, that point 4 will be seriously considered, much less acted on, in the present session.

BOMB A POLITICAL WEAPON

The Soviet strategists will be pleased by this. They have rather nonchalantly admitted that they have the atom bomb, have had it since 1947, indeed, but otherwise they have made no great point of it, in Moscow or here in the United Nations, where the attention of the Assembly, like that of Congress, seems to be distracted from other issues by this new item on the agenda. Yet Russia has not yet employed her other military weapons to gain her ends, and nothing at the moment suggests that she will use the atomic weapon any differently. The atom bomb will not impel the U. S. S. R. into war. Only if the Politburo decides on war will the bomb be an all-important military factor.

At present it is mainly a political weapon in a political war. The record shows that the Soviet Union prefers political warfare and relies on it for victory. Why not? Gen. Bedell Smith, who had exceptional opportunities to study Soviet tactics during his ambassadorship in Moscow, reminded a meeting of Reserve officers last Sunday that the Russians began maneuvering for a good post-war position before the last war was won and have acquired far more territory by political pressure than the Red armies conquered in battle.

The struggle with Tito is a case in point. This is by far the greatest provocation to the use of force the Soviet Government has encountered. It is met by the threat of armed intervention, and a great parade of arms; seven divisions are reported to be poised on the border.

THE ONLY BOMB?

In the Soviet view, however, the decisive battles are political battles. If Russia can use the atom bomb to divert the west from its political program, designed to build up a community of free and prosperous nations, it will be a great victory. The New York correspondent of the Sunday Times of London reports on apparently good authority that American, British, and Canadian scientists know the type of bomb the Russians exploded and the time, place, and force of the explosion. These experts assume, he says, that it was a plutonium fission and that in the experiment the Russians destroyed the only bomb they have and probably most of the plutonium in their possession.

There will be others, of course, but if the first detonation can start a chain reaction that will frighten western governments into cutting down their plans for reconstruction and weakening their political defenses for the sake of concentrating on military measures, that one bomb will be more powerful as a political than as a military instrument.

There is not much danger of that. The United States, which is obliged to lead its more vulnerable allies in the political fight, takes the bad news from Russia with remarkable calm. Actually it is not such bad news as it would have been 2 years ago, because other means of defense and resistance have been immensely strengthened in the meantime. The political war has paid dividends for us, too. The west is nearer a community today than anyone would have believed possible even last year. This is no time for Congress to play the Soviet game by tossing point 4 aside for the atom bomb. This is the time, above all others, to make the utmost use of all the political weapons in our armory.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 28, 1949]

POINT 4 SPELLED OUT

The President's request for priority at this session of Congress for passage of his point 4 program of aid to underdeveloped countries is abundantly justified by the importance of an early start on what must in any case be a very long-range task. It is this need for a real beginning on a long-run job rather than any close connection with atomic explosions or any other incidents in our relations with Russia that gives the point 4 program its urgency.

The clear objective of the program is to help backward areas improve the living standards of their people and become strong partners in a richer and more fluid world-trading system. The program must be judged in terms of its implementation of this objective.

In these terms, President Truman's proposals rate high marks. They correctly emphasize the fact that the American contribution must be technical aid, not large grants. The administration recognizes, as some of the underdeveloped countries do not, that disease must be fought and food supplies improved before steel plants can be built. The program quite properly makes American aid conditional upon self-help in the assisted areas. It is designed, as it should be, to complement rather than compete with development work sponsored by the United Nations. It is realistic in acknowledging that technical aid will not alone be enough and that the desirable source of necessary capital is to be found in the American private investing community. Finally, in suggesting that Congress authorize Government guaranties for private investors, it faces honestly the problem of overcoming these investors' legitimate fears of property confiscation and restrictions on the withdrawal of earnings.

One apparent weakness is the tacit assumption that if Government guaranties are provided, private capital will flow freely. It seems certain that many underdeveloped countries will advance worthy projects in irrigation, road-building, water supply, and other areas where expected returns will promise to come so slowly or in such small amounts that private capital may not be attracted to their support. This problem needs more consideration than the program reflects.

Another potential weakness is the concentration in the State Department of authority to supervise the program. Such a program should be administered in terms of economic needs and possibilities. It is no reflection upon the State Department to observe that neither its interests nor its facilities single it out as the obvious choice for this task. There will be pressure enough from the underdeveloped countries to base aid on political rather than technical considerations.

Judged as a whole, the program is sufficiently well conceived to deserve strong bipartisan support. Its weaknesses are correctible; its objective and its basic method would be hard to improve.

Rehabilitation of Navajo Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Herald Express is most timely, inasmuch as we are considering the Navajo rehabilitation bill at this time. The Herald Express and other Hearst papers have been instrumental in bringing this issue to the people from the very start. In fact, they did not get on the bandwagon; they

started the bandwagon, and they should be given credit accordingly.

FULL REHABILITATION OF NAVAJOS SHOULD BE OUR NATIONAL PROGRAM

There could be no more appropriate time than this, American Indian Day, to consider our failure, as a Nation, to provide adequately for the 65,000 Navajo Indians who today live in squalor on their rugged wind-blown reservation in Arizona.

We, the American people, are directly responsible for the welfare of the Indians. They are our trust, and a trust which we have neglected. We have taken their land, giving them in exchange the promise of a living—a promise which we have failed to keep.

How great, and how tragic our failure has been is revealed by a study of conditions made by the American Red Cross following the fearful suffering of last year's winter.

This survey reveals that more than half of the Navajo families are in immediate need of assistance.

It shows that of a total of 4,244 children under 16 years of age only 481 are in school.

Almost half of the total of families registered are in immediate need of health assistance.

In 57.8 percent of the families there were employable males—but there was no employment to offer them on the reservation.

Living conditions among the Navajos are shocking. They do not have villages or towns, but families live in isolated hogans. These are eight-sided one-room hovels without widows and without chimney. The entire family lives in the single room.

In concluding its survey of conditions among the Navajos, the American Red Cross concludes that the only possible solution to the Navajo problem is the complete economic rehabilitation of the reservation as a whole—a solution which should be given full support by the people of America.

Increase of Postal Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, among the more important obligations of the Congress at this session is the passage of legislation providing for pay increases for postal employees and more equitable treatment in regard to leave, promotions and rewards for long service as compared with other Federal employees.

The least Congress can do is to treat all employees of the Federal Government alike. The inequities which now exist as between postal employees and other Federal employees with regard to sick and annual leave and as between the various classifications of postal employees themselves, such as longevity promotion, must be removed.

The bill before us, H. R. 4495, is a step in the right direction in accomplishing these purposes. In my opinion, the bill does not go far enough toward a solution of the needs of the postal workers. The bill as originally introduced did a better job toward removing these inequities. In the absence of comprehensive legislation, I am supporting the best bill offered with the expectation that steps will be taken in the future to provide such relief as may be deemed necessary.

The enactment of this legislation at this time is only simple justice to the many thousands of loyal, faithful, and efficient postal employees.

The Republican Party Is Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in Newsweek for October 3, 1949, by Mr. Raymond Moley. Mr. Moley sets forth his ideas as to the opportunities the Republican Party has to meet the issues raised by the Democratic Party. I commend it to the Republicans who are interested in achieving victory in 1950 and 1952:

READY-MADE ISSUES

(By Raymond Moley)

Whether the Republican Party recaptures Congress in 1950 or not, it has the first opportunity in many years to draw a real and sharp issue between the parties. This golden chance to present an understandable case to the voters is not due to anything the Republican Party has done. The Democratic Party has itself made the issue. If, because of divided counsel, cowardice, or vague expediency, Republicans fail in this test, it is not improbable that the Republican Party of 1952 will, like the Whigs of 1852, have come to the end of the road.

The issue cannot be drawn by crying generalities like statism or welfare state or socialism. These flimsy word vessels have foundered in successive elections for nearly 20 years. The public needs to be told specifically what these words mean and why it should vote against them.

The Democratic Party has in its 1948 platform, in Truman-endorsed proposals in this Congress, and in the authoritative plans and views of members of the Truman administration filled in the details. There merely remains the job of drawing the composite picture of what these mean, what they will do to our economy if adopted, and what will remain of freedom after their enactment. Call the composite what you will, the specifications are what count.

Democrats are making no bones about their plans. To illustrate, let us consider a recent 3-day, 11-State Democratic conference in San Francisco, first performance of a traveling circus of party notables. There appeared the Vice President, the national chairman, four Cabinet members, and a grist of under and assistant secretaries. There was Leon Keyserling, the most radical of the President's economic advisers. There were also represented Mr. Truman's "unselfish" interests in the persons of Jack Kroll, of the CIO-PAC; Joseph Keenan, of the AFL League for Political Education; and James Patten, of the Farmers' Union.

Now what were they offering as a party program? Brannan presented his farm plan. Krug urged the immediate enactment of the vast Columbia and Missouri Valley super-States. Tobin called for the Truman welfare program; Kroll, for a Government guarantee of jobs for all. Several were for scrapping the Taft-Hartley Act. And BARKLEY presented his well-worn anti-Hoover speech.

There are most of the parts. To these should be added the Murray plan to put Government into many industrial enterprises and the Federal socialized-medicine bill.

A bit of addition would prove that this program would probably increase the Federal budget to $100,000,000,000 if a mandate is secured in 1950 and 1952. It would probably add $50,000,000,000 to the debt and cut purchasing power in half.

Moreover, it would, in the case of the vast water-use authorities, reduce 20 States to Federal colonies. It would place millions of farmers and workers on Government bounties or doles or in legal strait jackets. It would, by nationalizing key industries, drive productive capital away from plant improvement and renewal. And it would create a Government bureaucracy of probably 5,000,000 employees.

This economic burden and government regimentation would create a new and totally different nation. It is silly to talk about preserving political and economic liberty in such a state. For the power of such a government could crush all opposition. Caught in a tide of sectional and group ambitions, Mr. Truman has drifted with his party into a very vulnerable position.

Thus the Democratic Party has left neglected large areas in which repose many of the most treasured and traditional liberties of Americans.

It is fair to assume that a great majority of Americans are unwilling to live under such paternalism. They will respond to an appeal which will not only present the clear details but the implications of this Fair Deal. And they will vote for a continuation of a system of freedom and opportunity, if that alternative is forcefully presented.

This is the Republican opportunity. But there must be details. Generalities won't go.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in today's extension of my remarks, I include part 20 of the Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak. You will note by reading part 20 that the real-estate division, having been exposed and smoked out by Mr. Neal's article, are now using a new technique to get the farmer's land and home for less than just compensation. The new technique is to frighten him into believing that real-estate values will go down and that there will be another depression or recession. Here is part 20:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

(Part XX)

Of late, and largely from among my own friends, I have been subject to mild criticism because I show in these articles that certain men are committing wrongs and, then, after I have condemned them, I turn around and defend them.

SUNDANCE, WYO., *September 6, 1949.*

FRIEND BIGELOW: I get the paper here and we and a lot of others here read the Valley

of the Dammed. We have told a lot of people here just how we were used and use your writing to back it up as they are building the Keyhole Dam a few miles from us, so people here are interested.

You and all your helpers are sure doing a wonderful job in writing the Valley of the Dammed, and I, like many others, would like to see it in book form.

I do not understand why apologize to the Government appraisers when we proved in court that they were nowhere near right in the value of our homes. They did not care how much they hurt us, why should we have any sympathy for them? You say they have families to support. So have we. They did not have any sympathy for us. This is just a little suggestion; do not pay any personal attention to it.

What is the difference? Russia calls in the rubles and gives 1 back for every 10. They take our land and homes from us at low value and take income tax as well. What is the difference between the way our Government used us and the way the rancher does with his cattle in a Government range country? When the time comes, the rancher drives his cattle out of their feed lots away from feed and shelter into the open range, "Now, find your own feed and shelter or famish." What is the difference between the way our Government used us and the rancher does with his cattle? None, to my judgment. More power to you on the Valley of the Dammed. Great work you are doing.

Your friend,

J. R. CROUSE.

Thank you, Jerry Crouse. May your whiskers never grow gray.

But I want to make one correction in your letter. The appraisers were no part of the injustice done to you, to our neighbors, and to me. The men really to blame are those who first tell the appraisers how to appraise and then try by the use of threats to frighten us into selling our lands at even less than the appraisal figures. To me, and I have had the original pair of appraisers under my eye from early in 1947 to as late as a week ago, they constitute the one bright spot in the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps.

Can you or I condemn, totally, a man who does not agree with us in religion or politics? Have we a right to condemn, as an outcast from society, a man who breaks into a bakery and steals a loaf of bread because his children are hungry? Have we a right to persecute a man who has talked and thought himself into believing he is right, even though you and I know that he is wrong?

I have said again and again that the wrongs done to my people in the valley of the Missouri are the result of a policy. It is a way of doing that always comes from autocratic power. It is not the Government. It is not the Congress. It is not the Army. It is an idea grown in the minds of incompetent men, entrusted with too much power over unfortunate people. I can't find, and you can't find, the men who are really to blame. Probably they are dead. They should be.

But now that I have got to bring up the story of these negotiators again, I am going to repeat myself: These men might, perhaps, be in better jobs. But they reason this way, "My superiors take their orders from Washington. Washington says these things are right. If they are wrong, I am not to blame. Anyway I've got to have the money for my family. I couldn't quit if I wanted to. So I'll go ahead."

But even as they go ahead, these men are uneasy in conscience. I know this because they tell me so. My mission, then, is not to condemn but to pray that, in some way, I may convince them that the only way not to do a thing wrong is to do it right.

For several months I have been trying to prove a vital point I knew was a fact and yet I couldn't use it in this story because I lacked the actual proof. And then, largely by accident, I stumbled onto the proof.

It seems that an employee of the Real Estate Division talked too much. Allowing his human side to get the better of his professional training, he said something that the Real Estate Division wouldn't admit for almost any amount of money. Was I tickled to death? I certainly was. I had the affidavits here on my desk; I was already to shoot. And then something occurred to me:

At heart this fellow was fine. If he hadn't been an honorable and kindly man, he never would have made that damaging statement. He did it to help another man—almost a total stranger—who was in trouble. If I published this—well—he would be out of a job in 24 hours. So I have filed the papers away. But I know how to find the proof now. And when I get it, in another way, I'll cheerfully plaster it high enough for everyone to read.

Now we come to act two. You will remember of my telling you how many of these farmers signed options because they were afraid of eviction in the middle of the winter. The Valley of the Dammed blew that up. You will remember how we were taught to be afraid of the United States District Court. That blew up also. Then came the threat of high rentals or no rentals at all. Because the Real Estate Division doesn't like to play with hot potatoes, that also has been thrown overboard. But now—but now listen to the latest.

I shan't use names, places, or figures. But the affidavits are here just the same.

The negotiator goes to Mr. Smith. He holds forth substantially as follows:

"Mr. Smith, I am sent by the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps to buy your farm. I can give you $10,000."

Mr. Smith knows that his farm is worth twice as much. He says so and waits for the second offer. But there will be no second offer. (That's another thing that the Valley of the Dammed blew up.)

Instead the negotiator says, "Oh, well, if you don't want to sell your farm, it's perfectly all right with us. We won't need it for 5 years. Then, of course, we'll have to condemn it or you can sue us and you'll have your money in another 2 years. We thought it would be fair to you, in view of a probable fall in real-estate values, to buy your land now. But, of course, if you want to run the risk of a falling market, it's perfectly all right with us. Good-by and let us know if you change your mind."

There you have it. There you have the cleverest stunt to date. To say that it is unfair and contrary to the wishes of Congress is redundant. To say that it is cruel and unjust is an understatement. When an officer of the Real Estate Division said to me—"What we are doing here is shameful. It is so shameful, it is disgusting." Did he tell me the truth?

Farm Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem of importing farm labor is of much importance. American farm labor is being more difficult to obtain as the old and the young now constitute most of the American farm labor. There is not any provision for social security for workers on farms. There is not any legal minimum wage for agricultural workers except in the Sugar Act. The Secretary of Agriculture provides as low as 25 cents per hour in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents per hour in Puerto Rico, and 32 cents per hour in Louisiana under this act. Where is the minimum wage of 75 cents per hour provided for other groups?

The following information stated is by Mr. H. L. Mitchell, of the A. F. of L.:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPORT FOREIGN LABOR

(By H. L. Mitchell, president, National Farm Labor Union, AFL)

H. R. 5557, by Mr. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, approved by the House Committee on Agriculture, authorizes the negotiation of international agreements and the importation of foreign labor to work on farms in the United States for the year ending February 28, 1951. It will permit the importation and employment of workers from any country in the Western Hemisphere for farm work. This bill is a modified continuation of the wartime program under which several hundred thousand foreign nationals were imported at Government expense. The bill provides that the State Department may negotiate agreements with foreign countries and the United States Employment Service, supervise and coordinate the employment of foreign workers, with all expenses for recruitment and transportation to be borne by the employers. H. R. 5557 is on the calendar for action Thursday, September 29.

In our opinion, this bill is wholly unnecessary and should not be passed. The importation of foreign labor when American citizens are unemployed is indefensible on any score. It is designed to perpetuate low wages, bad working and living conditions on the Nation's 100,000 large-scale farms classified by the United States Census reports as class I holdings. These farms produce 24.2 percent of all the Nation's food and fiber products and employ over half the hired labor force in the United States. Of the approximately 20,000 foreign nationals employed in the United States from January 1 to July 6, 90 percent were placed on farms and in food-processing plants hiring groups of 10 to 1,450 such workers. Few if any of the millions of small farm operators are interested in hiring these workers.

According to reports some members of the Agricultural Committee plan to offer H. R. 5828, by Mr. PHILLIPS of California, as a substitute for H. R. 5557 when it comes to the floor of the House for action, or a similar measure by Mr. PATTEN, of Arizona.

H. R. 5828 is legislation of a permanent nature which will flood the United States with cheap foreign labor from Mexico, Central America, South America, and the British colonies off the Atlantic coast. This bill is similar to S. 272 by Mr. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, which has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Either of these bills by PHILLIPS or PATTEN, if enacted, will set aside provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917 by abolishing the head tax and other admission charges and literacy requirements. Provisions of the law relating to contract laborers as well as prohibitions of payment of passage by corporations and foreign governments will be set aside. Procedures of the Immigration Service will be changed to permit admission of such foreign workers by authorities issuing a "white identification card." The United States Department of Agriculture will certify the number needed.

To enter the United States, all a Mexican or British West Indian worker will have to do is present himself to the United States Immigration authorities, state that he is willing to word on a farm, and be admitted.

Once such a worker is admitted, there are no means whereby his future movements may be controlled. He may get a job as a bricklayer, railway worker, or in any other trade or calling in any State or city. While the immigration authorities could deport him legally, the service has never been able to control the flow of illegal aliens from Mexico. In a report issued June 20, 1949, a survey jointly supervised by the University of Texas and the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation estimates that there are not less than half a million illegal aliens from Mexico in the United States now.

The Congress of the United States should concern itself with improving working conditions of farms, so that American citizens may be attracted to farm work. The best way to do this is to stop bringing in foreign labor and return all who are in the United States of America illegally or under contract. The enactment of a minimum wage for agricultural workers would stop requests of growers for foreign workers. There is a plentiful supply of American workers, able and willing to perform farm work at fair wages. Exploitation of both native and foreign workers by large-scale farm operators is responsible for such legislation as is proposed in H. R. 5557, H. R. 5828, and S. 272.

Mr. Speaker, why do not these large landowners plant what they can harvest with American labor when so many are unemployed or else drawing unemployment insurance.

There would not be so much cotton grown that takes millions to subsidize and to give away after it is produced if these imported-labor bills were defeated.

The rural people are not provided social security. They are not given an opportunity to have same on a permissive basis even. While others may have industrial pensions plus social security, the rural people can look forward to being placed on the relief rolls, though they are helping to pay the costs of security programs they are not allowed to enjoy.

National Association To Aid in Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a new national organization has come into existence called the National Association To Aid in Government Spending. Mr. W. M. Woods, of Grand Junction, Colo., is the managing director. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the membership pledge and a letter addressed to me from Mr. Woods.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my legislative record is such that I do not qualify for membership in this organization.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION TO AID IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The formation of this organization has been found to be a necessity in order that our leaders may be saved the nervous strain caused by trying to think up new ways of spending. After all, they have been carrying the spending burden for some little time, and they are entitled to relief.

MEMBERSHIP PLEDGE

"I shall do my utmost—

"To think up schemes to further discourage self-support in foreign countries;

"To assist in depriving fellow citizens of essentials to enable foreign nations to experiment in socialism and communism;

"To encourage the donation of arms to foreign nations, as a means of assuring Russia of easy access;

"To offer proposals which will encourage our Federal Government to engage in even a greater number of competitive enterprises;

"To back legislation to place all of our people on the Federal pay roll;

"To demand legislation to place subsidies on everything;

"To seek legislation which will make it lawful to accept bribes for Government contracts;

"To favor the imposition of 100-percent taxes on business, so that tax collectors may enjoy a full-time siesta;

"To exert such pressure as may be possible toward several more support prices (it wouldn't need many to accomplish our purpose). As an example, we suggest wild mustard, which requires no cultivation nor harvesting. It should be noted that in 1948, potatoes required only $225,000,000 of tax money;

"To favor the substitution of lounges for desks in Government offices, and the placing of 'Do not disturb' signs on the outer doors;

"To favor the reduction of the value of our 59-cent dollar as a means of saving us the trouble of buying necessities;

"To use all of my influence in promoting municipal as well as Federal ownership, so that cities, counties, and States may be deprived of tax income; and

"To favor further legislation to positively stop our builders from cluttering our cities with homes; and all other proposals to increase the national debt, so that future generations may be reminded of our thoughtfulness."

SEPTEMBER 26, 1949.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As a matter of rendering any protection whatever, NATAIGS agrees with you that the arms-for-Europe is about as absurd a program as might be considered.

However, to maintain the principles for which NATAIGS stands, we emphatically condemn your attitude wherein several billions might be saved for our taxpayers.

As it now appears, you would be a mighty poor prospect for membership in our organization.

Sincerely,

W. M. WOOD,
Managing Director, NATAIGS.

Some Observations on Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Grants Pass Courier, a newspaper published daily in the congressional district I represent:

OLD SAW APPLICABLE TO POLITICS

There is an old saying that one often "can't see the forest for the trees."

That adage is applicable to the American political picture today. A philosophy of government created by the freedom-seeking colonists who carved this Nation out of the New World wilderness is being rapidly relegated to the discard while a paternalistic Federal arrangement is being developed to take its place.

During a period of 150 years those sprawling settlements on the Atlantic coast expanded into one of the most powerful and prosperous nations on the face of the earth by following the original pattern.

In the last 15 years, a colossal (Webster says a synonym is "monstrous") change has been taking place.

The changes are of such a character that, even though the populace may eventually rue them, they, like Humpty Dumpty, cannot be put together again.

It is probable that a very small percentage of the Nation's citizens desire a form of government under which their individual rights are surrendered wholesale in the name of a welfare state.

How, then, it is possible that such a change is being speedily accomplished?

An analysis of the subject leads us to these conclusions:

A large proportion of the citizenry gives little thought or study to the over-all picture (the forest).

They see only the effect of particular propositions which concern them most immediately (the trees). They fail to realize that, in obtaining certain desired individual advantages, they are aiding in bringing about a situation which has more of what they do not want than what they do.

In politics, the favorite procedure is: "Scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

Let us examine particular situations: For instance organized labor sees an opportunity to get such a political strangle-hold on the Federal Government that it can force any desired economic advantage by Government fiat.

The individual unionist may squirm under the union rules he must observe to retain his employment. Yet, he accepts them in the belief that the added wages and easier working conditions resulting overshadow the personal disadvantages. He even goes further. To assure political success for his union policies he combines with other elements also seeking personal advantage that actually conflict with his own interests.

The farmer is interested in better prices for his products so he supports an administration who promises price supports at the expense of all types of taxpayers. He isn't interested in labor unions and he doesn't particularly enthuse at the prospect of a labor-controlled government.

The laborer wants ever higher wages, but he doesn't want ever-increasing prices to the consumer that price support entails. Neither farmer nor laborer wants an ever-increasing tax load.

Yet it is an unalterable fact that Harry Truman is President of the United States today because a major proportion of the unionists and the farmers supported him in 1948.

Neither the farmer nor the laborer wants millions of additional office-holding, tax-eating jobs created, but both have to accept them to gain individual ends. Both agree that business operations controlled by politicians and public officeholders are more expensive, that waste is great, and the red tape almost unbearable. Certainly, both must have moments when they wonder whether the final cost to both of them is likely to be too high.

There are other elements which help to entrench an administration in power despite floundering, expensive experimentation and even downright incompetence.

Millions of citizens have neither the time nor the inclination to seek the right answer to the problem of self-government. Millions do not even take the trouble to vote. Other millions who do make use of the ballot box base their decisions on a sporting or sentimental basis or because of tradition.

In the South, tradition plays a major role. The Republican Party was in power when the Civil War was waged and during the unspeakable reconstruction days which followed. Through resentment the southerners became Democrats and there they stayed.

Even in 1948, the Southern States which rebelled against the Truman policies wouldn't support a Republican. They became Dixiecrats.

The balance of power in the 1948 Presidential election undoubtedly was held in the hands of a group of voters who either looked upon the election as a sporting event and thrilled to the Truman "give 'em hell" strategy or else believed his charges because the opposition elected to ignore his type of attack.

The fact remains that millions of labor unionists who voted for the winner were not for price support, for state medicine, for more welfare withholding taxes. They were not even concerned with the racial issue. They care nothing about valley administrations. Yet, they made it possible for the winner to contend that they had approved all the governmental experiments in which he was engaged or would later adopt.

That brings us to the issue of a Columbia Valley Administration.

Such an administration, originally named an authority, is not a matter of concern to labor-union members as such. Neither is it of special concern to farmers except as it may play a part in reclaiming agricultural lands.

In respect to the latter, we recall that portion of a recent letter to this newspaper from Morton Tompkins, State grangemaster, stating "that almost from its inception nearly three quarters of a century ago, the Grange has concerned itself with the orderly development of the resources of this region."

Certainly that is true and we are for that sort of a program 100 percent. That doesn't mean, however, that the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana must assume practically the status of Territories rather than States.

This writer is opposing a CVA because he believes that it and the series of other such administrations will have placed the economy of the United States in the hands of a series of administrative boards of three men each which are responsible only to the man in the White House. We believe a CVA will place in the hands of such three political appointees the very economic fate of the States over which it extends.

We contend that no such surrender of area rights to a bureaucracy is necessary to obtain the original Grange objective of orderly development of the resources of the region.

Our fundamental objection to CVA, as proposed, is too much government and a major advance along the road to paternalistic government which can hardly be reconciled with existing concepts of constitutionality. We believe we already have too much government and are likely to get a great deal more. Hence, the present struggle.

F. S.

More Evidence That Contributions to Volunteer Fire Companies Should Be Tax Exempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago eight volunteer firemen were injured and damage estimated at $150,000 was suffered when fire destroyed property, equipment, and stored grains at the Department of Agriculture's research center at Beltsville, Md.

The extent of the loss to our Federal Government would have been immeasurably greater had it not been for the fact that this fire was brought under control by the members of eight or nine neighboring fire companies. And, Mr. Speaker, each of these fire companies was a volunteer organization.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Members of this House for the following reason: The approximately 14,000 volunteer fire companies in the United States are principally dependent for operating and equipment funds upon volunteer contributions from individuals and business enterprises. The Treasury Department has ruled that such contributions are not deductible for income-tax purposes.

On January 25, 1949, I introduced into this House H. R. 1822, in order to correct this unfair and illogical situation. In other words, H. R. 1822 would amend the Internal Revenue Code in such a manner as to make contributions to volunteer fire companies deductible for income-tax purposes. This bill does not request any Federal subsidy or grant.

On the day on which I introduced H. R. 1822 I made the following statement:

In nearly all of the communities throughout the Nation served by volunteer fire companies, our Federal Government has post offices and other public buildings and properties of tremendous value. For the protection of these public buildings from destruction by fire, our Government is wholly dependent upon the unselfish services of the volunteer firemen. I am not suggesting that these firemen be paid or that they receive any Federal subsidy, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that we should enable these companies to raise larger sums of money by reason of tax exemption to donors so that our own public property may be more adequately protected.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1949, the Treasury Department notified the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means that it is opposed to the enactment of H. R. 1822. As I stated in a letter dated May 3, 1949, to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the reasons for this opposition not only lacked logic but principally served to emphasize the fact that the Treasury Department has only a superficial knowledge of the operation and value of volunteer fire companies and fails entirely to recognize the practical aspects of the situation, especially the protection of Federal property.

Mr. Speaker, no words of mine can convey the fallacy of the Treasury Department's ruling so clearly as the incident to which I referred at the beginning of these remarks. The incongruity of the entire situation is brought into sharp focus when we see one department of our Federal Government opposing legislation involving no Federal grant or subsidy, which would serve to strengthen the services of volunteer fire companies, and another department of our Government being wholly dependent upon volunteer fire companies to save Federal property from destruction by fire.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the incident to which I have referred will be given serious and fullest consideration by all Members of this House, and Treasury Department opposition notwithstanding, that H. R. 1822 will be enacted into law at the earliest possible date.

Veterans' Education and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement concerning legislation which I have introduced today to curb the regulatory powers of the Veterans' Administration as they relate to veterans' education and training.

I have introduced today a bill designed to curb the regulatory powers of the Veterans' Administration insofar as they relate to education or training of veterans under the so-called GI bill of rights. Regulations issued recently by the Veterans' Administration have overextended the intent of Congress in modification of these programs for the protection of the veteran participating in them. Utter confusion has resulted, and both the veterans and institutions concerned are encountering extreme difficulty in complying with the regulations.

The primary purpose of the legislation I am sponsoring is to transfer the burden of proof of eligibility from the veteran or school to the Veterans' Administration. Provision is made for rescinding Veterans' Administration regulations which restrict the right of a veteran to enter a course of instruction during his period of entitlement. The bill spells out what courses are to be considered avocational or recreational in character and not to be certified by the Veterans' Administration. Under this provision flight training and related aviation courses shall be certified unless there is "substantial evidence" that they are not of vocational nature. "Customary cost of tuition" is defined in the bill as that required to be paid by nonveteran enrollees in the same courses of instruction. Exception is made in specific cases, and the Veterans' Administration is granted the right to fix a fair and equitable charge for tuition. If this legislation is enacted, a Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board shall be constituted to effect reviews of decisions relating to rates of payments for tuition, fees, or other charges levied by educational institutions.

There is need for legislation of this type to restrict the sweeping changes promulgated by the Veterans' Administration, which changes have the practical effect of nullifying educational benefits granted to veterans by Congress.

Henry Hazlitt on Deflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Hazlitt, who writes Business Tide in Newsweek, has an article in the October 3, 1949, issue entitled "The World Monetary Earthquake." Mr. Hazlitt is, in my opinion, the outstanding economist in his field, and his analysis of the devaluation of currency now going on in Europe and other parts of the world is of extreme importance. Mr. Hazlitt has called the turn on all of our foreign-aid programs, and his point of view regarding the economic ills of the world are being verified every day. In this article he states that a tremendous gain has been made in the world situation because of devaluation, but he points out quite clearly that devaluation alone is not the answer to the world's economic ills. It is his position that managed currencies is the little colored boy in the wood pile. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. Hazlitt:

THE WORLD MONETARY EARTHQUAKE
(By Henry Hazlitt)

Within a single week 25 nations have deliberately slashed the values of their currencies. Nothing quite comparable with this has ever happened before in the history of the world.

This world monetary earthquake will carry many lessons. It ought to destroy forever the superstitious modern faith in the wisdom of governmental economic planners and monetary managers. This sudden and violent reversal proves that the monetary bureaucrats did not understand what they were doing in the preceding 5 years. Unfortunately it gives no good ground for supposing that they understand what they are doing now.

This column has been insisting for years, with perhaps tiresome reiteration, on the evil consequences of overvalued currencies. On December 18, 1946, the International Monetary Fund contended that the trade deficits of European countries would not be appreciably narrowed by changes in their currency parities. I wrote in Newsweek of March 3, 1947: "It is precisely because their currencies are ridiculously overvalued that the imports of these countries are overencouraged and their export industries cannot get started." In the issue of September 8, 1947, as well as in my book Will Dollars Save the World? I wrote: "Nearly every currency in the world (with a few exceptions like the Swiss franc) is overvalued in terms of the dollar. It is precisely this overvaluation which brings about the so-called dollar scarcity."

Yet until September 18 of this year the European bureaucrats continued to insist that their currencies were not overvalued and that even if they were this had nothing to do, or negligibly little to do, with their trade deficits and the dollar shortage that they continued to blame on America. And the tragedy was that former Secretary of State Marshall, the President, and Congress, completely misunderstanding the real situation, accepted this European theory and poured billions of the American taxpayers' dollars into the hands of European governments to finance the trade deficits that they themselves were bringing about by their socialism and exchange controls with overvalued currencies.

In time the managers of the Monetary Fund learned half the lesson. They recognized that most European currencies were overvalued. They recognized that this overvaluation was a real factor in causing the so-called dollar shortage and unbalancing and choking world trade. But they proposed the wrong cure.

They did not ask for the simple abolition of exchange controls. (Their own organization in its very origin was tied up with the maintenance of exchange controls.) They proposed instead that official currency valuations be made "realistic." But the only "realistic" currency valuation (as long as a currency is not made freely convertible into a definite weight of gold) is the valuation that a free market would place upon it. Free-market rates are the only rates that keep demand and supply constantly in balance. They are the only rates that permit full and free convertibility of paper currencies into each other at all times.

Sir Stafford Cripps fought to the last against the idea that the rate of the pound had anything to do with the deepening British crisis. Trying to look and talk as much like God as possible, he dismissed all such contentions with celestial disdain. But at the eleventh hour he underwent an intellectual conversion that was almost appallingly complete. We "must try and create conditions," he said, "in which the sterling area is not prevented from earning the dollars we need. This change in the rate of exchange is one of those conditions and the most important one." And on the theory that what's worth doing is worth overdoing, he slashed the par value of the pound overnight from $4.03 to $2.80.

There are strong reasons (which space does not permit me to spell out at this time) for concluding that the new pound parity he adopted was well below what the real free-market level of widely usable sterling was or would have been on the day he made the change. What he did, in other words, was not merely to adjust the pound to its market value as of September 18, but to make a real devaluation.

The first consequence was to let loose a world scramble for competitive devaluation far beyond anything witnessed in the '30s. Most nations fixed new rates lower than their existing real price and cost levels called for. These countries, therefore, will now undergo still another epidemic of suppressed inflation. Their internal prices and living costs will start to soar. Unions will strike for higher wages. And if the past (or Sir Stafford's September 18 talk) is any guide, the governments will try to combat this by more internal price-fixing and rationing, continued or increased food subsidies, unbalanced budgets, and wage fixing.

In this country, on the contrary, the tendency will be to drag down our price level somewhat by lowering the dollar price of imported commodities and forcing reductions in the dollar price of export commodities. This will increase our problems at a time when the unions are pressing for a wage increase in the camouflaged form of insurance-pension benefits.

It will be necessary to reexamine our whole foreign economic policy in the light of the new exchange rates. Marshall-plan aid with overvalued European currencies was largely futile; Marshall-plan aid with undervalued European currencies should be unnecessary. In fact, we may soon witness the reversal of the world flow of gold. For the first time since 1933 (if we omit the war years 1944 and 1945) gold may move away from, instead of toward, our shores.

But getting rid of overvalued currencies, even in the wrong way, is nonetheless a tremendous gain. The chief barrier that has held up a two-way flow of world trade in the last 5 years has at last been broken. The chief excuses for maintaining the strangling worldwide network of trade restrictions and controls have at last been destroyed. Were it not for the echoes of the atomic explosion in Russia, the outlook for world economic freedom would at last be brighter.

The best British comment I have read since the devaluation comes from the London Daily Express: "Let every foreign country pay what it thinks the pound is worth. * * * But the Socialists will never consent to free the pound. It would mean the abandonment of their system of controls. * * * If you set money free you set the people free."

Dismantling and Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Col. Patrick Miller, formerly consultant to General Robertson, of the British military government in Berlin, on the dismantling of German plants:

DISMANTLING AND COMPETITION
(By Col. Patrick Miller, formerly consultant to General Robertson, British military government, Berlin)

It is about time that western European nations realize that their own hopes for peace and prosperity can only be fulfilled if the Ruhr remains one of the most important production centers in the world. An economically healthy Germany is the conditio sine qua non for a peaceful and stable Europe. However, one cannot expect the population of the Ruhr to cooperate in the vast scheme of western European recovery if one continues destroying their mechanical and other industrial equipment arbitrarily and without any sense—equipment which would render the recovery of the German economy possible. The folly was completed by the recently announced dismantling of the chemical works in the Ruhr which brought the hidden irritation of the Germans at the policy of the military government very distinctly to the light.

The German attitude is quite clear. Beside the opposition against the annihilation of assets as such, the loss of many places of work is their chief concern. They fear that the large number of unemployed which last month nearly reached the figure of one and a quarter millions is going to increase even more on account of these measures. The Germans hold that the consequences of this unemployment will be political radicalism. This need not necessarily show itself in the growing number of Communist votes. It is rather the revival of nationalist feelings that is most dangerous and must by no means be underrated. Both nazism and communism arise from dissatisfaction and unemployment. Just by the methods which the British are applying in Germany, dictators are bred.

The British usually motivate their attitude toward dismantling by the allegation that only such plant is removed which is unessential for German peacetime economy and which cannot be utilized at present. The foreign office represents that dismantlement is only carried out after thorough discussions on trizonal basis. They are of the opinion that we British are bound by inter-

allied agreements to reduce the German economic potential to the agreed level of industry. However, we would do better to try and look at things from another angle, than to adhere to these official statements. There has been much simple-minded talk about war potential and the necessity to insist on security in order to prevent Germany from ever starting another war. Such talk only helps to camouflage the real aims.

It might be very useful to investigate some of the reasons which the Foreign Office hides behind the harmless facade which they have erected in support of their dismantling policy. Germany can produce cheaper today than Great Britain. The reason for this is not private economy, but the welfare state of the Labor Government whose only endeavor it is to increase wages and to extend off-work hours. This policy can only lead to one thing, that British goods are no longer competitive on world markets. Private enterprise in England always supported sound competition and would not have objected to the German competition if private enterprise in England were still as elastic as before, and if they had a chance to attend to their own affairs in order to be able to compete on a sound basis. British industry has been deprived of its flexibility—fantastic wages must be paid for poor production. In former times private enterprise did not try to beat foreign competition by means of reduced wages and labor unrest, but by eliminating inefficient labor and by rewarding efficient and faithful workers. In former times people worked hard because there was sufficient incentive. Today they strike if those are dismissed who are inefficient and the trade-unions proclaim strikes if the efficient and faithful workers work harder than those who hate to work.

If the Labor Government dismantles in Germany, this is done in the first place in order to suppress German competition. However, this policy is not adhered to for the benefit of British undertakings, it is rather supposed to help the Government itself. For if they succeed in eliminating serious competition they will be able to keep up the idea of a welfare state paying high wages and reducing the hours of work eternally. The Government only knows too well that their socialized industries will never be able to stand genuine competition. However, labor is prepared to sacrifice all our hope for peace to their doctrinaire philosophy before they would give private enterprise in Britain a chance, or before they would free the German industry for the benefit of European recovery and the prosperity of this Continent. They are fully aware of the fact that their philosophy can only be maintained as long as they manage to uphold a system of restrictions to include competition. The price for such short-sighted policy will either be war, the forward move of the iron curtain to the banks of the Rhine, or the rising of a new and fatal German Fuehrer, brought to light by an uncontrollable emotional neofascism.

The American attitude toward dismantlement is dictated by other motives. While the Russians embrace political imperialism, the United States of America cling to economic imperialism. Neither the Steel Corp. nor Standard Oil, whose sphere of interest stretches far beyond oil, would welcome German competition. Standard Oil has still to settle a bill with I. G. Farben, whose capability disturbed the Standard Oil Co. during the twenties so much that it took another war to free them from the unpleasant ties resulting from an agreement signed between the two enterprises about 20 years ago. The monopolies of Standard Oil are spreading over a large part of the world. It is only natural that they do everything to keep them out of mischief.

The Germans would undoubtedly have understood dismantling if it had been carried out during the first 18 months following the end of the war. One cannot, however, expect the Germans to grasp a logic in 1949 which, on the one side, urges them to increase production and, on the other side, deprives them of place-bound production facilities. The western powers are busy making the Germans believe that they are prepared to look upon them as friends while at the same time they take precautions against German competition on international markets. All of us, America and France included, are playing the Russian game. We ourselves are creating the unrest in industry which Russia did everything in her power to bring about. The greatest mischief that could happen would be if the Germans living in the three western zones turned their backs on the western world. Considering the well-balanced potential of the western and of the eastern world, any shifting of potential must be looked upon as a decisive factor in the struggle for peace. We cannot await, however, for the Germans to throw in their weight for peace as long as we do not meet them with that generosity which we can claim to be our privilege as victors and as a great nation.

Progress of Socialism in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the National Fraternal Congress, composed of delegates from all the outstanding fraternal societies of the United States and Canada, is meeting in Washington, D. C., this week.

On Tuesday, September 27, the delegates were privileged to hear an address delivered by Mr. Tom Robertson, of Toronto, Canada. Mr. Robertson is the president of the Independent Order of Foresters, a fraternal organization with its headquarters in Toronto. This gentleman, who is a distinguished citizen of Canada, and an outstanding fraternalist, was born and grew to manhood in England. He enlisted in the British Army during the First World War and was severely wounded in combat.

His address to the congress, entitled "Observation re Recent Trip to England," invites careful study and consideration. Mr. Robertson spent two consecutive months this summer traveling in and about England and his information detailed in his address is not based on heresay but on personal observation and contact.

His comments about the progress of socialism in England and his candid analysis of the cause and effect of socialized medicine in that country is both enlightening and instructive. In taking a definite position on these important questions I wish to commend Mr. Robertson for his courageous and forthright attitude and also compliment him on bringing to the people of the United States a message that is replete with facts gained through first-hand observation. His talk was most inspiring and helpful. Excerpts from his address follow:

In a country such as Britain, with its long history of staid, conventional government, the revolutionary changes which have taken place since 1945 have caused public opinion to become positively riddled with ideas and conceptions that are diametrically opposed. * * *

It is difficult, if not impossible, in the light of what is taking place in the British Isles today, to discuss happenings there without becoming, in some measure at any rate, entangled in the politics of the country.

However * * * I feel, unquestionably, that we, on this side of the Atlantic, enjoy so much that is good under our economic system, as compared with the unification and regimentation of the people of Britain, that one must say so—fearlessly—and in no uncertain way.

We must be warned against, and continually on the watch for, individuals, movements, or agencies which would lead us down the same road as the people of Great Britain are traveling.

We must, though, as another great democratic country, keep in mind that the people of Britain chose their particular form of government by an overwhelming majority.

There are many people in England today, who think that the next general election will bring about a change. After having moved about amongst all kinds of people there, and making it my business to talk with, and put direct questions to the lowliest, as well as the loftiest people of the country, it is my opinion that the present Government will be very hard to dislodge. Much will depend upon the turn of events between now and the time the election takes place.

The question of discussing socialized medicine in Britain presents to any speaker a problem no less formidable that the scheme itself. * * *

Personally, I found that if one talks to 10 different people in England, one gets 10 different ideas as to what they pay, and what they get for what they pay.

The main basis is, however, that it is financed by contributions from the people, together with contributions from the Government—which is only another way of saying further contributions from the people.

It seems all embracing in its scope in that it provides for the populace and others anything from a small-sized filling for a tooth to an oversized wooden leg. Its cost, let me assure you, is crushing.

It looks to me that in the Labor government's anxiety to "lay a golden egg" it has brought forth a gigantic social protégé, which in view of the acute, economic problems with which the country is faced, may prove difficult to nourish and keep alive.

* * * * *

To be fair it must be said that the majority of the folks that I talked to in England and Wales liked the plan. It must be said, too, that many doctors, dentists, etc., favor the plan for, although it has regimented and harassed them with all kinds of forms and documents, it has also provided them with increased and immutable incomes. On the other hand, many of the country's finest medical men want no part of it. My own opinion is that no plan can hope to succeed and accomplish the purpose for which it is formulated unless it has the support of the medical profession. I do not believe that any program can secure the support of the medical profession—that is, all the medical profession, including the top-fighters, mediocre, and ordinary—unless some ways can be found whereby doctors can serve the country and, at the same time, retain a very large measure of that which traditionally belongs to private practice. Whether a formula for an arrangement of this character could be found I do not know.

* * * * *

Returning to the British scene, * * * I believe that one would be safe in expressing the opinion that socialized medicine is there to stay.

* * * * *

In my opinion it would be very hard, if not impossible, for a party not to be elected in

England today that did not have in its platform a fairly comprehensive program directed toward a welfare state.

* * * * *

There is, you know, the possibility that governments, in their anxiety to help the people—to say nothing of their anxiety to appeal to the people—are becoming too much inclined to legislation of a paternal nature. * * *

But, whether this is so or not, it would seem reasonable that before asking the people to embrace a project so immense and costly as social medicine, the governments should make clear to the people the staggering cost of such service—that is, providing the Government is able to discover what the cost would be. One thing is certain, whatever the cost is, it is going to be borne by the taxpayer. In this regard we should keep in mind that today in Britain the Government takes from the people 40 percent—£2 out of £5, or, in our language, $8 out of $20—of the entire national income. * * *

When I tell you that 1 out of every 10 of the working population of Great Britain is in the employ of some branch of civil service, you will have some idea of the mammoth job that is involved in the oversight and administration in countries where schemes of this kind are undertaken.

Now it occurs to me that the chief reason why we people on this side are so anxious to know what goes on, on the other side, is because we are wondering to what extent we are being led—or pushed—in the same direction.

* * * * *

As a great democratic country, we must believe in voluntary systems—if we do, let us adhere to them, and see to it that nothing alien to the great freedom of which we boast is allowed to creep in.

I am of the opinion that we fraternals should oppose anything that smacks of socialization. This is necessary, and we should regard it as our duty—

1. Because every move in this direction is a blow at freedom and free enterprise. Today, we enjoy a standard of living which, I believe, we could never have under any system of regimentation and planned economy;

2. Because it would destroy a great deal of what fraternals have toiled for years to build up; and,

3. Because it would very denitely detract from the quality of our citizens. * * * I believe that we are all the better people because we have to dig and work for what we get. * * *

Or, to put it more pointedly, if the coming generations of Americans and Canadians are to be brought up on crutches, they will never learn to walk; consequently, they will not develop the virility, resourcefulness, and stamina of those who have gone before them, and who have made this country the great country it is today under systems of business and political economy untrammeled by an excess of governmental paternalism and regimentation.

The Point-4 Program and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 29 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, entitled "The Point-4 Program and the Atomic Bomb," published in the New York Times of September 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POINT-4 PROGRAM AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

It is reported from Washington that President Truman's proposal to implement his famous "point 4," aimed at the development of backward areas, will run into stiff opposition in Congress because of the disclosure that Russia is able to produce atom bombs. When Under Secretary of State Webb appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday to present the plan, which ranks high in the administration's world recovery program, he met some opposition and a good deal of indifference, the latter due in large part to the fact that the thoughts of his audience were centered on the new development in the military picture. Since the news of Russia's bomb was released Congress is in a mood to go ahead with the arms program, and especially to speed up atomic research, but at the expense of political and economic defense measures.

Mr. Webb and Assistant Secretary Willard Thorp were the first of a line of administration spokesmen who will appeal for action on point 4 before Congress adjourns. Mr. Webb described the program as a modest start toward "an enlightened businesslike attempt to solve one of the most crucial problems with which our world is confronted." It calls for $45,000,000 to initiate work to develop resources and raise living standards in underdeveloped countries, part of the money to be the United States contribution to a United Nations fund for the same purpose and part to be spent directly on projects sponsored by this country.

Point 4 is the core of the "bold new program" which Mr. Truman presented in his inaugural address as a necessity of world security. It was hailed at the time as a kind of long-term sequel to the Marshall plan, designed to increase available stocks of raw materials while laying the foundations for a democratic order among hitherto exploited peoples. But now, judging by the first reactions of some Republican members, the Foreign Affairs Committee is engrossed in other means of security. There is little likelihood, it is said, that point 4 will be seriously considered, much less acted on, in the present session.

BOMB A POLITICAL WEAPON

The Soviet strategists will be pleased by this. They have rather nonchalantly admitted that they have the atom bomb, have had it since 1947, indeed, but otherwise they have made no great point of it, in Moscow or here in the United Nations, where the attention of the Assembly, like that of Congress, seems to be distracted from other issues by this new item on the agenda. Yet Russia has not yet employed her other military weapons to gain her ends, and nothing at the moment suggests that she will use the atomic weapon any differently. The atom bomb will not impell the USSR into war. Only if the Politburo decides on war will the bomb be an all-important military factor.

At present it is mainly a political weapon in a political war. The record shows that the Soviet Union prefers political warfare and relies on it for victory. Why not? Gen. Bedell Smith, who had exceptional opportunities to study Soviet tactics during his ambassadorship in Moscow, reminded a meeting of Reserve officers last Sunday that the Russians began maneuvering for a good postwar position before the last war was won and have acquired far more territory by political pressure than the Red armies conquered in battle.

The struggle with Tito is a case in point. This is by far the greatest provocation to the use of force the Soviet Government has encountered. It is met by the threat of armed intervention, and a great parade of arms—seven divisions are reported to be poised on the border.

THE ONLY BOMB?

In the Soviet view, however, the decisive battles are political battles. If Russia can use the atom bomb to divert the west from its political program, designed to build up a community of free and prosperous nations, it will be a great victory. The New York correspondent of the Sunday Times of London reports on apparently good authority that American, British, and Canadian scientists know the type of bomb the Russians exploded and the time, place, and force of the explosion. These experts assume, he says, that it was a plutonium fission and that in the experiment the Russians destroyed the only bomb they have and probably most of the plutonium in their possession.

There will be others, of course, but if the first detonation can start a chain reaction that will frighten western governments into cutting down their plans for reconstruction and weakening their political defenses for the sake of concentrating on military measures, that one bomb will be more powerful as a political than as a military instrument.

There is not much danger of that. The United States, which is obliged to lead its more vulnerable allies in the political fight, takes the bad news from Russia with remarkable calm. Actually it is not such bad news as it would have been 2 years ago, because other means of defense and resistance have been immensely strengthened in the meantime. The political war has paid dividends for us, too. The west is nearer a community today than anyone would have believed possible even last year. This is no time for Congress to play the Soviet game by tossing point four aside for the atom bomb. This is the time above all others to make the utmost use of all the political weapons in our armory.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. George J. Chryssikos, entitled "Thomas Jefferson."

Mr. Chryssikos, a resident of East Orange, N. J., and a member of the bars of the States of New York and New Jersey and Washington, D. C., in his spare time from his professional obligations has occupied himself with the preparation of this essay in appreciation of Jefferson's intellectual keenness, wide political knowledge, and power of expression. Jefferson's activities and deeds in the several high posts he discharged with distinction should receive the widest possible publication among our people as an inspiration and emulation, and I believe Mr. Chryssikos' essay is well worth reading.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

As we study the careers of famous men like Thomas Jefferson we are presently aware of a subtle difficulty: What is greatness? What

is genius? Where is the dividing line between the multitude unknown and unnumbered and the one in a million who rises above the common level? How shall we set the metes and bounds of the exceptional amid so much mediocrity? Of one thing we may be certain: Neither greatness nor genius will ever be cribbed, cabined, or confined—by birth, by circumstances, even by occasional lapse of error. There seems to be an innate drive or tendency in great men, in men of genius, which will not be denied by anything of the earth, earthy.

Let us glance at a few words from two or three great men, who without a thought that they were defining themselves, have given us a clue here and there to guide us in our quest. Shakespeare says that "Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." Perhaps, only the second type is really great for to achieve greatness implies far greater moral value than to be born great or to have greatness thrust upon us. However, wherever adverse conditions occur, it is the distinction of great men not to whimper or complain unduly but to reckon with them, struggle against them, and finally to conquer them. History affords abundant examples of such as these who are truly the salt of the earth.

Napoleon once observed that genius is that which knows what to do next. Disraeli was sure that to think and to feel constitute the two grand divisions of men of genius—the men of reasoning and the men of imagination. Longfellow went into greater detail:

"All the means of action—
The shapeless masses, the materials—
Lie everywhere about us. What we need
Is the celestial fire to change the flint
Into transparent crystal, bright and clear.
That fire is genius."

Arrange these varied words in column fashion and set Thomas Jefferson in a parallel column and you will quickly see a few reasons why America has not let his name pass from the recollection of mankind. For, in the phrase of the Bard of Avon, Jefferson was not born great unless indeed we are of that group of psychologists who believe that we become what we are by inheritance. With all such men greatness is inevitable. And, of course, there is more than a modicum of truth in this for it does make a difference whether or not we are well-born. Jefferson's greatness may better be considered as of Shakespeare's second type—he achieved greatness. He certainly did not have greatness thrust upon him except in the sense that he was lucky enough to have been born in a day and generation which could use his unique gifts to the full. That, it is true, is something very fortunate for any man. We often hear it said that such and such a person was born a generation too soon or too late. Not so, Thomas Jefferson. He was born at the right time for his genius to efflouresce to its best. There are mystics who will tell you that this is the way of Almighty God, that really great men should be born when and where they may do most for human kind. It would almost seem so in the case of Thomas Jefferson.

This penman of the American Revolution, as he is sometimes called, was not a genius of the Napoleon sort—one who knew what to do next—not invariably at any rate. One may not rightly expect anybody to have all the qualities that mark his type. But Thomas Jefferson does answer to Disraeli's definition: "A man of reasoning and a man of imagination." In these he was superbly equipped to do the work of his day and place. When we compare him with Longfellow's man of genius we find that he fits the pattern almost perfectly. It was given to him above all others of his period in America to take the shapeless masses, the materials—men and ideas—that lay everywhere about him and to change this flint into crystal, bright and clear, through the written word that has survived to this day as the best expression of human aspiration in the political sphere of action. "That fire," says the American poet, "is genius." Thomas Jefferson had that fire, and had it abundantly.

Americans have been blessed with their full share of greatness and of genius—the two are almost indistinguishable and meld into each other by imperceptible gradations. In one way or another, the founding fathers of this Republic were men who measured up to all the eloquent words just cited, from Shakespeare to Longfellow. Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson were possibly the only three who touched most of the heights of genius and of greatness. It is a good thing to consider them together, more or less, and to note the lines that mark them from each other. Such a study gives us perspective, gives us a measuring rod of worth. For many a man while great in and of himself shines brighter or not so bright when seen in the light of his contemporaries. He rises or falls by comparison.

In the formative period of the United States of America there were not a few whom every schoolboy recalls at once when their names are spoken. We have mentioned just three, and that will be enough for our purpose at this moment. Washington was great as a soldier but perhaps greater as a statesman. America was fortunate to have him at the head of her armies during the dark days of the Revolution. She was more than fortunate to have his hand at the helm of state during the first two Presidential administrations. Those 8 years from 1789 to 1797 were not far from the most momentous in our history. A single grave mistake might have done irreparable harm to the country and, as every candid historian will admit, to the world also. Here on these shores, as Lincoln later expressed it, there was the one last hope of all mankind. It may not have been quite that but it surely approached it so far as mortal sight could see. The first President of the United States had a responsibility which no other has ever had. No wonder there is greater unanimity on Washington than on any one else in our annals. It was his name which came to mind first when the Hall of Fame was suggested as a sort of American Westminster Abbey. Debate might be necessary as to others, but not on Washington. Had not he alone been elected to the Presidency unanimously, and rightly? It has been the same through all the years and will be in all the days ahead.

Franklin occupies a position peculiarly his own. He was of humbler origin than Washington, far humbler than Jefferson, whose mother was one of the aristocratic Randolphs. Like the Father of his Country, Franklin lacked formal education, which Jefferson had enjoyed at the College of William and Mary in his native Virginia. Both Washington and Franklin, but not Jefferson, had earned part at least of their living in their youth—Washington as a surveyor, Franklin as a printer. It was said of the Emperor Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble. So may we say of Franklin, that he found Philadelphia of muddy, unpaved streets, without the utilities of a modern city, and left it one of the best in these respects that the America of his time knew anywhere. The list of Franklin's public services would fill this page. When the time came for decision, he was like Napoleon's man of genius: he always knew what to do next. He wavered not at all in emergencies. As other men's hearts quaked with fear his was steady as a headland on his native New England's rock-bound coast.

And where then does Thomas Jefferson fit into this triptych of greatness? How does he comport himself, so to speak, in the company of Washington and Franklin? Where is his rank by their scale of values? In the first place, his position is secure in the world of affairs during the time of storm and stress which we commonly call the American Revolution and the critical period, but to mention the uneasy years following the establishment of the Government. Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "He is great who is what he is by nature, and who never reminds us of others." Jefferson may have been great by nature but he was certainly great because he never reminds us of others. His niche of fame is his and his only among the many of his time. He never could have been either Washington or Franklin—and neither could Washington or Franklin ever have been Jefferson.

There are no more fascinating lives among the early leaders of America than Thomas Jefferson's. His years spanned the whole period to which reference has just been made—from before the Revolution through the first 50 years of the Republic. At the time of his birth there were 13 British dependencies stretched along the Atlantic seaboard, each one different from the others and in fact different from its nearest neighbor. At the time of his death, these Colonies had become sovereign States with nearly a dozen more, all bound together in a Federal Union extending a thousand miles to and beyond the Mississippi River, and twice that distance from Canada on the north to Mexico on the south. In great part, this was of Jefferson's doing. At the time of his birth, there were scarcely 2,000,000 in the British dominions in North America. When he died, the new, free Nation numbered easily four times as many. Again, it was largely through his foresight in territorial expansion that this was so.

But enough of statistics. The facts of life and living are more significant, for they register the growth of a people, not of their lands and possessions, the extent of the territory they have, but rather their spiritual advances. And here also Jefferson played a major role. America had put behind her two devastating wars of liberation; the first was a civil war, the so-called American Revolution, and the second, usually known as the War of 1812, a struggle to gain access for our ships at sea to any harbor in the world. Americans had become self-confident, as what country would not be after so great an achievement? She was self-confident to the point where President Monroe, Jefferson's friend and disciple, felt sure of himself and of the Nation he headed, and issued the famous doctrine that bears his name but which is in a very real sense an extension of Jefferson's views on sovereignty. If any foreign power attempts to set a conquering foot on the Western Hemisphere, declared James Monroe, America will consider it an unfriendly act. This was in 1823, but 3 years before Thomas Jefferson was laid to rest on his Virginia estate at Monticello, near Charlottesville. It was an era of good feeling, a time of peace and quiet after turmoil. It was a period for which Thomas Jefferson had helped lay the deep foundations in the long years that had passed since July 4, 1776.

Now, a word on the special significance of this in our study of the life and career of the Sage of Monticello. The significance lies in the fact that as Aeneas of old could say of the Trojan War: "All of which I saw, and much of which I was," so Thomas Jefferson might have said of the America he did so much to create: "All of which I saw and much of which I was." There had not been one single great issue during the half century preceding his death on July 4, 1826, which he had not assisted in shaping and developing. No other statesman of his day could have paraphrased the words of Aeneas; not even Franklin, who died in 1790; not even Washington, who died in 1799. Only John Adams, who expired on the same day

as Jefferson, exactly 50 years after the Declaration, could have made a similar observation, and he could not have included so many events in which he had taken part. In very truth, then, Thomas Jefferson was one of the principal architects of this Republic of ours; intellectually, he and James Madison and James Wilson may be said to have been the chief artificers, the one of the Declaration of Independence, the others of the Constitution of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson was one of the most versatile of men. Here was a man who could supervise a farm, study nature like a scientist, make useful inventions, draw the plans for a mansion or a public building with the detail of a practical architect, play a Mozart minuet on the violin, ride after the hounds, write a brief or manage an intricate law case, draft state papers of exceptional importance, and conduct correspondence with distinguished men in half a dozen languages upon questions of history, law, ethics, religion, politics, science, literature, and the fine arts.

Jefferson's physical measurements were as large as his intellectual stature. He was 6 feet 2 inches tall and strongly built. His plain dress was in sharp contrast to the formal attire of most of his contemporaries. His personality was unusually winning and history says he addressed his slaves as kindly as his fellow statesmen.

With Washington, Franklin, Adams, Madison, and Hamilton, Jefferson ranks among the great builders of the Republic. With Marshall he ranks among the principal statesmen and jurists who, having a clear theory in their heads and a deep conviction in their hearts, did most to mold and brace the infant Nation. The real secret of Jefferson's power was his astounding foresight. He saw infinitely deeper into the principles of the new democracy and its future development than any of his contemporaries. Aristocrat though he was, by breeding and by training, he was democratic in his feelings toward all men. It is one of the infinitely pitiful facts of our history that the Continental Congress saw fit to strike his noble denunciation of Negro slavery from the Declaration of Independence, which was largely the work of his brain and heart and hand.

From the first moment of colonial unrest, Jefferson was a leader in the struggle for independence. It was he who urged the first successful meeting of representatives of all the colonies at Philadelphia in 1774, though Franklin had suggested it 20 years earlier at Albany, N. Y.

No one but a hard worker could have accomplished the many things that Jefferson attempted. It is reported that he studied 15 hours a day while at college. He knew French, Italian, Spanish, and German. His own words may give us the secret of his many achievements: "No person will have occasion to complain of the want of time, who never loses any. It is wonderful how much may be done if we are always doing." It was his scientific mind that made him say: "It is always better to have no ideas than false ones; to believe nothing than to believe what is wrong." He invented several useful devices, but never patented anything, preferring to give the public the benefit of such inventions as might aid his fellowmen. Even more important than his inventions, however, was his development of our decimal system of money. But, above everything, were his writings and his speeches upon the subject of labor, the courts, and especially the rights of men. So advanced were his ideas that when any public man now dares to express similar sentiments, the reactionaries of today call him a radical.

Shadwell should be one of the most noteworthy spots in Virginia, for it was there, on the 13th of April 1743, that Thomas Jefferson was born. From boyhood he planned his home in Monticello, on Little Mountain, near Charlottesville, Va. Every line of this mansion was designed by him. It has dignity, beauty, simplicity, and a domestic tone that might well be copied by the builders of modern mansions.

Jefferson was a practical and devoted farmer, introducing the principles of rotation and terraced farming into this country, and bringing from Italy a certain grade of rice which he considered best suited to conditions in Georgia and South Carolina.

As third President of our country, Jefferson hated the pompous and dominating spirit of aristocracy and did everything he could to build up what we know as the democratic attitude. He believed that the States should have rights in the Federal Government and that there should be a strict construction of our Constitution. He was one of the most economical of our Presidents. He reduced arms in both the Army and Navy.

Thomas Jefferson was nearing the close of his fifty-eighth year when he was inaugurated in the new Federal city of Washington. Both the place and the man were suggestive of a new chapter in our history. The stately Pennsylvania Avenue of today was scarcely more than a footpath cut through the bushes and briars. The contrast with the lively city of Philadelphia, the center of the colonial aristocracy, was striking. The new President who had never felt at home in the aristocratic circles of New York and Philadelphia, left the pomp and ceremony of the Federalist regime behind him. Instead of driving with a coach and six to his inauguration, he walked. In place of the speech to Congress, so reminiscent of an address from the throne, he sent a written message. But there was another reason of course for this innovation. Jefferson was not an effective speaker and was great enough to realize it and to act accordingly.

His political views were concisely given in his inaugural address: Equal and exact justice to men of every shade of political and religious opinion; peace and friendship with all nations; alliances with none; respect for the rights of State governments together with the preservation of the powers of the National Government in strict accord with the provisions of the Constitution; free elections, free speech, and a free press, but obedience to the law as expressed in the will of the majority; reliance on a disciplined militia rather than on a regular army for the defense; public economy, honest payment of our debts, encouragement of agriculture and commerce; preservation of the sacred rights of habeas corpus and trial by jury; trust in persuasion rather than in force to correct abuses and establish policies.

Jefferson's first term was a successful one, and a wise one. The President was an enthusiastic advocate of expansion and purchased the Louisiana Territory from Napoleon for a mere song. That was the greatest real estate transaction ever consummated on this earth. It was the greatest of all Thomas Jefferson's works. In all probability, if he had not been elected President in 1800 we never would have owned a square foot of land west of the Mississippi River.

Jefferson was more surprised than anyone else when the Louisiana Treaty reached Washington. He had sent Monroe to purchase New Orleans, with West Florida, if possible, for not more than $10,000,000. Now came a bill for $15,000,000 for the whole of Louisiana, a tract which doubled the area of the United States. There was no doubt that it was an excellent bargain and the popularity of the Louisiana Purchase was shown by the immediate ratification of the treaty by a vote of 27 to 4. A few weeks later the House voted the funds in the form of an issue of $11,250,000 in 6-percent stock.

It was also during Jefferson's first term that the Lewis and Clark Expedition was sent out. In 1783 he had suggested to George Rogers Clark, the hero of Vincennes, that he form a party to explore the country from the Mississippi to California. In 1803 he asked Congress to appropriate $2,500 to send intelligent officers with 10 or 12 men to explore even to the western ocean. Thus the Lewis and Clark Expedition established our best claim to the Oregon region in our later dispute with England. Our foreign trade doubled and our customs receipts increased.

Meanwhile, Jefferson had been triumphantly reelected over his Federalist opponent, Charles C. Pinckney. His second term was very stormy and unsuccessful. The Embargo Act, in which he overreached his Executive authority, but worse of all the humiliation to which he was subjected in the trial of Aaron Burr, took place during this second term. Some of this humiliation, it must be said in all candor, he brought upon himself by his partisan attitude toward the man he had once defeated for the Presidency by a single vote. Even the greatest of men stoop low at times. It seems to be innate in human nature.

While the Burr trial was proceeding in Richmond, an event occurred off the Virginia coast which threw the country into a state of excitement such as had not been experienced since the shots were fired on Lexington Green. The United States frigate *Chesapeake*, bound for the Mediterranean Sea, was overhauled by the British ship *Leopard*, searching for British deserters among her crew. When the *Chesapeake's* commander denied the presence of deserters, the *Leopard* came within close range and poured a broadside of shot, killing 3 men and wounding 18.

War seemed inevitable. Neither submission nor war was agreeable to Jefferson, who was something of a philosophical pacifist. On December 17, 1807, he sent a message to Congress urging an embargo on all the foreign commerce of the United States. The Senate immediately passed this by a vote of 22 to 6 and 4 days later the House concurred by a vote of 82 to 44.

The Embargo Act was never strictly enforced and what the political and economic effects would have been can never be known. The President resorted to force to carry out the law and was taunted with accusations of Executive tyranny which he had always professed to abhor but in this instance seemed to exemplify.

The political teachings of Thomas Jefferson, after 150 years of study by mankind, still influence the science of politics in its best and highest sense, which is in brief the relation of people to their Government. More than any other doctrines that have ever been proclaimed since the beginning of organized society, his immortal state paper adopted unanimously in July 1776 stands out unique and almost unassailable. It is as nearly perfect a statement of human rights and political aspirations as the brain of man has yet produced.

After 150 years we find all political leaders coming closer in their platforms to the principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address. He had already proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence a new concept of government and for more than 50 years he taught this truth to his countrymen. Now, a century after his death, could he return to view the scene of his activities, he would see the Government, to whose establishment he contributed so much, existing in the same form as he left it—the oldest and most powerful democratic government of its kind in any Christian country on the globe.

The life and works of Jefferson show indeed that the "pen is mightier than the sword." All his principles of government and social life were submitted to his countrymen by written appeal. He was never known as a public speaker and was without experience as a military leader. He addressed only the reason and sense of right in his fellowmen. He had confidence in the people, and he never feared to trust his cause to their judgment and his conduct to their criticism.

Jefferson has been at times rather severely handled by American historians. In spite of their recognition of his invaluable service to the cause of independence, of his correct and vigorous diplomatic conduct in the French mission and in the office of Secretary of State, his magnificent courage in sweeping away the political and ecclesiastical survivals in the law code of Virginia, his skill and constancy in the building of a truly democratic party in the decade of federalism, there are many who still call him "weak, vacillating, insincere, tricky," and who hold him responsible as well for the unpreparedness of our country in the War of 1812 as for the general low tone of public administration in the period from 1807 to the close of the second war with England. The tide of opinion, however, has lately shown a strong tendency to turn in his favor.

We may concede, as we have done in the case of Burr, that Thomas Jefferson had his faults. All men have, and perhaps public men necessarily. He was often indirect in his methods and dangerously near to duplicity in his words. He undoubtedly assumed a "war posture" for the sake of coercion when he had no idea of fighting. Yet he was in advance of his Congress in the matter of national defense and preparedness. The embargo was not a capricious act of Jefferson's to escape the dilemma of war or submission, but a policy approved by his entire Cabinet. Whether war would have been avoided if the less forceful and less judicious Madison had not succeeded him in the White House, it is impossible to say. There are really few "ifs" in history that need detain us very long.

All principles of American Government are summed up in one sentence of Jefferson's first inaugural: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none; economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened; the diffusion of information; the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion and freedom of the press; and freedom of person."

After all, is it not true that the foregoing sentence represents the ideal of American Government and the theory of American life? If it does, then Thomas Jefferson is justly entitled to be called one of the greatest patrons of the American ideal.

When the long shadows fell across Thomas Jefferson's life and he came to write his epitaph, this is what he wrote:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and father of the University of Virginia."

Thus, did Jefferson indicate the three outstanding services to posterity for which he wished, and thought himself entitled, to be remembered. One was the founding of a great institution of learning, a service that has stood as a model and therefore been matched by many others before and since. Another was the phrasing of the Declaration of Independence, an assigned task that might have been performed effectively, though perhaps not so gloriously, by some other person, had he not been available. For Jefferson owed a deep debt to the English philosopher, John Locke, for much of his fundamental political thinking on human rights and liberty. The immortal Declaration would certainly not have had his majestic sweep—no other state paper in the history of the world has ever had—but it would have sufficed. But the third, and in many respects the most important, was Jefferson's self-imposed service of drafting the first statutory declaration in all history, providing for individual liberty of conscience and religious freedom. The idea embodied in this statute was put into our Constitution and is now a generally accepted and well-understood attribute of American citizenship.

It is highly significant that Thomas Jefferson's epitaph omits all mention of the fact that he had been Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, and twice President of the United States. That is to say, he himself chose never to make mention of any personal rewards of anything that the people had given him, but only the service which his own genius and loyalty had rendered to the community and to the causes of democracy and education. This, alone, he cared to remember with joy and pride, and this, alone, he hoped that America herself would never forget. To Thomas Jefferson, steeped as he was in the great classics of antiquity, Plato was everlastingly right when he placed the spirit of man above the transitory achievements of men. Or, to cite the Bible, with which Jefferson was also familiar from cover to cover: "The things that are seen are temporal, the things that are unseen are eternal." Thomas Jefferson belongs in such company—the company of Plato and St. Paul. His words expressed their thoughts not only for his own day and generation but also for all modern men who are determined to hold high the torch of the human spirit at its noblest, so that the future, too, may carry on in the faith and hope that all three knew well and dearly cherished.

A Soldier's Soldier Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. LIND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 30, 1949, Gen. Jacob L. Devers retires from the Army. This distinguished soldier will be formally retired at an elaborate ceremony at Fort Leslie J. McNair after 40 years of service.

York, Pa., claims him as its outstanding soldier, and rightfully so. He was born and raised in that community and was appointed to the United States Military Academy by the late Hon. Daniel Lafean, then Congressman from that district, in 1905, graduating therefrom in 1909.

Mr. Speaker, the fine people from York are proud of him and his accomplishment as a soldier. He is a man of tremendous energy, sound judgment, an excellent administrator, and one who in his official capacity has cut red tape right and left to gain his objective. Having had a little military service myself, to me he has always been a soldier's soldier.

He has served in many capacities. His latest and final assignment came in 1945, when he succeeded General Stilwell as commander of the Army Ground Forces, and has been directly responsible for the training and shaping of our country's postwar Army force, and it is recognized that our postwar Army is in excellent shape.

We from York, Pa., salute General "Jakie" Devers on his retirement and wish him well when he doffs the uniform and dons civvies. Appended hereto is a short résumé of his promotion, service record, and decorations.

General Devers was born September 8, 1887, at York, Pa. He was appointed to the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., in 1905 and upon graduation was commissioned a second lieutenant of field artillery on June 11, 1909.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on April 1, 1916; to captain on May 15, 1917; to major, temporary, on August 5, 1917; to lieutenant colonel, temporary, on July 30, 1918; and to colonel, temporary, on October 24, 1918.

He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on August 20, 1919, and was promoted to major on July 1, 1920; to lieutenant colonel on February 26, 1934; to colonel on July 1, 1938; to brigadier general on May 1, 1940; to major general, temporary, on October 1, 1940; to lieutenant general, temporary, on September 6, 1942; to major general, permanent, on October 3, 1944; and to general, temporary, on March 8, 1945.

SERVICE RECORD

He joined the Fourth Field Artillery at Vancouver Barracks, Washington, in September 1909, and served with the regiment at that post, at Fort D. A. Russell, now Fort Francis E. Warren, Wyo.; at San Antonio, Tex.; and again at Fort D. A. Russell, until December 1912. He was then ordered to West Point as an instructor, in which capacity he served until August 1916, when he was ordered to the Hawaiian Islands for duty with the Ninth Field Artillery at Schofield Barracks.

Returning to the United States in December 1917 he was assigned to Fort Sill, Okla., where he served as an instructor and assistant director of the School of Fire until October 1918, as executive officer until March 1919, and as commanding officer of the First Field Artillery until May, 1919.

He was then ordered to Europe, where he served in France and Germany until August, 1919. Upon his return to the United States he was assigned to duty at the United States Military Academy as an instructor of field artillery tactics, in which capacity he served for 5 years. From September 1924 to June 1925 he was at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from which he was graduated as a distinguished graduate in June 1925.

He was then ordered to Fort Sill, Okla., where he was assigned as director of the Department of Gunnery at the Field Artillery School until April 1928, when he assumed command of the First Field Artillery at the same post. He commanded that regiment until July 1928, when he was transferred to Washington, D. C., for duty in the office, Chief of Field Artillery. He remained in that office until August 1932, when he was ordered to the Army War College, Washington, D. C.

Upon graduation from the Army War College in June 1933 he was ordered to Fort Hoyle, Md., with the Sixth Field Artillery, and also served as executive officer of the First Field Artillery Brigade until May 1934. He then served with the Sixteenth Field Artillery at Fort Myer, Va., until March 1936, when he was transferred to the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. He served at the headquarters of the Academy until June 1936, when he became graduate manager of athletics.

AT PANAMA CANAL

In June 1939 he was transferred to the Panama Canal department as chief of staff. He returned to the United States in July 1940, to assume command of the Washington Provisional Brigade with headquarters in Washington, D. C. On October 9, 1940 he was assigned to command the Ninth Division, Fort Bragg, N. C.

On July 17, 1941, he was assigned as Chief of the Armored Forces, Fort Knox, Ky., effective August 1, 1941. In May 1943, he was named Commanding General of the United States Forces in the European theater of operations, and on December 31, 1943, he was assigned to command the north African theater of operations. He later assumed the additional duties of deputy commander in chief, Allied Force Headquarters and deputy supreme allied commander, Mediterranean theater of operations. In September 1944, he became commanding general, Sixth Army Group, in France.

In June 1945 he succeeded Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell and he assumed command of the AGF at headquarters in Washington, D. C. July 24, 1945. On October 1, 1946, he moved his headquarters to Fort Monroe, Va., where it is now located.

DECORATIONS

General Devers was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters in 1943 for his work in building up the armored force.

The Navy also gave him the Navy Distinguished Service Medal in November 1945 for his duties as commanding general of the Sixth United States Army Group following the invasion of France.

The Oak Leaf Cluster citation was for service as commanding general of the European theater of operations from May 11, 1943, to January 8, 1944, during the period of accelerated debarkation of our troops in England preparatory to the invasion of German-held Europe.

General Devers was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for leading his Army group in cooperation with the Air Forces to achieve the collapse and surrender of the enemy on the southern flank of the Allied Expeditionary Force.

OTHER HONORS

He also wears the following decorations: Brazilian Order of Military Merit, with Rosette; British Knight Commander Order of Bath; French Legion of Honor, with Rosette; French Croix de Guerre, with Palm; Polish Order of Virtuti Militari; Chilean Star of Gold; Egyptian Grand Cordon of the Nile; European Theater Ribbon with five stars; American Theater Ribbon; Army of Occupation Ribbon; Victory Ribbon; American Defense. On his European-African-Middle East Theater Ribbon, he wears battle participation stars for the Naples-Foggia, Southern France, Germany-Rhineland, Rome-Arno, and Central Germany campaigns.

General Devers, in addition to other French honors, is an honorary citizen of Bordeaux, an honorary corporal of the French Army, and is authorized to wear the insignia of the French Moroccan Goums and of the Third Algerian Infantry Division.

He holds the following degrees: Bachelor of science, United States Military Academy, 1909; docteur honoris causa, University of Nancy, France, 1945; doctor of laws, honorary, Williams College, 1946; doctor of military science, honorary, Norwich University, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I also include herein the following article on General Devers which appeared in the York, Pa., Dispatch under date of September 26, 1949:

TWO THOUSAND HEAR DEVERS SCHOOL DEDICATED—"NO GREATER HONOR," SAYS GENERAL OF BUILDING NAMED FOR HIM—RITES HELD YESTERDAY

Gen. Jacob L. Devers, chief of the United States Army field forces, soon to retire stood yesterday before the modern, partly constructed school building that bears his name, the first of the great men for whom many York school buildings are named to be present for the honor.

He told an audience of approximately 2,000 persons, present for the dedication of the Jacob L. Devers Elementary School, that while today "the Army is the largest single educational institution in America" the public school still "is the institution most responsible for teaching our youth what democracy is and how it functions."

The native Yorker and World War II leader upon whom this and other liberty-loving nations have showered their greatest honors, said afterward that there was no greater honor than that paid to him by York in naming a school for him.

"I believe in this kind of a memorial," he said, "something useful for you young fellows." His remarks were made to two high-school youths who had asked him how it felt to have a fine school named after him. He said it felt very wonderful.

The general stood patiently on the speaker's stand for more than a half hour after the ceremony autographing programs and meeting old acquaintances and schoolmates. Approximately 25 members of the York High School class of 1905 were present for the ceremonies.

He was standing, he said in his speech, on the same spot where once there was an old water-filled quarry hole which he as a boy and other members of the Park Street Athletic Association used for swimming in the summer and skating in the winter, never dreaming that one day a splendid gymnasium would rise over it.

Informed that classes were expected to start in the building after the Christmas vacation, he said, in answer to a question, that he would be happy to return as a private citizen and address the first assembly.

He is to retire to his Virginia farm after September 30. He recalled that he got his first farming experience planting and picking potatoes as a youth in a field just west of the school which bears his name.

BAND-CHORUS PERFORMANCE

Except for a few minutes' wait to meet a broadcast schedule the dedication program moved promptly to schedule.

At 2:15 p. m., the 100-piece Army Ground Forces Band, under the direction of Capt. Chester E. Whiting, began a 45-minute concert program interspersed with two selections by a soldiers' chorus of 50 voices, directed by Master Sgt. Arthur V. Donofrio.

Both the band and the chorus were afforded generous applause for their excellent presentations and responded at the close of the scheduled program with the Teddy Bears' Picnic, a specialty for the children in which S1c Ray Bendos and Sgt. John Ricciabene appeared as vocal soloists. The narrator for the program was S1c Paul Henry.

FIRST FLAG PRESENTED

The dedication ceremonies opened with a rendition by the band of John Philip Sousa's famous march, Stars and Stripes Forever, after which the Reverend Canon Paul S. Atkins, rector of St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church and a past president of the York City school board, pronounced the invocation.

The school's first flag was presented by Mrs. Fannie E. Crowl, past president of the Jacob L. Devers Chapter, American War Mothers, and received by Richard E. Kohler, vice president of the school board and chairman of the committee on buildings and grounds.

At the bugle's command, the crowd stood with heads bared as the standard was run to the top of the school's mast by a squad of white-helmeted military police.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

After extending the school board's greetings, Wilbur G. Baker, president, introduced the following guests: Capt. John Hill, General Dever's aide; Mrs. Devers; Catherine S. Devers, the general's sister; Mayor Felix S. Bentzel; City Councilmen William H. Walker, Fred A. Schiding, Herbert F. Anderson; Dr. Victoria Lyles, director of elementary schools; S. Gordon Rudy, secretary of the school board; George W. Krone, superintendent of buildings and grounds; K. F. Ralph Rochow, school board solicitor; Harry R. Lenker and J. Alfred Hamme, architects; R. S. Noonan, builder; C. L. Peterman, president of the first national bank and General Devers' host; George Hubley, principal of the new school, and the following school directors: Mrs. Fern Strine Rumpf, Charles W. Yaukey, John W. Throne, Richard E. Kohler, Mose Leibcwitz, Harry W. Kraft, and Grover Senft.

CLASS PRESENTS PORTRAITS

An oil portrait of General Devers in military uniform was presented by Claude B. Lartz, publisher of the Sharon (Pa.) Herald for members of the York High School class of 1905. The painting will be hung inside the main entrance of the building.

After the rendition of an anthem by the Army Ground Forces Chorus, Arthur W. Ferguson, superintendent of city schools, who presided during the entire program, introduced J. William Stair, past president of the York school board, who formally introduced General Devers.

In his introductory address, Stair listed a number of native Yorkers who achieved national fame in war, science, and letters over two centuries, but pointed to General Devers as a man who "served not only his own country, but other countries as well."

Pointing up his remark that the Army is the largest single educational institution in the Nation, General Devers said that it operates 29 schools and conducts 360 courses from which 80,000 students graduated last year. Army officers, he said, spend one-fifth of their time in school and spend as much time pursuing graduate studies as do civilian university candidates for the doctor of philosophy degree.

COMMON FAITH NEEDED

But, he said, civilian education is so important to the individual's ability to absorb military training that, where the school has failed, the Army has found it necessary to give the recruit the necessary basic schooling.

Concluding, he said that "there can be no lasting peace in the world until there is a universal adoption of a common faith," which he said, "must stem from a fundamental regard for those ethical and moral precepts which insure the rights of man and his fellow men."

He called this a faith in a way of life which America has today and which schools must nourish and invigorate, giving strength to this Nation as we strive for world-wide realization of that faith and the promise of a world-wide peace.

After the general's address, the entire audience stood and sang the national anthem, led by J. William Stair. The Rev. Albert C. Robinson, pastor of Faith Reformed Church, pronounced the benediction.

Germany's Evil Inheritance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of September 25, 1949, analyzes the fundamental danger to the hope of world peace and security and to the morale of the free peoples of the world in connection with any renewed German nationalism. It could be as dangerous as that which resulted in World Wars I and II:

GERMANY'S "EVIL INHERITANCE"

On the eve of the Jewish New Year the Jews of western Germany receive friendly messages from a German President and a German Chancellor. Chancellor Adenauer called upon them to take part in "the intellectual, social, and political reconstruction of our country." President Heuss declared: "The Jews will not forget—the loyal Germans must not—but together we must overcome our evil inheritance." These are good words, and so far as words are currency they must be welcomed. What the Jews of Germany—and people everywhere who respect human life and dignity—cannot forget is the martyrdom of nearly 6,000,000 persons for which a former German Chancellor was responsible. There is danger that in encouraging the rise of a new Germany we shall forget the horrors perpetrated in the name of a previous Germany. It is well that we should look into this abyss from time to time, for it must be forever a warning of the depths to which human nature can sink.

One of the tests of the new Germany will be its full acceptance of religious, social, and racial equality. If there is any disposition to soften the memory of the Nazi crimes, if there is any tendency to forgive those responsible for those crimes, if there is any revival of the vicious and destructive discriminations which were the milder phase of nazism, then we may well despair of any rebuilding of civilization in Central Europe. We must, however, take the words of Herr Adenauer and Herr Heuss as meaning what they say. The past cannot and should not be wiped out. There remains a future in which the light of democracy with its tradition of full civil rights for everyone and unwavering respect for the individual, can shine.

Military Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 30 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial relating to the real acute need of military housing in Alaska, published in the Washington Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY HOUSING

Anyone who sees the photographs of military housing in Alaska brought back by the Joint Chiefs of Staff ought to become converted overnight to the need for immediate congressional action. What quarters there are on military bases in Alaska are in large measure substandard. But for enlisted men and officers living in rented accommodations off the post the conditions are atrocious. A tar-paper shack without plumbing is relative luxury; some families are forced to live in what look like abandoned tool sheds and even converted beer vans. Rents of $100 a month for one room are common—one quarter of the basement of an uncompleted house rents for $80—in a land where freezing temperatures are the rule 9 months of the year or more.

The most significant thing is not that the accommodations themselves are deplorable, but that the lack of housing is a limiting factor on the number of troops that can be stationed in Alaska. It is ridiculous to expand military installations when they cannot be staffed. Moreover, the influence on morale is depressing, since large numbers of men cannot afford to bring dependents with them under such conditions. Defense Secretary Johnson has summed it up this way: "Adequate housing for the minimum number of troops considered necessary for the defense of Alaska will strengthen their morale and improve their welfare; and no single measure will do more to strengthen our defenses on that northern frontier."

Appropriations for Alaska are contained in the $614,000,000 military public works bill, which has been languishing in both Houses. Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee said some time ago that he would not press for action. The pictures ought to bring a change of heart. Included in the $138,000,000 earmarked for Alaska are such drastically needed items as hospitals, petroleum storage facilities and warehouses. Although the works bill is a part of the President's budget estimate, probably parts of the over-all project could be trimmed without harm. But certainly military housing cannot be considered a frill.

Undoubtedly there has been some profiteering in Alaska. But the conditions faced by military personnel reflect the general housing shortage there, and the only prospect of relief is in Government quarters for servicemen. Construction in Alaska is expensive, but it will be even more so if necessary work must be postponed beyond next summer. If the defense of Alaska is vital to the safety of the United States—a proposition no one would challenge—then the first essential is to provide for the welfare of enough troops to man the outposts.

State Sales Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 30 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Four TVA States Have Enacted Sales Tax Laws," published in the Helena (Mont.) Independent Record of September 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR TVA STATES HAVE ENACTED SALES-TAX LAWS

Four of the seven States in the Tennessee Valley Authority area have enacted sales taxes as means of producing revenue since the TVA was established, Forrest E. Cooper, of Roseberg, Oreg., counsel for the Association of Public Lands Counties, today told a meeting of the public lands committee of the Montana Association of County Commissioners.

Cooper asked consideration of this fact by Montanans opposed to sales tax enactment in the face of proposed valley authorities in the Northwest. Of Hungry Horse Dam, Cooper said a Portland, Oreg., newspaper representative spoke to him confidently of getting power from Hungry Horse Dam, a fact which he added should interest Montanans who believe the power from that structure will stay in Montana.

Speaking generally of valley authorities, the CVA particularly, Cooper said, "In 50 years you may need all the water in your State, and whether authorities are created or not, steps will be taken to flood your valleys," and power and water exported.

Much of the discussion at the meeting was concerned with revamping of the present CVA bill so that, should it pass, tax revenues would be protected for local governmental units. Bert Weinrich, of Culbertson, is chairman of the committee. From Helena, Lewis and Clark County Commissioner Paul Knapp and Association Counsel William A. Brown attended.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 30 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on the Blair Moody radio program on September 17, 1949, dealing with the welfare state.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This should be an invaluable forum. From it we may get some idea of what the welfare state really is. So far it has been merely a trick political catch word, given a "pie in the sky" flavor by its advocates. In the absence of a concrete definition those who fear a certain concept of it can only state that which they fear.

I say that so far it has been merely a trick phrase, because everyone, I suppose, wants to promote human welfare. Our Constitution was framed to promote the general welfare. Certainly no party and no man has an exclusive concern in that field.

The issue is what the general welfare actually represents, and how it is best promoted.

For my part I think the general welfare is a sum of individuals' welfare and that individual welfare rests in man's freedom of action. I think the general welfare is promoted by promoting individual opportunity, the opportunity for every man to make this a better world for himself and his fellowman. I think the role of government is to protect and promote that opportunity, to curb any concentration of power which inhibits that opportunity whether it be a concentration in the hands of corporations, unions, or government.

As every person living today must know, the great human issue of these times revolves about man's freedom and his security. Both are desired. They are not incompatible. But the welfare state concept which I see is a governmental operation whereby security will be guaranteed to the individual, but at a necessary price in terms of freedom. There is a certain point at which the gain in security for the individual is less than his loss of liberty. I fear the welfare state concept because I fear it must necessarily cross that point

The welfare state, as I see it, says that individual opportunity is not the goal because government itself will provide security. By its operations it will define and guarantee individual welfare.

Curiously enough, the word "welfare" has a secondary meaning in America. During relief days it meant the dole. And that is just what the welfare state adds up to—the dole. The Government will provide everything.

I dislike that concept of the welfare state, because it stifles the individual and his initiative, which have been the source of all past progress.

I fear that concept, because in final terms I think it means the police state. Every American recognizes that term, and none wants it.

The mechanics of the welfare state are such that to make it work you must have decrees. Decrees mean enforcement. Enforcement means more and more centralized authority. The accumulated result inevitably is the police state.

The proof of the pudding is in its eating, and of the welfare state in its fulfillments.

I have just returned from a brief trip to Europe. The welfare state is not a new concept there, going back at least as far as Bismarck and his ruthless Prussian order. By and large, the countries of Europe today are welfare states. What do we find there?

One thing is that every European government is pleading for more American dollars. If the welfare state is the answer to the world's ills, why is there such universal reliance on the products of America's reactionary, outmoded system of individual enterprise; and, if America goes to the welfare state, where will that concept then turn for its necessary financial and economic supports?

But in Europe you are more than anything conscious of something else. It is the sense of controls, which exist everywhere. The sense of governmental power over the lives of people. The government regulates buying, selling, importing, exporting. Always there is government—and no government by the many, which is our ideal, but government by the few—the bureaucratic few.

This is so because to enforce its necessary decrees the welfare state must make its checks in every home, shop, office, and farm. It was once boasted proudly that an Englishman's home was his castle. Today, in socialized England, no less than 17 ministries can enter the private home or premises for inspections, without a search warrant.

Right there, it seems to me, is the great inconsistency and the grave danger of the welfare state. The welfare state is incompatible with civil rights and individual liberties when it must regiment the individual to accomplish its purposes.

I know the advocates of the welfare state in America say, "But we will stop short of all that." Since when, I ask, has any government of centralized authority ever been able to halt its growth or stop short in its tracks?

Relating to this matter of bigness inherent in the welfare-state concept, I am reminded of the fable of the ant and the elephant who were good friends. One day the elephant stepped on the ant, crushing out his life. When the other ants protested the elephant was full of remorse: "But I only meant to pat him on the back."

However all that may be, we don't have to go to England or to Europe to see the fulfillment of the welfare state. We have it at home as a blot upon our record and as a devastating condemnation of the welfare state in operation. It is the record of our paternalistic treatment of the American Indians—the Navajos in particular.

Since about 1860 the Navajos have lived under a welfare state—wards of the United States Government. The Government has provided them security from the cradle to the grave. But in so doing the Government has prohibited the exercise of individual initiative and responsibility by which the Navajo might help himself. On the papa-knows-best theory, the price of this Government-imposed welfare for the Navajo has been his complete regimentation and his disintegration.

The result of that American experiment has proved for the Navajo Indian—and as a warning to all Americans—that a welfare state is, in fact and in final effect, a police state, which means a state of servitude for all its citizens.

Speech by President Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, there was held in the congressional district which I am privileged to represent, one of the most outstanding civic and political events of all time. I speak, of course, of the great testimonial dinner honoring the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee, William M. Boyle, Jr. People from all over the United States came to Kansas City, Mo., to honor a man whose contribution to his party, his country, and the world has been outstanding. The high light of the dinner was a simple and moving address delivered by Bill Boyle's good friend, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. Our President made clear in this speech, which is included herewith, exactly what objectives he and the great party he leads are fighting for and will continue to fight for until they are attained:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Governor Smith, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen: You know I am highly pleased that the Governors of these adjoining States to Missouri and Kentucky are here. It is a tremendous handicap, however, for a man of my ability to have to follow a galaxy of orators such as have preceded me. There was a friend of mine from Vermont told me a while ago, if he could speak like that Vice President he would carry Vermont in the Democratic column. I don't know. I think that is taking in a lot of territory.

I am more than happy to be here to take part in this celebration to honor my friend, Bill Boyle. Bill is all right. Don't let anybody tell you differently. I was told—this was whispered to me by an expert in the business—that in all probability I wouldn't get a bite to eat here because they had everybody in Missouri and Kansas and Oklahoma and the surrounding States here for dinner and that there were not enough waiters in this part of the world to serve them all, but they were fooled. They did an excellent job and I got something to eat and it was all right. So did everybody else. And I liked that music. I liked this Regan boy (Phil Regan, singer) down here. He knows how to do it. More than that he is a darned good Democrat and he always comes to the Democrats when they ask him and serves them just like he did tonight.

JESTS WITH BARKLEY

It is great that so many friends have turned out to honor you, Bill. We are glad, and very glad, that we have managed to get our distinguished Vice-President to visit a place in Missouri outside of St. Louis. The Vice President is a grand man and I am proud that he is my friend and my counselor and I am also exceedingly glad that he is about to become a citizen of Missouri.

I am not surprised at this turnout. Everybody who knows Bill Boyle as well as I do knows that he deserves all the fine things that have been said about him tonight and nobody knows better than I do how fortunate the Democratic Party is to have him as our new chairman.

This is the second time in recent years that we have had a Democratic national chairman from Missouri. The other one was my good friend Bob Hannegan. He did a great job as chairman, and he helped me into a lot of trouble. He had something to do with getting me into the spot where I am now. I don't know whether to thank him or to spank him.

We also have with us tonight another man who did a great job as chairman of the national committee, my good friend, the Attorney General, Howard McGrath. He also had something to do with getting me into trouble, and Howard, and Bob and Bill, if you don't understand how you became chairman of the Democratic committee I can take you out behind the scenes and tell you how you got there.

PRAISED AS FRIENDS

All these men are friends to tie to. You never have to guess where they will be in a pinch. They are there when you need them and that is the kind of friends I like to have around me.

The chairmanship of the Democratic Party is a most important office. That is because the political party is the American way of getting things done. Our political parties are the means through which our people make the choice of going forward or backward, of having a government for the people or a reactionary government for special interests. We missed that last fall, thank God. The Democratic Party is the party of progress, the party of the people, the party that tries to serve all the people, not just a few of them. To keep the Democratic Party the party of the people we must be sure that the men who lead our party have a deep faith in the people and a firm devotion to the general welfare.

I was delighted when the Vice President decided to explain to you—you needed no explanation, you Democrats don't, but some of you Republicans who are here do need an explanation of what general welfare means—and I am more than happy to see

a large number of my Republican friends here. They expected to come here and weep with me after last November, but they are here to celebrate with me now. That is nice.

I think of no one who has a better opportunity for public service than the man who serves as national chairman of the Democratic Party. The national chairman of the Democratic Party is a most important individual to the Government of the United States and I am as happy as I can be that it has been my privilege to serve with Democratic national chairmen who have always had the public interest at heart. Bill Boyle will be no exception to that. I can think of no one who will fill the job better than you will, Bill.

REFERS TO PREDICTIONS

We did quite a bit last November to strengthen the Democratic Party. We proved that broken-down reporters turned columnists, pollsters, and misguided editors can't fool the people at home or abroad. That is one of the best things that ever happened to this United States. It is a great step toward a real honest free press, and that is what we need worse than anything in the world in this country. Because the Democratic Party won that election, it strengthened the United States at home and abroad. We still have much to do.

We must keep right on because we intend to carry out our promises to the American people. The Democratic platform adopted in the national convention is not a scrap of paper or a lot of platitudes just to catch the votes. The Democratic party has a reputation based on its record, a record of laws passed that have meant prosperity for the people and better jobs for the people of the United States, a record for fulfilling platform promises, and we are going to continue to do just that. I told Congress, and the leaders in the Congress, we are going to fight it out on that basis if it takes all summer and winter and all next summer. We intend to keep the record of achievement by continuing to work for the welfare of all the people of this country.

The Democratic party looks to the future. We are trying not only to meet today's problems but also to work out a course of action that will lead to a better world in the days ahead. The sole ambition of myself is a peaceful world where every nation can live without fear of being invaded or trodden down, and we are going to get that before we leave off. We do not propose, like some people, to meet today's problems by saying that they don't exist, or tomorrow's problems by wishing that tomorrow wouldn't come. Neither do we propose to meet today's problems by repeating the mistakes that got our country into trouble in the past.

CANNOT LOOK BACKWARD

We are not like some people who would like to go back to the 1890's. We know we can't go back, and it is dangerous to try to go back. The clock never runs backward.

The world has changed a great deal since 1890. We have problems and opportunities today which were not even dreamed of then. It is a wonderful thing to contemplate the progress we have made in this world since 1890. It is the most wonderful thing to contemplate. There is only one thing that we need to do and that is to catch up with a moral spirit that will match the material spirit in which we live. We can't attain that purpose by looking down and thinking only of material things. We must think of the welfare of our fellowmen everywhere in the world. We must think of the things that guided this country to success in the beginning.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY BASED ON SERMON ON THE MOUNT

My political philosophy is based on the Sermon on the Mount, and it is the hardest thing in the world for any man to live up to. If you haven't read it lately, I would advise you to go home tonight and read it. It will do you a lot of good.

One of the most remarkable changes since 1890 is the great growth of this country and its increasingly higher standards of living for all our people. We are still rising and our levels of income are still rising. We must continue this steady growth.

Not long ago I said we ought to raise our national income from its present level from well over $200,000,000,000 a year to $300,000,000,000 a year. You remember the plane necessity in the war when our great Democratic President, Franklin Roosevelt, said we must make 60,000 planes in 12 months. You remember how the backward-pulling boys said "It can't be done." Well, we did it, and did 40,000 more, and this $300,000,000,000 national income will mean great advances for all our people. It will mean better incomes for everybody. It will mean we can lift up those families, one-fourth of our population, who have incomes today of less than $2,000 a year and place most of them into better income brackets.

WORLD TRENDS IMPORTANT

That is what we are looking forward to. That is what our domestic and foreign policy means. That means the welfare of ourselves and the whole world, and when the world is doing well, we can't help but do well. We have a responsibility that no other country in the history of the world has had. We have a position in world affairs unequalled in the history of the world. Now we have got to assume that responsibility and that responsibility is ours. I only represent you as President of the United States.

It is within the range of practical possibilities if we continue the rate of growth which we have had in the past, that we can establish an income level in this country of $4,000 per family per year.

That is not a pipe dream. It can be done, but it can't happen by itself, and it can't happen if we have a lot of pullbacks at the helm of the Government. It is something we can do only by carrying out those programs for the growth of the country and the security of our citizens that have already shown such tremendous results in the prosperity and happiness of this country. These programs of ours, programs for public health and integration and reclamation and Federal aid to education and improved national health, are not the result of fanciful theories and tricky blueprints. They are not programs imposed from up high. They are programs which have come up from the needs of the people, programs which have been worked out by the people to meet their aspirations for a better life for themselves and their children. They are programs democratically conceived and democratically adopted.

The job of bringing this story home to every American is one in which we all should share. In the paths which we all must share sharper focus will be found as the message is told again and again. It is a job not only of the members of the Democratic National Committee, State and local leaders, but also of the precinct workers and active party members. This kind of political action is not limited to any 4-year interval or whenever an election happens to come around. It is a lifetime job of helping your fellow man to be a better citizen, to help him participate directly and personally in his own government.

The Democratic Party is going to keep on working for the people to attain a program for their welfare and benefit. We had a few meetings that Bill Boyle referred to. Had two recently, one at Des Moines, Iowa, and one in San Francisco, in which we discussed the needs of the people and the manner in which those needs were to be met. There was another meeting held in Sioux City, Iowa, in which it was frankly stated that the people who sponsored that meeting had no programs; they just wanted to talk, and they didn't say very much either, because the best Republican writer from Washington sent back a lot of information on what took place there and I couldn't find anything in it.

The Eighty-first Congress has already made great progress in enacting the measures that are necessary for the health and welfare of this country, and it will continue that progress. We are going to carry out the pledges of the Democratic platform of 1948 because we know they will promote the general welfare of all the people. We all have a part in that job. Bill Boyle has a part in that job. The Vice President has a part in that job. The Governor of Missouri, the Governor of Illinois, and the Governor of Oklahoma have parts in that job, and every Member of Congress, both House and Senate, has a part in that job. And so have I. Altogether we can do that job. Let's get together and do it. If we do that, we will win with that program in 1950, and we will win with that program in 1952.

Trade in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer delivered on the evening of September 21, 1949, at a dinner sponsored by the port of Seattle and the Propeller Club in Seattle, Wash.:

This city and this port have been graciously endowed by nature. You who live here have taken advantage of your endowment. Your new foreign-trade zone is only the latest of man-made improvements designed to make this port capable of handling ships and cargoes of all kinds from any part of the world.

You have a great harbor. You are closer to far-eastern ports by great circle routes than any other American port. What you want is more trade.

Trade among nations is aided by efficient ports, good trade routes, and adequate shipping facilities. These things in themselves, however, do not produce cargoes. Trade among nations rests upon the needs of certain nations for the goods produced by others. This need, however, will not send ships upon their way. World trade uses a complicated network of economic and financial relationships. A generation ago the world was blessed with a trading network that enabled goods to flow freely throughout the world. Once the exporter found a market he did not worry about obtaining import and exchange permits. He had never heard of the term "dollar shortage." The American dollar was exchangeable freely for the Japanese yen. The cruzeiro of Brazil could be exchanged for the drachma of Greece. The exchange rates of the world's currencies remained relatively stable through the constant buying and selling of currencies that went on in New York, London, Amsterdam, Berlin, and the other great banking centers of the world.

Underlying the stable exchange rates of the various currencies were patterns of supply and demand that had been worked out through generations of trading experience. The countries of Europe were the heart of the world trading system. They needed raw materials from many parts of the world.

From these raw materials they manufactured products for their own use and for shipment to other areas. Europe was a good market for the goods produced in other parts of the world—and because Europe bought from the world she created purchasing power for her exports. The great trading nation in Europe under the old system was Great Britain—and the British pound, based upon gold, was the stabilizer in the complicated machinery of world finance.

Today the center of world trade has shifted to the United States. Our productive efficiency has amazed the world. We produce the things the world wants and we have brought the techniques of mass production to a peak of efficiency that is the wonder of the modern world. We can undersell other nations in nearly every category of goods sold in the world market.

We have become the greatest exporting nation in the history of the world. In the 4 years since the end of the war, we have shipped to other countries an average of $12,000,000,000 worth of goods annually, more than four times the value of our prewar exports. To pay for these goods, the other countries of the world have dipped into their reserves of dollars and gold. They have liquidated many of their dollar securities. They have obtained dollar loans and grants. These temporary expedients cannot last. Some countries have earned dollars by selling goods to us—other countries have earned only about half enough dollars through their exports to us to meet their needs.

This is the heart of the problem. By virtue of our productive skills and energies, which were greatly stimulated by our wartime expansion, we have become the great producing nation of the world. Other nations, however, have not recovered from the cruel devastation of war. Two great trading nations, Germany and Japan, were all but destroyed. The United States is importing more goods from the rest of the world than it did before the war, but not nearly enough to enable other countries to buy the American goods they need.

In this brief address, I cannot discuss the many complexities of the world economic crisis. I must limit myself to one important part of the general problem. Here in Seattle, on the vast rim of the Pacific, we think naturally of trade with the Far East. Wherever we look, however, we see trouble. Japan was once the industrial center of trade in the Far East. Now Japan is a sick and beaten nation, her industries but slowly recovering from the wounds of war. In China there is chaos. In Indonesia, Siam, Malaya, and French Indochina, there is profound political unrest. We cannot think of trade in the Far East as something unrelated to these political disturbances. Men whose countries are threatened with revolution and invasion cannot produce goods and do business in normal ways. In many parts of the Far East chaos has become chronic.

The problem is to bring some kind of order out of this chaos. The times call for stout hearts and resilient minds to face the unpleasant facts and work out bold solutions. In Washington, leaders of our Government and leaders of the United Kingdom have recently met to talk about the crisis that faces the British commonwealth of nations and the nations that are members of the so-called sterling area. One of Britain's difficulties is that her dependencies in the Far East are not earning as many dollars as they once did. The United Kingdom and the sterling area as a whole are actually earning more dollars through their sales of goods to the United States than before the war, but this increase is not enough to meet the expanded needs of those countries for our products.

The United Kingdom and other European countries once earned a large share of their dollars in a roundabout way by selling to their dependencies in the Far East more than they bought. The far-eastern countries paid part of the balance in dollars, which they earned by selling to the United States more than they bought. In 1937 the balance of dollar earnings in their favor was $313,000,000. Malaya and Indonesia had a combined favorable balance of $324,000,000. Some countries, Japan for instance, bought more from us than they sold. They earned their dollars by selling to the other dollar-earning countries of the Far East.

The contrast between 1937 and 1949 is sharp. Last year the Far East experienced an adverse balance of $589,000,000. A great part of the far-eastern imports was financed by loans, grants, and other types of credit extended by the United States Government. Our trade with the Far East, as well as our trade with Europe, is sustained by filling the gap between exports and imports with American money. This procedure is defensible in a period when the world is recovering from the devastation and dislocation of war. We have become the world's greatest creditor Nation, and we have acted the part generously and grandly.

However, we cannot continue indefinitely to finance the world's dollar deficits. It would eventually weaken us and prevent a sound recovery of competitive world trade. The real solution is to find ways to strengthen the economies of the world so that there will be a better balance among the trading nations.

I have said that the Far East is traditionally an area that has supplied the United States with many of the raw materials it needs. As our economy continues to grow we shall need more tin and tungsten, more copra and hemp, more rubber and silk, more mahogany and teak. As the countries of the Far East become more stable politically, they will become stronger economically. Their economic growth, however, will not be automatic. In most of the Far East the level of basic economic development is low. Countries like Malaya, Siam, Indochina, and Burma need some assistance from countries which have highly developed technical knowledge.

Last January President Truman gave hope to the world by promising continued and increased American assistance to the development of the world's underdeveloped areas. In his inaugural address the President said, "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. * * * I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development."

The Far East needs the kind of assistance the President was discussing. It has been traditionally linked to the American economy as an important source of raw materials. It is a dollar-earning area, and anything we do to strengthen the basic economies of the Far East will tend to ease the world-wide dollar shortage. We can assist those countries by cooperative arrangements for sharing our knowledge and techniques in such fields as engineering, management, health, and education. Our country has a long record of achievement in this field. Private American business can help by making engineering surveys in cooperation with businessmen and governments in that area. Some American firms have already conducted surveys in the Far East on their own account. The International General Electric Co. has undertaken an extensive engineering survey of the hydroelectric resources of Siam, and no fees are being charged for this survey.

Ultimately what is needed is a climate conducive to large-scale investment of American capital. This climate cannot be created by the United States alone. It will depend upon cordial and cooperative relations with the nations affected. American businessmen want some assurance that they will be able to withdraw their earnings and, if need be, their original investment in dollars. Such assurances can come only as a result of negotiations, and such negotiations are difficult.

I believe, however, that there is hope for the future of American investment in some parts of the Far East. This is one part of the world that has traditionally enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with the United States. As our economy expands, the dollars earned by shipping raw materials to us should increase.

Already we have established an impressive record of cooperation in one important area. Shortly after the end of the war, the Philippine Republic started life as an independent country with most of its mills burned and looted, its mines flooded, its bridges blown, its ships sunk, and all but a few of its locomotives destroyed or out of service. In 3 years the people of the Philippines, with the financial and technical assistance of the United States and the practical aid of many of our Government agencies, have made amazing progress. Most impressive has been the recovery of agricultural production, especially in the production of hemp, sugar, and copra. In addition the Philippines are rapidly becoming an important source of chrome ore.

Our record in the Philippines is proof of the practical worth of an enlightened policy of assistance to the people of other countries. President Truman has said that this policy must be carried on and extended. Its fruits will be better business for our traders and new opportunities for our investors. More important still, it is the best hope for establishing peace based on human welfare.

I have mentioned only a few of the many problems that must be solved before we can hope for a real revival of trade in the Pacific. I have not attempted to discuss our trade with China. Until the pattern of political developments there becomes clearer it is vain, in my opinion, to talk about trade possibilities.

Much of the traffic in and out of this port has been with Japan. Japan was once an excellent market for American goods, and will buy in quantity from us again when her recovery is further advanced. In general, the revival of Japanese trade depends upon the establishment of policital stability throughout the Far East and upon general improvement of the basic economies in the area.

Before I left Washington I examined the statistics on the foreign trade of our west coast ports. I wanted to see whether, in the light of the circumstances I have described, the coast was holding its own in the general expansion of our foreign trade during the postwar years. I discovered some interesting facts.

In 1937 the ports on this coast handled a total export cargo of 12,200,000 tons. This was 28 percent of the total sea-borne tonnage exported from all ports in the United States. In 1948, the export from west coast ports amounted to 6,200,000 tons—or 11 percent of the Nation's total sea-borne export tonnage.

A comparable decline appeared when I examined the figures on imports. In 1937 the west coast handled 3,100,000 tons of import cargo—which was 8 percent of the total weight of the Nation's imports. In 1948 the cargo coming into west coast ports amounted to 2,500,000 tons—4.5 percent of the national total.

When I made the same comparisons on the basis of dollar value, I found that in 1948 the west coast had nearly the same percentage share of the Nation's imports that it had in 1937. With regard to exports, however, I found a marked decline. In 1937 the dollar

value of west coast exports was 14.5 percent of the national total. In 1948 it was only 7.4 percent.

These facts are a reflection of the lag in the postwar recovery in the countries of the Far East in comparison with recovery in other parts of the world. The people who live and earn their living on the west coast will benefit from any improvement that can be made in the economic strength of those countries. There is no simple formula for producing political stability and speeding up recovery in the Far East. We shall undoubtedly need a great deal of patience—combined with imagination, hard work, and skillful diplomacy—in working with the people of the Far East to help them bring about the desired results.

I have faith that in the long run the trade of the Pacific ports will once again take its rightful place in the commerce of the United States. In the meantime the Pacific States have forged ahead in the past decade with a domestic industrial and commercial growth unprecedented in our economic history. Let me review a few of the facts. In Washington your population increased between 1940 and 1948 at a rate of four times that for the Nation. California, alone, received almost a fourth of the Nation's total population gain for that period, and Oregon led all States with its 50.4 percent increase.

You along the Pacific coast have experienced a most dramatic industrial growth.

The recently published Census of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce shows that in 1947 value added by manufacture totaled $5,500,000,000 in the three Pacific States. In 1939 it stood at $1,500,000,000. The rate of increase, 260 percent, compares with a rate of 200 percent for the Nation as a whole. In 1939 there were 411,000 production workers in industrial plants of this region. By 1947 the number was 745,000—an increase of 80 percent against a Nation-wide increase of 53 percent. In California this meant 259,000 new factory jobs, in Oregon, 35,000, and in Washington, 41,000.

Growth in industry has brought growth in general business and the lifting of the income level of people. Total income payments in each of the three States increased over 200 percent between 1940 and 1948, while the national increase was 172 percent. Per capita income more than doubled in each of the Pacific States.

But even further economic growth is in store for this great area. I am told that the undeveloped hydroelectric power potential of the Columbia Basin—30,000,000 kilowatts—is greater than the total installed hydroelectric capacity of the United States. With the aid of the Federal Government you are pressing forward the development of this great resource. Out of it will come new investment opportunities, new industrial and commercial opportunities and even further expansion of employment and income for the region and the Nation.

Saving the American Fur Farms

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, certain definite policies of the New and Fair Deal have all but ruined the fur-farming industry of America. Henry Wallace, when Secretary of Commerce, even sent a delegation over to Russia and encouraged Russia to dump accumulated furs onto the American market. In 1 year the imports were $232,000,000 in value.

There is an ad valorem duty of 50 percent on manufactured fur, but there is not any duty on the raw furs except silver fox.

The national fur associations have pleaded for a quota on imports and for a support price as provided for Canadian producers, but no relief has been granted.

At the present hour the following amendment has been adopted by the Senate to H. R. 5332:

At the end of the bill add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Paragraph 1519 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"'G. The President shall establish such regulations on the importation of furs and fur articles as are determined necessary by the Tariff Commission to prevent serious injury to the domestic fur-producing industry.'"

The question now is whether or not the House conferees will agree to this Senate amendment. You will note that the amendment only asks that the Tariff Commission obtain the facts and that the President acts to prevent the complete ruination of the fur-farming industry.

But will this amendment be adopted I repeat, is the question. The fur hearings last year brought out the fact that the manufacturing articles had a 50-percent ad valorem duty. The testimony of the free traders was to retain this ad valorem duty to protect the labor in the fur industry but to deny any protection to the labor that raised the furs.

The following official table shows that $127,913,000 worth of furs imported free of duty the past fiscal year except the small amount collected on the $236,000 worth of imported silver fox. The official letter shows only $7,000,000 worth of manufactured furs and that had duty protection, while over $127,00,000 worth of unmanufactured furs were imported absolutely free of duty.

Value of unmanufactured furs imported into the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948–49

Beaver	$3,316,000
Coney and rabbit	17,087,000
Fox:	
Silver or black:	
Whole skins	236,000
Paws, heads, etc	(1)
Tails	
Piece plates made of pieces of fur, etc	
Other fox (whole skins)	1,067,000
Hare	3,308,000
Lamb:	
Persian and caracul	51,519,000
Other lamb and sheep fur	5,747,000
Marmot	3,895,000
Marten	4,231,000
Mink	12,329,000
Muskrat	5,793,000
Squirrel	5,378,000
Other furs	14,007,000
Total unmanufactured furs	127,913,000

[1] Less than 500.

Office Foreign Agricultural Relations.
Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in response to your telephone request of September 27.

The value of manufactured furs into the United States for the fiscal year 1948–49 amounted to $4,415,000. The value of hats, caps and bonnets amounted to $2,080,000 and of plates, mats, linings, etc. of squirrel skins (not dyed) was $1,051,000.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. BECKER,
Chief, International Commodities Branch.

When any of these spokesmen for labor that advocate free trade with no protection to the labor that produces the raw product like the furs, still insist on a 50 percent ad valorem duty to protect the labor that makes the furs into coats, capes, and caps they are taking a one-sided view. All labor is entitled to the same consideration whether on a farm or in a factory.

When President Truman and his assistants are boasting about their great love for the farmer they better check up and see what they have done and are really doing to one group of American farmers. The fur farmers are watching their industry destroyed because it is not given a small part of the legislative protection that is provided some other agricultural products like cotton.

If the New and Fair Deal can provide an import quota on cotton that is so low that is in effect an embargo, why is not the fur farmer entitled to at least some consideration?

The whole livestock industry is in constant jeopardy. We have witnessed the near destruction of the sheep industry and now the fur-farming industry. We have noted the deliberate attempts to weaken and destroy the dairy industry. We note the placing of insignificant crops given a basic and semibasic standing and support while the three and a half billion hog industry and the $3,000,000,000 poultry industry provided as low as zero support legislation. We see soil-depleting crops subsidized for production and export, and livestock products imports constantly invited to our markets.

While the Eighty-first Congress may give a $4,000,000 tung-oil crop a semibasic status, and while the Eighty-first Congress may give a $7,000,000 crop like mohair a semibasic status, it is evident that the billion-dollar fur industry—largely in the North—is not even going to have consideration by the present administration.

Constitutional Government or the Welfare State—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following speech delivered by me before a combined meeting of the Peoria Kiwanis Club and Peoria Realty Board, September 14, 1949:

Our Constitution—that sacred and well preserved scrap of parchment—will be the theme of my little talk today. Our Constitution, what does it mean? Why do we revere and worship it? Why do we keep it in our Library of Congress, under glass, secure from rains and storms and all sorts of weather, safe against damage and theft, guarded 24 hours a day?

Why? Because somehow and someway, God has seen fit to establish it as a guiding light that we should follow, believe in, and revere. No mortal will ever be able to explain it. God-fearing people will believe in it as they believe in and follow the teachings of the Bible.

And so, it is in this light that I shall today endeavor to instill in you, my radio audience, the spirit of our constitutional framers which certainly must have been the spirit of God.

I am firmly convinced that the welfare state, socialism, communism, or whatever you might choose to call it, cannot and will never exist, under our constitutional form of government. One or the other must go. To explain why, I must necessarily review some of the history of our Constitution.

You will all remember when you were in grade school, or high school perhaps, when your teacher talked about "taxation without representation," "the right to worship God as you please," and the "right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Yes, you, like all young people, absorbed these phrases and then, in the springtime, when the pussy willows began to bloom and the robins came back to nest, forgot history and government for the more exhilarating signs of spring. We took our American way of life for granted, we forgot the strife and struggles, the insecurity and uncertainty our fathers and mothers, our grandfathers and grandmothers must have felt and experienced. We forgot, or perhaps didn't realize the sacrifices they made. The New Deal, Square Deal, Fair Deal, or whatever you may choose to call it, has made light of these principles of constitutional government, and has sought to establish and inculcate in our minds a set of rules and formulas which are completely and entirely foreign to the beliefs of our forefathers.

The early American colonists, our forefathers, came or were forced to come to the New World because they could not, and would not submit to the unconscionable demands of a greedy monarchy. They had been persecuted and deprived of liberties to a point where they became willing to pull up stakes, leave families and friends, and escape to this wonderful new land of America. They had great visions for the future here in a land where no power-hungry dictator, they thought, could follow them. But they soon learned that they were mistaken about the power of the government they had so recently denounced. As soon as they had cleared the wilderness with untiring ambition and enterprise, and had attained to some degree at least, the personal freedom they had sought for, England cleverly realized that here was an opportunity to expand its empire and dominance into new and fertile fields.

So Mother England began a policy of paternalism and control over our struggling colonists, which, as you will see, exhibits a startling likeness to the policy of our New, Fair, or Square Deal of present history.

First, England sought to control the industry and trade of these colonists by imposing confiscatory taxes and duties on products they needed to build up their infant manufacturing. And further than that, these colonists were hampered and hamstrung by high export duties on raw material.

Second, the early colonists were deprived of local self-government, except in a few isolated cases. The crown sent a governor to each colony and he, with his appointed judges and agents, ruled the land for the benefit of themselves and the king.

Third, the right of the colonists to own and control property was limited and controlled to such an extent by the king that he, for all practical purposes, owned it. Early settlers were required to vacate their homes to make room for the king's soldiers, and were subject to searches and seizures without court order.

Putting it simply, then, the colonists soon realized that their efforts to escape control of a selfish government had failed. They realized that they could not just pull up stakes and travel a few thousand miles to obtain the precious individual liberty they wanted. They knew that they would have to fight and shed blood in order to realize their goal. They knew too, that if they won the fight they would need to set up a government of their own which would be strong enough to successfully resist foreign oppression, yet preserve the individual liberties of its citizens.

Rest assured, then, that these early Americans, while they were framing our Constitution, must have had in mind safeguarding these freedoms and liberties, and preventing their new Government from becoming the same monster of control and paternalism against which they had so recently fought, and for which they had shed so much precious blood.

You will all remember these safeguards in our Constitution. They are, or should be, thoroughly imbedded in the minds of every American citizen.

The framers of our Constitution wisely saw fit to establish three branches or avenues of control to our Federal Government, one to act as a check on the other. They specifically enumerated the matters over which each Federal branch had control. Finally, as if to assure Americans that this central Federal Government would never be able to become a monster of paternalism and control, they wrote this amendment to be found in the Bill of Rights: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now, let us pause for a moment to determine how well we Americans have fared under this physically well-guarded document for which we have, or should have, the utmost respect. For nearly 150 years this Constitution of ours stood as a bulwark against the destruction of our personal liberties. It stood as a guaranty that each and every American who had ambition and enterprise could make his mark in the world. It guaranteed each of us the right to make a living wage without exacting heavy penalties in the form of taxes for so doing. It guaranteed our Americn farmers and businessmen the opportunity to use their skills and ambitions to make a profit from their enterprise, without confiscatory taxes and domineering Federal controls. In short, our Constitution fostered progress and production instead of stifling it.

During the century and a half since our Constitution became the law of our land, we Americans have seen industrial peace and progress, the like of which the world has never known. We have seen the blending of capital and labor produce automobiles and household gadgets on the assembly line in mass production at low cost, enabling every American to obtain luxuries as well as necessities for a lower price than in any other nation of the world.

But now, something has happened, and is happening daily to change and destroy all these safeguards of our Constitution. A subtle and insidious scheme has been devised by the powers that be in Washington, both foreign and domestic. It has been given various names since its inception—the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the Square Deal. Lately it has been dubbed the welfare state, and socialism. Truly, it is the modern coat of many colors, in which a Russian Red predominates. It started out as a device designed to cure a terrible depression, a depression which had its origin while a Democratic Congress was at odds with a Republican President. Parenthetically, I might add, a President who was once ridiculed for his firm belief in the American way of life, but whose advice is now sought by our Chief Executive, but I am sorry to say, likewise disregarded.

Time will not permit me to thoroughly trace all of the events which led up to the American welfare state or American socialism, as we know it now. We do know, however, that it started with the NRA back in 1933. While the NRA did not last long, thanks to an astute and learned Supreme Court decision, it does represent the beginning of a threat to individual rights and initative—to our free enterprise system and generally to our American way of life. Here the roots of American socialism first began to grow. Our famous Chief Executive at that time, and the brain trusters who advised him, were outraged that this scheme which they designed to cure the depression, would be held unconstitutional by a body of "nine old men." They were outraged at the thought of our constitutional check and balance system actually working as it should. So they got together and plotted the virtual destruction of our judiciary branch by asking Congress to pass a law allowing the Chief Executive to pack the Court with men who would follow his program and mandates, whether they were constitutional or not. Here again, socialism was momentarily rebuffed when the legislative branch of the Federal Government refused to circumvent the Constitution in this manner. But the growth of the welfare state was not stopped for any length of time. Communistic influences in the United States were at work in those long days of the depression, and believe me they didn't mind working overtime to assist the administrative forces in its quest for a new order. Methodically these American Communists wormed their way into positions of power in the intricate and complicated set-up of Federal Government. A bright young Harvard law graduate named Alger Hiss was provided with a nice spot in the State Department, which was of course ideal as far as his purposes were concerned. Agents of the Soviet soon found their places in this ever-growing Federal Government, and did what they could to assist the New Dealers in furthering the socialistic state. Whether President Roosevelt knew that he was being assisted by the Kremlin or not, the world will never know. Personally, I would like to think that he was ignorant and unaware of this Soviet plot, which later even led to his appointment of this very same Alger Hiss as his adviser and confidant at Yalta. True, he had been informed and warned many times by his own Department of Justice and the FBI that many of his assistants were working for the Kremlin, but up to the day of his death, he never publicly admitted such knowledge.

At any event, the progress of socialism in those days was fast, and recovery from depression slow. Alphabetical agencies by the dozens were created, each requiring money on which to operate with the resultant increase of Federal taxes. And with the creation and subsequent granting of powers to each agency, we saw a loss of individual liberties, and a challenge to free enterprise. Each new scheme became a threat to our constitutional form of government. But what happened to our Supreme Court, and why didn't it hold these new socialistic laws and created agencies invalid? What happened to this previously powerful branch of

our Federal Government which had been designed by the framers of our Constitution as a bulwark against Federal control and paternalism? You may remember that after the Court-packing plot of 1935 failed, death and resignations of the "nine old men" had gotten for the President what he couldn't get from Congress. President Roosevelt lost no time after each death and resignation in appointing new members, not on the basis of qualification and experience, but on the strength of their willingness to obey his dictates. This method of selecting Supreme Court Judges for their political beliefs has persisted since 1935, and still persists today. As a result, we have witnessed a complete abdication and surrender of independence of the Federal judiciary to the executive branch of our Government. Yes, what used to be a body of men trained and experienced as judges has gradually been transformed into a body of politicians eager and willing to perform as puppets for the paternalistic Executive who appointed them. We have seen this body of men discard the legal doctrine of "stare decisus" and legal precedent to uphold the constitutionality of socialistic laws that our constitutional framers would consider outrageous.

Now, how has this complete surrender of the Federal judiciary to the Executive control affected you and me in our daily lives? Let me give you some indisputable facts:

Federal taxes of all kinds and descriptions have increased in abundance and size to a point where every American citizen, man, woman, and child are virtual slaves of the Federal Government.

Taxes on business income have become so large that investors are reaching a point where they doubt the advisability of investing their capital to make a profit.

The American housewife, when she buys a loaf of bread from her grocer, pays 58 different hidden taxes.

The American workingman, when he gets his pay check, sees that the Federal Government has already taken its slice in the form of withholding tax and social-security deductions.

The inherent desire of men to compete with each other for a profit has been effectually stifled.

The desire to have the goods and gadgets to make life happier and easier has been retarded.

And remember, little more than 150 years ago, our ancestors fought and died in order that they might be freed from the yoke of unjust and confiscatory taxes imposed by Mother England, who, ironically enough, has now become a child of ours, and a problem child at that.

What else has the fostering of American socialism and the welfare state done for we American citizens?

It has established our Federal Government as a domineering master of each and every one of us. It influences our every thought and act. It tells the workingman how many hours he may work in each day, and how much he shall be paid. It prevents him from leaving one job to go to another, even though he may secure additional benefits and happiness by so doing. And in order to provide this control of our thoughts and actions, our Federal Government has provided for us 2,500,000 bureaucrats for our bosses. And this Federal monster pays well for their services with the money you and I work for, but are not allowed to keep.

I've had an opportunity since being in Washington to see the growth of our Federal bureaucracy. Each new bureau and agency formed, of course, requires additional manpower. Each new bureaucrat appointed must have some place to put in his time, which naturally requires new Government buildings to be paid for by you, the taxpayer. Each new bureaucrat appointed must have someone to do the work, which requires secretaries and stenographers, desks, and typewriters, all at your expense. And the insidious part of this whole set-up is that eligibility for a Government job does not depend upon your willingness to work, or your ability to produce, but upon how good a vote getter you are, or how well you can follow the chief's instructions.

And finally to further this socialistic welfare state in America, President Truman has established what might be considered a 5-year plan to educate and train the citizens to the ways of socialism. And if 5 years isn't long enough, he may ask for another 5. We are now in the fifth year following the surrender of Japan, which ended the actual hostilities of World War II, yet President Truman still retains the broad and dictatorial powers of government enjoyed by the Chief Executive during wartime emergency. These powers give the President many controls over our lives and economy which he would not otherwise have during peacetime. They are very valuable and necessary if a complete welfare state is to be established successfully in a very short time.

So the question arises naturally, If we are not on a peacetime basis now, will we ever be? The extension of these wartime powers into peacetime has been responsible for the extension of rent control, for instance, whereby Uncle Sam can tell a landlord if he can make a profit or loss, and how much of either—and to tell a tenant where he can live or go to if he doesn't care to live where he is told. This 5-year plan of President Truman's bears a frightening resemblance to the Russian 5-year plan of the early twenties, which, as you will remember, was renewed several times. The fundamental reason for establishing that plan was the need to educate the peasants about the wonders of communism—but, you will remember during this period of education, a strong central government was designed to maintain dictatorial control and establish nationalization of industry. Three 5-years plans and some years have expired in Russia since the bloody revolution of 1917, and a dictatorship still exists in Russia. Can such a thing happen here in America? I would like to think not, but the signs certainly point to it.

In the few moments I have talked with you, I have made some startling statements concerning the state of affairs in our America. I assure you that each and every one of them is true, however, and certainly not made with the purpose of impugning the loyalty of President Truman or his predecessor or either of the two major political parties. I could not honestly say that the Democratic Party wants the welfare state or socialism to exist in America. There are left-wing elements in this great party, however, who are doing all they can to establish socialism in America quickly, but there also is a growing number of Democrats, chiefly from the South, who are conservative and are growing more and more alarmed about high taxes, Federal controls, and other evidences of socialism.

So now, with this state of affairs in our Federal Government, what can we expect to happen? I certainly am not able to make an accurate forecast of coming events, and I have no intention of doing so today. I do know, however, what I hope for, work for in Congress, and ever pray for, and that is a quick halt or stoppage of this socialistic nonsense and a quick return to common sense in government.

What chance do we have—those of us who believe in constitutional government and are opposed to the socialistic welfare state? Well, the chances are pretty slim, I'll admit. We have witnessed already the partial destruction of our check and balance system of government—the merger of the executive branch with the Federal judiciary, this merger seemingly bent on establishing the welfare state in America and thus follow Great Britain and other decadent nations of the world to bankruptcy and chaos. One feeble ray of hope for the forces of free enterprise and constitutional government remains—one bulwark to check the ever-increasing surge toward statism—your United States Congress, your Senate and your House of Representatives. In both of these legislative bodies there have been banded firmly together groups of Republicans and Conservative Democrats with but one purpose in mind regardless of the consequences—that purpose being to return America quickly to decent and honest constitutional government and to throw out the evils of communism, socialism and the welfare state. This fighting band of legislators have had remarkable success in this first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and I must say I am proud to be included in its ranks. How much longer can we expect our group to hold the fort? I wish I knew! Already the disciples of socialism and the welfare state are touring the country telling of the joys to be experienced under socialized farming, socialized housing, socialized medicine and socialized industry. They tell of the benefits the citizens will receive in the form of subsidies, in cash payments as a premium and reward for idleness and inefficiency. These disciples cleverly neglect to tell the American people that while they are putting money in one pocket, another disciple of socialism is removing it, and some more, to pay for their traveling expenses. They neglect to tell the American people that the United States Treasury is on the verge of bankruptcy, that our Federal budget has increased to an all-time high for a peacetime year, that continued deficit spending and continued increase in Federal taxes will be the price of the socialistic order.

Now how can we, who believe in constitutional government and the American way of life, fight and win over these evil teachings inspired by decadent foreign governments, themselves already in bankruptcy and poverty? It takes courage and a willingness to sacrifice, as our forefathers sacrificed to overthrow the yoke of greedy foreign nations. It takes a firm belief that our American way of life has made our Nation the most prosperous and envied in the whole world, and a belief that our American system of free enterprise and constitutional government will continue to give us the benefits and protection we have so long enjoyed. But our firm belief in these things is not enough, we must act and act now, we must educate the American people to the evils of socialism and the welfare State, we must exercise the right of franchise to the fullest to support the candidates, regardless of political affiliation, who stand firmly for constitutional government. In other words, we must place principle above politics in our thoughts and actions, and give unstintingly of our time and energy to fight the cold war against this creeping paralysis of socialism!

Mutual Defense Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post is one of several of the United States dailies to perceive the importance of the statement of the managers on the part of the House filed in connection with the conference agreement on the

Mutual Defense Assistance Act. I refer to its editorial of September 30, 1949, which under leave granted I wish to insert in the RECORD.

The Washington Post perceives in this statement a new milepost in the development of the North Atlantic defense system. It credits the Congress with providing new guidance, both in our own foreign policy and in the policies of the various other nations in the North Atlantic area. It is appropriate for the sake of history to record how this final language was developed.

Charles Burton Marshall, professional consultant to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, assisted the committee through the various stages of this legislation. During the absence of various members incident to the House recess he undertook to keep the members posted on developments in the Senate. He did so by three memorandums analyzing the unfolding issues. He correctly saw that, with the progress of events in the other body in particular and in the world in general, the critical issue had shifted from the amount to the conditions of the authorization. Marshall spent Friday evening, September 23, reviewing all the debate and all the testimony bearing on this critical problem. He concluded that the precise line of the conditions had been approached from each side, but had not yet been exactly defined. Between 11 and 11:30 o'clock that evening, Marshall tried his hand at new language to clarify the intent of the Congress as he then understood it. This draft was presented to a few members of the committee on Saturday. On Sunday it was mimeographed for wider review by members of the committee and officials of the State Department. On Monday one paragraph was eliminated at the request of two of the House conferees and Senator FERGUSON, author of the contingency language.

On Tuesday, with the completion of the conference, attention was redirected to Marshall's draft. At the instance of one member, two introductory paragraphs were slightly altered. One new sentence was interpolated. Two sentences were recast for style. Three other words were changed. In essence, we found that Marshall's draft formulated completely and exactly the fine line of performance that the Congress expects. Thus it was that we adopted the language for our report. This is perhaps the first time that a creative element of foreign policy has made its first appearance in a conference report. I think it worthwhile to note its genesis so that credit may go to Marshall, who usually works anonymously. The editorial follows:

MUTUAL DEFENSE

The key to this newspaper's approach to the issue of arming the Atlantic alliance has been that unity should take precedence over the supply of arms. It is gratifying that this governs the conference report which has now been accepted by both chambers. Even the title of the act has been changed in conformity with it. The measure is now called the "Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949"—a title which more nearly describes the "all for one and one for all" concept than the administration and Senate title "Foreign Military Assistance Act of 1949." The program itself is made into a weapon for unity. All but $100,000,000 of the $1,000,000,000 authorization will be withheld till an integrated defense system has been achieved by the new allies and approved by the President.

The provision in respect of integration bridged the differences between House and Senate. In August the House slashed half a billion dollars of contract authority for arms out of the administration program. But the purpose of the 50-percent cut—which this newspaper applauded—was primarily to insure prompt action on integrated defense arrangements. The House undoubtedly speeded up these arrangements. Since then the North Atlantic Council and the defense committee provided for under article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty have been established. There remains to be evolved not a static plan of defense but a dynamic framework of defense premised from the outset on the principle of unity of defense. This is to be undertaken on October 6.

Now the integration that Congress requires of the military planners of the North Atlantic area may seem vague and unsubstantial. Several shots at interpreting what is meant by integration have been made from time to time in these columns. The House managers offer an interpretation which conveys a clear expression of the intent of Congress. Unity of defense, says the House managers "means differentiation of functions among the parts in relation to an all-inclusive unity.

"Each nation must do its part, as determined by its position and its resources, in relation to the common security of all. No one nation in the group must aspire to perpetuate or expand its various military components for purely national considerations. Each must recognize its obligation to balance its forces in relations to the needs of the whole area in which common defense has been pledged. For some this may require submission to a secondary status in certain types of armament. For some it may require specialization in military activities that would not be preferred if a free choice were made on a purely national basis. All must be willing to give up those preferences which are characteristic of purely national defense but which are not in keeping with the common defense of the areas. This principle of unity must be undertaken early and thenceforth rigorously applied.

"As soon as possible, the essentials of the pattern of area defense based upon individual national specialization must be agreed to and the assignments thereunder made. This principle must be riveted into the base of the North Atlantic defense structure. Once this pattern has been developed and agreed to, it must be the governing formula for the assistance program here envisaged. That is the intent behind the language which makes the bulk of the authorized assistance contingent upon recommendations, acceptable to the United States, for integrated defense of the North Atlantic area.

"As soon as the proper authorities established under the North Atlantic Treaty have arrived at an agreement which the President approves as warranting the conclusion that integration will thenceforth be the basis for, and the governing principle of, subsequent stages of defense planning in the North Atlantic area, the condition will have been fulfilled and the entire authorized amount will become available."

Congress is to be congratulated for providing the leadership which, we are convinced, the peoples of the Atlantic world have been waiting for. Here is a mandate which we trust the political and military strategists will accept in spirit as well as in letter and carry out with the dispatch called for by the explosion of the Russian A-bomb. At present the North Atlantic alliance is paper work. Administration within the meaning imparted to it by Congress—and administration only—can breathe the breath of life into it. Only by a multiplicity of daily contacts, coupled with unqualified acceptance of the principle permeating the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, can the parties be knit solidly together into a single whole.

Address by Senator Martin Before American Society of Mechanical Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Annual Convention of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers at Erie, Pa., on September 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The record of achievement by the engineers of America is a proud one. It has been written by men of vision, enterprise, skill, and force.

The engineers have always looked forward to the challenge of new frontiers with courage and determination. Their daring spirit of adventure into new fields of discovery and invention created the giant strength of American industry.

Confidence in the future has always been one of the strong influences in American progress. This confidence has been shared by our skilled craftsmen, intelligent farmers, tireless men of research, persistent engineers, small business men, and great industrialists. It gave encouragement to venture capital.

These elements, and a government sustaining the ideals of freedom, have combined to give Americans a degree of security and a standard of living never enjoyed by any other people.

Enemies of the American system of private enterprise and even some of our own people say that the record of American accomplishment is one of selfishness.

We have been called capitalistic money grubbers because the American incentive system offers rich rewards to every man whose brain and skill make America a better land in which to work and live.

What has been the result?

Let us for a moment compare America with other countries.

Of the world's total population we have about 7 percent; Communist Russia almost 9 percent; and Socialistic Britain about 2¼ percent.

Of the world's land area we have 6 percent, Russia 14 percent and Britain one-sixth of 1 percent.

We have one automobile for every 4 persons; Russia one for every 252; and Britain one for every 22.

We have more than 46 percent of the world's developed electrical power; Russia 5 percent and Britain 6 percent.

We produce 61 percent of the world's oil output, Russia 6 percent and Britain less than 2 percent.

In the United States we have 1 radio for every 3 persons; Russia has 1 for every 45, and Britain 1 for every 5.

Of telephones we have 1 for every 5 persons; Russia 1 for every 188, and Britain 1 for every 156.

We produce about one-third of the world's total output of goods, Russia less than one-fifth and Britain less than one-tenth.

How does the buying power of wage earners compare?

In America it takes a worker 3 hours to earn the daily food for a family of five and it takes the Russian worker 9 hours. It takes an American 3 hours to earn a cotton shirt and in communistic Russia it takes 320 hours.

Our farmers enjoy similar advantages because of improved methods.

What is the reason of all this great superiority? What is it that we possess that other countries do not have?

It is the God-given freedom of the individual—the right of each citizen to carve out his own destiny—to work, to save, to invest, to prosper—in accordance with his own ability, energy, and resourcefulness.

Freedom is our most precious possession. It is written in the basic law of our land.

Our freedom holds out the golden promise of opportunity to every young man and woman in America, no matter how humble his or her origin—opportunity to reach a high place in industry, business, the learned professions, the church, and in the Government.

Freedom is the strongest stimulant the world has ever known for initiative and action.

It was that stimulant that enabled our country in the short span of less than 200 years to reach the highest place among the nations of the earth.

It has created more wealth, greater spiritual and cultural progress and a higher standard of living than the world has ever known.

What are some of the examples of these accomplishments?

To make Americans the best-informed people in the world we have 1,749 daily newspapers. Communistic Russia has 38 and socialistic Britain 150.

Our educational system is the best in the world.

Representing the deep religious conviction of our people America has almost 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues and temples, with a total membership of more than 77,000,000. Communist Russia is a godless country. There the state is all-powerful and is worshipped under compulsion.

We have billions in foundations to extend the blessings of science, research, medicine, education, and religion to all parts of the world.

Let us use one example of what has been done as a result of this work. The average life expectancy in America has increased by 16⅔ years since 1900. Most of the credit for this must go to the medical profession, the miracle drug products from our laboratories, and our high living standards.

Let us take one example of material progress. If you lived in 1909 and wanted to build an automobile the equal of our modern machines it would cost you $50,000 to have it hammered out by hand by craftsmen. The present low-priced car is just one result of American know-how in mass production and specialization.

These magnificent comparisons point to the paramount duty of every American to safeguard individual freedom and to preserve our system of self government from the dangers that now confront us.

What are some of these dangers?

First, there is danger from big and costly centralized government.

Increasing concentration of authority at Washington will destroy local control of local affairs, which is home rule, and will rob the States of their sovereign rights.

Not long ago local government performed almost all the functions that we regard as public service.

Today the Federal Government dominates practically every branch of public service at vastly expanded cost to the taxpayer.

Let us look at the figures: In 1902, 55 percent of all tax collections went to local governments. The States took 10 percent and the Federal Government 35 percent.

Today the Federal Government's share is 74 percent, the States' 13 percent, and local government 13 percent.

Government at all levels has grown by leaps and bounds in half a century. In 1902 the cost of all government was $1,555,000,000. Today it costs the American people more than $65,000,000,000 a year just to govern themselves.

Part of this tremendous cost goes to maintain more than 6,000,000 people on Government pay rolls. In 1900 all Government, Federal, State, and local employed less than 1,000,000. During this period general employment increased 120 percent, while Government employment went up 500 percent.

Of course, there was a big increase in population, from 76,000,000 in 1900 to about 148,000,000, an increase of 95 percent. But in the same period government costs increased more than 4,000 percent.

The national debt is another serious cause for alarm. We have the largest debt of any nation of all times. It can bring national disaster.

There is another peril in the trend toward centralization of big government.

Today, through the system of grants-in-aid, 18 percent of the expenditures of State governments come from taxes collected by the Federal Government. One-third of the cost of local government is paid by the States.

With money goes power. With power goes control. Increasing central control means grave danger to the American system of government—a system based upon local self-government—local control—and direct civilian participation.

If we are to have efficiency, and especially economy in government, taxes should be levied and collected by that level of government which performs the service.

Unfortunately, today more and more of our citizens are bypassing their borough buildings, city halls, county courthouses and State capitols, as they rush to Washington for aid.

Always remember that final control is held by the level of government which furnishes the money. There are three steps in the process: First, advice; then supervision; and finally, complete control.

We can curb big business if it becomes oppressive. The same applies to great labor organizations if they misuse their power.

But if big government becomes oppressive, if it levies excessive taxes and curtails the freedom of the people, how can it be curbed?

Free enterprise, freedom of opportunity and freedom of the individual cannot survive where centralized government authority controls and regulates the lives of the citizens.

Such authority is destructive of liberty—no matter whether it is called socialism, communism, fascism, statism, or by any other totalitarian label.

America will never be dominated by socialism or communism as the result of a direct election.

Americans will never knowingly or willingly, surrender their freedom for the iron rule of the so-called welfare state.

But slowly, step by step, we are advancing in that direction as more and more socialistic schemes are put forth in the name of security and social welfare.

One great danger in America is the self-styled social reformer and his false promise that economic security can be provided by government benevolence.

So plausible are these proposals that some of our people have been fooled into believing that all good things in life can be achieved by passing laws rather than by hard work.

Now each of these schemes, taken by itself, does not appear to be dangerous. But the whole program spells out a socialistic system that would completely revolutionize the pattern of American life.

When we consider the utter, dismal failure of socialism in England, it is impossible to understand why anyone should advocate the same destructive policies for the United States.

Let us look at the course that has been proposed for America.

Federal aid to education would take the school system away from local control.

Bureaucratic authority over what we shall teach in our schools would be a catastrophe.

Socialized medicine would tear down the health standards of our Nation. Experience in England has proven it to be inefficient and extremely expensive.

Government housing would mean political landlords.

Government guaranty of full employment has been proposed. That would bring allocations and controls. Individual freedom in the choice of a job would be lost. The workingman would be told where to work and where to live.

Subsidies in support of farm prices will eventually mean telling the farmer what he can plant as well as how, when, where, and how much.

President Truman has proposed extending steel mills at Government expense. That is outright socialism and would unquestionably be a costly venture because the Government has never succeeded in business.

All such things mean higher taxes to support increased Government spending. And when excessive taxation prevents the flow of venture capital into productive enterprise American progress will be halted.

State socialism will control and the state will be the supreme economic manager. Labor and agriculture will be in a straitjacket.

What course can we take to defeat these fantastic schemes How can we make certain that the individual freedom that we have enjoyed will be preserved for our children?

I would suggest the following as some of the things we should do:

1. Our country at every level of government must be kept solvent. Governments can go broke and an insolvent government goes into a receivership with some pattern of socialism as the receiver. The receiver is never discharged. The country ends up with a dictator.

2. Our people must know the obligations and duties of citizenship as well as their rights and they must perform those duties.

3. We must remember always that it is the American way for a man to be rewarded for his ability, persistence, initiative, and achievement.

4. Freedom of the individual has made America the superior of any nation of all history. Freedom cannot be limited to one class, one religion, one color, or one section. It must belong to all, or none will have it long.

5. Our houses of worship should be filled because there we are taught the virtues upon which our Government rests. Freedom is God-given. Our Government cannot live without the church. Tolerant religion is our bulwark and strength.

6. There must be a crusade against the law evader, the chiseler, and the racketeer, we must all have respect for the law. If we are to take our proper place in world leadership we must put our own house in order.

7. America can be strong only if our people are imbued with American ideals. Our country is for those who believe in America—not for those who conspire for its destruction.

8. And most important of all, we must stand firm in opposition to every departure from the sound principles of constitutional government upon which our Republic was established.

We must reject every socialistic proposal no matter how attractively it is presented. We must fight with all our energy against every encroachment upon self-government and the centralization of power in a Federal bureaucracy.

American heroes in every generation have shed blood and tears for freedom.

To retain that freedom we must all know the truth. We must become aroused to save our country.

Right now we need Americans with hearts burning with true American patriotism on every quarter-deck and in every post of command. We need them in positions of honor and trust in labor organizations and as the heads of our great industries. We need them in government. We need them in schools and colleges. We need them in the pulpits.

We need Americans who will place themselves above sectionalism, class, creed, and personal advantage and will be for those things which will make America a stronger and greater country based upon justice and right.

We need Americans who will not be bribed by promises of an easy way of life.

The founding fathers' blue print for American greatness was in practicing and advocating peace, good will, tolerance, thrift, courage, hard work, and the love of God.

Let us all reread the blueprints.

Let us all take our places on the ramparts as sentinels in the night to watch for the approach of enemies to our great country.

Building a Bridge for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the new bridge in Neenah, Wis., on October 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A BRIDGE FOR THE FUTURE

It is a real pleasure for me to participate in this inspiring civic occasion. You know, my friends, there is great meaning in the dedication of a new bridge. Why? Well, for several reasons:

1. For one reason, in building a bridge, we are demonstrating our confidence in the future of Neenah. If you and I were doubting Thomases, if we were defeatists, if we were filled with fear about what tomorrow will hold, no new construction projects would be begun. On the contrary, however, your mayor, your city council, your distinguished businessmen, and laboring men, and farmers, and others, all have bright hopes for the future of the Neenah-Menasha area.

WE MUST KEEP IMPROVING

2. There is another meaning in this dedication today. You recognize by this act that man cannot stand still if he expects to make progress. All about us, everything is in flux and change. We are living in an atomic age, an age of high-speed transportation, an age of increasing commerce between cities and between rural and urban areas. The city that fails to keep up with highway and street improvement, the city that fails to develop all of its resources and potentialities, that city will be left behind in the march of progress. I know, however, that Neenah's alert citizenry are going to be in the vanguard of the forward march of communities in our State.

FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL COOPERATION

3. Let me next point out that the building of this bridge is a fine example of Federal-State-local cooperation. As you may know, the Federal Government contributed approximately 50 percent of the funds to the construction; our State government contributed 17 percent; Winnebago County, 17 percent; and Neenah itself an equal sum, 17 percent. Thus, the total cost of the project, around $583,000 for this 1,458-foot bridge and approaches, was shared in round numbers by the Federal Government, $270,000, and by the State, county, and city at $104,500 each.

In recent years there have been an increasing number of grants-in-aid of this type and when soundly conceived as this project has been, they have served admirably in the development of internal improvements throughout Wisconsin and the country. Of course, we know that there are definite limits as to Federal finances and, for that matter, State and local finances, but where a cooperative project is undertaken which will, in effect, create wealth, we know that it is eminently desirable and should be followed up with vigor.

HISTORIC MEANING OF FOX RIVER

4. The spanning of the historic Fox River holds great symbolic meaning in its own right. Rivers have always occupied a crucial role in world, national, and in State history. We recall in 1673 how Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet canoed up the Fox on the voyage that led to the first recorded discovery of the upper Mississippi and the Fox-Wisconsin riverway linking the Mississippi with the Great Lakes. For a century and a half thereafter this waterway was the axis around which the exploration and early development of Wisconsin turned. A hundred years ago, in 1849, the first sawmill and gristmill were built in Neenah, and that same year Elisha D. Smith established in Menasha his famous wooden-pail factory, manufacturing woodenware of all kinds for an international market. In the years that followed, Neenah became a great flour-milling city; and then around 1870, when wheat production dropped off, Neenah turned to the manufacture of paper, which has figured so importantly in her history since then. Throughout Neenah's entire history and that of this entire region, the Fox River has played a vital role.

COOPERATION BETWEEN ALL GROUPS

5. Finally, another meaning of the new bridge is that it symbolizes the cooperation between all groups in the community. It was not businessmen alone in Neenah who saw the need for this new transportation link. It was not labor alone. It was not the public officials alone, nor only the farmers coming in from the surrounding areas. All of you had to see the need. All of you had to unite in pooling the financial resources of the city for this link—joining with other county, State, and Federal resources.

CLOSING RANKS FOR VITAL CITY PROJECTS

This shows how, on common needs, all groups can get together as Americans, as citizens of Neenah and of Wisconsin. There is so very much that we have in common and so very little that we have in differences between us that it is up to us to close ranks on important civic projects, like this, and march together in confident unity.

THE BRIDGE OF GREAT IDEAS

Now, my friends, if I may be permitted a few more general observations, you know there are more than material bridges in this life of ours. Sometimes men conceive great ideas which persist down through the ages. They recognize certain basic realities, and by their recognition they open up the eyes of succeeding generations. Two thousand years ago the Master taught us the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, and this great idea has come down through the ages, bridging time, bridging space, bridging the barriers of language, of race, of color, so that it is a part of the common heritage of all men.

Just as the folks of Neenah want, therefore, to bridge space and build for the future by this material structure, so I think you will want to bridge time by building still firmer spiritual foundations for this land.

One hundred and seventy years ago a small group of men in Philadelphia built a bridge, and they called it the Constitution. They bridged the chasm of absolution in government and built an approach for free men. To it was appended 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing the basic freedoms which have come to make this Republic the most blessed nation on earth.

Recently, my friends, you saw demonstrated in this community the consolidation of your local paper and the Menasha paper into the Twin City News Record. Edward C. Cochrane, the publisher, is entitled to much credit for accomplishing this job. He bridged the chasm. Recently this fine paper carried an editorial on the bridges we crossed. It mentioned that the first bridge that was ever built was probably a vine which swung across a creek or ravine, such as they have in the back regions of Peru or Tibet today. Then there developed the stone arch bridge, followed by the magnificent structures of steel and concrete that we have today. But the greatest bridges are those over which men cross the ravines of bigotry and intolerance and bridge the gorges of class and race hatred. Of course, in every field of human activity there are bridge-builders, and such a one is Edward C. Cochrane, the editor and publisher of your Twin City News Record. Back of this fine publication I am sure will be the support of both Neenah and Menasha.

BUILDING IN SPIRIT AS WELL AS IN STEEL AND CONCRETE

It is well, therefore, my friends, that you and I build in steel and concrete and that we build in spirit, too, which is more imperishable than steel or concrete. This is not just a matter of theory, because we learn that oftentimes the things of the spirit have greater reality, greater meaning than even the things that we have conceived through our material senses.

THE GREATEST BRIDGE

The greatest bridge on this continent does not span any river or mountain range. It is the bridge which was constructed in Philadelphia and which has been strengthened through each succeeding generation of Americans—the bridge of the United States Constitution. It is for us to keep it intact and to make sure that future generations of Americans will be able to walk toward the bright future through the means of a sound Constitution, a Constitution founded on the separation rather than the concentration of powers, a Constitution founded on the principle of checks and balances between branches of government and within branches of government.

All this, then, comprises the greater meaning of this fine structure which we are dedicating today.

CONCLUSION

In concluding, my fellow Wisconsinites, may I reiterate that ours is a constantly ex-

panding, rather than a static economy. There is nothing that can really limit us if we have the energy, the initiative, the imagination, to accomplish our goals. We simply cannot afford to stand still. We have got to push onward.

That is one of the reasons why we have fought for the Great Lakes seaway, which would be a bridge between the 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes and every deep water port on the seven seas. We know in fact that all of our facilities which might have been good 50 or even 25 years ago for water, highway, and air commerce, are obsolete now. We know that although Wisconsin has a good system of highways, for example, we still have a long way to go toward improving them and expanding them, particularly if we are to tap increased tourist revenue. The same holds true for Wisconsin airports. It holds true for Wisconsin bridges and other commerce and transportation facilities.

Expansion, therefore, is the keynote for these times. Not wild expansion, made without careful engineering plans and surveys, but courageous, intelligent, well-merited expansion. This is in firm keeping with the Wisconsin motto: Forward.

Thank you, and good luck to you all.

Now, on behalf of the citizens of this great community, State, and Nation, I dedicate this bridge, for the use of the public, now and for generations to come.

Exchange of Students With Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shining Side of Mankind's Coin," written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Hodding Carter, of Greenville, Miss., and published in the Washington Post of October 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHINING SIDE OF MANKIND'S COIN

(By Hodding Carter)

GREENVILLE, MISS.—Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who was once a Rhodes scholar, is the author of the novel bill of some 2 years ago which provides that foreign countries can help pay for surplus war supplies by paying the expenses of American students in those countries. It not only makes grants to students from the United States to study abroad, but it also helps foreign students who come here to study. Already the idea is a demonstrable success.

Undoubtedly, Senator FULBRIGHT got his inspiration for this bill from his own experience in England as a Rhodes scholar. In those days England was still a dominant figure in world trade and world politics. A generation before he went to England to study, an empire builder named Cecil Rhodes had dreamed of closer union between the English-speaking peoples, and had sought to fulfill that dream by providing scholarships at Oxford for competitively selected young American college graduates.

Neither the shadow of Russia nor the more ominous shadow of the atomic cloud had fallen then across the world. Men could plan more hopefully for democratic union and peace. Because peace seems remoter now, men may be prone to forget that the goal still exists. * * *

Senator FULBRIGHT must have derived singular pleasure from an insignificant news item which was buried last week in the papers of his State beneath the headlines announcing and evaluating Russia's possession of the atomic bomb.

That story announced that 5 graduate students from Arkansas were among 152 young Americans who have been given grants to study in the United Kingdom, Belgium, and Greece. The Arkansas students will go to the United Kingdom.

It is not the locale they selected but the subjects they chose that offer symbolic hope and immediate encouragement. These five young Arkansans selected fields as far removed from war and destruction as they could be. One will study architecture. Three will study philosophy. The fifth will study literature.

These pursuits distinguish man from his primal ancestors as clearly as warfare—by club, gun, or bomb—link him to his savage past of claw and fang. In a combative world, architectural beauty can turn in a moment to dust. Yet a boy from the tiny town of Hope, Ark., is off to England to add to his knowledge of creative design.

In a world whose only language seems that of force, a student from little Malvern goes to Kings College to study literature. In a world in which reason retreats, a young thinker from Wynne will study philosophy at the University of Edinburgh.

Certainly Senator FULBRIGHT must have been heartened. For this story reveals the other side of humanity's coin, the side that shines bright through the red fog of endless conflict.

Employment of Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN AND THE NATION PITCH IN TO CELEBRATE NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

I should like to submit a few comments on the subject of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week which is being observed throughout the Nation from October 2 to October 8. This is the fifth annual National Employ the Physically Handicaped Week dedicated to the millions of folks in our Nation who are physically handicapped. While there are many definitions of exactly what constitutes a handicapped person, there is no difference of opinion in any American quarter on the importance of achieving success in this week and in the 51 other weeks of the year in employing the physically handicapped.

PREVIOUS COMMENTS ON THIS VITAL QUESTION

On many occasions, on the floor of the Senate and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it has been my privilege to comment on the need for adequate job opportunities for the handicapped. For example, on July 7, 1949, I reported the excellent essay contest which was conducted among the high school children of the Nation on the theme: Why Not Hire the Handicapped? At that time and on other occasions it was my pleasure to pay tribute to the Labor Department, to the International Association of Machinists, the AFL, the CIO, the railroad brotherhoods, and all the other labor unions which, pitching together with management and with the public, have contributed to making National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week the great success that it has become.

EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

Right now, we know that in spite of the fine progress that has been made, some 600,000 physically handicapped persons are registered with employment agencies as seeking jobs. Among this group are more than 100,000 disabled veterans. Soon to join the labor force are an additional 40,000 disabled veterans still in hospitals, 150,000 disabled veterans enrolled in educational institutions, and another 100,000 engaged in on-the-job training programs under the Veterans' Administration.

I quote these facts from the Employment Security Review published by the Bureau of Employment Security and affiliated State employment security agencies. Surely there is no greater challenge to this country than to make handicapped persons adequate, self-supporting citizens insofar as possible. Here is an issue on which we can demonstrate true national unity regardless of whatever differences we may have on any other subject.

IAM EDITORIAL

Quoting from an editorial in the periodical, the Machinist, of September 29, 1949, published by the IAM, "tests have shown that the physically handicapped worker, when he is in the right job, can turn out just as good a day's work as anyone else, but he can't show what he can do until he is given a chance. Remember, all the physically handicapped person is asking for is an even break."

To make sure that the physically handicapped individual does get that even break is the challenge facing us in Wisconsin through the Governor's committee on employing the physically handicapped as well as many other fine organizations working on this problem.

In the 5 years which have elapsed since the first NEPH week, we have come to realize the many benefits that result from employment of the handicapped, not only to the handicapped themselves, but to industry, to the Nation's economy, to the taxpayer, etc.

IT PAYS TO HELP THE HANDICAPPED

The importance of a complete answer to the problem of employment for the handicapped cannot be underestimated for it is a problem that is constantly growing in size. As the result of accidents in industry and on the farm, on the road and in the home, and as a result of armed-service-incurred impairments, the numbers of disabled grow about 600,000 a year. This tremendous army of disabled cannot be left to shift for themselves, not only from the humanitarian standpoint of their mental and physical health, but also from the economic standpoint of the tremendous burden it would in the long run place on the taxpayer. It is our duty to help these citizens achieve a useful and independent existence. The best way to aid them is not through charity but through use of their productive capacity in jobs. Otherwise, we are wasting the Nation's human resources as surely as we waste

our physical resources when we permit forest fires, erosion, floods, and other impairments of nature to occur unchecked in our land.

Just as statistics show that dollars spent to plant trees are returned to the taxpayers manyfold, so statistics show that money spent by the Federal Government to rehabilitate the physically handicapped returned $10 for every dollar invested in the productive capacity of the disabled. For example, before training the employed disabled averaged earnings of less than $500 a year. After training they average earnings of $1,750. These figures speak for themselves in terms of taxable income for Government as well as from every other standpoint.

GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THESE OBSERVANCES

The question is, How much is America doing to help the handicapped help themselves through jobs? How much has National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week accomplished toward the goal of making our handicapped self-sustaining, well-adjusted, happy people? Let's look at the figures. During the month of October 1945, when the first National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was observed, nonfarm placements of physically impaired workers all over the Nation totaled only 18,639. As a result of the increased knowledge and understanding of the handicapped worker which employers and the public gained from this first "observance," placement of disabled workers in nonfarm jobs was increased to 30,765 in October 1947. In 1948 it was estimated that 10 percent of the then working population of 61,000,000 had significant physical impairments that must be taken into consideration in job placement.

INDIVIDUALS NOW OUTSIDE LABOR FORCE

Figures like that tell the story of how much we have accomplished. It is a record of which to be proud. But let's take a quick look at the figures of the handicapped who are not employed, who are necessarily dependent on their family or their Government for their very subsistence, who have nothing to occupy their mind or their hands during the long, lonesome hours of the day. As I have indicated, there are still 600,000 physically handicapped persons capable and willing to hold jobs, but who do not have work to do. In addition, it is estimated that there is a minimum of 1,000,000 disabled persons now outside the labor force who could become employable if they had modern rehabilitation and retraining. If these 1,600,000 handicapped were added to the present handicapped labor force of approximately 600,000, it would mean 2,200,000 employed handicapped. Although this would be a tremendous achievement, some authorities in the field of rehabilitation and employment for the handicapped go even still further. They feel that the response of the disabled to training is tremendous. With adequate training, they say that 95 percent of the estimated 28,000,000 handicapped can be taught gainful employment. That is truly a worthwhile goal to aim for—a goal that I feel National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week can and is helping to achieve.

WHAT DO WE NEED NOW?

Specifically, what are the forces that we need to help us achieve this goal? For one thing, we must have more facilities and trained personnel in medical and vocational rehabilitation, together with a greater responsibility on the part of free American medicine to see that the discharged disabled patient is trained to live and work with his handicap. We must have more complete knowledge of the psychological factors in disability. Employers must gain better understanding of the handicapped worker and the benefits of employing him. They must become acquainted with the fact that compensation insurance rates are not raised by hiring the handicapped.

PROGRESS TOWARD BETTER REHABILITATION

Fortunately, we are making progress in the general direction of achieving these desirable goals. For one thing, America's fine medical schools are beginning to teach rehabilitation as a regular part of a doctor's education. More and more rehabilitation programs are being planned and carried out. Our psychologists are developing more satisfactory and accurate techniques for measuring work capacities and functional skills required in given types of work. The fact that employment of the handicapped has increased is an indication in itself that American free enterprise is taking an ever more progressive attitude toward placing the handicapped. We can appreciate business' problem in this respect, and we know that it is going to do its very best.

HANDICAPPED WORKERS HAVE BETTER PRODUCTION RECORD

Much of this progress and potential progress is the direct result of the fine work done through the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week—yes, through the reeducation that has occurred in the publicizing of facts that speak for themselves—facts such as these: During the war, when business was trebled by war contracts, it was necessary for companies to let out subcontracts. In every case where a subcontractor was doing the same kind of work with normal workers as that being done in one sample plant with handicapped workers, the production rates of the latter were considerably higher.

In some instances, the rates of the handicapped were from 17 to 22 percent more per man-hour than those of the able-bodied. The Bureau of Labor Statistics show that workers with cardiac impairments produce 2.4 percent more than unimpaired workers on the same jobs. The experience of 83 percent of the Nation's industries has proven that, while output of the handicapped is as high or higher than that of the unhandicapped, the former are even more valuable as employees because among them there is less labor turn-over, fewer absentees, fewer accidents.

HOW WORKERS WHEN HANDICAPPED COMPENSATE WITH NEW TALENT

These facts are understandable in the light of plain common sense. For the disabled are vocationally able. After all, eyes aren't of any help to a person who sits in a dark room and winds live film. Nor are muscular legs necessary to sit at a sewing machine and turn out handiwork. In fact, the very loss of eyesight, or the ability to walk easily is compensated by increased sensitivity of touch, of hearing, of arm power, etc., which are more desirable assets in certain jobs.

Thus, a worker's physical defect can act as a tremendous stimulus to overcompensation. The overcompensation might be compared to the scientific fact that reportedly most individuals use less than 10 percent of their physical potential in daily living. It is only in emergencies that we call on our tremendous reserves of physical power and ability. For example, we know that, physiologically, man can live with half of one lung, a third of one kidney, a sixty-fourth of one liver, half of the normal volume of blood, and without a stomach. When one of these so-called vital organs is injured, nature automatically compensates physiologically. Compensation occurs in very much the same way when there is loss of eyesight or speech or hearing, or an arm or leg. A person who does not have the use of his sense of sight has increased use of his other senses—hearing, touch, smell, etc. It is easy to see how an employer can benefit by utilizing these extrasensory capacities in suitable jobs. The handicapped may be physically disabled, but they are not necessarily vocationally disabled.

WE WILL SOLVE THIS PROBLEM IN FREE AMERICAN WAY

Personally, I am proud of the record America's business has made in employing the handicapped. Of course, there is still a long way to go. But America has a reputation for accomplishing the objectives she sets up for herself. Other countries have attempted to legislate jobs for their handicapped in a compulsory, artificial way. That is, they have set up some scheme whereby all handicapped persons must register with the Government, and employers are then forced to hire a fixed percentage of their workers from that registry. However, that isn't the American way of doing things. We Americans, once we are informed of a humanitarian situation, never fail to meet it. Now that we have become more actively aware of the need of the handicapped for employment, I know that we will provide the opportunity for them to compete on an equal basis with nonhandicapped workers. By we, I mean everybody.

Not just large enterprises alone, but small business, too. Not just the manufacturing industries, but the retail and service businesses in our economy, the professions and the white-collar trade. Not just the big-city businessman, but the folks in the small towns and villages, and the farm folks. We must all pitch in. For, as you and I know, so-called big business employs only 10 percent of all workers.

We must all do our part if this program is to succeed. Our country can only continue on the road to prosperity and security and peace if we march all together—if we march 150,000,000 strong—yes, the crippled and the blind and the deaf walking hand in hand with the cardiacs and the epileptics and the palsied who in turn match their stride figuratively to that of the able-bodied.

CONCLUSION

If you could read the letters from handicapped folks that I have received from Wisconsin and elsewhere, you would know whereof I speak. Congress shares the responsibility, of course, for constructive legislation in the interest of handicapped folks. I know that Congress will live up to its responsibility as will our entire Nation.

Politics With the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics With the Atom," published in the New York Times of October 1, 1949; also an editorial entitled "Gutter Politics," published in the Washington Daily News of October 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 1, 1949]

POLITICS WITH THE ATOM

It seemed to most of us that President Truman did his best the other day to keep his announcement of an atomic explosion in

Russia out of politics. He deliberately waited until after the Senate had passed the military aid bill. He made the announcement in as unspectacular a manner as he could. An unprejudiced person would take it for granted that Mr. Truman was thinking of the good of his country and not the good of his party. It might also have been taken for granted that the responsible leadership of the opposition party would follow Mr. Truman's lead.

Yesterday Republican National Chairman George Gabrielson, interviewed at Omaha, declared that "the timing on Truman's publicity was political" and that he was sure the atomic announcement "had something to do with the administration's desire for increased appropriations to help Europe." For good measure Mr. Gabrielson added his opinion that the President "was trying to grab the headlines from the GOP farm conference in Sioux City which was meeting at the time."

On the record somebody has certainly been playing politics with this dangerous subject. We do not believe it was Mr. Truman.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 1, 1949]

GUTTER POLITICS

Republican National Chairman George Gabrielson has charged that President Truman timed his atomic statement to "grab the headlines from the GOP farm conference in Sioux City," which was meeting at that time.

That is reprehensible as well as silly.

It was the President's duty to give the public the information which had come to him, and he handled a difficult situation with sensible restraint. If he knew the Republicans were holding a regional meeting at Sioux City, that probably was more than most people did. Headlines, indeed. The meeting got all of the attention its sponsors had any reason to expect, and possibly more than it deserved.

National politics should operate above the gutter level.

The office of the Presidency is entitled to certain respect, and the chairmen of the two great national parties should display some sense of patriotism and proportion.

Youthful Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Youthful Criminals," from the Washington Post of October 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTHFUL CRIMINALS

The recent meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States has revived interest in the youth corrections bill that has been gathering dust on Capitol Hill. Last week Senator KILGORE introduced a slightly modified version of the bill, and a Senate judiciary subcommittee will begin hearings on it next Friday. This show of activity revives hope that the measure may be acted upon early in the next session, for its purpose is to inaugurate an enlightened system for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

The chief trouble with the present system is that many youthful offenders are hustled off to prison without much consideration for what the effect will be. Some of these young men need a rather stiff dose of correctional medicine. Others can best be reclaimed to useful lives by very mild punishment. Obviously it is impossible for a judge to know in advance just what treatment to prescribe in each case. Under the measure which the Judicial Conference is sponsoring and which has wide support among judges and correctional officers, the task of making the punishment fit the needs of the youthful offender could be left to a Federal Youth Correction Board composed of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons and two other Presidential appointees.

Judges would not lose their power to pass specific sentences on youths or to suspend sentences, but they could sentence a youth under the age of 24 to the custody of the Board instead of sending him to prison. Each youth so sentenced would be sent to a classification center for study of his traits, capacities, past record, and physical and mental health, with the object of discovering the causes of his delinquency. With the findings of the classification center before it, the Board could then restore the young offender to liberty under supervision, send him to a training school, farm, forestry camp, hospital or prison of a specified type, or confine him under conditions deemed essential for protection of the public. No youth could be confined for more than 4 years under this arrangement, and every youth committed to the Board would have to be released unconditionally at the end of 6 years.

Judge Orie L. Phillips of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals at Denver has said that "instead of 70 percent of our youth offenders developing into hardened criminals, more than 70 percent can be rehabilitated and made useful members of society." The plan that the judges have devised for this purpose, with the aid of specialists in youth corrections is so eminently sensible that it should have been adopted long ago. Several States now have similar systems. Congress owes it to the youth of the land to take the Federal Government out of the despicable business of pushing young men who have made one mistake into lives of crime.

Oil and Gas Royalties in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article which shows that oil and gas royalties in the United States amount to more than $1,000,000,000 a year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL, GAS ROYALTIES AMOUNT TO OVER BILLION ANNUALLY

NEW YORK.—Farmers, ranchers, and holders of royalty interests in the United States are harvesting a "cash crop" of more than a billion dollars annually from the oil and gas industry in the form of lease and royalty payments.

A survey just completed by the American Petroleum Institute shows that in 1948 oil and gas lease and bonus payments exceeded $400,000,000, and royalties exceeded $800,000,000—a grand total of more than $1,200,000,000.

Lease rights are negotiated for the purpose of exploring private property for oil and gas pools in the never-ending search for more petroleum reserves. Royalty payments, when production results, amount to at least one-eighth of the value of the oil and gas produced.

The vast sum which the farmers and the landowners receive for these mineral rights is another striking example of the financial contribution of the oil and gas industry to the American economy.

Throughout the country there are more than 5,000 oil and gas fields, and exploration for new fields is being actively pursued in 37 States.

In their constant search for oil and gas fields, the Nation's oil men do not overlook any opportunities to acquire lease privileges from landowners. In the 48 States, production of oil or gas, or both, has been achieved in 28. In addition, leases have been negotiated in 9 other States and exploration is in progress.

The leases cover a total of 206,567,000 acres of farm and ranch lands in this country. This is equal to 322,800 square miles—the combined areas of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virgina, Ohio, and nearly all of the State of Indiana.

Expressed in other terms, the leases represent 10.6 percent of the entire land and inland water areas of the United States, which in itself is 3,022,387 square miles.

In some States, the lease rights involve millions of acres of land. In Texas, more than 60,000,000 acres of land are under lease. Similarly, Florida has 26,000,000 acres under lease, California 17,000,000, Kansas 12,000,000, New Mexico 10,000,000, Oklahoma 7,000,000, and Louisiana 6,000,000.

In each of 30 other States, including even New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Georgia, Virginia, Arizona, North Dakota, and Oregon, the lease totals range from 34,000 acres upward to several million acres.

This contributes immeasurably to the physical development of the areas, and the financial support of the entire economy of the United States.

Such lease rights and explorations are in keeping with American traditions, too, for in nations where the governments control industries and mineral rights alike, neither the farmer nor any other landowner is allowed to lease his land, or enjoy the fruits of the discoveries that may result.

America Needs the Time-Proven, Honest, Fearless, Courageous, and Self-Effacing Leadership of Our Great Secretary of Defense—May God Bless, Keep, and Strengthen Louis Johnson To Guide Us in the Tasks That Lie Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Jim G. Lucas, the Scripps-Howard publications military writer, nationally distinguished for his factual reporting, has again rung the bell.

Today's Washington Daily News carries an article by Jim Lucas entitled "Johnson's First 6 Months." That article—short, concise, lucid—constitutes a great tribute to a great man.

Jim Lucas did not write about Louis Johnson, watchdog of the Federal Treasury, nor of the millions of taxpayers' dollars that Secretary Johnson is saving the American people today.

He did not write of the increased efficiency and new spirit of fair play among the several armed services that now dominates the offices and corridors of the great Pentagon.

He did not tell of the sense of greater security that the people on the American farmsides share with those living in the hot, sweltering tenements of the metropolitan areas—now feel with respect to the present defense of our Nation.

He merely wrote about the man—Louis Johnson—as much an American as is the soil of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a signal honor to a great public official to have the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert into the RECORD of this day's proceedings in Congress Jim Lucas' article entitled "Johnson's First 6 Months."

The article reads as follows:

JOHNSON'S FIRST 6 MONTHS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

After 6 months as Defense Secretary, Louis A. Johnson of Clarksburg, W. Va., is the unquestioned boss of the armed forces of the United States.

It probably is the toughest job, outside the White House, here in Washington. It killed his predecessor. Three months after he retired, James Forrestal took his own life.

What have the last 6 months done to Mr. Forrestal's successor?

Certainly, Louis Johnson is not the same man he was when he took his oath. He is surer of himself. He is proud of his record. He believes in himself and those about him. He is convinced the people like and support him.

His program is fresh, vigorous, and still developing. He believes in unification and economy with a ruthlessness Mr. Forrestal lacked.

But that is only one side of Mr. Johnson and his program. On other issues, he still is feeling his way. He often seeks advice. He is anxious to learn and determined to do the right thing.

The tragedy of Mr. Forrestal made a deep impression on Mr. Johnson and the President. They don't want it to happen again. Mr. Johnson has been ordered to stay away from the Pentagon on week ends. He doesn't always obey. He frequently takes an Air Force plane to his home town, for which he retains all the civic pride of a local boy made good. He likes to go there to make speeches. But his staff says he sometimes works overtime—and hopes the White House doesn't know it.

He is convinced Mr. Forrestal made the mistake of letting his subordinates know when he was undecided. To avoid that, he tells close friends, he sometimes shows more confidence in his own judgment than he feels. Outwardly, he sometimes dismisses criticism with a wave of the hand. Inwardly, it hurts. Mr. Johnson, basically, is the kind of fellow who does his best when he is patted on the back occasionally.

Physically, his work has left little mark. He arrives at his office at 8 a. m. and never leaves before 6. He lunches promptly at 1 p. m.—unless a White House meeting intervenes—with the Joint Chiefs, service secretaries or prominent civilians. He is trying to hold his weight to 200, so he diets moderately. A teetotaler, he doesn't object to drinking by others. But he has the teetotaler's aversion to those who drink too much. They get no second chance.

He likes a joke and is at his best among good fellows. He talks easily—usually about goals and ideals. He likes to do things for others.

He tries not to bear grudges. He keenly resented the bitter resignation statement of former Navy Secretary John L. Sullivan. But he has stood stanchly behind Navy Under Secretary Dan Kimball, who frequently is in hot water.

In the office, he expects a workmanlike job. He can, and does, "read off" his subordinates. But he is quick to reward and praise.

A politician, he has made few political appointments. He has kept most of Mr. Forrestal's professional staff.

He has his sentimental streak. His office overlooking the Potomac is crammed with souvenirs—a clock bearing the signatures of those who served with him on President Truman's campaign fund raising committee, a desk set from the American Legion which he once commanded, a water pitcher from a group of friends.

Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill, as I believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the States and communities in hospital construction where there is a definite need for such construction and where private or public finances have not been available to build them. This bill amends the Hospital Survey and Construction Act by extending its duration and providing greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals.

Early in the present session I introduced H. R. 2175, which was a bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act by striking out the words "33⅓ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent." I also introduced H. R. 2176, which was similar to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator HILL, of Alabama, which provided for additional Federal aid in the construction of hospitals by striking out "33⅓ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "an amount bearing the same ratio of the then value of the hospital, or of that portion of the hospital which constituted an approved project, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of the construction of such project."

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House considered these bills, along with others, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], a member of the subcommittee, recently introduced H. R. 5903, the bill that we are now considering, which serves the same purpose as those introduced by me. This bill extends the program for an additional 4 years, doubles the annual authorization for appropriations from the present $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 and changes the Federal share in the cost of projects from the present uniform 33⅓ percent to a basis wherein each State would have the alternative of determining, first, that the Federal share may vary between projects or classes of projects on the basis of equitable standards set forth in the State plan, in which case the Federal share for any particular project may be set within the range of 33⅓ percent and 66⅔ percent of the cost of the project; second, that the Federal share shall be uniform for all projects within the State, in which case the State agency would have discretion to fix the Federal share for projects approved in any given year at a rate between a floor of 33⅓ percent and a ceiling of 33⅓ percent to 66⅔ percent, depending upon the State's per capita income.

The present bill also provides for special aid to complete the construction of hospitals which were commenced without Federal aid and cannot be completed with the usual Federal assistance.

Another feature of this bill is that it authorizes the Public Health Service to conduct and to make grants for the conduct of research, experiments and demonstrations relating to the effective development, utilization and coordination of hospital services, facilities and resources.

How far should we go in this program? Does it mean encroachment into the medical and dental field? Will it mean the creation of a welfare state? I do not think so and, for this reason, have interested myself in this program.

I am intensely worried over the increasing paternalism of the Federal Government. We must be ever alert to see that it does not lead to a socialistic or welfare state. One cannot be against every program suggested by just saying "I am against it." We cannot take a negative attitude on all so-called progressive legislation unless we have something better to offer. For several hundred years we have been trying to get away from European systems of government. It does not make sense to me to fight communism on one hand and follow many of its socialistic ideas on the other.

People are interested in welfare and security. This is fine as far as it goes. We are dedicated to these principles. However, it is our duty to apprise the people of this Nation of the dangers that we face. The history of dictators shows us that when people are hungry they will oftentimes surrender their rights for food and security. The welfare state promises to provide them, however, when the yoke of the dictator is once around their necks, they have neither food nor security.

Today this Nation is the envy of all the world. The prosperity that this Nation has achieved was not done under a welfare state. This did not just happen. Hard work, individual initiative, and private enterprise brought it about. We are today practically feeding the whole world, yet some in this Nation continually shout that our system of enterprise is all wrong.

This bill is an answer to socialized medicine. There are those, many of whom are sincere, who would lead us down the road to a welfare state with socialized

medicine which, in the end, would become too burdensome for the taxpayers and would not work out satisfactorily for the great majority of people whom it intended to help. Socialized medicine would set up another army of Federal employees. Today in Britain the government takes from the people 40 percent of the entire national income. One out of every ten of the working population of Great Britain is in the employ of some branch of civil service. If we have socialized medicine in this country, every doctor, every dentist, every nurse, and everyone connected in any way with these professions would inevitably end up on the Federal pay roll. This must not happen.

I have heard it said many times that if we have socialized medicine that the doctors themselves are to blame. For the sake of argument I might admit that there are isolated cases upon which one could base such argument, but by far the great majority of doctors, dentists, and others in the medical profession have dedicated their lives to service. This is the creed of the medical profession.

It has never been the responsibility of the doctors to erect hospitals, although in many communities the doctors themselves have built hospitals and good ones at that. In my own home town we have two private hospitals which are owned and operated by the doctors. Many of the other towns in my district have private hospitals owned by doctors and they are all serving a definite need. These are not money-making institutions, as I am sure that these doctors would prefer to use the facilities of public hospitals.

You also hear it said that something should be done to make more doctors practice in the smaller communities and rural areas. It is true that for some years now the young doctors who have entered the practice have gone to the larger communities, however, if one knows the facts, I do not believe they would charge that this was done for financial gain. Young doctors just out of medical school, in most instances, do not have the money or credit to get the kind of modern equipment which they have been taught to use. His training with all of this equipment makes him lost without it. If it were possible for him to use the facilities of a hospital he could see a dozen or more patients while he was making a call to one patient in their home. The little black bag which used to be carried by the country family doctor is now not enough equipment for the modern practitioner. The answer to this problem is the establishment of small hospitals and clinics in the smaller communities. This bill is a forward step in that direction.

Unfair Subsidy Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note in an extension of my remarks that my efforts to call attention to the unfair subsidy programs being promulgated now and those heretofore enacted by Democratic administrations have resulted in my receiving the following letter from the president of the New Haven (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce:

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: This is a somewhat belated compliment to you, but nonetheless sincere in response to your splendid speech some weeks ago regarding the taking of money from Connecticut taxpayers to further the industrial development of backward sections of the country. As you said, this means that Connecticut taxpayers are financing such development at their own financial expense as well as at the risk of the loss of our own industries.

This seems like pallbearing at one's own funeral, and as president of the chamber of commerce of New Haven it is my pleasure to note that we have a public servant like you aware of the effects of this unfair competition upon our own taxpayers.

I feel certain that I can say that our entire membership would give you a rising vote of thanks for your courageous and outspoken opposition to such unfair competition.

Should further support of your position by our members seem desirable I assure you we would furnish such a word from you, and we trust that you will do all in your power to help us preserve the splendid industrial development which has made this State and its manufactudred products famous throughout the world.

Sincerely yours,
AMOS G. HEWITT,
President, New Haven Chamber of Commerce.

The Wisconsin Plan For Medical Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from C. H. Crownhart enclosing a statement as to the Wisconsin plan for medical attention.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 22, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR: I have given further attention to your letter of July 7, in which you asked a series of questions concerning the Wisconsin plan.

I think it best to submit to you a general statement concerning the program in order that you may have available a clear concept of its fundamental organization, its mechanical development, something of its history, and its current status.

The Wisconsin plan of prepaid surgical, obstetric, and hospital insurance was authorized by the House of Delegates of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin in October, 1945. It is operated through the medium of private insurance carriers whose policies meet minimum specifications of the State Medical Society. It includes an agreement on the part of participating physicians that surgical benefits will be accepted in full payment for services rendered and defined low income group established by the House of Delegates in 1946 as $2,000 annually for those individuals without dependents and $3,000 annually for those with dependents, including dependents' income.

The plan was considered in actual operation on April 1, 1946. Its first 17 months of operation to October, 1947, were in large measure experimental.

Acting with the approval of the House of Delegates given in October, 1947, the Wisconsin Plan Committee reestablished the mechanics of the program effective June 1, 1948. A new schedule of benefits was developed for all new policies and renewals of existing policies on their next anniversary date. The Committee established minimum specifications which all policies must meet.

All physicians of the State Medical Society have been supplied with descriptive pamphlets on the plan, and copies of these pamphlets have been made available to insurance carriers and the general public.

The Wisconsin plan was the first plan, written through the medium of private insurance carriers, to receive the Seal of Acceptance of the American Medical Association.

During the first 2 years, the Wisconsin plan was considered as an experiment. With the restatement of the plan, delays were encountered in printing contracts and explanatory material and in distributing information.

Because of the highly involved procedures of collecting and correlating experience of the participating companies, and compiling the individual experience in relationship to individual, franchise, and group policies, as well as combining that experience in the form of a bulk report, the society sought the assistance of others who by their special training and experience would be able to properly evaluate that information.

As this has been submitted to the Wisconsin plan committee, the figures given below cover the period from the time of the companies' enrollment in the plan to December 31, 1948. Included are group, franchise, and individual coverage.

Written premiums	$3,331,912
Earned premiums	$3,201,380
Paid losses	$2,430,102
Incurred losses	$2,707,576
Administration expense	$700,428
Loss ratio (earned premiums—incurred losses) (percent)	84.6
Expense ratio (written premiums—administration expense) (percent)	21.0

The loss ratio on an earned-incurred basis was 80.8 percent as of December 31, 1947. As of July 1, 1948, it was 83.1 percent and by December 31, 1948, had increased to 84.6 percent. On May 1, 1949, 203,265 persons were covered under the plan.

The above statistical information consists, in part, of either estimates or the application of formula for arriving at certain totals. I am told that it represents a reasonably accurate total picture.

I should like to emphasize, Senator MURRAY, that in whatever study you may be making of Wisconsin, you should not consider the Wisconsin plan as the only prepayment program supported by the profession.

Surgical Care of Milwaukee is operated under direction of the county medical society. Wisconsin Physicians Service operates under direction of the State Medical Society. The total enrollment in these plans, which are similar in concept to Blue Shield plans in other States, is reported as more than 335,000 participants.

Thus, prepayment coverage under society-approved programs in Wisconsin totals more than 500,000 persons.

I enclose the following material relating to the Wisconsin plan which I believe well summarizes its program:

Minimum specifications which must be met by each participating insurance carrier desiring to sell policies under the Wisconsin plan.

Pamphlet—"Questions and answers" which constitutes a method of describing the program to interested parties.

Pamphlet—"Participating physicians" in the Wisconsin plan. This is now out of date and a new publication is being compiled. However, it illustrates the wide participation given the plan by the physicians of the State.

I have kept in mind, Senator, your comment in the closing paragraph that if the data requested is not in the exact form you suggest, you would "be glad to have them in the form in which they are available."

Very sincerely yours,

C. H. CROWNHART,
Secretary.

SPECIFICATIONS OF COVERAGE—THE WISCONSIN PLAN

1. CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS OF COVERAGE

Franchise, individual, and group policies must cover surgical procedures performed after the insurance becomes effective, and without restrictions, except:

(a) All disabilities compensable under the Workmen's Compensation Act shall be excluded.

(b) In individual or franchise coverage, preexisting conditions may be excluded the first year, but must be covered thereafter. "Preexisting conditions" are defined as conditions existing at the time of coverage and known to the applicant or covered person.

(c) Under individual or franchise coverage, benefits for pregnancy may be excluded entirely, or a waiting period of 9 months may be required. Under no form of policy shall a pregnant woman qualified for obstetric benefits be canceled out except for failure to pay premiums.

(d) In the case of group insurance, benefits for pregnancy shall be provided, but a waiting period of 9 months for the insured persons and for dependents may be required.

(e) The policy shall provide for exclusion of coverage for those receiving the treatment and services for service-connected disabilities at the expense of the Veterans' Administration.

(f) In the case of individual or franchise coverage, the policy shall be contestable only during the first year on the basis of applicant failing to disclose all facts demanded in the application.

2. PERSONS COVERED

The definition of eligible dependents shall include wife or husband and unmarried children between 30 days and 18 years of age, inclusive.

Franchise and group insurance must be available to the dependents as well as the insured person, but on election of the purchaser of the insurance, dependents may be excluded.

3. OTHER LINES OF INSURANCE

Approval of the society is extended only to surgical and obstetric or surgical, obstetric, and hospital coverage.

4. DIVISION OF SURGICAL FROM HOSPITAL COVERAGE

The surgical and obstetric features of the Wisconsin plan may be sold either with or without the hospital features. The hospital features may not be sold separately as the Wisconsin plan of hospital insurance.

5. INSURING CLAUSE

The insuring clause shall provide coverage for surgical and obstetric expense resulting from each sickness or accidental bodily injury.

6. BENEFITS

Successive operations shall be considered to have been performed as the result of one accident or sickness unless the successive operation is performed under either of the following conditions: (a) after complete recovery from the injury or sickness causing the previous operation, or (b) unless the successive operation is due to causes unrelated to the causes of the previous operation. If more than one operation is performed at the same time, benefits are payable for each operation within the maximum limitation of $150.

7. ANESTHESIA AND RADIOLOGICAL BENEFITS OUTSIDE HOSPITAL

Where the services are performed outside of the hospital and are associated with surgery, the anesthesia and radiology benefits listed in the master schedule of surgical benefits must be made available but the maximum amount payable on account of anesthesia and radiology performed during any one continuous period of disability need not exceed the following limits: for anesthesia, $15; for radiology, $35; provided, however, that not more than $150 need be payable for all surgical procedures, radiology and anesthesia combined, during any one continuous period of disability.

Special note: With respect to this subject matter the committee adopted a motion encouraging the immediate inclusion in the surgical schedule of anesthesia and radiology benefits where those services are performed in the hospital. The committee announces that 2 years from May 31, 1948, this will be a requirement, and a special committee of two insurance men and two physicians has been appointed to study how this can best be handled.

8. SURGICAL BENEFITS PROVIDED WHETHER OR NOT HOSPITALIZED

Benefits for surgical operations and obstetric cases are payable whether in the hospital, doctor's office, at home, or elsewhere.

9. AGE RESTRICTIONS

There shall be no reduction of benefits by reason of age under any policy.

10. EXTENSION OF MATERNITY BENEFITS

If coverage of the individual under group insurance terminates for any reason, maternity benefits must be extended either for a period of 9 months or with respect to any pregnancy commencing while coverage was in force, unless no waiting period was required when coverage commenced.

11. POLICY TO CONTAIN ABBREVIATED SCHEDULE OF SURGICAL BENEFITS

An abbreviated schedule shall be contained in all policies issued as the Wisconsin plan. No abbreviated schedule other than as specifically authorized by the society shall be used.

12. SPECIFIED HOSPITAL BENEFITS IF INCLUDED AS PART OF THE WISCONSIN PLAN

These benefits shall include payment for room and board charges made by the hospital of at least $5 for each day of confinement, for a period of at least 31 days for any one disability. Payment shall be made for all other charges assessed by the hospital for therapeutic services (including ambulance service to and from the hospital) but subject to an over-all limit of $180 for all hospitalization charges during any one period of disability due to conditions other than pregnancy. Pregnancy benefits shall be at least $70, which shall include room and board charge for child. Hospital room and board charge shall not be a required condition for payment of hospital charges incidental to the treatment of emergency out-patient cases.

All specifications relative to the circumstances under which surgical and obstetric benefits shall be available shall likewise apply to the availability of Wisconsin plan hospital services.

13. INCREASED BENEFITS TO A CLASS

With respect to persons not within the eligible income brackets as defined in the statement of principles, the insurance policies may provide an increased surgical or hospital benefit, but such benefit shall not be represented as a Wisconsin plan benefit, which in the case of surgical and obstetric coverage, is construed to mean the benefit acceptable to participating physicians as full payment for all cases below the maximum income levels as declared and limited by the State medical society.

14. STATEMENT OF FULL COVERAGE PROVISION

All policies must contain the following statement in fairness to the plan and the public:

"Physicians and surgeons who are subscribers to the Wisconsin plan accepted and approved by the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, have agreed with the said society that their charges for operations and obstetric procedures, including the usual preoperative and postoperative and maternity care, described or referred to in this schedule, will not exceed the benefit herein provided for such operations provided the insured person is within the eligible income group of $2,000 annually if without dependents and $3,600 annually if with dependents, and directs the company to pay the amount of the benefit to the physician and surgeon performing the operation or delivery. This schedule represents charges that are less on the average than the usual charges of subscribing physicians and surgeons."

15. FREE CHOICE OF PHYSICIAN

All policies issued as the Wisconsin plan policies must contain a statement guaranteeing free choice of physician.

16. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WISCONSIN PLAN

To the extent applicable or interpretative, the statement of objectives and principles of the Wisconsin plan of prepaid surgical, obstetric, and hospital insurance, as approved by the house of delegates, State Medical Society of Wisconsin, October 1947, is incorporated in these specifications.

Speaking Editorially, the Washington Post on September 29 Declared: "Anyone Who Sees the Photographs of Military Housing in Alaska Brought Back by the Joint Chiefs of Staff Ought To Become Converted Overnight to the Need for Immediate Congressional Action."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, my long service on the old Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of this House, which committee was charged with the responsibility of all questions pertinent to all types of housing, has caused me to take the floor today.

The more immediate reason is the condition which has long existed with respect to the inadequate and substandard housing of our armed service forces everywhere.

Building construction and housing are matters upon which I can freely speak with first-hand knowledge gained long before and wholly apart from my congressional committee experience.

I hope that you all will pardon a personal reference and let me tell of the atrocious housing conditions that obtained even here in the District of Columbia after World War I. The shortage was true, not alone with respect to apartments and private dwellings here in Washington, but it was equally true with respect to hotel accommodations.

It seems that it was only yesterday that I sat down with the architects and the engineers to discuss with them the construction of the Hotel Hamilton, and the Hotel Roosevelt, which construction back in those days constituted the finest type of housing and hotel accommodations that had been built south of the Potomac River.

We went through it again in my home town of Mobile in World War II, where we had industrial and shipyard workers and their families temporarily housed in tents.

Hundreds of thousands of words have been spoken on the floor of this House about the inadequacy and lack of housing in practically every city throughout the land, but scarcely a voice has yet been heard telling of the atrocious and abominable conditions that still exist in every military, naval, and air installation, not alone in the continental United States, but in our every insular possession.

Many of you will recall one trip which I made with the old Subcommittee on Housing of the Public Grounds and Buildings Committee—and of my telling of the "cardboard houses" that had been erected—due to the shortage of proper building materials on the west coast * * * houses through which I myself had actualy pushed my fist. I am sorry to say that the conditions of military housing have not improved since that time.

I was indeed made happy on Thursday last to note that the Washington Post had editorially expressed itself with respect to the question of military housing in general and particularly to military housing in Alaska.

I have made several trips to Alaska. The occasion of one visit to that great Territory was while on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I could not help but observe the housing problem then existent.

The military-housing conditions which existed 8 years ago on the occasion of that particular visit were substandard then—and without renovation or betterment—must be actually atrocious today.

Now when I talk about military housing, I don't want that type of housing to be confused in any manner with the multitude of housing programs that have come before this House in the last 12 to 15 years. What I am now speaking of are military structures owned by the Government and solely for use by the uniformed members of our armed services.

I am now talking about a mere shelter from the elements—rain, snow, sleet, blizzards, and temperatures that drop to 50 degrees below zero and lower. By way of classification, it would be better if I called them berths, barracks, and quarters, or whatever else you might call structures wherein to house the military and civilian personnel of all branches of our armed services now located in that far-flung frontier Territory which constitutes, as never before, the first real line of defense against enemy action and the atom bomb.

It is unnecessary for me to elaborate upon the rigors of the seasons in that country. It is equally unnecessary to detail to you all the strategic importance of providing adequate defense in that great Navy, Army, and Air Force outpost lying within the Arctic Circle and virtually at the back door of our one great potential enemy.

The shortage of ample, to say nothing of adequate, barracks and quarters in Alaska is not a new problem. Some months ago in addressing myself to that question, I referred to the splendid business like annual report that the Honorable Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, had at that time made to the Congress.

In that address I also pointed out that Secretary Symington had told us, not alone of the successes and achievements that had been effected in the few short months that the Department of the Air Force had been in existence, but that he spoke with equal frankness and candor of the unsatisfactory progress that had been made in achieving certain things needful and necessary to adequate defense.

The Secretary's report of which I spoke covered the period from June 30, 1947, to June 30, 1948. Let me now quote from that report of conditions as they existed nearly 2 years ago, and still unchanged:

> The Air Force is in desperate need of additional housing—both family quarters and troop housing.
>
> Family quarters on Air Force bases in the United States are available for only one-fourth of the Air Force officer and enlisted personnel legally entitled to such quarters. About half of these are makeshift conversions of barracks and other buildings not designed for family living, and buildings constructed on a temporary basis for a short useful life that already has been exceeded.
>
> The troop housing situation is but slightly less critical.
>
> Inadequate housing—especially the shortage of family quarters—represents a serious and imminent threat to the entire Air Force program. Officer and enlisted personnel legally entitled to family quarters constitute the backbone of Air Force technical skill and leadership. If they are not adequately quartered on Air Force bases, they must compete in the civilian market for off-base accommodations, at inflated prices far in excess of their governmental rental allowances. These accommodations often are grossly inadequate; and in some cases represent a shockingly low standard of living.
>
> The end result of the Air Force housing shortage has a direct adverse effect on enlistment and reenlistment rates, as well as on individual efficiency and productivity. More than 35,000 airmen—one-third of whom are in the first three enlisted grades—have declared they do not intend to reenlist unless adequate family housing, to which they are legally entitled, is provided.
>
> Failure of these 35,000 airmen to reenlist will represent a loss of many millions of dollars in training costs, plus 3 years of training effort, plus the loss of their much-needed skills.
>
> The immediate set-back of the entire program that would result is obvious. Until the housing problem is solved, this trend will become worse instead of better.
>
> We are aware that the housing problem is not peculiar to the armed forces, but nevertheless believe that the vital nature of its mission entitles the Air Force to urge priority consideration of this critical need by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to note that Secretary Symington—in pointing out to this House the importance of the vital mission of the Air Force—urged that Congress give priority consideration to this critical need.

What Secretary Symington spoke at that time with reference to the conditions of the housing accommodations afforded to the men of the United States Air Force is equally true of the barracks and quarters of the United States Navy, the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Eighty-First Congress is now drawing to a close. While nothing concrete has been done to correct the now dangerous shortage of barracks, quarters, and so forth, I am hopeful that remedial measures will be translated into an action program at this session.

Full and complete hearings have been heard on the bills H. R. 4766 and S. 2440. It has been reported out from the House Committee on Armed Services. I trust it will shortly find its way to the Committee of the Whole House for adoption and passage before we adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no point in this whole world—at the present moment—more vital and as important to the defense of the continental United States than is the defense of Alaska.

Let the Russians once establish an air base—a la Pearl Harbor fashion—in Alaska—and they could virtually rain bombs on every important city in the continental United States.

By air from Fairbanks or Anchorage virtually all of our glorious United States would be within range of Russian bombers. That of itself would be terrifying to contemplate without the late announcement of the President that the U. S. S. R. possesses the secret of the atomic bomb. With the present incredible range and speed of modern aircraft, I fear even for my own beautiful city of Mobile, deep in the Southland.

It is because of these facts that I strenuously urge upon my every colleague—and on both ends of the Capitol—that they at once institute an action program to provide the essential barracks, quarters, and other structures needful and necessary to the adequate and assured defense of that great outpost.

This Congress has generously provided for the housing of veterans as well as our civilians. Can we then do less for our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, and the men of the Air Force who are still serving in the uniform of our country?

The press of this Nation is aroused. The American people expect this Congress to act. They will not long tolerate the conditions which exist as to inadequate quarters and barracks for those who are now charged with the defense of Alaska.

The Washington Post of September 29 carried an editorial pointing up the need, not alone for barracks and quarters, but the need for hospitals, petroleum storage facilities and warehouses, and other construction that will strengthen national defense on that northern frontier.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more expressive of inadequacy of housing than actual photographs spoken about in the Post editorial.

I hold in my hand a folder of these pictures obtained from the Secretary of Defense which were brought back by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Denfeld, United States Navy; General Bradley, of the Army; and General Vandenberg, of the Air Force—on their return from an inspection tour of that area.

I would like each and every Member to scan these pictures—either here on the floor or in my office in the Old House Office Building.

Because of the lucid and graphic portrayal of actual conditions in the Post editorial, I am asking unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein the editorial from the Washington Post which reads as follows:

MILITARY HOUSING

Anyone who sees the photographs of military housing in Alaska brought back by the Joint Chiefs of Staff ought to become converted overnight to the need for immediate congressional action. What quarters there are on military bases in Alaska are in large measure substandard. But for enlisted men and officers living in rented accommodations off the post the conditions are atrocious. A tar-paper shack without plumbing is relative luxury; some families are forced to live in what look like abandoned tool sheds and even converted beer vans. Rents of $100 a month for one room are common—one-quarter of the basement of an uncompleted house rents for $80—in a land where freezing temperatures are the rule 9 months of the year or more.

The most significant thing is not that the accommodations themselves are deplorable, but that the lack of housing is a limiting factor on the number of troops that can be stationed in Alaska. It is ridiculous to expand military installations when they cannot be staffed. Moreover, the influence on morale is depressing, since large numbers of men cannot afford to bring dependents with them under such conditions. Defense Secretary Johnston has summed it up this way: "Adequate housing for the minimum number of troops considered necessary for the defense of Alaska will strengthen their morale and improve their welfare; and no single measure will do more to strengthen our defenses on that northern frontier."

Appropriations for Alaska are contained in the $614,000,000 military public works bill, which has been languishing in both Houses. Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, said some time ago that he would not press for action. The pictures ought to bring a change of heart. Included in the $138,000,000 earmarked for Alaska are such drastically needed items as hospitals, petroleum-storage facilities, and warehouses. Although the works bill is a part of the President's budget estimate, probably parts of the over-all project could be trimmed without harm. But certainly military housing cannot be considered a frill.

Undoubtedly there has been some profiteering in Alaska. But the conditions faced by military personnel reflect the general housing shortage there, and the only prospect of relief is in Government quarters for servicemen. Construction in Alaska is expensive, but it will be even more so if necessary work must be postponed beyond next summer. If the defense of Alaska is vital to the safety of the United States—a proposition no one would challenge—then the first essential is to provide for the welfare of enough troops to man the outposts.

Another Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

MR. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who is unavoidably absent on public business today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Another Miracle," by Thomas L. Stokes, published in the Washington Star of September 30, 1949, together with an article by the Senator from Pennsylvania dealing with the article.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER MIRACLE—CONGRESS, HERE DESPITE DIRE PROPHECIES, HAS VOTED MUCH OF TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

With the end of Congress not too far away now, the time has come to note another Truman "miracle," less dramatic than the one of last November 3, but just as significant in its way.

It is the sort of miracle that happens gradually so that it escapes notice until suddenly, presto, there it is. It is the sort of miracle, too, that comes to pass through persistence and supreme faith, just as was the election last November.

It is a very simple thing, just this—that the Congress which met last January 3 is still here 9 months later and will accomplish finally, before it quits, a good deal, in spite of dire prophecies of only a few weeks back that it would do virtually nothing about Mr. Truman's legislative program. There were quite a few jokes about it all at Harry Truman's expense with which you are familiar.

TORTOISE BEATS THE HARE

To any one who has watched Congress here for many years and knows its habits and customs, it is a miracle, in itself, merely that Congress would stay around this long in a time of prosperity and peace, though the peace we have, it is true, is an uneasy one.

Even in times more critical, both at home and abroad, Congress would yank itself out from under the strings of Franklin D. Roosevelt who appeared to be a much stricter taskmaster than Harry Truman. It is another case where the patient tortoise beats the hare.

The uneasy peace is an emergency of sorts. In measures connected with that President Truman has not had too great difficulties, though there have been enough. Accomplishments in the domain of foreign affairs stack up high—extension of the European recovery program, the North Atlantic Pact, arms for western Europe to implement it, appropriations for our own national defense, and extension of the reciprocal trade program on a basis sought by the President without the restrictions imposed by the Eightieth Republican Congress.

Success in these things is not unusual in times such as these, though it was not all easy by any means.

But, in the field of domestic affairs, President Truman has got results in Congress on such measures as previously have been possible only in times of emergency on the domestic front.

President Truman's record speaks for itself. A long-range housing bill denied so long by Congress. Increase in the statutory minimum wage, now in the stage of final enactment. A Federal aid-to-education bill passed by the Senate and waiting in the House until a religious controversy over it is adjusted. Completion by the House Ways and Means Committee of a comprehensive measure to extend coverage of the Social Security Act and increase benefits, long sought, which is ready for action at the next session. Public hearings and opening of national debate on President Truman's health-insurance program. Revision of the Republican farm program soon to be completed, though not to the extent of the Brannan plan which, however, is still being pressed on a wide front and kept alive as an issue for the future.

President Truman's technique has been very simple. He just kept plugging, telling the public about his program from time to time and its situation in Congress, nudging his leaders at the Capitol, pressing steadily, and completely confident. He just kept saying that Congress was going to stay here until it got something done about his program, and here Congress still is.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, when a Senator on my side of the aisle rises to discuss the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress, he is generally regarded by Senators on the other side with a good-natured indulgence, and a tendency on their part to be amused at what they have termed the failure of the Truman administration and its leadership in the Congress to carry through into law the ambitious program we promised the people of the United States last year we would enact if elected.

Ever since early spring it has been commonly declared that the Fair Deal program was washed up and on the rocks, and there were even those who predicted that the Eighty-first Congress would wind up being the worst Congress in history.

The record of achievement during the nine long and weary months that we have been in session simply refutes those prophecies right down the line.

Now it is true that from time to time some of the legislation we have passed has managed to roll up big majorities as a result of bipartisan support, and this has been especially true in shaping into law our comprehensive accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs. But the Eighty-first Congress has also distinguished itself in the domestic legislation passed thus far, and, though occasionally the debate has become quite bitter and partisan, the fact nonetheless remains that both the House and the Senate have passed a tremendous volume of solid, decent, and constructive legislation designed to stimulate our free-enterprise economy and to enlarge the standard of living for all Americans.

The net results of our accomplishments in the Eighty-first Congress were brought strikingly to my attention the other day in a column written by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Star on Friday, September 30. Tom Stokes is a distinguished journalist, a former Pulitzer-prize winner, a man who has long been honored for his honest and hard-hitting reporting of the facts.

I feel that every Member of the Congress should see Mr. Stokes column, Another Miracle, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There Stands Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily of Strasburg, Va., regarding the action taken by the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable William M. Tuck, in declaring an emergency in Virginia by reason of the continued shut-down of the coal mines.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE STANDS VIRGINIA

The most sensational thing in the news this morning is the fact that John Lewis' United Mine Workers have resorted to violence in their efforts to prevent the operation of a large number of mines by nonunion miners or union miners who have decided that the thing to do is to quit Lewis and go back to work. The miner quoted in this column yesterday who said he "aimed to work" because he "had a family to support and the money had to come from somewhere" expressed the views of many of his fellow workers who feel that the striking business has been carried too far and that Lewis has overstepped himself this time. These miners know that they are doing unusually well and don't want Lewis to upset their apple cart by turning the public against them.

Over against the confused and threatening aspects of the Nation-wide coal strike is the calm and deliberate action of Virginia's Governor, William M. Tuck (good old Bill), who took steps to fulfill his promise that no Virginia home should go cold this winter for lack of fuel. The Governor ordered the State council of defense, sometimes referred to as the State emergency fuel commission, to secure "every possible pound of coal for the use of State and local governments and the people of Virginia." This commission is headed by Gen. James A. Anderson, in whom the people of Virginia have the most implicit trust. It has the power to take over the mines, if necessary, and operate them in the supreme interest of the Government and people of Virginia.

Thus Virginia stands out as the one State in the Union that can defy John L. Lewis and tell him and his miners' union where to go. The Federal Government cannot do this because the administration has sold out to the labor unions and the puny little Mr. Truman lacks the "guts" to protect the country from the hardships of a coal strike. That is a rather raw statement of the situation but it is true. It should serve to bring home to the people of America the fact that their freedom and real welfare rests with the States, not with the Federal Government. Our early Virginia statesmen warned us that our greatest danger lay in too much concentration of power in the Federal Government. John Lewis' evil power proves the soundness of that warning.

The coal strike situation in other States where violence has occurred, including murder and maiming by Lewis' coal-strike bandits, points to the need of absolute State control of labor relations, labor unions, and strikes in the interest of law and order and the general public welfare. At a mine near Jasper, Ala., a nonunion miner was shot and killed by strikers, and another miner was in a hospital seriously wounded. The sheriff has appealed to the Governor. And in Centre County, Pa., 13 truckloads of nonunion miners were fired on by union pickets. Sheriff Martin L. Kauffman told Governor Duff "There's no question that union pickets threw those stones and fired those rifles." He asked the Governor to protect the people. The appeals are always to the Governor—as they should be—not to a spineless President. The States should assert their rights to protect their citizens, and their Governors should be backed by adequate State laws. We have such laws in Virginia—and a Governor who fearlessly enforces them.

How They Hurt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Gloversville (N. Y.) Herald:

HOW THEY HURT

That these so-called luxury taxes hurt business, and especially retail business, tremendously is generally realized.

But just how they do may not have been so thoroughly understood.

Here is an incident related by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, during a discussion on the matter last week.

One of his constituents, a woman, had needed a purse for small change.

She went into a store, and saw one she liked. It was marked $3.94. But then she saw there would be a 20-percent tax, and a little hasty figuring told her that she would have to pay $4.74 for the bag.

It wasn't so much a question of value as exasperation. She just hated to pay a tax of one-fifth on an article she considered not a luxury but a necessity—and she didn't pay.

Because she didn't pay, the store lost a sale; and because the store lost a sale, and probably many more like it, some wholesaler did not receive an order for replacements as quickly as otherwise would have been the case.

And the wholesaler, in all probability, deferred sending in an order for a fresh supply of purses to the manufacturer—who continued to operate his plant with less-than-capacity held because of "slack business."

Representative KEATING, by the way is convinced that the administration is playing politics with these excise taxes—that it wants to remove them as much as anybody else; but that it is delaying their abolition until next year for the political effect.

The Rochester solon has had no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the Government is withholding luxury tax relief until 1950 so that when it comes the tax reduction or eliminations will be fresh in the minds of the voters in an election year.

Interference by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the very definite convictions I have always entertained and have frequently expressed is that high taxation driving from industry the venture capital so vital to expansion is a serious threat to the maintenance of the American economy.

Directly in accord with this view is an article in the business section of the New York Times of Sunday, October 2, by Gordon N. Nelson, who reviews a new publication, Human Action, by Ludwig von Mises, in which Mr. Von Mises discusses the subject most convincingly under the caption of "Interference by taxation."

In the belief that the Times article will shed a new light on this important matter, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESSIVE TAX, BUSINESS MENACE—DISCRIMINATORY LEVY ON INCOME CALLED DISGUISED EXPROPRIATION OF CAPITAL—VENTURE FUNDS CONSUMED—PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AND CONFISCATION INCOMPATIBLE, ECONOMIST SAYS

(By Godfrey N. Nelson)

Forebodings of the eventual outcome of the present trend of domestic Federal taxation are becoming more and more audible. Recognition of the fact that risk capital is dangerously scarce, due largely to the effect of heavy taxes, should be notice that the permanency of the capitalistic system and private enterprise is being threatened. A free business economy cannot indefinitely be made to function normally without new venture capital being fed constantly into business enterprise.

A valuable contribution has recently been made to literature on this important subject. Although the book is a comprehensive treatise on all phases of economics, it deals conspicuously with the evil effects of confiscatory and destructive taxes—Human Action, by Ludwig von Mises, published by Yale University Press, New Haven. Under the caption of "Interference by Taxation," he says:

"Businessmen complain about the oppressiveness of heavy taxes. Statesmen are alarmed about the danger of 'eating the seed-corn.' Yet the true crux of the taxation issue is to be seen in the paradox that the more taxes increase, the more they undermine the market economy and concomitantly the system of taxation itself. Thus the fact becomes manifest that ultimately the preservation of private property and confiscatory measures are incompatible. Every specific tax, as well as a nation's whole tax system, become self-defeating above a certain height of the rates."

TAXATION VERSUS EXPROPRIATION

While the author recognizes that taxes are a necessity, he says that "the system of discriminatory taxation universally accepted under the misleading name of progressive taxation of income and inheritance is not a

mode of taxation. It is rather a mode of disguised expropriation of the successful capitalists and entrepreneurs. Whatever the governments' satellites may advance in its favor, it is incompatible with the preservation of the market economy." Economics, he says, "is not concerned with the spurious metaphysical doctrines advanced in favor of tax progression, but with its repercussions on the operation of the market economy."

Describing the economist's approach from a different angle—more as restrictions upon production and distribution—Professor von Mises says they first inquire as to the effects of confiscatory taxation on capital accumulation. He holds to the generally accepted view that "the greater part of that portion of the higher incomes which is taxed away would have been used for the accumulation of additional capital," and that to the extent that such funds have been used for current Government expenditures, "the result is a drop in the amount of capital accumulation."

DEATH TAXES A BRAKE

He believes that the same would be even more true of death taxes, because the imposition of these can compel the sale of "a considerable part of the testator's estate." While such property is not destroyed, merely changing ownership, he maintains that the savings used to acquire such property from the heirs "would have constituted a net increment in capital available," and the accumulation of new capital is thus hampered and slowed down.

The author's philosophy throughout his work is that the consumer's place is supreme in all economic affairs concerning the market; that the satisfaction of demands of the consumer is uppermost. Likewise in matters related to taxation, if the businessman "fills the wants of consumers in the best and cheapest way, he will succeed by means of excessive profits. He plows back the greater part of his profits into his business, thus making it grow rapidly."

"But today," says Professor von Mises, "taxes often absorb the greater part of the newcomer's excessive profits. He cannot accumulate capital; he cannot expand his own business; he will never become big business and a match for the vested interests. The old firms do not need to fear his competition; they are sheltered by the tax collector. * * * They are virtually privileged by the tax system. In this sense progressive taxation checks economic progress and makes for rigidity."

Professor von Mises believes that there is no solution for "the irreconcilable conflict between the fiscal and the nonfiscal ends of taxation." Since the power to tax is the power to destroy, "this power can be used for the destruction of the market economy, and it is the firm resolution of many governments and parties to use it for this purpose."

Big Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Business and Government," from the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of October 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

The return of Henry M. Blackmer to this country after 25 years of self-imposed exile to square himself with the Government recalls the 12 dreadful years of 1921–33 when big business captured the Government of this country and rode it to the worst disaster in its history.

The Teapot Dome scandal with which Blackmer was identified was a shocking example of larceny in high places, but it was only one in a long chain that culminated on a Friday in October 1929, when government by big business came to the end of the road. From 1921 to 1929 the big business interests of the country which had responded to Will Hays' plea of "Boys, get the money," had control of the Government, from top to bottom, with no one to say them nay, with no hindrances and with nothing barred.

They were the Government and what they did to the people and the free enterprise system they yowl about so fervently nearly produced a revolution in this country.

In the Teapot Dome affair a group of oil men organized the Continental Trading Corp. bought a huge amount of oil from the Mexia Oil Co. and resold the same oil to their own companies at an advance which went into the coffers of the Continental Trading Corp.

From the proceeds of this shady transaction certain Government bonds were purchased and some of them turned up in the hands of Secretary of the Interior Albert Fall, who had had the Navy oil reserves transferred to his department, and had leased them to certain people, including Harry Sinclair and Ed Doheny.

Blackmer and an associate O'Neill exiled themselves to Europe to avoid testifying; a certain Stewart, another Continental organizer, was ousted by the stockholders of Standard Oil of Indiana as its president following a public campaign against him by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.; Harry Sinclair went to jail for contempt; Ed Doheny gave out a long rigamarole to the New York Times in which he said that his dealings in Navy oil were largely secret because he was building storage tanks for the Navy at Pearl Harbor, but admitted that he had advanced his "old prospecting friend," Fall, $100,000 and had destroyed the note because of the beautiful friendship existing between the two; a prominent oil executive died of a gun-cleaning incident; Doheny was acquitted of giving a bribe, but Fall was convicted of taking one and sent to prison.

This brought further inquiries into doings in high places in Washington and as a result 3 out of 10 Cabinet members resigned (the GOP plaintively claimed that after all only 30 percent of their Cabinet were corrupt).

The Ohio gang was reported stealing everything that wasn't nailed down and some things that were; the climax came when one of its members took his life in the apartment of the Attorney General.

There were scandals involving theft by other high members of the Republican Party, culminating some time later in the conviction and jailing of the president of the New York Stock Exchange; and one of the most unlovely incidents of the era was the publication of a book by a young woman in which she claimed that a President of the United States was the father of her baby—a claim that, so far as we know, has never been refuted.

Meanwhile, big business had gotten its wish and the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariff bill had become law.

Speculation and stock-market gambling reached a height never before dreamed of.

Everyone who could rake up a few dollars for margin was going to be a millionaire; it was the age of business running the Government with no interference from anyone.

But when the crash came, the business interests who had proclaimed so loudly that they were the only ones fit to handle government or who knew anything about government—when the fatal day came these omniscient business powers were helpless.

Because President Hoover firmly believed that only men of large business or financial connections were fitted to run things he was sunk when they came to him and confessed they were helpless.

These big business leaders came crawling to Government for the help to save them and their free-enterprise system; they moaned for the very help that later they were to denounce as socialism and now statism.

They admitted that they were powerless to correct the appalling state of near revolution they had brought upon the country.

This was and is their miserable record for the years when they owned and operated the Government, lock, stock and barrel.

It is a record that the GOP and big business cannot disavow for the GOP is the party of big business and big business owns the GOP.

There is no guaranty that if, given a free hand, they wouldn't do the same thing again.

They almost surely would do so for they don't know anything else or believe in any other way of doing things.

Strong America—the World's Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, can American dollars and supplies buy peace in Europe and put an end to the spread of communism in this turbulent world? Are our present foreign policies of giving vast sums of our taxpayers' money to almost countless countries on three continents and many islands helping to insure the peace, or are they simply postponing the time when more positive and constructive steps must be taken if America is to exercise its strength of leadership in the preservation of peace and the establishment of genuine collective security?

Mr. President, is it possible that too complete a reliance upon guns, bread, and money as our tools for fashioning a peaceful world is actually delaying the constructive steps which must be taken abroad if the free countries of the world are to formulate methods for maintaining self-supporting economies and mutually helpful defense programs?

All these questions, Mr. President, are easier asked than answered. Nonetheless, all of us should begin asking and answering these questions, inasmuch as our current expensive programs have now operated long enough to provide some interesting experience tables upon which to base our answers. Already the announcement of Russia's possession of the atomic bomb has in large part ren-

dered antiquated and unrealistic any real hope of preserving the peace or protecting freedom by reliance upon such devices as the Atlantic Pact and the military-aid programs. Devaluation of the British pound by unilateral action has made an impressive impact on the effort to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as a method for increasing trade on a two-way street between this country and the sterling countries. It is at least possible that the continuous change in the march of world events merits our reconsideration of the whole fabric of American foreign policy in an effort to develop more realistic, less exhausting and expensive, and more permanent and constructive methods for bringing about the collective security essential to survival in this atomic age.

As an interesting commentary by an alert eyewitness of what is happening in this world, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a recent broadcast by Henry J. Taylor, speaking under the sponsorship of the General Motors Corp., and reporting to his fellow citizens from the vantage point of an objective, nonpartisan observer who neither has the need to build a defense for what has happened nor the desire to find fault for political reasons with our efforts up to date.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARIS: STRONG AMERICA THE WORLD'S HOPE

Come with me down these streets here in Paris tonight. Walk into the shops, the crowded boulevards, the theaters, cafes, and restaurants. Push through the railroad stations, or the traffic on the Champs Élysées. Sit down with French Government officials—or most of our own American officials as well.

Here's the place to find the forgotten man—and the forgotten man is the American taxpayer. You and I and all other working folks at home are paying taxes to support France and other countries throughout Europe. But nobody seems to know it in the places I have visited.

We must be careful we don't crack up our own country in the process of supporting other countries. We must guard against going Socialist, as France went Socialist, by overstrains and overexpenditures over the long haul.

ODDS 3 TO 1 AGAINST AMERICAN TAXPAYER

The Kremlin knows we are spending about $3 here and elsewhere to do about a dollar's worth of good. The Kremlin Communists expect us to keep on spending what we spend in world aid in such extravagant ways that we knock ourselves out in our own gymnasium—not now—not tonight—but in 20 years, perhaps, when the chips may be down.

For if America blows up, the world blows up. Then what happens to world peace?

After UNRRA collapsed, in a scandal of inefficiency, stupidity and chaos, we were told that the Marshall plan would be operated differently. Mr. Paul Hoffman is trying hard to operate it differently. But he's certainly not getting the backing up he needs.

We were told that the Marshall plan would be operated over here in Europe with a small, efficient staff. At hearings before the Senate and House committees in Washington, I heard one Marshall planner after another testify that this could be done.

But that was before the billions were voted. Being a politically-dominated affair, the Marshall plan has not worked out that way.

MARSHALL PLAN GOES BUREAUCRATIC

Today American taxpayers are maintaining thousands and thousands of Marshall aiders over here—many of them on what amounts to pretty much of a holiday in Europe, and free. They work in elaborate offices. They live sometimes in apartments, sometimes in palaces. But, in principal, they live in a noticeably rich way, on the money we taxpayers send from home. Many of them have never had it so good in all their lives as on the United States Government pay roll.

NOT ALL AMERICANS ARE MILLIONAIRES

Unfortunately this strengthens the impression Europeans have always had—that all Americans are millionaires. Europeans believe that it is easy for America to give the world free billions. They forget—and I'm sorry to say that the Marshall planners seem to be helping to teach them to forget—that American taxpayers are not millionaires.

Whatever we in our land give away, we must work for and pay for. Furthermore, there are many things we need ourselves at home. But, again, we are the forgotten men and the forgotten women—the workers and the taxpayers of the United States of America.

Accordingly, in no country I have been to in Europe, on this trip around the world, are we really thanked for our Marshall aid. Yet some of this Marshall aid, perhaps half of it, is absolutely essential—providing these countries over here will respond by doing more, on their own feet, for themselves.

MONEY RUNS IN AS TIME RUNS OUT

Their conditions have improved. But this is largely because we have been pouring in, free from America, things that enable people to live better. We have given them food, tobacco, cloth, cotton, coal. But the fundamental promise of the Marshall plan, as you recall, was that it would be a long-term recovery project.

In that respect, little or nothing has been done by these countries themselves while all these billions have been supplied to assure the long-term recovery of Europe. To the largest extent, the money has simply been pumped into each country in an uncoordinated way. Our money runs in and time runs out.

PRODUCTION COSTS HIGH—BUYERS FEW

For example, at the expense of the American taxpayer, the textile industry here in France is being doubled, compared to prewar. But the Marshall plan, country by country, is also doubling the textile industry in Italy, doubling it in England, and more than doubling it in Belgium—compared to prewar.

Now who is going to buy all these goods? Where are they going to be sold? Nobody knows.

Meanwhile, the Socialist governments over here have helped to build up production costs to prohibitive heights. While in our own country one worker handles, we'll say, 50 cotton machines—and gets a good salary for doing so—here, in France, the same worker tends to only 8, and gets a poor wage for doing so. In Italy I found that the figure would be 1 worker for 5 machines; in Belgium, 1 tending to 12; in England, 1 for 24.

All these workers are working at low pay. Yet the cost of production is so high that it reduces the possibility of the public buying. The result is that the people have less. Exports are practically impossible. This is the pay-off under socialism.

So there's a big slump on in the textile trades in Europe; and as this condition is beginning to prevail throughout most industry—especially in England—it's called a dollar crisis.

DOLLAR CRISIS A MISNOMER

But there is no dollar crisis. There's a French franc crisis, a British pound crisis, an Italian lira crisis. That is because these countries are not producing efficiently enough to sell in the world market, or even in their home market, in order to stay off an industrial dole from the United States of America.

The trouble again is not a dollar crisis. The trouble is the inefficiency here—the graft and confusion and red tape and bureaucracy that accompanies socialism. The trouble is in the workings of these Socialist governments, as compared to American free enterprise, American competitive enterprise, which is producing more and better things for more people than any other system in the world.

The sooner we refuse to allow all this failure of production and marketing over here to be miscalled a dollar crisis—which sounds, and is intended to sound, a little as if the fault were in our country—the sooner we will begin to think clearly in these matters about which we get so little truth.

False remedies always divert attention from real remedies. The real remedy for Europe is to realize that there is some bottom to the American barrel. They must recognize that we are not going to be able to sustain this part of the world on a dole forever.

ARMS PROGRAM A SNOWBALL

Meanwhile, along comes the proposal for the arms-giving program, to which I referred in my previous broadcast from Switzerland last week. European leaders I have talked with pay little or no attention—and some even laugh at—the price tag they saw put on this program in the United States—a billion and a half dollars.

They don't care if this amount is whittled down. They don't care how small we start. Because they know that this bill can run into 50 times this amount once we start—and that there can be no end.

For the standard formula for getting us into big things, that have no end, is to get us started in a small way. Then, when the time comes, they tell us our spending must be expanded, not stopped.

Once we start down this road, in all these countries, there's not going to be any limit to the outpourings in your lifetime or mine.

So we'd better take a good hard look at that arms proposition before it is too late. We're entitled to limit our shipments to our own surplus arms. These arms, sent free here to France, to Italy and to the small nations, can have very little relationship to any decisive outcome in any great struggle between our country and the Soviet Union.

LIGHT NEEDED ON ARMS EQUIPMENT

Some armaments are clearly needed. But we're entitled to ask what has been done with the free American weapons already donated on a vast scale around here since the end of the war.

In addition to lend-lease, which ran into billions, we have already delivered to France over $116,000,000 worth of weapons, postwar. We built great networks of airfields and gave them back to the countries they were built in. We delivered incredible numbers of vehicles and tons of materials, ammunition, guns, signal equipment. The Germans had thousands and thousands of fine artillery pieces—like the German 88, the best gun in the war. The French got their full share as war booty.

Where is all this equipment now?

Certainly all these arms should be enough to keep down any local disorders. Yet keeping down local disorder is presented to us at home as the main reason for sending more arms. So let's get a little more truth about that one before we jump in.

ARE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS THE ANSWER?

However—and this is the big point we have to watch out for at home—when it comes to really equipping these nations to stand against the Red Army, this much is clear. Except for the politicians at the top over here, who would handle all these new billions of American dollars, no Frenchman or Italian

I've talked with thinks any stand these countries could or would make—when the army marches on a front a thousand miles long—would last more than a matter of 3 or 4 weeks. Then our arms would fall, perhaps, into Russian hands.

Suppose we put billions of dollars in arms into little Holland. Does anyone seriously think Holland can stand against the Red army? Or Denmark? Or Belgium? What about the millions for Luxemburg, a country which could hardly be expected to raise a single regiment, if war came, and yet is already asking us for a Luxemburg air force. The men who are supposed to stop the Red army on land are supposed to come from France and from Italy. But visit over here and ask yourself if the French could, or would even mobilize.

Remember, a far healthier France had a larger standing army in Europe in 1940—3,000,000 men under arms. That's three times the size of the army we are now told would be the key to the whole rearmament plan. But the 1940 army was beaten by the Germans from the east in 39 days.

Will the Russians move slower against a force one-third the size?

In any case, forces cannot be built up among Frenchmen and Italians that would be capable of stopping a land onslaught by 190 Red Army divisions. That much is a dead certainty.

No, the real implement to finally overcome such an attack—the real implement against the prospect of war and the real means of winning war—would not exist in western Europe. It would be a striking force from America, and from other areas of the world—standing, in advance at places where it could not be defeated or captured at the first onslaught of the aggressor.

SOUND AMERICA VITAL

Accordingly, the success of any American war plan depends on our home economy being healthy and solvent when the chips are down. We must not be bled white by waste and by misplaced billions.

Our safety requires a healthy, competitive, free-enterprise system, such as won the last war. We dare not trade it for a system overburdened by a crushing tax structure and browbeaten by smears and attacks that can make venture capital say, "Oh, what's the use?" We cannot be sabotaged by socialistic laws and dictates that are dedicated to supporting every other system in the world except our own.

Only a healthy America can be a helping America. Only a healthy and productive and competitive America can be strong.

Waste does not make our country strong. Attacks on everybody and any enterprise that is productive and wants to progress on merit—without favors or handouts—do not make our country stronger. Socialism does not make our country stronger.

These things make our country weaker. Yet who is to stay strong against the Soviet Union if the United States does not? Weakness—brought on by these things in our country—weakness right at home in America, not weakness in Europe—is, in the long run, the truest peril to our country, and the truest peril to the peace of the world.

The greatest problem of our day is which productive power will crack up first—the Soviet Union or the United States? It will not happen now. Not tonight. But it will happen in the next 20 years.

We must have wisdom enough and foresight enough to grasp that central fact—and shout and shout and shout for strength inside America, as the number-one hope for the security of the world.

My time is up now, in this talk across the Atlantic to your land and mine. So good night. Good night and good-by from Paris on this broadcasting trip around the world.

I'm going to Belgium tomorrow and then to England. Good luck to all at home, and God bless our counrty.

The Wisconsin Plan for Medical Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD questions and answers about the Wisconsin plan for medical attention, prepared by the State Medical Society of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE WISCONSIN PLAN OF PREPAID SURGICAL, OBSTETRIC, AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACCEPTED AND APPROVED BY THE STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN

1. What is the Wisconsin plan?

It is a program of prepaid surgical and obstetric insurance, or surgical, obstetric, and hospital insurance that covers costs of surgical and obstetric care rendered by participating physicans to those within certain income levels. The plan, sold by private insurance carriers, is accepted and approved by the State Medical Society of Wisconsin and, as a plan, has the seal of acceptance of the American Medical Association.

2. How is it obtained?

It is sold by private insurance companies under policies approved by the State Medical Society of Wisconsin.

3. What insurance companies sell the plan?

An up-to-date list of companies can be obtained from the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, 917 Tenney Building, Madison 3, Wis., at any time.

4. What coverage does the plan offer?

A surgical and obstetric insurance that provides full coverage for the cost of surgical and obstetric care by a participating physician when the employee and his dependents are within a certain income limit. The Wisconsin plan may also provide hospitalization insurance. (See question 16.)

5. Are benefits provided for treatment of fractures?

Yes. The treatment of fractures is included within the surgical benefits of the plan.

6. What are the income limits entitling patients to full coverage?

Benefits are available to all insured persons, but payment in full is guaranteed by participating physicians only to the insured person without dependents whose annual income at the time of disability does not exceed $2,000, and to the insured person with dependents whose annual income including that of dependents does not exceed $3,600. (See question 38.)

7. What benefit does the insured receive if his income is over the limits stated above?

The same benefits are paid as are applicable when the insured is within the income limits, but participating physicians have not agreed that the benefits will cover the costs of the operations for these people. The doctor may make an additional charge for those whose incomes are above the level specified.

8. Can coverage be obtained for surgical and obstetric care without hospitalization coverage?

Yes. Approval of the society is extended to surgical and obstetric, or surgical, obstetric, and hospital coverage.

9. What benefit is paid for surgery?

The maximum surgical benefit for one continuous period of disability is $150. If more than one operation is performed at the same time, benefits are payable for each operation within the maximum limitation of $150.

10. Is coverage provided for surgery outside the hospital?

Yes. Benefits for all surgical operations and obstetric care are payable whether the procedure is performed in the hospital, doctor's office, at home, or elsewhere.

11. Are anesthesia and X-ray benefits provided in or out of the hospital?

Yes. They are provided outside of the hospital when associated with surgery and are included within the $150 maximum. They are provided in the hospital under the balance available for therapeutic charges after the hospital room and board charge is paid, when the patient is insured under the hospitalization provisions of the Wisconsin plan. (See question 16.)

12. Are benefits payable for anesthesia rendered by the operating surgeon when surgery is performed outside the hospital?

No. Benefits are paid for anesthesia rendered by other than the operating surgeon or assistant operating surgeon.

13. How much is payable for anesthesia and X-ray outside of the hospital?

The maximum amounts payable for anesthesia and X-ray services performed outside the hospital during any one continuous period of disability are $15 for anesthesia and $35 for X-ray; provided, however, that not more than $150 need be payable for all surgical procedures, X-ray and anesthesia combined, during any one continuous period of disability.

14. Is there a waiting period in obtaining pregnancy benefits?

Under individual or franchise coverage (small groups of three or more), benefits for pregnancy may be excluded entirely by a participating insurance company, or a waiting period of 9 months may be required, depending on the policy of the company. (See question 20 for definition of franchise.)

In group insurance there may be a waiting period of 9 months.

15. Are medical complications of pregnancy included?

No. But separate benefits are provided for miscarriage, Cesarean section, and ectopic pregnancies.

16. What hospital benefits may be included as part of the Wisconsin plan?

These benefits, if included, provide payment for room and board charges, made by a legally constituted hospital, up to at least $5 for each of the first 31 days of hospital confinement during any one disability. Payment is also made for all other charges made by the hospital for therapeutic services (including X-ray, anesthesia, ambulance to and from the hospital) but subject to an overall minimum of 36 times the daily rate. This provides a minimum allowance of $180 for all hospitalization charges during any one period of disability due to conditions other than pregnancy.

Maternity benefits are at least 14 times the daily rate. This provides a minimum allowance of $70, which includes room and board charges for the child.

Hospital charges incidental to the treatment of emergency out-patient accident cases are paid even though a room and board charge is not incurred.

17. Who are the participating physicians?

Members of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin and of the Wisconsin Osteopathic Association who agree to accept as full payment the benefits provided by the plan for those within eligible income groups.

18. How is a list of these physicians obtained?

A list of participating physicians is prepared by the State Medical Society of Wisconsin annually. These lists may be obtained from each insurance company participating in the program.

19. To whom is the plan sold?

It is sold to individuals and groups.

20. How large must a group be to obtain the Wisconsin plan?

Groups of 10 or more may obtain it at group rates. A variation of the group policy can be sold to groups of three or more. In that case, the insurance companies reserve the right to select the individuals in that group who can be covered. A health questionnaire is prepared since a physical examination is not required, and some risks might be refused coverage. This is known as franchise insurance

21. What happens if an insured person severs his employment with the organization through which he obtained his insurance?

The coverage is canceled, but he may apply for individual coverage from those companies offering that type of policy.

22. Are dependents covered by the plan?

Yes. But on election of the purchaser of the insurance, dependents may be excluded.

SCHEDULE OF SURGICAL EXPENSE BENEFITS

Description of operation	*Maximum benefit*
Thyroid: Thyroidectomy, subtotal (bilateral)	$125
Breasts:	
Breast, tumor, removal	50
Breast, simple removal	75
Miscellaneous:	
Ligation, saphenous vein, low	35
Extensive bilateral varicose veins	75
Abdomen:	
Herniotomy, single, inguinal, femoral, or umbilical	75
Herniotomy, bilateral (same or successive days) inguinal or femoral	100
Appendectomy	100
Cholecystectomy	125
Proctology:	
Hemorrhoidectomy	75
Hemorrhoidectomy and fistulectomy	100
Carcinoma of rectum, extirpation	150
Urology:	
Nephrectomy	150
Obstetrics:	
Pregnancy, delivery with monthly office prenatal and office 6-week postnatal care (exclusive of medical complications)	60
Miscarriage (curettage)	25
Caesarean section	100
Gynecology:	
Dilatation and curettage	25
Ovarian tumor removal	100
Hysterectomy, total	150
Ophthalmology:	
Cataract, needling	35
Cataract, removal	125
Otology:	
Mastoidectomy, single	100
Mastoidectomy, radical	150
Nose and throat:	
Tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy	35
Laryngectomy	150
Bone, joint, tendon, surgery—Simple fractures:	
Rib (one or more)	15
Humerus	35–50
Radius and ulna, shaft	30–60
Pelvis	30–60
Radiology:	
Skull	10
Lungs, posterior—anterior and lateral	10
Spine, entire	20
Clavical	5
Hips	10
Ankle	5
Anesthesia (by other than operating surgeon or assistant operating surgeon):	
Less than half hour	5
½ hour to 1½ hours	10
Over 1½ hours	15

23. What dependents are covered?

Eligible dependents include wife or husband and unmarried children between 30 days and 18 years of age, inclusive.

24. Are maternity benefits extended when an individual leaves a group?

If coverage of the individual under group insurance terminates for any reason, maternity benefits are extended either for a period of 9 months or with respect to any pregnancy commencing while coverage was in force, unless no waiting period was required when coverage commenced.

25. Are disabilities covered when benefits are obtainable under the Workmen's Compensation Act?

No. They are excluded.

26. Are preexisting conditions covered?

Under individual or franchise coverage, preexisting conditions may be excluded in the first year, but are covered thereafter. They are covered from the time the insurance becomes effective under group insurance.

27. How is the term "preexisting conditions" defined under the Wisconsin plan?

Conditions existing at the time of coverage and known to the applicant or covered person are defined as "preexisting conditions."

28. What benefit does the insured receive if he is treated by a nonparticipating physician?

The same benefit as an insured whose income is over the income limit stated above.

29. Are there any conditions under which an insurance company may refuse to pay benefits?

Yes. In the case of individual or franchise coverage, an insurance company may refuse to pay benefits during the first yea of the policy on the basis that the applicant failed to disclose all facts in his application.

30. If successive operations are performed for the same accident or sickness, what benefits are payable under the surgical provisions?

They are considered within the $150 maximum surgical schedule when the result of one accident or sickness, unless complete recovery is obtained since the previous operation.

31. When successive operations are performed for causes unrelated, what benefits are provided?

Each operation is considered separately within the $150 for each.

32. Are medical benefits included in the plan?

No. But an insurance company may provide this coverage through a rider to the Wisconsin plan.

33. Can labor unions enroll in the plan?

Yes.

34. Can rural groups enroll in the plan?

Yes. If not organized for health purposes only. Members of a marketing cooperative, for example, can subscribe.

35. Is approval of the society extended to lines of insurance other than the coverage offered by the Wisconsin plan?

No. Approval of the society extends to surgical and obstetric, or surgical, obstetric, and hospital coverage.

36. May persons over the eligible income brackets receive increased benefits?

Yes. The insurance policies may provide an increased surgical benefit, but such benefit is not represented as a Wisconsin-plan benefit.

37. May the insured select any physician?

Yes. All policies issued as the Wisconsin plan contain a statement guaranteeing free choice of physician.

38. Does the insured person receive the benefits provided?

If the insured is within eligible income limits and directs that the benefit be paid to the physician by signing a direction-to-pay form for the insurance company, he is assured that the benefit provided will cover the cost of the surgery.

A doctor may make additional charges for those above the income level specified.

The insured person may also request that payment be made directly to a nonparticipating physician, but he will not be assured full payment.

39. What charges may the assistant operating surgeon make?

An assistant cannot be allowed additional fees so as to accomplish by indirection that which cannot be done by direction. The operating surgeon and his assistant may bill a patient separately, but within the maximum provided for that procedure.

40. Are pre- and post-operative care included within the schedule?

Yes. Usual pre- and post-operative care are included within the schedule.

41. Does the plan include time-loss, accidental death and dismemberment and life insurance?

No. But the participating companies may sell these features under riders, but not as part of the Wisconsin plan.

42. What are the rates charged for the program?

Information as to rates may be obtained from the insurance companies participating in the program.

43. What supervision does the State medical society give to the plan?

The committee on extension of insurance, which developed the Wisconsin plan, acts to arbitrate disputes and generally is in direct supervision of those aspects which directly affect the practice of medicine.

44. What were the objectives of the State medical society in establishing the Wisconsin plan?

(a) To increase the extent to which voluntary protection against the cost of medical care is made available to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

(b) To increase the effectiveness of such protection through the voluntary cooperation of its members.

(c) To make such protection available through duly licensed insurance companies at the lowest practicable cost under competitive conditions.

(d) To retain the personal, confidential relationship between patient and physician deemed necessary by the society to maintain and improve the high standards of medical service in the State of Wisconsin.

The Late Ralph O. Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Ralph O. Frank, of Brookline, Mass., died suddenly. He was a great personal friend of mine for whom I had deep admiration and affection. Not alone in his business life as vice president of the United States Trust Co. but likewise in his personal and civic life he had achieved a position of unusual distinction in his community.

The following editorial from the Jewish Advocate of Thursday, September 29, 1949, expresses in eloquent language the loss which not only his community but a very much larger area in this country has suffered in his death:

RALPH O. FRANK

The sudden and untimely death of Ralph O. Frank came as a shocking blow to the entire community. It is difficult to believe that this vigorous, buoyant, and convivial

personality has been snatched from our midst in the prime of life.

His loss cannot be measured in words. He was interested in every phase of civic and communal life. His unselfishness, kindheartedness, and human understanding endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He was a tower of strength to the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom of which he was a past president. The annual Nieman Fellowship dinners of the brotherhood, which he founded and presided over each year, were an eagerly anticipated annual Boston institution.

The passing of Ralph Frank has left a rent in the hearts of a legion of friends of all races and creeds that will not soon be healed. This community is poorer in the loss of such a stalwart citizen.

Department of Justice Should Move Against John L. Lewis and UMW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I consider John L. Lewis public enemy No. 1 in the labor field. He is an enemy not only to his union members—as we shall see—but to the American public which has been long suffering and tolerant of his arrogant outrages. He can also be considered an enemy of our Government, since his union operation is a perfect example of fascism in action and he has lent every possible aid and comfort to the Communists by continually attempting to wreck traditional patterns in our Nation.

Lewis claims to be violently anticommunistic. He also claims to be against fascism. But he has practiced fascism in his union as no other leader and, by using Communists and adopting their technique in his union, he has done as much to help the Communist cause as any other man in America. His policy of creating contempt for Congress and the laws of Congress was taken right out of the books of Lenin and Trotsky, whether he knows it or not.

The New Deal, which helped Lewis to build his union into a powerful, antipublic group, and the Fair Deal, which coddled him as long as the public would permit it, are equally to blame for the enormous power he has developed.

Actually, in the long run, John L. Lewis has been a great enemy to coal miners in the United States, although most of them may never realize or admit it. When he began organizing the mines, there were more than a million miners, each earning a livelihood in his occupation. Now, there are not as many as half a million miners working in America, due to the enormous strides mechanization has made, mostly because of Lewis and his exorbitant demands.

Coal only 20 years ago could be purchased for less than $2 a ton at most mine openings. Now, consumers who have to burn coal, must pay $8 a ton, plus the freight.

Millions of consumers, hundreds of railroads, and scores of industries have reconverted from coal to oil and natural gas in an attempt to get away from the price-domination of John L. Lewis. In effect, Lewis is gradually wrecking the very industry that has made him possible.

But coal is too much of an essential ever to be overlooked, or displaced. This, Lewis knows. It is the backbone of our steel industry—and of many another industry without which America's enormous industrial machine would grind to a halt.

We must have coal. The men who dig the coal deserve to be treated fairly. These two facts go hand in hand. But we do not have to have John L. Lewis and we do not have to have a United Mine Workers' Union, organized along fascistic lines, that can control the heart of America's industry at will.

The Fair Deal's Department of Justice has been quick to move against the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. and other aggregations of big business that have been lowering prices of all possible goods. Action to break up union monopolies which cannot only threaten our national safety, but have been for years increasing our cost of living is long overdue.

If the Fair Deal means to be fair, why does not the Department of Justice move against John L. Lewis and his fascistic UMW union, revoke its charter and break this union up into six or seven unions? This would be far more logical and far more helpful than moving against big business concerns that have been lowering living costs.

If action is not forthcoming from the Department of Justice, surely Congress should consider contempt proceedings. No one can deny that he has shown contempt of Congress in ignoring the Taft-Hartley Act in the current coal strike. I warn you, Mr. Speaker, the patience of the people of the United States is wearing thin.

Medical Veterans Having Practiced Medicine Under Government Control Oppose National Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the Medical Veterans Society of Minnesota:

Whereas there have been introduced into the Congress of the United States measures whose purpose is to provide a program of national compulsory health insurance; and

Whereas these proposals would institute a system of compulsion, violating the rights and privileges of a free people now working under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas the experience of all countries exposed to a program of compulsory health insurance has resulted, without exception, in a progressive deterioration of medical standards, providing inadequate medical care, to the ultimate detriment of the health of the people of these countries; and

Whereas there are now available a wide variety of voluntary prepaid health plans which provide the public with an opportunity to budget in advance on a nonprofit basis against the future cost of health care, retaining their own choice of physician and without dictation by the Government; and

Whereas the extension of medical service to all the American people can be best achieved by the adoption and effective application of the 12-point program submitted by the American Medical Association; and

Whereas we believe the extent of Federal grants necessary to aid the various States in providing care for the indigent, the medically indigent, the halt, the lame, the blind, the handicapped, the mentally afflicted, and the tuberculous can be determined by Nation-wide governmental-supported surveys made by State agencies; and

Whereas we believe the extent of Federal grants to the separate States to aid in the cost of erecting new voluntary hospitals, or in the expansion of those now in existence, can be determined by the results produced by the hospital survey recently completed in the various States; and

Whereas we believe Federal grants should be made to the separate States for the purpose of assisting in the expansion of our educational and teaching facilities necessary to the education of additional doctors of medicine, nurses, and technicians; and

Whereas we, the members of the Minnesota Medical Veterans' Society, having practiced medicine under governmental control, are keenly aware of its inability to meet the health needs of the American people—a plan that would stifle initiative, incentive, and progress in the field of medicine and be financed by a Government now condemned for its wasteful expenditures and top-heavy administrative structure on a basis of taxation by compulsion that would shackle the free people of this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Medical Veterans' Society of Minnesota:

1. That the members of the Minnesota Medical Veterans' Society affirm their unanimous opposition to any measures now or in the future that propose a program of National or State compulsory health insurance.

2. That the Minnesota Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

CLYDE M. CABOT, M. D.,
Secretary.

Swiss Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD the following information about war claims:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., September 12, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter makes further reference to your communication of

recent date in which you requested a breakdown of certain figures relative to Swiss claims against the United States for violation of neutrality during World War II.

I have secured this break-down from the appropriate agency in the Department of the Army and attached hereto is an analysis of selected individual items of claim by the Swiss Government as you requested.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to develop this information for you, and if I can be of further service at any time, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL E. MAYS,
Colonel, Cavalry, Legislative and Liaison Division.

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED INDIVIDUAL ITEMS OF CLAIM OF SWISS GOVERNMENT

1. ITEM 1, ANNEX A, $200,199.74

On July 19, 1944, at about 1140 hours, a United States Army Liberator bomber, while returning from a combat mission over Germany, was abandoned by its crew over Siegershausen, Switzerland. One of the crew of eight men was killed in the jump. The plane continued for a distance of about 30 kilometers and nose-dived into a turret of Castle Wyden at Ossingen, which is about 5 miles from the nearest portion of the German border. One engine of the plane was burning before the crash. The plane broke in two parts as it struck the building and drenched gasoline on the roof. The resulting explosion and fire destroyed the two top floors of the castle. The fire was not brought under control until the following day. The castle was owned by Prof. Max Huber former president of the Court of International Justice at The Hague, and former president of the International Red Cross. The building was occupied at the time by two sons-in-law of Mr. Huber and their families, including two governesses. A maid, Lotti Fehr, suffered burns on both forearms and fractured ribs. The castle contained 48 rooms with furniture, family heirlooms, and other items, and a library of about 3,500 volumes. Extensive damage to the building and its contents was incurred. The damage was subsequently assessed by investigators of the United States Army after consultation with the Building Insurance Department of the Canton of Zurich and with independent appraisers. The individuals concerned and the amounts recommended for payment in settlement of the damage are as follows:

(NOTE.—All computations are based on the exchange rate of 4.28 Swiss francs to the dollar.)

	Swiss francs	Dollars
1. Max Huber:		
Costs of rebuilding	662, 183. 00	
Damage to chattels	168, 211. 00	
Damage to gardens	11, 340. 00	
City expenses	1, 550. 00	
Hospitalization for maid	718. 10	
Expert's expense	5, 038. 50	
	849, 040. 60	198, 373. 97
2. Rubel-Huber: Personal property	2, 688. 00	628. 04
3. M. Egger: Personal property	3, 214. 00	750. 93
4. Cecil Grob: Personal property	309. 00	72. 20
5. W. Syz-Huber:		
Personal property	1, 260. 00	
Expert's expense	29. 40	
	1, 289. 40	301. 26
6. Electrical power works: Loss of 2 meters and switchboard in castle	313. 90	73. 34
Total	856, 854. 90	200, 199. 74

2. ITEM 42, ANNEX A, $14,018.69

During the period August 17, 1943, to April 20, 1945, 90 United States Army aircraft of the B–17 and B–24 types landed at the Dubendorf Airport. Among these landings 8 were belly landings and 4 were capsized landings. In all the landings considerable damage was caused to the runways and adjacent terrain. The Swiss Air Force did not have planes comparable in weight or landing speed during this time and the field was not built to accommodate these planes. About one-twelfth of the total area of the field, or approximately 100,000 square meters, required repairs in the nature of replacing sod, filling, leveling, fertilizing, and reseeding. During this time 49 enemy planes also landed at the airport. A total of 170,000 Swiss francs was spent, mostly for labor, to restore the damage caused by all planes. The amount of 60,000 francs, or an amount representing about one-third of the damage, was said to be attributable to United States planes. Upon investigation by an officer of the United States Army, it was recommended that this amount, or $14,018.69 be accepted as the responsibility of the United States.

3 ITEM 7, ANNEX B, $114,916.26

The bombing incident occurred at Zurich on September 5, 1944. Responsibility appears to have been accepted by the United States on October 7, 1944. The original assessment of the damage by the canton authorities, in accordance with adopted procedure, amounted to 541,462.60 Swiss francs; however, upon final assessment of the damage in the one death case involved, the total amount was reduced to 491,841.60 francs, which amount has been recommended for payment. The names of the 11 individual claimants and the separate amounts follow:

	Swiss francs	Dollars
Stadt Zurich	55. 60	12. 99
Schweiz. Anstalt fuer Epileptische	10, 452. 40	2, 442. 15
Ampt-Oberthaler Frau Magd	12. 00	2. 80
Tuggerner-Weber Frau Marta	25. 60	5. 98
Buchner Frau Maria E	100. 00	23. 36
Kant. landw. Schatzungsamt	50. 00	11. 68
Holzkorporation "Hurst"	200. 00	46. 73
Wuhrmann Jakob	40. 00	9. 35
Armeeflugpark	420, 300. 00	98, 200. 96
Treu Paul	59, 785. 00	13, 968. 46
Heiniger Robert	321. 00	75. 00
(Federal costs)	500. 00	116. 80
Total	491, 841. 60	114, 916. 26

4. ITEM 1 (JEZLER), ANNEX C, $172,422.43

On April 1, 1944, one of the United States Air Forces was assigned a primary target in Germany. Because of weather, the bombers could not attack and targets of opportunity were bombed. Two groups of B–24's dropped a number of bombs on Schaffhausen which is located within Swiss territory in an area roughly in the shape of an open umbrella bulging into Germany, and which is from 1 to 2 miles from Germany at some points. Extensive damage was inflicted. Among the Swiss firms damaged was Jezler & Cie A. G., a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of silverware. This company, in addition to property damage, at first claimed 2,265,514 Swiss francs, or $529,325 for damage due to interruption of business. After several technicians had appraised the damage the case was referred to a special commission appointed by the Swiss Federal Council for the express purpose of determining the damage in 10 loss-of-profits claims. This commission consisted of experts including a president of the federal court. One of the principal items of damage was the destruction of about 10,000 work sketches which would require on the average work of 5 hours each for reconstruction. In addition, replacement of sketches for tools, loss of profits for stocks on hand, loss of stock statistics, additional expenses in reconstruction of estimates, loss of rent of premises, erection and dismantling of temporary buildings, replacement of advertising materials, and other items of damage were considered. The final amount of the damage for interruption of business was determined as follows:

	Swiss francs	Dollars
Destruction of sketches	485, 500. 00	113, 434. 57
Loss of profits on stock	32, 936. 00	7, 695. 33
Loss of stock statistics	20, 300. 00	4, 742. 99
Added expenses for sketches	10, 000. 00	2, 336. 45
Various losses (rent, temporary installations, etc.)	42, 040. 00	9, 822. 43
Restoration of estimates	56, 325. 00	13, 160. 05
Advertising costs	18, 200. 00	4, 252. 34
Emergency buildings	72, 667. 00	16, 978. 27
Total	737, 968. 00	172, 422. 43

5. ITEM 2 (ZIEGELFABRIKEN), ANNEX C, $186,507.74

The bombing incident occurred at Thayngen, less than a mile from the German border, on December 25, 1944. Responsibility appears to have been accepted by the United States on February 16, 1945. Among the Swiss firms damaged was Ziegelfabriken S. A., a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of bricks and ceramic works. This company, in addition to property damage, originally presented a claim in the amount of 1,259,031.56 Swiss francs, or $294,166 for damage due to interruption of business. After the damage was appraised by a local technician, the matter was referred to a special commission appointed by the Swiss Federal Council for the express purpose of determining the damage in 10 loss-of-profits cases. This commission consisted of experts, including a president of the Federal court. On the basis of detailed records the Commission found the company had suffered a loss of profits due to the damage in the amount of 177,619 Swiss francs for 1945, 161,780 francs for 1946, and 177,026 francs for 1947. A lessee, who was also damaged, was required to pay 10 percent of its profits to the company; since its profits were reduced the income of the company was diminished and the amount of 72,877.40 francs was allowed. Other special damages were involved, 28 temporary structures were constructed to resume business with the least amount of interruption, and machinery had to be dismantled and reassembled. The total award recommended by the commission was reduced by the Department of the Army by 64,449.60 francs for the expected rent from the lessee. The amount recommended for payment by the Department of the Army is as follows:

	Swiss francs	Dollars
Loss of profits for 1945, 1946, and 1947	516, 425. 00	120, 660. 05
Loss of income from rent	8, 427. 80	1, 969. 11
Special expenses	134, 109. 59	31, 334. 02
Temporary structures	111, 351. 80	26, 016. 77
Dismantling, etc., machinery	27, 938. 95	6, 527. 79
Total	798, 253. 14	186, 507. 74

Meetings With Uncle Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of September 28, 1949:

MEETINGS WITH UNCLE JOE

Members of the American Congress and the British Parliament who are urging a Truman-Attlee-Stalin meeting to reach an agreement on atomic energy controls should review Uncle Joe's performance record at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill were rated better than green hands at the diplomatic game. But when they clinked glasses with the Soviet's generalissimo, Stalin carried away everything but their shirts.

Russia got the promise of a third front in 1944, three votes to our one in the United Nations, the control of Poland, naval bases and railroad rights in Manchuria, the right to occupy the Balkans, the occupation role in Berlin, and the veto in the Security Council.

In return, we got Russia's promise to invade Manchuria—which resulted in Manchuria being added to the Soviet empire.

President Truman and Ernest Bevin joined Mr. Churchill in representing the western powers at Potsdam, where Uncle Joe picked up the rest of the marbles—the lion's share of German reparations, a stranglehold on Austrian economy and the right to occupy half of Korea.

Everything we got out of these deals has cost us money.

Russia picked up most of Hitler's loot in Europe, and a big slice of Japan's conquests in the Pacific.

One more Big Three meeting with Uncle Joe might be our finish.

Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, 1949, in a speech on the floor of the House, I recommended and urged that Congress take action to place into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Again I urge that the House of Representatives give careful and adequate consideration to such portions of those recommendations which have not up to this time had conderation by Congress.

The people of the United States are interested in the economy and efficiency in Government which can be effected pursuant to these recommendations.

The Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., has forwarded to me a resolution adopted by that body urging immediate and appropriate action upon these recommendations. It is a timely resolution, and for the information of Members of the House, I insert it herewith:

Whereas the findings of the Hoover Commission, consisting of 2,000,000 words—a series of 18 reports—have been sent to Congress; and

Whereas the monumental character of the undertaking, the vast amount of money expended, the voluminous work and study, necessarily technical in many respects, have fired the imagination of all students of government and inspired the hope that a way may be found to restore order and efficiency in government; and

Whereas it is urgent that a curb be placed on the bigness in government as it exists today and economy and efficiency be recognized and restored to its proper place, regardless of special interests; and

Whereas the recommendations of the Commission are deserving of careful consideration by the Members of the House and Senate, the various departments and bureaus; and

Whereas the economic situation of the world demands that this country exercise care and caution in the operation of its business and this report offers many splendid and logical recommendations for the curtailment of expenditures for Government reorganization and restoration of efficiency: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, That we recommend a careful study of the findings of the Hoover Commission by the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, looking toward the introduction and passage of legislation which will achieve efficiency and economy in Government, and urge the earnest consideration of bills already introduced which are based on recommendations made in the Hoover Commission report, so that the best possible and speediest legislative remedies may be enacted without undue delay; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that a copy of the same be forwarded to each of the two Senators and the Congressmen from the 10 congressional districts serving the State of Georgia.

This the 2d day of August 1949.

WOMEN'S CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF ATLANTA,
By LUCILLE HOFFMAN,
President.

Attest:

RUTH MARGARET SMITH,
Secretary.

We're on the Road to Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 3 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We're on the Road to Bankruptcy," written by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and published in a recent issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE ON THE ROAD TO BANKRUPTCY

(By HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia)

President Truman declared recently, "There are too many Byrds in the Senate." He meant me.

Perhaps the President was provoked because of my opposition to his spending program, to his demand that taxes be increased, his calm acceptance of reckless extravagance and awful waste, and his plans to spend more money than the Government takes in—and thus to add more billions of dollars to our already top-heavy national debt.

The President should come over to my side and get a BYRD'S-eye view of the grave financial mess in which the Government finds itself. He could see quite clearly from where I sit that our course leads to bankruptcy.

Even as this is written officials close to the President are said to be completing plans for another New Deal spending program to be launched this coming fall. Its purpose, they say, would be to check a decline in business and to counter increasing unemployment. In this familiar pump-priming operation more billions of Government money would be poured into loans for business ventures, construction of post offices, hospitals, and other public works.

It seems incredible, even fantastic, that men who are supposed to be responsible for the Nation's welfare should even consider further deficit spending to add to our already overwhelming public debt. Yet this new drive to revise the New Deal formula of spending what we haven't got is actually taking form in a bill to be placed before Congress, probably by the time you read this. It can be stopped only by protest to Washington from a shocked and aroused public.

Unless we put on the brakes at once and change our course, we shall plunge into disaster. We are approaching a crisis now. The only way to stave it off is to stop right now, today, this reckless spending at home and abroad and this criminal waste of billions of dollars every year, by inefficient and profligate bureaucrats and other officeholders.

Experience tells me that only a miracle, such as a Nation-wide, vigorous, continuing demand for real economy from all the people—only that can save us.

We are being pushed toward disaster by different kinds of powerful groups. Some are plain greedy and want to grab all they can. "Everybody else is grabbing," they say. "Why shouldn't we get ours, before the money is all gone?"

Others, in responsible Government positions, build the prestige of themselves and their departments, and make good jobs for themselves and their friends, by squandering all the money they can get their hands on.

Another dangerous class is made up of do-gooders. Sometimes they honestly believe that our wealth should be shared with all the unfortunates in the world. Many are sincere in their belief that the quicker we reach state socialism, the better. But many are more concerned with increasing their own power and aggrandizement—at the taxpayer's expense—than they are with the troubles of the underprivileged.

By hook or by crook, these groups exert enormous pressure upon those who hold the Government purse. Many of them are concerned only with their own interests and, thus far, have completely ignored the warnings. Arguments, facts, and figures influence them not at all.

These ruthless, relentless spenders—the greedy, the pressure groups, the bureaucrats and officeholders, and the idealists with their heads in the clouds—continue to loot the Treasury in spite of the protests of the great mass of citizens who have no personal axes to grind.

Is there any way to stop them? I sincerely hope so. But, thus far, all attempts have failed.

I am sure President Truman will not show the way. His budget, submitted in January, contained some 40 spending proposals—exclusive of major military and foreign commitments—which required new legislation. And his budget did not recommend the elimination of a single one of hundreds of functions, services, and activities of the Federal Government, many of them wasteful and extravagant.

Unless the American people take charge, we shall plunge straight down into the same pit in which the British find themselves—practically broke, completely regimented, our goods rationed, our people forced into a shamefully low standard of living. And remember this: Unlike the British, if we be-

come insolvent we shall have no rich friends across the seas to make us loans that we won't have to pay back.

If the economy of the United States breaks down, our private enterprise system will have to be destroyed, the Government will take over practically all the income of the people and act as a Great White Father, deciding how much each person shall earn, what he shall spend, and how he shall spend it.

That is the direction in which the British are rapidly moving now. They are trying, unsuccessfully, to work out a compromise between our system and the totalitarian system. But the two just can't be compromised. When you are forced to give up one, you must take the other.

We are in trouble, not alone because of what we are spending today, but also because of commitments of billions of dollars that we cannot repudiate, which will come in the immediate future. At the rate we are going (expenditures may total $45,000,000,000 for next year), even without a 70-group air force, free medical care, and the St. Lawrence seaway (which ultimately would cost $523,000,000), in the fiscal year ending July 1, 1951, we shall spend up to $7,000,000,000 more than we take in. That estimate is based upon tax receipts as they are today. Government economists are reporting periodically a continued recession which is reducing those receipts by billion after billion. If this recession does not end soon, reductions in tax receipts will cause that deficit to be higher. And remember, that deficit will come at a time when we should be reducing our national debt, instead of increasing it.

It looks bad, doesn't it? Well, it's even worse. You probably have forgotten that on top of Federal Government spending you have spending at home—State, municipal, and local spending. In every State, today, huge bond issues are committing States, municipalities, and local districts to heavy future payments. In nearly every locality the taxes are going up, the local debt is increasing. The citizen, now, and his children, tomorrow, not only must pay for the expenditures of the Federal Government, he also must pay for such things as education, housing, roads, public buildings, and State services at home.

The one thing that every American adult longs for is security—security for himself and for his children when they grow up. That is what he is working for, that is what a great mass of our people think they are getting through our present policy of spending, spending, spending—at home and abroad. But what kind of security do we want? There was security of a sort in slavery.

The fact is that when they support this policy they are stubbornly destroying every possibility for future security and for future economic and social freedom for themselves and for their children. A family that spends more than it makes wrecks its chances for security. So does a government. We are squandering our substance, piling up enormous debts for our children to pay. When the time of reckoning comes, and they cannot pay—in a family or in a government—the end is bankruptcy.

Already, we find that the Federal income this year will be at least $2,000,000,000 less than the President's budget estimate. But even if the President's estimate had been correct, his budget necessitated a Federal tax bill of 21 percent of the average income of our citizens. Add to that the State and local taxes, which are estimated to be $16,000,000,000, and the total income taken from the people in taxes will be nearly 30 percent of all they earn.

Right here, I would like to point out that one of the most powerful arguments in favor of more spending is the absolute untruth: "Nearly all the taxes will be paid by the rich and by big business." That argument makes it easy to line up unthinking millions back of these schemes to loot the Treasury. The voters are told that the man who owns the factory—not the employees—will pay the bills.

The fact is that everybody pays taxes—many of them hidden. First, look at the difference between your wages and your take-home pay. Then give thought to sales taxes, gasoline taxes, taxes on tobacco, telephone calls, railroad tickets, movies, on your car and a hundred other things you buy. Taxes paid by manufacturers are passed on to you in the purchase price. If you own a home, you pay taxes; if you rent, the tax is hidden in the price you pay. The farmer who thinks that, in subsidies, he is getting something for nothing is badly fooled. He pays hidden taxes in everything he buys, and if he isn't paying dollar for dollar for all the benefits he gets, his children will. Nobody dodges taxes.

If you lose your job the reason may be that, because of high taxes, your employer can no longer afford to hire you. Taxes on business increase the cost of goods; taxes on workers reduce their buying power. Sales and production are reduced, the national income goes down, and so does the income of the Federal Government. And unless the Government economizes, up goes the national debt. It's a vicious circle.

High taxes are helping to reduce employment because they discourage industrial expansion that would create new jobs. For example, an industry wants to expand, or capitalists want to invest in a new field, such as plastics or electronics, or in the development of other new scientific achievements. They do some figuring, and find that the risk is not worth the possible profit. Taxes take such a large part of their proceeds that the new plants are not built, the new jobs are never created.

High taxes not only slow down industry, they also stop ambition in men who are so taxed that they have no desire to work hard. Once we had a policy that he who produces and serves the people the best, get suitable rewards.

Because of many factors, including high taxes, business is not as good as it was a year ago. Unemployment is increasing. So what will be the next move by the pressure groups?

In a family, if income is decreasing, what is the policy? Economy, of course.

But in Government the next demand will be not for economy, but for further deficit spending—to make work for the unemployed. The spenders are ready to go. The present budget reports that $12,800,000,000 worth of construction work has already been authorized by Congress. Most of this is in the programs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Rural Electrification Commission, and the forest services.

In addition, according to the budget, Federal agencies are prepared to begin $14,000,000,000 worth of construction which has not been authorized by Congress, but which the agencies hope to put through. On top of that, many Federal agencies are hard at work on plans for new projects which, so far, they haven't told anybody about. More than $26,000,000,000 worth of new projects. All set to start when the make-work pressure is put on.

If we go in for deficit spending in a big way, if we borrow so much more that our national debt increases $15,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 a year, we shall be sunk. We not only could not properly finance another war, we could not finance our own economy.

Today the interest on our national debt of $252,000,000,000 is $5,500,000,000—more than 10 percent of all general fund expenditures. That interest would pay one-third of all the State and local taxes levied in the 48 States. How can thoughtful citizens demand that their representatives in Washington vote for projects which will increase that debt? But the citizens do make those demands.

Some argue that during the last depression, spending to make work, much of it deliberate waste, reduced unemployment and accelerated the return to prosperity. So, they say, we should do the same today. Whether the ultimate result was good for the Nation, nobody can ever be sure. But in those days we could afford such experiments. In 1931 our national debt was less than $17,000,000,000, and our Government was spending only $4,000,000,000 a year. Today we are spending 12 times that, and our debt is 15 times as large.

In 1931 our national debt amounted to $135.45 for each man, woman, and child. Today the per capita debt is $1,721.45. In 1931 we had a reserve. We could spend billions without damaging our financial structure. Today that reserve is gone.

Many of us do not realize we are helping to wreck the economy of our country. We belong to organizations that are working for a worthy cause, asking money for something that appears to be necessary. We probably do not know that our leaders sometimes use us to support causes which we would not support if we understood their economic impact.

We may be farmers, veterans, laborers, businessmen, schoolteachers, lawyers, doctors, elderly people, or members of any of the hundreds of other groups that ask for Government spending.

You may believe firmly in economy, you may agree with every word I say about retrenchment, you may think your group is asking for more than is fair. But you don't raise your voice to protest when your leader tells the politicians that the entire organization is solidly back of him and will vote as one man for the Representative or Senator who supports its demands. You go along. You sign petitions, you write to your Congressman. You help put on pressure that accelerates our progress on the road to bankruptcy.

You are told that we have so many fixed expenses that it is impossible to make any substantial savings. That is not true. It will be difficult, but it can be done. When a family must save, it stops buying things it doesn't acually need. It eliminates waste. It spends carefully and efficiently.

So it is with government. Government can save by giving less to everybody, after careful examination of what we actually need and what can be classed as unnecessary luxuries.

At this writing, it looks as if Congress may give $300,000,000 to States for education. Once started, this subsidy will increase every year. No schemes of this kind are ever abolished; they always grow. All this, in spite of the fact that in every State in the Union State and local appropriations for schools are being increased.

This plan is one more step in the Government's policy of centralizing in Washington the power to regulate the lives and income of the people, in the towns, the cities, and the States. One after another, new bureaus have been organized to spend huge sums to do for the people something they usually could do much better and much more economically for themselves.

The bureaucrats, with their armies of employees, step by step are getting more money to spend and more power. Some of the money, it is true, is given back to the States, but 15 percent of all of this sort of money sticks to the hands of the bureaucrats in Washington, for administration. Our total expenditures of Federal aid to States in 1948 was about $5,500,000,000. That money first came to Washington from the States, of course, and $625,000,000 stuck in the hands of administrators to pay for overhead.

Centralized government is mighty expensive.

Our direct subsidies to business and farmers, in the 14 years up to June 30, 1948, totaled

$14,500,000,000. The biggest single item is nearly $5,000,000,000 to farmers for soil-conservation practices. One item is $132,000,000, to hold up the price of potatoes.

Take our postwar foreign assistance. In the period beginning July 1, 1945, and ending June 30, 1948, we gave $19,973,000,000 for foreign aid. The estimated total, up to June 30, 1950, will be more than $33,500,000,000.

This just can't continue.

One situation that makes every conscientious Senator and Congressman furious is the lobbying of Government departments to increase their appropriations. Appropriations Committee men are almost helpless when they consider applications from bureaus and departments that swear they need a certain number of millions or billions of dollars for their projects. Only the insiders know the facts, and these insiders won't tell, because they are the ones who are fighting to get the money.

So inaccurate and confusing are the "facts" which are submitted that I have heard Senators differ by as much as $9,000,000,000 in their estimates of what should be spent. And they all reached their conclusions from the same sets of figures.

Some members of the Appropriations Committees have protested vehemently against the inaccuracies and exorbitant demands made in department requests for money. The Senate Appropriations Committee for instance, was once asked to allocate $16,000,000 more than was necessary for one item because the resources of Austria had been improperly tabulated. Once the State Department asked for $12,000,000 more than was necessary because it listed the price of grain too high. Another time the Appropriations Committee showed that $1,000,000 could be saved by rerouting shipments of coal.

In a large corporation, if the president discovered such deliberate or accidental mistakes and misstatements, the persons responsible for them would be promptly fired. But not in government. Such mistakes and misstatements are in every budget—known, usually, only to the insiders—but I have never heard that the perpetrators were ever seriously reprimanded.

For 16 years, as a United States Senator, I have studied the Federal budget minutely and I have observed the Government's trend toward more and more paternalism, regimentation, and centralization, with all the extravagant characteristics of the course. I have studied the figures and advices of economic analysts, taxation experts, and fiscal officers. I have canvassed the views of industrial experts, businessmen, and farmers.

I am convinced that in the current fiscal year we shall extend our fiscal and economic stability to extremes where it may be unable to withstand the additional pressures that are unavoidable next year. And when that stability weakens there is certain to be a demoralizing crisis which—unless some miracle occurs—will break down our private-enterprise system and our form of government.

The picture of our financial affairs is bleak. The prospects are fraught with the gravest public consequences. We have only three courses open: (1) a drastic reduction in spending, (2) a substantial increase in taxes, (3) large-scale borrowing and an increase of the public debt.

The third course is unthinkable. It would undermine the public's confidence in Government bonds, our credit would be wrecked, our system of government destroyed.

New taxes could easily accelerate a minor business decline into a mighty, crushing depression.

The only solution is retrenchment, and that can be brought about only by quick action by the people. They must immediately end their demands for special privilege; they must rise in such force that their elected representatives throughout the Nation will act boldly and firmly to save money and to save our Nation.

With the exception of interest on the debt and several other items of similar character, there is not a single category of Federal expenditures that could not absorb immediately a 10-percent reduction in administrative costs without the impairment of essential functions.

If you help to save the American enterprise system, you save the freedom of all the people in the world who now know freedom or who long for it. We alone are bearing the torch. Without its light, freedom and progress will perish.

To save our Nation, the people, in a mighty mass, in towns, cities, States, and throughout the Nation, must vote for the councilmen, selectmen, mayors, State representatives, governors, Senators and Congressmen who will fight for economy instead of for reckless spending. We must sacrifice our individual selfish interests for the good of all the people.

Only the people of America can save themselves and the world. And the time is now.

United States Still Groping in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin from the New York Times of September 18, 1949:

UNITED STATES GROPING IN CHINA

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Yugoslavia and China were still the key points last week on the world-wide battlefield of the cold war.

Our politico-military policy toward one of these key areas, Yugoslavia, gradually has crystallized: American economic aid is to help Marshal Tito in his fight against Kremlin autarchy. That fight is still in its relatively early stages, but there can be no doubt that it will be a struggle to the end. For although Yugoslavia is a Communist state, Tito's brand of national communism represents a broad crack in the monolithic structure of international communism that has been erected in eastern Europe. If Tito's defiance should be protracted and successful it could become contagious; political heresy has a way of spreading, and it can never be tolerated in a totalitarian ideology. Moscow's attempt to overthrow Tito, therefore, will not falter; force of arms may supplement force of ideas and the deadly battle of propaganda.

Our position in this struggle gradually is being clarified. We hold no love for a Communist state of any ilk, and Tito's repressions of liberties cannot be forgotten. But his dissidence weakens the greater danger; a little economic aid to Yugoslavia may help to broaden the crack in the structure of international communism.

In China, on the other hand, no United States policy save the negative one of "wait-and-see" is yet apparent. The State Department's white paper on China seems to have settled nothing; it has merely elicited laudatory or acidulous comments; the debate still rages. There are signs, however, that the groups that are trying to grope toward a new China policy in Washington—on Capitol Hill, in the State Department, in the Pentagon—are moving gradually toward something more affirmative than our past negativism. The $75,000,000 for the Far East area that was inserted in the military assistance program seems to represent something more than a mere political sop; this projected aid is based on hopes, admittedly, but also on some hard facts.

The facts are these:

The Communists control much of China, but no more than the Japanese did. There is still an area in the south about 500 miles deep, which separates the spearheads of the Communist armies from the lands bordering China in southwest Asia.

Anti-Communist guerrillas are active in Shantung and other areas of China and seem to be increasing in strength. There are 10 or 12 large groups in different parts of China, varying in size from 7,000 to 50,000 men.

The immensity of China's economic problem is now causing the Communists grave difficulties in the areas they have conquered; these difficulties have been increased by the blockade of Communist-held ports by the Nationalist Navy, by inexperienced Communist administrators and by the open hostility of many Communists toward foreigners and foreign investments. Capture of the big port cities has been, in this sense, at least short-term liabilities to the Communists; from Shanghai about 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 persons are being moved into rural areas largely unprepared to receive them. The capture of Canton by the Communists, which probably can be achieved at nearly any time the Communists wish, will add another administrative monstrosity—millions of people strong—to their problems.

It is probably fair to say that disappointment and dissatisfaction with Communist rule is increasing slowly in Communist China.

Non-Communist China is no longer controlled by any one man or group. Chiang Kai-shek remains the dominant figure, with Formosa clearly under his control, and with his greatest assets, the Nationalist treasury, a pretty good American-trained air force, which has been little used, and the Nationalist Navy, blockading Communist ports with destroyer escorts and smaller craft.

Chiang's influence still extends well beyond Formosa, but on the mainland that influence is tenuous in many areas and there are three or four other leaders of resistance of some importance.

In the south and southwestern areas, Acting President Li Tsung-jen of Nationalist China, acting in considerably closer cooperation with Chiang than he did a few months ago, with Gen. Pai Chung-shi, defender of Canton, as one of his principal generals, supervises a large area.

Gen. Lu Han, governor of strategically important Yunnan Province, bordering Burma and French Indochina, has flirted with the Communists, but now seems to be bound to the Nationalist cause.

The Moslem war lord, Ma Pufang, though severely beaten by Communist forces in recent engagements, still has some support in northwest China, and in Mongolia, the Mongol—Prince Teh—has a loose allegiance from some anti-Communist forces.

Those who add up the foregoing facts into hopes believes that it is essential that we attempt to contain communism within China, not at the borders of China. A monolithic Communist China would surely mean, sooner or later, the advance of communism into southwest Asia. A very little, but wisely distributed and carefully supervised aid—not exclusively or necessarily to Chiang or the Nationalist Government but to selected anti-Communist groups—might greatly strengthen the defensive capabilities of the areas still not under Communist control.

There would be no attempt to reconquer Communist-held areas by military means—although anti-Communist guerilla operations might be encouraged; the basic military policy would be defensive containment,

not offensive conquest. But the pressure of China's age-old economic problems—a pressure increased by the naval blockade—would, it is hoped, help to break down Communist control and increase dissatisfaction.

Those who hold these hopes point out that that Nationalist failure in China stemmed from an administrative and economic debacle, which in turn brought about a military debacle. Perhaps this same process—and here the planners are groping into the clouds of wishful thinking—can bring about disintegration and dissolution in Communist China.

This is, of course, a fond and quite possibly a fallacious hope, but the fact that it exists at all seems to indicate that we are slowly groping toward our greatest need—a China policy.

Barter Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM B. FUGATE
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article featured in the September issue of the "Made in America," monthly magazine, by Hubbard K. Hinde III.

Barter Theater is the work of Robert Porterfield. It was born of necessity. In 1933 when bread lines were the daily routine of millions, those of the stage had not escaped. Economic conditions had affected actors earlier and more acutely than other groups. Those who attended the theater for cultural, recreational, and aesthetic purposes were unable to do so because of inadequate funds. Hence, widespread unemployment of actors.

Robert Porterfield, a product of the Virginia highlands, is a distinguished son of a distinguished family. His ancestors were pioneers in western Virginia a quarter of a century before the American Revolution. He is typical of the mountain people.

With inherent resourcefulness he came forward with an idea; a plan to take from the sidewalks of New York to the mountains of Virginia, some of those who had heretofore earned a living on the stage, and establish a theater. Admission would be available by presenting at the box office some farm product which could be used for subsistence and sale. Barter was the means of maintenance. The institution became known as the Barter Theater. It grew from its inception.

Today, by legislative act, it is the State theater. Annual appropriations are made by the General Assembly of Virginia to assist in making available to the communities of the State a recognized cultural need. The idea has spread. A resolution was introduced by Congressman J. K. JAVITS in the Eighty-first Congress to establish a national theater, patterned after the Barter Theater plan.

Mr. Porterfield has offered his plan to the National Park Service for after-dark entertainment of the millions of visitors to the national parks.

The article follows:

THE STORY OF AMERICA'S FAMED BARTER THEATER
(By Hubbard K. Hinde III)

In the bleaker days of the depression—in 1933—when Broadway, the erstwhile home of all good actors, was filled to overflowing with job hunters and had little or no jobs to offer, one Robert Porterfield, who himself was one of the lucky ones—he was working—touring with Walter Hampden—had a brainstorm. All on the strength of an idea, he took 22 out-of-work actors, and headed home.

Home was Abingdon, the heart of the highlands of Virginia, a little town about 600 miles from Broadway's bright lights. The idea was to bring the stage to the people in the form of a regional theater. This was something new—almost radical in those days. Broadway actors and organized companies had toured the country before. But never had there been a company of Broadway professionals resident in the hinterland. This bold step was taken because Bob Porterfield firmly believed that the theater has a place in the everyday life of every community, that it brings emotional experience that enriches the lives of the inhabitants of the community, and that that community or region will support "good theater."

Barter, in the strict sense of the word is "exchange," give and take. Barter, in the theatrical sense, is much the same; it is bringing "good theater" to the people and in turn, taking from them the assurance that good theater has a definite place in community life. It was on this premise that the Barter Theater was founded—the people in and around Abington had food; Bob Porterfield and his company did not. But they had the wherewithal and the know-how to put on plays, so an exchange was made. The audience bought their tickets with produce, in the manner of good old-fashioned barter. That first season the Barter Theater produced seven plays and counted their receipts at the end of the summer to the amount of a barrel of jelly and $4.35. And the actors were well repaid for their continuous work—performing in one play while rehearsing the next; washing the paint off their one and only set and repainting it in preparation for the next performance. In physical strength they gained an aggregate of 300 pounds off the good goods of Abingdon.

That was 16 years ago. Today The Barter Theater operates with a company of over 50 people. It is a year-round repertory company which tours Virginia and the Southeastern States. Three complete companies played in 22 States in 1948–49. Barter counts among its alumni such well-known stage, screen, and radio actors as Gregory Peck, Hume Cronyn, Katherine Raft, Jeffrey Lynn, Charles Korvin, William Prince, Frank Latimore, and Patricia Neal. With its presentation of Hamlet in the summer of 1948, Barter established its two hundredth repertory.

Barter is a professional company, working on a plan similar to that of the Metropolitan Opera. Many of the actors rehearse during the day for one production while playing performances of another at night. Because of this highly professional standard, Barter has consistently staged productions that are superior.

Bob Porterfield has the knack of appealing to people; he is a superior showman himself. He has even managed to pay royalties in Virginia hams which are famous the world over. Several years ago a brood sow was brought to the box office as barter. Before his hungry actors could get to her Bob had carried her off to his father's farm near Abingdon, where she was bred to begin a long line of Barter pigs. Her descendants have graced the tables of such noteworthy playwrights as Eugene O'Neill, Thornton Wilder, and Noel Coward. Vegetarian Bernard Shaw couldn't be tempted. Bob Porterfield, not to be daunted, sent him two crates of spinach, which he accepted.

The best known of the Barter companies—the Hamlet company—left the States this June for Denmark, where they had been invited by the Danish Drama Festival to present Hamlet at Elsinore, Hamlet's castle. After leaving Denmark, the company has completed a very successful tour, during which time they played for the occupation forces in Germany.

In the States this summer one company is closing its summer repertory at home, Abingdon; another has established a new summer home at Luray, in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, and has had a highly responsive season; and the third road company has been traveling hundreds of communities throughout the Southeastern States. Their winter tour will include Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Barter makes this offer: If you belong to or know of any organization in your community that might be interested in sponsoring an appearance of the Barter players, write Barter Theater, Abingdon, Va., for information. Take it from one who knows, your humble editor, you will never regret having one of Bob Porterfield's companies grace your community, whether it be large or small.

Gen. Jacob L. Devers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. LIND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the introductory remarks of Mr. J. William Stair, of York, Pa., on the occasion of presenting Gen. Jacob L. Devers to the audience assembled in front of the new high school, named in honor of General Devers, and the address delivered by the distinguished general on Sunday, September 25, 1949:

REMARKS OF J. WILLIAM STAIR IN THE INTRODUCTION OF GENERAL DEVERS

Members of the York School Board, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to pay honor to a native son of York—and to commemorate his name.

In 200 years of history, York County has produced no man of equal attainments—no name which is more widely known.

Not only in our own country do millions of men know of him and his work—but in many foreign lands his service to mankind, in a period of greatest emergency, is similarly renowned.

In paying him honor in this ceremony today, the community is therefore, not only expressing its own gratitude, but in a sense expressing the gratitude of many villages, towns, and cities throughout the world.

York Couny in the past has not been without men who have distinguished themselves beyond the limits of their own community.

In the earliest period of bitter national emergency more than 150 years ago, this community provided a military man in whom Gen. George Washington placed the greatest trust. That man was Col. Thomas Hartley who served so well in the Revolutionary War which guaranteed us the right to existence as an independent, democratic Nation.

In the years since then, many residents of York and York County have made major contributions in a great number of fields.

In the realm of law, Jeremiah Sullivan Black, of York, gained distinction as Attorney General of the United States during the administration of President Buchanan.

In the field of science, Edgar Fahs Smith received national awards for his outstanding work in chemistry, and was honored with the office of provost of the University of Pennsylvania.

The work of the scientist, F. V. Melsheimer of Hanover, in the field of entomology, laid the foundation for the world-famous entomological collection at Harvard College.

In medicine, Dr. George E. Holtzapple will forever be known because of his discovery of the therapeutic value of pure oxygen in the treatment of pneumonia and respiratory ailments.

Among inventors, Phineas Davis is nationally known as the builder of the first successful coal-burning locomotive in 1831, which made possible our present-day great network of railway transportation.

In the field of literature and drama, the name of John Luther Long of Hanover will always be remembered as the author of the well-known book, later to become the opera, Madame Butterfly.

The late Winfred T. Root achieved a high position in the field of early American history through his research and published text books while in the capacity of professor of history at the Universities of Wisconsin and Iowa.

The industrial fame of York was carried throughout the States of the Union through the names of A. B. Farquhar, S. Morgan Smith, and Thomas Shipley.

What is today significant in the achievements of these York and York County men is that the foundation of their success was laid in a public-school system providing equal opportunities for all.

Their fame was largely regional.

In contrast, the man whose name we are to commemorate today in this new elementary school, served not only his own country, but other countries as well.

His achievements were in a world theater—with the freedom of the world greatly depending on his success and that of his associates.

The role he played in World War II is well known. His accomplishments need no further elaboration here. He has placed the world—and us—deeply in his debt.

It is therefore a pleasure to have him once again in our midst, and an honor for me to present him to you now as the commander of the United States Army Ground Forces, Gen. Jacob L. Devers.

ADDRESS OF GEN. JACOB L. DEVERS

It is with great pride and a deep feeling of humility that I speak here today at this ceremony dedicating the school to which you have chosen to give my name.

This new building will add another to the many structures marking York as a civic-minded, forward-looking community. It bears further evidence that this city is deeply conscious of its responsibility to equip its youth with the moral and intellectual capacity to meet the challenge of this confused age.

This modern plant will bring to present and future generations of children many advantages which we adults did not have. There will be ample classroom space, properly heated, lighted, and ventilated. There will be an ideal auditorium for programs and special exercises. There will be athletic facilities superior in many ways to those heretofore available.

I can recall the day when I, as a boy, lived but a few blocks from here and attended the Garfield School, which although then considered quite adequate, has since become overcrowded and obsolete, according to present-day standards.

The school then offered no athletic facilities, but we boys in the neighborhood felt that the old quarry, on the site of which this building now rises, was a better gymnasium than money could buy. Here we swam in the summer, oblivious to the awful dangers of water pollution. Here the perfect winter sport was skating—we never dreamed that one day a splendid gymnasium would rise from the murky depths of our natural playground.

To round out and diversify our athletic program an older boy in the neighborhood, Everett Williamson, took the lead in organizing what was called the Park Street Athletic Association. He coached us in football, baseball, basketball, track—every sport we have today.

The advantages that our school lacked then in plant and facilities were largely compensated for by the counsel and guidance of the older people, and the superior instruction we received from our splendid teachers.

Of my own school teachers, I am very happy that several who still live in the community—Miss Miriam Morehead, Miss Ruth Dorsey, Mrs. Mary Steig Strickler, Miss Anna Wellensiek, and Miss Hettie Rupp—are here today. It is a great tribute to the school teachers of York and it must be a great source of satisfaction to those present, that hundreds of their students have gone on to achieve success in their chosen careers.

My classmates of the class of 1905, most of whom are here today, and most of whom still live in York, all have, in their individual ways, built successful careers on the foundation of their elementary schooling.

As I look today on the framework which is rising here I see much more than a material creation of brick, stone, and mortar. I see even more than books and blackboards and classrooms. I see a symbol of an American institution—an institution which holds the power to preserve that faith in the democratic principles upon which this Nation has been nourished and has grown.

It was Thomas Jefferson who once said that no better means could be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness than the establishment of a system of free public schools. Thanks to the wisdom of our early leaders who acted on this principle we have for many years had a free system of public education leading in a direct chain from the primary grades to the university.

More recently we have begun to extend the application of that principle by concentrating on the establishment of more and better universities. As a result, the higher degree, once a rarity, has become as familiar as the high-school diploma a century ago. Higher education is a fine thing and should be encouraged to the utmost. Yet we must not neglect that highly important first link in the chain of education, the elementary school. "As the twig is bent so the tree is inclined."

The things we learn or fail to learn in the primary grades often exert a powerful influence on our futures.

In my own case, I have always been especially grateful for the splendid elementary instruction I received in arithmetic and my later schooling in high-school mathematics under Mr. Weiser Zeigler and Miss Anna Wellensiek. It enabled me to achieve a good record in mathematics at the Military Academy and, later, I became an instructor there in that subject.

I speak here today primarily as an Army officer, but this in itself qualified me to speak with some authority as an educator. Though it may not be generally known, the Army is the largest single educational institution in America. Its educational activities are many and varied: they pervade the entire structure of Army operations.

From the time the recruit enlists until he receives his discharge from the service he is engaged in the learning process, either by receiving formal schooling, by day-to-day training, or by acting as a leader-instructor, imparting his knowledge to others.

One phase of the Army education system is basic military training. Every recruit without previous military training, upon entering the Army, goes through a 14-week training course at one of our training divisions. These divisions have permanent instructors and are run not unlike other educational institutions.

Of necessity, the Army also conducts schools in the three R's for those men taken into the service who have less than the equivalent of a fifth-grade education. While we have no intention of competing with civilian education it is necessary in such cases to raise the level of education to a point where the individual can absorb basic military training. The Army also offers a comprehensive program of off-duty education for those persons who desire to obtain further schooling beyond that acquired before entering the service.

In the field of military education, the Army school system forms the backbone of all training. We have 29 schools which conducted 360 courses, from which more than 80,000 students were graduated in the last fiscal year. The Army school system is so organized that each officer takes successive courses at different schools, each course at a progressively higher level of instruction to qualify him for a more responsible job.

The officer career system is so designed that most Army officers will spend nearly one-fifth of their time in school. It will probably surprise many of you to learn that the average Army officer spends as much time in school pursuing studies on the graduate level, as a candidate for a Ph. D. in a civilian university.

Army education has been accompanied by extensive research. We have pioneered in the adoption of some teaching methods which have proven useful in the realm of civilian education.

For example, the Army has been first in the use of educational aids such as mock-ups, small-scale models, and training films. As many of you know, the motion-picture film has now received widespread adoption in many of our elementary and secondary schools, and colleges as well.

The Army was the first to use a simplified method of language instruction whereby the student gains a speaking knowledge of foreign languages in a fraction of the time required by conventional methods. This system has since been adopted by many of our civilian schools.

The Army pioneered also in a practical method of teaching, in which theoretical instruction is always followed by a demonstration and then by having the student perform the operation.

This principle of teaching was used on a large scale to train factory workers for the multitude of jobs performed in producing the weapons and equipment used in the last war.

On the other hand, the Army has also benefited materially from the findings of civilian educators; many of their methods are now used in the Army schools.

Many of our people do not realize that while the armed forces are charged with the responsibility for security, security is equally dependent on factors beyond the control of the military. We in the Army have given serious thought to the importance of education to the national welfare. A high level of general education throughout the Nation is regarded as one of the essentials to a comprehensive integrated program of national security.

Civilian education is of immediate interest to the Army in that an individual's ability to absorb military training is largely dependent on the level of schooling he has attained. Thus where civilian education has failed we have found it necessary to equip the recruit with the minimum knowledge

necessary to absorb the bare essentials of military instruction.

Moreover, the individual's potential value as a soldier is directly proportional to his educational level. His ability to rise and assume positions of leadership responsibility or technical proficiency are dependent to a high degree upon the level of education he has achieved.

Furthermore, as a Nation, we depend on trained scientists and technicians to maintain the scientific and industrial preeminence so essential in modern warfare.

But of even greater importance is the influence of civilian schooling on the character and basic attitudes of the individual. Three major forces—the home, the school, and the church—predominate in their influence over the individual. While character training was once largely the product of the home, with religion also exerting a strong influence, the schools have more recently assumed increasing responsibility for this function.

The relation of character development to our national strength may not be readily apparent. But when we probe the inner structure of democracy itself we discover that true democracy springs from a widespread sense of social responsibility among the people. Knowledge must not be regarded by the individual solely as a tool for his own advancement. A self-serving intelligence alone is not the aim of education in a democracy. Intelligence must be coupled with the development of character and ideals.

Character will perhaps be shaped in the schools as much by the student's constant association with his instructors as by formal instruction. For this reason it is imperative that among our teachers the highest type of moral and ethical standards be maintained. I am proud to state that the ethical and moral standards of the teachers of this community have always been of the highest.

From my own experience, let me add that the Army regards character as the most essential qualification of a good soldier and a good leader. By example in close daily association our leaders develop in the soldier a high type of character which is essential to his value as a soldier and a citizen.

In the school, character can be developed no less by organized athletics, the value of which will be greatly enhanced by the splendid plant now being erected here.

On the playing field the boy or girl learns the principles of sportsmanship and cooperation. Sports and other activities that put the student in first-hand contact with social facts, make them face the problems of working together and stimulate their best moral reactions. The Duke of Wellington once said that "the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." When faced with the final test, character will triumph.

Our greatest potential national strength is realized through an informed public opinion and a universal understanding of the duties and responsibilities, as well as the benefits, of citizenship in a democracy. The school is the institution most responsible for teaching our youth what democracy is and how it functions.

There can be no lasting peace in the world until there is a universal adoption of a common faith. That faith must embody more than religion, more than political ideology. That faith must stem from a fundamental regard for those ethical and moral precepts which insure the rights of man and his fellow man. It is a faith in a way of life. It gives strength and determination which stems from the conviction that the democratic way of life is the good way.

We have that faith in America today. Our schools must nourish and invigorate it, giving strength to this Nation as we strive for world-wide realization of that faith and the promise of a world-wide peace.

Analysis of H. R. 6189

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill known as H. R. 6189, a bill to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes. Although the purpose of this bill is quite simple to one familiar with Indian affairs, its meaning might be obscure to many not so informed. The welter of treaties, laws, administrative decisions, and interpretations that have developed through the years in connection with these matters makes it most difficult for the average man or woman to understand legislation such as I now propose. That is why an analysis of this bill would appear to be very much in order at this time.

Our Government has, for years, said that its purpose in all its dealings with the American Indians was their ultimate emancipation and freedom from restrictions and controls. This bill is another step in that direction so far as the Choctaw people are concerned. The Choctaws are a great race of people, and I am proud to say that they have made great progress. It remains now for our Government to recognize this accomplishment and bring up to date its relationships with the tribe.

By way of explanation I will develop briefly some of the history of the subject matter of this bill. In some of the treaties between the United States Government and the Choctaw Nation, there are sections providing for the granting of certain annual payments of money to the Choctaw Nation for a variety of purposes. Article 2 of the treaty of November 16, 1805, and article 13 of the treaty of June 22, 1855, provided a permanent annuity of $3,000. Article 13, treaty of October 18, 1820, and article 13, treaty of June 22, 1855, provided an annuity of $600 for the support of light horsemen. Article 6, treaty of October 18, 1820; article 9, treaty of January 20, 1825; and article 13, treaty of June 22, 1855, provided another $600 annuity for the support of blacksmiths. Article 2, treaty of January 20, 1825, and article 13, treaty of June 22, 1855, provided an educational annuity of $6,000. And article 9, treaty of January 20, 1825, along with article 13, treaty of June 22, 1855, provided an annuity of $320 for iron and steel. These annual payments totaled $10,520, and for many years such an item has been included in each annual appropriation for the Interior Department.

Obviously, there was good reason at the time for the inclusion of these articles in the treaties. For example, the money for light horsemen was necessary if the tribe was to preserve peace and order in its then vast domain. At the same time, these people needed iron and steel as well as blacksmiths, so provision was made for an annual payment for these vital purposes.

But changing times have changed the needs of these people. The procedures involved in the making of the appropriations for these treaty obligations puts an undue burden on the United States. At the same time, the amounts appropriated are too small to be of any real benefit to the Choctaws.

It is proposed, therefore, to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation of $10,520 into a lump-sum appropriation. This would be done by applying the formula commonly used in commercial circles, under which the amount required to commute a permanent annuity is considered to be the amount which produces at an interest rate of 3 percent the total amount of the annuity. The application of this formula in the present instance will require an appropriation of $350,666.67.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the lump-sum appropriation of $350,666.67, and provides that any amount so appropriated shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the Choctaw Nation.

Since the annual appropriations that would thus be commuted are a matter of treaty obligation, provision is made in section 2 of the bill for securing the consent of a majority of the members of the Choctaw Nation to the commutation. The wishes of the Indians would be ascertained in a referendum election to be conducted by the Secretary of the Interior under rules and regulations prescribed by him with the concurrence of the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to distribute per capita to the enrolled members of the Choctaw Nation, or their heirs and devisees, the lump-sum appropriation of $350,666.67, which would be made if the Indians consent to the commutation. This provision would further promote the objective of winding up as soon as possible the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes and would be entirely in line with the policy already recognized as appropriate by the act of June 24, 1948—Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress—which, in providing for the approval of a contract for the purchase of the coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, authorized the distribution per capita of the tribal funds of these Indians.

Section 4 of the bill authorizes an appropriation of not more than $20,000 to defray the expenses of the referendum required by section 2 of the bill, and the cost of making the per capita payments authorized by section 3 of the bill.

If this bill is approved, and I most earnestly hope that it will be, the question will be taken to the members of the Choctaw Nation. They will be afforded an opportunity to express by ballot their support or their opposition, and if they concur and an appropriation therefor made by Congress, the entire amount of the $350,666.67 will be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Choctaw Nation and paid out per capita.

I feel sure that this would be much more desirable to the individual Choctaw Indian than the present practice of making these token appropriations year in and year out.

Why Not Give Farm Labor Fair Consideration Under the Present Sugar Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news article is from the CIO News. The news article may be worthy, but what I would like to have the CIO do is to tell us why the present administration does not provide an acceptable wage for farm labor when the present law already provides for it under the Sugar Act.

Why does the present administration boast of their interest in a more satisfactory minimum wage when it provides a 25-cents-per-hour wage in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents per hour in Puerto Rico, and 32 cents per hour in Louisiana?

Does not and would not the sugar taste just as sweet with a minimum wage of 60 to 65 cents per hour, as in Colorado and California? Or 72 to 78 cents in Hawaii as it does in the 25- to 32-cents-per-hour regions provided by the present administration?

CHEAP LABOR BILL FLAYED

Sharp opposition to a bill that would provide large-scale farm operators with a flood of cheap labor from Mexico was voiced last week by the CIO.

Nathan Cowan, CIO legislative director, wrote to Chairman HAROLD COOLEY (Democrat, North Carolina) of the House Agricultural Committee that H. R. 5557 and related bills are neither essential nor desirable.

The bills "would bulwark the disgraceful exploitation of agricultural labor by large-scale farm operators," Cowan wrote.

"Whatever temporary arrangements may have been necessary during World War II to bulwark our agricultural manpower supply, it is neither essential nor desirable that Congress approve plans either (1) to continue the wartime emergency procedures, or (2) to open the floodgates for the admission of cheap foreign labor."

Under those procedures, thousands of Mexican peasants were brought into this country for jobs on factory-type farms, at wages far lower than prevailing United States standards.

Congress would do better to lift the minimum wage for farm workers and to eliminate abominable working conditions on the factory-type farms, Cowan said. Equitable action along these lines would be a more constructive approach to farm manpower problems, he pointed out.

The present administration's farm program is a landowner's program and a speculator's program instead of a farmer's program. It will not even provide a satisfactory minimum wage when it has the law to do so.

Flax—Not a Livestock Product

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with all the radio and newspaper comment about the egg program, I wish to call your attention to the funds tied up in nonlivestock products. The poultry business was a $3,000,000,000 business in 1948 and two billions was the farm return for eggs alone.

Surely the Government has some $80,000,000 in eggs but the egg producer has not had any subsidy all these years when billions have been dished out to the nonlivestock products. The past fiscal year $1,700,000,000 worth of grain was exported. A large percentage of these wheat exports were gifts under the Marshall plan.

Cotton exports in the past fiscal year were $814,000,000, of which a large percentage was a gift under the Marshall plan.

Take a look at flax, a crop with a total farm marketing value of less than $100,000,000 over the years. The Washington Farm Letter of September 24 states:

Flax: CCC has over $180,000,000 tied up in flax price support and stand to lose half or more of it, barring some unforeseeable sensational rise in prices in the next few years.

This year's crop is 42,000,000 bushels. Domestic requirements are 30,000,000 to 35,000,000. CCC may have to add to its present holdings. General plan is to sit on present stocks and let the 1949 crop move. Only bright spot in the picture from CCC standpoint is that growers in all but a few counties will have to put flax under loan or purchase agreement to qualify for price support this year and next.

No acreage allotments are planned for 1950, though support will be dropped to 60 percent of parity. This means total crop will be eligible for support, and producers can divert acreage to flax without penalty.

Yes, while the champions of the nonlivestock, soil-depleting crops and products have and are now providing special-privilege legislation for the products of their districts, they are providing that the livestock and livestock products get the short end of the legislative stick. Before they get too exercised about $80,000,000 tied up in eggs, a $2,000,000,000 crop, they should address themselves to the billions tied up in cotton, flax, and other nonlivestock products.

The amount of funds invested in all livestock products is mighty small when one realizes that livestock and its products provides much over half the national farm, food, and fiber needs. The small amount invested in livestock products would be zero, if the livestock products had had anywhere equal purchase consideration in the use of section 32 funds, and gifts under the Marshall plan.

It should be borne in mind that the livestock industry provides the great ever-normal granary that our country has ever experienced. So long as we import over $100,000,000 worth of beef and cattle, and pay out a billion and a half dollars to subsidize and give away soil-depleting crops like cotton and other soil-depleting crops, just so long will we have an upside-down agricultural program.

The following article from the Washington Post is additional evidence of the relatively small amounts invested in livestock and its products:

SIX HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR LOSS SEEN FOR UNITED STATES ON 1948–49 FOOD PRICE PROPS

The Government estimated yesterday that it lost $600,000,000 supporting the prices of farm food and fiber products during the year ending last June 30.

That amounts to about $4 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Commodity Credit Corporation published the estimate in its annual financial report. The agency supplies funds for the price-support program which is administered by the Agriculture Department.

The report showed that the big losses during the 1949 fiscal year wiped out all of the huge postwar price-support fund and put it $170,000,000 in the red. The fund originally totaled $500,000,000 and only $71,000,000 had been spent up to the start of the 1949 fiscal year.

Congress will be asked later to make up the difference.

The report disclosed that the Government during fiscal 1949 lost $254,000,000 in actual cash in carrying out price supports. The rest was an "inventory loss" representing the amount that will be lost when the Agriculture Department disposes of the huge stocks of commodities held under loan programs or in warehouses.

As far as actual losses were concerned, potatoes topped the list with a $203,886,000 expenditure. Another $23,000,000 was lost on peanut supports.

In inventory losses the Corporation estimated that 30 cents a bushel on corn and $8.33 a bale on cotton would be lost during fiscal 1949. That would amount to $99,000,000 on corn and $36,000,000 on cotton on the basis of stocks held on June 30.

In addition, the Government wrote off as lost $56,000,000 of its $529,000,000 invested in wheat, $75,000,000 on $191,000,000 it has invested in flaxseed and linseed oil. It figured as "lost" $38,000,000 of its $81,000,000 inventory of eggs.

The report also showed inventory losses on wool, peas, beans, barley, rosin, turpentine, prunes, raisins, grain, sorghums, and tobacco.

The report showed the Government had taken an actual loss on two dozen commodities. They ranged from the huge potato outlay to only $495 required to support the price of turkeys.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted unanimously by the Schenectady County (N. Y.) Board of Supervisors September 13, 1949:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the board of supervisors that it should be a funda-

mental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression, through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of law; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to Bernard W. Kearney, Representative in Congress; Irving M. Ives, John Foster Dulles, United States Senators from New York State; Oswald D. Heck, assemblyman, Schenectady County, and speaker of the assembly; Thomas F. Campbell, State senator, with the request that the legislative representatives herein mentioned make known to their respective legislative bodies the receipt by them of this resolution.

The Seattle Foreign Trade Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer at the dedication of the Seattle Foreign Trade Zone September 22, 1949:

All my life I have heard about the scenic beauty of Puget Sound and about this great harbor in Elliott Bay. When I was a boy I read with great excitement about the ships that left this harbor for Alaska loaded with men and supplies bound for the Klondike. In later years I was impressed by the descriptions of your great docks at Smith Cove, and of the swift unloading of the fabulously valuable cargoes of silk from the Orient. This is my first visit to Seattle, and I must say that this port and its magnificent natural setting more than live up to my expectations.

It is one thing for the people of a community to be endowed by nature with a spacious and beautiful harbor. It is another thing to take full advantage of such an endowment to develop a thriving trade. Through your own initiative you have made of this harbor a great port through which flows an impressive volume of trade with Alaska, with other cities along our coast, and with all parts of the world. Now you have taken another step to increase your facilities for handling foreign trade. This foreign trade zone which is being dedicated today was not created at the instigation of the Federal Government. It was your idea, and you have assumed responsibility for its success. As chairman of the Foreign Trade Zones Board, I examined your application and the engineering surveys you had made before requesting authorization for this zone. It was plain to me that you had made a careful survey and that you were convinced the zone would be advantageous to you.

This is the fifth foreign trade zone to be opened on the seacoast of the United States. We now have foreign trade zones at New York City on the east coast, at New Orleans on the Gulf coast, and at Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle on the Pacific coast. I believe that the great interest shown by the foreign trade community in the creation of these zones is a clear sign of maturity in our thinking as a people regarding the importance of foreign trade. Other great trading nations have long realized the usefulness of foreign trade zones—or free ports—in the development of trading between nations.

Foreign-trade zones make for flexibility in international trade. They are useful in many ways. In essence, a foreign-trade zone is a spot of territory in the United States that is free from the customs regulations ordinarily governing goods shipped into or out of this country. This means that shippers of other nations can deposit their goods in a foreign-trade zone without going to the trouble and expense of bonding or making formal entry of their shipments. It means that foreign traders may store their goods or samples of their goods on American soil until they receive orders for shipment to other parts of the United States or to ports in other countries.

No one can now foresee the many practical advantages of this foreign-trade zone that will develop out of experience and use. It will be a storage place where goods from foreign countries will be more readily accessible to American buyers. It will also be a place where the goods and materials produced in the United States can be mixed with goods from foreign countries and then reexported to other countries or brought into the United States. For instance, cotton goods can be brought to a foreign-trade zone from abroad, dyed with American dyes, and then shipped to another foreign destination. Spices and condiments of all kinds may be packaged in a foreign-trade zone and transshipped without ever going through customs. Sugar and flavoring may be brought to this zone, mixed with flour, packaged as baking mixes, and then reexported. These and hundreds of other possible activities will increase the activity of this port, and, no doubt, bring added employment to your people.

At present the activities of foreign-trade zones are somewhat restricted by existing legislation. For example, it is not possible to conduct formal exhibitions in a foreign-trade zone. Furthermore, the present law draws a distinction between the mixing and manipulating of goods in a foreign-trade zone and the manufacturing of goods. Many times the Foreign Trade Zones Board in Washington is forced to decide whether such operations as the galvanizing of pipe or the processing of chili peppers are permissible in a foreign-trade zone. Under the provisions of a bill that is now before Congress we would not have to make such hairline decisions. This bill would also make possible the holding of formal exhibitions in foreign-trade zones.

During the past year I have become intensely interested in the problem of increasing imports into the United States. It has become clear to all of us that if we are to maintain our present high rate of exports we shall have to import more goods from other countries so that they can earn the dollars they need to buy what we have to sell. One of the ways to encourage imports into the United States is to establish international trade fairs in this country, so that our businessmen may become better acquainted with the products of other countries. If the bill now before Congress is passed, permitting formal exhibitions in foreign-trade zones, we could then have continuous international trade fairs in progress at all of our five foreign-trade zones.

I have been deeply impressed by the energy and enthusiasm shown by the businessmen of Seattle in promoting the establishment of this foreign-trade zone. I was particularly pleased to learn about the trade clinic that you held a few weeks ago to discuss the problems and the purposes of operating a foreign-trade zone. I understand that this clinic was well attended by importers, exporters, bankers, professors from the University of Washington, and by men with general business interests. I have heard a great deal about the Seattle spirit, which drives the various groups in your community to cooperate toward developing the vast economic potentialities of this area. Apparently it was this spirit that lay behind the creation of this foreign-trade zone.

The future of the Pacific Northwest is rich in promise. You have great resources in hydroelectric power, timber, soil, and above all, in a growing population. I have discovered already that the people of the Northwest are optimistic. They have faith in the future and a deep faith in themselves. This federal-trade zone which we are dedicating today is another step in the economic development of the Pacific Northwest. It is not a panacea. It will not solve all of the stubborn problems of world trade. In economics, as in all other branches of social and political activity, we move ahead by taking one step at a time. If we are practical and realistic, we can continue to find other ways to move forward toward a happier and more prosperous world.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night, in Salt Lake City, Utah, Cathrine Curtis, national director of Women Investors in America, Inc., and president of Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., of 224 Second Street SE, Washington, revealed a plan which, when adopted by this country, will end all threat of atomic warfare.

Speaking at the annual dinner of the Utah Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, Miss Curtis pointed out that the atom bomb is not the first horror weapon used in war within our memory. Let me quote from Miss Curtis' speech of last Friday, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. She said, in part:

Do you remember that dread announcement of April 22, 1915, of the new German secret weapon, a horrible weapon, poison gas? The world was shocked, as much if not more than it was by the news of the atom bomb dropping on Hiroshima. The horror weapon of World War I was a byproduct of the laboratory, discovered by scientists seeking to produce new industries and new products.

We did not agree, as a result of that deadly byproduct, to place all chemistry first under Government control and then seek to turn it over to a world group control. We had some sanity and common sense then. We turned production gas weapons over to the armed forces, but left the chemical industry unhampered by Government control, able to go on producing its beneficial products to create new jobs, new wealth, new prosperity. * * *

Then why should we be frightened by the horror of the atom bomb into giving control of this great new discovery over to the Government or to an international group? That is what is being proposed by the two plans which have been advanced by our State Department and Russia. Both proposals would give all control over every phase of atomic energy to a world Atomic Energy Authority. That means, if either of these plans is adopted, that this new fuel for industry will be controlled by this world

authority. And, if you don't believe that he who controls a nation's fuel at least controls part of its industries, ask John L. Lewis. * * *

Instead of turning our backs on the great lesson we learned from World War I relative to the control of poison gas, we propose to put that lesson to good use now. We propose that:

1. All nations sign a protocol or treaty, similar to that signed in 1925, banning the use of poison gas as a war weapon, whereby all signatory powers agree to ban the use of atomic weapons in war.

2. Production of atomic weapons to be turned over to our National Defense Department, to which will be assigned the duty of producing atomic weapons more powerful and dreadful than those of any other nation as a warning to all countries of what will happen if anyone violates the foregoing agreement. The agreement of 1925 worked in World War II in preventing the use of poison gas.

3. Private industry have the right and be free to develop, make, and produce atomic energy for all possible constructive uses, in order to create new industries, new jobs, new wealth, and new investment opportunities in this country, thereby building to new heights our one great national defense asset, our mass-production system. * * *

It may well be that, upon the issue of keeping atomic energy for free and constructive use may depend the survival of our private enterprise system, the economic independence of American women, the continuation of the American home as the foundation of our economy and last, but by no means least, the survival of Christianity and the Christian principles which made our country strong and free.

Miss Curtis is right. Our one great national defense asset is our mass-production system and our private individual enterprise economy. Russia fears that more than she does the atom bomb. Like a light shining through a thick fog, her proposal is the beacon that can lead this country out of its coma of fear caused by atom-bomb propaganda to new industrial heights, new jobs, new wealth, all of which we need so badly to produce the revenues we must have if our Government is to be solvent, and to bring us to new mass-production heights that will make our Republic the most respected in the world.

This great American woman, whose proposal will place her name in history beside those of other great men and women who helped found, build, and protect this Republic, has shown the way. It is now up to us to follow her lead. In order to make this possible, I have introduced today a bill to put the Curtis atomic-energy plan into law.

We are continually declaring our belief in and adherence to our private individual enterprise system. We all know that system today as facing its most serious threat in history and is in danger of being replaced by a socialized, regimented economy under which there will be no individual liberty. Here is the opportunity for all to help protect, perpetuate, and make stronger that system.

I hereby call upon all true believers in the Republic, its representative constitutional system, and private individual enterprise economy—I call upon the President, Congress, industrial, financial, and business leaders, and all men and women to join in ending for all time this threat of atomic warfare and in creating new and greater job and wealth possibilities by helping to write into law the Curtis atomic-energy plan.

A bill to increase revenues by raising the national income, creating new jobs and new wealth, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. The President hereby is directed immediately to call a conference in Washington of all civilized nations for the purpose of obtaining the approval and agreement of said nations to ban the use of atomic weapons in war.

SEC. 2. The National Military Establishment hereby is assigned the duty of designing, developing, and carrying forward all activities necessary to produce the most efficient atomic weapons possible, to store such weapons within the continental limits of the United States, unless permission is otherwise granted by Congress, and to keep said weapons readily available and usable for the national defense in the event any nation or group of nations use or threaten to use atomic weapons for war purposes.

SEC. 3. The Atomic Energy Commission is hereby abolished and is directed to turn over immediately to the National Military Establishment all records, equipment, plants, machinery, and any and all other data, equipment and/or material in its possession.

SEC. 4. Public Law No. 585 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and all amendments thereto, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective when the terms of section 1 are declared by the Congress, by joint resolution, to have been fulfilled.

SEC. 6. This act may be known as the "Curtis Atomic Energy Act of 1949."

Promote the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this administration seemingly has adopted the attitude that the sum total of the wants of various voting groups adds up to a program that is for the best interests of the Nation.

I insert herein a searching editorial from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE

President Truman has now summoned the Constitution to the defense of the Fair Deal. In his radio talk to women Democrats he cited its declared purpose to "promote the general welfare." So, he contended, those "who say there is something alien or dangerous in the idea of a Government that works for the welfare of all our citizens" were 160 years behind times.

But is anyone saying that? Are they not merely disagreeing on the methods proposed? Is not Mr. Truman in effect saying "Papa knows what's good for you"?

Surely Mr. Truman has a valid complaint against the use of scare words and the labeling of his program as a welfare state. But isn't he confusing the issue when he makes the Fair Deal synonymous with the general welfare? Isn't the real issue not whether, but how Government should work for the general welfare?

Isn't it about time for those who debate the Truman program to stop tossing words around like daggers and get down to meanings? This newspaper does not believe that some Federal expenditures for education, for slum clearance, for reclamation and power projects, for social security, and for putting a floor under farm prices set up a welfare state. But we do believe that every step along this path should be checked and double-checked to make sure that it genuinely serves the general welfare.

For somewhere at the end of this road lies a paternalism which would undertake to guarantee comfort and happiness to everybody and can legitimately be called a welfare state. And along this road the political temptations are terrific.

Mr. Truman has illustrated some of them by his encouragement to grab-bag government, his holding out special benefits for special voting groups like the farmers and labor. The warning that nobody shoots Santa Claus may be old, but it is still needed. The President last year properly warned Congress against cutting taxes and risking deficits, but his current attitude encourages the belief that Federal aid costs nothing.

Moreover, his assumption that the wants of every voting group add up to what the country needs is basically mistaken. To say that satisfying the total combination of such wants by help from the Federal Treasury is synonymous with promoting the general welfare is like saying that a family deeply in debt will have its welfare promoted by doubling A's retirement annuity, sending B to the mountains for a rest, and buying a motor mower for C who cuts the lawn.

Don't we need to ask just how the general welfare is going to be promoted by each proposal?

What's Happened to Margarine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the September 17, 1949, issue of The Christian Science Monitor:

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO MARGARINE?

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Things have a curious way of disappearing in Washington, just as things do from a reporter's desk on his vacation. You come back to the Capital to discover that not merely a pair of scissors gets lost but something more important, national attention, gets lost.

Take the big drive to repeal the Federal excise taxes on oleomargarine. Six months ago it looked as though the thing was all over but the shouting. Coming back from vacation it looks as though it were the shouting that is all over. Are housewives going to keep on paying that tax? What's happened to margarine, anyway?

You remember, of course, that margarine (or poor man's butter) is the one food that the Federal Government levies a tax upon. To a whole lot of people including housewives the idea of this tax is absurd, not to say outrageous. There is probably more unanimity among consumers' groups and women's organizations against this tax than on any other one subject. The issue rose in the last election. Mr. Truman wanted the tax removed; Governor Dewey in a tentative way indicated to a Wisconsin dairy paper that he wasn't sure about it.

The Federal tax is 10 cents per pound on colored margarine, one-quarter cent a pound on uncolored. The result is that most wives are put to the necessity of squeezing and paddling and manipulating yellow coloring material into their butter substitute. You can watch them doing it every day over the white enamel kitchen tables of the Nation. It's almost like churning. It's kind of a queer manual operation for homes equipped with modern machinery like automatic washers and sink disposal motors, and husbands are known to comment about it.

In addition to this tax, manufacturers of the stuff pay $600 a year; wholesalers pay $480; and each retailer who sells colored margarine must pay a $48 tax annually to the Government.

In 1933 total revenue from this tax was $1,347,000; by 1948 the amount was up to $9,800,000; and this year the estimated tax yield is expected to be $18,700,000. Of course, a lot of the States impose their own taxes, particularly where there is a strong dairy interest.

The argument for the tax has been that it prevents the sale of a butter substitute not proved the equal of butter. The argument against it is that the two are nutritionally equivalent; that good butter and good margarine are both good foods; that it's queer business for the Government to tax one American food because it competes with another American food, and that, in brief, we are living in the year 1949 and for heaven's sake should wake up to the facts of life.

But what has happened to the "free-margarine" drive which attracted so much attention?

Well, the answer is that the big push put the bill across in the House of Representatives. Sponsor of the bill was Representative WILLIAM R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas. He has been introducing bills like this for the last 10 years and seeing them slapped down, sidetracked, or pigeonholed. This time it was different. The bill went through with a bang. The vote was 287 to 89 on April 1. Behind the vote you could hear a dim, faint sound rising from the kitchens of America where women were rolling little gooey capsules of yellow coloring material into federally taxed margarine.

The Poage bill may bring the triangular pat of "butter" to the American restaurant.

It provides certain conditions so that the customer may know he is getting margarine if it is served to him: One is that the yellow pat with his rolls shall be three-cornered. In lieu of that, the presence of margarine may be stated on the restaurant menu, or the pat may be molded to carry the letter "O" or "M" so that the man who eats may read.

The big question now is the Senate. Backing the repeal bill here is WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas. Three things have been done.

First, the Senate Finance Committee—which curious agency has been handling margarine—has favorably reported the Poage-Fulbright repeal bill.

Secondly is a queer development. Ever since 1932, the Army appropriation bill has carried a "rider" from dairy lobbyists requiring that soldiers shan't be served margarine. When the armed services appropriation bill came up August 29, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin punctually rose to attach the same old rider—and was beaten down, 45 to 31. In its own small way it marked a milestone. Congress has reached the point where it feels it safe for the Army and Air Forces to eat margarine. (The Navy is another matter; the existing ration law specifies "butter" for the Navy by name and it will require specific legislation to change it.)

Finally, the third development. As I was writing this column, a telephone call from Senator FULBRIGHT'S office announced that the seven-man Senate Democratic Policy Committee had just voted to make margarine repeal the No. 1 order of business in the Senate in the second session, meeting next January.

If consumers' groups are on their jobs, every sign is that repeal will come then. And that's what's happened to margarine.

Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Friday, September 30.

While I am not in complete agreement with the statement that the post office, if reorganized along the lines of the Hoover Commission report, should pay and be well able to meet the wage standards of general business, I am in agreement with the statement that the money is not lost by the rank and file employees. I have a rather intimate knowledge of Chicago postal employees and know how difficult it is for them to make ends meet under present conditions. To my mind, the bill H. R. 4495 which we passed by a vote of 332 yeas and only 2 nays is the absolute minimum required at this time. I had hoped that we might grant to postal employees the same sick and annual leave that we give to other Federal employees, and I had hoped too that it would be possible to grant them a salary increase more nearly commensurate with the cost of living. Apparently that is not possible at this time. Nevertheless, I shall continue to support and work for a program that will place postal employees on an equal plane with other Federal employees insofar as hours and leave privileges go, and on a plane with private employees with regard to wages.

To my mind the amendments made by the other body to the bill H. R. 4495 are totally inadequate and unacceptable, and I hope the conferees on the part of the two bodies will quickly agree to the House version of the bill.

POSTAL PAY RAISED

The Senate should concur with the House of Representatives on the $180,000,000 postal pay raise. The half-million postal workers are conspicuous examples of those who get left out in a period of inflation when institutional wages and salaries are slow to respond to the whipsawing of wages and prices in private industrial and commercial fields.

Postal work calls for honesty and intelligence. Its jobs are also public trusts to a great extent. The work is done well and also in an atmosphere of good manners that is usually more than routine.

The Post Office loses money. Reorganized along the lines of the Hoover Commission report it should pay, and be well able to meet the wage standards of general business. In any event, the money is not lost by the rank-and-file employees and the consequences of politics and inflation should not be taken out of their hides.

Health Insurance Is Modern Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., under date of September 27, 1949:

HEALTH INSURANCE IS MODERN NECESSITY

No one today should be without hospital or health insurance.

Not to carry any type of hospital, or health, or accident insurance is equal to betting one's income that he will never be sick or injured. Would anyone care to make that bet?

It is not likely that anyone could, yet for a reasonable fee private insurance companies will take such a bet.

Carrying insurance is necessary in order to pay for hospital and medical expenses incurred during a sickness or injury. One can't very well budget ahead for a period of expected sickness or accidental injury. But he can budget in a weekly or monthly premium that will keep him free from financial worries during his period of ill health.

The only possible reason for the proposal of compulsory health insurance being made by the Federal Government, patterned after the socialized medical structure of England, would be to provide medical and hospital care for everyone who cannot afford it.

Thus, to advance the argument in behalf of compulsory health insurance and a federally controlled system, its proponents argue that not everyone can afford hospital and medical care.

Yet the facts seem to be that practically anyone who can afford to live at all—to eat, to buy clothes, to buy housing—can afford to insure his health. Practically every corporation in the United States these days recognizes the necessity of insuring for it and helps out by contributing out of corporate funds for the premium payments of individuals.

A total of 55,000,000 Americans, out of nearly 150,000,000 (according to life insurance statisticians) today have voluntary health insurance plans.

Take one of the best known plans for hospital and health insurance, the Blue Cross system. A family can get insured for $3 a month, an individual for $1.50 a month. If sickness or injury visits, the policy allows $5 a day for 30 days for hospital costs for each family member each year. It also pays for special diets, nursing, operating room service, surgical dressings, basal metabolism tests, oxygen, all ordinary drugs, a $15 allowance for special drugs such as penicillin or streptomycin, a $15 allowance for laboratory work, a $15 allowance for X-ray work and a $15 allowance for physiotherapy, 10 days hospital care for a mother and one child, and payment for treatment of a communicable disease 10 days each year. There are certain qualifications, of course, but they aren't too technical.

Take another typical example of coverage offered by a typical private insurance firm.

For a premium of $5.65 per month for a family, regardless of size, the policy will pay for 90 days hospitalization for any one member for any one illness and also covers tonsillectomies, appendectomies, and childbirth, after a 9-month period from date of policy. Such a typical private insurance firm (and this newspaper has consulted insurance men and their ratebooks to get these actual figures) policy also covers: 10 times the

daily benefit which can run from $4 to $10 according to the premium amount, but which in this example is $5 for the extra hospital expenses; five times daily benefit for accidents putting one in the hospital; one daily benefit for a nonresident sickness; three daily benefits for emergency treatment needed less than 24 hours after an injury; $10 for X-ray; $6 for anesthesia at home or doctor's office; and $10 for ambulance.

There are many variations on that basic theme of coverage. But that in itself is a strength of voluntary health-insurance plans. You can get practically any particular combinati n of covcrage you desire.

Most important, if a family can afford a daily pack of cigarettes or a weekly movie, it certainly has enough money to buy health insurance and remove the specter of debt caused by sudden or long illnesses or injuries.

The Brookings Institution, a research organization, has figured that in the average household, medical bills take 4 percent of the income. Government taxes already take 20 percent and upward, of individual income, and the bite would be much heavier if taxes were levied to support a compulsory health insurance. Yet a breadwinner making $60 a week can pay 1 percent of his income to insure his whole family against heavy expenses for sickness or injury.

Health insurance is not a new idea. It has long been needed and long been available, because private companies saw the demand for plans to meet that need.

Compulsory health insurance is not needed. What is needed is a better factual educational campaign by medical associations and insurance companies to show the job that voluntary health insurance is doing and can do.

They have the figures to prove that voluntary health insurance can do a better job and at less cost to everyone than a Government compulsory health-insurance system.

It is quite true that everyone should have health insurance. And it is also true that the number of people taking such insurance is growing at a rapid rate.

It simply isn't smart nor foresighted not to have health insurance, and there are plenty of voluntary plans to suit your needs.

Veterans, Schools, and Colleges Greatly Concerned Over Recent Arbitrary and Unwarranted Regulation Issued by Veterans' Administration Curtailing Veterans' Educational and Training Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, actions which the Congress may take prior to adjournment may be of crucial importance to the veterans of our country—to those veterans who are vitally interested in continuing their education and training under the educational program of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—the so-called GI bill of rights. I say "critical" because of the ruling and regulation which the Veterans' Administration has recently issued crippling and, in some instances, curtailing the veterans' right to choose a course of education or vocational training which he may desire and to which he may be entitled under the law—that is, he had an entitlement until the Veterans' Administration issued its recent infamous instruction regulation 1–A curtailing that entitlement.

Under this regulation, certificates of entitlement to take a course of training under the GI bill of rights are canceled, effective September 12, 1949. As a result of a wave of protests, General Gray, the Veterans' Administrator, postponed the effective date of the regulation until November 1, 1949, but this action does not cure the disease—cancerous growth of bureaucratic regulation—it only postpones the necessity for treatment.

There is nothing in the law designating September 12 or November 1 as the deadline for applying for resumption of dropped training or for changes in courses or schools. The date was picked by the Veterans' Administration not long after passage of the VA appropriation bill on August 24, but everybody there kept it a dark secret until 3 days after it had become effective. First announcement of the deadline was made in a press release on September 15.

Officials have indicated that the early deadline was chosen with a view to cutting off enrollments in fly-by-night courses not likely to qualify under the ban on avocational training. This ban was instituted on July 1, 1948, and was extended in the new appropriation bill. Congress adopted the restriction to meet criticism of GI courses in dancing, personality development, horseback riding, and the like. But in slapping an early application deadline on such courses the VA inadvertently has administered a severe blow to GI students who wish to resume worth while, approved training, or who wish to take up a new line of study or switch schools. And to add to the difficulties of such students, some field representatives of the VA are reported to have ruled, in effect, that the mere seeking of a degree is not necessarily proof of a vocational objective.

Here is what the VA regulation does:

First. Cancels, in effect, all certificates of entitlement heretofore issued to veterans.

Second. Requires the making of new applications for certificates of entitlement—even though they are presently pursuing approved courses of training—to continue to pursue courses of educational training.

Third. Requires applications for supplementary certificate where a veteran desires to transfer to another institution—or change course, or courses, of training—failure to do so may mean loss of credit in addition to curtailing aid in tuition payments and authorized subsistence allowances.

Fourth. It requires the filing of affidavits and other supporting documents and evidence showing "complete justification"—whatever that may be, to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration—before certain courses may be approved.

The regulation goes on to describe in detail which courses a veteran may and may not take, leaving in doubt many that are undetermined.

The five-page, closely drawn, regulation is an effort by the Veterans' Administration to assume unto itself power which is not granted under congressional mandate and is, in effect, an entering wedge, under Federal regulation, of control of veterans' education.

The theory of the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights was that each veteran should be free to select and choose the type of training which the veteran desired to pursue and to leave to our State educational authorities the power to approve the colleges, schools, and institutions for offering training and the courses of training and study. This regulation is an effort to reverse that policy and to give to the Veterans' Administration almost complete authority over veterans' education and training—schools which they may attend and courses of study which they may pursue.

Congress in enacting the GI bill of rights took the position that a man old enough to fight for his country was mature enough to determine for himself what schooling he might want and might need—without an official of the Veterans' Administration telling him what course or courses he could take and those which he could not take. The Veterans' Administration here is trying to usurp authority which it does not possess and which it was never intended that the Veterans' Administration possess.

Personally, I dislike to be in constant warfare with Veterans' Administration officials, for I hold many of them in high esteem, but it seems necessary, at times, to protect the veterans' interest—to hold the Veterans' Administration in line, so to speak, otherwise the benefits intended by Congress may gradually be taken away and the funds appropriated exhausted through administration made necessary by the myriad of red tape and regulation.

It took a fight in the Eightieth Congress to preserve the veterans' flight training program—the VA wanted to curtail such training altogether even where such training, in many instances, was of vital importance for civil aviation and National Defense. By reason of the fight in the previous session of Congress, such training has been preserved, but here again the Veterans' Administration is endeavoring to curtail other types of desired and valuable training and to limit the scope of the application of the law through administrative regulation.

I hope that the Veterans' Administration will rescind its regulation 1–A—if not the Congress should prohibit the VA from issuing such a regulation which assumes unto itself complete authority over veterans' education and which eliminates the right and choice of decision of a veteran in selecting necessary and desirable courses of education and training.

There have been several bills recently introduced to accomplish this purpose. I shall support the principle of these bills although from a study of certain of these measures I feel they might not fully accomplish the desired objective. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill limiting the scope of VA authority in this field and I trust that the measure may have the support of the Members of Congress.

Czechoslovakian People Betrayed by Communist "Liberals"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, from a letter written in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia, on September 18, a newspaperman submits significant information relative to the infiltration of Communists, as "liberals," in Czechoslovakia and the ultimate seizure of government there by these Reds.

Mr. Speaker, the same kind of program that prevailed in Czechoslovakia prior to this conspiracy is the same kind of propaganda now being spread in this country. It will lead to the same result. We are on notice. As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including the letter in question which appeared in Mr. Frank C. Hanighen's Not Merely Gossip, a Supplement to Human Events, dated September 28, 1949. Every member of this body and every citizen should read this letter. It contains a vital message for all of us—at least, those of us who are interested in maintaining liberty and freedom in the United States.

The matter referred to follows:

LETTER FROM PRAGUE

Actually it was a letter written in Prague on September 18 and later mailed to us, air mail, from this side of the iron curtain. The writer, a newspaperman, says: "It is very significant that now, high in the Czech Government, acting for Moscow, are former labor union leaders, educators and writers, who once were the 'liberals' crying loudly for reforms, more pay, less work and all kinds of social measures. The clichés used in Czechoslovakia by the Social Democrats are almost identical with those heard in the United States. The left wingers in the various political parties were the stepping stones for the Communists. They softened up the people who were oppressed by the Nazis for so many years and who were reaching out for social reforms and liberty. For the old people, the liberals and left wingers offered pensions. For the workers, they screamed for social security. For the young people, they demanded job opportunities and better education. They wanted more and better land for the poor farmers.

"In the meantime, there was a steady and rapid infiltration of Communists who operated behind the liberals in the labor unions, schools and youth organizations. The newspapers, magazines and bulletin boards, because of the Communist control of unions, easily fell into line with 'liberal' policies. Czechoslovakia had 23 parties, ome with right and left wings. All this made for confusion, and the liberals and Commies increased it. The Commies so befuddled the public that in many sections of the country the people did not vote and thus opened the door for Communist domination.

"It is amazing and not a little disturbing to find so many familiar terms used behind the iron curtain. For one thing, there are 'county agents,' who contact farmers and farm labor, checking on crops, output, storage bins, etc.—something like the triple A boys of our Department of Agriculture. There are 'block leaders' who are in reality informers, watching the inhabitants of each block, what they say, who they consort with, etc. This term was used by Mrs. Roosevelt and became part of the Office of Civilian Defense organization in the war, fortunately for us an organization which missed fire. 'Welfare state' is used by Czech politicians, all Commies now, in talking of the benevolence of their administration. With this, come all the clichés with which we in the United States are now so familiar: 'Old-age security,' 'maternity benefits,' 'workers' housing.' These terms were used by the Social Democrats—counterpart of our New Dealers and Fair Dealers—before the Communist coup in 1948, and the Commie rulers still use them. The people talk about all these social benefits but admit now that with the advent of each one, they lost their freedom. The government has control of everything; a worker's pay, his vacation, his lay-off, his housing, his clothing rations, his food rations, the produce of his back-yard garden, the number of ducks or geese he keeps, the milk production of his cow, his children's education. The only thing the government does not control is the time of the birth of a child and the current joke is that 'it won't be long now before the dictators in Prague will prescribe the how—when—and where of a conception.'"

Another "Miracle"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent column by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Star on September 30, 1949:

ANOTHER "MIRACLE"—CONGRESS, HERE DESPITE DIRE PROPHECIES, HAS VOTED MUCH OF TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

With the end of Congress not too far away now, the time has come to note another Truman "miracle," less dramatic than the one of last November 3, but just as significant in its way.

It is the sort of miracle that happens gradually so that it escapes notice until suddenly, presto, there it is. It is the sort of miracle, too, that comes to pass through persistence and supreme faith, just as was the election last November.

It is a very simple thing, just this—that the Congress which met last January 3 is still here 9 months later and will accomplish finally, before it quits, a good deal, in spite of dire prophecies of only a few weeks back that it would do virtually nothing about Mr. Truman's legislative program. There were quite a few jokes about it all at Harry Truman's expense with which you are familiar.

TORTOISE BEATS THE HARE

To anyone who has watched Congress here for many years and knows its habits and customs, it is a miracle, in itself, merely that Congress would stay around this long in a time of prosperity and peace, though the peace we have it, it is true, is an uneasy one.

Even in times more critical, both at home and abroad, Congress would yank itself out from under the strings of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who appeared to be a much stricter taskmaster than Harry Truman. It is another case where the patient tortoise beats the hare.

The uneasy peace is an emergency of sorts. In measures connected with that President Truman has not had too great difficulties, though there have been enough. Accomplishments in the domain of foreign affairs stack up high—extension of the European recovery program, the North Atlantic Pact, arms for western Europe to implement it, appropriations for our own national defense, and extension of the reciprocal trade program on a basis sought by the President without the restrictions imposed by the Eightieth Republican Congress.

Success in these things is not unusual in times such as these, though it was not all easy by any means.

But in the field of domestic affairs President Truman has got results in Congress on such measures as previously have been possible only in times of emergency on the domestic front.

President Truman's record speaks for itself. A long-range housing bill denied so long by Congress. Increase in the statutory minimum wage, now in the stage of final enactment. A Federal aid to education bill passed by the Senate and waiting in the House until a religious controversy over it is adjusted. Completion by the House Ways and Means Committee of a comprehensive measure to extend coverage of the Social Security Act and increase benefits, long sought, which is ready for action at the next session. Public hearings and opening of national debate on President Truman's health insurance program. Revision of the Republican farm program soon to be completed, though not to the extent of the Brannan plan, which, however, is still being pressed on a wide front and kept alive as an issue for the future.

President Truman's technique has been very simple. He just kept plugging, telling the public about his program from time to time and its situation in Congress, nudging his leaders at the Capitol, pressing steadily, and completely confident. He just kept saying that Congress was going to stay here until it got something done about his program, and here Congress still is.

Capitulation on Arms-Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was among those who voted to cut the amount of the authorization for the military assistance program when it came before us in August. In that instance, I voted with the majority of the Members of the House.

Just before the House voted to restore the full amount requested by approving the report of the conference committee, the President announced that there had been an atomic explosion somewhere behind the iron curtain. This announcement was used as the basis for the capitulation of the House conferees and a majority of the House membership.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I can see no real connection between an atomic explosion and a plan to defend western Europe on the ground—a plan in which I have no faith.

I fear, along with one of the outstanding newspaper editors in the congressional district I am honored to represent here, that hysteria has dictated the action of the House.

The referenced editorial from the September 27 issue of the Waukesha Daily Freeman, of Waukesha, Wis., is here set forth:

HYSTERIA DICTATED ACTION IN ARMS AID BILL

It is apparent that considerable hysteria entered into deliberations yesterday of a joint House-Senate conference on rearming the North Atlantic security pact nations. House conferees in Washington late Monday scrapped their economy-sized foreign arms aid program and accepted the full $1,314,000,000 proposal previously approved by the Senate. Leaders of the conference denied that Russia's possession of the atomic bomb had anything to do with the decision, but it was an all too obvious factor. It is this type of hysteria in high places which usually draws nations into an arms race with one another and eventually leads to incidents that make war inevitable. Unless responsible leaders in this country are extremely careful in avoiding the elements of armed conflict, a new war cannot be avoided. While some members of the conference yesterday denied that their decision was based on the disclosure that Russia is in possession of the atomic bomb, others frankly admitted they were convinced a full arms program was necessary since President Truman's disclosure of an atomic blast in Russia.

A few weeks ago the North Atlantic Pact was ratified because this Nation wanted to make it crystal clear that if Russia should attack any friendly nation in Europe it would be regarded as an attack upon the United States. With this country as a signatory, the pact is unequestionably insurance against war because of its great potentialities. The Atlantic Pact presently confronts Russia with a combination of allies which can produce much more war material and equipment than all the rest of the world combined. If a nation would dare attack any or all of these countries against the overwhelming potentialities already in existence, any arms we may furnish now in peacetime, under the pending arms program, would be wholly insignificant as a further deterrent to such aggression. Supplying arms to implement the pact is unquestionably an act of war preparation without provocation and it cannot be justified by any other interpretation.

There is not a line or a word in the Atlantic Pact that binds the United States to furnish arms to other members of the pact in time of peace although those who are insisting upon putting "teeth" into the pact would have Congress and the people of the United States believe the pact and arms aid go hand in hand. To vote more than a billion dollars annually to arm signatories to the North Atlantic Pact may well mark the beginning of an arms race laying the groundwork for a third world war. The pending measure is, of course, unrealistic and could be only the cup of water to prime the arms race pump. There is no way that the United States can arm 16 nations in Europe to make them impregnable to a Russian invasion. There appeared no military expert before the Armed Services Committee who gave the slightest credence to the thought that this country could arm these nations so that an attack by Russia could be successfully repelled. But what this splatter of arms aid will do is make each of the 16 nations an active war conspirator against the Soviet Union and give the latter a powerful phychological weapon to use in whipping up the temper of the Russian people against the western nations and make the claims of Russian war mongers valid. Charges of warmongering have been thrown time and again against the United States by the dictator countries. It will be much more difficult to answer these charges—if they can be answered at all—once an active arms program is approved and the United States once again becomes the arsenal for a bloc of 16 nations.

Truman's Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of October 1, 1949:

TRUMAN'S WELFARE STATE

In many ways the speech which President Truman broadcasted Tuesday to the women of this Nation is the most important political document ever issued from the White House.

This address brings into the open an issue which has been disputed and denied for 4 years.

In his talk President Truman conceded for the first time that the real objective of his present administration, and the issue on which he will seek renewed control of Congress is the establishment of welfare-state government over the American people.

It was early September of 1945 that President Truman, then only a few months in office, delivered his first peacetime message to Congress. Prior to then, he had been merely coasting on the policies of his predecessor, President Roosevelt. For the first time the new President set forth his own objectives.

These objectives included socialized medicine, nationalized education, continued Federal controls over privately owned industry, cradle-to-grave social security, political favoritism to labor union bosses, bureaucratic regulation of production and markets and prices.

In a broader sense, what Mr. Truman proposed was that the Federal Government keep and strengthen the emergency wartime powers surrendered to it by Congress, by the Federal judiciary, by the States, and by the American people. He sternly resisted the strong sentiment in the Nation for a return of these various emergency authorities to the agencies of government entrusted with them by the Constitution.

A great many voices, including that of this newspaper, were raised at once to charge that Mr. Truman's program was outright state socialism, patterned after the welfare states of Germany, Italy, and Russia.

Mr. Truman's critics pointed out two things about the welfare-state system of government. They pointed out, first, that a welfare state has to become, of necessity, a police state; that it is at best, thinly disguised dictatorship, and at worst, communism along the pattern of Russia; that the welfare in mind is never, in the long run, what is best for the whole people, but merely what despotic bureaucrats decide is best for them; and that the individual, under the welfare pattern, becomes the slave of his government, with neither rights nor property nor future of his own.

The critics pointed out also that the welfare-state concept is an economic monstrosity, which never has worked, never will work, and never can work. They pointed out that welfare government drove Italy into the African invasion, forced Hitler to reach out for one conquest after another, compelled Russia to territorial expansion and mass slavery—all because the welfare principle calls for the dissipation of internal wealth faster than it can be created.

Since that period, Great Britain has also been added to the list of victims of the welfare-state form of government. The British Empire has fallen apart, England herself has steadily lost ground, the British people have suffered an austerity worse than they have experienced in centuries, and the Labor Party Socialist Government is moving rapidly into a dictatorship as rigid as that of present Russia or prewar Germany.

For 4 years, prior to last Tuesday, President Truman's reply has been a persistent denial that his proposals led toward an American welfare state. He has heatedly denied that they were socialistic either in whole or in detail. Even last year, when he campaigned on a platform which he swiped from Henry Wallace, who had copied it almast verbatim from England's Socialists, the President persisted in his denials.

But now the mask is off. Read closely the following quotations from the President's speech—for they define an issue which is the most fundamental question this Nation has ever faced; whether to preserve free government under the Constitution, or to abandon that plan for a one-way experiment in welfare-state socialism:

"Our program * * * is a program unshakably founded on the principle that the power of government should be used to promote the general welfare. * * *

"The general welfare is the sum total of the welfare of all the groups in the country.

"The Constitution was established to promote the general welfare. Those are the words of its preamble. And that is the duty of our Government."

So far as the Constitution is concerned, the President's statement is a fraud. It deceives with a half truth—perhaps one-sixth of the truth would be more accurate.

True, the words "promote the general welfare" appear in the Constitution among the list of fundamental purposes for which the Federal Government was founded.

But five other objectives are listed, all of which a welfare government would forget and abandon. These are: a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic transquility, provide for the common defense, and secure liberty.

Nothing could be more tragically erroneous than for the President to believe—or at least, to argue—that the writers of the American Constitution were trying to set up a welfare state.

That's what they were seeking to escape. The older form of this welfare-state proposition was the doctrine of the divine right of kings. King George the Third of England would have defended every one of the very long list of abuses listed in the Declaration of Independence (abuses closely similar to today's abuses of power by our own Government) on the theory that they were all intended to promote the general welfare of the whole British people.

Perhaps the best way to understand how wholly incompatible with the American Constitution is this new socialistic invention of the welfare state is to consider the question of minority-group rights under the two systems.

The American Constitution, if observed and followed, completely protects the rights of minority groups—whether as groups or as individuals. That is no accident. America was settled by minority groups, whose rights were trampled by the British crown or other despots. Their biggest single objective, in writing the Constitution, was to give protection to minority groups—hence the checks and balances, the limitations on the power of government, the assurance of hearings and open jury trials and appeals, the listing of guaranteed individual rights in the Bill of Rights and elsewhere.

The iniquity of the welfare-state system lies in this very point. Under that concept, no individual and no group of individuals are permitted to have any rights which the Government (which means the bureaucrats)

decide are contrary to the general welfare. Since the Government, and not the people, determine what is for the general welfare, the result is that all citizens lose their rights, whenever the Government sees fit to violate them.

Under our Constitution, the machinery is there by which any citizen can protect and defend his inalienable rights—primarily against his Government.

In the welfare state, no citizen can defend himself against whatever the government does to him—so long as the bureaucrats remember to say they are doing it "for the general welfare."

All this new Truman doctrine is tragically familiar. It takes us back to where this generation came in. The same siren song of dictatorship has been sung over and again. Every time, it has led to appalling disasters for the people who tried it. Over and over, it has spread its catastrophes far beyond the country which started down this primrose path.

The blunt truth is that the biggest single cause of the recent Second World War was Europe's various experiments trying to make the welfare-state system work.

Every recent dictatorship, from Russia's down through the list of Germany and Italy, and into such smaller and lesser publicized ones as those of Argentina, Portugal and Spain—every one of them started out on the concept of being a welfare state.

Consider the case of Germany. What was the sales talk on which Hitler sold the German people with the idea of letting him be their dictator?

Idea for idea, and almost word for word, it was the same proposition which President Truman has made to the American electorate. Compare the following paragraph from a Hitler speech (February 20, 1938) with that of President Truman 11½ years later:

"The new Reich shall belong to no class, no profession, but to the German people. It shall help the people find an easier road in this world. It shall help them in making their lot a happier one. Party, state, armed forces, economics, are institutions and functions which can only be estimated as a means toward an end. They will be judged by history according to the services they render toward this goal. Their purpose, however, is to serve the people."

Hitler's story was that everything he did, from persecuting the Jews to disbanding the Reichstag (Germany's Congress), was for the welfare of the German people. That was the most disastrous deception recorded in history—thus far.

If America agrees to try out the welfare-state proposals made by President Truman, then what comes next? The answer to that is ready at hand. Consider some further quotations from Hitler's address referred to above:

"Whoever disturbs our mission is the enemy of the people * * * I have a right to turn against those who, instead of helping, think their mission is to criticize our work."

There you have it. Behind every welfare state is government's mailed fist. Hitler was shaking it, in 1938—and shaking it, bear in mind, primarily at critics in his own country. The mailed fist is beginning to emerge from the confusion in Britain's welfare-state experiment. It bears down unmercifully on every individual in the Russian welfare state.

The welfare pattern is very simple. The would-be dictators buy votes and power with the people's money. They make impossible promises. When these fail, they outlaw criticism, put it down ruthlessly as obstructionism and treason.

Is that the future which the American people want?

Alaska's Defense Imperative to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, from Detroit, Mich., from Washington, D. C., and many other cities in these United States come warnings as to the ultimate meaning of a poorly defended Alaska.

These editorials support the general position which I took following an Alaskan inspection trip in mid-September.

The Washington Post of September 29 indicates the crux of the Alaska defense problem to be the lack of housing and accommodations for troops:

The most significant thing is not that the accommodations themselves are deplorable, but that the lack of housing is a limiting factor on the number of troops that can be stationed in Alaska.

And the Post adds:

If the defense of Alaska is vital to the safety of the United States—a proposition no one would challenge—then the first essential is to provide for the welfare of enough troops to man the outposts.

The Detroit Times estimates the costly meaning of inadequate Alaska defenses in this editorial which I ask be printed in the RECORD:

OUR VULNERABLE COASTS

The decision of the Air Force to divert bomber plane production from the Pacific Northwest, specifically from the Boeing plant at Seattle, to the Middle West, on the grounds of national security, raises many grave questions.

If the state of our national defenses is so desperate as to make the Seattle area vulnerable in this degree, it is difficult to imagine that any of our coastal areas, either east or west, are any less vulnerable.

In fact, the whole proceeding seems to be an American version of the Russian tactics of the last war in "getting behind the Urals."

But, in this instance, since Russia is our only potential enemy and Russia's only medium of effective war against America is by air, it is hard to imagine that our area of vulnerability—if it is as bad as the Air Force policy suggests—can be limited to our coasts.

Of course, if we are going to continue leaving Alaska as undefended and defenseless as it is today, then the Russians would occupy the whole Alaskan territory in a matter of hours and in a matter of a very few more hours would unquestionably have our centers of industrial production and transport under aerial bombardment.

Surely in that case the Seattle area would be vulnerable, but so would every other production center within aerial bombardment range of Alaska—and if the Air Force thinks Wichita and Omaha are out of that range, it should take a refresher course in map reading.

It all boils down to this:

If our coastal areas, either west or east or both, are so vulnerable to military assault by Russia that our defense plants are precariously situated, then the whole country is almost equally vulnerable and all of our defense plants are in a precarious situation.

The obvious answer is that, if the country is to be safe at all, its coasts and outposts must be made invulnerable and impregnable—and the place to begin and right now is Alaska.

There is no longer any such thing as "getting behind the Urals" in modern warfare, the range of aerial warfare being what it is.

The removal of bomber plane plants from Seattle to Wichita, leaving Alaska undefended, is like trying to hide an elephant in a cellophane bag.

Of course, the Seattle plants would be doomed if the Russians had Alaska, but so would the plants in Wichita and Omaha and probably Bangor and Miami.

So, why let the Russians have Alaska?

Why do we not make our coasts safe, and not continue to leave them vulnerable?

There is only one way the Russians will ever be able to make war against us in our American homeland, and that is by air.

So, why do we not make ourselves invulnerable to attack by air?

Unless we do this, there is no use running inland for safety in America, for there will be no safe place to hide in our whole American homeland.

Our vulnerable coasts are indeed a menace to us.

But they need not be either vulnerable or a menace.

The best way to defend America in the event of future war is by being strong.

The best place to begin is by making Alaska strong, and all our coasts and frontiers and outposts impregnable.

The best means, in fact, of avoiding future war altogether is by being strong enough to discourage our potential enemies from making war upon us, and that should be the solid rock of our defense policy.

The conclusion reached by these widely separated newspapers agree substantially with my report to the people of the first Washington congressional district, which I made upon my return from Alaska, September 14.

In this preliminary report I stated in part as follows:

Since leaving Seattle last Friday for Alaska with Air Secretary Symington I have inspected military installations at Juneau, Sitka, Anchorage, Nome, Fairbanks, and Point Barrow. I've seen the military airports at Elmendorf, Ladd, Eielson, Point Barrow, and Nome. I have conferred with Alaska military commanders, public officials, civilian business men and rank and file officers and enlisted military personnel.

I have examined with care the installations and the nonsecret plans of the Air Force for the protection of Alaska and the Northwest. Secretary Symington and I are in agreement, I believe, with the military experts in Alaska that the strictly military installations, such as air fields, are reasonably adequate or in process of being made so. We have agreed also, however, that the necessary supply and personnel facilities are woefully inadequate and render the military installations far less efficient than they must be.

The primary military need in Alaska today is housing for personnel. Thousands of trained troops are standing by in the United States awaiting transportation to Alaska because there are no housing accommodations for them in the territory.

Those officers and enlisted men presently in Alaska are suffering unbelievable housing hardships to serve their country. Tar paper shacks and unsuitable Quonset huts endanger the health and morale of our troops. Barracks are overcrowded, primitive, and inadequate in number. Family quarters, on base or off base, are almost nonexistent and when available are outrageously expensive. I visited several officer and enlisted men's families in their rented quarters. Typical is the case of an Air Force sergeant—a highly skilled aircraft technician. This sergeant,

his wife and two children have secured a two-room tar paper shack with no plumbing and a kerosene stove. For these sumptuous quarters the sergeant pays $150 per month. It is no wonder that key service personnel all over Alaska—officer and enlisted alike—are planning on leaving the service at the earliest possible time if housing conditions are not improved. Without exception they said they liked Alaska and would stay if suitable housing were available.

Naturally building costs in Alaska are higher than elsewhere. In addition to transportation costs for materials and high living costs for construction labor, every housing installation must be equipped with complete utility facilities. Except in rare cases there are no established water, electricity, and sewage systems to tap into. These must be installed from scratch as part of the building project. Short-sighted, economy-minded-at-all-costs Congressmen have refused adequate appropriations and have clothed their verbal opposition in pious platitudes about so-called excessive building costs in Alaska. Many of them cannot be made to see the facts but they can be outvoted.

The welfare of the Nation, the security of the Northwest and the defense of Alaska require immediate steps to solve the critical military housing shortage in Alaska.

All responsible officials with whom I conferred agreed that adequate military housing was the key to adequate Alaska defenses and therefore was the key to removing from Seattle and the Northwest the stigma of strategic vulnerability.

Alaska family housing needs, totaling more than 13,000 civilian and military family units and almost as many barracks units, should be a challenge to the building industry both in Alaska and in the Pacific Northwest. Private industry with a knowledge of Alaska building problems has a responsibility it should not shirk.

In Alaska I found Territory and city officials moving to take advantage of legislation already passed by this Congress to improve housing conditions.

I met with the Alaska Housing Authority and reviewed advances it has made under the Alaska Housing Act passed this year. I discussed with the housing commissioners and others, both military and civilian, the importance of the Military Housing Act, passed just a few months ago, under which a 418-unit apartment building is being constructed on Government land in Anchorage. I discussed the meaning of the Alaska Public Works Settlement Act with Governor Gruening and others. I discussed the meaning of the Eklutna hydroelectric bill passed by the House with the city officials of Anchorage. These are cited now just to reassure the Pacific Northwest that development of importance to defense is not standing still.

While housing is by far the major and immediate concern, other problems must also be solved in order to provide complete military protection for Alaska and the Northwest. Port facilities must be expended. Methods for better distribution of vital oil supplies must be found. The Alaskan road network must be extended and improved. Further studies on the necessity and feasibility of the railroad link between Alaska and the United States should be expedited.

We are well on the way to an improvement of the vital radar network. The Congress has already authorized, in Public Law 30, an $85,000,000 radar screen in recognition of Alaska defense needs. The economy-at-all-cost program apparently will prevent an appropriation. However, Secretary Symington has assured me that for a program as important as this he will see that funds are made available from within the military budget.

All of these projects will cost money but it will be money well spent in the interests of national security. We cannot afford to listen either to those who demand penny pinching at all costs nor to those who pompously demand indiscriminate budget cuts 1 minute and clamor for costly defense measures the next.

As Secretary Symington put it when talking to the commander of the isolated Eielson air base north of Fairbanks, there is no economy in a program where the lack of a $10,000 house results in the loss of a million-dollar airplane. This could, and has been the case, when highly trained airplane mechanics leave the Air Force at the end of their duty simply because they can't bring their families to Alaska. Then because of the lack of efficient mechanical care, an airplane cracks up—a measurable million-dollar loss in the plane and an unmeasurable loss in the death of pilot and crew.

A safe majority of the Congress can be made to see the absolute and immediate necessity for adequate Alaskan and Northwest defenses. By continuing to work together with a high sense of community, area, and national solidarity—and without narrow partisan political bickering—we can work out satisfactory and permanent solutions to our Northwest defense and employment problems.

Under instructions from Chairman SPENCE, of Kentucky, I will submit a formal report on housing to the Committee on Banking and Currency as quickly as all of the complicated figures and facts collected in Alaska can be correlated.

Margarine Manufacturers Deny Use of Trash Fish Water in Oleo Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on July 5 of this year I called the attention of Members of the House to an article reprinted from the Utah Fish and Game Bulletin in an issue of a publication of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. In that article it was stated that the water pressed from trash fish was used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

I submit herewith a letter which I received yesterday from Paul T. Truitt, president of the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MARGARINE MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1949.

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will doubtless recall your remarks, which appeared on page 8834 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of July 5, regarding the use in margarine of water pressed from trash fish, as reported by the Utah Fish and Game Bulletin.

Since this source of vitamins for margarine was entirely unknown to us, we made immediate inquiry of the United States Wild Life Service and also of the Utah authorities. We quote the following paragraph from page 4 of the August 1949 issue of the Utah Fish and Game Bulletin:

"Your editor wishes to make a correction of an error found in the July-August 1948, issue of this bulletin. It was stated the body water was impregnated with vitamins and was used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. This statement was based upon inaccurate information. Investigation indicates stick water is used in no food product."

We trust you will correct the statement in the RECORD at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely your,
PAUL T. TRUITT, *President.*

Palestine Students in the United States Are Distressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter that appeared in the Washington Post on September 30. It points out the plight of many Palestinian students who are in the United States, who apparently have no visible means of support. In most instances their homes in Palestine have been destroyed. It would seem that special consideration should be given to this group as we have accorded other nationalities.

PALESTINE STUDENTS

May I draw the attention of your readers to the plight of Palestinian students in the United States?

There are about 200 of us. We came before the Palestine mandate ended, with funds provided by relatives, in the expectation that further remittances for the period of our studies could be sent us.

At the end of the mandate, fighting broke out in Palestine and continued for many months. Communications were disrupted and a great proportion of Palestinians were driven from their homes. Most students have not heard from their families since, let alone received funds, and do not know their fate.

In spite of appeals to the American Government, no financial help was forthcoming to tide us over. Return to Palestine was practically impossible in the circumstances. Our situation has become desperate. We can only take part-time employment, provided it does not interfere with our full-time studies, and jobs are very hard to get. Our resources are gone; we can get no funds from Palestine through no fault of our own.

Most of us have no home to return to and there would be no jobs if we did return to the small part of Palestine, now crowded with refugees, which is left to those war victims. We are moreover to all intents and purposes stateless.

Cannot something be done to help us exist until conditions are better? Some of us, like myself, would like to settle down in the United States but we cannot stay or continue our education here, on which our future depends, without some guaranteed means of support. We cannot get a job unless we find an employer who can obtain us a Department of Justice permit, which is almost impossible now in view of the labor situation. But when we appeal for help here we are told: "Why don't you go to Palestine?"

Our plight is in great part due to the role this country played in Palestine affairs and I feel strongly that we have a right to expect a helping hand from the United States.

JOE NUSEIBEH.

WASHINGTON.

Croatian Fraternal Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution in defense of the principles of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America

The Croatian Fraternal Union of America, a fraternal benefit society created 55 years ago under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, today comprises a membership of more than 100,000, with assets of $17,000,000. It operates in a majority of the States of the United States and in the Dominion of Canada, in strict accordance with the laws of the various jurisdictions in which it does business. Membership is open to any person of Croatian or other Slav birth or descent, irrespective of political or religious belief.

The charter and by-laws of the organization prohibit participation by the Croatian Fraternal Union of America or by any subordinate lodge in any political or religious controversy. To this principle the Croatian Fraternal Union of America sedulously adheres. The members of the organization, as individuals, however, retain the right of all Americans to espouse political and religious beliefs of their own choosing.

The Americanism and the patriotism of the Croatian Fraternal Union require no affirmation or protestation. The contributions of the organization and of its individual members to the successful prosecution of World War II stand for all to see.

Because we feel that there has been an organized campaign against our organization instituted by a minority group in opposition to the present administrative heads of the Croatian Fraternal Union, and the wide publicity given this, we deem it appropriate to set forth clearly and without equivocation the principles by which the Croatian Fraternal Union of America is guided.

Be it resolved, therefore, by the supreme board of directors of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America, in regular semiannual session duly assembled, that—

1. As a society of loyal American citizens, we are unalterably opposed to any individual, organization, or foreign government which seeks to impair or weaken the safety and well-being of the United States of America. We shall continue to train and educate ourselves and our children in the ways of American democracy and in our responsibilities to the United States and to its free institutions.

2. We shall not permit the Croatian Fraternal Union of America or any of its lodges to participate in any political or religious controversy. We recognize, however, that as American citizens, our members are free to engage in such lawful political or religious activity as they see fit. We do not seek, nor do we have the right to condemn or inhibit such activity on their part.

3. We deeply deplore and bitterly condemn the efforts of those individuals and organizations which seek to embroil the Croatian Fraternal Union of America in political and pseudo-political disputes and personal quarrels. Such individuals and organizations are seeking only the complete destruction of the Croatian Fraternal Union.

4. Our interest in and respect for Yugoslavia stems from the sentiment and gratitude we hold for the world renowned culture and social contributions willed to us by our forebears who were part of that land. We see nothing in this spiritual and sentimental attachment incompatible with our complete loyalty to the United States. Should a conflict ever arise, however, between Yugoslavia and the United States, we are always mindful of the fact that ours is an American organization, composed of American citizens, and our allegiance, our loyalty, without reservation or diminution, would be on the side of the United States of America.

Done in Pittsburgh, Pa., this 13th day of September 1949.

V. I. MANDICH,
Supreme President.
JOHN BADOVINAC,
Supreme Secretary.

The Congress Is Beginning To Act Like South America's Zo-Zu Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the debate in the House last Thursday on the conference report concerning appropriations for the Economic Cooperation Administration was most disappointing, and I believe the public who happens to read that debate will conclude likewise.

The Senate had raised the amount the House authorized by $60,000,000—this was agreed to by the House conferees, and then the Senate had attached another amendment providing for $150,000,000 for loans to those countries. Those in charge of the bill definitely stated that this amendment merely earmarked $150,000,000 for loan purposes and would be deducted from the whole sum authorized. That statement had the direct effect of carrying the amendment. The facts were at the time of the debate and still are that this amendment made $150,000,000 more available to Europe through loans, but this $150,000,000 is in addition to the amount authorized by the House, plus the $60,000,000 added by the Senate. The $150,000,000 is not deductible from the original authorization, but adds $150,000,000 to it. If Members of Congress do not know what is happening on the floor, what can the people expect? The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] tried in vain to inform the House of this added $150,000,000, but the majority paid no attention and voted the amendment.

This Congress is getting more like the zo-zu bird of South America every day. Nature equipped that bird with eyes in the back of its head instead of in front. It cannot see where it is going, but it does know where it has been.

The way we are appropriating billions when we have not a red penny except what we borrow is a lesson in economics that was omitted from any course of study with which I am familiar.

The leaders in charge of this amendment adding $150,000,000 more to the ECA said the $150,000,000 would be loaned by the Export-Import Bank and that this institution was looking for good loans right along. It seems to me it is unnecessary for this bank to worry about finding good loans, when Uncle Sam is now $4,000,000,000 behind in expenditures today. Why not encourage this bank to loan some money to Uncle Sam, instead of skylarking around Europe to find some nice choice, juicy loans, especially so since this Export-Import Bank is one of Uncle Sam's financial arms.

That amendment was just another ruse to boost the appropriation for the ECA by $150,000,000.

Wisconsin, on Its Own Two Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, because it speaks so clearly of a philosophy of government which I personally hold, I am pleased to include herein an editorial from the leading newspaper in the Second Wisconsin District, the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis.:

WISCONSIN, ON ITS OWN TWO FEET

There have been a few cracks made in these parts about the record-high budget approved by the 1949 Republican legislature.

"The Republicans claim to be in favor of economy, but the Republicans that control the Wisconsin Legislature approved the spending of more money than any other law-making body in State history," complain the critics, who are Democrats.

This would seem to be a justifiable criticism.

Until you remember that the No. 1 problem faced by the American people today is to find a method of checking the fantastic growth and power of the Federal Government in Washington.

Yes, the 1949 legislature voted to spend quite a bit of the taxpayers' money. Why?

Perhaps a clue can be found in a speech given by Wisconsin's Governor Rennebohm in New York Thursday. The Governor told the annual convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists:

"How many of you, I wonder, have considered that the growth and complexity and resulting inefficiency of this great machine in Washington is due in some part to the unwillingness of the local governments and the State governments to fulfill their responsibilities?

"The way to check this dangerous trend to big and irresponsible government in Washington is to build vigorous and responsible government at home. If each community in our land and each State did all that it reasonably could do to solve its own problems, and resisted the temptation to stand in the handout line outside the Federal Treasury, there would be fewer impulses and less need for this expensive (Federal) organization which we have built. We must build in our towns and our own States the kind of government which solves problems without help or assistance from the outside."

Well said, Governor.

The increased spending by Wisconsin's Republican lawmakers in 1949 was principally in the fields of public welfare and education.

These are the very fields in which the big Government supporters are most energetically attempting to extend the authority and power of the Federal bureaucracy.

Admittedly, progress must be made in these two important fields. And how could the State of Wisconsin better combat the growth and expansion of Federal authority than by doing the job itself?

We hold to the belief that a State government can do necessary jobs cheaper, more efficiently, and to the taxpayers' satisfaction more readily than the Federal Government.

If we tend to our own business, the Federal Government won't have to come to our rescue. And if we, right here in Wisconsin, do our local and State governmental duties well, those who seek an excuse for the expansion of Federal authority will have to travel elsewhere to peddle their wares.

That is one reason, of course, why the big Government boys get so excited about spending—if it is done by a State administration.

If the Federal Government appropriated money for the same purposes, it would be wonderful.

It would, we also must point out, be more expensive.

A Warning to Disabled Veterans Who Have Permitted Their Insurance To Lapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House, I want to call attention to the fact that all service-connected disabled veterans of World War II who have dropped their insurance have a right to reinstate it up to December 31, 1949, without examination.

There are thousands of these disabled veterans who have let their insurance lapse and who probably are not aware of the fact that they have a right to reinstate it without examination.

It would be to their interest to reinstate this insurance in order to protect themselves and their families.

I hope that all the veterans organizations will take this proposition up and urge these boys to reinstate their insurance at once.

For, if they should fail to take advantage of this opportunity between now and December 31, then, they and their families would lose the protection which this insurance provides.

The Real Struggle: The Battle of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 4 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all of us, I am sure, are familiar with the very fine publication issued by the Daughters of the American Revolution each month and published here in Washington. It has been my pleasure and privilege on several occasions to have various statements of mine reprinted or published originally in this distinguished periodical. In the October 1949 issue there was carried a reprint of one of my talks regarding the ideological struggle now going on throughout the world and within our own boundaries. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article as published in the DAR magazine be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL STRUGGLE: THE BATTLE OF IDEAS

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Man's spirit at noontide stands,
Reflecting the intelligence of that hand
That shaped the spheres.
So man, through the years,
In mind, whole, complete,
Remains immortal, with powers replete,
And though mortal anchors slip away,
Man lives forever and a day."

In those lines there is the idea that man's spirit at noontide stands, reflecting the intelligence of the Almighty. In that language there is the concept that man is immortal—not a temporary bit of human clay, not a creature without a soul. The ideas of the material and the spiritual have been in conflict throughout the centuries.

We read in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In that paragraph is a granite idea that has come in conflict with the Fascist and Communist concepts. This language of the founding fathers, when interpreted as they meant it—(remember, "The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive")—this language is in agreement with the dynamic words of John: "Now are we the sons of God."

Unfortunately, some of our alleged liberal friends cannot see in these words of the Apostle, or in the words of the Declaration of Independence, the true spiritual meaning that they possess. Looking back through the years and rejoicing in our finest traditions of the past, we realize that we are at a turning of the road, just as in 1776 our fathers found themselves at the crossroads. They took the right, that is, the correct turn, and it is for us to take the right turn.

Today the battle is on in this struggle of ideas. You may call it the battle between Christianity and paganism, between the things of the spirit and materialism, between the democratic way of life and totalitarianism, or you may call it a battle between capitalism and communism. At any rate, the time for straight thinkers has come.

Every man's mind is an arena and in that arena are exponents of these various concepts. Every nation is an arena and the conflict is waged therein between the exponents of the various ideas. Yes, even behind the iron curtain the love of liberty burns, though dimly. Within the human soul, there are the wellsprings for better things, though, of course, in Russia and in the other police states, there is very little opportunity for minds to get constructively into action—in a democratic fashion.

On one side of these arenas—in the states of the earth and in the minds of men—there is the idea or exponent that elevates the individual, that gives him the dignity of a thing of the spirit—on the other side, man is considered as mud, as mere material substance.

In our own land, this conflict is reflected in various minor conflicts. One is between the concept of a planned society, wherein the state is master, and the concept of free enterprise, where man is a free builder and creator. You know that the exponents of a planned society and of the police state fill men with fear. They put to the fore the issue of security, wherein men are asked to surrender their freedom for what is alleged to be economic security guaranteed by the state.

Yet, as we look around Europe and the rest of the world, where the police state obtains, we see that the freedom which men had under the free-enterprise system has been bartered away for the freedom to starve, and for the supposed freedom to be ruled like animals. In this conflict of ideas, we who are exponents of the American way must not permit the shouting and the tumult to detract us from the line of attack. In spite of our economic recessions and a certain instability, in spite of, in particular, the world collapse in the thirties involving America, we ask: What other nation can be compared with our own? Where else do people have the income, the comforts, the standard of living, that we have here?

But you hear someone say: Is there no place for intervention by the state? Lincoln answered that, and I quote his words:

"The legitimate objective of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do it all, or cannot do so well in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves the government ought not to interfere."

Instances where the state can act best are, of course, illustrated in times of great depressions or panics or war. In such cases, the intervention of the arm of the state functions as the arm of the people. But it should be only temporary so that it doesn't give opportunity for the servants of the people (who are the officers of the state) to become the masters of the people and the masters of the state.

We realize that the challenge to America's enterprise system is principally that it has not always provided economic stability. We recognize that, of course, our system is run by men, human beings, with human shortcomings. We recognize, too, that the world has been shrunken and that what happens in the rest of the world automatically affects ourselves. We have seen that now in two world wars when the war fever has crossed the oceans. There was no iron curtain to prevent it. And with the war came a disarranging of our whole economy, and what is more, a tremendous spending of our material wealth. We have been on a material jag which has left us with the jitters—high prices, shortages, and so on.

Now it is recognized by the medical profession that a fever is not a sickness, that it is a result—not the cause. And what human beings must do is to get at the cause of these fevers—wars, depressions, and other ills. The American enterprise system is a result of our American way of thinking and when we experience a fever which interferes with the American enterprise system, we should not destroy the system, but get at the cause of the fever.

If we follow this idea, we will not permit the exponents of the Fascist or the Communist ideas who are battling in these arenas to take our minds off the value of free men, but go forward and meet the challenge successfully on every front. We know that those who would destroy our American way of life which includes the free-enterprise system, say that it is inefficient in producing wealth, and it is inefficient in the distribution of what it has produced. And so they argue for the police state, for a so-called regulated economy, for the withdrawal of the economic

freedoms that have made America great. These folks want the job planned and executed by a chosen few whom we call bureaucrats. They want the Government to allocate labor, materials, and resources.

Now let us demolish this fake argument that the free-enterprise system is inefficient.

Studies recently released show that American productivity has increased at the rate of 3 percent a year over the last 50 years. More people are receiving more things—in other words there is a more equitable distribution—than ever before. And the facts show that the so-called depressed one-third of the Nation made greater progress during the war than the other two-thirds.

We know, too, that where governments—national and state—have engaged in planning, that it hasn't brought about the millennium. In Britain, where industry has been nationalized, it hasn't increased the productivity potential. There simply is no substitute for work and production. We have seen politicians seduce the workers by saying they could be paid more for less work. And we have seen the evils that followed in the wake of such falsehood.

We also know from what has taken place in Great Britain that when the state nationalizes its industry, it doesn't make for better working conditions or better relations with labor. No; the planning by the state is just another fake term, like that of "streamlining" which is so often abused. There is no magic in mere words so that they can constitute a substitute for work and production. Industry in Russia has been state-controlled for over 30 years. Yet a recent report of the Department of Labor indicates that the Russian standard of living is only one-tenth of that of the American. And this, after Russia has had four successive 5-year plans and regimentation and sacrifice under rigid state planning.

Yes; the idea is the thing, as Knute Rockne used to say—the right idea. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. As a nation thinketh in its heart, so will it be. And it is time that we do some straight thinking and kick out from our own minds the exponents of the wrong way of thinking—the wrong concepts and wrong ideas.

As long as we are human beings, in order to get results, it is well that there be a proper incentive. One of the great weaknesses of the so-called planned economy is its failure to provide people with adequate incentive. If people are supposed to share equally, there is no motive, there is no desire to excel. The result is depressed production and depressed standard of living.

Yes, the real struggle is the battle of ideas, and it is up to the American people to get hold of the right ideas. Was it not Paul who said:

"Whatsoever things are true; whatsoever things are honest; whatsoever things are just; whatsoever things are pure; whatsoever things are lovely; whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, think on these things."

I have stressed the political and economic angle of this struggle because it is going on in the arena of the nations today. What of the educational angle? Here we are confronted with a step that we Americans must take. We must see to it that our educational institutions are cleaned of all insidious and irresponsible teachings—teachings of mere materialism, teachings that reject America's founding philosophy.

Some months ago when in New York I heard Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Vice Premier of Poland, who had just escaped from that stricken land, give an address. He made a deep impression upon the people who listened to him, and it was because I heard him that I chose this subject, "The Real Struggle—the Battle of Ideas." Poland, as you know, was once gloriously free. The citizens of Germany, even under Frederick the Great, the Germanburgers, were once free men. How these and other once free peoples have suffered from lack of freedom.

After we became a Nation, after our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution came into being, the ideas they represented were carried by countless foreigners filled with the passion for freedom. These ideas circumnavigated the globe, but the flame and the fire thus generated were allowed to die down. As a result, the ancient evils have returned, garbed in flashy new clothes, the evils of absolutism and absolute monarchs. They have come back into the arena, under the guise of communism and fascism and totalitarianism, the police state; and so the world is in the mess that it is today. But right ideas and right concepts are still right, and free men and free enterprise are the result of the minds of men being filled with right ideas.

Address of Cathrine Curtis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, following is an address by Cathrine Curtis, president, Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., and national director, Women Investors in America, Inc., Washington, D. C., before the Utah Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 30, 1949:

Your president has asked me to talk to you about women's investments and taxes, and what might be done to reduce those taxes. But instead of following her suggestion I am going to talk to you tonight about our approaching bankruptcy, chemical warfare, atomic energy, and the priceless stake this country has in this potentially great new industry.

Every housewife knows that she cannot indefinitely give away her family's substance and assets without eventually wrecking her family. Every businessman knows that he could not continue indefinitely to give away his products, to squander his capital, to continue a program of bad management of his company without eventually forcing that company into bankruptcy.

Your Government is the biggest business in the world. But at the rate it is spending and giving away the people's resources, one wonders how much longer we can continue to do so.

We don't stop to realize that this country is big and great because of the generations before us who have worked, saved, invested, and accumulated wealth which the entire world is enjoying today.

WOMEN'S INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

I must bring to your attention the fact that the women have a tremendous financial stake in our country's institutions, industries, and corporations.

Our country was developed through individual initiative, private ownership of property and resources, and with the determination to earn, to make profits, and to benefit.

Our railroads, our public utilities, our motor industry, our aviation companies, all have the savings, or capital, of women invested in them to a very great extent. This has provided capital appreciation and income to millions of American women.

During World War I the savings of our women came out of hiding and were used to buy war bonds promoted by this Government. Following the war the utilities industry was growing, and again it was the savings of women that made possible many of the local electric plants that were built to provide local home and industrial power. As of today women are the largest owners of the corporate stock in the public-utilities industry.

This represents, over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars of invested capital and has provided millions in dividends and income to the owners—to say nothing of the jobs, and the taxes paid to Government.

As women are also great consumers of that electrical power or energy they have enjoyed the comforts and the countless labor-saving devices in the home, which are byproducts.

American industry perfected its high-speed mass production with the use of electric power, and women have a tremendous stake also in the corporate shares of American industry. Many companies have better than 50 percent of their stock held by women. Here, too, we find their ownership of wealth and their income earned flows from the dollars the women have invested for profit or security.

We can well wonder how different this might all be if, when electric power was in its early days of development, its entire control and operation was given to a Government body or to an international organization.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN'S GREAT DISCOVERY

I wonder what would have happened if—when Benjamin Franklin first discovered electricity—the Government had warned the people of its great dangers, of how it could kill and destroy and cause fires, and in so doing propagandized the people at that early date into turning complete control of electricity over to an electrical energy commission? Would we now have a public utilities industry and a mass-production economy? Would we have had an Alexander Graham Bell or a Thomas Alva Edison? And more important to the women, would we have had the byproducts of electricity—electric lights, vacuum cleaners, electric washers, and so forth?

The United States has become great by inventing and developing new means of wealth creation. Other countries have captured—by military aggression or diplomatic chicanery—the existing ways of wealth production rather than by developing new methods, as we have.

We read much today of the miracle of America, as if this great Republic was some amazing country which just happened overnight by a miracle or an unexplained act of our Divine Creator. America is no miracle. The Republic of the United States is the result of courage, toil, thrift, deprivation—and even blood, sweat, and tears. Generation after generation of work, of effort, of saving, of investing, of building, of living by the Christian rules upon which this country was founded and prospered. That is the real miracle of America.

FOUR-PRONGED PROGRAM

That miracle of America is about to be destroyed by a four-pronged program being put forward in Washington. It is vitally important to every woman, to every investor and to every owner of a business, or of property.

First, the foreign-aid program which has increased over-all appropriations to a point where the Government now is spending more than it is collecting in taxes.

Second, the antimonopoly program—the purpose of which is not only to break up large, successful corporations, but to destroy the incentive to create and build large industries.

Third, Mr. Truman's point-4 program to drain venture capital out of this country and scatter it to the four corners of the world.

Fourth, and probably the most important, is the plan to deprive us of all chance of the

free use of atomic energy for constructive, wealth-producing purposes.

Let us consider the foreign-aid program. Do you realize that—through the 4 years since VJ-day, we have embarked upon 23 different foreign-aid programs?

COST OF FOREIGN AID SINCE WAR ENDED

Do you realize that—from VJ-day to June 30, 1949—according to figures obtained from the Bureau of the Budget—that we have spent $27,100,000,000 to help other countries? Can you fully appreciate that means we have been spending—on these foreign-aid programs—$200 every second—day and night—since the last gun was fired in World War II?

Here are the 23 foreign-aid programs which Congress has voted to date. Let me quote from a recent speech on the Senate floor by a recognized authority on Government spending—Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia:

"First, there was $820,000,000 for direct relief for military supplies.

"Second, there was $2,600,000,000 in UNRRA.

"Third, at the end of this year there will be $3,800,000,000 for Government and relief in occupied areas.

"Fourth, at the end of this year there will be $308,000,000 in post-UNRRA relief assistance to war-devastated countries.

"Fifth, at the end of this year there will be $577,000,000 in interim foreign aid.

"Sixth, there was $3,700,000,000 in the British loan, the record for which is now under review.

"Seventh, at the end of this year there will be $2,000,000,000 in Export-Import Bank loans.

"Eighth, at the end of this year there will be $1,900,000,000 in Office of Foreign Liquidation property transfers.

"Ninth, there was $186,000,000 in Maritime Commission ship transfers.

"Tenth, at the end of this year there will be $607,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey.

"Eleventh, at the end of this year there will be $768,000,000 in the Philippine-aid program.

"Twelfth, at the end of this year there will be $9,200,000,000 in the European-recovery program.

"Thirteenth, there was $120,000,000 in stabilization aid to China.

"Fourteenth, at the end of this year there will be $351,000,000 in other aid to China—$400,000,000 under original budget estimates.

"Fifteenth, there was $75,000,000 in the International Children's Emergency Fund.

"Sixteenth, there was $635,000,000 in the International Bank subscription.

"Seventeenth, at the end of this year there will be $212,000,000 for the International Refugee Organization.

"Eighteenth, there was $217,000,000 in subscription in the International Monetary Fund.

"Nineteenth, there was $2,600,000,000 in lend-lease aid—postwar. That is after the war was over. I think that is greatly underestimated. No one will ever know the millions and hundreds of millions of dollars of lend-lease material which was transferred to nations abroad after the last gun was fired.

"Twentieth, at the end of this year there will be $355,000,000 in other foreign aid.

"Twenty-first, at the end of this year there will be $8,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission.

"Twenty-second, at the end of this year there will be $16,000,000 for the Palestine-refugee program.

"Mr. President, those are official figures. I think they omit some of the expenditures, but I am not able to show the omissions, and I give these as being official and authentic as coming from the proper agencies of the Government."

At this point, Senator RUSSELL pointed out that—to the above figures should be added another $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 in usable military equipment which we left behind in Europe.

And to Senator BYRD's list of 22 programs now must be added number 23—the military-aid program—bringing the total for 4 years up to about $35,000,000,000.

The new military-aid program will cost $66,000,000,000 over 5 years' time—or $440 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

While we are spending this $200 or better a second—Representative CELLER, of New York, and Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, move forward with their antimonopoly, Federal licensing of industry campaign to destroy bigness—without defining what they mean by bigness.

This campaign is to include also the breaking up of large insurance companies and no one can foretell what effect that will have on policyholders and the assets behind their policies.

It plans to dismember the du Pont Co., the A & P, and other large corporations yet unnamed. What effect may this have on the price of the company's stock or the jobs held by employees? What effect on its products—and on our economy?

THE KARL MARX APPROACH

And, incidentally, if the du Pont suit should be won by the Government—and I am speaking now of that part of the suit which affects the du Pont family—will it establish the legal precedent that a family or an individual does not have the right to pass on, by inheritance, its assets or wealth?

At this point—I would like to remind you that the wiping out of all rights of inheritance is one of the major points in the Karl Marx program.

Coincident with this antimonopoly program, a move is being made to provide for Federal licensing of all industry. This, in effect, would mean that the individual—or corporation—would, by Government legislation, have taken from him or her—or it—the basic right to own property free from Government domination.

Then all business would find itself in much the same situation as the radio stations, which actually have no basic property rights, but operate on a Government license and that license is continued dependent upon what some Government official decides is good behavior or performance of that radio station.

POINT-4 PROGRAM

Next—apparently to make sure that it will be extremely difficult to start new industries in this country or to expand present ones—we now are being asked to accept the so-called point-4 program set forth by President Truman.

This program—stripped of much of the fancy talk in its cleverly worded prospectus—simply means that we are to be propagandized into shipping our savings out of the country to help build competing industries in other parts of the world.

You will not be told that—if, as and when these new industries are established in Africa, China, India or elsewhere—they will be dependent for their fuel and energy upon a world control group.

Of course, you will be told you have nothing to fear for your investment—that it will be guaranteed by the United States Government in case the property in which you invest your money is seized by some foreign government and nationalized. That is just another neat way of eventually saddling upon the backs of the American taxpayers the cost of building up our competitors.

Evidently the ultimate result of this program—if it is successful—will be to drain from this country much of the savings and risk capital so badly needed here for the expansion of old and creation of new industries to provide jobs and incomes for our peoples to create new pools of wealth.

The campaign to sell you on investing in this drain-the-Republic program—as it properly should be called—already is under way. Organizations—both public and private—are traveling about the country, staging so-called economic and financial education programs—working to interest primarily the woman investor—to stimulate and revive her interest in stock ownership so that her mind—and her pocketbook—will be conditioned for this new foreign policy endeavor and for this new attack upon our national economy.

TAXES—AND MORE TAXES

The thing I would like to stress is the fact that this country—through war involvement and its foreign policy—plus its over-all program to socialize our Republic and bring about the welfare state is fast spending itself into bankruptcy.

Future taxes will be terrific. Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee already has announced he is convinced we must increase taxes next year.

Business and individual liberty will be questionable. Political independence will be nonexistent.

Instead of reversing our socialistic trend, curtailing Government spending, reducing taxes and stimulating new, low-cost production—the American people, through a continuing fear campaign, are being propagandized into giving up their basic property rights in the priceless new atomic-energy industry.

RUSSIA ACQUIRES ATOM BOMB KNOW-HOW

The announcement last Friday by Mr. Truman that Russia had exploded an atom bomb 2 weeks previously was not news to high officials in Washington, Quebec, and London. British and Canadian Intelligence had informed us months ago that Russia actually had exploded an atom bomb last June 15.

That was not unexpected. Actually, there have been reliable reports in this country and in England since January of 1947 that Russia had perfected atom bomb know-how and that she had unsuccessfully exploded such a bomb as early as July of 1947.

It also has been known to the authorities both in this country and England since 1942 or 1943 that Russia had possession of the same formula which we used to develop atomic explosions. A German-Jewess refugee named Lise Meitner—world-recognized nuclear fission scientist—fled from Germany in 1939 to Sweden and then went to London.

She was associated with a Russian cosmic ray scientist named Kapitza, and Meitner and Kapitza worked out the formula for making atomic explosive. She gave that formula to us—Kapitza gave it to Russia. That was known.

In addition, our authorities knew early in the war that German scientists not only were working on atomic research, but also on rocket bombs. They knew the principal German laboratory for this research was located at Pennemunde.

Pennemunde could have fallen to American troops—as could also Berlin—had it not been for orders issued by Mr. Roosevelt as a result of secret agreements entered into between him and Stalin at Yalta and Tehran.

Those agreements compelled our troops to withdraw from certain areas of Germany—foregoing the capture of Berlin and Pennemunde—and permitting the Russians to get control of the Pennemunde laboratory, its staff of scientists and the scientific research records stored in Berlin.

Pennemunde today is a Russian fortress. No one is allowed within 30 miles of the land side of that area. It is patrolled by members of the dreaded MVD police.

The water side of Pennemunde also is well protected—with a group of patrol boats which the United States lend-leased to Russia during the war.

British Intelligence reported to our authorities in January of 1948 that—as a result of

the start made through Kapitza—plus the records seized in Berlin and Pennemunde—plus the equipment taken at Pennemunde—plus the German scientists captured by the Russians when our troops fell back under Mr. Roosevelt's orders—the Russians had succeeded in developing atom bomb-making technique.

MORE ATOM INFORMATION FOR RUSSIA

And—in case that wasn't enough to help Russia catch up with us on atom bomb production—we gave them additional information in a publication captioned "A General Account of the Development Methods for Using Atomic Energy for Military Purposes."

In this book, Prof. H. D. Smyth described three different methods by which atomic explosions could be produced. He pointed out that the only real successful method was the diffusion method, thereby eliminating the other two.

Scientists admit today that particular information alone could have cut the time by two-thirds that the Russians otherwise would have required to produce atom bombs.

And that wasn't enough. Professor Smyth also declared that if natural uranium—U-235—was not available, man-made plutonium would do the job by the diffusion method.

This was not a secret document. It was offered for public sale by the Government Printing Office at 45 cents per copy.

Of course, it is claimed this document revealed no real secret information. However, the records show that the Four Continents Book Co. purchased several thousand copies of this report from the Government Printing Office.

And—for your information—the Four Continents Book Co. is listed by the Attorney General as an agent of Soviet Russia.

WHAT OF ATOMIC ENERGY'S PEACEFUL USES?

There is no question but what atomic energy is the new high-speed energy which will make possible even greater industrial development and know-how in this country if we are allowed to keep it and to use it.

The average individual cannot imagine the possibilities of this new atomic power. We are only allowed to read of its destructive possibilities. We think only of the death-dealing atom bomb—terrifying and devastating.

Little is written about its potentialities for industrial uses. If, however, the American people give up control of atomic power to a world committee or a world government—surely such control of that energy will have far-reaching effects on our industry and our national economy.

If it is controlled by government—or a world group—what are its wealth-making possibilities for individuals? What dividends can investors ever hope to receive even though their taxpayers' money is invested in and finances the atomic-energy-development program?

Surely, if the present Government program of breaking up bigness—withdrawing from individuals their basic property rights and giving to a government or world body our rights in atomic energy succeeds—then individual enterprise will be a thing of the past and world control of industry the new order. And then—where will be the American woman's economic independence?

WORLD WAR I HORROR WEAPON

The atom bomb is not the first horror weapon produced for war within our memory. Do you remember that dread announcement of April 22, 1915, of the new German secret weapon—a horrible weapon—poison gas?

The world was shocked—as much, if not more than it was by the news of the atom-bomb dropping on Hiroshima.

What happened?

Allied scientists pooled their knowledge of poison gas. They found it was not new. Mustard gas—the most deadly used in World War I—was discovered in 1886 by a German scientist named Hoffman. Phosgene and chlorine—other gases used in that war—long had been known to industry both in Europe and the United States.

Hoffman's gas discoveries were a byproduct of his research seeking to develop new industries for Germany—the synthetic dye and medicinal industries. But his poison-gas discoveries remained dormant until that fateful night in April of 1915.

It is admitted today that no great strides were made by the Allies in counteracting Germany's gas weapon until the United States entered the war and brought to the Allies not only manpower but industrial know-how and mass-production methods. That is what turned the tide in World War I against Germany's gas weapon.

Again, you may all remember how—at the end of the first war—we were told we had developed a new and more deadly gas than anything the Germans had—Lewisite. However, several years after that war ended it was quietly admitted that mustard gas was far more effective than Lewisite.

BETTER LIVING THROUGH FREE CHEMISTRY

The horror weapon of World War I was a byproduct of the laboratory, discovered by scientists seeking to produce new industries and new products.

We did not agree—as a result of that deadly byproduct—to place all chemistry first under Government control and then seek to turn it over to a world-group control. We had some sanity and common sense then.

We turned the production of gas weapons over to the armed forces—but left the chemical industry unhampered by Government control—able to go on producing its beneficial products to create new wealth, new jobs, new prosperity.

Do you think if we had been frightened by poison gas in the First World War into turning control of chemistry over to a Government body or a world group that women today would be wearing nylon? Do you think that when the Japanese cut off our supply of quinine and raw rubber from the Pacific we would have had the scientific know-how to produce synthetic quinine and rubber? Do you think we would have developed the plastics and innumerable other products of the laboratory that are so widely used today?

Then why should we be frightened by the horror of the atom bomb into giving control of this great new discovery over to the Government or to an international group?

That is what is being proposed by the two plans which have been advanced by our State Department and Russia. Both proposals would give all control of every phase of atomic energy over to a world Atomic Energy Authority.

That means—if either of these plans is adopted—that this new fuel for industry will be controlled by this world authority—and if you don't believe that he who controls a nation's fuel at least controls a part of its industries—ask John L. Lewis.

Of course, when you oppose any of these one-world dream plans—you are asked—have you a plan?

We have. This is it:

AN AMERICAN ATOMIC ENERGY PLAN

Instead of turning our backs on the great lesson we learned from the First World War relative to the control of poison gas, we propose to put that lesson to good use—now.

We propose that—

1. All nations sign a protocol or treaty—similar to that signed in 1925 banning the use of poison gas as a war weapon—whereby all signatory powers agree to ban the use of atomic weapons in war.

2. Production of atomic weapons to be turned over to our National Defense Department, to which will be assigned the duty of producing atomic weapons more powerful and dreadful than those of any other nation as a warning to all countries of what will happen if anyone violates the foregoing agreement. The agreement of 1925 worked in World War II in preventing the use of poison gas.

3. Private industry have the right and be free to develop, make, and produce atomic energy for all possible constructive purposes in order to create new industries, new jobs, new wealth, and new investment opportunities in this country—thereby building to new heights our one great national defense asset—our mass-production system.

This, of course, means abolishing Mr. Lilienthal's useless, inefficient, spy haven—the Atomic Energy Commission.

We are convinced this plan will harness and control the destructive phases of this new, great power—while releasing its constructive phases for the use and benefit of our people and the Republic.

It may well be that upon the issue of keeping atomic energy for free and constructive use may depend the survival of our private-enterprise system—the economic independence of American women—the continuation of the American home as the foundation of our economy and—last but by no means least—the survival of Christianity and the Christian principles which made our country strong and free.

You may ask, "But what can we do?"

GOD AND TRUTH MUST MARCH ON

With all due respect to the men—we women must not bow to economic enslavement. We have too much to lose.

Remember—it was the women in the Massachusetts Bay Colony 300 years ago who ended the first experiment in communism in this country.

Our history is replete with the stories of the brave women that kept aflame the courage and fighting spirit of our Revolutionary Army that won for us our independence and liberty.

Let me recall for you the story of one courageous American woman who played an important role in the great struggle of the sixties when the Republic was fighting to survive.

That woman—in the quiet of her Boston home—wanted to help her country, wanted to do her bit to abolish slavery, but—as she once stated—always, within her something seemed to say:

"You would be glad to serve, but you cannot help anyone; you have nothing to give and there is nothing you can do."

She went to Washington in the late autumn of 1861 with her husband and—while there—saw Federal forces marching through the streets to relieve some of their companions who had been surrounded by Confederate forces.

She returned to the Willard Hotel that night and finally went to sleep. Awakening in the gray, dim light of early dawn—she automatically reached for a sheet of paper and stub of pen beside her on a table—and half awake—wrote the words that were ringing through her mind.

Later that morning—Julia Ward Howe again awoke—looked at what she had written—and read—the Battle Hymn of the Republic—

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord,
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword,
His truth is marching on.

I have read the fiery gospel writ in burnished rows of steel,
As ye deal with My contemners, so with you My grace shall deal;
Let the hero, born of woman, crush the serpent with His heel,
Since God is marching on."

Yes—God and truth are marching on. But God and truth must not march alone.

Women of Utah—will you join the march?

The Great Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 4 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Great Deception," delivered by me over radio station WGN in Chicago on October 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT DECEPTION

The unveiling of President Truman's great deception is now complete.

The truth which he misrepresented in his campaign a year ago has been unfolded.

Behind his smoke screen of false accusations against the Republican Eightieth Congress has been found the carefully laid plans of the President to invoke upon this Nation the British Socialist scheme.

Sole purpose for his deception in the 1948 campaign was to retain the political control necessary to promote the powers he will need to install socialism.

The proof of his deception has been found in his own words and confirmed by his actions.

Business, which heard him say before war's end that controls must be relaxed after peace, saw him endorse a bill in this Congress to give him power to put ceilings over prices and wages and floors under prices and wages.

Labor, which reciprocated his love and affection during the campaign, first knew him as the man who wanted to draft strikers into the Army.

Then, they knew him as the candidate who would do anything for labor's support.

Now they know him as the man who can wreck their jobs with his power to bring foreign goods into the American market at prices the American worker cannot meet and maintain the standard of living he is now enjoying.

Latest in these revelations of deplorable maneuvers by the President of the United States to lead Americans, by falsifications into statism or socialism is that which he attempted against the Nation's agricultural industry.

A year ago Mr. Truman was beginning the most vicious public tirade ever indulged in by a President of the United States against the Nation's Congress.

He berated the Eightieth Republican Congress on many counts, none of which he supported with facts.

One of these charges by Mr. Truman was that the Congress had failed to adopt an acceptable farm program.

Well, I can use here today a phrase which Mr. Truman has never used and never dares use.

That is: Let's look at the record.

First of all, my friends, the Eighty-first Democrat Congress now favors extension of the same program adopted by the Eightieth Congress with improvements that both Republicans and Democrats agreed would be needed at the time the original bill was enacted.

But even more impressive is the fact that the flexible support program now in effect and which will be in effect on farm products in the immediate future is the same basic program that has been in effect since 1933 with various improvements from time to time.

Now, let's get one point straight right here.

When Mr. Truman objected to the long-range flexible price-support program of the Eightieth Congress in the campaign a year ago he made no mention of the plan he favors today.

He made no mention in that campaign that 1 year later he would not favor flexible supports at all.

He made no mention of the fact that 1 year later he would favor complete regimentation of the farmers under the Brannan plan.

In fact, my friends, on May 14, 1948, Mr. Truman wrote a letter to the Eightieth Congress asking for development of a flexible price-support program.

He said in that letter—and I quote:

"Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly fashion."

At the time Mr. Truman wrote that letter Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON was Mr. Truman's Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON favored a flexible support program and so advised the Eightieth Congress as spokesman for the Truman administration.

The record also shows that on October 7, 1947, Mr. Carl C. Farrington, then chairman of the Department of Agriculture's Committee on Price Policy and Production Adjustment, testified before the joint meeting of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.

Mr. Farrington, a chief aide to Mr. ANDERSON, said in that testimony—and I quote:

"Our committee spent a great deal of time studying this question in light of our past experience and arrived at several general principles which we believe should characterize future price-support programs.

"First, a high degree of flexibility, both as to support levels and methods, is essential in view of differences between commodities and constantly changing conditions that cannot be foreseen."

Following study of such testimony for more than a year, the Eightieth Congress adopted the Hope-Aiken Act.

But, my friends, here is another twist in Mr. Truman's great deception.

Title II of that act does not become effective until next January 1.

That is the section which would provide for flexible price supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity with mandatory supports for eight crops.

Today, and a year ago today when Mr. Truman began his great deception, the farm program has been operating on the same basic theory that has existed for many years.

Mr. Truman is the only man, other than Mr. Brannan and a few labor bosess, who wants to change that basic theory.

Mr. ANDERSON, who now is a member of the United States Senate, gave virtual endorsement to the long-range Hope-Aiken Act of the Eightieth Congress when he introduced his bill in this session of the Eighty-first Congress.

His bill, which was strongly supported by both Republicans and Democrats merely changes the sliding scale of flexible supports to 75 to 90 percent of parity from 60 to 90 percent in the Hope-Aiken Act.

He makes supports mandatory on 12 crops instead of 8 crops.

Some idea of the deep consideration which went into the Hope-Aiken Act can be gathered from the statement in Sioux City, Iowa, on September 23 by Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, coauthor of the bill.

Congressman HOPE said—and I quote:

"I said when it was accepted a year ago that it would need to be reconsidered and amended this year before going into effect on January 1, 1950."

The great American Farm Bureau Federation recognized the progress of the Eightieth Congress toward an acceptable long-range farm program in spite of Mr. Truman's deception.

Last December this organization, which has 1,325,000 farm families as members, adopted a resolution which began as follows—and I quote:

"We commend Congress for its recognition of the need for a long-range farm program in the enactment of the Agriculture Act of 1948."

My friends, the Agricultural Act of 1948, mentioned in the resolution, was the Hope-Aiken Act around which Mr. Truman built his great deception.

These are facts, my friends.

They come from the record.

They are not falsifications.

You need not take my word for them.

You can write to any Senator or Congressman and get from the official records every word I have quoted to you.

But don't go away.

We have more of the record of this great deception which you should know.

The President of the United States has no more right to misrepresent matters to the people of this great Nation than would anybody else.

In fact, the President has far less right to deceive the people.

So, hear me out, my friends, and then compare notes with this man who fails to keep the record straight.

We have had Mr. Truman on record as both favoring and opposing flexible price supports up to the time of his election last November.

He favored them in May.

He opposed them in the election campaign.

The fact of the matter is, my friends, Mr. Truman turned right around and supported them in his budget message to his own Democrat Eighty-first Congress this year.

In that message he said—and again I quote:

"As I said a year ago, price supports should be regarded chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression."

In other words, he confirmed what he had said in his letter to the Eightieth Congress after having assumed an entirely different position in his campaign.

Does consistency become a jewel with him at this point?

Of course not.

It was less than 2 months later that the real reason for the great deception was made apparent.

That was the so-called Brannan plan.

Here was the real reason he turned against flexible price supports in his campaign.

If you recall, Mr. Truman never did say what he favored as a substitute for the flexible support program during his campaigning. He was just against the Eightieth Congress program.

Well, what he was really for was the Brannan plan which he did not dare reveal until after the great deception had succeeded. Under this plan there are no price supports. The plan would let prices on farm produce fall to the level created by supply and demand.

The Government would use tax money to pay the difference to the farmers in hand-

outs. It would replace parity with an income support standard for each farmer as fixed by the Government.

Do you know what Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said about this plan?

You can find this comment in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee in a hearing last July 14—and I quote from Mr. Kline's statement:

"Here is the basis for real regimentation."

That is Mr. Kline's statement.

There is the real purpose behind Mr. Truman's great deception.

The Brannan plan is a piecemeal sneak attack against the American way of life. It is a part of the plan to institute British socialist regimentation into the American system.

Let's read further what Mr. Kline had to say about this Truman-Brannan-British labor program for the American farmer.

Again I quote from the statement of Mr. Kline before the Senate subcommittee:

"Under the Brannan proposal, the farmer's only hope for a fair income would depend on Government hand-outs from annual appropriations by Congress.

"We maintain that it is unreasonable to stake the welfare of agriculture upon such a hazardous possibility."

Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Farm Bureau in my own State of Indiana, appeared as a witness before the congressional Committee on Agriculture in this session of the Eighty-first Congress and testified in favor of the immediate application of the flexible price features of the Hope-Aiken Act. This is what Mr. Schenck had to say before those committees about the Brannan plan:

"The philosophy of the Brannan plan is so dangerous to agriculture that we vigorously and unanimously oppose any trial run."

Mr. Schenck feared even a trial run of the Socialist scheme Mr. Truman now favors for the American farmer.

Time does not permit me to go further in the revelations of this great deception by the President of the United States. However, before closing let me say that his own former Secretary of Agriculture left a telling implication the other day in Washington in answer to a newspaper reporter's query as to why the administration executed the about-face on the farm program in this Congress.

Senator ANDERSON said, and I quote from the newspaper article in the Washington Post: "I guess the best person to tell you that would be the administration. I don't know why it starts on a wholly new farm program. As a matter of fact, I think the farm program from 1933 on has been a pretty good program."

My friends, I close this talk with repetition.

Again I charge that the great deception was designed to install British socialism in this country.

Otherwise, the President of the United States had no basic reason whatever for the deplorable misrepresentations of which he has been found to be guilty by his own words and deeds.

Re-Nazification of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a few questions regarding American policy in Germany, questions which fill every honest American with grave concern.

The State Department hailed the recent elections in western Germany as a victory for democracy. The president of this west German republic is Dr. Theodore Heuss. Who is this Dr. Heuss? Our State Department admitted, according to the New York Times of September 21, 1949, that Dr. Heuss voted in favor of the "enabling act" in the German Reichstag. This act gave Hitler full dictatorial power over the German people. Is this our concept of a fighter for democracy?

I am also alarmed by reports that our occupation authorities abolished newspaper licensing in western Germany. Drew Middleton, of the New York Times, pointed out, on August 24, that, as a result, such Fascist publishers as Max Willmay and Dr. Ottmar Best are in business again. These gentlemen were connected with the notorious Sturmer and the Allgemeine Zeitung, respectively, during the Hitler regime. I ask you, is this our idea of a free democratic press? Every day, new reports about the revival of violence against Jews reach us. My constituents ask themselves: Do we maintain an occupation force in Germany so that anti-Semitic violence should be rampant?

Our new foreign-aid bill grants nearly $1,000,000,000 for western Germany, out of a total appropriation of close to $6,000,000,000. The average American worker has to pay the Government 2 months' wages each year in taxes. The American people have to sacrifice in order to raise these funds. On behalf of my constituents, I ask: What are these funds used for?

Facts show that the economic situation in western Germany is deteriorating. Of a working force of 12,000,000, nearly one and a quarter million are unemployed. Another three-quarter million are working part time. The Economic Research Institute of the West German Trade Unions revealed last summer that real wages were 40 percent lower in June of this year than in 1946. Almost 20,000,000 Germans cannot buy the food allotted to them in their rations. This means that, despite our sacrifices, almost half of the population of western Germany is sinking into destitution.

I ask again, what happens to our money? Is it used in the interests of the American people? Is it used to improve the economy of the German people? Does it serve the interest of peace and economic stability?

Let us look at those who are running German economy. Look at the men of the Ruhr Control Board, who were chosen by our military government. Among the German representatives, are men like Herman J. Abs, former director of the Deutsche Bank. Abs was Hitler's man in charge of the economic exploitation of the countries occupied by the Nazis. Then there is Dr. Heinrich Dinkelbach, former director of the German Steel Trust, Vereinigte Stahlwerke, for 30 years. Are our funds being used to fatten people whose efficiency reached its height when they made soap out of human fat? These men, together with Werner P. Neuman, Ronald Clark, and F. L. Elliot, of United States Steel and Frederick M. Dilles of the Inland Steel Corp. control all the important German steel and coal industry of the Ruhr. It cannot surprise anyone that these men, who refuse the most elementary demands of their workers in our country, do not consider the needs of the German workers.

Some light was shed on the expenditure of United States funds in Germany by the Mainzer Allgemeine Zeitung which wrote:

> It is quite likely that these reports are unpleasant to the Anglo-Saxon powers, and they may possibly say that the Russians should not be furnished with such material for propaganda. But sooner or later the Russians will get to know anyway that large military formations are being trained on German proving grounds in the Anglo-Saxon zone of occupation. Whether these facts are published 3 months earlier or later makes no difference.

What are these facts? Are we building up a new German army? Is the money of American taxpayers used to support storm troopers? How long will the American people be asked to pour money into Germany without results? While we talk of aiding the German people, their indebtedness to the United States and Great Britain is increasing daily. Americans big business extracts tremendous profits from trade with Germany. As a result, Germany's foreign trade deficits mount from year to year. In 1946 it amounted to $495,000,000 and rose to $800,000,000 in 1948.

This illustrates what JOHN FOSTER DULLES meant when he said, "The United States itself has become a European power in western Germany." It is in the interests of the American people that western Germany should be reduced to the status of a colony? Will the subjugation of the German people guarantee the peace of the world?

It was the avowed purpose of our occupation to guarantee the development of a democratic nation. Is it not a sad reflection of the way we bring democracy to other countries, when the German people are denied two essential rights of a sovereign nation: The right freely to determine its constitution and to conduct its foreign policy? The Bonn Parliament is not permitted to adopt amendments to the constitution which affect constitutional relations between the federation and the states.

Did our occupation guarantee the denazification of Germany? No, because reports reach us that Nazis are back in power all over Germany. Why is it, that denazification has been turned over to those Germans who were Nazis themselves? Why was Herr Otto Vortisch made chief of denazification of western Berlin? Herr Vortisch was a high Nazi official in occupied Poland. Why is anti-Semitism on the increase in the United States zone of occupation?

The American people want peace. The peoples of Europe are sick of wars. Why is it that 4 years after Hitlerism has been beaten we have not signed a peace treaty with Germany yet? Does it serve the cause of peace to keep Germany divided? Is it in the interest of democracy to keep Germany dependent on the profits of United States monopolies?

I charge that our Government is deliberately blocking a German peace treaty and the subsequent withdrawal of the occupation troops in order to prolong the cold war. On the basis of such a peace treaty our Government could come to an agreement with the Soviet Union on the question of Germany.

Mr. Speaker, the answers to these questions are of vital concern to the American people. The answers to these questions bear not only on the economic welfare of our people but also to the question whether or not American boys will once more die on the battlefields and drench the soil of some no man's land with their blood in world war III.

II. ANSWERS

While the world was still engaged in the war against nazism, millions of people in America and abroad were asking, "What is to be done with Germany?" What guaranties shall be established that the German bankers, militarists, and Junkers, who had twice within one generation unleashed untold bloodshed and destruction, shall be deprived of the power ever to launch war again? What was to be done with the Nazis and their collaborators, who were guilty of crimes against humanity, the like of which had never been witnessed by civilized nations?

Under the leadership of a wise and farsighted statesman, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, America answered those questions. That answer was founded on a clear understanding of the international situation arising out of the war and of the role of America in international affairs, if peace was to be achieved and maintained. That answer called for international cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union as the very foundation stone of any durable peace. The declaration of principles on postwar Germany which was issued by the great powers at Crimea, derived from and was predicated upon this basic concept. The historic declaration at Crimea announced to the world the firm resolve of the big powers to destroy German militarism and nazism, to break up for all time the German general staff, to wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organizations, and institutions.

These principles were further developed and expanded at the meeting of the big powers at Potsdam in July 1945. Agreement was reached on the payment of reparations to the nations that had suffered at the hands of the Nazi war machine. Precise directives were laid down for the punishment of war criminals, for the demilitarization, denazification, decartelization, and democratization of Germany.

What has happened since those fateful days? Delbert Clark, New York Times correspondent, gives the answer in the foreword to his recent book, Again the Goose Step. Says Clark:

> Four years after the surrender of Germany, American correspondents were writing dispatches about jack-booted young toughs, marching in political parades and singing Deutschland uber alles; about the recapture of the school system by Nazi teachers; about the restoration of Germany's highly integrated industry to its old managers; about the unashamed resurgence of anti-Semitism; about the Nazis in key positions in the police force.
>
> These things do not "just happen." They have been the result of a policy which ignored history, ordinary common sense, and the national interests of the United States of America. Worse, they have resulted from a policy which was never publicly announced, but which went into effect piecemeal, undercover, almost furtively, while the Nation and the world were being assured that nothing was changed.

We have betrayed our trust. We have made a farce out of denazification. We have allowed the German general staff to go free. We have returned to power Hitler's bankers and industrialists who kept Hitler's war machine in high gear, who grew fat on the looting and enslavement of millions of people. We have permitted storm troopers and anti-Semites and Gestapo men to determine the future of the "new order." We have ripped to shreds the promise of peace held out at Yalta, Tehran, Crimea, and Potsdam.

In the spring of 1945 General Eisenhower, standing amid the corpses of Buchenwald, declared to the newly appointed civilian administrator of the camp: "Please inform your comrades we will right everything in which they have been wronged." What has happened to that promise? In the first flush of victory we made some feeble efforts on behalf of the victims of fascism. Some Nazi property was turned over to anti-Nazis and political opponents of the Hitler regime. Two years later, however, this property was returned to the Nazis by decree of German courts.

In the first flush of victory and under the impact of the universal demand for the destruction of the armies that had wreaked such havoc upon mankind, we made some feeble efforts at bringing some of the military leaders to justice. But in 1948 not only were these Nazis at liberty, but German legislative bodies were voting pensions to all ex-Wehrmacht officers and their widows. We were righting everything with a vengeance. The 27-year-old widow of a Nazi major since 1931, Landrat Hoellfritsch, was granted a monthly pension of 500 marks. But the widows of German anti-Fascists who had been murdered in concentration camps were granted a bounty of 80 marks a month.

In 1947, former Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall announced that the "pernicious cartels in Germany were abolished." But by the end of 1948 the evidence that German cartels were very much alive and flourishing had become such a scandal that Royall was forced to appoint a three-man committee, known as the Ferguson committee, to investigate the decartelization program. The committee reported that—

> The decartelization program, despite uncontroverted policies and clear directives, has not been effectively carried out. After almost 4 years of occupation and 2 years of operation under an adequate law, the program has not proceeded very far.

This was a masterpiece of understatement. The fact is, and the testimony gathered by the Ferguson committee proves conclusively, that the decartelization program was never implemented. General Draper, vice president of Dillon, Read, the firm that had helped to build up the Ruhr in 1926 by loaning Fritz Thyssen $100,000,000 and which later helped finance Hitler's war machine, saw to that. And when Draper left to become Under Secretary of the Army, he was assured that his policies would be continued by the appointment of his son-in-law, Philip Hawkins, to head the decartelization division. "Within 6 months," writes Delbert Clark, "decartelization was interpreted out of existence, and the branch was largely broken up." These men made no bones about their opposition to the denazification and decartelization program. In fact, General Draper stated before the Ferguson committee that General Clay knew his views on the subject. Yet General Clay did nothing to remove the men who were sabotaging the program for the establishment of a democratic Germany.

While American bankers in diplomatic frock coats or general's uniforms were ensuring that their Nazi banker and industrialist friends got proper treatment, highly respected and sincere Americans who had been appointed to supervise denazification and decartelization and who were naive enough to believe that their superiors really meant business, were driven to despair and either resigned in disgust or were quietly eliminated. Such was the case with James Stewart Martin, Russ Nixon, Johnston Avery, Heinz Norden, George Wheeler, and a host of others.

Particularly instructive is the case of Alexander Sacks, a young attorney in the employ of the American military government. Sacks had appeared before the Ferguson committee and presented detailed evidence of the calculated and deliberate sabotage of the decartelization program. For daring to do this, Sacks incurred the wrath of General Clay, who showed no great concern over the fact that the program had been sabotaged. General Clay ordered the suspension of Sacks and also held him liable to court martial on the charge of making statements attacking the integrity and good faith of the Under Secretary of the Army and of key United States military government officials charged with the formulation of policy and the implementation of the decartelization program in the United States zone of Germany.

Decartelization was of course not the only field in which we manifested our feverish haste to be done with Potsdam. Equally revealing is what happened to our solemn promise to mete out punishment to those guilty of war crimes. At Nuremberg, we joined with the big powers in giving a name to the unspeakable crimes that had been committed by Hitler and his cohorts. We coined a new word—genocide—to describe the mass murder of millions of people. But what happened? Von Papen and Fritzche were freed. Schacht, financial adviser to Hitler, was acquitted, on the grounds that he was not the actual trigger man

and because it had not been proved beyond doubt that he was aware of Hitler's plan. Justice Charles B. Sears, of Buffalo, N. Y., who allowed three leading Nazi industrialists to go free, ruled on December 22, 1947, that—

A person cannot become guilty of a crime against humanity merely by exerting anti-Semitic presure to procure * * * industrial property owned by Jews.

In other words, it was not a crime if one merely had a Jew killed in order to take over his property. This, by the way, is the same Judge Sears who ordered the deportation of Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader, in 1942 on the grounds that he was a dangerous alien.

Schacht had prophesied that he would go free. Capt. C. M. Gilbert, United States psychiatrist who was attached to the Nuremberg prisoners awaiting trial, told in October 1946 of a talk he had one day with Schacht:

Schacht laughed in his cell at the suggestion that German industrialists were to be indicted for rearming Germany.

"If you want to indict industrialists who helped Germany to rearm, you will have to indict your own, too," he said.

The Opel Works which did nothing but war production, were owned by General Motors. * * * You cannot indict industrialists.

But is was not only the bankers we freed. Having decided to reestablish a militaristic Germany and to resurrect the anti-Comintern axis, it was, of course, desirable to enlist not only bankers and industrialists but every storm trooper, Gestapo agent, and Nazi we could lay our hands on. Ilse Koch, who practiced the art of making lamp shades out of the skin of murdered persons, was certainly too valuable to allow to be sent to the gallows. Nor for that matter, the less sensational, but equally guilty, criminals such as the Kordt brothers, who had both been members of the German Foreign Office, and against whom sufficient evidence was available of having been guilty of war crimes. It would be a pity to send such men to jail. They could do yeoman service in the rallying of Germans for the next war. After all, they had plenty of experience at it. So now one Kordt is an important member of the Bavarian chancellery and the other is a delegate to the constitutional assembly in Bonn.

I have no idea where Hitler or Goebbels may be now, but I am certain that, wherever they are, they must have had a good laugh if they had heard the announcement of the American military government on August 15 that the denazification program was 99.8 percent complete. How they must have chortled to read Drew Middleton's report in the New York Times, on August 24, that newspaper licensing had been abolished and that 80 pro-Fascist papers, in many cases under the same names used during the Nazi regime and under the same publishers, would make their appearance again. Among the new publishers are such people as Max Willmay, formerly connected with Julius Streicher's pornographic, anti-Semitic gutter sheet, Der Sturmer. Another new publisher is Dr. Ottmar Best, who edited the Allgemeine Deutsche Zeitung under Hitler. According to Middleton, Best stated that "my paper will show the German people what they lost when they lost Hitler."

These are only a few of the signs of the revival of fascism in Germany. They are no surprise to anyone who has followed events in Germany. They are a result of the policy which began as soon as American troops moved into Germany. That policy became evident when progressives and democratic Germans in the western zone were subjected to intimidation, when efforts were under way to suppress the trade-union movement and to prevent it from playing a leading role in the democratization of Germany. The course of American policy in Germany, approved by the leadership of the Democratic and Republican Parties, was indicated by Allan Dulles in November 1946, at a meeting of the American Bankers Association, when he stated: "For us it is essential to participate in a leading capacity in the rebuilding of German economy in order to stabilize the economic situation in the United States through control of the German economy and to assure American firms suitable profits." And his brother, JOHN FOSTER DULLES, similarly indicated the direction and the orientation of American policy makers when he declared that, with the enactment of the Ruhr statute, "the United States has now become a European power in western Germany."

No single incident, however, is as revealing of our determination to renazify Germany as the recent elections in bizonia under the Bonn Constitution, which we hailed as "democracy in action." And more significant, perhaps, than the results of the elections is an event which took place in Munich during the course of the campaign. On August 9, a letter appeared in the Sueddeutsche Zeitung. The letter was signed "Adolf Bleibtreu (remain true to Adolf)." The writer went on to say: "I work for the Americans and they say they can forgive us everything except that we did not gas all the Jews. * * * I belong to those known as the 'Silent Ones' and our propaganda is worth more than a hundred newspapers. At the right time you will hear from me."

One thousand Jewish displaced persons who gathered in front of the newspaper offices to protest this scurrilous attack were attacked and driven away by the German police, urged on by a rabid mob.

General von Wagener, United States military governor of Bavaria, took no action to prevent a recurrence of the letter and its shocking sequel but merely reprimanded the offending newspaper. And at a meeting held in the mayor's office on August 17 the police were cleared of charges of anti-Semitic conduct and their behavior was interpreted as action in the line of duty.

The pogrom in Munich on August 11 speaks volumes as to where western Germany is heading 4 years after the destruction of nazism.

Not democracy but nazism was the victor in these elections. Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the American-approved president of the constituent assembly which framed the Bonn Constitution, had been a servant of the coal and steel magnates of Germany as far back as 1919. His reliability was manifested very early when he proved to be one of the first German politicians to affirm: "We will never accept the Potsdam decisions." And the purpose he was serving was made perfectly clear during the course of the elections, when he stated: "One of the first tasks of the west German state will be to demand admittance to the union of the Atlantic Pact nations."

If any further proof were needed of how the west German chancelor intends to defend western civilization and to rebuild democracy in Germany, one has only to study some of his cabinet appointments. As Finance Minister, Adenauer has appointed Fritz Schaeffer, who was prominent in Bavarian politics in 1923 and who in that very same year in a speech before the Bavarian Diet, passed off as mere jealousy any fears as to the dangerous menace of nazism.

Our policy in Germany has led to the revival of nazism, to the encouragement of anti-Semitism, to the rebuilding of a militaristic Germany. The fundamental principles which we accepted at Potsdam and which constitute the only basis for peace, have been violated by our Government. James Stewart Martin, who headed the decartelization branch of the American Military Government in Germany from 1945 to 1947, expressed the matter quite clearly when he stated a year ago: "Hitler built his Nazi Party on the slogan that nazism would save the world from communism. He might have vainly plotted forever had it not been for a handful of powerful financiers like Baron von Schroeder, the Cologne banker, and powerful industrialists like Krupp, Thyssen and the I. G. Farben management. Their monopoly control was running Germany into bankruptcy; they had to find a scapegoat or risk losing control. Hitler was ready-made for the job.

The alliance of Germany's heavy industry trusts and cartels with the Nazis in a crusade against communism fooled enough people once to help bring on the world's bloodiest war. It is now fooling them a second time.

The United States is making Germany a bulwark against communism. Reorganization of the heavy-industry cartels in Germany has been called off, and Nazis are being allowed to slip back into their old grooves.

Totalitarian-minded groups are resuming key positions in Germany, and many individuals who financed the Nazi Party are climbing back into power. How a Germany dominated by Nazis and their political heirs can become a bulwark against totalitarianism is unexplained.

The Dulleses and the Drapers may be well satisfied with what they have achieved in Germany. For the reuniting of American and German cartelists and bankers has paid off well. But for the American people, the policy we are now pursuing is disastrous and suicidal. Potsdam must be enforced and the shameful, undercover policy of rebuilding a Nazi Germany must be halted. A

full, thoroughgoing and public investigation of the American military government and its activities must be undertaken. To that end, I introduce the following resolution:

Whereas the American Government solemnly undertook at Crimea and at Potsdam to insure the establishment of a democratic Germany, shorn of its war-making potential and of those responsible for the crimes committed against humanity; and

Whereas the American Government has by its policies and deeds repudiated all of the basic principles of Potsdam; and

Whereas American military government has sabotaged the denazification, demilitarization, and decartelization program; and

Whereas this has led to the resurgence of nazism and anti-Semitism, to the return of leading Nazis to high posts of authority and public office, and the persecution and intimidation of democratic and progressive Germans:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on American Military Government in Germany to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of conduct and administration of the American military government in Germany.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit in and out of the United States and act during the present Congress at such time and places whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

A Great Polish-American Journalist Places His Confidence in President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the great journalists of America is Mr. Ludwik Lesnicki, who is the political commentator of the important Polish Daily News of Chicago and editor of the Current News Bureau, also of Chicago. Mr. Lesnicki, covered the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore which nominated Woodrow Wilson, and since that time has been present as a newspaper man at every national convention of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties, colorfully reporting in three languages to many hundreds of thousands of his readers the stirring events on those historic occasions.

As a keen and experienced political observer, employing a forceful and virile vocabulary in the interpretation of momentous political events, and accurately charting the trends of public opinion, Mr. Lesnicki for years has enjoyed a national reputation, especially among Americans of Polish blood.

In the Polish American Journal of Scranton, Pa., a weekly newspaper of wide circulation and great influence, to which Mr. Lesnicki contributes an outstanding column—issue of October 1, 1949—appears the following article by this distinguished writer which it is a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues. The article by Mr. Lesnicki follows:

DON'T ROCK THE BOAT

Business conditions are sound.

We have one of the greatest crops in history.

We have a sound financial system, backed by the greatest store of gold in the world.

Our banks are solid and safe.

There is nothing the matter with our United States.

The President has decided to appeal to the public to help maintain existing conditions.

The Nation cannot fail to respond.

Because as said by the great rebuilder, the late President Roosevelt: "The only fear we have to fear is fear itself."

The President has all the angles of the tangled skein of foreign politics in his hands.

He has the assistance of an excellent Secretary of State.

None will insist that President Truman has not made mistakes.

No President ever has had so many opportunities to do the wrong or the right thing.

His presence in Potsdam has not been productive of the happiest results.

But—as it looks from here (Washington) now—there is no good ground for assuming that any other course—at the time of the Potsdam "confab"—would have been happier.

There is nothing the matter with the boat that we are in.

The boat is straight and strong.

The boat is well seamed, well timbered, well caulked.

Our boat, with Harry S. Truman as skipper, will bear us safely and prosperously through.

On the record—as a whole—of things done, on the prospect of things to be done there is a real reason for every American to stand behind our President Truman. And there are in my humble opinion very many good reasons why we should do so.

What American can or should forget in so short a time the manifold difficulties which confronted President Truman since April 12, 1945, and during the last months of the war?

What American can or should forget that President Truman was called on almost at every moment to act on matters big with the fate of the Nation?

What just man can overlook that President Truman acted not in the light of subsequent events but under the direct menace of the event itself?

Let every man and woman realize that at this moment—I refer to the atomic-blast affair in Russia—calm confidence and calm thankfulness are the first duty.

They are absolutely justified by the favorable situation in which we find ourselves.

They are the certain guaranty of a continuance of those conditions.

Sit tight, don't rock the boat, keep its head well up against the sea, don't let it get into the trough of the waves.

Don't rock it.

That's the watchword today. That's the central idea.

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 4 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of September 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE

A political record is something that bobs up to hit politicians in the face at the most unexpected times and places.

For instance: Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART has turned back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to look over some of the speeches that Harry S. Truman made when he was United States Senator. In 1941 Thomas G. (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran was one of the fair-haired boys about the White House and used his White House influence, much as General Vaughan has been doing recently, to obtain favors for his political friends. Senator Truman did not approve, so he introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post severely condemning Corcoran for "selling his influence to obtain Government contracts for his friends and clients." Now, with General Vaughan doing the same thing, Mr. Truman, the President, does not see anything wrong with the same thing that Mr. Truman, the Senator, condemned.

Here is another one: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 90, No. 8, page 318, is recorded a statement made by Senator Truman on the floor of the United States Senate January 18, 1944—a little more than a year before he became President:

"I think the time has come when labor unions, cooperatives, and similar organizations which have grown to such vast proportions during the last few years are going to be required to make an accounting of their funds and what they do with them for the benefit of the public and in the public interest. There is no difference between a labor leader with too much money to spend on an election and Mark Hanna with too much money to spend on an election."

The thing which Mr. Truman, the Senator, advocated in that statement is one of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which Mr. Truman, the President, now severely condemns. There is no record of his objection to the millions of dollars which labor organizations spent in his behalf in the last election or against the millions of dollars proposed to be spent in Ohio next year in an effort to defeat Senator TAFT.

It begins to look as if Harry S. Truman, the Senator, and Harry S. Truman, the President, are two different people with opposing ideas.

Why Does Uncle Sam Pick on Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, I feel certain that every Member of this House would be interested in the article by Carl A. Gray, a businessman and president of the Grenby-Cardwell Manufacturing Co., with a plant at Plainville, Conn., written for the Saturday Evening Post, published October 1, 1949.

Small business has a most important place in the economic operation of this Nation. In fact, we are a nation of small-business firms, both as to retail and manufacturing. I have read statistics stating that small-business firms, both retail and manufacturing, account for as high as 75 percent of all the business of our Nation. Regardless of the number of small-business firms and regardless of their importance, every one of us must realize the important part small business plays in the employment field and in accounting for the basic prosperity of our Nation. I know you will find this article well worth the time and effort required in reading it:

WHY DOES UNCLE SAM PICK ON US?

(By Carl A. Gray)

My son Harvey is 10 years old and already is a businessman. He has his own paper route. I am flattered that he has decided to follow in my footsteps. I am a businessman, too, and have been ever since I left college some 25 years ago. Harvey is more enthusiastic about being in business than I am. According to his lights, being in business means supplying needed services or articles for a modest profit. With the uncluttered view of youth, he now looks forward to a lifetime of following this simple formula.

I don't know whether to tell Harvey now the economic facts of life or to let him enjoy his illusion. I cannot decide whether to tell him that the future of the small-business man is in jeopardy; that a generation hence he may be as extinct as the dodo or the marsh hen. Frankly, I hesitate to tell him that his father, and others like him, daily face troubles and travail; that we are badgered at every turn in our fruitless task of trying to make our companies secure.

If I were blunt, I'd say, "Look, Harvey, I've been beating my head against the business wall and getting such tiny returns that I'm on the point of throwing in the sponge, buying some tax-exempt securities and sitting it out."

Along with thousands of others, as a small employer I am today staggering along in a labyrinthine economy of uncertainty, weakened by the blood-letting of excessive taxation and faced at every turn by inquisitive agents of government. Today the margin of safety is so tenuous that one costly mistake of judgment in buying, selling, or engineering could wipe out not only the year's profit but the business as well.

Like my machine operators and my accountants, I want security too. I don't have it. Few small employers do, these days.

We don't have it for a perfectly obvious reason. There was a time when the fat years took care of the lean year. Now, when there is a fat year, excessive taxation and high pressure by Government agents, sometimes resulting in forced distribution of dividends up to 70 percent of earnings, make it almost impossible to provide for a rainy day.

I'm not just being selfish about it. I'd like to do more for my employees. I'd like to have profit sharing, give them longer vacations and better recreational facilities. I'd like to keep them on the pay roll in dull periods. All these things are impossible now because the money is siphoned off almost as fast as we make it.

One day I walked into my office and it was as busy as the Grand Central Terminal. When I got over the shock, I started counting noses. There were no fewer than eight Government agents there, representing a variety of bureaus. They were checking our files, looking for statistical information, studying time cards, examining our books and conning our personnel records. It was just a coincidence that they arrived on the same day, but it started me thinking. That night I went home and toted up the advantages and disadvantages of operating one's own business.

I was appalled to find that the debits more than outweighed the credits. A lot of things had happened, I discovered, since 1939, when my partner and I started in a tiny plant with three employees. Now we have, 175 and the headaches have increased by geometrical progression.

Comparing our business with the big fellows is like matching a motor launch against the *Queen Mary*. But even small motorboats were handy things in one big emergency in England. I think the small motorboats of business are equally important. But there is a squeezing process going on. If it continues there just won't be any small-business men when Harvey grows up. He'll have to settle for being a State manager or emissary of a Government agency. Then everybody will be working one way or another for the Government in a new version of a self-sufficient economy where everybody lives by taking in the other fellow's washing. We're almost there now.

Large companies, because of bigness, have their troubles, I know. One vice president told me that his company in no way was acting against the public interest, and yet he spent 2 days a week for 7 years in court, fighting a Government suit.

What ails the small-business man? Well, first of all, he suffers from too much Government. Every "level," as they say in Washington, from the first selectman right up to the Federal bureaus, is poking and prying into his business, taking his time with reports, audits, and examinations, treating him meanwhile as though he were the dirty little coward who shot Mr. Howard. Do you believe that a man is innocent until proved guilty? That might be true when it comes to pickpockets and footpads, but not when the possible infringement of a Federal regulation by a small-business man is considered.

Here are just a few of the Government agents who drop in to see us, sometimes in twos and threes, sometimes like small hordes of locusts: State sales tax, State labor department, factory inspectors, Federal unemployment, State unemployment, revaluation and conversion, Internal Revenue, War Assets, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government auditors on contracts, renegotiation representatives, and last, but not least, wage-and-hour representatives.

Many of them are pleasant fellows, but in their own way they are trapped in the system just as we are. Some are suspicious, others hardly conceal their hostility. Pleasant or otherwise, they all take time. Sometimes I wonder if they think we have a still hidden out in back of some of the vats in our plating department.

Take the fellow who came in the other day to check our wage records. He found that one of our top engineers was not receiving time and a half for overtime. "Aha," he said in effect, "at last I've caught you."

We explained this man was an executive making a good salary and was not subject to the law. Was that enough? It was not. We had to dig up our personnel records to prove that the man had graduated from Yale's Sheffield Scientific School and that he had a long and distinguished record in his profession. That took somebody's time.

When you get a Government contract with many agencies—and I hasten to exclude service procurement—your troubles really begin. We had one that ran for 7 months, back in 1945. Our monthly reports were filed, approved, and passed on for payment. At no time were the reports questioned or even criticized. We received payment, and final releases were signed. We thought the matter was closed.

Then out of a clear sky in June 1947, two men walked in and said they were going to audit all transactions on this contract. They stayed 4 weeks.

Three months later we got a letter saying our records were incomplete and we were liable to a penalty of $10,531. We yelped loud enough and the case was reopened. New auditors arrived and the whole thing started from scratch. After a couple of weeks, one of the auditors got sick and left. A week later his partner left. Heaving a sigh of relief, we put everything back in the files.

In June 1948, a total stranger walked in He was a nice fellow and explained that he was there to audit the contract. He stayed so long that I began to mistake him for one of the help. Then one fine morning he came up with an answer. These countless visits by auditors had finally borne fruit: The Government owned us $2.09, he said heartily.

But hold. This was not the end. A couple of months later two grim gentlemen from Washington arrived to tell us that they were going to do another once-over-lightly. That was early in 1949, and we were still holding our breath until recently a new 64-page set of regulations arrived, superseding everything else.

That is only one aspect of Government wasting your time. Equally irritating is the inability of a manufacturer to find out what certain rulings mean. Not long ago we called the collector of internal revenue to ask him if contracts secured from the Government prior to May 21, 1948, were renegotiable. We thought we'd get a quick, incisive answer. He told us to call the office at Hartford. We did. They told us to call the main office in another city 40 miles away. We did. They told us to write to Washington. We did. Several weeks later we got a suggestion that the answer was included in certain sections of an enclosed document that covered 145 pages of legal-size paper. A few days later we received a note telling us to "please destroy the copy of part 423 sent to you earlier." Accompanying this note was another fat volume of 64 pages of legal-size papers. Somewhere in it is the answer.

Of course, there are regular checks on our time cards to see that we don't cheat on time and a half. But in spite of this concern that the worker get his due, on a Government job we're doing, we have to pull junior engineers off the job right in the middle of a big problem in which they are engrossed. They protest vigorously because they're young professional men and want to see it through. But the Government says nix, they won't be paid for work overtime.

Far worse, however, than these day-by-day pinpricks is the tragic siphoning of money out of business through taxation and dispersal of dividends. If we're lucky enough to make a profit of $100,000 in 1 year, I'm sure an economist like Bob Nathan could make something out of it. But here's what happens: Instantly that shrinks to $62,000 as the Federal Government takes its cut of 38 percent. Then the State government gets a whack at it. I'd like to keep what's left, or

part of it anyway, for a rainy day. But section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code stipulates a penalty of from 27½ to 38½ percent unless I parcel out a large part of the balance for dividends. That way, of course, the Government gets still another lick at it through personal income taxes. But it leaves me with less than $20,000, probably nearer $10,000, to go into surplus. You can't win.

The country is going through what one economist calls the most prosperous recession in history. We have the greatest number of unemployed in 10 years. We also have the largest number of employed in the history of peace. I know part of the reason for this anomaly. The naturally expanding economy of a growing country, the symptoms of which are new industries and new jobs, has been atrophied by Government policies. Men are not starting new industries for two reasons: (1) It is almost impossible to find private venture capital. (2) The cost of floating a public stock issue is too much for the small-business man to pay.

Some men shiver at the prospect of dying during a good year. The reason is simple. They may have been losing money for years, but if they hit a prosperous year and pay 10 percent profit, dying from the shock, the taxes may take all that a widow has. In the absence of a market for a stock of a closely held corporation, the Government will use a formula by which an arbitrary market value is established, often in excess of the price which is actually realized through sale. I know a widow who wants to get rid of her husband's stock in such a company as if it were a hot potato, so she will not be taxed to ruination. She is offering her stock at 80 percent of the net quick assets.

At the present time our company has no fewer than five good new devises gathering dust on the shelves. We just don't have the money to finance their production. And if we did, there's the inevitable feeling, "What's the use? We're only adding to our headaches."

You can't blame private investors for being skeptical. Only about 1 new business in 20 succeeds. They've got to have some incentive far beyond a possible 5 percent to lure their money out of hiding.

Here's an illustration: I just talked to the owner of a business in Boston. He makes small castings for us. He was telling me that he was trying to get more equipment and modernize his plant. It called for venture capital. He talked to one of his friends who has considerable money. Here is the answer he got: "If I put money into your company, even though it is in excellent shape, I am just risking money. And if I make money, it means that I have to pay more to Uncle Sam. The risks are too great for the sake of paying more income taxes."

Suppose then, that you try to float a public stock issue to raise money. That's a nightmare that I've also been through. Before anything else, you've got to file a prospectus with the SEC. Minimum legal advice for this costs about $15,000. Minimum charges for so-called SEC audits run to another $15,000. Bankers also like to have special reports from outside engineers. These cost another $10,000. There are other expenses, so that if the small entrepreneur wants public financing he's got to put about $40,000 on the line before his application is considered. With that kind of money lying around loose you probably wouldn't be applying in the first place.

When we were getting financed the market broke and we could do no public financing; the banks told us to go to the RFC, and we ran into a paradoxical tug of war between three agencies of Government. We were as usual, in the middle. RFC, distinguished for its intelligent and cooperative staff, was trying to help us. But the RFC Price Adjustment Board was trying to take our money away. Complicating it still further, the Internal Revenue Bureau also got into the act. The RFC would not lend us the money unless the Internal Revenue Bureau agreed to freeze our back taxes, held up for lack of Government audit, for the duration of the loan. And we had both the RFC and the Internal Revenue Bureau worrying about what the Renegotiations Division would do.

We finally got it worked out, but not before I had a first-hand view of how each agency operates a separate empire, often at cross purposes, and hardly ever with full consideration or knowledge of the total problem.

Have I broken your heart yet? Then perhaps you'd like to hear about the sleeper in the wage-hour law. We got rooked by it even though our company is meticulous about its records. Other small manufacturers I know are still waking up at night in a cold sweat, thinking what might happen to them.

There's a provision in the law that says if a foreman spends as much as 20 percent of his time doing any of the work of his men, then he's entitled to time and one-half for overtime. Well, we bought out the assets and liabilities of a New York concern and took quite a few of their old employees on our pay roll. One fine morning we had an attachment slapped on our factory by one of these newcomers. Our bank accounts were frozen. It seems that during the war years one of these foremen had more on his mind than winning the war. He kept careful tab of the hours worked. He felt he had $20,000 coming to him.

Understand, all this had happened before we even came into the picture. We didn't know what it was all about. But all our assets were permitted to be frozen by State law. The pay envelopes of our employees were put in jeopardy until I scurried around and posted a bond. I have a friend who got nicked for nearly $75,000 by several of these sudden suits for overtime. The suits were stimulated by overenthusiastic representatives of Government.

Now, I'm not moaning low out of pure cussedness. There are a lot of things I'd like to be doing if we had a proper margin of safety for operations. I'd like to help train more apprentices. I have lots of swell youngsters coming to me wanting to learn a trade. It takes a couple of years to train a good machine operator. Even a graduate engineer with an ME or a BSEE needs a year or so under mature guidance before he earns his keep. We've had to pass up some of this good raw material, letting it go to some of the bigger companies or, even worse, to seed.

Even in the friendliest milieu there are inherent hazards in running a business. It's easy now to purchase an inventory at one price and find that the finished product is overpriced and can't be sold in a falling market. We don't have the means to do consumer research or make surveys. Our engineering department can underestimate the cost of doing a job, and again we lose money.

When any of these economic bricks fall on us, there's nobody around to hold our hands and tell us he's sorry. Take the matter of strikes. We're building right now a highly precise meteorological device. Each unit represents the investment of thousands of man-hours. Every day thousands of dollars' worth of engineering skills goes into its manufacture. Right now there's a strike in a factory 100 miles away. They make slip rings for the turntable casting for this machine. The rings are worth about $200 per set. But the unit can't be completed without them. If they're not here soon, we'll have to lay off the help. We don't want to. But we've got to watch our pay roll like hawks. If we wait too long—zip, we go into the red. If we went to the labor leaders in this other town and told them our difficulty, they'd say, "Brother, that's your worry." So it is. But it illustrates the fact that small-business men are faced with enough vicissitudes without the extra straws piled on by Government.

It seems to me there is a grievous inconsistency in those who speak in favor of a free, competitive system, but who at the same time do everything possible to discourage us small fellows from staying in business. Not only should we be tolerated, but we should be encouraged to expand and create new jobs.

I'm not being mealymouthed when I say I'm in business for more reasons than just to make a profit. I do want to make a profit, because I want job security as much as the next fellow. But I also like to create jobs for other people. I like to feel that I am contributing to the welfare and prosperity of my community. I like to train young people to become productive workers. And—heaven help me for being so naive—I like to feel that my small company can contribute its part in creating a strong industrial fabric for war or peace.

I think my country is more secure with thousands of small plants like ours than with just a few big ones under centralized control. Experience has already shown that when industrial paralysis strikes one of the Gullivers all the Lilliputian tributaries are also stricken. A coat of armor with thousands of small circlets is stronger and more flexible than one composed of a few great ones. Recently we underbid one of the largest corporations in the country. The purchaser is saving $400,000 on this one transaction because we carry no excess baggage on the pay roll.

Despite these facts, we who run these small plants are in danger. We need sympathetic support, not bedevilment. We are not getting that support. There's not a small manufacturer I know who wouldn't be satisfied with a decent annual profit and the chance to operate in a friendly and secure atmosphere. By profits I mean not only money to put into stockholders' pockets but profits to plow back into business; profits to ease the nightmare of sudden disaster and bankruptcy; profits to make new products and to create new jobs.

My company is in good financial shape—better than most. Yet for 2 years during conversion from war to peace we made no profit at all. This year we will make a reasonable profit. But it will sift through our hands like sand through a sieve. During the year I have taken all the headaches and heartaches. I have risked all my capital and I have, into the bargain, worked day and night, harder and longer than any of my workers. I will have little to show for it, even in this good year.

Why should I take all these risks? My $260,000 investment will bring me only about $10,000 in a good year. Taxes will take a big bite out of that. But there is an easy way out. I can avoid all these risks by retiring and investing my money in tax-exempt securities. There's a lot to be said for it. I'd see more of my family. I'd worry less and sleep better. I'd stop waking up at night and asking, "Have we done this right? Are we violating a law or regulation if we do this? Shall we ship now or wait for the new fiscal year because of taxes?"

Don't get me wrong. I have no use for parasites. I've sweated hard for 25 years. I don't like nonproducers, whether they're sitting behind a bureaucratic desk or fulminating against the ancient New Deal from the depths of their overstuffed club chairs. To me, there is only one "real wealth." It is the product of man's mind and skill and sweat. Anybody who tells you that Government produces wealth is just kidding. Government consumes it. But you and I, when we take the raw stuff of nature and transform it into something usable, are creating wealth. That's why, when we kill off the small entrepreneur, we are killing

off the real wealthmakers of the country. That's bad.

If we don't believe in a free competitive system, then, for heaven's sake, let's junk it manfully and cleanly. This slow suffocation is a painful sight to those of us who believe that free competition is best for all of us individually and collectively. I believe it is worse than a direct frontal attack from men who do not believe in the dignity of the individual or the worth of private brains, private capital and private sweat. It is worse because small business is today slowly being throttled by the ignorance, stupidity and suspicions of the very men who protest their faith in the American system.

And what of my son Harvey? I watch him as he walks down the street whistling and delivering his papers. One of my neighbors told me, "I tried to tip him, but he refused to take the money. He said, 'One price and the same good service to everybody.' "

I am old-fashioned enough to feel proud about that. Harvey finished the summer with a total profit of about forty-five dollars and a belief that he had discovered the American system: Do your job, display enterprise, give people the service they're glad to pay for. In return, you get the security of a good business and a steady income.

It will pain me to disillusion Harvey, to tell him that doing business today is more complicated than that. Harvey thinks now that one can travel freely and trade freely. Some day soon, however, he's got to learn that the planned economy of the welfare state is here. In that state men will seek pensions, not profits. They will eschew adventure in favor of security.

To illustrate this theme, I will use an analogy out of my own experience. "Son," I will say, "think of yourself delivering papers along an obstacle course. The man in charge has placed all these barriers in the way. You must climb speedily over them. But that isn't all. As you try to race a great many of the man's retainers spread along the course will impede you. They will ask you questions, examine the spikes in your shoes, check your form. Now and again, for no good reason, some of these retainers, in a burst of authority, will hit you over the head with folded audit sheets.

"If, in spite of all these difficulties, you finally get your papers delivered, at the finish line they will prepare to present you with a beautiful loving cup for your speed and skill. But just as you reach for it a venerable gentleman in a goatee will snatch it from you. He will wrench the handles from it and hand one of these fragments to you. The rest he will quietly appropriate, scowling suspiciously meanwhile."

That may sound like travesty to the uninitiated. But there are plenty of small-business men who will say it is quiet understatement.

I am not completely despairing. I think men like myself at 50 are probably too old to carry on the fight. I think that the generation that followed right on my heels is too enervated in its search for the illusion of security. They are too pension-bent, too hypnotized by the idea of the state as the all-in-all. Besides, many of them are cowed because in some intellectual circles profit is a taboo.

I know in the future, though, that still another generation must cut cleanly through these cobwebs. These are the post-depression babies and I hope they can rediscover America.

They must come as a courageous, adventuring troupe, not bent on exploiting other men or plundering our natural resources, but only intent on the development of their own potentialities and inner resources. A man who is concerned only with security is only a half-man, because he does not live up to the promise as a creative creature made in the image and likeness of God.

And when that clean, creative wind sweeps through this country of ours, I hope fervently that my son Harvey will have the honor of being among those present and doing something about it.

Massachusetts Lady Uses Good Dried Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter I received from Mrs. Nellie Gregory, of Springfield, Mass., and my reply thereto:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *September 26, 1949.*

Representative REID F. MURRAY,
Ogdensburg, Wis.

DEAR SIR: Saturday evening I read an article in my paper written by Mr. Othman.

I wanted to tell you that I am able to buy dried skim milk at my grocery store at 33 and 35 cents a pound box, Borden's Starlex.

I find it a great convenience and a great saving. I use it for cooking, and not caring to put on weight, I drink it as well.

I had my two grandchildren with me all summer, and I made puddings nearly every day with the powdered milk, which was much cheaper than the dairy milk, and I felt I could use more.

It is very convenient when short of milk, and a quart is made in about 5 minutes. A pound box is supposed to make 5 quarts of milk. I think I use a little more powder for a quart of water. I am not able to get it at all stores, and it is not in a great abundance; hope it grows more popular.

Send some of your dried milk East, and I'll boost it for you.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. NELLIE GREGORY.

Mrs. NELLIE GREGORY,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR MRS. GREGORY: Thanks for your letter of September 26.

Before the war, a total of 200,000,000 pounds of this product was produced for human consumption. Before the war as in 1939 140,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk was manufactured for animal feeding and in 1948 there were 658,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk produced for human consumption and only 14,000,000 pounds produced for animal use. The present Government support price to the producer is 11.5 cents per pound for roller process and 12.75 cents per pound for spray process. It is a most desirable protein food and it contains 35.6 percent digestable protein. This is about twice the amount of digestible protein found in meats.

There has been a great diversion of this skim milk to human consumption and it is used by first-class bakers and added to bread. It is also used in many processed meat products.

In 1938 only 21,000,000 pounds of the milk produced in the United States was manufactured into dry whole milk, while in 1946 over 14,000,000 pounds of dried whole milk was manufactured into dry whole milk or many times the prewar figure. In 1947—1,200,000,000 pounds of milk was used for dried whole milk. This indicates that the war-time demand has not been maintained but the present production is still much in excess of the prewar production. It is being used for table use and for camping and hunting trips and general home use where bottle milk is not available. About 13 pounds of this powder is obtained from 100 pounds of milk. One pound theoretically makes nearly 4 quarts of normal milk. It is easily reconstituted. The producer is receiving about 30–32 cents per pound for this product. This is in bulk and in barrels.

The per capita production of this "most perfect food known to man," milk, is being reduced to the danger point. Milk is the greatest single food. The dairy cow is the most efficient producer of human food and in fact is the "foster mother" of the human race.

It is to be regretted that obsolete regulations prevent the consumer from enjoying the privilege of using more milk and milk products in his and her diet.

Your interest in writing me about dairy products is very much appreciated.

Yours truly,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the American Legion has been actively in the forefront of the struggle to support the House Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives in its fight against subversive groups and individuals; and

Whereas this congressional committee in the past has made substantial contribution to the safety and welfare of our country and to the perpetuity of its established institutions in that it has been instrumental in providing evidence resulting in the conviction of Gerhart Eisler, No. 1 Comintern agent and now a fugitive from justice; Leon Josephson, another important Communist who operated in the United States; Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist organization in the United States, and other subversive groups, and individuals: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in convention assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 30, 31 and September 1, 1949, That we do hereby demand that the House of Representatives continue the Un-American Activities Committee and that sufficient appropriations be promptly provided for its work; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the American Legion acquaint itself with the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee and thereby be better equipped to meet its captious critics.

It is hereby certified that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at the Thirty-first Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Philadelphia, Pa., August 29, 30, 31, and September 1, 1949.

PERRY BROWN, *National Commander.*

Attest:

HENRY H. DUDLEY, *National Adjutant.*

The Growth of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the growth of the Federal Government is all out of proportion to what it should be. In 1933 there were about 533,000 on the Federal pay roll. Today there are more than 2,000,000. In the last 4 years this administration has spent $177,000,000,000. This is more than our Government cost in the first 152 years of its existence and during that time we went through several wars and depressions. We are currently spending about $3,300,000,000 a month. This is more than the Civil War cost us in 4 years. When we look at the present budget we realize that more than half of it is being used for military and foreign-aid programs. In 1939, when we thought we were preparing for war, we were spending less than a billion dollars on the military and had no foreign-aid programs. Today that sum is close to $23,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask what is the remedy? In my own humble opinion, I believe we must adopt all of the Hoover Commission's recommendations. The President should take immediate steps with this purpose in mind. It would take two or three hundred thousand off the Federal pay roll and save around $4,000,000,000. It would bring some semblance of sanity to Federal Government. I believe we should further scrutinize carefully all of the present spending programs. I am sure it would be possible to trim billions off the present requests.

Mr. Speaker, your administration is in the driver's seat. You have a majority of 90 in the House and 12 in the Senate. Upon you rests the solemn obligation of adopting programs which will keep America solvent. We can spend ourselves into destruction for the power to tax is the power to destroy. Before it is too late, I hope there will be a real uprising at the grass roots, and there will be, when the people become conscious of what this administration is doing to them. This will result in a demand for economy and efficiency which even this free-spending administration cannot ignore.

United States Naval Reserve Training Center, Joplin, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday October 4, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following two speeches: The first delivered by Rear Adm. J. Cary Jones, United States Navy, at the commissioning ceremonies of the United States Naval Reserve Training Center, Joplin, Mo., September 29, 1949; the second, delivered by Hon. DEWEY SHORT, Member of Congress, Seventh Missouri District, at the same place and on the same date:

SPEECH BY REAR ADM. J. CARY JONES, UNITED STATES NAVY

In the Ninth Naval District, which embraces 15 States in the Midwest and provides approximately one-third of the Nation's total reserve strength, we consider the development of the Naval Reserve program to be our most important mission.

There are a number of reasons why the Naval Reserve should, and does, receive top consideration. But these two are the most important:

First, a well-trained civilian reserve is the backbone of our national defense system;

Second, civilians share with our armed forces the responsibility for national security, and the reserve program provides the most effective means for civilians to participate in national defense functions.

As far back as 1887, legislation was first introduced in the Congress for the creation of a Naval Reserve. While this legislation was not enacted into Federal law, it became the basis of action by several States in creating Naval Militia organizations. In 1915 a Naval Reserve, to be composed of ex-Navy men, was finally authorized. Due to insufficient funds, the organization became very weak after World War I. This situation continued until enactment of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938. From that date to the time when the Naval Reserve was mobilized for World War II, training became more intensified, both with respect to drills and cruises. As a consequence, reservists were equipped to assume positions of reponsibility with the fleet when hostilities began.

It has been traditional for the United States to reduce its armed forces, in peacetime, to a minimum commensurate with national security. These active forces provide a nucleus upon which to build a civilian Army, Navy, and Air Force in times of national crisis. This is illustrated by the fact that in World War II when naval personnel reached a peak of some three and one-third million—10 out of every 11 were members of the Naval Reserve.

Today, more than 300 Naval Reserve training centers have been established throughout the country. The latest type equipment has been installed for training purposes, including radio, radar, sonar, machine and tool shops.

About 765 organized divisions of the Surface and Submarine Reserve (239 of which are in the Ninth Naval District), totaling more than 150,000 officers and men, drill one night a week. Despite the great distance of the Midwest from salt water, we have such famous submarines as the *Silversides*, located, for Reserve-training purposes, at Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Detroit.

More than 2,000 Volunteer Reserve units, composed of inactive reservists, have been established throughout the country.

Both the effectiveness of training and fitness of personnel are proved from time to time by active training duty with the fleet. The speed with which Naval Reservists become proficient in their duties on such occasions is a tribute to the spirit and intelligence of personnel, and confirms the fact that every phase of the training program is being absorbed.

Greater incentives for more active participation in the program now exist since enactment of Naval Reserve retirement legislation. Your faithful attendance at drills, as well as correspondence courses, will help you accumulate points for retirement benefits.

All of us are keenly aware of the tremendous financial burden imposed upon this country by the high cost of national defense. I believe that one of the most gratifying aspects of the Naval Reserve program is that it provides maximum security at minimum cost.

Your membership in the Naval Reserve is conclusive evidence of your continuing interest in the naval service. Your support will mean much to the active fleet as it stands on the alert all over the world.

Remember always that a strong United States is our greatest possible insurance for world stability and peace.

It is a very great pleasure to be with you on this occasion. I extend my congratulations and best wishes to you all.

SPEECH BY HON. DEWEY SHORT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTH MISSOURI DISTRICT

Lieutenant McGehee, Admiral Jones, Admiral Wassell, Commander Martin, fellow Americans, this has been a great day in the history of the city of Joplin and one not to be forgotten. Because of its favorable location, healthful climate, and intense interest of its wide-awake citizens, especially the young naval veterans, Joplin was chosen as one of the 322 Naval Reserve training centers of the United States. From its humble beginning in October 1946, the Joplin Naval Reserve Surface Division has grown to its full complement of 209 enlisted men and 15 officers with many on the waiting list to enter.

This phenomenal success could not have been achieved without the excellent teamwork and wholehearted cooperation of all concerned. After the impressive ceremonies and remarkable demonstrations today, I believe the Navy can rest assured that the Joplin training center will make a record of which everyone can be proud.

On behalf of the people of this progressive city and district, I wish to thank Admiral Louis Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, and his fellow officers in the Navy for their sympathetic and helpful cooperation. We have been highly honored today by the presence of Admiral J. Cary Jones, commandant of the Ninth Naval District, Great Lakes, Ill., and his staff, Admiral Corydon M. Wassell, medical hero of World War II, and Commander William I. Martin, one of our greatest living naval aces of the Pacific war, and the first boy I named to either academy.

We are most grateful to the crew of the *Blue Angels*, led by Lt. Comdr. Dusty Rhodes, and to Lieutenant Riddle, pilot of the *Neptune*. Our thanks are also due to Lt. John L. McGehee, Lt. Comdrs. Charles E. Ruyle, Henry S. Ross, E. L. Niehaus, W. E. DeLong, W. E. Owen, and to Mr. Wayne Slankard, who have contributed so much to this program. Of course, their efforts could not have succeeded without the help of city officials, the chamber of commerce, and particularly the generous and invaluable assistance given by the Joplin Globe and News Herald, different county newspapers, and radio stations.

If World War II taught us one lesson it was not only the desirability but the necessity of having an integrated, coordinated and synchronized mobile striking force on land, sea, and in the air. An army, navy, and air force are all three needed to win a modern, mechanized war. Each arm is indispensable to victory. We shall not overlook the Coast Guard and there will always be a Marine Corps and an air arm to the Navy. All these services won immortal renown in the last global conflict and there is enough glory and honor to pass around to everybody. We are members of the same defense family and must always work as a team. Any one service would be lost without the other. And at all times we must have the support of an enlightened and interested citizenry.

Until 2 years ago the Congress had two entirely separate and distinct legislative committees working on military and naval

legislation instead of one. There was the old Military Affairs Committee, with a history of well over 100 years of working with the legislative problems of the Army. I served on that committee for many years and became thoroughly conversant with the problems of that branch of our armed forces. But I never had occasion, nor did the committee, to work with Navy matters in any particular way.

Then, there was the Naval Affairs Committee, which also had many generations of experience working with the legislation of our great Navy. The members of that committee, after years of service, became recognized experts on Navy legislative problems. But the work of the Naval Affairs Committee, and the work of the Military Affairs Committee, rarely meshed. Each of these old committees, because of the heavy burdens they carried, and because this idea of unification was not seriously considered until recently, sought its own legislative solutions to the problems of its particular armed service, and the committees consulted with each other on matters of common interest very rarely indeed. In fact, there was no little rivalry between the members of the two committees—rivalry that had both good and bad, but mostly bad, effects on legislation.

Then we came along and streamlined the Congress in 1946. In furtherance of unification, and after a hot debate, it was decided to unite and coordinate these two old committees into what is known today as the House Committee on Armed Services. I am now the ranking minority member of this new, unified committee—which is to say, that I am the senior Republican member of the committee.

So here I am tonight, a former member of the historic Military Affairs Committee of the Congress, speaking to you on the occasion of the commissioning of a Navy installation. This would have been unheard of a few years ago. But now, and I am glad that it is so, there is no longer in the Congress this concentration on the separate service idea which produced the Unification Act, and our new, unified Armed Services Committee is doing a great job of unifying the armed forces. We want a balanced national defense and must equally consider every phase of all the departments of our National Military Establishment.

I may say that there is another symbol of unification here, whether openly evident or not. It is a different kind of unification. But it is of importance to each of us because it relates so directly to our readiness in time of national emergency. Not only is there today, under the Unification Act, a growing spirit and sense of unity among the armed forces themselves, but what we are here for on this occasion relates directly also to the spirit of common purpose and realization of mutual interest between the armed forces and the people of the United States and between the Reserves of the armed forces and the members of the Regular services. Those of us who are or have been associated with the armed forces, either as civilians, as reservists, or as Regulars, must never lose sight of the fact that what we have achieved in the past or whatever strength we may possess today and in the future is founded upon the support of all our citizens. No hard and fast line should be drawn between our military and civilian populations. I discovered in the extensive hearings on the subject of unification before the Armed Services Committee that there is too much heat in respect to unification and far too little light.

I discovered, to my surprise, that unification has become a shibboleth—a slogan—which is tending more and more to become a means in the name of which things may be done which perhaps, in some instances, should not be done.

It is sound to support the concept of unification. But that support must be an understanding, critical, alert support, not a blind support of a mystical, undefined word. For we must be ever watchful that in the name of unification action is not taken which will work to the injury of our national defense by those who have risen to power within our tremendous Military Establishment which now takes almost one-third of our national budget.

I would like to say that I believe that our new Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, is going to do an excellent job. I believe he is going to carry forward forthrightly and well the magnificent accomplishments made by one of the finest men I have ever known, James Forrestal, our first Secretary of Defense. While we want unification, we do not want merger of our armed forces. We should at all times maintain the identity and integrity of each branch of our services, and each branch should determine for itself the particular kind of tools and weapons necessary to carry out its own peculiar mission. A healthy rivalry and wholesome competition between the different branches of our armed forces is a good thing, but there is no room for spite and jealousy. The Nation is sound in insisting upon the elimination of petty bickering among the armed forces, and I am confident that Secretary Johnson will see that this is accomplished.

However, I am not so confident now—although I must confess that I once was, and not so long ago—that the Nation can realize billions of dollars of savings from unification per se; neither am I quite so confident that the new defense structure we have erected will insure that each branch of our armed forces will develop appropriately in the accomplishment of its own peculiar mission.

What I am referring to, of course, is the situation confronting the United States Navy today in the counsels of our Nation.

Under unification, the Navy has lost representation at the Cabinet level.

Under unification, the Navy has lost the right, apparently, to use its appropriated funds to develop the weapons the Navy itself considers necessary in the furtherance of the naval might of the United States.

Under unification, the Navy has lost the right of direct access to the President of the United States, constitutionally the Commander in Chief, but must henceforth proceed to the President, if such is permitted, through the Secretary of Defense, whomever he may be at any given time.

Under unification, Navy planning, Navy strategy, Navy appropriations themselves are no longer matters determined by naval experts but they are now subject, under unification, to a voting process or at least a sort of conference action, in which conferences the Navy finds itself confronted and outnumbered by individuals wholly without naval training and experience.

These are basic matters of which I speak. And I want to emphasize that I am not speaking for or against the Navy in making these remarks. I am speaking of the facts as they exist in Washington.

What I do want to say—and this is a subject requiring the most profound thought of American citizens today—is that there is a valid question as to whether or not, in our zeal for unification, we may not find ourselves some time in the future with a type of defense planning and outlook which characterized Prussian Germany with its vast, overpowerful, narrow-minded, autocratic general staff. Japan also had one. We should profit by their mistakes.

I mention these matters today because they are troubling many of us in the Congress, despite the fact that we, like most of you here, believe that unification is sound if prudently conducted. You see, under this new scheme of things, it has become far more difficult for an officer in the armed forces—and, for that matter, even for the civilian leaders of the military departments—to deal directly, personally, frankly, on an open and above-board basis, with those of us who represent the American people in Congress.

The tendency now—and I point at the tendency, and not at individuals—is to remove all of these basic problems involving national defense from the purview of the Congress. The tendency is to cloak them all within the vast Pentagon Building. Heaven help us to prevent this.

The tendency is for the Congress to view this business from the side lines, by listening to radio commentators and reading the newspapers. Be critical of what you hear and read.

However, I hold the very deep conviction that the Constitution-imposed responsibility upon your representatives in Congress was wisely imposed. In providing in the Constitution that the Congress shall "raise and support armies" and "provide and maintain a navy," our forefathers were intentionally making these basic military and naval matters subject to the earnest and detailed consideration of the Congress. I hope and trust that the Congress will insist—despite unification, if necessary—that it keep fully abreast of the basic issues of our national defense and that it not permit itself to be relegated to the side lines by the intermediaries which have been interposed between the Congress and the armed forces by the Unification Act.

One further comment on this general subject. I think we should all be cautious in our eagerness for vast savings as a result of unification. We tried diligently in our hearings on unification to obtain concrete, factual evidence of where such savings will be made and how they can be made without weakening the national defense. We never received any answer of substance. Try as we might, and we tried most vigorously, we were unable to document before our committee how such savings are to be made.

The difficulty is, of course, that savings, the eagerness for which being mainly the basis for wide public support of unification, mean increased efficiency, the elimination of unnecessary—and I emphasize unnecessary—duplications and overlappings between the armed forces, and the elimination of activities which do not contribute to the armed forces generally. Savings under unification do not mean reductions in strength of the armed forces unless this is accomplished without diminishing our fighting strength. The Congress can reduce the armed strength at any time by reducing the appropriations and has done so many times in the past. But these are not savings. Reducing the strength of the Army, cutting back the size of the Navy, closing air fields and posts, camps and stations and Navy yards—all of these are reductions and not savings in the concept that unification carries with it.

So I say that all of us must be watchful lest we come to believe that in the guise of unification vast economies are to result. If we pursue this concept too far, our dividend may ultimately be the impairment of the basic efficiency of our armed forces.

Here is another item for you to mull over, in addition to unification.

Many of you here may recall that I was the leader of the group in Congress who fought against the conscription law last year. I maintained then—and I still do—that conscription was wholly unnecessary and contrary to the tradition of the American people as a peacetime undertaking. But the President had asked for the passage of that act on March 17, 1948, and the Congress went along—but over my protests.

Then what happened?

Within a month after the President signed the Selective Service Act he said was so necessary, he imposed budgetary and manpower ceilings upon the armed forces which made mockery out of the law. He adhered to the budgetary ceiling—which ceiling is

now in the armed forces appropriation bill pending in the Congress—so that we now have the ridiculous situation of having a conscription law not being used because the armed forces have been over-strength.

As a result, we have today some 30,000 men inducted into the Army against their will whereas 3,500 officers are now being thrown out and recruiting was until recently sharply restricted in order to keep the Army within the budgetary ceiling imposed by the President.

This reversal of plans to expand the armed forces, this waste in the loss of training of the men already in service, is deplorable. Furthermore it is, to my way of thinking, extremely unfair to those few individuals who were inducted whereas the many thousands of others—most of whom are the younger men, by the way—have not been required to share this burden.

Such actions as this throw away our defense dollar. They shake the confidence of the American people in the administration of their armed forces.

And here's another one like it. This spring the leaders of each of the armed forces paraded before the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and before my own Committee on Armed Services as well, and insisted that they needed certain funds and certain numbers of military and civilian personnel to accomplish their missions today, in the light of existing world conditions. Acting in good faith, the House of Representatives approved and the Senate has just approved a month or two ago, funds which would support the number of persons and the posts, camps, and stations of the armed forces which our armed forces earnestly reported were required.

Then what happened?

Before the appropriation had even been passed by Congress—this happened just the other day—the Secretary of Defense found it desirable in the interest of economy to close down large numbers of posts, camps, and stations throughout the United States and to release 135,000 civilians in the employ of the armed forces. Moreover, some 17,000 military personnel were found no longer necessary and were ordered to be relieved from active duty.

No matter how you slice it, it is clear that the armed forces either padded their budgetary presentations to the Congress a short while ago, or the fighting efficiency of our armed forces is being sharply reduced. It cannot be otherwise; it has to be one of these two alternatives.

Certainly I see nothing in the international situation which has changed so substantially in recent weeks as to make it possible now to revise downwards so drastically our armed forces' civilian and military strength.

Now, I mention this incident of the conscription law and the recent order of the Secretary of Defense as evidences of what certainly appears to be improper planning or, certainly, shortsighted planning by the administration.

Just what kind of a business is this? Today we need a conscription law. The next day we need to reduce the armed forces. Today we need $14,500,000,000 for the armed forces. Tomorrow we find we need $1,500,000,000 less.

I find these incidents very disturbing, and I am sure you do. They lead to the conclusion that consistency and vision in our defense planning are lacking in some quarters which now hold great power in our Government. I bring them to your attention so that you also will be on the alert for such incidents in the future and will bear them in mind at the appropriate time.

Somewhat in line with what I have been saying is the recent investigation by the Armed Services Committee of the B–36 bomber. I have been participating actively in these hearings, of which you have no doubt seen accounts in the press.

These have not been pleasant hearings. It is never pleasant to inquire publicly or privately into such things as the reputation, character, and integrity of individuals, especially when they are located in high places in the Government.

However, I am delighted to say that the committee has become wholly convinced that there is not the slightest blemish on the character or reputation of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force, and further, the committee did receive the very abject apology of the individual who had impugned these respected public officials. As you have seen in the press, the Navy Department is following the matter still further to see to it that all individuals identified with the effort to disparge and discredit the motives of these public officials are identified and dealt with properly.

But this is not the whole story. There is an issue more basic than the question of who wrote inferences against the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Air Force.

There still remains the very basic issue as between the Navy and the Air Force in regard to air power and as regards the use of weapons by any particular service.

I am firmly convinced that the United States Navy should be given the opportunity to present its side of the story before the Armed Services Committee. The Congress has heard the Air Force, and moreover, the arguments of the Air Force in respect to air power have been widely disseminated for the past 3 or 4 years. But the viewpoints of the Navy in respect to these matters and the effect of recent decisions upon the fighting efficiency and capabilities of the Navy have not been appropriately aired. The recent decision to cancel the supercarrier of the Navy gives evidence that each of the three services will no longer be permitted to determine what type of weapons it needs to accomplish its assigned missions. If this is true, unification has reached a critical juncture. If this is not true, I am convinced that our committee should so establish it for the official record in order that there may be no doubt in the future.

If recent decisions, and the forthcoming action on the 1951 military budget, will result in serious impairment of the Navy's fighting efficiency, especially the capabilities of its carrier forces, then assuredly the Armed Services Committee should know of it and be brought up-to-date on its significance to the defense of our country.

And so I say that on October 5, when the Armed Services Committee reconvenes to consider further the question of the B–36, I shall insist upon and fight as hard as I know how for the appearance of qualified Navy witnesses to tell the Congress and the American people through the Armed Services Committee of Navy concepts and how present defense planning relates thereto. Secretary Johnson already has assured me in open hearings that any member of our armed forces could testify fully and freely without the least fear of reprisals.

It is hard to realize that it has been as long ago as 10 years—10 years this month—that World War II started. At that time the struggle was between the democratic countries and Fascist and Nazi dictatorships. Today the struggle seems to be between the democratic countries and a Communist dictatorship—a struggle in a cold-war stage but in many aspects similar to the conditions existing in 1937, 1938, and early 1939.

After this last war, as after World War I, we democratic countries hoped that the world could get together and live at peace. The League of Nations was the effort after World War I, and it failed. The United Nations is the League of Nations equivalent today. But unfortunately before a United Nations police force could be established to enforce world views on international disputes—and it is meaningful that there is still no such force today—the Communists overthrew the governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Then, in the United Nations meetings the Russians voted "no" on a long series of actions which the rest of the member nations approved. And so it became evident, before long, that the Russians were determined not to abide by decisions of the majority, and in the meantime they refused to join United Nations agencies such as the World Bank and Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the Refugee Organization.

The United States finally moved into the difficult situation which followed these events, and here we are today with two vast power blocs in the world, a situation which is fraught with grave danger to world peace. Our part of the world bloc really began when we joined in a military alliance with Canada very shortly after the fighting stopped. Then we joined with Latin-American countries in the Inter-American Defense Pact which completed the line-up of the Western Hemisphere. Then along came the Marshall plan, which grew out of a promise by this country in June of 1947 to help Europe if Europe would help itself. It is significant that the benefits of this plan were offered to Russia and her satellites but that they flatly refused to participate.

The Marshall plan took effect in April of 1948 involving about five billion dollars each year for 4 years to 16 western European nations. So we are now committed to a vast undertaking in Europe, unheard of heretofore, directed toward economic rehabilitation.

But then we found out that this did not meet European military fears because on the borders of these comparatively small countries remained a vast Russian Army almost at peak war strength. Five million armed Russians in your backyard is not a good sleeping potion.

So out of these fears grew the Brussels Pact of 1948. It bound together Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg for 50 years and they promised to stand together if any one of them were attacked.

The next big step—and it is a most historic one for the United States—is the North Atlantic Pact in April of this year which has bound together 12 nations—the 5 Brussels powers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, plus Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, and the United States. Again, as in the Brussels Pact, the signatory nations promised to come to each other's aid if any of them is attacked, the only reservation being that it may not have to be armed aid.

So today the United States defense zone has been extended all around the globe. For in addition to the steps I have outlined we are still committed to the Far East in Japan and in Southern Korea. And there is talk in Washington of additional pacts of this general nature involving the Mediterranean areas, the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and the Southwest Pacific.

Meanwhile Russia has rung down her iron curtain in eastern Europe. Behind it are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and the eastern portions of Germany and Austria, as well as Russia proper. And in Asia, Russia has Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, and northern Korea. The Communists now have most of China. Russia has treaties of mutual assistance with most of these countries, so that she has what amounts to a military alliance within her own sphere.

So the one world has been split in two. It is an ominous picture. What are we to do about it?

As I see it, we are now faced by a series of stern decisions as to what we can afford to spend in the interest of our national security. Right now we are spending three-

fourths of the forty-odd billion dollar budget on past wars or in an effort to be prepared for any future war. The armed forces' budget alone is one-third of the national budget today.

And what of our international obligations. In 1946 we loaned England $3,750,000,000. In 1947, we started the Greek-Turkish aid program. By June of this year that had totaled $625,000,000. The Marshall plan adopted in 1948 is expected to cost somewhere around $17,000,000,000 in 4 years. Occupation costs in Germany, Japan, and Korea have amounted to about $2,000,000,000 a year. And now, to back up the Atlantic Pact, the first year will cost one and a third billion dollars, with the planners in the administration talking in terms of ultimate costs reaching some $20,000,000,000. Additional aid is being sought by Latin America and southeast Asia. And on top of all of this is our own $14,000,000,000 military budget.

The problem is extremely serious. How can we do all of these things and maintain the solvency of our own Nation? How can we maintain the strength of our national economy and give so much of our substance to foreign countries? How can we maintain free enterprise in the United States and spend for our own armed forces well over $13,000,000,000 a year? Financial solvency and sound economy are the first lines of defense of any nation. Yet the House has voted $15,905,000,000 for our National Military Establishment. That is almost $16,000,000,000, and I voted for it and I believe in it. It is painful; it is a staggering sum; it is a heavy burden to bear; but if we are going to make cuts in appropriations, I think at this critical point, with the uncertainty that hangs over our heads, the last cut we should make would be in our Military Establishment.

We must, out of sheer self-defense and for survival, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air until the United Nations becomes more firmly established, with an international police force to carry out its decisions. As long as there are brigands in the world, aggressors who would swallow up and divide not only the little countries in the world but whose chief aim and primary objective is world-wide domination, more through psychological penetration and infiltration than by armed conquest, nevertheless, the only language those aggressors understand is the language of force. They respect strength; they have only contempt for weakness. So, at least for the next year or two, we must have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force; we must carry on our scientific research, technological developments, and hold fast to the atomic bomb, bacteriological, and other modern forms of warfare.

I am not at all sure but that in some respects we may be overemphasizing the danger we face abroad. The Western Powers today top Russia in steel production 4 to 1. We are ahead of Russia 3 to 1 in pig iron and 2 to 1 in coal. Our superiority was 10 to 1 in petroleum 10 years ago, and it should be greater today. We are so vastly ahead of Russia ourselves, not counting our potential allies, in so many of the basic items involving military strength, that I cannot but believe that we tend to be a little frenzied in our approach to Russian strength. I am hopeful that in our zeal to have satisfactory protection we do not strain to such an extent to build up and to maintain our standing armed forces and go so far in building up the standing forces abroad that we finally end up with a gutted national economy and thereby ruin the greatest basic strength our country possesses.

This naval training center at Joplin is part of this gigantic, infinitely complex undertaking—a part in which communities throughout the length and breadth of the country are sharing. And our citizens of Missouri who will receive training in this center likewise are a most vigorous part of our present effort to maintain adequate strength in our armed forces. I know that those who participate here recognize the direct obligation of citizenship which requires that the citizens, as a matter of duty, share in the common defense, and I am confident that the Regular Navy so ably led by Admirals Denfeld, Blandy, Radford, Jones, and others will see to it that the Reserves of the Navy receive the attention to which they are entitled as a result of their voluntary service.

In order to stimulate and maintain interest and enthusiasm the Congress has wisely offered incentives to reservists. After all you are the backbone of our national defense. We have voted you not only drill pay but also provided retirement benefits based on satisfactory service both active and inactive. More important we are now offering effective training with the most up-to-date tools and methods and inculcating in every Navy man's consciousness that the reservist is an integral and vital part of the Regular Naval Establishment.

At all events, I can assure all Navy Reservists and the Reserves of the other armed forces that the Armed Services Committee, through its Special Subcommittee on Reserve Components of which I have the honor to be chairman, will keep actively in mind and closely abreast of service planning in respect to the civilian components so as to see that our Nation is adequately prepared to meet any emergency.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 4 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the September 1949 issue of the National Grange monthly, written by Mr. Albert S. Goss, national grange master, and entitled "The Welfare State." The subject matter of this editorial should be read by every American citizen, and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress and to the American people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WELFARE STATE

(By Albert S. Goss, National Grange master)

For 30 years many of the world's most powerful nations have been turning toward the "welfare state" under which the Government supplies varying degrees of social services and becomes increasingly powerful in ordering the lives of their people. America's experiments with welfare statism have been limited to about half this length of time and have been less extensive than many of those conducted elsewhere. It may pay us well to take a careful look at what has happened where this luxury has been extensively employed before yielding to the popular demand for widely expanding our social welfare activities. The limitations of space forbid more than very brief mention of a few examples here and there which may have some lessons for us, if we are willing to learn.

ITALY

Following World War I, Italy, under weak leadership, was in a state of economic collapse when Mussolini seized power and instituted many economic reforms. Through seizure of private property, he gained control of the government and plunged into a series of social reforms which brought quick benefits to the people and soon, with the aid of dictated elections, brought overwhelming political support. But the nation could not continue to spend more than it produced indefinitely, even under dictatorship, without wrecking its credit structure. In desperation Mussolini sought to replenish his dangerously depleted resources by force in the capture of Ethiopia, and the end was near. This may be oversimplification. It is recognized that Hitler, World War II, and other forces contributed to the final collapse, but basically Italy's doom was sealed before she started the Ethiopian raid. Her collapse was due to building a tremendously costly centralized government and its vain effort to bring widespread benefits to the people with greater expenditures of economic wealth than the people produced. Once started down this primrose path, the people demanded more and more, and even a dictator had to try to meet the demand or lose his power.

GERMANY

The history of Germany is largely a repetition of what happened in Italy, except the leadership was stronger and the productiveness of the people greater. Under such conditions the experiment had a much better chance to succeed, but even under German efficiency, the costliness of government operation drained the resources of the Reich, and Hitler was compelled to add new resources by force in order to avoid collapse through bankruptcy. The details of the expanding confiscation of the territory and wealth of neighboring territories are little known even yet, but were fast becoming a world problem when finally halted by the overwhelming tragedy of World War II.

It is another example of the failure of a major effort to bring the benefits of very desirable and commendable social reforms to the people through the medium of statism, under a dictatorship which in many ways was the marvel of the world for efficiency. The very efficiency of the state led to dependence of the people upon government. Even under such efficiency, the costliness of the government operation, coupled with the military establishment necessary to maintain control, proved greater than the peoples' capacity to pay, and the economic collapse inevitably led to the desperate efforts to balance the budget by confiscation and aggression resulting in war.

RUSSIA

The Russian situation is quite different. Under the cruel despotism of an absolute monarchy, Russia was near the bottom of the list of so-called "enlightened nations" when measured in terms of progress, literacy or standards of living. While millions perished from war, persecution, or want, during the transition to communism, for a majority of her people almost any change represented an improvement, and the welfare state brought better conditions than they had ever known, although the standard of living is today the lowest in the world among the so-called world powers. To support even such low standards of living, dictatorship is necessary. Freedom of choice of occupation or residence is almost unknown. Not only are people forced thus to support the costly inefficiencies of complete government operation dedicated to the welfare state, but to keep it afloat two devices are necessary, each repugnant to our ideas of freedom and justice. Human slavery is practiced with some millions of unfortunate human beings the tragic victims, while the iron curtain hides both terrorism and the

miserable living conditions from the outside world, and enables the dictatorship to keep its people in ignorance of what freedom has brought to others. Even under complete dictatorship the welfare state is producing results which the dictators are afraid to make known to either their own people or to others.

FRANCE

For two generations or more France has experimented more or less extensively with the welfare state, and, although one of the richest nations in Europe in terms of natural resources, she has been on the verge of bankruptcy for years, while the purchasing power of the franc has dropped over 98 percent. We do not minimize the economic effects of two wars, but we believe they have been less devastating to the French economy than the welfare innovations adopted under the guise of social benefits. One example will suffice to illustrate the trend. The destruction of war, added to the natural shift of populations from farm to city industries, caused serious urban housing shortages, and profiteering in rents. The Government sought to protect its people of low income by rigid rent ceilings. As costs and prices rose due to many causes, including other welfare innovations, building construction ceased, for no one could afford to build for the limited returns under rent control. As costs continued to rise, owners could not afford to make repairs or pay taxes. The situation became progressively worse over the years until now two and three families are living in quarters designed for one, and housing conditions are indescribably bad. Legally one can rent an apartment for $10 per month in Paris equivalent to one renting for $100 per month in Washington or New York, but there are none to rent unless one pays some black marketeer $75 or $90 per month for a lease. Of course, the Government has had to step in with subsidies and building programs at tremendous expense, and France has not balanced her budget for years, while the franc goes steadily down. Administration after administration has undertaken to abandon some of these impossible welfare benefits, but the voters promptly vote them out of office. Just recently they managed to vote an increase in rent ceilings of 500 percent—about half as much as needed to enable construction to start, but to do this they had to limit the increase to 100 percent per year for 5 years and postpone the first increase for 12 months.

Just as dictators find it impossible to back away from the compounding expense of overexpanded welfare innovations, democracies find it politically impossible to retreat when once a start is made.

NEW ZEALAND

While a small country, its experience is interesting because it was one of the first to undertake welfare statism on a large scale. Early benefits brought wide acclaim, but the inevitable increase in costs soon brought difficult tax problems. These were met largely by the government setting a price on farm products and buying at the legal price, then selling to England at a figure providing a comfortable margin. As costs went up in New Zealand, and competition forced prices down in England, the New Zealand producers found themselves progressively pinched, and they were saved only by the expanded markets resulting from World War II. Under the prosperity of war markets the voters have provided themselves with the additional benefits of a comprehensive government medical and hospital service. Already the cost of this has expanded until it now is costing the government more than the entire cost of government before its innovation. As their war markets are shrinking, farmers are becoming deeply worried as to where the burden will fall.

UNITED KINGDOM

To support the welfare state the British have boosted their per capita income taxes to almost, if not the highest, in the world. They have depleted the individual savings of generations until, according to their government, only 250 people among all the millions of that once wealthy nation have incomes of $20,000 or over. By vote they have adopted state welfare programs which are beyond their means to support, and they do not know how to let go, even if the voters would permit them. For example, when the government buys all the hospitals and establishes them on a basis of operation that involves tremendous losses, they do not know how to back up. They can't close them, and there is no one to sell them to, so they seem doomed to continue to operate them at a continuing loss. This is true of many of the other welfare innovations they have plunged into. Britain's financial problems are indeed deep, and probably will be solved only by subjecting her whole people to lower standards of living.

STOP! LOOK! LISTEN!

While promotion of the welfare state is not the sole cause of the difficulties that nations face, it is, nevertheless, one of the chief causes. There are two very important lessons that we should learn from this array of disasters. First: That through welfare statism we can secure for ourselves many prompt and appealing benefits, but they may prove more costly than we can support, and be almost impossible to get rid of without inviting disaster. In fact, history shows that many a democracy has failed because the people refused to deny themselves benefits that the state could temporarily supply but could not long sustain.

Second: There is a simple yet basic reason for most of this. Every tax dollar the Government collects starts to diminish rapidly through supporting the unavoidable and expensive processes of Government from the moment of payment until application on the final project. Because of these many governmental processes, we get but a fraction of the value in final expenditure. The more politics, the more jobs, and the bigger the governmental operation, the greater is the inefficiency and the less we receive from our tax dollars. We must learn to measure the benefits carefully against the total compounded cost. The closer we can keep governmental expenditure to the people who benefit and who pay the bills, the more chance of successful outcome we can expect. Some quite necessary things people cannot do for themselves, or can do more efficiently collectively than singly. In such cases Government operation may be justified. But to use Government welfare benefits to help us pay our food bills, or our rent, or our doctors' bills, or to provide other services which we can directly provide for ourselves, will likely put a burden on Government which will eventually break down under a free economy, or which will demand the rigors of a complete dictatorship in order to survive. Even then it will last only if the dictatorship proves efficient and benevolent in character—a combination too rare to expect.

AMA Man Quits Health Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called the attention of the House to the unscrupulous and unethical campaign against the President's health program which is being waged by the notorious huckster lobbyists Whitaker and Baxter on behalf of the American Medical Association.

Further evidence of the low character of this campaign was brought to light this week when the well-known columnist Robert Allen announced that the former editor of Liberty magazine, David Brown, had resigned from the staff of Whitaker and Baxter in protest against their unethical tactics. Mr. Allen's story, which appeared in the Washington Post of September 20, follows:

AMA MAN QUITS HEALTH FIGHT

(By Robert S. Allen)

The American Medical Association has lost one of the top officials of its $3,500,000 drive against the President's national health-insurance program.

He is David Brown, former editor of Liberty magazine.

Brown resigned because of strong disapproval of tactics and statements by Whitaker and Baxter, the high-powered, $100,000-a-year team of California publicity agents employed by AMA to mastermind its campaign.

One W-B assertion particularly challenged by Brown was an intimation that the Justice Department is terrorizing doctors opposing the President's plan. This charge was made to Washington newsmen. Brown investigated and stated he found the claim untrue.

An ace editor, Brown left Liberty to become editorial director of the AMA's drive. He was in immediate charge of the series of dinners AMA is staging for newsmen in big cities. In resigning, Brown told Whitaker and Baxter that if he had known in advance the nature of their methods and policies, he would not have joined them.

Civilian Defense and Protection an Urgent Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, billions have been spent for the military defense of the United States and for the defense of foreign nations abroad, but to date the administration has failed to propose plans to provide adequate defense for our civilian population.

We know that in the event of any future war, we must expect attacks upon our centers of population. Our military strength is being increased to meet this threat, but no protection has been provided for civilians. We have no adequate shelters, no centralized supply stations for first aid and medical treatment.

In short the administration has developed a lopsided defense program in which our sole protection lies in the ability of our armed forces to stop every plane, every guided missile, or other weapon before it reaches its target. If they fail and one bomb reaches the target, the civilian population has no protection.

Since we have learned that Russia has developed an atom bomb, we must act without further delay to provide for the immediate study and investigation of the problem of building facilities for civilian defense.

I have today introduced legislation to authorize and instruct the Secretary of Defense to study, investigate, and hold public hearings for the purpose of determining the urgent necessity of Federal coordination with the several States and provision of Federal funds for the installations in underground structures of first-aid and hospital equipment and other equipment which can be used by the civilian population during a bombing attack or in the event of any other major disaster.

Underground shelters and underground facilities were proven during the last war to give the greatest degree of protection during actual bombing attacks.

In many of our cities underground structures for municipal parking lots and other purposes have been constructed or are under consideration for construction at this time, and the Federal Government could cooperate with the State and municipal officials for the immediate installation of certain emergency equipment, such as auxiliary lighting, and first aid and surgical supplies in these structures.

Such a program could provide a practical starting point for the building of our civilian defense.

This proposal has been under consideration and study by various experts on civilian defense for sometime, and they have come to the conclusion that barriers or shelters of earth, concrete, or other materials if of sufficient thickness will protect against bombings, including the blast, ionizing radiation, and thermal effects of an atomic bomb.

The immediate urgent need of municipalities to solve their automobile-parking problems by the construction of underground municipal garages can be utilized for the far-reaching long-range objectives of national civilian defense through cooperation with the Federal Government to incorporate defense measures against atomic bombs and other types of destructive agents in their construction.

To go underground is to obtain the best protection against the modern weapons of warfare. This was proved by the effectiveness of the London and Berlin subways and the basement dwellings of World War II. Yet ironically major developments are under way in our cities to provide underground garages similar to the Union Square Garage in San Francisco without any consideration by the Federal Government to incorporate such defense measures into this construction as to provide for the shelter, treatment, and mass feeding of civilian casualties in wartime.

The emergency facilities installed in underground structures also would serve in peacetime as centrally located stations for first aid, hospital care, and shelter for immediate use in the event of any major disaster caused by hurricane, tornado, earthquake, fire, blast, or epidemic. Such stations would have been invaluable in the Florida hurricane of a year ago, in the Texas City blast, in the Long Beach earthquake. Their value in the future is evident.

The legislation which I have introduced provides for the complete investigation and study of this program by the Secretary of Defense, including types of equipment to be installed and methods of financing the acquisition and installation of such equipment.

Our need for adequate civilian defense is of vital importance, and I urge immediate consideration of this legislation which will start the work on a constructive program to provide civilian defense.

The following recent report on the statement of Bernard M. Baruch points out our need for a thorough-going civilian-defense program now:

BARUCH ASKS SPEEDY PLAN TO MOBILIZE

NEW YORK, October 3.—Bernard M. Baruch, American elder statesman and promulgator of the United States atom-bomb control plan, today called for "immediate enactment of a standby mobilization plan, including a thoroughgoing civilian defense" in view of the recent atomic explosion in the Soviet Union.

"While Soviet possession of an atomic weapon was to be expected," said Baruch, "let no one be deceived that it does not necessitate revaluing our strategy for peace. Recently General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that 5 years would be required to rebuild western Europe's defenses at the rate then projected. If 5 years was considered a 'safe' timetable some weeks ago, can it be 'safe' today?"

In his first extended statement on President Truman's announcement that the Soviet had achieved an atomic blast, Baruch said "four actions seem vital at this time," including the mobilization legislation. His other recommendations were:

1. "That the United States stand its ground in insisting upon nothing less than a truly international control of atomic energy, while welcoming any Soviet proposals that would contribute to that end."

2. "Until safe and sure control is obtained, every effort must be pressed to maintain our overwhelming advantage in the development of atomic weapons. We dare not lose that advantage for the sake of peace."

EUROPE MUST ACT, HE SAYS

3. "Reexamine our strategy for peacemaking. Our aims remain unchanged—to resist aggression and to unite the free peoples of the world in common defense for lasting peace. All plans for attaining these aims must now be reviewed."

This is the minimum program for the United States, Baruch insisted, but "the nations of western Europe must ask themselves how much longer do they dare delay in banding together into a political, economic, and defense union, without which they invite being broken one by one?"

For, he went on, the question before the world today is: "Must we prepare for a possible Soviet effort to plunge the world into war in relatively few years, or is the attrition of the cold war likely to persist indefinitely?"

CITES PREWAR II SITUATION

Baruch asserted that his proposals were not being put forward "in any alarmist sense," and that even his stand-by plan "would not mean taking actual mobilization measures now." What it would mean, he said, would be equipping the Government with laws for instant applicability "in event of emergency on proclamation by the President and concurrent resolution of Congress—by both acting together."

He's been urging such legislation for 20 years, he pointed out, and he added a guess that if a stand-by plan had been adopted before World War II "it might have prevented Hitler's blitzkrieg."

In the present situation, Baruch was by no means hopeful. "Merely to outlaw the atom bomb is no insurance against atomic destruction," he warned, pointing out that fissionable material, whether intended "for peaceful purposes or as a weapon" is produced by identical processes.

"A would-be aggressor, through a figurative twist of the wrist, could divert seemingly peaceful fissionable material into an instrument of international blackmail and destruction," he added.

He proposed, therefore, that "all future atomic energy proposals should be submitted to one test: Do they mean safe and sure control?"

"Anything less than that would be worse than nothing," Baruch continued. "It may well be we shall have to live with the inability to control atomic energy all our lives. If that is to be our lot, let us face it calmly and resolutely, with wide-open eyes. Let us not blind ourselves with false reassurances or meaningless words, babled agreement."

WE CAN TAKE IT, HE SAYS

In his conclusion, however, Baruch reaffirmed his faith in American ability to take the atomic situation, no matter whether control is established or not. He said:

"No previous President and no previous Congress have faced more difficult problems. The President was wise in informing the people of this atomic explosion, for it swells the already heavy burden of responsibility every American bears. I have no doubt we shall measure up to this responsibility if we are told what is expected of us."

Violence and Lawlessness Should Not Be Condoned—Should Be Condemned Even Though Carried on by Politically Powerful Groups

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the beatings, occasionally a killing, the frequent destruction of personal property, and the denial of the citizen's right to work have been permitted because and only because some of those in authority expected, and all too often received, political support in return for immunity from law enforcement and prosecution.

An editorial from the September 26, 1949, issue of the Allegan Gazette, published in my home town, tells the story:

TIME FOR ACTION

Not many weeks ago, newspapers reported that a mob of labor goons marched through a strike-bound Bell Aircraft plant in New York State, beating up workers and destroying property. Among the leaders of this organized mob were certain union men, known to have Communist leanings.

The company and local police authorities appealed to Governor Dewey for State police aid. The Governor refused to send in State police and informed the local police that it was their duty to enforce law and order and if necessary they should deputize private citizens for that purpose.

A few weeks later, in the same community, the labor goons staged another attack upon people trying to work. They even chased some of these citizens into their homes and there administered beatings. Again an appeal was made to Governor Dewey for police protection and the Governor replied that he would look into the matter.

About the same time a mob of veterans and anti-Communists raided Paul Robeson

and his Communist concert crowd in Westchester County, New York State, and we read that State police were present to break up the riot.

The day following this riot, Eleanor Roosevelt, in a newspaper article, termed the attack upon the Communists "a disgraceful affair."

We agree with this woman that it was disgraceful, but wish to add that it is not nearly as disgraceful as union Communists and labor goons attacking citizens who are merely exercising their constitutional right to work and earn a living.

Furthermore, we add that the rioting itself is not nearly as disgraceful as the Government's policy of refusing police protection in cases of labor violence.

Never have we read that she has ever termed "labor-goon rioting" as being disgraceful. Evidently to her and to Governor Dewey there is a difference. It appears that the State police must protect the Communists from violence, but the Communists and labor goons can attack the workers.

It was her husband, Franklin Roosevelt, and his cohorts, who, by refusing to enforce the law, taught the people of this country that it was safe to form a mob, grab a club, and beat up other citizens. That has been going on ever since Roosevelt was elected, and State police all over the land have not only been conspicuous by their absence, but in many instances have actually been present and watched a mob administer a beating to a private citizen, but for their sake we will add that they were under orders from some cowardly official not to interfere.

It is time that the people of this country insist that the elected officials of this country enforce the law, or there will come a time when private citizens take the law into their own hands and form their own organization for self-protection. Already in isolated cases some individuals have refused to submit to the indignities of mob manhandling, and in attempting to protect themselves and their rights have turned on their tormentors and as a result people have been killed.

If Dewey and his kind don't perform their duty, there will be many more of these instances and they will occur with ever-increasing frequency.

It is time that the Republicans cleanse their party of Dewey and his me-tooism, and choose as their leaders men who believe in the impartial administration of the law as established by our Constitution.

Senate Faced With Welter of Farm Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. John W. Ball, in the Washington Post, is a rather comprehensive analysis of the proposed farm bills:

SENATE FACED WITH WELTER OF FARM BILLS

(By John W. Ball)

The Senate this week will attempt to work out a new long-range farm bill, with both parties trying to please the farmers.

Coming up for debate is the Anderson bill—a modification of title II of the present farm law. The new measure was prepared by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON (Democrat, New Mexico), and attempts a compromise between the present law and the Gore bill passed recently by the House.

Hanging over the situation, of course, is the interest of the millions of other voters—the consumers of the food the farms produce. The farmer is interested in higher prices for his products; the consumer in lower prices for his food.

Every section of the country has provisions it wants included in any permanent program. Each commodity has its proponents.

Whatever the Senate does, the result will have rough going before becoming law. Prospects are that the Senate will pass a bill far less rigid in price supports and much less liberal in amounts than the Gore bill already passed by the House.

House agriculture leaders are frank in stating that they will accept no measure that cuts support levels to the extent proposed in the original draft of the Anderson law. Time after time the House has shown its antagonism to a sliding scale of price supports. In fact, the present law was turned down last year time and again in conference until finally, under prodding from party leaders just beginning their national convention at Philadelphia, the present compromise was adopted.

WELTER OF BILLS OFFERED

The present confusion over farm legislation results from the welter of bills offered. The Aiken bill, the Anderson bill, and the Gore bill are all measures designed to make the present idea of maintaining high prices for farm products work. Stirring up the confusion is the Brannan plan, which the House abruptly turned down for the Gore bill, but which has many features appealing to consumers.

Unless out of the mess a new law emerges, the Aiken law will become effective on January 1. In many respects it is similar to both the Anderson bill and the Brannan plan.

But all of them—the Anderson, Aiken, Gore, and Brannan plans—differ in the way they would solve the different problems of agriculture. Because of this difference, the Washington Post has attempted the following point-by-point comparison of the proposals:

1. Duration: Anderson bill, Aiken bill, and Brannan plan, indefinite; Gore bill, 1 year only.

2. Production payments: Anderson bill, none; Aiken bill and Brannan plan, permitted.

3. Basic commodities: Anderson bill, Aiken bill, Gore bill—cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat; Brannan plan—corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, whole milk, chicken eggs, farm chickens, hogs, beef cattle, and lambs.

4. Price-support levels to cooperators for basic commodities when marketing quotas are not disapproved:

Anderson bill: 75 to 90 percent of modernized parity (including hired labor), varying as the supply percentage varies from less than 102 (108 in the case of cotton and peanuts) to more than 130. May be increased by the Secretary, but not above 90 percent of parity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect after a lapse of a year. Tobacco is to be supported at 90 percent of parity whenever marketing quotas are in effect.

Aiken bill: 60 to 90 percent of modernized parity, varying as supply percentage varies from less than 70 to more than 130. Twenty-percent premium when marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect. May be increased by Secretary, but not above 90 percent of parity. Tobacco is to be supported at 90 percent of parity whenever marketing quotas are in effect.

Gore bill: 90 percent of old 1909–1914 parity.

Brannan plan: A price equal to the price-support standard. Support prices of milk, eggs, chickens, hogs, cattle, and lambs may be reduced by not more than 15 percent in order to reflect desirable feed ratios.

5. Price support when marketing quotas are disapproved.

Anderson bill: 50 percent of modernized parity (including hired labor) "to cooperators," except in case of tobacco. Price support for tobacco prohibited.

Aiken bill: 50 percent of modernized parity.

Gore bill: No support required.

Brannan plan: Price support prohibited.

6. Support price to noncooperators.

Anderson bill: Not in excess of support price to cooperators.

Aiken bill: No provision.

Gore bill: 60 percent of rate to cooperators and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

Brannan plan: Either no price support or price support at reduced rates.

7. Mandatory price support for designated nonbasic commodities.

Anderson bill: (1) "Shorn" wool, mohair, tung nuts and Irish potatoes at 60 to 90 percent of modernized parity (including hired labor); (2) whole milk and butterfat at 75 to 90 percent of modernized parity (to be supported only through loans on, and purchases of, products); (3) storable nonbasic commodities for which marketing quota, agreement, or order programs are in effect at 75 to 90 percent of modernized parity, varying with the supply percentage, or at such lower level as the Secretary deems desirable.

Aiken bill: Wool and irish potatoes at 60 to 90 percent of modernized parity.

Gore bill: (1) Milk and its products, hogs, chickens and eggs at 90 percent of old parity (or comparable); (2) turkeys, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, dry peas, flaxseed, soybeans, and American-Egyptian cotton at not less than 60 percent of old parity (or comparable) nor more than the level at which supported in 1948; (3) cottonseed at not more than parity taking into account the price levels at which other commodities are supported; (4) wool at the price at which it was supported in 1946; (5) mohair at not more than 90 percent of parity taking into account the support price of wool.

Brannan plan: None.

8. Guides in determining levels of support (to the extent such levels are discretionary) and in determining support for commodities not required to be supported.

Anderson bill: Eight factors as follows: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand; (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported; (3) the availability of funds; (4) perishability of product; (5) product's importance to agriculture and the national economy; (6) ability to dispose of stocks acquired through price-support operation; (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep suppliers in line with demand.

Aiken bill: Substantially the same as the Anderson bill.

Gore bill: It is the policy to support the prices of commodities other than the basics, Steagalls, and cottonseed so as to bring the price and income of the producers of such other commodities to a fair parity relationship with the basics, Steagalls, and cottonseed.

Brannan plan: Substantially the same as in the Anderson bill.

9. Conditions upon which Secretary may support prices at levels higher than maximum levels otherwise prescribed.

Anderson bill: If increased level is necessary either to prevent or alleviate shortage in supply of agricultural commodity essential to national welfare or in the interest of national security. Public hearing required.

Aiken bill: If increased level is necessary in the interests of national security, public hearing required.

Gore bill: No increase.

Brannan plan: If increased level is necessary in the national interest. No hearing necessary.

10. Adjustments in support price for cotton.

Anderson bill: Support prices for cotton are to be adjusted so that average support price for middling seven-eighths-inch cotton will equal the support level.

Aiken bill: Adjustments to be made so that actual average quality will receive the support level.

Gore bill: No provision, but effect is same as in Anderson bill.

Brannan bill: Same as Aiken bill.

11. Forward pricing.

Anderson bill, Brannan plan: Support prices may be announced prior to beginning of planting season. If at the beginning of the marketing year it develops that the announced prices are in excess of the maximum support prices otherwise permitted, support may be given at the announced prices.

Aiken bill, Gore bill: No similar provision.

12. Restrictions on prices at which Commodity Credit Corporation may sell farm commodities.

Anderson bill: Not less than current support price, subject to certain exceptions (including oilseeds for oil and mohair).

Aiken bill: Not less than lowest of: (1) The amount invested in the commodity: (2) a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price; and (3) 90 percent of parity. Same exceptions as Anderson bill, but not including oilseeds for oil or mohair.

Gore bill: No restrictions except as provided with respect to cotton by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Brannan plan: Same as Anderson bill, except that oilseeds for oil and mohair are not included among the exceptions.

13. Parity formula.

Anderson bill: Modernized parity formula (including hired labor and wartime subsidies).

Aiken bill: Modernized parity formula computed in the same manner as in the Anderson bill, except that hired labor is not taken into account and it is not clear that wartime subsidies are taken into account.

Gore bill: Present parity formula under which the 1910–14 price of the commodity constitutes its base price.

Brannan plan: A price-support standard is used in lieu of a parity price. The base period, 1910–14, is abandoned.

The Anderson bill repeals the restrictions of the Aiken bill with respect to (1) price support for poultry, and (2) the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to support prices of perishable commodities. No similar provisions are contained in the other bills.

The Anderson bill would amend the definition of normal supply in the case of corn as set out in the Aiken bill by providing for a 10-percent, in lieu of 7-percent allowance for carry-over.

The Anderson bill would permit Commodity Credit Corporation to issue obligations in excess of its assets for the purpose of carrying out its annual budget programs. No similar provision is contained in the Aiken, Gore, or Brannan plan.

The Anderson bill provides that section 32 funds are to be devoted principally to perishable commodities. This provision is not contained in any of the other bills.

The Anderson bill also provides for an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in Charge of Sales Operations, whose function it would be to dispose of surplus commodities acquired through price-support operations. This provision is not contained in any of the other bills.

The Aiken bill makes certain changes with respect to marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and continues the availability of section 32 funds until $300,000,000 of such funds is accumulated. These provisions are not changed by the Anderson bill, but would be repealed by the Gore bill. The Brannan plan would make considerable change in the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and would reenact the Aiken bill provisions for the accumulation of section 32 funds.

The Brannan plan, in addition to providing for price support, constitutes a complete revision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and therefore contains many provisions in addition to those concerned with price support. In this comparison only the price-support provisions have been considered.

Subject to certain exceptions, the Brannan plan would limit the price support received by any one farm to 1,800 comparative units per year.

PRICE GUARANTIES COMPARED

The table below compares the prices the Government would guarantee the Nation's farmers under the four bills now before Congress:

	Unit	Gore [1]	Aiken [2]		Anderson [2]		Brannan [1]
			With quotas or allotments [7]	Without quotas or allotments [8]	With quotas or allotments [8]	Without quotas or allotments [4]	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic commodities:							
Wheat	Bushel	$1.94	$1.70	$1.41	$1.84	$1.72	$1.86
Corn	do	1.41	1.07	.894	1.35	1.12	1.45
Cotton	Pound	.2723	.2214	.1840	.2588	.2358	.2776
Rice	Bushel	1.78	1.95	1.62	2.09	2.06	(5)
Peanuts	Pound	.105	.0999	.0877	.0999	.0999	(6)
Tobacco:							
Flue-cured	do	.422	.428	.338	.453	.433	.487
Burley	do	.410	.430	.335	.455	.430	.490
Steagall commodities:							
Butterfat	do	.578		(6)		.542	(6)
Milk, wholesale	Hundredweight	3.51		(6)		3.39	[9] 3.56
Hogs	do	15.90		(6)		(6)	[9] 16.00
Eggs	Dozen	.472		(6)		(6)	[9] .386
Chickens	Pound	.250		(6)		(6)	[9] .245
Flaxseed	Bushel	2.47		(6)		(6)	(6)
Soybeans	do	1.40		(6)		(6)	(6)
Potatoes	do	1.07		1.02		1.02	(6)
Sweetpotatoes	do	1.28		(6)		(6)	(6)
American-Egyptian cotton	Pound	.3734		(6)		(6)	(6)
Dry field peas	Hundredweight	3.06		(6)		(6)	(6)
Beans, dry edible	do	4.93		(6)		(6)	(6)
Turkeys	Pound	.211		(6)		(6)	(6)
Other commodities:							
Wool	do	.423		[3] .423		[3] .457	(6)
Mohair	do	(9)		(6)		.407	(6)
Cottonseed	Ton	(10)		(6)		(6)	(6)
Tung nuts	do	(6)		(6)		$1.80	(6)
Beef cattle	Hundredweight	(6)		(6)		(6)	[9] 14.20
Lambs	do	(6)		(6)		(6)	[9] 15.50

[1] Level of price supports is the same regardless of whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, provided quotas have not been disapproved in a referendum.

[2] Estimated supply percentages for 1949 are as follows: Wheat, 114 percent; cotton, 124 percent; corn, 131 percent; rice, 103 percent; peanuts, 91 percent; flue-cured tobacco, 109 percent, and burley tobacco, 112 percent.

[3] Except for tobacco, minimum support prices are increased by 20 percent but not above 90 percent whenever marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect. Support prices for tobacco are 90 percent of parity in each year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

[4] These prices reflect a situation in which marketing quotas have not been disapproved in a referendum.

[5] Minimum level of supports for basic commodities (except tobacco) in a year in which quotas or allotments are in effect immediately following a year in which neither quotas nor allotments were in effect. Quotas or allotments do not affect the level of price support in other years, and support prices would be the same as those in column 5. For tobacco, price supports are 90 percent of parity whenever quotas are in effect.

[6] Price support not mandatory. Whether or not support is given, and the level of support is determined by the Secretary.

[7] These prices are 85 percent of the price support standard. The Brannan plan provides that support prices for livestock and products may be reduced by not more than 15 percent to levels which the Secretary determines will reflect desirable food ratios.

[8] This price is 90 percent of parity. The provision specifies that the support price shall be 60–90 percent of parity, as may be necessary to encourage annual production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. Present levels of sheep numbers and world production would indicate prices at 90 percent for some time.

[9] Price support is mandatory. The level is to be not more than 90 percent of parity, taking into account the price level at which wool is being supported.

[10] Price support is mandatory. The level is to be not more than the parity price, taking into account the price level at which other commodities are being supported.

Mr. Speaker, without going into any details, I wish to call attention to the fact that if a lowering of the support is the only vehicle or formula under which production can be curtailed, one fact is certain and that is that the family-sized farm is placed at a disadvantage. Though livestock and livestock products provide over half the national farm income, they are not provided the special privileges afforded some other minor crops and commodities.

An analysis shows the similarity of the Anderson and the Aiken bills, and some similarity between the Aiken and the Brannan proposals. The Gore bill, really a continuation of the Hope bill, is the most fair to all segments of American agriculture.

If the provisions of the Gore bill gave first consideration to the crops and products of the family-sized farm, it would be difficult to improve on its formula, and the losses to the Federal Treasury could be very, very materially reduced.

If any of these bills become law, and if more diligence is not exercised in following the law, than has been exhibited in supporting the price of milk used for manufacturing purposes, the name of the bill passed or put in operation will not be of too much consequence.

Associate Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House of Representatives were as deeply shocked as I when I heard of the calamitous accident that befell Associate Judge Justice William O. Douglas, and I know that you will all join me in sending to him our deepest sympathy and our wishes for his quick recovery. It is peculiarly important to all of us that his recovery should be speedy and complete, since the Bench of the Supreme Court of the United States will suffer greatly from the absence of one of its most distinguished and liberal members—a great justice and a great man. It is therefore with great pleasure that I can assure the Members of Congress that the public reports that his condition is not quite so serious as we originally feared have been corroborated by the personal assurances of his family and friends.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Thursday, September 29, 1949:

FULL RECOGNITION FAVORED

For some time, many prominent Americans have believed that the United States should resume friendly relations with Spain and an important addition was made to their group this week, when United States Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, head of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, urged that move as a step toward strengthening North Atlantic defenses against a possible Soviet Union attack. In taking that stand, he voiced the strong opinion that Spain should be invited into the community of nations prepared to fight any advance of communism.

It seems reasonable to think that Premier Francisco Franco of Spain would welcome the chance to join the western powers lined up against any further aggression by Russia, because Moscow lent strong support in the Spanish Civil War to the Loyalist Government that he finally defeated. Although Germany and Italy gave him valuable active aid in that civil war, Franco did not join them in World War II and therefore should be quite acceptable now to the western powers from that angle.

Senator TAFT believes that there is great strategic value in the United States having the friendship of Spain, because the latter is in a key military position as far as Europe is concerned and he cannot see any reason why this country should not recognize her fully and send an ambassador to Madrid. Although admitting that Spain would be as vulnerable to atomic attack as other European countries, the Ohio Senator declared that it would furnish additional bases from which to launch counterattacks by air and also areas in which American troops could be landed in the event of necessity.

New strength to the movement in Congress to recognize Spain also has been provided by farm State Senators and Representatives who have been wondering out loud recently why the United States cannot sell grains, cotton, and other products to that country. They point out that Great Britain and France trade with Spain and an American Ambassador in Madrid might succeed in getting some of that business, with resultant benefit to their States. That sounds reasonable.

Probably the strongest congressional advocate of United States recognition of Spain in the past has been United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, who now is in Europe on an unofficial trip, during which he plans to visit that country and confer with Premier Franco. On his return home, the Nevadan may have some additional good arguments in favor of recognition and he also is likely to have extra support that was lacking before.

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks I include part 21 of the Valley of the Dammed by Bigelow Neal, Garrison, N. Dak. In part 21, Mr. Neal gives you a picture of the heartbreaks and desolation in the Valley of the Dammed. Most neighbors gone, others to go. No one knows when he will be next. It reminds one of Hiawatha and Evangeline. These things may be necessary for the public good, but from past observation and experience we know that the Army Engineer Corps always grab more than is necessary to accomplish the public good.

They do not give a continental how many homes and how much property they destroy unnecessarily. They are like the proverbial bull in a china closet. They are not unlike the person whose eyes are bigger than his stomach and who indulges far beyond his capacity. Here is part 21:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XXI

In only a few days now, when the warm skies of Indian summer give way to scurrying clouds with driving rain and snow, there will be much of unhappiness in the upper valley of the Missouri. Men and women who have heretofore seen nothing of the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps in action will be facing a great personal disaster. The immediate future will be frightening and dark and depressing. And because they are facing something that is very cruel and they will feel much alone, I am changing the order of these articles in the hope that I may reach them in such a way that they may feel a bit more of cheer at Thanksgiving time and Christmas.

It is a wonderful thing, on these prairies of ours, to be ready for winter, to feel that your family is surrounded with warmth and clothing and food. It is a terrible thing to shatter a man's faith in the immediate future of his family. That is enough to make cold days colder and dark nights darker. It makes a threatening howl out of the song of the wind, and where a feeling of warmth and coziness should have full sway, it brings the chill of fear and depression.

I know about these things all too well. I have been through them. Also I know now that had I been better informed, much of the dread would have been unnecessary. I have seen them driven away until my home in the valley is about the only thing left to stand against the force of the wind. I say again that the thing that has come to the valley is partly the result of ignorance. I did not know, and my neighbors did not know, what to do in the face of a nameless threat, something we did not understand.

More than 19 families were once my immediate neighbors. In the face of this ghostly, nameless thing we call the policy of the Real Estate Division, they turned and left the battlefield. I do not blame them. But I am still here and I am here for a reason that I consider a trust. Instead of leaving, I turned and fought this policy for no better reason than to show that there is really little to fear. I knew that, if I demanded my rights on the one hand and obeyed the law on the other, I had nothing of which to be afraid. Truly, if the Real Estate Division could think of any way on earth to get rid of me, they would have done so long ago. I am the first man of all my neighbors that they would have driven over the hill. Think of this when you are afraid and take courage. I am here. There is no reason for you to run.

Now I am going to take some of the questions that are asked me by people who are puzzled and afraid. I am going to list them about as they occur in actual experience. Then I shall undertake to answer them as best I may—you understand that I am not a lawyer and it is always a good plan to check any information by the most reliable source. In other words, no man should undertake to steer himself through the maze of this land acquisition program without competent legal advice.

Question. Do these appraisers have a right to come on my land if I tell them to stay away?

Answer. The answer, I believe, is no. As long as your land is yours, no man may trespass upon it without a court order. Even a sheriff has no right on your land unless he can show that he comes in the necessary performance of duty. But to forbid these appraisers to come on your place would be an error. In a few days they would come back escorted by the United States marshal and armed with the necessary authority from the United States District Court. Then you would be right back where you started from with the appraisers angry with you to boot. I have met them and if I were to meet them again, it would be on friendly and cooperative terms.

Right here I want to pay a tribute to two men who receive a good deal of abuse that they do not deserve. In this neighborhood Mr. Victor Lundeen and Mr. Josephson did the appraising. I understand they are now working farther up the river. This is the first time in these articles that I have mentioned names, and I should like to celebrate the occasion by a word of genuine praise for these two young men. I commend them to you as absolutely honest. They are not allowed to tell you much, but if they answer your questions they will tell you the truth. You are to remember, however, that they appraise by rule more than by their personal judgment. They look it up in the book, and there you are. The fact that nobody agrees with their ideas of values, not even our juries in the United States district court, is not their fault.

Question. Will the appraisers tell me the appraised valuation of the land?

Answer. No. They say it is a secret and are not permitted to tell you.

Question. What rights have the negotiators on my place?

Answer. Here, again, I believe the answer is none at all. In my case I fooled along according to my lawyer's instructions, getting the highest offer I could. When I couldn't jack it up any higher, I referred them to my attorney for all further dealings.

Question. Do they offer me the appraised valuation of my land?

Answer. As far as I know, no case where they did ever came to my attention.

Question. What is this option they want me to sign?

Answer. It is a promise to sell.

Question. If I sign the option and then change my mind, have I lost my land?

Answer. I question my right to answer this question. See your attorney. He should have news for you.

Question. If I refuse to sign the option, can they chase me off my place?

Answer. Not on your tintype.

Question. How can they eject me?

Answer. After your land has been condemned by the regular process of law and you refuse to either rent or to vacate, you can be ejected but only by order of the United States District Court and only after you have been given a chance for a hearing.

Question. Can they eject me in the middle of the winter?

Answer. I can't answer for the Court, but I never heard of such a thing and I don't expect to.

Question. What happens when I don't sign the option?

Answer. Condemnation or nothing. Here we wanted them to condemn because that was the only way we could get them into Court. They first offered me $6,000 for my home. They condemned it, and a jury gave me $10,500.

The condemnation proceedings are conducted by the Department of Justice. That means the United States District Attorney. Usually it is a long, slow process often taking a year or longer. After it is over, you have the first chance to rent your own land from the Government.

Question. What if they do nothing?

Answer. This is the $64 question. Of late, they have been telling landowners to sign the option or wait maybe 5 years. If they told me that, I'd say, "Thanks, I'll wait."

As a matter of fact the Government will never put a drop of water on your land until it has title to your property. That means the Real Estate Division can't hold off very long or they won't be out of the way when the dam is finished. With their present one-offer or wait-5-years system, they have backed themselves out on a rotten limb. If they did that to me, I'd stick around and watch them hit the ground.

Question. If I refuse to sign the option and take my case to court am I fighting my Government?

Answer. Absolutely not. The Constitution and Congress wisely gave you the right to do this to protect your own interests.

Question. Is there any reason why I should fear the United States district court?

Answer. None whatever. We found the court and its entire staff courteous and friendly to all.

Question. Will the district attorney inquire into my income tax returns to show what I have made from my lands?

Answer. Piffle.

Question. I'm deaf, will they make it hard for me?

Answer. I am deaf and I made it hard for them.

Question. I am a woman and I'd be afraid, would they be hard on me?

Answer. Tell the simple truth the best you can and they will be very kind to you.

Question. Who actually decides how much money I shall receive for my home?

Answer. A jury made up of North Dakota people, really neighbors of yours. Their word is final. The only way that amount can be changed is by a new jury in a new trial. I haven't seen it happen.

Question. How do I get my money?

Answer. Shortly after condemnation proceedings are started, the appraised valuation of your land will be deposited for you with the court. You may draw on it. Usually it will all be paid to you promptly. Later the difference between that amount and the finding of the jury will be paid you with interest from the beginning of the action.

Question. What am I entitled to ask for my land?

Answer. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that we should be "put back in the same position we occupied before." It follows that we have a right to a new home of equal value with the one taken and in the same community. In addition we are justly entitled to any honest damage which we may suffer in moving. If the taking of one piece of land renders another piece that we own worth less to us than it was before, we are entitled to severance damages in that amount. At best we lose much, but we are not supposed to lose financially.

Question. Am I smart enough to deal with these negotiators and to get what I have coming?

Answer. If you were smart enough to get the better of these negotiators, the Real Estate Division would hire smarter negotiators.

Again, when these negotiators dealt with us, the highest offer they could make was the appraised valuation. When you deal with a negotiator and drive what you think is a good bargain, remember, if he closes the deal with you, it means that he is satisfied too. If he is satisfied, it must be that he feels he has bought your farm for a very reasonable figure. In our experience juries did not agree with him.

Question. How do I pick a lawyer?

Answer. The best cost no more than the worst.

Question. How are they paid?

Answer. Our lawyer offered to take all of our cases for 15 percent of what a jury might give over and above the appraised valuation, or the first offer, whichever proved the higher. We countered with an offer of 25 percent and the lawyer to take care of all our legal problems in connection with our lands; this included protecting our rights in the matter of rentals. The arrangement proved satisfactory and profitable for all parties.

Question. Are there other expenses to meet?

Answer. Not that I know anything about, except your personal expenses and those of one neighbor for a witness. Incidentally I had no witness at all. I wasn't even present when my case was tried. The Department of Justice apparently had its own way right up until the jury handed down its decision. Then all the Department of Justice had to show was a loss of $3,500 above the appraised valuation of $4,500 above my first offer.

Question. Should I hire so-called expert testimony?

Answer. No. It costs a lot and isn't worth anything. Go on the stand yourself. Tell the truth. If you do, the jury will believe most that you say.

Question. What shall I do if two negotiators come to my place and tell me they must talk with me alone and will allow no witnesses to the conversation?

Answer. For my part, I should refuse to talk to them in pairs at all and certainly I should refuse to talk to two of them unless I had one disinterested party as a witness. But I should consider a better way would be to refer them to my attorney and go on about my business.

Question. What about the cases I hear of where some fellow got $65 an acre for his land?

Answer. I have investigated several of these. Usually the reason lies in some man once building up a big farm with a high-priced set of buildings. After dividing his farm among his sons, he wound up with buildings like a small city on only a few acres of land. Paying him a fraction of what his buildings were worth brought out the $65 offer.

In one case, highly publicized, a man received $55 per acre. Everybody thought the Real Estate Division had experienced religion. Investigation showed that this was the one case on record where a farmer had a chance to see the appraisal sheet for his own farm. Adding the value allowed for an electric light plant to a lot of other valuations, including the buildings, subtracting from the amount paid and then dividing by the number of acres showed that he had actually received between $23 and $25 per acre for his farm. For a time this farmer thought he was smarter than the negotiator. Now he's changed his mind.

In bringing this little volume to a close, I want to repeat that I never have been paid a nickel, either by this paper or by any man, for my work. Except for a lone $10 bill, and an occasional ride with a friend, I have traveled hundreds of miles in investigating, and I have received no financial aid whatever. But no man can go on working for nothing forever. Accordingly I am collecting a royalty on this book and I hope you men and women of the Missouri Valley and you other men and women all over the United States will not begrudge me the few dollars that may—or may not—come my way.

Starting with this document as a public-service effort, I shall go forward on the same basis as far as the serial publication is concerned. If my efforts have been of help, I wish you who read would write me and tell me about it. Also write me any information you believe I should have. Your name will be kept in confidence if you wish. My best wishes are with you. If they weren't I never should have written this little book.

Schwaeber Offers $1,000 for UN Opening Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. I. VINCENT QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper clipping entitled "Schwaeber Offers $1,000 for UN Opening Prayer," which appeared in the Long Island Star Journal on Monday, October 3, 1949:

SCHWAEBER OFFERS $1,000 FOR UN OPENING PRAYER

Martin Schwaeber, of Jamaica, an assistant district attorney, today offered through Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, an award of $1,000 for an appropriate opening remark to be used at UN meetings. The award would be known as the Schwaeber Memorial Award, and would be in memory of Schwaeber's parents, William and Ann Schwaeber.

In a letter to Lie, who lives in Forest Hills, Schwaeber suggested that a world-wide competition be held to elicit a statement symbolizing the ideals of the world organization

and honoring the memory of those who have died to uphold these ideals.

Schwaeber has been on the staff of District Attorney Charles P. Sullivan for 14 years. Previously, he served as an assistant United States attorney.

He advanced his proposal as an alternative to the minute of silent meditation proposed by Lie last spring and recommended last week by the legal committee of the general assembly of the UN.

"Silent meditation is the easy way out," Schwaeber wrote in a letter to Lie, "but since the success of the United Nations and the realization of the goal shared by all men of good will—whatever their religious, political, or economic views may be—depend upon a meeting of the minds of all concerned, it must certainly be possible to fashion some expression of faith in which all in the United Nations can concur without abandoning their individual beliefs.

"If we cannot agree on such a generalized matter, how can we hope to achieve unanimity on the many more specific problems that confront us?

"In the firm belief that some general remark can be found to affirm this universal faith, I am prepared to establish an award of $1,000 for an expression of faith deemed most appropriate."

Schwaeber is a former president of the Jamaica Jewish Center.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the farm program delivered by the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at Blue Earth, Minn., on September 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I get around the country meeting with farm groups, I find that wherever I may be the hopes and problems of all farmers seem to be very much alike.

It is love of the soil and love of growing crops and better crops that makes farmers what they are in the first place. That is why they are constantly seeking new ways of producing bigger crops of better quality.

Then comes the problem of marketing those crops, for I don't know of anyone living on the land that doesn't like to have all the less fortunate people share in the wealth of his production.

After raising a good crop and finding a market we hope to get a price which will provide a good living on the farm, keep the family healthy, send the youngsters through school and in general provide conditions which will make the younger generation want to stay on the farm also.

We have learned a lot about producing farm crops in recent years. We have found that it isn't so hard to market our production either here or abroad if the price is low enough, but up until the war years—most farmers, including myself, found it pretty difficult to get an income that would enable us to live on a level comparable to that of other people.

Probably farmers as a whole are better off today and are able to do more things for their families than they ever have before. Unfortunately, and I believe unnecessarily, it took the world's biggest war to bring about this condition.

Fortunately, the American farmer was not found wanting when war came and the need was great.

Next to the fighting forces themselves, our farmers were the most potent factor in winning that war.

Without the 35-percent additional production of food in America, we could not have fed our own armies and those of our allies. We could not have provided so much food for the civilian population of western Europe during the years following the ending of hostilities.

Our ability to produce is well-nigh miraculous.

Although I yield to no one in my support of programs designed to restore and maintain the fertility of American soil resources, I do refuse to be scared by the numerous books and articles which indicate that America and the world will soon be on the verge of starvation.

The American farmer, under improved methods of production, could feed twice as many people as there are in the United States today and have something left over for his neighbors.

I want to give full credit to our State agricultural colleges, our experiment stations and the extension service, which have played such a great part in educating and training the farm youth of America and in spreading information concerning new methods of production, new varieties, new types of processing, and better marketing methods.

Our county agents, home demonstration agents, vocational agricultural teachers, and club leaders have all done a wonderful job.

More recently the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service have entered the field of farm operations.

Through the medium of these newer agencies we see the soil recovering from the effects of being depleted and a good many million acres being checked in their mad effort to reach the ocean.

But, most of all, credit for the improved position of American agriculture is due to the farmer himself.

Naturally individualistic, self-reliant and imbued with an inherent desire for independence, he has largely worked out his own problems and applied the teachings of the experts in the research field.

Although by nature an individualist, he recognizes the necessity of working with other farmers and other people.

The result has been farm organizations, which, in many instances, set the standard of price, quality, and service for their communities.

The farmer today is not only a well-informed leader of his community, but a broad student of national affairs as well.

We know that our welfare is linked with the welfare of others. We know that when industries close down, our markets are bad. When our markets are bad we cannot pay the doctor, send boys and girls to college, or buy the products of industry. Certainly agriculture, labor, industry, and the professions were never more interdependent than they are today.

Although we can easily recognize the interdependency of one group with the others, yet the responsibility for solving our problems successfully must rest with ourselves.

Farmers have many friends and well wishers outside their own ranks. Good relations with other groups is excellent, but when any other group steps over the line and attempts to map the future and evolve programs for us the results are not likely to be satisfactory.

So I want to stress the point right here and now that the working out of farm problems is a job for farmers and should not be turned over to any other class of people or to the Government itself.

Government should enter this picture only enough to lay down the rules of the game which will insure fair play.

Men in government, like men in other positions, aim unfalteringly at the objective of permanent security for themselves and their families.

Therefore, the tendency which has been emphasized during recent years is to make themselves necessary to the welfare of the farmer.

We all like to think of ourselves as being necessary to the welfare of others. We all want to be in a position to do the most for others, but there comes a time when if our efforts to make ourselves necessary to others is successful enough, we create in them a state of dependency which instead of helping them may permanently injure them.

We are too near this point in our agricultural economy in the United States today, and one reason that I am out here today is to do what little I can to encourage farmers to do their utmost against becoming dependents of government.

We cannot get along without government, however. It is entirely necessary to our welfare. It is an agency wisely set up by the original States through which they could unite to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare.

But, let's have this clear, government should always be an instrument of the people and not something set above the people.

Government has been used in many ways to benefit and assist farmers of our Nation. I have mentioned extension service, soil conservation, ACP, and could add many others through which farmers have been aided.

I have been disturbed during recent months over the possibility that the resistance of American agriculture to Government domination and control might be broken down. I feel much easier now though than I did 6 months ago.

We are encountering a conflict of philosophies in America today which may affect our agricultural future and even our form of government.

One philosophy would have government assume responsibility for our agricultural welfare with a guaranty of a satisfactory income to the farmer even though such guaranty carries with it full authority to control and direct the operations of the individual.

The other philosophy recognizes fully the importance of government as a medium through which we may work to assure a high level of prosperity for agriculture, with a minimum of control over the individual farmer and with an area between the guaranteed minimum level and the fully satisfactory level in which the farmer himself may exercise his own ambitions and resourcefulness.

This conflict of philosophies has resulted in a great deal of misrepresentation and misunderstanding concerning present and proposed farm legislation.

It has been my lot to find myself pretty nearly in the middle of this conflict of ideas.

I have had to review so many proposed farm programs and panaceas that I lost count of the number long ago.

I generally manage to find something good about the worst of them and something bad about the best of them, but one conclusion I have reached after studying them all is that there is no panacea for farm problems, there is no perfect farm program, and there is no such thing as permanent security for the farmer any more than there is for other people.

It is well that this is so for if we could be assured of permanent security, our initiative and enterprise would soon lapse and the strength of our Nation would rapidly wane.

Much of the controversy of the last few months has been raging around the question

of price supports or income supports for agriculture.

Of course, the farmer has to have an income to do the things he wants to do and ought to do.

I would, however, rather regard price supports as the last line of defense in the battle for farm prosperity rather than the first line.

Price supports are something to fall back on when every other means has failed and when our agricultural economy and our national economy demands that artificial operations be brought into action.

Frankly, I don't think we have begun to explore the field of processing, transportation, and distribution of our farm commodities both within and without the United States.

We have overemphasized the importance of getting a Government check or loan into the hands of the farmer and have underemphasized the desirability of developing new methods of processing and distribution, thereby maintaining a good price in the market place.

It is true, as I said earlier, that I am not alarmed over the ability of the American farmer to feed our people or twice the number we have now. It is equally true that if the 40 or 50 million folks in this country who at present are unable to buy enough of the right kind of foods to keep them healthy were able to do so, the surpluses about which we worry would disappear virtually overnight.

For the last few years, I have had a bill in the Congress which seeks to promote the distribution of the right kinds of food among low-income people of this country who through no fault of their own are unable to enjoy a minimum adequate diet. This proposal was endorsed by Senator ANDERSON when he was Secretary of Agriculture.

If it were put into effect, there would be no need to worry over farm surpluses and a lot of poor folks would be happier and healthier.

The proposal would cost some money, but a lot of good could come from it, and the cost would be charged up against an effort to enable 50,000,000 Americans to live better than they are doing today.

More recently a proposal has been made to subsidize the food bill of all the American people and charge the cost up to a farm-support program.

I am for the objective of making it possible for every deserving American to get a decent living, but I am unalterably opposed to subsidizing every consumer in America and charging the cost up to farm relief. I don't like the idea of making the farmer appear to be the recipient of benefits derived by other people.

Now, I want to refer to a couple of matters which pertain directly to work with which I have personally been closely connected.

I want to correct some of the misunderstanding which has been broadcast through this great agricultural region during the last 12 months.

The first point which I want to clear up relates to the Commodity Credit Charter Act passed by Congress a year ago last June and which for the first time gave the Commodity Credit Corporation a permanent legal existence.

I feel a personal responsibility to tell you exactly what was provided for in that act, because I was chairman of the Senate committee which gave it final consideration in conference with the House.

I was not completely satisfied with the bill. In fact, very few pieces of major legislation are completely satisfactory, but it was much better than you have been given to understand. Otherwise, I would never have approved it at all.

The act prohibited the Government from leasing, constructing, or acquiring grain elevators or leasing land on which to put any buildings for the storage of grain owned by the Government.

It did, however, provide for the full cooperation of Government in a program for storage of grain on the farm under which the Government could sell or lease bins to the farmer, loan him money for construction, and assist him in other ways in the storage of grain on the farm, or through the facilities of any commercial concern or farm cooperative.

There is nothing in the farm-storage program as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on June 7, 1949, that could not have been done just as well in August 1948 under the Commodity Credit Charter Act of that year.

The injection of politics into the price-support and storage program last year cost the farmer dearly.

The erroneous belief that Government could not assist in a farm-storage program caused many producers to sell at lower prices. This dumping of crops on the market caused a general decline in values until even those who had no need for additional storage were also adversely affected.

If there is any one thing that would do more than anything else to bring stability and confidence to our agricultural and national economy it would be to get farm legislation out of the field of party politics and back to a nonpartisan basis again. I hope the leadership of both major political parties may be impressed with the need for doing this.

The other misunderstanding which I wish to clear up relates to the long-range price-support program approved by the Eightieth Congress.

This does not go into effect until January 1, 1950. We are still operating under the wartime support program for the crop year 1949.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture which developed this first permanent price-support program, I am in a position to know well what the act provides.

It was developed by a bipartisan committee of seven of which your own local farm Senator, ED THYE, was a valuable member. We kept party politics completely out of the picture during our work. The bill presented to the Senate was unanimously approved by the full committee of seven Republicans and six Democrats.

It was developed as far from the heat of a political campaign as it was possible to get.

Its objectives are the guarantee of adequate production and fair prices to farmers. It emphasizes the support of farm income rather than commodity prices. It encourages the marketing of grain in the form of animal products, thus greatly widening the market for grain and insuring consumers of a higher dietary level. It permits forward-pricing of farm commodities so that the farmer may know better how to plan his production.

The Secretary of Agriculture has already used this authority permitted him by the act to fix the support level of hogs at 90 percent until April 1, 1950.

It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to "give consideration to the practicability of supporting prices indirectly as by the development of improved merchandizing methods rather than directly by purchase or loan."

It provides for the revision of the parity formula so as to put the different farm commodities in the proper price relationship with one another. The result of this revision of the formula is to give somewhat higher values to animal products and somewhat lower values to corn, cotton, and wheat.

It provides for the support of the six basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts at a level not exceeding 90 percent of parity nor less than a minimum level fixed by a formula provided in the act.

You may have heard that under this act the support price of wheat and other basic crops will drop to 60 percent of parity. I do not intend that such misstatements shall go unchallenged.

The plain facts are that the flexible support provision of the act was supported by the United States Department of Agriculture and all the major farm organizations as well as by planks in both political party platforms.

In spite of all you may have heard over the radio, in spite of the millions of copies of misleading pamphlets and other material distributed to the farmers of this Nation, the fact is that the minimum support for any basic commodity cannot ever be as low as 60 percent of parity, under this act unless quotas have been voted upon and disapproved by the farmers themselves.

Those who point out that the formula calls for support at 60 percent of parity fail to tell you that although the formula uses percentages running from 60 to 90 percent the area between 60 and 72 percent is used only as a base for determining the actual minimum level of support below which the Secretary of Agriculture cannot go.

And those who for political reasons would destroy the Agricultural Act of 1948 also fail to tell you that the Secretary of Agriculture can at all times fix the support level of any basic and the more important nonbasic commodities up to 90 percent of parity.

The act itself simply gives him maximum and minimum levels within which he must exercise his best judgment—and I mean economic and not political judgment.

The 1948 act provides for the support of any nonbasic farm commodity—and there are nearly 150 of these—at levels varying from zero up to 90 percent.

A fair interpretation of the act as a whole would require the Secretary to support the major nonbasic commodities ,such as animal products, soybeans, oats, rye, flax, and barley, at a level comparable to the mandatory supports given the basic commodities.

I am glad to have this opportunity to tell you these facts and to correct the misrepresentations which have been so widespread.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 gives to the farmers of America the best supports which any peacetime, long-range agricultural act has ever provided and which, if properly interpreted and applied, will result in a minimum of Government controls.

The people of this Nation will be making some important decisions in the next few years. Whether we realize it or not, we will be making decisions which will determine whether we shall drift down the seemingly easy but treacherous road to Government guardianship, or take the road that will enable us to freely exercise our own intiative and self-reliance in working out our salvation.

As farmers, we are already facing this decision. The path that we take will not only set the pattern of our farm programs of the future but it also will have a major influence on what other groups do, thereby influencing the future course of our Government.

The American farmer, through his own cooperative efforts, can do more than any other group to keep alive the free-enterprise way of life in this country.

It is up to us to determine whether we will be in the vanguard of the drift toward agriculture of the Government, by the Government, and for the Government, or whether we will lead the way to a renewal and maintenance of faith in an agriculture by the people and for the people.

As much as anyone else, I want to see farmers prosper, and get their fair share of the national income. But I don't want to see them lose their freedom in an elusive and fruitless search for security by government.

Let us not confuse political expediency with economic progress.

Lasting agricultural prosperity cannot be handed out by government, it must be achieved through the united effort and cooperation of farmers themselves.

Give-Away Show Weakens America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of an address made by me before the Frozen Food Locker Institute in the Sherman Hotel, Chicago, on October 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE-AWAY SHOW WEAKENS AMERICA

Ladies and gentlemen, the days when Congress met a few months each year apparently have passed, at least until the ancient landmarks fixing limits of government are restored. We must cut big Government down to size.

Less time in Washington—more time at home—is mandatory for Members of Congress to find out at the grass roots what the people are thinking.

If Congress is to continue sessions lasting all year, there should be brief recesses so that lawmakers can mingle with the people, and exchange views, to provide leadership responsive to the will of the people.

From my contacts in Nebraska and from across the country, there is growing concern over domestic and international affairs.

1789 WAS GLORIOUS YEAR

In an effort to shake off this anxiety, it has been suggested recently by our President that those who are concerned are 160 years behind the time, and that their thinking goes back to 1789. Well, the year 1789 was a glorious year in the history of mankind. In that year the Constitution of the United States went into effect. George Washington, who gave us a lot of good advice, was establishing our Republic.

Alexander Hamilton, who believed in a balanced budget, was organizing our monetary system. Thomas Jefferson, who believed in personal freedoms, was extolling the dignity of the individual, States' rights—home rule. He was warning against the evils of centralized power in which Government bosses control the affairs, the activities, and the lives of the people.

It was then, in 1789, James Madison, as a Member of the First Congress, was drafting the sacred Bill of Rights.

Oh, yes, there was no telephone, no telegraph, no radio, no television, and there was no steamboat, no train, no automobile, nor airplane. And believe it or not, there were no quick freezers to conserve the Nation's food supply.

And, strange as it may seem, in 1789, half the world was not beating a path to our door to get cash and goods to support them. Oh, no, but let me remind you, there was great rejoicing by freedom-loving people around the world, that the new Republic—America—had been born.

Those never-varying principles upon which our Republic was established, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of choice, freedom for competitive enterprise, yes, and freedom from the lash of Government bosses, are just as immutable today as they were in 1789.

And they shall not be snuffed out.

Fellow Americans, administrations and political leaders change, but the principles upon which the Republic was founded will never change. They will never, never die.

Thank God, more and more Americans are rededicating themselves today to the principles of 1789. There is no room in America for socialism, fascism, communism, or any of the other worthless alien isms. Statism has never worked anywhere and we don't want it here.

Statism and representative government won't mix. There can be no compromise. One or the other will be destroyed. One is wrong and destroys confidence; the other is right and gives incentives for invention, industry, and production. One is compulsion; the other, freedom.

America's system of competitive enterprise, is like a power-producing dynamo. Every time the power or productivity of that dynamo is drawn upon, to support a socialistic, nonproductive governmental scheme, the less power there is left, and the dynamo is weakened and robbed of its wealth-producing energy.

There are among us, in this fair land of ours, alien-minded spoilers who would have us believe that by taxing all the riches and distributing it, our country would be wealthier.

They say our national economy will become stronger if controlled by Government bosses instead of by all the people. They say, where every man is guaranteed security by an omnipotent state, men will work harder. They totally disregard incentives to get greater productivity.

You know that was not the philosophy of those patriotic, God-fearing men and women in 1789, and it is not the philosophy of the unbroken line of builders of America—right up to this very moment.

WORLD ENVIES AMERICA

These liberty-loving Americans believed the Government is the servant, and not the master of the people. Under their philosophy America has become great and strong. It has become the envy of the world. But, for our beloved country to remain the land of opportunity and freedom of choice, it must be kept pure and undefiled by statism. Only in such an economic climate, can business, agriculture, and labor prosper and America go forward.

Here we are, a Nation with one-sixteenth of the earth's population, and yet America produces nearly seven-sixteenths of the world's goods. Our people own 46 percent of the world's electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 98 percent of its television equipment, 54 percent of its telephones, 59 percent of its steel capacity, 60 percent of its life insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, 92 percent of its modern bathtubs, the most schools, the most churches, and the best health record.

This country, in the 160 years of its dynamic, adventurous life, has made more progress than all the other nations have made in 6,000 years. And all this progress is based upon the foundation established by those men and women of 1789, whom persons highly placed in government, ridicule, as dullards unworthy of emulation today.

There is no perfect security. The law of progress is to get in there and pitch, and be thankful you live in a land of opportunity in which freedom of choice prevails. Our job is to keep that freedom and opportunity alive.

Argument by the proponents of the welfare state that it is authorized in the general welfare clause of the Constitution is fraudulent.

The whole intent of the Constitution is antagonistic to the philosophy for an all-powerful, all-wise government, managing and directing the lives of our people from cradle to grave. But, inroads are being made by the disciples of statism, the minds of our people are being warped by alien ideologies. Our way of life today is in mortal danger.

Too many are being misled because they fail to get the truth. They must have the truth to make the right decisions, otherwise they are helpless.

That's what happened to the people of Germany, that's what is happening in Russia, and that is what will happen in America unless the people get the facts.

For example, we are now being told we can get something for nothing, free houses, free education, free medicine, lifetime security, all free, as free as the air. You know these things are not free. They must be paid for through work and sweat, taxes, and indirectly, through the cost of living.

While our people blithely go about their way, the Government bosses are taking over, sugar-coating their invasions into the rights and responsibilities of the people with such pleasantly sounding words as security, prosperity, contentment, and happiness for all.

But, at long last, the facts are beginning to get out to the grass roots. Stung by the rising wrath of the people, and to defend themselves against violation of these principles of 1789, the Government bosses in concert chant: "Do you want to stop Government aid for highway building?"

"Do you want to stop Government aid in reclamation, forestry, soil conservation, electric power, and commerce from the rivers?"

"And," they chant, "do you want the Government to stop research into the causes and cures of diseases?"

Fellow-Americans: Don't be fooled. No one who believes in our republican form of Government want to stop any of these meritorious activities, activities which the Government has pioneered. The Government pioneered for the railroads. It pioneered for public roads so that people can travel upon them under traffic rules that protect the rights of all.

The same is true for reclamation, and electric power from our rivers which belong to all the people. All of these activities lie within the province of government, but should not be used by the Government to control the affairs, activities, and the lives of the people.

And, that's the big difference. It is the difference between those of us who believe with Jefferson and Lincoln in the dignity of the individual, and those who believe in regimenting the individual into a socialistic state. To those who say it can't happen here, let me say, it is happening in Great Britain, and our people are being led in the same direction.

BRANNAN PLAN IS SOCIALISTIC

For let me ask you, if the making of foreign-trade agreements in star-chamber proceedings and the President's refusal to explain when he cuts tariff rates below peril points is not statism, what is it?

If the Spence bill to give the President, one man, absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages, and floors under prices and wages, is not fascism—what is it?

If giving the President, one man, power to build and operate steel and other plants in competition with private industry, is not socialism—what is it?

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not Government control of the lives of the people—what is it?

If federalized education, thought control, is not statism—what is it? Keep Government bosses out of our schools. They take our money, but they shall not take our children.

If Government, all taxpayers, paying part of the cost and rental of homes for some of the people is not socialism—what is it?

If using the tax power to destroy initiative, thrift, and investment, is not a blow to competitive free enterprise—what is it? And, worst of all in this parade of spoilers, is the so-called Brannan farm plan, a plan to sovietize the farmers.

When Government bosses regiment farmers to produce surpluses of food so there

will be cheap prices to consumers, and promise to give the farmers a dole in exchange for their freedom, then, fellow Americans, a long step toward complete regimentation of the food industry will have been taken.

And that's only the beginning—if the farmers are regimented then controls will have to be extended to all segments of the food industry. You may be next on their timetable.

But the Government bosses are in for a big surprise. I am a farmer, and I know the philosophy of the farmer. The American farmer will not let any Government boss make him stand in line with a tin cup in his hand.

You members of the Frozen Food Locker Institute are conservationists.

You are in an industry that evolves from the sound, sensible precept that it is wise to conserve foods in times of abundance, when prices are at their lowest, for consumption in times when they are not so plentiful. This helps to stabilize prices, and you perform a real service to our whole national economy. You also help the housewives of the land by enabling them to have a more constant flow of seasonal foods in keeping with good dietetics, right out of their quick freezers, bought when prices are the most advantageous; all of this available by merely lifting the lid of an ornamental cabinet.

It is a cabinet built by private initiative, powered by the wonders of the electrical industry that have been accomplished by private initiative. And it is sold in free markets by salesmen with initiative, to housewives who know a good thing when they see it.

Your business, the invention, the processing, the fabricating, has been built and distributed by private enterprise. Are you now going to let the Socialists take it over? Do you think they will make yours an exception?

Your industry is in as much jeopardy as the remainder of our national economy that was built by private initiative.

Big Government is rapidly dissipating our Nation's substance through riotous spending of the people's money; invasions into States' rights, unbridled meddling in private business, and in the biggest give-away show on earth.

It is axiomatic that national prosperity is dependent upon a prosperous agriculture. Your industry is directly linked to agriculture. The Government bosses are converging in the Farm Belt like a plague of grasshoppers, and will soon be on your backs. Their answer to farm surpluses is controls, controls, controls. Theirs is the defeatist approach. They look upon abundant crops as a curse, and not the blessing of nature that they are.

ALCOHOL MAKES GOOD MOTOR FUEL

The solution of crop surpluses is utilization, not destruction.

There is a new approach to farm surpluses. A combination of many actions, all geared to production for use, is the answer. Diversion of agricultural products to hundreds of industrial uses; diversion and new crops, such as safflower, which is a substitute crop for wheat land, and which is making great strides in the Middle West; improvement in processing and marketing; new techniques to give agriculture more outlets in world markets, all of these avenues are open for constructive action.

Alcohol, made from grains and other starchy commodities is used in a dozen countries as a supplement to gasoline for motor fuel. The Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry recently reported after practical road tests, that alcohol blended with low-grade gasoline makes a premium grade of motor fuel, and that injection of alcohol into automobiles and truck motors develops greater power for quick starting, passing, and hill climbing.

Government stock piling of foods, feeds, and natural fibers in times of need could be a capital asset more precious than gold. Through expansion of exports under a two-price system which enables countries short of dollars to buy from our surpluses, there could be greater utilization.

Loans of foods, feeds, and natural fibers to other countries could be made. It is more practical to make a food loan to hungry people than it is to loan them money. It is more beneficial to our economy to give them food than to give them money to spend in other countries for purchase of farm products that are in surplus here.

But, instead of following this constructive course, the Government bosses are furnishing the money to let Great Britain buy the surplus wheat crop in Canada while our wheat crop is bulging our bins and storage space in the United States.

Improvement of processing, storage, and distribution of foods, feeds, and natural fibers through cost-saving procedures would contribute to stability of farm income and lower prices to consumers. Chemists have discovered hundreds of industrial uses for farm products, but unless leaders in Government have a will to utilize the crop surpluses instead of trying to regiment the farmers, these opportunities will die on the vine.

Failure to utilize crop surpluses has made the Commodity Credit Corporation one of the biggest businesses in the country. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the latest fiscal year did a business of $3,400,000,000 in supporting farm commodity prices.

Its losses were about $350,000,000. The Government's inventory is already huge. Among more than a score of foodstuffs, it has on hand 75,000,000 pounds of butter which cost $47,257,000; 187,000,000 pounds of dried milk costing $24,388,000; 64,000,000 pounds of dried eggs costing $85,000,000; 3,783,000 bales of cotton costing $602,300,000; 15,900,000 bushels of corn costing $28,000,000 and 192,000,000 bushels of wheat costing $455,000,000.

Some authorities estimate the Commodity Credit Corporation's operations for loans and parity payments in the present fiscal year may reach $4,500,000,000. No one is prepared to say what the net loss will be. Isn't it high time to apply sound, business-like solutions to crop surpluses?

NEW SPENDING GADGETS IN OFFING

Fellow Americans: Big Government is so adept at finding new ways to spend the taxpayer's money that it is becoming a game in Washington to guess what the next device will be for reaching into the pockets of the people.

That allegedly "bold, new program" to scatter the American taxpayers' money around the globe obviously offers unlimited opportunity for spending in the name of greater world commerce—peace and abundance. Government guaranties for private investments in backward countries, that will not be backward in accepting the American taxpayers' dollars, has possibilities for endless appropriations.

This is an especially interesting proposal in the light of how unanimously foreign countries devalue their currencies to block imports from the United States; and their agility in making bilateral trade agreements among themselves; their quota restrictions, and embargoes on imports from the United States.

Of course, we want to help backward countries so they can help themselves and enjoy increasing trade with us.

If the Department of Commerce and Foreign Service of the State Department were revitalized to facilitate contracts abroad by private American investors and business-seeking American industries, progress could be made in expanding our foreign trade within the framework of competitive enterprise.

But the administration's bill now before Congress would channel this worth-while procedure into another program for a socialistic domination of our foreign trade.

When I left Washington there was talk, in important circles, of establishing a revolving fund for Great Britain and other countries, a sort of international Brannan plan—to subsidize their producers against losses they might incur as a result of lifting of restrictions on American imports by their governments. The suggestion was that this so-called revolving fund be started at $175,000,000.

Fellow Americans: Isn't it about time to take soundings of whither we are drifting?

More and deeper tariff cuts are in the offing under the broad power voted to the President by Congress in the recently passed, incorrectly named Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Within a few days, the President will announce slashes in import duties on about 250 commodities and manufactured products. These were negotiated at a 6-month conference with representatives of 10 other countries at Annecy, France, near the Swiss border.

Then we will know, for the first time, which additional American industries have been sacrificed on the altar of global planning. The State Department is already planning a 40-nation conference for early next year in the tariff-cutting spree.

TARIFF CUTS RUINOUS

Tariff cuts, together with the currency devaluations abroad, have effectively breached tariff protection for American industry, agriculture, and labor, who are entitled to first call on the American markets. And the result will be mounting surpluses of farm products and manufactured goods in the United States—with our country dragged down to the world level in standards of living.

Certainly, we want foreign trade, and we want it on a two-way basis in which both sides benefit. We should buy from other countries what we need, but they should buy from us what they need, and not make a mockery of reciprocity through embargoes, restrictions, bilateral agreements, and currency devaluation, all of which block our exports to them.

This give-away show at Washington cannot go on much longer without collapsing our national economy.

Fellow Americans, let me remind you that in 1924, the then Russian dictator, Lenin, said: "Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction." Unless you call a halt, Lenin's terrible prophecy will come true.

Extravagant Government expenditures to support the domestic economy, and to bolster socialism abroad, are reflected in back-breaking taxes, higher cost of living, and a rising national debt.

The debt has increased $5,000,000,000 since a postwar low last April. It is now over two hundred and fifty-five billion, and skyrocketing toward the wartime peak. Time and again, some of us in Congress have tried to cut the all peacetime high appropriations, but the spenders have prevailed. Instead of cutting expenditures they have taken the easy way out—deficit spending, borrow and spend, let the public debt, the mortgage upon you and your children, go up and up.

Deficit spending is the most ruinous of all the devices of bad government. It must be stopped. And the right way to stop it is to cut reckless spending. The American people are a trusting, tolerant people, steeped in the wholesome traditions of our Republic. But there is need today, urgent need, for Paul Reveres to spread among the people that great danger threatens.

We, the American people, must reject the philosophy that permits Government bosses to steal the fruits of years and years of initiative, invention, and skill under private enterprise, and consume those fruits in soulless, regimenting statism.

We assert ours is a Government pursuant to laws, and not of men. The National Labor Relations Act provides definite, specific procedures for the settlement of labor-management disputes, with the rights of both sides spelled out. This law should be invoked in every case under its jurisdiction. It should have been applied in the steel dispute.

But, it was bypassed and now, with the steel strike on, the futility of bypassing the way laid down by law should be plain to all.

AMERICA MUST BE STRONG

Labor bosses don't like the law, because it clips their high-flying wings and because it protects the workers in their rights to control their own unions. Above all, it recognizes the public interests as paramount. With each passing hour, the steel strike is paralyzing our national economy. The coal stoppage in the East and South is contributing to the same tragic result.

This is a free country, but no group of men—management or labor, either or both—has the right to prostrate the whole economy and deprive millions of citizens not parties to their disputes of their right to earn a living and go about their usual ways.

Labor-management disputes are solvable. They will be solved when reasonable men, under reasonable government, act reasonably. Law and order must prevail.

Fellow-Americans, the time for hard thinking is here, but it is not a time for discouragement. America has faced many trials and tribulations in the past and I have an abiding faith in the wisdom of the people awakening to the dangerous road down which they are being led. But the hour is getting late; time is running out. Confidence among the people must be restored; confidence in the principles of our Republic; confidence in the dignity of the individual and his right to freedom of choice and competitive enterprise in free markets; confidence that the best government is that government which recognizes thrift as a virtue and spends wisely within the means of the people; confidence that government for all the people, and not for selfish pressure groups, is the best government; confidence that government which treats all nations fairly and squarely, invites friendship and good will from right-thinking people everywhere; and confidence in a strong America, strong in preparedness against attack by any potential aggressor with atomic bomb or any other weapon including poisonous propaganda, strong financially, economically, and spiritually.

My fellow-Americans, these are solid policies that build the structure upon which America, please God, will go forward, true to its destiny as the hope and inspiration of all freedom-loving people. America is the best place on earth. Let's keep it that way.

Third Annual Harvest of Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Third Annual Harvest of Harmony," prepared by me, relating to a musical festival to be held in Washington, D. C., this fall.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD ANNUAL HARVEST OF HARMONY

Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of presenting a quartet of singers who call themselves the D. C. Keys to audiences at two meetings in Virginia, and at that time I commended the soothing effect upon tired nerves and discouraged spirits of the harmony of a good barber-shop quartet.

I wish to repeat that statement today and at the same time to remind the Senate that on Friday evening, October 28, the Washington (D. C.) Chapter of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber-shop Singing in America, Inc., will be host for the District of Columbia's Third Annual Harvest of Harmony.

The Elastic Four of Chicago, 1942 international champions, regarded by many devotees of harmonizing as the greatest barber-shop combination of all time, heads the list of visiting quartets. Other guest foursomes will include the Westinghouse Quartet, of Pittsburgh, Pa., title contenders for several years; the Buffalo Bills, of Buffalo, N. Y., 1949 international finalists; and the Firesiders, of Louisville, Ky., 1949 international semi-finalists.

Washington chapter will present its own Potomac Clippers, 1949 mid-Atlantic district champions and international finalists, and several other popular quartets, in addition to its singing Capitol Chorus of 120 redcoats, under the direction of Dr. Robert Howe Harmon. This great chorus sang for the official recording of the United States Treasury Department's new savings-bond theme song, Keep America Saving, which was written by Frank H. Thorne, a bass of the Elastic Four.

The Role of the Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, none of my colleagues need be told of the importance of American newspapers in preserving the freedoms of our people. Nor, for that matter, need they be advised of the crucial role of a free press for a free and peaceful world. It has been my pleasure in the past to introduce legislation on behalf of international freedom of the press.

Unfortunately, the shadow of dictatorship still falls over many of the newspapers of the world. Recently the European Affairs Division of the Library of Congress published a booklet analyzing the status of individual newspapers in foreign countries. Any reader of that document could not fail to note to what a tremendous extent newspapers in foreign countries are (a) muzzled by dictator governments, (b) harnessed to particular political parties, (c) slanted to particular partisan or social movements, (d) subsidized by private or governmental sources.

In other words, the failure to have a vital free press remains as one of Europe's crucial problems although much progress has been made toward improving the quality of European journalism.

Fortunately, we here on this side of the ocean are blessed with a Fourth Estate that is free, vital, dynamic and beholden to no man, no party, no group.

In connection with National Newspaper Week, I was glad to read an editorial in the Monday, October 3, Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette. This editorial stressed the role of a free press in combating corruption, discrimination and other vicious conditions.

A FREE PRESS PREVENTS PERSECUTION

I am particularly delighted that the editorial pointed out how in Wisconsin and elsewhere, newspapers have led the fight against hate groups organized to persecute racial, religious and foreign language minorities. The press is the indispensable ally of American brotherhood. We cannot have unity between all religions—Protestants, Catholics and Jews—unless newspapers and civic organizations are constantly on the alert against those insidious individuals and hate mongering groups which would set gentile against Jew, white man against his Negro brother, Protestant against Catholic, North against South, farm against city, which would divide our country and would promote the chaos which the enemies of America desire.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial from the Janesville Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK IS PEOPLE'S FREEDOM WEEK

Freedom goes where the newspaper goes.

That slogan of 1949 National Newspaper Week spotlights the priceless heritage which Americans enjoy through their right of a free press in a free country, for freedom of the press is a freedom that belongs to the public and not to the newspapers alone.

Thomas Jefferson emphasized that point when he said, "* * * were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

History has demonstrated that every encroachment on liberty starts with or quickly leads to attacks on the press. Freedom is indivisible. It cannot apply to education and not to religion. It cannot apply to the spoken word and not to the written word. These rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights are combined and inseparable. Freedom of the press is coupled to the rights of free speech, free worship, and freedom of assembly.

Where authority attacks the free press and is able to bind and restrict it, the people's loss is their first freedom. Freedom goes where, and when, the newspaper goes, for control of the press leads to control of free speech and of assembly and of religion.

We are seeing this control behind the iron curtain as the enemies of freedom burn books, throttle the press, and now stifle free worship. We see it in Argentina where Peron is exerting constant pressure to cow the major independent newspapers, La Prensa and La Nacion of Buenos Aires. There is no freedom of the press in Argentina, in Spain, in the Soviet Union or her satellites.

In these countries, freedom has gone where and when the newspaper has gone.

Through generations in this country the American press has shown a conscience as the defender of human liberty. It has continued to fight attempts to curtail freedom. It has constantly striven to extend democracy. It continues to keep the people informed so that they may make decisions intelligently and keep this Nation free.

It was the vigilance and courage of the American press that broke the Ku Klux Klan 25 years ago. By showing how the Klan was motivated by cheapness, by self-seeking gangsters, the newspapers attached a stigma to the Klan that has helped to rid American communities of its scourge.

Likewise, in Wisconsin, this and other newspapers revealed a wicked discrimination group for what it was. Gentiles, Inc., seeking to persecute minorities, was given a stigma from which it never recovered. Hate groups cannot live in an atmosphere of true freedom, where an informed public has been alerted.

The concept of freedom has a twofold meaning. It means not only that the newspapers must be free to print what they get as news, but also that the reader must be free to make his own judgments.

National Newspaper Week is a good time for all newspaper readers to realize the benefits and blessings of a free press in a world which needs freedom more than ever before.

United States Participation in World Wars I and II Was a Tragic Mistake, Says General Fuller, Noted British Soldier-Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the statement is often made that this country should not have become involved in either World War I or World War II. Arguments without end could be made for and against and I shall not labor the point here. Recently, however, a noted British soldier and author, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, has come forward in support of the view that it was a mistake for the United States to have entered either war. General Fuller's statement was contained in the military magazine Ordnance for September-October 1949. The general is one of the outstanding military analysts and historians of the present day and his article entitled "Unstrategic Bombing and World Ruin" commands our attention. He points out very clearly that Europe after two wars is today impotent either to make peace or wage war.

Mr. Speaker, this great Nation, after having contributed untold wealth toward military victories in those wars is now called upon to spend its resources to rehabilitate those countries it helped to defeat on the field of battle. This is indeed a paradoxical situation without parallel in the history of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a part of the article by General Fuller:

We Europeans are a truculent congeries of nations who have been fighting each other for upward of 2,000 years, and we dislike outside interference. In 1917 you Americans stepped into the war to save one side, and whatever at the time we may have asked for as Englishmen and Frenchmen, as Europeans we did not want to be saved by a non-European power. Instead, what we really wanted was to settle our quarrels in our own historic way. Had you not stepped in, we should have been forced to come to terms between ourselves, as we have done scores of times before. Without your aid, and it was generous, we Europeans would have concluded the First World War, probably in 1917, by a negotiated peace which could not have been worse than the one established.

Again in the last war, what with your lend-lease, etc., you got entangled in the European brawl, and between 1942 and 1945, backed by your enormous industrial power, you laid the greater part of central Europe flat. But for lend-lease the war could not have continued for long. Again there would have been a negotiated peace, which could not possibly have been as bad as the present so-called one. Though it is true that it would almost certainly have been followed (if not preceded) by a war between Germany and Russia, nothing could have been more beneficial to the world at large, for in it the two dictatorial powers which were threatening the western way of life would have bled each other white. To imagine that Hitler, had he conquered Russia in Europe, could have held it for long is a joke.

It needed no hindsight to see these things, only a modicum of foresight; but, sad to say, this was lacking. Europe is now impotent either to make peace or wage war, and today she is hanging around your neck like the ancient mariner's albatross. If you abandon her she will be turned Red; if you do not, there is a high probability that there will be another war. And now comes the question: Next time are you going to resort again to unstrategic bombing? If you do, the probability is that Europe will end by becoming a scarlet jungle.

Thus we return to the opening sections of this article. What are your moral principles; what is your political aim? Are you going to fight in accordance with Queensberry rules or are you bent upon winning another total victory?

The Military Assistance Program and the Necessity for Augmenting It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 28, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, only one day after the military assistance program had passed both houses of Congress the President's announcement of an atomic explosion in the U. S. S. R. radically altered certain of the basic premises on which the arms aid program was founded. Indeed, the whole fabric of international politico-strategic relations is affected by the knowledge that the Soviet Union is in possession of what is presumably an atomic weapon. Even on the supposition that the Soviet atomic bomb is at a crude stage of development and is not yet being mass-produced, nevertheless a factor has been created which has fundamentally effected the world balance of power. This has forced a reappraisal of the strategic position of the western powers vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and its satellite bloc.

An integral part of this reappraisal is a reconsideration of the efficacy of the political and military structure at present binding mutually and jointly the United States and Canada with the free nations of western Europe. Politically, the North Atlantic Treaty probably represents the limit to which the United States—and other countries—will go at the present moment in the direction of a legal commitment for cooperative defense. That is not necessarily to say, however, that in the light of the latest atomic development this legal commitment is adequate for attaining the purposes of joint defense. Effective joint defense, in this second phase of the atomic era, may possibly demand a substantive surrender of sovereignty. This, however, whatever else one may say about it, is at the moment not politically feasible and this question is excluded from the purview of this statement.

But the military assistance program is another matter. Here it is a question of hard-headed self-interest whether, under the new atomic dispensation, it is necessary to strengthen our collaborative defense arrangements beyond that contemplated in the present MAP bill which, it should be emphasized, was conceived in the pre-Soviet-atomic period. The impetus generated by the President's announcement was enough to cause within the next few days the House of Representatives in conference with the Senate to withdraw promptly from the reduced version of the bill which it had previously passed. As finally cleared for the President's signature the MAP bill provided for $1,000,000,000 for defense assistance to the Atlantic Pact countries in the period before June 30, 1950. $500,000,000 of this amount, however, is only in the form of authority to enter into contracts. Actually, therefore, the United States can spend only $500,000,000 between now and June 30, 1950, for strengthening its allies against atomic attack. When the high cost of the recent war is recalled—about $340,000,000,000 as calculated by the Army—it is patent that the present program is extremely small in scope. In a word, it fails to measure up to the new world strategic situation.

The North Atlantic Treaty, by establishing the principle that an armed attack against one of its signatories is to be considered an armed attack against all, is—on paper—a deterrent to any potential aggressor. How effective a deterrent the treaty is, however, depends upon the "teeth" that may be given it. One of the main purposes of the Military Assistance Program is to give to the western European nations the capacity and the means to withstand aggression. The stronger this capacity is, the greater the constraint upon the expansive tendencies of the Soviet Union. The immediate aim of the Military Assistance Program, in the words of the administration, "is to provide in the briefest possible time compact, effectively trained forces-in-being, equipped with modern weapons, backed by at least a minimum industrial potential, and capable of maintainng internal order and resisting external aggression." For these purposes the administration requested the sum of $1,160,990,000 for western Europe. This was before the revelation of an atomic

explosion in the U. S. S. R. Yet not even this much was granted by the Congress in the bill finally passed. It is imperative, therefore, that in the light of the new international strategic situation the executive branch work out an expanded plan of military aid sufficient to meet the requirements of recent developments.

Increased military aid to western Europe is even more urgent because the whole timetable of international strategy has been speeded up by the Soviet Union's unexpected atomic progress. Russian discovery of the atomic bomb came years ahead of the predictions of western scientists. The period of grace permitted to the western powers to strengthen their defenses has been considerably shortened. Consequently, additional American military help must be hastened to close the time gap in North Atlantic defenses.

One very important reason for the passage of the military assistance program is psychological. Fear of aggression on the part of the Soviet Union and international communism has been impeding the progress of economic recovery in western Europe. Economic expansion and capital investment can carry forward only in an atmosphere of security and confidence. By providing means of defense, MAP was intended by its original sponsors to establish such an atmosphere. Now, however, the whole defensive structure of the western world, envisioned in the North Atlantic Security Treaty and the MAP, is severely shaken. Armed with atomic instruments of mass destruction, the Soviet Union can, if she chooses, use her new discoveries in a propaganda campaign that could strike terror to the heart of west European man and immobilize his economic plans for the future. More important, it might make the western European citizen an easy target for subversion. Such a propaganda campaign has not yet materialized because the Soviet Union is at present engaged in a peace offensive. But the latter does not appear to be having much success, and it would not be surprising if in the near future the Soviet Union should embark upon a terroristic propaganda war that would put Goebbels to shame. To lessen the chance that the western Europeans will become easy prey to atomic terrorism, it is vitally necessary that their sense of security be bolstered by increased military aid.

For the military defense of the American continent it is now all the more imperative, since the U. S. S. R. has atomic weapons, to prevent western Europe from falling into enemy hands. Up to the present the American monopoly of the atomic bomb has of itself been, as Winston Churchill pointed out, one of the chief deterrents to the aggression of the Kremlin. But insofar as the Soviet Union now has, and will most certainly increase, its capacity to wage atomic war, so much the less will the American atomic bomb be a deterrent to Moscow because the United States will be most reluctant to provoke retaliation on its own soil and cities by use of the bomb against the Soviet Union. A key factor in this situation is the relative ability of the Soviet Union and the United States to deliver the bomb on each other. The United States is at present in the lead in the race to develop long-range bombing, but it would be folly to assume that the U. S. S. R. will not constantly improve its position in the field of long-range aircraft. In a future war possession of air bases in western Europe by the U. S. S. R. may be the decisive factor in determining whether the latter can effectively bomb the United States. Consequently, the United States should take additional steps to render more secure that area, namely, western Europe, which might easily become a launching ground for atomic assault upon the United States.

In order to strengthen the military forces of western Europe against the atomic threat several improvements are necessary. First of all, the tactical air power of the western European countries must be greatly reinforced. Very fast jet interceptors in considerable numbers are required as insurance against breakthrough by atomic bombers. To give advance warning against the approach of enemy raiders an extensive radar net must be constructed. One of the very probable results of the advent of this second period of the atomic age will be greatly intensified western European research on atomic energy in its military applications. All of these measures, undertaken as a necessary result of the Soviet discovery, will obviously incur expenses that were not planned when the present arms program was enacted. Consequently, if the United States wishes to strengthen the military forces of the other Atlantic Pact signatories in order to boost western European morale, deter aggression, and reinforce the defenses of the United States, additional appropriations for military help must be forthcoming in the near future.

Finally, the military assistance program will have to be expanded in order to back up the western powers, led by the United States, in the international councils of the world, particularly the United Nations. Already the Soviet Union, relying on its improved political position, has launched an offensive in the United Nations for a plan of international atomic control, which had been rejected overwhelmingly by the members of the United Nations last year because it was not considered adequate for security. The Soviet Union is also currently conducting an international drive for "peace" and proposing that the major powers meet once more to reach agreement on the differences between them. In reality, these maneuvers on the part of the Soviet Union are not attempts to reach honest and reasonable solutions, but are only invitations to appeasement. In view of the psychological advantage at present enjoyed by the Kremlin because of its success in the atomic field, there is greater danger that its overtures may be considered favorably by some non-Communist nations. To counteract whatever advantage of this type Moscow may now possess, a counterstroke by the United States and the other western countries is necessary in order to redress the political balance. An increase in military assistance to western Europe will demonstrate that the west is determined to defend itself effectively against attack—atomic or otherwise—and will reinforce the stand which the United States continues to take in the United Nations in regard to international control of atomic energy.

Therefore, for all these reasons—psychological, political and strategic—it is necessary to increase the amount of military assistance at present authorized for western Europe and my vote shall be cast accordingly.

John Joseph Delaney

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1949

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN JOSEPH DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker—

Give sorrow words: the grief that does not speak
Whispers the o'er-fraught heart and bids it break.

I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without expressing my very great admiration and esteem for our late genial colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. DELANEY, and paying a brief but heartfelt tribute to the singularly distinguished and splendid service which he rendered his enlightened constituency and the country during the 20 years, years which were freighted with such deep consequence to Christian civilization, he graced this assembly.

Indeed it was a great privilege for me to serve with him in the halls of Congress, especially on the same committee, where I came to know him quite well. Then being only a novice here, Mr. DELANEY, with a heart so kindly and a sympathy so comprehensive as to gain and retain the friendship of men of all creeds and all parties, frequently counseled me in connection with important pending legislation. He unstintedly and unremittingly gave me, as he no doubt gave others, the advantage of his broad, penetrating and successful experience as a national legislator. Possessed of a massive common sense and sagacious comprehension, they made his counsel invaluable whether in political broils or private embarrassment. His long experience on the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Rules gave a deeper insight into and understanding of legislation than is gained by membership on some other committees. Whatever of importance that attracted him he could expound with singular lucidity and embellish; and he never allowed himself to become entangled in the briars of petty details.

Mr. DELANEY will not be remembered as one who rent this Chamber with windy opposition or fervent advocacy; because he reserved his ripe talents mostly for committee work; and he did not in committee unnecessarily expound his own views, but always sought enlightenment by his relatively few and simple questions

of witnesses. In short, whether on this floor or in committee he did not tire anybody by prolixity, pedantry, the oleaginous, or an air of pontifical certitude.

This eminent deceased, as he marched with dauntless tread and indefatigable zeal for the public weal, was of the main pillars of hope in a distraught world and is an element of comfort when one looks back along the lengthening, fading track of life. Indeed he was a pattern to be encouraged and multiplied. The only guides he knew were disinterested patriotism and inflexible integrity.

Our friend is gone and gone when sorely needed; but his enviable record, which is a good model for anybody, remains as a priceless legacy for family and kinsmen and a lively inspiration and hope for his myriad friends.

The physique and constitution of our deceased colleague seemed to be capable of supporting indefinitely every form of mental and physical exertion, but when that broke the end was relatively swift. Between the setting of the sun and the night there was only a relatively brief twilight. It was better so. Prolonged ill health and deprivation of all the activities upon which his useful life was built would have pressed very hard upon him.

It is, of course, a great inspiration to youth who hope to get a better handhold on the better things of life to learn in the career of Mr. DELANEY, as from other figures who have served in this honorable body but are no more of this world, that there is no bar of class, privilege, or riches in our great country, which is humanity's greatest hope, to prevent the full fruition of outstanding capacity.

In conclusion, it is enough to say that our deceased colleague stands in the ranks of the select relatively few who, in the words of Keats—

"Tower in the van
Of all the congregated world."

Bar Justices as Character Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union for July 19, 1949, commenting on H. R. 5671, a bill to prohibit justices of the United States from testifying as to the character or reputation of any person or matters of opinion, and justly commending its sponsor, the able gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]:

BAR JUSTICES AS CHARACTER WITNESSES

There will be widespread endorsement of the bill introduced by Representative KEATING, a Member of the House judiciary committee, to prevent United States Supreme Court justices from appearing as character witnesses in any action in any court of the land.

This bill was prompted by the appearance of Justices Frankfurter and Reed as character witnesses in the recent trial of Alger Hiss for perjury in New York.

The United States Supreme Court is held in an esteem that borders almost on reverence by the American people. For that reason the voluntary testimony of any of the members of that tribunal in an ordinary court procedure must carry a weight that might easily obliterate other evidence in the minds of many people.

This fact alone should be sufficient to restrain Supreme Court Justices from appearing as witnesses in matters relating to private opinion. But there is a further consideration. Decisions of the lower courts are continually being appealed to the United States Supreme Court, and there is no assurance that the verdict in any trial in which Supreme Court justices have appeared as witnesses will not one day find its way to that tribunal. That may still be true of the Hiss case.

The fact that these justices have influenced the lower court decision by taking part in either the prosecution or defense, automatically rules them out as qualified to pass the supreme judgment when it is required.

The Keating bill would bar Supreme Court Justices only from testifying in the lower courts on the reputation or character of any individual, and would leave them free to testify on facts that might influence the course of justice. From the standpoint of the Supreme Court's prerogative, it would be better if the restriction were extended to include all testimony of the justices of that tribunal while they are in active service.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. SECREST
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John W. Love, from the Cleveland Press of September 29, 1949:

THE TOWNSEND PLAN
(By John W. Love)

The way I've been trending lately, I shouldn't be surprised if I came around to supporting the Townsend plan before long. It isn't that I'm getting up to where I will soon be on the Townsend pension, though anybody who reads the newspapers carefully must feel older each passing week.

It's just that maybe the Townsend plan or a stripped-down model might be better than the dangerous controversy over more elaborate and also more exclusive pension plans. No more people would be on the paying end under Townsend, but a lot more of us would have a chance for the money. One big strike is going on and others are threatened over schemes that will cost us all something but will benefit only the employees of the industries.

The current version of the Townsend plan differs somewhat from the original. Fifteen years ago Dr. Francis Townsend proposed that everybody over 60 be allowed $50 a week, provided he quit work and promised to spend his pension within 30 days. The money was to come from a turn-over tax of 3 percent. The present plan, as written into bills in Congress, calls for only about $35 a week, to be financed by a 3-percent tax on incomes over $250.

Both plans were designed to see that "benevolence and kindly consideration for others will displace suspicion and avarice, brotherly love and tolerance will blossom into full flower and the genial sun of human happiness will dissipate the dark clouds of distrust and gloom and despair." These are the words of Dr. Townsend, now 82, of Long Beach, Calif. Maybe we can reach that golden age by way of strikes, but I wonder.

One additional requirement I would write into his plan, and that is that the pensioners spend the money where they live and not go bouncing down to Florida, the great remittance State.

The Townsend plan as embodied in the House bills provides not a great deal more money than the retired coal miners would be getting if their own plan were in working order and Government's old-age pensions had reached their full payments. The Townsenders' switch from the turn-over tax to income-tax financing was made probably to attract more supporters, but the miners' plan is based on a turn-over tax. When Secretary of the Interior Krug settled one of the coal strikes he pushed the industry into biting off a piece of the original Townsend plan.

To the extent the industrial pension plans aim to collect more than going rates of wages they edge us into the 1934 Townsend plan as to method of collections, but not as to method of payment. In the end a great many people would be left always paying but never receiving. Hence the probability that when the public wakes up it will want to have the scheme broadened either in Townsend directions or along the saner lines of the existing social security.

Marshal Tito's Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of recent date:

TITO SPEAKS UP

Marshal Tito's courage in accusing the Russians of "rattling their arms" along the Yugoslav border has already brought results. The Soviets have broken off their friendship treaty with the Yugoslavs. But a far more important result of Tito's forthright stand is that it may encourage other European countries to stand up in their shoes against Stalin.

In some circles there is some wonder as to why Stalin seems to be taking his quarrel with Dictator Tito so seriously. After all, they are both Communists and were allies in the war against the Nazis. So, many are inclined to the opinion that Stalin is letting his personal feelings get the better of him.

But there is more to it than personalities. Communists never let their personal feelings enter into their fanatical devotion to communism. They would send their own grandmothers to Siberia if they regarded this as in line with their duty to the coming world revolution.

Most of us remember our experiences at school. If one boy in the class turned unruly and was permitted to get away with it, then the discipline of the whole class was ruined and sooner or later the teacher would be looking for another job. There is something similar in the controversy between

Stalin and Tito. For Tito has become the unruly child. Stalin cannot permit him to get away with it or even to forgive him for his aberrations and give him another chance. The effect on the rest of Europe, and particularly the iron-curtain countries, would be disastrous.

Little tough guys behind the iron curtain would soon be trying the same thing, and the Kremlin would be confronted by trouble on all sides. Indeed, Yugoslavia is not the only trouble spot for Joe in Europe. There are rumors of anti-Soviet underground movements in Rumania, Czechoslavakia, and even in Hungary and Bulgaria. Finland has been openly hostile. This brave little country took a firm stand against the Russian plots to communize the nation through crippling strikes. And from Russian-occupied zone of Germany have come reports of rebellion among the German Reds who are said to have sent words of sympathy to Marshal Tito. Even from China there comes reports that revolts are already starting in the newly won Red Chinese territories, although these reports may in part be propaganda from the Nationalists.

In other words, Stalin seems to be slipping some in eastern and central Europe. To temporize with Tito would only make matters worse. What Joe no doubt would like would be to get rid of Tito without going to war. A real war might easily spread into a world conflict.

Let's Know What We Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of October 3, 1949:

LET'S KNOW WHAT WE PAY

Perhaps, if Americans knew just exactly how much in taxes they were paying, they would think more deeply about these spending programs which the Federal Government deals out in such multitudes year after year.

A comprehensive study of taxation would be an enlightening subject for all Americans. Perhaps if we knew just exactly how much Government is costing us, we should keep a closer check on it, and listen with a little more serious attention to Federal plans to "give" us free medicine, and other "free" Government services.

If we were to check up on the taxes we pay, we should find we get nothing free from the Government.

In 1928, out of all taxes paid by the average American for schools, municipal government, county and State Governments, and the Federal establishment, the latter took 34 percent. Now, the Federal Government takes a total of 74 percent of all taxes paid by Americans.

And, Americans pay nearly 30 percent of their income to taxes.

If the Government's "take" was not so huge, the States would be able to levy more for public education, and other essentials.

Yet, now there is a demand for Federal aid for education. Such methods only increase the cost of the Federal Government, and offer further excuse for still more taxes. Any education aid the Federal Government would give the States could be obtained far cheaper by the States themselves, since they would not have the vast Federal bureaucracy taking its "cut" out of the tax dollar allocated for educational needs.

The congressman who offers a bill requiring by law that every article bearing any kind of hidden Federal taxes must be stamped with itemized tax levies would be doing the people of this country a very great favor.

The Federal stamp should state the cost of the Federal taxes computed on that single item, whatever it may be, or upon the components of the article, if each is taxed separately.

Amazing costs would be revealed to the people. Businessmen who must act as Government tax collectors would get a break at last, for they could show to the public that a large portion of the cost of merchandise these days is directly due to high taxes.

The Federal Government takes hundreds of millions of dollars a year out of each State. Naturally, the more it takes out of the State, the fewer services the State will be able to give, and so the Federal Government, called upon to aid this State or that, slowly but steadily increases its centralized powers, and takes more powers and more services and responsibilities away from the States.

Thus does paternalistic government grow.

Our Government is fostering a spirit within us that is destroying the courage and the independence and the drive that made America great, and made Americans respected as doers all over the world.

It has given us a security complex. High taxes are making businessmen afraid to risk the ventures they used to undertake, and which were responsible for the growth of the vast American industrial establishment.

The men who built our great railroads and our mammoth factories were not men who carefully calculated security risks. They took chances to build America.

High taxes do not permit most Americans these days to lay away anything for the future. We are being forced by high taxes into the position of taking up Government pension plans, or doing without any hope of support in the sunset of life. Even men who earn adequate incomes to take care of their future find that, when the Government slice is removed, they cannot afford the kind of protection they want.

Thus, we are breeding fear in America * * * fear of the future, and the Government is feeding this fear by forcing it, and forcing the people to come to it for help.

If Americans were to look closely at tax costs, they would regard with horror every program offered them by politicians, in the White House and out, who want to buy votes with promises * * * promises which can be met only by taxing the life out of America.

King-Sized Pay Rolls, Unbalanced Budgets, and Some Disservices to the People Under Rapacious Republican Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the numerous statements of certain Republican Congressmen, and some Democratic Congressmen, too, if one was slap-happy credulous, that there never had been a time in the history of the Republic before the year 1932, which ushered in the New Deal, when large Government pay rolls and unbalanced budgets were distressingly factual matters and nothing constructive was done to remedy the situation—except talk, talk, talk.

True historians of the not too distant past, however, proclaim otherwise, and truthfully so, one of whom is my old friend and Democratic coworker C. L. West of Omaha, Nebr. For many years this great Nebraskan was a top-flight newspaper man and directed his splendid efforts toward developing and stabilizing financially the then splendid Democratic newspaper, the Omaha World-Herald, which was under the leadership of one of the greatest Democratic Senators ever furnished to Congress by the electorate of Nebraska—I refer to Gilbert M. Hitchcock. Since the death of Senator Hitchcock, this newspaper, which was founded and built upon a solid Democratic foundation, has rushed to the flesh pots of Mammon, like a bull loping to earthly enjoyment, and has become one of the most senselessly vicious apostates in the Nation, to the workings and the ideals of the Democratic Party.

In quoting from the Omaha World-Herald I am sure that Mr. C. L. West desires the reader to be mindful ever of the fact that the language which he refers to was expressed by the Omaha World-Herald before and not after it had been ruined—before it lost its political faith—and began gathering financial provender from the greenback pastures of extreme right winged bad, big business Republicanism, which now has a semigarrotte upon the once great Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. West in the Farmer-Labor Press of Council Bluffs, Iowa, edited by clear thinking and hard hitting George Woodward, Sr., had this to say about past big Government pay rolls and woefully unbalanced budgets, and certain disservices which the Republican Party, in the past have been guilty of as far as some people of the Republic are concerned:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT PAY ROLL

In the year 1925, that is 4 years after Harding's inauguration as President and a few days before Coolidge was inaugurated as the elected President, both being Republicans, the World-Herald stated, "Do you know for what single item Uncle Sam spends the biggest chunk of the taxpayers' money? No, you are wrong. It isn't to pay for the war. It is to meet the pay roll to defray the costs of Federal officials and employees. 'The heaviest single item of our expenditures' said President Coolidge recently, speaking to the department and bureau chiefs at Washington, 'is the Government pay roll.' "

Further on the editorial said:

"Before the World War broke out our own country was amazed and distressed over European militarism. Europe itself complained that every peasant, every laborer, had to carry a soldier on his back. Yet the United States Government last year, 1924, met a pay roll greater than the combined cost of all the armies and navies of Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Russia, and Austria-Hungary, for their fiscal year 1912–13; and this takes no account of the pay rolls of our States, cities, and other smaller units of government which are constantly increasing both in number of employees and in the size of their salaries." Again quote, "The militarism of the worst army-ridden nations of Europe at the very height of the evil, was inconsequential by comparison with the American public pay roll of today, 1925."

Now, remember, this was February 5, 1925, under a Republican administration with a majority of both branches of Congress largely Republican. This swollen pay roll continued through Hoover's administration which ended March 4, 1933, and without a balanced budget in the last few years of Hoover's administration carrying with it a deficit of several billion dollars. The Republican Party had full power with its three Presidents and both branches of Congress from March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1933, and I wonder if the Republican Party has the gall to refer to these 12 years with pride or to refer to the Eightieth Congress which they controlled from January 1947 to January 1949, and I wonder if they do not hang their heads in shame when they make the claim that they are the friend of the laboring man since they passed the Taft-Hartley law for the purpose of destroying the dignity of the unions and in the Eighty-first, or present Congress, they have tied up with the southern Democrats to save the Taft-Hartley law and voted with the southern Democrats to disfranchise the colored race of the South which ought to make the children of the old Union soldiers ashamed of the Republican Party, and prove to the colored race of the North that the Repubicans are not their friend for they sacrificed the liberty of the colored man in order to save the slave-labor law. I wonder if the GOP voters realize that their best minds are no longer to be trusted.

I also feel that the fault-finding Republicans who growl and grumble about Truman's extravagance and an unbalanced budget should read up on Coolidge's and Hoover's expensive administrations and their unbalanced budgets.

It is in very poor taste for the past kettle to call the present pot black.

C. L. WEST.

The Farm Meeting at Sioux City, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Don L. Berry of the Indianolo Record-Herald, of Indianolo, Iowa, gives a composite report of the recent Republican farm meeting at Sioux City, Iowa.

Mr. Berry is one of Iowa's outstanding editors. For many, many years he has been a keen student of the farm problem. He has an uncanny ability in sensing the real problems of and dangers to agriculture.

The following is an example of his ability to accurately appraise the farm situation:

THE REPUBLICAN FARM MEETING AT SIOUX CITY

(By Don L. Berry)

It was a rather pleasant fall lark to take the missus and go to the Republican farm meeting at Sioux City.

Right off the bat I may as well answer the question which nearly everyone asks—right off the bat. It will be only my humble opinion.

Was the meeting worth while? Did it do any good?

My answer to both is "Yes." I believe it started something if the party leaders will follow through. It will do no good if they drop it right here, because they did not hear from enough farmers to say finally that they know what farm feeling is. Meetings of a similar nature should be held in more limited areas and with less formality and fanfare.

When we arrived in Sioux City Thursday afternoon, September 22, and circulated around that afternoon and during the evening, I was afraid it was going to be nothing more than a parade of Republican bigwigs, shaking hands with each other, making a few speeches, and going away telling what farm opinion was and believing they knew.

And I think it would have been that way, or worse, had not Senator HICKENLOOPER and some others piped down on the committee having the hearing in charge. Some of them wanted to have as keynote speaker Clare Boothe Luce.

HICKENLOOPER told them she was a brilliant woman and estimable, but what did she know about farm opinion and what in the mischief would an Iowa, Dakota, or Nebraska farmer care for what she thought about the farm problem?

So the glamorous keynoter was dropped and Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, was brought in as keynoter. He made a good speech, one that farmers can understand. His record throughout the past 20 years in Congress has proven that he puts the farm problem ahead of all others in his own thinking. Farmers recognize him as a genuine friend.

The other set speakers possibly didn't do any harm, but they did no good in getting a cross section of farm opinion.

FARMERS' HEARING STEALS THE SHOW

Friday evening there were two meetings. One was where farmers told what they thought. At the other there was a speaking program, addressed by a number of speakers of national reputation. Both meetings were originally scheduled for the Martin hotel, the farm hearing to be in the smaller room. So many people indicated their preference for the farm hearing that Chairman Beck, national committeeman from South Dakota, said the farmers would be heard in the Shrine auditorium. I split my evening between the two meetings. There were more people at the farm hearing than at the set speeches.

It was interesting to note the difference in the character of the crowds too. The farm hearing was mostly made up of farmers and those directly interested in the farm. At the other meeting you saw the professional politicians and the people from Sioux City. I think all the folks who are still voting for William McKinley and the sons and daughters of those who were progressives 50 years ago, and who have not learned anything since their fathers died—they were all at the speeches. I am not playing down the speeches. They were good speeches. But they didn't develop a farm policy based on what farmers think—and that was what the whole affair was about.

To the credit of the members of congress from Iowa and other States, be it said that most of them were at the farm hearing, learning something they can use in their business. When I had been in both meetings that evening, and noted that real farmers were out to the hearing in greater numbers than the politicians at the speeches, then I felt the project was worth while and we were getting somewhere in spite of the spellbinders.

HOPE'S SPEECH

Congressman HOPE attacked the so-called Brannan plan. He charged it with being the plan of the CIO, the railroad brotherhoods, and the big labor leaders, which the Truman Administration is trying to cram down the farmers' throats. He was very blunt about it and pulled no punches. Unquestionably his speech has antagonized some labor leaders.

I have heard some criticism of him for the bluntness of his attack on labor. There is possibly some justification for the criticism. But Congressman HOPE wanted to jar people into thinking and there was just one way to do it; and that was to say something which would jolt them loose.

If he is subject to criticism, I think it would be that he did not make the whole train of his thinking clear. I happen to know that Congressman HOPE is not antagonistic to labor; but he does not want labor to run the farmer's business.

Let's go back in recent history. Thirty years ago, after the First World War, the bankers had a terrific case on themselves. Banker was a word to conjure with. A good many small-business and professional men hardly thought they were respectable unless they held a block of bank stock; and if one could just get on the board of directors of a bank, it was about the equivalent of a doctor's degree.

CONSULT YOUR BANKER

For some years banking was very profitable. Bankers got the notion their brains made it that way. They strutted. The bankers' "horn was exalted like the horn of an unicorn," as the Scriptures say. There was nothing bad about them. They were merely human and, because of their profits, they got delusions of grandeur.

All of us, who were of mature age in those days remember the slogan that was posted in the street cars, painted on the billboards, played up in the newspapers and magazines in bank advertising: "Consult your banker."

FARMERS WENT DOWN WITH BANKERS

A lot of us did; and—wow. We found out we had better have consulted the garbage man or the piccolo player—or even an impecunious editor.

Oh, sure, there were good bankers; but they were in the minority. They were back numbers. All they thought about was their depositors. An up-to-date banker had to make loans. Lots of them. He had to take care of his customers. You bet.

Well, the bankers, the up-to-date bankers, all went down in a heap with their customers. Millions of farmers had consulted their bankers and found themselves right down in the bottom of the heap.

The bankers were not crooks. They meant well. Most of them went broke along with their customers. They just were not the smart guys they thought they were. They thought 2 and 2 could be made something bigger than 4, and they couldn't get away with it.

The sorry part of it was they fooled the farmers into taking their advice. And they dragged a lot of good bankers down along with the mess.

MUST FARMERS GO DOWN WITH LABOR, TOO?

Now, I think all Mr. HOPE had in mind was to keep farmers from getting into that kind of a fix again, from going down with some other fellow's boat.

Labor leaders have been very prosperous of late. They appear to be reveling in the same delusions of grandeur and power that dazzled the bankers 30 years ago. And in the Brannan plan they have something by which they can drag the farmers down with them.

Oh, no; they are not crooks. They probably think they will make the farmers and working people all happy.

If the farmers will just follow them, 2 and 2 can be 5 or 6 or maybe 9 or 10. If the Government will pay everybody's grocery bill, golly Moses, won't we have a big time.

Now, if I read Mr. HOPE's mind aright, he does not want to see the farmer go off the deep end with labor in the 1950's as he went down with the banker after the other war. It won't do labor any good—and it certainly won't do the farmer any good. If the labor leaders are bound and determined to walk on the water, let them try it alone.

LONG MEMORIES MAY SAVE FARMERS

There are sound labor leaders as there were good bankers. They will eventually win out, as the good bankers are still in business. They will ultimately be called on to reassemble the salvage of the labor organizations, just as the better bankers survived and had to get the banking business going again.

The great mass of labor, if my humble guess is worth anything, is speeding down the road to a crack-up, just as the bankers did after the other war. It may come soon or it may be delayed a while, depending on when our economic highway comes to curves. There should be good enough judgment and long enough memories amongst farmers that they won't permit themselves to be dumped over the bank with labor as they were dumped with the bankers.

Mr. HOPE may have temporarily antagonized some elements of labor; but if his warning can save farmers, even labor will eventually thank him.

DEPENDENCE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Friday afternoon was mostly given to hearing speakers from the four big farm organizations, Farmers' Union, the Grange, Farm Bureau, and National Council of Farm Cooperatives. None of them favored the Brannan plan except the union man—and he didn't act as if he would be heartbroken if it failed of a trial.

The grange man, Herschel D. Newton, chairman of the executive committee of the National Grange, seemed to me to make the best presentation of his case. He was opposed to any farm plan that calls for any large appropriations to pay subsidies to farmers. Those appropriations, he contended, might be cut off any time and the farmers come down with a bang. One Congressman tried to argue with him that Congress would not go back on the farmer. He shot back a closing clincher: "Sixteen percent of the voters can't control appropriations very long."

FOR FAMILY-TYPE FARM

A young dairyman from Wisconsin said if parity was guaranteed for milk, on a permanent basis, the Mississippi River could not carry away the milk Wisconsin would produce. He argued that the support price must be flexible or production would run away with itself, unless rigid controls were enforced on everything; and he did not want to see that.

He sprung another argument for support prices that would sometimes fall pretty well below parity. He said high support prices play right into the hands of big farmers, corporations and bonanza farms, because with high support they can afford to pay high wages to hired help. An occasional low price crimps the big fellows with their high wages to pay, but the family type farmer can weather it. He does most of his own work, can live through a year or two of low prices and simply not buy a new car or refrigerator or maybe not even a new suit of clothes that year.

BEARDSLEY'S SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER

Governor Beardsley made a good address, and had the good judgment to make it short. Mrs. Beardsley and Senator and Mrs. Loyd Van Patten were with him in Sioux City. Friday afternoon the governor went to Sutherland to pay the official respects of the State of Iowa at the funeral of the last Iowa veteran of the Civil War.

Congressman HOPE was born in Birmingham, Iowa, the town in Van Buren County where Governor Beardsley grew up and worked his way through high school in a drug store. Mr. HOPE moved with his family to Kansas at an early age. His grandfather was Governor Beardsley's Sunday school teacher, a matter of mutual interest to the two distinguished men when they met in Sioux City.

RUMOR ON FORCING OUT GILLILLAND

The rumor was abroad around the hotels that the Iowa Manufacturers' Association and National Committeeman Harrison Spangler are trying to force the resignation of Whitney Gillilland of Glenwood as Iowa State Republican chairman. I don't believe they will get away with it while William S. Beardsley is looking.

The Iowa Manufacturers' Association is the antithesis of the CIO and Iowa Federation of Labor in Iowa. Both groups are of the utmost importance to the State. Both are entitled to every consideration it is possible to give them. But in my humble opinion it is not in the interest of the people of the State as a whole that either of them dominate the State through either political party.

There is nothing in Governor Beardsley's record to indicate that either of them has anything to fear from him. There is nothing to indicate that either of them will run away with him. Neither of them can claim credit for his election. All classes in Iowa rallied to Beardsley's support. He is as completely independent of obligation to any class or clique as any governor the State has had in half a century, perhaps in its whole history.

NO BRANNAN SUPPORT IN NEBRASKA

The president of the Farmers' Union of Nebraska spoke briefly Saturday morning. He said he found little evidence of support of the Brannan plan in his organization. He was himself opposed to it, and he believed the farmers of Nebraska generally feel the same way. His statement drew the most applause I heard.

WHAT FARMER WANTS

From the expressions of opinion I heard from farmers, I would say that the average farmer there represented wants forward pricing, that is, a support price announced before the crop is planted. He believes that for the immediate future some acreage controls must be endured; but he wants to get rid of them as soon as possible. He does not want subsidies handed to him from the United States Treasury except to stabilize prices on sudden and unpredictable drops. He wants a stabilized price, rather than a support price. He believes the price floor should be flexible in order to encourage or discourage production according to the need for the various crops. He wants a program that will encourage soil conservation. It must be fair to consumers as well as to producers, else it will soon collapse. He wants a program that will encourage and preserve the family type of farming as a bulwark to free and independent private enterprise.

NO TENANTS HEARD

One thing was lacking in this hearing. I did not hear a single farmer who said he was a tenant. No farm program can be sound which does not play fair with the better class of tenants. Tenancy may have some evils; but it has always been the American way of coming up to ownership for many farmers. What is a good program for farmers in general will probably be a good program for tenants; but the hearings would have been better balanced if the voice of the tenant had been heard. This lack can and should be corrected in district hearings.

STORAGE BINS

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, principal author of the present farm program, was at the hearing and took an active part in questioning farmers. To one farmer who spoke of the Eightieth Congress stopping the erection of bins for storage, Senator AIKEN, in a very kindly way but firmly, explained that nothing in the law passed by the Eightieth Congress prevented the Commodity Credit Corporation providing all the grain storage it might have thought necessary. Because it did not do it, the present Congress has passed a law compelling it to do so. That is all the difference, said the Senator, in the grain-storage situation between the law passed by the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first.

DEWEY BLAMED FOR DEFEAT

It seemed to be the general feeling amongst Congressmen and Senators that Governor Dewey and his close advisers are primarily responsible for the Democratic victory of 1948. Instead of clarifying what the Eightieth, Republican, Congress had done for the American people, he let President Truman get away with his charges that it was the worst Congress in history. Mr. Dewey thought he was going to coast into the White House without commitments of any kind. He had a naive faith in the validity of polls. The polls showed Truman hopelessly beaten. Therefore, in Dewey's thinking, President Truman was beaten and he himself was as good as in the Executive Mansion. He listened to no suggestions from anyone but his close personal consultants.

Chelsea (Mass.) Kiwanis Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of a speech delivered by Mr. Herbert D. Hancock, general manager of the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., and a past president of the Chelsea Rotary Club, before the Chelsea Kiwanis Club recently.

Mr. Hancock, who has had considerable experience as a tireless worker in support of the efforts of the various civic societies in Massachusetts, spoke at length in reference to the efforts by the local Kiwanis club in their help to the people of that city.

He paid great stress upon the success of the various activities conducted by the organization in behalf of the underprivileged boys and girls of that city and urged the members to continue their praiseworthy endeavors.

He was introduced to the gathering at the monthly luncheon by Dr. Nicholas D. Gianturco, a leader in that organization, who has given much of his time and effort in support of the purposes of the Kiwanis club.

The matter referred to follows:

From my position it is possible to look at what goes on here in Chelsea with a detached view, objectively, impartially, and impassionately. In fact, that is what we in the newspaper business are trained to do.

I want to draw for you a picture of yourselves, as you are seen by others, sort of a looking-glass talk, if you will. I want to evaluate you as men and Kiwanis as a unit among the many that have their existence in our city.

When the local Kiwanis Club was organized here in Chelsea, back in the first part of 1930, we didn't know a great deal about it, except that it was generally regarded as one of those luncheon clubs, where grown men assembled once a week to sing songs, whack each other on the back, call one another by the first names, and try to regain their lost youth.

However, it wasn't very long before the Kiwanis Club began to be heard about and heard from in numerous ways, chiefly because of its work among the less fortunate boys and girls in the community.

The newspaper, naturally, in covering the activities of the group, came in contact with the good that was being accomplished. I recall your early Christmas parties, down in Elks' hall, where a group of children were brought in by the school nurses, given a great time, a big feed—a Christmas turkey dinner with all the fixin's, topped off with ice cream—and then came Santa Claus with warm clothing, underwear, sweaters, suits, dresses, coats, and stocking caps, not to mention some of the joy-bringing toys, too, so dear to childish hearts.

And the city cocked an eye Kiwanisward when you ran your penny sale, your softball games with the Revere Club to raise money for your work with the underprivileged children.

Out and around the city, beyond the circles in which you individually moved, it became quite noticeable that the city was beginning to recognize that something new was taking place here and that a group of local businessmen were truly taking an interest in the things worth while in Chelsea.

The city then learned of your generous gifts to the Chelsea Memorial Hospital, the operating room lamp, costing $600; your interest in procurement of the Simmons crib, and so many other things for the hospital.

The community YMCA here, right in this building, has benefited by your efforts and interest. The Salvation Army, the Red Cross, and all other good causes have been the recipient of your generosity, help, and practical support.

I could further mention the scholarships for deserving high-school students, the provision of camp privileges for various lads throughout the years and countless other things. There have been private donations of money, shoes, toys, food, and provision for medical attention, dental aid, gifts of glasses, and the like.

And then, in March of 1947, the Kiwanis Club of this city embarked upon what is now its major project, the operation and support of the Chelsea Day Nursery and Children's Home.

If you had nothing else, if you hadn't raised a finger to help anybody, or any worthy cause from the time your club was organized until you took over the day nursery, this one action alone would more than justify your existence as an outstanding service organization. The Kiwanis Club is truly the savior of the day nursery.

And all the while the club, as a unit, as a service group, has been doing all of these things, I haven't failed to notice that so many of your members, imbued with the spirit of service, have given so liberally of their time and energy to the successful promotion of so many worth-while city-wide events, drives, and campaigns.

I recall the work of George Moffitt, Al Sartorelli, Saul Kessler, Fred Ryan, Tom Salvi, Bernie Sullivan, Jack Seeley, Irving Brendze, Dr. Kuperstein and many others as the leaders in campaigns during the war and later years in the interests of humanity. Their interest and devotion to the things that make for a better community have not only brought them personal credit, but reflected much honor upon your group.

I want to take advantage of your invitation and the opportunity you have given me, to tell you that I know that your efforts have not been in vain, that I know they have been appreciated; that in speaking for many, many others who might not be in a position to tell you, or who might never think of telling, that you have, indeed, carved a name for yourselves in this city, both as individuals who get things done and in establishing the Kiwanis Club as one of the outstanding organizations in the whole community.

Justice for Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an outstanding editorial entitled "Unjust and Futile" which appears in the September 30, 1949, issue of Israel Speaks, the only publication which devotes its entire contents to news as it comes from the state of Israel.

This well-thought-out editorial discusses in detail the problem for the city of Jerusalem and presents the situation in a realistic and objective manner:

UNJUST AND FUTILE

Speaking before the UN General Assembly on September 26, the Israel representative, Aubrey S. Eban, restated Israel's attitude on the question of Jerusalem. He emphasized Israel's readiness to accept international control over the holy places, but pointed out that the imposition upon Jerusalem's population of any burden or deprivation not strictly related to satisfying universal religious interests would mean encroaching upon cherished political freedoms.

This statement is based on a realistic appreciation of the situation as it exists. Whatever the arguments, the fact remains that New Jerusalem is now part of Israel. Thousands of years of history, plus 24 months of dramatic action, have produced something which it is beyond the capacity of Flushing Meadow to unmake.

To say that the original partition plan envisaged the internationalization of the city can hardly now claim any validity. Events of the past year have proved to the world that it was only Israel which saved the 100,000 Jews of Jerusalem from annihilation, and the city itself—together with its holy places—from destruction. This last is a fact far too often overlooked by those who try to use the religious argument as a weapon against Israel.

Since November 29, 1947, the 100,000 Jews of Jerusalem can only be thought of as 100,000 Israelis. The Jew who lives in Jerusalem's Rehavia quarter is not in the slightest degree less a citizen of Israel than the Jew who lives in Tel Aviv. His representatives sit in the Knesset; he pays his taxes to the Israel Treasury, and all his children will join the Israel Army when they are 18.

The Jerusalem plan as submitted by the Palestine Conciliation Commission to the General Assembly is impracticable from every angle. It suggests no answers for any of the questions it creates.

The first of these is security for the Jews of Jerusalem who, were the plan carried out, would find themselves surrounded by Arab territory on three sides and cut off from Israel. This situation was best summed up by a cartoon published in an Israel newspaper showing the Arabs falling upon the defenseless city while the UN Commissioner rushes off to get a telephone call through to Lake Success.

The next question is: How would Jerusalem maintain itself economically? The 1947 partition plan spoke about an economic union between the Jewish and Arab states which would benefit Jerusalem also. But there is no economic union now, and the Palestine Conciliation Commission suggests no alternative. Jerusalem is not self-supporting. Even without the paralyzing effect of the siege, Jerusalem would have been badly hit by the end of the mandate. It was the capital of all Palestine, the center of the administration, the army headquarters, the seat of the supreme court, the university city. With the officials, the soldiers, the lawyers, and their families gone, the city would wither away unless a special effort were made from outside.

Such an effort is in progress now. The railway line has been reopened; a number of Government departments and the supreme court have been moved to Jerusalem. The Government and the Jewish Agency are subsidizing industry; a new water pipe line is being laid from the coast which will supply the water needs for industries. The corridor linking Jerusalem with the plain is rapidly filling up with new agricultural settlements which will supply food for Jewish Jerusalem.

But even all this is inadequate, and further plans are being worked out, with the financial responsibility for them resting squarely on the Government of Israel. This work must go on if Jerusalem is to live and not be turned into a museum—or a mausoleum.

And, finally, the UN plan gives no formula for denationalizing Israelis or for governing them without their consent.

The forces which sought to frustrate the creation of the state of Israel now seek to frustrate the aspirations of the people of Jerusalem. But while there may not be entire clarity among the delegates at Lake Success as to Jerusalem's future, the citizens of Israel know exactly where they stand.

Why Prices Stay High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the September 12 issue of the Trainman News:

WHY PRICES STAY HIGH

When the National Association of Manufacturers and other big business units were out to "scuttle" price controls 3 years ago they promised us that when ceilings were removed prices might go up a little, but production would spurt and that would eventually cause prices to fall.

Some prices went up so high that it was impossible for most people to buy, then they came down a bit when the stores and warehouses became glutted. That was on luxury goods that we can do without. Those prices are still unreasonably high.

The story on the essentials of life is different. These prices have remained sky high. One reason for this is that monopoly industries have substituted their own brand of price control for that of the Government. This new price control safeguards the interests of big business instead of the people's.

How this is possible is driven home in another report of the Federal Trade Commission which lists the handful of companies that control the meat and dairy industries.

When you buy a hamburger, for example, the chances are about 50–50 that the meat was processed either by Armour & Co. or Swift & Co. And the milk left on your doorstep today was probably sold to you either by National Dairy Products or the Borden Co., which together control about half the dairy business.

Eight companies own 78 percent of the net capital assets of the meat industry. Four control 70 percent. Two own 55 percent.

The two biggest meat packers are Armour & Co., which owns 29 percent of the net assets of the industry, and Swift & Co., which owns 26 percent. The other two members of the Big Four in meat are Wilson & Co., Inc., 9 percent of the assets, and Cudahy Packing Co., 5 percent.

The four other packers are John Morrell & Co., 3.2 percent of the assets; Rath Packing Co., 2.2 percent; Hormel & Co., 1.5 percent; and Oscar Mayer, Inc., 1 percent.

In the dairy industry, here are the facts:

Eight companies own 71 percent of the net capital assets of the industry. Four control 60 percent, and two own 49 percent.

The two largest companies are National Dairy Products Corp., 27 percent of the assets, and the Borden Co., 21 percent. Carnation Milk comes next with 7 percent, and Beatrice Foods Co., 4 percent.

The four other concerns of the Big Eight are Pet Milk, Fairmount Foods, and Golden State Co., Ltd., each 3 percent of the assets, and Arden Farms Co., 2 percent.

The companies listed do not own all the productive and distributive facilities of the meat and dairy industries. They do own enough, however, to control effectively production and prices and to squeeze out competition.

How much of the free enterprise, so widely heralded in their advertising, can we expect where 16 companies control two gigantic industries like these?

Certainly the consumer will never get a fair shake on price and quality until the Government takes steps to do away with these tremendous combines that work against public interest.

The Story of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Story of Steel," from the New York Post Home News of October 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF STEEL

A long and bitter steel conflict threatens the country. Unless the deadlock is broken soon the consequences may be world wide and irreparable.

A prolonged shut-down will cripple the national economy.

It will undermine the prestige and position of free nations throughout the world.

It will bolster the forecasts of western economic chaos offered by the Soviet theorists and give new life to the fading Communist influence in American labor.

All these dangers are palpable and generally recognized. They are as apparent in Wall Street as in Union Square. Yet the chance for early settlement of the struggle seems slender. The major corporations in the steel industry proclaim their readiness to sit this one out. The union is digging in for a long autumn.

How did it happen? Why are we drifting into man-made disaster? Is the simple cry of "a plague on both houses" warranted? Can anything be done to halt the battle before its full impact is felt?

Not all the answers are easy. But we think the record of the dispute is an eloquent indictment of the industry's stand. It marks out the course which President Truman must follow.

HOW IT BEGAN

Negotiations between the steel industry and the CIO were stalemated in early July. The union, citing steel's unprecedented profits, was asking for a "fourth round" wage increase and establishment of pension-insurance funds. The industry was resisting on every front and a walk-out was imminent. To avert the strike President Truman appointed a fact-finding board and requested both sides to accept a 60-day truce. CIO President Philip Murray agreed at once to postpone the stoppage. The steel industry truculently rejected the proposal. Its action evoked criticism throughout the country; so unanimous was the condemnation from conservative as well as labor sources that the rulers of steel finally retreated. The episode is worth recalling now. It is a dramatic reminder that the industry was prepared 3 months ago to risk a strike rather than submit its case to an impartial tribunal * * * and that it retreated only in the face of widespread public protest.

INCIDENTAL MUSIC

As the board conducted its hearings, spokesmen for the industry made it plain that they were testifying under protest. They denounced the fact-finding procedure as a dangerous innovation (although it has been employed for decades in labor disputes). They hinted that the tribunal was packed. They predicted in advance that the board would uphold the CIO's position on every crucial issue. They served notice that they would resist any adverse finding. This, of course, was their privilege. The recommendations were not binding. But the industry's threats of resistance had a curious sound, as if its leaders were persuaded that their case was unconvincing and spurious.

RAVE NOTICES

The fact-finding tribunal released its opinion on September 10. It proposed in essence that the CIO waive its wage demand in return for the creation of company-financed pension and insurance systems. Seldom has any document received such favorable press notices. The Times said "we believe that those who read the text of the board's report will agree that (it) sets a new and noteworthy pattern for such a document in both its tone and the quality of its reasoning" and saw "a strong probability" that the recommendations would settle the dispute. The Herald Tribune was no less generous: "The board showed an ability to pick its way through the mass of conflicting documentation which had been offered, rejecting extreme claims on each side and outlining a solution which may well provide the basis for peace in the steel industry." These reactions were echoed throughout the land.

BACK TO THE BARRICADES

When the report was issued there was initial reason to believe that the union, rather than the industry, might balk at its terms. Industry spokesmen voiced instinctive surprise and delight at the middle ground which the board had outlined; not even a token wage increase was approved. Phil Murray's left-wing critics in the CIO promptly cried that acceptance would be tantamount to selling out; left-wing CIO unions asserted that the fourth-round wage drive could not be abandoned. Within the steel union itself, some local officers urged Murray to hold out for more. Under those pressures an irresponsible man might easily have decided to spurn the report. But Murray had a genuine respect for the power of public opinion; he also had, if we may say so, an authentic reverence for the national interest. He agreed to accept the board's findings. With the union's decision it appeared almost inconceivable that the industry would once again provoke a crisis. Company-financed pensions are neither new nor revolutionary. Executives in the industry have long benefited from them. The cost was not prohibitive; this was tacitly admitted when the industry, rejecting the board's terms, agreed to finance a 10-cent package if the union would agree to an employee tax to augment the fund.

Nevertheless, on that issue—and on that issue alone—steel's high command decided to invite a long war. Was its decision motivated by high principle? It is difficult to believe so in view of the precedents for company-financed pensions that already exist in the steel industry, the Ford Co.'s recent adoption of a similar plan and the apparent willingness of steel to perpetuate such a program in the captive mines. But if the principle were truly sacred, the clash could have been easily resolved; the companies could have agreed to label a fraction of the 10-cent package as a "wage increase" earmarked for the pension fund. It is probable that the union would have accepted. The offer was never made. Instead Big Steel and its satellites chose to take a strike.

WHERE WE STAND

The chronology is familiar; yet it requires repetition because the obfuscators are busily at work. Many of the editorialists who less than a month ago hailed the judicious report of the fact-finding board are devising high-flown and abstruse justification for the industry's adamance. Others are piously calling for mutual concessions—forgetting or ignoring the fact that Murray's most meaningful concession was made when he scrapped the fourth-round wage demand. In effect the industry is now saying it will accept the union's surrender on the wage issue and strive to whittle away the remainder of the package. There can be no peace on those terms and the industry knows it. Any further capitulation by Murray would not bring peace. It would simply destroy his effectiveness as a labor leader. It would provide a field day for demagogues, ranging from the Communist labor bloc to Republican John L. Lewis.

THE PRESIDENT'S CHANCE

President Truman recently described the report of the fact-finding board as "a statesmanlike formula for fair and equitable settlement of the dispute in the steel industry." We agree. We think most Americans will agree unless a fog of doubletalk and rationalization is permitted to obscure the issues. The report is no less fair and reasonable today than it was when first proposed—when conservative commentators freely praised it. Some smaller steel units have already signed up. The tragedy is that Big Steel's defiance has changed the minds of those molders of opinion who believe the captains of industry can do no wrong.

We cannot read the minds of steel's directors. Certainly the pattern of the industry's behavior in recent months has given substance to the charge that steel is aggressively seeking a show-down with the union—that the industry's financial position is so strong and its lack of enthusiasm for economic expansion so deep-rooted that it welcomes this moment for a fateful test of strength with labor. There may be some leaders in steel who are determined to prove to the President—and to the country—that the administration's labor policy is ineffectual. There may be still others who have been maneuvered into open warfare by a handful of diehards at the top.

Whether passion or prejudice inspired the industry's stand, the case against it is conclusive.

We believe steel's rulers will retreat—as they did in July—only if convinced that pop-

ular opinion is overwhelmingly behind the recommendations of the board.

We urge the President to take the offensive on that front now; to tell the country, by radio and every other means of communication, the full story of the conflict and the reasonable terms which the industry is rejecting.

We urge him to hammer home these key facts:

1. The steel industry has established new profit records this year.

2. It has refused to cut prices despite the unanimous judgment of the fact-finding board that cuts are in order.

3. It has turned down the board's proposal for company-financed pension and insurance plans.

THE ULTIMATE POWER

Steel's performance is a throw-back to industrial primitivism.

We urge responsible conservatives to use their influence now to end a corporate sitdown that should never have begun.

We hope voices will be raised in the Senate and House to challenge a corporate policy so full of peril to the country—a policy that would be justly denounced as reckless and capricious if adopted by a union.

We call on the President to lead the fight to force steel's acceptance of the terms proposed by his board.

In the last analysis steel is affirming the doctrine of "the public be damned."

The answer must come from the President and the public.

One Hundredth Anniversary of St. John's Parish, Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent article which recently appeared in the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, outlining the history of St. John's parish in Clinton, Mass.

This thriving parish which is located in my home town of Clinton, Mass., is celebrating its centennial and the present article is such a splendid and well-documented and concise portrayal of its history that I believe it will be very interesting to the present and future generations.

The author of this outstanding article is a very talented young man, Mr. Peter J. O'Toole, of Clinton, who has given careful and diligent study to the history of the parish and has brilliantly set forth this inspiring era of spiritual progress.

The article follows:

FIRST CHURCH ERECTED ON SOUTH MAIN STREET—ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOHN'S PARISH TO BE OBSERVED DURING WEEK OF OCTOBER 9

The members of the centennial committee of St. John's Church have completed plans for the one hundredth anniversary celebration of the establishment of St. John's parish which will open with a pontifical mass to be celebrated on Sunday, October 10, by Most Rev. Bishop Thomas M. O'Leary, in the present imposing edifice constructed in 1886 under the supervision of Rev. Richard J. Patterson, who for 31 years worked untiringly in behalf of the parish leaving it with a church which is known for its beauty throughout New England.

The following brief history of St. John's will be of interest to its many parishioners and many of its former parishioners who will attend the anniversary ceremones:

The establishment of Catholicism in Clinton antedates the incorporation of the community. In Clintonville, in 1845, Father Matthew Gibson, pastor of St. John's Church, Worcester, offered the first solemn mass in what is now the California district. The mass was celebrated outdoors and was attended by about a score of faithful followers. Before the arrival of the first priest in Clintonville devout souls assembled early Sunday mornings and walked the long distance to Worcester to partake of the sacrifice of the mass.

The growth of the industrial activity in Clintonville under the genius of the Bigelow family, offered an opportunity for the services of many Irish immigrants who were first employed in the construction of the Clinton Co. and later became operatives there.

Timothy Moran, who arrived in this community in 1843, is recorded as a dyer in the Clinton Co. and is generally regarded as the first Irishman to permanently settle here.

Services were offered at first in the home of one of the parishioners at irregular intervals. With the coming of Father John Boyce, as assistant to Father Gibson, in 1847, mass was offered twice a month and later, weekly. Catholicism in the area was expanding for the Irish famine resulted in a tremendous exodus from Ireland and many found their permanent abodes in this locality.

St. John's parish, Worcester, was the mother church of Catholic missions in Clinton, Millbury, Leominster, and Northboro, all of which required the administrations of Fathers Gibson and Boyce.

Father Boyce began the collecting of funds for a church in Clintonville as early as 1847 when he reported $175 in the fund.

After considerable difficulty in purchasing a site, Abel Rice sold Father Boyce land where the present Caiazzi home, on South Main Street, is located.

The pines, still standing, were planted by Father Boyce and are the only reminder of the mother church of Clinton, built in 1849 and dedicated to St. John the Evangelist, October 4, 1850. It was a modest frame structure accommodating only 300 parishioners and was demolished in 1874.

Father Boyce's achievements in establishing Catholicism in the area were heroic. He worked during the know-nothing movement and his influence resulted in an attitude of restraint and forbearance on the part of his charges under provocation.

His effectiveness as an orator led him to be considered at his time as the finest pulpit orator of his church in New England. He labored arduously and well-nigh superhumanly in his mission. He was skillful in debate and engaged such a formidable figure as Orestes Brownson in controversy.

Father Boyce, as Paul Peppergrass, was the first Catholic novelist in the United States. His novels of merited artistry include Mary Lee or a Yankee in Ireland, Shandy McGuire or Tricks Upon Travelers, and the Spaewife. The first two deal with what might be termed the stage Irishman in reverse. He caricatures Yankees visiting Ireland who did appear strange in an alien environment. The final novel is an essay into historical fiction, based on the writings of the historian Lingard concerning Queen Elizabeth. It is primarily a defense of the recusants persecuted under the policies of Elizabeth.

Father Boyce succeeded Father Gibson as pastor of St. John's Worcester in 1857 and, in turn, was given an assistant, Rev. Patrick T. O'Reilly, who alternated with Father Boyce in ministering to his Clinton charges.

In 1862, St. John's received its first permanent resident pastor in the person of Father J. J. Connolly who was fated to serve but 6 months when death called him. His successor, Father James Quinn, served from 1863 to 1868 when declining health forced his resignation.

A priest, young in years, being only 28, full of piety and promise, assumed the pastorate of the growing parish in 1868. He was Father Dennis O'Keefe, whose sudden death October 19, 1868, left his flock inconsolable.

A few days later St. John's was assigned Father Richard J. Patterson, whose career in length of service and achievements has not been surpassed in Clinton's Catholic history. For more than 31 years, to his death, December 31, 1899, Father Patterson was to place his stamp on parochial activity. By his unremitting labor, earnestness, and dignity, he won the esteem of the entire community.

When Father Patterson, after several months of declining health, died on the last day of the year 1899, a landmark passed away. The thousands who affectionately paid their last respects to his memory felt they had lost a friend as they had indeed.

His material monument is in the magnificent edifice, on Union Street, whose cornerstone was laid August 8, 1875, by Bishop Patrick T. O'Reilly, former curate of St. John's. The building was dedicated June 27, 1886.

St. John's is considered one of the finest examples of Romanesque ecclesiastical architecture in New England. Built of Lancaster brick, with cut granite trimmings, one is impressed as he enters the church, of its grandeur and awe-inspiring pictorial representations.

Frescoing and designing reveal delicate unity of execution; the arches, ribs, and columns give it a cathedral effect.

The storied windows, the life-size statues of blessed sons and daughters of the church, the general richness of effect are conducive to reverence and sublimity. Successive pastors were to improve on features of the church, aiming to increase its beauty and utility.

The opening of the new church, on Union Street, made possible the conversion of the Pleasant Street church, which had been dedicated November 21, 1869, into a school and convent. The Presentation nuns began their contribution to the educational life of the parish in 1888.

Father Patterson, in 1891, purchased the Horatio Nelson Bigelow property, on Chestnut Street, as a parochial residence, and, with some alterations, it has remained to this day.

Successors to Father Patterson include: Rev. John J. O'Keefe, 1900–1911; Rev. Michael H. Kittredge, 1911–17; Rev. William A. Hickey, 1917–19; Rev. John J. Bell, 1919–28; Rev. Patrick J. Griffin, 1928–34; Rev. Michael P. Kavanagh, 1934–44; Rev. James S. Barry, S. T. D., 1944 to the present.

In the last years of Father Patterson's pastorate negotiations were conducted for the construction of the Metropolitan Reservoir. The old parish cemetery, west of Sandy Pond, was within the areas of the new reservoir. Consequently, land was purchased in Lancaster, and Martin Murphy was given the contract to remove the bodies to the new location of the cemetery. The removals occurred 1899–1900, and over 4,000 bodies were brought to the Lancaster site from the old one.

Father O'Keefe's chief contribution was the installation of the chimes, which were dedicated March 12, 1902. The set of 11 bells, ranging in weight from 469 to 4,200 pounds, was later augmented by the addition of 2 in 1910.

They are considered one of the most melodious sets of chimes and effectively filled

with resounding tones the former toneless tower.

Other parochial achievements of Father O'Keefe included the laying of granolithic walks, the replacement of the wooden steps at the entrance to the church, the parish guild house, where domestic arts were taught to the young women of the community, and the purchase of the present convent on Church Street from the Bigelow family.

Rev. Michael H. Kittredge, who succeeded Father O'Keefe, was the first local priest to return here as pastor. He was regarded as a kindly and benevolent pastor. During 1912-17 he was a member of Bishop Beavan's council. He purchased the present plot of land between St. John's Church and Scanlon's Newsroom as a possible rectory site from the estate of the late Dr. Edward T. Fox.

Parishioners were acquainted with Father William A. Hickey, who took over parish duties on the death of Father Kittredge. He had served as curate in the early part of Father O'Keefe's tenure and had worked among the French parishioners.

Father Hickey's proficiency in French was recognized in his translation of the remarkable three-volume Life of Christ, by the Abbe Le Camus. Father Hickey's primary absorption as pastor was in the construction of the present parochial school on School Street. He did not remain to see his project completed under his auspices, as he was called to the episcopate as bishop coadjutor of the see of Providence with right of succession in February 1919. This signal honor was the second accorded to a priest who labored in St. John's as Father O'Reilly, assistant to Father Boyce, we recall, had become the first bishop of the Springfield diocese in 1870.

Father John J. Bell, present pastor of St. Peter's, Worcester, is well remembered by the parishioners. During his days in Clinton he saw the parochial school finished and dedicated October 14, 1919. Of course, his hardest task was to reduce the heavy indebtedness incurred in the construction.

One of the novel means of effecting this was the presentation of movies in St. John's auditorium. Another noteworthy project was the publishing of a parochial organ, the Parish Calendar.

Under the sponsorship of the Holy Name Society, St. John's achieved a preeminence in baseball that recalled to the old-timers the prowess of those early giants produced in Clinton as contributions to the national pastime.

Father Bell's successor, Rev. Patrick J. Griffin, showed foresight in acquiring the former Clinton-Lancaster driving park to be used for a further enlargement of the beautiful parish cemetery. The interior of the church was completely redecorated by McHale & Gill, of Buffalo, N. Y., during his pastorate.

Father Kavanagh, now stationed at St. Paul's, Worcester, appreciated with his artistic sensitiveness the beauty of St. John's Church and contributed greatly to making it unsurpassed in not only architecture but in appointments.

Particularly of significance was his commissioning the famous stained glass artist, Wilbur Herbert Burnham, to execute several windows. These include those over the main and side altars, the choir window, and those over either side entrance on Union Street. His pride and joy was the Jubilee Window, which with its exquisite interplay of rich blues and crimsons, richness of symbolism, and scintillating jewel-like effect compliments majestically the loveliness of St. John's. The installation of a wrought oak sanctuary rail, the enlargement of the sanctuary, and the artistic lighting fixtures evidence his rich sense of values.

Father James S. Barry, the present pastor, is the third former curate to return as pastor. His pastorate has been fruitful in the material and spiritual aspects of parochial endeavor. Extensive church, school, convent, cemetery, and rectory improvements have been made. The church property has never been better conditioned.

St. John's School, in particular, has been redecorated throughout. Modern pedagogical tendencies of encouraging learning by pleasant environment have been considered in the various improvements. The latest phase of parochial enterprise was the remodeling, repairing, and enlargement of the convent. Long neglected under the necessities of the hour, St. John's Convent is today appreciated by the selfless sisters whose deeds and benefactions have been unlimited.

Father Barry is carrying on in the traditions of his predecessors who have labored diligently, competently, and fruitfully in giving of their faculties to advance the spiritual morale of their charges.

St. John's has attained an aura of venerability in 100 years, but is youthful in its ebullience and vigor and is sobered by the reflection that her age is indeed young when measured by the age of an ageless church.

From a group of simple, God-fearing immigrants, carrying with them little beyond the mantle of faith and moral integrity, the seeds sown have been productive of an abundant harvest, and their sons and daughters, while endowed with advantages unknown to their ancestors, still carry the priceless inheritance bequeathed them in the realm of the spirit.

Gold's Triple Standard of Thought, Word, and Deed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received through the mail today one of the most thought-provoking pamphlets which I have received in many a day.

It was prepared by Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America and distributed by the United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

It deserves to be read not only by Members of Congress but all of the people of the Republic who do not know that extreme right-winged bad, big-business men, are the sires of double talk, instead of the authors of truly American thought, word, and deed, as some poor, closed-minded dupes seem to think that they are.

This pamphlet is as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT CONTRIBUTORY AND NONCONTRIBUTORY PENSIONS AND SOCIAL INSURANCE

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

The steel industry is coldly preparing to force a strike upon the Nation on what it contends is a matter of principle:

Whether pensions and social insurance should be jointly paid for.

Official records filed by these steel companies with the Securities and Exchange Commission show that the matter becomes one of principle only where the steelworker is concerned because officials of the steel industry will receive very substantial pensions entirely paid for by industry.

In dozens of telegrams received by the United Steelworkers of America, in response to our request that these steel companies bargain with us on the basis of the Presidential fact-finding board's recommendations—that pensions and social insurance should be paid for by the companies—this so-called matter of principle is repeatedly raised.

Companies are trying to tag the board's recommendations as a "loss of freedom for the worker," "socialism," "a dangerous new trend," and, in fact, any other of a dozen derogatory terms.

In its report the Presidential fact-finding board, in making its recommendations for a noncontributory plan, emphasized—

1. The general trend is for noncontributory plans. A Government study shows that of some 3,000,000 workers covered by insurance plans most are financed entirely by employers.

2. Pension plans submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for tax purposes number 6,862, covering 3,290,608 employees—the majority noncontributory.

3. So long as the cost of the noncontributory plan is integrated into the labor-cost structure and has a bearing on rates set in wage negotiations, the worker will know that he is, in fact, paying for his own insurance.

The facts recorded here should throw some light on this issue of contributory and noncontributory pensions and social insurance.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, United Steelworkers of America.

FOR WORKERS: "LOSS OF FREEDOM"—FOR OFFICIALS: "A GOOD THING"

A study of steel companies' own official statements, filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, is truly an exposé of the inconsistent position of the steel industry. It resolves itself to this:

For an official of a company to receive a pension paid for solely by the company is "a good thing."

For the worker to receive the same benefits is a "loss of his freedom."

Here are some outstanding examples:

United States Steel: The corporation's own proxy statement, dated March 25, 1949, shows that at the age of 65, Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board; Enders M. Voorhees, chairman of the finance committee; and Benjamin F. Fairless, president, will each receive a pension of $50,000 paid for by the company.

These officials also participate in an additional contributory plan which gives Mr. Olds $13,815 more, Mr. Voorhees $20,323 more, and Mr. Fairless $26,537 more. Mr. Olds pays $4,410 a year to this plan and the company pays $7,350; Mr. Voorhees pays $4,410 to the plan and the company $7,350; Mr. Fairless pays $5,910 and the company $9,850.

It is interesting to note, in the same proxy statement, that Mr. Olds received a wage increase last year of $22,367, Mr. Voorhees a wage increase of $21,567, and Mr. Fairless a wage increase of $20,167.

In other words, the wage increase of these three officials was nearly five times what they contribute to an additional pension plan. Mr. Olds' salary last year was $161,300; that of Mr. Voorhees was $160,700, and that of Mr. Fairless, $207,900.

Bethlehem Steel: This plan is entirely noncontributory. Pensions are based on average compensation 10 years prior to retirement. A. B. Homer, president, will be 65 in 1961. At his 1948 compensation of $263,280 a year, he will receive a pension of $110,460 a year, to which he contributes not 1 cent.

There are 12 other officials who will receive pensions ranging from $9,122 to $76,-

802. Eight of these will receive more than $20,000 each annually. Three former officers are now receiving pensions in excess of $25,000: one of $25,668, one of $27,168, and a third of $76,968 per year.

Incidentally, Mr. Homer, in 1948, had a fixed salary of $120,000 plus $143,280 incentive compensation for a total of $263,280.

Eugene Grace, director and chairman, drew a total salary of $321,932 for the same year.

Two other officials were paid wages well over $200,000. Five others received more than $150,000. Three received over $100,000, and several more than $50,000.

Allegheny-Ludlum Steel: Hiland G. Batcheller, president, in a recent address before the Connecticut Manufacturers Association at New Haven, Conn., declared that noncontributory social insurance and pensions for steelworkers are definitely socialistic.

Mr. Batcheller, if he retires at 65, will receive retirement compensation, in a consultative capacity, for 10 years at a salary of $40,000 a year. E. B. Cleborne, vice president, will receive $12,000 for 10 years as a consultant after retirement; E. J. Hanley, vice president, will receive $10,000 for 10 years as a consultant after retirement, and F. B. Lounsberry, vice president, will receive $14,400 for 10 years as a consultant after retirement.

In addition, if any of these four officers should die before completing 10 years' consultantship, the money will then go to the beneficiaries.

They also participate in a contributory plan which will give them an additional average of $9,000 a year, but the amount of payment is not shown.

Where does socialism start, Mr. Batcheller?

Mr. Batcheller drew a salary of $125,000 from Allegheny-Ludlum in 1948. Mr. Cleborne's salary was $81,500; Mr. Hanley, $49,000; and Mr. Lounsberry, $52,500.

Jones & Laughlin Steel: Ben Moreell, chairman and president, if he retires in 1953, will receive a pension of $25,000 annually. If he continues to work for an additional 5 years, his retirement allowance becomes $35,000, all paid by the company. He has been with the company 2 years.

Mr. Moreell, incidentally, draws $125,000 in wages from J. & L.

Wheeling Steel: This pension plan is noncontributory and is based on the number of years of continuous service at age 70 (or voluntarily at 65) multiplied by 1 percent of the compensation. It applies to everybody, workers and officers alike. William W. Holloway, chairman, with the company since 1920, now receives $75,833.36 in salary; Archie J. McFarland, president, with the company since 1930, $75,833.36; and John L. Neudoerfer, vice president, $56,875.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube: Frank Purnell, president, will receive an annuity of $18,000 a year for 8 years after retirement, paid for by the company.

He drew, in 1948, $117,000 salary, which was $13,000 more than in 1947.

Walter E. Watson, vice president, received $91,000. He received a $16,000 raise over 1947.

J. L. Mauthe, vice president, received $66,000 in 1947, but a $12,000 raise in 1948 netted him $78,000.

Crucible Steel: This is a noncontributory plan and provides a pension of $7,500 a year for W. H. Colvin, Jr., president; W. P. Snyder, jr., chairman, $7,212 a year; and R. E. Christie, vice president, $7,500.

In 1948, Mr. Colvin's salary was $72,000; Mr. Snyder's was $60,000; and Mr. Christie's was $40,000.

Armco Steel: This plan is now contributory, but past service prior to 1945 was paid for entirely by the company. And in the case of Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board, his pension plan is still noncontributory. Mr. Hook will receive a pension of $20,000 a year.

Mr. Hook did all right, too, in the way of salary in 1948. His regular salary was $100,046.08, and his incentive compensation amounted to an additional $110,000. W. W. Sebald, president, drew a total salary of $166,708.72. Ralph L. Gray, vice president, was paid $117,765.80.

National Supply: A. E. Walker, chairman and president, will receive $25,000 for 10 years following retirement, paid for by the company. The company has an additional contributory plan which will give him another $12,000 a year, but what payments are made by the company and those made by Mr. Walker are not shown.

Mr. Walker's salary in 1948 was $75,000, and that of A. W. McKinney, vice president, was $65,000 (including a $20,000 bonus).

The official statements filed with the SEC do not make clear whether the pension plans in the following companies are contributory or noncontributory:

American Steel Foundries, whose president, Thomas Drever, will receive a $17,474 pension each year, and Sharon Steel, whose president, Henry A. Roemer, will receive a pension of $7,092 a year.

Mr. Drever, by the way, drew a total of $76,996 in salary from American Steel Foundries in 1948. C. C. Jarchow and C. L. Heater, vice presidents, each received $45,000, and Ernest P. Waud, president of Griffin Wheel (an American Steel Foundries subsidiary), was paid $63,048.

In his capacity as chairman and president of Sharon Steel, Mr. Roemer was paid $100,000 in 1948.

In the case of Republic Steel, T. M. Girdler, chairman, is listed for a pension of $50,000 per year, and C. M. White, president, $50,000 per year. The record seems to indicate that Mr. Girdler's pension is noncontributory.

Mr. Girdler's 1948 salary was $275,000 and Mr. White was paid $200,000. One vice president was paid $85,000, one was paid $80,000, and three others received $70,000.

Mr. White told newspaper reporters, after the fact-finding board made its report, that Republic Steel does not like the idea of bearing the entire cost of social insurance and pension programs.

In the case of Inland Steel, there are two plans in effect, one of them noncontributory. Clarence B. Randall, president, is listed to receive a pension of $19,716.96 per year, but what amount is noncontributory is not shown.

Salaries paid by Inland to its executives in 1948 were also very substantial, to say the least. Mr. Randall was paid $79,000. He was vice president at that time. Wilfred Sykes, 1948 president, was paid $100,000; Joseph L. Block, vice president, $79,000; L. B. Block, vice president, $53,000; Philip D. Block, Jr., assistant vice president, $49,025; Everett D. Graff, president of Ryerson & Son, Inc. (Inland subsidiary), $89,000; Russell L. Peters, treasurer, $33,825; Robert C. Ross, vice president, $62,999.92; Edward L. Ryerson, chairman of the board, $60,000; Henry H. Straus, vice president, $52,500; Earl A. Tanner, president, Inland Steel Products Co., $65,000.

Mr. Randall ($19,716.96 pension per year) issued a statement on the fact-finding board recommendations.

"In a free America," he said, "no man should be fully relieved by others of the duty of providing for his future and that of his family."

How can the steel industry honestly and logically argue against noncontributory pensions and social insurance for the steelworkers?

Monetary Agreement With Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of a biweekly report, issued by the American World Intelligence Group, of which Dr. C. S. Norborg is editor. I am informed by Dr. Norborg that his organization has a proud record of scoops in the intelligence field over the last few years. The report follows:

UNITED STATES PLANS RETURN TO GOLD STANDARD—TENTATIVE DATE SET FOR THANKSGIVING WEEK

The devaluation of the pound was but the first step in a dramatic sequence worked out behind the secret doors of the Cripps-Bevin meeting with the United States leadership.

The next bomb to fall will be the Presidential proclamation of America's return to the gold standard. That move is tentatively set for the week of Thanksgiving, when 8 weeks will have passed since the devaluation of the currencies of western Europe.

Sir Stafford Cripps who had protested, nine times over, his unwillingness to devaluate the pound, did agree to do so only after forcing Washington to a word-of-honor agreement that the United States Government would take the British pound along with the United States dollar when America would return to the gold standard.

In a top secret working agreement the British and the American negotiators then agreed upon the following over-all monetary recovery plan:

1. Sir Stafford Cripps' return to London, announcing the new pound rate at $2.80.

2. Within 2 months, or at such time as the drastic devaluation of the European currencies has been accepted and proved itself in practice, the United States Government, in close cooperation with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, will announce America's return to the gold standard.

3. Working with a gold-sustained American dollar, the International Monetary Fund will make available to the British Government a gold conversion loan of $1,000,000,000, or better. Within 48 hours of the United States announcement of the return to the gold standard, the British Government will follow suit.

4. The United States dollar will be devalued by 10 to 15 percent in the conversion process.

5. The price of gold will be raised from $35 to $45. The price of uranium will be adjusted upward by 20 percent.

6. A thorough statistical monetary survey, recently concluded, seems to reveal that the hoarded gold throughout the democratic nations amounts to $8,000,000,000, or more. The pending return to the gold standard will release most of this hoard and thus make available a minimum of $20,000,000,000 in good international interchange.

Thus, Sir Stafford Cripps may go in history as the man who took Socialist England back to the gold standard by forcing a decision on the American Government.

It is generally conceded that Mr. Truman's decision to take the United States back to the gold standard will be hailed by the overwhelming majority of American citizens.

Politically speaking, the President's decision will pay high dividends, both at home and abroad. The Anglo-American gold pact will become the Gibraltar of a new expansionist era, which will make of the Soviet Union a beggar nation.

Wall Street will have a couple of disappointing months adjusting to the devaluation of the dollar which is inevitable at the moment that the United States returns to gold. It is thought possible that the administration may permit the Government war bonds to find their natural level in the new situation. Such a free move on a realistic market may eventually result in the reduction of our national debt by $100,000,000,000, to a point where the debt becomes manageable.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this report, I sent the following letter to the Secretary of State:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: Information on my desk indicates that—

1. Our Government entered into an agreement with England to the effect that we would return to the gold standard.

2. United States would raise the price of gold to about $45 an ounce.

3. We have entered into an agreement to take the British pound along with the American dollar when the United States does return to this new gold standard.

4. The National Monetary Fund will make available, to the British Government, a gold conversion loan of $1,000,000,000 or more.

5. We have agreed to devalue our currency by 10 or 15 percent in this conversion process.

I would like to ask what agreement, if any, our Government has made, or will make regarding war bonds. Will they be permitted to find their natural level in this new situation? These are important problems upon which the American people should be informed.

It is my desire to have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on Monday, unless your Department can find some reason of tremendous importance for not making it public.

Very truly yours,
A. L. MILLER, M. C.,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Congress have been kept in the dark so often that I, for one Member, am hopefully looking ahead to the day when the American people and the Congress will not have to grope in the darkness, but will have access to the truth at all times. The most startling thing about this statement seems to be that of devaluing our own currency another 10 or 15 percent and tying our dollar to that of the British pound. When we once begin the debasing of our currency there seems to be no end. I am also concerned as to what might happen to the bonds held by banks and others, if and when such a devaluation of our currency occurs. Personally I think it would be a good thing to go on to the gold standard, but I would certainly want the American people to have the right to own gold just as the other peoples of the world now have that right.

I have not as yet received a formal reply to the letter I wrote to the Secretary of State. I did talk with Mr. Orville J. McDiarmid, who is the Acting Associate Chief of the Division of Financial Affairs, and he seemed to be rather hazy about committing himself to the specific questions which I asked. In the course of the conversation, Mr. McDiarmid referred several times to statements by Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder.

I do understand that the entire gold problem is being studied.

When I receive the formal reply from the Department of State, I shall again ask permission to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Trade Relations With Russia and Other Countries Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of two articles dealing with trade and commercial intercourse with Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain. The first is entitled "Iron Curtain Threat," written by A. N. Spanel, chairman of the International Latex Corp., and the second is entitled "Soviet Trade Piracy in the United States," written by J. Anthony Marcus and published in Plain Talk.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRON CURTAIN THREAT

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

It is not the atom bomb that will bring world war III. For now that Russia has the atom bomb, its use as a military weapon probably will be outlawed, just as poison gas was outlawed. No nation, great or small, dares to use gas or germ warfare for fear of reprisal. No power will initiate vast destruction by means of atomic weapons, knowing that another great power will retaliate with even more terrible destruction.

For this reason, a revitalized United Nations must forge a workable agreement between Russia, the United States, and the other powers, on the international control of atomic weapons.

But outlawing this weapon is not enough. Gas warfare has been outlawed by agreement for years, yet World War II came just the same. There is no guarantee that if atomic warfare is outlawed we will not drift into world war III because of the much greater threat to peace, the iron curtain.

So long as the iron curtain divides Europe into the secret East and the open West, suspicion, fear, lack of mutual understanding, frustration, and the building up of human hate, must inevitably lead to greater and greater military apprehension, preparedness for war * * * and finally explosion into war itself. Already we are in the midst of a colossal armaments race.

There is now practically no free movement of people or of ideas between Russia and her satellite countries on the one hand, and western Europe and the rest of the Western Hemisphere on the other. Practically all cultural relations are at a standstill. All the suggestions offered by our State Department and various private organizations since the end of the war to exchange students, artists, scientists, and literature have failed or remain unacknowledged.

Not only have these offers been turned down or disregarded but worse still the iron curtain has been made more rigid and impenetrable. It is, in fact, now illegal for a Russian citizen to indulge in conversation with foreigners.

This is the picture as some of us, in the countries not dominated by Russia, see it. The Russians may have their own version of recent international developments to justify their blind and completely isolationist policy. They point to what they consider hostile plans and pronouncements on the part of western countries and western spokesmen that seem to them to belie the genuine offers to establish friendly relations. There is no point now in analyzing Russian thinking * * * or in arguing where the responsibility lies for this dangerous state of affairs. The fact stares us in the face that the world is divided intellectually, economically, and morally into two great camps, and that the iron curtain between these two camps must be removed before horrible and irrevocable damage is done on both sides.

The Russian people are now given a completely distorted view of our way of life, of our social, economic, political, and religious aims and aspirations. We have no knowledge what the Russians are thinking and feeling except in the words and actions of their official spokesmen. On the basis of these words and actions we cannot but conclude that the Russian people are being taught consistently that we are out to destroy them and their system. Therefore, we of the West must, under the circumstances, be prepared for the worst until the iron curtain is lifted.

The attitude of the two camps on atomic energy and weapons is now undergoing change in view of the fact that Russia, as well as the United States, today possesses atomic power. But even more urgently does the barrier of the iron curtain require removal. For if peace is our objective, any agreement to outlaw the military use of the atomic bomb or the agreement on the international control and inspection of atomic energy, must be accompanied by the raising of the iron curtain. Nothing less. And it is to this end that the statesmen of the whole world must fervently devote themselves, now.

For only in the absence of iron curtains, only with the establishment of a free interchange and movement between the East and the West of goods, people, and cultures, such as must exist between friendly neighbors, is there hope for the peace worthy of the struggle.

SOVIET TRADE PIRACY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By J. Anthony Marcus)

A curious anomaly has arisen to plague America's economy at home and abroad.

Our Government is pressing prosecutions against domestic firms for monopoly practices. That is as it should be. But at the same time it permits totalitarian foreign government monopolies to operate with impunity right here in the United States.

Has not the time arrived for us to establish an antimonopoly division in the Department of Justice, with the Departments of Commerce, Treasury and State participating, to meet the encroachments of monopolistic totalitarian economies? How long can we afford to expose our private business firms, restricted as they are by antitrust laws, to robbery and exploitation by foreign government monopolies right on our soil?

Since taxation now takes the lion's share of the profits of American industry and commerce, our Government itself has much at

stake in this problem. If our free enterprise economy is to survive and prosper, it must protect itself from the incursions of the trade vultures of our times—the totalitarian government monopolies. We must devise means and ways to meet this challenge.

How did it all begin? Shortly after the Bolshevik conspirators under the Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin leadership had taken over the destinies of Russia in 1917, they set up a foreign trade monopoly. Naive businessmen here and abroad, indulging in wishful thinking, hoped against hope that some day the Soviet Union would relax this monopoly. But why should it? It has worked well for the Kremlin interests. It has done incalculable harm to ours. As time goes on, it will be even more dangerous to free enterprise everywhere. The more industrialized Russia becomes—and only the aid of this country and the other western powers can bring that about—the stiffer will her competition become in foreign markets. It is unavoidable, and the Soviet rulers do not have to wait until the last Russian moujik or worker has at least one car in every garage or two pairs of shoes and two decent suits to wear. They can tell their people to do without as they have done in the past, and dump their products abroad at any price.

The Soviet foreign-trade monopoly has not been relaxed since 1918, and within the last 4 years all the satellite countries, under the Kremlin lash, have followed suit. They too have adopted the Soviet pattern of squeezing and plundering friend and foe, wherever possible.

In the hands of a Communist government the foreign-trade monopoly is a powerful and convenient weapon to be used against us. Since 1945 it has been used by the Soviet Government with singular success even against the satellite countries, exploiting and robbing the supposed friends of the U. S. S. R. Tito in Yugoslavia is the only one who has dared to rise against this form of international brigandage, and this has already earned him the undying enmity of the Soviet rulers.

The Soviet Government, itself the largest and most ruthless monopoly on earth, rather likes free enterprise in America for the time being, as it suits its purpose well. Moscow can squeeze our buyers and sellers with impunity. It looks askance upon combinations of manufacturers, exporters, and importers who try to meet its monopoly tactics with a united front. The Soviets know that while the Webb-Pomerene Act, passed after the First World War, permits the formation of associations, industry by industry, to function jointly in foreign markets, the act is impotent, since it is confined only to a specific industry or product. It is not suited to meet the problem created by the all-country monopoly of the totalitarian vintage.

The Politburo regards its foreign-trade monopoly as a potent shield against capitalism. Permitting no American corporation to operate in Russia, it has set up on our territory a branch of its all-powerful monopoly in the guise of an American company—the Amtorg Trading Corporation. This is wholly owned by the Soviet Government and is operated by men sent out from Moscow. For over a quarter of a century this agency has been flouting our antimonopoly laws and succeding administrations have done nothing about it. When the Russians are in the market for some of our products—never consumer goods—they make us compete against each other to force the prices down. This works to the detriment of our economy and the benefit of theirs. When they want us to buy something from them, acting as a single seller for the products of the entire Soviet Union, they make our firms compete against one another, again to the detriment of our economy and the enrichment of theirs.

Under present conditions our business people stand helpless. They must submit to Amtorg's dictates or forego the business. As a super monopoly, where the needs or wants of their enslaved subjects are of no consequence to the dictators, the Soviet Government can withhold purchases or sales, depending upon momentary political expediency. The recent experience of Yugoslavia illustrates the true methods and aims of the monopoly under discussion.

Thus our economy and the world's flow of materials, goods, and services are interfered with, restricted, or entirely withheld. With the globe shrunken and the economic interdependence of nations grown to unprecedented proportions, former Attorney General Clark's recent statement that "liberty is endangered when either economic or political power is concentrated in a few hands" is as true in the international arena as it is in the domestic.

We all know how the current industrial recession here has been exaggerated beyond all reason by the controlled Soviet press. Inspired articles recently began to appear in certain American publications about Stalin's willingness to permit our trade emissaries to come with offers of billions of dollars in credit. He promises "to receive with attention and interest any United States proposals designed to broaden Russian-American trade and looking toward general relaxation of economic barriers." This is what Soviet President Shvernik told Admiral Kirk when he presented his credentials as our new ambassador in Moscow, according to the New York Times of July 5.

We heard similar refrains before recognition was extended to the U. S. S. R. in 1933. Nothing came of the $2,000,000,000 market held out as bait to our unemployed during the great depression. As a matter of fact, business fell off perceptibly, although Russia's needs were as great as, if not greater than, they are today. To me the real purpose in Shvernik's statement is clear: that our manufacturers once more open their factories and laboratories to Soviet so-called purchasing commissions, to enable them to snoop around, to steal all the technological information they can, to thank us graciously and never be seen again. Here and there a model will be purchased; the Amtorg will insist on a factory discount and will get it by holding out prospects of more orders in the future, a future which never comes.

Shvernik's statement is designed to conceal the fact that the boot is pinching Stalin's foot. He has told his muzzled subjects that every modern invention in the world has been created by Russians. The equipment with which he is now operating his industrial plants is based on old models copied from American machinery years ago. In recent times some of our manufacturers have learned not to admit so readily Stalin's emissaries from the Amtorg offices. Unwilling to buy our latest types of machines in large quantities, he is playing the old game of dangling tall promises.

This must not be permitted. If there is to be any trading at all, it should be on terms explicitly defined, as for example:

1. Congress should enact legislation to compel Soviet and other foreign trade monopoly branches here to incorporate under a Federal act. They must not be allowed to operate as American State corporations. Their names must not be misleading, as, for instance, is the case with Amtorg Trading Corp. Since it is a branch of the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Government, it should be so labeled.

2. A National Technological Council with men participating from various industries should be formed. Its aim should be the protection of our industrial and scientific know-how from totalitarian piracy. No present Government agency in Washington is competent to handle this problem. All purchasing inquiries for industrial equipment, all terms under which sales are to be made, should be cleared through this council.

3. The interdepartmental division in the Department of Justice to supervise foreign monopoly operations in this country, suggested above, would be guided in its work by this council. It is worth mentioning that neither the NAM nor the United States Chamber of Commerce nor the various foreign trade bodies have shown sufficient understanding of the problems facing us as a result of the pernicious influence of the Soviet and satellite foreign trade monopolies. We must therefore start afresh. The council herein suggested is the answer. We must build something powerful, farsighted, and efficient, to set an example to the other countries of the world.

4. It is to Russia's interest to buy our machinery and equipment. But it is to our national interest to sell her consumer as well as durable goods. The process must be reversed. For every dollar's worth of equipment we sell to Russia, after passing the scrutinizing eye of the National Technological Council, she should be made to buy a fixed ratio of our consumer goods. Her people are naked, starved, ill-housed. Since the Soviet Government took power, the Russian market for our consumer goods has become extinct. It will remain so even though the Russian people continue to subsist on a submarginal level. I have seen how they live from one end of the country to the other; I have seen their millions more ragged than when I lived there prior to World War I.

The sale of consumer goods as part of our commerce should be made a sine qua non in our trade relations with Soviet Russia. Heretofore her purchases here averaged about $60,000,000 a year. In our economy this is like a drop in the ocean. We did not grow richer by such trading. The Soviet Government did grow richer through the one-way-street business dealings because it has carried away from us a technological know-how worth billions of dollars.

5. How is Russia to pay us? We need none of her gold, neither should we accept it. We do need her metals, minerals, and forest products. With many of our natural resources fast running out, it is high time to stock pile them in vast quantities; it is time to draw on Russia's unlimited forest resources in order to replant and replenish our own forests.

Left to itself, the Soviet Union, due to the lack of freedom, suppression of initiative, and recurrent purges would be unable to make adequate payment in the manner suggested. If we insist that the Soviets purchase machinery and equipment in a fixed ratio to consumer goods, they will need our crack technicians to help step up production of pulp, metals, minerals, and certain prefabricated products.

The plan here outlined is based upon the firm conviction that the avowed goal of the Soviet rulers is to tear down the free institutions of the world; to sacrifice, if need be, countless millions of people here and elsewhere in order to achieve world-wide Sovietization. The Soviet foreign trade monopoly has been a powerful weapon in this offensive. It is being used to help friends and punish enemies—and we are enemy No. 1.

Our freedom will not be preserved by toying with totalitarian monopolies. If we are to do business with the foreign powers which have come in the wake of the Communist movement abroad, we should demand of the totalitarians that they do business in our markets the way we expect our own firms to do—on a free competitive basis, subject to antitrust laws. It is unfair to discriminate against our own industries by restraining them through antimonopoly laws while permitting avowed totalitarian monopolies to ride roughshod over our economy.

The Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, by request, the following news item from the Springfield (Mass.) Morning Union:

STRAY BITS

Everybody seems to be talking about the atom bomb and the fact that Russia apparently has perfected one. A lot of people think that the Russians have been grabbing our secrets through spies. Perhaps, but—

If you will read even a lay treatise on relativity you can easily understand that, since science is familiar with the theory of relativity which concerns, among other things, the formula for the energy existent in matter, it ought not to be too tremendously difficult for the scientists of any country to work out methods which would produce a bomb.

You will also realize that the bombs which the United States used on Japan were only factionally effective and that the atom age, only in its infancy, can conceivably produce bombs of a giant destructive power which would make those used on Japan puny weapons in comparison.

You may get the sneaking suspicion that Russia was on the level in suggesting the complete outlawing of atomic warfare because the bomb neutralizes the advantages of Russia in manpower and in other fields in any attempt at world conquest.

Personally we hope the United States does not consent to any United Nations atomic control, even though the bigwigs in Washington seem to favor it, because we feel that the possession and development of atomic force by the United States for defense of democracy should constitute the nearest thing to a guarantee of world peace and democratic security that could be established.

If we had to use the bomb we probably would do so promptly and not quibble about it. The Lord only knows what the United Nations might do about anything, or when it might act.

As for the Army and the Navy, the generals and the admirals, we, for one, are convinced the atomic age has or will shortly dispose of their importance.

Resolution Passed by International Association of Y Men's Clubs, Minneapolis, August 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of the Young Men's Christian Association at their meeting last month passed a resolution endorsing the world federation resolution which so many Members of this Congress have sponsored.

Because the Young Men's Christian Association has the respect and admiration of all citizens, I think it only fitting that their support of this high ideal be made a matter of public record.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the fear of war divides the world, itself increases the likelihood of war, subjects the peoples of the world to the burden of increasing competitive armament, fosters the growth of narrow nationalism with their attendant rivalries and other ills; and

Whereas that fear of war may be removed only by the voluntary subjection of the several nations to law above themselves; and

Whereas such law for its enactment, interpretation, and enforcement must depend upon government: Therefore be it

Resolved:

1. That the International Association of Y Men's Clubs reaffirm its belief in efforts to further the ideals of world citizenship; and

2. It endorses development of the United Nations into a world federation, open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

Boysville of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with a great deal of pride and interest a pamphlet entitled "Boysville of Arkansas," telling the story of Arkansas' greatest youth project. Arkansas is proud of its Boysville, which is located near Wynne, Ark., in the First Congressional District. It is a pleasure to serve the people who are making such rapid progress in offering opportunities to the State's underprivileged boys. It is our Nation's youth of today who are the builders of tomorrow. Only as our youths are trained and developed can our Nation be assured of an educated and thinking leadership for the future.

The complete text, What is Boysville, follows:

WHAT IS BOYSVILLE?

Boysville is a home for neglected Arkansas boys. The age group served is 10 through 16 years. Sources from which the boys come are: Child welfare, juvenile, and social-service agencies. Believing there is no such thing as a bad boy the founders and directors will work toward a home where love and understanding abide. Boysville accepts only those boys for whom no other provision of home can be made by society.

PURPOSE

Patterned after the famous Boysville of Texas, the purpose of Boysville is to cause each boy-citizen to feel secure and wanted. Criminals are born where neglect rules. Boysville's purpose is to take unwanted boys and give them secure, adequate home life in decent surroundings. Through the sympathetic and constructive guidance of trained and experienced personnel, Boysville will produce good citizens for Arkansas' tomorrow.

PROGRAM

There will be a balanced educational, recreational, spiritual, and work program in effect at Boysville. Boy-citizens will attend the public schools and the church of their choice at Wynne, Ark. A special program of remedial education will be maintained for those boys too far retarded to attend public schools. Each boy will be developed in skills for which he is best suited. Self-government will be in effect by which the boys learn to practice honesty, fair play, and tolerance. Whether on the farm, dairy, shop, or working with poultry, each boy will do his share toward production of food for use in the home.

STAFF

Equal in importance with a progressive character building program is the necessity for trained and experienced staff workers. Boysville of Arkansas, plans to employ competent and proven personnel who will guide the destinies of boy citizens. The executive director, form manager, dietitian, homemother, and all employees will be selected with the greatest of care.

FACILITIES

Pictured on pages 4 and 5 is the projected plan of Boysville of Arkansas, which will adequately meet the needs of 100 boys and staff members. Boysville has purchased on contract 600 acres of land 3 miles east of Wynne, Ark. A good barn and farm house are now situated on the ground. There will be $50,000 required to build and equip the first unit for 25 boys and operate the home for 1 year. Total costs to build all of the facilities over a 3-year period will be $250,000. Boysville expects to open the first unit by spring, 1950.

CONTINUING SUPPORT

Through the plan of sustaining honorary memberships, the Dollar-a-Month Club members, memorials, bequests, endowment, and miscellaneous gifts in kind. Boysville expects to obtain funds sufficient for future operating costs. Production of food by the home will reduce expenses considerably. Many friends will want to leave some remembrance in their will, others will help by sponsoring a boy on an annual basis.

Seafarers International Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago an invitation was extended by Mr. Al Bernstein, international representative, Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf district, to myself and other Members of the House to visit the Atlantic and Gulf district headquarters of the Seafarers International Union in New York. As a Congressman from the Brooklyn district embracing part of New York's waterfront, I felt it was my duty to accept the invitation.

This union of seafaring men, through Mr. Bernstein, expressed a desire to build greater understanding between the legislative representatives of the people and their representatives on the economic front. Desirous of improving that understanding and because I wanted to see how a maritime union, whose members are so vital a part of our economy, functions. I am glad I made that visit, and I wish to review it for the benefit of my colleagues.

The SIU headquarters is located in New York's financial district in the heart

of the shipping center. The six-story building also houses the New York branch of the union.

Perhaps the most striking thing about this particular union to an outside observer, is the air of informality, the man-to-man relationships between the officials and the membership. I should imagine this is the kind of relationship that exists among seafaring men aboard ship, and the union has admirably transferred it to its shore-side apparatus.

From this relationship stems the democratic process, which the union religiously adheres to in every phase of its activities, as I observed in the course of my visit.

The union officials bypassed nothing in the visit.

I saw how the seafarers maintain their records, with their complete data on the membership and the finances.

All of the union records are available for inspection by the membership. In fact, the union encourages interest in these aspects of its operations. Elected committees of members inspect the books every week.

At the Seafarers I had an opportunity to see the hiring hall, backbone of today's free maritime trade-unionism, in operation. Here is where the democratic, equitable system of rotary shipping is utilized every hour on the hour. This method of dispatching men to jobs—on a first-come-first-served basis—represents the greatest single attainment in the interest of maritime labor and I learned that it has proved beneficial to the employers as well as the workers.

It is the militant desire to protect this system of employment, from which the SIU's principal objection to the Taft-Hartley law arises. For the SIU, and the other maritime unions, asserts that the Taft-Hartley law places this precious symbol of free trade-unionism in jeopardy.

The SIU's desire to acquaint its membership with the structure and functioning of their union is well demonstrated in a movie called This Is the SIU, which I took 20 well-spent minutes to witness. The movie, while high-lighting the attainments made by the union in the field of wages and working conditions for the membership, also shows the members why they pay dues. The spending of each dollar, as the movie points out, is calculated to make the SIU membership the best represented seamen in the world. I would heartily recommend this movie to all who are interested in knowing how a sound union functions.

I also learned that the SIU operates on the theory that a well-informed membership is the greatest insurance for continued democracy. The union publications, notably the official organ, the Seafarers Log, are black and white examples of the practice of this theory. I daresay that few publications reveal so great a degree of membership participation. In its pages any member can—to use one of its colorful figures of speech—"blow his lid" on any matter in which the welfare of the membership is concerned. The pages of the paper are sort of a testing ground, and many ideas expressed in it by individual members later emerge as union policy.

Another and interesting phase of the union's activities is the providing of recreation for its members while they are on the beach, waiting for jobs via the rotary shipping board. Seafaring unions, like the SIU, differ from shoreside unions in several respects. The recreation hall offers one example. Unlike shoreside workers, the men who sail our merchant fleet are dependent upon their union almost 24 hours a day. Not only for economic representation but for a means of recreation and relaxation.

This need the SIU meets foursquare. Comfortable lounging facilities are available. Checker and chess games are in constant progress. Radios and television work around the clock. On the walls are displayed samples of members' talents and craftsmanship—paintings, unusual examples of rope splicing, and the like.

Briefly, I would say that the SIU is a good example of clean, sound trade-unionism. Its members, most of whom are now young, vigorous Americans who wish to make seafaring a life-long career, practice democracy in peace in their union, just as most of them fought to preserve this precious heritage in the recent war.

Such trade-unionism can never harm our country. Rather it is essential that it continue unfettered if democracy is to grow and develop as an instrument of free men.

I ask no one to accept my observations as the gospel truth. Instead I would recommend that my colleagues avail themselves of the opportunity to witness a democratic trade-union in action and see for themselves.

It is one way in which we Representatives can learn the needs, problems, and accomplishments of a section of our constituency.

Mr. Lewis Decides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Examiner relative to the Nation-wide coal-strike order by John L. Lewis.

As this editorial points out, as long as President Truman declines to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, Mr. Lewis is free to decide how much coal our Nation shall have. As he likes, according to his own whim, fancy, or special interest, personal or otherwise, he has the power to shut down the Nation's industries and deprive the Nation's homes of heat. He has demonstrated that he has this power. And it is President Truman who permits him to exercise that power.

On September 29 I introduced a resolution in an appeal to the President to invoke the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. If this resolution were called up on the floor of the House, I am confident that it would pass by an overwhelming majority. But apparently the administration has successfully bottled it in committee.

It may be, however, that the resolution has had some effect. Shortly after it was introduced and I spoke on the floor to urge its enactment, Mr. Lewis ordered the miners in the anthracite areas and west of the Mississippi back to work. He ordered them back to work without any new contract and under exactly the same conditions as prevailed when they went on strike.

I repeat what I said on a former occasion. That in his refusal to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act, President Truman must be held responsible for the violence that has taken place in the coal-mining areas in recent weeks. He must also be held responsible for any shortages of coal for industry or heating homes. He is sacrificing the health and safety of the entire Nation on the altar of political expediency .

The editorial follows:

MR. LEWIS DECIDES

The Nation-wide coal strike ordered by John L. Lewis has been conducted in complete defiance of law.

Organized armies of striking miners, numbering in some cases more than 1,000 and armed with rifles, pistols, and shotguns, have traveled openly about several States in long caravans of automobiles, compelling mine owners to cease operations and forcing men who wanted to work, and had the right to work, to abandon their jobs.

Mine tipples in Pennsylvania and Kentucky have been dynamited.

In Pennsylvania, a caravan of coal trucks under guard of State policemen was ambushed by snipers firing rifles.

Making no pretense at peaceful picketing, the strikers have been engaged from the first in open and undisguised armed revolt.

All this is known, of course, to John L. Lewis, and at least condoned by him.

It is known to the governors of the States in which the acts of revolt are committed, but nothing decisive is done to restrain or punish the defiant lawbreakers.

Worst of all, the situation is well known to President Truman, who is equipped with full authority both to suppress armed revolt and to end the coal strike himself, but who does nothing in either direction.

As Representative CHURCH, of Ilinois, has pointed out in a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, President Truman, under the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, has the power to require that coal mining be resumed and continued for at least 80 days while negotiations are conducted with a view to settling the dispute between John L. Lewis and the coal operators without any further interruption of production.

But President Truman, for political reasons, declines to invoke the Taft-Hartley law, so Mr. Lewis is left in sole charge of the Nation's destiny in the vital matter of coal supply.

Mr. Truman having abdicated his duty, it becomes the privilege of Mr. Lewis to decide whether or not the Nation's industries shall be shut down and the Nation's homes go cold.

Mr. Lewis' complete ability to regulate the flow of coal from mine to hearth, at his whim and in his interest alone, is demonstrated by his order directing 100,000 miners to return to work because "suspension of mining in western and anthracite areas is not vital to pending wage negotiations."

Mr. Lewis can grant the Nation a little coal, or he can deprive it of coal altogether, as he likes.

But distasteful and dangerous as the American people find this dictatorship of Mr. Lewis, they should remember that he is only doing what he is permitted to do.

So long as Mr. Truman, catering to left-wing and labor-leader enemies of the Taft-Hartley law, continues to play politics with the Nation's welfare, responsibility for the rising coal-strike disaster and its accompanying violence must rest squarely on him.

Technical Bumps Mar Pan-American Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD a series of articles which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor with respect to the involved and intricate restrictions placed upon citizens of the United States and citizens of the South American Republics who wish to travel between the two countries on business or pleasure. It would seem as though many of the complex travel regulations could well be simplified and standardized and thereby, in my opinion, serve to bring about closer unity between North and South America.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 17, 1949]

TECHNICAL BUMPS MAR PAN-AMERICAN FLIGHTS

(The good neighborhood of 21 American Republics may be the world's most peaceful and prosperous neighborhood, but it still has room for improvement, particularly in making travel easier. Following is a series of articles depicting current practices begging for correction.)

MIAMI.—Today there isn't a country or colony in the Western Hemisphere an American can't reach in a few hours—or, at the most, in a couple of days—by air.

He can streak southward at the rate of 5 miles a minute. But he still spends weeks unraveling the red tape that continues to hamstring international air travel.

Consider the case of Joe Doakes, Boston businessman. He wants to make a business trip to Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil, spending 2 days in each country.

He can board a Pan American World Airways clipper in New York and arrive in Caracas, the Venezuelan capital, 11 hours later. From then on, until he reaches Rio de Janeiro, speedy clippers and multiple daily schedules make it possible for him to spend only 90 minutes to 7½ hours in actual travel between stops.

WAIT—THERE'S A CATCH

Doakes' entire swing around South America doesn't quite total up to 65 hours aloft. His whole trip—travel time and 2-day stopovers at each point—will take just 17 days.

But before he can be swiftly sped to his destinations, he will spend 21 days filling out lengthy forms, getting a physical examination, and being inoculated, finger-printed, and photographed.

Doakes first must get a United States passport to satisfy the immigration requirements of the countries he plans to visit. For this document he must present proof of his citizenship—birth or baptismal certificates or naturalization papers—at a court authorized by law to naturalize aliens.

If he's applying for a passport for the first time, he must also bring along an identifying witness. This should be a friend who has known him for 2 years or more and who is a United States citizen. Also necessary are two recently taken full-face photos 2½ by 2½ inches or 3 by 3 inches in size.

This done, Doakes will wait at least 2 weeks before he receives his passport. If he has an old passport, he can avoid these preliminaries and get his new passport quicker.

POOR OLD DOAKES

Once he has his passport, Doakes sets out to get a visa from a consular representative of each of the South American nations he plans to visit. All of these countries also require health and vaccination certificates. The former must certify he is free from all communicable, contagious diseases and is sound of mind. The vaccination certificate must not be more than 2 years old.

Chile and Argentina complicate these two requirements by specifying that both these documents be certified by a National, State, county, or municipal health authority. So, to make it easy on himself, Doakes should get vaccinated and physically examined by a United States Public Health Service surgeon.

And then there are the special requirements.

Venezuela, for example, may make Doakes deposit 500 Bolivares (about $160) at the consulate to which he applies for a visa. This requirement is left to the discretion of the consul. The money will be returned to Doakes when he gets back home.

A "BREAK" FOR OUR MAN

Colombia wants a marital status document, a yellow-fever certificate, and a financial status document.

Brazil wants two cards of qualification. When Doakes finishes filling these out, there will be little the Brazilian Government won't know about him.

Yet Doakes is fortunate. Boston has full consular representation of the nations he plans to visit. If he lived in a city where there were no Latin-American consular offices, the 21 days for document-gathering would be lengthened to allow time for travel to an American city where consuls could be found.

Finally Doakes boards his clipper. Once aloft he relaxes and enjoys the speed, comfort, and service of air travel. He blissfully thinks he's through with red tape.

But he's so wrong.

PEREZ ENVIES DOAKES

On arrival in Colombia he has to declare the amount of foreign funds he's carrying. This will be registered in his passport to prevent him from carrying out more than he took in. Since he's going to spend a full 48 hours in Colombia, he must use some of his precious time to register at the Bureau of Foreigners, with the national police, or at the mayor's office.

In Chile he also declares the amount of dollars in his possession—and it can't be more than $50 in currency. Again he uses some of his 48-hour stay to get an exit permit before departing.

By this time Joe Doakes has some pretty harsh thoughts about the good-neighbor Republics. He's steamed up about the barriers they've erected to harass an honest businessman intent upon stimulating inter-American trade.

But that's because Joe Doakes doesn't know what Uncle Sam makes Juan Perez, a citizen of any of the 20 other American Republics, go through to enter the United States.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 20, 1949]

FLYING UP FROM ARGENTINA IS NO MUSICAL COMEDY

MIAMI.—Juan Perez of Buenos Aires has just as tough a time as Joe Doakes of Boston in unsnarling red tape to travel in the Americas.

To visit the United States, Señor Perez fills out a form containing 20 questions to get his visa. He gets fingerprinted, and he must be sure his passport is valid 60 days beyond the time he desires to remain in the United States.

Then, after complying with all these requirements, Juan Perez may arrive in the United States and not be permitted to enter the country. The visa he received from the consul in his native land simply means he's gone through a preliminary examination. The final say-so comes from the immigration inspector Juan Perez faces on arrival at an American port.

THIRTY-TWO REASONS TO SAY "NO"

There are 32 reasons why an alien may be excludable from the United States. They range from possessing insufficient funds to suffering from constitutional psychopathic inferiority.

Division of authority between the United States State Department and the Department of Justice, under which the Immigration and Naturalization Service operates, means trouble to a third party—the air line. For, if Juan Perez is found inadmissible to the United States, the air line is not only fined $1,000 for attempting to bring in an excludable alien, but must also pay Juan Perez' return passage.

Although 13 of the American Republics have made it easier for United States tourists to visit their lands since the war, the United States has only taken steps which simplify the travel of Cubans, Mexicans, Canadians, and British subjects. And even then there are strings attached.

WHAT'S BEING DONE

Native-born Cubans and Mexicans coming to the United States from their own countries and Canadians and British subjects domiciled in Canada and coming to the United States directly from Canada do not need a visa. Cubans still must have a passport and cannot remain more than 29 days without a visa. British subjects domiciled in Canada do not need a passport if their stay does not exceed 29 days. Mexicans are required to have nonresident border-crossing cards for a 29-day stay.

Canadians get off easiest. Nothing is required of them for a 6-month stay.

What's being done about the situation?

In 1944 the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) was formed. It consists of representatives of world governments and of international air lines. It set up a division for facilitation of international air transport, which drafted and sent to member nations a series of recommendations which would simplify international travel. Backing up ICAO's proposals is the International Air Transport Association.

COORDINATING GROUP FORMED

Meanwhile, in the fall of 1946, the United States Government established the Air Coordinating Committee, composed of representatives of the State, Defense, Post Office, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. It, too, has a division whose job is to standardize and simplify regulations and procedures affecting international air travel.

In 1947 the United States Government also set up an interdepartmental committee which made a survey of the procedures in effect at all the international airports of entry in the United States. It worked with

local authorities and representatives of air lines and accomplished a number of things.

It speeded up passenger handling. Formerly it took a returning United States citizen an hour to pass public-health, immigration, and customs inspections. Today, at several airports, it takes only 7 to 15 minutes. This was accomplished by increasing the staff of immigration inspectors and separating the examination of aliens and United States citizens.

NEW FORM ISSUED

The committee also got immigration to further cut down the time required for aliens' examinations by (1) issuance of a new form, covering the record of an alien admitted for a temporary stay, which considerably trimmed the number of questions on the previous form; and (2) arrangement for having this form prepared when the visitor buys his ticket instead of filling it out in front of immigration authorities on arrival in the United States.

Greater efficiency and speed in health and customs inspections were also achieved by adding bilingual personnel to the staffs of these two services.

Internal revenue regulations were also simplified for alien temporary visitors by cutting down the number of documents required for their departure from the United States.

To show improvements, the governmental group set up at the various airports of entry local committees consisting of representatives of Government agencies and the airlines. Meeting at regular intervals, these committees are continuing to simplify regulations which can be changed under local authority.

But since the most sweeping changes can only be made by the United States Congress and the equivalent legislative bodies of other nations, Joe Doakes and Juan Perez will probably be toting along a satchelful of documents for quite a while to come.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 3, 1949]

RED TAPE SNARLS HEMISPHERIC AIR TRAVEL

NEW YORK.—One morning not long ago, the departure of a Pan American World Airways Clipper, bound for Venezuela via Puerto Rico and Curaçao, was delayed in New York by weather conditions.

Reaching San Juan, the Puerto Rican capital, the captain realized he would not be able to land at the Caraças airport before sunset unless he overflew Curaçao—and the formidable mountain ramparts which edge the Venezuelan airfield make daylight landings and take-offs imperative.

That posed another problem—a problem of red tape. Before the clipper could land in Venezuela the aircraft entry documents had to be visaed by a Venezuelan consul. By Venezuelan law the visa must be obtained at the last scheduled point of departure before arrival in Venezuela. If the aircraft landed in Venezuela without the visa, Pan American could be fined as much as a thousand bolivares, or about $320.

MAJOR PROBLEM

The captain looked at his watch. There was time to reach Venezuela before nightfall by overflying Curaçao—but not if he first had to send a clerk with the aircraft's papers to the Venezuelan consul in San Juan, which now had become the last scheduled point of departure. So fingers crossed and brow clouded, the captain took off, dreading the unpleasant task of trying to talk his way out of the fine.

This is only one example of the extent to which red tape affects international travel—and particularly air travel, whose greatest asset is speed. Red tape is one of the air lines' biggest problems, and one it is beyond their power to remedy directly.

Red tape obliges carriers to employ special manpower to fill out hundreds of documents for each flight. It frequently delays schedules. This, in turn, curdles the customer's humor, often causing the air line to be blamed.

As the largest air line in the world, Pan American Airways initiated its own red-tape-snipping program in 1946. It formed a group known as the System Aircraft Documentation Coordinating Committee, which met in Washington and drafted five uniform declaration and clearance manifests and forms. These now have been adopted by the majority of the countries served by PAA.

In spite of these and other measures, however, a lot remains to be done.

FIVE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-TWO DOCUMENTS

For example, a minimum of 572 documents must be prepared in New York alone every time a PAA clipper flies from New York to Buenos Aires, touching en route at Puerto Rico, Trinidad, the French, Dutch, and British Guianas, Uruguay, and the Brazilian ports of Belem, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Porto Alegre.

This is a conservative figure, because it is based on the transport of 200 items. If, however, a clipper carries 800 items—which it often does—and if most of the cargo is destined to the several Brazilian ports along the way—a frequent occurrence—the total number of documents runs to more than 1,000.

Naturally, a plane seldom carries all its original passengers, cargo, mail, and baggage to the end of the line. As it flies across the Caribbean and down the east coast of South America, it "off-loads" passengers, baggage, cargo, and mail and takes on new loads.

NEW SETS NEEDED

If even one passenger, one piece of cargo, one piece of baggage, or one piece of mail is taken on at any point, complete new sets of documents must be prepared in the quantities required by the country to which they are destined.

The five standard documents covering the New York-Buenos Aires flight are a general aircraft declaration, a crew list, and separate passenger, cargo, and mail manifests. Documentation would be relatively simple if every country accepted these standard forms in the same quantities.

Brazil, for example, specifies that a 13- by 19-inch form be used instead of the standard general aircraft declaration. The Brazilian document, five copies of which are required, must be visaed by the Brazilian consul at the American port of the flight's origin.

First listed on this document are full details about the crew, although five copies of the standard crew list form must also be submitted. Next come the names of passengers, with their sex, age, marital status, profession, nationality, port of embarkation, port of destination, type of visa they hold, passport number, and the place and date of issue of Brazilian visa.

PASSENGER MANIFEST

In addition, 191 copies of the standard passenger manifest must be submitted at Belem, 14 at Rio, and 9 each at São Paulo and Porto Alegre.

But that is not all. The air line also must prepare a Brazilian landing card for each passenger, no matter where he is going. This card lists name, sex, age, nationality, marital status, religion, education, port of embarkation, port of destination, address at destination, passport number, the place where passport was issued, and the type of visa. It is signed by the passenger and the information is used for the preparation of a Brazilian police list.

Every time a passenger boards the clipper, the special Brazilian form must be hauled out and the person's name must be listed on it, even though he is only transiting Brazil.

ELEVEN COPIES NEEDED

Brazil has other special requirements for the documentation of cargo. Of the 11 copies of the air cargo manifest required for each Brazilian port, 5 must be visaed the day before the flight takes off from its home base.

Nothing can go to Brazil unless covered by visaed documents in quintuplicate. The only exceptions are emergency supplies. Even then, the port of destination must be notified in advance. If this is not done, Pan American Airways is liable to a fine ranging from 200 to 1,000 cruzeiros (about $10 to $50).

Uruguay and Argentina also have designed their own special forms instead of using the standard general aircraft declaration sheet. It is only slightly smaller than the Brazilian one. Uruguay wants 10 copies of it and, if any passengers destined to that country should board the clipper en route, 10 more copies must be made at each place of embarkation.

Argentina wants 23 copies of this form and stipulates that the complete name (no initials permitted) of each passenger be listed. The air line is subject to a $10 fine for each name not filling this requirement.

SIX MAN-HOURS

All this means that the departure of one New York-Buenos Aires flight entails at least six-man hours of work devoted to pretake-off red tape. On the basis of $2.50 a man-hour, it costs Pan American Airways about $10,950 a year just to handle the pretake-off red tape for the two daily New York-Buenos Aires flights alone.

Yet this is a small item compared to other red-tape costs. Since air lines fly around the clock every day in the year, they must pay liberal overtime rates for government employees in the United States and abroad. In 1947, for example, Pan American Airways shelled out $250,000 in overtime payments for United States customs and immigration officials at American ports of entry served by its flights. The same year it paid $95,352 to Latin-American consuls, customs, immigration, and public health officials.

Since Pan American spans the world, serving all six continents, its total red-tape bill averages about $1,000,000 a year.

Ultimate payer is the traveler himself, for the cost of red tape is inevitably reflected in the price of a ticket.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 8, 1949]

TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES PAY HEAVY "RED-TAPE" FINES

MIAMI.—Ignorance of the law sometimes lets the passenger off, but never the transportation company.

A classic case is that of Mrs. T. Born in Italy, she came to the United States as a small child and spent her entire life in this country. She married a naturalized American and for more than 26 years thought she was an American citizen because a 1922 law provides that, if a foreign woman married an American before September 22 of that year, she automatically attained United States citizenship.

A year ago Mrs. T. decided to spend a holiday in Jamaica. She boarded a PAA clipper in Miami, flew to the British colony, had a wonderful time, and flew back to Miami. On her arrival she was briefly questioned by an immigration inspector and admitted as a citizen.

Mrs. T.'s jaunt to Jamaica gave her a taste for foreign travel, so 2 weeks later she flew over to Habana, only 65 minutes by PAA

clipper from Miami. On her return, however, she was examined by a more thorough inspector.

NOT A CITIZEN AFTER ALL

He came up with some surprising news. Mrs. T. wasn't an American citizen at all. Her husband had received his naturalization papers on December 10, 1922, 2½ months too late to make the 1922 law apply to their marriage.

Mrs. T., however, because of her long residence in the United States, was finally admitted as a returning resident. But Pan American was fined $2,000 for twice bringing an alien to the United States without a passport and immigration visa, a condition which made her excludable.

In addition, the law required the air line to refund to Mrs. T. the fares from Miami to Jamaica and from Miami to Habana because, had Mrs. T. actually been deported—which she wasn't—the air line is supposed to provide the deported alien return passage to point of origin.

The cost of these cases to transportation companies rolls up to a considerable yearly sum. Fines pyramid those costs. Pan American, which is the largest international air line, serving six continents, has been assessed $172,927.42 in fines at the Miami gateway alone in the past 10 years. Detention expenses—hotels, meals, cab fares, telephone calls, etc.—amounted to $43,463.84 at the Miami gateway during the period between January 1941 and February 1949.

The case of Mrs. T. underscores the little known fact that the most frequent and hardhit victim of international travel red tape is not the much publicized traveler but the transportation company.

Although the United States Department, through its consular offices abroad, has an elaborate and intensive system of processing all aliens who plan to visit, undergo medical treatment, or reside in this country, many an alien arrives in the country to be told by the United States immigration authorities that he is an excludable alien and therefore must be deported.

In such a case the transportation company again is penalized. For innocently attempting to bring an excludable alien into the United States, it may be fined $1,000 and must furnish the alien free transportation back home, even though he may be financially able to pay his own passage.

The division of authority between the State Department and the Department of Justice, under which the Immigration and Naturalization Service comes, is one of the causes for this situation. But in many cases, it is caused by the manner in which aliens are handled by either United States Foreign Service officers or immigration authorities, or both.

Here's a common example:

HOLIDAY TRIP—DEPORTATION

Last year a young Colombian girl came to the United States to study. During the middle of her course she changed schools. When summer rolled around she decided to hop a PAA Clipper and spend the holidays in Habana, Cuba.

On her return to Miami she learned—the hard way—a few facts about United States immigration laws which should have been made clear to her when she obtained her visa from the American consulate in Bogotá.

These laws provide that a person who obtains a student visa must attend a school approved by the United States Attorney General. American consulates and immigration authorities at ports of entry have a copy of this list. If a student wants to attend an unapproved school, it is then necessary to get a different type of visa—temporary visitor's visa.

The Colombian girl had switched to an unapproved school and therefore held the wrong type document. She was consequently deported, and Pan American was fined $1,000 and ordered to fly the young lady back home free of charge.

In all these cases, students are detained until special waivers for their admittance can be obtained. Detention expenses for the passenger, as well as expenses of one or more long-distance calls to Washington to clear the case, must be borne by the carrier, even though these mix-ups are the fault of American consulates.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ravenswood Lincolnite:

THE FIRST COLUMN
(By Leo A. Lerner)
THE BRANNAN PLAN

WASHINGTON, D. C.—An idea for preventing depression so exciting that it makes pulses quicken, and yet so simple you will wonder why nobody thought of it before, has been proposed to Congress and the American people by our Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan.

The idea is being called the farm price-support program, or more simply, the Brannan plan.

In the long run I believe that will mean much more to the American people than the Marshall plan or the Truman doctrine. If, as the President himself has said so many times, a strong America is the best guaranty of America's winning the battle of ideologies, the Brannan plan can mean as much to the workers and farmers of America (and therefore to business and to the free peoples of the world) than the other steps being taken to "contain" communism.

The Brannan plan is not widely understood, nor has it received very much publicity since it was brought to Capitol Hill early in April by Secretary Brannan. The same old opposition to most of the Fair Deal legislation has been conducting a smear campaign against the Brannan plan.

The Republican Party, which lost the initiative for helping the farmers during the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, those who stand to gain by depressed markets and a lower standard of living, many southern Democrats who get their campaign funds from large cotton growers, the big wheat farmers, banking interests which profit from the old farm-loan systems, and the "tax-saving" bloc which would rather save money on taxes now than keep up the economy later, are all peppering away at Brannan.

He has already had the distinction of being called a "dangerous" man.

The dangerous man is a modest fellow who looks like a neighborhod businessman. He goes in for blue-serge suits, plain color ties, and white shirts. He is tall, thin, bald, and wears rimless glasses.

In the parlor of a friend's Washington home I heard him explain the Brannan plan, in simple language and without assertion that he was going to lead us all to the promised land.

One of the most amazing things about Secretary Brannan's statement was his obvious dislike of the old "economy of scarcity" scheme which has ruled the roost in farm legislation for so many years. Brannan frankly hates to pay for potatoes and then destroy them. He doesn't want the Government to buy pork just to keep the price up and then have to dump the spoiled pork in the ocean some dark night. This pork, when fresh, could have gone to people in America who need to eat it.

Brannan wants the farmer to get a fair price for his pork and he wants the consumer to be able to buy it at a fair price. Both of these objectives can be accomplished by the direct production payment system he proposes.

Brannan begins with a very obvious fact—that American depressions are farm-led and farm-fed.

He says that if we don't work to maintain farm purchasing power, city people will lose their jobs. Nearly everything made in any Chicago neighborhood, for example, is bought on the farm. In 1948 farmers took in $31,000,000,000 and spent most of it for things made by city factories. From the Rite-Way milkers made on Belmont Avenue to the radio and television sets of Stewart-Warner's, it's the farm dollar that helps keep factories humming, pay rolls rolling, and city retail stores going.

The Department of Agriculture, looking for a floor under which farm income should not fall without affecting you and me, figures national farm income in 1949 should be maintained at 26,200,000,000. Any less would lead to the start of the toboggan. Brannan's idea is to peg that income for the sake of the country.

The old parity system had a lot of things wrong with it.

For one, it was based on averages and conditions prevailing from 1910 to 1914, a ridiculous and unrealistic basing point. Second, it covered only 23 percent of the things farmers raise and grow, thus making a cockeyed price-support system that gave potato raisers as much as $23,000 per acre and other farmers nothing.

Third, the Government had to buy and store perishables at terrific cost and often had in the long run to dump or give away the surplus, thus artificially keeping up the price at the same time it was wasting the commodity.

Brannan isn't rapping anybody when he tells you this. He admits we had to fly in a Wright Bros. plane before we could ride in a Constellation. But for 1950 he thinks we should benefit by what we have learned about American economics.

The new Brannan plan says we must stabilize the farm income of the American people. So it begins by establishing a realistic income support standard. This standard is a formula which can be carried on permanently, based on the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts for the years 1939 to 1948.

For every year, the income support standard would be based upon the average of the first 10 of the last 12 years, taking into account not only the average cash income, but the prices paid by farmers for goods and services, so that the income and outgo are balanced off to determine what the Nation's farm income should be to keep the national economy on the beam.

Brannan wants to support small and medium-sized farms only. He thinks the big-acre boys should take their chances. His plan as it now stands contemplates helping to maintain farms with up to about $25,000 gross income. That's not the net profit, of

course, and it may mean the Government will have to pay very little or nothing in average or good years.

In bad years the cost of the program would admittedly go up, but at no time would the Government pay more than the difference between what the farmer gets in the market and the new parity income his farm should bring that year. This means, of course, direct cash payments—the simplest, cheapest, and most sensible way to subsidize if you are going to subsidize.

The most amazing thing now comes—the public has a better than even chance to get its money back because it will be able to buy the farmer's goods in the market place at any price they'll bring. If there's a surplus of eggs or milk, for instance, a family can save much more (and consume more) by paying the natural, unrigged price for food than the Brannan plan will cost in taxes.

Agricultural economists at Omaha have figured that a worker earning $3,250 a year in Detroit will have to pay only $2 a year in taxes if the Brannan plan costs a billion dollars. But that same worker might save $36 on milk alone, and the main point is that his kids will get the milk. That family can step up milk, not cut it down. Brannan says frankly that milk should sell for about 15 cents a quart to bring the largest volume of sales.

Cash payments direct to the farmer, therefore, and allowing the market to find its own supply and demand price level, especially for perishable products, are the heart of the Brannan plan. The farmer will get the difference between the average level of prices for his commodity and the amount he should have to maintain the minimum income support standard.

There is no "regimentation" in the plan that does not now apply to farms, such as the marketing agreements in which local farmers now have a voice and vote. There is less "socialism" in the Brannan plan than in the artificial price rigging system which plows under or destroys the food we should eat.

The worker benefits—

The farmer benefits—

Business benefits.

Just remember one thing—that DDT and 24D and new types of farm machinery are constantly increasing the farm yield. As production increases, we'll solve the problem of that part of our population that is underfed. But we'll never solve it if we have to withdraw food from the public just to keep the price up.

The Brannan plan, therefore, becomes the realistic way to meet the most important issues of the day—avoidance of depression through keeping up farm income and finding a way to keep up food consumption. This plan encourages farmers to raise food.

The old system, says Brannan, "just doesn't make sense."

If America can pour 26 billions into Europe to contain communism, it can spend money to keep America strong economically and make it possible for all Americans to get enough of the good things of life to keep them from going Communist at home.

The immediate problem is that the Republican Congress last year passed the Aiken bill, which goes into effect in 1950. The Aiken bill does not do what the Brannan plan would; in fact, it provides less support and does not consider a minimum total of national farm income. Surpluses would have to be removed from the market in the old-fashioned way.

To stop the Aiken plan from going into effect, and to bring the new Brannan plan into operation as soon as possible to bolster American business, the Eighty-first Congress will have to act within the next few months.

Improvement of Health and Attitude of Japanese People by Supplementing Their Diet With Enriched White Bread

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement prepared by Mr. J. L. Locke, president and general manager of the Fisher Flouring Mills Co., of Seattle, Wash., dated August 3, 1949. In this statement Mr. Locke suggested a plan for developing new markets and demands in Japan for the surplus wheat of the United States and at the same time improving the health and attitude of the Japanese people. I commend it for careful consideration of every Member of the Congress.

The statement follows:

During normal periods prior to the war, the Japanese people relied largely upon rice for the cereal portion of their diet. In spite of the highly developed rice culture, the country was unable to raise sufficient rice to feed its population. Rice and, to a limited extent, other cereals were imported to supplement their diet. Food imports 1930–34 averaged 4,000,000 metric tons per year. This would be the equivalent of 148,000,000 bushels of wheat.

During the period of the occupation, it has been necessary for the Army to supply approximately 35 percent of the total food requirements for the eighty-odd million people in Japan. This has been accomplished in the main by shipments of wheat originating in the Pacific Northwest. From January 1 to June 30, 1949, approximately 1,300,000 long tons of wheat were shipped to Japan. During this same period approximately 50,000 tons of flour were shipped. During the year of 1948, flour was shipped to the extent of 411,000 tons.

This wheat has been processed in Japan. The substantial milling industry of Japan has been operated at full capacity to process the maximum wheat possible. In addition, some has been ground in primitive hammer mills and some, we understand, has been cooked and fed as wheat. The flour produced in the flour mills has varied from 92 to 94 percent extraction, and is a whole wheat type meal when produced in primitive hammer mills. The bread produced from this flour is of a dirty and unappetizing appearance. It is not a food product that would encourage people accustomed to rice to supplement their diet permanently with wheat products.

On the other hand, it is reported to us that long lines formed at distribution outlets and bakeries when white flour and good bread were available.

The popularity of white flour in countries producing and accustomed to eating rice and corn is well known to the milling industry of the Pacific Northwest. The Philippines are a good example. From a small beginning a generation ago, wheat and white bread consumption has grown until bread forms a substantial and important part in the diet and economy of the Philippines.

We have the same opportunity in Japan. First, we have the opportunity to improve the health and diet of the Japanese people. There is some reason to believe that a change in diet might so change the health and attitude of that warlike people that we could live with them with improved peace and harmony.

Recent studies made in Newfoundland give significant proof of the improved health of a people when their diet was supplemented with enriched white flour and where no other significant change was made in their diet. In the Newfoundland studies, the experiment in nutritional food values was conducted with controls as demanded by scientists and yet on a scale large enough to be impressive to the layman.

This study, started in 1944, was resurveyed in 1948. During that 4-year period the death rate from all causes fell from 12.1 to 10.5 per thousand of population. The number of deaths from tuberculosis declined sharply. The rate of stillbirths and of deaths of infants less than 1 year of age was strikingly reduced. The average annual infant mortality for the city of St. John's was reduced from 102.3 to 61.0 per thousand live births. There was a noticeable reduction in the apathy, and in the attitude of its people. Outward signs of malnutrition, so characteristic in 1944, had almost disappeared. The chemical analysis of the blood and urine of the people told the same story.

Credit for these significant changes has been given to the addition of enriched white flour to the diet of the Newfoundland people. The improvement in morale is reported as would be expected with the improvement in health; children playing and laughing; men and women willing and able to work, contented and ambitious instead of surly and discouraged.

Our first point, then, is that supplementing the Japanese diet with enriched white flour and bread can be expected to improve the health and attitude of the Japanese people.

ADVANTAGES TO THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States of America can and should produce more wheat than can be consumed within its own borders if its agricultural economy is to remain healthy. The international wheat agreement has been negotiated with the hope that it will afford an outlet for the 168,000,000 bushels of this United States surplus.

Students in Government recognize that this country should export each year 450 to 550,000,000 bushels, an amount substantially in excess of that contemplated under the international wheat agreement. It is, therefore, particularly important to establish and develop new markets and new demands for our surplus wheat.

Narrowing this national problem to the Pacific Northwest, the States of Washington, Oregon, and northern Idaho produce 100 to 125,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. This wheat is grown largely on lands unsuited for any other crop. Normally, approximately one-half of the crop is ground into flour. In the past, 40 to 50 percent of that flour was shipped into export markets. These markets consisted of Central and South America, the Philippine Islands, and other islands in the Pacific, China, and Japan.

Today, shipments to Central and South America have been substantially curtailed through shortage of dollars. The China market has completely disappeared. The Philippines, although still a good market for the Pacific Northwest flour, cannot begin to absorb the surplus. The States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho will consume only 8 to 10 percent of the wheat produced in that area.

The Pacific Northwest formerly shipped substantial quantities of wheat and flour of its softer varieties to the centers of population in the Midwest and East. This has been estimated in years past to have amounted to

18 to 25,000,000 bushels per year. Substantial increases in freight rates have been responsible for the almost complete loss of that eastern market. We, therefore, find a situation in this northwestern corner of the United States where wheat and only wheat can be raised and where the market for that wheat, through no fault of its own, has been so curtailed that the surplus in this area will become a substantial burden on the agricultural economy of this country.

The milling industry, developed to supply these various markets, is currently operating only at approximately 40 to 45 percent of its capacity. This has resulted in labor unrest within the industry and unusually high prices for byproducts of wheat, bran, shorts, middlings, etc. Feed prices, basis Seattle and Portland, during the current year have been substantially higher than Kansas City, Minneapolis, and Chicago, at times as much as $23 to $24 per ton.

This high feed cost has made it unprofitable to raise poultry, and dairy products to the extent it has been the case in the past.

The records will show that prior to the war, many thousands of cars of poultry and dairy products were shipped from the Pacific Northwest to California, midwestern, and eastern markets. At the present time, eggs are being shipped into this area. The milk industry is moving farther and farther afield to get its raw materials.

An increase in the milling production of the Pacific Northwest would, therefore, improve the feed ratio and that portion of our economy.

Although the milling industry would selfishly like to mill or grind all the wheat going to Japan, we question whether this is a practical or sound request. We are more interested in developing in Japan a permanent and growing outlet for the wheat and flour produced in this area. If good flour and good bread is furnished to Japan during the occupation, we have a real opportunity to accomplish this much-to-be-desired aim. We, therefore, make the following recommendations:

1. Reduce the extraction rate on wheat ground in the mills of Japan from 94 percent to 72 percent. Give the people of Japan white bread. Let them learn to enjoy it. Notice and check improvement in their health. Use the byproducts from this milling in Japan to rehabilitate their own poultry, dairy, and livestock industry.

2. Supplement this with importations of enriched white flour from the United States. Supplement to the extent possible under the program. If at the present time, their flour is running 94 percent and this is reduced to 72 percent, the difference between 94 percent and 72 percent may be an appropriate measure of the wheat shipped to Japan which should be ground into flour in the Pacific Northwest mills, approximately 22 percent.

It may be said that limited funds available for feeding the Japanese people make it necessary for the Army to concentrate on the cheapest possible foodstuffs and for that reason, wheat must be shipped instead of flour.

For the purpose of determining the relative costs of wheat and flour in varying extraction rates in terms of food value in available calories for human consumption, we have used the following table on the authority of Dr. Betty Sullivan, of Minneapolis, Minn.:

Available calories per long ton

Wheat	3,293,898
90-percent extraction flour	3,449,354
80-percent extraction flour	3,542,537
72-percent extraction flour	3,624,230

From this it will be seen that there is approximately 10 percent more caloric content to 72-percent extraction flour than to the wheat itself.

Now, let us suppose wheat is worth $2 per bushel. It takes 2.33 bushels or 140 pounds of wheat to make 100 pounds of flour. That 140 pounds of wheat then would cost $4.67. In grinding 100 pounds of flour, we would have 40 pounds of feed. We then suppose that feed is sold at $45 per ton or $2.25 per hundredweight. We should then credit our wheat account with a feed credit of 90 cents so that the flour portion of the wheat would cost $3.77 per hundredweight. To this would have to be added sacks and the cost of milling the wheat—23 cents for sacks, 50 cents or less for grinding the wheat, depending on the quantity, etc., or a total cost of $4.50, free along ship steamer Pacific coast ports. Therefore, 100 pounds of flour can be bought for fewer dollars in the United States than the wheat required to grind 100 pounds of flour would cost if ground in Japan—$4.50 for flour, $4.67 for wheat. It would require fewer United States dollars to buy the flour than to buy the wheat.

However, the transportation cost of flour would be somewhat higher than the transportation cost of bulk wheat. We would suppose this might amount to $10 per ton, this being the difference between the charter rates for bulk wheat and parcels for flour. However, 140 pounds of wheat must be shipped to make 100 pounds of flour. One hundred and forty pounds of wheat at, say $10 per ton, would cost 70 cents for freight; 100 pounds of flour at $20 per ton would cost for freight, $1, so that the difference in delivered costs, instead of $10, becomes 30 cents per hundredweight or $6 per ton. To offset this $6 per ton, we should give credit to several items.

Sacks, in which that flour would be packed, have real and important value in Japan. Japan has always imported cotton, they have a need for fiber and the sacks would not be wasted, but would be used and eliminate the necessity of shipping the cloth in some other form.

The sack cost was 23 cents per hundred weight or $4.60 ton. Any wheat ground in Japan requires power. A portion of that power is furnished in the form of coal shipped from this country. The coal itself and the freight on the coal can be saved. It is difficult to determine the amount involved but if imported coal furnished half of the power, this might well run to $1 per ton of flour produced. We have a credit of $5.60 for sacks and power to offset the $6 extra freight cost.

There are further contingent and intangible advantages in shipping flour. Labor would be employed in the United States with incomes upon which tax would be paid to this country. Unemployment insurance would be saved for those in the industry not working now because the mills are shut down.

The shorter extraction flour milled in Japan would furnish feed for their animals. The additional flour produced in this country would reduce the value of millfeed through the greater supply of those byproducts. This would be expected to improve the feeding ratio and reduce the cost of the poultry, dairy and meat products in an area where food costs are high.

The immediate as well as the long range advantages to both Japan and the United States seem to be self-evident. The whole program is based upon the belief that good enriched bread will supplement the rice diet of the Japanese to their nutritional advantage and to the economic advantage of the United States.

To be sure that good bread is produced, the Fisher Flouring Mills Co. will send to Japan what we call a food missionary, a person capable and trained to instruct groups and bakeries in the proper method of baking bread. I am confident that if a reasonable movement of flour from the Pacific Northwest is established, that the industry will jointly support such a program, making it possible to increase the size of the crew of food missionaries.

This is not a new venture to the mills of the Pacific Northwest. Other food missionaries have been sent to the Philippines and other markets. Their work has been constructive and has resulted in improved quality and greater consumption of bread.

For the reasons we have outlined, we therefore suggest:

1. Reduce the extraction rate of wheat ground in Japan to 72 percent.

2. Use its byproducts where they can be fed to rehabilitate the flocks and herds in Japan.

3. Supplement the flour supply, which would thereby be reduced 22 percent, with enriched white flour milled in the United States.

4. The additional supply of byproducts thereby made available in the Pacific Northwest will reduce the price of those byproducts in one of the highest markets in the United States and improve the feeding ratio in the poultry, dairy, and livestock industry.

5. Permit the milling industry in the Pacific Northwest to send at its own expense a crew of food missionaries to insure and improve the quality of baked products in Japan.

6. In this manner establish a growing market for the surplus wheat produced in the United States.

We sincerely believe that today we have an opportunity that may never present itself again to improve the health of the people of Japan and improve the agricultural economy of the United States.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation's attention is directed toward the plight of the physically handicapped and the great necessity for placing them in employment. This is the fifth annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, the purpose of which is to bring into national focus the need for placing in employment those who suffer physical disability.

We have made great progress in the last few years in this direction, but we have much more to do. We have learned that there is scarcely any type of physical disability that cannot be used to advantage in business and industry. We have found that with vocational rehabilitation and intelligent job placement the performance of the physically handicapped equals the normal employee, and in many cases surpasses it. There has always been somewhat of a superstition that workers with physical handicaps would be more prone to injury, but records in industry have proved that belief to be false. Actually, they are more careful and their rate of injury is lower. They are, if anything, steadier employees,

valuing their employment, and more interested and faithful to the job.

Many people believe that in our efforts to promote the interests of the physically handicapped we are trying to provide them with pensions. This, we have found, is the last thing the disabled wish. Their only hope is to have the opportunity to make their own way and to contribute to the national welfare, rather than to be a charge on it. We must realize that with every disabled person taken from dependency and placed in a position the economy of the country is enhanced. The disabled then becomes a taxpayer and a distributor of his wages. This fact, coupled with their ability to perform on the job, enriches the Nation. National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week will again emphasize to the country the intelligent approach to this pressing problem.

In this connection, I should like to include the following joint statement issued by Cabinet members and heads of agencies at the outset of this annual observance:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, WASHINGTON, D. C.—JOINT STATEMENT, 1949

In order to provide a maximum of economic security to all citizens, it is necessary that the physically handicapped of our country receive equality of employment opportunity for jobs for which they are both prepared and qualified. During the past few years the Federal Government has earnestly worked to provide suitable employment for all handicapped persons, veterans as well as nonveterans within the framework of its personnel needs. More than 100,000 seriously disabled workers have thus been placed through the United States Civil Service Commission in the last 7 years.

The Federal Government should and must continue this enlightened policy which has given it the sincere labor and talents of the doubly appreciative handicapped worker who has been proven in all surveys to be productive, reliable, careful, adaptable, and regular in attendance.

The State and community governments have made a great contribution to this placement program. They can do much more. Industry and business have made considerable strides since the handicapped proved themselves on wartime production lines. But much more remains to be done to assure the hundreds of thousands of presently unemployed handicapped workers and the million or more who could be employed with rehabilitation, that ours is truly a land of economic opportunity and equality.

As the fifth observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week begins on October 2, we join with the President and members of The President's Committee in asking American employers and workers to open wider their minds and hearts to the handicapped worker whose productive skills and abilities are needed by America and the world as we work for peace and prepare for the future.

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce; Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor; Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator; Harry B. Mitchell, Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission; Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The Proposed National Health Program—Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Oscar Ewing, is the man behind the program for a national health program. If a Federal program of socialized medicine is established, he would be the man to administer it. Mr. Ewing intimates that the doctors of America, 180,000 of them, oppose socialized medicine for selfish reasons. He says a program of socialized medicine would bring about better health for the American people. However, socialized medicine has been a failure wherever it has been tried—in Russia, in Germany, in France, in New Zealand, and in Australia. Since its establishment in England, 8 months ago, the decline in medical standards and in the personal interest and relationship between doctor and patient has become quite evident. So, judging from the way socialized medicine programs have worked out elsewhere, Mr. Ewing seems to be overly optimistic when he says a program of socialized medicine would bring about better health conditions for the American people.

If the United States adopts a program of socialized medicine as called for in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, it will be taking a long step toward state medicine as now rigidly operated in Russia. No wonder American Communists are working hard for socialized medicine.

Mr. Speaker, in an address at Sycamore, Ill., on August 30, 1949, at a testimonial dinner given in honor of Dr. John W. Ovitz, celebrating three decades of outstanding medical service Dr. Ovitz had rendered that community, I made the following remarks:

MY REASONS FOR OPPOSING SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The first and best reason I can offer for being against socialized medicine is the life, the character, the work, and the service rendered to this community by Dr. Ovitz, the guest of the evening. No system of socialized medicine ever produced such men, or ever will produce such men. Characters like Dr. Ovitz are the result of our free American medical system. They are scattered all over the Nation, the best and the most devoted doctors in the world. The Good Book tells us, "By their fruits shall ye know them." I know of no better way to judge the value of our American medical service than by its fruits, and I know of no better way to judge socialized medicine than by its fruits.

Socialized medicine, wherever it has been instituted has been a disappointment from every point of view. In Germany, in Austria, in Russia, in Australia, in New Zealand, and recently in England, it has not worked out as planned. In every instance it has been more costly and less efficient than promised. In every instance the public health instead of being improved has deteriorated. In every instance a gigantic and oppressive medical bureaucracy has been built up. In every instance hospital facilities, medical education, and scientific research have become impaired. By its fruits shall ye know it.

Socialized medicine was first instituted in Germany in 1885. At that time the average number of days per year lost by German workers on account of sickness was 14. By 1913 the average number of days lost had increased to 20, and by 1932 it had increased to 30—more than double what it was in 1885. Now let us compare the German record with our own. In 1900 the average American worker lost 28 days each year on account of sickness; today the average days lost from work by the American worker on account of sickness is 6 days per year. Under socialized medicine the number of days lost on account of sickness in Germany doubled. Under our free American system the number of days lost on account of sickness in the United States was reduced 75 percent. By their fruits shall ye know them.

England recently established a socialistic labor government. One of its products is socialized medicine. Socialized medicine has been in effect in England for a little over a year. Cecil Palmer, an English statesman, author, and lecturer, has been on a lecture tour of this country giving us a first-hand eyewitness account of socialized medicine in England. I was one of the fortunate few to hear his first lecture in Washington last February. This is what he said:

"State medicine in England is a swindle. It is based on fraud, having been foisted upon an unsuspecting public as a 'free service.' It is neither free nor efficient. There are not enough doctors, nurses, hospitals, false teeth, eyeglasses, nor medicine to go around. The program has already destroyed the personal relationship between doctor and patient. Under a directive of the British Minister of Health each doctor must furnish a case history of each patient, giving details of symptoms and treatment, to the local board of health, composed of laymen. This forces the doctor to violate his 'hippocratic oath.'"

By its fruits shall ye know it.

Today the American medical system and service is the best in the world. Why scrap it? Fifty years ago our medical schools looked to the famous medical institutions of Germany, of Austria, of France, of England, and of Italy for scientific leadership. Today, they look to us. We have attained world leadership in the field of medicine. Our scientific medical equipment is the envy of the world. We ship it to every land. Today we have 1 doctor for every 750 people—twice as many as Europe has on an average. We have twice as many hospital beds available on a per capita basis as any other nation on earth, and our hospitals are the best equipped in the world.

A child born today in America has a life expectancy 12 years longer than a child born here in 1900. Our death rate per thousand has been cut almost in half during the last 50 years, from 17½ to 10½—the lowest death rate of any country on earth. And so I ask, "Why scrap the best system in the world for one that has been a failure wherever tried?"

Socialized medicine is a long step toward a socialized state. Why take that step? Lenin said, "Socialized medicine is the keystone in the arch of the socialized state." Is it any wonder every Communist in America is an ardent advocate of socialized medicine? Every radical labor leader in America is for socialized medicine; every follower of Henry Wallace; every ardent New Dealer. Why? Because they know it leads to a socialized state with centralized control, and dictatorship. Whatever such people are for, I am against. I don't want any of it in mine.

Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article I recently submitted for appearance in the Journal of Commerce, New York, Monday, September 26, 1949:

AGGRESSIVE LEADERSHIP HELD NEED OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY—LITTLE IN THE WAY OF COMPENSATING ACTION TAKEN TO HALT THE FLIGHT OF NEW ENGLAND MILLS

(By Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, Seventh Congressional District, of Massachusetts)

To set this comment in its proper perspective, it may be well to repeat that Lawrence is the leading woolen-worsted manufacturing city of the Nation.

We have been extremely hard hit by unemployment.

The greater Lawrence area, with a population of approximately 125,000, had 24,000 claims for unemployment compensation in the spring of this year. As textiles constitute the one dominant industry, it is clear that a full-scale, if but a temporary depression, hit this sector of our national economy with a maximum drop in production and employment.

According to the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, factory pay rolls for June 1948 reached a total of $5,400,000. In June of 1949 this had dropped to $3,000,000. In the same month of this year, the Division of Employment Security paid out unemployment benefits to the tune of $1,712,254, which helped to stabilize the local economy.

CLAIMS DROP STEADILY

A remarkable fact in conjunction with these figures is that the welfare case load in July of 1948 was 204—and it only increased to 207 in July of 1949, in spite of the fact that so many thousands have been unemployed during the intervening year.

Unemployment compensation claims have been dropping steadily from the peak reached earlier in 1949. The total of continuing and initial claims for the week ended August 27, 1949, was 15,969.

As of September 1, 1949, the American Woolen Co. stated that conditions have been picking up. The outlook is favorable for the rest of the year, dependent, of course upon the volume of business that this corporation expects to book within the next few weeks.

In April of 1949, I first brought to the attention of the President's advisers the serious and mounting unemployment in the textile industry of Lawrence, with a plea that some remedial action be taken to alleviate the problem.

DESIGNATE DISTRESS AREAS

The Government after a survey, has since designated 32 areas in the Nation as distressed * * * signifying that in each, 12 or more percent of the labor force is out of work.

The situation was found to be most acute in Bristol, Conn.; Cumberland, Md.; and Lawrence, Mass., where unemployment totaled more than 25 percent. In Lawrence it was close to 40 percent.

In his midyear economic report President Truman said that the specified areas present a serious problem because the total of unemployed in these communities has reached a dangerous proportion.

"These pools of unemployment need to be treated before they spread, and the responsibility is in part national," the President stated.

Under his directive, listings of industries in the affected areas, showing their products and their potential for other work, are forwarded to the various Government procurement agencies, construction agencies, and loan agencies, with instructions to concentrate most of their purchasing in these areas.

Lawrence expects to benefit immediately through Air Force orders for uniform material.

ENCOURAGING FACTORS

Another encouraging factor comes to light with the report that collections of duty on bonded wool withdrawn from customs bond during this August, nearly doubled that of the previous month. This indicates that textile production is picking up and will result in many workers being reemployed after enforced idleness of many months.

Manufacturers are keeping their fingers crossed as they await the outcome of Anglo-American discussions concerning ways and means of closing the dollar gap under which the British economy is laboring. Britain, a large textile producer, may insist on a lowering of tariffs so that she may sell her textiles in the American market. This would be of fatal consequence to American textiles. However, I know that the industry and the Government, sufficiently aware of the peril, will not tolerate such damaging concessions.

The flight of New England textiles, particularly cotton, to low-cost production regions continues. Although there is much talk about this trend, not much in the way of compensating action has been taken to halt it.

PROCESS OF REORGANIZATION

A process of reorganization is going on at the Arlington Mills, Lawrence, Mass., with several top-flight executives stepping out during the past week. Departments are being consolidated and stream lined, new machinery is gradually replacing the old and, as a result, the over-all competitive position of this plant should improve. A regrettable development is that many experienced and valuable workers are being displaced from jobs by this modernization. In Lawrence, we hope to attract other industries to take up this slack and to provide for a much-needed diversification of economic activity for the community as a whole.

I have long been an advocate of public-power developments for New England for I believe that we are operating at a disadvantage, compared with other sections of the Nation, in our failure to utilize to the fullest, this one natural resource of our region. We cannot afford to neglect any factor, however marginal it may be, that will help industry without sacrificing the improved wage-levels of our workers.

I am also impressed with the research progress of certain of our great industries in the United States. And I hope that our textile industry will constantly experiment, not only on improvements in machinery, in production and marketing methods but with an eye to the development of synthetic, low-cost raw materials upon which the future of the industry depends.

The textile industry cannot stand still. It must pioneer in every department. Although the production-employment temperature is slowly rising from a chilling "low" it will not get up to normal without aggressive and imaginative leadership.

Summary of Mississippi War Casualties—Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted in the RECORD the official War Department list of soldiers from Mississippi who lost their lives in the recent war.

I have now secured the Mississippi list of the ones who lost their lives while serving in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, together with their post-office addresses, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this time, together with an important explanatory notice which the Navy Department issued concerning this list of brave Mississippians who made the supreme sacrifice, or suffered serious injuries in the recent conflict.

The matter referred to follows:

STATE SUMMARY OF WAR CASUALTIES—MISSISSIPPI—NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Inclusion of names in this State group has been determined solely by the residence of next of kin at the time of notification of the last wartime casualty status. This listing does not necessarily represent the State of birth, legal residence, or official State credit according to service enlistment.

Casualties listed represent only those on active duty in the United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, resulting directly from enemy action or from operational activities against the enemy in war zones from December 7, 1941, to the end of the war. Casualties in the United States area or as a result of disease, homicide, or suicide, in any location are not included.

This is a State summary taken from casualty lists released by the Navy Department, corrected as to the most recent casualty status and recorded residence of next of kin.

Personnel listed as missing are under continuous investigation by the Navy Department, and therefore are subject to momentary status change. Many of these will be officially presumed or determined dead. Some will be found alive. The last official notice to next of kin will take precedence over this list.

The wounded tabulation represents a count by individuals and includes only those whose next of kin were officially notified during the war. It does not reflect the number of wounds inflicted by the enemy since many individuals were wounded more than once and many minor wounds were recorded only by Purple Heart awards in the fields of action. Complete data on all wounded naval personnel will be available later.

(Compiled May 1946 by Casualty Section, Office of Public Information, Navy Department.)

State summary of war casualties—Mississippi

Dead:	
Combat	601
Prison camp	22
Missing	9
Wounded	904
Released prisoners	80
Total	1,616

KILLED IN ACTION, DIED OF WOUNDS, OR LOST LIVES AS RESULT OF OPERATIONAL MOVEMENTS IN WAR ZONES

A

Abels, Cephus J., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl H. Abels, 108 Bachman St., Kosciusko.

Ables, Clarence E., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Clara T. Ables, 1312 Grove St., Vicksburg.

Adair, Jeff Robert, Pharmacist's Mate 3c., USN. Father, Mr. Ollie Adair, Box 170A, Rt. 2, Belzoni.

Adams, Joe Willie, Jr., Gunner's Mate 2c., USN. Mother, Mrs. Dosha Adams, Water Valley.

Adams, John Robin, Fireman 1c., USN. Wife, Mrs. Billie H. Adams, 316 Davis Ave., Pass Christian.

Adams, Otto Alvin, Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Morris Elmer Adams, Rt. 1, Moorhead.

Adams, William C., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Leverne Adams, RR 3, West.

Adkins, Raymond Ford, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Johnnie Olear Adkins, Rt. 1, Pittsboro.

Ahrend, Charles Jefferson, Technical Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Valaire L. Ahrend, Union Church.

Alexander, Toy, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David Alexander, Rt. 4, Jayess.

Alford, Elwin, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Warren E. Alford, Jr., 1202 E. Harrison St., Pascagoula.

Allen, L. C., Mess Attendant 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lucy Allen, Rt. 2, Box 215, Greenwood.

Allen, Robert K., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Jewell Allen, Rt. 4, Magnolia.

Allred, John A., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. William W. Allred, Rt. 4, Laurel.

Anderson, Burnett Wallace, Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Olen Lacar Anderson, Rt. 2, Box 139, Perkinston.

Anderson, Levi Major, Cook 3c, USN. Father, Mr. Charles Anderson, Box 446, Cleveland.

Anderson, Toxie, Gunner's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Irene Anderson, Moselle.

Anding, William Thomas, Quartermaster 1c, USN. Father, Mr. William J. Anding, Cannonsburg.

Anthony, James Clint, Electrician's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ozell Anthony, RFD 2, Box 127, Forest.

Armstrong, James Elbert, Radioman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ida B. Armstrong, 735 Farmer St., Vicksburg.

Armstrong, Thomas W., Sgt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Thomas W. Armstrong, Rt. 4, Florence.

Arrington, John Francis, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Arrington, Rt. 2, Shubuta.

Attaway, James Ruble, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Attaway, Rt. 2, Nettleton.

Averhart, Vernon McCoy, Officer's Cook 3c, USN. Father, Mr. Henry Donald Averhart, Rt. 5, Lexington.

B

Bagley, Edwin Russell, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William W. Bagley, Rt. 1, Box 244, Forest.

Bagwell, Charlie A., Jr., Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Charlie A. Bagwell, Sr., Rt. 2, Kilmichael.

Bailey, Kennon G., Assistant Cook, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Kennon G. Bailey, Richton.

Baker, Oren David, Sr., Fireman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Bertha Aleen Baker, 207 N. Poplar St., Greenville.

Ballard, Robert Evans, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Maxine Ballard, Rt. 1, Box 177B, Shaw.

Barber, Edward, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lester D. Barber, Rt. 1, Box 67, Columbia.

Barber, Horace Lawson, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ozie Barber, Rt. 2, Amory.

Barfield, Walter Travis, Storekeeper 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. James Leslie Barfield, DeKalb.

Barkley, Troy C., Aviation Radioman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. James Elmer Barkley, Ripley.

Barlow, Laurence Lee, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert O. Barlow, Rt. 3, Tylertown.

Barnett, William B., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred D. Barnett, Rt. 1, Dixon.

Baronich, Martin Paul, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Martin Paul Baronich, 223 Sophia St., Biloxi.

Barton, Robert Elee, Steward's Mate 2c, USSNR. Mother, Mrs. Emma Russell, PO Box 584, Itta Bena.

Bates, Frances M., Cpl., USMCR. Father, Mr. Daniel M. Bates, Rt. 4, Philadelphia.

Baxter, Thomas R., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Flemn T. Baxter, Rt. 3, Lumberton.

Beach, Revis C., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel I. Beach, Gen. Del., Hazlehurst.

Beall, Bentone Wilson, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Pearl Armstrong, Gen. Del., Hazlehurst.

Becker, Thomas D., 2d Lt., USMCR, Wife, Mrs. Thomas D. Becker, c/o Twin Oaks, Natchez.

Beck, Oree Charles, Assistant Cook, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Beck, Sr., Rt. 1, Heidelberg.

Beckett, Robert Andrew, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cullen C. Beckett, Bruce.

Beckton, Murphy, Officer's Steward 3c. Mother, Mrs. Maggie Beckton, 3401 Twelfth St., Meridian.

Bell, Marvin W., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Dock A. Bell, Box 314, Ethel.

Benton, Dora T., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Irene T. Benton, 1136 Tenth Ave., Laurel.

Bessonette, Charles Thurman, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leon Bessonette, Rt. 1, Brookhaven.

Bethea, Edward Talmadge, Seaman 1c., USCGR. Father, Mr. W. C. Bethea, Rt. 2, Ellisville.

Bilbo, Eldridge A., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John W. Bilbo, Rt. 2, Box 328, Biloxi.

Blanton, Walter A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Love A. Blanton, 1025 Shady St., Columbus.

Bloombergh, Augustus Alexis Susan James, Lieutenant, USNR. Mother, Mrs. William Bell Martin Bloombergh, 620 College St., Jackson.

Blount, Newton Buford, Captain, USMCR. Uncle, Mr. John M. Balis, 218 West Fourth St., Hattiesburg.

Bludworth, Robert Florentine, Jr., Apprentice Seaman, USNR. Father, Mr. Robert F. Bludworth, Sr., 900 S. Pascagoula St., Pascagoula.

Boals, Clinton W., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Herbert L. Boals, Rt. 3, Walnut.

Boland, Cecil Horton, Aviation Radioman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. Charles Bethell Boland, Rt. 3, Pontotoc.

Bolis, Henry R., Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Emily Bolis, Gen. Del., Crystal Springs.

Booth, Thomas, Steward's Mate 1c., USN. Wife, Mrs. Rebecca Booth, Star Rt. 1, Box 37, New Augusta.

Bond, Burnis L., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ellen S. Bond, Wiggins.

Boulanger, Columbus, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillie Bourlanger, Box 409, Carthage.

Bounds, Claude Wilburn, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Maggie Blackburn Bounds, 635 Columbia, Hattiesburg.

Bourland, Charles Wood, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Cora Lillian Bourland, Guntown.

Bowers, Robert E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George F. Bowers, Rt. 1, Sidon.

Bowie, Clovis W., Jr., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Clara Bowie, Box 5, Highpoint.

Brady, Frank Dempsey, Fireman 1c, USNR. Brother, Mr. Dewey Brady, Roxie.

Bramlett, Adrian, Gunner's Mate 3c, USN. Father, Mr. G. L. Bramlett, Bruce.

Brantley, H. R., Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Houston Riley Brantley, Sr., Greenville.

Bratton, Ottis L., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Ottis L. Bratton, Rt. 1, Pittsboro.

Bratu, Cecil Victor, Radioman 3c, USCG. Mother, Mrs. Lemmer Bratu, Laurel.

Breakfield, Isaac, Warrant Officer, USMC. Sister, Mrs. Bettie M. Holder, 909 Gill St., Columbia.

Bridges, Raymond Leon, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Leon Bridges, Star Rt., Braxton.

Brooks, George Wright, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Colom Odell Brooks, Rt. 1, Carthage.

Brooks, Harry Lenwood, Jr., Boatswain's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Nellie Mae Brooks, 1515 Central St., Jackson.

Brown, Amos, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Jennie Brown, Gen. Del., Magee.

Brown, Joseph Clifton, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lizzie R. Brown, Rt. 2, Brookhaven.

Brown, Max Donner, Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Henry Clay Brown, Box 320, Grenada.

Brown, Ralph Alonza, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Ed Washington Brown, 305 Fortieth St., Meridian.

Brown, Winton O., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. William O. Brown, Box 124, Tchula.

Bruce, Robert Lee, Steward's Mate 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Bruce, Rt. 1, Box 31, Coldwater.

Bruce, William H., 1st Lt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ruth E. Bruce, box 402, Clinton.

Bryant, Everett, Jr., Radarman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Everett Bryant, Sr., Rt. 2, Foxworth.

Bulford, John David, Jr., Machinist, USN. Wife, Mrs. Gladys Ellen Buford, 1304 Thirty-sixth Ave., Gulfport.

Burns, Ufa S., Sgt., USMC. Fother, Mrs. Mittie L. Burns, box 279, Union.

Bynum, Gains Curly, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Bynum, Rt. 5, Laurel.

Bynum, Rufus Hardy, Quartermaster, 1c., USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Bynum, 1009 Douglas St., Corinth.

Byrd, Faris G., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Vera L. Byrd, Bellefountaine.

Byrd, James M., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James M. Byrd, 1626 Twelfth Ave., Meridian.

Byrd, Roosevelt, Cook 2c., USN. Mother, Mrs. Ula Byrd, Rt. 1, Box 84, Slate Spring.

C

Cagle, Thomas Vinson, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Cagle, Sr., Rt. 2, Purvis.

Calhoun, Jack Starr, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie Shepard Calhoun, Mount Olive.

Callahan, Grady L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elijah L. Callahan, Rt. 1, Hattiesburg.

Cameron, James William, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Nettie Fairley Cameron, Wiggins.

Camp, Leo Donald, Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Vinnette Camp, 945 Main St., Biloxi.

Campbell, Robert Andrews, Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Beatrice L. Campbell, c/o B. S. Cooper, Braxton.

Campbell, Warren Edmond, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Charles Edmond Campbell, Rt. 1, Holcomb.

Canty, W. H., Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Sister, Mrs. Dorothy Lee Forsberg, 200 Krebs Ave., Pascagoula.

Caraway, James Toxis, Chief Commissary Steward, USN. Wife, Mrs. Mytrle Caraway, Rt. 4, Box 230A, Meridian.

Carpenter, John Raymond, Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy Roberta Carpenter, Box 13, Woodland.

Carroll, Wilber O., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John E. Carroll, Gen. Del., Magee.

Carruth, Wilson Aspasio, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. L. Carruth, Rt. 3, Sumrall.

Carter, John W., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Annie V. Carter, Rt. 1, Raymond.

Cathcart, William C., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Cathcart, Gen. Del., Plantersville.

Caughman, Hondel LaBarre, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Grady Caughman, Burns.

Cayten, Eldridge, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ander Cayten, Rt. 1, Purvis.

Chadwick, Charles Bruce, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Charles Wright Chadwick, Rena Lara.

Chalmers, John Wilbur, Jr., Aviation Radioman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John W. Chalmers, Sr., 7 Homochitto St., Natchez.

Chancellor, Homer Eugene, Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Joyce Lynn Chancellor, 1109½ W. Capital St., Jackson.

Chapman, Arthur Gibson, Motor Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Henry Chapman, Sr., Rt. 3, Box 179, Osyka.

Chapman, Eddie R., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary M. Chapman, 921 Pearl River Ave., McComb.

Chapman, Vernon Dow, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Vernon S. Chapman, Coffeeville.

Clark, Cecil Vernon, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Sarah Linda Clark, Rt. 1, Box 83, Lyman.

Clark, Cullen Benjamin, Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Marion Franklin Clark, Rt. 1, Laurel.

Clark, Earnest A., 1st Lt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Clark, Rt. 3, Box 14, Seminary.

Clay, Jesse L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse J. Clay, Rt. 4, Pontotoc.

Cleveland, J. V. Dale, Signalman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Adolphus Armstrong Cleveland, Rt. 2, Fulton.

Cliburn, Cletus, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Vergie Cliburn, c/o D. W. Welch, Magee.

Cochran, James V., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Herman Cochran, Rt. 1, Box 114, Isola.

Cockrell, Alvin C., Jr., 1st Lt., USMCR. Father, Dr. Alvin C. Cockrell, Sr., Hazlehurst.

Coleman, Lewis Freeman, Chief Fire Controlman, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Louise Coleman, 614 Kuhn St., Biloxi.

Collins, Conner DeWitt, Jr., Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Conner DeWitt Collins, Sr., 815 Randolph St., Holly Springs.

Collins, Frank Ervin, Jr., Aviation Radioman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. Collins, Sr., Coffeeville.

Collins, James, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Rosie Lee Collins, 3007 Railroad St., Meridian.

Collins, James Dorsey, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Naomi Lester Collins, Box 141, Drew.

Collins, Percy, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR, Wife, Mrs. Bessie Mae Collins, 313 Cleveland St., Greenville.

Collins, Sidney E., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Jewel M. Collins, Gen. Del., Fayette.

Collins, Vernon C., Electrician's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Collins, 104 College St., Grenada.

Conn, Willard Earl, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. William R. Conn, Gen. Del., Steens.

Cook, John B., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Cook, Rt. 3, Decatur.

Cooley, John Paul, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN, Father, Mr. James Hughes Cooley, Waynesboro.

Cooper, Reuben C., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ruby M. Cooper, Gen. Del., Tylertown.

Cosby, Edward H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Sudie Cosby, Rt. 1, Rienzi.

Cotten, Gerod Louis, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Rosa Verta Hammock, Rt. 2, McCall Creek.

Covington, Cecil Lavelle, Yeoman 3c, USCG. Mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Covington, Rt. 3, Meridian.

Cowart, John Thomas, Electrician's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Cowart, Rt. 2, Brookhaven.

Cox, Homer Dudley, Storekeeper 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Jeannette Gulledge Cox, 195 E. Fortification St., Jackson.

Crimm, Cecil L., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur L. Crimm, Rt. 1, Forest.

Crisco, Maxie Joe, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alvin L. Crisco, Rt. 2, Hazlehurst.

Crockett, Milton M., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James B. Crockett, Gen. Del., Tyro.

Crofford, A. B., Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Eva Crofford, Ivy Henry Farm, RFD, Marks.

Crout, Jacob Vincent, Aviation Radioman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Bowen Crout, Rt. 1, Box 220, Columbia.

Cuevas, George Lenard, Jr., Coxswain, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George L. Cuevas, Sr., 112 Bookter St., Bay St. Louis.

Culp, John R., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. John C. Culp, Rt. 1, Batesville.

Curran, Michael J., Jr., Captain, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Michael J. Curran, Jr., 312 North St., Yazoo City.

Curtis, Harvey Arnold, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Thomas L. Curtis, 1321 Harrison St., Vicksburg.

Curtis, Herbert Smith, Jr., Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Herbert S. Curtis, Sr., Rt. 1, Kilmichael.

D

Dalton, Stanley Fayette, Aviation Ordnanceman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Wilma Litew Dalton, Lexington.

Daly, James Welch, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Leo Daly, Purvis.

Danner, George Arnold, Lieutenant, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Louise Combel Danner, 554 Forrest Ave., Biloxi.

Dardon, LeRoy, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lucy Dardon, 206 McGee St., Leland.

Davenport, James Watson, Jr., Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. James W. Davenport, Sr., 120 N. Twentieth Ave., Hattiesburg.

Davis, Donald Avil, Torpedoman's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. George Otho Davis, Lumberton.

Davis, Fred Lee, Assistant Cook, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas L. Davis, 103 Lee St., Kosciusko.

Davis, James T., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mattie Davis, Rt. 2, Carpenter.

Davis, Kenneth Graham, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Charles Davis, Seminary.

Davis, Leland Lafroy, Machinist, USN. Mother, Mrs. Connie Lee Davis, 147 Rankin St., Jackson.

Dawsey, Claud, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Levicy Dawsey, Rt. 1, Box 235, Picayune.

Decker, Denzil M., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Denzil M. Decker, Sr., Gen. Del., Shelby.

Deese, Wayne Mills, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hardy Deese, Rt. 3, Corinth.

De Long, William Welton, Jr., Boatswain's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Grace Helena DeLong, 2323 Twenty-first Ave., Gulfport.

De Priest, Stanley E., 2d Lt., USMCR. Aunt, Mrs. Addie Stanley, 215 Dampeer St., Crystal Springs.

Dethloff, Frank Albert, Water Tender 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lulu Dethloff, Escatawpa.

Dial, John Buchanan, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. C. C. Dial, 1403 River Ave., Hattiesburg.

Dick, Floyd Anthony, Electrician's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Joseph Dick, 413 John Henry St., Pascagoula.

Dickens, Arthur J., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lida E. Dickens, Gen. Del., Moss Point.

Dickerson, James David, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry A. Dickerson, P. O. Box 335, Kosciusko.

Dismuke, Wilfred Julius, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Frank Dismuke, North Hopkins and Charter Sts., Biloxi.

Dixon, Billy Harrison, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Iley Dixon, Star Rt., Hickory Flat.

Dodd, William P., Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Dodd, Box 46, Ethel.

Doolittle, William J., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nana B. Doolitle, 716 W. Pearl St., Jackson.

Doss, William Hillery, Hospital Apprentice 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Kathleen Doss, 1524 36th Ave., Meridian.

Dotson, Major Melvin, Jr., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Major M. Dotson, Sr., Rt. 2, Brandon.

Dougherty, Robert H., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Dougherty, Gen. Del., Coldwater.

Dousay, Willie Emmit, Jr., Seaman, 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie Emmitt Dousay, Sr., Rt. 5, Liberty.

Drew, Harry Laverne, Radioman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. G. Drew, 618 Fifty-second St., Meridian.

Duckworth, Thomas, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Jasper E. Duckworth, 1724 Bell Ave., Columbus.

Dunagin, Charles A., 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Charles A. Dunagin, Box 66, Houston.

Duncan, Joe Edward, Seaman, 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. James T. Duncan, Farmington Rt. 2, Corinth.

Dunnaway, Mason Lewis, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ocie Larue Dunnaway, Rt. 1, Foxworth.

E

Edwards, Harvey Dee, Machinist's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Earline Edwards, 1605 W. Capitol St., Jackson.

Ellerman, Nolan James, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Douglas Ellerman, 2325 24th Ave., Gulfport.

Ellington, Claude, Pfc., USMCR. Sister, Mrs. Juanita McCann, Rt. 1, Sturgis.

Embrey, James Sidney, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Embrey, Rt. 2, Hernando.

England, Rufus Junior, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Mack England, Rt. 1, Big Creek.

Ethridge, George Erskine, Storekeeper 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lillie Kelly, Rt. 1, Collins.

Eubanks, James Harold, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar J. Eubanks, Rt. 4, Box 58, Hattiesburg.

Evans, William Henry, Chief Water Tender, USN. Mother, Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Evans, Crystal Springs.

Everett, Joe Victor, Fireman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. I. G. Everett, Braxton.

Ezell, Oceamus, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Ezell, Rt. 2, Hamilton.

F

Farish, Eddie Wilborn, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mavis Louise Farish, Rt. 1, Black Hawk.

Farmer, Loyd Edwin, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Edwin B. Farmer, Shaw.

Ferguson, Charles Venable, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Joseph Green Ferguson, Hickory.

Ferguson, Charlton Hanna, Musician 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Unis Zeb Ferguson, 312 N. Madison St., Kosciusko.

Ferguson, LaVern Lee, Yeoman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur Lee Ferguson, Danby.

Ferguson, Paul Ray, Metalsmith 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Paul Elbert Ferguson, 922 Washington Ave., Pascagoula.

Fitzgerald, James Flood, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Sister, Mrs. Mary Fitzgerald Lowden, 2105 Cherry St., Vicksburg.

Fitzgerald, Robert Ernest, Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Ellis J. Fitzgerald, Rt. 2, New Albany.

Flowers, Hubert, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. James Bammer, Gen. Del., Duffee.

Flowers, Shelby A., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ivy W. Flowers, 2408 Marshall St., Vicksburg.

Folger, Edward Wheelock, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Georgia Folger, Box 207, Tupelo.

Fondren, Jake D., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Jake D. Fondren, 363 Glendale St., Jackson.

Forbes, Frank, Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Egbert Forbes, Rt. 1, Sandyhook.

Forman, James Hubert, Lieutenant (jg), Supply Corps, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Julius Moyese Forman, 224 August St., Indianola.

Fortenberry, Alvie Charles, Coxswain, USN. Father, Mr. Archie Arthur Fortenberry, Magnolia.

Fowler, Dan Haywood, Coxswain, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Henry Fowler Star Rt., Box 11, Vaughan.

Franklin, William Aubry, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Carry Mable Franklin, Rt. 1, McCool.

Frazier, Percy Lamar, Motor Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Ed Frazier, Rt. 2, Sweatman.

Frisby, Bigelow Gilbert, Fireman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Veda Jean Spikes Frisby, c/o Mrs. Aubrey Baxter, Rt. B, Poplarville.

Frishman, Jack S., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Abe Frishman, Port Gibson.

Fritts, John Forest, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Roberta Council Fritts, 120 N. Denver St., Jackson.

Fullilove, Gordon Harvey, Jr., Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Harvey Fullilove, Sr., Rt. 1, Winona.

Furtick, John D., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Laura E. Furtick, Rt. 1, Booneville.

G

Gannon, Otis Charles, Aviation Radioman 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Florence Lanora Gannon, 225 Orange St., Pascagoula.

Garrison, Dorris Gwin, Radioman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Levi Robert Garrison, Rt. 1, Union.

Garrison, Herbert E., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert E. Garrison, Sr., Gen. Del., Elizabeth.

Gary, James Crisler, Jr., Chief Fire Controlman, USN. Wife, Mrs. Annie Lee Gary, Box 734, Terry.

Gates, Alex S., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Alex Gates, 909 Gill St., Columbia.

Gates, Bascom Eugene, Jr., Ensign (sc), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bascom E. Gates, Sr., Box 153, Rosedale.

Gholston, James Marvin, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Tannis L. Gholston, Rt. 3, Baldwyn.

Gibson, Edwin R., Field Cook, USMCR. Father, Mr. James C. Gibson, Jr., Rt. 6, DeKalb.

Gilbert, Otis C., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Otis E. Gilbert, Gen. Del., Box 54, Stoneville.

Gilbert, Warner, Jr., Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Kate Gilbert, Box 275, New Albany.

Gilbert, Warner, Jr., Seaman 1c. USN. Father, Mr. Elmer L. Gilmore, 1408 Eleventh Ave. S., Columbus.

Gill, Warner E., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Warner E. Gill, Box 256, Magnolia.

Glenn, Thomas Broderick, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. T. N. Glenn, 308 Longino St., Jackson.

Golson, Graham E., 1st Lt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Graham T. Golson, Houston.

Gonia, Hugh Tracy, Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ruby Baker, 24 North St., Hazlehurst.

Goode, John Howard, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Calvin Goode, Rt. 1, Cedar Bluff.

Goodwin, Vernon L., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Mabel Goodwin, 1750 Grand Ave., Jackson.

Goss, Howard William, Water Tender 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Bertha Wyatt Goss, Rt. 1, Neshoba.

Gotliboski, Thomas Jacob, Chief Water Tender, USN. Wife, Mrs. Edna Genevieve Gotliboski, Box 232, Long Beach.

Granier, James A., 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James A. Garnier, care of R. S. Majure, Newton.

Grantham, Evans Cercel, Fireman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. William M. Grantham, Rt. 1, Star.

Graves, James Melvin, Seaman 2c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Virginia Christine Graves, Rt. 5, Tylertown.

Graves, Willie E., Platoon Sergeant, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Willie E. Graves, 14 Monticello St., Hazlehurst.

Graves, Willie R., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary B. Graves, RFD 1, Box 44, Sharon.

Gray, Amos H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother Mrs. Vessie Gray, Gen. Del., Raymond.

Gray, Robert Henry, Jr., Chief Gunner's Mate, USN. Mother, Mrs. Guila Gray, Coffeeville.

Gray, Steven T., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Alline R. Gray, Rt. 1, Box 154, Belzoni.

Green, George, Seaman 2c., USNR. Brother, Mr. J. H. Green, Pulaski.

Green, Glen Hubert, Seaman 1c., USN. Father, Mr. Barry Walker Green, Rt. 1, Paulding.

Green, Hezzie, Steward's Mate 2c., USNR. Father, Mr. Leonia Green, Rt. 2, Box 100, Dorsey.

Green, James Bennett, Seaman 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Asa Green, Rt. 4, Meridian.

Greene, Ellis N., Platoon Sergeant, USMC. Father, Mr. Marvin R. Greene, Rt. 1, Dorsey.

Griffith, Edwin Cyrus, Pharmacist's Mate 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Clinton Griffith, Rt. 1, Box 171, Gloster.

Grubbs, James Earl, Seaman 2c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Burnley Grubbs, Rt. 1, Shivers.

Guest, Howard E., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Pearl Guest, P. O. Box 155, Marks.

Guice, William Lee, Jr., Lieutenant, USN. Father, Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Guice, Sr., First National Bank Building, Biloxi.

Guin, Charles L., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Hackett, Box 602, Greenville.

Gumm, Charles Criss, Fireman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Opal Maxine Gumm, Calhoun City.

Gunter, Berchart Kenneth, Radioman 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Van Gunter, Rt. 3, Lucedale.

Gurley, Thomas Rentz, Quartermaster 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Reba Elizabeth Gurley, 209 Penn St., Corinth.

H

Hague, Douglas Kell, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Pearl Rose Gautier Hague, Box 36, Pascagoula.

Hales, Billy Earl, Gunner's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elige Bryne Hales, Mendenhall.

Hall, James Theodore, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Hall, Rt. 2, Cleveland.

Hammett, Harold, Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Eva J. Hammett, Rt. 5, Hattiesburg.

Hancock, Frank, Jr., Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Father, Mr. Frank Flowers Hancock, Bentonia.

Haney, Josh Oden, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph S. Haney, 807 Thirty-eighth Avenue, Gulfport.

Hankins, Marvin Rex, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Curtis Hankins, Box 112, RFD 1, Dorsey.

Hanser, Rutherford, Steward's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Bertha Howard, 640 Bell Aire St., Greenville.

Hardee, Armestead Sigrest, Aviation Radioman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Armestead Hardee, Sandersville.

Hardisty, George, Pfc, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Irene Hardisty, 308 Reynoir St., Biloxi.

Harrell, Robert Charles, Fireman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Robert Clyde Harrell, 401 Earl St., Jackson.

Harris, James W., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley H. Harris, Box 242, Itta Bena.

Harris, Joseph Jessie, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe J. Harris, Rt. 1, Rose Hill.

Harrison, Charles Ray, Aviation Ordnanceman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David Lee Harrison, Rt. 1, Laurel.

Harrison, James McLaurin, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marion Harrison, Little Rock.

Harrison, Mack Ray, Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lillian Delanel Harrison, 709 Eighteenth St., Eastlawn, Pascagoula.

Hart, Thomas David, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ava F. Hart, Gen. Del., Crystal Springs.

Hayes, Charles Sidney, Storekeeper 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Henry Hayes, Farmhaven.

Hayles, John Thomas, Jr., Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. John Thomas Hayles, Sr., Rt. 3, Water Valley.

Hayles, Raymond Sisler, Fireman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Erin Alto Hayles, Rt. 3, Water Valley.

Hayman, Rue L., Pfc, USMCR. Daughter, Miss Jane A. Hayman, c/o Mr. and Mrs. Wallace J. Hayman, Rt. 3, Pelahatchee.

Haywood, William C., Cpl., USMC. Uncle, Mr. James K. Short, Enterprise.

Henderson, Alfred Delano, Officer's Steward 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Harneatha Johnson, Raymond.

Henderson, James Webster, Seaman 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Arrella Henderson, 210 Bell St., Jackson.

Hensarling, Lemar F., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mattie M. Breland, RFD 2, Hattiesburg.

Herrington, Haskell Raymon, Yeoman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Ben Herrington, Mount Olive.

Hester, Frank R., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ruth Hester, Rt. 3, Sallis.

Hester, Harris Ryland, Ensign, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mable Bernrenter Hester, 215 Fifth Avenue, S., Columbus.

Hester, William Donald, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Odell Hester Benjamin, Pontotoc.

Hewitt, Hollis, Mess Attendant 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Ernest Hewitt, Rt. 8, Box 15, Tylertown.

Hicks, John A., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Hicks, RFD 1, Edinburg.

Hicks, Wilson W., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Hicks, Rt. 5, Carthage.

Higginbotham, Sherman, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Virgel Higginbotham, Star Rt., Houston.

Hill, Branch Coleman, Mess Attendant, USNR. Father, Mr. Willie W. Hill, P. O. Box 375, Vicksburg.

Hill, Bryant J., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Major B. Hill, RFD 4, Philadelphia.

Hill, Earl Donaldson, Captain, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eric I. Hill, Sr., Okolona.

Hill, Emmett, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luther Hill, Rt. 4, Ellisville.

Hinton, Charles L., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lizzie A. Hinton, Gen. Del., Soso.

Hinton, Clinton F., Pfc., USMC. Sister, Mrs. Theodore Walley, Box 126-A, Rt. 1, Richton.

Hodge, Roy Ray, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John H. Hodge, Estes.

Hodges, Aubrey D., Staff Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Myrtle Hodges, 324 Beach St., McComb.

Hogue, Alfred Owen, Fireman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lona Deskin, Rt. 2, Box 153, Yazoo City.

Holder, Randolph Mitchell, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Mother, Mrs. Annette Holder, 1205 Lyncrest St., Jackson.

Holder, William Boykin, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Eloise McLain Holder, Rt. 2, State Line.

Holliday, W. F., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. W. F. Holliday, Box 181, Gloster.

Hopper, William Floyd, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Maude Pigford Hopper, DeKalb.

Houston, William Howard, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Grover Houston, Union.

Howard, Zack C., Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Zack C. Howard, Jefferson St., Okolona.

Howe, John Thomas, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer T. Howe, Rt. 1, Walls.

Howell, Reubin Hollis, Fireman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Evelyn Howell, Rt. 2, Box 157, Charleston.

Hubbard, A. G., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Hubbard, Big Creek.

Hudson, Alton Ervon, Boatswain's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dewey Daniel Hudson, Rt. 1, Columbia.

Hudson, Grady, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Hudson, Rt. 4, Box 146, Union.

Hudspeth, Daniel W., Sgt. USMC. Father, Mr. Thomas O. Hudspeth, Rt. 2, Ashland.

Huff, Perry Alfred, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eddie A. Huff, Rt. 4, Corinth.

Hughes, John Benjamin, Seaman 2c, USNR. Uncle, Judge William Hughes, Box 223, Louisville.

Hughes, Opal C., Master Technical Sergeant, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Calla Hughes, RFD 1, Magee.

Hughes, Willard David, Fireman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Vernice Hughes, Rt. 3, Mize.

Hust, Stanley Martin, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Renard Lee Hust, Rt. 1, Hattiesburg.

I

Ingram, Arnold Allen, Coxswain, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jennings Bryan Ingram, Box 201, Bruce.

J

Jackson, Arthur Daniel, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Corinne Jackson, Rt. 1, Taylor.

Jackson, Willie James, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Jackson, Rt. 1, Box. 175½, Maud.

James, Jack Bradford, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Curtis James, Rt. 4, Grenada.

James, Ray, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Sallie James, Gen. Del., Sylvarena.

Johnson, Albert, Jr., Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lorinne Speight, 2359 Prosperity St., Jackson.

Johnson, Chester Rice, Motor Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Ora Lillian Johnson, Rt. 1, Aberdeen.

Johnson, Howell T., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel S. Johnson, Rt. 1, Weir.

Johnson, Murray M., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Murry M. Johnson, Rt. 2, Shannon.

Johnson, Robert Justice, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ella Dunaway Westerfield, 223 Rankin St., Jackson.

Johnson, William Lester, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Eads Johnson, Rt. 5, Lexington.

Johnston, George Sebron, Boilermaker 2c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Patricia Johnston, 522 1st St., Picayune.

Johnston, Jim Hal, Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Frank William Johnston, Wesson.

Jones, Charles T., 2d Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Charles T. Jones, Box 443, Clinton.

Jones, Jerry, Mess Attendant 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lucille Jones, Stonewall.

Jones, Jim, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam L. Jones, RFD 3, Newton.

Jones, Leo, Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Tommie Hope Jones, 1122 Langley Ave., Jackson.

Jones, Oscar Turner, Jr., Radioman 2c USN. Mother, Mrs. Lillian Jones, 329 S. Congress St., Jackson.

Jones, Rollie Gordon, Chief Machinist's Mate, USN. Wife, Mrs. Ruby Hazeleen Jones, Rt. 3, Meridian.

Jones, Roy E., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Jones, Rt. 3, Philadelphia.

Jordan, Grady E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Jordan, Rt. 2, Nesbitt.

Jordan, Lemuel Joseph, Pharmacist's Mate 2c USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mellie Lois Jordan, P. O. Box 45, Ellisville.

Jourdan, James Millard, Boilermaker 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. James A. Jourdan, Iuka.

K

Keen, Henry L., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Aileen Hines, Rt. 3, c/o Harper's Grocery, Florence.

Keenum, Willie R., Field Cook, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Annie D. Keenum, Rt. 1, Calhoun City.

Keigley, Louis H., 2d Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Louis H. Keigley, 503 S. Theobauld, Greenville.

Kellon, Carl, Seaman 1c USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Gibson Porter, Rt. 1, Box 37, Drew.

Kemp, William Marcus, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Marcus B. Kemp, Box 648, Corinth.

Kendall, John Clifton, Gunner's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Clifton Kendall, Rt. 3, Houston.

Kennedy, Aubert, Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. John V. Kennedy, Rt. 1, Box 61, Mendenhall.

Kennedy, John W., Jr., Captain, USMC. Father, Lt. Col. John W. Kennedy, Sr., U. S. Army Infantry Reserve, Port Gibson.

Kimble, Jack Harty, 1st Lt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond V. Kimble, 502 S. Broadway, Greenville.

Kimble, Joseph, Jr., Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Fields Kimble, c/o Pink Rose Cafe, Shelby.

Kinkennon, John Wesley, Coxswain, USNR. Father, Mr. James Perry Kinkennon, Box 156, Gunnison.

Kirby, Harry, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Kirby, Box 116, Newton.

Kirby, Robert Wayne, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Andrew Kirby, Gen. Del., Houlka.

Kitchens, Clovis W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clovis J. Kitchens, Corinth.

Knowles, Edward Earl, Jr., Seaman 2c. USNR. Father, Mr. E. E. Knowles, Sr., 122 Union St., Greenville.

Knox, Jefferson Elmer, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James I Knox, Rt. 7, Meridian.

Kyzar, Robert R., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Roselee Kyzar, 1121 Gill St., Columbia.

L

La Cook, James Elbert, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mae La Cook, Bryant.

Ladner, Gene Clifton, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lumo Ladner, Rt. B, Box 100, Poplarville.

Lamar, Thomas F., Jr., Pfc, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Lamar, Sr., Box 28, Hernando.

Lamb, Auzy L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kelcy J. Lamb, 303 N. Central St., Winona.

Lambert, Cecil Grant, Ship's Cook 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Frank Lambert, Rt. 2, Lucedale.

Lane, Lambert, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lilla M. Lane, Gen. Del., Forest.

Laseter, Marion Kenneth, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Laseter, Rt. 5, Tylertown.

Lass, Robert Merriett, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Maytie Walker Lass, 912 Forest Ave., Kansas City.

Lawhon, Andrew F., 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Andrew F. Lawhon, 812 Allen St., Tupelo.

Lea, Frank, Jr., Coxswain, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Lea, Sr., 1203 School St., Pascagoula.

Lee, Jesse Barry, Quartermaster 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Eugene Lee, Etta.

Lee, William Vinson, Jr., Water Tender 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Addine Clara Lee, 14 Grove St., West Point.

Lepoma, Clarence Manuel, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Theresa Helen Lepoma, Rt. 1, Box 405, Biloxi.

Letort, Francis Vernon, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mary M. Letort, RFD 1, Box 99, Biloxi.

Lloyd, Earl Louis, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl L. Lloyd, Sr., Gen. Del., Glendora.

Libbey, Robert G., Pfc., USMCR. Uncle, Mr. Arza Jay Libbey, 1318 Grove St., Vicksburg.

Lizana, Hilton James, Steward 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Lizana, Rt. 1, Box 350, Pass Christian.

Lofton, John Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Smith Lofton, Rt. 2, Brookhaven.

Lokey, Allen Zane, Jr., Boilermaker 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Allen Zane Lokey, Sr., 118 Inez St., Greenville.

Long, George Washington, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Emmie Graves, 206 L St., Pascagoula.

Long, John Quitman, Fireman 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Rufus C. Long, Rt. 1, Saltillo.

Long, Percy Eugene, Torpedoman's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Long, Box 185, Belzoni.

Loper, Wenson Webster, Radioman 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Lamar Loper, Rt. A, Perkinston.

Love, William Ward, Ship's Cook 1c, USN. Sister, Mrs. Eleanor Maud Craig, 66 Court St., West Point.

Lovett, Horace G., Sgt., USMC. Sister, Mrs. Evelyn L. Pierce, Pearl City.

Lowe, Clarence D., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Lowe, Rt. 2, Box 105, Kosciusko.

Lowe, Ethan Ernest, Jr., Radarman 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ethan Ernest Lowe, Sr., 915 N. West St., Jackson.

Lower, Quincy, M., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Susie Callahan, Star Rt., Denmark.

Lowery, Curtis V., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Gennie Simms, Kosciusko.

Luster, Miles Joseph, Jr., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Dr. and Mrs. Miles J. Luster, Sr., 503 School St., Clarksdale.

Lyon, Gordon L., Jr., 2d Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Gordon L. Lyon, Jr., Indianola.

M

Mabus, Doncil K., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Butler Mabus, Vardaman.

Maddox, Samuel Monroe, Seaman 2c, USCGR. Mother, Mrs. Maybelle Inez Johnson, 219 Bellman St., Biloxi.

Malone, Elvin C., Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Jewel Roper Malone, Box 95, Guntown.

Malone, James Wesley, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mack Malone, Rt. 1, Ripley.

Mann, James T., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Reuben L. Mann, RFD 5, Columbus.

Marbury, Allen Gaston, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nora Drake Marbury, RFD 4, Jackson.

Marie, Thomas Gerald, Seaman 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Octave Marie, 751 Thomas St., Biloxi.

Marks, John Henry, Motor Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Minnie Marks, Rt. 1, Tupelo.

Marlar, Robert Brice, Jr., Boatswain's Mate 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Robert Brice Marlar, Sr., Rt. 1, Burnsville.

Marsicano, Joseph Vincent, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Marsicano, 1019 Main St., Vicksburg.

Mason, Benjamin Franklin, Jr., Fireman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Hettie Lee Mason, Box 22, Mendenhall.

Massey, Archie O. V., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie L. Massey, Rt. 1, Soso.

Massey, Stanley E., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. John A. Massey, Bruce.

Mathieu, Paul Leverne, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Edwina Mathieu, First Ave., Ocean Springs.

Matthews, George R., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Thomas L. Matthews, Rt. 1, Forest.

Maurer, Jack G., Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mary B. Maurer, Round Lake.

Maxey, John Collier, Jr., Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Collier Maxey, Sr., 132 N. Denver, Jackson.

May, Archibald Butt, Lieutenant (jg), USN. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy Courtenay May, 377 Clarence Ave., Pass Christian.

McCain, Robert James, Aviation Radioman 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Virginia Barbara McCain, 767 N. President St., Jackson.

McCall, Quentin W., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Effie McCall, P. O. Box 12, Union Church.

McCann, Thomas James, Baker 2c, USNR. Grandmother, Mrs. May Wommack Cole, Rt. 4, Grenada.

McCardle, Benjamin J., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard L. McCardle, Rt. 3, Richton.

McClain, Johnnie H., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Sammy E. McClain, W. Gresham St., Indianola.

McCrory, Hubert Lee, Ship's Cook 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. John Dee McCrory, RFD 2, Sallis.

McDaniel, Herbert H., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Carl C. Richardson, 2 Lincoln Ave., Natchez.

McDaniel, Paul M., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Clarence M. McDaniel, 204 S. Vine St., Lexington.

McDavid, Theodore Ford, Jr., Aviation Radioman 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Ford McDavid, Sr., Petal.

McDonald, Carl Johnnie, Torpedoman's Mate 3c, USNR. Son, Master William Carl McDonald, % J. M. Few, RFD 2, Water Valley.

McElroy, Warren Monroe, Machinist, USN. Wife, Mrs. Margaret Mae McElroy, Gen. Del., Eddiceton.

McEvers, Harry Blachard, Electrician's Mate 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Beatrice Louise McEvers, Box 203, Hattiesburg.

McGough, Joseph Nelson, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eunice Moore McGough, Rt. 1, Morton.

McKee, Arthur Lawrence, Torpedoman's Mate 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Minnie Lee McKee, Rt. 1, West Enterprise.

McKinney, George Huston, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Russell, Lyon.

McLendon, Wallace Howard, Water Tender 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard McLendon, Rt. 3, Crystal Springs.

McLendon, William, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William McLendon, Sr., Box 83, Hazlehurst.

McMahen, William Cooper, Electrician's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Marvin McMahen, Box 345, Union.

McMillan, James U., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James U. McMillan, 801 Polk St., Vicksburg.

McNeil, Charles L., 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Charles L. McNeil, 410 Wood St., Water Valley.

McNutt, Thomas L., Mess Attendant 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Nancy McNutt, Winona.

Meek, Floyd Shelton, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Emmett Meek, Tyro.

Medlin, John C., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James O. Medlin, Rt. 1, Cotton Plant.

Melton, Carl George, Aviation Radioman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Effie Zoll Melton, Pachuta.

Melton, John Russell, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. John Henry Melton, Box 35, Liberty.

Menard, Alvis Joseph, Machinist's Mate 3c, USCGR. Father, Mr. Clodie Menard, 208 E. Bay View, Biloxi.

Menefee, James Austin, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Cecil Lafayette Menefee, 221 Erie St., Jackson.

Merchant, Robert Andrew, Ship's Cook 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Robert Raymond Merchant, Rt. 1, Cedarbluff.

Merritt, John T., Pfc., USMC. Sister, Miss Cora J. Merritt, RFD 2, Moselle.

Metcalfe, Murrel Grady, Water Tender 1c, USN. Father, Mr. James Ben Metcalfe, Tupelo.

Middleton, Charles R., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ollie E. Middleton, Rt. 1, Mendenhall.

Miller, James A., Fireman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Otis Arthur Miller, Rt. 4, Box 11, Columbus.

Miller, R. L., Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Sally Ann Miller, 1707 E. Third St., Biloxi.

Mills, Charles L., Captain, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Mills, Rt. 1, Tupelo.

Mills, Houston Eugene, Soundman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paulee Mills, 323 Third St., Picayune.

Mister, Joe Eddie, Mess Attendant 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Maggie Mister, 28 Plum St., Grenada.

Mitchell, Robert L., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ida H. Mitchell, 636 Maple St., Natchez.

Mize, Richard Rieser, Jr., Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard R. Mize, Sr., 414 Winter St., Jackson.

Moody, Robert Edward, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Robert Alexander Moody, Rt. 3, Utica.

Moore, James A., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James A. Moore, Rt. 3, Lucedale.

Moore, John Thomas, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Virginia D. Moore, Rt. 3, Woodland.

Moore, Ralph E., Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Dorothy A. Moore, Homestead, Hattiesburg.

Moore, Troy D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Will D. Moore, Rt. 1, Randolph.

Moore, Walter M., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Catherine Moore, 815 Gillespie St., Jackson.

Moore, William E., 1st Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Moore, Rt. 3, Kosciusko.

Moore, William G., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James P. Moore, Rt. 3, Lucedale.

Moore, Willie, Jr., Mess Attendant 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Willie Moore, Sr., 525 Wilson Ave., Tupelo.

Moorman, Madison Kent, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Margueritte Moorman Murphy, Hotel Riviera, Biloxi.

Moran, Warren Joseph, Coxswain, USCG. Father, Mr. Damase V. Moran, Rt. 1, Box 856, Pass Christian.

Morehead, George, 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lula Morehead, Clinton.

Moreland, Lloyd Harold, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ab Lee Moreland, Rt. 2, Merigold.

Mullins, Grady Lamar, Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Mullins, Lena.

Mullins, Harra E., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harra E. Mullins, Sr., RFD 2, Merigold.

Murphree, Jesse E., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arch E. Murphree, Rt. 1, Box 7-A, Lyon.

Murry, Harold T., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jasper T. Murry, 108 Gay Ave., Hattiesburg.

Mustin, Emmett Ray, Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Grace Louise Mustin, Box 762, Hattiesburg.

N

Nabors, Jesse C., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse C. Nabors, Sr., Rt. 1, Houston.

Nagy, Andrew, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Nagy, Sr., 1400 E. Laurel Ave., Hattiesburg.

Nason, James Nickelson, Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ruby Nason Langston, Saltillo.

Nazaretian, Onick, Watertender 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Emma R. Nazaretian, Box 230, Long Beach.

Neal, Oscar Melvin, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Neal, Rt. 3, Utica.

Neal, Ralph Douglas, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Estus Neal, care of H. W. Lambert, Rt. 1, Brookhaven.

Neill, Wiley Bryan, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wiley B. Neill, Sr., Rt. 2, Utica.

Newman, Prentiss, Lieutenant (jg.), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Sam Newman, Rt. 5, Jackson.

Neyland, William Harris, Seaman 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Madison T. Neyland, Rt. 5, Liberty.

Nix, Ralph R., Assistant Surgeon (US Public Health Service), USCG. Wife, Mrs. Jeannette B. Nix, c/o A. J. Bosworth, Box 1075, McComb.

Nolte, David Edward, Chief Pharmacist's Mate, USNR. Brother, Mr. Herman Crisler Nolte, 733 4th St., Yazoo City.

Nordan, William Council, Seaman 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Zack Wilkinson Nordan, Auburn.

Northam, Joseph Hayes, Seaman 1c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Jennie Belle Northam, 812 Bragg Ave., Meridian.

Norwood, Gus Hayward, Coxswain, USN. Father, Mr. Charles W. Norwood, Duck Hill.

Nunley, James Preston, Fireman 1c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy Elizabeth Nunley, Rt. 3, Iuka.

O

Oakes, Enlow Dodson, Signalman 3c., USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Jackson Oakes, Durant.

Oglesby, Lonnie Harris, Seaman 2c., USNR. Father, Mr. A. S. Oglesby, Rt. 1, Box 34-A, Jackson.

Omness, Lawrence E., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Robert L. Omness, 4000 Cooper St., Jackson.

P

Pait, Robert Edward, Boatswain's Mate 2c., USN. Father, Mr. Walter Claud Pait, 307 Miller St., Hattiesburg.

Parham, Fred, Steward 2c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carnel Parham, Rt. 1, Box 41, Tunica.

Parker, Cornelius Judson, Motor Machinist's Mate, 2c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Eloise Pilgreen Parker, Onward.

Parker, James R., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Parker, Rt. 2, Hazlehurst.

Parker, Jackson Welch, Ensign, USN. Mother, Mrs. W. L. Parker, Bonita.

Parker, Jesse Carl, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ennis P. Livingston, 705 18th St., Pascagoula.

Peck, Milton E., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. R. S. Peck, 2409 Oak St., Vicksburg.

Perez, Ernest Chester, Seaman 1c., USNR. Father, Mr. Anthony Michael Perez, 835 Reynoir St., Biloxi.

Perkins, James Gordon, Seaman 1c., USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hudson Perkins, Jr., Benzoni.

Perry, Henry Oliver, Jr., Radioman 3c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry O. Perry, Sr., 204 Center St., Crystal Springs.

Peters, Joseph Bartholomew, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph B. Peters, Sr., 620 Magnolia St., Jackson.

Phagan, Dovie W., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. James G. Phagan, Rt. 1, Cotton Plant.

Phillips, John Henry, Mess Attendant 2c, USN. Father, Mr. John Phillips, Oxford.

Pickens, William W., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Pickens, Gen. Del., Randolph.

Pickering, Harold Durell, Watertender 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Margaret Helen Pickering, Rt. 1, % J. H. Scruggs, Shannon.

Pilgrim, Luther W., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Alma R. L. Pilgrim, 807 13th Ave., Laurel.

Pinson, Oliver Wendell, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Weaver Pinson, Rt. 1, Paden.

Pitts, William Stein, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lucille Pitts, Waynesboro.

Platzer, Robert P., Cpl., USMC. Son, Master Jack C. Platzer, % Mrs. Lina Mastronardi, RFD 3, Box 4C, Vicksburg.

Polson, Roy Henry, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Susie Rose, Rt. 4, Laurel.

Poole, Hilton Gordon, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Father, Mr. John Riley Poole, 366 Jennings St., Jackson.

Poole, John Paul, Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Lamathelle Poole, Box 417, Picayune.

Poole, Minor Butler, Gunner's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Minor Herndon Poole, Clinton.

Poole, Troy R., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey E. Poole, Gen. Del., Morton.

Powers, Dorman Muskedward, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harmon F. Powers, 300 Johnston St., Greenville.

Powers, R. C. Ottis, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Vader Coats Powers, Rt. 1, Tishomingo.

Presley, Sam Davis, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Willie Lynn Presley, Carthage.

Prestridge, Steve Harmon, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lelar Frances Prestridge, Box 224, Amory.

Q

Quinnelly, Walter Wills, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. John Hardee Quinnelly, Rt. 3, Mize.

R

Ragland, Ralph Kyle, Torpedoman's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Duff Ragland, Box 2, Delay.

Raigins, Lee Henley, Gunner's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Arthur Raigins, Prairie.

Raines, Clifford Junior, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Clarence Raines, Sledge.

Randolph, Cleo, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Harriett Randolph, Rt. 1, Box 5B, Silver Creek.

Ratliff, James Williams, Steward's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Randle Ratliff, Box 28, Grace.

Ray, William D., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eugenia D. Ray, 2712 7th St., Meridian.

Reaves, Clyde Victor, Elecrician's Mate 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Audie Belle Reaves, 138 Cagle St., Louisville.

Reed, Henry Edward, Aviation Radioman 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Margaret Nelaline Reed, 212 N. Pennsylvania St., Corinth.

Reed, Hubert Austin, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ira Ollie Reed, Rt. 3, New Albany.

Reed, Louis D., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elijah H. Reed, 225½ Gibbons St., Greenville.

Reed, William T., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Jewel T. Kelley, Blue Mount.

Regions, Jones Peek, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Josephine Regions, Morton.

Reid, Leo Jackson, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Pauline Reid, Stonewall.

Reynolds, James Robert, Specialist 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Arthur Reynolds, Rt. 1, Vossburg.

Rice, William Edgar, Fireman 2c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Mary Alma Rice, 201 Chrisman Ave., Cleveland.

Richards, Clifton Ervin, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Richards, Rt. 2, Box 246, Yazoo City.

Riley, Fair, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Fannie Riley, Box 176, Cleveland.

Robbins, Arthur G., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Robbins, Sr., Rt. 2, Shannon.

Roberts, Benjamin Ellsworth, Water Tender 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Ephraim Ezekiel Roberts, Rt. 1, Hattiesburg.

Roberts, Percy Tubb, Storekeeper 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Maggie Shelton Roberts, Smithville.

Robertson, Carley Campbell, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred H. Robertson, 909 High School Ave., Columbia.

Robertson, John Allen, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Allen Castelman Robertson, 962 North St., Jackson.

Rodgers, Ernest Edwin, Jr., Radioman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Ernest Edwin Rodgers, Sr., 324 Washington St., Yazoo City.

Rogers, Aubrey Joseph, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Rogers, 723 E. Broadway, Yazoo City.

Rogers, James Bertrand, Jr., Signalman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Bertrand Rogers, Sr., 507 Walthall St., Greenville.

Rogers, Ralph H., Jr., Pfc. USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mary K. Rogers, 306 Millsaps Bldg., Jackson.

Rogers, Robert H., Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Rogers, 1221 1st Ave., Jackson.

Roland, Earnest Frank, Fireman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. Frank Roland, Rt. 1, Terry.

Ross, Jack Hailey, Aviation Ordnanceman 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Erwin Ethel Ross, RFD 1, Philadelphia.

Ross, Louis Homer, Fireman 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Barney Franklin Ross, D'lo.

Ruddock, Cecil Roy, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Thomas Jefferson Ruddock, 435 E. 2d St., Pass Christian.

Rutherford, Thomas Perry, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Scott Rutherford, Rt. 3, New Albany.

Rymer, Charles Jesse, Motor Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Ann Rymer, Rosetta.

S

Sadler, Felix H., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Holloman Sadler, Rt. 4, Yazoo City.

Sam, Willie C., 1st Lt., USMCR. Father, Mr. A. M. Sam, 1315 Farmer St., Vicksburg.

Sandidge, Louie Ernest, Jr., Aviation Machinist's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Sandidge, Sr., Rt. 1, Clinton.

Sawford, Clyde Henry, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ruby Sanford, Box 203, Columbus.

Sanford, Hilburn, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh E. Sanford, Rt. 2, Collins.

Sanford, James Leland, Jr., Fireman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Leland Sanford, Rt. 1, Box 21, Clarksdale.

Saucier, Henry Quitman, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Randolph Saucier, Box 429, Sumrell.

Scales, Fred C., 2d Lieutenant, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. N. B. Scales, Crawford.

Schneider, Leonard Mark, Fireman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Chester John Schneider, 737 Church St., Biloxi.

Scott, William Haynes, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer B. Scott, Rt. 2, Box 115, Oakland.

Seale, Euce C., Cpl., USMC. Brother, Mr. Julius Seale, Rt. 1, Natchez.

Severance, Edwin St. John, Chief Motor Machinist's Mate, USN. Wife, Mrs. Pauline Severance, P. O. Box 606, Pascagoula.

Shackelford, Joe Marlin, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Shackelford, Rt. 2, Ripley.

Shattles, David Edward, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David Solomon Shattles, RFD 2, Box 18–E, Pascagoula.

Shepard, Joseph Woodward, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Shepard, 949 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula.

Sherman, Earl Brewer, Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Brother, Mr. J. H. Sherman, Courtland.

Sherman, H. D., Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. H. Daniel Sherman, Taylorsville.

Shirley, Charles McDell, Cook 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Eddie A. Shirley, 1121 Pascagoula St., Jackson.

Shirley, Harold C., Field Music 1c, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lafe Shirley, 2121 24th Ave., Gulfport.

Shoemake, Robert A., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Shoemake, Rt. 3, Richton.

Sides, Perrilon E., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rayburn E. Sides, Rt. 3, New Albany.

Simmons, Asbell, Steward's Mate 3c. USNR. Mother, Mrs. Clara Barkley, 374 Garfield St., New Albany.

Simmons, James Edward, Motor Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ben Simmons, Sr., 115 W. 1st St., Long Beach.

Simmons, John Douglas, III, Ensign, USNR. Father, Dr. John D. Simmons, Jr., Hill Building, Cleveland.

Simmons, Thomas C., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Simmons, Rt. 1, Magnolia.

Simpson, Louis Gordon, Watertender 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Louis Gober Simpson, Water Valley.

Slaughter, Malcolm, Cook 3c, USNR. Father, Mrs. Asa Slaughter, Rt. 2, Box 16, Canton.

Smith, Charles Howard, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Edgar Smith, Rt. 2, Brookhaven.

Smith, David Leon, Cook 3c USNR. Father, Mrs. David Leon Smith, Gary.

Smith, Dewey Lawson, Signalman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James S. Smith, Star Rt., Puckett.

Smith, Frank M., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. M. T. Smith, Box 533, Kosciusko.

Smith, Fred Cecil, Electrician's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Smith, 603 E. Claiborne St., Greenwood.

Smith, Gordon Cleveland, Fire Controlman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ella Jane Smith, RFD 2, Box 90–A, Vicksburg.

Smith, Heidie James, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Elizabeth James Smith, State Line.

Smith, James O., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie B. Smith, Rt. 1, Richton.

Smith, James S, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mamie G. Smith, Liberty.

Smith, Jerry Edwin, Jr., Electrician's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Edwin Smith, Sr., Allen.

Smith, John, Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Emelida Smith, 1312 1st St., Biloxi.

Smith, Loyd B., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Omie B. Smith, Gen. Del., Fulton.

Smith, Richard Mark, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Tasso Smith, 127 Ulman Ave., Bay St. Louis.

Smith, Walter Tharnel, Mess Attendant 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Rosa Lee Smith, Gunnison.

Snell, Robert Jefferson, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Jackson Snell, P. O. 1022, Meridian.

Spell, Aaron Earl, Gunner's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. O. Spell, Rt. 1, Box 46, Isola.

Springer, Wade J., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Springer, Rt. 2, Box 150–B, Clarksdale.

Stanley, John, Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. John F. Stanley, P. O. Box 404, Port Gibson.

Starks, William Gordon, Seaman 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Gladis Blanch Hogue, P. O. Box 218, Bruce.

Staten, Harry Lee, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Staten, Paynes.

Staton, George Norfleet, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George N. Staton, Sr., Box 151, Union.

Stephens, Bobby Ray, Seaman 1st, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Virginia Stephens, Rt. 2, Meridian.

Stephens, Robert Houston, Seaman 1c, USN, Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Stephens, Webb.

Stephenson, Robert Miller, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Vance V. Stephenson, Belden.

Still, Leslie W., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ora Still, Gen. Del., Rich.

Stone, Herbert Francis, Radarman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Herbert Stone, Rt. 1, Gulfport.

Strehle, Fred Albert, Ship's Cook 3c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Maxine Shannon Strehle, 1413 23rd Ave., Meridian.

Stribling, J. W., Fire Controlman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Otha Elijah Stribling, Rt. 2, Houlka.

Stuart, Charles W., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Gussie Stuart, Box 6, Picayune.

Sudduth, Robert Blake, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Octavia Faust Sudduth, Box 362, Pontotoc.

Sullivan, Roland Joseph, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Vander Joseph Sullivan, Rt. 4, Mount Olive.

Sumlin, Jesse, Mess Attendant 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Golden Sumlin, Rt. 3, Box 149, Coffeeville.

Sumrall, Harrell B., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Barney Sumrall, Rt. 1, Foxworth.

Sumrall, Robert, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Sumrall, Rt. 2, Ovett.

Sutton, S. L., Steward's Mate 1c, USNR, Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luke Parks, Metcalfe.

Swinney, Fred Shepard, Aviation Radioman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sharkey Fredric Swinney, Lexington.

Sykes, Clovis L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dalton L. Sykes, Tula Star Route, Oxford.

Sykes, James M., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Sykes, Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Sykes, William David, Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Mabel Estelle Sykes, Vardamann.

T

Tanner, John Howard, Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Delia D. Tanner, 447½ Short 7th Ave., Laurel.

Tanner, Winfred Lewis, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Burlin Tanner, Rt. 1, Box 178, Lucedale.

Tarver, James Wesley, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Columbus Tarver, Box 81, Show.

Tarzi, Johnny F., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Louise Tarzi, 611 DeSota Ave., Clarksdale.

Therrell, Jack, Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold H. Therrell, Rt. 5, Carthage.

Thompson, Clyde Carl, Coxswain, USN. Father, Mr. Webb Thompson, Bassfield.

Thompson, Richard Oliver, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Thompson, Rt. 4, Box 5, Woodville.

Thompson, Solomon, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Father, Isaac Thompson, Rt. 3, McCool.

Thornton, George Hayward, Gunner's Mate 3c, USN. Father, Mr. George Madison Thornton, Rt. 1, Blue Springs.

Thornton, Nathaniel, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Katy Smith, 108 Water St., Yazoo City.

Thornton, Tullie Clarence, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Franklin Thornton, Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Thurman, Albert Judson, Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Helen S. Williamson, 1320 14th Ave., Meridian.

Thurman, Irby Hinson, Machinist's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Cecil Thurman, 204 Magnolia St., Jackson.

Thurmond, Kenneth Laverne, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Thurmond, Box 605, Hollandale.

Toney, Victor Nally, Seaman 1c, USN. Guardian, Mr. Edward J. Lippin, 1019 Labranch St., McComb.

Townley, Millard Clark, Fire Controlman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Napoleon Bonny Townley, Richey.

Townsend, Willie Winsfield, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Willie Mae Townsend, 2115 29th Ave., Gulfport.

Tremmel, John O., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Father, Mr. John O. Tremmel, Sr., 202 Couvas St., Biloxi.

Trest, Guy Colon, Gunner's Mate 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Angus Colon Trest, Foxworth.

Tucker, Julius Stevens, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James S. Tucker, Rt. 1, Collinsville.

Turfitt, Edward D., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Turfitt, Box 373, Centreville.

Turner, Robert Lidell, Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Grady Turner, Drew.

Tutor, Herby O., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter L. Tutor, Rt. 2, Box 28, Serapta.

U

Ulmer, Coleman Ott, Jr., Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Abbie Elizabeth Ulmer, Leakesville.

V

Vance, Frank W., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Myra Vance, Rt. 2, Indianola.

Van Dolah, Justin Shotwell, Jr., Aviation Pilot 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Justin S. Van Dolah, 2208 Wilkes Ave., Biloxi.

Vetter, Adolph R., Captain, USMCR. Grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred R. Raines, Box 181, Hickory.

W

Wade, Durell, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. J. A. Wade, Calhoun City.

Waldrop, Henry Griffen, Jr., Fireman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Griffin Waldrop, Sr., Boonville.

Waldrup, Robert Charles, Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Robert Furman Waldrup, Star Route, Lake Como.

Walker, Elton, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Walker, Rt. 2, Box 17, Senatobia.

Walker, Thomas Willie, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Dovie Katherine Walker, Rt. 4, Pontotoc.

Wallace, Ray Author, Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Eleanor Wallace, Rt. 2, Magee.

Walters, Henry Smedley, Fireman 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Beatrice Walters, % J. W. Pitts, Rt. 1, Ellisville.

Walters, William, Jr., Boatswain's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Walters, Sr., 119 Oaks St., Biloxi.

Ward, Jack P., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Moly Ward, 3 Govan St., Grenada.

Warren, Coleman Yates, Seaman 2c USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mary Warren, % B. W. Smith, Rt. 1, Neshoba.

Washington, James Decordell, Mess Attendant 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Henry Washington, 2 Homochitto St., Natchez.

Weaver, Eugene Newsom, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Fannie Newsom Weaver, 186 Sharp Ave., Cleveland.

Weaver, Jeff, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Jack Weaver, Swan Lake.

Weeks, Robert Herrington, Jr., Chief Gunner's Mate, USN. Mother, Mrs. Mary Jane Weeks, Rt. 1, Quitman.

Welborn, Hillyer W., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Hillyer W. Welborn, Rt. 3, Laurel.

Whaley, James Dudley, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ella Diggs Whaley, Myrtle.

Whayne, Thomas Samuel, Radioman 2c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Audra F. Whayne, 828 Eastview St., Jackson.

Wheat, Alpheus Achilles, Jr., Lieutenant (jg), USN. Wife, Mrs. Christine Wheat, Webb.

Wheatley, Booker Taliaferro, Mess Attendant 1c, USN, Father, Mr. Henry Claiborne Wheatley, Rt. 1, Box 32–B, Summeral.

White, Eugene Lamoreaux, Gunner's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ruth Yvonne White, East Beach, Ocean Springs.

White, Volmer Dowin, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. George L. White, Rt. 1, Kokomo.

White, William L., Sgt. Major, USMC. Sister, Mrs. Amanda W. Phipps, 721 N. Pearl St., Natchez.

Whitehead, James H., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Alvie M. Whitehead, Rt. 3, Booneville.

Whiteley, Earl B., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Jewel E. Whiteley, 3003 Pearl St., Hattiesburg.

Whitfield, Acie W., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Della L. Whitfield, Rt. 3, Mendenhall.

Whitlock, Thomas, Eeaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Emma Whitlock, 312 Willis Ave., Hattiesburg.

Wicker, John Luther, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Wicker, Rt. 1, Pulaski.

Wilde, Gustave Frederick Wilhelm, Jr., Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. A. W. Wilde, 61 Hardy Ct., Gulfport.

Wilkinson, Charles Barkley, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Robert Sidney Wilkinson, Columbia.

Williams, Clyde, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Erby Herrod, c/o Mr. Z. R. Hastings, Bruce.

Williams, Dewey, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Daughter, Miss Dolores Leflore Williams, c/o Margie Owen Williams, Rt. 1, Madison.

Williams, Leonard E., Platoon Sergeant, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Leonard E. Williams, Biloxi.

Williamson, Wesley O., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Wesley A. Williamson, Gen. Del., Lena.

Windham, Henry Roy, Chief Motor Machinist's Mate, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jim Andrew Windham, Rt. 2, Duck Hill.

Wise, Charles Louis, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lois Scott Doering, Rt. A., Perkinston.

Wood, Wyatt Barnes, Storekeeper 1c, USNR. Sister, Miss Louise Wood, 327 Jackson St., McComb.

Woodruff, William C., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. William T. Woodruff, Quincy.

Woodyard, Sam Carl, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Woodyard, Ridgeland.

Wooten, Lowery William, Gunner's Mate 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Forest Wooten, 615 13th St., Laurel.

Y

Yarbrough, James B., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bryant W. Yarbrough, Rt. 2, Noxapater.

Young, Major Eligha, Mess Attendant 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Brown Young, 33 Garden St., Natchez.

MISSING IN ACTION OR DURING OPERATIONAL WAR MISSIONS

A

Atkinson, Wallace, Jr., Lieutenant, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Nancy Atkinson, 324 Ward St., Yazoo City.

B

Barker, James Edward, Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Eliza Barker, Highway Village, Meridian.

Breithaupt, Charles Woodson, Jr., Yeoman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles W. Breithaupt, Sr., 1109 Main St., Vicksburg.

Brown, Guy McAdory, Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Guy M. Brown, Sr., 3300 Drummond St., Vicksburg.

H

Hight, Francis Leon, Aviation Radioman 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Hight, Coffeeville. (Later address, 763 Hollywood St., Memphis, Tenn.)

J

Jones, Leslie Earl, Radio Technician 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Rachel Marie Jones, 601 Washington St., Corinth.

M

Mallard, Joe Robert, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Noah A. Mallard, West Enterprise.

R

Rutledge, Walter Jackson, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nora McCharen Rutledge, 413 Park St., Tupelo.

S

Smith, William Mack, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Father, Mr. Tom Smith, Rt. 1, Brookhaven.

WOUNDED IN ACTION OR DURING OPERATIONAL WAR MISSIONS

A

Abbott, William Gerald, Soundman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Abbott, Sr., 2117 Washington St., Vicksburg.

Abel, Rondo G., Cpl., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Rondo G. Abel, 515 Mitchell Ave., Jackson.

Adair, Wallace G., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Wallace G. Adair, Gen. Del., Shuqualak.

Adams, Horace, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George P. Adams, Gen. Del., Terry.

Adams, Hugh Welton, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lester B. Adams, Gen. Del. Eden.

Adams, William J., Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Wife, Mrs. William J. Adams, Box 83, Rt. 5, Yazoo City.

Adcock, Charles Symoin, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Anderson Monroe Adcock, Rt. 8, Philadelphia.

Ainsworth, Sidney Thomas, Jr., Pfc, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Mary E. Ainsworth, Box 206, Belzoni.

Alexander, Hubert Lee, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Alexander, Rt. 5, Bentonia.

Alexander, Willie W., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lucia I. Bowlin, Gen. Del., McComb.

Alford, Howard L., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard L. Alford, Sr., 208 W. North St., Canton.

Allen, Albert Bryan, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Virginia Rhea Allen, Collinsville.

Allen, Raymond Walter, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Berry Allen, Silver City.

Anderson, Joseph John, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe M. Anderson, 335 Alexander St., Jackson.

Anderson, Leon D., Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Leon D. Anderson, P. O. Box 226, Blue Springs.

Anderson, Lewis E., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie H. Anderson, Rt. 2, Forest.

Anderson, Merrell D., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Merrell D. Anderson, Rt. 2, Cholson.

Anderson, Neville, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rufus C. Anderson, 409 15th Ave., Laurel.

Armour, Joseph Clarence, Jr., Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Armour, Sr., Rt. 1, Coffeeville.

Arnold, Joseph Henry, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. John Arnold, Box 382, Poplarville.

Arnold, Thomas J., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hardy L. Arnold, Sontag.

Austin, Byron Lorenzo, Sr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Zula G. Austin, 409 Van Buren, Oxford.

Averitte George W., Jr., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Father, Mr. George W. Averitte, Sr., 911 Arnold Ave., Greenville.

B

Bailey, Jeffie G., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Jessie N. Bailey, Rt. 1, Sylvarena.

Bailey, Walter D., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tom Bailey, Rt. 1, Pachula.

Baldwin, James Hyde, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Annie L. Baldwin, Box 82, Como.

Bales, Robert E., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Bales, Sr., Box 127, Columbia.

Ball, David William, Torpedoman's mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilford W. Ball, Rt. 3, Box 114, Columbia.

Ball, Iddo William, Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ada Ball, Osyka.

Ball, Nelson Allen, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Ball, Rt. 2, Smithdale.

Ballard, Charlie, Steward's mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Will Ballard, Rt. 1, Box 44, Shuqualak.

Ballard, James Howard, Pfc, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Lois J. Ballard, Rt. 3, Ackerman.

Barden, Harry D., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Leona V. Barden, 221 Jessamine St., Jackson.

Barker, Marshall E., Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Father, Mr. Marshall E. Barker, Sr., Rt. 2, Hazlehurst.

Barlow, John L., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. William N. Barlow, 230 S. 12th Ave., Laurel.

Barlow, John W., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony W. Barlow, Gen. Del., Hazlehurst.

Barnes, James Curtis, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer C. Barnes, Box 262, Gulfport.

Barnes, Travis H., Cpl., USMC. Brother, Mr. Chester B. Barnes, 512 Union St., Greenville.

Bartels, Ronald P., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert J. Bartels, Rt. 1, Box 43–A, Meehan Junction.

Bates, Carl T., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Pearl A. Bates, Rt. 2, Meridian.

Batton, Gus, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel A. Batton, Rt. 2, Crystal Springs.

Baucum, Donald, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold O. Baucum, Rt. 1, Lawrence.

Beasley, Ronald L., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. William J. Beasley, 211 Twenty-third Ave., Meridian.

Beasley, Sidney T., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Sidney T. Beasley, Brookhaven Creamery, Brookhaven.

Beckwith, Byron D., Cpl., USMC. Uncle, Mr. William G. Yerger, 306 George St., Greenwood.

Bell, Reeley, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Bennie Z. Bell, Rt. 4, Box 126A, Starkville.

Benefield, James W., Pfc., USMRC. Wife, Mrs. James W. Benefield, Rt. 4, c/o C. H. Hall. New Albany.

Bennett, James Claiborne, Radarman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie Edward Bennett, 1701 19th St., Gulfport.

Bennett, Julius L., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lola B. Bennett, Gen. Del., Harrisville.

Berry, Lawrence H., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence H. Berry, Sr., Rt. 2, Magee.

Bevon, John A., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Anna Bevon, 402 2d St., Hattiesburg.

Billington, Godfrey William, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Billington, Crowder.

Birdsong, Elton H., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Rema M. Birdsong, RFD 1, Lambert.

Blakeney, Johnny Evaughn, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Blakeney, Rt. 1, Box 12, Weathersby.

Blakeney, Oree L., Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Belle Blakeney, Rt. 2, Taylorsville.

Blankenship, James Orion, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Blankenship, 72 E. Westbrook St., West Point.

Bledsoe, James T., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Emma Mae Bledsoe, 3612 Security St., Vicksburg.

Bond, James Clifton, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Alvanelle Holmes Bond, Rt. 3, Jayess.

Boone, Tommie, Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Myrtis Bullock, Morgantown.

Bounds, Robert Wells, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Bounds, Box 176, Brandon.

Bounds, Thomas A., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Daniel A. Bounds, Rt. 5, Box 332, Meridian.

Bounds, William W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Bounds, Gen. Del., Brandon.

Bourne, James E., 1st Lt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Bourne, Grace.

Bourne, James R., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Bourne, P. O. Box 112, Monticello.

Bowen, John Melvin, Seaman 1c, USNR. Brother, Mr. Cedric S. Bowen, Skene.

Brame, Joe Webb. Carpenter's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Ellis Brame, 322 E. Fortification St., Jackson.

Bratton, Rufus Fort, Water Tender 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Thomas Bratton, Brandon.

Breal, Floyd L., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd L. Breal, Sr., 413 Holley St., Biloxi.

Breeland, Ansel, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Breeland, Rt. 1, Box 389, Columbia.

Breithaupt, William Edward, Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Vivian C. Breithaupt, 1111 Walnut St., Vicksburg.

Breland, Elvis Elawes, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Elbert Breland, Perkinston.

Breland, Jabus H., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gaines E. Breland, Rt. 1, Kokomo.

Brent, George M., Assistant Cook, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. George M. Brent, Rt. 3, Box 63–D, Vicksburg.

Brewer, Ernest Alvin, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. James Brewer, Rt. 2, Box 131, Bolton.

Brewer, Roy J., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy J. Brewer, Sr., 335 Clairmont St., Jackson.

Brister, Hugh N., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Hugh N. Brister, Rt. 2, Jayess.

Brister, Jessie E., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Father, Mr. Eugene Brister, Bogue Chitto.

Britt, Henry A., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elon Britt, Rt. 1, Box 156, Wesson.

Britt, Oscar L., 2d Lt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Margaret F. Britt, Rt. 1, Box 124, Wesson.

Broadus, Philip Collins, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Nora L. Alford, Box 103, Saucier.

Brock, Troy, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Julia A. Brock, Gen. Del., Brownfield.

Brophy, James M., Jr., Ensign, USNR. Father, Mr. James M. Brophy, 906 Adeline St., Hattiesburg.

Browder, Earnest, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. John B. Browder, Rt. 1, Richton.

Brown, Raymond Taylor, Pfc, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Dora M. Brown, 1521 Grand Ave., Jackson.

Brown, Samuel Clevenger, Jr., Chief Torpedoman's Mate, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C. Brown, Sr., 708 Percy St., Greenville.

Brown, Thomas, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Annie Hemphill, Rt. 1, Brookhaven.

Bruce, Oscar O., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar A. Bruce, Rt. 4, Eupora.

Bryan, James O., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dan O. Bryan, Gen. Del., Madden.

Bryant, Jesse D., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mamie Bryant, Gen. Del., Blue Mountain.

Bryant, Norman Clifton, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Loene E. Bryant, Rt. 1, Osyka.

Bullard, William Adrian, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Bullard, Rt. 2, Booneville.

Bunch, Luther H., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hamp Bunch, Clara.

Buntyn, Johnnie D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Otho R. Buntyn, Box 103, Morton.

Burke, Robert J., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Robert J. Burke, Lake Cormorant.

Burks, J. B., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Southern H. Burks, Gen. Del., Etta.

Burrow, Marshall W. Gunnery Sgt., USMCR. Daughter, Miss Romona O. Burrow, % Mrs. Valle B. Burrow, 1123 Madison St., Corinth.

Burton, Joe Ray, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Fannie J. Burton, Catchings.

Busbin, Luther Lee, Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Ura D. Busbin, Rt. 3, West Point.

Busby, Leonard J., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Earline Lyons, 812 Masonite Rd., Laurel.

Buseck, Heinz C., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Auguste L. Buseck, 48 St. Catherine St., Natchez.

Bush, James H., Pfc., USMC. Notified, Mr. Will W. Jones, Gen. Del., Philadelphia.

Butler, Joe, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Butler, 708 E. Amite St., Jackson.

Butler, Wash H., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ella Butler, Rt. 1, Moselle.

Byrd, Owen, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lottie Byrd, Neely.

C

Caillavet, Wilfred Vincent, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred C. Caillavet, 105 Jefferson Davis Ave, Biloxi.

Cain, Byron A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Cain, Rt. 2, Sallis.

Cain, Charles E., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leavy Cain, Rt. 2, Box 1, West.

Caldwell, William T. E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard M. Caldwell, Rt. 2, Goodman.

Campbell, Melvin L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William L. Campbell, Rt. 3, Box 340, Tutwiler.

Campbell, William Joseph, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Vera Campbell, Rt. 2, Brandon.

Cannon, James H., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John W. Cannon, 324 Nearview St., Jackson.

Caperton, Twant Bell, Chief Machinist's Mate, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Evelyn Allen Caperton, 201 E. 3d St., Leland.

Carr, Edward R., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John P. Carr, Gen. Del., Ridgeland.

Carr, John Harvey, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Carr, Sr., Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Carr, Ralph P., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Clyde S. Carr, Rt. 5, Columbus.

Carter, James W., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillie O. Carter, 312 S. Union St., Canton.

Carter, John A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James O. Carter, Rt. 2, Box 71, Yazoo City.

Casey, Emmett T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Emmett C. Casey, Rt. 5, Carthage.

Cassell, Charles Jacob, Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Cassell, Batesville.

Castle, Hardy Vernon, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Green Castle, Chunky.

Castle, Wayne A., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ira Castle, Hinchcliff.

Castleberry, Morris, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ruby Wilson, Darling.

Caulfield, Joseph Alton, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Caulfield, PO Box 237, Centerville.

Cavenaugh, James Earl, Aviation Radioman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Myrtle Thaxton, Mendenhall.

Chambliss, Luther Edward, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Porter Chambliss, Rt. 1, Purvis.

Chandler, Robert Edward, Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Minnie C. Chandler, 1900 Marian Road, Meridian.

Chapman, Irvin C., Pfc., USMC. Aunt, Mrs. Bonnie W. Bass, 523 S. Canal St., Natchez.

Chevalier, Frederick Odessa, Fire Controlman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Joel A. Stevens, Rt. 1, Eden.

Childers, Kearney Lee, Seaman 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Evva Riser Smith, Rt. 5, Laurel.

Childress, John Robinson, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Katherine Lane, Box 334, Flora.

Clark, Albert Bobby, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher H. Clark, Drew.

Clark, Albert Vernon, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Vernon Clark, Sr., Darling.

Clark, Don C., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Don C. Clark, 124 New Orleans St., Hattiesburg.

Clark, Thuma D., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ira Clark, Rt. 1, Neshoba.

Clark, William A., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Samuel F. Clark, Gen. Del., Shuqualak.

Clinton, George William, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lelia May Clinton, Rosedale.

Cochran, Aubra W., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bura D. Cochran, N-82 Briarfield Homes, Hattiesburg.

Cochran, Chester W., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer H. Cochran, Rt. 3, Waynesboro.

Cochran, Duel Fay, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Cochran, Rt. 3, Waynesboro.

Cochran, Hubert McKinley, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William M. Cochran, Rt. 3, Waynesboro.

Cockerham, Charles Henry, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David N. Cockerham, Rt. 1, Shaw.

Cockrell, John K., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Stella M. Cockrell, Rt. 6, Louisville.

Cofer, Howard J., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Claude C. Cofer, Gen. Del., Crowder.

Coffman, Charlie Q., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Addie M. Coffman, P. O. Box 193, Merigold.

Coleman, Leon, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Coleman, 508 2d St., Indianola.

Collier, John D., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Bitha Morrow, 4711 Finley St., Gulfport.

Collier, Lee Earl, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe H. Collier, Rt. 4, Ripley.

Collins, Wilson Hollis, Platoon Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alvah A. Collins, 1616 First Ave., Laurel.

Conerly, William M., Jr., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William M. Conerly, Tylertown.

Conn, Claude H. Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. William A. Conn, Rt. 3, Hattiesburg.

Conn, James Harold, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Conn, Steens.

Conway, Aubrey Verner, Radioman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Verner Conway, Rt. 1, Tupelo.

Cook, Arliss C., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ann L. Cook, Gen. Del., Houston.

Cook, Richard L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Cook, Rt. 1, Corinth.

Cooley, Philips Theadore. Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Trane Cooley, Wiggins.

Copper, James M., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James L. Cooper, Star Rt. Morton.

Cooper, Theophlis Vernon, Jr., Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Theophlis Vernon Cooper, Sr., Waynesboro.

Corley, Edwin H., Pvt., USMC. Father, Mr. L. C. Corley, 1421 7th St., Laurel.

Cosper, Jack D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Cosper, Box 214, Prentiss.

Cotton, Jesse J., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Hallie Nettles, Rt. 3, Yazoo City.

Cotton, James E., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillie B. Sims, Rt. 1, Kewanee.

Counselman, John D., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Leta M. Counselman, Gen Del., Lucedale.

Courtney, Albert Jennings, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. James M. Courtney, Wax Lumber Co., Woodville.

Courtney, Louis E., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Milton M. Courtney, Rt. 1, Water Valley.

Covin, Elbrey Fay, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Simeon Swan Covin, Rt. 2, Aberdeen.

Cox, Bob Elmore, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Goldie E. Cox, 701 McAllister St., Greenville.

Cox, John Raymond, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Willie Beatrice Cox, Sarah.

Cox, William Cunningham, Jr., Major, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mary G. Cox, 915 Buchanan Ave., Oxford.

Crecink, William A., 1st Lieutenant. USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Crecink, Meadville.

Creel, Carlton, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alex Z. Creel, Rt. 1, Bentonia.

Crisman, Francis B., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Frances M. Crisman, Box 1655, Long Beach.

Crosby, Mulford Cullen, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mrs. Willie Americus Crosby, Seminary.

Croswell, Kenneth L., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Kenneth L. Croswell, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Jackson.

Crouse, William T., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Margaret E. Crouse, 1610 Washington Ave., Columbus.

Croxton, Sam, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Inez Croxton, Gen. Del., Senatobia.

Crump, Robert D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Amos E. Crump, Quincy.

Cuevas, Ray Joseph, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Cleveland, Cuevas, Rt. 2, Gulfport.

Currie, Joseph Kennedy, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Gervis Blakeney Currie, 130 Taylor St., Jackson.

Curtis, Roland Paul, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mattie Eleanor Curtis, Wesson.

Cutrer, Claude Lane, Sr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry A. Cutrer, Rt. 4, Box 9, Jackson.

Cutter, Samuel Wheelock, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Madonna Witt Cutter, Box 718, Gulfport.

D

Dalton, Nathan Coats, Fireman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. James Dalton, Rt. 1, Holcomb.

Daniel, Curties, Steward 3c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Madison Daniel, Star Rt., East Macon.

Daniels, Lamar, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Arthren Daniels, 424 Washington St., Biloxi.

Dansby, Harold Earl, Field Cook, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wiley H. Dansby, Rt. 2, Raymond Rd., Jackson.

David, Justin Joseph, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Antonie David, Woodville.

Davis, Coy, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Davis, Rt. 2, Seminary.

Davis, James R., Ass't Cook, USMC. Wife, Mrs. James R. Davis, P. O. Box 2462, West Jackson.

Davis, John, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Davis, Rt. 2, Shubuta.

Davis, John F., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. John F. Davis, 809 Henry St., Greenwood.

Davis, Kermit Roosevelt, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mary H. Davis, 410 W. Main St., Starkville.

Davis, Loran L., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Loran L. Davis, Jr., 1423 Forty-second Ave., Gulfport.

Davis, Neal S., Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ida M. Davis, Rt. 4, Lumberton.

Davis, Robert T., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Martha Davis, 543 Lexington Ave., Jackson.

Davis, Thomas Clay, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Jefferson Davis, Rt. 4, Rienzi.

Day, Troy William, Gunner's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. M. W. Day, Rt. 3, Pontotoc.

Dean, Roland Robert, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Dean, Rt. 2, Waynesboro.

Dear, Bryan R., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Robert L. Dear, Box 495, Hazlehurst.

Dedeaux, Glen R., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Loren A. Dedeaux, Rt. 2, Gulfport.

Deen, Billy B., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. Deen, Gen. Del., Moorhead.

Dennis, John Wesley, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. John Wesley Dennis, Sr., Box 44, Pearson.

Denny, David P., Jr., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David P. Denny, Sr., 1218 Rose Hill, Dr., Jackson.

Dent, Joseph H., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Joseph H. Dent, Sr., Gen. Del., Lorman.

Derrington, Leslie E. Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Katie L. Derrington, Houston.

Dickey, Edward L., Master Technical Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Edward L. Dickey, Box 343, Water Valley.

Dickinson, William H., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Dickinson, Sr., Rt. 4, Hattiesburg.

Different, Jack, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Elect Different, Braxton.

Dill, James B., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Lee A. Dill, Rt. 2, Pheba.

Dillon, Q. R., Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Q. R. Dillon, Rt. 4, Box 186, Tylertown.

Divine, Arla J., Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. James Moses Divine, Rt. 6, Philadelphia.

Donald, Charles Morris, Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. George M. Donald, Rt. 8, Wiggins.

Doherty, William Finley, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William F. Doherty, Sr., 315 Elizabeth Ave., Hattiesburg.

Doss, Joseph F., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Maggie D. Mixon, Gen. Del., Marks.

Doster, Henry Preston, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mable A. Doster, Rt. 1, Marks.

Doty, Walton L., Jr., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Dalton L. Doty, Sr., Eden.

Dowland, Gentry B., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Annie R. Easley, P. O. Box 183, Magnolia.

Drake, James Monroe, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Velma E. Drake c/o J. A. Shurley, Rt. 5, Airport Rd., Meridian.

Draughn, Alphonso, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred R. Draughn, Rt. 1, Box 94, Hattiesburg.

Dresselhaus, Charles H., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Tessie M. Gollott, Rt. 4, Jackson.

Drummond, Jack Fowler, Ship's Cook 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Opal Dunnaway Drummond, 503 Bullis St. Columbia.

Dubard, Melvin Hart, Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Mary Helen Dubard, RFD 1, Carrollton.

Duggar, Noah D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Duggar, Rt. 1, Bethany.

Dukes, Daxton T., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Dukes, Magee.

Duncan, Aloysius Eylwood, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John F. Duncan, Rt. 1, Philadelphia.

Duncan, Bertram McLain, Technical Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oma J. Duncan, Carrollton.

Duncan, Robert P., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Frances H. Duncan, Gen. Del., Carrollton.

Dunegan, Claude T., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Thaully Dunegan, 929 Valley St., Jackson.

Dunlap, John Akin, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Edna E. Dunlap, Rt. 3, Box 25C (Vicksburg.

Dunlap, William H., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clark T. Dunlap, Rt. 2, Blue Springs.

Dunn, Robert H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lula V. Dunn, Rt. 2, Crowder.

Dunn, Walton Blackburn, Sr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Natalie M. Dunn, 420 Main St., Biloxi.

Durr, Robert W., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Kate W. Durr, 237 W. Railroad Ave., Crystal Springs.

Dyer, William Henry, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Laura D. Dyer, Rt. 1, Aberdeen.

Dyees, Thomas J., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Dyess, Sr., Box 124, Rome.

E

Earnest, James C., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John R. Earnest, Rt. 2, Eupora.

Easterling, Oscar Bennett, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Bennett Easterling, Richton.

Easterling, Woodrow W., Platoon Sgt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Burl R. Easterling, 208 10th St., Laurel.

Eckford, John Hal, Cpl., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Margaret E. Eckford, 1007 18th Ave., Meridian.

Eddins, Matt, Jr., Field Music 1c, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Matt Eddins, Sr., Barnett.

Edmonds, Marvin Wirt, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. T. D. Wooten, 620 Russel St., Starkville.

Edwards, James W., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James W. Edwards, Sr., Rt. 4, Box 157, Union.

Eldridge, Ernest Lee, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jess E. Eldridge, Rt. 4, Philadelphia.

Elizie, Archie D., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie D. Elizie, Sr., Rt. 1, Soso.

Erwin, James T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elliehue Erwin, Rt. 2, Saltillo.

Estes, Charles William, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elbert O. Estes, Rt. 2, Marietta.

Estes, Williard M., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ben F. Estes, Rt. 2, Tupelo.

Estridge, Chester A., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillie M. Estridge, Rt. 1, Box 81, West Point.

Etheridge, John Thomas, Radioman 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Sophie Etheridge, Crystal Springs.

Eubank, William L., 1st Lt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. William L. Eubank, Winona.

Evans, Horace O'Neal, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luther Elmer Evans, 1625 W. Jackson St., Tupelo.

Evans, Tom Curtis, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Louise Evans, Rt. 1, Box 121, Prairie.

Everett, Charles A., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Charles A. Everett, Sr., 525 Lexington Ave., Jackson.

Everett, Daniel Dalton, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Brodus Everett, Rt. 1, Mendenhall.

F

Falkner, Terrell M., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillian W. Falkner, Rt. 1, Nesbitt.

Fancher, Wilard Ray, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Fancher, Rt. 1, Belmont.

Fant, Foster Clarke, Jr., Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Foster Clarke Fant, Sr., 519 School St., Clarksdale.

Fant, Gale Boyd, Gunner's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Abner Fant, Rt. 2, Minter City.

Farley, Drewie W., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Rosa Farley, 113½ 4th St. S., Columbus.

Farmer, James F., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James H. Farmer, Rt. 1, Sontag.

Farrell, Warren Joseph, Radio Technician 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Martin T. Farrell, 505 E. 2nd St., Pass Christian.

Farris, Frank E., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Farris, Rt. 2, Tutwiler.

Faulkenbery, Jessie R., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marvin E. Faulkenbery, Rt. 4, Jackson.

Faulkner, John M., 1st Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Julian M. Faulkner, Dossville.

Fears, Bailey, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Bailey Fears, Sr., Rt. 2, Amory.

Ferguson, Carl H., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James F. Ferguson, Rt. 1, Randolph.

Field, Jennings Pemble, Jr., Ensign, USNR. Father, Mr. Jennings Pemble Field, Sr., Magee.

Fisher, Robert John, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Fisher, Box 25, Rt. 2, Yazoo City.

Fillingame, Horace Edgar, Boatswain's Mate 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Lonnie Lenore Fillingame, Rt. 1, Purvis.

Flake, John A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Flake, Rt. 6, Louisville.

Flint, John Lewis, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Wesley Flint, Rt. 2, Charleston.

Flowers, Abner J., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lois Flowers, Box 66, Magnolia.

Flowers, Miller T., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie O. Flowers, Rt. 1, Ellisville.

Floyd, Lewis Earl, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Claud Floyd, Rt. 4, Corinth.

Floyd, Lewis Rowan, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Jessie L. Floyd, 1123 N. West St., Jackson.

Floyd, Sam P., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Charlotte E. Floyd, Rt. 2, Sarah.

Fluker, George Washington, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Helen A. Fluker, 215 Walker St., Biloxi.

Ford, James E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Ford, Rt. 1, Houston.

Ford, James Mathew, Sr., Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Ford, Rt. 1, Box 18, Greenwood.

Fortenberry, Clifton Reid, Gunner's Mate 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willis Franklin Fortenberry, Rt. 1, Box 97-A, Osyka.

Fortinberry, Adrian Woodrow, Fire Controlman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. Ferman E. Fortinberry, Rt. 1, Osyka.

Foster, Andrew, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Frances Foster, c/o H. P. Akins, Rt. 2, Cascilla.

Foster, Billy Joe, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hubert C. Foster, 690 Speedway, Winona.

Foster, James Cline, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Truman T. Foster, Rt. 3, Kosciusko.

Foster, J. D., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Lewis H. Foster, Rt. 2, Houston.

Fox, William J., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marion Fox, Rt. 1, Box 82, Sallis.

Franklin, Arlis Dickson, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alis J. Franklin, Moss Point.

Franklin, James M., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Chester M. Franklin, Gen. Del., Nettleton.

Freeman, William Lackey, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Uban Freeman, 1800 15th St., Meridian.

Freeman, W. T., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Effie Freeman, Rt. 1, Foxworth.

French, John Byrd, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Lenox French, 4051 N. State St., Jackson.

Fulgham, Norris Broome, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mary J. Fulgham, Oak Court, Natchez.

Fulton, William A., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Nolan W. Fulton, Rt. 3, Louisville.

Fulton, Woodrow Wilson, 2d Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Woodrow W. Fulton, 310 N. Jackson St., Durant.

G

Gadd, James E., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eunice Burge, Ashland.

Gammill, Charles Lester, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie B. Gammill, Rt. 2, Carrollton.

Garner, Thurman P., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Eula M. Garner, Rt. 2, Winona.

Gary, Luther R., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm B. Gary, Rt. 3, Box 121, Yazoo City.

Gazaway, Willdy Preston, Gunner's mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Preston Prentiss Gazaway, Rt. 2, Longview.

Gill, Donald A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Grady Gill, 506 Southern Ave., Hattiesburg.

Gipson, Gerold Burnice, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mary Ethel Gipson, 822 S. Tenth Ave., Laurel.

Glasgow, Dudley Q., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert B. Glasgow, Gen. Del., Thaxton.

Glenn, Billy G., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. K. H. Glenn, 810 Childs St., Corinth.

Goodwin, Herman P., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary E. Goodwin, 1018 N. Broadway, Greenville.

Gory, James Milton, Watertender 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Sarah Lusco Gory, 1309 Carrollton Ave., Greenwood.

Goss, Burl, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Stella Shivers, 517 Cohea St., Jackson.

Goss, William K., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carson H. Goss, Rt. 1, Box 159, Minter City.

Gossett, Fred Cameron, Ship's Cook 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Fred C. Gossett, 905 31st Ave., Meridian.

Goza, Norman E., Platoon Sergeant, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Norman E. Goza, 712 Boyd St., Jackson.

Graham, Alfred F., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry A. Graham, Rt. 2, Pontotoc.

Graham, James C., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene B. Graham, Rt. 1, Ethel.

Grayson, Edward F., Jr., Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Bettie L. Grayson, RFD 6, Meridian.

Green, William L., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Doshia E. Green, Rt. 2, Rienzi.

Gregory, Riley W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Gregory, P. O. Box 212, Leland.

Grey, Frank Owen, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Josh Grey, Gen. Del., Germania.

Griffin, John Edgar, Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roscoe C. Griffin, 334 Church St., Columbia.

Grimes, Edward, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Maxine S. Grimes, Rt. 4, Box 162, Osyka.

Grubbs, Kenneth Alton, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Edward Grubbs, Rt. 3, Mendenhall.

Guthrie, Bernard James, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Guthrie, Rt. 1, Philadelphia.

Guynes, Luther Fred, Aviation Chief Ordnanceman, USN. Wife, Mrs. Juanita Guynes, Crystal Springs.

H

Hales, Vernon E., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John B. Hales, Sr., Georgetown Station, Jackson.

Hall, Roy, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Roy Hall, 1425 Foot St., Corinth.

Hall, William W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Hall, Rt. 1, Nettleton.

Ham, John E., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Edwina Ham, Rt. 4, Jayess.

Hamblett, Claude R., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Claude R. Hamblett, Rt. 2, Coffeeville.

Hammond, Robert C., Jr., 2d Lt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. R. C. Hammond, Rt. 3, Utica.

Hammons, Vernon, Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Artie Hammons, Rt. 3, Brookhaven.

Hamphill, James E., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Grace Hamphill, Rt. 2, Brandon.

Hariel, Leo E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lemuel E. Hariel, Rt. B, Poplarville.

Harmon, Robert L., Platoon Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ila Harmon, Houston.

Harper, Charles E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry F. Harper, Rt. 3, Box 124-A, Vicksburg.

Harper, Guy M., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Morris L. Harper, Rt. 1, Box 176, Florence.

Harris, Bill, Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Annie L. Harris, Rt. 3, Shannon.

Harris, James Douglas, Gunner's Mate 3c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Harris, Rt. 3, Tupelo.

Harris, Tommie, Steward's Mate 1c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lizzie Alice Harris, 503 Lake St., Tupelo.

Harris, William D., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Gressett Harris, Rt. 3, Decatur.

Harrison, James, Steward's Mate 3c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Harrison, Center Star Rt., Kosciusko.

Harrison, John Frederick, Hospital Apprentice 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Harrison, 211 Keener St., Jackson.

Harrison, Tommie W., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tom D. Harrison, 607 12th St., Pascagoula.

Harshbarger, Leo Boyd, Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Marie A. Harshbarger, Pass Christian.

Hart, Roland T., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Roland T. Hart, Sr., Gen. Del., Pickens.

Hartley, Joseph E., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. R. W. Hartley, Gen. Del., Leland.

Hartzog, Thomas Earl, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Victor Hugo Hartzog, Silver Creek.

Hassell, James Bowe, Seaman 2c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Aude Crowell Hassell, Horn Lake.

Haughton, Silas E., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Haughton, Box 254, Collins.

Hauk, Burrell Weiser, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Alice Chennault, 334 S. Gallatin St., Jackson.

Haven, Willie B., Pfc., USMCR. Sister, Mrs. Dorothy M. McIlwain, 211 N. LaFore St., Cleveland.

Hawes, Percy W., Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Percy W. Hawes, Rt. 4, Brookhaven.

Hayes, E. J., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Patrick H. Hayes, Rt. 1, Meridian.

Haynes, George William, 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. George W. Haynes, Rt. 2, Utica.

Hays, Kellie Clyde, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Eloise Hays, Rt. 1, Steens.

Heard, Richard Joseph, Gunner's Mate 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Andrew Jackson Heard, 50 Court St., West Point.

Hearn, James Edward, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Hearn, 606 4th St., Yazoo City.

Hellums, Dwight, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillie Hellums, Rt. 2, Paris.

Helms, Douglas Watson, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Stella Sanders, 1917 Bell Ave., Columbus.

Helms, William Jasper, Yeoman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Florence Helms, 325 W. Fourth St., Hattiesburg.

Helton, Ralph Joseph, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leroy T. Helton, 514 Oak St., Biloxi.

Hemphill, Albert D., Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sharp Hemphill, Rt. 1, Holmesville.

Hemphill, James E., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Hemphill, Rt. 2, Brandon.

Hemphill, Louis Thomas, Fire Controlman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Hemphill, Rt. 1, Florence.

Henderson, Lucket L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jefferson N. Henderson, Rt. 2, Center.

Henderson, Robert Harvey, 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard C. Henderson, Gen. Del., Sumner.

Henegan, William Thomas, Jr., Storekeeper 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Thomas Henegan, Sr., 1110 Second North St., Vicksburg.

Henley, Clyde Earl, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 1t, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Helen H. Henley, 504 Kentucky Ave., McComb.

Hennis, Harold G., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Hennis, Gen. Del., Saucier.

Herrington, Gaddis N., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lottie O. Herrington, Box 184, Ellisville.

Herrington, Jack B., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Carrie Herrington, Rt. 2. Moselle.

Hester, J. C., Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Amny Lou Hester, c/o Jack Entrican, Rt. 2, Box 85, Wesson.

Hickman, Arnie Andrew, Gunnery Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ida B. Parrish, Rt. 3, Box 4. Laurel.

Hickman, William B., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Father, Mr. William B. Hickman, Sr., 603 Washington Ave., Greenville.

Hickman, William Robert, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Eva Marshall Hickman, Noxapater. (Later address: 221 Bonneville St., Pasco, Washington.)

Hicks, Charles L., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary L. Hicks, Union.

Higginbotham, George Joseph, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Jewel M. Higginbotham, 1044 Lameuse St., Biloxi.

Higginbotham, Grover Louis, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Pearl L. Higginbotham, Rt. 1, Box 83, Meehan Junction.

Hill, Glen Austin, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Sybil Hill, Gen. Del., Morgantown.

Hill, Herman Othis, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Hill, Rt. 2, New Albany.

Hill, James E., Platoon Sergeant, USMCR. Father, Mr. John T. Hill, Rt. 6, Philadelphia.

Hines, William, Pfc., USMCR. Sister, Miss Beverly B. Hines, % R. L. McKinney, Gen. Del., Amory.

Hodges, Herbert Wilson, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. L. C. Hodges, Coila.

Hodges, William Clyde, Ship's Cook 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. D. Hodges, Rt. 1, Mathiston.

Hogue, James O., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Cassie Hogue, Rt. 2, Walnut Grove.

Holland, T. B., Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Grace Evelyn Holland, Rt. 1, Burnsville.

Holland, William Loyd, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Clara V. Holland, 526 S. Natchez St., Kosciusko.

Holley, Royce Dwight, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley C. Holley, Rt. 2, Marks.

Holliman, Edward S., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Nellie J. Holliman, East End Homes, Biloxi.

Holloman, Jesse Boyce, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Clifford Holloman, Wiggins.

Holloway, Lester Franklin, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. William Tell Holloway, Rt. 3, Laurel.

Holmes, Deamus Walter, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Deamus W. Holmes, Rt. 2, Foxworth.

Holmes, Newton Lacie, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lizzie Vanderbilt Holmes, Rt. 4, Box 273, Tylertown.

Holston, Odis D., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gardner O. Holston, Rt. 1, Baxterville.

Honea, William Paul, Fireman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Oscar Honea, Rt. 2, Magnolia.

Hood, Leon Royall, Storekeeper 2c, USNR. Sister, Mrs. Emily Irene Hood, 1216 Farmer St., Vicksburg.

Hood, Wood T., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John S. Hood, Gen. Del., Long.

Horton, Charlie W., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Horton, Rt. 1, Maud.

House, Bernie Ray, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie S. House, Rt. 2, Hamilton.

House, Gordon Lester, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 2c., USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. L. House, Sr., Rt. 1, Box 148, Greenville.

House, Robert Burton, Electrician's Mate 1c., USN. Mother, Mrs. Sally House, Saucier.

Housley, John L., Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mattie Housley, Rt. 1, Purvis.

Houston, James Robert, Seaman 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harry A. Houston, Box 221, Bruce.

Houston, Marshall Lee., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Sister, Miss Mary E. Houston, 121 E. Main St., Charleston.

Howard, Douglas H., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Douglas H. Howard, Rt. 1, Anguilla.

Howell, Dorman Alford, Machinist's Mate 1c., USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Burns Howell, Rt. A, Wiggins.

Howell, George W., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Howell, Rt. 1, Golden.

Huff, Jim T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ben F. Huff, Sylvarena.

Hutchins, Orville George, Jr., Platoon Sgt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Helen H. Hutchins, 3204 Jayne Ave., Jackson.

Hutchison, Bailey Dickens, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Houston Hutchison, Rt. 2, Sallis.

I

Inabinett, Mack Davis, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mack Davis Inabinett, Box 14, Vancleave, Ocean Springs.

Irby, Andrew K., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eunice Irby, Rt. 1, Gulfport.

Ivy, Willie Vaugh, Seaman 1c., USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harris H. Ivy, 1102 Wood St., Jackson.

J

Jackson, Fred Leroy, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred L. Jackson, Sr., Rt. 2, Gulfport.

Jackson, Robert E., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Sudie B. Jackson, 10 Sixth Ave., Meridian.

Jackson, Travis W., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Travis W. Jackson, Rt. 5, Walnut.

Jacobs, Frank, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Will Jacobs, 936 Morningside St., Jackson.

Jacobs, Gerald Irving, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Jacobs, Aeolian Apartments, Vicksburg.

James, Henry Isaac, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Ernestine James, c/o G. E. Pendergrast, Eupora.

Jennings, Grover Cleveland, Jr., Pharmacist's Mate 2c., USN. Wife, Mrs. Joan Carrol Jennings, Rt. 1, Myrtle.

Jennings, Marcus White, Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Marcus W. Jennings, Sunflower.

Jennings, William George, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Bobbie Jennings, Rt. 2, Mendenhall.

Joel, Joseph Dewey, Jr., Machinist's Mate, 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Bonne Bell Joel, Rt. 1, Tutwiler.

Johnson, George M., Jr., Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Georgia H. Gates, 64 S. Main St., Sardis.

Johnson, Herman Leo, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leon J. Johnson, Rt. 5, Philadelphia.

Johnson, James C., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Allie M. Johnson, Rt. 1, Auburn.

Johnson, James Clarence, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ann J. Brake, Box 444, Scooba.

Johnson, Samuel Therrell, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry G. Johnson, Gen Del., Florence.

Johnson, Tetlow Roberts, 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Margaret E. Johnson, 902 S. Court, Cleveland.

Johnson, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Johnson, Sr., Box 15, Valley.

Joiner, Edward E., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence A. Joiner, Gen. Del., Money.

Jully, Roland Dickert, Electrician's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Roland D. Jully, c/o Mrs. T. A. Griffing, Port Gibson.

Jones, Amos G., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George G. Jones, Rt. 1, Hattiesburg.

Jones, Edward W., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George G. Jones, Rt. 1, Hattiesburg.

Jones, Frank, Platoon Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Lorene Jones, c/o Mrs. A. J. Carpenter, Terry Rd., Rt. 5, Jackson.

Jones, John H., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Etta L. Jones, 7835 Liberty Ave., University City.

Jones, Mitchell Lewis, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Norwood B. Jones, Gen. Del., Taylor.

Jones, Tom, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Jones, 604 Fourteenth Ave., Laurel.

Jones, Willard, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Beulah Jones, Winona.

Jones, Wilson Cole, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilson C. Jones, Sr., 921 Memphis St., Holly Springs.

Jones, Winston, Davis, Jr., Radarman 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Mae Pevey Jones Furlow, 917 Poindexter St., Jackson.

Joseph, Raymond Anthony, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kalil Joseph, 410 Ronie St., Hattiesburg.

K

Kabbes, John Theodore, Quartermaster 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank William Kabbes, 1435 4th Ave., Jackson.

Kates, Robert A., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Alice M. Kates, Box 13, Tinsley.

Keene, James Williard, Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Pauline S. Keene, Box 285A, Rt. 2, Meridian.

Keith, Marvin Tillman, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tillman Keith, Rt. 2, Purvis.

Kelley, James Odell, Mess Attendant 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Tom Jefferson Kelley, Rt. 2, Box 87A, Philadelphia.

Kellner, Ernest V., Jr., Pvt., USNR. Father, Mr. Ernest V. Kellner, Sr., 413 Arnold St., Greenville.

Kemp, Richard Gale, Baker 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Laura Hillhouse, Cumberland.

Kendrick, John P., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lida M. Kendrick, 522 Hooker St., Jackson.

Kennedy, Kenneth Hayes, Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Edna G. Kennedy, Box 60, Tupelo.

Kennedy, Urbane J., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter E. Kennedy, Mendenhall.

Kessel, Joe L., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mattie Kessel, 510 W. Cohea St., Jackson.

Ketchum, John Thomas, Jr., Torpedoman's Mate 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Maggie Lou Ketchum., Rt. 4, Ripley.

Kimbrell, Leslie A., Cpl., USMCR. Grandfather, Mr. Jack Pearson, Rt. 2, Stewart.

Kincaid, William Owen, Pharmacist's Mate 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Jocie Lillian Carson, Rt. 1, Falkner.

King, Alfred D., Warrant Officer, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Alfred D. King, Rt. 4, Summit.

Kirkland, Edward K., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Wilda M. Kirkland, Gen. Del., Quitman.

Kirkpatrick, Henry D., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Henry D. Kirkpatrick, Jr., 1207 Parsley Ave., Pascagoula.

Knight, Allison Cicero, 1st Lt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Etta Knight, Rt. 1, Laurel.

Knighton, James M., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James M. Knighton, Rt. 2, Blue Springs.

Knox, Richard G., 2d Lt., USMCR. Father, Dr. Isaac C. Knox, Hillcrest Manor, College Addition, Vicksburg.

L

La Barracare, Walter F., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. La Barracare, Rt. 1, Falkner.

Ladner, Charleston G., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charleston A. Ladner, 151 Favre Lane, Waveland.

Ladner, Drexil, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hugo Ladner, Rt. B, Box 125, Poplarville.

Lambert, Calvin Coolidge, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lella Lambert, c/o H. D. Darwin, Glen.

Lambert, George R., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillian E. Phifer, Amory.

Lambert, James Clay, Seaman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. George Talton Lambert, Rt. 1, Paden.

Land, Gordon Larmar, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Inex Land, Box 223, Mendenhall.

Langford, Thomas D., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eva Langford, c/o Newton Hospital, Newton.

La Varnway, John F., Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. John F. La Varnway, Box 392, Pass Christian.

Lea, William Michael, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Vena Lea, Summit.

Lee, James Earl, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Earl Lee, Sr., 1521 Bailey Ave., Jackson.

Leggett, Johnny Ezell, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mondell Lee Leggett, Box 222, Sumrall.

Lewis, James Dewey, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Lewis, Rt. 3, Box 91, Hattiesburg.

Lewis, William W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Lewis, Rt. 3, Philadelphia.

Ligon, Ernest Ralph, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest R. Ligon, Corinth.

Lindsey, John Edward, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary V. Gilliland, 138 Kolb St., Jackson.

Lindsey, John Paul, Lieutenant (jg), USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Augustus Lindsey, 213 S. Pearman Ave., Cleveland.

Little, Olan Monroe, Machinst's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Alexander Little, Rt. 3 Mize.

Loftin, Horld Glynn, Pfc., USMCR. Mother Mrs. Emma Loftin, 900 Broad St., Columbia.

Logan, George Leonard, Jr., Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. George Leonard Logan, Sr., Rt. 1, Hamilton.

Logan, Raymond Elton, 1st Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jack L. Logan, 1521 13th St., Pascagoula.

Lomax, George E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene W. Lomax, Rt. 1, Florence.

Long, Bishop Marvin, Jr., Seaman 2c USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bishop Marvin Long, Sr., 912½ Tenth Ave., Laurel.

Long, Jimmy, Fire Controlman 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Irene Long, 1304 Van Buren Ave., Oxford.

Longino, William H., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Longino, Box 45. Handsboro.

Lott, George, Jr., Steward's Mate 3c, USCG. Wife, Mrs. Dorothea Louise Lott, 451 Bellmon St., Biloxi.

Love, Samuel J., Sr., Steward's Assistant 2c, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Samuel J. Love, Sr., 608 Rose St., Jackson.

Lowe, William James, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William B. Lowe, Box 412, Poplarville.

Lowery, Joe Victory, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lucy Lowery, Box 205, Holly Bluff.

Lowery, Wiley Gilbert, Metalsmith 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Wiley G. Lowery, 418 Sunflower, Cleveland.

Lowry, Thomas Madison, Aviation Ordnanceman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Wilodyne Lowry, Box 392, Jackson.

Lucius, Robert Howard, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hiram H. Lucius, Rt. 2, Eupora.

Lucy, Ivory O., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Hollie E. Lucy, 101 Rembert St., Natchez.

Lunsford, Hildon Ray, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ruben Benjamin Lunsford, Rt. 1, Leakesville.

Lyman, Aubrey, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Maggie Lee Lyman, Rt. 3, West Point.

Lynchard, Tommy, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edd Lynchard, Rt. 1, Boyle.

M

MacIntosh, Philip E., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Thomas L. MacIntosh, Rt. 3, Box 19, Vicksburg.

Madison, Felix Edward, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Malachi Madison, Montrose.

Madison, James Greer, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Myrtle Madison, Rt. 2, Philadelphia.

Magee, Kenneth L., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Kenneth L. Magee, 557 West Monticello, Brookhaven.

Magee, Robert Lavelle, Chief Commissary Steward, USN. Mother, Mrs. Larren Tobas Magee, 249½ Pascagaula St., Jackson.

Malone, Fred R., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Troy Malone, Rt. 2, Wesson.

Matthews, John L., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. John L. Matthews, Jr., Rt. 1, Box 76 F, Shaw.

Matthews, Thomas Melvin, 2d Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Nellie J. Matthews, Rt. 2, Sturgis.

Mauney, Hubert D., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Grady Mauney, Rt. 2, Ripley.

Maxwell, Richard V., Pvt., USMC. Father, Mr. James W. Maxwell, Gen. Del., Wesson.

May, Durward T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. M. May, Rt. 3, Coldwater.

May, Max L., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. William D. May, Blue Mountain.

May, Robert N., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Gertrude May, 240 S. 13th Ave., Laurel.

Mayfield, George Coke, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Mayfield, 515 N. Magnolia St., Laurel.

Mayo, Sidney E., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nannie D. Mayo, P. O. Box 113, Boyle.

Marta, Lawrence K., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Lawrence K. Marta, 465 N. Jackson St., Starkville.

Martin, Lorenzo F., Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Gracie L. Martin, RFD 2, Bentonia.

Martin, William M., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mary L. Martin, 1332 Sullivan St., Jackson.

Massey, Odis Ivison, Staff Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Massey, Rt. 1, Boyle.

Massey, Tom Owen, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Myrtle Massey, 173 Independence St., Booneville.

Mathews, Guy L., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry T. Mathews, Marks.

McCaa, Charles Edward, Metalsmith 3c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Ruth Lee McTaggart McCaa, 304 Pollock St., Greenville.

McCain, Edward Lee, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Grace McCain, Gen. Del., Prichard.

McCallum, Willie H., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Willie H. McCallum, Rt. 1, Mize.

McCandless, Orlanda Berg, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Sybil L. McCandless, Rt. 2, Aberdeen.

McCarley, John O., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. James G. McCarley, Box 78, Tupelo.

McCarstle, Howard P., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Grandmother, Mrs. Carrie Wroten, Russum.

McCollister, Charles Francis, Ensign, USNR. Brother, Mr. Emmett Benjamin McCollister, 131 Davis Ave., Pass Christian.

McCollum, Ernest R., Jr., Sgt. USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest R. McCollum, Sr., Macon.

McCormick, Melba L., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lyda B. McCormick, Rt. 1, Planterville.

McCrary, James W., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James W. McCrary, 469 N. Columbus Ave., Louisville.

McCray, Theodore Roosevelt, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Issia McCray, Box 584, Lyon.

McDaniel, Trubert H., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Denby M. McDaniel, Rt. 2, Dorsey.

McDonald, Elliott Delacy, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elliott D. McDonald, 355 Clark St., Pass Christian.

McGehee, George W., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Kate McGehee, 126 Stonewall St., Okolona.

McGraw, Joe, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley L. McGraw, Rt. 4, Brookhaven.

McGuffee, James C., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Estus McGuffee, 412 N. State St., Jackson.

McInnis, Buford D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel H. McInnis, 37th Ave., Hattiesburg.

McInnis, Leo Everett, Platoon Sgt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Willie McInnis, Vernal.

McInnis, Willie P., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Willie W. McInnis, Star Route, Bexley.

McKeithen, Howard Wesley, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. McKeithen, 3045 W. Capitol St., Jackson.

McKibben, William C., Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. William C. McKibben, Bruce.

McKinley, James Calloway, Boatswain's Mate 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nancy Eatman McKinley, 634 Maple St., Natchez.

McKinley, Walter Bernard, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Nancy McKinley, 634 Maple St., Natchez.

McKnight, Philip Felix, Seaman 3c, USN. Father, Mr. W. J. McKnight, Chester.

McLaurin, Horace W., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Horace W. McLaurin, 526 W. Silas Brown St., Jackson.

McLaurin, John M., Jr., 2d Lt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. McLaurin, Sr., Murphy.

McLeod, John Knox, Shipfitter 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robin Donald McLeod, Rt. 1, Lucedale.

McMullen, William P., 1st Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Claude A. McMullen, RFD 2, Maben.

McNair, Walter Scott, Radioman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl McNair, Main St., Mt. Olive.

McNamee, Jeff J., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Theresa McNamee, Box 161, Eupora.

McQueen, Elwin H., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ora A. McQueen, Rt. 1, Gulfport.

Meeks, Archie W., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mary L. Meeks, Pickens.

Melton, Arthur D., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Sam Melton, Stover.

Melton, Robert, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Jessie L. Melton, Box 335, Tylertown.

Meredith, Thomas W., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Thomas W. Meredith, Rt. 3, Coldwater.

Merritt, William David, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Lendous Merritt, Rt. 1, Leakesville.

Middleton, John Vail, Cpl., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy L. Middleton, Clinton.

Middleton, Norvel Robert, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Sudie W. Ashley, Rt. 1, Mize.

Miller, Grayson Lemuel, Electrician's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lemuel Miller, Rt. 1, Box 218, Picayune.

Miller, Harold L., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Maude Miller, Rt. 2, Monticello.

Miller, Robert Leslie, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ada Eugenia Tillman, Rt. 2, Box 314, Gulfport.

Miller, Roy D., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. John W. Miller, Rt. 1, Monticello.

Milling, Felix L., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Milling, 612 John St., Hattiesburg.

Mills, George Forrest, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James W. Mills, P. O. Box 208, Holly Springs.

Mills, Norvell P., Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Mills, c/o C. L. Stringer, Rt. 1, Box 56, Columbia.

Millwood, J. C., Chief Cook, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. T. Millwood, Gen. Del., Belzoni.

Milstead, John Postell, Jr., Gunner's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Jewell Lucille Milstead, 407 Sixth Ave. North, Amory.

Mitchell, Ernest A., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Etta B. Mitchell, Rt. 2, Cascilla.

Mitchell, Philip D., 1st Lt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Noah B. Mitchell, Enid.

Moak, Carlton Rainey, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Edwin Moak, Rt. 5, Summit.

Moates, William Jennings, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John B. Moates, Gautier.

Mohundro, Bruce L., Cpl., USMCR. Wife Mrs. Bruce L. Mohundro, Gen. Del., Brownsfield.

Moody, Prentis, Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. James Moody, Gen. Del., Laurel.

Moody, Sam Eugene, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Moody, Rt. 3, Utica.

Moore, Elvin F., Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Elvin F. Moore, Rt. 1, Louin.

Moore, John William, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Lawrence Moore, Rt. 1, Booneville.

Moore, Lester Beach, Pfc., USMCR. Brother, Mr. Vardaman Moore, Box 536, Cleveland.

Moorer, Karl Louis, Gunner's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lottie Lee Moorer, 919 N. Jefferson St., Jackson.

Moorman, James Herbert, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James W. Moorman, 638 S. Church St., Tupelo.

Morman, Robert L., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Miller W. Morman, Rt. 1, Sweatman.

Morreale, Jake V., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Jake V. Morreale, Jr., 133 State St., Bay St., Louis.

Morris, Ernest L., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary S. Morris, 1826 Hewes Ave., Gulfport.

Mott, James W., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. James W. Mott, 409 Roosevelt Ave., Canton.

Mull, Walter Lewis, Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Wema L. Mull, c/o Thomas Lott, Seminary.

Mullican, James C., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Olla Sykes, Gen. Del., Crystal Springs.

Murphree, Arch E., Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arch E. Murphree, Sr., Rt. 1, Lyon.

Murphree, E. R., Shipfitter 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Clayton E. Murphree, Rt. 2, Calhoun City.

Murphree, Elton M., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Murphree, Rt. 1, Box 138, Lyon.

Murry, Hardy P., Warrant Officer, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Hardy P. Murry, 228 Highland St., New Albany.

Myers, Robert Owen, Radarman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Annie Myers, Lake.

N

Naro, William J., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. William J. Naro, Falkner.

Nash, Drexel, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lena M. Nash, Gen. Del., Cathings.

Neal, James William, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mabry V. Neil, Rt. 1, Nettleton.

Nestler, William H., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Augustus E. Nestler, P. O. Box 257, Yazoo City.

Netherland, Larry, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George D. Netherland, Rt. 4, Brookhaven.

Newman, Guy W., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs Allie B. Newman, 816 Edgar St., McComb.

Newman, Warren G. H., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillie B. Newman, 507 Burnette St., Aberdeen.

Newsome, Fred, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Erea Newsome, Gen. Del., Round Lake (new address: % Lemon Buts, Port St. Joe, Fla.).

Nichols, Lowell Prentiss, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Nichols, Gen. Del., Mendenhall.

Nichols, William B., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Nichols, Rt. 1, Dorsey.

Norman, James D., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Norman, Baldwin.

Norman, William Edward, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thurman Lee Norman, Rt. 1, Purvis.

Norris, Leslie Lavell, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Littleton W. Norris, Rt. 3, Houston.

Nunley, Troy Audie, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Virgie Mae Smith Nunley, Rt. 1, Dennis.

Nunnally, Bruce W., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mattie Nunnally, Rt. 1, Etta.

Nyman, John William, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Andrew Nyman, Gen. Del., Escatawpa.

O

Olson, George T., Technical Sergeant, USMC. Mother, Mrs. John N. Nelson, 3820 W. Capitol St., Jackson.

Ott, Cecil, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard L. Ott, Rt. 1, Lucedale.

Overby, William E., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. John G. Overby, Rt. 2, Isola.

Overstreet, Jeff P., 1st Lt., USMC. Father, Mr. Hal Overstreet, DeKalb.

Owen, William Earl, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Minnie Daniels Owen, Pelahatchie.

Owens, Wilbur L., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin H. Owens, 738 Winter St., Jackson.

P

Pace, George Emery, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Sister, Mrs. Marian Pace Johnson, Box 333, Purvis.

Palmer, Murphy M., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Pearlie A. Palmer, Rt. 2, Columbus.

Palmer, William Carroll, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Palmer, Sr., Rt. 1, Preston.

Pannell, Leroy, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Annie Street, Ripley.

Parker, Benjamin Franklin, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Mother, Mrs. Stella B. Parker, Foxworth.

Parker, Robert E., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nora Jane Parker, 507 Beacon St., Laurel.

Parker, Robert Giles, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. Joseph M. Parker, Rt. 2, Flora.

Parker, William Henry, 1st Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillie Hartfield, Rt. 6, Hattiesburg.

Parkis, Barnum Henry, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Barnum A. Parkis, 402 Lee St., Biloxi.

Parks, Ames, Mess Attendant 2c, USN. Father, Mr. John Parks, Rt. 4, Box 134, Rock Hill, Purvis.

Parris, Robert Bruce, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Parris, Sr., 520 Pine St., Picayune.

Parrish, William O., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Parrish, 103 14th Ave., Laurel.

Parson, Allen Lee, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mayford Parson, Rt. 1, Scobey.

Parvin, Millard G., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Millard G. Parvin, 906 Cruise St., Corinth.

Patterson, Earl H., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillon Patterson, RFD 1, Holmesville.

Patterson, Millard M., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas S. Patterson, Star Rt., Columbus.

Payne, Cecil H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Chester Carter, Rt. 1, Brandon.

Pearce, Guy M., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Pearce, R. R. 1, Eden.

Pearcy, William James, Jr., Sgt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Winnie J. Pearcy, P. O. Box 109, Bay Springs.

Peeler, James Randall, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edythe P. Peeler, Hernando.

Penn, Joseph Neil, Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mamie Penn, 1108 Canal St., Pascagoula.

Percoff, Manuel, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Percoff, 756 Fourth Ave., Laurel.

Perkins, George M., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. George Perkins, Louin.

Perkins, Herman Eural, Carpenter's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Janice Clara Perkins, Rt. 2, Box 167, Gulfport.

Peterson, Charles Joseph, Fireman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lemous Peterson, 166 Second St., Pass Christian.

Phillips, Arnold Odell, Torpedoman's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Anderson Phillips, Rt. 1, Bay Springs.

Phillips, Cecil Wilson, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. May Retta Phillips, 1309 Heidenham Ave., Biloxi.

Pickering, Doyle D., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dewey G. Pickering, 1218 First Ave., Laurel.

Pickering, Merrill, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Isaac Pickering, Rt. 1, Summerland.

Pierce, Julian Oneal, Aviation Ordnanceman 3c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nina Pierce, 1512 Twenty-fourth Ave., Meridian.

Pigott, Robert A., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Hattie A. Pigott, Rt. 7, Box 88, Tylertown.

Piserich, Glenn A., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gasper Piserich, 841 Lameuse St., Biloxi.

Pittman, Loyd, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert A. Pittman, Rt. 2, Columbia.

Platt, Hannis E., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. B. Platt, Rt. 1, State Line.

Poindexter, Charles Bernard, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Beatrice C. Poindexter, 639 Maple Ave., Natchez.

Pollock, Millard H., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ludie Pollock, Gen. Del., Crowder.

Pope, Leo T., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Evelyn G. Pope, Rt. 2, Shannon.

Porter, Burneal, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Vander H. Porter, Rt. 4, Columbus.

Porter, Robert, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ephraim Porter, Rt. 4, Box 178, Columbus.

Posey, Jimmie Harding, Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Bessie M. Posey, Rt. 1, Box 21-A, Vicksburg.

Posey, John C., Master Technical Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. William B. Posey, Gen. Del., Belzoni.

Pounds, Theron S., 1st Lt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Seth Pounds, Booneville.

Prescott, Harold M., 2d Lt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Prescott, Rt. 1, McComb.

Prevost, William Redditt, Electrician's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Otho Thurman Prevost, R. R. 3, Wession.

Price, James Murray, Jr., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Price, Sr., Gen. Del., Centerville.

Pritchett, Milas T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Milas B. Pritchett, Box 224, Hollandale.

Pruitt, Charles W., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Hettie M. Pruitt, Old Leland Rd., Greenville.

Purvis, Jack Nelson, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Grover Isham Purvis, Rt. 1, Polkville.

Purvis, James Pittman, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas W. Purvis, Rt. 3, Box 347, Columbia.

Purvis, Joseph Daniel, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas W. Purvis, Rt. 3, Box 347, Columbia.

Q

Quave, Raymond Lazro, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Rose Quave, 1422 W. Howard Ave., Biloxi.

Quintana, Benjamin A., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Jaunita Quintana, 214 21st St., McComb.

R

Rabun, Willie H., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tom C. Rabun, Rt. 1, Weir.

Ragsdale, Thomas Haywood, Lieutenant (Supply Corps), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lady Helen Ragsdale, Box 94, Enterprise.

Ramsay, Wyeth Trybue, Lieutenant (jg); USNR. Mother, Mrs. Etta Stewart Ramsay, Ocean Springs.

Raspilair, Joseph, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Raspilair, Sr., Coastal Neon Service, Handshore.

Ratcliff, Lolies, Mess Attendant 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Octavia Ratcliff, Box 35, Gloster.

Ratcliff, Leonard Howard, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Edna P. Ratcliff, 265 Beacon St., Philadelphia.

Ray, Berwyn E., Pfc., USMCR. Grandfather, Mr. Robert L. Ryan, Rt. 2, Baldwyn.

Rayburn, Sedgie Eugene, Carpenter's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Edward Rayburn, Rt. 2, Columbia.

Rea, Marshall Eugene, Seaman 1c, USNR, Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Rea, Rt. 1, Nettleton.

Ready, Jesse Ervin, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Quin Ready, Rt. 3, Richton.

Reed, Lee Willie, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Smith, Rt. 2, Box 8, Charleston.

Reed, Lewis Philips, Seaman 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lucian P. Reed, Box 397, Greenville.

Reeves, Louis E., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. David E. Reeves, Gen. Del., Montrose.

Reid, Henry F., Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Richard M. Reid, Rt. 1, Box 70, Kokomo.

Revels, Charles S. H., Warrant Officer, USMC. Wife, Mrs. Charles S. H. Revels, % A. J. Ward, Sidon.

Rhudy, Porter O'Neal, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clifton T. Rhudy, Rt. 2, Tupelo.

Rich, John Franklin, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Audrey Rich, Stonewall.

Richardson, John C., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Verna O. Richardson, Rt. 1, Union.

Richardson, Joseph Thurman, Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Olene Richardson, Rt. 1, Bailey.

Richerson, Freeman, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Freeman Richerson, Rt. 1, Box 55, Lake Cormorant.

Ricketts, Clyde S., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Ricketts, Rt. 6, Booneville.

Rigby, William F., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl P. Rigby, Gen. Del., Pope.

Rimmer, Steven J., Pvt., USMCR. Father, Mr. Whitfield H. Rimmer, 208 W. Academy St., Canton.

Roane, John William, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Edward Roane, Rt. 1, Sarepta.

Roberts, Samuel Augustus, Jr., Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Augustus Roberts, Sr., Rt. 1, Lucedale.

Roberts, Willie Green, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walton G. Roberts, Gen. Del., Quincy.

Robertson, Talmadge Webster, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Beulah Robertson, Box 264, Iuka.

Robinson, Chester Oliver, Seaman 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Henry E. Robinson, 605 Roosevelt St., Pascagoula.

Rodgers, Claude Aubrey, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Albert Stevens Rodgers, Belzoni.

Rogers, George N., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Kirgie L. Rogers, Tiplersville.

Rogers, Jefferson Zabra, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Burr Rogers, Collins.

Rose, James Douglas, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Ben Franklin Rose, 1024 Arbor Vista, Jackson.

Ross, George W., Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Ross, Sr., Box 254, Mendenhall.

Ross, Herschel Dee, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lon Ross, Okalona.

Rotstein, Joseph, Storekeeper 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Bertie Mae Rotstein, 2017 Ryan St., Vicksburg.

Routt, Harry L., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Hattie Routt, Rt. 1, Meridian.

Ruffin, William A., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. William A. Ruffin, Sr., Rt. 2, Taylorsville.

Ruhr, William H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eva C. Ruhr, 164 Nicholson Ave., Waveland.

Russell, Marvin Alexander, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Marvin A. Russell, Sr., Lyon.

Rutherford, John W., Sgt., USMC. Brother, Mr. Tom Rutherford, Rt. 1, Falkner.

Ryan, Leonard M., Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Grover C. Ryan, River Rt., Sasartia.

S

Sadler, Robert H., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. I. W. Sadler, Rt. 1, Chunkey.

Sanders, Jack Vernice, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Isom Sanders, 724 S. 7th St., Columbus.

Sanders, William T., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry G. Sanders, RFD 1, Box 128, Greenville.

Sanderson, Vonnie T., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John L. Sanderson, Rt. 1, Waynesboro.

Sappington, Paul Howard, Pfc., USMCR. Father, Mr. James E. Sappington, Rt. 2, Pontotoc.

Saylors, Van Buren, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ida Lou Saylors, Rt. 1, Baldwyn.

Schoggen, William L., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Allie C. Schoggen, 1114 14th St., Columbus.

Schrader, Cecil Gerald, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Stella Bowman, 306 Unitta St., Hattiesburg.

Scott, Edward E., Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Edward E. Scott, Rt. 3, Lucedale.

Scott, James Aubry, Motor Machinist's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Myrtle Ada Scott, 206 Fourth Ave., Meridian.

Scott, Lawrence, Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Austin P. Scott, Rt. 1, Sardis.

Scott, O. W., Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie Scott, Rt. 1, Box 79, Isola.

Scruggs, Virgil Ray, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Curtis Scruggs, Rt. 2, Laurel.

Seal, Esco D., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. William F. Seal, 522 Burns St., Jackson.

Seale, Arthur David, Jr., Aerographer's Mate 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Arthur David Seale, Sr., Roxie.

Seale, James Harvey, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ivory C. Seale, Gen. Del., Batesville.

Seals, Fred, Steward's Mate 2c, USNR. Father, Mr. Grant Seals, P. O. Box 87., Panther Burns.

Senseman, Howard E., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Gertrude Senseman, 1276 N., Congress St., Jackson.

Sewell, Robert R., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Sewell, Gen. Del., Thaxton.

Shafer, C. A., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andy Shafer, Rt. 2, Box 90E, Cleveland.

Sharpe, Willie Ray, Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Sharpe, Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Shears, James, Cook 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alex Shears, Rt. 2, Jackson.

Sheeley, Efford Eugene, Lieutenant (Medical Corps), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Victoria Adams Sheeley, 1711 2d St., Gulfport.

Sheppard, John W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Levi T. Sheppard, P. O. Box 446, Tchula.

Sherrill, Douglas W., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rube W. Sherrill, Box 43, Toomsuba.

Shoemake, Robert V., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Robert V. Shoemake, Rt. 1, Ovett.

Shows, Louis J., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Thelma J. Shows, Rt. 1, Moselle.

Shurden, Robert W., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Shurden, 729 Roseneath St., Jackson.

Simmons, Harry Daniel, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam S. Simmons, Rt. 4, Yazoo City.

Simmons, Milton, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. Simmons, Gen. Del., Cumberland.

Simmons, Travis J., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Ventia Simmons, Box 442, Houlka.

Simmons, William T., Jr., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William T. Simmons, Sr., 1218 Langley Ave., Jackson.

Simon, Edward, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Simon, Sr., 233 Clairmont St., Jackson.

Simpson, Johnnie W., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Verna A. Burns, 211 Coahoma St., Clarksdale.

Sims, Harry E., Assistant Cook, USMC. Father, Mr. Lee M. Sims, Box 92, Moorhead.

Skipper, Homer H., Sgt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lillie L. Skipper, Philadelphia.

Slade, C. L., Signalman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dedo Slade, Maxie.

Smith, Carroll Lavern, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Smith, Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Smith, Elmer Sidney, Jr., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer S. Smith, Sr., Box 267, Batesville.

Smith, Herman J., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Virgie M. Smith, Poplarville.

Smith, Hiram O., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hiram O. Smith, Sr., Rt. 2, Box 26, Picayune.

Smith, Houstin Allen, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Eunice M. Smith, 17 Georgetown St., Hazlehurst.

Smith, James Wesley, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Smith, Pontotoc.

Smith, Kenneth F., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Cora Smith, 228 N. Prentiss St., Jackson.

Smith, Odis O'Brian, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Steve Smith, 1715 6th St., Meridian.

Smith, R. C., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. Smith, Rt. 4, Union.

Smith, Robert E., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Louis E. Smith, Rt. 1, Center.

Smith, Sam, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Tinny Bland Smith, Rt. 2, Box 3, Forest.

Smith, Tom L., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Beulah E. Smith, 314 25th Ave., Meridian.

Smith, Walter C., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. Smith, Union.

Smith, Wiley M., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kelly A. Smith, Rt. 2, Purvis.

Smith, William E., Jr., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Jeanetta W. Smith, 112 W. Court St., Brookhaven.

Snowden, Lamar, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Lamar Snowden, Rt. 1, Bailey.

Soldinie, William T., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William T. Soldinie, Sr., Gen. Del., Waveland.

Speed, Norris Lavelle, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William W. Speed, Meehan Junction.

Speer, James W., Jr., 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Emma M. Speer, Goshen Springs.

Spence, Harold Watson, Master Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Claude L. Spence, Tylertown.

Spencer, Ellis L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Spencer, Rt. 3, Fulton.

Spencer, Rex Dayton, Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Luther N. Spencer, Gen. Del., Derma.

Spencer, Thomas Edward, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Marjorie A. Spencer, Box 1, Rt. 1, Olive Branch.

Spiers, James H., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Spiers, 43 Ward Ave., Ocean Springs.

Spring, James William, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Elloweese Spring, Auburn.

Stevens, James, Coxswain, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marian C. Stevens, Rt. B, Box 168, Poplarville.

Stevenson, Oscar Earl, Fireman 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mose Clifton Stevenson, Box 302, Moss Point.

Stewart, Otis E., Cpl., USMCR. Parents Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Stewart, 907 16th Ave., Laurel.

Stiglets, Charles Francis, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Stiglets, 208 Aztec St., Hattiesburg.

Still, Elbert Lee, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Della I. Still, Box 234, Sardis.

Stone, John Carl, Torpedoman's Mate 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. N. Stone, Rt. 1, Big Creek.

Stokes, G. W., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Salley J. Stokes, 1615 28th Ave., Meridian.

Stokes, James C., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Stokes, Gen. Del., Homewood.

Strawbridge, Hansel, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Merle Strawbridge, Star Route, Columbus.

Strickland, George A., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. John H. Strickland, Eden.

Strickland, Wesley R., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Strickland, Rt. 4, Box 86, Holly Springs.

Strong, Hubert R., 2d Lt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Strong, Port Gibson.

Stroud, Paul V., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Floy Stroud, Rt. 1, Clinton.

Sullivan, Bedford LeForrest, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bedford L. Sullivan, Sr., Box 124, Drew.

Sullivan, Hampton S., Pfc., USMC. Grandfather, Mr. Wesley J. Sullivan, Meadville.

Sullivan, Iria Lee, Cook 1c, USN. Wife, Mrs. Joe Ella Sullivan, Rt. 1, Box 54, Kilmichael.

Sullivan, Orson P., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Polly A. Sullivan, Rt. 1, Shivers.

Summers, James A., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie Summers, Rt. 4, Jayess.

Sumrall, Alvin W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Addison Sumrall, Rt. 3, Box 221, Columbia.

Switzer, Theo., Jr., Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Theo. Switzer, Sr., Box 894, Hattiesburg.

T

Tabb, James Cheairs, Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James C. Tabb, 609 Leflors Ave., Clarksdale.

Tackett, Aubrey Wade, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mary E. Tackett, Box 163, Benoit.

Tadlock, Walter L., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie E. Tadlock, Homewood.

Talbert, Charlie Joe, Captain, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie D. Talbert, Louisville.

Talbert, James L., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie D. Talbert, Rt. 6, Louisville.

Tate, Roger Dees, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Tate, Star Route, Columbus.

Tatum, Luther Paul, Seaman 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lilly D. Tatum, Rt. 1, Taylor.

Taylor, Clarence V., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Louise Taylor, Gen. Del., Como.

Taylor, Gaither W., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mildred Taylor, 509 4th St., Amory.

Taylor, James H., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Taylor, Rt. 3, Crystal Springs.

Taylor, Robert A., Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Robert A. Taylor, Sr., Rt. 6, Hattiesburg.

Taylor, Sam Eddie, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willis Taylor, 212 Camp St., Crystal Springs.

Taylor, William S., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur R. Taylor, Gen. Del., Como.

Tennyson, Scott Pressley, Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Selwyn Pressley Tennyson, 1705 5th Ave. S., Columbus.

Thiac, Philip J., Jr., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Edith S. Thiac, 326 Dunbar St., Jackson.

Thigpen, Fred Clifford, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Thigpen, Rt. 1, Box 182, Picayune.

Thomas, Jack H., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lula Thomas, Box 984, Vicksburg.

Thomas, John, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Thomas, Sr., Rt. 1, Meridian.

Thomas, L. J., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. L. J. Thomas, Rt. 4, Laurel.

Thomas, Mitchell A., Sgt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Josephine Thomas, Rt. 4, Box 10, Yazoo City.

Thompson, Branscomb D., Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Manuel E. Thompson, Shannon.

Thompson, George Kearney, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Henry Thompson, Rt. 1, Box 3, Taylorsville.

Thompson, James Morrell, Coxswain, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jack S. Thompson, Star Route, Phoenix.

Thompson, John Frederick, Gunner's Mate 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Thompson, 1528 8th Ave., Meridian.

Thompson, Merlin Langston, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Z. Thompson, Rt. 2, Newhebron.

Thornton, Clarke, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarke Thornton, Sr., 2422 24th St., Meridian.

Thornton, Lamar, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Burton M. Thornton, Rt. 5, Carthage.

Thurmond, James T., Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Thurmond, Cotton Plant.

Tidmore, Johnnie Macon, Motor Machinist's Mate 3c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Lizzie Rene Tidmore, Box 448, Drew.

Tidwell, David, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. David Tidwell, Rt. 2, Potts Camp.

Tidwell, Joseph G., Jr., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Joseph G. Tidwell, Jr., 318 E. Fortification St., Jackson.

Timberlake, Joe Henry, Lieutenant (Supply Corps), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Mildred Elizabeth Timberlake, 412 Greensboro St., Starkville.

Timlake, James William, Seaman 2c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Lillie Mae Timlake, 1202 Tate St., Corinth.

Tolley, Cecil R., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Felix W. Tolley, Gen. Del., Calhoun City.

Townley, Edward Denver, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Doris M. Townley, 502½ Moore St., Greenville.

Travis, David F., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William W. Travis, 1023 Delaware Ave., McComb.

Tribble, Elex E., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Livie M. Tribble, Gen. Del., Quincy.

Truly, Loyd Hester, Jr., Signalman 3c, USNR. Father, Mr. Loyd Hester Truly, Sr., 611 Church St., Columbia.

Trussell, Granville L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel M. Trussell, Rt. 4, Grenada.

Tubertini, Willie, Jr., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willie Tubertini, Sr., Rt. 2, Box 189, Shelby.

Tucker, Charles Shields, Pharmacist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Wesley Tucker, Rt. 1, Forest.

Tucker, William Levert, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James H. Tucker, Rt. 1, Fulton.

Tullos, James E., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alburtice F. Tullos, Rt. 6, Philadelphia.

Turnage, Ray S., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Ray S. Turnage, Rt. 2, Collins.

Turner, Eudine Wallace, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Turner, Rt. 2, Ripley.

Turner, Harry Smith, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Turner, 306 Miller St., Hattiesburg.

Turner, Norbert Bryan, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Henry Turner, Kreole.

U

Umfress, Samuel L., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George E. Umfress, Gen. Del., Burnsville.

Upchurch, Laton Cellios, Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Margarette Upchurch, Rt. 2, Box 368, Drew.

Usry, Willis B., Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Delores Usry, Rt. 2, Box 27, Grenada.

V

Vance, Bonny S., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lessie Vance, Gen. Del., Dixon.

Vance, Lawrence, Jr., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Vance, Sr., Rt. 2, Indianola.

Van Devender, Leon, 1st Lieutenant, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oswald N. Van Devender, Rt. 2, Gholson.

Van Duzor, Willard K., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillian Van Duzor, 723 Bridge St., Vicksburg.

Varnado, Narvel A., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Leah M. Mulkey, Rt. 1, Holmesville.

Vaughn, Joe A., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Inez Vaughn, Rt. 2, Meridian.

Vickery, George W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Vickery, Rt. 2, Grenada.

Vincent, Oscar, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mary L. Vincent, 210 Oak St., Philadelphia.

Vinson, Norby T., Assistant Cook, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Norby T. Vinson, Rt. 3, Valden.

Voyles, Charles W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Taylor C. Voyles, 608 Buchanan St., Corinth.

W

Walker, Joe Cleon, Seaman 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Charles Cleon Walker, Plantersville.

Waldrop, Clarence E., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry C. Waldrop, Rt. 1, Flora.

Wallace, Amon H., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Danzell W. Wallace, 620 9th St., South, Columbus.

Wallace, James Crews, Seaman 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Evin Wallace, Rt. 2, Jackson.

Waller, Thomas V., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Tom G. Waller, Rt. 1, Hazlehurst.

Wallis, Lamar P., 2d Lieutenant, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ama Wallis, Rt. 4, Lexington.

Walters, Hilmon Eugene, Jr., Lieutenant, (jg), USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hilmon Eugene Walters, Waynesboro.

Ward, Robert T., Cpl., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Doris H. Ward, 609 Ash St., Columbia.

Ward, Thomas A., Pvt., USMCR. Uncle, Mr. Loren B. Ward, Rt. 1, Doddsville.

Warren, Thomas Thrash, Pfc., USMC. Brother, Mr. Clarence M. Warren, Rt. 2, Philadelphia.

Watkins, Russell P., Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Ella Watkins, Gen. Del., Wiggins.

Watkins, Walton Monroe, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Watkins, Rt. 1, Moselle.

Watts, James V. Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Doris P. Watts, Rt. 1, Moss.

Webb, Boatman A., Pvt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Beatrice F. Webb, Rt. 1, Walnut.

Webb, John Donald, Pfc., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Abbie Webb, Rt. 2, Ashland.

Weiner, Ben, Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Meyer Weiner, Tupelo.

Welch, Sidney David, Hospital Apprentice 1c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Timmie William Welch, Rt. 3, Mendenhall.

Wells, Junior E., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Enos W. Wells, Rt. 4, Oxford.

Wells, Oscar Leon, Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Edna L. Wells, Rt. 1, Rienzi.

Westbrook, James R., Field Music 1c, USMC. Father, Mr. James M. Westbrook, Box 329, Houston.

Westerfield, Earle E., Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. George Westerfield, Sr., P. O. Box 308, Columbia.

Westmoreland, Dewey P., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Willie M. Westmoreland, Gen. Del., Carpenter.

Wheeler, Algie Jordan, Sgt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie L. Wheeler, Gen. Del., Rt. 18, Lawrence.

Wheeler, George D., Cpl., USMC. Wife, Mrs. George D. Wheeler, 352 E. Fortification St., Jackson.

White, Cleon B., Jr., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cleon B. White, Sr., 211 So. Chestnut St., McComb.

White, James R., Pfc, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lola M. White, 205 N. 9th St., Columbus.

White, Theo, Seaman 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Armarie Alice White, Montpelier.

Whitehead, Clyde Leon, Pfc, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Mary E. Whitehead, Gen. Del., Hoxie.

Whitehorn, Leland G., Pfc, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Velma L. Whitehorn, Rt. 2, Hickory Flat.

Whitfield, Willie W. W., Pvt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Willie W. W. Whitfield, 515 1st St., Picayune.

Whitt, Barns Oris, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Braxton B. Whitt, Rt. 1, Box 73, West Point.

Wier, Rufus, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James S. Wier, Rt. 1, Box 3, Sidon.

Wilbanks, Lloyd B., Pvt., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Lena L. Wilbanks, Rt. 1, Ashland.

Wilcher, Floyd, Pfc, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Delphia Wilcher, Rt. 5, Carthage.

Williams, Charlie, Steward 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Mary Williams, Box 115, Anguilla.

Williams, Denzel Wright, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luther Wright Williams, Box 318, Iuka.

Williams, Herman Frederick, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Maranda Williams, P. O. Box 26, Greenwood.

Williams, Homer Reed, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Robert Williams, Gen. Del., Moselle.

Williams, James E., Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Wife., Mrs. James E. Williams, P. O. Box 532, Biloxi.

Williams, James Roy, Torpedoman's Mate 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lafayette Williams, Wesson.

Williams, Joseph Coy, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Flora Williams, 221 Beacon St., Philadelphia.

Williams, Julius E., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oliver E. Williams, 201 Stevenson St., Picayune.

Williamson, Howard Otha, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Needham Franklin Williamson, Rt. 1, Braxton.

Williamson, James T., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Alva E. Williamson, Rt. 6, Louisville.

Williamson, Thomas W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Williamson, Rt. 1, Columbia.

Willis, Everett Bryant, Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Byars, Rt. 6, Philadelphia.

Willis, Paul Berkley, Fire Controlman 3c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Columbus Willis, Woodland.

Wilson, Aaron Jackson, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Mae Wilson, Rt. 2, Saltillo.

Wilson, Charles Carroll, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Wilson, Rt. 3, Eupora.

Wilson, Henry James, Jr., Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry James Wilson, 504 Henry Ave., Pascagoula.

Wilson, Louis H., Captain, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Bertha B. Wilson, Brandon.

Windham, Norman R., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Mabel B. Chancellor, % J. K. Kelley, Rt. 1, Laurel.

Windham, William K., Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. William K. Winham, Box 101, Rt. 1, Summerland.

Wingo, Lloyd Earl, Jr., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Ora M. Wingo, 508 Congress St., Pontotoc.

Winter, James B., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Patrick M. Winter, Rt. 2, Box 28, Vardaman.

Woods, Edgar Hall, Lieutenant, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Amelia Carrish Woods, Rosedale.

Woods, George E., Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Woods, E. Star Route, Duck Hill.

Woods, George L., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Woods, Rt. 2, Cascilla.

Wooley, Thadius M., Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thadius L. Wooley, 216 Jassamine St., Jackson.

Wright, James H., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert G. Wright, Starksville.

Wright, Willis W., Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Wright, Rt. 2, Box 41, Collinsville.

Wyres, William Perry, Pfc., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy V. Wyres, Rt. 4, Lumberton.

Y

Young, Jesse George Wilbur, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edd C. Young, 113 Park St., Tupelo.

PRISONER OF WAR RECORD—DIED OR KILLED IN PRISONER OF WAR STATUS

B

Bynum, Cecil Woodrow, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lucy M. Bynum, 320 S. 12th Ave., Laurel.

Byrd, Jack Rudolph, Pharmacist's Mate 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John King Byrd, Mount Olive.

Byrd, Malcolm Louis, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Maggie H. Byrd, Tylertown.

C

Clements, Henry Britt, Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. William C. Clements, Rt. 5, Terry Rd., Jackson.

F

Ferriss, James Furr, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilson E. Ferriss, 730 Adams St., Vicksburg.

H

Hartzog, Shelton, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Hartzog, Silver Creek.

Hogaboom, William Frederick, 1st Lieutenant, USMC. Parents, Brigadier General and Mrs. George E. Hogaboom, U. S. A. (Ret.), 1625 Monroe St., Vicksburg.

J

Joyner, Earl Ezell, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R. Joyner, Star Rt., Goshen Springs.

L

Lee, George Waldon, Seaman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Lee, 1423 32nd Ave., Gulfport.

M

Miley, Clifton Spencer, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Melton C. Miley, Box 359, Philadelphia.

Mitchell, George Robert, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James D. Mitchell, 720 Marietta St., Booneville.

Moore, J. W., Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Millie Crutchfield, Rt. 1, Box 28, Lyon.

Murray, Grady, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Emma Murray, Ovett.

N

Nesbitt, Judge Richmond, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lily Northup, 309 Webster Ave., Yazoo City.

P

Parish, Bartow Harrison, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Barry Parish, Charleston.

R

Rigney, Elbert Lee, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Willis E. Rigney, Rt. 2, Bucatunna.

T

Taylor, James Edward, Platoon Sgt., USMC. Brother, Mr. Leonard D. Taylor, Port Gibson.

V

Vance, Guy, Fireman 1c, USN. Father, Mr. Walter Lee Vance, Star Rt., Duck Hill.

Vawter, Olice Jasper, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hubert L. Vawter, Box 44, Hickory Flat.

W

Warren, John Otis, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James C. Warren, Rt. 2, DeKalb.

White, James Henry, Shipfitter 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Thomas White, Rt. 1, Philadelphia.

White, John Thomas, Gunnery Sgt., USMC. Sister, Mrs. J. C. Phipps, 721 N. Pearl St., Natchez.

RELEASED FROM PRISON CAMPS

A

Allen, Carl Lee, machinist's mate 2c, USN, Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Sammie Allen, 121 Lee Ave., Belzoni.

Austin, Rufus Baker, Pvt., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Austin, 341 McKee St., Jackson.

B

Baggett, Ralph Newel, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Silas S. Baggett, 246 Texas Ave., Jackson.

Beeson, Walter Leroy, seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Loy Beeson, Rt. 1, Box 146, Monticello.

Bishop, Paul, assistant cook, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Annie L. Bryant, c/o Mrs. Della Lucas, New Augusta.

Boyd, Berdyne, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Dora Boyd, RFD 1, Jayess.

Burkett, Claude Leland, platoon sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde L. Burkett, Bassfield.

Burt, Larkin Jay, cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dudley T. Burt, Rt. 1, Box 118, Columbia.

Byrd, Frank Marshall, pfc., USMC. Mother. Mrs. Maggie H. Byrd, Tylertown.

C

Carpenter, Herman Oliver, cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Verna Carpenter, P. O. Box 268, Forest.

Cavin, James Theodore, cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lulu Cavin, Rt. 3, Box 99, Gloster.

Chamblis, Julius Cecil, machinist's mate 2c, USN. Father, Mr. Christopher Columbus Chamblis, Rt. 3, Hattiesburg.

Comfort, Floyd Herman, pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nora Comfort, 204 Dewitt Ave., Jackson.

Conerly, Albert Marion, pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lucius L. Conerly, 2127 Bailey Ave., Jackson.

Copeland, Clifton Eugene, cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Eugene B. Copeland, 109 Park Ave., Indianola.

Curet, Fred, Jr., sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Curet, Sr., Kiln.

D

Dethloff, Robert Lee, fireman 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lula Agnes Dethloff, Escatawpa.

F

Fowler, Miles Bailey, coxswain, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Angelo Fowler, Rt. 1, Courtland.

G

Glaze, James Edwin, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Glaze, 1515 Bailey Ave., Jackson.

Goff, Harold Eley, Pfc., USMC. Brother, Mr. J. V. Goff, Rt. 2, Pascagoula.

Gordon, Edward S., Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nellie Gordon, Raymond Blvd., Jackson.

Grant, Everard Meade, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter N. Grant, 1020 Central St., Jackson.

Griffing, Denver Hooker, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Father, Mr. Robert Hooker Griffing, Fayette.

Gulledge, Inman, Pfc., USMC. Guardian, Mr. William N. Barlow, 230 S. 12th Ave., Laurel.

H

Haggard, Fred Daniel, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Haggard, Rt. 2, Louisville.

Halford, William Thomas, Pfc., USMC, Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William B. Halford, Rt. 2, Canton.

Harper, Joel Eligh, Pvt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Marie E. Harper, Rt. 1, Crystal Springs.

Hegwood, Cecil C., Cpl., USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Jincie Green, Rt. 2, Taylorville.

Holloway, Carl Milner, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Holloway, Box 5, Carriere.

Howell, Ernest Price, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry B. Howell, Baldwyn.

J

Johnson, David L., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Livingston B. Johnson, 414 S. State St., Jackson.

Johnson, Solon Lamar, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Fannie Williams, Stonewall.

Johnson, William Rhett, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Preston B. Johnson, Wade.

Jones, Artis Willis, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Straudy W. Jones, Deemer.

Jones, Douglas Charlie, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John P. Jones, Rt. 4, Laurel.

Jones, Otis Terrell, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jinny N. Jones, Rt. 1, Box 428, Corinth.

K

Keyes, Johnny Paul, Pfc., USMC. Uncle, Mr. Howard Keyes, Rt. 4, Laurel.

Kidd, John Henry, Jr., Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John H. Kidd, Sr., Box 86, West Enterprise.

L

Lancaster, Marion Barnett, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie Lancaster, 814 N. Broadway St., Greenville.

Landrum, James Oden, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James C. Landrum, Ovett.

Leggett, Marion Kinnon, Field Cook, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Marion F. Leggett, Rt. 3, Box 119, Newton.

Lewis, Clifton Henry, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius L. Lewis, 275 Gum St., Philadelphia.

Lockley, Rufus Wilbur, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Lockley, Rt. 4, Box 359, Philadelphia.

M

Malone, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Malone, Sr., Rt. 3, Box 56, Kosciusko.

McAlister, John Alexander, 2d Lieutenant, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Judson T. McAlister, Blue Mountain.

McCaulla, Henry Ford, Gunner's Mate 2c, USN. Sister, Mrs. Maxie Pettigrew, Rt. 1, P. O. Box 121, Isola.

McKenna, Hugh Joseph, Chief Watertender, USN. Sister, Mrs. Elaine Montgomery, 902½ National St., Vicksburg.

Mitchell, James Paul, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elbert E. Mitchell, 908 1st St., Picayune.

Mosley, Harvey Lee, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Nannie Jordan, Rt. 1, Box 64, Blackhawk.

N

Nettles, Howard, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Nettles, Rt. 2, Brookhaven.

O

O'Brien, John Patrick, Jr., Platoon Sgt., USMC. Sister, Mrs. Florrie K. Cranston, 3306 12th St., Gulfport.

P

Perabo, Phil, Jr., Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Phil Perabo, Sr., 316 Robins St., Tupelo.

Pickett, Wilbert, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James C. Pickett, Wesson.

Powers, Claude Devoe, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Powers, Rt. 2, Leland.

Price, William Monted, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence W. Price, Rt. 1, Bogue Chitto.

Puckett, David Oliver, Jr., Lieutenant, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David Oliver Puckett, Sr., Robins St., Tupelo.

R

Ratliff, Owen Ray, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joe T. Ratliff, Rt. 4, New Albany.

Rawls, James Conley, Pfc., USMC. Guardian, Mr. Zabert E. Rawls, Rt. 2, Seminary.

S

Scarborough, Carlton Eugene, Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. James W. Scarborough, Dossville.

Seal, William Riley, Storekeeper 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ida Florida Seal, Box 344, Picayune.

Seymour, Charles Ray, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eddie Seymour, Box 478, Rt. 1, Biloxi.

Shedd, Homer Lester, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Shedd, Rt. 1, Dorsey.

Smith, Gordon Lester, Pvt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Garnet L. Smith, Rt. 2, Carrollton.

Smith, Herman Edward, Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. William H. Smith, Wesson.

Smith, John Marvin, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Susie Smith, Box 188, Wiggins.

Stephenson, David Milton, Field Music 1c, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. David L. Stephenson, Rt. 5, Box 109, Meridian.

Stewart, Glenn Emanuel, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Stewart, Sr., Rt. 3, Box 72, Brandon.

Swain, Dixon Herbert, Pfc., USMC. Father, Mr. Jesse Swain, Star Rt., Pontotoc.

Taylor, Marion Alexander, Pfc., USMC. Brother, Mr. Aden Taylor, Terry.

T

Thompson, Thomas Richard, Cpl., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tom J. Thompson, Rt. 3, Box 162, Columbia.

Thornton, George Burnice, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George E. Thornton, Rt. 1, Mize.

Troney, Norris Henry, Seaman 1c, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry D. Troney, 1321 E. Beach, Biloxi.

Turnipseed, Truman Elliott, Radio Electrician, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Turnipseed, Rt. 2, McCool.

V

Vaughn, James, Pfc., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Malachi M. Vaughn, Rt. 2, Taylorsville.

W

Walton, Felix Burrell, Machinist's Mate 2c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Jessie Pauline Walton, Rt. 1, Box 71, Benton.

Ward, James Sample, Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. W. E. Ward, c/o R. O. Carruth, Melden.

Weekley, Warren Lamar, Chief Electrician's Mate, USN. Mother, Mrs. Lilly Belle Weekley, Rt. 5, Summit.

Williams, Clyde Peery, Yeoman 3c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Hazel Williams, French Camp.

Wiloughby, Lloyd Cline, Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Mary F. Wiloughby, 914 Deer Park St., Jackson.

Z

Zeigler, William Louis, Pfc., USMC. Son, Master Wiliam L. Zeigler, Jr., c/o Mr. H. O. Marshall, Rt. 4, Lexington.

NONCOMBAT DEAD

Adams, Hilliad Lemuel, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Johnie Q. Gregory, Route 6, Louisville.

Ainsworth, A. W., Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ethel Windham Ainsworth, Route 1, Box 225B, Vicksburg.

Albritton, Nilton Norwood, Aviation machinist's Mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph N. Albritton, Route 3, Bogue Chitto.

Allen, Jesse Eugene, Jr., Pfc., USNCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse E. Allen, Sr., P. O. Box 201, Tylertown.

Anderson, Prentiss Merlin, Motor machinist's mate 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Evelyn Anderson, c/o Mrs. Susie Anderson, Route 4, Liberty.

Baker, Trannie Oscar, Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Dunbar Baker, Route 2, Pontotoc.

Banks, Percy, Steward's Mate 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Josella Banks, Fayette.

Barrett, Roscoe Houston, Chief shipfitter, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Seal Barrett, 509 N. Jefferson St., Jackson.

Benton, Richard Carlton, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Eva May Benton, 742 Eastview St., Jackson.

Berry, Baynon, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Henry Berry, General Delivery, Yazoo City.

Blanks, William Earl, Chief electrician's mate, USNR. Daughter, Miss Shirley Ann Blanks, 705 Beacon St., Laurel.

Bonner, John Henry, Steward's mate 1, USN. Wife, Mrs. Evella Bonner, Route 2, Box 96, Perkinston.

Bounds, Ellis, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Dorothy Herbert Bounds, 33 Davis St., Biloxi.

Bradley, McKinley, Steward's mate 1, USNR. Stepmother, Mrs. Mary Bradley, 517 Grant St., Clarksdale.

Brasfield, Rubel William, Aviation machinist's mate 3, USNR. Father, Mr. William Floyd Brasfield, Smithville.

Brewer, Arnie Webb, Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. Adolphus Paul Brewer, Route 2, Tylertown.

Brook, Zack Lamar, Jr., Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Zack Lamar Brook, Sr., General Delivery, Utica.

Brown, Lionell Richard, Seaman 2, USNR. Father, Mr. Lawrence Madison Brown, Box 272, Union.

Burroughs, Ralph Lane, Sr., Pharmacist's mate 3, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Nadine Agatha Burroughs, RFD., Harpersville.

Busby, Richard Cran, Hospital apprentice 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Eleanor Busby, 8th Ave., Laurel.

Campbell, John Eddie, Steward's mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arve Campbell, Route 7, c/o Mr. Trusty, Water Valley.

Campbell, Robert Phillip, Aviation Cadet, USNR. Foster-father, Mrs. John V. Campbell, 10 Adams St., Grenada.

Cartlidge, J. P., Lieutenant, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Andrew Cartlidge, Route 2, Hattiesburg.

Caviness, Luther Doyle, Yeoman 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luther Albert Caviness, Box 265, Ripley.

Christmas, Davis Lee, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. J. Y. Christmas, Sr., 2122 Clay St., Vicksburg.

Clark, Eddie Lewis, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. L. T. Clark, 912 9th St., & 46th Ave., Meridian.

Clements, Lenord Euston, Coxwain, USNR. Aunt, Myrtle C. Gordon, Box 85, Escatawpa.

Cole, Wintern Laughton, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Frances Olene Cole, Box 105, Holly Springs.

Cooper, Elmer Richard, Apprentice seaman, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Jewell Cooper, Route 4, Box 14, Vicksburg.

Cox, James, Jr., Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Booker Cox, Sardis.

Crayton, Fred, Steward's Mate, 2c., USNR. Wife, Mrs. Irene Crayton, Drew.

Daly, Bernard Christopher, Chief Electrician's Mate, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Myrtis Simms Daly, 454–6th Ave., Laurel.

Daughtrey, John Archie, Machinist's Mate 1c, USNR. Father, Mr. Evander Mack Daughtrey, Route 3, Box 1, Collins.

Davis, Curtis Lavaughn, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William C. Davis, Route 2, Quitman.

Davis, James Earl, Specialist's 3, USNR. Father, Mr. James Lester Davis, Box 501, Magnolia.

Dayton, Donald K., First Lieutenant, USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Donald K. Dayton, Cedar Acres, Greenville.

Derden, Edward Jackson, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Mother, Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Derden, 387 North St., Yazoo City.

Dixson, Nathaniel Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Maggie Dixson, Route 4, Grenada.

Driver, Odis Lawrence, Seaman 1, USN. Mother, Mrs. Maudie Lee Campbell, Route 2, Nettleton.

Dubois, Ward Auston, Staff Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Sadie Dubois, General Delivery, Charleston.

Duckworth, Benjamin Ford, Apprentice Seaman, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Hattie Duckworth, 1005 S. Theobald St., Greenville.

Dunaway, Charles Watson, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Vetta Dunaway, 202 S. Cherry St., McComb.

Dunnam, James Lewis, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Voncile Brock Dunnam, Box 91, Richton.

Eaton, William Douglas, Ensign, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Daisy Joe Eaton, Box 225, Gulfport.

Ebey, Leslie Levi, Jr., Seaman 1, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Levi Ebey, Sr., Route 2, Box 38, Centerville.

Evans, Hubert Bernon, Seaman 1, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wert Gaven Evans, Route A, Box 6, Perkinston.

Fairchild, Foster Brown, Seaman 2, USNR. Sister, Miss Clara M. Fairchild, Louisville.

Fletcher, Edward, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Fletcher, Route 1, Box 141, Pickens.

Franklin, Leon, Steward's Mate 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Frankie May Franklin, 206½ B. C. Church St., Belzoni.

French, Wilbur Bruce, Aviation Machinist's Mate 1, USN. Wife, Mrs. Lilian Burris French, RFD, McComb.

Gaines, Louis, Steward's mate 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Rosie Lee Gaines, 403 Farmer St., Port Gibson.

Gaither, Stanley Earl, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elbert B. Gaither, General Delivery, Fulton.

Gary, Lester Eugene, Torpedoman's mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert West Gary, Route 5, Jackson.

Gault, William David, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Evelyn Loflin Gault, Carter.

George, Clifford Morriss, Chief radioman, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Josephine Alma George, 725 Ave., F. McComb.

Gillich, Joseph, Fireman 2, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Gillich, 1126 Clay St., Biloxi.

Glenn, Jarvis Hearn, Machinist's mate 2, USNR. Father, Mr. William Chester Glenn, Route 1, Iuka.

Gober, Joe E., Jr., Private, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Willie G. Gober, General Delivery, Georgetown.

Goff, James O., Sgt., USMC. Brother, Mr. Harvey L. Goff, Route 2, Pascagoula.

Golding, Everette Gwin, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Audrey Golding, Farland St., Box 215 Clarksdale.

Griffith, Thomas Carter, Aviation cadet, USNR. Father, Mr. Randolph Ray Griffith, 700 Oak Ave., Columbia.

Hamilton, A. D., Seaman 2, USNR. Father, Mr. Homer Hamilton, % Mr. B. F. Bell, Starkville.

Hamilton, Robert Lee, Apprentice seaman, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Evelyn Pauline Hamilton, Route 2, Calhoun City.

Hanson, Grover Cecil, Aviation machinist's mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Hanson, Route 2, Union.

Hardy, John Sanford, Lieutenant, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Allison Hardy, Route 3, Columbus.

Harley, James Thomas, Steward's mate 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Cleve Harley, Route 3, Houston.

Harrison, William Joseph, 1st Lt. USMCR. Father, Mr. Granville P. Harrison Sr., Ashland.

Hartgrove, Alpha Andy, Quarter master 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Minnie Hartgrove, 227 Issaquena St., Clarksdale.

Hartley, Earnest Lee, Hospital apprentice 2, USNR. Aunt, Mrs. Carl Wilbanks Mitts, 414 Magazine St., Tupelo.

Hartzell, Gordon Page, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Agnes Pickett Hartzell, Pope.

Hathorn, Thurman Eugene, Apprentice seaman, USNR. Father, Mr. Rovert Eugene Hathorn, Route 5, Laurel.

Havard, Walter DeWitt, Seaman 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Nora Bell Harvard, Route 3, Lucedale.

Hawkins, Grady, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Marsella Hawkins, General Delivery, Newton.

Hays, Sam Patrick, Seaman 1, USN. Wife, Mrs. Willa Maxine Hays, Star Route, Dlo.

Henderson, Felix, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Harper Henderson, Box 312, Newton.

Herring, William Wadell, Aviation pilot 1, USN. Father, Mr. W. J. Herring, College St., Winona.

Higginbotham, Leon, Pfc., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Leon Higginbotham, Route 1, Carthage.

Hill, Charles Lee, Ship's Cook 3, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ruth T. Hill, Shuqualak.

Hill, Francis Small, Jr., Specialist's 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Small Hill, Sr., 126 Snider St., Grenada.

Hodges, T. H., Aviation Cadet, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ferrell Hue Hodges, 405 Rubush St., Meridian.

Holden, Rudolph Valenteen, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Elinora Elizabeth Holden, 201 E. Hamilton St., Jackson.

Holliman, Oliver Lawrence, Seaman 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Rachel Louise Holliman, Route 1, Box 144, Gulfport.

Hollingsworth, Alton Frederick, Seaman 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Annie Mae Thweatt Hollingsworth, 610 16th St., Meridian.

Hooper, James Orville, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Wood Hooper, Route 1, Kosciusko.

Hopkins, Charlie, Private, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Millie Hopkins, Box 213, Brookville.

Howze, A. J., Steward's Mate 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ora Howze, Route 2, Box 165, Shubuta.

Hughes, Glen, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Hughes, Route 1, Ethel.

Jackson, Walter Eugene, Chief Yeoman, USN. Mother, Mrs. Claudia Jackson, Box 545, Corinth.

Jefcoat, Lawrence E., Cpl., USMC. Father, Mr. Felix D. Jefcoat, Route 2, Kilmichael.

Johnson, Henry Lee, Seaman 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Levi Johnson, Rt. 2, Grenada.

Johnson, William Watson, Jr., Metalsmith 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ollive E. LeLouis, Rt. 2, Box 189, Greenwood.

Jones, Archibald H., Aviation cadet, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Archibald C. Jones, Box 42, Magnolia.

Keller, Louis, Boatswain's Mate 1c, USNR. Wife Mrs. Willie Mae Keller, Rt. 1, Box 49, Leakesville.

Kelly, Henry Hern, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Myrtle Ruth Kelly, Rt. 2, Quitman.

Key, Sammie, Apprentice Seaman, USNR. Sister, Miss Carrie Key, Rt. 1, Box 46, Osford.

King, Sidney Clyde, Apprentice Seaman, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Less King, Rt. 6, Corinth.

Kyles, Vanderbilt Rufus, Steward's Mate 1c, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Leeze Mayfield Cooper, Box 104, Gloster.

Lamb, William Moore, Chief Machinist's Mate USN. Sister, Mrs. Virginia P. Fartner, Eupora.

Lancaster, William Parkes, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Bryan Lancaster, 504 West Main St., Louisville.

Laney, Robert Wayne, Seaman 2c, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Emily Maicoe Laney, Dossville.

Lawson, John Edward, Gunner's Mate 1c, USN. Mother, Mrs. Ora Belle Lawson, 139 Armandale St., Jackson.

Lesley, Albert Sidney, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luther W. Lesley, Rt. 1, Dorsey.

Lewis, T. C., Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ineta Lewis, Route 6, Box 28, Tylertown.

Little, Charles Everette, Seaman 1 USNR. Father, Mr. Shem Paul Little, Route 1, Mathiston.

Little, Earnest, Private, USMCR. Father, Mr. Jim Little, Route 1, Box 161-A, Madison.

Malone, James, Steward's mate 2, USNR. Father, Mr. Roscoe Malone, 1117 Mobley St., Shene.

Martin, John Caldwell, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Moody Martin, Dundee.

McAdory, James Berlin, Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Warren Bernard McAdory Route 1, Noxapater.

McAllister, James Carrol, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Adrian McLaurin McAllister, 1116 28th Ave., Meridian.

McCarty, Joseph Coffee, Jr., Ensign, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Patricia Marie McCarty, 775 Arlington St., Jackson.

McCormick, Amos Jordan, Ship's cook 2, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Frank McCormick, Sr., 612 Beel Ave., Greenwood.

McCracken, Joseph W., Cpl., USMC. Wife, Mrs. Joseph W. McCracken, 329 Duncan St., Jackson.

McFadden, Samuel Givens, Ensign, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Sally Williams McFadden, 2018 Laurel St., Jackson.

McLaurin, Phillip Wilson, Machinist's mate 2, USNR. Sister, Mrs. Mavis McLaurin Blair, 312 Midway, Pascagoula.

McLellan, Edward Arthur, Lieutenant, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Von Nelle Byrd McLellan, Summer.

McMorris, Elliott J., Private, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard McMorris, General Delivery, Woodville.

Mitchell, Thomas Reginald, Chief machinist mate, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Allen Mitchell, Route 1, Paynes.

Mobley, William Edward, Aviation machinist's mate 3, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Riley Mobley, General Delivery, Columbia.

Moore, Ebbie Clinton, Seaman 2, USNR. Father, Mr. Kip Moore, Route 1, Fulton.

Moore, Hardy Theo, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Eril Mae Moore, Route 2, Vardamen.

Munlin, John Carlos, Cpl., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Tommie J. Munlin, Houlka.

Nall, John Van Buren, Jr., Ensign, USNR. Father, Mr. John Van Buren Nall, Sr., Petal.

Nance, James Morgan, Electrician's mate 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Ollie Lucille Nance, 307 Pearl St., Greenwood.

Neal, Billy Reynolds, Fireman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Rachel Ora Neal, P. O. Box 176, Caledonia.

Neal, James Albert, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Bessie Saxon Neal, 415 Sixth St., Corinth.

Newsum, William Paul, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. H. D. Newsum, U. S. V. A. Nurses Home, Biloxi.

Nichols, William Thomas, Jr., Boatswain's mate 2, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Thomas Nichols, Sr., 302 East Jefferson St., Yazoo City.

O'Callaghan, George Franklin, Aviation radioman 3, USNR. Father, Mr. James Patterson O'Callaghan, Box 74, Tupelo.

Overby, Denzel, Platoon Sgt., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Lillie E. Burt, Houlka.

Pace, Henry Thomas, Seaman I, USNR. Father, Mr. James Pace, Route 2, Box 864, Hickory.

Parsons, George L., Supply Sgt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. George L. Parsons, 1028 Spengler Ave., Jackson.

Parsons, Thomas Albert, Jr., Chief torpedoman's mate, USN. Father, Mr. Thomas Albert Parsons, Philadelphia.

Payne, Earl Waite, Lt. Commander, USNR, Wife, Mrs. Earl W. Payne, Church Hill.

Pettit, Clarence O'Neil, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Augustus Pettit, Star Route, Houston.

Piner, James Anguish, Seaman 2, USN. Father, Mr. James C. Piner, 116 Rankin St., Jackson.

Pitner, Paul Nelms, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Marcus Pitner, New Albany.

Polk, Earl Baker, Jr., Aviation machinist's mate 3, USNR. Father, Mr. Earl Baker Polk, Sr., 1124 8th Ave., Laurel.

Porter, McCoy, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Minnie Heterson, Route 1, Box 144, Cleveland.

Powe, James McWillie, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Emma Willis Powe, Route 3, Box 51, Waynesboro.

Prewitt, Oscar Estill, Jr., Ship's cook 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Estill Prewitt, Sr., Route 3, Florence.

Purvis, Hewey Herrington, Seaman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Leavie Leacy Purvis, Route 1, Lucedale.

Pyron, Howard Allen, Coxwain, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andy Pyron, Route 2, Duck Hill.

Reeves, Holley Stone, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. H. S. Reeves, 628 Bohn St., Biloxi.

Rimpson, Eddie Francis, Pfc., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Ethel Parks, 1408 29th Ave., Meridian.

Rogers, Samuel Eddie, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John David Rogers, Route 3, Tupelo.

Rouse, Donald G., Cpl., USMC. Mother, Mrs. Anna B. Rouse, 524 Porters Ave., Biloxi.

Rundle, John Nabers, Ensign, USNR. Father, Mr. John Rundle, 119 Margin St., Grenada.

Rushing, J. G., Radarman 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Moon Rushing, Forrest.

Rust, Charles Weathers, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Winonah Weathers Rust, 531 Cherry St., Clarksdale.

Scarbrough, A. V., Fireman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph M. Scarbrough, Route 1, Collinsville.

Scott, Sam Arthur, Jr., Steward's mate 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Arthur Scott, Sr., Sledge.

Roberts, Olin Wesley, Seaman 2, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Minnie Roberts, General Delivery Dlo.

Searcy, Anner Clifton, Fireman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Anna Lee Price Hood, Box 336A, Route 3, McComb.

Shack, John Walter, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Hattie May Shack, Verona.

Shackelford, T. J., Private, USMCR. Mother, Mrs. Mollie M. Shackelford, Route 2, Columbus.

Shepard, Joseph Woodward, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Shepard, 949 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula.

Sissell, John Reuel, Jr., Chief machinist's mate, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Reuel Sissell, Sr., Route 2, Water Valley.

Sisson, Charles Augustus, Lieutenant, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ione Calhoon Sisson, 331 Main St., Grenada.

Slaughter, Albert, Seaman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ruth May Slaughter, Route 2, Box 177, Coldwater.

Smith, James Sinclair, Shipfitter 1, USN. Uncle, Simon Williams, Meridian.

Smith, Ollie Rubbin, Private, USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lem Smith, Route 1. Box 104, Hub.

Speede, Ira Oryon, Seaman 1, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Rembert Speede, 107 Palmetto St., Hattiesburg.

Stephens, Trannie D., Seaman 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Myrtle Lee Stephens, Route 3, Baldwin.

Stephens, William Henry, Private, USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde L. Stephens, 431 Chestnut St., Tupelo.

Stinson, Clyde Harold, Ensign, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Eulice Stinson, Ruth.

Stribling, William Bradley, Jr., Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nancy Vida Stribling, 1520 Kelly St., Gulfport.

Sullivan, Franklin Grey, Fireman 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Francis Jeanette Sullivan, Route 3, Box 46, Seminary.

Sykes, Billie, Seaman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Mary Annie Wilbourn, Scobey.

Taconi, Paul Joseph, Jr., Boatswain's mate 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Joseph Taconi, Sr., 509 Bohn St., Biloxi.

Taylor, Lesry, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Taylor, Jr., Sand Hill.

Thomas, Jack Googe, Sgt., USMC. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Thomas, Route 3, Booneville.

Tolar, Joseph Isarah, Carpenter's mate 2, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Ida Kate Tolar, Route 1, Oakvale.

Townley, William Garland, Pharmacist's mate 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Robert Townley, Route 4, Aberdeen.

Triplett, J. P., Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. George Triplett, Route 2, Carthage.

Turner, Jessie, Jr., Seaman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Madie Turner, Route 1, Box 48, Minter City.

Turner, Willis Boone, Seaman 1, USN. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alvin H. Turner, Route 2, Soso.

Vance, Lonzo Shaw, Jr., Aviation cadet, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lonzo Shaw Vance, Sr., P. O. Box 387, Inverness.

Vickery, Hubert Lee, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Wife, Mrs. Alice Blanche Vickery, 637 Chickasaw St., Jackson.

Vonkohn, Harry Bayard, Sgt., USMC. Father, Mr. Herbert Vonkohn, Bacon.

Wallace, William Thorton, 1st Lt., USMCR. Wife, Mrs. Evelyn L. Wallace, P. O. Box 264, Hollandale.

Waltman, Eugene, Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Waltman, Route 1, Box 184, Ocean Springs.

Ward, James Bryan, Aviation ordnanceman 3, USNR. Father, Mr. William Horace Ward Sr., Enterprise.

Warren, George T. Jr., Private, USMC. Mother, Mrs. Eliza N. Warren, Box 110, Brookhaven.

West, David Sanford Jr., Seaman 1, USNR. Wife, Mrs. Margaret Fowler West, Box 282, University.

West, Robert David Jr., Gunner's mate 3, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert David West Sr., Route 1, Lucedale.

West, Sarah Evelyn, Hospital apprentice 1, USNR. (wr) Guardian, Mrs. Frank Oswalt, Wesson.

Whitington, Frank Smith, Ensign, USNR. Father, Mr. Frank R. Whitington, Summit.

Williams, George, Fireman 1, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Girtrue Williams, 816 Cherry St., Vicksburg.

Williams, Paul Crawford, Ensign, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Nellie Crawford Williams, 187 W. 2nd St., Clarksdale.

Williams, Whitney, Seaman 2, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Lee Williams, McCall Creek.

Williamson, Ernet Truman, Seaman 1, USNR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Warren Williamson, Route 3, Mount Olive.

Willingham, Ernest Van, Pfc., USMCR. Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wiley Willingham, General Delivery, Marks.

Wilson, Charles Stanley, Signalman 3, USN. Father, Mr. C. S. Wilson, General Delivery, Schlater.

Wolfe, George Washington, Aviation machinist's mate 2, UN. Father, Mr. Bearmon Monroe Wolfe, Route 2, Cascilia.

Woods, Robert Mark, Lieutenant (jg), USNR. Mother, Mrs. Addie Claire Woods, 125 Suter Place, Biloxi.

ADDENDA

Cooks, Lewis James, Steward's Mate 1, USNR. Father, Mr. Cal Cooks, Stoneville.

McFarlane, John Norman, Jr., Chief Machinist's Mate, USN. Wife, Mrs. Edna Tira McFarlane, Route 7, Meridian.

Brock, Edmond Reed, Chief Yeoman, USNR. Mother, Mrs. Beall Alexander Brock West, Holmes County.

The Dangers Facing the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] before the Federation of Women's Republican Clubs of Ohio, at Columbus, Ohio, September 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a privilege, on such an occasion as this, for an Indianian to be invited to visit with his neighbors in the great State of Ohio, where the climax of a 16-year-long struggle by the Republican Party, to keep America sound, strong, and free, now holds the political spotlight in the center of the national stage.

The eyes of American public opinion, indeed of world opinion, are beginning to focus on this crucial fight which, having been kept under wraps during the past three national political campaigns, is finally shaping up right here in your own midst. It is my solemn conviction that on the outcome of this struggle rests the future of our constitutional representative Republic.

These are indeed dark days in which we live. Yet, who, save "Red-Herring-Happy Harry," can fail to understand that the course we are continuing to follow is heading us deeper into the gathering gloom of an even darker international night?

Who is there, save our New Deal founding fathers and their fanatical Fair Deal front men, who defy the lessons of history, and who are busy as beavers consigning the historical documentation of their own acts to the secrecy of Hyde Park vaults, State Department files, and White House deep freeze units—who is there, save these, I ask, who cannot see that the road we are traveling is the same road that has destroyed every other nation in history that has tried it?

And, except for those who are determined to take more "calculated risks," even with the future of this Nation, if need be, in order to perpetuate their vested interests in their own terrifying mistakes, who is there who cannot or who will not see that, at the end of this road, lies the destruction of our form of government, of our economic freedoms, of our financial solvency and our personal liberties?

Yet the hour is later than we think, and it is my solemn conviction that if America is yet to be spared the fate of other nations and civilizations of the past, there is a heroic work for us to do.

That is why I have so looked forward to this occasion. Knowing the background of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, I knew that your concern, first, last, and always, is for the future of these United States. I knew that this same background of basic Americanism has been reflected in the caliber of men you have chosen to represent your great State in the United States Senate, my distinguished colleagues, Senator TAFT and Senator BRICKER.

Certainly, you must be proud that Ohio, like my own native State of Indiana, is one of the few States left which can boast that both of its representatives in the highest legislative body in the land have been in the thick of the fight to preserve the traditional safeguards of our free American institutions, and that these representatives, no matter how overwhelming the odds, have refused to strike their colors.

That is why this opportunity to speak to you meant so much to me. I knew that I could speak to you in the common language, of a common faith, in a common cause. That is why, I am also sure you realize, I am not here begging for votes, or asking political support for predigested, crackpot cures for any of our economic, social, or political ills.

I am here instead because of my sincere desire to help my fellow Americans, as best I can, to drag the crucial issues that are involved in the crisis we now confront, out in the open for all to see.

The truth is indeed stranger than fiction. Perhaps that is why it is the truth, and the truth alone, that makes and keeps us free. Certainly if we ever needed the truth about

what has been happening to America during these past 16 years, we need it now. But where are we going to get the truth?

Of course, Hand-out Harry denies that during these fateful years, a whole generation of Americans has fallen ever deeper into the clutches of politcal messiahs, who have been luring us away from our traditional principles and practices, into their promised land, where the greener pastures of "a brave new world of the common man" awaited us.

Yet he boasts that whatever it is that has happened to this generation of Americans, the Democratic Party is responsible for it.

One needs only recall how, during his acceptance speech at Philadelphia, our "little white father," decreed what outrageous and ungrateful wretches those Americans would be, upon whom the Democratic Party had bestowed such unmeasured blessings, during all these years, if they did not return the favor by crossing his palm, with a vote of gratitude, and by returning him to power.

Certainly we can remember how he insisted and continues to insist, that the Democratic Party is the only political party in this Nation exclusively devoted to the people, to progress, prosperity and peace, and the only party that can be entrusted with the task of completing the journey to the promised land, which he still sees stretched out before him.

Why, just three days ago on the Democratic Women's Day program, the President charged that those who opposed his Fair Deal as alien and dangerous, were 160 years behind the times, and that he was only determined to make the Federal Government carry out what he calls the general welfare mandate in the Constitution.

I just know the Republican women of Ohio wouldn't want me to let that one go. So let's just go back 160 years to check up. Here is what Thomas Jefferson had to say about this so-called welfare mandate of the Constitution, and I quote:

"I am for preserving to the States the powers not yielded by them to the Union, and to the legislature of the Union, its constitutional share in the division of the powers; and I am not for the transferring of all the powers of the States to the general government and all those of that government to the executive branch. I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, supplying all the possible savings of a public revenue to the discharge of the national debt, and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans and for increasing every device, the public debt, on the principles of its being a public blessing."

Actually, such manhandling of history, by an American President, would be an uproarious practical joke, if it did not reflect such a tragic reality.

And we had better find out, quickly, why "historical-accident Harry" believes he is the exception to this historical rule.

The fact is, that this man, who is shouting about the welfare mandate of the Constitution, has been picking the political fruits of political demagoguery for so long now, he just cannot see the police-state fences he is building around the orchard, for the trees. Figures recently published show that Harry Truman has spent more of the taxpayers money in the past four peacetime years, than all of our American Presidents from George Washington, to and including the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. These figures show that from 1789 to July 1, 1941—thirty-one Presidents working 152½ years spent a little less than $180,000,000,000, this including the entire cost of the war of 1812, the Mexican, Civil, and Spanish-American wars and including the entire cost of the first World War, together with the alphabetical pump-priming projects of the New Deal. But from July 1, 1945, to July, 1949, President Truman's Federal spending programs have cost the American taxpayers a little more than $180,000,000,000.

It is obvious we shall not get the truth from a President who can see nothing but such sweetness and light. Yet, he is so cocksure in his beliefs that when the slightest criticism is raised, when he confronts irrefutable proof to the contrary, or when he is asked for demonstrable accomplishments of what his world crusading fervor has achieved, he resorts to ridicule, smear, to charges that vested interests or isolationist obstructionists are playing with scare words.

If in our search we turn to the bipartisan Republican leadership, we find it joined hand in glove as the President's partner, continuing to hold high his hands, and refusing to let the American people see what he is holding in them. If we turn to the American people, we find that the so-called champions of a people's party, have finally succeeded in transforming what ought to be an enlightened, aroused and united public opinion, into a welter of bewildered, resigned, and scattered fragments, of pump-primed pressure groups.

These are the reasons why I believe that, if we are now determined to see this crisis through, we are forced back onto our own resources, where we must stand our ground, and dare to trust and to act on our own deepest convictions.

It must be obvious to you folks that the time has come to call a spade a spade. And if we are ever again to regain control over our own destiny as a free people, I am convinced that now is the time to start, and we must start with the facts.

It may be that the President and his bipartisan Republican supporters actually believe that those who have seized control of the Democratic Party during the past 16 years and who have forced the Republican Party into line, have really been strengthening the voice and the participation of the American people in the administration of a constitutional representative republic.

But how many of you folks believe it? How many of you believe that your own best interests can be served by a continued abdication of its constitutional powers by Congress to the Chief Executive?

It may be that these same men believe that the staggering concentration and abuse of arbitrary power, which has mushroomed the Federal Government into a monstrous bureaucracy, is the kind of progress that has strengthened the future of our American traditions.

How many of you folks want to expand the army of over 2,300,000 civilian employees which is already on the Federal pay roll, exclusive of the armed services?

How many of you believe that you can maintain your freedoms under an economic system that is rapidly being taken over by this army of bureaucrats and which is being subjected to more and more Government red tape, regulation, and control?

How much further do you think this Government can extend its influence, without finally taking over the direction of our lives and putting us on its bureaucratic leash from the cradle to the grave?

How many of you want to increase the number of nearly 15,000,000 Americans who are now receiving direct subsidy payments or salaries from the Federal Government?

It may be that these same men actually believe that our staggering national debt, that has now climbed back to $258,000,000,000, and the return to deficit spending of $8,000,000,000 in this fiscal year, which underlie the frightful waste and sacrifices of our continued war-stimulated economy, together with the rising tide of inflated blood money which it continues to pour into circulation, is something to boast about as a magnificent achievement, and as a sound basis for our continued economic well-being.

How about you folks? An $8,000,000,000 deficit will soon become 10 billions next year, and 12 billions the next year, and 15 billions the next. When we realize that it takes $5,000,000,000 of national income to pay off one billion of national debt, we can see how we are now being driven to accept as a permanent practice, the mortgaging of our children's future to bail these political pied pipers out of their own blundering promises.

It may be that these same bipartisan architects of our foreign policy continue to believe that the criminal betrayals of America's interests and principles, and the suicidal squandering of American billions, which underlie the vicious struggle of power politics, in which we are caught, represents a firm foundation on which we are building a just and lasting peace.

Yet how many of you folks believe it? How many of you want to continue to be parties to the outrageous secret conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, which these leaders have never dared to submit to the United States Senate for ratification or repudiation? How many of you want to continue to pour out your billions in a suicidal attempt to underwrite the permanent deficits resulting from these outrageous agreements? How many of you realize that already, just from the ending of the war to this very hour, we have poured out nearly $35,000,000,000, which has been siphoned away from us through 23 assorted foreign hand-out programs engineered by this administration? How many of you want to take the next step that will be inevitable, if we keep on the way we are going, namely, the surrender of our sovereignty and freedom into the control of an international superstate, where international allocations of raw materials, industrial potential, and markets and manpower will be used to remake our economic and political systems from one end to the other?

Of course, the deficits of this bold new plan will be underwritten at the expense of the American taxpayer so long as our money lasts.

Is this the direction in which you folks want America to continue to move? I don't believe it. I am convinced that when these implications of what our leaders profess to believe in, are dragged into the open, for all to see, they will die of the withering contempt of the American people.

These things these men may still believe, but if they do, the crisis confronting us now becomes more terrifying than ever. For, from across this land and from the four corners of the earth a rising chorus of brute facts cries out against a perpetuation of this monstrous swindle of the American people for one moment longer.

These brute facts clearly demonstrate that men can continue to be a party to a hoax only in the event that they are either criminally ignorant of the domestic and international facts of life; or second, that they are determined to cover up the bloody tracks of the part they have played in the betrayal and blunders of the past; or that they have become the victims of a self-induced fanaticism that cannot and will not see the truth.

For myself I can come to no other conclusion than that we now confront the consequences of our failure since 1933 to take our leadership at its own word.

Throughout all these years this leadership has boasted openly of its deliberate attacks on our form of government, our economic system, and our way of life. For sixteen long years it has browbeaten, bribed, and sloganized its blueprints into reality over an ever-widening area of our daily lives through four successive national political campaigns.

And what is more tragic, in the process it has discovered how international meddling

fitted into its plans for us right here at home. So successfully have these alleged champions of the common man concealed this fact from the American people that it is not until recent months that those who have been closest to the affairs of government themselves have been shocked into a realization that the gravest danger to our future as a free people comes not from without but from within.

I believe that, as grim as it is, the news that Russia developed the atomic bomb has only made this danger from within graver than before. That is why we now need to recognize this danger for what it is and to attack it at its roots.

For what could be more tragic than that we should not permit these internal forces that are bent on our destruction to continue feeding on our substance and gnawing at our freedoms until they achieve a collapse from within and inflict on us a disastrous defeat which no combination of external forces could ever have imposed from without.

Our duty is to arouse the American people now to the vicious techniques by which these alien forces in our midst are seeking to destroy us, techniques which in turn we must destroy in self-defense.

First is the deliberate plan to isolate our Government from the people. For 20 years the master minds behind this technique have been appealing to the baser instincts, to the selfish interests, the fears, and emotions of racial, religious, class, and sectional groups across this country. They have been determined to divide and conquer us by preventing an aroused and united opposition from calling their hand.

This divide-and-conquer technique has torn the American laborer loose from the economic realities of local interests and set him adrift on the sea of domestic power politics as a puppet in the hands of gigantic labor monopolies and their bosses. The farmers have been set against the consumer; labor against industry; the North against the South; and right against the left.

Never have more flagrant political appeals been made than by the President during this last campaign. In Boston he appealed to the Catholics, in New York to the Jews, and throughout the whole sorry spectacle the Negro was made the special target of his political promises. In addition, a deliberate smear attack on Congress has been carried on for years. This one branch of Government which wields no physical power, which has no arms and no propaganda agents at its disposal, but which is the one bulwark against the usurpation of power that can protect the American people from the tyranny of their own Government.

This divide-and-conquer technique also has practically destroyed the opposition of the Republican Party, whose duty it has been to serve as a watchdog of the people's interests. This kind of a people's government, by its own actions, is determined to divide, conquer, and enslave us.

And if the Republican Party is to survive as a political organization worthy of the name, our duty now is to organize as an honest opposition party and destroy this bipartisan paralysis of our two-party system and our constitutional Government.

The second technique which we must now expose and tear up by the roots is the distortion of the English language out of all recognition by political press agents who continue to publicize as progress this administration's steady march backward into the strangling embrace of statism.

I am sure that, in the face of the following facts, the President's admission that he does not know what collectivism is, is but another way of saying, that he not only does not know where he is going—he still doesn't know where he has been.

And I ask you folks who are gathered here, if, on top of the spider web of powers to make foreign commitments in the field of economics, finances, trade, armaments, and politics, together with the enormous powers the Chief Executive already exercises on the domestic scene, these following additional demands for dictatorial powers are not the very essence of statism, what are they?

If power to nationalize steel is not statism, what is it?

If a determination to continue to squander American resources at home and abroad, even if it means increased taxes or a return to deficit spending is not statism, what is it?

If the compulsory health-insurance program of Oscar Ewing and his welfare state which the Senate turned down, is not statism, what is it?

If Federal aid to education with its Government direction of the Nation's school and its thought-control powers, is not statism, what is it?

If the Spence bill and the Economic Expansion Act of 1949 of Senator MURRAY for the complete control of the industrial and economic life of this country, including price control, and production quotas are not the bone and sinew of statism, what are they?

If the Brannan proposal for subsidizing both the American farmer and the American consumer with its crop-acreage controls is not statism, what is it?

If the so-called reciprocal trade program without any restrictions on the President's power to destroy any segment of America's industrial economic or agricultural life, which the President demanded and got, is not statism, what is it?

If the outrageous powers of a global war lord the President requested under his original military-aid plan are not statism, what are they?

The third vicious technique by which our political planners are seeking to impose their alien ideology and system on us is their hypocritical share-the-wealth program of a welfare state.

Slowly but surely this program is destroying the private enterprise system by putting Government into the field of business, power development and finance, in direct competition with private enterprise.

In addition, it is taxing the new wealth produced so savagely that it is destroying our power to reinvest new wealth in new tools of production to keep pace with the growing society. This share-the-wealth program is the means every totalitarian government has used to destroy the economic independence of a free people and the political freedoms which are based upon it. These share-the-wealth practices are generating into a vicious circle, where the more the Government takes and squanders for nonproductive purposes the less we have left with which to provide for our own needs and the further we head into deficit spending.

It makes the average old-age payment of $20 per month a cruel mockery.

It dupes those who support our social-security system into believing that an extension of the system will strengthen our over-all security, when at this very moment the $9,000,000,000 social-security fund that has been paid into the Federal Treasury has been squandered and must be paid in all over again if this service is to continue.

Such a policy also forces greater and greater reliance on the Federal Treasury until, as right here in the State of Ohio, the following fantastic developments have occurred. How many of you folks realize that in 1946 here in Ohio you raised $319,000,000 in State taxes? This is the sum you used to carry on your State Government.

How many of you folks realize that in this 1949–50 fiscal year you in Ohio will pay as your share of the staggering Federal budget $2,442,000,707?

And is there any question in your minds that with similar conditions prevailing in every State throughout this Union the time has come for the Republican Party to gird itself for an all-out assault on this monstrous Federal vampire that is sucking the lifeblood of our private enterprise and destroying our economic independence and our political freedom?

And, finally, is there any question in your minds but that it is the duty of the Republican Party to expose as a shameless fraud this claim by the leadership of the party in power that it is "the party devoted to the cause of peace?"

Is it not time that we confronted the American people with the fact that the Democratic Party is, instead, a party that has maneuvered us into two world wars in one generation, that has squandered our resources and the lives of our youth on battlefields around the world?

And, it is this same Democratic Party which has lost the peace both times.

Now this same party is determined to surrender what remains of our blood and treasure, and to subordinate what remains of our sovereignty as a free people, to their determination to use the American people to bail them out of this terrifying predicament we all are in.

If the Republican leadership continues to be a party to this further assault on our form of government and our way of life, it will render a criminal disservice to generations of Americans yet unborn.

The only hope I see for the future is that it will not be too late when the rank and file of the Republican Party and the American people wake up and find that we are not laying the foundations of a lasting peace and we are not rebuilding a "brave new world," but instead, we are following the same suicidal course of the seas of international power politics that has destroyed every other nation in history that has tried it.

That is why the future looks so dark. This Government is neglecting its own people, living way beyond its income, flaunting the constitutional safeguards against the abuse of power, and compromising itself behind the scenes in the halls and chambers of secret diplomacy in the most brutal and futile game of power politics in history, squandering the earnings and savings of a free people in a futile betrayal of American interests and ideals and principles all around the world.

Yet, as dark as the future is, I see a ray of light breaking through the clouds. The American people are waking up to the dangers we face, and they are still a hard-working, law-abiding, and God-fearing people. I can see the time coming when they will realize that they cannot entrust the future to those who have betrayed the past, and they will take the destiny of this Nation back into their own hands.

I am firmly convinced that so far as America and the world are concerned, there is just one basic thing wrong now.

Somebody has sent Uncle Sam into exile. Uncle Sam has become a "man without a country," and what the American people must do now is to send out a searching party to find him, and bring him home.

A Rainbow Over the Alps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an article entitled "A Rainbow Over the Alps," by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, which was published in the Washington Sunday Star for September 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RAINBOW OVER THE ALPS—MORAL REARMAMENT IDEAL SEEN AS A WAY TO WORK NECESSARY CHANGE IN HUMAN CHARACTER

(By the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D. D.)

Spanning the sky like a radiant scarf of blended colors, I saw a rainbow overarching the majestic peaks of the Alps. Under that sign in the heavens lay a little town perched on the mountainside 3,000 feet above the city of Montreux and that liquid-blue gem which is Lake Geneva. As a blazing star once hung over Bethlehem of Judea so a rainbow hangs over a little town in another small land, lovely Switzerland.

That spot, high and lifted up, is a modern Mecca which, as a magnet, has been drawing to its spacious Mountain House pilgrims from all parts of this fear-haunted earth. For during these crucial months, when it is later than we think, the paths of peacemakers who are to be called the children of God have led to Caux, pronounced in our English tongue Co.

All for which Caux has become an inspiring symbol fits in perfectly with that opulent word, cooperation. Here is an enchanted mount where the Sermon on the Mount is being put into practical operation in this very year of crisis and chaos. That mountainside has been called by a distinguished Member of the United States Congress "the brightest spot in the dark picture of Europe." In many aspects that somber picture is dismal indeed. One of the world's most profound thinkers, whose frank telling of unpleasant truth has earned him the title of the "Gloomy Dean," Dr. Inge of St. Paul's, London, has just emerged from retirement after much brooding over the present ominous world situation with this startling warning: "Either the nations must surrender some fraction of their independence to a supernational authority which will have the power to settle disputes peaceably or peace will be restored as in the Roman Empire by knockout blow by the strongest power. This last looks painfully like a Tartar domination of Europe and Asia. Shall we have the sense to choose the former alternative?" But the fatal trouble is that the "former alternative," namely, just adjustments of the differences dividing mankind, cannot be chosen unless men and nations change. Above political, diplomatic, and economic levels, earnest men and women weary of frustrated mechanical shuffling of the same old cards of fate, are frankly facing the fundamental necessity—change, changed hearts, changed desires, changed attitudes, changed motives, changed objectives.

A Burmese leader at Caux, speaking for the teeming East, declares: "We need money. We need about everything. But we need most of all changed people, a change which will enable us to trust one another."

Communism is out on a world-wide scale to liquidate one class and put another unchanged class at the top of the heap. Socialism, often sincere enough in its attempts to eliminate exploitation in order to bring the good things of life to all people, is still dealing with unchecked selfishness which can wreck any social scheme. Even in a chastened capitalism, management and labor confront each other with belligerent bitterness and suspicion in a constant tug-of-war. With legislative bricks, a sorry attempt doomed to futility is being made to build an altruistic edifice on the sinking sands of an unchanged society. It is self-evident that the utopian plan will not work without the utopian man.

The only escape from catastrophe is to change human nature. That diagnosis is as old as the Matchless Figure who enunciated the Sermon on the Mount and who insisted, as He fronted the deepest needs of the individual and of society, "You must be changed." "Born again," He called it. That is the working gospel of Caux—change, not in some sweet by and by, but in the here and now. That is the rainbow over the Alps. Here men and women by the thousand, representing all walks of life, from more than half a hundred nations, are finding the secret of actually practicing the presence of God—the God who did not cease to guide and to speak when some holy book was closed centuries ago, but who is speaking now to those who will but listen. Here at Caux, in a hostile world longing for peace but preparing for war, is an arsenal of the spirit where the invincible instruments of moral rearmament are being put into the hands of eager crusaders who are marching forth with the old cry which once rang through the embattled hosts of Europe, "God wills it." Here is the laboratory proof that human relationships, individual and social, dull, defeated and divided, may be changed to relationships radiant, victorious, and united. Seeing that rainbow, parliamentarians, diplomats, legislators, Cabinet members, labor leaders, capitalists, Communists, miners, and ministers—Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Moslems—are climbing the path to Caux, to carry back with shining faces the answer.

Next week the Spires of the Spirit will point to the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Use of Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice To Terrorize Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a public statement issued by the American Medical Association "protesting the use of a police arm of the Government—namely, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association today issued a public statement protesting the use of a police arm of the Government—namely, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance.

The statement revealed that 16 State and county medical societies, and other medical organizations, including the AMA itself, have been made the targets for investigations by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department during the past 30 days.

The medical groups suddenly brought under investigation, it was announced, include the following:

American Medical Association, New York State Medical Society, Utah State Medical Association, Washington State Medical Society, Arkansas Medical Society, and the Oklahoma State Medical Association.

Michigan Medical Service, a Blue Shield prepaid medical-care plan, and the Arkansas Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan.

Los Angeles County Medical Society, California; Beckham County Medical Society, Oklahoma; Wayne County Medical Society, Michigan; Harris County Medical Society, Texas; King County Medical Society, Washington; and the New York County, Nassau County, and Queens County Medical Societies, in New York State.

The AMA statement follows:

"This is an official statement of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, protesting the use of a police arm of the Government—namely, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance.

"The AMA has opened its records to the Justice Department, without reservation, and medical societies throughout the country undoubtedly will do likewise, but we intend to keep the public fully informed of developments, as we are convinced that these are not bona fide antitrust investigations, and that the American people will not tolerate police state methods in this country.

"We would be naive, indeed, if we ignored the political implications of this sudden rash of investigations, attacking medical societies, at a time when the administration is doing its utmost to stifle opposition to its proposed system of Government-controlled medical care.

"This scheme, it is specifically provided, would be a Government monopoly, to which every citizen would be compelled to contribute, and which would destroy all the hundreds of voluntary health insurance systems which now provide prepaid health care for more than 61,000,000 of the American people.

"Certainly it will be a travesty on justice if the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department can be used to silence opposition to the creation of a Government trust in medicine.

"The American people, we believe, will hardly think it a coincidence that these antitrust investigations should be ordered at this time—after there have been repeated threats that medical groups would be investigated because of their opposition to socialized medicine.

"The chronology of events, since the American Medical Association decided to make a Nation-wide campaign against compulsory health insurance, and in behalf of voluntary health insurance, is, we believe, of real significance.

"In November 1948, the AMA at its midwinter meeting, voted to collect funds from its members to finance a campaign of public education on this issue. A public announcement was made to that effect.

"Only a month later, in December, agents of the Department of Justice called on the Chicago Medical Society, seeking to check the society's records in connection with an alleged antitrust investigation.

"During the February session of the board of trustees of AMA in the early hours of February 10, the board room was broken into and records of the board were thoroughly searched by persons unknown. Brief cases of the trustees, left in the room, also were searched. Entrance was gained through a window. The facts indicate this was a search for information, rather than an ordinary burglary. Certainly no friends of medicine would take this means of obtaining medical data.

"A few weeks later, toward the end of February, Administration leaders began threatening medical societies and medical men with investigation as part of their campaign to discredit and intimidate the medical profession. Since then, there hasn't even been much attempt to disclaim the political nature of these investigations.

"On February 28, 1949, for example, one of the national press associations carried a dispatch from Washington quoting Government officials as stating that antitrust actions would be started against several medical societies soon after the compulsory health insurance drive was started in Congress.

"The implication was plain that the investigation would be part of the administration's campaign for its socialized-medicine scheme.

"The threats made then are now realities. An epidemic of investigations, aimed at medical societies and voluntary medical-care plans, has broken out in widely separated States and cities all over the country.

"We want it clearly understood that we believe this attack on the medical profession stems from the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department and political string-pullers who have exerted influence on that agency. We believe it to be an outrageous abuse of public power which far transcends in gravity the issue of compulsory health insurance, vital as that issue is.

"We recognize that politically motivated attacks have been made on many other groups by this Division of the Government—and we invite their cooperation with American medicine in an effort to alert the American people to the seriousness of this trend toward police-state methods. If the police arm of the Government is used to intimidate doctors and others, and this abuse of power goes unchallenged, it may next be used to terrorize publishers or grocers, farmers or lawyers, Catholics or Jews, or any other minority in the Nation."

The Defense Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of October 5, 1949:

CONGRESS CAN NO LONGER DODGE THE DEFENSE ISSUE

For months, ordinary citizens have been confused and even worried by recurring evidences of basic disagreements inside the defense organization. Unification, the catchword, seemed to exist on paper only. Under the surface and sometimes just above it, there were seething quarrels about technical issues difficult for the layman to grasp.

What most of us gathered was that the Air Force was getting most of the defense money and was consequently sitting pretty and that the Navy, as Navy men saw it, was being cut back to the point where its effectiveness as an offensive arm was gravely limited.

The issue almost exploded into the open at the time of the famous anonymous charges against the methods by which the great bomber B–36 was given the prime role as a weapon of offense. A congressional committee heard those charges and finally discovered the source. Nothing was brought out which suggested improper activities either by the Air Force or by any manufacturer.

But the committee did not, at that time, choose to go into the fundamental issue. That issue, as most people now see it, is whether so much stress is being laid on strategic bombing that other weapons equally vital to our national security are being sacrificed.

The Navy has been doing its best to see that the issue be faced. But Navy people, like all members of the armed services, operate under a strict code of propriety. A naval officer who speaks out of turn, who ignores the customary channels in getting his thoughts to the public, takes his career in his hands. Even civilian officials, as the record shows, have to be devious and even clandestine before getting a hearing. All too often, if they do manage to make themselves heard, they are slapped down for their pains.

This is an exact description of the situation. We do not denounce it, for it has certain values. But it has the result, nevertheless, of keeping the taxpayers ignorant of some things they have a right to know.

Now, at last, three high-ranking naval officers, under the leadership of Admiral Denfeld, chief of naval operations, have finally spoken out with admirable clarity giving full expression to their fears. The observant will note that even these naval leaders could not address the country directly, but spoke, instead, to the Secretary of the Navy. It was only because some naval officer took the risk involved and turned copies of the documents over to the newspapers that the country knows how damaging the quarrel has become.

But now that we know, there can surely be no further effort to gloss over the situation. The question before us is not an academic one. It has nothing to do with the prestige of the Navy as compared with that of the Air Force. It isn't whether an admiral shall command a big carrier or a little one. It isn't even whether a B–36, with an atom bomb in its belly, can fly to Moscow and return.

It is, instead, whether the strategic concepts which have resulted in the paring down of the Navy and the whittling at the Army so that we may have a great fleet of strategic bombers in being are soundly based. Do they, in fact, promise us the greatest degree of national security at the lowest possible cost? Are our minds filled with visions of air armadas flying the oceans at the speed of sound and showering atomic bombs on cities and industrial centers, and so winning a quick and easy victory? Are we losing sight of the fact that war, after all, can be a long-drawn-out affair, with men landing from ships on bloody beaches and fighting their way inland with only the protection that ship-based planes can give them?

Certainly no layman can have a fixed conviction on such complex questions. But as a citizen of the country which must endure the strains of a possible war, long or short, he can demand that the decision taken be based on the best possible judgment, technical and civilian, and that once it is taken, all branches of the service give it their full support.

Finally, the only way the citizen can be sure that the issue is being faced is to demand that the Congress undertake a full investigation, letting the public in on every part of it save that which involves strictly military secrets. The whole business has been kept under cover far too long, and has engendered unnecessary emotion. Let's get the facts and make a decision on them.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the passage of the second unification act, I pointed out in a speech on the floor of the House the dangers to the Navy and Marine Corps and their air arms that could arise through administrative actions under that concentration of power. In that speech I quoted the following from a statement of Admiral Halsey:

The concept of what each weapon can or cannot do theoretically is very ridiculous. The only thing I can think of that is more ridiculous is the fact that you have a weapon and, through legislative or other act, you cannot use that weapon because it might interfere with the glory of some other person who has a similar weapon. I think the object in war is to strike with as many weapons as possible as often and as fast as possible. I think that is the surest and best way to terminate a war. I would go further than that, and say I do not think any weapon should be in any way restricted, whether it belongs to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force, or is used only for a special purpose. In other words, they should be used where they are most needed.

As Congress has little power over the armed services left after the passage of that act, it is important that the Armed Services Committee and the Congress fully and periodically look into the administrative actions of the Department, particularly in view of the policy apparently prevailing there of stamping administrative and other material that has no connection with military secrets or security as "confidential," so that it cannot, according to regulation, be given to the Congress or to the public through the press.

Support and Strengthen the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was adopted by the Essex County Bar Association of New Jersey on September 16, 1949:

Whereas the following resolution was recently introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

"It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Essex County Bar Association:

1. That this association endorses the above-quoted resolution and urges the members of the New Jersey congressional delegation to support it.

2. That the secretary is directed to send a copy of this resolution to each New Jersey Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States.

This is to certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution passed by the Essex County Bar Association at its regular meeting on September 14, 1949.

RICHARD J. CONGLETON,
Secretary, Essex County Bar Association.
Dated September 16, 1949.

The American Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] before the Colonial Life Insurance Co. annual convention at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., September 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, my fellow laborers in the vineyards which afford protection to so many of our fellow citizens.

I come here tonight with deep humility. I realize that I appear before a group of American citizens who have rendered distinguished service to our free enterprise system. I am proud that a good part of my life has been spent in the insurance field, not your own specific field but one which gives me a complete understanding of the insurance business generally. It may be of interest to you to know that I am still a partner in one of the oldest fire and casualty agencies in the southern part of New Jersey, so with this brief introduction, you will understand that I am sympathetic to your problems. More than that, I am definitely for the continuation of your place in the American way of affording security to those who truly appreciate the cost of security.

You see, gentlemen, I am mindful of those factors which represent earned security and aid in time of distress, when a family most needs assistance, life insurance provides that need. In New Jersey alone, almost 80,000 death claims were paid during 1948. This means that some 50,000 families received approximately $70,000,000 during those 12 months. Although statistics are often dull and boring, I am sure that it is not boring to know that throughout this fair land of ours, a million and a third benefits were paid upon the death of those insured, with total claims reaching the figure of $1,500,000,000. There is no way to measure the amount of comfort your industry provides to our way of life.

It is because I understand and appreciate your professional contribution to the things which America holds dear that I shall make a special appeal to you tonight, an appeal for that same high degree of your talents in the thing of government that you so enthusiastically give in the interest of your families, your clients and your employers.

Gentlemen, we are met tonight in a period of the world's history which has no counterpart. It will mark either the continuation of progress under a great civilization, or it will mark an end of all that man has struggled to attain down through the ages of his existence.

Your great industry and our great Nation stand tonight on the brink—all of us are in great jeopardy both from within and without our national boundaries—but let me say, without fear of contradiction, that despite the atomic bomb and all its dangers, our greatest threat is from within. And why do I say this? It is because I have seen at close hand the dangers on all sides. Thus, I recognize that our first objective in America must be to revitalize our own internal well-being. We are like the proverbial chain "as strong as our weakest link" and if that weak link is our internal strength, we will collapse as all other great powers have collapsed in the face of external pressure.

Let us, therefore, take our bearings and fairly appraise the trends from within.

As in the case of all giants of strength, we have been resting secure in sinews which have given us strength without properly counting the full measure of that strength. Like Sampson of old, we have been prone to overlook those moral virtues which have furnished the genius to fully utilize our physical powers.

As in the case of Samson, a divine providence endowed us with virtues heretofore unknown. It is well, then, that we remind ourselves tonight that 162 years ago this month there came into being on this continent a constitutional republic founded by men who had thoroughly studied all of the civilizations which preceded ours. They gave us a pattern of government which has never had a peer. We have lived happily under that Government and under it have given the entire world more of the blessings of a bountiful God than it has ever known before. But, gentlemen, we are now on the point of departing completely from the principles of the great charter of liberty and justice. We have reached a point where the pied pipers and the chanters of new orders—the modern economic planners—have all but thrown the system of a well-conceived constitutional republic completely out of gear, and, gentlemen, we have had enough of it to prove to any thinking citizen that their enchanting proposals will not work. Their tunes have, on occasions, frustrated and befuddled even the best of us, but in the light of the fates of other nations which should be clear to us all—it is high time that we get down to earth and think—if not for ourselves, then for those who must one day carry the burdens which our errors may create.

Gentlemen, we have problems in this Nation tonight on the domestic front alone which, if listed categorically, would send you all to your homes with distraught minds, but I shall not visit this misfortune upon you. I do, however, feel constrained to wrap these problems in one package so that you will, in turn, take them to your hearts and, by positive and dynamic action, contribute the best within you to their solution. Gentlemen, a creeping socialism is our worst danger. Like the thief in the night, it is stalking upon us while we sleep. The best proof of this are the current trends in Federal legislation. When carefully analyzed, it becomes at once apparent that they ignore the most fundamental principles of our great system of checks and balances and as for the State and local governments—they cannot long survive the destructive influences of the subsidies and grants in aid which are fast reducing them to mere fictions. I fear that we have already gone much further in this respect than we like to believe to the great jeopardy of our free-enterprise system.

No, gentlemen; we cannot do lip service to a well-conceived charter of government on the one hand, and then on the other violate at every turn the basic principles of that charter and expect it to survive.

When Caesar crossed the Rubicon his act was, standing alone, of no great importance, but it was a violation of a great constitutional principle, and once condoned, it foreshadowed the end of the Roman Republic. By the same token, when his great nephew Augustus induced the Roman Senate, in a period of great depression, to yield to him its powers, the senate never regained those powers, and ultimately the Republic was no more. O my good friends, in this month when we celebrate the adoption of our great constitutional system, may we be inspired by those patriots whose rich experience in the extremes of government gave us its matchless pattern, to turn back to its basic principles before the siren voices of modern day convince us all that there is a magic substitute for work and thereby turn a great and rich economy into a shambles. Can we, the greatest and most intelligent nation of all times, not profit by the tragic errors of history? I know that there are certain dissimilarities between our own Republic and that of ancient Rome, but, my friends, the fundamental principles are the same—exactly the same. So let us take heed, measure the costs, and marshal our forces against the things which can so easily destroy the accomplishments of our brief, but no less noble, national existence.

On the home front we can do this only by clear recognition that we must reduce the ever-growing cost of Government and pare some of the well-meaning but extravagant luxuries by which we now seem enchanted. Otherwise, we will very shortly find ourselves under the domination of a bankrupt Socialistic Government equally as impotent as that in Great Britain today. Oh let us remember the words of that great statesman, scientist, and philosopher, Mr. Franklin, who said: "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

So much for that all-important duty we owe to our country here on the domestic front.

Now, may I turn briefly to the problems which confront us on the international front. On this score I would like to say at the outset that I have faithfully supported every effort which has been made thus far since VJ-day to lead the world to the ways of peace. I concede that I have done this in some instances with serious mental reservations, nevertheless I have felt that the various stopgap and piecemeal steps we have taken have each in their turn provided that all-important factor of time, time during which we could muster our great spiritual and moral forces which are so essential to winning the peace.

Gentlemen, let me repeat what I have said on the floor of the Senate of the United States: "The problem we confront today at the international level is not merely military and political; it is economic and moral. So we must tackle it, big as it is, as a whole. We have been trying to solve it piecemeal. First by the extension of the European recovery program, then by the North Atlantic Treaty, now by military aid, and by the recent currency talks which have had so much publicity recently."

This is not the way out of our dilemma. We cannot hope to achieve peace any more than we can achieve domestic tranquillity here at home by buying our way out. It must be done by setting our sights much higher. We must and right now, face the fact that we cannot indefinitely bear the staggering burden of more and more arms for ourselves and Europe.

As I said to my colleagues in the Senate last July in the debates on the North Atlantic Treaty, I know of no better way than the way our forefathers pioneered when they constituted our own Federal Union. The United Nations is, of course, a forward step in the right direction but even on paper it fails to provide a sufficient formula to enable the great powers which were its sponsors to keep the peace. My good friends, it must be crystal clear to you as it is to me, that nothing short of a world government can

adequately deal with the removal of the atomic threat or initiate a just and equitable program of world disarmament. By what name we call this system of international security, is unimportant. What is important and indeed vital to the world, is that we provide world law which will prevent man from destroying himself and all that he has labored to achieve down through the centuries. To continue with the present inept structure of the United Nations is only to repeat the errors which grew out of the League of Nations. We must revise the charter promptly for in this fast moving world, time is of the essence.

This revision should look, first, to the elimination of unrestricted veto. It should provide an impartial world court. It should treat forcefully with prevention of armaments for aggressive warfare. It should treat squarely and courageously with the use of atomic weapons to remove the atomic threat and then it should provide for a strong international contingent of military forces under proper direction and control to enforce its mandates. Without a strong international police force, a world government would be as weak and helpless as was our own Government under the Articles of Confederation, but should this federation of nations be given a charter, patterned somewhat in the fashion and spirit of our own, with power of enforcement, the hopes of countless millions can be realized and a sound and lasting peace will be well on its way. If we turn our backs on this opportunity, if we continue to muddle on as we have through the past 3 years of precious time, treating with war as something inevitable, then we must take the risk which goes with frustration, apathy, and despair.

There is no easy way to attain this objective, demanding as it does strength, courage, vision, and the highest degree of effort, but attained it must be. In fact, there are only two alternatives; first, the long and tortuous democratic path which is full of pitfalls and temporary set-backs; and second, world unity through might, conquest, and domination by the mailed fist. The latter is the more rapid and certain, but I feel sure that no nation would ever choose that way if the high road of peace were presented to it in an intelligent manner.

In a recently published book, Gen. Claire L. Chennault of Flying Tiger fame makes the following statements based on his experiences:

"As a practicing warrior for many years, I am convinced of the complete futility of war. It settles only problems of the past and creates the new problems of the future. There is no place in the world today for the narrow, competitive nationalism that sparks the tinder of war. My long experience as an airman has taught me the folly of the artificial borders of political states. The ease with which the airman passes them by with his load of peaceful commerce or atomic destruction should have served notice long since that they are no longer necessary.

"I am convinced that the people of this planet must ultimately and inevitably move toward a single form of world government if civilization is to survive. But it is our immediate task to see that this world government comes as a mutual federation of free peoples rather than through the ruthless domination of a master state enslaving all the others. In this struggle there are still many battles that cannot be avoided. This is an amazing admission from a man of war, but its truth is beyond any shadow of a doubt.

I have already said that I know of no other way to the objective which General Chennault would set for us than the one pioneered by our forefathers. Let us look for a moment at their problems. Our Thirteen Original States were faced squarely, as the world is faced today, with complex political, military, economic, and moral problems. They failed to settle them separately and piecemeal, so they finally tackled them together at the Federal Convention. They solved them by a federal union, and why should we not hope for the same success at the world level? The Thirteen States tried, first, the Articles of Confederation. Each State then had its own little army—think of it—its own army, and several then were threatening war on each other—New York and New Hampshire over Vermont; Pennsylvania and Connecticut over the Wyoming Valley. That was the situation under the Articles of Confederation, and in that respect the situation was worse then than it is today, for at least no two of our Atlantic democracies are now threatening war on each other. Oh, I realize the difficulties which confront us today from the division between free enterprise and social democracies, but I will not concede that it is so dangerous or deep-seated as was the division that faced our Thirteen States of yore. Try to remember that each of these Thirteen States then had its own currency, its own tariffs, most of the States were bankrupt, their currency worthless, their trade reduced to barter, and depression was rife. After trying piecemeal solutions, of which the Annapolis Convention was a notable example, they finally followed the lead of the State New Jersey and the Philadelphia Convention resulted. Out of that Convention came a great constitutional republic. What did that change mean? It meant a change from a feeble alliance of State governments to a strong union of citizens—a change from "We, the undersigned delegates of the States" to "We, the people of the United States."

It meant the change of the Congress of the United States from a powerless diplomatic conference, to a true legislative assembly, flanked with both executive and judicial departments. It meant the creation of the first democratic representative interstate government in human history, one that operated up from the people through the representatives they elected, and back to the people, for the peace and prosperity and freedom of the people individually. It meant the transfer from each State to the Union Government of the right to issue currency, regulate interstate commerce or communications, maintain an army, make treaties, declare war, name ambassadors or enter into alliances.

The Constitution of the United States, my good friends, meant the constitution of a monetary union, a customs union, military union, a citizens' union, an organic political union by the people of those States and at the same time, the guaranty by the people of the Union to the people of each State in it that every power not expressly transferred to the Union would remain in the hands of their independent State government or in their own hands.

There are many, I know, who will balk at any suggestion of a federation of world governments. They say it is too difficult and dangerous to achieve. They had their counterparts prior to the Philadelphia Convention and even Mr. Washington in a letter to Hamilton some 6 weeks after the convention began wrote "I almost despair of seeing a favorable issue to the proceedings of your convention, and do therefore repent having had any agency in the business." From a man of Washington's stature, that was truly a discouraging remark but he continued to work for agreement and 6 days after that letter was written, the fight ended by agreement and the famous Connecticut Compromise, to which our own State of New Jersey contributed so much. Here we have a perfect example of how, one day, we can completely overcome the difficulties which face any attempt to federate our world of nations.

Gentlemen, as I have tried to indicate, I am deeply conscious, as you must be, of the dangers and difficulties which beset our Nation and our economy from within and without, and I am certain that we can surmount them, but I say in all seriousness, if we continue to yield to the demagogic influences at work in the world today and swerve from our charted course, away from those fundamentals of a constitutional republic—if we depart from the tried and trusted ways of proven initiative which have built our economy, I predict that within another quarter of a century we will be a broken and divided people, stripped of the capacity either to guide the world on the course of peace or to manage competently our own individual affairs. On the other hand, if we but have the will, if we sufficiently believe in our own capabilities under divine guidance, we can fully meet every burden that world leadership and our own pressing domestic needs impose upon us. We can only do this, however, by developing in America an ever better and finer citizenship. We somehow, all of us, must learn to develop the habit of giving more and more of our precious time to the things of our Government, and we must insist that our leaders in all fields of government be men who are qualified and competent to lead in their respective fields. Having attained this higher quality of citizenship and leadership at all levels, then let us insist that those leaders adhere to the basic principles upon which our constitutional republic was founded and thus avoid the Rubicons which mark the sure and certain way to disaster. If there is any group in America who should accept the responsibility of spreading the gospel of better citizenship, it is the insurance fraternity for not only do they know the pitfalls, but they have the contacts to make the truths known.

Gentlemen, I invite you to join me tonight in a pledge to make our Nation so strong—so competent and so right under the free-enterprise system—that no national leadership anywhere in the world will dare to oppose us and expect to survive.

The American Legion's Exposure of Hate Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report entitled "Subversive Activities of Hate Groups" of the Americanism commission, Department of Illinois of the American Legion:

The American public is becoming increasingly aware that there exist organizations which, under the guise of spreading the principles of Americanism, create discord and misunderstandings among all races, creeds, and colors, contrary to our basic democratic concepts. The American Legion membership has fought for a long time the dangerous and totalitarian precepts of the Communists and Communist front groups. During recent years, it has become aware of other types of anti-Democratic organizations. The Legion's exposure of these organizations has been a great factor in curbing the growth and, indeed, in some cases, putting out of business these potentially un-American organizations in the United States. It is our view that communism, fascism, socialism or any other form of totalitarianism cannot be

countenanced by our membership which must fight these un-American activities.

At the Miami 1948 National Convention of the American Legion, two resolutions, in particular, were passed that form the basis and motivation of this report. These resolutions are quoted below:

"Resolution 264

"Whereas, for God and country, we have again assembled to renew our pledge of allegiance to the principles upon which the American Legion was founded, to consolidate the victories already won and to organize our resources for the battles still ahead; and

"Whereas, the events of the passing year have emphasized more than ever before those dangers to our liberty which spring to life during the slightest relaxation of that eternal and self-sacrificing vigilance which keeps men free: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in national convention, assembled in Miami, Fla., October 18–21, 1948, That we again declare our undying allegiance to the faith of our fathers, the faith that founded a nation of free individuals creating and employing the powers of government only to make their freedom the more secure and their liberty the more desirable, a nation in legend and in fact the last great hope of a theretofore bewildered and enslaved humanity; be it further

"Resolved, That we propose to see to it that this last great hope of man be not lost either to enemies invading from without, or traitors corrupting from within; that this government of free men, by free men, and for the freedom of men shall not be lost either to those who would become tyrants for their own selfish interests or to those whose vulnerability to the songs of Utopia make them the easy prey of fascistic and communistic totalitarianisms; be it further

"Resolved, That we go forth from this convention to warn all those who believe in Americanism that in this hour of national peril, the time is later than we think; that their defense of the life they love must be prompt, thorough, united, and militant; that they and we, defending our Nation in its maturity, are not worthy of the trust given us if we do not pledge to the cause, as did those defending it in its infancy, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor; be it further here and now highly

"Resolved, That we recognize the time of the battle as now, the place of the battle as here, and that we enter the fray in the firm determination that our zeal for Americanism shall be unmatched in degree by the fanaticism of its worst enemies, and that the ultimate victory shall certainly be ours, for God and country."

"Resolution 621

"Whereas it has been the policy of the American Legion, as part of its Americanism program, to condemn and oppose all forms of subversive activities, whether they be manifested by an appeal to racial hatreds and prejudices or by attempts to divide this Nation into industrial strife by agitating and fomenting trouble between capital and labor, and economic group against economic group; and

"Whereas communism is an ideology, a state of mind, a bundle of emotion, which has skillfully organized and developed, with many secret and conspiratorial aspects, to serve where required as a fifth column for the Government of Soviet Russia; and

"Whereas many Communists, Communist sympathizers, and their fellow travelers are reliably reported to have secured employment in confidential and key positions in public office, political and labor organizations, and particularly in the teaching profession in our schools and colleges; and

"Whereas subversive organizations and individuals are continuing their vicious campaigns of propaganda to disunite and divide the American people, setting class against class, race against race, and creed against creed; and

"Whereas these un-American forces are disrupting national unity in these critical postwar years, when victory on the home front and peace in the world are as important as was victory on the battle front; and

"Whereas some form of legitimate democratic action is necessary as a defense against Communist betrayal of our form of government and to insure the safety and security of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we call upon the people of our Nation to oppose this threat to American unity and urge our fellow citizens of all races, colors, and creeds to demonstrate that same spirit of cooperation that was evidenced by our armed forces on the battlefronts in our fight against aggression, bigotry, and intolerance, and fight every attempt of these un-American forces to destroy the fundamental principles of life, liberty, justice, and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution."

The American Legion has always stood for an Americanism based on the dignity and equality of all human beings and has been sternly vocal against false Americanism doctrines that attempt to foster religious, racial, or class hatred among the American people. The American Legion firmly believes that it has helped and can help further in the eradication of religious and racial strife in the United States by exposing to its membership and their families those organizations, groups, individuals, sometimes through publications, radio, and on public platforms, who seek to destroy a harmonious and democratic America.

Therefore, in this new 1949 report of the Americanism Commission Department of Illinois of the American Legion, we shall list and discuss many of the existing organizations whose purposes and techniques are contrary to the basic moral and legal values of American citizenship. We do this, strongly believing, that when the entire membership of the American Legion knows fully about these organizations, and individuals, it will not only not fall victim to them, but it will continue to expose the true character of these organizations and individuals to the entire American populations and individuals that foster racial and religious hatreds. The Department of Illinois, American Legion, has in other exposures emphasized and reiterated its opposition to the equally dangerous Communist groups in the United States. The same is true of the national organization.

After a careful study of the activities of many organizations, we have reached the conclusion that those listed below are inimical to the best interests of American democracy. These organizations are anti-American since they pit class against class, race against race, and creed against creed, and make appeals with varying degrees of emphasis—all with the purpose of creating chaos and disunity among our people.

Anglo-Saxon Federation, Haverhill, Mass., Howard Rand, leader.

The Anglo-Saxon Federation is a group which preaches the theory that they are the true descendants of Israel. They resort to anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism. Operating under various names, the group has its counterpart in all of the English speaking countries. In the United States, it has chapters in Chicago, Dayton, Portland, Los Angeles, and Boston. The official publication of the Anglo-Saxon Federation is a monthly magazine called Destiny.

Christian Nationalist Crusade, Christian Nationalist Party, Patriotic Tract Society, St. Louis, Mo., Gerald L. K. Smith, leader.

Gerald L. K. Smith is probably the most vicious of the rabble-rousing and sensational hatemongers operating today. He has followers throughout the country, and his literature distribution has reached large proportions.

The Patriotic Tract Society is a paper organization that is used as a front for the distribution of this literature. The official publication of Smith's outfits is the Cross and the Flag. Typical of the false and dangerous doctrines that have appeared in this publication are the following excerpts from the May 1949 issue.

"We believe in the complete social and political segregation of the black and white races in America. * * *

"The danger to the white race comes from the aspirations of the Jewish race to dominate the world."

Citizens Protective League, New York, N. Y., Kurt Mertig, leader.

The Citizens Protective League has been a rallying point for Bund elements and native Fascists. On January 10, 1946, Mertig was arrested for unlawful assembly, and drew a sentence of 6 months in the workhouse and served his time. The Citizens Protective League was branded "subversive" by Attorney General Tom Clark in May 1948.

Constitutional Educational League, New York, N. Y., Joseph P. Kamp, leader.

The Constitutional Educational League's main activity is pamphleteering. Pamphlets issued by the group try to create religious hostility. In its accusations of "Communist infiltration," it makes malicious and irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals who are working to strengthen and improve our democracy. The league is a personal vehicle of Kamp's which sells its pamphlets at profiteering prices in order to insure a good living for him.

Great Pyramid Club, Los Angeles, Calif., Ray and Sam Capt, leaders.

Among the leadership of this group are a number of former klansmen. Rev. Wesley Swift has been a regular speaker before this organization. Swift is a former klansman and a known rabble rouser. He has a reputation of being the west coast's most vicious hatemonger.

House of Prayer for All People, Denver, Colo., Rev. William L. Blessing, leader.

Blessing preaches the Anglo-Saxon Federation's type of religion, although he is not directly connected with the group. He is not only anti-Semitic, but frequently makes vitriolic attacks upon the Catholic Church. Blessing's official publication is called Showers of Blessing. A typical quote from his publication is the following taken from the May 13, 1949, issue:

"How much better off would we in this country be if Roman Catholicism were completely defeated—not a Roman Catholic left in the country?"

Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Tex., George W. Armstrong, leader.

The Judge Armstrong Foundation was set up to support financially those divisionist "nationalist" groups in which Armstrong was interested. Armstrong is an independently wealthy man, and has written several anti-Democratic pamphlets. In one of his pamphlets Armstrong urged the repeal of sections of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution "thereby limiting the franchise to the Nation's white Americans," another aspect of the "white supremacy" doctrine.

Ku Klux Klan (Association of Georgia Klans), Atlanta, Ga., Dr. Samuel Green, leader.

We have before us again the hooded secret order and its fiery cross. Its methods of intimidation and terrorism have long been the disgust and disdain of law-abiding citizens. Antimask laws have been passed in a number of southern States, in an attempt to curb the order. The Klan is, of course, not only anti-Negro, anti-Jewish, and anti-Catholic,

but extends its cruel and inhuman activities against veterans. Recent indictments and resultant convictions of those guilty of these illegal acts are eagerly expected by all law-abiding and law-observing citizens.

Loyal American Group, Union, N. J., Conde McGinley, leader.

This organization was set up by McGinley for the purpose of promoting his hatemongering paper Common Sense. Numerous meetings have been held in New Jersey, at which some of the most poisonous literature published has been offered for sale. The Loyal American Group and Common Sense have been denounced by patriotic organizations and by official Catholic bodies. The official publication of this group is called Common Sense.

Lutheran Research Society, Detroit, Mich., Lawrence Reilly, leader.

The Lutheran Research Society is an independent venture and has no connection with the official Lutheran Synod, a respected organization. This society does not hold regular meetings but it has sponsored the appearance in Detroit of Don Lohbeck and Kenneth Goff, representatives of Gerald L. K. Smith. The official publication of this group is called Eleventh Hour.

National Blue Star Mothers, Philadelphia, Pa., Catherine V. Brown, leader.

A violently hatemongering group. It labels its critics as either "Jews" or "Reds." This group distributed masses of hate literature at the Democratic and Republican conventions held in Philadelphia in 1948. They tried to cause disturbances to focus attention on their activities. This group has recently been cited by the Attorney General's office as being subversive.

National Economic Council, New York, N. Y., Merwin K. Hart, leader.

Merwin K. Hart operates his National Economic Council with an aura of respectability. Recently, Hart abandoned his subtle innuendoes and showed his true character by resorting to anti-Semitic items in his publications and speeches. The official publication of this group is the Economic Council Letter.

National Renaissance Party, Beacon, N. Y., James H. Madole, leader.

The National Renaissance Party is a one-man paper antidemocratic organization. Madole is given to one-man crusades which have fancy titles, such as "The Animist Party," "National Renaissance Party," etc. He has made several attempts to unify the nationalist movement in the United States. The following are two of the published aims of this group:

1. "Nationalization of our people through an educational campaign among college, church, and labor groups."

2. "Termination of political bureaucracy and establishment of rule by the intellectual elite."

Nationalist Action League, Philadelphia, Pa., W. Henry MacFarland, Jr., leader.

The Nationalist Action League was recently set up by MacFarland, a Philadelphia extremist. It is a political action group, aimed at influencing voters and legislation. MacFarland works closely with such known rabble rousers as Catherine V. Brown, of the National Blue Star Mothers, Gerald L. K. Smith, etc. The official publication of this group, National Progress, has, as of June 1, 1949, been consolidated with Common Sense, the official publication of the Loyal American group.

Organized Americans of German Ancestry, Chicago, Ill., Leonard Enders, leader.

A number of leaders of this group were former Bund members and key figures in the old pro-Nazi Einheitsfront. The ostensible purpose of the group is to weld all German-Americans together in order to form a powerful political bloc.

Original Southern Klans, Inc., Columbus, Ga., Alton E. Pate, leader.

A splinter Klan group which is openly anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic, and whose aim is the defense of white Protestant America. The official publication of this group is called the Klansman.

Pro-American Information Bureau, Hinckley, Ill., Andrew B. McAllister, leader.

The Pro-American Information Bureau is a clearing house for hate literature. McAllister has made several unsuccessful attempts to coordinate the hate groups and has held several conferences in Hinckley, attended by representatives of a number of these groups.

Protestant War Veterans of the United States, New York, N. Y., Edward James Smythe, leader.

A one-man paper organization, which publishes anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic leaflets and pamphlets. Apparently the funds solicited by Smythe through his organization are his sole source of income. He is a habitual drunkard with no ostensible means of support. In a recent brochure, published by this group, the following slogan was printed in bold type: "We stand opposed to racial and social equality."

Public Affairs Forum, Los Angeles, Calif., Earl Craig, leader.

A hate organization, which holds regular meetings. The gatherings of the forum are the rendezvous of a number of other notorious rabble rousers and a distributing point for a great deal of hate literature.

Not only are there organizations which by their policies and techniques attempt to further disunity among the American people, but there are a number of publications that have no organizational affiliations which try to contribute to the same pernicious goal. Below are listed some of the more important of these publications (name, address, and editor):

American Digest, Americus, Ga., Dewey Taft.

Beacon Light Herald, Atascadero, Calif., William Kullgren.

Bible News Flashes, Faribault, Minn., William D. Herrstrom.

Boise Valley Herald, Middleton, Idaho, A. Boyd and I. W. Cornell.

Broom, San Diego, Calif., C. Leon DeAryan.

Christian Veterans Political Counsel, Chicago, Ill., Frederick Kister.

Dayton Independent, Dayton, Ohio, A. G. Silvey.

Defender, Wichita, Kans., Gerald B. Winrod.

Free Press, Redmond, Oreg., Syd D. Pierce.

Georgia Tribune, Columbus, Ga., "Parson" Jack Johnston.

Guildsman, Germantown, Ill., Edward A. Koch.

Kingdom Digest, Fort Worth, Tex., J. A. Lovell.

Malist, Meriden, Conn., Henry S. Sattler.

Methodist Challenge, Los Angeles, Calif., Robert P. Shuler.

Ohio Pioneer, Dayton, Ohio, Ohio Pioneer, Inc.

Prayer Circle Letter, Wichita, Kans., publisher, Gerald B. Winrod.

Truth and Liberty, Minneapolis, Minn., C. O. Stadaklev.

Williams' Intelligence Summary, Hollywood, Calif., Robert H. Williams.

The American Legion has on many occasions warned its membership of activities of some of the groups and publications listed above. Ever since the end of World War II the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has energetically gone on record every year in condemning all those organizations and publications which try to foster disunity in our country. Other sections of the Legion have opposed those groups similarly. For example, in January of 1949 the Legionnaire, official publication of the American Legion, Department of New York, warned its membership not to have anything to do with the publication Common Sense, the Union, N. J., paper published by Conde McGinley. The Legion publication referred to Common Sense as "a hate sheet," and said that Common Sense is "violently anti-Semitic and in direct conflict with the principles of the American Legion." In a recent issue, April-May 1949, of the Summary of Trends and Developments Exposing the Communist Conspiracy, published by the national Americanism commission, subcommittee on subversive activities, of the American Legion, a number of the organizations listed above were classified by this publication as subversive; for example, the National Blue Star Mothers of America and Original Southern Klans, Inc.

The chairman of Americanism commission of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, believes that it is the duty of every Americanism chairman of every post and that of each liberty-loving American not only to familiarize himself with the contents of this report but to be responsible for the creation of positive Americanism programs on this subject throughout the year. This department invites post Americanism chairmen and other citizens to make use of its services in the creation of affirmative and effective Americanism programs in local communities. It is hoped that these programs will carry into effect American Legion mandates against those fostering religious hatreds, hate mongering, and rabble rousing as well as other mandates against those isms which place in peril our established institutions.

ELLIODOR M. LIBONATI,
Chairman, Americanism Commission, Department of Illinois, American Legion.

Work of Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. WOOD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OCTOBER 6, 1949.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: The first session of the Eighty-first Congress is drawing to a close and, in this connection, I would like to apprise you of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the present date.

The committee is divided roughly into three separate sections, for the purpose of this report to you: Research and files, publications, and investigative. However, in actuality, it is one coordinated unit, each section dependent on the other for the successful functioning of the committee in accordance with House Rule 5 of the Eighty-first Congress.

The Research and Files Section is responsible for the indexing of all subversive publications, indexing of officers and members of subversive organizations, research on the character of new organizations, indexing of Communist Party nominating petitions, indexing of all testimony taken in executive or public session, indexing of information received by the Investigative Section from local investigative agencies and sources other than confidential informants, and the preparation of reports to inquiries from Members of Congress on the character of individuals and/or organizations.

At the present time this staff, with the assistance of clerical employees of other sections, is indexing the complete membership list of a certain subversive organization.

Ninety-three countries, totaling close to 1,000,000 persons, are represented in this membership. Evidence of the accuracy and value of the work performed by the Research and Files Section is shown by the fact that the committee has received so far during the Eighty-first Congress 828 requests from Members of Congress for information on individuals and organizations and, while the files contain no information on many individuals whose names were submitted, information was supplied on 4,165 individuals and organizations. During the same period, 2,991 visits were made by investigative agents of the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of checking the committee's files and 381,644 individuals were checked by these agents. Hundreds of exhibits not available from other sources were supplied these investigative agents for use mainly under the President loyalty program. During the same period, 68,000 cards containing individual or organizational references to subversive organizations and activities were added to the committee's index system. In addition to the above, the Research Section has prepared, and the committee has approved, the report on the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace and the report on the American Slav Congress and associated organizations.

The Publication Section is responsible for the printing and mailing of all publications issued by the committee. At the start of the Eighty-first Congress, there were on hand requests for over 500,000 copies of publications on communism in the United States of America, government, labor, education, and religion, which were published during the Eightieth Congress. Regarding the publications printed during the Eighty-first Congress, namely:

Documentary Testimony of Gen. Izyador Modelski, Former Military Attaché of the Polish Embassy, Washington, D. C. (March 31 and April 1, 1949).

Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and Held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949 (April 19, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory and Atomic Bomb Project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., Volume 1 (April 22, 26, May 25, June 10 and 14, 1949).

Testimony of Paul Crouch (May 6, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Clarence Hiskey Including Testimony of Paul Crouch (May 24, 1949).

Testimony of Philip O. Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney and Statement Regarding Their Background (May 24, 25 and June 9, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Toma Babin (May 27 and July 6, 1949).

Soviet Espionage Activities in Connection With Jet Propulsion and Aircraft (June 6, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Steve Nelson (June 8, 1949).

Report on the American Slav Congress and Associated Organizations (June 26, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Minority Groups—Part 1 (July 13, 14, and 18, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Minority Groups—Part 2 (Testimony of Manning Johnson) (July 14, 1949).

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Labor Unions—Part 1 (Local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, Pittsburgh, Pa.) (August 9, 10, and 11, 1949).

The committee has received requests totaling in excess of another 500,000 copies. By the end of September requests for over 1,000,000 copies of the committee's publications will have been completely filled. I might state that as of January 3, 1949, the committee had on hand more than 250,000 communications from the American public which had not been answered. I am pleased to report that, as of this date, each and every one of these communications has been answered.

The Investigative Section is responsible for the actual investigation of individuals and organizations in the United States who are suspected of participating in subversive activities of the right or left. During the present Congress, many investigative leads have been followed by the committee, in addition to which the investigative staff has been ordered by the committee or requested by Members of Congress to conduct full investigations of Communist influence such as communism in Hawaii and the Communists within Local 601, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO. Many leads still remain unpursued because of the small investigative staff. In organizational categories, investigations have been made during the first session into Communists in labor organizations, Communists in the field of entertainment, Communists in education, Communists in the Government, Communists in United Nations organizations, Communist-front organizations and Communist Party membership in Washington, D. C., and other cities of the United States. In addition, investigations have been made of the activities of organizations commonly referred to as Fascist.

In spite of numerous handicaps, the committee has produced sufficient evidence during this first session to hold hearings relating to former employees of the United States Government, some of whom were employees of the radiation laboratory at the University of California; former employees of the meteorological laboratory, University of Chicago; a former employee of the Department of the Army; a former employee of the Department of State; a former employee of the Farm Security Administration; and a former employee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In addition to these cases, the staff has under investigation other past and present employees of the United States Government.

Through hearings on the subversive activities of former employees of the United States Government, the Committee was able to inform the Congress and the American people of the existence of a Communist cell within the radiation laboratory at the University of California and that a member of this cell supplied to a high Communist Party functionary information regarding the highly secret project relating to the development of the atomic bomb at the radiation laboratory.

Through a report issued by the committee, the Congress and the American people have been advised of the fact that a former employee of the Department of the Army was identified as being a member of the Communist Party. This individual, while employed by Army occupation forces in Japan, was discharged from his position because of serious infractions of security regulations.

It was also made public that this witness, after being refused a passport by the Department of State, attempted, with the aid of Communist lawyers, to ignore our passport laws and to depart from the United States on the escape ship of Gerhart Eisler, the *Batory*. This witness was attempting to leave the United States for the purpose of accepting employment in an iron curtain country.

The Congress and the American people were further advised that a former employee of the Department of State permitted herself to be used as a courier for the Communist Party during the period of her employment with the United States. This witness, while denying membership in the Communist Party, admitted contacts with Gerhart Eisler. She explained an invitation which she had extended to Eisler and his wife as one arranged for a discussion of Germany and its problems. In view of the fact that Eisler had been in the United States since 1941, it does not appear likely that he could have been in possession of any first-hand knowledge of conditions in Germany. With respect to her denial of membership in the Communist Party, exhibits introduced in the trial *United States of America* v. *Judith Coplon* reflect that, according to the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, this person who denied membership was a well-known Communist Party member on the east coast, about whom the Bureau has information furnished by a confidential informant who was himself a member of the Communist Party.

The Congress and the American people were further advised of the activities of Clarence Hiskey, a former employee of the meteorological laboratory at the University of Chicago. The committee reported during the Eighty-first Congress that Hiskey was a contact of a known Soviet espionage agent who had operated in the United States; that he furnished this Soviet agent with certain secret information regarding the atomic bomb project, not necessarily the bomb itself; and that he encouraged another person engaged in the development of the atomic bomb to meet a Soviet agent for the purpose of supplying information to him. This latter person who met with the Soviet agent refused to cooperate with him. Another former employee of the atom bomb project who was introduced to the Soviet agent by Hiskey is presently under subpena and will appear before the committee in the near future. During this session the committee made public testimony reflecting that Clarence Hiskey was a long-time member of the Communist Party, having been a member in the early 1940's during the time he was a student at the University of Tennessee and an employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority. During this period of his membership in the Communist Party, Hiskey was shown to have been a Communist Party functionary who was considered loyal enough to be elected a delegate to, and who attended meetings of, the control commission of the Communist Party.

From the sworn testimony of Paul Crouch, former functionary of the Communist Party and one-time organizer of the party in Alameda County, Calif., much of which testimony has been made public, the activities of the Communist Party in the formation of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which organization is now defunct, were exposed and thereby the citation of this organization as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities was further substantiated. In executive testimony, the committee obtained from Paul Crouch the identity of the Communist Party functionaries with whom he associated during his years of membership with the party, which individuals are now under investigation by the investigative staff.

The Congress and the American people were advised, through the testimony of Gen. Izyador Modelski, former military attaché of the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C., of the use the Soviet Government makes of the embassies and consulates of Soviet satellite countries to carry out its international espionage activities.

Investigations prior to and during the scientific and cultural conference for world peace supplied the committee with sufficient evidence to justify the committee's report to the Congress on the purpose of this conference and on the Communist or Communist-front associations of the members of the organization which sponsored this conference, namely, the national council of the arts, sciences and professions. Subsequently, other evidence was obtained on the background of this conference and the identity of the persons who, behind the scene, arranged the affair which will probably result in a public hearing in the very near future.

The Congress and the American people were further advised, as a result of an investigation by the committee, of the activities of Andrei V. Schevchenko, a Soviet citizen who was sent to the United States as a purchasing agent for the Soviet Government but who in fact and reality operated as an espionage agent and attempted to obtain highly secret information on aeronautical designs and developments from employees of the Bell Aircraft Corp.

Investigation uncovered the activities of Toma Babin, a Yugoslav citizen who entered the United States illegally on two separate occasions and who in late years, as an official of the Yugoslav Consulate in New York and president of the Yugoslav Seamen's club in the United States, was active among Yugoslav citizens and nationals residing in the United States. Babin, in his testimony before the committee, denied knowledge of individuals and activities about which he was questioned. For instance he denied any knowledge of a meeting held by the nationality commission of the Communist Party in New York on June 21, 1947, at which meeting Communist Party strategy among foreign nationality groups was discussed and decided upon, when in fact Babin was the one who reserved the meeting room and signed the register. A handwriting expert who compared the signature on the hotel registration card with Babin's known signature, testified before the committee that the signature on the hotel registration card in question was the genuine signature of Tom Babin. Consideration of a recommendation for perjury prosecution is awaiting the outcome of deportation proceedings which are presently pending.

Investigation resulted in making public the activities of Steve Nelson who has been a member of the Communist Party of the United States for some 25 years, holding many positions, including that of a member of the central committee of the Communist Party. The American public for the first time was furnished with a complete history regarding Steve Nelson. The committee hearings and report covered Steve Nelson from the time of his arrival in the United States on a fraudulent passport until the present date. The committee exposed Nelson's use of other fraudulent passports and his connection with the Soviet espionage apparatus in the United States.

For the first time, the American public was apprised of the manner through which Joseph Stalin operates the Communist International. This was established during the testimony of Joseph Zack Kornfeder, former student at the Lenin Institute in Moscow, Russia.

Extensive investigations resulted in the exposure of the American Slav Congress and associated organizations. This report, which was published on June 26, 1949, details the role the American Slav Congress played in fostering communism among citizens and nationals of Slavic descent residing in the United States. The report further exposed foreign-language periodicals and newspapers printed in the United States by members of the Communist Party, which publications are as Communist as the Daily Worker openly financed and managed by the Communist Party.

Investigation of Communist infiltration of minority groups produced, through the public testimony of Manning Johnson and others, evidence of the infiltration of Communists among Negro people and the part the Communist Party has played in deceit among this race for the purpose of fostering its program toward a Sovietized America.

Investigation of Communists within the labor movement resulted in a hearing and partial exposure of the Communist control which has been exercised over Local 601 and District Council 6 of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO. Only four of the alleged Communist Party members of Local 601, who are now and were officers of District Council 6, have to date been brought before the committee. These four all refused to confirm their membership in the Communist Party on the ground that to do so would tend to incriminate them. Other alleged Communists within this district are under investigation at the present time, as well as Communists in other labor organizations, such as the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union.

The committee, as the result of further secret investigation of the Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers case during the Eighty-first Congress, discovered two additional individuals who have knowledge of Soviet espionage activity in the United States. These individuals were not called as witnesses before the committee because of the indictment of Alger Hiss for perjury before a United States grand jury in New York City. However, at the conclusion of the Hiss case, the committee will subpena four or five individuals and take testimony from them regarding their activity within the Communist espionage apparatus.

Many other fields of Communist influence are at the present time under active investigation. Thus far, the committee's hearings and reports have covered 14 different phases of Communist Party activity.

In the very near future the committee will release several further reports containing information of value to the American public. The committee recently issued a report in which it requested that a witness who appeared before the committee upon several occasions be prosecuted for perjury. This report pertained to the so-called "Scientist X" case.

I shall continue to keep you advised of the work of the committee as it progresses.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

Summary of Rural Life Conference by the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for years, those of us who have known farm life from first-hand experience have sought to secure on the part of city folks a greater understanding of rural problems. For a long time in our country, there was a great gap between farm life and city life. The farmer did not have a tiny fraction of the comforts and conveniences which his city brother enjoyed. His income was only a fraction of that earned by the city worker. His children did not get the schooling, the health facilities, did not live in comparable housing, did not have the opportunities for growth and development that youngsters in the cities did.

FARMER IS ENTITLED TO PHONE

Now, however, there has come a revolution in the thinking of our people—a revolution which we welcome. More and more the city folks are seeing that upon the farmer's prosperity, upon his wealth, upon his health, his enjoyment of modern standards, depends much of the future of our country. Last night, without even a roll call vote, the Senate approved rural telephone legislation. The unanimity with which this legislation was adopted with certain amendments is heart warming indeed because it signifies the fact that America will not tolerate a condition wherein 45 percent of her farm homes are not connected with telephone lines. Now this bill has gone to conference, where I am sure an equitable version will be worked out.

FARM PRICE PROBLEM

Tomorrow we will be taking up the farm price support bill. Out of the intense debate on the floor and in committee will come, I trust, a measure which will guarantee the farmer his cost of production plus a reasonable profit without resulting in:

(a) Unfair prices to the consumer, or

(b) Disproportionately high charges to the Federal Treasury.

The farmer still only gets a small fraction of the consumer's dollar. The price spread between what the farmer gets for his milk, for his butter, for his cheese, and what the consumer pays for those items, is still enormous, largely because of increased costs of labor all the way down the line in the processor, the distributor, the transportation company, and so forth. This question of farm prices will continue to be a great challenge to us, but we are on the way toward meeting it.

If we give the farmer the electricity he deserves, the phone equipment, if we give him as we have started to—aid for rural housing—we will help him help himself, which is in the true American tradition.

FARMER ASKS FOR JUSTICE

The farmer is not asking for handouts. The farmer is not a leaner on Government. But he does ask for justice for himself and his loved ones. He will not take a back seat in the forward progress of American civilization.

Recently there was held in Columbus, Ohio, a meeting of the American Countrylife Association. More than 300 delegates attended and a wide variety of subjects were discussed by leaders in the farm movement, religious dignitaries, labor representatives, businessmen, etc.

We, of Wisconsin, are proud that Mr. Milo K. Swanton, one of the outstanding agricultural leaders of America's dairyland and executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, was elected as president. In the October 1, 1949, issue of the magazine, Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, an editorial reports Mr. Swanton's words on taking over the office of president of the association:

> No challenge is greater than to build in the souls and minds of rural people a deeper sense of the values of country life and living.

The Wisconsin Agriculturist goes on to say:

> This is a job that should be taken up by all of us. There are many great values in rural living. Let's bring them out in the open and talk about them. * * * Let's all work to preserve these values of rural living for generations to come.

The farm, Mr. President, as I have pointed out, is the great laboratory of life. It is the source from which the greatest of American values have come—independence, self-reliance, a joy in labor with one's hands to bring forth the fruit of the earth.

We all know of the drift away from the farm in recent years, because farm life has simply not paid off economically as it should in comparison to the reward in the cities.

It is up to us to help maintain the farm as the bedrock of American civilization.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary in the aforementioned magazine, the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, describing the various topics that were discussed at this rural life conference.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER FARM POLICY UP TO RURAL FOLKS—COUNTRY LIFE DELEGATES URGE COMMUNITY ACTION TO FOSTER AN EFFICIENT NATIONAL PROGRAM

Can farm policies be decided upon in your own home or in your local community? More than 300 delegates to the American Country Life Association who met recently in Columbus, Ohio, thought they could.

Several workshops discussed the theme "The Place of the Rural Community in Farm Policy Making." Their conclusions may be summarized as follows:

RURAL HOME

The rural home is the nucleus of all civilization. It can provide a proper environment for all to live life at its best. It can foster independent thinking through family councils. The spirit of its homes influences the community.

RURAL CHURCH

One of the functions of the church is to develop leaders who will speak as Christians and face issues from a moral standpoint. The church needs pastors genuinely interested in rural life, with an understanding of its problems.

RURAL EDUCATION

Our basic job is to build good men and women who can live and work together as world citizens, who have a sense of responsibility and stewardship.

RURAL HEALTH

A public health system with emphasis on preventive medicine would solve many problems. Health councils are needed with trained public health workers, and practical nurses. Prepayment plans for medical care were approved.

LABOR AND AGRICULTURE

There is a lack of understanding between labor, industry, and agriculture. Decentralization of industry into small communities and joint conferences between labor, agriculture, and industry will help.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Leadership is needed to encourage more local participation in shaping Government policies. Unbiased agencies need to study Government policies and make their information available to community discussion groups.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Farm organizations have a responsibility to stimulate local discussion of Government policies. They should call results of such discussions to attention of State and National organizations.

Some of the Nation's leaders were represented in the panel on "What Does Agriculture Need?"

They included Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Albert Goss, master of the National Grange; John Davis, National Council of Farm Cooperatives; Mrs. Charles Sewell, Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Charles P. Taft, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Philip Pillsbury, president of Pillsbury Mills; Merle Thomas, Rural Youth of United States of America; and a CIO representative.

Moderator Frank W. Peck, director of the Farm Foundation, summarized their conclusions.

"Agriculture needs an effective sustained demand to meet the surplus problem," the panel agreed. "It needs reasonable price floors. It needs a rising level of living among consumers. It needs improved medical care, education, and recreation. It needs leadership in rural churches. It needs a better understanding among all people of our political economy."

Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara, Catholic leader, felt the most pressing problem of agriculture was to keep in the rural community the majority of the intelligent, spiritually minded people born there.

Methodist Bishop William C. Martin, cited the need for men who take pride in being country preachers.

He urged closer cooperation between all churches and other agencies trying to develop a better country life.

Will Congress Be Duped Into Voting $3,000,000 for a Celebration in Washington, D. C.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that once again, before this session of Congress is brought to a dismal end, Members of the House of Representatives will be confronted with an old grab bag in the form of ladling out $3,000,000 for a sesquicentennial celebration in the District of Columbia.

Members of the House have already emphatically rejected this raid on the Federal Treasury, but the money-hungry boys, evidently finding a fresh scent, have put their bloodhounds to work again. It matters not to them that the Treasury is likely to be five to seven billions dollars in the red next June. It seems that the fitting procedure is to stage a celebration in the Nation's Capital—celebrate next year the Federal debt of more than $260,000,000,000 and the hell-bent-for-election drive down the road to national bankruptcy.

We have no quarrel with the individuals in Washington, D. C., or Whooppole Township, who want to stage a celebration, but let them toss their own money in the kitty. That is precisely the way it is done in every town, village, and hamlet in the rest of the country.

The Washington Times-Herald has a timely editorial on this subject. It follows:

LET'S DO IT OURSELVES

The House of Representatives last week for the third time refused to cough up $3,000,000 for a celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Nation's Capital.

The sesquicentennial officials, therefore, are taking a very dim view of the chances on a real show next year that will mean much.

WE CAN DO IT

We think they are right in saying there's little hope left that the Senate will force the House to back down and put up the $3,000,000. But we think they are wrong when they doubt that a proper celebration can be put on without congressional funds. The sesquicentennial commission has announced that the celebration running from spring to fall can't fail to pay for itself and return a handsome profit besides.

Two ways are open by which the celebration can be made big enough and grand enough to do justice to this once-in-a-lifetime occasion.

HOW TO DO IT

First, every civic, fraternal, and patriotic organization, national and local, like the DAR, the American Legion, Rotary, Kiwanis, Knights of Columbus, Masons, Board of Trade, Federation of Citizens Associations, etc., could band together to guarantee the money needed. The goal should be ten or twenty millions. Then the promoters and organizers who each year plan the conventions for these organizations should pool their efforts and know-how into a grand plan to make this the biggest celebration this country has ever seen.

The second way to put this celebration over would be for the businessmen here to join in pledging a guaranty of several millions in order to attract attention from big-time promoters to come in and take over.

WHY NOT BILLY ROSE?

This country has plenty of men capable of putting on a show of the sort that has entertained millions at the world fairs held in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York. For instance there is Billy Rose who made Fort Worth, Tex., even more famous than Amon Carter, with his aquacade. Or if you like the Hollywood touch, Cecil B. De Mille. Or maybe John Ringling North, the circus genius. At any rate, there are plenty of such able gents to be had, and with the backdrop of Washington for their scenic effect, they could make a show here next year to be remembered.

Gen. Jacob L. Devers—a Soldier's Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, General Devers has completed 40 years of faithful service to his country and has held positions of high responsibility in our national defense set-up during two wars and during the peace that followed these conflicts. Even though he is now retiring from active service, his leadership will long be felt by our Army field forces.

It was my privilege to serve under his command during World War II when he

had the Sixth Army in Europe. The battle front assigned to his command was of considerable length and he had to use his troops wisely to cover the area as their strength was fewer in number compared to other Army commands. His men fought well under him as the soldiers and officers alike knew that they had a friend in court when General Devers had command.

Recently the General made a very earnest plea for the Army and the Air Force to further the development of close-air support for our ground troops. This type of training that he is encouraging will pay big dividends in combat if our young men are ever called again into the service.

Mr. Speaker, I know the other Members of the House will join me in a proud salute to General Devers. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on September 30, 1949:

OLD SOLDIER

An element of sadness is always present when an old soldier retires. In the case of Gen. Jacob L. Devers, who leaves his post as Chief of the Army Field Forces today to become a gentleman farmer at nearby Herndon, Va., the sadness is tempered by knowledge of the lasting imprint he has left on the Army during his 40 years of service. To General Devers fell the difficult task of reshaping a fighting force from the amorphous mass left by the hasty postwar demobilization, and he has done his job well.

By training an artilleryman, "Jakie" Devers had an unusual grasp of the problems affecting the Army as a whole. It was he who at Fort Knox just before the war settled the row between the Infantry and Cavalry and unified the armored force. He later filled top positions in the European theater, his last job being that of commander of the Sixth Army Group, which launched the push through southern France. General Devers showed himself a man of mobility and imagination, with an ability to get things done, and withal a great friend of the GI.

Since the war he has had responsibility for the development of new and lighter weapons and equipment. He has also had a major part in the campaign to bring about a more intelligent, thinking Army with the accent on education and individual dignity. One of his last services was to call attention to the need for tactical aviation support, a field heretofore neglected by the Air Force. To his successor, Gen. Mark Clark, will go the job of welding a professional combat force out of the new Army General Devers planned.

Education's Place in Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Education's Place in Reorganization Plans," written by Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, and published in the Washington Post of August 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION'S PLACE IN REORGANIZATION PLANS

(By Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers)

The United States Senate, by vote of 60 to 32, on August 16, refused to create a Federal Department of Welfare to include education, health, and social security. Doctors and dentists were primarily responsible for the defeat of the proposed Welfare Department, with their professional organizations favoring a Cabinet post for health services rather than the independent agency suggested by a majority of the Hoover Commission.

Although the battle was one of the hardest fought of the Eighty-first Congress and was of crucial importance to education, most educators were only casual onlookers. They were onlookers in spite of the fact that the success of the plan would have eliminated entirely the separate identity and small remaining autonomy of the United States Office of Education.

Some educational organizations even gave a little support to Reorganization Plan No. 1, and supporters of the Taft-Fulbright proposal for a Cabinet Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were quoted in the Senate debate as favoring it. The Taft-Fulbright proposal, of course, would have preserved a measure of independence in the Office of Education and the Public Health Service, while Reorganization Plan No. 1 would have placed both completely at the mercy of political officers.

The majority of the Hoover Commission was willing to give health an independent agency because the profession of medicine had a voice and used it. The entire Hoover Commission plus the Truman administration were willing to abolish all semblance of independence in the Federal educational agency because the profession of education, if it has a voice, has not used it effectively. Chairman Hoover and the Commission merely ignored the representations made in December 1948 by the National Education Association, American Association of School Administration, and chief State school officers in favor of an independent Federal agency for education.

These issues in Federal educational organization arise out of fundamentally different and conflicting viewpoints about the place of education in Government. One viewpoint, commonly held by political theorists and practitioners in the administration of general government, holds that public education is similar to any other function of the executive branches of local, State, and Federal governments, and that its administration should accordingly be directly under the control of the chief political officer in the town, city, county, State, and Federal governments. This view prevailed in the Hoover Commission and would have been implemented if Reorganization Plan No. 1 had succeeded.

Most educators, on the contrary, believe that educational administration, somewhat like the administration of impartial and nonpartisan justice by judges, needs some protection from politics and politicians. This viewpoint finds expression in the election of boards of laymen on a nonpartisan basis, with authority to appoint the chief educational administrator and to shield him enough from the local politicians to enable him to serve effectively as a professional leader of the school system.

Separation of education administration from municipal politics prevails in about 85 percent of American local school systems. The school board typically has complete fiscal and administrative independence from the municipal government. The legal theory is as clear as the practice. School boards are the governing bodies of political subdivisions of the State, and are held by the courts to be State officers locally elected. The school district is not strictly a municipal corporation, but a quasi corporation of limited powers designated by the State legislature to administer public education, which is everywhere a function of the State under our system of constitutional government.

In approximately 15 percent of American school districts, including a majority of the large cities, there are varying degrees of dependence by local school boards on municipal officers. It is in these districts that education is most mixed up with partisan politics, and where the administration of public education is usually least satisfactory.

Fiscal dependence of local school authorities has commonly grown out of a lack of separate legal tax and debt limits for school districts. When the school district tax and debt limits are combined with the municipal tax and debt limits, the respective shares have had to be determined. The determination has usually been made by the municipal authorities. The remedy is to set separate tax and debt limits for school districts, such as has been done by State law in California and other States, thus giving school boards the fiscal responsibility prerequisite to fiscal independence.

Although many political theorists and municipal politicians still seek to control the State function of education by including it within the general municipal government, the trend is fortunately in the direction of local school board autonomy. Schools cost so much these days that many politicians have discovered them to be political liabilities rather than political assets when their budgets are included in the municipal budgets.

One of the most recent and clearest indications of the trend can be seen in the recommendation of a committee composed of State and local educators, educational officials, Government officials, and representatives of taxpayers and other civic groups, all under the chairmanship of the Comptroller of the State of New York, that all school boards in New York cities of 125,000 or less be given complete fiscal independence and responsibility as soon as separate school district tax limitations can be established.

The same fundamental conflict exists in the State governments between educators and those who would place education entirely under the political executive. Here, again, both present practice and the trend are clear. In 30 of the States, the chief State school officer is elected by the people, often on a nonpartisan ballot. In a majority of these States he is a constitutional officer, with the same constitutional and legal standing within his field of authority as the governor has within his own field of authority.

In 11 of the States, the chief State school officer is one step removed from the general authority of the governor through appointment by a State board of education. The members of the State board are typically appointed by the governor for long overlapping terms, which gives the board considerable independence. Two States, Utah and Washington, have further removed the chief State school officer and the State board of education from gubernatorial politics by providing that conventions of local school board members shall elect the members of the State board of education.

The governor appoints the chief State school officer, and thus brings the State educational agency into direct responsibility to the political head of the State government, in only seven States.

Changes in recent years have all been in the direction favored by educators rather than in the direction of subordination of education to general government. In Massachusetts, Missouri, Colorado, and Texas,

State boards of education have recently been provided, with increased independence from general State government and with authority to appoint the chief State school officer.

In the Federal Government, however, education is not as well served. The major Federal educational functions are administered by noneducational agencies as byproducts of their respective agency programs, without the benefit of a deliberative and nonpartisan board of education of the kind which has been so successfully employed in State and local school systems.

Until recently there has been no real effort to define the educational policies of the Federal Government. There has been notable indifference to the necessary coordination of federally aided programs with the State and local educational structure. State and local school authorities have never known what next to expect from the Federal Government and have become almost inured to surprise at any educational program that may be thrust upon them from Washington.

Educators have a tremendous responsibility for educating all members of the profession, the general public and both the legislative and executive branches of the local, State, and Federal governments on this fundamental issue. Educational government must have a measure of independence from municipal, State, and national politics, and freedom from domination by municipal, State, and Federal politicians.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 6 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "Bills Get Graham's Support."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS GET GRAHAM'S SUPPORT

WASHINGTON, October 5.—Senator GRAHAM today said that there are now two bills before Congress: The Gore bill and the Anderson bill, and that he would support the Anderson bill.

The Gore bill is a 1-year stopgap and continues the present agricultural policies. It contains some anomalies which cry out for reform. The Anderson bill is more of a long-range bill. The Gore bill continues the old 1909 to 1914 base period for the calculation of parity. The Anderson bill uses the same base period, but also takes into account the price relationship of the most recent 10-year period. Two world wars, a world depression, mechanization of agriculture, and other factors have made the old basis 35 years out of date.

The Aiken bill, passed by the last Congress to go into effect January 1, 1950, in addition to holding on to the old base period, has a sliding scale of 60 to 90 percent of parity according to supply, with provision for 20 percent addition when acreage allotments and marketing quotas are in effect, with 90 percent as the limit. The Anderson bill has a sliding scale from 75 to 90 percent. In all bills tobacco would be supported at 90 percent of parity unless marketing quotas are voted down by the farmers.

The Anderson bill also has a provision, which is neither in the Aiken nor the Gore bill, that wages of farm labor are to be a factor in the calculation of the parity formula. The Anderson bill thereby would in actuality provide an increase in the parity price of approximately 6 percent at the present time. The Anderson bill is therefore a better bill for the farmers than the Aiken bill or the Gore bill.

The Brannan plan, which has some meritorious provisions, one or another of which is included in both the Aiken bill and the Anderson bill, has raised serious questions as to its cost to the Government and is opposed by the major farm organizations and will require closer examination and understanding of its provisions. It has been rejected in the House, which overwhelmingly passed the Gore bill, and was rejected by the Senate Agriculture Committee which unanimously reported out the Anderson bill.

When asked the fundamental question as to why he was supporting a national policy of parity support prices for agricultural commodities, he said the farmers need support for a stable income because farm prices, in addition to being subject to the dislocation and disruption of wars, depressions, and other hazards of our industrial society, are subject to the additional uncertainties, disruptions, and dislocations of the climate, weather, insects, pests, blights, droughts, plant and tree diseases, and other hazards of nature which, when added to the hazards of modern economic society, put the farmers in double jeopardy.

Industry and transportation have had and have their protections and governmental subsidies. It is only fair that agriculture, which is one of the main foundations of a sound economy, should have the support of a national parity policy; that is, a policy of equality and equity for agriculture in our economic system. Maintenance of parity means the maintenance of a fair relation between the prices of the things which the farmer sells and the prices of the things which the farmer buys.

A robust agriculture is the indispensable basis of old and new civilizations. The farmer brings into creative focus the earth, the sun, the air, the rains, and the labor and intelligence of men and women on the farm for the production of the foods and fibers upon which depend the sustenance, the clothing, the shelter of all the families of man. Agriculture and industry are the twin economic foundations of our national economy and of our modern civilization. The farm is dependent upon the factory, and the factory is dependent upon the farm. Human society is basically dependent upon both.

The raising, processing, and selling of $30,000,000,000 worth of agricultural products in a most recent year furnished work for nearly one-third of all the civilian workers in the Nation. Approximately one-fourth of the people employed in manufacturing 4 years ago were processing agricultural products. Approximately one-third of the persons engaged in wholesaling and over half of all those engaged in retailing were dealing with agricultural and allied commodities. Agricultural products furnished most of the basic raw materials used in the manufactured goods on which the American public spent about $85,000,000.

There is, therefore, a basic interdependence of farms and factories, urban and rural communities. The great cities burn out the people in several generations. City populations are renewed from rural people as a part of the cycle of civilization. Because our economic society and civilization itself are so basically dependent on farms and rural people, it is in the interest of the rural people, of city people, and the Nation itself, that farmers have a place of equality in the great society of men and nations. The farmer asks not for charity but parity, not for privileges but equity and for equal opportunity to play his indispensable and creative part in the making of a fairer and stronger America.

Why Central Valley Must Have a Steam Power Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the House, in the Interior Department appropriations bill, included money to build the Delta steam-power plant as an integral part of the Central Valley project. Those funds were cut out of the bill in the other body.

A stand-by steam plant is an essential part of any large hydroelectric project in order to provide a continual flow of power, at periods when water, the principal source of energy, is low.

Firm power—that is, power always available—is the wage earner of power projects. Auxiliary steam plants substantially increase the amount of firm power available from most hydroelectric projects, and thereby enable those projects to earn back the cost at a much more rapid rate. When the people, through their Government, have invested as much as is planned in the hydroelectric features of the Central Valley project, it is the falsest sort of economy not to include sufficient steam generating capacity to insure the maximum output of firm power.

It is perfectly clear that those who oppose needed steam plants as a part of the Central Valley project, do not wish to see this great project operated for the benefit of the people of California.

Hydroelectric power is produced by the natural force of perpetually falling water. The cost involved is almost totally that of the cost of harnessing such power. No fuel is used, so that once the capital costs are paid, this power becomes almost a free gift of nature. Our very valuable expendable resources, such as gaseous, liquid, or solid fuels, are also conserved. The consumption of both indigenous gas and liquid fuel resources in California has been so great—even profligate—that now California is in the position of a "have not" State, forced to look to other parts of the country or the world for its future fuel requirements.

But hydroelectric power has the unfortunate characteristic of not being available in the same quantity year in and year out, and sometimes even month in and month out. While nature gives us a perpetual resource of hydroelectric power, there are times when that supply is greatly diminished by poor water years or perhaps even a series of poor water years. California has just suffered this great restriction in the past several years, resulting in 1947 in very serious power restrictions which not only necessitated rationing of power but actually put people out of work and shut down irrigation pumps. This was due to lack of power, and should have been a warning.

Unfortunately, as in 1947, the dry periods last so long that even the storage reservoirs are greatly depleted. This leads to the inevitable consequence that a supplemental source of power is absolutely essential.

In actual figures, if the Central Valley hydroelectric power plant is run without steam stand-by, there is available only 311,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy that is dependable energy to serve the loads when needed. On the other hand, if a steam stand-by plant is provided, we have the very favorable production of over 1,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or over six times the firm energy that we would have without steam. Of this 1,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours, over 1,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours is the average amount of hydroelectric power produced.

The sum and substance of this situation is that by virtue of a steam stand-by plant, the usefulness of hydroelectric power is practically increased fourfold at the expense of using fuel to supply a relatively small portion of the total. The increase in dollar value of this change in status of the hydroelectric power is conservatively estimated at nearly $2,000,000 a year. Also by this procedure the bad effect of drought years is canceled.

The question arises as to why the Government should advocate the construction of a publicly owned steam plant when the private companies have capacity already in steam plants and are on a program for increasing that capacity.

The answer is clear when the facts are known. In the first place, the present fuel capacity is not, in spite of its large amount, sufficient to take care of really bad water years. This was amply illustrated in 1947. This happened soon after the president of the P. G. & E. Co. declared that central California would never run short of power. Yet in 1947, people were thrown out of work and irrigated land went without necessary water. Secondly, the program of the private utilities for developing electric plants is still inadequate to meet future needs, if the predictions of unbiased and authoritative agencies, such as the Federal Power Commission, are correct.

The Government is advocating the building of a steam plant for the Central Valley project to be used only as a stand-by to produce needed energy in lean water years, but not to waste fuel by continuous production of energy in place of developing hydro energy. We should still go on as rapidly as possible with hydroelectric development, but if the stand-by steam plant is not built as a part of the public power system, it can be truly argued that production of steam electric energy by private companies is the only thing that gives firm value to otherwise unsupported public hydroelectric production. And this of course is just what some folks would like.

It is most essential that the public power system be an integrated system with a necessary stand-by steam power plant so it can independently and to an optimum degree produce firm or continuously available electricity in good and in bad water years.

World-Wide Gap Between Science and Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's proposal, in his inaugural address, that technical and scientific knowledge be shared by America with the rest of the world, especially with people in underdeveloped areas, has aroused in men everywhere a new hope for peace and plenty for all peoples.

I have recently read in the magazine Foreign Agriculture an article by the executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Nathan Koenig, which points up the very great need for enactment of the President's justly famous point 4. I feel that this report, entitled "World-Wide Gap Between Science and Practice" will be of great interest to every Member of Congress, and therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I include it here. The article follows:

WORLD-WIDE GAP BETWEEN SCIENCE AND PRACTICE

(By Nathan Koenig)

The technical and scientific know-how that established the greatness of American production is being shared increasingly with the rest of the world. People in other lands, especially those in underdeveloped areas, are to get the benefit of our knowledge and skills so that they may make more secure their own foundations for peace and plenty.

President Truman first unfolded this new course of action in his inaugural address as a major addition to what we already have been doing to help world recovery and bring freedom to all mankind. Since then, many nations have expressed their desire to pool their technological resources in this undertaking and to join with the United States in a common fight against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. The United Nations and its specialized agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, along with our own Government and the governments of other countries, are already deeply engaged in developing the detailed plans for this participation.

Since the beginning of the war the United States has been sharing its material resources, such as food and equipment, with much of the world. The result was victory over the aggressors. Then started the gigantic task of reconstruction and this called for more help. A year ago we added to this assistance through the European recovery program. We are now providing dollars in addition to food and other essentials. The result of all this is seen in the recovery taking place in the cooperating countries. New hope has been brought to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

But, obviously, there is a limit to the dollars and other material resources that the United States can keep pumping out for the assistance of others. Therefore, from a longer-time standpoint, the emphasis will be on providing the less fortunate with the basis for greater self-help so that through their own efforts these people will be able to have more food and other necessities, as well as more mechanical power to lighten their burdens. They will be supplied with the information, technical assistance, and other related aids needed to develop their own agricultural and industrial possibilities and improve their standards of living. This is the substance of the "bold new program" outlined by President Truman. High lighting its significance is the fact that half the people of the world live in near misery under more or less primitive and stagnated conditions. They do not have enough to eat and are easy victims of disease. These people could be helped materially by the application of science and skill to their fundamental problems.

From our own standpoint, scientific knowledge and technical skill are valuables that we can give away and be none the poorer for it. In fact, the gift should come back manyfold through the prosperity that the practical use of such know-how can bring to people abroad. It holds possibilities of broadening our world trade opportunities, for experience shows there can be no real trade with people who have little or nothing to offer from their own production.

The problem then is to see that the underdeveloped areas have the ways and means by which their production can be increased. This means closing the gap between science and practice. The starting point is food, since in most of these areas entire populations are underfed despite the constant struggle of their farmers to produce.

First to be tackled are the basic obstacles that now keep those people from getting enough to eat. What some of these obstacles are and how they have long limited vast segments of the world to a mere existence. I had an opportunity to observe first-hand in the weeks I spent in a large part of Europe and Asia during each of the past 3 years while studying postwar agricultural conditions in the different foreign countries. Wherever I went I found agricultural leaders and government officials hungry for information about how things are done in the United States.

I soon discovered that this keen interest was not accidental. Many of these countries had been cut off from the rest of the world during most of the past decade as the result of war. The food crisis experienced by them since the war began made them especially receptive to new ideas in farming. The significant fact is that these people are not only anxious to catch up but are also eager to forge ahead to a brighter and more secure future. This provides the basis for effective international cooperation in promoting greater self-help among nations. For, as Mr. Willard Thorp, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, recently said: "Many a country which thinks itself poor in resources may find that by taking stock of what it has it will discover capacities now unknown. Every country needs not only resources but resourcefulness, and in many an instance it is the resourcefulness of a people that creates a new resource."

Take the case of Asia where the need for an improved agriculture is perhaps greater than in any other part of the world. Here I saw the tragic results of centuries of land exploitation and neglect. The failure to adopt conservation practices and to maintain soil fertility has, through the long span of years, impoverished wide areas so that food production could not keep pace with the growth of population. In fact, the farming methods now employed are those that for the most part have been handed down from father to son, generation after generation, frequently under conditions of oppressive land tenure and taxation and government disinterest in the problems of the land and the farmer. Custom and tradition long ago submerged the resourcefulness that now needs to be brought out and put to constructive work in applying modern science and techniques to the problems of land and people.

Mother Nature has her own way of revealing where resourcefulness has lapsed into dormancy. Recurring floods, droughts, and dust storms serve as constant reminders of this fact and bare the truth about a country's economic security. I saw these telltale signs spread out over such countries as Greece, Korea, and China as counterparts to unmatched poverty. Korea, for instance, each year suffers disastrous local floods. Flying over the country I could see in the valleys the ribbonlike scars left by the wild waters. It is a mountainous country and the floods come with marked certainty, doing extensive damage to land, property, and people. After the floods are over, it is the practice of the Korean farmer to go to the areas along the stream or river where washed-away land has been deposited, gather the soil up in baskets, and carry it back for replacement and recultivation on his farm.

In all these countries the forests have long been exploited. For hundreds of miles within their borders I saw hills and mountain slopes either denuded or sparsely covered and in an alarmingly advanced stage of erosion. It was evident that these countries did not have enough growing wood available to meet even the fuel needs of their people. I was told that to supply the barest requirements, heavy cutting back into young growing trees was necessary. This means more and more erosion, flood damage, and silting of irrigation works.

All of Asia is subject to recurring famine and pestilence, as well as floods. In China, for example, I discovered that a surplus of food in one agricultural area could do little to alleviate hunger in another. I saw in Shanghai, as well as in other coastal cities, stocks of food that had been brought in by boat stacked up for sale in public markets while actual starvation prevailed in the interior of the country. When I inquired of Government officials why this situation existed, I was told that it was due primarily to China's historic lack of adequate transportation. I was informed that it was easier for hungry people to move to the food than to move food to the people. This accounts for the great migrations that have taken place in China as a matter of course for so many centuries whenever famine struck.

In many countries of the Far East, where more than 75 percent of the farms are about 2½ acres in size, the farmer ekes out a living from the soil with virtually nothing more than bare hands and crude implements. The owner of a draft animal, whether it be a cow, horse, or water buffalo, is considered fortunate indeed. But disease has no respect for either man or beast and, due to the sorrowful lack of medical services, plagues are permitted to run their course and take their toll.

Thanks to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), at least a start is being made in dealing with the most serious of animal diseases in the Orient. Perhaps the most costly animal disease in the world is rinderpest, killing at least 2,000,000 animals a year with staggering loss of meat, milk, and draft power. Chinese technicians were taught how to make an effective vaccine that is now in the mass-production stage and it is being used successfully by Government veterinarians. FAO estimates that some 300,000 animals in China were safeguarded from rinderpest in the short period that the vaccine has been used and that at least 100,000 animals were saved from death.

This saving is even more significant when translated in terms of food production. The water buffalo, for example, is highly prized for tilling ricelands and when the farmer loses his only animal it usually means working the land by hand. The spread of rinderpest to a great number of animals in one province often results in a local famine. Thus, for an area such as the Far East in which the great majority of the population obtain more than 70 percent of its total calories from rice, effective control over such a dreaded disease as rinderpest alone would represent a major victory in behalf of the well-being of these people.

But applying preventive measures and controls over animal disease is only part of the big job that needs to be accomplished. A formidable obstacle to agricultural improvement and to general economic development of most backward countries is the ill-health of their people, which sharply reduces working efficiency and shortens their working life. Tuberculosis, malaria, smallpox, cholera, and various other diseases and intestinal parasites are common in many areas due to the lack of control and preventive measures.

Many of the same problems that beset the underdeveloped countries of the world exist in varying degrees in the more advanced countries. We need only to look about us here in the United States to see how true that is. However, when we make some comparisons, even at random, it is not too difficult to realize how fortunately we are situated. But we cannot afford to be content with the rate of our own progress, neither can be be complacent over the needs of others. For wherever poverty exists it can only handicap the more prosperous.

We have had some valuable experience in sharing our scientific knowledge and technical know-how with the nations of Latin America since 1939. Though this cooperative work has had little publicity, it has made a valuable contribution to the agriculture of those nations and to the United States. Latin Americans have been brought to this country to study in our agricultural colleges and institutions. Our specialists have been invited to advise with Latin-American governments and to teach in their colleges. We have also cooperated with those nations in setting up seven agricultural stations for experimentation and teaching.

This program has been so successful that Congress, in the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, authorized its extension to other parts of the world "to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations." The Smith-Mundt Act may well tie in with the bold new program on which the United States is about to embark and also with what can be done through the European recovery program under the Foreign Assistance Act.

In my travels through Europe and Asia, studying agriculture in those areas, I have said to myself time after time: "What these farmers need are some good county agents and home demonstration agents." Here is where the Foreign Assistance Act fits into the picture. One of its provisions requires that all grants made by us to governments taking part in the European recovery program must be matched by their local currencies, which must be set aside for certain purposes, including "the stimulation of productive activity," and other related objectives. Why shouldn't some of that money be used to expand agricultural services—such as extension work, crop reporting, and research? A positive answer to that question is now taking shape. This approach does offer good possibilities of helping nations abroad profit from our own excellent experience with extension work and related activities for agricultural improvement.

While the European farmer is far more advanced than his Asiatic counterpart, his method of farming still requires a great deal of back-breaking labor. In many areas, producing a crop is the job of the entire family and the pressure of field work on farm women leaves them with little time for improving home living. But since the end of the war there has developed a great deal of dissatisfaction with this sort of existence. Many of these farmers have learned the value of farm machinery (much of it American made) during recent years and are anxious to put more of this equipment to their own use. Their governments are also interested in mechanization of agriculture, but largely to increase domestic food output and promote greater self-sufficiency. In some of the countries, government officials maintain that too much of the farmers' land and labor goes to feeding work stock. Further, many of their farms are too small to utilize effectively the work stock that they have. These officials believe that small farms in particular could be helped materially through cooperative use of farm equipment and thus release more land for food production.

Thus, with more and more emphasis being placed on wider use of agricultural machinery, there is good prospect of a change in many of the established customs long considered characteristic of European farming. Many of the countries of Europe, especially those taking part in the European recovery program, are working closely with FAO on the problem. But it will take more than an increased use of farm machinery to bring about the modernization needed by European agriculture. Also required are improved strains of seed, a greatly increased production and expansion in use of fertilizers and insecticides, along with an overhauling of other phases of their national economies.

Both farmers and consumers are greatly handicapped by antiquated methods of handling and distributing food after it is produced on the farm. Even in the more advanced countries of Europe there is a great deal of waste and loss in food value due to the inefficiency of distribution. I saw a striking example of this in London on a Sunday in mid-July when, at the invitation of a friend, I visited one of the city's major wholesale fresh fruit and vegetable markets. I knew what such a market would look like in the United States. Though it might fall short in some respects, it would still have fairly ample buildings and each would have suitable storage for the various products handled. There would be refrigeration for the products that needed it. Products that needed cool temperatures or darkness would have that kind of storage. So I was curious to see how this London market would compare.

What I saw was mostly an open, huge, stall-like structure. The stalls of the various merchants were separated only by wire. There was nothing to protect the produce from the hot July air. This was at the height of the produce season, but, since it was Sunday, the market was closed and vast quantities of fruits and vegetables were being held over for sale the next day. There were tender fruits imported from Italy and other countries—plums, peaches, melons. There was a great variety of vegetables—beets, carrots, tomatoes, and others that are so common to us in July. Most of this produce had been brought into London at great expense, but here it was deteriorating rapidly.

Typical of what I saw was a tremendous pile of beets, stacked on the floor inside of one of the cagelike stalls. The beets were a wilted mass. Unquestionably, all of them were sold the next day. They had been handled that way for years.

This lack of adequate facilities for handling food goes through the entire European distribution system, although it is not nearly as serious as in the Asiatic countries. There are few refrigerated railroad cars, refrigerated warehouses, or canning plants in all of western Europe. And, of course, the situation is worse in eastern Europe. Electric refrigeration in the home is practically unknown. In England, there are quite a number of old-fashioned ice boxes, but the use of ice is rare in the average home or food business on the Continent. The lack of adequate facilities for refrigerating, cooling, or canning means that perishables have to be eaten within a short time after they leave the farm, other-

wise they either suffer great loss in food value or actually go to waste. And the amount of wastage is high, entailing a loss that food-short countries can ill afford.

What I saw in Rumania on one occasion serves to emphasize how great this waste can be. It was during the summer when I was there and the country was suffering from the worst drought in years. There had been no rain for 3 months. Corn, up knee high, had withered and dried to a tinder. Trees were fast becoming leafless. Pastures for the cattle had dried up, and the prospect for winter feed was black, indeed.

Faced with this critical situation, Rumanian farmers were forced to kill off large numbers of their cattle so that the animals would not die from thirst and starvation. But facilities for storing the meat by refrigeration or canning were practically nonexistent. So, in spite of the prospects of a hungry winter, the nearby populace had to eat this meat as fast as the cattle were slaughtered. Because of the lack of facilities for processing or storing the meat for future use, cattle prices had dropped to ridiculously low levels. I was told that good cows could be bought at this time for the equivalent of $5 a head.

In all the countries where these serious shortcomings in food handling and distribution exist, they have had a profound effect on people's diets. Under such circumstances, the availability of fresh meats, milk, fresh fruits, green vegetables, and fresh fish is definitely limited both by the time of the year and the location of the supply. As a result, variety in the diet is greatly restricted, with grains and potatoes being the mainstays of everyday eating.

But the inescapable fact is that most of the people of the world are not getting enough to eat—even of grains and potatoes. That situation has existed for a long time but is only now beginning to receive the attention it so desperately needs. In the past 10 years alone, the population of the world has increased by an amount at least equal to the total number of people living in the United States. But the production of food and other basic necessities has not kept pace with the increasing number of mouths that have to be fed. Even with the good crops of this past year, the total world food supply on a per capita basis is 15 percent less than prewar.

The experts figure that by 1960 the world may have 25 percent more people than it had prewar. Thus, it is evident that the world must aim to do far more than restore world production to prewar levels. In the case of food alone, FAO has estimated that to meet minimum nutritional needs of the world population forecast for 1960, food production would have to be increased above prewar levels by the following amounts: Cereals, 21 percent; roots and tubers, 27 percent; sugar, 12 percent; fats, 34 percent; peas and beans, 80 percent; fruits and vegetables, 163 percent; meat, 46 percent; and milk, 100 percent. In addition, production of cotton, wool, rayon, and other fibers for clothing would have to be increased 130 percent over the prewar level and this would provide the people of the world with no more than 50 percent of the prewar consumption of these fibers in the United States.

Here, then, is the challenge that today faces the world in its struggle for a more secure future. It is a challenge that can be met through intelligent and united action to increase production, raise buying power, and improve distribution within and among the countries of the earth. Fortunately, the skill and knowledge needed to tackle this job are now available. It is a long-range job and must be undertaken, but in the end it should pay off in the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom for all mankind.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 5 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, our distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] has put us on notice that while there will be no effort to bring up civil rights bills at this session of the Congress, they will be among the first order of business when we convene again next January. Included in that program will undoubtedly be a bill to prohibit the States from requiring the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voters in the election of Federal officials.

Shortly before the adjournment of the second session of the Eightieth Congress I spoke at great length on a similar bill in which I cited the clear provision of the Constitution concerning the exclusive right of the States to fix the qualifications of electors subject only to the limitation that the qualifications for electors in Federal elections should be the same as those for the most numerous branch of the State legislature; the debates during and subsequent to the ratification of the Constitution in support of that clear constitutional provision, and an unbroken line of decisions of our Supreme Court sustaining it. But regardless of that constitutional issue it would appear to be politically expedient for the 41 States that do not have a poll tax requirement to impose their will through congressional action upon the 7 States that do now have it.

In anticipation of that contingency and aware of the delays incident to judicial determination, to say nothing of possible uncertainties, the General Assembly of Virginia has proposed an amendment to the Virginia Constitution designed to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

My distinguished predecessor, Hon. Carter Glass, was a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1901–2, and was the author of the suffrage clause of the constitution adopted at the convention. In it he inserted a provision for a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. The constitution framed by that convention was adopted, and ever since that time a poll tax has been required in Virginia.

On November 8 next, Virginians will vote on the repeal of that provision of the Virginia constitution, and, needless to say, it is a rather controversial issue. I have received a letter from the Public Printer stating that the manuscript would take in the RECORD about three-quarters of a page more than allowed under the rule, except by special consent. The three-quarters of a page, I estimate, would cost an additional $53.31.

In view of the importance of the issue to the State of Virginia, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the explanation recently given by the Honorable Stuart B. Campbell, of Wytheville, Va., of that amendment on which the voters of Virginia must act on November 8, next.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED VOTE REFORMS DEFENDED—CAMPBELL ASSERTS CHANGES TO INSURE HONEST ELECTIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following factual and comprehensive explanation of the proposed constitutional changes in the Virginia voting laws was prepared by former Delegate Stuart B. Campbell, of Wytheville, chairman of the commission which drafted them, at the request of the Roanoke Times.

(Subject to considerable debate, the amendments come up for final action in November, having already been approved by two different sessions of the general assembly.

(As a leader in the House and chairman of the commission, Delegate Campbell is probably closer to the work than any other man in the State and he has devoted considerable time to the preparation of the article for the Times and which is also being made available to other papers in the State.

(In the article Delegate Campbell explains how the commission arrived at its various conclusions on changes in the law and also replies to some of the criticism leveled at the amendments.

(Delegate Campbell's article follows:)

PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

The general assembly of 1944 appointed a commission to study the laws relating to the rights of suffrage (voting) and make a report of such changes as might be thought desirable. This commission consisted of State Senators Robert C. Vaden and William D. Medley, Delegates Vernon C. Smith, William R. Shaffer and Stuart B. Campbell, and gubernatorial appointeees, Judge John Paul, Dr. Charles J. Smith, Messrs. W. L. Prieur, Jr., and J. Frank Wysor. This commission examined thoroughly the laws of all the other States, held public hearings and executive sessions, and submitted its report to the 1946 general assembly. That body adopted, with a few minor changes, the recommendations of the commission as to constitutional amendments and passed appropriate resolutions to submit those amendments to a vote of the people. The 1948 assembly reenacted these resolutions and directed that the popular vote be taken at the November 1949 general election.

The mechanics of amending the State constitution require that the proposed amendments be approved by two different sessions of the general assembly and then be voted on by the people. These requirements entail unavoidable delay, but this has passed and the voters of the State now have the responsibility of approving or rejecting the proposals as submitted.

There has been some criticism of the form in which the proposals will appear on the ballot, and the thought has been expressed that the ballot may appear to be unduly complicated. These expressions arose doubtless because of the legal requirement that any section of the Constitution to be amended must be set out at length as it now is and then be set out at length in its proposed form. This is necessary even if the amendment involves only the change or omission of a single word. The actual voting is simple, check the square "For" or "Against," as the voter may desire; if he wishes to adopt the amendments, he checks "For"; if he opposes them, he checks "Against."

The immediate cause for considering the proposed amendment was, and is, the movement to abolish the poll tax (capitation tax) as a prerequisite to voting. The present State constitution mentions the poll-tax requirement in four of the six sections defining the qualification of voters, and it appears in several other sections prescribing the duties of public officers or the powers of the general assembly. The proposed amendments eliminate the payment of the poll tax as a qualification for voting, and hence each of these sections must be rewritten and must appear on the ballot in both the present and proposed forms. The amendments propose the substitution of a bipartisan registration board composed of representatives of the two most numerous political parties for the present precinct registrar; therefore it was necessary to amend each section mentioning registrars or registration. These circumstances account largely for the number of amendments necessary to accomplish the changes recommended.

The commission formulating the proposals set out their purposes as follows: "First, to extend the suffrage franchise to all who demonstrate sufficient intelligence and sufficient interest in the government to indicate that they are entitled to participate in determining its affairs; second, to provide sufficient safeguards so that opportunities for irregularities and fraud in elections may be reduced to a minimum."

If the amendments may reasonably be expected to further these objectives, they should be adopted, if not they should be rejected.

Certain general principles must be kept in mind in reaching a conclusion in this matter, some of them are:

1. The State constitution must, and now does, define the persons entitled to vote and prescribe the qualifications necessary to voting.

2. The Virginia General Assembly has all powers not prohibited to it by the State constitution or surrendered to the Congress by the United States Constitution. Stated another way, the general assembly (State legislature), as the direct representative of the people, exercises, on behalf of the people, all powers not taken away from it by the State or Federal Constitutions. If the people wish to limit their representative, the general assembly, they must do so by constitutional restriction.

3. If fair and orderly elections are to be held there must be adequate legal safeguards reasonably designed to accomplish this end.

4. Human nature must not be overlooked and realities must be faced. It is well known that otherwise honest and honorable citizens, under the stress of a heated campaign, may engage in practices which in calmer moments and under different circumstances, they would be the first to denounce. Election laws must be designed for practical purposes rather than ideal conditions.

5. The surest method of securing fair play under all circumstances is to permit full examination by interested participants and clothe them with sufficient authority to prevent or correct abuses.

In order to understand and appreciate the significance of the amendments they must be considered in relation to existing provisions. This will now be presented under headings devoted to particular phases of the subject matter.

At present there are two classes of voters, those registered prior to January 1, 1904, known as the permanent roll, and those registered since that date. The proposed amendments do not affect the first class at all, except to relieve its members from paying a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. The poll tax as a voting qualification will also be removed as to the second class, but it will be required to renew its registration annually, or, as sometimes expressed, keep its registration current. The annual renewal of registrations will be discussed fully under an appropriate heading.

POLL TAX

The poll tax is one of the oldest forms of taxation. Often it has been coupled with voting measures, but in recent years opposition has developed to this association, and while a great deal of criticism may be unwarranted, the fact that public opinion condemns the practice makes it expedient to divorce the tax from the exercise of suffrage. The amendments do this.

At present there is made up and posted in each county and city a list of persons who have personally paid their poll taxes 6 months prior to each general election. This is known as the tax-paid or certified list and is the only public evidence of continued residence in the election district. It has been presumed that if the proper public officer assesses the poll tax and the voter pays it in person then, in the absence of a contrary showing, the person so assessed with and paying the tax is a bona fide resident of the locality for which the list is posted. If anyone questions the truth of the assumption, the existing remedy is a challenge of the voter on election day at the polls. Needless to say these challenges cannot be given much consideration by the election officials because to do so would unduly delay legitimate voting.

As already stated, the payment of a poll tax is eliminated as a voting requirement. This does not take away from the general assembly the right to levy such a tax for other purposes. The present constitutional provision (sec. 173) requires the general assembly to levy a poll tax not exceeding $1.50 on every adult resident of the State (with certain unimportant exceptions), but prohibits its collection by the ordinary means employed in the collection of other taxes. One dollar of the present tax is required to be applied to schools, and the residue is returned to the cities and counties for their general purposes.

The present poll-tax provisions were designed primarily as suffrage requirements but incidentally the tax produces about $900,000 each year for school purposes and local expenses. Both of these objects are badly in need of funds, and ought not to be deprived of any existing source of revenue. With the purpose in view of maintaining the school revenues, but of limiting the amount of any per capita tax; amendment of section 173 is proposed. This amendment is in reality a restrictive amendment. Without it the general assembly might impose a per capita tax of any amount without regard to ability to pay. Modern thought adopts the view that while all ought to assist in bearing the burden of taxation, this burden should be adjusted so that those less able will not be oppressed unduly. The limit of the proposed tax, $3 per adult, and its purpose, "exclusively in aid of public free schools," ought to commend the provision to those residents of the Commonwealth who are interested in education and conscious of civic responsibility.

Criticisms have been directed at the provisions of the amendment permitting the general assembly to require the payment of this tax as a condition to the granting of any license or permit for any privilege. The persons advancing this criticism seem to lose sight of the fact that anyone who can afford an automobile, ought to be willing to pay at least a small school tax, and that those applying for a hunting and fishing license, and may their tribe increase, should certainly think of the school child and pay something to aid that cause before considering personal pleasure only. Even a brief review of these matters will convince the thinking citizen that the proposed poll-tax provision is not only legitimate and proper, but under existing demands for further school funds, necessary. If any doubt exists, it must be recalled that the proposed poll tax, as distinguished from the present tax is permissive only, the general assembly may levy it, but need not do so, and may require its payment before issuing a license or a permit for a privilege but, again, need not do so. Fears as to a possible hardship in this respect seem to be groundless.

ANNUAL REGISTRATION

With the abolition of the poll tax as a voting requirement there will disappear every record evidence of continued voting qualification. Something must be substituted for the tax-paid list. The various States have varying requirements, designed to determine the continued eligibility of the voter. The most effective of these provisions seems to be periodic renewal of registration, accomplished either positively by requiring the voter to register personally at stated intervals, or negatively by dropping from the registration roll those who have not voted for two or more elections. After much inquiry and thought the commission recommended, and the amendments propose, annual renewal of registration. The proposals do not adopt as a whole the law of any one State but endeavor to embrace the provisions from the general body of such laws, as are best adapted to Virginia and best calculated to insure fair elections.

A distinction must be drawn between original registration and renewal of registration. Original registration is effected by the personal appearance of the applicant before the proper officer and the filing of a written request to be registered, setting forth the applicant's qualifications. The proposed amendments make no change in this procedure except to transfer the registering authority from a single individual to a bipartisan board. Any person thus registered has established the fact that he is a resident, is not disqualifies by insanity, conviction of crime, etc., and can read and write, and hence is, as of that date, entitled to vote. But what of the future?

In considering the suffrage laws it must be remembered that in the nearly half a century elapsing between the adoption of the "New Constitution" of 1901–02, and the present, Virginia has changed much—population has increased, cities have grown up, we have, or are, changing from a rural to an urban people, whole counties are being incorporated into cities, great plants have brought an influx of people from other States. We are no longer almost exclusively a people whose roots are in the soil or whose attachment is to a particular locality. The old order is passed as surely as the chain store is encroaching on the local merchant and the garage has taken the place of the blacksmith shop. Provisions that were adequate when almost every voter knew every other voter at his local precinct are not sufficient to identify the shifting population incident to new modes of life. The National Capital, due to expanding Government activities, has attracted to itself thousands of persons from all over the United States, great numbers of these people live in apartments or other places of transient abode in Virginia, large corporations operating in the State shift their executives and employees from place to place, and moving tides of industry cause a constant flow of population. These and other factors are destroying the old-fashioned neighborhood associations and our voting laws must be framed to meet realistic conditions.

The proposal for annual renewal of registration is intended to effect two main purposes, one to furnish evidence of continued residence and qualifications, and second to provide a correct list of all persons entitled to vote at an election.

The first of these objects is accomplished if the voter appears in person before the registering authority. It is also evidenced if the voter discharges his responsibility of citizenship by paying promptly the personal taxes assessed against him, or by the mere act of voting in the previous election. In any of these three ways may be furnished evidence of continued residence and qualification.

The proposed amendments permit the General Assembly to adopt these simple methods for renewal of registration, they also empower that body to utilize any other method of registration that may be found to be better or more suited to the needs of the people.

The second objective a definite list of voters, is obtained through the requirement that the local board of elections make and publish this list. A reasonable time, 30 days, is allowed, within which any person wrongfully left off the list may move to correct the error, and any person believing another to have been placed on the list wrongfully may, after notice to the person, move to strike off his name from the list. This insures a two-way road for correction and permits any interested person to challenge the correctness of the list, both as to persons improperly included and improperly omitted. These questions are settled by a bipartisan body, with right of appeal to court, and at a time and under circumstances permitting a full and fair investigation of any error and its timely correction if that seems proper. The list, as corrected, becomes the definite voting list, is accessible to the public, available to candidates, and most important, is sent to the polls on election day, there to be checked when the voter deposits his ballot, and thus checked is returned at the close of voting, with the poll books and ballots, to the proper authority. If this plan is adopted, fraud or irregularities ought to cease as a possible factor in our elections.

Incidentally these provisions would eliminate the search through registration books for the name of a person offering to vote. Frequently, as things are now, there are several books to be examined, voting is delayed, and sometimes voters, in the rush of election day, are wrongfuly denied a ballot or improperly permitted to vote. The definite voting list will eliminate these and other possible difficulties now encountered.

The criticisms directed to annual renewal of registration charge that it is too complicated or that it will unduly restrict the number of voters. The first criticism is answered by the simplicity of the methods suggested, (1) apply in person or (2) pay your personal taxes, or (3) just vote, and lastly, if any other desirable method can be devised the general assembly has authority to put it into effect.

The objection that the requirement will unduly restrict voting is also without substantial merit. If the period of closing registration is too long, it would seem that its critics might have proposed a shorter period of time. Other helpful proposals were made and adopted, if the time element was out of proportion the mistake might have been corrected. The proposals contain three periods, first, 30 days after the close of registration for the preparation of the list; second, 30 days for correction of errors, if any develop; and 60 days prior to the election within which every person may know exactly who is or is not entitled to vote. It is submitted that this schedule is not unduly long but is only sufficient to permit the officers to perform their duties, the voters to protect their rights, and the public to be assured of an honest and correct voting list. If any error was made in fixing these periods, which is denied, its harm will be far more than offset by the good to be accomplished, namely, purity, certainty, and fair-dealing in elections.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

At present registration is accomplished before a local registrar, except in cities having boards of registration. The public hearings developed substantial objections to this one-man system. Some of the matters urged were partisan unfairness, inability to find the registrar, and in some instances the unfitness of the registrar to perform his duties. The proposed amendments provide for a bipartisan board in each county and give to the board exclusive authority over all registrations both original and renewal. Statutes appropriate for carrying out these regulations are proposed for passage by the general assembly.

If the amendments are adopted the local boards will be required to maintain a permanent office at which persons desiring to register or renew registration may apply, and the general assembly will be required to enact implementing legislation requiring each board "to sit and to keep its office open at such times and places as will permit persons desiring to register or renew registration to do so with reasonable convenience." The State board of elections is also authorized to require local boards to sit or keep offices open at definite times and places to permit convenient registration or renewal of registration of all persons applying. These provisions were designed to afford every person an adequate opportunity to appear before the local board at a convenient time and place, thus eliminating objections urged before the commission that applicants for registration were often unable to find the local registrars and therefore were unable to register. The proposed amendments further provide that adequate publicity be given of the times and places of sittings.

Another objection urged to the present system of registering is that one person alone, and that person usually a partisan, determines for all practical purposes, who shall and who shall not be registered. Such a system is liable to abuse, and is subject to a great deal of just criticism. Frequent charges are also made that the single registrar is himself unqualified to pass upon the qualifications of the applicant. Undoubtedly there may be foundation for this charge. The proposed amendments eliminate entirely the first criticism by placing all registrations and renewals under a bipartisan board, with adequate right of appeal designed to redress fully any error committed. For the first time in Virginia's election history a really effective method of unbiased registration with adequate appeal will be established. The conduct of these matters will also be placed in the hands of what ought to prove more capable officials, with the attendant beneficial results to the general public.

LITERACY TESTS

Closely allied to the method of registration and the officials in charge of it is the question of the qualifications of the individual applicant. An examination of the laws and histories of the various States discloses that some states have tried arbitrary standards, such as succesful completion of sixth grade at school, others require an ability to read and write, and some have employed the understanding clause. It is not felt that an arbitrary standard is fair or necessarily correct in determining to the qualification of a citizen to vote. It is common knowledge that some of our best citizens may either not have attended a grade school, or if they did do so may not have finished the sixth grade, yet these persons may be real examples of good citizenship and patriotism. It is unthinkable that they should be excluded from voting, serving on juries, or holding office. These considerations impelled the commission to discard a fixed or arbitrary standard.

The understanding clause means generally that the applicant be able to understand or explain a clause of the Constitution when read to him. The registration official selects the clause to be read, which may be as simple as section 140 reading: "White and colored children shall not be taught in the same school," are as technical as a portion of section 58 that: "The General Assembly shall not pass any bill or attainder, or any ex post facto law." The possibility of partisan abuse of such a provision is obvious. If the newspapers of the time are true, or credence be given to word-of-mouth accounts, the criticisms of this method during the 2 years, 1902–04, that it was in force in Virginia, were so severe as to eliminate this provision for all time.

Some States, New York among them, employ an offshoot of this method. The applicant is given a card on which is printed certain information. He is then asked to take the card and from it answer certain questions. The success of the applicant is then determined by the registering authority. The only difference between the possibility of abuse under this practice and under the understanding method is one of degree, so it was discarded.

The simple truth is that if the applicant can read and write that is about all that a literacy test will develop. It may be that the future may produce a fair and workable test, if so the proposed amendments permit the general assembly to adopt it, try it, keep it, or discard it as experience may dictate.

APPOINTMENT OF ELECTION OFFICIALS

The State board of election is appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by the general assembly, and representation must be given to the two largest political parties in the State. This insures biparitsan control in this board, and this plan is carried out all the way through the local boards, down to the officials, judges, and clerks actually in charge of each voting place. The minority is given the right to nominate members of the local boards and to the minority representatives at the polling places, thus insuring from beginning to end an effective policing of every step and procedure in every election, a most important matter.

The proposed amendments set out that the local boards shall be appointed "as may be provided by law." There was a substantial conflict of opinion as to whether the State board of elections should appoint the local boards, or whether the circuit and city judges should exercise this power, as they now do in the selection of electoral boards, or whether the selection should be made in some other manner. In view of these varying possibilities, it was thought best to leave this appointing power to such authority as the general assembly might determine, therefore the quoted phrase.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

It is not practicable for all the people to come together in a great mass meeting and there enact laws, hence the representative or republican form of government has been evolved. The people, by democratic processes, regularly elect their representatives, delegates and senators, to represent them in the general assembly, commonly called the legislature. These persons, the legislators, are the agents of the people, acting for them, subject to recall (defeat at the polls) and replacement at the will of their constituents, one branch of the assembly, the house, is elected every 2 years, and the other, the the senate, every 4 years, thus requiring one body to come before the judgment of the

people at every session, and the other, the senate, at every other session. No officials can be closer to the people nor more subject to their will than these legislators.

The proposed amendments confide to the General Assembly broad authority, in fact plenary power, as to all matters not deemed essential to fixed elements of the over-all electoral structure. This was done so that advantage might be taken of experience gained in the actual operation of the plan, and that flexibility might be given in matters of procedure and detail, in fact it was thought that the only restraints on legislative authority should be those alone which were believed to be essential to the successful operation of the proposed plan and the fair conduct of elections under it. If this was a mistake, which is not admitted, it was an error on the side of liberality.

CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The Commission proposed the removal from the Constitution of some outmoded provisions no longer applicable to modern conditions. Some of these were known as the antidueling laws, another related to the method of marking a ballot by erasing the name of a candidate, now superseded by the present method of placing a check by the name of the candidate to be voted for. These amendments are desirable and necessary, but are also space consuming and may lend color to loose criticisms of length and complicatedness so often brought by those who either don't understand them or misconstrue them, innocently or intentionally.

Another factor contributing to length and so-called complicated structure is the necessity for providing a schedule, or timetable for the effective dates of the amendments and the requirements for legislative action prior to the effective date. This could not have been avoided. Amending a constitution entails these mechanical requirements, no matter how simple the proposal may be.

CONCLUSION

The proposed amendments were formulated after careful study by a group of citizens whose only interest was to present to the people of Virginia a comprehensive plan of essential constitutional provisions and statutory proposals, which in their considered judgment were best calculated to insure honest elections, free voting by all qualified citizens, fair returns of results, and lastly to prevent frauds and render abuses as difficult as possible. To attain these ends it was necessary to weigh advantages against possible disadvantages, and achieve a result that upon a consideration of whole matter seemed most beneficial. Doubtless some of the provisions could have been improved upon, but only at the expense of some other equally or more important provision. If the people of Virginia want fair elections, and want to discourage corruption and fraud, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed amendments, with suggested implementing legislation will accomplish this end in the following manner.

1. Bipartisan control of every step of the election process.

2. The furnishing of definite evidence of (a) original qualification to vote; and (b) the continuance of this status.

3. Full, complete, and accurate publication of a voting list, something not heretofore enjoyed.

4. Effective and timely methods of restoring to the voting list any person wrongfully omitted therefrom, with a corresponding opportunity of purging the list of names wrongfully included therein.

5. A definite list of persons entitled to vote at each precinct in each election compiled by a bipartisan board, sent to each precinct on the day of election, checked as each voter deposits his ballot in the box, and as thus checked returned and kept as a permanent record available as indisputable evidence in the event of an election contest or prosecution for fraud.

6. Fair representation to the minority by persons of their own selection.

7. Adequate safeguards to prevent fraud, criminality, and sharp practices.

8. Fixing responsibility for every election process upon a definite authority or official, thus eliminating opportunities for irregularities and unauthorized acts.

9. Elimination of the poll tax as a condition to voting, but permitting its retention at the discretion of the legislature as a pure revenue measure for school funds only.

10. Accuracy in certifying the results of each election.

There's More Security in a Zoo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the bill passed here yesterday was humanitarian in purpose and aimed at improvement of a bad situation. But, if it passes the other body and becomes a law, I fear it will serve only as a stopgap and a delusion unless we balance the national budget. If we do not cut all but essential Federal expenditures to the bone—if we do not release all unnecessary Government employees—the situation of those we seek to benefit will not be improved for long.

We should bear in mind two simple truths. Increased taxes and production costs promote inflation, and inflation decreases the value of the dollar. When the purchasing power of the security payment drops—security crumbles.

As a writer in the Wall Street Journal put it recently, and I quote:

> Security and "the welfare state" have mutually antagonistic aims. A genuinely welfare state can only be one which effectively guards its people against the miseries of a rotting currency. What has happened to the value of old-age and survivors insurance benefits since the middle 1930's has similarly affected the usefulness of all other thrift accumulations, including that of $200,000,000,000 of insurance policies and other billions of savings deposits.
>
> To lay the foundations of real social security a genuine welfare state must not only keep its budget in balance but also take to itself only an irreducible minimum out of the stream of new capital that keeps a private enterprise economically sound.

One does not have to be an expert in the field of economics, a financial wizard, or a graduate of the Harvard Business School, to figure that one out. It is just as plain as 2 and 2 make 4. Let us note just how obvious it is.

If pay-roll taxes are increased—and the bill calls for something like a 300-percent increase in the next 30 years—the cost of each hour of labor that goes into making or producing anything automatically is raised by the same amount. In order for business, farm, or factory to continue without ending in bankruptcy, the price asked for its products must be higher than otherwise would be necessary to break even or show a profit.

It is therefore self-evident that increased pay-roll taxes tend to make higher than they otherwise would be necessities such as food, clothing, and fuel, as well as luxuries.

As prices go up security payments will buy less and will not provide enough for the recipient to live on, without aid from other sources or an increase in the amount of the payments.

The contemplated 70-to-80-percent raise in old-age pensions, if established, would leave everybody just where they are now, if and when prices of necessities rose 70 or 80 percent. They have mounted more than that since 1940 and unless a halt is called in the inflationary spiral, they will do it again before 1960. Where then is any security for anybody unless there is some stability in the value, the purchasing power, of our currency? Again the answer is obvious: there is none without a solid financial structure. There is no security for anyone unless our Government and its finances are secure. We have seen what deficit spending has done to other countries.

During the last war, I watched the Chinese dollars drop in purchasing power to one one-hundredth of what it had been in less than 2 years time. In other words, a Chinese dollar had shrunk to a cent in a few months. Today the Chinese national currency has hardly the value of waste paper.

When I was in France in World War I, the exchange rate was 5 or 6 francs to the dollar, about 20 cents of our then gold dollar. Today, with our dollar greatly devalued and the franc worth less than a third of a penny, what would a life insurance policy in French money taken out in 1918 be worth now? The value of all of our insurance has shrunk terribly. To figure how much you have lost, think back on what you could do with a dollar when you took out your insurance policy or started your savings account.

If you could get 3 pounds of steak for a dollar then, and only a little over a pound today, that is what you have lost in the steak department—nearly two-thirds. If you could get 4 dozen eggs for a dollar then and can only get some 15 eggs today—that is what inflation has done to your savings in the egg department, and so on.

My friends, there is no perfect security anywhere in the world. Life itself is uncertain. But we face the loss of all the accumulated gains of our civilization and the things our ancestors risked much to win, if we do not band together and stop this silly, Communist-encouraged socialistic idea of statism, or the welfare state that will care for all of us from the cradle to the grave—even as we care for chickens in brooder houses. I think I would rather be a wild bird—a duck, quail, or a dove—at the risk of being preyed upon by hawk or hunter. Life is more interesting outside the pen and besides the battery-reared chick is eaten in the end just the same.

Animals in the zoo have the closest approach to social security. They have the best food, shelter, and medicine until the end. But most zoos have a balanced budget and assured income.

Biggest Raid in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of October 4, 1949:

BIGGEST RAID IN HISTORY

Everything now is set for the biggest raid in history. The cards are dealt. The chips are down.

The victim? Uncle Sam. The spoils? Your job, your income, your future.

Who are the raiders? The governments of virtually all countries outside our borders, and outside the iron curtain of Russia. Stalin is playing the role of jackals to the lions—he plans to move in and pick up the pieces after the raid is over: he hopes to take over, and form a new Red "one world" out of the spoilers and the despoiled alike.

This is not to be a raid with clubs or guns. It is not to be a military invasion, but a mass attack in the more polite, white-collar, desk-top realm of a world-wide trade war.

It's Uncle Sam against the world. If you want to know who is on the other side, call the roll of those 30 or more nations who have devalued their currency, or are in the process of doing so.

This devaluation was a direct attack on the American dollar—already inflated and shaky as a result of 16 years of financial error in our own country.

Collectively and individually, these foreign countries have asked President Truman over and again to revalue American currency by pushing the artificial price of gold upward—perhaps as much as $100 instead of the present $35.

The President refused, not because the foreign-exchange rates made sense, but because he was committed to a policy (through the monetary fund and the Marshall plan) of holding the currency rates where they were.

So the foreign powers got the same result, in reverse. At a signal (the British devaluation of the pound) virtually every country involved in world trade cut its currency price. quite by coincidence, of course, they all cut the same amount—approximately 30 percent.

This is currency warfare. It brings the American dollar under the heaviest fire it has ever known—worse than in the early days, when the genius of Alexander Hamilton was all that prevented the baby American Republic from going broke (as the baby French Republic actually did) in the first years of its life. The American dollar is shakier today than in the years after the Civil War, before the Government tardily returned to the gold standard; worse than in the crisis of the 1890's.

This Nation may prove to be in no condition to withstand the attack on our paper dollar. Between watered currency and overstrained national credit, our financial stability is none too certain.

Yet this is only the first assault wave in the trade war we face. Far worse is to come.

Smashing the American dollar is not the main objective. It is merely incidental. The attack on the dollar was intended to do one thing, and one thing only—to demoralize our foreign trade. Whether the dollar survives or falls, that already has been accomplished.

What the foreign powers are really after is the markets of the world—and most especially, our own home market.

They want to manufacture the goods now produced by this Nation's industries.

They want the profits. They want the jobs.

If they can get them, industry in this Nation will stagnate, unemployment will soar, living standards will toboggan down to the poorhouse level.

Figure it out for yourself. Whatever you do, if it is something that can be done by slave-labor abroad, or by an overseas workman whose standards of living are infinitely lower than yours. And if the world-wide conspiracy to give your job to a foreigner is carried out, what will be left for you to do except apply for relief?

And if our Government winds up where it is now headed, which is in bankruptcy—who then will be able to send you a relief check?

That's what the coming raid is about. It's a drive to take your job away, ship it abroad, give it to enslaved labor forces of the socialistic dictatorships—and let you fight off starvation the best you can.

Nothing in history compares with a raid of this dimension. The vandals who sacked Rome plundered an empty shell. Their damage was great—but Rome was dying anyway. Genghis Khan swept from China to Europe, destroying or seizing millions of dollars' worth of property.

But this is a raid, not on a sick and dying nation—but on the richest and strongest country on earth; a raid, not for millions, but for hundreds of billions.

And what of our sentries? What of those whom we, the American people, elected to stand on watch at Washington, and alert and alarm us against such dangers?

They are helping the enemy. They are hailing them as liberators. They are unlocking the doors and unbarring the gates.

Befuddled and misguided President Truman has made it his especial pride to tear down the only protections mankind has ever invented against mass trade-war raids of this kind—tariff protections.

More, he has already helped set up the machinery by which greedy foreign powers can direct their raid from the inside.

This is the so-called International Trade Organization, the charter of which was worked out in Habana last year and is now before Congress. Under this charter, the power of life or death over virtually all American industries would be vested in an international body in which Uncle Sam, who owns all the chips in the game, has only one vote—and in which the overwhelming majority of votes are those of nations which already have displayed strong antagonism toward the United States, mixed with greed and ingratitude.

Congress has balked over this outrageous scheme of giving control over American manufacturing industries to the unreliable heads of foreign powers who are barely on speaking terms with us when we give away billions—and who would tear our economy apart in a moment, if ever they came to have the power to do so.

Instead of being grateful to Congress for recognizing a danger he should have noted, but didn't, what has been the President's reaction?

His official statement of September 26 made exceedingly clear what he proposes to do. He plans to go over Congress' head, and write into the trade agreements a special agreement which will cover the same ground as the ITO plan Congress has declined to approved.

If he is permitted to carry out this subterfuge, the President will have abrogated to himself the trade powers assigned by the Constitution to Congress, and also will have abrogated the senatorial authority of approving or rejecting foreign treaties.

But still worse, Uncle Sam will have turned over to the would-be raiders full power to veto anything which we as a nation might wish to do to protect ourselves against their raid.

Democracy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD articles by Dr. Frank Kingdon and Mr. Max Lerner, which appeared in the New York Post-Home News on September 16, 1949. These articles, appearing as they do at a time when Israel is struggling virtually alone to establish democracy in the Near East, should be read and studied by everyone who is concerned with the peace of the world.

Even Great Britain, at one time completely antipathetic to all of the democratic ideals of the new state is beginning to realize that only in Israel can the Near East be secured for democracy:

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

I always enjoy a good coincidence. Here is one: While Ernest Bevin is here more or less on his own, as Cripps is working out currency problems, I suddenly read a headline "Britain and Israel held ending rift." The timing is so pat I wonder if there's some connection.

Away from the currency conference, Bevin and Acheson have had a chance to talk international policies without the press or other foreign ministers overhearing. They have taken advantage of the opportunity to clear up several matters. Among them have been relations with Israel.

On Israel, President Truman has always taken a firm and independent position. He forced the State Department to recognize Israel. He has consistently overruled the Near East experts to keep this Government supporting Israel. This was one policy on which he opposed General Marshall, then Secretary of State. He made him go along with the White House.

When Marshall resigned and Dean Acheson became Secretary of State the President for the first time had a man in that office who was his man. Byrnes did not pay much attention to Truman. His attitude was so independent that there was almost an open breach. When Marshall was Secretary of State the President was a bit overawed by him, like a colonel dealing with a general who was his hero. When Acheson came in both men understood that there would be teamwork between the White House and the State Department, with Truman having the last word.

As far as Israel is concerned this has meant that Acheson has taken the President's line. True enough, some of his subordinates are still more adept at following Britain than developing statesmanship, but at the top level, where the Secretary operates, the Truman policy has set the course.

This has meant that when Acheson and Bevin have talked over Israel the British Foreign Secretary has been disabused of any idea that this Government will waver on Israel, and has been told that we propose to act on the conviction that Israel is here to stay and must be treated with the same respect and dignity as any other independent power. Bevin has probably had to swallow hard to accept this, but he has had no alternative. Consequently he is preparing to change the British attitude.

He has suddenly discovered what everybody else already knew, that British and Israeli interests dovetail on vital economic

questions. It is to the advantage of British oil interests to reopen the oil line at Haifa and to use that excellent port for shipments. Britain will prevent a lot of headaches if Arab refugees are settled in Arab countries, thus removing a disturbing factor from Near Eastern politics. British investments in the Near East will benefit from water-power developments and other enterprises for lifting the standard of living of the area. Britain's protege, Abdullah, will profit in prestige from the Israeli proposal to leave the old city of Jerusalem in his hands while giving the new city to Israel.

The sooner Britain releases the sterling balances of Israel the sooner its economy can be stabilized, and with it the economic outlook for the whole region be improved. Even in terms of military defense, Britain ought to be able to see from its experiences with the Arabs in the last World War that friendly association with Israel is a firmer support than it can reasonably expect from Arab countries. In line with this, it ought to see just as clearly that arming the Arab countries at the expense of Israel is merely courting uncertainty and jeopardizing its investments.

I hope that now Bevin's eyes have begun to open he will focus them on realities in the Near East and put Britain where it belongs, in partnership with the United States for cultivation of a strong, free, and independent Israel as a bulwark of democracy on the borders of Asia.

ISRAEL'S PLACE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(By Max Lerner)

TEL AVIV.—In a world split sharply into two hostile camps, Israel holds a unique position. It belongs neither to the "western bloc" nor to the "eastern bloc." Nor is it like any of the governments in the Arab League, which hate both America and Russia with a rancor which makes them almost certain to betray whichever side they join in the end. Israel's policy is one of friendly neutrality toward both sides on all matters affecting the cold war, and of active friendship toward both sides on all matters outside of it.

But everyone recognizes that willy-nilly Israel is oriented toward the United States. If it goes too far in this direction it will run afoul of mass opinion in Israel, which is Socialist rather than capitalist, which is deeply democratic but knows that democracy can be threatened by business exploiters and oil barons as well as by communism. The people of Israel also remember that the British democracy was their enemy and still is, that American democracy wavered badly on UN partition.

Israel's labor movement has been split by world forces into two wings. The larger one, Mapai, is moderate labor, or Fabian Socialist, as with the British Labor Party. The smaller one, Mapam, is left-wing labor. The Mapam people are not in the cabinet, having quarreled with Ben-Gurion over the minor ministries he was ready to allot to them. They have deep roots, however, in the Israeli mind. They still have a hold on many of the young people, although Mapai is also showing impressive strength among the youth. Ben-Gurion is confident that he can break Mapam for good, but he is an optimist. He is not reckoning with the State Department forces in America, who play into the hands of Mapam every time they put unreasonable pressures on Israel.

For Mapam is frankly anti-American, frankly Russia-oriented. The Mapam leaders accuse the Government of having gone too far in its orientation toward America. When I asked several of the Mapam leaders about the "people's democracies" of eastern Europe, they said they had no quarrel at all with their basic program. Yet actually the current behavior of these "people's democracies" has dealt a sharp blow to Mapam's standing in Israeli opinion.

Rumania and Hungary have both closed their gates and do not allow any Jews to emigrate to Israel. This is a serious matter to Israel, since there are still close to 600,000 Jews left in those two countries, and Israel's source of new immigration are beginning to dry up. The fact that Mapam's own representatives in the iron curtain countries have received the same harsh treatment as the other Zionists has simply made the whole situation more ironic, but has not improved Mapam's prestige.

It is a healthy thing to have a left-wing labor minority in Israel along with a moderate labor majority. Actually the Mapam group has one very sharp difference with the Communists: it is deeply Zionist while the Communists are anti-Zionists. It is part of Israel's soil, and of its tradition of democratic collectives. Yet given their pro-Russian orientation it would be disastrous for America's interests if the Mapam group were to increase in prestige or even win power some day.

America's best hope for stability and democracy in the Middle East rests on a strong and democratic Israel which can serve as a center for economic progress and western political ideas. Every added pressure which the United States or the U. N. places on Israel today—on internationalizing Jerusalem, on giving up territory to the Arabs, on taking Arab fifth-columnists into Israel—is a blow to moderate socialism in Israel and a help to the pro-Russian and anti-American forces.

We cannot expect Israel to survive when we are at the same time undercutting the position of the very forces in Israel that are friendly to us. The people of Israel have overcome great difficulties, but you cannot expect them to perform a new miracle every hour on the hour.

ECA Funds for Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

ECA FUNDS FOR COMMUNISTS

A deal now cooking in the British crown colony of Hong Kong would use Marshall plan money to finance commercial transactions between American business firms and the Chinese Communists, according to a Hong Kong dispatch to the New York Times.

The plan calls for creation of a United States commercial company, using ECA funds, which would underwrite barter deals with the Chinese Reds. A capital fund of $50,000,000 would be drawn for the purpose from the unexpended ECA China appropriation.

Norman Meiklejohn, acting China ECA director, is reported on his way to Washington to discuss the deal with the State Department.

Congress voted this money to assist Nationalist China in resisting communism. Now, at a time when the Nationalist government is fighting for its life, and with some success, it is proposed that the money be used to help the Communists.

Which side of this fence is the United States Government on, anyway?

Surely we aren't going to complete the cycle and now put our money behind the Reds. Or are we? If the State Department has its way the answer probably will be yes. A joint American-British agreement to do business with the Chinese Communists is one of the things under discussion right now between Secretary of State Acheson and British Foreign Minister Bevin.

Pulp and Paper Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in 1940 the United States imported 1,224,750 tons of wood pulp, and in 1948 we imported almost twice that much, or 2,176,111 tons.

During the same period our pulp and paper exports were declining rapidly, having fallen from 480,938 tons exported in 1940 to only 93,782 tons exported in 1948.

The Canadians have now devalued their money by 10 percent, and the British have devalued the pound by 30 percent. This devaluation threatens to decrease even further our vanishing export business in pulp and paper and at the same time makes it probable that foreign nations will dump an increased quantity of pulp and paper on the American market.

Pulp and paper were our No. 1 imported commodity in 1948, the imports of pulp and paper in that year being valued at $753,000,000. The 10 commodities ranking first as imports were:

	Million dollars	Rank
Paper and paper materials	753	1
Nonferrous ores and metals	736	2
Coffee	698	3
Petroleum and products	418	4
Sugar	313	5
Crude rubber	309	6
Unmanufactured wool	308	7
Vegetable oils and oil seeds	234	8
Fruits, nuts and vegetables	222	9
Cocoa	194	10

Source: Foreign Commerce Weekly, Mar. 14, 1949.

Further increases in our pulp and paper imports would threaten the stability and full-time operation of our United States pulp and paper industry in which American risk capital has invested almost $5,000,000,000 and which employs, in its operating plants, a total of 205,000 workers.

We must protect these 205,000 workers against the dangers in devaluation and by a protective tariff if necessary.

On the dangers of devaluation of currencies to the pulp and paper industry, Pulp and Paper, one of the largest and most influential of the Nation's trade magazines, in its October issue said editorially:

CURRENCY DEVALUATION—A CLOUD OVER THIS INDUSTRY

Currency devaluation in Europe has placed in the hands of the Scandinavian nations

the power to destroy or at least to seriously cripple some of the most important segments of the North American forest industries. To what extent the Scandinavian nations use this power remains to be seen.

British socialism and the United States State and Treasury Departments cannot issue any white papers to blot out their responsibility for this grave turn of affairs.

Now if history repeats itself, which it has a way of doing, the outlook is very black indeed for those particular segments of the North American forest industries which:

1. Have done the very most of all in reforestation.

2. Are among the most vital of all national defense plants.

3. Have done the most to stabilize hundreds of thousands of jobs of mill and forest workers.

4. Have built up scores of the happiest, healthiest industrial communities of all industrial America.

We are speaking principally of the great market paper and rayon pulp industries created in the past quarter century in America, and also of the scores of integrated paper companies, so-called because they have had the foresight to build up their own wood and pulp resources.

If the European producer takes all the advantage offered by devaluation, he can now dump his pulp in the United States market at 40 percent off, and 30 percent below the lesser devaluation of the Canadian producer.

Canadian producers also are in a position to demoralize the United States market. But the few who might be tempted should look over their shoulder to the Scandinavians, who can wreck them in turn. It just takes one to start the cutthroat game, and Canadians and Americans would both be the losers.

And the foresight and planning of the integrated mills becomes bitter gall to them if pulp comes in so cheap as to make it uneconomic to develop their own resources.

The critical question today is how much pulp has Europe to spare—how deep will they cut their forests? We know, for instance, Russia has been taking much of Finland's pulp and wood. Would Russia be apt to release that now, if it meant disaster for these United States industries?

In recent years the No. 1 "goat" or "guinea pig" in creating the greatest increase in foreign dollars of any industry is this one. No other industry has given so much to implement the philosophy of economic internationalism of our State Department. In effect, these forest industries have been used to subsidize automobile and other industries. And now they are to be the principal "goat" again.

And yet when war came and the submarines blocked off the sea lanes, we learned to our dismay that we had to have our own as well as Canada's pulp and paper mills in full production to win a war. Too late, our Government tried to freeze labor in the woods and mills. Every product the mills could make—from nitrating pulp to fire guns, and V-paperboard boxes to ship goods overseas, to the paper used for propaganda and a general's war map—was needed critically.

Market pulp and integrated mills both stand to bear the brunt of the blows that may fall as a result of devaluation—from the great kraft mills of the Southern Pine Belt and the biggest white paper mills of the East and Midwest to the huge market pulp mills of the Far West.

Let us, however, single out the State of Washington as potentially the most horrible example of what may happen. Producing over 2,000,000 tons of pulp, more than one-sixth of the Nation's total, it is the greatest pulp State in the Union. It markets over 750,000 tons—some Washington State pulp going to virtually every paper mill and every rayon and cellophane plant in America.

Four of these big Washington State mills during the war made virtually all the nitrating pulp the United States Army used to fire nearly all of its medium- and large-caliber guns. But when devaluation came over a decade ago, two of the Washington mills were shut down; several others ran at 50 percent and at less, and kept skeleton crews on at a loss to help pay the grocery bills of employees.

Luckily, that time they survived, and now they pay an average wage of $1.76 an hour—35 cents higher than any other United States mills and much higher than anywhere else in the world. Their woods workers, too, are in this rarefied financial atmosphere as wage earners. Ironically, on the very day devaluation in Europe burst upon their world, these mill workers were asking further wage increases.

Last year Washington State produced 25 percent of the market pulp for the United States, and Scandinavia produced about 17 percent. Canada produced about 40 percent. Last year Scandinavia shipped only 575,000 tons here, at a time when pulp was in high demand and inflation was active, and extracted a price 40 percent to 50 percent higher than American or Canadian producers. But back in 1937, Scandinavia shipped 1,250,000 tons after devaluation.

If it happens again who will come forth with a "Marshall plan" for our most important forest industries?

Drop in the Bucket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News of September 29, 1949:

DROP IN THE BUCKET

An official of the State Department went before the House Foreign Affairs Committee the other day to urge Congress to approve President Truman's point-4 aid program for backward areas of the world in the interest of world security.

Point 4 to which reference was made is the fourth point in President Truman's foreign program as outlined in his inaugural address last January.

It is: "We must set out a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and our industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

In pressing for adoption of this program, the administration has asked Congress to appropriate $45,000,000 to cover the expense of getting the technical part of the proposal under way.

There is no question that the objective of Mr. Truman's proposal is highly laudatory. But when you get down to considering all of its aspects, you find the cost would be so staggering that it would be far beyond the ability of the American people to finance.

There are many backward and underdeveloped areas in the world. The population of these areas runs into the hundreds of millions. China alone has 400,000,000, and so does India. Both are backward areas.

The cost of improving the lots of these hundreds of millions of human beings would have to be levied against the American people. And there are only about 150,000,000 Americans to shoulder that burden.

As to the ultimate cost of the project, one man's guess is as good as another's.

But to bring these hundreds of millions up to a good standard of living it would be necessary to provide them with jobs at good wages.

In the United States, industrialists know that it costs several thousand dollars to provide the facilities to put one man to work.

To provide 400,000,000 industrial jobs, at $2,000 per job, would cost $800,000,000,000, a low estimate at the rate American industrialists spend to provide the facilities for putting men to work.

All the hundreds of millions of those in backward areas would not be put in industrial jobs, of course.

Some would be put to work at farming, but to build up soils which have been worn out through generations of misuse and to introduce modern farming methods would be tremendously expensive.

So would the development of the backward areas' natural resources. Mining, drilling for oil and the like are not conducted on a shoestring these days. It takes money to locate and produce mineral and oil deposits. It takes still greater sums to process these sources of wealth and market them.

It isn't much of a guess to say that the eventual cost of the program, if adopted, would run into the trillions (not billions) of dollars.

The $45,000,000 appropriation asked of Congress is just a drop in the bucket, bait to get the country launched on a world-wide program so expensive that it could—probably would—bankrupt the American people.

The Water Fight—A Reply to the Governor of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, in one of his current columns, strikes at the very heart of the Arizona-California controversy over the waters of the Colorado River. While we would like to have the adjudication of these rights determined in the Supreme Court, the project asked for by Arizona would still be extremely fantastic even though they were entitled to the water. This is very ably brought out in this column which I am submitting.

THE WATER FIGHT—A REPLY TO THE GOVERNOR OF ARIZONA

(By Raymond Moley)

Gov. Dan E. Garvey, of Arizona, has written to the author of this column protesting that a column some weeks ago did great injustice to his State. The article raised questions concerning the central Arizona reclamation project which is the cause of a violent dispute between Arizona and California.

The project would, at a cost estimated at $738,000,000, include a dam on the Colorado River above the Hoover Dam, a pump to lift the water 1,000 feet, and a tunnel, aqueducts, and canals to carry the water 300 to 400 miles to fertilize an area of 225,000 acres in Arizona.

The State of California is against this project because it claims that there isn't enough water to meet the contractual rights for water to California and also to supply this new Arizona project. California wants a clear adjudication of its claims by the Su-

preme Court before Congress approves of the Arizona project.

My column concluded that California's case should be settled before any action is taken by Congress. It said also that, aside from California's seemingly ironclad rights to its water, it is better to provide water for a potentially dangerous shortage among the vast population of southern California than to restore to cultivation great areas of farm land in the Arizona desert.

It also seemed to this taxpayer that three-quarters of a billion is a lot of money to spend on a new project to increase agricultural acreage when the Government is already spending billions because of agricultural surpluses.

Governor Garvey claims that the land in question has been or is in cultivation and that it needs the new water to save it.

The fact seems to indicate that the acreage in question can be divided into two parts. One consists of 150,000 acres rushed into production during the war boom. This was largely a speculative venture. People moved in and cultivated the land, despite the certainty that the ground water would ultimately not support it. The level of the ground water is falling, and the farmers are now in distress. Another 73,000 acres to be supplied by the new water consists of land now idle which was in some remote past used and then abandoned. This is in practical terms new land, despite Governor Garvey's technical objection.

The dispute over Arizona's contractual rights involves the measurement of water now obtained for many other Arizona projects. Much of this comes from the Gila River. Arizona claims that only 1,100,000 acre-feet should be charged against its contract. California claims that Arizona uses more than twice that amount.

Despite Governor Garvey's protest, my conclusion remains. It is, simply stated, that before any commitment is made by the Congress the Supreme Court should pass upon the contracts of both States and should resolve the issues of fact. Then, after that is done and after it is decided whether there is enough additional water for the Arizona project, Congress should weigh the question of saving a great and reckless exploitation of land which probably should never have been brought into cultivation.

For with the Federal budget in red ink, it would seem that Congress might consider this huge expenditure against other and better claims, including that of the long-suffering taxpayers in 47 other States.

How About Our Soldiers' Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a clipping has been sent to me from the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes, together with an inquiry as to the reason for the existing conditions respecting the Soldiers' Home here in Washington. That clipping is as follows:

WANTS SOLDIERS' HOME EXPANDED TO TAKE IN MORE VETS

EDITOR, NATIONAL TRIBUNE:

Five hundred forgotten soldiers who survived past wars, but are victims of old age, are waiting to get in the National Soldiers' Home at Washington, D. C., but there is no room for them. Those on the inside would like to make room by building new quarters. They have plenty of money, $33,000,000, every cent contributed through the years by enlisted men. But the money is held in trust by the Treasury Department and the ex-soldiers can't get it out without an act of Congress. The money belongs to the soldiers and not the taxpayers.

The Budget Bureau has turned down the request to release $16,700,000 of the money to expand the home. The Bureau recommendation has influenced Congress to refuse use of this fund despite the fact that the ex-soldiers' home has not been expanded since 1911. Meanwhile, the waiting list of aged and lonely ex-soldiers who paid for this home is growing larger.

The home is not under control of the Veterans' Administration; it is supported by the military forces in deductions of pay of the United States Regular Army. This home has not cost the taxpayer of the United States Government 1 cent.

JOHN M. CURRY.

LANCASTER, PA.

I was interested in this matter and I have taken it up with the Board of Commissioners of the United States Soldiers' Home and I have received a reply from the president of that Board which contains information I believe the Members should have. That reply is as follows:

OFFICE, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1949.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CURTIS: I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 3d instant addressed to the Board of Commissioners, and in reply to state that the situation at the United States Soldiers' Home with reference to the urgent need for expanding its facilities to accommodate those eligible applicants for admission, for whom no accommodations are currently available, is substantially as outlined in the clipping you enclose from the September 15 issue of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes. However, the clipping should be modified to read that the funds held in trust by the United States Treasury (United States Soldiers' Home permanent fund, trust fund) are about $35,000,000 instead of $33,000,000 and the number of names on the waiting list from 500 to about 400. Within a few days estimates for a building program for the fiscal year 1951, the exact amount being $16,547,000, will again be presented to the Bureau of the Budget with a view to its subsequent consideration by the Congress.

Commenting on the acute situation now confronting the home, I quote below an extract from the annual report of the Board of Commissioners, for the fiscal year 1949, reading as follows:

"Having made monthly contributions toward the support of the Soldiers' Home and thereby being assured by law, by regulations, and by the officers under whom they have served that they would be admitted to the home upon request, it is understandable that they should feel disillusioned when advised that on receipt of their applications their name would be carried on a list for many months awaiting vacancies for admission. The accumulated permanent fund (trust fund) * * * has now reached an amount above any anticipated possible requirement for a working balance, and would appear to warrant expenditures therefrom at the earliest practicable date to cover the cost of the building and rehabilitation program."

Returning your letter and the clipping enclosed therewith, believe me.

Very sincerely yours,
H. K. LOUGHRY,
Major General, United States Army (Retired), President, Board of Commissioners.

Social Security Bill Should Be Pushed in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 5, 1949, which suggests the importance of early action in the other body upon the social security bill, H. R. 6000, which passed the House yesterday by the overwhelming vote of 333 to 14:

PUSHING H. R. 6000

It is not to be supposed the Congress can revamp the social-security system in time to hasten the end of the steel strike. The bill for this purpose, H. R. 6000, on which the House began its debate yesterday, covers more than 200 pages, and the committee report is still longer. Considerable time will be required for legislators to digest this complicated measure and pass judgment on it. But at least it can be passed by the House as a token of what Congress expects to do.

To be sure, the proposed liberalization of the old-age and survivors insurance program would not satisfy the steel workers if it were on the books. But it would lessen the intensity of the demand for large private pension and insurance benefits to be financed solely by the employer. The fact is that many unions are seeking special systems for the benefit of their members only because they have lost hope of bringing the Nation's general social-security system up to reasonable standards of adequacy. This is frankly acknowledged by the Ways and Means Committee. "Without an adequate and universally applicable basic social-insurance system," it advises the House, "the demands for security by segments of the population threaten to result in unbalanced, overlapping, and competing programs." It is about time for Congress to wake up to the fact that its delay in bringing the Social Security Act up to date is threatening to undermine that legislation.

There is, of course, another serious danger to the social-security system, which is based on the sound principle of helping people to help themselves. That danger stands out sharply from the following comments in the Ways and Means Report:

"The assistance program, instead of being reduced to a secondary position as was anticipated, still cares for a much larger number of people than the insurance program. Furthermore, the average payments under assistance have more than doubled in amount since 1939 while benefits under insurance have scarcely risen at all. There are indications that if the insurance program is not strengthened and expanded, the old-age assistance program may develop into a very costly and ill-advised system of noncontributory pensions, payable not only to the needy but to all individuals at or above retirement age who are no longer employed. Moreover, there are increasing pressures for special pensions for particular groups and particular hazards."

The question for Congress, therefore, is really whether the social-security system shall be allowed to go to pieces. If it remains so inadequate as to encourage the development of all sorts of special little areas of social security based on the noncontributory principle, its chief element of strength will be lost. It seems to us that the superiority of a general system covering all workers who can reasonably be brought into it

is indisputable. Such a system spreads the burden of social security over all industry. It generalizes benefits instead of permitting them to be concentrated in a few prosperous corporations. It enables workers to change jobs without losing their security. It conserves their independence and dignity because they contribute to the system and draw benefits from it as a matter of right. The desirability of extending such a system is evident without any reference to the current widespread demand for special pension plans, but these demands have made action by Congress especially urgent.

In addition to bringing 11,000,000 new beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program, the House bill would increase the benefits by about 70 percent on the average. Of course, taxes on employers and employees to support the system would also be sharply increased, and the maximum sum of earnings on which contributions and benefits would be computed would be raised from $3,000 to $3,600. Some details of the bill are likely to be changed before its enactment, but there seems to be little doubt that a liberalized social-security measure will be passed in some form. Industrial statesmanship on the part of both the steel companies and the union calls for a compromise of their dispute over pensions that will make allowance for a liberalized Federal pension system.

Bricklaying Machine Demonstrated at Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on September 29 over 2,000 people attended the first public demonstration of a bricklaying device on the campus of Huntingdon College in Montgomery, Ala. This amazing bricklaying machine was developed by John S. Hodgson and Paul H. Sommers of Montgomery.

Mr. Hodgson is a native of Montgomery and graduated from the University of Alabama in 1924 and then joined his father in the construction business. During the war he served with Corps of Engineers in Construction and was awarded the Legion of Merit for service at Oak Ridge, Tenn., in connection with the atomic bomb project.

Mr. Sommers is a native of St. Louis, Mo., and graduated from Washington University in 1930. He also served with the Corps of Engineers during the war on military construction, later going to Burma on the Lido Road construction. Since that time he has been associated with the Hodgson Construction Co. of Montgomery. He is author of several technical publications.

This demonstration was sponsored by the chamber of commerce of Montgomery and the principal speaker was Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers. Many contractors and interested spectators were present from practically every section of the Nation.

This machine is said to be the first improvement in brick masonry since the second Babylonian Empire. It is designed to enable a workman to lay as many as 3,000 bricks in an 8-hour day.

The head instructor of masonry at Tuskegee Institute, which is one of the largest Negro schools in the Nation, stated that this machine would be a great aid in solving the rural housing problem and that it would increase the work for bricklayers. And H. H. Houk, of Montgomery, who had charge of the engineering work on the great National Airport here in Washington, predicted that it would necessarily force brick masons to improve their workmanship.

The developers state that the machine will save up to 36 cents a square foot and that any reasonable acceptance by the construction industry will cut costs at least $100,000,000 a year. Several models will be manufactured ranging from one weighing 20 pounds to a 90-pound size, which takes two men to operate. The machine will be placed on the market by Messrs. Hodgson and Sommers and its general adoption will mean mass production, which will provide better things for more people at lower cost. To quote from the booklet, the Story of a Great Need and Its Fulfillment, issued by the Montgomery Chamber of Commerce in commemoration of the premier demonstration on September 29. "So along with other great engineering advancements, machine bricklaying takes its place to serve for the benefit of mankind."

The Value of American Motion Pictures Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the statement of Mr. Irving Brown to the press of recent date is a very revealing disclosure of the value of our American-made pictures toward the promotion of good will and the advertisement of American democracy. His statement follows:

A prominent American Federation of Labor leader just back from Europe said today that American motion pictures are "a vital and indispensable force in spreading American democracy abroad."

Irving Brown, European representative for the American Federation of Labor, said that "I've seen it demonstrated time and time again that American motion pictures are more popular with the masses of the people than the films of any other nation."

Brown, who is attending the 68th Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor here, said that "the peoples of Europe prefer American pictures over any other medium of communications or information."

"I have just returned from Europe," Brown said, "where for 4 years as representative of the American Federation of Labor I have had a chance to see first-hand the tremendous impact American motion pictures have on all peoples abroad, particularly those behind the iron curtain."

Brown said American motion pictures are so popular behind the iron curtain that "getting tickets to see them is tougher than pulling a strike in the salt mines of Siberia."

At the same time, he said, Russian pictures often play almost to empty houses.

"In Czechoslovakia, for example," he said, "I have tried to see American films only to find that it was easier to get in to see 'South Pacific' in this country. I have had to wait for as many as 5 weeks to see an American film when I could have had a theater showing Russian pictures practically to myself.

"American motion pictures," he said, "are popular primarily because of their superior entertainment value. People the world over are weary of the type of propaganda fed them every day by Communists.

"Even though American motion pictures are seen because of their entertainment value, they carry an important social and ideological byproduct, because through the movies peoples of other countries form their ideas, impressions, and prejudices of the American way of life.

"It is because American films have no conscious propaganda that they have such a powerful influence abroad. This is true whether the movie is 'good' or 'bad.'

"It is therefore vitally important that the American motion-picture industry realize even more the great necessity of being aware of what American movies can do in the conflict for men's minds.

"I think for this reason that pictures showing the history and progress of American labor would be very valuable in nailing down as lies Communist propaganda about our American labor movement. But the best way to do this, I emphasize, is through the entertainment film rather than through one carrying the conscious propaganda methods."

Jobs for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article which appeared recently in the Washington Star about my friend Charlie Boswell, of Birmingham, Ala., entitled "I Can Do Anything," and an article which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Jobs for the Handicapped." The great spirit of Charlie Boswell is a constant inspiration to me as I wrestle with tough problems from day to day in the House of Representatives. Its this spirit that has made America great and it will pull us through these dangerous times victoriously. It is easy to see why Employ the Handicapped Week is something special in Jefferson County, Ala., which highlights the great work that is being done to help our handicapped folks to help themselves. Mr. Speaker, I recommend these articles to every Member of Congress:

[From the Washington Star]

"I CAN DO ANYTHING"

(Everybody has trouble. In that fact itself lies great solace. And in it, too, lies inspiration, for man is at his greatest when he faces trouble and surmounts it.—EDITOR.)

About 1940, in Birmingham, Ala., life looked good to Charles Boswell. He was popular, a natural leader, a hard-working student, and a football star—first in a Birmingham high school, then in the University of Alabama. He fell in love and was married.

Then came trouble. Charlie went to war.

November 30, 1944, a German antitank missile screamed across a road near Lendern, Germany, and hit an American tank. Company Commander Charles Boswell saw a soldier trying to get out. He ran to his aid.

Another shell hit the tank, exploded in shrapnel—and for Boswell the lights went out, permanently. He was blind.

Blind, but not licked.

"HECK, I CAN DO ANYTHING"

At Valley Forge Hospital, Pennsylvania, a golf pro named Kenney Gleason showed him how to play golf, rattling the pin in the cup so he could aim his putts by ear. In 1946, he finished second in a blind golfers' tournament in Los Angeles. This year he won the same tourney in Norristown, Pa.

Meanwhile he had to make a living. He got a job in Loveman, Joseph & Loeb's department store in Birmingham; within a year he was sports department manager.

He takes his wife and two kids to ball games; swims with them, plays bridge using Braille cards. He is friendly, easy to talk to; looks directly at you when he talks. His expressive eyebrows, moving as he talks, gives his face animation.

"Heck," he says, "I can do just anything I want to do. I could have sat around to be waited on. But it's more fun doing things myself. It's fun to beat trouble."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 30, 1949]

JOBS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

To a Nation we well know is somewhat surfeited with weeks for this and that we nonetheless commend a week that should be lifted out of that surfeit. It is Employ the Handicapped Week. And it begins October 2.

Back of this special week and the program it publicizes stands a Presidential committee of uncommon prestige. Its chairman is Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire (retired); its vice chairman, able Robert Ramspeck, former Congressman. Listed also on its roster are five members of the President's Cabinet and the heads of the Veterans Bureau, Civil Service Commission, and Federal Security Administration.

First inspired, undoubtedly, by the need to reestablish the war wounded as self-supporting, self-respecting members of society, Congress set for the committee objectives much broader. Civilian pursuits also have their casualties.

Evidence continues to pile up that the handicapped make good workers. What is needed is either to fit them to the right jobs, or to tailor jobs to fit them. Their services may be limited in scope, but not in skill. Steadiness and a sense of responsibility often more than compensate for lesser versatility. And employers are sometimes surprised at how little handicapped the "handicapped" prove to be.

This week and the effort it symbolizes should pay dividends, economic as well as humanitarian.

The Texas GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention of the House to a splendid article, Under Texas Skies, written by the eminent author and historian, A. Garland Adair, curator of history in the Texas Memorial Museum, which appeared in a recent issue of the Bertram Enterprise, one of the fine newspapers in my district, published by Mr. Oliver Cox. In this article Mr. Adair pays tribute to Maj. Horace Shelton, a distinguished lawyer and veteran of Texas, who was elected chaplain of the American Legion, Department of Texas, and to the typical Texas GI. The article is as follows:

UNDER TEXAS SKIES

(By A. Garland Adair, curator of history in the Texas Memorial Museum)

Carl Schurz did not know Maj. Horace Shelton but he described him well when he wrote: "Ideals are like stars; you will not succeed in touching them with your hands, but like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and, following them, you reach your destiny."

Major Shelton has an ideal which he follows vigorously, and that is to accomplish much good by serving with veteran organizations. This distinguished Austin man has won many honors in the American Legion, included in which was the magnificent award, a few years back, of being America's outstanding Legionnaire. Recently at Fort Worth he was elected chaplain for the Department of Texas. He will do a genuine service in that field just as he has in everything he has set his hand to do. Legionnaires were happy to elect such a man to the chaplaincy. The love of labor is his sheet anchor.

Another event at the Fort Worth convention of special interest to the citizens of Texas, and especially to the people of the capital city of Austin, was the acceptance of a life-size portrait of the typical Texas GI, to be placed in the Texas Memorial Museum with other oil paintings of Eisenhower, Nimitz, Eaker, and Oveta Culp Hobby. The Texas GI was presented to the American Legion for the museum by Seymour Stone, one of the Nation's foremost portrait artists.

The painting is an action picture, portraying a youthful Texan with rifle in his left hand and a hand grenade in his right, which he is hurling at the foe. A look of determination mingled with distress is on his boyish face, as he fights on without giving heed to his own wounded condition or to his tattered blood-marked trousers. Behind him lies the body of another Texan who has just paid the supreme offering, and in the distant battle clouds hovering over the scene is the Lone Star of Texas.

In the presence of this life-like painting of a soldier on the firing line, one must think inadvertently of the mighty contribution to the success of all our wars heroically made by the enlisted man—a patriot without rank, all too often unknown, unhonored, and unsung.

The painting illustrates a priceless principle in the philosophy of man. In every clime and country, patriots have preserved in song and story, in bronze and marble, in paintings and other works of art, the sacrifices of those who have responded to their country's call in its hour of need.

Such honors usually attend gallant leaders and distinguished sons and daughters whose uniform covered decorations are advertised to a grateful and worshipful world.

This painting does honor to all who responded to duty's clarion call. It is a lasting tribute to Texans who unsheathed their bright blades and marched down the rugged road to victory.

The typical enlisted man—a composite of many teen-age Texans, is representative of all units of Uncle Sam's military might. On land and sea; under the ocean and in the skies, all around the earth, he fought the war that toppled despots from their thrones and reshaped the map of the world. The Texas boy had a reputation to sustain and not one just to make. He loved and was loved, for he was some proud mother's affectionate son. He had dreams and ambitions common to all; a life of peace and honest struggle; and, at the end a place on the hillside with his fathers. Where were duty and honor, if Texans felt that death draws a gloomy shroud behind which nothing stands and stares but the horror and blackness of eternal night.

So, in all in whom the spirit and spark of hope has not died, they can well believe that: "Though he were dead, yet shall he live again." There is the promise which men and women hold when everything of this earth has slipped away.

Promote the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following copy of my radio address which I shall deliver over station WMEX this evening from 7:30 to 7:35 p. m.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, it is common business practice to set aside money each year to cover the depreciation of machinery.

In time, the machine wears out, and there must be money in reserve to replace it with a new machine.

Human beings also wear out.

The difference is that we do not throw an old human being on the junk pile, then gather it up with other pieces of junk and melt them down to salvage the steel with which to help manufacture new machines.

In recent centuries, at least, we did not junk the human being who had outlived his economic usefulness.

We sent him to the poor house or excused society by saying that the human being should have provided for his old age. As long as our individual old age was provided for, we paid scant attention to the fate of others. Of course we did contribute something to charity, to ease our conscience, conveniently overlooking the humiliation that often goes with charity.

This problem of others did not seem to have any bearing upon us.

If we took time out to think about it, we would realize that most people work and produce during the years from 20 to 60, and even beyond. As they sacrifice to provide for their families, it becomes increasingly difficult for them to put aside enough to support themselves in old age. They have worked without getting retirement benefits from the product of their labors. Depressions and wars and other circumstances which they cannot control, often defeat their best efforts to set aside enough for the "rainy" days of disability, sickness, unemployment, and old age.

With the coming of the machine age and the growing interdependence of society, we are beginning to see that the welfare of others does concern us in a very practical way. If too many people are without work, or without income, they cease to be customers, and there is less demand for the goods and services which those of us with jobs are producing. Furthermore, the Government must take more money from us, and suddenly, to alleviate the distress.

Wouldn't it be far better to have a long-range depreciation program for human beings, financed from their earnings at the source, to provide economic protection to

the individual and to society? This is the insurance which our way of life needs to prevent the violent "ups and down" of the past that cannot be tolerated in the future. This is the sound base for security, organized in the democratic manner, which will prevail over the siren calls of dictatorship, whether of the "left" or the "right." It is the one way we can effectively answer the propaganda which challenges individual Americans with the taunt: "What good is your freedom when you haven't any job or any income?"

We have already witnessed many changes in the revolutionary era of the past 35 years, in which the old social order had to adjust itself to the realities of scientific progress or be succeeded by a new and violent system which tried to do so.

That adjustment is far from complete, but already two developments stand out, insofar as the situation within the United States is concerned. One happened in the year 1935, when the original Social Security Act was passed by the Congress. This recognized, for the first time, that group action is necessary to protect individuals from the economic hazards which so often lead to destitution. It was a beginning, and like all beginnings, it merely scratched the surface of the problem. The encouraging point is that we finally faced the issue, and we are still working on it, both to extend coverage and to increase benefits.

The second development, which was inspired by the first, is the effort to accelerate social security through pension plans and welfare guaranties concluded between labor and management as part of the collective-bargaining process. These, rather than wage increases, hold the center of the stage in the year 1949.

Under the Social Security Act of 1935, 42,500,000 workers are insured against unemployment and old age. It is financed by pay-roll taxes on employees and employers. Its benefits, however, are woefully inadequate. The average worker on retirement gets only $26 a month. If he has a wife, they get $40.

The war stimulated the growth of private pensions systems. By 1946, according to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, there were 6,862 pension plans and 3,291,000 participating employees. That number is now up to 4,500,000. Before the war some of these plans were financed exclusively by unions. Now the demand is that the employer should foot the whole bill.

Without getting into the controversy as to how these private pension systems should be financed, I want to emphasize the fact that many of them provide for $100 a month or more, as contrasted with the unrealistic $26–$40 scale of old-age insurance administered by the Government.

For years progressive Congressmen and labor leaders have warned that it was not enough to put a token social-security law on the books and then forget about it. There is no security in undernourished benefits. We have completed the foundation but we have failed to get on with the building of a real security structure. As of this year, we are spending at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year for public assistance to the needy, but only $600,000,000 in old-age and survivors insurance benefits. To compensate for this lack of progress we are now confronted with a rash of private pension plans which may throw our over-all objective out of joint by providing security to one worker and denying it to another.

Clearly, we must add range and substance to the present social-security law, in justice to all.

The Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives, by a 22 to 3 margin, has recommended additional legislation whose major provisions include:

1. Blanketing of 11,000,000 more workers into the old-age and survivors insurance program.

2. Boosting by 70 percent the present benefits of two and a half million persons already retired, or their survivors if they have died, and increasing by an average of 80 percent the insurance benefits of persons yet to retire, or their survivors.

3. An increase of $150,000,000 a year in Federal participation with the States in public assistance or home relief for needy persons. The Government already contributes $1,100,000,000 annually for this program from general revenues. Under the old-age and survivors insurance program, the workers and their employers pay for the benefits which the worker gets later on. The public assistance program, by contrast, is direct relief to the needy who have not qualified for old-age insurance because they have not worked long enough in covered employment. As coverage is extended, the costs of public assistance should decrease.

4. Increase the pay-roll taxes supporting the insurance program, currently 1 percent on employee's pay and employer's pay roll, to 1½ percent each on next January 1, 2 percent on January 1, 1951 to 2½ in 1960, to 3 percent in 1964, and to 3½ percent on each in 1970.

5. Create a new category of aid to totally and permanently disabled persons under both the insurance and public assistance approaches to the problem.

The action of the labor unions reveals the public pressure for a decent standard of security. If backward elements in the Congress stand in the way of progress, the people are determined to circumvent this obstacle. Those who are organized in labor unions are using the instrument of collective bargaining to win for themselves a greater measure of protection in their declining years.

Although these drives for private pensions will benefit only a few groups immediately and would appear to discriminate against the unorganized workers, I believe that they are but the advance guard of an aroused public opinion which will insist upon a wide-scale expansion of social-security legislation by the Congress.

A poll among farmers reveals that 60 percent favor extension of social-security benefits to include them. Small-business men, professional workers, and others who comprise the nonfarm self-employed, are asking for coverage. Farm operators number about 6,000,000. Urban self-employed total 7,700,000.

Originally the self-employed were left out of the Social Security Act, because there seemed to be no practical way of taxing their income for contributory purposes. However, experience has since demonstrated that there are no administrative problems which cannot be solved. It is suggested that reports would be required only from self-employed persons with gross cash incomes from all sources of $500 or more in a year, and with net incomes from self-employment of $200 or larger. Income from self-employment would have to be separated from return on investment. Net income from self-employment could be gaged on the basis of two figures already included in the income-tax return.

It is also advisable that employees of the Federal, State, and local Governments (adjusting their special retirement systems where they exist, to the basic social-insurance system), members of the armed forces, and employees of religious, educational, charitable, and similar nonprofit organizations, should also be included. Independents, such as salesmen, taxicab operators, insurance agents, and home workers, must not be overlooked, as they have been so far.

In order to bring newly covered workers up to an even status with those previously covered, the existing law should be changed to permit such workers insurance, if they had covered wages in one out of each of the four quarters elapsing since 1936, or since the age of 21.

Since the present level of benefits is far too low, benefits should be increased substantially.

Furthermore, the qualifying age for women should be reduced from 65 years to 60. Women are generally younger than their husbands and, on the average, live longer. If women are allowed to draw benefits at 60, about three-fifths of the married men would have wives immediately eligible for benefits when their husbands retire. This would also help widows. Women workers themselves should, as a matter of consistency, be eligible for benefits at the same age that other women qualify for dependents' benefits.

Actuarial estimates of an expanded old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, based on present employment and wage levels, would approximate a 7.4 percent levy on pay rolls.

I am certain that the American economic system, with its high level of productivity, can afford this insurance. I am equally sure that, if it does not provide these safeguards, it will be the loser.

There is room for argument on details, but none on principle.

Seven and one-half cents on each dollar is a small price to pay for eliminating the poisonous worry bred by destitution. The alternatives of social unrest, and huge relief projects, are much more costly.

Basic security for the individual adds up to group security.

I believe that it is the duty of Congress to bring the Social Security Act up to date by including all residents of the United States within its coverage, and with benefits scaled to the cost of living.

And I shall do all within my power to make social security a reality.

Republican Party Challenged to Stern Self-Analysis on Isolationism

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of September 28, 1949:

STATE OF THE NATION—GOP CHALLENGED TO STERN SELF-ANALYSIS ON ISOLATIONISM

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—It would seem to me that the Republican Party must do some soul searching on its international program. News that atomic energy information no longer is the monopoly of the United States and Britain opens a new chapter on foreign affairs. In Congress recently there has been a decided diminution of bipartisan cooperation. News of the atomic explosion in Russia offers an opportunity for reconsidering the situation.

Let me offer two recent examples, the story of the treatment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act extension in Congress and the parallel story of the Truman program for military aid to Europe. In the final vote, both measures passed handily in the respective Houses. A reader of headlines would not appreciate the dangers to which each measure was subjected.

Take the tariff act extension first. A great many persons now agree that as the world's

great creditor country the United States must ease its old tariff barriers. The initial test was in the House. On a Republican motion to block extension of the Hull treaties by recommitting the bill, 97 percent of the Democrats voted against recommittal; 95 percent of the Republicans voted for it.

The measure passed the House and went to the Senate. On September 15 the Senate also passed the extension measure after beating crippling amendments by a tie vote, broken by Vice President Alben W. Barkley. On the final vote to extend the measure, 97 percent of the Democratic Senators voted for it, 53 percent of the Republicans opposed the bill.

This GOP opposition to the Hull trade pacts was not exceptional. Since the law first was adopted in 1934, it has now been extended six times. That means seven votes in each House. The scorekeeper notes with some interest that of these 14 votes, the Republicans have opposed it all but a couple of times.

If Thomas E. Dewey had been elected President last year with GOP congressional majorities, it is likely the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would have been modified or restricted. Mr. Dewey personally favored the act, for he is an internationalist. But whether he could have carried GOP legislators along is uncertain.

A second great international issue recently has been the military aid program to back up the Atlantic Pact with arms. Discovery that Russia is on the way to building an atomic bomb pushed through this program quickly. But prior to this development the House had halved the proposed funds for European aid. Here, again, the line-up of parties is significant. On the crucial motion by Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, Democrat, of South Carolina, to cut the funds, 94 percent of the Republicans approved, while 64 percent of the Democrats opposed. The cut was voted.

Then came the battle in the Senate. The Senate passed the bill September 22 by 55 to 24 without the cut. But a drive to cut the funds was undertaken, led by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia. On his motion, 80 percent of the Democrats voted against the cut, whereas 69 percent of the Republicans voted for it. Again the parties had shown a notable cleavage on basic international affairs.

On the military aid program bill, there was another significant point. Both Senate Republican leaders on domestic affairs, ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska, voted against the completed measure. If Republican leader ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, quits the Senate for physical reasons, which now is possible, Senator TAFT may extend his sway from the domestic to the international field.

Many internationalists are so persuaded of the correctness of their position that they fail to take account of the other side. Yet for 150 years the country has been traditionally aloof from European affairs. Internationalism is a relatively new thing. It is dangerous to ignore the strength of latent isolationism.

An editorial in the Washington Times-Herald, which now is a property of Col. Robert McCormick, followed the news of the Russian atomic explosion. The title summarized the argument, "The Reward of Being Meddlesome." Thanks to American internationalists, the editorial explained, "the United States has been made the logical target of Russian military force." It continued:

"For 35 years the internationalists have exerted every effort to destroy the historic American policy of nonintervention in foreign quarrels." The editorial says the happy old policy of aloofness was unwisely broken down. "On this theory (internationalism) our country provided the decisive power in the First World War. * * * Soon the internationalists got the United States into another world war. * * *" And now at last, concludes the editorial, the United States is committed to preventing Russian expansion in Europe and elsewhere. "These are America's rewards for succumbing to the meddlesome gospel of the internationalists."

It may be asserted that editorials like this are extreme. But reading them and watching the fascinating congressional sway to and fro, it cannot be said that the final answer to America's world role is given yet. Outright isolationalism is over, but the mood persists and still affects vital decisions.

The Mechanical Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the August 1949 Popular Science:

MECHANICAL COW SERVES GLOBAL MILK ROUTE

(By Martin Mann)

GI's in the Pacific are now drinking milk from cows that don't moo—they clank. These new mechanical cows produce pasteurized, homogenized, grade-A milk that only a calf can tell from the original. And a quart costs no more, maybe less, than the ones you buy from the corner grocer.

The postwar-model mechanical cows are providing pure, tasty milk in places with little or no local supply. In the Far East, the American soldier's thirst for milk is being slacked by seven machines making 22,700 gallons daily—equivalent to a herd of 7,500 live cows. Any surplus goes to native kids. One strictly civilian plant is now running in Haiti (unlike the GI plants, it uses coconut oil instead of butterfat, to cut costs). And others will shortly be supplying the milk-thirsty citizens of the Philipines, Venezuela, Trinidad, Curacao, and Aruba.

All this is possible because a way has finally been found to take the water out of milk before shipment and put it back again at its destination—without affecting the taste. Until recently, no one had been able to do that trick. There was lots of powdered milk—the Army shipped tons of it to troops overseas during the war. But chances are that anyone who tasted it will wrinkle up his nose at the memory. The new stuff, its makers report, tastes just like milk straight from the cow.

There are several tricks to protecting the flavor. First, it's not enough just to evaporate water from milk, giving whole-milk powder; you must separate the butterfat from the milk and then evaporate the water from the remaining milk solids. Next, the evaporation itself must be done with extreme care, quickly, under vacuum, with little heat, to avoid the cooked taste typical of the older powders.

Many of the details of the process that gets milk from a Stateside cow to a Japanese glass are trade secrets. However, Dr. Charles E. North, who himself has invented many of the methods and machines used, outlined for Popular Science the general procedure followed at his pilot plant in New Paltz, N. Y.

There the first step is removal of the butterfat. This is done in machines like souped-up cream separators—huge high-speed centrifuges that spin the milk at 18,000 revolutions per minute. The butterfat is then put in special tanks, where curd and other impurities settle out. The result is a clear-yellow, honey-like material which is as close to 100-percent butterfat as laboratory analysis can determine. This "butter oil" is sealed under pressure of nitrogen gas in metal cans. Packed that way, it stays fresh indefinitely without refrigeration.

The skim milk left after removal of the butterfat is next dried. It is evaporated to one-fourth its original volume in a vacuum with as little heat as possible. Then pressure of 2,500 pounds per square inch forces it through a nozzle, creating a spray that causes the rest of the water to evaporate.

The dry skim milk and butter oil can then be shipped any place milk is needed. There—unlike Humpty Dumpty—they are put back together again with pure water.

In a typical recombining plant, such as the one the International Dairy Supply Co. operates for the Army in Yokohama, workers feed the skim powder into an agitator tank, where it is mixed at great speed with the correct amount of water. (Since the water previously removed was H_2O, and nothing else, the water put back must be just as pure, free of minerals, chlorine, etc.) A 500-gallon pasteurizing vat receives this mixture, plus melted butter oil, and holds it for 30 minutes at 143° F.

Next a homogenizer breaks up the butterfat particles, making smooth milk that cannot separate on standing. At the same time, the milk is chilled to 36 degrees in 10 seconds.

To finish the job, standard packaging machines open up flattened cartons, seal the bottoms, dip them in paraffin, cool them, fill them with the milk, and close and staple them. Each machine turns out 65 quarts a minute. The entire process—mixing, pasteurizing, homogenizing, cooling, and packaging—takes less than 2 hours.

How does the "new" milk stack up against the genuine article? Most experts admit that nothing yet available exactly duplicates milk fresh from a cow. Yet, in a series of tests, 20 nonexpert men couldn't tell the difference. And food values are identical; both have equal amounts of vitamins, calories, mineral salts, amino acids, and proteins.

Recombined milk is first being introduced on an extensive scale in places where local milk is poor or nonexistent—and that means much of the world. Dairy cattle can't take the climate of the tropics. Other sections, like Japan, are so overcrowded that good land is not available for grazing. A plentiful supply of wholesome milk in these areas should help improve health, particularly among children. And American businessmen are not blind to the potential profits in a global milk route.

Here at home, plenty of good milk is available. Recombined milk will have to win a United States market the hard way—by furnishing a product that is as good or better at a lower price. Men like Dr. North, Grover T. Turnbow, of International Dairy Supply Co., and Paul Jones, of International Dairy Products Corp., think it can.

If this fresh-tasting milk were available in the United States, they say, you might save as much as 25 percent on your milk bill. They estimate that recombined milk could be sold in New York City for 15 cents a quart. Fresh milk costs about 20 cents.

They point out that fresh milk is mostly water. In a gallon weighing nearly 9 pounds, all but about 1 pound is just plain water. And since transportation expenses make up much of milk's cost, you must pay a lot of money to haul water.

Other factors add to the cost of fresh milk. Even under refrigeration it stays fresh only a few days. Hence it must be produced close to big cities—on comparatively expensive real estate—and rushed to the creamery in express trains of expensive, glass-lined, refrigerated tank cars.

COULD SAVE WATER HAULAGE

Recombined milk could reduce many of these expenses. There is no water to haul.

Butter, oil, and skim powder stay fresh indefinitely—one sample of Dr. North's oil was stored by the United States Quartermaster Corps for 9 months in a 100° F. test chamber without spoilage. It can be shipped in ordinary boxcars on ordinary freight trains. The dairy farms could be located wherever convenient, perhaps as far away as Australia or New Zealand, where production costs are about half those in the United States.

The economies of the recombining process have already found it some uses in this country. Many restaurants and institutions make ice cream, cooking cream, and other milk products by this method.

If recombined milk gains wider use, the dairy industry may concentrate far from population centers. Then children almost everywhere, like city kids now, would know live cows only from picture books. But that would be a small price to pay for the better health more and cheaper milk promises people all over the world.

Wisconsin, which produces over one-eighth of the milk of the Nation has been prevented from selling its high-quality milk in accordance with scientific facts. The road block is a result of obsolete regulations in various milksheds. These road blocks are not based on scientific facts nor on modern nutritional facts.

It is hoped that the vegetable-oil interests will not be allowed to capitalize on this program by being allowed to purchase the needed skim milk at a price that is not fair in relation to the butterfat in the normal milk. Though dried skim has only an 11- and 12-cent-a-pound support price, it contains 35.6 percent digestible animal protein. The support on this part of 100 pounds of milk should be higher. Since about twice as much dried skim milk is obtained from 100 pounds of natural milk as there is butterfat, any change in price of the dried skim of 1 cent per pound creates a 2-cents-per-pound change in the support price of butter. Of course where the vegetable oil is used, vitamin A is lacking, and this product cannot be legally shipped interstate in the United States. Mexico is using and has been using this concoction. If they had to pay somewhere near what the skim-milk powder was worth, they would not be tempted to make the concoction either. So long as they can lean on the dairy cow and secure a byproduct below production cost, they may expand. But this situation may not always exist and we may not always have an antidairy attitude in high places.

American Freedom Sprang From the Ashes of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, socialism or communism is not new in America. Many of our Colonies were founded on communism. The Jamestown settlers of the South and the Pilgrims of New England were both Communist colonies. In the last three and a half centuries more than 200 such groups have tried out some form of socialism or communism on American soil. Everyone has failed in the past and for the same reason that they continue to fail in modern times.

The first English-speaking settlers landed at Jamestown, Va., early in 1607. At first all industry and land were held in common and as Colonial Secretary Ralph Hamor reported, "Our people were fed out of a common store and labored jointly." The settlers failed to produce enough to sustain themselves. Capt. John Smith demanded a compulsory 6-hour workday and decreed that he who will not work shall not eat. Captain John failed. A tougher dictator, Sir Thomas Dale, who ruled with an iron hand, also failed.

The English backers found the settlement a growing expense and sent still another governor, Sir George Yeardley, who established the right of private property and the first representative assembly in America. From that time on the colony prospered. In commenting on the change, Secretary Hamor wrote, "The most honest of them, in a general business, would not take so much faithful and true pains in a week as he will now do for himself in a day." And so by working for themselves the settlers saved the day and grew into a prosperous colony based on fredeom to manage themselves and their property.

When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, Mass., in 1620, their chief aim was not material gain. So, by the famous Mayflower Compact they agreed that the products of their labors were to be kept in a common storehouse from which food and clothing were to be rationed on an equal basis. This pious and conscientious group felt that all would do their utmost for the common good.

The young single men did not see why they should work for other men's wives and children. The older men thought it disrespectful that they should be called on to perform arduous unskilled labors. Neither husbands nor wives liked having the wives do the cooking and sewing for other men. The colony lacked incentives to produce and soon, as Governor Bradford wrote:

> It well appeared that famine must still insue the next year allso, after much debate of things, the Gov. gave way that they should set corne every man for his owne perticuler, and in that regard trust to themselves. And so assigned to every family a parcell of land. This had very good success; for it made all hands very industrious. The women now wente willingly into the field, and tooke their litle-ones with them to set corne, which before would aledg weakness, and inabilitie; whom to have compelled would have bene thought great tiranie. And the effect of their planting was well seene, for all had, and some of the abler sorte and more industrious had to spare, and sell to others, so as any generall wante or famine hath not been amongest them since to this day.

Another seventeenth century socialist community called Bohemia Manor was started near Elkton, Md.

A record was kept of all personal activities, extending to the most microscopic details. Liberty for the individual was outlawed. The individual was part of the group indivisibly, inextricably. His life was not his own; it was part of the group, of the colony. No one possessed any more than any there. All wealth was common. And it remained so until Sluyter forsook the Communistic ideal and introduced private property into the colony, divided up the land, and initiated the profit motive (V. F. Calverton, historian).

So 200 American colonies ran the gamut of their socialist alphabet from Aurora, Brook Farm, Economy, Equality, Harmony, New Harmony, Oneida Community, and so forth, to Zion City. Each one thought it had a new wrinkle that would work in spite of earlier failures. Some were founded by deeply religious groups, others by atheists. All of them killed private incentive and personal responsibility. When any country does that it matters not whether it be founded in prayers or curses. It violates a fundamental law of God and must fail. If we will not learn from European experience, surely we will profit by our own history.

An Epitome of Cherokee History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1948, Judge O. H. P. Brewer, district judge of the Thirteenth Judicial District of the State of Oklahoma, and one of the greatest living Cherokees, delivered a speech to a convention of Cherokees, approximately 700 in number, in the auditorium of the Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Okla. The convention had been called by the principal chief of the Cherokee Nation, the late Honorable J. B. Milam, for the purpose, among others, of discussing the general welfare of all Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma.

Judge Brewer has long been identified with Cherokee affairs, having been born near Webbers Falls in 1871 in the Old Cherokee Nation and educated in its schools. He is a graduate of the Cherokee Male Seminary at Tahlequah, and the law school of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, Ark. Since his graduation from the latter institution, in 1892, he has occupied with honor and distinction many offices of public confidence and trust.

He served in the Old Cherokee National Government and, since statehood of Oklahoma has held many offices under that jurisdiction. He served as senator in the Cherokee National Senate for many years; he was superintendent of education for the Cherokee Nation when the tribal government was abolished by the Curtis Act of 1898; he served in the constitution convention for the State of Oklahoma in 1906, and

was chairman of the committee on education. He served as postmaster at Muskogee, Okla., from 1913 until 1920 under President Woodrow Wilson. He was elected county judge of Muskogee County, Okla., in 1921 and continuously served in that office until 1932, at which time the people of the district elevated him to the office of district judge, where he has served until the present time.

The remarks delivered by Judge Brewer on this occasion afford many interesting side lights on the history of the Cherokee people. His comprehensive mastery of the history of the Cherokee Nation and of our Government's relations with the Cherokees from the establishment of our National Government up until the dissolution of the Cherokee tribal government is amply demonstrated. Such utterances should be preserved for history.

It therefore affords me a great pleasure to include the speech of Judge Brewer under the extension of my remarks. It is as follows:

AN EPITOME OF CHEROKEE HISTORY

(By Judge O. H. P. Brewer, Muskogee, Okla.)

Principal Chief Milam, members of the Cherokee Tribe of Indians, visitors and friends, perhaps for the first time in my life I am offering an apology, as a preliminary to my address, which is attributable to my depleted physical condition. I am not in good health. If it had not been for the importance of this occasion, and the fact that the management of this convention urged me to be here, I would not have had the courage to come of my own volition.

My friends, the origin of the Cherokee people as an integral portion of the vast body of American Indians which originally populated this Western Hemisphere is merged in uncertainty and conjecture. The Indians were here at the discovery of this continent, whether by Columbus or by some Scandinavian adventurer, and your forefathers and mine at that time were living in that vast region south of the Great Lakes and comprehending a portion of what is now Virginia, North and South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama.

They were an alert and vigorous tribe. They were evidently possessed of a keen foresight which is natural to a people of positive character and discrimination, because they had chosen and occupied a delightful region of lush plant life and virgin forests, a region favored with the most healthful climate, a region blessed with the abundance of providence, where they freely enjoyed the fruits of nature's bounty and like all primitive people made their way by clothing themselves with the pelts of the wild beasts of the forests, sustained by the food acquired by their persistence and cunning as well as the nutritious products of the fertile lands over which they roamed at will. At least, we have the right to indulge this view of their situation until we reach a period of authentic history.

The first contact made by any white man with the Cherokees was in 1540 when Ferdinand De Soto, under the patronage of his native land, imperial Spain, made an incursion into the southeastern part of this continent, then leisurely wended his way northward as far as the Carolinas and then turned westward passing through what is now the State of Tennessee on his tour of exploration looking for gold; which was the principal objective of the adventurous citizens of all nations at that time.

He appeared before the Cherokee people in those regions in an arrogant manner and at once incurred their distrust and suspicion. He had horses and his soldiers with coats of mail were dressed in an unusual fashion and both he and his associates brought with them perfected plans to cheat and deceive the Indians, with fetters to bind them and priests to save their souls by spiritual intercession.

Following this unusual incident the Cherokees were naturally absorbed in speculating as to the intentions of their visitors and were apprehensive of the possibility of recurrent invasions by them. Being an observant people they were distressed and perplexed over the possibility of future contacts with these interlopers and they naturally discussed their untoward experiences around their firesides, following the procedure of every primitive tribe under similar circumstances.

Soon thereafter immigration began to increase on this continent and many other adventurers came to the Cherokee domain, some of philanthropic character and some who wanted to settle on the land and amalgamate with these primitive people and establish a wholesome home life and a lasting stable government.

After the settlement at Jamestown in 1607 we find a great many of the white people traversing the Appalachian Range, meeting the Indians and intermarrying with them, and in the course of time many mixed blood Cherokees were anxious and desirous to follow the example of their white brothers and set about the task of improving their holdings and developing the resources of the country. They soon learned to engage in trade, to advance their economic situation, and shortly thereafter we find them not only owning property, such as cattle and horses, but building substantial homes and looking upward and forward to a time when their children might have opportunities for progress in every field of human endeavor.

It is a matter of record that in 1693 Governor Sinette of Carolina was visited by a group of Cherokee chiefs and was asked to assist them in getting rid of a horde of Esaws and Congarees who were annoying the people of all races in that region. This incident shows that the Cherokees were disposed to maintain an orderly society and there evidently existed a healthy spirit of cooperation between the races at that time and place.

Later on, in 1711, the Creeks and Cherokees visited the State of Virginia at the instance of Governor Craven and assisted the Virginians in driving out of the country a band of Tuscaroras and Corees who had massacred 137 white citizens in the vicinity of Roanoke, Va. This is an added proof that they were on good terms with, and willing to assist, the people of the colony.

In 1715 the Chickasaws and Cherokees advanced into the Cumberland region and assisted in driving away a group of Shawnees who were interfering with the orderly procedure of the Government there and ran them across the Ohio River for the protection of both whites and Indians.

Thereafter the Cherokees assisted the whites in driving away a remnant of Tuscaroras from the Atlantic seaboard to the vicinity of Lake Oneida in New York where they attached themselves to the Iroquois confederacy.

Indeed so harmonious was the situation as between the whites and Indians in 1721 that Governor Nicholson of the Carolinas came before the Cherokees and invited them to a conference to which they agreed; and in that conference he advised them that the white people of the fatherland recognized them as true friends and wanted to be at peace with them and induced them to enter into a treaty of friendship, understanding, and commercial relationship.

At that time Charleston, S. C., being an ambitious settlement wanted new territory and the leaders came before a body of Cherokee chiefs and proposed that a small area of territory should be ceded to them so they might enjoy the fruits of expansive growth without hindrance and in an evil moment the Cherokees agreed to the proposal and did cede a portion of their lands to them and thus began a system of territorial disintegration which, in the course of 115 years, was to leave them not 1 foot of their original domain.

In 1730, the British Empire, realizing the imminent conflict between the French and English, with admirable foresight deemed it a good policy to cultivate the friendship of the Cherokee people because they would be of great assistance to the English in any contest with the French so the English people began to make overtures to that end and sent Sir Alexander Cumming to intercede with them. He held a meeting with a group of Cherokee chiefs and invited them to select a delegation to go back with him to England and meet the king, the great White Father, and to renew the treaty he had theretofore made with them; that the King wanted to form a lasting, binding alliance, so that both parties thereto could go forward as companions and allies and under the solicitation of Sir Alexander Cumming seven Cherokee chiefs did make the trip. Among them were two distinguished Cherokees, Attacullacullah and Oconostota, who were destined to win high places in public estimation as distinguished leaders of their tribe.

We may realize, my friends, what a startling impression must have been made on the hearts and minds of this inexperienced group of primitive people in arriving in a cultivated country, among a cultivated people, where there were wonderful educational opportunities and an architectural grandeur sufficient to invoke the admiration of any visitor to the busy cities of the British Empire.

These people stayed there for quite some time and were royally entertained by the King and his subjects. They exchanged tokens of friendship while there, and the Cherokees renewed their former treaty and in return received distinguished courtesies and tokens of good fellowship at the hands of the English royalty, and during recurrent conferences they were assured that this relationship would be binding and lasting forever and they should take each other by the hand and be friends through the ages "as long as the mountain stands, as long as grass grows, and as long as water flows"; after which they returned to this beloved land and made extensive and glowing reports to their expectant tribesmen.

What an interesting event it must have been, how entrancing to our anxious fathers to listen to the recital of the magnificent reception they were accorded while in England; indeed, we may image that the refinement of society, attainment of intellect, glory of achievement manifest there and the kind of treatment given them, provided stimulating entertainment and stirred the latent ambitions of the Cherokee people so they likewise yearned to cultivate their minds and hearts, to develop their country, and lift themselves to higher standards.

In the latter years of the eighteenth century we find the Cherokees striving to make their way to a plane of higher civilization, and at the very commencement of the nineteenth century we find a group of missionaries coming from a foreign land, actuated by a commendable zeal to follow the Spirit's calling. And in 1801, in Georgia, a group of Moravian missionaries arrived and sought to establish the mission at Springplace, near the home of Joseph Vann, a mixed-blood Cherokee, who made them welcome, and in the

course of time they established a mission to teach the Cherokee youth and many were converted to Christianity while attending the mission.

Subsequent thereto Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists arrived and during the period for 1801 to 1835 there were 12 or 13 public schools established in the Nation, which action inculcated a closer attachment to their country because it was their native land, and because they were being educated and tenderly directed to a more useful and harmonious life under the urgency of cultural and refining influences.

In 1810, Sequoyah, a half-blood Cherokee, took notice that the white man could read printed matter on paper which Sequoyah called talking leaves. This was a mystery to him and excited his native curiosity. He was a silversmith by trade but he neglected his profession to study the means whereby this astonishing thing had been accomplished and being a diligent student, in the silent recesses of the forest primeval this uneducated man, who could not speak a word of English, after years of study evolved a Cherokee syllabary consisting of 86 characters and he took his own child, a little girl, and in a few days demonstrated how she could learn to read in her native language from the Cherokee talking leaves on which were inscribed the characters of Sequoyah's ingenious invention. I may say there is no alphabet known to man that can compare with Sequoyah's syllabary. It is impossible to mispell a word by anyone adopting it as a means of communication. Any person who speaks the Cherokee language may, with a few days of study, read anything written in his native tongue and understand it, by the use of this great boon of such tremendous importance to the Cherokee people.

In 1817 the Congregationalists established a school for the education of the Cherokee youth at Cornwall, Conn. and seven boys were in attendance in 1822 among them being John Ridge and Elias Boudinot, his cousin, two pupils who were later to bring distinction to the tribe. In 1825, Rev. S. A. Worcester, a congregational minister, a graduate from the University of Vermont, after marriage to a christian lady of culture, was given an assignment to missionary work among the Cherokees and after a long and tedious journey he appeared among them to fulfill the covenant he made with his church and the Master. Soon thereafter he became acquainted with Elias Boudinot, who had been graduated from the school at Cornwall, and was so impressed with him that he assisted Mr. Boudinot in establishing a newspaper called the Cherokee Phoenix which they hoped to have printed, part in the Cherokee language and part in the English language. Reverend Worcester made the long trip to Boston, Mass. and had type cast in conformity to the Sequoyah syllabary and shipped them back for use in the Cherokee Phoenix and thereafter he assisted Elias Boudinot in making the paper a success. This likewise was a wonderful agency in forwarding the educational progress of the Cherokees and in a short while a large percentage of the tribe were being advised as to current events of interest happening within the limits of the Cherokee domain, in the adjoining States and in the National Government at Washington. The paper continued in publication greatly to the satisfaction of the people as a source of information and instruction and also as a means of disseminating the principles of Christianity but was suspended by arbitrary action of the Georgia authorities in 1834.

The disturbing heart-rending experiences of the Cherokees in their dealings with the authorities in Georgia and the National Government at Washington wherein they were threatened with enforced removal from their homeland brought to them untold mental distress but they were so absorbed in their educational advancement and spiritual well being that no untoward circumstance could wholly divert their minds from the main objective, though suffering from the pangs of despondency caused by the fear of eviction. Even the miseries and distractions of the enforced migration along the trail of tears, making their tragic journey from the old Cherokee Nation to the new home, provided for them by treaties of 1828 and 1835, did not still their inborn yearning for intellectual and spiritual acquirements and in an attitude of prayerful resignation they softened the hardships of travel by constant supplication to Divine Providence whom they had learned to praise and adore through the intercession of the Christian missionaries.

Radical differences of opinion on the question of removal occasioned a most bitter feeling among the members of the tribe in Georgia which continued after the arrival of the factions in the new Cherokee Nation and on June 22, 1839, three of the most distinguished citizens were ruthlessly murdered on the same day, a tragedy which tore the nation apart and disorders, riots and expressed intentions of reprisal were heard on every hand, which grave situation continued for years. To the credit of the citizens be it said, that in the throes of factional distractions and threats of internal war a constitution was written and ratified by them in the fall of 1839. On the subject of education the constitution provided "religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged in this Nation." This official action again proved that educational advancement was still a paramount objective.

In 1841 eleven public schools were created by the Cherokee authorities to be followed in 1843 by the establishment of seven more. From this modest beginning the number increased at intervals to the aggregate of 120 before the tribal government was discontinued. In 1844, the publication of the Cherokee Phoenix, always educational in style and tone, was resumed and thereafter continued to inform and uplift its readers until the Cherokee Nation gave place to another form of government when it became an integral portion of the State of Oklahoma.

Supplementing these commendable tribal activities, in 1846, a year of tempest and discord, the national council projected two national high schools, one for boys and one for girls, locating both in the vicinity of Tahlequah, the capital of the nation. The cornerstones were laid by Chief John Ross on June 7, 1851. The completion of these leading institutions marks an epoch in Cherokee history.

After the adoption of our constitution and during the period when we were enjoying the full benefits of tribal autonomy and our executive, legislative, and judicial departments were responding to every duty imposed upon them with probity, patriotism, and administrative ability and the economic development was so unusual as to bring entire satisfaction to the citizenship at large, with the highest consideration being given to the educational advancement of our citizens, we were recognized by welcome visitors to our country and by the inhabitants of the surrounding States, and the officials in authority in Washington City, as a civilized and cultured people with prospects for a happy continuous existence as a political entity.

But the same old spirit which has dominated the world from the very beginning and brought about despoilment and eviction from our former homes in the old nation, had followed us with accelerated vehemence to our new habitation, the insistent pressure brought to bear by greed and prejudice, sustained by legislative arbitrary power, resulted in reluctant tribal ratification of treaties long years before a large proportion of our citizens were prepared to enter into the obligations incident to a new form of government with all its varied political perplexities.

The final treaty we made with the Federal Government which was ratified by vote of the Cherokee people in 1902 providing for the allotment of our lands, and pointing to the dissolution of our tribal government, was consummated under the pressure of necessity and under circumstances causing much displeasure and disappointment to the full-blood Cherokee as a class, and supported by many mixed bloods of high mentality, whose forebears actively opposed all agreements looking to the removal from our original homeland to our last Territorial possessions now a part of the State of Oklahoma.

Who can blame the full-blood Cherokee for his overwhelming desire to maintain the customs and practices of his people during the happy days when he could enjoy the full measure of pleasure without restraint, under a communal system of government, where his interest in the tribal holdings were free from taxation and were inalienable, and where the policy of the good neighbor was ingrained in his being by centuries of continued enjoyment under a social structure where the latch-string hung outside every door.

Surely, if in truth and in fact, this trusting child of the forest has been bereft of his patrimony against his will by force of adverse circumstances over which he had no control and under which he was forcibly allotted cheap unproductive lands, and now finds himself without the means of gaining a livelihood, he is entitled to as much consideration as the peoples residing in lands, who were lately made the beneficiaries of a substantial appropriation by a late act of Congress.

May the quality of mercy be glorified by liberal bounties in his behalf by the Congress of the United States under strict proof being made thereof that an actual emergency exists.

My friends, I am here this morning to greet you and to extend to this assemblage a most copious and sincere sentiment of respect and good will. We meet in conference, as I understand it, under a call from our principal chief, J. B. Milam, issued in collaboration with a duly authorized representative of the Federal Government. The call has brought forth a large representative body assembled here to participate in matters of supreme concern to the Cherokee people and during the convention you will no doubt be called upon to take action on several subjects.

Some 25 years ago a jurisdictional bill was passed by Congress permitting Indian tribes to sue the Federal Government for moneys due them and pursuant thereto suits were filed in our behalf but no judgments were rendered thereon for our tribe. We trust that better results may issue from the presentation of our requests for payment of sums due our people on obligations arising out of our dealings with the Government, based on promises and treaties entered into by the parties beginning in 1785 and ending in 1902, when final action is taken thereon by the Indian Claims Commission.

May I not, in closing, express to you my boundless gratification in being permitted to present to you an epitome of Cherokee history preliminary to your deliberations on matters demanding immediate and careful

consideration at your hands. In the classic atmosphere of this Northeastern State College, successor to our beloved Cherokee National Female Seminary, the finest spirit of accommodation and cooperation should serve as your guide to the end that peace and concord here prevail and righteousness and good fellowship grace this meeting.

May we realize the gravity of this occasion. May we look to the Father of Mercies for guidance. May He be with us in the uncertain days to come.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur Favors Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 30 in which the editor of that newspaper, Mr. Riley H. Allen, reports on an interview held in Tokyo, Japan, on September 28 with Gen. Douglas MacArthur on the subject of statehood for Hawaii.

The article follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII IS SUPPORTED BY MACARTHUR

(By Riley H. Allen)

(Note: Mr. Allen was one of the party which flew to Tokyo and returned on Pan American's "trail-blazing flight" via Midway. The tour was made by Boeing Stratocruiser and, for Honolulans, ended at 2 Wednesday afternoon when the big plane arrived at Honolulu airport. At Tokyo the entire party was received by General and Mrs. MacArthur and entertained at luncheon at the United States Embassy. This is the official residence of General MacArthur as supreme high commander of the allied forces (SCAP).

TOKYO, September 28.—Statehood for Hawaii is still regarded by Gen. Douglas MacArthur as not disadvantageous to American military strategy in the Pacific.

This was made plain by the general himself to this writer during our brief stay in Tokyo.

General MacArthur had previously expressed himself to visiting Congressmen in the same vein.

He added that promoting the Territory of Hawaii to full statehood would demonstrate to the peoples of the Far East that American statements on democratic principles and government by participation of the governed are not empty words but active policies.

PUT ON THE RECORD

Later his forthright statement on statehood for Hawaii was made part of national records by inclusion in official congressional reports.

The supreme commander, who is making history in Asia by his highly organized efforts to encourage rebuilding Japan politically as well as economically, may be counted as a consistent friend of statehood.

But his comment is given, it is important to state, not as a local political view. It is his considered feeling that all peoples should take an active and influential part in the government under which they live.

The general feels that from the standpoint of American and allied long-range strategy in the Pacific, the satisfaction of peoples that their government truly represents them is important.

He sees no danger to military security and to peace in the change of Hawaiian government from Territorial to State status.

OTHER EMINENT MEN AGREE

Thus from the vantage point of his long experience in the Orient plus his continuous leadership in postwar Japan, he coincides with the frequently expressed opinion of President Truman and of Interior Secretary Julius A. Krug, both of whom are outspokenly for immediate statehood for Hawaii.

It is interesting to note too that other military notables including Admiral Chester Nimitz are on public record at Washington similarly. They see no disadvantage to peace in the Pacific from conferring on the people of Hawaii government powers they do not now possess.

The Great A & P's Propaganda Campaign—2,000 Full-Page Ads Day After Day Smear Government Antitrust Suit—Noted Commentator on Washington Scene Presents in the Public Interest Justice Department's Views of the A & P Civil Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department's Antitrust Division cannot compete, even if it so desired, with big business by taking full-page ads in thousands of newspapers to explain the filing of an antitrust suit or the effect of a court decision. The recent civil suit, resulting from the conviction of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. on a criminal complaint, is an excellent example. The Great A & P runs for cover by way of newspaper advertisements, intended to deceive and mislead the public as to the nature and purpose of the civil antitrust suit recently filed after the A & P had been convicted of criminally unfair practices by a district court and the decision of that court upheld by the Seventh United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

EMINENT WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT AFFORDS ANTITRUST DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THE OTHER SIDE OF THE CONTROVERSY TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. David Lawrence, noted commentator on the Washington scene, felt as many of us do that it is in the public interest to present the Government's side of the controversy. Mr. Lawrence devoted his entire column, as it appeared in the Washington Star Tuesday, October 4, 1949, and in hundreds of other newspapers throughout the country, to the public's side of this very important matter. Mr. Lawrence stated:

Since the Government does not have a fund set aside to advertise its views * * * it was thought only fair by this correspondent to invite Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson, who is in charge of the Government's Antitrust Division, to give his comments on the announcements recently published by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

Mr. Bergson responded to Mr. Lawrence's invitation with a short prepared statement which pointed out that A & P's "false and misleading advertisements" were contrary to the facts. Mr. Bergson said:

Successful prosecution of the civil proceedings * * * will not increase but should decrease grocery prices. It will not result in the closing of a single store much less destroy the A & P.

The A & P stores—

Mr. Bergson said—

are today operated in seven separate divisions each with its own president and operating staff. These divisions, each consisting of about 850 stores, are subject only to policy control by the top holding company in New York. Ninety-nine and ninety-seven one-hundredths percent of the stock of this holding company is owned by the Hartford family whose main policy, according to the court of appeals in the criminal case, is to earn $7 on each share of stock. The relief sought by the Government, the complete independence of each of these seven divisions should, through competition, result in lower grocery prices by freeing these divisions from the shackles of the top holding company's pricing policy of earning $7 a share.

MR. DAVID LAWRENCE RENDERED DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE BY PRESENTATION OF THE FACTS IN THE A & P CIVIL ANTITRUST CASE

The entire article is factual and free from the flamboyancy characterized in the A & P's full-page advertisements. I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Lawrence for rendering distinguished public service in making his column available for the presentation of the truth in the A & P civil antitrust proceedings. I also take pleasure in presenting the entire article to Members of the Congress and to the public:

GOVERNMENT'S VERSION OF ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST THE A & P CO.—ATTORNEY GENERAL'S AIDE REPLIES TO CLAIMS MADE IN ADVERTISING

(By David Lawrence)

When full pages of advertising are purchased in each of 2,000 daily newspapers by a single company to combat an antitrust suit, it is natural for the public to wonder what there is to say on the other side of the controversy.

Since the Government does not have a fund set aside to advertise its views but has the benefit of Nation-wide attention in the news columns for whatever news it may give out, it was thought only fair by this correspondent to invite Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson, who is in charge of the Government's Antitrust Division, to give his comments on the announcements recently published by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. Mr. Bergson's prepared statement issued to this correspondent follows:

"Contrary to A & P's false and misleading advertising, successful prosecution of the civil proceedings against it will not increase but should decrease grocery prices. It will not result in the closing of a single store, much less destroy the A & P."

BASED ON EARLIER CASE

"The present civil suit is based upon the same conduct involved in an earlier criminal

case in which A & P was found guilty and this year paid maximum fines totaling $175,000. A & P contended in that case, as it now does in its advertisements, that it is big because the American people have made it big. On the contrary, the court found that A & P's bigness was not due to efficiency and enterprise but to the predatory application of its mass purchasing power and the abuse of that power through boycotts, blacklisting, preferential rebates, price wars, and below-cost retailing in selected areas.

"The court also found that A & P prices were reduced in as many as 30 percent of its 6,000 stores only long enough to drive out local competition. By deliberately selling at higher prices in the remaining 70 percent of their stores which were located in noncompetitive areas, A & P was able to accomplish this at the expense of its customers and at no cost to itself. A & P's customers in 70 percent of its stores were compelled to subsidize price wars in those A & P stores being run at a deliberate loss.

"A & P stores are today operated in seven separate divisions, each with its own president and operating staff. These divisions, each consisting of about 850 stores, are subject only to policy control by the top holding company in New York. Ninety-nine and ninety-seven hundredths percent of the stock of this holding company is owned by the Hartford family whose main policy, according to the court of appeals in the criminal case, is to earn $7 on each share of stock. The relief sought by the Government, the complete independence of each of these seven divisions should, through competition, result in lower grocery prices by freeing these divisions from the shackles of the top holding company's pricing policy of earning $7 a share."

COERCIVE PRACTICES CHARGED

"The present civil suit seeks once and for all to put an end to A & P's long continuing coercive and destructive practices which have destroyed competition without benefit to the consumer. Its successful completion should, as Attorney General McGrath said, 'reduce prices in those A & P stores which must now return a sufficient profit to pay for the losses sustained in planned price wars by other A & P stores.'

"As a further consequence of this case, A & P will be unable to procure preferential rebates from suppliers and as a result the price of merchandise sold to competitors of A & P should be reduced. This in turn, should enable A & P's competitors to reduce their prices to the consumer and compete with A & P on a fair basis. Since over 90 percent of the American public buy their groceries from retailers other than A & P, the general public benefit should be substantial.

"The apparent intent of A & P's recent national advertising is to misinform the American public concerning this case. Typical of A & P's distortions is the assertion in recent advertisements that the 'formal complaint' in this case states that A & P 'have regularly undersold competing retailers.' These five words were lifted from the following paragraph of the Government's complaint:

" 'Defendants, by coercing and receiving unlawful buying preferences, have become enabled to and have regularly undersold, regularly taken patronage away from, and sometimes eliminated competing retailers who have bought in substantial compliance with applicable Federal laws prohibiting the sale of merchandise on discriminatory terms.'

"The aim of the Sherman Antitrust Act is to guarantee the American public the benefits resulting from a free, competitive economy. This case is within that tradition."

Official United States Census Figures Show Hawaii's Present Population To Be 26 Percent Greater Than 1940 Figures—Territory Outranks Six States in Population and Almost Equals Four Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has gained 26 percent in population in the 8 years since the last census, according to estimates released last month by the United States Census Bureau.

The increase of 109,000 over the 1940 census figure shows the estimated population of Hawaii, both civilian and military, to be 533,000 as of July 1, 1948. Hawaii thereby outranks six States in population, these States being New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Montana, Wyoming, and Nevada.

Hawaii's 26-percent increase in population was exceeded only by six States and the District of Columbia.

Seven States which lost population, were North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The losses ranged from 9 percent for North Dakota, to 2.5 percent for Nebraska and 0.6 percent for Arkansas.

Hawaii's gain in population of 109,000 resulted from three factors: A gain of 72,000, or 66 percent, from the excess of births over deaths; an estimated gain of 34,000, or 32 percent, due to net civilian immigration; and the remainder, about 2 percent, the net change in military personnel stationed in Hawaii.

The migration into Hawaii was far greater, in proportion to population, than it was for the mainland United States. The Continent gained but 9 percent while Hawaii gained 32 percent from immigration.

The rate of natural increase of births over deaths in Hawaii was high primarily because of an extremely low death rate, attributable to a relatively low average age among Hawaii's population.

The birth rate generally was lower for Hawaii than for the mainland, but computed on the basis of the civilian population alone, latest figures show the birth rate per 1,000 to be 29 in Hawaii and 26 in the mainland.

Of the total population in Hawaii, the census estimates show 503,000 of the 533,000 to be civilians.

Hawaii's population has increased an average of 18 percent per year from 1940 to 1948.

Though the Census Bureau's population estimates are shown only to July 1, 1948, the Territory of Hawaii's Bureau of Health Statistics for July 1, 1949, reveal that in the following 12 months Hawaii's population loss—the first in 15 years—was 9,609 or 1.8 percent. This loss was due to cut-backs in the civilians employed in the military and naval establishment.

According to the Territory's estimates of population on July 1, 1949, there were 461,581 American citizens in Hawaii, or 86.9 percent of the total.

Federal Authority Development and the Lower Cumberland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the address of W. V. Howard, president of the Lower Cumberland Valley Association, Dover, Tenn., before the National Water Conservation Conference, Chicago, Ill., September 23, 1949. Being an adjoining neighbor of TVA with ample opportunity to observe it in action and with the added interest of having to choose for or against inclusion in the TVA, Mr. Howard's remarks are a valuable and highly illuminating contribution to the study of river authorities.

Since the question has been raised as to the desirability of a Columbia Valley Authority or Administration which affects the territory I represent, I was especially impressed with Mr. Howard's position. I quote from his address:

Three times in the past 5 years, we have seen an attempt to extend the area of total operations of TVA to include the Cumberland and three times in the past 5 years we have defeated that proposal. If necessary, and if our position is not jeopardized by the abject surrender of the Columbia and Missouri Valleys to authority rule, we shall beat down this proposal three times in the next 5 years, or five times in the next 3 years.

That is how strong an observing neighbor of TVA opposes inclusion. His address follows:

Discussions of Federal authorities, both at this meeting and elsewhere, seem to be based very largely on the theory that these authorities are totalitarian in nature.

I have analyzed the Authority bills now pending, and I agree that they do represent very definite steps toward a dictatorship of bureaucracy. I am also of the opinion that these bills definitely resolve all points of controversy which have arisen between TVA and those who would question its policies in favor of the authorities.

TVA is truly a yardstick—not of the cost of electric power but of the distance an authority can go. If it can exceed the powers outlined in the act, then the next act drawn up includes those extended powers and paves the way for more.

However, we, in the lower Cumberland Valley, tend to disregard these considerations, deeming them largely theoretical. We live within from 1 to 50 miles of TVA's Kentucky Lake and we have seen, at very close range, the operations of TVA.

We also have, for our river, a plan prepared by the Corps of Engineers. It provides for the construction of flood-control dams where flood-control dams should be

built. It provides for the construction of low-navigation dams where these are necessary for the development of the commerce of the region. It is a sensible, conservative plan, and we like it. We have been called reactionary and unprogressive for liking it, but we still like it.

Three times in the past 5 years, we have seen an attempt to extend the area of total operations of TVA to include the Cumberland and three times in the past 5 years we have defeated that proposal. If necessary, and if our position is not jeopardized by the abject surrender of the Columbia and Missouri Valleys to Authority rule, we shall beat down this proposal three times in the next 5 years, or five times in the next 3 years. TVA, like a pushful house-to-house salesman, has its foot in our door, and that is as far as we want it to get.

We are right alongside of it. We have seen what it does, and we don't like it.

There is a growing feeling that socialism has not worked in countries where it has been tried. We know, from direct observation, that it is not working in the United States, either; that is, if you admit that TVA land is still in the United States.

Let us look at Kentucky Lake, the largest man-made lake in the world, from two points.

One is Pilot Knob, where there is a State park. Here, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest and his cavalry beat the tar out of some Federal gunboats. From this point, a year ago, the view was wonderful, except for one thing. Save for an occasional barge loaded with sand and gravel, there was not a sign of human activity. The region for miles to the north and south was a beautiful, empty, man-made or TVA-made wilderness.

Today, there is some sign of life. A few miles to the southeast, TVA is building the New Johnsonville steam plant. Old Johnsonville has, of course, disappeared. About half of it is under the lake and the other half was burned several years ago to make room for the steam plant that TVA intended to build, but didn't get around to talking about until an artificial power shortage made smooth sailing for the appropriation.

Downstream some 20 miles is Danville. Out in the lake is a massive concrete building. This was the old Danville elevator where farm produce was transferred from river boats to freight cars. There were four sidings here. Today, to quote the Nashville Tennessean, 5-pound bass frolic in the shadows. Today, there is no Danville, except a railroad-flag station. The river traffic is gone because it was used for the transportation of farm produce and there is no farm produce. The cultivated lands are now subject to the only TVA soil-conservation program that we see locally. The fertile soil is being protected by burial under from 2 to 30 feet of water, plus silt, sand, and gravel that is being washed down from the hills, which TVA is so busy protecting on paper that it hasn't had time to protect on the ground.

This region was not, as many would have it, a rural slum. It was land which produced good crops for its owners, many of whom were direct descendants of those who received the land as a grant from the State of North Carolina in return for their services in the Revolutionary War. It was intended to be an outpost against the raids of the Indians. It held off the Indians pretty well, but TVA used different tactics.

It built Kentucky Dam at a cost of about $120,000,000. Of this amount, navigation is charged with about $30,000,000. This navigation consists almost entirely of imports into the region of oil products, grain, coal, and automobiles for Florida, Georgia, and the eastern Gulf region.

Navigation on the Tennessee is very different from navigation on the Ohio and Missouri. These rivers are used mainly for exports, which aids in the development of the valleys.

The Tennessee is used mainly for imports which aids the shippers outside of the valley. As a matter of fact, the Tennessee is not used very much even for imports. By ignoring the plans of the Corps of Engineers for navigation dams on the river, TVA converted a channel protected by high banks into a broad expanse of shallow water subject to cross winds and, therefore, hazardous to river navigation.

The single existing important export of this area consists of railroad ties. Because of the frequent swamping of barges on the Tennessee, these ties are trucked across to the Cumberland or are shipped by rail. Mighty few of them travel on Kentucky Lake.

Then, of course, another $30,000,000 of the cost of Kentucky Dam was allocated to flood control. Obviously, since the dam is near the mouth of the river, that flood control was not intended for the Tennessee Valley. The dam submerged land that was never flooded before and every once in a while, TVA gets panicky and lets water out of upper dams so fast that it floods farm land even above maximum lake level.

Whether Kentucky Dam will reduce floods on the Ohio and Mississippi is not proven. All that TVA has done is to let some water out, which would not have been there without the dam, so as not to increase floods on the Ohio and Mississippi.

But, in the name of navigation and flood control, TVA has hurt navigation and drowned out more than 8,000 tracts, including small towns, because it wanted to sell power.

It removed from private ownership 300,000 acres of land with an average estimated marketing yield of $15,000,000 for $4,000,000 worth of electricity and spent $120,000,000 doing it.

What is more, the area around the lake—those hill farms that are supposed to be getting such wonderful production, thanks to TVA, isn't getting any electricity, except along main highways.

That is the type of progress that we on the Cumberland do not want.

We have a dam site, a mile or so from Kentucky Dam. TVA talks of integrating the power developments on the two rivers. That means a high dam on the lower Cumberland, possibly a short connecting canal, the drowning of more than 200,000 acres of the best farm land in the region, the bankruptcy of three counties and irreparable injury to three more.

But don't get the idea that there is no progress connected with development a la TVA. There is a growing recreation and tourist business and real estate values around the lake have risen rapidly. Land acquired by TVA at from $1 to $10 an acre is now being offered for sale by TVA at an average of from $135 an acre up. As for the recreational sites left in the hands of the former landowners—well they didn't leave any. You see this area is dedicated to the people of the United States and any profits that are made by their agents, the Tennessee Valley Authority. After all, it costs money to pay all those jobholders in the land department.

TVA says it acquired hill land to protect the lakes. How do fishing cabins protect the lakes? It says it acquired land where it was cheaper to buy it than to build new roads to it. Maps dated prior to TVA's acquisition show roads to the areas it is selling. But as Lenin has said, truth is a bourgeois virtue.

The fact is that TVA took any site likely to be worth anything as a part of its plan to place the area under totalitarian rule.

TVA sells what land it wishes. It licenses what people it chooses to undertake private enterprises around its lakes. Sometimes it may sell a village, such as Norris, for cost less depreciation, plus what it can get. Sometimes, it leases a coal terminal, such as that at Harriman for $1 a year, because that gets it off the books without an admission that it should never have been built. Sometimes, it appraises a gravel site at its agricultural value, which is obviously low, seizes it and leases it to a competitor of the original owner. Why not? Democracy marches on.

But, there are other signs of progress in the region. Along every traveled road there is a string of minnow hatcheries and worm foundries. There are numerous stucco-covered shacks where one can get a 50-cent plate of catfish and hushpuppies for $1.50

The lower Tennessee suffered terrible destruction during the Civil War, and recovered. It will not recover from the TVA invasion.

We, of the Cumberland, have watched these events. We have seen the devastation, waste, and cheapening of what was once a happy and prosperous group of communities. We know that this retrogression was accomplished by the fiat of three men (or was it one man) at Knoxville without regard for the people of the region, nor for the laws of sound economies. We know that the principal aim of these men and their supporters is power, political as well as electrical. We know very well how an authority works and we want none of it.

Under the appellation "democracy on the march" it smells just as bad as if it were boldly labeled whatever variety of totalitarianism it actually is.

The Real Test in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE REAL TEST IN CHINA

Formation of a central government for the half or more of China controlled by the Communist armies will shift emphasis from the purely military to the economic and political problems in that area.

The new regime proclaimed by Mao Tze-tung faces its acid test in dealing with these matters.

There have been few major battles in the Chinese civil war. The Nationalist failure has been due to economic collapse more than to military reversals. Inalibity to pay and feed their troops forced Nationalist commanders to live at the expense of the countryside and alienated support by a people already war weary and in distress.

Now the Communists are confronted by the necessity of restoring an economy which they helped to wreck. And, having promised the peasants the Chinese equivalent of 40 acres and a mule, they may find themselves expected to provide something much better in the way of a people's livelihood than China has known before. That's a large order.

Meanwhile, too, the war continues in the south and the northwest, with the Communist forces spread almost as thinly as the Nationalists were 2 years ago, when they began their long retreat out of Manchuria. Thus, in some respects at least, the situations of the two forces have been reversed.

Unfortunately, the Nationalists appear to be in no condition to attempt a counter-offensive. Acting President Li Tsung-jen, in another appeal for American aid, admits his position has become critical, without enough rifles or ammunition to go around.

Vice Admiral Badger, until recently commander of our far-eastern fleet, reported to Congress that the $75,000,000 it had voted for China would be sufficient to stem the Communist advance, "if properly applied." But little prospect appears that any of this money will be made available to President Li's hard-pressed forces.

Italy and Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of October 4, relative to Italy and her former colonies. It is hoped that the remarks Count Sforza made to the General Assembly of the United Nations will be given the careful and considerate attention it deserves.

The article follows:

ITALY AND THE COLONIES

The question of what to do with the former Italian colonies is now being debated in the General Assembly of the United Nations—specifically in the political and security committee. What the committee decides the entire Assembly will probably approve, for the same nations make up both bodies.

To this committee Count Carlo Sforza, Italian Foreign Minister, made a notable address by invitation late last week. He renounced Italian hopes for a part in the administration of Libya and Eritrea, asking only for opportunities for collaboration in Somaliland. This was obviously a bid for an Italian trusteeship under the UN in that latter, most backward area of Italy's former African empire.

The plan will have certain attractions for the western powers. It does not appear to embody anything that ought to be called a conspiracy with them—though a charge to this effect could come from the Soviet Union just the same. For the Sforza plan would help keep Russia out of the Mediterranean. But if it serves western aims to that extent, it hardly provides a safe timetable for those aims.

Count Sforza spoke of 6 months as a period in which the independence of Libya should be achieved. The United States and Britain have been thinking in terms of years, ranging up to 5. Earlier last week the Soviet Union proposed independence for Libya, urging that all foreign troops be out of the country in 3 months.

This proposal puts all the Big Four on record as favoring Libyan independence. But the similarity of their positions covers a multitude of subsurface factors, whose common denominator is power strategy. The Russian proposal doubtless seeks to reinforce Soviet propaganda throughout non-self-governing Africa. It would serve Soviet policy in other ways, for a too-speedy change-over in government status and mechanism could breed local dissensions on which communism could feed. And it is evidently aimed at western air bases in Africa.

The subject of the Italian colonies is criss-crossed with inherent complexities besides being caught in the east-west tangle. Count Sforza has made a contribution toward unraveling the snarl. The influence of his statement may become visible in the future development of western policy on this subject.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution which I have received from the Polish-American Labor Council, 1588 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1949.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Massachusetts,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In March 1948, the Polish-American Labor Council submitted to the Members of the Eightieth Congress, a resolution condemning the agreements made with Russia, which permitted communism to run rampant in Europe and in many other areas of the world.

Further, the Council petitioned for action by Congress toward counteracting this engulfment by communism, and to force Russia to return to her prewar boundaries by whatever means deemed necessary.

This is the second such petition and resolution addressed to our representatives in Congress and members of our Government, and it again pleads for recognition and support on your part, in a matter deeply vital to millions of Americans of Polish descent—a matter deeply vital to us sentimentally and realistically.

To this end, we, the undersigned, do hereby reaffirm our plea and urge you to take cognizance of the result of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements. Agreements which have been so directly instrumental in bringing Poland and her neighbors under the yoke of communism. Agreements which have created so much fear and ever increasing anxiety—fear and anxiety throughout the world of yet another war.

Be it known, therefore, that—

Whereas the decisions and commitments made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam were, and continue to be, without any official sanction of the people of these United States,

We do hereby resolve and urgently petition the Congress and Government of the United States to:

1. Call a joint session of Congress for the purpose of declaring all decisions and commitments made at the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences null and void.

2. Submit a concrete plan to the United Nations organization for the sole purpose of forcing Russia back to her prewar boundaries thereby liberating all nations suffering under the Russian yoke.

3. Withdraw recognition of the Warsaw puppet government—a government actually antagonistic to the best interests of Poland, and an enemy of our United States and all other freedom-loving nations.

4. Announce the rerecognition by the United States of the legal and constitutional government of Poland, now in exile in London. This action will fully undo previous injustices and assure a continuation of the traditional friendship between Poland and the United States.

5. Give all-out help to the Chinese National Government—with our help China can and will stop communism in the Far East.

Upon the fulfillment of the above actions depends, we honestly believe, the peace and prosperity of our Nation, central and eastern Europe, and the world in general.

POLISH AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL,
JOHN K. WIECZOREK, *President.*
VALENTINE M. SPUNAR, *Secretary.*
ZDZISLAW S. ALBRECHT,
FRANK BARANOWSKI,
JOHN P. WALKOWICZ,
Resolutions Committee.

Confirm Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal for October 4 carries a very important editorial concerning the fight being made against confirmation of the reappointment of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and include it with my remarks:

CONFIRM LELAND OLDS

Leland Olds, nominated for a third 5-year term on the Federal Power Commission, is being made the victim of a merciless and unjustified attack by the natural-gas lobby.

Spearheaded by Representative LYLE (Democrat, Texas), opponents are accusing Olds of Communist sympathies, radical beliefs, and have even dragged in the old bromides that he is opposed to the home, the family, and the church.

These charges, which were fought over and disproved when Olds was renominated in 1944 and when he was first nominated in 1939, are patently ridiculous. As a young man Olds was a labor writer. He held admitted leftist views, but not Communist views. He wrote with a labor viewpoint. His articles for the Federated Press were reprinted in leftist papers. Those things are matters of record and Olds has never hidden them before any committee considering his nomination. They were views not uncommon to many thinking young men.

Olds has matured. He is a liberal, but certainly not a radical. He has had almost 20 years of utility regulation experience, 8 of them as a member of the New York State Power Authority and 10 as a Federal Power Commissioner. As a Federal Power Commissioner, he has, in the words of Thomas C. Buchanan, a fellow Commissioner, been "a watchdog of the public welfare, which to some people makes him a dangerous radical." He has aroused the indignation of utility interests by his constant insistence on wringing water out of utility accounts and keeping down utility rates.

Olds' current crime is that he opposes bills, such as the Moore-Rizley measure, which

have attempted to remove independent producers of natural gas from Federal Power Commission control. That would take about three-quarters of the industry out from under any effective rate control and send natural-gas rates skyrocketing. So far Congress has refused to grant such immunity to the natural-gas industry. In the interests of consumers it will have to continue to refuse it.

Natural gas, and natural gas alone, is the point at issue in Representative LYLE'S outrageous attack on Olds' nomination. Communism and all the other charges are pure smear tactics. Attacks like this on able public servants are major reasons for the reluctance of good men to take Government posts of responsibility. The Senate, as it has on two previous occasions in the case of Olds, should show its disapproval of such tactics by confirming him for a third term.

Time To Stop Compromising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, a congressional candidate had the courage to tell the voters the true character of the welfare state. He was triumphantly reelected in Pennsylvania this September 9, 1949.

John P. Saylor told the people of his district the issue is the American way of life, free enterprise, and opportunity versus the regimented semipolice state. In a district made up of steelworkers and farmers, most of the eligible voters turned out. He received the highest majority his party had ever received in that district.

It takes Americans a long time to wake up to danger, but once they believe their liberty is at stake, they act, and the chips fly.

We waited 40 years to get really angry at the British before 1776. We took years after the war to decide we must make a new Constitution. We delayed over the slavery issue and again over honest money. But when the American people did speak, they chose the side of right.

In 1733 the British Parliament passed the Navigation Act and the Molasses Act, forcing the colonists to buy their molasses, rum, and sugar from the British and British ships. This was in fact a 5-year plan. It was followed by one plan after another. Our ancestors ignored these attempts to control their trade with other countries and became smugglers, the colonial name for black marketeers. When the British placed oppressive taxes on their labor and enterprise, they rose and dumped tins of tea into Boston Harbor in 1773.

King George could not learn. He thought he was with the trend of the times. All the other European countries were doing the same thing. So on July 4, 1776, the "representative of the United States of America" declared that the colonies were "and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

We fought for our freedom from European planned economy. After victory everyone knew something ought to be done to set up our own form of government but the politicians drifted. They did not want to be definite. Things grew steadily worse. So farsighted men called the constitutional convention. In less than a year they produced what Gladstone called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." Some members urged doing nothing but the American people followed the appeal to courage with overwhelming approval.

The slavery issue was before the nation for 50 years before it was met. Politicians suggested compromise after compromise. Abe Lincoln came out of the wilderness to say, "Friends, this thing has been retarded long enough. The time has come when these sentiments should be uttered; and if it is decreed that I should go down because of this speech, then let me go down linked to the truth—let me die in the advocacy of what is just and right." Within 3 years he was elected to the Presidency by a new party. The people were tired of the politicians in the old parties who dared not speak out.

For 30 years after the Civil War, we avoided the issue of honest money. Planners offered all sorts of panaceas while parties and politicians dodged. In 1896 McKinley and Bryan put the choice clearly. More than 80 percent of the people turned out and voted for the gold standard. American paper money became as good as gold around the world.

The issue freedom or socialism has been with us now for decades. No major politician has openly endorsed socialism. But each has been willing to "go along" while socialism is invited in at the back door. Parties and candidates try to win votes by promising subsidies instead of appealing for the moral support the people are so ready to give.

In 1946 we had our first clear chance to vote on Socialist controls. The new Congress abolished the worst of the war socialism, and our magnificent industrial prosperity followed.

Still the politicians do not want to believe their eyes. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania has proved that, given a chance, the people will support overwhelmingly measures of freedom and reject offers of socialism.

As Lincoln said in his day the time has come to stop compromising.

Flight Training for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent letter from Mr. John T. Griffin, president of the Massachusetts Aviation Trades Association, relative to the unfair and inequitable results of Veterans' Administration instructions 1 and 1A which are working such havoc with veterans seeking flight training and further education.

While the Veterans' Administration has already moved to cancel these instructions, it seems to me that we should settle the questions involved once and for all and for that reason I propose to support remedial legislation of the kind introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman TEAGUE, contained in H. R. 6254.

The letter follows:

MASSACHUSETTS AVIATION
TRADES ASSOCIATION,
Lexington, Mass., October 3, 1949.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: May I take this opportunity to express to you the sincere appreciation of all members of this organization for your sympathetic understanding and cooperation in helping us solve the difficulties which have been facing all veterans and schools in connection with aviation training during the past 16 months. In our opinion, the passage of the Thomas amendment, if properly administered by the Veterans' Administration, was a happy solution.

Unfortunately, however, all concerned have already learned with regret that the Veterans' Administration does not intend to cooperate with the Congress, and the difficulties which have affected those interested in aviation during the past 16 months have now been increased manyfold; and the scope of the new Veterans' Administration regulations have been expanded so as to include all private schools in the United States. On the other hand, we in the aviation field believe that this new move by the Veterans' Administration at this time may be fortunate for two reasons:

1. It produces widespread national interest in the same problem which we were forced to combat alone.

2. It produces this interest while the Congress is still in session and is in a position to enact corrective measures in time to save the American private school system from destruction.

I am referring to Veterans' Administration instructions No. 1 and No. 1–A, dated September 8, 1949, and September 1, 1949, respectively. Instruction 1–A was received by us via registered mail on September 19, 1949; and the information contained in it became effective on September 12, 1949, 7 days prior to its receipt. Instruction 1–A was a well-guarded Veterans' Administration secret, and none of the veterans or schools had a single inkling of the catastrophe which was about to overtake them.

The instructions were effective at the very height of the fall enrollment period, and must have produced Nation-wide chaos and hardship for thousands of veterans. I can certainly testify to many cases of hardship in our own local area. Prior to the time that public pressure forced the Veterans' Administration to temporarily delay the effective date, to November 1, many veterans who had made major family adjustments for the purpose of furthering their education during the coming school year, threw up their hands in disgust and went out to seek employment. These veterans who, for the most part, were entirely dependent upon the Veterans' Administration subsistence allowances while attending school, immediately realized the futility of proceeding with their educational plans in view of the bureaucratic red tape

which was thrown at them on enrollment day.

I feel sure that you have already heard from several of your constituents on this matter, and I sincerely trust that you fully realize just what is involved, as well as the aims and objectives of those who would promulgate such regulations without prior warning or discussion, at such a time. I shall not undertake to further enlarge upon this matter by letter, nevertheless, I shall be very glad to proceed to Washington to further discuss the matter with you, should you deem it desirable.

I have been informed that Representative TEAGUE, of Texas, took immediate cognizance of this situation and introduced bill H. R. 6254, now pending in the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for the purpose of providing immediate relief for the veterans involved; and to force, by law, the Veterans' Administration to adhere to the will of the Congress.

May we count upon you again for your quick support of H. R. 6254, or any similar legislation drawn for the purpose of correcting the present chaotic situation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. GRIFFIN,
President.

Biennial Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill known as H. R. 6275, which proposes a major change in our approach to and the handling of appropriations of money for the operations and activities of the Federal Government. Although this bill is relatively simple, its enactment would materially affect the financial affairs of our Government and would, in my opinion, prove most beneficial to the executive branch, the Congress, and the people themselves. I urge every Member of Congress to give this proposal careful consideration because it may offer a way out of what now seems to me a most difficult situation in connection with appropriations.

The American dollar is one of the most sought-after commodities in the world today. For years they have said in other countries that we Americans were dollar crazy, but the international scramble today for our money would put to shame the worst money grabbers of the frantic twenties. The international dollar seekers make our Wall Street tycoons look like pikers by comparison.

It is a simple economic fact that our only source of dollars is the pockets of the American people. I have a deep and abiding respect for our people, and I believe that one of our greatest obligations in Congress is to help bring about the wise appropriation and economic spending of public money.

Having served in the Oklahoma State Senate and as president pro tempore of that body, I was not entirely unfamiliar with appropriations measures when I came to Washington as a Member of Congress. However, I must frankly admit that I was totally unprepared for the magnitude and volume of appropriations I was called upon to consider during my first years in Congress. The war, of course, accounted for a large measure of this volume—but I have never overcome my awe at billion-dollar appropriations measures. I expect that as long as I am in Congress I will continue to feel that way about public funds.

As I said, the bill I offer is relatively simple. It proposes that budgets and appropriations shall cover a 2-year period rather than the present system of making annual appropriations. The benefits should be multiple and far reaching.

Let us look for a moment at some of the vexatious problems confronting us in connection with our financial affairs. The Federal Government keeps its books and plans its finances on a fiscal year basis. In other words, the books are closed on June 30 of each year, and the new money comes into use the next day—July 1. Under the provisions of most laws, there can be no commingling of money from one fiscal year to the next, and if the money is not available on July 1, the agency or department is in a quandary. The appropriations log-jam this session is all too familiar to us and to the American people. The plain truth is that sometimes the squabbles which develop over appropriations have more than once doomed other very desirable legislation of a substantive nature. The impasse developing in connection with money bills never contributes to good relationships between our two legislative bodies.

Under permission granted by the House, I am including a table which graphically illustrates the growth of this problem during the last 10 years:

Date of enactment of regular appropriation bills, 1939–Sept. 27, 1949

Congress	76th	76th	77th	77th	78th	78th	79th	79th	80th	80th	81st
Session	1st	3d	1st	2d	1st	2d	1st	2d	1st	2d	1st
Year	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Independent offices	Mar. 16	Apr. 18	Apr. 5	June 27	June 26	June 27	May 3	Mar. 28	July 30	Apr. 20	Aug. 24
Legislative	June 16	June 18	July 1	June 8	June 28	June 26	June 13	July 1	July 17	June 14	June 22
Treasury and Post Office	May 6	Mar. 25	May 31	Mar. 10	June 30	Apr. 22	Apr. 24	July 20	July 1	June 14	June 30
Agriculture	June 30	June 25	July 1	July 22	July 12	June 28	May 5	June 22	July 30	June 19	June 29
State, Commerce, and Justice	June 29	May 14	June 28	July 2	July 1	June 28	May 21	July 5	July 9	June 3	July 20
National Military Establishment										June 24	
Military Establishment	Apr. 26	June 13	June 30	July 2	July 1	June 28	July 3	July 16	July 30		
Navy	May 25	June 11	May 6	Feb. 7	June 26	June 22	May 29	July 8	July 18	June 24	
War Department civil functions	June 28	June 24	May 23	Apr. 28	June 2	June 26	Mar. 31	May 2	July 31	June 25	
Interior	May 10	June 18	June 28	July 2	July 12	June 28	July 3	July 1	July 25	June 29	
Labor-Federal Security	June 29	June 26	July 1	July 2	July 12	June 28	July 3	July 26	July 8	June 14	June 29
District of Columbia	July 15	June 12	July 1	June 27	July 1	June 28	June 30	July 9	July 25	June 19	June 29

Source: House Calendars, final editions.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the multi-billion-dollar budget is here to stay. It, therefore, becomes increasingly necessary that we bring up to date our methods of handling such appropriations.

The current situation regarding appropriations is the best illustration of our problem. Many of our most important governmental agencies such as the Military Establishment are operating under temporary authorities granted by joint resolution of the two branches of Congress, and at the same time they are now working with the Bureau of the Budget on the estimates of needs for the fiscal year beginning next July 1, and which by law must be handed to the Congress at the opening of the session next January. Think, if you will, of what those charged with the administration of our governmental laws and programs are up against.

I doubt that not even the corner grocery store in our neighborhood could successfully operate under such conditions. Most certainly no corporate or other big business interest would attempt such a thing. And yet, we see the American Government, the biggest financial operation in the world—yes, in the history of the world—trying to function under such handicaps.

At times the Government employee is most maligned and abused, but look at his side of it. At the beginning of each fiscal year in July, if he has been able to weather the budget difficulties, he sets about developing the following year's budget. We know that the budget for his agency is never approved by Congress in anything like the form it is submitted, so for the rest of the fiscal year he wonders if he will have a job after June 30. If the House or the Senate or both cut the budget materially, staffs must be reduced to come within the limitation. This often means lay-offs as early as April and May because of the annual-leave accumulation of many, so the average Government employee has very few productive, worry-free months in which to work each fiscal year.

Needless to say, neither labor nor management would tolerate such a condition in private industry. From a moral and production standpoint alone it is highly desirable that we lengthen the scope of our economic planning.

Think for a moment, if you will, of the administrators in government.

They go through the same economic gymnastics throughout the year and they are never certain for more than a few months at a time just how much money they will have and what programs they will be able to carry out. I know, as a matter of fact, that in many instances there is little accomplished in July and even August as agencies readjust themselves to new budgets. Is there either sense or economy in such chaos? I say "No," and I say that it is our responsibility to do something about it. If my bill offers not the solution the majority of Congress desire, then let us set about devising a method and a system that will meet the need. At least I offer a beginning to a solution to this problem.

Look now at our own position in this maze of Government finance. We receive budget estimates at the opening of each session. In the House, the Appropriations Subcommittees schedule hearings and commence consideration of requests for funds. This year, I am proud to say, all regular appropriations had cleared the House before Easter. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and our subchairmen we plowed through our work and got our job done. But then what happened? After the committee-reported bills were passed by the House as a whole, they were sent on to the Senate. Then legislative stalemates followed, requiring the enactment of successive temporary continuing resolutions in order that the Government might pay its bills after June 30. Reference to the above table discloses that the first appropriations measure was enacted into law June 22 of this year, and that only five became law prior to July 1.

While we are still wrangling over appropriations for the fiscal year, beginning July 1, the day draws near when we will take up for consideration the appropriations for next fiscal year. In effect, we are the board of directors for the great American Government, and if we are to consider the American people as our stockholders, then must we give to them a service and an accounting in keeping with our grave responsibilities. That we are not getting the job done in the most effective manner is now abundantly clear.

I have discussed this proposal from the standpoint of the Government employee; the agency heads; and the Congress itself. Now let us give our attention for a brief moment to the most important and the most vitally concerned group in the whole picture—the American people. They are the ones who foot the bills; they are the ones for whom the Government functions are intended; and they are the ones to whom we look for our employment and our guidance.

There is absolutely no justification for the wasteful and extravagant system now in operation. There is neither rhyme nor reason in a financial process that by its own defects costs the American people untold millions in direct loss and even more millions in indirect losses resulting from uncertainty, low morale, and economic chaos. Nor can we with conscience hold out to our people any promise of continuing programs of service and assistance if we allow a condition to exist under which there is no certainty of year-to-year programing.

How long do you think a county commissioner could stay in office if the county programs were cloaked in uncertainty for several months out of each year? And just how long do you think a people would tolerate a State government in which similar conditions were permitted to exist on any broad scale?

In further justification of the proposal I now make, I cite the record and experience of the various States in making biennial appropriations. There are only seven States which make annual appropriations. The balance follow the course I recommend. I feel sure they have found it both practicable and desirable or they would adopt the annual plan. Therefore, there is adequate reason to believe that such an approach to our national fiscal problems would result in a material improvement in our fiscal affairs.

A collateral but nevertheless definite benefit to be derived from this procedure would be the careful consideration of appropriations measures at the opening session of each Congress, and an unencumbered deliberation of other legislation at the second session.

In keeping with our mutual sense of responsibility as stewards of the people's welfare, and in the furtherance of the economic interests of those who bear the burden of the costs of government, we can do no less than make an earnest attempt to bring about a more intelligent and economical handling of the people's money.

Representative Brown of Georgia Assisted in Passage of MAP Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following news item appeared in Newsweek's October 10, 1949, edition. I personally know this information is true. It is as follows:

CONGRESS: QUICK SWITCH ON MAP

Just a few moments before the House convened on September 28 to debate the conference report on the military-assistance program, Representative PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, strode into the small Democratic cloak room at the rear of the Chamber and sought out Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, the majority whip.

"PERCY," he declared, "I voted to cut the arms program in half. I believed I was doing the right thing for the country. Now, with this announcement of Russia's possession of the atom bomb, I realize I made a mistake. I'm going to support the full $1,314,010,000 appropriation."

The news of BROWN'S switch spread swiftly, for in his 16 years in the House the tall, lean, white-haired legislator had become one of its most respected Members. He had never missed a committee meeting or a roll call—with one exception, the day in 1944 when the Navy informed him that his son was dead, lost on a submarine in the Pacific.

Within half an hour no less than 25 of BROWN'S fellow legislators approached him and told him that they too had been wondering whether they were right in voting originally to cut the MAP to $869,505,000. His admission of error had now resolved their doubts. They were going to follow his lead.

Who's Afraid of an Honest Debate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of September 13, 1949:

WHO'S AFRAID OF AN HONEST DEBATE?

There seems to have been one important difference between the Republican farm forum held in the Memorial Union at Iowa State College Monday and the Democratic farm rally here in Des Moines a couple of months ago.

The meeting at Ames really was a forum. Its purpose was to get all points of view about agricultural legislation out in the open. And they were got out in the open. So the fact that it was held under GOP auspices is just that much greater credit to the Republican sponsors. The Brannan rally in Des Moines was quite otherwise; it was a carefully stage-managed political show in which any controversial opinions were to (and did) get short shrift.

Howsoever, the Ames meeting was Republican-sponsored and it was held on the Iowa State College campus. President Friley says that this was none of the college administration's business because the Memorial Union is operated by a separate corporation, not by the college.

Oh come, now. We wish that our institutions of higher learning wouldn't be so doggoned fidgety about this business. They do have jurisdiction over their campuses, and they can prevent or allow just about any kind of meetings they wish. In the register's judgment, there is no reason whatever to apologize or pussyfoot about the farm forum Monday, for the simple reason that it permitted a free, democratic debate of the subject.

Why in the world do we not make this the criterion? Why do we not allow the use of campus facilities unashamedly, when they are available and regular school activities are not jeopardized, as long as the meetings proposed make an honest contribution to democratic knowledge and debate?

If any group abused this privilege, by staging a plainly "rigged" political meeting, then the college or university would have a perfect right to deny it the use of college facilities thereafter. But as long as it conducted a meeting as thoroughly honest and open as the Monday farm forum, does this not make a real contribution both to the informedness of the campus population and also to the workability of the democratic process itself?

We admit that the opening up of campuses by the State board of education to political meetings probably involves some headaches. That is a characteristic of democracy and of freedom itself. It would be much easier just to go on saying that nothing "controversial" should ever be spoken on a college or university grounds. But that isn't education.

And the people on our college campuses these days aren't children; they are citizens, many of them already voting.

There is no need to be afraid of honest debate. The more of it, the stronger democracy we shall have. Let us simply insist that it shall be debate, and that it shall be honest.

And let the political parties go to it.

President's Point-4 Program Should Be Promptly Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of September 28, 1949:

POINT 4—PLUS PARTNERS

Congress begins its study of plans for carrying out President Truman's "bold new program" in favorable circumstances. The dollar crisis has given the western democracies an object lesson in world economics. Devaluation of the pound and of other currencies has underscored the fact that more fundamental readjustments will be required in trade balances.

Even as Under Secretary of State Webb explained the administration's point-4 proposals to the House Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Truman was signing the newest Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Any real understanding of point 4 must recognize that it is only one player on the team now being shaped to set world trade on its feet. The basic problem is how the United States can shift from a traditional debtor position to that of the world's one big creditor—making extensive investments abroad to develop the globe's resources (point 4) and accepting imports in payments (trade agreements).

Point 4 in the President's inaugural speech captured the imagination with its vision of helpfulness and cooperation. It proposed an increasing export of American technical skill to help backward areas. It emphasized the value of promoting more prosperity in backward areas both from an economic and a political standpoint. Since then a good deal of intensive study has gone into developing practical ways and means. Much of what is planned hooks up with the World Bank or the Marshall plan.

Some may be surprised to see that the administration is asking for only $57,000,000 to set the program in motion. This amount would be augmented by the countries getting the help and by the United Nations. It would be supplemented—and possibly far exceeded—by private investment. As under the Marshall plan, the beneficiary countries would take a major share of responsibility.

The program has two major sections. One has to do with setting up an agency with a cabinet-rank head and funds for development projects that have been properly certified. The second centers on safeguarding private investment. Under this it is proposed to furnish guaranties—through treaties—by the participating countries.

The program appears to have been well considered, but Congress should give it careful examination. There appear to be few opponents of the broad idea, and most criticism will be intended to improve not block the program. Point 4 offers an immediate opportunity for the United States to export its mounting surpluses of materials and skills. But it should be regarded as much more than a safety vent. It has vast humanitarian aspects. It can become a check on communism.

If point 4 is to realize its wonderful promise the American people must relate it properly to a vast partnership of efforts required for their new role as the world's banker.

President Truman Addresses Major Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the President of the United States has delivered addresses before three of our major veterans' organizations assembled in national convention and encampment. These organizations which were privileged to hear the Chief Executive were the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, and the American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS.

The address of the President before the assembled Veterans of Foreign Wars was delivered at the golden jubilee encampment of this great veterans' organization on August 20, 1949, and represents a major policy statement of our Government relating to the necessity for providing military assistance to our partners in the North Atlantic Pact to prevent aggression.

The speech of the President on this occasion is as follows:

Mr. Commander in Chief, distinguished guests, fellow members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am happy to be in Miami today to help celebrate the golden jubilee anniversary of our organization.

I am proud to be a member of the oldest active veterans' organization in the Nation. For 50 years the VFW has been serving not only the interests of the men who have fought for our country in foreign lands, but also the interests of our whole Nation.

I have watched the splendid humanitarian work which our organization carries on. I have also been gratified by the record of the VFW in other fields, and particularly in the field of international policy. I recall the United Nations Rally in 1942, at our forty-third national encampment in Cincinnati, to which 14 Allied nations sent repesentatives. I remember the victory conference in 1945 at our Chicago encampment, where representatives from 21 Allied nations met to discuss the value of cooperation in war and the importance of continuing international cooperation in time of peace. The VFW has continued this fine record by its strong support of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I am particularly pleased that you have asked me to be here on the day the VFW is honoring distinguished representatives from other countries which have joined in the North Atlantic Treaty. The presence of veterans from most of the treaty countries, meeting with our own veterans, is deeply symbolic of the spirit that binds together the free nations of the world.

All the countries that signed the treaty have learned the tragic cost of war. All of us have learned how weakness invites aggression—how democratic countries, unless they stand together, can be taken over one by one. And now, all of us are determined that, by joint efforts and a common defense, we shall become strong enough to prevent another terrible conflict.

Four years ago, when the war ended, the world entered a new phase of human history. There were many who believed that the world would quickly return to its old ways. Many believed that the countries of the world would work their way, peacefully and in cooperation, back to conditions of stability and prosperity.

But the effects of this last war were too far reaching to permit such an easy adjustment. The destruction had been too great to allow a quick recovery. The accumulated wealth of generations had been poured out and lost in the conflict. Conditions of world trade had been fundamentally altered. As a result of the upheaval, many peoples demanded new rights and new responsibilities. Men who had lived for centuries in economic or political servitude asked for independence and a fair share of the good things of life.

The war against tyranny was sustained by belief in the "four freedoms." Men refused to yield to dictatorship because they desired and believed they could secure conditions of material and spiritual freedom. When the war ended, they demanded to be treated as free men. They demanded a world in which they could attain security and liberty.

This demand cannot be suppressed. It must not be frustrated. It presents a challenge to us and to the values of our civilization which will require all our energies and wisdom to satisfy.

One pretended answer to this demand of mankind is offered by organized communism. But that answer is a false one. Communism claims to satisfy the universal desire for a better life. But, in fact, it lures men by false promises back to tyranny and slavery—and more and more people, all over the world, are learning that fact.

The free nations of the world offer a different answer to the demand of mankind for security and liberty. Our answer is based upon voluntary association among free nations, mutual adjustment of our common problems, and combined economic effort. We are convinced that through these means the world can achieve economic progress and at the same time maintain and expand democratic freedoms. We are convinced that our answer will prevail.

The people of the United States have been meeting this challenge. In four short years they have done more in the cause of world peace and world recovery than any nation has ever before been called upon to do.

We are not alone in this effort. Many nations which share our democratic values and our traditions are working with us. Without these allies in the cause of peace, our task would be hopeless. We can win a permanent peace only through the joint efforts of free nations striving toward the same objectives.

To achieve a better world we must prevent international violence. Unless protection against war can be secured, all efforts for the advancement of mankind will fail. One of the most important aspects of our foreign policy, therefore, is our effort to establish international order.

To this end, we have joined with other nations in creating a world organization which would outlaw aggression and establish a means of settling international disputes.

The principles of the United Nations are still our goal. We have undertaken to defend and preserve them. We will keep that pledge.

Shortly after the end of the war, however, it became apparent that the United Nations could not live up to all our hopes for it until all nations were united in the desire

for peace. It became necessary, therefore, for the free countries to take action to defend the principles of that organization and to preserve it.

By an overwhelming bipartisan vote, the Congress approved my recommendation early in 1947 that the United States help Greece and Turkey resist Communist pressures. Our prompt action preserved the integrity of both countries.

By an equally overwhelming vote in 1948, the Congress approved our joint enterprise with 16 European nations to achieve economic recovery. The European recovery program has prevented general collapse in Europe, and has given hope to all countries who want to see the world resume the course of economic progress.

While we are working with our friends in Europe, we are also working with our friends and neighbors in this hemisphere. The pact of Rio de Janeiro, signed in September 1947 binds the nations of North and South America together in a defensive alliance.

The United States and 11 other nations have now joined in the North Atlantic Treaty. Like the Rio pact, this is a pledge of mutual assistance by nations which are determined to protect their independence. It is based on the principle that an armed attack on one member nation is an attack on all.

The next task is to back up this principle with military assistance to European nations, and to certain other nations, which are unable to build up their defenses without outside help.

I have recommended to the Congress that the United States supply three kinds of military assistance to friendly democratic nations in need of our help. First, we should help them increase their own military production. Second, we should transfer to them some essential items of military equipment. Third, we should send some of our experts abroad to help train and equip their military forces.

Some people who do not understand the state of the world very well have tried to make the military-assistance program seem a difficult and confused issue. On the contrary, it is very simple.

The purpose of the military-assistance program is to prevent aggression. Our European partners in the North Atlantic Treaty are not strong enough today to defend themselves effectively. Since the end of the war they have been concentrating on rebuilding their war-torn economies. We can strengthen them and ourselves by transferring some military means to them, and by joining with them in a common defense plan. The military-assistance program is based on the same principle of self-help and mutual aid that is the cornerstone of the European recovery program and the North Atlantic Treaty.

We are not arming ourselves and our friends to start a fight with anybody. We are building defenses so that we won't have to fight.

Our aid will be limited to the material necessary to equip mobile defense forces. These forces will constitute no threat to the independence of other nations. The democratic nations have no desire for aggression; they only want to be able to defend their homes.

Most of our assistance under this program will go to Atlantic Treaty countries, but we will also help certain other nations whose security is important to world peace. We must continue our aid to Greece and Turkey. We should help Iran maintain its firm stand against Soviet pressure. And in the Far East two young Republics—the Philippines and Korea—need military assistance if they are to maintain their national security.

If it were possible, we would prefer that these bulwarks against aggression be established by the United Nations. We hope the peace of the world will some day be enforced by security forces under the control and direction of the United Nations.

We have been working for that.

But the Soviet Union has blocked every effort to establish an effective international police force and to free the world from the fear of aggression. For that reason, we have had to join other friendly nations in forming regional defense pacts.

The United Nations Charter was wisely drawn to permit these regional defense pacts and other collective security arrangements which are consistent with the great principles of the Charter. The military assistance program will help the United Nations to operate more effectively by increasing the collective as well as the individual ability of free countries to resist aggression.

The military-assistance program and the European recovery program are part and parcel of the same policy. There is the closest relationship between economic recovery and military defense. On the one hand, economic recovery will lag if the haunting fear of military aggression is widespread. Such fear will prevent new investments from being made and new industries from being established. On the other hand, if protection against aggression is assured, economic recovery will move forward more rapidly. Sound economic recovery and adequate military defense must be carried forward together in balance. That is exactly what we propose to do.

Great progress has been made in economic recovery in Europe. The production of the western nations of Europe has been rising steadily. To continue the momentum of this economic advance it is necessary now to remove the obstacles created by the fear of military aggression.

We should therefore undertake a program of military assistance without delay. The cost of such a program is considerable, but it represents an investment in security that will be worth many times its cost. It is part of the price of peace.

Peace with freedom and justice cannot be bought cheaply. No single program can bring it about, nor can any single nation. It can only be assured by the combined efforts of the multitudes of people throughout the world who want a secure peace. They are our friends and they are friends worth having. We must keep them our friends if the world is to be a decent place for our children and their children to live in.

We must face the fact that we have forever put behind us the false security of isolationism. We have done so because we have learned—learned the hard way—that in the world of today, isolationism is a futile and vulnerable shield. We have learned that the defense of the United States and the defense of other freedom-loving nations are indivisible. We have learned that we can serve our country best by joining in the common defense of the rights of all mankind.

The Congress of the United States in noble words has set out certain purposes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Our organization is pledged:

"To maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America, and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies."

In the fulfillment of those high purposes, I enlist your support to the end that we may persevere in the ways of peace with the same vigor and determination with which we fought our country's wars.

The address of the President before the assembled membership of the great American Legion organization was delivered at Philadelphia, Pa., on August 29, 1949, and is a most thought-provoking address concerning world economy and world peace and our own national prosperity and security.

The address before the American Legion convention follows:

Mr. Commander, members of the auxiliary, comrades of the American Legion, I am happy to be here with the members of the American Legion again at their annual convention.

At the Legion convention last year I talked to you about your Government's efforts to achieve world peace based on freedom and justice. Today I am going to talk to you again about peace, because I think that is the most important thing in the world, and I know that you agree with me.

Last week at Miami, before another convention of veterans, I discussed our efforts to protect nations against aggression and to preserve the principles of the United Nations. I talked about our collective security agreements and the necessity of providing military aid to other countries to support those agreements.

Today I would like to talk about another equally important aspect of our efforts to achieve a lasting peace—that is, our international economic policy.

I find that there is a good deal of misunderstanding and misinformation about our international economic policy. Some of this is deliberately stirred up by certain newspapers and politicians strictly for political reasons. Some of it is due to the fact that the economic problems of the world seem to be distant from our daily lives and hard to understand.

World economic problems are undoubtedly complex. But their importance to us is very clear. World prosperity is necessary to world peace. Furthermore, world prosperity is necessary to our own prosperity here in the United States. If these facts are kept in mind it will be easier to understand what this country is trying to do.

In working for prosperity in the postwar world, the nations of the world face new problems—and greater ones than they have ever faced before. They are suffering from the terrible after effects of the war, which caused an almost complete break-down of European industry and of world trade. There is also the rising demand of men all over the world for independence, and for a greater share of the good things of life which only a restored and expanding economic system can bring. Added to these two problems there is a third. This is the attempt of organized communism to achieve economic and political domination of the world through the misuse of the desires and aspirations of mankind.

These problems require the combined efforts of the free nations. Together, we must repair the damage of war, complete the restoration of the economy of Europe, and revive world trade. We must go forward to establish an expanding world economy in which men everywhere can work to satisfy their desire for freedom and a better life. We must demonstrate that the economic system of the free nations is better than the system of communism.

The free nations are determined to avoid the mistakes of the past. The roots of the present economic problems go back to the First World War. After that war, the nations of the world made the mistake of following narrow and short-sighted policies of economic nationalism. Each country, working for its own selfish interest, tried to get the best of the others. Each nation erected trade barriers to keep out the products of other nations. You all remember Hawley-Smoot and what it did to the country. Each nation tried to dump its own products in foreign markets.

These policies were self-defeating. They achieved neither national nor international prosperity. Instead, they helped to bring on the worst depression the world has ever seen.

Factories closed down all over the world. Ships lay idle in harbors. Surplus crops rotted in the fields. Unemployment grew and hunger became widespread.

In every country there were hundreds of thousands of young men and women without jobs and without hope for the future. Many of these young people became the prey of unscrupulous demagogues. They joined the black shirts of Italy and the storm troopers of Germany. They were the tools of the Japanese militarists. In the end, they marched to war under the bloody banners of those dictatorships.

Before the end of World War II, we resolved that the international economic chaos which had led to war should not occur again. We knew that permanent peace could not exist if the nations of the world resumed the policy of dog-eat-dog.

Consequently, the United States joined with other nations to prepare for a peaceful economic world. The International Monetary Fund was set up to deal with exchange and monetary problems among nations. The International Bank was established to provide investment capital for reconstruction and development. In our proposals for a world-trade organization, the United States outlined a method for breaking down the trade barriers which had strangled world commerce in the period between the two wars. As the war ended, we made billions of dollars available to relieve suffering and repair the damage of war. We are proud of that accomplishment.

These were good beginnings. Never before in history had nations made such careful, long-range plans for a better economic future. For the first time in the history of the world the victor attempted to bring the vanquished back to life and to prevent people from starving to death. It has never been done before in the history of the world. And I am proud we did it.

Shortly after the war ended, however, it became apparent that the economic life of the world was more badly disrupted than anyone had expected.

Still further difficulties were created when it became clear that the Soviet Union would not join in working for world economic recovery. The Soviet Union was hostile to European economic cooperation. It refused to join in the European recovery program, and prevented its satellites from joining. Russia's aggressive foreign policy created alarms and fears that hampered recovery. On every hand, there was evidence that the policy of the Soviet Union was aimed at prolonging the distress and suffering of free nations.

If we had been discouraged by these difficulties and had abandoned our efforts, the results would have been disastrous. Once again the streets of Europe would have been filled with crowds of hungry and hopeless men and women. Once again, unscrupulous agitators would have used these angry millions to create tyranny and slavery.

But the nations did not let this happen. The free nations went ahead with our recovery programs. As a result, production has risen greatly in Europe. Men and women there have jobs and food and a hope in the future. They know that the democratic way is the way of hope.

The free nations have overcome the danger of immediate postwar collapse, but we have yet to achieve the sound and expanding world economy that is necessary for a lasting prosperity and peace.

This larger task is the one that now confronts us.

The free nations have the resources and the means to accomplish that task.

Together, they have most of the industrial capacity of the world. They have vast supplies of raw materials. They have industrious and skillful populations. The free nations together have all the elements necessary to provide a better way of life for mankind. What is needed is to draw these elements together into a continually expanding and productive international economy.

Such a world economy is vital, not only to the cause of world peace, but also to our own national prosperity and security. We in the United States depend upon foreign countries for many vital minerals and other raw materials. Without foreign trade, many of our industries would suffer. Without foreign trade, for example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for us to develop atomic energy. Moreover, we need to sell many things abroad. Our cotton, our wheat, our tobacco, for example, must have foreign markets. Our prosperity would be seriously damaged if the export of our products were cut off.

We cannot, therefore, fall back into economic isolationism. Instead, we must take every action we can to bring about more trade, expanding markets, and growth and development in other countries as well as our own.

One of the most serious difficulties we face is the fact that, at present, foreign nations need to buy more things from us than we need to buy from them. They have called upon us for food and raw materials in unprecedented amounts. Furthermore, many countries need equipment and machinery, which only we can supply, if they are to develop their own resources and raise their own standards of living.

The urgent demand which foreign countries have for these things far exceeds their present ability to pay for them. As a result, world trade is now seriously out of balance.

We have both short-range and long-range plans for meeting these difficulties. We will continue the European recovery program as our principal means of meeting emergency needs in the next 3 years. At the same time, we are moving ahead with long-range measures.

We are encouraging American business to make productive investments abroad in increasing volume. Through such investments, foreign countries—especially underprivileged areas—will be able to obtain the equipment they do desperately need.

We are also planning to help the people in underprivileged areas to learn modern industrial and agricultural methods. By this means, they will be able to double and redouble their production. By this means, they will be able to make an increased contribution to an expanding world economy and a balanced world trade.

In addition, we must continue our well-established policy of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements in order to reduce barriers to international trade. These agreements enable us to buy more from other nations at the same time that they help to maintain markets abroad for our own products. We must increase our buying abroad if we are to achieve a balanced world trade.

Furthermore, we are encouraging closer regional ties among nations in order to lower trade barriers and increase production.

The nations of Europe, under the stimulus of our aid, are working toward closer ties of economic union. Already, through the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, they have begun to make joint decisions that affect their basic economic policies. In the Council of Europe, now meeting at Strasbourg, more far-reaching measures of European union are being considered.

Closer economic union means a difficult period of transition for the countries that enter into it, but it is essential for a better world. The United States will do what it can to aid the European nations to achieve greater unity.

As we go ahead with these long-range measures for a stable and growing world economy, we shall have to adjust our actions to changing conditions. We shall need to be alert to new developments, and turn to advantage every possible resource.

We shall be concerned in the months immediately ahead with certain special and urgent problems arising out of the present unbalanced state of world trade. Representatives of the United Kingdom and Canada will soon be here to discuss some of these problems. We look upon these talks as discussions among friends about problems which affect us all, and in the solution of which we all have a common interest. The people of this country are well aware of what the war meant to Great Britain and of the stresses and strains which have been laid upon the British people in recent years. The representatives of the United Kingdom will find here a warm personal welcome and may be assured that these mutual problems will be examined by us in a spirit of friendliness and helpfulness.

In our discussions with the representatives of the United Kingdom and Canada, as in our approach to problems with other nations, we must keep clearly in mind the basic underlying principles upon which the economic policy of the free nations must be based.

The first principle which we should clearly understand is that a sound and expanding world economy is essential to world peace. International economic discussions revolve around such prosaic things as tobacco and rubber and rates of interest and the value of currencies. But, behind all these, lie the great objectives of satisfying the material and spiritual needs of mankind and preserving democratic freedom.

The second principle which should be clearly understood is that we are trying to expand the exchange of goods and services among nations. Sound and prosperous relations among nations rest upon the exchange of goods and services on a business basis. We are not engaged in a charitable enterprise. We are not looking for trick solutions to deep-seated problems.

The third principle is that we cannot succeed in creating a sound and expanding world economy unless we keep everlastingly at it. There are times, no doubt, when we shall become impatient or annoyed by delays and obstacles. But we cannot throw in our hand and walk out of the game. Nor can any other nation afford to do that. The path of mutual adjustment and combined economic effort is not an easy one. The economic interests of nations are not easily reconciled. No group can get all its wants. But there is no other way to the solution of our difficulties than the way of mutual concession and cooperation.

The fourth principle is that the democratic nations are not proposing to interfere in one another's internal politics. We know very well how we would feel if some foreign nation tried to tell us how to vote. We recognize that each nation has its own political problems and that it uses different political labels and different slogans from those we use at home. In the same way, nations have different business practices and different governmental devices for achieving the same economic ends.

A community of democratic nations cannot insist on uniformity in matters of politics or business. The only uniformity on which they can insist—and this is what binds them together as free nations—is a firm adherence to democracy—true democracy, not the fake kind put out by the Communists—coupled

with a common desire to improve the standard of living of all of their citizens.

On the basis of these four principles, the free nations of the world can solve the difficulties which confront them. On the basis of these principles, they can achieve their goal of a sound and expanding world economy.

There is one more thing for us, as Americans, to remember. Our country is the most important economic unit in the world today. The future of the world depends upon the continuation of our own economic growth and development. If we can continue to increase our national income, and to raise our standards of living, the solution of international economic problems will be far less difficult.

Every one of us has a responsibility in building a peaceful world, and I am very sure that there is not a man here who does not want to see that peace in the world in the future. We can contribute to that cause in our daily lives, in our jobs, in our thinking. We contribute to peace when we work for the prosperity and growth of the United States. We contribute to peace when we reject the claims of those selfish interests, here and abroad, that would turn us against the cause of international cooperation. We contribute to peace when we ask for divine guidance and help for the efforts of mankind to establish understanding and good will among the nations of the world.

The address of the President before the annual convention of the American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—a great and growing veterans' organization of our younger veterans, was delivered at the State fair at Des Moines, on Labor Day, September 5, 1949.

This address, delivered in the heart of the American farm belt to the younger World War veterans, emphasizes the importance of American agriculture of our world responsibility and the prosperity of our country.

This address is as follows:

I am happy to be here today with the American Veterans of World War II.

This is the third time I have met with veterans in the last 3 weeks. In Miami and in Philadelphia I had the pleasure of addressing two of the other veterans' organizations.

Today in Des Moines you have given me the welcome opportunity to speak to this association which has grown up since the last war. Judging by this meeting, your group has a long, vigorous, and useful life ahead of it.

I have found that veterans generally carry over into civilian life their strong interest in national and international affairs. They are determined to do everything they can to see that the United States grows in strength and prosperity and exerts its full influence for peace in the world. A veterans' organization like yours can do much to aid our progress toward peace and prosperity. I am sure all of you will do your part.

Earlier today, in Pittsburgh, I discussed the effort we are making to achieve a better future for our country. One of the most important elements in our country's future is agricultural prosperity. And there is no better place to talk about that than right here, in the heart of the Nation's farm belt.

Some people seem to think that nobody but the farmers ought to be concerned with farm prosperity. Some people claim that programs to improve the welfare of farmers are just pressure-group politics. The selfish interests would like to have us believe this because they went to divide the people and set one group against another.

The plain fact is that everyone should be interested in the welfare of farmers. The prosperity of this Nation is indivisible. The economic future of the whole country depends upon the growing welfare of every group in the country. If we want a healthy and prosperous economy, there must be economic opportunity, not just for the fortunate few, but for all of us—workers, businessmen, and farmers.

It's just plain common sense that good incomes for farmers are good for the workers who make the things farmers buy. Farmers this year will have more than $27,000,000,000 to spend. That means employment for more than 9,000,000 workers in factories, and stores, and other business enterprises.

All of us need the things farmers produce. When farmers adopt new and more efficient methods, and produce more at lower cost, that raises the standard of living of everybody in the country.

That's why it is just as important to the future of our country farmers to be well off as it is for workers or businessmen.

That's why I believe the Government of this country must work for the welfare of farm people.

Let's look at some of the things the Government should do to help achieve continued and growing farm prosperity.

It is not always easy for city folks to understand the conditions the farmer faces, and the need for the particular programs the Government has developed.

First of all, the farmer faces the uncertainties of nature. He is in a constant battle with insects, weeds, weather, and erosion. He needs to learn and apply the best methods of soil conservation, weed killing, crop rotation, and all the other scientific advances in agriculture. One of the outstanding accomplishments of our Government has been its research and education programs to help farmers do these things.

Furthermore, the farmer is confronted with special problems because he lives in the country. Too often in the past, good schools and modern health facilities and electricity and the other advantages of modern living were not available to our farm population. In recent years, however, our Government has helped to make it possible for many of our farmers to obtain these things.

In addition, the farmer faces a market which he can't control. Years ago, it often happened that a whole year's hard work went for nothing because there were unexpected crop surpluses or sudden drops in demand. In the past 16 years, however, with the help of the Government, farmers have been making much headway in achieving economic stability. Farm cooperatives have been greatly strengthened. Cheaper, more abundant farm credit has been made available. Price supports, marketing agreements, and other special programs have been developed and steadily improved.

In all these ways, farmers with the help of the Government have been meeting and overcoming the special difficulties they face. They have been making great progress toward the steadily growing farm prosperity they need and the Nation needs.

None of these advances came easily. They were all opposed by selfish and narrow-minded men who didn't understand what the farmer was up against—and didn't care whether or not he was well off. Sometimes these interests have managed to reverse the course of progress, though fortunately not for long.

It was just about a year ago, a few miles from here at Dexter, that I talked to another audience about farm prosperity and opportunity for the farmer.

At that time the outlook was pretty black. The Eightieth Congress had been hitting sledge-hammer blows at the very foundations of farm opportunity.

The Eightieth Congress had cut the soil-conservation program. In doing this, it had threatened the existence of the farmer-committee system, through which conservation, price support and other programs are administered.

The Eightieth Congress had killed the International Wheat Agreement, which was negotiated to assure farmers a reasonable share of the world wheat market and help maintain stability of grain prices.

It had caused farmer cooperatives to fear for their lives.

It had restricted the reclamation program and cut down our efforts to bring low-cost electricity to farmers and other people.

And on top of all that, the Eightieth Congress had started to tear down one of our strongest bulwarks against depression, the farm-price support program. It had done this in a sly and underhanded way—by eliminating the Government's power to provide grain storage facilities. As you know, we can't support grain prices without adequate storage.

I reminded the people at Dexter a year ago, just as I am reminding you today, that the welfare of the entire Nation depends upon the welfare of the farmer. I reminded them that they could express their opinion of the Eightieth Congress at the polls in November.

Well, you know what happened last November. As a result, there are a lot of new Members in the Eighty-first Congress. With these new Members, there has been a big improvement. Of course, there are still many reactionary Senators and Representatives in Congress, but they are no longer in control as they were last year and the year before. They are still doing all they can to slow up our progress, but they are not able to stop it. The majority of the Eighty-first Congress are going ahead building for the future.

The new Congress has already repaired most of the damage done to farmers by the Eightieth Congress, and it is going forward with new measures for a growing and prosperous agriculture.

The Eighty-first Congress understands the fundamental importance of soil conservation. It has restored and expanded this program and given a new lease on life to the farmer-committee system.

The Eighty-first Congress understands the importance to American farmers of a balanced and expanding world trade. A new international wheat agreement has been negotiated and is now in effect. By this agreement, American farmers are assured a fair share of the world wheat market at fair prices for the next 4 years. Furthermore this Congress is going to extend and improve the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This will mean more world trade.

The Eighty-first Congress is interested in building up farm cooperatives, not tearing them down. It understands that cooperatives are as necessary for the welfare of farmers as unions are for the welfare of workers. Both cooperatives and unions are means whereby men who are weak economically can become strong enough by uniting to bargain on a basis of equality. This Congress will not listen to those who want to tax cooperatives out of existence. Furthermore, before this Congress adjourns I think we shall have a cooperative telephone program similar to the highly successful rural electrification program.

This Congress has already taken important steps to meet the serious need for more low-cost electricity and to revitalize the reclamation program in our Western States.

The Eighty-first Congress has restored the Government's authority to provide storage

for grain under the price support program and the difficult storage problem is being met. Farmers are building new bins and the Government is preparing to take care of the overflow that cannot be handled by farmers and grain elevators. With the biggest supply of corn in history now in sight the corn loan program is especially important, and the Government is helping farmers get every bushel in storage.

In all these ways the Eighty-first Congress has repaired past damage and is making new gains.

However, there is one important part of our farm program on which the Eighty-first Congress has not yet completed its work. That is the farm price-support system.

The Congress needs to modernize our farm price-support system, and the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the administration, has made recommendations to the Congress for this purpose.

An immense amount of confusion has been stirred up about these proposals in recent months. Some people are going around telling industrial workers that our attempt to improve the price-support system will mean higher food prices and heavier taxes. Some people are telling farmers that an improved price-support system will take away the protection they now have and regiment the farmer. Much of this talk is deliberately intended to mislead and divide farmers and workers.

But it will not succeed. Farmers and workers have learned to cut through the fog of misrepresentation and propaganda and look at the facts. And when that is done, there is no reason for confusion about the kind of farm price-support program we ought to have.

First, we need a farm price-support system that will afford farmers an opportunity to secure a fair return for their production. Too often in the past we have seen farm prices at give-away levels because temporary surpluses resulted in distress selling. That was bad for farmers and bad for the Nation. Our system of price supports, therefore, must protect farm income from collapsing and injuring the whole economy.

Second, price supports must be so organized and administered that they will give consumers the benefit of our abundant farm production. Our people want to buy more milk and meat, more fruit and vegetables, and all the things that go into a better diet. We must have a price-support system that will encourage farmers to shift their production to meet the demand for more and better foods at reasonable prices.

Present price-support legislation is not adequate to accomplish these objectives. It encourages surplus production of some commodities, such as potatoes, and not enough of other products, such as meat. The worst thing about the present program is that it takes food away from consumers instead of enabling them to eat better. The Government has had to buy tremendous quantities of potatoes and take them off the market at great expense. The Government has had to build up big stocks of dried eggs and is wondering how to get rid of them.

Some people say that we ought to cut down support prices, but that would not meet the problem. The record shows that, in the past, when prices dropped, farmers produced bigger and bigger surpluses in a hopeless effort to make up for low prices.

Instead of cutting down support prices, we need to adjust our price-support system so that it will encourage farmers to grow what is needed and encourage consumers to use what is produced.

Our farm-price support system, therefore, first of all should aid farmers to adjust production to demand. Farmers are under the same economic necessity to adjust supply to demand as are the producers of automobiles or washing machines or any other product. And by and large, they are willing to do it, if they have assurance they can shift their land to other uses without economic disaster.

But no matter how willing farmers may be to adjust their production, and to change from one crop to another, they cannot eliminate the possibility of surplus. Weather, world conditions, market fluctuations are all things beyond their control. So even under the best circumstances, we shall always have some surpluses.

In the case of storable crops, like corn, tobacco, or cotton, we can and should store up a good part of the surpluses as reserves against emergency. In the case of perishable products, such as meat and milk, we cannot store them very long. These perishable products must be used to avoid waste.

This presents a problem that is not easy to solve. We know that we shall have to adopt a new method of price support. The most promising method yet suggested is the production payment. Under this method the prices of certain farm commodities would be allowed to seek their own level in the market, and the farmer would be paid the difference between the support price and the average market price. Production payments thus would safeguard farm returns, and at the same time our entire production of perishable foods would be available to consumers on the regular markets.

This method, or any other means of accomplishing the same purpose, would go a long way toward overcoming the defects of present legislation and giving us a modern price support system.

It is urgent that we modernize our price-support laws or we shall face unmanageable surpluses. Startling progress has been made in increasing agricultural production in this country in recent years. This has enabled farmers to double and triple their production of many crops at lower costs.

This new productive ability must be used for the good of our people; it must not be allowed to destroy the prosperity of our farmers and the stability of our economy. This is the essential purpose that we should seek to achieve by our new farm-price support legislation. A price-support system that fulfills this purpose will be good for the farmer, good for the worker, good for the whole Nation.

I am convinced that the Eighty-first Congress will enact this kind of farm-price support legislation. I am convinced that it will not be led astray by the loud opposition of those who oppose any change in our price-support system.

The stability and progress of our agriculture is important not only to ourselves, but to the whole world. Over the last few years, our farmers have taken a leading part in the struggle to feed a hungry world. In the future, foreign markets will be essential for many of our farm products.

But we must remember that we cannot maintain foreign markets for our agriculture, over the long run, unless we buy in return the products of foreign countries. Foreign trade is not a one-way street. There will be tremendous benefits to this country, in rising living standards, in reduced appropriations for foreign aid, in a more prosperous world economy, and in closer ties between the free nations, if we buy more from other nations.

Our country has been endowed with the ability to produce the good things of the earth in abundance. I am sure we have the wisdom to use this gift as a blessing for all our people. We know much more about our economy and how it works than we used to. We have profited by experience.

We must keep our eyes on our main objectives. We must not be led astray by the false arguments and the loud clamor of the special interests. They are only trying to set us against one another. They are using slogans and scare words to frighten us away from the programs and policies that are good for us all.

But we will not be frightened. Too much depends on our ability to handle our common problems in a spirit of cooperation. It is not only our own future progress that is at stake. It is the future peace and prosperity of the world. That is our goal, and we shall continue to work toward it with all our strength and all our faith.

The appearance of the President of the United States before the three major veterans organizations of our Nation emphasizes the importance which the Chief Executive attaches to the veterans of our country and the importance of the contributions which they have made in the past in the winning of the wars in which our country has participated and the importance of the role which they assume in preserving the peace as citizen-soldiers and citizen-sentinels of America.

His Pennsylvania Rifle Made Boone Prize Shot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "His Pennsylvania Rifle Made Boone Prize Shot," written by Capt. John M. Cummings, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Friday, October 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS PENNSYLVANIA RIFLE MADE BOONE PRIZE SHOT

(By Capt. John M. Cummings)

They're going to have quite a celebration down Lancaster way a week from Sunday. Lots of big shots will be there, including Gen. Jacob L. Devers, a Lancaster County native, who recently retired from the Army after a lifetime of distinguished service.

What they're going to do, right at the outset of Pennsylvania Week, is place a marker at the birthplace of the Pennsylvania rifle. Dan'l Boone and others, many others, knew this weapon as the Kentucky rifle. It got that name because of its wide use in the dark and bloody ground. Although it was a prime favorite in other parts of the country and, in fact, the world, the name Kentucky rifle somehow managed to stick to it. Kentucky had about as much to do with developing it as our Uncle Dominick had with the anchoring of Noah's ark.

If you should go down Lancaster way to participate in the ceremony, you'll find the crowd gathered on Factory Road about 3 miles south of Lancaster city. There on the stone wall of the original rifle shop you'll see the marker.

Martin Meylin, a Swiss gunsmith, settled in the Pequea Valley of Lancaster County in

1710. There he built his little gun shop and there he turned out the first rifle of a type that revolutionized the manufacture of firearms the world over.

The men on the frontier to whom a handy gun frequently meant the difference between life and death found in the Meylin rifle just what the doctor ordered. You could fire this rifle with some assurance the slug would go where you intended it to go. It was with the Lancaster County product that Dan'l Boone won his reputation as a crack shot.

Ten-year-old Audrey W. Meylin, a ninth-generation descendant of the Swiss gunsmith who thrust his roots so deeply into the Lancaster County soil in the early part of the eighteenth century, will unveil the tablet. Her grandfather, Martin B. Meylin, owns the only known authentic rifle manufactured by the inventor and developer. This will become the property of the Lancaster County Historical Society during the exercises.

It's a 62-inch rifle, very long by present-day standards. In fact, it was sometimes called the long rifle. The initials "M. M." for Martin Meylin, are carved on the rear sight section of the barrel. The stock is of curly maple, finely carved. The weapon, now more than 200 years old, was last fired in 1896.

Experts in firearms say it could be fired today. We are willing to take them at their word. For all our confidence in the workmanship of Martin Meylin, we are willing to let others do the experimenting. General Devers and Lt. Gov. Dan Strickler, being military men, should have the qualifications necessary for putting the weapon to a test.

Speaking of the generals—Strickler is one, too—it is interesting to note that in Europe, despite a multiplicity of wars, rifles were not used in the military service during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and most of the eighteenth centuries. This type of firearm was used chiefly by hunters, the gentry who followed the stag and other game. That's how the German Jaeger rifle received its name—Jaeger meaning hunter.

During the long period referred to, soldiers carried smoothbore muskets, with fixed bayonets. Firing was done in volleys and it was more remarkable for its inaccuracy than its accuracy.

Looking over an inventory of the estate of Martin Meylin, filed in 1751, you are likely to note a "Hoghot of Liquaire" valued at 10 pounds. This, of course, was long before the pound was devalued by the labor government.

The accounting was signed by three appraisers, one of whom was a gentleman called Hans Rohrer. We have a notion, although we can't be too sure, that he provided the name for Rohrerstown, some 3 miles west of Lancaster. In our book Rohrerstown is noted as the site of Lime Spring Farm, and the farm in turn is noted as the residence of one of our favorite women—Gertrude Stauffer.

We've been over there to Mrs. Stauffer's place, that ol' woman of our'n and self, and we'll always remember it as a house of charm and hospitality. Incidentally, we notice in a communication which came to hand by late post, that Mrs. Stauffer's Lime Spring Farm is one of a number of fine Lancaster County places to be open to the public the day before the dedication of the marker commemorating the Martin Meylin rifle.

They're going to have a sort of pilgrimage around the county, a history-rich section of the State, conducted by the Lancaster County Art Association. If you make the rounds you'll see Wheatland, the home of James Buchanan, Pennsylvania's only President, and J. Hale Steinman's place down along the Marietta Pike and many others.

We're going to do our darndest to get down Lancaster way for one or more of these interesting events. All we need to make us jump is an invitation from Mrs. Stauffer. Hey, there, Gerty.

Mary T. Schiek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me published regarding the case of Mary T. Schiek, a Red Cross nurse, for whom a relief bill is pending on the calendar, together with an editorial from the Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., and a letter from me to the editor of the paper.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF A RED CROSS NURSE

(By United States Senator McCARTHY)

United States Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following report of a United States Senate committee dealing with the plight of Mary Thomas Schiek, a Red Cross nurse, who allegedly was incapacitated for life while in United States service, and for whom a Federal grant of $50,000 was urged. The report asserted there had been "gross negligence and malpractice" in her poignant case. The report which we believe will be of interest to every reader was as follows:

"It appears that Miss Schiek received injuries on May 27, 1945, in Bengal Province, India, while in the service of the American Red Cross, while riding in an Army truck, which overturned, throwing Miss Schiek out. She was immediately taken to the Three-hundred and Seventy-second Station Hospital of the United States Army where she remained for 48 days. Charles H. McDevitt, Jr., chief of the surgical service, discharged her on July 21, 1945, stating that he could find no reason for her constant pain, found no serious injuries, and believed she would be ready for active duty in 2 weeks. Shortly thereafter, she collapsed in Calcutta and was taken by ambulance to the Hundred and Forty-second General Hospital there. Maj. Helman C. Wasserman was in charge of her case. His office is now at 4500 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

"The Calcutta hospital found gross negligence and malpractice had occurred at the Three Hundred and Seventy-second Field Hospital and that Miss Schiek actually had received the following injuries which had been overlooked—severe transverse fracture of sacrum, fracture of the pelvis, fracture of the process of lumbar four and five, midlateral ribs broken, severe injuries to the cauda equina and sacro nerves, no sensation in the lower part of the extremities, inability to walk, unable to control bowels or urine, atrophy of muscles of leg.

"The claimant was removed to Halloran Hospital, Staten Island, N. Y., in the fall of 1945. Consultation by Capt. John J. Lowrey, February 5, 1946, suggested ability to return to work in 3 or 4 months. Further examination by same doctor in May 1946 suggested further total disability for 6 months, examination October 1946 by the same doctor suggested inability to work for at least an additional year. In November of 1947, Dr. Wasserman examined Miss Schiek, and stated that 'these restrictions will remain and your future life will undoubtedly have to be regulated by these handicaps.'

"Approximately 4 years after accident she is still unable to walk more than 2 blocks without exhaustion and will slide off an average chair unless her feet are supported. She cannot wear ordinary shoes, but only soft soled slippers. Because of weakness and atrophy of muscles she is unable to sit or lie in any one position for more than a short period, is still incapable of properly controlling urine and feces, and must spend most of her mornings caring for these functions. Any earning capacity that claimant will have will be restricted to what she can do in her own home. Prior to enlisting in the service of the American Red Cross, Miss Schiek was employed by the Boston Store, Inc., of Milwaukee. Robert A. Heinz, assistant promotion director there, has written that Miss Schiek would have been rehired if physically able to resume her duties and would earn between $45 and $50 per week. As it is, she earns nothing.

"Claimant does not come under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act and may not institute suit for her injuries because the accident took place in India, outside of the continental limits of the United States, and her only relief must necessarily come from Congress. Her claim has been examined administratively in the War Department, and on February 20, 1948, C. O. Wolfe, colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, Chief, Claims and Litigation Division, and T. L. Borom, lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, Assistant Chief, Claims and Litigation Division, Department of the Army, wrote to the claimant's counsel, 'The Department of the Army can take no administrative action on your client's claim.'

"On March 12, 1948, claimant's counsel in an interview with above-named Lieutenant Colonel Borom at the War Department was told that the War Department could not take action because the claim did not involve property damage, medical expense, or hospital bills. He stated that the War Department felt Miss Schiek had a most meritorious claim and undoubtedly had received very severe injuries in the accident which were not recognized during her 48 days in the Three Hundred and Seventy-second Field Hospital, and that the War Department would approve any sum which Congress felt would properly compensate Miss Schiek for th- injuries and disability which manifestly will leave her totally disabled for the rest of her life."

[From the Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., of October 4, 1949]

WAS SHE EXPENDABLE? A TRAGIC STORY

In the harsh canons of war, there can be no doubt that Miss Mary Thomas Schiek, a Red Cross nurse, was expendable; that is, her life had patriotically been placed at the disposal of the United States people.

But the poignant story of her misfortunes, as narrated in full elsewhere on this page today, we believe, will touch every heart.

In informing the United States Senate of what had happened to her, Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, spoke as follows:

"This claimant was a Red Cross nurse. While serving in India a truck tipped over and injured her. She went to the hospital. The doctor who originally treated her, according to the later hospital report—and I quote from the committee report—'the Calcutta hospital found gross negligence and malpractice had occurred at the Three-Hundred and Seventy-second Field Hospital.' What happened originally was this: She went to the base hospital. The doctor said to her, 'You are not hurt.' He would not give her an X-ray. Finally he consented to X-ray her on condition she could climb onto the

X-ray table herself. She could not do that. She was semiparalyzed from her hips down. The doctor X-rayed her and said there was nothing wrong with her. He discharged her. He said to her, 'It is just merely imagination. You are a crybaby.' He abused her terribly. According to the information contained in the committee report, she went to the Calcutta hospital where she was X-rayed. It was found her back was broken in two places. They found the sacrum badly fractured. They found one of the main nerves had been impinged, because of malpractice in the original hospital."

Senator MCCARTHY told the remainder of this story in the Senate committee's report, which we give elsewhere on this page today.

The ordinary reader will inquire, we believe, "Could such things happen, even in time of war?"

The matter came before the Senate in a controversy as to whether Miss Schiek should receive a $25,000 award or a $50,000 as compensation for her injuries and life of torment.

Our view is that the larger sum would be none too great, in view of her suffering.

We think that also here is a case where the American Medical Association should bestir itself.

If the doctor in question actually was guilty of cruel malpractice, as alleged, then that would seem to call for some investigation by the doctors.

It is our earnest hope, which we believe would be universally shared by the masses of the American people, that this gallant Red Cross nurse be compensated at least to the extent of the larger sum mentioned.

Senator MCCARTHY deserves the Nation's gratitude for bringing the case to public attention.

OCTOBER 6, 1949.

Mr. HERMAN E. GIESKE,
Editor, the Intelligencer,
Wheeling, W. Va.

DEAR MR. GIESKE: I want to thank you very much for your editorial of October 4, in regard to the case of the Red Cross nurse, Mary Schiek. The attention which the press has been giving the case of this extremely unfortunate young woman increases the possibility that some semblance of justice may be done in her case.

As you know, under the rather peculiar rules of the Senate, any one of the 96 Senators can object to the consideration of a bill on the Consent Calendar. This practically means that unless the majority party decides the make a bill the business of the day, one Senator can prevent action thereon.

In this case the House gave this young woman $35,000. The Senate committee reduced the amount to $25,000. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas (p. 13332 of the RECORD) and Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, notified me that if the Senate increased the amount above $25,000, which their committee had set, they would then prevent passage of the bill by entering an objection. I know it seems unusual that one or two Senators can block passage of legislation on the Consent Calendar, which may be favored by a majority of the Senate, but such are the Senate rules.

I think that the attitude which your Senator KILGORE has taken in this case is doubly unfortunate, in view of the fact that from the discussion on the Senate floor, it appeared that he was not acquainted with his committee's report on this case. For example, on page 13332 of the RECORD, he says, "Why do they (meaning Mary Schiek) not elect to go to the Court of Claims, where they have rights? This is a tort case." The report of Senator KILGORE's committee, however, explained in detail why she could not go to the Court of Claims because of the fact that the accident occurred in India, and she could not very well seek redress in an Indian court, which would, of course, have no power to enforce its judgment in this country.

While it is important that this young woman receive honest, fair treatment from the Government, the Senate is being called upon to pass upon an infinitely more important matter. Your Senator from West Virginia, Mr. KILGORE, on page 13354 of the RECORD, asks the Senate to place its stamp of approval on what I consider an extremely dangerous political philosophy, a philosophy adopted by some other nations with disastrous results. I quote from his speech as follows:

"The taxpayers are paying the amount this girl will receive. If a private hospital had a doctor who was guilty of malpractice that would be a different proposition, because the doctor and the hospital are paid for the services rendered."

This theory that the individual has no rights when dealing with the omnipotent all-powerful state, is, in my opinion, a viciously dangerous philosophy, one which other nations have adopted to their sorrow and one which I sincerely hope the United States Senate does not stamp with approval.

With your permission, I would like to insert a copy of your editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a copy of this letter.

Thanking you for expending time and effort to help the cause of justice in this case, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

P. S.—Incidentally, I would like to call your attention to one error in the RECORD. I made the statement on the floor that this young lady would never be able to get married. I have subsequently been informed that she has married since her injury. I have never met this young woman and only knew that she was not married at the time of the injury. Instead of saying she never could be married, I should have said that the medical record in her case and the prognosis of the case, as set forth in the medical reports and committee reports, would indicate that she would never be able to perform the normal marital functions. I don't know anything about the circumstances surrounding the marriage, but assume it must be an extremely devoted young man who would take on as a wife a girl with her hopeless and permanent disabilities.

Antimonopoly Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the need for additional antimonopoly legislation by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA, ON NEED FOR ADDITIONAL ANTIMONOPOLY LEGISLATION

On August 24, the Federal Trade Commission issued a new report, The Concentration of Productive Facilities. According to this report, in 1947 the 113 largest manufacturing corporations, those with assets of $100,000,000 and over, owned 46 percent of the Nation's total productive facilities.

In addition to revealing this startling degree of concentration in manufacturing as a whole, the report indicates the extent of concentration in 26 separate industries. The report shows, by name, which corporations control which industries.

I submit the facts revealed in this report are nothing less than astonishing. Of the 26 industries studied, the report shows that the three largest corporations in the following fields control more than half of their respective industries' productive facilities.

Percent of net capital assets owned by three largest companies

Industry:	
Aluminum	100
Tin cans and other tinware	95
Linoleum	92
Copper smelting and refining	89
Cigarettes	78
Distilled liquors	72
Plumbing equipment and supplies	71
Rubber tires and tubes	70
Office and store machines and devices	70
Motor vehicles	69
Biscuits, crackers, and pretzels	68
Agricultural machinery	67
Meat products	64
Dairy products	56
Primary steel	50

In the remaining industries, the eight largest companies control more than 50 percent of their industries' facilities in all but four cases. The percent of control in these other industries by the eight largest corporations is as follows:

Percent of net capital assets owned by eight largest companies

Industry:	
Glass and glassware	74
Aircraft and parts	74
Industrial chemicals	70
Carpets and rugs	[1] 58
Electrical machinery	55
Footwear (except rubber)	53
Canning and preserving	51
Grain-mill products	49
Drugs and medicines	48
Bread and other products	38
Woolens and worsted goods	36

[1] Percent owned by four largest companies.

This extraordinary degree of concentration should be a matter of great concern to everyone interested in the maintenance of peace and democracy throughout the world. If there is one lesson to be learned from the record of history, it is that private monopoly and international cartels lead to collectivism. Where private monopolies and international cartels are created, one of two things happens: Either the monopolies, in effect, "take over" the people by bringing about the establishment of fascism, or the people "take over" the monopolies by nationalizing the basic industries. In either event, free enterprise, as we think of it here in this country, is replaced by collectivism.

As examples of the former, we all know that Mussolini came into power with the aid of the Italian industrialists; the Japanese militarists operated hand in glove with the so-called Zaibatsu, or family groups, which have long controlled practically all Japanese commerce and industry; and Hitler not only received vital aid and support from Krupp, Thyssen, and other powerful German industrialists, but in addition used their cartel connections with firms in this country to undermine our industrial strength and ability to defend ourselves.

As an example of the latter, the case of Great Britain provides the most striking illustration. In all of the attacks upon that country which are appearing too frequently in our own press, there is little, if any,

recognition of the fact that in nationalizing their basic industries, the British people were only taking over what had in effect become private monopolies. Had not private monopolies, with their international cartel connections achieved such prominence, the pleas of the socialists to "take over" the basic industries would have fallen on much less responsive ears. By voting in their Labor Party, the British people clearly indicated their feeling that if there had to be monopolies, the people should have some degree of control over them.

I would like to document with a few examples my statement that British industry had become highly concentrated before the Labor Party came into power.

In the British steel industry it was estimated that 18 large companies accounted for two-thirds of the heavy steel production. In chemicals, the great trust, the Imperial Chemicals Industries, Ltd., held a near-100 percent monopoly in explosives; a near-100 percent monopoly in dyestuffs; a near-100 percent monopoly in alkalis, and was also a leading producer of many other chemicals such as sulfuric acid, sulfate of ammonia, salt, and benzol.

In soap, Lever Bros. produces 75 percent of the British output of that product and is the dominant concern in vegetable oils—seed crushing, cattle cake, margarine, candles, etc. In matches, the British Match Corp. controls about 80 percent of the output.

In asbestos, one company, Turner & Newall, Ltd., has acquired control of practically all of the producers.

In wallpaper, the Wallpaper Manufacturers, Ltd., controls practically the entire industry. In textile machinery, Textile Machinery Makers, Ltd., is a combine resulting from the amalgamation of the six important firms making such machinery and dominates the entire field.

The record is clear that most of these and many other British monopolies have engaged in cartel activities, raised prices, limited production, and actually destroyed capacity. One organization alone, the National Shipbuilders Security, Ltd., which was organized in the thirties, destroyed more than one-fourth of Great Britain's shipbuilding capacity prior to World War II.

In the face of such overwhelming power of private monopoly, is it any wonder that the British people voted to place control of some of these monopolies in their own hands?

In this country, as the report of the Federal Trade Commission so clearly reveals, the power of private monopoly is approaching the levels which promoted fascism in Italy, Japan, and Germany, and more recently socialism in Great Britain and many other European countries. On what grounds can we in America expect to escape this historical trend?

There is an answer to this question, and that answer lies in the antitrust laws. We are unique among the nations of the world in that not only do we possess these laws, but we have made some effort—though certainly far from enough—to enforce the statutes, which have been termed the "Magna Carta of Economic Liberty." It is upon the existence of the antitrust laws that we must rely more than anything else in preventing the emergence of collectivism in this country. Antitrust enforcement has suffered greatly from inadequate appropriations and from loopholes in the law. But even so, the very existence of these laws has kept alive competition and opportunity for small business in numerous fields which otherwise would have become completely monopolized.

If, however, the antitrust laws are to become a truly effective protection against monopoly, these deficiencies in the form of inadequate appropriations and loopholes in the law must be remedied. It is with a deficiency of the latter type that I shall devote the remainder of my remarks.

On August 15, 1949, the House of Representatives took a historic step in acting to plug the most outstanding loophole in the whole structure of the antitrust laws. By the overwhelming vote of 227 to 92 the House voted to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act and to give the Federal Trade Commission power to prevent acquisitions of assets similar to the power which it already possesses in regard to acquisitions through the purchase of stock.

The background of this legislation runs somewhat as follows: After the dissolution of the Standard Oil trust and the American Tobacco trust in 1911, Congress began to consider ways and means of preventing the development or creation of monopoly. Congress felt—and rightly so—that the antitrust laws were seriously deficient if an effective action could be taken only after a monopoly had been achieved. To the Congress of those years, it seemed to make much better sense to prevent the development of monopoly in the first instance. Accordingly, Congress passed the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act in 1914, the purpose of which, in the words of the Senate Judiciary Committee report accompanying the Clayton Act, dated July 22, 1914, was:

"To prohibit and make unlawful certain trade practices which, as a rule, singly and in themselves, are not covered by the act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Act), or other existing antitrust acts, and thus by making these practices illegal, to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency and before consummation."

In section 7 of the Clayton Act, Congress provided that the Federal Trade Commission should have the power to prevent one company from acquiring the stock of another company if the effect of the acquisitions was to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In thus prohibiting acquisitions through the form of the purchase of stock, Congress was taking action against the customary and prevalent method by which mergers and acquisitions had, up to that time, taken place. Since it was much simpler to acquire control by buying stock rather than assets, nearly all acquisitions of those early years were brought about by the purchase of stock. In comparison, acquisitions which took the form of the purchase of assets were practically unknown. Around the early part of the 1920's sharp-eyed corporation lawyers began to realize that while the law was indeed a sharp instrument against stock acquisitions, it said nothing about assets. And with this discovery, the loophole which had been lurking in the law became a wide-open gap. Acquisitions through the purchase of assets thus became the means of frustrating and circumventing the original intent of Congress.

It is a loophole which degrades the standing and dignity of statutes of the United States Congress. It is difficult to conceive of a more nonsensical situation than is represented by this loophole. On the one hand if an acquiring company buys one type of paper called stock, it is subject to action under the act. On the other hand, if it makes its purchase by buying another type of paper called assets, it is immune from any action under the act. Moreover, the more aggressive is the Government's action against conspiracies and collusive activity among independent firms in restraint of trade, the greater is the incentive to accomplish the same objective by the more enduring and permanent methods of consolidation, acquisition, and merger—a route to monopoly control which this loophole makes wide-open.

Since 1927 the Federal Trade Commission has been calling upon Congress to correct this anomalous situation and to make the law apply to assets as it now applies to stock. Year after year the Commission has sent up its annual report to Congress for action, and year after year Congress has done nothing. In the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, companion bills were introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator (then Representative) KEFAUVER, designed to close this loophole in the law. In each case the bill was favorably reported out of the House Judiciary Committee but died in the Rules Committee. On the Senate side, extensive hearings were held in the Eightieth Congress by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, composed of Senators LANGER, MCCARRAN, and FERGUSON. But until August 15 of this year, no bill to close this loophole has reached the floor of either House. However, on that date, the bill was finally brought to the floor of the House of Representatives under a suspension of rules which required two-thirds vote for passage. Instead of the required two-thirds vote, the bill received an affirmative vote of 71 percent. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will see fit to equal this courageous and inspiring action of the House. It is my firm belief that if the bill comes on the floor of the Senate for debate, the Members of this body will be found to be just as vigorous in their support of effective antitrust enforcement as the Members of the other body have already demonstrated themselves to be.

I trust that in their deliberations they will give full consideration to the crucial lesson which has been so clearly written by the hand of history—the lesson which I have been trying to drive home today—the lesson that the road to monopoly is the road to collectivism which will surely destroy economic freedom and which may, depending on the form it takes, destroy political freedom as well.

Leif Erikson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the coming Sunday will be the nine hundred and forty-ninth anniversay of the discovery of America by Leif Erikson. In this connection I have been glad to prepare a statement on this anniversary. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO LEIF ERIKSON AND THE VIKING SPIRIT

Mr. President, the 9th day of this month is the nine hundred and forty-ninth anniversary of the discovery of America by that intrepid Viking seaman, Leif Erikson. It is a day filled with significance. It is significant for Americans of Scandinavian descent who can well be proud of the wonderful heritage which has been handed down to them by one of the world's earliest explorers.

It is significant for the many Scandinavian-American organizations which have done so much to keep alive and vital the memory of the great discoverer of America. And it is significant for our good Viking friends and neighbors across the Atlantic.

Few nations have contributed more to the world's knowledge of geography than the sturdy Viking folk who dwell among the beautiful fjords of the northland. How we need today the stalwart Viking spirit which sailed on into the unknown. How we need it to brave the doubts, the fears, the anxieties of the unknown future in the atomic age. How we need it particularly to inspire our school youngsters starting out on their lives.

OBSERVANCE OF LEIF ERIKSON DAY

The importance of this historic anniversary is indicated by the fact that seven of our States, including my own State of Wisconsin, and also the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, Illinois, Washington, Colorado, and California have all designated by law October 9 as Leif Erikson Day. Governors from many other States, including Governor Dewey, of New York, have proclaimed this day from year to year, although it is not inscribed in their statute books.

We here in the Senate and some of my colleagues on the House side have always sought to secure appropriate national observance of Leif Erikson Day. This first session of the Eighty-first Congress has seen the introduction of two bills, one (of which I am proud to be a cosponsor) to erect a statue of Leif Erikson on public grounds in the Nation's Capital, and the second to issue a commemorative stamp in 1950 in honor of the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Leif's discovery of America. It is my earnest hope that these bills will be enacted into law. For both Leif and his father, Eric the Red, were fearless seafarers who pioneered in the field of exploration and who wrote a thrilling page in world history several hundred years earlier than anyone else. It is these courageous Norsemen who started off the era of world exploration carried out by such other great explorers as Columbus, Magellan, Balboa, and others whom we are also proud to honor.

LEIF'S VOYAGES TO NORTH AMERICA

But regardless of the formal recognition that Leif receives, October 9 stands out as an inspiring beacon in the history of America. Everyone knows the stirring story of how in 999, Leif Erikson sailed from his home in Greenland to Norway to visit at the court of King Olaf Tryggvason. Such a journey in the icy northern waters and in sail-borne seacraft without the aid of modern instruments obviously took great courage. This trip is recognized as the first direct trans-Atlantic voyage from an American shore to the European continent. After spending the winter in the King's court, Leif set the prow of his boat back toward Greenland. But strong contrary winds would not carry him back home. Instead, he found himself on the shores of a strange land, somewhere on the northeast coast of America. Fearless, Leif camped his crew on the mainland, and took time to gather samples of the strange vegetation—wild wheat, grape, and large trees to take back home to Greenland.

Urged on by the unknown, he had left unexplored in the new land, Leif set out once again in 1000 with a crew of 35 men. He found the American shoreline and followed it from the barren north which he called Flatstone Land, to a territory he called Woodland, on down to what he named Vinland, meaning grape or meadowland. He landed in Vinland, built houses there and made explorations. A cargo of lumber, grapes, and other products was put aboard and a safe return made to Greenland. Leif died 21 years later in the year 1021.

WHERE DID LEIF LAND?

Many conjectures have been made by experts as to just where Leif landed in America. Several years ago, Dr. John R. Swanton, collaborator of the Smithsonian Institution, stated that it might possibly be at the mouth of the Merrimack River in northern Massachusetts. Dr. Swanton spent years checking the vague descriptions given by the Norse mariners against the terrain, vegetation, and other conditions as they probably existed along the North Atlantic coastline around the year 1000. The mouth of the Merrimack, he said, comes closer to fitting the description than any other point between Labrador and southern New England.

Fifty-five years ago, another expert, Eben N. Horsford, placed Leif's Vinland in the vicinity of Watertown, Mass. Mr. Horsford also spent many years analyzing the Icelandic sagas and exploring the New England and Canadian coasts for terrain that fitted the descriptions. He found at the Watertown site what appeared to be the foundation of a large fortified house of ancient Norse design.

Several other experts have put Leif's landing at other places, but none have been accepted as conclusive.

THE HERITAGE OF VIKING AMERICANS

This brief history indicates to some extent the sturdy pioneer stock, the fearless enterprise, the courage and initiative of the Scandinavian-Americans who are descendants of Leif Erikson. It helps us to understand the why and wherefore of the great contributions that Scandinavians have made to American and world culture. It is little wonder that a folk which spring from such a forbear as Leif has produced superb engineers who have built some of the finest bridges, tunnels, and buildings in America and in the world; have produced some of the finest sailors in the world who keep our merchant marine and other sea enterprises working smoothly; have produced great musicians such as Grieg, playwrights such as Ibsen, and statesmen such as Count Folke Bernadotte (Swedish).

Nicholas Murray Butler, the late president of Columbia University, knew whereof he spoke when he said, "There comes from these northern people certain sturdiness of character, simplicity, and dignity of life, an interest in contributions to music, art, literature, and to the science of the world that causes them to take a place in the van of civilization."

Thus it is with real reason that the Scandinavian-Americans take great pride in the Viking spirit with which they have been endowed. Like many of my fellow Wisconsinites, I am the son of Viking immigrants. While we glory in the varied cultures, the varied backgrounds, the varied gifts with which other American groups are endowed, naturally we take pride in our individual heritages. That is a part of the American way with its multicolored rainbow of cultures.

SCANDINAVIAN-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

I think it is appropriate at this point to offer a special note of thanks to such organizations as the Leif Erikson Memorial Association of America, the Scandinavian-American Fraternity, and other fine groups. For these organizations have played a tremendous part in not only preserving the saga of Leif Erikson by erecting suitable memorials, preparing articles, broadcasts, essay contests, and holding appropriate ceremonies, but also by encouraging Scandinavian-Americans to live up to the fine record of their forebears.

They have played a vital part in encouraging their kinsfolk here in America to cherish the Old World folk ways and at the same time, assimilate completely the New World American ways. Thanks to these fine organizations with their splendid ideals, American-Scandinavian friendship has flourished unblemished for many centuries. May American-Scandinavian friendship continue to thrive through such splendid institutions as Leif Erikson Memorial Day.

CONCLUSION

And so, Mr. President, we are glad to commemorate the Viking tradition of exploration. We honor, too, in this same process, the spirit of freedom which has always characterized the Viking lands—the love of liberty, for example, which made Norway stand up to the aggressor in 1940; the love of freedom which permitted Denmark to maintain her independence in spite of foreign occupation; the love of freedom which has permitted Finland to battle back almost every attack of the Red aggressor from without and from within; the love of freedom which has permitted Sweden to establish a middle way of cooperation which has become a model for the world.

Leif Erikson Day is no mere empty tribute to the past. It is a living, dynamic challenge of the present and the future. We are what our history has made us. We can be what we have the will to make of ourselves, drawing upon the finest traditions of the past and the present.

The Forgotten Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Forgotten Word," written by Mr. Henry B. Bryans, and published in the Union League Bulletin of Philadelphia, Pa., for October 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN WORD

The other day as I left the library and was passing the Lincoln Memorial Room, I noticed the small light burning over Lincoln's statue. I looked in. There was no one there. It was very still and quiet. Slowly I entered, and Lincoln, in the bask of light, seemed to be aware of my presence. As I looked at the various regimental colors of the GAR flanking the walls of the room, I pondered a moment. I could almost hear the faint, then the thundering, throbbing refrain of that stirring song, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." Lincoln seemed to be looking at me and a quizzical, penetrating light came over his face, and somehow I got the impression he wanted to speak. It seemed to me he said, "What has happened to this Republic of ours? Yea, what has become of the word 'Republic'? The men who carried the flags you see around this room, they and I knew the meaning of that word, but they, too, have asked, 'What has happened?' We never hear the word any more. Has it been cast into the limbo of forgotten words? Has it lost its thrilling significance to the American people of your day? Why, the men of today in their public and private lives, in the seats of Government, in the public forums and even in the conversations at their luncheon tables, rarely, if ever, refer to the word, or ever use it. Even in Lincoln Hall, named in memory of me, there is rare reference to our form of Government as a

Republic. When they speak of the American philosophy of Government, they seem to identify it as a Democracy, and refer to the dynamic, vital way of life of the American people as 'the Democratic way'.

"Words, in the course of time, may lose their true character and significance, and to different people may mean different things, and 'Democracy' is such a word. To the Russians and to the peoples of her satellite nation, and even to the peoples of our glorious ancestor, Great Britain, the word has a different meaning. In the former it means communism in operation, in the latter it means socialism. It is a word which truly reflects its basic character which is the collective thought and action, at a given time, of a majority of the people of any nation when expressed as a group or though their representatives, notwithstanding its ultimate effect upon the basic inalienable rights of the minority respecting their freedom and their rights of property.

"The men who drafted our Constitution knew the meaning of words, and they used them cautiously. Have you forgotten the meaning of words? When I hear phrase 'Democracy' as spoken by the speakers who visit this league which was born out of the throes of a great conflict for freedom when minority rights were trampled upon, I wonder if those men have forgotten that in no place in the Constitution of the United States, which is the basic law of our Government, its very charter of existence, is the word 'Democracy' used. You find only one descriptive term and that is set forth in article IV, section IV, which guarantees a republican form of government to its citizens of each State. Therefore, I exhort you, at a time when the current popular will of the majority of Americans today marches down the road with an air of abandon headlong into collective statism, to give our country's form of government its proper designation, and at least refer to our Government as to what it was, what it is, and what it must always be if freedom is to prevail—a Republic. The men who fought in my day knew what it meant and were willing to march to the glorious strains of 'The Battle Hymn of the Republic' with the same fervor as the Christians of old, and sang

" 'As He died to make men holy, let us die
to make men free,
While God is marching on'."

Such has been the experience of one of our members when he visited the Lincoln Shrine on the second floor. Have you been there recently? Have you been one of those who has forgotten the meaning of the word "Republic"? Have you thoughtlessly abandoned its use? Let us keep faith with Lincoln and be worthy of our creed, "Amor patriae ducit."

HENRY B. BRYANS, *President.*

Loyal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Loyal Employees," which appeared in the Washington Post on October 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYAL EMPLOYEES

The astonishing thing about the statistics released by the Loyalty Review Board is not that 102 persons have been dismissed from the Federal service on grounds of disloyalty, but that the number is so infinitesimal. Of more than 2,000,000 employees screened, only 10,000 have come before regional loyalty boards. This is something less than one-half of 1 percent. Some workers have been absolved, some have left the Government of their own volition, and 1,098 cases remain to be adjudicated by the top loyalty board, but the number of actual firings constitutes only .005 percent of the total Federal employment. These figures are both a testimonial to the loyalty of the overwhelming proportion of Federal workers and a rebuke to the frenetic sensationmongers who repeat the slander that the Government is infested with Communists.

The job of loyalty boards within the definitions of the President's Executive order is an indescribably delicate one. That order quite properly is directed against the undeniable security risk that does exist in the Communist spy network; but its terms of reference include not only positive acts of disloyalty but also possible acts and even sympathetic association with potentially subversive elements. Inevitably such indefinite criteria bring with them a considerable invasion of freedom of conscience and even of the right of nonconformity. It is to the credit of the loyalty boards that, with a few notorious exceptions, they have avoided both hysterical inquisitions and prefabricated decisions.

Aside from the few pending cases, most of the work of loyalty boards now will be confined to new employees. A good deal remains to be desired in the determination procedure—for example, accused employees ought to be accorded the right to see the evidence against them, and the jobs requiring investigation ought to be narrowed to those that are truly sensitive. But, in any case, the report of the loyalty board certainly indicates that it is time to end the wholly disproportionate emphasis which "disloyalty" has received.

A Sound Balanced Economy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on a program to establish a sound balanced economy in this country, delivered by Walter Harnischfeger, before the Council of State Chambers of Commerce at the annual meeting in Columbus, Ohio, September 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM TO ESTABLISH A SOUND BALANCED ECONOMY IN THIS COUNTRY

For a number of years, I have been devoting considerable time and attention to problems relating to a sound fiscal program in this country. If we are to retain a free economy, it is unquestionably one of the most important matters confronting us. The problem, however, is not much different than that of maintaining a solvent business. In the case of our Government, solvency is not only desirable, but necessary, if we are to survive as a free people.

Due to the two world wars, there has been a tremendous dislocation in the world economy, and as a result, we are rapidly and constantly moving in the direction of a planned economy. A planned economy offers temporary relief by altering the normal economic cycle, but it has its weakness, in that the greater centralization of authority brings about the ultimate inability to comprehend and control all the factors necessary to the maintenance of a balanced economy. The end result is a dictatorship.

In order that our free economy will not be stifled by dictatorships, America must assume world leadership. To accomplish this, we must reconstruct our domestic and foreign policies. These policies must be built upon a sound and logical basis, a basis that does not expose us to vulnerability from remote and undesirable influences.

In analyzing the national economy, even over so short a period as the last 25 to 30 years, I am sure that our country's leaders, in the early part of this century, were more conservative and the average citizen was satisfied with a more simple method of living. There was less class hatred and less pressure on the masses of the people by ruthless and selfish labor leaders. The advances in science and invention have brought about a change in our mode of living. We, undoubtedly, will never return to conditions as they existed 25 years ago. However, to live a more normal life and to avoid, if possible, future wars—and particularly atomic wars—it is of great importance that the gears be put back in mesh, and sound natural forces should again be allowed to function.

It is not easy to establish a balanced Federal budget with our large domestic and foreign commitments. The $255,000,000,000 debt has already mortgaged the earnings of the coming generation. While it is true that this debt can be refunded indefinitely, the fact remains that its fixed charges are with us and must be met. As money becomes more scarce, there will be a rise in interest rates and consequently, the fixed charges. First, therefore, we must prevent a further increase in the debt by avoiding additional deficit financing. This can best be done by establishing a base line—a normal business volume of, let us say, $160,000,000,000 to $200,000,000,000. This volume, to say the least, is optimistic, since it represents approximately twice the turn-over of the highest prewar peacetime year. Added consideration should be given to a certain number of recessions which, if not too severe, help to stabilize our economy, because in the leveling-out process, they tend to separate the efficient from the inefficient—the producers from the hangers-on.

On this volume of business, I believe a $25,000,000,000 Federal tax is about as high as the economy can stand, and still offer incentives necessary to the development and expansion of business. Over-all, this would mean a reduction of approximately $15,000,000,000 in our present Federal spending program.

To this $25,000,000,000 must be added State and local expenses which, at the present time, amount to $16,000,000,000. Strenuous efforts must also be made to prevent further expansion in State and local budgets.

Since we are at the present time in a business recession, I do not believe that this reduction can be accomplished at once. It is for this reason that I advocate an immediate 10-percent reduction across the board on

items which might be called "nonfixed charges." At the end of each 6 months thereafter, there should be a similar reduction, until a level of $25,000,000,000 is reached.

In order to maintain a high, or at least a normal, business turn-over during this period, and the consequent high tax revenue to the Government, business must again be permitted to operate as a free agent. Labor policies will have to be taken out of the hands of labor racketeers. Business must again be permitted to make wage agreements in line with what they can afford. Free markets must be established in labor as well as in commodities.

The farm-support program, in my opinion, should be gradually dispensed with so that farm products will again respond to natural markets. Farm surpluses should be sold abroad, and if necessary, some concessions should be granted.

Waste and inefficiency in government must be eliminated. A comparison of our national expenditures of the last prewar year with the latest fiscal period is indicative of the road to ruin we are traveling. Our Federal expenses in 1940 were $9,000,000,000; in 1950 they will be $42,000,000,000. Don't forget, every dollar that is being spent by our Government bureaucrats is one dollar less spent by the individual taxpayer who as a citizen has earned it. We must find a way to drive this point home to the average citizen. He must be aroused so that he will make his opposition felt by his Congressmen and Senators.

The technique of publicizing these facts and bringing about some effective opposition to our spenders is the most important problem to which this organization should direct its efforts.

If we are to remain solvent, consideration must be given to the fundamental relationship of revenue to expenditures.

Providing our Government will insist upon a realistic curtailment of Government expense and in order to develop a greater incentive for venture capital and expansion in private employment, I recommend the following changes in our tax structure:

1. Elimination of double taxation of dividends.

2. Acceleration in depreciation should be permitted. Within reason, each manufacturer should be allowed to establish his own rates.

3. Wartime excise taxes should be reduced by 50 percent.

4. A tax credit on earned income should be reestablished in order to provide expansion of equities among the producing segments of society.

5. Individual tax rates should not exceed a maximum of 50 percent.

6. The national debt should be retired at the rate of at least 2 percent a year, releasing funds for business expansion. To make this debt reduction possible and to offset the loss of revenue from the preceding suggestions I favor a 2 percent Federal sales tax at the manufacturer's level, except on foodstuff.

7. The adoption of the Hoover Commission reorganization program in its entirety. This would not only drastically reduce Federal expenditures but improve the operating efficiency of the Government.

In this connection may I also advocate the use of the single appropriation bill, such as recommended by Senator BYRD. With such a single appropriation bill Congress could consider the budget as a whole, and by knowing what it means in annual expenditures it could act in the light of revenue estimates.

Our largest single item of Government expense is for defense. In connection with the problems involved in our global military policy, a more realistic approach should be developed, and the assistance of the new Government of Germany be solicited so that we may in a reasonable manner establish military bases and utilize their manpower.

Insofar as Japan and the Far East are concerned, I would recommend that General MacArthur and his staff be used to carry forward a program for defense in that area.

Arms required by countries abroad should, as much as possible, be manufactured abroad, thereby utilizing their resources and manpower. Military appropriations made for other foreign governments should be deducted from our present $1,400,000,000 defense appropriation.

Our foreign policies require a very drastic overhauling. We are endeavoring to reconstruct the world through a dollar economy, rather than to develop means so that various countries can reconstruct themselves on a sound basis. The ECA program, no doubt, had certain merits during the height of the emergency, but, in my opinion, the program should be reduced at least 25 percent a year. It is not necessary that the entire program be in the form of a gift. A maximum of 25 percent of the required funds should be allocated as a gift for only the most urgent relief problems. The balance should be channeled through private banks on the basis of long-term, Government-guaranteed loans. Our entire export trade program must be realined. The gap between imports and exports is too great. We cannot continue to expand our exports without compensating with equivalent imports. Our domestic high wages and low-cost imports do not harmonize.

There are other important fundamental problems. The key to the entire European rehabilitation problem is the establishment of a peace treaty for western Germany. We should encourage the new government to develop a sound reconstruction program and help it establish the acceptability of its currency in the international market so that it may obtain its needs and sell its products on a businesslike basis.

The continuous dismantling of productive plants in Europe, which is nullifying what we are giving, should be stopped immediately. Germany should be permitted to reacquire some of her colonies so that sufficient area is available for its excess population. I believe the same procedure should be adopted for Holland and Italy, so that some of their former colonies will also be available to absorb their surplus population.

A great deal is written these days regarding the administration's point 4 on foreign investments. Our foreign-loan policy should, however, recognize the practical problems involved. It is undoubtedly desirable to stimulate interest in foreign investments; nevertheless, foreign investments will never attract venture capital unless the climate is right. Return on foreign investments must be greater than domestic, because of the greater risk entailed. Venture capital for domestic expansion is scarce. This must be unfrozen, first, by revised and sounder labor, spending, and tax policies.

To attract foreign capital, it will be necessary to eliminate the many restrictions, such as state trading, inability to transfer dividends, and strict controls through quotas and licenses. Free markets and liberal tax policies are the inducements necessary to foreign investments. Our foreign-government loaning policy should be rationalized. If the recipient country or its nationals have investments in this country, loans should be collateralized. In addition, loans should contain the stipulation that they will not be used to socialize the industry of recipients.

In this world crisis, there are only two roads we can travel—the one just related, or the road of inflation. The latter appears, superficially, to be the easier road, but the consequences are grave and will lead to higher wages, higher costs, higher Government expenses, deficit financing and debasing of currency, and ultimately, a social upheaval.

The answer to most of these problems must, of course, be determined in Washington. In order to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government, ways and means must be found to elect Senators and Representatives into office who recognize this need and will do something about it. The election in 1950 is not far off, and it behooves everyone to spend time and effort to develop an effective organization to insure success.

Purchase of Canadian Wheat by Great Britain With ECA Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Jesus said, Matthew 6: 3, 4:

> But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret Himself shall reward thee openly.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the Administration in handling the ECA program for assistance to Europe has followed the scriptural admonition to the letter. When American money is used to buy Canadian wheat for Europe, in spite of the tremendous wheat surplus that has been acquired by the Federal Government, it is clear that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

I have advocated and voted for continuing to support the price of wheat and other basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity. Opponents of this proposal have charged that 90-percent supports would be excessively costly to the Federal Treasury, but that will not be true if our wheat surplus, rather than the Canadian surplus, is sold to Europe via ECA. The decision of the State Department to use ECA funds to buy Canadian wheat will prove extremely costly to the American taxpayer and to the farm program.

Mr. President, I have pointed out these facts in a letter to the Administrator of ECA, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and I ask that my letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1949.

Hon. PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator, ECA,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Reference is made to your letter of September 22 setting forth in detail your reasons for approving the purchase of Canadian wheat by Great Britain with our money, at a time when we have a gigantic surplus of American wheat in storage in this country.

You state that this proposed Canadian-wheat deal will be in furtherance of the purposes of the ECA Act. If I understand your reasoning clearly, you feel that the restrictions and limitations of the act, and the clear intent of Congress, have no binding force at all whenever they conflict with your own judgment. In my judgment, Congress was trying to further the purposes of the act by requiring that American surpluses be purchased first. That provision was calculated by Congress to cut down the over-all cost of the program to the American taxpayer by making available surpluses which had al-

ready accumulated and been bought and paid for by the United States. For this reason, I must address two further questions to you.

First, since the British will pay Canada a base price of $2 a bushel for wheat, as compared with a price of $1.80 a bushel if purchased from America, would it not help Britain more and save them 10 percent on their wheat purchases if they bought American wheat?

Second, I am confident you do not desire the ECA program to be unnecessarily burdensome to the American taxpayer. Since the Fededal Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, has already bought and paid for several hundred bushels of American wheat, will it not cost the American taxpayer more if he has to put up the money to purchase the Canadian wheat surplus as well as the American surplus that he has already purchased?

Your reply to these questions will be deeply appreciated.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons" which appeared in the Washington Post of October 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS

The bill to liberalize displaced persons legislation, passed by the House last June and bottled up ever since then by Senator MCCARRAN'S Judiciary Subcommittee, is scheduled to come before the Senate next week. Amendment of the existing law is imperative because, as adopted by the Eightieth Congress, it is not only meanly inadequate but discriminatory on religious grounds. Thus it leaves an ugly stain upon the statute books of the United States.

It is officially estimated that 65 percent of the displaced persons are Catholics, 20 percent are Jews, 15 percent are Protestants. The law as adopted by the Eightieth Congress deliberately restricted the immigration of Catholic and Jewish DPs. For one thing, it declared refugees ineligible if they entered Germany, Austria or Italy after December 22, 1945, automatically barring 130,000 persons, 81,000 of whom were Jews fleeing the postwar Polish pogroms, and a majority of the rest Catholics. For another thing, the law gave a 40 percent absolute preference to the predominantly Protestant Baltic States. For still another, the law contained an administratively unworkable provision that 30 percent of all visas must be issued to farmers—a provision patently aimed at Jews whose confinement to European urban ghettos denied them agricultural experience.

These discriminatory devices are removed in the bill passed by the House. For those who, like Senator MCCARRAN, argue that the existing law cannot be called discriminatory because Catholics and Jews constitute a majority of the displaced persons so far admitted under it, there is a simple answer. Catholic and Jewish philanthropic agencies were naturally better prepared than Protestant groups to facilitate the immigration of displaced persons because most of those desiring admission belonged to these two faiths. As a result, Catholics and Jews came in disproportionate numbers among the earlier arrivals. But the percentage of Jewish displaced persons coming into this country has been dropping steadily and very sharply. The percentage of Catholics has been far below what it ought to be; 44 percent of those admitted as compared with 65 percent of the displaced-persons total. As time goes on, the discrimination against these two groups is certain to become even more marked.

The bill to come before the Senate, in addition to erasing discrimination, would raise the total of displaced persons to be admitted from 205,000 in 2 years to 339,000 in 3 years. There are elaborate security precautions to determine that no one shall be admitted who has ever been a Communist, Nazi, or Fascist. There need be no fear that they will promote unemployment; most of them will go into labor-shortage areas and occupations and, in any case, will add only a minor fraction of 1 percent to the American labor force; the A. F. of L., the CIO, and many independent unions have indorsed the bill.

Nor need there be any fear that the United States is doing more than its share under the International Refugee Organization's program. This country still lags far behind both Israel and England, with their much smaller resources, areas, and populations, in the number of displaced persons received. The liberation promised 5 years ago to these earliest and most pitiful victims of the Nazi terror has already been far too long withheld. It is time for the promise to be fulfilled.

Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7. (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Olds' Views," by Marquis Childs, appearing in the Washington Post for today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
MR. OLDS' VIEWS

The Senate committee that has rejected with righteous indignation the nomination of Leland Olds to a new term on the Federal Power Commission has put itself in a ludicrous position. It is more than 10 years too late with this noble indignation.

If Olds was all the things the committee found him to be, then he never should have been named to the Commission at all. Yet, he was not only appointed—and confirmed by the Senate—to a full term, but he was reappointed and confirmed a second time.

The material that Olds wrote for the Federated Press was available 10 years ago and 5 years ago. It was all there in the record and the words that Olds wrote meant then just what they mean today.

Nor has Olds himself changed during those 10 years. He is just as firm a believer in the regulation of public utilities in behalf of the consuming public. That is the real issue in the case—whether utilities shall be regulated in such a way that the companies make a fair and even a generous profit as they have during Olds' term as a Commissioner, while at the same time the consuming public pays a reasonable rate for gas and electricity.

In some of his writing for the Federated Press 20 years and more ago Olds expressed radical opinions. In the light of events that have happened since, what he said then may sound wrong and foolish. But many men have said things that were foolish, things they lived to regret later.

While it is true that Olds was not young when he wrote the articles that the committee professes to be so shocked by, they were written in quite another climate of opinion when doubts about capitalism were widespread because of the excesses of the boom of the twenties. That bubble burst in the crash of 1929 and there was more doubt and disillusion.

In the past decade the belief has grown that by regulation and a minimum of control exercised by Government, the excesses can be prevented and the free-enterprise system preserved in virtually its entirety. At the same time the danger of creeping controls of a gradual encroachment of bureaucracy is real, and it is necessary to be alert against it.

But the kind of regulation that Olds stands for and the kind of controls represented by the power commission cannot be considered a new or threatening encroachment. The committee that rejected Olds didn't even pretend to say so. They evaded the whole issue by raising their hands in pious horror at words Olds had written long before he was first appointed.

A. A. Berle, Jr., who has proved himself over and over to be a determined and consistent anti-Communist, put it very well when he testified in Olds' behalf. Berle said that if there weren't men like Olds to do the regulating job, then we should have to invent them in order to protect the enterprise system from its own excesses. Another effective witness for Olds was Morris L. Cooke, the engineer who left a lucrative private business to initiate the Rural Electrification Administration.

Quite apart from the words spoken by Olds, by his accusers and his defenders were the looming economic realities. The powerful forces and the clever men who worked behind the scenes to block Olds' confirmation were aiming higher. They were aiming at passage of the bill that takes the production of natural gas out from under Federal regulation, a bill Olds has consistently opposed. That means that the little group of men who control the production of natural gas, among them Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, can charge what the tariff will bear.

That explains why officials from several large cities came to testify for Olds. They know that the millions of consumers now dependent on natural gas—a large proportion using it to heat their homes—will be charged much higher rates. If the group that blocked Olds can put across the next step and pass Senator KERR'S bill to take gas production out from under regulation, then the householder will very quickly discover that something has happened to his gas bill.

Still another powerful economic force was at work. That force has a broader political base than the natural gas group. The coal producers, and this includes John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers, would like to see a sizable rise in the price of natural gas, which competes with coal and in instance after instance has replaced coal. So that force was also behind the pious words.

In our complicated society cause and effect are often so far removed that we fail to see the connection. When the householder notes, a year or so from now, that the figures on his gas bill have jumped up, he may not even remember the action taken by a Senate committee that for a brief day or so made the headlines.

Forced Migration the Greatest Crime of This Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Josef Totzauer, president, American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia and Other European Countries, regarding the expellee problem as it affects people from Czechoslovakia. The situation to which he calls attention is to be deplored, and right-thinking citizens of the United States should do something about it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the letter from Mr. Totzauer:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1949.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Five years have come to pass since the Yalta understanding initiated the greatest crime in history, the expelling of 15,000,000 people from their native homelands. With the signatures by the heads of Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, the Potsdam agreements became the shield by which revengeful governments could cover their inhuman actions against a helpless civilian population. The German race and German mother tongue of the victims was the only justification of their acts. Their object, as we know now, was loot and malice.

HISTORY'S GREATEST CRIME

Bishop Aloisius Muench, of Fargo, N. Dak., writes: "The forced migration of millions of people is the greatest crime of this age."

A distinguished journalist, Anne O'Hare McCormick, similarly stated on November 13, 1946, in the New York Times: "If Allied statesmen had imagined how heavily this wandering mass of helpless people would beat upon themselves they couldn't have assumed so casually the moral and historic responsibility for the most inhuman decision ever made by governments dedicated to the defense of human rights."

Senator WILLIAM LANGER in a speech in the Senate of the United States, April 5, 1949, made the following remarks on the inhuman mass deportations: "One of the greatest crimes against humanity in all of history, a crime to which we have directly been made a party."

As Senator LANGER said: "It is unbelievable that American representatives should have continued to be parties to these forced mass migrations which incriminate the whole American people as accomplices in mass crimes against humanity. Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already from fifteen to twenty million people have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell, to perish, or to be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed, even by the Nazis themselves. Yet we are now committed to a continuation of these same inhuman policies in the future, although the conscience of the American people cries out against such bestial practices."

DEPORTATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NUREMBERG INDICTMENTS

At this point, it is well to remind ourselves of the charge against the Nazis, entered into the Nuremberg indictments. Count 3, section J, reads: "In certain occupied territories, purportedly annexed to Germany, the defendants methodically and pursuant to plan, endeavored to assimilate these territories, politically, culturally, socially, and economically, into the German Reich, and the defendants endeavored to obliterate the former national character of these territories. In pursuance of these plans and endeavors, the defendants forcibly deported inhabitants who were predominantly non-German and introduced thousands of German colonists."

"NO OBJECTION" TO EXPULSION (ROOSEVELT)

Again referring to war crimes, Mr. LANGER continues: "As far back as November 17, 1944, Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nuremberg tribunal, when, in a letter to Mr. Mikolajczyk, he stated, 'If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from territories of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection, and as far as practicable, will facilitate such transfer.' "

TOTAL EXPULSION PROPOSED BY CHURCHILL

Churchill, who now sees otherwise, asserted a few weeks later in the House of Commons, on December 15, 1944: "The transference of several millions of people would have to be effected from the east to the west or north, as well as the expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south. For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be most satisfactory and lasting. I am not alarmed by the large transferences, which are more possible in modern conditions than ever before."

Thus, these once great statesmen played with the lives of innocent and helpless human beings. Not only Anne O'Hare McCormick, Senator Langer, and Bishop Muench were shocked by the cold-bloodedness of those who held the lives of millions in their hands. There were few Americans who did not, when informed, express deep resentment and concern. Mr. Bevin, who had at Potsdam witnessed the signing of the treaty and at Berlin seen with his own eyes the consequent arrival of the tortured, starved expellees from the east, exclaimed: "My God, it is the worst sight one possibly could see."

Accusingly adds Senator LANGER: "Mr. President, of those 15,000,000 persons 5,000,000 are dead." (It would not be exaggerated to add another million or two slave workers to the total.) "Yet, according to the directives of April 28, 1947, we formally agreed to underwrite more inhuman brutality, misery, and death. Mr. President, is it not time that this administration should give an accounting of its policies, and answer to this further charge of betraying American principles?"

ONLY CONGRESS CAN RIGHT THE WRONG

The American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia, speaking for many thousand Americans of Sudeten-German origin throughout our land, requests you to define your position on the unratified Potsdam and Yalta agreements by which the expulsions of 15,000,000 victims of hate have been effected. It is definitely against American tradition to participate in genocidal policies and at the same time pretend to be democratic by condemning others guilty of the same criminal action. As taxpayers, we beg you to raise your voice in Congress against further abandoning of these innocent victims to their fate. Let it be our duty as Americans to amend the wrong we have helped to inflict upon the guiltless, either by opening our doors to them or making the return to their homeland a future possibility.

As righteous citizens of our democratic America, we beg, hope, and believe that our representatives in Washington will make the fight to redress this crime against humanity an ever-present purpose, not only in well-expressed phrase but in effectual deeds.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH TOTZAUER,
President, American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia and Other European Countries.

Information for Veterans and Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an article from the National Defense Magazine, Arcadia, Calif., published by our former colleague, Congressman Hoeppel. In and out of Congress, Mr. Hoeppel has fought the battle for the veterans. The article is instructive and gives valuable information to veterans and their dependents in connection with veterans legislation. Here is the article:

DISABILITY, DEATH AND AFTER-DEATH PROBLEMS OF VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS

HOW TO SECURE HOSPITALIZATION

Entitlements to benefits

All war veterans (retired or not retired) and all who are in receipt of pension from the Veterans' Administration for peacetime disabilities are entitled to free hospitalization or domiciliary care in any Veterans' Administration hospital or soldiers' home. All within this category who are receiving compensation from the Veterans' Administration for war or peacetime disabilities are given preferred status in admission to these facilities.

Individuals who desire hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration hospital should obtain a veterans' form (P–10) from the nearest veteran facility and make application for admission for required medical treatment.

Because of a large waiting list and the further fact that the recognized disabled are given preference, the ordinary war veteran oftentimes is required to wait months before he will be admitted for medical treatment.

Do this in emergency

If and where a war veteran (this includes retired personnel) or a peacetime pensioner becomes suddenly ill or injured where their life appears to be in jeopardy, they can be admitted immediately to Veterans' Administration hospitals. In instances such as this the attending physician should call the Out-Patient Department of the veterans' hospital where it is desired to have the patient admitted and where the distance is not too great, the hospital authorities will send an ambulance to bring the suddenly sick or injured veteran to the hospital for treatment. We have personally known ambulances to travel almost 40 miles from the hospital to pick up an emergency case.

All individuals are treated free in Veterans' Administration facilities. Where the

individual is married no deduction is made from the retired pay, compensation, or pension of the patient. Where the patient is without dependents, while he is a patient he is only paid $30 per month of the benefits to which he is entitled. The residue is retained for his credit at the respective hospital. If and when he vacates the hospital these funds are turned over to him.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS FOR THE RETIRED

Retired personnel of the armed services are entitled to hospitalization in hospitals of their respective branch of service. In addition Army personnel are entitled to hospitalization in a Navy hospital and Navy and Marine Corps men are entitled to hospitalization in any Army hospital. Navy enlisted men are treated free in Navy hospitals, but they must pay for their maintenance if they enter any Army hospital. Army men must pay when they enter an Army hospital, and they likewise must pay when they enter a Navy hospital.

Dependents of retired personnel are also entitled to treatment (if beds are available) in the respective hospital of the husband's branch of service. Dependents are also required to pay for their maintenance while hospitalized.

Retired personnel of the armed services have very little difficulty in obtaining almost instantaneous admission for treatment in a hospital of their respective branch of service. It is, therefore, suggested that in all instances where distances are not too great, retired personnel seek admission for hospitalization in the nearest general Army or Navy hospital to their homes. After they have been admitted they should then request the Veterans' Administration representative at the hosiptal to take them up as war veterans. If and when this is done, retired personnel are then hospitalized free in an Army or Navy hospital the same as any short service war veteran. Every armed service general hospital has contracts to provide hospitalization for a stipulated number of war veterans. Hence, there is nothing to prevent the Veterans' Administration representative from taking up a retired officer or man (with war service) as a Veterans' Administration patient, thus saving the patient from paying for his maintenance.

Bear this in mind

The ordinary post, station, or detachment, Army, Air Force, or Navy hospital is not equipped to provide hospitalization for the retired personnel. Hence, except in some rare instances these authorities invariably refuse to provide hospitalization for the retired.

In emergencies, however, if your attending civil physician recommends it, we are of the opinion that the commanding officer of the nearest port or station hospital will send an ambulance if the distance is not too great, to transport to the hospital any retired officer or man whose condition is dangerously critical.

However, in instances such as this we ourselves would prefer and recommend hospitalization in the nearest civil hospital.

If death occurs

If and where any individual in the above category dies in a veterans' hospital, interment may be held in the adjacent veterans' cemetery. All expense connected with interment is paid by the Veterans' Administration. Where it is requested that interment take place in any national cemetery in the United States (including Arlington) the Veterans' Administration will defray the expense of transporting the remains to the respective cemetery and will defray the entire cost of interment as well.

Where an individual dies in a veterans' hospital and interment is desired in a private cemetery anywhere in the United States, the Veterans' Administration will also transport the remains to the selected private cemetery without cost. In addition, they will allow $150 for burial expense payable to the undertaker or to the individual who takes charge of the burial. Application for this $150 must be made within 2 years of the death of the veteran. In all instances where the veteran is interred in a Veterans' Administration cemetery or in a national cemetery, a suitable grave marker will be automatically supplied by the Quartermaster General.

Where interment is held in a private cemetery the Quartermaster General of the Army will furnish the authorized grave marker or headstone on requisition f. o. b. the point of delivery. The cost of moving the headstone and erecting it at the cemetery must be borne by those who requested this service. The undertaker in charge of burial will obtain a flag from the postmaster or veterans' facility, which flag is given free to the next of kin after the burial ceremony.

WHERE DEATH OCCURS IN HOMES OR CIVIL HOSPITALS

Ordinarily where a war veteran does not die in a veterans' facility, interment is not authorized in a veterans' cemetery. We have, however, known of individuals who have died in hotels who were thus interred, but it is not the practice of the Veterans' Administration to authorize burial in veterans' hospital cemeteries unless the veteran dies in a veterans' facility.

National cemeteries

All individuals in the above category are authorized burial in any national cemetery. If and where the survivors of a veteran desires that interment take place in a national cemetery, they should furnish the undertaker with a copy of the war discharge of the deceased veteran. Or, if retired, they should furnish the undertaker with a photostatic or certified copy of the order of retirement. The undertaker will telephone or telegraph to the custodian of the national cemetery where interment is desired and arrange for the interment.

Where the deceased is survived by a wife, application should immediately thereafter be made in writing (and it may well be included in the undertaker's request) to reserve a grave beside the decedent for the surviving wife. In such instances where the wife precedes a veteran encompassed in the above category, the undertaker should make arrangements for the interment of the wife of the veteran and the veteran, at the same time, should make application for a grave reservation for himself beside that of his wife.

Unless reservation for a grave beside the deceased is made by the survivor the only alternative then would be for the survivor to later be interred in the same grave with the first deceased.

In all instances where burial is had in a national cemetery from the home or civil hospital the transportation of the remains must be borne by the survivor. All facilities at the national cemetery are free. The undertaker or individual in charge of the burial, in instances such as this, will be paid $150 burial expense. Here again the regular grave marker for veterans will be automatically erected over the grave of the veteran by the cemetery authorities.

WHERE THE DECEASED CARRIED GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

In all instances where the deceased veteran carried Government insurance we suggest that the beneficiary write to their Congressman asking him to furnish you with the necessary blank form to apply for the Government insurance which is due you. State whether the insurance carried by the decedent is World War I or a World War II policy. Upon receipt of the blank form from your Congressman fill it out and return it to him by registered mail, asking that he obtain for you early payment of the insurance due you. We suggest applying through your Congressman because of the inordinate delays so many beneficiaries experience when they apply individually. Applications submitted through your Congressman are given preferred status and are, in nearly every instance, paid more promptly.

As a precaution, we suggest that all veterans holding Government insurance check over the insurance policy to ascertain whether or not the beneficiary named is the actual party to whom you now wish the insurance money to be paid. This applies especially to veterans of World War II whose married status may have changed and who, as a consequence, would wish to be sure that their insurance is paid to the wife or to the children. The Veterans' Administration has no other recourse except to pay the insurance to the designated beneficiary.

We suggest, as a precaution, that your government insurance be not paid in one lump sum to your beneficiary, especially where there are children. In such instances we suggest that it be spread out for payment over a period of from three or more years, or until the youngest child is more or less able to provide for itself. If your policy now reads for lump payment, we suggest you take this question up with a view to providing more definitely over the years for your loved ones.

Any insurance or any other monies received from the Veterans' Administration is not considered as income for tax purposes under existing income tax laws.

Civil insurance

Because of income restrictions which exist today against widows and dependents of certain veterans of World War I and World War II, we suggest that you check any civil insurance policy or policies which you may have. In all such instances take it up with the company to provide that the face value of the policy or policies be paid to you over a protracted period of time so that in no event will the total annual insurance benefit be in excess of $1,000; if the beneficiary is without children, or $2,500 per annum if there are children.

This is precautionary inasmuch as your widow and children will be denied a pension for an entire year if, in the preceding year, because of a large civil insurance payment, they were required to pay an income tax.

Another possible safeguard

Where veterans do not carry insurance, or where they are unable to obtain insurance because of their physical handicap, all such individuals should at least take out burial insurance so as to protect the widow this much in the hard and dark days which follow the loss of a loved one. In addition, especially for war veterans whose dependents are not entitled to hospitalization in an Army or Navy hospital, we feel that hospital insurance may also well be taken out to provide this security in the event the wife or children require hospitalization. Here in southern California we have one such medical organization where at a cost of $4 monthly free and reduced medical attention, and free and reduced hospital care is given to husband, wife and children on one (family) membership.

WAR WIDOWS' PENSIONS

Under existing law all widows of war veterals (who married within prescribed dates) are entitled to pension of from $42 to $75 per month depending upon the service and cause of the death of the veteran, etc.

The only widows of war veterans who are not entitled to pension under existing laws are the widows of World War II veterans

whose death was not due to service and who, at the time of death did not have any recognized war service-connected disability.

Pensions are as follows:

Widows of veterans of any war where the veteran died in war or after war as the result of service-connected disability, are granted $75 per month and a liberal additional provision for children. All widows of World War I veterans who married the veteran before December 15, 1944, are entitled to $42 per month pension regardless of the cause of death of the veteran. In this instance there is also an additional allowance for children.

All widows of World War II veterans' regardless of the cause of death, but who at the time of death had some recognized war-service-connected disability, are also entitled to $42 per month pension plus the same allowance for children; as for widows of World War I veterans. The widows of World War I and World War II in the two latter categories are not entitled to a pension for themselves or their children where the widow, if alone, has an income of $1,000 per annum or if with children she has an income in excess of $2,500 per annum.

Legislation is now pending in Congress to increase these restrictive amounts to $1,500 and $3,000, respectively.

If and where any widow of a World War I or World War II veteran remarries she loses all right to pension on account of her deceased veteran husband. If and where there are children, her remarriage does not prevent the children from receiving the regular pensions provided for children of a veteran where there is no wife. In other words, by remarriage, any of these three categories of widows forever lose all right for pension as a war widow unless her second husband may also be a war veteran, in which case she would again be eligible for pension, depending upon the veteran status of her husband, and date of marriage.

Spanish War widows

All widows of Spanish War veterans who married before January 1, 1938, are entitled to $48 per month pension without income restrictions of any kind. Likewise all widows of Spanish War veterans who married after this restrictive date are entitled to pension at the age of 60 provided they have lived with their veteran husband a period of 10 years. Spanish War widows who remarry in the event of subsequent death or divorce of the second spouse, are permitted to refer back to and to claim and receive pension on account of the service of their Spanish War veteran husband. In other words, remarriage does not forever annul a Spanish War widow's right to again revive the pension she forfeited on remarriage.

UNPAID VETERANS' RETIRED PAY, COMPENSATION, OR PENSION

Where the veteran was in receipt of pension or compensation the check received after the passing of a veteran should be turned over to the postmaster, marking thereon the date of the death of the veteran. Application then should be made to the nearest veterans' facility requesting Form 8-614, on which the widow or dependent should make application for the unpaid compensation or pension due the veteran at the time of his demise. This form should then be returned to the office from which it was received.

Unpaid retired pay

A retired pay check received after the death of a retired individual should be returned to the postmaster, marking thereon the date of death of the individual. The widow, or other dependent, should then write to the disbursing paymaster of the respective branch of service of the deceased and request a blank form on which to apply for the unpaid retired pay due. This form when filled out, should then be returned to the office from which it was received.

Unpaid widow's compensation or pension

Compensation or pension checks received after the death of a widow should also be returned to the Postmaster, giving the date of death of the widow. The person who bore the expense of the last sickness and burial of the widow should then obtain Form 601 from the Veterans' Administration and make application for the unpaid compensation or pension due the widow at time of death, which amount will be paid to such applicant to defray the expense of the last sickness, burial, etc.

In the above three instances of retired pay, veterans' and widows' compensation or pension, payment on these claims is made through the General Accounting Office and from 2 to 4 months are usually required in each instance before settlement is made of these respective claims.

Finally

Every retired officer and man and every veteran, especially the aged, in their leisure moments (for the benefit of his widow and dependents) should prepare a statement outlining all pertinent steps to be taken in case of death, such as where he wishes to be buried, and other items of a delicate nature, which individuals, only too frequently, are reluctant to discuss with one another while alive.

A prepared statement such as this will, indeed, make it easy for the widow in her sorrow and distress, if she can be guided by the written word as to the recommendations, wishes, and desires of the deceased. A similar statement may well be prepared concerning property, personal effects, pending claims, if any, and other matters which may be of a financial interest to the survivor who, without question, will appreciate a helpful statement such as this—when sorrow is at its height.

The Roman Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and thought-provoking address entitled "The Roman Road to Ruin," delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of West Orange, N. J., before the Kiwanis Club of Washington, D. C., on October 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROMAN ROAD TO RUIN

Many years ago Lenin, the chief architect of communism, said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself to destruction." The way we have squandered our wealth and pyramided our debt during the last 20 years must have gladdened the hearts of Communists everywhere.

"You cannot keep out of trouble," said Abraham Lincoln, "by spending more than you earn." That is exactly what our Government has done in the last 20 years—spent more than it took in.

While candidate for the Presidency in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt emphasized the importance of economy in Government when he said: "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger."

Indeed, we must. Perhaps that was the thought that prompted the leaders of the Democratic Party to insert the following plank in their 1932 platform: We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction in governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a savings of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

That platform, in my opinion, was one of the greatest documents ever submitted to the people of this Republic. Had it been faithfully followed, we would not today be faced with an unmanageable debt, an unbalanced budget, and confiscatory taxes.

The Federal debt in 1932, which Candidate Roosevelt asserted was dangerously high, amounted to less than $20,000,000,000, and the annual cost of Government, which he promised to reduce by 25 percent, was a little over $5,000,000,000—less than the cost to service the national debt today. Five years later the Federal debt had risen 82½ percent to approximately $36,500,000,000 and the annual cost of Government had increased to more than $8,000,000,000, or 60 percent.

President Roosevelt said: "Such an addition to the national debt * * * need not give concern to any citizens, for it will return to the people of the United States many times in increased buying power and eventually in greater tax receipts."

Has your debt increased your buying power? Our Government's debt is a lien on the pay check of every citizen of the land. This debt is the people's debt and must either be paid by the people or repudiated. Have you ever tried to buy a house or an automobile with a tax receipt?

A few years later, when the Federal debt reached $45,000,000,000, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau said he did not think the economy of the Nation could stand a debt greater than $55,000,000,000. President Roosevelt said: "Our national debt, after all, is an internal debt owed not only by the Nation but to the Nation. If our children have to pay interest on it they will pay that interest to themselves."

You will note that he made no reference to paying the debt and his reference to paying interest to ourselves seems to oversimplify the problem. The interest on our national debt today is greater than the total cost of Government in 1932.

How can President Roosevelt's about-face on cost of Government and debt be reconciled with his policy of economy and debt reduction during the first 4 months of his first administration? Here, I think, is the answer to that question: He embraced the philosophy of the late Lord John Maynard Keynes, British economist, who visited the United States in 1933 and, according to the British press, Keynes' ideas captivated President Roosevelt. Those who are in a position to know, say that Roosevelt's about-face in matters of debt and economy stemmed from this captivation. Since that time Keynes' philosophy of compensatory spending—the essence of which seems to be that the more you spend, the more you have—has been practiced by our Government and it has infiltrated the States and municipalities of our Nation.

It has been followed by our Government as a justification for inflated debt, unbalanced budget, and general extravagance.

Keynes' philosophy of compensatory spending has about bankrupt Britain. The same kind of philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire. Keynes' philosophy is advocated by the Communists for our destruction.

Much is said today about Britain's dollar shortage, but very little is said about the

cause of that shortage. Britain's dollar shortage is caused by inefficient management, confiscatory taxes, and the chloroforming of incentives by the Socialist government.

We, too, have a dollar shortage. Our budget has been balanced but once in 20 years and then by accident. The Government's income was larger than the politicians thought it would be so they didn't have an opportunity to continue the deficit in 1947. Our dollar shortage is the result of our spending more than we can afford.

Rome was ruined by extravagance, Britain is being ruined by extravagance, and if we continue to follow her lead, we will meet the same fate.

Rome fell because her rulers gained and retained power through false promises and the use of taxpayers' money with which to corrupt the electorate, a procedure not different in principle from that of our British brethren and our American politicians.

Those Americans who are today clamoring for more aid to Britain and other nations at the expense of the sorely pressed American taxpayer, might well give thought to the fact that since World War I our Government aided Britain to the tune of approximately $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we have aided Britain and other nations by grants amounting to $33,000,000,000. We have kept socialism alive in Britain which would have died on the vine long ago without our subsidy, and in some instances those grants have helped the Communists. For example, since World War II we have aided Communist Russia through lend-lease and other grants to the tune of over $440,000,000, and to her satellite Poland we have given over $480,000,000 and are today buying rye from her, a grain of which we have a great surplus in this country.

I know that this aid to Russia and Poland amounting to more than $900,000,000 since World War II is hard to believe but I would have you understand that the United States Department of Commerce and Senator HARRY F. BYRD are my authority for this statement. We are, therefore, fighting communism on the fringe and wooing it at the core.

Socialism and communism, whatever their differences, agree on these points: they hate and despise free enterprise and our capitalistic form of government, of which they are often the beneficiaries.

We are told that Britain and other nations will go Communist if we don't keep open the doors of our Treasury to them. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree and not of principle. Socialism is often the intermediate step between capitalism and communism. The difference between socialism or communism and capitalism is one of principle and it is that principle of government which we in America must restore and defend if we are to remain a free and prosperous people.

If we continue our extravagance, if we continue to live beyond our income, and if we continue our loose fiscal policy, our living standard will drop to that of Britain and other Socialist countries. This may force us to adopt communism through the back door. That is the fervent hope of the Communists everywhere.

Our free-enterprise system is strong, efficient, and effective, but it cannot provide 140,000,000 Americans with a high living standard and at the same time continue to subsidize hundreds of millions of others in idleness throughout the world.

"Our socialist spendthrifts and muddlers," said Winston Churchill, "* * * extracted from our people a higher rate of taxation than was required in the very height of the war. Never before in the history of human government," concluded Britain's great wartime premier, "has such great havoc been wrought by such small men."

Much of Churchill's statement, I think, is applicable to many of our political leaders. We were greatly alarmed 10 years ago when the cost of Federal Government reached $10,000,000,000 a year. Four years following World War II—this fiscal year—our Federal Government plans to spend $46,500,000,000. That astronomical figure is $8,500,000,000 more than the total income of the Nation 18 years ago.

In order to understand this enormous increase in the cost of our Government, let me make a few comparisons:

During President Roosevelt's three terms, the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000 including most of the military cost of World War II, and F. D. R., as you recall, was no miser in spending public funds. In the four postwar years of Truman's administration, the average yearly spending jumped $14,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000—an increase of almost 50 percent.

The Truman administration collected an average of $42,000,000,000 per year in taxes or three times the average collected by Roosevelt. Yet, present indications are that the Federal deficit for the year ending June 30, 1950 will be around $7,000,000,000. That deficit will exceed by $2,000,000,000 the cost of Government in 1932.

It is clear from the foregoing that Truman, like his immediate predecessor and his Socialist-minded British brethren, has embraced the Keynes philosophy of compensatory spending and not unlike former President Roosevelt, he seems to look upon a mounting debt as an asset. "We owe it to ourselves" is perhaps his philosophy too.

During the last 18 years a Roman holiday has been declared by and for our spendthrift and muddling politicians. Governmental extravagance has been the order of the day. The national debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $255,000,000,000—an increase of 1,175 percent. The cost of Government has increased from $5,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000, or 800 percent.

In offering the welfare state Truman is following the precepts of the British Socialist leaders.

He is following Keynes' philosophy of compensatory spending. He is following the philosophy advocated by the Communists for our destruction. He is following the Roman road to ruin.

"The 'welfare state' is the greatest invention of the twentieth century," said one of the New Deal members of the Supreme Court. If this member of the highest court in the land were steeped in the history of ancient Rome he would never have made that statement. The "welfare state" is neither new nor is it great. It destroyed the liberty, the security, and the power of the once glorious Roman Empire and is certainly destroying Britain today and if we continue to follow the philosophy of the "welfare state" it will destroy America.

We are being promised cheaper homes for which we will pay in taxes. The farmer is being promised higher prices for his produce and the consumer is being promised lower prices but both will pay the difference in taxes. We are being promised free medical care for which we will pay more taxes and get less. We are being promised more security for which we will pay more taxes. That is what the advocates of the "welfare state" never tell the people—that the people will pay for it and at the same time lose their liberty.

Government cannot give the people anything without first taking it from them. Government can only give our people economic security by first taking away economic liberty.

The "welfare state" is a malignant growth on our body politic. Once this cancerous cell reaches the blood stream of this Republic, our form of Government will die.

How long will it take the American people to learn the lesson of the collapse of the Roman Empire and understand why Britain is today tottering?

If America falls, it will be from extravagance and internal decay. We see both all around us. America will not follow the Roman road to ruin if we and millions of others like us discharge our duty as citizens.

"Duty," said Robert E. Lee, "is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot. "You cannot do more, you should never wish to do less."

We can do our duty as good citizens by emulating Paul Revere.

We can do our duty by lifting our voices above the self-serving, conniving politicians.

A Defense of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, September 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOBBY TARGET

Leland Olds, nominated by the President to serve another term as member of the Federal Power Commission, is in danger of being rejected by the Senate because he has had the temerity to oppose the powerful natural gas lobby. He was known to be an opponent of the Moore-Rizley bill, which passed the House but died in the Senate during the Eightieth Congress. He testified vigorously before the House and Senate Interstate Commerce Committees in opposition to the similar bills before the present Congress. These bills would amend the National Gas Act of 1938 in such a way as to remove from regulation of the Federal Power Commission all the independent producers of natural gas—about three-fourths of the industry. The effect would be to deprive consumers of the protection afforded by Federal rate fixing and make them the victims of a price gouge by an already profitable industry.

Mr. Olds has had nearly two decades of experience in utility regulation. He served the New York State Power Authority from 1931 to 1939, when President Roosevelt named him to the Federal Power Commission. On that body, where he has completed two 5-year terms, he has been vigilant in squeezing the water out of utility accounts and vigorous in pressing for gas- and electric-rate reductions. Testifying in his behalf on Tuesday, Ordway Tead, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education, observed that "if, as some allege, there is a disposition to have men serving on this Commission whose first loyalty is to some lesser private interest, then Mr. Olds is not your man. He has served and will serve one interest only—that of all the plain people of America."

It is clear that there is a disposition, at least among the utility lobbyists, to have men on the Commission whose loyalty is to private interest. This disposition was evident in the opposition to Mr. Buchanan's confirmation as a Commissioner as well as in the opposition to Mr. Olds. It was evident

in Representative LYLE'S despicable and preposterous attempt to smear Mr. Olds as a Red because he worked and wrote for labor unions 20 years ago. The Senate can best demonstrate its own devotion to the public interest by confirming Mr. Olds at once.

Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "FPC Appointment," appearing in the El Paso Herald-Post for October 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FPC APPOINTMENT

The utilities, particularly the natural gas interests, are staging a knock-down fight in Washington to prevent Senate confirmation of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission. He has served one term.

The gas interests and their brothers-in-law, the electric utilities, don't like Commissioner Olds because he's the people's man. They want a man of their own. They would make the FPC a creature of the utilities as the Interstate Commerce Commission has been made a creature of the railroads.

Mr. Olds got in bad with gas last year when he reported on the Commission's Nation-wide gas investigation.

He said that if the gas reserves of Texas and other Southwestern States were tied up to supply the industrial areas of the remainder of the Nation, the effect would be to—

(1) Take away raw materials from which literally thousands of materials and products can be processed;

(2) Cause fuels and electric rates to skyrocket;

(3) Put an end to the hope of industrialization;

(4) Consign such States to a permanent raw material status;

(5) Doom the people of the have-not States to continued low purchasing power and poor living standards (Texas ranks 33 among the States in per capita income, New Mexico 38);

(6) Make it impossible to absorb into industrial activities within the State the surplus farm population created by mechanization; and

(7) Create unwise and unnecessary migration.

Commissioner Olds' report containing the above findings was 323 pages, but his text was in this one paragraph:

"We are dealing here with an important factor, not only in the ambition of the Southwest to build up industrially, but also in the national interest in industrial decentralization through the widest possible dispersion of manufacture and population. To achieve these allied objectives, policies must be promoted which will bring about the development of manufacture in areas heretofore predominantly raw material producers. Such policies will include the conservation of the exhaustible natural-gas resources of the Southwest, because the reserve would hamstring industrial development in that region while encouraging further centralization of industry in the great coal-producing region of the northeastern industrial belt."

Coming to the aid of the natural-gas industry and its cheering section, the electric power boys, are a number of Texas Congressmen, including K. M. REGAN, of the El Paso district, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

They have advanced no sound argument against Mr. Olds. They have turned to shedding tears for "the poor farmer" who, they claim, can't get full price for his gas if Mr. Olds stays on the Commission and the successor to the Rizley bill, defeated last session, is not passed.

Utilities act strangely when possible regulation of their rates comes up. An honest reflection on the record would show them that regulation—Federal, State, and municipal—has through the years meant sounder and more profitable business for them. They have been taught that low prices and high quality mean increased profit and increased good will. El Paso Natural Gas Co., for example, had its rates cut $500,000. Among the beneficiaries were the citizens of El Paso. A greater beneficiary was the company itself, which went ahead at the lower rates and sold more and more gas to its old and new customers. An expertly managed outfit, we doubt if it would raise rates if it could. But there are many that can't see beyond the price per thousand cubic feet.

Mr. Olds is one of five Commissioners. He does not control the FPC, but he does speak up for Juan Smith.

We hope the Senate confirms him.

Letter From Mayor D'Alesandro to Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in these times when there is so much confusion of mind among our citizens as to the point of demarcation between freedom of speech and subversive activity, it would seem appropriate to bring to the attention of the Senate a very splendid letter by the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore and a former outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, dealing with this very vital matter.

Mayor D'Alesandro's letter was in response to an invitation by Paul Robeson to join the national nonpartisan committee to defend the rights of the 12 Communist leaders. His reply is such a splendid exposition of the dangers of communism and expressed so truly the feelings of millions of Americans in the matter, that I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1949.

Mr. PAUL ROBESON,
National Nonpartisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am replying to your circular letter of September 22, not because I deem a reply worthy of the importance of your communication, but solely in the hope that it will prevent some misguided person or persons from being fooled by the sugar-coated information contained therein.

Treason is a crime in practically every country on the face of the earth. In Russia, as you know, or should know, any one suspected of treason against communism is not even given the benefit of a trial, as we know legal justice in America, but promptly shot or banished to Siberia.

You insult democracy when you mention communism in the same breath with our democratic form of government, because the two have absolutely nothing in common.

Here, under our democratic form of government, you, yourself, have earned fame and fortune under our right of free enterprise. You have the right of free speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom to choose those who represent you in city, State, and National Government, under the orderly processes of the ballot.

Are these things possible in Russia or in those countries behind the iron curtain? You, who have visited Russia, know they are not. What, then, do you have to offer in place of our democratic form of government, the grandest conception of true democracy ever devised by man?

Communism, as you know, or should know, is a conspiracy to conquer and rule the world by any means, legal or illegal, in peace or in war. Americans worthy of the name do not want communism. Communism seeks to regiment the people of the world under proletarian dictatorship directed from Moscow. The Communist Party of the United States is an outpost in this country from the Kremlin. It is just as subservient to the Soviet Union as are the Communist Parties of Bulgaria, Rumania, and other Soviet satellite nations. The members of the Communist Party of the United States admit they owe their first allegiance to the Soviet Union.

They are the agents of a foreign government working for the overthrow and destruction—by any means—of the Government of the United States.

Does this constitute treason, or do you not know the meaning of the word?

We Americans are satisfied with our form of government. We do not want to substitute communism for freedom. Men of your own race fought and many of them died on fields of battle. They valued liberty and justice, and to their everlasting glory, they did not hesitate to take up arms in defense of their homes and their American way of life.

As one who is proud to be able to say he is an American, I reject with all the power that lies within me, your plea to join a committee to defend the so-called rights of 12 Communist leaders. I repeat, treason is not a right in America, just as it is not a right behind the iron curtain. Thankfully, our courts are competent to decide what does and does not constitute treason. I am satisfied to leave the verdict in the hands of our courts. Your Communist friends will be sure of obtaining in free America what they could not hope to obtain in Russia, and that is a fair trial.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.
Mayor.

Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the dedication by this great institution of its fourth building, making this the largest, voluntary, nonprofit,

nonsectarian institution of its kind in the country, the Governor of the State of New York sent a message of great importance to our knowledge of public health problems. It is appended hereto:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, September 9, 1949.

Mr. ISAAC ALBERT,
President, Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ALBERT: I am happy to send warm greetings to the staff and sponsors of the Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases on the occasion of the dedication of its fourth building on September 18.

The distinguished medical and hospital services of the Jewish Sanitarium and Hospital for Chronic Diseases since its establishment in 1929, its steady growth through the years, and the consequent extension of its facilities and expert care to the chronically ill constitute a model of unselfish civic endeavor.

Now, upon the dedication of its fourth building, this great institution becomes the largest vountary, nonprofit, nonsectarian hospital for chronic diseases in our Nation. But it is not merely size or quantity that inspires one. It is rather the generosity of spirit, the undeviating devotion to the sick and disabled, the humanitarian will to improve the lot of man that should arouse our admiration, enrich our hope for the future, and enhance our confidence in the essential good will of American men and women.

Chronic illness is increasing with the rapid aging of our population. No age, however, is immune. Scarcely a family escapes its ravages. The resulting loss of productive manpower is unequaled in magnitude. Indeed, if the chronic diseases continue uncontrolled, they may well undermine the economic stability of our communities. Today, in the State of New York, more than 2,000,000 people are suffering from some form of chronic disease. A million of these persons are under 45 years of age. Nearly 780,000 are disabled for an average of 100 days each year. In 1900 one-quarter of all deaths in the State were caused by chronic illness; today two-thirds of all deaths are so caused.

It is with the ominous implications of these facts in mind that I urge the people of the State of New York to look upon the dedication of this new building as an occasion which commemorates our determination to solve a disease problem that profoundly affects the happiness, welfare, and productiveness of so many of our fellow citizens.

With kindest regards and best wishes,
Sincerely,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Russia's Atomic Explosion Accentuates Futility of Military Assistance Program for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely article by Gen. Bonner Fellers which appears in Human Events for October 5, 1949. General Fellers is now retired; a graduate from West Point, 1918; Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster; was military observer with the British in Africa, 1940–42; and on General MacArthur's staff as a ground officer, 1943–46.

Mr. Speaker, General Fellers is well qualified to discuss the merits of the military assistance program and I recommend it to all Members of this House.

RUSSIA'S ATOMIC EXPLOSION

(By Bonner Fellers)

The President's announcement of an atomic explosion in Russia brings his European military-assistance program into sharp focus.

Even the strongest supporters of that program must admit now that there is no sound basis for the assumption that, in war, the French frontiers will receive the first shock from the Red forces. It may well be that Washington, D. C., and our key industrial centers will be the objectives of the initial atomic assault. Moreover, Red agents in America have not been idle during the past 16 years and if war comes we must expect sabotage of our war industry to accompany atomic bombing. Terrific devastation will result unless we make every possible effective preparation against it.

The atomic explosion in Russia makes it imperative that America gain and maintain mastery of the air. Russia has her own version of the B–29. It may not have round-trip intercontinental ranges, but Soviet bombs would have a good one-way ticket. Or, as the Soviet Red Star puts it, "There are just as many kilometers from Philadelphia to Moscow as from Moscow to Philadelphia." If, in war, we are unable to control the skies above us, Russia with the atomic bomb could destroy us. On the other hand, our atomic bombs have no value if we do not have an air force sufficiently powerful to deliver them. If war comes, mastery of the air is essential for our security as well as for victory. Russia's atomic explosion has made it essential that we build it now.

A country which can turn out 6,000,000 motor units annually can certainly outbuild the Soviet Union in aircraft without undue interference with our peacetime economy. Air supremacy and other necessary security measures can be achieved for some two or three billion dollars less than our present budget if we avoid lavish expenditures for allied assistance and for our Army and Navy which, against Russia, would be simply supporting arms for the Air Force. Hand in hand with this military program, we must establish radar screens to detect approaching enemy aircraft. And, what is even more important, we must stimulate, extend, and improve our intelligence agencies so that we may anticipate the intent of our potential enemy. Radar would give us an hour's warning, intelligence might sound the alert months before an attack.

II

The atomic explosion in Russia accentuates the futility of the President's military-assistance program for Europe. It would be criminal if we were to repeat the natural mistake which the French made in World War II. After the mass slaughter of the First World War, French leaders resolved never again to try to hold their frontier with human beings. They built a Maginot line of steel. But, in concept, it was one war too late.

Today, France again desperately strives to defend her borders. This time it is not to be a static defense of the Maginot type. The plan provides a balanced, highly mobile striking force of tanks and self-propelled artillery and infantry in trucks, all supported by tactical aircraft. It will be poised to strike only if Stalin moves.

Actually, the allied collective defensive forces, as now projected, are but the Maginot line of World War II on wheels. This new force would be more expensive than the static type because it is costly to motorize a Maginot line. Against our mobile European frontier forces, Stalin could hurl a thousand Red divisions. In addition to being outnumbered 10 or 20 to 1 on the ground, our frontier forces would be subject to attack from the 16,000 combat planes the Red air force is believed to possess.

After the Red air force cleared the air above our Maginot line on wheels, the latter's mobility in relation to air power would be as nothing. To Red airmen, it would appear to crawl like a worm, and, characterized by enormous ponderosity, it would be the easy prey of Russia's lightning jet-cavalry of the sky. Military authorities are in general agreement that the allied line could not prevent a rapid Red occupation of western Europe.

This proposed Maginot line on wheels would give us a false sense of security during peacetime. It would be two wars behind sound military concepts. It offers no real threat to Stalin's security; it interposes no barrier of consequence to his occupation of western Europe. It would only serve Stalin's purpose.

Our Government would do well to advise our allies that this $1,300,000,000 expenditure is the first and final installment for ground combat equipment in Europe. We should suggest that the weapons be used for interior security rather than the initial increment for garrison forces to hold the Red Army east of the Rhine. Meanwhile, they could complete their recovery from the last war's devastation and devote their energies to defeating Communists' political encroachment. If we will build the best air force in the world, and call upon our allies to assist with men and planes and air bases which can be defended, Russia can probably be contained within her borders.

III

The administration's military-assistance program will serve to incite rather than deter war. It is time our leaders gave serious consideration to the psychological reactions of this ill-advised measure. We may cry to heaven that our defensive forces on the Rhine are to keep the peace, but the Kremlin can logically claim that capitalistic armed might is being amassed to destroy Russia.

How would the Russian people respond to such a claim? The Russians are living under what amounts to a military occupation. Some ten to fifteen million political prisoners are working as slave labor, slowly dying of starvation. Closely checking on the population and keeping it subservient to the system are 2,000,000 armed police. Even so, there have been recent occasions when the police had to call on the Red arm to help subdue anti-Communist demonstrations. Meanwhile, the Kremlin has 500,000 full-time paid Communist propagandists to extol the virtues of the system to the people. Yet another half-million Russians have escaped into Europe because of their anti-Communist views.

The above picture of internal division might well be changed overnight. Kremlin leaders need a unifying agency to distract their people from their sad plight and prevent increased internal dislocation. They merely have to acquaint their people with our administration's military-assistance program to convince them that the western powers seek to destroy Russia. Guns on the Rhine—especially American guns pointing east—offer the necessary unifying catalyst.

IV

Although history is replete with the failure of nations to keep the peace by force, we have chosen a peace program today which relies principally on military might. The belief that might makes right is un-Christian. Peace can stem only from things of the spirit.

America possesses a golden opportunity to launch a psychological program against

Russia. We should mount a full-scale psychological campaign addressed to the Russian people and directed against the Kremlin military clique. From among the 500,000 Russian refugees and Red Army deserters now in Europe, we can select volunteer planners and operators who will penetrate the "iron curtain" and carry our great weapon—truth—to the Russian people. A number of techniques have been worked out by our intelligence agencies and with the help of Russian refugees we know the "iron curtain" can be penetrated. Many would risk their lives to emancipate their enslaved people. These Russian escapees might well start a great movement for a liberal government in Moscow. Stalin then would have to turn aside from foreign military and political expansion and seek to put his own house in order.

Why not enlist, in this work, the services of the American Federation of Labor to transmit a message of freedom from American labor to the workers and peasants of Russia? Could not the churches, all denominations, collaborate in this work to send, via the mechanism of penetration, their message to the unfortunate Russians who are starved for things of the spirit?

The psychological job cannot be effectively done by the State Department's Voice of America, which must always conform to diplomatic policy. The campaign must be shaped so as to present the talent and genius and the spiritual virtues of our people in a compelling appeal to the Russians.

From my own experience under General MacArthur as officer in charge of psychological warfare against Japan, this proposal is neither visionary nor impractical. Similar techniques worked out in our program against Japan met with amazing success. This is what they helped to accomplish: (1) Turned the Japanese population against their own militarists; and (2) gave the Emperor assurance that his people would support him in demanding that his militarists surrender.

At the very time when we were destroying them by bombing, psychological warfare changed the minds of the Japanese who had been indoctrinated to hate us. Why, then, can't a similar campaign of truth dissemination, in peace, influence the Russians—who, from my observation in Russia, already like us—to demand a liberal government? In the cause of world peace this campaign should be attempted.

This psychological program is absolutely essential. But the time has not yet come when we can depend upon it alone. While we appeal to the Russians, we must at the same time build the best air force in the world. Russia's atomic explosion has narrowed the time factor. For our own security and for keeping the peace both programs must start now.

Force and Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Force and Violence" which appeared in the Washington Post of October 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Senator JOHN FOSTER DULLES, who has never been charged, even by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with membership in any organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, indulged in some rather remarkable advocacy Thursday in the heat of his campaign for election to the Senate. Attacking his opponent, former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, as blind to the dangers of communism and oblivious of the trend to an all-powerful state, he quoted Thomas Jefferson on the need for occasional revolutions and then said:

"I don't believe that we need to have a violent revolution, certainly not today. The people still have it in their power peacefully to check this thing, but if we don't do it and do it soon, we will have to fight our way back, as Thomas Jefferson said, through revolution."

We presume that very few Americans desire an authoritarian welfare state but that a great many Americans desire a state of welfare. They have a long-entrenched habit of deciding how to achieve what they want by ballots instead of bullets. Presumably they will decide the senatorial contest in New York in precisely this traditional way. If Senator DULLES really means that a bloody revolution will be necessary in case they decide in a way of which he disapproves, perhaps he had better join the little group now in the dock of a Federal district court in New York. They, he may remember, are the ones who keep insisting that change can't be achieved peacefully because men like Mr. DULLES are sure to resist it by force.

Use of ECA Funds for Canadian Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 7 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Fumble by USDA," written by Henry S. French, the Kansas City Star's well-informed grain reporter, and published in that newspaper on October 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUMBLE BY UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—DEAL PERMITTING BRITAIN TO USE ECA FUNDS FOR CANADIAN WHEAT IS SCORED—ADDS TO SUPPORT TASK BY REDUCING OUTLET FOR AMERICAN SURPLUS, DOUBLE SPENDING MAY RESULT, CRITICS SAY

(By Henry S. French)

Farm-State Senators, grainmen and producers generally feel that Secretary Brannan had rather a flimsy excuse for permitting Great Britain to use ECA funds to purchase Canadian wheat.

Under an arrangement recently announced, $175,000,000 of Great Britain's ECA allocation is to be used to buy 80,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada. Fifty million dollars of the amount was allocated last week.

Proponents of the idea believe that England will get more benefit from her dollar grants if she is permitted more flexibility in their use.

AS A STAB IN THE BACK

Critics condemned the move as a stab in the back to American wheat producers, pointing out that since wheat has been declared a surplus in this country, every effort should be made to move off the burdensome supplies.

The agreement grew out of the monetary talks held in Washington recently between the United States, Great Britain, and Canada.

At first the legality of the action was questioned, since the ECA Act provides that aid funds shall not be used by Marshall-plan countries to buy agricultural commodities outside the United States when such commodities are in surplus supply. Such a provision is made in section 112 (D) of the law.

However, that section contains a qualification, which authorizes offshore procurement of surplus commodities when the ECA Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, determines that such procurement would not create burdensome surpluses within the United States, or seriously prejudice the position of domestic producers.

REASONING IS QUESTIONED

Now most objections center around the rather tortuous reasoning Brannan employed in concluding that the purchase of 80,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, thereby excluding the shipping of United States wheat by that amount, would not be detrimental to the American producer.

The announcement of the deal came soon after an order from the United States Department of Agriculture to wheat farmers to reduce their 1950 plantings by 17 percent. The acres which have been ordered out of production would have supplied the wheat which now can be produced by Canadian farmers.

The United States gained little compensation for agreeing to finance Britain's Canadian wheat purchases, Canada agreed to purchase from the United States around $10,000,000 in perishable commodities, mostly fruit.

Britain agreed to spend $30,000,000 for an estimated 15,000,000 bushels of United States wheat, which had not been planned previously. This was made possible by release of a part of British aid funds by the ECA Administrator, which was another part of the deal.

APPARENTLY CUTS MARKET

Brannan contended that the action would mean as large, if not a larger market for exportable wheat this year. Most analysts cannot follow this line of reasoning, since giving up a market for $175,000,000 worth of wheat for the chance to export $30,000,000 worth would appear to cut the potential by about 65,000,000 bushels.

Critics declare the move would help no one but fruit growers, and at that only a negligible amount.

The consensus is that the wheat deal will have the double-barreled effect of reducing the income of the wheat farmer and unnecessarily forcing the Government to spend additional millions to support domestic wheat prices.

A carry-over of 293,000,000 bushels of wheat was reported July 1, compared to 195,000,000 bushels at the end of the previous crop year. The bulk of this wheat was in the hands of the Government, taken over in price-supporting operations.

The effect of losing the sale of wheat to Great Britain will tend to increase the burden of supplies on the domestic market, making more difficult and costly the Government's efforts to support prices.

MAY ALERT CONGRESS

With the wheat supply already burdensome, and public opposition to the continuation of high support prices growing, any situation which would contribute to the cost of price propping operations means that Congress is likely to take a more thoughtful view of farm programs.

Cutting shipments of American wheat to Britain also will mean the Commodity Credit Corporation will be less active for grain in the open market. Buying by the export agency has been an important price factor in the markets during the last few weeks.

Even before the decision was made, CCC purchases were running far behind the fast pace set last year. Exports of wheat and wheat products during July and August were only 67,000,000 bushels, compared with 111,000,000 a year ago.

Civilian Defense and the Atomic Bomb

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a total neglect on the part of the administration to do anything about civilian defense. This Nation is not prepared for the shock of an atomic-bomb attack. If there is such an attack on the United States, the civilian population will be the victims of it. We are spending millions of dollars for military defense in every possible effort to prevent such an attack, but we are doing nothing to protect the American people from destruction if such an attack should come.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced Joint Resolution 369, authorizing the Secretary of Defense to hold public hearings and make a study and investigation of the urgency of the installation in underground facilities which are now being used for civilian purposes, such as parking lots, and so forth, any first-aid and hospital facilities that might be used for any major disaster in congested centers of population. The neglect on the part of the administration is difficult to understand, since the recent announcement by President Truman that Russia now has the secret of the atomic bomb.

In the interest of the defense of some of the people in congested population centers and the urgency of doing something about it now, I have written the following letter to the Secretary of Defense:

OCTOBER 10, 1949.

The Honorable LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of National Defense,
Department of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Joint Resolution 369, a bill which I introduced and which was referred to the House Armed Services Committee for consideration.

I have been informed by Congressman CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that due to the heavy demand on the committee at this time, it will have no time to consider this resolution until the January session. However, Mr. VINSON states that he is vitally interested in the purpose and intent of my resolution, and has forwarded a copy of it to you for your comment.

I am certain that you are fully conscious of the urgency of a well-organized civilian-defense program, and since the Armed Services Committee will not have time to consider House Joint Resolution 369 before January, I am of the opinion that you have sufficient authority to proceed with a preliminary study and investigation of the urgency and need for seeking the cooperation of the mayors and governors in the several States in an effort to provide the type of civilian defense, first aid, and hospital facilities as sugggested in my resolution.

I would appreciate your informing me as soon as possible whether you find that you have this authority and if you will proceed on some preliminary study and investigation of the plan outlined in my resolution between now and the next session of Congress so that we will then be prepared to introduce legislation following out your recommendations.

Very truly yours,

GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress, Fifteenth District, California.

Following is a copy of my House Joint Resolution 369 which I introduced October 4, 1949, and which if adopted will be the first step toward a practical, efficient, and economical program for civilian defense in large cities in the event of an atomic bomb attack or any other major disaster:

Joint resolution to provide for a study to determine the urgency of the need for, and the feasibility of, installing in underground parking facilities equipment which could be used for the protection of the civilian population or for military purposes

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Defense is authorized and instructed to hold public hearings on and otherwise to investigate and study the urgency of the need for, and the feasibility of, a coordinated program among the Federal Government and the governments of the several States and of their cities, counties, and other political subdivisions, for installing in underground parking facilities heretofore constructed, being constructed, or proposed to be constructed in such subdivisions, equipment which could be used for the protection of the civilian population or for military purposes in event of war or other major disaster. If the Secretary determines that the results of such investigation and study would justify his recommending such program, he shall also investigate and study the type of equipment (including first aid and hospital equipment) which should be installed in such facilities and the methods of financing which could be employed in acquiring and installing such equipment.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary, upon request made by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense shall report, on or before June 30, 1950, to the Congress, or to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, if the Congress is not in session, the results of the investigation and study made pursuant to this joint resolution, together with any recommendations for legislation which he may determine to be necessary.

I urge the Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of Defense, and the Congress to give this resolution immediate attention. We cannot act too quickly on such an important protective issue as civilian defense.

Oil Imports

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, there are about 600,000 barrels of oil being imported into this country each day, and there is good reason to believe imports of oil may reach 1,000,000 barrels a day between now and the first of next year.

An efforts was made to establish a quota limiting to 5 percent the amount of oil that could be imported into this country, through an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act recently, but that failed in the Senate.

I have now introduced a bill covering the provisions of the Senator Thomas amendment to establish by an act of Congress a quota limitation on oil of 5 percent of the demand in this country, which would reduce to about 350,000 barrels a day the amount of oil coming into this country, so that the Members of the House may give some thought and consideration to it, in the hope that we can do, by legislation, what the executive branch and the State Department could, but have not done. If they have not set such a quota by January 1, then the House and Senate should take direct action.

For many months the oil producers and the oil workers of the United States have been deeply concerned that the Government has been permitting about 600,000 barrels of oil to be imported into this country every day.

Thousands of workers have lost their jobs, thousands of oil rigs have been made idle, and where they have State controls to limit production from wells, by use of such controls domestic output has been reduced by 600,000 barrels a day. All of this because of the flood of oil that has been allowed to come into the United States by reason of the administration under the reciprocal trade treaties reducing import tariffs by over 50 percent during the past few years.

As I have suggested, in an attempt to correct this situation Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma attempted to write a provision in the Reciprocal Trade Act passed 2 weeks ago that would establish a quota which, in substance, would provide "that oil imports and petroleum products coming into this country from all nations should not be permitted in an amount

in excess of more than 5 percent of our domestic demand."

There was such strong sentiment in the Senate in support of Senator THOMAS' amendment that it was only defeated by 1 vote—40 Members of that body supporting the amendment to only 41 in opposition.

On July 5, 1949, and subsequently in speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives I pointed out the great and damaging effect these excessive imports of petroleum products are having on the economy of our country. I urged that import duties should be raised to give a fair measure of protection to the great oil industry so that it might continue to expand, continue to explore, define, and build up our oil reserves and keep our people employed; that this great basic industry which largely powers our country in times of peace and war shall be kept in a position to meet the need of our people, and to provide an adequate supply of oil to power our military machine in the event our national defense is challenged.

The President and the State Department now have the power to establish quotas that will prevent too great a flow of imported oil and petroleum products into this country. It is to be hoped that the President will take such action before Congress reconvenes which would make the legislation sought under this bill unnecessary.

However, the administration's successful efforts recently in the Senate which beat down the Thomas amendment to establish a reasonable quota of imports, though by a majority of only one vote, seems to indicate that if the necessary protection of the great oil industry of the Nation is to be brought about, it may have to be done through the efforts of the legislative branch of the Government by the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I have been getting many letters from oil producers from my congressional district in southern Illinois and from other oil-producing States expressing their alarm at the conditions which they face today.

Foreign oil is pushing our own oil producers out of their own market. Many small refineries are shutting down or restricting their operations. Producers are changing their plans for future drilling. Some of the able executives fear that foreign imports in the future will probably increase to a million barrels a day. The Congress may have to resort to direct legislation in an effort to establish a quota on imports that will be just and fair to our economy and to the oil industry of the Nation. If we establish such a quota there will still be a sufficient latitude for large and constant oil imports from other nations. This is a matter of extreme importance to the economy of our Nation and possibly of greater importance to our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, consequently I am introducing a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit importations of petroleum and petroleum products, by the establishment of a quota which I referred to in the opening of my remarks.

I realize that this session is speedily coming to a close, however, I wanted to raise this question in the hope that the Members will have time to give it thought, and in the hope that when Congress convenes next January that thought may be crystallized along the line to the point where such legislation may get early consideration by the proper committees.

I venture the prediction that oil imports will increase between now and January 1, 1950, to the point where the Members of Congress will feel that legislation to establish a quota is imperative.

For the benefit of the Members, I am including with my remarks the text of the bill I have introduced:

A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit importations of petroleum and petroleum products

Be it enacted, etc., That section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) Quotas for petroleum and petroleum products to be imported to the United States shall be provided limiting the total quantity imported from all countries, including petroleum and petroleum products purchased abroad for use of the United States Military Establishment and oil for supplies for bunkering vessels at United States ports but excluding oil for manufacture and reexport, in any quarter of a year to an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the domestic demand for petroleum and petroleum products in the United States for the same quarter of the previous year as reported by the United States Bureau of Mines, plus petroleum and petroleum products purchased abroad for use of the United States Military Establishment. Quotas established under this provision may be suspended during any period of inadequacy of petroleum supplies to meet current national consumption."

First Elected Woman Senator Was Gladys Pyle, of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, numerous references have been made in the press to the election of women to the United States Senate. Not long ago an item was called to my attention which referred to a very distinguished former Member of this body, our esteemed former colleague, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, as "the first woman to win a Senate seat in her own right, without prior service under appointment."

No one who knows the estimable lady from Maine would in any sense want to detract from her accomplishments or any honor due her—nor could anyone. She is a brilliant woman and worthy of every distinction she has won.

In the interest of accuracy, however, the RECORD should show that Miss Gladys Pyle, of Huron, S. Dak., was actually the first woman elected to the United States Senate in her own right without prior service under appointment.

For a summary of the facts in the matter I am indebted to Mrs. C. A. Wilson, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., who has written as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1949.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago my attention was called to a news release by your committee under date of September 14, 1948, which was an item pertaining to the apparent election of Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH to the United States Senate. The item contained the following statement:

"Her election to the Senate as the first woman to win a Senate seat in her own right, without prior service under appointment * * *."

Because of the erroneous statement that Mrs. SMITH was the first woman to win a Senate seat in her own right, it was suggested that you be informed correctly so that your records would not be in error—particularly inasmuch as the first woman who did win a Senate seat in her own right was a Republican woman.

I am referring to Miss Gladys Pyle, of Huron, S. Dak., who holds the honor of having been the first woman elected to the United States Senate in her own right.

The history of Miss Pyle's election to the United States Senate is as follows:

"Senator Peter Norbeck (Republican) died December 20, 1936. Herbert Hitchcock (Democrat) was appointed by Gov. Tom Berry to fill the vacancy caused by this death, which appointment was until December 1 following the next general election on November 8, 1938.

At the South Dakota Democratic primary election on May 3, 1938, Hitchcock was defeated by Tom Berry. Therefore there was a short term for a United States Senator from November 8, 1938, to January 3, 1939, the commencement of the 6-year term of the Senator elected in the preceding November (twentieth amendment, United States Constitution). At the general election on November 8, 1938, CHAN GURNEY (Republican) defeated Tom Berry (Democrat). At the same election Miss Gladys Pyle, of Huron, S. Dak., defeated J. T. McCullen, Sr. (Democrat) by more than 43,000 majority for the short term expiring January 3, 1939. She qualified for this office and served as United States Senator from South Dakota until succeeded by Senator CHAN GURNEY on January 3, 1939."

It is true that Mrs. SMITH was the first woman elected to the Senate in her own right for a full term, but Miss Pyle should receive credit when the statement is made as to the first woman elected to the Senate in her own right.

Miss Pyle comes from a strong Republican family in South Dakota and she herself has been an outstanding Republican woman. She was the first woman in South Dakota in two other political offices.

This achievement was not the first such "first" for Miss Pyle. In 1922 she was elected to the house of representatives from Beadle County, S. Dak., and was the first woman to serve in the South Dakota Legislature. She was reelected in 1924.

She was assistant secretary of state of South Dakota from 1923 to 1927. In 1927 she was elected secretary of state and served 4 years, being the first woman in South Dakota to serve as secretary of state. She really started something in South Dakota, for a woman has been elected to that office since 1927.

Miss Pyle is now a member and the secretary of the board of charities and corrections, which board supervises the charitable and penal institutions in the State.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. C. A. WILSON.

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK.

Petroleum Imports and Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following information concerning imports and exports of petroleum:

THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, August 25, 1949.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of August 13 requesting certain information concerning the import-export balance of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States. The data which follow will supplement information on this subject which we have given to you before.

The fact that the United States has changed from a net exporter of petroleum in 1938 to a net importer at the present time does not necessarily mean that the domestic industry has suffered a loss of market to imports during this period.

Domestic demand for petroleum products over a period of years has grown so rapidly that, until recent months, output from domestic sources has been insufficient to meet this demand. Increased imports from foreign sources were required to supplement domestic output and to prevent shortages. In the early months of 1949, however, as a result of the extremely mild weather, the seasonal increase in the demand for petroleum products, principally heating oils, did not materialize to the extent anticipated and for the first time in years, domestic demand for petroleum products declined sharply. This reduction in domestic demand soon had its effect on domestic production of crude oil.

However, a recent revised forecast of the Bureau of Mines shows that domestic demand, which dropped from 5,882,000 barrels daily in the first quarter of 1949 to 5,391,000 barrels daily in the second quarter of 1949, is expected to rise sharply to 5,740,000 barrels daily in the third quarter and attain a record high of 6,435,000 barrels daily for the last quarter of the year. A record domestic output, large withdrawals from storage and in all probability a satisfactory rate of imports will be required to meet this unprecedented demand.

It is true as you note that imports for the first and second quarters of 1949 have been at the highest quarterly rate in the history of the oil industry, reaching a quarterly average of 612,000 barrels daily. Several importing companies attribute this to the fulfillment of long-term contracts and tanker charters negotiated in 1948 at a time when domestic demand was at record levels and forecasts indicated a still higher rate of consumption for 1949.

With reference to military requirements, figures recently released by the Munitions Board show that in 1948, 92,193 barrels daily were shipped from continental United States and 62,467 barrels daily from sources outside the United States. Military shipments from United States during the first 6 months of 1949 averaged 69,840 barrels daily, while shipments from other sources totaled 91,265 barrels daily.

Enclosed you will find (1) a table showing United States petroleum supply and demand for the years 1938 to 1948, inclusive, with a forecast of 1949 by quarters and (2) a table showing United States imports and exports of petroleum for the period January–June 1949 as compared to the first 6 months of 1948.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

United States petroleum supply and demand

[Thousands of barrels daily]

Year	Supply			Demand			Change in all stocks [5]
	Production, all oils [1]	Total imports [2]	Total new supply	Domestic demand [3]	Exports and shipments [4]	Total demand	
1938	3,472	149	3,621	3,115	531	3,646	−25
1939	3,614	162	3,776	3,373	518	3,891	−115
1940	3,858	229	4,087	3,625	356	3,981	+106
1941	4,073	266	4,339	4,071	298	4,369	−30
1942	4,034	99	4,133	3,972	321	4,293	−160
1943	4,372	174	4,546	4,168	411	4,579	−33
1944	4,864	252	5,116	4,562	571	5,133	−17
1945	5,010	311	5,321	4,857	501	5,358	−37
1946	5,073	377	5,450	4,912	419	5,331	+119
1947	5,449	437	5,886	5,449	451	5,900	−14
1948	5,907	513	6,420	5,761	368	6,129	+291
1949 (forecast)	5,627	570	6,197	5,863	362	6,225	−28
First quarter (actual)	5,749	583	6,332	5,882	349	6,231	+101
Second quarter (estimated)	5,386	573	5,959	5,391	380	5,771	+188
Third quarter (forecast)	5,455	558	6,013	5,740	380	6,120	−107
Fourth quarter (forecast)	5,918	565	6,483	6,435	337	6,772	−289

[1] Includes crude oil, natural gasoline, related products and benzol.
[2] Includes both refined and crude oils.
[3] Includes military and civilian demand in continental United States, shipments to United States armed forces abroad and bunker fuel-oil loadings.
[4] Includes shipments to noncontiguous territories.
[5] Includes changes in both refined and crude oil stocks. Minus signs indicate decreases and plus signs increases.
Data from Bureau of Mines.

UNITED STATES IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF PETROLEUM

Total imports of crude oil and refined petroleum products for the month of June 1949 amounted to 627,000 barrels daily, an increase of 40,000 barrels per day over the May 1949 total of 587,000 barrels per day. Crude oil imports were up 8,000 barrels per day and refined products 32,000 barrels per day.

Most of the increase in imports of refined products and over one-half the increase in total imports were accounted for by imports of residual fuel oil which climbed from 150,000 barrels per day in May 1949 to 171,000 barrels daily in June.

Total exports for the month of June 1949 (exclusive of bunker fuel oil loadings and military shipments) averaged 304,000 barrels per day and consisted of 102,000 barrels per day of crude oil and 202,000 barrels per day of refined products. This was a decline of 46,000 barrels per day as compared to May 1949 exports which included crude-oil shipments of 107,000 barrels per day and refined-products shipments of 243,000 barrels per day. Only the group designated as other products showed greater exports in June 1949 as compared to May 1949.

In the first 6 months of 1949 total imports (612,000 barrels per day) were 99,000 barrels per day higher than for the first half of the year 1948 (513,000 barrels per day). Imports of crude increased from an average of 326,000 barrels per day for January–June 1948 to 427,000 barrels per day for 6 months ending June 1949. This increase of 111,000 barrels per day was partially offset, in computing the increase in total imports, by a 12,000 barrels per day decline in imports of refined petroleum products, from 187,000 barrels per day in 1948 (January–June) to 175,000 barrels per day during 1949 (January–June).

Total exports for the first 6 months of the current year averaged 334,000 barrels per day. This was 10,000 barrels per day less than the 344,000 barrels per day shipped in the first half of 1948. Crude exports were lower by 23,000 barrels per day, but refined products were higher by 13,000 barrels per day with gasoline and residual fuel oil as the only products showing increases. The decline in exports of crude oil from the United States reflects the increase in world availabilities and also the decline in foreign exchange available for purchases of dollar oil.

If only commercial shipments are considered in arriving at a net balance of exports or imports, June imports exceeded exports by 323,000 barrels daily. However, if bunker fuel-oil loadings (178,000 barrels per day) and military shipments (70,000 barrels per day, see note below) are added to commercial exports (304,000 barrels per day) imports actually exceeded exports by only 75,000 barrels daily.

Commercial shipments for the first 6 months of 1949 show a net import balance of 278,000 barrels per day. Inclusion of bunker-oil loadings and military shipments as exports reduces the net import balance to 39,000 barrels per day.

NOTE.—In the August issue of the Digest of International Petroleum Developments, military shipments from United States were estimated at 100,000 barrels per day. However, data recently released by the Munitions Board indicate such shipments averaged 92,193 barrels daily for the year 1948 and 69,840 barrels per day for the first 6 months of 1949.

United States [1] exports and imports of petroleum products

[Thousands of barrels]

	June 1949	May 1949	June 1948	January to June 1949	January to June 1948
Crude:					
Imports	13,092	13,273	12,849	79,145	59,412
Daily average	436	428	428	437	326
Exports	3,071	3,318	3,961	17,236	21,552
Daily average	102	107	132	95	118
Gasoline: [2]					
Imports	16	------	61	157	555
Exports	2,935	3,657	2,793	20,063	14,186
Kerosene:					
Imports	9	9	9	63	202
Exports	45	181	220	1,279	1,336
Gas, oil, and distillate fuel oil:					
Imports	401	242	460	1,135	2,049
Exports	656	718	2,014	6,255	9,870
Residual fuel oil:					
Imports	5,125	4,647	3,748	29,692	30,516
Exports	608	1,019	607	4,286	3,788
Lubricating oils and greases: Exports	898	1,332	1,290	6,571	6,966
Other products:					
Imports [3]	155	39	15	508	621
Exports [4]	895	613	932	4,715	4,971
Total:					
Imports [5]	18,798	18,210	17,142	110,700	93,355
Daily average	627	587	571	612	513
Exports [6]	9,108	10,838	11,817	60,405	62,669
Daily average	304	350	394	334	344

[1] Includes continental United States and noncontiguous United States territories and possessions such as Alaska, Hawaii, etc.
[2] Includes natural gasoline, aviation gasoline, and other gasoline and motor fuel.
[3] Includes oil unfinished for further processing, solid petroleum asphalt, and paraffin wax.
[4] Includes blinding agents and antiknock compounds, naphtha and light products, petrolatum and petroleum jelly, liquefied petroleum gases, micro-crystalline and paraffin waxes, petroleum asphalt, petroleum coke, and natural gas.
[5] Imports represent general imports which are compiled by combining entries for immediate consumption and entries into bonded warehouses.
[6] Exports include both foreign and domestic merchandise excluding (1) bunker oil laden in United States on vessels engaged in foreign trade; (2) shipments to United States armed forces for their own use (January to June 1949 estimate 70,000 barrels daily, calendar year 1948 estimate 92,000 barrels daily); (3) petroleum products n. e. s. total value of which follows: June 1949, $851,209; January to June 1949, $5,065,102; June 1948, $597,583; January to June 1948, $3,416,499.

United States [1] exports and imports of petroleum products—Continued

[Thousands of barrels]

	June 1949	May 1949	June 1948	January to June 1949	January to June 1948
Bunker fuel-oil loadings: [7]					
American vessels	2,843	2,657	3,512	16,619	20,274
Foreign vessels	2,502	2,406	2,173	14,039	9,032
Total	5,345	5,063	5,685	30,658	29,306
Daily average	178	163	190	169	161

[1] Includes continental United States and noncontiguous United States territories and possessions such as Alaska, Hawaii, etc.

[7] Represents bunker oil laden in the United States on American and foreign vessels engaged in foreign trade.

NOTE.—Shipments from United States to noncontiguous territories and possessions (Alaska, Hawaii, etc.), not considered as exports in the table, were as follows: June 1949, 1,250,000 barrels (estimated); May 1949, 1,256,000 barrels; June 1948, 1,322,000 barrels; January to June 1949, 7,110,000 barrels (June estimated); January to June 1948, 6,356,000 barrels.

Prepared by Fuels Branch, Office of International Trade, from Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce reports.

ARMED SERVICES
PETROLEUM PURCHASING AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1949.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Admiral Foster's letter of August 30, 1949, with your memorandum endorsement of October 2, 1949, is herewith returned.

Of the 42,849,000 barrels of bulk fuels purchased for delivery in the first half of fiscal year 1950, 3,405,000 barrels were purchased in Aruba, Netherlands West Indies; 10,900,000 barrels were purchased in the Mideast; and the balance will be supplied in the United States. The following tabulation shows the sources of supply by product:

	Aruba, Netherlands West Indies	Mid-East	United States
Aviation gas			10,998,000
Jet fuels			1,764,000
Motor gasoline	630,000	1,125,000	6,069,000
Kerosene			338,000
Diesel fuels	575,000	3,555,000	1,858,000
Navy fuel oil, special	2,200,000	6,220,000	7,517,000

Sincerely,

C. W. FOX,
Rear Admiral, SC, United States Navy,
Chairman.

Connecticut Is a "7-Percenter" State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of Federal subsidy programs and their effect on the Nation's well-being has been prominently mentioned in both news and editorial columns recently.

Figures are normally dull reading, but I can assure the Congress that the people of Connecticut, in particular, are greatly concerned over the release of statistics showing that our great State receives from the Federal Government the sum of 7 cents for every dollar paid by Connecticut taxpayers to the Federal Treasury. This is in contrast to North Dakota's $1.88 return, Mississippi's $1.20, Arkansas' $1.06, and on down the line until we reach the State of Connecticut, which ranks forty-sixth in amount returned. From 1933 to date we have received $397,267,000 and contributed $5,267,393,000. The liberals proclaim every hand-out, pointing to the beneficence of the Democratic national administrations. They disregard entirely the sum contributed in taxes, which would finance the Marshall plan for recovery of European nations for the coming fiscal year.

I fear that continued beneficence on the part of the Democrats will bankrupt Connecticut. This fear is enhanced by the fact that those States receiving greater sums than they contribute are, at the same time, offering tax inducements to New England industry for locating in their areas.

As a part of my remarks there are included editorials from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, the New Haven Register, and the Bridgeport Post, as well as a special report from the United States News and World Report.

[From the Waterbury Republican of October 2, 1949]

WE'RE PAYING THE FREIGHT

No State has a better right than Connecticut to inveigh against the brokerage of bureaucracy and to assail administration favoritism to the South and the West. For it is costing us plenty.

We don't get too excited over a superficial statement of the case that the Federal Government is forever taking money away from Connecticut and certain other States and giving it to Mississippi and certain others. Connecticut isn't taxed as Connecticut. People with decent and large incomes are being taxed and if States that have a vast number of low-income people pay far less and get substantially more in the way of Federal grants, that's part of the Federal tax idea isn't it, and what would you expect?

But the extent to which we are paying in and the extent to which others are drawing out add up to quite a contrast. According to a recent study by the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, the Federal Government collected $664,000,000 in taxes from Connecticut last year. Yet Federal grants to Connecticut and its citizens over the same period totaled only $57,000,000 or less than 9 percent. Even more striking are figures recently compiled by the Treasury Department and the Tax Foundation. This study shows that Connecticut has paid upwards of $5,000,000,000 into the United States Treasury since 1933 and got less than $400,000,000 back in the form of benefits. It works out to about 7 percent. And North Dakota has been getting back $1.88 for every dollar put in over the same period; South Dakota, $1.57; Mississippi $1.20; Arkansas $1.06; and New Mexico, $1.05.

That's a wide discrepancy and Connecticut has reason to resent it on two counts. One is the wastefulness of Federal aid which flows to State governments via 60 regular programs administered by bumbling bureaucrats remote from the scene of their benefactions. To the considerable extent that Connecticut foots the bill we are being mulcted by every grandiose plan for social betterment to the tune of every superfluous worker, overlapping activity, and inch of red tape in the whole squandering process. And to the suspected extent that Arkansas, Mississippi, the Dakotas, et al, might by State and community action meet their own problems, we are also on the short end of this deal. And this is a fact brought sharply home to us when the have-not States bid for our industry with promises of rebated taxes.

"From each, according to his ability to pay," which is the principle on which the income tax is based carries with it the corollary, "To each according to his need." A wealthy State like ours is bound to take a certain whip-sawing in that process. But it is something to which we aren't reconciled as long as large elements of waste and certain elements of favoritism are part of the picture.

Certainly it is right and natural that here in this State of ours opposition should be heavy to any further extension of Government paternalism under Mr. Truman's Fair Deal program. For by every increase in that program Connecticut, or, more accurately, Connecticut's people, are going to pay more and get less.

And if it is going to be "To each according to his need," let us be sure that the need is actual—that the scheme isn't something like the Brannan brain storm which was politically conceived as a means of reducing the American farmer to a condition of dependency on the State. We already supply more than is needful at a cost which is beyond ability to pay if that ability is defined as leaving to the taxpayers and the businesses of Connecticut the capital and investment incentive necessary to assure a wholesome economic condition. And for all of the example of a little New Dealer and Fair Dealer in our own State capitol, it is time to call a halt.

[From the Ansonia Sentinel]

FEDERAL GRANTS

Connecticut ranks forty-sixth among the 48 States of the Union in the distribution of Federal largesse in the form of grants and handouts. But when it comes to putting the money into the Federal kitty in the form of taxes, Connecticut is right up there among the leaders.

[From the New Haven Register and the Bridgeport Post]

CONNECTICUT GETS BACK 7 CENTS

[New Haven Register]

The effect the Federal program is having upon Connecticut finances and its industrial life should by now be familiar to all who can read. The damage it has done is incalculable. It drains away the revenues taken from our citizens in tax dollars and deposits them elsewhere. It not only retards our industrial growth, but stifles it and discourages it.

There have been repeated instances where the policies that take from Connecticut to feed poorer and more backward sections have driven business out of this State. There have been many others where it can be established as the direct and sole cause for business failure.

DAMAGE

The damage now being done by Federal tax policies and wasteful Government spending is compellingly set forth through a recent article appearing in the Hartford Times under the byline of Kermit Hill. This points out, intelligently and concisely, that over the last 16 years Connecticut has been getting back only 7 cents from each tax dollar that it pays into the Federal Treasury.

Only two States in the Union, New York and Delaware, fare more poorly at the hands

of the New Deal and its Fair Deal successor. With the exception of the measly 7 cents returned here, the rest of our tax dollars are poured into the South and West, where they are turned to purposes putting them in competition with the industries and development of Connecticut.

AID

The something-for-nothing theorists and the planned economists howl long and loudly in praise of the $397,267,000 that has come to Connecticut since 1933 from Federal sources under the guise of Federal-State aid. This is no gift. Far from it. To get this meager return Connecticut has paid over this same 16-year period the colossal sum of $5,267,393,000 into the Federal Treasury.

That is our 7 cents worth. It is the return we may expect for so long as we make the mistake of looking to Washington for the funds to provide services that should rightly be furnished by the State, with our own money and without this bureaucratic bookkeeping and deletion system.

[Bridgeport Post]

What is Connecticut's most costly luxury? The highway system? The schools and colleges? The State government as a whole? Not at all. We can tell you in two words. Uncle Sam.

Yes, this State groans and sweats more to pour money into Uncle Sam's coffers and gets less back in proportion than 45 of the other States. We stand forty-sixth in the list, in this respect. Only two other States get back less of the money they put in. They are New York and Delaware, and in each case the difference is explained by the Nationwide financial corporations which are incorporated in those two States.

Connecticut's vast contribution is not due to the presence of large financial corporations in our State but to the labor and sweat of productive industry. During the past 16 years, the State-aid programs, financed by the Federal Government, have returned to Connecticut just 7 cents out of each dollar taken out of this State in the same period.

A great deal of the money siphoned out of Connecticut is poured into Southern and Western States to build them up. Such States as North Dakota, South Dakota, Mississippi, Arkansas, and New Mexico, for example, receive from the Federal Treasury a great deal more than they pay in the form of Federal taxes. Connecticut's taxpayers help very substantially to make up the difference.

[From the United States News and World Report of October 7, 1949]

INDUSTRY MOVES SOUTH AND WEST—NEW AREAS ARE EXPANDING FASTER THAN OLD

Shifting of industry away from some States and regions and into others, accelerated during war, has continued since the war.

The trend, definitely, is toward decentralization. It is away from big cities toward smaller areas. There is a shift, too, from North to South, and from East to West. Yet, while the rate of growth is most rapid in new industrial centers, the older industrial areas continue to expand and to dominate output of most products.

Precise measurements of what has gone on within industry during and after war are available for the first time. These measurements are provided by the census of manufacturers taken last year for 1947. The resulting mass of data only now is being analyzed for ready understanding of businessmen making new plans, and for all individuals who are interested in industrial trends and markets.

To show what the census has found, United States News and World Report brought together and analyzed this important information, along with more recent Government reports, to give the new picture of United States industry. Later reports will focus on each region individually, and show major industrial developments within individual States.

On an over-all basis there have been broad changes for industries and for regions. Some industries doubled in size and output, while others have lagged. Some regions, too, have made rapid gains in manufacturing, while others have lost ground relative to the United States as a whole.

The accompanying map gives the outline of the industrial change. It shows where manufacturing gains have been greatest and where least. Basis for this rating is the value that is added to goods by manufacturing—the sale value of products over and above the cost of materials that went into those products.

Biggest gains in manufacturing, clearly, are being made in areas where factories have been few and far between. Not a single one of the 11 States making the big gains had as much as 2 percent of all United States manufacturing in 1939. And only four of the States that made even average gains had that much in 1939.

The agricultural South shows the most rapid rate of expansion. Only other States in the fastest-gaining group are Oregon, Idaho, Kansas, and Nebraska. It's in the South that new factories springing up have brought the big relative increases. Arkansas had 17 factories in 1947 for every 10 in 1939. So did North Carolina and Alabama.

Texas had nearly two factory production workers in 1947 for every one in 1939. Not far behind are Kentucky, Mississippi, Kansas, and Nebraska.

Above-average increases are scattered over all of United States, except New England. Alabama and Louisiana are high on the list. With California, they barely miss being in the high group.

Below-average gains—less than the 203.7 percent gain of United States as a whole—are concentrated in the older industrial areas, from Michigan and Ohio on east and north. But the small percentage gains of the big industrial areas show up large in absolute dollars and numbers of factories. New York is an example. Its increase of $6,300,000,000 in value added by manufacturing—small in percentage gain—amounts to more than the entire amount of value added by manufacturing in all the 24 least industrialized States.

Smallest gains of all in industry are in agricultural and mining States of the West. But some of the lagging States are in the East—Rhode Island, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Maryland, along with the District of Columbia. Again, the small percentage gain in the industrial State of New Jersey stands for an increase of well over $2,600,000,000 in value added. New Jersey's increase alone is nearly three times the value added by all manufacturing in the eight Mountain States.

Changes within industry are no less important. They provide important suggestions for businessmen who are looking for markets for particular products.

Textile mills, for example, have expanded rapidly in newer industrial regions, while older regions have lagged. New England and the Middle Atlantic States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey still have the big share of the industry. But their share has shrunk from more than 56 percent of the total to less than 49 percent. The South Atlantic States, meanwhile, have claimed a growing part of the textile industry. Their share has grown from less than 30 percent to nearly 38 percent.

What those figures mean to the regions involved is shown by the fact that the share lost by New England and the Middle Atlantic States would have meant another $400,000,000 in value added by manufacturing in those States in 1947. Other States gaining in textiles were in the east south central region—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi—and in the Pacific coast region.

Clothing industry added 219 percent more value to goods in 1947 than in 1939, for one of the big industry gains. And where those gains occurred is shown by the census. South Atlantic States—from Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia on South—were the big winners, along the Pacific region.

Electrical machinery, fastest growing industry of all, achieved an increase of 313 percent in value added in 1947 over 1939. And it became a bit more concentrated in the East North Central States around the Great Lakes. That region increased its share of the industry total to 42 percent. New England and the three Middle Atlantic States lagged behind. And the south Atlantic region and much of the whole West got large shares of the additional electrical machinery plants.

Other machinery made the second biggest gain—284 percent in value added. New England again lagged in the gain, but all other regions east of the Mississippi expanded their shares of output and employment in the machinery industry. And still more concentration resulted in the area from Illinois east to New York and New Jersey. That region now has nearly three-fourths of the industry.

Fabricated-metal products, as an industry, also massed more and more in the East North Central States around the Lakes. By value, more than half of the thousands of products fabricated of metal now are made in that region. But no region except the Atlantic coast failed to get a larger share of this industry in 1947 than in 1939.

Lumber industry, including all lumber products except furniture, expanded rapidly from 1939 to 1947, increasing its added value by 254 percent. It was the Pacific and the Mountain States that gained most in factories, employment and output of lumber and products. The Pacific States made big gains, too, in food-processing plants and plants for making rubber products, as well as in such transportation products as airplanes, ships, and automobiles.

Biggest expansion in the paper industry, the census shows, is in the South, where the share of value added jumped from 15.5 percent of the industry total in 1939 to well over 20 percent in 1947.

Shifts of industries from city to city, too, have involved thousands of new plants and millions of workers. The census gives the picture in a report on the 53 standard metropolitan areas that have 40,000 or more manufacturing employees.

Metropolitan areas that are gaining most, again, are not the biggest centers of industry. Only Los Angeles, among the big industrial metropolitan areas, made a top gain. And only one other of the 10 biggest industry centers in the United States—Cleveland—made even as much as the average gain of 203.7 percent in manufacturing.

Second biggest expansion, next to that of Los Angeles, was made by Houston. That city's increase in production workers was nearly twice the national average. In value added, too, that city's factories kept far out in front of the average advance. The Louisville area made an even bigger gain than Houston in value added by manufacturing, but its factory employment grew less. Top gains also were made by the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and the Springfield-Holyoke area.

Gains made by the big centers mean big changes in terms of numbers of plants and employees—if not in percentages. In the New York City and northeastern New Jersey area, for example, the number of factories rose from 34,102 in 1939, to 48,287. That increase of more than 14,000 factories—the gain alone—is more than the entire 12,278 factories that were operating in 1947 in Chicago—the second biggest metropolitan industrial area.

And the relatively small percentage gain in manufacturing registered by the big New York metropolitan area amounted to well over $6,000,000,000 in value added. That was about one-eighth of total gain made by all the United States factories together.

What is shown, in brief, is that the South, the Pacific coast, and some of the Great Plains States are making tremendous strides in industrialization. New plants that employ thousands of workers still are being built in those regions. And industries that are new to those States are moving in all the time. But the great part of all products of industry still comes out of the areas in which manufacturing first started in any significant amount. That area is the North and East, from Illinois on through New England.

The Northeast, too, is still the mass-market region of the United States. But, as industry grows and moves southward and westward demand for goods and services in those areas is expanding. Later reports in this series will show where, how, and why.

A Psalm for a Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the present peacetime year, which started last July 1, the Truman administration will spend more than $45,000,000,000.

This is almost exactly the same sum of money that was spent by Woodrow Wilson during the entire 8 years of his administration including all of the money he was required to spend in financing World War I.

Truman administration expenditures during the past 4 years aggregate $180,000,000,000 which is about the same sum that was spent by all Presidents of the United States from the inauguration of George Washington up to and including the first 12 years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

The Truman administration's extravagant peacetime spending has loaded on the backs of American taxpayers the heaviest peacetime taxes in the history of the Nation.

The enormous size of this tax burden caused Chapin Collins, editor of the Montesano Vidette, Montesano, Wash., to write the following editorial:

A PSALM FOR A TAXPAYER

The State is my shepherd; I shall not want.

It maketh me to pay many taxes so it can keep me in mine old age.

It taketh my earnings; it reacheth into my bank account for its solvency's sake.

Yea, though I struggle with reports unto the dead of night, I will not catch up; for they are with me always, their penalties, discomfort me.

It has obliged me to conduct my business in the presence of its agents; it fills my files with forms; my funds runneth out.

Surely, its rules and regulations shall follow me all the days of my life; and I may dwell in the Big House of my uncle forever.

"From the Civilians' and Taxpayers' Point of View, Common Sense Demands a Reduction in the Size of the Navy in All Its Branches and in Its Cost of Maintenance to Appropriate Peacetime Proportions," Thus Spoke Naval Secretary Matthews Last Thursday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, for months past the Halls of Congress have resounded with a cry that expenditures be reduced and economies effected in every department of Government. Members of both Houses have proposed—and introduced resolutions—that if and when all appropriations were made, President Truman should be mandated to further cut 10 percent off all appropriations made by Congress—across the board in all agencies and departments.

So much time, thought, and study have been given to economy measures in the armed service appropriations, H. R. 4146, comprehending the vast sum of $15,000,000,000, that the bill has not yet met with approval of the House and Senate conferees, although 3½ months of the fiscal year 1949 have already passed.

Mr. Speaker, a tremendous controversy is now raging with respect to the economies which Secretary Johnson, in response to congressional demands, is now effecting in the administration of the Department of Defense.

The President, Secretary Matthews of the Navy, Gray of the Army, Symington of the Air Force, and the American people are behind Louis Johnson. Dubbing him "the watchdog of the Federal Treasury," the American press demands that Louis Johnson's program be expanded to all departments.

A highly vocal opposition to these economies has recently been developed by a certain naval captain and some naval air admirals. They are being expressed in the House Committee on Armed Services now holding hearings on unification.

On Thursday last, the Hon. Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy, appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services and made a statement with regard to the effectiveness of the Unification Act.

Mr. Speaker, it was a masterful statement. President Truman, this Congress, and the country at large are to be congratulated on having today as the head of our Navy a prudent man possessed of the calm, judicial sagacity, wisdom, and forthrightness which Secretary Matthews exhibited in presenting the official viewpoint of the United States Navy on the proposed economies.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate at this time that a printed copy of the splendid statement by Secretary Matthews will not be available for use by the Members of this House before adjournment—and certainly not until such time as the report of the hearings now being held have been printed and bound.

I am myself persuaded that no official who has yet appeared, nor any words that have thus far been spoken, will have greater weight in evaluating the controversial issue existing between the Department of the Air Force and certain naval aviators, than will be the statement made by Secretary Matthews Thursday last.

It is for that reason that I am asking the unanimous consent of this House, and without any comment on my part, to extend my own remarks and include therein, so that one and all may read what the Secretary of the Navy has to say about the "dog fight" now taking place in our armed services.

The statement of the Secretary of the Navy reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in response to your committee's invitation, which I received yesterday, I appear here today as a witness from the Navy.

You have invited several other officials of the Navy to testify in this proceeding at this time, and it may be that you plan to call other Navy witnesses later. All of us in the Navy desire to cooperate with your committee in every possible way. To that end, let me assure the committee that any naval officer or enlisted man or any Navy civilian whom your committee wants to hear, or who desires to be heard by your committee, is completely free to testify. There has been no censorship. There will be none.

In addressing ourselves to the agenda which your committee adopted some time ago, we in the Department of the Navy had considered the advisability of having four top naval officers take the lead in presenting the official views of our Department. That plan represented a desire to offer you an orderly statement of the views and conclusions of the Department of the Navy. It was distinctly understood by all, however, that your committee would call such additional witnesses from the Navy as you might desire, and that any other member of the naval personnel who might not be called by you or by us who wished to be heard would be at liberty to speak so far as the Navy is concerned.

In that connection, my position is the same as that which former Secretary Forrestal outlined in his annual report to the President and the Congress when he said:

"I have stated to the Congress my position on the expression of personal views by the Secretaries and chiefs of the Departments in the National Military Establishment. I have told those officials that I want them to feel perfectly free to express their personal views when called upon to do so by the Congress. The public and the Congress are entitled to know the personal views of the Secretaries and the chiefs, but the public and the Congress are also entitled to know whenever there is a material distinction between such personal views and the official conclusion which the Military Establish-

ment has arrived at after mature consideration."

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that on July 21 of this year, in response to a request from you, I wrote you a letter in which I set out my personal views with respect to the eight items contained on your committee's agenda as outlined in your communication to me.

As I understand the state of the record, your committee has disposed of items 1 and 2 on that agenda, and I feel that all of us are greatly indebted to your committee for the manner in which your committee has considered those two important items on the agenda, and that we should be greatly pleased by the outcome of that part of your investigation.

Since the views which I expressed in my letter just referred to with respect to the other six items on the agenda are the same today as they were at the time when I wrote that letter, may I request that I be permitted to have a duplicate of that letter incorporated in the record of this hearing at this point?

Further along in my statement, I shall restate briefly for you my personal views which that communication embodies. At this time, because of recent statements which have appeared in the press from certain officials of the Navy, I would like to comment briefly upon the situation which they seem to reflect.

I refer to the condition of the morale of the personnel in the Department of the Navy. On various occasions, when asked about it, I have stated that in my opinion the general morale of the Navy is good; and, furthermore, I want to say now that I believe that there is every reason why it should be good. In that connection, I distinguish between Navy morale generally and the morale of some few individuals who, for reasons sufficient to themselves, in spite of their oath taken as a member of the Military Establishment of the United States which imposed upon them the solemn obligation to support the Constitution and the laws of the United States, have deliberately engaged in the indefensible procedure of surreptitiously disclosing to persons unentitled to possess it documentary and other restricted information belonging to the Department of the Navy in a manner and under circumstances which could leave no doubt of their own consciousness of the impropriety of their action and the disloyal character of their conduct. Such actions cannot be condemned too severely. Be it said to the credit of the Navy that such instances of faithlessness and insubordination are rare in her proud tradition. Naval personnel are distinguished by their long reputation of devotion and fidelity to the service to which their very lives, if need be, are dedicated. Happily, even in our present distressful situation, but a very few are involved in this disappointing and unworthy procedure. Such actions and related developments, though indulged in by a comparatively few individuals, undoubtedly have unfavorably affected Navy morale. That its further impairment may be avoided, those guilty and responsible for imposing this latest blemish on Navy tradition will all be identified and brought to an accounting for their guilty conduct.

My analysis of the condition which this incident indicates exists convinces me that most of such impairment of naval morale as prevails is to be found among the personnel in the naval aviation section of the service. Even before the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were brought together in the Department of Defense under the National Security Act of 1947, sharp differences of views prevailed among the submarine service, the surface-water service, and the naval aviation arms of the Navy. That different views should be held among these three groups should not be unexpected. In its structure the Navy comprehends these three types of services. They are all manned by strong, vigorous, able, and inspiringly loyal and patriotically devoted enlisted men and officers. Such limited impairment of morale as does exist, as I stated before, in my opinion, will be found almost exclusively in the aviation personnel in the Navy. I base that conclusion upon the identity of the individuals who have expressed their dissatisfaction with the conditions in which they are involved as members of the personnel of the Department of the Navy. In my opinion, that is a significant fact which should be taken into consideration in evaluating the real condition of Navy morale.

That there should be some dissatisfaction with present conditions on the part of naval aviators is not surprising to me. During the war our Navy expanded to a theretofore undreamed-of size on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. Naval aviation made tremendous progress and attained a glorious record, particularly in the Pacific and in the conduct of the war against Japan. It expanded to the unanticipated extent necessary to subdue a powerful and resourceful enemy.

Since the war has ended, conditions have changed. The navies of our wartime enemies were completely destroyed. The fleets of our allies were greatly reduced. At the conclusion of the war, we found ourselves with the greatest Navy the world has ever seen and with practically no other country with any navy capable of challenging our control of the seas. From the civilians' and taxpayers' point of view, common sense demanded a reduction in the size of the Navy in all its branches and in its cost of maintenance, to appropriate peacetime proportions. The processes of accomplishing such common-sense reductions were felt most keenly by naval aviation, and naval aviators responded quite naturally. Some of them voiced their protests quite frantically. Such alarming demonstrations of mistrust and concern, to say the least, did not serve to contribute to the composure of others observing and hearing them. Even under ordinary circumstances, in peacetime, problems of morale in a military organization present themselves. Under the necessity of making adjustments to substantial reductions in budget, ships, weapons, and shore establishments, as well as becoming accommodated to the realities of peacetime operations, the equilibrium of naval personnel would be especially tested.

In addition to these irritating developments, another cause of unrest on the part of the naval aviation personnel was occasioned by the procedure of several naval aviators who testified against the enactment of unification legislation in 1947. In that year, after long and careful consideration, Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal agreed upon a unification bill which was submitted to Congress by President Truman. Several naval aviators were included among those who spoke vigorously in opposition to the enactment of that bill. Included in that list were Admiral Bogan and Capt. John Crommelin. Their testimony at that time reflected practically the same arguments against unification which are embodied in their recent published statements. I can find little that is new in what they say now, as compared with their testimony before the Hoffman committee on July 1, 1947. They opposed unification at that time as they do now, but, in spite of their opposition and that of those who testified as they did, the Congress overwhelmingly passed the unification law in response to an undeniable demand of the American people.

You gentlemen in this Congress this year again responded to the will of the American people and again overwhelmingly reaffirmed the approval of unification by adopting, without a record vote, I believe, the 1949 amendments to the Security Act of 1947. By reason of these recent amendments, the unification provisions of the law of 1947 were greatly strengthened in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and President Truman.

The spectacle of distinguished naval aviators, holding high office in the Navy, denouncing a law offered to the Congress by the President of the United States and twice overwhelmingly approved by the Congress, could hardly be expected to be utterly without effect upon some members of the Navy personnel among whom they are numbered. However, the fact that they have seen fit, in the exercise of their discretion, to speak out so sensationally and in such an un-Navylike manner, against a law which they can be rightly expected to support, does not in any sense justify a conclusion that the morale of that portion of the Navy personnel which is not involved in their forensic maneuvers is all shot to pieces. No matter how sincere they may claim to be, nor how zealously they may crusade for their objectives, it cannot be conceded that they monopolize the loyalty, the honor, or the patriotic devotion of Navy men, even among naval aviators. In my opinion, they do not reflect the views of anything approaching a majority of naval officers.

Therefore, in spite of the deliberately publicized letter of Admiral Bogan and the statement of Captain Crommelin, I believe that, generally speaking, Navy morale is good. Furthermore, I believe that it should be good. That is true because it is my conviction that the Navy today is, and for the predictable future will be, one of the most vital and important cogs in providing for the security of this Nation, and throughout the foreseeable future it will continue to be a proud and satisfying privilege to serve in the ranks of the Department of the Navy. In his eloquent address before the National War College in June of this year, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson inspiringly spelled out this role of the Navy in words so clear that I feel it would profit all of us to have them in mind at this time. Secretary Johnson said on that occasion:

"There exists in our present strategic concept of national defense an essential and honorable role for each of the armed forces. For security is a cooperative venture to be gained with cooperative effort by the Army, the Navy, and Air Force. It is not a competitive enterprise where one service can profit at the expense of another. It admits of neither preeminence nor first emphasis. To provide effectively for security, the National Military Establishment must adjudge impartially the representations of our armed forces in weighing the priorities of their needs.

"The cancellation of construction plans for a naval supercarrier has been twisted into a charge of persecution against the Navy. Some partisans of that service have exaggerated this action and have represented it as part of a conspiracy either to sink the Navy's air arm or to reduce the Navy to a second-class role.

"In their campaign of terror against further unification of the armed forces, they have roused false issues without the substance of truth.

"With the extension of American commitments overseas—both in Europe and in the Pacific—a strong Navy is absolutely vital to the security of the United States. Because the naval air arm is a critical weapon in modern sea warfare, we could no more deny the fleet its carrier aircraft than we could deny ships their radar.

"That we may put an end to this charge of conspiracy, let me assure you that I am convinced of our continuing need for carrier aircraft.

"At the same time I reaffirm the birthright of the United States Marine Corps and its air arm. The Marine Corps' role in the future is guaranteed not by sympathy for its historical tradition but by the proven necessity for equipping fleets with assault forces for the seizure of defense of naval bases essential to the conduct of naval campaigns.

"It will be the duty of the Navy by prompt and sustained combat operations at sea to control vital sea areas, to deny ocean highways to an enemy, to guarantee the uninterrupted flow of vital strategic and war materials to ourselves and our allies, to transport overseas Army and Air Forces."

Furthermore, on the very day that he spoke at the War College, Secretary Johnson announced his approval of a Navy proposal for the modernization of two aircraft carriers of the Essex class, a modernization designed to give us eight carriers capable of handling the new and modern planes which are just coming into use by the fleet.

Taking up, now, Mr. Chairman, the letter which I forwarded to you on July 21, 1949, let me restate briefly my views on some of the agenda items.

Item 3 concerns the performance characteristics of the B-36 bomber to determine whether it is a satisfactory weapon. I stated in my letter that the performance of any aircraft is a compromise between speed, range and service ceiling. I, personally, am not acquainted with the technical details of the B-36 bomber nor with its latest performance characteristics. In my opinion, the most complete, impartial and satisfactory answer to this question will be furnished by the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group which currently has the performance characteristics of the B-36 under study as a part of its consideration of the larger subject of strategic warfare. I do not feel that we will have complete or impartial definitive information until that study is completed.

The fourth item of your agenda concerns the roles and missions of the Air Force and the Navy, especially Navy and Marine aviation, and the determination of whether or not the decision to cancel the construction of the aircraft carrier *United States* was sound. The development of this carrier, and the initial plans and specifications were determined before I became Secretary of the Navy. The discontinuation of the building of the carrier *United States*, however, does not, to my mind, mean that naval aviation is to be brought to a halt. It was a decision on a phase in the development of aircraft carriers, but not a denial of the necessity for aircraft carriers in general. The Secretary of Defense has made this plain by his decision in June authorizing the modernization of two additional Essex class carriers.

Item five of the agenda raises the question of whether or not the Air Force is concentrating upon strategic bombing to such an extent as to be injurious to tactical aviation. As I stated in my letter before referred to, this would appear to be a matter of primary interest to the Army and the Air Force, and it may be that their opinions on the subject would be more expert than any held by the Navy. However, since the Navy's views were requested, I stated in my letter that in the opinion of the Navy, the Air Force as projected in its 1950 Forces was unbalanced in favor of strategic bombing.

Item six of your agenda involves the consideration of procedure followed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the development of weapons to be used by the respective services. It also seeks to raise the question as to whether or not two of the three services should be permitted to pass upon the weapons of the third. In my letter to your chairman, I stated that I am in agreement with the general sense of the Secretary of Defense's recent public address in which he stated:

"It can no longer be claimed that each service is entitled to exclusive judgment and autonomous control of the funds allocated for its role. Since the Joint Chiefs are mutually responsible for the Nation's whole defense, it is their duty to consider the major decisions of any services."

That does not mean, however, that the weapons employed by any service are to be determined by a two to one, or any split vote, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am convinced that the chief of any service is the best informed as to the weapons systems his service needs to carry out its responsibilities. Furthermore, I do not feel that that means that he should be given the sole responsibility for determining those weapons. The responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in considering the weapons of all systems does not mean that final determination is placed in them, particularly if they are not unanimous in their views. Under circumstances where there is a split vote, in my opinion, under the law and in practice, the responsibility passes to the Secretary of Defense, who is not bound by a majority vote.

In answer to the question propounded by this item, I think it is proper for the services to consider weapons of sister services within the framework of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and, in view of the fact that their determination is not necessarily the final one, I feel there is no reason for concern.

Item seven of your agenda calls for a study of the effectiveness of strategic bombing to determine whether the Nation is sound in following its present concept. I have furnished the chairman of your committee my views on this subject, but they are of a highly classified nature. In view of their security classification, I feel that I cannot appropriately discuss them in open meeting.

In conclusion I would like to mention briefly my own confidence in the organizational arrangements which Congress has provided in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. Through such agencies as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Navy, as well as its sister services, has a proper and useful forum in which to present the merits of its case. I have confidence not only in the organizational set-up but I have the utmost confidence in the men who man this set-up. We are, indeed, fortunate to have as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a man with the wisdom, the integrity, the experience, and the willingness to understand the problems of others that Gen. Omar Bradley has shown himself to possess. I have no misgivings whatever with respect to the Navy's ability to present its case to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and where appropriate before the Secretary of Defense. I am a lawyer by profession with many years of practical experience, and it is my feeling that you have given us a good court within the Department of Defense before which to present our case.

We have recently been engaged in presenting to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to the Secretary of Defense our views with respect to the 1951 budget for the Department of Defense. As you know, no information with respect to the proposed budget can be released until next January, when the President submits his budget message to Congress. We are presently engaged in the process of formulating this 1951 budget, and I can assure you that not only the Secretary of the Navy but also the duly appointed officers who head the Navy are presenting the need for a strong Navy with all the vigor at their command. I am sure that the case which we are presenting is a good one, and I am sure that, in the interests of national security, we will maintain a strong Navy, just as I am sure that there will be maintained a strong Army and a strong Air Force, and it is only through the maintenance of all three in a high degree of readiness that our national security can be preserved.

Upon the Secretary of Defense, as the principal assistant to the President in all matters affecting the Department of Defense, falls the heavy responsibility of insuring that all three services are maintained in the high state of readiness I have mentioned. Knowing Louis Johnson as I do, I am sure that he will ably discharge this responsibility which has been placed upon him by Congress in the National Security Act amendments of 1949, and by the President and the Senate in his appointment and confirmation to the high position which he holds. I know that he will discharge his duty with the utmost fairness, with equal concern for all three services, and with a single eye to the safety of America.

More Inflation Found Implicit in $4,000 Family Income Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on October 7.

I think it is well to call to the attention of the people the speech Mr. Truman made at Kansas City predicting an established income level in our country of $4,000 per family a year. Without a doubt, we are heading toward inflation and by carrying through Mr. Truman's plans, more and more citizens are becoming dependent upon our central Government in Washington.

Last week the House passed the bill expanding social security. This increases the number of persons covered by 11,000,000 more making a total of 46,000,000. With inflation coming so rapidly, no one can deny that increasing the averages for old-age insurance from $26 a month to $45 is unreasonable. Of course, the sad part of it is the effect such inflation will bring upon those who depend on accumulated savings, whether those savings are in the form of cash in savings banks, bonds, stocks, and even real estate. Mr. Truman is certainly making his appeal to the larger voting groups especially the farmers and the workers. Some day the "forgotten group," those who followed the American scheme of working and saving for the future and not caring for Government subsidies in any form will certainly be heard from and rightly so.

The article follows:

MORE INFLATION FOUND IMPLICIT IN $4,000 FAMILY INCOME GOAL—MARK SULLIVAN RECALLS THAT TRUMAN RAISED STEEL WAGES IN 1946 STRIKE—AND ALSO STEEL PRICES

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman last week made a speech at Kansas City frankly political in its circumstances. It was at a dinner in honor of the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee. The gist and spirit of it was in a quotation carried by the Associated Press:

"We can establish an income level in the country of $4,000 per family a year. That is not a pipe dream." Mr. Truman added that a quarter of the population who now receive less than $2,000 a year would receive $4,000.

What Mr. Truman thus said informally, at a political party get-together, was in effect said by him seriously and officially some 2 months before, in his July economic report to Congress and accompanying radio address to the country. On that occasion Mr. Truman was dealing with the sum of individual incomes, "the national income—the total of all the income received by all the people in the United States." About that Mr. Truman said:

"A little more than 10 years ago President Roosevelt called for a national income of $100,000,000,000 a year. That was a surprising figure when he mentioned it, but we have far surpassed it in the space of 10 years. Our national income last year was $225,000,000,000. * * * Before long our national income should reach a total of $300,000,000,000."

AN ALLURING POLITICAL APPEAL

What Mr. Truman was saying in his political speech last week was, in effect, that families now receiving $2,000 a year or less will, before long—by implication 10 years—receive $4,000 a year. As political appeal, hardly anything could be more alluring. Mr. Truman can reasonably assume that many voters will compare a present $2,000 a year with an implied promise of $4,000 a year, that they will think no further and will vote accordingly.

The increase of over a hundred billion dollars in national income during the last 10 years came in large part from a sound cause. The number of persons at work, total employment, increased from some 45,000,000 in 1939 to some 60,000,000. That was a sound and normal basis for increase in national income; it was accompanied by corresponding increase in the production of goods. But that cannot be repeated during the next 10 years: employment is now at maximum.

For the increase in national and individual income which Mr. Truman now envisages, the method must be largely one that he has already practiced, a mere marking up of wages, and also of prices. In January 1946, during a strike of workers in the steel industry, he brought about an increase of some 18½ cents an hour in wages and simultaneously the administration, which then had control over prices, granted an increase of $5 a ton in the price of steel. Corresponding wage increases accompanied or followed by price increases went on in practically all industries. In terms of the national income, that was a mere paper increase simple for an administration to bring about if it gives no thought to ultimate consequences.

EFFECT ON SAVINGS SHOWN

The ultimate consequences include effect on savings. When Mr. Truman says that families receiving $2,000 a year are to receive $4,000, he omits a very large number of families and individuals. These are persons who live on savings or the income from savings. They include widows with young children dependent on income from life insurance, and individuals who depend on accumulated savings—in savings banks, Social Security, and, in a very large number of cases, savings invested in bonds which the Government urgently solicits them to buy. These will have no increase in the number of dollars they receive; they are totally omitted from Mr. Truman's promise.

Further than that, savers, and everybody else, would experience detriment in the purchasing power of the dollars they receive. What Mr. Truman envisages includes what has already gone on, increase of wages accompanied or followed by increase of prices. The price increase cancels out the wage one. Workers whose wages have already been doubled and are now promised a new doubling, have already learned that with increase of wages goes increased cost of goods they buy, increased cost of living. This is the same as to say reduced purchasing power of the dollar. What Mr. Truman envisages would mean further reduction: in short, more inflation.

More inflation is implicit in the sum of several Administration policies and practices—the political appeal to farmers and labor, increased Government expenditures, increase of the Government debt.

Proposes Big Four Sing at Concert With President at Keyboard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Racine Journal-Times of October 5, 1949:

PROPOSES BIG FOUR SING AT CONCERT WITH PRESIDENT AT KEYBOARD

(By Harman W. Nichols)

WASHINGTON.—Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, the Republican whip of the House and a fine tenor besides, has an idea for cleaning up the mess the world is in.

It won't work, but it makes interesting reading.

The gentleman from Illinois is a card-carrying member of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., and, as such, he is interested in seeing that the GOP is represented in the harvest of harmony which the SPEBSQSA sponsors each year at Constitution Hall here. This time on October 28.

"LET ME CALL YOU SWEETHEART"

ARENDS' idea is this:

"There has been some talk," he says, "that a Big Four conference might settle a lot of world problems, including the A-bomb. However, that has been hashed over the table without much success. How about a little singing? You know, music hath charm stuff."

ARENDS says it would be nice to have President Truman, a well-known piano player and member of the barbershop group of Kansas City, to double at the ivories and also to take the lead in singing. The Congressman suggests Clement Attlee of Britain as tenor, Charles de Gaulle of France as baritone, and Joe Stalin of Russia on the bass.

"The boys," says the Congressman, "could warm up on Let Me Call You Sweetheart and go on from there."

It's a nice thought, anyway.

Both the Republicans and Democrats want to get into the act in the harvest of harmony. But, as of now, both are having troubles. No baritones.

ARENDS would take the tenor in the GOP vocal foursome. He can depend on Representative HARRY L. TOWE, of New Jersey, for the lead. Representative FRANK FELLOWS, of Maine, is hot on the bass. But ARENDS lost his baritone at the polls, that was Representative Harve Tibbott, of Pennsylvania, who was the best singer in Congress. He used to get up and sing on the floor of the House and get a bigger hand than the speech makers. Tibbott, naturally, was a baritone. The Republicans are holding try-outs, being hard put.

SOME GOOD TALENT

The Democrats are no less depressed.

The leader of that potential quartet is JAMES PERCY PRIEST, the majority whip, from Nashville, Tenn., a fine tenor with a southern accent. TOBY MORRIS, of Lawton, Okla., takes a back seat to no one when it comes to singing the lead. The Democrats also are not lacking in the boom-boom, or bass department. They have J. FRANK WILSON, of Dallas, Tex.

But, me, oh, my! As for baritones they're as bad off, or worse, than the Republicans. The last time these fellows held practice what do you suppose they had to do? Call in a Republican to fill in as baritone: PAUL W. SHAFER, of Battle Creek, Mich. He fit in all right on the singing part, but wouldn't look too good on the stage trying to play harmony with his House opponents.

"Besides," said SHAFER, who would rather do almost anything except risk a chance of not being reelected, "I don't think it would be good politics."

Electrification Job Nearly Done on Michigan Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the Congress that much progress has been made in Michigan in recent years in electrification of rural territory. I have just read an article in the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News by Arthur W. Stace, editor of the Ann Arbor News. Mr. Stace is a student of these things, and his writings are always factual and informative.

Pursuant to the permission given to me by the House, I am including Mr. Stace's article in these remarks. It reads as follows:

ELECTRIFICATION JOB NEARLY DONE ON MICHIGAN FARMS

(By Arthur W. Stace)

Close to 100 percent of Michigan farms now have electric service. The total number at the beginning of the year as reported by the Edison Electric Institute was 172,800, which was 98.6 percent of the State's 175,268 farms counted in the 1934 United States Agricultural Census. And since the first of the year approximately 1,000 new customers have been added by one company alone, Consumers Power Co.

Thursday Consumers is formally celebrating the connecting up of its one hundred thousandth farm customer—the Cletus R. Fredericks' farm in Wheatland township, Hillsdale county, 5 miles northwest of Hudson. Service to this farm was actually begun last July, and since then Consumers has taken on several hundred more farms, bringing the total number served up to around 100,225. That's just a few isolated farms away from 100 percent in the 23,334 square miles in its service area. This area extends from the Ohio and Indiana line to beyond the Au Sable and Manistee Rivers in the

north, and from Lake Michigan to Lake Huron.

Detroit Edison, serving 11 counties in industrial, heavily populated southeastern Michigan, has 35,875 farm customers, which is also near to 100 percent. Detroit Edison claims that electric service is available to all farmers within its territory who may apply for it.

BIG ADVANCE

This electrifying of 173,000 farms in Michigan, with most of them using electric power for productive, labor-saving farm work and for home helps and conveniences, represents a tremendous advance from conditions in 1925. Farm electrification then was just beginning to attract the interest of the farmers and the utilities in the State.

In that year only 6,800 farms had high-line electric service. They were mostly near towns and were connected with town lines. They used electricity mainly for the same purpose as did city domestic customers—for lighting, for ironing, for running sweepers and washing machines. Their average consumption was 30 kilowatts a month.

NOT A LUXURY

The farmer at that time—in 1925—looked upon electricity much as his city cousin did—as a substitute for kerosene lamps and as a home convenience—not as a farm worker, not as a labor saver, not as a money maker. The change in his attitude came as a result of an intensive experimental, inventive and education campaign inaugurated in that 1925 period. The campaign aimed at adopting electric power to actual farm operations; to develop practical and profitable uses for it. This involved the changing of farm equipment for the use of small electric motors instead of big gas motors. Power on the farm at that time was furnished mainly by human muscles, by horses, by windmills, and by gasoline engines.

In this movement were Michigan State College, Consumers Power Co., Detroit Edison, and the Michigan Electric Light Association.

STUDY, EXPERIMENT

Consumers Power Co. built an experimental line from Mason to Danville. This was used by MSC Agricultural Engineering Department as a laboratory. Detroit Edison established electrified educational farms of its own. The MSC project was in charge of Prof. Herman J. Gallagher, who now is farm electrification superviser for Consumers Power Co.

Through studies and experiments it was shown that electric power could be used profitably for such operations as milking, grain grinding, pumping water, silo filling, young pig raising, chicken incubation, and even—by lighting poultry houses—fooling the chickens into laying more eggs in the dark months of the year.

As soon as practical uses were found the farmers of the State were informed of them through MSC extension course and demonstration trucks financed by Consumers and Detroit Edison.

MICHIGAN PLAN

The companies, too, worked out a line-extension financing arrangement which became known as the Michigan plan and was widely copied throughout the Nation. Under this plan the farmer was relieved of much or all of the heavy costs of taking lines to his farm.

Results of the farm-electrification campaign were quickly evident. Michigan farmers who had been indifferent to electric power, became enthusiastic for it. And their wives, seeking relief from home drudgery, were even more enthusiastic.

In 5 years from 1925 to 1930 the number of electrified farms grew from 6,800 to more than 30,000. By the end of 1935, even with the depression slowing down new ventures in general, the number had advanced to 50,000 which was more than 25 percent of all operating Michigan farms.

USE MORE POWER

Consumers Power back in 1930 had 8,336 farm customers. They used an average of 722 kilowatt-hours a year. In January this year Consumers was serving 99,228 farms—to which around 1,000 more have been added since then. In 1948, the average amount of power used by these farms was 3,051 kilowatt-hours; five times the average used in 1930; six times the average used in 1925.

Back in 1930 the average cost to farm users on Consumers lines was 4.51 cents per kilowatt-hour. Last year the average cost was 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Back in 1930 Consumers had 2,982 miles of farm lines; in 1948 it had 23,114 miles. This year it has still more, bringing service within reach of every farmer who asks for it.

DOING BIG JOBS

What work is electric power doing on Michigan farms?

It is doing all the old jobs. It is also providing cold storage in a big way for vegetables, apples, peaches, and the like. One plant on consumers' lines has a 100,000 bushel capacity. Another at Au Gres can hold 100 carloads of onions. It is pumping water for irrigation and for drainage.

It is drying hay in a mow. It is cleaning the gutters in dairy barns. The litter from 40 cows in one barn is carried out and loaded on a manure spreader in 3 minutes.

According to Herman Gallagher, practically every dairy herd on Consumers' territory with 10 or more cows is milked by electric power.

During the war years, with human help scarce, electricity was a mighty aid to Michigan farmers. The State was fortunate that the big work of education and development was far advanced by 1942.

According to the Edison Electric Institute, the Michigan Public Service Commission, and figures from privately owned utilities the number of farm customers on January 1 of this year was:

Consumers' Power Co	99,228
Detroit Edison Co	35,875
Other private utilities	16,463
Total	151,566

That would leave 21,224 served by REA and municipal plants, assuming that the 172,800 total is correct.

United States Versus Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. is spending millions of dollars in an effort to mislead the American housewives. It should be remembered that A & P has been convicted in a criminal case by proof beyond a reasonable doubt, fines were assessed amounting to $175,000 which were the maximum under the law, and these fines have been paid.

UNITED STATES NOW SUES TO END A & P CRIMINAL CONDUCT

This new civil suit will not close a single A & P store. A & P has been found guilty of cheating its own customers. The court found A & P's reductions in prices were caused by chiseling and cheating tactics. As a Member of Congress I can truthfully answer any criticism of the Government's case against the A & P as follows:

DEAR AMERICAN HOUSEWIFE: The A & P was convicted in the criminal courts of a gigantic racket violating the antitrust laws and fined $175,000. A & P was convicted of cheating its own customers by short-weighting, substitutes, etc. A & P was convicted of obtaining huge illegal and secret rebates which the suppliers then charged to all other American housewives.

Uncle Sam has now brought A & P into the civil courts to obtain an injunction to stop such illegal acts by A & P, of which it has already been found criminally guilty. Not a single A & P store will be closed. But Uncle Sam asks the courts to break up the A & P combine into 10 or more parts in order to bring about more free competition.

Competition means lower prices. Do you see anything wrong with that?

WRIGHT PATMAN.

INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS GET BUSY TO EXPOSE A & P'S FAILURE TO TELL TRUTH

I have just received a full-page advertisement that appeared in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, October 7, 1949 by independent food merchants. It is such an interesting advertisement, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE A & P STORY—YOUR LOCAL INDEPENDENT GROCER WANTS YOU TO KNOW THE OTHER SIDE

Does A & P, whose profit last year totaled $66,546,000, bring you lower prices or does it exact unfair profits that keep prices high?

There are always two sides to every story. You've read the A & P's side, now let's look at the other side. What evidence is there to back up the United States Justice Department's contention that the Great Atlantic & Pacific's present practices result in monopoly and high prices.

First. Shouldn't you, the public, know that the Antitrust Section of the Department of Justice at New York has indicated that the purpose of this civil suit is to prevent in the future, practices that A & P were found guilty of in September 1946. The decision was affirmed by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Chicago in February 1949. A & P paid fines of $175,000.

Second. Shouldn't you, the public, know that the Government states, in its brief that "neither the criminal action, in which A & P was found guilty in 1946, nor this action, is an attack upon integration or size or the power that accompanies integration or size. On the contrary, they are directed at the abusive exercise of such power to impose unreasonable and harmful restraints upon every phase of the food industry."

Now, what about high prices? If the A & P is found guilty, will it result in "higher food prices and less food on every dinner table," as they contend? We believe not. It is true that this company does sell in some cases at bargain prices. It is a well-known fact that A & P has a policy of selling below cost in some sections of a city in order to drive out competition. If you, Mrs. Housewife, pick the right A & P store and don't care about what happens when A & P monopoly hits your area, you no doubt can save money for the time being. After this monopoly is established and other stores put out of business, then watch out—up go prices in the A & P store you were saving money in. This has already happened in some areas where this company has its own

way. In such areas as just mentioned they sell at higher prices to make up for the bargain-price areas.

It should be pointed out also that A & P has a very ruthless way of forcing wholesalers and manufacturers to furnish its chain with produce and foods at prices far below those offered competitors by threatening to go into that particular processing or manufacturing field itself.

These are facts—A & P doesn't tell them.

When you were short of cash, did the A & P extend credit to you?

Your welfare is uppermost in the minds of your local independent grocer.

Where does this tremendous profit that A & P nets every year go? Does it stay in your own community to help better the lives of us living in Oil City? We don't think so. Your local independent grocer has this community and your welfare at heart. If the community and you do not prosper, then neither does he. Contributions to the hundreds of charitable organizations, churches, etc., are given to freely and without grudge by your local grocers. Ask those who do the soliciting how much that chain store gives. And what would happen if there ever was another depression? Who would you turn to for food and say "Charge it"? Your local grocer, of course. Such was the case, as we all remember, during the last one. For it is a policy with A & P that it operates on a strictly cash basis. All these facts and human-interest phases of this problem are worth your consideration. Know both sides of the story. Then you may draw your own conclusion as to who is guilty of what.

This message in your interest is published by the Independent Food Retailers Association of Oil City, Pa.

Lucy Ellen Lenhart Brehm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in this brief space I desire to pay tribute to a lady who passed away on October 3 and who was my most beloved constituent—my mother.

State-Federal Public Assistance and Welfare Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an analysis, which I have made, of the State-Federal public assistance and welfare services programs under the social-security bill (H. R. 6000) which recently passed the House. I believe that this material will be of value to the membership of the House.

STATE-FEDERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE SERVICES

1. What is the purpose of State-Federal public-assistance programs?

Answer. Notwithstanding old-age and survivors' insurance, there will always be some persons in the population who cannot meet their needs through their own efforts and who are not covered by or entitled to insurance benefits, and also persons entitled to benefits who need supplementary income; therefore the Federal Government makes grants-in-aid to the States to aid them in giving financial assistance to groups of needy persons.

2. What groups of needy persons are eligible for State-Federal public assistance?

(a) Present law: The needy aged 65 years of age and over; the needy blind; and dependent children—under the age of 16 or under the age of 18 if regularly attending school, who are living with relatives and have been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or incapacity of a parent.

(b) H. R. 6000: The needy aged 65 years of age and over; the needy blind; dependent children—this program would be modified so that the relative with whom a dependent child is living is classified as a recipient for Federal matching purposes, and needy children as under present law; permanently and totally disabled needy persons. Federal grants-in-aid to the State would be provided for assistance to this group on the same matching basis as for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

3. To what extent does the Federal Government share in the costs of State-Federal public-assistance programs?

(a) Present law: (1) Old-age assistance and aid to the blind: For Federal matching purposes the maximum payments are $50 per month. The Federal share of expenditures within these individual maximums is three-fourths of the first $20 of the State's average monthly payment plus one-half the remainder. Thus, for an individual payment of $50 or more, the maximum Federal share is $30.

(2) Aid to dependent children: For Federal matching purposes the maximum payments are $27 per month for the first child and $18 for each additional child in a family. The Federal share of expenditures within these individual maximums is—three-fourths of the first $12 of the State's average monthly payment per child, plus one-half the remainder. Thus, for an individual payment of $27 or more for the first child in a family the maximum Federal share is $16.50, and for each additional child receiving a payment of $18 or more the maximum Federal share is $12.

(3) Administration costs: Federal Government bears one-half the expense incurred by the States in administering the programs.

(b) H. R. 6000: Federal share for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment, plus one-half of the next $10, plus one-third of the remainder within individual maximums of $50; for aid to dependent children, four-fifths of the first $15 of the average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the next $6, plus one-third of the next $6 within individual maximums of $27 for the relative with whom the children are living, $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child in a family. Administrative costs shared 50 percent by Federal Government and 50 percent by States for all categories.

4. May State-Federal assistance be furnished to individuals without regard to their income and resources?

(a) Present law: No. All income and resources available to a claimant of old-age assistance or aid to the blind or aid to dependent children must be taken into consideration in determining eligibility for or the amount of the assistance payment.

(b) (1) H. R. 6000: No change as to old-age assistance and aid to dependent children and the same requirement as for these two programs would apply to aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

(2) Aid to the blind: In order to encourage and assist blind persons to become self-supporting a State may, in determining eligibility for or the amount of assistance, disregard earned income not to exceed $50 per month, as certified by the State agency administering vocational rehabilitation for the blind. Also the States would be prohibited from taking into consideration any income or resources of a claimant of aid to the blind which were not predictable or actually available to him.

5. Are the State and local agencies administering aid to dependent children required to take any action to obtain support from their parents when children are on the rolls because they have been deserted or abandoned?

(a) Present law: No action is required.

(b) H. R. 6000: The agency administering the program would be required to notify the appropriate local law-enforcing officials of the furnishing of aid to any child who has been abandoned or deserted by a parent.

6. Are the States required to provide State-Federal public assistance to all individuals who are eligible under the State plans approved by the Federal Government?

(a) Present law: No specific Federal statutory requirement.

(b) H. R. 6000: The States would be required to furnish assistance to all persons who qualified under the State plans.

7. Is State-Federal public assistance furnished to persons in public institutions?

(a) Present law: No, except for persons in public medical institutions for short time treatment.

(b) H. R. 6000: Recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled may reside in public medical institutions including nursing and convalescent homes without regard to the duration of such residence. Recipients residing in such mental institutions or tuberculosis sanitariums are not eligible for assistance.

8. How are other needy persons in the population who cannot qualify for one of the State-Federal public-assistance programs cared for?

Answer. The other needy persons are cared for under general assistance which is financed by States and/or local governmental units without Federal financial participation.

9. What factors have contributed to the general increases in both assistance case loads and payments from their low wartime levels?

Answer. One factor is the continued growth in population, but the primary reasons stem from adjustments from a wartime economy. The groups who make up the assistance rolls no longer have the employment opportunities of the war years when employers, faced with acute shortages, offered work at attractive wages to persons formerly considered unemployables. Moreover, the rise in the cost of living has made it necessary to increase assistance payments and to furnish supplementary assistance to persons with small fixed incomes who were self-supporting prior to the sharp rise in prices.

10. In addition to the direct effect on the public-assistance programs of the continued upswing in consumer prices, what has been the indirect effect through the impact or the price rise in old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries?

Answer: An assistance payment may be increased to meet higher living costs, but an

insurance benefit is a fixed amount, related to the previous wages of an insured individual, and once filed it cannot be adjusted upward to meet higher living costs. Frequently, therefore, public assistance is being called on to supplement inadequate insurance benefits.

11. To what extent does the Federal Government participate in the costs incurred by the States for child welfare services for neglected children, children in danger of becoming delinquent, etc.?

(a) Present law: Federal appropriations of $3,500,000 per year is authorized for grants to the States for child-welfare services.

(b) H. R. 6000: The authorization for Federal appropriations for this purpose would be increased to $7,000,000 per year.

12. What other changes would be provided by H. R. 6000 relative to child-welfare services?

Answer: A State would be authorized to use Federal funds to pay for the costs of returning runaway children to their homes in other States.

Can a Small Cotton Farmer Become a Large Cotton Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters written me:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of July 29, 1949, in which you asked what chance a young man of 21 would have under the new quota bill of becoming a large cotton producer with an allotment of 100 acres, assuming that he was allotted 11 acres initially.

Cotton acreage allotments are established on the basis of a farm and not on a personal basis. Under the provisions of S. 1962 as reported by the conferees on August 11, 1949, a farm could never receive a greater allotment than the initial 11 acres merely by overplanting the cotton acreage allotment. Section 344 (i) of this bill, as now written, reads as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, any acreage planted to cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be taken into account in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

There is provision, however, in the bill, wherein the county committee may use a part of a county acreage reserve to increase the initial allotment, in meritorious cases, above the highest planted acreage, and/or acreage regarded as planted under Public Law 12, established for the farm for the previous 3-year period excluding 1949. In giving consideration to any such adjustment the committee must consider such factors as (a) acreage available in the county for adjustments, (b) the needs of one farm for adjustments in allotment as compared with another, (c) the land, labor, and equipment available for cotton production, crop rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton.

In the event a farm does not qualify for an adjustment of an allotment by the county committee out of the county acreage reserve, it is conceivable that the operator may purchase or lease additional land which has cotton history, and if such land so purchased or leased becomes a part of the farm with the original 11-acre allotment the combined unit may receive an allotment somewhat greater than that which could have been established prior to the purchase or lease of the additional land.

We must emphasize that it is extremely difficult and hazardous to attempt to prophesy what may happen in future years with respect to an individual farm-acreage allotment. Although it may be legally possible for a farm to get an 11-acre allotment increased eventually to 100 acres through committee adjustment, it is likely that such cases will be very exceptional and even then only over a period of several years.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

MINEOLA, TEX.

Hon. Mr. BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: See, I am a renter and I want to know how much cotton I will be allowed to plant next year before I start farming cotton. I am enclosing a letter from the Quitman AAA office.

Will say under the new law you fellows have made instead of putting more fellows on the farm you all are fixing laws to put them off the farm. Me and my son have now about $900 worth of peanuts we can't sell because there wasn't any allotment on these farms, and there are thousands of farms that don't have allotments, so you can see cotton will be on the same order the farms have been laying out during the war and can't get allotments in Wood County.

So let me know how much cotton I will be allowed. If I am cut very bad I will be forced off the farm. I am 60 years old, and farming is all I know and can do, but when you fellows make laws to stop me and others from farming it is too bad. So let me hear from you at once.

I could write a book of how the farmers are being pressed off the farm, and you can see, can't you?

Yours respectfully,
U. S. BELCHER.

Overhauling of Regulatory Agencies Suggested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and banker, who has been a champion in the fight for competitive bidding on stock and bond issues for years and whose efforts made competitive bidding an SEC responsibility.

It is stated to me that more than 400,000 smaller corporations, which constitute the backbone of our economy, have had to forego any hope of selling their securities to the investing public because of the exorbitant cost of SEC registration.

Mr. Eaton cites the urgent need for a thorough overhauling of regulatory agencies such as the Securities and Exchange Commission. His letter is as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *September 23, 1949.*
Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR STEVE: The Federal Securities and Exchange Commission is reported to be on the verge of sending a proposal to Congress for legislation purporting to liberalize the offering of new issues of corporate securities to investors.

The SEC proposal, in reality, is an attempt to extend the Commission's already overpowering authority. Its enactment into law might well provide the final straw needed to break the back of that already badly crippled camel, the capital markets.

Congress would be well advised to greet the SEC's suggestions with skepticism, for nothing has done so much to paralyze the capital markets as the SEC, with its endless and obstructive red tape. The International Bank, it will be recalled, found its work so impeded by the SEC that special legislation was obtained to exempt the bank's financing from SEC jurisdiction.

Access to the capital markets has practically been denied to the medium-sized and smaller companies by the SEC. In the 12 months ended June 30, 1949, for instance, only 5 bond issues of less than $1,000,000 were registered with the SEC and cleared for cash sale to investors. In other words, only 5 companies with financial needs in this category were willing to endure the elaborate and expensive ordeal of SEC registration. This is appalling in a nation of 425,000 corporations, most of which ought to be expanding with our growing population.

The SEC is barred by statute from interference in municipal finance, and during the same 12-month period, 5,466 municipal issues aggregating more than $4,000,000,000 were sold to the public for cash. Had the communities that sold their bonds been forced to submit to the SEC's red tape, most of them assuredly would have been unable to raise the funds they needed.

The SEC's attacks on private investments are also in large measure to blame for the fact that the stocks of many companies are selling in the market at prices less than the per share values of the working capital of these companies. This means that the market puts no value on the property, plant, and equipment of a great many of our corporations, large and small. How can we build new mills and factories when existing ones are worthless in the eyes of investors?

If our capitalistic system is to escape extinction, there is urgent need for a thorough overhauling of such regulatory agencies as the SEC, the so-called blue sky commissions of the various States and the quasi-governmental body known as National Association of Securities Dealers.

Sincerely yours,
CYRUS EATON.

Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an analysis which I have made of the old-age and survivors insurance program

under the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, which recently passed the House. I believe that this material will be of value to the membership of the House:

OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

1. What is the purpose of the old-age and survivors insurance program under the Social Security Act?

(a) Present law: It is to insure workers in covered employment against wage loss of old age and to provide survivor insurance for these workers in the event of their death. Supplementary benefits are provided to the aged wife and dependent children under age 18 of such retired workers and survivors benefits are provided for widows, children, and sometimes aged dependent parents of deceased workers.

(b) H. R. 6000: In addition to the above protection furnished to workers by the present act, monthly benefits are provided for workers who are permanently and totally disabled.

2. To what are the monthly benefits in each case directly related?

Answer: The monthly benefits in each case are directly related to the wages earned by the worker in employments covered by the program.

3. In general who does old-age and survivors insurance cover?

(a) Present law: In general, covers workers in industry and commerce and excludes the following: The self-employed, household workers (domestics), employment in agriculture, nonprofit organizations, Government employees, and railroad employees.

(b) H. R. 6000: In addition, coverage is provided for the following new groups: The self-employed, except farmers and certain professional workers (doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, and editors and publishers); nonprofit organizations; regularly employed household workers (domestics); and Government employees not covered.

4. Are State and local government employees like teachers, policemen, and firemen, brought into coverage by H. R. 6000?

Answer. Only if both the State or local government which employs them and a two-thirds majority of the employees elect such coverage.

5. The amount of the taxable wages paid to the worker is reported to whom?

Answer. The amount of the taxable wages paid to the worker is reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue every 3 months by the employer, who pays at the same time his and his employees' contributions, or premiums, as required under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

6. What portion of the wages of a covered employee is taxed?

(a) Present law: All wages up to $3,000 a year paid a covered worker by each of his employers subject to that act are taxable.

(b) H. R. 6000: All wages up to $3,600 a year paid a covered worker by each of his employers subject to that act are taxable.

7. What is the contribution rate on these wages?

(a) Present law: The contribution rate on these wages is 1 percent each for employer and employee for all years up through 1949. In 1950, the rate is scheduled to rise to 1½ percent each, and in 1952 and thereafter, to 2 percent.

(b) H. R. 6000: The contribution rate for employer and employee is scheduled to be as follows: 1½ percent each for 1950, 2 percent each for 1951–59, 2½ percent each for 1960–64, 3 percent each for 1965–69, 3¼ percent each for 1970 and thereafter.

The self-employed persons who are covered contribute 1½ times the employee tax rate, or in other words, three-fourths of the combined employer-employee rate, namely: 2¼ percent in 1950, 3 percent in 1951–59, 3¾ percent in 1960–64, 4½ percent in 1965–69, 4⅞ percent in 1970 and thereafter.

7A. What special provisions as to taxes apply for employment by nonprofit organizations and State and local governments?

(a) Present law: These groups are not covered under present system.

(b) H. R. 6000: The nonprofit organization is not required to pay the tax as an employer, although it must collect the employees' contributions; if such an employer does not pay the tax, its employees will receive only half wage credits. Employees of State and local governments are covered only if their employer elects such coverage; further, if the employees are under a retirement system, they, too, must elect by a two-thirds majority to participate in the OASI system.

8. Who keeps the wage records?

Answer. The employer wage reports are forwarded by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Administration which keeps a continuous record of each worker's wage credits under his individual social-security account number.

9. What do these wage credits determine?

Answer: They determine the worker's insured status and the amount of benefits for which he and his dependents may qualify.

10. What amount of the worker's wages is taxed?

(a) Present law: Not more than $3,000 a year; if any tax is collected on more than this amount, the excess is refunded.

(b) H. R. 6000: Not more than $3,600 a year; if any tax is collected on more than this amount, the excess is refunded.

11. What is the maximum wage credits allowed a worker for any calendar year?

(a) Present law: Cannot exceed a maximum of $3,000.

(b) H. R. 6000: Cannot exceed a maximum of $3,600.

12. Upon what is the amount payable to persons entitled to monthly benefits based?

Answer: The monthly benefits are based on the worker's average monthly wage.

13. How is the average monthly wage determined?

(a) Present law: It is determined by dividing his total wage credits by the number of months he could have worked under the system—that is the number of months between 1936 or beginning with attainment of age 22, if later, and the first month of the quarter in which he becomes entitled to benefits or dies.

(b) H. R. 6000: In general, it is determined by dividing his total wage credits in his years of coverage (a year in which the worker received $400 or more in covered employment—$200 or more for years before 1950) by 12 times the number of such years of coverage. If it produces a more favorable result, only years of coverage after either age 21 or 1949 are counted.

14. How is the worker's retirement (or primary) benefit computed?

(a) Present law: It is 40 percent of the first $50 of his average monthly wage plus 10 percent of the next $200, with the resulting amount then being increased by 1 percent for each year of coverage (a year in which the worker received $200 or more in covered employment).

(b) H. R. 6000: It is 50 percent of the first $100 of his average monthly wage plus 10 percent of the next $200, with the resulting amount then being increased by one-half percent for each year of coverage (a year in which the worker received $400 or more in covered employment—$200 or more for years before 1950) and then reduced for those who are not in covered employment during the full time possible (namely, by the ratio of the number of years of coverage to the possible years in which he might have been covered).

15. Give an example showing how the primary benefit is computed under the present law.

Answer: Assume that the worker's average monthly wage is $150 and that he has 20 years of coverage. Then his monthly benefit is 40 percent of $50 (or $20) plus 10 percent of $100 (or $10) plus 20 percent of the preceding two items (or 20 percent of $30 which equals $6) giving a grand total of $36.

16. Give an example showing how the primary benefit is computed under H. R. 6000.

Answer: Assume that the worker's average monthly wage is $200 and that he has 20 years of coverage out of a possible 25 years of coverage. His basic benefit is then 50 percent of $100 (or $50) plus 10 percent of $100 (or $10) giving a total of $60. This amount is then increased by 10 percent (or $6) because of the one-half percent factor for each of his 20 years of coverage. The basic benefit is also reduced in proportion to the time he was in covered employment by multiplying it by 0.80 (obtained by dividing his 20 years of coverage by the 25 potential years of coverage), thus yielding an amount of $48, to which is added the $6 previously derived to give a final total of $54.

17. What is done about the amount of the benefits for those now on the rolls?

Answer: A special conversion table is provided which adjust these benefits upward by an average of 70 percent, in part to recognize the increase in the cost of living and in part to recognize the more liberal benefit formula for those who will retire in the future, including those who will retire in the immediate future.

18. To what are the benefits payable to worker's dependents and survivors related?

Answer: The benefits payable to a worker's dependents and survivors are related to the amount that his wage record would yield as his own primary benefit at the time the computation is made.

19. How is the worker's total and permanent disability benefit computed?

(a) Present law: No such benefits are available.

(b) H. R. 6000: It is computed in the same manner as though the worker had reached retirement age at the time he was disabled. However, no supplementary dependent's benefits are payable.

20. At what age can a fully insured worker become entitled to a primary old-age benefit?

(a) Present law: He must be at least 65 years old.

(b) H. R. 6000: He must be at least 65 years old.

21. If the worker is fully insured and has become entitled to a primary benefit, what supplementary benefits are payable to his dependents?

(a) Present law: Supplementary benefits equal to half the primary benefit are payable to his wife if she is at least 65 years old and to each unmarried dependent child under age 18.

(b) H. R. 6000: Supplementary benefits equal to half the primary benefit are payable to his wife if she is at least 65 years old or if there is an unmarried dependent child under 18 present and to each such child.

22. What is the amount of a widow's benefit, and when is it payable?

(a) Present law: The widow's benefit is three-fourths of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death, and it is payable after the widow reaches age 65.

(b) H. R. 6000: The widow's benefit is three-fourths of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death, and it is payable after the widow reaches age 65.

23. What benefits are payable to a deceased worker's widow when children are present?

(a) Present law: The widow's benefit is three-fourths and each child's benefit is one-half the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death.

(b) H. R. 6000: The widow's benefit is three-fourths and each child's benefit is one-half the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. An additional one-fourth of the primary benefit is payable to the family.

24. What is the amount of a parent's benefit, and under what conditions is it payable?

(a) Present law: The parent's benefit is one-half the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. It is payable after the parent reaches age 65 and only if the deceased worker left no widow or children under 18 and if the parent was chiefly dependent on the deceased worker.

(b) The parent's benefit is three-fourths the monthly amount of the insured worker's primary benefit computed from his wage record at the time of his death. It is payable after the parent reaches age 65 and only if the deceased worker left no widow or children under 18 and if the parent was chiefly dependent on the deceased worker.

25. What are the minimum and maximum amounts of monthly benefits payable to a retired worker without considering any supplementary amount for his dependents?

(a) Present law: The minimum is $10 a month and the maximum as of 1950 is $45.60 a month.

(b) H. R. 6000: The minimum is $25 a month and the maximum as of 1950 is $69.90 a month.

26. What are the minimum and maximum amounts of monthly benefits payable on the basis of any worker's wage record?

(a) Present law: The minimum for the total benefits payable is $10 a month, while the maximum is $85, twice the primary benefit, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever is least.

(b) H. R. 6000: The minimum is $18.75 a month, while the maximum is $150 a month, or 80 percent of the average monthly wage, whichever is least.

27. Under what conditions are lump-sum death payments made, and how is their amount determined?

(a) Present law: The lump-sum death payment is made if there is no survivor immediately entitled to monthly benefits. The payment amounts to six times the worker's primary benefit and is made to the surviving spouse; if there is no such spouse, then the lump sum is payable to the person who paid the funeral expenses (but in no case can it exceed such expenses).

(b) H. R. 6000: The lump-sum death payment is made for all deaths of insured workers. The payment amounts to three times the worker's primary benefit and is made to the surviving spouse; if there is no such spouse, then the lump sum is payable to the person who paid the funeral expenses (but in no case can it exceed such expenses).

28. Show by a table the monthly amounts payable to a single retired worker and to a married couple on the basis of various assumed years of coverage and average monthly wages.

Answer: See table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for retired worker*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Present law		House bill	
	Single	Married [1]	Single	Married [1]
Insured worker covered for 5 years:				
$50	$21	$32	$26	$38
$100	26	39	51	77
$150	32	47	56	85
$200	37	55	62	92
$250	42	63	67	100
$300	(2)	(2)	72	108

[1] With wife 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

TABLE 1.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for retired worker*—Continued

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Present law		House bill	
	Single	Married [1]	Single	Married [1]
Insured worker covered for 10 years:				
$50	$22	$33	$26	$39
$100	28	41	52	79
$150	33	50	58	87
$200	39	58	63	94
$250	44	66	68	102
$300	(2)	(2)	74	110
Insured worker covered for 20 years:				
$50	24	36	28	40
$100	30	45	55	80
$150	36	54	60	91
$200	42	63	66	99
$250	48	72	72	107
$300	(2)	(2)	77	116
Insured worker covered for 40 years:				
$50	28	40	30	40
$100	35	53	60	80
$150	42	63	66	99
$200	49	74	72	108
$250	56	84	78	117
$300	(2)	(2)	84	126

[1] With wife 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

NOTE.—"Average wage" is computed differently under the 2 plans (see text). These figures are based on the assumption that the insured worker was in covered employment steadily each year after 1949 (or after 1936 as the case may be).

29. Show by a table the monthly amounts payable to the survivors of a deceased worker.

Answer: See table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for survivors of insured workers*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Aged widow [1]		Aged parent [1] or 1 child alone		Widow and 1 child		Widow and 2 children		Widow and 3 children	
	Present law	House bill	Present law	House bill	Present law	House bill	Present law	House bill	Present law	House bill
Insured worker covered for 5 years:										
$50	$16	$19	$11	$19	$26	$38	$37	$40	$40	$40
$100	20	38	13	38	33	77	46	80	53	80
$150	24	42	16	42	39	85	55	113	63	120
$200	28	46	18	46	46	92	64	123	74	150
$250	32	50	21	50	53	100	74	133	84	150
$300	(2)	54	(2)	54	(2)	108	(2)	144	(2)	150
Insured worker covered for 10 years:										
$50	17	20	11	20	28	39	39	40	40	40
$100	21	39	14	39	34	79	48	80	55	80
$150	25	43	17	43	41	87	58	116	66	120
$200	29	47	19	47	48	94	67	126	77	150
$250	33	51	22	51	55	102	77	137	85	150
$300	(2)	55	(2)	55	(2)	110	(2)	147	(2)	150
Insured worker covered for 20 years:										
$50	18	21	12	21	30	40	40	40	40	40
$100	23	41	15	41	38	80	53	80	60	80
$150	27	45	18	45	45	91	63	120	72	120
$200	32	50	21	50	53	99	74	132	84	150
$250	36	54	24	54	60	107	84	143	85	150
$300	(2)	58	(2)	58	(2)	116	(2)	150	(2)	150
Insured worker covered for 40 years:										
$50	21	22	14	22	35	40	40	40	40	40
$100	26	45	18	45	44	80	61	80	70	80
$150	32	50	21	50	53	99	74	120	84	120
$200	37	54	25	54	61	108	85	144	85	150
$250	42	58	28	58	70	117	85	150	85	150
$300	(2)	63	(2)	63	(2)	126	(2)	150	(2)	150

[1] Age 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

NOTE.—"Average wage" is computed differently under the 2 plans (see text). These figures are based on the assumption that the insured worker was in covered employment steadily each year after 1949 (or after 1936 as the case may be).

30. Show by a table the lump-sum death payments payable in respect to a deceased worker.

Answer: See table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Illustrative lump-sum death benefits*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Insured worker covered for 5 years		Insured worker covered for 40 years	
	Present law	House bill	Present law	House bill
$50	$126	$77	$168	$90
$100	158	154	210	180
$150	189	169	252	198
$200	220	184	294	216
$250	252	200	336	234
$300	(1)	215	(1)	252

[1] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

NOTE.—"Average wage" is computed differently under the 2 plans (see text). These figures are based on the assumption that the insured worker was in covered employment steadily each year after 1949 (or after 1936 as the case may be).

31. How does the covered employee qualify for a retirement benefit?

(a) Present law: He must be "fully insured."

(b) H. R. 6000: He must be "fully insured."

32. When is a covered employee fully insured?

(a) Present law: He is fully insured if he has received $50 or more in covered employment in at least one-half the number of calendar quarters elapsing after 1936 (or attainment of age 21, if later) and the quarter in which he reaches age 65 or dies (whichever is first). A minimum of 6 such quarters of coverage is required, and a maximum of 40 such quarters will make a worker permanently fully insured. For workers now near age 65, or beyond, such insured status can be acquired with fewer quarters of coverage.

(b) H. R. 6000: In addition to the qualifying conditions of the present law a new condition is introduced for those workers who cannot meet the previous requirements, namely the worker may be fully insured if he has 20 quarters of coverage out of the last 40 quarters elapsing. However for quarters after 1949 there must be $100 of covered wages to count as a quarter of coverage.

33. On what basis are survivor benefits payable?

Answer: All types of survivor benefits are payable if the deceased worker was fully insured. Even if the deceased worker were not fully insured, the lump-sum death payment and monthly survivor benefits for children and the widowed mother are available if the deceased worker was currently insured.

34. When is a worker currently insured?

(a) Present law: The worker is currently insured if at his death he has received $50 or more in covered employment in at least 6 of the last 13 calendar quarters including the quarter in which he died.

(b) H. R. ——: The worker is currently insured if at his death he has received $100 or more in covered employment in at least 6 of the last 13 calendar quarters including the quarter in which he died. However, for quarters prior to 1950 only $50 of covered wages is required for a quarter of coverage.

35. How does the covered employee qualify for the permanent and total disability benefit?

(a) Present law: No such benefits are available.

(b) H. R. ——: He must be both currently insured and have 20 quarters of coverage out of the last 40 quarters including the quarter in which he became disabled. He must be disabled for at least 6 months before any monthly benefits are payable.

86. How is the amount of the disability benefit computed?

Answer: It is computed in the same way as though the individual has reached age 65 at the time he became disabled. However no dependent's benefits can be payable until the man reaches age 65 at which time he is then considered to be an old-age beneficiary.

37. What conditions as to income and retirement from gainful work are imposed on beneficiaries?

(a) Present law: Benefits are not payable for any month in which the beneficiary has wages of $15 or more from covered employment. There are no restrictions on the amount of income from investments or earnings from noncovered employment.

(b) H. R. 6000: Benefits are not payable for any month in which the beneficiary has wages or self-employment income of more than $50 from covered employment. However for disability beneficiaries this restriction applies to all types of employment. There are no restrictions on the amount of income from investments or earnings from noncovered employment (except for disability beneficiaries as noted above).

38. What special benefits are provided for veterans?

(a) Present law: Special survivor benefits are payable for veterans who died within 3 years after discharge if no veterans' pensions are payable.

(b) H. R. 6000: The above provision is continued, and in addition wage credits of $160 for each month of military service are given to veterans and also in respect to those who died in service.

39. What provisions are made for Government contributions to the financing of the system?

(a) Present law: Authorization is provided, although it has not as yet been used, for appropriations from the general Treasury as may be required to finance the program. In addition, the added cost due to the special veterans' benefits described previously is currently being met from the general Treasury.

(b) H. R. 6000: There is no provision as to appropriations from the general Treasury for financing the system (other than for the special veterans' benefits) since it is anticipated that the rates provided will be sufficient to make the system self-supporting.

Patents, Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter Mr. Boyd wrote me August 22, 1949, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In our telephone conversation of today you asked three questions concerning the construction of the coal demonstration plants at Louisiana, Mo., as follows:

1. Was a search made of enemy patents in the Department of Justice before the plants were built?

2. If so, who made this search? and

3. Did we obtain any substantial help from the patents so far as the construction of the plant is concerned?

The answers are as follows: No search was made of enemy patents in the Department of Justice. The answers to the next two questions, then, are in the negative.

The information for the construction of these plants was obtained from visits to European plants, study of the technical literature, and consultation and employment of American and European engineers and scientists. As finally evolved, the plants differ in major respects from any constructed in Europe and permit advantage to be taken of developments in this country, as well as advanced American engineering practice.

I hope that this information may be of assistance to you in your work.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BOYD, *Director.*

Progress of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, thinking people must realize that our country is slipping into a sort of ideological erosion that, like termites in a building, eats away the timbers that support our way of life. These changes steal upon us silently and indeed are a revolution in which people lose their rights by default. It seems to me that the subdued indifference of individuals brings on a common fate where the lazy and the indifferent are always subdued by the more active.

Our Government is approaching more and more a labor-Socialist state. There are Members in this House who call themselves Fair Deal Democrats. They are in fact labor-Socialists and should be so labeled. They advocate everything which is advocated by the government in New Zealand. We can be thankful for those stanch Jeffersonian Democrats who have not seen fit to go along with this Fair Deal program of a labor-Socialist government.

These changes in our Government steal upon us silently. The stream of our Government is flowing toward a well-defined socialistic government. This is a condition in which the government becomes our master and not our servant. The people will wake up some day and find that they are paying a terrific price in their loss of freedom and individual action by the adoption of so many plans where the government directs their activity from the cradle to the grave. Members of this House ought to recognize that future generations must carry the burden which we are now saddling upon them. Certainly as we solve today's problems we shape tomorrow's future.

This Socialist-labor government which is creeping upon us has never succeeded anywhere in the world. It tempts, beguiles, and panders the individual. It is not the type of government that produces great men. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the best things of life come through sacrifice. We cannot get them by having government give us everything we think we would like to have. If we keep on the road we are now traveling the Government will become a machine of control and compulsion, managing our lives, our money, our credits, prices, farming, rents, housing, foreign trade, social security, production, transportation, communication, education and health. And with all this come taxes which control and regulate our business. Such a government is a denial of the rights of the individual to support himself; the denial of the right of the individuals to manage themselves and their property. Such a Socialist-labor government always moves toward compulsion and away from freedom. It denies the individual the right to dispose of his property as he sees fit. Such a government holds that it and its corrupt politicians are best suited to dispose of what the free mind and spirit of the individual can produce. Under this type of government, freedom of invention and production soon disappears.

I urge my colleagues to read what is happening in New Zealand. It ought to cause you to stop, look, and listen as to what is happening to our American way of life.

The following are excerpts from a letter from New Zealand where it now is possible to observe what happens under a socialistic regime. Says the writer:

I have just returned from a two-months study of conditions in New Zealand and after 12 years of Labor Government, 10 years of social security, and 8 years of socialized medicine. * * *

The Labor Department defines "social security" as a "social obligation to be financed by society." It shouldn't take a mental colossus to envision what a program based on that definition would produce and cost. I will simply state that in New Zealand today:

1. It is almost impossible to get anyone to work. The want-ad pages of the newspapers corroborate this statement. Column after column of help-wanted ads with not more than one-tenth of one column of position-wanted ads, but the applicants clearly state that they must be their own boss or mistress or, in the case of a domestic servant, "one of the family."

Under social security, which includes superannuation benefits, age benefits, invalids' benefits, widows' benefits, orphans' benefits, family benefits, miners' benefits, sickness benefits, unemployment benefits, Maori war benefits, and emergency benefits, taxes are so high that there just are no private savings with which to provide the tools of production so desperately needed there. And as practically everyone is eligible for benefits of some kind, there is little incentive for people to work. Every family receives 10 shillings a week for every child from birth to 16 years of age. Consequently, those who have large families (and the Maoris, who are prolific breeders, borrow children when the government inspector comes around) are able to live comfortably on the government dole. As housing is heavily subsidized by the government, it is possible to secure homes at a very low rate.

2. Under socialized medicine, it is extremely difficult to get a doctor to leave his office to come to a patient. Since everything is free, people flock to the doctors for treatment of the most minor ailments. Consequently, the doctors are treating three and four times the number of patients by remaining in their offices as they would by making

calls. I'm talking quantitatively now. I could give some shocking evidence of the quality of the treatments—some that happened in my own family. Medicine is free; so you are given prescriptions for twice as much as you need. You don't pay for medicine at the drug store—simply sign a form.

3. Obviously, the money for all this must come from somewhere, and that somewhere is that part of the people's earnings that, left alone, would be used to create additional tools of production. As a result, the only step that would raise living standards by giving this magnificent country a balanced economy (i. e., agriculture and manufacturing) is being neglected. It is virtually impossible to save, and it is virtually stupid to work, because most of one's earnings are used to support people who work very little or not at all.

4. Under the Labor Government it is necessary to get a permit for constructing or importing anything. The bureaucrats decide on how many rooms, how many bathrooms, and what color your house will be. My brother-in-law spent more than 6 months getting the necessary permits to add two rooms to his house to accommodate a growing family. People don't voice their criticisms of the Government for fear of being put on the "black list" or being branded antilabor. The upshot of it all is that the women of New Zealand are the hardest working people I have ever seen. They work from sunup to long past sundown. They do the cooking, housekeeping, marketing, baby tending, washing, and cleaning—even shoe shining (you can't get a shoeshine in New Zealand). There are no deliveries and no servants to look after their babies. The mothers take their babies to market. The street cars have rows of baby carriages outside, on front and back. The carriages do perform an extra service, however, for one seldom finds a paper bag for groceries—every item is wrapped individually in newspapers.

Navajo Rehabilitation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore had and obtained, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Phoenix Republic, reproduced in the editorial page of the Gallup Independent on Friday, October 7, 1949, with respect to Mr. Collier's criticism of and opposition to the Navajo rehabilitation bill:

AN UNCONVINCING CRITIC

So much sound support for the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation bill undoubtedly exists in Congress that the blast directed against the measure by John Collier, former Indian Commissioner, probably won't do serious damage. There is little in the record of Mr. Collier's 12-year administration of Indian affairs to make his recommendations a substitute for the study that has gone into shaping the long-range program set up by the $88,000,000 measure.

Few men of greater sincerity than Mr. Collier have had a hand in Indian affairs. His approach, however, reflected his basic training as a social worker with immigrants. For a decade prior to his place in the Roosevelt administration he had been executive secretary of the American Indian Defense Association. This group of well-meaning and financially liberal citizens wanted something done overnight to correct the situation which has resulted from pushing the Indian around for 50 years.

Mr. Collier and his group took hold of the problem with the typical New Deal planner's touch—by recruiting helpers from Columbia University to teach the Indians their own crafts. The philosophy was that Indians should continue to be Indians in an Indian's world. There was some sort of visionary concept of meeting practical requirements in the white man's world via beadwork and rug weaving.

It was during the Collier regime that problems resulting from over-grazing on Indian lands led to cuts in livestock by Government order. Making a living from a flock limited to 20 sheep was an impossibility and overgrazing was solved by substituting near-starvation for hundreds of Navajo families.

In his attack on the rehabilitation bill Mr. Collier cited possible exploitation of Indian lands under State instead of Federal control, particularly in the matter of water rights. He was critical also of the proposed division of social-security costs. The record of States could hardly prove worse than that already written under Federal control.

There are imperfections in the Navajo-Hopi program but at least it is a start in the right direction. Roads, hospitals, schools, and employment opportunities are certainly to be desired over a return to the dreamy experiments of the Collier era in Indian affairs.—Phoenix Republic.

Ways and Means Committee Is Opposed to the Principle of Insurance Without Contributions by Employees Advocated by President's Steel Board and the CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, so far as the Ways and Means Committee is concerned, it is interesting to note that the principle of noncontributory-employee insurance recommended by President Truman's Steel Board and the CIO was rejected by the Ways and Means Committee just 3 weeks before the Board's report was issued. The major issue in the current steel dispute is whether employees shall contribute something toward their own insurance and pensions or whether pensions and insurance shall be financed by the companies involved.

The CIO and the President's Board say that employees should not contribute.

Here is what the Ways and Means Committee had to say in the social security report about the contributory principle:

The time had come to reaffirm the basic principle that a contributory system of social insurance in which workers share directly in meeting the cost of the protection afforded is the most satisfactory way of preventing dependency. A contributory system, in which both contributions and benefits are directly related to the individual's own productive efforts, prevents insecurity while preserving self-reliance and initiative. (H. Rept. 1300, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 2.)

Some Pertinent Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein copy of a letter to the editor of the Detroit Times, published in that newspaper on September 27, 1949.

This letter reflects the thinking of one good American whom I know personally and who is more than ordinarily interested in the welfare of his country. It follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *September 20, 1949.*
To the CITY EDITOR, THE DETROIT TIMES,
DETROIT, MICH.

DEAR SIR: I have found in my life—

When you talk to educators they think they know it all.

When you talk to clergymen they think they know it all.

When you talk to politicians they think they know it all.

When you talk to union leaders they think they know it all.

When you talk to lawyers they think they know it all.

When you talk to doctors they think they know it all.

When you talk to editors of newspapers they think they know it all.

They are all smart in one sense of the word but childish in another.

Those few smart men are trying to run the affairs of others and neglecting their own.

I have found from experience, if someone tries to correct the mistakes that those small percentage makes he is classified as a nuisance and often they pretend they are protecting the majority's side which in reality they are against.

On the 15th day of August while returning from Denver to Detroit aboard a United Airliner, I met a Protestant clergyman from France who informed me he was touring the United States and Canada for religious purposes. In the course of our conversation we began to talk about the political situation. This clergyman accused Leon Blum of France for the restlessness of France because when he came to power he promised the people of France things that they never received.

In America since the Roosevelt family and their New Deal came to power they promised security to the workingman, which later proved very expensive. The mothers of America were promised that their sons would never fight on foreign soils but they did fight and today are still scattered all over the world and the future of their children's sons will live under the shadow of fear. All this was done to make history for themselves at the expense of others.

The present administration, instead of preventing commotion, creates it. Such things don't bring unity and harmony amongst people but keep them divided.

Great Britain today is trying their own new deal (socialism) and so far if it weren't for the American people's dollar it would never survive.

Russia (Communist) usually shoots one man to please another or either robs four to help one and eventually the fifth one will be robbed too.

I have found that man is often lured to worse instead of better. The reason for that is he never profits from his past expe-

rience and he always follows the man that promises him a home built on quicksand.

I have found in order to get what you aim for you have to work for it. No individual should depend on others, but should learn to depend on himself. No matter how little you may earn you will enjoy it.

Man should know that life is not all rosy and everything that shines is not gold. He should never give up hope for his future. Remember that life is only what you make it.

Since 1937 we have heard strikes, strikes, strikes. What does it bring a man? It only deprives him from buying the things that he produces because everything is much higher priced than he can afford. This is the bad habit which France has taught to others, and I believe it is time to discontinue such practice for the benefit of all.

Unions are a blessed thing for both sides and for the community in general if they are conducted right and consideration is shown for each other. No individual should feel that he is the owner of another person's home.

Respectfully yours,

ALFRED P. ADAMO.

Korea in the Midst of the Struggle for Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Dr. John M. Chang, Ambassador to the United States from Korea, at a luncheon at the Press Club, Thursday, September 22, 1949:

Being a diplomat in Washington in these postwar years is a good bit like being a poor young man dating the banker's daughter. No one will believe it is a case of pure love. Few will take seriously the young man's pride in his own people or confidence in their destiny. It is so easy to rest on the simple conclusion that all the young man is interested in is the old banker's money. International love may not look very convincing under the shadow of Fort Knox.

We Koreans, however, are proud of our own people, and we do have confidence in our destiny. We feel that we can stand in the American forum and speak to you, and through you to the American people, in a spirit of honest comradeship, as fellow soldiers in a world-wide struggle for human dignity and freedom.

It is my purpose to speak to you in utter frankness about the issues we face, and the way in which we are meeting them.

This is no time for a long historical review. I need not detail for you the humiliation and degradation, and physical suffering we Koreans endured under 40 years of Japanese rule—a period so black that your President and the other statesmen at the Cairo Conference could find no better term to sum it up than the stark word "enslavement." Suffice it to say that we in Korea have had our fill of foreign totalitarian rule—and we are determined that whatever the cost, we shall never endure it again.

During the period of enslavement, Korea was a forgotten nation. Why? Because the Japanese did everything they could to wipe out our individuality. They spent millions of dollars, all over the world, to efface Korea from the consciousness of all peoples. Their policy was to keep Koreans ignorant—and to make the world ignorant of Korea.

Came the world-shaking blast at Hiroshima, and the shackles that had bound us for an entire generation were blown away. Thousands of our people defied the strict orders of the Japanese police and broke out home-made Korean flags. We lined the 20-mile roadway from Inchon to Seoul, welcoming the boys in khaki as they brought us the liberation we had prayed and struggled for since 1905.

While our eyes were still filled with the tears of gratitude and rejoicing, we saw our liberating allies split into two camps, with their line of division drawn squarely through the middle of our own land. For 2 years we witnessed the lifeblood of our economy drain away, while a new totalitarian power entrenched itself in our industrial north, and we suffered complete inability to take any measures in our own behalf.

Korea emerged from that dangerous period for two reasons. The first was that our people never yielded to the specious plea that we regain our unity by surrendering to Communist demands. And the second reason was that the United States sought no advantages for itself in the portion of our country which it occupied, but promised us aid in securing the reunification and independence of our distraught nation.

During those 2 years, while we struggled to find the means to exist, the Communist grip on north Asia gradually tightened, and a Communist puppet regime was solidly entrenched in our own country, north of the 38th parallel line. It was not until September 1947, that the United States turned from direct negotiations with the Soviet Union to present the Korean question to the broader forum of the United Nations. And it was still another 9 months before an election was held in South Korea to give our people their first chance to set up a government of their own choice.

Meanwhile, northern Korea was completely submerged under totalitarian police control. An estimated 2,000,000 people had, meantime, uprooted themselves from their ancestral homes in the north to seek the sanctuary of freedom in the south, thus presenting us with a refugee problem as severe as exists anywhere in the world.

Our mines and factories had fallen into disrepair, with production down to 20 percent of the prewar years. Our people were disorganized and empty-handed, and across the border was a Soviet trained and equipped army estimated to number 200,000 men.

We had to build our government and our industry from the ground up, while confronted with the powerful Communist aggression drive for Asian empire. Thousands of well financed and organized Communist agents had infiltrated with the refugees into our very midst, some of them indeed into our own police force and constabulary units.

Then came what was intended to be a decisive blow: the electricity upon which we depended for industrial power was shut off from the north. Our political organization, our newspapers, our schools, all had to proceed on the shaky foundations erected following the Japanese defeat.

Back in August of 1948, when our Government was finally inaugurated, there were many reasonable prophets who doubted our capacity to survive. We Koreans, however, have a proverb that helped set our feet on the right path. "You cannot build a mountain without carrying every load of earth." We knew that no miracle would build our nation for us. We would have to buckle down and build it for ourselves.

The problem was that we could build only with our left hand. Our right hand was occupied with defense—with rooting out the Communist conspiracies in our midst, and with holding back the Communist armies from the north.

With our left hand, however, we feel that we have done enough to show what could be done if both hands were freed for the task.

Simple security has had to be our foremost concern. Here, I believe, our record is one of which we need not be ashamed. Ours is a mountainous country, ideal for guerrilla warfare. Thousands of Communist agitators had spread among our people before our Government was set up. They were strong enough to throw the island of Cheju into disorder and to instigate a bloody rebellion at Yosu and Sunchon. They raised a loud clamor against our Government, against the United Nations Commission, and against the continued presence of American troops.

But we put down their rebellions. We broke up their underground organization. Above all, our people remained loyal and were not confused by the propaganda barrage. Now, a year later, we are proud to report that the cancerous Communist growth in our midst not only has been checked, but is actually dying out.

Our foremost economic problem was simply to exist. There was a dire shortage of all kinds of consumer goods. But our Government and our people united in one firm resolve. We did not want the slender resources of American aid to be spent to put food in our stomachs or clothes on our backs. We tightened our belts and put every cent that could possibly be spared into rehabilitation of mines and factories, in generation of electric power and purchase of raw materials, into transportation and education.

As a stop-gap measure to restore some of the vital electricity lost when the Communists pulled the switches in the north, the United States rushed several power barges to our assistance. As a long-term solution to the problem, we had to increase our coal supplies, to provide the fuel for steam generation of electricity. Within 5 months we had stepped up coal production in the key Machari coal mines from 100 tons a day to 800 tons a day. Our electric generating capacity is now gradually increasing to restore the amount of electric power we formerly received from the huge hydroelectric power plants in the northern part of the country.

In agriculture, in textile and rubber goods industries, in transportation and in fisheries, similar or even better progress has been made. Considering the state of our country a year ago, and the dangers with which we have had to deal, I think it is fair to say that our people have already demonstrated their capacity, and shown what, in normal circumstances, they would be able to do.

Our final goal is to achieve a peaceful unification of our country, and this can only be accomplished by strengthening our Republic through moral and economic assistance from the friendly nations of the United Nations—chiefly, the United States. We are deeply grateful for the support which your country has already given us, and for the sympathy and understanding of your people. We are sure that you will continue to aid us.

But the chief emphasis in our thinking today must rest upon the fact that the circumstances we confront are not normal—either in Korea, or in Asia as a whole, or in the world. We are confronted by an aggressive and relentless pushing force that is doing its best to keep the democracies off-balance, to create chaos, and to move in when the power to resist has been destroyed.

We, in Korea, are in the very front line of a struggle that causes even you in the United States a degree of dread. We believe that in striving to hold back the Communist conquest of our own country, we are serving the cause of democratic freedom everywhere. We do not quail in fulfilling our role, described in the words of Mr. Paul Hoffman as "a bastion of democracy in Asia." We

believe in that fulfillment, and are supported in our belief by the words of Congressman WALTER HUBER, of Ohio, who recently said, while visiting our country, "If ever a country is destined to become a real democracy, that country is Korea."

I know, as you do, that the United States is in the midst of a soul-searching reappraisal of its policies in the Far East. Knowing something of the history of the United States and the character of the American people, I am convinced that your force will be thrown decisively against the spread of totalitarian aggression in that part of the world.

It is no longer necessary to preach political sermons on the theme that the loss of liberty anywhere endangers freedom everywhere. You have learned from Japan that a strong force can strike from the east as well as from the west. And I know that in your hearts you desire that peace-loving peoples everywhere should have the simple opportunity to live decently and be secure.

But if by some tragic chance, Korea should be lost, what would be the outcome? At the south end of our peninsula is Chinhae, one of the best naval bases in the world. There are, in the south, several important airfields. With these key points in Communists hands, access to Japan would be so simple as to be inviting. Thus, Korea lost, can make war inevitable; Korea strengthened can help maintain peace for all men.

In speaking to you today, I would enter the plea that your economic and military aid should not be too long delayed. A fire is raging in the east, and we feel it hot upon our faces this very day. It is my belief that delay means tragedy for the exposed friends who are holding advanced segments of the front line.

We in Korea are fighting the world battle to hold back the most dangerous aggressive force of our time. We need supplies. We need the substance with which to fight. We need the cheering news that our effort is integrated with the rest of the program around the world to achieve the same goal for which we strive.

The simple fact is that our thin line of troops along the thirty-eighth parallel is confronting the organized Communist power of Asia with no more than light arms, and with inadequate ammunition for the rifles in our soldiers' hands. We need artillery and we need planes. We need ships. We need at least the rudiments of what any army must have in this twentieth century if it is to succeed against the weapons with which it is faced.

Meanwhile, behind the front lines, the economic advances we achieved so precariously are threatened by delay in raw materials and essential machinery. As month after month creeps by, the paralyzing delay of vital industrial aid threatens us with the awful specter of economic collapse. Like a donkey with a carrot dangling in front of its nose, we can redouble our efforts and hasten our steps, but without sustenance we must finally fall.

You have no idea how eagerly our people are waiting for the speedy passage of the $150,000,000 aid appropriation.

Daily, the Communist radio in northern Korea thunders the charge that the Republic is the victim of American imperialism. Of course, we know the utter nonsense of that. The record of the American Government and the American people in dealings with other nations is just too clean to permit acceptance of that kind of fabrication. Not all of us realize, however, how constant reiteration of a lie can delude the unsuspecting into believing that what they hear—over and over and over again—is truth. It is difficult to combat a never-ending barrage of falsehoods.

My country, having regained its ancient status of a free and independent nation, looks forward confidently to the reinstitution of a modern counterpart of its original treaty of commerce and amity with the United States. This further evidence of age-old ties being renewed between our Governments and the Korean and American people would, we feel, either cause the Communist radio to lie more loudly—if that be possible—or to find a new lie. And that is always possible.

We are also confident that we shall have your assistance and sympathetic understanding in our righteous efforts to obtain reparations from the Japanese.

What is our bill?

How can one compute, in dollars and cents, the toil and sorrow of millions of Korean men and women for more than 40 years under the cruelest taskmaster the world has ever known? Your own American war prisoners will confirm the accuracy of this description.

The bill is incalculable. We could redeem it only by lowering ourselves to the level of a militaristic and rapacious Japan. That we will not do.

But, when you restored our house to us—though circumstances temporarily enable us to occupy only half of it—the ruffian tenant had already removed most of the furniture.

We Koreans want back what he took away.

We want our ships, our iron ore, our manganese, our timber, our gold, our objects of art, and an infinite number of other things. We want what was confiscated from Koreans in Japan as well.

At this precise moment I realize that I may be making news. I am in the strange position of not asking the United States for anything of a tangible nature.

All I want is your cooperation in helping us regain our stolen property. That is priceless. I am sure you will not deny me that cooperation.

I cannot conclude without one further word. Our President, Dr. Syngman Rhee, has taken the realistic diplomatic step of calling for a Pacific pact—an economic and defensive regional understanding among nations bordering on the Pacific Ocean.

The need for it is at least as great as the need for an Atlantic pact in the west. The dangers that confront us cannot be wished away. We must organize and stand together to push them away. If it is feared that the people of the Pacific Basin are too disorganized or disunited to enter into a regional understanding, it must be considered that our disorganization and disunity can only be overcome by their opposites.

The Far East is beset by two dangers: lack of economic development, which breeds poverty, and Communist aggression, which feeds upon the chaos it helps to cause.

President Truman has boldly and farsightedly outlined both dangers and proposed remedies for them. Long ago he set in motion the Truman doctrine of resistance to further Communist aggression in Europe. The world will not be safe until this same doctrine is extended to the Far East.

And in his inaugural address, he pointed out the need for concerted effort of the peoples of the world to hasten the development of underdeveloped areas. The fruits of the industrial revolution are lavish enough to be enjoyed by all peoples in every part of the world.

Korea at the present moment is continuing to hold the line against Communist pressure in the Far East. But it is only due to the frankness demanded in such a group as yours to say that we must have help. We need the immediate help of additional supplies, and the long-range help that comes from being a part of the organized body of the other democratic peoples of the world.

Prayer Time for United Nations Assembly Will Be Mighty Force for International Good Will and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent very thoughtful article from the publication Gist, urging that the United Nations sessions be opened and closed with prayer or meditation.

Surely this is an entirely reasonable request and would be viewed with approval and deepest appreciation by most member nations. I hope that proper officials of our Government will give early and careful attention to this meritorious proposal and strive earnestly for its adoption.

The article follows:

UN PRAYER TIME WILL BE MIGHTY FORCE FOR GOOD WILL AND PEACE

In the United States Congress, where all Senate and House sessions are opened with prayer, news that the UN Legal Committee had voted 44 to 0 for recommending that the Assembly meetings open and close with a minute of silence for prayer or meditation was received with unanimous approval by Congressmen. The consensus was that the peace of the world and the lives of hundreds of millions of people will be safeguarded by silent prayers of delegates for divine guidance and strength. And as this procedure in the UN may last for centuries, this development is of paramount importance and significance.

SOME TYPICAL COMMENT

Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming: "Good idea."

Chairman ROBERT DOUGHTON, of House Ways and Means Committee: "Bringing the power of prayer into the UN sessions is a practical application of religion to world problems and will result in increased faith in and prestige for the United Nations."

Representative COMPTON WHITE, of Idaho: "An encouraging sign. Will be very far-reaching, probably for hundreds of years."

Chairman JOHN LESINSKI, of House Education and Labor Committee: "A good thing. We have prayers in Congress so why not in the UN?"

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan: "People work together better after meditation and prayer. It does not make any difference what one's religion may be. Prayer is a great influence for good. It helps us think about all our fellow men—the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Prayer creates a certain kinship essential in all international gatherings."

Inauguration of prayer in UN sessions is an example of the power of public opinion and prayer itself. Fred Burdick, Gist editor, suggested regular UN prayer time before the inaugural UN sessions. A poll of United States Congressmen and Washington Ambassadors by the Gist in 1947 showed virtually all in favor of the idea. Some Congressmen wrote UN officials and Ambassadors to the UN. The Gist sent letters to the chairmen of all UN delegations apprising them of the results of the poll and enclosing a

Gist featuring interviews with Congressmen on the question, "What is most needed to prevent a civilization-destroying world war?"

Having interested Don McNeill, master of ceremonies of the Chicago Radio Breakfast Club, in the summer of 1944 in the idea of encouraging his more than 20,000,000 radio listeners to join each morning in a moment of silent prayer for world peace, the Gist editor informed Don McNeill of the sentiment in Congress for having UN sessions opened with silent prayer. McNeill gave the idea a "boost" and suggested to his millions of listeners that it would help for people to pray for the success of the proposal and to write letters to UN officials.

The Greatest Opportunity on Earth for United States Private Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there follows a profound exposition of the role which American business must play if the United States private economy is truly to perform its role in the United States and in the world to preserve freedom while giving all the people the great material benefits of the industrial age. This article is by the distinguished author and publicist, Russell W. Davenport, from the issue of Fortune of October 1949. It is "must" reading for every Member who believes in the validity of our constitutional system and in its future in the maintenance of peace and security and in a secure prosperity:

THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY ON EARTH—THERE EXISTS IN THE AMERICAN TRADITION A REALISTIC ALTERNATIVE TO THE WELFARE STATE, AND AMERICAN BUSINESS CAN PROVIDE IT

(By Russell W. Davenport)

Since the depression of 1932 there has existed in the United States a trend that runs parallel with the Socialist trend in Britain and Europe. Inaugurated by the New Deal, it has been carried further by Harry Truman's Fair Deal and its program for a welfare state. Opponents of the trend have cogently argued that, if continued, it can lead nowhere except to socialism. Their case is fairly overwhelming. They point to the mounting taxes required to meet welfare costs, the loss of initiative, the rigidifying of the economy, the destruction of open markets, the growth and concentration of Government power. While none of these effects has run its full course in the United States, it is easy to show that all of them have begun. The conclusion can hardly be escaped, that the welfare state is of necessity the prelude to a total state. Yet, as Winston Churchill has been heard to observe, the argument against the welfare state is intricate and involved—ill-adapted to political campaigning. The result is that even though the American people are dead set against state socialism—as all the polls indicate—they continue to support men and measures that can lead them eventually nowhere else.

Deeply implicated in this situation is that vast combination of capital and labor known as American industrial enterprise. The incredible achievements of this system of private ownership scarcely need reviewing in Fortune, which has been reporting them now for 20 years. American enterprise has literally changed the nature of life on earth. It has created a new kind of society, with new criteria and new hopes. It has twice saved Western civilization on the battlefield. It has set living standards never dreamed of before. And it now stands forth against other systems, whose promises may be alluring but whose performances are slim, as the representative of a way of life evolved in freedom and offering the only hope of a solution to the heartbreaking problems of Western man.

Yet at the midcentury mark, faced with mounting political pressures for welfare, American enterprise, despite its protestations, is neither confident of itself nor hopeful of its future. It is, instead, hesitant and uncertain. It lives in the shadow of a government, which, while paying it lip service, seems both hostile to its hopes and blind to its needs. It is engaged in a political struggle with its own workers, who also pay it lip service, but who act as if enterprise were their enemy. It is burdened with unwise taxes based on political rather than economic considerations; yet it is too inept politically to get these corrected. Its profits are attacked as exorbitant, though these are the chief source of capital growth, upon which jobs depend. It is bedeviled by the fear of war, of communism, of depression, of collapse. In short, despite its magnificent record, American enterprise has failed to hold the confidence of the people, or to generate that kind of initiative which has hitherto accounted for its leadership.

These considerations give rise to two fundamental questions:

(1) Is the demand of the American people for welfare a justifiable demand, or is it merely the irresponsible clamor of the mob for bread and circuses?

(2) If it is a justifiable demand, consonant with the necessities of social evolution, is there any way to satisfy it without recourse to the authoritarian state?

These are the two most important questions facing the American people on the domestic front at the midcentury mark. They are inseparable questions. For if the demand of the people is not justified, then there is nothing for the conscientious leader of public opinion to do but to oppose it—a position already taken by many so-called conservatives. If, on the other hand, it is justified, then a dilemma emerges: do the people want welfare so much that they are willing to accept socialism; or, if they knew socialism were inevitable otherwise, would they be willing to give up some of the welfare in order to avoid it? Or is there some other way out?

It is the thesis of this article that the above dilemma is unreal—that there is, indeed, a way out. The development of this way out is not primarily the task of politicians, or even of the people at large. It is primarily the task of the enterprisers, the businessmen, who find themselves today in such an anomalous situation. This way out, moreover, is no mere compromise; it is a new opportunity, which, if seized through clear thinking and bold action, can open up a whole new social and economic era for the American people. That it has not been seized to date is not because it is idealistic or nebulous, nor because the wave of the future is against enterprise, nor because state socialism is inevitable, but because businessmen have not yet fully awakened to the possibilities inherent in it. These possibilities, it is contended here, are so great, and the political theory supporting them is so sound, that American business now has a chance to lead the way to a new solution for modern man, applicable not only in the United States but throughout the western world.

That such a subject goes beyond the bounds of a single article scarcely needs to be said. Other articles will follow. Let us begin, however, with an examination of the two inseparable questions already posed, on the supposition that, if they can be answered, further inquiry will be stimulated and more precise recommendations evolved.

IS WELFARE JUSTIFIED?

In a helpful article in Foreign Affairs for July 1949, G. T. Robinson, director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University, had this to say concerning United States political economy:

"There is urgent need for philosophic reconstruction and renewal. This undertaking has some resemblance, on the one hand, to that of the philosophies of the French Encyclopaedia, and on the other, to that of the authors of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Bill of Rights, or the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. All these monumental achievements were products of collaboration, and a somewhat similar collaborative effort would give the best promise of meeting our present need—a task for philosophers, in all the eighteenth-century * * * richness of that term."

One may go along with Mr. Robinson in recommending collaborative discussions on the philosophical foundations of the American system; yet one must be careful at the same time not to fall into the assumption, characteristic of many modern thinkers, that such foundations are altogether lacking today. In America there does in fact exist a foundation, formulated at the very outset of the American experiment and generally referred to as the rights of man—the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is true that the modern intellectual tends to dismiss these rights as mere verbiage, or else as obsolete; and semanticists raise the further warning that the concepts involved are so abstract that they may mean anything at all. Nevertheless, three very distinct concepts are involved; and so far from being obsolete, inspection shows that they are very much alive today. If we adopt the hypothesis, that the founders chose their words carefully, and if we are willing to enter into their meaning in an open-minded way, a proposition emerges which collaborative discussions certainly could not disregard, and which may serve us in the meantime as a kind of criterion, tested by nearly 175 years of progress.

Three different spheres of human life are covered by the American proposition, each with it own peculiarities and characteristics; and three different kinds of rights are actually invoked. Of the three, the right to liberty has played the dominant role in American evolution, to such an extent that the meaning of the others has been somewhat obscured. This right, when extended through practical legislation, has to do with the individual's relationship to the society in which he lives—his relationsip to other individuals, and, most important, his relationship to the State. The right to liberty gives every individual certain protections that are publicly recognized and officially enforced. It is therefore correctly characterized as the political right.

Yet the American proposition is not merely political. It is also spiritual. This becomes evident when we consider the right to the pursuit of happiness. This right cannot very well be translated into strictly political terms; it can have meaning only in the spiritual or cultural sphere. What it means, in brief, is that the individual is guaranteed an opportunity to fulfill himself as he may choose. The manner of his fulfillment will depend, not upon the state, but upon his own version of the nature of happiness, which may be materialistic, idealistic, or

halfway between, according to his lights. This principle, evidently, goes far beyond the mere political guaranty of free speech, etc. It is a fundamental guaranty to the human spirit, an appeal to freedom, not only within the law but beyond the law, in the realm of human aspiration.

What, then, is the meaning of the right to life? Is it merely the right to breathe? For a century before the Declaration of Independence political thinkers in both England and France had concerned themselves with the foundations of government. Taking their start from a hypothetical state of nature, in which every man was threatened with violence by every other man, they concluded that the first justification of an organized society was the protection of life and limb. In its simplest terms, then, the right to life is the right to go unarmed unharmed; and this construction of the right was all that seemed necessary in a frontier society where violence was always a real possibility.

Today, however, the lawless highwayman is the exception, and the rough frontier has gone. Men still need protection from violence; yet violence does not constitute the chief threat to life. This threat has now become economic. In an industrial city like Pittsburgh, for example, it is sheer hyprocrisy to talk about the rights of man in terms only of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Since meat, milk, and vegetables will not grow on Pittsburgh's streets, when a worker loses his job he cannot eat—that is, he cannot live. If the American proposition is to have any meaning in Pittsburgh, therefore, an economic right must be established. And this is none other than the eighteenth century right to life.

This latter interpretation may encounter a certain skepticism. Does it not read into the rights of man more than the founders could have been aware of? Yes, and no. It has been characteristic of all our great documents, including the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself, that they contain many intuitive truths that must be understood and interpreted in the light of changing circumstances. Were this not so they could scarcely have endured for more than a century and a half. The political founders, who formulated their philosophy before the rise of industrialism, could not foretell the precise nature of the economic problems that industrialism would create. For them the economic problem was summed up in the right to own property and enjoy its fruits, since this was the way most Americans of that day lived—self-employed, on farms, or with the tools of their craft. But as Sumner Slichter has pointed out, we have today, for the first time in history, an economy composed predominantly of employees—more than three out of four persons who work in the United States work in that capacity. Hence the economic emphasis has been transferred from property to jobs. If, therefore, we are to give reality to the American proposition in our time, we must be prepared to translate the right of life in accordance with the necessities of human evolution. Paraphrased today, this right extends beyond the problem of life and limb to that of economic need; it must include in its meaning the proposition that society shall not proceed in such a way, and the right to property shall not be so construed, as to deny to human beings the possibility of living—that is to say, in modern society, of earning a living.

THE WAY OUT

The acceptance of this view, that three different kinds of rights are involved in the American proposition—spiritual rights (pursuit of happiness), political rights (liberty), and economic rights (life)—sheds a strong light on the first of the questions already posed: is the demand of the American people for "welfare" a justifiable demand? On the basis of the rights of man, translated into modern terms, there can be no doubt that it is. For what the people mean by "welfare" is, precisely, the implementation of the right to life. This is not to say, of course, that every new welfare scheme has to be accepted. It is not even to say that we can afford all the welfare that the people think they have a right to. But if we are to do anything more than scratch the surface in our search for a modern solution in the field of political economy, we must recognize that the trend, which was inaugurated with the New Deal, and which is now pressing against enterprise in the form of the welfare state, arises from an instinctive demand on the part of the American people for the implementation of one of the basic rights that their forefathers designated in the very beginning as an essential of freedom.

Does this mean, then, that we are faced with a development similar to that of Britain, where the demand for an adequate implementation of the right to life has resulted in a Socialist state? Is it true that we must either accept socialism or else spend our political energies, like many conscientious conservatives at the present time, in opposing an apparently irresistible wave? Such simplified alternatives are seldom real. An examination of the true nature of the American proposition points to a way out.

One of the radical contributions of the American proposition, as originally formulated, was that it put government in its rightful place. And this very question of the role of government happens to be the key question in modern political economy. The coincidence suggests that our real trouble has been a failure to interpret the American proposition correctly. And it holds forth a promise that the trouble can be overcome if we now learn to interpret it.

Government, of course, exists for the purpose of assuring the existence and maintenance of all three of the rights of man; but government is not adapted to the implementation of any of them, save only the political rights. The fact that Americans have been so intent upon the establishment of the political rights, making liberty almost synonymous with the whole of the American proposition, has led to some confusion on this score. But in one field, the cultural or spiritual, the correct principle has clearly emerged. We turn to government for the building and support of many of our educational institutions, but we oppose as a violation of freedom any interference with our cultural rights. These, we maintain, must be exercised and implemented by each and every individual and by the cultural institutions themselves. The universities, not the state, should appoint professors, designate what should or should not be taught, and generally implement the principles of academic freedom. The universities are, in this sense, guardians of the cultural right. Similarly, the right to religious freedom is exercised and implemented by the churches and other religious bodies, and by every individual. The real implementation of cultural or spiritual rights is a question beyond the province of government.

The question of economic rights does not present an exact parallel to that of cultural rights. At the present time government has to concern itself with economic rights in many different ways. But the point at issue here is not whether government should concern itself at all, but whether private citizens acting in their economic and corporate capacities, that is to say, whether business should concern itself at all. There are many who maintain that it should not. The job of a businessman, these people point out, is to run a profitable enterprise. He is neither a social policeman nor a political reformer. His task lies with markets—the market for capital, the market for labor, the market for his goods—and if he is deflected from this by the necessity of implementing human rights he will not perform his own task well. The business of business, these people maintain, is economic and not social.

Ironically, however, it is exactly this position that is leading society toward some form of managed economy wherein privately owned business will not be able to flourish. For the economic rights of man cannot be escaped. And if it is true that business has no business in this field, then it follows that these rights must continuously be implemented by the state. This is precisely the basic principle of state socialism, which acknowledges the first right, the right to life, but which finds no way to make it a reality except through authoritarian compulsion. If, therefore, businessmen insist on separating themselves from the field of rights to concern themselves only with the field of markets, the only answer a democratic society can reach is that of state socialism.

And there is only one escape from this answer, namely, that businessmen and industrialists must concern themselves with economic rights. They must take responsibility for them, just as educators, artists, and religious leaders take responsibility for the cultural or spiritual rights; and they must learn how to implement them. Indeed, if the matter is examined carefully, it will be seen that the business community, in combination with labor, is the only institution that can concern itself with these rights without misleading or stifling the economy. Those who take the position that rights are no affair of business are confusing economic rights with political rights. The political rights are entirely the affair of government, the courts, and other public institutions. But such institutions are ill adapted to the implementation of economic rights; a court may uphold the law, but it cannot intelligently determine the best agreement or productive system for carrying it out. And government bureaus, as we are learning, are inefficient instruments to this end. The people who are best able to implement such rights, in all their manifold aspects, are the people actually engaged in the economic process, namely, the owners, managers, and workers. Between them they know, or can find out, what the troubles are, how to fix them, how to provide better solutions for the future, and what the costs of such solutions will be. If the American proposition is to be correctly interpreted, they, not the government, are the actual guardians of the right to life.

THE NATURE OF THE TASK

The way out of the dilemma, therefore, is not to seek to deny the justifiable demand of the people for the implementation of the right to life. Rather it is, by conscious and concerted voluntary action, to transfer the primary responsibility, and therefore the initiative, from Government to private hands. Such a move, if undertaken with enough resolution and on a broad enough scale, would at a single stroke cut through the Socialist threat and open up a whole new vista of freedom.

What, then, does this move entail? How do we go about it? First of all, the right to life is not the right to live in any old society, but specifically, in the society in which the individual has been trained, for which he is adapted, and to which he makes his contribution—the American society. And life in the American society is something more than mere subsistence. How much more is not a matter that any one generation can settle, nor one to be determined here. There are a number of over-all objectives that have to be accepted in our time if the right is to have meaning. For example, the American way of life includes a concept of decency which is so important that it is probably unrealistic to talk about the right to life in America without reference to it. It includes, also, a certain opportunity for advancement, without which

most Americans would consider life intolerable. It includes freedom of movement and communication: If a man loses his job, for instance, he should be able to get about in order to find another one. More recently it has begun to include some kind of orderly provision for the maintenance of health, on the grounds that a man in bad health is to that extent handicapped and that the welfare of his family is jeopardized. And so forth. Perhaps a good project for Mr. Robinson's philosophers would be to compose a bill of economic rights that would, in effect, define the right to life in terms that modern Americans could understand.

But second, since the right to life raises such broad considerations, the full implementation of it touches almost every aspect of the economic system, governmental as well as private. The maintenance of opportunity, for example, poses a number of problems such as that of the tax program. The maintenance of employment, a critical factor in the implementation of the right to life, leads into the issue of governmental fiscal policy. Indeed, a thoroughgoing study of how to implement this right would have to take up the tangled question of competition; how monopoly can be restrained—how Government interference with prices can be restricted—how the open market can be preserved.

These weighty matters, however, lie beyond our present thesis. We are concerned here primarily with the American business community; and while businessmen interest themselves as citizens in all of the above questions, there is one aspect of the right to life that opens up before them as their particular concern. It is to be found at their very doorstep, in that unsettled area of modern society known as employee relations or management-labor relations. It is here—on the front line, so to speak—where worker and employer come together for the production of wealth, that the implementation of the right to life becomes most understandable and most pressing. And it is precisely here that the American industrial enterprise has its opportunity to seize the initiative.

There are as many solutions to the labor-management problem as there are business concerns. In every plant, conditions and personalities are different, which means that the economic rights have to be implemented in different ways. Nevertheless, for our present purpose, to define as clearly as possible the nature of the task herein proposed, the whole field of labor management falls conveniently into three divisions. While some companies will put chief emphasis on one, others on another, it is doubtful whether a satisfactory solution can be found without some reference to all three.

1. ECONOMIC SECURITY

Americans have come to use the word "security" as more or less synonymous with what has here been called the right to life. It is a much misunderstood word. Indeed the worker's idea of security is far more dynamic than his critics like to pretend. He would not want security carried to such a point that freedom of choice and a chance for advancement would be eliminated; nor, on the other hand, does he expect something for nothing. What he means is, that he thinks he has a right, which ought to be just as good as the employer's right, to be able to live in the society, to participate in it, in a permanent and confident way. His right to live in it—his right to life—must not be taken away from him by circumstances, such as fluctuations in employment, over which he has no control; or by accident or the onset of old age.

Boiled down to its most practical terms, security for the worker means stable employment. Elmo Roper, summarizing the researches of many years, has stated that 10 times as many workers would rather have steady employment than higher pay, and 25 times as many would rather have it than shorter hours. Yet steady employment is probably the hardest kind of security for the employer to provide. To most industrial workers the annual wage is the symbol of the ultimate to be achieved in this area, and a few companies such as Geo. A. Hormel, Procter & Gamble, and the Nunn-Bush Shoe Co. have successfully installed it. But most employers consider it virtually an impossibility. (However, more have succeeded in achieving it than might be supposed. The Latimer Report, made for the Federal Government, revealed that in 1946 a total of 196 annual wage plans covered 500 establishments.)

Such experienced practitioners as Jay Hormel and Richard Deupree of Procter & Gamble, however, make a point of great significance for those companies that cannot see their way to an annual wage. The first step, they say, is not the proclamation of the guaranty but the stabilizing of employment to the highest possible degree within the circumstances prevailing in the particular company. The truth is, that an annual guaranty is impossible until this painful stabilizing process has been carried out. And nearly every company, if it is willing to make the effort, can achieve a far greater degree of stability than prevails today. Production for stock, transfer of workers to other departments (here the union must cooperate), a flexible workweek (the Fair Labor Standards Act should be amended to allow more latitude in this respect), the development of complementary products, and the scheduling of maintenance work in slack seasons, are methods of stabilization that are now being used by some employers and should be used by more. The Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), without actually guaranteeing the wage, is an outstanding example of progress in this direction. In an industry that is subject to wide seasonal variations, Jersey now reports that 90 percent of of its employees (wage-rate as well as salaried) have been continuously employed since they were hired.

Economic security can also be strengthened by insurance schemes in which the workers themselves may participate—pensions, hospital plans, general medical plans, maternity care, accident insurance, and so forth. Perhaps the most spectacular pension system is that of Sears, Roebuck, to which the employee contributes 5 percent of his yearly salary (up to $250 a year) and the company contributes 5 percent of its net annual profits before Federal taxes and dividends. The result is a huge fund of $216,000,000 that owns 19 percent of Sears stock and whose retirement benefits, in many cases, considerably exceed the mere requirements of security.

International Business Machines has one of the most generous retirement plans in industry, which is paid for entirely by the company. Many smaller businesses that do not have the resources to set up plans on this scale have had recourse to the profit-sharing trust. This has the advantage that the company is committed to payments only in years when it has profits. Stein, Hall & Co., Sylvania Electric Products, Nathan Straus-Duparquet, Inc., and Electrolux Corp. have all chosen this method. Despite the inexcusable difficulties created by the United States tax laws, Continental Paper has managed to work out a trust for retirement benefits geared to productivity and cost savings.

So many companies and unions, indeed, have provided for pensions, some form of medical care, and other aspects of security, that it hardly seems fair to mention any few of them. This fact was noted by the steel fact finders' report to President Truman only a few weeks ago. "The concept of providing social insurance and pensions for workers in industry," said that report, "has become an accepted part of modern American thinking"; and the report further points out that such insurance has been gained "either by the unilateral action of employers or, to an increasing extent, through collective bargaining." The examples given here serve merely to illustrate the principle in hand: to protect the worker, at the economic level, from risks and human vicissitudes that could otherwise ruin him. Through such measures he is given a chance to live in his society on a continuing basis and in a confident way.

If, however, the welfare state is to be avoided, insurance plans of this kind must be even further developed, with employers taking the initiative. Very little work, for example, has as yet been done on the possibility of privately insuring against lay-off or temporary unemployment caused by economic recessions, though preliminary investigations would seem to leave this possibility open. Eastman Kodak, together with 18 other Rochester firms, launched such a plan in 1931 but had no chance to build up adequate funds before mass unemployment struck. The plan was therefore abandoned. Nevertheless, since certain advantages would accrue to enterprise were it able to put an unemployment backlog behind its employees (as a supplement, at least, to Government unemployment insurance), new experiments should be tried.

2. HUMANIZATION

One of the most difficult problems management has to face in a large industrial plant is that of the human being. And the failure to solve this problem has had as much to do with the weakening of the enterprise system, here and throughout the world, as any other single factor. As Elton Mayo has said, "While material efficiency has been increasing for 200 years, the human capacity for working together has in the same period continually diminished."

A man's work is of necessity a commodity that he sells on a market. The problem is, how to buy it without taking over the man too—that is to say, without making him the slave of the machines that he is supposed to command. Americans have instinctively resisted the idea that the labor of the human being is a commodity, and have so expressed themselves in such fundamental legislation as the Clayton Act. And the whole trade-union movement is in fact an effort to protect the man who sells the work. Consequently it can be said that the first, most elementary step in the humanization of industry is the principle of collective bargaining.

However, collective bargaining alone is not enough. The worker needs not only a power to bargain but a sense of belonging. He wants to be treated like a human being—not just a number on a pay roll. In a big plant this is not easy. The greatest danger at the present time is a certain observable tendency among managements to rely upon gadgets that have their origin in the field of advertising, selling, and public relations. "Human relations" has become a catch phrase and formulas for "human engineering" are springing up like mushrooms. These approaches are dangerous because they are apt to end in disillusionment for management and workers alike.

The humanization of industry is something that has to be undertaken with the utmost earnestness, and it must have the personal attention and enthusiasm of the topmost executive. Loud-speaker systems, plant newspapers, suggestion boxes, depth interviewing, and similar devices are perfectly sound so long as their limitations are understood. It is obviously necessary to develop adequate forms of communications between employer and employee. But the communications must have integrity. Management must really respect the worker's ideas. And, on the other hand, the information that management gives out must

be real information about matters that affect the workers' lives—not pep talks and political orations. The management that pursues this question will find that one of the keys to it is the foreman, who should be specially trained for the purpose. General Electric and Servel, among many others, place great emphasis on the foreman's role.

That which has hitherto been lacking in this field, however, is precisely the theme of this article, namely, the recognition by the employer that his employee is possessed of certain rights, the implementation of which is the joint concern of the boss and the worker. From this principle the humanizing of the shop will inevitable follow.

3. PARTICIPATION

The more labor relations are studied, the more evident it becomes that the ultimate answers are to be found in a real participation of the employee in the destiny of the business. This can be effected at various levels. A great number of firms have profit-sharing plans, some of which are extremely successful. Yet profit sharing as such is often disappointing, because the monetary incentive is an inadequate one when relied on exclusively to establish good labor relations. Only the personal participation of the employee in both the profits and that part of management which has to do with production can evoke from him the kind of dynamic cooperation that the enterprise system now needs. The reason has been eloquently stated by James C. Worthy, of Sears, Roebuck:

"The essence of 'free enterprise' is a system of economic and political organization which taps spontaneously the creative and productive resources of its citizens. Under conditions of small-scale enterprise the 'hidden hand' of prices, costs, and profits was a reasonably adequate means for accomplishing this spontaneous release. * * * We must recognize, however, that this 'hidden hand,' by itself, is quite inadequate for tapping any high percentage of the productive energies of a nation when the greater part of its workers are no longer independent enterprisers but are employees of larger corporate entities and, therefore, not directly subject to the stimulus and control of the economic processes of the market.

"Business management must develop within its own organization structure a system of stimulation and control which will be as effective in releasing and directing the productive energies of individuals and groups as the 'hidden hand' of prices, costs, and profits has been in releasing and directing the efforts of corporate enterprises" (James C. Worthy, Democratic Principles in Business Management, Advanced Management, March 1949).

Various experiments along these creative lines are now being tried, such as McCormick Co.'s "multiple management plan," the Rucker "share of production plan" (Orangeburg Manufacturing, Continental Paper, Reznor Manufacturing), Bundy's Tubing's "cost saving sharing plan," and the remarkable pioneering of Joseph N. Scanlon of MIT (to be reported in a forthcoming issue of Fortune). In any case, the principle of participation, which industry has scarcely begun to explore, probably holds the key to the solution of more labor problems than any other. For it represents not only a verbal acceptance of the worker's economic rights, but an actual integration of them with the industrial process.

THE THORNY PATH

Many will not altogether agree with the three categories just outlined; some will want to add other categories; others will point out that in actual practice one merges into another. These objections can be granted providing only that the over-all objective is held clear; that the worker is a human being (not an industrial atom), who, as a member of the American society, is in possession of certain rights that stem from the "unalienable" right to life; that these rights entitle him, on the one hand, to adequate protections, and on the other, to adequate incentives; and that their implementation is primarily the joint concern of himself (through his union, if he so desires) and of his employer, acting as private parties.

Moreover, it is equally important to be aware of what is not involved. Altruism, for example, is most emphatically not involved. The paternalistic view that an employer is in some mysterious way personally responsible for the happiness and welfare of his workers belongs—if it ever belonged anywhere—to a feudal type of society, not a democratic one. There is no question, either, of burdening a business with so many welfare plans that it loses its flexibility and power of growth. Nor is there a question of setting minima of various kinds so high that the given company would find itself unable to survive a period of depression. The business must be profitable over a reasonable period of time, and it is the employer's job to make it so. The economic rights of the workers, therefore, are not strictly speaking absolute—though with the help of government they can be made virtually so. They are inevitably related to the profitability of the enterprise.

The objection will be raised, that all this sounds fine, but that labor itself makes it impossible. The responsibility for implementing economic rights in a free nonpaternalistic society must be a joint one, and this in turn requires that labor bring to the economic problem the same intelligence and good will that the employer is asked to bring to the social problem. A full discussion of this question would lead into another field. We may dismiss it here with the passing observation, that if American labor wants to avoid a Government-managed system it must awake to the necessities of a privately managed one. This in turn requires the development of a higher type of labor leadership than is commonly found today.

An even greater obstacle lying across the thorny path of the employees is government itself. The business community has in the past committed the error of permitting government to assume the role of sole protector of the employee, the sole guardian of his rights. If, for example, when the bottom dropped out of things in 1932, businessmen had taken the lead, by insisting that the Government help them to implement the economic rights of their employees, the whole tenor of American history during the last two decades would have been different. Instead, business allowed Mr. Roosevelt to step into that heroic role. And Mr. Roosevelt and his heirs and assigns have been shrewd enough to capitalize on it ever since. The result is that almost all the legislation having to do with the implementation of these rights is designed to promote the role of government, not enterprise. Certain tax legislation and Treasury rulings, instead of providing incentives, actually make it difficult to set up private social insurance.

In a modern society, obviously, there is much room for government action. For one thing, even if American businessmen should undertake an extensive program of implementing the economic rights of their employees, this would not directly affect everyone in the Nation. Yet the trouble with Washington is that, instead of trying to pass as much responsibility as possible over to private hands, through tax incentives and other devices, it tries to pass as little as possible. It has forgotten how to be a servant of the people. The result is the trend already mentioned, paralleling European socialism.

These and other obstacles can be overcome only if employers will now abandon the defensive position that they have been occupying and really take the initiative. To make the obstacles an excuse for doing nothing is merely to increase them. The only way to begin to change the quality of the labor leadership is to challenge it with a proposition, the validity of which no good American could deny. And the only way to stop the trend toward government power is the exertion of private leadership in behalf of those goals that the administration finds it so profitable to exploit. Leadership and initiative are the only answers to the dilemma of enterprise.

THE MAGNIFICENT OPPORTUNITY

Moreover, there is real hope that enterprise will now begin to exert this leadership—for one good reason, namely, that the opportunity in question is no mere reformer's opportunity, no mere dreamer's opportunity. It is in the literal sense of the word an economic opportunity, a profit opportunity. The line of reasoning adopted here opens up for industrial enterprise the possibility of an entirely new capitalistic adventure. And when enterprisers begin to realize this they will surely find the means—as they always have in the past—to push through the obstacles, whatever they may be.

It may sound strange to speak of the implementation of human rights as an economic opportunity, but examination reveals that this is so. Enterprise capitalism is a system for enabling private individuals to fulfill the demands of other private individuals. There exists today a tremendous demand for all the products that enterprise makes. But there exists also a new demand, a demand for the realization of a way of life that can make the material products worth while. There exists a demand for a social product. And if the demand is there, the business is there, even though the way to profit from this business is different and not at first obvious.

One concrete reason for this is not far to seek. In a competitive society, whose resources are largely harnessed and whose basic plant is well established (even though never fully grown), the chief source of profit springs, not from the scarcity of materials, but from the use that can be made of human ingenuity. In such a society those businesses will succeed best whose employees like their jobs, where they are given reasonable economic security, where they are treated like human beings, and where they can participate in the productive process in a creative—and profitable—way. The executive, in short, who establishes a good society within his corporation finds himself able to produce a better product at lower cost.

The truth of this proposition is demonstrated by the fact that those corporations that have already gone furthest toward the voluntary implementation of economic rights have not lost, but on the contrary have gained in competitive position. Hormel, for example, which has been bold enough to saddle itself with the annual wage, has grown faster than most of its competitors. H. C. Nicholas, president of Quality Castings Co., of Orrville, Ohio, has declared that although he thought he was operating efficiently in 1940, he found that 2 years after the installation of his profit-sharing system in 1945, plant efficiency had risen 40 percent. "Our employees," he says, "are now anxious to put their talents to maximum use. * * * This is the most effective reason for our production record."

Richard R. Deupree, of Procter & Gamble, pointed out in 1945 that employment stabilization had accomplished many savings for his company, the biggest of which nobody had thought of before the annual wage was installed. This was the elimination of excess capacity, made possible by year-round production—a total saving over 22 years of $100,000,000 in plant investment, exclusive of depreciation, carrying charges, and in-

terest on the money. Innumerable other examples could be cited. But perhaps the final word should be given to that august body, the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which declared in their annual statement for 1949: "As we see it, the basic interest of the stockholder—security for his investment and a fair return—is best served only if the corporation deserves and enjoys public confidence. Such confidence can be based only on recognition by people at large that their interest—the interest of society—is a factor in corporate action."

A SHOT AROUND THE WORLD

It may finally be asked if so many businesses have already taken steps to implement the economic rights, why is it that the welfare state idea continues to grow and the position of enterprise democracy continues to become more insecure? The answer is threefold. In the first place, not enough businesses have tried, and the measures taken by most that have tried have been only partial. In the second, the measures have not always been taken in a positive manner, backed by a real belief, but somewhat grudgingly and defensively. And in the third, they have been scattered and haphazard.

What is needed now is concerted and positive action on the part of at least a large segment of the business community. If a hundred leading firms were to announce that from now on they intended to make themselves primarily responsible for implementing the economic rights of their employees, and that they were undertaking a program of research and action to that end, a very different atmosphere would be created. Such an announcement could well take the occasion to state some fundamental truths about these economic rights and about the role of the corporation in our society. It might even call for a panel of philosophers, to try to work out the underlying theory of the American way of life in modern terms. Backed up by employer organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, and possibly also by labor groups, it could carry enough authority to start a wholly new trend in national affairs.

Indeed, it would resound around the world like the crack of a gun. For every important society on earth is now in the throes of a mortal struggle with its own state, for the very reason that no society has been able to find a way to implement economic rights except through the state. If, however, American industrial enterprise were to rise to this challenge, a sudden light would be shed. This light would reveal state socialism to be a great reactionary movement, signalizing the failure of man to realize the dream of democracy.

For the dream of democracy was always clear: That the state was a necessary and limited evil rather than a desirable and boundless good; that the springs of progress, happiness, and security are to found in individuals, acting in their private capacities, in response to their self-interests and their moral judgments. It was the belief of the founders of this country, well-substantiated until the rise of the corporation, that men and women could be relied upon to implement the rights of man to their own mutual interest, and thus to keep the state at arm's length. It is now time for the business community to show that corporate action, which is still private action, and which emanates from individuals, can achieve the same result: that the rights of man can be made just as safe in corporate hands as they were in individual hands.

Such a demonstration would cut through all the ideologies of the world. It would show modern man a way out of the impasse into which he has fallen. It would open up for enterprise an era of new possibilities. It would awaken everywhere new hope for the perpetuation of freedom. Indeed, the vista will become immeasurable, once American enterprise awakes to the realization that in the social problem it is in fact faced with the greatest opportunity on earth.

Why All the Pressure for a CVA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, because of the current interest in the discussions for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority, I ask that an address of Daniel B. Noble, secretary-manager, Pacific Northwest Development Association, before the National Water Conservation Conference be printed in the RECORD. His address follows:

It is a fine thing when so many organizations and interests represented here can come to a common understanding on issues vital to the welfare of our country, and work toward their sound solution. I represent an organization that is one of the major targets of those forces actively seeking to replace our representative form of government, as it has been known for the past 160 years, with a more dictatorial form of government. I trust, in the few minutes available, I can bring you a few facts on the subject assigned me.

In 1945, in line with the association's objectives, we undertook a twofold program. The first phase was in cooperation with other organizations to develop a more effective, constructive plan and action program to conserve and develop our resources in the Pacific Northwest.

At that time we had most of the basic resource laws (including the Flood Control Act of 1944), but we did not have the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, no Revised 308 Report, no Interior Department river basin plan. We now have before Congress the coordinated Army-Interior plan, sometimes referred to as the Weaver-Newell plan for the Columbia.

All of this I point out to emphasize the fact that we have a sound, constructive plan for the Columbia. This, of course, can be improved from year to year as needed. I have the conviction that the creation of an Interstate Commission, patterned somewhat after the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River (INCODEL), to work with and cooperate with the Federal agencies, will give us the best and safest type of regional development administration that can be created under a representative form of government.

Despite the fact that we have, by our present methods, made far more progress in the Pacific Northwest by every human measure, with one possible exception, than they have in the Tennessee Valley, strong forces continue a desperate and determined effort to force an authority type of administration on the 255,000 square miles and 4,500,000 people in the Pacific Northwest.

I was interested in learning, if possible, the cause of all this pressure for CVA, for I could easily see its effects. One of the first public meetings I attended where Judge Robert W. Sawyer and I were called to discuss CVA was at Hillsboro, Oreg., in the late fall of 1945, where we met with the County Agricultural Land Use Planning Committee. The late Dr. Carl Thompson was at that meeting, as a proponent for CVA. Dr. Thompson stated he was a representative of the Bonneville Power Administration. I think everybody knows that Dr. Carl D. Thompson was former head of the information department of the Socialist Party, and a sincere Socialist of long standing, notwithstanding the fact that the last few years he was registered as a Democrat. In addition to promoting a CVA at this meeting, Dr. Thompson advocated the nationalization of the basic industries.

As time went on, it became evident that propaganda was being infiltrated into the Bonneville Power Administration, and from there to the people of this region. Consultants on the Bonneville pay roll were leaders in important organizations, and these influences were used to propagandize and proselytize their members for a CVA. It did, however, become apparent to many of us that the Bonneville Power Administration (which was created to market surplus power from the Army engineers' dam, constructed at Bonneville, and the Bureau of Reclamation dam, constructed at Grand Coulee) was not satisfied with this role of marketing surplus power. It is clearly evident that they are determined to socialize the entire power industry of the region and to create a Federal corporate monopoly that will give them control, not over power alone, but over all of the other resources of the region, and would regiment the business and political economy of the region. TVA propaganda and personnel came to the region through this source. Our present Assistant Secretary of the Interior, C. Girard Davidson, who has been in the region much of the time in the last 6 months, came to Bonneville from TVA before being advanced to Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Reliable reports state that he wrote the first Mitchell bill, after which all CVA bills have been patterned. The Power Division of the Department of the Interior, of which Mr. Stephen Raushenbush was for a long time an official, was also an ardent proponent of valley authorities. Most of the master minds in this group are strong advocates of the socialization of basic industries. Only recently Mr. Davidson stated that if the steel companies did not produce as much steel as he thought they should, he would advocate the Government going into the steel business. Through the practical demonstration or experimentation route, as provided in pending authority bills (S. 1645 and companion bills), a CVA, under the direction of this group, could, by employing the same tactics as have been used to socialize power in this region, socialize any industry which they desired.

The strategy used to promote a CVA, therefore, is for these Government agencies to evangelize and proselytize. With their indoctrinated organization leadership they then seek to develop a strong class prejudice against any groups that are not sympathetic to their program. Anyone who opposes them and who effectively gets the public acquainted with their methods, purposes, and objectives is attacked as being a tool of the vested interests, a reactionary, a glutton of privilege, controlled by the power trusts, an enemy of the little man, etc. Their program is one of obstructionism and confusion. They make claims of gross inefficiency of existing agencies.

The following are some of the false or half-truth statements they make in their propaganda and promotional efforts to create a CVA:

1. CVA would have no more power than existing agencies already have.

2. Hoover Commission favors CVA.

3. Private industry has no need to fear socialization under CVA. It cannot take over the private utility business unless there is a willing buyer or willing seller.

4. Present agencies of Government doing resources work are inefficient.

5. Congress would exercise complete control over CVA and pass any laws needed to correct any abuses.

All who have carefully analyzed S. 1645, or companion bills, know that none of these statements are correct. The one relating to Congress is probably the most important, as there is little question in anyone's mind that a concentration of money, manpower, and propaganda devices provided for in the bill, plus the broad power of contract and eminent domain, plus the instructions in the act to interpret the bill liberally, would give CVA all that is needed to establish a machine that would control the political economy of this region.

Many ask the question, "Is CVA a political issue?" Our investigations lead us to this conclusion: Strictly speaking, CVA is a political issue because it involves a basic change in our representative form of government. Our observations also reveal that the party division on the CVA issue has Jefferson Democrats and most Republicans opposing it. Socialist Democrats, Wallace-Taylor Progressives, national Socialists and Communists are recorded as favoring the creation of a valley authority.

Proponents seek to make the people of this Nation believe that practically everyone in the Pacific Northwest favors the creation of a CVA. More than 200 organizations are already on record as opposing CVA or valley authorities in general. Over 80 percent of our newspapers in the region are on record in opposition to it, as well as six out of seven governors of Northwest States. This should indicate the falseness of any such statement.

Here we are today, a group of people representing a segment of the business, industrial, agricultural and professional fields, and like many other groups laboring over technical problems while a class warfare is being waged at the heart of everything we hold dear, the freedom and individual initiative that is the very core of our representative government—which has made this the greatest Nation in history.

The coalition Socialist forces have been using every method they can to create class prejudice against us and the principles we represent. From 1833 to 1883 Karl Marx effectively promoted the theory that profit was robbery, and that anyone that engaged in business for profit was a robber. The present day tactics directed at those who have worked, earned, saved, and invested in private business that makes jobs and markets is to call them profiteers, economic royalists, land barons, industrial tycoons, enemy of the common man, reactionary, etc.

We all know the part that racial intolerance played in creating national socialism in Germany; we know that the continuation of a class prejudice program is just as vicious, and will, if continued, destroy our country. Historical precedent gives plenty of illustrations as evidence. The point I make is that unless we lay aside many of our technical problems and place some of these political problems that are destroying our country higher on our program of action, we are headed very definitely for disaster. We are fiddling while Rome burns. The class warfare of prejudice and confusion is paying off for those pursuing it.

What are we going to do about it? Here are only a few suggestions:

1. We need more research to determine what forces are working to destroy our representative Government, what they are doing and how we can change this trend.

2. More people need to know what part the man who has worked, earned, saved, and invested plays in our economy and our form of Government.

3. We need to know the relation between successful private business and representative Government.

4. We need to know the effects of Government taking over business that can be handled by private enterprise.

5. We need to know the dangers of more and more big Federal Government, more taxes and its effect on business.

6. We need to know the dangers of giving fewer people more power as proposed in CVA legislation.

7. We need to know how the proposal to create a great Government machine with unlimited powers is an effective device for bringing about many of these socialistic proposals.

8. We need private-enterprise task forces in more individual firms and organizations to help us get more sound, basic facts, and get them to our people.

9. We need a better coordinated plan for getting this information out to the people on a community, State, regional, and national level.

Accomplishing the steps mentioned will require a great deal more effort and help, and we must have it soon. Bills to create regional authority dictatorship are before Congress now, and strong pressure is being exerted by the executive branch of Government to get them enacted into the law of the land. These forces only have to win once, because mammoth Government machines, when created and well-entrenched, can never be exterminated. We can never back up.

The position of the National Water Conservation Conference is set forth in resolution 1, from which we quote, as follows:

"Whereas the advocates of valley or regional authorities or commissions, with un-American ideology, continue to come forward with undemocratic proposals differing from the original suggestions only in minor particulars and all involving the unnecessary sacrifice of state and individual rights; and

"Whereas this conference is opposed to Federal valley or regional authorities or commissions, and to legislation in any form, designed to create or to provide for the operation of such authorities or commissions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the National Water Conservation Conference, That it reaffirms its opposition to the creation of any Federal valley or regional authority or commission in whatever guise the same may be presented, and to legislation proposed to accomplish such purposes, on the following grounds:

"1. They are undemocratic in denying the people affected an effective voice in the formulation and development of programs for the utilization of their natural resources.

"2. They will create confusion and chaos in the development and operation of programs which can be made to function in a satisfactory manner.

"3. They will jeopardize every established water right within their reach and initiate interminable litigation.

"4. They will tend to upset and unduly hamper and restrict the traditional freedom of the social, cultural, commercial, and industrial life of our citizens.

"5. They will remove direction and governmental control over local matters from the communities where such matters arise, and will render more difficult the solution of our problems whether by the authorities or by the courts."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from a distinguished educator, Dr. Frazer Banks, superintendent of the board of education, Birmingham, Ala.

Dr. Banks points out certain difficulties caused by a big increase in enrollment. This same condition exists throughout the South. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should read this letter:

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Birmingham, Ala., October 4, 1949.

Mr. LAURIE BATTLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAURIE: Knowing your interest in our school affairs and the relationship of Federal aid to education to us, I think you will want to know certain facts which have shown up here at the opening of our schools.

Our net enrollment at the end of September was 46,588, which was 1,482 pupils more than we had a year ago. There was an increase of approximately 1,700 in the elementary schools. Our white high schools showed some decrease and our Negro high schools a slight increase. This means, of course, a much more crowded situation in our elementary schools.

We have problems of rooms, equipment, and teachers. The greatest of these is teachers. We are not getting enough well-qualified people trained for teaching in elementary schools. In my opinion, the question of salaries has an important bearing on the situation. I believe that an increase in salaries would help us greatly in getting enough qualified young people into courses preparing for elementary teaching.

This is where Federal aid comes into the picture as I see it. We are now levying our constitutional limit of ad valorem taxes. The State, as you know, gets a large share of its school money from income, sales, and use taxes.

I know you are doing all you can to help but thought you might like these additional facts.

With all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. FRAZER BANKS,
Superintendent.

The Townsend Plan Versus H. R. 6000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monaay, October 10, 1949

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, has impelled me to do something that I have steadfastly refused to do for over 12 years; namely, to sign the Townsend-plan petition now at the Speaker's desk. I signed that petition because when I compare the two programs for social security—the one contained in H. R. 6000 and the one contained in the Townsend plan—I am convinced that the Townsend plan is to be preferred to H. R. 6000.

In my opinion, after careful consideration, the Townsend plan is more equitable, more practical, more just, much easier and cheaper to administer, and less costly in the long run.

The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 when fully matured will require the payment of something like $1,000,000,000 per year in interest alone, in addition to the hundreds of millions

of dollars each year for administrative costs. The Townsend plan will do away with both the interest on the social-security fund and the heavy administrative costs.

The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 proposes that the Federal Government shall collect up to $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 per year and spend the same for current Government expenses. The Townsend plan proposes that the Federal Government shall collect $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 per year and hand it out immediately on a monthly basis to the old people of the Nation for them to spend for the necessities of life. I ask, which is the better plan? Which will bring more happiness to more people? Which can spend the money to a better advantage, the Federal Government or our worthy old people?

In my opinion the social-security program as set up and amended in H. R. 6000 is both unsound and dishonest. I shall do what I can hereafter to substitute the Townsend plan, or some modification of it, for the administration's social-security program.

Three Congressmen Who Protect the People's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, when three Congressmen contribute a great service to the people of the Nation, the people should know about it. Accordingly, I hope that as many of the people as possible will read the following article by Robert S. Allen in the Washington Post today, which I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

UTILITIES BLOCKED IN POWER ATTACK

(By Robert S. Allen)

President Truman came within a hairs breadth of losing his hard-won victory on his big public-power program in a closed-door parley of a House-Senate conference committee.

Only the firm stand of three Democratic Congressmen blocked a wily, last-minute scuttling maneuver by the utility lobby.

They are Representatives MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio, CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, and HENRY JACKSON of Washington.

Obscured by the clatter of the hectic congressional drive to adjourn, the undercover battle raged unnoticed for 2 days. Leading for the utilities were Senator ELMER THOMAS, Democrat, Oklahoma, and Senator KENNETH WHERRY, Republican, Nebraska, from the only all-public power State in the Union. Potently aiding them was a swarm of utility lobbyists, headed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Members of Congress also reported receiving telephone calls from influential persons in home areas urging acquiescence in the utility move.

Had this move been put over, it not only would have cut the ground out from under the President's program, but, in effect, would have set up a new policy on the sale of power from public-built dams without direct action by the House and Senate.

ADROIT MOVE

It was one of the most adroit and far-reaching backstage lobby maneuvers attempted in a long time.

(NOTE.—In the closing days of a session, some of the most important decisions of Congress are being made in the secrecy of the so-called House-Senate conference committees. These bodies, made up of small groups from the two Chambers, meet behind closed doors to iron out differences on major measures. Conference committees are subjected to tremendous lobbyist pressures and manipulations of all kinds.)

Administration leaders first got wind of the utility's scheme when Senator THOMAS sprang it at the initial meeting of the conferees.

Up to that time, the administration rested confidently on its decisive victories in the House and Senate. Under the leadership of Representative KIRWAN, the House, early last spring, overwhelmingly approved the President's power program.

Several months later, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in a secret meeting, struck the program out of the Interior Department budget bill. Later, after a hot fight, the Senate, by a big majority, reversed this action and restored the program. Senator THOMAS was utility spokesman in this battle.

With these two smashing victories, White House leaders assumed they had nothing to worry about. They learned differently at the first meeting of the conference committee.

Seconded by WHERRY, THOMAS uncorked the new maneuver. It not only caught the administration by surprise, but was so deftly worded that it won the support of two Senate conferees who had previously voted for the program. They are Senators CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, and JOE O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming.

The wily utility proposal required no additional legislation.

Instead, it consisted of a statement of policy that, after approval by the conference committee, would have had binding effect on the Interior Department.

Under this directive the Government would have been barred from selling power developed at public hydroelectric projects except through private utilities at their rates.

AT UTILITY RATES

That is, distribution of cheap public power would have stopped at the bus bar. From then on, the utilities would sell it at their rates to consumers. The adroit secret proposal was as follows:

"The Department of Interior has stated during the hearings on this bill that its policy with respect to arrangements for the delivery of power produced at hydroelectric projects for delivery beyond load centers is to make wheeling arrangements where * * * (three alleged conditions exist) * * * the conferees direct that a report be made not later than January 15, 1950, as to what progress has been made * * * with private utilities to obtain contracts which conform to this policy."

Interior Department heads hit the ceiling when they read this. They denied as completely false the claim made regarding their testimony, and challenged THOMAS and WHERRY to produce the transcript of the hearings to prove their contention. Interior chiefs also charged the utility proposal was drafted by Purcell Smith, $65,000-a-year lobbyist of the National Association of Electric Companies.

The final session of the conferees was stormy. THOMAS and WHERRY fulminated at length. KIRWAN, CANNON, and JACKSON stood pat. They held the whip hand and used it. Under House rules, a majority of a House conference group is necessary to approve such a declaration of policy. The utilities lacked that majority, as the six House conferees split evenly on the issue.

By that hairline margin, the President finally nailed down his big public power program in the West, Southwest and Southeast.

The other conferees who voted for the proposal were Senator CHAN GURNEY, Republican, South Dakota; and Representatives IVOR D. FENTON, Republican, Pennsylvania; BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Iowa; and W. F. NORRELL, Democrat, Arkansas.

President Truman was so elated he telephoned KIRWAN and warmly thanked and congratulated him.

The Implications of Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, not content with authorization for the spending of nearly $7,000,000,000 on assorted European nations during the coming fiscal year, President Truman is now asking Congress for an additional $35,000,000 to carry out point 4 of his inaugural address this year.

The object seems to be to send American experts abroad to teach the people of selected foreign countries how to increase their industrial production. If this plan were to be successful it would also call for loans or outright gifts to build new industrial plants and modernize many of those now in existence.

The fact that private capital has little confidence in the ability of foreign countries to help themselves is clearly demonstrated in the $150,000,000 so-called loan provision that was added to the already enormous foreign-aid bill that came from a House-Senate conference committee.

There is no shortage of capital in this country, in private sources, seeking an opportunity to be put to work. But private capital will not be made available without reasonable assurance of stability of foreign governments and there can be no real governmental stability abroad until there is a disposition on the part of the people to help themselves.

The following editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier points up quite clearly the fears that many of us entertain with respect to giving effect to point 4:

No American can look at the conditions of unrest which pervade so many regions of the world without some feeling of uneasiness. The yeast of change is beginning to act in many backward areas, and Communist agents are everywhere seeking to direct these movements for their revolutionary purposes. In fact, it seems that the more backward an area, in an industrial sense, the more progress the Communists are making in exploiting it. Czechoslovakia is the sole country which was highly industrialized and enjoyed an enlightened democracy when the Communists took over. The Reds otherwise have attained power only in industrially backward nations.

President Truman and his advisers feel that the United States cannot sit idly by and

see the major part of the world become dominated by a philosophy which is the declared enemy of our way of life. They do not feel it is safe, from a military-security point of view, to say that we will run our affairs and that what happens abroad is no concern of ours.

He, therefore, proposed in point 4 of his inaugural address last January that the United States take the lead in helping these backward countries to industrialize, use their natural resources to best advantage, and raise their standard of living. He did not, apparently, contemplate using American capital grants, but proposed only that the Government pave the way for private American loans and the employment of American technicians.

Then recently the President sent to Congress a proposal for an expenditure of $35,000,000 to implement this "point 4" program. This would be spent to send technicians to backward countries to study their economic situation and develop a plan for industrial progress. Physical construction under this plan would be financed by private and, possibly, governmental loans.

The Courier is sympathetic to the idea behind this program. We are living in a vastly changed world in which some of our old conceptions are so obsolete as to be dangerous. American needs imaginative leadership and bold planning.

Yet, in all fairness, Congress must ask what his proposed new expenditure will really accomplish. Nations do not embark on ambitious programs of industrialization unless the will and the desire is present and the government is enlightened enough to provide the necessary leadership. The United States cannot provide those things. Yet, if those things exist, those countries can come to us and employ the technicians which they need. And, if their development plan is sound and their government stable, they will have no difficulty obtaining American capital.

In other words, we fear that the expenditure of this money would become just another boondoggling operation which would actually accomplish very little. We have seen similar proposals bog down in bureaucracy and red tape. Is there any real reason to suppose that the point 4 program would really work? No nation can lift another physically to a higher standard of living. That can only come from the genius and work of a nation itself. And the proposal would force us to adopt one of two alternatives: We would either have to cooperate with some of the most reactionary and feudal regimes in the world, or we would have to form our own revolutionary movements to match those of Russia. Is either alternative satisfactory to us?

Ten Members of Congress Request Fertilizer Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, reports have been coming to me indicating that the farmers are suffering from the monopolistic practices of the fertilizer industry, and that there is reasonable ground for the belief that an excess of soluble nitrogen in fertilizers is not only the cause of tobacco-plant diseases, and potato and tomato blights, but that food crops and vegetables grown with it have a lot to do with the increased incidence of vascular diseases and degenerative diseases.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the House on more than one occasion, and I am glad to see that my colleagues in the House, and Members of the Senate, are devoting some thought, and manifesting considerable interest in this important matter.

During this session of the Congress, eight Members of the United States Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives have introduced resolutions requesting a congressional investigation of the monopolistic practices of the fertilizer industry. I think it is high time something was being done about this matter.

On May 9 last, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, introduced House Resolution 207, calling for the appointment of a special committee to conduct an inquiry into the effect upon the health of human beings of the chemicals, compounds, and synthetics that are being used in the production of food, in the place and stead of butter, lard, milk, eggs, and so forth, and to determine whether food crops grown with an excess of soluble nitrogen are harmful to plant life and injurious to the health of the people.

On August 10, 1949, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH introduced House Resolution 323, calling for the appointment of a special committee for the same purpose, and to do the same things specified in the resolution offered by Congressman KEEFE.

On July 20 last, eight Members of the United States Senate introduced Senate Resolution 139, which authorized and directed the Senate Agriculture Committee to conduct an investigation of the nature and extent of the monopolistic practices in the fertilizer industry.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago I met Mr. William G. Holman, a public-spirited citizen of Virginia, and invited him to my office. Mr. Holman told me that he was trying to secure a grand jury investigation of the fertilizer industry, and that he had the backing of the late Josephus Daniels of North Carolina, and the late Senators William E. Borah and George W. Norris.

A year or two afterward I met Mr. Holman again, and learned from him that 102 fertilizer firms and individuals had been indicted and fined in a Federal court in North Carolina for having exerted an illegal influence on State lawmakers.

Mr. Holman told me that, while this influence was being exerted, the State laws were amended, and that these amendments permitted the manufacturers: (1) To increase the nitrogen content of all fertilizer 21 percent; (2) to remove from the fertilizer bags what were known as "source tags," which told the farmers what materials had been used in making the fertilizer; and (3) to use almost unlimited proportions of the cheap, soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done. He said that these loopholes in the laws were invitations to fraud, and that he did not think it was right to force the farmer to buy a "pig in a poke."

The Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE introduced a truth about fertilizer bill in Congress in July 1945, at the request of Mr. Holman, and this bill has been introduced by him in each Congress since that time. This bill requires the manufacturer to tell the farmer what materials have been used in making the fertilizer, the number of pounds of each material, and the number of pounds of sand, or other useless filler. It also prohibits the use of coloring matter, and the use of materials known to be harmful to crops.

On February 28 last, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE introduced a fertilizer bill in Congress which contains the same labeling features as the Lemke bill, and forbids the shipment of fertilizer in interstate commerce that contains more than 50 percent of soluble nitrogen. I think that is a wise provision, and greatly needed.

As a practical farmer, I can see that this legislation would enable the farmers to buy fertilizer intelligently, and grow better crops with less fertilizer per acre.

I am convinced that the use of more organic nitrogen in fertilizer would enable tobacco, potato, and tomato plants to be grown free of disease, and I have reason to believe that food crops grown with it would be less likely to injure the health of the people.

Mr. Holman has an array of facts that are backed by the opinions of eminent agricultural and medical scientists, which plainly show that this proposed legislation has a vital relationship to the health and welfare of the people, and there is no doubt in my mind as to whether it would save the farmers millions of dollars.

I am glad to see the untiring efforts of this patriotic Virginian bearing fruit, and hope the farmers may rally to his standard, and give him the moral backing he rightly deserves. Mail will reach Mr. Holman at 305 B Street NE., Washington, D. C., or at Bremo Bluff, Va., his Fluvanna County home.

Tourist Development in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Soterious Nicholson entitled "Tourist Development in Greece," which appeared in the Atlantis, October 2, 1949:

TOURIST DEVELOPMENT IN GREECE

(By Soterios Nicholson)

The tourist trade is building up to prominence in Europe as a wealth-producing industry. Since the end of the war, tourism has been on the increase. Largest percentage of travelers come from the United States where the urge to visit the Old World has

reached a high point among vacationers. To meet this demand, most European countries are setting plans for the expected future influx of visitors. Significantly, the tourist trade is important to the productivity of such nations as Greece for a pertinent reason.

That reason is the need of such nations as Greece, still in a period of reconstruction, for American dollars. Dollars mean more business, more trade, and the purchasing power that will aid in the development of industry and bolster the nation's economic health. For its part, the United States can ill afford to ignore the wide opportunity for increased tourism in Greece. First off is the American investment in that nation. A close second are United States exports to Greece.

The American who visits Greece eats delicacies imported from his home country, fruit from as far away as Oregon. The pen and paper he uses when he registers at his hotel, more than often is made in the United States. The clothing, jewelry, and the many other products he buys all bear the made-in-the-United-States label.

His payments made to businessmen in Greece accumulate in the financial process into credits which are used by Greek commercial interests to purchase additional goods and materials for its industry. The credits are sorely needed by Greece in its individual effort under the foreign aid-to-Greece program. Greek recovery and tourism are inseparable. In order for Greece to buy goods from the United States, the nation must have money to pay for them.

American investment in the Balkan nations must be protected. As a chief trading center for American goods in the Balkans, Greece has access to many markets. However, the question remains: What can the United States do to help the tourist trade in Greece?

The answer involves much high-level finance. But a practical aid can help solve Greece's main problem in tourist accommodation—that of good, modern hotels. Many hotels handling the tourist trade in Greece before the war were destroyed or damaged by invading armies, while others were allowed to deteriorate because of war conditions.

The Greek Government, through its central tourist agency, is making great strides in its program to repair, modernize, and build hotel accommodations. Much of the program is still in the planning stage. And it is here that the United States can lend assistance. Many an investor in this country—hotel chain or big business corporation—could finance the building of big, luxurious hotels in Greece.

Roads repaired and reconditioned give access to existing hotels or hotel sites. Coordination of information bureaus with those in smaller communities, now under way by the central agency, also will help the tourist flow. American enterprise could convert these beginnings of tourist development into a flourishing industry.

There will be large expenditures by both the Greek Government and private enterprise in the nation, for tourist enhancement during the 4-year period ending in 1951. These expenditures include outlays for such undertakings as revitalization of the hotel industry, development of tourist areas, road, tourist area and museum reconditioning as well as expenses for tourist publicity and other media designed to attract the tourist.

Moreover, Greece is endowed by nature with great attractions for the tourist. Expansion of facilities to handle the trade could boost the number of 60,000 visitors annually estimated in prewar years to a much greater figure.

Greece is the ideal land for the tourist. It has the traditions of the ancient past combined with a wondrous climate, crystal green seas, dreamy light blue skies, scenic mountains, colorful villages, and friendly, hospitable folk. These attributes can well take care of the Amercian tourist, who, at heart, wants to tear himself loose from the everyday humdrum by a friendly, beautiful nation.

By projecting its Old World greatness, Greece performs itself a service. The nation is placing its natural resources at the disposal of the tourist. American capital can make its dollar perform double duty.

Sheep Losses From Poison Weeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in many of the agricultural sections of the country, the Federal Government has come in and assisted in financing the eradication of noxious weeds. Many of these weeds are a serious menace to the production of crops.

From the reports being received from the State of Idaho, it appears that a new variety of poison weed has invaded our State with disastrous results to sheep that are grazed on the open range.

For the information of my colleagues, and particularly the members of the Agricultural Committee, there is inserted here a letter from Mr. Sherman J. Bellwood, a prominent attorney of Rupert, Idaho, together with letter he received from Mr. Wilmer G. Priest, county extension agent:

RUPERT, IDAHO, *October 4, 1949.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Wilmer G. Priest, county agent, Minidoka County, has called to my attention a problem which is becoming more urgent with the passing of time; this problem concerns the spreading of a poisonous weed known as halogeton. It is causing considerable concern to those engaged in the raising of sheep and cattle. I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Priest to me, giving some history of the problem.

It seems that this problem concerns several Western States and is one which can best be handled by some sort of cooperative action.

I call this matter to your attention with a full realization of how busy you are, but with the hope that you will find the problem as pressing as we do in this area. You may be assured that any consideration you can give will be tremendously appreciated here and in surrounding areas.

Very truly yours,

SHERMAN J. BELLWOOD.

SHERMAN BELLWOOD,
Rupert, Idaho.

DEAR MR. BELLWOOD: Following is a history of the spread of halogeton in Cassia County and the effect it has caused there since it was noticed. This is the information that I promised you the other day when I talked to you. It was secured through Glenn Bodily, the county agent at Burley:

"HISTORY OF HALOGETON IN CASSIA COUNTY

(By Glenn L. Bodily)

"The first known cases of halogeton in Cassia County were in two spots about 7 years ago in the southern part of the county. One spot was located on a sheep trail coming out of Nevada, just south of Almo. The other spot was found just west of Bridge, near some hot artesian wells in that vicinity.

"For the first 2 years sheep were camped on these spots without any serious difficulty. However, the third year John Ward moved his band of sheep within the vicinity of the hot wells and lost nearly a thousand head of sheep on halogeton in 1 day. This was the first known loss in this county of any importance. Since that time halogeton has spread from these spots throughout the Raft River Valley.

"It is now known to be in the areas between Highway 30 north, south to the Utah line, and can be found anywhere from Almo to Black Pine Mountain, and all the way across Raft River Valley. This area would cover approximately an area 25 miles wide by 50 miles long.

"In addition to this, the weed has spread into Utah and can be found along Highway 30 south almost to Snowville, Utah, and almost as far south of the Utah line as it has spread north. I am not acquainted with the extent of the weed in Utah.

"Originally the weed came from Nevada and the extent of the area covered in Nevada must be considerable.

"Recently this weed has been found in an area northwest of Oakley and also spotted over about four sections in northern Minidoka County.

"Before halogeton came into the Raft River Valley, many flocks of sheep were wintered in that area. Now most of the sheepmen, who own sheep in that vicinity, have been forced out of the sheep business, or have been forced to find other winter range. One or two bands are still being wintered in the lower region around Cotterel.

"We have not had any serious death losses in sheep since John Ward suffered the heavy loss several years ago. However, there have been any number of cattle die from the same cause. Although it doesn't kill cattle in large numbers, it does cause considerable damage by the loss of a few cattle at a time. This poisonous weed does present a most serious threat to the livestock industry in this area, and if not controlled it will soon spread to the other grazing land in the Snake River Valley and, by doing so, force most of the sheepmen out of the business and cause serious losses to cattlemen and livestock in general."

Yours truly,

WILMER G. PRIEST,
County Extension Agent.

I am also inserting a letter on the same subject from Mr. Ross B. Haddock, secretary-treasurer of the Shoshone Chamber of Commerce, and would like to call your particular attention to paragraph 3, wherein Mr. Haddock stresses the importance of agriculture and livestock to our domestic economy and the necessity for correcting this situation:

SHOSHONE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Shoshone, Idaho, October 5, 1949.

Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The local office of the Bureau of Land Management, under the supervision of John A. Keith, district range manager, has reported the presence of Halogeten on the Federal range area in this grazing district, which district lies on the north of Snake River between American Falls on the east and King Hill on the west, and extends from the Snake River on the south to the national forest boundary on the north.

This plant is very poisonous to livestock and serious death losses have resulted in northern Nevada, northern Utah, and in the Raft River section of southern Idaho. The

seed from this plant (Halogeten glomeratus) is winged and scatters very readily.

Since our economy is built altogether on agriculture and livestock the spread of this poisonous plant is a very serious matter and we, therefore, urge you to extend every effort to make funds available for the control of Halogeten and other noxious or poisonous plants on the public lands.

We further urge that this matter be given immediate consideration since the various counties and individuals are not in a position to finance such an undertaking. The necessity for fast action cannot be overemphasized.

Yours truly,

ROSS B. HADDOCK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 1, the fifth annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was officially launched at the Masonic hall in New York City, under auspices of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped educational fund.

The principal speaker was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who dwelt upon the great value of the handicapped as workers and as citizens. Among other speakers were Hon. Jennings Randolph, chairman, AFPH Educational Fund, who served as toastmaster; Paul A. Strachan, national president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and author of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, president, American Heritage Foundation—Freedom Train—and chairman of the board, Kenyon & Eckhardt; Dr. Marcus D. Cogle, commissioner of hospitals, city of New York, representing Mayor O'Dwyer; Miss Betsy Barton, author; Mr. Alan Corelli, president, Theatre Authorities; June Gardner, radio singing star; Bernard M. Baruch. Dr. Merle E. Frampton, principal, New York Institute for the Education of the Blind; Walter E. Ditmars, president, Gray Manufacturing Co., and Mr. Brophy composed the committee on arrangements. Rev. Ralph O. Sockman pronounced the invocation and Rabbi Henry A. Schnorr, the benediction.

A feature of the performance was the chorus of blind singers from the New York Institute for the Education of the Blind, under direction of Mr. Ernest Anderson, rendering a repertoire of selections from Handel, Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, and others.

Since Mr. Strachan's address reveals some hitherto unpublished data on operations of the week, as well as the situation respecting national programs and conditions affecting our millions of physically handicapped, I am inserting it in the RECORD in the hope that all Members of Congress and many of the public will read and realize from it the tremendous scope of this vital problem:

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt, distinguished guests, members of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and friends of the physically handicapped, tonight marks another milestone along the road to better public understanding of the varied problems of the handicapped. In order to appreciate the size and scope of these problems, let us consider the fact that various sources today estimate the number of handicapped to run from 28,000,000 to 55,000,000, with from 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 of these being severely disabled.

To localize this problem, in the metropolitan area of Greater New York City, out of the approximate 8,000,000 population, according to our best statistics, about 1 in 4 are in some degree physically handicapped, and of these it is estimated that some 350,000 are severely disabled.

The civilian handicapped outnumber the military disabled approximately 10 to 1. During the war years, 11,112,600 disabilities occurred on the home industrial front, while in the various branches of the armed forces there was a total of 966,981 casualties. During the past 10 years, according to latest official figures, 20,680,800 have been injured in industry—an average of more than 2,000,000 per year. And I vigorously assert the program for civilian handicapped is miserably inadequate to the needs of our time.

For a period of 10 years prior to World War II we piled up an average of 800,000 disabilities each year, and of that number the combined Federal-State rehabilitation agencies were only able to rehabilitate approximately 10,000 per year, while private industry restored about the same number, leaving an army greater than that which we used to invade North Africa on the human scrap pile.

And during those years, very little real effort was made to ameliorate this situation. The public was (and, I am sorry to say, still is, to large extent) indifferent to the needs of handicapped; their potentials as workers were practically unknown and not understood, while those of us who endeavored to champion the handicapped were looked upon as crackpots or fools, or both.

While manpower needs of industry mounted daily, we in AFPH spearheaded a movement in which we were able to get a few other groups to join, and we pounded home to industry and business: "Hire the handicapped. If fitted to the task where their particular disability is not a factor, they can do your job, if given opportunity."

Industry, at first displaying the same enthusiasm as doubtless did Marie Antoinette while riding in a tumbrill to the guillotine, yet began to try out this idea and, finding it practical and worked well, they opened the doors wider and wider to employment of handicapped. A final summary showed that through United States Employment Service Offices nearly 1,400,000 handicapped were placed during the war years, and they wrote a brilliant page of production history in countless plants across country.

Although our great Government, presumably the most humanitarian and enlightened in all the world, prior to World War II had some 6,800 jobs in the then classified civil service, handicapped were only admitted to examination in some 365 of them. I knew that was wrong because, under the then prevailing rules, Edison could not have gotten a job in civil service because, forsooth, he could not hear a watch tick at 15 feet; Milton could not have taught English in an Indian school, because he was blind; Steinmetz would have failed appointment because of his disability; Bobby Burns would never have been a Government gager, because he was a cardiac, and there are countless other illustrations of the fallacy of these old-time rules and traditions.

I fought that condition and with the aid of friendly Congressmen we brought pressures to bear that resulted in the Civil Service Commission, War Manpower Commission, and Public Health Service instituting a survey of positions suitable for physically handicapped. The first report showed some 1,800 jobs; the second, 3,200; the third, 6,000; and today, out of the 27,700 jobs in the Occupational Directory, it has been shown that handicapped people, if given selective placement, can suitably fill more than 8,500 of these jobs. And the end is not yet. More research is needed, but we believe, ultimately, we will be able to fit nearly any handicapped person into some kind of a job that he or she can perform well.

I have often been asked, "Paul, what is the real purpose of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week?" I have replied, "The purpose and intent of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week is to focus public attention upon the abilities of people, rather than their disabilities, and, primarily, to change the public concept, developed and continued through long years of incompetent handling and lack of vigorous salesmanship on the part of so-called rehabilitation experts, who ceased dealing with the handicapped individual once he or she had been medically treated and maybe given some kind of education and training, after which the handicapped person would be turned out to grass to participate in the doubtful benefits of rugged individualism which, as most will remember, during the years in question, simply meant, "You are welcome to starve by yourself."

The great work of physicians, the effective training of eminent educators, all this is so much wasted energy and money, insofar as the handicapped are concerned, unless it ends in a job that is suitable to their individual abilities and requirements. I want to emphasize, successful placement of handicapped people is slow, tedious, and often an expensive job. Yet, if we spend approximately $600 to $800 a year keeping a person in enforced idleness, idleness often compounded by misery and despair, when an expenditure of say $500 would enable that individual to be restored and able to earn a living, wholly, or in part—I say that it is not only good public policy to spend that money, but, in this day and time, when we, as a nation, are beset by all manner of evils and threats, foreign and domestic, our economy will be no stronger than the people who man it, and if we are going to continue to ignore the needs of our millions of handicapped, thus intensifying weakness of our people and Nation, then we shall be deserving of whatever ills are put upon us as penance for our stupidity, callousness, and avarice. Some have said to me that such a course as I suggest is socialism. I say it is simply good, American common sense to take care of our people.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, then, has been responsible for throwing the needs of the handicapped into sharp focus. If a man or woman cannot work—why? For lack of medical or surgical treatment? For lack of proper education and training or retraining? For lack of guidance and vocational counseling? We are now beginning to realize that these things must be supplied, so that the handicapped individual may thus be placed on more or less parity with his or her nonhandicapped brother or sister, and, above all, having applied treatment, training, and vocational guidance, there must be selective placement—the science of fitting the man to the job—in all successful employment of handicapped.

From a dollars-and-cents standpoint we have been able to show that operations of National Employ the Physically

Handicapped Week have been responsible the past 4 years (exclusive of this year), for employment of more than 150,000 handicapped, and that salaries or wages paid to them have amounted to more than $500,000,000. And, as proof of the soundness and value of such a program, handicapped, so placed, have gladly taken up their share of the responsibilities of support of their homes, communities, States, and the Nation, and have paid Federal, State, and local taxes amounting to more than $100,000,000.

The week, then, is continually justifying itself and proving the value of handicapped people as workers. But we cannot ignore its beneficial impact, otherwise, upon the morale of the entire population. Even the nonhandicapped citizen, seeing a disabled worker succeed, says, "There is inspiration for me. If he can do it, so can I." And, speaking as one who is himself 85 percent permanently disabled and erstwhile on the human scrap pile, I can truthfully say that none of the handicapped welcome enforced idleness. Few of us are willing to be drones or parasites upon the body politic. We want to do our share, and given opportunity, we will do our share.

I fully understand that this "ball game" has just started. We have come a "fur piece" in the past 7 years, considering where and from what we started. But this is a job that must be done. We know that the varied problems and needs of the handicapped require special study, treatment, and handling. We cannot say, "Here, this is your problem," and dump it into the laps, let us say, of the chamber of commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, American Bankers Association, or other business groups; or the powerful American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, railroad brotherhoods, United Mine Workers, machinists, and other labor groups; the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, American veterans committee, and others; General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Federation of Business and Professional Women, National League of Women Voters; civic bodies such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Civitan, International Exchange, Lions, Optimists; scientific and professional organizations; the American Medical Association; and other groups. It is my judgment that no organization in the United States, nor combination of them, can deal effectively with the needs and problems of our millions of handicapped.

This, then, is the place for that which has made ours the greatest Nation on earth—American teamwork. If all organizations and individuals at interest will combine and with adequate help and leadership from our Federal Government, and intelligent and vigorous action on the part of States, and on down to local community levels, we cannot fail.

To the employer I will say: "Give the handicapped a chance." You cannot lose, and you have much to gain. Besides, in doing this, not only will you perform a great humanitarian action and thus create a better life for many who, otherwise, might be condemned to misery and want, but, practically, you will help spread the cost of taxation amongst many more wage earners and thus lessen the drain upon yourself, the States, and Nation.

To my handicapped brothers and sisters, I say, "Hold up your heads. Do not lose hope. Organize, study, work to equip yourselves so that you will be competent to perform and thus able to ignore, if you desire, the doubtfully valuable advice of the so-called rehabilitation experts and do-gooders who beset you, on the one hand, whilst you fend off the 'Oh-you-poor-deah-man- or-woman' saccharine sympathizers, shedding crocodile tears, and enjoying the Lord-and-Lady-Bountiful role, on the other.

Apply yourselves to learning whatever it may be that you are best fitted to do. Do not beg. Do not whine. You are a citizen of this, the greatest Nation on earth, and each of you should feel, through having that citizenship, as did St. Paul, with respect to his own status as a Roman citizen. Finally, remember this: You get out of this world just about what you put into it, and if you take the position of seeking favors or hand-outs, you will be tied to a tin cup and a green eyeshade for the rest of your lives. Look up—not down. We are on our way, and those of us who have learned to live with our disabilities know that we are engaged in a grim struggle for existence; one in which there will be little quarter given, and we must, therefore, fight and fend for ourselves.

I do not intend, tonight, to enter into lengthy discussion of pending national legislation beneficial to handicapped, but, our federation now has before the Congress a bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, which has the support of organizations representing some 30,000,000 of our people, and I am hopeful Congress will pass this bill in the next few months.

I am happy to say that the principal speaker here tonight, Mrs. Roosevelt, has always been a great source of inspiration to me. A few months after leaving the hospital in 1940, I called upon her and discussed the handicapped problem at considerable length. She made every effort to assist in having Federal agencies at interest take a more positive stand, and I can vouch for the fact that she is one of the greatest workers for the handicapped in the world today. In token of our love and respect, we present to her our AFPH certificate of appreciation, knowing that she will continue her efforts on behalf of humanity.

I may say that our federation has, as its official motto, adopted the stirring words of her late husband's first inaugural—those words which, even now, ring down the corridors of time and, trumpet-like, bring renewed hope to all peoples, "We have nothing to fear, but fear itself."

I am grateful for this opportunity to state the case for the handicapped and I thank you all.

Wake Up, America—Stop Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch, of Moline, Ill., of September 27, 1949, which I believe is timely:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

An interesting journey into the realm of speculation starts with the presumption that all business, large and small, decides to follow the example set by the Federal Government, and operate on a deficit basis.

Profits are to be ignored, no attention is to be paid to the matter of credit, cash balances are to be a thing of the past. Regardless of income, expense of operation is to be permitted to increase.

If there are stockholders, they will be milked for the last possible dollar, with dividends becoming only a fond memory. Result, bankruptcy.

In private life, family budgets will be forgotten. Living expenses will exceed family earnings. Credit will be stretched in every way possible. Living only for the day, the future must take care of itself. Gone will be the security which comes with savings. There will be nothing for old age.

The whole system of family economy which has made the American people a thrifty race, sufficient unto themselves, would go out the window if families followed the example of their Government.

These things will not come about if the American people retain a modicum of their former vaunted spirit. But the American people are today expected to live under a Government immersed in such practices. They are expected to have faith in that Government, and place their future in its hands.

In times of war there are shouts of "Wake Up, America!" The country could be going to sleep.

Return of Hitlerism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of the Members of the House to the unsatisfactory policies of the American military government in occupied Germany. Our denazification and decartelization program has failed. Our immediate postwar program to prevent the rebuilding of cartels and heavy industry which was the basis of World War II is forgotten. The military executives in occupied Germany have in too many instances been influenced by their previous connection with the great financial and industrial interests in the United States, who have financial stakes in rebuilding a nationalist Germany. The great chemical and basic metal cartels, which financed the Hitler regime, in many instances, had interlocking financial interest and trade agreements with their counterparts in the United States. Many of the United States military leaders in occupied Germany have been chosen not for their professional military skill, but because of their prewar positions in our great financial and industrial concerns.

Part of this regrettable and tragic revival of Nazi interests in occupied Germany depends on the propaganda of a biased press. This biased pro-Hitler newspaper technique is being reestablished now. One of the outstanding editors in my congressional district has recently written a brilliant and informative editorial on this subject.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the September 28 editorial of Mr. Al Waxman, owner and publisher of the Eastside Journal:

HITLER IS BACK

Some of our readers may feel that this is not a local issue. Neither was World War I; neither was World War II; neither is world war III, which is now very much in the making. But we were all affected, directly and indirectly.

It just is impossible to sit by and watch another war in the making without saying something about the matter. You see, there was once a Munich and we all sat by and said "That's not a local affair," but it turned out to be so local that our sons, fathers, and brothers had to go and fight and die.

Little has been said here about developments in the German Nation in relation to the return of Hitlerism. Why we try to hide our heads in the sands here is not quite understandable, because in Germany the movement is already under way toward another catastrophe.

There has appeared on the German national scene a man who is said to resemble the Hitler pattern in every way except the little mustache. His name is Alfred Loritz.

Loritz heads the extreme rightist Economic Reconstruction Party. He has already declared his creed: "The great democratic systems built up in Britain and America are not suited to Germany."

Observers predict that his recently licensed party will go far under the present nationalist mood of Germany. And the prediction is based on the fact that this man resembles Hitler in his early days (when we felt it wasn't a local issue): His gestures are the same, his hatred is as deep and wide, his eyes are as wild with dreams of power and he carries out the same wild, hysterical appearance on the rostrum. He doesn't like the United States, Britain, and the democracies they represent. His goal: To free Germany and dominate the world.

Watch this man. Today his party has 12 out of the 402 Bundestag (West Germany Parliament) seats. While we sit by he'll gather more, enough to give him power. Then: world war III.

Loritz is not the only one to watch in Germany. The press is bending in his direction also. Pals of Goebbels and Julius Streicher are setting up shop again to kindle the old hatreds and start where Hitler left off.

Othmarr Best, a Nazi and former pal of Goebbels, went back into the newspaper business last week. He has been financed by a big machinery combine. His offer to his readers: "Show the German people what they lost in Hitler."

Max Willmy, who was once publisher of Julius Streicher's rabidly anti-Semitic, anti-United States Der Sturmer, is setting up shop again. His program will undoubtedly be the same as before World War II.

Max Amann, pre-war Nazi press lord, who is now in prison, has already announced that he will open a newspaper when freed.

In Bavaria alone at least 80 frankly pro-Nazi papers are making preparations to print again under their old, Hitler-era names.

When these new rabble-rousing, war-demanding sheets come into full power the entire blame will have to go on the shoulders of the military government. Particularly responsible is the American zone, which has replaced licensing control over the press with easy-going state laws. Now anyone with a printing press can put out a newspaper. Under licensing there were 55 papers in the American zone, now there are 201. They represent the prewar nationalistic press. Dr. Walter Janecke, who was cochief with Amann, of Hitler's German Publishers' Association, has started a Publishers' Association. He is said to have a $600,000 bank roll for his purpose. It is interesting to note that occupation officials once pointed out that Janecke was the collaborating publisher without whom the Nazis could never have gained total power.

In Straubing, Dr. Georg Huber has revived Straubinger Tageblatt, which he published under the same name during the Nazi regime.

There is talk today that the German courts may return to their old Nazi owners many of the newspaper publishing plants which the western Allies seized. These things are happening only in the American zone. British and French zone commissioners have not yet lifted licensing. If Hitlerism and Nazism is fanned back to pre-World War II days, the blame should rest entirely upon the shoulders of the American military government in Germany.

As we said at the outset, this may not be a local issue but it certainly deserves local consideration because the sons, fathers, and brothers who will have to die on European battlefields will definitely be local products.

Soviet Pressure on Satellite States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excerpt from the celebrated Boston (Mass.) Post summarizing the remarks I recently made before the Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs at Webster, Mass.:

PHILBIN IN ATTACK ON SOVIET—SAYS MORE PRESSURE PUT ON CHURCHES AND PEOPLE

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, addressing the Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs last night at Webster, declared that Soviet pressure on helpless peoples of satellite states was steadily increasing.

NOW VASSALAGE

"Outrage after outrage," said PHILBIN, "is perpetrated upon Christian churches and ministers of the Gospel and loyal worshippers of organized religion of many sects. The steel bands of political bondage behind the Iron Curtain are being drawn tighter and tighter until the ordinary man and woman within these countries is reduced to a cruel and unbelievable vassalage.

"Up to this time it is almost incredible to note that the United Nations, designed to insure world peace and human rights, has been entirely inactive in moving to stop these abominable outrages. Nor can it be said that our own Government has shown more than a desultory, and up to this time, ineffectual interest in seeking to check these violations of human freedom affecting millions of sincere, liberty-seeking, God-fearing peoples."

UNWORTHY OF HERITAGE

"If this Nation abandons to their cruel fate the enslaved and persecuted nations of the earth, it will be unworthy of our great democratic heritage and faithless to the sacred sacrifices which our noble sons offered to secure democracy and freedom.

"Your organization can continue to make invaluable contributions, not only to the cause of Poland but to the cause of all oppressed peoples, if you will but persist, as in the past, with zeal and determination in your demand for justice and liberation for those who claim as their right self-government, free worship, and all the other freedoms associated with democracy.

"This is an age of jet-propelled aircraft, guided missiles, atomic weapons capable of indescribable destruction. We must, therefore, so organize this world that these horrible creatures of science may be harnessed for humanity and peace rather than for war and the destruction of civilized mankind.

"In the spirit of the Prince of Peace, let us renew our efforts to end the confusion, dissension and injustice that exist in the world today. Let us courageously strive through wholehearted international cooperation to strengthen the United Nations and every other agency of peace and serve notice upon the Kremlin that the free people of America and the free peoples of the world will not permit any one nation or any group of nations to obstruct our aspirations for freedom, peace, and democracy."

PHILBIN praised the Polish people as "having borne persecution with fortitude and faith," and declared that "from their inspiring sacrifices would rise the rebirth of Polish independence." He also complimented the distinguished Polish leaders present at the gathering for their faith, loyalty, and persistency in fighting for the cause of their afflicted people.

No Place To Stop If We Adopt Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of September 29, 1949, which I believe is timely.

NO PLACE TO STOP

The administration's global aid scheme for the development of underdeveloped areas is not to be confused with charity, Undersecretary of State Webb told the House Foreign Affairs Committee the other day.

On the contrary, Mr. Webb said, this program, which might run 10 years or 50, is "an enlightened businesslike attempt to solve one of the most crucial problems with which our world is confronted."

That problem is that a lot of people in various parts of the world are badly off as measured by the American standard of living. The State Department's "businesslike" approach to this problem is to pour American taxpayers' money into such areas. The first year's outlay would be disarmingly modest—about $35,000,000 in addition to what the Government is already doing along these lines.

The figure is doubly deceptive. First, it does not include the cost of guaranteeing private investments in such areas, an integral part of the universal-aid concept. This would permit the administration to use Treasury funds, through the Export-Import Bank, to compensate Americans for various losses they are almost certain to incur by taking nonbusinesslike risks.

Secondly, once the administration's view is accepted, the direct annual cost to the Government cannot fail to grow and grow. Once you accept the premise that it is the duty of the United States to provide for economically backward peoples everywhere there is literally no place to stop. Indeed, if you operate on that premise there is little chance of ever stopping.

To suppose that people will be content with $35,000,000 or $350,000,000, plus a billion or so of guaranteed private investments, when there is obviously more to be got is to misread human nature. Nobody is that backward. And if the administration thinks it will be an easy matter to turn off the spigot after 5 or 10 years it will discover otherwise.

The examples already at hand demonstrate that. We undertook a European recovery program which was to last 4 years. The Europeans are already assuring us that that will not be enough, and there is little we can say in refutation; we have put our responsibility for European recovery on record for all to see and use.

We are now undertaking a European military-aid program the end of which is nowhere in sight. For we are putting ourselves on record as responsible for the security of western Europe.

With point 4 the administration would have us extend our responsibility to the whole world. Once we acknowledge that obligation we leave it to the whole world to tell us the scope of it.

That is neither enlightened nor businesslike. It is also, as the State Department rightly says, not charity. For the dispenser of charity can at least stop where he wants.

"The Fury of the Naval Aviators Has Been Directed, Not Only Against the President and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, but Also Against Admiral Denfeld and Other Sea Officers Like Him"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the words that I have just spoken were extracted from an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, writers of the nationally known Matter of Fact column published in the Washington Post on Friday last, and today.

Countless thousands of words have now been written about the controversy raging over the fact that this Congress voted to unify all defense agencies and the armed services of our country. Nothing I have read was as much to the point as were the Alsop articles.

It is unnecessary for me to tell my colleagues of the twofold objectives of this Congress when it passed, and when it recently amended, the Unification Act.

First was the declared purpose of Congress to reduce the cost of the national defense and at the same time to obtain the maximum of national security with the minimum expenditure of the hard-earned moneys paid into the Federal Treasury by the taxpayers of the Nation.

The second purpose of the Congress was to insure retention of civilian control over all departments and subdivisions of Government charged with effectuating congressionally declared policies made with respect to the armed services of our national defense, as well as with respect to the expenditures of funds lavishly appropriated to their use.

Mr. Speaker, when I say civilian control I mean men like the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of the Department of Defense, congressionally trusted, hard-hitting, time-proven, efficient, and economy minded "Watchdog of the Federal Treasury."

I mean men like Hon. Gordon Gray, whose long career in the War Department found him eminently qualified to discharge the duties as Secretary of the Army; men like the Honorable Francis Matthews who, although the junior member of our President's Cabinet, has already distinguished himself by his calm, able, judicial, resolute, and firm administration of the Department of the Navy; men like the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, young, forceful, dynamic business administrator that he is, who, as Secretary of the Air Force, and believing that air power is truly peace power, has done so much, and in so short a time, in giving the country undisputed and factual supremacy in the air.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to any question involving the administration of our armed services, no statement of mine would be complete were I not to express my personal appreciation and admiration for the attitude taken with respect to the Unification Act and unification of the armed services by the Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley of the Army, General Vandenberg of the Air Force, and Admiral Denfeld of the United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, better than which the Navy has never had.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that these civilian and military officials are all of them of one mind as to the need for, and as to the benefits that will come out of, the Unification Act, Public Law 253—as amended by this Congress.

They are each and everyone of them in hearty agreement with the declaration of purpose and with the policy enunciated by this Congress when we passed the bill and as proclaimed by President Truman when he signed it.

Each and everyone of them—civilian and military heads alike—stand four-square behind Secretary Johnson in their support of his ambition and desire to effect the economies of the savings that we here in Congress demand should be effected.

Mr. Speaker, I know Louis Johnson and I know that he regards it as his bounden duty to carry out the principles and policies laid down by this Congress.

The sum of the whole question of the controversy now raging in the press and over the air is fully exhibited in but a few words by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in their articles as published in the Post.

It is because of that fact that I am asking the unanimous consent of this House to extend my remarks and include therein that brilliant piece of factual reporting.

The articles read as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1949]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE ANGRY ADMIRALS

A good rousing row is always good rousing fun, but it is a bit dangerous to forget that serious issues may be involved. Despite the distracting drama of hole-and-corner passing out of confidential documents, serious issues are involved in the current tempest in the Navy.

In the first place Captain Crommelin's blast against service unification and its various sequels are not merely episodes in the struggle between the Navy and the Air Force. They are also symptoms of a bitter split within the Navy itself, between the sea officers, led by the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Louis Denfeld, and the naval aviators, led by the Pacific Fleet commander, Admiral A. W. Radford.

In wartime the naval aviators met only the inferior Japanese air force, and from this experience conceived an exceedingly dubious theory of the potentialities of naval aviation in land warfare. Postwar, the naval aviators for a time dominated naval policy. To put it bluntly, their plans for extensive encroachment on the functions of the land-based Air Force offered the best chance of building the vast naval establishment that all admirals, battleship or other, instinctively desire. Thus all admirals supported the aviators.

This situation was in itself gravely disquieting. After all, the primary mission of the Navy is, and must always be, maintaining control of the seas. From the end of the war onward, our control of the seas has been directly threatened by the German high-speed, radar-proof submarine, which the Soviet Union is building in quantity. Yet our Navy long gave naval aviation high priority over antisubmarine warfare. While funds were lavished on such projects as the giant carrier, the Research and Development Board had to protest vigorously against the inadequacy of the antisubmarine research effort. Even now, this fundamental submarine problem has not been really solved.

The passage of the service unification bill, and the subsequent brilliant work of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, had the effect of forcing the Navy back into its primary mission. The job of controlling the seas looked almost big enough to the sea officers like Admiral Denfeld, who is himself a submariner. But the resulting limitation of their expansive plans enraged the naval aviators like Admiral Radford, to the point of the rather open insubordination that has now been displayed.

The fury of the naval aviators has been directed, not only against the President and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, but also against Admiral Denfeld and the other sea officers like him. The thought seems to be that Admiral Denfeld has been criminally weak to accept the fact that the Navy cannot make its policies and develop its strength in total independence, and even in defiance of both the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the United States Government. And the motive of the recent outbursts has been as much to embarrass Admiral Denfeld as to build a fire under Secretary Johnson.

This is speaking out in meeting, and such inconvenient truths may of course be denied. But they are true nontheless. And it is true also that the Navy's present share of the total defense investment represents rather generous concessions to the Navy's touchy sensibilities by the other Chiefs of Staff and by General Eisenhower.

The central fact, which everyone seems to forget, is that the Soviet Union has no navy except for the submarines which our Navy has somewhat neglected. In war planning against a nonnaval power it is obviously logical to economize, if economies must be made at all, on our own naval strength.

The British long ago have done this. But even after the British Navy has been cut to the bone, and our own naval forces have been reduced in a manner that Captain Crommelin says cripples our defenses, the strength ratio between us and the Soviets must be at least 10 to 1. So judicious and impartial a soldier as General Eisenhower is known to believe that there is no real justification for investing over 30 percent of total defense funds in maintaining a 10-to-1 naval strength ratio. And in view of our appalling weakness in other branches, the argument certainly seems hard to refute.

There remains the issue of the Navy's morale, which has been raised by Captain Crommelin and Admirals Radford and Bogan. In harsh terms, it must be considered a symptom of shockingly low morale if the requirement that the Navy adapt itself to a national strategic plan can send so many of its officers off the deep end.

If morale is in question, it surely cannot be vastly improved by exhibitions of fairly open insubordination by high officers in responsible positions. And open attacks on the more cooperative naval officers like Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Forrest Sherman (who was exiled to the Mediterranean for his part in the unification bill) cannot help morale much, either. In short, the drama is pleasing, but the facts are not.

[From the Washington Post of October 10, 1949]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE GRAIN AMONG CHAFF

Through no fault of the Air Force, there is an important grain of truth among the volumes of dusty chaff that are being so angrily blown about the Capitol by the embattled naval aviators. Our defense has not been balanced since the war; it is not balanced today; and if present plans are followed, it will not be balanced for a long time to come.

This is so because our civilian political leaders have chosen to gamble on the deterrent effect of our strategic aviation and our stock pile of atomic weapons. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have not recommended this gamble any more than they have approved Admiral Radford's fantastic project for defending ourselves against a nonnaval power by investing the bulk of our resources in the Navy. The gamble has been chosen as the easiest way out of a dilemma.

The dilemma is, of course, whether to meet the challenge of Soviet rearmament, with all the attendant effort and expense; or to avoid the effort and expense, and not meet the challenge. The gamble on strategic aviation plus an atomic stock pile represents an attempt to escape both of the dilemma's extremely uncomfortable horns. By the standards of modern war, it is only moderately expensive to maintain the necessary groups of B-29's and B-36's and to push forward with the atomic energy program. Yet it can be (and is) argued that the Soviet Union will never risk aggression while the masters of the Kremlin know their country "can be put back into the fourteenth century in a matter of weeks."

The main reason why we have drifted into this immense gamble on a simple deterrent, is probably the most obvious reason. In the past 4 years, only three leaders of the administration have really believed in rearming in earnest. But Robert A. Lovett is now in New York; Averell Harriman is in Paris; and James V. Forrestal is in Arlington Cemetery. They alone asked, "What needs to be done?" The question asked nowadays is, "What can be done?" which, being interpreted, means, "What is it convenient to do?"

In part, it is understandable why the underlying question of all policy-making is being rather differently phrased nowadays than in the past. Even under Lovett, the State Department staff was always primarily political-minded. They regarded the world-contest with the Soviet Union as chiefly a political contest. They feared that the defense effort would be competitive with the gigantic efforts needed to build strong economic-political foundations under the free world. They came perilously close to deprecating such purely strategic developments in our foreign policy as the Atlantic Pact.

Now, moreover, although in Dean G. Acheson we have a Secretary of State of the greatest attainments, it is not possible for Acheson to take the part that Lovett did in American defense planning. Indeed, it is hard enough for Acheson to protect his own field of policy making from unwarranted incursions from the defense establishment.

Meanwhile, at the defense establishment, Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, has wisely and courageously sought to break the shockingly wasteful habits of the armed services, which have done so much to prevent straight thinking about defense problems. But Johnson lacks the ripe politico-strategic experience of a Lovett or a Forrestal; and he is also immensely ambitious. Thus he is inevitably tempted to go beyond true economy and to make the false economies that look fine now but may cost, later on, untold lives and incalculable treasure.

Finally, there is the Bureau of the Budget, with its great influence and its natural professional deformation. There is the Chairman of the Economic Advisory Council, Dr. Edwin Nourse, with his peculiar doctrine that America, the wealthiest Nation the world has seen, is not rich enough to defend herself. And there is the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snyder, with his great influence on the President, and his firm commitment to the doctrines of business as usual.

In view of this array of influences on the side of not doing what obviously needs to be done, we should perhaps thank God that at least we possess the deterrent of the B-36s and the atomic stock pile. Anyone who knows the state of the defenses of the free world, knows that we have very little else. And at any rate, a deterrent is something.

On the other hand, it is difficut to forget that the world was once before confronted with a giant power, frankly aggressive in intention, and rearming with all possible speed. On that occasion, Stanley Baldwin was the man whom the dilemma bleakly confronted. Baldwin chose to do only what it was convenient to do. Before long, the aggressor had achieved decisive strength. Fear begot weakness, and weakness begot the appeasement of Neville Chamberlain. But appeasement achieved nothing but shame. And the ultimate horror ensued.

Peace in the Clothing Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Post:

PEACE IN THE CLOTHING SHOPS

The day's grist of news about industrial strife which closes mines and factories isn't the whole story of labor-management relations in America.

Perhaps we need reminders now and then of the many industries in which management and union sign new contracts year after year in peaceful bargaining. Cincinnati is getting a reminder of this sort this week.

The men's clothing industry (management) of Cincinnati and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (union) are having a dinner party Saturday night to celebrate a decade of unbroken harmony in their relations. That period of peace goes back as far as 1919 in one instance at least—the Globe Tailoring Co. It's a particularly heartening example to report in this month of coal and steel shutdowns.

Commissioner Miller on Section 4 of Displaced Persons Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Watson Miller, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1949.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: This will acknowledge your welcome letter of September 19, 1949, in which you call my attention to certain aspects of the procedure implementing section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which, you believe, may partially defeat the purpose of this bill. It being my recollection that the decisions of the Adjudications Division of this Service had been in accord with the views expressed in your communication, I again reread those decisions in the light of the representations made by you.

My review of those cases indicated that you were correct in stating that some examiners in the field offices of this Service had recommended denial of adjustment of status under section 4 of the act in question predicated on an interpretation of the law contrary to that expressed in your communication. In each such case, however, the Adjudications Division of the Central Office reversed the position of the hearing examiner and interpreted the law and the regulations promulgated thereunder so that the final decision of this Service was and still is completely in harmony with the views expressed by you. I am certain you appreciate the fact that it is administratively difficult to so completely anticipate all of the possible interpretations of a new statute on the part of hearing officers throughout the country as to be able to thoroughly safeguard against erroneous decisions by regulation or instruction. May I assure you that, to the extent to which we are capable of such anticipation, appropriate instructions are issued in advance. The hearing examiners in the respective field offices will, of course, be obliged to follow the view of the Adjudications Division and I am pleased to be able to inform you that full compliance with our decision is being made in cases presently being considered.

With reference to the view expressed in the second paragraph of your letter under consideration, this Service has taken the position that a person may properly be considered a displaced person within the meaning of Section 4, notwithstanding the fact that such person had left the country of his birth or nationality or last residence prior to the occurrence of the events occasioned by or occurring subsequent to the outbreak of World War II. Thus, in Matter of Feigelstrock, A-7052465 (May 5, 1949), this service held that an alien, a native and former citizen of Austria, who left Austria in March 1938 to seek refuge in Hungary where he was admitted temporarily, qualified as a displaced person within the meaning of the law in question. In that case, however, adjustment of status was denied for the reason that the subject alien had established a bona fide residence in Uruguay to which country he testified he was able to return. Such denial was predicated upon the interpretation of the act given by you

during the debate in the House of Representatives at which time you stated:

"The purpose of this bill is to aid those who are stateless, who have no roofs over their heads, who have no havens to which they can repair." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1948, p. 7862.)

On the basis of the facts present in that case, this Service concluded that the subject alien's displacement ceased when he found refuge in Uruguay to which country he was lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to which country he stated he could return without fear of persecution.

In matter of Szucs, A-6887200, this Service enunciated the principle that an alien who voluntarily left his country of birth, nationality, or last residence at a time when there were no factors of displacement could nevertheless qualify as a displaced person within the meaning of section 4 where by reasons of events occurring subsequent to his departure he would have been obliged to flee such country had he then been still resident therein. In that case, this Service expressed the view that the term "displaced person" comprehended not alone those aliens who were forced to leave but also those who had previously departed without compulsion and subsequently became refugees.

With reference to the fifth paragraph of your letter, it may very well be, for the reasons previously mentioned, that hearing examiners in the field have recommended denial of adjustment of status on the ground that persons of the Jewish faith would not be subject to persecution by reason of their religious faith nor have any basis for fear of such persecution if Austria or western Germany were their country of birth, nationality, or last residence. As far as the cases reviewed by me indicate, no such determination has been made or approved by the central office of this Service. I agree with you that the existence of antisemitism is a serious factor to be considered in determining whether persecution or fear of persecution may be found to exist within the meaning of section 4. You have my assurance that such factor will be accorded great weight in reaching a decision on that phase of the law.

The policy and procedure of this Service, especially as they relate to the administration of displaced persons, are constantly scrutinized by us to achieve more effectively the intent of the Congress. Your criticisms and suggestions assist us in reaching this objective and I sincerely appreciate your sending them to me. The decisions thus far rendered convince me that your views and mine are harmonious with respect to the issues which were the subject of your communication.

Sincerely,

WATSON MILLER, *Commissioner.*

The Marketing Co-ops Are in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while our good Democratic friends are in danger of breaking their own arms, in an effort to pat themselves on their back and trying to make the farmers believe that the Republicans are opposed to them, it might be well to look and see what the co-ops think about it.

The following, by Fred Bailey, is from the Washington Farm Reporter of October 8, 1949, issue No. 376:

Meanwhile, representatives of farmer cooperatives, meeting in Chicago under sponsorship of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, charged CCC policies can lead only to ultimate nationalization of farm marketings.

The cooperatives demanded that CCC withdraw from the field of farm marketing to the greatest extent possible at the earliest possible time and that, instead, it employ the usual and customary channels of trade.

The questions, of course, is just exactly where will the co-ops be if and when the Government takes over the responsibility of being the marketing agency for the food and fiber of the Nation?

The Democratic platform and the Democratic legislative effort is to ruin one group of producing co-ops, and by that I mean the dairy co-ops.

Sam Hobbs, Friend of the Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD deGRAFFENRIED

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tuscaloosa News, Tuscaloosa, Ala., of September 28, 1949:

SAM HOBBS—FRIEND OF THE SIXTH DISTRICT

Announcement by Representative SAM HOBBS that his present term in Congress will end his career in the House comes as a distinct disappointment to many friends in the sixth district. They are disappointed that such an able spokesman will be missing from the Alabama delegation. And they will be personally grieved that Judge HOBBS' health is such to make his retirement advisable.

Down through the years, 20 of them spent in the House, Judge HOBBS has been truly "the gentleman from Alabama." He has served well his Fourth Congressional District, and his State and Nation.

He has been a most sincere and effective friend of the Sixth Congressional District. Many recall the valiant help which he gave this area when his beloved colleague, the late Representative William B. (Buck) Oliver, of Tuscaloosa, was ill while serving his last term in the House.

In attempting a brief summary of Congressman HOBBS' service, the Anniston Star says it will require a "Gulliver" to fill his shoes in Congress.

"What has been the greatest achievement," asks the Star, "since he has been in Congress? He has placed millions of dollars worth of Alabama marble in the Nation's Capital; he has helped to locate scores of industries, military establishments, and marble post offices in the cities and towns of his district; he was a pioneer in parity for farmers and has lived to see them prosper. * * *

"But none of these things * * * constitutes SAM HOBBS' greatest achievement. * * * It is his gentility, his charitable nature, his moral courage, his intellectual integrity."

To this comment the Montgomery Advertiser adds:

"HOBBS is perhaps the most characterful Member of Alabama's congressional delegation. It is assumed that ill health is forcing his retirement, and it may be assumed that the same failing prevented him from seeking a higher post.

"How HOBBS, a commanding Milleresque figure imbued with the tough conservatism of the Black Belt, would have fared in a contest for Governor or Senator we have scarcely a guess. The State plainly does not elect purely on a basis of political viewpoint; no sensible person would contend that we elect on the basis of right or left, for a multiplicity of contradictions are holding office right now. The factor of personality is a far more reliable index. We therefore suspect that HOBBS would have given a good account of himself, for vigor and courage usually elicit response."

Truman's Failure To Invoke Taft-Hartley Law Has Cost Millions of Dollars in Hawaiian Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial on the Hawaiian strike situation which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on October 8:

PRESIDENTIAL NEGLECT OF DUTY

The Hawaiian strike is being settled. It has cost millions upon millions of dollars. It has threatened our national security. And it has taken 159 days to reach an agreement because President Truman refused to do his duty under the Taft-Hartley law and force an earlier settlement.

On May 1, 2,000 stevedores, members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, headed by CIO's Harry Bridges, struck for a 32-cent-an-hour increase in wages. The strike paralyzed all shipping to and from this strategic military outpost. Hawaiian exports of sugar and pineapples were halted. Food imports rotted in the harbor as the island's inhabitants moved closer and closer to starvation.

While pickets indulged in bloody violence and the island suffered, Communist spokesmen chortled.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, Mr. Truman should have taken out an injunction as soon as the strikes started. This would have put the men back to work and started the Federal mediation and conciliation service to work.

However, the President did not use his powers under the law he hates. From the day the Taft-Hartley Act was forced on him by the people, Mr. Truman has been obsessed to be rid of it, regardless of the cost to the country. Time and again he has shown he would rather let a strike degenerate into a calamity, rather than use this nationally endorsed law which the citizens will not let him shake.

His inaction in this tragic Hawaiian case is just another example of the Truman determination to play politics at the expense of the United States of America.

George B. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appears in the Washington Daily News today, upon the death of an eminent American citizen, Mr. George B. Parker, a newspaperman for 40 years and a famous editorial writer. In 1936 he was awarded a Pulitzer prize for his distinguished editorial writing. He became editor of the Cleveland Press in 1920. Two years later, he was named editor in chief of Scripps-Howard's southwestern group, with headquarters in Houston. In 1924, Mr. Parker was named general editorial executive of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. He had served as editor in chief of all Scripps-Howard newspapers since 1927. As editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Mr. Parker dealt chiefly with broad lines of policy. He particularly concerned himself with country-wide trends in politics and economics. The following editorial appears in today's Washington News:

George B. Parker, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, died early today at Emergency Hospital.

He would not have wanted a lengthy eulogy in these columns. But he was our friend and counselor and guide for many years, and because of that fact he had made his influence strongly felt on this newspaper and, through it, on this community.

That influence, invariably, was for the good. We never knew a man in whose integrity, personal and professional, we had more unfailing confidence. His own opinions were strong, but he had genuine respect for the views of others. When "Deac" Parker helped us to think through a problem his advice was always on the side of tolerance and truth.

He believed fiercely in the brand of journalistic independence which was the ideal of E. W. Scripps, founder of these newspapers. He believed that a newspaper should serve one interest, and one only— the best interest of its readers. He never chose to follow any course because it seemed expedient. What he always wanted to make sure of was that the course was honest and right and for the greatest good of the greatest number.

He had faith in the kind of democracy that is spelled with a small "d." His last editorial was a demand that the public be fully informed about the current Air Force-Navy-Army controversy in Washington.

"We would prefer the opinion of the American people on this question of national safety—after the light has been turned on," he wrote. "That, in accord with Abraham Lincoln's idea that everybody knows more than anybody."

One of his favorite passages in literature was the account in Pilgrim's Progress of the death of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth. He read from it at memorial services in 1944 for Columnist Raymond Clapper, who had gone to the South Pacific as a war correspondent and had died in an airplane crash:

"When the day that he must go hence had come, many accompanied him to the river side, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

Those trumpets, we think, must be sounding today for another valiant fighter in the cause of truth.

Government Can't Do It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the magazine This Week by the Honorable Herbert Hoover. This distinguished American points out that the people should not expect Government to take care of them from the cradle to the grave. In a voluntary society such as we have it is necessary for the citizen to provide for his own welfare outside the framework of Government.

The article follows:

We have seen a steady expansion of Government into welfare activities. I am not criticizing the expansion of Government aid to public welfare. It has a place in American life—provided the cloak of welfare is not used as a disguise for Karl Marx. But parallel with this expansion, we have stupendous taxation to support the hot and cold war. That makes it difficult for the citizens to support voluntary welfare agencies. It requires more personal sacrifice than ever before.

From all this, many citizens ask themselves: For what reasons must we continue to support the voluntary agencies? Why not let the Government do it all?

The first short answer to this question is that you cannot retire from the voluntary field if you wish our American civilization to survive. The essence of our self-government lies outside of political government. Ours is a voluntary society. The fabric of American life is woven around our tens of thousands of voluntary associations. That is, around our churches, our professional societies, our women's organizations, our businesses, our labor and farmers' associations—and not least, our charitable institutions. That is the very nature of American life. The inspirations of progress spring from these voluntary agencies, not from bureaucracy. If these voluntary activities were to be absorbed by Government bureaus, this civilization would be over. Something neither free nor noble would take its place.

MORALS ARE PRIVATE PROPERTY

The second answer to this question is that it is our privately supported and managed hospitals and educational institutions that establish the standards for similar governmental agencies. It is the voluntary institutions which are the spur to official progress. Without them, our governmental healing and educational agencies would lag and degenerate.

The third answer to this question is that morals do not come from government. No government agency can create and sustain a system of morals. Even when private charities are not working specifically in the religious field, their works confirm religious faith and morals.

There is a fourth answer. Governments and bureaucracies cannot build character in our youth. With the brutalization which results inevitably from war, character-building has never been as necessary as it is today. Many private welfare organizations are, directly or indirectly, helping build character. Some, for example, support the development of sports in our youth. The ethics of good sportsmanship are second only to religious ethics.

There is a fifth answer. The greatest and, in fact, the only impulse to social progress is the spark of altruism in the individual human being. "But the greatest of these is charity" has been a religious precept from which no civilized people can depart without losing its soul. Governments practice charity solely because it rises from that spark in the hearts of the people. The day when altruism in the individual dies from lack of opportunity for expression, it will die in the government. At best, charity by government must be formal, statistical, and mechanistic. We need charity in its real sense—from the heart.

There is a sixth reason. The world is in the grip of a death struggle between the philosophy of Christ and that of Hegel and Marx. The philosophy of Christ is a philosophy of compassion. The outstanding spiritual distinction of our civilization from all others is compassion. With us, it is the noblest expression of man. Those who serve receive an untold spiritual benefit.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN'S SOLUTION

The day we decide that the government is our brother's keeper, that day the spirit of compassion will have been lost. If we abandon private charity, we will have lost something vital to America's material, moral, and spiritual welfare.

But a simpler answer than all this lies in the parable of the Good Samaritan. He did not enter into governmental or philosophic discussion. It is said that when he saw the helpless man "he had compassion on him * * * he bound his wounds * * * and took care of him."

Federal Pollution Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on Federal pollution-control legislation submitted by the special committee on pollution abatement of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation:

FEDERAL POLLUTION-CONTROL LEGISLATION

Whereas Public Law 845, the Federal water-pollution control law, recognizes the rights and responsibilities of States and interstate agencies to control pollution in their own waters; and

Whereas a new bill, H. R. 4568 (CROOK, of Indiana), has been introduced in the House of Representatives which will seriously affect such rights and responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the special committee on pollution abatement of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation urges that the proposed Crook bill be not approved; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the New York State Members of Congress.

The Price of Our Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by M. Amrine and E. A. Conway, which appears in the October 8 issue of America, titled "The Price of Our Survival":

THE PRICE OF OUR SURVIVAL

(By M. Amrine and E. A. Conway)

An era died, an era only 4 years old, when President Truman announced on September 23 that "within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R."

We Americans seem these days to read the newspapers as one reads the death notice of a friend suddenly gone. (It was indeed a cherished friend—our atomic-bomb monopoly). There is this difference. One reads such obituaries through a blur. In this case the notices themselves are blurred. Never have we read fuzzier, more misleading, more fundamentally wrong statements than those uttered by our high national leaders when the news broke that the Soviets had exploded our monopoly.

We sympathize with prominent people pinioned by the press without warning and asked for comment on this or that emergency. We were none the less shocked when a man as respected for his perception as Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, said flatly: "I see no reason why a development that was anticipated years ago should cause any revolutionary change in our thinking or in our actions."

If there is not such a change, the land we love may not live through the next decade.

We were shocked even more by the statement, obviously carefully considered, of a man most qualified to comment, a man whose understanding of human relations we have always admired—David E. Lilienthal. According to United Press, the AEC Chairman said that this country must do everything necessary to "establish unquestioned and unmistakable leadership" in an atomic armament race. Mr. Lilienthal said he felt now precisely as he felt before he knew Russia had the bomb. He then referred to a July 6 statement in which he had said that by maintaining that leadership we could "buy time for reason to prevail." He added that "numbers and not simply the first atomic weapons are the crucial item."

It is vital for you, our reader, to join us in our search for the sense of that statement. What happened somewhere in Siberia happened to you. The atom bomb is no longer a mysterious something we dropped on the other side of the world, killing some thousands of unknown Japanese. Today your very life is involved in the truth or falsity of statements like Lilienthal's. Foreign policy has become personal policy. We ask you to ask with us: "What actual concrete assurance does this plan of atomic leadership offer me? If the United States travels in this direction. will I be safe tonight, will I be safe tomorrow, and the tomorrows after that?"

Let us see.

Though our leaders would not admit it, the cornerstone of our foreign policy during the past 4 years has been our monopoly of the atomic bomb, our unique ability to annihilate enemy cities and citizens, without fear of similar retaliation.

That monopoly now has vanished. What does Mr. Lilienthal say now?

It is not really gone. Though sole possession is gone, proportion is still ours. You see, we still have a monopoly of the art of making bombs quickly. And we can keep ahead. The Russians can never catch up with us.

The Russians have one bomb? We have a hundred. The Russians have a hundred? We'll have a thousand.

This atomic leadership doctrine is fundamentally unsound. It is based on the same kind of assumption that beguiled us before. Then we said that our superiority lay in nuclear physics, in engineering, and in dollars. A top United States atomic adviser, John M. Hancock, went about saying that the Russians wouldn't be able to produce a bomb for 20 years. On September 23 we were forced to admit that the Russians had matched our physics and presumably our dollars. Now we fall back on the only assumption left, that they cannot match, much less surpass, our engineering. We still wishthink that the Russians are five-thumbed boobies who can't repair a Ford car.

Already there is a disquieting unanimity about the answers being given to the question: "What do we do now?" The answer given is merely "Keep ahead." Is this to be the summit of our statecraft in this crisis?

For once Mr. Lilienthal finds himself side by side with the Hearst press. Here is the Hearst simplified version of the Lilienthal doctrine:

"The United States is making what amounts to two bombs every day. America has an enormous jump on the U. S. S. R. The United States can make the cold war even colder by staying ahead of the Russians. America had a slogan some years ago. It was: 'Two ships for every one,' and in time its observance enabled her to win the greatest war in history. It would be a good slogan to revive. It would also be good for America to coin a new slogan to fit these times. It is one which, if strictly observed, could enforce the peace of the world: 'Four bombs for one.'"

Mr. Lilienthal should shiver.

Suppose that by 1952 (remember, that was when the Russians were going to have bombs) we have 1,600 bombs and the Russians have 400. Would that give us any actual strategic advantage over them?

No. Why not? Because the Russians could do as much damage, if not more, with their 400 bombs as we could with our 1,600. The 40 Russian cities with populations of 200,000 or over contain less than 10 percent of the Russian people. The 40 corresponding American cities contain 27 percent of our population. Even if only 10 percent of her bombers got through in a nocturnal atomic blitz, Russia could wipe out our 40 major cities.

But wouldn't we, with our 1,600 bombs, retaliate in kind? We are not discussing an attack on atomically vulnerable Britain. We are talking about an attack on Russia, the one country which has spent 15 years in decentralizing its economy. Besides, Russia happens to be a police state which could move millions of its urban population to dispersed points before it launched its own surprise attack. Then although the United States would have bombs in abundance it would have no target for the next night.

Keep ahead, and four bombs for one, are dangerous and deceptive slogans. The safety-in-numbers theory on which they are based must be exploded before those slogans become fixed in the minds of Americans. We must beware of a new complacency based on them and others like them: Our air-power is supreme: the Russians couldn't deliver their bombs, and radar and proximity-fused rockets will defend us.

Mr. Lilienthal said further that we must keep our atomic leadership in order to "buy time for reason to prevail." Words will be our undoing unless we watch how they are put together into propositions and judge just what those propositions mean. Buying time for reason to prevail, is a flashy phrase, but fallacious.

So now we are buying time. What does that mean? Our barter is bombs. In this strange commerce we do not deliver the bombs. We hold them, nay, we increase their number. But we hope that by doing so we will induce the Russians to give us time. Time for what? Time to let reason prevail. Time, presumably, to work out amicably an effective system of international control.

The time Russia gave us would be worth less to her every minute. Would it be in Russia's interest to give us time under this, to her, dismal devaluation program? Would it be in her interest to give us time until, say, 1952, when we had 1,600 bombs and she had 400? Would that be the time when sweet reason would prevail? It is more likely that by that time one country or the other would have lost its collective head and loosed its bombs. There is a limit to the fear man can stand.

But suppose the day came when both countries had reached and passed the saturation point, when each had enough bombs to obliterate the other. Russia, let us say, has 2,000 bombs, and we, according to the Hearstian law of parity, have 8,000. Is that when sweet reason is supposed to prevail?

This whole theory is based on an untenable psychological assumption, that two peoples will stay sane and calm and reasonable in the midst of an ever-accelerating atomic armament race. It is also based on a completely gratuitous scientific assumption. We assumed that Russia could not build bombs until 1952. Shall we now assume that she cannot build them as fast as we?

The central sobering facts about our present predicament are these: there is no safety in numbers of bombs. Nor is there any long-term safety in air power, in radar screens, in rocket interception. Science got us into this predicament, but science cannot save us. The Soviets will scorch our cities, our soil, and ourselves until every stone and clod and bone screams out to the Geiger counter, unless we summon up new resources of intelligence and will to find a political solution of the crisis we are in.

We have no pat solution to offer, nor are we proposing any particular leadership. But we are asking for real leadership, the best that can be found in America. With Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, we say:

"I hope the national decisions which will have to be made will express the highest level of our national intelligence, our finest instincts for the preservation of the best in humanity, and that the execution of these decisions may be characterized by resolute, undeviating courage."

While the search for that real leadership proceeds, we might start at once on this interim program:

1. A national act of humility, which is nothing more than honest acknowledgment of the truth. Out of this humility should come caution and the spirit of compromise. Caution will counsel an end to boasting, blustering, bullying, and blackmail. Two can play at those games, when both have the bomb. Caution will require more restraint on the part of the press and radio, and more care on the part of official spokesmen. The spirit of compromise is needed, now that negotiations will be conducted by equals, in power, if not in probity.

2. Mobilization of the best physical, sccial, and political scientists in America for a supreme, cooperative, national effort to work out a viable atomic policy. We suggest, for a starter, that the leading nuclear physicists be polled for their frank judgment on the scientific soundness of the UN majority plan

for international control as it now stands—not the first American proposal, but the radically revised scheme approved last year.

3. A thorough reevaluation of the personnel that has been setting and executing our atomic policy. No respecting of persons, prestige, or political power must prevent the selection of top-drawer personnel.

4. Restudy of our entire atomic policy, both national and international, from the nucleus out. This would include a searching analysis of every one of the assumptions and formulas and slogans which served us so badly in the past, and a similar analysis of the new ones already taking shape.

Nothing less than revolutionary changes in our thinking and in our actions is going to satisfy the American people, who, after all, like to sleep at night. When they come out of their present state of shock, they are going to ask for those changes. Leadership worthy of the name of leadership would not wait to be asked.

International Good-Will Plan and National Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 3, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a letter from R. M. White, of the Mexico Ledger, and an editorial and news items on a unique plan to disseminate information on the American way of life through distribution of the Ledger in foreign countries. The distribution is to be effected through the Rotary Clubs and the first mailing, as announced in the accompanying editorial, is to the Edinburgh, Scotland, Rotary Club.

The plan is expected to be taken up by other American newspapers and it is to be hoped will meet with a reciprocal and corresponding distribution of foreign newspapers in the United States.

The Mexico Ledger is a typical American newspaper and is one of the outstanding weekly papers of the central West. Its editor, L. M. White, has served as president of the Missouri Press Association and president of the Inland Daily Press Association. Robert M. White II, the originator of the international exchange idea and general manager of the Ledger, is the grandson of Robert M. White, the founder of the Ledger and the White dynasty. He served with distinction in the World War and was assigned to accompany Mrs. Roosevelt on her world tour through the South Pacific. Under his management the Ledger was given first place in 1949 for community service in the national better newspaper contest, second place in both 1948 and 1949 for best editorial, third place in 1949 in the Herrick editorial award, honorable mention for typographical excellence, and honorable mention for general excellence by both the NEA and the Missouri Press Association.

Throughout Europe and Asia one of the great needs of the day is a knowledge and understanding of everyday American life as contrasted with the artificial versions so often conveyed by motion pictures and comic supplements. Mr. White has a practical solution of the problem. No more effective and comprehensive reflection of life in the United States could be provided than the factual accounts of rural and inland community happenings as reported in the Mexico Ledger and similar weekly and daily papers. And Mr. White's plan to mail to rotary clubs throughout the world places them where they will best serve the purpose.

In initiating the plan and explaining its objectives, Mr. White says:

MEXICO, MO., *October 8, 1949.*

DEAR MR. CANNON: I think we here at the Ledger have a pretty good idea. We are sending daily free papers to foreign countries to be distributed where the most English-reading people will see them.

The enclosed story and editorial explains in fuller detail.

Our hope is that the Ledger is representative of America's backbone—the great, rural Midwest, in contrast with the frenzied metropolitan areas and the glitter of Hollywood.

We believe reading the Ledger a few days will help some people in other lands better understand the real America, and at the same time help focus public attention here in the so-called isolation belt, on the importance of international problems, understanding, and participation.

And, in order to make this idea of import, we hope other papers will join us in this program.

Any comment or help you can give us on it would be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. WHITE II.

EDITORIAL

THE GRASS ROOTS ARE THE KEY TO ACTION IN AMERICA

Too many of us say about national issues: "I wish somebody would do something about it, but I can't do anything here in Mexico."

Too many of us see ourselves as just one lone individual in a small town in the middle of America.

We think that if there is going to be a major change in national policy or international policy, somebody in Washington will have to do it. Or the head of some organization with millions of members.

We think this—and we're all wrong.

We're forgetting that when the President, himself, wants to get a major job done in Washington he comes out here. He goes to the people. He comes out here and tells us about it and tries to sell us on his idea.

Why?

Because he knows that what you think—you, the grassroot voter—is the most important thing in the world to Washington politicians.

For this reason the Ledger believes sincerely in encouraging everybody with a good idea to go right ahead selling it here in Mexico, Mo. Our theory is that if it can be sold here, sooner or later somebody will take it somewhere else and sell it, and if enough people—voters—start pushing for one given idea, Washington will come begging to do it for us.

Certainly; Washington—the White House or Congress—can't for long do anything which we the voters don't like.

This being our basic belief on the subject, the Ledger has launched an international good-will program.

Certainly, we don't expect to talk Joe Stalin into running for the county school board, but we do expect to develop just a little better international understanding * * * where otherwise there might not be any.

With this for our objective, the Ledger is entered on a 6-months program of mailing 10 copies of the paper daily to, first, the Edinburgh (Scotland) Rotary Club. After 10 days we'll send the papers to another club in England. During the next 6 months we'll send the papers all over the world.

And at each place, we'll ask the Rotary Club to distribute these papers where the most English-reading people will be able to see them.

Our thought is that in reading about your doings in Mexico, Mo., the people of these foreign countries will be able to get a little better understanding of life in the backbone of America—the Midwest.

And, also, we hope some of these people will, in turn, write us about themselves or send us their newspapers. If they do, we'll publish their letters and distribute their papers in our schools, library, clubrooms, or wherever the most people here can see them.

Thus, we hope, the exchange will help us in Mexico, Mo., as well as our neighbors overseas.

Obviously, the only reason for trying to develop this mutual understanding is because we believe peace, when it does finally come to this world, will come hand in hand with understanding between the peoples of the world—the everyday, working, praying, living, grass-root people.

YOUR NAME MAILED TO SCOTLAND—NEW FOREIGN PROGRAM BY LEDGER

"Your name has been in the Ledger. * * * It will be again."

And from now on, when your name is in the Ledger it will be mailed to a foreign country.

Robert M. White II, Ledger coeditor and publisher, announced the Ledger's new international good-will plan today, as a feature of National Newspaper Week.

"We plan to mail the Ledger all over the world during the next 6 months," White said. "We will make daily mailings to various Rotary clubs in various foreign countries, asking each club to distribute the papers where English-reading people can see them—schools, libraries, churches, railway stations * * * even pubs.

"Our thought is that if peace is ever going to come to this world, it will come hand in hand with understanding. We hope that reading the Ledger will help some people in other countries to better understand the backbone of America—the small midwestern town.

"Certainly, from time to time the Ledger will carry those stories—because they will be true—about things of which no American can be proud. But, at the same time, we also will carry those usual news stories which point up the greatness of our country, its vast momentum toward better living for all people everywhere," White said.

The first foreign mailings of the program were dispatched Monday to Edinburgh, Scotland.

"While we don't expect to reach many people with these mailings," White said, "We sincerely hope other papers in the United States will follow our example. If other papers join in the idea, we may be able to take the daily story of America to many thousands of people living in other countries * * * and have them in turn, send us their story in their newspapers."

"If the plan works at all well," White said, "We will make it a permanent part of the Ledger. The 6-month period is purely to try it out."

"To Our Edinburgh Readers:

"We hope you enjoy the Ledger.

"It will give you the day-to-day story of life in this midwestern American town for the next 10 days. Our town, Mexico, Mo.,

is located in the center of the United States. Our population is about 10,000. We have the world's largest fire-brick plants here, raise American saddle horses, and are very proud of our surrounding farm areas.

"The Ledger—10 of them—is being mailed to your Rotary Club every day for the next 10 days, free of charge. We have asked your Rotary Club to distribute these papers to as many readers as possible. After Edinburgh, the Ledger will be sent to some other town in Scotland * * * England, Ireland, Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America.

"We know you are as interested as we are in peace. Maybe you believe as we do, that peace will come with better understanding between the people of all countries. We are sending the Ledger to Edinburgh in the hope that it will give you a better understanding of our part of America. We hope many of you will write us or send us your Edinburgh newspapers so we, in turn, may get to know you better."

California's Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here are some significant figures. I do not give them in any sense of selfish pride but rather to impress upon you, my colleagues, that we Representatives in this House, hailing from my native State of California, have visibly sharp and enlarging problems to interpret to you our colleagues from other climes.

This statement appeared in the Bay Region Business, San Francisco, September 1, 1949:

NATION DOMINATED BY CALIFORNIA'S GROWTH—INCREASE EQUALS ONE-FOURTH NATION'S

California accounted for 24 percent of the Nation's population increase during the years 1940–48, according to a study by the research department of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Compiled from figures released August 5 by the Census Bureau, the study shows America's population increased from 131,669,275 in 1940 to 146,113,000 in 1948.

California, at the same time, had a population increase of 3,446,613, giving a total count, in 1948, of 10,354,000. Percentagewise, this was a population increase of 49.9 percent.

"People make markets and markets are the creative forces of diversified opportunities," Ralph Koeber, manager of the chamber's research department, said in making public the study.

California, Washington, and Oregon, combined, accounted for 32.7 percent of the country's growth during the charted period, rising from 9,733,262 in 1940 to 14,456,000 in 1948.

Oregon led the 11 Western States in percentage increase with a 50.4 percent rise, up from 1,089,684 to 1,639,000. In numbers, however, this was less than one-sixth of California's increase.

"In any study of population growth in America," Koeber said, "California is the dominant factor.

"Our State's increase in number of people was more than three and a half times the increase of any of the next three fastest growing, Michigan, Texas, and Ohio."

Moreover, he went on, more people have adopted California as their home during these 8 years than now live in Florida, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, or Wisconsin.

Montana was the only Western State which lost in numbers. Its population fell 9 percent, from 559,456 in 1940, to 511,000 in 1948.

Together, the 11 Western States accounted for 36 percent of the Nation's growth.

North Dakotans Have Had Unhappy Experiences With Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard and read about the success the displaced persons program has met with in this country. Newspapers and radio broadcasts have spoken of the displaced persons who came to America, in glowing terms.

But let us see just how this DP program is working out as far as the Americans who take these people into their homes are concerned. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this letter from Mrs. Ruth F. Fischer, wife of a physician in Minot, N. Dak.:

MINOT, N. DAK., *September 12, 1949.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: Having had a very disillusioning experience with a DP maid in our home—a secretary who used domestic work to get into this country and then left us after a few months to take a secretarial job here in Minot, Dr. Fischer and I feel strongly that something should be done if at all possible about DP's who are not staying in the places to which they were assigned and are taking instead jobs and housing which displace our people. There have been several instances similar to ours and feeling against the DP program is mounting around here. I sincerely hope the bill will not be liberalized as some groups want, and I wish instead some teeth could be put into the existing law.

Churches and social agencies say we can't put DP's under legal obligation or compel them to stay in their assignments for a set period of time because that would be slavery, but my husband and many others served overseas in our armed forces for several years and had to stay in many places they didn't like and do jobs they didn't care to do simply because they had an obligation to their country, and they fulfilled it—and that wasn't slavery.

Better screening and selection in Germany would help too. Domestics should be sent to do maid's work. We are led to believe we are helping the destitute, starving people of Europe, but our experience wasn't such. Our Latvian maid came over with 450 pounds of baggage—300 pounds over the maximum allowed. She was very well fed, well dressed, had in her possession good jewelry and went on our vacation with us with genuine alligator luggage. She left in an aura of mystery after accusing us of ruining her health. Her baggage was hauled away one night when we were out, and she simply vanished; refusing to leave a forwarding address for her mail. These aren't the kind of people we want in our country.

We appreciate your good judgment in matters before the House, and want you to know that glowing articles in recent publications to the contrary, the DP program around Minot is not a great success. There are quite a few of us here who took DP's in good faith who feel we were taken advantage of and are very unhappy about it.

Very truly yours,

RUTH F. FISCHER
(Mrs. V. J.).

I have other letters from North Dakota concerning the displaced persons that North Dakotans have taken in. It seems strange to me that I have not yet heard one word of praise from my State for these people about whom the press and radio have been raving.

Wasn't Farm Income To Be Maintained as One of the Promises of the Last Presidential Campaign?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the Marshfield News Herald of September 28, 1949:

FARM INCOMES ARE CURTAILED

MADISON.—Cash income of Wisconsin farmers has been cut sharply from the record level of 1948, according to the Crop Reporting Service of the Wisconsin and United States Departments of Agriculture.

Income from farm marketings in Wisconsin during July this year was 23 percent below July 1948. For the first seven months of this year cash income from farm marketings in the State dropped 20 percent compared with the income in the same period of last year.

Cash returns from livestock and livestock products show the greatest drop, although a substantial loss in income is also reported from crops.

During July of this year hog prices averaged $19.50 per hundredweight which is $5.50 per hundred less than in July 1948, and Wisconsin farmers received $1.64 less per hundred pounds of milk sold. Any increase in production of livestock and milk during the first 7 months of the year was more than offset by lower prices.

Total Wisconsin cash farm income from marketings for the first 7 months of this year is estimated at nearly $552,000,000 compared with almost $686,000,000 from January through July of 1948. Receipts from livestock and livestock products declined about $117,500,000 and cash from crops dropped almost $16,500,000 from the 7-month total of 1948.

Note the $1.64 per hundredweight drop in milk prices. One of the important reasons this milk income is much less than in 1948 was and is because the price of manufacturing milk has not been supported in accordance with the price-support law. The Eighty-first Congress is evidently getting ready to further reduce the support price.

Prayer in Congress and the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of daily prayer at the opening of every session of the House and Senate, I became interested to ascertain the source of the custom of prayer, before we began business, in Congress. So I asked the Library of Congress to tell me about it. Herewith I include a statement by the Library of Congress to me August 2, 1949.

The other day I again visited a few moments with our own faithful and consecrated Chaplain as he finished his daily talk with God in our presence before we began doing business. What a joy and uplift it is to hear him.

Mr. Speaker, more and more do I feel that only as we in Congress remain humble and practice keeping an attitude of supplication for help to clear thinking will we do our best work for the American people. As prayer is an entreaty and earnest request, I am sure every Member of this great deliberative body recognizes the need of practicing the habit of prayer as part of clearing mental attitudes and removing petty or puny thinking from the field of performance of congressional duties.

Humility begets power and nothing gives ordinary man so much humility as to consciously seek divine guidance.

Yes, we pour billions into arms and airplanes to defend our beloved Nation against the possibility of successful attack from some godless, crazy mortal. And we have need to be fully aware that men who do not pray to God for humility are certain to think in terms of godless acts and conduct. But, Mr. Speaker, is not the whole world rapidly getting into such condition that it must soon get on its knees? Will it not be a choice between God or chaos?

In using the term "God," I do it as indicating the Infinite Spirit which all civilized men have sought. Yes, man seeks the infinite in various ways—but the main thing is that mankind everywhere consciously becomes humble enough to get close enough to this Infinite Spirit to realize that the spiritual forces of mankind must triumph over all else, lest this atomic age will be the last age of civilization as we know it. We are beginning now to go underground from a sense of fear of our fellow man. So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is either God or chaos that the world must consider and choose between. Civilization based upon fear will not endure as civilization. Man who is compelled to live in a state of fear will turn his capabilities of expansion into the field of contact with the spiritual forces.

If I seem to speak this day in words which to some may seem too religious, believe me it is because I feel that the world has come to the crossroads and must either choose an awareness of a Supreme Being and practice such belief, or the world will experience chaos.

We of today can well emulate the first Chaplain of Congress wherein he said:

Be Thou present, God of Wisdom—

And so forth, and now word comes that the United Nations legal committee has recently voted 44 to 0 to recommend that the Assembly open and close with a minute of silent prayer or meditation. Surely a paramount step toward world peace. Prayer is the universal language of man, for men pray in every language. When men of all creeds and colors get close enough together to pray together for guidance of the divine, then, Mr. Speaker, then men will put more of unselfishness and of the spiritual values into places of control in their attitudes and actions. The United Nations will be logically stronger because of this prayer and meditation moment each day. World peace is that much closer, because the God of all peoples is the God of peace.

Here are the communications from the Library of Congress to me:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
August 2, 1949.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE:

The attached information is forwarded in response to the inquiry from your office noted below.

Respectfully,

W. C. GILBERT,
Assistant Director, Legislative Reference Service.

HISTORY OF EARLY PRAYERS IN THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

The first prayer officially given in the Congress of the United States was made on September 7, 1774, by the Reverend Jacob Duché, On Tuesday, September 6, Mr. Thomas Cushing, of Massachusetts, had proposed that Congress have a season of prayer every morning. Mr. Samuel Adams moved that the Episcopal clergyman, Reverend Mr. Duché, be requested to offer prayer the following morning.

Reverend Duché read the psalter for the seventh day of the month, which included the thirty-fifth psalm. He then struck out into an extemporary prayer which noticeably moved the delegates. No complete text of this prayer was found in any of the bibliographical sources.

On May 10, 1775, the Second Congress invited Reverend Duché to open the following morning's session with a prayer. Silas Deane wrote that Reverend Duché "made a most pathetic and pertinent prayer."

On July 8, 1776, John Hancock wrote to Reverend Duché asking him to accept the appointment of Chaplain of Congress. The appointment was accepted and the duty consisted of opening each session at 9 o'clock with a prayer. The first prayer which Reverend Duché offered in his new official capacity was a plea for protection for the new American States. The prayer, quoted from Sabine's History of the Loyalists, is as follows:

"O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of kings and Lord of lords, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers on earth, and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all kingdoms, empires, and governments, look down in mercy, we beseech Thee, on these our American States, who have fled to Thee, from the rod of the oppressor, and turn themselves on Thy gracious protection, desiring to be henceforth dependent only on Thee: to Thee do they now look up for that countenance and support which Thou alone canst give: take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, under Thy nurturing care; give them wisdom in council, and valor in the field; defeat the malicious designs of our cruel adversaries; convince them of the unrighteousness of the cause, and if they still persist in their sanguinary purposes, O let the voice of Thine own unerring justice sounding in their hearts, constrain them to drop the weapons of war from their unnerved hands in the day of battle. Be Thou present, God of wisdom, and direct the counsels of this honorable assembly; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundations, that the scenes of blood may be speedily closed, that order, honor, and peace may be effectually restored, and pure religion and piety prevail and flourish among thy people, preserve the health of their bodies, and the vigor of their minds: shower down on them, and the millions they represent, such temporal blessings as thou seest expedient for them in this world, and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this, we ask, in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, and our Saviour. Amen."

Reverend Duché resigned on October 17, 1776, because of ill health and parochial duties, Congress voted him $150 as an acknowledgment for his services. However, on October 30, the Rev. Jacob Duché replied that the money should be applied to the relief of widows and children of Pennsylvanian officers killed in battle.

According to the sources consulted, Reverend Duché was actually not sympathetic to the cause of the new republic. He went to England and did not return to America until 1792.

A Great Newspaperman Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the United States today mourns the passing of one of its great journalists. In the death early today of George B. (Deac) Parker, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard papers, there passed from the American newspaper scene one of the men chiefly responsible for the high reputation which journalism in this country enjoys throughout the world.

Mr. Parker was a man of integrity, of conviction, and of great ability. His life was dedicated to the proposition that an informed public is necessary to the proper functioning of our kind of government. In his capacity as chief editor of one of our great newspaper chains he saw to it that the public was informed.

We in Alaska had cause to be grateful to Mr. Parker. Long ago he sensed that the strategic situation of Alaska in this atomic age was such that the United States could not be properly defended if Alaska were left undefended. So it was that for some years now the Scripps-Howard papers have been urging that more attention should be directed to our northern Territory.

"Deac" Parker carved his own monument. He will not soon be forgotten. His work will live after him.

Lithuanian Right to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very able address delivered by Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago, at the conference of Chicago Lithuanian American Council on Sunday, October 2, 1949, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, Chicago, Ill.:

The entire 10-year period of Lithuania's sufferings and the wrongs done and being done to her by her neighbors will have to be discussed at this conference and the approaching American Lithuanian Congress. The main cause of these wrongs and sufferings is the secret Soviet-Nazi agreements of 1939, under which the dictators started World War II and enslaved more than 10 countries, among them Lithuania.

The dagger was being sharpened for Lithuania in Moscow some time before 1939. The Soviet war maps of 1939 already showed Lithuania as a part of the Soviet Union. In the summer of that year the Soviets demanded a free hand in the Baltic States from the British and the French. Rebuffed by the democracies, the Soviets rebounded to their fellow dictators—the Nazis. There they received the support they craved—in August and September of 1939 they came to an agreement with the Nazis for the partition of Lithuania, Poland, and central Europe between themselves. These agreements and all the subsequent facts are now known to the world. They are cited here only to corroborate additional facts.

These other facts clearly prove not only the Soviet policy of aggression and seizure, but also the violation of their given word and formal pledges. A vivid example is the Soviet behavior toward Lithuania. The Soviet Union and the Republic of Lithuania had recognized one another as sovereign states. They had concluded treaties of peace and nonaggression which guaranteed their territorial integrity and political independence. Dictator Stalin and his high commissars had also made such guarantees, both orally and in official proclamations. Despite these treaties, however, and their guarantees and international law in general, the Soviets secretly planned, conferred and conspired with the Nazis against Lithuania and her people. The agreement with the Nazis to divide Lithuania was concluded on September 28, 1939. Yet, in the first part of October of the same year, while they were polishing their rifles and already had included Lithuania in their war maps, the Soviets grandiloquently and without batting an eyelash spoke of friendship—on October 10 they signed a mutual aid pact with Lithuania, in the preamble of which they said:

"For the purpose of developing the friendly relations established by the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and based on the recognition of an independent state existence and nonintervention in the internal affairs of the other party;

"Recognizing that the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and the pact of nonaggression and peaceful settlement of disputes of September 28, 1926, continue to form a firm basis for their mutual relations and undertakings;

"Convinced that a definition of the exact conditions insuring mutual security and a just settlement of the questions of state appurtenance of the city of Vilnius and the Vilnius region, unlawfully wrested from Lithuania by Poland, meet the interests of both contracting parties,

"Found it necessary to conclude the Lithuanian-Soviet Union Mutual Aid Treaty."

Article 7 of this agreement states:

"Fulfillment of his treaty shall not affect in any way the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, in particular their state organization, economic and social systems, military measures, and generally the principle of nonintervention in internal affairs." Nevertheless, before Commissar Molotov's signature had dried on the treaty and while his words of reassurance were still echoing in the chambers of the Supreme Soviet, Moscow began seeking provocations against Lithuania and putting into effect her secret agreement with the Nazis. Unable to find any tangible accusations against Lithuania, they thought up the fantasy that the Lithuanians were kidnaping Soviet soldiers from their garrisons, when, in fact, these soldiers were deserting their garrisons exactly as they are now doing in Germany. Upon being caught and returned, one Soviet soldier shot himself; the Soviets blamed Lithuania, and in June of 1940 they occupied the country with a huge military force—they executed their agreement with Hitler.

What took place thereafter is well known to all of us. It was an exact copy of the occupation of Austria and Czechoslovakia—except that it was more densely drenched with blood and tears and heaped with incomparably greater suffering and wrongs; everything was taken from the people and the people themselves were dehumanized, converted into Soviet chattels, evicted from their homes, and deported from their homeland.

The deportations and the Soviet-Nazi occupations of Lithuania have cost the country about 1,000,000 people. The Nazis wrested about 300,000 people from Lithuania and the Soviets well over 600,000 people. Latest reports from the fighters for Lithuania's freedom give this blood-curdling picture: The unceasing arrests and deportations from prisons have already affected some 150,000 people; 7 mass deportations tore away from Lithuania 40,000 people in 1941, about 110,000 people from 1944 to 1946, about 50,000 in 1947, about 100,000 in 1948, and about 120,000 in 1949. Add to these figures approximately 30,000 to 40,000 Lithuanians slain in prisons and on the battlefields of liberty, and we have almost the complete quota of 700,000 which was set by the order of Commissar Serov in 1941. This is probably the most fully completed and least publicized Bolshevik 5-year plan, the plan of genocide, the plan for the annihilation of the Lithuanian Nation.

The Bolsheviks are destroying Lithuania and the Lithuanian Nation by every imaginable means: Russian and Kalmuk-Kirghiz colonists are imported into Lithuania to take the places of the deported Lithuanians; the country is being wrecked economically and culturally; it is being turned into a Bolshevik labor camp, into a Russian garrison; a military base surrounded by military airports and rocket-launching depots; into a target for the enemy's bombs.

This horrible and factual picture is in no way compatible with the humanitarian speeches of Russia's commissars in Moscow and at Flushing Meadows.

In his latest speech to the United Nations General Assembly, Soviet Foreign Affairs Minister Vishinsky accuses America and other countries of imperialism and planning for a war of aggression, and cites Dictator Stalin's speeches of 1934 and 1939, in which he stated that "The U. S. S. R. stands for peace and is not thinking of threatening anyone and all the more attacking anyone." Having quoted the Soviet doctrine, Vishinsky further states: "The Soviet Union now, as before, stands true to the principles expressed in these words by its great leader," and ends by offering a three-point resolution, one of which states, among other things: "The General Assembly calls upon all nations to settle their disputes and differences peacefully, without resorting to the use of force or to threats of force."

What does all this mean? And how are we to understand it? One, if, as Vishinsky says, the Soviet Union still holds to its 1939 policy by which it demanded that the British and the French keep hands off so she could seize the Baltic States; by which she conspired with Hitler to divide Lithuania and central Europe; attacked Poland and Finland; forced the Baltic States to accept Soviet garrisons; occupied and subjugated Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by use and threats of force, in violation of the treaties of peace, nonaggression, and friendship—committed acts of aggression and used deceit and treachery to their fullest extent, then, it follows, the Soviet Union wants to continue this same policy of imperialistic expansion and annexation, and the subjugation and enslavement of her neighboring states and their peoples.

Secondly, if the Soviet Union is honestly inviting all nations to settle their disputes and differences peacefully, without the use of force or threats of force, then she should start this action with herself; the Soviet Union should withdraw her army, police, all kinds of agents and colonists from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the other territories occupied and dominated by her; she should return the deported Lithuanians and other deportees to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and everywhere else that they belong; she should restore sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, from whom she took them by force, duplicity, and treachery; she should not just talk about the United Nations Charter, but should comply with its obligations; she should respect the territories and political systems of other states; she should live up to her agreements and international law; she should respect human rights and freedom.

The United Nations Charter requires the observance of all these obligations—it is demanded by the Lithuanian nation and all the other nations which the Soviet Union has occupied by force, and now dominates, tortures, and annihilates by brute force.

This vital and principal demand for freedom has been handed to the United Nations and to all freedom and justice-respecting states by the lawful and national representatives of Lithuania. The entire Lithuanian nation is fighting for its inalienable right to freedom. This demand will not be recalled and the fight will not cease while the Soviet Union continues to dominate Lithuania—and until freedom is returned to Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation.

Cigarette Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution relating to cigarette taxation, submitted by the State of New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation:

CIGARETTE TAXATION

Whereas the enforcement of State cigarette taxes cannot properly be handled without adequate information regarding purchases by mail from nontaxing States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Annual Executive Conference of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation hereby urges the Congress to complete action on H. R. 195, to provide the States with such necessary information.

Unanimously adopted by the annual executive conference of the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, Westport Inn, Westport, N. Y., September 12–13, 1949. Assemblyman Harold C. Ostertag, conference chairman; Senator Floyd E. Anderson, chairman of resolutions committee.

Broken Homes, Slums Cited as Causes of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following was printed in the Press-Telegram, daily newspaper, in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., on August 8, 1949. It is self-explanatory. It adds to the fund of facts supporting the action of Congress in voting for slum clearance.

BROKEN HOMES, SLUMS CITED AS CAUSES OF CRIME

SACRAMENTO, August 8.—What causes crime? Is it poverty? Or liquor? Or lurid comic books?

Governor Warren's special crime study commission on the causes of crime and delinquency studied the problem for 2 years. It came up with a few answers today.

The commission said in its final report that poverty, liquor, and even comic books were partly responsible for the upswing that crime has taken in California since the war.

But it listed a dozen other reasons, too, for the $100,000,000 a year the State is forced to pay out in its fight against crime. Among them:

Broken homes. More California homes are broken through divorce than in most States, the report said. "And broken homes, loss of parents through desertion or death, or discord between parents are found in many delinquents' families."

Racial discrimination. Twenty percent of the persons sent to State prisons between July 1, 1946, and June 30, 1948, were male Negro adults. "These statistics reflect both minority group difficulties in making economic and social adjustments and the presence of hostile community attitudes toward minority group offenders."

Slums, where protective gangs are formed. "Petty pilfering and hijacking are common pursuits of these gangs, and the more illicit sexual and immoral codes are often perpetuated and practiced."

The commission found that in the slum area of San Francisco—the Geary-Fillmore district—there were 4,771 residents arrested during a typical period as compared to only 39 in the better housed Marina neighborhood. The two areas hold approximately the same population.

About comic books and movies and radio programs the report said: "Children in the impressionable stages of life are often unduly influenced by the glorification of brutality, murder, social callousness and the hero's bravado."

One thing the commission was sure of: "Criminals are made, not born."

In preparing its report, the commission studied social and economic conditions in four counties it considered typical of California—Fresno, Kern, San Diego, and Riverside.

An Appeal for Funds for the Washington Cathedral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made on Sunday, October 9, 1949, in an appeal for funds for the Washington Cathedral.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL FOR FUNDS FOR THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL

To enter a great cathedral and to worship there is one of the most sublime experiences that a human being can have.

Robert Louis Stevenson tells us:

"Mankind was never so happily inspired as when it made a cathedral."

Other great writers and poets have described a cathedral as Goethe did:

"Music that is frozen."

The poet, Longfellow, sang:

"Ah, to build, to build
That is the noblest art of all the arts."

Our own great American author and philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, told us:

"The Gothic cathedral is a blossoming in stone subdued by the insatiable demand of harmony in man. The mountain of granite blooms into an eternal flower."

It is our privilege to contribute to the blossoming forth of this "mountain of granite"—in which you and I are today—into a "flower" which will endure in the ages to come.

IT TAKES CONVICTIONS TO BUILD A CATHEDRAL

On one occasion Heinrich Heine, as he stood before the cathedral of Amiens, stated to a friend in relation to the great cathedral-building era:

"Men in those days had convictions, we moderns have opinions, and it requires something more than an opinion to build a Gothic cathedral."

For better than 10 years now, I have looked from my office window in the Senate Office Building at this vast structure on the horizon, and I have longed for the day of its completion.

It was in the hearts of David and Solomon to build a House "unto the name of the Lord," and it was in the hearts of the men who envisioned this beautiful structure—who had convictions—to build a House unto the name of the Lord. Now, let us have that same conviction and finish the job so nobly begun.

You and I appreciate the fact, my friends, that our Capital City is renowned throughout the world for its magnificent public buildings and monuments. This edifice, however, in which you and I worship today, is destined to become, and has already become, one of the great monuments and shrines for this city and Nation. It is the great national cathedral to which already come hundreds of pilgrims and worshipers each day. And, as they worship their Heavenly Father here, they can behold the progress being made. They hear the sound of tools upon stone, as stonecarvers, bricklayers, stonemasons, build step by step this great house of worship.

THE NATURE OF THE CATHEDRAL

We know, my friends, that Washington Cathedral has no formal church membership, for its congregations are drawn from all over America rather than simply the residents in the District. Clergymen of many denominations preach from the pulpit. It was my pleasure some years ago to participate in one of these inspiring services which was participated in by clergymen of a number of denominations. The chapels of this cathedral are available for the use of whatever group or sect desires to hold services.

From all over the Nation have come financial contributions. Yes, men and women are contributing of their time, their energy, their finances, to the ultimate completion of this great cathedral. They recognize that funds are needed to finance not only building activities, but the operation of the great variety of services of worship and other events in the cathedral, which has become the focus for so many outstanding occasions of national and even international significance.

THE FIFTH GREAT STEP

Today we are on the eve of the fifth great step in building this cathedral—that of completing the south transept which will contain the war memorial shrine and Denys baptistry. When finished, it will also add 400 to the present seating capacity of the cathedral.

This is our challenge: Men and women of America, in a few short months construction contracts will be completed and work must cease unless new and adequate contributions are forthcoming. This is the task—yours and mine—as we launch the vital 1949 campaign for funds. This is the job before us and before all men of good will throughout this Nation.

BUILDING IN ENDURING STONE

You and I are familiar with the great plans being made for Washington's important sesquicentennial celebration next year.

Here, however, my friends, in the program of the Washington Cathedral, we are building for the ages, not just for a celebration in 1 year nor for 10, but for as long as this mighty edifice shall bespeak to all mankind the devotion of mankind to its God.

Each of us, I am sure, has had the sad feeling at one time or another, that we are writing merely in sand, so to speak, and that time's waves will wash away our brief messages. In the Washington Cathedral, however, we are presented with a magnificent opportunity to write, not in sand, but in enduring rock which conquers time and which conveys to all succeeding generations the fact that noble men and women planned for them, worked for them, contributed for their spiritual welfare.

From time to time you and I have read unfair criticisms of the people of the District of Columbia from those who have tried to attribute a lack of civic sense to the folks in our Nation's Capital. The best answer, however, to such unjustified criticism lies in the splendid cooperation which men and women from all 48 States residing in the District have shown and will show in raising this great temple of worship which the people not just of the District will enjoy, but which all Americans, yes, visitors from beyond the seas will enjoy and worship in.

CATHEDRAL IS A SYMBOL OF FAITH

All about us is news and talk of war, the atomic bomb, germ warfare. There is a feeling in some folks of, "What's the use?" "Why build; why plan for tomorrow?" By your act, however, of contributing to the cathedral, you are showing that this Nation intends to carry through its constructive plans and will not be daunted and will not become morbid, defeatist, in the face of the problems of the atomic bomb.

We are here confronted by a great symbol of faith and a great challenge to action, one to which I am sure you and I, our families and friends and business acquaintances and relatives will be adequate.

BLESSED BE THIS CATHEDRAL

Turning back the pages of history, you and I recall how in May 1864, an American President, Abraham Lincoln, said to a delegation:

"Bless all the churches and blessed be the God who in this our great trial giveth us the churches."

And we recall a year previous, speaking at the Battlefield of Gettysburg, Lincoln brought forth the thought that it was for us "to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task lying before us."

And so today, my friends, we merge these two messages of Lincoln, and we state:

"Blessed be this cathedral and the task before us, which we are to finish."

"Blessed be thou who will contribute to this inspiring monument of granite."

May I conclude now with the words of the poet, John Ruskin:

"Therefore, when we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone, let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and the wrought substance of them, 'See, this our fathers did for us.'"

Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent by Hon. William M. Tuck, the Governor of Virginia, to the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in response to a telegram sent to Governor Tuck by Mr. Boyle urging that the Governor bring pressure upon the two Virginia Senators to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission.

To follow this, I ask unanimous consent to insert also a very able article on this same subject by Mr. Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of October 9.

There being no objection, the telegram and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHMOND, *October 8, 1949.*

WILLIAM M. BOYLE, Jr.,
Chairman, National Democratic Committee, Washington, D. C.:

In reply to your telegram of the 7th, I never have and never will undertake during my term to influence the vote of a Congressman from the sovereign State of Virginia. The United States Senate has the duty and the power of confirming or rejecting certain appointments made by the President, which power under our system of democracy is separate and distinct from the Executive and ought to remain so.

I may add that it is alleged that Olds is a Communist or a fellow traveler. In my opinion, his rejection by the Senate will be applauded by the citizens of Virginia and all thoughtful Americans. The manner in which this and previous recent administrations have kowtowed to Communists and fellow travelers and their sympathizers is alarming. Needless to say, it is my hope that the Senate will promptly reject this appointment and thus revive the lagging confidence of our people in the Government at Washington.

The so-called issue of low power rates referred to in your telegram is a specious one and no doubt is intended to becloud the real issue involved, and that is, is our Government and our democracy to be freed from these profligate and alien influences. The power to fix rates, as everyone knows, rests with the various utility commissions of the separate States. Your implied threat of withholding patronage from those who may refuse to vote for confirmation is a violation of the fundamental principle of checks and balances. Virginians are more interested in principle than patronage.

WILLIAM M. TUCK,
Governor of Virginia.

TRUMAN POSES QUESTION: WHAT IS "PARTY MATTER"?—DEMANDING THE CONFIRMATION OF OLDS, HE GOES FURTHER THAN PRESIDENTS HAVE SOUGHT TO GO IN THE PAST—DEMOCRATIC SENATORS OBJECT

(By Albert Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 8.—When the President at his press conference this week strongly implied that his nominations to office are a party matter, and therefore all elected Democrats should support them in the interest of that discipline which is requisite to good government under a two-party system, he raised a series of complicated questions in the area of political action. And the reception of his viewpoint at the Capitol demonstrated that a large number of his fellow Democrats do not agree with him on the answers.

Mr. Truman illustrated his point by recalling that in the contest for Senate majority leadership some years ago between Pat Harrison of Mississippi, and ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, he had promised to vote for Mr. Harrison and had done so because this was not a party matter; it was an intra-Democratic affair. He had done this, said the President, despite the fact that James A. Farley, then Democratic National chairman and President Roosevelt's political manager, had "put the heat" on publicly in favor of Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Truman explained that his refusal as a Democratic Senator to do what a Democratic President's political agent wanted on that occasion was different from the refusal of Democratic Senators now to vote to confirm Leland Olds for a third term as Federal Power Commissioner. It was different, he explained, because on the earlier occasion no one told him the leadership fight involved a party matter. If he had been so informed he would have voted for Mr. BARKLEY, he said.

SEVERAL QUESTIONS RAISED

In view of the subject-matter of his discourse—the opposition of Democratic Senators to Mr. Olds—the only logical inference is that Mr. Truman regards this nomination of his as a party matter. The questions raised accordingly were these:

1. How did it become a party matter? By the President's fiat at an advanced point in the debate over confirmation?

2. Does he believe that such a classification is the prerogative of the President as party leader, to be exercised whenever he chooses and unilaterally?

3. Does he then contend that all the Members in Congress of the same party as the President who make such a classification are required by party discipline, on which he said good government in this country depends, to be bound by it, regardless of individual judgment or prior commitments to the contrary?

4. Since Mr. Truman's sweeping statement was laid on the base of one of his nominations for Federal office, does he mean to apply his dictum to all his nominations, as well as to legislative programs he lays down?

It is implicit from what the President said at his press conference that be believes the answers are all in the affirmative. And that envisages domination of a congressional majority by a President of the same party which has never been possessed, much less publicly claimed, by any of Mr. Truman's predecessors, including Jefferson, Jackson, and F. D. Roosevelt—notable masters of The Hill. It supports the conclusion also that the party caucus, which is the historic American method for laying down a party line and demanding that all members follow it or be disciplined, is now supplanted in Mr. Truman's view by the edict of the party leader in the White House.

EXTREME THEORY

The President's remarks imply the most extreme theory of party leadership which has been expressed in this country within the memory of politicians consulted by this correspondent. Woodrow Wilson asked substantially for the election of "a Democratic Congress" in 1918 on the plea that he required the loyalty inherent in party association to safeguard the Nation in wartime. The plea was resented, and it failed. But Mr. Wilson's implication was only that Democrats would do as he advised, not that they must as a party matter.

DISAGREEMENT WITH THESIS

Democratic Senators who oppose Mr. Olds and who provided 5 of the 10 votes in committee against his confirmation instantly disputed Mr. Truman's thesis. No presidential proclamation that a nomination is a party matter, one spokesman contended, can take precedence over the constitutional prerogative of Senators to refuse to approve a presidential appointment; and no sound concept of "party discipline" could sustain such a position. It might, he said, more logically apply to legislative proposals from a President which he interprets as carrying out the platform on which he and congressional Members of his party ran for office. But even in that case Members of the legislative branch have the right to differ on the interpretation, while recognizing the fact that many such intraparty differences weaken its claim to the voters that it is a responsible agent of government. Finally, said this Senator, a Member of Congress who has made a different platform interpretation to his constituents, or has repudiated any pledge in the document, is free to make that reservation, even against a party line drawn by a caucus of the House or the Senate.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the President's remarks was that they threw no light on the procedure by which he thinks a party line can be fixed without resort to the caucus method. In the immediate controversy his successive steps were these: He sent the nomination of Mr. Olds to the Senate; informed of Democratic committee opposition, he dispatched a letter to the subcommittee in charge and caused it to be read also to the Senate; when thereafter both the subcommittee and the full committee rejected his nominee he said in effect that the nomination laid down a party line which all Democrats should follow. But in his letter Mr. Truman never used the words "Democrats" or "party matter." He based his plea for confirmation on the ground that the issue was between selfish power interests and that of the general public.

DEMOCRATS "REPLY"

Availing themselves of the President's explanation why he voted for Mr. Harrison as leader despite administration pressure to support Mr. BARKLEY, the Democratic Senators who were the targets of his press conference statement could reply:

"At no time were we told by you or anyone else that the Olds nomination was a party matter, though we do not mean to imply that, if we had been, we would have thought this required changing our position and withdrawing a pledge, as you say you would have. The first we ever heard of this was indirectly when we read what you had to say at the press conference. Party discipline does not involve acceptance either of this dictum or this procedure."

At any rate, that is plainly the attitude of many with respect to Mr. Olds' nomination. It remains to be seen whether the President, who is a most determined man, will follow through his vast and highly explosive implications.

Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Money Back," appearing in the Washington Post for October 9.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY BACK

It is a pity that point 4 has got all mixed up with the guaranty of foreign investments. Our view from the beginning has been that point 4 should be restricted to the circulation of America's skills in agriculture, health, and other fields, except industrial. But point 4 has become a double-barreled presentation to Congress, half of it taking the form of a bill, now before the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, aimed at empowering the Export-Import Bank to guarantee American investments abroad. The language of this bill is too comprehensive, in our opinion, to be permitted to stand. Not only would it insure investor receipt of dollars in payment of profits or dividends, it would safeguard the investor against "loss resulting from expropriation, confiscation, or seizure by action of public authority." This latter proviso seems to us wrong in principle and full of dangers in practice.

The encouragement of a free flow of capital abroad is a meritorious undertaking. Yet the risks that are nowadays encountered are so great that little private money is going abroad beyond the sums extended in selective areas, mainly Latin America, by American interests in specific projects, mainly oil development. What the Government seeks to do in the current legislation is to offset the worst risks by offering guaranties. However, the Government cannot go too far in this direction without inviting a number of other risks, such as the charge of imperialism, discrimination against local investors, and, finally, a deterioration in incentives to efficient operations.

This dilemma would be overcome by having some burden of guaranty assumed by the recipient country. In some cases, such as the inconvertibility of currencies, that country might be helpless, and in this respect an American guaranty would be permissible. But safeguards against such risks as expropriation should be sought by bilateral treaty. This is a quest on which the State Department says it is engaged, though there is no tie-in with the bill under discussion. Representative HERTER has an alternative bill which while allowing guaranties, would, inter alia, prohibit guaranties to any country which after 2 years had not subscribed to a code of fair practices toward American private investment. This is an improvement which deserves acceptance by Congress. It reinforces the principle underlying point 4 of mutual aid, though, as we have observed, the guaranty of private investment should have flown under a banner other than point 4.

Bunker Fuel—Memorandum on H. R. 5300, Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to say that the conference report on the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1949—H. R. 5300—restores the House provision which prohibits the Maritime Commission from accepting, on redelivery of chartered vessels, any bunker fuel, consumable stores, or slop-chest items, except such minimum amounts of fuel as the Commission deems it advisable to be retained on the vessel. The effect of this provision will be that the charterer will be required to remove such items from the vessel before redelivery and use his best judgment as to their proper disposition.

It is my understanding that this provision is to be applied prospectively only. This understanding was confirmed by Mr. TABER, one of the conferees for the House, when the report was being considered by the House. He said at that time:

This provision * * * will not have any application to presently existing charters. If those charters are extended, it will, but not as to any vessel which is presently under charter. It will not have any application to the surrender of that vessel at the completion of the present term of charter.

Since the provision will be applicable to charters which are extended or entered into subsequent to the enactment of the bill, it is my understanding that any expense or loss to the charterer resulting from the removal of bunker fuel, consumable stores, or slop-chest items will be treated as part of the expense of redelivering the vessel to the Commission, and taken into account in determining additional charter hire under the terms of the charter. It would be inequitable for the Government to require that these expenses or losses be excluded in making the voyage accounting adjustments.

Furthermore, the sole reason for insertion of the provision by the Appropriations Committee was a desire that appropriated funds not be used by the Maritime Commission as payment for the items in question. The provision, therefore, should not be construed as requiring that expenses or losses resulting from removal of the items be treated in any manner except as part of the expense of redelivering the vessel.

Hon. Sam Hobbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Alabama delegation, and the people of the State of Alabama, heard with deep regret the announcement of our colleague, Hon. SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, that he will retire as a Member of Congress at the end of his present term.

I shall save for a later date a full and complete review of the outstanding achievements and accomplishments of Judge HOBBS during his long tenure here in the Congress. For the present, I desire to include in the RECORD a few of the many editorials in the Alabama newspapers, commenting upon Judge HOBBS' announcement that he will retire.

In one of the outstanding newspapers in his district, the Anniston Star, has appeared this editorial about his retirement:

HOBBS' SHOES HARD TO FILL

For his own sake, we are glad that SAM HOBBS has decided not to offer for another term in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District. For under conditions that now exist, the office of Congressman is a man-killing job, if held for as many years as Judge HOBBS has been privileged to serve, and if the duties of the office are discharged with the conscientiousness that has characterized his tenure of office, some 15 years to date.

But for the people of the district, and especially with respect to his hundreds of close personal friends, it will be difficult to envisage the House of Representatives without the presence of the courtly gentlemen

from Alabama, now dean of the delegation from his State. Yea, more than that; he will be missed by the freshman Representatives from all over the United States who have come to his office from year to year for wise counsel and guidance.

But SAM HOBBS, himself, can surrender his commission without any sense of regret in looking backward. For there is not a county, or any part of a county, in his district that is not the richer as a result of his distinguished service in behalf of his constituency. Nor has the welfare of Alabama as a whole and of the entire United States been beyond the reach of his indefatigable energy and his remarkable storehouse of knowledge.

We have never known a man in which there has been such a remarkable synthesis of the introvert and the extrovert in his personality as that which has characterized SAM HOBBS. We dare say that the introversion in his make-up sometimes has caused him to want to spend all his time in the Congressional Library. But the extroversion that marked his football career as a college student drove him out into the highways and byways of life and made him the friend of all mankind.

What has been the greatest achievement of this great man since he has been in Congress? He has placed millions of dollars of Alabama marble in the Nation's Capital; he has helped to locate scores of industries, military establishments, and marble post offices in the cities and towns of his district; he was a pioneer in parity for farmers and has lived to see them prosper; he has helped to develop rivers and harbors and modern highways, and hence if he would see his monument, like Sir Christopher Wren, all that he has to do is to look about his sphere of operation.

But none of these things, which will perish with the passing of time, constitutes SAM HOBBS greatest achievement. For that consummation that is so devoutly to be wished is an intangible something: it is his gentility, his charitable nature, his moral courage, his intellectual integrity, his spiritual perception, and his innate belief in the dignity of man, be he high or of low estate. And it is in the light of these imponderables that he has lived and wrought and sacrificed material gain that often has been within his reach for the asking.

This paper has not always agreed with SAM HOBBS' every act or with his expression of political philosophy. But we have admired him for his intrinsic worth and have loved him for his fine human qualities. Hence, we can but wish him well in his efforts to regain his waning strength and pity the man who undertakes to travel the road that has worn him down. His shoes are like Gulliver's, and they will be hard to fill.

The Birmingham News, under the caption "HOBBS' service," writes the following editorial:

Representative SAM HOBBS has announced that he will not seek reelection in 1950. The announcement is not surprising. Judge HOBBS has been ailing of late, and there have been repeated rumors that he was planning to retire.

The retirement will remove from Congress one of its best-informed men on constitutional law. Mr. HOBBS has been a member of the important Judiciary Committee almost from the time he first entered the House in 1935. He has impressed not only his fellow Congressmen but also the public with his deep knowledge of the Federal Constitution and his insistence that all laws be squared with it. He has rendered invaluable service to the Nation in this regard.

Judge HOBBS was in his early thirties when he first entered public life as a circuit judge, on appointment. He was elected to the judgeship once, practiced law for a while, and then successfully ran for Congress, to serve in all eight terms, including the present one. His seat was never seriously threatened, although he represented Alabama's most gerrymandered district, including Dallas and Calhoun Counties and a string of those in between, in which Black Belt and white mountain counties present frequently opposing viewpoints.

Alabama, over the years, has had a number of Representatives and Senators who have become conspicuous in special fields. They have included Steagall and currency, Underwood and the tariff, Clayton and antitrusts, Bankhead and farm problems, and, in an earlier period, Joe Wheeler and military affairs. The State's two present Senators, while versatile in their interests, also have special fields of still developing concern. SAM HOBBS and constitutional law have made a distinguished addition to that list.

The Montgomery Advertiser has this to say about Congressman HOBBS:

CONGRESSMAN HOBBS

Congressman SAM HOBBS, of Selma, is retiring and as the Anniston Star puts it, a Gulliver is required to fill his shoes.

That is twice a tribute to Congressman HOBBS because the Star in its political viewpoint—incidentally one of the educated and thoughtful in Alabama—is much closer to that of Senator HILL or Senator SPARKMAN, but it has laurel for the HOBBS brow because of his integrity and courage.

"What has been the greatest achievement * * * since he has been in Congress? He has placed millions of dollars of Alabama marble in the Nation's Capital; he has helped to locate scores of industries, military establishments, and marble post offices in the cities and towns of his district; he was a pioneer in parity for farmers and has lived to see them prosper. * * *

"But none of these things * * * constitutes SAM HOBBS' greatest achievement * * * It is his gentility, his charitable nature, his moral courage, his intellectual integrity * * *."

HOBBS is perhaps the most characterful member of Alabama's congressional delegation. It is assumed that ill health is forcing his retirement, and it may be assumed that the same failing prevented him from seeking a higher post.

How HOBBS, a commanding, Milleresque figure imbued with the tough conservatism of the Black Belt, would have fared in a contest for governor or Senator we have scarcely a guess. The State plainly does not elect purely on a basis of political viewpoint: no sensible person would contend that we elect on the basis of right or left, for the multiplicity of contradictions are holding office right now. The factor of personality is a far more reliable index. We therefore suspect that HOBBS would have given a good account of himself, for vigor and courage usually elicit response.

Price Spread of Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the price spread between what the farmer receives for his milk and what the consumer pays, including a letter addressed to me by an Ohio dairyman.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the Subcommittee on Utilization of Farm Crops, under the Senate Agriculture Committee, has been investigating the price spread between what the farmer receives for his milk and what the consumer pays, we have been deluged with either anonymous communications or signed communications asking that their names not be made public. One dairyman wrote that if it were known that he had written the subcommittee, an effort would immediately be made to cut off his outlet for milk.

A man describing himself as a dairyman for some 25 years, but not otherwise identified, wrote me from Ohio as follows:

"I understand that your committee is investigating the spread between farmer and consumer prices, as well as possible monopoly. You are on the right track and I want to thank you.

"Please take a look into the Cleveland milk-marketing situation. The spread here is far greater than the historic normal margin and it is getting worse. Consumers are paying too much, farmers are not getting enough, and dealers are making excessive profits according to their own financial statements.

"Let me illustrate: Tellings, the largest dealer, owned by National Dairy Co. of New York, has just announced that the retail price goes up from 17 to 18 cents per quart on October 1, 1949. Do the farmers get any of this raise? They do not.

"The producer price for class-one milk in September was $4.10 per hundredweight f. o. b. Cleveland. (Deduct 25-cent cut for hauling from farm to get farm price.) The consumer price was 17 cents or $7.90 per hundredweight. The farmer got $3.85 at the farm if he shipped direct and less if he went through a cooling station. Even this margin was excessive and above normal.

"In October the consumer will pay 18 cents or $8.37 per hundredweight and the farmer will still get $3.85 per hundredweight or about 45 percent of the consumer price. The entire raise of 46½ cents per hundredweight will go to the dealer. These are facts, easily obtainable.

"But, was this announcement made to the consumers? Oh no. They were quoted the May price, in the announcement, not the September price, and told that all of the 46-cent raise was to go to the farmers. Clever, very clever propaganda, but it doesn't fool the farmer any. Of course the dealers advertise in the newspapers.

"You see, the May price to the farmer was about $3.68 and the consumer price 17 cents. The dealer had to raise the producers through the summer drought months to get enough milk but he still made plenty of profit as there was a very wide margin at this price. Even in September the farmer got only 8 cents out of the 17 cents the consumer paid or less than 50 percent for producing the milk.

"Farmers' prices since last August have been below actual cost of production according to sworn testimony by Ohio experts from the Rural Economic Department, Ohio State University, at several Federal milk hearings in Cleveland.

"Consumers are being fed propaganda by press and magazines. Let me illustrate. The United States News, page 26 of October 7 issue tries to cleverly cover up these excessive margins and profits of middlemen. On milk, it states, consumers pay 19 cents, with the dealers getting 7 cents and the farmers 12 cents. Apparently they didn't get these figures in Ohio.

"In September the farmer got 8 cents and the dealer 9 cents out of 17 cents; in October the farmer will get 8 cents and the dealer 10 cents out of 18 cents in the Cleveland market.

"There is a Federal marketing order and agreement in Cleveland, but this fixes only minimum producer prices. It does not fix consumer prices. Why not? It is of little or no benefit to farmers and does nothing to prevent excessive spread or monopoly.

"Supports for butter and milk powder help some. If colored oleo is sold in Ohio after November 8 the situation will get worse. The farmers' buying power will vanish. A few big milk dealers and oleo manufacturers will get richer, if that's possible, and he will be headed for that dreaded depression for which Russia has been waiting like a vulture.

"Perhaps your committee can help stop this. We hope so. It is about the only hope left. I would sign this but, if so, my milk would be cut off from market."

Let me repeat that last statement: "I would sign this but, if so, my milk would be cut off from market." I ask you, Mr. President, is America afraid to be free? Even anonymous letters are helpful in pointing up facts for the subcommittee, but I cannot choose but point out the need for a most thorough-going investigation if the producers are under such intimidation that they are afraid to sign their names to communications to a United States Senator, or a senatorial committee.

Statement of Hon. Henry W. Sweet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by the Honorable Henry W. Sweet, director, Alabama State Docks and Terminals, found in the August 1949 issue of the Port of Mobile News:

WHICH ARE YOU?

I watched them tearing a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town;
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell
They swung a beam and the sidewall fell.
I asked the foreman: "Are these men skilled,
And the men you'd hire if you had to build?"
He gave a laugh and said: "No indeed!
Just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two
What builders have taken a year to do!"
And I thought to myself as I went my way,
Which of these roles have I tried to play?
Am I a builder who works with care,
Measuring life by the rule and square?
Am I shaping my deeds to a well-made plan,
Patiently doing the best I can?
Or am I a wrecker, who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

In 2 or 3 months the efforts of this administration to finance and construct the most efficient and modern piers and shipside warehouses will be complete. The achievement is a wonderful sight, and climaxes many months of heartaches, headaches, joy, and satisfaction. Four million dollars have turned much planning, study, and hard work into a facility unexcelled anywhere on earth.

By its side is an old outdated frame structure which is being torn down to make ready a site for an additional development of three ship berths, with similar facilities as just described. Many heartaches and headaches are yet in the picture before complete planning, financing, and construction will produce a new facility to take the place of this old one.

As in the poem, a lesson worth while is learned by this comparison. It takes little effort to tear down that which it takes years to build. Little knowledge is required and less able men are employed in tearing down.

Such facts as these should enable all of us to play fairly the game of life. Many a good man has literally been destroyed by the wrecking crew of society. Jealousy and envy cause false critics to ply their trade in efforts unbecoming the beasts of the jungle. Progress has never come from this segment of our society and progress never will. It is a compliment to be able to appreciate the efforts of men. No man in public life, however, accomplishes much if he waits to be fully appreciated. The greatest achievement comes from that deep-within feeling of personal satisfaction for the good accomplished.

So it pays to be a builder and not a member of the wrecking crew. And in being a builder, it pays to possess the following fundamentals of a successful human life:

1. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot lift up the wage earner by pulling down the payer.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble when you spend more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by harboring and inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

HENRY W. SWEET,
Director,
Alabama State Docks and Terminals.

On World Affairs Present Congress Is Outstanding for Progressive Cooperative Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, released by General Features Corp. on October 3, 1949:

ON WORLD AFFAIRS PRESENT CONGRESS IS OUTSTANDING FOR PROGRESSIVE COOPERATIVE RECORD

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The passage of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act for rearming foreign countries (H. R. 5895) shows that in foreign affairs this Congress, far from being the "eighty-worst," is among the "eighty-best."

No previous Congress has ever in peacetime contributed so much to the safety of the United States. Four acts stand out particularly—two of them ordinary, two new and revolutionary.

Routine if you like were the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements and the ECA appropriation. Remarkable beyond precedent was the acceptance of the North Atlantic Security Alliance and now the authorization of a billion American dollars for the rearmament of western Europe.

Administration spokesmen are reluctant to say so but, actually, Congress and particularly the House of Representatives, improved on the original administration bill. For by insisting that the billion-dollar appropriation "be used to promote an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area," the House managers at the conference that drafted the compromise bill really compelled the American administration to do just what European statesmen like Spaak of Belgium hoped—force Europe's military leaders to plan a common military establishment with standardized equipment and a common military plan.

INTERNATIONALLY MINDED

Incidentally, this is believed to be the first time that the members of the House ever played such a big role in shaping what is, after all, part of the foreign policy of the United States. In this task Representatives VORYS, of Ohio; JAVITS, of New York; and JUDD, of Minnesota, Republicans, cooperated whole-heartedly with Democratic Representatives KEE, of West Virginia; RIBICOFF, of Connecticut; and MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

In the Senate, once Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, reversed himself and asked for the whole hog, the bottom fell out of the opposition. VANDENBERG'S colleague, FERGUSON, of Michigan, made a telling argument on the Senate floor. Left protesting to the end were only that persistent pair, LANGER, of North Dakota, and WHERRY, of Nebraska—sincere but bewildered voices from a bygone age.

Passage of this rearmament bill will strengthen Europe's faith in the United States just at the moment when Russia's possession of the atomic bomb makes that confidence more necessary than ever.

THESE ODD AMERICANS

Europe's Communists, pacifists, and fellow travelers argue continually that the United States cannot be trusted to carry out a long, tough, and expensive foreign policy. The implication is, other governments had better change their minds and come to terms with the Soviet Union while there is still time.

These critics sometimes find more credence than they deserve because American ways are not Europe's ways. European diplomats and newspaper correspondents in this country agree on one thing: The United States is the country in the world easiest to know about and hardest to understand. It is easy to know about because practically all information can be had on request. It is hard to understand because everybody talks at once and as loudly as possible. Foreigners have difficulty in knowing which voices carry weight and which are merely barks in the wind.

BOLSTERING EUROPE

Some European diplomats and at least two foreign newspapermen were so sure that Congress would reject the European rearmament bill that they offered bets—one of which I took.

Actually, the record of all Congresses since the new American foreign policy was announced in 1947 is perfectly clean. All the major steps requested by the President have been accepted.

There has frequently been excessive delay. There has been plenty of protesting and screaming. A good deal of hot air has been produced. But in every case the policy has finally been accepted and carried out approximately as formulated. When the test came, Senators and Representatives have regularly put patriotism before partisan and private issues.

Obviously, Soviet possession of the A-bomb will try Europe's nerves even more than in

the past. Leaders who thought they had 5 years in which to reestablish common defense against possible Soviet aggression are horrified to find that they may have only 3 or 4 years.

What they must know is, how far can they depend upon the continuous and wholehearted cooperation of the United States?

The more ways our leaders can build up Europe's confidence the deafer the European peoples are going to be to Moscow's threats and blandishments.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," which I delivered on October 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 9)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

Down here in Washington these days we hear a great deal about statism and the social-welfare state.

The word "statism" had become a symbol, a word to sneer at, to defend or attack, depending upon the individual's philosophy of government.

In this discussion I want to talk about statism and the social-welfare state—what they are and how they will affect you.

In my broadcast some weeks ago, I took as my topic the Brannan agricultural plan, which I described as a fantastic, unworkable scheme that was unquestionably a step toward socialism.

At that time I said that many other proposals, equally fantastic and equally dangerous, had been offered by the administration at Washington.

We now have a program before Congress which, if adopted, would completely revolutionize the American system of government and the American way of life. It would destroy initiative, free enterprise, and individual freedom. I want to tell you something about that program.

In considering a proposition of such vast importance to the future of our Nation, two questions naturally arise:

First: Do the American people want to change our system of government to a socialistic welfare state?

Second: Would they vote for such a change in a direct election in which they had to decide that specific question?

If these questions were submitted to the American people, there is no doubt what their answer would be. I do not hesitate to say that the voice of an aroused and angry electorate would thunder across the Nation—a loud and mighty "No."

Why, then, should we be disturbed? Why are so many of our people seriously concerned over the trend toward statism or the socialistic welfare state?

A few months ago James F. Byrnes, former United States Senator, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and former Secretary of State under President Truman, brought the word "statism" into sharp focus. Describing the path this administration was taking, this great Democrat told an audience at Washington and Lee University:

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up, no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

That was strong language. Its echo carried across the Nation.

We Pennsylvanians have heard a lot about statism. We know what it means.

President Truman has called it a meaningless scare word. To him, it is an unpleasant word. It turns the spotlight on the direction his administration is pursuing, and warns of what lies at the end of that path.

What is statism? The latest dictionary describes it as a "concentration of all economic controls and economic planning in the hands of a highly centralized state government."

Recently, Senator JOHN FOSTER DULLES, of New York, gave a splendid definition of statism. He said:

"Statism represents man's conceit that he can build better than God. God created men and women with great moral possibilities—industry, thrift, creativeness, self-control, compassion, love of God and fellow man.

"These qualities are the foundation of every good society; and government should be a way to give these qualities cooperative expression.

"Sometimes those in power lose faith in their fellow men. So they take more and more of the fruits of human labor so that they may, as they think, do more and more for human welfare. That process destroys the individual's incentive to produce and destroys his sense of social responsibility. It makes human beings into mere cogs in a man-made machine."

When Mr. Byrnes said that America was going down the road to statism he sounded a stern warning to the American people. America must not make that journey with its eyes closed. Americans must be made aware of the direction in which they are moving and what is at the end of the road for them and their country.

The trouble with the movement toward statism is that it is gradual. It advances step by step. The movement is so slow that people seldom realize how far they have traveled down that road until it is too late to turn back.

Some people believe that we can have a little socialism, a little statism, or a little communism, and still retain our freedom. Unfortunately, that is not true.

Like a narcotic drug, it slips up on you, takes complete possession, and finally enslaves your whole physical and mental structure.

Americans do not want statism. We have gone part way down the road of statism only because our people reassure themselves by saying, "It can't happen here."

Well, let us see whether it "can't happen here." We know there was statism in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. There the highly centralized governments concentrated in their hands all economic controls and economic planning.

We know that in Communist Russia today there is statism to an extreme degree. Private industry and private welfare do not exist. Instead, all controls and all planning are concentrated in the Kremlin.

Today we are watching the damaging effects of increasing statism at work in England. There the Labor Party is in control. It admits it is a Socialistic Party and that its goal is for economic and social control in the hands of an all-powerful central government.

We are following the same course today. If there is any doubt about it in your mind, listen to what Mr. Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, had to say recently. He told Parliament, and I quote:

"This so-called welfare state has developed everywhere. The U. S. A. is as much a welfare state as we are. Only it is a different form."

Now let's see if Mr. Bevin is correct.

Let us look at what has been happening at Washington despite those who declare "it can't happen here."

In a previous talk I told you about the Brannan farm program which promises a high income for the farmer and low prices for the consumer, with the taxpayer making up the difference.

Washington would dictate to every farmer what he must grow and how much. His income would be controlled by the Government. Much of it would come in the form of Government checks. That would lead to economic slavery.

What do you suppose that is? It is statism and the welfare state.

Now let us look at Senate bill 281. That's the Murray bill, the so-called economic expansion bill. On its face this bill might appear as backing private enterprise, but a thorough reading will reveal that it gives the executive departments and Government economists authority to plan and control all industry and the entire national economy. It would substitute the judgment of Government bureaucrats for that of American private business in the use of capital and manpower.

What do you suppose that is? It is statism and the welfare state.

Then there is the plan for socialized medicine which, we are told, would make free medical service available for every individual. But, of course, it is not free. It would be paid for by new pay-roll taxes from the wages of every man and woman who works for a living. The entire system would be managed, controlled, and directed by the Government.

England has a similar system and they are learning how inefficient and how expensive it can be.

What do you suppose that is? It is statism and the welfare state.

Government control of education through Federal aid to the States is another part of the program. With grants of money goes control. When Washington dictates what our schools shall teach local control of education will be gone.

What do you suppose that is? It is statism and the welfare state.

I wonder how many Pennsylvanians have heard of the Spence bill—House bill 2756. It is called the economic stability bill of 1949. It would give the President vast powers to regulate and control the economic life of the Nation.

Under this bill the Federal Government could regulate wages and prices. It could establish priorities and allocations. It could control production and distribution of all essential materials.

That is not all. The President could construct steel plants and other industrial facilities if he decided they were necessary.

What do you suppose that is? It is statism and the welfare state.

These proposals are not the brain child of any individual Representative or Senator. They are all part and parcel of the Fair Deal program and are only a few of the recommendations made by the President to the Congress.

Time will not permit discussion of all the bills introduced to carry out these recommendations.

But, there can be no doubt that these proposals spell out a socialistic plan that would transform the American system of self-government into statism and the welfare state.

That was the danger against which Mr. Byrnes warned so emphatically. That was the danger which Senator DULLES described as "man's conceit that he can build better than God."

The British Foreign Minister had the same thing in mind when he said that the welfare state developing in the United States is the same as that in England, only in different form.

I was not at all surprised when Henry Wallace, addressing a Progressive Party conference on September 17, advocated the welfare state, declaring it was inevitable and close at hand in the United States.

But when the President of the United States, in a radio address 10 days later, boldly and frankly told the American people that he, too, believed in the welfare state, it came as a complete surprise.

He declared that the founders of our Republic had advocated the welfare state when they wrote into the preamble of the Constitution that one of the objectives of government is to promote the general welfare.

The truth is that the welfare state, in which the government is all powerful, is contrary to every principle of the American Constitution.

No government promotes the general welfare when it attempts, in peacetime, to control, regulate, and regiment the lives of the people.

No government promotes the general welfare when it undertakes to guarantee comfort, security, and happiness for one segment of the population at the expense of another.

No government promotes the general welfare when it destroys incentive, initiative, and self-reliance, and robs youth of opportunity to get ahead.

No government promotes the general welfare when it lives beyond its means, flinging borrowed money in every direction with no thought of the day of reckoning.

And no government promotes the general welfare when it continues to pile up additional debt and places upon present and future generations a back-breaking burden of taxation.

The patriots who framed the American Constitution did not promise security or an easy way of life in a welfare state. They believed in the Biblical injunction: "In the sweat of they face shalt thou eat bread."

Through all the ages of mankind that has been the law of progress. Generation after generation of Americans have built their country's might on that precept.

Individual effort, individual responsibility and individual freedom are the greatest stimulants to progress and prosperity.

These elements of our national greatness would be destroyed by statism or the welfare state.

My fellow Pennsylvanians—I appeal to you to think deeply about this. It goes far beyond the narrow confines of political controversy.

It is a fundamental question of real Americanism as opposed to a philosophy which can destroy America.

That is why there are Democrats and Republicans in Congress, fighting shoulder to shoulder, to save America from the poison of statism.

I appeal to you to join in the fight—not as Republicans—not as Democrats—but as Americans who want to preserve for their children and grandchildren the birthright of freedom and opportunity that has come down to us from those who established this land of liberty.

All my life I have fought to defend and preserve the great heritage of American freedom. The Lord has blessed me with good health and vigor. I shall continue to give every ounce of energy to fight the alien philosophy of statism and the social welfare state. If the fight is to be won it must be won here in the Halls of Congress. I assure you as long as I am privileged to serve you I shall continue this fight.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Tribute by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, to Memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today marks the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the death of a great son of Poland, and a great patriot, too, from the standpoint of our own beloved country. On this day, 170 years ago. Gen. Casimir Pulaski died of battle wounds received in action in the war for American independence. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the meaning of General Pulaski's life and death be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI AND A FREE POLAND

Mr. President, I should like to submit a few comments on the occasion of this, the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the death, by battle wounds on October 11, 1779, of a great son of Poland—Casimir Pulaski. In so doing, I should like to comment on the broader meaning of the memory of this gallant warrior for freedom in relation to his motherland and its freedom—a meaning of deep significance to the sons and daughters, the grandsons and granddaughters, of Poland in my own State of Wisconsin and elsewhere.

It has been my pleasure on many previous occasions to comment on the heart-rending trials and tribulations of brave Poland now beneath the Red yoke. Yes, on previous Pulaski obsevances, I have (as a cosponsor of Pulaski Day legislation) recalled to my colleagues the age-old struggle for sovereignty on the part of this people whose devotion to their God and to their beloved soil has never been and will never be quenched by alien bullet or sword.

POLISH DP PROBLEM

Recently, it was my pleasure to address an American Relief for Poland picnic in Milwaukee and to discuss the problems of other exiles from Poland—the displaced persons and the humanitarian legislation designed to meet their need. Now, may I review the history of Casimir Pulaski, an exile from his native land who gave his life for freedom of another land—America?

GENERAL PULASKI'S DEEDS

We are all familiar with the fact that Casimir Pulaski, born at Podolia, took a prominent share under his father, Count Joseph Pulaski, in the formation of the Confederation of Bar and thereafter in the military operations. Ultimately he became commander in chief of the Polish patriotic forces. Having been driven into exile in 1772, Pulaski came to America and joined the army of Gen. George Washington.

He distinguished himself in the Battle of Brandywine, was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by order of Congress. He fought at Germantown and in the battles of the winter of 1778. After that, he raised a mixed corps called the Pulaski Legion, with which he defended the city of Charleston in May 1779. We all know that General Pulaski was mortally wounded at Savannah and that he passed to his eternal reward on October 11 on board an American fighting ship.

WHY WE OBSERVE PULASKI DAY

Mr. President, I call attention to the birth of this great patriot of Poland and this great friend of the United States, not as a mere tribute to a man who has long since passed into the realm of history. Rather, I call attention to his magnificent life because the inspiration of his deeds is so important not only to the United States, but to all the sons and daughters of Poland—the inhabitants of that stricken land which was the first to fight in the Second World War, but which seems to have paid for its sacrifices only by continued enslavement.

The inspiration of General Pulaski, I am sure, will continue to give courage and confidence to all the friends and lovers of Poland, both within that ravaged land and beyond its boundaries.

It seemed as difficult in Pulaski's time as it does in ours that the forces of enslavement and tyranny would one day be driven back from the borders of Poland. But we are certain that that land shall indeed experience her freedom, that the dream of Pulaski and the dream of other Polish patriots shall be fulfilled.

PULASKI LIVES TODAY

Pulaski lives today in every Pole who wants to keep America free and in every American who, just as earnestly, wants to restore freedom to Poland, as it must and will be restored.

Dictators pass as snow before the sun.

A prophet of freedom never dies.

Casimir Pulaski was, and is, a prophet of freedom.

POLAND'S ETERNAL DEVOTION TO LIBERTY

For 20 centuries there have been Poles in Europe. That means that for 20 centuries there has been a whole people in Europe who loved liberty more than life. When Patrick Henry demanded in the Virginia House of Burgesses—"Give me liberty or give me death"—he was saying nothing new. That very phrase had been on the lips of countless millions of Poles for 1,700 years before Patrick Henry saw the light of day.

FOLK TALES OF FREEDOM

The battle cry of freedom rings in the very folk tales told to Polish children.

There is the story of the Princess Vanda who chose to drown herself in the Vistula River rather than to become the bride of an invading knight who, as her husband, might have ruled Poland.

There is the age-old pageant of the Little Horse which was held in Cracow even in the twentieth century. This observance honored Poland's Paul Revere who saved the people of that region from the Tartars by galloping all night through the countryside, rousing his countrymen to defend themselves against the invading horde.

There is the Hejnal—the story of the Cracow trumpeter who saw the enemy approaching and gave the warning signal, only to have it cut short by an arrow in his throat. Never since has the Hejnal, the trumpeter's song, been played to its final note.

I recall for you these stories, because Casimir Pulaski heard them, because they became part of him, because from his cradle,

from his first spoken word, he learned to love freedom.

POLAND'S TRAGIC PARTITION

The pages of Polish history from its earliest beginnings with Mieszke Miecislaw I (who was converted to Christianity and who reigned from 962 to 992) are full of patriotic sagas of sacrifice and achievement. At one time, Poland was the most powerful state in eastern Europe, being composed of Cracovia, Silesia, Cuyavia, Masovia, Lithuania. As early as 1400, the University of Cracow was a center of world culture. In 1569, Poland reached her greatest territorial expansion—around 380,000 square miles, with 15,000,000 people. But 200 years later, beset by perpetual foreign intrigue, on August 5, 1772, came the first partition of Poland—with a loss of one-third of her territory to other powers. A second partition ensued in 1793—with a loss of more than half her remaining territory and more than 4,000,000 population. This is why the great Kosciusko organized the Polish patriots to regain the soil of the motherland. But hopelessly outnumbered, Kosciusko met defeat on October 10, 1794, and a weakened Poland suffered a third partition on October 24, 1795. Thus, Poland ceased to exist as an independent political entity.

From that unfortunate date until the outbreak of the First World War, Poland's sons and daughters bled for freedom time and again. With the spirit of Pulaski and Kosciusko, the patriots rose in revolution after revolution—in November 1830, in February 1846, in 1848, and on January 15, 1863—only to be defeated by the foreign enslavers. The years passed, but not Poland's hunger for freedom. At long last, in November 1918, an independent Poland was reborn as a partial fulfillment of Wilson's 14 points, including self-determination of peoples.

No one need be told of Poland's more recent history with which we are all familiar—culminating in the so-called Soviet-Nazi nonaggression pact of August 1939 which lead to the Second World War. I have previously discussed in the Senate the magnificent record of Polish arms—the story of her army, navy, and air force in exile which bled in Egypt, in Libya, in Italy, in Greece, and elsewhere for the common victory.

POLAND WILL NEVER YIELD TO ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM

And so, we return to the present—with Poland again cruelly partitioned, cruelly enslaved but bravely unconquered. Six million Poles died in World War II—in battle, in street executions, in the gas chambers in concentration camps, in forced labor. Many of her cities are still rubble, but the spirit of Pulaski lives on amidst the ruins. Poland which gave to the world Chopin, Paderewski, Sklodowska-Curie, Copernicus, and countless other greats, will yet be free. These are not just words. This is the testimony of the ages.

As Americans, we deplore the foreign policy which has meant only slavery to atheistic communism for Poland. As Americans, we will never accept Poland's dismemberment. As Americans, we will continue to seek humanitarian relief and haven for Poland's sons and daughters.

No people has more proved its unyielding devotion to its church and its Saviour. No people has more proved its right to independence and sovereignty.

PULASKI AS AN HEIR OF POLAND'S HERITAGE

And so, Casimir Pulaski was not merely one man. He was the rightful heir to a noble heritage of freedom, the true descendant of generations of Poles who stood, like sentinels, at the gates of Europe, defending liberty from the Godless hordes of darkness.

Washington, Pulaski's leader and comrade in arms, recognized his friend's worth when, in writing about him to Congress, the great Virginian declared: "This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country, and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for those objects."

In writing to Congress, Pulaski, himself, observed:

"Know that, as I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America; and, desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free and before settling as a citizen, to fight for liberty."

History tells us what Pulaski did. We know why he did what he did.

Pulaski did not die when the body of an exile lay in state aboard an American fighting ship in October 1779. Pulaski lives on.

Should Marshall Plan Money Be Used To Buy Canadian Wheat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Should Marshall Plan Money Be Used To Buy Canadian Wheat?" written by George Rothwell Brown, and published in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, October 9, 1949, dealing with a question in which the American farmer is greatly interested.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The Socialist-labor administration now has to explain another Brannan plan to western farmers, and the going promises to be even tougher for the bureaucrats of Mr. Truman's welfare state than it was at last June's regional conference at Des Moines.

The investigation unanimously ordered by the Senate Agriculture Committee, of the flagrant violation of law involved in permitting Britain to use $175,000,000 of Marshall-plan money for the purchase of Canadian wheat, is the first serious challenge yet offered to Secretary Dean Acheson's pro-British foreign policy.

The resolution for the investigation was so drawn by Senator KEM, of Missouri, its author, as to narrow the case down to a specific inquiry into the effect of the concession to the Attlee government upon the American wheat industry and the wheat-support program.

This prevented Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee from claiming a coequal part in the investigation.

An unbiased examination of the deal under which this Government has shown extreme partiality for the Socialist-Labor government in London, at the expense of the American wheat farmer, could have two important results:

It could end in the cancellation of the Anglo-American Canadian wheat agreement, as the result of congressional insistence upon strict adherence to section 9 of the British loan agreement of 1946, under which the Attlee government pledged itself not to discriminate against American imports.

Britain had hardly blotted the ink on the $3,750,000,000 loan when she entered into an agreement with Canada to buy from her annually 140,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour.

Some days ago, on September 20, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, took the unusual step of appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and coolly informing there few Senators that the United States Government—meaning the Truman administration, exclusive of Congress—had agreed to relax enforcement of the nondiscriminating provisions of the 1946 loan agreement.

The understanding to do this was reached at the recent Anglo-American Economic Conference in Washington.

Sir Stafford Cripps had asked that the nondiscrimination principle be waived. Snyder rejected this, but according to the Senate committee, took the position that while he would not surrender the principle, he had decided that the time had passed for the enforcement of this clause of the loan agreement.

This constituted an almost perfect example of the contempt of the vast New Deal bureaucracy for the authority of Congress.

This bureaucracy has repeatedly arrogated to itself functions of well-nigh legislative power.

It has repeatedly by-passed Congress by establishing rules and regulations without legislative authorization.

It has become a great secret government. When Snyder made his amazing disclosure to the Foreign Relations Committee that Britain would be allowed to spend $175,000,000 of ECA money for Canadian wheat at a time when wheat was piling up in huge surpluses on American farms—that committee took it meekly. It made no move to stop the proposed violation of law.

At this point Senator KEM moved into the picture, introduced a resolution of investigation of the whole deal, channeled it through the committee on agriculture, and obtained a unanimous favorable report.

With a huge wheat surplus in the United States, the understanding agreed to by Secretary Snyder at the Washington economic conference is clearly illegal.

It has been reached behind the back of Congress, and without congressional authority.

The deal reveals the hypocrisy of the Truman administration in its courting of the farm vote.

The investigation will put Secretary Brannan on the spot.

He will have a hard time explaining his new Brannan plan in the wheat belt, and also to the taxpayers who will have to stand a loss of dollar for dollar for the $175,000,000 that Britain spends for Canadian grain.

Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, October 7, 1949, relative to the pending nomination of Mr. Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission. The editorial is entitled "Sham Battle."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAM BATTLE

It would have been embarrassing, to be sure, but still it would have been respectable, if the Senate Commerce Committee had rejected Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission on the candid ground that he has been stubborn in his opposition to the utility interests. But the proprieties, it appears, call for a greater measure of piety. Thus we have the spectacle of Senators "shocked beyond description" because more than 20 years ago Mr. Olds wrote disrespectfully, indeed sacrilegiously, about the Fourth of July.

Mr. Olds' disrespect for the oil and natural gas lobbies, therefore, has nothing to do with the case. And President Truman was just wasting so much ink and paper when he wrote to Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON pointing out that "Mr. Olds is a nationally recognized champion of effective utility regulation," that "he has already served two full terms as a member of the Federal Power Commission," that "he has labored diligently in the service of all the people and has earnestly sought to protect the public against the narrow interests of special groups." If the President could only show that Mr. Olds now sets off firecrackers fervently whenever Independence Day rolls round, he might get somewhere.

One can only hope that when Mr. Olds' name comes before the Senate as a whole, that body will prove more profound and less chauvinistic, more interested in substance and less in symbols. It would be a good idea to make the fight over Mr. Olds' confirmation something more than a sham battle.

The Grass Roots Are the Key to Action in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Mexico Ledger, a daily and weekly newspaper published in Mexico, Mo., gives an excellent idea of what America, the real America, is like. The general manager of that paper, R. M. White II, has conceived the idea of making it available to a group of people in foreign countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Mexico Ledger of October 4, 1949, which explains this plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRASS ROOTS ARE THE KEY TO ACTION IN AMERICA

Too many of us say about national issues: "I wish somebody would do something about it, but I can't do anything here in Mexico."

Too many of us see ourselves as just one lone individual in a small town in the middle of America.

We think that if there is going to be a major change in national policy or international policy somebody in Washington will have to do it, or the head of some organization with millions of members.

We think this, and we're all wrong.

We're forgetting that when the President, himself, wants to get a major job done in Washington he comes out here. He goes to the people. He comes out here and tells us about it and tries to sell us on his idea.

Why?

Because he knows that what you think—you, the grass-root voter—is the most important thing in the world to Washington politicians.

For this reason, the Ledger believes sincerely in encouraging everybody with a good idea to go right ahead selling it here in Mexico, Mo. Our theory is that if it can be sold here, sooner or later, somebody will take it somewhere else and sell it, and if enough people—voters—start pushing for one given idea Washington will come begging to do it for us.

Certainly, Washington—the White House or Congress can't for long do anything which we the voters don't like.

This being our basic belief on the subject, the Ledger has launched an international good-will program.

Certainly, we don't expect to talk Joe Stalin into running for the county school board, but we do expect to develop just a little better international understanding—where otherwise there might not be any.

With this for our objective, the Ledger is entered on a 6 months' program of mailing 10 copies of the paper daily to, first, the Edinburgh, Scotland, Rotary Club. After 10 days, we'll send the papers to another club in England. During the next 6 months we'll send the papers all over the world.

And at each place, we'll ask the Rotary Club to distribute these papers where the most English reading people will be able to see them.

Our thought is that in reading about your doings in Mexico, Mo., the people of these foreign countries will be able to get a little better understanding of life in the backbone of America—the Midwest.

And, also, we hope some of these people will, in turn, write us about themselves or send us their newspapers. If they do, we'll publish their letters and distribute their papers in our schools, library, club rooms, or wherever the most people here can see them.

Thus, we hope, the exchange will help us in Mexico, Mo., as well as our neighbors overseas.

Obviously, the only reason for trying to develop this mutual understanding is because we believe peace, when it does finally come to this world, will come hand-in-hand with understanding between the peoples of the world—the everyday, working, praying, living, grass-root people.

Lustron Prefabricated Houses

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in looking up the Federal housing bill, H. R. 6070, to amend the National Housing Act, I was surprised to learn, after making considerable investigation that while the Lustron Prefabricated Housing Corp. was not mentioned in the bill so far as I am able to determine, it carried the authority of the Congress to expend $75,000,000 more on this organization, the purpose of which is to finance the distributors or agents in the field in the distribution of Lustron houses. I was out of Washington at the time and was surprised to learn that for this organization which has already cost the Government approximately $35,000,000 and has proven to be a complete failure to date, the House had approved this legislation and sent it to the Senate.

I think many of the Members of the Congress will be surprised that the authority for such action went through the House without full knowledge that they were voting this enormous amount of money for further waste on the Lustron project.

From information I was able to get this morning I am informed that the Senate has sidetracked a similar bill in that body, and has passed and sent Senate bill 2246 to the House, with no provisions for the Lustron project; that the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday reported favorably a resolution extending the titles I and VI of the present Housing Act for Government insurance of housing loans to March 1, 1950, and that the Banking and Currency Committee in such resolution provided for $25,000,000 for the Lustron project.

I hope when the resolution comes before the House that there will be an opportunity for full consideration and debate with respect to the $25,000,000 which, as I understand, is provided to finance the agents or distributors in the field who are handling Lustron prefabricated houses.

Mr. Speaker, to date the Government has used $37,500,000 of the taxpayers' money on Lustron houses. The Government is pretty definitely committed, I understand, to spend $12,500,000 more. Now we are asked to throw down this rat hole $25,000,000 more which I am willing to agree is a better compromise than to waste the $75,000,000 previously approved by the House and sent to the Senate.

This Lustron Corp. is running in the red $1,100,000 a month after a 2-year experiment. A large part of the $37,500,000 borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has gone into pay rolls, machinery, and capital equipment. Lustron says they must have $12,500,000 more from the RFC and it appears they will get it. They want $75,000,000 contained in the housing bill which is now out to $25,000,000 in the resolution referred to, for the purpose of financing distributors in the field. The Lustron prefabricated housing firm is a private corporation, yet it has been sponsored by the Government.

Harvey J. Gunderson of the RFC, in being questioned about Lustron said, and I quote, "I think the Lustron experiment even now has no better than a 50–50 chance of ever succeeding."

Had it not been for great pressure it is apparent that the RFC would never have made the vast loans. Dr. John R. Steelman, a White House assistant, said in 1947, that Lustron's prefabs "would make a real contribution toward meeting the housing shortage during the coming 2 years." But since Lustron produced its first house last November it has turned out only 1,785 homes.

In January 1948, Mr. Strandlund, president of the corporation, predicted that in June that year Lustron would turn out 1,000 homes. He was a little

off in his prediction as the actual production that month was no houses.

In February 1949, he forecast production of 2,300 houses in August of this year. He was a little off again, the production in August was 320 houses.

Lustron must make 50 houses a day to break even according to a statement of Mr. Gunderson of the RFC. Production has slumped however, and the last figures I have show that they were making 15 houses a day. In the face of these facts, is it wise for the government to keep pouring more money into Lustron?

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that Wilson Wyatt, the wonder housing mayor of Louisville, when he was in charge insisted that the RFC make a $52,000,000 loan to the company. The RFC, believing it to be a bad risk, said "Nothing doing."

Then on June 30, 1947, the RFC received a letter from presidential assistant, John R. Steelman, on the last day the RFC would have authority to make such a loan.

Mr. Steelman's letter said in part:

I am greatly impressed by the fact that, according to expert advice, production by Lustron would make a real contribution toward meeting the housing deficit during the coming 2 years and would have important long-term implications in that the Lustron method represents the fullest application of mass-production techniques to the housing problem.

I have discussed this matter with the President and he has authorized me to state that the views expressed herein meet with his approval. I believe therefore under all the circumstances that this loan should be made.

That day—June 30, 1947—the RFC granted Lustron a $15,500,000 loan.

Since then, the RFC has granted an additional $22,000,000 of loans to Lustron for a total of $37,500,000. But Mr. Strandlund, the president, says it isn't enough. He wants another $12,500,000 for working capital. "If things go along according to plans $50,000,000 ought to take care of our manufacturing requirements," explains Mr. Strandlund.

You will also recall that Wilson Wyatt, when refused loans requested from the RFC, resigned and at least that much was accomplished for the good of housing in the Nation when he got out of the Federal service.

Lustron set up business in the great Curtiss-Wright plant at Columbus, Ohio, and agreed to pay a rental to War Assets Administration of $425,000 a year. To date, War Assets Administration has not collected a dime from Lustron. The rental money has gone to the RFC as it should which holds it as collateral for the Lustron loan.

Mr. Strandlund, who promoted prefabricated housing, took over Lustron management as its president at $50,000 a year. Mr. Strandlund had previously put into the new company $1,000—$500 for himself and $500 for his wife. For that the Strandlunds received 86,000 shares of common B stock giving them voting control of the company, hence it was an easy matter for him to be elected president at a salary of $50,000 a year along with three vice presidents, each getting $25,000 a year, and salaries for various other employees ranging from $7,100 to $18,000 a year. The total pay roll started off at $328,500 a year.

Mr. Gunderson of the RFC who has kept pretty close to this matter and who has his own production men on the scene in Columbus thinks it will take an output of 50 houses a day or more to break even. The most houses Lustron has put out in a single day is 26. It is back now to 15 houses a day.

You will recall when the first appropriation was voted to experiment with prefabricated houses, the purpose was to build a house for about $5,600 to $8,000 for the low- and moderate-income group. To date the Lustron house is selling in New York for about $11,000 without the land. In New Hampshire a completed job, allowing $1,000 for a lot, sells for $12,140; in Chicago without land, $10,650; and in Detroit, $11,500. The difference between the factory price of $5,600 and the delivery price reflects the cost of putting in the foundation, installations, and utilities, erecting the house and the dealer's profit.

Mr. Strandlund, president, says:

There is no chance that the price will come down, as our price is at rock bottom today and for the next several months.

These are only a few of the facts again showing how important and how wasteful the Federal Government can be when it goes into the housing business. While it uses a private concern yet it furnishes all of the financing and now proposes with this extra $25,000,000 requested to finance the dealers in the field of distribution. It is my opinion we have wasted $35,000,000 in this project and I think the smart thing to do is to withhold any further appropriations and not waste more millions of the taxpayers' money on this ill-fated experiment.

In the meantime the RFC has done what the Congress should have suggested in the first place. It has hired a competent engineering firm to make a cold and hard survey of the whole Lustron picture to determine whether more loans should be poured into it. The engineers are on the scene now.

The fundamental objection which should have been recognized and raised in the beginning which makes this project impossible of success hinges on the fact that the American people will not accept a steel prefabricated house. These houses should go over big and be a luxury in Russia where the Government tells you where to live and in what type of a house you shall live in.

About Two Grades of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of Friday, August 19, 1949, entitled "About Two Grades of Justice."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT TWO GRADES OF JUSTICE

Throughout our history the United States has accepted and practiced a single, comprehensive form of justice. Under this form there has existed a single, broad category of offenses, called crimes, and those accused of them have been entitled to certain privileges, and if found guilty have been subject to certain specified punishments. Among the privileges have been a fair and speedy trial, the right to testify in one's own behalf, the right to offer evidence in one's own behalf, and so forth. Punishments have been death, imprisonment, or the payment of fines.

In the course of the current national furor over communism another kind of offense has been conceived and dealt with—broadly and hazily termed "disloyalty." The Constitution does not cover this classification; it defines treason, but this is not treason. Nevertheless, and completely outside the authorization of basic law, it has been deemed punishable, the punishment being the forfeit of one's job.

Since the Constitution does not cover this offense, the Nation has set up its own procedures to deal with it by rule of thumb. And the rule of thumb procedures ignore the constitutional requirements imposed upon normal judicial procedures, such as for a speedy trial, a public trial, a prior assumption of innocence until proved guilty, and respect for the rules of evidence.

What has resulted is a system of star-chamber proceedings violating the spirit of the Constitution and the concepts of a free society.

What set us thinking about this once more was the story from Tokyo of a civilian executive of the Allied headquarters' economic and scientific section, Harry F. Alber, being reinstated after a year's suspension. Alber, suspected of disloyalty, waited 8 months for a hearing. The hearing was secret—no details have ever been disclosed. What comes now is merely the announcement that he has been cleared of suspicion of disloyalty. His job—a responsible executive position paying $10,000 a year—has since been filled.

We know nothing as to the details of Alber's hearing, other than that it was conducted before a civilian-military security review board. But we know what has been happening throughout the system of quasi-judicial proceedings concerning loyalty, and we consider it a threat to our way of life, and recommend it as such to the careful consideration of thoughtful Americans.

Russia and the Atom Bomb

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Leo Szilard, one of the scientists who worked on the development of the first atomic bomb, recently made a startling revelation when he declared on September 27, this year, that "President Truman made an attempt at Potsdam in 1945 to tell Stalin about the atomic bomb."

It would appear from this statement that President Truman intended for

Russia to know of the atomic bomb before it was used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which up to that time had been kept a secret from the American people, and that probably his announcement that Russia had the secret of the atomic bomb on September 23 was no secret at all in spite of all our efforts to keep the atomic bomb a secret since its discovery by American scientists.

According to Dr. Szilard, President Truman apparently wanted Russia to know about the bomb before it was exploded, and Russia's announcement that it had an atomic bomb was no surprise to Mr. Truman who wanted to tell Stalin about it at the Potsdam Conference in 1945.

The following is the recent statement of Dr. Leo Szilard on the Truman policy and the atomic bomb:

A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

(By Leo Szilard)

The headlines say "Russia has the bomb." Where does this leave us? Clearly we are in a difficult position, and it might be of some value to remember how we got ourselves into this position.

During the war, while we worked on the bomb, we scientists thought for a while that we were in a neck-and-neck race with the Germans and that getting the bomb first might make the difference between winning or losing the war. But when Germany was defeated many of us became uneasy about the proposed use of the bomb in the war with Japan. Many of us were uneasy about how the existence of the bomb would affect the position of the United States after the war.

After President Roosevelt's death and 6 weeks before the bomb was tested in New Mexico, I tried to reach the White House and was directed to call upon Mr. Byrnes. There were three of us who went to see him, and H. C. Urey was one of us. Byrnes was not at that time Secretary of State, but he knew of the bomb and had given some thought to problems of foreign policy. The question of whether the bomb should be used in the war against Japan came up for discussion. Mr. Byrnes did not argue that it was necessary to use the bomb against the cities of Japan in order to win the war. He knew at that time, as the rest of the Government knew, that Japan was essentially defeated and that we could win the war in another 6 months. At that time Mr. Byrnes was much concerned about the spreading of Russian influence in Europe. Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were all living under a shadow cast by Russia. Mr. Byrnes' concern about Russia I fully shared, but his view that our possessing and demonstrating the bomb would make Russia more manageable in Europe I was not able to share. Indeed, I could hardly imagine any premise more false or disastrous upon which to base our policy, and I was dismayed when a few weeks later I learned that he was to be our Secretary of State.

On my return to Chicago, 63 of us scientists sent a petition to the President. We asked him not to set a precedent for the use of atomic energy for purposes of destruction by approving the military use of the bomb against the cities of Japan. Our attitude was by no means shared by all scientists. There was another group of scientists, centering on Los Alamos under the leadership of J. R. Oppenheimer, who had no objection to the use of the bomb against Japan, but laid much emphasis on informing the Russians of our intentions before we dropped the bomb. This view was fully shared by Secretary Stimson, who urged President Truman to inform Marshal Stalin at Potsdam of our plan to use the bomb.

Mr. Byrnes relates in his book, Speaking Frankly, how President Truman made an attempt at Potsdam to tell Stalin about the bomb. Stalin happened to be engrossed at that moment in discussing Russian transportation problems and double-track railroads. He did not show any particular interest when he was told that we had a very powerful new bomb which we proposed to use against Japan, and so President Truman dropped the matter. One could hardly say that the attempt to inform Stalin was a very vigorous one. Mr. Truman did not say, "Excuse me, Mr. Stalin, but you do not seem to understand. I am not speaking of just another bomb; I am speaking of something that will get Russia and the United States into the greatest difficulties after the war unless we find a solution to the problem which it poses." Mr. Truman said nothing of the sort. So the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and caught the Russians by surprise. "We have gambled $2,000,000,000 and won," said the President's statement announcing the bombing of Hiroshima.

With the ending of the war, Russia and America lost their common enemy. The Potsdam conference and the year that followed were crucial for determining the pattern of future Russian-American relations. The pattern set was most unfortunate. Patience and firmness was the slogan. Containment of Russia was the policy.

Mr. Byrnes was followed by General Marshall as Secretary of State. By the time he took office, the pattern was frozen. In a sense, the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact were necessary consequences of the policy initiated by Byrnes.

This is not the place to discuss whether our policy was good or bad—and, anyway, the terms "good" and "bad" may be the wrong terms to use—but who can doubt that this policy is totally inadequate to cope with the problem which now confronts the world?

Thomas L. Stokes Hails House Foreign Affairs Hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 64 To Perfect United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on October 10, 1949:

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In the lore of our own West a legendary institution was the "Last Chance" saloon, a plain, weathered clapboard edifice perched at the end of Main Street in those numerous tiny habitations which, themselves, sat on the edge of the seemingly boundless plains that rolled toward the sunset.

Inside, about the bar, there was usually a congenial atmosphere as neighbors who lived miles apart passed the time of day. Often it was a debating society. On occasion it was the scene of brawls and gun fights, or the place where local feuds were talked about familiarly, for they were numerous and there was no law but the law of the gun.

But, as our empire moved westward, new folks moved in who wanted to live and work and raise their families in peace and quiet. They made that plain. But it was not until the strong men in the community saw it, too, that something was done about it. And one day they got together, like as not in one of those "Last Chance" saloons, and decided it was time for law and order and elected themselves a sheriff from among them and gave him a badge and told him to enforce the law and they'd back him up.

We've got a "Last Chance" saloon of sorts in New York today, though its polite name is United Nations. There are gathered the strong men and the "hands" of the great ranchers of the world today whom we call "diplomats," also politely. Sometimes there's a friendly atmosphere there. Always it's a debating society. And constantly there's talk about the feuding going on in our community, which is the whole wide world.

The rest of us folks in the world have been talking anxiously among ourselves for a long time now about having a community where we can live and work and raise our families in peace and quiet. But the leaders of our community in the "Last Chance" saloon in New York don't seem to get the idea yet.

Now they're in a dither and somewhat excited because one of the two biggest ranchers has now got hold of the same deadly weapon, known as the atom bomb, that the other big rancher has got—and with bad blood between those two big fellows, too. Folks in the community want something done about all this. But all we hear is talk about each fellow getting more and bigger guns, and lining up more smaller ranchers in the neighborhood and passing guns out to them, and dispersing the bunkhouses of the hands on the place and digging holes in the ground to hide in and work in.

All we want is for those fellows in the "Last Chance" saloon to get together, and organize a real community government with the same law for everybody, and a sheriff and a posse to enforce it. Law is the only way, for folks always are going to squabble among themselves.

All of which is directed to something that's going to happen here this week among representatives of your own Congress of the United States, one of the two big ranchers. This is public hearings on Wednesday and Thursday by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on a resolution sponsored by 105 House Members and 22 Senators, nearly a fourth of Congress, which says:

"It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of law."

A lot of big words—Congressmen and diplomats still talk that way—but all it means is for those fellows in our "Last Chance" saloon in New York to do just what those follows did in that "Last Chance" saloon in our own West in the early days.

Handicaps on Constitutional Guaranties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the noted San Francisco Chronicle columnist, Mr. Royce Brier. The article appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of Wednesday, September 21, 1949. It is a scholarly and well-thought-out discussion of the hysteria prevalent in our country which has caused us to place severe handicaps on our constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech, thought, and assembly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Royce Brier)

The course of the Salem witchcraft affair in 1692 is well known. There was a small beginning, an extension of hysteria which became pandemic, rising to a zenith, then declining and ending in a violent revulsion against what had occurred.

A small minority was at first involved in the persecution. It is doubtful if a majority of the colony ever concurred, but the influential were pushing the hunt, and to dissent in the zenith period was to declare oneself a witch and invite trial. As the revulsion set in, however, dissent became less perilous, and the decline was rapid as more and more individuals were overtaken with doubt of their previous advocacy.

This is the morphology of virtually all religious and political persecution in human history. It is the process of great and terrible historial events, like the terror in the French Revolution, as well as of local panics like the Salem affair. It is the process of many groups and national movements against unorthodox belief and conduct where the penalty sought was corporeal.

It may be the process of the current loyalty oath crusade in the United States. It is difficult, of course, for a participant to estimate the stage of so complex and diffused a movement. But at a guess one would say that the loyalty oath crusade in the United States is a little past zenith. One can see the beginnings clearly, and the rising curve as a low-gear hysteria took hold—low gear because nobody wanted to raise a lynching party for the disloyal, but a great many wanted, with the third martini, to get very indignant about penalizing them some way.

In the indignation the loyal were held to have no American rights which could not casually be suspended, and if their honor and fidelity were publicly questioned, that was their tough luck. That was fate.

It so happened, however, that the loyal employed in American public institutions outnumbered the disloyal about 9,999 to 1, and increasingly they have made their voices heard against the loyalty oath, the one saying they are not Communists, and/or don't have a superior loyalty to a foreign power, and/or don't advocate the overthrow of the United States Government.

One would guess therefore that a decline has set in and that it will continue unless outside forces arrest it. One would guess it set in about the time President Conant of Harvard University said, "No loyalty oath."

For it is in the American university that there lies the key to the loyalty oath idea; there it has its highest potential, and there it will be first and most effectively repudiated if we are to return to a rational position where we haven't the pants scared off us by a few tens of thousands of screwballs.

Instructors at the University of California, like those of most American public institutions, take an oath to uphold the State and United States Constitutions. This oath is modeled after the one required of the President and set forth textually in the Constitution. The oath is traditional and reasonable. It does not question the fidelity of the individual taking it, or hint he may have a superior fidelity. It merely says, "You are now entering the public service. You will swear to uphold the charters under which the public service exists."

It is, moreover, complete. By positive oath to uphold these charters, fidelity to any system irreconcilable with them is automatically and wholly excluded.

Early last summer the board of regents of the university prescribed a loyalty oath for faculty members. In addition to the traditional oath, the member was required to swear he did not believe in and was not a member of or a supporter of any subversive party or organization.

It was reported, though the regents were officially silent, that the oath was devised to head off a more drastic one earlier pending in the legislature. In any case, faculty members protested that this was an attack on their personal beliefs, and in effect what has lately been called thought control. Thereupon the regents altered the text to have the instructor swear he was not a member of the Communist Party, or committed to anything "in conflict with my obligations under this oath."

But this was reductio ad absurdum, so far as the closing passage is concerned. A man takes an oath binding him to certain conduct. He then takes an oath he will not pursue any conduct conflicting with the first oath. He takes an oath to observe an oath. Why not a third oath he will observe the first two, and a fourth, and so on?

The academic senate is now on record almost unanimously against this oath. It believes the traditional oath is sufficient, and why not?

The trouble with all these extra oaths is that they question the veracity of an individual who has taken an oath. They say flatly: "You have taken an oath to be loyal to the Constitution under which your country exists. But maybe you were a liar. So you will now take an oath that you were not a liar."

You often hear it said nobody who's loyal should object to a loyal oath, the idea being there ought to be a lot of people who don't object. You don't often hear it said, though, that nobody should object to the implication that he is a liar.

Finally, you won't catch any commies this way, either. They'll swear to any combination of words you can cook up, and if it furthers the revolution, why, O. K., O. K.

Thank You, Elmo Swanbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in Minnesota we have in each county a veterans' service officer. These men have done an excellent job generally in assisting the veterans in their varied problems, and a most deserved public tribute to Elmo Swanbeck, the veterans' service officer for Brown County, appeared in the New Ulm Review for Thursday, October 6, 1949. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THANK YOU, ELMO SWANBECK

Elmo Swanbeck, veterans' service officer for the county, is the last man on earth to think of or ask for a bouquet. Swanbeck has been at the helm of the veterans' service office for a long time. He is a World War I veteran and long before he came to New Ulm from Springfield, he never forgot that all veterans are worthy of the finest and best, and he gave his time and efforts without recompense, in their behalf. As veterans' service officer he has become the friend to hundreds of families throughout the county. He has literally performed miracles in obtaining aid for veterans and families. He hammers away at what a veteran must do to receive this benefit and that, through publicity to the county papers; he has never stopped trying to help.

Now the soldiers' bonus processing begins. Swanbeck has been on the job for weeks lining up the procedure so that, if all veterans and their dependents in the county cooperate, there will not be a hitch in the program. Hours and work mean nothing to him. The editor has seen him tell of something that he had been able to get for the good of a veteran, and watched the tears gather in his eyes and heard his voice become husky. A man like that just doesn't happen.

Elmo Swanbeck has been able to do more for the veterans of this county and their families and dependents than most of us realize. Certainly he is paid for his job; but never is anyone turned away and never, if it is humanly possible, has Swanbeck refused a request or tabled any business, if action was possible.

His job isn't easy; the red tape connected with it is beyond comprehension, but he plods along. He has been recompensed a thousand times, not in money, but in the satisfaction that comes from service to a fellow man.

Now he needs the cooperation of every World War II veteran in processing the bonus papers. Let's make sure that he gets it. He has performed and will continue to perform a great service for all veterans. He isn't superhuman, but there are hundreds who raise their hands in salute to his achievements.

Industry Moves South and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, industry is coming to realize the many advantages of location in the South. This statement is borne out by recent census reports compiled by the United States Government. Since 1939, the agricultural South has had the most rapid rate of industrial expansion of any section of the country. Today, Alabama has 17 factories for each 10 it had in 1939.

The South is making tremendous strides in industrialization.

Improved agricultural methods, plus industrial expansion and development, is providing the South with more money with which to buy manufactured products.

Some of the attractive factors which the South has to offer new industries are as follows:

First. Expanding domestic markets for manufactured products. An example is the growing market for electrical appliances and products that has come with the electrification of the South.

Second. Transportation: Railroad, truck, aid, and water transportation serve not only the growing domestic markets of the South, but offer ready

access to other domestic and foreign markets. The South is filled with streams and rivers awaiting the hand of further development which will bring cheaper water transportation.

Third. Raw materials: The South has the greatest untapped concentration of raw materials of any section of the country. Alabama, for example, has a new and growing oil and gas field. Coal, iron ore, marble, sandstone, clay, salt, timber, and undeveloped water power are found in abundance in Alabama.

Fourth. Power: Public and private sources of electric power, both hydro and steam, give the South a favorable balance in the cost of electric power. Both public and private sources of electric power are today engaged in expansion of their facilities in anticipation of the needs of a growing industrial economy.

Fifth. Climate: Our God-given resources of a comparatively mild and healthful climate, coupled with a high average rainfall gives us the ability to produce all the common crops in abundance, and makes our region suited to year-round industry and agriculture.

Sixth. Labor: Our native labor supply has been little more than tapped. The southern people, though generally unskilled, lend themselves to being easily trained, and to becoming highly competent producers and artisans in the industrial fields. In the past few months, two reports have come to my notice with respect to production in two separate small industries in my congressional district, wherein production in these two plants was reported to be much higher than the national average. For years the South has been losing its labor supply to the industrialized sections of this country. It would seem to be advantageous that industry provide employment for our labor supply at its source.

Seventh. Agriculture: Along with industrial development, southern agriculture had undergone great expansion and diversification in the past few years. The development of dairying, beef cattle, broiler, and truck farming are coming to supplement the income of the cotton farmer, and are developing cheese plants, packing houses, and canning factories, providing new sources of employment and, therefore, more purchasing power for our people. Cotton continues to be our basic cash crop, and whereas 25 years ago we produced a bale of cotton to 3 acres, today a yield of one bale per acre is not uncommon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the October 7, 1949, issue of the United States News and World Reports, styled Industry Moves South and West, which analyzes some of the data with reference to the industrialization of the South:

INDUSTRY MOVES SOUTH AND WEST—NEW AREAS ARE EXPANDING FASTER THAN OLD

New centers of industry are coming up fast, prompting all business to take another look at markets, plant sites, etc.

Industry, over-all, continues to grow. But expansion in old areas is slower than in the South and West, new census shows.

Shifting of industry away from some States and regions and into others, accelerated during war, has continued since the war.

The trend, definitely, is toward decentralization. It is away from big cities, toward smaller areas. There is a shift, too, from North to South, and from East to West. Yet, while the rate of growth is most rapid in new industrial centers, the older industrial areas continue to expand and to dominate output of most products.

Precise measurements of what has gone on within industry during and after war are available for the first time. These measurements are provided by the census of manufacturers taken last year for 1947. The resulting mass of data only now is being analyzed for ready understanding of businessmen making new plans, and for all individuals who are interested in industrial trends and markets.

To show what the census has found, U. S. News and World Report brought together and analyzed this important information, along with more recent Government reports, to give the new picture of United States industry. Later reports will focus on each region individually, and show major industrial developments within individual States.

On an over-all basis, there have been broad changes—for industries and for regions. Some industries doubled in size and output, while others have lagged. Some regions, too, have made rapid gains in manufacturing, while others have lost ground relative to the United States as a whole.

The accompanying map [not printed] gives the outline of the industrial change. It shows where manufacturing gains have been greatest and where least. Basis for this rating is the value that is added to goods by manufacturing—the sale value of products over and above the cost of materials that went into those products.

Biggest gains in manufacturing, clearly, are being made in areas where factories have been few and far between. Not a single one of the 11 States making the big gains has as much as 2 percent of all United States manufacturing in 1939. And only four of the States that made even average gains had that much in 1939.

The agricultural South shows the most rapid rate of expansion. Only other States in the fastest gaining group are Oregon, Idaho, Kansas, and Nebraska. It's in the South that new factories springing up have brought the big relative increases. Arkansas had 17 factories in 1947 for every 10 in 1939. So did North Carolina and Alabama.

Texas had nearly two factory production workers in 1947 for every one in 1939. Not far behind are Kentucky, Mississippi, Kansas, and Nebraska.

Above-average increases are scattered over all of the United States except New England. Alabama and Louisiana are high on the list. With California, they barely miss being in the high group.

Below-average gains—less than the 203.7 percent gain of United States as a whole—are concentrated in the older industrial areas, from Michigan and Ohio on east and north. But the small percentage gains of the big industrial areas show up large in absolute dollars and numbers of factories. New York is an example. Its increase of $6,300,000,000 in value added by manufacturing—small in percentage gain—amounts to more than the entire amount of value added by manufacturing in all the 24 least industrialized States.

Smallest gains of all in industry are in agricultural and mining States of the West. But some of the lagging States are in the East—Rhode Island, New Jersey, Connecticut and Maryland, along with the District of Columbia. Again, the small percentage gain in the industrial State of New Jersey stands for an increase of well over $2,600,000,000 in value added. New Jersey's increase alone is nearly three times the value added by all manufacturing in the eight Mountain States.

Changes within industry are no less important. They provide important suggestions for businessmen who are looking for markets for particular products.

Textile mills, for example, have expanded rapidly in newer industrial regions, while older regions have lagged. New England and the Middle Atlantic States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey still have the big share of the industry. But their share has shrunk from more than 56 percent of the total to less than 49 percent. The South Atlantic States, meanwhile, have claimed a growing part of the textile industry. Their share has grown from less than 30 percent to nearly 38 percent.

What those figures mean to the regions involved is shown by the fact that the share lost by New England and the Middle Atlantic States would have meant another $400,000,000 in value added by manufacturing in those States in 1947. Other States gaining in textiles were in the east south central region—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi—and in the Pacific coast region.

Clothing industry added 219 percent more value to goods in 1947 than in 1939, for one of the big industry gains. And where those gains occurred is shown by the census. South Atlantic States—from Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia on south—were the big winners, along with the Pacific region.

Electrical machinery, fastest-growing industry of all, achieved an increase of 313 percent in value added in 1947 over 1939. And it became a bit more concentrated in the East North Central States around the Great Lakes. That region increased its share of the industry total to 42 percent. New England and the three Middle Atlantic States lagged behind. And the South Atlantic region and much of the whole West got large shares of the additional electrical-machinery plants.

Other machinery made the second biggest gain—284 percent in value added. New England again lagged in the gain, but all other regions east of the Mississippi expanded their shares of output and employment in the machinery industry. And still more concentration resulted in the area from Illinois east to New York and New Jersey. That region now has nearly three-fourths of the industry.

Fabricated-metal products, as an industry, also massed more and more in the East North Central States around the Lakes. By value, more than half of the thousands of products fabricated of metal now are made in that region. But no region except the Atlantic coast failed to get a larger share of this industry in 1947 than in 1939.

Lumber industry, including all lumber products except furniture, expanded rapidly from 1939 to 1947, increasing its added value by 254 percent. It was the Pacific and the Mountain States that gained most in factories, employment, and output of lumber and products. The Pacific States made big gains, too, in food-processing plants and plants for making rubber products, as well as in such transportation products as airplanes, ships, and automobiles.

Biggest expansion in the paper industry, the census shows, is in the South, where the share of value added jumped from 15.5 percent of the industry total in 1939 to well over 20 percent in 1947.

Shifts of industries from city to city, too, have involved thousands of new plants and millions of workers. The census gives the picture in a report on the 53 "standard metropolitan areas" that have 40,000 or more manufacturing employees.

Metropolitan areas that are gaining most, again, are not the biggest centers of industry. Only Los Angeles, among the big industrial metropolitan areas, made a top gain. And only one other of the 10 biggest industry centers in United States—Cleveland—made even as much as the average gain of 203.7 percent in manufacturing.

Second biggest expansion, next to that of Los Angeles, was made by Houston. That

city's increase in production workers was nearly twice the national average. In value added, too, that city's factories kept far out in front of the average advance. The Louisville area made an even bigger gain than Houston in value added by manufacturing, but its factory employment grew less. Top gains also were made by the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and the Springfield-Holyoke area.

Gains made by the big centers mean big changes in terms of numbers of plants and employees, if not in percentages. In the New York City and northeastern New Jersey area, for example, the number of factories rose from 34,102 in 1939 to 48,287. That increase of more than 14,000 factories—the gain alone—is more than the entire 12,278 factories that were operating in 1947 in Chicago, the second biggest metropolitan industrial area.

And the relatively small percentage gain in manufacturing registered by the big New York metropolitan area amounted to well over $6,000,000,000 in value added. That was about one-eighth of total gain made by all United States factories together.

What is shown, in brief, is that the South, the Pacific coast and some of the Great Plains States are making tremendous strides in industrialization. New plants that employ thousands of workers still are being built in those regions. And industries that are new to those States are moving in all the time. But the great part of all products of industry still comes out of the areas in which manufacturing first started in any significant amount. That area is the North and East, from Illinois on through New England.

The Northeast, too, is still the mass-market region of the United States. But, as industroy grows and moves southward and westward, demand for goods and services in those areas is expanding. Later reports in this series will show where, how, and why.

William Green and Oscar Ewing Support Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week at the convention of the American Federation of Labor two speakers discussed the welfare state. A speech by the national commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig, which attempted to raise a scare over the welfare state, was received very coolly. A speech by Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing for the welfare state was received most enthusiastically.

At this point I am inserting a story from the Labor Press Association giving the reaction of A. F. of L. leaders to these speeches:

AFL SHOWS WHERE IT STANDS ON ISSUE OF "WELFARE STATE"

ST. PAUL.—Little doubt was left by the AFL at its convention here as to where it stands on the issue of the so-called welfare state.

Earlier, the new national commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig, devoted almost his entire speech to raising a scare over statism and the welfare state and he referred to these as stepping stones to communism.

Craig got a polite but hardly a sympathetic reception from the AFL convention. President William Green did little more than thank Craig for coming.

The story was different when Oscar Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, spoke. Ewing pulled no punches, and denounced all who brandish the statism bugaboo in an effort to halt social progress. He was cheered time and again.

And when he finished, Green went all-out in praising Ewing.

"He spoke our language; he reflected our thinking," the AFL leader declared. He added:

"I am one of those who believes that the poorest man or woman in the world is entitled to receive adequate hospital care, nursing care, and medical attention when they are ill, and I believe in a welfare state that will accord to them that kind of service."

Then Green told Ewing, "You can count on us to work with you and fight with you for the realization of this great objective."

Also to newsmen AFL leaders were blunt in their characterization of Legionnaire Craig's speech.

"The American Legion elects a new commander each year, but it's the same old reactionary speech, propounding the economic philosophy of Wall Street and the National Association of Manufacturers," declared Secretary-Treasurer George Meany.

I am also inserting in full Mr. Ewing's speech, which I consider an excellent statement of the attitude behind the Fair Deal program:

ADDRESS AT AFL CONVENTION BY OSCAR R. EWING, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

I am grateful to you for the privilege of meeting with you here in St. Paul at this convention of the American Federation of Labor. This year your deliberations and your decisions are more important than ever in your long and honored history. We stand today on the verge of one of the subtle but essential turning points in American life—one of those rare moments when an old era ends and a new one begins, a moment whose ultimate meaning can only be recognized far in the future.

We are—whether we realize it or not—in the process of deciding what kind of country America is going to be. The conflict is coming to a head. Basically, it is a conflict between people who look backward and people who look forward, between those who are selfish and hopeless and those who have faith in this country and its destiny. All of us are involved in this conflict—workingman and farmer and businessman; adult and child; Negro and white man; city-dweller and villager; skilled craftsman and manual laborer. All of us are called upon to stand up and be counted.

The conflict itself has always existed. It will probably exist, in one form or another, to the end of time. But there are fleeting moments when it reaches a critical stage; and this is one of those moments.

GOVERNMENT OF THE TWENTIES BEHIND THE TIMES

During the 1920's, as many of you will recall, our domestic affairs were in the hands of men who, however sincere, were guided by ideas that could not meet the needs of the times. Those men believed that our country had not changed at all since the days when it was first founded. They may have been engineers, but they did not understand the meaning of the huge technological transformations that had taken place in our society. They thought it was still possible for a vast, complex, industrialized nation to go along as though it were no different from the little seacoast fringe of farms and ports that was the United States 150 years ago. They thought businessmen should be encouraged to behave as though they had no responsibility except to themselves, that the measure of a nation's prosperity was the smallness of its tax burden; that somehow the citizens of this country could cope with their problems without making use of the machinery of Government, which, in their view, was not the servant of the people but in most respects the enemy of the people; that any cooperative efforts by which individual Americans might try to better their lot, whether through trade-unions or through Government, were somehow dangerous; and that, if a crisis came, private charity and the dole could take care of it.

It may have been a workable philosophy in past generations. But it could not work in the face of modern problems. In the end, it had to collapse. It did collapse.

NEW DEAL BASED ON INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEINGS

Our people are not easily fooled. They saw that these old, tired ideas had failed. And they put into office a man—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—who had new ideas, a new philosophy, a New Deal for America. You know the essence of that man's philosophy as well as I do. He saw that the very core of America was not an economic theory, but the individual human being. He saw America as a country where the most important element was the private citizen, the men and women and children of America. He was interested in their rights, their opportunities, their dignity, as human beings. And at the same time he saw that, in our day, the rights and the equal opportunities and the dignity of the individual could not be protected and promoted unless each individual could band with other individuals for mutual self-help. That is why he knew that the trade-union movement was not a threat to America, but the essence of America. That is why he refused to agree to special privilege for any single person or group in this country. That is why, where necessary, he used the Government of the United States as the servant of the people of the United States, a mechanism by which all of us could help one another and through which we could cope with problems far too big for any single person or any single interest.

Because it was based on this simple but profound philosophy, the New Deal succeeded in meeting the crisis that stemmed from old and out-worn ideas. It gave us back our confidence in ourselves. At the outset, the New Deal was essentially an emergency program, designed to meet the emergency needs of a country gone hay-wire. Before it had time to consolidate itself, the outside impact of international conflict interfered with its orderly growth. As President Roosevelt himself put it, Dr. New Deal had to move over so that Dr. Win-the-War could take charge. Well, we won the war, and I think one of the fundamental reasons why we won it was because there had been a New Deal in the United States since 1933.

FAIR DEAL BELIEVES GOVERNMENT SERVANT OF ALL THE PEOPLE

Now the war is a thing of the past. We have had a kind of peace for more than 4 years. We have a new President, Harry S. Truman, whom the American people returned to the White House against the predictions—and against the wishes—of the minority whose minds are still fixed on pre-1933 ideas. Our postwar version of the philosophy that considers the individual American more important than the overprivileged and selfish groups of special interests, is called the Fair Deal. We still believe that government must be the servant of the people, that it must serve all of us, not just a few of us. We still believe—and we believe it more strongly than ever—that in a complex and industrialized economy the people can only be served if they are permitted to

help one another, preferably through cooperative effort but, if that is not adequate, then through governmental machinery.

In our domestic life, the forces for and against this philosophy are now mobilizing. Our reactionary friends have forgotten the economic chaos from which they, along with the rest of us, were rescued by our kind of philosophy and our kind of action. Having forgotten it, they no longer fear it. But everything they think and want and work for will inevitably take us back to depression and privation. Time and time again, they have flung themselves headlong against new ideas that would keep our country strong and prosperous and happy. They are against labor, they are against social security, they are against health insurance. They are against everything but reaction.

BASIC RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

That is the conflict of our time on the domestic front. It is we or they. On the one hand we are building on the foundations of the Roosevelt-Truman political philosophy, on the very ideas which have been shared by all of your great labor leaders. We are trying to make sure that every American can be certain of the minimum of the necessities of life. The minimum includes his basic civil rights; his right to a job, to organize, and to receive a fair wage at his job; his right to education, to health, to reasonable protection against the misfortunes too often associated with old age or unemployment. These are his rights, because they are inherent in the tradition of equality of opportunity for all our people—equality of opportunity which is the unique characteristic of our American democracy.

On the other hand, they are fighting against these historic American ideas. They are flinging loose and meaningless words at us. They used to call us Communists, until they realized that Americans thoroughly understand the difference between a Communist and a liberal-minded, intelligent American. They screamed about the "welfare state." Now they have another word—"statism." Senator DULLES the other day said: "I believe that the trend to statism needs to be stopped now and here." And other Republican politicians have been making similar remarks. Stop statism. That is the reactionary line. According to the 1949 edition of Webster's New International Dictionary, statism means: "Belief in a state government, as in a republic, in contrast with belief in communism or a Soviet Government." Obviously these gentlemen either do not know the meaning of the word "statism" or they are opposed to a republican form of government.

But their vocabulary is not important. What is important is their philosophy. They think Government is the enemy of the people whenever the people use Government to help the underprivileged. It's all right, they say, for Government—whether by its action or by its inaction—to serve the special interests of special groups (provided the group is their group), but it is not all right, they say, for Government to serve all the interests of all the people. They talk about liberty. The rich man's son is free to enjoy good health, they say, and the poor man's son is free to be sick. The rich man is free to retire on his savings, they say, and the poor man is free to accept charity when he is in need. That is a kind of freedom, I suppose; but it is not our kind of freedom.

WELFARE STATE NOT A NEW IDEA

You know as well as I do that from the earliest days of our Republic, our Government has always given special help to parts of our population. From the time of Alexander Hamilton, we have had a tariff system that benefited the manufacturing interests of this country at more cost to the consumers; yet they don't call that statism. We have laws enacted during President Hoover's administration to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend money to railroads, banks, and insurance companies; yet they don't object to this bounty from a "welfare state." We subsidize certain shipping companies and air lines, to the great benefit of their stockholders; yet they don't complain of being coddled by their Government. In most cases, such laws have been enacted because it was to the interest of our entire society that one group or another receive special protection or assistance.

Yet the opposition to proposals that are designed to permit all our people to achieve equality of opportunity rallies around the battle-cry of free enterprise and liberty. You know, and I know, that in all these cases the real opposition arises because it is to the interest of one tiny group or another to keep things as they are—to prevent the world from moving on.

They say we are coddling ourselves.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THIS LEGISLATION?

We have a social-security act, which offers many of us a minimum guarantee against the pitfalls of unemployment and privation and old age. Do you feel coddled because there is such legislation?

We have a pure food and drug act which protects you every time you go to the drug store or the corner grocery. Do you feel coddled because you have such protection?

We are conducting certain research into new cures for diseases that needlessly strike down hundreds of thousands of Americans. Do you feel coddled because this research is going on?

Of course you don't.

Now let me move from the general to the particular. I have the honor to be Federal Security Administrator. I am therefore responsible to my fellow citizens, including yourselves, for the administration of the Federal Government's duties in the fields, primarily, of health, education, and security.

It is an important part of my job to get the facts about the health of our people, and to report to the country on what we have found. Let me, therefore, tell you that the health of America is not as good as it should be in this the wealthiest country on earth. Our Nation's health has not caught up with the great strides that medical science has made in recent years. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have died in our time, not because the doctors could not cure them, but because they did not have the money to pay the doctors. Many thousands of people are sick today who will die before they should, for the same reason.

This is a matter of grave concern to the Nation as a whole. Our country's strength is not to be measured by the gold buried at Fort Knox. America is as strong as its people—and no stronger. We are dissipating this greatest of all our assets, and I submit to you that this is a serious national calamity, in time of peace and in time of war. The answer to this problem, as the American Federation of Labor has itself recognized, is a national health-insurance program. You know what this program will do; that is why you are for it.

SELFISH MOTIVES BEHIND FIGHT ON HEALTH PROGRAM

Who opposes it? The American Medical Association. The American Dental Association. The National Association of Manufacturers. Mind you, I do not say health insurance is opposed by the doctors, the dentists, or the businessmen of America. It is opposed by their trade associations, which presume to speak in their name.

It is the job of a trade association—whether of doctors or of manufacturers—to protect the interests and promote the profit of its members. There is nothing especially wrong in this job, provided the special interest does not conflict with the public interest. In the case of the AMA, the doctors' trade association, has done much good work to establish adequate professional standards and to encourage medical research. But the AMA has gone off the track in the field of medical economics. It has tried to promote the financial interests of the American physician. But it has not served the physician well—for it has ignored the very purpose of all medicine—to heal the sick, and to keep all of us healthy. The patient is more important than the doctor—and the AMA seems to have forgotten so basic a truth. It has opposed virtually every progressive proposal that would make it possible, moneywise, for all patients to receive the continuing medical care they need. It is now engaged in a bitter—an unreasoning—battle against national health insurance.

Look at what the AMA is doing today. With the help of a high-pressure publicity firm, it is urging every doctor to propagandize his patients—and they are doing so, they say, because they are opposed to political medicine.

Political medicine. Let me read this excerpt from the campaign plan of the American Medical Association, published recently in the Dallas Medical Journal:

AMA AFRAID OF OPEN DEBATE ON HEALTH

"We need to locate the personal physician of every Congressman and every United States Senator * * * and have him send a personal letter to his patient, the Congressman, telling him of the danger of socialized medicine"—socialized medicine is another example of the reactionary vocabulary at work—"and asking for his help in defeating any compulsory health-insurance program which may be submitted. We will provide the form letters, but the society secretary should help the doctor, if necessary, in rewriting and personalizing the letter in each instance."

These, I remind you, are the opponents of "political medicine." A little further in the same AMA plan you will find these words:

"We do not believe it a sound campaign practice to sponsor too many debates. * * * They make a forum for the opposition which would be difficult for them to secure otherwise, and they are too easily stacked. This is particularly true of broadcasts of debates open to the public."

You know what this means. It means that these special-interest groups are afraid to encourage free and open factual discussion of the national health insurance program. They want to spread their poison by means that make it difficult for the truth to catch up with them. They know very well that most Americans approve of the plan, and they know that in open debate they are always licked. That is why they now avoid debate, why they exert personal pressure on patients, why they send telegrams to Capitol Hill. Doctors spend a lot of money on telegrams to Senators and Congressmen. On the other hand, millions of Americans who would benefit from national health insurance cannot afford the price of a telegram.

In the name of free enterprise these special interest groups are suggesting that to those Americans who will not accept charity but who cannot pay big doctors' and hospital bills, we should apply a "means" test before they can receive medical care. If self-respecting Americans refuse to accept this indignity and abasement, then, say the AMA and its friends, let them get along without medical care. To my mind, this callous indifference of the AMA is hideous.

AMA, FELLOW TRAVELERS SHOULD READ CONSTITUTION

But the AMA and its friends go further. With a heady sense of power they are now throwing their money and influence into the whole conflict between the liberal and the reactionary philosophies. They spewed money broadcast to help all other reactionaries defeat the President's first plan to carry out the Hoover Commission's recommendation—a

plan to establish a Federal Department of Welfare. Their opposition was found on the simple dog-in-the-manger proposition that unless there is a separate department for health activities headed by a doctor, then health, education, and security matters can do without Cabinet status. The fact of the matter is that the AMA and its fellow travelers are more concerned with the control of medicine than they are with the advancement of medicine.

The AMA and its fellow travelers are now firmly in league with those elements of our political life who are so busy concocting new words for the reactionary vocabulary that they have overlooked the constitutional provision about promoting the general welfare. Let them, in the search for words that do have meaning, follow President Truman's advice and reread the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, which declares that one of the basic purposes of our Government, is to "promote the general welfare." Perhaps we are to believe that Washington, Madison, Franklin, and all their colleagues at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia were sinister intriguers plotting to impose an un-American welfare state on this country.

I move on to another field—Federal aid to education in the States. This proposal has inevitably, I suppose, become tangled in the question of separation of church and State. I think it is healthy for us to discuss this basic problem frankly, but I suggest that we continue to keep our eyes on the primary purpose of Federal aid to education, which is to make sure that all our children—all of our children—are assured of at least the elementary education to which every American has an inherent right. We do not believe that the accident of birth in a poor State rather than in a rich State should deprive any American child, no matter who he is, of the equality of opportunity which adequate education can afford. Yet that is apparently the belief of the spokesmen for yesterday—not of all businessmen, but of the National Association of Manufacturers; not of all conservatives, but of those reactionaries who begrudge every dime of tax money that is spent on public education. In the name of free enterprise and American liberty, they are prepared to condemn American children to the slavery of ignorance and the serfdom of technical incapacity.

SAME PEOPLE OPPOSE SOCIAL SECURITY

By the same token, and with the same arguments, these same forces have opposed extension of the old-age and survivors insurance program, which would bring additional millions of Americans under the cover of minimum security against personal calamity. In our rich country, there is no excuse for the fact that many of our countrymen today look forward to the future with fear and anxiety in their hearts. Old age should be a time for relaxation and self-respect as a useful life enters its final chapters. Instead, for too many of us, it is a time for nervous worry about financial needs, for dependence on private charity and family hand-outs. The masters of the reactionary vocabulary would have us keep it that way.

You and I do not accept this kind of philosophy. We refuse to lie with the dogs in the manger. We refuse to strain the English language by inventing new and meaningless words to attack every progressive idea that is before the American people.

These are some of the issues that confront us today. They are at the very heart of the domestic argument—the argument between progress and reaction. The battle lines are drawn. We must recognize that this conflict between progress and reaction is endless and that from this conflict come the step by step advances that democracy makes in its groping for better things. In this battle I know on which side you members of the American Federation of Labor will be; and you know where I stand. We have battled together before and we shall continue to battle together in the great army of liberals fighting for progress. The American Federation of Labor, under the valiant leadership of the beloved William Green, has never failed in that fight; and I hope that I shall never fail. Coming here today to meet again with so many doughty warriors in the cause of progress makes me feel that in essence this is an old soldiers' reunion and I am proud to salute you as comrades in the struggle for a better world.

Planned River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planned River Development," which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, August 30, 1949.

Everyone knows the conservative nature of the New York Times and it naturally follows that they are not going to endorse any ideas or schemes which might promote socialism. That is why I feel it important that this editorial should appear in the RECORD. The New York Times does not print editorials without careful consideration of all the facts involved, so I feel that the criticism of haphazard development of natural resources contained in this editorial and the endorsement of the principle of coordinated river development following the pattern of the TVA is important to the controversy now going on between the proponents and the opponents of the authority type of river development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNED RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Army's Corps of Engineers is the Nation's No. 1 flood control and navigation agency. The Bureau of Reclamation is primarily concerned with western irrigation projects. Between them the two agencies are responsible for many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of past and projected dams and levees and other works that are changing the face of the Nation.

But in recent years, as the millions pour out and the dams are raised and the channels deepened, a question has been rising with increasing intensity in the minds of many of the most disinterested and qualified observers. The question is this: Are these mighty works being planned in relation to the area which they affect, or are they promoted and "sold" and built as individual units without too much regard for the secondary effects which flow from them? And back of this question lies another: Is there adequate study and planning for the development of these vast regions as a whole—specifically the great river valleys—so that all of the enormous construction work fits into a pattern of maximum use and minimum destruction of the resources already available?

Speaking of the Missouri Basin, an official of the Budget Bureau said just last week that the agencies now planning the eventual expenditure there of $5,000,000,000 are basing their plans on not more than one-tenth of the fundamentally needed basic data in geological, soil, and hydrologic surveys, and in topographic mapping.

Unfortunately the evidence is becoming increasingly clear that in their desire to get things done, and, incidentally, to build up the prestige, personnel, and power of their own organizations, the Government agencies most directly concerned tend to overlook the potential multiple-purpose use of the regions where they operate, and concentrate instead on their own limited field. Sometimes this results in inefficiency, sometimes in downright destructiveness. To take a simple example, dams may be constructed at great expense to control floods when a much smaller expenditure for protection and reforestation of watersheds far above the dam sites might result in preventing them.

The piecemeal method of attacking such a profoundly important project as, for example, the development of the Missouri or the Columbia Basins is obviously unjustified in view of the enormous expense and is also contrary to the national interest. Flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, forest, soil, and wildlife conservation, and recreation are all involved. The basic facts concerning these areas must first be established, and then these various needs must be weighed one against the other, conflicts reconciled, compromises made.

Two years ago we observed that "the spending of money on rivers for single purposes, such as the control of floods, has been rendered obsolete" by the success of the TVA. If the problem is handled by several agencies, competition and friction are bound to result. Over-all authority on the TVA model, as frequently advocated by the President, seems clearly to be the solution to the problem of our great untamed rivers and undeveloped river valleys.

Tax Payments by Public Housing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD a letter of September 8 by Mayor Eugene I. Van Antwerp of the city of Detroit, making known the necessity for action by the Congress to prove helpful to the city's tax structure. In the conference report accompanying H. R. 6008, this subject has been given proper consideration by our body this day, and the relief sought by the Mayor of Detroit will be accorded to his city and to many other municipalities where public housing projects have and will be erected. Therefore it gives me pleasure to place in the RECORD the letter from Mayor Van Antwerp:

CITY OF DETROIT,
September 8, 1949.

Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: I have been informed by Mr. James Inglis, director of the Detroit Housing Commission that you have

discussed with him over the phone our problems in regard to tax payments by public-housing projects and have offered to do what you can to help us get this problem ironed out.

This continues to be a very complicated and troublesome matter for the Detroit Housing Commission and many other housing authorities because of apparently conflicting legislation adopted by Congress.

Our permanent public-housing projects in Detroit during the 11-year life of our program have paid taxes to the city of Detroit in varying amounts ranging from 5 percent of shelter rent to full taxes depending on operating conditions and permission that has been given by the PHA to make voluntary payments. On Herman Gardens project, for example, our tax payments have ranged from 66 percent of full taxes to 100 percent of full taxes, because in the case of this project no Federal subsidy payments whatsoever have been made.

On Parkside, Brewster, and Charles projects our payments have generally been 5 percent of shelter rent with the exception of certain war years when we went to 10 percent of shelter rent because no Federal subsidy was required.

In the Federal Subsidy Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1946–47 some economy-minded Republican Member succeeded in having inserted a provision that no Federal subsidy would be permitted for a project which paid taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original-assistance contract.

This language resulted in a tremendous amount of confusion and controversy between the PHA and housing authorities all over the United States. In many original-assistance contracts (including Detroit's) there is no mention at all of payments in lieu of taxes. For other cities the amounts vary from 1 percent of shelter rent up to 5 percent. The reference back to the original-assistance contracts results in great unfairness among the various cities.

Our legal adviser to the Housing Commission, Vance G. Ingalls, of the Detroit corporation counsel's office, contends that we are entitled to the 5-percent payment in lieu of taxes regardless of the fact that our original-assistance contracts make no mention of the amount.

Among other things, he points to the fact that the Michigan public housing law under which we operate specifically provides for 5-percent payments in lieu of taxes. We are convinced that the failure to permit 5-percent payment in lieu of taxes for Detroit is illegal because its represents a breach of contract on the part of the Federal Government. Mr. Ingalls has filed a brief to that effect with the Comptroller General.

Our difficulty is further complicated by the fact that the PHA erroneously (from their viewpoint) permitted us to make this 5-percent tax payment for fiscal 1946–47 and then in the subsequent year withheld this amount from the subsidy payment due the Detroit Housing Commission at the direction of the Comptroller General.

When the new National Housing Act of 1949 was finally adopted we thought our payments in lieu of taxes headache was at an end. This new act apparently nailed down a definite and uniform policy for the entire country with regard to tax payments by local housing authorities. It provides for 5-percent payments for fiscal 1946–47 and 1947–48 and 10 percent for the current and all future years. We were naturally bitterly disappointed at having our large tax payments on Herman Gardens so sharply reduced for fiscal 1946–47 and 1947–48, but we were reconciled to this in view of the fact that at least all future controversy would be ended and a clear equitable formula would be established for future years.

Now with the recent enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1949–50 we find the same old objectionable formula back in the law in direct contradiction to the National Housing Act of 1949 and we are right back in the same controversy with the PHA and the Comptroller General. It means further argument and possible litigation that we thought had been avoided.

You will be doing the Detroit Housing Commission, the city of Detroit, and many other local housing authorities a great favor if you can secure the enactment of an amendment to the current Public Housing Appropriation Act which will provide the funds with which to carry out the clearly stated intention of the new National Housing Act with regard to tax payments.

There is one other item of legislation that we are concerned about.

As we understand it, the current session of Congress has decided not to take any action for the time being on the matter of disposition of Lanham Act housing. Title II of H. R. 5631 provided among other things that temporary housing transferred to cities could be used temporarily to house families displaced from slum-clearance projects.

We feel that this was an excellent provision and that it would be particularly beneficial to Detroit where we operate more than 5,400 units of temporary war housing and where we hope to effect several extensive slum-clearance projects in which the problem of relocating families will be most acute. We are already in the midst of two big relocation jobs in connection with the Jeffries and Douglass projects. Under the present law we are limited exclusively to veterans of World War II in filling all vacancies in this temporary war housing.

This is the principal reason why we were disappointed to see the Lanham Act disposition section of H. R. 5631 dropped.

It would be very desirable from our viewpoint if this provision could be enacted at once as an amendment to the Lanham Act without waiting for the complete temporary war housing disposal program to be perfected.

I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to the other Michigan Members.

Sincerely,

EUGENE I. VAN ANTWERP,
Mayor.

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to lend my enthusiastic support to the postal pay bill—H. R. 4495—as it passed the House. The merit of this bill was clearly demonstrated by the fact that the House approved it by the overwhelming vote of 333 to 2. This constructive piece of legislation is long overdue and I vigorously urge the House and Senate conferees to approve the House version as its provisions are clearly more liberal than the Senate version. A brief glance at the following chart will show this to be so.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN H. R. 4495 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

AS PASSED BY HOUSE	AS PASSED BY SENATE
1. Increase in compensation for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service paid on an annual basis (except fourth-class postmasters) of $150 per annum.	1. Increase in compensation for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service paid on an annual basis (except fourth-class postmasters) of $100 per annum.
2. Compensation increase for hourly or part-time employees at the rate of 5 cents an hour.	2. Compensation increase for hourly or part-time employees at the rate of 2½ cents an hour.
3. Increase in compensation for fourth-class postmasters at the rate of 5 percent of their basic annual compensation.	3. Increase in compensation for fourth-class postmasters at the rate of 2½ percent of their basic annual compensation.
4. Provides for an annual uniform allowance of $100 for city and village delivery letter carriers, special-delivery messengers, motor-vehicle employees, custodial guards, elevator operators, and watchmen.	4. No comparable provision.
5. Increases the annual leave of postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to 20 days (now 15), to be cumulative to a maximum of 60 days.	5. No comparable provision.
6. Provides three additional grades for meritorious and faithful service for those postal employees who are not granted such grades under present law. Employees affected by this provision include custodial employees, employees in the Division of Equipment and Supplies, and special-delivery messengers.	6. No comparable provision.
7. Provides that employees in the postal service may count all years of service prior to July 1, 1945, toward promotions to "meritorious" grades. These grades, established for faithful and meritorious service, are limited under present law to those employees who have served a required number of years in the grade immediately preceding such grades. This provision removes this limitation and will enable employees of many years' service to obtain the higher grades.	7. No comparable provision.
8. In recognition of longevity of service increases the basic annual compensation of: (A) each postmaster at a post office of the first, second, or third class by $100 upon completion of 13 years of service, (B) each officer or employee of the postal	8. No comparable provision.

AS PASSED BY HOUSE	AS PASSED BY SENATE
service paid on an annual basis who is in a single salary grade with no provision for automatic promotion by $100 upon completion of 18 years of service, (C) each fourth-class postmaster by 5 percent of his annual basic compensation upon completion of 25 years of service.	
9. Same, but word "regular" is omitted, thereby treating regular and substitute employees alike with respect to this provision.	9. Provides that employees in the postal service, when appointed to a regular position, will be placed in grade 3 and those who are presently in regular positions in the postal service at a grade lower than grade 3 will be placed in grade 3.

PAY INCREASES

The House version provides for the modest pay increase for most postal employees of $150 a year. Fourth-class postmasters would receive a pay increase at the rate of 5 percent of their basic annual compensation and hourly or part-time employees would receive a 5-cent-per-hour pay increase. Many postal employees are compelled to accept additional employment on a part-time basis in order to eke out a livelihood for their wives and families. This is a deplorable situation. In view of the loyal and conscientious service rendered by the postal employees this modest pay increase should certainly be supported by all. It is estimated that the cost of this provision will be $75,000,000 annually.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

The House version also would provide for an annual uniform allowance of $100 for city and village delivery letter carriers, special-delivery messengers, motor-vehicle employees, custodial guards, elevator operators, and watchmen. These employees in the postal service are required to wear uniforms while on duty and yet must provide these uniforms from their own pay. Soldiers, sailors, and many other Government employees who are required to wear uniforms are not expected to furnish them. It is well known that the wear and tear on the uniforms of these employees is great. They should not be required to stand this burdensome expense. It is estimated that this provision will cost $12,500,000 annually.

ANNUAL LEAVE INCREASED

The House version increases the annual leave of postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to 20 days (now 15), to be cumulative to a maximum of 60 days. Even so, this still leaves annual-leave benefits for postal employees far below the leave benefits for other Federal employees, who receive 26 days' annual leave. The Senate version does not increase the annual leave of postal employees at all. The only way to even partially remedy the existing inequality between postal employees and other Federal employees in the matter of annual leave is to insist upon the House version. It is estimated that the cost of this provision will be $25,700,000 annually.

OTHER BENEFITS UNDER HOUSE VERSION

The House version also provides three additional grades for meritorious and faithful service for those postal employees who are not granted such grades under present law. This provision affects 50,000 employees of the postal service, including custodial employees, employees in the Division of Equipment and Supplies, and special-delivery messengers and will cost an estimated $8,000,000 annually.

In addition, the House version provides that employees in the postal service may count all years of service prior to July 1, 1945, toward promotions to meritorious grades. This will cost an estimated $25,250,000 annually.

Employees in the postal service, under both the House and Senate versions, when appointed to a position will be placed in grade 3 and those presently in positions at a grade lower than grade 3 will be placed in that grade. In effect, this eliminates the lowest two grades in the postal service. It is estimated that the cost of this provision will be $13,000,000 annually. By increasing the beginning salaries the postal service will be able to attract promising young men who will be eager to make the service their career.

The House version, in recognition of longevity of service, increases the salaries of postal employees by the amounts shown on the chart above. This reward for faithful service will serve as an incentive to all those who make the postal service a career.

It is estimated that the total cost of the House version, exclusive of the longevity provision—for which no figures are readily available—will be $159,450,000. This is small enough recognition of the loyal and efficient service rendered by our conscientious postal employees. It merits the support of every Member of Congress.

"Doc" Royal Alive in Many Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very well written, very unusual and touching article regarding my old and valued friend, Dr. Herbert Royal, of Harvard, Mass., who was recently called to his eternal reward.

This article which appeared in the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Telegram was written by an outstanding and talented member of the staff of this distinguished newspaper, Robert Cormier.

It is a fitting tribute to a great American. Dr. Royal exemplified in his life the very best qualities of the country doctor. He was tireless and self-sacrificing. Without hesitation he invariably responded to the call of duty. Possessed of rare professional skill, sound judgment, common sense, and an abiding love of his fellow man, he never faltered. There is hardly a family within a radius of several miles from his Harvard home but which at some time or other was not the beneficiary of his ministrations.

Loved, admired, and respected by all, Dr. Royal held a rare place indeed in the hearts of the community he served so diligently, skillfully and faithfully for many years. In his passing, a giant oak has fallen, a great soul has returned to his Maker. He leaves behind a grief-stricken family and a host of friends who will sorely miss him. He is widely and deeply mourned. Above all he left a lasting impress of his noble character and good works, a legacy of unexcelled example in unselfish living and constructive contributions which will long be remembered.

A STORY FROM THE COUNTRY—"DOC" ROYAL ALIVE IN MANY HEARTS

(By Robert Cormier)

HARVARD, Saturday.—Dr. Royal is dead now after giving 60 years of his life to service in this little town and the places surrounding it. They buried him a while back and it was the largest funeral the town has seen.

But a man just doesn't die after all that time. He leaves pieces of himself in the minds and hearts of the people who knew him. If you walk around the streets of Harvard, chatting with people in front of the library and on the common, you find that he is still alive in many ways.

"Doc" Royal was a country doctor, a general practitioner who started out in the "horse and buggy days" with a little black bag that served as his drugstore. There weren't many prescriptions to write. "Doc" carried his remedies with him, but they extended beyond pills and cough sirup. He gave confidence and advice and doled out common sense as well as medicine.

REMEMBERED IN DIFFERENT WAYS

A man presents many sides of his personality to many people. It isn't any wonder that Mr. and Mrs. Albert Bigelow, two of his contemporaries, remember him as a quiet, dignified man while his nurse looks back on him as a jolly fellow. In fiction, the author takes care of the inconsistencies in a man's character. In real life, a man is always moving and changing and his character is a series of impressions.

Mr. Bigelow met the doctor when he began his practice here in 1888. He was their family doctor. "Not only a good doctor," Mr. Bigelow says, "but a good friend. He was a deep one, didn't have time for gossip or small talk. Never went to card parties or things like that. A quiet man, a real 'Down easter.' Born in Maine, you know."

He remembers the days "Doc" Royal finished his rounds and dropped in at Bigelow's Meat Market to rest a while by the old stove. Tired, maybe, and worn out but not complaining. Just taking a few minutes to sit and talk a while, smoking.

RECALL LITTLE THINGS ABOUT HIM

Now that he's gone, folks remember the little things about him, the cigar, and how he always rode around in his car with the window beside him down, and the wind blowing in, summer or winter. "He was slow as molasses," people recall. "But he always got there. Never looked like he was

rushing but maybe that's why he got so much done. Sure was a busy man."

Legends are quick to spring up when a man dies, and even now Doc Royal is becoming a legendary figure. They tell about the snowshoes he wore to make his calls during certain severe New England winters. They tell about how the door to his house office was never locked, and if you knocked, he took you in whether it was noon or midnight. They tell about the time years ago when he had a call to Lancaster in midwinter. Doc hitched up one of his horses (he had four at the time and kept them all busy) and started out to answer the summons. He had hardly reached the edge of town when the snowdrifts became too high for the animal. So Doc tied the horse by the side of the road and walked the long, snow-covered miles to his patient.

BROUGHT MANY PEOPLE INTO THE WORLD

He brought a good many people into the world. The Callahan family remembers him. Mrs. Georgiana Callahan is a little old lady who mothered 10 children. Eight of the children were born here on Bolton Road. Doc Royal delivered them. "He was a wonderful man," the old woman says now, "a wonderful man for babies. We're sure going to miss him. Used to drive by the house in that slow way of his." One of the Callahan girls says, with pride, "I'm one of his babies."

There are many people like the Callahans in this section. A doctor's success can be found in what his patients say about him, not by the amount of money he made. He never wanted to get rich. But the unpaid bills are his investment in the people he served and loved. If someone didn't have the money, it didn't seem to matter to Dr. Royal. He was repaid with something greater than money. People liked him, especially kids. He had three sons of his own, but folks say he always had a yearning for a daughter. Delivered a baby girl once and told the mother, "I'll give you $2,000 for that girl." He had his girls at the end, when his granddaughters were born.

NURSE ONE OF MOST DEVOTED

During his lifetime here, he drew devotion from people. One of the most devoted was his nurse, Mrs. Ethel Scholfield. A small, gray-haired lady with a quick smile, she was town nurse for 23 years and worked side by side with the doctor. She cared for him during his last illness and stayed with him until the end.

There have been many tributes to Dr. Herbert Royal. Perhaps the greatest came when Mrs. Scholfield, standing on the sidewalk across the green common from his office, talked about him a little. "He was a great man," she said simply. Tears stood in her eyes.

Interoceanic Canals—The Atomic Bomb and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, ever since the current Isthmian Canal issue has been actively before the Congress I have examined available published literature on modern weapons, with the idea of ascertaining the potential effects of the most powerful weapon of them all—the atomic bomb—on the security of the Panama Canal as a part of the national defense system of the United States.

From time to time during the present session I have included in extensions of my remarks instructive articles and statements on the subject, as listed in the bibliography on the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States in the Extension of Remarks by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, on page A5580 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, to which special attention of our membership is invited.

Another most illuminating contribution concerning the effects of the atomic bomb, by William H. Hessler, was published in the September 17, 1949, edition of Collier's. The following biographical sketch of the author accompanies the article:

The author is eminently equipped to make these observations. He served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy during the war, witnessed the Bikini tests of the atomic bomb, and had access to all except top secret documents on the effect of radioactive explosions. Now, having resigned his naval commission, he is chief editorial writer for the Cincinnati Enquirer, and chief foreign affairs commentator on radio station WLW.

This article is adapted from Hessler's book Operational Survival, to be published by Prentice-Hall on October 17. It promises to be an important and controversial argument in the great debate on what the A-bomb means.

In his treatment of the defense problems of our Nation Mr. Hessler warns against the currently exaggerated enthusiasms and oversimplification of warfare concepts as to the effectiveness of superb instruments and controlled mechanisms, in warfare. To avoid unsound military reasoning he emphasizes what he terms "the plain facts of geography."

In this regard the view has long been recognized by many authorities that the important strategic areas in the foreseeable future are to the northward—in the vast Arctic spaces, especially in Alaska. The probable changes in the primary means of warfare have materially shifted the strategic focal points to which we have long been accustomed. The structure of the American system of defense is no longer centered around the Isthmus of Panama, but in the north polar regions, with chief reliance on military aviation and its attendant features and supports.

In view of the President's recent statement that Russia is now in possession of the atomic bomb, the publication of this informative article is most timely. It fully supports the viewpoint presented in my previous extensions on this subject, and confirms the obvious deductions I have sought to make, that the defense of any type of Panama Canal or isthmian waterway, like the defense of highways and railroads in the United States, is an over-all governmental responsibility. It depends upon the combination of our industrial capacity and military might, motivated by an unquenchable American spirit, and not upon advantageous physical conditions of passive defense features that, conceivably, may be embodied in the design of canal construction.

Permit me to commend Mr. Hessler's contribution to the consideration of all Members of the Congress, and especially to those concerned with interoceanic canal proposals and national defense.

Under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the article:

THE A-BOMB WON'T DO WHAT YOU THINK
(By William H. Hessler)

The atom bomb is a weapon generally overrated by American political leaders, probably underrated by many tradition-minded military men, shockingly misinterpreted by the scientists who invented it, and grossly misunderstood by the bulk of the people who stand to gain or lose most by its use or misuse.

To begin with, it is not a new weapon. It is simply a new and much more powerful explosive. It can kill a human being by its gamma radiation at a range of a mile. A Springfield rifle will kill at 4 miles.

The reception of the atom bomb by human society, with all the overtones of doomsday, recalls the lugubrious predictions that were made when the machine gun was invented. In 1914 the rapid-firing machine gun was a marvelous, lethal contraption. It would shoot through several husky soldiers with a single bullet. It fired 400 rounds a minute. Therefore, it was argued by its promoters and by frightened commentators, a few soldiers with machine guns could and undoubtedly would slay millions of enemy troops in a matter of days. War could not possibly go on for more than a few weeks.

As it happened, the war just then beginning went on for 4 years. The machine gun did not shorten wars by speeding up the rate of killing. It prolonged wars, by giving a new advantage to the defense and choking out the war of movement. And World War II, which brought far more devastating weapons of mass destruction and mass assassination than the machine gun, was a 6-year orgy of killing.

All that is said today of the atom bomb has been said, in years past, of other weapons at their debut. The confusion stems from the overlapping of two entirely separate points of view.

A scientist can calculate the destructive power of the A-bomb. He can tell you, in degrees centigrade and in units of blast pressure and radioactivity, just what it will do. He does this just as the mathematician of 1914 calculated the lethal power of the machine gun. He may be just as wrong.

The military man is not too much interested in knowing how much energy is released by the detonation of the A-bomb. He is interested in the demonstrated results of the new weapon. He knows that very little of the energy expended in warfare has any actual effect on the enemy. Most bullets fired in war don't hit anybody. Most shells and bombs miss their targets.

In other words, the calculated destructive power of an atom bomb is not a reliable basis for appraising its military usefulness. And that is why the scientists have led us far astray.

The fashion of our time is to prepare for another and greater war of gadgets. The plain American's view is unmistakable. What he wants—if there's to be a new war for him—is to sit in front of a large instrument panel, full of knobs, dials, and handwheels. It should be taken right out of the Westinghouse factory and mounted on Long Island. There he would like to take readings, make calculations, pull levers, and then without getting out of his seat drop atomic war heads by guided missile on targets staked out somewhere east of Tashkent.

This popular enthusiasm for gadget war is by no means an evil thing. Something of the

sort is needed, undoubtedly, to prod the lagging imaginations of legislators and military men alike. But there is a risk, a real one, that the Nation's popular interest in technology and its spawn of fascinating new weapons may divert responsible policy makers and cause them to misread and exaggerate the implications of the new technology so as to lose sight of the plain facts of geography.

Nobody will question the importance of our industrial and military technology. Like our capacity for mass production, it is a stupendous military asset. It is our arsenal, our breeding ground for new weapons and tactics. Properly maintained and fed by good research in basic science, our technology will insure our qualitative and quantitative superiority in weapons and equipment.

OBSESSION WITH GADGETS IS RISKY

But if we wander too far from sound reasoning in our obsession with gadgets atomic and electronic, we may find ourselves superbly equipped to defend some other country, yet unable to defend our own. For our military problem is always framed by certain geopolitical realities—our oceanic position, our declining natural resources, our reliance on a single interoceanic canal, the vulnerability of our coastwise shipping, and the dispersion of our allies over widely separated continents.

Leaving morals to one side, as is sometimes convenient, we must suppose that the atom bomb is the supreme triumph of technology and of science to date. We must therefore examine this weapon, not for its philosophical meaning to mankind, but as one more new instrumentality of warfare.

The atom bomb, either the uraninum-235 bomb used at Hiroshima or the plutonium bomb used at Nagasaki, destroys in an area of 2 to 5 square miles of urban territory, depending on altitude at the instant of detonation, the efficiency of the particular bomb, and the character of the terrain. The extent of property damage and human casualties depends also on the type of construction prevailing in the area.

A more powerful bomb is now in production. It will release more energy and therefore work destruction over a larger area. But the area does not increase in proportion to the augmented power of the bomb. In military terms, which are not the same as scientific terms, the more powerful the bomb the less efficient it is. For most military purposes 10 bombs, each with one tenth of the power of the Nagasaki bomb, would be more effective than was the one Nagasaki bomb. This would be true even if the 10 smaller bombs were dropped in a random pattern, and whether the target were a single large installation or a considerable area of general strategic importance.

DESTRUCTIVE POWER APPRAISED

The damage worked by the atom bomb results from the release of energy in the form of light, heat, radiation and blast pressure. Precise data such as were obtained at Bikini and Eniwetok have not been revealed, of course. But it is clear that the bomb will destroy or seriously damage reinforced concrete structures up to 700 or possibly 1,000 feet from ground zero—the point on the earth directly beneath a burst somewhat above. The bomb will ignite inflammable materials, if they are directly exposed, up to ranges of a mile or somewhat more. The heat of the bomb will inflict severe burns on the human skin, if directly exposed, up to a mile away. Even light clothing, however, will protect at this extreme range.

The radiation of the bomb is probably lethal to human beings directly exposed, up to a distance of something less than a mile. But at that range or anything near it, any shielding material of metal or masonry will give good protection. Even at "ground zero," 3 feet of concrete will stop radiation of lethal intensities. Six feet of earth will give complete protection. At a range of a half mile from the burst, a foot of concrete will insure survival against blast, heat and radiation.

On fairly level ground in an urban area rather fully built up, one may visualize the atom bomb as demolishing everything but the most solid of structures in an area of one seventh of a square mile, working very heavy damage over one half a square mile, and spreading more moderate destruction to the more exposed and vulnerable buildings over two or even three square miles. If the bomb is detonated low over a valley, the damage will be limited by the surrounding hills. Any irregularities of the terrain confer some immunity on structures and persons shielded by a rise of ground.

Persistent radioactivity is unlikely to be a factor, save in underwater bursts in fairly deep water. In most cases persons who do not receive a lethal dose of radiation at the instant of the burst are not endangered by remaining in the area of devastation or by entering it. In certain conditions alpha particles may be emitted by unfissioned fragments of the bomb. This may go on for years. But this hazard is a small one, after proper decontamination measures. And in atomic air bursts, which are the most effective in military terms, the risk of alpha radiation after the detonation is negligible.

These very general observations about the effects of the atom bomb are not exact data meant for the guidance of military planners, either Soviet or American. They are merely rough approximations intended to suggest in a rough way what the bomb does when it explodes. Now we must see in a little more detail what the bomb did at Hiroshima.

The Hiroshima bomb killed 78,500 people, or 15,000 to the square mile. One airplane, a B–29, carried the single bomb which accomplished this macabre feat. In the great explosive and fire raids on Tokyo of March 9, 1945, about 80,000 people were killed. That took about 300 B–29's instead of 1. Tokyo is much more densely populated than Hiroshima, perhaps four times more so. An atom bomb, it is therefore commonly assumed, would have killed four times as many people in Tokyo as it did in Hiroshima. And from this it is an easy step in arithmetic to conclude that 1 B–29 with 1 atom bomb is the equivalent, in killing power, to 1,200 B–29's with full loads of explosive and incendiary bombs.

This is easy arithmetic, but it is not correct. The extremely high casualties at Hiroshima stem from the fact that no warning was given to the population there. Only a few hundreds were in the shelters that could have accommodated 100,000. Had the Japanese been led to fear a single B–29 when sighted, their losses at Hiroshima might have been much less than half what they were. It must be supposed that, in future military use, the atom bomb will not always be a total surprise.

Hiroshima was typical of industrial cities all over the world in at least one respect. It was a sprawling complex of factories, transport facilities, public utilities, and actual military installations, not to mention residential areas and business districts. And even at Hiroshima, according to the Strategic Bombing Survey, although the small factories in the heart of the city were fully destroyed, the big plants on the periphery were virtually undamaged and 94 percent of their workers uninjured. These undamaged factories accounted for 74 percent of the city's production.

As for transport, the railroad lines passing through the city were repaired and ready for use 48 hours after the attack. It would have taken several atom bombs to destroy Hiroshima, a city of 343,000 people. It would take quite a number of such bombs, dropped with precision based on good intelligence data, to halt all production in a larger and more populous city such as Leningrad or Moscow or Kharkov.

But consider the problems of such a mission.

To begin with, we have no bomber aircraft that will fly from our homeland to the main centers of Soviet war industry with a bomb load and return. Such an airplane does not exist. And there is no reason to believe it will come into being soon.

The six-motored B–36 is an impressive airplane. It can carry a tremendous load of bombs, 72,000 pounds, for a limited distance. It can carry a smaller load (one atom bomb, let's say) much farther. But the B–36, even as beefed up in recent modifications, is not a New York-to-Moscow-and-return airplane. In combat conditions, it's radius of action is about 3,000 miles.

There is an easy answer to this objection, of course: Let's do our bombing of the Russians from the British Isles. Already B–29's have been flying from the great runways of East Anglia to soar over Europe in a cold-war show of force. Or let's work from Tripoli, where the United States has an airfield and could build a great bomber base. The one base area is 1,500 miles from Moscow, the other 1,600 miles from Kharkov. The ranges are practical for the B–29's and B–50's, which were until recently our heavy bombers, but which are now known as medium.

This sounds sensible. And if it works out, it is sensible. But unfortunately we have no good reason to count on the possession of usable air bases in Europe or even north Africa after the first few weeks of a new World War started on the Kremlin's signal.

It doesn't make pleasant reading in the newspapers of western Europe, but it is a fact that American strategic planners must figure on the possibility of losing all continental Europe to the Soviet armies in the first few weeks of a conflict. And a further assumption must be made: The British Isles may be neutralized soon afterward as a base for large-scale, long-range air operations.

Assuming that the B–36 could lick the question of distance, could it—being no faster than the B–29—spend 6 or 7 hours over Soviet soil en route to its target and returning, without being destroyed? There are some hard-bitten fliers who doubt it, who gravely fear that few would get through.

Gagged by their own superiors, American fighter pilots of the Air Force and Navy have had little to say on this point. But off the record they have dissented from the official Air Force dictum that the B–36 is invulnerable at altitudes above 30,000 feet. And the Russians are shrewd. Their air power goes largely into fast-climbing, high-speed pursuit planes, built especially to intercept and destroy bombardment craft.

Maybe we can protect these giant bombers of ours with fighter escorts. Well, we had better, if we want a fair share of them to come back. Bombers much like them fared badly indeed over Germany in World War II, when fighter escort was lacking. Unescorted Flying Fortresses (B–17's) were used in the early stages of the Anglo-American air offensive, until the great Schweinfurt raid of October 14, 1943; but the losses were too great. Of that force of 228 bombers, 62 were lost and 138 damaged, some beyond repair. Personnel casualties were 599 killed and 40 wounded. And as the United States Strategic Bombing Survey reported: "Such losses could not be sustained. Deep penetrations without fighter escort were suspended."

Experience leaves no doubt, then, that until the enemy's combat air power is quite well neutralized, no nation can count on putting atom bombs or any other bombs just where it wants them.

Up to this point we have dealt with the relatively simple problem of getting bombs put down on target areas, assuming all the

while that this is a fruitful enterprise. Now it is time to inquire whether the over-all objective is, in fact, worth the effort and cost. Fortunately, the performance and achievements of bombardment aviation during World War II have been fully and accurately measured by the Bombing Survey, a neutral and highly competent technical group. We have the means, therefore, of making an honest, impartial evaluation of this instrument of warfare.

In the European theater, Anglo-American forces dropped 2,690,000 tons of bombs, of which 1,350,000 tons—50.3 percent—were dropped on Germany. At the peak in 1944, 1,300,000 uniformed personnel were engaged in this strategic air offensive. Roughly half of the civilian war effort of Great Britain was devoted to the support of this single phase of the war. And what did 1,350,000 tons of bombs do to Germany? They killed approximately 500,000 people. The damage to property was stupendous. But German production of war equipment increased steadily through all this aerial fury, until late in 1944, when American forces already were in Paris and the Russians had recovered Poland.

The uses of the atom bomb and the limits of its usefulness emerge from the data on its performance. It is a very efficient means of killing people by surprise in urban concentrations—if there is any point in doing that.

But we have seen that there are clear disadvantages in destroying urban areas other than actual installations of direct military value to the enemy. The object of war is to persuade the enemy to abandon military resistance, not to kill his people and destroy the structures in which those people live and work.

By this criterion, the atom bomb should be of great utility—given the sort of war we have envisioned—against a few great industrial centers, against some oil-field developments and refineries, against some of the very largest of railway centers, and of course against seaport areas and harbor installations.

The last of these is a singularly tempting target. The second test at Bikini proved that a fission bomb detonated under water in a relatively small enclosed harbor will toss up tons of radioactive water and steam, spreading a fog of radioactive materials over the vicinity. This plagues all the ships and dock installations in a radius of perhaps a half mile. The radioactivity persists in the water and some structures for many weeks, even months. But this probably would not happen in shallow water—15 or 20 feet—because the surge of water and steam would be slight.

And this of course is of much greater interest to the United States, with its great fleet and its reliance on sea-borne trade than it is to the Soviet Union which has little of either. The United States Navy, quite properly, has taken pains to show that a task force steaming at sea is not a good target for the atom bomb. It is virtually proof against atom bombs. But the Navy should be equally concerned by the fact, which is indisputable, that a fleet at anchor in a harbor is an extraordinarily attractive and vulnerable target for atomic attack.

The atom bomb will not serve us as well as it will the Russians, once they have it and the means of delivering it to North America. Only about 14,000,000 people of the Soviet Union live in cities of a half million or more population. Our cities of that size or larger total nearly twice as many inhabitants all together. In percentage terms, 18 percent of our mainland population live in cities of 500,000 or more, while in the Soviet Union only 7 percent of its populace live in equivalent urban areas. As a matter of fact, half the people of the United States now live in 140 densely populated metropolitan areas surrounding cities of 50,000 or more population. We are an urban people; and we are just that much more vulnerable to the very technique of mass-destruction attacks which we have had the dubious honor of lifting to its greatest development!

The ratio is changing, to be sure. The Soviet Union is going through an industrial revolution which the western democracies completed long ago. The urbanization of the Russian people is proceeding swiftly. Perhaps in 10 or 20 years the pattern may not be greatly different from our own, in respect to the concentration of people in compact cities.

One thing of great importance, however, is likely to remain much as it is. American urban centers are largely in the northeastern section of the country, in the area most open to Soviet air attack—however remote such attacks may be. The main population centers of the Soviet Union are much more dispersed, in contrast, because the development of heavy industry has been far to the south and east of Moscow and Leningrad.

One careful scientist, Dr. Philip Morrison, estimates that at least 1,000 atom bombs would be needed to do the same damage to Russia as was inflicted by the Germans in the Stalingrad campaign alone. Dr. Stefan T. Possony, drawing upon a wealth of experience in bombing-target selection and bombing evaluation, concludes that it would take something like 6,500 atom bombs to bring about the total destruction of the cities of a major enemy. So an atomic blitz, a quick war for total victory, is not something to count on.

It must be added that freedom of information makes a difference—and in our case a handicap. The United States is thoroughly mapped, and its strategic centers are known to all. The precise locations of almost all important targets are available to anyone who is interested. That goes for industrial and transport bottlenecks, for outright military installations, for atomic energy installations, for steam and hydroelectric power facilities. But this is not all true of the Soviet Union, whose industries have been on the march eastward and whose newer developments, such as those for atomic energy experiments have been cloaked in a secrecy far surpassing anything that is possible in a democracy.

We face another handicap in the fact that the atom bomb is peculiarly a weapon adapted to surprise, as we proved to a stunned world in 1945. The maximum utility of atomic weapons will lie in their use without warning, as the opening phase of a war. Such an enterprise would be a difficult one for a peacefully inclined democracy to undertake. It is among the innate handicaps of democracy that the people must be persuaded to make war. For a dictatorship, that is a hurdle much more easily surmounted. So the atom bomb, in the long run, is a weapon much more likely to be used by surprise against us than the other way around.

To be realistic, we must appraise the atom bomb as a weapon which can be used in two directions. And on this reckoning our advantage shrivels away rapidly.

Yet it is only the United States, and no other power in today's world, which is advancing the principle of mass destruction from the air as the key to future victory. The United States alone is building a strategic air force planned to lay waste cities as such.

In other words, it is the American concept of strategic air power which is guiding future war into the pattern of blind devastation. And in the long run, that is the sort of war from which the United States, with its urban concentration and high technology, will suffer most disastrously.

Atom bombs and long-range aircraft will never win a war for us. The rightful place of the atom bomb in American military policy, therefore, is very restricted.

We must keep it, and develop it, and have it ready—simply in order to retaliate if it is used against us. In our lawless world that is our best hope of dissuading an enemy from launching an atomic attack on us.

But in the conditions of war that seem probable in the decade to come the atom bomb should not be thought the instrument of victory. It is only an instrument of destruction. And while some destruction is incident to any military victory, they are not synonymous.

Israel: Young Blood and Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlantic Monthly of October 1949:

ISRAEL: YOUNG BLOOD AND OLD
(By George Biddle)

TEL AVIV, April 21, 1949.—The modernistic, stuccoed, matchbox, balconied buildings; the tropical shrubs and trees; the crowds thronging the Sir Herbert Samuel Square on the shore of the Mediterranean. A vital energetic, up-to-date, youthful and enthusiastic crowd. The faces might come from any city where type, color, and dress are not too rigidly stressed; from Geneva or Lausanne, from the French towns of the Mediterranean, from north Italy or Barcelona. Nothing particular to mark them; youth, a high proportion of physical beauty, health, vitality, politeness, good nature. Many young soldiers in English uniform; boys and girls, single and in groups. A look of belonging which one had not associated with an all-Jewish population.

One sees comparatively few marked Semitic types; and fewer still of the East Side bearded, skullcapped, moth-eaten, grease-spotted, parchment-dry rabbis. One hears much German and Yiddish, but in the main Hebrew. The better-educated all speak English perfectly; a lesser number, largely from Algiers or Tunisia, French.

It is impossible to get rooms anywhere. Much building is going on. All in brick and stucco on steel girders. It continually reminds me of Rio; the heavy-ladened, tropical-odored sea air; the modern balconied architecture and the mingling of the occasionally exotic, dark-skinned, sensuous slant-eyed women and strikingly handsome boys.

Little dark-skinned Jews from the Yemen, with Arab caps, wind in and out among the cafe tables selling papers. Against the completely contemporary and highly intelligent background of Tel Aviv, they seem as alien and anachronistic as the little bearded rabbis, who look as if they changed their ideas as infrequently as their underwear—once every thousand years or so.

Lewis Brown in his history of the Jews points out that, in order to survive as a nation and retain their national identity, they walled themselves in by a tremendous and successful effort to return to the past, to the womb of their greatness. This is to me the unique and tragic fact in Jewish history; the need to perpetuate their identity, which became possible only by the renunciation of the stream of contemporary thought and life. Now for the first time in 2,000 years

they can retain their identity and also live in the present and the future. Looking at the young people, one senses an almost immediate and complete physical transfiguration.

I called on the Polanys, to whom Wellesley Aron had given me a letter. Asaph Goor, a Palestinian-born Israeli of Russian parentage, a graduate of the University of California, and a government employee in forestation, joined us.

They tell me that there are no Arabs left in Tel Aviv. They fled one and all on the outbreak of hostilities. Why? They were on comparatively friendly terms with the Jews for many years. The Jews rarely employed them, it is true, on account of the highly unionized labor conditions in Tel Aviv. But the Arabs sold vegetables and eggs. Was their departure due to cowardice or to orders from the Mufti? Probably a little of both, but mostly the latter.

Walking home with Asaph, I asked him how large a proportion of the inhabitants were refugees from Hitler's Europe. Perhaps 40,000 or 50,000, a quarter of the entire population. "Listen to this group of boys. They are talking Hungarian. Perhaps not here many days longer than you."

"I had supposed, having known the DP camps, that anyone who had been submerged in that hideous atmosphere for 5 to 10 years would be stamped a neurotic all his life."

"No. Nine-tenths of them are cured human beings. We have given them a belief in themselves; a home; a future."

"And the Irgun? I was told that it was mostly composed of DP boys whose life in the lager had turned them into gangsters."

"That is English propaganda. The Irgun was Fascist, if you want; but its leaders were patriotic and they had their own mistaken ideology. The wreck of the *Altalena*, whose hull is being salvaged for scrap iron, is the symbol of the end of their political power in Israel. The followers and hangers-on of the Irgun were toughs and gangsters. But not DP boys."

April 29: After lunch I walked to Jaffa, one of the most ancient cities in the world. The former Arab section was completely and systematically destroyed by Hebrew bombing during the war. Yet—by intent—only one mosque was damaged. I have seen no city in Europe more ruthlessly demolished. Entire blocks were heaps of rubble, the height sometimes of a two-story building.

I continued along King George V Avenue, down King Feisal Avenue around the old fortress overlooking the port, whose arrogantly solid masonry dates from the days of Suleiman and the Crusaders. All this section of old Jaffa encompasses slums as miserable as any I have seen in San Antonio, Mexico, or Algiers. Heaps of swill and rubbish lay piled by the houses. The sewage trickled down the middle of the unpaved streets. Snotty, half-naked babies and slatternly women in filthy rags crawled in and out of the dark stinking alley and among the wreckage left by the bombing.

For in Jaffa are still living many Arabs who remind me of the untouchables of Algiers; foul, diseased, smelling, rotting, and pullulating with vermin and corruption, slinking about the streets, flat-footed, with loose, dribbling lower lip; carrying with them their sacks of refuse, orange rinds, scraps of bread and meat; begging a coin or a half-smoked cigarette.

Yet through all this misery is filtering great activity. Beams are salvaged from the rubble. Walls are replastered. Stores with furniture, clothes, and food are opening up in half-demolished buildings. I am told that the rehabilitation of Jaffa with its hybrid population, squalor, and filth is a serious headache for the Government.

All over the town, buildings, streets, and sometimes entire sections are closed off with wire entanglements. But even in Tel Aviv many of the passages and doorways, as at 3 Yeshurun where I lodge, are walled up with sandbags.

April 30: Lunched at the Tel Aviv Museum, where I met Dr. Haim Gamzu, the Director, and saw a very fine retrospective exhibition of Hanna Orloff. At times her work approximates arts and crafts and is pretty weak in design, and some of her portraits are frank caricatures, and mediocre. Others of her portraits are exceedingly sensitive and sculpturesque.

The galleries were packed with young people, eager, vivacious, alert. It suggested to me what might have been the enthusiasm of the Italian youths during the High Renaissance. Often I think, too, of the same mental eagerness, democratic simplicity, pride, and prophetic sense of fulfilling a world mission that shine through the writings of Americans at the birth of our country—particularly Jefferson and the Adamses.

Three teen-aged girls chattered in front of a piece of sculpture, following through the movement of the design with animated and caressing gestures. I caught their eyes and smiled. They grinned with a delicious look of guilty happiness, as if proud of being caught stealing forbidden fruit.

In the evening I went with Ed and Itzhak Norman to hear Paul Paray conduct the Tel Aviv orchestra with Richepin at the piano. Beethoven's Sixth Symphony. Packed crowds; wild enthusiasm; ovations. Afterwards refreshments were served with cakes, wine, and the native cognac.

II

JERUSALEM, May 1.—Where Tel Aviv is all modern—but tawdry and completely lacking in architectural distinction—Jerusalem is a jumble of many styles, brought, however, into some sort of fusion by the warm color, austerity, and fine solidity of the almost universal cut stone. I was immensely impressed by the Jewish Agency Building, wrecked during the war, but already completely restored. Johann Ratner, a Jerusalem architect, designed it. The Yeshurun Synagogue by Rubin is also very fine. The Anglo-Palestine Bank by Eric Mendelsohn and the Post Office by an English architect, Harrison, who also did the Rockefeller Museum in the old city and the Government House, have great style. All these buildings have individual distinction and are a sober and intelligent adaptation of the modern. They fit well into the country's background.

I never saw so many rabbis. Most of them, of course, with sweat-stained broad-brimmed black felt hats, grease-spotted and dust-stained coats, and dull, resigned, kindly, gray-skinned faces. A few of the younger exhibit, however, a pardonable touch of vanity. Great calflike eyes; a cream and pink complexion; pouting lips and coquetishly combed side curls.

After lunch we walked to the National Museum of Bezalel. Dr. Schiff showed us his archaeological treasures; some Bakst drawings, and a really fine exhibition of prints: Rembrandt, Jean Calot, Delacroix, and French modernists.

A charming little drawing of Klee, done in 1911. It had an easy spontaneity; it seemed the natural idiom of this much overrated petit-maître. How often does the personal gesture or expression of the artist become institutionalized into the cold empty shell which no longer houses a living, growing organism.

I showed Dr. Schiff and the others my drawings of the Nuremberg trials and of the Dachau and Landsberg DP concentration camps. I think they were really touched when I said I wished to present them to the museum. He asked me how I could do this. I said that I had always realized they had a very real historical significance, apart from any artistic value; that I had kept this collection together, feeling that it should go to the Library of Congress or some Palestinian institution; and that I was glad it would be housed with him.

May 3: I went sketching to Ein Karem, the birthplace of John the Baptist, with Nancy Norman, a Dutch photographer, William Van Der Poll, and a German writer, Hilda Kristeller. She told me that she had spent 2½ years in German concentration camps: Westerbork, Teresienstadt, Auschwitz, Bergen, Belsen, and Kleine Festung. She had worked for the underground, passing many women and children into Holland. She was caught carrying arms for the underground. I said to her, "There are few, indeed, who went to Auschwitz and received a subsequent transfer. You were lucky." She answered me: "My husband was killed at Dachau 3 days before the American liberation." Subsequently I learned that she was made an honorary citizen of Holland for her work.

I sketched in the olive groves below Ein Karem. The grass is jeweled with poppies, Queen Anne's lace, wild geranium, and a great variety of other flowers. The air, clean and fresh. Bands of boys and girls walked by singing.

In the village I heard a number of charming little boys talking Spanish together. I asked them where they had learned it, for they spoke a pure Castilian. They were Sephardic Jews from Turkey and Yugoslavia, where their ancestors had been living for 400 or more years, since their expulsion from Spain by Ferdinand and Isabella.

May 4: From my window I can see the low ridge of Mount Scopus, the Mount of Olives, the cedars behind the English Cemetery, and the Hebrew University. The windowpanes of my room have many small holes in them, pierced by spent shrapnel.

I watched the liberation-day parade from the wooden grandstands on the Jaffa Road. For an hour the troops marched by. They looked as tough and seasoned as the soldiers from the English Eighth Army or our own best divisions which I had seen in Africa or Italy, yet different. During the hour-long parade—with two exceptions, a driver and a wounded man—no soldier smiled at the crowd that cheered and clapped continually. Pride, exultation, tension, a tremendous overflow of physical vitality. But it was not the haughty overbearing pride of Russian and German troops. It was the almost mystical look of dedication, sublimation, of the young boy approaching confirmation. The men were occasionally out of step, but as they passed the reviewing stand, their muscles knotted and stiffened as they saluted; their shoulders twisted back and their eyes stared out in rapture.

Mr. Samuels, my guide, said to me, "When the Arabs attacked us in the old city we had one Bren gun, which we fired from window to window. The soldiers were armed with sticks. With our present equipment we could have been in Bagdad or Bokara. The Arabs were well officered, but cowards, and ran at the least excuse."

III

May 7: To the Rebareles Yeshiva, an advanced or fanatical Hasidic synagogue. The holy scholars and rabbis draped in their black and white woolen or silken tallithim—which reminded me of a painting of Chagall's—stood or sat, shouting, wailing, or chanting their prayers. Some beat the desks and tables with their heads; others jerked forward in frenzy, as if in the act of copulation. Most of them wore the long familiar gray or black caftans, with wide lapels. Some had velvet coats, crimson, yellow, or plum-colored. Usually they hung their fur hats on nails and placed on their heads the little black skullcaps—the yarmulka. These fur hats or streiml originated in Poland during the Middle Ages. At first, as a mock

crown of thorns, they were intended to ridicule the Jews. Now they are made of 13 skunk tails, as emblems of the 13 Jewish articles of faith.

Later we went to a Rumanian Yeshiva, where the behavior was more orthodox. The music seemed Gregorian.

In a Hungarian Yeshiva the Kohanim, or those of the priestly caste, in the ceremony of duchaning, were blessing the community; the tallithim spread over their heads, their hands extended in front of them. This is only done by the Cohens, the aristocracy of the descendants of Aaron, of the tribe of Levi.

In the street Mr. Samuels said: "See this lovely creature approaching us. She is a Hungarian. That charming coiffure is a wig. For she was, of course, a virgin when she married; and she shaved her head to make herself palatable and acceptable to her husband. She wears that wig, the shaytel, only on the Shabat, or on other holidays."

At the Cafe Wien I talked with Gershon Agronsky, the editor of the Palestine Post. "There are four strata of people in Israel," he said. "The young generation, who were born here and fought in the war; who grew up with Hebrew as their language; who 'belong.' They are at the core of those impulses which will mold the coming type in Israel, as they will mold its history. Then there are the foreign intellectuals and professionals; Germans, Americans, English, who bring with them the culture and background of their native lands. Such are the scholars, Dr. Schiff, Moshe Gordon, and Dr. Haim Gamzu. They cling to their language and traditions, since these are part of their personal identity. Thirdly, there are the immigrants and DP's, whom one can sometimes recognize by the persistent look of tension in the eye, the wasted or bloated frame, the yellow skin. Lastly, there is the remnant of medievalism and the Orient: the Hasidic scholars, the Yemenites, Algerians, Persians, and Kurds. This element is largely concentrated in Jerusalem, which is perhaps—with Nazareth and Beersheba, both Arab towns—the most picturesque and least typical city in Israel. The first three will quickly fuse; perhaps in a generation; for they pull toward a common goal, united Israel."

I asked him, too, how the enlightened Jew feels about the orthodox and religious zealots.

"The Government need take no steps to liquidate or even modify these elements," he answered. "They are fast disappearing. Perhaps as rapidly as in New York. Fifty years ago they were the dominant element in Jerusalem, socially and politically. The Government will hasten the process of disintegration by cleaning up the unsanitary quarters; and eventually by new housing and the hopes of a better life. For my own part, I look upon their gradual disappearance with nostalgia and regret. They may be counted as the few idealists and mystics in a material world. They want nothing of the world's goods; and if the mediation, study, and prayer of a lifetime will result in the correct transposition of a comma in the Talmud, their work on earth has been to them fruitful and justified."

"I have nothing of the mystic in me," I replied. "Like all Americans, my approach is pragmatic. When I think, however, of Raphael Soyer, Max Weber, or of the many Jewish artists and intellectuals whose fathers were rabbis, I cannot feel that retrogressive religious mysticism is the only answer to materialism and mammon. In his search for salvation, does not the Jewish mystic shut out the world—much as did the medieval Christian hermit—as a necessary evil? He looks only inward to find his God and happiness. Retrogression has been occasionally a historical necessity. But creative vision will always be seen through eyes that are focused on the future."

IV

May 10: I reached the Nvey Eitan Kibbutz about 6 o'clock in the evening, on the bus from Afula. The Khamsin had been blowing for 2 days from the desert. The temperature touched 100 degrees Fahrenheit. Rachel Kolin Langsam met me and led me to her home. She and her husband are one of four families, each owning a single room in the small, low, tin-roofed cottage.

In the little white-plastered room were a narrow bed, two chairs, a table, and a combination bureau and wardrobe, with a few bits of glass on the shelves. There were a few snapshots of their three small children, pinned to the walls; and a graphophone, plugged into a corner. On the porch outside were stacked two or three canvas-backed chairs. There were electric lights but no running water.

The children sleep and attend their classes in separate dormitories and study rooms. Rachel took me to the men's showers and somewhat rudimentary toilets in an outbuilding. When I had washed, she introduced me to her husband and brought in supper from the communal dining room.

We ate black bread and fresh butter, canned sardines and canned herring, cream cheese, jam, stewed apples, and tea. Later we sat out on the mosquito-infested lawn with friends of the family, and chatted in broken German and Hebrew until 11 o'clock. Rachel served hot tea and cognac. I was drugged with fatigue. Too tired to sleep.

The next morning we breakfasted in the communal dining quarters. She then walked me about the Kibbutz, showing me the new air-conditioned dining hall, the motor pool, cow sheds, chicken coops, and children's quarters. I made drawings of some of the babies sleeping in the out-of-door nursery. I left for Ein Harod, the large processing Kibbutz and artist rest house, before lunch.

At Nvey Eitan are about 90 families. The 180 adults live in some 35 small houses. The hundred children are housed in their own dormitories and nurseries. Most of these Jews come from Cracow and have been living here 18 years. The children go to nursery schools until 6 years old, when they begin their serious studies. The adults work from 6 till 8, when they breakfast; from 9 till 12, when they dine and rest; and again from 3 until 6, when they bathe and have supper. Each member gets a 10-day holiday a year. Rachel works in the hospital; her husband drives a tractor.

Perhaps 60 percent of the farming in Israel is worked by Kibbutzim. One reason is that agriculture here is more highly mechanized than in any other country except the United States. Private owners on small farms could not successfully compete with them.

I asked Rachel about the immigrants. One is apt to forget that about 200,000 of them—that is, 1 person in every 4—came here during the war year, the first year of Israel's national life; and that perhaps 400,000—1 person out of 2—have come here during the past 15 years. She said, "Of course they raise serious problems. Most of them have lived in cities and are not inclined to make over their life in the country. Others are not sympathetic to communal ownership and would prefer working for their own profit. Still others are physically unfit and ignorant as farmers. Those who are inclined to try the experiment are given a year's training, when a final decision is made."

Rachel told me that when they first came to Ein Harod the country was wild and had never been under cultivation. The tall Palestine thistle grew 8 feet high and choked out vegetation. The Arabs had never seen motors, and ran in fear from automobiles. For years they shot at and ambushed the Jews. Those were hard times. Now the Jews get on well with the Arabs, who very slowly adapt themselves to western standards. I asked Rachel what they most needed. She answered—as has everyone—"More settlers and more capital. With borrowed money and more workers this country could support twice the population. Of course, the immigrants are a grave problem. But we shall meet it. We must offer asylum to all the Jews of the world who would come here. And quickly. Before the next war. For then it will be too late."

The Kibbutzim are to me the most interesting thing in Israel. They supplied the core of the crack fighting troops, which saved the nation. Here you see the faces—lean, hard, tanned, self-reliant, intelligent, sober; yet full of faith, hope, and confidence—that are the promise of the future of the country and explain the success with which to date the young state has met its prodigious challenge. Many farmers in America could not stand the austerity of Rachel's life. In certain ways it is as creative and satisfying as that of her aunt, Helena Rubinstein.

V

May 12: I visited the Al Hamei Tiberia baths a mile below the walled-in town of Tiberias. Here was a melting pot of the Jews of four continents. Hasidic elders in long yellow and black or rose-colored striped gowns; European Jews, speaking English, German, or Yiddish; Druse women, squatting in the shade, eyes and mouths hid with white burnooses; tattooed Bedouins from the desert; city Arabs in western dress with thinly veiled faces; Yemenite women in close-fitting embroidered black trousers, tucked into long GI woolen stockings; Yemenite men with flowers embroidered in wool on white vests; Sephardic Jews from Turkey or Persia; soldiers; boys and girls in the universal khaki shorts or slacks and khaki shirts; and the attendants in short white togalike gowns and green aprons above their brown legs and sandaled feet.

Inside, swathed in sheets and resting on marble slabs, the bathers talked in Yiddish, Rumanian, Polish, German, English, and Hebrew. In the hot sulphur pool an old fat white-bearded Jew held on to the rail, bobbing majestically up and down and quite immersing his fine, heavy-featured patriarchal and hirsute countenance. He looked for all the world like some old Greek sea god or Poseidon; or a kindly, heavy-lidded and venerable porpoise.

The heavy walls of cut stone circling the old Roman city, and the bastions and towers built by Tiberius, are still standing. He, too, unquestionably bathed in the hot sulfur Al Hamei Tiberia baths. To the casual traveler these walls are the only enduring symbol, in these parts, of the splendor of Roman civilization. Like the petrified footprints, or bones, of huge mastodons, these skeleton vestiges of the tremendous energy and life drive of former civilizations are to me very dramatic.

What dynamic drive the Arabs must have had. How can one explain their architecture and achievements in mathematics, war, medicine, and the humanities in terms of the apathy, filth, disease, degradation, and laziness of their descendants? I have felt the same way in attempting to measure the furious thrust of the Spanish conquistadores in some lazy, half-buried Guatemalan town, rotting away in apathy, pellagra, and undernourishment.

May 14: In the very old synagogue in Safed, the elders were preparing for the Feast of Lag b'Omer at Meron. Here many hundred years ago was buried the miracle worker, Rabbi Simon ben Yochai, author of the Zohar. Another American (an unorthodox Russian Jew from New York) and I were invited in to hear the singing. It struck both of us that there were no young, westernized Jews in the synagogue. Everywhere one has the impression that religion

here has less hold on the people than in any Catholic community in America. The old men were very polite and friendly. They invited me, as a special honor, I am told, to take the roll of parchment with the torah from its little closet and present it to the reader.

At a guess, my acquaintance tells me 1 out of 10 Jews here is strictly orthodox. In New York it may be one out of a thousand. What probably broke down the ritualism in the U. S. A. is the necessity of doing business and taking money on Saturday. Here, for instance, no food is cooked on Saturday, although it is "kept warm" in the kitchen. In my apartment house at Tel Aviv the electric lights in my room were cut off Friday night.

VI

NAZARETH, May 15.—I wandered about the streets of Nazareth with my bags, looking for a place to sleep. An all-Arab city, with only Jewish soldiers. A young Arab, Hanna Jurban, insisted—much against my inclination—on taking me to his home and introducing me to his mother, aunts, sisters, and four brothers. Half the Nazarenes are Communists, easily propagandized on account of their present unhappy economic plight. Two of Hanna's brothers argued with—or rather attacked—me quite bitterly. When, in reply to their questioning, I told them that Wallace was a politically discredited man, they retorted, "That is because you only read the capitalistic, bourgeois press. You will hear from Wallace, the greatest man in America." They asked me about free education. "But in Czechoslovakia even if I visit it for 2 months I am given the best free education and my expenses are paid," and so forth. As to the Marshall plan: "And you know what Marshall is doing in Lebanon? He is sending them nothing but fountain pens and typewriters, to get rid of your surplus stock. Will that feed us?" They were, however, all deeply interested in the prices of United States articles, particularly shoes, safety razors, automobiles, hotel rooms, food. Their hatred against the Jews occasionally blazed out. "For us May 15 was a day of sadness. But we shall fight again." I have seldom seen greater disillusion and frustration.

May 16: Left Nazareth early after visiting the sacred churches and underground cave where Mary and Joseph may have lived on their return from Egypt. In Haifa I lunched with Harry Beilin of the foreign office the following day.

"Three years ago," I said, "when I was told that the English were afraid to allow greater immigration or concessions to the Jews in Palestine, because they dreaded a Pan-Islamic uprising that would threaten war in the entire Orient, I always answered that two first-class motored divisions could police the entire country. I felt then, as events have shown, that the Arabs were about as dangerous as so many North American Indians in modern mechanized war. The English must have known that a strong and friendly state of Israel was the best guaranty for the protection of their interests in Asia Minor. How could they have been so stupid?"

Beilin answered, "Many believed, and Bevin believed, in the myth of Arab superiority. He actually thought that when they left the country on May 15, it would be overrun in 2 weeks, and that the English would be recalled by the 30th."

"But why, then, did he not do all that he could to strengthen the Jews during the mandate?"

"Bevin—and the English Foreign Office, which still on certain questions thinks in terms of 1750; that is, where the Empire is concerned—felt that they could handle the Arabs if they were victorious. The Jews would be tougher bargainers."

It is tragic to think that the English of Churchill's Their Finest Hour should have shown themselves so morally corrupt, so unchivalrous, ungenerous, and politically stupid, as they did in their behavior toward the most democratic and intelligent people in Asia.

After lunch I went by bus to visit the old walled city of Acre. The bastions about Tiberias looked in places 7 feet thick. But the walls surrounding Acre, inside the moat, were about 30 yards wide; the bastions, angled out into the moat, were another 7 meters in depth. There is a brutal massiveness about these Norman strongholds. Yet it was the same race that built the French cathedrals. Or was it? The Crusaders were fighting robber barons. How much of the inspiration of the cathedrals came from Italy and Byzantine culture?

May 21: Jean Norman had made appointments for me to do portrait sketches of Meskin and Hanna Rovina of the Habima Theater.

I made a fine drawing of Meskin and showed it to him. "It is all right," he said, "but you have made me look 25 years younger." He is about 50, entirely bald, with a heavy, bulbous, intelligent, and sympathetic face. He was quite the grand old man, but jovial and friendly. He had played twice in America. I asked him what he thought of Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne and of Helen Hayes. He couldn't recall their names and did not seem interested.

Hanna Rovina has a sensitive, rather tragic face. She told me that the Habima had started in Russia 25 years ago. They had always acted in Hebrew, although they had been trained by Stanislavsky in the tradition of the Russian theater. "You have fine actors in America," she said, "but no theater."

I understood what she meant when I visited the Habima that night. The stage settings were very simple and the actors were costumed in long, flowing robes. The play was based on some Bible story. The groupings were splendid, formal, and constantly shifting and regrouping. Both the scenery and the studied, nobly statuesque and dramatic groupings reminded me of Giotto. I felt that here was material for a whole series of mural paintings.

May 22: The PIO got me a plane to fly down to Sodom—the Sodom of Genesis—on the Dead Sea. As we approached the Dead Sea the sullen landscape became more terrifying in appearance. The black crust of the earth was split with broad chasms. Canyons, barrancas, arroyos, dried-up rivulets, wriggled and zigzagged in all directions. One would suppose that not a living thing, a lizard, a bird, a plant, could suck nourishment or moisture from that torrid, salty, sun-baked clay. The earth was totally without color, but ranged from a dead black to every tone of gray and dirty white, by the edges of the sea.

After lunching with the soldiers I did sketches of two uniformed girls in the transport corps. Both were born in Jerusalem of Russian parents. Hester Segal had high cheekbones, black hair, and a dark skin. She was broad-nosed, with slant hazel eyes, a wide sensual, proud mouth, the corners easily flickering into a charming smile. A good deal of Tartar in her I would suppose. I jokingly asked her if she had killed any Arabs. She answered quite casually, "In Jerusalem."

The other girl was named Arna Mer. She had a fine low forehead, extreme delicacy of feature, a small mouth, honest, dark blue eyes, and a broad column of a neck, set on ample shoulders. She was a red-cheeked, yellow-haired Valkyrie, a Gagnerian Nordic. Like many of the girls in uniform, she wore shorts and worked barefooted.

May 23. The PIO took me to the improvised set of buildings on the outskirts of the town which constitute the foreign office—to a reception for Moshe Sharett, who had flown in from Paris 2 hours earlier. There were about a hundred members of his staff and the foreign office, gathered in a small garden. He spoke to them off the record, very informally, for an hour. This gifted man was born, I believe, in Russia but came here as a child. I am told he speaks with absolute fluency his native Hebrew, Arabic, Russian, Polish, English, French, German, and Turkish. He has a look of deep and gentle intelligence. He smiled frequently. The listeners laughed continuously at his anecdotes. It was very nice the way he seemed to gather them into his confidence.

VII

May 24. This last week many trees have burst into bloom; hibiscus bushes, the beautiful cobalt-violet jacaranda, which must have been imported from Central America, and the feathery old-rose blossoms of the tamarisk trees. But the flowers are mostly gone from the meadows, and the fields are a seared yellow where the crops have been mowed. I took off for the Lydda Airport at 6:30 a. m.

My visit to Israel has been uneventful; certainly much less exciting than the stay in Germany during the Nuremberg trials or the year in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy during the war. Yet it has cleared for me many Jewish problems. It makes me feel that every anti-Semite ought to be sent down here for a month. He would probably return an anti-Semite; but his prejudices would get some pretty rough jolts. A visit here destroys once and for all the myth that Jews are a type apart—physically or morally. Whenever we contrast a Jew with someone else, we isolate him as a species and begin to attribute to him characteristic. When we see him with a Nordic, we don't say, "Nordics have qualities that differentiate them from other people." We say, "All Jews have special characteristics." Actually, of course, there is far more difference between certain Frenchmen than between most Frenchmen and most Jews; far more difference between certain Americans or Italians than between most Americans and Italians and most Jews. At the end of a few days here, with the multiplicity of types, we entirely forget that they are all Jews, and we begin to distinguish between the Russians, who came first and are the best-looking, the most intelligent, the aristocrats; and the Poles, who came after the First World War, the sturdy, broad-cheeked, tough Kibbutz workers; and lastly those who came since the last war, the Germans and the Sephardic Algerians and Orientals, the lowest and the least assimilated types.

I think it would be just as important for Jews to visit Israel. It might rid them of some of their inferiority complexes, their overcompensation, and other neuroses. For the qualities that most characterize the younger generation, which was born here, are self-confidence, faith, manliness, and pride—the pride that never has to shout or boast or bully.

And all this of course implies another lesson that it's well to hold in mind—the speed with which physical environment and spiritual drive can create type.

But for me the real excitement has been to watch in its early germination a social and moral experiment in government. Other nations have professed, but Israel is putting into practice, asylum, without prejudice as to origin, to all Jewish victims of religious persecution. They boldly proclaim: We must, we can, and we will integrate them all into our national ideal: the Algerian, the Yemenite, the Oriental, the Russian, Polish, English, German, African, or Chinese.

And they have done this during their first bitter war year, during the throes of the creation of a new state, at the rate of one-quarter of the total population the first year, without any wealth or housing facilities or capital resources; relying, of course, heavily on the hope of American help; but even more on the spiritual faith that burst into flame in the concentration camps of Europe.

Radio Executive Speaks of United States as a Land of Unlimited Opportunity for Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this article by Robert J. Dean, president of the Black Hills Broadcasting Co., of Rapid City, S. Dak., is one of the most inspiring that it has been my pleasure to read for a long time. Mr. Dean gave this material in a speech before Beta Chi Chapter of Eta Kappa Nu at the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, May 11, 1949.

The article follows:

I confront you with the universal challenge with which all of us are presently confronted: the challenge of an electronic-atomic race for the political domination of the world. This is a generic thought which must of necessity underline all others, regardless of what we do or who works for whom.

Americans are much the same from Maine to California. They, like those of us in this room, who are "they" to all those outside this room—we, that is, hate to face facts. Particularly when they are too obvious. In the late World War it was a race of the first with the most, today it is a race of scientific brains.

One afternoon last February I was faced with an amazing truth, which seemed more amazing when it was brought to the very doorstep of our State. I heard a most startling half-hour dissertation by the Chancellor of the University of Nebraska. He said, "Virtually all great thought leading to questions and later to their inevitable answer has grown in the minds of students, not in the huge universities of the world, but in the small colleges and schools where small groups work together under a common tutelage." He cited the case of a young boy who came from a Nebraska farm, a boy by the name of Kiselbalch, who, after graduating from the University of Nebraska and upon a very meager thread of hearsay evidence, traveled to Austria, there to ferret out the works of an Austrian monk, who had died 50 years previously. It seems that this monk had devoted much of his life to cross-pollinization of beans and peas, and he had finally grown a species of short-stemmed, long, tender-bodied beans, which are now commonplace, the world over. He had likewise developed a large-podded pea, with a sweet, delectable seed, much more edible than when found in its native state. Kiselbalch came back home with an idea that has revolutionized the entire maize-growing of the earth: Hybrid corn. He and a chap named Harold Beadle produced the first tall, full-kerneled corn in America, and they and their successors have developed an ear upon which they can determine the number of kernels in any row and the actual length and size of the ear. A Nebraska farm boy, who graduated from the State's school when it was much smaller than it is today.

Another student majoring in chemistry was struck with the thought that some atoms of hydrogen and some atoms of oxygen might weigh less than other like atoms, and he set out to learn whether or not all H_2O weighed the same. Discovering the radical, quite by accident, he was able to produce what is known as heavy water and received, for this discovery, the Nobel prize. That boy's name was H. C. Urey—fresh from a ranch from our neighboring State, Montana, and a graduate of that State's university.

The use to which heavy water might be put was not important at the moment; that it could be manufactured was important. Not long after we heard of the word "cyclotron" and of smashing the atom and of a very scarce metal called uranium and U–235, we began hearing about a boy who had become a doctor of science at the University of California. His name was Ernest Lawrence and it was he who, one afternoon in a physics class at our own State University conceived the idea of chain reaction. Small schools—not great universities—give time and space for the creation of inventive giants.

Two boys growing up one State apart in two small schools conceived two ideas that gave the world the greatest miracle of science of all time, the release of atomic energy. Heavy water was to become the most important link in the release of the energy of the atom. Heavy water, born in the brain of Urey of Montana; chain reaction, born in the brain of Ernest Lawrence—both boys the product of small, unimportant schools.

The South Dakota School of Mines and Technology is no exception to the rule. Sherman D. Gregory, from Pierre, graduated from the school of mines in 1926 with an EE degree and immediately thereafter joined Westinghouse Electric, later to manage the Westinghouse radio station KDKA, in Pittsburgh. From there he moved to the management of WNBC in New York, and in 1943 became the manager of all NBC-operated stations. In one of his letters to a former professor of the school he wrote:

"Having lived in Pittsburgh, where the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology are located, two different times during the past 14 years, and having been an instructor in radio at Carnegie Tech night school for 2 years, I have not been entirely out of touch with the progress that is being made in the field of higher education. I don't know of any high-grade engineering school in the country where ambitious young men can get a sound engineering education at as low a cost as at the School of Mines and Technology."

If we were to choose from the 300-odd EE grads of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology the man who has contributed the most actual creative work, we would no doubt choose a boy from Mitchell, whom the alumni records list as Percival Deforest McKeel. He had two strikes on him to start. The famous name Deforest, and onerous Percival. After graduation in 1927, he, too, went to Westinghouse where, under Dr. Frank Conrad, then assistant chief engineer, now know as the father of radio broadcasting, McKeel got his start. He has since designed a portable field intensity measuring unit, a continuous recording field intensity measuring unit, and through a series of progressive creations, he became the associate manager of the Institute of Radio Engineers. In 1947 he became adviser of the International Telecommunications and Air Navigation Aid of CAA. He now represents the United States in London, Paris, Montreal, or wherever the Provisional International CAA organizations meet. It was he who made possible the first radio teletype machine.

Of course, most of you have heard of C. J. Burnside. For many years Burnside was the vice president in charge of transmitter construction for Westinghouse at Baltimore, Md. Answering a questionnaire mailed to alumni members in 1947, under the caption, "Former positions held since 1942," Burnside wrote: "Same as present," and then in parenthesis he added, "Just in a rut." I have been in the Westinghouse factories at Pittsburgh, its radio station and also its huge electronics plant at Baltimore, and I know what a comfortable rut "C. J." has been in. During his tenure of service with Westinghouse he has climbed the ladder steadily and effectively and it was he who was chosen to install the first radio station in the Vatican City. During the recent war he supervised the production of more than four hundred million dollars worth of radio and radar equipment for his firm. This meant stepping up the company's production level more than 80 times its prewar level. He is now in private consultant work and is one of the most honored engineer in the country, having as one of his first clients none other than Westinghouse Electric.

It is really of signal note that 98 percent of the graduates of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology are, today, following their chosen line of work. I could tell you about Tracy Jarrett, James Zimmerman, and dozens of others who have gone out from this school and almost immediately landed in positions of supreme responsibility. I mention these to bring home to you how closely knitted our modern living, modern working, modern thinking is with the world picture. We are in a mad race to see how we may use science to gain the balance of power in Wendell Willkie's One World. And when you leave this school you will find that your assignment will be in a building operated by a large electronic manufacturer who is either making or contracting to make radio, radar, or kindred equipment for huge airplanes in our 70-group air force, for the Navy, or for some other branch of Uncle Sam's armed might, all of which is tied in to this one consuming thought: Defense of the American way.

As I travel as a plain ordinary citizen across this country, interested mainly in my own field, it is my good fortune to speak to a number of the men who are in the higher brackets of radio, television, facsimile, and the broadcasting network business. Also, I have an opportunity to speak with many people in Washington who are in close touch with Uncle Sam's plans, worries, and top secrets, and in every case the conversation always returns to one hurdle or impediment in the progress of the world—Russia. One man said to me, "Whenever there is one predatory animal loose in the forest, it is not safe for any child to live there." Another said that for a rest he had been on a safari in Africa immediately after the late war. He was in the last two wars as an espionage agent for Uncle Sam, had been in Russia after the war, in Germany during the war, and finally was mustered out in Italy. He said that one hot night they were having what they call a "sundowner" in front of their tent. A sundowner, in Africa, is the same thing a Zombie is in the South Sea Islands. He said, in fact, that the sun went down two or three times while they were sitting there. One of the guides was a very well educated man, though a native bushman, and he made the observation concerning world problems, "An elephant can have a flea but a flea cannot have an elephant." Upon being questioned by my friend as to the meaning of this sage observation, the native said, "A big country like Russia can have a little country, but a little country cannot have a big country."

It worries me and it should worry you to constantly be aware of the fact that time is working to the advantage of the predatory enemy. It worries me and it should worry you to know that the B–29 bombers which were interned during the war are being duplicated by that enemy; and if this were in any other time in the history of this country or the world, the predatory actions which seem so commonplace and ordinary would have caused such alarm that we would long since have called the bluff and delivered an ultimatum to that potential enemy, demanding a clarification of his position within 48 hours under penalty of war—a shooting war. We who have the most powerful weapon of war known to man are hoping against hope that we will never again have to use it, knowing good and well that with the kind of activity that's going on right beneath our nose we will have to use it—or worse—in order to

settle some grave, serious, and unmistakably conflicting political difference on the world scene. By the time we have goaded ourselves into this grim and firm decision sufficient time will have elapsed so that the balance of power will have slipped.

This may seem a stern and severe stand for someone this far away from the larger national scene. It may sound like warmongering to some, who still believe all nations are bound under international law to keep the peace. But if Patrick Henry were alive today standing in the same spot in which he stood in 1777, you would hear an impassioned speech that would sound strangely familiar: Men may cry peace, peace—but there is no peace. Our men are already in the field.

Today it is not a question of liberty or death, it is a question of liberty for the peace-loving countries of the earth or the finality of all living creatures' existence. I should like to quote, before I leave you tonight, from the closing chapters of a book which I have written and which will be published this month under the title, "Living Granite," and I wish to say that these lines are not for previous publication:

"I saw the work (Rushmore) in many stages as it was being done. I have looked at the monument many times since work on it ceased and constantly its meaning impresses itself more deeply and clearly into my consciousness. It says to me things like these: While it is essential that we take our full and effective place in a union of nations, fulfilling our responsibility for the peace and welfare of the world, we need not, we must not, enter into crippling and limiting agreements with other individual nations. America must stay free, and use the force of her freedom and strength in the task of establishing a united world; she must work to that end without ceasing. We, as a Nation, must lead the way as the Mount Rushmore four led us.

"It is a long and difficult task that is set for us, but those four—and Borglum—believed its successful completion was possible. The world can live in perpetual peace; international relations can, and must, be founded on the simple, elemental teachings of Jesus Christ. But to achieve this, one powerful free nation must lead the way with unquestionable sincerity, fervor, and faith. There is only one nation in the world capable of this, and that is America, which was founded and has maintained herself on the principles laid down by the Rushmore four. Vigilant and forthright thinking, such as theirs was, must prevail in the common mind of the American Nation. There must be constant, unrelenting diligence on the part of every American in the task of spreading the freedoms we cherish throughout the world."

I am reminded, as I look at the young men in this room who soon will leave the halls of science and electronics to embark on the most exciting voyage of practicality, of something Gutzum Borglum said at Mount Rushmore the morning when the Boy Scouts of several States were gathered together for one of their annual jamborees. We were up to our hips and shoulders in Boy Scouts, their young eager faces peering from every tree, rock, and perch. George Bruntlett introduced the speaker, Mr. Borglum, who stood with his eyes glued to the ground as he listened to the flowery introduction. Then he stepped forward and I'm sure that every boy worth his salt in that audience was affected at that moment, but not so much as Borglum. He stepped to the microphone and looked into those faces. Then he looked at the mountain, then into the intent faces of the boys again. They were all alike in their eager waiting, but different in many details. There were red heads, black heads, yellow heads; long noses, snub noses, big ears, and ears hidden by mops of hair—a thousand American boys. There were tears in Borglum's eyes and for a moment he could not speak at all. Then he said, "Men of tomorrow——" He stopped, his lips trembling as tears flowed over onto his cheeks. He swallowed quickly but was unable to get the words past that thing in his throat. I will not continue with his sage and scholarly speech to those lads. I will only give you the lesson he gave them. "Men of tomorrow, men who will take over most of the management of this great country in your time, we only have courage and dreams in a few men. Courage and dreams, but dreams amount to nothing unless we have the courage to go on and on through life and realize that those dreams have got to become real. A dream is just as important as writing your name in water unless you have the courage to freeze it into form and make it intelligible, so that the people around you can understand it and care for it."

You men of tomorrow have been very singularly fortunate in gaining the knowledge you have here in the shadow of the great shrine of democracy, a daily reminder of the very things I have been saying to you here tonight, a reminder that the great truths of American democracy, the great thought enshrined in this tremendous monument to the spirit of a nation, to a system of government by the people, to the principles which your father and his father's father stood for, fought for, and died for, must not perish from this earth.

You are not simply in a race between men. The competition in your field is far and away beyond that. You are fighting a war and waging a conflict on two fronts; and wholly dependent on how well you think, how hard you work, and how far you go, will rest the fate of this, your native land and mine.

Meanwhile, in our workaday tasks, we are moving onward, building faster and better than any men on earth, living better, fearing less, more faithful to the teachings of God, yet going at such a pace in this commercialized age that we seldom look up to recognize the powerful facts which face us. And so, to conclude this series of observation, this warning of an epochal challenge: if you leave this room tonight with no other thought of what I have said and carry away with you nothing more than this, I shall be very well repaid for having said it: There is no peace on this earth, as there is no safety in the forest, where one predatory nation lives; and your all-out effort in whatever you may do in your field will not be sufficient unless you are forthrightly mindful, fearful, and militantly cognizant of the one threat to your success, the success of America and the peace of the world * * * the threat of communistic domination. May God grant that you, when you leave this hallowed spot, may carry with you the remembrance that here rests the shrine and burns the torch of freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom to worship God and to speak as you will and carry that torch into every field you enter and every place you go, that this America which gave you birth, gave you opportunity and gave you freedom shall be kept free so that you will be free to live in it, work in it, and love it, during all the days of your life.

Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, as shown by the bibliographical compilation of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, page A5580, has become a national issue.

As contributions toward the intelligent discussion in the Congress of the national security features of that issue, I have, during the present session, included in extensions of my remarks several interesting and authoritative articles directly related to the subject. The previous articles have mainly concerned the general nature of the destruction to be expected by an atomic attack. Another contribution which specifically deals with the vital petroleum industry is an article written by Commander Robert C. Wing, United States Navy, and published in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, September 1949. The magazine carries the following biographical sketch of the author:

A graduate of the Naval Academy in 1935 and the Harvard Business School in 1939 Commander Wing served in the carrier *Saratoga* for several years, and during the war he commanded the *PC–1253*, the destroyer escort *Kretchmer*, and Atlantic Fleet Escort Division 6. Other duties have included service as legal officer on the Munitions Board and his present duty on the Munitions Board Petroleum Committee. In addition he has worked in South America for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and in Cleveland for the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio.

In his paper Commander Wing states that the foreordained primary targets in an atomic war would be the mobilization centers, aircraft plants, shipyards, governmental and population centers in the United States. He emphasizes that the oil refining industry, because of its strategic industrial value and highly concentrated set-up, would prove a choice target, susceptible for classification by an enemy as a high priority objective.

The other authors included in my remarks in the RECORD are: Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, January 13, 1949, page A169; Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, February 14, 1949, page A755; Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, March 24, 1949, page A1713; Lt. Comdr. H. B. Seim, May 3, 1949, page A2640; Hanson W. Baldwin, July 19, 1949, page A4627; and Gen. Omar N. Bradley, August 18, 1949, page A5403.

These articles, combined, form a most enlightening and useful symposium on the national security question with reference to the atomic bomb and national defense projects. A careful reading of them will—I respectfully submit—demonstrate that the security of the United States depends upon combined military and industrial power of the Nation, and not upon any type of canal construction, either at Panama or elsewhere on the Isthmus.

In any discussion of this subject it must be borne in mind that the cost of manufacturing atomic weapons is well-nigh prohibitive, especially so if the formula must be discovered and developed. Thus our own country has expended billions of dollars in this connection, and the cost of delivering atomic bombs to the Nagasaki and Hiroshima targets was, indeed, vast. All of which shows that any nation employing these weapons must determine, with the greatest care, the places

for attack, based on the elements of surprise, accessibility, vulnerability, inadequate protection, and military and industrial value.

The full text of Commander Wing's article follows:

POTENTIALITIES OF ATOMIC WARFARE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

(By Commander Robert C. Wing, U. S. Navy)

The atomic bomb has by popular conception been conceded to be a weapon against which there at present exists no reliable defense. Members of the general public carry the impression that the nation in possession of the atomic bomb will swiftly and surely prevail over any adversary. It is also generally conceded that if both adversaries should possess the weapon, the inevitable results of its use would be the mutual destruction of each other's industries and centers of population.

In order to test against the United States petroleum industry this popular conception, it is herein proposed to apply publicly known facts concerning the atomic bomb's destructive potential to equally publicly known facts concerning the United States petroleum industry. Necessarily, utilization of data will have to be limited to that which is publicly known and unclassified. The destructive power of the atomic bomb was revealed at Hiroshima, and it is hoped that the assembly herein of some general data and a logical application of this data to material published in petroleum industry journals will be considered sufficient for a generally conclusive survey regarding the potentialities of atomic warfare against the United States petroleum industry.

The utilization of the atomic bomb against our oil industry, by any foe, is severable into two distinctly different types of application. The first type of possible application would be atomic bomb attacks directly against the petroleum-industry facilities within the United States, and the second type of possible application would be against our harbors through which much of our petroleum in one form or another must necessarily move as it proceeds from foreign sources to the refineries in our country, or as it proceeds in the form of coastwise trade from United States oil fields through the refining centers to the consumers.

Analysis of the potentialities of atomic warfare directly against the petroleum-industry facilities within the United States necessitates exploring the nature of the target. Where are the production centers; where are the refining centers; what is the degree of concentration; and what is the trend?

Nature ages ago determined the location of crude oil, gas and natural gasoline. "Oil is where you find it," is an industry saying that recognizes the element of chance in finding oil. Production facilities must be concentrated over the subterranean deposits. During the present decade the great demand for petroleum products has intensified the development of existing fields through additional drilling to already developed production levels, and in many cases to deeper sands in the same field. The great market demand produces an economic pressure to obtain more and more oil in shorter time from our known fields, and this trend toward forced concentration of production facilities is likely to continue. Nevertheless, since there are literally hundreds of separate oil and gas fields and tank farms, the concentration in the production end of the petroleum business is not, and cannot, become so acute as in the refining end; nor is it concentrated in a degree that makes it subject to substantial disruption by atomic bombing attack.

In contrast with production facilities, refining facilities in the United States are acutely concentrated. In fact, most of our refining capacity is grouped in particular industrial sections of the east coast in the New Jersey-Pennsylvania area, on the Gulf coast in a few sections of the Louisiana-Texas industrial area, on the West Coast in a couple of the major industrial areas of California, and again on the mid-continent in a couple of the major industrial areas that are accessible to the Mississippi and its tributaries.

Refining of crude petroleum into finished products is a manufacturing process which is peculiarly adaptable to large-scale operation. The process requires specialized and expensive equipment which is almost fully automatic in operation. As compared to other major industries, the manpower requirement for operation is small, although the skills required of the operators are very considerable. Virtually the only limitation to refinery size is the quantity of crude oil available to the plant and the size of the market available within the range of economical distribution.

In the United States 18 oil companies own nearly three-quarters of the total refining capacity of the country. The principal refinery construction that took place during World War II was the building of 100-octane gasoline plants. Most of this was financed by industry, and some 80 percent of all the wartime refinery construction was carried out by the 18 companies that own the three-quarters of all our refinery facilities. It is, therefore, easy to understand why the wartime catalytic-cracking facilities and other related structures requisite to the manufacturing of high-octane aviation gasoline were built within the confines of existing refineries or adjacent to them.

The petroleum-industry management is aware of the concentrated nature of the refinery facilities and the undesirable security aspects of this situation. Although an effort is being made to expand the smaller refineries before carrying on with further expansion of the big plants, and in this way slow down some of the abnormalities of concentration, little possibility exists for the development of many new and diverse refinery locations. In a large measure, the industry is powerless to stem the trend. The economic laws are such that expansion through integration with existing facilities gives operating economies, lower cost in steel, manpower, utilites, and housing savings that cannot be achieved through the erection of completely new units. The short supply and high-cost situation in steel, housing, skilled manpower, and the struggle for operating profits makes the trend for concentration virtually inevitable. The demand for all petroleum products has increased tremendously, and additions are being made to existing terminals, both marine and inland. The same reasons which justified the original location of these terminals now justifies their expansion. Likewise, additional pipe-line facilities are being expanded by looping and by the addition of pumping stations. Generally speaking, new pipe lines to transport crude or products are built only when, for various reasons, the same results cannot be achieved by expanding existing facilities.

It may be comforting to say that no potential enemy yet possesses the atomic bomb, but we would, indeed, be living in a "fool's paradise" if we were to depend on that condition to exist for long. When war comes, and if with it comes the atomic bomb, the refinery industry because of its concentrated nature will be in an unenviable status if it is selected as a high priority target objective. It is unlikely that atomic bomb production can achieve, at least in our time, anything like mass production. Therefore, it will be used only against choice targets. The degree of concentration in the production and transportation end of the oil industry is not such as to provide choice targets. Mobilization centers, aircraft plants, shipyards, governmental and population centers are foreordained to be primary targets.

Will the petroleum refinery industry be a high priority target for an enemy possessed of a limited supply of atomic weapons? We have already seen that it is so extremely concentrated as to be highly vulnerable. Certain areas of concentration present unit targets of a high percentage of our total petroleum industry refining capacity. Furthermore, no enemy will long overlook the industrial nature of the refinery surroundings. Effectiveness of an attack against refineries may well be compounded through damage to surrounding industrial facilities, which in many areas are key industries. The Secretary of Defense has already publicly acknowledged before an open hearing of the Armed Services Committee of Congress that in the event of war we must have at least 2,000,000 barrels a day more product than the continental United States is capable of producing. At the peak of a raging war, at the time when our war planes and our warships, and our tanks, and all the myriad of petroleum powered tools of the American way of battle begin to cast the shadow of despair upon the foe he will not overlook the source of all this energy. The refineries are so logistically important that their destruction would be directly and immediately reflected on the field of battle. Destiny has it that the refining industry must face attack by atomic bomb, if war should come.

The amount of destruction that the atomic bomb could accomplish against us would depend upon the area selected, the number of bombs available for the operation, and the enemies' ability to place accurately such attacks. The effect of exploding an atomic bomb over the production units of a petroleum refinery must be based on theoretical and interpolated data inasmuch as oil refineries were not included in the devastated areas of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. The heavy steel in buildings at Nagasaki suffered severe damage from blasts alone over an area of 1.8 miles in diameter. An area of this size would be sufficient to cover the major production units of most refineries. The result is that the principal installations such as cracking coils, distillation units, and alkylation plants would be exposed to heavy and concentrated damage rather than the scattered and relatively easily repaired damage which resulted from World War II conventional bombs. It should be noted that the individual area of effectiveness of the atomic bomb is probably 5,000 to 15,000 times the area of effectiveness of the conventional bomb. The light steel characteristic of tank farm construction is such that the area of structural damage to them would be at least two or three times that of refinery process units. Perhaps some surcease from anxiety here can be found in development of underground storage facilities.

Successful damage control requires that the effect of damage be arrested before the cumulative results of even minor destruction goes beyond the repair ability of damage control organizations. Complete destruction of industrial facilities by using the conventional bomb usually requires an extended campaign of numerous attacks. After each attack the interim respite provides an opportunity to control damage. On the other hand, use of the atomic bomb provides no opportunity for damage control operations during successful attacks because it apparently is so extremely destructive that one attack virtually annihilates the target area. The refinery damage control organizations probably will find that the atomic bomb creates almost unmanageable destruction.

Before proceeding with an evaluation of the effectiveness of atomic warfare against our harbors and the results upon the operations of our petroleum industry, it is necessary to present some aspects of the needs of the petroleum industry for use of the ocean highways and of United States harbor facilities.

Prior to World War II, 95 percent of the petroleum used on our east coast involved transportation by tankers. During the war tankers carried only 22 percent of the load after completion of the Big and Little Inch pipe lines. Today, the position again is more nearly that of pre-World War II. Statistics for the year 1945 show that approximately 1,000,000 short tons of crude and finished products, amounting to roughly 7,000,000 barrels, were moved daily by tanker in and out of our ocean terminals in domestic and foreign trade. The amount moved today, due to certain market recessions and post-war changes in the export-import pattern, is about one-half million short tons per day, amounting to about 4,000,000 barrels. However, in event of emergency this slack would disappear, and the actual movements would approximate or surpass the 1945 movements.

As previously stated, the Secretary of Defense has acknowledged that the United States needs for petroleum in an emergency are 2,000,000 barrels per day above the now predictable production capacity within the continental United States. This astounding figure is 34.5 percent above current United States production capacity which until recently has been straining to the ultimate and currently striking an all-time high. If we can succeed in time of war in maintaining access to foreign sources, our war machine will want to take from those areas, 2,000,000 barrels per day which is not available in our own country. Add this import requirement to the 7,000,000 barrels per day in 1945 moved daily by tanker in and out of our ocean terminals, and it can be readily understood how vital our harbor facilities are to the operation of the United States petroleum industry.

The problem of whether or not the sea lanes will be kept open so that tankers may actually reach the harbors is beyond the purview of this article since it is not considered a matter of atomic warfare. There have been acknowledged technical developments in aerial and submarine warfare that present grave defensive problems. The advent of the Schnorkel submarine and the fast underwater submarine unquestionably poses a dire threat to our maritime lifelines. Undoubtedly the defensive technique against these modern submarines is under constant high priority study. However, whether or not our harbors will be available for use once the seas are successfully traversed is definitely related to developments in atomic warfare.

What is the possibility of atomic warfare against our harbors, and what effect would it have on our ability to import needed supplies? Most United States ports are unique because of their tremendous size. For example, the port of New York has 770 miles of waterfront, of which only 350 miles are developed. When we consider the fact that one atomic bomb can destroy steel-frame buildings only within an area of 4 square miles, it can be seen that a tremendous number would be needed against this one port alone. Even if an aggressor were to possess the weapon in quantity, the cost to destroy completely as a harbor a port such as New York would be fantastic.

The effect of the air-blast damage rendered by atomic weapons against our ports would be of the same type, although much more intense than the damage rendered against the ports of our enemies by conventional bombing in World War II. If the blast occurred under water, additional damage would be caused by tidal waves and by radioactivity. The employment of a large number of atomic bombs on a port probably would produce enough radioactivity to force the evacuation of the area.

The United States has approximately 62 major ports capable of handling an estimated 18,000,000 long tons per month of dry cargo under normal working conditions. This capacity could be increased to an estimated 25,000,000 long tons per month by the more effective use of lighterage and the more intensive use of alongside facilities to reduce the turn-around time of vessels. At present, less than 50 percent of our potential port capacity is being used. With particular regard to petroleum, approximately 30,000,000 short tons of petroleum and its products per month were moved into and out of our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports in 1945. The unused and expandable capacities represent a cushion that can be used to absorb much of the effect caused by an atomic weapon attack. Also, the use of alternate ports should permit to a great degree the continuation of effective movement of essential shipping, and if the worst should come tankers can be anchored offshore and floating lines used to carry on loading or discharge. The problem is comparable to the experience of World War II from which was evolved the art of movement of supplies over beachheads, through improvised harbors, and through destroyed areas. Should the occasion arise, it is reasonable to conclude that an even higher degree of success in making landings on our own shores can be expected.

In conclusion, it must be admitted that the highly concentrated nature of the United States refining industry is such that it is vulnerable in a major sense to atomic warfare, and that it is a choice target susceptible of classification by the enemy as a target objective of high priority.

As for our harbors, they are of such great size and numbers, and the use of alternate ports and expediences in loading and discharging tankers is so readily available, that even the atomic bomb is not likely to do more than cause temporary closing down of a given port or portions thereof, or disruptions in petroleum handling. The net effect on tanker operations or other aspects of petroleum distribution will not be sufficiently substantial to critically hinder oil industry operations.

Student-Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I received a letter yesterday from a young friend of mine from Utah who has just arrived in England to study at the London School of Economics under the auspices of the Fulbright Act, named in the honor of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas who first proposed this splendid program.

The Fulbright scholarship program, as all of us know, is a sort of reverse lend-lease. It visualizes, over perhaps the course of the next 20 years, the annual exchange of students and teachers between America and a dozen or more foreign countries.

For the coming year about 2,500 students will participate in the program, half of them being American students who will go abroad for study and teaching, and an equal number of foreign students and teachers who will come to the United States. Already more than 800 Americans have been notified that they have been selected for this present year of study, and, of course, more applications are being processed all the time.

I have been tremendously interested in this student-exchange program, and earlier this year participated in the resolution which later made it possible for many young Americans to go abroad for a summer of study this year.

The letter which I received from my young friend was, I thought, a very good letter, and with it he enclosed a copy of a welcoming address given to the newly arrived American students in London the middle of September.

The address was made by Mr. R. J. Cruikshank, editor of the London News Chronicle, and I feel that both Mr. Lowery's letter and Mr. Cruikshank's speech are of much interest. I should, therefore, like to ask unanimous consent that both be printed, together with my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: I thought you would be interested in knowing what a really fine thing is being accomplished through the Fulbright program.

I was one of the fortunate students, selected from all parts of the United States to study in England for a year—or more—being paid in sterling by reverse lend-lease. Quite a large group of us traveled over here on the same ship—the steamship *Washington*—and arrived in the middle of September.

I can say very frankly that we have been treated beautifully since our arrival. We were met by members of the United States Educational Commission here, and were taken care of in fine style. And the English people that I personally have met since then have gone out of their way to be considerate. It seems very refreshing to be in such a natural atmosphere—everyone remaining quite calm and polite, especially the bobbies, in traditional British style.

During the first 2 days of our arrival we were given an orientation by members of the Commission and heard speeches given by officials of both our Governments. One of the speeches impressed me so much that I thought it was of special significance, particularly during these times. The speech was given by Mr. Robin Cruikshank, editor of the London News Chronicle, to all the American Fulbright scholars assembled together, and I think it approaches being a masterpiece in its expression of the essence of the problem of Anglo-American relations today.

For this reason, I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of this speech, which I asked him to give me, with the hope that you will read it and see for yourself what a fine speech it was.

It is a real experience to be among the first students to be sent to England under the Fulbright program. Even in the short period that we have been here, there has been time enough to receive some very favorable impressions of the British people. When it is considered that this kind of an experience will be received in different ways by students going to and from all parts of the world, it is possible to see what a remarkable effect the Fulbright Act will have upon international relations and what a really significant piece of legislation it was.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY W. LOWERY.

(Postgraduate student at the London School of Economics and Political Science, from Stanford University.)

ADDRESS TO THE FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

Mr. Churchill called lend-lease the most unsordid act in human history. It is good

to be able to welcome today the first Fulbright students. For there could be no finer memorial to that unsordid act than their presence.

This is a monument not built with human hands. It is a living influence—a spirit eternally renewed through the freshness of youth.

Not here a plaque—not here a cold marble figure commemorating a turned page of history—but a memorial that is itself an ideal—a monument that is an enduring hope.

We have lately been entertained to one of those recurring exchanges of courtesies across the Atlantic. Some newspapers on your side of the Atlantic have said harsh things about this country. These have drawn hot retorts. Congressman has called unto M. P., as deep calleth unto deep.

I don't think we need be unduly perturbed about these manifestations. They are part of our joint history. I think it might be a sensible idea if we set aside one day in the year for letting off Anglo-American fireworks.

It is an old tradition, so why not formalize it? You keep July the Fourth when the rockets soar and the squibs go off and George III is gratefully remembered. We have our Guy Fawkes Night, when favorite effigies are burned. It is a fine thing both to recognize tradition and to get emotions out of the system.

Why not call our annual festival of ill will Martin Chuzzlewit's Day, and let all the crows, ravens, and other birds of ill omen croak in chorus?

At this particular time, it is just and right and also pleasant to pay tribute to the imaginative conception of the Fulbright scholarships—to the noble impulse and the generous vision. This is something more than beating swords into plowshares. It is turning the weapons of war into philosophy and science and poetry and ideas into friendship and the dreams of youth.

I won't be misunderstood if I say that this is an aspiration which comes from the very peaks of the American spirit.

One reflection strikes me with some force on this occasion—that not the most romantic and innocent of dreamers, looking for the crock of gold where the rainbow ends, could have imagined this happening after the end of the First World War. Could he?

Harking back a moment to current Anglo-American disagreements, doesn't that give the measure of progress in the art of living together?

It is worth remembering how many causes and occasions of controversy, suspicion, and misunderstanding between the United States and Great Britain have vanished in the past 25 years.

When I went first to America Mr. Coolidge was President. The war debts controversy was being carried on with great spirit on both sides of the Atlantic. No stone that was unturned was unthrown.

There existed—can we credit it now?—a real naval rivalry between Britain and America. The breakdown of the naval conference at Geneva left the admirals biting thumbs at one another—a truly distressing but fascinating sight to those of us who were not admirals.

The ancient grudge of Ireland was united with the newer grudge of India to create feeling against Britain.

A favorite subject of American contemplation was the wickedness of British imperialism.

Above all, there was isolation. By their verdicts at the polls in the 1920's, the American people seemed to have pledged themselves for the rest of the century to an eternal withdrawal to the icy mountaintops of detachment. The woes of the world had became a "tale of little meaning though the words were strong." And, on our side, there was an ignorance of American history and ways of thought as dark as the night. For many Britons, the United States was a never-never land whose eastern frontier was Wall Street. It was bounded on the west by cowboys and Miss Garbo's lair; on the north by Red Indians scalping Puritans; and on the south by My Old Kentucky Home.

It is sometimes said that the fundamental cleavage existing between the Americans and the British today is the widest that has yet yawned.

It is, they say, the gulf between a planned society, a socialized state, and a private enterprise society.

Now I suggest this is one of those beautiful simplifications designed by orators and writers to save people, including themselves, the trouble of looking at things as they are.

It assumes that everybody on one side of the Atlantic is a collectivist, while everybody on the other side subscribes to laissez-faire; that Uncle Sam is really Adam Smith with a goatee, and that John Bull is really Karl Marx in mutton-chop whiskers and a Union Jack waistcoat.

What appears to me rather nearer the truth is that there are a great many men and women on both sides of the Atlantic who are still wrestling with that classic problem of our fathers and grandfathers—to what degree and to what extent should a democratic community use the social organization, its conscious collective will, to redress grievances and abuses, to protect the weak against the strong, to widen the area of the good life for its citizens and to set free the energies of the people for the common benefit?

We could debate this question all day. Indeed, the British and American peoples have been debating it among themselves for at least a century and a half.

My purpose just now is to do no more than to suggest that all America is not of one mind on this high issue—nor is all Britain.

There are no parties, and very few persons in the United States or Britain who contend that the State should not use its powers to achieve social justice.

The argument is one about the expansion and application of the principle, rather than about the principle itself.

And it is not—I repeat—an argument that is taking place between Americans and Britons. It is an argument between Americans and Americans, between Britons and Britons—and each has his ally in the other country.

Some fantasy builders who had read Mr. Shaw's Apple Cart have toyed with the notion of the United Kingdom becoming the forty-ninth State of the Union. If that apocalyptic vision did come true, I think you might discover how easily our main strands of political thought and action would fit into yours. I fancy I could even guess the names of the members of the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee from the forty-ninth State.

If, for example, Mr. Churchill were elected one of our Senators he would certainly find himself working with men of like mind and heart. But so too, I think, would Mr. Attlee if he were elected our other Senator.

No. This division is not nearly so vital as the old one between the isolationist America of the twenties and thirties and the Britain of that time. That really was an Atlantic wall, a sort of heaviside layer that threw back all our signals, including the S O S.

The Macaulay or Gibbon of the next century will surely say that one of the great new days in the history of civilization came when the United States decided to act as a leader in the world—to wear the heavy thankless burdens of responsibility as well as the glittering pride and jeweled crown of power—to accept the ardours and hazards and expense of spirit and the material discomforts that so great an obligation imposes—and, with them, all the animosities, suspicions, and jealousies that are part of our wretched human nature and original sin.

In the realm of ideas that surely represented the winning of one of the decisive battles of the world.

Looking at things on a purely material basis, I think we can be fairly certain that so long as the United States and Britain feel that each has need of the other, and that their primary interests march side by side, there will be some resolution found of temporary troubles and misunderstandings, and the partnership preserved.

But I take it that our chief concern on this occasion is not with the dollar gap or with the problems of strategic defense. The purpose of the Fulbright scholarships goes far beyond the range of politics and economics, although these subjects are included.

A great American lady once said to me that the chief thing our two peoples had in common was Alice in Wonderland. That is not such a paradox as it may look. For Alice is just as much part of our universe of discourse as Shakespeare and Dickens. And it is here that it seems to me we touch the deep heart of the problem of all relationships—the sharing of the inner vision.

May I disgress? I remember Gilbert Chesterton saying something to the effect that if he were an old woman who kept a boarding house—a delightful speculation in itself—he would never worry very much if a new lodger turned up without any baggage. He would not even ask the young man to pay a week's rent in advance to show his good faith.

What he would ask him would be this: "What is your philosophy of life? What is your view of the universe, young man?"

If, said Gilbert Chesterton, the young man without a bag replied that he was a follower of one of the nobler philosophies of life, he would feel more or less confident about getting the rent at the end of the week.

But if the young man declared himself to believe in Nietszche and the bounding superman, or Schopenhauer and universal gloom, a wise landlady would say, "Young man, rent in advance, if you please."

There is something in that—even though the disciples of Plato have been known to cheat.

What I feel to be of deeper concern in the long run than the problems of economics and finance that have taken up so much of our headlines lately is this continuous process of inquiring of one another about our basic point of view—our philosophy of life—and not only our attitude to the world we live in, but the kind of dream we have when we look ahead as far as our thought can reach, and imagine the world of the future, the land of heart's desire.

Certain obvious things spring to mind. We both reject the idea that man was made for the greater glory of the state—that he can only attain meaning and purpose and happiness by losing himself in service to the Godlike state.

We both place our final emphasis on the sacred uniqueness of human personality.

We have both built our legal and political systems on the recognition of certain inalienable rights of man, on respect for the individual conscience, and on a reverence for the dignity of human beings. We have both had fallings-away from these ideals, but the ideals persist.

And, to revert to a theme I touched upon just now, I would suggest that the evolution of the idea of freedom has moved on parallel lines in both countries.

Cannot one trace that changing conception through the amendments to the United States Constitution and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court?

With you, as with us, liberty is not a static thing.

A Tory of the Duke of Wellington's time would think Mr. Eden and Mr. R. A. Butler radicals of the most subversive character.

And, I suppose, a Federalist of Mr. Hamilton's day would find common ground with a Jeffersonian Democrat in being astounded at the sentiments of Senator VANDENBERG.

It seems to me that one the chief uses of education is to prevent us from being unduly alarmed by change.

I hope you will have many opportunities of pursuing those most enthralling and rewarding adventures of the mind—the exploration of the point of view, the discovery of the forces of will, faith, and intuition which animate a society or groups of persons inside that society.

During the past century a great part of the energies of Britain and America have been devoted to extending man's command over nature—to widening his domination of his environment. We are more or less inclined to feel nowadays that while man was triumphantly subduing nature, he was losing command over himself.

It may not be too fanciful to suggest that a desire for a restoration of man's self-command, after that orgy of the irrational which culminated in the war, may be one of the deep underlying impulses you will find in this country.

In any case, I trust that though you may be staggered to find, for example, that the gap between our two languages—our two forms of written and spoken English—is widening even more than the dollar gap. You may decide before your term is out that the basic attitude to life, the world, and the future is still much the same in both countries. And as Gilbert Chesterton's landlady would have said to her young man lodger, "That is all that matters."

The world is still very young. Its troubles may be due to its exceeding brashness and juvenility. Life is still an adventure. It is pleasant to think we may still be only in the morning of things. May I wish you every happiness, every interest, every luck.

Proposed Tax on Imported Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. George C. Delp, president of the New Holland Machine Co. in New Holland, Pa., stating his opposition to the proposed import tax of $40 per ton on imported copper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HOLLAND MACHINE CO.,
New Holland, Pa., September 30, 1949.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The proposed import tax of $40 per ton on imported copper stirs me to an unusual action (one which I have never taken before); that is, to write to you and several other Senators, concerning the real concern that I have, which I am sure is shared by many others, in connection with the depletion of the United States resources in connection with the ECA program.

It is recognized that much must be done for the countries included in the ECA plan and possibly even for many that are not now so included. It is also recognized that the United States must bear a lion's share of this load. These are two fundamental aspects of our philosophy with which only the most short-sighted would quarrel.

There are two corollary aspects to this problem which to me do not seem to be sound, however, and which are frightening in their prospects.

First, doesn't it seem unwise to ship manufactured goods abroad without taking payment in return of raw materials insofar as it is within the power of the recipient to make such payment? As far as possible, let us give away the product of our labor and ingenuity, but let us not give away our natural resources. In other words, would it not be better for us to conserve that portion of our natural wealth that does not regenerate and give away that which improves and grows with use?

Tariff barriers to keep raw materials out of the country seem to be so ludicrous as to hardly deserve comment, in my opinion. We should be moving in the other direction and possibly even be subsidizing imports of raw materials (except gold.)

This whole question of conservation of raw materials calls for a statesmanship of the highest order, as it is recognized that conservation of the type that I am suggesting would not be to the best interests of persons owning copper mines, iron mines, oil wells, etc., on a short-run basis. I think our legislation must move against this current of special interest, even though in some immediate respects it may seem unfair to the owners of them.

The other aspect of this foreign-aid program that is extremely disturbing is the part wherein we are building huge inventories of arms in areas where they might well eventually be used against us, either through a change in the attitude of the people or through capture by overwhelming forces that would move in so quickly that they could not be effectively used in their own defense. I have no constructive thought on this, only the sense of alarm, which I express to you in the hope that you and your good colleagues are considering and planning for a proper outcome of such a program.

Your indulgence in reading this far is greatly appreciated, as will your efforts be to see if we can't get a realistic program with regard to our national resources, so that we will not be pauperized forty or fifty years from now. The multitude of problems of great magnitude facing our country makes one humble in their contemplation. I trust that the thoughts expressed above will serve to buttress your own thinking on these subjects.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE C. DELP, *President.*

Regulation Relating to Labeling and Advertising of Distilled Spirits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Mr. J. E. Boswell, Independent Stave Co., Lebanon, Mo., to the Deputy Commissioner in Charge, Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mr. Boswell very clearly and forcefully protests any change in present regulation regarding the aging and labeling of distilled spirits. I hope that Members of Congress will carefully read this letter. The letter follows:

INDEPENDENT STAVE CO.,
Lebanon, Mo., September 30, 1949.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
IN CHARGE,
ALCOHOL TAX UNIT,
Bureau of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Pertaining to proposed amendments to Regulation No. 5 (27 CFR, pt. 5) relating to labeling and advertising of distilled spirits. To be incorporated in the record of the hearing of October 3, 1949, 10 a. m., at room 1318, Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Our company produces whisky-barrel staves and heads for making new whisky barrels.

If adopted, the first part of the proposed amendment will ruin our market. If distillers are allowed to first put whisky in used barrels for aging there can be no normal market for new barrels. Because the distilleries could operate for several years storing whisky in used barrels for aging and no new barrels would be used. The industry would shut down, employees laid off, in fact the industry would have to quit because it could not wait the period the distillers could refrain from using new barrels. There is absolutely no doubt but that if this amendment be adopted the cooperage industry will be killed.

Change the amendment, whereby distillers put whisky in new barrels first, and then in used barrels and our industry will be content. This should make no difference to the parties desiring the proposed amendments because the whisky would be partly aged in new barrels and partly aged in used barrels, just what they are asking for. We simply want the new barrel used first.

This amendment is undoubtedly sponsored by the distilleries who have in mind killing the cooperage industry. On its face this amendment does not look out of line. Our company has no objections to whisky being sold that is aged in used barrels if it is properly and adequately labeled so, but we will fight with all the means at our disposal against this amendment unless it is changed whereby whisky must age first in a new barrel.

From profit and loss statements of the distilleries it is very apparent they make satisfactory profits aging whisky by the conventional method of first using new barrels. We cannot see why they should desire any change. Perhaps the answer to this is, that most distillers don't want any changes, but speculators who now have whisky that is in used barrels, or whisky that has been transferred from used barrels to new barrels, want the regulations changed so they can sell their cheaper product at a great profit. Gentlemen, if that is the true reason why some parties want present regulations amended, then you, as employees of the United States Government, must reject the proposed amendment. Your job in an administrative capacity, is to regulate the alcohol tax unit, first according to the laws of the country. and secondly for the greatest benefit of the most people. If you allow the proposed amendments as they now read, the effects will be as follows:

1. Probably a few speculators will make great profits.

2. Distillers will fill used barrels, many not because they want to, but because they are forced to because of competition.

3. The barrel factories will shut down throwing thousands out of work.

4. Stave and heading mills will shut down throwing many more thousands out of work.

5. Barrel factories, stave and heading mills will become worthless, millions invested will be lost.

6. Privately owned white oak timber will decrease greatly in value.

7. The United States owns a great part of the country's white oak timber, this will decrease to one-tenth its present value.

You see the only possible gain the proposed changes could make would possibly be a profit for some speculators and losses to the country as a whole would be tremendous. It is your duty to regulate for the welfare of the most people, you cannot possibly allow these proposed amendments, or if you should, you would vitally hurt probably 100,000 people, the only probable gains would allow a very few speculators to make an unearned profit.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our views. I beg that you investigate all the facts thoroughly and the effects such proposed changes will have on the country. When you have done that, I know you will see it your duty to reject part 1 of the proposed amendment as it is now worded, whereby "age" can be claimed for whisky first stored in used barrels. Change the amendment so whisky must be stored first in a new barrel, then our industry will not be hurt and whisky of the same quality will be produced. Why not settle this matter that equitable way?

Yours very truly,

INDEPENDENT STAVE CO.,
J. E. BOSWELL, *Manager.*

Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. It is a pleasure for me to submit this statement in support of Senate confirmation of Mr. Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a statement to urge confirmation of Leland Olds' reappointment as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

It is difficult to conceive why there should be opposition to Mr. Olds' appointment. He has served long and faithfully as a member of the Commission. Not a charge can be made that he has failed in any way in his duty. He has faithfully enforced the laws, enacted by Congress under which the Federal Power Commission operates and whose enforcement is in the Commission's hands. Every person who knows him will testify to his integrity, his patriotism, and his devotion to duty. As the conservative Kansas City Times said on September 9 last, "We have heard of no case that could be made against Olds except vigorous action under the present law which was written by Congress."

The Times further said: "Human memory and gratitude are short, but a few persons in this area have reason to remember Leland Olds. He is the strong man of the Federal Power Commission who stepped into the 15-year-old battle for lower gas rates in this area and won." Then the Kansas City paper points out that as a result of Mr. Olds' efforts the consumers of that area received refunds of past overcharges for natural gas of $24,000,000 and are currently being saved about $4,500,000 a year. And "after all this saving," says the Times, "the pipe-line company has continued to make a good income by utility standards."

I am glad the Times chose this story of one of the reasons why Mr. Olds should be reappointed, because it is an excellent example of the way in which a conscientious Government official can represent the public interest and be fair to all concerned. Mr. Olds' record as a Commissioner has shown that low cost to the consumer can be balanced against reasonable profit for the producer. Mr. Olds has demonstrated the effectiveness of the laws passed by Congress designed to help make the power resources of this country available to all the people and to all industry. It is because he has represented the best interests not only of farmers, householders, and businesses up and down Main Street, but of the manufacturers, transportation companies, and other producers that he should be continued in the office for which his experience, his wide knowledge, and his proven ability qualify him.

On the basis of his record as a member of the Federal Power Commission—on the basis of job performance, if you will—this nomination should be approved. This record is perfectly clear. It has appeared in the annual reports of the Commission and in its decisions. Regularly each year Mr. Olds has appeared before congressional committees to answer any questions as to policy or procedure which may have arisen and to explain how the laws were being carried out by action of the Commission. Briefly, this 10-year record has shown that low-cost rate regulation can be accomplished on a sound basis. The rate-making principle, upheld by Supreme Court decisions, has made it possible for State as well as Federal commissions to assure to consumers lower electric and gas rates.

Mr. Olds has also demonstrated his broad knowledge of the development and integration of power in terms of supply. His interest in low costs to the consumer has extended beyond the matter of rate regulation as he sees the importance of Federal river-basin programs in furnishing low-cost hydroelectric power and aiding in its distribution—especially through rural electric cooperative systems. Thousands of farm homes have been lighted and hundreds of thousands of the tasks of farm men and women throughout the country have been simplified in this way. The people of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, for example, are aware that they have benefited from his cooperation with the Southwestern Power Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives in that region. Among other reasons, Mr. Olds should continue to serve the American people on the Federal Power Commission because he understands how valley authorities can furnish consumers throughout the country with lower electric rates.

Mr. Olds should be continued in office because of his emphasis on proper cost accounting and the establishment of true cost standards in the power industries. The resulting savings to consumers are estimated to run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. His stand on the right of the FPC to fix a fair rate for natural gas is of special importance because the use of this gas has grown tremendously in recent years. By the most recent count of the Commission, there were 4,755 towns and cities supplying natural gas to 34,577,392 consumers, and since that date some 250 communities have begun to use natural gas. From these figures we can conclude that around 40,000,000 American consumers will be vitally interested in what happens to the man who championed their right to low-cost fuel for their plants, their furnaces, and their kitchens.

Like most people in public life, Mr. Olds has done considerable writing—some of it a quarter of a century ago. Some of the things he wrote then I could not agree with, and I doubt if Mr. Olds could. But I only ask the committee to find one man of long service in public life whose thinking has not been changed and refined through the experience of the years.

I believe every fair-minded man who is aware of his record must agree with the five principles for future policy development which Mr. Olds outlined before this committee on September 27, 1949. In his own words, they are as follows:

1. Protection of the consumer and investor interest in the economical and efficient integration of public-utility systems on a regional basis.

2. Continued encouragement of the extension of rural electric lines and of new standards for farm use of electricity.

3. Continuing survey of generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity, as well as of resources and requirements, as a basis for planning by public and private agencies of ample power supply in peace and war.

4. Recognition in such planning of the importance of conserving energy resources subject to depletion.

5. Development of all economically available water power in connection with river basin conservation programs, and the marketing of such power so as to assure low resale rates and wider and better use of electricity.

Mr. Olds has demonstrated the effectiveness of the great principle that the power resources of the country should be available to all the people at the lowest practicable cost. He has helped make the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act work for the public. He has conscientiously implemented the safeguards established by law to protect the consumer. He has demonstrated his devotion to the prudent investment theory, to proper cost accounting, and to the other elements of real and effective regulation. In the words of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "Mr. Olds' offense is his unbroken record of zeal in the protection of the public."

The foregoing statement which I ask to have included in the committee record is my own statement and has not been cleared with the Board of Directors of the Cooperative League. I am confident, however, that what I have said would meet with the approval of most of, if not all of, the members of our Board.

Christopher Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 12, the people of this hemisphere will look back through the march of over 4½ centuries to honor the courageous spirit of Christopher Columbus that led men across the western ocean. It is fitting that tribute be paid

to the great discoverer to whose questing mind and dogged determination we owe so much. I should like to insert at this point the following resolution adopted by the city commissioners of Newark, N. J.:

Whereas the people of the city of Newark are everlastingly grateful to Almighty God for the many blessings he has given us; and

Whereas we, the people of the city of Newark, enjoy religious, economic, and political freedom made possible by the discovery of this great land by the Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus; and

Whereas we believe that real recognition should be given to the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus and that people of all races, colors, and creeds should all join in a huge celebration commemorating this great event; and

Whereas the 1949 Municipal Columbus Day Committee has arranged for a mammoth parade in furtherance of the celebration of Columbus Day, 1949: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That Ralph A. Villani, mayor, be and he is hereby authorized to issue a proclamation declaring October 12, 1949, to be a legal holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That all commissioners of the city of Newark, their department heads and employees, join in said celebration and cooperate to the fullest extent with the committee; be it further

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That the city clerk be authorized to advise the Governor of the State of New Jersey that the city of Newark officially is on record in making October 12 of each year a State legal holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That the governing body of the city of Newark is also officially on record in declaring October 12 of each year as a national holiday, and that the city clerk advise by letter the Members of Congress from the Newark area of its recommendation.

Mutual Defense in the North Atlantic Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of October 8. It deals with the relationship between the initial undertakings of the organization set up under the North Atlantic Treaty and the formula for integrated defense adopted by the Congress in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

I wish also to call the Members' attention to the following key paragraph of the communique of October 5, 1949, issued by the North Atlantic Defense Committee at the close of its first meeting:

The Defense Committee has carried out the directive of the North Atlantic Council by establishing the Military Committee and other subordinate organizations and their procedures. These agencies will commence planning under a broad concept for the integrated defense of the North Atlantic area. All agreed that each party must do its part as determined by its position and its resources to contribute to the common security of all. The principle of integrated defense was accepted as the governing factor in the planning.

The degree in which the Congress has provided leadership for the North Atlantic undertaking may be indicated by comparing the above language with the following excerpt from the statement of the managers on the part of the House in connection with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act:

What is essential is that the planning that takes place among the North Atlantic nations be premised from the outset on the principle of unity of defense. That means differentiation of functions among the parts in relation to an all-inclusive unity.

Each nation must do its part, as determined by its position and its resources, in relation to the common security of all.

As soon as possible, the essentials of the pattern of area defense based upon individual national specialization must be agreed to and the assignments thereunder made. * * * Once this pattern has been developed and agreed to, it must be the governing formula for the assistance program here envisaged.

The editorial from the Washington Post follows:

ARMS AND THE PLAN

What the President still has to decide is whether the Atlantic allies in their defense plans have met the specifications of Congress for an integrated defense. Till he is so satisfied the money allotted for the arms program beyond the initial $100,000,000 will be withheld. The real burden of proof that congressional conditions have been fulfilled will be upon the military committee of professionals who are currently meeting under General Bradley's chairmanship. The defense ministers on their part have given them a mandate bearing out the will of Congress in the agreement which they signed after their conference on Wednesday. They accepted the principle of integrated defense, and all agreed that each party must do its part, as determined by its position and its resources, to contribute to the common security of all. The principle now has to be spelled out in the deliberations of the professionals.

Nobody will underrate the difficulties of working out in detail the unity that the Congress specified. It is nothing less than a restatement of roles and missions in relation both to the groupings within the Atlantic combination and to the entire combination. Each party's effort, in other words, will be assessed in terms of its contirbution to a supranational defense to be planned in common. This noncompetitive and nonduplicating view of Atlantic defense corresponds to present-day realities of human existence and of the nature of war. The greatest responsibility belongs to the United States as the dominant military power. All the other parties realize that the United States must exercise the role of first among equals if the alliance is to be effective. That means, surely, the end of the system of American observers in the regional groupings in Europe—an end which was pledged by the foreign ministers when they outlined the organization which the defense ministers have now endowed with guiding principles. The United States was pledged in the foreign ministers' statement "to participate actively" in the work of the regional planning groups.

If there had been any doubt as to the wisdom of this, surely it was shattered by the A-bomb explosion in Russia. Thoughts on this momentous event are still in process of crystallization. Obliteration by long-range atomic bombing—hitherto an American monopoly—could now be mutual, and, for that reason, this strategical doctrine may be due for the discard. In other words, the A-bomb may become in fact as neutralized as poisoned gas, without, however, being formally banished in view of its value as a reserve instrument of terror. At least new considerations are involved, all pointing to more emphasis on the land defense of Europe by a military establishment aided by land-based and carrier-based air support. (It is, incidentally, of considerable importance that the Vinson committee which is now going over the Navy-Air Force row should bend an ear to the members of the military men of the Atlantic alliance who are now in conference.) Such a revision of strategical concepts clearly underlines rather than detracts from the need for integration of Atlantic defense.

Now, to repeat, nobody expects the professionals to put on the President's desk within the next few days a plan all neatly tied up with pink ribbon for integrated defense and unity of command. Fixed plans, anyway, are anathema. The President would doubtless be satisfied with a framework of all-in operation so that the money could be appropriated in the few weeks remaining of the life of the present session of Congress.

Report of Fair Employment Practice Commission of Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that legislation to create a Fair Employment Practice Committee is now on the Senate Calendar, I think it would be helpful to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the experience of a fair employment practice commission in the city of Minneapolis. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the report included at this point.

We learn a great deal on the national scale from experience on the local level. To a large extent, this is an important function of our Federal form of government, and we ought to utilize its advantages.

It is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Senate this 2-year report, in view of the fact that the ordinance in the city of Minneapolis creating this commission was passed under my administration as mayor of that city. I am proud of my association with this legislation and with the record of our city's accomplishment.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO-YEAR REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1947–JUNE 30, 1949

The Minneapolis fair-employment-practice ordinance was passed by the city council on January 31 and became effective on February 5, 1947. The commission members were appointed by Mayor HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and were confirmed by the city council on May 9.

The commission held its first meeting on June 2, 1947. The first complaint of discrimination was presented to the commission on June 19.

The commission had no budget or staff during 1947. The nine complaints of discrimination handled during the last 6 months of that year were investigated by Wilfred C. Leland, Jr., whose services were loaned by the mayor's council on human relations for that purpose. These complaints were adjusted by the commission members, who also filled a considerable number of requests to discuss the commission's work with labor, business, and civic groups.

The commission received an appropriation of $3,475 from the city council for 1948 which enabled it to employ an executive director on approximately a quarter-time basis and to finance a limited amount of clerical and educational work. In 1949 the commission was granted an appropriation of $6,893, which enabled it to use the executive director's services a little more than half time and to pay for some additional clerical and educational work.

During the 2-year period from June 1, 1947, through June 30, 1949, the commission has adjusted some 75 complaints of discrimination in employment. In approximately 45 percent of these cases, a favorable settlement has been achieved and the complainant either obtained the position he was seeking or was satisfied with the commitment made by the party charged to follow a policy of nondiscrimination in the future.

About 23 percent were dismissed because no discrimination was found. In these cases the commission determined that the complainant was denied the opportunity sought for some valid reason other than his race, religion, national origin, or ancestry. In most of these cases the commission also found positive evidence that the party charged was carrying out a policy of hiring on merit and without discrimination.

Approximately 11 percent of the cases were dismissed for the reason that the commission lacked jurisdiction because the employment was outside the city of Minneapolis, was in domestic services or was by an employer with less than two employees or by an organization limited in its membership to persons of a single religious faith.

In approximately 11 percent of the cases, a final determination could not be made as to whether or not discrimination had been practiced. Action on these cases was deferred pending further evidence of violation or compliance. The remaining 11 percent of the cases were still in the process of adjustment by the Commission on June 30, 1949.

In about 65 percent of the cases, it was alleged that discrimination was practiced because the complainant was a member of the Negro race. Approximately 23 percent claimed discrimination against people of the Jewish faith. In approximately 4 percent of the cases the complainant was of the American Indian race and in 1.3 percent, the complainant was of Japanese ancestry. In the remaining three cases, it was alleged that discrimination had been practiced because the complainant was not a Lutheran, not a Jew, or not a Catholic.

Of the parties charged with discrimination, private employers made up about 83 percent of the total, Government agencies made up about 12 percent, and labor unions and employment agencies about 3 percent each. A further analysis of the parties charged revealed that about 30 of them were in the service industries, including such establishments as hotels, beauty shops, dry cleaners, laundries, and restaurants. Twelve of the parties charged were manufacturing concerns, 10 of them were insurance and finance companies, 4 were construction contractors, 4 were retail stores, and 2 were wholesale distributors. There were six complaints against local government agencies, three against Federal agencies and one against a State government office. As suggested above, two were against labor unions and two were against employment agencies.

In about 79 percent of the cases, the complaint was based upon refusal to hire. About 8 percent were concerned with working conditions, wages, or up-grading, 7 percent involved discharge, 3 percent of the cases were based upon refusal to register and refer and another 3 percent on temporary suspension from work. One case was based upon denial of opportunity for apprenticeship training.

(See statistical summary.)

In addition to the cases handled since it began operations in June 1947, the Commission has reviewed and corrected discriminatory items on the application for employment forms of 41 additional employers. The Commission members spent a total of 35 hours in the 20 meetings which they held during 1948, and a total of 26 additional hours in the 11 meetings which they held in the first 6 months of 1949 working to correct problems of discrimination in employment.

The executive director addressed over 30 meetings of civic, business, labor, and student groups and the Commission members themselves addressed a substantial number of other community organizations. The executive director and individual Commission members have also held over 100 personal conferences with city government officials, with workers in other intergroup relations agencies and with representatives of business, labor, and employment agency organizations to work out programs for employing qualified workers on merit and without discrimination.

Cases handled from June 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949

	Number	Percent
Disposition of cases:		
Dismissed because—		
Commission lacked jurisdiction	8	10.7
No discrimination found	17	22.6
Favorable settlement achieved by—		
Satisfactory adjustment with complainant	6	8.0
Commitment to follow nondiscrimination policy	28	37.3
Action deferred pending—		
Further action by party charged	8	10.7
Further investigation by Commission	8	10.7
Total	75	100.0
Nature of cases:		
Discrimination because complainant was—		
Of the Negro race	51	68.0
Of the American Indian race	3	4.0
Of the Japanese ancestry	1	1.3
Of the Jewish ancestry	17	22.8
Not a Lutheran	1	1.3
Not a Jew	1	1.3
Not a Catholic	1	1.3
Total	75	100.0
Party charged was:		
Private employer	62	82.7
Government agency	10	13.3
Labor union	2	2.7
Employment agency	1	1.3
Total	75	100.0
Complaint based upon—		
Refusal to hire	59	78.6
Discharge	5	6.7
Working conditions, wages, or upgrading	6	8.0
Denial of training opportunity	1	1.3
Refusal to register and refer	2	2.7
Temporary suspension	2	2.7
Total	75	100.0

PROGRAM FOR 1950

In addition to continuing the foregoing activities on a larger scale, the commission believes that the following additional work should be done during 1950 in order to properly discharge its responsibility under the ordinance:

1. Periodic follow-up of each respondent to offer the commission's assistance in maintaining a fair employment policy.

2. Arrange a comprehensive series of conferences with all employment agencies and labor unions, and with major employers, to develop positive programs for the employment of qualified minority workers.

3. Hold several briefing sessions with the Industry and Labor Committee of the Community Self-Survey to inform the members as to the operating experience of the commission and to enlist their help in getting full acceptance and application of the practice of employment on merit.

4. With the help of this committee, cover the meetings of every civic, business, and labor group in Minneapolis with a discussion of the commission's work.

5. Encourage every employer, employment agency, and labor union in Minneapolis to post a notice proclaiming its adoption of the policy of hiring on merit and without discrimination.

6. Prepare and distribute more broadly informational material on the commission's services and on methods for successfully employing all qualified workers.

7. Continually study the results of the commission's work so as to improve its procedures and make its work more effective.

ANALYSIS OF OPERATING EXPERIENCE

Technique of handling a case: We have accepted and investigated complaints of discrimination brought to us by the Urban League, the Minnesota Jewish Council and the social workers dealing with American-Indian and Japanese-American groups in Minneapolis. We have also investigated problems of discrimination brought to our attention by any individuals in the community having a knowledge of such problems, whether or not they themselves have been the victims of discrimination.

We endeavor to take immediate action on a complaint as soon as it is brought to our attention. We find that our chances for obtaining a satisfactory adjustment of the problem are much better if it is brought to our attention immediately after it arises and if we take immediate action on it.

Relations with parties charged: As soon as the complaint of discrimination is received, the executive director calls by phone the individual who is charged with the discriminatory practice and seeks to arrange for a personal interview with him at the earliest possible time. In carrying out that interview, the executive director uses the nondirective technique to as great an extent as possible. He usually opens the interview with a statement of the commission's responsibilities and a brief outline of the problem which has been presented to it. He then encourages the party charged to talk as freely as he will about both this specific problem and the general principle of employment on merit.

The result of this approach is normally to bring forth from the party charged a statement of his belief in the principle of employment without discrimination. The remainder of the interview is devoted to seeking ways in which the particular problem presented to the commission can be resolved in terms of this principle. This procedure normally results in as favorable an adjustment of the specific complaint as can be worked out and in an agreement to carefully follow a policy of nondiscrimination in the future.

Enforcement powers: The three principal barriers which sometimes prevent a satisfactory adjustment being achieved by the interviewing procedure outlined above are: (a) the fact that the job has already been filled and the employer is reluctant to displace the worker already hired by hiring the person who brought the complaint, or (b)

the employer fears an unfavorable reaction from his employees, or (c) the employer fears an unfavorable reaction from his customers.

When faced with refusal to comply with the ordinance for one of these reasons, the executive director calls in one or more of the Commission members to attempt further conciliation of the case. In some cases, the party charged has been invited to attend an informal session of the entire Commission to discuss the problem and to seek a solution.

If these initial efforts at conciliation fail, the Commission makes it clear to the party charged that its next responsibility is to schedule a public hearing at which the facts in the case would be publicly presented and the party charged would be given the opportunity to present his side of the problem. In one or two cases, the prospect of such a hearing has been used successfully to persuade the party charged to satisfactorily adjust the complaint. However, most employers have worked constructively with the Commission to overcome any barriers which they believed might stand in the way of employment of minority workers in accordance with their skills. Therefore, the instrument of a public hearing or the penalties of fine and imprisonment which could be applied through court action have never been used. However, the Commission believes that these enforcement powers are necessary in order to make sure that the party charged will give serious attention to the complaint and will work constructively with the Commission in adjusting it.

Relations with complainant: Prompt and sympathetic attention to each complaint has resulted in establishing a favorable and friendly relationship with most of the complainants. However, in most cases, the person bringing a complaint of discrimination to the Commission no longer wants to secure employment with the employer complained against. In the majority of cases, the complainant tells the Commission that he would like to have the policy of the party charged corrected for the sake of future applicants, but that he does not want the job himself because he believes that the employer is prejudiced. This has created a serious problem in securing a satisfactory adjustment of the case. In such cases, the best the Commission can do is to get a commitment from the employer that he will not discriminate in the future and then to put the case in an "action deferred" category to await positive proof that the employer has corrected his discriminatory policy. In those cases where the complainant has been willing to press the charge, the Commission has been reasonably successful in securing a satisfactory adjustment of the complaint.

In those cases where investigation has proved that the original charge of discrimination was not justified, the complainant has usually accepted this finding with good grace and has expressed appreciation to the Commission for clearing up his suspicion of discrimination. In order to make a finding of nondiscrimination, the Commission has normally required both proof that the refusal of employment was based on some valid consideration other than race, religion, national origin, or ancestry and positive demonstration that the party charged has employed members of the same group as the person making the complaint and at comparable levels of status and skill.

Effects of commission's work: The most important effect of the passage of the ordinance and the establishment of the commission has been to focus the attention of the major employers in Minneapolis on their employment practices in regard to the members of different racial, religious, and nationality groups. When employers do review their practices, they inevitably conclude that employment on merit is the only sound policy. When they examine the record, they find that other firms have employed minority workers without any serious objections from other employees or customers. Thus, any fears they may have on this score are proved to be without foundation. The clear statement of a public policy of nondiscrimination in employment, and the establishment of the commission with enforcement powers, have proved to be powerful instruments with which to overcome the ignorance and apathy which have been the principal barriers to the employment of qualified workers simply on the basis of their ability to do the job. Employment opportunities in retail and wholesale trade, in manufacturing, and in office and clerical jobs have been significantly expanded for minority workers by voluntary changes in policy by a great number of important employers entirely apart from any specific complaints of discrimination handled by the Commission.

Social Security Bill Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item:

TOWARD ECONOMIC STABILITY—SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL IS RIGHT

The social-security bill passed by the House yesterday is a major step forward in the history of national progress. This is made particularly true by the nature of present labor-management negotiations.

Here is what the bill provides:

Workers covered by old-age and survivors insurance would be increased 30 percent, from 35,000,000 to 46,000,000.

Old-age benefits would advance an average of 70 to 80 percent.

Pay-roll taxes to finance the program would climb 300 percent over the next 30 years.

A new insurance system for persons who become totally and permanently disabled would be created.

When the Social Security Act was first adopted in 1936, it was literally a revolutionary departure from the accepted way of doing things. Perhaps no other piece of New Deal legislation so clearly defined our break with the philosophy of hands-off government.

For in this law, and particularly in its old-age insurance program, there was embodied a new concept of public responsibility. No longer would the Nation permit periodic economic crises to keep millions of workers in perpetual fear of want in their declining years. Now the Government would see to it that enough was set aside during the productive years to assure workers of minimum security in old age.

Yet even so momentous a change was hobbled by certain compromises. By no means all the persons who needed it were covered in the act. Pay-roll taxes (paid equally by employer and employee) were graduated from 1 to 3 percent, thus holding initial benefits to a very low figure.

Moreover, Congress has repeatedly suspended the intended tax boost, so that employers and employees still pay only 1 percent on wages up to $3,000 a year.

At present monthly benefits to those who have been in the program for 10 years range from $41 for a man with wife over 65 and an average pay of $100 a month, to a maximum of $86.

These sums, if paid out in 1936, would have gone a fair way toward providing minimum needs. But the intervening years have witnessed a creeping inflation in the United States to such a point that present benefits are utterly inadequate.

At the same time the Nation's real wealth has increased prodigiously. Whatever excuse there was for holding the pay-roll tax to 1 percent in the prewar and war years has now disappeared.

Certainly the House believes so. The new bill proposes the following increases in the tax: 1½ percent beginning next January, 2 percent a year later, 2½ percent in 1960, 3 percent in 1965, and 3¼ percent in 1970. Deductions would also be made on the first $3,600 of earnings, as against the present $3,000.

Even Republican opponents of the administration measure argued for a bill only slightly different. The cry of "welfare state," leveled at so much of President Truman's Fair Deal program, did not rise from any responsible quarter of the House when this bill came up.

As we stated at the outset, there is special significance in the move to expand social-security coverage and benefits at the present time. For the crux of the current disagreement between management and labor is the issue of pensions.

In both coal and steel strikes, the unions are pushing for company-financed pensions. The mine workers have already won a welfare fund which they are seeking to enlarge. As yet, the steel industry refuses to bear the full cost of such benefits.

One break in the lines of management occurred when Ford signed an agreement with the auto workers providing noncontributory pensions. At the moment, however, industry is generally resisting labor's drive to secure free pensions by foregoing fourth-round wage increases.

Industry has therefore revised its attitude toward social security. A. H. Raskin, writing in the New York Times, puts it this way:

"One byproduct of the fight in steel and other industries is a belated recognition by American employers of the value of expanded Federal social-security programs.

"Most executives are frank to admit that the movement for employer-financed welfare systems would have made far less headway had Federal programs been more adequate.

"Agreements like those at Ford, which scale down employer contributions as Federal benefits increase, give industry a concrete incentive for shifting toward active endorsement of larger Government benefits."

Talk of benefits should not lead anyone to assume that this is a source of something for nothing. It is an intelligent program of social insurance, whereby employer and employee forego a percentage of present income in order to achieve security and stability when the day of retirement arrives.

For these reasons, then, the House bill is a landmark in the growth of American economic democracy. We urge its approval by the Senate at the earliest opportunity.

Talk About Taxes!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic City Press Union quite graphically presents a picture of our $54,000,000,000 ta:

bill. I hope the time will come when the true seriousness of this situation will be appreciated by a majority of the Congress. The editorial follows:

TALK ABOUT TAXES—LOOK AT THIS BILL

Talk about a tax bill—and we always are—the huge sum of $54,500,000,000 was paid into public, official coffers in the past fiscal year. That "take" poured into treasuries of the Federal, State, county, and local governments, according to an estimate made by Bertram Benedict, of Washington, on the staff of Editorial Research Reports.

Certainly, that represents a lot of taxes. On a per capita basis it figures out $372 for every man, woman, or child; about $610 for each adult—or about $1,415 per average household, if put on that basis. However, as we know, the average household just could not assume such a burden.

On the contrary, one-fifth of the total tax collection was levied on corporations, and mostly on corporation profits.

It is understood, of course, that the load was ultimately and undoubtedly passed on to the consumers in form of higher prices, but to the extent that it was absorbed by corporations, stockholders footed the bill indirectly because of lower profits.

Of the total, more than 10 percent was represented by property taxes. "Some of this was on business property, and some of that was absorbed by the business unit," said Mr. Benedict. "Similarly, not all of the Federal excise tax was passed on to the ultimate consumer. The individual who pays social-security tax is making an investment. He may get back in social-security compensation more than his contribution."

To review a bit: Total tax collections per capita rose by 118 percent between 1942 and 1948. National income during these years increased by 65 percent. In 1942 total taxes were 17 percent of national income, and in 1948 they were 24 percent of it. Property tax receipts increased by 24 percent between 1942 and 1948.

The greatest increase was in school districts—slightly above average in counties, slightly below in cities—very slight in State collections.

And the end is not in sight. Ever-rising public demands for services, the swelling of the ranks of public workers will continue to pile tax on tax until the $54,500,000,000 mark has been passed. An enormous host of American workers is toiling productively to support a great force of jobholders—some needy, some useful and valuable—and many merely parasites.

Investigation of the Lustron Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution authorizing an investigation of the Lustron loans. Since 1947, the RFC has loaned some $37,500,000 to the Lustron Corp., of Columbus, Ohio, a manufacturer of prefabricated houses.

Last August I questioned officials of both the RFC and Lustron about the loans. The facts developed then, together with later reports, lead me to believe that a most careful inquiry into the situation is necessary. To do an effective job, the investigating committee must have subpena power together with adequate technical assistance.

The August hearing disclosed that the RFC "had been hesitant" to grant the Lustron loan. It was made, however, after President Truman expressed his approval.

The known facts are that Mr. Strandlund, president of the corporation, invested $1,000 cash for a controlling interest in the stock of the company. His salary was not disclosed at the hearing, but I am reliably informed it is $50,000 a year.

Lustron has been losing $1,000,000 a month, and RFC has been footing the bill.

To break even, Lustron must produce and sell 700 houses per month. Early in 1948 company officials said they would reach this figure in June. Last August, they said it would be reached in October of this year. The October 1949 production will be less than 100 houses.

Over $3,000,000 worth of houses are crated and standing forlornly on trailers at the Lustron plant, with no takers.

There are 600 of these huge trailers at the plant and about 200 tractors to haul them. It is reported to me that the rental on the unused tractors and trailers is enormous.

The problem of sales and distribution of these houses is still as much a mystery as it was when the President approved the loan. Neither RFC nor Lustron has any plan for its solution.

In order for Lustron to continue, RFC must loan it $1,000,000 a month and we are entering the off season for housing.

The Congress and the people of the country should know all of the facts. The following and other questions should be answered:

First. By what authority were these loans made? [It is my judgment there is no statutory authority.]

Second. Can the experiment succeed?

Third. If it succeeds, will a private monopoly of the prefab housing industry be created?

Fourth. If it fails, will the Government take over and socialize the prefabricated home building?

Fifth. Other disturbing reports are widely circulated. These reports charge political intrigue, mismanagement, waste, intercompany bickerings, and maneuverings for private gain through privilege.

Too Many Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can emphasize too much the theme that excise taxes are not only a nuisance and a drain on the economy, but are a major obstacle to the improvement of business. A recent editorial in the Cape May County Gazette entitled "Too Many Taxes" makes sensible reference to this problem.

TOO MANY TAXES

Recent reports from Washington indicate that congressional sentiment in favor of reducing or eliminating the retail excise taxes levied on various kinds of commodities is on the increase.

These taxes were imposed as war measures. Their purpose was not only to raise revenue, but to discourage the manufacture and sale of nonessentials. It has been argued in their favor that they apply only to luxuries—furs, cosmetics, etc. However, in peacetime this country has never been expected to live on a bare subsistence basis, and what is a luxury and what isn't is a matter of individual opinion.

Another war measure, similar in principle, was the imposition of a special tax on rail, bus, and airplane tickets. Here too sentiment in favor of repeal is growing.

No one can prove with cold and irrefutable statistics just how much the retail excise taxes have hurt the sale of items to which they apply. Experienced retailers, however, feel that the damage is substantial. These taxes run up to 20 percent, and it doesn't take an expert to understand that so large an increase in the price of anything sold across store counters isn't going to do business any good. And the same thing applies, of course, to the tax on transportation.

This country is plagued with special taxation and double taxation of many kinds. The retail excises are conspicuous examples. They should be repealed, now that the emergency that led to their creation is over.

The World in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows:

THE WORLD IN REVIEW

(By Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, military authority, former president of the University of California)

Since our State Department repudiated President Chiang Kai-shek, of the Chinese Republic, there has been great doubt as to what it wants to see happen in this great and distressed country.

Openly hostile to Chiang, do our makers of foreign policy want the Chinese Communists to conquer the whole of China and succeed with their Communist state?

It is well known that for some years there has been a pro-Communist element in the State Department favoring this end, but does it actually dominate our policy and fix the attitude of President Truman? If so, why?

Something has now occurred which, if allowed to go forward, might inform American judgment. This is a charge made by Mr. Tsiang, the Chinese representative in the Assembly of the United Nations, that Soviet Russia has violated the 1945 Treaty of Friendship and Alliance with China, and has been actively helping reduce China to its painful and perilous situation. This appeal, made to the Policy Committee, must be accepted by the full General Assembly before it is placed upon the agenda and debated.

Whether such an open discussion is allowed to take place depends much upon the attitude of the American delegate, Dr. Phillip C. Jessup. We may understand why the State Department may not wish this discussion to occur. It has definitely turned its back upon

China, and openly rebuffed its Nationalist Government, the Kuomintang Party, and Marshal Chiang himself. It has published its white book which it obviously hoped would allay American concern and close the issue.

A debate upon Tsiang's motion would reopen the subject, bring to light the performance of the State Department and its representatives, and compel us to face another grave issue with Soviet Russia and its actions and ambitions in the Far East. So the General Assembly may refuse to consider the Chinese appeal, and if so, the curtains will be drawn again around the great crisis which will determine the future of the Far East.

This incident raises again the question why our Government discountenanced the the Nationalist Party in China, and the worth of its reasons for doing so.

The reasons given appear to be mainly two. The first is that Marshal Chiang refused to fully follow our advice of bringing the Communists into the Government and the Army.

We put great pressure upon him to do so. More than once he made offers to the Communists to come in, but they raised their demands. Chiang was astute to perceive that if the Communists were brought into the Chinese organization they would dominate it.

Our own representatives and experts felt otherwise. They had agreed to and encouraged this very action in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Balkan States. There the Communists, using their tactics of penetrating and seizing power, rapidly attained complete domination.

Was our State Department hopeful that although this had happened in eastern Europe it would not happen in China?

Did Chiang prove himself to be a more resolute and wiser man than the European leaders who accepted compromise with the Communists and thereby lost their leadership, their liberties, and even their lives?

The other reason for the State Department's repudiation of Chiang was the unhappy result of public and military aid granted by our Government. The best arms and military equipment were lost when the Nationalist armies succumbed in Manchuria, and relief supplies were pilfered and squandered.

Was our State Department so impressed with the brilliance of its statesmanship in Europe that it turned down Chiang when he refused a comparable settlement?

And if our State Department determined to adopt a neutral attitude between the Communists and the Nationalists, why did it go to such lengths to publicly disparage their resistance to Communist revolution?

Why did our State Department, if neutral, not remain silent, instead of publishing the "White Book," which Communist members of the general assembly are already quoting?

Broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., made on September 29, 1949:

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, this broadcast is going to be somewhat off the beaten track, because I think it's a good idea sometimes to go back and dig up some of the things we've talked about in the past and see what finally has become of them, and that's what we're going to do for a little bit this evening.

This time it's going to be that famous program of prefabricated houses, to be built by a concern called the Lustron Corp., under the violent and enthusiastic sponsorship of Mr. Wilson Wyatt, who then was Federal Housing Expediter. You remember the furor that was occasioned at the time, and Mr. Wyatt's bitter denunciation of the things I told you over this microphone about his Lustron program—that I had misrepresented the facts to you; that this was a vitally important program and the backbone of his solution for the postwar housing shortage; that these things could be turned out at the rate of 150 a day, and they would sell for approximately $7,000. He insisted that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation give Lustron a loan of some $52,000,000, the company itself putting up only about $35,000.

I presented the facts to you at the time and a tremendous public protest arose. Mr. Wyatt resigned in outraged indignation because he could not get his Lustron program. Quietly, a little later, the White House went through with the Lustron deal anyway, on a somewhat more conservative basis, requiring Lustron to put up $840,000 against an RFC loan of $15,500,000.

On one occasion, when in the interest of fair play I voluntarily turned this microphone over to Mr. Wyatt to tell his side of the story, he was most bitter in his defense against the criticisms that I had voiced about the proposed Lustron deal, and I happen to have here before me his own carbon of his remarks on that occasion. Among the things he had to say were the following:

"Mr. Lewis has described one of these new types of homes as 'metal igloos,' as 'built on the order of refrigerators with white enamel on the outside and inside.'

"I have seen the house. The truth is that it is a sturdy bungalow-type home, its framework is of strong structural steel. This framework is covered with steel panels, enameled in a variety of soft, attractive colors, the same colors that are used on the outside and inside of other houses. The outside of the home I saw is a soft greenish blue. The pitched roof is gray. The inside walls are in other shades. A veteran and his bride are moving into this house in a few days."

And so it went. Mr. Wyatt, who was a personal protégé of Chester Bowles, then being given the skids from the national scene, insisted that this Lustron house was the indispensable project. He had to have it. Anybody who questioned whether it was sound or not, was an obstructionist of the first order and should not be tolerated. It was a great new industry of the future. Veterans and their brides—like the couple he cited in the quotation I have just given you—were crying and pleading for the Lustron houses. It was within their means.

I'm recalling this background to your mind—and I'm very sure it rings a familiar note—because the sole question involved in the tempest was whether the idea was a sound, sane, practical project, that had a reasonable chance of success, and whether the people whom with Mr. Wyatt, had supported it had really thought the thing through or whether this was just the crackpot concoction of another lot of hair-brained amateurs who were off on another merry-go-round ride, at Government expense, who would end with nothing practical to show for it. My contention, and the contention of the others who opposed it, was that it was visionary, unrealistic, untried, and untested; that it would end in considerable loss to the public treasury with little or no real accomplishment, and that it would take considerable quantities of materials away from legitimate homebuilding by private enterprise, which the public really did want and was ready to buy.

President Truman himself complained, only a few months back when he was demanding a Government-subsidized housing project, that private enterprise was unwilling or unable to produce housing at anything less than $10,000 a unit. Some of it, he said, ran even higher than that.

Well, there are developments at the moment that seem to suggest that it's time to take another look at the Lustron Corp., and see whether Mr. Wilson Wyatt was correct or whether his critics were. So here goes.

As I told you earlier, the original Lustron loan was $15,500,000. Production would be at the rate of about 50,000 of these homes every year. Price, $7,000.

As of this moment, this is what has happened.

In 3 years not 1 year total production has been less than 2,000 houses. Shortly after the original loan, the company needed another $10,000,000, which the RFC obligingly put up, making the total Government investment $25,000,000. Thereafter, Rebecca came back to the well on increasingly frequent visits. By the early part of this year, RFC has put a total of $32,500,000 into the project and Lustron was clamoring for three million more, to merely keep it going.

At that time, a Senate Banking Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a Democrat, began delving into the matter, by virtue of a request by the Truman administration for an additional $100,000,000 to finance the distribution and sale of these houses to the public. Mind you, up to the present moment they have turned out less than 2,000 homes, a very large proportion of which are unsold because of various conditions. The Government already had $32,000,000 invested in Lustron directly, and was being called upon to put in more millions at the rate of one million per month, and the proposal here was to appropriate one hundred million more, to help distribute and sell the houses. The House of Representatives had cut that to $75,000,000 and the Senate subcommittee, somewhat aghast, was looking the scene over to find out what it was all about.

RFC board member, Harvey Gunderson—who, in all fairness, had nothing to do with the original conception of this thing and merely inherited the headache, admitted his skepticism about the whole thing, and said he saw only a 50-50 chance that the project would ever be a success. Time magazine, commenting at the time, rated that as an extravagant overstatement. But Lustron continued to march on. On June 30, another million. July 11, still another. July 28, still another. August 29, not another million but this time it was two million. And furthermore, they admit that the longer it goes on, the more additional millions will have to be poured in—and you understand, this is not for capital investment; this is not for buying machinery, or anything of the sort. This is to keep the outfit going, and to meet losses on current operations—pay rolls and so forth.

The cost of the houses, instead of being $7,000—as Mr. Wyatt so confidently predicted—is as high as $12,000 and even more. That is $2,000 higher than the price Mr. Truman talked about when he was complaining that veterans could not afford the houses private industry was building—he had to have something down in the six-and-seven-thousand-dollar class. And on top of it all was this request by the Administration for $100,000,000 to finance the marketing and distribution of these houses—a figure which the House had reduced to $75,000,000.

The Fulbright subcommittee held its nose and cut the $75,000,000 to $25,000,000. Chairman Fulbright himself made the motion, and indicated rather clearly that so far as he was concerned, the $25,000,000 was

$25,000,000 too much. But to others on the committee, White House orders were White House orders, so the $25,000,000 went through the subcommittee, and then through the Senate Banking Committee as a whole. The top committee chairman, Senator BURNET MAYBANK of South Carolina, who somehow doesn't take orders from anywhere very well, as long as they conflict with his principles (and I might say, by the way, that that's true of Senator FULBRIGHT, too) voted against the bill, when the show-down came. But it went through the committee just the same.

Senator MAYBANK told me this afternoon that when and if it reaches the Senate floor, he's going to vote to kill the remaining $25,000,000—plus various other items in the bill which we'll go into some other time.

In the meantime, on its own responsibility, RFC has retained a New York engineering firm to make a cold and hard survey of the whole Lustron picture, as a basis for recommendations as to whether more loans should be poured into it. The engineers are on the scene now. A New York architect has been requested to make a survey of the actual Lustron house and see whether there is any possibility that the public ever will accept it. The total investment now is $37,500,000, plus a call from Lustron for another million a month.

Senator FULBRIGHT says that unless and until there is some favorable report from these experts, he is opposed to the $25,000,000 or any part thereof.

And there it stands tonight. This is the outcome of the Wilson Wyatt prefabricated housing dream, which he said I was so unfair as to question. Does it suggest, perhaps, that just because government proposes an idea, and offers a program as a solution, that it really is a solution? Or does it suggest, perhaps, that even government can be fallible.

By way of a progress report on the case of Mrs. Adelaide Johnson, the world-famous sculptress, now aged 103, for whom the Federal Government could find "no funds available" to help in her distress, I'd like to make a little interim report to you.

By way of proving that there are funds available, from the hearts of the American people, we have received gifts—most of them small—from listeners to this program all over the Nation, in the total of more than $2,800 as of this moment. The gifts are being put into an Adelaide Johnson Trust Fund, duly audited, to be administered in keeping her for the remainder of her days in the comfort and happiness to which her distinction and talents entitle her. If, perchance, any further contributions are sent in by check, the check should be made out to the Adelaide Johnson Trust Fund. And gifts will be acknowledged as rapidly as the trustees are able.

I was going to add a word of thanks to those of you who have been so generous as to help out. I'm not going to, though; you really don't need that. The warmth and satisfaction you receive from what you've done is its own reward.

What a shame Mrs. Johnson was only a great sculptress. She should have known Wilson Wyatt and have made prefabricated houses.

Would You Trade Places?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

WHO WANTS TO TRADE?

Would you trade places with a person of your occupation living in Russia, Spain, England, or France?

Wilford I. King, Ph. D., professor emeritus of economics at New York University, asks this important question in an article, United States at the Crossroads, in the October issue of American magazine. And with this simple query Professor King has brought out the vital point in the most important domestic problem of this country.

"This issue is most accurately described as socialism versus free enterprise, or statism versus individualism," he wrote. "Put in another way, shall each American family continue to spend its own money and manage its own affairs, or shall such management be turned over to planners having their headquarters in Washington?"

For the benefit of those who are a little hazy on the principles involved in the opposite poles of socialism and free enterprise, King offers these definitions:

"Socialism may be defined as a philosophy based upon the belief that mankind can achieve maximum happiness, prosperity, and progress through cooperative labor and communal ownership of productive property. Under the supervision of a paternalistic government, everybody works for society as a whole instead of private profits, and the benefits are distributed as ordered by the government in power.

"Free enterprise, under which we have always lived, is based on the opposite belief that human beings gain their greatest happiness and well-being when they are permitted to manage their own lives. Every individual is given freedom of action; he is entitled to keep the profits he earns; and the government does not interfere unless he breaks the law."

HOW WOULD YOU VOTE?

With these definitions in mind Professor King expresses the opinion that the majority of Americans would vote against socialism if it were put up to them cold on a yea-and-nay vote. But he points out that many are reaching out for the fool's gold of high minimum wages, unemployment insurance, higher social-security benefits, farm subsidies, Federal aid for education, Federal control of public utilities and natural resources.

And that road leads to socialism pure and simple.

As for the Socialist plan for the redistribution of wealth, the article points out that high inheritance taxes during the past 25 years and the heavy income taxes have cut down considerably on the wealth held by rich families. As a matter of fact the latest income-tax figures show that the combined gross income of persons receiving $25,000 or more a year amounts to $8,000,000,000.

If this were distributed among the 150,000,000 people in this country each one would receive only $53.

So with these thoughts in mind the professor pops his question and says you had better let your Congressmen know how you feel about it because they are eager to know your attitude.

They are eager all right. They want to know how to jump because they want to keep their jobs. They know that if the country goes socialistic the Government will have absolute power to spend all the money you make and to dictate your every move.

And the Truman politicians are eager to get their hands on that power. They are willing to corrupt the United States of America into another Russia, Spain, England, or France so long as they profit in office thereby.

So we think it's imperative that you answer Professor King's question with an emphatic "No." And we also recommend that Washingtonians who have votes in the States use their ballot in 1950 to stop socialism.

Resolution of Western New York Division of Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a mass meeting sponsored by the western New York division of the Polish-American Congress, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Hitler September 1, 1939, and by Stalin September 17, 1939, held at the Polish Union Hall, 761 Fillmore Avenue, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the month of September 1949 marks the tenth anniversary of the brutal and unprovoked invasion of the Republic of Poland by Hitler and Stalin, having been brought about by the shameful treaty between the two powers signed August 23, 1939, and known as the Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty which was the spark that set off the conflagration of World War II; and

Whereas the Republic of Poland has been deprived of her political independence and has suffered the loss of approximately one-half of her eastern territory and 13,000,000 of her citizens having been unilaterally, unjustly, and arbitrarily absorbed by the brutal action of the Soviet Union and contrary to the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, and contrary to international law; and

Whereas the people of Poland have endured and suffered by the millions, death, torture, and enforced slave labor under the successive Nazi and Soviet occupations, and from reliable sources it conclusively appears that at the present time the Soviet Union is in total and complete domination of what remains of the Republic of Poland, and with her Red Army and secret U. B. police, together with her fraudulently elected puppet government; and

Whereas the persecution and spoliation of the weak by the strong is at all times repugnant to our American concept of equity and justice in international as well as in personal relations, bearing in mind that Poland was the first nation to fight and resist totalitarian aggressors and is looked upon as the inspiration of nations; and

Whereas these unfortunate events that followed the end of World War II were conceived and agreed upon at the now infamous conferences of the Big Three at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, from which it appears now, that because of the temporary political expediency, democratic principles were scuttled, solemn pledges of the Atlantic Charter were broken, and whole nations bartered into slavery of communistic Russia and have been encircled by the iron curtain; and

Whereas the present western boundaries of Poland on the Oder and Nisse Rivers have been historically Polish territory through the ages and have been so recognized at the conference held at Potsdam in the year 1945; and

Whereas insidious communism is threatening our own liberties in these great United States of America, through infiltration into our schools, Government agencies, and into various other institutions and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, As Americans dedicated to the freedom of all nations, we feel duty-bound in the name of justice and equity to all to take a firm stand in defense and restoration of the just rights of our ally—the Republic of Poland; be it further

Resolved, That we firmly believe that the decisions of Tehran and Yalta Conferences concerning Poland and other nations, arrived at without their representations, be revoked and repudiated in toto in the spirit of good conscience and equity.

We hereby petition and appeal to our Government that its foreign policy revert to the principles as were duly enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" and thus demonstrate to the whole world that it will not tolerate serfdom, bondage, and subjugation of free people by communistic Soviet Russia.

We hereby further petition and appeal to our Government to continue to take all necessary military steps and prepare on land, on the sea, and in the air in order that we can properly defend our homes and our loved ones against the totalitarian aggression of Soviet Russia and her satellites.

We further petition and appeal to our Government to take the necessary steps to defend our way of living and our institutions and to be on the alert against communistic red fifth columnists and their fellow travelers, and that our Government take all necessary and punitive steps against them; and be it further

Resolved, That we protest against any change in the present western boundaries of Poland as presently constituted and the same should be considered as partial reparations for the war crimes and atrocities committed by Hitler's armies; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as loyal citizens of the United States of America, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson; to the Vice President of the United States, Alben Barkley; to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate; to Senators John Foster Dulles and Irving M. Ives, and to Congressmen Chester C. Gorski, Anthony J. Tauriello and William P. Pfeiffer.

The Gladewater Plan—Democracy Beats Communism Week—Tribute to John Ben Shepperd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Gladewater plan, which was a week devoted to citizenship with the title "Democracy Beats Communism Week," was held in Gladewater, Tex., March 20 to 26, 1949. It was sponsored by the chamber of commerce. The idea was originated by my friend and neighbor, John Ben Shepperd, Gladewater attorney, president of the chamber of commerce, and former president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. For the past 2 years Mr. Shepperd has traveled over most of the world and became alarmed over the spread of communism and the conception in many foreign countries that democracy was rapidly becoming decadent. Mr. Shepperd, himself, knew that the United States is a great country and has a great Government, but he realized, too, that apathy and indifference on the part of the individual was endangering our way of life.

When he returned to his hometown of Gladewater, Tex., also my home post office, to settle back into his law practice, he conceived an idea which he thought would reawaken the average citizen to a sense of his responsibilities. This idea was that the Gladewater plan for democracy beats communism. Mr. Shepperd deserves much credit and praise for conceiving so worthy and such an outstanding plan. We of Texas honor him for it.

CREED

The citizens of Gladewater, fully aware of the great battle of ideas between democratic and communistic ideologies in the world today, are undertaking to renew their faith in democracy and bring about a new birth of freedom.

Therefore, we are adopting a plan of militant citizenship, education, religion, and civic responsibility inclined to reawaken the individual citizen's pride in his democratic heritage.

By our practical demonstration of democracy, we hope to set off a spark to be followed by the 10,000 other Gladewaters in these United States, thereby giving hope and inspiration to the whole world.

We believe that the best weapon against communism is an active and intelligent participation in public affairs on the part of our people. Unless Americans are capable of defending our economic and political system on an intelligent, logical basis we will have lost our heritage. Democracy is not an accomplished fact. It is an unceasing crusade.

Local and State governments are still the foundation of democracy. When we inform ourselves about these agencies, and through these established institutions solve our own problems, we set an example and give hope and inspiration to America and the world.

This is our answer to communism!

PROGRAM

Sunday, March 20, go-to-church campaign

Every citizen in the church of his choice!

Special radio programs on What Price Communism and Youth and Democracy.

Monday, March 21, citizenship day

All committees of the Gladewater Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups meet.

12 noon: Citizenship day luncheon. Speaker, Militant Citizenship, Harold Hamlin, president East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

1:30 p. m.: Freedom of opportunity tour. Tour of industries in Glade area.

4:30 p. m.: Freedom parade, with bands and freedom floats from Kilgore, Gilmer, Longview, White Oak, East Mountain, Union Grove, Leverett's Chapel, Hawkins, Pine Tree, and Gladewater.

7:30 p. m.: American heritage banquet, sponsored by American Legion and VFW. Speaker, Hon. William McGraw, State commander of American Legion.

Tuesday, March 22, local government day

10 a. m.: City commission meeting, regular business session.

12 noon: Jaycee luncheon, honoring all local and county officials. Speaker, Judge Lew Sterrett, Dallas County judge.

All day: Open house—city hall, community building, and library.

2:30 p. m.: Public meeting, board of education. Presiding, Claude Dailey, president, board of trustees, Gladewater County Line Independent School District.

7 p. m.: Know your county government. Regular meeting of county commissioners court.

Wednesday, March 22, invest in education and democracy

9 a. m.: Savings bond campaign opens.

9 a. m.: Open house, elementary school. Dad's Day. All parents, friends, and patrons of our school system are invited.

10:15 a. m.: Special program, sponsored by elementary PTA. Speaker, Education—A Safeguard of Democracy, Miss Emma Mae Brotze, of Marshall, immediate past president, Texas State Teachers Association.

12 noon: Ladies' Day luncheon (all women in town invited). Principal speaker, Spinning Wheels, Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, of Eastland, member State board of education and former president Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.

All day: Students' Day at high school. Students will occupy administrative jobs during the day and teach all classes.

2:15 p. m.: Special meeting for all citizens and friends of education. Principal speaker, Democracy Begins at Home, Mrs. J. H. Moore, of Deport, president of Texas Congress of Parents and Teachers.

7:30 p. m.: Brotherhood Night (high school auditorium), interfaith meeting of laymen of all churches. Speakers: Dr. Arthur A. Smith, chairman economics department, Southern Methodist University; Robert S. Strauss, of Dallas, member board of directors, Jewish Welfare Federation; Tom C. Unis, of Dallas, grand knight, Knights of Columbus.

Thursday, March 24, freedom of press and communications

Morning: Open house: Newspapers and radio station.

12 noon: Rotary Club Labor Day luncheon. Speakers: L. B. Brooks, president, Stanolind Employees Bargaining Agency, Texas-New Mexico district; John Sorenson, secretary, Dallas Building Trades Council, A. F. of L.; and Robert Oliver, Texas regional director, CIO.

2 p. m.: Negro Day: Open to all citizens. Leave Community Building by bus for program at Gladewater Negro Vocational School and Weldon School.

2:30 p. m.: Program at Weldon School. Speaker, Dr. C. F. McAddams, State supervisor of Negro education.

Friday, March 25, a healthy community is a free community

All day: Clean-up and beautification campaign. Clean-up, paint-up campaign with city, county and trucks of individuals picking up trash. Plants of all kinds will be available at the community building at cost.

12 noon: Lions Club State Legislative Day Luncheon. Speakers: State Senator A. M. Aikin, Jr.; Representative Tom Whiteside; Representative Cecil Storey, and Representative R. E. (Peppy) Blount.

Afternoon: As a preview of Saturday's activities, student officials will give us "a look at ourselves as others see us" when they engage in a frank and revealing discussion of what they think should be done in Gladewater (to be broadcast over the radio).

Saturday, March 26, the 4th R—developing tomorrow's leaders

Sponsored by Gladewater high school student council.

9:30 a. m.: If We Ran Gladewater—Gregg Theater (conducted entirely by students). Free picture show.

11 a. m.: Youth Looks at Our City Government (conducted entirely by students). City commission meeting—city hall (all invited).

12 noon: Youth Day barbecue, all invited. Introduction of guests: student president chamber of commerce. Introduction of principal speaker, member Gladewater student council. Principal speaker, Barefoot Sanders, president of the University of Texas Students Association.

2 p. m.: Exhibition ball game at Bear Park.

All the meetings were open to the public and capacity crowds filled each event.

WHAT THE PLAN ACCOMPLISHED

The Communist philosophy aims to divide and conquer by force, if necessary. If they could have seen Gladewater at work they would realize just what unity can accomplish. Such unanimity has not been shown since the war drew people into one common effort.

Gladwater residents feel like they proved something else, too. Individuals can do something. Strengthening our democracy does not begin abroad with the Marshall plan or in Washington, or even in the State capital. It begins right at home, with the individual. For after all, it is individuals who form the basis of our democratic system.

The plan was gigantic. It embraced more people working on committees than any other program ever before attempted in Gladwater. The bug-a-boo of getting people to actually work on committees was downed. Everyone who was asked took an active part in the plan. And as many people as could be personally contacted in the month the plan entailed were asked to work.

COMMENTS

The following was taken from the Dallas Morning News, Sunday, March 20, 1949:

THINKING OUT LOUD

(By Lynn Landrum)

GLADEWATER PLAN

When John Ben Shepperd was on his tour around the world, following his election as president of the junior chamber of commerce (national), he looked around. When he came back he had a head full of ideas. One of the biggest was the idea that the United States is a good country and has a good government—if the people will only give it more of their attention and more of their loyalty.

The upshot of these cogitations was that all Gladewater, which is Mr. Shepperd's home town, has devoted a solid week to the idea that freedom is as good as the men and women who exemplify it, uphold it, and defend it.

The Gladewater plan begins today. By next Saturday night, every man, woman, and child in Gladewater ought to know what democracy at work really looks like, how it works, and why we ought to speak up for it wherever we may be.

CHURCH DAY

Gladewater is filling up the churches today. Religion is not a democracy and democracy is not religion. But each is safer with protection of the other. Neither fully fits the human problems of humanity without a touch of the other. So Gladewater begins with going to church. Churchmen will make it 100 percent, so far as the pews and standing room hold out. The overflow will have to depend on the radio.

Sunday afternoon is set aside for programs by panel and group discussion on international relations. Sunday is a good day on which to think about the rest of the world. If international relations could be shaped to take on a little Sabbath day sobriety and sincerity, peace wouldn't be so puzzling or friendliness so frigid.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

Monday is Citizenship Day in Gladewater. In the morning all committees of the chamber of commerce meet. Civic groups throughout the town hold business sessions. The chamber of commerce luncheon will be addressed at noon by Harold Hamlin of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The afternoon will be devoted to tours of Gladewater industries. Just to put a point to it, it is called the freedom-of-opportunity tour. Had you ever thought about that? Suppose over the doorway of every useful, job-giving civilization-serving industry there were a sign which said: "Freedom of opportunity made this institution possible."

It would be a good idea, wouldn't it? Well, it isn't patented. Go ahead and put it up at your plant, if you care to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

"We've got to show people that democracy beats communism, not just tell them," says John Ben Shepperd. So John Ben has persuaded his people Tuesday to turn out and watch their local government at work.

The City Commission of Gladewater holds a public session Tuesday, with charts and diagrams to explain how city government works. Anybody who has a question in his system will have a chance to get it out and answered. City business is his business, too, if he is a citizen, so why not?

In the afternoon the county government does its work with the public as audience—everybody welcome and no caucus allowed. At night the board of education holds forth in public, too. Just to liven things up at the high-school auditorium, where the meeting is held, there will be a band concert.

It's open house for every form of local government in Gladewater Tuesday. It is hoped that everybody ends the day knowing more about democracy at home than he knew when he started out in the morning.

PRACTICAL DEMOCRACY

Democracy is for society as well as for government; it is for the individual as well as for the public servant in his official relations. So Gladewater proposes that Wednesday be set aside for buying United States bonds, for honoring club women and homemakers, for a joint meeting of parent-teacher associations with school assemblies, and, finally, for a big nondenominational meeting of lay churchmen, with speakers representing all faiths.

Thursday follows up this idea with open house for the instrumentalities for freedom of the press and information, with newspaper and radio station participation. Union labor will have the program at Gladewater Rotary, and Thursday afternoon will be given over to a tour of Negro business houses, with a program at the Negro high school.

BETTER GLADEWATER

Friday calls for cleaning up, painting up, and sprucing up Gladewater. Trucks will be provided to pick up the trash. Garden Club holds a meeting to discuss a better and more beautiful city.

The noonday luncheon honors the State senator and two representatives, who come up from Austin for the occasion.

Saturday is the Fourth-R Day. Gladewater youth is expected to learn "readin', 'ritin', 'rithmetic—and responsibility." It is a good way to put it. The fourth "r" has been too long neglected. Every youngster should be taught, "This is your town; you're going to live in it yourself; why not make it worth living in?"

This last day of the week the youngsters take over local government and run it—sitting in as commissioners, sheriff, mayor, and so on. And the week winds up in good old American style—with a baseball game.

"There are 10,000 Gladewaters," says John Ben Shepperd. God bless America—and Gladewater.

I hope you will express to your colleagues my interest, my appreciation, and my best wishes for complete success of the Gladewater plan, not only at home but over the State and Nation. (The late Gov. Beauford Jester.)

Your plan is designed to bring vividly before the people the fact that democracy is superior to communism and that the poisonous doctrines of totalitarianism are to be deplored and detested. (Senator TOM CONNALLY.)

The conception and purpose of your week's activities must be endorsed by all citizens who recognize the gravity in ideological conflict. Your purpose has my enthusiastic endorsement. (Congressman TOM PICKETT.)

Democracy needs and must have the alert and active participation and efforts of all people who subscribe to democracy in order that it be strong, virile, and enduring. (Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.)

I want to congratulate you and your organization upon helping to arouse the people on this thing, which is bringing a crisis to our Nation and to our civilization. (Don H. Morris, president, Abilene Christian College.)

This program features one of the most basic of all our democratic principles—that of making democracy work on a local level. Certainly that is the main difference between the democratic system and the dictatorship. (Congressman O. C. FISHER.)

I want to express my personal appreciation and that of our staff and student body for the privilege of participating in Gladewater's plan for democracy in action. We had the finest lesson in social studies that it has been our privilege to have. (E. D. Cleveland, superintendent, Gladewater schools.)

Mr. Shepperd may have something. If the American people can be induced to give as much thought to their duties and responsibilities as citizens as they do to the enjoyment of rights and privileges, democracy will be safe. (Editorial from the Houston Post.)

Unless we miss our guess other communities will adopt the Gladewater plan. It's a practical way to keep the wheels of democracy well oiled and in shipshape running condition. (Raymondville Chronicle.)

The program gives the citizen a clear insight into his local government, that phase which is nearest home and which affects him more intimately and certainly. Communism springs from one central authority. Democracy comes first from the people in the local communities. It is this truth that the Gladewater week's program drives home. And that is how the Government should work. (Tyler Morning Telegraph.)

The eyes of the Nation are upon Gladewater this week, because Gladewater is doing something that no other community in America, so far as we know, has ever done: it is mobilizing all citizenry to pay tribute to the most dynamic political idea that ever has entered the minds of men. (Editorial, Gladewater Daily Mirror.)

Over in Gladewater, Tex., there's a young man with the fire and ambition of a Washington or Lincoln. And all of Texas is proud of John Ben Shepperd, an attorney, now president of the chamber of commerce, and former president of the American Junior Chamber of Commerce. During the week-long exhibition of true democracy at the grass-roots level, church services, public meetings, civic programs, and open forums will accept the benefits of a free society.

"Too many of us are content to just tell people about democracy," says Shepperd. "We are prone to let George do it. We must forcibly bring home to people that democracy begins at home, and our best weapon against communism is an alert, well-in-

formed, intelligent, and above all, a militant citizenship." (Fort Worth Press.)

Under the direction of John Ben Shepperd, perhaps that city's most widely known citizen, numerous Gladewater (Tex.) residents recently dropped their customary routine for a week and devoted the time to demonstrating how "democracy beats communism."

The way to get democracy to work is to get the people working at it. Not only communism, but also innumerable civic ills, thrive upon apathy. The people hold in their own hands the most effective weapon against that menace: "active, intelligent participation in public affairs." (Editorial, San Antonio Express.)

Every community should work out a similar program or plan and carry out some project that would have for its purpose the desirable objective of making Americans more conscious of the rich heritage that is theirs and of awakening them to the individual responsibilities which when exercised both protect and perfect our democracy. Gladewater, by putting Americanism on parade, has shown the way at the community level to enlightenment and progress at the State and national levels. (Editorial, Longview Journal.)

John Ben Shepperd, president of the Gladewater Chamber of Commerce, said the purpose of the observance was to show that education and enlightenment are the fundamentals of democracy.

With the Red threat growing daily, it seems that the Gladewater project is just what the people need. Too few understand the machinery of American Government. Other communities would do well to adopt the Gladewater plan. (Editorial, Galveston Tribune.)

The Truman Version of American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Outlook, Santa Monica, Calif., for October 3, 1949:

THE TRUMAN VERSION OF AMERICAN HISTORY

It was one of our best historians, Woodrow Wilson, who long before his Presidency wrote of the vast power and prestige which the Presidential office enjoys in the United States, and which make it the greatest office on earth. In Wilson's view, this power was most striking when a President acted in the national interest for the good of all the people. The President has to run for office and lead his political party, but the greatest Presidents succeed in making the American people forget this fact most of the time, and believe that they are at least trying to stand above party.

The truth of his general statement has been well illustrated by President Truman in the last 2 weeks. When he made his simple announcement that Russia had the A-bomb, he spoke as the leader of the Nation, and the prestige of his great office was enhanced. But in the next week he delivered a political harangue to Democratic Party workers which reminded the Nation that he has never stopped running for office since 1948, and has indeed been engaged more constantly in political campaigning than any President since 1940.

In his latest bit of campaigning, he asked the country once again not to be scared of the "social-welfare state," and declared that its opponents are "160 years behind the times." This would seem to mean that everything which has happened in the United States since 1789 has been working to produce the present perfection of statism and deficit financing known as the Truman administration. Anyone who objects to this perfection, according to Harry, belongs back in the time of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and the other founding fathers.

In this remarkable abridgment of 160 years of American history, Mr. Truman skipped one great American who used to be regarded with veneration by the members of Mr. Truman's party. He was strangely silent about Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. * * * If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors, and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

General Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following speech which I delivered at exercises commemorating the Revolutionary hero, General Pulaski, and the tenth anniversary of the tragic attack on Poland, under the auspices of the Polish United Societies of Chelsea, Mass., Pulaski Monument, Chelsea Square, on Sunday, October 9, 1949, following 10 a. m. Mass at St. Stanislaus Church:

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was a Polish hero and an American hero.

But this is impossible, some say. A man cannot give allegiance to separate national causes. He must choose one or the other. He cannot be both at the same time.

The fact remains that General Pulaski fought for human freedom, and that is the common struggle, more important than boundaries or flags, whether it is taking place in the United States, in Poland, or through the efforts of the Russian underground.

The aspiration is the one great hope of the peoples of this world. It will not be realized in our time because we are engaged in the first world-wide struggle between freedom and tyranny. The issue is clear and it is global in scope. It will not be decided soon or easily. But when it comes it will affect everybody on earth for better or for worse.

From the dawn of history slavery was the unhappy fate of millions of human beings. But then, on isolated fronts, men began to speak up for freedom and to fight for it.

Freedom for a nation and freedom within a nation as we have seen the pattern unfold even in the young history of the United States.

But General Pulaski, with remarkable vision, was able to see much farther into the future. At a time when travel was long and difficult he fought in Poland and in America for his faith in the right of man, in association with his fellow men, to shape his own future. He knew that freedom should be everybody's business, not limited by race, creed, color, or any other circumstances. He was determined to help in this great cause wherever he could and he sacrificed his life at an early age for that belief. We are tempted to say that he died too young, but that is not so, for the value of any life is measured, not by its quantity but by its quality. One hundred and seventy years have passed since the heroic death of Pulaski, but the lesson of his life is a vivid memory to most of us. The cause which he fervently embraced is in danger today from a new despotism. Tyranny has assumed a different form and a different name, but it is more oppressive in some parts of the world. It is not content to enslave the body of man but his mind and soul as well. It has taken the great gifts of science and has twisted them to serve its evil ends. Its power to deceive and betray is a fatal trap for all who are careless of their liberties.

The spirit of Kosciusko warns us to "beware." So tuned to the modern crisis was his life that he seems to be living in our times, telling us that freedom is indivisible in this world. Do not be content with the fact that we have it in the United States. The world cannot be half-slave and half-free. As others are robbed of their sovereign rights as men, the peril for us becomes greater as this cancer spreads. We must help others to save themselves before we stand alone, hopelessly alone.

As Kosciusko fought the tyranny of his time wherever he found it, we too must rally the community of freemen to resist the Communist infiltration of today. Contain it, and then overwhelm it, by developing those greater opportunities for all people which will rout Communist theories by democratic results.

Kosciusko by his historical foresight and his universal grasp of the problem points the way.

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

This eternal truth is the guiding light of democracy. From it we must fashion a minimum security for all, so that men and women may have the freedom to nourish those special talents given to them by their Creator.

This is the universal potential of life the great richness inherent in all individuals and all peoples which can only bear fruit under a developing democracy aided by the grace of God. It is not the exclusive wisdom possessed only by 14 men in the Politburo of the Kremlin at Moscow in Russia.

As long as there are men with the courage of Kosciusko, no matter how small in numbers, the power of tyranny is never secure.

It is well for us to remember the days of the American Revolution when a few men dared to defy the power of Great Britain. The colonists were ill-equipped and ill-fed. Many of the citizens were not in sympathy with their cause. The makeshift Congress had a hard time raising revenue to support the small armies in the field. There was confusion, despair, and much suffering. From our schooldays we recall the story of that bitter winter at Valley Forge when men wrapped their feet in scraps of clothing because they had no shoes.

I often think that it was the example of men like Pulaski who saved the American morale from utter defeat. Here was a foreigner, born to luxury, who cast his lot with the ragged armies of Washington. Why did he do so? Because of his burning faith in the rightness of the cause, a faith that was superior to every material shortcoming. If he could carry on, in spite of all difficulties,

why couldn't the men who were born in this land of ours and who called it home?

His was the spark that inspired men to do the impossible. His was the belief that overcame the difference of language, religion, and custom, uniting all in a common purpose to win independence for the common man. His was an outstanding contribution to the American cause in which all succeeding generations take pride, no matter from what land their ancestors came, because it made possible that great and successful experiment in living together as equals which we enjoy today.

From the time when this father of the American cavalry led a charge against the enemy lines and fell mortally wounded, he set a standard of devotion to the United States and the principles for which it stands, that has been honored by every Polish family that has since emigrated to this country.

The American character would not be what it is today without the industry, the deep religious feeling, and the steadfast love of liberty which you of Polish descent are contributing to it.

Your fellow Americans are aware of it. Their sense of brotherly obligation will not be satisfied until they, with you, are able to do something to help the long-suffering people of your homeland.

To honor the memory of General Pulaski is to honor all the Polish people, not only in the past, but in the challenging present. We in the United States feel an abiding spiritual kinship with your compatriots overseas. Our aspirations merge so often as to make us twin brothers in the effort to create that better way of life in which there shall be no masters and no slaves.

We had our Valley Forge. Your friends and relatives had their Warsaw.

Both are symbols of heroic sacrifice that, far from crushing a people's will, inspire it to greater efforts for liberation.

Warsaw, leveled by a merciless attack that tried to obliterate this seat of culture from the face of the earth, is rising again. Its people who withstood attack from the sky and over land—a modern David fighting against two Goliaths—who rose in rebellion even after their proud city was reduced to rubble; these Poles are of a breed which can never be conquered.

When the history of the past grim war is written, the civilized world will acknowledge its debt to the Poles, as to no other nation.

They were subjected to trials that seemed beyond human endurance. They died but they never surrendered. They never recognized the cowardly word "appeasement." And there were no quislings among them.

For Poland has been trained in the hard school of adversity. She had been physically conquered before, but the independent spirit of her people can never be conquered. Time and again she has regained her freedom and it was this knowledge which gave her strength in 1939 even as it does today.

When the Nazis struck 10 years ago every Pole fought back in defense of his land, his home, his family, and his religion. They were blasted by Hitler's planes and crushed by his tanks—men, women, and children fighting for the right to live their own lives without dictation from others. And then, then from the other side, they were stabbed in the back by the Communists of Russia. Betrayed and massacred, tortured and starved, their faith did not falter even in the slow death of concentration camps or the merciless grind of slave-labor exile in the Siberian wastes.

Although their churches were destroyed, the Poles who survived, worshiped their Creator in homes and cellars, and in their hearts. The Gestapo and the MVD could break the bones of the Polish people but they could not crush their immortal souls.

While Warsaw was still in the Nazi grip, the Poles organized the heroic underground army and fought to the last even in the sewers of that martyred city betrayed again by the Russian armies who were within range but failed to come to the Poles' relief as they had promised.

In the early days of the war, as the Nazi and Communist allies closed in for the final kill, many Poles managed to escape in order to fight again. Abroad, they came together—from youths of 16 to older men of 60—as soldiers of Poland. Their exploits in France and Italy were unsurpassed. Operating from bases in England, the Polish Air Force delivered telling blows against the Nazis. Forty percent of these men died in action, giving up youth and future for the redemption of their homeland.

More than 6,000,000 Poles sacrificed their lives in World War II. This was 20 percent of its population. On a comparable scale, the United States would have to lose more than 29,000,000 people to measure up to the staggering price which Poland paid in defense of our human liberties.

But when the war ended in victory and so many nations rejoiced in their liberation, Poland did not become free. Her government today is made up largely of men who were trained in Moscow and voted into office through elections which were plainly rigged. Poland is surrounded by Red armies and is deep behind the iron curtain.

But there are encouraging signs that Poland is coming back. Warsaw, which was methodically destroyed by the Nazis—house by house, until a Nazi general boasted that never again would a single Pole live there, now has a population of over 600,000. The energy of her people is the vital factor which outlives all partitions and all temporary tyrannies.

Even Stalin was once quoted as saying that "communism does not fit the Poles. They are too individualistic, too nationalistic."

Whether he said it or not, the fact remains that Christian Poland will never embrace atheistic communism, for eternal truth, among the faithful, will always outlast economic terrorism fashioned by the hand of mortal man. Therein lies real hope for Poland, and the world.

The iron curtain is not as strong as you think. There are small holes in the armor which may become larger. Tito, the Communist head of Yugoslavia, is rebelling against the dictates of Moscow. The Russians will probably do everything short of war to make him behave. Meanwhile, the world is watching Tito. If he gets away with it, other nations will be encouraged to call their soul their own. The prestige of Moscow is at stake. The Communist bosses are having trouble keeping subject nations in line.

Knowing Poland as we do, that nation will be the first to throw off the Communist yoke when the time is ripe.

Pulaski understood that freedom must be universal. Eventually, its voice must be expressed through a representative world federation with power to outlaw war, to help build up backward areas, to encourage civil and religious liberties, and to promote the free flow of information among all men.

As a tribute to his courage and his foresight, the legislatures of many of our States have designated October 11 of each year to be observed as a General Pulaski's Memorial Day. Early this year it was my privilege to introduct a joint resolution in the United States House of Representatives authorizing the President to proclaim October 11 as a day on which to honor this American hero.

When the final victory of that world freedom is won, the peoples of this earth can thank God for the contributions of Pulaski, and Poland.

Orderly Society Cannot Exist Without Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, good government is the greatest blessing enjoyed by mankind. Some individuals advocate anarchy—the absence of all government. These people seem to overlook the fact that this country has gone through the experience of having an area of population without government, when people from all over the world flocked into California after gold was discovered in 1849. The turbulence and lawlessness of the area soon made the enforcement of law and order necessary for the protection of life and property.

Of necessity, the citizens were forced to organize and take the law into their own hands. They soon brought order and security out of chaos; and established a code of laws that are in effect in many Western States to this day.

There is inserted herewith an illuminating article by Mr. Wheeler McMillen, which is taken from the September 7, 1949, issue of the Pathfinder:

One would not like to live in a neighborhood that had no government at all. If each citizen had to protect his possessions and his family, he would have to carry arms continually and keep some kind of guard by day and night over his house.

Thousands of years ago men found that they could better protect their families and property by banding together. One watchman could stand guard for a hundred persons. When a leader arose who could decide who should be the guard, and who could instruct the people how to avoid attack, the beginnings of government took place. The purpose was protection.

The well-known imperfections of human nature make government necessary. Every society seems to tend to produce a few individuals who would rather steal than work, whose behavior is unruly and unsocial. Anarchy, a society without government, would be practicable only in a place where everyone always behaved himself.

Every kind of association of people, from the most primitive and savage, has found that rules have to be made and enforced if its individual members are to live peaceably.

From its earliest beginnings government undoubtedly had two such protective purposes. One was to prevent individual members of the community from damaging other members. The other was to keep the community as a whole from suffering personal or property injuries that a foreign community might attempt to inflict. All the earth's systems of government have grown out of these two necessities.

Whenever certain individuals were chosen to exercise the function of protecting their fellows, they had to be provided with authority, and with the force to make their authority effective. They came thus to possess power over others. Inseparable from power over others always stands the temptation to abuse it.

Thus a paradox has always been evident. It is that the very governments which men must institute or accept for their own protection are forever potentially man's most dangerous enemy.

Within the past 35 years, two great wars were produced by the mistakes and stupidities of men who were charged with the powers of their various governments. The prices of the two wars included the killing of 20,000,000 men, the destruction of incalculable amounts of productive property, and the creation of immeasurable human misery. Neither war established peace or freedom.

The powers of government everywhere now tend to revert to their ancient uses for oppression. In Russia estimates report seven to twelve million people subjected to forced labor. In the United States everyone is forced to work about 1 week out of every month for Government. The difference is one only of degree.

If in our Government the influence of one pressure group or another continues to push spending and taxes upward, the number of slave days per citizen must likewise move upward.

Government itself thus fails to protect the citizen from invasion of his right to use his own earnings.

Americans have so long been so proud of the advantages of their own usually benign and beneficial Government that few can readily view it as a potential enemy. We realize so clearly the advantages of orderly communities, and of the necessity to protect our country against foreign hostility, that it strains one's philosophical powers to accept the fact that any and every government contains the utmost potential dangers to the very life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness our Government was set up to secure.

The American future will be safer if enough people do bear in mind that any government, even ours, however useful for protection, may also become a destructive enemy.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark Star-Ledger of October 10, 1949:

UNITED STATES SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH SAYS CIVILIAN DEFENSE IS NEGLECTED

Official confirmation of the fact that Russia has the atomic bomb has placed new emphasis on defense against the bomb.

In addition, we have had warnings that bacteriological warfare has even greater destructive power than the atomic bomb—that scientists have developed certain bacteria so deadly that only a few ounces of it, if well distributed, could wipe out all life on this earth.

Think that over a moment. Literally, the possessor of those few ounces could hold the fate of the world, of you and me, of every human being, every animal, every form of life, in the palm of his hand—if these warnings are true.

Since they come from men considered reliable, I think they are at least worth considerable thought.

We've had warnings. But that is all. We haven't been told how to defend ourselves. We haven't been told how, individually, we can protect ourselves against atomic radiation and poisonous bacteria—except perhaps to get a heavy concrete shelter deep in the ground. But how soon would it be safe for us to come up for air and what protective measures should we take then? We haven't been told. We have been told only what to fear—but not how to combat that which we should fear.

One of the most important factors in war is morale—not just the morale of the troops, but the morale of the civilian public as well. When that morale breaks down, the country is defeated and it is just a matter of time until surrender to the enemy.

If there is another war, the civilians will be in it. No longer is it possible to fight a war on foreign soil. Most of us don't understand a great deal about war because it has never hit the shores or the soil of this country in our lives. And the time to learn is not in the middle of an atomic or bacteriological atack.

But would you know what to do? Has your Government given you any instructions for such an attack? Some pamphlets may have been spottily distributed. But who has any real idea of what should be done in the event of such an attack?

The question, then, is Who in the Government by now should have told us what to do? The answer is the Office of Civilian Defense. It has been in existence for some time. I have checked with that Office to see if it had any printed instructions for distribution. It has not. Neither has the Atomic Energy Commission. Neither has the National Resources Security Board.

I'm afraid the blunt truth is that our Government is doing too much wishful thinking and too little planning for any eventuality.

We almost fall over ourselves in providing aid to Europe. Yet we don't prepare or plan at home. We let the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board, the top Federal agency in time of war, go vacant for almost a year just because of a political difference between the President and the Senate. The Senate has rejected the President's choice for the post because they don't think the man is sufficiently qualified. In a stalemate, the President has refused to nominate anyone else than his rejected choice for the post.

How long will we gamble our security with politics? How long will we fail to tell every American how to protect himself against modern warfare? How long will we keep waiting instead of anticipating? How long will we coast—downhill?

Must Naval Officers Choose Between Career and Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the present interservice controversy concerning what is the best means of defense for our country, it is my feeling that members of all branches of the armed forces should not only be permitted, but should be encouraged, to freely give their views to the people and their duly elected representatives without fear of recrimination. In fact, it is their duty so to do.

It is unthinkable that any American should have his career destroyed, who, in response to that obligation of duty, has courageously revealed pertinent information of a nonsecret nature because of a deep conviction that this will strengthen the security of his country. To permit any such thing would be a violation of every concept of decency and fair play.

Particularly is this true where the man so threatened, Capt. John Crommelin, United States Navy, is one of America's foremost combat heroes, who has personally felt the scourge of enemy fire, and is one of five brothers who fought gallantly in the last war and from which two, who were naval aviators, did not return.

From what I have read about John Crommelin, he will never complain about any punishment meted out for his technical breach of a regulation. Any puninshment would fade into insignificance compared to what he has already suffered for his country.

But it would be to the everlasting shame of this Congress if it permits him to be sacrificed upon the altar of the personal ambitions of defense officials motivated by political aggrandizement rather than a sense of what is best for the security of this Nation.

This Congress must see to it that there is no iron curtain, no gestapo, or no dictators in our Defense Department.

I wish to call the attention of the House to an article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, October 7, 1949:

SOMETHING DEEP SEEN IN FACT NAVAL OFFICERS RISK LOSS OF CAREERS—INTIMIDATION AND THREATS FAIL TO HALT STATEMENTS ON NATION'S DEFENSE NEED

(By David Lawrence)

Something deep and soul-stirring must account for the fact that men in naval uniform, trained to obey instantly orders that might send them to their deaths, should now risk the loss of their careers in order to bring to the attention of the public what they regard as a serious blow to our national defense.

Capt. John Crommelin is now under technical arrest by orders of President Truman, Commander in Chief of the armed services, who admitted to a press conference that he had a hand in suspending the naval hero—at least he failed to stop a disgraceful procedure.

The same John Crommelin isn't squawking about his fate any more than he did that tragic day—November 30, 1943—when his aircraft carrier, the *Liscombe Bay*, was blown up by a Japanese torpedo and set ablaze, and he found himself burning.

DESCRIBED BY SURVIVOR

Here is how a survivor describes that episode:

"Captain Crommelin, chief of staff, although wrapped in flame by the blast, was one of the few survivors of the flag organization. The admiral was killed. Stick your finger in a match flame some time. The captain can tell you how that feels, spread all over your hide. He jumped over the side, swam to a raft and for some time calmly discussed with the others on the raft the proposition of whether or not he was roasted to the point where it wouldn't be worth while for him to hang on.

"Later, however, lying in the sickbay of the *Leonard Wood*, wrapped up like a cocoon, he had the same old grin for anybody who dropped down to see how he was taking it. 'Glad to see you made it, too,' was the word. Odds were about 10 to 1 among the crew that he'd never pull out, but it seems he did."

Just what did Captain Crommelin do this week that should invite such ignominious punishment as house arrest? He gave the press letters that discussed America's naval future in an abstract way, with not a single

mention of anything secret or classified therein. Since when is it a crime or must a naval officer be punished for being interviewed by the press or for giving information to the press that is not secret or classified? At the worst, he might deserve a court of inquiry and a chance to be heard on his constitutional right to speak his views and give the public information in his possession on national policy.

WHY DID HE TAKE STEP?

Why, it must be asked, did Captain Crommelin take the step he did? Why are so many naval officers so deeply aroused? President Truman, who ought to be more respectful since he is Commander in Chief, treats it all flippantly—as if it were just a squabble between children. Secretary of Defense Johnson treats it likewise and talks about knocking heads together. Secretary of the Navy Matthews takes the position that a naval officer loses his rights as an American citizen and dare not criticize the laws of his country.

The American people should be seriously concerned—not because there is a controversy over a national policy but because militaristic methods are being used to squelch public discussion and because the prerogatives of the Congress are being impaired.

If officers in the armed services are to be intimidated by threats of punishment when they seek to discuss the very subject on which they are qualified to speak, it can only mean that Prussian militarism has taken hold in the United States and that the ways and methods of the Nazi general staff, which brooked no opposition from the Reichstag, are being duplicated in supposedly free America.

THREATS OF PUNISHMENT

Talk of tapped wires and threats of punishment if members of the armed services even speak to Members of Congress are emerging as collateral phases of a controversy as to whether America is preparing the right offense and defense against a potential enemy.

But why are the officers of the Navy so apprehensive? Why are they so eager to get their story to the public? Why did Secretary of Defense Johnson and Secretary of the Navy Matthews try to squelch all testimony? Why did the House Armed Services Committee at first decide to hear Admiral Radford, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, in open session and then order his testimony to be given in secret session and then reverse itself and order open sessions? What kind of pressure is being exerted on the vacillating House Armed Services Committee, and by whom?

President Truman frankly confesses that he uses lobby methods and puts pressure on Members of the Senate in dealing with appointments. How much assurance can anybody, inside or outside the armed services, have that the American people will get all the facts if the unification law now is being construed as a gag law? The issue transcends all questions of defense planning and goes directly to the right of the American people to freedom of information about what is going on inside their own Government.

Unification of Europe—Or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann's column from Paris in today's Washington Post, contains a statement of the present attitude of our officials and those of the Marshall-plan countries that should interest Congress, and a warning concerning that attitude that had better not be ignored by our officials and those of the Marshall-plan countries.

All of those officials, here and abroad, should understand that by the time the third Marshall-plan authorization comes to Congress there must be unification of Europe, or else.

This is not just my own idea. It is in the ECA law. Of course, it may not occur to diplomats here and abroad to look for congressional intent in the acts of Congress, but this is a case where the future attitude of Congress can be found in the law and its history, rather than in the feeble attempts of our officials to carry out the law.

Congress was never very enthusiastic about making this a 4-year plan. When the ECA law was enacted in the Eightieth Congress, the preservation of the 4-year period in any form was by a very narrow margin. Provisions for annual review and statements denying express or implied forward commitments were incorporated to reduce hostility to the 1952 date. In spite of this, the amendment cutting the whole plan to 1 year had the closest vote of any amendment that was defeated. The teller vote on this amendment in the House was recorded as—ayes 117, noes 127.

Continuity of cooperation is required by the law. In 1950 there must be "impressive and substantial progress in Europe toward that mutual aid which has always been promised but has never been realized," as Mr. Lippmann puts it, or there may be no Marshall aid.

Section 101 of the ECA law contained the policy statement. Last year at the State Department's behest, our encouragement toward unification was watered down to the sort of sustained common effort set forth in the CEEC, report of September 22, 1947. This year we struck out all reference to the past feeble efforts and inserted in the law that it was our policy to encourage the unification of Europe.

These words are in the law. They are not just window dressing. I think they are the "key" Mr. Lippmann is talking about. If Congress is not encouraged by the unification of Europe in 1950; if there has not been continuity of cooperation along this line; then there may be trouble. Unification of Europe is the key that will unlock the United States Treasury in 1950 for the Marshall plan.

Under leave to extend, I include The Key to the Door, by Walter Lippmann:

THE KEY TO THE DOOR

(By Walter Lippmann)

PARIS.—Before leaving Washington at the end of September, I looked into a number of things it seemed useful to make inquiries about in Europe. One of them was the complicated subject of the third appropriation of the Marshall plan. Though Congress will not begin to consider it until early winter, the administration will be making decisions of policy and formulating its plans this autumn. It is evident that the third year will be difficult. For it took Congress from February to September to agree to the second year of Marshall aid, and all observers I have talked with feel that opinion in Congress and in the country is less confident now about the future of the undertaking than it was before the sterling crisis developed.

Indeed, a high American official who has had a leading part from the beginning of the whole experiment told me that he did not think the administration could obtain a full third appropriation in 1950 unless before the votes were taken in Congress there had been some kind of impressive and substantial progress in Europe toward that mutual aid which has always been promised but had never been realized. He felt, no doubt rightly, that the prospect of voting money for 16 separate subsidies for 16 separate countries would not satisfy Congress when it meets next year.

Here in Paris I have found, after talking with a few Europeans who have lived with the problem and understand it, that there is no belief among the people generally and little even among responsible officials that the United States is very serious about mutual aid in Europe. The working assumption is that America's relationship to Europe will be one of two very simple alternatives: Either we shall subsidize indefinitely and unconditionally any government that is anti-Communist, or we shall withdraw from Europe into isolationism. The idea that the American Government and people have more than a platonic interest in the reorganization and reconstruction of Europe has not yet been taken seriously. It is an idea that everyone feels he must make phrases and gestures about. But it is not an idea that shapes the policies of governments or determines their decisions.

And so, though in one sense American power in Europe is enormously great, indeed unpleasantly great, American influence for constructive European action is remarkably small. The conviction has formed that while Europe cannot live without American subsidies, the United States, because of the Communist danger, could not withdraw subsidies. Thus, Marshall aid, which was to provide the inducement and the means to closer European collaboration, exerts little effective pressure to bring about European collaboration.

Recent events in Washington during the Anglo-American talks have accentuated the feeling that we do not have clear or firm views on the need for European mutual aid. In fact, the views, first publicly attributed to Mr. Kennan by the Alsop brothers and supported by confidential reports, that the United States has agreed to some sort of British separation from the Continent, are now, perhaps mistakenly, regarded as real American policy—confirmed by the action of Bevin and Cripps. If this impression is not corrected, the idea of European mutual aid and unification will have been fatally injured.

For the French—and I have no doubt the European—view is that, without an intimate Anglo-French understanding as its foundation, nothing can be done toward the solution of any great European problem. The Germans are recovering their power at a prodigious rate and a satisfactory equilibrium in Europe is impossible unless the British and the French are able to work jointly toward an understanding with Germany. Separately, France and Great Britain will not be strong enough to deal with the coming Germany as equals. Unless they can unite with confidence and in intimacy, their separate relations with Germany will be competitive and disruptive.

But Britain and France are not likely to work out a partnership unless the United States encourages it, induces it, and presses for it. This is, in fact, the key to the door of that mutual aid which is, with self-help, the object of the Marshall plan. We have come very near to throwing away the key during the critical weeks of the month of September.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of an essay entitled "Soil and Water Conservation," written by Derwood Haines of Luray, Page County, Va., which won first prize in a contest conducted by the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Chamber of Commerce among grade school students of Page, Augusta, and Rockingham Counties:

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

(By Derwood Haines, Andrew Jackson School, eighth grade, Luray, Va.)

Conservation is the use of all natural resources in such a way as to benefit as many persons as possible. The proper use of resources is always a basic part of the conservation program. Conservation is a complex problem with many interrelated parts and means different things to different people.

Conservation movements are results of scientific developments and a desire to prevent waste and make the most of nature's gifts. It is an attempt to prevent destruction and exploitation and to conserve for the bad years. It has much to do with man's existence.

A national policy of conservation for the United States was started by Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. He appointed the National Conservation Commission to conserve the forests of America. State governments, in the field of conservation, are usually unified in a State conservation department and help to settle the State's problems of conservation of natural resources. Such organizations as the Boy and Girl Scouts, Torchbearers, 4–H Clubs, and Campfire Girls, are junior organizations to conserve natural resources. Some senior organizations are doing much to conserve natural resources also. Such groups are: Farmers' organizations, garden clubs, Audubon clubs, numerous science clubs and societies, and wild flower organizations.

Water is important for navigation, wildlife, forestry, human life and soil conservation. If not properly watched, water will cause erosions and floods. Nature uses many devices to conserve water and to prevent too rapid evaporations or run-offs.

Soil and water conservation are important because when soil and water leave, human life and wildlife will leave and the process does not take long. It takes from 200 to 800 years to build one inch of top soil. But this top soil could be washed or blown away in a few years or even a few weeks if the areas are flooded or dust storms occur often and the soil is unprotected.

There is a little, if any, soil losses in forests and grasslands, except that the land is grazed too closely. Ordinarily, crops deplete soil but the soil can be restored by crop rotation, plowing under green manure crops, and fertilization.

Soil without a cover loses as much as 60 tons of earth per year by water flowing over the surface which washes away the thin sheet of fertile soil. The wind also carries topsoil. Gullies appear and erosions begin. By 1938 erosions had ruined 50,000,000 acres of farm land in the United States and seriously threatened another 50,000,000 acres. The annual loss by this means is estimated at $400,000,000. Erosion not only affects the individual farm but its boundaries are unlimited and it spreads from farm to farm.

To prevent this erosion, you may follow some of these plans. Carry on farming practices which tend to hold water in the ground. These practices consist of plowing at a right angle and contour planting. If the water is held on top of the soil, it will cause erosions; but if allowed to go under the soil, it serves man in a helpful way. We should use steep ground for pastures and forests so as to hold the soil. This process is important because the animals wear away the topsoil and the water stays on top of the ground and will soon cause erosion. However, if it is on a steep grade the water will wash off.

The farmer should practice rotation farming, which means that he should not plant a crop twice a year on the same plot of land without planting a winter crop to replace the elements which are taken from the soil by the summer crop. He should plant water-holding crops alongside non-water-holding crops so as to keep the water in the soil and keep the crop healthy. The farmer should always place check dams in gullies and streams to halt run-away rain water, because this water will go on to good soil and will cause gullies and erosions. If the farmers were more careful and wise, much of our soil would be preserved. It has been a proven fact that in 200 years, the topsoil has a loss of one-third.

Plants increase the value of soil in two ways: They send their roots through the soil which tends to break it up and make it better for growing things. When plants die, their bodies, so to speak, are returned to the soil and decay to form humus.

Animals help to keep the soil fertile. The body wastes of many animals enrich the soil. When an animal dies, its body decays and adds richness to the soil.

Air helps to make soil because it contains oxygen. This oxygen combines with the chemical rock elements in the rocks, causing the rocks to decay. Moving air or wind helps to make soil when it blows sand against rock and causes it to wear away.

Another method of conserving the soil is the planting of bicolor lespedeza.

If soils are treated and helped in the right way, they serve as a help in the progress of our world, but if treated wrong they will eventually bring an end to all living things.

Wildlife conservation is important as well as necessary. If we neglect our animals, they will die out and become extinct. The Government has taken steps to conserve animal life by setting up hunting laws and requirements. Violation of these laws means prison terms and heavy fines. This control is necessary for conservation. In the building of the first railroads the men killed several million buffaloes and endangered many human lives. This made the buffalo become almost extinct, and so the Government took the buffalo under supervision and forbade the further killing of this animal. This is only one of the examples of Government and in conserving our wildlife.

Our woodlands serve as a help to the farm, civilization, and further advancement of the people today. If it were not for the woodlands, we would have no houses, food, or farm life. Our woodlands must be conserved. Civilization will die out and we will live much as the cave man did. Farm life depends upon the woodland for fences and barns. All people depend upon wood for fuel and lumber. As far back as we can trace, we can see that wood has served as a helper to the advancement of civilization. We ruin forest growth by unnecessary cutting. Keeping land in good condition helps the growth of small trees. Wood also helps to stop floods, because it serves as a border line. Its roots absorb the water and hold it. It controls erosion and serves as a home for wildlife. The Government has also helped conserve our woodlands. This was done in President Theodore Roosevelt's time when he started the forestry conservation plan.

Without water agriculture is impossible. Water has also many uses in industry where it plays an important part in the removal of wastes. In order to conserve water for irrigation during the dry season, the Federal Government has built many great dams on the rivers of our dry Western States.

Water gives us recreation in the outdoors, such as fishing, boating, and swimming.

Another kind of water conservation is the building of power dams. One method of using water power is the furnishing of electric power that otherwise might go to waste.

I think all Americans should awaken and realize the importance of these factors to life and living. We must, therefore, preserve soil, water, wildlife, forestry, and human life because these things serve as recreations, hobbies, and better working conditions, and an enjoyment of life to its fullest extent. We can protect our wildlife, soil, water, and forests by keeping the laws pertaining to them. Life and better living depend on conservation.

Military Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, even privates in the service oppose the recent pay increase granted the armed services. Here is a letter from one who expresses his views as follows:

Actually I doubt if there are more than a scant hundred men in the combined branches of service who even deserved their former rate of pay. As for the increase, I doubt if anyone really needed it.

For instance, here at Fort Meade the NCO quarters present a good reference. In front of each trim little brick home stands an automobile of recent vintage. None of these are more than 3 years old, and I think that is a good indication of a man's financial status. If he has a new car, he doesn't need a pay raise.

Still on the subject of cars, quite a few soldiers own and operate rather expensive ones like Buicks, Oldsmobiles, Pontiacs, etc. In their cases it is quite true they didn't make enough to pay for them. That being the case, with their expensive tastes they got their wives or other dependents jobs on the reservation to make up the difference. The commanding general of this Army is General Motors.

With the coming personnel cuts in the Department of National Defense, I would suggest that the first job holders to be cut should be the wives and daughters of servicemen. The auto is still a fair index of income, and I can think of no way to justify the white-collar workers to pay for these autos while he, the private, perhaps, is riding the trolleys.

Actually the pay raise will draw more near-do-wells onto the services pay rolls than before. Good hands simply won't join the services, because there's still nothing attractive about it. We're paying our third and fourth raters more just to get more of their ilk. Perhaps we have packed Congress with the same type.

Why H. R. 6000 Should Be Enacted Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6000, which is now before the Congress, is a real step forward in our march toward security and well-being for all our citizens. This bill greatly increases the proportion of our working population which is protected by social security and also increases the benefits which would accrue from the national old-age and survivors insurance system.

This bill not only corrects certain obvious deficiencies of the present social-security system but it breaks new ground in the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage and in the extension of State-Federal public-assistance programs.

Two obvious deficiencies in the present system which are corrected by this bill are the following: (1) World War II veterans are given wage credits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance programs of $160 per month for the time spent in military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947. These wage credits would be given regardless of whether death occurred in the service and whether veterans' benefits were payable. It may be readily understood that where the individual died in the service the wage credits provide real and substantial benefits for the widow and children.

It provides liberalization of benefits to meet the increase in cost of living since the original law was enacted on the basis of estimates in 1939. Under the provisions of this bill the benefits received by the present recipients under the old-age and survivors insurance program will be increased on the average by approximately 70 percent. The increases would range from 50 percent for the highest benefit group to as high as 150 percent for the lowest benefit group. In addition a provision is included which makes it possible for those retiring after 1949 to have their benefits computed on a new formula which will give a considerably higher proportion of the monthly wage than the present system allows. The present minimum benefit of $10 is increased to $25. It is generally agreed that the present minimum benefit of $10 is hardly sufficient to maintain even the barest standard of existence. The inadequacy of the present old-age and survivors insurance benefits has forced large numbers of the aged to seek relief locally in the States and has imposed a greater burden on these units of government. Benefit amounts are computed by a much simpler method and persons covered by the extensions can now take full advantage of the program.

Extension of coverage as affected by this bill reaches almost a half of the remaining workers not now protected by social security. This extension of the old-age and survivors insurance protection is effected in two ways: (a) By specifying new occupational groups, particularly the self-employed, to be added, and, (b) by clarification of the term "employee" so that most persons in the twilight zone nonagricultural occupations between self-employment status and employment will be included. Extension of coverage is also made optional on group choice for the many different groups of State and local employees such as teachers, policemen, and firemen. Many other new occupational groups are specifically named in this bill for coverage and it may safely be said that all groups have been included for which adequate administrative procedures have been worked out.

Finally, it must be added that this bill is of immeasurable value in its improvement of Federal participation in State-Federal public-assistance programs. Briefly it may be stated that aid is extended to persons not now eligible for assistance under these programs, the Federal share of public assistance costs is increased in accordance with a new formula, the Federal participation is extended to include sharing the costs of maintaining public medical institutions housing needy aged, blind, and disabled persons, authorizing direct payment for medical care to practitioners and institutions and increasing support of child-welfare services. Moreover, this bill makes it possible to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance system to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, areas which are greatly in need of this type of protection.

This bill, in sum, is a necessary advance in our program of security and welfare for all Americans. By insuring the welfare of a larger proportion of our people it builds up our national defenses and provides for our national future. We cannot avoid the responsibility now imposed on us to increase the social security of our citizenry.

The Legion's Exposure of Hate Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by request I am including as an extension of remarks a statement made by the chairman of the Americanism commission of the American Legion for the Department of Illinois.

I call particular attention to the two resolutions, and to the list of subversive organizations, publications and individuals inimical to the best interests of American democracy:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF HATE GROUPS

The American public is becoming increasingly aware that there exist organizations which, under the guise of spreading the principles of Americanism, create discord and misunderstandings among all races, creeds, and colors, contrary to our basic democratic concepts. The American Legion membership has fought for a long time the dangerous and totalitarian precepts of the Communists and Communist front groups. During recent years, it has become aware of other types of antidemocratic organizations. The Legion's exposure of these organizations has been a great factor in curbing the growth and, indeed, in some cases, putting out of business these potentially un-American organizations in the United States. It is our view that communism, fascism, socialism, or any other form of totalitarianism cannot be countenanced by our memberiship which must fight these un-American activities.

At the last National Convention of the American Legion, two resolutions, in particular, were passed that form the basis and motivation of this report. These resolutions are quoted below:

"Resolution 264

"Whereas for God and country we have again assembled to renew our pledge of allegiance to the principles upon which the American Legion was founded, to consolidate the victories already won and to organize our resources for the battles still ahead; and

"Whereas the events of the passing year have emphasized more than ever before those dangers to our liberty which spring to life during the slightest relaxation of that eternal and self-sacrificing vigilance which keeps men free: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in National Convention, assembled in Miami, Fla., October 18–21, 1948, That we again declare our undying allegiance to the faith of our fathers, the faith that founded a nation of free individuals creating and employing the powers of government only to make their freedom the more secure and their liberty the more desirable, a nation in legend and in fact the last great hope of a theretofore bewildered and enslaved humanity; be it further

"Resolved, That we propose to see to it that this last great hope of man be not lost either to enemies invading from without, or traitors corrupting from within; that this Government of free men, by free men, and for the freedom of men shall not be lost either to those who would become tyrants for their own selfish interests or to those whose vulnerability to the songs of Utopia make them the easy prey of fascistic and communistic totalitarianisms; be it further

"Resolved, That we go forth from this convention to warn all those who believe in Americanism that in this hour of national peril, the time is later than we think; that their defense of the life they love must be prompt, thorough, united, and militant; that they and we, defending our Nation in its maturity, are not worthy of the trust given us if we do not pledge to the cause, as did those defending it in its infancy, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor; be it further here and now highly

"Resolved, That we recognize the time of the battle as now, the place of the battle as here, and that we enter the fray in the firm determination that our zeal for Americanism shall be unmatched in degree by the fanaticism of its worst enemies, and that the ultimate victory shall certainly be ours, for God and country."

"Resolution 621

"Whereas it has been the policy of the American Legion, as part of its Americanism program, to condemn and oppose all forms of subversive activities, whether they be manifested by an appeal to racial hatreds and prejudices or by attempts to divide this Nation into industrial strife by agitating and fomenting trouble between capital and labor, and economic group against economic group; and

"Whereas communism is an ideology, a state of mind, a bundle of emotion, which has skillfully organized and developed, with many secret and conspiratorial aspects, to serve where required as a fifth column for the Government of Soviet Russia; and

"Whereas many Communists, Communist sympathizers, and their fellow travelers are reliably reported to have secured employment in confidential and key positions in public office, political and labor organizations, and particularly in the teaching profession in our schools and colleges; and

"Whereas subversive organizations and individuals are continuing their vicious campaigns of propaganda to disunite and divide the American people, setting class against class, race against race, and creed against creed; and

"Whereas these un-American forces are disrupting national unity in these critical postwar years, when victory on the home front and peace in the world are as important as was victory on the battle front; and

"Whereas some form of legitimate democratic action is necessary as a defense against Communist betrayal of our form of government and to insure the safety and security of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we call upon the people of our Nation to oppose this threat to American unity and urge our fellow citizens of all races, colors, and creeds to demonstrate that same spirit of cooperation that was evidenced by our armed forces on the battle fronts in our fight against aggression, bigotry, and intolerance, and fight every attempt of these un-American forces to destroy the fundamental principles of life, liberty, justice, and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution."

The American Legion has always stood for an Americanism based on the dignity and equality of all human beings and has been sternly vocal against false Americanism doctrines that attempt to foster religious, racial, or class hatred among the American people. The American Legion firmly believes that it has helped and can help further in the eradication of religious and racial strife in the United States by exposing to its membership and their families those organizations, groups, individuals, sometimes through publications, radio, and on public platforms, who seek to destroy a harmonious and democratic America.

Therefore, in this new 1949 report of the Americanism Commission Department of Illinois of the American Legion, we shall list and discuss many of the existing organizations whose purposes and techniques are contrary to the basic moral and legal values of American citizenship. We do this, strongly believing, that when the entire membership of the American Legion knows fully about these organizations, and individuals, it will not only not fall victim to them, but it will continue to expose the true character of these organizations and individuals to the entire American populations and individuals that foster racial and religious hatreds. The Department of Illinois, American Legion, has in other exposures emphasized and reiterated its opposition to the equally dangerous Communist groups in the United States. The same is true of the national organization.

After a careful study of the activities of many organizations, we have reached the conclusion that those listed below are inimical to the best interests of American democracy. These organizations are anti-American since they pit class against class, rate against race, and creed against creed, and make appeals with varying degrees of emphasis, all with the purpose of creating chaos and disunity among our people.

Name: Anglo-Saxon Federation. Place: Haverhill, Mass. Leader: Howard Rand.

The Anglo-Saxon Federation is a group which preaches the theory that they are the true descendants of Israel. They resort to anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism. Operating under various names, the group has its counterpart in all of the English-speaking countries. In the United States, it has chapters in Chicago, Dayton, Portland, Los Angeles, and Boston. The official publication of the Anglo-Saxon Federation is a monthly magazine called Destiny.

Name: Christian Nationalist Crusade; Christian Nationalist Party; Patriotic Tract Society. Place: St. Louis, Mo. Leader: Gerald L. K. Smith.

Gerald L. K. Smith is probably the most vicious of the rabble-rousing and sensational hate mongers operating today. He has followers throughout the country, and his literature distribution has reached large proportions. The Patriotic Tract Society is a paper organization that is used as a front for the distribution of this literature. The official publication of Smith's outfits is the Cross and the Flag. Typical of the false and dangerous doctrines that have appeared in this publication are the following excerpts from the May 1949 issue: "We believe in the complete social and political segregation of the black and white races in America."

"The danger to the white race comes from the aspirations of the Jewish race to dominate the world."

Name: Citizens Protective League. Place: New York, N. Y. Leader: Kurt Mertig.

The Citizens Protective League has been a rallying point for bund elements and native Fascists. On January 10, 1946, Mertig was arrested for unlawful assembly and drew a sentence of 6 months in the workhouse and served his time. The Citizens Protective League was branded subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark in May 1948.

Name: Constitutional Educational League. Place: New York, N. Y. Leader: Joseph P. Kamp.

The Constitutional Educational League's main activity is pamphleteering. Pamphlets issued by the group try to create religious hostility. In its accusations of "Communist infiltration," it makes malicious and irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals who are working to strengthen and improve our democracy. The league is a personal vehicle of Kamp's, which sells its pamphlets at profiteering prices in order to insure a good living for him.

Name: Great Pyramid Club. Place: Los Angeles, Calif. Leaders: Ray and Sam Capt.

Among the leadership of this group are a number of former klansmen. Rev. Wesley Swift has been a regular speaker before this organization. Swift is a former klansman and a known rabble rouser. He has a reputation of being the west coast's most vicious hate monger.

Name: House of Prayer for All People. Place: Denver, Colo. Leader: Rev. William L. Blessing.

Blessing preaches the Anglo-Saxon Federation's type of religion, although he is not directly connected with the group. He is not only anti-Semitic, but frequently makes vitriolic attacks upon the Catholic Church. Blessing's official publication is called Showers of Blessing. A typical quote from his publication is the following taken from the May 13, 1949, issue: "How much better off would we in this country be if Roman Catholicism were completely defeated—not a Roman Catholic left in the country?"

Name: Judge Armstrong Foundation. Place: Fort Worth, Tex. Leader: George W. Armstrong.

The Judge Armstrong Foundation was set up to support financially those devisionist "nationalist" groups in which Armstrong was interested. Armstrong is an independently wealthy man, and has written several anti-Democratic pamphlets. In one of his pamphlets Armstrong urged the repeal of sections of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution "thereby limiting the franchise to the Nation's white Americans" another aspect of the "White Supremacy" doctrine.

Name: Ku Klux Klan (Association of Georgia Klans). Place: Atlanta, Ga.: Leader: Dr. Samuel Green.

We have before us again the hooded secret order and its fiery cross. Its methods of intimidation and terrorism have long been the disgust and disdain of law-abiding citizens. Antimask laws have been passed in a number of Southern States, in an attempt to curb the order. The Klan is, of course, not only anti-Negro, anti-Jewish, and anti-Catholic, but extends its cruel and inhuman activities against veterans. Recent indictments and resultant convictions of those guilty of these illegal acts are eagerly expected by all law-abiding and law-observing citizens.

Name: Loyal American Group. Place: Union, N. J. Leader: Conde McGinley.

This organization was set up by McGinley for the purpose of promoting his hate-mongering paper, Common Sense. Numerous meetings have been held in New Jersey, at which some of the most poisonous literature published has been offered for sale. The Loyal American group and Common Sense have been denounced by patriotic organizations and by official Catholic bodies. The official publication of this group is called Common Sense.

Name: Lutheran Research Society. Place: Detroit, Mich. Leader: Lawrence Reilly.

The Lutheran Research Society is an independent venture and has no connnection with the official Lutheran Synod, a respected organization. This society does not hold regular meetings but it has sponsored the appearance in Detroit of Don Lohbeck and Kenneth Goff, representatives of Gerald L. K. Smith. The official publication of this group is called Eleventh Hour.

Name: National Blue Star Mothers. Place: Philadelphia, Pa. Leader: Catherine V. Brown.

A violently hate-mongering group. It labels its critics as either Jews or Reds. This group distributed masses of hate literature at the Democratic and Republican conventions held in Philadelphia in 1948. They tried to cause disturbances to focus attention on their activities. This group has recently been cited by the Attorney General's office as being subversive.

Name: National Economic Council. Place: New York, N. Y. Leader: Merwin K. Hart.

Merwin K. Hart operates his National Economic Council with an aura of respectability. Recently, Hart abandoned his subtle innuendoes and showed his true character by resorting to anti-Semitic items in his publications and speeches. The official publication of this group is the Economic Council Letter.

Name: National Renaissance Party. Place: Beacon, N. Y. Leader: James H. Madole.

The National Renaissance Party is a one-man antidemocratic organization. Madole is given to one-man crusades which have fancy titles, such as the Animist Party, National Renaissance Party, etc. He has made several attempts to unify the nationalist movement in the United States. The following are two of the published aims of this group:

1. "Nationalization of our people through an educational campaign among college, church, and labor groups."

2. "Termination of political bureaucracy and establishment of rule by the intellectual elite."

Name: Nationalist Action League. Place: Philadelphia, Pa. Leader: W. Henry McFarland, Jr.

The Nationalist Action League was recently set up by MacFarland, a Philadelphia extremist. It is a political action group, aimed at influencing voters and legislation. MacFarland works closely with such known rabble rousers as Catherine V. Brown of the

National Blue Star Mothers, Gerald L. K. Smith, etc. The official publication of this group, National Progress, has, as of June 1, 1949, been consolidated with Common Sense, the official publication of the Loyal American group.

Name: Organized Americans of German Ancestry. Place: Chicago, Ill. Leader: Leonard Enders.

A number of leaders of this group were former bund members and key figures in the old pro-Nazi Einheitsfront. The ostensible purpose of the group is to weld all German-Americans together in order to form a powerful political bloc.

Name: Original Southern Klans, Inc. Place: Columbus, Ga. Leader: Alton E. Pate.

A splinter Klan group which is openly anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic, and whose aim is "the defense of white Protestant America." The official publication of this group is called the Klansman.

Name: Pro-American Information Bureau. Place: Hinckley, Ill. Leader: Andrew B. McAllister.

The Pro-American Information Bureau is a clearing house for hate literature. McAllister has made several unsuccessful attempts to coordinate the hate groups and has held several conferences in Hinckley, attended by representatives of a number of these groups.

Name: Protestant War Veterans of the United States. Place: New York, N. Y. Leader: Edward James Smythe.

A one-man paper organization, which publishes anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic leaflets and pamphlets. Apparently the funds solicited by Smythe through his organization are his sole source of income. He is a habitual drunkard with no ostensible means of support. In a recent brochure, published by this group, the following slogan was printed in bold type: "We stand opposed to racial and social equality."

Name: Public Affairs Forum. Place: Los Angeles, Calif. Leader: Earl Craig.

A hate organization, which holds regular meetings. The gatherings of the forum are the rendezvous of a number of other notorious rabble rousers and a distributing point for a great deal of hate literature.

Not only are there organizations which by their policies and techniques attempt to further disunity among the American people, but there are a number of publications that have no organizational affiliations which try to contribute to the same pernicious goal. Below are listed some of the more important of these publications:

American Digest, Americus, Ga., Dewey Taft, editor.

Beacon Light Herald, Atascadero, Calif., William Kullgren, editor.

Bible News Flashes, Faribault, Minn., William D. Herrstrom, editor.

Boise Valley Herald, Middleton, Idaho, A. Boyd and I. W. Cornell, editors.

Broom, San Diego, Calif., C. Leon DeAryan, editor.

Christian Veterans Political Counsel, Chicago, Ill., Frederick Kister, editor.

Dayton Independent, Dayton, Ohio, A. G. Silvey, editor.

Defender, Wichita, Kans., Gerald B. Winrod, editor.

Free Press, Redmond, Oreg., Syd D. Pierce, editor.

Georgia Tribune, Columbus, Ga., "Parson" Jack Johnston, editor.

Guildsman, Germantown, Ill., Edward A. Koch, editor.

Kingdom Digest, Fort Worth, Tex., J. A. Lovell, editor.

Malist, Meriden, Conn., Henry S. Sattler, editor.

Methodist Challenge, Los Angeles, Calif., Robert P. Shuler, editor.

Ohio Pioneer, Dayton, Ohio, Ohio Pioneer, Inc., editor.

Pray Circle Letter, Wichita, Kans., Gerald B. Winrod, publisher.

Truth and Liberty, Minneapolis, Minn., C. O. Stadaklev, editor.

Williams' Intelligence Summary, Hollywood, Calif., Robert H. Williams, editor.

The American Legion has on many occasions warned its membership of activities of some of the groups and publications listed above. Ever since the end of World War II, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has energetically gone on record every year in condemning all those organizations and publications which try to foster disunity in our country. Other sections of the Legion have opposed those groups similarly. For example, in January of 1949 the Legionnaire, official publication of the American Legion, Department of New York, warned its membership not to have anything to do with the publication Common Sense, the Union, N. J., paper, published by Conde McGinley. The Legion publication referred to Common Sense as "a hate sheet" and said that Common Sense is "violently anti-Semitic and in direct conflict with the principles of the American Legion." In a recent issue, April-May 1949, of the Summary of Trends and Developments Exposing the Communist Conspiracy," published by the National Americanism Commission, subcommittee on Subversive Activities of the American Legion, a number of the organizations listed above were classified by this publication as subversive; for example, the National Blue Star Mothers of America and Original Southern Klans, Inc.

The chairman of Americanism commission of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, believes that it is the duty of every Americanism chairman of every post and that of each liberty-loving American not only to familiarize himself with the contents of this report, but to be responsible for the creation of positive Americanism programs on this subject, throughout the year. This department invites post Americanism chairmen and other citizens to make use of its services in the creation of affirmative and effective Americanism programs in local communities. It is hoped that these programs will carry into effect American Legion mandates against those fostering religious hatreds, hate mongering, and rabble rousing as well as other mandates against those isms which place in peril our established institutions.

ELLIODOR M. LIBONATI,
Chairman, Americanism Commission, Department of Illinois, American Legion.

Soil-Conservation Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of an essay entitled "Soil and Water Conservation," written by Peggy Hopkins, of Staunton, Augusta County, Va., which won first prize in a contest conducted by the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Chamber of Commerce among high-school students of Page, Augusta, and Rockingham Counties.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

(By Peggy Hopkins, Lee High School, Staunton, Va.)

Of what importance are our soil and water to us? Do we realize how much they mean to us, or do we just derive many things from them without actually realizing their importance? It is feared that too many people don't consider how much they mean to us and are sometimes very wasteful or destructive. This is one reason why we must begin now, before it is too late, to conserve the soil and water that we have.

Soil is our Nation's most important resource as both city and country people cannot live without it. Today we are becoming more concerned with America's soil and water resources as we realize that they will mean a lot in the future prosperity of the United States. Our food and fiber crops come from the soil and if we hope to continue having these we must conserve the soil. The soil in our land is therefore the foundation of America, for everything we do is built from the productivity of our agricultural lands.

Everyone is also dependent upon our water resource throughout every day of his life. It is necessary on farms for the growth of crops and in raising animals as well as for many other things. It is a necessity in all homes for cooking, drinking, and washing. Towns and cities must use water for fire protection and for sanitation. In our industries, it is used for power and light. These are only a few of the things for which it is necessary; in fact, without water, we could not live. Even though water is so important many of us don't even know where water comes from. We think that there is nothing to it except a twist of the faucet and we will have pure, clear water. It is not quite as simple as this for there is much behind the faucet which brings us our water. There are pipes, the lake or reservoir, the stream and the soil. The soil is really a source of our water as it collects and stores the water as it falls from the sky. Both water and soil are quite necessary for we could not live without both of them.

Although, we sometimes do not realize it, our soil is not permanent. Both wind and water carry away some soil with them when they move across any bare land and unless we can keep the soil fastened down, it may be eventually washed away, either a short distance or for hundreds of miles. We can keep the soil fastened down by planting crops which will hold the soil in place. Dense growth is a great aid in helping to slow down the movement of the soil. If we have dense growth, there will still be a slight erosion of the land, but it will be so slow that nature will have time to replace the soil by constantly forming new topsoil. This type of erosion is not dangerous as a rule, but if our land is cultivated or left bare, a faster kind of erosion will occur. It is this type of erosion that is caused by man's carelessness. This erosion destroys grasslands which have been made thin by overgrazing. It also destroys woodlands in which there has been overcutting or burning. If we aren't more careful about this soil erosion it may ruin most of our good land.

Ever since the beginning of civilization in America, man has had the terrible habit of wasting the gifts of nature. The greatest waste in our resources has been in the misuse of our soil and water. Erosion has ruined much of our best farming and grazing land because of the carelessnes of man. This has caused many farm families to lose their means of earning a living.

Destruction of these resources is not as critical now as it was in the past but it is still going on to some extent. We must be ever mindful of the trouble that the loss of soil and water can cause for they are valuable resources upon which future generations must live.

So much land has been wasted in the past that the stage has been reached where we have no more land to lose. We really need more good land for crops now, but too many farmers are using poor land that should be

turned back to grass or woodland. If we lose much more land, we will be unable to keep our standard of living of today.

Soil conservationists have many things to consider in protecting the land from erosion and exhaustion. They must realize and make other people realize that all land is not alike, and that certain types of soil are better suited for certain crops and that the soil would be wasted if not planted with the proper crops. Conservation of soil is the proper use and care of the land. It is using the land wisely and producing the largest amount of things which are needed most, and at the same time protecting the soil and not damaging it.

There are certain soil problems that conservation helps prevent; such as keeping the topsoil from washing or blowing away, the exhaustion of plant food in the soil by overcropping, too much water in the soil or wet lands, a lack of water in the soil or dry lands, and improper cultivation.

There are also several means of preventing these soil problems and waste of water and protecting our land which many of our farmers are practicing at the present time. On some land, farmers have made drainage waterways, ponds, firebreaks, and shelter belts and windbreaks. In planting crops, certain methods are used such as contour farming, strip cropping, terracing, gully control, crop rotation, proper use of lime, manures, and fertilizer, planting of cover crops, irrigation and pasture development. Now most of us have heard of these methods before but probably don't even realize what they are. The drainage waterways provide a source of hay for grazing. They are seeded with soil-holding and soil-binding crops and are more desirable if they are broad. Farm ponds are necessary for several reasons on a farm. They will serve as a storage for water to be used in irrigation, they will provide fresh fish for food, and water for livestock and fire protection. Firebreaks are placed in wooded areas and in pastures. They should be wide enough to act as a barrier against fire. Shelterbelts and windbreaks are an aid in preventing soil blowing. The shelterbelts consist of several rows of trees and shrubs.

Contour farming is level farming which saves power and equipment and also holds the water in many small ridges so that it will not wash away the soil. The furrows are curved to fit the lay of the land instead of straight furrows that run up and downhill. Strip cropping is the planting of strips of close-growing plants such as grass or clover between alternate strips of row crops. These strips hold water and prevent erosion. Terracing is the ridging of the land somewhat on the contour. This is usually done on sloping fields and tends to hold the rainfall which will then run off slowly without causing much erosion. Gullies are caused by a rush of water downhill which washes away the soil They may be prevented by planting grass, vines, trees, and shrubs, or by forming dams to catch silt. Crop rotation is the growing of different crops in succession to keep the soil productive and to improve it; in this way one crop helps another crop. Lime, manure, and fertilizer are used in the soil to enrich it when necessary. This will enable the growth of vigorous roots to hold the soil in place. Cover crops are planted as summer crops, winter crops, and permanent crops. The purpose of these is to furnish cover for wildlife and to utilize places on the farm that are not being used for other crops. This practice is being neglected. Irrigation is an important method which is used to help the growth of crops. It is the spreading of water which is brought by canals and ditches. The last and one of the most important practices is pasture development. Grasses and legumes are planted which enrich the soil and furnish food for livestock. All of these methods cannot be used on the same type of soil but since there are so many different types of soil there is a method for practically every type. If these methods had not been developed our land would probably be in a state of total destruction.

The United States is divided into soil-conservation districts which are local units of government which operate under States laws. These districts are set up and run by farmers to protect farms and other lands from erosion, to conserve rainfall, and to improve productivity. They may receive help from State and Federal Governments. These farmers cooperate with each other to protect their lands and each farmer has a part in the district-wide plan instead of being looked upon as an individual. The success in these soil-conservation districts is due to teamwork, and with teamwork the work of the farms is done faster and all farmers benefit from it.

Outside of the soil-conservation districts there are other agencies organized for the purpose of conserving our water and soil and other resources. The CCC camps did a tremendous job in this way.

From time to time, new ways of conservation are being developed and more farmers are realizing the importance of conserving their soil and water. Not only farmers but everyone must think seriously about how much they mean to us and not just ignore them.

Ever since the beginning of civilization in America man has had the terrible habit of wasting the gifts of nature. The greatest waste in our resources has been in the misuse of our soil and water. If conservation is not begun within our generation there will be no good water or land for future generations. The soil in our country is, therefore, the foundation of America, for everything we do is built up from the productivity of our agricultural lands.

The Price of Our Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely article which appeared in the October 8, 1949, issue of America.

The article follows:

THE PRICE OF OUR SURVIVAL

(By M. Amrine and E. A. Conway)

An era died, an era only 4 years old, when President Truman announced on September 23 that within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R.

We Americans seem these days to read the newspapers as one reads the death notice of a friend suddenly gone. (It was indeed a cherished friend—our atomic-bomb monopoly.) There is this difference. One reads such obituaries through a blur. In this case the notices themselves are blurred. Never have we read fuzzier, more misleading, more fundamentally wrong statements than those uttered by our high national leaders when the news broke that the Soviets had exploded our monopoly.

We sympathize with prominent people pinioned by the press without warning and asked for comment on this or that emergency. We were nonetheless shocked when a man as respected for his perception as Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, said flatly: "I see no reason why a development that was anticipated years ago should cause any revolutionary change in our thinking or in our actions."

If there is not such a change, the land we love may not live through the next decade.

We were shocked even more by the statement, obviously carefully considered, of a man most qualified to comment, a man whose understanding of human relations we have always admired—David E. Lilienthal. According to United Press, the AEC Chairman said that this country must do everything necessary to establish unquestioned and unmistakable leadership in an atomic armament race. Mr. Lilienthal said he felt now precisely as he felt before he knew Russia had the bomb. He then referred to a July 6 statement in which he had said that by maintaining that leadership we could buy time for reason to prevail. He added that numbers and not simply the first atomic weapons are the crucial item.

It is vital for you, our reader, to join us in our search for the sense of that statement. What happened somewhere in Siberia happened to you. The atom bomb is no longer a mysterious something we dropped on the other side of the world, killing some thousands of unknown Japanese. Today your very life is involved in the truth or falsity of statements like Lilienthal's. Foreign policy has become personal policy. We ask you to ask with us: "What actual concrete assurance does this plan of atomic leadership offer me? If the United States travels in this direction, will I be safe tonight, will I be safe tomorrow, and the tomorrows after that?"

Let us see.

Though our leaders would not admit it, the cornerstone of our foreign policy during the past 4 years has been our monopoly of the atomic bomb, our unique ability to annihilate enemy cities and citizens, without fear of similar retaliation.

That monopoly now has vanished. What does Mr. Lilienthal say now?

It is not really gone. Though sole possession is gone, proportion is still ours. You see, we still have a monopoly of the art of making bombs quickly. And we can keep ahead. The Russians can never catch up with us.

The Russians have one bomb? We have a hundred. The Russians have a hundred? We'll have a thousand.

This atomic-leadership doctrine is fundamentally unsound. It is based on the same kind of assumption that beguiled us before. Then we said that our superiority lay in nuclear physics, in engineering, and in dollars. A top United States atomic adviser, John M. Hancock, went about saying that the Russians wouldn't be able to produce a bomb for 20 years. On September 23 we were forced to admit that the Russians had matched our physics and presumably our dollars. Now we fall back on the only assumption left, that they cannot match, much less surpass, our engineering. We still wish-think that the Russians are five-thumbed boobies who can't repair a Ford car.

Already there is a disquieting unanimity about the answers being given to the question: "What do we do now?" The answer given is merely, "Keep ahead." Is this to be the summit of our statecraft in this crisis?

For once Mr. Lilienthal finds himself side by side with the Hearst press. Here is the Hearst-simplified version of the Lilienthal doctrine:

"The United States is making what amounts to two bombs every day. America has an enormous jump on the U. S. S. R. * * * The United States can make the cold war even colder by staying ahead of the Russians. America had a slogan some years ago. It was 'Two ships for every one,' and in time its observance enabled her to win the greatest war in history. * * * It would be a good slogan to revive. It would also be good for America to coin a new slogan to fit these times. It is one which, if strictly

observed, could enforce the peace of the world: Four bombs for one."

Mr. Lilienthal should shiver.

Suppose that by 1952 (remember, that was when the Russians were going to have bombs) we have 1,600 bombs and the Russians have 400. Would that give us any actual strategic advantage over them?

No. Why not? Because the Russians could do as much damage, if not more, with their 400 bombs as we could with our 1,600. The 40 Russian cities with populations of 200,000 or over contain less than 10 percent of the Russian people. The 40 corresponding American cities contain 27 percent of our population. Even if only 10 percent of her bombers got through in a nocturnal atomic blitz, Russia could wipe out our 40 major cities.

But wouldn't we, with our 1,600 bombs, retaliate in kind? We are not discussing an attack on atomically vulnerable Britain. We are talking about an attack on Russia, the one country which has spent 15 years in decentralizing its economy. Besides, Russia happens to be a police state which could move millions of its urban population to dispensed points before it launched its own surprise attack. Then although the United States would have bombs in abundance it would have no target for the next night.

"Keep Ahead" and "Four Bombs for One" are dangerous and deceptive slogans. The safety-in-numbers theory on which they are based must be exploded before those slogans become fixed in the minds of Americans. We must beware of a new complacency based on them and others like them: "Our air power is supreme; the Russians couldn't deliver their bombs"; and "radar and proximity-fused rockets will defend us."

Mr. Lilienthal said further that we must keep our atomic leadership in order to "buy time for reason to prevail." Words will be our undoing unless we watch how they are put together into propositions and judge just what those propositions mean. "Buying time for reason to prevail" is a flashy phrase, but fallacious.

So now we are buying time. What does that mean? Our barter is bombs. In this strange commerce we do not deliver the bombs. We hold them; nay, we increase their number. But we hope that by doing so we will induce the Russians to give us time. Time for what? Time to let reason prevail. Time, presumably, to work out amicably an effective system of international control.

The time Russia gave us would be worth less to her every minute. Would it be in Russia's interest to give us time under this, to her, dismal devaluation program? Would it be in her interest to give us time until, say 1952, when we had 1,600 bombs and she had 400? Would that be the time when sweet reason would prevail? It is more likely that by that time one country or the other would have lost its collective head and loosed its bombs. There is a limit to the fear man can stand.

But suppose the day came when both countries had reached and passed the saturation point, when each had enough bombs to obliterate the other. Russia, let us say, has 2,000 bombs, and we, according to the Hearstian law of parity, have 8,000. Is that when sweet reason is supposed to prevail?

This whole theory is based on an untenable psychological assumption, that two peoples will stay sane and calm and reasonable in the midst of an ever-accelerating atomic armament race. It is also based on a completely gratuitous scientific assumption. We assumed that Russia could not build bombs until 1952. Shall we now assume that she cannot build them as fast as we?

The central sobering facts about our present predicament are these: there is no safety in numbers of bombs. Nor is there any long-term safety in air power, in radar screens, in rocket interception. Science got us into this predicament, but science cannot save us. The Soviets will scorch our cities, our soil, and ourselves until every stone and clod and bone screams out to the Geiger counter, unless we summon up new resources of intelligence and will to find a political solution of the crisis we are in.

We have no pat solution to offer, nor are we proposing any particular leadership. But we are asking for real leadership, the best that can be found in America. With Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, we say:

"I hope the national decisions which will have to be made will express the highest level of our national intelligence, our finest instincts for the preservation of the best in humanity, and that the execution of these decisions may be characterized by resolute, undeviating courage."

While the search for that real leadership proceeds, we might start at once on this interim program:

1. A national act of humility, which is nothing more than honest acknowledgment of the truth. Out of this humility should come caution and the spirit of compromise. Caution will counsel an end to boasting, blustering, bullying, and blackmail. Two can play at those games, when both have the bomb. Caution will require more restraint on the part of press and radio, and more care on the part of official spokesmen. The spirit of compromise is needed, now that negotiations will be conducted by equals, in power if not in probity.

2. Mobilization of the best physical, social, and political scientists in America for a supreme, cooperative, national effort to work out a viable atomic policy. We suggest, for a starter, that the leading nuclear physicists be polled for their frank judgment on the scientific soundness of the UN majority plan for international control as it now stands—not the first American proposal, but the radically revised scheme approved last year.

3. A thorough reevaluation of the personnel that has been setting and executing our atomic policy. No respecting of persons, prestige, or political power must prevent the selection of top-drawer personnel.

4. Restudy of our entire atomic policy, both national and international, from the nucleus out. This would include a searching analysis of every one of the assumptions and formulas and slogans which served us so badly in the past, and a similar analysis of the new ones already taking shape.

Nothing less than revolutionary changes in our thinking and in our actions is going to satisfy the American people, who, after all, like to sleep at night. When they come out of their present state of shock, they are going to ask for those changes. Leadership worthy of the name of leadership would not wait to be asked.

Virginia's Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, October 5, 1949:

VIRGINIA'S POLL TAX

The people of Virginia will vote next month on a proposal to abolish the State's poll tax. And in the Star's opinion, this tax should be done away with.

Some people, including many of those who have been loudest in denouncing the poll tax, are backing away now, and saying that if the voters approve the pending proposal the legislature may impose requirements in lieu of a poll tax that would make it harder than ever to vote. This is possible but not probable.

The referendum on repeal of the poll tax is based on a careful study by a commission headed by Stuart B. Campbell, of Wytheville. The tax cannot be repealed without amending the State constitution. And any constitutional amendment in Virginia is a slow process, since it must be approved by two successive legislatures, which takes 4 years, and then submitted to the people for their approval. It is because of this that the Campbell commission has tried to draft a proposal which, if adopted, would not have to be changed through another constitutional amendment in the near future.

To accomplish this, the details of the change are left to the legislature, so revision can be conveniently made as experience may show the need. But if the legislature does what the commission has recommended, Virginia will have a very satisfactory voting procedure.

The poll tax would be repealed. In its place there would be, first, a literacy test requirement. Next is a provision for annual registering of voters, but a person who voted in the preceding election, or who paid any tax in the State, would not have to register a second time. Something of this sort is necessary to prevent fraudulent voting from "dead" registration lists. The Virginia proposal on this point follows the New York law, which is considered a model. There are two more main proposals. One fixes the time for registration at 120 days before a primary or general election. This time is needed to prepare and distribute lists of voters. The other authorizes a school tax, not to exceed $3 a person. Poll-tax receipts now go for school purposes, and the new tax would protect the school system against loss of needed revenue. The tax does not have to be paid, however, in order to vote.

It is hard to find serious fault with these proposals. The legislature, of course, is not bound to follow them, but the legislature, after all, is the creature of the voters and it is not apt to defy their clearly indicated desires in a matter of this kind. Those people who were fighting the poll tax, and who have now switched over and are fighting repeal of the poll tax, are putting themselves in a ridiculous position. If they want to get rid of the tax through State action, they ought to be urging a favorable vote in the referendum, and then, when that has carried, take up the cudgels for adoption by the legislature of the Campbell proposals.

Mildred Scott—A Well-Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Nation observed National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and hundreds of thousands of men and women received new hope from the interest shown in their personal search for employment.

But there might never have been such a week if it were not for Miss Mildred Scott, the national secretary of the American Federation of the Physically

Handicapped. It was she who finally helped convince Congressman Hatton Sumners, of Texas, that his committee should report out the resolution which Paul Strachan, AFPH president, had placed before it.

And there might not have been many other things had it not been for the tireless energy and courageous persistence of this devoted young lady who conquered a personal handicap to devote her life to the physically handicapped.

Most of my colleagues in the House and Senate have heard of Paul Strachan, but not so many have heard of Milly Scott, who acts as the ears for the deaf AFPH president. It is through Mildred Scott's ears that the woes of the handicapped, the requests of legislators for advice and assistance, and the multitudinous daily phone calls of AFPH pour.

And this young lady, who left a good job in the Government to take on the crusade for the handicapped in her office at 1370 National Press Building, finds time to make public speeches. She takes her cane and heads off to talk to any group that will listen to her tell America that it is good business to hire the handicapped. And she also finds time to inspire the establishment of lodges of AFPH across the country. People who have caught her fervor go out into the vineyard themselves to do their bit for the handicapped.

Because her remarks are important, because anything this fine woman says or does is important, I insert in the RECORD a speech which she made to the Zonta Club of Washington on October 5 in connection with National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week:

WOMEN'S RESPONSIBILITY IN DEVELOPING A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALL HANDICAPPED

It will, no doubt startle you to know that there are, according to estimates from various official sources, from 28,000,000 to 55,000,000 citizens of this country who are, in some degree, physically handicapped. At least half of them, estimated conservatively at 14,000,000, are women. Approximately 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 handicapped are listed in the category of being unfeasible for rehabilitation, and therefore, totally unemployable. Many of these have no income, and no means of support, other than an uncertain charity, or public assistance.

Women should concern themselves with this problem for many reasons. As homemakers, they are closer to disaster, when it strikes. Suppose children in the family suffer a handicap, then the mother has to see to it that the child receives special care. Perhaps some member of the family loses an arm, a leg, an eye—or suffers severe, chronic illness that strikes the victim down in adult life? We do not give much thought to such things until they happen, that is only natural. But, would you, for example, if such happened in your family, know where to turn for guidance or help, if needed?

The problems of the handicapped are economic in effect. You all know that the family's savings can soon be eaten up by the cost of treatment, etc., and then when an individual has gotten over that phase, naturally the next thought is, how to become self-supporting. Particularly is that true if the physical handicap has forced the individual to give up previous work because of its unsuitability in relation to his or her handicap, and instead, undertake vocational training for an entirely new job. When the individual determines to strike out on his own in that respect that is a healthy sign, because such determination, of itself, shows that the battle of rehabilitation is half won. But, unless opportunities and facilities to accomplish the desired end are available, and a better understanding of the capabilities of handicapped, as workers, developed on the part of employers, all too many handicapped find the doors of hope and achievement closed in their faces.

Having been born and reared in a small town, and having had a severe physical handicap from early childhood, perhaps I see things differently than some others, because of my own experience. I came of a large family. Maybe, in a way, that was a blessing, because we had to scramble pretty much for ourselves. Yet, I was left out of many things that other youngsters were doing, and, as an offset, I found there were many other things that I could do. Fortunately, I was not too much aware that I was "different," or looked upon as a "novelty," until 2 weeks before I graduated from high school. Then, it was brought forcefully to my attention.

I had been encouraged and led to believe that I could be a teacher. That seemed to be the most popular profession for a woman, and naturally the women I knew and admired best were teachers. But I learned that even though I continued school and graduated from a teachers college, I would be barred from teaching in the State of Pennsylvania, because of a visible physical handicap. That law still exists in the State of Pennsylvania, today, as well as in the State of New York, and other States, although, of course, there are some private schools where a handicapped person may teach. However, even in most schools, that profession is frowned upon for those who are handicapped. I am not, of course, advocating that all handicapped persons be permitted to teach, but I insist that all those who are otherwise qualified, be so permitted, if they desire, and this should be uniform in all States.

I turned elsewhere to see what I might do. I am not going into a recitation of my personal history, except to say that my experience convinced me that there should be a national service organization for physically handicapped. I also learned that if laws in this country were to be improved, or additional laws put on the books to bring about a better coordinated program for handicapped, that there must be a national organization fighting for those benefits.

Quite by chance, I picked up a small pamphlet and noted that a new organization had been formed—the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. This was early in 1943. I was curious, so I wrote a letter of inquiry, and on reply, I joined, and then forgot about it for a while, feeling, I suppose, that in merely joining, I had helped a little. I was in Texas at the time.

I was on their mailing list and I soon saw that the Federation was, in fact, pioneering in a virtually unknown field. When I came to Washington I did a bit of checking and then found myself giving of my evenings, and later becoming more and more interested in AFPH's program and objectives. Its founder and president, Paul A. Strachan, among other disabilities, is totally deaf. I had never met anyone before who was so convinced and determined that there must be a real program for the Nation's millions of handicapped, and, a militant organization to back it up.

It was only during and following World War I that women began to really organize. I believe that the National Business and Professional Women's Club was founded during that period and that your own organization came into existence. You all well know the knotty problems you had in getting your organization well launched. We, in AFPH, are encountering similar problems, and in many ways, even harder ones.

As, each year, the "week" will be observed during the first week in October, there will be ample opportunity for thought, study, and a better understanding of the problems, and I am not going to dwell upon too many of them, today. I do hope, however, that all of you will do everything you can to keep the program in line with its original intent. While it is, in a way, a national ballyhoo week for employment of handicapped, it should be much more than that. We who are handicapped, are people, and we have all the feelings, frailties, faults, and maybe virtues, of any other persons. Not any of us have any notion of being glamor girls and boy heroes. We only want people to accept us. We know that if properly trained, and given an opportunity on the right job, we can hold our own and earn our way, and we have proven this, beyond peradventure of doubt. We want to live as normal a life as is possible. As medical science and education advances, many of the problems we encounter today will fade into insignificance.

During this session of Congress, we had six bills introduced. Hearings have been held on five of them—all major bills, of real significance to the handicapped and a benefit to the country as a whole. These are: National Cerebral Palsy Act (there are 600,000 cerebral palsied); National Epilepsy Act (there are 800,000 epileptics); National Leprosy Act, and we are all familiar with the public attitude toward those who, unfortunately, are victims of Hansen's disease (leprosy); a census of handicapped (until that is taken, no one actually knows the number, type, and requirements of the handicapped, and we are, while spending hundreds of millions of dollars presumably on behalf of a national health program, simply legislating in the dark).

The most important of all our bills is, a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, with 17 other Senators as cosponsors, and in the House by 13 Representatives. This is the most far-reaching, comprehensive measure ever introduced in Congress on behalf of the handicapped. It does not establish any new agencies, but changes the name of a present one, and draws into one orbit some of the activities of the 30-odd Federal agencies, each of which has a piece of the handicapped program. If this bill passes, you, as taxpayers, will, very largely, be beneficiaries, because for the first time it will be possible to know where the tax dollar is being spent, insofar as the handicapped are concerned, who is spending it, and what results are being obtained. You have, therefore, a direct, and vital stake in the passage of this bill, which is now before the House Education and Labor Committee, and I urge you to get word to the chairman of that committee, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, and urge him to report it favorably to the House, at once. The number of the bill in the House is H. R. 3095.

I should like to make a suggestion: Those of you who are really interested in this matter could, for the next few days, pretend that you have suffered a sudden, severe disability. Then, figure out where you are going to get the service needed, where you will get necessary treatment, training, etc., if you chose a handicap that would prevent you from returning to your same job, tomorrow. Some of you may have a nest egg put aside for a rainy day. If you are lucky, it might tide you over. But, check up on costs, etc., and you'll find it soon vanishes. It isn't too much fun to look forward to taking a means test (a pauper's oath) before you are eligible to receive financial help, or some of the services needed, otherwise.

You folks are residents, mainly, of the District of Columbia. Take a look around. The greater number of you no doubt have come from other States. Has your home

State had money aside from so-called administrative cost, to actually perform needed services for the handicapped? Do you know, that prior to the last legislatures meeting, last year, which they do hold in some 40 States every 2 years, that rehabilitation directors complained that there was no money for case work for direct service to handicapped, for more than 20 months. In short, in a majority of States, the handicapped, themselves, got little or nothing, while, at the same time, of course, the salaries of so-called rehabilitation directors and their employees were being paid. Our federation believes that condition to be wrong and we are fighting it as hard as we can, and we invite you, and others, to join with us, in an effort to secure real justice for the handicapped. The fact is, there is no real national program for the handicapped, today, because the program varies, from State to State, and if, for example, you came from Texas, you would find you would not get the same service as might be afforded, for example, by New York State.

I hope you will form a study group and check into these things. You'll find them interesting and informative. I'll see that each of you receive copy of S. 1066, Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped. You could possibly get a copy of the hearings on the companion bill, H. R. 3095, introduced in the House by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, by calling the committee clerk, although the supply is nearly exhausted.

AFPH is young. It is growing, but it needs members, money, and facilities to perform the multitude of tasks we know should be done for the handicapped. Our small army is valiant, and we have faith and hope, but we need more fighters, more advocates for things that are right and just.

Once I made a pledge that if the opportunity ever presented itself I would devote as much time as possible to work for a program which someday would bring about better conditions for the handicapped and the members of their families. I want to see mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, and others who have assumed family responsibilities have things a bit easier than my own mother had. We were a large family, and there were other tragedies, not of her making, but they were things which could happen in any family.

I hope each one of you will look about. If there is a job which you know of which can be filled by a qualified handicapped person, give that person a break.

Tenth Anniversary of Invasion of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Congressman CHESTER CHESNEY, of Illinois, at Buffalo, N. Y., October 9, 1949, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Hitler:

Away back on September 1, 1939—it seems almost a century ago—the civilized world was shocked by the sudden attack of the Nazi hordes. This day marked a new era of barbarism unlike any recorded in the pages of world history.

The Polish military forces in the early stages of the invasion were no equal match for the well-trained and modernly equipped Wehrmacht and Luftwaffe. What the Polish Army lacked in tanks, planes, and manpower, they made up in courage and bravery. Unfortunately, these qualities were not enough to repel the invader from his quick thrust into the interior of Poland.

It was Poland's price to pay as a victim in the game of great-power politics. The Nazis outmaneuvered and outsmarted the statesmen of peace, as well as his Soviet collaborators. There was no Munich for Hitler. His bluff and arrogance turned to tenacious determination to destroy and plunder to satisfy his ego and imperialistic program of conquest.

The Nazi's military scourge ravished and then prospered on the souls of the Polish people. In his order to destroy Poland, Hitler knew that he would never overcome the deep love of country and God. His only mark in the hall of fame of cruelty is evidenced by the thousands of shackled peasants, shopkeepers, laborers, and priests who perished in the slave-labor camps.

The ovens of Oswiecin, where the smell of burning flesh replaced the pleasant smell of new bread in the homes of free people, were built by the inhuman orders of madman Hitler. This was a part of his program to make a "master race." It is almost unbelievable the extent to which Hitler depraved his mind in order to inflict horrible cruelties upon his fellow men. Only a savage mentality could possibly dream up such diabolical schemes.

The crazy madcap Nazi Hitler lasted, fortunately, but a brief period. However, the blood bath which he left in his wake will never be erased from the Polish soil. The ambitions of the modern Caesar are now an unforgettable blot upon the progress of humanity.

During those crucial and sad days it was not enough that the Nazi military boot marched into the defenseless countrysides of the western boundaries of Poland. The Polish nation will never forget the bestial and gangster attack of the imperialistic Soviet armies on its eastern borders. Never in the memory of the human mind has our civilization ever witnessed such greedy fingers of power extended by a nation beyond the boundaries of human decency. The act perpetuated by Soviet Russia would put the early revolutionists of their country in eternal shame.

In the east of Europe, Poland, the beacon of freedom, now had to resist an unexpected transgressor. The days and years that followed did not alter or change Poland's determination to fight for liberty. The freedom-loving people of the world are well acquainted with the events which followed in the wake of the Russians' stab-in-the-back invasion of Poland.

The leaders of Kremlin used cunning strategy to invade this citadel of freedom. They knew it would cost them fewer lives to deceive the Poles into believing that the Russians were arriving to fight the Germans. It was an evil plot. While the Nazis were losing thousands of lives in their invasion of Poland, their Soviet partners advanced with few casualties.

The Soviet imperialists did not fool the Poles—but they misled many leaders of democratic countries by claiming they were entering the Polish nation on the pretext of saving them from the Hun madman.

Again appeasement diplomacy destroyed confidence and faith of man in solving the complex problems of curbing the ambitions of Axis Powers.

Poland suffered inhuman treatment in the hands of the Hitler storm troopers but communistic Russia provides its shares of human cruelty.

How can the civilized world forget the graves of Katyn—a monument to barbarism unparalleled in history—where 11,000 Polish officers were cold-bloodedly murdered? How can the civilized world forget the hungry, frost-bitten Polish prisoners transported across the snow-covered Ukrainian steppes—the prisons crowded with political prisoners whose only crime was that they believed in justice and liberty? What changes have prevailed since the initial attacks of Communistic troops into free Poland?

Lately, evidence points that the Soviet Union is tightening its control over Poland. It has been proven that the propaganda mills have increased their tempo of attacks against the United States and Great Britain. The Communists are even now embarked on a program of expelling thousands of former members. The applications for travel visas of Poles who wish to go abroad must have the approval of police and the Communist Party. The rural collectivization has increased, and, above all, communistic pressure upon their satellite puppet government is being furthered to wage a class war.

This is only an example of the Soviet trend of events which has been moving in and directing the lives of the patriotic Poles. If the Politburo had its way the elimination of Catholicism and Protestantism would be the next step in Sovietizing the Polish nation. It is only the fear of the deep devotion of a religious people to their church which prevents them from moving ahead with their communistic program.

Why has providence shaped the events of this great nation which, throughout the years of sad and colorful history jealously safeguarded the ideas and ideals of free people, has now become the forgotten nation of world history?

Geography, politics, and economic social changes are usually the answers for the state of ideology which now exists in the land of Kosciusko and Pulaski.

It is not enough to generalize the responsibility for Poland's plight. The early game of world supremacy by the great powers conclusively proves that the friends of Poland deserted her when she was floundering in the sea of appeasement diplomacy.

During the war, the world traveler could not but admire the courage and patriotism of the Polish refugees in the deserts of India, Mexico, or in the thousands of other ports of refuge. These were the Poles who never knew the word "defeat." They may have lost their parents, their children, their homes, but never can it be said that the Poles lost their love for God and country.

The Nazi inflicted the wound but the Soviet imperialist made it fester. Each, ambitious and unscrupulous, destroyed the privileges of the common man. Each drove the free Pole from his land but as each ruler moves to subjugate the Polish nation he finds his task met with increasing resistance. Through each tragedy of partition and occupation the transgressor has sorrowfully discovered that the Polish nation will never be a servant of an ideology or rule which is not fundamentally Polish. A Polish nation can only exist if the Government and its people are a free people.

As sad as the fate of Poland has been, and is today, the burning light of democracy still brightly shines in the eyes of millions of Poles who are scattered throughout this troubled world.

In India, South America, England, Europe, North America—the Polish people are fervently campaigning for the ultimate freedom of their country.

Here in Buffalo, N. Y., the Poles of this community have expressed themselves by their constant determination to bring to the people of the United States the true history

of Poland's plight. This demonstration certainly affirms my belief that the Poles will never cast aside their movement for liberty.

The people of democracies can easily understand the zealous drive of native-born Poles to fight for their land of birth. The heartening fact is that Americans of Polish descent, whether they be on the farm, in factories, offices, or in the chambers of city, State, and national legislative bodies, have enthusiastically joined their fathers in the world plea for Poland's rightful place among the free people of this earth.

The march of destruction which began in Poland on September 1, 1939, first with the Nazi tyranny and now continues with communistic imperialism, conclusively challenges the democratic nations of the world that personal freedom and happiness for all will not be obtained until every remnant of Godless ideology is replaced by the tenets of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

Facts That Concern Every Californian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the enclosed editorial written by Manchester Boddy, of the Los Angeles Daily News, speaks for itself and should be very interesting to everyone:

FACTS THAT CONCERN EVERY CALIFORNIAN

Here are some notes taken from an address by Gov. Earl Warren to the Commonwealth Club of California. The speech dealt with current problems and governmental programs, and the following facts should be of great interest to everyone living in California:

We have 10,650,000 people in our State. Births in California outnumber deaths by 10,000 each month; in-migration exceeds outmigration by 15,000 per month. We can safely assume that our population next year will be in excess of 10,900,000; a net increase of 4,000,000 people in this decade.

Outside of California, there are only eight States that had as many as 4,000,000 people at the 1940 census.

Our situation is the same as if we had transported every man, woman, and child of the 4,000,000 people in the State of New Jersey to California, since 1940.

In 1930, California had 2,136,630 automobiles. In 1940 it had 2,990,262. In 1949 it has 4,540,000—of which some 750,000 are heavy trucks and trailers.

This is an immeasurably greater number of automobiles than has any other State. Placed bumper to bumper, they would fill every lane of a six-lane highway from here to New York.

In addition, more than 1,000,000 out-of-State cars have come here this year in tourist travel. They would fill another lane to New York.

In education, our congestion is worse. In 1930 we had approximately 1,000,000 children in our public schools. In 1940 we had approximately 1,100,000. This year we have 1,605,000.

Averaging 30 school children to the classroom, it will take more than 16,000 classrooms to overcome this deficiency, and 3,200 new classrooms each year to provide for the annual increase in school attendance. Until they are accommodated in such classrooms our children will be attending school in shifts and will be housed in nondescript temporary quarters.

We are little better off in our institutions of higher learning.

What I have said about our highways and education could be said with equal truth and force concerning our mental hospitals, our correctional institutions, our youth facilities. We have more than 50,000 wards in those institutions in quarters that were designed for only half that many.

Not only have our facilities been strained, but our natural resources as well.

Four million more people add an enormous strain upon water resources of a State that has always been short of water, regardless of its population. Our problem is not only that of the sufficiency of water, but the purity of water as well. Four million more people pouring effluent into our waterways of necessity deteriorates the quality of our water.

We dare not face a succession of dry years without greater conservation of our water resources. This is an enormous job. It is a cooperative job for individual farmers, irrigation districts, cities, the State, and the Federal Government.

Our next most important problem concerns our highways.

We need a system of great highways the length and breadth of our State. We need farm-to-market roads. We need limited access roads to and through our cities.

Last year, the State alone constructed some 800 miles of highways. This year, almost a like amount will be constructed, and we have plans and specifications already prepared for 5 years in advance. We are prepared for every emergency, and as the money comes along, from State or Federal sources, we will be ready to do the job without delay.

Agriculture always has been, and probably will be, the backbone of our economy, but we also need more industry.

We have balanced the budget 7 years in a row, and during six of those years on a 15-percent reduction in all taxes, the savings of which to the taxpayer aggregated about $600,000,000.

Our State is debt-free because we have set aside the money necessary to amortize all of our outstanding bonded indebtedness. We have a so-called rainy-day fund of $75,000,000 to take care of any unanticipated drop in revenues. We have firmly established in our State government the pay-as-you-go policy. And we are striving to keep our operating expenses within due bounds, increasing them only when necessary to render the service the people demand.—M. B.

OCTOBER 7, 1949.

Who Said "Peace"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to Congress written by L. F. Harza, consulting engineer of Chicago, Ill.:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS
WHO SAID "PEACE"?

JUNE 10, 1949.

The delusion of the North Atlantic Pact is that it presumes to be a pact of mutual defense to preserve the peace. Actually it is a pact to limit warfare to a form in which we have shown total ineptitude, a form of warfare with which we have shown no ability to cope and at which we have been outsmarted for many years during and prior to World War II and notably at Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, San Francisco, Bretton Woods, and China.

We predicate all of our policies upon the theory that we are at peace. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are at war. For many years Russia has been pursuing a war of world conquest and the entire world is on the defensive. Any skeptic only needs to read their own literature to be convinced.

Methods of warfare have changed over the years from throwing of rocks to bows and arrows, swords, guns, airplane warfare, the atomic bomb, and now to the apparently more refined method of the fifth column which we seem to be too blind as a Nation to classify in its true significance as very effective warfare.

An effort to destroy another country and conquer it as a subject race is warfare by whatever means it is pursued and should be so classified. The people engaged in such activity should be classified as enemy soldiers and the organization through which their efforts are coordinated as an enemy army, and be treated as such. Until we and every other country of the world recognizes the true nature of the present struggle as warfare, and treat it as such, we will be defeated at every turn and deserve to be.

The Russians did not invent this apparently new form of warfare of the fifth column. Traitors and spies have always existed but have been treated as such. Hitler expanded the idea and the organization method and Stalin has perfected it. Hitler was relatively honest and did not camouflage it as an idealist form of society. The new accomplishment on the part of Stalin, and truly a very great accomplishent which marks a new era of history, is his success in getting his army of traitors and spies classified as a political party, given the honor of a place on the ballot, allowed to speak and exhort at all times and places for the conquest of the United States by Russia. Could anything be more absurd? And yet in our credulity and democratic childishness we fall for this fake game as though our democratic principles would be violated otherwise.

Suppose in the War of 1812 rather than fight the British we had classified the British Army as a political party and put their army generals on the national ballot and yet recognized them as a party seeking the overthrow of the United States Government and the return of the United States to the status of a British colony and our people to British subjects. Would this have been absurd? Of course it would, but not one mite more absurd in any respect than the way we treat the Russian Army which is among us and operating in every country throughout the world.

How did the Russian bear accomplish this greatest hoax in all history while 130,000,000 innocent childlike victims played their baseball, football, auction bridge, and poker without noticing what was going on around them? The way Russia has gotten away, or nearly so, with world conquest by a newly perfected form of warfare is by stealing the word "communism," a brazen, daring piece of highway robbery if there ever was one in history.

Many people of good will and kind hearts throughout the world have long felt friendly with the general idea of true communism and socialism; the sharing of everything, this world's goods and this world's work and duties equally; a beautiful theory which can be easily sold to idealists who have led a sheltered life and do not know this world of reality and do not yet know and understand human nature, which is especially true of youth, teachers, professors, philanthropists, and theologians.

But Russia is not communistic in any true sense. Economically her system is state capitalism with a great range of income not equal in any sense, bonuses for production-incentive and other characteristics of a capitalistic society. There is probably as great a contrast as in any country between the luxury in which the ruling classes (politburo and bureaucracy) and the working classes live. The standard of living is no lower anywhere. In fact, it is the most brutal, despotic, ruthless, and heartless government in history, devoted to the exclusive purpose of maintaining itself in office and conquering the world by traitorous infiltration and revolution. In many respects it is a replica of the reign of Peter the Great whose cruelty and injustice is emulated by the Politburo. The word "communism" is merely a front, a camouflage to fool the people and hide the true nature of the international criminal conspiracy which it really is. It is poisoned candy.

Fortunately, the so-called Communists in nearly all countries of the world including the United States, have shown their true colors within recent months by announcing that, in case of war with Russia, they would support Russia. This announcement was doubtless made on orders from Moscow to frighten the world. They have thus classified themselves as traitors in principle, although they reject the word, and have no longer any moral right to a standing as respectable American citizens. They are Russian agents, soldiers, spies. They are, in every true sense of the word, a Russian Army among us.

This does not indict the numerous fellow travelers, the muddle-headed, the ignorant, the frustrated, who would follow any crowd with the loudest band and loudest orator. They can only be pitied. They are the raw material upon which all politicians prey. Holding the balance of power, as they do, and being so easily influenced, most political speeches are designed for their consumption. Is it any wonder that political speeches are what they are?

But no mitigating circumstances enter into the case of the leaders of so-called communism throughout the world. They are nearly all educated in Moscow, in the school of Lenin, trained in the methods of world revolution and dedicated to the one end of creating trouble, unrest, internal conflict and eventual revolution and assumption of power by Russia.

We cherish our traditions of free speech, free assembly. Our pink- and red-streaked ministry and college faculties loudly defend their right to teach all trends of human thought. But the fallacy is that they do not teach the Russian conspiracy, a misnamed communism, for what it really is, poisoned candy; they teach it as an idealistic form of human society, a character all semblance of which it has long since lost to the greater human motive of lust for power and conquest on the part of the Politburo.

There is not the remotest doubt that the objective is Russian conquest by internal revolution and destruction of all other governments by force. It has been proclaimed innumerable times in their literature, in testimony and in the official charters of the organization.

When another country attacks us from the outside we know how to resist by the recognized methods of warfare. When it attacks from the inside through a traitorous organization we seem helpless to defend ourselves because we imagine that any repression of their activities would violate our tradition of free speech which we uphold so vigorously. We leave the initiative to the enemy and we only mildly rebut his propaganda and intrigue. We must recognize that we are at war as definitely as though the Russian Army were invading our country. The methods of warfare at present are propaganda and intrigue, the methods of the fifth column, but nonetheless a war of conquest.

If our tradition of free speech does not permit us to suppress this propaganda (with which, however, I do not agree) let's meet it halfway or more. Free speech works both ways. Military men say that the best defense is a vigorous offense. Let us not meekly defend ourselves from Russian propaganda. Let us take the initiative and go them one (or several) better. Why not adopt the following program?

1. Quit calling this criminal gang "The Communist Party." Refuse to allow it on any ballot unless called the "Russian Conquest Party."

2. Let every patriotic newspaper, magazine, school teacher, minister, professor, legislator, Congressman, Senator, and private citizen in writing and speaking of this criminal gang call it by the same name. Entirely eliminate from our patriotic written or published vocabulary the false and deceptive term "Communist," except where true communism is under discussion and not the Russian fake.

3. Put public speakers on the road and on the air at the expense of the Government or private subscription to exhort for patriotism; to point out the true nature of the Russian criminal conspiracy in our midst; to make clear and by daily repetition to drive it into every citizen's head that if he plays with this conspiracy knowingly he is flirting with treason.

4. Publish a list in every patriotic paper and magazine every day, a standing column of reference, giving the names of all organizations known to be subversive, but with sugar-coated names to lure the unsuspecting muddle-headed, frustrated and ignorant to taste this poisoned candy. Keep it up to date as new front organizations are created and multiplied like rabbits.

5. Maintain an information center and urge every citizen before joining or contributing to any organization of any kind, anywhere, to first call up and find out whether it may be a Russian-conquest organization in disguise. Keep up such a constant barrage of publicity that few can be so ignorant and uninformed as not to know what they are joining.

6. Create by a constant din of publicity a feeling of scorn and utter contempt for every such traitorous organization and for every person who knowingly and with open eyes crosses the threshold.

7. Deport at once without ceremony and without years of judicial farce (such as attended the Eisler and Bridges' trials) every alien member and advocate of the Russian Conquest Party (misnamed "Communists").

8. If this cannot now be done legally, pass a law, before this session of Congress adjourns, making it illegal for any alien member of Russian Conquest Party to remain in the United States, except for special purpose, such as attendance at the UN meetings and then under constant surveillance.

9. Limit the number of Russians and Russian satellite citizens permitted to be in the United States at any one time (including UN and diplomatic corps, reporters, etc.), to exactly the number of Americans permitted to be in Russia or respective Russian satellite countries at that time, and absolutely refuse any additional visas when that quota is used up.

10. All Russian and satellite embassies and consulates are known to be primarily spy organizations instead of being devoted to friendly international diplomatic purposes. Pass a law, before adjournment of this session of Congress, that any such activity will be the cause for immediate severing of diplomatic relations, and do it within 24 hours if violated, no procrastinating, weaseling, and pussyfooting. Call a spade a spade.

It is merely lazy and unrealistic thinking to say that we have nothing to fear in this country. The Russian revolution was accomplished by only 3 percent of the population who were then Communists. The Russian conspirators have permeated our labor unions, churches, schools, colleges, and nearly all social organizations. They are very active and aggressive in interesting themselves in all of the routine duties and committee work of all organizations. By common consent, and due to laziness, the person who is willing to work in any organization gets the work to do. Soon he or she is in a key position and then starts the underhanded control of the whole organization in favor of the Russian conspiracy.

If Russia were to attack us today it is doubtful that we could successfully defend ourselves. Russian agents have so penetrated our labor unions that sabotage or strikes might conceivably entirely prevent our industries from functioning and thus throw us into ignominious defeat. Most of our strikes today are Russian-inspired. There is actual danger of our great Nation thus being absorbed and disappearing from history with the final loss to the world of all principles of individual freedom and democracy in favor of ruthless absolute totalitarianism.

What is going on in Asia may prove to be far more significant than Pearl Harbor. China is already nearly lost and will soon be a total loss to civilization and just another Russian territory unless we help quickly. General Chennault says it is not too late. Up to date our policy in China has been a dismal failure. Another Pearl Harbor would arouse our politicians to action but until then many are chiefly concerned with trading votes for expenditures in their respective home districts which will serve to buy votes for their reelection.

If China is lost, India and what little is left of Asia may soon follow. And he who says that the United States and western Europe, even with internal loyalty and the bomb could resist the hordes of all Asia, is deaf, dumb, and blind. And Russia will most certainly organize all China for aggressive warfare, as fast as it can be done.

The Russians are believed to have conquered more territory since the end of World War II than any other nation has ever conquered throughout the entire history of the world. Stalin is the most cunning conqueror of all time and the greatest imperialist although he charges others with imperialism to divert attention from himself. But a shooting war with Russia is improbable for some time, merely for the reason that Russian conquest is succeeding so well without such a war. Why should Russia start a war of a kind in which we excel in equipment and technique when she is succeeding like a prairie fire in a form of warfare in which we have proven helpless?

We should by all means adopt a realistic Far East policy at once but, of even greater importance, fight the present war in our midst with every means at our disposal. Eliminate the traitors and spies or the Atlantic Pact will be useless, too little and too late.

L. F. HARZA,
Consulting Engineer, Chicago, Ill.

ECA Import Program and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following resolution adopted in meeting of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, St. Paul, Minn., on October 6, 1949:

Whereas the national debt in the United States is in excess of $250,000,000,000, requiring $5,000,000,000 in payment of annual interest thereon; and

Whereas benefit payments and other assistance to veterans require annual appropriations of approximately five additional billion dollars, with little probability of reduction in the near future; grants to foreign governments for rehabilitation and recovery call for still another five or six billion dollars per year, and national-defense appropriations demand some $15,000,000,000 annually; while the costs of the civil government, including price support of agricultural products and higher pay of public employees, consume an additional fund of twelve to fifteen billion dollars; and

Whereas the annual national budget thus exceeds $40,000,000,000, a great part of which is fixed and recurrent in character, thus offering scant hope of material reduction; and

Whereas a national income of more than $200,000,000,000 per year is necessary to sustain a budget of this magnitude without an increase in Federal taxation which already absorbs approximately 20 percent of national income; and

Whereas such a level of national income can be sustained only by a combination of (1) high wages, (2) a high level of employment, (3) a high degree of production, and (4) a high level of prices; and

Whereas the dollar shortages of numerous foreign countries, caused in great degree by the financing of two world wars, has created a demand for a much greater volume of imports by the United States as a means of restoring trade balances and has led recently to a devaluation of foreign currencies as a step toward that goal; and

Whereas the high plateau upon which the economy of the United States now rests makes it highly vulnerable to the deflationary and undermining effects of imports if these can be offered in our markets at prices below those offered by our own producers; and

Whereas the condition of shortages which prevailed during the postwar period in this country has disappeared in nearly all lines of goods and commodities, and given way to the threat of surpluses, thus marking the shift from a seller's to a buyer's market; and

Whereas a moderate decline in the general price level may be desirable but a marked decline or a return to the prewar price level would be disastrous; and

Whereas the competitive effects of imports, priced, after payment of duty, below the level at which our own products can profitably be sold in our home market, are to depress wages and curtail employment in a buyer's market as distinguished from a seller's market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, a nonprofit organization, composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, with sympathetic understanding and appreciation of the economic difficulty that confronts foreign countries as well as the United States in their efforts to restore trade balances and to overcome the problem of dollar shortages abroad, memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States, setting forth the great economic peril to the Nation that inheres in the present policy of selectively exposing American producers, through theoretically considered tariff reductions, to low-wage competition from abroad; be it further

Resolved, That we regard it to be wholly unnecessary and in fact destructive of the avowed purpose of promoting imports, to reduce import duties to a point that creates pressure on wages and prices in this country; and that the objective of increased trade can best be met by setting tariff rates at a level that will insure fair and not destructive competition; that the deflationary pressures generated by unfair foreign competition cannot be localized nor readily arrested through present escape provisions in trade agreements and that therefore the idea of promoting the general interest at the expense of a few industries, to be sacrificed in behalf of a general policy, is both false and dangerous;

Finally, be it resolved that since of necessity our Nation is committed as a requisite of meeting its internal and external obligations and commitments for some years to come, to a high national income and high prices as compared with prewar years, we consider the claims of consumers to buy imported goods at low prices to be invalid if such low prices destroy wage earnings and profits and thus reduce the national income and the sources of internal revenue; that this is the crux of the problem and that the present method of reducing duties, through Executive negotiation, without authoritative guidance from an impartial fact-finding agency, is inexpert, irresponsive to the needs of domestic producers, and inadequate to the intricate requirements of the problem.

The implications of a greatly expanded import program are so far-reaching in their possible impact upon the present vulnerable economy of the United States, that any such program should be launched only under the guidance of the most responsible, practical, and competent officials and should not be left solely in the hands of employees of executive agencies who are far removed from the field of production and who regard our producers simply as selfish interests.

The Late Honorable Robert E. Hannegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 7, 1949:

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

Death chose a singularly untimely moment to lay its hand on Bob Hannegan. Even while the city's season of brightest gayety was being ushered in, while the Veiled Prophet was naming his Queen and the music of the coronation filled the air, he was fatally stricken and yesterday morning passed away. And had the Cardinals, whose president he was until last January, won the pennant as expected, the city would have been in the throes of a World Series. Death is seldom a welcome visitor; in this instance its coming has touched St. Louis with unusual sadness, because Mr. Hannegan was so definitely an integral part of its civic, recreational, and political life.

We have been writing about Bob Hannegan for a long time. He was a controversial political figure, and most of the time we disagreed with him, especially during his late years when he became a spearhead of the New Deal. But never was there rancor in our dealings with him. There couldn't be, because he was accustomed to the rough and tumble of the game he loved best, was willing to take a blow to give one—and remained, as always, a likable, personable man, with whom one might disagree but never dislike.

Mr. Hannegan's political life had storybook qualities. He rose from lowly party worker to Democratic leadership in his native city, St. Louis, and in the State. He caught the fancy of President Roosevelt, who advanced him by appointment within the internal-revenue department. Later he was named chairman of the National Democratic Committee and subsequently Postmaster General. He served under both Roosevelt and Truman. He had a fierce devotion to his party and his President; he was not as astute as Jim Farley, but he was as tireless, and he burned himself out.

By a quirk of coincidence, had not Mr. Hannegan been a political power, Harry S. Truman would not be President today. When Mr. Hannegan was chairman of the city committee in 1940 he put St. Louis in the Truman column when the latter was running for senatorial renomination. Had Mr. Truman lost that race, he would have been retired to political obscurity. Again, at the Democratic National Convention in 1944, he "put over" Mr. Truman for the Vice Presidential nomination. Had Mr. Truman lost, Henry Wallace would have been the nominee. Yes, Harry S. Truman is much in Mr. Hannegan's debt.

Divorcing himself from politics, he returned to St. Louis and found an interest in a field next dearest to him—baseball. He headed the group that purchased the Cardinals from Sam Breadon. But the ill-health that had plagued him did not permit him to continue. He disposed of his holdings and since the first of the year has been resting. Only recently he returned from an extended trip abroad. Death came suddenly, although not entirely unexpected.

One splendid quality he possessed without dispute even among his political foes. Not even the vaguest scandal ever flecked his family life, and for one engaged in heated politics where no holds are barred this was a tribute his wife and children must cherish. The city will miss him too.

The Freedom Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Freedom Bell," delivered by Very Reverend John A. Flynn, C. M., president of St. John's University, Brooklyn, N. Y., on the occasion of the opening of the eightieth academic year of St. John's College on September 15, 1949, in the Church of St. John the Baptist, the university church:

THE FREEDOM BELL

My few remarks to you on this occasion bear the title "The Freedom Bell." The reason for my using such an expression I shall make apparent immediately. Holy Scripture contains a simple sentence which is the perfect formula for genuine freedom. It says: "The truth shall make you free." If, therefore, truth is the avenue to freedom, then that knowledge by which we arrive at truth can be called the freedom bell. Today, for the eightieth time, it is sounding for the students of St. John's College. It is calling you to exercise your wonderfully active young minds to grasp the scientific, the cultural, the religious knowledge that will lead to truth and to the freedom which

is tasted and relished by the sons of God. The members of the administrative and teaching staffs of the university bid you a hearty welcome. They earnestly hope, they sincerely pray, that your enthusiastic presence here this morning is indisputable evidence that you are prepared to answer this clarion call to real freedom which is so much spoken of and so little understood by the license-loving world in which we live.

Because we are reading and hearing so much about academic freedom, about political freedom, about social freedom, and about economic freedom, I think it may be well to clarify for you the real definition of true freedom, so that you will be able to see through the mystifying and confusing smokescreen in back of which the enemies of classical human liberty are hiding. I want you to be able to penetrate the ideological iron curtain of human enslavement. I want you to be able to protect yourselves against the wild, turbulent engulfing ocean of licentiousness.

Let me commence by saying that no one or nothing is absolutely free in the sense that men and things can do anything at all at any time and in any circumstances. Men and things have natures and to each nature God, the Creator, has assigned a particular end or purpose. Hence, real freedom implies a choice of means within the defined frame of a given nature. It means that man alone who has the power to choose means can enjoy real freedom. It means that animals and plants and minerals have their routine imposed upon them by the all-directing force of divine providence. But, even in the case of man, with the sublime range of his personality that allows him to direct himself, freedom can signify only that he must choose means which will keep him safely within the bounds of the purpose of human nature.

You see immediately that our concept of freedom implies that there is a God, who created us, and who endowed human nature with the capability of free choice. But it also implies that God is our final end or purpose and that we must so control our free choice that we shall be united with Him in eternity. And right here is where we part ways with those who preach absolute freedom or the license to do whatsoever one pleases. For they admit no God in the traditional sense of the word, at least, and they make man a purely material thing, who is an end unto himself.

Of course, once a man subscribes to the philosophy that he is his own end, then he is responsible to no one for his actions, and indeed he may do as he pleases. But this is not freedom. This is licentiousness. Under such a philosophy a physician can rationalize birth control, a lawyer can rationalize perjury, a judge can rationalize injustice, a banker can rationalize embezzlement, a husband or wife can rationalize infidelity and divorce, a college professor can rationalize alien ideologies, an American—God save us—can rationalize communism.

However, in our system of thought the freer a man is, or the more opportunity he has to choose different means the more obligations he has. We should not be alarmed at this statement, because it is merely a crystallization of the mysterious and eternal paradox of life. After all, Truth Incarnate has said: "He who shall lose his life shall save it." So the physician who is freer than the unqualified layman to choose means to preserve life has a greater obligation to preserve life and not to destroy it. So the college professor who is freer to shape the minds of his students has a greater obligation to help perfect those minds and not pervert them. So the American citizen who is freer than the citizens of other countries has a greater obligation to uphold the Constitution of the United States and not to make a mockery of it in the name of civil liberties. So the Christian who is freer supernaturally than others has a greater obligation to exemplify the teaching of Christ in his life and not to cut corners, as it were, by some form of dogmatic or moral laxity. In other words, men must live in certain definite patterns. And they are free to choose only those means which fit the pattern in which they live. If they do not, then they are not leading rational lives. Rather they are violating the order of nature by acting according to man-made standards of morality.

Because of this reasoning, we agree perfectly with the Policies Committee of the National Education Asosciation when it states that Communists should not be permitted to teach our American youth. To be eligible to teach in American schools and colleges one must be convinced of the American way of life, one must think and act as an American, that is, one must have as his purpose the preservation of the dignity of the individual man and his natural rights to life, to happiness and to worship according to the dictates of his conscience. The doctrines of communism are diametrically opposed to traditional Americanism, and consequently those who profess them are not free to teach our youth. For they are sworn to acts which are outside the pattern of the Constitution, and consequently they can never have as their real objective the training of men and women to act within the frame of the Constitution.

It follows also that Congress, the supreme legislative body of the land and the guardian of the Constitution, has the right to know what is being taught in our schools and what kinds of textbooks are put into the hands of students. Perhaps Congress could have accomplished this function, not by demanding to review itself the texts of 107 colleges, but by appointing a committee of educators to clean their own house. This is a matter of opinion. However, it does not alter the fundamental fact that Congress has this right, and furthermore that it has the duty of seeing to it that only those texts which remain within the traditional frame of the Constitution should be used by the students. We regret exceedingly the flippant remark of one college executive in her comments on the request of Congress to examine the texts of certain colleges. Said she: "I suppose this means the Bible, too." First of all, she needs instruction badly, because the Bible contains primarily supernatural truths which constitute necessary knowledge for man's salvation. Secondly, it contains absolutely nothing that is subversive of the American way of life. But if she examines the sacred text carefully, she will find in the revealed word of God many items which are the basis of some of our finest American traditions. Lastly, all things to the contrary notwithstanding, she vastly underrates the intelligence of the Congress of the United States.

It might be remarked in passing that, as far as we know, Congress has not asked any Catholic college to surrender its texts—and this despite all the loose talk about denominational schools creating a spirit of divisiveness and the protests that they cannot produce perfect citizens for American democracy. Much like the word "liberty," democracy is another term that requires the most searching examination.

Gentlemen of St. John's College, the subversive groups in the United States are not ringing the freedom bell—they are not sounding the clarion call to objective knowledge that necessarily leads to genuine freedom. Rather they are pounding, cudgeling that bell until it is cracking. Their aim is to pulverize this bell so that it can no longer be a symbol of true liberty. Their purpose is to stamp and trample upon the resultant bits and pitiable pieces of this bell, so that they will stand only for the degradation and the ensalvement of American men and women. With their denial of God, of the necessity of religion, of objective moral standards they are perverting the minds and hearts of decent, honest citizens. With their distorted interpretations of social justice, with their studied rejection of Christlike charity, they are doing their diabolical utmost to make shambles of men's souls with hammer-and-sickle ideologies. The crystal-clear, gracious, benign revelation of Christ they abhor. They offer incense to the confused, selfish unrelenting revelation of the twisted mind of Karl Marx.

True to the concepts of western civilization and culture, the objectives of St. John's University have for their primary purpose the development of intelligent Catholics and loyal citizens of the United States. In general we aim to make you learned, cultured men according to the philosophical and theological principles and traditions of the Roman Catholic Church. In particular, we seek to enkindle in you a deep and lasting respect for your glorious country and the truly democratic principles on which it was founded and on which alone it is capable of surviving. It must be perfectly apparent to you that our objectives fit perfectly the purposes of your God and your country. The discipline of intellect and will so necessary for your assured success in time and eternity you will receive in the courses which you pursue in religion, philosophy, literature and science. In these courses are the means which you choose freely to grasp the purpose of living as real human beings in the profession of your selection. In vocational and spiritual guidance you are provided with practical methods of advancing to your temporary and eternal goal.

May we call your attention to the fact that, as befits administrators of a Catholic university, we are especially interested in your spiritual development. For this purpose the holy sacrifice of the mass, celebrated on St. Joseph's altar each school day at 8:15, is for your convenience. The spiritual counselors and the other priests are most willing, at any time, to advise you and to give you the sacraments. These sacred agencies signify for you an increase in sanctifying grace which is the life and the soul and which you must possess to love God and to love your country with the proper motive. Sanctifying grace it is that liberates your soul from the dark perversities of nature, just as knowledge frees you from the terrifying handicap of ignorance. You will find that it will give you the courage to be an honest-to-goodness Catholic collegian now, just as in the future it will give you the courage to be an excellent Catholic physician or dentist or lawyer or businessman or clergyman. It will give you joy happily mixed with holiness in your bright moments, and in the discouraging phases of life it will bring you sanctified consolation.

So the freedom bell rings out this morning—announcing an arduous year of scholastic striving. It is inviting you, in its clear, cool, calm tones to persevere in your quest of knowledge, speculative and practical, natural and supernatural, that you may grasp the truth. And the dividend for your willing

answer will not be the momentary licentiousness of the worldling, but the most precious of God's gifts, namely, the eternal freedom of the saintly. For the truth, but objective truth, understand, shall make you free.

It's High Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, for more than half a century a single decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has stood between a substantial portion of the citizens of the United States and full participation by those citizens in the rights and privileges extended to the majority of the citizens of this Nation.

The case of Plessy against Ferguson establishing the legality of the concept of separate but equal facilities remains a legal iron curtain, barring and shutting off millions of citizens from many of the cherished privileges which our country offers.

The case of Henderson against United States et al., which the Supreme Court has now consented to review, directly challenges the principal of separate but equal facilities as a basis for legal segregation. As stated in the editorial in the Washington Post which follows, the United States, in accordance with the law, was named as a defendant in the suit brought by Henderson. Nevertheless, the legal representatives of the United States have filed in the Supreme Court a powerful brief arguing that Henderson's appeal should be upheld.

The Justice Department is to be commended for the position they have taken in support of Mr. Henderson's appeal. This case is of momentous and historic importance.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the splendid editorial from the Washington Post of October 11, 1949:

The Supreme Court has consented to review a case that may have great historic significance—the case of Elmer W. Henderson against the United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Southern Railway Co. The case will test the validity of a Southern Railway regulation, approved by the ICC and upheld by a divided three-judge Federal district court, requiring passengers to be segregated according to their color in the railway's dining cars.

In accordance with law, the United States was named as a defendant in the suit brought by Henderson. Nevertheless, the legal representatives of the United States, the Solicitor General, and other officers of the Department of Justice, filed in the Supreme Court Wednesday a powerful brief arguing that Henderson's appeal should be upheld and that the order of the ICC should be declared invalid. This support of an appellant on the part of the Department of Justice deserves the warmest commendation.

The case originated when Henderson, a Negro, traveling as a field representatives for the wartime Fair Employment Practices Committee, was denied service in a Southern Railway diner, in accordance with company regulations, because the two end tables, curtained from the rest of the car and supposedly reserved for Negroes, were being used by white passengers. The Interstate Commerce Act provides that it shall be unlawful for any common carrier * * * to subject any particular person * * * to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever. The company reconciled its regulation with the law on the ground that the furnishing of separate but proportionately equal facilities entailed no discrimination. The ICC upheld this justification.

The doctrine that segregation is not discrimination rests upon an 1896 decision of the Supreme Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*—perhaps, with the single exception of the Dred Scott case, the worst decision in the Supreme Court's entire history. The court at that time dismissed the contention that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority, and blandly observed that if this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it.

The sophistry and callousness of this judgment were roundly scored by Justice Harlan in one of the court's great dissents. "Our Constitution is color blind," he said, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens * * * We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law. The thin disguise of equal accommodations * * * will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done.

The "thin disguise" has been used ever since to justify segregation in public schools, State universities, public transportation and other public facilities. The whole structure of discrimination by law has been based upon it. All experience has shown not only that separate facilities are never, in fact, equal but that enforced separation is imposed deliberately to humiliate Negroes and to emphasize their inferiority. It serves that purpose well. It creates inequality by imposing a caste status upon the group at which it is aimed.

The Justice Department's brief asks the Supreme Court to invalidate the ICC ruling on the ground that the Southern Railway regulation violates the Interstate Commerce Act. It seems to us clearly to do so. "But," says the brief, "if the court should conclude that the issues here cannot be decided without reference to the 'separate but equal' doctrine, the Government submits that the legal and facual assumptions upon which *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was decided have been demonstrated to be erroneous, and that the doctrine of that case should now be reexamined and overruled. The notion that separate but equal facilities satisfy constitutional and statutory prohibitions against discrimination is obsolete. The phrase 'equal rights' means the same rights." It is high time for the Supreme Court to say so.

Our Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 12 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview which I conducted recently with Robert Donihi, legal adviser of the military government in Germany. It gives some rather interesting information about our military government in Germany.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KEFAUVER. How long have you been in Europe, Bob, and what duties have you performed?

Mr. DONIHI. I first came to Germany in December 1946 and was assigned to the war-crimes program as a trial attorney and remained in that capacity for a year—after which time I joined General Clay's staff as a legal adviser.

Senator KEFAUVER. Were you in Berlin with General Clay during the blockade?

Mr. DONIHI. Yes, throughout the air lift.

Senator KEFAUVER. What is your present assignment?

Mr. DONIHI. My present job is legal adviser to the high commissioner for Land Bremen. At this headquarters I have acted as director of the public affairs and legal division. That division included public health, public welfare, public safety, denazification, civil administration, and office of the political adviser.

Senator KEFAUVER. Can you tell us, Bob, something about the location of Land Bremen and its relation to the west German state?

Mr. DONIHI. Land Breman is the smallest of four German states located in United States occupied Germany. It is in the northern-most part of this country and is severed from all other United States areas by British and Russian occupied territory. This land, which is bordered on the north by the North Sea, contains the only shipping ports located in American-occupied territory.

Senator KEFAUVER. In your opinion, Bob, is continued occupation of Germany necessary to the United States?

Mr. DONIHI. There is no room for doubt in any mind on that. The German people as a group have not yet earned the trust that is so essential to normal diplomatic relationship between world nations. By this I don't mean to infer that German people are not trustworthy. It is apparent, however, that Germany is a long stretch from having formulated policies or laws which will completely guarantee rights of all individuals whether of German or other extraction.

Senator KEFAUVER. Do you believe that military government succeeded in accomplishing its avowed purpose?

Mr. DONIHI. It is not possible to fully answer that question in the relatively short time assigned to this program and any unqualified answer would probably amount to an oversimplification of an otherwise complicated international situation. In general, it is my opinion that personnel of military government have worked long and hard in

an effort to accomplish difficult and sometimes idealistic objectives. It was our announced aim in the Potsdam agreement to, among other things, rebuild Germany along democratic lines. Over the period of more than 4 years, which have transpired since that agreement was approved of by President Roosevelt there has been increasing evidence of German persons demanding individual civil rights. The Germans frequently request us to intercede on their behalf in order to prevent the German Government from denying such rights. This is very encouraging considering the fact that the German people were subjected to a totalitarian form of government for approximately 15 years preceding the end of the war. We point with pride to the fact that American prestige in Europe is increasing. These are only two of many signs that military government has been a success.

Senator KEFAUVER. Is it true that military government is now extinct in Germany?

Mr. DONIHI. Yes; that is correct. The American authority here is now the office of high commission, for which I am legal adviser; only a handful of military government personnel remain in Germany, and those are now engaged in work for the high commissioner's office or in other work. Their military government organizations have been abolished.

Senator KEFAUVER. Do you believe, Bob, that if the United States were to cease occupation of Germany soon that the German Government would carry out the work and policies which you have undertaken?

Mr. DONIHI. No, Estes, I do not. My considered opinion is that Germany is right at this very moment at the crossroads between following the traditional dictatorship line and the establishment of precedent for democratic government of, for, and by the people. Until recently, Estes, military government has temporarily insured the rights of individuals by decrees, proclamations, and other forms of executive enactments which were promulgated by us and did not stem from the common will of the German people. We, of course, are anxious to insure all individuals, within the framework of their own law, that no person would be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of that law. We have now deliberately relinquished much of our executive, judicial, and legislative role and have reached a point in occupation wherein most of the responsibilities for governmental operations have been restored to the German Government. We have, however, certain reserve powers which we are holding in abeyance for use in the event that the German Government fails to fulfill its obligations to individuals or nations. The German people now, perhaps for the first time in modern history, have an opportunity to assert themselves for a government of, for, and by the people in lieu of a police state.

Senator KEFAUVER. Do you believe, Bob, that Germans will of their own volition become democratic politically?

Mr. DONIHI. I have great faith, Estes, that it is the desire of all mankind to live a free life, and when the way to that freedom is clearly marked and lighted I believe the average German will select the right path. Of one thing I am certain, this is that a democracy cannot be superimposed from the top. It must originate in the hearts of the people. We know it is the tendency of the German individual to goosestep and to sieg-heil at the sign of an authoritative voice. Nevertheless, in my opinion, this does not indicate lack of desire for freedom. It's only that these people have known no form of government which did not demand unquestioning acceptance of authority. As an example of the effect that attitude has left I cite the fact that, in the city of Bremerhaven alone, last year there were 5,688 house searches performed by German police; 35 were with search warrants. The Bremen constitution provides for search warrants in search cases. Most of the individuals whose homes were violated did not complain about the situation, although we feel sure they did not approve of it. As a result of military government intelligence reports, it was possible to prevent injustice in many of those cases. Our most difficult task now lies ahead. The American people should try to, at any dollar cost, teach the German people to resist any attempts by their own government to move in the direction of another police state. Should we fail in this, our own sons may pay the price with blood and lives. As you have no doubt seen from the destroyed cities of Germany, nearly every home has sacrificed members of the family to a horrible war. These people have learned to know the moral and physical disintegration and the terrors of war in a manner which we should ask God to spare our loved ones. Individually, Germans are anxious not to be led into another aggressive warfare. It may now sound like double talk to say that people want to be free but have not in 4 years of occupation accomplished that end. Knowledge of the situation, however, leads me to believe that people who have lived under a totalitarian state are unwilling to raise their voices against a showing of authority.

Senator KEFAUVER. Bob, tell us something about your living conditions here in Germany. Do you rent a German home?

Mr. DONIHI. No, Estes, members of the high commissioner's staff and the occupation forces are furnished houses requisitioned from the German economy. The houses are moderate in size, comfortably furnished and are charged to occupation costs—effort is made to prevent a severe drain on German housing and at the same time to house our people in an adequate manner.

Senator KEFAUVER. Where do you get your food?

Mr. DONIHI. We purchase food from the Army commissary, moreover we are also permitted to purchase unrationed items from the German economy. Most of our purchases, however, are from the commissary.

Senator KEFAUVER. What facilities do you have for recreation?

Mr. DONIHI. Almost every German city offers a wonderful schedule of theater, opera, and concert programs. In addition to this every community which houses Americans has established American movies, clubs and other recreational facilities. And of course, travel is a popular mode of entertainment—it is possible to be in France, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Austria, and other continental countries within a matter of a few hours.

Senator KEFAUVER. Do you have American churches?

Mr. DONIHI. There are United States Army posts throughout our occupied territory which provide chapel facilities for those who desire to attend. However, personally, not being a member of the armed forces, I find rich opportunity to attend the centuries-old European religious institutions which are found throughout Europe—many Americans both civilian and military take advantage of opportunity to become acquainted with these traditional houses of worship.

Senator KEFAUVER. Thank you very much, Bob Donihi, for this enlightening picture of life in occupied Germany.

Mr. DONIHI. Thank you, Senator KEFAUVER, for your interest in conditions here. We always welcome the helpful visits of House and Senate Members who are so anxious to defend and aid American leadership and prestige on behalf of the legislative branch of our Government. This evidence of interest in foreign affairs, which you have voiced on behalf of our fellow Tennesseans, is refreshing. The world has become a much smaller community than any of us would have dreamed 20 years ago and I personally sincerely hope the legislative branch of our Government will continue to exercise its constitutional balancing powers over the extended arms of the United States executive agencies—whether abroad or at home.

Housewife's Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 12 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, October 8, it was my pleasure to deliver a radio address to the morning-hour listeners of the prairie farm station, WLS, Chicago. The theme of this address was a Housewife's Bill of Rights, meaning the freedoms to which America's women—the working women of the home and of business—are entitled. I believe that the comments in this address might be of interest to my colleagues, so I ask unanimous consent that the text of the broadcast transcription be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOUSEWIFE'S BILL OF RIGHTS

Senator WILEY. It's a real pleasure to have the opportunity to chat with the housewives of the Middle West through the kind courtesy of Station WLS.

I hope that I won't be interrupting your Saturday morning duties. Perhaps, however, while you're having that second cup of coffee, you and I will have a really enjoyable little session discussing matters of mutual interest. I know from experience how busy my own dear wife was when the Saturday chores rolled around. But I also know that America's housewives are tremendously interested in the goings-on of their Congress. Ample proof of that fact is in the fine mail received by me from the women of my own State and of other States in the Union.

THE MEN ARE INVITED TO LISTEN IN

Oh, yes if the menfolk happen to be around at the radio set, I hope that you will listen in too. But I'd like to reserve these remarks primarily for you, Mrs. Housewife. This morning, I'd like to discuss with you some thoughts around the theme of A Housewife's Bill of Rights.

BASIC FREEDOMS AND ADDITIONAL LIBERTIES

You and I know, of course, what the original Bill of Rights was—the ten basic amendments to our United States Constitution. They guaranteed us trial by jury, freedom of religion, of press, of assembly and so forth. But there are some other freedoms too—freedoms even additional to the so-called Four Freedoms that were announced several years ago. You my kind listeners are, after all, the guardians of the American home, the mothers of the race. So, let's look into your freedoms in terms of modern-day America. I have in the studio here one of my secretaries who is going to ask me questions about this theme which I'll try to answer. All right, let's go with the questions.

FREEDOM FROM NUISANCE TAXES

SECRETARY. Well, Senator WILEY, I know that the financial problem is probably the most serious one faced by housewives today. They have to scrimp to meet present high prices, to make the family budget go just a little further to take care of hubby and the youngsters. So, is there any basic freedom on this financial question?

Senator WILEY. Yes, and I'd like to lead off with it. I think that you, Mrs. Housewife, are entitled to freedom from nuisance taxes. I needn't tell you housewives that every time you go to the drugstore, you have to pay a nuisance tax on your cosmetics, your lipstick, and, yes, even the baby lotions for Junior. In addition, if you are shopping for a radio or television set, or a suitcase, or a fur coat, or a camera, or a bottle of perfume, you have to pay quite a few added cents and dollars for taxes.

Every time you go driving with your husband and he buys a gallon of gasoline, he pays heavy Federal excise taxes (plus State excises). Chances are you pay about $25 a year extra just for gasoline taxes. (That would be enough to feed a whole family for quite a few days.) Moreover, if you have a family of four, let's say, and you see a movie once a month, you probably pay about $5 in admission taxes a year just on motion pictures. Well, that could be quite a bit of lunch money. Here's another item. If you bought a piece of equipment for your kitchen like a stove, a refrigerator, or washing machine, you might have to pay in the neighborhood of $50 just in taxes for it.

Now folks, it was all well and good for Uncle Sam to tack on these excise taxes during the war. After all, we were experiencing an emergency. Our men were giving their very lives overseas in combat. We all felt that it was a small contribution to pay excise taxes, so that our country could guy guns and bullets and uniforms. But the war has been over for more than 4 years, and I think it's about time your budget was relieved of these nuisance taxes on cosmetics and baby lotions and so on down the line. Yes, it's a privilege to pay taxes, but not unjustified taxes which we long ago promised to repeal.

SECRETARY. Well, Senator WILEY, what is holding up excise-tax relief?

BUDGET CUTS NECESSARY FOR TAX CUTS

Senator WILEY. Well, several things. For one thing, the present administration has stubbornly refused to recognize that these nuisance excise taxes are just about the worst blot on the American tax scene. These taxes hurt the folks who can least afford to be hurt. They operate like sales taxes. As you know, folks, sales taxes always hit the individuals in the low-income brackets hardest.

A second basic reason why these taxes are high is because our Government is invading more and more fields, is appropriating more and more money. If you have a $44,000,000,000 budget as we have, you've got to raise $44,000,000,000 in taxes. Or else you will have a deficit, meaning that you will have to print paper money. If, however, Uncle Sam were to cut down on expenses, that would lessen the necessity for these taxes. That's just what I am proposing and fighting for—budget reduction and tax reduction.

SECRETARY. As I recall, Senator, following this freedom from nuisance taxes, you feel that the housewife is entitled to freedom from fear of red ink.

Senator WILEY. That's absolutely correct, and the two freedoms go hand in hand.

FEDERAL ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

Now, Mrs. Housewife, you have to watch your budget pretty carefully in order to be able to pay $200 or $300 or more in income taxes every year, whatever the case may be. Therefore, I think it's only fair that Uncle Sam, meaning your Government and mine in Washington, D. C., should budget just as carefully and as cautiously. In addition, Uncle Sam should streamline the organization of his 2,250,000 Federal employees. If Congress were, for example, to adopt all of the Hoover Commission reports—in their letter and in their spirit—that would save around $3,000,000,000, according to the Hoover Commission findings. What would that mean? Well, it would, in turn, mean an average saving of over $75 per family per year. Now, Mrs. Housewife, you know that is a lot of money when you stop to think of it. And so I say that it is up to us to get this second freedom for America's housewives and for that matter for every one of us—freedom from red ink.

SECRETARY. Well, Senator, how are we going to get freedom from nuisance excise taxes and freedom from fear of red ink? There has been a lot of talk about those freedoms, but it seems that we aren't getting any closer to getting them today than we were a long time ago.

WOMEN AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS MUST ADVISE CONGRESS

Senator WILEY. Well, I think there are several answers to that question. One answer is that it is up to you alert housewives to speak up for these basic freedoms now. Already, America's women, as individuals or as members of organizations, have called the attention of the Congress to these and other important matters. Every day, every Senator and Representative on the Hill gets helpful and informative letters from individual women and from their organizations—the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the business and professional women's groups, auxiliaries of veterans' organizations, etc. Yes, they have done a wonderfully constructive job letting the Congress know how they feel about certain issues. Well, it is up to you to do even more along this line than before.

You know, you might compare this task to tending to your own never-ending housework. There is, of course, always something to do in your home. There is always Junior's pants to mend or buttons to be placed on hubby's shirts, or the rooms to be vacuumed, or a dozen other things to be done. The same thing is true of your continuing responsibilities and mine as a citizen. It is up to you and to me to make known our wishes to the Congress on both these questions that I have discussed, as well as on other questions.

SECRETARY. Well, Senator, what about some other freedoms in the housewife's bill of rights?

FREEDOM FROM FEAR OF SICKNESS

Senator WILEY. Here are some more. I'll just run down the list because time is short. I say that housewives and workingwomen are entitled for one thing to freedom from fear of sickness—from sickness affecting junior, or daughter, or hubby, or yourself. Now, the only way we can get such freedom is through encouragement by Government to America's great private medical profession. I say encouragement, not socialized medicine. In other words, we don't want Federal regimentation of medicine. We do want assistance to medicine by, for example, aid to medical schools, more aid for hospital expansion, etc. Yes, we say socialized medicine means poorer health for America, and more bureaucratic red tape. Socialized medicine legislation must therefore be defeated.

SECRETARY. All right, Senator, so, you've mentioned freedom from nuisance taxes, freedom from fear of red ink, and freedom from fear of sickness. What next in the housewife's bill of rights?

FREEDOM FROM FEAR OF UNNECESSARY STRIKES

Senator WILEY. I would say that another of the basic freedoms for American women is freedom from fear of unnecessary strikes. Now, what do I mean by that? Well, there is almost no greater anxiety that can come to a woman than when she hears from her husband: "Our plant is on strike. I will not be bringing any pay envelopes for a week, a month, 6 months." Folks, I needn't tell you the heartbreak such an announcement causes. It means that the grocery bills won't be paid, that you won't be buying that new refrigerator or that new car, or that new washing machine. It means a lot worse, too, in many instances. Youngsters going to bed at night on meager rations. Now, you and I know that strikes are occasionally necessary as a last resort, but, folks, I don't like to see workers lose pay checks, management lose profits, investors lose dividends, and what is most important, I don't like to see the public hurt by paralyzing stoppages which cripple the railroads or the steel industry or the coal industry or any key Nationwide effort.

That's why I have voted for the Taft-Hartley law. You know that has been called a slave-labor law. It has been smeared in every possible way by certain labor racketeers, but everyone of its provisions is designed to promote the freedom of labor, freedom from Communist control, freedom from unnecessary strikes, freedom from labor violence, freedom from chiselers who steal funds from union treasuries.

Now, ladies, if you believe in the rights of American labor, as I am sure you do, I hope that you will be fighting for this basic freedom—freedom from unnecessary strikes. I hope that you will urge your Congressman and Senator to keep up the battle to preserve the Taft-Hartley law on the statute books. Under the Taft-Hartley law, unions have prospered, collective bargaining has continued, yes, strikes have occurred when they were purely local in nature and did not damage the public interest, but key strikes have been prevented whenever the President has chosen to use this statute which he, himself, has smeared.

SECRETARY. Well, Senator, I think that our listeners will agree that freedom from fear of unnecessary strikes is certainly a basic freedom. I know that time is running out and that there is one other freedom that you want to mention.

FREEDOM FROM FEDERAL BALONEY

Senator WILEY. That's absolutely right. I think we can call it freedom from Federal baloney. Now, I am going to have to define what I mean. It is just this. Every day from Washington, D. C., you ladies and your husbands hear a lot of hokum. (I hope that this program is not included, however, in that category.) You hear a lot of false promises, a lot of glib talk from individuals who promise you the sky but who don't tell you how they are going to achieve their objective—usually through more taxes.

I say to you folks that it is up to you to tell the administration and the Congress in Washington that you don't want a diet of Federal baloney, a diet of hokum, of false promises, of misrepresentation of issues. You want the facts—the facts about Federal expenses, the facts about the costs of socialized medicine, facts about the Taft-Hartley law. With those facts, you can evaluate issues for yourselves. It is up to you my friends. Washington will hand you Federal baloney unless you complain against it, unless you speak up and tell the Congress and the executive branch that the American people will not be fooled by glib generalities, by smears, by lies, by rumor mongering.

CONCLUSION—LISTENERS' REACTION INVITED

SECRETARY. Well, Senator, we have covered four basic freedoms in the housewife's bill of rights. I think that your listeners will feel that these have provided food for thought. They may not agree with you in every instance, but I know that they will respect the sincerity of your convictions and the directness with which you have spoken to them today. I know, too, that you will be glad to get their reactions to this housewife's bill of rights.

Senator WILEY. That's right. I want to thank this station for permitting me the opportunity to chat with you. I hope that when you get a chance you will drop me a note telling me what you think about these ideas of freedom of fear from sickness, freedom of fear of red ink, freedom from fear of Federal baloney, freedom from nuisance taxes. This is your Congress and it is your Government. You can make it pretty much what you want to, depending upon your own alertness as a citizen.

I have faith that you will continue to make your voice heard in Washington for sound, sensible Government, for a domestic policy that will lead to continuing prosperity, and a foreign policy that will banish forever the threat of war between nations. Those are big tasks, but they are crucial to your home, to your family, to your future.

Thanks again for your kind attention. This is ALEX WILEY signing off from our Nation's Capital.

Resurgence of German Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, with the creation by the Soviet Union of an east German Government, the challenge of our high commissionership in Germany is again emphasized to us. Will we be able to make of Germany a democracy or will militaristic nationalism again take over, with the grave danger of Germany becoming the Soviet Union's most powerful satellite and its resulting implications to world peace and security. That this problem is moving to the front of the stage of world political action is shown by the attached special article by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times of October 10, 1949, and the same paper's editorial of the same day:

ABROAD—WEST STILL HOLDS INITIATIVE IN GERMANY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The prophets were right who predicted earlier in the year that by now we should be entering the most critical phase of the cold war. The establishment of two rival governments in Germany does not change the basic situation any more than Russia's possession of the atom bomb or the politico-economic tremors disturbing Europe in the wake of the devaluation of the pound.

These events were anticipated. They were all in the background—the Russian bomb, the ledgers that Marshall aid could not bring into balance, the preparations to complete the division of Germany in the name of unity. Coming to the front at the same time, however, on top of the shattering defeat of western policy in China, the challenge to Soviet power in the Balkans, the increased pressure of domestic problems, they shake the optimism that grows so easily in the American soil and climate.

The basic fact is the profound distrust that exists between Russia and the western powers. This is the real dividing line between east and west. This is the iron curtain. The wall of suspicion is far more dangerous than the atom bomb. The one way to prevent the use of the atom bomb is to prevent war, and the one way to prevent war is to create a modicum of confidence between the two big powers. Without this there is not the slightest hope of control of atomic energy or of any pause in the armaments race. It is idle to look for an agreed settlement of yesterday's war while everybody concerned is anxiously scanning the horizon for portents of tomorrow's war.

OFFSPRING OF DISTRUST

Today's Germany is the monstrous offspring of this distrust. The construction of the German Soviet state brings into focus the antithesis between the war and peace aims of Russia and the democracies. It puts a kind of period—a period as explosive as a bomb, because it doesn't end anything—on the long process of deadlock and frustration which produced the two republics, each created in the image of the sponsoring powers, one by a slow and orderly series of free elections, the other slapped together as a countermove, regardless of the popular will. One is intended to make the Germans independent, the other to use them as an instrument of Soviet policy.

The two governments have one thing in common—both are designed for a unified Germany, and each starts out by inviting the separated states to come in. From now on, therefore, they will be strong competitors for control of Germany, its body and its soul, which means that the Germans will be active elements in the competition between Russia and the west.

In retrospect it looks as if the Soviet Government planned the split in order to lead the fight for unity that was bound to follow. The manifesto of the eastern state demands "absolute recognition" of the Potsdam decisions, blandly ignoring that Russia's absolute refusal to carry out the Potsdam directive for economic unification forced Britain and the United States to set up a bizonal economic administration. France finally and reluctantly joined this economic merger, but for a long time the French supported the Russians in opposing unification. While their reasons were quite different, for any policy that reduces Germany relieves the deep-rooted fears of France, the French helped to solidify the division and place Russia in the position of obtaining a new satellite and using it to spearhead a crusade to win all Germany on the issue of unification. By way of turning the screw, Stalin took a leaf from Hitler's book and staged his political "coup" when France was without a government.

CONDITIONS GROW WORSE

The Bonn government was decided on because all efforts to reach a settlement with Russia led nowhere and the situation could not be left in suspense forever. Now the Russians have followed suit, and the contest is on. The time is past when the western allies can afford mistakes or differences in their German policy. But that does not imply that they have lost the initiative. On the contrary, the advantages are all on their side if they know how to use them.

The Soviet move sets up a dictatorship in contrast to free institutions, and sets it up after the Germans have experienced Communist rule and seen how it works in the neighboring countries. The German puppets, moreover, are a nervous and abject lot; they dared not act during the blockade and are afraid now to let the people vote on the new regime. They will never be permitted to speak up to the Russians as the Bonn politicians do to the western powers.

Economic conditions in Berlin are worse than during the air lift, and establishing the eastern capital in this divided city presents a new test of stamina to the population and the western garrisons. Yet there are no signs that the Berliners are wavering in their anti-Russian stand.

The only unity the Soviet Government can offer is the "unity" of Poland or Czechoslovakia. Short of changing the Oder-Neisse border in Germany's favor, which Wilhelm Pieck announced was out of the question in the first session of the Volkskammer, how is one-third of the country in better position to work for unity than two-thirds?

The west still controls the important part of Germany and the big majority of Germans still desire to go west. The outcome of the contest depends entirely on the capacity of the western governments to meet the new challenge head-on and as a team.

NEW PHASE IN GERMANY

As the Soviet program for the new East German Government unfolds itself it is becoming evident that the long-expected creation of this puppet regime ushers in a new phase in the struggle for Germany, which in its widest implications is a struggle for Europe. For this latest step of the Russian empire builders does not in any sense represent a Soviet acceptance of a German partition between east and west, to which many in the west had resigned themselves, and which many had even come to regard as a possible basis for a new European order. Rather it marks the resumption of the Soviet offensive for the ultimate control of all Germany as the key to the control of the whole continent. The new tactics which the Soviets are developing confront the western world with new problems which only the highest kind of statesmanship can cope with.

Contrary to the tactics which led to the fiasco of the Berlin blockade, the Soviets do not this time challenge the western powers directly, nor do they try to use force against them at the risk of war. This has the advantage that it saves the new Soviet policy from that truculent aggressiveness which created the dangerous tensions of the Berlin conflict and in the end turned the whole world against Moscow. As in the first phases of the last war, Soviet aggressiveness is again directed mainly against the smaller nations, with Communist Yugoslavia taking at the moment the place of Finland and the Baltic States. But in the central issue of Germany the Soviets appear to have reverted to primarily political means, and having failed to beat the western powers by frontal assault, they now pursue the same aim in flanking maneuvers through which Germany is to be conquered for them by their German dupes.

The manner in which this is to be accomplished is clearly indicated by both the Soviet program and its studied if grossly deceptive and purely propagandistic contrast to the program of the west. It is true that the new regime has no other legitimation than appointment by the Kremlin. But a like legitimation has been quite adequate to enable other Communist regimes to deliver their countries to Soviet control in defiance of their people, and the Soviets can hope to repeat that performance in Germany. For that purpose, the new German regime is proclaimed to be an all-German government, free, sovereign and independent, and claiming jurisdiction over all Germany—minus, of course, the quarter of Germany already annexed by the Soviet bloc. For all outward appearances it is to be given control of all the affairs of a sovereign state, including its foreign relations and foreign trade. And it is prompted to demand all the things the Germans want, including German unity, a

peace treaty, end of industrial dismantling and withdrawal of the occupation forces.

In contrast, the German Government sponsored by the west is a truly German Government created in free elections and ruling under a constitution freely adopted by the German people. But due to the federal character of the new republic, which for the present excludes all East-German States and even Berlin, it can be easily represented as a sectional government. Moreover, its functions are largely confined to domestic matters and are subject to the supreme control of the western powers officially laid down in an occupation statute and other western control agreements of indefinite duration.

Few Germans can today entertain any illusions about either the Soviet or the western aims. They must know that the western powers are trying to return them to the European community of nations, subject to necessary safeguards of security, and they see the earnest of this effort in the Marshall plan, which is rapidly transforming western Germany from a land of despair to a land of hope. They also know from their own experience that there is no necessary relation between Soviet words and Soviet deeds, and that the supervisory controls openly retained by the Western Powers are minor compared to the total if hidden control of all phases of life exacted by the Soviets. But the Soviet propaganda program voiced through German mouths is not only an open invitation to all German nationalistic demagogues to join in opposition to the west but must also inevitably exert considerable pressure on the western German Government to espouse many of the same aims, and thus drive it into ostensible support of the East German Government.

This could easily lead to friction between the western German Government and the Western Powers, which is, of course, one of the aims of the Soviet program. But such friction would represent such a danger to the whole western program, not to speak of the Germans themselves, that it behooves both the German Government and the Western Powers to be on guard against the trap being laid for them.

Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 12 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the equal-rights amendment, written by Helen Paul and Ernestine Hale Bellamy and published in the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, July 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT BACKERS SEE INFLUENTIAL GROUPS LENDING SUPPORT—PROPONENTS STANDING BEHIND MEASURE 26 YEARS HOLD EQUAL-STATUS BILLS TO BE DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED

(By Helen Paul and Ernestine Hale Bellamy)

There are today before the United States Congress two proposals containing diametrically opposing points of view with regard to the status of women.

These are the equal-rights amendment and the women's status bills.

The early pioneers for woman's emancipation had one main object—to remove every handicap from women. The national suffrage amendment gave women political equality and nothing else. But it did put in their hands the weapon with which they could win the rest of the equality program.

SUCCESSOR TO SUFFRAGE

Following the winning of suffrage in 1920, the National Woman's Party proposed a second constitutional amendment—to remove every remaining handicap under the law. This amendment was first presented to Congress in 1923 and has been introduced into every Congress since that time. It is known as the equal-rights amendment and reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

It is because of their inheritance of the ancient common law of England that women have found it necessary to have the principle of equality incorporated into the law of the land. The need for the equal-rights amendment was set forth by one of America's leading educators, Dr. M. Carey Thomas, former president of Bryn Mawr, as follows:

"Forever behind every man in every State of the United States are the rights of a man as a man with a final appeal for these rights to the Supreme Court of the United States, while forever behind a woman as a woman is the medieval English common law, if she is married, holding her to be her husband's chattel, bound, protected, owned, and, even if she is unmarried, influencing every legal decision about her and controlling unjustly all her life. This to me is the compelling argument for writing an equal rights amendment into the Constitution of the United States. Only such an amendment will do away with the present legal stigma of inferiority and bondage."

LAWYER STATES CASE

The late George Gordon Battle, an eminent American lawyer, has written:

"We submit that there can be no more important object than to secure equal rights to all our citizens, men and women alike. The present discrimination against women permitted by our laws is by far the most serious defect in our governmental system."

It is a great tribute to the wisdom, maturity, and stature of our American people that today a great tide of approval for this measure is sweeping the country. Today, 35 national women's organizations support the amendment.

Day by day the list of prominent men and women and organizations giving it support is growing. This list now includes the President and Mrs. Truman.

President Truman while he was a United States Senator declared for the amendment and has reaffirmed his stand since becoming President. Within the last several weeks President Truman has given added help by appealing to the Democratic leaders of the Senate for prompt passage of the amendment. The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, and Attorney General, the Honorable Tom Clark, have also given active support.

The present status of the amendment is most encouraging. It is explained as follows by Anita Pollitzer, past national chairman and now honorary chairman of the National Woman's Party:

"More than 44 governors, present and immediately past, have declared for the equal-rights amendment. The platforms of both major parties recommend favorable action. Two-thirds of the membership of the Senate and House, present and voting, must vote favorably on a constitutional amendment to secure its passage. Seventy-two Members of the Senate now are publicly pledged to the amendment."

NEEDED FOR PASSAGE

"Sixty-four votes, two-thirds of the Senate membership, would secure its passage. Two hundred ninety votes, two-thirds of the House membership, are pledged to the amendment. This comparison shows that after a quarter of a century of explanation and educational work this measure is now on the brink of victory. The amendment would make women 'people,' 'persons,' under the United States Constitution, as these words are now legally used. Each State would still decide how its laws should read provided that no law permitted discrimination against either sex."

The amendment was introduced in the present Senate in January of this year by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, of Iowa, and 34 cosponsors. The Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported the amendment in March of this year, without a dissenting vote.

The amendment was introduced in the present House of Representatives by the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, with more than a hundred cosponsors. The House Judiciary Committee, in the last session, favorably reported the amendment by an overwhelming vote and recommended that it be passed. It is again before the House Judiciary Committee.

PLEDGES ACCUMULATING

One of the latest pledges to come in is that of Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr., newly elected Member of the House.

At the first congressional hearing on the equal-rights amendment, shortly after its first introduction in 1923, the National Woman's Party stood alone in supporting the measure. One by one other organizations of women have taken their stand for the amendment.

In 1935 the National Association of Women Lawyers, by a vote of their convention at Los Angeles, joined in support. In 1937 the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs voted at their Atlantic City convention to endorse. The General Federation of Women's Clubs, by a referendum vote, added their endorsement in 1943.

The National Education Association, the principal organization of teachers in the country, appointed a committee several years ago to investigate and study this subject. In 1944 this committee brought in a report which led to endorsement at their convention at Pittsburgh.

The list of endorsers now includes the Supreme Forest Woodmen Circle, the American Medical Women's Association, American Society of Women Accountants, American Federation of Soroptimists Clubs, Women's International Association of Aeronautics, Industrial Women's League for Equality, National Association of Colored Women, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the National Association of Women Dentists, the Quota International, and many others.

Furthermore, the National Council of Women, a clearing house representing approximately 6,000,000 women (the United States branch of the International Council of Women), has repeatedly appealed to the Judiciary Committees of Congress, through its executive board, to submit the amendment to the States in accordance with democratic principles.

ENVOYS MUST APOLOGIZE

Our representatives abroad are handicapped in presenting the advantages of our form of government by having to admit that inequalities between men and women still exist in the laws of our country. The women of our country were embarrassed when our representatives at Bogotá, in May 1948, had to admit that the United States was the only

country present not able to sign the Inter-American Convention on Granting of Equal Rights to Women.

The proposed convention had to be divided into two parts so that we could sign one pertaining to political freedom, while not signing the one dealing with civil equality. Passage of the equal-rights amendment will enable us to sign the Inter-American Convention assuring full civil equality, signed by every other American Republic. The convention reads:

"ARTICLE 1. The American States agree to grant to women the same civil rights that men enjoy."

Examination of the laws of the land discloses that there are still many State laws on the statute books which discriminate against women. An interesting chart showing the nature and extent of these laws has been compiled by the southern California branch of the National Woman's Party.

WHERE INEQUALITY IS FELT

Examples of these inequalities, according to this compilation are: In certain States, the right to act as executor or administrator is unequal; in some States, management and disposition of property are unequal; in other States, the right to the guardianship of children is unequal; while in others, the opportunities under the law for employment are unequal.

As an example of how unequal laws hamper women in their efforts to make progress for themselves and their country: A Vassar graduate wanted to give her daughter the advantages of a Vassar education. She was an able, experienced woman. She applied three times for a position in three of the nearby schools and each time was accepted as qualified, until she stated that she was married. The school regulations forbade the employment of married women. Similar experiences have lined up 275,000 teachers behind the equal-rights amendment.

As stated in the beginning of this article, measures have been introduced into Congress which represent a different attitude toward the rightful position of women. These are bills which are called by their sponsors the women's status bills, but are popularly known as the biological status bills. There are several of these bills, but they differ only slightly.

OUTLAWING DISCRIMINATION

The National Woman's Party has presented to congressional committees their objections to the biological status bills, and so far no action has been taken on these bills by the committees to which they were referred.

The purpose of the woman movement has always been to remove all discriminations against women. To declare, as in the proposed bills, "That it is the declared policy of the United States that in law and its administration no distinctions on the basis of sex shall be made except such as are reasonably justified by differences in physical structure, biological, or social function," would be to oppose the whole trend of the movement for equality for women in this country and throughout the world, supporters of the equal-rights amendment contend.

This provision, they believe, would open the floodgates to all kinds of discriminations against women and would be especially dangerous for women who are earning a living for themselves and their families, for it would open the way to discriminations against them in opportunities for employment and in payment for their work.

KEEPING ISSUES CLEAR

The further fact is emphasized that progress already made in numerous States to wipe out habitual differentiation between men and women would be frustrated by Federal legislation taking account of differences between sexes. Among such affected States are Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, and Minnesota which have either provided full equality to women within the States or passed resolutions memorializing Congress to adopt the equal-rights amendment. Moreover, the constitutionality of discriminatory protective Federal legislation is subject to question, as inconsistent with the suffrage amendment of 1920.

Supporters of the equal-rights amendment maintain furthermore that another agency to study the status of women as provided by the status bill is not needed, as it would duplicate the work of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, as well as studies of the UN. Further appropriations for such study would be a waste of taxpayers' money. And finally they conclude that the enactment of a single uniform law for men and women, as embodied in the equal-rights amendment, is right in principle and would clear the way for broader justice.

Post-ERP Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole free world waits for the delineation of United States foreign policy as to what will succeed the European recovery program. It should not be improvised and should not come suddenly, but should be studied carefully and the free world should be prepared for it. Accordingly I have introduced House Resolution 286 to appoint a select committee to make such a study. There is appended hereto a most interesting article by the distinguished economist and writer, Sylvia F. Porter, of the New York Post, of September 30, 1949, showing how public opinion is raising the same question:

HOW LONG ERP?

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

How long will the Marshall plan last? Yes, I know it's supposed to run until mid-1952, but how long will it actually run?

And now that we're finally facing up to some world economic realities and western Europe has not only devalued but also undervalued its currencies, how long should the Marshall plan run?

"Over at ECA headquarters, the boys are beginning to look for new jobs," whispered my informant, a man who knows a great deal about what goes on behind the scenes in Washington.

"I've had several discreet inquiries from men below the top level just in the last few days. They're the bright ones who like to get out when the getting is good.

"They figure the Marshall plan, as such, won't last more than another year, if it lasts that. They're probably right."

Spelled out, ECA is, of course, the Economic Cooperation Administration—the formal name for the United States agency which administers the billions we donate and lend under the Marshall plan.

This week, ECA announced that Marshall-plan aid since April of 1948 is now well over $6,700,000,000.

And almost certainly Congress will put the final O. K. on additional billions for the Marshall-plan lands before it goes home.

Yet, even as these spectacular figures pass before our eyes and everything seems to be going according to schedule, below the surface the debate is intensifying and spreading. How long? And on what basis?

It's bound to come out no matter how ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman and his various assistants try to avoid it. In fact, Hoffman himself admitted as much the other day when he told a group of America's outstanding industrialists:

"The No. 1 fear among the people of Europe is that our aid will stop. They are afraid that we will not follow through with our plans to June 30, 1952. That is the projected date for end of the Marshall-plan program. That has been regarded as the earliest date by which Europe might stand on its own feet."

It's your tax money and mine which is financing Marshall-plan aid. In view of the stake we have in this, it would be rank stupidity for us not to take a good, long look at the Marshall plan as it is working out now and as it probably will work out in the future.

The Marshall plan has not failed; that's the first, the brilliant point to keep in mind. It has, on the contrary, been a heartwarming success. It has helped feed millions of people. It has helped create jobs. It has helped western Europe lift its production 15 percent above prewar levels. It has helped preserve friends for America and for democracy in the west.

But the Marshall plan is not reaching down to the fundamentals of the world's economic problems today. It wasn't designed to do so; it isn't doing so; and it's essential we realize that it isn't.

Moreover, in the last few weeks, the background against which this program operates has been violently altered. To be specific:

By slashing their currency rates so sharply, Britain and her sister Marshall plan lands are in position for the first time in years to tackle our markets, sell substantial amounts of goods here, thereby earn dollars they need and become less dependent on our gifts.

By knocking down our tariff walls in addition—even though we recognize this will increase the competition for our own producers—we are doing something really concrete and of long-term importance to help Western Europe onto its feet and off our backs.

By urging the Marshall plan lands to go ahead, take the risks involved in knocking down some of their own walls and controls, we are paving the way for a worthwhile trade revival within Europe itself as well as between Europe and other areas. And for the first time, an honest trade advance is at least a possibility.

And by admitting the basic problems cannot be solved by donations from us, regardless of their magnificence, we finally are removing the blinders from our own eyes.

Now we can get down to the fundamentals of revising global trade routes, restoring confidence in the cheapened currencies, developing backward areas into first-rate customers, settling such nagging problems as Britain's sterling balances, and so forth.

It boils down to this: the time for gifts is rapidly passing; the time for using our power, brains, and money to achieve a real balance of world trade is arriving.

Whether or not Europe fears it or ECA resents it, it's coming out into the open. It can't be held back.

Marshall Plan for France Falls Flat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a report of the joint congressional ECA "watchdog committee," which has concluded that the Marshall plan is not attaining its objectives in France. Mr. Douglas Larsen, writing in today's Washington News, has an interesting article on that report, which I include as part of my remarks:

FRANCE'S FIERCE PRIDE SLOWS MARSHALL PLAN

As a propaganda weapon against communism in France the Marshall plan is reported to have fallen flat on its face. And as a result the chances of the plan achieving its basic aims there are seriously jeopardized.

This is revealed in a report of the joint congressional ECA "watchdog committee." It is a penetrating study made by two staff members of the committee who spent practically all summer in France analyzing the problem. They are public-relations experts Robert L. Fallow and Gabriel R. Vogliotti.

Unfortunately, Messrs. Fallow and Vogliotti discovered most of the causes for the failure to sell the French people on the plan's merits are things that ECA officials can't do much about. They exist in the peculiar postwar state of mind of the average Frenchman and in French sensitivity, resistance, truculence.

"France's fierce pride," the report states, "is one of the elements slowing down the operation of the Marshall plan. To be told that the bread they eat contains free flour, their rails made of donated steel, their currency backed by donated money, is galling. The suggestion that Frenchmen should be grateful arouses antagonism so fierce as to jeopardize the negotiations necessary to the various projects in the Marshall plan."

KISS OF DEATH

"ECA's American administrators and publicists have long since learned that the kiss of death for any publicity project is the suggestion from any quarter that the United States is doing it out of a kind heart, or that it is a gift, or that France should be grateful. But the fact remains that ECA aid is free aid, and France bridles at the thought.

"Past events have created a French attitude of mind which is almost hysterically opposed to any hint of domination, and a belligerent attitude even toward the best-intentioned advice. France has a chip on its shoulder that has no counterpart in, say, Belgium, England, or Italy.

"The consequences of this attitude, so difficult to visualize in the United States and so real an obstacle in France, are immediate. They have a direct bearing on the rate of progress of the Marshall plan."

PRESS LYING DOWN

In their efforts to break down these national phobias, ECA's public-relations men have been hampered by lack of cooperation from the French press, the report states.

"The French press, the non-Communist press, is lying down. It is not championing the Marshall plan. It is not news that many of the leading newspapers of France can be bought and that their reputation of venality is pretty well founded. As a result, any paper adopting a strong position on an issue is inevitably charged with a sell-out. In an issue as controversial as the Marshall plan no papers have cared to go all out."

In talking to French editors Fallow and Vogliotti discovered that many of them "express sympathy for the plan and academic approval of objectives." But they say politely that they can't make a crusade of it. As a result, the report reveals, straight news on progress of the plan in France does not get as much space in the French papers as it does in the United States press.

GOVERNMENT MUTE?

The French Government's apparent lack of enthusiasm in helping ECA officials to sell the plan to the French people is explained in the report:

"Government inaction stems from the fact that the present Government is a coalition incorporating a wide range of violently conflicting economic groups. As a general proposition it is unquestionable that the coalition Government has indorsed the Marshall plan. But even the groups most favorably disposed toward Marshall plan measures are hesitant about too strong an advocacy of its requirements for fear of seating charges that they are obeying foreign masters."

Commenting on this part of the report, ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman says:

"While it is true that the French Government could do more in publicizing the Marshall plan to the French people, we do not believe that it is accurate to say, as the report does, that the French Government is mute on the Marshall plan. There are evidences at hand to dispute such an arbitrary statement."

DUE CREDIT

Due credit is given in the report to the efforts and work of the ECA information team:

"The ECA information team has made an intelligent and consistent effort to get the western side of the story across to France. This is not to say that it has succeeded; the odds against its doing so on its own are too great. But no account of information on the Marshall plan in France should slight the intensity of its work, the ability and its staff, and its understanding of the delicacy of the job."

France Must Help Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Ludwell Denny which appeared in the Washington Post for today, entitled "Despite Lots of Help France Is Wobbly." The article carries a Paris date line of October 12:

PARIS, October 12.—France will not be able to stand on her own feet by 1952 at the present rate of recovery even if democratic coalition government follows the fallen Queuille cabinet as expected.

She is receiving more outside aid than any other European nation. She has more native economic resources, and a better balance between industry and agriculture. But results are far short of her opportunity.

Her basic problems are not so much economic as fiscal and political. They are problems which foreign aid can postpone but only she herself can solve. This she is not doing. At least not fast enough.

Financial instability and political instability are her curses. They have been for generations. They go together.

Numerous weak political parties permit majority government only through unnatural coalitions, which are as ineffectual as they are unsteady. Sterile compromise becomes the price of political survival, and evasion safer than action.

So no government can be found with enough strength and courage to make taxes meet expenditures. Or to equalize the load between prosperous farmers, business profiteers, and some higher paid workers on one side and, on the other side, the desperately poor labor and middle classes victimized by indirect taxes and inflation. Or to break trade restraints of business organizations, or to clean up nationalized industries over union obstruction. Or to cope with a bulging, tradition-bound bureaucracy.

As a result France is still a sick nation. You would not know it by looking at the gay boulevards of Paris, the luxury shops and night spots. It does not show in the beautiful and lush countryside. Over all is an air of prosperity.

But it is mostly dole. It reflects the foreign aid which has been pouring in here at a rate of about a billion dollars a year from America, and another third of a billion indirectly from Britain and others. If that help stopped now, France would quickly fall back toward chaos. Her officials admit this.

During recent months these dangers have been obscured not only by Marshall plan gifts, but also by the blessings of God and the decline of communism. The 1948 harvest was bountiful. The Reds, by overplaying their revolutionary hand last fall, turned French labor against political strikes.

Thanks to these three temporary factors, there was a semblance of financial and political stability. The Queuille coalition cabinet stayed in office more than a year—a record. It was able for a few months to lower prices, hold steady the currency, boost production, even to start minor budgetary and tax reforms.

Now, instead of another bumper crop, this year's drought has left a poor harvest. Anti-Communist unions, which reacted against political strikes, are threatening stoppages on wage-price issues and the Reds are rising on that wave.

All this is happening just as the foreign aid is being cut; and when a buyers' world market, and more drastic British than French monetary devaluation, curb foreign trade here. France is not closing the great dollar gap between what she imports and exports.

These facts are beginning to correct the naive picture of recent months of French "prosperity."

But, now that sunny summer is over and a hard winter not far off, it would be equally inaccurate to obscure the progress made.

It is a matter of perspective. France almost went down the drain in 1947 and again last year. She is far better off now.

If she has not yet licked inflation, at least prices are under partial control, the franc is fairly steady, the black market is grayer, and the budget is in a little better shape.

If she is not anywhere near balancing her foreign trade, at least she is modernizing her obsolete and war-shattered industrial plants and improving her agriculture. Production in the factories is already a quarter above prewar.

If her government is still unstable, at least she escaped the civil war and dictatorship threatened by communism before. She is stronger to meet that threat when it comes again—as it may.

She has restored confidence. She is no longer paralyzed by fear.

These gains have been made possible largely by foreign aid. More gains could have been made if France had eaten less and saved more. But she still has her chance.

The question now is whether, by more self-sacrifice and more self-discipline, she can make even better use of outside help before it stops.

Power and Atomic Energy: Major American Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 11 (legislative day of Saturday, September 3), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Power and Atomic Energy: Major American Issues," by Mr. Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, as published in the July-August 1949 issue of the Machinists Monthly Journal.

Perhaps no program has ever been developed in this country which will contribute more to the development of our resources, the strengthening of our democratic institutions, and the expansion of free enterprise than our program for the development of our river valley systems. No man living today has contributed more to the successful outcome of that program than Judson King. Since the early history of the struggle for protection of our natural resources from control by special interests, Judson King has been closely associated with the leaders of the conservation movement in the United States.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will make 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $184.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE BALL

(By Judson King, director, National Popular Government League)

The pen with which I write is one of several used by President Roosevelt in signing the TVA Act on May 18, 1933—16 years ago. They were presented successively to Senator Norris and others, including myself, who had battled for 12 years to settle the Muscle Shoals problem in the public interest.

That signature, after a spectacular controversy, established three momentous precedents—multipurpose river valley development, public marketing as well as generation of power at Federal dams, and a single Board of Directors styled an "Authority" to coordinate and manage the entire project.

The private power combine and its allies fought TVA from the start. The Army engineers and old-timers in other Federal bureaus never accepted the TVA method and cooperated reluctantly during the first years of the New Deal.

A sizable portion of Congress also was opposed, especially the Republican leadership. But opposition of all kinds came into the open when in August of 1944 Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, introduced his bill applying the TVA principle to the Missouri Valley, and later when Senator Mitchell, of Washington, launched one for the Columbia watershed. The controversy continued through World War II.

All this was light skirmishing, however, compared to the battle royal joined on April 13 last when President Truman sent a special message to Congress urging the development of the Columbia River Basin by a single agency to be styled an "Administration" instead of an "Authority," but which carried forward the TVA principle. He wrote:

"I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide a means for welding together the many Federal activities concerned with the regional resources into a balanced, continuously developing program. In so doing I recommend that certain Federal activities in the region be consolidated into a single agency called the Columbia Valley Administration."

Quickly followed the introduction of the Magnuson-Mitchell bill for the Columbia, an administration measure. Also bills proposing TVA's in New England and talk of Valley authorities all over the Nation.

This White House endorsement of single agency planning and management, the first since President Roosevelt's memo of December 23, 1944, to be noted later herein, has brought on the most crucial conservation conflict since the time President Hoover vetoed the Norris Muscle Shoals bill, and President Roosevelt signed the TVA bill. Congressional hearings are now in progress.

It is possible that the present Congress may take action, but once more fair-minded citizens are confused over conflicting claims of all sorts which are flooding the country, particularly the West and New England.

This confusion as to what the TVA idea is and whether it is sound policy has, as might be expected, been intensified by the reports of ex-President Hoover's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

To which must now be added as a correlative matter the current investigation of the administration of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and former Chairman of the TVA Board.

ORIGIN OF THE AUTHORITY IDEA

To such puzzled citizens a brief account of the origin of the single agency or authority method of administration will be useful. Its adoption is as important as public power, flood control, soil conservation, and other objectives in control and use by the people of their natural resources. And since this old pen remembers things I am using it now.

First proposed in 1908. Elsewhere this pen has recorded the fact that neither multipurpose development nor single agency control is either new or un-American. They were first proposed in 1908 by the Inland Waterways Commission appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt and headed by Representative Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, later Senator, a Republican who, as chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, gained national fame for fighting wasteful pork-barrel appropriations.

The vice chairman was Senator Francis G. Newlands, Democrat from Nevada, the true father of the Reclamation Service. The only member of this nine-man Commission to object was Chief of Army Engineers, Brig. Gen. A. Mackenzie, who filed a dissenting report on the grounds that this new management was radical, premature, and the work could be done equally well by existing agencies—the latter-day counterpart of which is a departmental agency with Army engineers in dominant command.

These ideas had to wait 25 years till embodied in the TVA Act and what that delay has cost the Nation is a subject for some research foundation to estimate.

THE TVA INVESTIGATION OF 1938

This old pen remembers the charges of dishonesty and malfeasance in office made in 1938 by Chairman Arthur E. Morgan of TVA against David E. Lilienthal and Dr. Harcourt Morgan, his fellow members of the Board.

The Nation was agog over predictions by Members of Congress demanding an investigation and declaring that corruption worse than Teapot Dome would be unearthed.

Great was the disgust of the public when a joint committee of both Houses of Congress found the charges unfounded and commended the work of Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan.

We need to remember this, and sharply, because it was then revealed that the power trust was at the bottom of the commotion and that the major cause of the conflict in the Board was Arthur Morgan's determined effort to cooperate with the power trust.

The Commonwealth & Southern Corp. had a plan for distributing TVA power. It wanted to divide up territory, deny municipalities the right to compete with private companies and above all to form a power pool tying together transmission lines of TVA and the companies in one brotherly system.

Morgan favored this plan. Lilienthal and Norris fought it. A conference was held at the White House and President Roosevelt threw the scheme out the window.

Whereat Dr. Morgan issued a public statement defending it, concerning which article Senator Norris said: "I was amazed at Dr. Morgan's position. Had I read his statement without knowing its author I would have unhesitatingly declared it was the work of a power trust attorney." These issues are still with us.

Lilienthal's faithful administration of public power law as written was the chief cause of the hullabaloo raised over his confirmation by the Senate when President Truman appointed him chairman of the commission created by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

It was painfully evident then that the private utilities and other corporate interests were back of the barrage of unjust charges made against him. The reasons were manifest.

The act was the work of a special committee of conservative Senators. They were—

Democrats: BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut, chairman; RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado; TOM CONNALLY, Texas; HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia; MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland.

Republicans: ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Michigan; WARREN R. AUSTIN, Vermont; EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Colorado; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa; THOMAS C. HART, Connecticut.

E. U. Condon, scientific adviser, Director, National Bureau of Standards.

Section 5 of the act provides for "Government ownership of all fissionable material." Next, in section 11 (C) it puts all patents and inventions affecting the production of atomic energy under the control of the Commission.

It is the greatest blow to the monopolization of patents ever given by Congress. All manufacturers, small and large, can use a patent only if and when authorized by the Commission.

Evidently this raises the issue of whether big business shall be permitted to monopolize and control atomic energy when it becomes commercially feasible as it has electric energy and that depends on the character of the Commission.

Now, note: Lilienthal has recently stated that due to rapid progress being made atomic energy may begin to be available for peacetime purposes within 4 or 5 years. It is certain that Lilienthal will administer the Atomic Energy Act as faithfully as he did the TVA Act.

Hence big business does not want him around and the sooner he is gotten rid of the better. This, in my judgment, is the dominant reason for the present attack upon Lilienthal and far outweighs the yearning of the military brass hats to get atomic energy under their control.

CONTROL OF POWER, ELECTRIC AND ATOMIC

It is clear, I trust, that the main obstacle to the progress of the conservation cause thus far was not Communism, TVA in the red, and like red herrings, but the question of the control of electric power. Now it is atomic energy. The importance of that issue in this machine age need not be emphasized here. So we return to the CVA and MVA bills, the chief point of the controversy over which concerns valley authorities.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND VALLEY AUTHORITIES

TVA was made a Government corporation as the President in his message to the Congress stated "clothed with the power of Government, but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise," to be administered by a board cooperating with but independent of other agencies. He fought for that kind of management as long as he lived, but was blocked by the Army engineers and reactionaries in Congress.

He was anxious to extend the TVA principle to other river valleys and in 1937 he called me in for a long conference during which he emphasized the multipurpose and single authority phases and also the need of men who believe in these principles and who would faithfully execute them as administrators.

The European situation and World War II intervened. Meantime the Army engineers and Reclamation continued their ancient quarrel over who should build the dams and where. General Pick was for a great navigation project on the lower Missouri; Regional Director Sloan was for a great reclamation project on the upper Missouri.

In August 1944 Senator MURRAY, of Montana, introduced his first bill, creating an MVA to do a multipurpose job for the whole valley, and on September 21 the President sent a special message to Congress which, in effect, endorsed the bill in principle and stated his opposition to piecemeal development under old agencies and stated: "As the Congress knows, I have for many years advocated the establishment of separate authorities to deal with the development of certain river basins where several States are involved." He specifically mentioned the Arkansas, the Columbia, and praised results achieved by the TVA.

Did the Army engineers, the Reclamation Bureau, and congressional committees respect this message? Not they. The Army engineers and the Interior Reclamation Service, frightened by the Murray bill, patched up their differences, hurriedly devised what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan to be administered by an interdepartmental board composed of men from the Corps of Engineers, Interior, Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission.

This scheme was accepted by the reactionary committees as a part of the rivers and harbors appropriation bill and passed by Congress. The Murray bill was pigeonholed after extensive hearings, chiefly hostile. Roosevelt was compelled to sign or hold up authorized construction of all kinds. He signed, but he attached the following memorandum:

"I note, however, that the bill authorizes for construction by the corps of engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation those improvements in the Missouri River basin which, on November 27, 1944, I recommended be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley Authority. My approval of this bill is given with the distinct understanding that it is not to be interpreted as jeopardizing in any way the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, the establishment of which should receive the early consideration of the next Congress."

This served notice that the President fully intended to fight for Valley Authorities when peace came. Without doubt he would have done so. The conservative Washington Post on November 23, 1944, commented editorially: "The most serious danger inherent in these measures is that they offer specious substitutes for the valley authorities sought by the President. There is every reason to suspect, indeed, that they were designed to forestall the creation of such independent agencies."

The above drastic memorandum was President Roosevelt's last official utterance on this subject. He died on April 12, 1945.

DEMOCRATS SWING RIGHT

After his passing the Democratic high command, apparently apologetic in respect of New Deal policies and personnel, swung to the right.

They misjudged the temper of the increasingly vast independent vote of the Nation which is highly critical of the reactionary wing of both the old parties and President Truman followed along with the result that in 1946 the Republicans captured control of the Eightieth Congress.

The Republicans at once began attempting to put into effect policies advocated by the famous Purcell Smith power lobby. Said they: no TVA steam plant; no more Federal transmission lines; sell Federal power wholesale to private utilities; kick out of office officials like Reclamation Commissioner Mike Straus who believe in public power and above all, no more valley authorities like TVA. The West and all progressives took alarm.

President Truman in the 1948 campaign correctly gauged the mind of the independent voters; his judgment aided by the attitude of organized labor and the new Progressive Party rejected the advice of his conservative aides, swung left, made a fighting New Deal campaign and won for himself and the Congress, one of the chief factors being his endorsement of the Roosevelt power and conservation policies.

THE COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION BILL

In the summer of 1948 President Truman directed the Reclamation Service and the Army Engineers to prepare comprehensive plans for the development of the Columbia basin.

There had been sharp conflicts between the two as to who should build what dams in the basin, how they should be financed, etc., and of course they came up with differing recommendations, the Army's plan being much more acceptable to the private power companies and other vested interests.

They were then ordered to compose their differences, which was done, the plans being worked out in conjunction with an interagency committee with local advisory representation similar to the Missouri Inter-Agency Committee. The question of who was to be "it" in over-all control was left up in the air.

On April 13 President Truman, who for 4 years had been silent on the authority issue, surprised the Nation with a message urging the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration.

The bill carrying it into effect was introduced on April 19 and on that same day the Department of the Interior and the Army engineers issued to the press a joint release announcing that they had come to an agreement upon their parts in a comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia Basin. The release contains this significant statement, said to have been inserted by the White House:

"It provides an inventory and framework which would be extremely valuable to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration recommended by the President."

The agreement carried the signatures of Secretary of the Interior Krug, Secretary of the Army Royall, Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus, and Chief of Engineers Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

On May 6 Secretary Krug sent a memorandum to Commissioner Strauss agreeing with his report and containing two pertinent sentences: first, that he intended to designate the Bonneville Power Administration now headed by Dr. Paul J. Raver as the agency to market power to be developed, and, secondly, that the recommendation of the President to establish a CVA "has my wholehearted approval and support."

There has been no specific approval of a CVA by the Secretary of the Army or by General Pick and I predict there will be none. Since Harold L. Ickes was made Secretary of the Interior under the New Deal that agency has promoted a policy of building transmission lines and selling surplus power from its dams to the people instead of marketing it through private companies as had been done.

But the Army engineers since 1910 have been no friends of public power and that is why they are so loudly praised by the utilities. If neither of the Roosevelts were able to bring the engineers into line with their Commander in Chief it remains to be seen if President Truman can do it, including General Pick.

OPPOSITION TO CVA

A tremendous campaign against the CVA bill has been launched in the Northwest. As usual, the Power Trust is masquerading behind all sorts of front organizations like the chambers of commerce, the reclamation association, newly organized development associations, etc.

I recently talked with a keen journalist from the Northwest and remarked, "My guess is that 75 percent of the money and stimulus comes from the private utilities." He remarked, "You are wrong. It's nearer 90 percent." The people are being informed that a CVA would be communistic, authoritarian, a superstate which would destroy any local say-so in control of their resources or destiny.

The basic issue is who is going to control the marketing of the tremendous power to be developed in the Columbia Basin. Big business knows that it will be easier to control an interdepartmental board with conflicting interests and responsible to their bosses in Washington as against a regional three-man board with offices, say, in Portland or Seattle, with authority to plan, coordinate, and manage river control on the spot, emphasis being upon management.

That is why the Power Trust in the Northwest and in Washington is fighting to sidetrack President Truman's plan for a CVA and substitute the "comprehensive plan" worked out under the direction of Colonel Weaver, United States district Army engineer in the Northwest, and R J. Newell, Bureau of Reclamation regional director at Boise. It's the Pick-Sloan trick all over again.

The outstanding Federal official in the Northwest who strongly and openly supports the CVA idea is Dr. Paul J. Raver, head of the Bonneville project, and a smear campaign against Raver is being waged similar to the one against Lilienthal.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER AGAINST PUBLIC POWER

We come now to the surprising and confusing reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which ex-President Hoover is Chairman. Only brief references can be made here.

Some of the findings and reports of the Commission and its task forces are excellent. There is no question but that reorganization is needed and much of the criticism of existing conditions justified.

It seems inconceivable, however, that Mr. Hoover would permit his well-known prejudice against public power as a policy to crop up in proposing changes in administration machinery but it has.

It is germane to recall that as Secretary of Commerce under Harding and Coolidge he was the most outstanding spokesman and friend of the power trust in the Nation and the utilities responded by being the most powerful factor that put him in the White House.

For example, he opposed Federal regulation of holding companies declaring it should be left to the States. His speech against Senator LaFollette's party in 1924 titled "Government Ownership" was circulated by the utilities to the number of 500,000.

As President he vetoed the Norris Muscle Shoals bill because it put the Government into competition with the private utilities. He said, "That is not liberalism, that is degradation."

Under Hoover's direction the Federal Power Commission then composed of the Secretaries of War, Agriculture, and the Interior, was so partial to private utilities that it created a national scandal.

The late Senator Couzens, Republican, of Michigan, came to the rescue by having passed a bill making the Commission an independent agency of five members thus presumably taking it out of politics. Being as adverse to effective regulation as to public ownership, Hoover appointed a commission dominated by reactionaries.

Two of the commissioners, however, Frank R. McNinch, a Democrat, and Claude L. Draper, a Republican, refused to make a shambles of the act. Internal conflict followed with little accomplished until President Roosevelt removed Chairman George Otis Smith and made Commissioner McNinch chairman which put the Commission on the map in the public interest.

HOOVER ATTACKS ARMY ENGINEERS AND PICK-SLOAN PLAN

When the Hoover Commission was organized in 1947 it was observed that the task forces (committees of experts to help the Commission) dealing with water resources were heavily overstocked with private-utility men and there was a great curiosity over what the findings and recommendations would be in this field.

The most explosive product of the Commission's work after 18 months of labor, at a cost of some $2,000,000, was a heated attack upon the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in their river-development activities which rocked official Washington and spread like lightning over the Nation.

They were charged with outrageous waste of public money and disregard of national welfare in competing with each other for huge appropriations to finance projects for their own glorification.

To illustrate, a task force made a devastating analysis of the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. It was charged that the plan was a patched-up affair hurriedly made with entirely insufficient knowledge of the basic facts on which such multipurpose enterprises should be based; that it would be impossible to achieve the results anticipated, either in respect of irrigation, navigation, flood control, and other benefits. All true.

Another case study of like kind was made of the King's River project, a part of the great Central Valley project in California over which the two agencies have been in violent conflict as they have been over the Missouri and Columbia River projects until recently, the Reclamation Bureau's insistence on public power and transmission lines being the chief cause.

The chairman of the task force on natural resources was ex-Governor Leslie A. Miller, of Wyoming. The Commission's recommendations were made in March, and on May 14, 1949, the Saturday Evening Post carried a sensational article by Mr. Miller titled "The Battle That Squanders Billions."

The subhead read: "Do you want to pay a $52,000,000,000 water bill? You may have to if someone doesn't stop the money-spending contest between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. Here—from a Hoover Commission expert—is the story of their incredible extravagance."

In an introductory note, Mr. Hoover states: "The report of the Commission's task force on resources was a revelation." He urged full publicity and condemns the great hodgepodge of duplication, overlapping, and unbelievably extravagant planning to get reorganization through force of public opinion.

There was little that was new in these charges. As to the Pick-Sloan plan, they had been made for the past 4 years by the regional committee for an MVA; recently by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D. C., and the National Emergency Conference on Resources held in the National Capital in May, all with the assistance of competent engineers.

Surprisingly enough, Mr. Miller dealt with lobbying. Thus: "Naturally two such powerful and pork-dispensing organizations have drawn the support of potent lobbies. The National Reclamation Association is one of the more powerful lobbies doing yeoman service for the Bureau of Reclamation.

"The engineers have a whole string of lobbies behind them, including the aggressive Mississippi Valley Association and the wealthy, influential National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

"This rivers-and-harbors lobby has achieved an almost incestuous relationship with the National Congress as many of the Representatives and Senators who pass on the bills that the group lobbies for are members of the lobby itself, along with the contractors, chambers of commerce, and other special interests that make up the membership."

Nothing new here. Such revelations have been made on the floor of Congress and publicized in courageous magazines and newspapers and by progressive organizations for the past quarter century.

The gentlemen are late comers as searchlighters, though welcome.

Now everyone knows that the TVA was established to end departmental disputes over jurisdiction and eliminate the duplication and waste about which Mr. Hoover and his adherents on the Commission so loudly, and on the whole justly, complain. Although I must add that I am waiting for an independent analysis of their data.

Next, it is an axiom among disinterested authorities that land and water conservation are so closely related that they must be put under a single management to get the best and most economical results.

But Mr. Hoover, in his grouping, as pointed out in the dissenting report of Vice Chairman Dean Acheson (now Secretary of State) would "separate the management of public lands from the development of water resources * * * by placing the public lands in Agriculture and water resources in Interior.

"We are convinced that such a recommendation would only perpetuate the fragmentation of functions of agencies which for decades has paralyzed wise development of our natural resources. * * * These views give no recognition at all to the fundamental fact of resource development—its multiple-purpose character."

Hence, Acheson and two other members of the Commission recommend a Department of Natural Resources to solve a single indivisible problem.

HOOVER OPPOSES THE AUTHORITY IDEA AND GOVERNMENT TRANSMISSION LINES

Next, the Hoover Commissioners and task forces oppose the creation of any more TVA's; also urge that the Government should cease building transmission lines and should sell power developed at Federal dams at the dam site or bus bar to private utilities unless they decline to purchase; also that no new construction be undertaken until appropriations be made by Congress.

Senator AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont, Republican member of the Commission, strongly dissented. He pointed out that the recommendations on water resources and Government business enterprise "follow so closely the arguments which the private business interests present in opposition to public water-resources development that the general welfare viewpoint does not seem to be properly presented."

He refers to Haskins & Sells (business accountants) report on business enterprise and of A. B. Roberts (engineer) on water-resources projects. Acheson agrees with AIKEN and says the "accountants have run riot in a field of Government policy which they do not understand, or if they do are utterly unsympathetic toward."

And AIKEN adds that they show "a failure to recognize that there can be public investments yielding public returns, evaluated and appraised in terms of a system of general welfare accounting."

Finally, Acheson et al., criticize the Hoover element for making "sweeping recommendations as to basic national policies embodied in Federal statutes. This, we think, is beyond its province." He charges that in a series of reports "the Commission has abandoned its self-imposed discipline to refrain from comment on the wisdom of statutory enactments."

The question now comes: In criticizing Federal business enterprise in connection with valley development what appears to give Messrs. Hoover and Miller and associates their great concern?

The gentlemen leave us no doubt on that score. In endorsing the Miller article in the Saturday Evening Post, above noted, Mr. Hoover states "the battlers for the bureaus must be overcome by sheer force of public opinion if our free system is to be saved for future generations," as though the bureaus, and not the Congress and the President, decided upon the projects.

He gets more specific in a radio interview with the head of the Washington Bureau of the reactionary Gannett newspapers on Sunday, June 5. He was asked: "Do you consider business enterprise of the Government unwarranted competition with private industry?" Mr. Hoover answered:

"In some cases these enterprises are a helpful and a necessary aid in public welfare, as for instance veterans' insurance and certain types of loans for better housing. Others of them are steadily expanding in competition with private enterprise. Especially is that true in the case of electric power. We are on the road to socializing the electric power industry of the United States. The Government has established electric power plants as a byproduct of water conservation in at least 195 spots. Each one of these is being used today as an expansion of governmental power, instead of placing the distribution of power in established agencies such as municipalities and private companies. One effect of this has been to stifle private company development. Generally, it is proceeding on what I view as very dangerous lines."

Governor Miller in his Post article was equally direct. He wrote: "It is my impression that the United States is not a socialistic country and that the production and sale of electricity remain a matter for private enterprise."

It would appear that, as children playing hide and seek say, we are getting "hot" on the big reason why a majority of the Hoover Commission got off the beam into matters of policy and party politics.

In this publicity tremendous emphasis is placed on "wasteful spending" by "bureaucrats" who have gone "hog wild" on valley projects. These are, as Miller said in an interview out west, "taking this country down the road to socialism." Others dub it "com-

munism." All of which has been overworked, ad nauseam, since the first days of the New Deal.

It is apparent that Hoover and Miller want to slash the whole conservation program, especially as to public power. In the Post article they seek to terrify "John Q. Taxpayer" with the $52,000,000,000 figure, condemning it as a "terrific water bill." They fail to state that this is an estimate on the cost of tentative plans for the next 30 years or more and this work and more will be necessary to meet the flood danger, reclamation, and many other things.

As far as planning and construction and management are concerned, the TVA method would save millions on these future projects and give "John Q. Taxpayer" more for his money, yet the gentlemen are against it. The reason follows:

[NOTE.—Speeches describing the Missouri Valley Authority bill by Senators MURRAY, GILLETTE and HUMPHREY will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1949.]

DEMOCRATS VERSUS REPUBLICANS

The Hoover Commission has done a great service in confirming and expanding the findings of previous commissions that the executive department needs reorganization. The strong emphasis placed on waste and inefficiency caused by conflict between bureaus is commendable.

But Mr. Hoover and his contingent on the Commission have done great disservice in going out of their way to inject the public-power issue and add to the confusion over valley authorities by sustaining the Power Trust viewpoint.

No wonder the Commission was split open and reported only individual recommendations on these issues because they involve party politics of a high order as well as modern against antique policies.

We have for many years reminded our readers that the conservation movement from the start in 1906 has made progress only as a result of the fight made by progressive Republicans and Democrats voting against reactionary Republicans and Democrats.

Nevertheless, it remains true that since Theodore Roosevelt left the White House in 1909 the Republican Party as a national organization has been the party of the private utilities, especially during the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime.

The States differ, dependent upon the political strength of the utilities in each. With the exception of the Boulder Dam project major legislative progress was made in the Democratic administrations of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As to Boulder—now Hoover Dam—President Coolidge and Secretary Hoover would never have favored the bill sponsored by Representative Swing and Senator Hiram Johnson, of California, both Republicans, but for the certainty of losing California in the 1928 presidential campaign had they not done so.

Today—summer of 1949—the old line continues in respect to valley authorities. President Truman and the Democratic leaders are fighting in the public interest, with the exception of some governors and Members of Congress siding with the utilities.

Governor Dewey, ex-President Hoover, most Republican Governors and a majority of Republican Senators and Representatives endorse the policy of the private utilities with a decreasing number of progressive Republicans in Congress and out still bravely fighting in the public interest.

At the bottom, then, the evidence shows that while it is not the only one the dominant and most acute issue causing all this delay and confusion in the field of conservation, is who shall own and control electric power in the future, and to that we must now add atomic energy.

If in the years 1931–33 the people of the West, Southwest and New England States had been given their choice, deceived by the same kind of a hurricane of false propaganda now blowing, they would have voted against TVA by at least 4 to 1 and for States' rights."

After 16 years of experience with TVA all classes would, with no shadow of a doubt, vote 10 to 1 to retain it. It is most curious that the propaganda of fear over an alleged superstate originates in the Republican North and not in the States' rights South.

Manifestly, the South and the West are keeping their eye on the ball.

Separate but Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 12, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington post on October 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed as follows:

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL

The Supreme Court has consented to review a case that may have great historic significance—the case of Elmer W. Henderson against the United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission and Southern Railway Co. The case will test the validity of a Southern Railway regulation, approved by the ICC and upheld by a divided three-judge Federal district court, requiring passengers to be segregated according to their color in the railway's dining cars.

In accordance with law, the United States was named as a defendant in the suit brought by Henderson. Nevertheless, the legal representatives of the United States, the Solicitor General and other officers of the Department of Justice, filed in the Supreme Court Wednesday a powerful brief arguing that Henderson's appeal should be upheld and that the order of the ICC should be declared invalid. This support of an appellant on the part of the Department of Justice deserves the warmest commendation.

The case originated when Henderson, a Negro, traveling as a field representative for the wartime Fair Employment Practices Committee, was denied service in a Southern Railway diner, in accordance with company regulations, because the two end tables, curtained from the rest of the car and supposedly reserved for Negroes, were being used by white passengers. The Interstate Commerce Act provides that "it shall be unlawful for any common carrier * * * to subject any particular person * * * to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever." The company reconciled its regulation with the law on the ground that the furnishing of separate but proportionately equal facilities entailed no discrimination. The ICC upheld this justification.

The doctrine that segregation is not discrimination rests upon an 1896 decision of the Supreme Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*—perhaps, with the single exception of the Dred Scott case, the worst decision in the Supreme Court's entire history. The Court at that time dismissed the contention that "the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority," and blandly observed that "if this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it."

The sophistry and callousness of this judgment were roundly scored by Justice Harlan in one of the Court's great dissents. "Our Constitution is color blind," he said, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. * * * We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law. The thin disguise of 'equal' accommodations * * * will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done."

The thin disguise has been used ever since to justify segregation in public schools, State universities, public transportation, and other public facilities. The whole structure of discrimination by law has been based upon it. All experience has shown not only that separate facilities are never, in fact, equal but that enforced separation is imposed deliberately to humiliate Negroes and to emphasize their inferiority. It serves that purpose well. It creates inequality by imposing a caste status upon the group at which it is aimed.

The Justice Department's brief asks the Supreme Court to invalidate the ICC ruling on the ground that the Southern Railway regulation violates the Interstate Commerce Act. It seems to us clearly to do so. "But," says the brief, "if the Court should conclude that the issues here cannot be decided without reference to the 'separate but equal' doctrine, the Government submits that the legal and factual assumptions upon with *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was decided have been demonstrated to be erroneous, and that the doctrine of that case should now be reexamined and overruled. The notion that separate but equal facilities satisfy constitutional and statutory prohibitions against discrimination is obsolete. The phrase 'equal rights' means the same rights." It is high time for the Supreme Court to say so.

Foreign Investment Program an Idiotic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 28 entitled "Idiotic Policy on Foreign Investment." This editorial deserves the attention of every Member of this House, as it points out the paradox of every phase of President Truman's so-called 4-point program. The writer points out that the Government kicks certain business firms all over the lot, yet at the same time he insists that these same organizations invest their earnings in foreign countries. I include said editorial at this point:

Here is one of the strangest paradoxes of all time—President Truman's proposal to ease taxes for American investors in foreign industry.

For, while his administration thus rushes to stimulate private investment abroad, it

continues its policy of harassing and penalizing the only branches of American industry that can provide sufficient profit funds to invest in foreign enterprise.

The whole plan is self-contradictory. How can a Government that kicks certain business firms all over the lot because they happen to be efficient enough to prosper expect the same companies to lift themselves from the ground and obediently find the millions he wants them to raise for European and Asiatic industry?

While doing everything it can to injure and handicap American business, the Truman administration wants American business to go to the rescue of foreign business and foreign governments.

That administration has been acting very self-righteously in fighting anything in this country that savors of monopoly. It has attacked, and is trying to break up, such corporations as du Pont and the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

But at the same time it is urging American investment in countries where the cartel system of monopoly notoriously controls the economy.

A big, well-managed company in the United States is something to be smashed, in the administration view. But the vicious European cartels that have strangled business enterprise abroad for many years are to be encouraged by American aid and investment.

It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Truman's latest proposals for helping foreign countries come under the heading of his point 4 plan to build up underdeveloped areas in Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

In the four postwar years from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1949, the United States has already donated $13,260,000,000 to nations abroad.

In addition the United States has granted in the same period $10,808,000,000 in credits on which repayment over a certain number of years is supposedly required. From our past experience with such foreign loans we might as well write off most of these billions as permanently gone.

With direct aid of this type still continuing, the President wants United States investors to help out with their own funds, and he is promising them a number of concessions in the way of liberalized tax laws on income earned in foreign countries.

The President must know that this is no small-time proposition. Some scattered blue-sky promoters might try to lure suckers into foreign investments with promises of 25 percent or more return—promises that can never be made good. But this field is obviously not for the small individual investor. It is only for big capital, backed up by skilled and farsighted management. Even so, the difficulties in foreign investment at this time, with currencies tangled and restrictions imposed upon the withdrawal of funds, are acute.

But the industries which might be able and willing to risk investment abroad are the very ones that are the objects of administration hostility. A firm that is efficiently operated, and that, in consequence, manages to make profits and to expand, is regarded with suspicion by the Government and apt to find itself marked for harassment. One that is badly managed, that loses money and apes the Government in wasteful practices, presumably could count upon administration approval. But business efficiency is not to be tolerated.

If the President is so avid to help foreign nations with American capital put up by corporations and individuals, he needs to do more than propose the easing of taxes on profits obtained abroad.

He should treat American business and foreign business with the same standards of equity and impartiality.

He should stop his paradoxical nonsense of whipping United States industry with one hand and trying to extract from its pockets, with the other, millions for the revival of industry abroad, which is largely cartel-dominated.

Welcome to Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 12, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Welcome to Nehru," which appeared in the Washington Post of October 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO NEHRU

The arrival of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the Capital today will be an event of great import in the relations between East and West. Nehru comes as Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs of India. But these titles do less than justice to his prestige in his own country. He is a founding father, second only to Gandhi in the people's veneration. He wears a halo in his own lifetime—more or less like Mannerheim's in Finland or Masaryk's in Czechoslovakia. Neither's problems, of course, could compare with Nehru's, either in complexity or scope. Within India a sixth of the human race live, divided into innumerable classes and minorities. Nehru's task is to weld them into a single whole in a state based upon the liberal tradition. It is a mammoth undertaking—one that is complicated by the fact that India is still bedeviled by the border problems left by the partition with Pakistan, but one which has shown so much progress that that very fact has given Nehru a towering stature beyond the confines of his own country.

Few men in charge of great affairs are more gifted than Nehru. Pandit means learned one, given to all Kashmiri Brahmins, to which his family belongs; but the honorific suits the mind of Nehru as well as his pedigree. Incidentally, Nehru's lineage doubtless explains an attitude toward the allegiance of Kashmir which would otherwise be incomprehensible. Kashmir is a major issue in India-Pakistan relations, but a man of Nehru's great authority could dispose of this problem without inviting much trouble from his own constituency. There is a precedent in this respect in his adroit handling of the issue over separation from the British Crown. Equipped to act according to his own lights, he severed the link, and then agreed to a new link through the Commonwealth. The solution was as brilliant as it was statesmanlike. India is as free as any country in the world, and exercised its sovereignty to become a member of a new community. Nehru by this act demonstrated not only the hold he has on the Indian people, but also the kinship he recognizes between his love of country and love of mankind.

The unique leadership exercised by Nehru is at once hierarchic and democratic. He knows the art of being a king. At the same time he has a common touch which excites the sympathy of all kinds and conditions of India's population. He can stir millions with pen or tongue. This is the man we are now going to see. We want to know him, and we want him to know us, partly because of his own dynamic personality, partly because he has a contribution to make to world pacification. His vast country is an island in a continent of turmoil which makes the truth hard to discern. It would be the part of wisdom to listen to what he has to say on how to deal with Asia. His reading should tell him that the people of this country has its anticolonial past in its marrow, and his look at us—hurried and kaleidoscopic, though it is being made to be by the schedule-makers—may, let it be hoped, show him some of the folkways of America, where the good life is being lived.

Department of Natural Resources Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 12, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, former Gov. Leslie A. Miller, who was chairman of the task force of the Hoover Commission which conducted the study of natural resources, spoke on Monday, October 10, at Wheeling, W. Va., before the American Forestry Association. His speech deals with some of the reasons why, in the opinion of the task force, immediate and constructive action should be taken to establish a department of natural resources. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like now to tell you of some of the discussions regarding the consistent place of the Forest Service in the Federal administrative picture as the same took place in our consultative sessions. At the outset it was felt that sentimental or emotional thinking with respect to the past, and I refer to the old Pinchot-Ballinger controversy, should be discarded.

Admittedly the Forest Service has done a fine job in the public interest in the Department of Agriculture. To argue, however, that the Forest Service or the proposed Forest and Range Service can affect the public interest at high standards only if it remains in a Department of Agriculture is to admit failure to stimulate a national consciousness of the people's stake in their natural resources. A continuing belief in the compulsory need for relegation of the Service to the Department of Agriculture on the basis of the Pinchot-Ballinger episode has been a determining factor in its organizational climate and has guided the thinking of many of the friends of the Service in unofficial life. It was the feeling of our group that this was a weak approach, indeed, and that it would be greatly to the advantage of the Service if it could be once and for all forgotten.

Assuming then that the need for protective custody should not be a factor in weighing the relative merits of the two proposals for the placement of the Forest and Range Service, the problem resolves itself into a determination of whether or not the natural resources to be administered by a Forest and Range Service are more closely allied to the purpose and function of a Department of

Agriculture or a Department of Natural Resources.

The fundamental purpose of the proposed Department of Natural Resources is to obtain the most complete and effective use of the waters, minerals, wild land, forests, fisheries, and wildlife of the Nation.

It is not the view of the Natural Resources Committee that the proposed Natural Resources Department usurp soil and water conservation activity carried on by the Department of Agriculture in its services to farmers and ranchers. However, it is the intention that the national interest as well as the local interest be firmly represented in the conservation planning pertinent to range resources in the West.

The objective set forth for a reorganized Department of Agriculture by the Committee on Agricultural Activities is the development of programs which will: (1) safeguard our resources and amply provide our population with the agricultural commodities it requires at prices that will preserve for agriculture a sound position in our national economy; (2) provide assistance to farmers for purposes of achieving the best land-use adjustment consistent with long-time interests of both producers and consumers.

Fair comparison of the above-stated objectives in terms of forest and range resources indicates that the proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture will naturally continue to emphasize service to the farm population. A particular clientele is served as well as the Nation. On the other hand, while a Department of Natural Resources will be exposed to pressure groups, there will be no particular obligation to any one group. The latter Department will be in a better position to maintain the national and long-range interest in conservation and development of these and other natural resources.

The American people cannot readily be aware of and assume the necessary degree of mature responsibility toward the conservation and development of their natural resources until there is one definite executive department of the Government which can be held accountable to them as a whole for its policies and programs relating to the discovery, development, use and conservation of such resources.

Perhaps not in absolute sense but in general, the kind of a job which the proposed Natural Resources Department would perform is quite different from that performed by the Department of Agriculture. The proposed Natural Resources Department would be doing a resources-management job while the Department of Agriculture in accord with its traditional role of supplying services would be called upon to service the resource-management agencies in the Natural Resources Department. These services would be provided in the same manner as provided to private individuals engaged in what should be resource management on their own farms and ranches.

It is true that the evidence drawn from program-operating experience points to a close link between public wild-land management and the Department of Agriculture. However, the Department of Agriculture apart from the Forest Service and the temporary submarginal land activity of the Soil Conservation Service, is not a management agency but a servicing agency. Its traditional concept and pattern of organization are such as to provide services to its clientele and not to manage the resource itself. It is primarily an agency rendering many different types of service to farmers. Even the regulatory functions of the Department of Agriculture are in a real sense services to the farm population. Moving additional resource-management agencies into a servicing department such as Agriculture is a move in the wrong direction. This would further divide rather than consolidate the responsibility for Federal resource management. The Forest Service or, as proposed, the forest- and range-management agency should be placed in a department where resource management is the major objective of the department.

At this point may I ask your attention to what appeals to me as a major inconsistency in the proposal that the major functions of the Bureau of Land Management, now in the Department of the Interior, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture and there made a part of a Forest and Range Service? This, as you will readily see, would have the effect of separating the land from the water, speaking in terms of administration.

The contention that all Federal policies and programs bearing upon the land user's business must be consistent whether the lands be publicly or privately owned is a logical, yet viewed from the national interest, a dangerous approach to western forage resource development. The soil and water conservation program of the Department of Agriculture is geared to function through State soil conservation districts whose management is carried on by and for the local interest. In those cases where the national long-term interest conflicts with the short-term local interest, the employees of the Soil Conservation Service or its successor are particularly vulnerable to local pressure for the installation of improvements and for approval of higher range carrying capacities. These actions, although in the interest of the land users, if extended to the public range lands might in many instances conflict with other land or water users in the immediate vicinity or with those far removed from the local scene who are dependent upon the watershed for municipal and industrial water supply.

It is questionable whether the development of the forest and forage resources of the public domain and of private commercial forestry apart from farm wood-lots should be combined departmentally with the promotion of agriculture. Our natural resources are presumably held and developed for all classes of people and areas—city population as well as rural. It is important that adequate representation of diversified interests be attained and that where diverse or conflicting major purposes are involved that there be an opportunity for departmental presentation. Both the agricultural population and our natural resources including forest and forage resources of the public domain need the prestige of Cabinet consideration to represent adequately the diversified interests involved in their conservation development.

Analysis of the farm forestry problem with reference to its weight as an influence upon the placement of the forest and range management agency discloses that, while both range and forest resources may reasonably be considered as crops, particularly as they apply to farming operations, the management of timber resources, either public or private, apart from farms, is a vastly differing problem. It does not seem reasonable to contend that since there is a need for a farm forestry program the entire forestry activity of the Federal Government be centered in a Department of Agriculture. This amounts to the tail wagging the dog. To illustrate the overemphasis of this line of argumentation, the appropriations for the Forest Service for the fiscal year 1949 are set forth as follows:

Personal services, District of Columbia	$1,097,582
General administrative expenses	650,000
National-forest protection and management	25,204,175
Fighting forest fires	100,000
Forest research investigations:	
Forest and range management	2,787,500
Forest products	1,125,000
Forest resources	822,000
Forest-fire cooperation	9,000,000
Farm and private forestry cooperation:	
Norris-Doxey	660,034
Clarke-McNary:	
Section 4	83,700
Section 5	65,766
Land acquisition	500,000
Forest roads and trails	15,050,000

Obviously, the farm forestry program in terms of Federal expenditures is insignificant in comparison to the Federal expenditures for the conservation and development of the public forest and grazing lands administered by that agency.

Farm forestry is basically a farm problem, whereas commercial forestry and management of public forest lands is a different problem—the first definitely ties in as a responsibility of a department of agriculture; the second does not.

The farm-forestry program itself has failed to catch on with the farmers in the degree which might have been expected largely because the concept of the organization responsible for the national forestry program has been too much in terms of commercial forest management enterprise rather than in terms of farm operation. Farm forestry must be considered in terms of over-all farm planning rather than in terms of growing trees as a commercial enterprise.

It is erroneous to think of farm wood lots as containing 30 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land. Farmers do operate farms which contain about 140,000,000 acres of land covered with woods, but until it can be established that a wood crop will contribute more to farm economy than other crops that might be grown on forested acres—crops with which the farmer is already familiar—we are ignoring the facts to assume that the farm woodland area is a part of the permanent timber-growing land of this country. Farm woodland which is not permanently dedicated to timber growing is not part of our commercial forest land, but farm land temporarily used for woods. Farmer ownerships of woodland are not brought about by design, but are accidental, and therefore farmers are not obligated and frequently are not inclined to grow wood as a crop. Farm forestry can only succeed as a program as the farmer accepts a farm enterprise where forestry serves him in exactly the same manner as does agronomy, animal husbandry, or horticulture. Farm-forestry promotion should be done at the farm-planning level of the Department of Agriculture's activity. Forestry integrated with the farm business must provide an annual income. If farm forestry is conceived in terms of production of forest crops on a commercial basis, income is too intermittent.

The wording and philosophy of the report of the Natural Resources Committee suggests that it would be logical where practicable to place Federal responsibility for leadership in the forest, forage, fish, and wildlife resource fields in the same department that is responsible for the management of these resources on the public domain. However, as can be readily ascertained by reading the specific recommendations summarized on pages 8 through 11 of the committee's report, there is no intention of establishing a western Department of Agriculture nor to take over those services of the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration which pertain to private forage lands in the West, or of all research on forage and all educational services pertaining to private forage lands. Rather it is the intention of the committee that the major responsibility and the

bulk of the activity of the forest and range management service will be the administration of responsibilities on federally owned lands. However, it is intended that the proposed forest and range management service continue the research and educational activity now carried on by the Forest Service and that it will work very closely with and through the appropriate agencies in the Department of Agriculture providing conservation services and information to ranchers grazing stock on public and private lands within the watersheds under its jurisdiction.

Inevitably any organization which manages the public forest and range lands in the Western States is going to have a profound effect upon the agriculture of the region since the setting of grazing capacities and the installation or lack of installation of improvements on the public range will go a long way in determining the manner of improvements made and degree of stocking pursued on private lands used in conjunction with the public range. Conservation planning necessarily has to be a joint enterprise between the Department of Agricultural and the Department of Natural Resources in order that local short-term interests will not adversely affect long-term national interests in the use of the land.

In conclusion, may I again direct your attention to the theme of my opening paragraphs—the imperative need in these United States of ours for over-all conservation. Regardless of what finally may be the administrative methods employed, our future economic well-being calls for thoughtful and decisive action in the broad field of water, soil, and forest conservation now—50 years hence may be too late.

A Tribute to Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 12, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of October 11, 1949, entitled "A Welcome Visitor."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed as follows:

A WELCOME VISITOR

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, is scheduled to arrive in Washington today to begin a visit of about 3 weeks in the United States. It will be his first trip to this country and there will be a virtually unanimous hope that it will not be the last. We expect to enjoy having him here and we hope that he enjoys to the full being with us.

Pandit Nehru has headed the Government for India for a little more than 2 years and in that time he has made a notable record of accomplishment. Three things in his administration stand out. First, he was able successfully to ride out the awful storm of communal rioting, which was in effect an undeclared civil war, that followed the partition of the Indian subcontinent. A lesser leader might well have gone down in this trial. Second, he was able to assert his moral personality as something of an unofficial leader of modern-minded Asiatics. He brought them together in conference and gave them confidence in his own insight and integrity. Third, he was able to meet and successfully to solve the tricky constitutional problem of how India was to become a republic and still remain within the framework of the British Commonwealths. He did so while maintaining himself against some opposition at home and made a solid contribution to better Indian-British relationships.

In the long run, however, it is likely that Pandit Nehru will make his place in the hearts of Americans not by virtue of his political accomplishments but by virtue of his personal attributes. He will be admired as an individual long after his leadership has passed on to others. His integrity will be honored when his skills have ceased to be of consequence. It will be to Nehru the man that the United States extends its warmest welcome. It is a joy to have him with us.

Fundamentals of Management Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered October 7, 1949, at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce by Mr. Eric Peterson, general secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Machinists, one of our oldest and most respected American labor unions.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON WHAT FUNDAMENTALS BASIC TO FUTURE MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS CAN WE AGREE?

Recently, one of our Canadian representatives was summing up the different types of management with which he dealt in the Province of Quebec. "First," he said, "there is the French-Canadian manager, who knows little or nothing about labor and is sure the union is going to put him out of business; then, there is the representative of British management, who knows something about labor in general, and wants to learn all about your union in particular; and finally, there is the representative of American management, who knows all about you before he meets you."

I wish that characteristic were as universal among American management here at home as our representative claims it is in Quebec. So that you may know something about the union I represent, permit me to preface my remarks with a brief introduction of the International Association of Machinists.

The machinists' union was organized 61 years ago last May by some 20 men employed in a railroad roundhouse in Atlanta, Ga. They did their organizing, by the way, in an engine pit under cover of a friendly engine where the boss wouldn't catch them. From those 20 railroad machinists the organization has grown to a membership of more than 600,000 men and women working in almost every major branch of American and Canadian transportation and manufacturing. Through its 1,700 district and local unions, the International Association of Machinists has collective-bargaining agreements with 12,000 employers.

We machinists are proud of three major attributes of our union. We are proud of its democratic procedures under which all major decisions involving such matters as the election and recall of officers, the making and amending of laws, and the calling of work stoppages, are made by direct vote of the membership. We are proud of the militant strength which enabled us to survive and to develop in the early years of unionism, and which today enables us to maintain and improve the wages and conditions of our members. We are proud of our good relations with management and of our collective-bargaining skill, which together, enables us to make reasonable gains with a minimum use of economic force.

As a representative of that union I deeply appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the possibility of fundamental areas of labor management agreement. This is an important field of exploration not alone because it concerns the future problems of management which is a partner in the American economic system but because it affects the future progress, and perhaps the very existence, of an economic system which has brought great benefits to the millions of Americans represented by labor and management.

Let's start with real fundamentals. The International Association of Machinists believes in a system of free, competitive enterprise—in the right of an individual or a group of individuals to own and operate a business. We believe also in the right of the owners of business to realize a fair return on their investment—to make a profit.

We believe that these rights are not absolute, but like all rights in a free and just society, are subject to qualification. We believe, for example, that no individual has the right to operate a business which is injurious to the health or morals of his fellowman, or to operate a legitimate business in such a way as to jeopardize the rights of his fellowman. And we most emphatically believe that no business has the right to achieve profits through the payment of wages insufficient to maintain the employees in health and decency, or through the maintenance of working conditions which ignore their safety and health.

Specifically we believe the right to manage business should be subject to qualification by governmental regulation on such matters as monopoly, restraint of trade, fixing of prices, and payment of basic minimum wages. We further believe that the right to manage business should be qualified by the application of the collective bargaining process to matters directly affecting the interests of the employees in the plant.

In fact, it is the contention of the International Association of Machinists that in the absence of these qualifications American management would be subject to the danger of the same type of irresponsible antisocial conduct that brought about the decay and fall of private enterprise in many European countries.

This is not because management, as such, is avaricious but because management and the owners of industry are human beings, and consequently subject to the frailties of human nature. There is no man in this room, or anywhere in the world, who is competent to wield unrestrained power over any considerable group of his fellowmen. To maintain otherwise is to ignore the lessons of history and to deny the very concepts upon which this Nation was founded.

It has occurred in the course of human history, that some men have acquired complete political power over an entire nation. That was wrong. It also occurred in the development of our society, that some men by means of their wealth and power have acquired ownership of the bodies of other men. That was wrong. It occurred, too, in the development of our industrial system, that some individuals, through their ownership

and control of the means of production, acquired economic sovereignty over the lives and destinies of other men. And that, too, was wrong.

Those three types of power—outright ownership, political and economic—are all wrong for the same reason. That reason is that no man is good enough, no man is just enough, no man is competent enough, to hold unrestrained power over the lives and destinies of his fellow men. The best of us sin. The most just of us are subject to whims. The most competent of us make mistakes.

Recently, I read an advertisement in the daily newspaper which attempted to gain support for a business firm under indictment for violation of the antitrust laws, by pointing out the fact that the firm's management had governed competently the economic destinies of nearly 1,000,000 Americans who gained income from the firm in the form of wages or dividends. That type of plea is no defense of the American system of free enterprise. It is the plea of the potential dictator who seeks to entice men to a surrender of their freedom with a promise of bread.

Recently, too, I read a statement from a circular issued by management to its employees in the course of a union-organizing campaign, which stated in part, "A vote for 'no union' is a confirmation of your belief in our sincerity and our willingness and ability to do a job for you." That too, is the plea of the potential dictator—Surrender your independence and trust me.

I trust that my remarks so far have not sounded belligerent. They were not meant so. But I want you to know the minds and the hearts of the machinists and of all sincere labor-unionists. We feel strongly on the subject of human rights and freedoms. We want you to understand. We feel that upon our mutual understanding rests the future of a system to which you of management and we of labor have contributed much, and from which we have benefited greatly.

Within the framework of our beliefs, as just outlined, there is ample room for labor-management agreement. Let's consider the qualifications upon the right to management which I mentioned earlier.

Let's look first at the field of governmental regulation. The machinists' union has just finished one campaign in behalf of more effective administration of one Federal regulatory agency, and is now deep in a fight affecting the future of another.

That campaign concerned the nomination of John Carson for the post of Federal Trade Commissioner. The nomination was submitted to the Senate nearly 6 months ago. It was finally approved in the middle of September—and by an overwhelming margin. The delay was occasioned because of stalling tactics employed in committee at the behest of business groups antagonistic to the candidate. He had been at times, a critic of certain business practices. At the time of his nomination, he was employed by an organization of cooperatives. Incidentally, in our minds, cooperatives are essential to full and complete competition, since they provide an effective consumer tool against private monopoly and price fixing. The candidate was smeared as a Communist, and he is a devout Catholic. He was condemned as an enemy of free enterprise—and he is one of its most ardent supporters. And why was this done—because a few powerful groups resented his criticism and feared his purpose of carrying out the will of the people as expressed in the laws of the land.

Our current campaign involves the reappointment of Leland Olds to be Federal Power Commissioner. For 10 years he has faithfully discharged the duties of his office. For 10 years he has been alert in the protection of the consumers of gas and electric power. Now he, too, is being smeared as a Communist and an enemy of America. Why? Because in his faith to the people he has incurred the enmity of short-sighted power producers who seek a relaxation of existing regulation as a means to higher profit.

We participate in such campaigns because we feel that regulation is essential to curtail the abuse of power which would plunge the industries concerned, and the innocent people of America, into the abyss of the totalitarian state. History has shown that unregulated monopoly and concentration of economic power invariably result in the superstate, because the people in their plight are led to believe that the only escape from private power is state power.

We believe in such legislation as that embodied in minimum wage laws. We hold that in these times the establishment which cannot be operated to pay its most humble employee a wage sufficient to hold body and soul together, has no right to existence. The employer cannot chisel on the landlord; he cannot chisel on his suppliers; nor on his taxes. Why should he be permitted to underpay his workers?

Assuredly, there is ample area for agreement between labor and management at the collective bargaining table. What does labor seek in principle that management cannot readily agree to? Labor seeks at least the going rate of wages in the industry. Would other management in the industry have labor subsidize an inefficient competitor by means of lower than standard wage rates? That would be derogatory to free competition, to permit an employer to find advantage in the lower living standards of his employees and other businessmen's consumers.

We seek better than average earnings from firms with better than average profits, on the theory that we who helped make the firm more profitable are entitled to a share in the profits.

We seek security in the form of protection against unjustified discharge or demotion and in consideration for employees of long-standing service whose skills are so tied up in the firm that they might have difficulty securing employment elsewhere.

We seek opportunity, in a system which gives the employee of long service first opportunity at a higher-paid and more responsible job for which he is qualified.

And in reaching agreement on these and related matters, we seek to avoid the intervention of the Government, on the theory that as we of labor and you of management reject collective bargaining for the decision of alleged experts, we have surrendered some of our rights and responsibilities as free men.

In the day to day operation of industry, as at the bargaining table, we insist upon treatment as human beings. We set cooperation above pseudo-scientific management devices. That is why the machinists who conceived that joint production committee plan on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad over a quarter century ago, are set against such one-sided and iniquitous practices as time and motion study and incentive wage systems. To us, those devices are attempts to find easy solutions for inefficient management. They are scientific only in the formula and the instruments for which their application calls. But they are unscientific in their utter dependence upon the fallacious judgment of persons unacquainted with day to day operations of the shop and the intricate problems in human relations which those operations involve.

I stated earlier that the machinists' union believes fully and unequivocally in the free enterprise system and in the right of investors to a fair return on their investment. Of management we ask only a sincere belief in the philosophy contained in a recent statement by Mr. Charles P. McCormick, employer representative on the American delegation to the International Labor Organization. Mr. McCormick said:

"Employees are human beings first, citizens of our Nation second, and factors in production third. Labor is not a commodity to be bought, sold, or exchanged in the market place. Labor can never be understood if considered solely in the mass. The great working force of any business is a collection of human beings, all with individual rights and individual problems worthy of consideration by management and government."

If you subscribe to that philosophy, and I am sure that all of you do, then ask yourself these simple questions—"How, in the absence of an effective organization of my employees, can I know their problems? How, in the absence of grievance machinery, can I discover and adjust their grievances? How, if there is no union in my plant, can I achieve with my workers the degree of understanding and cooperation which is essential to their well-being as humans and to the profitable operation which is essential to their well-being as humans and to the profitable operation of my enterprise?"

There is no wide breach between labor and management on the fundamentals of the problems which face us. There is, and there probably always will be, a difference of opinion on the application of those fundamentals to specific problems. But that is not derogatory of our American system. Rather it is part and parcel of it. This Nation has grown and prospered through the contribution of many different types of people, whose interests frequently were in conflict. But it has remained one, and has grown great, because all of us agreed upon the fundamentals of human dignity and freedom upon which it was built.

The same, sound foundation exists within our industrial system. If we ignore the fundamentals in the heat of daily differences, we shall fail, as this Nation would have failed had the colonies put their differences above their mutual interests. But—if each of us admits the basic rights of the other, then we have established the ground upon which may be resolved our detailed differences—to our own mutual benefit, and to the perpetuation of the economic system under which we have grown and prospered.

The March to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by me before the National Wholesale Druggists Association Convention at Atlantic City, N. J., October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America is on the march to socialism. The pace is increasing to the tempo of expanding federalized programs and increasing national debt.

The expanding Federal programs are submerging what is happening to us in a pressurized stream of deficit dollars which are undermining the will of individuals, influencing the policies of agriculture, business, and labor, curtailing the sovereignty of

States, and reducing the privileges of self-determination which flow from our traditional institutions of local government.

The deficit financing of Federal programs in time of peace is piling up a Federal debt to proportions in which the liberties of free enterprise cannot survive. If the debt is allowed to grow, confidence will be destroyed. If effort is made to check or curtail the debt without reduction in expenditures, destructive taxation would be required. In either event insolvency would result. Neither the democratic form of government nor a free-enterprise system can exist in national insolvency.

I have been in the Senate for 16 years and I have seen both the beginning and the growth of this American brand of socialism. Some call it welfare state; some call it statism; some call it collectivism. Whether you call it one of these "isms" or whether you call it socialism is academic. The important fact is that the freedoms we have cherished under democracy complemented by the initiative inherent in free enterprise will not exist under the form of government which lies at the end of our present course.

Time and time again laws have been passed since I came to Washington in the belief that they were temporary expedients to meet emergencies. Almost invariably it has been this type of legislation which opened the gate leading to the socialistic destination now looming ahead. A few of them—not many—have been repealed, but their objectives almost without exception have been picked up and reincarnated in the legislation for the next emergency.

The foundation for socialism has been well laid in all of this previous legislation and even now it is being reinforced through nearly a hundred federalized programs channeled out from among the 60 major Federal departments and agencies with a thousand component units. The aid, subsidies, assistance, payments, and advances piped out of the Federal Treasury deaden the consciousness of the recipients and make them impervious to the pain accompanying the next freedom suffocating program.

Three such programs in rapid succession are scheduled now. The first is socialized housing, which within 10 years is estimated to cost $20,000,000,000. Part of the legislation for this program is already enacted. The second is socialized medicine, which within 10 years will cost $23,000,000,000 annually.

The third great pending program to commit this country to socialism is the so-called Brannan plan. The most accurate thing said yet about this plan is that the cost cannot be estimated. It is opposed by the great farm organizations, such as the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange. Despite this, politicians are exerting their most powerful effort to force this socialistic plan upon the farmers. The American Farm Bureau estimates its application to milk alone would cost $2,000,000,000.

These measures, if adopted, will irrevocably commit us to state socialism from which there is no retreat.

There is never any retreat from socialism, primarily because the state usurps not only the machinery of agricultural, mineral, and industrial production, but also the sources of wealth and capital which would be required by private enterprise to recapture its vitality. Moreover, it can be expected that federalized education, which is an integral part of socialization, would snuff out not only all desire of individual initiative but likewise all intelligence with respect to the advantages and liberties of free enterprise in democracy.

Other federalized programs would reach those beyond the influence of the school systems.

For instance, there are now more than 3,500,000 on Federal pay rolls (including military); nearly 4,000,000 on noncontributory Federal assistance rolls; nearly 3,250,000 on military, veterans, and civilian employee pension and aid rolls; more than 3,000,000 receiving farm-aid payments; 500,000 receiving National Guard and military-training payments; and approximately 3,000,000 receiving payments from the Federal Treasury under the contributory old-age assistance and survivors insurance program and the Railroad Retirement System. Parenthetically, when those who are receiving direct payments from State and local governments are added, the number whose faces are regularly turned to public treasuries now becomes 25,000,000—1 in every 6 of our total population.

The 17,000,000 people receiving regular payments directly from the Federal Treasury are only a part of those who feel the effects in their daily lives of federalized programs and Federal payments. There are untold millions more receiving Federal interest payments on their war bonds and other Government securities, and there are still more millions who are benefiting indirectly from approximately $25,000,000,000 which are flowing annually from the Federal Government into business through subsidies, purchases, construction contracts, and other expenditures, including those in this country which are charged up to foreign-aid programs.

Those who think they are benefiting from Federal payments and expanding federalized programs should ask themselves whether free enterprise and state socialism can live under the same national roof. The answer is graphically and tragically obvious in England today. If they get satisfaction from this prospect for their own future they can justify continuing to stuff themselves with the gratuities of a paternal central government which will bankrupt this Nation.

Their hope for individual success can be measured by the fact that in all England today only 70 Britons have a net income of $24,000 after taxes. In America there are 155,000. But the worst of the British situation as it has developed is the liquidation of the middle-income group. In all England today there are only 320,000 Britons with incomes of from $4,000 to $8,000 after taxes. In America there are 4,030,000.

The route of this march to American socialism is sometimes obscure. On July 13, when we were at the height of a minor business recession brought on primarily by the advocacy of oppressive taxes, the President reversed the order of March with the declaration that those who are attempting to curtail public spending and establish a balanced budget are committing a great blunder. And in the same speech he followed with a frank proposal to embrace long-range deficit spending to stimulate the purchasing power of the people.

It should be obvious to all that we have reached an important milestone on the route to American socialism when indeed we can count only on sustained inflation, and higher taxes on inflated income and business, to produce the revenue of the magnitude required to meet vast new Federal programs.

If the President's advice were followed we would again, in time of peace with no visible emergency, resume the pump-priming procedures of the thirties in another effort to hike purchasing power under the stimulus of public borrowing and spending.

This Nation can extricate itself from the present dilemma only by retrenchment in public expenditures which means returning initiative and freedom of enterprise to individuals availing themselves of true democratic liberties.

Unless the budget is balanced our credit will be destroyed and the integrity of the American dollar, which is the last straw of hope for freedom-loving people in the world, will be impaired. The consequences of more and bigger deficits in this country will be catastrophic. It is only with the restoration of confidence by American business in the future of our free-enterprise system that the stability of democracies, including our own, can be maintained. If we cannot balance the budget now in this period of prosperity it is improbable that we shall ever balance it again.

If deficit spending is to be accelerated in the next fiscal year beginning July 1, it will be the third peacetime deficit year since the war and it is certain that it will precipitate a fiscal situation critically close to a breaking point. Action in the session of Congress to begin in January will be vital. If this probability comes to pass the situation may be summarized in the following fiscal "BYRD'S eye" view:

Fiscal year 1950 (which began July 1, 1949):
Expenditures—$44,000,000,000.
Income from taxes—$37,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1951 (beginning July 1, 1950):
Expenditures—$45,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000.
Income from taxes—$37,000,000,000 to $38,000,000,000.

In 20 years we have been in the black twice. It appears that in 21 years—the period in which a whole new generation has reached its majority—we still will have been in the black in two of them. And the surpluses in those 2 years were by inadvertence and not from retrenchment in Federal expenditures. They resulted from a war-end flight into excessive inflation. Just as unanticipated inflation may result in unexpected surpluses, so also in our presently muddled economics there may be other unanticipated recessions. And under our present tax structure even an ever so light recession is reflected terrifically in Federal revenue. We have seen a glaring example of this in the current calendar year. A 10-percent recession in business, in times of inflated income ranging upwards from $200,000,000,000, may happen at any time. And under the Federal tax structure as it exists Federal revenue from taxes decreases at a ratio of $1,000,000,000 for each $4,000,000,000 of drop in income. Thus it is seen that a 10-percent recession in business and personal income would mean a reduction of $5,000,000,000 in Federal tax revenue.

In our present Federal fiscal situation we have three courses open. The first is drastic reduction in spending. The second is substantial increase in taxes. The third is large-scale deficit spending. It is probable either the second or the third course would increase the tempo of our march to socialism. But the third is the faster and more direct route. Under current circumstances its adoption would shatter public confidence in Federal securities at a time when the debt is more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

By all the rules new taxes in our present state of business uncertainty would be a self-starter for further business recession.

Reduction in Federal expenditures can be accomplished only if there is a desire for it and a will to do it.

Actually, we have assumed, and we are still assuming, tremendous long-term expenditure commitments without organized thought to any off-setting retrenchment, and there is no appreciable inclination in official circles to even token reduction. Yet the Federal Government is permeated with waste and inefficiency.

With the exception of interest on the debt, there is not a single category of Federal expenditures that could not absorb a 10 percent reduction in administrative costs without impairment of essential functions.

In the last budget the President recommended 40 new spending proposals but did not recommend the elimination of a single one of the thousands of functions, services, and activities of the Federal Government.

At this date, 4 years after VJ-day Federal civilian personnel still stands at more than 2,000,000 employees in the executive branch. This is more than double the number required at the prewar emergency peak in 1939. Secretary of Defense Johnson has promised he will reduce the number of civilian employees in the Defense Establishment by 135,000. The President, while approving Secretary Johnson's action, says he hopes those dismissed from the military agencies will find places on other Federal pay rolls.

Add to the Federal civilian employees those on State and local pay rolls and we find that nearly 7,000,000 people are actually employed in Government agencies. This number is the equivalent of one public employee among each nine persons in the entire labor force of the United States.

Surely Thomas Jefferson must have had this situation in mind, when at the age of 81, in a communication to William Ludlow, he said: "I think that we have more machinery of Government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious. I believe it might be much simplified to the relief of those who maintain it."

Our Federal programs are influencing the lives of not only our own people in the United States but also the attitude of millions of people abroad. Since the war there have been 23 programs for siphoning American money, matériel and credit overseas, and when this fiscal year ends it is estimated that the total value of our assistance through these programs since the cessation of World War II hostilities will be approximately $35,000,000,000. Through the end of the last fiscal year, which came to a close on June 30, expenditures of our money through these foreign programs averaged approximately $18,500,000 a day, $750,000 an hour, $12,500 a minute, or $200 every time your watch has ticked since the last gun was fired.

Eighteen cents out of every Federal tax dollar you pay is going into these foreign programs—35 cents for defense—and 15 cents for interest on the debt.

Interest alone is now more than the total cost of the Federal Government in 1933.

Our friends overseas who seek American aid and comfort must realize that their only hope for recovery and security lies in our continued solvency.

By the same token those among us at home who, through pressure groups and otherwise, continue to advocate expansion of federalized programs and more political pap from the Federal Treasury should make a place in their consciences for the fact that impairment of our financial soundness will hasten our march to socialism and serve the enemies of individual freedom, free enterprise and representative government far more than any weapon then can devise.

Reduction in Federal expenditures of course, can and should be made through economy and efficiency, but beyond a certain point drastic curtailment of Federal programs is required. If you want to know how you best can contribute to balancing the Federal budget and preserving individual independence, the free enterprise system and the democratic form of government, you will search your personal relationships with the Federal Government; you will search the record of all the organizations to which you lend your name, give your time and contribute your money to determine its relationship with the Federal Government; and you will search the relationships of your business and sources of income with the Federal Government.

If you or your organization or your business or other source of income are a party, professionally, socially or politically, or otherwise, to Federal programs which are contributing to the insolvency of our democracy or the socialization of our institutions, it is your duty to determine, within your own conscience, what your course of action should be.

Those who, willfully or otherwise, would destroy the American enterprise system would destroy the freedom of people everywhere. We, alone, are bearing the standard of freedom today. Without the light from our torch, freedom and progress will perish in the world.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to Pennsylvania Sunday School Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech written by myself but read by Dr. Raymond Kistler at the Eighty-Ninth Annual Pennsylvania Sunday School Convention, at Johnstown, Pa., on October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many elements of national strength and character have entered into the building of American greatness.

Extreme hardship, oppressive toil, resolute courage, love of liberty, heroic sacrifice, and the shedding of blood and tears—all have had a part in developing the unparalleled growth and progress of our Nation.

But supporting and sustaining all these qualities was the great spiritual strength gained from an abiding faith in God and profound reverence for the teachings of the Holy Bible.

The church and state in our country are totally separate. However, one cannot live without the other.

Always, through our history, has run a golden thread of deep religious conviction.

The brave and sturdy people who settled the North American continent prized freedom and religious liberty above life itself. In the New World they found a haven where each could worship in a manner dictated by his own conscience, free from tyranny or persecution.

One of the objectives of Christopher Columbus, whose memory is honored today, was to spread religion all over the world. His prayer of thanksgiving for safe deliverance was the first uttered in the land of his discovery.

The spirit of religion guided the Pilgrim Fathers to our shores. In framing the Mayflower compact they started with the words:

"In the name of God. Amen."

The illustrious founder of Pennsylvania, William Penn, established his holy experiment on the spirit of tolerant religion.

"If we are not ruled by God," he asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

George Washington, kneeling in prayer in the snow at Valley Forge, has given patriotic inspiration to many generations of Americans.

Firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence is set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Benjamin Franklin suggested prayer for divine guidance in framing the Constitution. That practice continues today in almost all our legislative halls.

President Lincoln, in his immortal Gettysburg Address, referred to the United States as "this Nation under God."

Now, let us briefly consider the American plan of government:

Our Republic was established on the proposition that human dignity and individual freedom are divine blessings, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. Its survival depends upon reverent submission to the will of God as revealed in the Holy Bible.

Our great men have accepted that concept and have lived by its teachings. If all of our people would willingly do the same we would be in a better position for world leadership.

Our Government was based on the premise that all men are divinely endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our founding fathers put particular stress on the pursuit of happiness. Always remember that they did not attempt to guarantee happiness.

In adopting the Bill of Rights, they did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, or religion, or to protect the right of property.

The founding fathers recognized these rights as God-given and sought to protect them from violation or encroachment by an all-powerful Government.

They knew from the pages of history that centralized authority in the hands of tyrannical rulers could be used as an instrument of oppression to rob the people of their freedom. They planned a government that would defend the liberty of the citizen.

Faith in God, firmly established in an atmosphere of individual freedom, has been the most potent influence in the growth of America.

I recall the statement of a South American visitor who was asked to explain why the material prosperity of North America has so vastly outstripped that of South America.

This was his reply: "The people who settled North America came here seeking God. The Spaniards came to South America in search of gold."

Not our material possessions, but our spiritual resources, increased and strengthened through the years, are the real wealth of the United States.

In less than 200 years we have become the foremost Nation in the world. We have the greatest culture and the highest living standard of any nation in all history.

We have more than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples with a membership of 77,000,000.

We have more homes, automobiles, radios, telephones, savings accounts, life-insurance policies, private foundations, and hospitals than any other nation of all world history.

In less than half a century, medical science, magic drugs from our laboratories, and high living standards have increased the American span of life over 16 years.

Our inventive genius, combined with unlimited opportunity in a free land, have given the average American more of the good things of life than have been enjoyed by any other people since the world began.

This is a beautiful picture. Many of our people think its beauties will continue forever. They are unaware of the dangers that are ahead.

Let me say to you that we have taken too much for granted. We are too complacent. We talk of our rights but have forgotten our obligations.

Instead of considering the welfare of the whole Nation we have become selfish. We seek special privileges and advantages for ourselves, our own group or our own locality. We have become a "give me" people. We go to Government asking for favors but forget to perform our obligations as citizens.

This applies to all classes, rich and poor, management and labor, business and agriculture, individuals and organized pressure groups.

We want security. We want our investments guaranteed. We want to borrow money from the Government. We want to sell our products at Government-supported prices.

What has brought this about? What has been responsible for these departures from the American tradition of initiative and self-reliance?

To a large extent it is the result of indifference and neglect of our civic duties.

It is because we have demanded that the Government do for us more of the things that we used to do for ourselves as individuals and as communities and which we should still do.

Too many have been led to believe that what they get from the Government costs them nothing.

Too many have given their support to demagogues who offer gifts and benefits to be paid for with the people's money. That caused the downfall of many nations from ancient days to our own times.

Too many otherwise well-meaning and intelligent citizens have combined into pressure groups demanding that Government money be spent for special regional or sectional advantage.

The demand for new functions, new services and new frills in Government is continuous and grows stronger with each passing year.

Our Government has grown so big and so costly that it endangers our freedom of action.

Let us consider some figures.

In 50 years the cost of Government has increased more than forty-fold. In the same period the population has a little more than doubled.

In 1929, only 20 years ago, the Federal Government spent less than $4,000,000,000. In this fiscal year, our Government will spend more than 11 times that amount, or approximately $46,000,000,000.

The tax collections for this year will not be sufficient to cover the expenditures and we will undoubtedly end this fiscal year with a deficit of at least $6,000,000,000.

In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later, it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

In 1929 the Federal Government had less than 600,000 civilian employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

In 1902 the cost of the Federal Government was 35 percent of the total tax collections by all levels of Government. At that time State and local government collected and spent 65 percent of the total.

Today Federal Government spends 74 percent, while the share of State and local government has been reduced to 24 percent.

Those figures clearly demonstrate the trend toward centralization of power, authority, and control at Washington.

This development should give us deep concern because it cannot fail to have a profound effect upon the structure of our Government.

Through the system of grants-in-aid, almost one-third of the total revenue expended by the local government is supplied from State collected taxes.

Through the same system, almost 18 percent of all the money spent by State governments come from taxes collected by the Federal Government.

The process in these grants is as follows: First there is advice, next supervision, and finally complete control.

With money goes power. With power goes control. And concentration of authority in the Federal Government endangers the American system of local self government which is home rule.

The founding fathers feared centralized government. They knew it could destroy initiative, opportunity and individual freedom.

That is what has been going on in America during the whole lifetime of our young people.

Today in Congress we are faced with a program which, if enacted into law, would transform our whole system of government and would place us under the rule of socialism or the so-called welfare state.

When we have socialized medicine, Federal control of education, Federal regulation of agriculture, government competition with business and industry and a planned economy controlled by bureaucrats in Washington, then the freedom of the individual will be lost.

The loss of one freedom eventually means the loss of all freedom.

Freedom of religion is the most important. Men have suffered torment, persecution, imprisonment and death to attain it. Remember that the loss of one freedom will mean the loss of all freedom.

Mark this—in 1948 our church contributions were only $1,840,000,000.

With the ever rising cost of government and increasing taxes, the men and women who have supported the churches, libraries, hospitals, charitable institutions, research foundations and educational centers will no longer have the income necessary to continue their support.

These institutions will be forced to make increased demands for govermental aid and will finally become totally dependent upon government for their existence.

What are free Americans to do?

To hold the line in America we must have a total mobilization of all the moral forces.

Our churches must be the armories of trained battalions of men and women working for God and country.

The battalions must be formed into armies under courageous and righteous leadership. With flags flying, they must march forward to fight the evils which endanger our country.

Men and women of the church should take an intelligent and militant part in government. Yes; I mean take part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government.

We must fight big and costly centralized government. We must oppose controls and regimentation because they destroy freedom.

We must wage relentless war against those who would weaken the moral fiber of our people—the racketeer, the chiseler, and the law evader.

We must drive out of office those politicians whose objective is personal gain and personal power, not public service.

We must fight intolerance, bigotry, deception, and selfishness.

We want a God-fearing nation comprised of people who practice love and good will.

We want peace on earth. This can be brought about by spreading religion throughout the world.

The Ten Commandments should be our basic law. They should be our rule of action. They should guide governmental activities.

What we need is courage and faith. We need the courage and faith we get from God's word. We must learn the truth through study of the Holy Bible.

Horace Greeley once said: "No Bible-reading nation ever becomes mentally or socially enslaved."

We need more of the deep religious conviction of the William Penns, the Muhlenbergs, the Beechers, and the Conwells.

We must, as individuals, live so we may become spiritually fit and mentally qualified to govern ourselves. We must all, willingly and with one accord, obey the laws of God and man.

With faith we can preserve American liberty and bring peace into the world.

All faiths have done so much to bring about the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

A Catholic wrote "Lead Kindly Light."

A Presbyterian wrote "Rock of Ages."

Martin Luther, the founder of the Lutheran Church, wrote "A Mighty Fortress is Our God."

A Methodist wrote "Jesus, Lover of My Soul."

An Episcopalian wrote "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name."

A Jew wrote "The Lord is My Shepherd, I Shall Not Want."

These have been a light of love in sadness. Our inspiration in joy.

Let us cleanse our hearts of every jealousy, hatred, and discord, and turn our hearts toward God.

May the Lord help us to curb the drift of our country toward the bondage of the state. Because from that bondage there is no return.

Yes; there is hope. But let us remember that men, in order to have freedom, had faith. They practiced "It is better to suffer for doing right than for doing wrong." They wanted to be on God's side.

The late Sol Bloom, a great authority on the American Constitution, was so right when he said, "God and one is the majority."

Let us all be a part of that majority. Let each of us practice Christian citizenship in our own community.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. President, before the conclusion of the present session of the Senate, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues again the critical situation that is developing in the iron and steel industry of this country as a result of the exhaustion of iron-ore reserves in the Lake Superior region.

It is well known that 80 percent of the steel industry of this country is located in the Great Lakes area and is dependent upon iron ore supplied by the Lake Superior area, mostly the Mesabi Range. We have taken out, since the opening of this range, 2,500,000,000 tons of iron ore and the end is definitely in sight. After an exhaustive study of the subject, the Iron Age magazine of January this year stated: "The reign of the fabulous Mesabi is ending; 1960, perhaps earlier, will see the end. United States dependency on foreign ores is a reality." It is a well-known fact among experts and industry men that the quality of ores being received in the lower lake ports from Minnesota is getting poorer and they have to scrape poorer veins in the open-pit mines in order to secure the necessary supplies. Experts are also agreed that at the present rate of consumption 1960 will see the end of most of the available high-grade ores.

This may not be true of those few fortunate companies that own most of the remaining high-grade ores, but it certainly is true

of a large number of steel companies which are not so fortunately situated.

CONFIRMATION OF MY PREDICTIONS OF ORE SHORTAGE

I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate in February 1948 in connection with the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, but the facts were questioned by those who, at that time, wished to defer the seaway project. Since then developments have more than confirmed my anticipations. Even steel companies, which opposed the seaway project in February 1948, have now changed their position because they have finally faced up to the fact that the iron-ore reserves in the Lake Superior region are on the way to exhaustion.

There are so many witnesses to this fact now that it would take too long to recite the testimony and the facts to the Senate. Suffice it to quote one or two recent expressions to show that the industry itself is highly concerned about this situation. In the annual stockholders meeting of Jones & Laughlin Steel Co. on April 26, 1949, Admiral Ben Moreell, president of the company, stated, "for many years most of our iron ore has been produced from our properties in Minnesota. However, as the result of continued capacity operation, the exhaustion of these reserves is now in sight. Operations of our largest producer since 1917, the Hill-Annis mine, will continue on a declining basis for about 10 years. Other Minnesota deposits of high-grade ores in eight mines will be worked out for the most part over an 8- to 10-year period."

In the annual report to stockholders of M. A. Hanna Co., issued in March of this year, recognition is given to the rapid depletion of iron-ore reserves. The company said to its stockholders, and I quote: "Through our various connections we are interested in the ownership of large reserve tonnages of Lake Superior iron ore. We are not unmindful of the importance of such reserves, nor do we contemplate the early exhaustion of shipments from that district, but the continuation of declining trend of shipments of high grade through shipping ore from Lake Superior is inevitable."

The United States Steel Corp., in a recent publication entitled "Basic Facts About United States Steel" confirmed this view of the industry by stating, and I quote: "Most of the iron ore mined in America has been a high-grade ore of the kind that can be used in the blast furnace just as it comes from the mines. These bodies of high-grade, easily mined ore have become severely depleted over the years."

UNFORTUNATE FAILURE OF INTERIOR COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE

Mr. President, there are the facts. Early this year I requested the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to institute an investigation of the iron-ore situation and the impact of the exhaustion of iron ores on our national defense. Unfortunately, the committee has not found time to delve into this vital subject.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY IS SEEKING VARIOUS ANSWERS

Mr. President, although our Government has been ignoring this vital subject, industry, fortunately, has been alert and has been trying to remedy the situation by various devices. Several of the companies have acquired iron-ore reserves in Latin America and Africa. Developments are now under way in Venezuela and Brazil, in addition to the continuing supplies being received from Chile. One of the companies recently acquired large iron-ore deposits in Liberia, Africa, and another one of our companies is engaged, in partnership with our Canadian neighbors, in the development of fabulously rich reserves in the Labrador-Quebec area. Several other companies are undertaking extensive research projects and pilot operations in the development of low-grade ores from the Minnesota range. It is fortunate, indeed, for the country that the ingenuity of American industry, aggressively applied, is seeking a solution to this very grave problem.

LOW-GRADE-ORE DEVELOPMENT AND SEAWAY ARE ESSENTIAL

I doubt, however, that industry alone will be able to solve all the problems connected with the provision of adequate supplies of iron ore to our steel industry without some help from the Government. Those who are experimenting with the development of low-grade ores are beginning to advance the theory that, the cost being very high, the Government might have to subsidize those operations. Those who are engaged in the development of iron ore from outside sources are vitally interested in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project. And there are some, fishing in troubled waters, who would like to create a conflict between these various groups in order to secure some private gain for themselves.

GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE STEPS TO INSURE ORE AVAILABILITY

I think it is the function of Government, in an industry so vital to national defense, to explore the whole subject and to arrive at a sensible program which will assure the continued supply of iron ore to this basic industry. To meet the 80,000,000-ton iron-ore requirements of the steel industry, we are going to need to exploit every available source of supply here and abroad when the Mesabi Range runs out.

We need to develop low-grade ores to the limit permitted by technological conditions, and we need to bring in from Labrador and elsewhere all the ores that the St. Lawrence River can carry up into Lake Erie. Any attempt to set off one source against the other so as to create conflict between one and the other group is detrimental to the national interests and will bring about a costly and painful relocation of industry and populations at a time very critical in our national life.

I consider the development of low-grade ores and the importation of ores from other places as complementary and not competitive. Members of the Senate might well give notice to anyone who comes to them to ask for help on Government subsidizing of low-grade development, while at the same time opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project. They might give them notice now, that such individuals will not find sympathetic hearing. I will cooperate in the development of any program that promises to meet the needs of the whole industry and that requires both the development of low-grade ores and the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The Facts With Reference to Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I have had the pleasure of being a Member since March 14, 1933, conducted public hearings on revision and expansion of our social-security laws from February 28 through April 27 of this year. Over 250 witnesses appeared and more than 2,500 pages of testimony was taken. At the conclusion of the hearings, the committee held executive meetings for over 16 weeks during which time we worked in preparing a social-security bill. On August 22, 1949, the committee favorably reported H. R. 6000, which contained amendments to both the old-age and survivors insurance system and the public-assistance programs of our social-security laws.

A closed rule was granted by the Rules Committee by a 5 to 4 vote on October 3, 1949, and was sustained on the floor by a small number of votes. This bill will now go to the Senate where it will be considered in the next session of Congress. No doubt the Senate will add many amendments. Many Members believed that at least the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee should have been permitted to offer on the floor of the House perfecting amendments to this far-reaching legislation which we had labored over for so long.

The following is a brief summary of the major provisions of H. R. 6000. It is important in this connection to distinguish between the provisions of the bill relating to the old-age and survivors insurance program—title II of the Social Security Act—and the public-assistance program under which payments are made by the States to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children—titles I, X, and IV. H. R. 6000 makes important changes in both these programs.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H. R. 6000

A. OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

First. Extension of coverage: H. R. 6000 provides for the extension of the program to approximately 11,000,000 new persons as follows:

(a) Self-employed persons except farmers, doctors, lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, optometrists, Christian Science practitioners, publishers and engineers whose net earnings from self-employment total $400 or more per year.

(b) Employees of State and local governments if the State enters into a voluntary compact with the Federal Security Agency. Teachers, firemen, policemen, and others who already have their own retirement system would also be included if a two-thirds majority of such employees and adult beneficiaries of the retirement system voted to do so.

(c) Domestic servants in a private home—but not if employed on a farm operated for profit—whose cash earnings are $25 or more per quarter, and who work 26 days or more per quarter, for one employer.

(d) Employees of nonprofit institutions other than ministers and members of religious orders, but, if the employer does not elect voluntarily to pay the employer's tax, the employee would receive credit with respect to only one-half his wages for the employee's tax which is compulsorily imposed upon him.

(e) Agricultural processing workers off the farm and certain other types of essentially commercial or industrial border-line agricultural labor; also em-

ployees of nonprofit agricultural and horticultural organizations.

(f) Federal employees not covered under any retirement system except temporary workers, elective officials, dollar-a-year employees, and so forth; employees of farm loan and production credit organizations.

(g) Americans employed by an American employer outside the United States and employees on American aircraft outside the United States.

Second. Higher benefits: About 2.6 million persons currently receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits would have their monthly benefit increased on the average by about 70 percent. Increases would range from 50 percent for highest benefit groups to as much as 150 percent for lowest benefit groups. The average primary benefit is now approximately $26 per month for a retired insured worker, and under the bill it would be approximately $44. Illustrative figures for individual cases are shown in the table below:

Present primary insurance benefit:	*New primary insurance amount*
$10	$25
$15	31
$20	36
$25	44
$30	51
$35	55
$40	60
$45	64

Persons who retire after 1949 would have their benefits computed under a new formula with resulting benefits approximately double the average benefits payable today.

The minimum primary benefit would be increased from $10 to $25, and the maximum family benefit would be increased from $85 per month to $150.

Third. Permanent and total disability: In addition to the increases in the amount of the retirement benefits, H. R. 6000 also provides that monthly benefits will be paid to everyone in the system who becomes permanently and totally disabled. The amount of the benefits will be computed on the same basis as the retirement benefits and there are certain additional eligibility requirements imposed. This is an entirely new program.

Fourth. Funeral benefits: H. R. 6000 provides that funeral benefits will be payable whenever an insured person dies.

Fifth. Taxable base: Under H. R. 6000 the tax base would be raised from $3,000 to $3,600 and the tax rate would go up as follows:

Date	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1950	1½	1½	2¼
1951–59	2	2	3
1960–64	2½	2½	3¾
1965–69	3	3	4½
1970 and thereafter	3¼	3¼	4⅞

Sixth. The definition of "employee": H. R. 6000 repeals the present definition of "employee" and substitutes for it a new definition based on the application of a seven-factor test as follows:

(4) Any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has, with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss

Seventh. Veterans: World War II veterans would be given wage credits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program of $160 per month for the time spent in military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947.

Eighth. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The whole system, including the disability insurance, is extended to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

B. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE SERVICES

First. Extension of State-Federal public assistance programs: Aid would be extended to persons not now eligible for assistance, as follows:

(a) Permanently and totally disabled needy persons would become eligible for State-Federal assistance by the establishment of a fourth category, with the Federal Government sharing in the costs in the same manner as for old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

(b) The mother, or other adult relative with whom an eligible dependent child is living, would become eligible as a recipient under the aid to dependent children program, and the Federal Government would share in the costs of the aid furnished such mother or relative.

Second. Increase in Federal share of public assistance costs: The bill would strengthen financing of public assistance in all States, and, particularly, would enable States with low-average payments to raise the level of payments to needy recipients under the State-Federal program. Federal funds would be made available to the States under the following matching formula:

(a) For old-age assistance, aid to the blind and aid to the totally and permanently disabled, Federal funds will equal four-fifths of the first $25 per recipient plus one-half of the next $10 plus one-third of the next $15 with a maximum of $50 on individual assistance payments.

(b) For aid to dependent children, Federal funds will equal four-fifths of the first $15 per recipient (including one adult in each family) plus one-half of the next $6, plus one-third of the remainder, with maximums on individual assistance payments of $27 for the adult plus $27 for the first child plus $18 for each additional child in the family.

Third. Public medical institutions: The Federal Government would share in the payments made by the States and localities to the needy aged, blind, and permanently and totally disabled recipients residing in public medical institutions, instead of limiting Federal participation to payments made to recipients residing in private institutions as provided in present law.

Fourth. Direct payment for medical care: States would be authorized to make direct payments to medical practitioners or institutions furnishing medical care to recipients of State-Federal public assistance. Under existing law the Federal Government does not participate in the cost of medical care for recipients unless payment for such care is made directly to the recipient.

Fifth. Child-welfare services: Authorization for child-welfare services in rural areas or areas of special need would be increased from $3,500,000 per year to $7,000,000. The use of child-welfare funds would be authorized for purposes of returning interstate run-away children to their homes.

Sixth. Cost: The estimated additional cost to the Federal Government for the public-assistance and welfare-services amendments would be $256,000,000 annually.

Seventh. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: Federal participation in public assistance would be extended to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I was in favor of most of the provisions contained in H. R. 6000 and voted for its final passage. I regret, however, that the majority saw fit to preclude any amendments to this legislation because in my opinion it contains many issues of great magnitude which each Member of Congress should have had an opportunity to pass upon for himself. Moreover, in my opinion, there are some very serious defects in H. R. 6000 which should be corrected when the bill is considered in the Senate. A bill introduced by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is more acceptable than H. R. 6000. It was offered as a part of the motion to recommit but was rejected by a strict party vote. This bill is H. R. 6297. It provides the same scale of benefits, the same increase in the public-assistance programs to the aged, the blind, and dependent children; the same provisions for veterans. It is different from H. R. 6000 in many respects, as follows:

First. A lower tax rate;

Second. Continuation of the present $3,000 wage base;

Third. Elimination of the automatic yearly benefit increase factor—the "increment";

Fourth. In conjunction with recommendations 2 and 3 above, the using of the highest 10 consecutive years in determining the average monthly wage;

Fifth. Elimination of the authority of the Treasury to extend definition of "employee";

Sixth. Realistic coverage for household workers;

Seventh. Teachers, firemen, and policemen, and so forth, with their own pension systems to be excluded;

Eighth. Establishment of an independent system for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other possessions;

Ninth. Continuation of existing law with respect to lump-sum death payments; and

Tenth. Confining of total and permanent disability payments to the public-assistance program.

I am making this speech in the hope that it might be of assistance to Members who would like to have the principal high points of this important piece of proposed legislation set out clearly

and briefly. This is by far the most important piece of legislation passed by the House in this session of Congress. It has raised a number of sharp and important issues which I have tried to present fairly.

Guaranty of Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to the editor of the Washington Post, relative to point 4 of the President's program. The letter was published in the Washington Post of October 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY BACK

The author of your editorial of October 9, on the subject of the guaranty of investments bill now before Congress makes statements which seem to reveal misunderstanding of what is actually being proposed.

He says that "Not only would it (the amended bill now before the Banking and Currency Committees) insure the investor receipt of dollars in payment of profits or dividends; it would safeguard the investor against 'loss resulting from expropriation, confiscation, or seizure by action of public authority.'"

This creates a wholly wrong impression. It seems to say that anyone who wished to make a foreign investment could, under the terms of the bill if it should become a law, automatically obtain protection against these hazards.

There is not any such intention and the bill doesn't offer any such promise. What it does mean is that the Export-Import Bank will have the power to grant such guaranties if it decides to do so in appropriate cases under the same procedure that it now follows in granting loans. There is a vast difference.

What obviously has escaped the attention of your editorial writer (as well as a good many others who have commented on this bill) is that the Export-Import Bank now has the power to obligate all its uncommitted lending power under guaranties as well as under loans. It can now guarantee bond issues, notes, debentures, or any other kind of fixed obligation representing foreign investment against any and all sorts of hazards, including ordinary business losses, riots, revolutions, theft, fire, and loss of capital from any cause. It can guarantee without qualification an issue on the American market or any other market put out by a foreign government or any foreign individual or entity. It can guarantee without qualification borrowings by any foreign individual, government, or agency.

In view of these sweeping powers, which the Bank has possessed without any claim of misuse of them for the entire 15 years of its existence, what is the meaning of the present legislation. It is simply to make clear the intent of Congress that guaranties by the bank within the same over-all limitations and for the same purposes may extend to equity investments—proprietorships—so long as the guaranties are within the limited area set forth by the bill.

You make the excellent suggestion that there ought to be some sort of reciprocal agreement with foreign countries. The bank has been getting agreements in specific cases from foreign governments covering convertibility and other hazards for many years. It has had those agreements with respect to private funds as well as its own funds. It has never considered discontinuing the practice. The Bank has had experience, in short, with all the dilemmas which your editorial writer brings up, but they are not, in fact, dilemmas; they are merely practical problems of administration to be met as they occur.

The objection might be made that to leave these problems to an administrative authority, however good its record, is dangerous; that they ought to be hedged about by specific limitation of law, such as your—and Mr. Herter's—suggestion for reciprocal agreements on conversion of foreign currencies to dollars. But that is only one of a dozen or a score of matters that have to be settled either by general or by specific agreement, in the negotiation of which the Bank expects to cooperate with the State Department.

It is a common illusion, not shared by any experienced lawmaker or administrator, that laws can be so framed as to compel administrators to do right and prevent them from doing wrong. It is the sheerest of fallacies. What results from the attempt is to add complexity to the law and embarrassment in its administration without adding anything whatever to protection of the public interest. It is well to remember an old and well-worn maxim that "The power to do right always includes the power to do wrong."

But let me emphasize again what I thought we made very clear in the hearings before both committees, that this is not a blunderbuss proposal to be offered to all comers. It is a minor addition—but one which we hope will have importance—to the already extensive powers of the Export-Import Bank to participate in foreign investment and to encourage private investment abroad. It is to be administered on a case-by-case basis, just as the lending power is administered, with a view to encouraging only those investments which will contribute to upbuilding the economies of the countries in which the investments are made. It is a proposal to supplement public funds to a greater extent with private funds invested with exactly the same care as public funds are being invested, for the same purposes and under practically identical restrictions.

An understanding of this point of view, which is fully expressed in the hearings before the two committees which caused them to report favorably on the bills, may, I think, modify your views on the subject.

HERBERT E. GASTON,
Chairman, Export-Import Bank.
WASHINGTON.

Payment of Death Compensation and Death Pensions to Survivors of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in the statutes governing the payment of death compensation and death pension to survivors of veterans which penalizes those not totally familiar with all the benefits enacted by this and previous Congresses.

At present, benefits are paid to survivors only from date of application, notwithstanding that eligibility might have occurred many years previously. In this manner, many deserving persons are unable to collect retroactive benefits to which they were entitled. The bill I am introducing today will correct this situation and make it mandatory that awards be granted from date of eligibility rather than that of application.

A typical example would be that of a widow whose veteran husband died of non-service-incurred causes in 1945. Under the act of 1944, pension is payable to the surviving widow under limitations prescribed by law. Through lack of knowledge, application was not filed until 1948; and subsequent approval granted. Under present laws the award would be granted from the 1948 date of application rather than the 1945 date of eligibility.

It is manifestly unfair to expect every person to be completely familiar with all benefits to veterans and their dependents. For this reason, the legislation is being introduced in the hope that the second session of the Eighty-first Congress may see fit to correct this injustice.

Pennsylvania Voters Expected To Approve Adjustment in Pay for Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on November 8 the voters of Pennsylvania will decide a very important issue, commonly known as the soldiers' bonus.

The Pennsylvania State Legislature approved the issue on two separate occasions and it is expected that it will receive overwhelming approval by the voters of Pennsylvania at the general election, November 8.

As chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars State-wide bonus committee, I have sent the following letter to veterans in Pennsylvania:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE VETERANS OF PENNSYLVANIA BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

On November 8, 1949, you, and hundreds of thousands of other voters of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, will go to the election polls to exercise one of the most important duties of good citizenship.

This is a particularly important election for you because one of the issues to be decided is whether or not Pennsylvania will pay an adjusted service compensation, commonly called "bonus," to its World War II veterans.

The average payment will be about $325, enough to pay off some debts, perhaps buy some furniture, begin buying your home, or paying for some needed repairs around the house. Some of you may be able to

buy that automobile, a new refrigerator, or some clothes for yourself, the wife, and youngsters.

About 1,282,958 ex-GI's will be eligible for this adjustment of pay in addition to the next of kin of approximately 33,000 deceased veterans and servicemen. The bonus dollars to be distributed will be slightly less than $400,000,000.

Remember, too, that this State bonus proposition is nothing new. Already 21 States are paying bonuses to their World War II veterans and have expended over $3,000,000,000 to almost 8,000,000 veterans. In the few States where a bonus was defeated veterans failed to get out the votes.

You may be asked why should Pennsylvania, or any State for that matter, pay a bonus to its veterans?

The first step in answering that question is to explain that it isn't really a bonus, although that's what everyone calls it. A bonus means a gift—something for nothing. What the people of Pennsylvania will vote for on November 8 is an adjustment of pay and not a hand-out, for its sons and daughters who served in the armed forces during World War II.

Ask our opponents to think this over. You could have made more money in a war plant in Pennsylvania than you did as Private First Class Jones or Seaman First Class Brown. The meaning of the words "adjustment of pay" make sense to any fair-minded citizen. It is something you have coming to you, for services rendered in World War II.

However, my purpose in writing this letter is not to tell you how much you're going to get or suggest what to do with the money if we win on November 8. I do want to take this opportunity for some plain talking.

In a sense November 8, 1949, is D-day for not only the veterans of Pennsylvania but for the veterans throughout the United States. On that day, if we lose, the traditional concept of veterans benefits which has existed since the earliest days of this country, will receive a set-back from which it may never recover.

Why is the Pennsylvania bonus campaign so important for the Nation's veterans?

In many respects Pennsylvania is like a miniature United States. Big issues that affect labor, business, and politics throughout the country generally get a preliminary testing in Pennsylvania. The national fight over service pensions for veterans, better hospitalization, and increased benefits for our service-connected disabled and the widows and orphans of our honored dead are going to get a preliminary going-over in this State bonus battle. This is a fact. Take a good look at who's fighting the bonus here in Pennsylvania. It's quite revealing. I have seen their faces before—and heard their voices—here in Washington.

Let's take another good look at the battle shaping up in our State.

Organized veterans anticipated that the State chamber of commerce would be out to defeat the so-called bonus on November 8. That is not surprising because the United States Chamber of Commerce, the parent body, follows a similar course against veterans' benefits, here in Washington.

The State chamber of commerce in Pennsylvania is a large, active, and influential organization. They always have a lot of money available for propaganda purposes. They have always taken a negative or neutral position on veterans' legislation. We naturally recognize their right to differ with us but insist they rely on facts in presenting issues to the public.

Some organizations, frantically organized overnight, are spreading the word that the so-called bonus is a hand-out, and that it will add burdensome taxes, etc. The State chamber of commerce says they are neutral on the question of the bonus, and are interested in informing the people. The articles they have been putting in the daily newspapers tell only half of the story and without doubt are prejudiced against veterans' benefits. No mention is ever made of the debt and gratitude of the people of Pennsylvania for its sons and daughters who donned the uniform in World War II.

An effort is being made to convince the public that the so-called bonus will cost about $650,000,000 and will involve a large increase in taxes over a period of many years. Here is the answer to such propaganda:

In World War I, $50,000,000 was authorized and only $44,000,000 expended over a 14-year period. Approximately 11 percent of the World War I veterans didn't apply. Using this experience and the fact that the bonus will be paid over a 4-year period, if the State assembly accepts our suggestion, there is no question but that the final outlay will be approximately $400,000,000. This is a far cry from the $650,000,000 used by opponents of this adjustment of your pay.

Now, as to increased taxes. Here's the answer you can give those who are foolish enough to repeat that propaganda. The Honorable Ramsey S. Black, former treasurer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, during the period from 1945 to 1949, had this to say on this question:

"I do not hold the view that the veteran bonus, which comes before our voters on November 8 represents a burden upon the taxpayer—rather I view it as an opportunity to pay a just debt and at the same time to profit by the increased lifeblood of purchasing power that will pour into the market place." Mr. Black emphasized that "during the last decade, Pennsylvania has had an annual surplus. It is my opinion that the Commonwealth can spread the bonus due veterans over a period of 25 years, at an annual rate of $19,000,000." Continuing, Mr. Black said:

"This outlay will never be felt, provided the people of Pennsylvania continue to receive good administration of their financial affairs."

The antiveteran boys are spreading rumors that you are going to squander the money, that no benefit will come to either you or the businessmen of your communities.

Attached to this letter you will find facts (exhibit A) as to just how you and your comrades will use this money based upon your own answer to hundreds of thousands of questionnaires sent out to you. Also, I am giving you additional facts as to just how this money is going to be distributed throughout the Commonwealth. This is exhibit B. Take both of these exhibits and show them to your local businessmen. Convince them that this is as much their fight as it is yours.

With further reference to these antiveteran groups, they are not satisfied with being opposed to the bonus, they are also trying to make you and the other good people of Pennsylvania believe that veterans are not for the bonus. They're using the old "wedge driving" technique by setting up so-called antibonus organizations such as the Veterans Committee Against the Bonus in Philadelphia and the Citizen-Veterans Committee in Pittsburgh. I know you're not going to accept such phony veterans' groups. They also have their representatives in Washington operating as bona fide veteran organizations against veterans' benefits.

If our opponents are victorious at the polls on November 8, you can expect their forces to grow. They'll start stepping out against some other veterans' bills, the pension, etc. The fight in Washington will become all the harder because the middle-of-the-roaders will say, "If the veterans are that weak in a big State like Pennsylvania, maybe we're giving them too much credit here in Washington." A defeat at the polls on November 8 will affect the entire structure of veterans' benefits built up over a half-century of vigilance and effort on the part of the various veterans' organizations.

Already, our opponents are nibbling away at the veterans' hospital program but hesitating before they take another step. What will happen if we lose on November 8 in Pennsylvania? Give that some earnest thought before November 8. Talk it over with your families, your comrades at the VFW, Legion, DAV, and Amvets meetings. Do you think it's worth the fight? If you do make every effort to get yourself, your wife, parents, and friends to the polls on November 8.

Don't give our opponents and especially the social planners who want to gobble up VA hospitals, any encouragement. If they win, watch the money start to pour into their campaigns to whittle away veterans' benefits.

The first thing you've got to do on November 8 is go to the polls and vote. Take your wife, your parents, your friends, and neighbors. There is not one vote that can be spared.

The bonus provision is actually an amendment to the constitution and is described on the ballot as "Amendment 1A." Remember, mark your "X" for amendment 1A and you must do it with an indelible pencil, or crayon which you will find in the voting booth. Those who use voting machines should make sure they pull the lever for the bonus amendment marked "1A."

You can help further by using your automobile to take the disabled and the sick to the polls.

Our State legislators after due deliberation on two separate occasions, in 1947 and again in 1949, voted unanimously to adjust your pay for services rendered in World War II. The vote on November 8, is to ask you, and your friends and neighbors, to approve the action of your legislators at Harrisburg. As a good citizen go to the polls and exercise your right to vote.

We can't afford to lose this battle of votes on November 8.

Yours in comradeship,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Chairman, Pennsylvania State Bonus Committee.

EXHIBIT A

The following percentages indicate the proposed expenditure of the adjusted compensation on a State-wide basis determined from the analysis by counties:

	Percent
Build home	4
Buy home	26
Reduce mortgage	6
Make home repairs	14
Buy car	3
Purchase appliances	3
Purchase clothing	6
Purchase furniture	9
Pay debts	25
Medical-dental care	3
Miscellaneous	1

EXHIBIT B

World War II bonus distribution by counties, veterans' population—July 1947

County	World War II	Bonus distribution
Adams	4,015	$1,304,875
Allegheny	206,098	66,981,850
Armstrong	11,190	3,636,750
Beaver	21,991	7,147,075
Bedford	4,509	1,465,425
Berks	27,636	8,981,700
Blair	16,591	5,392,075
Bradford	5,027	1,633,775
Bucks	13,041	4,238,325
Butler	11,580	3,763,500
Cambria	29,729	9,661,925
Cameron	885	287,625
Carbon	8,788	2,856,100
Centre	6,354	2,065,050
Chester	16,279	5,290,675
Clarion	4,788	1,556,100
Clearfield	11,580	3,763,500

World War II bonus distribution by counties, veterans' population—July 1947—Con.

County	World War II	Bonus distribution
Clinton	4,394	$1,428,050
Columbia	6,323	2,054,975
Crawford	8,240	2,678,000
Cumberland	8,536	2,764,200
Dauphin	24,406	7,931,960
Delaware	38,518	12,518,350
Elk	4,955	1,610,375
Erie	21,712	7,056,400
Fayette	26,778	8,702,850
Forest	668	217,100
Franklin	8,251	2,681,675
Fulton	1,058	343,850
Greene	5,734	1,863,550
Huntingdon	4,509	1,465,425
Indiana	9,854	3,202,550
Jefferson	7,571	2,460,575
Juniata	1,549	503,425
Lackawanna	37,051	12,041,575
Lancaster	21,307	6,927,775
Lawrence	13,083	4,251,975
Lebanon	9,421	3,060,825
Lehigh	21,116	6,862,700
Luzerne	60,571	19,685,575
Lycoming	12,014	3,904,550
McKean	6,235	2,026,375
Mercer	11,413	3,709,225
Mifflin	5,027	1,633,775
Monroe	4,142	1,346,150
Montgomery	37,870	12,307,750
Montour	1,549	503,425
Northampton	22,929	7,451,925
Northumberland	16,028	5,209,000
Perry	2,434	791,050
Philadelphia	254,424	82,687,800
Pike	790	256,750
Potter	1,676	544,700
Schuylkill	27,757	9,021,025
Snyder	1,802	585,650
Somerset	10,411	3,383,575
Sullivan	1,043	338,975
Susquehanna	3,351	1,089,075
Tioga	3,604	1,171,300
Union	2,181	708,825
Venango	7,070	2,297,750
Warren	4,677	1,520,025
Washington	30,397	9,779,025
Wayne	2,592	842,300
Westmoreland	42,589	13,841,425
Wyoming	1,549	503,425
York	21,718	7,058,350

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE

Approximate amount of bonus distribution in cities of more than 10,000

Aliquippa	$1,110,000
Allentown	3,730,000
Altoona	3,020,000
Ambridge	890,000
Beaver Falls	760,000
Berwick	550,000
Bethlehem	2,590,000
Bloomsburg	390,000
Braddock	750,000
Bradford	720,000
Butler	950,000
Canonsburg	520,000
Carbondale	700,000
Carlisle	570,000
Carnegie	470,000
Chambersburg	650,000
Charleroi	450,000
Cheltenham	701,000
Chester	2,700,000
Clairton	740,000
Clearfield	480,000
Coatesville	660,000
Connellsville	540,000
Darby	500,000
Donora	610,000
Dormont	490,000
DuBois	500,000
Duquesne	760,000
Easton	1,420,000
Ellwood City	500,000
Erie	5,010,000
Franklin	436,000
Greensburg	700,000
Hanover	580,000
Harrisburg	3,310,000
Hazleton	1,540,000
Homestead	550,000
Indiana	470,000
Jeannette	670,000

Approximate amount of bonus distribution in cities of more than 10,000—Con.

Jenkintown	$200,000
Johnstown	2,510,000
Kingston	900,000
Lancaster	2,480,000
Lansdale	390,000
Lansdowne	570,000
Latrobe	450,000
Lebanon	1,070,000
Lewistown	547,000
Lock Haven	510,000
Lower Merion	1,667,000
Mahanoy City	620,000
McKeesport	2,240,000
McKees Rocks	690,000
Meadville	810,000
Monessen	860,000
Mt. Carmel	650,000
Nanticoke	940,000
New Castle	1,900,000
New Kensington	1,000,000
Norristown	1,474,000
Oil City	490,000
Philadelphia	82,687,800
Phoenixville	540,000
Pittsburgh	25,800,000
Pittston	650,000
Pottstown	880,000
Pottsville	900,000
Punxsutawney	370,000
Reading	4,170,000
Scranton	5,090,000
Shamokin	690,000
Sharon	1,030,000
Shenandoah	770,000
Sunbury	650,000
Tamaqua	510,000
Tarentum	370,000
Titusville	360,000
Turtle Creek	430,000
Uniontown	840,000
Upper Darby	2,580,000
Vandergrift	390,000
Warren	550,000
Washington	1,000,000
Waynesboro	410,000
West Chester	540,000
Wilkes-Barre	3,220,000
Wilkinsburg	1,260,000
Williamsport	1,810,000
York	2,190,000

Foreign Goods To Flood United States Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, every citizen is disturbed over the recent wave of foreign currency devaluations, first started by Great Britain. Like many another top governmental maneuver, performed by power-seeking political leaders, the full impact of this action was covered up by ambiguous political double talk. But the American people are rapidly awakening to what is in store for them through this currency juggling. What they see looming up in the future is foreboding.

The people of my district have expressed their concern over the step taken by England. They recall, with the rest of the Nation, that the late President Roosevelt devaluated our currency. He gave us a 59-cent dollar shortly after he was elected in 1932. They remember that devaluation did not solve our financial worries. Neither did it reduce the 10,000,000 that were unemployed. The New Dealers ran the country into a $70,000,000,000 debt before World War II trying to prime the economic pump of recovery with a devaluated currency and deficit spending. It just did not work. Even though the New Deal economic planners were pulling all kinds of shenanigans with our currency, and our crops, they could not get the well of prosperity flowing. Now they have us plunged deep into a $250,000,000,000 debt, with mounting world-trade problems.

Our economic horizon is clouded by foreign currency devaluation; it is plagued with industrial strife. To top all of this off, hidden subsidies and back-breaking taxes continue to harass the people. But the administration blithely ignores these economic storm warnings, in spite of our efforts to get the country back on solid ground.

These fears are not unfounded. From some of the best, independent financial thinkers—those who base their conclusions on cold, historical economic facts—come rumblings of what we can expect in the wake of these currency devaluations. One of the startling comments, which deserves sober contemplation, is presented by Mr. Lou Schneider, financial writer for the Miami (Fla.) Daily News. This is one of the newspapers owned by the Honorable James Cox, former Democratic Governor of Ohio, and one-time candidate for President on the Democratic ticket.

Because Mr. Schneider's views point up this growing anxiety in the minds of many of our citizens, I believe it is of great public interest.

If our national economy is going to suffer from such financial policies in the hands of the nations we have been trying to help, then it is time to face the issue squarely. We must look out for the welfare of this country first, and keep it strong with a sound economy.

I have been among those urging the administration to be realistic about our economic problems. Continued waste and extravagance are roadblocks in the path of our future solvency. But these policies still run rampant in administration circles. The forecast is clear. This Nation will be in the red by $5,000,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year. Yet, there seems to be no way in which we can prevail upon the present national leadership to check its unprecedented peacetime spending.

If the picture has been properly interpreted by Mr. Schneider's analysis, then our warnings should be heard and acted upon. The outlook is grim. But understanding and action can head off the crisis, before it is too late. It is up to the administration to realize the seriousness of the situation. Otherwise, we are running into domestic financial storms. They could prove disastrous.

The newspaper article, written by Mr. Schneider, which was published in the Miami Daily News on Wednesday, October 4, 1949, is as follows:

The foreign currencies devaluations go round and round, and will come out with a deflationary impact on the American economy.

And, unknowingly, President Truman will hasten it. It is reported that he promised Sir Stafford Cripps to make further cuts in the United States tariffs.

Back in 1934, the tariffs on dutiable goods averaged 28.3 percent. Today they average 15 percent. It will fall lower.

As our tariff wall crumbles, the trend will be free trade. That's already so in numerous items. It will increase sales competition.

All this will not happen next week, or next month. Foreign producers aren't, as yet, prepared to dump in our markets. But that's their goal.

The main aim of currency value cuts is to sell more goods in America; not to buy them. And that will be clearly evident early in 1950.

Once the full impact comes, it will hit at American jobs, wages, and profits. Everybody will feel it.

Foreign nations will subsidize exports to this country via allocation of funds for advertising and sales promotion. The British Board of Trade will start that.

Consumers will see the price declines in their local stores. But not next week. Early in 1950. On foreign and domestic goods.

The price cuts, on foreign stuff, will start with a 10-percent dip. As supplies increase, the cut will jump to 20 percent. Then to 30 percent lower than now. That's when American producers will start complaining.

After the American markets get their fill, foreign nations will start trading among themselves. That will hurt our export business.

So, toward the close of 1950, there'll be a marked decline in foreign demand for American goods. Of course, the exception will be items they get for free from Marshall plan funds.

But private enterprise still accounts for about 60 percent of our exports. Therefore, loss of the foreign markets will be a bad blow.

With foreign competition in goods sold here, plus the loss of world-wide outlets, our vast output facilities will force lower prices. When that starts, it'll spread like a prairie fire.

Yes, bankers experienced in international trade predict that the aftermath of the foreign currencies devaluations will be deflation for our economy.

And why was the British pound slashed to $2.80 instead of the expected $3.20? Because at that point it can be held, and thus restore its prestige in world trade.

The Roman Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address made before State convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Charlottesville, Va., on October 4, 1949, by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROMAN ROAD TO RUIN

The real issue in America today is the "welfare state" versus Americanism. Since neither of the major political parties as such seems to stand for anything except "pap" and patronage, this issue cuts across both parties. It has split the Republicans and kept the Democrats from exercising effective control over the Eighty-first Congress even though the majority in both Houses wear the Democratic label.

A coalition of conservative Republicans and Democrats, symbolized by Senators BYRD and TAFT, has rendered this Nation a great service by holding the line and stemming the tide of the Socialist-minded politicians who would spend us to destruction. These great patriots, in my opinion, deserve our commendation, our wholehearted support, and our respect.

One of the most effective ways to destroy our form of government is through extravagance, unbalanced budget, and subsidies. Many years ago Lenin, the chief architect of communism, said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself to destruction." The way we have squandered our wealth and pyramided our debt during the last 20 years must have gladdened the hearts of Communists everywhere.

"You cannot keep out of trouble," said one of America's great statesmen, "by spending more than you earn." That is exactly what our Government has done in the last 20 years—spent more than it took in.

While candidate for the Presidency in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt high-lighted this subject when he said:

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger." Indeed we must. Perhaps that thought prompted the framers of the Democratic Party platform in 1932 to insert this plank:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and officers, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a savings of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

The Democratic Party's platform of 1932, in my opinion, was one of the greatest documents ever submitted to the people of this Republic. Had it been faithfully followed we would not today be faced with an unmanageable debt, an unbalanced budget, and confiscatory taxes.

The Federal debt in 1932, which Candidate Roosevelt thought was too high, amounted to less than $20,000,000,000 and the annual cost of Government, which he promised to reduce by 25 percent, was a little over $5,000,000,000. Five years later the Federal debt had risen to approximately $36,500,000,000 and the annual cost of Government had increased to more than $8,000,000,000.

Commenting on this increase in debt, President Roosevelt said:

"Such an addition to the national debt * * * need not give concern to any citizens for it will return to the people of the United States many times in increased buying power and eventually in greater tax receipts."

Has your debt increased your buying power? The Government debt is a lien on the pay check of every citizen of the land. This debt is the people's debt and must either be paid by the people or repudiated by them. Have you ever bought a hat or a pair of shoes with a tax receipt?

When the Federal debt reached $45,000,000,000 in 1938, the President said of this astronomical figure:

"Our national debt, after all, is an internal debt owed not only by the Nation but to the Nation. If our children have to pay interest on it, they will pay that interest to themselves."

This paying of interest to ourselves seems to oversimplify the problem.

The interest on the national debt is greater today than the total cost of government in 1932.

How can President Roosevelt's about-face on cost of government and debt be reconciled with his policy of economy and debt reduction during the first 4 months of his first administration? Here, I think, is the answer to that question: He embraced the philosophy of the late Lord John Maynard Keynes, British economist, who visited the United States in 1933 and, according to the British press, Keynes' ideas "captivated President Roosevelt." Those who are in a position to know say that Roosevelt's about-face in matters of economy stemmed from this "captivation". Since that time Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending—the essence of which is that the more you spend, the more you have—has been the philosophy of our Federal Government and it has infiltrated the States and municipalities of our Nation. It has been followed by our Government as a justification for inflated debt, unbalanced budget and general extravagance.

Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending has about bankrupt Britain. The same kind of philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire and it is the philosophy advocated by the Communists for our destruction.

Keynes urged Britain to quit the gold standard and devaluate her currency, asserting that this would bring about unparalleled prosperity for years and years. Britain followed Keynes' advice and as a result today she is practically bankrupt.

Much is said today about Britain's dollar shortage but very little is said about the cause of that shortage. Britain's dollar shortage is caused by inefficient management, confiscatory taxes and the chloroforming of incentives by the Socialist government.

We too have a dollar shortage. Our budget was balanced for the first time in 20 years by the Eightieth Congress although our people have been taxed to the breaking point. Our dollar shortage is the result of our spending more than we can afford.

Britain is today carrying on vast social, economic and political schemes which her economy cannot support, so we are helping her finance these projects. All of Britain's nationalized industries are in financial trouble. None of them, not one, is paying its way. Rome was ruined by extravagance, Britain is being ruined by extravagance, and if we continue to follow her lead, we will meet the same fate. Rome fell because her rulers bought power in a fashion not different from that of our British brethren and of our American politicians, through false promises and the use of taxpayers' money with which they corrupt the electorate.

The British traded their liberties for security. Today they have less security than any other people in the world, save the Russians, and very little liberty.

Those Americans who are today clamoring for more aid to Britain and other nations at the expense of the American taxpayer, might well give thought to the fact that since World War I our Government aided Britain to the tune of approximately $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we have aided Britain and other nations by grants amounting to many billions of dollars.

Our taxpayers' money has kept socialism alive in Britain which would have died on the vine long ago without our subsidy and, in some instances, those grants are aiding communism. For example, since World War II we have aided Russia through lend-lease and other grants to the tune of over $440,000,000 and to her satellite Poland we have given $480,000,000 and are buying rye from her today while we have a great surplus in this country.

I know that this aid to Russia and Poland amounting to approximately $900,000,000

since World War II is hard to believe but I would have you understand that the United States Department of Commerce is my authority for this statement.

Socialism and communism, whatever their differences, agree on these points: They hate and despise free enterprise and our capitalistic form of government of which they are often the beneficiaries.

We are told that Britain and other nations will go Communist if we don't keep open the doors of our Treasury to them. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree and not principle. Socialism is often the intermediate step between capitalism and communism. The difference between socialism or communism and capitalism is one of principle and it is that principle of government which we in America must restore and defend if we are to remain a free and prosperous people.

If we continue our extravagance, if we continue to live beyond our income and if we continue our "loose fiscal policy" our living standard will drop to that of Britain and other Socialist countries. This may force us to adopt socialism or communism through the back door.

Harold Laski, British economist and one of the moving spirits in the Socialist government, recently said: "We have to persuade big business in America to accept our full right to experiment with our lives on our own terms."

Certainly we recognize their right to experiment with their lives on their own terms, but the thing we resent is their asking us to pay for it. Professor Laski also said: "Capitalism in America is on its last legs." Indeed it will be if we continue to subsidize socialism in Britain and elsewhere in the world. While our free enterprise system is strong, efficient, and effective, it cannot provide 140,000,000 Americans with a high living standard and at the same time continue to subsidize hundreds of millions of others in idleness throughout the world.

"Our Socialist spendthrifts and muddlers," said Winston Churchill, "* * * extracted from our people a higher rate of taxation than was required in the very height of the war. Never before in the history of human government," concluded Britain's great wartime Premier, "has such great havoc been wrought by such small men."

Much of Churchill's statement, I think, is applicable to our country. We were greatly alarmed 10 years ago when our Federal Government spending reached $10,000,000,000 a year. Four years following World War II—this fiscal year—our Federal Government plans to spend $46,500,000,000. That astronomical figure is $?,500,000,000 more than the total income of the Nation 18 years ago.

In order to visualize this enormous increase in the operating cost of our Government, let me make a few comparisons:

During President Roosevelt's three terms, the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000 including most of the military cost of World War II, and F. D. R., as you recall, was by no means a miser in spending public funds. In the four postwar years of Truman's administration, the average yearly spending jumped $14,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000.

Let me give you another comparison. The average yearly taxes collected by the Federal Government during Roosevelt's three terms was $14,000,000,000. The Truman administration collected $42,000,000,000 in taxes, or three times the average amount collected by Roosevelt each year. Yet, present indications are that the Federal deficit for the year ending June 30, 1950, will be around $7,000,000,000. That deficit will exceed by $2,000,000,000 the total cost of government in 1932 when Roosevelt took over, when he was pledged, you will recall, to reduce the cost of government by 25 percent.

It is clear from the foregoing that Truman, like his immediate predecessor and his Socialist-minded British brethren, has embraced the Keynes theory of compensatory spending and not unlike former President Roosevelt, he seems to look upon a mounting debt as an asset. "We owe it to ourselves," is perhaps his philosophy too.

During the last 18 years a Roman holiday has been declared by and for our spendthrift and muddling politicians. Governmental extravagance has been the order of the day. The national debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $255,000,000,000.

In offering the welfare state Truman is following the precepts of the British Socialist leaders. He is following Keynes' philosophy of compensatory spending. He is following the philosophy advocated by the Communists for our destruction. He is following the Roman road to ruin.

"The welfare state is the greatest invention of the twentieth century," said one of the New Deal members of the Supreme Court. If this member of the highest court in the land were steeped in the history of ancient Rome he would never have made that statement. The welfare state is neither new nor is it great. It destroyed the liberty, the security, and the power of the once glorious Roman Empire and is certainly destroying Britain today, and if we continue to follow the philosophy of the welfare state it will destroy America.

We are being promised cheaper homes for which we will pay in taxes. The farmer is being promised higher prices for his product and the consumer is being promised lower prices but he will pay the difference in taxes. We are being promised free medical care for which we will pay more taxes. We are promised more security for which we will pay more taxes. That is what the advocates of the welfare state never tell the people that the people will pay for it and at the same time lose their liberty in doing it.

Government cannot give the people anything without first taking it from them. It can only give our people economic security by first taking away economic liberty.

The welfare state is a malignant growth on our body politic. Once this cancerous cell reaches the blood stream of this Republic our form of government will die.

How long will it take the American people to learn the lesson of the collapse of the Roman Empire and understand why Britain is today tottering.

If America falls, it will be from extravagance and internal decay. We see both all around us. America will not follow the Roman road to ruin if we and millions of others like us discharge our duty as citizens. "Duty," said Robert E. Lee, "is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot. "You cannot do more, you should never wish to do less."

We can do our duty by emulating Paul Revere. We can do our duty by lifting our voices above the self-serving, conniving politicians.

Foreign Isms Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, we Americans know that we have the best form of government on earth. But it has been a job fighting off the various minority groups who want to change our way of life to one of their foreign "isms."

While many persons are confused over the meaning of communism, socialism, and these other foreign ideologies, the best explanation I have seen was released recently by the Colorado Department of Agriculture. Particularly clear, and to the point, was the definition of New-Dealism, socialism, and communism.

The explanations follows:

Idealism: If you have two cows, you milk them both, use all the milk you need and have enough left for everyone else.

Socialism: If you have two cows, you keep one and give the other to your neighbor.

Communism: If you have two cows, you give both of them to the Government; then the Government gives you back some milk.

Sofa-pink communism: If you have two cows, you're a capitalist.

Fascism: If you have two cows, you keep the cows but give all the milk to the Government.

Imperialism: If you have two cows, you steal somebody's bull.

Capitalism: If you have two cows, you sell one cow and buy a bull.

New-Deal (ism): If you have two cows, the Government shoots one cow; you milk the other, then throw part of the milk down the sink.

Anarchism: If you have two cows, your neighbor shoots one and takes the other.

Nazism: If you have two cows, the Government shoots you and takes both the cows.

Realism: If you have two cows, they're both dry.

The Centennial of the Angora Goat in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the year 1949 marks the centennial of the Angora goat in America. It was 100 years ago this year that the first Angoras set foot on American soil. Since then that aristocrat of all domesticated animals has clung tenaciously to the brushy hillsides of the great Southwest and has made phenomenal progress in its new found home. Today America is the leading Angora producer in the whole world.

After years of attempted adaptation all over the Nation, for biological and other reasons the Angora was finally found to thrive better in a rather limited area of western Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and to some extent along the Pacific Ocean. Missouri is also a producer. In fact, more than 80 percent of the Angoras in America now make their home in the Edwards plateau region of southwest Texas, which area I have the honor to represent.

This animal, which has borne the brunt of many a funny man's joke, has been the victim of widespread misinformation and lack of information. This

year being the centennial of the introduction of the Angora into America, perhaps it is appropriate that I take this occasion to briefly recount its background and the place it has gained in our economy. Its history has been a very simple and yet an intensely interesting one.

ANGORA FITTED INTO OUR ECONOMY

Unknown in the New World 100 years ago, the Angora has survived the trials and tests of various climatic conditions over the Nation, and today ranges 3,000,000 strong over millions of brushy acres which would otherwise be of much less economic value to the country. Its fleece—mohair—furnishes some of the finest fabrics known among ladies' dress goods, as well as plushes, upholsteries, tropical worsteds, draperies, robes, rugs, and a multitude of other uses where durability and luster are in demand in mohair and blended fabrics. The term "mohair" among discriminating consumers has a connotation of quality, durability, luster, and resiliency.

These animals, in their struggle for a firm niche in our agricultural economy, have at the same time been of tremendous value as brush destroyers, enabling the ranchmen to subjugate the brushy areas with but little aid from the ax, and have thus contributed immeasurably to the soil conservation and economic usefulness of millions of acres of land. And the flesh of the Angora is exceedingly delicate and nutritious and is much sought after by those who have a distinct preference for what was once known as goat venison but now called chevon.

To begin with, it is well to bear in mind that in this brief historical accounting I am not talking about the common breed of goat nor of the Spanish or wild goat. I am not talking of the strange and mythical animal which the joke makers and fiction writers like to describe as consuming tin cans or laying waste to a shirt on a clothes line at mealtime. I am referring to an entirely different breed of the goat family—the famous Angora. In seeking food, it is by all odds the most fastidious of all animals in its quest for tender and delectable branches of brush and other vegetation. Where other animals are satisfied with what is readily accessible, the Angora searches wide and far for only the most tender, nutritious, and best that can be found in the brush-laden hills.

ORIGIN OF ANGORA BREED

The actual origin of this breed is buried in oblivion. Some claim this variety descended from one of the classes of wild goats while other historians contend different genera were the foundation of the Angora. There is, however, general agreement that Capra aegagrus is the class of goat from which this species developed. And there is pretty strong evidence which goes to show that it was a distinctive breed when Moses was leading the Israelites out of Egypt.

It is written that goats' hair was spun by the Israelites for curtains and other purposes in the Temple (Exodus xxxv: 5, 6, 23, 26).

> And he made curtains of goats' hair for the tent over the tabernacle; 11 curtains he made them. (Exodus xxxvi: 14, 15)

In the story recorded in 1 Samuel (ch. 19) of the artifice of Michol in deceiving the messengers of Saul by placing an image in the bed in place of David and giving it a pillow of goats' hair, is believed by Pennant to refer to a pillow made of the Angora fleece.

But the first known habitat of this amazing animal is the vilayet of Angora, located some 200 miles southeast of Istanbul. There was the seat of one of the first Christian churches, probably established by the Apostle Paul. The area is mountainous, somewhat comparable to the hills of southwest Texas, and has an altitude that ranges up to around 2,900 feet.

It was there in that beautiful mountainous setting that the famous Angora reached its early perfection. There the climate and topography were ideal and under those favorable conditions came the development of the soft, silky, lustrous white mohair goat.

But the purity of the breed was somewhat corrupted by crossing it with the common Kurd goat, and historians tell us that by 1863 the pure animals were about bred out in Angora, though a very high quality of breed remained.

FIRST IMPORTATION INTO AMERICA

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to briefly trace the sensational history of the Angora in America, and, as I have said, finally for biological or other reasons has found a natural home in the southwestern part of the United States.

It was during the administration of President Polk that the Sultan of Turkey requested him to recommend some one who would be qualified to conduct some experiments in cotton culture in Turkey. Dr. James B. Davis of Columbia, S. C., got the nod and made the trip. The Sultan was highly pleased with Dr. Davis' work, and upon the latter's return to America in 1849 the Turkish monarch desiring to reciprocate the courtesy of President Polk, presented Davis with nine of the choicest goats in his domain, right out of the vilayet of Angora. It is said Dr. Davis made the suggestion, he having become greatly intrigued by what he had been able to see and learn of the fabulous Angora.

There is some authority, though not confirmed, that Dr. Davis, with the blessing of the Sultan, went to considerable effort in obtaining the Angoras of his choice. This is indicated by a letter which appeared in the Country Gentleman in 1856, signed by one Richard Allen of Tennessee, who gave Dr. Davis much praise for managing to get the goats. In his letter Allen stated:

> While there (in Turkey) he determined to procure the goat from its native wilds. The story of the journey would be too tedious for my brief letter, and I will merely add that, with an expensive outfit at Constantinople, a perilous journey of months and the loss of many men and camels, he succeeded in capturing and carrying off 11 of the famous animals, whose fleeces, in shape of shawls, are so highly prized and coveted by the ladies of all civilized nations and for which prices almost startling have been paid by the wealthy.

Mr. Allen undoubtedly thought, as Dr. Davis at that time did, that the goats were actually Cashmeres. So little was at first known about them that for several years after the first importation it was believed that they were the famous Cashmere goats who furnished the fiber for the Cashmere shawl. Indeed it was not until 1861 that Mr. William M. Landrum discovered with certainty that they were not Cashmeres.

At the time Dr. Davis brought in the nine Angoras, he also imported one Tibet doe, several head of crosses between Angoras and Tibet goats, quite a number of grade does bred from the common short-haired ewes and Angora bucks.

These Davis goats attracted great interest in the United States. They were exhibited at many fairs. Then, in 1854, Col. Richard Peters, of Atlanta, Ga., purchased most of the Davis animals. Colonel Peters then devoted himself for many years to the task of keeping the Angora breed in existence in America. He continued in the business throughout his lifetime, and made a very creditable exhibit at the New Orleans World's Fair in 1885.

The next two importations of Angoras were in 1861 by Mr. W. W. Chenery of Belmont, near Boston, Mass. There is considerable mystery about what became of these goats but some sales from Chenery are definitely known. Regarding the imports, the Massachusetts Ploughman has been quoted as saying:

> The first of the two lots, consisting of 39 animals, was shipped from Constantinople on the 26th of March, 1861, and arrived at Boston on the 15th of May, except two animals which died on the passage. The second lot, consisting of 41 head, left Constantinople on the 6th of October 1861, and arrived at Boston on the 25th of November with the loss of only 1 on the voyage. In the whole flock, 80 in all, there were about a dozen males, and all the animals wintered well.

To follow a few of the other early importations, it was claimed that about nine head were brought in about 1861 by W. H. Stiles. But an important addition to American flocks occurred in 1868 by Israel S. Diehl, United States Consul in Turkey, and O. S. Brown of New Jersey. Mr. Diehl had been commissioned by our Government to investigate the industry in Turkey and later secured the lot estimated at from 100 to 160 head. When these goats arrived in the New World, Mr. C. P. Bailey provided funds for transportation to California.

Following the Brown and Diehl importation, one A. Eutichides, a native of Turkey, brought about 175 over. But the venture was ill-fated, and his flock was soon disposed of, some of them going to Sacramento about 1873.

JOHN S. HARRIS MADE WORLD-WIDE SEARCH

Bearing on the high importance attached to the Angoras in those early days of the industry in America, one other episode should be recounted. On April 16, 1875, John S. Harris, a pioneer in the industry, left his home at Hollister, Calif., and traveled via Yokahama, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Calcutta on his way to Tibet with the purpose in view of purchasing goats for his California farm, according to an account by George F. Thompson. After his first plans in China were thwarted, he went on to Calcutta,

thence to the Cashmere district to inspect the famous Cashmere goats there. The home of the Cashmeres, he found, was in the Himalaya Mountains, 22,000 feet above sea level, in the region of eternal snows.

Knowing that the Cashmeres could not be acclimated in California, he went on to Angora, via Calcutta and by way of Ceylon, the Indian Ocean, Red Sea, and Suez Canal to Port Said, thence over the Taurus Mountains. Arriving at last in Angora he purchased 2 bucks and 10 does. The animals were slung in boxes on donkeys, and mules were taken along to carry baggage and food. After much difficulty he turned north to Ismid, where he took a train for Constantinople.

After the Sultan of Turkey prohibited further exportations, one other expedition was undertaken into the native habitat of the Angoras. That occurred in 1901 when Dr. W. C. Bailey, armed with an honorary commission from our Department of Agriculture, after a wide search finally obtained two bucks and two does. They were transported out of Angora for miles on mule and camel back, carried across the Bosphorus under a boatload of hay, disfigured by shearing and powdered with coal dust, transported through the streets of what was then Constantinople in closed carriages, and, according to his notes, were protected from police molestation by the "golden wand," and finally condemned by the Italian Government because no health certificate accompanied them from their point of shipment, but eventually landed in California in 1901. The bucks Beibazar and Kjutiah, and the does Moholitch and Eskishcehr found the climate of California to their liking. These four goats are said to have cost over $5,000 landed in California.

COLONEL PETERS WAS FOUNDER OF INDUSTRY

Colonel Peters is looked upon as the real founder of the Angora industry in the United States. For years he engaged in judicious cross-breeding, looking always for a better fleece. This practice has been followed by many of his successors throughout the years.

Another early day importer was W. H. Stiles, who brought in 16 bucks and 168 does for his sons who had settled at Fort Clark, Tex., according to an account by Gustav A. Hoerle.

In 1886 the first imports came from South Africa. Fink & Co., of Texas, acquired two bucks and two does, and so far as is known added nothing to the quality of American flocks.

But 7 years later two famous Angora bucks, Pasha and Dick, were imported from South Africa by C. P. Bailey. They were sired by the great buck Sam. Many experts on the industry regard Pasha as the best individual ever brought to America. That opinion was expressed by Mr. Landrum in 1899.

Along with the embargo on exports placed on Angoras by the Sultan in 1881, the Cape Colony followed suit by imposing a punitive export duty of £100—$485.66—on each Angora exported from that country.

It thus appears that by the time of the Civil War the industry had gained a fairly good foothold in America, with small flocks distributed in a dozen States. By that time most of the Angoras in this country had passed to the ownership of Col. Richard Peters. The war, however, played havoc with the progress the industry was making, with the result that most of the flocks in the East and South sections of our country were annihilated, with the exception of a very few in isolated localities.

ANGORAS THRIVED AFTER CIVIL WAR

Then, following the War of Rebellion, the industry spread extensively into the West, principally into Texas and California. This movement is interesting to trace, and is marked by numerous deals and transactions only a few of which can be related here.

In the spring of 1861 Colonel Peters had sold two 16-month-old bucks to William M. Landrum, of San Joaquin County, Calif. They were shipped from Atlanta via express, thence by steamer to Ft. Leavenworth and on foot to California with a wagon train. One of these famous bucks died of snake bite after siring 30 kids and the other was one of the most famous of its breed in our history. Known as Billy Atlanta, he lived to be 10 years old, then was accidentally killed. But he had sired about 2,000 kids, won sweepstakes prizes over all competitors in the fairs and exhibits of the west coast right up to the time of his death. Colonel Peters remarked in 1876 that Billy Atlanta's numerous descendants were scattered all over the Pacific coast and that "his blood courses in the veins of over one-half of the Angora flocks in that part of the Union, estimated to approximate 70,000."

Mr. Landrum contributed greatly to the industry. In 1883 he moved to Laguna, Uvalde County, Tex. He added a pair of Angoras from the Chenery importation of 1867, and in 1872 he bought all the goats under 8 years old which Colonel Peters owned then, and took them to California.

The Angora industry flourished in California for more than a decade, but due to the low duty on carpet wool, the Angora numbers dropped in California from 100,000 in 1885 to 55,000 in 1889. At this time California has only around 15,000 head.

BIG MOMENTUM AT TURN OF CENTURY

The big momentum of the industry began to gain at the turn of the century and the years following. In 1898 Col. William F. Black, of Ft. McKavett, Tex., himself a leading breeder, estimated the goat population of the country at 247,775, and the Department of Agriculture made an estimate that in 1901 the number approximated 400,000.

In 1901 in an issue of Wool Markets and Sheep, the Department of Agriculture took notice of Angoras with this comment:

> After careful review of the situation, past and present, the Angora industry of this country we clearly conceive is destined to be one of very great importance in our agricultural economy.

TEXAS TAKES THE LEAD

By 1898 Texas had taken the lead in the industry, with an estimated 75,000 animals. California was second with 59,000, then New Mexico with 52,000 and Oregon with 15,000.

The title of father of the industry in Texas is given to the late Col. W. W. Haupt, a native of Alabama, who in 1857 settled in Hayes County, Tex., and a year later purchased eight head of Angoras from Colonel Peters, paying $100 each for them. Colonel Haupt was a leading Texas breeder for more than 30 years, finally disposing of his famous herd to Mr. W. G. Hughes, of Hastings, Kendall County, Tex., in 1895. Other pioneers in the industry there included the Arnold Brothers, in the Frio Canyon, Judge J. P. Devine of San Antonio, and J. V. Abrams, also of the Frio Canyon. The Reverend D. S. Babb started a flock near Sonora, in Sutton County, in the seventies, from the Peters stock; and R. H. Lowry of Camp San Saba, Tex., was a contemporary breeder.

Col. W. D. Parish, of Seguin, Tex., was another early breeder of fine quality animals, some of his first goats probably coming from the W. W. Chenery importation.

Other Texans to pioneer in Angoras included Virgil A. Brown, of Edwards County; Mr. Landrum (previously mentioned); Colonel Black, Judge Bob Davis, of Uvalde; George W. Baylor, of Montell, Uvalde County, who in the nineties formed a partnership with John S. Harris, of California, whose search for finer animals around the world has already been recounted; Chas. Schreiner of Kerrville; B. M. Halbert, of Sonora; J. A. Ward, of Sonora; and, more recently, Adolph Stieler, of Comfort, Tex., and Fred Earwood, also of Sonora.

Mrs. Margaret Armer, of California and New Mexico, was a pioneer grower and was affectionately known in the industry as the Mohair Queen.

These men and their hundreds of successors who have carried on the family breeds or who have entered the field, have been responsible for the growth and development of a truly great industry—one that has added wealth and security to a vast area of the rolling hills and plateaus of southwest Texas.

TEXAS, THE NATURAL HOME

At this point, and as bearing on the importance of this industry to our economy, I desire to quote from a 1948 report by the Department of Agriculture:

> The reasons for the dominant position of Texas in the production of Angora goats are the characteristics both of the animal and and of the natural resources in the major producing area. The center of goat raising in Texas is in the south central part of the State, a region generally known as the Edwards Plateau. In this area, which embraces about 40 counties, are found nearly one-half of the world's Angora goats. The land is characterized by rolling hills, somewhat rough and broken, covered largely with live oak and cedar trees, together with a great deal of brushy vegetation. The elevation is between 1,500 and 3,000 feet. Rainfall varies from 15 to 25 inches per year. The land in this area is ideally suited for the production of Angora goats, since these animals feed primarily on browse and secondarily on grass and weeds. They also prefer dry, rugged areas to wet and marshy range.

The report then goes on to conclude that the Angora goats have become "an

integral part of a balanced system of agriculture carried on in this region."

Texas growers produce the best quality mohair in the United States and have received a higher price per pound than growers in other States, according to the same authority.

While much remains to be done in the way of improving the quality of the mohair fiber through more careful selection and breeding, it is fair to say that today we produce the best quality mohair grown anywhere in the world. That fact was made quite evident during the recent war when 7,500,000 pounds of Turkish mohair was purchased by this Government from Turkey to keep Germany from getting it. It was sold shortly after the end of hostilities, and experts who examined it found that the American variety was of superior quality.

GROWERS HAVE PROMOTED ANGORAS

In their efforts to diligently strive for improvement of the breed, the American growers have had active organizations devoted to that task for half a century. These have included the National Angora Record Association and the American Angora Goat Breeders' Association, the latter having absorbed the former by merger in 1924. Along with this is the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, devoted to the interest of both sheep and goats, and the Texas Angora Goat Raisers' Association.

In addition, the growers in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture have engaged in research and development programs, seeking new markets and new uses. Only recently the growers raised one-third of a $30,000 fund which is now being used by the Department of Agriculture in a joint research program, the project being contracted to Ralph E. Burgess Services, Inc., of New York. This involves the most comprehensive survey ever undertaken of the uses being made and prospective uses and development of new uses for this mohair fiber which throughout the ages has added so much to the economy of nations and to the welfare of mankind.

The progress of the industry in this country has been fraught with many difficulties and has survived many trying times. But it has grown steadily. In 1941, the peak in numbers was reached when the total Angora population climbed to 4,544,000. At present, due to liquidation of herds caused by a depressed market, the total is about 3,000,000 of which an estimated 92 percent are found in the State of Texas. Our total cash receipts for the 18,476,000 pounds of mohair marketed in 1947 was $11,119,000. During that same period the production in Turkey was 10,500,000 pounds and in the Union of South Africa, 4,000,000 pounds. For 20 years the United States has led the world in Angora goat and mohair production.

Having survived sensitive and fluctuating markets, droughts heavy losses from bad weather, the grower of today nevertheless looks to the future with a sort of a determination and faith that has typified the Angora producers in this country for a hundred years.

ASHBURN BEFRIENDED GROWERS

In concluding this report on the Angora industry in America, covering a period of 100 years of phenomenal growth and development, I should like to quote from one of the most fervent modern-day friends the growers have had. I refer to the late and lamented Sam Ashburn, of San Angelo, Tex., who wrote copiously of both the woes and thrills that befell the Angora raiser. Ashburn originated a column in the San Angelo Standard-Times, entitled "Top of the Windmill." The Angora goat when freshly shorn, is very sensitive to cold, wet weather. There have been scores of instances where sudden weather changes that caught the flocks away from protection resulted in the loss of hundreds and in some cases entire herds. On one occasion when a long drought was broken by a cold rainstorm immediately following shearing, one ranchman's herd was wiped out. As typifying the spirit and grim determination of the intrepid raiser, Ashburn quoted him as saying:

I said I was out of the goat business, but I am back in now. This mohair market has flared up again and I am to buy 1,000 mixed goats from my neighbor so I will have something else to sacrifice if another drought comes. And if it does not come they will make me plenty of money.

What's Wrong With British Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Star of October 21, 1949:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH BRITISH INDUSTRY?

British industry hasn't been able to meet the competitive conditions of world trade, and, for that reason, American taxpayers have been assessed billions to keep the British economy from collapsing.

The question, "What's wrong with British industry?" has evoked a number of answers. "Socialism," is one of them. "Depreciation of the British industrial plant through two wars," is another. "Break-up of the British Empire," is another. And so the speculative answers go.

But the most encouraging answer is from the first of several British management-labor teams which are coming to the United States to study industrial production here. The first group to report is from the British steel founding industry. It represents the opinion of a British group who have earnestly studied American steel production and have compared it with British production. The superiority of American steel production is frankly acknowledged. Reasons for that superiority are summed up in the report of the steel team. It has just been published by the Anglo-American Council for Productivity.

The report declares that American foundries produce 50 to 90 percent more than British, in spite of the fact that individual British workers are generally more skillful in this industry than Americans. This is a strange paradox, but it is explained in the findings of the British investigators.

The difference in American and British production is explained not by one, but by several causes. Among them are British lack of incentives for both management and labor (the enervating influence of socialism), unimaginative routinism (another malady of socialized industry), restrictive trade practices (a necessary feature of statism) and wasteful production methods. The British worker, up to this time, has not been production conscious. He is more security conscious. The British, on the contrary, find the American foundry industry production conscious, both management and labor. (But if this industry follows the trend, it will grow increasingly security conscious.)"

It required some honest soul searching for the British team to report that in Britain "traditional practice is all too frequently a euphemism for obstinacy, 'trade custom' for pig-headedness. If any rule, practice, or policy acts against high productivity, it offends against the community as a whole, at defiance to whom a smaller interest must not selfishly set itself. * * * Neither the failure of a company which works at low productivity nor loss of his job because an employee is inefficient is to be regarded as unfair. The protection of inefficiency at whatever level constitutes a danger."

The report then discusses the old problem of labor's resistance to technological improvements which displace workers. "Opposition to increased productivity on that account is as misguided and ill-conceived as the nineteenth century uprising against the use of power spinning machines and weaving looms. There are other forms of production to employ those displaced."

And consider this astonishing conclusion of our British visitors, after studying American production. The report declares that under the present high British taxation, incentive to production is largely lacking among both labor and management. The report declares that "some form of direct incentive is essential, and the incentive must be properly shared by manual workers, supervisors, managers, and technicians, and in fairness by owners and investors also. The customers must gain through reduced prices."

The British team has summed up admirably the advantages of a free competitive capitalist economy over the restricted socialist economy. What it has said, in a nutshell, is that socialized industry lacks the incentives of private industry and cannot, in competitive markets, compete with the products of capitalist industry.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, since October 1 over 500,000 steel workers, members of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, have been on the picket line. This strike is not the result of irresponsible union leadership. Nor does it result from exaggerated, unreasonable demands on the part of the members of the union.

How, then, do we find ourselves in a situation of this kind? What caused this strike? Let us briefly look at the record

in connection with the current strike in the steel industry.

For a period of several weeks the union negotiated with steel management for a wage increase, for a social-insurance plan, and for a pension plan. To each of these items representatives of the steel companies answered a blunt, emphatic "No."

When it seemed clear that negotiations had broken down and a strike was about to ensue, the President requested the union and the companies involved to continue work under the existing collective bargaining contracts for a period of 60 days. The President indicated he was appointing a fact-finding board to study the issues involved in the dispute and to make recommendations as to a fair and equitable settlement.

The union's acceptance of the President's proposal was prompt. Many of the steel companies were very reluctant to accept the proposal though they eventually did so.

For a period of 18 days the Steel Industry Board took voluminous testimony and received much documentary evidence both from the union and the steel industry. It spent an additional 10 days studying the records of the hearings and preparing its recommendations.

When the report of the Board was presented to the President on September 10 and simultaneously made public, it was praised from coast to coast by the Nation's press as a "statesmanlike" document. Both sides to the dispute were universally called upon to accept the Board's recommendations as a basis for settlement.

The Board's recommendations were direct and easily understandable. It recommended against a wage increase at this time. It recommended that the steel industry establish a program of social insurance and pensions for its workers on a non-contributory basis—in other words, the total cost of 10 cents an hour to be paid for by the steel companies.

Despite the fact that it meant giving up the demand for a wage increase the union accepted the recommendations of the Steel Industry Board. This action on the part of the union was promptly hailed by the Nation's press as a major contribution to the cause of industrial peace, as indeed it was. At that time it was assumed that the recommendations of the fact-finding board would of course be accepted by the steel industry.

But for reasons which they alone know the major steel companies rejected the Board's recommendations. They forced a strike in the steel industry. Their continued refusal to accept the recommendations of the fact-finding board prolongs the strike and adversely affects our economic situation.

I have briefly cited this factual record of the steel industry labor dispute because it seems to me that the time has come for us, as representatives of the people in our respective districts, to speak out plainly in protest against the actions of the steel industry in this dispute. No amount of newspaper advertising or high-pressure propaganda can ever convince the people of this Nation that the course pursued by the steel industry during the past several months has been conducive to the best interests of the Nation and its welfare. It has not been in the interest of industrial peace. It has had, and is having, an adverse effect upon the stability of our economy. The course followed by the steel industry is a repudiation of every concept of genuine collective bargaining.

Let the steel industry immediately accept the recommendations of the fact-finding board. Let the industry match the union's demonstrated sense of responsibility throughout this entire dispute. Let the industry end its arrogant defiance of public opinion and grant the social insurance and pension programs to which its employees are so justifiably entitled.

A Tribute to Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 12, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, over four and a half centuries ago a brave Genoese voyager led a handful of men across the western ocean in search for a short route to the Orient. And even though he never realized his dream and never reached the land of the East Indies, he opened a New World to the people of western Europe—that New World which was to become the land of new nations, imbued with great new spirit, and which was to witness the birth and the growth of our Nation.

It was already in 1482, 10 years before it was to be put into effect, that Christopher Columbus presented King John II of Portugal with a plan for a western voyage—a plan which was promptly turned down. Through the ensuing 10 years he journeyed to the various courts of Europe seeking aid necessary for the realization of his ambitious dream, but the results of his efforts were equally discouraging. No one would back a dreamer who had such, in those days, impractical yet ambitious, plans.

Christopher Columbus was not to be dismayed. He clung to his idea—the challenging, gnawing notion that he could reach the Orient by sailing West. It worried him and would not let him rest. That was the difference between Columbus and most of his contemporaries. He was convinced. He knew. He wanted to go. Neither the fear of sailing through an unknown ocean or the uncertainty of traversing unmeasured distances with questionable results would daunt him. But he was forced to wait a long time before anyone would give him the ships.

It was the perseverance and the courageous spirit of Columbus that were responsible for the opening of the new world—and it is to the memory of that courageous man, who for 10 years would not accept defeat, that we today pay tribute.

In the years between 1482 and 1492 Christopher Columbus lived with a dream. He eked out a living by selling books and drawing maps, always propagating his one idea. His red hair turned silver and he began to suffer from arthritis; his cape and his shoes became so full of holes that he could not go out on rainy days. But he kept on waiting and talking, always talking of his dream. To that undaunted dreamer the world owes a vast debt.

After 10 years fortune smiled on him. With borrowed money, the help of Luis Santangel, the keeper of the privy purse at the Spanish court, and the support of Queen Isabella he commenced his first voyage across the unknown western ocean—a voyage which was to have such tremendous world-shaking results. Neither the beseechings of his fellow captains nor the crew which became rebellious when they were out of sight of land for almost 2 months could stop him now. And then, on October 12, 1492, land was sighted, and the age of exploration and conquest of the new world began.

Christopher Columbus day, which we commemorated yesterday, is no mere tribute to the past. It is a dynamic challenge to the present and to the future. Enriched by the experience of the past, and strengthened by the example of courageous men like Christopher Columbus, may we take heart in our efforts to accomplish those worthy ends which, even in our age, may be deemed as fruitless dreams by some.

A Deserved Tribute to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there is criticism of the work and record of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Such criticism is generally either by uninformed sources or by those who are selfish or disappointed in the promotion of public works that will not bear clear analysis and that cannot be economically constructed.

Projects are being proposed and plans are being adopted for several million dollars for public works. Many of these works are necessary for the normal functions of the Government. Others, while necessary, can be used to increase employment when unemployment becomes prevalent. It is essential that there be a shelf of sound public works so that work relief and half-baked projects will not be constructed under the guise of providing for employment.

Gen. Hugh Johnson had much and wide experience in public works under the national industrial recovery program in the early days of the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His experiences in public construction and his views with respect to the

Corps of Engineers constitute unanswerable arguments to any criticism of the Corps of Engineers or any effort to strip them of their civil functions.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote from an article by Gen. Hugh Johnson from the Saturday Evening Post of January 26, 1935:

If it were all to have been done over again I would have written the statute to provide for an administrator with a small advisory board of the best construction experts in the country, but I would have used as executive officer Gen. Edward Markham, now Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

I would have built the whole decentralized territorial organization upon the basis and the pattern of the existing system of the Engineer Corps, supplementing each district engineer with a staff of civilian engineers, architects, and construction experts. It would have saved enormously in overhead. It would have accelerated speed. It would have removed worry about speculation, favoritism, and graft.

Where World War III Could Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal of October 11, 1949:

WHERE WORLD WAR III COULD START

Americans have been watching with considerable interest the flare-up of trouble between Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, and Marshal Stalin, of Russia.

In fact our Government has been giving more than a little encouragement to Marshal Tito on the theory that anyone who causes trouble for Russia is a friend of ours. We have announced plans for sale of a steel mill to the Yugoslavian dictator and also have approved the granting of a huge loan to him by the Export-Import Bank.

While Tito is hardly a fellow for us to get sociable with, considering his past record, we have..'t been adverse to patting him on the back for his defiance of the Russian bear. How far we are willing to go is a problem that is perplexing not only to some Americans but Russia as well.

The Yugoslav situation has now reached a point where we must tread carefully and easily lest we get ourselves embroiled in a hazardous tangle.

Russia is continuing to bring great pressure to bear on Tito. Marshal Stalin cannot afford to let his erstwhile friend get away with his refusal to put Russian domination ahead of Yugoslav nationalism. Tito has adopted the theory that he can be a Communist and still be patriotic to Yugoslavia. That doesn't enter into Russian plans.

If Tito makes his stand good, there are bound to be other Communist leaders in Bulgaria and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and other satellite nations who would seek to emulate him. Russia might soon have a half dozen mutinies on her hands. That is why she must knock Tito down and quickly.

So far, Stalin has exerted every possible pressure against Tito short of war. Russian invasion of Yugoslavia may be the next step in the battle between the two dictators. That is especially so if Stalin is convinced that the United States will not rise to Tito's defense. Even now, the Communist Party is engaged in an anti-Tito propaganda drive in the United States to prevent our giving such aid.

If there is no outside interference, Russia should have little trouble in overrunning Yugoslavia and once more establishing tight control of that country. That fact accounts for Tito's appeals for United Nations intervention. He is endeavoring to prevent any Russian invasion of his country.

Should we be unwise enough to give material assistance to Tito in case of a war between his country and Russia, we almost certainly would find ourselves embroiled in world war III. Despite our distrust of Russia, there would be little sentiment in this country for interference in a war between two Communist dictators. Any aid we give to Tito should be sufficiently restrained that it cannot draw us into conflict. If the Communists want to fight, let them fight between themselves. We want no part in their battle.

Idiotic Policy on Foreign Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 28, 1949:

IDIOTIC POLICY ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Here is one of the strangest paradoxes of all time—President Truman's proposal to ease taxes for American investors in foreign industry.

For, while his Administration thus rushes to stimulate private investment abroad, it continues its policy of harassing and penalizing the only branches of American industry that can provide sufficient profit funds to invest in foreign enterprise.

The whole plan is self-contradictory. How can a Government that kicks certain business firms all over the lot, because they happen to be efficient enough to prosper, expect the same companies to lift themselves from the ground and obediently find the millions he wants them to raise for European and Asiatic industry?

While doing everything it can to injure and handicap American business, the Truman administration wants American business to go to the rescue of foreign business and foreign governments.

That administration has been acting very self-righteously in fighting anything in this country that savors of monopoly. It has attacked, and is trying to break up, such corporations as duPont and the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

But at the same time it is urging American investment in countries where the cartel system of monopoly notoriously controls the economy.

A big, well-managed company in the United States is something to be smashed, in the Administration view. But the vicious European cartels that have strangled business enterprise abroad for many years are to be encouraged by American aid and investment.

It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Truman's latest proposals for helping foreign countries come under the heading of his point four plan to build up underdeveloped areas in Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa.

In the four postwar years from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1949, the United States has already donated $13,260,000,000 to nations abroad.

In addition the United States has granted in the same period $10,808,000,000 in credits on which repayment over a certain number of years is supposedly required. From our past experience with such foreign loans we might as well write off most of these billions as permanently gone.

With direct aid of this type still continuing, the President wants United States investors to help out with their own funds, and he is promising them a number of concessions in the way of liberalized tax laws on income earned in foreign countries.

The President must know that this is no small-time proposition. Some scattered blue-sky promoters might try to lure suckers into foreign investments with promises of 25 percent or more return—promises that can never be made good. But this field is obviously not for the small individual investor. It is only for big capital, backed up by skilled and far-sighted management. Even so, the difficulties in foreign investment at this time, with currencies tangled and restrictions imposed upon the withdrawal of funds, are acute.

But the industries which might be able and willing to risk investment abroad are the very ones that are the objects of administration hostility. A firm that is efficiently operated, and that, in consequence, manages to make profits and to expand, is regarded with suspicion by the Government and apt to find itself marked for harassment. One that is badly managed, that loses money and apes the Government in wasteful practices, presumably could count upon administration approval. But business efficiency is not to be tolerated.

If the President is so avid to help foreign nations with American capital put up by corporations and individuals, he needs to do more than propose the easing of taxes on profits obtained abroad.

He should treat American business and foreign business with the same standards of equity and impartiality.

He should stop his paradoxical nonsense of whipping United States industry with one hand and trying to extract from its pockets, with the other, millions for the revival of industry abroad, which is largely cartel-dominated.

Historic Horse Race in Los Angeles Nearly 100 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the celebration of California's one hundredth anniversary, it seems appropriate that a review of the following historical event which occurred in Los Angeles would be in proper order.

The two prominent old California families referred to in the following story have left a lasting impression upon the State. Two of the most prominent streets in Los Angeles are named in memory of the Pico and Sepulveda families. Many of their descendants still live there.

I was personally acquainted with the youngest son of Pio Pico, the last Mexican governor of Lower California when it included southern California under Mexican rule.

The Sepulveda family is still prominent in the civil and social life of California. Here is a story of what actually happened in Los Angeles on July 4, 1852, as published recently in the American Weekly:

(By C. E. Sweeley and Warren Hall)

"It will," said Jose Andres Sepulveda, "be the fastest horse in these parts."

"Except for Sarco," Pio Pico said.

"No exceptions," Sepulveda said. "It can beat Sarco."

"For $25,000?" Pico asked.

"For $25,000," Sepulveda said, "and anything else you care to wager."

The race, which probably attracted the attention of a larger percentage of California's population than any other in the State's history, was set for July 4, 1852. It was run over a 9-mile course in what is now the very heart of Los Angeles, and more than a quarter of a million dollars in gold, real estate, and livestock changed hands on the outcome.

There were no prouder and few richer families in California than the Picos and Sepulvedas. Pio Pico, the last governor of Upper California under Mexican rule, had been deposed when the Americans took over in 1846. Jose Andres Sepulveda owned the 30,000-acre Rancho San Vincente, where much of the city of Santa Monica now stands.

Rivalry between them was not new, but it had reached a climax when Sepulveda announced he was importing from Australia a horse named Black Swan, which his agents assured him could show its heels to any native-bred animal. Pico was proud of his thousands of horses, but proudest of all of Sarco, a sleek creamy descendent of Arabian stock.

"Don Jose must have lost his senses," Pico said. "Sarco can outrun any horse in the world."

The $25,000 stake was only the beginning. Long before the Fourth of July celebration, which had become the year's most important fiesta since the Americans took over, the bet between the two horse owners also included 500 horses, 500 mares, 500 heifers, 500 calves, 500 sheep, and various parcels of land. Every time the two met, the ante was raised.

Word of the impending race was spreading through the State, and when the ship from Australia reached San Francisco, half of the residents of the mushrooming city were at the dock to watch Black Swan being hoisted overboard. Foremost in the crowd was Don Jose, who had journeyed north with his trainer, Bill Brady, to await the arrival of his prize.

Brady rode the travel-weary horse over 400 miles of dustry trails to Los Angeles, caring for it along the way like an anxious mother. Don Jose went back by boat. The land route would be too wearying for a man already exhausted by excitement.

Black Swan had a week to rest before the race, but instead of allowing the homesick creature to roam a pasture, Sepulveda ordered it led daily through the plaza to be admired.

Opinions on its chances were freely expressed and about equally divided. In the town which had been named El Pueblo del Rio de Nuestra Señora La Reina de Los Angeles de Porciuncula and which was teeming with the overflow from the gold rush, bull fighting, cock fighting, and horse racing were by far the most important occurrences.

The population was less than 3,000, but at least twice that many, it seemed, crowded on the Fourth of July into the tree-lined plaza, where everything traditionally started and ended. Visitors had come from as far north as Sacramento, and as far south as the tip of Lower California, and most of them appeared to be weighted down with gold to bet on the race.

It was a picturesque gathering. Gaily attired caballeros, wearing short, tight jackets of blue, green and yellow trimmed with silver and lace, and flared, brass-buttoned calzoneras or pants of the same hues, jangled past on their horses, riding six and eight abreast to be more sure of attracting attention. Flowing serapes and wide sombreros were everywhere.

The attire of the women was almost as colorful and the brilliant rebozos or scarfs tied around their heads might pale a rainbow.

Don Antonio Maria Lugo created a sensation when he arrived on his black steed followed by his 16 sons, all of them over 6 feet tall and each arrayed in silver, tooled leather and velvet trappings worth the price of a modern sedan. Peter Biggs, the municipal barber, was surrounded by a crowd on the theory that he might have an inside tip.

Starting time was heralded by the arrival of Don Jose's buxom wife in an open carriage trailed by a vast retinue of servants and attendants. In a large handkerchief she carried a small fortune in $50 gold pieces which she distributed among her entourage to be wagered on Black Swan.

Before John G. Nichols, the mayor, fired the starting gun in front of the Hotel Bella Union, many of the spectators had spread out along San Pedro Street, a 10-foot, vineyard-lined road which had been chosen as the course.

As the horses sped toward the turning point, four and a half miles out, various caballeros came spurring back to report on the progress of the race.

"Sarco is in front by 10 lengths!"

"Pio Pico will be the richest man in California. Sarco can't lose now!"

"Black Swan is 100 yards behind!"

There were long minutes of tense waiting, and then a dense cloud of dust rolled swiftly up the return path. In front of it, to the crowd's amazement, was a big black horse that seemed to be gaining speed with every step. Black Swan flew across the finish line an easy victor and Jose Andres Sepulveda was the happiest man in all the Golden West.

Camden: A Northern View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilcox Progressive Era, published in Camden, Ala., under date of September 8, 1949:

CAMDEN: A NORTHERN VIEW

It was a disappointment to those who talked with Cabell Phillips on his week-end visit to Camden last month to read his New York Times Magazine article.

However, we in Camden might have expected his story to be as it was. Written for consumption by northern readers, it would not have been true to type if it had not contained the things that they have come to expect in articles written about the South.

The Camden case study is largely marked by a shallowness, a failure to get beneath the surface in almost every aspect of the local scene. This superficiality is frequently covered up by generalities about the South as a whole.

The article seems to have been written by adding to its writer's preconceived ideas such facts, half-truths, and misconceptions about Camden as would fit the bias of his readers in the North. The local material was obtained on a 3-day visit here early in August.

Probably there would be no point in going through the Times article and correcting each erroneous statement, qualifying each partially true item with an "and" or "but." Perhaps its chief objectionable feature is an often-recurring unfortunate choice of word or phrase, frequently inaccurate and sometimes merely discourteous, where use of a different term would have been more appropriate and less unfair. The use of these words is less excusable than the natural misunderstandings and wrong interpretations incident to the shortness of time devoted to the study here.

Of course, a certain license is permitted in an article of this kind, as for example, the boiling-down of conversations with several local people into a single expression, quoted as coming from a local Protestant minister, and including therein some conclusions of the reporter which were never intended by any of these interviewed.

And in all fairness, it should be pointed out that some good things were said in the article about Camden and its people. A few years ago nothing of the kind would have ever appeared in any article about the South to be read in the North. The Times story refers to prospective changes in the South as an epic metamorphosis. Possibly the fact that some admirable qualities were reported as present here may indicate a metamorphosis of another kind—a metamorphosis in which articles on the South as they have been and still are written, would change into objective, fair, maybe even sympathetic stories of a region which, however peculiar its problems, is after all a part of these United States. Is such a change too much to hope for?

Veterans' Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of H. R. 5965, entitled, "A bill to provide for the construction of certain veterans' hospitals, and for other purposes."

It has been my privilege to sit as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives since my election to the Eightieth Congress and hear the plans of the Veterans' Administration for proper medical care and hospitalization for the veterans of the Nation. These plans were very intelligently and carefully discussed and explained by Gen. Omar Bradley, as Veterans' Administrator, during the Eightieth Congress, and he was most persuasive in his argument that all of this hospitalization was needed, that it had been given very careful consideration by the Medical Department of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and many other service organizations and was a

well-integrated and carefully planned and much-needed program. He explained frequently that each of these hospitals to be constructed under the plan had been located only after careful investigation of the necessity for the particular hospital, the medical care that was available for same, and the need that it would fill in the particular community in which it was being constructed.

General Bradley and his associates from the Veterans' Administration were absolutely convinced that the full program was necessary to furnish the proper hospital and medical service for veterans of all wars.

This was the plan until the well-known Presidential cut-back of the funds demarked for this program during the early part of 1949. I hope the President will at some later date consider and approve the program as outlined by so able and intelligent a man as the former Administrator, Gen. Omar Bradley.

With this idea in mind, the House and Senate have both restored $237,000,000 to carry out this program, and I feel confident that the President will be willing to carry through this program which would mean so much to the disabled veterans and many veterans who are not disabled but need hospitalization from time to time.

It may be that since there has been a cut-back by the President in the budget recommendations for the Eighty-first Congress that he would be glad to have a direction from the Congress as to the restoration of this program which, in my opinion, should be restored substantially as outlined by Gen. Omar Bradley.

In my home city of Charlotte, N. C., a general medical hospital of 500 beds is in this plan and specifically referred to in H. R. 5965, and it is very plain that there is quite a need for this type of hospital in the Charlotte area as there are 400,000 veterans located in North Carolina, and, of course, there are many others living in the northern part of South Carolina who would have the advantage of this hospital. The hospital can be easily staffed and can have the advantage of 150 specialists and very adequate medical assistance. This is typical of the care that is given in the location of hospitals set forth in the Veterans' Administration program.

I hope that the House when it does reach H. R. 5965 for a vote that it will pass same with few, if any, dissenting votes.

The Late Most Reverend Thomas O'Leary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Boston (Mass.) Post relative to the untimely passing of the revered and distinguished Bishop of Springfield, the Most Reverend Thomas O'Leary:

DEATH OF PRELATE MOURNED—BISHOP O'LEARY DEAD IN SPRINGFIELD AT AGE 74

SPRINGFIELD, October 10.—The Most Rev. Thomas O'Leary, bishop of the Springfield Catholic diocese and one of the top prelates in New England, died today in Mercy Hospital, of which he was president, following a brief illness. He was 74 years old, had been a priest 52 years, and bishop for 28 years.

TO DRAPE CHURCHES

All of the more than 500 churches in this diocese, which includes Worcester, Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden, and Berkshire Counties, and embraces 515,000 souls out of a total population of 1,010,000, will be draped in the black of mourning tomorrow. All pastors have been requested to offer solemn requiem masses for the repose of the late bishop's soul.

The board of diocesan consulters will meet tomorrow at the chancellory office to designate an administrator who will carry on the duties of the bishop's office until a successor is appointed by Pope Pius XII.

FIND BISHOP HERE

The board of consulters includes the vicar general of the diocese, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Phelon, of Worcester; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Conlin, of Chicopee; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas F. Cummings, of Northampton; Rev. Dr. E. P. Dumphy, of North Adams; Rev. Michael P. Cavanagh, of Worcester; and Rev. Victor Epinard, of Southbridge.

Bishop O'Leary was consecrated in St. Michael's Cathedral here on September 8, 1921, after having been designated by the late Pope Benedict XV on June 16, 1921, following the death of Bishop Thomas D. Beavan. Bishop O'Leary was the third bishop to preside of this diocese in its 90 years. The founder was Bishop John Boyle O'Reilly.

NEW HAMPSHIRE NATIVE

Bishop O'Leary was born in Dover, N. H., August 16, 1875, and attended the public schools of that town. Later he studied in the Jesuit College at Mongret, Limerick, Ireland, before completing his theological and philosophical studies at the Grand Seminary at Montreal, Province of Quebec, where he was ordained in 1897.

He was first a curate at St. Anne's Church at Manchester, N. H., and after a year, served at St. John's Church in Concord, N. H.

He later became chancelor of the Manchester diocese and was secretary to the late Bishop J. B. Delaney at St. Joseph's Cathedral at Manchester, later also becoming rector of that cathedral, until his consecration at Springfield.

PUSHED EDUCATION

The period spanned by Bishop O'Leary's service was marked by great expansion of the hospitals, schools, and colleges in the diocese, together with the institution of the monasteries in the area.

His term has been called the golden era of Catholic education in western Massachusetts, and one of his accomplishments was the establishment of Our Lady of the Elms College for young women at Chicopee, as well as the expansion of Holy Cross and Assumption Colleges at Worcester. Several novitiates for the training of candidates for the priesthood have also been established under his direction.

HAD TO USE CANE

Among other monuments to his administration are the Mother House of the Sisters of Providence in Brightside, the enlargement of Mercy Hospital, St. Vincent's Hospital in Worcester, St. Luke's Hospital in Pittsfield, and Farren Hospital in Montague City.

Bishop O'Leary suffered from his illness for several years and sought assistance through divine agencies with an annual pilgrimage to the Shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupre in Canada. He recovered sufficiently at one time to walk without his cane, but recently had been forced to use it again.

A strong supporter of a Catholic press, the bishop sponsored the Catholic Mirror as the official paper of the Springfield diocese. Today the paper has the highest circulation in its history and has been the sounding board for official reaction of the bishop toward problems of the day.

ABLE AND ENERGETIC

His administration became known throughout New England as able and energetic.

Bishop O'Leary invited the Passionist Fathers to come into this diocese to specialize in retreats for laymen. The Passionist Monastery in West Springfield is now one of the outstanding sites in the diocese and laymen's retreat movement has grown to large proportions.

Likewise, the Dominican Sisters came to West Springfield at the invitation of Bishop O'Leary to establish perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament in the diocese.

OUTSTANDING HONOR

In June 1927 Bishop O'Leary dedicated one of the diocese's youngest religious foundations, St. Hyacinth's Seminary, Granby.

On September 12, 1946, Bishop O'Leary was signally honored by the Vatican when he was appointed assistant to the pontifical throne of Pope Pius XII. The honor was a highlight of the bishop's twenty-fifth anniversary of his episcopal consecration, and was announced at a reception attended by 525 diocesan priests at Providence Mother House at Brightside.

Earlier in the day more than 500 priests, 150 nuns, and hundreds of laity jammed St. Michael's Cathedral to participate in a 2-hour pontifical mass of thanksgiving sung by Bishop O'Leary in commemoration of his silver jubilee as bishop.

TRUMAN MESSAGE

Among the hundreds of messages of felicitation the bishop received that day were a long letter from Pope Pius XII and telegrams from President Truman and former United States Senator David I. Walsh.

In his earlier days as a prelate, Bishop O'Leary was host to a number of distinguished visitors, the most outstanding of whom was the great Marshal Foch, of France, who came here shortly after the First World War.

Bishop O'Leary leaves one brother, William F. O'Leary, of Wellesley; two sisters, Mrs. Mary Finucane, also of Wellesley, and Sister Mary Agnes, of the Convent of Mercy at Gloucester; also a niece, Mrs. Richard Viano, of Cambridge, and two nephews, Thomas and William Finucane, of Wellesley.

PHILBIN GIVES HIS TRIBUTE—EXTOLS FINE VIRTUES OF BISHOP O'LEARY

WASHINGTON, October 10.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District, said today on learning of the death of Bishop O'Leary of the Springfield diocese:

"A great, inspiring, spiritual leader has been called by the Almighty to his eternal reward. His tireless, self-sacrificing work, his unselfish devotion to his churchly duties, his wisdom and effectiveness as an administrator, his deep humility and especially his profound spirituality and unceasing zeal in work of charity and mercy marked him as one of the truly outstanding churchmen of our generation.

"Kindly and generous, devoted friend of the underprivileged, the poor and the unfortunate, stalwart and able champion of the faith, patriotic and civic-minded, Bishop O'Leary will be widely mourned, not only by Catholics, but by citizens of every class and creed. The Springfield diocese has sustained an irreparable loss. The church has lost one of her greatest spiritual leaders. God has called to himself a true and faithful Christian gentleman, a sterling citizen and patriot.

"In mourning his passing, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and his priests."

ARCHBISHOP IN TRIBUTE TO PRELATE

Archbishop Cushing said last night, in tribute to Bishop O'Leary:

"Bishop O'Leary's death will occasion many prayers for him and expressions of sympathy from his people here in the archdiocese of Boston. The bishop was well known in this region and in years gone by, used frequently to visit priests and other friends within the archdiocese of Boston. For the past several years his health has not been good, but in the prime of his life he gave the diocese of Springfield and all the New England province the full benefit of his priestly zeal and episcopal leadership. May God grant him eternal rest."

Survey Reports on the White River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement which I submitted to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, at a hearing held in Newport, Ark., yesterday, October 12, 1949, together with a letter from Col. T. A. Lane, district engineer, Little Rock District, Little Rock, Ark.:

STATEMENT OF HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, EIGHTH MISSOURI DISTRICT, AT THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS IN NEWPORT, ARK., OCTOBER 12, 1949, IN REFERENCE TO SURVEY REPORTS ON THE WHITE RIVER BASIN

I regret that regular meetings of the House of Representatives, and the press of legislative duties, prevent my personal appearance at the public hearing in Newport on this date, October 12, 1949. I, therefore, submit for consideration, my views in regard to plans for flood control and other conservation and utilization programs for the resources of the White River Basin.

The problem of flood control is one of the major problems confronting us at this time. Flood damages each year run into appalling figures. This preventable destruction and loss to our economy should and could be largely eliminated.

In my opinion, the flood-control problem is just one part of the over-all task of rebuilding our fast depleting soils and the maximum use, while adequately conserving all our soil and water resources. In my opinion, the rebuilding and conservation of our far depleted, and still rapidly further depleting soils, is our No. 1 national problem. Unless we halt the present tragic rate of soil depletion and get into the business of soil rebuilding, we may expect difficult roads ahead.

I believe we should discard further use of the term, "flood control," and give adequate attention to the job of flood prevention in that problem's proper perspective in the over-all task of maximum use and conservation of all land and water resources. Floods should be prevented—not controlled after the flood stage is reached.

The task of flood prevention is certainly not an impossible, nor hopeless, task. Floods can be prevented, and in my opinion the procedure for flood prevention fits perfectly into the over-all job of conservation under maximum use of both land and water resources. The task is to retain the water on the soil where it falls and provide for planned, orderly, and nondestructive run-off. This can be done only by dealing with the problem locally over all the area involved. Only by grasping control at the only point which completely responds to control can a complete job be accomplished. Terracing, correct farm practices, reforestation, together with small check dams offer more adequate and more economical return than other approaches to the problem.

In my section of Missouri, streams like Eleven Point River, Current River, Black River, Piney River, Meramec River, and Big River are among what to us are major streams. A plan which calls for one or two large flood-control reservoirs on each of these, and our other streams, will help to relieve flood damages in the White River Basin and the Mississippi River Basin. However, this procedure will not help much in our section. Our soils will continue to be washed away and the ravages of floods will continue to take the usual annual toll. I cannot see the need, nor the wisdom, of recommending a system of flood control which will leave large areas completely unprotected when the same protection can be given by a plan which will give protection to all.

I have seen the terrible flood conditions along the Mississippi River. These areas must be protected. We hill people want to assist in the solution of the problem, and we are, of course, directly involved in any plan for handling the problem. We feel that for the greatest good to all concerned we should insist on a plan of flood prevention with protection to all, rather than accepting a plan of flood control which will leave so much of the entire area unprotected. I urge that the general plan for the White River Basin be further broken down and applied to each of the tributaries of the White River. If the plan will work for the White River, it will work just as well when applied to Current River, and going further toward the proper places for adequate solution of the problem, the plan will work when applied to Pike Creek, a branch of Current River.

It is within the power of the Corps of Engineers to take control and regulate the flow of every watershed in the White River Basin, or in any other river basin in the Nation. By the application of effective local check methods, much of the water can be kept near where it falls. The necessary run-off can be retained in correctly placed, and widely scattered comparatively small reservoirs, and can be fed into the stream channels as desired. By this plan the small streams can be brought under control, and thus, the over-all area responds to the desired plan.

The Corps of Engineers can, by the application of abundant "know-how," control the flow of any and all small streams. They can then control the flow of the larger river systems, and can prevent floods. It, to me, is not wild speculation to say that the Army Engineers have in their hands the magic touch by which the Mississippi River, which "just keeps rolling along," can be brought under control, and eventually made into a more gentle and clearer stream, with a rather constant flow.

By taking control of a complete watershed the results will not be confined merely to flood prevention. The entire river system will become an ever-increasing contributor to abundance and more enriched living in many and varied spheres.

To those who are interested in hydroelectric power, a controlled stream is the solution to many problems. The low-production point of the annual dry season, the rapid sedimentation of the power pool, the constant risk of flood destruction, and the loss of power over the dam during the annual flood season, get the lion's share from most hydroelectric projects. A controlled stream with a maintained annual flow will correct these hydroelectric headaches. A controlled stream will make usable a very high percentage of the potential energy of the stream in firm or constant electric power. And, incidentally, a controlled stream will relieve the necessity for an enormous, fluctuating power pool.

To those who are interested in water transportation, a controlled stream is the solution to many problems. A controlled stream will greatly reduce all the navigation hazards ranging between the sediment-filled channel during extreme low water and the crest of the flood. The channel of a controlled stream can be put in good shape for navigation and can be maintained in shape at low cost.

For those who are interested in preserving natural beauty, and we have an abundance of such in the Missouri Ozarks, the controlled stream is the ultimate answer. There are thousands of springs in the Ozarks. Among them is Big Spring, the largest spring in the world. These, and countless other masterpieces of natural beauty, merit preservation. Why settle for a system of flood control based on a few high dams which will be only partially effective while protecting only small areas when it is possible to have an effective system of flood prevention which will protect and enrich the entire area involved? Controlled streams will not only preserve but will enrich natural beauty.

To those who are interested in recreation, a protected watershed making possible a clear stream which will flow at a fairly constant stage the year around, will be a dream come true. The famous Ozark float trips and good fishing would be insured 365 days a year. Where power projects are needed a smaller lake with a fixed shore line can be the result. In addition to a few good lakes from the sportsman's point of view, there can be countless miles of sustained, inviting, clear, cool streams. Also, throughout an entire watershed, there can be thousands of the smaller check and storage lakes to encourage both wildlife and the sportsman.

To those who are interested in more available water at the right time for irrigation, the controlled and thus protected watershed offers rich returns. Water which would otherwise be dealing out wreckage and destruction in floods will become available when needed for irrigation.

From any point of view that I can think of, flood prevention by the controlled watershed method offers much more than can be accomplished by the high-dam plan. The controlled watershed method will pay dividends, not just in partial flood control but also in soil enrichment and conservation, maximum firm electric-power, navigation, irrigation, preservation of natural beauty, and recreation. To me, the plan has much to offer. The job is indeed a big one. The challenge should have an irresistible appeal to those who would do great things.

The great people which we are, with our abundant know-how, should not accept just any proposed conservation and utilization plan for our land and water resources. It is not necessary and would be foolish to settle for a plan other than complete protection for every acre of the entire watershed of every one of our river systems. Such a plan will make available for sustained use

all involved available resources. Such a plan will mean further enriched living for all of us.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT,
Little Rock, Ark., October 10, 1949.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have just received copies of your statement submitted to the public hearing to be held at Newport, Ark., on October 12, 1949, in reference to our survey report on the White River Basin.

I regret very much that you will be unable to attend the hearing. I have been looking forward to an opportunity to meet you and hoped that this would be the occasion.

Your statement will be read at the hearing and will be entered in the record.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. LANE,
Colonel, CE, District Engineer.

Honor to Columbus, Discoverer of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry H. Schlacht, from the New York Journal-American of October 12, 1949:

HONOR TO COLUMBUS, DISCOVERER OF AMERICA

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

O glorious city of Genoa!
Lost in the midst of the ages
Is the record of your birth.
But you gave to fame immortal
One whose praises now fill the earth.

Today we honor Christopher Columbus on the four hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the discovery of America.

Today we honor one of the greatest souls that ever wore the clay of earth about him.

Today we honor ourselves by remembering to honor him.

The great souls of history who have conquered in the face of adversity, who have hitched their chariot to the star of hope, achieved victory and snatched immortality from the ruins.

Thus did Columbus.

We can see backward across the centuries of the past a few sunken mountain peaks jut out of oblivion's sea.

We can see through the telescope of time the historical horizons.

We can see great stars whose magnitude is unabating through the ages.

Among them is Columbus.

His supreme confidence, his heroic endurance, and his unfailing faith in providence combated the superstitions of his day and made him the benefactor of the ages.

Columbus was a man of faith.
He acted by faith.
He achieved by faith.
He lived by faith.

He became by faith in Providence the divine instrument to blaze the pathway that marks the destinies of the centuries.

We know that the silent stars must have looked down with wonder upon the strange sight of three crude ships struggling with death on the briny deep of an angry unplowed sea.

We know that the God who rules over the winds and waves looked down upon him with his approving smile.

A great miracle occurred upon the earth.
A new continent was discovered.
A new civilization was born.
A new race was to rise.
This land was called America.

It was named after an Italian—Americus Vespucius.

It was to become the birthplace of democracy.

It was God's country.

Columbus brought to humanity a treasure trove of God-given gifts, surpassed only by the blessings flowing from the miracle of Bethlehem.

Here was a world with endless plains richer than the Nile.

Here was a world with cascades that sparkled in the sunlight.

Here was a world with majestic mountains that rose in towering grandeur to the very feet of the Creator.

Here came the blended blood of the best people of every land.

Here came the pillars of all the races and of every creed.

Here they brought the finest fruits of their nations.

Here they have become the defenders of American civilization.

Let us today tender our loving tribute to Columbus and his people.

The Italian people have contributed to the greatness of our country.

The Italian people have fought with heart, head and hand for the country they love—for the institutions they cherish, and for the principles that gave it birth.

Italy has given us her theme of freedom.
She has given to exploration, a Columbus.
She has given to sculpture, a Michelangelo.
She has given to painting, a Titian.
She has given to science, a Marconi.
She has given to military art, a Garibaldi.
She has given to theology, a St. Thomas Aquinas.
She has given to music, a Toscanini.

She has given to the world a code of laws that will stand as a sheet anchor for all mankind.

Let us thank God that Italy has been liberated from her oppressors.

Let us pray that the golden morning of peace and freedom will shine forever o'er the world.

We send our greetings across the sea.
We shout, "Long live liberty-loving Italy."
Viva Italia Libera.

Resolution of Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most impressive resolution recently adopted at the convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs held at Webster, Mass., Sunday, October 9.

This resolution points out admirably the present existing dangers to democracy throughout the world and stresses the urgent need for current action to protect American ideals of freedom and justice.

The resolution follows:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF
POLISH WOMEN'S CLUBS,
October 9, 1949.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

One hundred delegates of the Federation of Polish Women's Clubs in the State of Massachusetts assembled for their eighteenth annual convention in Webster, Mass., sent an appeal to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, pleading for an American ideological offensive as an answer to the march of communism.

"Mr. President, 10 years have elapsed since the time when, through his aggression in Poland, Hitler launched World War II. It seems timely to us today, and we feel it our duty to stop and analyze the present predicament of our beloved America and the world, pondering over this paramount question: Why not only is there no peace in the world today, but humanity is faced with the possibilities of another war?

"1. The characteristic method of all totalitarian leaders, is to instill fear through shouts and threats; thus paralyzing the will power and conscience of individuals as well as nations. Before starting the last war, Hitler through this well-organized and executed plan, had achieved this very end. His savage outbursts paralyzed the conscience and moral strength of statesmen, inducing them to sign the notorious Munich agreement.

"Stalin likewise achieved the same aim. He was successful in this, both at the Yalta Conference and during the subsequent period extending to this very day. Instilling fear of another war, he was successful in disintegrating the will power and conscience of the Western World.

"2. Recently, however, when the civilized world was shaken by the detonation of the Russian atomic bomb, not only the fear of war but also another, still greater fear, began to fill the hearts and minds of the American people. Again all began to ask themselves the same old questions, to which we, too, as Americans seek an answer.

"(a) Why did the American diplomats, including the executive branch of our Government, surrender to the Soviet Union, one-half of Europe and Asia?

"(b) Why did our trusted leaders permit Russia to prepare the atomic bomb, which was supposed to be our sacred guarded secret?

"(c) Why, after all these sad experiences, do we again hear voices with authority, supporting and sponsoring compromise and appeasement with Russia?

"We honestly and sincerely believe that any form of compromise today would be synonymous with granting to the Soviet Union, that very precious time so necessary for stock piling of atomic bombs, which in the very near future could be dropped on our homes.

"(d) We seek to know these forces, which betrayed into the hands of our enemies, this very diabolical weapon with which the powers of darkness seek to destroy us and our families. These are the unanswered queries, Mr. President, which cause amongst many people far greater fear and paralysis than Hitler's and Stalin's threats.

"3. Today the entire world is weary with our incessant acts of good will to preserve peace. Neither Yalta nor the United Nations, the numerous conferences of the western statesmen with the Soviet Government, nor our belated war preparations, have produced the desired effect. The naked reality is the fact that already 5 years have elapsed since the hostilities ceased, and still

no assurance of peace is in sight. We observe at the same time that the reach of Soviet influence and control is steadily expanding and enslaving more and more of the world's inhabitants. Seven hundred million people are already under its yoke. Today we are witnessing intensive preparation for a new and most important of all Soviet 5-year plans, namely the stock piling of atomic bombs for the final destruction of the Western World.

"Free peoples of the world, Mr. President, have ceased to trust our political common sense, and are now losing confidence in our diplomatic methods. They are beginning to accept the mission of our professed ideals, with distrust and often with irony. This concerns not only the countries behind the iron curtain, but also which is much worse the people of western Europe and east Asia, considered to be the moral and military bases for our security. This happens despite all our economic aid granted so lavishly; despite our political financial and even military support assured those nations. The people of the world are wondering today, whether in a moment of world crises, they could afford casting their lot with us in a conflict.

"Let us remember, Mr. President, that at a moment of emergency, neither economic nor even strategic support could induce man to fight if they have lost faith. History is full of examples of men, who proved ready to fight, sacrifice, and even to die, in the defense of ideals. No example, however, could be quoted of a similar self-sacrifice in the face of danger made in the name of containment, balance of power or even for the preservation of a high standard of living. In the evolution of human thought and endeavor, moral standards and their principal expression, namely, respect for the human being and his freedom have proven to be the only lasting and solid values. Thus if mankind is to be freed from paralyzing fear only a clear and honest language from our side can be effective and remove this menace which perhaps is even greater than the Soviet atomic bomb. The aim of our foreign policy must be harmonized with standard moral principles. Thus, we beg of you that our Government under your guidance, announce to the world in the most solemn terms, that Americans will struggle with all consistency and force for the liberty of all men and nations and will not abandon this struggle until the very source of enslavement, whatever it might be, is rooted out. To this goal all our resources and strength should be dedicated as the only true assurance at our survival as a free Nation. At a time of a global attack of totalitarian forces on liberty, American ideals of freedom and justice must sound a clarion call appealing to the world, for the sole effective weapon against the march of Communist ideas is the ideological offensive of freedom.

SUSANNE SKRZYPEK,
President.
MARY SZCZYGIEL,
Secretary.

The Steel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, it was just 1 month ago that the press of the Nation was hailing the statesmanlike quality of the report and recommendations issued by the fact-finding board appointed by the President in the steel industry labor dispute.

Do you recall the words of the New York Times?

The board acquitted itself commendably.

Remember the statement made by the New York World Tribune?

The board showed an ability to pick its way through the mass of conflicting documentation which had been offered, rejecting extreme claims on each side and outlining a solution which may well provide the basis for peace in the steel industry.

And who can forget the editorial appearing in Iron Age magazine just a few days after the board had made its report? The steel industry's own trade magazine had this to say:

It (the board's report) was remarkable for its simplicity and for its bluntness. * * * Steel management now has a tremendous responsibility. * * * Steel chose 60 days ago not to fight but to submit to the board under protest. Now it does not have much to fight about—or at least not enough to plunge the country into a steel strike.

Such was the general reception given throughout the Nation to the fact-finding board's report made to the President on September 10.

The union involved in this dispute, the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, showed a deep sense of responsibility to the welfare of the Nation by accepting the board's recommendations, even though such acceptance meant giving up the union's demand for a wage increase. The major segment of the steel industry, callous to all considerations except maintenance of their swollen profits, and pursuing a public-be-damned attitude, has refused to accept the fact-finding board's recommendations as a basis for settlement of the dispute.

As a result, over 500,000 steel workers are currently engaged in a strike to secure social insurance and pension rights to which they are entitled by every standard of justice, equity, and reasoned judgment.

The steel industry should know and understand that it stands condemned at the bar of public opinion for its arrogance and complete disregard for the general welfare in this situation. No amount of pious mouthings about principle or sanctimonious double-talk can change the fact that the steel companies, for reasons best known to themselves, have reverted to the law of the jungle in their relationships with their employees.

We call upon management in the steel industry to forthwith show the same statesmanship that has so adequately been demonstrated by the leadership of the steelworkers' union. We call upon the steel industry to immediately accept the recommendations of the fact-finding board. In the interest of the Nation's welfare the people have a right to expect this and will accept no less.

Our Financial Relations With Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial from the Bridgeton Evening News entitled "Our Financial Relations With Great Britain." The importance of the subject and the manner of its treatment, it seems to me, warrants that this editorial should be widely read.

OUR FINANCIAL RELATIONS WITH GREAT BRITAIN

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin and Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancelor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, have been in this country for some days trying to negotiate a deal by which their country may secure more American dollars, badly needed to keep it on an even financial keel.

Mr. Bevin, on their arrival, stated that they were not here as beggars. If the rumors which have leaked out from Washington are correct, Mr. Bevin is right, for we should say that to the contrary, they are here as racketeers.

Our financial transactions with Great Britain have never been very satisfactory and the present deal may be unsatisfactory also.

To get to the beginning of these deals we must go back to the end of World War I when we made Great Britain huge war loans. Of these loans, $11,000,000,000 still remain unpaid and no interest has been paid on them for years, but this country is still paying interest on the money it borrowed to make the loans and will be paying interest for some time to come. The debt will never be paid and will be rubbed off the slate, if it has not already been done. Eleven billions have gone down the drain, Britain claiming that it should have been our contribution to the war while we were getting ready to fight.

At the close of World War II, Britain sought a loan of $7,000,000,000. Remembering the unpaid First World War loan, this request was turned down, public sentiment being against lending her a dollar. The authorities finally compromised by making a loan of three and three-quarters billions to enable England to get on her feet, and she was relieved of paying interest on the loan for a long term of years, although our country had to pay interest on the money she borrowed to make the loan and is now paying interest on it.

Had this loan been properly used it should have served its purpose, but England's Labor Government came into power and instead of using this loan to put their nation on a sound basis, it squandered much of the money in its schemes for the socialization of industry and transportation. Feelers were put out about securing another loan, but these met with a cold shoulder. Soon, however, the prodigal Washington administration evolved the Marshall plan of giving Europe billions annually for 3 years, of which England gets one third. This helped for a time, but soon the British found themselves in the position that they must have more American dollars and the only way to secure them is to sell more goods in this country and buy less from us, hence the visit to this country of the British statesmen was to concoct some

plan which would count two for Britain and a goose egg for the United States of America.

More goods imported here from England would mean reduced markets for home products; curtailed markets would mean fewer jobs and less employment, already in a jittery state. But such a concession would not stop with England, for under the favored nation clause of all treaties, any favors shown England in such matters would have to be granted all other countries.

Under clause nine of the agreement, under which England secured the big after-the-war loan she was prohibited from discriminating against the United States in her purchases abroad. This clause she now wants abrogated so, that while she desires a lower tariff in order that she can sell us more of her products, she wants to buy wherever she can buy cheapest. For a wonder our representatives in the conference refused this concession except as to the Marshall plan dollars and agreed to buy more rubber and tin for stock-pile purposes from Malay which will enable England to secure more American dollars of which she is in sore need.

As to any further lowering of the tariff rates that would have to come before Congress, and if this British financial question ever does come before Congress, the British will hear some things that will make them squirm in their breeches.

England is in the position of the man who was down and out, who was forced to get down on his knees and dig in order to recover. The British will have to do this if they ever recover. They will have to throw overboard their Labor Government, their socialistic schemes, their 35 or 40 hour work week and dig for forty-eight or even fifty-two hours if they expect to get on their feet again. That is what made them once great and only that will make them great again.—W. E. M.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, West Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been perhaps no greater exhibition of bungling and incompetency than that in connection with the construction of the Veterans' Administration hospital in West Haven, Conn. Not only has there been a record of inefficiency on the part of the Veterans' Administration but the Army Engineer Corps as well.

With hospital space at a premium for sick and disabled veterans, there was authorized in 1945 the construction of a 500-bed hospital at West Haven. A series of unprecedented delays has occurred over the past 4 years, and there is no prospect of their subsiding.

Continual prodding early this year resulted in the Veterans' Administration assuring that the advertisement of bids would take place on October 11, 1949. Not even this date has been adhered to, as the advertisement is now scheduled for November 14, with the opening scheduled for January 4, 1950. Under this revised timetable, construction will not be completed until the fall of 1951. In view of the past performances, I am skeptical as to adherence to this schedule.

I am unable to comprehend that the magnitude of the proposed hospital required over 3 years of architectural planning. There is no doubt that the fault lies with all parties concerned and that Connecticut veterans are the last to be considered by the agency created to administer the benefits provided by Congress.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer some additional remarks by Cathrine Curtis, president, Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., and national director, Women Investors in America, Inc., Washington, D. C., before the Utah Federation of Women's Republican Clubs at Salt Lake City, Utah, September 30, 1949:

The greatest hoax in history is being perpetrated upon the American people in a world effort to steal from them their property rights in what is the most valuable new potential industry—atomic energy and all of its by-products. This new discovery is probably the most important since man discovered fire.

While we are being frightened and made jittery by gruesome tales of the atom bomb our thoughts are being diverted from the realization that atomic energy used for constructive industrial purposes could develop new industries, new products, and new prosperity undreamed of, even in this fabulous age.

While we have been hoaxed into giving away our atomic energy property rights to a Government Commission and are kept on edge with new horror stories, other countries feverishly build atomic energy plants for industrial use in their new program geared to atomic energy tempo. This country's mass-production system will become obsolete. We will no longer lead the world. Then these United States can well revert to the agrarian nation which the British Socialists tell us is the next step in our destiny.

In order to comprehend the motives and the over-all program to painlessly acquire this valuable product we must consider for a moment certain fundamentals as to the economy of foreign countries before we can have even a slight awakening to this gigantic scheme.

Foreign countries have operated on a low-speed-manpower-production basis in their industrial activity. They cannot now compete in the markets of the world with the high-speed machine-made mass production of our American economy. It is our high-speed American capitalism which has not only produced wealth in untold measure for many generations, but it has successfully waged two world wars, on a scale never before known in history. In addition, it is pouring out untold billions of our treasure to countless foreign countries.

If foreign countries are to compete successfully not only in world markets, but also in our domestic markets—then our industrial know-how must be crippled and our ability to develop new wealth, new products, new jobs, new prosperity, must be destroyed.

If we can be prevailed upon to bleed ourselves white, to spend ourselves into bankruptcy, and at the same time, can be wheedled into the idea of giving up our opportunity to develop this great new atomic energy industry, I claim there won't be much reason or incentive for any country to even waste an atom bomb on us.

It might be well to take a few minutes to review and to refresh your memories as to how this country was built—I'd like to touch briefly upon several common sense fundamentals that we all know, but, in this era of squandermania and perpetual give-away programs, we seem to have forgotten.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Michigan State Federation of Women's Republican Clubs held at the War Memorial Center, Grosse Pointe, Mich., Tuesday, October 4, 1949:

"That this assembly go on record as approving the Curtis Atomic Energy Plan as proposed by Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan."

Certified by Marion Techentien, acting secretary.

American Policy in Greece Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Soterious Nicholson, entitled "American Policy in Greece Justified":

AMERICAN POLICY IN GREECE JUSTIFIED
(By Soterios Nicholson)

"These foreign attacks upon Greece must not be permitted to be launched again."

In this way Constantine Tsaldaris, Greece's Vice Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, summed up his country's position following the recent defeat of rebel guerrillas in the Grammos and Vitsi areas. In effect, Mr. Tsaldaris told the United Nations General Assembly that it has happened before but let us not let it happen again.

However, there does not seem to be any assurance from the United Nations that the transgression of Greece's sovereign power will not be repeated.

It is apparent that the UN is unable to perform the proper function at the appropriate time; this fact modern history will attest. The UN's failing has been the more noticeable and of a discouraging nature in Greece. Even now the UN, through its committees, is attempting to settle the boundaries of Greece by kindling friendly cooperation among the Balkan states. But what credence can we give to any of the promises so readily given by Russia's satellites unless the Soviet Union is willing to abide by the terms of an agreement? How sincere is Russia, judging from the peculiar performances it has put on since the end of the Second World War?

Peace is precious to the Balkan peoples. Invader after invader has crossed the boundaries into free soil, grasped for power, and threatened subjugation of freedom-loving peoples. Seldom, down through the ages,

and particularly in the immediate past, has the atmosphere in Greece been free from the scourges of war.

Despite this longing for peace, there can be no assurance in the Balkans if the present situation persists. Without direct help from the western powers to fix the Greek, Albanian, and Bulgarian boundaries and seal them, new trouble can be expected near the border.

Mr. Tsaldaris told the UN during his address: "When the guerrillas retreated into Albania, covered by fire from Albania, Greece had every right under international law to follow them in hot pursuit. The Greek Government ordered its armies to stop at the borders. It did this mindful of the explosive situation existing in the Balkans and resolved toward a peaceful solution of the problem of the Balkan people."

Retracing history, Greece has been many times, but more recently twice, the servant of the democratic and free world. Today, she still carries on that burden. During the Second World War, the nation fought the troops of Mussolini and his Fascists to a decisive victory, and Hitler's troops to a standstill, stalling off the destruction intended by the invaders, thus giving the Allies time to organize and prepare their military strength.

Now, Greece is performing another miraculous feat. It has already stopped the advance of communism. The U. S. S. R. long sought to build up its sphere of influence in the Middle East and in the Balkans, and spill over to the Atlantic coast like the splash of ink from an overturned ink bottle. Such a foothold in the Balkans would eventually mean the establishment of a monstrous military power on the Mediterranean banks opening the door to east and west.

But in standing its ground against the shock of guerrilla thrust and Soviet propaganda, Greece has again been dealt full doses of suffering—economically, politically and socially.

Today, a good part of the battle has been won. The western powers played a stellar role in sending an uninterrupted flow of war materials and supplies. This supply line has been of untold aid and comfort to a fighting Greece, and the Greek Government has warmly thanked the powers, particularly the United States, for the aid in the battle to defeat totalitarianism.

There was skepticism voiced at the first announcement of the American aid program to Greece. Back in March 1947, when the go-ahead signal was given, some critics said the Greeks' hands would be tied, the spirit sagging, because of war fatigue. But the renowned courage of the Greeks and America's fortitude in seeing the situation through, finally leveled the guerrillas to their knees. The banditry in invading, armed groups, equipped and trained by foreign Russian satellite countries, has all but vanished from the scene.

The fight has been costly. No war is won without destruction of property and loss of lives. Since 1946, when first the enemy entrenched itself in the mountain ranges near the Albanian border, Greece has been warding off the rebellious attempts to paralyze the Greek Government and eventually establish a new Cominform-dominated nation. These efforts failed. Communism in Greece was dealt a death blow. Only a revival of rebel border crossings can upset the semblance of order now established.

The three-phased campaign against the guerrillas by the Greek National Army took the enemy by surprise and pushed the bandits from their battle lines. The retreat to the hills and the final battles of Vitsi and Grammos was executed with military precision.

The western world can, and must, do its bit to back up the brave nation which it already has aided in the fight for freedom. A comprehensive, decisive and hard-fact treatment of the situation in Greece would clear up the dilemma. This dilemma may yet force the Balkans into an uneasy atmosphere bordering on the explosive.

By taking the problem cat by the tail, the western powers can put a stop to further trouble—i. e., force Albania and Bulgaria to close their borders and keep them shut tight.

There will be other attempts by the international red organization (the Cominform) to foister its political philosophy, based on fear. The Communists, defeated on the battlefield, will try to keep their party intact in Greece, under some other name and go underground if necessary. They will try to maneuver the western powers into giving them further concessions in other parts of the world. In the Greek orbit, the Communists will demand that the Albanian, and perhaps Bulgaria's, borders be kept open, nonpatrolled and free for the movement of soldiers and guerrilla bands and their equipment, in and out of Greece.

The Greek people have saved the western powers precious time. Will this timesaving go to waste?

It Certainly Is Our Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the theory seems to prevail in administration circles that whatever Great Britain does is entirely her own business, and the only thing we are concerned with is to supply her with more and more money. An editorial entitled "It Certainly Is Our Business" is a cool-headed refutation of that doctrine, and I am including it for the attention of the membership. This editorial appeared recently in the Vineland (N. J.) Times Journal:

IT CERTAINLY IS OUR BUSINESS

"Whatever you have, spend less," was the advice of Dr. Samuel Johnson in a letter to his biographer, James Boswell. That practice was good enough for old England, but it has been altered slightly by present-day Britain, which operates on the theory:

"Whatever you have, spend more."

An example of how that theory operates was an announcement by the British Ministry of Health of Monday that for the time being it will give each patient only one free pair of eye-glasses. Under England's program of socialized medicine, each patient has been receiving two pairs. More than 3,000,000 persons are waiting to get theirs; some have been waiting more than 6 months. In order to cut this huge backlog, the Government will hand out only one pair of spectacles for each pair of eyes.

It is indeed a spectacle.

Addressing the thirty-first national convention of the American Legion this week in Philadelphia, President Truman set forth four "basic underlying principles" which he said will guide the United States in the important economic conference beginning next week in Washington.

The first principle is that "a sound and expanding world economy is essential to world peace." Secondly, "we are trying to expand the exchange of goods and services among nations," and "we are not engaged in a charitable enterprise." The third principle is that success in creating a sound and expanding world economy can be achieved only by keeping "everlastingly at it * * * there is no other way to the solution of our difficulties than the way of mutual concession and cooperation."

The President's fourth principle is that "the democratic nations are not proposing to interfere with one another's internal politics" as long as they adhere firmly "to democracy, coupled with a common desire to improve the standard of living of all their citizens."

Economic isolationism in 1949 is as nearsighted as was political isolationism in the post-World-War-I era, and for that reason Mr. Truman's first three principles will be mostly applauded. As he pointed out, without foreign trade many of this Nation's industries would suffer. American cotton, wheat, and tobacco, for example, must be sold abroad in order to prevent our economy from crashing.

The President's fourth principle says, in effect, "How Great Britain is run internally is none of our business." The fact that billions of American dollars have poured into London since the end of World War II, and that these dollars originate from taxes on this side of the Atlantic, would seem to indicate that England's internal economy most certainly is our business.

If Great Britain received United States aid only on a loan basis, perhaps it would be possible for the United States to ignore the disposition of those funds so long as they were repaid. Although America hopes to benefit from aid-to-Britain by a more sound world economy, the billions of dollars crossing the ocean either in the form of material or credit can be termed realistically nothing but a gift.

If the gifts were being used to good effect, if they actually bolstered English economy, again the United States could ignore the manner in which the money is being spent. What actually is happening is that England's Labor government is using American financial aid to finance a socialistic system which England cannot afford at the present time.

No one objects to a child spending a nickel to buy a bar of chocolate. When that child matures, however, he learns that money borrowed is for the purpose of earning money with which to repay the loan.

England is not a child, and her rich Uncle Sam is not divinely protected from financial deflation.

Recommendations of Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lima (Ohio) News of October 10, 1949:

PENNY-WISE

If we were a fraction as interested in saving dollars as we are in saving pennies, our letters to Congressmen would give the post office enough revenue to pull it out of the red.

Any Lima councilman or Allen County commissioner knows from sad experience that he dares not talk favorably of a tax

increase. All of us can name half a dozen bond issues and tax levies we have turned down.

What are we doing to encourage our spokesmen in Washington to force action on the Hoover Commission recommendations?

Five measures recommended by the Commission have become law. Those five alone are saving taxpayers $1,250,000,000 a year.

There are more measures to be enacted. The Post Office does an annual business of $1,300,000,000; hasn't changed its organizational structure since 1836; and loses $500,000,000 a year. The Hoover Commission has pointed out ways of cutting this loss.

The Commission's recommendations, if all are adopted, will save American taxpayers around $3,000,000,000 a year. Some Congressmen in both parties, including those representing Limaland, want to enact the needed legislation, but have to fight Government boards, agencies, and bureaus.

Big Government already has grown so careless that it costs the average working man or woman direct and indirect taxes equivalent of 61 days labor each year. It costs the average worker $1,300 a year, $300 for every man, woman, and child. It has contracted a debt of $7,000 for every average family in the Nation.

Average spending by our Government is $14,000,000,000 a year higher than during terms of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Hoover Commission's recommendations do not propose cuts in governmental activities; they do propose less costly ways of doing the same things.

Every employed man and his boss can profitably invest time and money in active support of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, 15 West Forty-sixth Street, New York 19.

A fraction of the money we could save on our Federal taxes could build a dozen arenatoriums.

ECA Import Program and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted in meeting of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, St. Paul, Minn., October 6, 1949:

Whereas the national debt in the United States is in excess of $250,000,000,000, requiring $5,000,000,000 in payment of annual interest thereon; and

Whereas benefit payments and other assistance to veterans require annual appropriations of approximately five additional billion dollars, with little probability of reduction in the near future; grants to foreign governments for rehabilitation and recovery call for still another five or six billion dollars per year, and national defense appropriations demand some $15,000,000,000 annually; while the costs of the civil government, including price support of agricultural products and higher pay of public employees, consume an additional fund of twelve to fifteen billion dollars; and

Whereas the annual national budget thus exceeds $40,000,000,000, a great part of which is fixed and recurrent in character, thus offering scant hope of material reduction; and

Whereas a national income of more than $200,000,000,000 per year is necessary to sustain a budget of this magnitude without an increase in Federal taxation which already absorbs approximately 20 percent of national income; and

Whereas such a level of national income can be sustained only by a combination of (1) high wages, (2) a high level of employment, (3) a high degree of production, and (4) a high level of prices; and

Whereas the dollar shortages of numerous foreign countries, caused in great degree by the financing of two world wars, has created a demand for a much greater volume of imports by the United States as a means of restoring trade balances and has led recently to a devaluation of foreign currencies as a step toward that goal; and

Whereas the high plateau upon which the economy of the United States now rests makes it highly vulnerable to the deflationary and undermining effects of imports if these can be offered in our markets at prices below those offered by our own producers; and

Whereas the condition of shortages which prevailed during the postwar period in this country has disappeared in nearly all lines of goods and commodities, and given way to the threat of surpluses, thus marking the shift from a seller's to a buyer's market; and

Whereas a moderate decline in the general price level may be desirable but a marked decline or a return to the prewar price level would be disastrous; and

Whereas the competitive effects of imports, priced, after payment of duty, below the level at which our own products can profitably be sold in our home market, are to depress wages and curtail employment in a buyer's market as distinguished from a seller's market: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, a nonprofit organization, composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, with sympathetic understanding and appreciation of the economic difficulty that confronts foreign countries as well as the United States in their efforts to restore trade balances and to overcome the problem of dollar shortages abroad, memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States, setting forth the great economic peril to the Nation that inheres in the present policy of selectively exposing American producers, through theoretically considered tariff reductions, to low-wage competition from abroad; be it further

Resolved, That we regard it to be wholly unnecessary and in fact destructive of the avowed purpose of promoting imports, to reduce import duties to a point that creates pressure on wages and prices in this country; and that the objective of increased trade can best be met by setting tariff rates at a level that will insure fair and not destructive competition; that the deflationary pressures generated by unfair foreign competition cannot be localized nor readily arrested through present escape provisions in trade agreements and that therefore the idea of promoting the general interest at the expense of a few industries, to be sacrificed in behalf of a general policy, is both false and dangerous; finally, be it

Resolved, That since of necessity our Nation is committed as a requisite of meeting its internal and external obligations and commitments for some years to come, to a high national income and high prices as compared with prewar years, we consider the claims of consumers to buy imported goods at low prices to be invalid if such low prices destroy wage earnings and profits and thus reduce the national income and the sources of internal revenue; that this is the crux of the problem and that the present method of reducing duties, through executive negotiation, without authoritative guidance from an impartial fact-finding agency, is inexpert, irresponsive to the needs of domestic producers, and inadequate to the intricate requirements of the problem.

The implications of a greatly expanded import program are so far-reaching in their possible impact upon the present vulnerable economy of the United States, that any such program should be launched only under the guidance of the most responsible, practical, and competent officials and should not be left solely in the hands of employees of executive agencies who are far removed from the field of production and who regard our producers simply as selfish interests.

Seventy-fifth Birthday of Former President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the public services of the Honorable Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States, prepared by Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, Ill., in his newsletters, on the occasion of Mr. Hoover's seventy-fifth birthday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT CLARK HOOVER

True appraisal and proper appreciation of his services is now accorded Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States. Because he either refused or did not know how to be a politician, he has emerged as one of the loftiest statesmen of this generation. Because he disregarded criticism from those whose object was to destroy his usefulness to the Nation, he has been instrumental in designing the most constructive program for the Nation's welfare. And because he has been above the demagogic practice of offering apologies, he lived to see the day when the Nation found it necessary and profitable to call upon him to reenter the service of his country. A call which our former President answered without hesitation when many men in a similar situation might well have refused.

Few Americans have served their country or the world community more conscientiously and more effectively. The Washington Times-Herald likens Mr. Hoover's speech he delivered on his birthday to Washington's Farewell Address. In an editorial, the paper said, "President George Washington's Farewell Address to the Nation, delivered September 19, 1796, when the great first President was happily looking forward to winding up his second term, is one of the most celebrated of United States historical documents. It seems more than possible that former President Herbert Hoover's address to the Nation, delivered at Palo Alto, Calif., may come to rank in history with Washington's great utterance."

It is not easy to review the life of this great American, who at the age of 75, is mentally more vigorous and more resourceful than many a man half his age. One thing

has been obvious. From the very day he entered public life, his activities in and out of public office, have been constructive and practicable. Whether he fed the Belgians or proposed methods of placing the Government on an efficient basis, the result has always been beneficial. Always Herbert Hoover has conceived brilliant ideas and then proceeded to build sound and useful structures on the foundation of those ideas.

I have been proud to know Mr. Hoover for a long time, and I am proud to have been able to champion his cause throughout the years. And above all, I am proudest of the fact that I am a citizen of a country which, quick to admit its error, now realizes the value of the man, and is eager to pay tribute to his wisdom, unselfishness, and patriotism. Herbert Clark Hoover, the only living ex-President, is today respected, revered, and loved by a grateful Nation.

His concern for our Nation is best expressed in his own words delivered at ceremonies held in his honor at Stanford University earlier this month. He said:

"The founding fathers dedicated the structures of our Government 'to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' We of this generation inherited this precious blessing. Yet as spendthrifts we are on our way to rob posterity of its inheritance.

"The American people have solved many great crises in national life. The qualities of self-restraint, of integrity, of conscience and courage still live in our people. It is not too late to summon these qualities."

To a great American I add my own sentiments to those of the millions of Americans and hundreds of millions all over the world who have sent their best wishes to you on your birthday this month. May God bless you and keep you for many years to come. This Nation and the world need you so badly.

ONLY LIVING FORMER PRESIDENT CELEBRATES SEVENTY-FIFTH YEAR; AMERICANS SALUTE HIM

On August 10, former President Herbert Hoover celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday.

Reprinted here are some of the many messages honoring Mr. Hoover on that day.

The Julius Klein newsletter joins with these men whose tributes are reprinted below in extending our best wishes via this issue of the newsletter.

Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY: "Accept my sincere congratulations upon your seventy-fifth birthday, Mr. Hoover—and my best wishes for many more years of useful service to humanity."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES: "It is pleasing to note the recognition which is being extended to former President Herbert Hoover for the outstanding service he has rendered to our country and to all humanity over so many, many years of his life. His service continues to be a live example of what is best in Americanism and for America. A grateful nation pays tribute to him as he approaches his seventy-fifth birthday anniversary."

Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson: "I regard Herbert Hoover as one of the greatest Americans I have ever known. My best wishes go with him always."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY: "Americans of all political faiths join in expressing our warmest regards to this distinguished public servant whose monumental work on the reorganization of government is but one of his long series of epic achievements of which he and this Nation may, indeed, be proud. The name Hoover has come to mean integrity, industry, impartiality, and character. We say to him good luck and Godspeed Mr. President on many more years of public service."

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON: "America is deeply indebted to Herbert Hoover for many things but I believe that his solid integrity in good times and bad is his greatest contribution to our country. As time gives us a clearer picture of true values, his stature will grow constantly."

Louis B. Mayer: "As one of the great Americans of my lifetime ex-President Hoover is constantly revealing a mature and brilliant concept of both national and international affairs. May God continue to bless our country and our people that he may give more years of this great American mind to function for the good of America."

Gov. Earl Warren, California: "Herbert Hoover has faced life in all its moods, having arrived at the three-quarter century mark in rugged mental and physical health, still serving his country and mankind. He is an inspiration to all who believe in courage and honor, in character and in undaunted determination to fight for the rights and welfare of man."

Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, JR.: "No man in the history of this Nation could have given more abundantly of his genius and selfless devotion to the country he loves. The life of Herbert Hoover is a ringing challenge to all Americans to preserve the Nation and the free institution which he has served so well."

Senator IRVING IVES: "I regard Herbert Hoover as one of the very few truly great Americans of his generation. In great ability, accomplishments, and genuine humanitarianism, he towers above his contemporaries."

Attorney General Tom C. Clark: "I am glad to join with millions of Americans in felicitating former President Herbert Hoover on his seventy-fifth birthday. He is a great American who has given much of his life to public service. His recent efforts on the Hoover Commission have been a fine contribution."

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY: "Herbert Hoover is truly the outstanding elder statesman of American government today. It is a real pleasure to join in extending him every good wish on his seventy-fifth birthday."

Publisher John S. Knight: "Herbert Hoover, our only living ex-President, will be 75 years old on August 10. Few Americans have served their country or the world community more conscientiously and more effectively."

Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson says he is deeply grateful to Mr. Hoover for the work of the Hoover Commission in the field of national security and for the continued and unremitting assistance he gave in connection with the enactment of the National Security Act amendments of 1949. To a very great degree, these 1949 amendments to the Unification Act are the product of his Commission, and it is especially fitting that these amendments will be signed by the President and will become law very close to the date of his birthday.

W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of Air Force: "I count it a privilege that I have known Mr. Hoover personally and that I have been permitted to observe at close hand his devotion to the American virtues."

Hon. James W. Gerard: "When on a mission to Germany I first learned to admire Herbert Hoover because of his masterly handling of food for Belgium and occupied France. Time kills some reputations but that of Herbert Hoover will increase as time goes on. History will give him a great place."

Secretary of the Senate Leslie Biffle: "It has been my pleasure to know the Honorable Herbert Hoover for many years. We all appreciate the great service he has rendered to our Government and to the peoples of the world."

Other messages too numerous to be reprinted here have been received, but we would like to add to our list the names of former Postmaster General James A. Farley, former Secretary of War Robert Patterson, and Gen. George Marshall, who said: "I especially appreciate the honor we wish to pay this great American."

Poland Wants To Expand Her Trade With the United States—Her Import of American Goods Has Declined About Two-thirds Since 1946—Trend Is Still Downward

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the August issue of the magazine Export Trade and Shipper. The article is written by Mrs. Stella K. Margold.

Mrs. Margold, who has conducted a combination export-import business for the past 10 years, principally with western and eastern Europe and the Middle East, recently returned from a month's business trip to Poland, with the following message to American world traders. Previous to setting up the American Products Co. in Boston in 1939, Mrs. Margold was connected with the Washington headquarters of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—for 2 years—and the Department of Commerce—for 5 years. She served in the RFC as research secretary on foreign and export matters, concentrating largely on matters in connection with preparing for the China loan of that day. With the Commerce Department she acted as business consultant, principally in connection with the eastern European and Middle East areas. Born in New York City of Russian parents, Mrs. Margold completed course requirements for a doctor of philosophy degree in international relations at the University of Michigan, after receiving her bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees.

The article follows:

That Poland desires trade with the west is evident not only from her trade figures, but from other facts and comments in significant Warsaw newspapers, such as the Tribuna Ludu (People's Tribune) and Zycie Warszawy (Warsaw Life).

These newspapers, commenting on the Council of European Mutual Assistance, created as the Molotov plan, declared that while Poland desires closer relations with the west, it is the actions of the west in setting up trade restrictions against her which made it necessary for Poland to join the CEMA.

That Poland and other eastern European countries are discriminated against by the United States, and through United States influence, by other western countries, was brought out last winter in the testimony of

a top executive of the Economic Cooperation Administration before the Senate Banking Committee, during a discussion on trade restrictions.

Yet Poland is living up to her contracts with American firms, even relative to commodities for which our American Government does not issue permits. Orders placed by Poland in the United States for industrial equipment, medical hospital supplies, and other items in 1947, for which export licenses are not being issued, are being paid for in accordance with the signed agreements. The total sums paid on such contracts are now over $4,000,000.

POLAND'S TRADE WITH RUSSIA

Although Poland's trade with the Soviet Union has increased in actual figures, it has decreased in importance. In 1945 Russia exported to Poland 90 percent of Poland's imports; in 1947 this trade dropped to 26 percent. In 1945 Russia bought 93 percent of Polish exports, whereas in 1947 this figure was 28 percent. The total of Poland's exports and imports increased from seventy-one and eight-tenths millions in 1945 to approximately $1,000,000,000 in 1948. This is more than twice Poland's foreign trade before World War II. And this was accomplished in spite of our export controls.

With its approximately 120,000 square miles and about 24,000,000 people, Poland bought almost twice as much from the United States in 1948, as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with its 200,000,000 of people. Yet this $54,837,216 of goods which Poland purchased from the United States in 1948 was approximately half of what she purchased here in 1947—$106,156,171—and less than one-third of her purchases in 1946, namely $170,535,702.

The downward trend in Poland's trade with the United States between 1946 and 1948 is becoming even more noticeable in 1949. For, during the first 4 months of this year, Poland's purchases here were only $6,600,000, a fraction of what they were in recent years. And this is happening at a time when we need more foreign business.

REASONS FOR LACK OF TRADE

The reasons why Poland is not buying from us are simple. She is cutting her purchases in the United States to a minimum primarily because of our trade restrictions. Our export licensing system is preventing the shipment of goods to Poland. Secondly, we are buying very little from Poland. There is no doubt that Poland could absorb more than $170,500,000 of American goods a year, if the trade weather were more agreeable.

Orders placed by Poland in the United States for industrial equipment, medical, hospital supplies, and a steel mill in 1947, were restrained from shipment by our Government. And our Government tightened her restrictions in 1948. Only recently were a few items released, but it remains to be seen whether the steel mill will begin to move to Poland in August as scheduled. Yet during the period between 1947 and 1949, obligations were met on time, in cash, as specified in Polish contracts with American firms even though the goods were not shipped as specified in the contract.

Our trade policy has caused Poland to stop buying cotton from us. She bought 136,901 tons of it in 1948 from other sources. There are no American rails or other American railroad equipment entering Poland. Poland is cutting her purchases to a minimum. This is quite pleasing to the Russians, for in many instances it gives Poland no alternative but to trade with Russia and other countries on Russia's borders. For this will aid the success of Russia's Council of Economic Mutual Assistance (CEMA) to stimulate trade between the Soviet Union and its border countries.

We worsen our trade position also by buying so little from Poland. The discrepancy in imports and exports in the trade between Poland and ourselves creates a shortage of dollars, a situation we hear about in the Marshall plan countries. And Poland has not even received such aid.

When Poland bought from us over $80,000,000 of goods in 1945, we spent only $3,504 there; when she purchased over $170,500,0000 worth of goods in 1946, our purchases were $258,075, or about 0.0015 percent of her purchases here. The following year our purchases went up to $1,335,083, and in 1948 were $1,248,884.

We appear to be increasing our purchases in 1949. In the first 4 months of 1949 we spent over $1,000,000 in Poland for goods. But the discrepancy, however, between purchases and sales is still very high, for Poland's reduced purchases in the first 4 months of 1949 are still 6.6 times greater than our purchases from her.

MUST INCREASE OUR IMPORTS

If we want Poland to increase her sales here, we must find means to increase our purchases from her or be ready to grant a credit. That we can find means to increase our purchases is evident from the fact that the discrepancies in two-way trade were not nearly as great before World War II.

In 1938, when Poland purchased around $25,000,000 worth of goods, we bought from her $13,877,074 worth of products. Our imports of meat products alone that year were $9,300,000. Another big item was edible vegetable food products and beverages, which totaled over $1,000,000, and vegetable products, inedible, over $700,000. Wool and manufactures thereof came to almost $700,000 also.

It might be argued that Poland's disrupted agriculture since the war has not recovered sufficiently to supply meat and vegetable products for export. For not only did Poland have the problem of resettlement, and new settlements in the "recovered" German areas, but because of the threat of collectivization, farmers slaughtered cattle as they did in Russia 18 years ago. And her grain crops did not reach prewar level until 1948–49.

With the announcement that collectivization would proceed only on a voluntary basis, and very slowly (for example, no more than 1 percent of the farmers the first year) and with a support price set on grain by the Polish Government, and supplies of fodder more plentiful, Poland will have more agricultural products, including leather to sell us.

PRODUCTS AVAILABLE

This year an American purchased a large quantity of dried mushrooms in Poland at a very advantageous price. Since we have a shortage of meat here, which holds up our domestic price, purchases from Poland should not disrupt our economy. But there are other products than meat and agricultural items we can buy from Poland.

Before the war Poland sold us undressed furs. There is no reason why we should not buy these, or dressed furs, from her now. The quality of her baum marten and fitch is excellent. Beverages played an important part in our trade before the war. These, especially Polish vodka, should be on sale here. Polish angustura is said to be the best in the world, and its price is ridiculously low. Poland can sell us in addition large quantities of linen, down, novelties of wood and pottery, glassware, and lace. She is making very sturdy plushes in varieties unobtainable here. And the prices are low because her domestic market cannot absorb the supply.

Since most of the large-scale trading is carried on with government agencies as in Russia, the best bargains can be arrived at by going to the premises. One may try to contact Plasco at 39 Broadway in New York City, but much time can be saved, and probably a lower price obtained at the government headquarters in Poland. The central agencies are not all located in the capital city of Warsaw. For instance, the central agency for linens or plushes in the Lodz.

That Poland desires trade with the west may be noted from the fact that since World War II 47 trade treaties have been signed with countries throughout the world, including Great Britain and the Argentine. The latest agreement was signed with the western zones of Germany. Before that, in June, trade agreements with Italy, Switzerland, and Egypt were entered into, and in April, with India and Pakistan, for an exchange of goods valued at $25,000,000.

THE DESIRE TO TRADE

Poland had no alternative but to trade with the Soviet Union after the liberation during World War II. Since then the trend is changing. In 1945 Russia exported to Poland 90 percent of Poland's imports; in 1947 this trade dropped to 26 percent. In 1945 Russia bought 93 percent of Polish exports; in 1947 this figure was 28 percent of Poland's total exports.

It is likely, however, that because of Poland's reduction in trade with the United States in 1948 and 1949 the percentages of trade with Russia may show some increase.

Poland has made it amply evident she wants to trade with the west. And she wants to trade with us, as is evidenced by her purchases before we restricted our exports to her. She appreciates American products and American know-how.

Because of our trade restrictions and the unfavorable trade balances Czech tractors plow Polish land today; mainly Russian cotton is being woven in Polish textile mills on British, not American, machinery.

Ten-thousand-ton tankers and all sorts of other capital goods are being supplied by Britain. Even Kellex chemicals, which we regard as dangerous war material, is purchased by the British in the United States and sold to Poland. Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria are selling to Poland ball bearings. Sweden is also selling electrical railway equipment.

What are we going to do about it?

Sea Power and a National General Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the entire Nation are focused on hearings now being held by the Committee on Armed Services concerning the Navy and its part in our future national defense policy. The problem is a very grave one, and on its proper solution may very well depend the security of our Nation, our form of government and our way of life. It is well that the repercussions of these hearings are reaching every corner of the land, and it is to be hoped that every individual will inform himself of all phases of this complex and difficult problem.

One of the most far-reaching results of the so-called "unification" of the armed services is the likelihood that it will create a national general staff. What may be expected in such an event is set forth by Lt. Col. J. D. Hittle, United States Marine Corps, in an article pub-

lished in the current issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings.

The article is accompanied by the following biography of its author:

A graduate of Michigan State College, Lieutenant Colonel Hittle was commissioned in the Marine Corps in 1937. After service on the cruiser *Portland* and with the Fleet Marine Corps, he commanded the marine detachment on the U. S. S. *Washington* with the British Home Fleet at Scapa Flow shortly after Pearl Harbor. He served with the Third Marine Division at Iwo Jima, and after Japan's surrender he commanded the Second Battalion along the Peiping-Mukden railroad in China. After subsequent service as secretary of the Academic Board, Marine Corps School, Quantico, Va., he is at present executive officer of the NROTC unit at the University of Utah. He is author of the books: The Military Staff—Its History and Development; and Jomini's Art of War.

Also accompanying the article is the following special statement disclaiming official sponsorship:

The opinions or assertions in this article are the private ones of the author, and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

Because of its importance and its unusual interest at this time, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the article:

SEA POWER AND A NATIONAL GENERAL STAFF

(By Lt. Col. J. D. Hittle, U. S. Marine Corps)

A national general staff and strong sea power cannot, at the same time, exist in the same country.

Present efforts to create a supreme general staff in the United States are nothing particularly new. Ever since World War I, when our national military thinking was brought into intimate association with European thought, there has been an unceasing clamor for the adoption of such a system of over-all armed forces control for our air, naval, and land forces. Repeatedly Congress has considered bills having as their principal objective the establishment of a supreme general staff. Just as frequently, Congress has consistently rejected the proposals, judging a national general staff to be inappropriate to the requirements of our national security and antithetical to the democratic character of our Government.

Historically the national general staff is a product of continental European military thought, the brain child of a landlocked military intellect. Prussia developed the arch type of supreme general staff, and it has since been, with good reason, referred to as the Prussian system.

In its basic form a national general staff is not complex. Its essential attributes are a top-level staff organization headed by one officer possessing the power of decision. That power of decision may be legally vested in that individual; it may be a power of decision that has been delegated by higher governmental authority; or it may be usurped, the latter process having frequently been adopted when power did not accrue with sufficient speed. Regardless of what it is called, when one man, assisted by a staff, directly or indirectly exercises power of decision over all land, sea, and air elements of a country's armed forces, then that country has a national general staff.

There is no doubt that a diagrammed structure of a supreme general staff presents an attractive picture to those seeking a simple solution to the problem of over-all control of armed forces. On any graph of such an organization sharp black vertical lines clearly delineate the channels of command. At the bottom of the lines are the heads of three services—land, sea, and air. As the lines go upward, the sources of authority pyramid rapidly, converging in the supreme guiding agency, the national general staff headed by the chief of that staff. The very apex of the pyramid of power is the chief of the national general staff. This is a simple and attractive picture of armed forces command. Its attractiveness is also deceptive.

At the peak of this pyramid of military power is the supreme general staff with its chief; and therein lies the fallacy of the concept. It is fallacious because there has never been a supreme general staff that has been able to understand and properly apply the diverse but mutually dependent agencies of land, sea, and air power. The directing force of the supreme staff is its chief, exercising the power of decision as to how the various elements of the armed forces must be employed to realize maximum effectiveness. The job description for a man in such a position calls for an unusual type of genius. There have been a few geniuses in modern military history, but there has never been one capable of adequately performing the duties of the chief of the supreme general staff of a nation whose security depends on the successful application of more than one type of power.

As the history of the supreme general staff concept is traced from its succesful use in land-minded Prussia on through its application in the German armed forces, the collective inadequacies of a supreme staff and its chief become increasingly apparent. In keeping with Prussian precedent the great German general staff dominated the armed forces of Germany prior to and during World War I. To all practical purposes the great general staff was the supreme general staff. Its authority over the nascent, but potentially powerful, German Navy was a practical fact.

There were those in Germany who understood sea power, but such individuals could never prevail over the great general staff. Such institutions have the peculiar habit of being able to think in only one kind of power and since the German Army was understandably land-minded, its great general staff, in effect the supreme national general staff, possessed a land-locked military intellect.

The sea-power-conscious leaders in Germany quickly learned an axiomatic truth about national general staffs: such institutions have single-track—or single-power—minds. To the detriment of the German war effort, the great general staff was land-power-minded.

The misunderstood role of German sea power prior to and during World War I was a case in point. After a lifetime of combating general staff land-mindedness old Grand Admiral von Tirpitz sadly remarked: "The German people will never understand sea power." With considerably more accuracy, von Tirpitz might have said, "The great general staff will never understand sea power." From the practical standpoint this would have been a much more meaningful statement, for it really didn't make very much difference whether or not the German people understood sea power. Germany was a general staff state, and so the only thing that mattered was the understanding of the supreme general staff.

In spite of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, the great German general staff never did really die. After years of underground existence, the general staff was brought out into the open and its place in the German Nation was defiantly proclaimed by Hitler. The philosophy of the general staff was still land power, and German sea power suffered accordingly.

Anyone who still nurtures the notion that the agencies of sea, land, and air power can live like three happy children within the family of the single general staff should learn well the story of the misfortunes that befell German naval power as the result of the machinations of its enemies within the Nazi supreme staff system. Actually the German Navy's struggle for effective status went back to the early days of Hitler's power. Back in 1933 and 1934, when the German war machine first began to flex its muscles, the naval leaders began dodging the attacks originating from within the land and air elements of the armed forces.

From 1933 until almost the beginning of the late war there was an internal battle going on within the German armed forces over the question of the detailed organization of the top-level direction for war. Out of this mass of argument one clearly discernible concept runs through all of the correspondence, regardless of originator; it was the concept of the over-all staff for all of the armed forces, with a chief or director at the head of that staff.

Principal exponent of the highly centralized supreme staff was General Keitel. In 1934 Keitel was chief of an innocuous-appearing section of the armed forces called the armed forces office, and was charged with general matters pertaining to matériel and war economy matters. This armed forces office warrants close scrutiny, for its steady rise to power demonstrates again how subtle is the process by which the national general staff concept can achieve domination over the armed forces. By the very expeditious process of clinging tightly to Hitler's coattails and sponsoring reorganization within the armed forces, Keitel assumed increasing power. By 1937 he was able to inform the three services that his office would be developed into an armed forces staff. This led to the next step in 1938 when Hitler created, by directive, the Armed Forces High Command—Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (or OKW for short)—and appointed Keitel its chief. The exact form that his top directing agency was to take was the source of the dispute among the chiefs of the three services.

Von Brauchitsch, commander in chief of the army, understood well the nature of the national general staff system, and sought to assure the official recognition of the army (ground force) primacy within its organization. He readily praised the establishment of the OKW, and then proceeded to stake out the claim for Army domination of that agency. The essence of von Brauchitsch's proposal was that the chief of staff to the supreme commander should also be the commander in chief of the army. If approved, his proposal would have assured the unquestioned continuation of army domination over the armed forces. It would simplify the matter considerably by official recognition of the domination that had in the past been achieved, however effectively, often by indirection. Von Brauchitsch knew full well the axiomatic principle that in every instance in which a supreme general staff is established, there is one branch of the services, regardless of whatever so-called equality exists among the three branches, that dominates the other services. He meant to settle the question before bickering began. In short, von Brauchitsch's proposal was simply an attempt to impose ground-force domination with the least possible effort.

Raeder, spokesman for the navy, realized what was in the offing for his branch of the armed forces, and he entered the memorandum-writing fray, shrewdly acknowledging the principle of the supreme general staff, but offering proposals that would, he hoped, preserve at least a semblance of naval participation in the top level planning. A major feature of Raeder's counterproposal called for each service staff within the top-level supreme staff to do its own service planning. If for nothing else, this was to

insure that naval planning was not bungled by those whose only interest in naval matters was to gain authority over them.

Hitler brought the memorandum exchanges to a quick conclusion in June of 1938 with the issuance of an executive order outlining the basic features of the OKW. As things eventually worked out, neither Keitel nor von Brauchitsch missed their principal objectives. Both were from the army; both were general staff officers. The army general staff dominated the OKW throughout its effective life. The only ones who really lost were Raeder and his navy—and Germany.

The historical truth, known by von Brauchitsch and feared by Raeder, that one branch would dominate the supreme general staff, was quickly manifested. Army general staff preeminence within the OKW sounded the doom of German naval power.

In keeping with precedent, Germanic military thinking did not fully grasp the concept of naval power. German land and air commanders could not understand that modern naval power rested on a foundation of balanced forces. Consequently, the need for adequate naval aviation was quite incomprehensible to those who dominated the top staff levels of the Nazi forces.

In the light of what is now known about national general staffs, we are able to recognize the unrelenting attack on German naval aviation as an almost natural development. Historically the idea of a single air force has been inseparably associated with the concept of the single national general staff. Almost as a matter of reciprocation, such staffs have resulted in the establishment of a single air force. It must be admitted that the German naval leaders were stubborn people, for as much as they must have realized that the dice were heavily loaded against them, they kept up a bitter rear-guard action against their interservice opponents for several years.

The conflict over naval aviation revolved about one very fundamental question. The single air force enthusiasts openly contended that such aviation as was maintained for naval purposes should be under the command of the German Air Ministry in every regard. Raeder was enough of a realist to know that this meant that the navy would not have anything approaching adequate air support. So, in keeping with sound naval thinking, he stoutly contended that naval air units were just as much a part of the fleet as were submarines, and all should be under naval command. Logic may have have been on Raeder's side, but since the battle over naval aviation was going to be fought within the supreme staff, the logic of the argument would not in the end counterbalance the strength of the antinaval army and air force elements of the supreme general staff.

Always the navy was on the defensive, trying to beat off the air force grabs for more authority over naval aviation. In spite of Raeder's continued protests that the naval commanders should have command of all the naval weapons, the single air force proponents succeeded just before the outbreak of the war in putting the commander in chief, air, in policy control over naval aviation. It was not to be the last time that Raeder was forced to yield to the encroachments of those who sought to destroy naval aviation.

Along with policy control over naval air units went the power of allocation of planes to naval air. With such authority in the hands of the air force, naval aviation was never adequate for even reconnaissance purposes.

This began to assume even more serious proportions in early 1940. Then, with the struggle for the North Atlantic moving toward a decision, the role of German sea power was of critical, even decisive, importance. Sound naval policy called for the maximum naval air effort, both in reconnaissance and attack missions.

But at this vital period of the naval war, naval air, instead of being strengthened, was weakened. In 1939 the commander in chief, air, had agreed to a definite number of planes to be allocated for naval purposes. But then in 1940, when increased naval aviation was urgently needed to help cut the North Atlantic convoys, naval aviation was reduced. Technically, the air force commander did not violate his prior agreement. But he did violate it in spirit. The total number of squadrons agreed upon was not altered. He merely directed the reduction of the number of planes per squadron.

Nor was the air force interference limited to control of units and material. The incursion into the navy's sphere of responsibility even went so far that the air force disapproved the use of aerial torpedoes, judging them to be uneconomical, and refused to furnish naval air units with the necessary fittings to equip the planes to carry torpedoes. However, later, when the value of aerial torpedoes was established beyond dispute, the air force admitted the need of such a weapon, and proceeded to organize its own torpedo squadrons.

The story of aerial mining operations is similar to that of the aerial torpedoes. As soon as the air mines became available, the navy saw their value and was interested in their immediate use. Goering, as head of the air force, opposed naval air mining operations, contending that none should be used until 5,000 mines were ready. Then, later, when mining operations were begun, the air force requested that all such operations be conducted by the ninth air division of the air force, because naval air units did not have the necessary planes to carry out such missions. The navy agreed to the request. It could do little else; the commander in chief, air, had planned it that way.

But the onslaught against naval aviation, and sea power, did not end with this major triumph by the head of the single air force. No, nothing but the complete destruction of naval air would be consonant with the philosophy of a single air force. Since the single air force was in harmony with the concept of a national general staff, the relentless battle against the navy's air arm continued, with the issues being fought out within the OKW, thus providing the opponents of naval air with a battle site of their own choosing. In such a position Raeder could not hope to win. Always there was issue being raised by the commander in chief, air. If it looked as though Raeder would be forced to yield, or at least agree to an unhappy compromise, the ground force members of the OKW remained apart from the dispute, much as if sitting at the ringside and watching their favorite belt a hopelessly outmatched opponent through the ropes.

But let there be no mistaken idea that the ground force members of the OKW (the national general staff) were reluctant to enter into the dispute over naval aviation. In fact they willingly took sides and acted the parts of the interested parties that they were whenever it appeared that the defenders of naval air might gain an important point.

For instance, by September of 1940 the position of naval aviation had deteriorated to the point where the commander in chief, air, began issuing orders directly to naval air units directly under naval command. On one occasion a naval air group engaged in vitally important reconnaissance over the North Sea was ordered to participate with the air force in the attacks on London. Naval commanders protested the order, for it went far beyond even the previous agreements by which the commander in chief, air, had gained almost complete control of naval air. If this bold effort to exercise even direct operational control over naval air units assigned to the navy was successful, naval aviation would suffer a further loss. And there wasn't much more left to lose.

Almost as soon as the dispute developed, it was announced that the question would be settled by the OKW. A few hours later it was directed that the order of the air force commander would be obeyed. Who made that decision? General Jodl, chief of the operations division of the OKW, and Hitler's close assistant, a career general staff officer imbued with the continental philosophy of war. So, again, the navy lost an important issue. It lost because the very nature of the supreme general staff was such that even the commander in chief of the navy was so hopelessly submerged in the system that, when he protested against the arrogant encroachment of those who sought to destroy a vital element of naval power, he could appeal only to the friends of this antagonist. Neither did a direct appeal to Hitler, the supreme commander, offer a solution to Raeder's dilemma. When Raeder felt compelled to take his case to Hitler, the request for such a conference was addressed to Jodl. It is readily understandable, then, why Raeder was never overly successful in getting Hitler to overrule a decision made by Jodl, his representative on the supreme general staff.

By February 1941, the erosion process to which naval aviation had been subjected had progressed to the point where Raeder, as if in desperation, again carried his case to Hitler, protesting against further continued incursions into naval matters by the air force. This latest effort to protect the remnants of naval aviation played directly into the hands of the antinaval elements of the OKW. By forcing the issue with a conference with Hitler, Raeder opened the way for the issuance of a directive for settlement of the dispute. The directive was issued, but it was not the kind of a settlement hoped for by the naval authorities. Again, Jodl facilitated the achievement of the air force objectives. The directive that was issued not only settled the points in question but it also sealed the fate of naval aviation. Jodl brought up in the land-minded atmosphere of the general staff, and never understanding the true meaning of sea power nor the principles of its application, was, because of his position within the German national general staff (OKW), able to play a decisive role in the achievement of the air force goal of a single air force through the destruction of the naval air arm. Jodl personally assisted in the drafting of the directive.

From the beginning of the struggle over naval aviation Raeder never had a chance. Whatever arguments there were between the air and ground elements of the OKW were forgotten when the question of naval aviation arose. The air force wanted to achieve a single air force, something that could be accomplished only through the destruction of naval air. Ground representatives didn't understand sea power and could not see the need for the navy possessing its own naval air elements. Besides, did not the very concept of a supreme general staff have as its corollary a single air force? Thus, the practical result was that as far as naval aviation was concerned, the air and the ground forces within the OKW forgot their differences and made common cause against the navy's air arm. Consequently, Raeder was in as tight a box as ever a man found himself. This supreme general staff that frustrated and smothered his every effort to protect German naval aviation was more than an ordinary box; it was the coffin of German sea power.

But the story of the sad fate of German naval aviation serves a purpose beyond showing that a naval arm with its own air elements cannot exist under a national general staff. It pointedly illustrates that under a single general staff and a single air force there can be no naval aviation in the sense that naval men understand it and use it. The very same lack of comprehension that prompts its involuntary inclusion into a

single air force results in its ultimate extermination.

Because strong naval power is unattainable unless it includes a necessarily powerful naval air arm, the annihilation of German naval aviation at the hands of the Nazi national general staff amounted to much more than an interservice squabble. In effect it represented a failure to exploit German sea power to the maximum at the very time when British survival hinged on adequate sea communications. Viewed from the allied standpoint, the intrastaff vendetta against the air arm of the German navy was a fortunate development, for had a strong naval air element been available to supplement the U-boat effort it is possible, as has been claimed, that such naval air assistance would have resulted in unbearable allied shipping losses. Whether it would have turned the tide may be conjectural, but it is hardly debatable that an effective German naval air arm would have forced the battle of the North Atlantic to a much closer decision.

So while rejoicing in the realization that the German supreme staff system brought about the destruction of its own navy's aviation, thus sparing the allies the tough and added burden of doing so themselves, we must realize that adoption of such a staff system in this country would unquestionably result in bringing about in time of war the same beneficial results for our nation's enemies.

However significant the fate of naval air under the OKW, the destruction of German naval aviation represented only one aspect of German failure to understand the capabilities of sea power and to apply it knowingly. From the Baltic to the Black Sea German naval capabilities were largely disregarded by the national general staff that directed the Axis war effort. In no instance was sea power utilized properly to assist the prosecution of land campaigns. The German Air Force, as if taking a page from Douhet and Mitchell, and believing in its own invincibility, continued to be guided and enthralled by the false air power creed that relegated Mahan's philosophy of sea power to the ash can of history. The army general staff, which continued to dominate the OKW, was steeped in the traditions of the great general staff and, like it, was land-minded to an extreme. So, within the confines of the all-powerful OKW it was as if sea power was a thing anathematized.

Here, briefly, are but a few examples of how the OKW, the national general staff, failed to use available naval power, to facilitate a major campaign.

In Norwegian operations as well as the campaigns against Holland, Belgium, and France, Nazi planning was characterized by a chronic failure to employ available naval strength to cooperate with and assist the land effort. The German High Command thought in terms of land power, and consequently it misused sea power.

On the basis of high German naval opinion it is not illogical to speculate but that the German failure to understand and use naval power contributed to the success of the British escape at Dunkerque; and—what is of possibly more significance in this study—such German failure to use the sea deprived the land forces of a complete victory. The long range result of this error by the supreme staff was in no way favorable to the Nazi war effort.

After Dunkerque England was at the mercy of the Nazi might. All that was needed was the final attack across the English Channel. But, the German supreme general staff, while fixing its gaze on the island objective, overlooked the narrow strip of water separating the Continent from Dover's chalk cliffs. This, incidentally, was the same mistake made more than a century before by Napoleon, another advocate of the single general staff system. None of the many examples of German staff ignorance of sea power is more pointed than that provided by the long planned, highly touted, but never executed Operation Sea Lion, the proposed cross-channel assault.

Never has there been a better example of how a national general staff, its thinking geared to problems of land-mass warfare as was the German OKW, is utterly lost when confronted with the problem of conducting a major amphibious operation. Such ignorance of major overwater assault principles stemmed directly from the German Army's long preoccupation with the problems of land warfare. Like the armies of other nations between the last great wars, the German Army never evidenced more than a vague academic interest in amphibious matters. Blissfully it went along in the years before World War II considering amphibious operations much as a wide river crossing. Consequently, when the OKW turned to the task of planning for Sea Lion, it found itself without any amphibious doctrine. Indeed it is pertinent to observe that the only nation that had an adequate amphibious doctrine at the outbreak of the war was the United States, where there was no national general staff to prevent full realization of the meaning of sea power nor to stifle its development.

German staff planning for the projected landing against England was characterized by an almost unbelievable ignorance of the most basic naval knowledge. Original plans prescribed a landing force of 40 divisions. However, as soon as the planning agencies, which in this case were not naval, were informed of the amphibious facts of life by the highly distraught Navy officials, the figure was scaled reluctantly to a mere 13 divisions. The utter ludicrousness of even this latter figure is readily seen when it is realized that it was not until late in the war that the United States Navy was able to embark landing forces of even half a dozen divisions. And, by the farthest stretch of fancy, available German shipping could not come close to carrying a fraction of the scaled-down figure of 13 divisions.

Napoleon once observed, "Masters of the Channel for 6 hours and we are masters of the world." Neither Napoleon's France nor Hitler's Germany could achieve channel mastery for those 6 precious hours. High among the reasons for such failure is the fact that the armed forces of both were directed by a national general staff, dominated by a land power philosophy that precluded the understanding and proper use of sea power.

In the Mediterranean theater there was abundant opportunity to utilize Axis seapower to assist the land campaigns. But, here again, the OKW failed to comprehend what was meant by gaining strength on land through domination of the water areas. Both Italian and German naval authorities claim that Malta could have been seized early in the war. Axis seizure of Malta would have conceivably set off a chain reaction of events all unfavorable to the Allies.

It is not our purpose to attempt to determine whether or not the Axis could have seized Malta in 1939–40. What is important is this: Despite the great advantages to be gained from such action it appears, on the basis of available information, that the OKW never seriously considered or prepared even a tentative Mediterranean campaign plan based on seizure of Malta and the control of Mediterranean waters. Of added significance is the fact that a naval representative actually presented top staff officers a concept for such a campaign in the Mediterranean based upon exploitation of sea power. It was curtly rejected and the plans went no further. Again the landmindedness of the OKW precluded, to the probable detriment of the German war effort, the exploitation of the sea for the purpose of assisting the battles on land.

The Russian campaign is generally viewed as exclusively a land struggle. At least such was the view of the land-minded staff that prepared the plans for the Russian campaign. German effort against the left (north) flank suffered from a failure to apply naval power, principally in the form of landings in rear of Russian concentrations, to assist the land offensive.

On the southern extremity of the Russian battle line was the Black Sea. To the German armies striking for the rich oil lands beyond its eastern littoral that body of water proved to be a major obstacle necessitating a long, laborious campaign around its shore. To the land-minded OKW the Black Sea appeared an obstacle, and so it was permitted to be just that. Yet to those who understood sea power the Black Sea lay like a shorter and safer route to the coveted oil fields. Therefore, the objective, instead of being to get around the Black Sea, should have been, obviously, to control it in order to use its direct sea lanes, free from the constant threat of Russian land power. The feasibility of such a plan is attested to by high German naval authority, which pointedly contends that a determined air and naval offensive would have reduced the Red Navy units in those waters. This, combined with air-borne and amphibious attacks against Russian harbor facilities, would have resulted in German domination of the Black Sea, which in turn would have permitted economical water transport of men and material down the Danube and across the Black Sea to the vital Baku area.

In this, as in all other instances where the sea exerted an influence on German military operations, the OKW failed to realize the relationship of sea power to the land campaigns. Land-power concepts of road and railroad rearward communications prevailed even in this southeastern theater dominated by the Black Sea. Because the military leaders of Germany were by tradition trained to think in terms of land warfare, the campaign in the Black Sea area was conducted in accordance with the continental concept of war, and consequently, it remained estranged from the sea.

When the fate of German naval aviation is considered along with the Nazi national general staff's failure to understand and use sea power, we can understand why British Air Vice Marshal Kingston-McCloughrey has stated in his study of high command methods: "The OKW is generally regarded as having been one of the most important factors leading to Germany's defeat."

Yet, in their failure to exploit the Black Sea the Germans were not alone. Russian effort in those waters was largely characterized by the same disinclination to conduct aggressive sea operations with the forces available. The passiveness of the Russian Black Sea fleet resulted in a failure to exploit Red sea power against the limited German coastal shipping and land positions. This deficiency, of course, was but the reflection of the fact that the Russian armed forces, like the German, were directed by a supreme general staff.

Land-mindedness in the direction of the Russian war effort was assured by the fact that the Red Army general staff was, for all practical purposes, the general staff of all the armed forces. The important point of all this is that the misunderstanding and misuse of sea power was a deficiency common to both the German and Russian conduct of the war. Both utilized a supreme general staff system for the direction of their armed forces. Both supreme general staffs were dominated by their ground force general staffs. Consequently the traditional continental land-minded concept of warfare prevailed in the conduct of the Russian as well as the German war effort. National general

staffs of enemy powers clearly manifested the same characteristics. This most certainly should emphasize the fact that German land mindedness and ignorance of sea power was not peculiar to that nation. In Germany, as in Russia, it was inherent in the system of the national general staff.

The example of the United States contrasts sharply with that of those countries having a national general staff system and which as a result failed to understand sea power. In the United States, Congress has repeatedly rejected the national general staff concept. Instead of a supreme staff system, incapable of concurrently understanding and applying land, sea, and air power, this country utilizes our Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

One of the principal differences between the continental supreme general staffs and our Joint Chiefs of Staff is that under the United States concept no one service should be dominated by the others. Decisions, until recently, were reached on the basis of unanimity. In this respect it is probably impossible for the continental military mind to believe that we have achieved such effective military power without vesting final power of decision in one military commander or chief of staff; but such is the evidence of history. Those who contend that deliberative agencies, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are incapable of making decisions, overlook the very important fact that during the entire war there were not over five or six questions that could not be resolved unanimously by the Joint Chiefs.

The absence of a national general staff in the United States has had a beneficial influence on our national security. For instance, a supreme-staff system could well have meant the end of effective naval aviation at the very time when that element of our naval power was undergoing one of its most important periods of development. In 1936 an interservice controversy arose over whether the United States warplanes should be liquid cooled or air cooled. The spokesmen for naval aviation defended the air-cooled motor and insisted on its continued use and development for naval purposes. The Navy refused to yield on this point. There was no single chief of staff and so there was no military authority possessing the power to direct the Navy to change from air-cooled to liquid-cooled engines. So naval aviation continued to concentrate on such power plants, which, incidentally, powered 85 percent of all United States (not just naval) aircraft in the last war.

How different could have been the result of this controversy had our armed forces been under a national general staff system. A single chief of staff would have had the authority to make an administrative decision that would have not only retarded the advance of the Navy's air arm, but, as things eventually worked out, it would have detrimentally affected the growth of air power in this country. It might be well to remember, in connection with this incident, that when the Navy's air cooled engine policy was attacked, the Navy went right ahead making and improving the air cooled engines; in a somewhat similar controversy the German Navy, handicapped by the national general staff, was not even permitted the necessary fittings to handle aerial torpedoes.

The Marine Corps, as developed in the United States, is a unique and major feature of our national sea power. Integration of adequate Marine landing forces into naval organization, a policy pursued by United States naval leaders since the Spanish-American War, has resulted in the achievement of a form of naval power found in no other modern nation's armed forces. Adherence to a policy of developing Marine fleet landing forces resulted, quite understandably, in the progressive development of a farsighted and fundamentally sound doctrine for the conduct of major amphibious operations. The efficacy of such naval policy manifested its worth in World War II, when prosecution of decisive offensive action against the Axis Powers was largely dependent upon the ability to conduct amphibious operations. It is one of the includible facts of history that without the benefit of amphibious know-how, produced by the Marine Corps and Navy, Allied plans for carrying the battle to the enemy would have been shackled by the same ignorance of amphibious doctrine that doomed the Nazi "Operation Sea Lion" from the minute that the need for a cross-channel assault was perceived.

A national general staff in this country during the first half of the twentieth century would quite probably have prevented the creation of strong fleet landing forces, and, because the existence of such naval agencies are a prerequisite to the continued development of landing doctrine, the light of amphibious knowledge that lit the way to victory in World War II would have been snuffed out while being kindled.

It takes but a brief recollection of the attacks leveled against the Marine Corps and its mission during the early 1930's to realize how certain would have been its fate under a national general staff. The certainty that Fleet Marine Forces would have been eliminated as a major element of naval power is all the more heavily underlined by the persistence of attacks against the Marine Corps. Even during and after World War II, in which the wisdom of our Nation's amphibious naval policy was so repeatedly and forcefully demonstrated, our naval power would have been in grave danger of being shorn of its Marine landing forces had a national general staff system been in effect in this country.

And this is no mere speculation. It is a matter of official documentary record that over a prolonged period the Chief of Naval Operations was the only chief-of-service member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who favored continuation of the Marine Corps in the form and for the purpose for which it had developed as an agency of naval power. While there was a failure by some elements of the armed services to understand the need for Fleet Marine Forces, there was fortunately no Chief of Staff with the power to eliminate the marines as amphibious specialists. Thus the naval service has retained its Fleet Marine Forces, and, as the history of the past decade clearly shows, our national security has been accordingly enhanced. Again, how different would have been the course of the late war if, for instance, a single chief of staff had decided sometime in the early 1930's that the Navy did not need Fleet Marine Forces.

Nor is it logical to contend that balanced naval power would survive under a national general staff system established in the future. In view of the long standing lack of comprehension manifested by nonnaval elements of the armed forces with respect to the need for Fleet Marine Forces and strong naval aviation, the fate of the United States naval power under a national general staff of today or tomorrow would be just the same and just as certain as it would have been under a national general staff any time in the past half century.

Fundamental philosophies of military power do not change in a day nor in a generation. For instance, soon after the First World War it was charged that the capital ship was obsolete. After World War II the need for any navy at all was publicly questioned at the highest military level. The persistency of such antinaval thinking is illustrated by the fact that, despite the intervening years, both of these attacks on naval power originated from within the same service. The attitude on the part of another element of the services against maintenance of a strong Marine Corps has been equally persistent and vigorous.

Thus, in this country we have a background of antinaval ideology within the services frighteningly similar to that existing in Germany when the OKW made possible the destruction of German naval power. The parallel is clear. The results under a national general staff would be the same.

All of which brings up another vital aspect of the case against a national general staff. Although there is no question but that our national sea power would suffer under such a system, the issues go far beyond strictly naval matters. In the final analysis, it is not simply a question of a national general staff bringing about the destruction of our naval power per se. What is of even more fundamental significance is that the existence of a national general staff would pose a threat to understanding and use of not only sea power, but air and land power as well. While land power has dominated national general staffs in the past, it is possible that under temporary and exceptional circumstances extreme air or even sea power advocates might dominate such a supreme staff. Air or sea power preeminence within a supreme general staff conceivably could result from astute placing of personnel at the "working levels" of the system, or through influencing the selection of the person appointed to the position of chief of the national general staff. Since one philosophy of power would at any given time dominate the thinking and actions of a national general staff, it is evident that the elements of the armed forces not represented by the then existing dominant thought would be in constant danger of being misunderstood and misused.

Such an eventuality could well have fatal results in this country, for the security of the United States, as compared with that of other major powers, is peculiarly dependent upon strong land, sea, and air forces. Action detrimental to any of these elements of national security would have a serious effect upon United States safety.

On the national strategic level, as distinguished from theater-of-operations levels, our security depends not, as has been erroneously claimed, on immediate decisions regardless of whether or not they are right but rather upon the correctness of decisions. A national general staff headed by a chief of staff certainly will be capable of giving a quick decision. On the basis of performance in other countries, it can be said categorically that such decisions, when they affect more than one service, will be wrong a large portion of the time.

This in turn points up the misconceptions of national general staff advocates who claim that unified theater or operational command systems must have their counterpart at the seat of the Government. Such an argument fails to recognize the very fundamental differences between the functions of command at the theater and operational levels as compared with that at the governmental level. Command at the seat of government renders only the broadest strategic decisions, which in turn determine what the commanders at the lower levels will be directed to execute. Such decisions, involving the nature of forces to be maintained by the Nation as well as when and under what circumstances the various elements of the national armed forces are to be used, must be based upon the requirements of global strategy. As the history of modern war has so clearly established, error in high-level strategy, once made, can be seldom rectified.

That is why decisions at the seat of government must be based upon correctness rather than alacrity. When one element of the armed forces dominates the agency for evolving such decisions, there is the ever-present probability of making a potentially fatal strategic error. Only when the chiefs of the land, sea, and air forces are able to present their views on the highest military level as partners is the possibility of misuse of one of the services adequately guarded

against. The partnership in protecting national security, so deliberately established under our Joint Chiefs of Staff, would cease to exist under a national general staff. The chances for a serious strategic error would increase accordingly.

This particular aspect of the undesirability of a national general staff system headed by a single chief of staff is sharply reflected in the late Secretary Forrestal's observation that "the strategic decisions as to the conduct of global war are beyond the capacity of any man, even when assisted by a brilliant and competent staff."

Under a national general staff the fate of a Marine Corps as developed in this country would be as certain as that of naval aviation. The concept of balanced naval forces is as incomprehensible to land-power-minded advocates of a national general staff as it is to single-air-force extremists.

Without naval aviation and Fleet Marine Forces, naval power as developed in this country according to the concept of balanced forces would cease to exist. Our Navy would be reduced to the kind of navy understood by national general staffs: cargo and combat vessels, and submarines—a navy that would be utterly incapable of fulfilling its mission. Because the United States will live or die according to its ability to control the seas, because a national general staff will inevitably destroy the means by which such control is effected, it is readily apparent why establishment of a national general staff would pose a vital threat not only to our sea power, but to our national security as well.

Ridicule Used To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective weapons in the Communist arsenal is that of ridicule. Thus, by poking fun at those who try to expose and oppose them they oftentimes confuse and mislead those Americans who enjoy a good joke even if it is at their own expense. It is like joking about polio when it is laying low your loved ones.

A leading publication indulging in this campaign is the magazine New Yorker, which seems to consider itself superior to the facts. Plain Talk for October 1949 has rendered a valuable service to the American people by its brilliant exposure of this wisecracking campaign in defense of the Red Fascists. I offer this article for the RECORD:

THE WAYWARD NEW YORKER

(By Peter Minot)

In the days when thousands defended Spanish democracy on the cocktail front, a new American type came into being. He was the carriage trade comrade, the purveyor of butter-ball bolshevism. Driven by boredom and a bad conscience, he threw open penthouse doors to the less unsavory party members and invited all his guests to sing the Internationale.

Aided by good liquor and abetted by bad dialectics, the Communists made the most of it. By the time the Red Army was making the world safe for Joseph Stalin, they had swept into the book publishing field, the magazine field, the theater, the movies, and radio. One of the casualties of this invasion was The New Yorker magazine, until then a combination of good writing, chi-chi snobbery, and highly distilled wit.

The New Yorker was founded in 1925 as the limited circulation organ of the city's social and intellectual elite. It was not, the editors boasted in their first issue, "for the old lady from Dubuque." In fact, they openly admitted, its humor would not always be comprehensible to the great unwashed.

To make their point clear, they chose for their first cover a drawing they have reproduced every year, on the anniversary of The New Yorker's birth. It was the likeness of a top-hatted dandy, peering down his nose through a monocle—obviously, a man so affected by the odor of the crowd that he carried a scented handkerchief up his sleeve.

This perfumed approach to life was The New Yorker's stock in trade. And it carried it off, too. So successful was its brand of sophisticated disdain that even the subway straphangers began to buy the magazine and to ape the stereotype it had created. Though the New Yorker never seriously competed with the million-reader slicks, the faithful were numbered in the hundreds of thousands. Professors in the better colleges recommended its prose style to aspiring writers. It became a force in American journalism and a symbol of a phase of American life. It even had its own cult.

As the cult grew—and as circulation picked up—The New Yorker moved away from its earlier formula of calculated snootiness. It concerned itself less with the polo scores of the Long Island set or the alcoholic pirouettes of Stork Club habitués, broadening out to take in reporting of the European scene.

It also began creating its own gods—naturally in its own image. The humorist James Thurber had a large niche in The New Yorker's pantheon, and a well-deserved one. A monotheistic myth was built around the editor, Harold Ross, whose edicts are famed for their nasty flavor. E. B. White, whose polished sentences filled Talk of the Town, also accepted this godhead. For a time, he dropped out of the picture, disturbed by the lack of "integrity" in the great city. But his Diogenes-like search among the New England primitives did not satisfy him. Or perhaps gentleman-farming filled his soul less than cocktail partying.

There were, of course, other minor gods, but they hardly figured in the gossip columns or the shrill chatter of Madison Avenue lounges.

After the 1929 stock market crash, gaiety was not so easy. To make fun of an apple vendor seemed like bad taste even to the most flippant of New Yorker wits. When, in the middle thirties, the Communists stormed Murray Hill and points north and east, they supplied the magazine's editors with a handy sop. By subscribing to a watered social consciousness, The New Yorker could again take up its joie de vivre without sin. As long as the laughter was directed against those poor souls who took political morality seriously, the Communists were ready to grant absolution. Thus began The New Yorker's era of "quiet liberalism."

At first this merely took the form of poking fun at people who did not see the wave of the future rolling out of the Soviet Union. Gales of laughter were reserved for all talk of "Moscow gold." With great delicacy, the New Yorker's Talk of the Town lifted the spread from the bed to show you that there were no Communists under it. That some had already crawled into it never occurred to Mr. E. B. White or his associates.

If, during this performance, the house detective rapped on the door and asked what was going on, they called him a witch-hunter and a "Red-baiter." "There's nobody here but us anti-Fascists," they would sing out in careless rapture.

This rapture has been sustained year after year. For the Talk of the Town, with an elegant disregard for the facts, has continued to belabor and belittle the anti-Communists who take a dim view of Mr. Stalin's Kampf and of the salty tactic employed by his American minions. Not even the spectacle of naked Soviet aggression has cooled Talk of the Town's ardor. The 12,000,000 people who rot in Soviet slave-labor camps—and this figure is a constant: As old ones die, new prisoners replace them at the rate of a million a year—are breezily equated with the "handful of American citizens [who] have been banished from industry for political reasons and forced into the camp of idleness" in the last couple of years. "No country," says the New Yorker with a prodigious leap, "has a monopoly on political terror."

The emaciated millions in Siberia, seeing themselves compared to the Hollywood Ten now languishing by the waters of Beverly Hills, will take comfort from this.

Typical of Talk of the Town's approach is "Notes and Comment" in the February 26,1949, issue on the dismissal of three Communist professors from the University of Washington. Editor White proclaimed mournfully: "In this land, an ousted professor is not an island entire of itself; his death diminishes us all."

He conceded "a certain merit" in the argument of the university's president that allegiance to the Communist Party unfitted a teacher for the search for truth, but pointed out that the magazine's editors had no opinion as to the fitness or unfitness of the fired professors; that they believed that some of the firings in this country in the last 18 months had resembled a political purge, rather than a dismissal for individual unfitness.

"Hollywood fired its writers in a block of 10. The University of Washington stood its professors up in a block of six, fired three for political wrongness, retained three on probation," he continued. "Regardless of the fitness or unfitness of these men for their jobs, this is not good management; it is nervous management and it suggests pressure."

The Talk of the Town's pundit expressed concern that academic freedom will be imperiled if we deny our students the privilege of being indoctrinated by Stalinist professors. And in the same piece he also expressed concern for academic freedom because "* * * colleges and universities these days are under pressure from alumni and trustees to clean house and to provide dynamic instruction in the American way of life."

Talk of the Town has not been the only offender, although its glib little paragraphs have been worth at least a division to the Communist underground. From the first page to the last, with the possible exception of the polo pony corner, the New Yorker has steadily derided all mention of Communist subversion in the United States. Since the summer of 1948 and the beginning of the Bentley-Chambers disclosures, however, the magazine has been working overtime to discredit all concerned—except the culprits. In this time, it has printed six major articles, totaling 20,000 words, which add up to the best defense the Communist underground has gotten this side of the Daily Worker.

Most of the credit for this job goes to A. J. Liebling, the New Yorker's Wayward Press columnist. Liebling, who was fired from the New York Times for a little skulduggery which he himself admits was not quite ethical, was the perfect man to do the hatchet job on Elizabeth Bentley. As a critic of the morals of American newspapers, he staunchly held that PM, of all New York dailies, was "fighting the good fight." The Communist-line In Fact he characterized merely as "George Seldes' aggressive little weekly."

Never openly plumping for the Daily Worker, he just chided it with an "Oh, you kid" laugh.

Liebling's first broadside was fired in the issue of August 28, 1948, shortly after Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It roared with laughter at "the Nutmeg Mata Hari." And in case you didn't get what Liebling was driving at, there was a sketch by William Attwood, titled "Those Red Blond Spy Queen Blues," which began as follows: "To one who has associated with a genuine yellow-haired female Communist secret agent, the appearance of Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley * * * was a great disappointment."

"What staggered me," Liebling wrote, "was the great, crashing newspaper display accorded a set of hearings that, it was evident from the first day, were reminiscent of a group of retarded children playing 'deteckative.' * * * If it should be argued that newspapers don't aim mudballs in their news columns—that they simply report on the mudballs other people throw—I should be tempted to reply that this defense is a triple distilled extract of Bulgarian fusel oil, turpentine, molasses, potato skins, and grain hulls. The importance that a newspaper attributes to a story depends upon the editor's judgment. An editor who couldn't smell an odor of burning synthetic rubber about Miss Bentley's inside policy data has an extremely insensitive nose for news."

In other words, the witnesses lied and the committee and press helped to spread their lies. Professing concern for the victims of mudballs the New Yorker flung every mudball available at Miss Bentley, Chambers, and the members of the committee. It misinterpreted motives and concealed oceans of facts that would have changed the picture it wanted to present. On at least one occasion it played downright monkeyshines with the facts themselves.

Liebling had already started violating his own standards in the opening attack, for there was not the slightest reason to detect "an odor of burning synthetic rubber" in the original Bentley-Chambers "deteckative" story. In substance it was simply the American edition of what had happened in Canada. The story had been told again and again in newspapers and magazines.

The New Yorker-led attack on Elizabeth Bentley did its best to destroy her usefulness. It painted her as a sick, deluded, publicity seeker. What it suppressed was that she fell into the net, like so many others, because of her hatred of fascism and her mistaken belief that communism was its cure. When she realized her error, she resolved to try to repair the damage she had done. (The part of her testimony reminded the sensitive Liebling of "a reformed drunkard at a prayer meeting.") There has never been a challenge of the committee's statement that "her informaiton and allegations had been thoroughly checked by the FBI and has been substantiated."

In the course of 10 months the New Yorker went after Elizabeth Bentley five times in four different departments of the magazine. During this period its editors had full opportunity to read the official record of the hearings and ponder the unanswered questions her testimony produced. But it printed absolutely nothing to indicate that any part of her story had one shred of truth in it. It ignored the FBI's reported substantiation. It never mentioned such proof as the committee gathered. It never wondered how a so-called insignificant, low comedy character like Elizabeth Bentley could have learned the extraordinary fact that a Presidential secretary saved the job of a suspected agent of the Soviet secret police. It never asked why so many wrongfully accused persons shrank even from answering the nongenuine. Red blonde spy queen, nutmeg Mata Hari prevaricator, when they had a chance to blow her "deteckative" story to bits from the witness stand.

The wayward pressman found room for one statement, though, that should enshrine him in the heart of every friend of true journalism. "The charges," he declared "were made with a great splash, and the answers held down to simple denials and softpedaled."

By my count, the denial of Alger Hiss was spread through three hearings—including one that lasted all day—in Washington and New York, with newspaper, newsreel, television, and radio reporters on hand most of the time. As for the other potential deniees, they were invited to speak their pieces too. Eighty percent ignored the invitation altogether, and most of those who accepted, did so under subpena. The answers of these latter were held down, true enough, but not by the committee. They did the holding down themselves with their we-won't-talk technique.

When Judith Coplon was caught with the goods, and Chambers produced 200 stolen Government documents to prove the existence of a conspiracy without parallel in American history, poor Brother Liebling was benched. By that time, even the New Yorker couldn't keep on pretending that he had been practicing objective journalism, to correct errors that had appeared in the daily press.

It could have demonstrated its own objectivity by putting in a pinch-hitter to state honestly that the Coplon arrest, the "pumpkin papers" and the indictment of Alger Hiss moved the whole "deteckative" story under a new light. It could have noted that the papers allegedly involved not only Hiss, but also Assistant Secretary White, who, in Liebling's pink-lidded eyes, had handled the committee like a Border collie maneuvering sheep.

Instead it crawled back in the dark. It might have stayed there permanently but for one thing. A Presidential Loyalty Board exonerated William W. Remington, high Commerce Department official, of membership in the underground, after Miss Bentley had failed to appear against him at the board's hearings. Now the New Yorker returned to the attack with an article purporting to tell the whole Remington story. The device used this time was a reporter-at-large piece by Daniel Lang, which avoided Liebling's disastrous pooh-poohisms and played the deadpan, factual approach.

* * * * *

What Liebling had done for Elizabeth Bentley, he also attempted to do to Whittaker Chambers. He called him a "dead beat" and howled for joy at the "pumpkin papers." Unfortunately, those papers could not be brushed off with a wisecrack and they led to the indictment of Alger Hiss. A zealous guardian of the press should have waited for the trial and then demonstrated to his erring colleagues just what objective reporting can be.

Not so Mr. Liebling. Having placed himself on record against Chambers, he became an unofficial member of the defense. In the guise of collecting material for an article on the accuser of Hiss, he trudged up to Columbia University and borrowed from Prof. Mark Van Doren a letter Chambers had written him 25 years ago. In the letter, the young student confessed to his faculty adviser that he had lied to Dean Herbert Hawkes on one occasion. The next day, Liebling presented the letter to Hiss' lawyers who eventually used it in court. When Van Doren objected mildly that Liebling had acted unethically, the press moralist talked him down.

Hustling about New York and its Connecticut environs, Liebling tracked down Malcolm Cowley, a writer of minor talent and major bile, who had an old score to settle with Chambers. And so Cowley, too, was presented to defense counsel and his garbled testimony was used in the trial.

Having descended to the level of the press he so strenuously criticized Liebling should have abstained from pontificating on the trial. But when the case ended in a hung jury, he was all ready with his bat for another clout.

The burden of his message was contained in a reference to the fact that Representative NIXON had given out a statement complaining about the pro-Hiss conduct of the trial judge. Liebling found this an intimation that it is un-American not to convict anybody Congressman NIXON doesn't like.

The case against Judge Kaufman was based on specific instances of alleged bias, just as was the case against Judge Thayer in the Sacco-Vanzetti trial. (The late Robert Benchley, founder of the Wayward Press department, testified against Judge Thayer, by the way.) It can best be summed up by recalling that Kaufman permitted one witness to testify to the portentous fact that Chambers used to wade through brooks 30 years ago, and prevented another from swearing that she knew Hiss to be a Communist undercover agent.

To the man with the monocle, the story of the Age of Traitors is still perfectly screaming. But I'm such a knobby-wristed rube that I just can't find any place to start laughing.

Army Racial Policy Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lem Graves, Jr., from the Pittsburgh Courier of October 8, 1949:

WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK

(By Lem Graves, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The Department of the Army has labored mightily for six long months and has brought forth a mouse in the way of a racial policy formula. In a two-page statement released at the Pentagon late last Friday, the Army announced a weak, ineffective policy formula which will prove what most Negroes and other United States liberals have always believed—that the Army intends to preserve the backward principles of discrimination and segregation at all costs.

It says here that Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson approved the Army plan. There are some people who don't believe that he did. They base this conclusion on the fact that Johnson has twice turned down innocuous Army formulas which were no less objectionable than this one and has, with some enthusiasm, endorsed much more enlightened policy formulas by the other two services, Air Force and Navy. It is suspected by several inside Pentagon sources that the new Army policy may have been slipped past Secretary Johnson's desk and released prematurely.

If Johnson does not now disavow this policy, many people will regard his position as inconsistent and will come to the conclusion that the long delay, cleverly maneuvered by the southern forces in the Dixie-dominated Army, has softened Johnson's heretofore forthright views on the matter of racial equality. In addition, Navy and Air Force

officials, who didn't particularly like the idea of establishing enlightened policy principles, will never forgive themselves for yielding to Johnson's pressure when they see what Army has been able to get away with.

The question of eliminating segregation and its concomitant—discrimination—seems never to have entered the thinking of Army officials. The Army made two minor changes in its essentially jim-crow policy: It opened all military occupation specialties to Negroes (some had been denied Negroes before); and it said Negroes would be eligible to attend all Army schools without restriction by quotas (as had been the case in Army technical schools before).

And even in these meager concessions, the language is equivocal and lacking in positive direction. Assuming that Negroes will be given an opportunity to qualify in all MOS categories and assuming that they will be sent to all of the schools (the announcement does not direct Army commanders to send Negroes to these schools but merely says that quotas will be abolished) what becomes of those Negroes who qualify in techniques which are not used in the limited jim-crow Negro units now operated by the Army?

A unique answer to this question was offered by one of the assistants to Army Secretary Gordon Gray last week. Karl Bendetson told the Courier that Negroes with technical specialties might be assigned to work, during the day, at jobs utilizing their skills in overhead or post installations. But, at 5 o'clock, these skilled Negroes will be shipped back to their jim-crow units for billeting, mess, recreation, and all normal associations. The Air Force, which used to use its pernicious squadron F units as a repository for all Negroes who had technical assignments with white troops, has long since abandoned this arrangement as administratively unorthdox and morally indefensible. The Army is now picking up, for its own use, the distasteful machinery for preserving jim crow that the Air Forces, under Johnson's directive, abandoned. It seems incredible that Secretary Johnson would approve Army policies in this atomic age which are in no respect better than the policies other services had (before his directive) to make changes in, was first issued.

In addition to the two minor changes, affecting a very small proportion of the thousands of Negroes now in the Army and the millions who may be called upon to defend America in world war III, the Army will now permit the 15 or 20 Negroes who attend ROTC summer camps from white schools to operate in their school units. In order to fill out some space in this weak report, the Army wrote in one paragraph on promotions in the career-guidance program but officials in that section reveal that the new regulation in that area is simply a restatement of existing rules. No gain whatever.

The Army will continue to "reexamine and review" its policies, said Secretary Gray. If the 6 months examination and review directed by Secretary Johnson last April is any criteria, such continuing study will not inspire too much confidence in Negro soldiers whose morale in the jim-crow United States Army is not likely to be greatly enhanced at this moment. The new policy makes no concessions on the question of segregation and does not affect, for any great good, the lot of the soldier in tactical or field units.

President Truman, who first directed the armed services to readjust their policies to effectuate equality of opportunity and treatment, will be called upon to reject the Army's formula. His committee, under Charles Fahy, has been charged with seeing the program through. It is doubted, by those in position to know, if the new Army policy will meet with the Fahy committee's approval. It is now up to President Truman and Secretary Johnson to bring the Army into line with Air Force and Navy policy.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Judge HOBBS, of Alabama, recently appeared before the House District Committee relative to the four home-rule bills pending before our committee at that time. Mr. HOBBS is one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers in the United States and has spent years in the study of the Constitution and its provisions. He enlightened the members of the committee as to how far we could go in recommending legislation to change the form of government of the District of Columbia as set out by the Constitution. I take extreme pleasure in including his remarks in the RECORD so that every Member will have an opportunity to read same.

STATEMENT OF HON. SAM HOBBS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, that is exceedingly gracious of you. I am delighted to be here. It always reminds me of a prayer-meeting crowd to attend committee meetings. The ones that need the talk least are the ones who are there. I think it shows that you gentlemen who have honored me to a high degree by being here are demonstrators of the true religion of performance of your congressional duty. I hate to bore you with facts that are perfectly familiar to you.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate your statement, my distinguished colleague. However, I said to my colleague from Arkansas, a few days ago, I hope the gentleman will not place an interpretation on the expression of views of those present other than that we have made a study of this problem, and have a broader view perhaps than some who have not.

Mr. HOBBS. Pure religion and undefiled is usually in the minds and hearts of those who attend committee meetings and it is very much like a prayer-meeting crowd.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have sought diligently to gain as much light on the subject as I can and notwithstanding the high compliment the gentleman has just paid me I still am seeking information. I have discussed this matter personally with the gentleman and know that he has made a study regarding the functions that are purely municipal and those that are legislative. I trust that in view of his study and the reading of the Supreme Court decisions and in studying the Constitution that he will attempt to give us his views regarding the difference in these two important functions of government.

Mr. HOBBS. That, of course, is the sole question at issue. I regret exceedingly that we and our good friend BROOKS HAYS differ on this, but I think that there is only one reason, and that is that he has allowed his heart to run away with his head.

Two of the greatest authorities who have spoken on this subject insofar as my information goes, who have delved deeply into the subject, come up with the same conclusion; they are Judge Hatton Sommers of Texas, and the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia, whose general counsel, Hon. E. F. Colladay, whose brief is absolutely unanswerable; and both have reached the conclusion that there must be, if there is to be any legislation worth while, the submission of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. At this point the record is not very clear, or during the entire course of the hearings. Will the gentleman state whether or not this Committee on the District of Columbia under the Reorganization Act would have any authority whatsoever with any legislation that might be submitted to include therewith the submission of a constitutional amendment?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, of course, I would not like to answer the question.

Mr. HARRIS. I recognize the gentleman's disinclination to answer the question because he is a member of the great Committee on the Judiciary, but I think it is a matter of law under the Reorganization Act and procedure in Congress, and that the record should be clear on that.

Mr. HOBBS. Well, of course, we adopted the Reorganization Act and conferred a good many additional powers on your great committee. I feel sure that you gentlemen have just as much or more ability than we members of our committee, and the mere fact that traditionally that was one of the four powers conferred upon the Judiciary Committee 136 years ago when it was created ought not to make any difference and I have no zeal in the matter at all. I am sure that traditionally the jurisdiction over constitutional questions has been reposed in the Judiciary Committee but we have the utmost confidence in this committee and there is no reason on earth why we should not reach the same identical conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, we can't be too often reminded by reading the words of the constitutional provision that is the "mud sill" upon which this inquiry is based.

Congress shall have power to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district as may become the seat of Government of the United States."

Now, of course, there are other words in the same provision but these are the vital ones, as I understand them, except that we have the same authority over the District as over a fort, arsenal, or any other property of the Federal Government.

But I wanted to read that because long before there was a District, in 1787, that became the supreme law of the land, and when we understand what that does, as is stated by one of the leading authorities on the Constitution, and I will read from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, page 116:

"One of the settled maxims of constitutional law is that the power conferred upon the legislature to make laws cannot be delegated by that Department to any other body or authority. Where the sovereign power of the State located the authority there it must remain, and by the constitutional agency alone the laws must be made, until the Constitution itself is changed. The power to whose judgment, wisdom, and patriotism this high prerogative has been entrusted, cannot relieve itself of the responsibility by choosing other agencies upon whom the power shall be devolved, nor can it substitute the judgment, wisdom, or patriotism of any other body for those to which alone the people have seen fit to confide this sovereign trust."

Then quoting from the court of appeals or whatever that court of last resort of New York is called:

"The legislature has no power to make a statute dependent upon such a contingency"—that was a statute adopted by the legislature of the State of New York which provided that a vote of the people of New York at their next general election should determine whether or not this should become a law. It is very similar, it seems to me, to the case here where it is provided that 1 man shall appoint the 12 heads of the 12 departments which have been set up for the District, and where the election by the people creates the majority members of the

City Council—"because it would be confiding to others that legislative discretion which they are bound to exercise themselves and which they cannot delegate or commit to any other man or men to be exercised that have no more authority"—they are talking about the legislature of New York that was sovereign, of course, according to their constitution in all things internal, just as the Federal Government beginning at salt water and going out has in all things foreign the sovereignty, as held by the Curtiss-Wright case in the Supreme Court within the last two decades—"they"—that is the sovereign legislature of New York—"have no more authority to refer such a question to the whole people than to an individual."

So we can't escape the responsibility which is ours. We can't delegate the duty which is imposed upon us by the constitutional provision which I read part of, and there can't be any question in my mind but that we must proceed by amending the Constitution if we are going to do anything such as is proposed by the pending bill.

Now, gentlemen, the founders of our Republic were not fools. They not only had good philosophical reasons for writing the constitutional provisions which they wrote but they had a very practical reason. I don't mean to try to enlighten you gentlemen as to the facts of history. You know them better than I. But sometimes it is well to refresh our minds as to the background of that provision.

It was not idle verbiage, thrown in for good measure. Congress was meeting in Philadelphia. The insurgent troops from Lancaster marched on Philadelphia and ran the Congress out by force of arms. There were only, I believe, 80 of them but they were organized and armed, and Congress "skedaddled." So they hurriedly passed a resolution to adjourn to Princeton, and changed their seat of government in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, before they ran from Philadelphia to Princeton, N. J., where they were promised protection by the town's people. Then I think the people of Princeton protected them satisfactorily and they stayed there until they were given more commodious quarters at Annapolis. So they slunk away to Annapolis to have their meeting of Congress.

What would we do if the garrison at Fort Myer were to come over here? How would you protect yourselves? What armed power have we? Absurd, you say? Sure, it is absurd. The founding fathers thought they could meet in Philadelphia safely and I am not suggesting that we can't continue, but we have the protection of every constitutional force including the Army and Navy that has been raised in accordance with the Constitution, to protect us. They did not have that then, for that was the era of the Confederation. I am not suggesting that we are in such danger. Understand me, but I do want to point out that there was a real and a pressing reason for the adoption of our Constitution and there are no idle words in it.

Now what is the law on the subject? It is abundantly set out, beginning, I believe, with *Roach* v. *Van Riswick* (11 D. C. Supreme Court Reports, at p. 171).

If I may summarize, except as to purely local matters Congress may not delegate any of its powers. Congress must remain the supreme legislative power of the District of Columbia. That case struck down a law passed by the then Government of the District of Columbia and declared it was not constitutional. It dealt with taxation with which there was no possibility of the delegation of powers because it was a governmental division of authority rather than a municipal.

Then coming on down, Chief Justice Fuller——

Mr. HARRIS. Do you mean continuing the discussion in that same case?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. Chief Justice Fuller in *Stoutenburgh* v. *Hennick* (129 U. S., at p. 141), says:

"Congress has express power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District of Columbia, thus possessing the combined powers of a general and a State government in all cases where legislation is possible. But as the repository of the legislative power of the United States, Congress in creating the District of Columbia "a body corporate for municipal purposes" could only authorize it to exercise municipal powers, and that is all that Congress attempted to do."

To the contrary, in the pending bill Congress is asked to go much further.

Then from the latest case, I believe, *Heald* v. *District of Columbia* (259 U. S. 114):

"Finally, it is earnestly contended that the act is void because it subjects the residents of the District to taxation without representation. Residents of the District lack the suffrage and have politically no voice in the expenditure of money raised by taxation. It is sufficient to say that the objection is not sound. There is no constitutional provision which so limits the power of Congress that taxes can be imposed only upon those who have political representation."

Now I want to go into the history a little bit further if I may. At the time the Constitution was written there was no District. You could not even get to F Street on a horse. That part of what is now the city of Washington was an almost impassable swamp.

Jefferson writing to Madison says: "Georgetown languishes." "I fear that our chance is at this time desperate." That is, the chance of locating or inducing the Federal Government to bring here the seat of government. Then there followed 7 years of frantic efforts, stratagems, propositions, trades and compromises, and Madison wrote in 1790 "The Potomac stands a bad chance."

Then the compromise of 1790, the act of July 16, 1790, provided four directives:

1. The acceptance of the District of Columbia site for the permanent headquarters of the Government;

2. Three commisisoners to lay out the site;

3. All offices to be removed from New York to Philadelphia before the first Monday in December, 1790, and to remain there until the first Monday in December 1800; and

4. Then to be removed from Philadelphia to this site.

Thus the fight of the two great cities of that day for the prize of the seat of government raged without gloves for more than 10 annual rounds.

Then by the act of 1790 the Nation bought the promise of its peace and security in a home of its own, where it could be master of its own castle. The price paid was the economic advantages and profits to be gained by Philadelphia by having the seat of Government moved from New York and kept in Philadelphia for 10 years. The legislatures of Maryland and Virginia ruled the District of Columbia for those 10 years.

Then the Congress created five governing bodies: the county of Alexandria, the county of Washington, the town of Alexandria, the town of Georgetown, and the city of Washington. Then we had the local District comprised of those five bodies for 2 or 3 years.

Then in 1804 an act of Congress created a new charter for the town of Alexandria, and for the first time Congress undertook to give voting privileges to anybody, and they limited it to free white male freeholders of full age.

Of course, we had no vestige of authority to give the vote to anybody. There never has been a Federal election. There never has been a Federal vote cast. The only right to give the vote is in a sovereign State. That is recognized all through the Constitution, of course.

It was one of the big quarrels in the constitutional convention of 1787, and the only way that anybody ever cast a vote is by State gift. It is not a right but a privilege.

Although the arrangement did not satisfy anyone, it continued until 1843, and in 1846, after 3 years of debate, the retrocession of Alexandria town and county gave them back to Virginia with thanks.

The county of Washington had no vote. Georgetown, from its creation and by the grace of Maryland, provided for voters, free white male citizens 21 years of age, 1 year's residence, who paid the school tax.

The city of Washington had no governing body, but by the act of May 3, 1802, they did grant the franchise to free white male inhabitants of full age, with 12 months' residence, and who paid taxes.

That extended on down from that time, 1802, until after the war between the States. In 1867, because of that internecine strife, the change was made granting universal male suffrage, repealing in 1869 the restriction to white office holders, and in 1871 the Congress experimented and the District had the regime of Alexander R. Sheppard until 1874—Congress turned over to them at that time with the provisions of law I mentioned, a solvent well-endowed and appropriated-for city. It had several hundred people at that time.

Mr. HARRIS. How was Governor Sheppard selected?

Mr. HOBBS. He was selected by a Presidential appointment.

Our beloved friend, Everett Dirksen, said in his speech on the floor a couple of years ago, when the Auchincloss bill was up, "All because of the dereliction in office of one man, Governor Sheppard."

"They"—I suppose referring to the people of the District—"could have cleaned it up if they had had a vote."

Well, he would not yield to me to ask the question: If they had not had the vote, universal male suffrage, since 1867? They had it. They exercised the franchise. They had it at the time and during the whole tenure of office of Sheppard, and although he only ruled for 4 years he left a bankrupt city, and worse.

Like the drunkard who swears off every Saturday night or Sunday morning, "Never again," that is what Congress resolved at that time, after that sad experience.

Here is a little history that you gentlemen ought to refresh your minds on. Why was it in the debates in the Senate—and I have the reference to the book and page—that Senator Morton claimed that the bill to abolish suffrage in the District was aimed at Negro suffrage and that the Federal Government could not afford to admit by its action that Negro suffrage had proven a failure, or at least not at that time, so closely following on the reconstruction amendments.

Senator Bayard contended that Negro suffrage was responsible for all the evils of the District, apparent in the abolished government, and that the people of the District were willing to be disfranchised in order to escape the repetition of such conditions.

Senator Bayard, of Delaware, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 17, 1874, at page 122, said the following and I quote:

"And I also have not the least doubt as a question of fact that Negro suffrage has been a very sickening business to the unhappy people of the District and to those who brought it here, and I have no doubt as a matter of fact this bill seeks to accomplish the complete abandonment of that most absurd attempt to govern this District through the instrumentality of the most ignorant and degraded classes."

Now, gentlemen, I am not here to advocate, as he did, any racial issue or question. I am a Jackie Robinson fan, both on the

diamond and in testimony before our committees in Congress. No one is going to hear me raise my voice on any such issue, and I deplore that it has ever raised its ugly head because I think this is purely and simply a matter very desirable in the abstract, in theory, but which is utterly impossible unless we forget our oaths to support and maintain the Constitution of the United States.

Now, gentlemen, I have a few words in conclusion. I merely put those references in to prove the reasoning.

There are about 300 pages of Senate debate on the questions which have more or less pertinency in our consideration, but I think we ought to know that of the seven great divisions of our population in the District six are excluded from suffrage automatically because of their home State affiliations. I think that is right. I think there are six.

First, is the group of Members of Congress and their families, and their office forces and all Capitol employees.

Second, civil-service employees which under our quota system has the same effect, their employees and families.

Third, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel and their families, quartered in the general vicinity, including the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. Most of these, where they vote at all, vote in their home States.

Fourth, the diplomatic corps and their employees.

Fifth, lobbyists and transients. It is estimated that there are several thousand lobbyists, and as many as a hundred thousand transients at times, and several thousand always. They live temporarily in Washington because of their business contacts with the Government agencies. Practically none of this group would vote anywhere but in their home States, of course.

Sixth, the student bodies of a half dozen colleges and universities, and a larger number of business, art, and technical schools, comprising the sixth group.

Seventh, of course, are those who are in business or in some profession here or engaged in domestic service or public work, but not classified as civil servants. It is estimated there are from 5,000 to 10,000 charwomen, street cleaners, and several thousand skilled workers in private employ. There are many excellent ladies and gentlemen who were born here and have lived here all their lives or a large part of their lives. However, this is a very small group in comparison with the others listed above in the six preceding categories.

Now, gentlemen, I have a word about the main issue and I am through.

Municipal power is not governmental power. There are 1,000 decisions of courts of repute, and all of the textbook writers, that make that distinction and insist on it. In all things purely local, and based upon the prior creation and authorization, legally, of the municipality, they can make municipal regulations, they can exercise purely local municipal authority.

However, if you take, for instance, the case where the Supreme Court held that a city trash truck backing into a plate-glass front was not a municipal agency in the performance of municipal functions, because it had to do with public health in cleaning the trash of the streets and the alleys and, therefore, was engaged in a governmental function, you see what I mean. I could go on through the whole list of categories of the different classes of power, but what I want to bear down on is this: That this bill which is passed by the Senate does not even touch the hem of the garment of authority for some of its provisions. It conveys, as I read it, to one man the power of appointment of 12 department heads for the city government without any vote of the people, subject to revocation by Congress and an overweaning exercise of that authority which we know we have, and cannot shirk.

This is a "phony." It is just to "kid" somebody. It does not even require anybody familiar with this city or with any similar city to be selected by the council as District manager. He is not elected by the people of Washington.

The whole structure is built on sinking sand. This is a quicksand bill. We cannot escape our authority if we would; and we would not if we could, if we have the interest of the Nation at heart.

It seems to me that we have here a good government; better than most. We have a cleaner city. We have a well-policed city, as good as most if not better than most. We have excellent capable officials and we have very little complaint about taxation.

The contribution of the Federal Government may need to be increased. That is possibly one of the answers which would solve many problems.

There are many splendid people in the District by the thousands, who really are better qualified than most for self-government, and yet they should have known when they came here, and not a one of them came here until the debates in the first Constitutional Convention made it abundantly clear, that they had no hope of ever having much voice in the government of this seat of government.

They came here for various reasons but it all boils down to this: Their own desire. Those of us who live here temporarily or permanently are all in the same boat in that regard, but most of the people who came here to live have come here from some idea of a profit motive.

And do not forget that we paid more for a part of a block in the District of Columbia in the last 5 years than was ever paid the Government for all of 10 square miles that was ceded us.

In other words, Virginia and Maryland did not make such a bad financial arrangement in giving the swamp, where few people lived, for a chance to establish the seat of the National Government here; and it has paid off handsomely.

I do not believe that we can justifiably say that Congress as the city council of the District of Columbia has done or is doing such an awful job.

It may be that it can be bettered. I profoundly hope so. If those who are qualified to vote could be legally allowed to as an experiment I would welcome it. It cannot be done. Neither can you grant legislative nor any other governmental power to anybody, 1 man or 1,000,000 men, to run this city.

The Constitution provides otherwise, and we are sworn to uphold and support the Constitution. The debates show every reason plainly. Far better than I have attempted to voice here this morning.

I thank you so much, gentlemen, for your attention and for the opportunity to appear. I love the District, as you do, and we would do everything we could to aid them in their laudable ambition, but we cannot.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Judge. We appreciate very much the very clear and highly informative statement you have just given. It may be that same of the members of the committee would want to ask you a question if you do not mind.

Mr. HOBBS. I would be delighted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Abernethy?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Judge, I thoroughly enjoyed your statement. I attempted in my very limited manner during the hearings last year, as well as this time, to put over the very points you bring out.

Incidentally, when Senator KEFAUVER, of whom I am very fond, testified before this committee some weeks ago I put to him the very direct question as to whether or not home rule could be granted to the people of the District with the Constitution as it is today. If I recall, I read that certain section from the Constitution, which is section 8 of article 1.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The Senator's answer appears on page 50 of the transcript of June 28. He said that there was no such thing as true home rule. I asked that question and he stated, "There is not."

He made similar replies which are found on pages 51 and 54.

Quoting the Senator as follows, he says:

"It is impossible to give them true home rule without amending the Constitution."

That bears out just what you have said this morning and just what I have said. I believe you have just stated that this thing is a phony and it is attempting to fool somebody. I have put it another way in saying that the city council is a proxy council. They will only carry my proxy in their pocket.

Another member of this committee has stated that it will be a synthetic council. On this issue proxy and synthetic mean about the same thing.

There was a very fine editorial which appeared in one of the Washington papers after the Senate passed the bill, which is the first time that any newspaper of the District to my knowledge has absolutely stated to the people that this thing was a phony. It did not call it a phony as you did, but the words meant the same.

I take it, Judge, that you and I are just old-fashioned enough to believe that the Constitution means just what it says.

Now I would like to ask you this question: The Constitution confers upon the Congress the exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. Some have argued that we can delegate that power and do our duty by a negative means. That is, the council will act and we will veto.

Would it not be just as correct to say that we could delegate to 48 governors of the States the power to legislate for their respective States as we do in the Congress and take the position that their acts would become law unless Congress vetoed it? By so doing, Judge, we would all have the pleasant privileges of serving in Congress without working at all.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the point I would like to make.

Mr. HOBBS. Then we have the law that we passed the other day about housing. Local self-government was attempted there. But the first court that has spoken on the subject has stricken it down. It says that provision is utterly unconstitutional, that we have no power to delegate our legislative authority to anyone.

The unbroken line of decisions has held that the legislative authority there mentioned includes the power to control the seat of Government in all respects. There ought not to be any quarrel with that.

May I say this: While I have the highest regard for all the proponents of this and similar legislation—and so have you——my word "phony" does not mean that they are not sincere and honorable in their efforts to do what they think is right for the District. What I mean is just what you understood me to mean, a more or less jocular reference to the effect of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, the Members of Congress knowing you as they do, would not, I am sure interpret it in that vein.

Mr. HOBBS. Just to the effect of the bill.

However, I want to call your attention to this fact: While Senator KEFAUVER served on our committee for several years—I think it was 8 or 10 years—he never advanced this theory as long as Judge Sumners was chairman of the committee, and as long as he served in that body. He is a recent convert to the theory that he can do everything by

legislation that he would like to have done. It cannot be done.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Teague?

Mr. TEAGUE. No questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Allen?

Mr. ALLEN. Judge, in the Auchincloss bill we finally came to the conclusion, very much along the lines we have discussed, using a little different terminology, that we could set up a system under which a proposal would come to the Congress as a procedural matter, as I saw it, in which some modicum of responsibility by the proposing group to the people of the District generally would be involved, with a positive congressional action approving that proposal.

Assuming that the proposal came here in any way that it happened to come and then was followed by the enactment of the proposal by both Houses of Congress and the signature of the President to the legislation later affixed, would there be any doubt in your mind as to the constitutionality of such a system?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. It would depend entirely on whether or not we answer the question affirmatively and get by with it, as to whether or not the legislation which we approve or do not veto is in the realm of municipal authority or in the realm of governmental action.

Mr. ALLEN. May I dispel that doubt? This would be definitely legislative action. The proposal would come for a piece of legislation to be enacted and, thereafter, the Congress not by failure to act nor by veto but by positive action on a resolution incorporating the terms of the proposal by reference would pass it by a vote of both Houses followed by the approval of the President. Where would the constitutional ban come in?

Mr. HOBBS. There would be no constitutional ban; but rather the specific constitutional authority which is granted in the Constitution to petition Congress. That is all that this bill amounts to.

When one wants to petition Congress for a redress of grievances he has a perfect right to do it, and if after that we go ahead and enact the law that is suggested, the better the suggestion the more praise to the suggester. But they have the same right now. All they have to do is to make any suggestion they want to and that is the way we get our legislation, by somebody making a suggestion.

You are exactly right, sir. Whether within the legislative sphere, governmental sphere, or in the municipal sphere, we have an absolute right to legislate for this District, and whenever anyone, one person, can make a valuable suggestion, if it is written into law by Congress, then it is utterly and absolutely constitutional.

We are very glad to have any such suggestions. As was said in the old case of Pollard against Hagen. I never will get away from it. While the jurisdiction and sovereignty of Alabama has been extended into the sea, it is there as it is on shore, but municipal authority and subordinate to the Federal power as set forth in the Constitution. That is not only good law that has stood for 140 years, but it is the insurmountable barrier that we cannot escape, no matter how much we might like to try.

Mr. HARRIS. Judge, may I propound this question: Taking into consideration the fact of such proposal, whereby the council would be selected by a majority of the voters or the qualified voters of the District of Columbia, who would recommend or petition to the Congress of the United States some specific legislation, would it not be the same and have the same effect as a recommendation or a petition for specific legislation from the citizens association of the District of Columbia, the League of Women Voters, the Board of Trade, or any other civic or local organization which makes such a request and petition to the Congress?

Mr. HOBBS. Or any other person.

Mr. HARRIS. Or any one individual.

Mr. HOBBS. Do not misunderstand me for a minute. You predicated that in the first part of your question upon a vote of qualified citizens of the District. Do not misunderstand me for a second on that.

We do not have any right to grant suffrage. There is nothing in the Constitution that provides the power for us. We can play at the job if we want to.

Mr. HARRIS. Judge, I understand your interpretation and I am in accord with it to a certain extent. However, you do not say that the Congress could prevent the local Lions Club from electing by a majority of their qualified members the president and other officers?

Mr. HOBBS. Oh, no. We can go further and give them a cordial engraved invitation to make any suggestion to us for legislation they might wish.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. Though it might not have any legal effect until the Congress acted on it——

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. There would be nothing in violation of the Constitution for the Congress to say to the people that they can under certain rules set up a procedure whereby they can select certain people to do certain things.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course not.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. HOBBS. You are exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. Now I wanted to ask you this question: Personally, for obvious reasons, I have refrained from expressing any personal feeling about this entire matter, because it is so far reaching, and there are so many proposals here. I have properly refrained from making any comments about my personal attitude at this time on these so-called bills, but I have had a feeling for a long time, which I have expressed over a period of time, that it would be helpful, indeed, to the Congress and to the people of the District and perhaps to the Nation if there were a delegate or somebody in some manner selected by the people to be here in the Congress representing them, such as the Delegates from the Territories, and so forth.

Do you feel that under the Constitution we could not set up a procedure whereby the people could legally and constitutionally elect or select someone to represent them in the Congress as a delegate?

Mr. HOBBS. I doubt very seriously if we can. You know Judge Sumner's resolution to amend the Constitution provided just that.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I know.

Mr. HOBBS. He did not think that we could go to the length of authorizing the electing of United States Senators, but he did think we could give them seats in the lower House.

Mr. HARRIS. You mean a nonvoting seat?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. He meant a full-fledged seat.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that. The difference in that proposal and my question here is the difference as to the nonvoting delegate.

Mr. HOBBS. My answer there is this: I am a strict constructionist. We have a written Constitution which was written for the sole purpose of restraining us and not for the purpose of implementing our desires and wishes.

I doubt very seriously, and with the most cordial sympathy with the desires of those who want it, that it can be done. I believe it would be stricken down just as quickly as it got to the Supreme Court.

Mr. HARRIS. A test, Judge, could be made if there were one provided and the bill were proposed.

Mr. HOBBS. It could be, yes; but I do not believe that it would be safe in any way for the simple reason that this is not a Territory. At least four Senators argued at length in the debates of 1876, using the Territorial argument almost ad nauseam. They thought it was an argument the other way. Some thought to the contrary, of course.

However, we have had the debate on that, and it was decided in the negative, positively, that we can make no Territory out of the District of Columbia. It is the seat of Government and under the control of Government and under the control of no one else.

The basic reason, originally, may have been they did not want to be killed. When they were run out of Philadelphia, they ran, and we would have, too, but it will not happen now, of course.

They felt then, and I think they feel now, that this cannot be made a Territory, and that is not what the people of the District are thinking on this subject.

Personally, I do not see any objection if the people of the United States, acting through the same power that created this National Government, should do that. Do not forget that the States created this Government, and no one else, and the States have a right to change their Government whenever they wish, and there ought not to be any fear or hesitancy in going to the people for renewed authority, if it is right. If it is right that the seat of the Government should be a Territory, which I very much doubt, then it is easy to submit a constitutional amendment, and we will know we are right. If the people of the United States want to do that, why, God bless them. It is their privilege.

Mr. HARRIS. You would not agree with some opponents of the legislation that the Supreme Court decision in the Binns case applied to Territories could equally apply to the District of Columbia?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not think so, and I do not think that the Supreme Court thought so. I do not mean to speak for them, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN. Judge, I do not have the background to judge this question.

Wherein would a proposal that the District might elect a Delegate to the House, who could introduce bills which the Congress would then consider, be much more than a rule of the House as to how bills should be introduced?

Mr. HOBBS. That is a very good question, a very pointed one, and I will take pleasure in trying to answer it.

The Constitution of the United States says that the legislative power of the United States is not, as the other powers, unlimited. The first section of the first article of the Constitution reads:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

I doubt, seriously, that we have the right to do anything more than to seat Delegates from the Territories, which is provided for by statute and rule, if that could be applied to the District. That is what I mean, sir. I may be wrong, but those are my sentiments.

Mr. HARRIS. Just one more question, Judge.

Mr. HOBBS. Surely.

Mr. HARRIS. By the same analogy you feel that the Congress could provide a procedure whereby certain people who meet certain requirements—we will call them qualified electors—of the District of Columbia may select the school-board members of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. You do not think that could be done?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; I do not think that could be done. I think exclusive governmental powers are all in Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. We can provide as the law now provides that the school-board members can be selected, and they are, by a committee composed of the chief justice of the district court, I believe, and some others.

Mr. HOBBS. As the agents of the Congress, the sovereign power.

Mr. HARRIS. Could not the Congress make the people its agent in appointing or selecting members of the school board?

Mr. HOBBS. That is a very keen question which has been debated a long time. Personally I do not think so because the power of voting—the suffrage—is, in my mind, over the line in the realm of governmental power rather than a mere agency for the purpose of education.

Mr. ALLEN. Would you yield there?

Mr. HOBBS. Or for the purpose of administering the educational set-up.

Mr. ALLEN. Judge, wherein is the difference between 200,000 or 300,000 people voting by a majority vote for the election or the designation of a school board, and the power of 7 or 8 or 10 judges voting by a majority vote for the same board?

Mr. HOBBS. Because those judges, or whoever they are—and I am not familiar enough with the provisions to know—have been authorized by us to act as our agents in that regard. We have delegated that power of appointment to our agents to make that selection and that appointment.

Mr. ALLEN. Where is the difference, though, other than just the number of agents?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all. I do not think so. I think that the exercise of suffrage, or the franchise of a ballot, is a governmental and essential governmental power rather than a municipal one and that the provision of teachers for our schools is purely municipal. I may be wrong.

I realize that the line in many cases is not clearly drawn and cannot be. Nor would I say that I am right in any of these prognostications.

Mr. HARRIS. Judge, thank you very much. I am sure you can tell by the questions from the members of this committee that we are diligently trying to seek the correct course and to do what is right and just in this matter.

Mr. HOBBS. And we are very grateful to you.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you for coming here.

Mr. HOBBS. May I tell you a joke off the record?

Mr. HARRIS. We would be glad to have it.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much, Judge.

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, sir.

Loyalty Program of National Alliance of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PREFACE TO THE ALLIANCE'S STATEMENT IN RE THE LOYALTY PROGRAM

The National Alliance of Postal Employees was born October 6, 1913—35 years ago. The objective declared at that time and pursued determinedly down through the years has undergone no change. Our founding fathers were fired with the burning desire to fight for the elimination of racial discrimination and proscription—twin un-American cancers that gnaw at the very heart of the traditional concept of American democracy—from Government service. Their successors and heirs, true to a noble and sacred heritage, trek on in their footsteps. Our founding fathers did not find the way smooth. Neither have their sons.

We take you back, though briefly, to our beginning lest there be some, outside the alliance, who might attempt to infer that our struggle is of but recent origin; that we have been influenced by some of the isms of a later day. Let no one, inside or outside the alliance, be misled, purposely or innocently. The line linking 1913 to 1948 is continuous and straight and the record speaks for itself.

Today, there is much confusion in the world. The danger of unbridled hysteria routing and replacing sane reasoning is lurking in the shadows. Our task is to keep level heads and to pursue our time-honored objective without fear or diminution. In this light, we deem it advisable to issue the statement that follows, which is nothing more than a restatement of our declared and known objective expressed in relationship to the current loyalty program.

ASHBY B. CARTER,
National President.

STATEMENT IN RE EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9835, THE LOYALTY PROGRAM

We, who have fought through the years for the enforcement of all provisions of the Constitution of the United States, can take no position other than one of vigorous opposition to what we believe to be the unconstitutional features of existing Executive Order No. 9835 and to the manner in which the loyalty program, established thereby, offers the threat of restricting the freedom of thought, speech, and activity of our membership. We, more than any other single group of Government employees, have been compelled to carry on a continuous struggle against Federal Government personnel policies and practices. We, more than any other single group of Government workers, have been restricted, suppressed, retarded, and deterred in our efforts to exercise our constitutional rights of American citizenship. We have been excluded from whole branches and divisions of the postal service. We have been often denied the recognition we have merited by our qualifications of loyal and faithful service, intelligence, and integrity, acquired knowledge and specific training. In short, we have been and to a great extent still are victims of administrative practices that tend to short-circuit our constitutional rights for no other reason than we are, for the most part, Negroes.

OUR POSITION

Members of our organization in several cities have been cited to show cause why they should not be separated from the postal service for alleged disloyalty to their Government. We realize that Jim Crow is a venerably old bird, but we insist that taking "pot shots" at him is not disloyalty to America.

We take the position that, in the absence of specific standards for determining the loyalty of government employees and in the further absence of the right to face and cross-examine those who might feel inclined to and do accuse any of our members of "disloyalty," we dare not rely solely upon the judgment of administrative officers (many of whom refuse to practice the true principles of American democracy and fair play) in the matter of determining our loyalty to the Government of the United States. We agree with Paul A. Porter, former chief of OPA, when he said (New York Herald Tribune Forum, October 22, 1948): "Like an iceberg, loyalty inquisitions have a massive submergence. Below the surface there exists an evil composite to bigotry, prejudice, hatred, gossip, petty ambition, and infamous tale-bearing. All that is despicable in decent human relationship is encouraged by these procedures. I am frank to say that I do not believe it to be coincidence that an apparent majority of those haled before the boards and committees are victims of prejudices as un-American as communism itself."

The National Alliance of Postal Employees is an organization of government workers loyal to the concept of government of, by, and for the American people. When, by the decree of a public servant, it is or may be deemed "disloyal" for American citizens to criticize the policies and actions of their public servants, then, by such a decree the Government of the United States ceases to be a government of, by, and for the American people.

Moreover, we possess the loyalty, judgment, and integrity to determine those of our members who might be suspected of disloyalty. We will, ourselves expel from membership and openly denounce any member or members who, by their words or acts, prove themselves disloyal to our United States of America. If this is not enough, then, let the standards for determining loyalty be established clearly lest some government employees be removed from service for other reasons; reasons that might well be hidden under the cloak of disloyalty. We will oppose any professed loyalty program, the effect of which is to intimidate us in the lawful exercise of our constitutional rights in reaching our 35-year-old objective—the total elimination of racial prejudice and discrimination.

In our relentless pursuit of this American objective, we will continue to press for the actual implementation of the present provisions of our Federal Constitution and to seek such Federal legislation and enforcement thereof as will further guarantee human dignity in accord with the Christian concept to all American citizens regardless of their race, creed, color, national origin or political affiliation. Despite the fact we are government employees, we will never relinquish our traditional right as American citizens to inquire into affairs of state, to draw our own conclusions and to contend for betterment of the society which we are a part. We submit that this is in truth the real American way—the only way to which we subscribe.

We speak not only in our own behalf and in behalf of other government workers but also in behalf of the millions of fellow Americans whose civil and constitutional rights are even now illegally curtailed. We welcome aid in the protection of our right to carry on our program from all citizens who, true to the concepts and principles upon which our great American Nation was founded and nurtured, are concerned with the acquisition, retention, and the protection of human rights and human dignity.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement

I made before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, which I sponsored:

I am pleased to speak on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 64 favoring the development of the United Nations into a world federation. When this resolution was submitted to Congress in June of this year, the prospects for lasting peace were already very dark because of the tension between the western democratic nations on the one hand and Russia and her satellites on the other. These prospects are now still darker since we have learned that Russia possesses the atomic bomb. The President's statement on September 24 that "we have evidence that within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R." has made more clear the threat of an atomic war and has emphasized the crying need for united action to preserve peace by all the nations of the world.

Within the lifetime of many of us, two world wars have been fought. The United States took part in both in the hope of saving democracy throughout the world and the right of individuals to live without fear of slavery or imprisonment for their political views. Neither war was followed by real peace.

The League of Nations was an attempt after the First World War to bring the nations together in an effort to prevent another war and to settle disputes peacefully, but it failed for lack of effective support. Now, after the second great war we have established the United Nations in the hope that it will prove effective in bringing the nations of the world together to thrash out their problems in a peaceful way. However, in spite of the great hopes placed in this organization, there appears to be a need for a stronger functioning world organization capable of maintaining security, in the form of world federation. The UN lacks the legal authority and the material power that it must have if it is to be able to protect its members.

The organization of the United Nations is a tremendous step forward in creating lasting peace. It includes the great majority of the people and the power in the world, but it has no real legislative body for the creation of international law by the representatives of the peoples of the world. It cannot take effective action against any of the Big Five. It can only punish violations of the principles on which it is founded by punitive action against nations whereas any effective enforcement of international law requires that it must be possible to bring the individual criminal before an international court of justice, so that he may be held responsible for his acts. The international organization must also have adequate inspection facilities which the United Nations lacks so that it may be informed promptly of any potential trouble zones.

The idea of a world federation has been advanced by some groups and individuals for a long time and more recently has been advocated by many others in a variety of forms. All of them have the same aims, prevention of war, preservation of peace and liberty for individuals throughout the world.

The course of human history indicates that some form of world government will ultimately be established. Tribes merged for strength. Duchies and principalities found union necessary for adequate protection. The United States itself followed their example when the 13 colonies formed a union. World government would only be an extension on a larger scale of what we already believe in and practice. As Leland Stowe has recently said: "If there is any strength in union under law, then there must be greater strength in greater union under law." The United Nations could become the foundation for the creation of a world government.

In his book entitled "World Revolution in the Cause of Peace," Lionel Curtis has said recently: "Our entire civilization stands today at the very point where those who were trying to end the American Revolution stood in 1787 * * *. They had realized that the functional approach, the attempt to end the revolution by gradual and imperceptible steps, by a 'creeping and incipient union,' had merely raised 'an insuperable jealousy' in the sovereign governments. They faced the fact that these sovereign governments had proved themselves unable to relieve the American people from the fear of impending war. They saw that this could only be done by putting the task of preserving peace on the shoulders of the whole American people."

Since national defense is impossible for most nations in the world today, with only the United States and Russia making an impressive bid for it, the problem must be solved through world federation. I, like many other people, have become convinced that the only way to prevent mass destruction is to set up enforceable world law through world federation.

Brief of New York City Branch, National Alliance of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
September 9, 1949.

Hon. ALBERT GOLDMAN,
Postmaster, United States Post Office, New York, N. Y.

SIR: The executive committee and board of directors of the New York City branch of the National Alliance of Postal Employees submit the following brief in behalf of the 3,500 postal workers it represents.

As a recognized service organization we seek no special privilege or favor, and are ever mindful that we are public servants and loyal Government employees, first and foremost. Likewise, we are aware of the postmaster's consistent "open-door" policy, and highly commendable record of fair counseling with postal organizations.

During the 15 years of the present administration, our relationship has been most cordial and mutually profitable. We acknowledge, too, the continuous improvement of the status of our group, and that of the Negro employees whom we unofficially represent.

There are, however, certain personnel practices within the New York postal system which we regard as just cause for complaint by a group seeking full integration of all employees on the basis of merit, seniority, and ability. The continued ignoring of these grievances is neither in the best interest of employee morale or public service. It is with these ends in mind therefore, that we call the attention of the postmaster to these conditions and petition for immediate action toward their remedy.

We firmly believe that adequate adjustment of these grievances would make for more democratic integration of Negro employees. This integration as our objective would be a fitting reward for the many years of faithful and loyal service we have rendered.

We reaffirm here, too, that we have the utmost faith in the ideals of American democracy as established in the Constitution of these United States. We pledge to you and to our Government our utmost toward the preservation of those ideals.

Respectfully submitted.

J. CARL CANTY,
President.
JOHN H. GRAVES,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
ELMER E. ARMSTEAD,
Chairman, Steering Committee.

PREAMBLE

One can hardly challenge the statement that there is in America today, a growing awareness of the need for complete elimination of race and creed as factors in hiring and employment. Already several State legislatures have acknowledged the need to correct such practices, and industry, commerce, and Government are cooperating to the fullest extent toward the eradication of this blind spot of American democracy.

As the Nation's largest employer, Government can ill-afford to set a poor example. Agencies of the Government are the Government, and citizens look to the Government for example. Failure to follow the doctrine of fair and fully integrated hiring is immediately interpreted as a green light to follow suit.

During World War II discrimination with Government agencies became so pronounced that the late President Roosevelt found it necessary to personally intervene in many cases. On May 27, 1943, he issued an Executive Order No. 9346 declaring it to be the policy of the Government that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of any person in the Government because of his race, creed, color, or national origin.

Sections C2-21 and C2-23 of the Federal Personnel Manual, in line with this Executive order, further states that "It is the duty of Federal departments and agencies to eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, or terms of employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin."

THE NEW YORK POST OFFICE

As a recognized craft union, acting in behalf of the more than 25,000 Negro employees in the postal system, the National Alliance of Postal Employees had been through the years a watchdog against biased employment practices. The cooperative efforts of this organization in reporting all instances of bias to high authorities have resulted in a steady improvement of the status of Negroes throughout the system.

Results of a survey issued from our national office indicate that postmasters of many of the Nation's largest cities are making a sincere effort to establish clear, unbiased policies and improve employment and upgrading conditions for Negroes. From Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, and Philadelphia come heartening reports regarding full integration within all departments and branches of the service and promotion of qualified Negroes to key posts. In some instances Negroes have been placed in policy-making positions.

We note, however, that the New York post office, with the largest number of Negro employees, falls behind other cities in several respects. These we list under the following general classifications:

1. Full integration: Several notable examples of lily-white divisions exist within the New York post office. Among the most outstanding examples we cite the following:

A. Within the office of the postmaster, representing the nerve center of the entire system, no Negroes are regularly assigned.

B. No Negroes are regularly assigned to the personnel department. We do not consider details for specific jobs as assignments. This fact is known to every single Negro worker and serves as a great contributing factor to low morale.

C. The inquiry division: One of the more important sections within the system, there are no Negroes in inquiry despite numerous requests for such appointments by qualified alliance members.

D. Finance stations are scattered throughout the city, yet, despite the fact that Negro employees live in the immediate vicinity of these stations, employment has been traditionally closed to them. Examples are Columbia University, Ogden, and Columbus Circle stations. Key positions within finance departments have also been denied Negro employees.

E. Legal department: Several fully qualified Negro attorneys are employees in the New York post office. To date none have been assigned to this department.

2. Upgrading and promotions: There are approximately 55 Negroes in supervisory positions in New York. This represents a mere 3.3 percent of the total supervisory personnel, whereas 14 percent of the total number of employees are Negroes.

Many instances exist where Negroes have been passed over despite greater seniority and proven ability. Moreover, the promotion of Negroes in most cases is not upgrading in the exact sense of the word, since salary increase does not always follow such appointments. The making of supervisors without all the perquisites of supervisorship is not upgrading. At Hamilton Grange station the assistant superintendent (one of three such appointments) does not receive the pay of an assistant station superintendent, thus reducing him to "acting" status.

3. Preferred assignments: These are consistently denied Negroes within such sections as orders and instructions, supply and scheme examination.

4. On-the-job training: Opportunities, particularly within the supervisory grades, to obtain experience at skills leading to further upgrading are withheld from Negro employees.

PUBLIC POLICY

While the terminology of the Civil Service Act does not touch on the subject of fair employment as such, the objectives are clearly set forth as follows:

1. To insure that all appointments and promotions in subordinate civil service be given to the persons best fitted to discharge the duties of the position, such fitness to be ascertained by open, fair, honest, impartial competitive examination.

2. To improve morale in the civil service by encouraging a feeling on the part of the employees that their appointment, promotion, and tenure of office depend upon fidelity, efficiency, and good conduct.

3. To enhance the respect of the general public for the integrity and equality of civil-service officers and employees. (The Civil Service Act of 1883.)

Responsibility with regard to proper upgrading is likewise made clear in a directive issued in 1943 by Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, as follows:

"From time to time, reports have come to this Department that postmasters and other supervisors lack fairness in handling their employment, promotional, and supervisory responsibilities. Various reasons are ascribed. Party affiliations, race, creed, and color are the principal ones; and it is sometimes charged that members of a group discriminate against others of the same group. Discrimination is repugnant to all our principles of good government and decency. The postal service serves all the people, and all the people pay for postal service.

"Every postal worker should have full opportunity of aspiring to positions to which his talents, his energy, and his integrity entitle him. I want all postmasters and superintendents to give this matter careful thought. It is the duty of each postmaster and each superintendent to see to it that his office is so conducted that it cannot be charged justly that any person whosoever under his jurisdiction has not received the promotions, the assignments, or other benefits that are due him."

RECOMMENDATIONS

The New York City Branch of the National Alliance of Postal Employees therefore recommends:

1. That the postmaster take immediate steps to eliminate any and all lily-white departments; and that qualified Negro employees be placed in legal personnel, inquiry, money order, finance, and station examination sections.

2. That qualified applicants for preferred assignments be granted opportunity for service in such appointments.

3. That Negroes now serving in supervisory positions be upgraded according to existing salary schedules.

4. That by administrative order, station superintendents be given due notice of official policy with regard to fair employment practices and opportunity for on-the-job training.

Heed Navy's Plaint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reading Times of October 4, 1949:

HEED NAVY'S PLAINT

For some time it has been apparent that the Capital at Washington has been a seething volcano with an eruption due most any moment in the rivalries between the various armed services.

It seems that the unification plan has not worked at all in the matter of unifying the services, maintaining harmonious relations while correlating the armed forces of this Nation into a mighty, an invincible, an impregnable unit.

Now at long last, there comes an outburst from high Navy officials, a blast that cannot be ignored if we are to have any regard for our national security.

These naval men have charged that the Navy is being and has been stripped of its defensive power and its offensive power as well and that Navy morale has been plummeted almost to despondency.

Those of us who raised our voices against the possible wiping out of the marines remember the feeling of uneasiness that has pervaded the circles of the military for some time. None of us can forget the efforts to muzzle Navy officers on the ground that they were creating disunity by protesting against encroachments of the Army hierarchy. And the morale of the Nation wasn't boosted by the attacks on the B-36.

At a time like this, the Nation should be united militarily, economically, industrially, politically, and socially as never before in its history. With the grim spectre of the atomic bomb hovering over us and with the international picture one of confusion beyond any previous degree, we are plagued with strikes and sorely beset with troubles in our military organization. Politically we are torn asunder and our loyalties seem to run to allegiance to political parties instead of to the Nation.

The releases of these statements by Navy officials may be some sort of bombshell or perhaps they may be an abortive uprising that will be put down without further ado. But the Commander in Chief, we believe, faces a situation that must be handled with unusual perspicacity not only for the moral effect here at home but for the enlightenment of the remainder of the world.

When men holding important career posts in the Navy which have taken many years of education, work and experience to achieve, balk, then we must believe that where there is smoke there is some fire. This is a serious conflagration. Can these men be mistaken and acting injudiciously, intemperately because of love for the Navy or are they acting primarily for the love of their country?

Certainly none of us can be too happy about the whole thing. It must not be that we are indulging in wishful thinking in hoping that it is a tempest in a teapot. How this matter is handled in official circles the next several weeks will mean a lot in relieving a tension we feel certain exists far and wide.

Certainly despair and despondency in an important arm of our defensive services does not augur well at a time when two great national strikes threaten irreparable damage to the national economy.

Neither Congress, nor the Chief Executive can dismiss this matter lightly as something of no consequence. The fears of Navy men of repute for the safety of this Nation deserve most earnest and serious thought, attention, and consideration.

Holyoke Transcript-Telegram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, since we all know the great part publications play in the life of America, and the great contribution publications have made in preserving our freedom and liberty, I think it important to call the attention of Members of Congress to any unusual event in the life of an important publication.

The Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, which has a large circulation in western Massachusetts, is celebrating its hundredth anniversary. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you and the Members of Congress would like to hear some of the interesting details about the paper.

If you will bear with me for just a few minutes, I will be very brief.

HISTORY OF HOLYOKE TRANSCRIPT-TELEGRAM, HOLYOKE, MASS.

This publication was first printed September 1, 1849, under the name of the Hampden Freeman at Ireland Parish, Mass. At that time, there was a move afoot to rename Ireland Parish, Hampden. Later the community was named Holyoke in honor of Capt. Elezear

Holyoke and also for the mountain range that overlooks the location.

The Transcript-Telegram of today is the full-grown heir and successor to the Freeman. Originally a weekly newspaper, it was first owned by William F. Morgan and James D. G. Henderson.

Attorney W. B. C. Pearsons, destined to become the first mayor of the city of Holyoke, was the first editorial writer for the Freeman. In his very first editorial, he called Ireland Parish "the infant giant of western Massachusetts, in the midst of a beautiful and fertile region, noted far and wide for the industry of its inhabitants, its salubrious climate, and its enchanting scenery."

In 1852 the newspaper changed its name to the Hampden Freeman and a short time later it was called the Holyoke Weekly Mirror. In the year 1863 the name of Holyoke Transcript was first written across its masthead. At this time it was still being published weekly. Nearly a score years later, on October 9, 1882, it started publishing daily.

One year prior to becoming a daily, William G. Dwight, fresh out of Amherst College, had joined the staff of the Transcript. Thus was started the Dwight newspaper dynasty in Holyoke. Mr. Dwight took over full control of the paper in 1888.

A young woman by the name of Minnie Ryan, of Hadley, started working on the Transcript on March 3, 1891. She was later to become Mrs. Dwight and at the present time is editor and publisher of the Transcript. She holds the unusual record of being associated with one newspaper for 58 years—a record probably unsurpassed anywhere.

Late in 1926, the Transcript purchased the interests of a rival daily newspaper, the Holyoke Telegram, and on New Year's Day, 1927, started publication of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, the name under which it is still being issued each day.

In 1908, Arthur Ryan, brother of Mrs. Dwight, was graduated from Princeton University. He joined the Transcript as sports editor and today holds the office of business manager. William Dwight, son of Mrs. Dwight, after attending Princeton and the Columbia University School of Journalism, was attached to the staff as political writer. He is now managing editor.

In addition to her son William, Mrs. Dwight also has two daughters who have served as social editor. In 1921, Helen Dwight, now Mrs. Oscar Schoeffler, of New York City, whose husband is fashion editor of Esquire Magazine, worked on the newspaper in this capacity and she was succeeded by her sister, Laura Dwight, now Mrs. Richmond Lewis, of Springfield, in 1923.

In recent years, William and Donald Dwight, sons of the managing editor; Dwight, John, and Edmund Schoeffler, as well as Larry Lewis, all grandchildren of Mrs. Dwight, have been writing with the various departments of the daily. Too, Miss Elizabeth Ryan, daughter of the business manager, writes a feature column from New York City.

On March 31, 1930, William G. Dwight died at his winter home in Fruitland Park, Fla. Mrs. Dwight immediately assumed the full powers of editor and publisher, one of the few women in the Nation to carry on in these important fields of public relations.

In the past near-score years that she has headed the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, Mrs. Dwight has been the recipient of many high honors, including doctorate degrees from American International College at Springfield, Mass., and the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. In fact, Mrs. Dwight has been accorded the distinction of being the first woman ever to be awarded an honorary degree by the State university.

Mr. Speaker, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram and I have not always seen eye to eye on every issue and I do not expect that we always will. But that is not of paramount importance. The important thing is that, for a hundred years, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram has made its contribution to our way of life and has always battled for what it believed was good for the people of this country.

I hope all the Members will join with me in congratulating and extending best wishes to all who are associated with the the Transcript-Telegram on its hundredth anniversary.

Civil Rights Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *September 7, 1949.*

Mr. President and members of the National Baptist Convention, Inc., United States of America, we, a group of members numbering 52, submit the following resolution:

"Whereas the President of the United States has repeated, espoused, and championed the causes of the minority groups in a civil-rights program—FEPC, poll taxes, and other denied constitutional guaranties.

"The President just recently declared before the National Democratic Committee that there are two things in his life for which he is more proud than anything else; that he was elected without the industrial East (New York) and the solid South (meaning the solid South opposed his human-right program).

"Whereas we have observed very closely the office holders in Senate known as the Dixiecrats, who revolted the President's civil-right program, and some Republicans of the Senate joined their efforts in defeating every effort to bring before Congress that which would lead to a vote for civil rights.

"It is high time for the leaders of the Negro people, especially the ministers, who are the prophetic voices of God, charged by the spirit of God, to speak boldly in the defense of justice, and with the responsibility resist all forms of oppression, and to preach universal good will and global brotherhood.

"We want the world to know that we have no sympathy for any movement to overthrow this, our Government of the United States of America, by violence. We have not even any foreign interest in any government outside of the United States of America, or in any other form of government, but we are determined that the democracy of the United States work the same for the Negro in every State of the Union, north, south, east, and west, with full and equal rights to the Negro.

"We agree with Dr. Sandy Ray, chairman of our Social Service Commission of the National Baptist Convention:

" 'If calling for the practical application of the principles of the Constitution of the United States for all citizens constitutes subversive activity, we are all guilty.

" 'If the claim that all of the benefits and privileges of a democratic society should be extended to all of the members of that society, constitutes subversive activity, then we are all guilty.

" 'If seeking to break down discrimination and segregation in housing, in education, in hotels, restaurants, travel, and employment, health facilities, and extend equal opportunities to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin, is a move to overthrow the Government. We are guilty, and may we add, doubly guilty.

" 'If our protest against police brutality, search and seizure without warrants, and injustice in courts constitute disloyalty, we are guilty.'

"We, therefore, feel that the civil-rights program which has been publicized and awaits an opportunity to be placed before Congress includes all of the above constitutional rights of minority people of the United States.

"We further feel that now they are belated and hindered by filibusters and what not, and that further delay will hinder the progress of civilization and impose the condemnation of God, therefore it should have the immediate consideration of Congress, regardless of party affiliations.

"We, the National Baptist Convention, Inc., of the United States, feel that the program of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is the program of God the Father and is none other than the program of civil rights as has been publicized before the nations and the United States of America.

"We, therefore, commend the President of the United States and all Senators of any party of the Senate and Congress who have sought to present such legislation, and we pray God's blessing upon you that you may continue to carry on until victory has been won.

"We want you to know that the National Baptist Convention represents over 4,000,000 votes that are behind your civil-rights program, and we shall use our influence to support for office only those who believe and pledge themselves to stand up for the civil-rights program as has been expressed in these statements, the civil-rights document now in your hand.

"We urge the enactment of the following civil rights legislation:

"1. Establishment by the Government of an active aggressive campaign to defend and enforce civil rights and liberties: housing, education, enforcement of the abolition of discrimination in all branches of the armed forces.

"2. Establishment of fair-employment practices.

"3. Abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting.

"4. Enactment of a Federal antilynching law.

"5. Elimination of discrimination within civic and professional groups.

"6. As a Christian group we denounce the activities of the Ku Klux Klan with or without hoods, and call upon our Attorney General to prosecute this and all other lawless groups which intimidate citizens without due process of law.

"The major theme of our Nation is national security. We do not believe that se-

curity can be based purely upon economic, military, and statesmanship basis. We believe that moral and spiritual values must undergird our national security. It is a moral and spiritual responsibility of a democracy to extend the privileges of that democracy to all of its citizens."

A. Wendell Ross, chairman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Sandy F. Ray, New York, N. Y.; George H. Crawley, Sr., Baltimore, Md.; John E. Nance, St. Louis, Mo.; W. H. Jeringan, Washington, D. C.; S. D. Ross, Detroit, Mich.; James F. Wertz, Charlotte, N. C.; L. K. Jackson, Gary, Ind.; M. L. Ramsome, Charleston, Va.; E. Huntley, St. Louis, Mo.; Valley V. Stokes, Maryland; Alexander Gregory, West Virginia; Benjamin J. Perkins, Cleveland, Ohio; Simion Williamson, Maryland; Leroy Bowman, Annapolis, Md.; W. L. Clayton, Maryland; G. W. Reed, Kansas City, Mo.; N. W. Whitt, Selma, Ala.; R. C. Campbell, Boonville, Mo.; W. A. Sparks, Kansas City, Mo.; S. Y. Nelson, Texas; E. T. Brown, Tennessee; T. Moore King, Joliet, Ill.; M. K. Curry, Jr., Wichita Falls, Tex.; G. W. Lucas, Toledo, Ohio; Calvin Perkins, Birmingham; D. A. Holmes, Kansas City, Mo.; George H. Sims, New York, N. Y.; J. Carl Mitchel, West Virginia; Attorney A. T. Walden, Atlanta, Ga.; J. R. Davis; Marshall A. Talley, Indianapolis, Ind.; J. Franklin Walker, Cincinnati, Ohio; Jonathan L. Gaston, Los Angeles, Calif.; W. P. Whitfield, Edwards, Miss.; William H. Ballen, Louisville, Ky.; R. C. Woods, Hot Springs, Ark.; James M. Bracy, St. Louis, Mo.; W. Louis Petty, J. H. Jackson, Chicago, Ill.; L. A. Pinkston, Atlanta, Ga.; D. J. Benefield, New York, N. Y.; Robert L. Rollins; W. H. Thompson, Baltimore, Md.; Thomas H. Houston, Washington, D. C.; A. J. Payne, Baltimore, Md.; J. B. Reid; William Holmes, Atlanta, Ga.; J. L. Moore, Illinois; E. C. Smith, Washington, D. C.; Roland Smith, Little Rock, Ark.; S. C. Taylor, Pennsylvania.

So-Called Insurance Moneys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, again the Maritime Commission has lived up to its reputation of doing things, wasting and spending money contrary to the intent of Congress according to the House Committee on Expenditures in the excessive allowance of some $25,000,000, and I am calling specific attention to more than $150,000,000 of the taxpayers' moneys dished out by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to marine insurance and underwriters.

I believe that the partial disclosures made through the General Accounting Office should be investigated and recoveries made through a select committee of the House. In view of that I am introducing the following resolution:

Whereas the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration were supposedly engaged in marine insurance; and

Whereas employees of insurance business were temporarily working for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration; and

Whereas such insurance employees while working for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration made arrangements with the insurance companies; and

Whereas the arrangements were made with all the marine insurance companies and so-called underwriters; and

Whereas by such arrangements made by such insurance employees of the Government with all the insurance companies and underwriters the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration turned over to said marine insurance companies and underwriters more than $150,000,000; and

Whereas said insurance companies and underwriters made investments out of said $150,000,000 and received an estimated additional income of nearly $18,000,000; and

Whereas said $18,000,000 was not given to the United States Government; and

Whereas said insurance companies and underwriters had in their possession more than $168,000,000 of moneys belonging to the United States; and

Whereas said insurance companies and underwriters only paid out approximately $25,000,000 out of said funds on ships and cargoes owned or controlled by the United States Government; and

Whereas said insurance companies and underwriters are the same as disclosed by lists of the United States Maritime Commission: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct an examination and investigation on all the so-called marine insurance activities of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration from January 1, 1940, to July 1, 1949, covering moneys of the United States turned over by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration to the marine insurance companies known by arrangement as the syndicate, and the marine insurance companies known as the underwriters, and any other persons, firms, corporations or groups that were given aid or received moneys belonging to the United States for the so-called insurance arrangements made to insure cargo and ships owned and controlled by the Government of the United States or otherwise.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Irish Have the Laugh on the English Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by Henry McLemore, newspaper columnist:

IRISH HAVE THE LAUGH ON THE ENGLISH NOW

(By Henry McLemore)

DUBLIN.—The Irish are very happy.

Make it very, very happy.

This little country, which fought England with nothing but pride for so many years, is now laughing.

Englishmen are now coming to Ireland to eat. Englishmen are now coming to Ireland to drink. Englishmen are now coming to Ireland for the comforts of life. There was a time when Englishmen came to Ireland only to conquer, or try to conquer, because they didn't.

ENGLAND TOOK, NEVER GAVE

Let's get philosophical. England is in the shape she is in today for just one reason. She didn't understand that there were countries who loved liberty just as much as she did. Do you think England would be a pauper today if she had India? And why did she lose India? She lost India because she wanted to take everything from India and give India nothing.

Go through India as I did a year ago and try to find any substantial thing that England did for India. You'll find polo fields, yes. You'll find golf clubs, yes. You'll find mountain resorts, yes. But the Indians couldn't enjoy them. They were for the English. What India needed was good sanitation and medicine, not polo ponies and limousines flying the Union Jack.

WORLD'S WORST COLONIZER

For some reason England is known all over the world as the great colonizer. To my way of thinking, she's the worst. Name me colonies that stood up for her in the last war. You can't because no colony really stood up for her. The United States has no reputation as a humane colonizer, but what did the Philippines do when we needed them? Fought and fought and fought.

England is now getting its full comeuppance. And here in Ireland the sons of Erin think that's completely all right. The Irish will tell you that in the world book of ethics the way they feel is wrong. No one should ever gloat over the trials and tribulations of another. But human beings never completely follow the book. When you've been tossed around by people for centuries it's the human, if not the nice thing to exult. That's what the Irish are doing. It makes them happy to see the bulldog that barked at them for so many years have his bark reduced to no bark at all.

IRISH LAUGH NOW

The Irish used to go to England and be given treatment that told them they were slightly unwelcome guests. Now the English come to Ireland and how do you think the Irish treat them? They treat them with full courtesy, but they can't help but laugh a little bit inside as they see the English pay for cream and eggs and ham and butter with a devalued pound.

England, an Irishman told me today, is now doing to its own people what it tried to do to all its colonies. And just as sure as there's a shamrock in the world the Irish

people will do the same as all the rest of the colonies have done. They'll break loose and be independent, and that will leave England just by her tiny self. And, the Irishman concluded, what would be wrong with that?

House Concurrent Resolution 64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the following statement in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The development of man's social and political institutions has been slow and plodding, but the direction over the ages has been toward the establishment of progressive, cooperative working organizations. This has been true from the development of the family, the clan, the tribe, the nation, and in more recent times the Hague Tribunal, the League of Nations, and in this decade the United Nations.

Political institutions, of course, must change to meet the needs of the day. Now that our world has become small and all countries are neighbors, we must develop the United Nations into an organization in which all nations may live in security. The pace of our progress in that direction depends on how rapidly the people of our Nation and of the other nations of the world can grasp this concept of world federation. People will only understand this issue when it is put honestly, squarely, and constructively to them. House Concurrent Resolution 64 takes into consideration this great need. It frames the problem so that people can understand it. I heartily endorse this plan, because I feel that we must start now to educate mankind to the necessity for this great step and to techniques by which this new achievement may be accomplished and at the same time save for peoples everywhere the good things of our American way of life.

To jump the gun and try and effectuate too hastly any federation would be disastrous. It would virtually destroy the United Nations. It would project a responsibility on a world that is not yet ready, in my opinion, for the necessary adaptation.

We must move with caution. At the same time we must not heed reactionary dogma that maintains that change is not necessary or possible. The world does not stand still. Any effort to stagnate or hamper progress is against the manifest course of mankind. I do not believe that war is inevitable. I believe that progress is inevitable; that each generation should move toward the good life of justice, order, and peace. The good will eventually win out.

For those of us who claim to subscribe to the teachings of Christianity, we must live our beliefs and strive for the better tomorrow. I think that a United Nations with power to enact, to interpret and to enforce world law is a vital step toward that brighter future. If we give to our foreign policy the long range ideal of strengthening the United Nations into a federation capable of maintaining peace, we will gird ourselves with moral ammunition that will offer to a world, bantered by the coercion and duress of communism and fascism, a new hope for peace and individual liberty. If we take the lead, others will join the cause. Then, with the achievement of the final goal, we can be sure that we shall have a world federation, rooted deeply in the firm foundation of lasting peace.

Panama Canal—John F. Stevens and the High-Level Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in another extension of remarks, I included the message to Congress of President Theodore Roosevelt of February 19, 1906, in which he recommended, for adoption, the high-level lake type canal at Panama. In that message he stressed the fact that Chief Engineer John F. Stevens was emphatically in favor of that type, and opposed to the proposed sea-level plan.

As the views of the late Mr. Stevens—undoubtedly one of the greatest construction engineers our country has produced—in his letter of January 26, 1906, to the Chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, constituted the technical basis for President Theodore Roosevelt's decision, this letter is an essential part of the record leading to the formal adoption of the high-level canal.

The main points in Mr. Stevens' reasoning—as shown in his letter—with some modifications, appear as applicable today as in 1906. Under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include his letter, the full text of which follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
January 26, 1906.

Mr. T. P. SHONTS,
Chairman, Isthmian Canal Commission, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your request for a statement of my views on the question of a sea-level or a high-level canal, as applicable to Panama, and my conclusions as to the relative value of each type, as discussed in the reports of the Consulting Board of Engineers—

As indicated in my letter of December 19, 1905, which was written prior to the receipt or inspection by myself of any report from the consulting board, my judgment was and is yet in favor of a high-level canal, and it has only been strengthened by the very able presentation of the facts and deductions made therefrom in the minority report.

I can, therefore, conscientiously and fully approve the adoption of the high-level type, and strongly recommend that the Commission give its official voice in favor of such a type as is described in the minority report, and there seems to be nothing that I can add to such report, in view of its clearness and completeness, more than that I am heartily in favor of its adoption.

As between a sea-level canal and any canal with a summit elevation of 30 feet or above, I decidedly prefer the high level, and believe the one with a summit level of 85 feet more fully meets the conditions and requirements than one at any lower level.

In my letter of December 19, I disapproved of the suggestion to change the present alinement of the canal at either ocean terminal. In relation to the northern terminal, at Colon, I am free to say that I now believe that either plan as recommended by the Consulting Board of Engineers in covering this question is preferable to the present alinement, and that the abandonment of the proposed seawall from Colon to English Point and the adoption of a plan for breakwaters parallel, or nearly so, to the proposed entrance channel (if such breakwaters are found necessary) much simplifies the situation.

I believe, however, that the construction of a large basin or inland harbor at or near Mindi, or at a convenient location which exists below the Gatun Dam, such basin to be supplied with coaling and other proper outfitting facilities, will be found advisable, the material excavated in the construction of such a basin to be used in the construction of the Gatun Dam.

As regards the plan and alinement of the canal at the Pacific end, I am still inclined to my former expressed opinion that, on account of the military and sanitary features, the location of all the locks at Miraflores and Pedro Miguel, instead of part of them at La Boca, with the necessary dam at the same place, will be found more satisfactory; but as the latter plan will cost about $6,000,000 less to construct than the former one, I am ready to waive my views in favor of the latter plan, although simply on account of the difference in the estimated cost.

The minority report of the consulting board has discussed so fully the relative merit of the two types that it would seem entirely unnecessary for me to endeavor to extend the arguments.

I will, however, express my belief that some of the estimates as to the length of time and cost, as set forth by the report in favor of the sea-level type, are hardly justified. I believe that the estimated cost of the auxiliary works, such as diversion channels, dams, and spillways, may very readily exceed by several times the amount allowed, and that the danger to the canal by the existence of such works would be much greater than apparently appreciated.

It is perhaps possible that the unit price per yard allowed for the removal of material in the prism of a sea-level canal below plus 10 (40 feet of it being all rock and below sea level) is ample; but I seriously doubt it. This unit cost might easily be double the estimate as allowed, and such an increase alone would add $20,000,000 to the cost of the sea-level canal.

A difference alone of $100,000,000 in the cost of the canal means, at 2 percent interest, an addition of $2,000,000 per year to fixed charges, which sum, of course, must be added to the cost of carrying charges and operation in estimating the relative value of the two types of canal. I believe the excess cost of the sea-level type, instead of being $107,000,000, as indicated in the reports, would be at least $135,000,000, and it might be very much more.

I also believe that the difference in the time required for the construction, as between the two types, will be much greater than reported, and I would not care to set a less time than 18 or 20 years for the building of a sea-level canal, while I am firmly of the belief that the time, as shown in the minority report, for the construction of the high or 85-foot summit level is ample.

The sum of my conclusions is, therefore, that, all things considered, the lock or high-level canal is preferable to the sea-level type, so-called, for the following reasons:

It will provide as safe and a quicker passage for ships, and therefore will be of greater capacity.

It will provide, beyond question, the best solution of the vital problem of how safely to care for the floodwaters of the Chagres and other streams.

Provision is made for enlarging its capacity to almost any extent at very much less expense of time and money than can be provided for by any sea-level plan.

Its cost of operation, maintenance, and fixed charges will be very much less than any sea-level canal.

The time and cost of its construction will be not more than one-half that of a canal of the sea-level type.

The element of time might become, in case of war, actual or threatened, one of such importance that measured, not by years but by months, or even days, the entire cost of the canal would seem trivial in comparison.

Finally, even at the same cost in time and money for each type, I would favor the adoption of the high-level lock canal plan in preference to that of the proposed sea-level canal.

I, therefore, recommend the adoption of the plan for an 85-foot summit-level lock canal, as set forth in the minority report of the Consulting Board of Engineers.

Very respectfully,

JNO. F. STEVENS,
Chief Engineer.

The Gulf Coast and Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, at the thirty-seventh annual convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, Philadelphia, Pa., October 7, 1949:

Less than 4 months ago, on Saturday, June 18, I was standing comfortably and proudly in the mud of the Laguna Madre along the Texas coast, in the midst of a wild and primitive region, which until that day had not been accessible by any means of transportation whatever. For mile after mile on the southern Texas coast between Corpus Christi and Brownsville these mud flats, stretching along by the sprawling King Ranch, had been to that very moment as remote from civilization as at any time during the infinite ages of the past.

But on that particular day this untrammeled wilderness surrendered to the inexorable march of civilization. A snip of a knife, cutting through a festive ribbon, opened to the Nation's water-borne commerce the last link in the main channel of the Gulf intracoastal waterway. It was a significant and historic moment, particularly for those leading citizens in our section of the country who comprise the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, a few of whom had pursued for 44 years the elusive goal of a navigable inland waterway from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande.

On that sunny June day, at 1:12 o'clock in the afternoon, the objective was realized. A bright clear channel, cut arrow-straight through the coastal wastelands, opened the fabulously rich Magic Valley of the lower Rio Grande to low-cost barge transportation with a vast area of the United States. It did more than that. It opened the rapidly developing area of northern Mexico to barge traffic; in fact, perhaps the heaviest movement thus far has consisted of thousands of tons of lead from Mexico consigned to Chicago and the American Middle West.

Superficially it may seem that my reference to that historic moment on the south Texas coast is none too relevant to the program and purposes which motivate your meeting here today. But I submit that it is significant to you, significant to this city in which you have convened, significant to every enterprising community along the Atlantic seaboard. Indeed, in some respects it is more significant to those communities which directly were scarcely affected at all, than to those cities throughout the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys which were immediately linked to the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and the northern reaches of Mexico. For it is characteristic of American progress to look to the future rather than to the past, to pursue a vision yet unfulfilled, rather than to bask complacently in the beneficence of a dream come true. It is such an objective, yet to be realized, which challenges us here—the opportunity to bring the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf coast into a compatible commercial relationship which it has long needed but still has not fully attained.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway extends for more than a thousand miles from the west coast of Florida to the southern tip of Texas, while the Atlantic inland waterway of similar dimensions and distance extends from the east coast of Florida to Trenton, N. J. Taken together, therefore, they would constitute a national transportation facility extending more than 2,000 miles along the eastern and southern seaboards of the United States. But they cannot be taken together, of course, because midway along that vast distance is a gap which must yet be closed—the gap across northern Florida. The method of closing this gap through the construction of the cross-Florida barge canal has been approved by the Corps of Engineers and authorized by Congress, but no funds have been provided by Congress to initiate construction, despite the fact that the project is, in my opinion, one of the most important in the entire public-works program confronting our Nation.

It may seem rather incongruous for a Texan to come to Pennsylvania to speak on a project in Florida, and I am by no means an expert on my subject, unless we rely on the classic definition of an expert as just an ordinary fellow a long way from home. This project across northern Florida is nearly a thousand miles from the thriving community of Corpus Christi, Tex., where I was born and reared, and I have seldom been in the region where this project is planned for construction. Fortunately, however, it requires neither an intimate familiarity with the region nor a technical knowledge of the subject to defend its vital importance to the commercial welfare of our country. Any schoolboy looking at a map might well wonder why such prosperous waterways serving more than 2,000 miles of coast line should lack this simple connection, without which the fullest potentialities of neither can be realized. Who would be so unwise as to build a highway between two great cities and then fail to construct a necessary bridge midway between them? Yet that is precisely what has happened with respect to the longest salt-water highway in our country.

The project across northern Florida, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 109 of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, contemplates a barge canal with a project depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 150 feet. From the eastern coast of Florida its route would follow the St. Johns River to Palatka, thence the valley of the Oklawaha River, across the divide, and the valley of the Withlacoochee River to the Gulf of Mexico. Three locks on the east slope and two on the west would provide total lifts of 55 feet to the summit pool, and this design would leave unchanged existing groundwater conditions.

This barge canal, by connecting the existing intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, would effect large annual savings in the cost of transportation of a wide variety of commodities, such as petroleum products, iron and steel, sulfur, forest products, limerock, fuller's earth, and many others, as well as in the movement of dredging and construction equipment, and in the seasonal migration of many commercial craft such as shrimp boats.

Not to be overlooked are the recreational benefits which would accrue from the joining of these existing waterways into a single system. The use of pleasure boats on the Gulf intracoastal waterway and connecting inland streams is widely increasing, and the cross-Florida barge canal would stimulate this type of recreational travel all the way from this Philadelphia area to the picturesque border of Mexico. We have learned from impressive and sometimes startling experience in Louisiana and Texas that the greatest benefits derived from the construction of the Intracoastal Waterway have been the intangible benefits, the benefits that did not exist and thus could not be measured when the project was authorized. The Intracoastal Canal from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande was authorized by Congress on the expectation that it would develop approximately 5,000,000 tons of commerce a year, and that it might reach as much as 10,000,000 tons a year through its connection with the Mississippi and Ohio River systems. Had the canal done only that it would have justified the cost of its construction and maintenance, but today the Intracoastal Canal in Louisiana and Texas alone is carrying more than 20,000,000 tons of commerce a year, four times the normal potential anticipated for it and twice the maximum tonnage predicted.

What even the most enthusiastic proponents of this project could not have anticipated was the tremendous industrial development which followed virtually in the wake of the dredges which constructed the canal. Great oil refineries, chemical factories, sulfur plants, oil and steel fabrication shops, sugar and rice mills, shipyards and drydocks, cotton compresses and lumber mills, and scores of other industries have risen from the coastal plains to transform a primitive frontier into America's most rapidly developing industrial empire. This astonishing metamorphosis was accomplished even before the main channel of our waterway was completed less than 4 months ago.

I cite this remarkable development we have experienced in my homeland, not to boast of what we have achieved in Texas, although no Texan is reluctant to do so, but to indicate confidently the enormous intangible benefits which today cannot be fully measured, but which will inevitably accrue from the construction of the cross-Florida barge canal, that missing bridge in our long and busy salt-water highway. Bear in mind that the tremendous industrial development taking place on the Louisiana and Texas coasts today does not consist of factories transplanted from one section of the country to another. These are all new industries, new manufacturing plants, creating new wealth, wealth which never existed before, and providing more lucrative employment and a higher standard of living for all. Whatever we know of the measurable benefits to be expected from the construction of meritorious river and harbor projects, such as the cross-Florida barge canal, that knowledge can be strengthened and supplemented by the substantial intangible benefits which we have

learned from long experience will materialize.

It has been said many times that experience is the best teacher, but it is regrettably true that too often we do not heed its lessons. When this important project was authorized by Congress in the early months of the last war, hundreds of American lives had already been lost within sight of the American coast, as tanker after tanker, and freighter after freighter, became a flaming prey of enemy submarines. Scores of ships were lost, hundreds of lives, and cargoes too precious to be evaluated even in the millions of dollars—and why? Because no safe passage across Florida existed for the barges laden with vital war materials which otherwise moved in a protected inland waterway virtually within sight of the catastrophes at sea.

Regardless of the tremendous commercial benefits to be derived from the construction of the cross-Florida barge canal in time of peace, the greatest unanswerable argument for its immediate construction is its vital importance to our Nation in time of war. Yet, with war clouds still hovering over the earth, and the submarine menace in the next war even more serious than that in the last, not a dollar has been provided for the construction of a vital waterway project which could even mean the precious margin between victory and defeat. Let us not be the victims again of too little, too late.

Now one more word as to the relationship between the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the cross-Florida barge canal. It is significant to remember that the extension of the Intracoastal Canal to the Mexican border, and the construction of the barge canal across Florida, were contained in the same bill in 1942 and authorized by Congress at the same time. In other words, the extension of the canal to the Mexican border at one end, and the extension of the canal across northern Florida at the other, were authorized together as essential parts of the same project. Seven years have passed, and the one extension to the Mexican border has been completed, yet no construction whatever has been started on the other. This is a paradoxical situation, and it should serve to demonstrate clearly the need for a more aggressive campaign along the broad front of the national interest to undertake the construction of this connecting barge channel across Florida with the least possible delay. Valuable to our country in time of peace—essential to our country in time of war—this project merits the earliest possible favorable consideration by the Congress of the United States.

I appreciate this opportunity of meeting with you here today. I bring you the best wishes of our Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, and I pledge you our active support and cooperation in the public-spirited work to which you, and we, have devoted our painstaking efforts over a period of many years.

Two Major Wars in the Prime of Every Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me I am extending my remarks to include the following statement made by me this morning at the public hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the world federation resolution, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS presiding:

Madam Chairman and members of the committee, during my lifetime the youth of three generations has been marshaled for war. But 17 years before I was born the war that divided the North and the South had ended. With some of the veterans of that war I served in the siege of Santiago in 1898, they then being two-war veterans. Later I, like many other participants in the Spanish-American War, became a two-war veteran by serving in World War I. With World War II came, with the reenlistment of many veterans of the First World War, another numerous class of two-war veterans.

The point I am emphasizing, Madam Chairman, is that we have been following the pattern of two major wars in the prime of every succeeding generation of Americans. That fatal pattern we have followed for one full century, the armies of the North and the South having been filled with veterans of the war with Mexico.

I came to this Congress with the solemn pledge to myself that any small influence which I might attain, and certainly always my voice and my vote, would be used on every occasion which presented itself to break the pattern of two major wars in the prime of every generation.

My grandson sat on my lap in the historic Chamber of the House when I was sworn in as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress. If the pattern of the last century were to remain fixed on us, his mother and his father could have the prospect only of a son raised in the atmosphere of a religion of gentleness and a home of culture twice in his prime being subject to the service of Mars.

I do not want that boy, or any other boy or girl, to be caught in the mess of such a diabolical pattern.

As I took my oath of office, my young grandson on my lap, I gave to myself the promise that as a Member of this body I would respect the Constitution by seeking to preserve its integrity and its purpose in molding my every act on the pattern, not of war, but of peace.

In making mention of my own feeling on the subject of peace I do not wish to convey the impression that any of my colleagues are in the slightest degree less motivated by a sincere desire to avoid the possibilities of war and to build for a permanent and enduring peace. The fact is that there is not a single Member of this body, on either side of the aisle, who while naturally and properly seeking to perfect the security of our own country would by intention incite toward war. I speak, therefore, Madam Chairman, to men and women, my distinguished colleagues, who are as peace-minded as myself and the great masses of the American people whom we represent.

There is not in Washington in any public office anyone who is not wholeheartedly for peace. President Truman, himself a combat soldier in World War I, is in the finer and proper sense a pacifist. His is the responsibility in a critical period of a world rebuilding from a devastating war of protecting the Constitution and assuring the security of the American people. But it is to peace, the attainment of the permanent peace, that his administration is dedicated.

I think that not only our own people but all the world should know and appreciate our purpose. We cannot live in a disorganized world of poverty and frustration. We best help ourselves by helping other peoples to regain their feet. By removing the barriers of trade and employing our surplus investment capital in the development of the rich potentialities of the neglected areas in foreign lands we are definitely advancing toward a contented and therefore a peaceful world. A world without poverty is a world of peace. As the investment of our capital and our technical knowledge serves the useful purpose of raising from the poverty fringe the standard of living in other countries inevitably we benefit from the necessary expansion of the markets for our products.

In this program there is no taint of exploitation. In a mechanized age, when our factories can produce more than we can consume domestically, all that we are undertaking to do is to find more customers by helping to put more people in position to buy. We help them develop the resources of their own countries, for the benefit of their own peoples, and having done that the only return we expect is the expansion of our markets in a world of free competition.

When at a session of the Banking and Currency Committee, the effect of the devaluation of the pound having been mentioned, I asked Paul Hoffman if there were any danger of a harmful reaction upon our American economy from competition with European imports, he replied with a statement as convincing as the addition of two and two that behind every European worker was two horsepower of machinery and behind every American worker seven horsepower.

Add to the excess of American horsepower the genius of American business and the know how of our executives and our workers. Certainly in the free competition in the markets of the world, expanded beyond our wildest dreams merely by helping millions of other people into position to buy, we confidently can expect to raise even higher our own standard of living.

Madam Chairman, as I have said all this is building toward peace. There is nothing in this program to incite war. Give us 10 years and in the contentment of men and women everywhere in the improved economic condition of their lives will be the foundation of the permanent peace for which we all pray.

But meanwhile the cold war continues. We are spending billions of dollars for defense. Those best in position to know, having access to information highly confidential, believe that it is necessary.

I do not know, Madam Chairman, if it is possible to end the cold war on terms which would be acceptable to Russia and which we would regard as honorable. But I am convinced that a cold war cannot go on indefinitely without great and increasing danger of an exasperating incident dethroning reason. Heated indignation and hot impulse so easily could bring about the suicide of our civilization.

Not being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and being sensitive of my newness in this body and the much greater familiarity of my colleagues older in service with all phases determining our foreign policy, I have participated in the actions of the House as they have affected international relationships only to the extent of my vote.

I speak now because a strong sense of duty impels me to break the silence which in proper deference I have kept. I think, too, that it is owing to my constituents in the second district of Illinois, as well as to my colleagues of my own party, to go briefly into the reasoning behind my negative vote on the armed-aid-to-foreign-countries bill.

My decision I reached reluctantly but prayerfully. I had the completest confidence in the intention and the wisdom of President Truman, of those about him and of the leadership of this House. I knew that they were in possession of information which I did not have, that they were in the best position to judge, and that the bill to them appeared necessary not only for the security of America but to make more certain the peace.

It is never easy for me, in a field wherein I have not the same knowledge as others, to set up my own opinion against that of the well-considered judgment of those

greater experienced and of high purity of purpose and of recognized wisdom. But there are times, my colleagues, when the voice of conviction within us is so strong that it must take priority in the determination of our actions. I could not reason myself into believing that the cause of peace would be advanced by placing guns in the hands of people who by the careless use of those guns—a use over which we would have no control—might engulf us in that which no one wants, another war.

We cannot discard the fatal pattern of two major wars in every generation unless first we discard the pattern of the thinking which has preceded all the wars of the past.

I think the resolution for a world federation is a better approach to peace than the giving of guns even to our friends. Granting that guns in dependable hands may serve to maintain, by fear of superior force, a temporary peace, they nevertheless constitute at least a menace to the permanent peace which the world must have to escape the suicide of civilization envisioned in an atomic and germicide war.

The thought of a world federation, on the other hand, holds no menace except to the pattern of irritating and continuing controversies resulting in two major wars in every generation for the simple reason that such controversies in the past had only the battlefield as the final place of decision.

There is no abandonment of our nationalistic purpose, or our mission in destiny, if I may be permitted to use of the term in its understandable sense, in the formation of a world federation.

It should be understood by the American people that world federation is in fact the logical development on a universal scale of that which at one time in some quarters, where adherence to the status quo was deep rooted, was viewed with question as the American experiment.

It also should be understood that world federation is a necessary instrumentality to the carrying out of the American program for world rehabilitation. Let me touch briefly upon that program as I understand it.

If we cannot live in peace and contentment in a world of poverty and frustration, self-interest alone must impel us to seek means of lessening the poverty and removing the causes of frustration even in the remotest areas. Thus we have undertaken to send American dollars, with American technical knowledge and American skill, into industrially neglected areas, just as at one time in our own country the capital and the skill of the older States on the Atlantic seaboard sparked the development of the Middle Western States and the States in the far West. It all worked out for us to the advantage of everyone, as the newer areas developed the markets of the older areas broadened. But this happy result would not have followed if there had been artificial trade barriers to interfere with or restrict free competition.

So now, as a vitally important part of our program, we are endeavoring to establish as a principle acceptable to all nations that trade among nations and the peoples of nations shall be as free and unrestricted as the trade among the peoples of our own States. The present procedure, involving lengthy discussions and the entering into agreements, is cumbersome, as it would be were the State of Iowa, for example, empowered to set up a tariff wall against the products of Illinois and to remove such tariff wall it were necessary for Iowa and Illinois to negotiate after controversy and discussion some sort of agreement.

Here, then, in the instrumentality of the world federation is a function to be exercised, in correction of the present cumbersome procedure, to the advantage of all nations and to the disadvantage of none.

I cite this merely as one instance illustrative of the constructive contribution that will come from a world federation, which while it does not trespass upon the domain of a proper nationalistic purpose, or ideal, does in fact advance that purpose or ideal by giving it the strength of cooperative support.

I return now to what we are attempting to do under what is known as point IV, that is the attack through the use of American dollars and American skill upon the disease of poverty which plagues the neglected areas in foreign countries. The danger here is that our motivation will be misunderstood, or that in an unguided impulse of enthusiasm unduly to advance the national interest we will go too far, the result in either case being that there will arise the cry of American imperialism.

Certainly that cry would be entirely without justification, since the only benefit we as a people can derive is after and not before the bestowal through the employment of our means and skill of benefits upon the peoples of those neglected areas the like of which they never have known. But the mischief would be done, not by the fact but by the mere raising of the cry. That mischief might be fatal to the success of the plan. I respectfully submit to the calm judgment of the people of America that such mischief, possibly fatal to our entire program of world rehabilitation, easily might be avoided by accepting the instrumentality of a world federation not as antagonistic to a laudable nationalistic purpose but as a means of the attainment without friction or misunderstanding of the goal desired by all.

What I have said has scratched merely the surface. It has been intended as an appeal to the common sense of the ordinary everyday men and women of our country. Having the facts, the decisions they reach in the exercise of common sense will be the decisions that I shall accept and by which I shall abide.

I do not want my grandson, or the child or grandchild of any person anywhere, to have his life cut out for him in the pattern of two major wars in the prime of every generation. To avoid this I, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, will be bold enough to experiment in the patterns of peace rather than to remain fixed in orthodox but stubborn loyalty to a formula which for a full century in America has given us in the prime of every generation two major wars.

I am glad that the opportunity has come to me in the Eighty-first Congress to be one of the sponsors of this resolution. The fact that approximately one-fourth of the entire membership of the national House of Representatives have joined in the sponsorship of this resolution is in itself proof, which all the world should notice and accept, that it is the purpose and the will of America to attain in this generation the real, the abiding, the permanent peace by eradicating causes of friction by approaching in the spirit of the brotherhood of man all problems that touch upon human life anywhere.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, it has been the fashion for some time to debunk the famous. A whole school of literature has been built around the pastime of finding the feet of clay in the idols of humanity and reducing the wise, the holy, and the witty to mediocrity. Even some of our serious scholars who want their works as permanent contributions to scholarship, apparently find that to sell them, they must dwell on some of the more human foibles of the great.

So it was a deep relief to have just read "Admiral of the Ocean Sea," a biography of Columbus, written in 1942 by Samuel Eliot Morrison of the history department of Harvard University. I believe sincerely that this is one of the greatest biographies written by an American and I earnestly recommend it to anyone wanting to learn the unvarnished story of Columbus, stripped of layers of myths, legends, and half-truths about the great explorer. Certainly, any biography of Columbus written henceforth must begin with Professor Morrison's monumental book as source material.

In preparation for many years and written only after Professor Morrison laboriously traversed every path and every mile of water which Columbus sailed, Admiral of the Ocean Sea was written without prejudice or to bolster some thesis previously concocted out of racial prides or political policies.

Through this most searching analysis of the character of Columbus and a fresh evaluation of his skill as a scientist and a navigator, and above all, as a man of profound faith, the great navigator emerges as a man truly worthy of our admiration. The four hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of his landing at San Salvador reminds us of one of the greatest feats performed by a human being, and amply warrants our commemoration of it today.

When Columbus sailed into the unknown in 1492 he left a Europe strangely in about the same state of chaos, fear, and uncertainty it is in today. All nations had been devastated by a series of wars. Western civilization was threatened by a barbaric and aggressive power from the east. The treasuries of the nations were bankrupt, and Columbus really made his first voyage on the credit plan. There was widespread cynicism about the value of religion, education, and scientific progress.

With his future mortgaged, surrounded by fearful, untrustworthy, and even traitorous men who later besmirched his reputation, Columbus sailed into the unknown. He was upheld almost alone by his faith in God and the inspiration which he took from his name of Christoforo, or the "Christ bearer." We all know what his faith and his courage endowed us with in the New World in a physical way. This one man alone rekindled hope, faith, and progress in a distraught Europe and enabled men to look up again.

No fair historian has been able to detract a scintilla from the luster of the name of Columbus, and he still remains for us a source of inspiration and an idol without feet of clay.

Panama Canal—President Theodore Roosevelt's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the future of the Panama Canal, as indicated in the interim report of the investigation of Panama Canal tolls under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress—House Report No. 1304, Eighty-first Congress—is one of the vital questions now before the Congress. To assist in its consideration the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], included in his extension of remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5580, a selected bibliography dealing with special phases of the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States.

From that list of references it is apparent that one issue in this subject is the physical form of the future Panama Canal: The terminal lake plan, or the sea-level lock proposal.

Though the recent literature on the Canal question is extensive, the issue presented is not new. It is merely a resurrection of the old 1906 "battle of the levels" for the determination of the future Canal in a new form on the basis of alleged greater security of the hypothetical sea-level lock plan over the present high-level lake type Canal.

Comparable discussions of the merits of the two ideas took place at the time of the 1906 decision. One of the questions frequently raised in discussions and referred to in technical literature regarding that famed controversy concerns the views of President Theodore Roosevelt and Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, whose wise decision for the present-type canal has been thoroughly demonstrated.

In order that the views and decisions of these two eminent leaders may be available to the Congress and the country, I am extending in my remarks, under leave accorded, the message to Congress of February 19, 1906, of President Theodore Roosevelt forwarding the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the proposed canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter from Chief Engineer John F. Stevens to the Chairman of the Commission, in which he recommended the construction of the present Panama Canal against the advice of the majority of the consulting engineers.

The main points in President Theodore Roosevelt's message of 1906 are as applicable today as then. As to his statement about the extent of exposure of the Canal to damage in the event of war, in 1906 the greatest possible war danger was bombardment by warships; today it is from atomic bombing.

In view of the opinions of leading atomic warfare authorities that any type of canal would be vulnerable to atomic attack, the feature of vulnerability appears even less germane today than it was in 1906, when the greatest danger was from naval gunfire. Thus, with slight changes, the principal ideas and arguments enumerated in the indicated and gravely important message of Theodore Roosevelt apply to the present Canal situation.

The full text of this message, which I commend for careful reading and for adding to the bibliography already mentioned, now follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the board of consulting engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea-level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the board of consulting engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the board of consulting engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the consulting board and on the commission by a more than two to one majority favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea-level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operation of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama;" that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea-level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfulness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide, deep water strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages. But, in my judgment, the disadvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project.

A careful study of the reports seems to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea-level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea-level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea-level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea-level canal be constructed, its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined in the accompanying papers such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 19, 1906.

Columbus Day Addresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 11, the Honorable William F. O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, and His Excellency Alberto Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, addressed the Columbus Citizens Committee at the Waldorf Astoria, New York City. It was my pleasure to hear the addresses of these distinguished gentlemen. Under leave to extend by remarks, I include their addresses in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WILLIAM O'DWYER

Citizens of the greatest Italian city in the world, I greet you.

This is not the first Columbus Day I have saluted you. Every year we have joined in honoring Christopher Columbus who gave this great country of ours to the world.

I have been extremely fortunate in knowing your people on both sides of the Atlantic. Their devotion to democracy—to our democracy—can never be fully told. Their heroism is written in blood on the battlefields of the world.

I was in Italy during tragic days. I saw the courage of their men and women. I saw disease and starvation follow the bombs. I saw the Italian people fight and toil along the road back. Their spirit will always remain close to my heart.

Today Italy is a fortress of freedom in a continent of unrest. She has reaffirmed her loyalty to democracy. Today she gives strength to the democratic nations of the west. We should help her to take a hand

in the development of the lands known as the African colonies—with a view to their development, and eventual independence.

Today Italy has been excluded from the United Nations. You know why all America should continue to insist on Italian membership.

Our America can aid Italy in another way. Under United States laws there is a quota on Italian immigration. We should permit Italians who wish to join us as Americans to make full use of the quotas of the war years.

America will benefit by bringing here the kind of immigrant who carries the qualities of the pioneers. These will be men like you, men like Generoso Pope, the president of your committee, the kind of men who, with their sons, will defend this land and uphold her institutions.

Christopher Columbus by his discovery made possible this haven of liberty and democracy. We are Americans all. In the spirit of this theme the Columbus Citizens Committee works in a wise and practical way. It has established a scholarship fund for students of our public and parochial schools who, despite fine scholastic records, cannot afford to continue their education. In the name of Columbus scores of them selected by the board of education, regardless of their racial antecedents, are able to go to college. The fund this year has been swelled by you who attend this dinner, by those of you who have contributed to the souvenir journal, and by 15,000 city employees who have contributed to the boosters page because they want to share in this noble undertaking.

That is the added significance which you have given to the celebration of Columbus Day, a day for which many future American leaders will be grateful.

As we march tomorrow, you and I, let us remember that the people of America and Italy will continue forever their onward march in freedom, peace, and security.

And now I would like to say a closing word.

Buoni amici. Ricordo con grande piacere i giorni trascorsi in Italia con i vostri fratelli. Il mio cuore si colma di gioia per un gradito invito. I Sindaci di Roma, Palermo e Napoli mi hanno invitato a visitare le loro belle citta'. Saro' piu' che felice di ritornare in Italia e prego Dio che mi conceda questo mio grande desiderio. Viva l'America. Viva l'Italia.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ALBERTO TARCHIANI

The celebration of Columbus Day happily interrupts, this year, my daily task at the United Nations where I have the honor and the care of defending the legitimate rights of Italy and of populations longing for development, freedom, and independence.

The glory of Columbus and the eulogy of this great Italian hero are familiar to all of you. I will not repeat what several speakers have so well illustrated and emphasized. My presence at this gathering has the signification of a renewed tribute to his genius which we once more are exalting today.

But I will take this occasion to explain to you, briefly, on the present position of my Government, confronted again with the problem of the African territories.

The spring session of the United Nations has amply proved that there was no possibility of obtaining the required two-thirds suffrage for an Italian trusteeship on the three former colonies.

Even a much more modest accord between Sforza and Bevin was bitterly antagonized and defeated in the assembly of the 59 nations.

It was evident that the movement for independence in Libya, encouraged by the free Arab states, was predominant and invincible, particularly for us who, being absent from Africa as a consequence of fatal errors of the past, are very easily considered to be wrong.

It is a good and honest policy to keep ourselves in the middle of the central current of our time, doing everything possible to restore, maintain, increase friendly and useful relations with the Arab world, a very important element in the Mediterranean, in Africa, in the East.

Italy's proposals to the United Nations are the most reasonable, moderate, and generous, favoring—in the limits of reality—at the same time the natural and permanent interests of the local populations and those of the Italian nation.

In spite of the many maneuvers and countermaneuvers, we loyally hope that a bearable agreement will be reached, permitting us, together with our friends and allies, to look steadily toward the future, and much more intensely than toward the past.

The history of the world is nearing narrow and dangerous passes. Under the present circumstances it is chiefly our duty to gather around us all the elements that can strengthen our position and assure the maximum of effective international solidarity and practical aid in the economic field and elsewhere.

This is the essential point at this moment. We must not be diverted by other important but not vital arguments of prestige and sentiment regarding temporary and not decisive situations.

Those arguments—if justified—will not be abandoned, and they will follow their course toward profitable results, when properly managed and cleverly adapted to the changing conditions of development.

Let us then look to the essential under the good omen of this Columbus Day.

And—remember it well and always—what is essential for Italy, what is bound up with her destiny of liberty and dignity, is—in the spirit of Columbus—the fraternal, honorable cooperation with the United States under any circumstance, for the sake of a peace assured, not only by noble intentions, but also by a strong common defense.

More Beautiful Than the Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by my distinguished and beloved fellow townsman, Dr. William States Jacobs. It is timely, and beautifully written.

MORE BEAUTIFUL THAN THE DREAM

This afternoon, just as the scaffolding had been torn away from the spire of the new Presbyterian Church on Main Street, I saw for the first time its incomparable and glorified simplicity outlined against the western sky. I had spent the day in the city—that incorrigible conglomeration of grossly materialistic pragmatics. I was tired of the hard pavements, the stuffy elevators, the dumb waiting rooms, the inane conversation, the slavish business conventionalities, the sprawling egotism, and self-importance of subaltern officials, of bent and tottering forms, of once strong men, of the noise and confusion and smell and poison gasses of the streets, of the motley masses of meaningless faces and the vast towering temples of Mammon crowded from pavement to pinnacle, with money-mad men running to and fro.

As I eased out of it along the main boulevard and came in sight of that superb heritage of the past, the spire of the new Presbyterian Church, I rejoiced in silence for no words can tell of the triumph of such a spiritual monument among material and temporal things.

True, the atmosphere was better out there, in that center of art and culture and science and learning and ecclesiastical modernity. But all of these level off far below the incomparable, indescribable, and ineffable finger of faith pointing triumphantly, gloriously, and serenely heavenward.

Out there are architectural interpretations of religion in varied human conceptions inherited from the past, but here is one that is stripped of every device of ambitious artistry, where the draftsman, in absolute self-effacement, has simply unveiled the symbol of pure and undefiled religion, which stands guard over the altars of worship, and the quiet aisles of prayer, and serenely points to Him who sits in the circle of the heavens, who from heaven, His dwelling place, hears and answers prayers of the faithful.

Other towering monuments in that cultural center speak eloquently of the wealth, the genius, and the generosity of man, while this matchless spire speaks only of God; and I thought of the apostle of old who fell down to worship at the feet of the angel that showed him many wonderful things; and the angel said to him, "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this book. Worship God!"

I drove on to the medical center where I visited awhile with the sick, and as I returned the day was dying in the west and reflected in the last rays of the setting sun, I could see faintly a star atop that exquisite spire—a gleaming memory of the spiritual past and a resplendent prophecy of Jehovah's kingdom to come, and I thought of a star in the east and of the wise men following afar off, and shepherds guarding their flocks by night on the Judean Hills, and of the song of the angels, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men," and of the manger in Bethlehem, of Judea, and of the words of the prophet, "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," and as I drew nearer, lo the star was a flaming cross and the words of Jesus came to me, "And I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Me," and my spirit that had been tortured and torn in the maelstrom of material things down in the city was quiet now, and peace that passes all understanding came over my soul.

And I dreamed, and I thought that there were patriarchs and prophets and apostles and martyrs and saints that have told us of God over the tumult of the centuries, and now in this hard, busy, eager, troubled, sinning world, this marvelous symbol of religion will still be telling the passing throngs in the words of the angel of Patmos, "Worship God!" And I recalled from memories of the past that I had once dreamed of this spire, but the reality is incomparably more beautiful than the dream. (Excerpt from the diary of Dr. William States Jacobs.)

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was very fitting that the House of Representatives should adjourn on Columbus

Day in honor of the discovery and the discoverer of America.

Inspired by the usual motives of his age, Cristoforo Colombo, the Genoese navigator, set forth for "God, gold, and glory." He was an eminently pious man and expressed his desire to spread Christianity in the Indies. A few hours before sailing from Spain Columbus went alone to a chapel and received the sacrament of Holy Communion from his friend, Friar Juan Perez, the superior of the monastery where Columbus was a guest. Also, the whole company of seamen went to confession and Mass just before sailing. On my visit to Spain it was my privilege to stand in the very room where Columbus knelt and received the blessing of Almighty God which resulted in the discovery of America. It was a solemn experience and brought the inescapable and poignant query: Are we doing all that God would have us do to make America the kind of land that He intended when He led Columbus to these shores? How Columbus answered God's call for a new world has been beautifully expressed by one of the poets:

Give me white paper;
The sheet you use is black and rough with smears
Of sweat and grime and fraud and blood and tears,
Crossed with the story of men's sins and fears,
Of battle and of famine all those years
When all God's children have forgot their birth,
And drudged and fought and died like beasts of earth.
Give me white paper.
One storm-trained seaman listened to the word;
What no man saw, he saw; he heard what no man heard;
For answer he compelled the sea
To eager man to tell
The secret she had kept so well:
Left blood and woe and tyranny behind,
Sailing still west that land new-born to find,
For all mankind the unstained page unfurled
Where God might write anew the story of the world.

That trait of character which above all else distinguished Columbus from others of his time was perseverance. In that respect he was like our own great Washington. It was not only on the sea that he would not turn back; perseverance was a lifelong trait. One needs to enumerate the disappointments and discouragements of this man to appreciate his unwavering purpose and his indomitable will.

The decade before his first great voyage of discovery was filled with a rapidly occurring series of disappointments. He was turned down and double-crossed by King John II of Portugal; disappointed by the Count of Medina Celi, who kept him hoping for 2 years before deciding adversely; refused by an investigating committee appointed by Queen Isabella of Spain; disappointed once more by King John and his brother in Lisbon, Portugal; unsuccessful throughout 1490 in securing a hearing at the Spanish court; in 1491 once more turned down by a junta in Spain; recalled on his journey to France by new hopes in Spain; his conditions were rejected, and he again started for France; recalled by Queen Isabella and an agreement was reached.

Then after seemingly insurmountable difficulties in securing men and ships, the adventurers sailed on Friday, August 3, 1492, at 8 o'clock in the morning. When 3 days out, one of the little ships lost her rudder and repairs at Teneriffe caused a month's delay. Then followed fear of capture by Portuguese ships; unexpected variations in the magnetic needle; a fearsome meteor falling into the sea; passage through the dread Sargasso Sea with its clinging seaweed; and threatened mutiny of his men. Still he sailed on because he was God's man fulfilling God's purpose. Would that we might all and always as truly be found fulfilling the divine plan for us and for our beloved America.

Behind him lay the gray Azores,
Behind the gates of Hercules;
Before him not the ghost of shores;
Before him only shoreless seas.
The good mate said: "Now must we pray,
For lo! the very stars are gone.
Speak, admiral! What shall we say?"
Why say "sail on! sail on! and on!"

Colored Television Developed by RCA at Princeton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last night it was my privilege to witness a demonstration of an outstanding scientific advance achieved in the congressional district which I represent. This was colored television—which is in the process of being perfected at the Radio Corp. of America Laboratories at Princeton, N. J. It is an achievement which will mean much to every American. I think it important for the Members of Congress to be familiar with the facts behind the development of colored television, and therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, offer some basic background information.

Colored television is being perfected at the RCA laboratories in Princeton, N. J., by the following outstanding scientists: Dr. C. B. Jolliffe, executive vice president in charge of the research laboratories; Dr. E. W. Engstrom, vice president in charge of research; Dr. G. H. Brown and R. D. Kell, members of the technical staff, and many other scientists and engineers.

The first scheduled program of color-television broadcasts—a part of the Radio Corp. of America field tests—is being presented in Washington, D. C., by RCA to demonstrate to the Federal Communications Commission and to the public the new RCA all-electronic, high-definition, and completely compatible color-television system.

The initial demonstration was presented for the official record of the FCC in its current hearing relating to the adoption of technical standards for color-television service. This demonstration and subsequent color transmissions, originating at the National Broadcasting Co.'s WNBW studios at the Wardman Park Hotel, provide an opportunity for representatives of the Government, the press, science, industry, and the public to observe the color system which RCA believes to be the best foundation for satisfactory standards.

Continuing demonstrations are planned to show how this system can be the basis for the establishment of a color television service without obsoleting present black-and-white sets.

The programs feature variety artists, radio and television stars, color motion pictures and color slides, all scanned by color cameras to demonstrate the effectiveness of the new RCA system in transmitting and receiving scenes and action in natural colors for the added enjoyment of the public.

OBJECTIVE OF RCA

Speaking for the record, Dr. Elmer W. Engstrom, vice president in charge of research, RCA laboratories, declared:

RCA has believed from the beginning that television should progress from black-and-white to color just as soon as this was practical. Believing this, RCA has aggressively worked upon all promising systems of color television and has earnestly directed its efforts to this end.

RCA has believed that color television, when established, should be based upon a lasting foundation of proper standards, excellent performance, and should be developed in an orderly manner with regard to the black-and-white television service.

RCA is pleased that its experimental work and engineering analysis provide the basis, and this we may now state with conviction, for high-definition color television within six-megacycle VHF and UHF channels and compatible with the present black-and-white service.

This system for the first time enables color television in six megacycles to proceed upon a lasting foundation of proper standards, excellent performance, and complete compatibility with existing receivers.

IMPORTANCE OF COMPATIBILITY

Dr. Engstrom pointed out that the RCA color television system is a compatible system. This means, he explained, that present television receivers can receive color programs in black and white without any modification. Also, when a broadcaster shifts from black-and-white transmission to color transmission, the viewer of an existing black-and-white receiver is unaware of the shift. On the other hand, a viewer of a new color set, receiving programs in color, will, when the broadcaster changes from color to black-and-white transmission, see black-and-white pictures without making any changes in his receiver.

The question of compatibility is of great importance not only to the present owner of a black-and-white receiver but may very well be fundamental to the economics of a color television broadcasting service—

Said Dr. Engstrom.

In considering the public interest, it is necessary to take into account these economic factors, because the public cannot be served unless the broadcasters are able to render a commercial service.

With a compatible system a broadcaster first starting color schedules is automatically

assured that he will retain his full potential audience on all the receivers in his service area, both black-and-white receivers and new color receivers. The economics of the television broadcasting industry appear to be such that regular color broadcasting service might be seriously delayed if the broadcaster must sacrifice circulation, and therefore revenue, in order to provide color transmissions.

With a fully compatible system, however, the broadcaster can change at will, either from color to black or white or the reverse, without disturbing the viewers of either the existing receivers or color receivers, and without requiring adjustments to either type of receiver. This means no loss of audience at the start or later, which will no doubt be an important factor for some time, because it is probable that many programs will be transmitted in black and white even when color becomes an established service.

With appropriate production design, Dr. Engstrom declared, RCA believes that new color receivers of reasonable cost, practical to install and simple to operate, can be made available by the radio industry. He pointed out that economies and price reductions have been achieved in black-and-white sets, and similarly it may be expected that economies and price reductions will be experienced in color receivers as demand and quantity production develop.

ADAPTING SETS TO RECEIVE COLOR

Existing black-and-white television receivers may be converted to receive color pictures by various methods in the RCA color system, Dr. Engstrom said. He described these methods as follows:

First. By using a separate converter unit containing appropriate electronic gear and picture-tube viewing arrangement of a 10-inch diameter size.

Second. By substituting a new projection unit for the cathode-ray tube in the black-and-white set.

Third. By adding one tube to the cathode ray tube in the black-and-white set and changing the three-color signal to a two-color signal to be viewed on the two-cathode-ray-tube combination.

SCOPE FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT

In a medium of such tremendous social and economic impact as color television—

Continued Dr. Engstrom—

RCA believes that it is vitally important that the system adopted be based upon such principles that its future improvement is unhampered. The RCA color television system provides this scope and flexibility.

It is the belief of RCA that this new system provides for the first time a sound basis for bringing color television service to the public, as well as full scope for the continuing development of color as the art progresses, without involving obsolescence of present-day black-and-white receivers. RCA color is a complete departure from mechanical color and the rotating color discs and moving parts which have characterized all the mechanical color systems invented since 1925.

EQUIPMENT USED IN DEMONSTRATIONS

Dr. Engstrom said that the RCA color television equipment used in the demonstrations before the FCC and others was developed at RCA Laboratories, Princeton, N. J. It consists of two cameras for live subjects in the studio, one camera for color motion picture film, and one camera for color slides. There are two color monitors and a control-room console. Color pick-ups also are viewed in the studio on a specially built receiving unit, designed with 16-inch tubes.

This studio equipment not only provides ample flexibility for current operations, but has the necessary elements for conducting the continuing color broadcasts planned by RCA at the conclusion of these demonstrations.

The WNBW transmitter used in the demonstrations operates on channel 4 of the assigned standard black-and-white television band.

Color receivers and black-and-white receivers for the demonstrations have been installed at the Washington Hotel, 2 miles from the transmitter. Since the RCA color system is compatible, RCA engineers pointed out that the transmissions in color do not interfere in any way with the regular black-and-white service of WNBW. In fact, any owner of a standard television receiver in Washington and surrounding areas can view the current demonstrations and subsequent field tests in black and white with full detail.

NEW COLOR CAMERA BEING DEVELOPED

An increasing number of color receivers are to be made available by RCA for field testing to obtain technical data, service experience and user comment and reaction, Dr. Engstrom reported. He also reported that RCA has started development of a field-type color camera and associated apparatus. This is expected to be ready next spring and will then be added to the field test set-up. This field camera will use a new camera tube which will greatly reduce the size of the camera itself. A mock-up of this camera and an operating sample of the camera tube was displayed during the demonstrations.

HOW THE RCA COLOR SYSTEM WORKS

Briefly, as Dr. Engstrom explained, this is what happens when the RCA color television system goes into action:

The color camera in the studio is equipped with three separate tubes. Each of these pick-up tubes, equipped with an appropriate color filter, receiyes one—and only one—of the primary colors, which in television are red, blue, and green. In transmitting a color picture, these colors are electrically sampled in rapid sequence and combined. The combination is then transmitted as a unit over a standard television transmitter.

At the receiving end, the single television signal is fed to an electronic arrangement which is the inverse of the sampler at the pick-up. The combination is separated and a signal representing each color goes to a tube in the receiver which reproduces a picture in that particular color. The three separate colors are then viewed simultaneously as a single, complete color picture.

The RCA all-electronic color television system retains all of the black-and-white picture characteristics, such as the number of lines and fields per second, and to these adds color. The picture detail, smoothness of motion and other characteristics are the same as for black and white. It is as high in definition as black and white. This is fundamental, Dr. Engstrom said, for to accomplish less would be to reduce color television to something secondary to the present black-and-white television system, and hence of uncertain lasting utility.

Washington Politics Moves the Nation Closer to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the official debasement of the pound sterling and in its wake the currencies of many other countries, which threatens to become universal and which profoundly altered the value of the American dollar in its relation to those currencies, is highly indicative of the moral bankruptcy of the regimes controlling the governments concerned. Further, it highlights the progress those political forces are making in tyrannizing peoples; that is, attaining complete political control over their actions, variously termed communism, socialism, fascism, nazism, New Dealism, Fair Dealism, statism, welfare state, planned economy, and so forth.

About 300 years ago a prominent English knight, addressing the House of Lords, said:

> The steps by which the Roman state descended were visible most by the general alteration of their coins; and there is no surer symptom of consumption in state than the corruption of money.

Assuredly one of the, if not the most important chapter in the history of the decadence of western civilization will deal with the almost universal debasement of money that is taking place in this period of the world's history.

Though the debasement of money since ancient times has been resorted to by politicians in practically every nation of the world there is certainly no record of such all-embracing and extensive debasement as has taken place since World War I.

Furthermore, until the present universal money debauch began mankind looked upon this practice as an unmitigated evil, as a system of political robbery and legalized bilking of creditors by debtors. But in our time so great has become the power of politics throughout the world as to actually make it possible for it to legalize this highway robbery—aye, even to give it appearance of respectability, thanks to the creation of the International Monetary Fund.

This international political scheme gives legal sanction to the debasement of the currencies that has taken place and to the great disturbance caused thereby in the relationship of the value of the dollar and that of those currencies. The reduction in the exchange value of the pound and that of nearly all the other currencies that followed amounts to approximately 30 percent. In practice this

will work out in such a way as to not only defraud by a like amount the public owning Government securities, but it will do the same in respect of all private savings—bank deposits, insurance policies, so-called social security, corporation shares, pensions, and so forth. Also, it will serve to cancel out international Government debts as well as international private debts. This is but another move by the international totalitarians to wipe out the middle classes.

Let us not forget that it was Lord John Maynard Keynes, the greatest monetary charlatan the world ever knew, that inveigled the Roosevelt Administration to adopt the International Monetary Fund agreement. Every important provision in the fund was copied from Keynes' plan for an International Clearing Union. Hence both Bretton Woods and the Administration in substance did practically nothing more than rubber stamp what Keynes dictated. Let anyone who doubts this read my statement relating to this point entitled "Who Devised the So-Called Bretton Woods Proposal for an International Monetary Fund" on page 1307 of the House Banking and Currency Committee hearings of 1945 on H. R. 2211, or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4903, May 22, 1945, as well as in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle in serial form, beginning May 24, 1945.

The late Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson, noted international monetary authority, referring to the Morgenthau drafts and the Clearing Union, said "both the plans are British plans." Dr. Melchior Palyi, another outstanding international authority on the subject, said "the two plans are identical in almost everything but technicalities."

Many other authorities noted the likeness of the two schemes. It was also pointed out by members of the British Parliament. In fact, no one has ever attempted to disprove the contention that the substantive provisions of the International Monetary Fund were written by Keynes. The late Harry D. White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, made a blanket statement denying my analysis showing item by item that the Bretton Woods agreement for an International Monetary Fund was written by Keynes but he offered not one bit of evidence in proof of his claim.

A great portion of the public, and I must say with much regret, the Congress as a whole, were induced to approve the International Monetary Fund agreement in the belief that its purpose was to stabilize the value of money in the sense of maintaining a fixed purchasing power. That, however, was not Lord Keynes' objective. His idea was to maintain a fixed exchange rate between the several currencies, not the value or purchasing power of the currencies in terms of services and goods.

Keynes was an advocate of printing-press money. His aim in establishing the International Monetary Fund was to coordinate the speed of the printing presses of the political regimes concerned so as to maintain a more or less stable relationship between the amounts of monetary units emitted. However, he was careful to provide in the fund enough loopholes to permit the political regime in each one of the countries belonging to the fund to resort to unlimited debasement of its currency. It should not be forgotten that Keynes in a long letter in 1933 urged President Roosevelt to print money to cure the depression. This advice was accepted and carried out to an extraordinary degree. And what price printing-press money to the United States! Printing-press money has already engulfed a large segment of the world and threatens to inundate the remainder. Back of this, of course, as previously noted, is the moral degeneracy of the forces controlling governments.

The Roosevelt administration was so taken in by Lord Keynes' scheme that the two first drafts for an international monetary stabilization fund put out by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau actually contained a provision which would have directly obligated the United States to assume foreign debts of Great Britain. Of course, through the Marshall plan, the $4,000,000,000 gift loan and the International Monetary Fund we are, in a sense, doing the same indirectly, in a measure, at least.

This monetary debasement will have the effect of substantially raising the United States price of gold in terms of certain foreign currencies. So we may expect an additional flow of the yellow metal to the United States, thus adding to our inflation potential and sterile gold hoard.

There can be no doubt that the United States silver- and gold-buying programs is a root cause of the perturbed world in which we are now living. The great imbalance of the holdings of these metals, principally of gold, of course, among the nations of the world that has been brought about by such program has been one of the most powerful forces making for trade restrictions, unilateral trade agreements, multiple currencies, import quotas, and so forth, and disorganization of international trade.

Political expediency, not principle, prompted the Washington politicians to approve the debasement of the pound sterling that led to the avalanche of debasements in other countries. They well knew that this act can do no more than temporarily improve England's position.

By our silver-purchase program the Roosevelt administration drained China practically dry of silver—China was on a silver standard—which completely disorganized her economy, laid her wide open to attack by Japan and formed a solid footing for the Communist control of China which now exists.

Three times in 1934 the Chinese Government protested to the United States Department of State that our silver-buying program was bringing ruin to China and requested that it be discontinued, but our Department of State lent only a deaf ear to these pleadings. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau was charged with the responsibility of carrying out the silver-purchase program, yet, strange to say, in 1939, 5 years after those protests were made and China was in dire distress as a result of losing her silver, and in danger of losing her struggle against Japan, before the House Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, when I questioned Mr. Morgenthau about these protests he admitted that he had never heard of them before. This should give one an idea of the kind of administration we had in Washington at that time.

Through the gold-buying program the New Deal administration furnished an immense amount of war materials to Japan which gave her great effectiveness in her attack upon China—whom we had already so greatly weakened by draining her of her silver. The New Deal bought about $750,000,000 worth of gold from Japan, paying her a high premium, gold which we neither needed or ever used. We paid for that gold with scrap iron, oil, airplane engines and parts, and a lot of other things that Japan later threw back at us, maiming and killing our boys in the Pacific.

Is it any wonder that John Bassett Moore, America's greatest international lawyer, says in his forthcoming Memoirs that our foreign policy is "insanity"? What earthly justification could the New Deal possibly conjure up to support any claim of interest in saving China, or, for that matter, any other country, from communism?

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the New Deal gold and silver buying program has not had the effect of making other nations more friendly to the United States of America. If it has done anything but create enmity toward this country of ours I should like to have someone point it out. No words can express the seriousness of this situation.

The International Monetary Fund and Bank, which we were assured would cure England's trouble and were to provide the last gift, has utterly failed. The $4,000,000,000-gift loan went down a rat hole and left England worse off than before. Now the Marshall plan is proving itself to be as ineffective in pulling Socialist England out of its doldrums as the other gifts we had made her. Whether the Washington politicians took this step of monetary debauchment as an expedient in desperation for want of courage and integrity to face the facts and frankly admit that the Marshall plan has failed as completely as the other measures, or whether guided by a determination to further move toward integrating the economy of the United States with that of Great Britain, thus compelling our people to accept a lower standard of living by making our country a dumping ground for cheap British goods, is uncertain.

But of one thing we may be sure. That since this monetary debasement must inevitably create a bigger problem than the one it was alleged to cure, other drastic political measures await us. Secretary Snyder says that the United States price of gold $35 per ounce, will not be raised. But is it within the power of the Washington politicians to make good this assertion? Only the future will answer this question. That tremendous pressure will be exerted in that direction no one who understands the situation will doubt. The gold-mining interests in this country that have been pressing for an increase in the price of gold will have a pretty good justification now for demanding this. Since the United States price of gold is raised for

foreign goods producers, which this so-called Devaluation Act has effected, what possible argument can be adduced to counter a demand by our gold producers that they receive like treatment.

A point of the utmost importance should be mentioned here. It must not be overlooked that the official debasement of the pound and other foreign currencies, which was participated in by the Truman administration, altered the exchange value of the American dollar in relation to the foreign currencies involved. Yet the Constitution of the United States says in the clearest terms that the Congress and it alone shall have power over our money.

Two other sources will have the effect of pressuring the Washington politicians into raising the Treasury price of gold and further debasing the dollar. The debasement of the pound sterling and the other currencies will have the effect of cutting down American exports. It will be possible for England and other foreign countries to undersell our merchants, certainly with respect to many items. They have already begun to do so. If the Snyder-Cripps debasement scheme really works as those gentlemen have given the world to understand it will—that is, if British and other foreign goods come into our market in the volume which the debasement procedure anticipates, keep your eye on Congress and see what happens. Members of this body will quickly hear from their constituents who are losing their business and their jobs because of the dumping into this country of cheaper foreign goods.

The New Deal Frankenstein doth grind and not so slowly either.

Statement of Policy Adopted by Western States Conference, San Francisco, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of policy adopted by the Western States Democratic Conference which convened recently in San Francisco, Calif.:

The Western States Democratic Conference is composed of representative members of the Democratic Party from all of the 11 Western States, Alaska and Hawaii. It has met for two full days with the principal officers of the Federal Government who are charged with administering our domestic and economic program.

We have considered with them the problems, the needs, and the aspirations of the people of our area under the general headings of jobs, land, water, power, and other resources. We reaffirm our support of the national democratic platform and the policies of President Truman, and we adopt this statement of a program for the West. This program will insure the continued building of a strong national economy with full provision for the expansion and development of our area. Every Western Democratic candidate should campaign on this program in 1950.

The Republican Party, in the Eightieth Congress opposed the principles of this program. It damaged the West. In the Eighty-first Congress, the Republicans have continued their tactics of sabotage. We are shocked that western Republicans, disregarding western interests, have continually joined in these tactics.

In the last 10 years, the West has grown more rapidly than any other area. Its resources, properly used and conserved, can provide more jobs, more and better homes, more productive farms, greater industry and commerce, finer natural playgrounds, and a richer life for all of us.

Our fellow citizens of Alaska and Hawaii are entitled to full representation and participation in our National Government. We strongly urge their immediate admission to statehood.

JOBS AND INDUSTRY

The manpower of the West is its greatest asset. The national objective of the Democratic Party is the maintenance and expansion of our more than $200,000,000,000 economy to a $300,000,000,000 level. The West, with its greatly increased manpower and its natural resources, has an immense contribution to make toward reaching this objective.

We must encourage the continued and rapid development of industry, land and water resources in the West to meet the needs of an increased population. We stand for fair treatment of business and industry in freight rates, transportation facilities, credit opportunities and protection of small business against monopoly and unfair discrimination. We recommend to the Congress the passage of the Economic Expansion Act of 1949, and we commend the National Administration for its fight for these objectives.

We want no special favors. We ask only equal treatment with other sections of the Nation.

We favor an integrated policy on a Nation-wide basis to permit the expansion of industry and job opportunities in the West without interruption. The Democratic program promotes business and industry in the West and in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska and assures full, fair job opportunity. Business expansion creates full employment and job opportunities. Jobs and job opportunities must be secure against economic uncertainties and against discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color. The new minimum-wage law adopted by the Democratic Eighty-first Congress helps protect the West's traditionally high employment standards. Those standards should be further safeguarded by extension of this law to cover more groups and by the enactment of complementary uniform State minimum-wage laws. Collective bargaining in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect between management and labor must not be restricted by repressive and discriminatory Government controls against either employer or employee.

We strenuously urge the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. We are determined to continue the pattern of sound labor-management relations developed by the Democratic Party since 1932.

Low employment standards anywhere in the country hurt the West. Real progress in protecting human rights was made when the Democratic Eighty-first Congress voted to raise the minimum-wage level to 75 cents an hour. We condemn the Republican opposition which caused the exclusion of some from protection and blocked extension of minimum-wage protection to millions more who deserve to be covered.

We condemn the Republican leadership in the Congress which conspired while giving lip service to civil rights, to alter the Senate rules to block the enactment of civil-rights measures.

We are proud that our Democratic Congress passed a comprehensive housing law which will provide low-rent housing for low-income families and will replace slums with parks and decent homes. We call for expansion of this program, which realizes that the root of true Americanism is in our home life, to encourage cooperative housing projects, especially for our veterans, and to promote better housing at lower cost for middle-income families.

We recommend a resurvey of all Federal income and excise taxes, as recommended by the President. We heartily commend the steps taken by the President to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and for his other actions to promote greater economy and efficiency in our National Government.

LAND AND PEOPLE

The land of the West is vast, fertile, and productive. We must find markets for its great crops. We must protect the farmers and ranchers who work the land from economic losses they cannot control. We must protect the soil itself from abuse and exploitation.

The wage earners of America are the chief consumers of farm products. The interests of farmers and workers are indivisible. Neither the farmer-producer nor the worker-consumer should be confused by those who would set one against another. The road from the farmers of the West to the consumers of the East should not be blocked by high and discriminatory freight rates.

The farmer cannot close down his farm nor cut production when prices drop. This is particularly true in the West, which produces 60 percent of the tree and vine crops which require years of cultivation. When there are surpluses our growers should not have to depend upon the chance of Government purchase in order to get a return for their labor. Instead they, and other farmers, should be protected by the production-payment plan recommended by Secretary Brannan.

Under this method the price of the product would find its own level in the market. The farmer would be paid by the Government the difference between the support price and the average market price. Production payments would provide fair farm income and a lower price to the consumer. This plan avoids the present double burden on the taxpayer of paying for the support program and paying the support price in the market.

We are proud of the fact that our Democratic Congress has restored the grain-storage facilities and undone the crippling legislation of the Republican Eightieth Congress in this field.

We commend the Democratic administration and the Congress for the reciprocal-trade program which provides foreign markets for western farm products.

We commend the Democratic congressional majority for its support of farmer cooperatives.

The independent family-sized farm must be protected against agricultural monopoly. We favor crop insurance and disaster loans which aid every farmer in coping with the hazards of nature. We commend the Democratic Eighty-first Congress for including in the housing bill a farm-housing program of direct loans and grants.

The farm-laborers of the West, who bear a special burden because of the great areas they must cover, are entitled to benefits and protection commensurate with their work.

Above all, our western soil must be protected from erosion and abuse. We endorse the soil conservation program which was ruthlessly cut by the Eightieth Congress and restored and expanded by the Democratic

Eighty-first Congress. We shall never permit selfish interests to rob us of the soil upon which our present and future depends.

WATER AND THE WEST

Water is the most precious resource of the West. It must be harnessed and conserved in the public interest from its source to its final use. Unless it is efficiently developed and used for the benefit of everyone, the West cannot achieve its destiny. It is essential that the waters of the West and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska be rapidly and fully developed and the reclamation act be extended to these Territories. The resources of the great drainage basins of the West and and Territories, such as the Columbia River, Central Valley, the Colorado River, and the Missouri Valley, can be developed only on a unified regional basis by adequate planning of area-wide projects to provide complete irrigation of arable land, ample water for domestic and industrial use, electric power publicly transmitted and sold at the lowest rate, control of floods, salinity and pollution; expanded and improved fish and wildlife resources, and greater opportunities for recreation.

We call for the immediate creation of a Columbia Valley Administration and a Missouri Valley Authority. We approve the principle of majority local representation on such Government agencies.

The West is the world's greatest playground. Its national parks and monuments are a trust for the people of the Nation. We favor their continued expansion and development; we insist that they be protected against all attempts at private encroachment and exploitation. We demand that adequate appropriations be made for their protection and operation.

CONSERVE FOR TOMORROW

We favor continued protection of our forests by our National Government against the hazards of fire and blight, and against overcutting and overgrazing. Our great timber and grazing resources must be preserved for coming generations through an expanded program of reforestation and reseeding of grass lands. We urge adequate appropriations be made to carry out the basic principles of the Nicholson plan.

Adequate appropriations must be given the Forest Service for more public camp grounds. Public camp grounds should be maintained without charge.

We recognize and urge that the vast land acquisitions of the Federal Government in the West and Territories require continuing examination of the problem of remuneration to local governments for lost tax revenue.

The unparalleled mineral resources of the West are the backbone of our national defense. We must promote the revival of the metal-mining industry through the passage of such measures as the O'Mahoney bill S. 2105, and the stock-piling of mineral products essential to defense. We urge a reexamination of present laws restricting the ownership, purchase, and sale of newly mined gold.

In contrast to the Republican Eightieth Congress which almost wrecked our reclamation program, the Democratic leadership of the present Congress has extended regional power development and reclamation projects under the Department of the Interior, and we urge upon the Congress the adoption of the recommendation of the President in the furtherance of this program.

The Democratic Eighty-first Congress has enacted a well-planned natural-resource program despite partisan opposition in which western Republicans consistently joined to the detriment of their own constituents. We commend the Congress on its approval of a bill authorizing construction of the Webber Basin project and for approving various river compacts between the States. We urge the Senate to concur in the action of the House in approving bills providing for the development of the American River Basin and the construction of irrigation canals in the Sacramento Valley.

A CALL TO THE WEST

We express our deep appreciation to the Vice President, Cabinet members, and other Federal officers and national party leaders for their keen interest in our western problems and for their active participation in our discussions.

We, the members of the Western States Democratic Conference, pledge ourselves to work for the achievement of this program. We support our President and our fellow Democrats in Congress in their fight for it. We call upon all the people of the West to elect candidates who will fight for it.

Repatriate Americans Voting in Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a bill to provide for the naturalization of former citizens of the United States who lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election in Italy after October 12, 1943, and before the enactment of this act. The history of the conditions abroad making necessary the enactment of this bill is as follows:

It is generally known that many persons while citizens of the United States voted in Italy without the knowledge of the serious consequence of their acts but who, nevertheless, lost American citizenship under the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940, which became effective on January 13, 1941. It is also a well-known fact that communication facilities throughout a large part of the world were disrupted as a result of war conditions and on account of the paramount interest in news concerning the war, little space was given in the press to the passage of the Nationality Act of 1940. Therefore, many persons voted in Italy who would not have done so had they had knowledge of the fact that under the act they would forfeit their citizenship in the United States, the greatest country in the world. These persons, many urged by relatives and friends in the United States who were considered well-informed in world affairs, and others, impelled by listening to the Voice of America over the radio, did what they felt to be their duty, not only to their own Nation but to the whole world, in order to prevent the spread of communism, the greatest menace to freedom.

The Eightieth Congress failed to approve legislation to enable these persons to regain their citizenship; it is up to this Congress to pass this bill protecting these former citizens of the United States and correct the injustice inflicted upon them.

A Tax Incentive Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill entitled "The Tax Incentive Act of 1950" because I am convinced that this is the time to correct existing defects in the Federal tax structure in order to preserve our prosperity. There are abundant signs that we can achieve a balanced and highly productive economy following the postwar period of inflation and readjustment if we adopt a sound fiscal policy. Such a policy would stimulate increased purchases of goods by the consuming public and give necessary incentives to job-creating investment without reducing Federal revenues. It will be a happy day for all when the Congress can substantially reduce the tax burden in all income brackets. This we are unable to do now if we are to fulfill our world-wide responsibilities, but we can make immediate revisions in the interest of incentive.

These principles have guided me in framing the tax-revision bill. The bill makes a number of changes of a limited nature in the Federal tax structure in order to stabilize industry and stimulate employment and consumption.

First of all, provision is made for the reduction of certain excise taxes and the elimination of others. Specifically, I propose that the rates be reduced on toilet preparations, long-distance and local telephone service, telegrams, photographic equipment and supplies, and the transportation of persons. The bill eliminates taxes on electric light bulbs and on baby powder, baby oil, and similar preparations intended mainly for use in the care of infants. It also exempts from taxes jewelry items selling for less than $50, furs selling for less than $500, and on luggage retailing for less than $25. This treatment of jewelry, furs, and luggage retains the full rate on luxury items but eliminates taxes on such things as costume jewelry and on the moderately priced fur coats, purses, wallets, suitcases and the like that are bought by the average man and woman.

The net effect of all the above changes would be to eliminate or reduce many of the taxes that are most onerous to consumers and that have given excises their well-deserved nickname of nuisance taxes. The high wartime excises were not designed primarily to produce revenue but were imposed in order to cut down the consumption of nonwar commodities. Supplies of these goods in the hands of producers and dealers are now adequate, and our job is to stimulate employment in these industries and make their products available to the public at lower prices.

In order to overcome the stagnant condition of our capital markets, I have included in the bill the following alterations in capital gains taxation: First, re-

duction of the tax rate on long-term gains to 10 percent; second, increasing to $5,000 the amount by which capital losses may be offset against ordinary income; and, third, shortening the holding period to 3 months. These changes will encourage the flow of investment funds that provide the machines and tools essential for the creation of well-paid job opportunities in industry. It takes an average investment of about $8,000 to provide one job in modern industry. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to multiply this figure by the 700,000 persons added every year to our labor force to see that billions of dollars of new money are required by private enterprise each year if full employment is to be maintained.

There is virtually unanimous agreement that double taxation of dividend income is unjust. Bearing the Treasury's revenue needs in mind, I have provided for only a 10-percent dividend credit on income received from common stock investments. This will not undo the inequitable arrangement but will serve as a token recognition of the evil, and, it is hoped, convince investors that the administration sympathizes with their problem. The gross return of those who assume the risks of industry is smaller in relation to national income than it was in the midst of the depression of the early thirties. Furthermore, a much larger share of the dividends received by individuals is now siphoned into the Federal Treasury than was the case in the depression years.

We must admit that times are difficult and uncertain in this period of uneasy peace, and it is easy to understand why the average individual will remain unwilling to venture his savings unless we make these long overdue changes in capital gains and dividend taxation. The added incentives are even more necessary if we are to implement the President's point four by stimulating private investment abroad. I heartily concur in the President's program, but in my judgment it is doomed to failure unless investment is encouraged by measures such as I have included in the present bill.

It is estimated that the excise and dividend tax proposals contained in this bill will involve a loss of revenue of about $1,200,000,000. This is divided approximately $616,000,000 in the case of excises and $560,000,000 by reason of the dividend credit. The revenue effect of the capital gains tax proposals cannot be gaged closely. Capital gains taxes are not primarily regarded as revenue features of the tax system, and since the present high rates curtail the volume of transactions in the capital markets, deter individuals from selling their homes to take up employment in other localities, and generally impede the transfer of all types of assets, it may well be that a lower rate will increase revenues.

It is with reluctance that in this measure I advocate an increase in the corporation income tax rate at a time when we are striving to lower costs and prices, but I have concluded that this tax would be less injurious to the economy than any other proposal I can think of to sustain Federal revenues. I have recommended an increase in the corporate rate of four points and have limited the increase to the calendar years 1950 and 1951. This would yield about $1,200,000,000 a year and offset the temporary revenue loss resulting from the excise and divided proposals. To the extent that the Incentive Tax Act of 1950 would stabilize industry and expand production, the actual added cost to business would be materially reduced.

It is my opinion that if the Congress and the administration cooperate to hold Federal expenditures in the calendar year 1950 to about $41,000,000,000 and pass this tax measure making it law effective January 1, 1950, we will not have to increase tax rates further to enable us to balance the budget in the fiscal year ending June 1951. In fact, I believe that the incentives to consumption, industry, and investment provided in this bill will be reflected in increased national income and hence in tax revenues and will make it possible for us to reduce individual income tax rates in fiscal 1952.

George B. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the passing of a truly great Oklahoman—and one of the Nation's foremost editors.

Those of us who knew "Deac" Parker lost a friend who cannot be replaced. His ever present help and advice, his good humor and ability to see clearly through the complications of great public questions made him a friend whose advice and counsel were of tremendous value.

American journalism, and through it this Nation and the world, are better because of "Deac" Parker. He had that rare quality of ability and good humor, of kindness and fairness that made his editorials outstanding.

First as a reporter, then as an editor, and then as editor in chief of a great chain of newspapers, he always sought for truth and would be satisfied with nothing less. Fearless yet fair, the good American common sense that he always possessed marked his copy with a distinct flavor that made his unsigned editorials always recognizable by his friends and associates.

The inspiration, training, and help that he was always ready to extend to any kid reporter or friend will live long after him.

No one man could possibly sum up those things that made "Deac" Parker what he was. Wherever the working press gathers for years to come, the stories about him will become a great legend of American journalism—and the right type to keep it tops among all professions.

Here are a few of the hundreds of tributes written of this kindly friend of all who were lucky enough to have known him:

[From the Washington News]

A READER'S APPRECIATION OF GEORGE B. PARKER

The Washington News Monday told of the death of George B. Parker, editor in chief. I did not know Mr. Parker. I do know the editorials he wrote. I have read them. I am one of the little people of America. There are at least 100,000,000 of us, maybe more.

We do not manage great industries, we do not belong to the great labor unions. We are not generals and admirals. We are just the little people who make up the core of this great country. None of us is in Congress. None of us has any say what taxes we pay or where the money we pay is spent. We are just little people.

But the editorials of the News, some prepared by Mr. Parker, others supervised by him, give us great comfort. They have made us feel we are not alone in a bewildering world.

The little people mourn the passing of a great man. May a merciful God have tolerance and mercy on the soul of George B. Parker.

FRANK J. MULKERN.

[From the Wall Street Journal of October 11, 1949]

GEORGE B. PARKER

We had not been very long in this business of trying to write things for newspapers. One day one of our efforts was handed to a man that we had not hitherto seen on the copy desk—a fellow from Oklahoma. As did all desk men he made quite a few changes. But unlike other desk men he walked to where we sat and explained why he had made those changes.

The desk man was George B. Parker, known throughout the newspaper world as "Deac" Parker; he did look like a deacon, too. When we read yesterday afternoon's paper we learned that he had died.

"Deac" Parker became the editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers in a distinguished career punctuated by award of a Pulitzer prize for editorial writing. He remained always the same decent, kindly man who could take time out to explain things to a kid reporter.

[From the Cleveland Press of October 11, 1949]

HE WILL FOREVER BE AN INSPIRATION

(By Louis B. Seltzer)

PARIS.—One cloudy morning almost 30 years ago we came to work at the Press office to find a new editor on the job. He didn't stay new for long. By the time the home edition had started revolving on the presses several hours later, he was like an old shoe to every one of us, and as comfortable.

Tall, lean, friendly "Deac" Parker captivated the staff of the Cleveland Press as no one before him or since.

He was the soul of American journalism. He wanted the profession he loved so deeply and graced so well to be the most honored of all, and strove throughout his lifetime to make it so.

If it is true that a man gives strength to other men and endows them with some of his own virtue, then we who were fortunate enough to have lived professionally those few short years in Cleveland with Deac Parker as our chief are better men in every respect for the privileges.

The Cleveland Press as an institution benefited from Deac Parker's influence, because he etched in our journalistic ideals those of his own.

A man like George B. Parker, no matter whether a great editor, a surgeon, a philosopher, an artist, never really brings an end to his life.

For me, for every man or woman who shared the rare opportunity of laboring with Deac Parker in the profession he loved with all his great heart, he will forever be an inspiration to strive toward those higher goals and brighter ideals he wished so profoundly for the printed word.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 11, 1949]

GEORGE B. PARKER

One of the ablest newspapermen of our time has been lost to the Nation by the death of George B. Parker, editor in chief of Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Cleveland came to know him for the dynamic, extraordinarily capable editorial executive that he was when he was editor of the Cleveland Press from 1920 to 1922 and when, as executive editor of Scripps-Howard newspapers, his headquarters were in this city from 1924 to 1927. Cleveland journalism has always been proud to consider him one of its alumni, one of its most distinguished alumni.

We know that a deep sense of loss today prevails in every Scripps-Howard paper, including the three in Ohio—the Press, the Columbus Citizen, and the Cincinnati Post—for the men and women who form the editorial staffs of those papers revered the man they all knew as "Deac" Parker, and they looked up to him as a commanding figure in our business.

[From the Washington Star]

GEORGE B. PARKER

American journalism is the better for having felt the influence of George B. Parker. As reporter, editorial writer, and finally, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, "Deac" Parker, as he was affectionately known to his friends, regarded the press as a public trust. As such he was a stickler for truth and objectivity in reporting the news, an attribute which won him the respect of his colleagues and of the newspaper reading public.

His fact-finding disposition stood him in good stead when he forsook reporting for editorial writing. His editorials reflected his determination to seek the truth or falsity of a statement, the soundness or fallacy of a policy, the motives—good or bad—underlying an official action. It was because of these outstanding qualities that his editorials won him the 1936 Pulitzer prize for excellence. The following year he added to his prestige by writing a notable series of editorials attacking President Roosevelt's "court packing" plan, a campaign which played a definite part in arousing public opinion to the dangers implicit in the Supreme Court proposal. He was just as vigorous in criticizing or praising other acts or programs of Government officials or private interests, after weighing all sides of every question or situation.

His death at 63 is a personal misfortune for all who were privileged to know him and a real loss to journalism in general.

[From the Washington Post]

GEORGE B. PARKER

We condole with our neighbor, the News, and the Scripps-Howard newspapers in general, on the death of George B. Parker, the Scripps-Howard editor in chief. Mr. Parker lived and worked in Washington. His editorials appeared all over the country, and were distinguished for their pith and moral purpose, as was recognized when he got the Pulitzer award in 1936 for distinguished editorial writing. He kept his sights high, and the newspaper business owes him a debt for this example. But he will be mourned as a person as well as an editor. "Deac" he was called by two generations of newspapermen, and in this diminutive it was a mark of real affection, which he won in all the circles he moved in. Mr. Parker was a kindly man, and the loss will be a real one for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Victory at the Polls by False Propaganda and Deception of a Political Party To Administer the Government Is Defeat for All of the People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when a majority of the people are induced by fallacious propaganda and deception to vote for placing in the hands of either of the major parties the power to administer the government, the people lose.

When a majority of the people go to the polls and defeat either of the major parties that advocates and upholds high principle and honesty in government, the people again lose, because:

It is a greater victory to be defeated advocating and upholding high principle in government than it is to win an election by deception. The party defeated may not have the power to administer the government, but the party elected by deception must keep up its deceptions in order to stay in power and all of the people, both Republicans and Democrats and others become the victims of the party that has gained power by deception.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

You can fool some of the people all of the time. You can fool all of the people some of the time. But you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The time has come to stop deceiving the people. They are getting wise to the dual policy of the two parties. The Republican Party by its policy of attempting to out deceive the deceptions of the Democratic Party has met defeat after defeat, and the people are getting wise very fast to the deceptions of the Democratic Party.

In a review of Felix Morley's book, the Power and the People, the following statement is apropos of the rapidly growing deceptive propaganda used in political activities in the United States:

The spell of the demagogue widens in the land. As the Government extends its control over the lives of the people, the demagogue, who is at once the product and the menace of democracy, becomes more and more plausible, telling people always what Government can do for them, until they forget what self-government means. There has been, Mr. Morley thinks, a decay in the political thinking of Americans. Partly, this is owing to the fact that the original doctrine, taken too much for granted, has not been nourished by restatement and discussion, so that its light has fallen, like the light of an untrimmed lamp. Here he says:

"The flame of the Republic has not expired. But it burns more dimly than it did. * * * The American system of government is based on principles that are eternal. But failure to review and reconsider those principles constantly has played into the hands of men who would identify them with the horse-and-buggy era. It goes unnoticed—until too late—that streamlining the horse and buggy ends by taking man back to the era of the chariot. And the ease with which the accomplished demagogue can practice deception is due not so much to the lure of his oratory as to the shocking lack of any critical faculty among the electorate."

The time has come for the Republican Party to return to its traditional policy of advocating and upholding high principle in government, to return to the party the people can look to for dependability, respectability, and honesty in Government instead of following the me-too policy of degeneration which has brought only defeat to the Republican Party and to all the people. The Democratic Party has successfully deceived the people too long and consequently remained in power and has continued to practice its deceptions because it knows that a change of course would be disastrous to it.

As further stated in the Morley review:

A deeper reason for the decay of American political thinking has been the impact of European thought since the beginning of the century. Mr. Morley says: "The greatest danger to the Republic lies in the increasing tendency to abandon the American in favor of the European political philosophy. The fundamental lesson of revolutions needs to be learned again. It is that a concentration of political power which aims to liberate men from oppression almost invariably ends in oppression as great or greater than that which is removed. Our own revolution is the exception that proves this rule."

The Republican Party has been led into the trap of following the deceptions of the Democratic Party, and the people had no choice between the two. The traditional percentage in favor of the incumbent Democratic Party carried them to a doubtful minority victory last November. I say a minority victory because Truman was not elected President by a majority of the people who voted.

The national totals are as follows:

Dewey, Thurmond, Wallace, etc.	24,407,133
Truman	24,047,205
Short of a majority	359,778

The people want an administration and a Chief Executive they can be proud of, elected by a majority of their votes. They are getting very tired and fed up on the brazen arrogance of the present administration with its political palsey-walsey policy, its incompetent appointments to high office, excessive spending, burdensome taxes, and its promotion of the false socialistic belief that the Government can give something to everyone without costing the people anything.

The people of Russia were led to believe under Stalin that "religion is an opiate to the people."

The Democratic Party is operating on the belief that the people can be opiated by offering them something for nothing

before they wake up to the realization that they are paying the bill and actually getting nothing but debts, deception, and delusion.

Our Nation was established "to secure the blessings of liberty" and we must realize what has been happening to its foundations from neglect, from a confusion of words and from the importation of alien ideas.

Defeat of the Republican Party when it upholds high principle, decency, and honesty in government is not defeat of the party. It is defeat for all of the people, both Democrats and Republicans, who have been led to believe in false propaganda and deception by the opposition.

There is no victory in winning an election by deception.

There is no defeat in losing an election upholding the truth and high principle in government.

Detroit—Back Door for Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein three articles which appeared in the October 4 issue of Detroit's leading newspapers, the Detroit Free Press, the Detroit Times, and the Detroit News, pertaining to immigration at the port of Detroit.

If conditions such as indicated exist, certainly the immigration service of our Nation has a duty to perform as a matter of national security. I urge the agencies of the Government having jurisdiction over this subject to act and to do so without further delay.

The articles follow:

[From the Detroit Free Press]

Transfer from Detroit of E. E. Adcock, Director of Immigration and Naturalization, is an act by his superiors in Washington which we believe deserves very penetrating investigation.

Adcock, who has held his post for 6 years, attributes his shift to the pressure of leftist groups who found the tightness of his border control inconvenient for conspiratorial travelings in and out of the United States.

You can say that this is only Adcock's opinion, but circumstances substantiate it.

There has never been a satisfactory airing of the frequently revived charge that Detroit is a favorite gateway to the Nation for "Commies." As long ago as 2 years a United States consul in Windsor asserted that "Commies" could cross the border here with no difficulty, but nothing conclusive came of even that.

Then, of course, we have the known affinity of some Government officials for anyone with a Red taint. Plenty along that line has come to light in recent months. Coupled with this is the fact that Adcock is a career man. It is not likely he would be raising his voice in a way that could be detrimental to his career unless he was firmly convinced that by keeping quiet he would betray his Nation's trust.

And, as a matter of fact, he has gone so far as to identify one outfit which denounced his official policies. That was the CIO Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, which has been accused of leaning toward Moscow. Who in high Government position is aiding the Reds?

Senator FERGUSON has asked that a Senate immigration subcommittee look into the background of Adcock's transfer. We recommend that the investigation be very thorough. It's time the Congress found out just what goes on here.

[From the Detroit Times]

ADCOCK'S TRANSFER BLAMED ON JUDGE O'BRIEN'S ACTION

(By Ed Brand)

E. E. Adcock, district director of immigration and naturalization, today charged Probate Judge Patrick O'Brien pressured through citizenship papers in 1946 for a left-wing official of the UAW-CIO without Adcock's knowledge.

Adcock said when he learned the citizenship papers were granted without his knowledge, he started an investigation which led him to "believe Judge O'Brien bulldozed the naturalization examiner into approving the papers."

An immediate investigation was started, Adcock said, which revealed the UAW official was a member of the Communist Party. Adcock said he asked officials in Washington at that time to start denaturalization proceedings against the union officer.

Adcock who recently was ordered transferred to Baltimore in a surprise Government move, blames his transfer on O'Brien and other factors he refused to discuss at this time.

The immigration chief also charged O'Brien threatened to get his job when he refused to speed up naturalization proceedings for an alien friend of O'Brien's.

Judge O'Brien issued a blanket denial of Adcock's charges, adding that he had never tried to malign Adcock in any manner.

JUDGE EXPLAINS STAND

He did say, however, he disagreed with Adcock's policy and that of the naturalization examiners in admitting aliens to citizenship. O'Brien said:

"I told Mr. Adcock that the naturalization department apparently wants a man to become a conservative and a reactionary before they will admit him to citizenship."

Said Adcock:

"Judge O'Brien called me on the phone about an alien we were investigating for citizenship. He told me we were delaying action on the case."

JUDGE SHOWS ANGER

"I told him the case was receiving the same attention as any other case.

"Judge O'Brien became angry, and told me there wasn't anything in the Constitution to prevent a Communist from becoming a citizen. He told me if I didn't clear the case in a matter of days he would take it up with the party.

"I guess I made the judge angry. I asked him which party.

"He told me the Democratic Party. He said he had plenty of influence, and told me to get busy and clear the case or he would call Washington. Then he hung up the telephone receiver.

"Judge O'Brien also bulldozed an examiner to get citizenship papers for a man who was a member of the Communist Party.

"This man still is under investigation, and, I might add, Judge O'Brien's interest in Communists and other radicals is not of recent origin. I could say more about that, but I won't at this time.

"Judge O'Brien alone was not responsible for my transfer. There are other factors, which I cannot disclose at this time because I don't believe it would be for the public interest."

O'BRIEN MAKES DENIAL

Said Judge O'Brien:

"If Mr. Adcock thinks I had anything to do with his transfer, he is badly mistaken. I never talked with anybody in the party about the case or Mr. Adcock.

"As to bulldozing an examiner, I am, in fact, a very mild-mannered man. I might have disagreed vehemently with the views of the examiner but I certainly have no recollection of bringing any pressure of any kind.

"I have long been opposed to naturalization officers introducing views he thought were ulterior. It is no part of the duty of the examiners to inquire into political, social, or economic ideals of applicants."

CITES LIBERAL VIEW

"So long as the applicant has been a good citizen for 5 years and swears to uphold the Constitution, he should be admitted to citizenship.

"The examiners, it would seem, would have the applicant to be a conservative or, in fact, a reactionary. I have merely endeavored to have Mr. Adcock liberalize his views."

Meanwhile, Police Commissioner Toy sent a letter to the naturalization department in Washington asking that Adcock not be transferred.

TOY PRAISES WORK

Toy's letter said in part:

"Mr. Adcock's work has been outstanding. We have a plan of cooperation with him that has been very effective in keeping at a minimum unlawful entry of individuals engaged in subversive activities, as well as criminal. As a result, practically every illegal method of entry in this area has been covered through the joint cooperative action of Mr. Adcock and this department.

"His removal would be a decided blow to law enforcement in this area."

Senator FERGUSON has demanded a Senate investigation of Adcock's transfer.

Meanwhile representatives of the 112 American Legion posts in metropolitan Detroit, in a committee meeting last night, voted unanimously to oppose Adcock's transfer.

PLAN PETITIONS

The legion will petition Ferguson, the Justice Department, the Attorney General, and the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to retain Adcock in his present post, said James B. Elliott, commander of the Detroit post of the American Legion.

Elliott said the Legion in its petition would also urge that Adcock be officially commended for his conscientious performance of his duties.

[From the Detroit News]

WE OUGHT TO KNOW WHY

The transfer from Detroit of E. E. Adcock, district director of immigration, may be as routine as his Washington principals say. Yet there are aspects of the case which seem to warrant the attention of a Senate subcommittee on immigration, as Senator FERGUSON asks.

Adcock while here has stood unyieldingly in the way of subversives seeking to use Detroit as a port of entry. This has not endeared him to leftists and sentimentalists of the pink persuasion. And Adcock has perhaps not recommended himself to his superiors by airing a suspicion that his present transfer to Baltimore may be due to the pressure of these elements.

A Good Record on Repayment of GI Home Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register, tells of the good work that has been done by the Iowa Veterans' Administration loan guaranty officer, Walter L. Robinson, and his excellent staff of associates, including Mr. Homer Gardner. The administration of the loan title of the GI bill, under the leadership of Mr. Walter L. Robinson, for the State of Iowa is one of the very best in the Nation. Under his administration and leadership there has been no loss to the Government on GI loans on both city and farm properties. The only losses have been on business loans and these have been more than offset by judicious management of the farm and property loans under Mr. Robinson and his staff. I am proud of the record that has been made in the State of Iowa under the loan title of the GI bill of rights.

HOME LOANS TO IOWA GI'S INCREASING—A GOOD RECORD ON REPAYMENT

There has been a sharp upswing recently in the volume of GI home loans made in Iowa.

Walter L. Robinson, Iowa Veterans' Administration loan guaranty officer, said the current volume is 40 percent ahead of the low point of the year—in the early spring—and is 20 percent above 2 months ago.

During the last week, 100 loans were submitted through lenders for guaranty, of which 86 were home loans. They originated in 75 of the 99 counties of the State.

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND LOANS

Since the start of the program 4 years ago in Iowa, 22,000 home loans totaling $105,000,000 have been guaranteed or insured.

Already 2,100 of the loans, totaling $8,500,000, have been repaid in full. This is 9½ percent of the loans made.

Iowa's record of loan default claims is one-third better than the national average, Robinson said.

To date, only 40 of the 22,000 loans in Iowa have resulted in default claims, or about two out of a thousand. The national ratio is three per thousand.

DOWN PAYMENT

The cash down payment on GI home loans now is 20 percent of the cost, an increase of 5 percent over a year ago. The interest rate is 4 percent.

Leading factors in the increase in the volume of loans in Iowa, Robinson said, are th rise in savings and money for investment, lowering of reserve requirements, and the lower interest yield on investments of equal security.

"With approximately 200,000,000 bushels of corn sealed and under purchase agreement, corn loans in banks being paid this month through the Commodity Credit Corporation have resulted in a large supply of cash available for loan and investments," he said.

"The record indicates that private lenders have given good support to the program of home loans and that the GI home buyer has a splendid record of meeting his obligation promptly," Robinson said.

Citation and Presentation of Scroll to Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, for Service to American Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a citation accompanying the presentation of a scroll to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], at the Seventh Annual Convention of the National Maritime Union, for his service to American seamen.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When this convention began to look for the man who had rendered the most outstanding service on behalf of the American seamen and who had made the most outstanding contribution to the American merchant marine in recent years, the choice was an easy one. One man stands out head and shoulders on the national scene above the rest. We honor him today for what he is, what he has done, and what he plans to do. We are in turn honored by his presence at our convention.

First and foremost, he is a fighting, courageous, liberal legislator. If we can add others at the 1950 election who will vote as he has consistently, Taft-Hartley will go, the people will have high minimum wages, more social security, better housing, greater civil liberties, and the Nation will have economic security.

Second, he has an outstanding record on behalf of American seamen and the American merchant marine. He led the fight to assure American-flag vessels fair participation in the transportation of ECA commodities. It is largely through his efforts that attempts to transfer hundreds of American vessels to foreign nations under the ECA program were defeated. He was the sponsor of an amendment to ban Panamanian and Honduran vessels from participation in the ECA program, and was successful in steering the amendments through the Senate, only to have it rejected by the House.

He has been outspoken in his condemnation of ship transfers. In addition to his efforts to ban Panamanian vessels from the ECA program, he is now investigating the practices of American interests who seek to evade our taxes and our labor standards by transferring their vessels to phony flags. He has already brought to light much information in his hearings on the operation of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. We know that he will continue his efforts in this regard until the run-away American fleet is returned to the American flag and until legislation is enacted curbing similar transfers of tonnage in the future.

He has been the outstanding champion of the American maritime worker. Single handedly he led the fight against the pork-barrel lobbyists who sought to raise the funds for maritime training. He came within one vote although he alone carried on the debate against a dozen Senators, of defeating an increased appropriation for maritime training.

He has sponsored the alien-seamen bill, which would provide greater recognition toward naturalization for alien seamen who served during World War II. He has sponsored legislation to reverse the Southern Steamship decision, which still keeps seamen in peonage by opening them up to the charge of mutiny when they strike in a safe port within the United States. He has sponsored legislation to increase manning scales aboard United States-flag vessels to provide greater safety.

He has consistently fought militarization of the merchant marine. He is at present investigating the extent to which the armed forces are operating merchant vessels to the detriment of the American merchant marine, and seeks methods of assuring that the commercial shipping needs of the armed forces will be met by the American merchant marine and not by merchant ships under the control of the armed forces.

Third, he is the one man on the national scene who has recognized the dangerous downward drift of the American merchant marine and has acted. He has sponsored a resolution designed to carry out a full-fledged investigation and survey of the problems facing the American merchant marine and to provide solutions therefor. He has steered this resolution through the Senate and is now chairman of a special Senate merchant marine subcommittee. He has secured a capable staff, has organized his survey intelligently, and we are confident that his research will mean much in terms of jobs for maritime workers and in terms of the building of the American merchant marine. He has refused to be stampeded into approving shipowner plans for supersubsidies, which invite profit taking and tax evasion rather than ship operation and construction. In all his work on problems facing the American merchant marine his only guidepost has been the public interest, and it is for this that we honor him most today. American maritime workers and the American merchant marine have suffered too long and too often from the odious scandals that have plagued our industry. It is our good fortune today to have the leadership of a man with integrity, imagination, and intelligence.

As the convention delegates know by this time, the man I have been talking about is Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington.

Senator MAGNUSON, in deepest appreciation of your efforts, I tender you this scroll on behalf of the seventh national convention of the National Maritime Union, CIO, and on behalf of its 60,000 members.

A Man Against Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, both branches of the Congress received and were addressed Thursday by a distinguished visitor, a deep philosopher, and one clearly showing he is a world's statesman, Prime Minister Nehru, of India, speaking for the House of Representatives, the Prime Minister made a most favorable and lasting impression on the Membership of the House.

I include in my remarks a fine editorial on the Prime Minister appearing in the Boston Globe of October 12, 1949, entitled "A Man Against Time":

A MAN AGAINST TIME

A tall, spare man of 60, with twinkling eyes, a warm smile, and sensitive features that might be mistaken for those of an

artist, was received yesterday afternoon with full military honors by President Truman at the National Airport in Washington. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Prime Minister, comes on this his first visit to America, as the respected head of the second most populous nation on earth and the only important one, on the Asiatic half of the globe, which is today completely free and independent, unharried alike by internal conflict or external control.

Nehru comes to negotiate neither pacts nor loans, but to get acquainted with the United States and talk to its businessmen. There is a story going the rounds in the Capital that his sister, Madam Pandit, India's Ambassador to the United States, urged him to be the first head of government to visit this country since the war without asking for anything. The idea appealed to him, especially as it gives him an excuse to slip away early from Washington and visit New York, New England, Canada, Chicago, the TVA, the Middle West, the University of Wisconsin, and San Francisco.

As leader of the new Indian nation—which will formalize its sovereignty next January under its new Constitution—Nehru is in search of ideas: the ideas needed to help raise India's struggling multitudes to a better life through development of her vast resources. This pursuit of ideas is no recent preoccupation of his. Ideas, he remarked long ago, provide, when constructive, the essential sustenance for ideals; and his loyalty to the ideals of freedom, peace, and creative democracy has been tested in his own land as have those of few mortals now living.

When, nearly 30 years ago, fresh from honors at Cambridge University and a member of the Middle Temple, he was ordered peremptorily by the British Government in India to hold no converse with a group of Afghans who happened to be passing through an Indian town he was visiting, he defied the order immediately. Though he had no idea of meeting those Afghans, he considered the Government order an insult to his rights as a free human being. Thus began one of the most brilliant political careers in modern India's annals.

It began, to be sure, in jail, where he was landed shortly for his defiance. He was to be thrown into jail by the British no less than 11 times between 1921 and the close of the recent war because of the dim view he insisted on taking of "the white man's burden" in India. Fourteen years in prison constitute a sizable portion of a mature man's lifetime. But prison, far from breaking the spirit of this aristocratic son of Kashmir, tempered it with steel.

The wide scholarship in which he had schooled himself during his younger days in England—studies which familiarized him with all the great literatures of Europe and gave him superb command of the English language—now became a weapon. He sharpened it tirelessly. Jails, he remarked with dry humor during his last incarceration, while he was reading his way through 1,000 volumes and writing a history of the world for his daughter, jails provided him with relaxation and an opportunity to study.

If jail whetted his pen, it also increased his prestige with the people of India. His closest friend and master, Mahatma Gandhi, had grown in spiritual power and political authority with successive persecutions. Nehru, selected by Gandhi himself as his successor to leadership of India's struggle, rose steadily through the ranks of the Congress party to become four times its president and, finally, to assume leadership of the new nation in its hour of triumph.

Nehru is a remarkable combination of qualities: he is a brilliant lawyer, a scholar, a poet, and a historian. His autobiography, written in prison, is one of the great classics of our time. He is also a fabulous politician, a keen student of government, and, as his labors attest since India's liberation, a farsighted statesman. His visit symbolizes the mighty tides of change which have overturned relationships between east and west since the 1930's. He is spokesman and leader for that enormous reach of Asia which opposes communism as a solution to Asia's problems. He is also a mortal foe of all forms of fascism and totalitarianism, since these seek to reaffirm an outmoded imperialistic thesis of racial inequality. He prefers government on the basis of free democratic principles.

Under Nehru's guidance, India is heroically at work, pushing huge projects for modernization of transport, industry, power, and agriculture. One of the purposes during this visit is to interest American capital in the investment possibilities offered by this gigantic program.

Dismantling Industries in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "O. K. Armstrong Is Ready for Crusade Against Dismantling," published in the Kansas City Times on October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O. K. ARMSTRONG IS READY FOR CRUSADE AGAINST DISMANTLING—MOVIES OF PLANT WRECKING IN GERMANY WILL BE SHOWN TO CONGRESSMEN AND TO TRUMAN, IF POSSIBLE, IN HIS FIGHT AGAINST PROGRAM

(By Larry Rue)

FRANKFURT, October 11.—Armed with movies showing how dismantling is wrecking industry, O. K. Armstrong, Springfield, Mo., author and staff writer for Readers' Digest, left today by plane for Washington to launch a one-man crusade to stop this crime against humanity. Armstrong, a former member of the Missouri legislature, was the first foreigner to address both Houses of the German Parliament in Bonn.

"I am interrupting a scheduled trip around the world to see Congressmen and even Truman, if possible, to tell the dismantling story," he told this correspondent. "Destroying jobs and industries in a defeated country 4½ years after the war is economic insanity, a social injustice, and a great political mistake."

Armstrong spent his last 2 weeks visiting plants being dismantled in the British zone and took movies of "some of this ghastly destruction." The movies, he said, will convince the Congressmen and others who had been told that the dismantling was finished, or practically so, that they were misinformed.

"The European recovery program administrator, Paul Hoffman, says we should bury this question," Armstrong exclaimed. "It won't be buried after I've shown the movies in Washington."

"Even the pretense that removal of the German plants is reparations won't stand as no more than 30 percent of the dismantled equipment could ever be used in new locations. The rest is scrap and rusting away. I saw expensive machines ripped up 2 years ago wasting away in the weather. It would have been better if the plants had been used to produce goods for reparations."

He asked:

"Why are we supplying Germany fuel oil and tearing down synthetic fuel factories? Why do we spend millions to supply Germany steel and other metal products when we permit the British to destroy Germany's best steel works? Why do we spend billions on the policy of containing communism in Europe when only last week I took pictures of freight cars loaded with dismantled machinery assigned to Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Albania? I am sure the taxpayers of my State, Missouri, would be interested in these questions."

A particularly tragic effect, he said, was that of the dismantling upon German workmen who "are willing to work to rebuild their homes and communities but find their means of livelihood ruthlessly destroyed. What can democracy mean to them if, this long after the war, it robs them of the God-given right to work?"

Armstrong hopes to inspire a congressional resolution directing the Secretary of State to conduct a new review with the British and French Governments. He is appealing for the support of organized labor, the churches, and other humanitarian groups. Since American taxpayers are supporting the economies of Britain and France, Armstrong believes the Secretary of State, if honestly motivated, could induce both countries to adopt the same economic policy.

Plea to the President To Apply Taft-Hartley Law to Nation-Wide Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared urging the President to apply the Taft-Hartley law in the Nation-wide strikes which are now increasingly crippling the American economy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW SHOULD BE APPLIED

Since the end of the war it is estimated that a total of $6,000,000,000 have been lost in strikes—around $3,000,000,000 in wages directly lost by industrial workers and an additional $3,000,000,000 in indirect losses by railroads, by workers who lost their jobs in secondary industries which ran short of raw materials, etc.

Right now, the Nation finds itself in the grip of a terrible coal strike and an equally deplorable steel strike. It is not my purpose at this point to analyze the respective merits in the arguments of labor or management in both of these strikes. Rather it is my purpose to emphasize something that both labor and management seem to have ignored in allowing the present impasse to come about, namely, that there is a third interest more vital than either of their interests—and I refer, of course, to the public welfare.

Obviously it is the public which is being hurt far more than either labor or management in these two crippling paralyses.

Surely, in this modern day and age, labor, management, government, and the public should be able to exercise enough intelligence to avoid the catastrophe of these recurrent strike disasters which deal such a terrible set-back to our whole economic life.

WHAT COAL STRIKE MEANS

We need only look at the coal industry to see how recurrent strikes have damaged the public welfare in addition to the interest of the industry itself. Since 1940, Mr. John L. Lewis has called around 17 strikes—approximately 2 a year. As a result the price of coal has soared and the industry has found that it is increasingly losing its market. In 1900 coal was approximately 95 percent of the mineral fuel produced in the United States. Today it is down to around 45 percent. Railroads are shifting from steam locomotives powered by coal to Diesels and electric locomotives. Heavy industries and some utilities are shifting from coal to oil, gas, or water power. Home owners are switching from coal to oil or gas furnaces.

While the wages received by miners have increased as a result of these strikes, the miners have not been able to reap the fruits of their increased earnings because Mr. John L. Lewis, by the raising of an eyebrow, can send them on a 3-day workweek or other shortened work period which seriously impairs their take-home pay. On previous occasions, I have called the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this Nation cannot possibly allow itself to be at the mercy of any one man or any one group, especially in this atomic age. We dare not risk our national defense on the whim of any single individual, whether he be in labor or in management.

RESPONSIBILITY IS AT PRESIDENT'S DOOR

Obviously, Mr. President, a major share of the responsibility for the present impasse must be laid at the door of the White House. The President has consistently refused to apply the law of the Nation. We in the Congress can pass statutes but we cannot enforce them. That is the constitutional prerogative of the Chief Executive. Under the Taft-Hartley law which we enacted in the Eightieth Congress and which we have refused to repeal, there is the possibility for injunctive relief against strikes affecting the Nation's health, welfare, or safety.

Had the President chosen to invoke the Taft-Hartley law provisions, he could have appointed a fact-finding board which would have analyzed this situation and reported back within 60 days, to be followed thereafter if necessary by a secret vote which might have been conducted by the National Labor Relations Board as to whether the employees wished to accept the employer's last offer of settlement. Thus, we have a 60-day inquiry period, another 15 days in which a vote can be held, and then another 5-day period in which the results of the vote can be certified to the Attorney General.

The Nation could therefore be given a breathing spell of 80 days. Instead, the President has refused to fulfill the mandate of the American people as expressed through their Congress.

WHAT A WISCONSIN HOUSEWIFE STATED

Recently a letter from a La Crosse housewife was published in the Milwaukee Journal. I should like to read in part from her message:

"I don't know who gains by these strikes but I do know that for a long time it hasn't been the housewife nor her family. I know that the last three wage boosts in my husband's work gained him nothing. The last wage-hour settlement put him out of a job. Three other men also were laid off in one very small department. Not only that but they were each assessed $5 extra union dues to fight for the very settlement which put them out of work. To me this just doesn't make sense. * * *

"While Congress is investigating everything else we should ask our Congressmen to investigate labor unions and their leaders, subleaders, and so forth. It ought not to cost too much, seeing as they are in the business anyway. * * *

"As we have to keep budgets and give an account of how we spend our share of the pay check, let's ask Congress to find out how labor unions spend their share of the workers' pay checks.

"That check is important. Without it we couldn't be housewives. Without it there would be no industries, no labor unions, nor labor leaders (and no pay checks for them). There must be a way to manage this. Union leaders haven't found it. They have got to be industrialists themselves dealing in the labor market. They have goods to sell, too. Workers are their wares. But their business is topheavy. Does it need a firmer foundation or remodeling? Let's find out."

COAL CRISIS IN WISCONSIN

Already, Mr. President, my own office, and I am sure many other offices here on the Hill, have rightly been flooded by protests from back home against the President's deplorable failure to apply the Taft-Hartley law. I, naturally, have taken this question up with the Federal Conciliation and Mediation Service, but unless the White House is willing to lay down a policy it is quite clear that the Federal Mediation Service will not be successful in its efforts.

I should like to quote at this point from another message sent to the President of the United States by Mr. Roch P. Botsch, president of the Wisconsin Coal Bureau of Madison. I could quote from many other messages from the coal industry in my State, but I believe that my colleagues are well familiar with the terrible meaning this coal strike is having, and will have, particularly as it gets colder and colder.

Mr. Botsch stated to the President:

OCTOBER 13, 1949.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

Domestic, commercial, and industrial consumers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and upper Michigan are almost entirely dependent on coal that moves during lake shipping season from Lake Erie to upper lake ports. Because of coal strike and work stoppages at the mines, it has been impossible for coal-dock companies to secure sufficient coal to take care of the needs of these consumers during the coming winter. Stocks now on hand will be exhausted by midwinter. Lake shipping season closes about November 15, and unless coal strike is immediately settled all consumers in this territory will suffer hardships this season.

We urge on behalf of these consumers that you exercise your authority to bring about immediate resumption of coal production in order to avoid industrial shut-downs and hardship and suffering to the average household consumer. Because of this impending calamity, we urge and plead for immediate action.

WISCONSIN COAL BUREAU, INC.,
ROCH P. BOTSCH, *President.*

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I conclude as I began: The public welfare is the paramount welfare. The public interest is the primary interest. We dare not allow the public interest to be crucified on a cross set by a heedless labor or management.

United States Spends $7,000,000 Yearly To Keep Truman's Pride Afloat—Obsolete "Big Mo" Would Be Stored if It Hadn't the Name of Harry's State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news item written by Walter Trohan appearing in today's Times-Herald:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of October 14, 1949]

UNITED STATES SPENDS $7,000,000 YEARLY TO KEEP TRUMAN'S PRIDE AFLOAT—OBSOLETE "BIG MO" WOULD BE STORED IF IT HADN'T THE NAME OF HARRY'S STATE

(By Walter Trohan)

American taxpayers are contributing almost $7,000,000 a year to feed President Truman's State pride.

The operating cost of the U. S. S. *Missouri*, the only active battleship in the fleet, is $6,700,000. This includes maintenance, personnel, overhaul, fuel, and other charges.

The Navy high command would like to put the *Missouri* in mothballs along with nine other modern battleships and five older capital ships, but Mr. Truman wants the name of his native State kept afloat.

The Chief Executive was disturbed about a report that the Navy was going to render the *Missouri* inactive to save money for urgent defense purposes. Out of deference to the Commander in Chief the obsolete vessel is being maintained in service.

LAST OF LONG LINE

The *Missouri* is the last of a long line of battleships. Other big battlewagons were placed in mothballs as naval leaders recognized that the day of the floating fortresses has passed. The *Missouri* is best known as the scene of the Japanese surrender to General MacArthur.

Modern naval strategy is based on the aircraft carrier and the submarine. Naval strategists see little use for the battleship in future years.

The Navy explored the possibility of stripping the *Missouri* of its superstructure and converting it into a carrier. Ship planners decided against such a move as too costly and impractical.

The *Missouri* carries 16-inch side armor which gives the vessel great weight. Addition of an armored flight deck would make the vessel too slow for carrier duty.

COST WOULD BE HIGH

The latest carriers make about 35 knots. The *Missouri* is capable of about 32 knots. It is believed the addition of a flight deck, even with the removal of superstructure, would bring the speed down to under 30 knots. It would be possible to take off the armor but this would necessitate rebuilding the hull.

Shipbuilders say it would cost possibly $200,000,000 to convert the *Missouri* into a first-class carrier. The latest type carriers cost about $168,000,000, so that naval experts hold it would be cheaper to build a new carrier than to convert the *Missouri*.

In experimenting with battleships the Navy removed the superstructure of the battleship *Kentucky*, which is of the same class as the *Missouri*. No flight deck has

as yet been added to this vessel, which was never fully completed, because funds have been diverted to what the Navy considers more pressing defense needs.

The Navy is using the *Missouri* for training maneuvers and transporting important personages. It carries 2,700 officers and men at full strength. Young officers frequently make their first cruise on the ship.

NEARLY 6 YEARS OLD

The *Missouri* was commissioned on January 29, 1944. It was the third vessel of a series in the Iowa class. The others are the *Iowa, New Jersey, Wisconsin* and the partly completed *Kentucky*.

The vessel is of 45,000 tons displacement and 52,000 tons with full load. It is 890 feet in length and has a beam of 108 feet. Its chief armament consists of nine 16-inch guns, twenty 5-inch guns and 130 20- and 40-millimeter antiaircraft guns. The *Missouri* carries three planes and has two plane catapults.

H. S. Denniston, a Man of Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved to learn by phone that one of Mobile's finest and greatest citizens on Friday last had entered upon that long, long journey from which no man has ever returned.

Harold Seibert Denniston, "Denny," as he was affectionately called, was my long-time good friend and business associate.

Mr. Speaker, I take pardonable pride in saying that 20 years ago, I induced "Denny" to leave his home in Brooklyn, N. Y., and come to Mobile, settle there, and take up life among us and make that town his home.

A man of vision, in less than 12 months from the day that he came, he had opened the American National Bank & Trust Co. and remained its driving force until that day last week when he was gathered into the arms of his God.

His beneficence and good work will long be remembered and his passing will constitute a great loss to the industries and the workers of Mobile.

Mr. Speaker, no words of mine could tell of his wonderful achievement more lucidly or clearly than they are depicted in an editorial carried in the Mobile Press written about Harold Denniston on the very day he passed away.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein that editorial as well as a news article written about my departed friend who, although an adopted son of Mobile, lived to become one of the most distinguished among its great civic, industrial, and financial leaders.

That editorial and news article read as follows:

H. S. DENNISTON, A MAN OF VISION

Mobile has lost one of its builders through the death of H. S. Denniston, chairman of the board of the American National Bank & Trust Co.

In this, his adopted city, and by friends elsewhere, Mr. Denniston was known as a man of integrity and ability, quietly and modestly intent on the day's work and with his gaze fixed toward the future.

H. S. Denniston was a man of vision and ambition. Coupled together, these two characteristics carried him through a successful career that included banking, mining, shipping, and other interests. From the time he left his native Brooklyn for South America, at the age of 21, until his recent illness and death at 63, he enjoyed a steady rise bringing him international prominence at its peak.

Mr. Denniston was a man who recognized opportunity when he saw it. Realizing that Mobile was destined to become a more important port in foreign trade, he moved here in 1928 and the following year organized his bank. During his career he was active in the development of commerce through Mobile and other Gulf ports, and aided a number of new industries in establishing themselves in this area. Though they may not bear his name, some of these businesses stand today as a monument to his vision and faith in Mobile.

His greatest interest, outside his business and family, was in yachting. It was his enjoyment at being with his friends, and his love for the competitive, that made the schooner *Sunshine* famed not only as a vessel of hospitality but as winner of important yacht races.

Mr. Denniston was a man of courage. The fortitude with which he faced his last, punishing illness and his efforts to keep going in spite of what he must have known to be overwhelming odds, compared with the tenacity he displayed in his determination to make successes and service institutions of the varied businesses he headed.

The sympathy of many friends goes out to the Denniston family in its hour of sorrow that has meant the loss of a fine and important citizen.

BANKING OFFICIAL SUCCUMBS AT HOME ON PARK TERRACE—H. S. DENNISTON FOUNDER OF AMERICAN NATIONAL HERE IN 1929

Harold Seibert Denniston, president and chairman of the board of the American National Bank and Trust Co., of Mobile, died early Thursday afternoon at his residence, 265 Park Terrace, after a long illness.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a. m., Friday, at the Roche Funeral Home, with interment in Pine Crest Cemetery.

Mr. Denniston was founder of the American National Bank & Trust Co. He engaged in international banking activities and had foreign banking interests, first in Bolivia and later in Mexico.

BORN IN BROOKLYN

Born May 1, 1886, at Brooklyn, N. Y., the son of George McDonald Denniston and Minnie Estelle Denniston, he received his early education at Brooklyn.

When he was 21, he went to South America as a cable clerk for W. R. Grace & Co. He was soon impressed by the opportunities for trade and he went in business for himself.

Beginning with the importation of the first automobile into Bolivia, he built up a flourishing trade, shipping wool and hides to the United States and importing the manufactured goods needed by the South American country. He subsequently went into banking and tin mining and attained considerable prominence in the industrial and financial life of Bolivia.

EIGHT CHILDREN

Mr. Denniston married Lillian Pendas, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and they made their home at La Plaz, the capital of Bolivia. They had eight children, five of whom survive. Mrs. Denniston died in Bolivia in 1924.

Shortly afterward, Mr. Denniston disposed of his bank and trading company and returned to the United States. In 1925, his tin mines were sold to British interests.

Soon after returning to the United States, he married Florence Foster, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and in 1928, he brought his family to Mobile.

ORGANIZED BANK

In 1929, he organized the American National Bank & Trust Co., which he guided through the great depression, the years of economic recovery and World War II, remaining president and chairman of the board until his death.

In the domestic banking field, Mr. Denniston will be remembered for his readiness to extend credit to small businessmen and to assist in the promotion of new business ventures.

He was deeply interested in the use of bank facilities for the encouragement of both domestic and foreign trade and was active in promoting commerce through the port of Mobile and other Gulf ports.

Applying his experience of 17 years in South America, he worked out the financing programs of many new enterprises throughout the Southern States, including the establishment of smaller banks in this territory.

In recent years he spent considerable time in Mexico, where he developed important financial interests and founded a banking house, Financiera Colon, S. A., at Mexico City, which is now under the active management of his son, Alexander C. Denniston. Mr. Denniston was chairman of the board of Financiera Colon and a director of the Banco del Sur of Cuernavaca, Mexico.

After coming to Mobile in 1928, Mr. Denniston purchased the historic Kilshaw Irwin home, Oakleigh, which, during the ownership of the Dennistons, became one of Mobile's most noted centers of hospitality.

He was an ardent yachtsman and the owner of the schooner *Sunshine*, which he sailed extensively along the Gulf coast and the Atlantic seaboard, winning the St. Petersburg-to-Habana yacht race in 1933. The hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Denniston aboard the *Sunshine* was enjoyed by friends from far and near during week ends on Mobile Bay. As honorary commodore of the Buccaneers, Mr. Denniston was well known in every harbor of the Gulf.

He was patron of the arts and he was particularly devoted to music.

Surviving Mr. Denniston are his wife, Florence F. Denniston; three sons, George H. Denniston, executive vice president of the American National Bank & Trust Co.; Robert P. Denniston, Mobile attorney, and Alexander C. Denniston, Mexico City; two daughters, Mrs. Andrew D. Henderson, Mobile, and Mrs. George Whiteman, New Orleans; one sister, Mrs. George M. Barry, Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; four grandchildren and other relatives.

The family requests that flowers be omitted and suggests that those desiring to do so may send their memorial gifts to the American Cancer Society, P. O. Box 1229, Mobile.

GREAT LOSS

Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN Thursday called the death of Mr. Denniston a "great loss to Mobile, to the State, and to the Nation."

In a statement telephoned from Washington, BOYKIN said:

"I had the pleasure of bringing Mr. Denniston to Mobile in 1928. He came in the hard days, and never weakened, through depression or war. Always he was striving to help in the development of Mobile commercially and industrially. His efforts were successful in many instances and resulted in benefits for this entire area."

The White Man's Future in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock entitled "The White Man's Future in the Orient" which appeared in the New York Times, Thursday, October 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE WHITE MAN'S FUTURE IN THE ORIENT"
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 12.—The headline above was not the one used by Secretary of State Acheson today over his report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the cold war with Russia, particularly in the Far East. Yet the headline summarizes, though bluntly, the point of chief interest to Mr. Acheson and the committee he addressed. For the future of the white man in the Orient will be more determined by the soundness and administrative quality of the revised Far Eastern policy of the United States than by any other factor.

The headline quoted is taken from a special supplement to the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, under date of October 3, 1949. The supplement consists of a series of dispatches to the newspaper from the Orient last summer by its editor and publisher, William R. Mathews, preceded by the conclusions he drew from United States policy as it was and as he thinks it should be. Mr. Mathews has often been a "chiel takin' notes" among the orientals. But these latest ones have especial interest and poignance because he was one of the two American newspaper people who left New York for Indonesia June 13 last, that survived the crash near Bombay as the party was returning. He survived it because, with Mrs. Dorothy Brandon of the Herald Tribune, he came home by another way.

The observations and conclusions set down by Mr. Mathews in the special section of his newspaper are already known to some influential persons here in the executive and legislative branches of the Government. But they have not aroused the official interest which the qualifications of their source might foreshadow. Though several Senators who have talked to the Arizona editor since his return were impressed with his views, he has made little headway in the State Department, particularly among those who were charged with carrying out our insolvent China policy and now with finding a solvent one.

The subject, however, is so important and immediate—witness Mr. Acheson's errand to the Capitol today and the presence in Washington of the Prime Minister of India—that Mr. Mathew's contribution merits some brief recording at this point. Among his notes and comments the following are selected:

1. The United States has been fighting the cold war in the Orient in a defeatist spirit, without knowing it. "The time has come when we must make a stand * * * as at Berlin."

2. We cannot bring all China under a government friendly to us. And before we can "expect a competent and reasonably stable" one "that can exercise suzerainty over a small portion of the Chinese mainland," the Chinese people, whose "manhood is now bankrupt," will have to be regenerated.

3. The way for us to assist in that regeneration is to encourage the formation of such a government by helping it to rally on bases like Hainan and Formosa and by seeing that Hong Kong is maintained as a symbol of Anglo-American interest. Evacuation or loss of it by the British would reverberate throughout southeast Asia, where millions of Chinese in Siam, Malaya, Singapore and Indonesia are waiting to see what happens.

4. We should support the Dutch in Indonesia, leaving to them the task of defense against communism; the British in Singapore and Malaya and the present Government of Siam. And we can afford to spend $500,000,000 a year to maintain Japanese economy pending future developments.

5. In Japan our position is safe, and it is the only place in the Orient where we have taken a firm stand. But we must recognize the need of the Japanese to rearm if we are to protect them from a Soviet-sponsored Communist revolution and restrain them from unduly coveting the raw materials of Manchuria and North China.

6. Japan is the only nation in the Orient capable and willing to fight as a unified force. * * * We do not want her to fight on the other side.

Mr. Mathews completes his conclusions with a very interesting and definite proposal which will receive sympathetic consideration from many outside the executive arm of the Government but most improbably will appear in the administration's new Far East policy when it evolves one. He writes:

To talk about Asians uniting behind the slogan "Asia for the Asiatics" is so much eyewash. If the people of Europe cannot unite it is presumptuous to assume that the great masses of illiterates in the Orient can.

As a practical means of promoting our policy [there] we should create the office of high commissioner and charge that officer with the unification of our military and political policy throughout all of that area.

The political skill that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has shown in Japan qualifies him as well as any man alive for the appointment.

This move, thinks Mr. Mathews, would change our defeatism into positivism and save much of the treasure of the present and the hope of the future. One of the illustrations of his special supplement shows General MacArthur personally escorting the editor out of headquarters and doing so with a most devoted air. In combination these two things justify the speculation whether Mr. Mathews came to his most important conclusion in Tokyo about that very time and told the General of it. If that is so, a lot of people would like to know what, if any, response he got from the most successful of all the victorious postwar administrators.

Columbus, Symbol of the Pioneering Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was our privilege and distinct honor, the other evening, to have had in the city of Newark, the great Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY. The occasion of his visit was the commemoration of the four hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of the discovery of America at a dinner tendered by the Columbian Civic League. Our great Vice President in extolling the contributions of that intrepid Genoese captain to the world, paid tribute to the spirit which guided him, and to the people who claim kinship with the land of his nativity—the Americans of Italian descent.

Mr. BARKLEY pointed to our great advancements in the four and a half centuries since Columbus discovered America, saying, "we have produced in this country, which he discovered, man's greatest genius for government and society, in the history of the earth." And he further pointed out that "the America which Columbus discovered, is the same land that was able to save Columbus' nation from fascism and communism."

The Newarkers who heard the genial Vice President will long remember him, not only for his warmth of personality, but for the great message which he left with them—that this land discovered by Christopher Columbus, will one day lead mankind out of the morass of intolerance and bigotry into the paths of freedom, kindness, and friendship.

On that same occasion, the Columbian Civic League made an award to a young lady of 15, Miss Rosalind Greenberg, a student of the Arts High School of Newark, N. J., for her winning essay on Columbus, The Symbol of the Pioneering Spirit.

The essay was so fine and worthy of recognition that it also merited words of commendation from our Vice President. Because it exemplifies, in my mind, how the spirit of democracy—which we seek to preserve—has been transmitted to our youth, I include it herein:

COLUMBUS—SYMBOL OF THE PIONEERING SPIRIT

A man who dared to follow an ideal, who could aim his life toward a goal that he believed in; a visionary in a time when visions came high and men sometimes paid for them with their lives—such a man was Christopher Columbus.

Perhaps to those of us who see only as far as the statement "* * * Columbus discovered America," that man's name is just something to remember for history class, or the reason why we have a holiday. But he, it, the spirit that he represents mean so much more.

It means that a man, modest in appearance and tongue, conceived an idea of something new, and had the conviction to strike out for it.

A pioneer, a forerunner, he made clear the way for generations of peoples. He opened the gates to a new world where a free society could exist.

The new world—what a sweet, fresh-sounding name—an outlet for all kinds of people. Although their physical differences were many, these first Americans were united in a common bond of courage; courage to fight man, and courage to fight the elements for what they thought was right.

Pilgrims, Catholics, Quakers, searching for religious freedom; poor men, merchants, servants, looking for a place with freedom from want and fear.

You, O Columbus, unlocked these avenues. You provided this outlet.

Your perseverance and spirit, imaged in thousands of immigrants, built our country,

our America, the outcome of pioneering bands.

To pioneer, however, is not just building out of wilderness; it is also to be found in the forging ahead of men in other endeavors:

Industries that will keep on bringing to all the people new helps—lights to read by, machines to ease the burdens of the housewife, clothes, furniture, jobs. These in the modern age of pioneering.

Science, forging ahead to new victories over germ enemies, searching the universe for the answers to man's questions.

Religion, extending to each of us a pillar of truth with which to reenforce the framework of our minds.

Education, raising each generation of Americans to even greater heights. A land where to be called ignorant is the highest form of ridicule.

Columbus! It was you who opened the way for the rise of great free-thinking American men. This is your land, the Nation of leaders.

How fortunate are we to be able to live in this land whose cornucopia overflows to all the world, bountiful in its generosity. Our youths go forth each day equipped to pioneer new goals, armed with elbowroom of free thought, just laws, and knowledge. Each day presents a challenge, and it is met and conquered by the prepared. Our bodies are strong and healthy; ready to work and develop still undisturbed expanses of earth, air, fire, and water.

Yet, we are far from perfect. A great deal of pioneering must still be done, and our future advancement has been sparked by you.

Gaze on us fondly, Columbus; we are your posterity.

It is we who will keep your heralding spark alive in the lamp of Liberty.

You are a symbol to us, Columbus, and we mark you well.

Skepticism Marks Reaction to Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have before me a story by George R. Harvey in the issue of the Hoosier Farmer magazine, which reached my desk just today.

This story reports the outcome of 10 special district meetings of Indiana farmers on the so-called Brannan farm plan.

Not only does this article set forth the general feeling of farmers in Indiana toward the Brannan plan, but it also emphasizes the most logical thinking possible against the Brannan proposal to regiment the American farmers.

The Hoosier Farmer magazine is the official monthly publication of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

I herewith present the article for printing in the RECORD, which I am sure will be of interest to every Senator, and I am equally sure of its interest to every farmer and consumer in the United States.

SKEPTICISM MARKS REACTION TO BRANNAN PLAN

(By George R. Harvey)

The 10 special district meetings to discuss the Brannan plan and other farm legislative proposals are now completed. After discussing the plans all over the State and contacting many farmers on the proposition at the recent State fair, several observations can now be made.

Some farmers came to the meetings feeling that cheap food to the consumer and continued high prices to the farmer was a perfect dream come true. Many others thought the above phrase sounded so good that there was bound to be a catch to it. Others had studied and figured the plan through and decided they did not like the idea at all. Still others had been so busy that they had given the plan no thought and wondered what all the discussion was about.

PRINCIPAL POINTS

Principal points of interest seemed to center around how much the cost would be and who would pay it? How much would the reduction in food prices amount to, how much administration would be necessary? What about the mechanics of getting the money each year to make the payments and how much absolute control would the Government have over the individual farming operation? After the plan was explained, the question period was open as long as any point was not clear.

The method used in figuring the proposed cost for the fluid milk program was explained. The cost of this program alone would be more than $2,400,000,000. Therefore it was not difficult to see that the costs for the complete program would be staggering and much more than agriculture had ever received or hoped to receive for a program. (In fact, we have just learned that the budget committee in Congress refused to consider money for the plan, due to the mystery surrounding the total costs.)

The too common thought that if the Government "picks up the check," it doesn't cost the individual anything, was good for quite a bit of discussion. It was well known by the groups, that taxes paid by any business are a legitimate expense and are passed on to the consumer, causing a great part of the consumer's dollar to be absorbed in hidden taxes. It was also brought out that the Government does not give anything, it only collects to distribute.

PLAN COSTS HIGH

Several examples of just how much the consumer could expect his cost of articles to be reduced, drew much comment. In so many instances, if the farmer's price were reduced 50 percent, or if he went so far as to give the raw materials, the consumer would benefit only in a small way. It was the opinion of many that the consumer would feel that he had been tricked into believing he would benefit by great savings. This belief would then cause consumers in general to resist appropriation of the necessary funds by Congress, to pay the so-called farmer subsidy. It was also noted that farmers are outnumbered by these consumers 4 to 1 and such resistance would be the final blow to such an attempted program.

In one district the number of additional Government personnel to administer such a program, gave them great concern. It was pointed out that the auditing of the individual accounts alone would be tremendous; and to assure the consumer of actually getting the benefit of any reduction in food costs, each step of the food processing business would have to be Government-controlled. Reason for this is obvious, since it is common custom, and good business, for the food processor to buy at the lowest dollar and sell at all the market will bear. Without such protection, someone "in between" would very likely absorb the savings the consumer hoped to make down at the end of the line.

The mechanics of actually getting the money is something that requires careful study. We know that regardless of what the law says, when expenditure of money is involved, it has to be appropriated. Many plans and programs in the past have been rendered useless because the required funds were not voted. Each year the farmers would have to go before Congress and convince them that all the necessary money for the program should be appropriated. Failure at any time to obtain the funds would cause the whole scheme to collapse leaving the actual market prices for farm goods at whatever level the subsidizing method had permitted them to sink.

SUPPORT AND CONTROL RATIO

The consensus regarding Government control on the individual farm was that it would be in direct ratio to the degree of support given; 100-percent support would mean approximately 100-percent control.

Farmers in all the districts feel that the recommended amendment to the 1948 agricultural law, providing for the flexible support of 75 to 90 percent of parity, tying it in to work automatically with supply, is a decided improvement over the law as now written.

It was pointed out that the 1948 act was the result of many years of experience in loans, supports, and marketing agreements, while the Brannan plan is theory and theory only. Much confidence was expressed by farmers in Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, who was the former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture. Senator ANDERSON is the author of the 75 to 90 percent of parity support amendment to the present 1948 Agricultural Act.

Save American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, imports of leather goods and other products of Europe's cheap labor are certain to be greatly accelerated as the result of Great Britain's devaluation of the pound. There is a question as to whether industry in this country can survive unless this Congress removes the wartime excise taxes, legislation for which this administration has ignored. Let us do something about this before we think of adjourning.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter, received today, from Thomas A. Buckley, president of the Luggage and Leather Goods Manufacturers of America, Inc., which well describes the position in which these producers find themselves. Here is the letter:

LUGGAGE AND LEATHER GOODS MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., October 13, 1949.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: What have we done to deserve this fate?

Beleaguered and belabored as we are with the discriminatory 20 percent excise tax, we

are now faced with an additional burden in the form of increased imports of foreign-made leather products at drastically reduced prices.

We refer, of course, to the action taken by Great Britain in the devaluation of the pound sterling and the effect this action will have on our industry. The United States always has been an importer of luggage and leather goods. Such imports far outweigh our exports of these products. With the devaluation, it is natural and normal that such imports wil be accelerated greatly.

This situation would be bad enough under normal conditions but it is made much worse for our American leather goods manufacturers who are saddled with an extra tax, which was put on to conserve vital materials during the war emergency. It is our contention that the situation in our industry is different as we are and always have been under a conservation order and not considered as a luxury, and justly so. The restrictions have been taken off steel, copper, brass, and paper; why not remove the restriction on leather goods?

We realize the world need for the American dollar and are willing to go along with the added competition. The point which makes our position untenable is the fact that the imported goods at reduced prices will carry much less tax and while we can try to meet the competition for value, we have absolutely no way of meeting the tax advantage which will be enjoyed by foreign goods imported. Is it the intention of the Congress to permit an industry to become extinct because of a tax law reinforced by international monetary action tantamount to a death sentence?

May we count on you to use your influence and urge your colleagues to use all their influence for the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on leather goods before this Congress adjourns?

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS A. BUCKLEY, *President.*

Yalta Surrender Can't Be Justified as Aid to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the blatant efforts of the New Deal-Fair Deal Roosevelt-Truman administration to ignore past mistakes in foreign policy, alibi them, and escape indictment for them through the simple expedient of deceptive and fallacious explanations and refusal to make any effort to rectify the error which might reveal its enormity has again been demonstrated in the recent China white paper issued by the State Department to explain our apparent complete loss of the peace in northern China and Manchuria.

The surrender to the demands of Russia at Yalta which permitted Russia to enter the war against Japan, a war in which victory already was assured through the sacrifice of American lives from Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, Tarawa, and the Coral Sea, was a major blunder by the administrative leadership which is now too obvious to ignore. But the administration has made no attempt to rectify this error since the cessation of hostilities in 1945.

Grandiose plans have been approved and billions of dollars appropriated to attempt construction of a defensive wall in western Europe. But threats to our security from the Far East have been disregarded and turned aside by statements minimizing such threats and even denying their existence.

Past mistakes must be accepted realistically and their future effects upon the future security of our Nation carefully evaluated. Where danger to our security exists, adequate defense must be established. But the administration's responsibility for the threat to our security and its neglect of that responsibility must be recognized.

Inefficient administrative leadership can only result in future mistakes, miscalculations, and errors, costly errors which may be paid for in American lives.

The following factual editorial from a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post reviews Yalta which was a prime example of our foreign policy blunders which have become all too frequent:

YALTA SURRENDER CAN'T BE JUSTIFIED AS AID TO VICTORY

One of the least convincing alibis for certain bizarre items in the Roosevelt foreign policy is the effort to explain Yalta as something more than an ignominious surrender to Stalinist aggression in Asia. The burden of the defense, which has been made by several apologists, including former Secretary of State Stettinius, is that the concessions at the Crimean conference were dictated by military necessity.

This line pops up again in the State Department's white paper on China. The argument is advanced this way: "It should be remembered that the atomic bomb was anything but an assured reality; the potentialities of the Japanese Kwantung Army in Manchuria seemed large; and the price in American lives in the military campaign up the island ladder to the Japanese homeland was assuming ghastly proportions. Obviously military necessity dictated that Russia enter the war against Japan prior to the mounting of Operation Olympic (the assault upon Kyushu) roughly scheduled for November 1, 1945, in order to contain Japanese forces in Manchuria and prevent their transfer to the Japanese home islands."

Now that we are trying to find some force capable of containing the Russian forces which we invited into Manchuria, it is important to evaluate the premises upon which the Yalta double cross of China was based. A long-term view of military necessity obviously dictated that Russia should not enter the war in the Far East. Even the short-term necessity was not accepted by many military leaders, although it was undoubtedly urged by some. In February 1945, when the delegates met at Yalta, Japan's offensive strength had been destroyed. A few weeks later General Kenney was to announce that the Japanese air force was no longer a threat. Her fleet had lost its striking force, and American naval craft were already cruising at will in Japanese home waters. Certainly by the time of the conference at Yalta the conferees knew who was going to win the Pacific war.

It is hard to believe that the negotiators at Yalta were ignorant of these facts. They had opportunities enough to learn them. According to Arthur Krock in the New York Times for August 12, "An Air Force officer was dispatched to Yalta with a well-documented report of Japanese weakness designed to fortify President Roosevelt to resist Stalin's 'price' for entering the war. Its purport was that the Russians were not required for a victory which would come much sooner than the high command believed (this before the atomic bomb was ready for operation).

"The officer who brought the report had a star on his shoulder. His entreaties won a promise from Mr. Hopkins to read the report and show it to the President. However, it seems that something prevented Mr. Hopkins from doing so. It could have changed the history of these times for the better, but diligent search fails to find any mention of it in the white paper."

Russian entry into the Pacific war was regarded in informed circles as certain, for the obvious reason that only by declaring war on Japan could Stalin get in on the division of the spoils. Furthermore, there was widespread understanding that Russia in the Pacific war represented a serious danger to American aims or at least to aims more substantial than an emotionally exciting campaign to kill Japs in order to achieve unconditional surrender.

The late George Moorad, a correspondent painfully familiar with American ineptitude in the Far East, wrote in his book, Lost Peace in China (E. P. Dutton & Co.), that the anxiety at Yalta to bribe Stalin to fight Japan "implies unpardonable neglect of Russia's historic yearning for the warm-water ports of Manchuria and Korea."

Robert Sherwood, biographer of Harry Hopkins, has the grace to leave the military-necessity alibi to less frank historians. Mr. Sherwood's explanation in Roosevelt and Hopkins (Harper Bros.) is that "Roosevelt would not have agreed to that firm commitment had it not been that the Yalta Conference was almost at an end and he was tired and anxious to avoid further argument." Sherwood added that Roosevelt hoped he could later "straighten the whole thing out with Chiang Kai-shek."

The pay-off comment on one of the consequences of Yalta comes from Communist sources in China, the immediate victim of the deal. Ta Kung Pao, Shanghai pro-Communist newspaper, defends the Sino-Russian treaty of 1945 on the ground that the treaty has assisted free (that is, Communist) China to ward off American imperialism and "prevent Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek from delivering Manchuria to the United States." (New York Times paraphrase.) Ironically enough, it was Roosevelt who urged this treaty on China. Thus, in order to bribe Stalin into helping us keep Japan out of Manchuria, the Yalta conferees handed over that vast area to Russia. To win one war, we set things up to give us a good chance to lose another.

Baby Selling in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald recently disclosed that the shocking and iniquitous business of baby selling was being conducted in interstate commerce. It is difficult to conceive that there are those callous enough to traffic in human lives by taking advantage of the unfortunate and deplorable condi-

tions which, for one reason or another, force a mother to separate from her child. In such instances, since proper investigation has not been made, it is possible that the child may be placed with persons who are not fit to raise the child.

It is my understanding that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is powerless to intervene in such cases because there is no applicable Federal law prohibiting such commerce. Even though some States do have laws which prohibit the selling of little children, enforcement is difficult unless the violators can be apprehended within the boundaries of such States.

The power of the Federal Government in the field of interstate commerce has long been established and has been invoked on numerous occasions in the public welfare. But to bring into operation the machinery of the United States Government requires legislation which this Congress must first enact.

Surely there is ample precedent. The Mann Act and the antikidnapping law were passed to supplement State laws in stamping out two revolting types of crime which had been using interstate commerce to escape State law-enforcement officers.

There has now been revealed a new kind of nefarious scheme which can neither be condoned or permitted to continue by decent people. It, therefore, seems to me that it is our duty as Federal legislators to enact such measures as will make the interstate sale of children an offense punishable by confinement in a Federal penitentiary.

I have been advised that Miss Katharine Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau in the Federal Security Agency, and her assistants, Miss Maude Morlock and Miss I. Evelyn Smith, are understandably and justifiably concerned by the Miami Herald disclosures. It is my earnest hope that the Children's Bureau will soon have prepared legislation to curb interstate baby selling so that when Congress reconvenes next January we will be able to take immediate action on such a necessary and desirable law.

The Integrity of Poland Should Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much publicity of late to the effect that American officials in Germany are laying design to sever the western boundaries of Poland and restore them to Germany.

Fully considering how Poland was overridden, exploited, and subdued in many wars by the nation that would be benefited in such a transaction, and the inestimable part the Polish people have played in helping to preserve our priceless freedom, I am stimulated to feel that this Congress should give this matter its grave concern that justice may prevail for the Polish people and their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and resolution from the Polish Falcons Z. B., No. 1, of South Bend, Ind., which fully exhibit the membership's sincere convictions on the injustice about to be rendered:

POLISH FALCONS, Z. B. No. 1,
South Bend, Ind., October 7, 1949.

Hon. THURMAN C. CROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR HON. MR. CROOK: The Zygmunt Balicki Nest 80, Polish Falcons of America, having a membership of over 500 of Polish descent, have adopted a resolution at their last monthly meeting held Monday, October 3, 1949.

In recent publications, it has been noted that American officials in Germany are proposing that the present western boundaries of Poland be taken away from Poland and restored to Germany, the same Germany that was the instigator of two ghastly World Wars wherein our sons and brothers were called upon to give their lives, if need be to protect the world against the terror of Germanism in its most brutal form.

The resolution is contained herein on separate copy.

Hoping that you, Hon. Mr. Crook, as our representative, will take action on this question, for this matter is vital to the best interests of the Polish people and to world peace.

For the Zygmunt Balicki Nest 80:

WALTER A. KARPINSKI,
President.

BERNARD A. TRYTKO,
Financial Secretary.

Whereas the heroic Polish nation was the first to fight against the tyranny of a Nazi Fascist Germany with all its inherent evils; and

Whereas the Polish people for centuries past, and to this day, have done all that is in their power to promote democracy for all nations, even to the extent of deliberately sacrificing their own lands and lives so that we might enjoy our liberties; and

Whereas the lands granted to Poland on their western borders are historically and ethnically Polish, and it is surely small compensation to offer the Polish nation in return for the misery and sufferings that were their lot under the yoke of the most sadistic enemy of mankind that the world has ever seen; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and other Allied powers decided to deprive Poland of approximately half of their territories in the east and to compensate Poland, our ally, with recovered territories from an enemy who has killed and maimed thousands upon thousands of our American boys who fought in two World Wars under the impression that they were fighting for truth, liberty, and justice; and

Whereas millions of Poles were arbitrarily forced to leave their homes that had been occupied by their families for centuries when Russia was given Polish territory, leaving them only the western lands to migrate to; and

Whereas Poland, who has never killed one American boy in the course of history, was never asked if she agreed to the rending away from her of her territories in the east, who suffered more than did any nation in this last war, whether victor or vanquished, is now prostrate in the ruins of once beautiful cities and prosperous farmlands, with her population decimated and suffering from malnutrition and disease; and

Whereas we watch with apprehension the sacrifice of American ideals of democracy and fair play wherein we see our Government playing into the bloody hands of the German imperialists, the very things our American boys gave their lives against: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Zygmunt Balicki Nest 80, Polish Falcons of America, a national fraternal and gymnastic association, does hereby strongly decry the efforts of the United States officials in Germany to appease these self-same German imperialists by trying to return to them these historically and ethnically Polish lands now rightfully held by the gallant Polish people to relieve the artificial overpopulation of western Germany, the same plaint that was made after the First World War, to these same Germans who thought nothing of crowding millions of innocent women and children into concentration camps under the most horrible conditions and then sending these millions to their deaths in the gas chambers; and be it further

Resolved, That in the view of the heroic deeds and the unswerving loyalty for which the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt called them the inspiration of nations, we beg against further abusing or mutilating of the boundaries or lives of Poland and her people who, after all, are also human beings, such as we, this should not be tolerated and certainly not advocated by the United States officials either here or abroad.

Civilian Defense Against an Atomic-Bomb Attack Must Not Be Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all Members of Congress to read the excellent article in the October issue of the Review of Politics under the title of "Constitutional Dictatorship in the Atomic Age" by Clinton L. Rossiter, professor of political science, Cornell University.

This article is timely, and has been thoughtfully prepared with the evident intention of arousing the Congress and the public in general to the urgent necessity of organizing an adequate civilian defense now, because of the latent danger of an atomic-bomb attack which, if it came, would do the most damage to the civilian population, and could create a great crisis in our Government which we are not at present prepared to meet.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 369 as the first step in preparing for civilian defense, and am therefore vitally interested in the above-mentioned article which should be a matter of concern to all Members of Congress.

Space does not permit reproducing the whole of Professor Rossiter's article. However, I am submitting a part of it which summarizes some of the excellent points he makes in favor of civilian defense, which follows:

I should like to make one final major suggestion, and that is that we should proceed without delay to establish a Nation-wide organization for civil defense and initiate an exacting training program for all citizens willing to serve in it. The way to sound civil defense has already been pointed out, in Civil Defense for National Security, a 300-page report prepared at the request of the Secretary of Defense and presented to him by the Office of Civil Defense Planning in November 1948. This document, to which every thoughtful American could well devote an evening of study, was the product of 9 months of intensive investigation and contemplation by Mr. Russell J. Hopley, president of Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., and a staff of about 40 full-time assistants and 130 expert consultants and advisers. The Office of Civil Defense Planning was established by a directive of the Secretary of Defense dated March 27, 1948. The scope of the Hopley plan is indicated by this definition of civil defense: "Civil Defense is the organization of the people to minimize the effects of enemy action. More specifically it is the mobilization, organization, and direction of the civilian populace and necessary supporting agencies to minimize the effects of enemy action directed against people, communities, industrial plants, facilities, and other installations—and to maintain or restore those facilities essential to civil life and to preserve the maximum civilian support of the war effort."

These, in Mr. Hopley's own words, were the chief proposals outlined in his report to the Secretary of Defense:

"1. The establishment of a permanent Federal Office of Civil Defense to be established within the executive branch of the Government and to be headed by a strong and able civilian director.

"2. Within this Office would be a technical staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions comprising: communications, engineering, fire services, police services, warden services, and emergency transportation.

"3. A plans and operation staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions, comprising: organization and methods, mobile reserves and mutual aid, evacuation, aircraft observers and air-raid warning, manpower and matériel, plant protection, and civilian war aid.

"4. A training staff, headed by a deputy director, including: field services, methods and training materials, public education, schools and colleges, and leadership training.

"5. A medical and health services and other special weapons defense staff, headed by a deputy director, to include medical and health services, radiological defense, chemical defense, and other special weapons defense.

"6. We also propose the establishment of regional coordinators to assist in coordinating matters between the States and Federal organization and with the military and other agencies, when involved.

"7. Our plan contemplates the establishment of a civil defense agency within each State—starting with the governor as the responsible head—then the appointment of an advisory council, composed of representative citizens of the State to advise and counsel on civil defense matters, and the State activity to be headed by a director. The various operating divisions in the State organization would be similar to those in the Federal organization.

"8. Similarly, in each community the establishment of a civil defense agency under the mayor as the responsible municipal official, with an advisory council of representative citizens to advise and counsel on civil defense matter, and the local activity to be headed up by a director. Here, too, the various operating divisions in the local organization would be similar to those in the State and Federal organization.

"9. Our entire plan is proposed on the basis of:

"A. Placing full responsibility for operations in the States and communities where we think it properly belongs.

"B. The Federal organization to furnish the leadership and guidance in organizing and training the people for civil defense tasks, coordinating, training materials, and the advice and counsel that is needed.

"C. Maximum utilization of volunteers, existing agencies and organizations—governmental, public, and private—and all available skills and experiences.

"D. Well organized and trained units in communities throughout the country prepared and equipped to meet the problems of enemy attack, and to be ready against any weapon an enemy may use.

"E. Intensive planning to meet the particular hazards of atomic or other modern weapons of warfare. (The atomic bomb is a triple-threat combination of (1) a high explosive, (2) a superincendiary, and (3) one of extreme radiation.)

"F. A small nucleus peacetime organization which could be used in event of peacetime disasters such as fires, floods, explosions, tornadoes, and other similar catastrophes, and that could be quickly expanded to meet the exigencies of a given situation in a war emergency.

"G. The plan and the legislation that we propose have been developed on a model basis for the Federal, State, and municipal organization, and can be easily modified and adjusted to meet a particular situation in the community or State."

These proposals should be carefully considered by all branches of our Government at all levels. They do not form the perfect plan of civil defense and might well, after further consideration and experience, be altered at several important points. Mr. Hopley's report admits that it does not have all the answers to the tangled question of civil defense, but it does provide a sound point of departure from which we can go forward to the formation of what we might truly regard as a twentieth century American militia.

It should be mentioned that, while about 95 percent of the Nation's editors had nothing but earnest praise for Mr. Hopley and his report, several of our more excitable commentators launched a strident attack against this "military conspiracy to supersede the Bill of Rights," despite the plain facts that the organization would be completely civilian in character and personnel, that the national head would report directly to the Secretary of Defense (and through or around him to the President), and that the fundamental emphasis of the whole plan is on civilian cooperation at the local level. These people seem likewise to have overlooked the simple truth of Mr. Truman's famous remark, inserted in his atomic-energy message to Congress October 3, 1945, that "the release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas." Our answer to the unthinking critics has fortunately been framed by Mr. Hopley's home-town newspaper:

"The Hopley planners simply attempted to set up a stand-by organization which would reduce losses and save lives if this country should become involved in an atomic-biological-chemical war.

"This Nation-wide organization would be headed by a small Federal department or bureau which would provide leadership and coordination—but which would have no authority whatever over the civil rights of the people.

"In only one circumstance would the procedure outlined in the Hopley plan impinge on anybody's rights. The plan suggests that if a monstrous calamity—such as atomic bombing—should befall any community probably martial law would be declared there. Can any rational person doubt that? Could any rational person oppose it?

"It is conceivable that an atomic war might wipe out not only the Bill of Rights but the whole Constitution, the Capitol, the White House, the radio networks, and the Messrs. Winchell and Pearson and their Hooper ratings.

"But Russell Hopley didn't invent the atomic bomb."

It need only be added that the less we have to put up with this sort of "thinking" about the threat of atomic war, the better will be our chances for responsible emergency government and ultimate survival. We must be on our guard against every needless or capricious invasion of our valued liberties, but where a temporary, calculated intrusion is necessary to save the whole structure of our freedom, we must permit the intrusion and concentrate our efforts upon making it as temporary and carefully-guarded as possible. The Hopley proposals are open to criticism, and they should indeed be scrutinized by Congress and the people with excessive care before they are set in motion, but not in a spirit of arrant frivolity.

To sum up this suggestion, it seems to me that there are at least three excellent reasons for initiating a Nation-wide organization of civil defense. First, the mere creation of a thoroughgoing system of civil defense will call for the enrollment and training of several million citizens. This could be, in time of extreme national emergency, a tremendous force for stability and discipline in an otherwise chaotic civil situation, if only because that many people would have definite duties to perform. The more citizens we can include in such a program, the less overwhelming will be the "mass destruction, mass panic, and mass flight" that an atomic attack will inevitably generate. Second, the more tasks that the civilian population can do, the less the military will have to do. The Army can devote all its energies to active defense, and the dangers of military intrusion upon the civilian area will be greatly reduced, a point that Mr. Hopley's critics seem gratuitously to have overlooked. Third, and most important, it is impossible to deny the cogency of the Hopley report's observation that national civil defense is the "missing link" in our structure of security and defense. The untold confusion, fear, damage, and suffering that a well-trained civil defense organization could avert are an aggregate horror that we will have called down upon our own heads if we refuse to be tough-minded about our plans for survival in atomic war.

There is much to be done, institutionally and educationally, to make our Government ready for atomic war. The time to begin our preparations is not next year or in 3 years or 5, but now; for we are faced with the brutal fact that within 5 years at the outside an atomic attack on the American Continent will be a scientific-military-political possibility. However horrified many good people may be by the mere mention of the phrases "constitutional dictatorship," "martial law," or "civil defense," they cannot bid this dangerous truth be gone by refusing to talk about it or think about it or call it by its right name. If the prospect of presidential-military dictatorship still horrifies them, then we have another excellent argument for perpetual peace, for a world government with no civil wars.

In the meantime, we must deal with the world as it is, not as we would like it to be. There is much to fear in the atomic age, and our fear is the more naked because it touches the unknown. Yet, as we prepare for calamity, we can take hope from the experiences of the democracies in the recent world war; from them we learn "that a democratic, constitutional government be-

set by a severe national emergency can be strong enough to maintain its own existence without at the same time being so strong as to subvert the liberties of the people it has been instituted to defend," and that "merely because we are to have a government strong enough to deal with the atomic age does not mean that we are henceforth to be slaves. Not at all, for if the crisis history of the modern democracies teaches us anything, it teaches us that power can be responsible, that strong government can be democratic government, that dictatorship can be constitutional. From this day forward we must cease wasting our energies in discussing whether the Government of the United States is to be powerful or not. It is going to be powerful or we are going to be obliterated. Our problem is to make that power effective and responsible, to make any future dictatorship a constitutional one. No sacrifice is too great for our democracy, least of all the temporary sacrifice of democracy itself." If we will be resolute about this matter of constitutional dictatorship, the future may be brighter than we have hitherto dared to think.

Is Harper's Magazine Biased?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter which I have written to the editor of Harper's Magazine.

This letter was written in reply to an article appearing in the September issue of Harper's Magazine which indicates a degree of carelessness on the part of this great publication that must be surprising to many Americans.

This magazine saw fit to publish ex parte and without any investigation of the truth or falsity of its contents, an article entitled "Still Life With Red Herring."

I asked Harper's Magazine to publish my letter in full. I have been advised by the editor that they would print only a "very much shortened version." I feel obligated, therefore, to insert my reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 7, 1949.

The EDITOR,
Harper's Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The September issue of Harper's magazine carried an article entitled "Still Life With Red Herring," by Emily Genauer. This article has been called to my attention by my friends and by artists who are modern and contemporary in the true American meaning of those two words. They consider the article of Miss Genauer as derogatory, and I am compelled, with some degree of reluctance, to call to your attention the inaccuracies and false statements with which the article is replete.

Miss Genauer has used what she purports are direct quotations from my conversation with her, when she called at my office in Washington in June. This visit to my office was entirely informal, was in no sense an interview for publication, and Miss Genauer made no notes whatsoever while she was in my presence during our talk. She repeated to me several times that she was in a very "confused" state, and it is my judgment that she carried this confusion away from my office, because the direct quotations of statements which she attributes to me are not true, but they have been twisted so that they sound rather puerile, and are just far enough from the truth to serve the purpose of Miss Genauer. If she or you would like to have a description of what I consider Marxism or communism in art, I shall be very happy to give you one, which you can use in any manner that you see fit. It is yours for the asking.

This twisting or distortion of the truth to belittle or ridicule is a weapon in literature with which Miss Genauer must be well acquainted. She has distorted before, and she distorts further in the article you have published, but there is nothing remarkable about this, because distortion, ridicule, and the warping of values is typical of the art, the so-called modern and contemporary art, which Miss Genauer has so persistently championed and promoted in her literary work.

It is my impression, recorded during my many years of service in Congress, that where a magazine publishes an article containing direct quotations attributed to a Member of Congress, it is customary for the publication to obtain confirmation from the Congressman before printing the article. At no time did you ask me to confirm the direct quotations attributed to me by Miss Genauer.

Concerning the Gallery on Wheels exhibit at St. Albans Hospital, Miss Genauer describes this venture as the kindly mission of a Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Aument, principally the latter. After reading what Miss Genauer says, one is justified in picturing a do-gooder going unobtrusively from patient to patient in the hospital and helping to give them a lift over some of their many rough spots. There must be something wrong in this scene which Miss Genauer depicts with her facile pen. In my speech titled "Communist Art in Government Hospitals," I quoted a news article from the Art Digest, dated January 15, 1949, and called attention to the fact that on page 16 there appeared the statement, which I quote in part:

"The hospital's fine arts exhibition, through its fine arts committee, headed by Carroll Aument of the Museum of Modern Art, is holding an exhibition in the ship's library. The art committee will take it to every large Government hospital in the country."

Now, it is a far cry from an unobtrusive do-gooder to an organized committee headed by a representative from the Museum of Modern Art of New York City, setting out upon a Nation-wide campaign. Either the statement of Miss Genauer is false, or the article in the Art Digest is false. As Miss Genauer is associate editor of the Art Digest she has a responsibility in either case. Either the Art Digest has made a false statement or you have published in your magazine a false statement by Miss Genauer.

In the article which you published the author says, in describing the paintings at St. Albans: "There were all kinds, academic ones and abstract ones." The article published in the Art Digest, to which I have made reference, gave the names of 17 artists who contributed to the exhibit, and I have no knowledge whether there were contributing artists other than these, for these were the only names revealed to the public. In my speech I repeated the names of these 17 contributing artists and gave a brief description of the Red affiliations of 15 of them. Concerning two, I gave no descriptive matter, because their records were not readily available. These 15 contributing artists all had Communist contacts, and not one statement of fact made by me in that speech concerning these affiliations has been repudiated or disproved. Perhaps Miss Genauer would care to tell me which one of these 15 painters may be accurately described as an academic artist, without Red affiliation, and whom she considers an untainted proponent of traditional American art.

There is another phase of the art incident at St. Albans Hospital which is totally at variance with, and in violent contradiction to, Miss Genauer's description of the event. Is it not in order for me to ask who arranged the publicity which featured this show? Was it the sweet, little, self-effacing do-gooder pictured by Miss Genauer? Was it spontaneous or was it prearranged, perfectly timed to harmonize with the Communist peace offensive, which reached its highest point at the so-called peace conference at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel from March 25 to March 27? Was it coincidence or was it by prearrangement that Look magazine in its issue of April 12 carried an article headed "Paintings for paraplegics" and reproduced many scenes from the show at St. Albans? The principal of these pictures, that on page 52 of the issue, is a propaganda picture in every sense of the word. It is subtle and effective, as the highest level of propaganda should be. It has been pronounced propaganda by competent authorities. It shows a convalescent sailor studying a modernistic painting, but centered, featured, and magnified in this picture is the gruesome steel apparatus that this unfortunate man must wear for the rest of his life. This picture is harrowing, disturbing to the emotions, and is a powerful plea for "peace at any price." The caption with the picture says, in part, "These paraplegics want to remind the world of the terrible toll of war."

Now, I know the terrible toll of war, as every American knows it. I yearn and strive for permanent peace, as every right-thinking individual does; but this is a period in our history when we are preparing for defense against a Communist power which, determined to dominate the world, hides behind a false front of world peace, designed to undermine the moral stamina of our people. It is a significant thing to me that this heart-rending picture, sponsored by the Gallery on Wheels Art Show of the so-called modern and contemporary art at St. Albans Hospital, fitted in so perfectly with the peace offensive of Communists, near-Communists, Communist sympathizers, and fellow travelers in the United States. While the date on Look magazine is April 12, the magazines containing these pictures were actually sold on the stands on March 29—just 1 day after the peace conference closed at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The attitude of Look magazine in this instance is not out of character. That magazine found occasion to get rid of its art director, William E. Fink, not very long after it published pictures which brought ridicule upon the State Department art junket. Merle Armitage, a Hollywood designer, who replaced Fink, has had ample opportunity to demonstrate, and continues to demonstrate, his partisanship toward so-called modern art. He is the author of books on Picasso, Communist hero to modern art, and on Rockwell Kent, president of the International Workers Order, and adjunct of the Communist Party.

The author of the article which you published takes keen pleasure in linking my name with those of Hitler and Stalin, because of the similarity of descriptive adjectives which have been used in describing so-called modern and contemporary art. The real significance of these statements is lost entirely upon the author. I have never read anything that Hitler had to say about art, nor can I recall ever having seen or read what Stalin had to say, but I have no doubt that both of these individuals have, at some

time, made simple statements of fact which were incontrovertible. If Hitler said about a dog that he saw, "that dog is black," and Stalin, seeing the same dog, said "that dog is very black," and I, when viewing the same animal, commented "that certainly is a very black dog," the average person who had knowledge of these comments would not say that Hitler resembled Stalin, or Stalin resembled DONDERO, or DONDERO looks like either or both of the others, but would come to the very sound conclusion that the dog of which all three individuals spoke must, indeed, have been a black dog. It is this refusal to face a simple fact that the vast majority of plain Americans recognize—namely, that the art of the "isms" is repulsive and is destructive of American standards—that further reveals the author's obliquity.

As as example of the inability of Miss Genauer to tell the whole truth, I wish to call to your attention a quotation which she attributes to Theodore Roosevelt. It concerns his attitude toward the armory show of 1913. In quoting Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, Miss Genauer says at the end of her quotation: "It is vitally necessary to move forward and shake off the dead hand, often the fossilized dead hand, of the reactionaries." You will observe that Miss Genauer ends her sentence with a period, and ends her quotation. This is false, and had she continued the quotation she would have shown that Theodore Roosevelt was intolerant of the art she espouses and despised it. That particular sentence to which she refers does not end in a period, but in a semicolon, and continues "and yet we have to face the fact that there is apt to be a lunatic fringe among the votaries of any forward movement. In this recent art exhibition the lunatic fringe is fully in evidence, especially in the rooms devoted to the cubists and the futurists of near-impressionists." Further on in his statement Theodore Roosevelt said, "Why a deformed pelvis should be called 'sincere' or a tibia of giraffe-like length 'precious' is a question of pathological rather than artistic significance." Miss Genauer, as a critic having frequent recourse to double talk in her criticisms of modern art, should be particularly interested in the last part of this quotation from President Theodore Roosevelt.

As another example of how your contributor twists and distorts facts to suit her fancy and meet her pressing needs, let me call attention to an article by her which appeared in the New York World Telegram on Saturday, December 6, 1947. This article is under the caption "This week in art" and carries a heavy five-column subheading "Pope's edict absolves friends of modern art." Miss Genauer uses a direct quotation in this article, attributing it to the Pope's encyclical, and says that "the Pope told the bishops to 'open the doors of our churches to modern art'."

In her opening paragraph in the World-Telegram article Miss Genauer says, "the next time anybody throws nasty names like radical or Communist at me for praising modern art—and they do—I'm going to duck behind a 15,000-word encyclical which Pope Pius XII has just issued to the Catholic bishops all over the world." The entire article of Miss Genauer's is devoted to using the Pope's encyclical to justify her attitude toward modern art and persistently distorts the facts, ending by saying, "Communists hate modern art, the Pope endorses it." May I call your attention to an exact translation of the encyclical, to which this article refers? It is as follows:

"What we have said about music may practically be said of the other arts, particularly of architecture, sculpture, and painting. One cannot generally spurn and reject out of prejudice new forms and styles which are better adapted to the new material out of which they are fashioned. On the contrary if, with wise balance, one avoids excessive realism on the one hand and exaggerated symbolism on the other, and takes into consideration the needs of the Christian community rather than the peculiar judgment and personal taste of artists, it is altogether necessary to give a free hand to that contemporary art which, with due reverence and honor serves the sacred places and sacred rites. Thus it becomes possible for contemporary art also to join its voice to the admirable canticle of glory that the masters raised in past centuries to the Catholic faith. We cannot refrain, however, as a duty of conscience, from deploring and reproving those forms and styles, recently introduced by some, which appear to be deprivations and distortions of true art, and which sometimes are openly repugnant to Christian decorum, modesty, and piety, and sadly offend genuine religious sentiment; these must absolutely be avoided and put out of our churches, as in general all that is not in harmony with the sanctity of the place."

You will observe from this translation that the Pope's intention was exactly the opposite to that which Miss Genauer attributes to him. He only welcomes into the church that contemporary art "which with due reverence and honor serves the sacred places and sacred rites" and warns that "those forms and styles * * * which appear to be deprivations and distortions of true art * * * must absolutely be avoided and put out of our churches."

I know of no greater disservice that Miss Genauer could have done to the Catholic citizens of our country than to mislead them deliberately into thinking that the Pope welcomed into the church the isms of art which are in truth so repugnant to Christianity.

In one of my speeches on Marxism in art, I made comments about Artists Equity. In her article Miss Genauer refers to this speech and says that, "Congressman CHARLES PLUMLEY, of Vermont, was so anoyed that he stood up in the House and gave DONDERO the lie." Anyone with a fair knowledge of our English language knows that there is only one meaning to the term "gives the lie." It doesn't mean that one refutes, or denies, or disagrees, but that an assertion is called a lie or the asserter is called a liar. The rules which control the conduct of the Members of Congress absolutely prohibit one Congressman calling another a liar. Miss Genauer knows this, she knows further that Congressman PLUMLEY did not rise on the floor of the House at all to ask permission to extend his remarks, because he was not present, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts requested permission of the Speaker of the House in PLUMLEY'S behalf. Mr. PLUMLEY did not at any time make any remarks on the floor of Congress concerning me or the speech which I had delivered. Therefore, this statement by Miss Genauer is false and deliberately malicious.

The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated June 16, 1949, carries a very brief statement by Mr. PLUMLEY, serving to introduce into the RECORD a letter and statement he had received from Hudson D. Walker, of Artists' Equity.

This letter is becoming lengthy to a disquieting degree but I trust you will bear with me while I make one additional comment. In the next to the last paragraph of her article Miss Genauer says that an article by me once appeared in a pro-Nazi propaganda magazine called Fair Play, along with contributions by a man later convicted as a Nazi agent. I have never written any article for a magazine called Fair Play, nor have I ever delivered a speech entitled "U. S. Was Never a Democracy," as Miss Genauer claims. On August 23, 1939, I delivered in the House of Representatives a speech which was titled "Our Form of Government—a Republic." I think that this distortion is again typical of the practice in which Miss Genauer constantly engages, and I think it is pernicious and vicious, and it amazes me that your magazine should have published this article without checking all of the statements made and the quotations attributed to various persons.

It may be of interest to you to know that the speech which I delivered under the title "Our Form of Government—a Republic" was prepared for me by Mr. William Tyler Page, who is the author of, The American Creed.

Yours very truly.

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

I Saw Christ in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon delivered in Atlanta, Ga., by Rev. James P. Wesberry, pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta. Dr. Wesberry will be remembered most pleasantly by the Members of the House as acting chaplain of the House of Representatives during the period from July 27 to September 2, 1949, during the vacation of our beloved chaplain, Dr. Montgomery.

I have read Dr. Wesberry's message. It is of particular interest to those of us who had the privilege of knowing Dr. Wesberry during his service as Acting Chaplain of the House, and who heard daily his petitions to Almighty God. This is an inspiring message and presents Congress in an entirely new light; that is, the view of Congress to one who serves as its Chaplain. This is a message of deep religious significance, and I take pleasure in commending it to the Members of the House:

I SAW CHRIST IN CONGRESS

(By James P. Wesberry, pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga.)

The favorite pastime of some people is criticism. Many people seem to get great pleasure from criticizing our National Government. One of our outstanding religious leaders recently referred to Washington as "our crazy Capital." The person who introduced me to speak at a large church banquet a few days ago said, "He will speak on religion in Washington, but I didn't know there was any there."

It grieves us no little to hear the light remarks that almost everybody makes about our National Government. If all the people who do this criticizing could go to Washington and make a careful study of our Government, much of this unthoughtful criticism would disappear.

Of course, some of this criticism is facetious. When someone mentioned the hot weather to an elevator boy in Washington, he replied, "It ain't so much the heat as it is the stupidity." Somebody wanted to know what I was doing going back to Washington. I said, "It's like this. We are building a new church and I am going back to Washington to see if I can get a deep freezer for it."

We must admit that a great deal of this criticism is justifiable. However, there never

has been and never will be a government on earth that does not have some corruption. We could hardly expect the 435 Members of the House, not to mention the Senate, elected from every State in the Union, to all be saints. We have never known a church with that many members in which all of the members were perfect. In almost any church you will find a few members who will get drunk, curse, lie, and who do not attend regularly. We are told that about one-third of most church membership really carry the load and hardly more than 50 percent ever attend the services on any one Sunday. Some of us have the honor of being Shriners. None of us would agree that because a small percentage of Shriners get drunk that this is true of all Shriners. The same is also true of almost all civic clubs. But because a few people are corrupt is no reason for us to say that our whole Government is corrupt. It simply is not true. Some people criticize and then think. Would it not be better to think first and not criticize so much?

By no means are we condoning corruption in government. We deplore that as much as anybody does. But, as one Member of Congress implied in an address not long ago, the kind of corruption we deplore the most is that in which all anybody does is laugh about it. Surely there is much cause for righteous indignation. One thing that alarms us is the strange paradox of fighting a world war, and even two of them, for freedom, and on the other hand seldom does more than a minority go to the polls and vote in any election. Any nation is in an unhealthy condition when its citizens lose respect for its government and when those who form its government are unworthy of the respect of its citizens. The psalmist has said, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." We may paraphrase this thus, "When the righteous people of any nation forget the ballot box that nation shall be turned into hell." The future of our Nation depends largely upon people who seek to understand government, take an abiding interest in it, think enough of it to go to the polls at election time and cast a ballot for righteous leadership, and pray for instead of criticizing their Government.

During the time that I had the honor of serving as Acting Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I am happy to say that I saw Christ there. Of course, I was looking for Him. I saw Him in the radiant faces and heard Him speak through the voices of some of the fine Christian Members of the House. I heard many of them express a deep, sincere, and burning desire for divine guidance. I heard a large number of them testify for Christ. I felt His presence in fellowship with some of the most consecrated Christians I have ever known; many of them are splendid Christians who attend, love, and serve their churches.

I shall never forget meeting Senator Broughton a few days before he died. His pastor who introduced us said, "I just came up from Raleigh to tell him that I love him and am praying for him." How comforting that must have been to him who was about to depart from this earth. I could not help but think how comforting and helpful it would be if more of us, pastors and people, could do more of that for our Representatives and Senators instead of criticizing them so much. What a great inspiration and example it was to our whole Nation to know that Senator Broughton's last act on Saturday night before he died was to read and study his Bible in preparation to teach his great Sunday-school class in the First Baptist Church of Washington.

Yes, I saw Christ in other Congressmen who are never too tired to teach a Sunday School class or to make a speech for Christ. I found Him also in many of the fine employees in our Nation's Capital. There are more of them like this than we realize.

Of them all, I saw more of Christ in Chaplain Montgomery, my dear, beloved friend, than in any other. For well-nigh 30 years he has carried the burdens of our Nation in prayer. He is the most respected man on the House floor. His prayers are the most beautiful I have ever read outside of the Bible. His magnanimous spirit transcends all denominations. He is a true saint of God. Just as truly as the mace is an emblem of authority; as the eagle is a symbol of the vision and strength of our Nation, the Chaplain is the sacred symbol of God in the House of Representatives of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States says that Congress shall make no law affecting religion, but rule 7 of the House is, "The Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of each day's sitting of the House and open the same with prayer." This rule was adopted in 1880, but before that it was always practiced. There is a similiar rule in the Senate.

We believe in the separation of church and state. We do not believe in the separation of God or religion from the state. We do not believe that any denomination or sect should seek to dominate the state, but we know that fundamentally our Governernment was founded upon faith in God. We affirm this faith on our coins in the words, "In God we trust." There are two giant pillars that hold up and support the whole superstructure of our Government without which our Nation would collapse. They are religion and belief in the dignity and value of the individual. When these two pillars crumble and fall, the old red, white, and blue will dissolve into anarchy and democracy will depart from the earth.

Yes, I saw Christ in the beloved Chaplain, and in all the beautiful tributes of love, respect, and appreciation I heard paid him.

I saw Christ and felt His spirit in the many warm, gracious, sincere expressions the Members of the House made regarding my humble prayers each day. There was a note of genuineness in those expressions. I felt very humble and unworthy, but they expressed such gracious gratitude that they made me feel that my service was worth while. Time and time again I heard such expressions as "we surely need divine guidance."

One of the finest Christian Members of the House told me one day with great enthusiasm that he has over 100 Bibles. He enjoyed talking about his Bibles, his church and pastor, and above all, his Lord. I saw Christ in this Congressman.

The first time I walked into a Congressman's office I was impressed by the white Bible on his desk, and as he told me of what the Book of all books means to his life and of his dependence upon prayer, I saw Christ.

One day I was asked to lead the prayer at a national meeting of retail hardware men. The Vice President and the Secretary of Agriculture were to be there. In the process of arranging this with the chaplain, I visited the office of the Congressman whose secretary had phoned me. That day I was wearing my past president's Lions button, but when I met this fine, young, Christian Congressman, what do you suppose he was wearing in the lapel of his coat? It was a small gold cross. I said to myself, "What does a Congressman know about the cross?" I found that this one knew the Christ of the Cross as his Saviour and is one of the outstanding Christians in our Nation's Capital. I saw Christ in this.

Almost a dozen Members of the House told me from time to time of their relation to some fine minister. One said that his father and grandfather were preachers and that his brother is now a pastor. Another told me of his son who is preparing for the ministry. I was impressed with the number of preachers' sons in Congress and reminded again that there are more preachers' sons in Who's Who in America than the sons of those of any other profession. I could not help but see Christ in this.

Then, too, my soul was stirred by the large number of times I heard the Bible quoted in the speeches and discussions on the floor of the House. One day, during the discussion of the bill which had to do with military aid for Europe, I heard the Bible quoted three different times. I told one of my friends how much this impressed me. He later asked me if I heard one of the Congressmen quote all of the Ten Commandments and the song which the angels sang at the birth of Jesus. Yes; I certainly did see Christ in Congress.

One cannot read the many fine messages of a moral and religious nature which appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without being profoundly moved. There is excellent sermonic material in many of these articles. In fact, some of them are really sermons. I saw Christ in many of them.

I saw Christ in the congressional prayer meeting. On my first visit to one of these breakfast meetings in the Vandenberg room I was amazed that there was such a large attendance. The waiters had to arrange several additional places. One of the Members of the House brought a deeply spiritual message and then presented a minister who in turn inspired us all. I heard one of the wealthiest Members of Congress pray, "Lord, in these trying times, we need Thy help." Another leading Member closed the meeting in gratitude to God for this great reservoir of material and spiritual blessings God has given us, that we may gladly open them to all the people of the world. On my second visit one of the Congressmen gave us a sermon on the text, "I Go Fishing." It was a sermon that would cause any preacher to sit up and take notice. It inspired my heart to hear their testimonies, and stirred my soul to hear them sing, "God Be With You 'Till We Meet Again." And, again, I saw Christ in Congress.

I saw Christ in the deep, burdened desire of many Members of the House to serve and to make our Nation and the world a better place in which to live. One Congressman said to me, "I wouldn't stay here 15 minutes if I didn't feel that I am serving my Nation." I saw how earnestly and seriously many of them carry their responsibilities. I saw many of them trying to do the best they know how. I saw Christ in the desire of many of them for peace.

I am convinced that Congressmen who take their work seriously, as many do, will, no doubt, die earlier. There are few, if any, ordinary people in Congress. Most of them are far above the average. Never in my life have I met a finer, more courteous, gracious, thoughtful group of men and women as a whole. Many of them are nearly worked to death. Some of us little realize the great demands that are made upon our representatives. They are busy people.

We do not have to write our Congressmen how to vote. They are highly intelligent and know how to do that. But if we do write, let us express to them our love and appreciation for what they are doing for our country. Let us assure them of our prayers. They, like us, are human. They need our encouragement.

Christ in Congress? Yes, Christ in Congress. I saw Him with my own eyes. I felt His presence there. I know Him when I see Him and I recognized Him there. I came away more convinced than ever that our's is a Christian nation, not completely Christian, but more completely Christian than any other nation. Yes, I, too, wish that there were more of Christ there. I, too,

wish that our Nation could be more Christian than it is. But, oh, how grateful I am that it is as Christian as it is. What a comfort it is to know that there is such a godly nucleus of men and women in our National Government. No, our Nation has not forgotten God.

As long as we have a strong minority of godly men and women on Capitol Hill, with multiplied millions of fine, humble, sincere Christians throughout our vast and beloved land to pray for, rather than criticize them, I do not believe that any country which has openly denounced God, even though it has the atomic secret, can triumph over us. Righteousness exalteth a nation and the stars in their courses fight against all atheistic Siseras. Let us take courage.

Let us be more deeply concerned for the righteousness of our Nation. If we are to see more of Christ in government, there must be more of Christ in us. May our prayers go up each day for all who hold office. And as we so earnestly pray for the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into the fields that are white unto harvest, let us also most eagerly implore the King of Kings and Lord of Lords to raise up more and more good, great, godly men and women who, with godlike character and the best of good training, will be our Nation's statesmen of tomorrow.

Congressman McDonough Opposed to United States Joining World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on House Concurrent Resolution 64, to establish a world federation:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I agree with the first and last part of House Concurrent Resolution 64. I disagree with the rest of it.

The part I agree with reads as follows:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations, to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

I disagree with that section of the resolution which reads as follows: "and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers."

I agree with the first and last sections of this resolution because I supported in Congress the establishment of the United Nations and have voted for funds for its support and for the participation of the United States in the various subordinate organizations which have been established by it, and I think it should be strengthened.

I disagree with the section which proposes to establish a world federation because I am opposed to the United States becoming a permanent part of any world federation which I am certain would weaken this Nation, would lower its honor and dignity and lessen its character in world affairs.

And I further disagree because I do not think that adopting such a policy will bring about a lasting peace, and I do believe that participation by the United States in a world federation would bring this Nation down to a lower level politically, socially, and economically.

Is it not clear that if the United States does not maintain its present level of living standards, industrial strength, and political position that other nations less fortunate than we are will go to a lower level?

It is evident that once we take this step of federating with the other nations of the world, we cannot take a step back. We will be in it to stay and for all time. Is it not further clear that we will be outnumbered and outvoted, and therefore subject to the rule and law of the majority as a nation, and are we certain that this step means permanent peace?

No one can successfully argue against the establishment of permanent peace among the nations of the world. No one has yet devised a successful formula for all nations to follow which has brought about permanent peace. All of the people on earth yearn and hope for permanent peace, and we are attempting to give the impression by the consideration of this resolution that we can find this long sought for formula by legislation and the organization of the nations of the world into a federation. I think we are holding out a false hope and that we are deceiving ourselves.

Have we not found out by sad and costly experience that peace does not come by treaty or alliance with other nations, that peace cannot be bought with dollars, nor can it be brought about by promise, however well-intentioned or solemnly entered into.

Peace is not a spoil of war. Peace is the bonus, the premium, the award that a nation receives and acquires to itself as the result of the orderly and self-respecting life it leads.

Peace cannot be legislated or forced upon a nation or an individual. To an individual peace is a state of mind. The greatest peace in the world may be enjoyed by the lowliest of people in the most abject poverty.

In the Gospel of St. Luke we read "Peace on earth toward men of good will" not as it is so often misquoted "Peace on earth good will to men." That to me means that there can be no lasting peace on earth unless mankind is of good will toward each other. That is the crux of this problem, and I do not think that a world federation of nations will solve it unless and until there is good will, good faith and good intention of purpose among the nations of the world which can be brought about by strengthening the United Nations instead of establishing a world federation of nations.

Nations do not organize for peace. Although they may have the best of intentions when they organize, every attempt in the history of mankind to organize for peace has been the direct result of war. Can this committee say that this proposal would not result in the same end as all previous attempts?

I doubt if this proposal, even if adopted by the United States and the peace-loving nations of the world, would do much or anything at all in fact to change human nature. We have been trying to do that for a long time with very little success.

Here is a copy of a letter to the editor of a Washington newspaper which makes that point quite clear:

"In our so-called Christian civilization, not a single government has a peace department, although all have war departments. And while many fine organizations have been founded to combat physical intemperance, not one has been established to cure mental intemperance, which is much worse.

"Even the churches have not made much progress in routing human 'cussedness.'

"There are countless instances of men and women going on mental 'jags' by venting spite and spleen on neighbors. Some actually say they feel better after 'blowing their top.'

"Clarence Darrow once said that 'everybody gets drunk on something.'

"Inasmuch as our efforts to legislate peace and establish a flock of freedoms have proved futile, why not adopt measures to eliminate vicious states of mind, which lead to war? The Chinese have an interesting definition of war. It is: 'Two women living under the same roof.'

"E. K. GOLDSBOROUGH."

If the Chinese who are a wise and noble race of people think that two women under the same roof is war, how much more explosive would be a world federation of nations, under the same roof.

With what nation are we trying to prevent war and for how long? Let us be frank and admit it is Russia and her satellites and communistic-controlled countries. We know that Russia would never join such a federation unless she had to, and if she did, could we depend upon her, in the light of our experience with her in the United Nations on the most important and vital issues.

If Russia and her satellites and the other Communist-controlled countries do not join the federation, then what will we have? We would have two federations of nations, one communistic, the other noncommunistic, organized not for peace but instead for war, one group waiting and daring the other to move aggressively against it. What did we send arms to western Europe for, for peace? No; to be prepared in the event of war. What did we send arms to Greece and Turkey for? For peace? No; but to fight a war.

Don't misunderstand me. I am unalterably opposed to communism and all that it stands for, but I cannot see the wisdom of this proposal as any solution to our present difficult position in world affairs.

I can see where the United States stands to lose much more than it would gain by joining with this federation, but I do agree that the United Nations should be strengthened, and I believe under its present charter that there is sufficient authority to preserve peace and to prevent aggression without the people of the United States losing any of their dignity, honor, sovereignty, or character which I think might occur if we were to join up as a nation to a world federation of nations.

Social Security for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 5, 1949

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I shall state the following on the matter of social security for Puerto Rico.

With the adoption by the House of H. R. 6000, there has been unanimous recognition of Puerto Rico's need for the direct-assistance features of social security. There has also been effective recognition of the need for extending old-age and survivorship insurance to Puerto Rico, although not unanimously as to how it should be extended. Thus, 10 years after the social-security system went into effect, Puerto Rico appears to be on the road to substantial inclusion in it. This is altogether justified and proper and to me very gratifying. May I express my thanks in the name of 2,000,000 American citizens?

The House bill, as passed, represents progress for Puerto Rico. Its effects will, over the years, help to render the island a more wholesome social community.

It was suggested, although such suggestion was not adopted, that in the matter of old-age insurance, a separate scheme be set for the island.

It was claimed that under the national system:

A. The real benefits of old-age pensions would be greater on the island than on the mainland.

B. A large number on the island would pay into the insurance fund without reaping benefits.

C. Many would collect their social-security pensions, but continue to work.

D. It would be an undue burden on citizens of the mainland.

These four points are, to my way of thinking, maintained in error. As to A above, the same schedule of pensions payments and benefits would, under the House bill as passed, be in effect for the island as for the mainland. The fact that a larger ratio of low-income persons would be covered in Puerto Rico than in the States is of no moment. The central purpose of this insurance is protection of citizens, as members of a nation, not of particular localities within the national economic system. It is fair that the low-income workers be covered in New York or in Mississippi, or in Puerto Rico. If there is justification for a national system of social security, then there is little justification for discrimination on a regional or local basis. The higher the income, regardless where a pensioner lives, the less need for coverage; the lower the income, regardless where a pensioner lives, the greater the need of coverage. Low incomes in Puerto Rico are attributable not to low cost of living or to indifference to work opportunities but to lack of that capital which makes for higher productivity and, consequently high incomes. The island workers earn only enough, in their vigorous years, to get along. It would be contrary to social-insurance philosophy to insist upon not the amelioration of want in old age, but the continuation and aggravation in old age of the hardships of early and middle life. It is preferable that the low-income worker be not merely assured of the direct assistance in his old age but rather of a pension which, in large measure, he has paid for.

Precise measurements of contributions and payments are fruitless for the purpose. For years Puerto Rico's consumers have been paying for most of their foodstuffs and other consumables at mainland prices, which surely reflects social security taxes for mainland workers. Their case is the same of the farmers all over the Nation, who are not covered by social security benefits. Surely, if the burden of security is a social concern, the incidence of that burden as exemplified above, inevitably becomes social and the distribution of social-security funds becomes a matter of social values and policies. Social security is as much a part of the American way of life as the free school, and as much a proper concern for all American citizens as military security. It would not be equitable to live and work, and consume within the American economic system and still be deprived of the economic security which such system is supposed to offer its component parts. And Puerto Rico has been a component part of the United States economic system since 1900.

The Puerto Rican worker will pay, as the law calls for, for any worker who earns as much as he does. He will get the same benefits any other worker, who who pays the same dues as he pays, gets. That the incomes of Puerto Rico are low would call for help to improve them, not for further aggravation of the situation through denial of insurance because of a large proportion of low-income workers in that particular area.

The nonagricultural worker in Puerto Rico earns about one-half as much as his counterpart in the State of Mississippi. But the wage earner in Mississippi earns only two-thirds as much as that of the average State.

If it were justified to keep the American citizens in Puerto Rico out of insurance, this line of reasoning might lead to justify that the workers in low income States were excluded. In this way, only States with average or above-average incomes would be covered. National insurance based upon local, territorial, or regional considerations would quickly vitiate its own fundamental philosophy.

The other bases upon which a distinctive system of security in Puerto Rico has been propounded are no less tenuous. It has been alleged—see B above—that old-age insurance taxes laid in Puerto Rico would lead to payments by a number of workers who because of irregular work opportunities, would not eventually qualify for a pension. This is so, but it is quite as true for mainland areas where work opportunities are not first-rate. Thoroughgoing acceptance of this objection would vitiate the social insurance concept quite as much as would acceptance of the first objection—see A above. On the other hand, thinking in the concept of the particular area, this adds to Puerto Rico's contribution to the fund and compensates for objection A.

As for the contention that in Puerto Rico many workers after 65 would continue to work and draw pensions at the same time, I should observe that the exiguous circumstances of the aged in an economy which provides too few decent opportunities for the young and the middle-aged worker, would not allow it. The chances of a 65-year-old worker getting or keeping a job in Puerto Rico, when 1 worker out of 10 is chronically unemployed and another 1 out of 10 is chronically underemployed, are just too slim to worry about.

As for the fourth contention, that inclusion of Puerto Rico would create an undue burden upon the Federal insurance fund: Puerto Ricans as consumers are dependent upon the mainland for most of their goods; they now indirectly pay into that fund. Not to extend insurance means a burden in behalf of insurance without the benefits of insurance. Besides, the products of workers in Puerto Rico should bear the burden of social-security costs on a scale sufficient to add to the pension fund a sum substantially large enough to pay for pensions meted out according to the national schedule of payments.

I appreciate that the opposition to the extension of national insurance to Puerto Rico has been made in good faith and in a wholesome spirit. In the same spirit, I feel it my duty to take issue with them. I hope that for the sufficient reasons given above, no further opposition to the extension of old-age insurance to Puerto Rico may arise.

Chicago Mass Meeting Supports the Cause of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the tenth anniversary of Germany's attack on Poland there was a large gathering of Chicago men and women at the Holy Trinity Auditorium in Chicago, among those serving as honorary member of the committee on arrangements being our distinguished colleague, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON. I include in my remarks the resolutions unanimously adopted at that memorable gathering:

We joined in this assembly sponsored by the citizens' committee in the Holy Trinity Auditorium on September 1, 1949, in observance of the tenth anniversary of the bestial raid of Germans on Poland, who, after concluding the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, signaled an unprovoked barbaric onslaught on Poland and started World War II, upon hearing the speeches of our patriots as to the trampling of the Germans on their peace treaty with Poland, after perpetrating unprovoked raids on the Polish lands, bringing on horrible ruination, plunder, and murder of over 6,000,000 of the country's population, express to our brethren in Poland a solemn assurance that we here on the American soil will do our utmost that the Germans will not arise again militantly to become a threat to the United States, the democratic world as well as to Poland itself;

We express with conviction that the present Polish western borders on the Oder and Nisa, outlined a thousand years ago by the great builder of the Polish Nation, King Boleslaw Chrobry, are historically justified. We will oppose every detrimental scheme aimed at Poland's people by a revision of these borders. Recovered territories on the Oder and Nisa and the Baltic are an age-old heritage of the Piasts.

We solemnly resolve to stand firmly and unfalteringly for the political program assigned to us by such notables of Poland, and Americans of Polish descent, as Henryk Sienkiewicz, Ignace Jan Paderewski, Gen. Wladyslaw E. Sikorski, His Excellency Bishop Paul Rhode, John Smulski, Wojciech Korfanty, Kazimierz Zychlinski, who were aware of the fact that the Polish Nation is confronted with a threat of extermination by the Germans, and these men have exerted great efforts to avoid this danger. Therefore we make this definite and unconditional declaration against every and all artifice to rebuild the military might of Germany endangering the existence of Polish independence and the peace of the entire world. Maintenance of the Polish border on the Oder and

Nisa is one of the main conditions for establishment of international peace.

Due to the fact that presently in Washington there will be a conference of Foreign Ministers of the Big Four countries, every American citizen of Polish descent should consider it his duty to send an immediate protest to his Congressman or Senator if there should be contemplated any project to change Poland's western borders by the western diplomats.

We, therefore, here assembled, raise a solemn protest against any attempt to change the Polish-German border established on the Oder-Nisa line. We affirm that the question of borders is not only a question of Polish-German concern, or a matter associated with this or any other Polish Government. It is a matter of maintaining peace in Europe and consequently peace in the world. It is also a matter of just, though only partial, compensation for the terrible damages and losses sustained by the Polish Nation under German occupation. Those losses amounted to over 6,000,000 persons killed, and the evidence of the tremendous material and cultural losses lies in the ruins of destroyed Warsaw. The Polish Nation has the right to reparations for damages and losses suffered for the common cause of the United Nations and, above all, has the right to such borders with Germany which would safeguard it against repeated growth of German imperialism and would assure for Poland a healthy foundation for economic development. We, here assembled, particularly affirm that:

1. We are in complete agreement with the Polish Nation on the principle that Polish-German border on the Oder-Nisa Rivers has been finally established at the Potsdam Conference of the three powers and only the formal determination of this border has been, in accordance with international procedure left for the peace conference. Moreover, the Conference distinctly speaks about delimitation, which word implies minor border adjustments as to former German provinces—"former" means lost to Germany in final analysis and not until peace conferences. Furthermore, the Potsdam Conference agreed upon the principle of transferring Germans from the Polish territories. In carrying out these principles, the Inter-Allied Control Council in Berlin—the highest Four Power authority in Germany—having considered the question in all its aspects, agreed to a specific plan for the transfer of Germans numbering 3,500,000, as much as there has been in entire Poland including the recovered territories. The agreement for the transfer of all Germans means nothing but unquestionable recognition of the territory east of the Oder-Nisa as belonging to Poland.

2. We again stress that during the last 70 years, Germany has started war three times, including two world wars which brought tremendous devastation and the slaughter of millions of people. Those wars were born of aggressive German imperialism which has its cradle and mainstay in military Prussia. In recognition of these facts, the victorious powers unanimously determined, during the Moscow Conference in 1947, to liquidate Prussia. By taking over the western territories, Poland essentially helped in permanently eliminating Prussia. The Germans are losing territories which have been used only as an instrument for conquering Europe, territories which have been inhabited in great numbers by a Polish population.

3. The Polish Nation has been able, through great effort, to rehabilitate the western territories devastated by the retreating German armies. This is recognized by all American observers and it is recognized even by honest German observers. The products of these territories are exchanged with all European countries. In Polish hands, the industry and agriculture of Silesia and Pomerania serve toward peaceful economic development of Europe and Poland. In German hands, these territories were instruments of economic aggression first and then political absorption and aggression of Poland and many other European countries.

4. The democratization of Germany is a matter of making Germans realize that there is no return to a policy of aggression. The support for revision, giving any hopes for a change of borders, means at the same time supporting of all groups in Germany which previously were always the pillars of imperialistic Germany policy and is consequently weakening the truly democratic groups. Germany has to learn how to cooperate with Europe and the way to this is not through the stimulation of nationalism, the tragic results of which can be seen all over Europe, but through complete abandonment of the spirit of aggression. Only on this basis the European nations will be able to cooperate with Germany and only on this basis can Polish-German relations be settled peacefully.

5. We here assembled learn that in Germany there are arising, for spreading anti-Polish propaganda, various associations of Germans resettled from the Polish territories. We assembled here protest against the toleration of such associations, realizing that this anti-Polish action is supporting German aggression and is unquestionably harmful.

On the basis of these facts, we assembled here declare ourselves firmly for immediate and unquestionable withdrawal of any attempts to change the Polish-German border, with the deep conviction that in this way we serve the interests of peace and also the best interests of the Polish Nation and our own country, the United States.

To our brethren across the ocean, who chose to cling firmly to the beliefs of our fathers—beliefs in democracy and freedom—we extend our brotherly greeting and ask that they continue to persevere in their stanch faith in Poland's future, for we believe that the time will come when all peoples will comprehend the errors made heretofore and that justice will prevail, and then Poland, too, the greatest heroine in the struggle for freedom, after so many years of suffering, will take her own place in the family of nations and will partake of the fruits of justice and peace.

To all our co-citizens of non-Polish descent, to the English language press, statesmen and radio commentators, who fully understand the vast wrong imposed on Poland and courageously defend the truth, we extend our heartfelt thanks.

Long live the United States of America.
Long live Poland.
Let there be justice in the world.

Leon T. Walkowicz, chairman; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Julian Skrzypinski, chairman, resolution committee; Rev. Stanislaus Fiolek, C. R., John A. Stanek, Dr. John P. Kobrzynski, Anthony J. Lukaszewski, Angela Ciura, Victoria Kolman, Dr. Wencel F. Hetman, John Schwaba, committee.

Secretary Johnson, What Are the Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio broadcast delivered last night by Robert Montgomery over the American Broadcasting System.

It is in the nature of an appeal to the Secretary of Defense to tell the people the truth about the B–36 and our defense organization. It is an appeal to him to put aside all political considerations and prove himself a real statesman. The defense of our country is at stake, and the American people want to know the facts. We want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The broadcast follows:

This is Robert Montgomery speaking from New York. Two hours ago I sent a telegram to the Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson asking him to listen to this broadcast on Station WMAL in Washington tonight. I hope he is listening now. There is something that I want to say to him. I'll get to it in just a moment.

Last Friday afternoon a big strato-cruiser touched its wheels to the landing strip at Idlewild Airport, New York City, U. S. A., and I was home. It is a great feeling.

I had just come from Europe. It is quite a troubled continent these days. Ever since it was announced that the Russians had the atom bomb, Europe's tomorrow is a big question mark. People kept asking "Is America prepared?" I comforted them and myself at the same time with the thought that the boys back in Washington had everything under control. I could just see those lights burning late at the Pentagon Building and in the Navy Department and I said to myself we will be ready for the battle if it comes.

Well, I got back and I found out that the lights were burning all right. In fact, the battle was already on, but what battle was it?

The weapons in this one were press handouts, leaks to the Communists, statements from unidentified spokesmen. The battlefield was a mahogany table in the congressional hearing room.

I was a little bit confused and I found out very quickly that I'm not the only one. The ex-Marine who drove me back from the airport didn't know what was going on either and neither did my wife nor my neighbors or anybody else I talked to.

I had a nice, neat homecoming broadcast in my pocket. It was a dandy broadcast if I do say so myself, but after listening to four commentators and reading nine newspapers, I tore that script into confetti and I sat down and wrote a telegram to the Secretary of Defense. Here it is: "Dear Mr. Secretary. Would you please listen to my broadcast Thursday night over Station WMAL–ABC? There is a question I would like to ask you. Respectfully yours, Robert Montgomery."

Well, I hope you are listening, Mr. Secretary, because here is my question. Are you being completely on the level with the American people in this B–36 controversy?

Maybe it is impertinent of me to ask this but it is a mighty important question. After all, in common with 150,000,000 other people, I'm helping to pay for those airplanes. I think we rate an answer.

In the last few days things in the national military picture have gotten rather confused. Here we are going along under the impression that with a B–36 and the atom bomb stock pile we need fear nothing on earth. Let any nation start something we were told and in a matter of a few hours that nation would cease to be a nation. It all seemed very neat and, as a matter of fact, some of us couldn't help being puzzled that the Russians weren't a little more afraid of us than they seemed to be.

Now, suddenly, we hear that things are not quite as neat as we had been led to believe. We've heard testimony to the effect

that the B–36 will not be able to penetrate the radar and jet-fighter defenses of a potential enemy. We appear to have a new type of military barnacle in the set-up, the battleship general, the general who clings to the idea of battleships of the air the same way the old battleship admirals fought for them on the seas. We have been told that the billion-dollar mass purchase of the B–36 before it was completely proved and tested has committed us to this one weapon in a way that the armed forces have never been committed. We have been told that we've staked everything on this one instrument of warfare and that the other services are not even being permitted to develop the types of weapons that they would need if a world conflict should occur. We've been told in short that somebody has sold us a lemon.

Is this true, Mr. Secretary? We've got to know and the answer is a lot more important than any single person involved in the situation. It is more important than you, Mr. Secretary, more important than whether you stay in office, more important than the elections in 1950 or 1952 and a great deal more important than the errors of the officers involved and a lot more important than the annual business statements of the aircraft companies, steel mills, and shipyards. It is the most important question of the day, Mr. Secretary, because the security of the United States depends upon it and upon the security of the United States depends the way of life of half the world.

For some time the answering of this question has been postponed. It seems clear that the only reason all this new evidence about the B–36 has come out is that a lot of high ranking officers have laid their careers and professional reputations on the line in order to get them to the public.

I don't know whether you personally played any part in trying to hush all this up, Mr. Secretary. It is possible that you share the attitude of other high-placed men in the administration who feel that it is not a good idea to have this flare-up in the headlines. Perhaps you feel this uproar is in some way damaging to our international position. Maybe you feel that way, maybe you don't.

As a plain ordinary taxpayer I think this rumpus is wonderful. Maybe I'm crazy, but I feel that if the B–36 is a mistake I'd rather have it come out the day before a war starts instead of the day after. And, as for the military secrets that may be bandied about this congressional hearing room—well, it is my hunch that the admirals haven't said anything about the plane's performance that the Russians didn't know already from reading a few technical journals.

Yes, Mr. Secretary, I'm glad this investigation started. I'm delighted by those fat black headlines, and however embarrassing they may be to you, Mr. Johnson, if you are a smart man you'll be happy about them too.

They tell me that you are ambitious, that you have big plans for Louis Johnson. If that is true you should welcome all this for whether you realize it or not this situation has just provided you with the opportunity of a lifetime. If you are still with me I'll tell you what I mean.

A moment ago, Mr. Secretary, I said that the headlines about the current B–36 investigation however embarrassing they may seem to you actually provides you with the opportunity of a lifetime. I'll tell you what I mean.

For some time now we've been faced with the spectacle in Government of little men making big decisions. It has gotten so we hardly expect real statesmanship or selflessness from public men. We feel that their actions require personal quirks or concessions to one pressure group or another and the best we can do is to hope that the quirks and interests somehow coincide with our own. This I suppose is one kind of democracy but it is a shabby kind.

There is another and more precious variety that comes when the leaders of the Nation are lifted above themselves by a sense of responsibility, by a true urge to serve. There may be votes in the first kind and power but in the second kind there is a glory and perhaps a leaf in the history books.

Yes, they tell me, Mr. Johnson, that you are an ambitious man. Well, here is your chance to prove to the American people that you are a man of destiny. You can do that, Mr. Johnson, by telling the truth.

Oh, it is not as easy as I make it sound, I know that. You are under fire now. You have to protect yourself in the clinches. The B–36 purchase, the cancellation of the Navy's big carrier, these decisions were taken during your term as Secretary of Defense and it is only human for you to want to defend them. That defense won't be hard for you, Mr. Secretary.

Once before we saw you parade the top brass of the Army, Navy, and Air Force through a congressional hearing room when the B–36 was under fire. These men had their careers and reputations riding with that decision too. Of course, you can always get from some of hem the kind of reassuring statements that you need. But that is the easy way, Mr. Secretary.

Again I say it would be hard to blame you for taking it. It would take a mighty big man not to get out of this tight spot in the most effective way he can. That is where your big opportunity comes in. You can take that opportunity by realizing that you in your life as a public official don't mean a hoot alongside the really important issue, the really important issue that the public find out the truth about America's defense picture.

Make the gesture Mr. Secretary, play it straight in the investigation in the coming weeks; keep remembering that you are not important and the men around you are not important, remembering that the only thing that is important is that the United States should have the strength and security it needs to face the tasks which are ahead in the troubled world.

Let's skip the political shenanigans. Let's skip the pressure techniques, the propaganda smoke screens; give it to us straight from the shoulder.

I have a hunch, Mr. Johnson, that you will do yourself more good with the public by this than you would by just squashing your opposition and silencing it forever. Tell us the truth about the things that we have to know.

Does the B–36 really have a chance to get through to the target for which it is destined? If it can get through now will it be able to get through 2 or 3 years from now when the bulk of that purchase of big bombers will be delivered.

And tell us about the rest of our military organization. Is it being sacrificed to this concept of the 1-day atomic blitz? Aren't we taking a terrible risk by cutting down on the development of their offensive weapons, on carrier aviation, on technical aviation, on submarine and antisubmarine warfare? And is this muddle of the unification program the true answer to America's military strength?

What we need now is statesmanship—not salesmanship. Give us the facts, Mr. Secretary.

And now, Mr. Secretary, you must forgive me for having taken up so much of your time with this broadcast. My only excuse is that I have a rather good memory.

I was in Paris in June of 1940, and I remember quite vividly the faces of the people of France during that time. Their country was dying. It was dying because it was not prepared. Their army and navy and air force were at an all-time low in morale. Everything that they held dear was being smashed and broken as the German Army swept south toward the city of light.

I remember my last look at these people as I drove out of the city a few hours before the Germans arrived. They were driving stakes in the pavements of the Champs Elysee so German planes would not be able to land in the streets, but they knew it was hopeless. You could see it in their faces. Mr. Secretary, I never want to see that look on the face of an American citizen.

Illinois A. F. of L. Urges United Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, at the recent convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, held in Springfield, a resolution was adopted urging that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland. This action follows close on the heels of the resolution passed by the Senate and House of the Illinois Legislature, declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

The members of the American Federation of Labor in Illinois are to be congratulated upon having taken a forceful stand on this important question, which is today the sole barrier preventing mutual friendship and understanding between Great Britain and Ireland. Like all citizens of the United States, the workingmen are most anxious to protect not only their own freedoms but likewise those of other peoples. They naturally detest oppression and tyranny wherever it may be found, and so raise their voices in opposition to the continuance of the enforced partition of Ireland.

The folly of partition, which was created less than 30 years ago by an act of the London Parliament, needs no comment on my part. Suffice it to say that the longer it continues, the more difficult will be its elimination. Already the Tory group which carved up Ireland to suit their own purposes have gained too strong a foothold there and now are most unwilling to surrender the advantages they have acquired.

The surprising thing, however, is to see the labor government in Britain continuing, even aiding and abetting the Tory policy of partition. The recent attempt of the London Parliament to wash its hands of the Irish question and leave it entirely in the province of the Belfast Parliament, not the people, mind you, was too much for many of the sound labor members of Parliament. They suffered party discipline rather than endorse the idea of partition in Ireland.

It is not surprising therefor to see our own labor unions express their disapproval of this policy of the British Labor Government. The stand taken by the Illinois State Federation of Labor at their sixty-seventh annual convention, was likewise taken by the Massachusetts State Federation recently. Only this

past week this position was likewise endorsed by the national convention of the American Federation of Labor at their convention in St. Paul, when they adopted a similar resolution.

It is my hope that these resolutions will not go unheaded, but that the Irish people in every county in Ireland may soon have an opportunity to vote upon this issue and at last be free to determine for themselves the type of government which they desire.

In concluding my remarks, I wish to set forth the resolution which was adopted by the Illinois Federation of Labor, that its text may be available to the Members of the House.

Resolution 136

(By Delegates Peter J. Hoban and Thomas J. Haggerty, Milk Wagon Drivers, No. 753; Frank J. Gillespie, Dairy Employees, No. 754; Emmet McHugh, State, County, and Municipal Employees, No. 726; John Bannon and Charles Waters, Painters, No. 147; Robert McCabe, Painters, No. 180; M. J. Sexton, Carpenters District Council; and A. J. Johannsen, Carpenters, No. 1367, Chicago.)

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Illinois, convened in general assembly, on June 28, 1949, has adopted House Joint Resolution 357 declaring, that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the people of Ireland, asserting the inalienable right to national freedom, have established an independent government, known as the Republic of Ireland; and

Whereas military occupation of Irish territory by British troops violates Irish national rights and the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, for which the United States of America poured out its blood and treasure in the recent great war; and

Whereas British foreign policy has seen fit to hold in subjugation, citizens of Ireland, including thousands of trade-unionists, and have outlawed freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the ballot in Ireland; and

Whereas the labor government of Great Britain has always championed the rights of the people in preserving the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the ballot; and

Whereas such acts of terrorism which are now being used against Irish citizens and trades unionists in Ireland is not approved by the great masses of British trades-unionists; and

Whereas Irish trade-unionists, and the people of the Republic of Ireland, resent the division of their country by British methods of foreign policy; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland, which as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution; and

Whereas there is existing in Ireland today, a well-equipped military force holding in subjection Irish citizens, including trades-unionists who reside in the six-county area of Ireland; and

Whereas the citizenry of the six-county area are prevented from determining their lawful desires in a free plebiscite on the question of partitioning Ireland into two States; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Irish people to find a solution to this problem in order to bring an immediate end to the partition of Ireland thereby removing the final barriers to lasting peace between the historic Irish nation and the Government of Great Britain; and

Whereas many thousands of Irish and British trades-unionists desire an end to this partition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Sixty-seventh Annual Convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor in convention assembled, Springfield, Ill., September 27, 1949, go on record as approving the democratic process of freedom of democracy by declaring that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite determine and declare to the contrary; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the State Department, Washington, D. C., and the consul general, Irish Free State, Washington, D. C.

The Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD BREEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, a subject that is of vital interest to the national welfare and to each and every individual in these United States, and to the miners and their families themselves is the present coal crisis.

Two years ago one of our most distinguished citizen-statesmen, a gentleman of national and international thinking and three-time former Governor of Ohio, the Honorable James M. Cox, offered what then seemed to be a revolutionary idea regarding a permanent solution to these recurring crises.

At this time may I respectfully suggest that the formula presented by the former progressive Governor be seriously studied and considered by the membership of the House.

GOV. JAMES M. COX'S FORMULA FOR A COAL PEACE

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 31, 1947, p. 724]

DAYTON, OHIO, November 28.—Former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1920, said today that Congress should enact legislation enabling the Nation's coal industry to be "organized and operated under an authority in spirit comparable to" the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"We have allowed control of this prime necessity—coal—to be placed so carelessly that at the behest of one man the industry is in collapse," Cox said. "This situation must be taken in hand firmly as a whole."

Stating that miners "have been left to live in squalor, not knowing how to live themselves or how the rest of the country lives," Cox said, "the miners believe, with some justification, that John L. Lewis has been their only friend.

"With the power over coal now in the hands of one man, there rises a dynasty in coal maintained with the pomp of a kingly throne.

"In my judgment there is one clear answer. The mining industry and the people employed in it must be humanized. To that end the industry must be organized and operated under an authority comparable to that which is lifting the Tennessee Valley to new heights of happiness, efficiency, and prosperity.

"The conservation of coal, and much more, the conservation of the manhood linked to coal, calls for this approach. Lacking such a measure, the end of this strike will be but the beginning of more such strikes to come.

"This may be called socialistic. I know of no measure for human welfare that has not been denounced at its beginning by some vested interests as socialistic.

"Congress should pass at once an act providing for such an authority and laying out rules to govern it. Congress should further set up at once a committee of inquiry so that the whole country may see the state of things in the mining camps and realize how neglectful we have been."

In Honor of Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was 457 years ago this week that Christopher Columbus had set foot upon the island, which he called San Salvador, and opened the Western World to the vast future, bringing us to this time and this great Government of democracy.

We, in this Congress, and others throughout this hemisphere, paid tribute to the far-famed explorer last Wednesday, on the occasion of the anniversary of his landing on those Caribbean shores.

Ambassadors from virtually the entire Washington diplomatic corps, and members of the Joint Committees on Foreign Affairs, gathered on the eve of that occasion in the magnificent Hall of the Americas in the Pan American Union, here, to honor Columbus, and to witness a remarkable motion-picture story of the events of his life which led to the discovery of these occidental continents.

The guests, watching the picture, were enthralled and inspired by the intense drama unfolding on the screen before them—an amazingly realistic reenactment of September and October days in 1492.

I feel this timely drama is such an inspirational experience that every boy and girl, man and woman in this country should have the opportunity to see Christopher Columbus as it has been brought to the medium of light, sound, and color, in a truly extraordinary manner.

In this way, the people of our America will be reimbued with that same Columbian spirit—that same faith and courage which led to the discovery of this great land of hope—this great New World, which is the beacon light for the distressed of the Old World.

We owe to Mr. J. Arthur Rank, to British film makers, and to Universal International Pictures, a debt of gratitude for the utmost solicitude which has attended this accomplishment. And our own American actor, Frederic March, should be complimented highly for his fine portrayal of Columbus.

I can think of no finer tribute to Christopher Columbus than to have every school student relive some of the events of the life of the Admiral of the Sea, by seeing Christopher Columbus.

Extract From 1948–49 Annual Report of the Pennsylvania Securities Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARDIE SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from the 1948–49 annual report of the Pennsylvania Securities Commission:

Seven years ago the Pennsylvania Securities Commission began publicizing illegal offerings of securities by unregistered dealers who resided in Toronto, Canada. Sufficient time has now elapsed to determine whether or not the Commission's warnings to citizens of Pennsylvania against high pressure solicitations both by telephone and literature, setting forth great promises of sudden wealth, were justified.

Accordingly, a check has been made for the period between April 1942 and April 1947 to determine what results show today regarding the investments made in the companies and securities which came under our observation and for which stop orders were issued.

During that time, cease-and-desist orders were issued against 78 dealers who had offered 151 different stocks.

Of these 78 dealers, 30 have had their licenses revoked for various reasons by the Ontario Securities Commission.

Of the 151 stocks which were offered it was found as of July 1948 that 14 were listed on the Ontario Stock Exchange, of which 6 were companies which had been in existence for some time prior to the offering and only 8 were new companies.

Of these eight companies, the stock of two was selling above cost in July 1948.

Using a reliable source of information to determine the present condition of these 151 stocks, it was found in July 1948 that: 78 companies were either inactive, dormant or idle; 32 companies, no record available; 23 companies were in some stages of development; 8 companies had been taken over by other companies; 2 companies were operating at a loss; 2 companies had charters canceled; 6 companies were active.

As previously stated, up until April 1947, 78 dealers had been served cease and desist orders. Today, June 1, 1949, that number has increased to 138.

On the same basis, comparing successes and failures in previous years, it can readily be seen what small chance the Pennsylvania investor has of making any money, or even recovering his investment, by paying any attention to the false statements and misrepresentations which are a necessity for selling illegal offerings.

The commission is continuing its efforts to warn the citizens of this Commonwealth against dealing with unregistered companies and individuals, and particularly high pressure telephone calls which follow literature of flamboyant nature regarding investments in companies at great distances from Pennsylvania, by releases for newspapers, notices to banks inviting banking institutions to refer persons who may request information regarding certain securities to communicate with the commission.

The commission is deeply appreciative of the excellent spirit of cooperation which banks, registered dealers, newspapers, better business bureaus, and enforcement authorities throughout the State are showing when possible illegal transactions come to their attention.

How Far Can We Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, no one who has read or given attention to the Hoover Commission reports on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government or who is familiar with our economic situation can help but realize the gravity of the pressing problems which confront the American people. During the last 20 years there has been a fantastic growth in the activities of our Government and its personnel. There has been duplication, overlapping, inefficiency, bureaucratic waste, and inconsistency with their attendant extravagance. As Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren said: "It is probably an ideal set-up for the tax eaters but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill." That is why I say it is time for the Government to put its own house in order.

Let us take note of the present situation by citing a few facts. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for a period of 11 years I have been constantly working on legislation coming before that committee and as a result, I am particularly familiar with the operation of the State Department and its functions.

Fifteen years ago in the Seventy-third Congress the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House got around to legislation only in the second session when it passed nine minor public bills. None of these even remotely resembled a controversial issue. The money involved was a mere $102,000. Compare this with the legislation handled by this committee since January of this year. The committee reported out 28 public bills, more than half of which went to the very heart of our foreign policy. A goodly number of them were highly controversial and involved strenuous floor fights. But the sharpest illustration for comparison purposes pertains to the amount of money authorized. The total authorizations in committee bills so far this session is approximately $7,395,000,000. So dollar-wise the work of this committee has multiplied 145,000 times in 15 years. Think of it. On foreign policy alone our Government is spending 145,000 times more than it did 15 years ago.

Now let us see what has happened to the State Department during the last 10 years. In 1938 its total personnel strength in Washington was 963; in 1948 it was 5,652—an increase of 487 percent. Overseas the increase was from 3,749 in 1938 to 12,294 in 1948—an increase of 230 percent. Appropriations for the State Department in Washington, for the Foreign Service, and for international organizations in which the United States participates increased from approximately $20,000,000 in 1938 to over $300,000,000 in 1948, or a percentage increase of 1,465.

Before turning to the over-all expanding cost and duplication in our Government let me call to your attention just one other example. Your Government operates the largest printing organization in the world. Senator BRIDGES collected over 84,000 different booklets and pamphlets issued to the public which he said were but a fraction of the total publications of the Government during that 1 year. This does not take into account the thousands upon thousands of copies of each nor the multitude of publications which are issued solely for the internal workings of the Government. They also exclude thousands of publications which the agencies indicated were too difficult to collect. When the various agencies were asked to furnish such copies of printed matter they issued that year one bureau estimated that just one of each of their publications would fill a warehouse if they could be collected; another bureau said it could not comply because its output would comprise a stack of publications estimated to be 52 feet high.

The Government Printing Office in the past 10 years from 1939 through 1948 delivered 133,582,867,587 copies of printed matter. Included in this collection of publications are pamphlets on methods of catching and killing vagrant cats, batproofing buildings, fleas of North America, estimating the muskrat population by house counts, the Cuban shark industry, the Venezuelan salt fish industry, mist netting for birds in Japan, habits, food, and economic status of the band-tailed pigeon, how to tell the sex of a watermelon.

OVER-ALL COST

In 1932 the executive branch of our Government employed 563,805 people. At the present time it employs 2,111,231. This means the total pay roll for the executive branch of our Government has increased from $1,688,684,000 in 1935 to $7,943,317,000 in 1945. As a result of the total expanded activities of the Federal Government the cost has risen from $8,707,091,581 in 1939 to an estimated $46,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The current costs are in addition to an already outstanding national debt of approximately $256,000,000,000.

I also wish to call to your attention that our assistance to foreign countries alone since VJ-day has cost $32,500,000,000.

I fully realize that the mere mentioning of dry, yet startling statistics in the billions cannot be fully comprehended, but to give you an idea of just how much money this is consider these facts furnished by the Commerce Department.

First. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would be just about enough to run the Government for this year.

Second. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock the total would amount to $43,000,000,000. Again this would not even run our Government a full year.

Third. If the rolling stock, the ground and buildings of all the railroad transportation companies of this Nation were converted into cash the total would not exceed $26,900,000,000. The Government

could only operate for about 9 months on this amount of money.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO YOU

Back in 1929 the cost of our Federal Government alone averaged $33.12 per capita. Last year it was $305.19 for every man, woman, and child in this country or over nine times as much. In addition the average family owes on the national debt already accumulated about $7,500. Twenty-two years ago there was 1 Government employee for every 41 citizens but now there is 1 Government employee to about 8 of the working population. Even worse, one person out of every seven is a regular recipient of Federal funds. Incidentally, for every dollar our citizens from Illinois pay into the Federal Government they receive back in grants and Federal aid only 7 cents. As a result of these conditions the average citizen works 11 days a year just to pay obligations from former wars, 24 days for defense and cold war, 12 days to pay for other Federal expenditures, 14 days to pay for State and local expenditures. In other words, you work a total of 61 days so that your Government might continue this reckless spending. President Truman's proposed welfare state would require you to work another 12 days to support it.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

The only way I know to balance the budget is to stop spending. It does no good to shift one bureau to another. To do a real job it is imperative that duplications in bureaus and agencies whose functions overlap be abolished.

This is the time for first things first. We are going into the red to the tune of over $5,000,000,000 this year alone. We must continue only those functions which are absolutely necessary and eliminate those of lesser importance no matter how worthy their purpose so that we can do away with deficit spending and return our economy to a sound basis within a balanced budget.

Let me point out that any government, like any family, can for a year or so spend more than it earns but you and I know that continuance of that habit means disaster.

While President Truman called the Eightieth Republican Congress the second worst Congress in the history of our country let me call your attention to the fact that it ended the 1948 fiscal year by cutting $2,741,481,291.12 from the President's budget and with a surplus in the Treasury of $8,419,469,843. At the same time we reduced taxes by $4,800,000,000 and cut the national debt $7,000,000,000.

Perhaps when the President called the Eightieth Congress the second worst he was thinking of the Eighty-first as the worst as it is now apparent the administration has returned to the Treasury-busting policies so prevalent during the New Deal years.

This thing we call Government has reached such gargantuan proportions that it is sprawled all over. It has become greater than the Congress, its creator, and at times attempts to arrogantly snap its fingers in the face of Congress. Now is the time for your Congress to decide whether the Government is to continue to be your servant or is to become your master.

It is, therefore, imperative that the Congress immediately take steps to correct this situation by—

First. Adopting the Hoover Commission reports. It is the belief of this Commission that untold millions could be saved and efficiency increased to a high degree by scientific, thorough reorganization. Incidentally I am glad to report my Foreign Affairs Committee was the first to adopt the Hoover Commission recommendations for the reorganization of the State Department, and it is now the law. I am hopeful this will result in doing away with the many duplications mentioned and a corresponding reduction in personnel and over-all cost.

Second. There should be an over-all reduction of from 5 to 10 percent on all appropriations so as to help bring about a balanced budget.

Third. There should be a repeal of excise taxes invoked during the war on theater and amusement tickets, electric light bulbs, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and hand bags, local and long-distance telephone calls, telegrams and leased-wire services, travel tickets, cameras, and photo supplies. Why in peacetime should a mother pay a tax on baby oil to keep her child comfortable? Why should you pay a tax on travel tickets when the original purpose was to keep people from traveling during wartime? All wartime taxes on the necessities of life should be removed. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, has introduced a bill for their repeal, and I have signed the petition to bring the measure to the floor of the House for immediate consideration. But this movement is being resisted by the administration.

Fourth. There has been proposed by the administration a number of socialistic programs such as compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine, which, if enacted into law, would cost the taxpayers, it has been estimated, $20,000,000,000 a year in addition to what we are already spending. The Congress should refuse to enact such legislation if we do not want to exchange our precious liberties for alleged promises of security.

Fifth. The President in addition to spending billions for rehabilitation of Europe under the Marshall plan, billions of dollars for rearming Europe, now proposes to spend millions and millions more to rehabilitate all the backward countries of the world. Certainly the Congress should look upon this with a jaundiced eye until we can get our own house in order and can look after the needs of our own people first.

CONCLUSION

In determining whether legislation is sound one must not merely consider the immediate benefits to a particular group but must also consider the ultimate consequences. We must consider the problem as a whole and not in fragments.

What we need in Government today is thrift, efficiency, economy, and forthrightness. Certainly we should resist without compromise any attempt to infringe upon our inalienable right of freedom of choice.

Many years ago President Jefferson stated these same principles which are as true today as the day he uttered them:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money.

Report From Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third in a series of articles on socialized medicine by Mr. William Alan Richardson, editor of Medical Economics, Rutherford, N. J.:

REPORT FROM BRITAIN—WHAT THE MEDICAL PROFESSION THINKS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

(NOTE.—Faced with the possibility of a medical new deal in the United States, American physicians want whatever cues they can get from the state medical scheme in Britain. To gather such cues first-hand, William Alan Richardson, editor of Medical Economics, a monthly reaching 138,000 United States physicians, recently undertook a month-long, 2,000-mile tour through England, Wales, and Scotland, visiting every principal city there and as many small towns.

(Mr. Richardson's aim was an objective study that would show how British doctors and patients are being affected by state medicine and what they think of it. The results of the study are being presented in a series of articles, of which this is the third.

(The author was aided in his inquiry by the opinion-research firm, Mass-Observation, and by Medical Economics' British correspondents, Harry Cooper and staff. More than 300 depth interviews were conducted among doctors and patients and among the heads of the various professional associations and the Ministry of Health.

(Medical men to be interviewed were chose at random by taking every *n*th name in the British Medical Directory. A sample was sought in this way that would reflect no over-all bias either for or against the Government health service. Equal care was taken to get an unprejudiced sample among the public. Here a stratified selection was made according to age, sex, location, financial status, and occupation.

(Mr. Richardson's initial material is being kept up-to-date as follow-up reports are received each month from London.)

Most people in Britain will tell you that their state medical service is "jolly good." Most doctors are less enthusiastic.

Yet you can't gage professional reaction to the scheme merely by asking, "Are you for it or against it?" The typical practitioner likes some things about the scheme and dislikes others. Your only solution is to measure his likes against his dislikes and find out which bulk the larger.

This was done in the course of the present study. It showed that the weight of opinion

among three-fifths of the doctors interviewed was against the national health service. About one-fifth of the physicians were, by and large, for the scheme, and the rest were on the fence.

Judged by American standards, Britain has always had more than its share of poverty. Up until July 1948 literally millions of indigent and near-indigent got only the barest medical attention. Some got none. British doctors now agree, therefore, that some tax-supported plan had to be launched to put treatment within reach of these people. The tremendous advantage of the national health service, they feel, is that medical care can now be given the patient without regard to financial considerations.

"To the established doctor the scheme offers no advantage whatever," said a general practitioner in Kent. "But it's a great thing for many patients.

"We can now do so much more for the poor patient especially. We can visit him as often as needed without feeling that we are running up a big bill. We can order what's best for his condition without worrying whether he can pay for it."

A young orthopedist in Manchester said, "There is no doubt that a large number of the poorer members of the Nation are receiving better medical care than they did. They are certainly receiving spectacles properly prescribed for them. They are also getting proper surgical appliances.

"It may of course be argued that in the present economic state of the country the expenditure being made for such things is unwise. And it is evident that most of the patients supplied with appliances will not thereby be made more fit for productive work. Nevertheless, the service has uncovered a very real need for medical care; and a great many cases are now receiving attention that was long overdue.

A general practitioner in a village not far from Liverpool said, "My personal inclination would be to scrap the NHS in its entirety. But for the benefit of my patients I'd keep it. The scheme is doing its greatest good in the industrial and lower-class areas."

Another general practitioner in Dundee, Scotland, felt the same way: "There's a lot of things wrong with the health service. But at least for the poor people some such arrangement is necessary.

"Doctors have always served the poor gratis. But it was not properly their responsibility. Now the cost of treating the poor is a charge on society as a whole—which it should have been long ago."

"LIMIT PLAN TO POOR"

While Britain's doctors agree that a better plan of medical care for the poor was imperative, many deplore what one called "its extension to persons of substance." An income limit, they feel, should have been imposed on those who were to get free medical attention; the self-supporting should have continued to pay their own way.

Among the several good points alleged for the National Health Service is its payment of a living wage to specialty trainees. Another popular feature is the Government's $1,200-a-year basic salary, paid under certain conditions to general practitioners whose lists of NHS patients aren't large enough to support them—e. g., young men starting practice and old men tapering off.

Although the price of these hand-outs is an eventual loss of personal freedom, many young doctors have jumped at the bait. With economic conditions in Britain getting worse all the time, the Minister of Health reasoned that the rising generation of M. D.'s would rather be hooked than hungry. And he wasn't far wrong.

GOOD POINTS

Another thing these beginners in medicine like is that they no longer have to buy a practice in order to get started. Instead of plunging themselves into debt to the tune of, say, $10,000 to purchase a practice (and being saddled with repayments for years thereafter), they now simply nail up their plates and go to work. There are usually plenty of patients to go around; and if there aren't, the Government's basic salary can be applied for.

A young general practitioner in Cheshire, demobilized from the RAF last November, said, "The National Health Service may well prove to be an example of impractical idealism. But it has saved me from having to buy a share of a practice, which means a load of financial worry off my mind. To that extent at least, it has indeed been a blessing."

Established practitioners, when asked what they like about the NHS, mention several minor points, such as "There is no dispensing of medicines" and "There are no bills to bother about." But a major factor with some has been the pay:

Take the case of a general practitioner in one of Britain's crowded, lower-class industrial districts. Before July 1948 perhaps half his practice was made up of employed panel patients—factory workers and such. For each of these the Government paid him a capitation fee, while from their dependents and others he had to eke out whatever private fees he could.

Since July of last year, when the National Health Service began, virtually all his patients have been "on the scheme." He now gets a capitation fee for every one of them, including those who, before, never paid him anything. While he's now working harder than he ever did, he may also be enjoying a somewhat higher income; so his criticisms of the service are soft-pedaled.

General practitioners in the less densely populated areas sing a different song. And they are in the majority. These are the men with suburban, small-town, and rural practices—even men in some industrial communities outside the big centers. Before the NHS, they used to do most of the private work. They had few or no panel patients. But now it's all changed. Their private work today has shrunk to a remnant. They often have only small lists of NHS patients.

Their incomes, therefore, have nose-dived. Instead of being reduced to the financial level of the panel doctor, some have dropped even below that. This come-down they've suffered, coupled with everything else, is proving to be almost beyond endurance. It explains the desire of a good many doctors to emigrate.

The irony of it is that many of the physicians who dislike the state medical service most and who have taken the worst beating financially are those with the highest standing professionally. Their colleagues whom the National Health Service has favored and who comprise the main NHS cheering section are, by and large, the more mediocre clinicians.

"RUINED MY PRACTICE"

A well-known Southampton general practioner summed up his attitude in these words: "The National Health Service has simply ruined my last 15 years in practice. I'm now 52. I wish I didn't have as many more years to go."

What private practice is left in Britain is shared mostly by specialists. A handful of those with top reputations continue to do well, but they take a dim view of the future. The majority take a dim view of the present also.

It is by now common knowledge that most British doctors are overworked and underpaid. A Harley Street surgeon remarked that "Bevin has the best slaves in the world." The big question is: How long can they stand the gaff?

A tuberculosis specialist in Lancashire said, "Doctors' incomes in this small town have dropped alarmingly. One practitioner here is down at least £600 ($2,400) per annum. The Socialists are killing the very thing that has made our country great: the hope of reward."

LOSS OF DIGNITY

In a letter to the British Medical Journal this summer, Dr. Harold Sanguinetti of London said, "But there are other matters even more important than pay which demand consideration by the profession and the public. I refer to the dignity of and respect for the general practitioner."

Dr. Sanguinetti was distressed by the fact that so many general practitioners had become form fillers and traffic guides, doing little more than hand out certificates and direct patients to specialists and hospitals. "It is an insult," he said, "to a branch of the profession which in Germany produced Koch and here gave us Sir James Mackenzie. * * *"

The thing that bothers some doctors most about the NHS is the changed attitude of many patients toward their physicians. "People used to ask us for things; now they demand them," said a Welsh general practitioner. "We've degenerated from independent professional men to brow beaten civil servants."

Before the NHS, when a patient needed attention, he would try to see the doctor at his office. Now it's often too much trouble. So he requests a house call.

By the same token, the private patient who needed a small cut bandaged would often do it himself. The NHS patient is more inclined to go to the doctor for such things. He reasons that he's paid his four shillings and eleven pence to the Government this week, and he wants his money's worth.

A general practitioner near Exeter observed glumly that "The decent people wait too long to call a doctor. The others call all the time. The M. D. who is conscientious kills himself trying to treat his patients properly. The other fellow takes it easy and makes out financially just as well."

SHORT CUTS DEPLORED

An NHS doctor practicing near Great Yarmouth was upset by the short cuts he had to take in keeping up with over-eager patients.

"Everyone who comes in," he said, "wants a bottle of medicine or a tonic. And they want one every week or two. Where I used to give a four-ounce bottle, I now often prescribe a pint. It's the only way to keep them from coming back so often. I have little enough time as it is for my really sick patients."

According to the Welsh general practitioner quoted, "People are losing their sense of responsibility. The old doctor-patient relationship is fading fast. In 10 years the doctor won't care what the patient thinks of him—only what the Health Ministry thinks of him."

This transfer of the NHS physician's allegiance from the patient to the state has been mentioned also in a letter from Dr. H. A. H. Harris of Chelmsford, England, to Dr. Wemple Dodds of Crawfordsville, Ind.

Dr. Harris' letter, published recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, states that "Our future doctors will be small-minded little men with civil-service mentalities. Their main concerns will be keeping on the right side of the administrative superiors, filling forms correctly, watching the clock, and passing the buck."

Much professional alarm over the National Health Service arises from the belief that it will in time reduce every doctor to the same stratum of mediocrity. The only opportunity left under those circumstances will be the opportunity for a low-level personal security.

Unfortunately, this prospect does not deter a good many British doctors of indifferent ability. These men exhibit little of the old-fashioned will-to-get-ahead. First they became resigned to the system, now they

actually welcome it as an easy way out. Many are tired out from the war, austerity living, and the staggering demands of their NHS practices. The fight has been sapped out of them.

One such doctor, queried about his plans for the future, said, "Plans? What plans? I have none. I just hope I can stay in the groove I'm now in. It may be hard for you to understand this, but after what we've been through, I'm glad just to be alive."

There's another factor also. Many of Britain's doctors had a long period of conditioning to state medicine. Under the Government's panel system that operated from 1911 to 1948, they took care of the medical needs of 40 percent of the people. To these M. D.'s, government methods and terms of practice are old hat.

NO INCENTIVE

Doctors who used to do mostly private work and who had few panel patients are the ones who now feel most apprehensive about the threat of regimentation. An obstetrician in Shropshire said, "Under the NHS, one is no longer a free agent. One must bend to the dictates of administrative committees.

"Bureaucratic interference is increasing all the time. This makes not only for irritation but for frustration—and that's what kills incentive. We've gotten into the present mess by putting our security ahead of our freedom. In the process, we've undermined the best interests of ourselves and our patients."

ABUSES OF SCHEME

Besides objecting to the health service on broad grounds, doctors cite a variety of more detailed complaints. High on the list of these is the multitude of trivial cases the scheme tends to breed.

According to a Liverpool general practitioner: "I get so many trivial calls that the serious ones must sometimes wait. From the descriptions over the phone I can't always tell, of course, which cases are urgent and which are not.

"Just yesterday I received a call that a patient needed me and would I please come over as soon as possible. When I got to the house she was out for a stroll."

A country doctor near Inverness, Scotland, had had a similar experience: "The other afternoon I got a call to visit a patient who lives about 5 miles from here. I hurried out to her place at the first opportunity to find out what was wrong.

" 'It's this bunion,' she said. 'I began to be troubled by it a fortnight ago. Do you think I need a surgeon to remove it?' "

Another doctor in the same district said: "This is the heyday of the neurotics. They've seized the chance of a lifetime to glorify their ailments—at public expense."

Not all practitioners report abuses of the system, but the number who do are in the majority. They're particularly irked—as any citizen might be—by the gross waste of public money.

They mention, as examples, the many people who get spectacles without needing them; those who demand glasses to preserve their eyesight; those who want a pair because they think they look better in them. They also mention the women who come in to get free corsets for obesity. The prize case cited was that of the balding male patient who, rather than buy a hat, asked his doctor for a free wig to keep his head warm.

A number of doctors, in common with their patients, feel that the Government, through its National Health Service, attempted too much in too short a time. Not only has the quality of medical care deteriorated as a result, they say, but a number of proposed features of the scheme have gone by the board—e. g., the program of preventive medicine.

"NOT FOR MY SON"

The real pay-off in this matter of how doctors view the NHS is found in their answer to the question, "Would you advise a son of yours to go into medicine now?"

Most said no.

A general practitioner in Wales remarked, "My father was in practice here for 46 years. I've been at it since 1933, except while in service. I had hoped my son might carry on after me; but I'm now advising him to make a career in another field.

"Things have reached the point where a young man may well ask, 'Why should I spend 7 or 8 years studying to practice medicine at, say, £800 ($3,200) a year when I can make as much in another field with one-third the training—and not have to resign myself to the status of a civil servant?' "

The Chelmsford surgeon quoted said "My general practitioner friends are now, without exception, unhappy men. Pride in their job is waning. I know of none who are bringing up their sons to follow in their fathers' steps."

WILLIAM ALAN RICHARDSON.

Bertha Schwartz Deserves Reelection to the City Council on Her Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Bertha Schwartz, a member of the City Council of the City of New York, has been a valiant champion of more and better schools, hospitals, libraries, playgrounds, transportation, aid for the aged, and all social services. She has supported beneficial rent laws. She also sponsored a bill creating the city youth commission. In addition, she has rendered a valuable service to the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Federation for Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, Urban League, Bronx Women's Division, American Jewish Congress, Hadassah, New York Council of Jewish Women, Bronx Women's Civic Council, Red Cross, Infantile Paralysis Foundation, and other groups.

The Reverend Richard E. Evans recently sent Councilwoman Schwartz a letter of commendation which has not received the publicity that it should. Reverend Evans is a nationally known Christian clergyman, who has been recognized for many years as one of America's outstanding leaders in the battle against the forces of bigotry and intolerance, and a fearless crusader for equal rights for people of every race, color, and creed. He presided over a Nation-wide observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Bill of Rights, and has been widely heard as the moderator of radio's Human Rights program. He has long been one of the staunchest Christian champions for the freedom of Israel and for the liberation of all victims of totalitarian persecution.

When we have a public official as conscientious and civic-minded as the Honorable Bertha Schwartz, we should sing her praise and acclaim her to the Nation as an outstanding woman by virtue of her invaluable public service and brilliant legislative record.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of the letter written to Miss Schwartz by the Reverend Richard E. Evans:

My attention has just been drawn to the fact that you are a candidate for reelection to the city council of New York. May I take this opportunity to wish you every success in achieving once more an honor which you so richly deserve.

I recall that 4 years ago, when you were a candidate for your first term, it was my privilege to speak on the same platform with you at a meeting at which you made a very eloquent plea in behalf of the great cause of Palestine, that has since become the splendid, new, free, and democratic nation of Israel.

I was so deeply impressed by what you said, and the things for which you stood, that following the meeting I wrote you a letter, a copy of which I have before me at this moment. I quote herewith from a few of its paragraphs:

"I was told at the meeting that you were a candidate for the city council from the Bronx. I was delighted to hear this, for your type of unselfish humanitarian civic service is desperately needed in our councils of government—city, State, and National—during these difficult days.

"As I said from the platform of the meeting, I regretted greatly that I was not a resident of the Bronx, so that I could cast a vote for you. However, as a citizen and voter of Greater New York, and interested in the city's welfare, I hope very much that the council will have the high privilege of your membership upon it.

"As a Christian minister and an active worker all my life in interfaith activities, I know full well that such an influence as yours will contribute greatly in bringing about better understanding between different creeds and groups in our city."

Four years have passed since I wrote that letter. I want you to know that I feel you have justified, many times over, the very sincere convictions I expressed in it.

I have watched your career in the council with deep interest and pride. It has been one of high unselfish service and of signal accomplishment. I have also been privileged to know from first-hand experience the effectiveness of your leadership in the many civic activities in which we have participated together.

In all of these, you have greatly advanced the welfare of our citizens, not only in the Bronx, but throughout the entire Greater New York area citizens of every race, color, creed, and national origin.

To speak of all the things you have done which deserve gratitude of your constituents, would take altogether too much time here. There are one or two points, however, which I feel I must mention.

You have always worked for more and better schools, hospitals, libraries and playgrounds. You have labored diligently for the aged. You have consistently supported beneficial rent laws. You sponsored the bill creating the City Youth Commission, one of the most important enactments of the entire administration. In a word, you have spoken and worked on behalf of all social services for the good of your constituents.

In addition to this, you have introduced legisiation supporting the cause of civil rights, of the United Nations, on behalf of displaced persons, for the welfare of Israel, and many other equally important measures, too numerous to list here.

May I add a word of personal appreciation for the many times in which you spoke on my "Human Relations Program" for these and other great humanitarian purposes. Your effective and convincing presentations added greatly to the purposes we strove to achieve.

All in all, yours has been a magnificent record. I was happy to urge your election 4 years ago. I am doubly proud today to urge all those whom I know, to return to office one of New York's finest public servants. Your place of leadership in the council is imperative to our city's welfare in these days of critical emergency for our own Nation and all the world.

With every good wish,

Very sincerely yours,

The REVEREND RICHARD E. EVANS.

Ode to Hon. Reid Murray, of Wisconsin, on His Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, our beloved colleague, REID MURRAY, has just had a birthday and many Members of this House paid tribute to him in his office. As part of my remarks I am including a poem which is to the point:

ODE TO MURRAY ON HIS BIRTHDAY

Here's to REID MURRAY, the man with a cow.
Does she give milk? I'll say, and how.
It's the powdered kind you buy in a can;
When water is added, it's drunk by man.

REID can make a speech at the drop of a hat,
And on oleomargarine he'll always stand pat.
He's known to his colleagues as "Oleo" MURRAY.
When he hears that name, he's never in a hurry.

Why, he'd give you his tie or the stripe in his shirt,
Or even get out and shovel dirt,
To help his pals or partners in crime—
Why, he'd even dig deep and pull out a dime.

So here's to this man who's just a big boy;
Oh, come now, Reid, don't try to be coy;
We know Rosie's your closest friend,
And her powdered milk may be a trend.

We are here to drink to the years ahead;
May you keep your health and stay well fed,
Just keep on fighting for butter and cheese,
Then all Wisconsin you will surely please.

It's men like you that are the salt of the earth.
That's why we're here, to celebrate your birth;
We're glad you were born; we're glad you are here,
And we really think your Ogdensburg's dear.

So keep on dishing out the same kind of stuff;
That for your opponents makes the going rough;
And when 1950 rolls around
Rosie and you'll be back in town.

You'll be doing business in the same old way,
Sleeping at night and talking oleo all day.
So here's to you and your family and friends,
And to all of those who best regards send.

—*Eleanor J. Smith.*

Address of Hon. Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN of the Seventh Ohio District, at the annual banquet of the Associated Industries of Georgia, held in Atlanta, Ga., Friday, October 7, 1949:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Associated Industries of Georgia, and my fellow Americans, when I received the cordial invitation to be your guest speaker on this occasion, I accepted with pleasure and with promptness. I am grateful to you for the honor you have conferred upon me by your invitation, and for the opportunity you have given me to partake of your hospitality and to participate in the annual meeting of this splendid organization which is doing so much for the development and advancement of the great State of Georgia.

I note the subject assigned to me for tonight is Reducing Uncle Sam's Waste Line. Before any of you inquire, I wish to make clear that the "waste" in the "waste line" referred to in the subject of my address is spelled w-a-s-t-e and not w-a-i-s-t. However, I can assure you that I found it just as difficult, and perhaps even more so, to get something done about reducing Uncle Sam's "waste" line as it has been for me to do something about reducing my own waistline.

All of which reminds me that last week I was the principal speaker at the ninety-ninth annual banquet of the Pennsylvania State Medical Society, held in Pittsburgh, where I opened my remarks by telling the 1,500 assembled medical men it was the first time I had ever had a group of doctors look me over without at least one of them saying: "How on earth did you ever get in that shape?"

But, I am sure you who are here tonight are far more interested in Uncle Sam's "waste" line than in my own, and, believe me, my friends, you have a right to be.

Today, one of the most serious questions before the American people is whether the Government of the United States is to continue to be our servant or is to become our master. This is neither an academic nor a hypothetical question. Instead, it is a very practical and very important one. Governments—at least all free governments—have always been brought into existence to serve the people who created them. In every free government the individual citizen is always the master; but, when the position of citizen and government is reversed, and government becomes the master, it is no longer a free government—and those living under such a government are no longer free. Need I remind you of that which history teaches us—that free and representative governments always face greater danger of destruction from within than from without?

Need I remind you of the great and never-ending struggle which has gone on throughout the ages between slavery and freedom? On the one side has always been found those seeking to control the lives and activities of their fellow men, and on the other those who have sought, and fought for, liberty under law for themselves and their families.

Need I remind you that there are many ways in which men can be enslaved. That high taxes and huge public debt can enslave a citizen to his government and bring about the loss of his liberty and freedom just as effectively as can any conquerer from without who may drive him into the concentration camp.

The average American now has from 1 to 2 days' wages taken out of each week's earnings to pay for the cost of Government. Just let any of you who may be on a wage or salary try next week to take home all of your own pay. You will find that you cannot do it, for much of your earnings will be withheld by a beneficent Government to pay your income taxes, or under some promise to take care of you in your old age. If some of the legislation now pending before the Congress is enacted into law, more of your earnings will soon be withheld to pay for your lumbago, your grocery bills, or what have you.

The United States of America is today following down the road which so many other peoples and governments have already traveled to their destruction—the broad highway which leads to state socialism. A long time ago an eminent British historian, in his great essay on the American Republic, gave our form of government 150 years to live. It was his contention that a century and a half was as long as any free people could be expected to govern themselves soundly and sanely. He warned that by the time 150 years had come and gone, the citizens of this Republic would fall easy victims to the demagogic appeals of false leaders to exchange their precious liberties as freemen for gilded promises of security. That instead of contributing to the support of their Government, the citizens of this great Republic would finally reach the time and state when they would demand more and more of the materialistic things from their Government as a matter of right, with the inevitable result that the Government would grow larger and larger in size and greater and greater in cost until it would finally collapse of its own weight.

During the last third of a century, we have seen our Federal Government undergo fantastic growth. Back in 1915 the number of executive establishments with the rank of bureau or equivalent totaled only 158. By 1932 this number had increased to 521; by 1944 to 1,141; and today, believe it or not, we now have more than 2,500 different and distinct agencies or divisions of government within our Federal structure.

In 1916 there were 438,057 public employees on the Federal pay roll. By 1936 this number had grown to 824,259. By 1946, a year after the fighting of World War II had ended, we still had 2,776,165 civilian employees on the pay roll of the Federal Government. Now, more than 4 years after the end of that tragic war, we still have more than 2,200,000 civilians working for the Federal Government. Mind you, this number does not include the more than a million and a half Americans who are now in the armed forces of the Nation.

To emphasize more clearly what has been going on in our Federal Government, let me point out that back in 1914, or only 35 years ago, the total cost of all Government here in the United States—Federal, State, and local—was only $2,500,000,000 a year. Twenty-six percent of this $2,500,000,000 was expended by the Federal Government, 14 percent by the various State governments, and—get this, please—60 percent by local governments.

By 1924, or 10 years later, the total annual cost of all Government, including Federal, State, and local, had risen to slightly more than $8,000,000,000. Of this amount the Federal Government was then spending 37 percent; State governments were still spending only 14 percent; while total spending by local governments had dropped to 49 percent.

By 1940, or only nine short years ago, a remarkable transformation had taken place.

The total yearly cost of all Government had risen to approximately $18,000,000,000, with the Federal Government spending 49 percent thereof, State governments 19 percent, and the local governments only 32 percent.

By last year the total cost of all Government had risen to approximately $60,000,000,000 annually, with the Federal Government spending 71 percent of this amount, State governments 15 percent, and local governments only 14 percent.

This, my friends, should be an indication to you of how far we have already gone down the road toward State socialism through taxation alone.

Economic history teaches that no people are long able to provide wholly or adequately for their own needs when the cost of government, in one form or another, takes as much as 20 percent of their income. As abundant proof of this, one has only to look at Russia, Germany, and, yes, Great Britain. In the United States today we are being taxed approximately 27 percent of our total income simply to support Government, of one kind or another, exclusive of social security and other pay-roll taxes which are an additional burden on us all. So we have already crossed the 20-percent danger line and are now at least 7 percent beyond.

Another striking corollary fact is that 20 years ago only 1 person out of each 40 of our population was receiving money from the Federal Government, either as a wage or benefit. Today 1 person out of every 7 in America is a regular recipient of Government money.

Back in 1929, which was only 20 years ago, mind you, the cost of our Federal Government alone averaged $33.12 per capita. Last year it was $305.19 for every man, woman, and child in our beloved land—or over nine times as much.

At the same time, back 20 years ago, there was only 1 Government employee—Federal, State, or local—for every 41 Americans. Today we now have 1 Government employee for every 22 of our population.

Back in 1933, or just 16 short years ago, it cost us $5,000,000,000 to run our Federal Government for 1 year. By 1940, the last peacetime year before World War II, the cost of the Federal Government was slightly more than $9,000,000,000—$9,300,000,000, I believe, was the total figure. Why, I can even remember how, back in that day, we who were Republicans were loudly and vociferously protesting against the waste and extravagance of the Roosevelt administration. We were charging that Mr. Roosevelt was a spendthrift—and, by the way, when you come to think of it, F. D. R. was not any slouch of a spender at that. But, last year the administration in charge of our Federal Government at Washington was able to spend between $41,000,000,000 and $42,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money; and in this fiscal year, which started July 1 last, the present budgetary program calls for Federal expenditures of approximately $46,000,000,000. Of course, if we enact into law the bills which are now pending in Congress to give us socialized agriculture, socialized housing, socialized medicine, socialized education, and other socialistic schemes, the annual cost of runnng the Federal Government will be even much higher. According to the best estimates we can obtain, if the spenders have their way and these pending bills, which have strong support in high places, are written into law, the annual cost of operating our Federal Government will be at least $84,000,000,000, the socialization of America, through taxation alone, will be an accomplished fact.

Little wonder it is that our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, has warned us, "We are on the last mile." It is little wonder, too, that another great American, James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, in a stirring speech at my alma mater, Washington and Lee University, which I had the pleasure of hearing, told the American people that unless the present trend was reversed we would soon become—and I quote—"slaves pulling oars in the galley of the state."

The appalling and shocking truth is that unless we stop the present orgy of wild and profligate public spending, the cost of government will be not only 27 percent of our national income, but probably 50 percent, or even more.

It was because of these facts, which I have just given you, that I came to the conclusion 2 years ago that the time had come when we must take some definite and concrete steps toward putting our governmental house in order. After months of study I came to the conclusion it was time we took an over-all look at the structure of our Federal Government, and that an effort be made to get greater efficiency and economy in the conduct of our public affairs.

With these thoughts in mind, I wrote and introduced H. R. 775 in January of 1947. This bill later became Public Law 162, and the 12-man Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government came into being. H. R. 775, or Public Law 162, provided that this 12-man Commission should be bipartisan, made up of six Democrats and six Republicans. In order that we might have the viewpoint of those both in and out of Government, my bill required half of the Commission membership to be civilians and the other half Federal officials. Four members of the Commission—two from the House of Representatives and two from private life—were appointed by the Speaker of the House. Four were appointed by the President of the Senate—two from the Senate and two from private life. The other four were appointed by the President of the United States—two from the executive branch of Government and two from private life.

The then Speaker of the House, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN of Massachusetts, selected Herbert Hoover, our only living ex-President, as one of his appointees from private life. Later I had the pleasure of nominating Mr. Hoover to become Chairman of our Commission, which has since become popularly known as the Hoover Commission. Other members of the Commission were Dean Acheson, our present Secretary of State, who served as Vice Chairman; the late lamented James V. Forrestal, then Secretary of National Defense; Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, then Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and now president of Ohio Wesleyan University; Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain; Dr. James K. Pollock, head of the department of political science at the University of Michigan and the man who set up the civilian government of Germany; Hon. James H. Rowe, Jr., former Assistant Attorney General and once secretary to President Roosevelt; George H. Mead, prominent industrialist and former member of the War Manpower Commission; Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Senator John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Carter Manasco, Representative from Alabama; and myself.

Incidentally, I believe I should not fail to mention the fact that H. R. 775 has been the only important bill in modern legislative history to pass both branches of Congress with the affirmative vote of every Member present, and I wish to pause for a moment to pay tribute to the splendid support the Members of Congress from this State gave to both the enactment of H. R. 775 and to the work of our Commission.

The Hoover Commission was organized at the White House in August of 1947 and immediately began its study and survey of all the various activities and functions of the many departments, divisions, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government. We were not long embarked upon our task until we came to the realization it would be a physical impossibility for the Commission of 12 men to make a comprehensive study and survey of the executive branch of the Government and submit its recommendations and findings to the new Congress, which would convene in January 1949 unless we had a great deal of help. So, under the able leadership of Mr. Hoover, 24 task forces were organized. These task forces were made up of more than 300 prominent American citizens, every one of whom was virtually drafted into the service of his country, and practically every one of whom served without compensation. In fact, even a great many refused to accept any reimbursement for their actual expenses incurred in their work.

When I say these individuals were drafted, I mean just that. The Commission would discuss who, in their opinion, might be the most able persons to constitute a task force to make a study of some particular Department, activity, or function of the Federal Government. Then the individuals decided upon would be called in, and I can still hear Mr. Hoover as he would put the so-called "bite" on these men by saying: "Now, John," or whatever the individual's first name might be, "many of us remember when you were just a poor farm boy like the rest of us, but America has been good to you, as it has been good to most of us. You have made a great success in life, and now your country needs you. You can afford to give it 6 months of your time. We want you, and we will take no excuse except that of ill health."

My friends, we had in the service of our Commission more than 300 of the greatest and most outstanding citizens of this land of ours—industrialists, financiers, businessmen, educators, Governors of States—all individuals of unquestioned ability and integrity.

These 24 task forces, together with their aides and assistants, spent many months of hard, grueling work making a first-hand study of your Government and mine. They made their reports only to our Commission, and the Commission in turn sat day after day considering the reports which had been submitted, making spot investigations of its own and trying to fit together all of the information we could obtain as to how we might eliminate waste and extravagance in the Federal Government, with resultant savings to the taxpayers, and still get greater efficiency in the conduct of public affairs.

These task forces found many strange things. Perhaps you would be interested if I would outline just a few of them to you.

The Federal budget itself is a huge document or book of 1,670 pages, from which it is a practical impossibility to determine the real cost of any of the various programs or activities of our Government. These 1,670 pages are all in fine type—with column after column of small figures which are almost impossible even to read, let alone interpret. For instance, one title in the Veterans' Administration budget is a single line—"Salaries and expenses—$848,897,000." On another page in the budget is a similar short item for "carfare and bicycle allowance, $42."

To determine the cost of some Government operations, one would have to look for and find some 20 or 30 different items in different portions or sections of the budget document. If you didn't overlook any item, you might possibly add all of them together and determine what would be the actual cost of conducting some Government activity—for instance, the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda.

In its general accounting the Federal Government now maintains at least three, and often four, separate and complete sets of books, none of which usually ever agrees with any other.

The personnel problem in the Federal Government is a perplexing one. As an example, we found in many instances personnel super-

visors are compensated according to the number of employees they have under them, rather than on the basis of the efficiency and economy displayed in their conduct of the work they supervise. So it doesn't take the ordinarily intelligent Government supervisor, who has a new baby arriving in his home, and therefore needs a little extra income, very long to figure out that by adding a dozen or so employees to his staff he can get an extra $50 a month in pay from the Federal Government.

Perhaps I should mention that under the present archaic civil-service regulations it now takes as long as 18 months to finally discharge or get rid of an unsatisfactory civil-service employee, and then only after lengthy hearings which usually result in the discharging officer, rather than the unsatisfactory worker, being put on trial. As a result of many sad experiences in the past, many department heads have stopped trying to discharge unsatisfactory workers, having found it easier just to transfer them over to "the dead letter office" as it were, where they do little worthwhile work for the taxpayers, but will no longer annoy their supervisors.

So, it is no wonder the head of one great Government department told some of us on the Commission he had 10,000 employees in his department alone whom he did not need and did not want, but could not get rid of without great difficulty.

Procurement is another general Government activity which gave our Commission grave concern. For instance, more than half the purchases made by the Federal Government are of items costing less than $10. Yet it costs the taxpayers of the Nation $11.20 to process each Government purchase order. So it can readily be seen that when a Federal purchase order is issued for an item which sells for $1, the final cost to the taxpayers is actually $12.28—$1 for the item and $11.28 for Government administration and red tape.

We found that many of our public works programs are quite expensive, too. For instance, two different Federal agencies surveyed the same projected dam at the same site on the same river and announced the results of their surveys on the very same day, at a roughly estimated cost of $250,000 for each survey. One agency estimated the cost of the dam to be $385,000,000, and the other estimated it would cost $434,000,000. According to one of our task force reports, the Federal Government has actually constructed irrigation dams at a cost of $3,500 per acre for every bit of land which could possibly be irrigated by the new dam.

New Government hospitals were found to be under construction in cities or communities where other Federal hospitals were being closed or abandoned for lack of patients. In one Government hospital visited more doctors than patients were found, and in another hospital less than 50 percent of the beds were in use. Yet the hospital building program of the Federal Government was going madly ahead.

Now, to mention Social Security—and I don't want to take time out to discuss the bill amending the Social Security Act which passed the House this week under a gag rule which permitted us to vote only yes or no on the measure in its entirety, without the opportunity to offer or consider any amendments to it of any kind—but—well, down in the Social Security Office our task force found almost 5,000 Government employees busily engaged in posting detailed actuarial records which have had no real value, or have actually been necessary, to our present Social Security System since the Social Security Act was amended 10 years ago, back in 1939.

In the Department of Agriculture we found as many as five separate agencies sending out field representatives to visit the same farm, to advise the very same farmer, at the very same time, as to how he should operate his farm. Down in the Department of Agriculture you can find one group of individuals busily engaged in figuring out how to control or limit farm production by allotting the acreage to be planted in various crops. Another group is busily at work figuring out how we can bring new land into production of food crops through irrigation and reclamation. Still another group or division is publishing booklets and sending advice to farmers on how to produce more food on less land. Another division of the Department of Agriculture spends its time on experimentation, in an effort to get higher yielding crops and faster growing livestock. Still another agency is right now building all sorts of storage facilities in which to place last year's grain crops so there may be room on the farms to store this year's crops, which in turn will be moved into new Government storage facilities next year in order to make room on the farms to take care of next year's crops.

In the National Defense Establishment our task force found more waste and extravagance than anywhere else in the Federal Government. For instance, in one small $39,000,000 budget item request we found a slight error of only $30,000,000. Many hundreds of huge armored tanks could not be located or accounted for by the armed services; and, when a request for a huge appropriation to modernize a large number of these big tanks at $100,000 each was looked into, it was found that the tanks had already been transferred to another branch of our armed services, where they had already been modernized at a cost of only $4,800 each, instead of the $100,000 per tank originally requested.

In another Government office a survey showed that the individual work load per worker was fixed at handling 12 items, or operations, per day. Yet it was noted that the average worker could easily handle five items an hour without any overstrain, and that many were completing their day's work in a little over 2 hours and spending the rest of the time visiting with each other, talking to friends over the telephone, or what have you.

In the insurance section of the Veterans' Administration, for instance, the work load per employee is only one-fourth of that which pertains in the private insurance companies of the Nation where comparable transactions are conducted.

On the financial front the Federal Government often pays interest on its own money. In the Post Office Department a penny post card costs the Government an average of 2½ cents for printing and delivery.

I could go on and on, my friends, for many hours in giving you different illustrations as to how your tax money and mine has been wasted by Government agencies. I could also give you many examples of how bureaucracy has enmeshed the American people in Government red tape.

But, to return to the work of the Hoover Commission, I am proud to say that never once did our Commission divide in its views along party lines. Never once was there a division of opinion between civilian and Government officials serving on the Commission. I am also happy to report that ours has been the only Commission I know of which not only lived within its appropriation, but also returned a sizable portion of it to the Treasury. Our Commission was the only Government organization I know of which ever completed its work and went out of existence on schedule.

Last June we concluded our task by filing with the Congress and the President 318 different recommendations as to how the Federal Government can be made more efficient and greater economy can be obtained in the conduct of our public affairs. It was the considered opinion of the Commission that, if its recommendations are put into effect, somewhere between three and five billion dollars a year can be saved in the normal operation of the Federal Government.

Many people believe the Hoover Commission report to be one simple document, which can be adopted, like a motion or a simple resolution, by one single action of the Congress. Of course, this is not true. The 318 recommendations and findings made by the Commission fill five large, printed volumes. The task-force reports take many more volumes.

Incidentally, the reports of our task forces and our Commission form the only authentic source from which accurate information can be obtained as to how our Federal Government actually functions.

But to make the 318 recommendations of the Hoover Commission effective, and to bring about the possible savings I have mentioned, will require both time and the cooperation of the President, the Congress, Government agencies, and the people of the United States, themselves.

About 20 percent of the recommendations of the Commission can be made effective by Executive or administrative order alone. Between 30 and 40 percent can be accomplished by the President through the submission of reorganization plans to the Congress under the authority conferred upon him by the Reorganization Act of 1949, the passage of which was recommended by our Commission. The remainder of our Commission's recommendations can be made effective only through the enactment of new Federal statutes or by many changes in our present Federal laws.

In many instances all three methods must be followed to obtain the desired results. For instance, in the Post Office Department many of our recommendations to get greater efficiency and more economies can be put into effect by orders from the President or the Postmaster General, some of which have already been issued. Other reforms in the postal service have already been provided for by the submission of a reorganization plan for the Post Office Department to the Congress by the President. But, in addition, there are 74—I believe—different statutes dealing with postal matters which the Congress must amend to make the Hoover Commission's recommendations on that great business activity of the Government really effective.

I am happy to report to you here tonight that since the Hoover Commission first began to submit its recommendations to the Congress last winter, considerable headway has already been made. The President has already submitted eight reorganization plans to the Congress, under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Six of these plans became effective at midnight on August 19. One was rejected by the Senate. The other was not brought to a vote, because legislation had been enacted by the Congress to accomplish the very same purpose.

The Congress has also passed, and the President has signed into law, a bill for the reorganization of the State Department and our Foreign Service. Another law has been enacted by the Congress and approved by the President to reorganize the procurement activities of the Federal Government and to create an Office of General Services, in which have already been consolidated many Federal agencies and bureaus, making possible numerous economies and much greater efficiency.

Congress has also written into law a measure for the reorganization of many of our national defense activities. It was the opinion of the Commission that through the enactment of this law, and its proper administration, at least a billion and a half dollars a year could be saved in the operation of our National Defense Establishment

without in any way endangering or lessening our security. The Secretary of National Defense has estimated that under this new legislation he can save $1,000,000,000 in operational costs in the coming year, and it is my firm conviction that this saving can and should be increased to at least a billion and a half, and perhaps $2,000,000,000, in the next year or so.

Yet, there is still much to be done. The battle has only started. The President has promised to submit to the Congress in the months ahead many new reorganization plans in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. There will be those selfish interests who will want to defeat any reorganization plan or any bill in the Congress which may in any way interfere with their past prerogatives and money-spending activities. Government agencies can be just as selfish as individuals, you know, and men who head Government activities often become honestly convinced the thing they are doing is of the utmost importance, and that those who try to circumscribe their activities are endeavoring to injure the national welfare. There are Members of Congress who have their pet Government agencies from which they obtain great favors. Even many business and civic organizations, which believe in economy as a general thing, are often quite anxious to obtain Government funds for projects or activities in which they are especially interested.

I can only say to you, who are members of this great organization, that those who served on the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—better known as the Hoover Commission—have given you the blueprint by which you can, if you wish, build a stronger, less costly, and more efficient Federal Government than we now have. It is up to citizens like you to decide whether we shall have such a governmental structure. After all, this Government of ours does not belong to the men who served on the Hoover Commission. Neither does it belong to the President and those about him, or to the Congress. It belongs to you. It is your Government. You can do with it what you will.

The challenge of the day to all real Americans is to guard well the priceless heritage of liberty and freedom which has been ours. The future of our beloved land, of our children, and of our children's children—yes, of all mankind—will depend upon how we meet that challenge. May divine providence give us the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to meet our responsibilities as true Americans.

Last Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of August 1949 the last encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic was held at Indianapolis. A constituent of mine, Mr. Howard Thomas Mitchell of Kenwood, Calif., has written a very appropriate poem in commemoration of this event and in remembrance of his father, Thomas Mitchell, who served in the West Virginia Light Artillery, GAR. I include this poem in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

(By Howard Thomas Mitchell)

Let the bugle sound out tonight
As warriors in their troth unite;
Who held on high the torch of light
That the cause of Union be right.

'T's Nation's honor first they place
Old comrades now meet to retrace;
Out front Old Glory floats in grace
For one Army that freed a race.

Lincoln with his firm eloquence
For United States due eminence;
Held freedom's course in excellence
GAR led by Providence.

All at ease in God's firmament
With those they hold more reverent;
The men in blue shall represent
In glory, the last encampment.

In remembrance of Thomas Mitchell, 1845-1901, Company K, West Virginia Light Artillery, GAR, grandfather of the author.

Gas Inflates Fight on Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of October 12, 1949:

GAS INFLATES FIGHT ON OLDS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It is hardly surprising that the case of Leland Olds has embittered political Washington as few such cases have in recent years.

Leland Olds is a candidate to succeed himself as a member of the Federal Power Commission. His nomination was long since sent to the Senate by President Truman. If the Senate confirms that nomination, the action will be much more than a third term for Mr. Olds. It will keep in a place of authority in Washington one of the very few remaining Rooseveltian New Dealers.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt picked Mr. Olds for his team in the Albany days. At that time Mr. Olds helped draft and operate New York State laws curbing utilities. Like several others, he was transplanted from State regulatory activity to Federal regulatory activity when Franklin Delano Roosevelt moved from Albany to Washington.

Add to this that before Mr. Olds came into Government he had been economics editor of the Federated Press, which at that time was the principal news agency for the labor press. The Daily Worker was, and still is, a subscriber to the Federated Press news service, which is how his writings got into the Communist publication. So Mr. Olds was not only a Rooseveltian New Dealer; he also has a background of active association with the trade-union movement.

Through it all he has been a vigorous advocate of such measures as TVA, Federal power development, and strict public regulation of public utilities. That background is quite enough to make him anathema not only to a vocal majority of the Republican Party but also to a powerful segment of the Democratic Party. He is detested automatically by all those who detested President Roosevelt, the New Deal, Federal regulation of utilities, and the rise of organized labor as a major political force.

Then there is a further element to explain the vehemence of the attack on Leland Olds, This just happens to be a moment of exceptional opportunity for profits from natural gas. If there were no Federal regulation of utilities, any man owning a natural gas well within reach of a pipe line could look with contempt on the oil millionaires of the last generation. The rising cost of coal and oil, the perfection of the long-distance pipe line, and the low, almost negligible extraction cost of natural gas, all combine at this moment in history to make a natural gas well better than a gold mine. Or, rather, it would be better than a gold mine if it were not for Federal regulation of utilities.

But there is Federal regulation by a law upheld by the Supreme Court and interpreted by a Federal Power Commission which up to this time has favored the theory that the owner of a gas well is entitled to his costs plus a 6-percent profit, but no more.

That 6-percent profit looks pretty stingy to a man who today could raise the price of his natural gas five or six or seven times over and still be able to undersell coal and oil in the market. This is a sellers' market for natural gas. The demand seems to be almost unlimited. Why shouldn't people who own natural gas wells cash in on their bonanza. That's the question they ask. It's a natural question for anyone owning a well.

And they might be able to cash in if Leland Olds could be kept off the Federal Power Commission and a person sympathetic to the old-fashioned idea of freedom to cash in on bonanzas were put in his place. The Commission tended to divide three to two, against the well owners, when Mr. Olds was a voting member. Now it divides two against two, and so it can't make any controversial decision until the issue about Mr. Olds is settled one way or the other.

Actually, failure of the Senate to confirm Mr. Olds probably would not have the results the gas well owners hope for. Mr. Truman almost certainly would seek another candidate sharing Mr. Olds' views on regulation.

Yet in the eyes of the well owners, Leland Olds appears at this moment to be the sole barrier between themselves and possible profits.

Obviously, they don't like him and don't want him confirmed for another term on the Federal Power Commission.

Atom Bomb Not a Political Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 10, 1949:

CUT OUT THE HICKENLOOPERISMS

Russia developed the atom bomb through espionage and President Truman's "loose administration," Harold Stassen, Republican Presidential aspirant, says on returning from a trip to Europe.

It's time that responsible people stopped handing out these irresponsible "Hickenlooperisms." Russia might have been helped speed her discovery of the bomb by getting information from the United States. Nobody has proved it, but, of course, it is possible.

But the United States, as our scientists have repeatedly told us, has no complete monopoly on scientific research and brains. There has been no "secret" about the atom. Most scientists know the theory of smashing it. The only "secret" lay in the techniques for doing the job. Those techniques could not long evade any hard-working, intelligent researcher. The Russians, with the help of German scientists, have men capable of doing the job.

If espionage and "loose administration" can be proved, of course, they should be. But charges without proof serve no purpose except to add distrust to an already uneasy situation.

And even if espionage and other charges can be proved, they will prove only that they helped Russia cut a few months from her atom-bomb timetable, not that they made discovery possible.

The atom bomb is not a political issue and should not be made one. It is a horrible fact of modern life. Irresponsible charges won't make it less horrible. Only a preponderance of American strength or, finally, effective international controls can reduce the horror of the A-bomb threat.

A United Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor has just completed their sixty-eighth annual convention in St. Paul. Among the various resolutions which were adopted at this convention is one which is of particular interest to a large segment of the people of this country in that it recommends an end to the partition of Ireland.

The resolution was prompted by one adopted by the delegates attending the Massachusetts State Convention of the A. F. of L., which urged that the national convention take action on the matter. Also a similar resolution had been adopted by the Illinois State convention.

These resolutions emphasize the fact that peoples throughout the world are entitled to free self-government and that organized labor has always championed the cause of freedom and the right of self-government. Since the government in northern Ireland is being perpetuated by the Government of Great Britain, which is in the hands of the Labor Party, organized labor in the United States rightly urges that this denial of freedom and independence of government in Ireland should not be continued by the Labor Party.

No stronger endorsement of the anti-partition movement can be found than in this resolution on the part of the representatives of the working people of the United States. Where one freedom is denied it invariably follows that other rights and freedoms are soon lost. No one knows this better than the workingman and so he is naturally in the forefront in championing the cause of liberty both at home and abroad.

Interested as I am in seeing all of Ireland united into one happy people, constituting one nation, a sound economic unit covering the entire island, I have been extremely pleased to learn of the sound stand that has been taken by the American Federation of Labor. Along with my colleagues in this House, I extend my congratulations to them in making this forthright declaration, and I trust that it may prove of assistance in bringing about a speedy end to the unreasonable division of Ireland.

As a part of my remarks, I desire to include copies of the two resolutions, one by the national convention and the other by the Massachusetts State Convention of the American Federation of Labor.

[Resolution 116, American Federation of Labor]

PARTITION OF IRELAND

Whereas there still exist throughout the world, governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority right of free self-government; and

Whereas there is a government in northern Ireland being perpetuated by a foreign power which is breeding bigotry and tends to destroy the unity of a race of people; and

Whereas the Irish people have contributed, over the centuries, more aid to the freedom of oppressed people than any nation in the world; and

Whereas organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people; and

Whereas the partition in Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition; and

Whereas the present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Sixty-eighth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor records itself against the continuance of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland and call upon the President of these United States and the State Department and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end, once and for all, this unjust condition to the end that the government of Eire will truly represent all of its people within its natural borders so that she can take her rightful place among the family of nations.

[Resolution 38, Massachusetts Federation of Labor]

PARTITION OF IRELAND

Whereas there still exists throughout the world, governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority right of free, self-government; and

Whereas there is a government in northern Ireland being perpetuated by a foreign power which is breeding bigotry and tends to destroy the unity of a race of people; and

Whereas the Irish people have contributed, over the centuries, more aid to the freedom of oppressed people than any nation in the world; and

Whereas organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people; and

Whereas the partition in Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition; and

Whereas the present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Federation of Labor go on record against the continued perpetuation of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland, and call upon the president of these United States, or the State Department, and all the Massachusetts Representatives in the Senate and Congress to do all in their power to end, once and for all, this unjust condition to the end that the Government of Eire will truly represent all of its people within its natural borders, so that she can take her rightful place among the family of nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the 1949 convention of the American Federation of Labor for further action.

(Submitted by Delegates Kenneth J. Kelley, Quincy Central Labor Union; Edward P. Reardon, Local 8; John J. Devlin, Local 504, Teamsters, Boston; Luke Kramer, Local 380, Milk Wagon Drivers; James J. McCarthy, Local 829, Teamsters; Nate Hurwitz, Laundry Drivers 168; Wm. J. McCarthy, Harry F. Heila and James V. Hurst, Local 25, Teamsters; Helen F. Kirby, Local 66, Teachers; Nicholas P. Morrissey, Local 25, Teamsters; Martin J. Moran, Local 68, Teamsters; Matthew P. Maney, Local 111, Stage Hands, Lawrence; Frank C. Burke, Lathers 142, Waltham; Michael Flaherty, Norwood Local 138; Bennie Costa, Teamsters 526, Fall River; Joseph Camara, Gil. Mello, and Carl Torres, Teamsters 59, New Bedford; James M. Murphy, Local 100 P. O. Clerks; Charles J. Murphy, Local 379; Ernest Tonpianie, Local 59, New Bedford; Daniel Collins, Norwood CLU; Martin D. Kelley, P. O. Clerks 100; Walyer Aircheson, Bakers 20, Boston; Timothy H. O'Neil and Patrick J. Lawton, Local 477; Joseph A. DeVincentis, Local 116, Cambridge; John J. McNamara, Firemen 2, Boston; Joseph P. McNamara; Merman Koster, Local 14, Lowell; Julia E. Daley, Mary E. Martin, John W. Davies, Michael J. Norton, and Thomas F. Tighe, Local 25, Boston; Joseph P. Suttin, Meat Cutters 294, Quincy; George Stack, Local 1291, Boston; Helen T. O'Donnell, Patrick Coleman, and Roy DeCoste, Local 711, Boston; Francis M. Curran, Local 4, Holyoke; Daniel J. Goggin, Local 138, Boston; Edward F. Jenkins, Local 25, Boston; Francis E. Lavinge, Local 653, Brockton; John E. Hamilton and John J. Greeley, Local 829, Teamsters.)

The Potato Industry in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by interested groups in the State of Maine, representing the Maine Department of Agriculture, the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, the Maine Extension Service, the Potato

Industry Council of Maine, Inc., the Aroostook County Farm Bureau, and the Aroostook County Bankers' Association, relative to the potato industry of Maine.

Mr. President, this is the result of very widespread misrepresentations which have been made regarding the situation. It did not seem wise to precipitate discussion of it during the pendency of the farm legislation since it was entirely a red herring across the trail, but now that that has been disposed of so far as the Senate is concerned, it seems only just that there should be in the RECORD and before the people of the country, available in this concise form, a statement of the potato industry of Maine and the potato growers of Maine—a statement which does justice to the enormous contribution they have made to the feeding of the people of the United States and of other lands.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT OF FACT RELATIVE TO THE POTATO INDUSTRY IN MAINE

(Submitted by the Maine Department of Agriculture, the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, the Maine Extension Service, the Potato Industry Council of Maine, Inc., the Aroostook County Farm Bureau, the Aroostook County Bankers Association)

AN INDUSTRY COMPOSED OF THOUSANDS OF SMALL UNITS

Contrary to impressions created in the several articles which have recently appeared in the national press, the Maine potato industry is composed almost exclusively of numerous small growers. In 1948, the commercial acreage was produced on 5,074 individual farms of which number, 79 percent were farms growing 50 acres of potatoes or less, 16.8 percent were farms growing 51 to 100 acres, and only 4.2 percent were farms producing over 100 acres. In addition there were approximately 3,000 noncommercial farms in the State that produced 3 acres of potatoes or less.

These farms are farmer-owned and operated with 95 percent of the growers actually living on the farms and owning the equipment which they operate.

This, therefore, indicates that the Maine potato industry is based on a multiple, small, family-unit farm operation as contrasted to large corporate combines characteristic of production patterns for other commodities. This situation in Maine represents an agricultural economy advocated by economists as being the most ideal for the general welfare of the Nation.

Each of these farms is a separate business entity; each with its own problems of production and marketing dependent upon the judgment and ability of the farmer-manager. Each farm must carry its own fixed investment charges relating to machinery and equipment, buildings, taxes, insurance, and other miscellaneous operational expenses. In 1948, machinery and building depreciation and replacement alone amounted to $25 per acre or $1,250,000 for each farm producing 50 acres of potatoes.

AN INDUSTRY INVOLVING HEAVY RISKS AND TREMENDOUS ANNUAL INVESTMENTS

The inherent risk and tremendous cost connected with potato production can never be overemphasized. The per-acre investment in Maine for 1948 amounted to approximately $386 from the initial operations in the spring up to and including grading prior to bagging and loading. The following breakdown shows each of the respective cost of production contributing to this per-acre investment figure:

Fertilizer	$60.00
Seed	50.00
Dusting or spray materials	15.00
Gasoline, oil, and grease	13.50
Labor (including harvest)	125.00
Insurance on buildings and equipment (including storage)	15.00
Telephone and lights	2.00
Taxes (real estate)	18.00
Fuel for warehouses	1.50
Service fees (certification, PMA, etc.)	2.00
Liming essential to potato production	1.00
Repairs	20.00
Depreciation on buildings and equipment	25.00
Grass seed and/or other expenses rotation land	8.00
Interest charges	25.00
Supplies and miscellaneous	5.00
Total	386.00

AN INDUSTRY WHICH ANNUALLY CONSUMES IN EXCESS OF $24,000,000 WORTH OF GOODS AND SERVICES OBTAINED FROM OTHER INDUSTRIES

Based on Maine's 1948 commercial acreage of 182,928 acres, it is immediately apparent that this one industry required in this 1 year in excess of $24,000,000 worth of machinery, chemicals, and other goods procurable only from the industrial segment of the national economy. Nor does this staggering procurement commitment take into consideration the labor, distribution—including transportation—taxes, insurance, interest, and marketing service charges required for ultimate delivery of the crop to the consumer's table.

AN INDUSTRY IN WHICH THE PRODUCER RECEIVES ONLY A REASONABLE RETURN FOR HIS EFFORTS AND INVESTMENTS

Many consumers have the idea that they were forced to pay exorbitant prices for potatoes last year. At least as far as farmer returns go and after considering the above production costs the facts do not show that to be the case.

It is true that prices last year were high by comparison with most years. The grower did do better than usual, but his "usual" isn't very hot.

According to the best estimates available the average Maine farmer cleared somewhere around 30 cents a bushel (60 pounds) last year in addition to hired hand wages for himself for the days he worked. Last year was one of the good years. Many years he has gotten only part wages. Some years he worked the whole year for nothing or mortgaged the farm to pay up the losses. That's when potatoes were "cheap."

To the consumer it means this. When she bought a 10-pound bag of Maine potatoes last winter the grower netted about 5 cents on them. That's what he got for management and risk and to offset the losses in the bad years. Potato growers in Maine are among the most skilled and efficient in the country. Only by using the very latest in scientific methods and working from dawn to dark through the rush seasons did the grower succeed in clearing that 5 cents.

Different consumers paid different prices for these 10-pound bags, anywhere from 39 to 69 or 70 cents. The grower got in total about 24 cents out of it. Five cents of that was net. The rest went to the people who packaged, transported, wholesaled, and retailed the potatoes. It was out of that 24 cents that around 5 cents was net. And that is after giving full credit for all he got in the way of Government payments.

If potatoes had sold cheap enough so that the farmer cleared nothing the average consumer would have saved 50 or 60 cents on his year's food bill and, in fact, if the potatoes were given away at the farm, the consumer would still have to pay from 15 to 45 cents per 10 pound bag to cover the costs of distribution alone.

If the major agricultural economy in Maine is dependent upon the stability of this one crop, the standard of living of the producers thus engaged is directly proportionate to that stability and so, also, the standards of living of those elements of society which supply the goods and services required by the potato growers.

AN INDUSTRY WHICH IS CONTINUALLY SEEKING INCREASED EFFICIENCY THROUGH RESEARCH

We believe that Maine, after having established itself early in the twentieth century as a major producer of Irish potatoes, has been a leader in soil-conservation practices, production efficiency, and marketing improvements.

Through the continuing endeavors of the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the Federal Government, Maine farmers have increased their average per acre yields from 260 bushels in 1913 to 278 bushels during 1936–45 and finally to 380 bushels for 1948. This record of consistent improvement in production methods places Maine as the foremost potato producing area in the country (15 percent of the total United States production). Other areas have certainly not been reluctant to adopt these measures of efficiency and know-how arising from Yankee intelligence and ingenuity.

Aroostook County, the principal potato production area in Maine, was one of the initial areas in the country in which the Soil Conservation Service (erosion) operated. Since the original establishment of this service in 1936, its work in Aroostook County has expanded tenfold. Contour cultivation, diversion ditches, terraces, waterways, strip cropping, and other erosion control features are now readily accepted by the majority of all Aroostook growers.

AN INDUSTRY WHICH HAS WILLINGLY COMPLIED WITH ALL REQUESTS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Later the inauguration of production controls met the same acceptance as did intelligent soil building rotations, land care, fertility, and seed selections. The following table shows goal and planted acreage for Maine potatoes:

Year	Commercial potato acreage goals	Commercial potato planted acreage	Percent planted acreage is of allotment or goals
	Acres	*Acres*	
1938	144,390.8	143,839	99.6
1939	144,625.0	140,434	97.1
1940	144,404.4	144,520	100.1
1941	143,718.6	139,552	97.1
1942	145,109.3	144,104	99.3

The above figures indicate very clearly our willingness and intentions to comply with Federal requests. The fact that during this same period we increased our efficiency as is reflected in our increased yield per acre will only work to the best interests of the public in the long run but any corrective action to bring production in line with demand should be in keeping with sound economics.

When this country was plunged into World War II, the Maine potato industry answered the challenge by producing its increased share demanded by the war effort as is evidenced by the following:

Commercial potato planted acreage

	Acres
1941	139,552
1942	144,104
1943	195,215
1944	195,908
1945	210,606

To further point up the extent of this achievement it must not be overlooked that during these war years 35 percent of the peacetime farm labor force in Aroostook County migrated either to war industries or

to military service and was thus lost to agriculture.

Despite this and in spite of a shortage of machinery and an inability to replace worn out equipment the job was done.

What seems to escape the thinking of many Americans is that food was as important to the war program as tanks, planes, and guns. Food went into action just as did these tanks, planes and guns and just as with these same items turned up in surplus after the shooting stopped.

For this we should be thankful.

AN INDUSTRY WHICH WAS THE FIRST TO SEEK READJUSTMENT FROM WARTIME CONDITIONS

During the reconversion period following the war, potatoes, among other commodities, were under the so-called Steagall amendment, supported at 90 percent of parity for 2 years subsequent to the war's end as a means of enabling an orderly return and adjustment to the supply and demand requirements of a peacetime economy. Naturally the provisions of this legislation were required to protect producers of farm products from surpluses created as a result of the early and fortunate climax of the war. By reason of the production and distribution pattern of the national potato crop, the surplus for the Eastern States has been pushed back onto Maine with the result that Government-support commitments in that State were more pronounced. The cost of this operation is properly chargeable to wartime expedients, the aggregate expense of which ultimately defines the supreme waste incident to wars.

The potato industry in Maine has since 1937 levied upon itself a tax of 1 cent per barrel in order to secure funds to carry out advertising and research studies.

More recently, Maine imposed upon itself a marketing agreement and order as a further means of strengthening its position on the market place. This feature of our marketing practices assures the commercial movement of only the better portion of the State crop.

The potato industry on a national level, under its own initiative and leadership, was the first and today remains the only commodity group which has requested of Congress that wartime support legislation be adjusted to meet the needs of the times.

Our Maine potato industry recognized that support levels at least for potatoes should be reduced to a level only sufficient to provide insurance against disastrous losses and that production should be adjusted to demand. This same concept was endorsed by other potato producing areas and as a result, Congress passed in June 1948 the Agricultural Act of 1948 which with respect to potatoes, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to support potatoes at 60 to 90 percent of parity and to further limit acreage in strict conformance with estimated demand.

Insofar as the State of Maine is concerned, this has resulted in the reduction of potato acreage to below the prewar figures with the same high degree of compliance being maintained.

Year	Commercial potato acreage goals	Commercial potato planted acreage	Percent planted acreage is of allotment or goals
	Acres	*Acres*	
1938	144,300.8	143,839.0	99.6
1939	144,625.0	140,434.0	97.1
1940	144,404.4	144,520.0	100.1
1941	143,718.6	139,552.0	97.1
1942	145,109.3	144,104.0	99.3
1943	179,084.5	195,215.0	109.0
1944	[1] 200,000.0	195,908.0	98.0
1945	[1] 200,000.0	210,606.0	105.3
1946	[1] 184,000.0	220,879.0	120.0
1947	182,594.3	173,307.2	94.9
1948	182,594.3	182,928.4	100.2
1949	141,300.0	----------	[2] 98.2

[1] Suggested.
[2] Estimated.

This same bill, in furtherance of the public interest, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to support potatoes in certain areas only if those areas operate under marketing agreements. By insisting that marketing agreements be used wherever feasible, Congress has assured the public that only the better portion of the crop will enter the commercial market.

The limitations and provisions imposed by the Agricultural Act of 1948 are exactly the same as those suggested to Congress by the potato industry and these same salient features have been repeatedly reiterated upon the several occasions that industry representatives have appeared before congressional committees considering new legislation for potatoes.

The 1949 crop is the first to be planted and harvested under this new legislation. Preliminary figures indicate that the cost of supporting this crop will be far less than that of prior years.

AN INDUSTRY WHICH SEEKS ONLY DISASTER INSURANCE WITH PROFITS TO BE OBTAINED BY INDIVIDUAL EFFORT AND INITIATIVE

Certain elements in the press would imply that it is a crime for a farmer to make any money or to enjoy any of the luxuries of today. To their way of thinking, the farming element of our society should be considered as peasants to be denied the privileges of the automobile, the telephone, electric power, and advanced education.

We believe that a stabilized and reasonably prosperous agriculture is a primary prerequisite for a healthy national economy. History will show that all major depressions started at the farm level. The support program for potatoes, under existing legislation, is in the nature of fire insurance on the grower's investment. The 1949 support level of 60 percent parity certainly does not insure a profit; in fact, only the most efficient operations would break even with the market at support levels.

In Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "In Defense of America," written by Walter Winchell and published in Coronet magazine for October 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF AMERICA

(By Walter Winchell)

History records that Ben Franklin landed in Philadelphia nearly two-and-a half centuries ago and walked up the street with a loaf of bread under each arm. He used the next 67 years of his life proving that at the very same time he also carried a printing press in his heart.

Having no congressional appropriations at his disposal, Ben's sole assets were that he knew what he wanted and he was willing to work to get it. He had an early grasp of fundamentals; he discovered that a wheel with two handles on it—a wheelbarrow—could be used by an editor for delivering his circulation to his readers.

It was American of Ben Franklin to rely on himself—to do the job himself and devise a better way to do it—by which everybody profited. But it has also become very American, unfortunately, to take the whole thing for granted.

Not only this country, but this civilization, was built by men who, in relying on themselves, found a better way for the world. Mathematically, that seems to prove that the only people the world can really rely on—are the people who rely on themselves.

There is no liberal advance in the last 30 years that this reporter hasn't supported. But his whole experience is that, in the showdown, the acts of a man himself will help him far more than any acts of Congress.

I favor a housing bill, but I also know there was a terrible housing shortage when Lincoln was born because the cabin had only three sides. There were no shower baths in the prairie schooners, either. But the pioneers faced the West with a child on one shoulder and their rifles on the other. Far more than the history of their accomplishments is the tradition by which they accomplished it.

It was an American custom in those days to regard every handicap as a personal challenge. If they hadn't accepted it as a personal challenge, Kentucky, for instance, would still be in the "Barrens"—instead of the land of the bluegrass thoroughbreds.

It seems to me that in cataloging how much the Nation lacks, it is about time we register how much we take for granted. For instance, if Charles Goodyear hadn't gone broke a half-dozen times, there wouldn't be any tires on cars—because we wouldn't have vulcanized rubber. If John Ericson hadn't backed his fantastic ideas with his last few pennies, ships would still be using paddle wheels instead of propellers.

If Orville and Wilbur Wright hadn't backed an idea (which had failed for 5,000 years), the continent wouldn't be crossed in a night by air lines. We may owe only a nickel to the telephone company when we pick up a phone, but this civilization can't begin to measure its debts to Alexander Graham Bell.

Everybody knows that care should be provided for the aged. Social security, after a man or woman has worked a lifetime, is an obligation on the conscience of the Nation. But as Mr. Justice Holmes pointed out, this is hardly a new discovery, having been written in the Ten Commandments under the simple title of "honor thy father and thy mother."

However, when our cousins in London manage to distill a slogan of "security from the cradle to the grave," it is reversing the process. It would have been pretty unattractive in the early days of this Nation. The British Labor Party would have trailed a bad last in any early American election, because the young and vigorous Republic had a simple slogan which everybody believed. It was as crisp as New England bacon—but as nourishing as Pennsylvania buckwheat. The Colonials simply said: "Beaten paths are for beaten men."

The first great miracle of civilization is that, like the human body, it not only works, it grows—and much faster than people realize. Thus, in 1945, Henry Wallace produced a best-seller by promising a millennium—called Sixty Million Jobs. By 1948, the capitalistic system which he criticizes so bitterly had 63,000,000 people at work in industries, many of which didn't exist a century ago and which no man living then could have predicted. It should produce some humility in legislators to recognize that they do not produce the civilization they purport to regulate.

Certainly the legislators should prevent people from speeding 70 miles an hour—but school children should also be taught that it is individuals like Henry Ford and his Model T who put America on wheels—and

that hundreds of thousands of workers turn out of bed every morning at 7 a. m. in Detroit to keep them rolling.

It is necessary that a 10-man Interstate Commerce Commission regulate railroads, but every school child should also know that, as the Super Chief roars through the night, the work and skill of thousands of highly trained men and women are riding in the cab with the engineer, and that the click of the rails under his throttle is the strong pulse beat of 5,000 years of civilization.

The demagogues of every age, the Huey Longs, always make their bid for power on the same theme—"Every Man a King." But the average man today wouldn't accept the living standards of the kings of only a century ago, if for no other reason than modern plumbing. How much do you suppose Louis XIV would have given for 1 ounce of penicillin? Henry VIII would have given half of England for the services of one modern dentist.

What do you think modern anesthesia would have been worth to Napoleon in his hours of physical agony? Think of the long and hard journeys on horseback Washington and Jefferson would have been saved if there had been a long-distance telephone between Mount Vernon and Monticello. And what Patrick Henry wouldn't have given for only 15 minutes on a microphone.

A true perspective of the industrial revolution is possible now. Great inventions have done far more than elevate the standard of living. They have opened up vast new fields of service, innovations, and improvement. For example, it has been estimated that the American economy of 1835 required eight men working on farms to support every two living in the city. But the threshing machine changed all that. Now, two men with the proper machinery can support eight men working in the factories. And those factories turn out the motorcars, the radios, the magazines and newspapers—and the machinery—which create the better modern life for all of them.

A young man today has a thousand opportunities for every one which existed in 1776. The new, complex civilization is pleading for genius to improve it and for millions of skilled people to run it.

To approach life with the philosophy that there is nothing new under the sun, that the greatest discoveries have been made, does more than deny the fundamental tradition of the American Republic. It denies every human being who believes in his chief romance—that of his own life.

In the lifetime of middle-aged people now living, they have seen the world transformed three times—and each of these changes changed the world more than anything which occurred in the last four thousand. The automobile gave each family a daily radius 10 times that of an emperor of only 100 years ago. The radio enabled his mind to circumnavigate the globe at the rate of 186,300 miles a second. The flying machine enabled him to measure latitude by the second hand on his wrist watch.

If twentieth-century man is in a quandary, it is because he cannot fit his broader soul into the old, familiar narrow niches. But he need not go questing for "something in which to believe." From the hoot of the Diesel in the night to the music of his radio, the twentieth century answers that question for him. The answer is: "Man—believe in yourself."

The early American colonists were more right than even they knew in relying on individual effort. The great milestones of human progress are not in the names of emperors, kings, congresses, parliaments or battles; they are the names of individual men. Anthony Van Leeuwenhock, a Dutchman, bent a piece of glass in 1677 and his microscope discovered the world of germs, which is why you are going to live 40 years longer than his generation; Copernicus, a Pole, discovered in 1530 that the earth revolved around the sun and the whole heavens fell into place.

William Harvey, an Englishman, discovered in 1628 that the blood circulates, and hundreds of millions of people, yet unborn, were liberated from beds of pain; James Watt, a Scot, in 1765, invented the steam engine and the world leaped ahead 2,000 years in 24 hours; Eli Whitney, an American, invented the cotton gin in 1794 and the world was able to afford a cotton shirt for its back; Thomas Jefferson made both physical and financial sacrifices to write the Declaration of Independence. He was poor in his old age because this very uncommon man had spent much of his time in giving common men a Bill of Rights.

Beyond our wildest dreams, the twenty-first will be the century of the common man, not because the Henry Wallaces promise it but because some very uncommon men are going to discover, invent, and produce it.

Right now, in the great laboratories and tiny attics of this country, a greater civilization is incubating. It will come in the form of successful challenges to previously accepted truths. The great Kettering has been trying to answer the child's question, "Why are the leaves green?" That opens the new world of chlorophyl, and when that magic formula is solved, the great tropical jungles, which we now call the green hell, may well become the green heaven, a source of miracles employing the stored power of the sun.

Out on lonely mountains, scientists are studying the Aurora Borealis. When the great Northern Lights send their flares to the zenith, a vast network of telephone communication instantly opens. As intently as if they were plotting an enemy air fleet winging toward our cities, the scientists mark every flicker in the sky. Why? Because they are interested in knowing.

And what good is that? When Prof. Michael Faraday was working on the storage battery, one of his students asked him what were its possibilities. "I don't know," shrugged Faraday—and added prophetically: "What are the possibilities of a newborn babe?"

The lights on Broadway and the submarine beneath the surface are variations of Faraday's babe. Who knows but that the Aurora Borealis may be harnessed one day as the great Niagara of the sky? The twentieth century has proven that there's more than a sermon in a stone; there's a world of power in an atom!

Scientists operate on a basis of cause and effect. If we consider the whole world as a laboratory, and a hundred years as an hour, the American system emerges as more than a mere philosophy. The fact is that, over the years, wherever and whenever private property and free enterprise have disappeared, the freedom of men and their minds has disappeared with it.

It follows, therefore, that free enterprise, at minimum, is the guarantee of the continuance of free speech, a free press and free assembly. At maximum, it can be argued that free enterprise is the cause of them.

Practically, the experiment to prove this is too dangerous to perform. We can never yield our free enterprise in the hope that freemen will still exist—because then the world could enter the second Dark Ages. In fact, our system works so well that the totalitarians must erect an iron curtain—not to keep us out, but to keep their poor serfs from seeing how well it works.

In the vernacular, the common-sense approach sometimes cuts through whole bales of learned manuscript. Some years ago, a prominent labor leader stood before the desk of the President of the United States. "I'm for free enterprise," he said, "because outside of government, that is the only place a man can find a job."

Ralph Waldo Emerson, our great American philosopher, advised young people "to hitch your wagon to a star—to hang right on—and there you are." This reporter, also an optimist, can't help but add that modern telescopes have discovered that there are more stars than people—more than enough to go around.

Horace Greeley may have had to do some thinking in order to say in the nineteenth century "Go west, young man, go west." But opportunity has increased so much since then that it's even easier to be a sage today. The soundest advice in the twentieth century is simply this: "Go on, young man, go on."

Rocky Mountain National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a news item in my own home-town paper, the Fort Collins Coloradoan is quite interesting. The Rocky Mountain National Park has had its most successful year; as the news item states, more than a million people visited the park during the tourist season in 1949, which was 10 percent over the number visiting it in 1948.

When more than 400,000 people visit a national park in 1 month, the importance of properly supporting the upkeep of such vacational areas is beyond question, and I might add in closing, this is only the beginning.

The news item is as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SETS RECORD FOR TRAVEL

ESTES PARK.—Setting a new all-time record, 1,138,162 persons visited Rocky Mountain National Park during the 1949 tourist season, Park Superintendent David H. Canfield reported today. This was an increase of 10.2 percent over the 1948 travel year total.

The visitors, he added, arrived in 314,841 automobiles and came from all the 48 States, four possessions, and 29 foreign countries. Travel from Colorado represented 29 percent of the total.

August had a travel record of 403,528 persons, with August 7 setting the 1-day record for the park with 19,718 persons entering.

Water, Resources, Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 28, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the Western States Democratic Conference held at San Francisco on September 18 and 19 was entitled "Land, Water, and Jobs." As a member of the panel on water and power, I wish to include my remarks for the RECORD, as follows:

I am very glad that the emphasis of this conference is falling on the question "What do we do, now and tomorrow?" Because that is exactly the question that I, as a Member

of the House of Representatives, find myself confronted with at the end of every day, and at the beginning of the next.

We vote on questions in the House every day; what we say is, "we decide them." But one thing I have learned in Congress is that we very seldom decide a question finally by voting on it once. If one final vote could have decided whether and how to develop western water resources, we wouldn't need to be here today. We are not the first westerners to see the need for Federal help to develop our waters, to create homes and a livelihood for families on the land, to develop power to create jobs, to guard against private monopoly and speculation in the benefits of public water and public power.

Fifty years ago our predecessors saw these things clearly, and were holding citizens' congresses every year to talk western water—resources—jobs. After more than a decade of those annual congresses they finally persuaded the National Congress to pass the Reclamation Act of 1902, to give them what they wanted. That was one decision, and a grand one; that law is still a very good law. But a good law not followed up with appropriations of the right kind and amount is not enough to do the job.

Here in California we fought through a whole series of decisions in the State legislature trying to get our Central Valley waters developed. That was in the 1920's. People were telling each other then just what Oscar Chapman told the California State Federation of Labor the other day: "You can have high-cost and insufficient power which means cheap muscle; or you can have low-cost and plentiful power which means employment and high wages. That is the meaning of Central Valley development in a few words." So in 1933 the people of California voted at a special election that they wanted public water and power development, and no monopoly. That was another decision.

Here we meet again, just as the National Irrigation Congresses used to meet in the 1890's, and just as the citizens of California used to congregate before they went to the polls in 1933. What we are trying to do here is to validate, to implement, to carry forward to completion the great enterprise of western water development that our predecessors started—that the National Congress wrote into reclamation law in 1902—and that the people of California declared they wanted for Central Valley in 1933.

So the question, "What do we do, now and tomorrow?" is the right one. In the next couple minutes I want to offer specific suggestions on what some of the answers ought to be.

1. We want this session of Congress to appropriate for a steam plant and for power transmission lines in Central Valley. I have in my hand the text of the decision of the people of California in 1933, saying in so many words that is what they wanted. The present House of Representatives has already passed a bill containing those appropriations. For some reason or other the other body left them out (with about one exception) and nobody even introduced an amendment or made a fight on the floor to put them in. Fortunately the distinguished chairman of the House conferees on this bill, who is participating with us in this conference, is a stanch friend of western reclamation. You can tell him now that you want him to stand firm for the bill the way the House wrote it, and against the weak measure that was allowed to come through the other body.

2. The basin-wide plan for reclamation of Central Valley, as you know, has just gone to Congress with the consent of President Truman. So has the report of the Commission of Reorganization headed by ex-President Hoover. This matter of reclaiming the waters of the West is not political. Both President Truman and ex-President Hoover agree that water development must be unified; there should be only one agency, not two. Therefore,

3. We can ask Congress to move toward defeat of the special interests that work so tirelessly to defeat reclamation, by acting promptly on Congressman CECIL WHITE'S bill to unify all reclamation work within the Department of the Interior.

4. We can ask Congress to place all responsibility for Central Valley reclamation in the sole hands of the Bureau of Reclamation.

5. We can ask the present Senate why it neglects to act on the Engle-Miller bill that the House passed long ago, to unify reclamation on the American River and integrate it with the Central Valley project.

6. We can ask that the persistent attempt to nibble away at the vitals of the antimonopoly provisions of reclamation law be struck down every time they are made, and that Members of Congress recognize for what they are the repetitious harassments of reclamation officials for their determination to enforce those antimonopoly protections.

7. We can ask Congress to make it possible for qualified veterans and other citizens to make their homes and livelihood on the land at an early date, by authorizing the Government to purchase holdings of excess lands under reclamation law, as was done in Columbia Basin.

I remember in March 1948 when the electric clocks in the factories, offices, homes, and even on the billboards of California began to run slower, when the State adopted daylight-saving time to save power; when the San Francisco newspapers carried the banner headline: "AFL raps power set-up"; when the State department of industrial relations reported that because of power shortage the average weekly earnings of 5,000 workers around this bay dropped from $62.04 in February to $53.17 in March; when power—which we may not be able to spare next time—had to be sent into the Central Valley from southern California; when the farmers had their irrigation stopped because the power companies pulled the switches. I remember distinctly, and so do many of you.

The answer we make to the question, "What do we do, now and tomorrow?" will tell whether we have man-made emergencies like that again. They will tell whether we are going to bring to completion the grand enterprises for the West that the people started by their decisions in 1902 and 1933.

Address by Hon. Edward Foley, Under Secretary of the Treasury

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Under Secretary of the Treasury Edward H. Foley, Jr., before the tax section of the New York State Bar Association, Hotel Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y., Saturday, October 8, 1949:

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Today is a most happy one for me. My appearance this afternoon at the first meeting of the newly organized tax section of the New York State Bar Association affords me an opportunity to combine two very pleasant experiences.

First of all, it enables me to resume my contracts with the members of this association in which I have had the privilege of being a member for almost 20 years. And secondly, it brings me back home to Syracuse where I was born and lived for almost half my life—an occasion to which I have looked ahead for some time with keen anticipation.

I am delighted to be here this afternoon in the company of my old friend and associate, George Schoeneman, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and have this chance to talk to you briefly about the business situation.

Now you may wonder why I am talking on this subject to a group of lawyers who in the main, I realize, are primarily interested in Federal tax questions. I am doing so with the knowledge that all tax problems are directly affected by the strength or weakness of our basic economy and with the hope that you as lawyers might be interested in hearing what we in the Treasury envisage in this field for the immediate foreseeable future.

The business trends of the past several months, as revealed by the financial statistics compiled just prior to the inception of the coal and steel strikes—have shown unmistakable evidences of the basically strong economic situation that is being maintained today throughout the country.

The best proof of this is seen in the personal income figures, as estimated by the Department of Commerce, which cover all incomes received by individuals from all sources. I think it is worth while to point out in this connection that during the first 7 months of this year, a period which some have characterized as a "business recession," the level of personal income for the Nation as a whole was higher this year than during the comparable period last year.

Most encouraging is the high level of retail sales. Sales figures usually indicate how rapidly people are taking goods off the market; and this, in the end, should determine how high a production level we may expect to maintain.

Total retail sales, according to Department of Commerce figures, have been maintained at a very high level. Sales in August were only 3 percent below those in the same month last year.

But the dollar totals do not tell the whole story. While average retail prices in August were slightly below last year's prices, the real physical volume of goods moving off retailers' shelves and out of dealers' showrooms has actually been running higher than last year.

This is a significant fact to keep in mind. It means that consumers have shown no intention of curtailing their over-all spending. Although they are spending a little less this year for clothing and other items, they are actually spending more for automobiles.

A strong bulwark for this high level of retail sales has been the record volume of savings in the hands of consumers. The total liquid assets of individuals remain at $200,000,000,000, the highest level on record. People now hold $22,000,000,000 in currency. These holdings, however, have been reduced by $2,000,000,000 since December 1946. They hold $41,000,000,000 in demand deposits, which are down $3,000,000,000 since December 1947. Savings accounts of individuals, on the other hand, have risen to a new record level of $68,000,000,000; and holdings of Federal securities have been increased to $69,000,000,000.

This huge volume of liquid savings constitutes a backlog of stored-up purchasing power. In the months ahead, the possession of adequate savings will continue to encourage liberal buying from current income.

Other factors of basic strength have also helped keep the business readjustment within a limited area. Notably absent from the present picture has been the forced liquidation of goods and commodities from speculative accounts and business inventories.

which was largely responsible for the price decline after the First World War.

The 1920 decline was the aftermath of a widespread speculative boom, financed by an overextension of credit. When credit became tight and collateral became impaired successive waves of forced liquidation caused a typical deflationary spiral. Public confidence was shaken by severe weakness in prices of Government bonds. You may remember that in 1920 long-term Governments declined to around 80. I shudder to think what might have happened if a similar decline had taken place this time.

Today the financial situation is one of unparalleled strength. Interest rates are low, and bank credit is readily available. Public confidence in the strength of our banking system could scarcely be greater. Above all, the financial soundness of the United States Government—which is today the fulcrum of world stability and world peace—is beyond question.

The business readjustment after World War II has been gradual and orderly. During the postwar period there has been neither excessive credit expansion nor excessive speculation.

Businessmen generally have been unusually cautious in their inventory policies, having in mind the possibility of inventory losses if prices should decline as they did after the First World War. Stocks of goods have remained at moderate levels in relation to sales. There has been no liquidation of goods to pay off bank loans except on a purely voluntary basis. In short, the current business situation is incomparably stronger and on an infinitely sounder foundation than that after the First World War.

There has been some inventory readjustment, as you are well aware, which has been under way since the latter part of 1948. But this readjustment has been associated with the return to normal competitive conditions and normal buyers' markets. It has been an effective protection against an overextended economy and a consequent business recession. To a large extent, it explains why the economy today holds so firmly against deflationary tendencies.

Ever since the war ended, it was recognized that the shortages of consumer goods which created the sellers' markets of the early postwar years could not continue indefinitely. Eventually it was necessary to get back to normal competitive conditions, and to the normal buyers' markets under which this country in the past has grown and prospered.

This return to a more normal competitive economy has actually been going on since the very close of the war. Some luxury industries were affected in 1946. Machine tools, auto tires, radios, and others followed in 1947. Textiles, shoes, auto trucks, furniture, household equipment, and various other industries started their adjustment in the spring of 1948. Others, such as rayon and crude petroleum, first began to experience buyers' markets only a few months ago. By this time, many of the adjustments have practically been completed; and, in a number of industries, significant upturns in activity have occurred just recently. These have been sufficient to raise the Federal Reserve Board index of production to 170 in August from 162 in July. Further improvement has occurred in September. This has strengthened the employment picture.

It is clear that, with consumer incomes continuing at close to record levels and with large untapped resources of purchasing power in the hands of business firms as well as individuals, adjustments since the war have not proved severe.

With conditions of plenty returning, of course, business must satisfy the customer, and business is prepared to do that.

In the 4 years since VJ-day, businessmen in this country have spent the tremendous sum of $85,000,000,000 in construction and modernization of plants and for new equipment.

With these huge outlays for capital purposes, our businessmen are showing their determination to make use of recent discoveries and improved techniques to increase the efficiency of their plant operations, better their products, and broaden their markets.

As you know, the recent war compressed many decades of experimentation and research into a few brief years. The development of atomic fission and its possibilities in our future is, of course, the one outstanding development which immediately comes to mind.

But it is less often realized that other phases of physical research—notably, those generally summed up in the term "electronics"—have already found their way into many aspects of our daily lives. They are of vital importance today in industry, aviation, navigation, communication, and a great number of trade and household operations.

In the metal industry, for example, electronics has made it possible to pick out flaws in metal sheets as they are passing through the rolling mill. At another stage, the heat of molten metals is precisely controlled by the aid of an electronic device which records the amount of light given off during the process of melting.

Induction heating and new developments in resistance welding are other examples of basic uses which have been found for electronic techniques. Most of us have only recently read of experiments with electronic cooking, in which an entire meal is cooked in a few seconds. But the aluminum industry has already made use of similar techniques to produce a white heat in a fraction of a second on a tiny spot of metal. Under the old methods, metals like aluminum melted down instead of welding. Now, electronic welding operates in a series of sharp thrusts, up to 2,000 a second, to stitch the pieces together, while the metal a few inches away from the stitches remains cool. It is hardly necessary to add that a single discovery, such as this one, opens up a whole new field of usage for the entire light-metals industry.

The field of electronic vibration studies, likewise, indicates that we will be able in time to build much less cumbersome factories, apartment buildings, industrial machinery, and automobiles. This is because electronics has made it possible to make precise calculations of capacity loads and to measure the fatigue of metals with exactness—both beforehand, on an experimental basis, and during the time the finished product is in operation. The result is that the number of allowances which must always be made for unknowns is enormously reduced, and efficiency in use of materials and in operation is correspondingly increased.

I have been taking you rather far afield in order to emphasize some of the really spectacular developments behind the figures on investment in plant and equipment which I cited earlier. But many products which have become commonplace in our daily lives—for example, neon lights, long-distance telephones, radio, and television—are also at their present stage of development as a result of scientific research in the field of electronics.

Television is particularly noteworthy because it is a striking instance of a new product which has been brought forward—and already vastly improved—in response to a shift in consumer demand. Early in 1946, you will all recall, the demand for old-model radios was so great that people were taking them as fast as they could be turned out. There was no incentive to make improvements. But the radio industry was one of the first to experience a buyers' market—and when that happened, the research of many years was drawn on to develop television on a commercial basis. Already, mass production and the more efficient use of materials and labor have made it possible for the industry to broaden its potential market by offering the consumer an improved product.

Since the war, business conservatism—based on a hard-headed view of the near-term outlook—has gone hand in hand with an $85,000,000,000 investment in the future. Our industrial plant is the most efficient in the world; and our businessmen are still eagerly searching out every means of modernizing operations and improving products.

We do not know exactly what forms these new developments will take in the years ahead; but we can be sure that new industries will appear which will be as important in our future economic development as our great industrial enterprises are at present.

Despite the high level of investment and the record outflow of consumer goods during the postwar period, however, important sectors of the economy are still suffering from a failure of output to catch up with accumulated demand. Residential construction is an instance in point. In the last 3 years, 1946 through 1948, about 6,000,000 families bought or built houses for their own use. New housing starts so far this year amount to another 647,000, close to last year's record total for like months. Yet there still remains an enormous unsatisfied demand for housing. Contract awards in the first 3 weeks of September for new residential construction were 68 percent higher than in the same period last year.

The need for more housing, however, is only one part of the construction picture. Total construction contract awards in the first 3 weeks of September were 37 percent higher than last year. We have about 18,000,000 more people in this country than we had before the war; and, in addition, many millions of our citizens have moved to new sections of the country. It is clear that we have hardly made a start on postwar improvements and additions to our schools, hospitals, public institutions, municipal-service plants, shopping centers, and highway systems—to mention only a few areas in which the need for additional facilities is most urgent.

It is estimated that public hospital construction alone this year will run to a record total of almost half a billion dollars—roughly six times the yearly average in the 1930's. Our highway expenditures are totaling several billions. Yet it is evident from the scope of plans already prepared that we have barely scratched the surface of our need for improved hospital facilities and for better roads.

I have taken you a little distance away from the day-to-day occurrences in the business world and have tried to emphasize, instead, the basic foundations of our present strength. That strength emphasizes our confidence in the future of America.

Confidence in the future has been the heritage of each generation of Americans. As the pioneers moved westward, it gave the new communities the courage to take root, to build homes and schools and churches which were shaped to the needs of a growing population.

More than that—it provided an environment in which American inventive genius could flourish. Our young people grew up, generation after generation, in an atmosphere of individual opportunity unknown in any other country in the world. The result was that not only our technicians, but our business planners, managers, and workers were constantly alert for new materials, new products, new and better ways of doing things. As a young, growing country, we believed in abundance in planning for a larger future; we had no faith in scarcities. And our belief was justified. Older industries and older ways of doing things disappeared; and in their place, millions of new jobs

opened up. At the same time, productivity—the true source of our high American standard of living—constantly increased.

Now, we are faced with a new challenge. Our important position in international affairs has brought with it problems of a new nature.

These, also, we are meeting with the will to find a solution which has characterized our domestic and foreign policies since the founding of this Nation.

Large areas of the world are still confronted with shortages of essential goods—the result, in part, of war destruction. They are making great efforts to repair the damages of the war. They are trying to achieve an economy of plenty. We have already reached that goal and we have reached it, moreover, without serious dislocation of industry and trade. We do not need to read the future in order to perceive the richness of the opportunities for further progress which are already in our hands.

Enact Displaced-Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune:

THE SENATE'S OPPORTUNITY

Now that the Judiciary Committee has at last released the displaced persons bill, we urge that the many Senate supporters of liberal amendment rally to secure its passage. Undoubtedly the little die-hard clique which prevented any measure from coming to the floor earlier will continue the fight there. The committee, whose chairman, Senator MCCARRAN, has cabled his final disapproval from Europe, first discharged its subcommittee yesterday, then voted, 7 to 3, to report the House bill without recommendation. Senator LUCAS promptly arranged to permit debate today.

The bipartisan measure calls for admission of 339,000 displaced persons in 3 years, eliminates the hampering farm and Baltic quotas and sets forward the date for determining refugees' eligibility. On Monday the American Federation of Labor, in annual convention, reaffirmed its stand for a liberal bill and urged action at this session of Congress. The Congress of Industrial Organizations and some 150 other national organizations are likewise on record for it.

This is the Senate's opportunity. Enactment of a measure so clearly dictated by justice, wisdom, and humanity would be hailed the country through as a victorious climax to the long troubled session.

Veterans' Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the effects of recent regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration on our educational and training program for veterans as it appears to me that many of the benefits will henceforth be denied to a great number of this group. Our State approval agencies which certify the eligible schools to train veterans have in almost every case done a good job in eliminating poor schools. The Veterans' Administration has gone too far with its regulations because many deserving veterans will be denied educational benefits and many good schools will be closed because of the restrictions issued by the VA.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include several resolutions adopted by the National Association of State Approval Agencies together with a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Texas Department of the American Legion on September 25, 1949:

[National Association of State Approval Agencies, second annual conference, Indianapolis, Ind., September 19–21, 1949]

Resolution 6

Whereas the interpretation of Public Law 266 in Veterans' Administration instruction 1 is handicapping State Departments of Education, State Board of Vocational Education, public tax supported institutions and State approving agencies in their efforts to establish good schools and adequate training facilities for veterans in areas in which they are needed; and

Whereas it appears that under the building ownership requirement of the Veterans' Administration interpretation, many schools are now and will continue to be precluded from offering training to the veterans in their communities despite the fact that training is needed and will, if given, raise the standard of living of a vast number of veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the National Association of State Approval Agencies in convention at Indianapolis, Ind., September 19–21, 1949, That the Veterans' Administration be strongly urged to relax the rules and regulations contained in instruction 1 so as to permit public-school systems and State, county, and local boards of education to rent or lease facilities and operate classes therein, based on need, with rented or leased equipment in the same manner as if they owned such building or equipment.

Resolution 7

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has seen fit to require public schools to submit cost data to determine fair and reasonable tuition rates for veterans training programs without regard to established rates; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has insisted that rates be reduced without regard to established rates, using the formula prepared by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas in using the formula prepared by the Veterans' Administration, many States have submitted cost data which indicates a rate of tuition in some States and some programs higher than previously charged; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has refused to recognize such data to raise the rate, but has urged such data in all cases which indicated a reduction in rates: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Association of State Approval Agencies in convention at Indianapolis, Ind., September 19–21, 1949, That the Veterans' Administration be urged to observe the following conditions in contract negotiations:

1. The formula for determining fair and reasonable cost be determined in cooperation with public school authorities.

2. Tuition rates may be either raised or lowered in accordance with the facts indicated by cost data.

3. After fair and complete analysis of cost data, both parties shall be bound by the findings.

Resolution 9

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has issued certain rulings prohibiting the payment of subsistence and tuition for veterans' training in building trades away from school premises which has discontinued practically all building-trades courses in the United States; and

Whereas there has been passed by the House of Representatives H. R. 5833 relating to full-time institutional and industrial training for veterans which will correct and clarify the conditions under which building-trades courses may be given and define such courses as full-time institutional training: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the National Association of State Approval Agencies take action to support H. R. 5833 through its national organization and its duly elected officers.

Resolution 10

Whereas the veterans' training program under Public Law 346 has grown to a size beyond all expectations in many States; and

Whereas many States have found difficulty in supervising the institutional training program in addition to their regularly established educational program: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the National Association of State Approval Agencies in convention at Indianapolis, Ind., September 19–21, 1949, urge the passage of H. R. 3264, which is a bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred in supervision of educational institutions.

Resolution by the Executive Committee of the Texas Department of the American Legion, September 25, 1949

Whereas the Congress of the United States through the enactment of Public Law 346 provided for veterans benefits for the veteran of World War II; and

Whereas the Congress through the enactment of Public Laws 862 and 266 did not intend to deprive the veteran of his benefits provided for through Public Law 346; and

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his Chief of Education and Training, located at central office in Washington, D. C., have promulgated rules and regulations, specifically instructions No. 1 and 1–A, dated September 1 and September 8, 1949, respectively, definitely deny the veteran the education and training intended for him through Public Law 346; and

Whereas thousands of veterans have postponed their entrance into training for justifiable and legitimate reasons; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has consistently made it very clear that the veteran had until July 25, 1951, to initiate a training program; and

Whereas courses of education and training established prior to June 22, 1944, cannot possible accommodate the demand brought about by Public Law 346, and courses established after June 22, 1944, are being arbitrarily classed as avocational and recreational and veterans desiring to enter such courses will be subjected to certain restrictions not intended by the Congress of the United States in its passage of Public Laws 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; 862, Eightieth Congress; and 266, Eighty-first Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this resolution as passed by the Boxer County Central Council of the American Legion of Texas be presented to the Department Executive Committee of the American Legion of Texas for their passage, and that that body demand a complete and thorough investigation of the operation of

the Veterans' Administration, central office, concerning their departure from the intent of the laws which provide for veterans' training and the arbitrary regulations promulgated by that office in direct conflict with the intent of Public Laws 346, 862, and 266.

A Challenge to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am enclosing a resolution adopted by the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club of Wichita, Kans. It is entitled "A Challenge to the American People":

A CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The Republican Party is the hope of America.

We bungled in 1948. And because of that, some Republicans, instead of standing by the right as God gives us to see the right, say we must out-deal the New Deal.

This is shocking talk. The Republican Party must not veer from truth merely to catch votes.

The New Deal is neither progressive nor liberal. It is not even new. It is as old as the ancient Roman Republic, which it destroyed. Its principles have ruined many nations as they are ruining England today.

Let us not be misled into believing that the last election was a mandate for Harry Truman. Far from it. So many people lacked enthusiasm for either new dealism or me tooism that more people remained away from the polls than voted for the winner. Those nonvoting millions challenge us to lead them with a campaign of education.

The Abraham Lincoln Republican Club has proved that even the New Deal can't fool all the people all of the time. We organized our club when Kansas had a New Deal Governor, a New Deal Senator, a New Deal Congressman from our district, and a court house at Wichita full of New Dealers. In cooperation with the Republican Central Committee, we presented the truth. When the people had the truth, they kicked the New Dealers out of office in Kansas and in Sedgwick County.

We, hereby, offer the Wichita plan for adoption as a national plan.

First, we ask everybody to study the tenth article of our Constitution's Bill of Rights, which was designed to protect the people should we be made subject to a power-grabbing President. This tenth article reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States, by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The New Deal Party interferes with local governments.

The President arrogates to himself unconstitutional powers.

The administration has given employment to Communist spies, who stole confidential State Department documents to hand to Stalin or to hide in a pumpkin.

The New Deal has befuddled Americans.

Not one man or one woman in our Republic less than 38 years old has had any adult experience with any other than a New Deal administration. We must direct their thoughts to this basic truth:

There is no such thing as Federal aid.

The Federal Government has nothing to give away until it puts the taxpayer through the wringer.

Federal aid is like chopping off a dog's tail to provide his meat. This is no time, when the Nation's credit is weak, to increase spending through Federal funds on education, socialized medicine, and Federal housing. Such expenses belong rightly to the States and the communities.

To go adventuring at this time into more Federal spending will imperil the value of Government E-Bonds, which 8,000,000 working people bought this year in good faith.

The United States Internal Revenue Collector took $424,185,561 in direct taxes from the people of Kansas in 1948. Counting indirect taxes, the take exceeds a half billion dollars. No State can build the schools and roads it needs, when the Federal Government grabs its money and insults us by calling the fraction it returns by the name of Federal aid.

We want to retain all those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law that protect the rights of the public from the consequences of disputes between labor and management. We want to protect labor from unfair labor leaders.

We want to bring local government back home, for through all history local government has handled community problems with less waste, less corruption and greater justice than can high-salaried Washington bureaucrats.

The waste of so-called Federal aid is so staggering that in 1948 it cost the American people $1,200,000,000 just to keep the books of its extravagances.

We want Congress to give top priority to the nonpartisan Hoover plan for reorganization of the Federal Government and to adopt its recommendations thereby saving a minimum of three billions yearly.

We want a return to rigid economy and accountability.

We want to kick off the Federal pay roll at least 1,000,000 bureaucrats, and use the five billions paid them each year in salaries and expenses to reduce the Nation's debt. The office buildings they encumber all over the land can then go back to the use of the people.

We oppose the Brannan plan for subsidizing the grocery bill of everybody in the Nation, whether rich or poor.

We want to wean the gimmies from the Federal Treasury.

We want a businesslike sinking fund for payment of the national debt.

We want to bring back competition and to stop inflation so that a GI is not forced to pay $10,000 for a $4,000 home; an office girl is not required to pay 65 cents for a two-bit lunch; a farmer is not compelled to pay $2,000 for a $900 tractor.

We want young folks, no matter how rich or poor, to have the right to build their destinies as Lincoln built his, untrammeled by Government meddling.

Opportunity is calling the Republican Party to serve the country.

We, the members of the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club of Sedgwick County, meeting at Wichita, therefore, call one and all Americans everywhere to help us guide our Republic back to constitutional government.

We call on the national committee to inspire our party and our Nation with aggressive and courageous leadership.

It is no time to dilly-dally.

It is only 3 years until 1952.

Begin now.

We have a victory to win.

Our Stake in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 13, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the great address made by the Prime Minister of India to the House of Representatives yesterday makes the following editorial from the New York Times of October 13, 1949, vitally important:

OUR STAKE IN INDIA

The arrival of Pandit Nehru in the United States should provide more than the opportunity to express our friendliness for a great contemporary and a great new nation. It offers a reason for the study of one of the biggest and most critical problems in the world today and it may be that the administration's analysis can lead to action.

During the war President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull gave advice on India that the British then considered uninformed and unwise. It was based on theoretical principles of anti-imperialism that may or may not have had validity at a time when the Japanese threatened to invade India. After the war we went on encouraging Britain to grant India independence. We also made it a part of the Anglo-American loan agreement that Britain should seek to block sterling balances and not use them to channel trade toward London, and the greatest debt was to India. The British felt that the two suggestions were incompatible. They are trying to keep India within the Commonwealth by making it worth her while to stay there, and naturally they want to keep the vast Indian market to the greatest extent possible. Hence, Sir Stafford Cripps permitted the Indians to draw on the sterling balances to a degree that shocked Washington, as well as British economists. It was a mixture of politics and economics, a sort of "enlightened self-interest."

"Now," say the British, "the United States has a moral responsibility toward India, not to mention similar interests." Washington wants India to be a bulwark against communism and a great and growing market. Yet India has been able barely to keep going at her present dismally low standard of living. The Government under Pandit Nehru is enlightened, courageous and, within its historic limits, democratic. But independence was not a release from economic problems; on the contrary, it intensified them, because it forced India to become self-supporting at the same time that the country was split in two. Pakistan is proving economically viable but India is yet to get on her own feet. Thus far independence has cost India more than the loss of the Empire cost Britain.

It could be argued that India has not made the best of her opportunities. Certainly she finds herself today without financial reserves, with a declining production and a worsening balance of trade. However, in a world where financial and trade equilibrium has eluded the most experienced industrial countries no one can afford to be critical. That is especially true in the case of a country starting with such handicaps as India, and facing a continuing population increase of more than 4,000,000 souls a year.

What India needs most is capital equipment both for industry and agriculture. She is still an agricultural country to the extent of more than 90 percent, and she will always be a predominantly agricultural country, but

the economy should be much better balanced than it is now. There is a great field for investment and for credits, but whether it is a field that will attract the private American business investor and b: ker is doubtful. Perhaps point 4 will provide a solution.

What Pandit Nehru can do by this visit is to crystallize attention on his immense human and governmental problems. India is potentially a great counterweight to China. We of the West have temporarily lost China. India is in safe hands, but she is vulnerable from two directions—her economy and Kashmir—and the two are linked because the threat of conflict with Pakistan over Kashmir has forced New Delhi to keep up a military establishment that consumes half the country's revenues. The President's recent effort, along with Prime Minister Attlee, to bring about a solution of the Kashmir problem was sharply rebuffed by his present guest. There is now an opportunity for a better understanding.

India needs peace and prosperity, which in practical, present-day terms means a settlement of the Kashmir dispute and economic help from the United States.

Gen. Omar Bradley's Speech on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am a great admirer of Gen. Omar Bradley as he has demonstrated and continues to demonstrate the kind of leadership this country needs. Those of us who have had the opportunity to hear him speak on military matters and have read his speeches which he has delivered to various organizations know of his sincere desire to provide for a military establishment giving us our best insurance against another war.

I invite you to read the speech General Bradley made before the American Forestry Association at Akron, Ohio, on October 12. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this speech of General Bradley's:

The world today stands almost transfixed in awe of the tiny but powerful atom. Its power to destroy overshadows in every mind its power for helpfulness.

So long as we alone held the atomic weapons we could be sure that no atomic bomb would start another war. Hoping to turn its power to peaceful gain, we offered it to international control; we used its silent threat to deter any quick aggression; and we used the breathing time for peaceful reconstruction.

Just as we knew that Soviet scientists soon would solve the atomic riddle, so did we realize that on Red atom day a new phase of our struggle for peace would begin.

As calmly as they have taken the pronouncement of that discovery, Americans and their friends await further information on our collective security plans.

TIME FOR REVIEW

Although defense problems cannot be entirely solved by spending I do believe that we must now review our rate of spending for certain previously planned installations and developments of our national security establishment. For Russia's atomic explosion takes its earliest effect on our defense pocketbook.

I believe it will call for even more wisely placed security investments—and some sensible thrift. For as Mr. Bernard Baruch has stated, we must not "delude ourselves into thinking we can spend our way out."

As your military counselors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff can make the estimates and draw up the plans. However, modern war is so complicated and complex that there will always be different views on how our present defense dollar should be invested. In the end, the American taxpayer must pay the bill for his own security; thus he is vitally interested in this problem. The present unsettled world conditions make the question of defense an important one for every citizen.

INTERNATIONAL FACTS OF LIFE

Facing the awesome possiblity of a war at some indefinite time in the future, and knowing that we cannot tell exactly when that sometime might be, we realize that we cannot maintain sufficient armed forces and modern weapons to provide absolute security. On the other hand we have the comforting knowledge that the United States of America, and its newly allied friends of the Atlantic Pact, will never start a war for any purpose. This increases the possibility of having no war at all.

However, facing all the international facts of life, you realize that there is a large land-based power in the world today that might start a war.

Whether motivated by misplaced fear of attack or by schemes for aggression, Russia has maintained an army of 2,500,000 men. Her air force numbers over 600,000 men, with somewhere between 14,000 and 16,000 aircraft. And, adapting German submarine models, she has developed a very modern undersea force. Since VE-day, she has devoted a large percentage of her industrial capacity to the maintenance and modernization of her armed forces.

And 2 weeks ago, the Soviet Union—the only possible enemy in sight for the next 20 years—threw into the balance its newly revealed possession of the atom.

ARMY REBUILDING

Keenly aware of our position, Americans have not been living a grassshopper summer to be confronted now with the chill of unpreparedness. Our Army, allotted 33.6 cents of the security dollar, has been steadily rebuilding, while carrying on the occupation duties to which it is assigned. The Air Force, given 34 cents of the defense dollar, has progressed steadily in size and ability, and the Navy, allotted for the present fiscal year 32.4 cents of the defense dollar, stands second to none in the world. Hence you will see that our three services have approximately equal shares of our defense dollar.

The American people realize that the first prize for any aggressor in the world today might be Europe, with its industrial potential and its market for goods. So they have reaffirmed in economic aid, and by political tie, that the western Europe which we have twice defended is linked with this continent in peace, and for protection. The President last week signed a military-assistance program to speed up the military rehabilitation of those nations whose ideological and security interests are held in common with our own.

The basic defense principle of the North Atlantic Treaty, and of the military-aid program, is that each nation shall contribute those things which it can best provide in the collective security plan. And in dividing our own defense dollar in future years, it is this same principle which must override wishful adherence to prestige, time-honored tradition, or biased enthusiasm for any one of our armed forces, as we contribute our share.

OBJECTS OF ENVY

Even in friendly eyes, American resources and industrial production can be objects of envy. Then add to these our possession of stock piles of the atomic bomb, and the security of distance from the possible battlefields of Europe. The sum total of our strength must seem infinite. But we who have lived with the treasure, in the well-fed comfort of prosperity, know that money for defense is a valid expenditure only so long as it is an investment in peace. Unlimited expenditures for weapons of war would quickly spell bankruptcy for our economy.

To gain maximum safety at the least expense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff must give very careful consideration to those items which constitute the basic necessities.

First priority must provide those forces which can avert disaster in the event that war is thrust upon us and our friends.

To impress the aggressor that a bully's blow can't escape the sting of reprisal, we must possess the means to retaliate quickly and hard.

And finally, knowing well that blows once exchanged do not subside until one or the other is victor, we must provide the means necessary for the mobilization of our manpower and other resources which can eventually carry the war back to the enemy, to his ultimate defeat.

MUST CHOOSE CAREFULLY

These are the priorities which have governed our plans so far. Now with certain knowledge that atomic weapons, by plane or by missile, could be used against us eventually, we must chose carefully the further armaments of defense.

Your President, your Secretary of Defense, and your military counselors, have assured you that this calls for no change in basic defense plans. When we ourselves have leaned so heavily on our monopoly of the atomic bomb as a deterrent for war, it is natural for Americans to doubt this statement.

These assurances are sound, and I will explain the merit of their meaning.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have anticipated that the Russians would, sometime, solve the problem of atomic weapons. We have pointed out that in the second phase of the atomic problem, America and her friends will have a continued respite from attack, because of the preponderance of our stock pile of atomic bombs and our lead in men and planes to deliver bombs on any aggressor. That phase exists today. How long this condition will exist, no one knows.

EXPLOSION PRECEDED ESTIMATES

Estimates in our staff on when the Russians would have the atomic bomb ranged from 1950 to 1952. Their atomic explosion preceded earliest of these estimates by several months.

Estimates have also been made of the time from this first announcement until the Russians could have enough atomic weapons in quantity to influence the outcome of a modern war.

They could be foolhardy enough to launch an atomic attack with only a handful of atomic bombs. But of all the people on this earth, they are students of force, and of power in war, and should understand clearly the disastrous result of such a gruesome error.

In the meantime, I earnestly hope that they will see the difficulty and tremendous expense of atomic manufacture, and shall come forward to join us in international control of such a weapon.

But military men must be realists. You depend on them to be prepared. We have

worked out an orderly timetable of preparations for atomic defense. Like a plan for mobilization in case of attack, it was tied to a day in the future on which a specific event should come to pass. That day has now arrived—Red atom day—and our program to provide for defense in this second phase is already well under way.

SPREADING EXPENDITURES

The American people might logically inquire: If we knew that this day was sure to come, why couldn't those preparations have begun a long time ago? The answer is, obviously, that common denominator—the defense dollar. Our earlier preparation for the preponderance of might, and the stock piling of atomic weapons, and the general refurbishing of our armed forces required all of the defense money our economy could stand.

Further realizing that when this A-day arrived, our economy could not stand the immediate expenditure of all the moneys necessary to provide for the atomic defense of this continent, our timetable calls for the spreading out of these expenditures in an orderly progression over a period of years. The people and the Congress will be asked to provide for those items essential to the orderly implementation of these security measures.

These requests may cut across preconcieved notions of defense and tread on many toes. It will take unselfish and objective study to arrive at the best protective measures for the over-all good of the country. And we must continue to provide even these new requirements out of a limited arms budget, while our economy continues to strengthen. For a strong economy is our best resource against the onslaught of the poison of communism.

If our plea for the international control of atomic energy is heeded, any attempt to overrun Europe will first touch the point of Allied bayonets in Germany. If this becomes the case, then the Army must be ready to repel a land assault, with sufficient tactical air power to gain and maintain local superiority over Red bombers and fighters.

If our pleas for control of atomic energy are not met with honest agreement, then the blow may strike at the heart of industrial America. If that is the case, we may have to invest our funds in antiaircraft, guided missiles, necessary radar screen for Canada and the United States and the Arctic and the necessary fighter intercepter squadrons to dispel long-range bombardment attack.

In either situation, our Navy must maintain control of the seas. It possesses that power to control today. Our collective defensive frontiers in the heart of Europe need the support of American industry and arms; we must deny any aggressor close bases for attack against this continent.

I believe that our present investments have been neither misplaced, nor less thrifty than we should desire. The forces to avert disaster have been allotted most of our available funds, including the budget recommendation for 1950. This reaffirms the statement of the Secretary of Defense that there need be no change in our basic defense plans. And the orderly implementation of our next timetable program will also reaffirm this view.

Within this pattern of security, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have been assigned roles and responsibilities. Their leaders are responsible and earnest men, each seeking to carry out his mission at maximum efficiency. Naturally, each proponent of his service will seek as great a percentage of the defense dollar as he can get. Estimating the total problem and then turning to his specific task, he realizes that there will never be enough money to go around. Defensewise, he is dealing in dollar deficits.

The American people have decided that they can get the maximum security out of each dollar through a unified effort, and have so organized the Department of Defense. Encouraged by the great accomplishments of teamwork from earliest Colonial times to the latest developments in modern industry, Americans are convinced that efficiency and accomplishment go hand in hand with teamwork. Within this organization, we of the Joint Chiefs of Staff hope to provide relative security within decreasing defense appropriations. It is not going to be easy. In the complexity of defense planning, the division of the defense dollar undoubtedly will continue to be a very serious bone of contention among the services.

With the unification machinery only 2 years old, you can hardly expect earnest and sincere citizens, faced with the grave responsibility of protecting our people with fewer funds than are considered necessary, to agree on budget division.

I believe the American people would not want it otherwise, for in this spirit of competition is born the close examination of expenditures that assures no waste and maximum security.

But, finally, when the President and the Secretary of Defense have made the decision of the defense budget, then each service must carry its fair share of our calculated risk.

As we began this discussion of the defense problems facing the American people, I told you how the defense dollar has been divided for 1959. I expect that a tally of estimates made by you in this matter would reveal no two of them alike. But after careful consideration of the priorities, and commitments, and with the full knowledge that the timetable for the second phase of the antiatomic peace is under way, I am sure that collectively, we would arrive at a good solution.

The people of the United States have twice affirmed, through their elected representatives, that the maximum security at least cost can be provided through unity in planning and command. And the Congress has recently pointed out that our defense plans must be closely related to those of our allies, if funds are to be granted.

I firmly believe that unity of effort, both nationally and internationally, can produce the greatest security for all of us; that unity of effort and common ideals of humanity can negate the Red atom; and that, ultimately, Americans shall lead the way steadfastly to a lesser possibility of war for our children, and the world we are building for the future.

American Investments in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 10, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wide interest in and the importance of point 4 of the President's inaugural-address program, and the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee has reported favorably H. R. 5594—the Export-Import Bank loan guaranty authority bill—I feel that my colleagues who are not already fully informed on the subject might wish to have available for reference a reliable statement of the historical background of American investments in foreign countries, especially those in Latin America. Therefore, under leave unanimously granted me I am including in my remarks the article by J. Fred Rippy, professor, department of history, University of Chicago, which appeared in the Journal of Business of the University of Chicago, issue of January 1949, volume XXII, No. 1. Professor Rippy is one of the outstanding Latin-American scholars of the Nation and is a recognized authority in the field.

His article follows:

INVESTMENTS OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES IN LATIN AMERICA

(By J. Fred Rippy [1])

I

The common assumption that investment of United States private capital abroad did not begin until after 1898 is not entirely accurate. Foreign investments began within a few decades after the Nation was founded, and the holdings of United States citizens in foreign lands reached a total of more than $700,000,000 by the end of 1897.[2]

The assumption is especially inaccurate in respect to Latin America. Even without taking into account Louisiana, Texas, and the various Spanish borderlands annexed between 1803 and 1854, the history of United States investments in Latin America begins before 1830, especially in Mexico, Cuba, and Chile. Considerable capital migrated to the region in the 1850's and 1860's, some of it southern capital, and by 1870 there was hardly a Latin-American country in which American money and skills had not been invested at one time or another. It is true that many of these early investments—in mining, farming, extraction of forest products, mercantile establishments, transportation ventures, and public utilities—were unprofitable and ephemeral; there were too many political and administrative disorders in Latin America and too much hostility in some countries toward the United States and its citizens. But they were investments none the less. Among the more permanent enterprises of this early period were the Panama Railroad; steamboat lines on the rivers of Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador; gas plants in Habana, Guayaquil, and Mexico City; and shipping lines connecting the United States with Cuba, Venezuela, Panama, and other parts of Central America.[3]

[1] Professor of American history, University of Chicago.

[2] Writers of textbooks on United States history sometimes mention the early investments in Cuba, but they seldom refer to those made in Canada, Mexico, Central America, the Hawaiian Islands, and other parts of the world. Cleona Lewis, America's Stake in International Investments (Washington, D. C., 1938), p. 606, estimates the total at $684,500,000 at the end of 1897 but evidently ignores the investment in the Hawaiian Islands. The aggregate in Canada and Newfoundland was around $190,000,000 and the investment in Europe, $151,000,000.

[3] I know of no estimates of United States capital in Latin America as a whole for any period before 1897. The best sources of information regarding the number and character of investments in the region before 1870 are the letters of United States consuls and the reports of claims commissions (see John Basset Moore, History and Digest of International Arbitrations (6 vols.; Washington, D. C., 1896), especially vols. II–IV). I have dealt with the subject to some extent in my Latin America and the Industrial Age (2d ed.; New York, 1947). Prominent among the early shipping lines connecting

The stream of dollars flowing from the United States into Latin America expanded after 1870. Capital accumulated more rapidly in the United States, and some of the Latin-American countries became more stable and receptive. It is likely that the total investment was not far less than $250,000,000 by the end of 1890, over half of it in Mexico and most of the rest in Cuba and Central America. The investment in the South American countries would have been larger if French capitalists had not secured control of the Panama Railroad in 1881 (Panama was, of course, a part of Colombia at that time) and if British investors had not acquired major interests in several telephone exchanges originally installed in the early 1880's by United States citizens. The decade following 1880 was a period of fairly rapid American investment, not only in widely scattered public utilities, especially telephones and submarine cables, but also in mines, railways, and forest exploitation in Mexico and Central America; in farm and ranch lands in Mexico; in sugar and banana lands in several of the Caribbean countries; in Venezuelan asphalt, public utilities, and river transport; and even in Peruvian and Mexican petroleum.[4] The 1890's witnessed a further acceleration of the capital movement, so that the total investment, including the properties of United States citizens residing in Latin America, probably exceeded $320,000,000 by the end of 1897, around two-thirds of the total in Mexico and a good part of the remainder in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Central America. Table 1 presents estimates of the distribution of this capital among the principal recipients at this time.

Table 1—Investments of United States capital in Latin America, end of 1897 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country or region:	Total
Mexico	205
Cuba	50
Dominican Republic	6
Haiti	1
Central America	16
Northern Latin America	278
Colombia	8.2
Peru	6
Venezuela	3.8
Chile	2
Other South America	8
South America	28
Cables and shipping	14
Grand total	320

[1] In compiling this table, I have depended largely upon the volume by Cleona Lewis, America's Stake in International Investments (Washington, D. C., 1938), pp. 575–606, but I have raised her estimates in some cases and lowered them in others in order to make them conform with seemingly reliable information drawn from other sources too numerous and scattered to be conveniently cited here. For example, I have reduced her estimate for the Central American countries because she included the capital of the Panama Railroad, which had long been controlled by the French and which should have been listed under Colombia in any case, since Panama was still a part of the Colombian national domain; I have reduced her total for South America by approximately $10,000,000 because I felt unable to justify a larger figure on the basis of any available evidence; and I have slightly increased her estimates for Mexico and the Dominican Republic. Nathaniel Macon's figures for investments of United States citizens in Latin America at the beginning of 1899, published in Yale Review, IX (1900), 275–276, are too low for Mexico and Central America, but his figure for South America, $31,500,000, seems satisfactory.

The major part of this capital was in railways, mining, and agriculture (including extraction of forest products). Next in size was probably the investment of trading firms, some of them subsidiaries of companies with their main offices in the United States; but since many of these—such as Grace & Co.; Beeche, Duval, & Co.; Flint, Eddy, & Co.; Boulton, Bliss, & Dallett; and several small fruit companies that were soon to be taken over by United Fruit—were engaged in other activities besides buying and selling, it has not been possible to arrive at a satisfactory estimate of the capital in trading organizations. In anticipation of immediate future trends it is appropriate to call attention to two other types of investment. Around $6,000,000 were already invested in petroleum—refining in Mexico and Cuba, extraction in Peru, and distribution in many countries; and holdings in public utilities, besides some $4,000,000 in submarine cables in the Gulf-Caribbean region and extending down the Pacific coast from southern Mexico to Chile, probably aggregated around $13,000,000, nearly half of the total in Mexico and the remainder in Peru, Cuba, Colombia, Venezuela, Chile, Argentina, and two or three other nations. Except for the processing of sugar and the refining of petroleum, manufacturing enterprises were insignificant; and, although citizens of the United States had purchased Mexican bonds in the 1860's and had made one or two loans to Colombia in the 1880's, they probably held no Latin-American government securities in 1897, with the exception of bonds of the Dominican Republic, where investment in Latin-American banking had been initiated by New York capitalists a few years before. Table 2 contains estimates of the distribution of United States capital in railways, mining, and agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of the major investments of United States citizens in Latin America, end of 1897* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country or region	Railways	Mining	Agriculture and forestal
Mexico	110.6	68.0	12.0
Cuba		3.0	31.5
Dominican Republic	1.0		2.0
Central America	6.0	2.5	7.0
South America	5.9	7.0	6.5
Total	123.5	80.5	59.0

[1] Again, in compiling table 2, I have relied heavily on Lewis, op. cit., pp. 575–606, but I have supplemented her data and made some modifications in accordance with information obtained elsewhere.

The railroad investment in Central America was in Guatemala, and the mining investment was mainly in Honduras; the agricultural capital was distributed through all the five countries, but the largest holdings were in Costa Rica and the smallest in El Salvador. Railway capital in South America was confined to two nations, Colombia and Ecuador, and to a single railroad in each; the total for Colombia, nearly $5,000,000, includes some capital in shipping (the railway company owned a wharf at Cartagena and steamboats operating on the Magdalena River). The mining investment in South America was concentrated mainly in Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru; the investment in agriculture and the extraction of forest products was mostly in Colombia (including Panama), Venezuela, Peru, and Brazil.

So much in reference to the assumption that export of capital from the United States did not begin until after the Spanish-American War. The assumption ignores some significant history, especially in the field of technology, which the United States symbolizes, and fairly large investments, not merely in Cuba, of which historians are

---

the United States and Latin America were the Red D Line (1838) and the lines of the Pacific Mail S. S. Co. (1848). The Panama Railroad Co., founded in 1849, completed the railway across Panama early in 1855. Other lines of transportation connecting the eastern and western parts of the United States by way of the isthmian routes were ephemeral; the most important of them was Cornelius Vanderbilt's. Among the early trading firms were Samuel B. Hale & Co., in Buenos Aires, and a branch house of Hemingway & Brown of Boston, in Valparaiso. Both were established in the 1830's, and both were still in existence half a century later (Michael G. Mulhall, The English in South America (Buenos Aires, 1878), p. 612; H. Ex. Doc. No. 50 (49th Cong., 1st sess.), serial 2392, pp. 323, 440). Two Delano brothers, William and Paul, began their commercial life in Chile before 1830, and William Wheelwright started his business career there at about the same time (Mulhall, op. cit., pp. 374, 382). Levi Woodbury's brother not only invested in Cuban sugar plantations but founded the port town of Cardenas around 1828 (Louisiana Planter (New Orleans), XXXI (1898), 105). Dr. John Baldwin, during the 1820's, built sawmills on the Mexican Isthmus of Tehuantepec, established a mercantile house, and founded the town of Minatitlan (Moore, op. cit., IV, 3235). The list of more than a thousand claims of United States citizens considered by the Mexican-American Claims Commission of 1868 discloses hundreds of investors, including 13 mining companies and several other business organizations besides the numerous individuals owning farms, ranches, stores, and other properties (S. Ex. Doc., No. 31 (44th Cong., 2d sess.), serial 1720).

[4] I have dealt with some of the business activities of United States citizens in Latin America during this period in my Latin America and the Industrial Age (see esp. pp. 51–95, 115–51, 177–87, 200). The commercial commission sent by the United States Government to Latin America in 1884–85 found their fellow-citizens engaged in business of one kind or another in every country they investigated. I quote the following sentences from one of their reports: "As dentists and photographers, our countrymen easily lead in nearly every large town. In many cities American physicians enjoy lucrative practice. * * * In every Republic will be found American businessmen with wide circles of influence. * * * Moreover, resident merchants offer the best means to introduce and increase the use of our goods. * * * It has resulted favorably in almost every city of South and Central America we visited" ("House Executive Documents," No. 50, pp. 24–25). Further information on the travels and proceedings of this commission will be found in "House Executive Documents," No. 226 (48th Cong., 2d sess.), Serial 2304. A member of the consular service of the United States estimated American investments in Mexico at the end of the year 1887 as follows: railroads, $80,000,000; mines, $20,000,000; ranches and farms, $5,000,000; commerce, $1,000,000; total $106,000,000 (Consular Reports, No. 89, February, 1888, pp. 339–40). A mining boom in Honduras in the 1880's resulted in a fairly large investment of United States capital in that country, perhaps $8,000,000–$10,000,000 (Council of the Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, Fourteenth Annual Report (London, 1887), p. 81; Cecil Charles, Honduras (Chicago, 1890), pp. 54–70).

generally aware, but likewise in Mexico and in the Caribbean countries, to say nothing of Canada and the Hawaiian Islands. It is but fair, however, to make two concessions. In the first place, this early capital was not very significant in terms of the balance of payments, in which economists are primarily interested, because much of it was held by citizens of the United States who were residing more or less permanently in Latin America; and, second, the aggregate in 1897 was small in comparison to the total for any subsequent decade. Compared with the outflow during the 16 years following 1898 or 1914, for example, the investment for any previous period of equal length was hardly more than a trickle. Citizens of the United States did not begin to send their money abroad in huge sums until after the end of the nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, it is not extravagant to contend that these beginnings are entitled to more serious consideration that they have received. They were pioneer investments which encountered the usual hardships and disappointments of pioneering and yet laid broad foundations for the diversified investments of the future; and, notwithstanding the customary assumption that the disappearance of the free-land frontier and the maturing of industry were the motivating forces for the beginning of capital exportation, these early investors in foreign countries were not influenced entirely, or even mainly, by such forces. Excepting those who engaged in ocean shipping, trading, and the extraction of forest products—and even these were responding to the market demands of farmers and other groups as well as manufacturers—citizens of the United States who made investments in Latin America before 1898 were not primarily the emissaries of manufacturers in pursuit of industrial raw materials or food for factory workers. In the main they were searching (1) for precious metals, for which a strong demand may exist in agrarian as well as in industrial societies, (2) for profits they hoped to gain from farming, ranching, and the operation of transport and communication services, or (3) for escape from troubles at home and for the satisfactions to be derived from pioneering in strange and distant lands. There was no urgent demand in the United States for foreign raw materials for industry or for the bananas, sugar, cocoa, and coffee these early investors produced. Such commodities were mainly luxuries which investors expected to persuade consumers—not merely industrial workers but farmers, merchants, clerks, and many others—to buy. This does not mean, however, that the absence of the frontier and the mandates of a rapidly expanding industry were not to be factors of increasing importance during the decades that followed. Already American capitalists were beginning to search in foreign countries for copper, petroleum, dyewoods, tanning materials, rubber, and medicinal plants. The search would soon become more vigorous and comprehensive and include not only a great variety of minerals and metals but also a number of foods which were urgently needed in other industrial nations or had been transformed from luxuries into necessities by habitual use in the United States.

II

Capital began to flow swiftly from the United States into Latin America around the turn of the century. The aggregate by the end of the year 1914 was more than five times the total at the close of 1897. Mexico, Cuba, Chile, and Peru were the largest recipients, and the greatest expansion occurred in investments in mining and petroleum, agriculture, and public utilities. Among new types of holdings, Government securities were conspicuous, and the investment in manufacturing was also becoming prominent. Estimates for the end of 1914 are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Investments of United States capital in Latin America, end of 1914* [1]

Country:	*Millions of dollars*
Mexico	853.5
Cuba	265.0
Dominican Republic	16.0
Haiti	11.5
Costa Rica	24.0
Guatemala	36.5
Honduras	10.0
Nicaragua	4.5
El Salvador	7.0
Panama	13.5
Northern Latin America	1,241.5
Argentina	36.0
Bolivia	11.0
Brazil	28.0
Chile	180.5
Colombia	21.5
Ecuador	9.0
Paraguay	5.5
Peru	62.5
Uruguay	5.5
Venezuela	8.0
South America	367.5
Latin America (excluding ocean shipping and submarine cables)	1,609.0

[1] Compiled mainly from data supplied by Lewis, op. cit., pp. 575–606, 652–55; but I have presented my own estimates in some cases. My total for Cuba is probably a little higher than hers—she does not give separate estimates for Cuba but includes that island with the other West Indies—yet I feel that my figure is not exaggerated. Max Winkler, in his Investments of United States Capital in Latin America (Boston, 1929, p. 275), gives estimates for the year 1913 which seem wide of the mark in some cases. John Ball Osborne's estimates for early 1912, published in North American Review, CXCV (1912), 687–700, supply valuable details for some of the minor countries thrown together by Lewis. His total for the investment in Cuba is $220,000,000. I have little doubt that an additional $45,000,000 flowed into the island between the early months of 1912 and the end of 1914. I have accepted Lewis' figure for Mexico. It is much smaller than the estimate sent by Consul Marion Letcher to the State Department in 1912 (Daily Consular and Trade Reports, No. 155, July 2, 1912, p. 316), but a destructive revolution had swept over Mexico since that estimate (for 1911) was made. The Letcher document placed the total, including properties of United States nationals domiciled in Mexico (excluded by Lewis), at approximately $1,058,000,000. I have also accepted Lewis' figure for Colombia, although it seems somewhat too high. Enthusiasm for the establishment of branch banks in Latin America was just getting under way in 1914, but five had been opened in Panama since 1904, one was founded in Mexico City in 1903, and one began operating in Colombia in 1913 (Clyde Williams Phelps, The Foreign Expansion of American Banks [New York, 1927], pp. 142–62, 211–12).

Of this total of well over $1,600,000,000 invested in Latin America at the end of 1914, portfolio holdings accounted for $352,600,000 [5]—$246,600,000 in government bonds and $106,000,000 in the securities of corporations controlled by nationals of other countries—and direct investments for $1,256,400,000. The mining capital, a total of around $450,000,000, was now not only much larger than the investment in agricultural enterprises but also considerably in excess of the total capital in railways and public utilities combined. Next in order of value after these three was the investment in the production and distribution of petroleum, which amounted to around $130,000,000. Excluding the sums invested in the distribution of petroleum products, the capital in trading firms, around $32,000,000, was somewhat less than the investment in manufacturing, which amounted to approximately $37,000,000, nearly all of it engaged in Cuba, Mexico, and Argentina.

[5] These are Lewis' figures for the portfolio. I suspect that she is giving par values. If so, they are much too high, especially the figure for Mexico, $266,400,000, which would be about three-fourths of the total.

TABLE 4.—*Investments of United States citizens in Latin America, end of 1914: Government bonds, mining, agriculture, and railroads* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country or region	Government bonds	Mining	Agriculture	Railroads
Mexico	161.4	202.0	37.0	110.4
Cuba	35.0	15.0	129.0	13.4
Dominican Republic	4.6	[2] (?)	11.0	-------
Haiti	.4	(?)	-------	10.4
Central America	3.6	11.2	36.5	37.9
Argentina	24.7	-------	-------	-------
Bolivia	8.2	2.0	-------	-------
Brazil	6.1	2.0	(?)	(?)
Chile	.6	169.8	-------	-------
Colombia	-------	3.0	16.0	-------
Ecuador	(?)	5.0	(?)	3.6
Paraguay	-------	-------	5.0	-------
Peru	2.0	39.0	3.0	-------
Venezuela	-------	(?)	1.0	-------
Latin America (approximate)	246.6	449.0	238.5	175.7

[1] See the works cited in table 3.

[2] Throughout this article interrogation marks in tables indicate a strong conviction that investments existed but that information is too scanty for an intelligent estimate.

The portfolio holdings of United States citizens at the end of 1914 included government securities of 11 Latin-American nations and securities of corporations operating in 2 of them (Mexico and Argentina). The major portfolio investment, however, was in Mexican, Cuban, and Argentine Government bonds.

While the major direct investments, namely, the investments in economic enterprises controlled by United States citizens living in the United States, were in mining, agriculture, and railways, investments in the production of petroleum and in public utilities had attained importance. Capital invested in the oil wells and refineries of the principal producing countries amounted to some $107,000,000; Mexico, $85,000,000; Peru, $15,000,000; Venezuela, including asphalt, around $5,000,000; the rest was scattered through eight or nine countries, two or three in Central America and the others in South America. Banking capital was confirmed mainly to Cuba, Mexico, Panama, and Haiti. Table 4 gives the distribution of the investment in government bonds, mining, agriculture, and railways.

Finally, there are two other items which must be mentioned in order to complete the analysis: the investment in ocean shipping and submarine cables. Although this capital cannot be accurately apportioned between the United States and Latin America or among the several Latin-American countries, it should not be ignored. It would probably raise the total given in table 3 from $1,609,000,000 to around $1,630,000,000.[6]

III

Excepting Mexico, Nicaragua, Ecuador, and Paraguay, it can be stated without exaggeration that the 16 years following 1914, especially the decade of 1919–29, were a boom period in the private investment of United State capital in Latin America. The total capital of American citizens in the Latin-American countries, excluding capital in missionary and other nonprofit enterprises

[6] But see note 5.

and the holdings of nationals domiciled in the region, was considerably in excess of $5,000,000,000 by the end of 1930. The most startling expansion was in the investment in Government bonds, but enormous increases occurred also in the capital invested in the production and marketing of petroleum and petroleum products, in mining and smelting, in public utilities, in agriculture, in banking, and in manufacturing. Table 5, which omits shipping lines and submarine cables connecting the United States with the Latin-American nations and a few other general enterprises whose capital could not be accurately distributed, gives estimates of the total investment in each of the 20 nations.

TABLE 5.—*Investments of United States capital in Latin America, end of 1930* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Government obligations	Other portfolio	Direct investment	Total
Mexico	15.0	----	694.8	709.8
Cuba	126.3	4.6	935.7	1,066.6
Dominican Republic	17.4	----	69.8	87.2
Haiti	13.3	----	15.2	28.5
Costa Rica	10.2	----	22.4	32.6
Guatemala	4.4	----	70.7	75.1
Honduras	----	----	71.7	71.7
Nicaragua	----	----	13.0	13.0
Panama	17.8	----	28.7	46.5
El Salvador	5.3	----	29.4	34.7
Northern Latin America	209.7	4.6	1,911.4	2,165.7
Argentina	449.3	----	358.5	807.8
Bolivia	54.4	----	61.6	116.0
Brazil	343.9	2.9	210.2	557.0
Chile	260.1	----	440.8	700.9
Colombia	144.0	27.7	130.0	301.7
Ecuador	----	----	11.8	11.8
Paraguay	----	----	12.6	12.6
Peru	75.3	----	124.8	200.1
Uruguay	53.2	----	27.9	81.1
Venezuela	----	----	247.2	247.2
South America	1,380.2	30.6	1,625.4	3,036.2
Latin America	1,589.9	35.2	3,536.8	5,201.9

[1] Firmer ground has now been reached. Intense interest in foreign investments developed in the United States after World War I. It would be pointless to list here all the works on the subject, but a few will be mentioned besides the volume by Lewis already so frequently cited. Most useful in compiling table 5 was Trade Information Bulletin, No. 767, entitled "A New Estimate of American Investments Abroad," published by the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce (Washington, D. C., 1931). I have followed, in the main, the estimates for Latin America given in this monograph, but I have supplied some additional details derived from other sources and checked the data with those furnished by Lewis, op. cit., pp. 575-606, 652-55; by Max Winkler, op. cit., p. 278; and by Robert W. Dunn, "American Foreign Investments" (New York, 1926), pp. 61-135. Winkler's estimates for Cuba and Mexico are much too high, and some of his estimates for South American countries seem too low. The figures given in the Department of Commerce monograph, pp. 16-19, and the figures in my table 5 represent market values for portfolio and a combination of market and book values for direct investments.

Data on the distribution of the direct investment among the major economic activities at the end of 1930 have not been found, but fairly reliable information is available

TABLE 6

[In millions of dollars]

Public services (313.7 of the total in railroads)	887.1
Agriculture (643.2 in sugar production)	807.9
Mining and smelting	732.1
Petroleum (79.4 in distribution)	616.8
Manufacturing	231.0
Trading firms	119.2
Total capital in 6 major groups	3,394.1

for the close of the previous year.[7] The aggregate direct investment at the end of 1929 was approximately $3,462,000,000, and the distribution among the major economic groups was roughly as shown in table 6. Some $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 should be subtracted from the total in table 6, however, for investments in the Guianas and the non-Latin West Indies. The remainder of the direct investment at this time was in banking, construction organizations, motion pictures, and a few other miscellaneous enterprises.

The distribution among the principal recipient nations of the investment in the first three of these major groups is set forth in table 7. Nearly all the capital engaged in producing and refining petroleum was operating in six countries, namely, Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Cuba, and Bolivia, listed in descending order of the size of the investment, the total for Venezuela being around $226,000,000, the total for Mexico nearly $202,000,000, and that for Colombia about $56,000,000, with much smaller sums in the other three. Most of the investment in manuafcturing, again in descending order of size, was located in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Uruguay, Chile, Mexico, Colombia, and Peru—Some $82,000,000, or more than a third of the total, mainly in the processing of meat, being in Argentina alone; and a good part of the capital in trading organizations was likewise in these eight countries.

TABLE 7.—*Direct investments of United States citizens in Latin America, end of 1929: Distribution among the principal recipients of the capital in 3 major economic groups* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country or region	Public services	Agriculture	Mining and smelting	Total
Mexico	164.2	58.9	230.4	453.5
Cuba	214.9	575.0	9.0	798.9
Dominican Republic	(?)	61.3	(?)	61.3
Central America	93.4	70.8	11.3	175.5
Argentina	147.8	----	(?)	147.8
Bolivia	(?)	----	(?)	147.8
Brazil	90.9	2.0(?)	40.7	40.7
Chile	66.7	----	331.5	398.2
Colombia	24.9	15.8	10.6	51.3
Peru	11.3	4.0	79.5	94.8
Total (approximate)	820.1	787.8	716.0	2,323.9

[1] American Direct Investments in Foreign Countries ("Trade Information Bulletin," No. 731 [Washington, D. C.: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1931]), pp. 18-19. The total for banks and finance could not be ascertained, but American capital was dominating the banking field in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Cuba.

IV

A marked decline in the value of the investment occurred in the 1930's and early 1940's. The causes of the contraction were numerous; prominent among them were not only the general economic crisis, which depressed all economic values, and general disturbances in international politics but also the expropriation of oil properties in Bolivia and Mexico, rising economic nationalism, and the redemption of large blocks of Latin-American securities. Latest available statistics—for the end of May 1948 [8]—disclose a decline in values in 14 of the 20 nations and no marked increase in any of them save Panama, Venezuela, and Guatemala. The total investment at this time was around $3,424,000,000 as compared with over $5,200,000,000 at the end of 1930, a shrinkage of some $1,778,000,000. The most conspicuous contraction was in government bonds, which shrank from an aggregate of almost $1,590,000,000 in 1930 to a total of hardly more than $214,000,000 in 1943. Other portfolio investments, although still of minor importance in value, expanded by almost $70,000,000, namely, from $35,200,000 to $104,700,000. The shrinkage in direct investments was more decided than available statistics indicate. They declined from $3,536,800,000 in 1930 to considerably less than $3,105,300,000 in 1943 (arrived at by subtracting $319,000,000, the portfolio investment in 1943, from the total investment of $3,424,300,000), since this $3,105,300,000 included both short-term investments and investments of United States nationals domiciled in Latin America, which the estimate for 1930 omits. Table 8 gives a comparative view of the investments in each country at these two periods.

TABLE 8.—*Investments of United States capital in Latin America, end of December 1930 and end of May 1943*

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Total	
	1930	1943
Mexico	709.8	422.2
Cuba	1,066.6	590.5
Dominican Republic	87.2	80.5
Haiti	28.5	17.7
Costa Rica	32.6	36.7
Guatemala	75.1	93.0
Honduras	71.7	42.2
Nicaragua	13.0	13.5
Panama	46.5	154.4
El Salvador	24.7	20.4
Northern Latin America	2,165.7	1,471.1
Argentina	807.8	497.5
Bolivia	116.0	24.0
Brazil	557.0	334.7
Chile	700.9	388.1
Colombia	301.7	178.9
Ecuador	11.8	13.3
Paraguay	12.6	10.0
Peru	200.1	88.8
Uruguay	81.1	19.3
Venezuela	247.2	398.6
South America	3,036.2	1,953.2
Latin America	5,201.9	3,424.3

Table 9 indicates roughly the trend in direct investments in the major economic groups. These figures disclose a slight increase in the investment in trading firms and a considerable increase in the capital engaged in manufacturing, but expansions in these two are far more than offset by shrinkage in the investments in mining and smelting, agriculture, and public services. Investment in the production and marketing of petroleum was well sustained in spite of reverses in Mexico and Bolivia. The aggregate capital invested in the six major groups registered a decline of $832,500,000, but the total for the year 1929 as already observed, included thirty-five or forty million dollars for the Guianas and the non-Latin West Indies, so that the discrepancy is somewhat less than the figures indicate. The remainder of the direct investment in 1943, nearly $644,000,000, consisted of real estate (presumably urban) valued at approximately $71,000,000, considerable banking capital (which appears not to have been very prosperous in Cuba and Uruguay), investments in trust funds and estates, short-term loans and advances, bank deposits, stocks of bullion and other commodities, and small miscellaneous items.

This difference in the items included should not be concealed, but I think it is not significant in view of the fact that returns given by owners who may have had a suspicion that the government had in mind some new plan for securing additional revenue would err on the side of moderation.

[7] "Trade Information Bulletin," No. 731 (Washington, D. C.: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1931), pp. 18-19. The title of this bulletin is American Direct Investments in Foreign Countries.

[8] United States Treasury Department, Census of American-owned Assets in Foreign Countries (Washington, D. C., 1947), pp. 67-70 et passim. The Treasury Department figures represent market values for securities (portfolio) and book values for other assets, and, unlike the Commerce Department estimates for 1929 and 1930, they include short-term investments and investments of United States citizens residing in Latin America, amounting to a combined total of around $200,000,000, perhaps, although certain duplications may reduce the sum considerably.

TABLE 9

[In millions of dollars]

	1929	1943
Public services	887.1	869.9
Agriculture	807.9	275.3
Mining and smelting	732.1	396.0
Petroleum: production and distribution	616.8	559.7
Manufacturing	231.0	332.3
Trading	119.2	138.4
Total in 6 major groups	3,394.1	2,561.6

Elaborate comment on the distribution of the investment among the various countries in 1943 seems unnecessary in view of the analysis presented for 1914 and 1930. The largest investments in Government bonds in terms of market value, were in the bonds of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Uruguay, and Panama; those of Peru, Bolivia, and Mexico were quoted at far below par. The portfolio corporate investment was located mainly in Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Cuba, and Panama. The major mining capital was still in Mexico, Chile, and Peru, although considerable sums were active in Bolivia, Argentina, Cuba, Honduras, and Nicaragua. More than 60 percent of the petroleum investment was now in Venezuela; other major recipients were not Mexico and Bolivia but Colombia, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Panama, and Cuba. (Petroleum and banking capital, together with a considerable sum in public utilities, accounted for the pronounced increase in United States investments in Panama.) By far the largest public utility investment, approximately $272,000,000 and nearly a third of the total in Latin America, was in Cuba. Next in order was Argentina, with almost $182,000,000; Mexico, with about $105,000,000; Brazil, slightly less than $88,000,000; Chile, $66,000,000; Guatemala, almost $63,000,000; Panama, $22,000,000; and Colombia, nearly $18,000,000. The major investments in manufacturing concentrated in six nations: Argentina, $101,000,000; Brazil, $66,400,000; Cuba, $65,400,000; Chile, $27,500,000; Mexico, $22,300,000; and Uruguay, $16,800,000.

V

The number of economic enterprises controlled by United States citizens in Latin America is probably more significant than any general estimates of their aggregate value. For the years 1929, 1940,[9] and 1943 the statistics, although probably not complete for the first two dates, are sufficiently impressive. They are presented in table 10.

TABLE 10.—*Number of enterprises controlled by United States citizens operating in Latin America: 1929, 1940, and 1943* [1]

Country	Number of enterprises		
	1929	1940	1943
Mexico	285	200	359
Cuba	219	208	338
Dominican Republic	21	23	39
Haiti	23	15	24
Costa Rica	16	14	26
Guatemala	26	22	32
Honduras	27	24	25
Nicaragua	14	20	22
Panama	22	42	79
El Salvador	6	9	17
Northern Latin America	659	577	961
Argentina	99	125	249
Bolivia	14	14	21
Brazil	90	112	265
Chile	51	56	96
Colombia	63	64	140
Ecuador	16	10	34
Paraguay	9	12	6
Peru	36	39	89
Uruguay	32	28	51
Venezuela	52	48	86
South America	462	502	1,037
Latin America	1,121	1,079	1,998

[1] Compiled from sources cited in nn. 7, 8, and 9 and in tables 5 and 7.

[9] Economic Series, No. 20 (Washington, D. C.: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942), p. 13.

The figures for 1943 indicate a striking increase in numbers over the preceding years, an almost incredible expansion in view of the fact that those for 1943 include only enterprises controlled by corporations, while the statistics for 1929 and 1940 include all enterprises controlled by nationals residing in the United States. The remarkable increase in numbers may be explained in part by war investment, but a far more complete coverage is probably the most significant factor.

TABLE 11.—*Investments of United States citizens in Latin America, end of 1940: Number and capital of controlled enterprises in the major fields of activity* [1]

[Capital shown in millions of dollars]

Country or region	Public services		Petroleum		Mining		Agriculture	
	Number	Capital	Number	Capital	Number	Capital	Number	Capital
Mexico	25	116.4	15	42.0	36	168.3	10	10.3
Cuba	21	233.4	7	10.2	7	6.6	49	240.9
Dominican Republic	3	4.0	3	2.0			5	37.5
Haiti	5	3.8	2	.4	1	.3	2	4.0
Central America	28	96.4	13	8.0	8	6.6	17	51.1
Northern Latin America	82	455.0	40	62.6	52	181.8	78	343.8
Argentina	12	221.1	8	36.0	3	10.0		
Bolivia	1	.5	2	14.8	4	10.0		
Brazil	12	112.5	6	30.7	3	2.0	1	1.0
Chile	9	121.4	2	3.0	8	276.8		
Colombia	11	25.8	15	75.1	4	4.0	1	2.6
Ecuador	3	1.5	3	3.5	2	3.0		
Peru	5	11.1	1	10.0	4	20.2	1	8.0
Uruguay			4	2.4				
Venezuela	4	8.5	21	249.7	2	.6		
South America	57	503.4	62	425.2	30	326.6	3	11.0
Latin America	139	958.4	102	487.8	81	508.4	81	354.4

[1] "Economic Series," No. 20 (Washington, D. C.: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942), p. 13. Using the monograph cited in n. 8, I have supplied the estimates in a few instances where the data were lacking.

Since most of the business organizations listed for 1929 and 1940 and all those tabulated for 1943 were controlled by corporations domiciled in the United States, the paramount significance of corporate capital in inter-American relations would seem to be quite obvious. It is likely that less than 300 United States corporations owned practically all the numerous enterprises operating in Latin America in the 1930's and 1940's. Some corporations had several affiliates concentrated in three or four countries; others, like W. R. Grace & Co. and Electric Bond & Share or the International Telegraph & Telephone Co. and some of the major oil and motion-picture corporations or the National City Bank, had subsidiaries and affiliates in the majority of the nations. The extent of concentration is further illustrated by the following statistics for 1943: 225 corporations in the United States controlled the 359 business enterprises operating in Mexico, 207 controlled the 338 operating in Cuba, 157 controlled the 265 in Brazil, and 171 controlled the 249 in Argentina. (Excepting sugar corporations in Cuba, practically the same corporations controlled the enterprises in each country.) The influence of American business organizations, especially corporate enterprises, was significant in nearly all the countries except Haiti, Paraguay, and possibly Bolivia and Ecuador; and American corporations practically dominated the economies of the Dominican Republic, Cuba, the Central American nations, and Venezuela.

An inspection of the number and capitalization of the organizations engaged in the major economic activities in each country will give a fuller view of their impact. Table II classifies the data as of 1940 for public services, petroleum, mining and smelting, and agriculture. There were, in addition to those shown in table 11, some 80 miscellaneous enterprises; approximately 230 manufacturing, assembly, and processing plants, with an aggregate capital of around $200,000,000; and over 100 trading firms capitalized at approximately $50,000,000, the trading organizations being widely distributed and the manufacturing establishments being concentrated mainly in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Peru, and Colombia, named in descending order of the amount of capital engaged.

The operation of these numerous business enterprises requires many intimate associations and a multitude of contacts between managerial and investment groups [10] of the

[10] It would be a most difficult task to determine the numbers involved on either side, especially the Latin-American side. Even a careful census—and no such census has ever been taken so far as I know—of the management, labor force, and patrons of these hundreds of business organizations would not disclose the full impact; the families of Latin-American officials, directors, workers, and patrons, as well as the impact, direct and indirect, on entire national economies would be involved; and it would be necessary to include not only the organizations owned by citizens of the United States living at home but enterprises of citizens of the United States living in Latin America and owning property there. Statistics for all the corporate controlled enterprises operating in the region, with the exception of those in Haiti and the Dominican Republic, indicate that around 2,400 officers and directors from the United States are associated as managers with somewhat more than that number of Latin-American officers and directors. In order to present an accurate picture of the relations of this United States managerial and technical group with Latin-American labor, it would be necessary to investigate certain labor policies with the view to determining the extent to which the workers are dealt with by Latin-American management associates, and a similar investigation would be necessary in order to obtain a correct impression of the relationships of United States management and Latin-American purchasers of services and buyers and sellers of commodities. In other words, it would be necessary to ascertain whether, and to what extent, the relationships of each business organization are immediate and personal or remote and impersonal. The contacts between buyers and sellers, in the case of both services and goods, are probably the most numerous if not also the most intimate. Latin-American patrons of the public services owned by investors of the United States must number between two and three millions, without including the families of those who pay the telephone, electric, gas, and water bills; and the patronage of mercantile

United States and Latin-Americans of every class. This is emphatically true of banks, transport, telephone, and electric utility systems, sugar and banana plantations, mines, and various types of manufacturing. Thousands of businessmen and technicians from the United States are brought into close touch with millions of Latin-Americans every day in the year. It therefore seems quite evident that Pan-American harmony must depend in large measure upon harmony in business relations.

Congressional Action on Recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The concluding report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was transmitted to Congress by the Honorable Herbert Hoover on May 20, 1949.

The Commission as a body, on that same day, presented a full set of the reports to President Truman at the White House. He then affirmed once more his belief in the principles which we on the Commission had espoused. We, who were members of the Commission, feel that he is endeavoring to carry out his side of this bargain.

Since that date, Congress has passed laws covering almost 10 percent of the recommendations of the Commission. Reorganization Plans Nos. 2 through 7 of 1949 took effect with congressional consent, thus adding somewhat over 5 percent more to the total.

This means that over 15 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been acted upon favorably by Congress since the concluding report was submitted in May. Sixty percent of the recommendations call for congressional approval.

Putting it another way, Congress has completed about fifteen-sixtieths, or one-quarter, of its actions on the Commission's recommendations. The Congress has done this on a bipartisan basis. I am sure I can speak for Mr. Hoover and the Commission in strongly urging that this public-spirited cooperation will continue.

As the one who "invented" the Commission, I can sincerely say that this record of the present Congress far exceeds my early expectations. Creditable though this record is, it does not mean that we should slow down on this job. We cannot neglect the remaining three-quarters. We must finish them off at the next session.

We must always remember that the recommendations were drafted as an over-all pattern. Those of us, who studied so intensively the operations of the executive branch, recognized that it cannot be overhauled with scotch tape or pieces of string. It has to be overhauled according to an intelligent plan.

If integral parts of the Commission's program are neglected, we will end up with next to nothing.

Inaction on our recommendations must not be permitted next January.

Already bipartisan citizens' committees supporting the Commission's recommendations have been started up in 36 States, where citizens have banded together to insist upon reorganization. This ground swell arises from the wishes of citizens who plan to see through the Commission's efforts to a successful conclusion.

To those of us who believe so strongly in the Commission's program, this ground swell is most encouraging. In January, we will redouble our efforts to have the other three-quarters of the program enacted.

If we are to do this, one important step is imperative. The scores of bills now before us on the Commission's reports must be telescoped and rewritten, so that (1) they will be more complete; (2) they will be perfected; and (3) they will be limited to a dozen or so specific major and all-inclusive proposals.

Such legislative proposals must be presented. They should be sponsored on the same bipartisan basis which typified our Commission. There will be two advantages from such bills: First, those of you who have often wished for specific measures on the Commission's program would have them. Second, it would afford our constituents with an opportunity to indicate their attitude toward a few specific measures, rather than toward scores of bits and pieces.

If such specific measures are prepared, I hope that our bipartisan cooperation on this matter will continue to be as effective in the future as it has been in the Eighty-first Congress to date.

Enough for our plans. Now I would like to present a comprehensive review of what has happened on legislation which stems from the reports of our Commission. This report supplements the one I made to you on August 11, 1949.

THE PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PLANS

Six of the seven major reorganization plans submitted by the President to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949 took effect August 20, 1949. Plan No. 1 was vetoed by the Senate August 17, 1949, by a vote of 60–32. These reorganization plans were:

Reorganization Plan No. 1, Department of Welfare: This plan would have changed the name of the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Welfare and have constituted this department an executive department. It was vetoed by the Senate primarily on the ground that it conformed only partially to the Hoover report.

Reorganization Plan No. 2, Department of Labor: This plan transferred the Bureau of Employment Security of the Federal Security Agency to the Labor Department. It transferred to the Secretary of Labor the functions of the Veterans' Placement Service Board and of its Chairman and abolished the Board. It covered two of five pertinent recommendations of the Commission.

Reorganization Plan No. 3, Post Office Department: This plan transferred the functions of all subordinates to the Postmaster General. It conformed, except for minor details, to the Commission report.

Reorganization Plan No. 4, Executive Office of the President: This plan transferred to the Executive Office of the President the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board, two important over-all staff agencies of the executive branch. It conformed to the report.

Reorganization Plan No. 5, Civil Service Commission: This plan reorganized the Civil Service Commission. It centered authority in the Chairman, but reserved so much power in the Commission that, in my opinion, its efficacy is doubtful.

Reorganization Plan No. 6, United States Maritime Commission: This plan reorganized the United States Maritime Commission, but did not remove the business operations which, in our Commission's opinion, were not appropriate activities for a five-man commission.

Reorganization Plan No. 7, Public Roads Administration: This plan transferred to the Department of Commerce the Public Roads Administration (Bureau of Public Roads) of the newly created General Services Administration (Public Law 152, 81st Cong., 1st sess.). It conformed to the report.

These plans cover 15 of the 87 steps which, in the opinion of the Budget Bureau and of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, can be accomplished most effectively through use of the authority granted to the President by the Reorganization Act of 1949.

In addition, the President submitted plan No. 8, relating to military unification, but, in view of the passage of the Military Unification Act, the major steps proposed in this plan were effected by Public Law 216; and the plan was discarded.

STATUS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Report No. 1, general management of the executive branch

Public Law 109, Reorganization Act of 1949, was enacted June 10, 1949.

House: H. R. 2613, a very broad bill prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Mr. DAWSON on February 10, 1949. It was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held on this measure. H. R. 5526, an excellent but more limited bill, was introduced by Mr. MCCORMACK on July 7, 1949, and was passed by the House on August 12, 1949. It is now before the Senate.

Senate: S. 942, a very broad bill prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced in the Senate by Senator MCCLELLAN on February 14, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. The Senate Expenditures Committee referred S. 942 to a subcommittee June 22. H. R. 5526 (see House above) was sent to the Senate by the House and referred to the Expenditures Committee on August 15, 1949. No hearings have been held on these measures.

---

firms probably amounts to another million. Workers are less numerous than patrons, but Latin-Americans employed by these "Yankee" business organizations—office help, technicians, laborers on the plantations and in the manufacturing and extractive industries—probably number several hundred thousand. And, finally, in arriving at a reasonably accurate estimate of the number of contacts involved, consideration must be given to the more than 1,500 property-owning citizens of the United States domiciled in Latin America in the early 1940's. The whole subject is as complicated as it is significant. Until an exhaustive census is made, the investigator must depend upon Moody's Manuals, accessible company reports to stockholders, and such information as can be gleaned from government publications of the type suggested by the footnotes accompanying this essay.

I have not considered it necessary in this article to identify the major corporations which control these numerous enterprises, but I have compiled long lists from the investment manuals. I am aware also that I have said nothing of significance of the investments for the United States. It is reasonable to assume, I suppose, that they have stimulated exports, brought returns to some investors, furnished profitable occupation for managers and technicians, and supplied many raw materials for industry as well as foods for factory workers and others. A thorough discussion of this aspect of the subject would require not only a complete command of the principles of economics but a detailed examination of the history of each company.

Report No. 2, personnel management

House: H. R. 5181, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced in the House by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on June 15, 1949, and was referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. No hearings have been held. H. R. 1689, to increase top officials' salaries, was introduced in the House by Mr. MILLER of California on January 20, 1949. It was passed by the House on July 8, 1949. The conference version of H. R. 1689 was adopted by the House October 13, 1949. H. R. 5931, a partial reclassification bill with a general salary increase included, was introduced by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee on August 9, 1949, and was passed by the House on August 28, 1949. H. R. 5931 is in conference, the House having agreed to a conference October 3, 1949.

Senate: S. 2111, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced in the Senate on June 20, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY. Sporadic hearings on this and unrelated measures, were held by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on July 20 and 27. The committee never consulted our task forces and made no report. H. R. 1689 was sent to the Senate by the House on July 11, 1949, and was passed by the Senate September 29, 1949. The conference version is now before the Senate. H. R. 5931, the "Classification Revision Act of 1949" was passed by the Senate September 30, 1949. H. R. 5931 is now in conference.

Report No. 3, Office of General Services (supply activities)

Public Law 152, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 was enacted on June 30, 1949. This is the most important measure in this field in the Nation's history.

Report No. 4, the Post Office

House: H. R. 5177, a comprehensive bill prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on June 15, 1949. H. R. 5775, a financial bill only, was introduced on July 26, by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, as a result of the President's message on the Post Office. These two bills were referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. No hearings have been held.

House: On October 13, 1949, the Post Office Committee approved H. R. 2945, raising postal rates $130,000,000 a year. The bill would double the rate for all post cards from 1 cent to 2 cents, and it was estimated that increased revenue from that source would be $36,000,000 a year. The increase on fourth-class mail would bring in an extra $38,000,000, and third class $24,000,000. Other services affected are special delivery, postal notes, c. o. d., and registered mail. This bill conforms for the most part to the Commission's recommendations.

Senate: S. 1103, a controversial rate bill to which a few of the Commission's recommendations were added, was introduced by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, on February 28, 1949. It was reported favorably by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee September 30, 1949. S. 2062, a broad measure prepared by the Commission's staff, was introduced by Senator MCCARTHY on June 13, 1949. S. 2212 and S. 2213, a financial bill and a measure to put the postmasters under the civil service, were introduced by Senator FREAR on July 7, 1949, as a result of the President's message on the Post Office Department. Both of these bills were referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which held hearings on July 20 and on July 27. The committee has not yet reported out S. 2062, S. 2212, or S. 2213, all of which are excellent bills.

Report No. 5, Foreign affairs

Public Law 73, an act to reorganize the Department of State, was enacted on May 26, 1949. It is being prosecuted with great vigor by our former Vice Chairman, Mr. Acheson.

Report No. 6, Department of Agriculture

House: H. R. 5179, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and was referred to the Agriculture Committee. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2055, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 13, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY and was referred to the Agriculture Committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 7, budgeting and accounting

House: H. R. 5178, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on June 15, 1949. A substitute bill, H. R. 5823, was later prepared and introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, incorporating the financial provisions of the Short bill on military unification (H. R. 5632). The new bill was introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on August 1, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2054, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Senator MCCARTHY on June 13, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. The Senate Expenditures Committee referred S. 2054 to a subcommittee June 22. Certain amendments were also introduced on August 1, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY as a result of the Military Unification Act. These were referred to the same committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 8, the national security organization

Public Law 36, providing for a much-needed Under Secretary of Defense, was enacted as a result of the tragedy of our overworked colleague, the late Commissioner Forrestal. A conference version of the Short bill, H. R. 5632, providing for a modernized budget and accounting system in the Military Establishment, was passed by the House. As amended in conference, it confers very broad authority on the Secretary of Defense. Savings of at least a half billion dollars annually are resulting from it. It was signed by the President on August 10, as Public Law 216.

Report No. 9, Veterans' Affairs

House: H. R. 5171, to create a Veterans' Life Insurance Corporation, was introduced by Mr. RANKIN on June 15. H. R. 5283, prepared by the Commission's staff, was introduced by Mr. EVINS on June 22, 1949. Both of these bills were referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2019, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 8, 1949, by Senator MCCLELLAN, and was referred to the Finance Committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 10, Department of Commerce

House: H. R. 5180, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2056, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 13, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 11, Treasury Department

House: H. R. 5174, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. No hearing have been held.

Senate: S. 2058, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 13, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY and was referred to the Finance Committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 12, regulatory commissions

House: H. R. 5173, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held.

Senate: Four bills were introduced in the Senate. Two of these were prepared by the staff of the Commission: S. 2059 was introduced on June 13, 1949, by Senator MCCARTHY, and S. 2073 was introduced on June 14, by Senator MCCLELLAN, both of which were referred to the Expenditures Committee. The committee agreed on August 10, 1949, to defer action on S. 2073 until the next session. Two bills covering portions of the McCarthy and McClellan bills were introduced separately to assist in committee consideration of them: S. 2330 was introduced by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado on July 26, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and S. 2340 was introduced by Senator MAYBANK on July 27, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. No hearings have been held on any of these measures.

Report No. 13, Department of Labor

No legislation was prepared by the Hoover Commission and no bills have been introduced yet; but, in view of the shortcomings in Reorganization Plan No. 2, a comprehensive measure will be prepared.

Report No. 14, Interior Department

House: H. R. 5176, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and was referred to the Public Lands Committee. H. R. 5469, a more complete bill, was introduced by Mr. WHITE of California on June 30, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. The latter bill, unlike the other bills following the Commission's recommendations, is broader than those prepared by the Commission's staff. It includes organization matters which could be effected through reorganization plans, but, in its major respects it conforms to the Commission's recommendations. The White bill pattern will be followed in other cases. H. R. 6317 was introduced by Mr. WHITE of California also, on October 4, 1949, and referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held on any of these measures.

Senate: S. 2057, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Senator MCCARTHY on June 13, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 15, Social security, education, and Indian affairs

House: H. R. 5175, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on June 15, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2060, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Senator MCCARTHY on June 13, 1949. Major amendments, differing in many details, were added to S. 2060 by Senator MCCARTHY on August 5, 1949. Both bills were referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 16, medical activities

House: H. R. 5182, prepared by the Commission's staff, was introduced on June 15, 1949, by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No hearings have been held.

Senate: S. 2008, prepared by the Commission's staff, was introduced by June 7, 1949, by Senator THOMAS of Utah and was referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. No hearings have been held.

Report No. 17, business enterprises

No legislation was prepared by the Hoover Commission. Pertinent bills have to be introduced in January.

Report No. 18, overseas administration, Federal-State relations, Federal research

A. Overseas Administration

House: H. R. 5172, prepared by the staff of the Commission, was introduced by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan on June 15, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. S. 2072 was sent to the House by the Senate and on September 2, 1949, was referred to the Expenditures Committee. H. R. 6170 was introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD on September 13, 1949, and referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee. No hearings have been held on any of these measures.

Senate: S. 2061, prepared by the Commission's staff, was passed by the Senate with amendments on August 27, 1949.

B. Federal-State Relations

House: H. R. 4507 was introduced by Mr. BONNER on May 3, 1949, and was referred to the Expenditures Committee. No action has been taken on it.

Senate: S. 1946 was introduced by Senator TAYLOR et al., on May 25, 1949, and was reported favorably by the Expenditures Committee on June 13. It is before the Senate.

C. Federal Fesearch

House: H. R. 4846 was introduced by Mr. PRIEST on May 24, 1949, and was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which reported the bill favorably on June 14, 1949.

Senate: S. 247 was introduced by Senator THOMAS of Utah on January 6, 1949, was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on March 18, 1949, and was passed by the Senate on the same date.

Report No. 19, concluding report

No legislation was prepared by the Hoover Commission. Pertinent bills will be introduced in January.

The Real Problem of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close it is my view that every one of us who believes in the good life—who believes in freedom for himself and others—is going to have to do some good, hard, sound thinking during the coming months and years. We are going to have to get down to fundamentals in our thinking about our work, about our responsibilities one to the other, about our various governments—local, State, and Federal—and the part each of these governments must play, both in regard to us as individuals and in regard to each other.

There are so many problems facing us that never faced our forefathers that we have to be incomparably better informed. It often is said that the demands upon Congressmen and upon our leaders in the executive branch are heavier today than ever. That is true. But it is just as true that the demands upon every citizen are greater, too.

We think first of ourselves. Then we think of our families—our brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, our friends and neighbors. But as is the case of a man who is in a burning building, it would be disastrous for us and for our fellow Americans in the building with us if we think only of ourselves, first, always. There are times when we are being selfish in a most enlightened way if we think of our larger problems.

It is to those larger problems to which I would like to direct your attention at this time. We must think together on those larger problems if we ever are going to solve, satisfactorily, our individual problems.

Take, for example, our family budget. Every one of us, from the best off to the poorest, must think of cutting family expenses to make ends meet, at times. That is good, but many times a cut in spending by individual families may be disastrous for its members. There simply are certain necessary expenses which we must incur to keep body and soul together.

Though it may not have occurred to you, every family in America could improve its lot a little, economically, by thinking more today of cutting Government expenses. Every new Government employee means that much more money taken away from me and from you. Every new loan, gift, or whatever you call it, to another nation means that much more taxes you and I have to pay. A demagog will tell you that the rich will pay the taxes, if he can make them, but anyone who can add or subtract, knows that it is not true. If the fortunes of everyone worth more than $50,000 were confiscated in America, it would not keep the Federal Government going 3 months. You and I—and the other millions of Americans—are going to have to pay for everything our Government undertakes.

Or, let us think for a moment of security. Just what do we mean by security? Do we mean the security which a convict has? He has no fears about tomorrow. He has a State guaranty of three meals a day, a place to sleep, the care of a physician, and, of course, very steady work. That is security. Is that the kind we want? Our forefathers fought a war against the British tyranny, not for security, but for freedom. The freedom consisted in the inalienable right of each citizen to be certain, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that his home would not be entered without a warrant, showing proper cause. It consisted of the inalienable right of each citizen to be certain, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that all laws would apply to all citizens with the same equality. Merely because a man had political influence with a king's nobleman would not, our forefathers reasoned, give him the right to pull shady deals and get away with them. We know that we are losing some of that assurance of freedom.

Many of us have not spent the time we should thinking on these things. We ought to devote more of our time to pondering the drift of our Government. Not in a negative or pessimistic frame of mind, but in an aware and alert manner so that we might make a positive contribution to every good move toward more freedom, which, to every American means more real security of the basic kind. Freedom is security, but not the kind certain politicians are peddling. They are peddling slavery and calling it security. We must examine all segments of every proposal. If we take socialized medicine, we might be making it impossible for our sons to practice medicine, if they choose, without passing several Federal IQ tests, or getting appointments from some political board. If we continue to socialize the building industry, we might make it impossible for a man to go out and construct his own home with his own hands without first getting permission from some Government board or bureau. Each of these results may sound farfetched to you, but remember that the people of this country had some terribly pernicious experiences merely with the OPA, which sent thousands of agents over the country, hailing citizens into court without warning and levying fines without even holding hearings. You and I know that, given untrammeled power, as many men are seeking, politicians can become arrogant and power-mad.

We ought to spend more time thinking of the kind of government our forefathers formed and of how far we have gotten away from their basic concepts of government. When Benjamin Franklin walked out of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, someone called to him from the crowd: "What kind of government have you given us, Ben?"

"We have given you a representative republic—if you can keep it," he replied with characteristic vigor.

It is up to every generation to learn what kind of government it has and how best to make it work. I do not hesitate to say that today, at a crucial period in our history, millions of our citizens do not know what kind of government we have, or we should have, or how to make it work.

There is, for instance, a lot of talk about Congress. You can get anyone to tell you what Congress should do or should not do. President Truman last year made his campaign on the basis of the alleged badness of the Republican Eightieth Congress. Now, some Republicans are going to base next year's campaign on the alleged badness of the Eighty-first Congress.

I will say very frankly that I will not be among these Republicans. I believe that the time has long since passed when the people should worry a half, or a tenth as much about Congress as they should be worried about the overweening executive branch. Every citizen who is trying to think of government, should think seriously of what has happened to our representative Republic and how it can be made to work better. The executive branch, through development of modern propaganda techniques and through the construction of a huge political machine appealing to the more thoughtless elements of our population, should be examined with a microscope by the eyes of every citizen.

There was a time, not too many years ago, when the Congress was the sole

arbiter of the people's destiny in America, insofar as the enactment of laws and the passage of appropriations was concerned. It still is the arbiter, to an extent, but to compare the power of Congress today to its power of yesteryear is to compare the power of modern Greece to the powers it once held three or four thousand years ago, when it ruled the known world in its hey-day.

Congress no longer is the powerful organization it once was. No laws have been enacted specifically cutting the powers of Congress. The Constitution reads the same today as it did yesterday. But subtle changes have taken place—about which our forefathers warned us—that make Congress a secondary factor in our lives instead of the primary factor.

There no longer is any dispute about which branch of the Government is predominant. Once the three branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—were coordinate in responsibility and power. This is the way it was supposed to work. But today, everyone knows without even thinking about it that the executive is predominant, no matter who or how weak the President or how inept his bureaucratic leaders may be, by and large. Once Congress, and congressional leaders, made the headlines and occupied the limelight. Now, the President and his economic advisers and his propagandists make the headlines and occupy the limelight. Congress, not too many years ago, was consulted before an expenditure of as much as $100,000 would even be considered by an administration, whether Democratic or Republican. Now, the executive branch commits the Nation to treaties, to huge gifts and loans, and even to potential wars without even so much as a by-your-leave to Congress. After the commitment is made and the propaganda machine is turned on, it is presumed—and it generally is the case—that Congress will go along.

What has happened to make it possible for the executive branch virtually to usurp the functions of the people in such a way—for, of course, you and I realize, Congress represents the people in the Government? It is the last stronghold for the people. If Congress goes, then the freedom for which our fathers died in every generation will be gone.

To understand what has happened in recent years to give the executive branch so much power, it is necessary to understand many facets and factors in Washington life and in economic developments.

As the years have passed, crises and emergencies—whether real or imagined—have taken place in America. According to the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, we are still at war and still are in a national emergency originally proclaimed back in 1939, more than 10 years ago.

At any rate, under the urgency of such crises and emergencies, Members of Congress—most of whom were looking for and received, good appointments later in the executive branch—appropriated huge sums and grants of power to the executive branch. Laws and regulations and methods of punishing and penalizing citizens were passed in a steady stream, with only a bare minority voting against these laws and undue allocations of power. No regard was given by Congress to the checks and balances that might be used to restrain those administering these laws and regulations. Now, although Congress itself still passes many laws—too many, in my judgment—the officials of the executive branch, acting under authority granted by Congress along ago, pass many times as many laws as does Congress. Day after day, literally hundreds of bureau rulings are issued, affecting this or that individual, group, industry, or section. Few of them can be appealed under the existing grants of authority voted by Congress, even if the people wronged had the money to appeal which is doubtful in most instances.

As the years have passed, many citizens journeying to Washington have learned that they no longer can look to Congress for redress of their grievances. If so, they are accused of being lobbyists by the Department of Justice. They must look to the bureaucrats who perpetrated the wrongs in the first place. In one way or another, either through payment of money, building of friendships, or paying 5 percent to men of influence, they make their peace with the bureaucrats and can go on living, unmolested, in a country that is losing its freedom, where, indeed, many citizens already have lost their freedoms. In years past, there was no need for "5 percenters," "influence artists," or "men with know-who." Now, thousands of these men make their living doing for clients what Congress should do for the citizens. These 5 percenters, in final analysis, are more powerful than Congress, because they have seen that the real power has swung from Congress to relatively little known "experts" who are heads of this or that relatively unknown bureau.

This was the inevitable result that had to come, granted human beings would remain human beings, because of the huge growth in power and influence and cash bequeathed to the executive branch by supine and ignorant Congresses of years long gone. To say that it is the present Congress' fault is misplacing the emphasis, except in one respect. Those Congressmen who do not see the light and are not honest enough to fight the executive's encroachments, ought to be replaced. The people, awakening from their lethargy, should send to Congress only men who believe in a strong Congress, which means a strong, enlightened citizenry, alert to the threats to its freedom from within or without.

There is nothing left for an American to do but to ponder deeply the facts of economic and political life to see that Congress no longer is the powerful and influential body it once was. That role has been taken over by the executive branch of the Government. Whether the pendulum ever will swing depends in large measure on how many people understand how clearly what has happened, why it has happened, and how it can be remedied.

A good Congress, in my judgment, is one that would spend more of its time repealing laws than it would in considering legislation. It would spend most of its time examining former grants of power to the executive branch and determining how best to retrieve these grants.

This country has too many laws as it is. There literally are thousands of laws on the city, State, and Federal statute books. There are millions of rules under which you and I live and move and have our being. Any person in the United States could be accused of being too big or too little, or accused and probably indicted, for almost a thousand unknown and undefined crimes, if the powers that be decided that he should be so accused and indicted. Generally, it is not necessary for him to be indicted. Under the present propaganda set-up, he can be accused in such a manner as to be smeared successfully, and his influence, business, and social contacts ruined for years to come.

A good Congress should not spend its time investigating individuals who have learned to live and work honestly, insofar as they know how, under the bad laws that have been passed by other Congresses, or by the multitudinous bureaus. What has happened has been done so subtly, so carefully, so painlessly to most Americans that not many of them actually know they no longer are living under the same kind of government they once had. They still are worrying about whether Congress is good or bad. Congress no longer holds the whip. The executive branch, through its huge propaganda machine and its enormous control over the Federal budget, now virtually calls the tune in America.

Take the Republican Eightieth Congress, for example. Its leaders were busy trying to enact good laws. Many of the laws they enacted, particularly when they voted to send huge sums to various countries far from here, were bad. But, oddly enough, most of the bad laws were suggested originally by the executive branch. Whenever the Eightieth Congress attempted to pass any law, whether good or bad, to which the executive branch objected, the full force of the Federal propaganda machine was turned on. In every case, the Congress was made the issue, when the executive branch might logically have been made the issue. The Congressmen were painted as mere obstructionists, although the truth may have been—and frequently was—that the proposals of the administration were not constructive proposals for our system, but destructive proposals. Yet, through clever propaganda it was made to seem that Congressmen who fought these destructive proposals were not taking a constructive attitude.

Any Congress, by the definition of the founding fathers and of every man who knows anything about Republican government, is a bad Congress if it is supine and a tool of the executive. To the extent that the Eightieth Congress responded when the President cracked the whip on farm legislation, foreign aid, and other proposals, to that extent it was a bad Congress.

So, by the same method can we judge the record of the Eighty-first Congress. When Congress has passed higher and higher appropriations, not because these were needed, were sound, or were logical, but merely because of pressure from the executive branch, then the Congress has been bad. Naturally, the executive branch has hailed congressional "cooperation" on passing these laws as "good," but the executive branch hardly could be called unbiased. Its officials are thinking of one thing—retain power and to grab more. Their standard for judging what is good and what is bad is far different from the standard an aware, informed, and alert citizen should apply.

It seems incredible, in view of the plain facts of the matter, that there still are Americans who will insist that the three branches of the Government are coequal in authority and influence, as the Constitution provided and as every citizen should wish them to be. The peculiar viewpoints of our executive leaders in recent years as to what is "right" and what is "wrong" has caused the Supreme Court to be loaded with men more anxious to retain favor in party circles than to render justice under the written law. As a result, the Supreme Court has fallen into disrepute among intelligent persons, and its contradictions have become notorious among those who think logically, or try to.

We, as Americans, are going to have to think more about these facts and factors. It is possible that the men who may seem to be weaving a garland of security for us to use in our old age may, in reality, be making chains for our children.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the current steel strike there has been much misunderstanding. When one knows the facts, the conclusion is inevitable that the workers in the steel industry were within their rights in declaring the strike. The record indicates that since June 15 the union has been endeavoring to adjust this matter. The steel workers demanded a wage increase. They also asked for a noncontributory social insurance plan costing 4 cents per hour and a noncontributory pension plan costing 6 cents per hour. The Steel Industry Board, appointed by the President, held long and extensive hearings. The Board explored the questions and reached the conclusion that the steel workers could not receive a wage increase but they did provide that the 4 cents per hour and the 6 cents per hour on a noncontributory plan be established as requested by the steel workers. That should have ended the matter. The case at that point should have been marked closed. The union accepted the rejection of its wage increase but the steel companies, while willing to accept that part of the decision, rejected the part unfavorable to them.

Obsolescence of machinery has through the years prompted the intelligent businessman to lay aside out of profits a certain percentage of his net gains for the replacement of that machinery. That was good business; it was sound business and it still is today. But on through the years, no such consideration has been given to the human being who possesses a body and soul. Great care and solicitude has been shown by the industrial giants for their lifeless and soulless machines. Is not the dignity of man of more consequence to our Nation than the replacement of the parts of a machine? The 4 cents per hour as granted by the Steel Industry Board will be set aside to give to the worker social insurance so that when his body becomes broken or injured or its efficiency impaired he would not be placed upon the industrial scrap heap. The 6 cents per hour will be set aside so that when the human being no longer is able to keep up with the fast pace of the younger people in the industry, he would receive only the same consideration as was given to the mechanical man, namely, a pension.

This is sound economics. It is good morals. It is the true American concept that a human being, the handiwork of God, is of more value than any man-made machine. It is good economics because it relieves society or the family of the worker of the duty of supporting him. It is justice because the worker who has created the profits for the corporation shares when he is no longer able to aid that corporation. It is good Americanism because it fills the heart and mind of everyone in industry with the thought that here in this land of opportunity we do not grind down our workingmen or make slaves of them, taking all they have to give and giving nothing in return, but here in America we say we recognize in you, the working men and women of America, that you are human beings with the dignity of your person and we relieve you of the worries and fears that come from insecurity. The steel companies have failed in this controversy. It is hoped that the high-paid executives who have all the protection which the worker now asks for will realize and realize quickly their duty to the United Steelworkers of America.

The Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the President continues his successful formula of belaboring the Eightieth Congress, and is now referring to the Eighty-first Congress in terms of high praise. The truth is that from the standpoint of carrying out the President's program, it is, if anything, worse than its predecessor, and the President's praise is wishful thinking. The Atlantic City World accurately appraised the situation in a recent editorial, which I herewith include:

IN 8 MONTHS

Even before the Eighty-first Congress has completed its first session, President Truman tells the country that his Pittsburgh and Des Moines speeches on Labor Day opened the campaign for the election of a Democratic Eighty-second Congress in 1950. Although the party now has more than working majorities in both branches of Congress, he will exert his influence, he says, to elect an even larger number of Democrats. Why should he, with 54 Democrats to 42 Republicans in the Senate and a 263 to 171 division in the House?

There is one plausible deduction. Truman's declaration suggests a dissatisfied or apprehensive state of mind as, perhaps, he recalls his large promises a year ago, conditioned upon his party being given executive and legislative control. Well, that is what he got in generous measure, but what is the record of his leadership in the 8 months since he was inaugurated for a full 4-year term?

When the Senate reconvened last Tuesday, 2 weeks before the House is dated to get back to work, only eight bills of major importance had become law. In addition, the Senate had ratified the Atlantic security pact and the international wheat agreement.

The eight major bills covered the Marshall plan continuance, defense unification, Government reorganization, rent control, Government crop storage, export control, public housing and crop insurance. Besides, some five-hundred-and-odd other bills had been approved, but almost half of them were "private" bills in settlement of claims by individuals and business concerns which, in large batches, are disposed of on the floor in a few minutes.

On the negative side three of the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year that is already 10 weeks old await conference agreement. Tied up in the same way are five general measures. More than a dozen others, all part of the administration's program, have yet to be acted on by one or the other of the two Houses. Included is the proposed new Trades Agreement Act, under debate by the Senate nearly 7 months after it passed the House.

On this record the President, who has been so critical of the Eightieth Congress, accorded the present Congress high praise in his Pittsburgh speech Labor Day. But in face of the overwhelming control given the Democrats last November, the record would seem a modest one for 8 months. This holds whether viewed from the standpoint of progress on administration measures or from the standpoint of what may fairly be regarded as constituting an effective legislation program.

Kid Lobbyists Win a Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest an editorial in the Press-Review of East Bronx, Parkchester. It indicates the type of lobbying that should be helpful to the country. Those of us who know Representative McGRATH are, of course, not surprised at the willing service he immediately rendered. It is

typical of CHRIS MCGRATH to use his splendid character and capabilities for a worth-while cause. He has done it again in this instance and I know we are all pleased.

KID LOBBYISTS WIN A PARK

There's a heart-warming little story on another page of this issue about a small group of young Americans, aged 8 to 12, who exercised their rights of citizenship when they were confronted with the problem of having no place to play.

These Van Nest kids weren't content to grumble. They did what so many of his constituents have done—they visited their Congressman, CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, in his offices at 1444 Williamsbridge Road, and they were given an audience.

There was no brush-off for these kids. MCGRATH personally toured their neighborhood of Van Nest, looking for a playground site, with four members of his staff and the kids themselves making up the intent and businesslike entourage. They found a site at Tomlinson and Morris Park Avenues, and MCGRATH got in touch with Borough President Lyons and Park Commissioner Moses, and was promised that funds would be provided for the play site.

We like this story for two reasons. One is because we have to chuckle and admire the little kids for their gumption in acting like good little Americans and going right to their Congressman for help, a splendid example of democracy in action that is exemplary for older Americans and other officeholders.

The second reason is that the kids were able to do this—able to see their Congressman themselves in the office that he keeps open for the benefit of his constituents.

We have absolutely no interest in partisan lines in commending the Congressman for this superb program, which takes so much of his time which might be free when he is out of the halls of Congress, but is instead given over to personal service to his constituents.

William A'Agostino and David Amadeo and Patrick McMenamin and John Wexler and the rest of the kids are lucky to have had so inspiring an early lesson in practical politics. This lesson will be more valuable than their carefree play hours in the playground provided.

This kind of story is the sort that makes all Americans feel good and is the finest kind of propaganda for lethargic American adults and to the world.

Beverage Taxes Unfair to Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1949, I had occasion to make a short speech in the House again demanding the repeal of excise taxes generally, and referring especially to the 20 percent cabaret tax.

There is a growing realization in the House and country at large that these wartime excise taxes must be repealed, and the outrageous tax on alcoholic beverages must be moderated along with them.

Liquor is presently taxed at $9 per gallon, which is a tax of about 900 percent on production cost. This is not only grossly unfair to an industry which has been declared legitimate by the will of the American people, but what is worse, will inevitably lead to the increase in bootlegging and the other evils of the prohibition era.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Laurence H. Eldredge, of Philadelphia, who is president of the Pennsylvania Alcoholic Beverage Study Inc., has made a long and thorough study of this problem. The result of that study was incorporated in a speech before the National Alcoholic Beverage Control Association in Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 27, 1949. The speech is an important social document and is worthy of the attention of everyone interested in the problem.

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin commented on that speech in an editorial, Bootlegging's Rise, which is herewith included:

BOOTLEGGING'S RISE

Unduly high liquor taxes are fostering bootlegging and threatening a return to the conditions breeding gangsterism which drove the country to repeal. This is the judgment of Laurence H. Eldredge, expressed at a meeting of the National Alcoholic Beverage Control Association at Cincinnati.

Mr. Eldredge, who is president of the Pennsylvania Alcoholic Beverage Study, has been a close observer of the social consequences of repeal and the workings of the control system.

The wartime Revenue Act of 1943 taxes liquor $9 a gallon, which, reckoning production cost at $1, makes the tax 900 percent. The high tax is regarded as unfair by the average man, who particularly resents that the price of liquor has risen to a point at which only a man of means can afford it.

In addition to the Federal tax, cost to the consumer is increased by the mark-up of State monopolies or retailers and by special levies, such as Pennsylvania's 10-percent "emergency" tax.

A still greater objection is the social implications of the excessive tax. Consumption of legal liquor declined between 1946 and 1948 to a degree that cut Federal revenue by $542,000,000. Increase of the bootleg products shows why. Illegal stills seized by the Alcohol Tax Unit in 1949 had a daily capacity of about 225,000 gallons. That adds up to loss to Federal revenue of more than $2,000,000 for every day the stills operated.

The criminal element that goes in for bootlegging can make a gallon of whisky for less than a dollar, to sell in competition with legal bottled liquor which costs the consumer $20 per gallon.

Emotional criticism of those who buy or use liquor isn't going to stop a portentous bootlegging development that is shaping into a national menace.

Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll has likewise taken note of this problem, which has been referred to in a worthy editorial recently published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which said:

HIGH LIQUOR TAXATION ENCOURAGES BOOTLEGGING EVIL

There can be no mystery as to why bootlegging has been increasing steadily in this country. The answer rests with the continuing fantastically high taxes on liquor.

As Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, pointed out in an address the other day, the high Federal taxes "constitute an open invitation to illicit operators to get into the business."

The price of legitimate liquor is so high that there is an immense market for a low-cost alcoholic product. The bootlegger serves that market. Minus the tax, alcohol is cheap. The bootlegger dispenses it in various forms and packages and is able to make a huge profit while underselling the legitimate product.

The bootleg beverage is sold in speakeasies, where no law is observed and anyone with the small price demanded may buy.

Governor Driscoll says rightly that the primary Government emphasis in the matter of liquor "should be on an orderly market, the promotion of temperance, and the elimination of racketeers." Instead it is on the tax dollar.

From 1939 through 1948, Federal taxes on the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages have risen from $500,000,000 to about $2,250,000,000. State taxes are also huge.

The bootlegger does not pay any part of that. He exempts his own business from taxation, thus robbing the Government.

A review of the Federal liquor taxes, leading to a general reduction, would not only knock out the seller of poisonous rot-gut, but would serve the interests of the legitimate liquor dealer and consumer who have been taxed beyond all reason.

It is not popular to defend the liquor industry, but persons of foresight realize that not only is the present rate of tax exorbitant but that it will lead to great social evils if not corrected.

When the Congress reduces excise taxes, as I hope we will at our next session, taxes on alcoholic beverages should certainly be included in the reduction program.

Address by James M. Mead to the Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James M. Mead, a distinguished former United States Senator from New York, to the Sixty-first Annual International Convention of the Loyal Order of Moose, at San Francisco, Calif., August 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am cognizant of the honor that has this day come to me. I am deeply grateful; I am proud to have been a member of our great order for the past 40 years. I am happy to be here in your company.

I often recall hearing my former colleague, our late beloved Brother Jim Davis, tell of the early struggles of the Moose. I recollect his telling me of some of the problems that burdened the mind and the heart of Dr. Wilson, that great humanitarian, philosopher, and idealist, who authored the philosophy that is today the soul of Moosedom. I am better advised of the later and realistic application of the cardinal precepts of our order by our departed friend, Brother Jim Davis. However, in retrospect we can realize now the priceless contribution made to national unity and mutual understanding by the hundreds of lodges and the hundreds of thousands of members of the Moose located

in every section of these United States. Before our altars were dissipated the intolerance and the bigotry that were to be found at times where strange people from strange lands made their homes. Into our defending circle came the hardy warriors and their equally brave sons from the North and from the South to bury the hatreds and the animosities engendered in the War Between the States. Moosedom furnished the spark that activated the great American melting pot.

In World War I and again in World War II at the battle fronts around the world, as well as here on the home front, Moosedom rose up as one man to contribute to the invincibility of American arms. In peace as in war, the Moose is ever alert to our Nation's needs and stands ever ready to render that character of service expected of a good American.

Today our beloved republic, our friendly neighbors of this hemisphere and those of the Atlantic community are engaged together in a struggle pregnant with terrifying dangers far beyond that which burdened the minds and hearts of any other generation of man. With the decision for war or peace in the hands of the 14 members of Russia's powerful Politburo, with a cold war in progress on the European continent and a hot war in the Orient, anything can happen at any of their nocturnal conferences.

A horrible armament race, bankrupting all the nations, is in the making. Devastating atomic warfare remains a possibility. All of the world beyond the Americas are apprehensive of their ability to ward off the deadly toxic of communism. In such a turbulent world, our own security is in grave danger. To prevent such unthinkable catastrophe, to bring order out of the confusion that tortures our generation, a call for national service, for united community effort, for all-out patriotic leadership is more vital, more commanding than in the days of reconstruction or in the crises of the last two world conflicts; our Nation must rise up to assume the grave responsibility which contemporary conditions force upon her. We shall meet the obligations destiny has bequeathed to us or we invite disaster. It is a challenge which the late President Teddy Roosevelt predicted in his time, when he said, "My countrymen, I believe in you with all my heart. I am proud it has been granted me to be a citizen in a Nation of such glorious opportunities. We have no choice, we people of the United States, as to whether we will play a great part in the world that has been determined for us by fate, by the march of events. We have to play that part. All that we can decide is whether we play it well or ill."

These prophetic words have been sustained by the march of world events since that great American uttered them. Wilson, Willkie, and Franklin Roosevelt, all of happy memory, bore witness to them. Our contemporary leaders support them. To assume our vital role as individual citizens or collectively as the men of Moosedom, we must become thoroughly conversant with the grave issues, the conflict of ideologies, the incompatible doctrines of politics and economics that form the unbridgeable chasm separating our spiritual democratic philosophy from the atheistic statism of totalitarian Russia. No loyal citizen of the United States can be a Moose and a Communist at the same time. [Applause.] To embrace the one is to reject the other. Our fraternity clings to the teachings of Holy Writ. We take our political creed from the proclamations of 1776 and 1789, from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Our form of government grew out of a revolution, but that revolutionary experience upheld the sanctity of the human personality and the laws of God, which placed reasonable limitations upon the authority of the Federal Government and of the States.

We implemented the materialistic discipline of the State with the moral controls of religion. We held that men are created equal in the eyes of the Creator and that they are endowed by Him with specific rights which the authority of government cannot take from them. [Applause.] Spelled out boldly in our political Magna Carta are the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To attain those God-given rights, governments, we Americans hold, are created among men. Those are our beliefs and no power on earth will wrest them from us. The accumulated wisdom of the centuries, the inspired teaching of the prophets of the old law, the matchless brilliance of the founding fathers who gave to the world their conception of free democratic government, sustain our position in support of the American system. The future of that system is in our hands.

The atheistic totalitarian system also grew out of a revolutionary experience, but that revolution denied the intrinsic sanctity of the human personality. It advocated unnatural practices in the fields of government and of economics. It destroyed the moral controls of religion and it ignored the natural law. It introduced the totalitarianism of the superstate. It conceived the disorganizing notion of the class struggle. It advocated the destructive intolerance of a program of hate. The very antithesis of the precepts of purity, aid, and progress as thought by our fraternity. The difference between communism and our American system is one of kind, not of degree. One cannot exist where the other thrives, nor can one evolve into the other or vice versa. It's the democratic system or it's communism.

An American will foster the living ideals on our political declarations of 1776 and of 1789. A Red will wilfully sabotage them. There is no middle ground. Either we follow Marx and Engels or we take sides with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Fraternities—creeds—civic, labor, and management groups thrive here in the free atmosphere of our American system. Over beyond the curtain of iron they are outlawed by the materialistic concept of a phoney pseudo brotherhood of the proletariat. Over there it's big government and little people. Over here it must always remain big people and little government. Here we believe man is created in the image and likeness of God. There the regimented, directed man has a common destiny with the beasts of burden. There is consequently an inherent conflict of ideology, of political temperament, of spiritual outlook, of historic approval, of procedures of change and implementation. Such are the issues.

Upon their determination rests the future of our fraternity, our Government, our civilization. Escape from this conflict is impossible. No man can remain neutral. We must play our part well. The glories of our past, the security of the present, the heritage we leave for the future, demands action now.

Our first duty as individual citizens after exercising the privileges of free speech, free press, free elections, and of petition is to support our Government in its nonpartisan foreign policy and to insist that it continue to be as it has been in the past, a policy free from partisan politics. Nothing in derogation of our country's efforts to stop war before it starts—to outlaw aggression, both military and ideological, to make the United Nations Organization powerful enough to insure the peace, should be condoned or tolerated by one who calls himself an American. As one great American, a signer of the Declaration of Independence put it, "We must all hang together or we will hang separately."

Oh, we will always retain the right of choice of political or economic institutions as long as they are not opposed to the dictates of the natural law and of the Constitution, but when in the current conflict the two great parties act and the roll is finally called we should stand up and repeat the sentiments of that great naval hero, Stephen Decatur, who said, "My country, may she always be right in her intercourse with other nations of the world, but my country, right or wrong." [Applause.]

Intellectual conviction, nonpartisan determination, the force of reason and logic, together with the bitter experiences of two world wars, tell us we are right in this current conflict. In unity there is strength and as strength will determine the victor, our responsibility to encourage unified action among the free nations is inescapable. To rehabilitate the war-devastated nations of the Atlantic community, to prepare them to resist aggression, to form an invincible union of free nations to keep the peace is the core of our foreign policy. As individual citizens, it commands our support.

And now a word about our collective service as members of the Loyal Order of Moose. Just as our order expounded a philosophy that brought greater unity to our people, just as we promoted bond drives, blood banks, Red Cross appeals, so, too, can we summon Moosedom in this crisis to enlist once again in the service of the Republic. In the world wars we followed our boys all around the globe with practical manifestations of our deep affection and our heartfelt gratitude. We encouraged at every turn our Nation's maximum productive potential. We are proud of these accomplishments. They remain a treasured memory of our devotion to our common country.

It is true, my brothers, that we salute the Nation's flag, that we pledge our fealty to our brothers upon the sacred Bible, that we acknowledge with all humility the presence of the Supreme Being as we repeat the ritual of the Moose. All this within the four walls of our defending circle.

Now, however, we should move out into the open. The example of our collective action will allay fear and apprehension; it will encourage faith and confidence in our country's future and in its objectives. It will help to unify our people. We must not become partisans except as we insist on our rights to live in a free world as free people. But we can win the lasting approval of all right-thinking men and women by an effective program of education, emphasizing the superiority of our American system, based on our traditional conception of private enterprise, of religious freedom, and of democratic political participation. That is one way we can serve. We can at the same time point out the dangers of yielding to a militant atheistic communism so threatening to our very survival as a free nation, so destructive of everything we hold worth while in life.

Only as a further suggestion to you, my brothers, and, frankly, these are only suggestions—leaving thoughts in the form of suggestions leaves more than mere words on the record—I would recommend considering an educational program depicting the formation of the infant Republic; the epic achievement of our statesmen, our scholars, and our military leaders. I would point up the poverty of the struggling infant Republic in 1789, its staggering indebtedness, its complex political problems. I would emphasize its steady growth, its ever-accumulating strength until in our day this Nation, as conceived by our founding fathers, was able, through its vast resources, to save the world from economic collapse and possible political anarchy.

As another suggestion I would like to call our program "The American way of life." I should clearly define and effectively illustrate the true meaning of these words. Set it up in pageantry, arrange it for stage and screen adaptation. Let Mooseheart's youth and Moosehaven's aged supply the cast, and then I would engage the services of talented experts to put on the show. There are too

many who fail to appreciate all that the American way of life implies. There are many more who are unable to explain clearly just what it really is. It isn't only the living standards we here enjoy; it isn't that we flock to the American game of baseball while the British enjoy cricket throughout their dominions; it isn't a comparison of our living habits as compared with the customs of those who live on other continents. Our way of life is the result and the effect of the great epics of American history. From out of this crucible of sacrifice and service comes the individual personality we hail as the American of the twentieth century. These ennobling experiences testing the metal and character of our people define the American way of life.

First of these great experiences of the past is the colonizing era, when hardy, self-reliant men and women dared the turbulent uncharted seas to escape Europe's tyranny for a chance to build a new life on this continent.

Second, I list the American Revolution when the raw and untrained Continental Army flung the gage of battle into the teeth of the mightiest military machine of that day to bring forth the new Nation, dedicated to the rights of man.

Third of these great American epics is the winning of the West, the Louisiana Purchase, the exploration of the Northwest Territory, all the result of the vision of our leaders and the intrepid selfless characteristics of our rugged frontiersmen.

Fourth in its order is the Emancipation Proclamation, the abolition of slavery in the new Republic and the subsequent unification and solidarity of our people.

Fifth, and in our time, the extension of suffrage, the laying of the mudsills of a vast social security system, and a virtual declaration of war on poverty, intolerance, illiteracy, and disease.

Out of these priceless experiences, my brothers, comes the American way of life, the source of the characteristics that we find in the American personality, a history of unrivaled courage and of splendid progress that should awaken the pride we must have in our American citizenship.

To display the finished program, "The American Way of Life," each lodge could arrange a patriotic community celebration, call it Allegiance Day or Dedication Day or some other patriotic day, invite the widest possible outside participation, and include appropriate music, singing, marching, an address, and then the highlight of the day, the American Way of Life, by the Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose. [Applause.] No man could become or remain a Communist if he realized the sacrifices, the heroic achievements, the magnificent epics of the country of which we are all proud to be citizens.

No matter what form of an educational program we may adopt, it will prove timely; it will enhance our prestige. As a democracy our final maximum power and strength is measured by the intellectual conviction that we are right by our total citizenship. Let us make our contribution to national unity in this global conflict as loyal Moose; proud, determined, confident, unafraid, alive to our greatness, certain we have the best form of government one that squares with the sublime principles of our order, one steeped in the religious teaching of the old and the new law, one born of the Revolution, developed by a series of great adventures, and safeguarded in our time by the eternal vigilance of an alert citizenship.

While I visited in Chicago on my way out I stopped at one of its great museums, and I should like now to leave with you the thoughts that came to mind as I gazed upon a statue there.

I saw the work of a great sculptor depicting two men, one lying upon the ground, with a sinister, sordid, materialistic look upon his face. He appeared as though he was endeavoring to pull down his fellowman to the low beastly level to which he had fallen.

Growing out of his hips, as it were, was the other figure, looking heavenward, with a manly benign look upon his countenance. He seemed to be seeking union with his Creator to satisfy the thirst present in every human heart. He appeared to be endeavoring to lift up his fellow man to new heights, to higher levels, to bigger and better attainments.

I said, as I looked upon that menacing figure upon the floor: That man represents to my mind atheistic, materialistic, communistic totalitarianism. The other man, the manly man that one could easily believe was made of the image and of the likeness of God, represented to me the men of the Moose, the men that gave us Mooseheart and made Moosehaven a possibility, the men who believe in God and in the future of our beloved Republic.

I thank you.

The Cooperative Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the cooperative movement in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

COOPERATIVES: A KEY TO AMERICAN PROSPERITY

Recently, it was my pleasure to address a fine REA regional gathering at Madison. At that time, I discussed the crucial importance of greater unity and cooperation between all American groups. There is so much that we have in common and so little in difference between us that we all ought to close ranks, in true American collaboration, insofar as possible.

WE SHOULD ALL CLEARLY UNDERSTAND CRUCIAL CO-OP ROLE

One of the crucial factors in the continued prosperity of 150,000,000 Americans—in their continued happiness, health, and well-being—is America's cooperative movement. In the past, unfortunately, many people in the United States have not had as clear an understanding of the cooperative movement as they might have. Many of us, however, come from States where the cooperative movement—particularly among farmers—has become as customary, as indispensable, as welcome as the sight of a filled silo on a well-kept farm. Five million nine hundred thousand American farmers are members of co-ops (although there are some duplications of memberships in different co-ops included in that figure).

During the years, city folks, too, in America have come to see more clearly how cooperatives, not only in the farm areas but in the urban areas, play a vital role in American well-being.

FARM CO-OPS AND CONSUMER CO-OPS HELP AMERICA

We, in Wisconsin, have always felt particular pride in the cooperative movement. The Badger State comes close to leading the Nation in the number of co-ops. It ranks next to top-ranking Minnesota in the number of co-op associations—almost an even thousand as of this summer. Wisconsin co-ops alone are now doing around a half billion dollars a year business. Three hundred and thirty-five thousand Wisconsin farmers—again with some duplications—comprise our co-op membership.

My State is 50-percent industrial and 50-percent agricultural. In the agricultural segment, cooperatives have proven crucial helpmates to these Badger farmers. Farmer cooperatives have given to the family-size farm in the United States the same advantages of improved quality, improved service, and lower costs that are enjoyed by the large manufacturers of such items as steel, for example, and automobiles.

Farm cooperatives have benefited the consumer, too, by improving the quality of products marketed and lowering the cost of producing and marketing them. Food is, after all, the biggest single item in the city worker's budget. So, I say that every means that helps stretch that food budget further is that much to the good.

WISCONSIN'S PIONEERING IN CO-OPS

The State of Wisconsin entered the cooperative movement back in 1857, when farmers organized a cooperative grain elevator. This early co-op is, of course, long since out of business, as are most of the pioneering organizations. But they prepared the way for the modern co-ops that are functioning so efficiently and beneficially today.

The first cooperative act in Wisconsin was enacted among the statutes of 1887. Present Wisconsin cooperative law is contained in chapter 185.01 to 185.24. The following definition of a cooperative conforms to law:

"A cooperative enterprise is one which belongs to the people who make use of its service, the control of which rests equally with all the members and the gains of which are distributed in proportion to the use they make of its services."

In the 1920's, many States of the Union adopted new, uniform cooperative acts. In considerable part they were passed upon the outstanding pattern which we in the Badger State had set.

It has been my pleasure to know from first-hand experience the values of the cooperative movement in Wisconsin and elsewhere. For over 30 years I have owned and operated a dairy farm in Barron County. I have sold my milk to a dairy cooperative and the electricity that comes to the farm is from the Barron County Electric Cooperative—largest in my State.

WISCONSIN'S WIDE VARIETY OF CO-OPS

Yes, in my own home area cooperatives dot the landscape and have become an integral part of our economic life. My own home town of Chippewa Falls saw the organization in 1944 of the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives as a promotional and educational association designed to serve all kinds of cooperatives in America's dairyland.

I have in my hands a list of the cooperatives in my State, county by county—creameries, shipping associations, cheese factories, oil cooperatives, insurance organizations, tobacco growers, dairy testing groups, telephone cooperatives, grain elevators, consumer co-ops, brewer co-ops, cooperative water systems, poultry-livestock co-ops, housing co-ops, dairy herd improvement associations, co-op medical clinics, swine breeders' co-ops, Farm Bureau co-ops, ice cream, casein, cranberry, and a wide variety of other types too numerous to mention.

THE DEEP ROOTS OF CO-OP MOVEMENT

The road to co-op prosperity has not, of course, been a simple or easy one. It has taken hard work, perseverance, and true leadership.

Cooperation is, of course, not a new concept here in America. It is as old as the first colonies that were set up at Jamestown and Plymouth, as old as our early pioneer forefathers who settled this great land of ours. Without cooperation, those first colonies might never have grown into the mighty and powerful United States of America. For cooperation was the basis that made our forefathers' existence possible. Those early settlers cooperated with each other in clearing the land, in building the humble log cabins, in planting and harvesting the crops, making quilts and homespun and other essentials at quilting bees and spinning parties. They cooperated with each other in building forts and fighting off the attacks of the savages.

But, you might ask what about formal cooperation—what about the cooperative movement as we know it today? Even in that instance, cooperation is no youngster. Many folks think that co-ops are an institution of the last 25 years. But as far back as 1810, dairy farmers saw the wisdom of cooperating with each other. A cheese dairy was established at South Trenton, N. Y., during that year. In addition, cooperative dairying was being undertaken at Goshen, Conn., in 1810. So it is the industry in which we Badgers lead the Nation—the dairy and cheese industry—which can be credited with starting the cooperative movement.

It was the National Grange, the oldest of the farmers' national organizations, which, to a large extent, was responsible for changing the farm co-op from a purely experimental small-time operation to a Nation-wide large-scale activity. From about 1867, when the National Grange realized that the local granges could be used to develop cooperative marketing and purchasing, the grange and the cooperative movement grew together.

HUGE INCREASE IN CO-OPS

Where there were about 1,000 active farmers' co-ops America during the last decade of the nineteenth century, today there are more than 10 times that number. Where there were about 400 butter and cheese co-ops in the middle of the nineteenth century, today there are over 2,000 dairy marketing co-ops throughout the 48 States. I mention the dairy co-op, in particular, not only because Wisconsin is America's Dairyland but because the dairy co-op, in the early days as well as today, was one of the largest and most active of the co-ops. As of this summer, the number of dairy co-ops ranked second only to the grain co-ops, and then only by a small margin. But the members of the dairy co-ops were greater by a hundred thousand than the membership of the grain co-ops, with annual business estimated at close to $4,000,000,000.

It was only natural that the recent celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the American Institute of Cooperation was held at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

ADDED ADVANTAGES OF CO-OPS

Now, one may ask again: Why co-ops? I have already given part of the answer. Let me add the following:

First of all, the co-op makes possible greater savings to the individual farm members. These savings are spent on any number of things—on more modern farm machinery, on more modern home equipment, on increased acreage, on better clothes, on education for the farmers' children, and so on. No matter where these savings are spent, the country as a whole benefits. A modernized farm means greater production. New home furnishings mean more work for the city laborer who produces refrigerators and washing machines and armchairs. And education means a more intelligent American people which can better cope with individual, national, and international problems.

Secondly, the co-op helps to supply the competitive force which has made this country great. It is competitive force that leads to lower prices and higher quality which in turn means a better standard of living. It is competitive force which makes for economic progress and which has made America the No. 1 Nation in the world.

Thirdly, the co-op makes for increased neighborliness and better understanding. Farmers and others who are members of the same co-op and who are thus working for their mutual benefit gain a new sense of interdependence and at the same time a new sense of strength and independence that can come only from being part of the power that is a unified organization. Because of their common interest—selling milk or making cheese or whatever the case may be—a heightened spirit of understanding develops.

Other benefits that the co-op has made possible are higher quality of products which result from the standards set by the co-op, lower marketing costs which result from mass marketing, lower selling cost because of the large volume handled. Among the nonmaterial benefits are an increased interest in town, civic, and social affairs on the part of co-op members. Because co-op members, in effect, own an enterprise in a town, they are inclined to take more interest in that town—in the school and the church, in the chamber of commerce, and the development of the community as a whole.

CO-OPS HELP TO DEVELOP LEADERSHIP

In addition, the co-op develops the most priceless product of all—farmer leadership. The decisions that must be made for the good of the entire membership, the policy and standards that must be set, the cooperative action that must take place between the members, all help to develop the farmer's potentialities in shaping the destiny of agriculture and of America.

Cooperatives, it should be noted, are usually divided into three classes or kinds:

1. Producer of marketing cooperatives;
2. Consumer or purchasing cooperatives; and
3. Service cooperatives.

Some cooperatives are strictly of one or the other kind, while many serve in all three capacities. Producer or marketing cooperatives organized primarily to sell farm produce such as milk, butter, cheese, etc., may and often do, take over the buying of farm supplies like feed, seed, fertilizer, oil, gas, farm machinery, etc. REA cooperatives which I have previously described and praised on the Senate floor on many occasions are often in the production, wholesaling and retailing of electrical current.

COOPERATIVES CONTRIBUTE TO CHECKS AND BALANCES

Let me emphasize this point. The cooperative movement is not in conflict with the free-enterprise system. Rather, it is an essential part of that system. It gives a certain varity to American economic life. It helps keep us on the middle way in which the friendly Scandinavian countries have always pioneered. Cooperatives exist side by side with small business and large business, with organized and unorganized labor, all of which have a contribution to make to the American way of life.

Cooperatives serve as a check and balance against monopoly, and we all recognize that it is this system of checks and balances which is the bedrock of American political, economic, and social well-being.

ADDITIONAL TYPES OF CO-OPS

I have already mentioned some of the wide varieties of United States co-ops. There are in addition co-ops which provide credit, transportation, business services, frozen-food lockers, housing for college students. There are cooperative hospitals, cooperative radio stations, and all sorts of consumer co-ops.

And now there is an international relief co-op—the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe—better known as CARE. Backed by Protestants and Roman Catholics, Jews and Christians, Government and private organizations, CARE is probably the leading international relief organization in the world. It sends about $2,500,000 worth of food to Europe each month. This little statement is primarily focused on the farm cooperative, but I'm sure you will agree that CARE is a fine example of how the co-op can be used for indispensable nonfarm purposes.

RELIGIOUS ENDORSEMENTS OF CO-OPS

And speaking of religious organizations, we all recognize that cooperation has more than material use. Rather it is vital for the spiritual kinship which it promotes. It is only natural therefore that the leading religious faiths in the United States—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—have all endorsed the cooperative movement on countless occasions. Let me quote from the words of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America:

"The freer exchange of farm and industrial products through consumer cooperation offers at once a more abundant life to both groups and brings them together in practical economic cooperation from which there can emerge a better society for all."

And now I should like to quote from the words of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII:

"We hold that it is * * * useful to create cooperative associations for each branch of the public economy, which would favor the prosperity of enterprise."

REPUBLICAN ENDORSEMENT OF CO-OPS

We in the State of Wisconsin, which has always been traditionally Republican, appreciate the fact that much of the favorable cooperative legislation now on the statute books of the United States was enacted during periods of Republican control.

I should like to quote, for example, from the words of another Republican Senator, the Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio:

"The cooperative movement has made great strides and cut down the margin between the producer and the consumer. It should be encouraged still more by legislation and by sympathetic Government assistance."

CONCLUSION

I conclude as I began. We need more cooperatives in American life, yes, more cooperation between co-ops and private businesses. We need more unity, rather than less unity. We need, too, the initiative, the pioneering which the whole history of the United States cooperative movement exemplifies.

One Hundred and Seventy-fourth Anniversary of United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, next month the United States Marine Corps will observe its one hundred and seventy-fourth anniversary, and it will be honored by a grateful Nation in appropriate speeches and ceremonies. The Fraternal Order of Eagles in a tribute to the marines for this November 10 anniversary

will publish an article in its November issue of Eagle magazine entitled "The Marines Have Landed."

The article, written by Maj. William P. McCahill, United States Marine Corps Reserve, executive director of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, is one of the great interest at this particular time and I take real pleasure in asking unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARINES HAVE LANDED—IN 174 YEARS OF GLORIOUS SERVICE AS THE NATION'S TROUBLE-SHOOTERS, THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS HAS ALWAYS HAD THE "SITUATION WELL IN HAND"

(By Maj. William P. McCahill, U. S. Marine Corps Reserve)

The eagle of the United States Marine Marine Corps is watching developments at home as well as abroad. Traditionally on guard against foreign foes across the globe, the 174-year-old bird on the marine standard is keeping a weather eye cocked at recent developments in national defense.

To thousands of the men and women of Eagledom, the future of the United States Marine Corps is taken as much for granted as the colors in the Stars and Stripes. And to others in the eagle family, the marines are an honored institution as they plan traditional cake-cutting ceremonies for the November 10 anniversary at posts and stations and in cities across the Nation.

Eagledom, embarked as it is upon its memorial foundation, is one of many civilian organizations that pause to throw a fond salute to the marines and wish them "happy birthday, 1949." Marine Henry Gosselin has become a symbol around which the men and women of the Fraternal Order of Eagles have rallied in the American tradition of helping the other fellow. When Henry's wife and children were selected to be featured on the memorial foundation stamp and at public ceremonies, the Eagles tied a little tighter the tie of affection for the corps which has been "always faithful" since the infancy of our Republic.

Marine Henry Gosselin died in the fly-ridden canefields of Saipan in the summer of 1944. Five years later his wife and children helped spark the Eagles to a national drive to provide for the education of the orphaned children of other Americans who sleep quietly beneath white crosses or Stars of David on ground forever sacred. In the symbol of Gosselin, the Eagles and the marines are carrying on an ancient tradition of service above self.

The corps which started in the Revolution has seen few days of peace in the troubled history of our Nation. Rich in tradition and color, the history of the corps has been written in strange and distant scenes with violence, heroism, and accomplishment. The lines of the Marine Hymn, From the Halls of Montezuma to the Shores of Tripoli, refer to distinguished service in the Mexican War and also to more than a speaking acquaintance with the Barbary pirates. A quiet assurance, sometimes confused with boastfulness by the uniformed, has been a Marine trait, in the stanza which reads:

"In the snow of far off northern lands
And in sunny southern climes
You will always find us on the job,
The United States Marines."

The salty hymn, changed only once in recent years to include Marine aviation's ascendancy during the war, tells the story of the triphibious force, "in the air, on land and sea." But it hasn't yet included the Air Force in its clincher which tells all who will listen, that—

"If the Army and the Navy
Ever look on Heaven's scenes
They will find the streets are guarded
By United States Marines."

The marine, model 1949, is still 100 percent American and comes from every State in the Union, in spite of the Texan's boast that the Corps is predominantly from "God's country." He's somewhat younger than his wartime older brother. And he does not have as many ribbons, perhaps, as when the Fleet Marine Force was making nonsocial visits at way points from Guadalcanal to Okinawa. But he's a trim, erect chap who knows how to make a rifle talk and handle the weapons of an atomic age. He's as basic as a .30 caliber rifle and as twentieth century as guided missiles, jet planes, and troop-carrying helicopters.

At the age of 174 venerable years, the corps can boast 83,780 sons on active duty, including 6,991 officers. Its "auxiliary" doesn't take any back seat, for the Reserves number 40,220 officers and men in organized units and 82,305 volunteer reservists. The Reserves, training weekly at innumerable armories and air stations across the land, include veterans of the late war plus plenty of younger brothers who were Boy Scout age during the shooting.

That's the secret of the corps, experience generously sprinkled with young men who learn by doing, as well as by listening. One who might be considered slightly prejudiced due to wartime contact, Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey, told the Nation this summer: "The Marine Corps has been called by the New York Times the elite corps of this country. I think it is the elite corps of the world."

A wartime commander of the Fourth Marine Division, a colonel on Guadalcanal, today wears the four stars of the Commandant. He is Gen. Clifton B. Cates, USMC. Today, as in 1775, the Marines of General Cates serve aboard ships of the fleet.

Under the Key West Conference decisions, General Cates is responsible for the continued development of amphibious warfare. This means that no matter what the other services are doing, the Marines will continue to work on innovations and perfections in the bothersome business of getting people across beaches and into possession of land needed by our country or its allies. Recent maneuvers with both the Atlantic and Pacific fleets have allowed officers and men alike to bring theory and practice into better focus.

To a marine of 1775 with his leather collar as protection against enemy cutlass slashes (hence the term "Leathernecks"), the business of getting ashore under fire in 1949 would be old stuff. But, taking off from a carrier deck a hundred miles at sea and wave hopping at more than 100 miles an hour toward a distant beach would be startling. It might even startle some of the 1941–45 Leathernecks who could always be sure of a couple of crawling miles in choppy seas as they bobbed toward a bomb- and shell-pocked beach. But to the marines of 1949 the helicopter will fly him ashore unwet, perhaps behind enemy lines and under smoke clouds laid down by fast-flying, ground-hopping marine jets.

To a layman of 1949 this simply means that it may be possible to get marines ashore in a future fight without giving the enemy a chance to atom-bomb a fleet massed for an old-stayle invasion. Recently at Quantico, marines gave a demonstration for Congressmen that dramatically demonstrated this doctrine by getting marines into an enemy area with close air support from marine fliers and then supplying these same marines with artillery pieces, ammunition and other equipment via helicopters which hardly seemed to linger in the area more than seconds.

In the magic name of economy, the Navy has had to roll back its bases and today there is only a token force in the whole vast Pacific where marines once stood guard on countless atolls and larger islands. Guam no longer has any substantial numbers of marines and, recently, marines in China shoved off for the States, ending one of the longest traditions of the corps. Marine camps and stations in the Hawaiian Islands are ghostly places, the roll-back having almost lapped against west coast shores where the storied First Marine Division is at work at the sprawling Santa Margarita Ranch, near Oceanside. Here Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, who called upon the Eagles in 1946 to lend their efforts to the employment of the physically handicapped, is division commander. And here the battalion landing teams of the Fleet Marine Force trained tens of thousands of reservists during 1949's summer encampment programs.

At nearby El Toro the aviators keep in trim for any assignment. Late in August on this California air base converged 2,117 Marine Reserve officers and men to fly 218 planes for 10,000 hours. Fifteen squadrons from bases west of the Mississippi flew into El Toro in a 24-hour mobilization practice. Many reservists were checked out in jet planes.

A month earlier at Cherry Point, N. C., 16 Reserve squadrons east of the Mississippi had completed their 2-week maneuvers with approximately the same number of hours in the air. The results proved to the taxpayers very conclusively that effective Reserve air strength can be developed on a part-time or week-end basis, with economy, and also that pilots, ground officers, and enlisted men are fully capable of expert, full-time work under combat conditions.

At nearby Camp Lejeune, named after the wartime leader of marines in France who made Belleau Wood and other French name places among the proudest remembrance names in American history, the Regulars and reservists were working side by side.

The aviation arm transported 28,000 Reserve ground troops either to or from their summer training posts at Lejeune and Camp Pendleton at Oceanside. Many organized companies and battalions embarked at coastal ports for their voyage to camp. Everything possible was done to simulate emergency and field conditions so that the American people could be certain of a full return on their investment in the corps during budget-conscious 1949.

Maj. Gen. Frank Hart, United States Marine Corps, who commands the Second Marine Division at Lejeune, recently spoke to a hushed audience in memorial services at Arlington's Amphitheater. The thesis of his remarks, as his veteran audience thought back to the mud and blood of '41–'45, was the marine's simple prayer that God would allow him to be worthy of those who had gone before. He reminded his listeners and his country that peace was something that had to be earned and that eternal strength and readiness was still the best assurance of that peace which everyone desires.

Cased and put away except on these occasions are the battle standards of most marine regiments and of four divisions, part of a peaceful people's heritage. But borne proudly by the crack drill team and the showy drum and bugle corps of the Marine Barracks in Washington, the corps' colors have stirred thousands in exhibitions and meetings.

In Washington's Statler Hotel presidential room a United States Senator whose son was killed with the Marines on Guam had finished talking. Eagle and Marine Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD had joined other celebrities in the applause when, suddenly, the lights were dimmed. A bugle blew and chills ran up the spines of a thousand men and women as Old Glory, flanked by the Marine gold and red standard, swept into the room at the head of the scarlet-clad musical marines. The precision and un-

canny marching ability of the drill team was something that had to be seen to be believed.

From the ceiling the large sculptured eagles seemed to wink as if to say they could claim kinship with the golden marine eagle on the standard. Hadn't they been molded by Marine Sgt. John Fabion, of the Chicago Art Institute? That's one of the amusing things about the Marines. Not all of them can do everything but there are few things that some of them can't do, whether it is flying faster than sound like Maj. Marion Carl or winning trophy rooms full of cups and medals every year at rifle and pistol matches across the country.

In 174 years an organization can pick up a lot of things from nicknames to anecdotes.

The Germans called them Devil Dogs in World War I, when aimed rifle fire at several hundred yards began to have deadly effect in German ranks. The soldiers called them seagoing bellhops, and the Japs had other names. Gen. "Blackjack" Pershing said in France that the deadliest weapon in the world is a United States marine and his rifle. Some 22 years later, Admiral Thomas Hart, commander of the Asiatic Fleet, said of the Marines at Corregidor, "There are no better fighters anywhere."

Col. Jimmy Devereux, Wake Island Marine commander, denied having sent the famous "send us more Japs" message, but there was no denial of the authenticity of the last message which tersely said: "Enemy on island; issue in doubt."

As the United States of America moves forward to meet its destiny in an atomic age the Marines mean to have a place in that destiny. There will be men in the future like Marine Flyers Joe Foss and Pappy Boyington, and like Sgt. John Basilone and Gen. "Howling Mad" Smith on the ground. Each age produces its own men who have that certain spark and the corps is loaded with latent talent, waiting for the right occasion to make history.

Ready for anything and armed with the latest weapons, the corps looks to Congress and the people for the opportunity to be Semper Fidelis in the future. They are willing to do anything considered necessary, even to go ashore at Talasea in New Britain again where air cover failed to show up and they had no surface support. If necessary, they'll put a Piper Cub plane in the air again to drop grenades for air support and lower the ramp of their LST's so tanks can provide naval gunfire as the troops storm a defended beach.

It's all in a day's work and the American people expect that eternal battle message to come through loud and clear. "The Marines have landed and have the situation well in hand."

Report of the AEC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Report on the AEC," published in the Washington Post of October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE AEC

The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy has issued a notably illuminating report as the result of its long investigation of the Atomic Energy Commission. It provides not only a clear vindication of David E. Lilienthal and his colleagues but also a genuinely brilliant exposition of the complex problems involved in the atomic energy program.

No reasonable reader of this report can accept Senator HICKENLOOPER's shrill complaint that it is a whitewash. It deals seriatim and in detail with the extravagant charges—incredible mismanagement, misplaced emphasis, lax security, wasteful operation—made by Senator HICKENLOOPER last May. The joint committee studied these charges in 45 separate meetings, 24 in public, 21 in executive session. Not only was the sweeping nature of the indictment refuted by his own concession that the results achieved in the atomic energy program during the past 2½ years have been good, but even the specific evidence he presented did not seem substantial under critical scrutiny. The AEC undoubtedly made mistakes, some of them costly in money terms. But the record shows it unmistakably to have been scrupulous in its observance of the McMahon Act under which it operates, vigorous in its promotion of atomic energy production, and zealous in its protection of the national secret.

There is a section of the committee report outlining its standards of judgment which is deserving of the very highest praise. This section makes clear what everyone ought to understand in evaluating the difficult task of the AEC, that a delicate balance must be struck between "security by achievement" and "security by concealment." The report observes:

"The law's 'paramount objective' of 'assuring the common defense and security' has always placed greatest emphasis upon an affirmative task: protecting our country by keeping it far ahead of rivals in the sciences, in nuclear reactors, and in quality and quantity of bomb output. * * * The correct use of secrecy as a technique of 'assuring the common defense and security' furnishes us a measure of negative protection, in the sense that we avoid helping rival nations to manufacture the bomb, and hence contrasts with the positive protection afforded us through our own continuing progress. * * * It is apparent that the defense of the United States calls for the striking of a sane and judicious balance between the two indispensable but competing types of security. * * * Just where this balance should be struck in particular instances depends upon circumstances, and upon a weighing of the fact that, on the one hand, Russian success in achieving first a bomb and later a stock pile has always been a foregone conclusion and that, on the other hand, American secrecy slows the rate of foreign progress but may hamper our own progress as well."

Security by concealment can never be absolute. In some measure prudence dictates that it be compromised in the interest of security by achievement. Similarly, urgency in promoting production may dictate expenditures which would be considered excessive if speed were less imperative. It seems indisputable from the committee's investigation that the AEC has endeavored conscientiously, and on the whole with distinguished success, to strike the "sane and judicious balance" demanded for the defense of the United States. The American people are now well warranted in feeling confident that their atomic-energy program is in able and resolute hands.

Women of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in its characteristically penetrating style, the Christian Science Monitor has most effectively made a point in its editorial of October 13 entitled "Women of the World."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN OF THE WORLD

Among the distinguished figures who greeted Pandit Nehru on his arrival in Washington was one very charming lady of very exceptional ability. She was officially present as India's Ambassador to the United States. She happened also to be Mr. Nehru's sister.

The name of Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit has become familiar to Americans in recent years. One of the notable women of modern India, she shares something of the fire and force of her brother's character but stands firmly on her own two feet as a diplomat in her own right. In this respect she may be compared to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has risen to the level of world statesmanship through her own remarkable abilities and not merely through the magic of a name.

These two outstanding women of the world were for some time associated together as delegates to the United Nations from their respective countries. Women everywhere may take pride in these examples of members of their sex who have earned their way into positions of leadership and responsibility once reserved for men.

Police State Methods Are Being Used by Justice Department Against Medical Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department has suddenly started investigations aimed at medical societies and other medical organizations throughout the country. From first-hand information it appears that the Government is using its police powers for political purposes. This practice should be condemned by all of our people. It is a practice that has no place in a free society. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement which I have just received from the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., which states the position of that organization regarding the so-called

antitrust investigations. I am also including a release from the Insurance Economics Society of America with offices in Chicago on the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these so-called antitrust investigations are not designed to assist the New Deal's effort to force socialized medicine upon the people of the United States.

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association today issued a public statement "protesting the use of a police arm of the Government—namely, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance."

The statement revealed that 16 State and county medical societies, and other medical organizations, including the AMA itself, have been made the targets for investigations by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department during the past 30 days.

The medical groups suddenly brought under investigation, it was announced, include the following:

American Medical Association, New York State Medical Society, Utah State Medical Association, Washington State Medical Society, Arkansas Medical Society, and the Oklahoma State Medical Association.

Michigan Medical Service, a blue-shield prepaid medical-care plan, and the Arkansas blue-cross, blue-shield plan.

Los Angeles County Medical Society, California; Beckham County Medical Society, Oklahoma; Wayne County Medical Society, Michigan; Harris County Medical Society, Texas; King County Medical Society, Washington; and the New York County, Nassau County, and Queens County Medical Societies in New York State.

The AMA statement follows:

"This is an official statement of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, protesting the use of a police arm of the Government—namely, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance.

"The AMA has opened its records to the Justice Department, without reservation, and medical societies throughout the country undoubtedly will do likewise, but we intend to keep the public fully informed of developments, as we are convinced that these are not bona fide antitrust investigations, and that the American people will not tolerate police state methods in this country.

"We would be naive, indeed, if we ignored the political implications of this sudden rash of investigations, attacking medical societies, at a time when the administration is doing its utmost to stifle opposition to its proposed system of Government-controlled medical care.

"This scheme, it is specifically provided, would be a Government monopoly, to which every citizen would be compelled to contribute, and which would destroy all the hundreds of voluntary health insurance systems which now provide prepaid health care for more than 61,000,000 of the American people.

"Certainly it will be a travesty on justice if the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department can be used to silence opposition to the creation of a Government trust in medicine.

"The American people, we believe, will hardly think it a coincidence that these antitrust investigations should be ordered at this time—after there have been repeated threats that medical groups would be investigated because of their opposition to socialized medicine.

"The chronology of events, since the American Medical Association decided to make a Nation-wide campaign against compulsory health insurance, and in behalf of voluntary health insurance, is, we believe, of real significance.

"In November 1948, the AMA, at its mid-winter meeting, voted to collect funds from its members to finance a campaign of public education on this issue. A public announcement was made to that effect.

"Only a month later, in December, agents of the Department of Justice called on the Chicago Medical Society, seeking to check the society's records in connection with an alleged antitrust investigation.

"During the February session of the board of trustees of AMA in the early hours of February 10, the board room was broken into and records of the board were thoroughly searched by persons unknown. Brief cases of the trustees, left in the room, also were searched. Entrance was gained through a window. The facts indicate this was a search for information, rather than an ordinary burglary. Certainly no friends of medicine would take this means of obtaining medical data.

"A few weeks later, toward the end of February, administration leaders began threatening medical societies and medical men with investigation as part of their campaign to discredit and intimidate the medical profession. Since then there hasn't even been much attempt to disclaim the political nature of these investigations.

"On February 28, 1949, for example, one of the national press associations carried a dispatch from Washington quoting Government officials as stating that antitrust actions would be started against several medical societies soon after the compulsory health insurance drive was started in Congress.

"The implication was plain that the investigation would be part of the administration's campaign for its socialized medicine scheme.

"The threats made then are now realities. An epidemic of investigations, aimed at medical societies and voluntary medical-care plans, has broken out in widely separated States and cities all over the country.

"We want it clearly understood that we believe this attack on the medical profession stems from the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department and political string-pullers who have exerted influence on that agency. We believe it to be an outrageous abuse of public power which far transcends in gravity the issue of compulsory health insurance, vital as that issue is.

"We recognize that politically motivated attacks have been made on many other groups by this division of the Government, and we invite their cooperation with American medicine in an effort to alert the American people to the seriousness of this trend toward police state methods. If the police arm of the Government is used to intimidate doctors and others and this abuse of power goes unchallenged, it may next be used to terrorize publishers or grocers, farmers or lawyers, Catholics or Jews, or any other minority in the Nation."

STATEMENT OF INSURANCE ECONOMICS SOCIETY OF AMERICA

CHICAGO, October 9.—E. H. O'Connor, managing director of the Insurance Economics Society of America, today issued the following statement supporting the American Medical Association's protest against the wave of investigations recently begun by the Department of Justice:

"Attorney General J. Howard McGrath stated on October 6 that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice was investigating complaints regarding an alleged effort by the medical profession to monopolize prepaid medical-care plans.

"If the medical profession were attempting to monopolize prepaid medical care, that would mean that the American Medical Association, and doctors in general, would be opposing private insurance companies which sell policies covering hospital, medical and surgical expenses.

"Actually, the medical profession is doing exactly the opposite. The American Medical Association is making a Nation-wide effort to promote all types of voluntary health insurance, including the type our private insurance companies sell, as well as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, and the plans offered by all other sound private agencies.

"There is open, wholesome competition between insurance companies and the medical-care plans sponsored by physicians and hospitals. Doctors all over America are cooperating closely with health insurance programs offered by insurance companies.

"The medical profession, through its national association and State and county societies, also makes every effort to protect the public against health insurance plans which do not meet high standards. It disapproves all plans which are not medically, professionally, and financially sound—regardless of whether they are sponsored by physicians, insurance companies, or other groups. Likewise, it approves all plans which give the public real protection.

"The American Medical Association is in favor of voluntary health insurance and is opposed to compulsory health insurance. This opposition to a Government proposal apparently has brought about Government action against the medical profession.

"The insurance industry of America joins the American Medical Association in protesting such police-state methods."

Investigation of Operations of the Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from page 23 of the report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on its investigation of the practices of the United States Maritime Commission submitted October 13, 1949, and also the additional statement of Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, as printed on page 28 of the report.

It will be noted that both statements strongly condemn the attitude of the majority of the members of the Maritime Commission but are full of praise for the frankness, cooperative spirit, and detailed knowledge and ability of Commissioner Raymond S. McKeogh. In view of the grave issues involved and the expected forthcoming recommendations of the Commission in the so-called Mariposa case, I urge that this report be given appropriate consideration by the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of the Senate as a whole.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The impressions gathered by your subcommittee from the hearings compel it to record the following critical observations. Nothing contained in this report, and particularly in these observations, should be interpreted to be contrary to the subcommittee's wholehearted endorsement of the maintenance of a strong merchant marine consistent with budgetary limitations and with the policy of a maximum economic investment of private capital.

The issues presented by the General Accounting Office, while subject to the criticism of being oversimplified, were nevertheless clear and direct. Those testifying for the General Accounting Office were well prepared and gave evidence of having exerted considerable effort in getting at the facts. The special report of the Comptroller General on factual matters was virtually uncontroverted by testimony of the Commission spokesman. The conclusions of the General Accounting Office, however, based upon opinion are confused somewhat with conclusions based upon fact.

The reports of the Comptroller General, in addition to being informative to the Congress, provide administrative agencies with a means for correcting inefficiencies and poor administrative practices and procedures of their organizations. Your subcommittee takes the view that the agencies should welcome these reports as providing an objective basis upon which they can account to the Congress and to the people for their stewardship.

In the instant case the special report of the Comptroller General was not so received by the Maritime Commission. From the very outset of your subcommittee's consideration, a completely hostile attitude toward the Comptroller General and his staff and even toward your subcommittee was adopted by some persons representing the Commission. The derogatory remarks of Commissioner Grenville Mellen concerning the General Accounting Office's efforts to carry out its legislative duties were without justification.

The attitude of uncooperativeness, hostility, and even occasional defiance displayed at times on the part of certain Commissioners and certain staff members caused your subcommittee to be confronted with extreme difficulty in securing the facts surrounding the subject matter of the hearings and in developing a clear picture of the basis for the actions taken by the Commission in connection with these transactions.

The present Chairman of the Commission offered only the fact that he felt he was not sufficiently familiar with past actions of the Commission and had consequently designated Vice Chairman Mellen to speak generally for the Commission.

Commissioner Mellen had the decided tendency to overgeneralize. He did not have at hand such detailed information as was properly expected from one designated to present the facts for the Commission. This was also true of his fellow Commissioners, Coddaire and Carson, who showed a general lack of information concerning the Commission decisions discussed and gave the impression that even such pertinent observations as they did make may have been based almost entirely upon recent preparation. This situation, of course, made it extremely difficult for the committee to get at the facts from the Commission level of the organization.

Of the Commissioners directly involved, Commissioner McKeough alone showed a completely cooperative attitude. His testimony evidenced a detailed knowledge of the subjects under consideration.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CLARE E. HOFFMAN

While joining in the committee report, in my opinion it is written in too charitable a vein. Accepting the statements of the General Accounting Office, which were not disproved by the members of the Commission or anyone speaking in its behalf, one reaches the opinion that somewhere around $25,000,000 of the taxpayers' money was expended for the benefit of private interests. If that be the situation, some congressional committee or the Department of Justice should continue the investigation until an adequate remedy is found.

As I listened to or read the testimony, the conclusion came to me that the members of the Commission never had before them the convincing evidence required by statute to justify the granting of subsidies in excess of 33⅓ percent.

Whether this failure to follow the law was due to a lack of knowledge of the facts, inability to interpret them, reliance on the Commission's experts, or just plain negligence on the part of the Commissioners, the testimony does not conclusively disclose.

The committee report is more than charitable when it refers to this noncompliance with statutory requirements by setting forth that there appeared to be but meager evidence to sustain the Commission's finding and award.

True, the committee report criticizes the method, or lack of method, used by the Commission in arriving at the subsidy determinations and the national defense feature allowances.

Every member of the Commission was not only given full opportunity by the chairman of the subcommittee but was time and again requested to give to the subcommittee the evidence which would sustain the Commission's determinations. This, the members of the Commission, other than Commissioner McKeough, failed to do.

The only logical conclusion which can be drawn from that failure is that the Commission did not possess the convincing evidence required by the statute to justify the awards made.

In my opinion, the hearings demonstrate beyond argument that the members of the Commission other than Commissioner McKeough did not comply with the statute. Whether, as stated, this failure was due to a lack of ability on the part of the Commissioners, or to disregard of their respective duties, I have no way of ascertaining.

Inasmuch as the Commission did fail to comply with the letter and the spirit of the statute, it would seem as though they should be removed from office or the Commission abolished and the responsibility of making the awards be placed upon an individual under a statute which would make punishable nonfeasance or misfeasance. The criticism of the Commission herein expressed does not apply to Commissioner McKeough, who apparently made every effort to induce the Commission to follow the letter and the spirit of the law.

The Congress might well more closely and continually watch the activities of this Commission and if better service is not rendered inquire more deeply into the reason for excessive awards of public funds to private individuals and then either by legislation or prosecution under the law, take action to prevent a repetition of what happened in the cases which the committee investigated. Someone—either the Commission or the Congress—is at fault when millions of dollars of public funds can reach the hands of private interests in a manner not authorized by rule, regulation, or statute.

In addition to the recommendation to the Maritime Commission that it review the contracts executed or to be executed with the operators in each of the three cases involved and take all possible action to prevent excessive expenditure of Government funds, the subcommittee might have recommended that the existing agreements with the three private ship operators be repudiated and effectively voided by the Maritime Commission, if that course is still open.

The subcommittee might well have recommended that the Comptroller General be authorized and directed to continue its study of this phase of the Maritime Commission's activities and to make follow-up reports to the Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Oppose Resolution for World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a statement by Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, on House Concurrent Resolution 64 before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on October 13, 1949. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are definitely on record in opposition to the purposes of House Concurrent Resolution 64 which seeks congressional action in support of world federation. The position of this great veterans' organization will have a considerable impact upon the people of this country and likewise upon the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I am also including resolution No. 27 adopted by the VFW's apropos this subject:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity and privilege of presenting the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—an organization composed of a million and a quarter men who have served in the armed forces on foreign soil or in hostile waters during America's wars, campaigns, or expeditions—with respect to House Concurrent Resolution No. 64, which, if approved by the Congress, might become the first step toward entrance of the United States into a world federation or government with the attendant risks involving such a course and subsequent loss of national sovereignty.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars takes a dim view and is properly suspicious of the various movements and groups which hold forth the tempting appeal of everlasting peace if only we will approve and enter into some scheme—of varying degrees—of world government. An atmosphere of generalities and obscure details surrounds most of these proposals. This resolution before your committee is an example of seemingly innocuous proposals to explore the tempting but vague delights of one world, one citizenship, and one currency.

Our organization has watched with concern for several years the growing propaganda and drum beating in behalf of this illusory ideal which is represented as the

last hope for civilization and the only certain way to preserve and maintain world peace. We have watched many substantial and otherwise patriotic citizens sucked into this tempting crusade for Utopia in our times. We have seen a few of our own local units swept off their balance by a one-sided and clever appeal for peace and the end of wars, the end of large armed forces, and the end of huge expenditures for armaments.

Recognizing this growing danger and threat to our national sovereignty and way of life, the Fiftieth Golden Jubilee Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Miami, Fla., August 21 to 26, 1949, had this to say with respect to world federation or government:

"RESOLUTION 27—OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENT

"Whereas it has been proposed that the United States of America become a part of a world federal government; and

"Whereas the individuals and organizations supporting this program are advocates of theory of world government which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty and would bring into being a form of government whose authority would supersede that of the United States Government; and

"Whereas such a world government would institute a system of laws whereby American citizens could be tried by aliens in controversion of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars is composed solely of men who have worn the uniform of the United States on foreign shores and in hostile waters in time of war and from their personal experiences are familiar with the traditions and operations of other countries; and

"Whereas many of our comrades rest forever in foreign soil and their sacrifices were made to retain the dignity and sovereignty of the United States of America: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to any program which would entail the surrender of any part of the sovereignty of the United States of America in favor of a world government; and be it further

"Resolved, That our legislative representatives on both the State and national level be directed to use every effort to oppose any effort to place the United States of America in a position which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty in any form whatsoever.

"To Committee on National Security, National and Foreign Affairs.

"Adopted by the convention."

Resolution No. 27 was unanimously reported for favorable action by the VFW convention committee on national security and national and foreign affairs. It was adopted by the convention without opposition. If there were any officers and delegates opposed to this position they were strangely silent. Every delegate in attendance was informed of the resolution, which was read in full, and under our democratic procedure had the right and privilege to speak for or against.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars understand by personal experience the horrors of war. No group in the United States more earnestly desires to preserve world peace than does the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They reject, however, the theory of peace at any price. We believe there are some things more precious than an abject surrender to obtain physical peace. Freedom, human dignity, and the right to govern our own lives are most precious to men who have fought all over the world to maintain those rights. We believe it is better to risk dying on our feet than to live on our knees.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars believe in world cooperation to solve international problems and maintain peace. We were one of the original champions of the idea of the United Nations and sent a group of consultants to San Francisco where the Charter was drafted and the organization born. We have consistently supported the United Nations ever since. It is an association of sovereign nations sincerely trying to solve world problems and prevent wars. We recognize there is room for improvement in the United Nations, but we insist it has been more successful than is generally credited. The same elements and forces which have retarded the work of the United Nations would be even more obstructive in any efforts toward world government.

We cannot believe that millions of American men have risked their lives all over the world, with hundreds of thousands shedding their life's blood or returning maimed and crippled for life in defending our national sovereignty and our way of life, only to surrender it all in some form of world government for the illusory promise of peace forever. We suggest your committee give our idealistic and visionary friends their day in court in keeping with our democratic procedure and then bury this proposal so deep on the shelf that the only thing it will catch in the future is dust. If the people of the world earnestly desire peace, we will have peace. If some insist on war, they will have war. World government is not the answer, and the price is too high for this Nation to pay.

List of Members of Chicago Committee on Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of certain statements which were made on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, October 15, concerning the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of the members of the Chicago Committee on Displaced Persons. It will be noted that the committee is headed by Mr. John Nuveen, an investment banker and the present ECA Administrator for Belgium, and that it includes amongst its members Gov. Adlai Stevenson, Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, Corporation Counsel Benjamin S. Adamowski, and a host of men and women prominent in the business, labor, civic, and religious life of Chicago.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

Chairman: John Nuveen, Jr., John Nuveen & Co., investment banking firm. Now ECA administrator for Belgium.

Ely M. Aaron, 33 South Clark Street, attorney.

Dr. Edith Abbott, University of Chicago, dean emeritus, School of Social Service Administration.

Mrs. Irving Ackerman, 2043 North Spaulding.

Benjamin S. Adamowski, 33 North La Salle Street, corporation counsel for city of Chicago.

Mrs. Earl H. Addison, 11432 Union Avenue, American Association of University Women. Served as secretary to Chicago Citizens Committee.

Senator Thaddeus V. Adesko, 10 South La Salle Street, State senator.

Paul G. Annes, 123 West Madison, attorney. Former president, City Club of Chicago.

Miss Harriet S. Aries, 130 North Wells Street.

Russell Ballard, 800 South Halsted, head resident of Hull House.

Cyrus P. Barnum, 35 East Wacker Drive, Rotary International (former secretary).

O. D. Bebb, Palos Park, Ill., attorney.

Mrs. Bruno Beghe, 1047 North Austin Boulevard, League of Women Voters.

Irving C. Billow, 130 North Wells, Federation of Jewish Charities.

Louis Binstock, 3480 Lake Shore Drive, rabbi, Temple Sholom.

Nathaniel H. Blatchford, 123 West Madison, retired businessman.

Miss Babette Block, 50 West One Hundred and Eleventh Street, American Association of University Women.

Allan Bloom, 608 South Dearborn, American Jewish Congress.

Dr. Preston Bradley, 941 West Lawrence, minister, People's Church.

Dr. Marthe Erdos Brown, 822 West Junior Terrace, physician.

John Burdulis, 8 Woodstock Avenue, Clarendon Hills, Ill.

Mrs. Norman Burns, 6011 Kimbark.

Dr. Horance Cayton, 5120 South Park Avenue, former director, Parkway Community House.

Mrs. John Clayton, 18 East Sixth Street, Hinsdale, Ill., businesswoman.

Mrs. Elizabeth A. Conkey, 7601 Crandon Avenue, Democratic National Committeewoman, State of Illinois.

Miss Mary E. Crimmins, 126 North Desplaines, Catholic Charities Bureau.

Mrs. Jerome Cutler, 825 Independence Boulevard.

Mrs. Frank A. Damm, 4915 North Kilpatrick Street, former president, Illinois Parent Teachers Association.

Mrs. Abel Davis, 600 South Sheridan, Glencoe, Ill., widow of Gen. Abel Davis, former president of Chicago Title and Trust Co.

Dr. Estelle A. DeLacy, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University.

Mrs. Edison Dick, 612 Woodland Road, Lake Forest, Ill., wife of industrialist.

Dr. Marshall E. Dimock, 1625 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill., professor of political science, Northwestern University.

Harry S. Ditchburne, 230 South Clark, attorney, former Republican candidate for State's attorney of Cook County.

Mr. Arthur Dixon, 208 South LaSalle, head of Dixon & Co.

Rt. Rev. Bishop Dionisije, Libertyville, Ill., bishop of Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church for the United States and Canada, Servian St. Sava Monastery.

John Doebele, 4612 Magnolia, Council Against Religious and Racial Discrimination.

Mrs. Emily Taft Douglas, 5658 South Blackstone Avenue, former United States Congresswoman-at-Large, State of Illinois.

J. Earle Edwards, Jr., 2264 West One Hundred and Seventh Place, executive director, Chicago Office, American Friends Service Committee.

Edwin R. Embree, 4901 Ellis Avenue, former director, Julius Rosenwald Fund.

Mrs. Elsa Englander, 422 West Evergreen, United Charities of Chicago.

Dr. Joseph M. Evans, 4106 South Park Avenue, pastor, Metropolitan Community Church.

Mr. Donald E. Ewing, 126 Commonwealth Avenue, Aurora, Ill.

Patrick N. Farrell, 326 South Paulina Street, Inter-Ocean Cabinet Co.

Mrs. Eleanor S. Feeney, 529 South Wabash Avenue.

Marshall Field, 400 West Madison, editor-publisher, Chicago Sun-Times.

Mrs. Walter Fisher, 225 North Michigan, former president, Illinois League of Women

Voters; wife of chairman, Illinois Commerce Commission.

Miss Virginia C. Frank, 919 Hyde Park Boulevard, social worker.

Miss Helen Ganey, 7709 Sangamon Street.

Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, 5824 South Woodlawn, dean emeritus of the chapel, University of Chicago.

G. R. Girardin.

Ben J. Goldman, 100 North La Salle.

Anthony Olis, 155 North Clark, attorney.

R. Patrick O'Reilly, 1 North La Salle Street, insurance, prominent in American Legion.

Mrs. Richard Painter, 150 North Wacker.

Edward E. Plusdrak, 2420 North Kedzie, executive vice president, Polish American Congress.

Malcolm J. Proudfoot, 2120 Sedgwick, professor of geography, Northwestern University.

Dr. Ernst W. Puttkammer, 1221 East Fifty-Sixth, professor of law, University of Chicago.

Samuel A. Goldsmith, 130 North Wells.

Daniel Gombiner, 100 North La Salle, Businessman and City Club.

Mrs. Esther K. Goodman, 10512 South Claremont Avenue.

Dr. Pius Grigaitis, 1739 South Halsted, Lutheran National Federation.

Joseph Grish, room 1708, 77 West Washington.

Mrs. Lillian M. Hardge, 4106 South Parkway, social worker, Metropolitan Community Church.

Michael N. Hatsos, 1201 Addison Street.

F. A. Hathaway, 19 South La Salle, YMCA of Chicago.

Mrs. Frances H. Higgins, 203 Forest Avenue, Oak Park, Ill.

Mrs. Frank P. Hixon, 855 East Rosemary, Lake Forest, Ill.

Fred K. Hoehler, 100 West Monroe St.

Mrs. Wendell K. Holmes, 7424 South Stewart.

Frank Hubachek, 191 North Michigan, attorney.

Joel D. Hunter, 123 West Madison.

Dr. Homer Jack, 123 West Madison.

S. D. Jaworski, 1552 West Chicago Avenue, businessman.

Mrs. S. D. Jaworski, 1552 West Chicago Avenue, formerly with IRO.

Dr. Ray Freeman Jenney, 7000 Jeffery Avenue.

Joseph Kania, 904 Milwaukee, president, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

William X. Kaplan, 100 North La Salle.

Howard Keeler, 1140 Farwell Avenue, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

Mrs. Alfred D. Kohn, 1209 Astor Street.

Mrs. Helena Koniuszewsta, 1520 West Division Street, women's division, Polish National Alliance.

Michael Lascarie, 126 North State Street.

Ira Latimer, 21 East Van Buren.

Mrs. William G. Hibbard, 840 Willow Road, Winnetka, Ill, former national director, League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Arthur G. Laufman, 162 North State Street, National Council of Jewish Women.

Miss Nora LaTourneau, 506 South Wabash.

William Lee, 666 West Lake Shore, president, Chicago Federation of Labor.

Samuel Levin, 333 South Ashland, former manager, Chicago Joint Board of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, former president, Illinois State Industrial Union Council.

Hamilton M. Loeb, 4812 Kimbark, insurance.

Virgil Lowder, 77 West Washington, executive secretary, Chicago Federation of Churches.

Mrs. P. Lyons, 5644 Kimbark.

Frank McCulloch, 231 South Wells Street, administrative assistant to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Maurice McElligott, 205 West Wacker, secretary, Illinois State Industrial Union Council, CIO.

Mrs. Arthur C. McGiffert, 1220 East Fifty-eight Street, wife of president, Chicago Theological Seminary.

Michael Mann, 205 West Wacker, regional director, CIO.

Edward Marciniak, 3 East Chicago, editor of Work, organ of Catholic Labor Alliance.

William Mareneck, 100 South Columbine Avenue, Lombard, Ill.

Mrs. James Mason, 9953 South Longwood.

Byron Miller, 123 West Madison, American Jewish Congress.

Albert P. Mitnick, 100 North La Salle, president, B'nai B'rith Council.

Rev. Charles Clayton Morrison, 6144 South Kimbark, former editor in chief, the Christian Century.

Mrs. Truman Morrison, 1819 South Fourth Avenue, Maywood, Ill.

Mrs. Joseph Nyberg, League of Women Voters.

John Nuveen, Jr., 4314 Field Building, 135 South La Salle, member of investment banking firm, John Nuveen & Co., chairman of Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.

Edna Vanek, 25 East Delaware Place.

Miss Edith Reynolds, 6516 Woodlawn Avenue.

Wilfred Reynolds, 343 South Dearborn, director, Chicago Council of Social Agencies.

Mrs. Kenneth Rich, 4832 Dorchester, executive director of Immigrants Protective League.

Mrs. A. R. Rohlfing, Farmington, Ill., Federated Women's Clubs.

Charles A. Rovetta, 1414 East Fifty-ninth Street, professor, school of business, University of Chicago.

Charles Rozmarek, 1520 West Division, president of Polish National Alliance.

Miss Marie Scanlon, 5052 Washington Boulevard.

Mrs. Sarah B. Schaar, 1631 Lunt Avenue, social worker.

Fred Schenbrun, 5736 Waveland, Chicago Latvian Club.

A. J. Schevers, room 210, 31 East Congress.

Charles P. Schwartz, 135 South La Salle, former president, Chicago City Club.

Judge Ulysses S. Schwartz, 118 North Clark Street, Superior Court, County Building.

Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, 31 East Congress, Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago.

Mrs. George Seibel, 200 Oxford Road, Kenilworth, Ill., League of Women Voters.

Leonard Simutis, 2334 South Oakley.

Charles Smith, 31 East Congress, former secretary, Catholic Youth Organization.

Samuel Smith, 333 South Ashland Boulevard.

A. Sorontino, 20 East Jackson, Italian Welfare Conference.

Edward J. Sparling, 430 South Michigan Avenue, president, Roosevelt College of Chicago.

Adlai E. Stevenson, 11 South La Salle, Governor of Illinois.

Miss Lea D. Taylor, 955 West Grand Avenue, head resident, Chicago Commons; former president, National Federation of Settlements.

Mrs. Aneita L. Tidball, 7427 South Shore Drive, Travelers Aid Society.

Miss Helen G. Todd, 3121 Home Avenue, Berwyn, Ill., American Association of University Women.

Dr. Lucy Tasher, Normal, Ill., Illinois State Normal University.

Miss Mary Ellen Trottner, 1544 North Dearborn Parkway, Catholic University Club.

Clifton M. Utley, 5827 South Blackstone, prominent radio commentator.

Michael Vaidyla, 840 West Thirty-fourth Street, publisher.

Mrs. Helen Van de Woestyne, 59 East Monroe, YWCA.

Miss Rosalie Venable, 59 East Monroe, YWCA.

Miss Harriet E. Vittum, 1400 Augusta Boulevard, former head resident, Northwestern University Settlement.

Dr. Jacob J. Weinstein, 4939 Augusta Boulevard, rabbi, KAM Temple.

Mrs. W. D. Suthers, 11111 South Hoyne.

Carroll R. West, 520 North Michigan, associate secretary of Kiwanis International.

Mrs. Mary B. Wirth, 5725 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago Association of American Association of Social Workers.

H. B. Wolowska, 1309 North Ashland.

Mrs. Quincy Wright, 84 East Randolph, director, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.

James M. Yard, 203 North Wabash, former secretary, Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Miss Mary Young, 343 South Dearborn, director, family service, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

John A. Zvetina, 77 West Washington, professor, Loyola University.

T. Louise Viehoff, 1983 Greenleaf Avenue.

Sophie L. Fisk, 1059 Ardmore Avenue, American Association of University Women.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Final Link in the Slack or Still Water Route From the Gulf to the Great Lakes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in his extension of remarks the other day, finally admitted that the Demopolis Dam is to be constructed across the Tombigbee River, and not across the Warrior River.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will examine the statement by the engineer at the hearing, he will find to the contrary that it is not a part of the Tombigbee system but is part of the Warrior system.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman contended that this Demopolis Dam was to be built on the Warrior River. He ought to admit now that it is to be across the Tombigbee.

It is part of this great slack water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, which would have been impossible a few years ago, and of which this Tennessee-Tombigbee project is the final connecting link.

But the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is not going to be able to block it against the wishes of the people who are vitally interested in the construction of this great inland waterway, which will give us a slack, or still, water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as to all points on the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio and its tributaries—including the Cumberland and the Tennessee, as well as the Allegheny and the Monongahela.

It will contribute more to our national defense than any other project of its kind that has ever been constructed or proposed. It will cut the water distance from our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., to New Orleans by more than 600 miles and from Oak Ridge to Mobile by more than 800 miles.

As I pointed out the other day, it will cut the cost of transporting essential materials needed at Oak Ridge from

Mobile to the Tennessee River by more than 75 percent, or from $39,060 to $8,680, or a saving of $30,380, on a barge load of 14,000 tons.

Why send billions of dollars of the American taxpayers money abroad, and give it away, under the pretext of bolstering our national defense, and then refuse to appropriate the necessary funds to supply materials to this great defense plant on which we must rely for our safety and protection in case of another conflict?

I am glad the gentleman has at last found out that this dam is to be built across the Tombigbee River, and not across the Warrior.

While it is true that this dam will aid navigation on the Warrior—since it is to be constructed across the Tombigbee just below the mouth of the Warrior—its greatest contribution will be to the navigation of the Tombigee. It will provide a 9-foot channel on the Tombigbee for approximately 60 miles above Demopolis, which will be by far the longest stretch of navigation provided by any dam on this Tennessee-Tombigbee route.

This project was not feasible 20 years ago. At that time the Pickwick Dam had not been constructed on the Tennessee River. As the Army engineers have pointed out, when that dam was finished in 1938, it raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 55 feet, which enabled them to cut through the sand ridge which separates the Tennessee from the Tombigbee and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River.

But even then the Tennessee River was not navigable the year around. The navigation was completed in 1942 when the construction of the Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville on the Tennessee was finished.

Twenty years ago the Ohio River was not navigable the year around, because the 57 locks and dams between Cairo and Pittsburgh had not been finished.

The upper Mississippi from Cairo to Minneapolis and St. Paul was not navigable the year around until those 26 locks and dams on that stretch of the river were completed in 1940.

The navigation on the Illinois River, which connects the upper Mississippi with the Great Lakes at Chicago, was not completed until the last dam was finished in 1939.

All of these developments have stimulated traffic on those streams to where it is absolutely necessary to provide this slack, or still, water route for the upbound traffic.

This project would give us a slack, or still, water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee River, and then we have downstream route on the Tennessee 215 miles to Paducah, and 47 miles on the Ohio from Paducah down to Cairo on the Mississippi.

Last year the traffic on the Ohio River amounted to about 17,000,000 tons more than that on the Panama Canal; and the traffic on the Illinois River between the Mississippi and Chicago amounted to more than 40 percent of that on the Panama Canal—as did that on the upper Mississippi between Cairo and Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I predict that within less than 20 years from today the traffic on this Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway will exceed that on the Panama Canal today, and that the savings will be sufficient to pay for its construction in a few years.

I repeat what I have said before, time and time again, that this is the greatest inland waterway project of its kind that has ever been proposed, and, as the engineers have pointed out, it is the only one that could possibly be constructed anywhere on the face of the earth with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

This Demopolis Dam is the first long essential step in the construction of this great project. All the forces of the opposition cannot stop it now.

We are on our way to complete success.

Tombigbee River

REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is only necessary to read the discussion of this question on page 14249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 11, 1949, to understand the fallacy of the gentleman's conclusions.

Every member of the committee understands that no money for construction was provided for the Tombigbee project. And I may add that so far as I know no member of the Committee believes any money for construction ever will be provided for construction on this visionary project.

As a matter of fact it was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee, both Democrats and Republicans alike, that the money for planning should not have been granted and it would not have been granted but for the parliamentary interpretation which the Senate took of the differences between the two Houses on a class of projects which happened to include the Tombigbee project.

If anyone takes seriously the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi, it is only necessary to refer to page 14249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pages 186 and 217 of the hearings to understand that the Demopolis Dam is a part of the Warrior River system and not a part of the Tennessee-Tombigbee system and no money was appropriated for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project at any time or in any amount.

In order to be certain the appropriation of planning money for the Tombigbee was not to be considered as a commitment for future expenditures on this project, the committee incorporated in the report on the bill the following language:

The conferees are agreed that, with respect to both rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, appropriations approved for planning are in no way to be interpreted as a commitment by the Congress for subsequent appropriations for construction nor, that by allowing funds for planning, it is the desire of the Congress that construction of a particular project be initiated.

The Tombigbee proposal is so impracticable that it has been the laughingstock of Congress for years.

American Labor Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the sixty-eighth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, on October 3, 1949, at St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Green, officers, and members of the American Federation of Labor, my friends, I welcome you enthusiastically to our beautiful State and to the inspiring, historical city of St. Paul. I welcome you here even though I fully appreciate the risk I take in exposing the beauty and wonders of our community to your eyes and experience. I know that after spending a few days in our pleasant Commonwealth, you will be sorely tempted to leave what is now your homes and migrate to our midst. Should that be your wish, I assure you that our building trades are perfectly capable of providing all the homes you require and our merchants will supply you with all of the necessities of life. We have 3,000,000 enlightened, hard-hitting, aggressive, understanding people in our State. We welcome you.

My role here today, however, is more than that of a greeter. I have a second function to perform and some troublesome thoughts on my mind. I come to talk to you about a job which needs to be done—a job which the Eighty-first Congress has not yet done and a job which is vital if you are to feel secure as members of free trade-unions, and if the American people are to feel secure with their liberties.

Labor's rights are no longer secure merely through the process of collective bargaining. The rules of collective bargaining and the rights and privileges of organized labor are now the subject of legislation and the subject of political determination. Politics, effective political participation must go hand in hand with the growth and the development and the maintenance of a strong labor movement in America. No one is asking anyone any longer in this country of ours "Are you interested in politics?" The simple fact is you are either interested in it or somebody is going to take the very interest out of you by political action. Labor can never gain its objectives when the rules of collective bargaining are stacked against them and the umpire and the referee are already bought off and paid off. The Taft-Hartley Act has destroyed the neutrality of government in labor-management relationship. The Taft-Hartley Act says to every American worker that no matter how you may fight, no matter how just is your cause, the orders are stacked against you and you haven't got a chance to ultimately win.

There is a volume of evidence coming to Washington these days demonstrating that the Taft-Hartley Act is crippling the growth of the union movement, particularly in the South and in some of the other areas of this country where union membership is not as strong as it is in the industrial East and in the industrial centers of the Midwest and far West.

I say this without fear of any successful contradiction, there will not be any labor-management peace in this country until this grossly unfair antilabor legislation is removed from the statute books. There can be no labor-management peace until the economic relationships between labor and management are no longer settled by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, but are settled around the conference table between employers and employees.

Now, let's move along to this other part of the labor movement program. We need—when I say "we" I mean every American—needs and welcomes an aggressive, constructive political action program on the part of organized labor. To hear some people talk and to read the writings of some editorial commentators, one would think it was against the law for a man that carries a union card to even be interested in politics. For years and years in this country the molders of public opinion, the powers that be who managed the political machines and the major political parties have told the folks in labor, "You just kind of keep out of our way. We will run this whole thing for you."

They have operated it pretty well, but not for you. They have operated it in behalf of management, of their political organizations. They have too often been what is called the political bosses.

Now, I say we need a constructive and an aggressive political-action policy on the part of labor. But I want to make my position quite clear, because all too often we think of these political policies at top level strategy. Make it crystal clear in your own minds that elections are not won in Washington, D. C. They are lost there, but they are not won there.

Elections are not won by top strategy. If that had been the case there would have been a lot of difference in the last election. There was lots of top brass strategy. Unfortunately not enough hard work, for some people at least, where it needed to be done.

Elections are won by hard work and by active participation in every voting precinct in this country. The essentials of a successful political campaign—and I know my friend Joseph Keenan is interested in this—the essentials as I see them are the following: A program—and I put program first—a program that meets the needs of the people. Secondly, candidates willing to fight for the people. We have got too many candidates where you have to fight for them. We need candidates who are willing to go out and fight for you, to fight for the American people.

Thirdly, there is a need of political organization that belongs to and is controlled by and managed by the rank and file of the people.

Finally, a clear-cut statement of the issues in language, in the simple language that is understandable by all of the people.

Now, my friends, if you have those ingredients, if you have a program that meets the needs of the people, candidates willing to fight for the people, if you have a political organization that belongs to the people and they are a part of it, and if you have a clear-cut statement of the issues in language that is understandable by the people, I submit to you no one can beat you, no one. There is the essence of success.

Now, this is a job which the American Federation of Labor and the Political Education League have undertaken, and I want to commend Mr. Keenan and his organization. I want to commend those political leaders and directors in the local bodies, in the city central bodies. I want to commend those at the State level who have been in there on the firing line doing their job. The program of political education—and that is good emphasis—political education—has advanced with amazing strides. But, my friends, the acid test of the effectiveness insofar as you are concerned, insofar as the vast majority of the American people are concerned, the acid test will be in the election year of 1950. That will be the pay-dirt year.

There are some disturbing signs. Liberal organizations and labor groups have not always set themselves down to the job of effective political action. In some areas there is a tendency on the part of labor to remain aloof from other groups who have similar objectives, and in some areas there is an outright refusal to join hands with other sections of the labor movement and the liberal, democratic forces. Now, if the Fair Deal program is to be passed, if the Taft-Hartley Act is to be repealed, if the people of this country are to get legislation that they were promised and that you worked for, it is going to be a responsibility of the labor movement and of every liberal and democratic organization to forget personal pride, petty differences and to unite behind candidates and around a program between now and 1950.

Yes, the election year of 1950 is the crucial political battleground in the struggle to see whether or not this country of ours is going to go forward in the pattern of the New Deal or whether or not it is going to go backward into the confusion and desperation and disillusionment of the Old Deal. That is what it amounts to.

I submit to you that the Fair Deal has made significant gains in the Eighty-first Congress. Not enough to please me, not enough to please Mr. Green, not enough to please the officers, Mr. Keenan, not enough to please many people in America—millions and millions of them. Some of those gains can be quickly listed—housing and slum clearance, the greatest program in the history of this country—a program that is going to mean to the city of St. Paul 2,000 low-cost public housing units for the people that desperately need them; a program that is going to mean to my own city of Minneapolis 1,000 low-cost public housing units within the next year for the people that desperately need them; a program that is going to mean 810,000 decent home units for workers in America, for workers and their families that have never had a decent place in which to live for the past 25 years. I submit that is legislation of significance and of great consequence.

A minimum wage of 75 cents an hour has been established. To be sure, the bill was cut down and watered down. You would think, to hear those that did that job, that they could live on less than 75 cents an hour. I have often wanted to pose the question to those who thought the coverage of the minimum wage ought not be extended, I have often wanted to ask them how they get along on 40 cents an hour. I would like to have that answered, because if I get it I am going right back to see Mrs. Humphrey and see what she does with all the money I give her.

Something else has happened. The TVA plant was built as a stand-by in that great regional valley development. Transmission lines for hydroelectric power have been authorized. REA, the very life of the farm belt of this country, has been extended. Rural telephone legislation is now passed. You are going to be able to call up your relatives on the farm; rural telephones so that the people of the farms in America can have the phones as we have them in the cities; grain storage for this great and tremendous productive agriculture of ours; expanded crop insurance for the farmer, who has to face all conditions of the weather. Expanded conservation of our soil.

These are some of the accomplishments of our Congress. The Labor Department has been strengthened for the first time in years. Both political parties year after year have been pledging to strengthen the Labor Department, and the more they have promised to strengthen it the more they have weakened it. At long last a miracle has happened. We actually transferred some agencies to the Labor Department, this one office in the Government whose purpose it is to cooperate with labor; we actually gave it some machinery of government to help the working people of this country.

Yes, we have expanded rivers and harbors, flood control. We have expanded irrigation and reclamation. And every bit of this, my good friends, is good for America, every bit of it.

If this program that we have pledged ourselves to, that your resolutions have pledged you to, if the Taft-Hartley Act is to be repealed, if the people of this country are to get the legislation that they were promised, I say again that it is the responsibility of the labor movement and of every liberal and democratic movement to get busy now on a local level in your own local communities where you know your own people and get behind a program and behind the office seekers that will carry out that program.

There is a dangerous coalition in this country. There has never in the history of America been a greater propaganda barrage against the American worker than there has been in the last 7, 8, or 9 months. Ever since the miracle of November 2 the soothsayers have been concocting some kind of a new witches' brew to pour out to the American people. While we were celebrating and while we were patting each other on the back the old rear guard was in there plotting and planning every day of the week, getting their machinery ready again for the onslaught.

There is a dangerous coalition, a coalition that distorts public opinion, a coalition that defies the truth, a coalition that is not interested in the presentation of the truth. It is a coalition of the reactionary element of the press of America.

That coalition is made of the reactionary element of the press, the postwar isolationists, the politically bankrupt leadership—and I must say this even in the presence of my colleague—I say the politically bankrupt leadership of the GOP, and a handful of determined Dixiecrats and the soft-headed confused pinks, along with the outright Communists. That is the coalition that faces America.

They are the ones who have lost faith in this country and whose vision has not gone beyond yesterday, who are incapable of facing the problems of today, and who shudder and shake at the thought of tomorrow. This frustration of political malcontents have set themselves up as a holding company for all and sundry purposes, for all and sundry ideologies. No matter what you are or what you believe, if you are just against the Fair Deal, if you are just against labor, if you are against these things then you hear the old song, "Join up with us," and they join in a common family against a liberal program in domestic affairs and in international affairs. The only qualification for membership in the fraternal order of frustrated politicians is to be against labor, to be against price supports for the farmers, to be against pensions for the aged, to be against the good life, and, God bless you, to be against the welfare state. God bless you, that's what you have to be. The fraternal order of frustrated politicians condemns our policy at home and abroad in the same wild irresponsible charges. At home it is the welfare state they are against, and abroad it is our aid to Great Britain and western Europe. Their

policy is isolationism abroad and confusion and despair at home, and they have seized upon the concept of one of the most noble, one of the most decent, one of the most worth while and blessed words in the English language—they have seized upon the word "welfare," and they have added to it the word "state," and they have tried to make the American people believe that the welfare state is equivalent to purgatory or hell, or is a manifestation of all the human evil that it is possible to conjure.

As one of the men on the other side I accept that challenge. As one young man I am prepared to do battle with them on any issue. I am prepared to argue the issues of the welfare state. I am prepared to argue the issues of the welfare state just as it is going on in New York at this very hour, where, in that great State, the issue is being brought to the sharp attention of the American people, where one man is going up and down the State talking about statism and another man, a former Governor of that State—may God bless his soul—is going up and down the State talking about people. And mark my words, unless the American people have in some way or another lost their way and lost their reason, that grand and noble man who served for you as governor of the great State—and I speak of former Gov. Herbert Lehman—will be joining with MALONE and HUMPHREY in Washington after next November.

Those who are screaming today against the welfare state tell you that you are losing your liberty, that you are being collectivized, that the omnipotent hand of the state is upon you. Have you ever thought that those who cry out the most about the welfare state today, who are saying that the welfare state will make you lose your liberty are the very people that robbed you of your liberty with the Taft-Hartley Act? They are the very ones. They are opposed to this, they say. Didn't you feel enslaved under the Wagner Act, or did you feel a little bit freer under that act than you do under the Taft-Hartley law? I have a sneaking idea you felt a little bit freer under the Wagner Act.

Let's go along and take a look at this subject and see who is on the right side. I like to believe in the American Constitution, a great immortal document, and yet those who are opposed to the welfare state are registering their opposition, despite the mandate of the Constitution of the United States of America, where it places upon the Government of this country the responsibility to promote the general welfare. And those words are written out in the commerce clause of the Constitution, article I, section 9.

These opponents of the welfare state identify the New Deal and the Fair Deal as the fabric and substance of the welfare state, and then with a flourish of their political pen they have recently called it statism. Doesn't that sound bad? That word cost somebody a lot of money. That is a product of some Louis XIV brain in American politics. We call it statism. I think it is about time that the American people realized just what these frustrated political malcontents are talking about. By their logic the welfare state is the Fair Deal. Then by their own words they are telling the American people that they oppose the program of social security because that is the New Deal. By their own words they are telling you they oppose the elimination of child labor because that is the New Deal. By their own words they are telling you that they oppose free collective bargaining, because that was the New Deal. By their own words they are telling you that they oppose the Fair Labor Standards Act and a minimum wage, and that was the New Deal. By their own words and by their own criticism of the welfare state and its identity with the New Deal they are telling every farmer in America that they do not believe in price supports for agricultural commodities. They are telling every farmer they do not believe in grain storage, that they do not believe in soil conservation, that they do not believe in REA, that they do not believe in cheap farm credit for farm expansion, that they do not believe in agricultural research.

They are telling the American people, in their irresponsible charges against the so-called welfare state that they want no regulation of the stock market, they want the burglars to be free to do as they see fit. They are opposed to the development of our rivers and our valleys. They favor the growth of monopoly and the liquidation of small business. They deplore the action of the Government of the United States in the field of heart and cancer and mental health research, because that is the New Deal, the Fair Deal.

Yes, these frustrated political malcontents are seeking the confidence and the support of the American people on the basis of a program which repudiates the express desire and policy and wish of the vast majority of the American people. If they think they are going to be elected on that program, they are just plain "nuts." Why, they are going up and down this country telling the American electorate, telling our own intelligent citizenry that they, these frustrated politicians of the past, these soothsayers of yesterday, these special-privilege pleaders of the present, that they should be entrusted with political power in this critical hour.

This sort of political leadership reminds me of the old French kings of whom it was said that they never seemed to learn anything and they never seemed to forget anything. This reactionary leadership apparently has not learned that the American people are through with a do-nothing, backward-moving policy of Government, that they are through with union-busting, labor-hating employer organizations.

This type of leadership has not found out that the American people look upon their Government as a partner in promoting the security and prosperity and freedom of our country. Two world wars and a major world-wide depression have not demonstrated to these die-hard apostles of the past that we are living in a changed world. And believe me, we are living in a changed world as the fraternal delegates who are here from the western democracies of Europe will tell you—not only a changed world but one that was almost destroyed.

My friends in the labor movement, I urge a rededication on the part of the American Federation of Labor to the fulfillment of our responsibility for international leadership. I repeat, I urge a rededication on the part of every delegate in this great assembled convention, on the part of every member of the American Federation of Labor and every one of its affiliated unions to the fulfillment of our responsibility for international leadership. If this world is going to be a better world we are going to help make it that way. If this world is going to collapse in its own evil, in its own misdoings, we are going to be a part of it. We are not the America of 1800, we are not even the America of 1900; we are the America of 1949 and 1950. We are the America that is the greatest financial power the world has ever known, and believe me, we have to act with a sense of great social responsibility when we hold the money bags of the world. I don't want my country getting the reputation of pinching the last ounce of blood and the last pound of flesh. We are the greatest industrial power in the world. Our industrial know-how goes on beyond any possible comparison in this world, and with that tremendous productivity that is ours, the skill that we have, we cannot just live unto ourselves.

I submit to these men and women in this great assembled convention that the very ethics of our religious faith, whether we be Jew, Gentile, Protestant, or Catholic, every moral tenet of our religious faith tells us that we are our brother's keeper, and he who would deny it will destroy himself.

I submit to you also that it is a privilege to help other people. Nothing that we should go around boasting about, but something about which we should be humble. Isn't it wonderful that out of this terrible destruction of World War II God Almighty spared one nation to help its fellow men? Isn't it wonderful that out of the terrible cost and the torture and the suffering of millions and millions of people one great economy of this world was spared to lift up the level of mankind?

That is our mission. We have a destiny to fulfill, and that destiny is one which should make every American proud—proud that you are an American, proud that you can do something for those who have done so much for us, because every one of us in this room at one time or another was a DP, every one of us at some time or another in the years gone by in our family were immigrants. Now it is our opportunity to offer the advice and counsel of a great democracy, of a great, free people—not only to offer it, but to share the fruits of our labor, to share our productivity, to be the good Samaritan—and believe me, friends, no one hates a good Samaritan. But some people hate bill collectors, double-entry bookkeeping artists. So I call upon this labor movement to accept the responsibility for international leadership. The liberal, social, democratic forces of Europe—and by the way, friends, the only hope in Europe are the liberal democratic forces—are looking to us. The hope in Europe does not lie in the reactionary communistic left. That is the black pit of disillusionment and despair. The peoples of Europe will only turn to that when there is no other place to turn. The hope of Europe does not rest in the economic or political leadership of the extreme right, and it does not rest in the mollycoddle leadership of those who want to be in power. It rests with those great forces of the free labor movement, it rests with the forces of the free cooperative movement, it rests with those intellectual leaders of Europe who are attracted to the proposition of human freedom. And may I say to the American Federation of Labor, God bless you, may you join with those forces as you are doing in saving western Europe and western civilization.

There is no room in the ranks of labor, in the house of labor for a selfish isolationist policy. The labor movement is one of brotherhood. It is one of sharing, it is one of fraternity. There is no room in the ranks of labor for a political policy that sets labor off from the rest of the community. The political fact of this decade is the recognition of our interdependence, not only our independence, but our interdependence—the interdependence of the nations of the world on trade between the nations and world commerce. The political fact of America is the interdependence of the worker and the farmer. These two great producers of real wealth are the lifeblood of our free, ec nomic system. The economic well-being of both the worker and the farmer is the only hope for a prosperous America.

I wish I had every member of the Chamber of Commerce, every businessman, every merchant in Minnesota in this hall today. The only hope of prosperity along Main Street is the prosperity of the farmer, the producer, and the worker in the factory. That is the only place they have any hope. Unemployment in the ranks of labor, or partial unemployment, depressed prices in the agricultural economy would be more destructive to the American way of life than any atomic bomb in the hands of any foreign aggressor.

My good friends, an economic break-down in America as to its effect upon the world

situation and the future peace and security of this world would make the atomic bomb that Russia may have look like a firecracker. An economic break-down in America would destroy the productivity and the prosperity of the greatest nation in the world, of the only nation that many other nations are leaning upon and looking to for help.

The greatest contribution that this Nation can give to the rest of the world today is a strong, prosperous, enlightened, humanitarian America. That is the greatest contribution we can give, and those who would seek to destroy us are patiently waiting for us, the American people, to create our own mistakes and our own troubles. The aggressor, or the potential aggressor, the foe and the enemy of free America is a reactionary policy at work that does not recognize the needs of the American people, a reactionary, isolationist policy abroad which fails to recognize the basic needs and legitimate rights of their people. That is the major weakness and the major foe of this country, and I want my friends in the trade-union movement to remember it.

I want you to remember that even as we are in our hours of adversity we have to keep a broad vision. We must keep our eyes set on the higher goals. To be quite frank with you, conventions like this may come to an end unless we do. To be very, very frank with you, world war III may well bring the end of what we call the free way of life.

It is our job, as responsible American citizens, as responsible citizens of the world to figure out to the best of our ability how we can best prevent the catastrophe and calamity of world war III. It is our job to remember that no matter what may be the cost of peace, it is better than the cost of a catastrophic war.

And I want to say to my budget-balancing friends, to those who cry out for economy, that peace is not cheap, nor is war. But no matter how much we may spend in our crusade for peace, put this down in your memo notebook: It won't be one-tenth of 1 percent of what we have to spend in a do-or-die effort if we should ever be engulfed in world war III. The expenditures for peace are expenditures for the good of the spirit, for the good of the soul and body. The expenditures for peace are expenditures for the good life, for better men and better women, for healthier and more enlightened children, and I want to see the same determination in our eyes and in our minds and bodies, to win this struggle for a free Europe, to win this struggle for a free Asia, for a free world. I want every American to dedicate his life and to dedicate his treasure and to dedicate his ability to the crusade for a just and enduring peace, which we can obtain if we but will it, so help me God.

Labor and the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Labor Pros Help Marshall Plan," written by Murray Kempton and published in the New York Post of August 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LABOR PROS HELP MARSHALL PLAN

(By Murray Kempton)

Ever since January, the bargaining that is not bargaining has dragged on in threadbare conference rooms on shabby Parisian streets. Every day the union men ask for just a chance to discuss wages. And every day their employers come up with a flat "No."

That's the deadlock that labor relations have reached in France right now. It is a condition that extends right down to the plant manager's offices where union personnel committees stand hat in hand with dozens of grievances unresolved and undiscussed.

There is an end result to these things. It is next fall's tragic, crippling picket lines. In the meanwhile, it is the desperate futility of France's democratic union leaders, hopelessly torn between the demands of their followers and their knowledge of what a strike could do to their country's recovery.

And it is the ultimate profit of the French Communist Party, which is afflicted by no such niceties of conscience.

The Communists still have the French labor movement; they hold its core in transport, in the coal fields, in the machine shops. And they will keep it until the French Government offers its workers a measure of free collective bargaining.

That picture of the state of French labor didn't originate with any Gallic Trotskyite. It is the painful report of a democratic French union leader and it was issued this week under the imprimatur of the Marshall plan administration.

It means, to anyone who reads English, that we are still losing the French worker. And it underlines again the essential tragedy behind the State Department's gleeful reception of the news that the German people had reelected Warren Gamaliel Harding this week.

The State Department had made its choice in Germany long before. It neglected and starved the free unions of the western zone when they were fighting for life a year ago.

And, if these unions have paper for leaflets and typewriters to print them with right now, the only Americans they can thank for it are the A. F. of L. and CIO leaders who got up the cash to pay for these elementary tools in the war against Soviet propaganda.

So, more and more when the European non-Communist left looks to America, it looks to our labor movement. And we are seeing the emergence of an auxiliary, unofficial State Department staffed and run by American labor professionals.

On the basic issues of the fight against communism, these labor foreign servants cooperate closely with the State Department.

Some of them are even on its pay roll. Under the general direction of a brilliant young United States Assistant Secretary of Labor named Philip Kaiser, our Government now maintains a corps of labor experts in 23 foreign capitals.

These labor attachés represent a very real State Department concession to the importance of foreign labor to our diplomacy. A labor attaché acts as liaison man between the American embassy and labor leaders in the country to which he is assigned. He reports to his mission chief on local labor opinion and acts as an information center for foreign unionists.

Not all the labor attachés are professional unionists. But Tom Lane, in Rome, is an old A. F. of L. bricklayer and Lloyd White in Berlin is a machinist.

The Marshall-plan administration is of course full of personnel lend-leased from the American labor movement. Some of them have policy jobs; others act as production experts in the Marshall-plan countries.

All this is labor directly cooperating with United States Government policy. But its corps of foreign servants remains quasi-official because it recognizes that it owes something to the European worker beyond the immediate, pressing job of saving him from the Soviets.

That's why the French story is so important. With their own funds and sometimes in direct opposition to the policy of conservative American diplomats, both the A. F. of L. and CIO are keeping men in Europe whose job it is to strengthen the democratic left by hardening its only real base—the struggling and sometimes pathetic free labor movements.

On November 28, 20 A. F. of L. and CIO leaders will go to London to help set up a new democratic world federation of labor. The men who go there will be militantly anti-Soviet. But they're just as determined to rewrite the French story.

Aid to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell dealing with aid to Great Britain, published in the New York News of October 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 12.—It's a coarse observation to make, but it's a fact that beggars seem to be running short of gratitude these days. This applies particularly to the present Labor Government of Britain, with its smart-thinking Fabian Socialists who cooked up the creeping communism idea a generation ago and now make their fellow citizens austerely miserable. These boys certainly fumble the ball so far as ordinary gratitude toward the United States Treasury is concerned.

After all we—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, etc., etc.—agreed that we would bank-roll the British Empire and piously keep our fingers crossed and never, never mutter any observations as to how the United States cash was being used by the Socialist politicians in Britain to nail down their jobs.

Damned decent both ways. We kick in the dough, both sides agree to pull back from any nasty cracks on domestic politics.

MARXIST TACTICS DIDN'T GO WELL

As might have been expected, came the howl from the Socialist rulers of Britain that we were using our big United States Treasury bank-roll by way of the Marshall plan ($3,628,000,000 for the current year) to influence their internal politics.

It isn't bad enough that we're told to keep our inquisitive nose out of British politics. We're now told that thanks to our dough they'd like to tell us how to run ours. And this with particular respect to the British labor idea of moving in on strikes in our basic coal and steel industries—industrial

terrain in which the London Marxists haven't been too happy in their recent explorations.

So the most intelligent and effective organ of the Socialists—the Statesman and Nation—comes out in its current issue with the blunt declaration that "It is high time that British Socialists realized how closely their own struggle is linked with that of the American trade union."

Here is the snapper:

"Today, because the struggle for the welfare state is the dominant issue in both countries, right speaks to right and left speaks to left as never before. Mr. Truman's political future is bound up with that of Mr. Attlee and Mr. Churchill's with Senator Taft's."

IT REFLECTS LABOR BOSSES' IDEAS

This is really important because the Statesman and Nation reflects the thinking of the political group now running Britain as accurately as did the London Times in the days of Churchill. What you find suggested in the editorial columns soon becomes (unless the editorial balloon is shot down swiftly) the all-out government policy.

So now we have the British Labor Party, living on United States money, bellowing happily that "while the labor movement in Britain is fighting its defensive political battle to preserve the welfare state which it has built since 1945, American labor has launched an offensive in the industrial field."

Now bearing in mind that the big squawk from Britain has been over the mild suggestion that perhaps some American taxpayers objected to their dough being used to finance a socialistic regime, get—to put it roughly—this load of advice from the British labor editorial writers:

"It is high time that British Socialists realized how closely their own struggle is linked with that of the American trade unions. On the other side of the Atlantic this realization is already widespread among American labor leaders and Fair Deal politicians. They appreciate that the British experiment is the testing ground for a future American planned economy and welfare state.

"If the Labor government were defeated in the next election, the chances of the Fair Dealers in the mid-term campaign of 1950 and of Mr. Truman in 1952 would be seriously diminished."

THAT BUSINESS OF TRANS-ATLANTIC ALINEMENT

"Ever since Mr. Marshall's Harvard speech, American labor has been running a highly effective campaign—partly of political education and partly of direct lobby pressure—in favor of aid to Britain and against the reactionary forces which are only too anxious to assist Mr. Churchill in strangling British socialism.

"This movement of support for Labor Britain has gone so far that the A. F. of L. and CIO are actually seeking to popularize the British export drive among the American trade-unionists, who might suffer from British competition.

"This change is as revolutionary as it is encouraging. Today, because the struggle for the welfare state is the dominant issue in both countries, right speaks to right and left to left as never before."

May we point out that this important British publication bears down heavily on the deeply significant phrase the British Socialists have created—"this new trans-Atlantic alinement of political forces."

That's important. Once you get a trans-Atlantic alinement (might be Moscow to Washington, according to the map) you may be in trouble. A political marriage always leads to a military divorce, according to the history books.

Now they come up with the tough one that the political boys in Britain, after taking United States cash, should use their political power to pull British strikes, if necessary, to back up Truman's reelection campaign for his welfare state or congressional control in next year's election. We again quote from the distinguished Statesman and Nation of London:

"If Mr. Churchill has his allies in Wall Street, British labor also has powerful friends in the United States of America; and this friendship is based not on sentiment but on the consciousness of common aims in a common struggle.

"It is high time that Transport House woke up to its American responsibilities. A fraternal message to the American trade-unionists, on strike in their struggle for the welfare state, would be a modest first beginning of what should become an enduring alliance."

Government, Business, and the Employment Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most timely and interesting article written by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on Government, Business, and the Employment Act of 1946, which appeared in Dun's Review for July 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

(By Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Senator from Wyoming, chairman, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report)

For the first time in history following a major war, the Government of the United States is equipped with the machinery by which to prevent a business depression. Heretofore every major war has been followed by a depression, the magnitude of which was measured by the magnitude of the war.

It was the realization of this fact that made Congress pass the Employment Act of 1946 with its Council of Economic Advisers to keep the President apprised of economic developments, its direction to the President to make an annual economic report to Congress, and its Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report to analyze the President's recommendations and to keep Congress currently abreast of changes in the economic picture.

Even before the Employment Act was enacted and even before the shooting war had been finished, Congress took steps to prevent depression by promoting reconversion of industry from production for war to production for peace. Two laws in particular come immediately to mind. They are the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 and the Contract Settlement Act. These were examples of economic planning by Government in the public interest, but of direct benefit to business. They were intended to facilitate reconversion and to provide the necessary capital by speedily settling the contracts business and industry had made with the Government for the prosecution of the war.

There was no precedent for either of these two laws. They were outstanding examples of how government can intelligently aid business. They were essential because the war had been so largely an industrial effort that reconversion would have been impossible without them. They were effective. Indeed it is not too much to say that the forecasts that 8,000,000 persons would be unemployed as a result of the end of the war were upset only because Congress had had the foresight to provide this legislative machinery by which the transition from the war economy was made practically painless.

The Employment Act of 1946 was part of the same program. It was drafted because it was realized that the reconstruction of the world on a basis of peace and economic activity was a task which could be accomplished only through wise, constructive action by Government. It was the fruit of our experience in the depression that followed World War I. Because Government failed to act after that conflict and because during the succeeding years we clung to the theory that things would somehow take care of themselves, we had an experience which certainly must have taught us that it is much wiser to prevent a depression than to have Government act in a frantic and necessarily poorly planned manner after depression has come.

COOPERATION IS NECESSARY

As has already been pointed out in the May supplement of Dun's Review, business is now going through a period of adjustment, "moderate and gradual in character." We have none of the abrupt and drastic declines which have ushered in all previous depressions. This adjustment can be kept moderate and gradual. The Employment Act can be the bridge over which the country may safely pass to a sound and prosperous economy of long duration. It is needful only that business leadership and Government leadership unite to make the act work.

To make this cooperation of government and business possible it must first be understood clearly that government does have a positive function in the economic field. Successful business would not be possible without government. Consider, for example, the obligations placed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution itself.

The first power given to the Congress in that instrument was the power to levy and collect taxes, to pay the debts of the United States, to provide for the common defense and the general welfare.

The second was the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States and the third, the power to regulate commerce.

It is the duty of government to prevent violence, fraud, and coercion in business; to encourage and stimulate industry, trade, and commerce by granting patents and protecting the rights thus granted; to coin money and fix its value; to establish post offices and post roads. These are but a few of the duties which government must not neglect if business is to have a climate in which it can operate successfully. The mere recitation of these is proof of the fact that those who seem to believe that government should always keep its hands off business and economics do not understand how essential the cooperation of business and Government is.

Only government can provide the framework within which a free economy can operate. This was so well realized by business back in 1787 that it was primarily the commercial classes who brought about the ratification of the Constitution. Leading businessmen of the Thirteen Original States banded together to raise the money and to conduct the campaign to establish the new National Government by inducing a sufficient number of the States to approve the new Constitution. They understood how essential gov-

ernment is to the preservation of business because they knew from sad experience how painful the results are when government, for lack of power or understanding, does not function.

Just as government was essential to stabilize the economy after the American Revolution, so it is essential now. One of the principal objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 was to make it possible for an informed society, through the Federal Government, to provide the framework within which modern trade and commerce may efficiently operate.

I am conscious of the fact that the law was criticized by some in the belief that it was intended to give the Government more authority than Government ought to have. The record of this statute since its enactment 3 years ago should be sufficient to demonstrate that these fears were without foundation. The people of America are much better informed today with respect to economic problems and trends than they could have been if the law had not been enacted. The President's reports, the reports of the Council of Economic Advisers, the hearings and the reports of the joint congressional committee have all resulted in a much broader dissemination of economic facts than ever took place in any other postwar period. The Council and the joint committee continue to be invaluable sources of information and the committee is particularly an instrumentality for developing a wider comprehension of the issues which are at stake.

There is less likelihood now than ever before that leaders in either business or in Government can be hurried into unwise and unnecessay action through fear arising from unawareness of actual conditions, from false reports, or misinterpretations of fact. Two years ago, under the chairmanship of Senator TAFT, this committee invited Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., to conduct a survey of business opinion. The members of the committee were struck by the fact that businessmen who were interviewed were uniformly more optimistic about their own businesses and their own industries—the areas with respect to which they were best informed—than they were about other businesses and other industries with which they had less intimate contact. So the widespread distribution of more and better information on the economic problem through the agency of the Employment Act is of itself a distinct service to business.

Information, however, is not enough. There must be also a plan of action and this is particularly true because in our time the economy is much more complex and much more highly organized than ever before. The success or failure of an individual in business does not have any appreciable effect upon the national economy, but if a large modern industrial unit should fail it could easily wreck not only local communities in which it may be the dominant business, but send a chain reaction into distant States and distant communities. Only Government can coordinate the actions and reactions of modern business. To Government all of the people must look for protection whether they are executives or workers, farmers, industrialists, or professional experts.

THE GOVERNMENT AS A REFEREE

Probably no better illustration could be cited of the need for Government action—some might almost call it Government interference—than the current debate over the repeal or modification of the Taft-Hartley law. What is transpiring in Congress now is only another phase in the effort which has been going on for several years to devise a just and workable law by which Government may become the referee in a free system of negotiations and interrelations between workers and the executives of complex modern industry.

The Wagner Act as first enacted, the Taft-Hartley law amending it, and the modifications which are being presented to both of these statutes by Senator TAFT, upon the one hand, and Senator THOMAS of Utah, on the other, are all illustrations of the fact that, though they may disagree in detail, industry and labor and all the members of Congress are in agreement upon one fundamental point, namely, that the Government must step in to preserve a rule of order in the relations between employers and employees.

"Laissez faire," in the sense in which it has been most recently used, is the dictum of an age that is gone. When originally proposed it was conceived to mean, not that the Government should follow a "do nothing" course, but that it should prevent people and classes from interfering with one another in the pursuit of their economic interest. Later on it came to be interpreted to mean that government should not govern. Such, however, was not the purpose of the men who drafted the Constitution of the United States. They could not possibly have agreed upon giving Congress the power "to regulate commerce" if they meant that the Government should not exercise it.

So the function of the Employment Act of 1946 is to develop the facts upon which a sane and constructive economic program for Government may be developed. We cannot afford to drift in this age of transition because drifting would bring about exactly the same results that postwar periods of the past have brought, namely, depression. Because the last war was the most terrible and destructive ever fought, a depression following it, if one were permitted to develop, would smash all previous records of hardship and disaster.

Worse than that, drifting into a depression now would have far more than economic results. It would have results affecting the very structure of free society, for the Communists of the world are waiting for a depression as the instrumentality for destroying capitalism and taking over control of the world.

PURPOSE OF EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Employment Act of 1946 is the barrier against such a result. As the preamble of the act has it, the law was designed to effectuate "the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its need and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." It was a law designed to "foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare."

It must be used. Failure to use it, coupled with the dissemination of alarmist reports and interpretations of current facts, could easily generate the fears out of which a depression could be made. Business observers and business economists have pointed out that 1949 is utterly different from 1929. Twenty years ago there were no cushions against disaster. There was no unemployment insurance. There was no guaranty of bank deposits. Farm and urban mortgages then were at high and unmanageable levels. There was no farm-parity concept. Now the mortgage situation is sound. Now we have price supports. In 1949 it is the Federal Government which is carrying a huge debt and not the individual citizen or the individual business organization, as it was in 1929. Then neither the States nor the Federal Government had any substantial programs of public works. Now both units are actively engaged in such construction and even at this writing engineering contract awards are substantially and measurably higher than they were last month or last year.

Back in 1929 there was no backlog of consumer demand. Now, even though much of this backlog built up during the war has been absorbed, we have still not completely caught up. It is still not possible to walk into any automobile salesroom in any part of the country and drive out with the model one desires. The automotive industry tells us that only about one-quarter of the automobiles now on the road are less than 5 years old. Back in 1939, when the buyer could buy any car he wanted and nobody thought it a danger signal, fully one-half of all the automobiles in use were less than 5 years old.

TODAY'S BROADER MARKET

More than that, back in 1929 the Government was not buying goods and services to rehabilitate Europe and win the peace of the world. To date more than 60 percent of the funds expended under ECA have been expended for commodities produced and fabricated in the United States by American industry. So there is a market for business, a market which justifies the findings of Dun's Review that two-thirds of the manufacturers and businessmen it interviewed for the May supplement looked forward to "no change in expenditures for plant and equipment" and "no change in the number of employees." The best statistics we have show that savings have reached a new high so that currently business has a market in government, both State and National, and among the people as well.

These briefly are the facts upon which I concur with the opinion expressed by thoughtful leaders in business and in government that the country is now experiencing only a period of hesitation and delay, while we change from a sellers' to a buyers' market. A buyers' market is much more normal than a sellers' market, and there is nothing in the buyers' market to cause alarm to any business executive who is also a good salesman.

After its first series of nation-wide hearings, the joint congressional committee made note of the fact that consumer resistance was developing to the prices which then were being charged. It is not unreasonable to expect that a balance between the two may soon be obtained to the advantage of both the producer and distributor, on the one hand, and the consumer, upon the other.

NEED FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that this condition would justify inaction by the Government. There are two substantial reasons why this is not the case. The first of these is that when we approach more nearly the time when government rehabilitation expenditures, on which the peace depends, can be substantially reduced, it will be essential for us to follow a consciously positive course under the Employment Act to maintain maximum employment. There is no market for business except that which is provided by what the people desire to buy. The prosperity of the future cannot be contracted upon a basis of low living standards. It is only by raising the standards of all of the people that we can create and supply the demand which alone will sustain business.

The second reason is that we have a national debt of gigantic proportions, $250,000,000,000 plus. That debt was incurred to fight the war. It must be carried and it

must be paid. To carry it requires an annual payment of $5,000,000,000 in interest.

Every leader of government and every leader of business who believes in the system of private property must know that the income of the Federal Government must be maintained at a level which will enable the Government to manage and to reduce this debt. We cannot disregard it as of no immediate concern just because it has been handled well to date. We must be certain that it will continue to be well handled. That means that the functions of government must be used to foster and stimulate business, to promote production, to stimulate employment. We are swinging from a war economy in which industry produced its goods to be destroyed to an economy in which industry is producing its goods to be used. The transition has not been accomplished.

The Employment Act is the means of transition and it must be used intelligently so that we in America may demonstrate to the peoples of the world, which the Communists are confident they are about to take over, that a free economy in a free government can produce a higher and more stable standard of living for the masses than any other system.

To Be Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 15 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. Frank Kingdon which appeared in the New York Post of October 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

Nehru is a lot of things besides Premier of India. Taken altogether they make him not only unique among men of power but also a symbol of the revolutionary shift in the ties between the Orient and the West, including the ramifications of the relations of the white man with all other men.

The dominating fact about him is that he is a moral figure. He is an individual of extraordinarily luminous intellect who was driven to political action by a profound moral conviction. Trained in Harrow and Cambridge, he might easily have become a successful and respected pillar of British influence in India, but Britain's cruel persecutions of the Indians in 1918 so aroused his spirit that he separated himself from his former friends and identified himself completely with his fellow countrymen and their emancipation from British rule. This was a moral decision, and his hold on his people is more moral than political to this day.

He is a living reminder of the stupidity of men of empire. They might have had him on their side. They turned him into an enemy by their own ruthlessness. Imperialism called into the lists against itself the moral fervor of an outraged spirit, and turned the sharp edge of consummate talents to its own undoing.

As the active leader for political independence he naturally became the first Premier of India. This puts him in an epochal position. The importance of a political leader as an individual depends on the state of his nation's political institutions. While they are fluid and relatively untried a strong leader can stamp them with his own personality so deeply that they will always thereafter follow the lines he sets, as we know from the influence Washington exerted on our institutions while we were still a young Nation. When a nation's political institutions are firmly established they can continue to operate even though they have a man of mediocre talents at their head, as we have seen several times in our history, and are seeing today.

Nehru stands in India where Washington stood in the United States. He has the same universal respect and, fortunately for India, the same sort of integrity. Washington came from the field and Nehru from the study, but they share the same robust patriotism and fidelity to duty. In his own person, Nehru not only incarnates the independence of India but is an assurance that it is capable of producing a political leadership that will make its independence flourish.

We think of him as a disciple of Gandhi, but it would be a mistake to conclude that his stature is merely the result of his reflection of the Mahatma's glory. He held his own individuality when Gandhi was alive. He did not hesitate at times to follow a path the other rejected. He has come to his eminence in his own right.

He now occupies the somewhat perilous position of the moral man as politician. He is being tested by the most severe of corrupting acids, the acid of power. Many a chalice which has seemed to be the Holy Grail has been tarnished and proved of baser metal when power has come to its bearer. Thus far Nehru has kept faith.

He has performed one of the political miracles of our time. He has brought into being a nation of 300,000,000. He has achieved national unity among many religions and tongues. He has brought this national birth safely through a migration of millions, possibly the greatest in mankind's history.

He still faces two overwhelming problems—the economic rehabilitation of a country in which millions die of starvation annually, and the adjustment of India to the quicksands of international policy.

His visit to this country offers more than a chance to cheer a great man. It presents an opportunity to undergird democracy in Asia and to lay the foundations of an understanding that will endure in mutual dignity, a partnership of equals from East and West.

How Texas A & P Store Managers and Clerks Raided Independent Competitors Offering Bargains and Then Putting on Sale of Bargains so Obtained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been common practice for many years in the grocery business for small grocers to attempt to attract business by selling a few special staple items such as flour and sugar at low prices. This is particularly true over week ends when the housewife is apt to be attracted by these specials. Now the giant A & P has used its vast organization not only to deprive these little grocers of the opportunity to attract some business by running a few specials on these items but has actually sent crews of A & P people in to buy up the grocer's entire supply of these items until the grocer was tearing his hair and did not know his customer from his competitor.

Store managers who organized these buying brigades were complimented by their superiors for their resourcefulness.

When the competitor's ad appeared in a Friday paper, A & P organized its brigade on Friday ready to converge upon its competitor on Saturday morning. This is the way it was done and I am quoting from A & P's instructions to one of its superintendents in the southern division:

We believe the best plan would be to give each purchaser among the wives, sisters and other members of our clerk's families, an amount say $5 with instructions to buy all of the particular specials that we want. To cause more confusion it is suggested that they might converge on one store at about the same hour but without trying to buy a set amount as we did last week as this disclosed immediately what we were doing.

But A & P did not stop with the organization of a crew to buy out these specials. It actually backed up trucks to the competitor's doors. In the city of Dallas I quote from the record a description of these activities as described at a meeting of A & P supervisors in the southern division:

The wives of the supervisors and managers were formed into a brigade that worked as a unit to purchase the below-cost specials of competition, with a truck being taken to the vicinity of the competitor's store to collect these purchases. When the manager or the clerk tries to do this the competitor's store usually refuses to sell them, but in the case of the wives, they cannot identify them both from their regular customers. It took only several weeks of this for the practice to be discontinued in the city of Dallas.

After such little grocers had been cleaned out of their supply of the staple which they had intended to use as a week-end special, A & P turned right around and sold that special as a red-hot special of its own.

Final Proof That Communists Are Not Another Kind of Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun:

FINAL PROOF THAT COMMUNISTS ARE NOT ANOTHER KIND OF DEMOCRAT

The jury's verdict in the case of the Communist leaders can hardly surprise people who have followed the press dispatches on the long and bitterly contested trial. Indeed, the opinion has been gaining for some

time that the Communist leaders were engaged in a conspiracy whose ultimate purpose was to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

What has not been so clear, and what is not yet settled by the jury verdict, is whether the statute directed against such activities squares with the first amendment of our Constitution. Judge Medina, presiding in the New York case, was required to make a conclusion on this point in order to send the case to the jury. Here is what he said:

"I find as a matter of law that there is sufficient danger of a substantive evil that the Congress has a right to prevent, to justify the application of the statute under the first amendment of the Constitution."

Unquestionably counsel for the Communist leaders will seek to test this finding of Judge Medina's in the circuit court of appeals and then in the Supreme Court of the United States. Questions of constitutionality aside, however, and however they are ultimately to be decided, Judge Medina's masterful charge to the jury and the jury's action thereon will have permanent value.

For now we have a factual determination of the nature of organized communism and the aims of the Communist leaders. This determination is on the basis of the full facts reached in open court, and under the very generous protections which our criminal jurisprudence gives the defense. We have that determination at the hands of the body charged with the ultimate responsibility for finding fact under our criminal law.

This factual determination is that the accused did not merely "pursue peaceful studies and discussions." They did not limit their advocacy to "peaceful change." It follows that no "issue of thought control or putting books on trial" was raised. The issue raised and the charge proved was "conspiracy to teach and advocate overthrow or destruction of the Government by force or violence * * * as speedily as circumstances would permit."

That factual determination by the responsible triers of the fact (from whose factual determinations there can be no appeal) should clarify the whole question of communism in America in the middle of the twentieth century. It should awaken the last of those unvigilant souls who still think of Communists as just another kind of democrat. It should permanently influence opinion, legislation, and policy.

ECA Import Program and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very thoughtful and impressive resolution from the America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference on the question of devaluation.

I believe that the comments expressed herein are worthy of the most careful consideration of the Congress.

The resolution follows:

ECA IMPORT PROGRAM AND THE TARIFF

RESOLUTION ADOPTED IN MEETING OF AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE, ST. PAUL, MINN., OCTOBER 6, 1949

Whereas the national debt in the United States is in excess of $250,000,000,000, requiring $5,000,000,000 in payment of annual interest thereon;

Whereas benefit payments and other assistance to veterans require annual appropriations of approximately five additional billion dollars, with little probability of reduction in the near future; grants to foreign governments for rehabilitation and recovery call for still another five or six billion dollars per year, and national defense appropriations demand some $15,000,000,000 annually; while the costs of the civil government, including price support of agricultural products and higher pay of public employees, consume an additional fund of twelve to fifteen billion dollars;

Whereas the annual national budget thus exceeds $40,000,000,000, a great part of which is fixed and recurrent in character, thus offering scant hope of material reduction;

Whereas a national income of more than $200,000,000,000 per year is necessary to sustain a budget of this magnitude without an increase in Federal taxation which already absorbs approximately 20 percent of national income;

Whereas such a level of national income can be sustained only by a combination of (1) high wages, (2) a high level of employment, (3) a high degree of production, and (4) a high level of prices;

Whereas the dollar shortages of numerous foreign countries, caused in great degree by the financing of two world wars, has created a demand for a much greater volume of imports by the United States as a means of restoring trade balances and has led recently to a devaluation of foreign currencies as a step toward that goal;

Whereas the high plateau upon which the economy of the United States now rests makes it highly vulnerable to the deflationary and undermining effects of imports if these can be offered in our markets at prices below those offered by our own producers;

Whereas the condition of shortages which prevailed during the postwar period in this country has disappeared in nearly all lines of goods and commodities, and given way to the threat of surpluses, thus marking the shift from a seller's to a buyer's market;

Whereas a moderate decline in the general price level may be desirable but a marked decline or a return to the prewar price level would be disastrous;

Whereas the competitive effects of imports, priced, after payment of duty, below the level at which our own products can profitably be sold in our home market, are to depress wages and curtail employment in a buyer's market as distinguished from a seller's market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, a nonprofit organization, composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, with sympathetic understanding and appreciation of the economic difficulty that confronts foreign countries as well as the United States in their efforts to restore trade balances and to overcome the problem of dollar shortages abroad, memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States, setting forth the great economic peril to the Nation that inheres in the present policy of selectively exposing American producers, through theoretically considered tariff reductions, to low-wage competition from abroad; be it further

Resolved, That we regard it to be wholly unnecessary and in fact destructive of the avowed purpose of promoting imports, to reduce import duties to a point that creates pressure on wages and prices in this country; and that the objective of increased trade can best be met by setting tariff rates at a level that will insure fair and not destructive competition; that the deflationary pressures generated by unfair foreign competition cannot be localized nor readily arrested through present escape provisions in trade agreements and that therefore the idea of promoting the general interest at the expense of a few industries, to be sacrificed in behalf of a general policy, is both false and dangerous;

Finally, be it resolved that since of necessity our Nation is committed as a requisite of meeting its internal and external obligations and commitments for some years to come, to a high national income and high prices as compared with prewar years, we consider the claims of consumers to buy imported goods at low prices to be invalid if such low prices destroy wage earnings and profits and thus reduce the national income and the sources of internal revenue; that this is the crux of the problem and that the present method of reducing duties, through executive negotiation, without authoritative guidance from an impartial fact-finding agency, is inexpert, irresponsive to the needs of domestic producers and inadequate to the intricate requirements of the problem.

The implications of a greatly expanded import program are so far-reaching in their possible impact upon the present vulnerable economy of the United States, that any such program should be launched only under the guidance of the most responsible, practical, and competent officials and should not be left solely in the hands of employees of executive agencies who are far removed from the field of production and who regard our producers simply as selfish interests.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Executive Secretary.

Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. Sets Up Its Own Court and Levies Fines Against Customers Accused of Stealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to defend any person who is guilty of stealing. Like other people, I am opposed to theft in any form. At the same time, if a kleptomaniac is on the loose in any town, justice is not served by a chain store manager levying the fine against him instead of using the courts—local and State—which are set up for that purpose. It is an offense against the peace and dignity of the State and not necessarily a private individual wrong. All stores should be protected against such conduct, not just A & P.

It is rather ironical that the A & P levies a fine and collects the penalty of $10 or $15 for every $1 the person is accused of stealing when at the end of the year that particular store has sold more merchandise than was billed to it; in other words, there was an inventory gain instead of an inventory loss.

Some pilferage is common in any grocery store, but of course even more so in self-service supermarkets. When a customer is found to have stolen, let us say, a loaf of bread, it would naturally be considered equitable for the grocer to collect from the customer the price of that loaf of bread or to turn the customer over to the authorities for proper punitive action.

A & P, however, has a system all its own. It assesses and receives arbitrary sums

of money to reimburse A & P not only for the price of that loaf of bread but to pay A & P for other merchandise which A & P assumes the customer has stolen on other occasions.

The record in the criminal case against A & P in which A & P was found guilty shows, for example, in one case where an average of 70 cents of merchandise per person had been stolen in a particular store, A & P collected anywhere from $1 to $20 per person to cover the cost of the 70 cents worth of merchandise which the person had stolen. This collection was made in this way: When the customer was caught in the act of stealing the loaf of bread or the particular item stolen, he was informed by the manager of the store that A & P felt the customer owed them a certain amount "based on the number of previous visits" which the customer had made to the particular store.

In actual practice it worked out like this: In a store in New York City, for example, 11 persons were found shoplifting on a particular Saturday. Fifteen items had been taken or an average of 1.3 items per person. The retail value of these items was $2.76 all together or 25 cents per item. Now to cover this loss to the store of 25 cents per item or the total value of the merchandise of $2.76, A & P collected not $2.76, but $51.78 in all, or a total of $4.71 per person. Thus, each pilferer paid to A & P a sum almost twice as great as the total value to A & P of the entire merchandise stolen by the 11 caught pilfering on that Saturday.

The Valley Authority Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the members of this body, especially those from the great Northwest, will be interested in the thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the October 10 issue of the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis.:

THE VALLEY AUTHORITY PHILOSOPHY

During this session of Congress and the next, American citizens are going to be exposed to a terrific amount of propaganda in behalf of the "valley authority" philosophy.

Two of these proposals are now before Congress. One would create a "Missouri Valley Authority" to bring the "blessings" of Federal benevolence to citizens of the Missouri River Basin. A Columbia Valley Authority also has been dreamed up to extend "benefits" to the great Pacific Northwest.

President Truman and his advisers are no fools, politically speaking.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is an excellent example of the manner in which the usual processes of representative self-government can be—and are—bypassed.

In TVA land, the men who run this agency are supreme.

Although the tax dollars of all of us went into this great experiment, the elected representatives of all of us have nothing to say about TVA operations, finances, or activities. Indeed, upon the occasions when Congress has sought to make TVA accountable to Congress for its money, Congress was told quickly and emphatically to please gets its dirty hands off of something that was none of its business.

As a result, TVA charges the rates it pleases, and spends the money it collects as it pleases.

The Potomac philosophers have visions of nine of these authorities, each dominating the economic (and political) life of its own geographic kingdom. (The name, "authority," by the way, probably will be changed to "administration," a word that gives away no secrets.)

These authorities or administrations would be supergovernments imposed regardless of State lines.

Each would be run by a trio of Presidential appointees (at salaries of $17,500 a year). They could condemn real and personal property; condemn water rights; sell electric power at retail; buy and sell real estate; and engage in any commercial or industrial activity, in competition with any privately operated commercial or industrial enterprises. There would be no limit on the size, cost, or scope of these commercial experiments or pilot plants.

When the Congress of the United States first considered the bill establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority, the excuse given for this vast development was flood control.

The production of electric power, during the early debates, was mentioned only casually as a sort of byproduct of the dams built principally to control floods.

Now, however, there is less of that subterfuge.

Supporters of these regional authorities admit frankly that they want to put the Government whole hog in the electric-power business.

They do not say it directly, but if the TVA experiment is any standard, they also want these authorities to venture into such fields as food processing, and the commercial production of chemicals and fertilizers.

We must point out this fact:

It is only a short step from these commercial ventures to others—general manufacturing, mining, and general retail trade operations.

If the United States is to nationalize all industry and commerce, we believe the people of the United States should be allowed to vote on such a change directly. They shouldn't get socialization under the guise of flood control or limited public power.

AN IDEOLOGICAL BLITZ

The wonders of the regional-authority form of government, by the way, are being "sold" to the taxpayers by the taxpayers' hired help.

President Truman has listed the Columbia Valley Authority on his agenda of must legislation.

Furthermore, Mr. Truman has instructed a large number of Government employees to whip up a public demand for this new bit of regimentation.

The Department of the Interior is using its propaganda resources—its many bureaus, its thousands of employees, and its multimillion-dollar budget in the Northwest—to stir up a demand for the CVA.

Masterminding this ideological blitz is C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Davidson formerly was on the legal staff of TVA under David Lilienthal, and later he served as chief counsel of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Robert Ormond Case, an expert on the Pacific Northwest's economic resources, in a recent magazine article said:

"To grasp the impact of this development it should be borne in mind that the Department of the Interior's budget and personnel today outranks those of many independent nations. Interior's Bonneville Power Administration exercises arbitrary control of more than half the hydroelectric power output of the Columbia Basin, supplies Bonneville power to the area's largest private utilities on a year-to-year basis, and for a decade past has maintained a staff of consultants in the field of 'educating' the people as to the benefits of 'cheap' public power."

There is no question but that public money is being used to "sell" the public on this great scheme.

Opponents of CVA, for example, have been attempting to get some significant information from the Bonneville Power Administration. They have been trying to find out how much of the multimillion-dollar Bonneville power revenues have been diverted to the pro-CVA propaganda machine under the guise of public relations or administrative expense.

The opponents have failed to get the information they want. An agency established with public funds has, in effect, refused to tell the taxpayers what the agency is doing with the funds that it collects.

These, Mr. Citizen, are your "public servants."

NO LIMIT TO THEIR POWER

This entire argument goes beyond the mere issues of public power, and whether that is good or bad.

This "valley authority" theory is something that could have a serious and lasting effect upon the form of our American Government. It is philosophy that, if carried to the extreme to which we are certain it would be carried, would set self-government back a half-century.

For example:

A triumvirate of Presidential appointees would head the Columbia Valley Authority. At the time the CVA bill is passed, an event we hope we will not have to report, practically all Federal appropriations in the Columbia Basin area would be spent under the direction of this triumvirate. And the CVA Board would have authority to spend these appropriations regardless of the purpose for which Congress made them.

In addition, the CVA Board would have authority to spend all CVA power revenues as the judgment of the Board dictates. This would be no small sum. Based on Bonneville's present wholesale rates, this sum could be as large as $525,000,000.

Now, how could the CVA triumvirate spend this money? What could they do with it?

The answer: Anything.

They could put the Government into any business that they selected. They could use present appropriations and future revenues to establish "experiments," and "practical demonstrations," and "pilot plants."

What do these words mean?

They mean anything the three CVA board members want them to mean.

If the CVA wanted to chase the private operators out of the flourishing Northwest orchard business, they could establish competing experimental orchards. They could go into the steel business, in competition with Henry Kaiser. They could use public money to build and operate railroads, shipyards, and mines. They could establish "practical demonstrations" in retail store operations. There would be no practical limit to their field of activity.

The economic power of these three men would be so great they would have almost unquestioned political influence over the governments of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Montana, and Wyoming. Valley authority benefits could be given or withheld on the basis of local and State government cooperation with CVA.

This is dangerous stuff. Here would be an extra-legal unit of government, superimposed upon State government. And the regional authorities would be units over which Con-

gress would have little or no control, if the TVA example is followed, as it would be.

American taxpayers, citizens who value their freedom, should look this valley authority deal over pretty closely.

There is a lot to it that doesn't appear on the surface.

Is It Time for a New Declaration of Independence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the first Declaration of Independence and the last one up to date was a firm and courageous expression of the people of the Thirteen Original States, or Colonies as they were then, against the oppressive and unnecessary and burdensome taxes, and the unjust, unfair, and arrogant administration of Great Britain under the reign of King George III and his governor generals and power-drunk bureaucrats.

We fought a long and bloody war to prove to Great Britain that we meant what we said in that Declaration of Independence. It made us a respected and a free nation. Free from domination by all foreign powers, free of all the rest of the world, except ourselves.

Our freedom has made us a great and glorious nation, but the very Government which we have formed, which we have fashioned ourselves, to protect us from foreign domination, has been fast becoming our greatest burden, our greatest threat to freedom; yes, our greatest enemy to the freedom we declared ourselves independent of more than 160 years ago.

What have we been doing to ourselves? Where is the freedom and independence we fought so hard to preserve, the freedom and independence in which we took so much pride, which made this Nation so great and glorious both at home and abroad?

Has the Government of the United States become greater than the people who created it? Has it become the master instead of the servant of the people?

Are we allowing a dictator to rise in our midst without realizing it, a dictator with more power over us than the power that Great Britain wielded over us under King George III which demanded a Declaration of Independence 160 years ago?

Mr. Wheeler McMillen wrote the following statement in an article in a recent issue of the Pathfinder:

> Whenever certain individuals were chosen to exercise the function of protecting their fellows, they had to be provided with authority, and with the force to make their authority effective. They came thus to possess power over others. Inseparable from power over others always stands the temptation to abuse it.
>
> Thus a paradox has always been evident. It is that the very governments which men must institute or accept for their own protection are forever potentially man's most dangerous enemy.
>
> Within the past 35 years, two great wars were produced by the mistakes and stupidities of men who were charged with the powers of the various governments. The prices of the two wars included the killing of 20,000,000 men, the destruction of incalculable amounts of productive property, and the creation of immeasurable human misery. Neither war established peace or freedom.
>
> The powers of government everywhere now tend to revert to their ancient uses for oppression. In Russia estimates report seven to twelve million people subjected to forced labor. In the United States everyone is forced to work about 1 week out of every month for Government. The difference is only one of degree.
>
> If in our Government the influence of one pressure group or another continues to push spending and taxes upward, the number of slave days per citizen must likewise move upward.
>
> Government itself thus fails to protect the citizen from invasion of his right to use his own earnings.
>
> Americans have so long been so proud of the advantages of their own usually benign and beneficial Government that few can readily view it as a potential enemy. We realize so clearly the advantages of orderly communities, and of the necessity to protect our country against foreign hostility, that it strains one's philosophical powers to accept the fact that any and every government contains the utmost potential dangers to the very life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness our Government was set up to secure.
>
> The American future will be safe if enough people do bear in mind that any government, even ours, however useful for protection, may also become a destructive enemy.

Mr. McMillen is telling us what is happening now; this is not ancient history nor is it a fanciful prophecy of some crackpot. It is a sound and logical appraisal of the condition of our Government today, a condition which we have brought about ourselves under our own constitutional government.

Thomas Jefferson very wisely said:

> The United States Constitution contains the seeds of its own destruction.

This statement can be paraphrased today as follows:

> The Government of the United States can become master and enemy of the people who created it instead of its servant and protector if the people permit it.

False propaganda and deception can delude and frustrate the people of this Nation just the same as it can and does the people of any other nation. Apt slogans and deft similes often carry more weight than sound common sense and logic in political campaigns.

The people of this Nation have withstood many a severe shock which has threatened our freedom and independence and unity in the past. Are we now to become the victims of our own folly, or is it time for a new Declaration of Independence in order to free ourselves from an administration and a rapidly growing trend in government that is sapping away the freedom and independence which we thought we had but is rapidly disappearing.

Benjamin Franklin said:

> He who sacrifices his freedom for security loses both.

Here is another timely warning from a thoughtful writer and a close observer of our present day political problems. Mr. Graham Patterson, publisher of the Pathfinder, wrote this in a recent issue of his magazine:

> Many people are unaware that their freedom is being inexorably taken away from them. A few months ago, the eminent James F. Byrnes, himself a distinguished Democrat and former Secretary of State, said in an address at the bicentennial celebration of Washington and Lee University: "We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."
>
> Another distinguished American, Senator JOHN FOSTER DULLES, said recently: "I believe that the trend to statism needs to be stopped now and here. Proposals which exalt the state at the expense of the individual, I shall be against."
>
> The trend toward statism is not always apparent to many, as it is often concealed under the guise of social progress; the citizen may feel he is being given something, but what he forgets is that he gives in return his freedom of independent action. What the state does for the citizen, the citizen can no longer do for himself.
>
> And what the citizen often fails to realize is that he never gets anything for nothing. He pays for everything he gets—in taxes. The British people know this only too well. The impractical planners of England's Socialist party promised the voters protection "from the cradle to the grave"—but to pay for it a $40-a-week worker in England works one full week out of each month to pay his taxes. They call it "austerity"—a better word would be "disillusionment." He has seen prices go up, the standard of living go down, production and quality of goods lowered. And he has seen his leaders having to ask the United States for additional funds, on top of the billions this "capitalistic" country has already given them—that they may continue their disastrous efforts to prove the state is better able to run the citizen's life than the citizen himself.
>
> Yet, despite this evidence, there are politicians here who would like to foist this kind of government upon our people. Every thinking man and woman will resist such efforts toward statism, no matter by what high sounding name it may be called.

Are we so blind to our present dangers that we will allow our Government to get so much out of the control of the people that it will be to late to correct or remedy the situation—or is it time for a new Declaration of Independence?

The Twentieth Kansas Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, all States are proud of the record made by their native sons in the time of war.

Kansans are particularly proud of the Twentieth Kansas Regiment in the Spanish-American War.

Recently this famous regiment held its fiftieth reunion. On that occasion Col. Don C. Little, son of Col. E. C. Little, a former Member of Congress and who commanded this great regiment in the Philippines, gave a most inspiring address.

His address follows:

I am sorry that October commitments have made it impossible for my old commander, General Eisenhower, to speak to you today.

I know how much, as a Kansan and as an old soldier, he would have enjoyed this meeting.

The first time I ever saw General Eisenhower was in North Africa in June of 1943.

I was one of 140 officers, half Americans, half British, who were isolated on the top of a mountain some miles out of Algiers, where we were planning the methods of military government we were to use in Sicily after we had joined the invasion divisions to which we were to be attached.

Several nights before, from our mountain top we had watched the German planes bomb the city of Algiers where General Eisenhower had his headquarters.

Suddenly, without warning, we were herded into the planning room and General Eisenhower spoke to us at some length. In substance, he pointed out that as the first Allied military administrators of liberated Fascists' territory in Sicily our actions would show the people in unconquered Europe what they could expect from us.

That under the Fascists the people existed for the state; under our governments the state existed for the people. Under our system the humane dignity of the individual meant something. We were to make the Sicilians see that difference. The little people of Sicily were not to blame for the Fascist regime. In substance, he said, "They are little folks. Treat them right."

From what he said, I could see that under the uniform of this professional soldier was the heart of a Kansas farm boy, who would never forget his own people. This general was not tortured by conflicting ideologies. His only ideology was the practical American ideal of government that we in the Middle West know so well.

Here, I thought, is a commanding general who has not lost the common touch of our Kansas prairies, and who will not forget his old comrades in arms.

As I listened to General Eisenhower, of Abilene, Kans., my thoughts turned to a dinner in Kansas City that Company B of the Twentieth Kansas had given for me the night before I went on active duty. I remembered Frank Oswald's story of how in 1898 another officer from Abilene, Kans., Lt. Col. Ed Little, had told the men of his battalion that the Filipinos were little folks, that they were not to blame, and to treat them right.

At that moment I was proud to have been born in Abilene, Kans., the home of my new commanding general. I hope he can speak to you at some future time.

For myself nothing has ever pleased me more than this invitation to speak to my father's old comrades in arms. Today we roll back the pages of memory for half a century, old faces rise before us and old forms go trooping past. It is again the spring of 1898. In Cuba and in the Philippines men are tossing on prison beds—across the sea people are praying for deliverance. We declare war on Spain.

Governor Leedy calls for volunteers. The survivors of this regiment and their comrades enlist. In Topeka they are mustered in as the Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry. They move on to San Francisco and spend the summer there.

We see the regiment board the transports *Newport* and *Indiana*, and commence their long voyage in the first American overseas war. They arrive at Honolulu, and in December we see them arrive in Manila. Their Christmas is spent at the La Rosa Barracks.

We see them move on to the fighting line; we see their entry into Caloocan; the advance up the railroad; the crossing of the Tulijan River; their engagements at Polo, Malinta, Maralao, and the short, fierce fighting at Guiginto. We see them take Malolos, the insurgent's capital. They advance against Calumpit where Joe Scott and others were wounded. We see the crossing of the Rio Grande, famed in song and story. They take the town of Santo Tomas and force their way into San Fernando and Bacalor. We see their repulses of the enemy attacks on San Fernando. We see them return to Manila and enforce military government in that area.

The enemy is defeated everywhere. The fighting is over. They board the transport *Tartar*. They stop at Hong Kong. They stop in Japan at Yokohama and many members of the regiment go to Tokyo. Almost half a century before Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we see the return of the regiment to the continental United States as the first of this Nation's overseas conquerors of foreign soil.

Again, the curtain rises—the flags are in the windows and the folk are in the street, the bands play, the crowds begin to cheer, "the Twentieth, the Twentieth, the Kansas boys are here," and

"By yonder dark-stained blouses and suits
of dusty brown,
The raggedy men from Kansas again have
come to town."

"The Twentieth Kansas was fortunate in opportunity and heroic in action and has won a permanent place in the hearts of a grateful people," writes the President of the United States.

Today, what survivor of this regiment can fail to respond to that memory of 50 years ago?

And what son or daughter of this regiment can fail to burn with pride at the honor and valor of their sires?

Fifty years is a long time, but the Republic has not been ungrateful.

"For they gave them of the corn land
That was of public right
As much as two strong oxen
Could plow from morn to night
And they made a molden image
And set it up on high
And there it stands until this day
To witness if I lie."

In every war there are outstanding acts of valor.

Thermopylae had her messenger of defeat. The Alamo had none.

Homer sang Achilles into 30 centuries of renown and yet the Twentieth Kansas has its own feat of arms, performed as it was, above and beyond the call of duty, that equals any performed by those old heroes of song and story. The regiment had reached the Rio Grande:

"The river's running deep and red
The Island lies before
Now is there one of all this host
Will dare to venture o'er.

"For not alone the river's sweep
Might make a brave man quail
The foe are on the other side
Their shots come fast as hail.

"God help us if the middle isle
We may not hope to win
Now, is there any of the host
Will to venture in.

"Their volley flashes sharp and strong
By all the saints I trow
There never yet was soldier born
Could force that passage now.

"Thick blew the smoke across the stream
And faster flash the flame
The water splashed in hissing jets
As ball and bullet came.

"Yet onward pushed the swimmers
Both stern and undismayed
With a thousand armed foes before
And none behind to aid.

"There rose a warning cry behind
A joyous shout before
The current's strong—the way is long
They'll never reach the shore.

"High flew the spray above their heads
Yet onward still they bore
Midst cheer and shout, and answering yell
And shot and cannon roar.

"Now by the holy cross I swear
Since earth and sea began
Was never such a daring deed
Essayed by mortal man."

Yes, from the ranks of this regiment are Eddie White and Trembley who swam the Rio Grande.

And sprinkled on its further bank a touch of Kansas sand.

Recently at the commander's dinner of the American Legion at Wichita—as the distinguished guests were presented the audience applauded but remained seated.

Finally the last guest, a member of this regiment who has the Congressional Medal of Honor, was introduced. Then the whole audience rose to its feet and applauded for several minutes. Afterwards when Bill Trembley was being interviewed he said: "I swam a little river and they gave me a medal." And I thought of the famous interview between Napoleon and Goethe and of how Napoleon said: "Herr Goethe, I have told you of my life, tell me of yours." And Herr Goethe replied: "Sire, I have only a little garden."

From the ranks of the Twentieth Kansas have come no four-star generals or Presidents of the United States. But this regiment has its little garden of valor—it has two private soldiers who won the Congressional Medal of Honor over 50 years ago by deed of valor, second to none, in the military history of this Republic. And recently the President of the United States, himself an old soldier of some note, said in presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor: "I would rather have this medal than be President."

To say "I was a soldier of the Twentieth Kansas in the Philippines," as your forefathers said, "I wore the black cockade, the badge of the Continental Army with Washington at Valley Forge"; and as your sires said, "I was with Grant and the Army of the Potomac at the Wilderness"; or as your sons and grandsons say, "I was in the Thirty-fifth Division at the Argonne"; or "I was with Truman in Battery D"; and "I served with Eisenhower in North Africa and Italy and Germany."

That is honor enough for any man in one lifetime. But they tell us there is an end to all things mortal.

More than half a century has come and gone since the advance guard of this famous regiment crossed their last great river and passed in review before the great white throne as all good soldiers do.

In that advance guard were, "McTaggart, Alford, Elliott, and a file of 67 that stand guard forever on the battlements of heaven."

A few more winters and only the thinned and vanishing rear column of the Twentieth Kansas will be lingering on this side of the great divide.

The time will soon come for that rear column to mount guard with their comrades on the ramparts of the sky.

The bugle that calls this regiments assembly will soon be heard on the other shore.

For more than 50 years the grim reaper has relentlessly been taking his toll from the ranks of this regiment. Now as the survivors advance into the twilight of this life, let them remember of their departed comrades, that in the highest moment of their lives they were freed from the tyranny of the "body of this death" as the Apostle Paul described his prison.

Let them remember as Ezekiel prophesied, "There was a noise and behold a shaking * * * and the bones came together and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood again upon their feet, an exceedingly great army."

How often this has occurred before no man knows. By the quiet Nile are the pyramids of kings who ruled an empire. Today the empires of Babylon and Assyria are only a grazing ground for nomad shepherds. Carthage, Rome, and Byzantium are only pleasant sounds to romantic ears.

The empire Spain conquered from Cuba to the Philippines has long since fallen apart.

The empire that conquered King Phillip's Spain is dying, and already from its ashes, rises a union of free nations.

They tell us that some day the luster of our stripes may fade, our silver stars may dim, that the hallowed flag may crumble into dust, and the graves of the Nation's dead become 10-acre fields.

Some day the ghosts of their old comrades in arms and the spirits of the men who fought beyond both seas will march to the muffled beat of soundless drums in the last funeral procession of the last soldier of the Twentieth Kansas Volunteer Infantry.

We have this day the splendid honor of saluting the survivors of the most famous of Kansas regiments.

Yes, there is an end to all things mortal, but as long as history is written in Kansas our people will remember this regiment.

Time cannot stale nor custom wither that infinite variety of holy memories that cluster round the battle-scarred flags that the Twentieth Kansas brought back from America's first overseas war in the Philippine Islands over 50 years ago.

Need for Strengthening the United Nations and Establishing a Rule of Law Between Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel, the National Grange, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on need for strengthening the United Nations and establishing a rule of law between nations—House Concurrent Resolution 64—October 13, 1949:

1. Progress of man in freeing himself from fear of other men, from turmoil, uncertainties, and wars, has, throughout history, been made by the establishment of law and its enforcement, first in local groups and tribes and later to larger and larger aggregations of people. This growth of law and order has largely paralleled the expansion of size of nations. People now clearly recognize that they would have no peace, no security in their homes and property if they did not have recognized laws, and law interpretation and enforcements in villages, wards, and cities. The same holds for the group that constitutes counties, parishes, states, provinces, and similar legal areas of the world's nations as well as for nations as a whole. When the national borders are reached, however, the world has, up to now, been compelled to live under conditions that recognize no well-defined agency responsible for the formulation, interpretation, and enforcement of law. This means that beyond the borders of the world's nations either chaos or might rules, that the law of the jungle, the rule of might, is still the dominant and the ultimate means of settling the deep-seated fundamental disputes between nations.

2. The fact that the world has long failed to recognize or to agree that the only substitute for might as a means of settling conflicts between nations is established equitable world laws fairly interpreted and enforced, has for centuries been the world's greatest tragedy. Especially has this been a tragedy since the turn of the century. During these 50 years the world has moved headlong into greater uncertainty and ultimately toward chaos and self-destruction solely because there has been no recognized rule of law between and among nations. The world has undoubtedly come to the predicament of either accepting accelerated chaos or the establishment of law between nations fairly interpreted and enforced. There does not appear any midway course between these two alternatives.

3. The National Grange, at its 1948 annual session last November, passed the following important resolution on this subject:

"We are convinced that our policy should be one of wholehearted support of the United Nations and that we should do everything in our power to build it and strengthen it as an instrument of peace. A strengthened United Nations would undoubtedly provide a legislative body to enact laws related to world peace, with some practical and equitable system of weighted representation, a world court to interpret the law, and a world police force to enforce it. We recommend:

"(1) That the United States take the lead in securing such revision of the United Nations Charter as may be necessary to give it strength commensurate with its task.

"(2) That the veto be modified so as to limit it to actions which clearly relate to the internal affairs and sovereignty of nations.

"(3) That consideration be given to making the General Assembly of the United Nations a legislative body provided that some practical and equitable system of weighted representation can be developed.

"(4) That consideration be given to establishing a world judiciary system with compulsory jurisdiction, applying laws to individuals found to be violating the program of the United Nations, with due regard to protecting the sovereignty of nations.

"(5) That an international police force be established with a program of armament limitation subject to international inspection and commensurate in any country with the preservation of world order.

"(6) That until we have solved the problem of maintaining the peace, the authority of the United Nations be limited to those matters related to world peace and security."

4. It will be noted that the end sought by this Grange resolution closely agrees with that of House Concurrent Resolution 64. The resolution of the Grange, however, does not specify the type of world organization or means needed to strengthen the United Nations and to establish a greater extent of world law, and law interpretation and enforcement. We therefore heartily endorse the basic aims of the resolution but cannot either endorse or oppose the proposed attainment of it through a federated type of world government.

5. If it is our determined national policy to do everything in our power to hasten the strengthening of the United Nations, the Grange believes that constant progress toward this aim can be made through the current sessions of the United Nations. Bit by bit, if we as a nation consistently take advantage of every opportunity to move toward this goal, it is our conviction that real progress toward an effective respected world government can be made. As stated in the Grange resolution above, we want to emphasize that we believe that the United States should take the lead in securing such revision of the United Nations Charter as may be necessary to give it strength commensurate with its task.

6. We believe that whatever form the world government may take that entry into such a world organization should be opened to all nations alike, and that some equitable system of giving weighted representation in the conduct of the affairs of this world organization to the member nations should be worked out and incorporated into the Charter.

7. In closing, I would like to emphasize that we believe that our Nation has a unique responsibility of leadership in developing the United Nations from a world organization characterized by many frustrations to one of effective limited laws, and to an organization that will inspire respect and obedience of these laws by member nations. We thank the committee for giving us this opportunity to present our views on this very important problem confronting all of us individually and all mankind.

A & P Tea Co. Secret Discounts Cause Criminal Indictment Against the Borden Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Borden Milk Co. et al. were indicted in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois July 30, 1948. It is alleged that this concern granted the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. and other national chain stores secret rebates. The indictment is as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, AGAINST THE BORDEN CO.; H. H. INGLEHART; O. N. KOENIG, DEFENDANTS—CRIMINAL CASE NO. 48ER-362 (15 U. S. C., SEC. 13a), FILED JULY 30, 1948

INDICTMENT

The grand jury charges:

Count 1

I. Defendants

1. The Borden Co. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with its principal place of business in New York, N. Y. Said corporation, hereinafter referred to as "Borden," is hereby indicted and made a defendant.

2. The individuals whose names and addresses set forth below are hereby indicated and made defendants. Each of these defendants is associated with, or employed by, Borden and holds the official title or position with Borden shown below. Each of the individual defendants, within the period of time covered by this count of the indictment, and within the applicable period of the statute of limitations, has been actively engaged in the management, direction, and control of the affairs, policies, and acts of Borden, has been engaged in the interstate commerce described in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7 of this indictment, and, in the course of such commerce, and during the said period, has been a party to, or assisted in, and has authorized, ordered, or done the acts constituting the offense hereinafter charged:

Defendants: H. H. Inglehart, 103 Washington Boulevard, Oak Park, Ill., general sales manager and director, Chicago Milk Division of Borden; O. N. Koenig, 5700 North Kimball Avenue, Chicago, Ill., vice president and director, Chicago Milk Division of Borden.

3. The acts in this indictment alleged to have been done by Borden were authorized, ordered, or done by the officers, agents, or directors of said corporation, including the officers or agents named as defendants herein.

II. Nature of the Trade and Commerce

4. Fresh cow's milk and cream, to be consumed in fluid form, are perishable products that are moved as rapidly as possible from the cow to the consumer by those engaged in the business of buying and selling such milk and cream, including Borden.

5. Borden is engaged in the business of buying said fresh cow's milk and cream in Wisconsin and Illinois, transporting them to the city of Chicago, Ill., and selling them to stores in Chicago and its suburbs, which resell them to consumers. Borden delivers this milk and cream to stores in Chicago in from about 24 to 36 hours after it has received them in these States.

6. Borden receives fresh cow's milk and cream daily at receiving stations at Lake Geneva, Lyons, and Avalon in the State of Wisconsin. Borden transports this milk and cream to the city of Chicago, Ill., commingling them with milk and cream purchased by Borden in Illinois. About one-half of this commingled milk and cream consists of milk and cream transported from other States into Illinois. The commingled milk and commingled cream are pasteurized, bottled, and delivered by Borden for resale to various customers in the city of Chicago and its suburbs, including The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), a New Jersey corporation, the Jewel Tea Co., Inc., a New York corporation, and competitors of said concerns. From day to day there is a continuous flow of fluid milk and cream from producers (operators of dairy farms) in States other than Illinois, through the plant and handling facilities of Borden, to the said customers.

7. The purchase and receipt of said fluid milk and cream in States other than Illinois, its transportation into the State of Illinois, and its said processing, sale, and distribution in Chicago and its suburbs by Borden has constituted, and does constitute, interstate trade and commerce in fluid milk and cream between States other than Illinois and the State of Illinois.

III. Offense

8. Some time prior to July 1, 1942, which time is unknown to this grand jury, defendant Borden, in the course of the said interstate commerce, became a party to a continuing contract to sell fresh pasteurized cow's milk and cream to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), in Chicago, Ill., and its suburbs, by the terms of which contract Borden agreed to pay that company a continuing secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance in consideration of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), continuing to purchase milk and cream from Borden. The said secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance was 10 percent of Borden's sales price on all purchases by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), from July 1, 1942, to about September 1942. It was changed to 10¼ percent about September 1942, to 10½ percent about April 1943, and to 11 percent about July 1946, the exact month being to this grand jury unknown, and thereafter it continued to be 11 percent until about March 1948. The said contract discriminated, and has continued to discriminate, against competitors of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), in that it granted, and from July 1, 1942, until about March 1948, continued to grant a discount, rebate, and allowance to said company over and above those then, and thereafter, available to competitors of said company in respect of sales of milk and cream of like grade, quality, and quantity. All defendants knew at the time Borden became a party to said contract, or learned during the life of said contract and prior to their assistance in said contract, that the said contract discriminated and has continued to discriminate as aforesaid. The said contract is a violation of section 3, as amended, of the act of June 19, 1936 (ch. 592, 49 Stat. 1528, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act.

9. The said contract was performed by the parties thereto. Continuing from about July 1, 1942, until about March 1948, Borden paid the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), a secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance, at the percentage rates hereinabove stated, which payments amounted to about $55,000 for 1942; $115,500 for 1943; $115,000 for 1944; $125,000 for 1945; $170,000 for 1946; and $215,000 for 1947.

IV. Jurisdiction and Venue

10. The said contract to sell was performed, in part, in the northern district of Illinois, eastern division. Payments of said secret percentage discount, rebate, and allowance were made by Borden to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), in the northern district of Illinois, eastern division.

Count 2

11. Each and every allegation contained in this indictment numbered 1 through 7 is here realleged with the same force and effect as though said paragraphs were here set forth in full.

I. Offense

12. Some time prior to July 1, 1942, which time is unknown to this grand jury, defendant Borden, in the course of the said interstate commerce, became a party to a continuing contract to sell fresh pasteurized cow's milk and cream to Jewel Tea Co., Inc., in Chicago, Ill., and its suburbs, under the terms of which contract Borden agreed to pay that company a continuing secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance in consideration of Jewel Tea Co., Inc., continuing to purchase milk and cream from Borden. The said secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance was 9 percent of Borden's sales price on all purchases by Jewel Tea Co., Inc., from about July 1, 1942, to about August 1942. It was changed to 10 percent about August 1942, to 10½ percent about April 1943, and to 11 percent about June 1947. Thereafter, it continued to be 11 percent until about March 1948. The said contract discriminated, and has continued to discriminate, against competitors of the said Jewel Tea Co., Inc., in that it granted, and from July 1, 1942, until about March 1948, continued to grant, a discount, rebate, and allowance to said company over and above those then, and thereafter, available to competitors of said company in respect of sales of milk and cream of like grade, quality, and quantity. All defendants knew at the time Borden became a party to said contract, or learned during the life of said contract and prior to their assistance in said contract, that the said contract discriminated and has continued to discriminate as aforesaid. The said contract is in violation of section 3, as amended, of the act of June 19, 1936 (ch. 592, 49 Stat. 1528, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act.

13. The said contract to sell was performed by the parties thereto. Continuing from about July 1, 1942, until about March 1948, Borden paid Jewel Tea Co., Inc., a secret rebate, discount, and allowance, at the percentage rates hereinabove stated, which payments amounted to about $45,000 for 1942; $110,000 for 1943; $125,000 for 1944; $145,000 for 1945; $195,000 for 1946; $265,000 for 1947.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

14. The said contract to sell was performed, in part, in the northern district of Illinois, Eastern Division. Payments of said secret discount, rebate, and allowance were made by Borden to Jewel Tea Co., Inc., in the northern district of Illinois, eastern division.

A true bill.

Dated July 30, 1948.

Jesse J. Qurollo, Foreman; Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General; George B. Haddock, Special Assistant to the Attorney General; Otto Kerner, Jr., United States Attorney; Melville C. Williams, Special Assistant to the Attorney General; Paul V. Ford, Harry H. Faris, George E. Leonard, Walter A. Bolinger, Special Attorneys.

The Independent Scientific Laboratories Serve the Food Industry and the Nation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the less publicized but vitally important contributions to the health and welfare of the American people is made by the independent scientific laboratories throughout the Nation which serve the food industry.

These laboratories carry on food research, analysis of food products and food containers for contamination or toxic effect, plant inspection to insure sanitary conditions, and many other research activities relating to food and its production.

Dr. Roger W. Truesdail, of the Truesdail Laboratories, Inc., of Los Angeles, Calif., recently presented the following excellent review which outlines the accomplishments of the independent scientific laboratories of America:

THE INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC LABORATORIES SERVE THE FOOD INDUSTRY

The independent scientific laboratories in this country are an integral part of our national economy and are vigorous exponents of the American system and of the principles of private enterprise. As commercial organizations, they are dedicated to assist the development of American industry and make specific contributions to the communities in which they are located.

At present there are approximately 300 such laboratories staffed with over 5,000 scientists,

the large majority of whom are college and university-trained chemists, bacteriologists, food technologists, engineers, and physicists. They are experienced in meeting the problems of industry and are familiar with a wide variety of products of manufacture, from raw materials to finished products. This group of independent commercial laboratories should not be confused with the so-called "captive" industrial laboratories owned and operated by individual companies.

Approximately 80,000 clients use these services annually and in this way the laboratories render a service which directly relates to the continued employment of 20,000,000 workers employed by these 80,000 clients. This helps to create and sustain the conditions which result in a productivity estimated by a recent survey to run to approximately $40,000,000,000 annually. It is of interest to note that the majority of these 300 laboratories serve members of the food industry.

The independent research laboratory is the logical place for small and medium-sized businesses to come. This professional group has the plant; it has the equipment; it has the personnel; and it has the scientific know-how. If the research problem is temporary in nature, the sponsor will find this type of organization to be the most economical place to conduct his research. When his research problem is completed, his expense ceases. The sponsor has to make no investment in personnel or equipment. He can terminate the work whenever he wants to. He can start new problems on short notice, and he can have his work done by people who are trained in doing research and making investigations with the objective of a practical application of the findings.

This latter viewpoint and experience is most important. We have seen some processes and products developed in the pursuit of pure scientific research, which at first appeared to be the answer to a sponsor's prayer. However, they could not be utilized or marketed because they were uneconomical. In the case of the process, it was theoretically sound and demonstrable in the laboratory, but in pilot plant or commercial-scale production, certain "bugs" showed up, such as low yields or uneconomical operating costs. While with products, the ingredients selected were too costly to produce a finished item with a satisfactory margin of profit to the manufacturer, wholesaler, and retailer. After all, the development of a superior product is of little commercial value to the client, if it cannot be produced and marketed at a price the consumer is able and willing to pay.

The independent scientific laboratories have served and are serving the food industry in many ways. Some of the more common ones are classified below:

1. Research and development of new products and processes and improvement of existing products;
2. Quality control of production;
3. Special trouble-shooting problems;
4. Product liability cases and technical testimony;
5. Establishment of label claims, representation before regulatory agencies and preparation of proposals for seals of acceptance;
6. Scoring and standardization of finished products;
7. Plant inspections of sanitary conditions;
8. Study of the toxicological aspects of foods;
9. Problems relating to agriculture as pertaining to food production; and
10. Utilization of byproducts and disposal of waste products.

In the brief time allotted to this paper we shall consider a few case reports and experiences of our own laboratories as well as others kindly reported to me by colleagues of that Nation-wide professional group of independent scientific laboratories known as the American Council of Commercial Laboratories. Specific names of clients and products will not be used.

Research directed toward the development of new food products, better quality of present ones, and improvement of existing methods of food production are numerous. This particular field of activity holds great importance. It is one which appears to be most essential for the food industry during times of economic recession and increased competition. Enlarging consumer acceptance of a line of prepared foods through improved quality with little or no increase in the cost of production may be the difference between financial success and failure. In this day of aggressive research in all fields of human endeavor, no food producer can afford to be without research services.

Although a leading industrialist of this country, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman was not speaking specifically of foods, we of the food industry might well reflect upon his words of several years ago when he said, "Small businesses should engage the services of properly qualified laboratories to assist them in research. Today 50 percent of all commodities which are manufactured and sold did not exist in their present form 25 years ago and I predict that in 10 years, 25 percent of all products manufactured and sold, will be those not even existing today."

Organoleptic panel scoring is one of the effective research tools used by laboratories today. The value of this depends upon the degree of precision and reproductibility attained. Quantitative evaluation of appearance, aroma, color, flavor, and texture of food products has been correlated to a high degree with actual consumer acceptance as determined by suitable consumer surveys. Although advertising, method of distribution, packaging, and appearance may be of paramount importance in the initial sales of a food, repeat sales depend upon consumer preference.

One food producer who was marketing a highly competitive canned food found that initial sales were satisfactory but repeat sales were poor. An organoleptic panel test revealed that one spice ingredient in the product imported a flavor which made the product unacceptable to a substantial majority of the panel. The producer stated that his production superintendent, who had developed the product, insisted that he liked the particular flavor and there was no good reason why the consumers wouldn't like it, too. But they didn't. The offending ingredient was removed from the formula and in due time sales increased.

Accelerated storage tests are easy to conduct, but are overlooked by many producers of new food products. They are so anxious to get into the market, they overlook the possibility of what might happen to their new "baby" under adverse shelf-life conditions. A producer had his plant in a part of the country where relatively low temperatures prevailed during most of the year. He hadn't stopped to realize that his product was going into areas where relatively high year-around temperatures prevailed. The flavor changes which developed in his merchandise in these areas made it unacceptable. A heavy financial loss resulted through replacement of the product after he had properly stabilized it.

The quality control of production generally involves both the raw ingredients and the finished food product. Severe have been the economic losses when this control has been neglected. Cases of such are legion and many are specifically within your knowledge. Large companies maintain their own laboratories. However, the smaller food producers have available the services of the independent laboratory which can conduct the required laboratory work or can supervise or staff a small laboratory at the producer's plant.

Another phase of this work involves the responsibility vested in the independent laboratory by a client, such as a buyer or commodity loan department of a bank, who wishes analyses and examinations made upon lots of food which are under consideration for purchase. The matter of acceptance or rejection is most important to all concerned.

One case involved a product which was sold on the basis of protein content. The producer generally was successful in "unloading" his low protein or substandard lots upon small buyers who did not have laboratory analyses run upon their purchases Perhaps this is not a typical case, but it does illustrate that buyers should seek competent laboratory services.

Numerous and varied are the problems encountered by food producers. Production can be proceeding normally when without warning, a serious problem may arise. Prompt assistance is required and the independent laboratory generally can give it.

Insurance adjusters have found in the independent laboratories a reliable service for determining the facts in specific cases. It is fortunate that a very small minority of consumers are dishonest. Some of the cases which have come to your speaker's personal attention are most amusing. However, claims by consumers of contaminated foods and beverages have often been substantiated by laboratory examinations. Portions of rodents, insects, lubricating grease, nuts, bolts, and many other foreign materials have been identified.

The sequel to the above may be court appearances to provide technical testimony. Such legal services often are sought in other matters involving the food industry, but unrelated to consumer claims for damage.

Within recent years greater emphasis has been placed upon the preventive service of the laboratory in carrying on periodic plant inspections of sanitary conditions. It would seem advisable that the staff member assigned for this work should have a background of industrial bacteriology and food technology. The recommendations of such an inspector may involve such matters as adequate rodent and pest control, proper water treatment, suitable refrigeration, plant clean-up procedures, the proper use of germicides and cleaners and good over-all production procedures. Carrying out such recommendations has been of great value to many of the food industry. The proverbial ounce of prevention is just as true here as it is in other matters.

Recent emphasis has been placed upon the study of certain toxicological aspects of foods by one of the independent laboratories. Animal experimentation has been employed in studying the safety of the use of chlorine dioxide in the bleaching and maturation of flour to supplant the nitrogen trichloride process which has been in use for the past generation or so. While the nitrogen trichloride treatment has never been shown, at least to date, to produce toxic results in man despite the most elaborate attempts to induce it, its adverse effects on other species, especially the dog, has resulted in its prohibition. The chlorine dioxide treatment has been found to be completely innocuous.

The use of chemical agents in foods as preservatives, antioxidants, emulsifying agents, etc., has expanded considerably in recent years. One independent laboratory has been studying the toxicological aspect of polyoxyethylene derivatives when used as softening agents in bread. The result of this work was reported at hearings of the Federal Food and Drug Administration designed to determine the acceptability of such softening agents in the definition and standard for bread.

Another independent laboratory investigation involved a study of bactericidal and fungicidal agents incorporated in paper pulp and coating to inhibit bacterial growth. The possibility of imparting injurious properties to foods wrapped in such materials is of great importance.

The recent discovery of toxicity alleged to have resulted from the use of salt substitutes by cardiac patients on salt-free diets has led to the investigation by an independent laboratory of this subject from the point of view of the relation between the sodium and/or potassium level of the diet and the toxicity of supplemental lithium or potassium.

One of the most interesting research projects being carried on by an independent laboratory group involves a consideration of man's oldest industry, agriculture, and his newest discovery, the development of atomic energy. More than half of the approximately 2,000,000,000 people in the world today do not get enough to eat, and the population is growing at the rate of about 20,000,000 each year. Food production is not increasing as fast as population. A prime need of mankind is a greater output of agricultural products.

Although research with isotopes has not as yet brought larger food yields, perhaps it will in time. Radioisotopes of a score of elements useful in plant and animal research, such as carbon, phosphorus, sulfur, calcium, and potassium, today are plentiful and inexpensive.

The fundamental question of agriculture is how plants grow; how green leaves, in the process of photosynthesis, manufacture carbohydrates out of sunlight and the carbon dioxide in the air; how roots pick up minerals and organic matter from the soil; how these many substances are distributed in and used by the plant in its growth. The majority of such questions has gone unanswered because scientists have had no means of observing the intricate processes and the minute quantities of materials. But, the tracer technique has changed this. For example, using radioisotopes, observers have been able to follow through the soil, into the rootlets, and to their final disposition in the plant, minerals such as zinc, copper, and manganese, all of which are available to the plants in amounts of less than an ounce per acre.

Through this new scientific tool, much information is being gained regarding fertilizers and thus directly the production of agricultural products. Another phase of this research involves the general recognition that certain minerals in extremely small amounts are essential for animal health, having a regulatory function perhaps similar to that of the vitamins. The bodily requirements for these trace elements are so minute that their function cannot be studied with ordinary chemical methods. The use of radioisotopes offers unique possibilities for the investigation of the role and function of these minerals in animal metabolism. It is anticipated that these studies will contribute to improved animal production, as well as improved nutrition for man.

It is hoped that this brief presentation has indicated some of the services being rendered the food industry by the independent scientific laboratories throughout this land and how they may more fully be of service. These laboratories believe that the spirit of independence in America is necessary to the maintenance of our democratic way of life and they are so dedicated.

Brazen Antics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, October 16, 1949:

REDS ON TRIAL WIN UNITED STATES SCORN—COURTROOM INSULTS OF 11 TOP COMMUNISTS BARE THEIR LACK OF RESPECT AND DECENCY

(By Lester Allen)

For 9 months the trial of 11 top leaders of the American Communist Party dragged on in the Federal courthouse in New York before Judge Harold R. Medina, attended by some of the most brazen antics ever undertaken in an American courtroom.

During the trial the public has virtually forgotten what the Communists had done other than that they had sought by some means to overthrow the Government of the United States. What the public remembered best was that the Communists on trial had little or no respect for American law or justice, that they had been treated with the greatest forbearance by a judge who was openly insulted on the bench.

And, somehow, in sneering at American justice, the Communist defendants had done themselves great harm, and helped to make their political beliefs and their party so loathed that the term "Red" and "Communist" has become an insulting epithet. Indeed, great American educators had to raise their voices in protest against the indiscriminate use of Red and Communist as a term of opprobrium.

ALREADY CONVICTED

Here is a paradox. During the 9 months of the trial, the outcome of which would be determined by an American jury, the American public had already tried and convicted the Communists in their own minds. While the law of the land went through painstaking and often important hair-splittings to insure complete justice for the Communist defendants, the public had decided that they were guilty, not because of any extensive knowledge of the evidence against them, but because of their behavior in court.

The indictments against them said that they had conspired knowingly and willfully to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence. It was alleged that these acts of conspiracy were in violation of the Smith Act of 1940. The penalty is up to 10 years in prison and fines up to $10,000.

Had the Communists, like millions of American citizens, accepted the court and the jury system as the authority to weigh the merits of the Government's contention and the defense counterclaims, the public at large might have viewed the proceedings with tolerance. But, the Communists chose to deride the court, and disqualify the jurors. For the first time in many, many years the Communists dramatized for the American people the fundamental facts that as jurors the American people themselves are the law—and the affront would never be forgotten.

MACHINATIONS UNMASKED

While the Government built its case, often over the hoodlum derision of the defendants, outside the courtroom the world moved through an unmasking of the sinister machinations of the Politburo, the Cominform, and the secret Soviet police. The disclosures of Whittaker Chambers in his allegations against Alger Hiss, the charges by Tito against the Cominform, the People's Courts trials abroad of prelates of the Catholic Church—all these were confirmations in the public mind of the explicit charges against the American Communists.

Perhaps the testimony with the greatest impact upon the public was that of Herbert Philbrick, young Boston advertising man, who had infiltrated the Communist organization for the FBI, and told his story under oath in the New York courtroom. It was a terrifying story to the public.

He was the average man—neither more brilliant nor more informed than the average American of his age and station in life. He has worked in the Communist Party for 9 years and not even his closest associates, even intimate members of his family, were aware of his connection with the Communists. That was what was so terrifying to the public. It could be anyone close to the individual who was boring away from within.

MAY LOOM LARGER

In future years, the contribution of Herbert Philbrick to his country may loom larger. Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the Communist newspaper Daily Worker, gave revealing testimony, but it didn't have the impact of Philbrick's. Budenz had been a Communist, and he had recanted and come over to the side of the average American. But Philbrick was the average American, and his disclosure of how he was trained to secrecy, to concealment of his membership in the party sent shudders through American public.

The Communist leaders claimed that they were being persecuted for their political ideology, and that the Government could not show any overt acts against the United States. They claimed the Communist Party was an advocate of peaceful political change, and that if there was or had been violence it was the fault of capitalists.

Even as the trial with its monumental record of 5,000,000 words of testimony was in progress—the gains the Communist Party had made in the United States were slipping away. The intellectuals and fellow travelers in the universities were sadly closing the covers of their Marxian books and wending their way back to the sunnier climes of the capitalist democracy. The labor unions into which the Communists had tunneled a termite network were purging themselves of Communist influences.

The destructive techniques employed in many a cause celebre to undermine the confidence of the American people in their courts and their system of law and justice—techniques devised in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, the Scottsboro case, and many another which might have had happier endings had it not been for the Communist taint, were not working in the trial of the top Communist leaders.

Budenz was a renegade, the Communists shrieked. Justice Medina was many things loathsome, epithets for which any judge would have slapped on contempt decrees. Philbrick was a stool pigeon of the FBI.

The vilification and abuse didn't arouse the sympathizers as they used to. The Wallace supporters who had been counted on for plentiful contributions fell away. When they passed the hat they got pennies instead of dollars.

UNCOVER BACKGROUNDS

John F. X. McGohey, the Government attorney, and his corps of assistants, dug doggedly into the backgrounds of the 11 men before the bar. They had lied—many times, had concealed their identities under cover names, had given false information in seeking motor vehicle driving licenses, passports, and official permits. They had communicated in a kind of secret double-talk, which only the initiates and reliable party members understood.

Somewhere, somehow the party leaders had miscalculated. They had counted upon a grave internal crisis in the United States, a crisis caused by a depression and widespread unemployment. The crisis had not developed, and the Communists had emerged too far out into the open to retreat.

Even as the trial proceeded in New York, there was ample evidence unearthed that regardless of its outcome, the surviving core of the party was going underground, and the hapless 11 would be thrown to the wolves and left to their own devices.

PENALTY FOR FAILURE

They have no reason to hope for better treatment than the other minions of the

Communist movement had received when they failed to accomplish what they had been assigned to do. The Bill Heywoods and Emma Goldmans of the past had too many modern counterparts in Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other countries. The penalty for failure is to be discarded. Indeed, it was shown at the trial that the real top men are never identified. And when they are identified, their usefulness has ceased.

None of this, however, swerved the defendants from the resolution to take advantage of every legal strategem permissible under American law.

There was always the Supreme Court and the constitutional question of whether advocacy of a revolution without an overt act is a "clear and present danger" as defined by the late Justice Holmes which would be cause for withholding of the right of free speech, assembly, press and franchise. There was always a chance to turn the weapon against the American people.

STRUGGLE NOT OVER

In time to come, the social significance of the revulsion of feeling against the Communists will be studied and evaluated. But, what seems now to have been most repugnant to the American public was the idea that an individual could lie, deny membership in a political party, assume a faked name, work against the Government, foment disorder and spy upon the American people under cover of the front of a political party.

The American public is too used to stepping right up to the polls at a primary, calling for a Republican or Democratic ballot and voting the way they feel, for whom they prefer. They were acutely aware that the few Communists who ran for office were but the top eighth of the real power, which, like the top eighth of an iceberg, shows above the surface.

The struggle is not over. But, regardless of the outcome of the trial, it didn't really matter after the first few months whether they were convicted or acquitted in the courts. They had been tried and convicted at the bar of public opinion.

A & P Continued Illegal Practices After Conviction in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America, through the Attorney General, received an indictment against the Bowman Dairy Co. et al., defendants, in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, July 30, 1948.

The true bill is as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, AGAINST BOWMAN DAIRY CO., J. A. BOWMAN, F. H. KULLMAN, JR., E. J. LARSON, M. J. METZGER, DAVID B. PECK, AND D. CAMERON PECK, DEFENDANTS—CRIMINAL CASE NO. 48 CR 361 (15 U. S. C., SEC. 13A), FILED JULY 30, 1948

INDICTMENT

The grand jury charges:

I. The defendants

1. Bowman Dairy Co. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, with its principal place of business at 140 West Ontario Street, Chicago, Ill. Said corporation, hereinafter referred to as "Bowman," is hereby indicted and made a defendant.

2. The individuals whose names and addresses are set forth below are hereby indicted and made defendants. Each of these defendants is associated with, or employed by, Bowman and holds the official title or position with Bowman shown below. Each of the individual defendants, within the period of time covered by this count of the indictment and within the applicable period of the statute of limitations, has been actively engaged in the management, direction, and control of the affairs, policies, and acts of Bowman, has been engaged in the interstate commerce described in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7 of this indictment, and, in the course of such commerce and during the said period, has been a party to, or assisted in, and has authorized, ordered, or done, the acts constituting the offense hereinafter charged:

Defendants: David B. Peck, 1233 Crain, Evanston, Ill., president and director; F. H. Kullman, Jr., 2723 Simpson, Evanston, Ill., vice president and director; M. J. Metzger, 140 West Ontario Street, Chicago, Ill., vice president and director; D. Cameron Peck, 1233 Crain, Evanston, Ill., vice president, director, and head of sales department; J. A. Bowman, 140 West Ontario Street, Chicago, Ill., treasurer and director; E. J. Larson, 140 West Ontario Street, Chicago, Ill., director and sales manager, fluid milk division.

3. The acts in this indictment alleged to have been done by Bowman were authorized, ordered, or done by the officers, agents, or directors of said corporation, including the officers or agents named as defendants herein.

II. Nature of the trade and commerce

4. Fresh cow's milk and cream, to be consumed in fluid form, are perishable products that are moved as rapidly as possible from the cow to the consumer by those engaged in the business of buying and selling such milk and cream, including Bowman.

5. Bowman is engaged in the business of buying said fresh cow's milk and cream in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana, transporting them to the city of Chicago, Ill., and selling them to stores in Chicago and its suburbs, which resell them to consumers. Bowman delivers this milk and cream to stores in Chicago in from about 24 to 36 hours after it has received them in these States.

6. Bowman receives fresh cow's milk and cream daily at receiving stations at Brooklyn, Clinton, Delavan, Janesville, Marshall, and Nichols in the State of Wisconsin, and at Francisville and Kouts in the State of Indiana; and Bowman purchases and receives cream at various other places in the State of Wisconsin. Bowman transports this milk and cream to the city of Chicago, Ill., commingling them with milk and cream purchased by Bowman in Illinois. About one-half of this commingled milk and three-fourths of this commingled cream consists of milk and cream transported from other States into Illinois. The commingled milk and commingled cream are pasteurized, bottled, and delivered by Bowman for resale to various customers in the city of Chicago and its suburbs, including the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), a New Jersey corporation, and competitors of said concern. From day to day, there is a continuous flow of fluid milk and cream from producers (operators of dairy farms) in States other than Illinois, through the plant and handling facilities of Bowman, to the said customers.

7. The purchase and receipt of said fluid milk and cream in States other than Illinois, its transportation into the State of Illinois, and its said processing, sale, and distribution in Chicago and its suburbs by Bowman has constituted, and does constitute, interstate trade and commerce in fluid milk and cream between States other than Illinois and the State of Illinois.

III. Offense

8. On or about July 3, 1942, defendant Bowman, in the course of the said interstate commerce, became a party to a continuing contract to sell fresh pasteurized cow's milk and cream to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), in Chicago, Ill., and its suburbs, under the terms of which contract Bowman agreed to pay that company both a secret lump-sum rebate, discount, and allowance of $50,000 and a continuing, secret percentage rebate, discount, and allowance of 11 percent of Bowman's sales price on all purchases by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), subsequent to May 30, 1942, of milk and cream from Bowman, in consideration of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), continuing to purchase milk and cream from Bowman. The said contract discriminated, and has continued to discriminate, against competitors of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey) in that it granted, and continued to grant, until about March 1948, a discount, rebate, and allowance to said company over and above those then, and thereafter, available to competitors of said company in respect of sales of milk and cream of like grade, quality, and quantity. All defendants knew at the time Bowman became a party to said contract, or learned during the life of said contract and prior to their assistance in said contract, that the said contract discriminated and has continued to discriminate as aforesaid. The said contract is in violation of section 3, as amended, of the act of June 19, 1936 (ch. 592, 49 Stat. 1528, 15 U. S. C., sec. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act.

9. The said contract was performed by the parties thereto. Bowman paid $50,000 to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey) about the second week of July 1942. Thereafter, continuing until about March 1948, Bowman paid that company 11 percent of Bowman's sales price on all purchases by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), which payments, in addition to the said payment of $50,000, amounted to about $25,000 for 1942, $52,000 for 1943, the same amount for 1944, $55,000 for 1945, $74,000 for 1946, and $98,000 for 1947.

IV. Jurisdiction and Venue

10. The said contract to sell was entered into, and was performed, in part, in the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. The said payment of $50,000 and quarterly payments of the said 11 percent of the sales price were made by Bowman to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey), in the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.

A true bill.

Dated July 30, 1948.

Jesse J. Qurollo, Foreman; Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General; George B. Haddock, Special Assistant to the Attorney General; Otto Kerner, Jr., United States Attorney; Melville C. Williams, Special Assistant to the Attorney General; Paul V. Ford, Harry H. Faris, George E. Leonard, Walter A. Bolinger, Special Attorneys.

This was a true bill of indictment, presented by the foreman of the grand jury.

It will be noticed that A & P commenced in 1942 receiving a lump-sum secret rebate of $50,000 and continued to receive 11 percent discount up to the end of the year 1947.

Performance Instead of Promise Required of European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News of October 3, 1949:

PERFORMANCE INSTEAD OF PROMISE REQUIRED OF EUROPEAN NATIONS

The substance of the military-assistance program as it finally emerges does credit to the Congress in general and to certain of its Members in particular.

Developments in the late stages saw Senators VANDENBERG and FERGUSON, of Michigan, come forward prominently in the fight to make it a strong and practical bill, which partly compensates for the regrettable fact that only one Michigan Member of the House, Representative RABAUT, voted for the bill on its initial passage.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee's version of the legislation, brought before the Senate last week, contained a highly equivocal proposition relating to the portion of the authorization for military assistance contingent upon the development of a plan of integrated defense in the North Atlantic area.

Its language would have required only an expression from the Council and the Defense Committee under the North Atlantic Treaty that the full measure of assistance would promote integration of defense.

It was apparent in Senator VANDENBERG's recent great speech that the Senator's understanding of the terms was at variance with the actual wording. The Vandenberg interpretation was that integration must be an achieved principle rather than a mere hopeful prospect before the full measure of aid would be available.

Here Senator FERGUSON entered the play with an amendment, warmly supported by Senator VANDENBERG, to permit an initial grant of assistance adequate to get the program started, but to withhold the balance until the Europeans had come up with performance rather than promise. The Senate accepted this amendment—a vast improvement over the language which it replaced.

It in no wise subtracts from the credit due Senator FERGUSON to observe that the principle embodied in his amendment is in keeping with a principle which was contained in the version of the bill offered a month ago by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and subsequently eliminated by the House when it voted for a 50 percent horizontal cut.

The News has contended for this principle since before the time when the Congress first came to grips with the legislative problem, and has continued to insist that the principle was far more vital than support of the dollar amount asked by the State Department.

Fortunately, Representative JOHN LODGE, Connecticut Republican, who was the first public figure in the country to speak in favor of military assistance to the North Atlantic area, saw things in the same light.

Some weeks ago we pointed to Mr. LODGE's work as illustrating that one man believing determinedly in an idea can produce great impact on the course of events.

Mr. LODGE can now congratulate himself that the program and the contingency principle which he originated have been enacted into law, and the Congress as a whole may congratulate itself that it has legislated an MAP formula which makes far more sense than that asked by the administration.

Whereas in the early summer the Washington prophets were forecasting that the ideal of bipartisanship in foreign policy would be wrecked on this issue, the proof is clear that it has just scored its most resounding triumph.

The issue would have failed but for the diligent regard given it by members of the Republican Party.

Why Is an Adequate Civilian-Defense Program Being Delayed? Must We Wait Until an Atomic-Bomb Attack To Realize Its Need? It May Then Be Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, an atomic-bomb attack upon the United States could come with the silence of the grave and with the swiftness of the speed of sound. If it does it will then be too late. It may be all over before we realize what has happened. The enemy will not be concerned with adhering to rules or restrictions of warfare. Swift victory will be their goal and the civilian population will be their prime target as well as strategic objectives.

It is apparent that the public is aroused and giving serious thought to the need of civilian defense and protection. My House Joint Resolution 369 proposes study, investigation, and public hearings by the Secretary of Defense in order to determine what steps should be taken to provide adequate civilian protection and defense. My bill does not ask for any funds or appropriations because I believe the Secretary of Defense can proceed with such a study without additional funds. What the Secretary of Defense may recommend as a result of this study, I do not know at this time, but I am confident that the public is seriously concerned about the need for civilian defense and protection since the announcement on September 23 by President Truman that Russia has the secret to the atomic bomb.

This announcement can mean peace among the nations of the world, or it may mean that the most destructive war of all time is in the not too distant future.

We must be fully conscious and realistic as to our position as a nation in either event. We seek peace, we want peace, and we hope that will be the answer. If it must be war, we must also be prepared to meet that eventuality.

The United States is no longer the world's great military arsenal for democracy. We are no longer the great invincible power in military might that most of the people of this Nation have for so many years believed we were. The United States is now the great target to be shot at—to be destroyed—to be conquered.

These are not pleasant things to say. These statements may crush many cherished ideals that have been held by many Americans all of their lives. But we must face facts. We must be realistic. The time has come to do more than we have up to now for the protection of our civilian population. True we have spent billions more for military defense. We have given millions to foreign allies to arm themselves against a possible attack. But we have done nothing to provide civilian protection in the event we are attacked.

God forbid that it will ever happen, but it is better to be thinking and planning about it now, because it will be too late after it happens. There will be no delaying action the next time, no time to prepare, no barrier of time to hide behind until we can step up our protection and organize our forces.

I submit here an article from the October 7 issue of the United States News which contains an article entitled "Ninety-two Atom-Bomb Targets for Russia in the United States." Let me read part of this article:

NINETY-TWO ATOM-BOMB TARGETS FOR RUSSIA IN UNITED STATES—CITIES THREATENED IF SOVIET SENDS ONE-WAY SUICIDE MISSIONS OF B–29'S

At this time, all but three major United States cities lie within range of suicide bombers from Russia. These cities, all above 100,000 population, together with the big United States atomic-production centers, now offer 92 prime targets for possible atomic attack when Russia builds a stock pile of bombs.

Inside Russia lie 70 major cities that are in range of United States bombers carrying atomic bombs. Concept of many United States Air Force planners is that, if those cities are destroyed with atomic bombs, Russia will be knocked out of any future war.

The score of total destruction, as measured by war planners, therefore, is to be equalized if Russia becomes able to destroy about 20 more cities within the United States than the United States now is pictured as able to destroy inside Russia. One bomb to a city is considered sufficient except for very big cities or cities widely dispersed. Then two or more may be needed.

Russia now possesses a fleet of TU–70 bombers—Soviet copies of the American B–29. These bombers are capable of carrying the atom bomb at least 4,000 miles.

From bases in eastern Siberia, bombers flying 4,000 miles can strike the west coast almost without warning, then reach all major United States cities except those in Florida. This route gives widest coverage, but it provides time for warning eastern areas while Soviet bombers are crossing the United States.

From bases near Murmansk in northwestern Russia, Soviet bombers could strike at New England, travel as far south as New York, as war West as Montana.

From bases in north central Russia, bombers traveling over the North Pole area could supplement these attacks with atomic-bomb raids across the entire northern United States as far south as California.

Actually, United States air planners estimate that the Russians can stretch the range of their B–29's to 4,500 or even 5,000 miles. This covers the entire United States.

Big problem for Russian bombers, thus, is not how to deliver the bomb but how to acquire a big enough atomic stock pile.

AREAS FOR ATTACK

Alabama: Birmingham.
California: Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, Long Beach, Sacramento, San Diego.
Colorado: Denver.
Connecticut: Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport.
Delaware: Wilmington.
Georgia: Atlanta.
Illinois: Chicago, Peoria.
Indiana: Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Gary, South Bend.
Iowa: Des Moines.
Kansas: Kansas City, Wichita.
Kentucky: Louisville.
Louisiana: New Orleans.
Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Boston, Worcester, Springfield, Fall River, Cambridge, New Bedford, Somerville, Lowell.
Michigan: Detroit, Grand Rapids, Flint.
Minnesota: Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth.
Missouri: St. Louis, Kansas City.
Nebraska: Omaha.
New Jersey: Newark, Jersey City, Paterson, Trenton, Camden, Elizabeth.
New Mexico: Los Alamos.
New York: New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Yonkers, Albany, Utica.
North Carolina: Charlotte.
Ohio: Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Akron, Dayton, Youngstown, Canton.
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City, Tulsa.
Oregon: Portland.
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Erie, Reading.
Rhode Island: Providence.
Tennessee: Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Oak Ridge.
Texas, Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, Fort Worth.
Utah: Salt Lake City.
Virginia: Richmond, Norfolk.
Washington: Seattle, Spokane, Tacoma, Hanford.
Wisconsin: Milwaukee.
District of Columbia.

We must act and act without delay to provide protection to the civilian population—by the adoption of my House Joint Resolution 369—instructing the Secretary of Defense to investigate, study, and recommend ways and means to further help in providing civilian protection in underground structures throughout the Nation.

On Friday, September 23, the day President Truman announced Russia's possession of the atom bomb—the earth of America trembled; the struts of a free society—nobler than any the world has ever known—felt the impact of destruction.

Possession by Soviet Russia of the atomic bomb finds America no longer the mighty fortress, no longer the impregnable continent.

Today we find ourselves the vulnerable target of Red Russia.

On Friday, September 23, we shifted abruptly from a nation blessed by the natural barriers of oceans to a nation as vulnerable, as defenseless, as weak, as the tiniest country in Europe because of our lack of preparation for an atomic war on the home front.

Billions have been spent for the military defense of the United States and for the defense of foreign nations abroad, but to date the administration has failed to propose plans to provide adequate defense for our civilian population.

We know that in the event of any future war, we must expect attacks upon our centers of population. Our military strength is being increased to meet this threat, but no protection has been provided for civilians. We have no adequate shelters, no centralized supply stations for first aid and medical treatment.

In short, the administration has developed a lopsided defense program in which our sole protection lies in the ability of our armed forces to stop every plane, every guided missile, or other weapon before it reaches its target. If they fail and one bomb reaches the target, the civilian population has no protection.

Since we have learned that Russia has developed an atom bomb, we must act without further delay to provide for the immediate study and investigation of the problem of building facilities for civilian defense.

We are face to face with the big fear—the biggest fear the human race can know—the fear of sudden, swooping extinction.

All over America people are asking the question: How can we survive? How much time have we? Is time on our side?

The grim truth is that time is running out. Not one among us knows these answers.

But one thing we all know—our invincibility as Americans is being challenged by a ruthless foe, an evil enemy bent upon destroying our way of life within his lifetime. And Stalin is 70 years old.

The atomic attack against our free world can come at any moment.

No man living can deny that statement.

We have not yet taken steps to protect our country and its people in case of sudden attack.

Our citizens are completely in the dark concerning any civilian-defense measures. Our vast population must have orderly plans in order that it will not become a detriment and a hindrance to our fighting forces. We must not jeopardize our chances of victory by domestic confusion. We must at once embark upon revolutionary and experimental measures. Suddenly we are living in a new and dangerous world, and we must initiate new and imaginative defenses.

To go underground is to obtain the best protection against the modern weapons of warfare. This was proved by the effectiveness of the London and Berlin subways and the basement dwellings of World War II. Yet, ironically, major developments are under way in our cities to provide underground garages similar to the Union Square Garage in San Francisco without any consideration by the Federal Government to incorporate such defense measures into this construction as to provide for the shelter, treatment, and mass feeding of civilian casualties in wartime.

It is proposed, therefore, that all underground construction and specifically that which is built for automobile parking be supervised and, where necessary, supported by the Federal Government to incorporate the defense measures against atomic bombs and other types of destructive agents.

Essentially there would be available in peacetime self-liquidating structures to relieve the automobile parking congestion of cities and at the same time serve as emergency casualty stations with stock piles of medical and food supplies that could be kept in A-1 condition by continual turn-over.

In outline, the following primary objectives would be aimed at or accomplished:

(a) Relief of traffic congestion by the creation of self-liquidating underground parking facilities.

(b) Incorporation of protective features in the construction of these facilities that are essential in wartime.

(c) Utilization of these facilities in peacetime as centrally located, easily accessible emergency hospitals.

(d) Habituation of civilians in the procedure of going underground and preparation psychologically for the type of defense measures and restrictions of wartime.

The following secondary objective could be accomplished:

(a) Relief of unemployment by providing a coordinated national self-liquidating public-works program.

The Power Trust Lobbyist Delivers a Sneak Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to my colleague, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, which was written to him on the stationery of Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, calling attention to a reprint of a newspaper editorial attacking me for my stand in favor of public power. I also include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of that reprinted editorial.

For the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that Mr. Herman C. Kruse is listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a lobbyist for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that Mr. Kruse receives a salary of $9,000 a year and that he spent in three months a total of $3,875.96, which means a lobbying expense on the basis of $15,000 per year. Mr. Kruse's salary and expenses combined, therefore, total about $24,000 a year.

I am wondering whether, in the final analysis, the people of California have not actually paid in electric service charges the $24,000 expended to and by the P. G. & E. lobbyist Kruse.

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I consider it an honor to be attacked by this arm of the power trust and I serve

notice on them here and now that I shall continue to fight them to the bitter end to see that they do not further usurp the natural resources of this country which belong to the people. These resources, Mr. Speaker, should be converted to the use of all the people, without selling the electric energy to the P. G. & E. and other members of the power trust and then buying it back from them to their profit and the people's loss. I believe in free enterprise, Mr. Speaker, when it works to the best interests of the majority of the people. But public power is like our public roads, it is one of those things which is best handled by the people themselves.

HERMAN C. KRUSE,
San Francisco, Calif., September 9, 1949.

CONGRESSMAN MILLER:

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this editorial to you for your information.

KRUSE.

[From the Sacramento Bee and Fresno Bee of September 1, 1949]

PRESTIGE OF WHITE, DISTRICT, SUFFER FROM HIS TACTICS

The real friends of public development of power, in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, have characterized as amazing the victory in the Senate over the private power lobby on the vital power-transmission-lines issue.

Consequently, it comes with poor grace to have Representative CECIL F. WHITE, of Fresno, issue statements attacking United States Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, over the important role they played in this surprising victory.

WHITE'S complaint against KNOWLAND and DOWNEY is that they only secured Senate approval of funds for construction of the Sacramento Valley west side transmission line from Shasta Dam to Tracy, which has been the crux of the Central Valley project public power battle for years. The Senate Appropriations Committee deleted funds for this line.

He thinks the two Senators should have included in their fund-restoration amendment a sum for a steam plant and certain other facilities approved by the House. In not doing so, WHITE charges, KNOWLAND and DOWNEY proved themselves to be "pseudo public-power advocates."

While WHITE was making his unfair and politically flavored attacks on KNOWLAND and DOWNEY, top officials of the Department of the Interior issued statements expressing their delight over the Senate's action on the Interior appropriation bill.

Under Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman said the Senate approved "the finest appropriation bill we have ever had," adding:

"The Senate bill provides the finest opportunity we have ever had to carry forward the development of the West.

"It reaffirms completely our public-power policy, and our right to build transmission lines.

"Its significance is far greater than most people realize."

The reading of the last two paragraphs of Chapman's statement is recommended to WHITE. Or does he think Chapman, too, is a pseudo-public-power advocate?

Senator KNOWLAND tabbed WHITE'S statements for what they really are—political tirades.

He then went on to point out that, through the efforts of himself and Senator DOWNEY, the Senate increased the over-all CVP appropriation by $7,000,000 to speed water deliveries to the San Joaquin Valley.

In other words, the Knowland-Downey amendment, which KNOWLAND said was prepared after he consulted several weeks ago with Assistant Secretary of the Interior William Warne, not only will assure construction of the west-side transmission line but also will facilitate delivery of water to thirsty San Joaquin lands.

KNOWLAND further emphasized that if Representative WHITE is not interested in getting critically needed water to the San Joaquin Valley, being content rather to issue political statements, he and Senator DOWNEY are interested.

Suffice it to say, WHITE'S attacks on Senators KNOWLAND and DOWNEY, coming as they do from a freshman Member of the House, have not been calculated to win friends, or to influence Congressmen, for himself, and most important, for the people of the Ninth Congressional District.

So Labor May Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a statement by one of the thoughtful and highly regarded labor leaders of St. Louis, Mr. Lloyd Weber, appearing in his column "So Labor May Know," in the St. Louis Labor Tribune of September 21, 1949. Mr. Weber's comments concerning the responsibilities and burdens of Members of Congress were very interesting to me and I am making them available to my colleagues of the Eighty-first Congress:

SO LABOR MAY KNOW

(By Lloyd Weber, chief business representative, machinists district No. 9)

BELITTLING OUR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

Recently I read a small news item from Watertown, N. Y., where a woman celebrating her one hundred and second birthday said she would like to get down to Washington, D. C., to straighten out a few things.

I would say that this is the most common misconception of our day and a dangerous one as well as it breeds suspicion and contempt for our representative form of government, which is the base of our democracy.

There are too many unthinking and poorly informed citizens who have gotten into the habit of damning Congress for all the ills and mishaps of government. You would think that the politicians as they call them, whom the same critical citizens, by their votes send to Washington to represent them, are a bunch of little men, misfits, men who temporize, procrastinate, who lack character and are downright venal.

Of course you have such men in Congress and in every kind of public office, human nature being what it is. But I believe the record will bear me out that most of the men and women in Congress and in high, responsible administrative posts of our Government possess much more than average ability and experience. Most of them were successful in some kind of enterprise before they entered politics. Most of them earned more money in private enterprise than they do in Government service. And most of them have a lot more character and a good deal more guts than do most of the citizens who are so prone to condemn them.

WHAT GOVERNMENT IS

We must remember that the United States is a great, sprawling nation, a half-continent containing 155,000,000 people sprung from every nationality, race, and religion under the sun. These people have different and conflicting sectional economic and social interests, ideas, and diversions. Maintaining a republican form of government and democratic ways of life under such conditions is one of the greatest miracles of history. Our Federal Government is a combination of the most complicated and diverse science and art under the sun.

The Government of the United States is the biggest business enterprise that ever existed. It spends close to $45,000,000,000 a year, employs several million people directly, and indirectly pensions, subsidizes, and helps millions of other citizens. Besides its business encompasses the whole planet. Whatever affects the United States of America affects the government and people of every country on earth. It would be impossible for one man, even if he was a dictator, to personally understand, much less direct the mechanism of that incredible machine that makes the Government of the United States function as well as it does.

Our Federal laws are made by 435 Representatives and 96 Senators. Every major law that comes up for discussion in Congress has so many angles, so many contrary reactions, so many potentials for good or bad, that Congress, of necessity, to properly serve the best interests of the Nation, has to act slowly and give every interest a chance to be heard before it votes on such measures.

Like the old lady, most of us, at one time or other, indignant about something going on in Congress, assert: "If I was only in Congress—if I could only go down to Washington to tell them where to get off at."

If you were elected to Congress—or, what is much more important elected to the biggest job on earth, that of President of the United States, you would be a babe in the wood—and I don't mean a 'teen-age babe either, but one who still wears diapers. Most Members of Congress spend their first term learning the complicated formula of procedure—how to vote and get around. There are very able men and women in Congress who have been there for 20 years or more who will tell you frankly that they learn something new every day as well as try to apply what they learned in the past, to present day situations.

If that 102-year-old lady went to Washington, she'd die of frustration the first day.

WAY ABOVE AVERAGE

Far from being a lot of nincompoops, angle-shooters and grafters, the average Congressman is a man of superior attainments, a hard-working guy just as patriotic as you or I, a fellow who daily is put under terrific strain and pressure that might make you and me psychopathic cases, that might make us just as timid, expedient and cynical as some men in Congress eventually become.

Remember the old Greek fable from your grade school copy book about the Sword of Damocles, how a friend of the tyrant of Syracuse, envying him his wealth and power, expressed the wish that he could reign in his place. Damocles, the tyrant said he would be glad to have his friend rule for a while because he needed a vacation. But once the friend took over the throne, he saw hanging above him, a heavy sword suspended only by a hair. It made him so nervous that he could do nothing but think of it dropping. He begged Damocles to relieve him, and was glad to get back to his old carefree, private enterprise and get away from the uneasy feeling and sense of insecurity that rests in authority.

Rather than damn and cuss out our elected representatives, it would do us good, once in a while to put ourselves in their shoes, and try to visualize them from the inside looking

out, rather than from the outside looking in. It would be good if now and then we praised them for the good things they do, rather than constantly criticize them and carp at their shortcomings and divergence from our views. But even the worst Congress that ever made laws or failed to make them in a bad republic is much preferable to the best dictatorship that ever existed. And, dear reader, never forget that fact if you value your personal liberty and want to stay free.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my remarks delivered at the First Annual Columbus Day Celebration, Lawrence Lodge, No. 902, Order, Sons of Italy, Savastano Hall, 109 Oak Street, Lawrence, Mass., on Wednesday, October 12, 1949:

This is discovery day, on which we honor the name of Christopher Columbus, the great navigator whose vision and skill and courage led to the finding of a New World.

All Americans rejoice on this day, but none more so than those of Italian descent, because they come from the same stock that gave birth to the genius of Columbus.

I do not have to dwell on the great contributions which the sons and daughters of Italy have made to the civilization of this world. On the cornice of the Holy Rosary School in our city we see those famous and imperishable names etched in stone. Saints, philosophers, scientists, sculptors, artists, musicians, whatever the field in which they excelled, all were discoverers, for each one led the way to some new truth which has enriched the lives of all mankind.

In honoring Columbus, we honor all of these leaders, for he was the greatest discoverer of all time.

He opened up a New World and a new opportunity for the poor and oppressed of every nation. From England, Italy, France, Ireland, Poland, and so many other countries they came to find liberation and the chance to develop their talents without the restrictions imposed in the Old World by race, color, or creed.

Less than 500 years have passed since Columbus discovered the wilderness that was America. In that brief space of time, the wilderness has been transformed into the richest nation on earth, and the happiest one. How was it possible for immigrants, and the sons and daughters of immigrants, to accomplish so much? They had no worldly wealth to begin with. Very few of them had any education. All they had was faith in God and in themselves. And they were determined to build a free society in which every human being could get ahead if he worked with his brain and his hands.

And a miracle came to pass, a miracle earned by all who call themselves Americans, because here, for the first time, our ancestors practiced an old truth which had been preached for centuries. They believed in the dignity and worth of every law-abiding human being, and they put this belief into action.

This, and only this, is the secret of the progress made by the United States of America. Other nations had resources, and opportunities, both of which they squandered because the many were supposed to live as slaves for the few.

In this country there is no such thing as entrenched wealth or power or special privilege, handed down from generation to generation, by the accident of birth. The family that was wealthy in 1880 may be just getting by today, while the sons and daughters of immigrants who came to Lawrence in 1905 may be enjoying a higher standard of living.

The best inheritance which any parents can give their children in this free country of ours is an education, strengthened by home training in character and in the desire to work, which will stand them in good stead when all else fails.

It is heartening to see how first generation Americans of Italian extraction, take to our way of life with a zest that is a contribution. And they do it without sacrificing the solid home virtues inculcated in them by their parents.

It is well for you, and for the Nation, that your parents have such faith in education, and were willing to make sacrifices so that you would be better prepared to meet the competition of life. Now everyone cannot be a doctor, lawyer, dentist, teacher, clergyman, or engineer. But everyone nevertheless does need an education for the enrichment of family life and the solution of those problems which we face as equal citizens and partners in democracy. When it comes to the professions, do not forget that the pride of title, being called a doctor or an attorney, isn't everything. Some would be much better off, financially speaking, if they could trade their titles for the benefits that come from possessing a union card.

The point I wish to make is that education is never wasted. It is an improvement of the individual and is a contribution to public progress. Let us never repeat the Old World mistake of measuring a man's worth by his title. In this Republic of ours we must respect our fellowmen on the basis of their character, their citizenship, and their service.

On this historic day, it is well for us to inquire: "What is an American?" He is a composite of all men. He has shaken off the shackles of prejudice which have fettered so many other peoples. His color ranges from light to dark. His religion is the respect for all religions. He has put the barriers of race behind him. By cooperating with other men, as men, he has developed a society in which the individual has more freedom than he ever had, anywhere or anytime. His representative government stems from self-government. And the worth of this way of life is demonstrated by the fact that it brings forth the best in every man. Result, more comforts and conveniences than the world has ever seen. But more important than these present and material benefits is the hopeful climate in which he lives. His children have a future.

If we try to distill the American character, to find its essence, we discover that its one common denominator is, the willingness to take a risk.

Columbus did, when he left the known shores of Europe to sail across the vast uncharted seas. In those days, men thought that the earth was flat. If you sailed far enough, you would come to the end, and then drop off into some bottomless abyss.

But Columbus had other ideas, and he took the chance.

He dared, and won, as every pioneering American has done ever since.

Christopher Columbus was the first American, followed by many who also became Americans early in our history.

For instance, how many Americans know that an Italian, Filippo Mazzei, was among the very first men in the American Colonies to urge publicly that they should throw off the yoke of England? Mazzei was a friend of Jefferson, Washington, Franklin, Patrick Henry, and other famous revolutionary patriots. He came to Virginia in 1773 at the invitation of Jefferson and Franklin. Under the pen name of Furioso he wrote articles exposing the tyranny of English rule. In one of these articles he first penned the phrase "all men are by nature created free and independent." Jefferson himself has acknowledged translating this phrase and incorporating it into our Declaration of Independence in the form of the immortal "All men are created equal."

Here is another fact. Most of the interior decoration of the Capitol Building in Washington was done by Italians.

The records shows that several hundred Italians gave their lives in the Revolutionary War for independence. We have some proof that William Paca, the delegate from Maryland who signed the Declaration of Independence, was an Italian.

Did you know the Italians were building a glass factory in Virginia even before the Pilgrim Fathers had settled at Plymouth?

Or that Alfonso Tonti aided Cadillac in founding Detroit; that in 1704 Tonti became governor of Detroit and that his daughter was the first white child born in the West?

I could go on and on citing such surprising historical gems but for the fact that my interest, and yours, is largely concerned with the present.

Lawrence, our home city, is only 102 years old as a community. It was built up largely by immigrants. From 1887 to 1916, almost 4,000,000 Italians came to the United States, more than half of them between 1906 and 1916. Many of them came to Lawrence to build up and work in our large mills. These immigrants were mainly laborers and farmers, but what progress they and their descendants have made in a few years.

Italians assimilate quickly and are among the most enthusiastic supporters of the "American way of life." The children of the first generation become thoroughly American in thought, word, and deed. Look at the way they have taken to baseball, football, and boxing. Their thought processes and outlook on life are very different from those of their parents. Among the characteristics of the second generation are: (1) complete assimilation of the idea of progress and of self-betterment through one's own exertions; (2) entire erasing of all national and class prejudices which are so common in Europe; and (3) replacement of clannishness by wide social interests and participation in community life on a broad scale.

Although the Italian is easily assimilated into American life, he does not generally lose many of the virtues which he inherits from countless generations of living in "the old country."

His inherent sociability is proverbial but, whereas in Europe it is confined to the small village group, in this country it assumes the form of an intense and enduring interest in the problems and welfare of all the citizens of our country. The grace, ambition, and courtesy of Italian children and their heritage of thrift and industry are noticeable. These ambitious and forward-looking people have indeed made a place for themselves in the modern life of America. Many have gone into small-scale enterprises and have eventually built up large businesses by the exercise of these virtues.

Some citizens of Italian extraction have made notable contributions to the Americanization process. In the books of Angelo Patri and of Constantine M. Panunzio, we find an abundance not only of pictures showing the successful struggle of Italian immigrants to adapt themselves to the American way of life, but of words of wisdom for all good United States citizens.

Many children of Italian immigrants tend to marry non-Italians. The natural health with which the Italian physique is endowed, is a valuable addition to the biological heritage of the American people. With the changing tides of economic need, the Italian can,

with equal facility, turn his hand to common labor, to skilled artisan work, and to managerial or business functions. His faculty for art and music are well known. It is of singular value as it counteracts and balances the puritanism of the Anglo-Saxon. It enriches and diversifies American life as may be seen in the work of Italian-born Frank Capra, one of Hollywood's leading directors.

I am very happy to join with you in this celebration of Columbus Day. And I share the opinion of the Sons of Italy Lodge that this Nation should observe it more fully. For if Christopher Columbus had not ventured forth with vision and courage the discovery of America might have been delayed for so many years that you and I would not be enjoying the freedoms and the comforts which we now possess.

We observe an outstanding date in history and the man who made that milestone possible.

But more important than a date or a name is the pioneering spirit which animates Christopher Columbus.

We can use it today in our own lives and in the life of our Nation to discover ways and means of building greater progress.

The will to discover new horizons so brilliantly successful in 1492 must also inspire us of 1949 as we face a future that will be far different from the recent past we have known.

This is the challenge which Columbus Day poses for all of us.

In meeting it, I am sure that we will not fail the great explorer who pointed the way.

Mid-Atlantic States Quartet Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, harmony reigns in the District of Columbia today. Two District barber shop quartets, the Columbians and the D. C. Keys, captured first and second places, respectively, in the Mid-Atlantic States Quartet contest, staged yesterday afternoon at the Forum, in Harrisburg, Pa. Both of these melodious fours will appear in the third annual Harvest of Harmony of the Washington Chapter of the Society for the Preservation of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., next week, on Friday, October 28, in Constitution Hall. The champion Columbians will sing with Howard Cranford, top tenor; William Ball, lead; Charles Hay, baritone, and Joseph Yznaga, bass. The D. C. Keys, who made a singing tour of the Capitol last week, will appear whit Mickey Beall, top tenor; Vincent Gingerich, lead; Jesse Nussear, baritone, and Ed Place, bass.

Twenty-two quartets were entered at Harrisburg. Sixteen sang. The Ambassadors of Harmony of Woodridge, N. J., finished third; the Chordblenders, Nazareth, Pa., fourth, and Keystone Four, Bethlehem, Pa., fifth.

It is getting to be a habit for Washington quartets to finish one-two in the District championship rivalry. At the last contest, staged at Philadelphia, Washington scored with the Potomac Clippers, first, and the Singing Squires, second. Both of these popular quartets also will appear in the Harvest of Harmony, together with the out-of-town Elastic Four, Chicago; Buffalo Bills, Buffalo, N. Y.; Westinghouse Quartet, Pittsburgh, Pa., and Firesiders, Louisville, Ky.

March to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

WE HOPE HE'S WRONG

"America is on the march to socialism," Senator BYRD, of Virginia, said the other day in an address at an Atlantic City convention.

We hope he's wrong, but at the same time fear he's right.

The Senator backed up his conclusion on the future of the country by saying:

"The deficit financing of Federal programs in time of peace is piling up a Federal debt to proportions in which the liberties of free enterprise cannot survive."

The Virginian added that if the debt is allowed to grow, confidence will be destroyed. "If effort is made to check or curtail the debt without reduction in expenditures, destructive taxation would be required. In either event insolvency would result. Neither the democratic form of government nor a free-enterprise system can exist in national insolvency," declared this outstanding exponent of economy in Government.

Senator BYRD said that in his 16 years in the Senate he had seen the beginning and growth of this "American brand of socialism."

"Some call it welfare state, some call it statism, and some call it collectivism. Whether you call it one of these 'isms' or whether you call it socialism is academic. The important fact is that the freedoms we have cherished under democracy complemented by the initiative inherent in free enterprise will not exist under the form of government which lies at the end of our present course."

Is there any chance that Senator BYRD is wrong? There is, of course. But there will have to be an abrupt shift in governmental policies if the socialism of which Senator BYRD talks fails to come to pass.

That is why we fear he is right. During the 16 years of which Senator BYRD speaks—covering the era of the New Deal and its successor the Fair Deal—there has been at no time any indication on the part of our Government's policy shapers of veering one whit from the course of lavish spending of the people's money.

There has been plenty of talk of economy during that time but precious little action designed to bring down the cost of government.

As a result the cost of our Federal Government has grown to the $40,000,000,000 mark, the highest peacetime level in the history of the country.

These spending programs have been cleverly planned. They have put many billions of dollars in the hands of a sufficient number of people to sway national elections in all those 16 years, and thus keep the spenders in power.

To change the course of Government policy on spending, there would have to be a tremendous shift in public opinion. The likelihood of such a shift is made somewhat remote by the fact that millions of voters are the recipients of Federal subsidies which they are most reluctant to relinquish.

So there you are. The spending will continue, probably at an accelerated pace, unless the people turn thumbs down on this policy.

And only a radical change in our form of government and set-up of our economy can result if the spending continues.

So there is every reason to fear Senator BYRD was right when he made this direful prediction.

Power, Water, and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, the conference on power, water, and jobs recently held in San Francisco by the Democratic Party emphasized once again the close relationship existing between agriculture and labor. We are all aware that the progress and full development of our country depends upon the united effort of all segments of our society and we cannot penalize one group without penalizing the other. It follows then, that when we fully develop the natural resources of the Nation for the benefit of the people, both labor and agriculture will be the recipients of those benefits. I wish to include a very fine statement on the relationship of agriculture and labor as it exists in the development of the West. This statement is the address to the San Francisco conference by Joseph D. Keenan, of Labor's League for Political Action:

POWER, WATER, AND JOBS

(By Joseph D. Keenan)

Nowhere in the United States have the individual farmer and the city worker so much in common as here in the West. This mutuality of interest is not simply because the worker and the farmer are each other's best customer.

In the West the problem is not that simple. With ever-increasing population pressure, acute shortage of water and electric power is not an alarmist's prophecy but a bread-and-butter crisis right now. The dry well, green acres turned brown for lack of power to turn pumps, and lost income is a reality for the farmer today. The brownout, the plant shut-down and the empty pay check is a reality for the city worker. Upon water and power from western rivers the prosperity of both depends. For that reason we of organized labor have a very real economic concern in the deliberations of this conference.

Everyone agrees on the problem, but unfortunately there is no such agreement on how to solve it. But solve it we must and quickly.

That the West is beyond the "We can do it by our own private bootstraps" stage is obvious. Rivers are no respecters of State lines. River basin areas cover many States, yet full integrated planning and development of each river is essential. The cost will run into billions. Federal financing and coordination is the obvious answer.

Three questions immediately arise: Who will reap the benefits from water and power developments of the West? Who will build the projects? Who will pay the cost?

In the answers to these three questions labor has a very real political concern.

On these three questions the city worker and the individual farmer along with other liberal forces find themselves united in opposition to the private power companies and large corporate farm interests.

What is labor's stake in these three questions. Let's look at each in turn.

WHO WILL REAP THE BENEFITS

Public pressure has been so great that private power monopolists have abandoned outright opposition to public power. They now use rear-guard delaying tactics. They use smear campaigns against single agency river basin developments which would mean highest efficiency with lowest cost power. They want no low-cost yardsticks.

Just last month the power lobby lost its key battle to prevent the further erection of public transmission lines. Their motive is simple * * * let the taxpayer foot the bill to generate the power so long as it must be turned over at the bus bar to the biggest private monopoly in the area to transmit and sell at high-profit prices to the same taxpayers.

Cheap power means new industry and low costs. New industry means jobs for AFL members. Low costs mean high real wages. For these obvious reasons we back the administration's power program. Public power must mean more wealth for the many, not for the grasping few.

For the transmission line victory as well as the TVA steam-plant victory, the supporting members of both parties in Congress deserve great tribute. The great difference between the Eighty-first and Eightieth Congress was conclusively shown on these votes.

With irrigation water the situation is the same. The huge land companies operating thousands of acres on a corporate basis want the Federal Government to pay the bill. It is the 160-acre limitation and the restrictions against land speculation which they are trying by every underhanded device to blast out of the law.

Henry George, the economist, became an obsessed single-tax advocate after observing the vast unearned fortunes accumulated from land speculation right here in San Francisco. The evils he saw were nothing compared to the reprehensible greed of the land companies who would emasculate our land laws in order to reap speculative profits from deserts made fertile at Government expense. The modern land grabbers are not confined to California's Central Valley, but also in Colorado's San Luis Valley and in the gravity canal project in Texas * * * in fact wherever the Reclamation Bureau is in there trying to do a job for the public.

Why is labor interested in how many acres there are to a farm? Just go down in the Central Valley of California and you'll find the answer. The name "okie" did not come from Oklahoma, it came from the Central Valley. In communities where the farms are small, there are stores and buying power to keep the goods of factory workers moving. Where the corporation farms spread out for thousands of acres, you will find a blighted area with landless exploited hired workers who have little in their pockets to attract thriving towns and businesses. But more than that there is the plight of the workers themselves to be considered * * * many of them AFL members. If you need one more reason, go up to Sacramento and watch the antisocial influence of the corporation farmers on progressive legislation. There is more than a little of that same influence in Washington * * * on members of both parties, I am sorry to say.

WHO WILL BUILD THE PROJECTS

Not all Western States have identical problems nor is there any one formula for solution. However, the representative farm organizations and State federations of the AFL are not only in agreement but organically united behind the same program in each area.

The Southwest is semiarid. The problem is not only to catch and hold rain water for distribution in dry months but also to catch and hold enough water to give a firm supply in dry years. Although flood control is a factor, the main problem is water for irrigation and power. This is the legitimate concern of the Reclamation Bureau * * * not the Army engineers, of whom I will have more to say later.

In the well-watered Pacific Northwest we recognize that irrigation must compete for priority along with flood control and power generation, not to mention navigation, recreation, and fish conservation.

The present patchwork compromise whereby the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation go their own way willy-nilly building the same type of multipurpose projects is highly unsatisfactory. It prevents proper planning. It plays right into the hands of those who would sabotage the whole river development. Nor is the Weaver-Newell plan any solution. It just splits the "pork barrel."

The farmer groups and the State labor groups of both the CIO and the AFL are joined together in a league to push for the integrated development of the Northwest under a single agency, CVA.

CVA would not be socialism or Washington dictation but just the opposite. With responsible headquarters on the spot it means good planning, lower costs, and more—not less—local control.

Nothing could be worse than the present set-up. As Congressman MITCHELL, of Washington, recently pointed out, 20 Federal agencies are now operating in the Columbia River Basin. These 20 agencies must go to 8 congressional committees for authorization and to 8 different committees for their appropriations. Even Congress can get no overall picture—much less the local citizens.

WHO WILL PAY THE COSTS?

For every project there has to be money to build it. In discussing financing I want to bring up again the name of the Army engineers.

First let me make it plain that we have a personal ax to grind. If you will get copies of the April and June 1949 bulletins of the AFL Building Trades Department you will see why. The engineers have been the most notorious violators of the Bacon-Davis Act. This act is supposed to require payment of prevailing wages on public construction contracts. Since the contracting agency is charged with enforcing the act, there is little we can do about violators.

The anti-CVA lobby charges that labor's rights would not be protected under such an authority. Such hyprocisy falls on deaf ears within our organization. The proposed CVA is modeled after TVA. TVA labor relations with AFL unions are exemplary. That is one reason why we would like to see the Hoover Commission report carried out and the civilian functions of the Army engineers transferred to the Department of the Interior.

But aside from our personal feelings in the matter, there are other good reasons for our opposition to the engineers. Money is appropriated to the Army engineers to catch floodwater and then run it on down the river later on. Nobody is expected to pay for this as a service. It just comes out of the taxpayer's pocket and nothing goes back into the Federal Treasury to replace funds spent.

On the other hand the Reclamation and CVA-type projects are reimbursable programs. The taxpayer puts up the money to build the projects, but the users of water and power in the area pay for the service and eventually the taxpayer gets his dollars back in the Federal Treasury. It is not wasteful spending but sound business investment for the benefit of all.

One other point. The Army engineers are not bound by any 160-acre limits or land speculation bars. This explains why the big land companies have used the engineers as an entering wedge already on some strictly irrigation projects in the West.

The day of the single purpose project is past. We can't build multipurpose integrated well-planned developments by merely splitting the projects between various agencies.

The Census Bureau tells us that in 25 more years there will be an additional 14,000,000 people in the West. Will these people find steady jobs in new industries? Will these people have opportunities to be independent farmers on irrigated land?

The answer is in river water now flowing to the sea. The administration has the master blueprints and has stood steadfast by its conviction that the people not the special interests shall reap the benefits.

Sound river valley development is fast becoming the most explosive political issue of the Nation. As here in the West the people of power-starved New England are in revolt. In the Missouri Valley the farmers and workers have set up permanent grassroots MVA committees.

I promise the administration leaders the all-out support of Labor's League for Political Education behind their western water and power program. We will not be alone in our support, for no issue has so united the forces of labor and independent farmers as this one.

To office holders of both parties I would like to say this. You have been forewarned. If you want to stay in office, then you can no longer afford to do small favors for the land companies and private power lobby no matter how large their campaign contributions.

The little people won't stand for it and they are watching your voting records. And the little people have the votes.

B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a well-deserving editorial that appeared in the editorial column of the Daily Item of Lynn, Mass., on October 13, 1949:

CONGRATULATIONS TO B'NAI B'RITH

Today marks the one hundred and sixth birthday of the founding of B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant). In Greater Lynn, as elsewhere all over the globe, the lodges (men) and chapters (women) of B'nai B'rith are officially launching the greatest membership campaign in the history of the organization—a campaign which will be climaxed by a Nation-wide radio program Sunday, December 4, the birthday of Frank Goldman, of Lowell, international president of B'nai B'rith.

From its humble start 106 years ago by 12 sincere, determined men in New York, B'nai B'rith stands today as the oldest and largest

Jewish service organization in the world. Its century plus of existence is a proud record of accomplishment and selfish devotion to the cause of democracy. Everything it undertakes is in response to the needs of the people—and the needs are many.

The constant alliance between the way of freedom and the way of B'nai B'rith is a matter of historic record. It is a fact that B'nai B'rith was the first civilian organization in the United States to receive a certificate of merit for World War II services from both the Army and the Navy.

B'nai B'rith maintains a diversified program of service. It is a program of immense width and depth, yet sufficiently elastic to take up new problems as they occur. The first hundred years make up a proud record. We have every confidence that the next hundred will be even more notable.

The Time To Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, since it is known that Russia has the atomic bomb, and in view of the instability of our peace moves, I think it advisable to consider legislation, out of an abundance of precaution, which we should take as a nation.

General Bradley, in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee the other day, suggested the possibility that in case of an attack by an enemy nation, in another war, Washington might be considered the first point of attack. Since that is a possibility and, since if it did come it would more than likely come when the House and Senate were in joint session, I think it incumbent upon us to pass legislation to start a constitutional amendment through the different processes for adoption. I have, therefore, introduced House Joint Resolution 48, which I am inserting as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the suggestion that the Judiciary Committee consider it along with other like proposals as soon as possible.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. (a) When there is no President, Vice President, or person provided by law able to act as President, the ranking officer of the Army (exclusive of the Army Air Forces), the ranking officer of the Navy, and the ranking officer of the Army Air Forces shall meet and select a civilian to act as interim President, who (1) shall forthwith call a meeting of the Governors of the several States at a point designated by him for the purpose of selecting his successor, and (2) shall serve until his successor is selected and takes office.

"(b) The Governors shall meet at the call of the interim President and select by majority vote one of their number to act as President and one of their number to act as Vice President. Those selected by the Governors shall immediately take office and serve for the uncompleted portion of the terms for which the last elected President and Vice President were elected, respectively, at the site selected by a majority of the Governors.

"(c) Judges of the Supreme Court appointed by the interim President shall serve only until the expiration of his term; and judges of the Supreme Court appointed during the period after an individual to act as President has been selected under subsection (b) of this section and before the expiration of the term for which the last elected President was elected, shall serve only until such expiration.

"SEC. 2. When a majority of the Senate of the United States are unable to perform their duties, the legislature of any State whose Senator or Senators are unable to perform their duties shall meet and select by majority vote from their number a person or persons to take the place of such Senator or Senators. Any person so selected shall hold office for the uncompleted portion of the term of the Senator he succeeds.

"SEC. 3. When a majority of the House of Representatives of the United States are unable to perform their duties, the legislature of any State whose Representative or Representatives are unable to perform their duties shall meet and select by majority vote from their number a person or persons to take the place of such Representative or Representatives. Any person so selected shall hold office for the uncompleted portion of the term of the Representative he succeeds.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

California Needs a Financial Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News under date of Monday, October 10, 1949:

CALIFORNIA NEEDS FINANCIAL PROGRAM

A hopeful man in Long Beach writes: "I see that it's now official, Russia has the atomic bomb. That should mean that we workers in the about-to-be-shut-down Terminal Island Navy works do not have to worry any more. This is no time for economy. It's an emergency. We will have to stay on the job."

Nearly 6,000 workers will be thrown out of employment if the Navy closes down at Terminal Island. In the meantime, there will be rent, installments, and other living expenses to pay.

It is not the purpose of this editorial to plead for or against the case of Long Beach interests and workers who are seeking to have the close-down order rescinded, or at least modified. I refer to it only because it is a perfect example of the part defense plays in our national economy.

I am sure that everyone of the 6,000 threatened workers on Terminal Island wishes the atom bomb had never been created. I am sure that all concerned wish that Russia were a peace-seeking democracy with whom the great family of civilized nations could walk, hand in hand, down or up the road that leads toward universal peace.

I am equally sure that since the atom bomb does exist, and since Russia does threaten the peace of the world, military preparedness will become an indispensable factor upon which a large segment of the economy of the Nation will depend.

The Long Beach situation offers a perfect example. One doesn't need to be an economist to see what will happen to hundreds of little business establishments, rental values, and the jobs of thousands if Navy defense work on Terminal Island is stopped. Nor does it require much imagination to realize the terrific hold that military preparation has on the economy of the Nation as a whole.

A look at the 1950 budget as it pertains to foreign affairs and national security, now in the process of being hammered out by Congress, shows what a big cut of the total spending (about 47 percent) is being dedicated to these matters.

1. The military appropriations bill, passed by both houses and now in conference, will dedicate about $13,000,000,000 to the armed forces.

2. The 1950 appropriation for the Marshall plan is $3,628,000,000.

3. For military government and relief in occupied areas, $912,500,000.

4. Arms aid to Atlantic pact nations, $1,314,000,000.

5. Aid for Greece and Turkey, $45,000,000.

6. Authorized Export-Import Bank loans to Marshall plan countries, $150,000,000.

7. Atomic Energy Commission, about $500,000,000.

8. Technical aid to backward areas (President Truman's point 4), about $85,000,000 in direct appropriations plus possible "guarantee" legislation to underwrite private enterprise investment abroad which could mean another billion, according to some estimates.

It is evident that, taken together, these items constitute not only a program of military security but also provide a continuation and extension of our "pipe-line economy" that has been developing since New Deal "pump-priming" days and was carried through the war by lend-lease.

The time is here, however, to plan expenditures for California. We have a problem unique among the States of the Union.

If Washington can manage finances for the whole world, surely with our vast wealth of people and resources, we can manage to finance a program calculated to make life possible for the new millions who have come to California.—M. B.

The Growth of Hospitals and Voluntary Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Growth of Hospitals and Voluntary Health Insurance, which I delivered before the 1949 convention of the American Hospital Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, September 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWTH OF HOSPITALS AND VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

Fifty years ago this month the American Hospital Association gathered in Cleveland for its first annual convention. I cannot claim that my association with you goes back quite that far. But we have worked for some years as brothers-in-arms in the cause of better hospital and medical care and better health for the American people.

I remember most pleasantly the golden jubilee of last year at Atlantic City. The year before at St. Louis, although I could not be with you, your convention honored me with membership in the American Hospital Association.

Our real work together and our close association began with the 1944 convention, also held here in Cleveland. At the 1944 convention the American Hospital Association urged a program of Government aid for public and voluntary hospital construction to help meet the desperate need for hospital beds over the United States.

Out of the experience, the work and the objectives of your association—out of congressional hearings and legislative study by a Senate subcommittee of which I was chairman—grew the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The act, sponsored by former Senator Burton, of Ohio, now Mr. Justice Burton, and myself, is familiarly known as the Hill-Burton Act. But it is your act and your program as much as it is the product of any group or any person.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act is a bench mark—hewn in the rock in the history of hospital development in America. It has produced the greatest program of hospital and health-center construction in the Nation's history. Today nearly 800 hospitals, health centers, nurses' homes, and other health facilities—costing a half billion dollars—are under construction or have been approved for construction. For the first time in the history of any Federal-aid program all the 48 States and the 5 Territories are taking part.

The act is unique for its recognition—for the first time in any Federal legislation—of the principle that the low-income States should receive the greatest proportion of Federal aid and for its preference to rural areas and small communities.

The wisdom of giving the greatest assistance to the neediest States has been proved by the enthusiasm and the initiative of the low-income States in taking advantage of the program. Those States which have taken the lead in the hospital-construction program—Oklahoma, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas—those States are substantially below the national average in the incomes of their people.

The wisdom of giving preference to rural sections and small communities is evidenced by the fact that two out of every three hospitals being built under the program will be hospitals serving farm areas and communities of less than 10,000 people.

This year it become obvious that rapidly expanding State programs for hospital and health center construction made necessary additional Federal aid under the act. Accordingly I introduced in the Senate a bill with amendments that will double the present $75,000,000 a year for Federal grants, extend the Federal program for 5 years, and give to the individual projects within a State the same percentage of Federal funds as the particular State receives from the over-all allotment of Federal funds. I am happy to tell you that the Senate has passed the amendments and I am confident the House of Representatives will give final approval before adjournment of this session of Congress.

The amendments will give a sharp lift to the hospital-construction program. Rural and low-income areas which have not been able to raise their share of the construction costs will now be able to build hospitals and health centers they so badly need. Low-priority areas—generally in the larger cities—will be eligible to take part promptly in the program, months, or perhaps years ahead of their original prospects.

We can expect that many more hospitals for the treatment of tuberculosis and mental and chronic diseases will be built as a result of the additional funds.

As hospital administrators, you will have a special interest in another of the amendments providing funds for surveys, research, and demonstrations of integrated hospital use. Two-thirds of the general hospitals being built under our program will have less than 50 beds. As long as each of these hospitals must act as an individual unit they cannot give complete hospital service. Regional coordination of hospital service offers an important means of improving the quality of care in small-town and rural hospitals. We know that the coordination of hospital use—among communities and among types of hospitals—may often be as important as building new hospitals in our efforts to provide complete hospital care and specialized medical treatment.

After the new hospitals are built—imposing and modern and challenging—there will, as always, remain the practical, workaday problem of maintenance and operation. Somebody must do the housekeeping and be responsible for paying the bills. And that somebody is you.

The American Hospital Association had the problem in mind in its 1944 convention, in the resolution calling for local, county, State, and Federal aid in providing hospital and medical care for the indigent. You wisely urged at that time that emphasis be put on local participation in any such program.

In Congress we have for some years been aware of the problem. In developing the Hospital Survey and Construction Act our committee gave intensive study to the requirements for maintenance and operation of the hospitals that would be built under the program. It was the final conclusion of the committee—and I quote from the committee report—that "assistance in the cost of maintenance and operation of hospitals in the neediest areas should be considered in separate legislation when more information is available."

To the individual, the problem of hospital costs presents itself as a matter of obtaining adequate hospital care for himself and his family without the sudden, dread financial burden that hospitalization so often means. We know that half the medical bill of the United States is paid by only 10 percent of the sick—those who must have hospital treatment.

To the administrators of our hospitals, the problem is one of assured, steady income that will enable them to operate efficient hospitals giving the best possible care. It is vexing but necessary that those who are doing the Lord's work—and in truth you are—must always keep an eye on the bookkeeping while you serve suffering humanity.

The objectives of adequate hospital care for the individual, and adequate income for the hospitals are not incompatible. They have been achieved to the satisfaction of millions of Americans through the Blue Cross plans and similar voluntary prepayment plans of hospital and medical insurance.

Sixty-one million Americans are protected by voluntary prepaid hospital coverage. The Blue Cross plan alone is now a quarter-billion-dollar-a-year business. More than 34,000,000 persons have voluntary coverage against surgical expense. Some 13,000,000 have medical-expense coverage. And more than 39,000,000 of the Nation's 60,000,000 employed civilians are insured under some form of voluntary protection against loss of income due to sickness or accident.

The confidence of the American people in the voluntary system is best demonstrated when we compare today's millions of members with the 3,000,000 people who had hospital coverage only 10 years ago; less than a million had some form of surgical or medical protection.

The voluntary system grew naturally out of America's traditional reliance upon private initiative and individual action. It has survived and prospered because it has met the test of hard-headed American business sense. It gives the buyer a good bargain for his money.

The present prepayment plans provide hospital and medical care for about $5 a month for the worker and his family. The plans have demonstrated their strength and vitality by their phenomenal growth over the past 10 years. They have demonstrated their inventiveness and flexibility by extending protection to dependents and maternity cases, by providing for medical and surgical care, and by reciprocity of membership and services on an international basis. These were once considered radical ideas of health insurance.

It would be wasteful and extravagant and foolish to cast aside this tested voluntary system in favor of some strange and untried system. The course of wisdom is to utilize the knowledge and experience and service invested in the voluntary plans and to expand and strengthen and adapt the voluntary plans to fulfill the health requirements of our people.

That is the objective of the voluntary health insurance bill S. 1456, which I have introduced in the United States Senate, with Senators O'CONOR, of Maryland, WITHERS, of Kentucky, AIKEN, of Vermont, and MORSE, of Oregon.

The bill was written after the most careful thought and study. I worked closely with Mr. George Bugbee, executive director of the American Hospital Association, and Mr. Albert Whitehall, your Washington attorney, and we are indebted to Dr. Gilson Colby Engel of Philadelphia, president of the Pennsylvania State Medical Society and professor of clinical survey at the University of Pennsylvania, who proposed a 10-point program for improving medical care. We conferred at length with Dr. Engel and important parts of his program are incorporated into the bill. We are also indebteded to Dr. Paul Magnuson, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, for his forward-looking and helpful suggestions regarding diagnostic services.

The first and immediate purpose of the voluntary health insurance bill is to provide hospital and medical care for persons who cannot pay, by giving them Government-supported membership in nonprofit, prepayment health insurance plans. These persons would receive the same type and quality of medical care provided regular subscribers to health-insurance plans. They would not be identified as recipients of Government assistance and there would not be the delay or embarrassment of a means test at the time hospital care is needed.

Persons of limited income are encouraged to pay part of the cost of their hospital and medical care. Medical protection will be assured, however, through the State health insurance agency while the individual contributes to his protection within his own financial limits. It is important that we maintain this sense of individual responsibility. The independence of our people has been America's strength and this is one way to maintain and encourage that independence.

Another basic purpose of the bill is to stimulate and encourage every self-supporting citizen to protect himself and his family against the sudden cost of hospital and medical care by voluntary enrollment in the prepayment plans that now serve millions of Americans. The voluntary health insurance bill gives assistance to the States to survey the extent of enrollment and to develop methods of broadening protection and increasing the number of persons enrolled. With universal participation the voluntary health plans can provide more comprehensive protection than they do now.

The bill provides for pay-roll deduction of subscription charges for Federal employees who request it, and encourages similar voluntary deduction for State and local government employees. When persons enrolled in prepayment plans become unemployed, the bill provides that subscription charges will be paid during the period of unemployment compensation.

The bill looks forward to the fullest integrated use of the Nation's health resources by assisting the States to survey their need for diagnostic clinics and for hospitals treating tuberculosis and mental and chronic diseases. The bill helps the States to survey areas which do not have sufficient doctors because there are no hospitals where the doctors can practice. We are building hospitals and we must also pass the bill, which I have joined in sponsoring, to give Federal aid to our colleges to help them train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and health technicians. We have passed the bill in the Senate and I am most hopeful that the House will pass it without delay.

The use of surveys to determine the facts about local needs in the States is the sound preliminary to programs of action. You will recall that before ground was broken or foundations laid for a single hospital under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the first year was spent taking inventory of hospital and health-center needs in each State. We know that these surveys led to specific corrective action.

We have deliberately limited the bill to medical care provided in a hospital or diagnostic clinic. I do not believe we have sufficient medical resources—doctors, nurses, hospitals, and other facilities—to provide the care that would be called for if we immediately included office calls, home care, and minor illnesses. The bill recognizes these practical limits to the medical care that can be immediately provided and does not precipitate the Nation into a program of universal medical care definitely beyond the capacities of our present health resources. At the same time, the bill is flexible and encourages and promotes the growth of the national health program.

We look with confidence to the voluntary method of bringing hospital and medical care to the American people. Since the earliest days of the Republic the voluntary system has been the American way of getting things done. And we know that it has always done the job.

Under the voluntary system our people know the greatest individual freedom on earth. Our people have by far the highest standard of living in the world. And our people have enjoyed the highest quality of medical care in the world. During the greatest of all wars, our people built the mightiest war machine in history and produced more goods and more materials of war than the rest of the world combined. These are the accomplishments of a people acting voluntarily, not under a compulsory system.

We must preserve the incentives of our free medical system—the incentives for individual effort, initiative and resourcefulness, the incentives that flow from the personal relationship of the hospital, the doctor, and the patient.

We must preserve the independence and freedom of our hospitals—so many of them, such as St. Luke's Hospital here in Cleveland, founded through the generous public spirit and the civic consciousness of individuals and private organizations.

We must preserve the freedom of the individual doctor and his unique place of trust and confidence.

We cannot preserve the freedom of our hospitals, we cannot keep them uncontrolled and unregimented by the Federal Government, we cannot maintain our American free practice of medicine by simply denouncing socialized medicine or by a stand-pat opposition to socialized medicine.

We can preserve our free-enterprise system in the field of hospitals and medicine by offering a better solution for our hospital and medical-care problems than socialized medicine offers. And it will not suffice to provide only for the indigent—as important as it is to meet our responsibility for those who cannot pay. We must go further. We must carry forward programs of voluntary health insurance that will meet the hospital and medical needs of the great rank and file of the American people.

So much of the responsibility for leadership rests upon you—who build and organize and operate the hospitals of America. Through the Blue Cross you pioneered in the field of prepaid hospital protection. Through the Hospital Survey and Construction Act we pioneered together in the field of planned national hospital construction.

Now we have the opportunity to merge these programs. The citizen who can see a new hospital in his own home town is a better prospect for hospital insurance than the man who must travel many miles to reach a hospital. The hospital is a constant reminder and incentive to the citizens to provide hospital insurance for himself and his family. The new hospitals we are building present the opportunity to you and to me to bring millions of our people into new and enlarged hospital prepayment plans.

This is the challenge to you and to me—the challenge to take the voluntary system to town and hamlet, crossroads and farm, and close the final gap in the health protection of our people.

Beneficial Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, October 16, 1949:

MORE GOOD THAN HARM COMING FROM HEARINGS ON ARMED-FORCES ROW—HEARTENING TO HEAR MEN HIGH IN MILITARY COUNCILS TALK AT LENGTH ABOUT IMMORAL USE OF ATOM BOMBS

(By John Griffin)

Some officials in Washington have asserted that the present hearings before the House Armed Services Committee on Navy discontent with the working of the unification plan endanger the security of the country by revealing details of the row.

Actually, it is beginning to look as if the whole world will benefit by the controversy, for if it did nothing else, it revealed that the men at the head of the Navy are concerned with the moral aspects of war.

Disclosure of theories of defense against the possibility of war with Russia are not going to hurt us, even though details that ordinarily are kept secret are being broadcast. Every Nation is at all times working on plans to meet any eventuality, and it is certainly no secret to the Russians that we want to be prepared.

But it is heartening to this country and to all the world to hear the highest officers in the Navy talk about the moral values or lack of values involved in the use of atomic bombs. War itself is immoral under most circumstances, but the advent of the atomic bomb has brought a situation in which morals must be considered more than ever before.

Of course, there are critics who will say that all the Navy wants is to return to old-fashioned warfare in order to keep their own establishments at its greatest size. But these criticisms are not very effective now; the country is pretty well convinced that the Navy is fighting desperately because of conviction that the country will be in danger if everything in the way of defense is based on use of the atomic weapon.

A POWERFUL PRESENTATION

Some Navy men, such as Admiral Halsey, have testified before the committee strictly on military and naval grounds, that is, as to whether this way or that is best for the good of the country strictly from the standpoint of warfare.

But others, including Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Ofstie, have based their objections to all-dependent reliance on the atomic bomb, on the grounds that it is barbaric and against the decent opinion of mankind to deliberately plan the random slaughter of men, women, and children in the enemy country.

Admiral Ofstie is a member of the military liaison committee that advised the Atomic Energy Commission on the military application of atomic energy. He made a powerful presentation of the Navy case, dealing with many aspects of the problem.

"If we consciously adopt a ruthless and barbaric policy toward other peoples," he said, "how can we prevent the break-down of those standards of morality which have been a guiding force in this democracy since its inception?

"I am sure that the moral force of the people of this country is in strong opposition to military methods so contrary to our fundamental ideals. It is time that strategic bombing be squarely faced in his light, that it be examined in relation to the decent opinions of mankind."

FLAWS IN UNIFICATION

The Navy officers seemed to be unanimous in the belief that strategic bombing, which is the destruction of urban centers and indiscriminate bombing of civilians, will not win a war. They want, as Admiral Ofstie said, "Balanced power rather than the single shot philosophy."

They have made out a strong case, even though their opposition apparently includes President Truman. They have also disclosed the flaws to the unification scheme which were not foreseen when that plant was passed by the Congress.

They expected to be partners with the other services, and now are afraid that they are going to be hamstrung because of a military theory that places everything in the hands of the Air Force equipped with big bombers carrying atomic bombs.

Whether they can win their case is another matter. The other side of the story hasn't been brought out yet in the hearings, but probably will be developed during the next week. In the end, it is likely that there will be some compromises which will recognize the complaints of the Navy.

One of the astonishing aspects of the whole thing is the place of the atom bomb. The scientists who developed it had hoped, so they said, that the creation of such an awesome weapon might result in an end to war

simply through the fear that the use of atomic weapons would be so dangerous to user as well as intended victim that nobody would dare use it.

But the military men, especially those in the Air Force and supported by Secretary of Defense Johnson and presumably the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have apparently decided that it is the greatest of all weapons for winning a war.

WELL TO BRING IT OUT

It is not so long ago that Winston Churchill, speaking in Boston, said that the United States possession of the atomic bomb was the only thing that kept Russia from bombing London. The inference was that Russia would have no scruples about wiping out a city like London.

There are many people, of course, who will fear that American admirals are not being realistic when they shy away from the use of the atomic bomb on the grounds that it is barbaric, when they feel that a potential enemy such as Russia would have no such scruples.

Yet the answer to that is clear, and was well expressed by some of the admirals. It is that any conflict with Russia would have to be fought in the light of the ideological differences between us, and that the use of barbaric and immoral weapons would prove only that we are as ruthless and immoral as they.

If such a war came, their belief is that there could be no victory if the conflict destroyed all the ideals and all the moral values that the United States has held to ever since its beginning.

Of course, they don't mean that we wouldn't use the atomic bomb against an enemy who would use it. What they obviously mean is that there is no excuse for the deliberate bombing of civilian populations which they feel cannot win a war but can only bring horror to the world.

It is a bitter fight in Washington, but it is well to have it out in the open. It will, in the long run, bring more good than harm.

Rejection of Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Rebuke to the President," appearing in the Evening Star October 14, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial summarizes my reaction based upon personal experience.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBUKE TO THE PRESIDENT

In voting overwhelmingly—53 to 15—against the reappointment of Federal Power Commissioner Leland Olds, the Senate has been perhaps a bit more emphatic than it might have been had it not been goaded into administering a stinging rebuke to the President.

As the chief goader, Mr. Truman has only himself to blame for this new blow to his prestige. To begin with, in a thoroughly ill-advised way, he sought to make it appear that the opposition to Mr. Olds stemmed only from private utility companies selfishly intent upon ridding the Federal Power Commission of a member resolved to protect the interests of the public. Next, even after it had been pointed out to him that no company had either testified or asked to testify against Mr. Olds, and after the full Commerce Committee had voted 10 to 2 against the reappointment, he called upon the national Democratic chairman to urge all the party leaders in all the States to pressure all the Democratic Senators into voting to confirm.

In other words, by implication, Mr. Truman suggested that one could question the good faith and sincerity of those opposing Mr. Olds because of his past radical writings or because of a feeling that he was biased. And as if this were not enough to make the Senate see red, the President then tried to pose the issue as one of party regularity and discipline. That is to say, he tried to whip the Democratic Senators into line with the strange and essentially ridiculous argument that they would be bad Democrats, deserving punishment, if they did not do as he said. The party's platform, of course, never pledged anybody to support Mr. Olds, but Mr. Truman seems to have ignored that fact, along with the fact that it is the Senate's constitutional right and duty either to reject or confirm—as it sees fit, in wisdom or conscience—all such Presidential appointments, regardless of partisan pressure.

In the circumstances, it is not surprising that 21 Democrats out of the 34 voting joined with the Republicans in denying Mr. Olds another term. The result might have been closer if there had been no clumsy and bullying intervention by Mr. Truman. But that intervention certainly had the effect of hardening the opposition, and it may also have persuaded more than a few of the undecided to come out against confirmation. Whether Mr. Olds deserved to be defeated, or whether exaggerated and unjustified conclusions were drawn from his writings of 20 years ago, may be debatable. What is not debatable, however, is that the President himself helped to insure the Senate's thumbs-down action.

If there is any moral to be found here, it is simply this: That Members of the Senate, regardless of party, do not like to have their motives questioned, even by implication, that they resent being bludgeoned or bulldozed, that they are jealous of their constitutional prerogatives, and that they do not take kindly to Presidential dictation of the sort just tried by Mr. Truman. All of which is one reason why our form of Government, despite its imperfections, is still about the best in the world.

Should Marshall Plan Money Be Used To Buy Canadian Wheat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Should Marshall Plan Money Be Used To Buy Canadian Wheat? which I broadcast over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. on October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD MARSHALL PLAN MONEY BE USED TO BUY CANADIAN WHEAT?

Good evening. I welcome this opportunity to talk with you about a new Brannan plan—the Brannan plan for Canada.

The British came back to Washington last month—came to Washington once again. The Socialist leaders, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Ernest Bevin, were here for the announced purpose of tapping the United States Treasury—as the British Socialists have tapped it so frequently—so successfully—in the recent past.

When Sir Stafford returned to London, he announced: "The recent dollar talks in Washington were the most successful we have ever had."

Why was Sir Stafford so satisfied with his mission to America?

For one thing, Marshall plan Administrator Paul Hoffman had given the British permission to use $175,000,000 of Marshall plan money—that is, your money—to buy Canadian wheat—at a time when we have a surplus of wheat here at home. And stranger still—Sir Stafford had secured the approval of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to this raw deal for the American farmer.

This use of your money is a clear violation of the spirit, if not the very letter, of the Marshall plan law. When the law was first passed, it was understood by Members of Congress—and by everyone else so far as I know—that when there is an oversupply of farm commodities here at home, orders from abroad, to be paid for out of Marshall plan money, would be filled in the United States.

The other day at Atlantic City, Mr. Brannan spoke very feelingly and very eloquently about the problem of farm surpluses. He said that unless we solve this problem we may "reenact the tragedy of another farm-led depression." Yet he has deliberately given his approval to a deal which will aggravate the oversupply of wheat already plaguing the American farmer.

Just about every warehouse and bin in the country is now full of wheat. Wheat is practically running out of the farmers' ears. But despite the mountains of wheat here at home, the Secretary of Agriculture has agreed to let Britain use Marshall plan dollars—your money—to buy Canadian wheat.

The wheat situation has become so critical that the Government is now requiring our farmers to cut back production next year. The national wheat acreage allotment for the coming year is nearly 14,000,000 acres less than it was a year ago. Less production will mean lower incomes and less purchasing power for our farmers. Yet Canadian farmers planted 12 percent more wheat this year than they did last year.

In other words, we are cutting back our own acreage to give a market to the farmers of other countires. I am sure that you will agree with me that charity should begin at home.

The Secretary of Agriculture is by law charged with the duty and the responsibility of looking after the interests of the American farmer. Why did he approve a deal to take money out of the pocket of the same American farmer? If the administration wanted to give more aid to Britain's Socialist Government, why was our farmer picked out—or picked on—to pay for it? This is another one of those calculated risks. It is calculated to destroy the farm price-support program. Whatever happens, our farmer will lose.

Mr. Brannan has tried to explain his approval of the Canadian wheat deal. But after reading his involved excuses, one feels very much like Alice in Wonderland after reading the Jabberwocky poem.

When she had finished the poem, you will remember, she said: "It seems very pretty, but its rather hard to understand. Somehow it seems to fill my head with ideas, only I don't exactly know what they are."

Mr. Brannan says the use of Marshall plan funds to buy Canadian wheat should not worry the American farmer, for he will find a market somewhere else. But the American farmer asks: Where? Where? The American farmer is not willing to give up an assured British market in the hope that other markets will be found to take its place.

Today we are giving our markets away—and paying for the privilege—while our surpluses pile up. I raise this question: Should not the American situation be the first concern of the American Secretary of Agriculture?

There has been a lot said in the past few years about bilateral trade agreements. These are agreements by which the government of one country agrees to take from the government of another country certain products to be paid for, either in money or trade. The effect is to squeeze out the products of countries that are not in the deal. These bilateral agreements stifle and clog world trade. One of the announced objectives of our postwar foreign policy has been to stop the making of these unfair bilateral agreements. The American people have spent billions of dollars with the announced purpose of preventing them. But now we find that one of the most unfair of bilateral agreements is approved and is actually being financed by our own Government.

In 1946, we gave Britain almost $4,000,000,000—a so-called loan. The then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, said that it would prevent further discrimination by Britain against American producers. Yet, before the ink was dry on the loan papers, Britain and Canada announced that they had completed a bilateral wheat agreement. Under this deal, Britain agreed to buy 150,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat each year through 1950. It is that agreement—made under those circumstances—that the administration has decided to finance with Marshall-plan money—with your money.

The American farmer was hit hard by the British-Canadian wheat deal. It took away a large market for his wheat—a market that had traditionally been his. Now, to add insult to injury, Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Brannan decide to let Britain use Marshall-plan dollars—your money—to pay for the wheat she agreed to buy from Canada.

Equally disturbing is the announcement that France and all other Marshall-plan countries may make similar use of Marshall-plan money.

You know and I know the American farm price-support program is not liked in England. Prime Minister Bevin and other Socialist leaders have complained about it more than once. They do not like it because they say it raises the prices of American farm products they buy from us.

Mr. Brannan does not like the farm price-support program either. Under the law, as Secretary of Agriculture, he is charged with the duty and the responsibility of carrying it out. However, he has not hesitated to say that he prefers another farm plan, of which he is the author and which bears his name.

It may be that some further changes are needed in the present farm-support program. If so, they should be made. But changes in the farm program should be made by the elected representatives of the people in Congress. The program should not be choked to death by American, British, and Canadian bureaucrats, sitting in hush-hush sessions behind closed doors.

It is now apparent that at the "dollar talks" in Washington, important steps were taken to scuttle the existing policy of price supports for American farm products. Anyone who remembers what happened under the ill-fated Farm Board knows what undigested and undistributed surpluses of farm products will eventually do to a farm program.

I am lacking in originality, I know, when I say that someone has "stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back." But this is an accurate description of what has occurred. As the Secretary of Agriculture wielded the fork, he whispered sweet nothings, smooth as butter, in the farmer's ear.

The use of Marshall-plan money to buy Canadian wheat is bad. It may be all right for Canada—it may be fine for Great Britain—but it is bad for the United States.

It is so bad that the Senate Committee on Agriculture has decided to investigate it. I hope the committee, under the able chairmanship of Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, finds out just what was done to the American farmer at the "dollar talks" in Washington.

Navy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me under the heading "An advance tribute to Navy Day—October 27, 1949."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADVANCE TRIBUTE TO NAVY DAY
OCTOBER 27, 1949

Mr. President, Navy Day 1949 is not supposed to be observed. It is out. It is "kaput." But, by John Paul Jones I'm celebrating it this year. And I hope every Navy man and every ex-Navy man is celebrating it in his own loyal way, too, and that Air Force men and Army men will informally, if necessary, celebrate their holidays.

WE'RE FOR UNIFICATION BUT ALSO FOR PRIDE IN BRANCH

I'm all for unification of the services. I believe unification means less waste of the taxpayer's dollar in purchasing necessities for the National Military Establishment and in eliminating unnecessary jobs. I believe unification will eventually build our National Military Establishment into a more efficient rampart of defense for the lives and liberties of the American people.

But no definition of unification that anybody has yet to come across includes a requirement that loyalty to a man's individual job must be crushed out or that pride in his branch of service must be eradicated. And that's just what is being done, I regret to say, to each Navy man whose Navy Day is on the "verboten" list.

Now, let's try to be fair. What exactly is the reasoning behind Secretary Johnson's quietus on Navy Day? My most charitable estimate is that what he wants is to subordinate each service to the sum total of all of the services. There are other possible estimates which are distinctly less charitable. But, let's assume the best.

The best is wrong.

Loyalty is growing into a more valuable commodity because it is now more rare. We are in no position to offend loyalty; much less, to crush it. If our Navy wants its sincere friends to give it a pat on the back once a year, by Farragut, our Navy's entitled to it.

OTHER NATIONS OBSERVE NAVY DAY

Great Britain has a navy day. The Soviet Union tries to forget concentration camps long enough to have a navy day. I don't know whether or not France has a navy day, but if France hasn't a navy day, it ought to have one. Yet, apparently, in 1949, the United States has joined Switzerland in not having a navy day. That's nothing against Switzerland. Switzerland just doesn't have a navy.

WILL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROHIBIT ROBERT E. LEE DAY?

But, to come back to the United States, this country has days and weeks set aside for almost everything. Yes; we've got National Dairy Products Week. I'm all in favor of it. I haven't heard any objections to that week from even the most confirmed oleo-ander. Across the river in Virginia they close their banks on the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Still, when that particular holiday rolls around next year, Secretary Johnson won't be sending a couple of armored divisions over the Potomac to open the Virginia banks. And it is my distinct impression that General Lee was not exactly an advocate of unification.

WE OBSERVE DIVERSE RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

No American Christian would think of protesting against the observance of Yom Kippur or other holy days by patriotic brother Americans of the Jewish faith. American non-Christians would not object to American Christian devotions on Easter and Christmas. American Protestants and American Jews believe that it is the inalienable right of American Catholics to honor Saints' Days. It isn't the policy, yet, of this country to crush loyalty to individual religious beliefs.

Each year Senators travel thousands of miles in order to speak and lead the celebrations on the inspiring French Bastile Day, Polish Constitution Day, Italian Garibaldi Day, Finnish Kalavalla Day, Norwegian Independence Day, and Canadian Dominion Day. Yet no one has questioned the unimpeachable loyalty of each and every one of those Senators to the United States of America.

SHALL WE BE SHOT FOR SINGING "ON, WISCONSIN"?

If Secretary Johnson's reasoning on Navy Day was right—and I say that in this instance it is not—Senators WHERRY and BUTLER could hardly defend their attendance at Nebraska Founders' Day observances, for, obviously, Nebraska's Founders' Day has nothing whatsoever to do with the 48 States in our Federal Union. To carry this reasoning to its ultimate conclusion, the Senators from South Carolina and the Senators from Connecticut would bow in dejection, since the historic and honorary military companies of Charleston and Hartford would be disbanded in shame. These honorary organizations are not shared in common by the whole United States. The Senators from the Lone Star State would then be guilty of questionable conduct if they hummed, "The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You." Yes; and I, in all probability, would be led before a firing squad singing at the top of my lungs, "On, Wisconsin."

"THEY'RE DISGRACING MEN AND WOMEN FOR THE WEARING OF THE BLUE"

Still on the subject of singing—there is a song to the tune of "Wearing of the Green" which certain Navy men sing behind locked doors, requiring all present to join in.

That song goes something like this:

"Oh, Paddy dear, and did you hear
The scuttlebutt around?—
Lou Johnson has forbade we breathe
On aught save Fed'ral ground.
It's the most distressful fix we're in
That ever yet you knew:—
They're disgracing men and women
For the Wearin' of the Blue!"

There are other verses containing other, even stronger, words. However, I consider

the ones I've given you sufficient for the present.

I repeat: I am for unification. I have admired the forceful economy efforts of the new Secretary of Defense. I do not want to see interservice feuding or bitterness. But I also repeat: I am not for the crushing of loyalty to fine institutions. Loyalty to one's branch is not inconsistent with loyalty to the over-all armed service unless it is carried to a ridiculous extreme.

EACH BRANCH IS ENTITLED TO ITS SEPARATE DAY

Should the Army want to set aside a particular day to honor its heroes and to point to its present performance, I would fight to let them have that day. Surely our ground troops deserve that right.

Should the Air Force want to set aside a particular day to honor its heroes and to point to its present performance, I would fight to let them have that day. (Wisconsin which gave to the Nation Billy Mitchell and Dick Bong and more aviators than any other State except Texas has always had a particular affection for Air Force Day.)

Should the unified Military Establishment want to set aside a particular day to honor the heroes of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard, I would fight to let them have that day. Certainly, we do need up-to-the-minute sincere cooperation among all the services in this atomic age. Bickering and rumor-mongering are totally out of place.

The Navy wants its own day—and right now I'm fighting for it.

LET'S OBSERVE NAVY DAY THIS YEAR

The President hasn't done anything about Navy Day. Secretary Johnson won't do anything about it. For ourselves, let us proclaim that October 27, which used to be Navy Day, is—for us—still Navy Day, a vital reminder of the deeds of valor on the seven seas of America's fighting men in blue.

Gentlemen, I give you Navy Day 1949. May those Americans who revere justice as they admire courage give their heartfelt and enthusiastic support, particularly on that day, to the patriots who man our battlewagons and to the men, ashore, who are devoting their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the end of keeping our Navy the most efficient in the world.

Record of the First Session, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today a statement of the record, to date, of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress demonstrates that the conflict within the Democratic Party makes it an unsafe agency for translation of the will of the people into law.

It is a record of reckless disregard of the taxpayers and the importance of stability in our national economy. Appropriations to continue waste and inefficiency in the over-swollen bureaucracy reached a new high for all peacetime.

Through its loose fiscal policies, the Eighty-first Congress has plunged the Federal Government once more into deficit-spending, borrowing to spend, which is a dangerous policy. Time and again the Republican membership sought to cut appropriations, but the high spenders under administration leadership prevailed.

The $8,500,000,000 Treasury surplus accumulated under the wise policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress is gone. Instead of the $7,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt accomplished by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the country is now confronted by a constantly rising public debt.

This mortgage upon the backs of the people has increased from the postwar low of $251,349,380,305, reached last April 8, to $256,538,816,324 on October 12, 1949. This is an increase of $5,189,436,019. Present indications point to a Federal Treasury deficit for the present fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000, which is equal to the tax reduction voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress was able to hold the majority to go along with the President on his disastrous spending programs.

The leadership was able to hold its majority to repeal the protection offered to American industry in the "peril-point" provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

The Democratic leadership, however, found little support for the more extravagant demands of the President's program.

When the Eighty-first Congress organized January 5, 1949, there were majorities in both Houses of Congress for the party of the administration. In the Senate, Democrats outnumbered Republicans 54 to 42; in the House the voting strength was 263 to 171. The Congress was greeted by a reelected President who claimed a mandate to initiate vast spending programs which had been turned down in the Eightieth Congress, and to wipe from the statutes laws enacted for the general welfare in the Eightieth Congress.

For 9½ months, meeting 4 or 5 days a week for an average of 5 or 6 hours a day, the poorly organized and weakly led Eighty-first Congress has dragged out the longest peacetime session in the history of the Republic. Night meetings and Saturday sessions, often employed in previous Congresses to drive through important legislation, were a rarity in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Poor leadership in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress resulted in the worst log jam on appropriation bills in the United States legislative history. Many departments have carried through the first quarter of the fiscal year 1950–50 without knowing the amounts of money the Congress would appropriate to meet their budgets.

The full lack of leadership in the Eighty-first Congress is illustrated by the number of special resolutions that provided temporary funds in lieu of regular appropriations on five occasions.

On October 1, 1949, 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year 1950 and 9 months after the organization of the Eighty-first Congress, regular appropriations for Army civil functions, for the Interior Department, for the National Military Establishment, and for foreign aid were not enacted and the third deficiency appropriation for fiscal 1949 was still pending.

Although the Democratic Party had a majority in both Houses of the Congress, it is perfectly clear in the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress that the Fair Deal of the President is meeting with no more success than it met in the Eightieth Congress. The extravagant promises of a political campaign in which the President offered everything to everybody and a paternalistic government to distribute the booty have turned out to be empty promises.

Most of the legislation enacted in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress spells out a general endorsement of action taken in the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress.

In the field of foreign relations, labor-management legislation, farm-price policies, and domestic problems, the Eighty-first Congress has subscribed to the political philosophy of its predecessor. The President has found little sympathy in the Eighty-first Congress for new taxes, wage and price controls, restrictions on consumer credits, priorities on materials in short supply, compulsory health insurance, farm-production subsidies, and authority for the Government to build industrial plants.

The Taft-Hartley law was not repealed.

The President and the leaders of the Democratic Party seeking reelection sought support from the labor bosses, voicing their eagerness to erase the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 from the statutes.

In the House, the administration forces failed completely and bottled the Taft-Hartley repeal bill in committee.

In the Senate, responsible members of the Democratic Party joined with the Republicans to amend sensibly the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The bill that passed the Senate subscribed to the 1947 legislation, offering justice to labor while it recognized also the rights of management to an honored contract and the rights of the general public to protection against Nation-wide tie-ups in key industries.

In fear of complete repudiation, the administration leaders in the House have not dared to bring the Senate bill out of committee onto the House floor for a vote.

The Brannan farm plan, lauded by the President in his political speeches around the country, has been an unrecognized child to administration spokesmen in the Congress. The House leadership adopted a bill to continue for another year existing supports at 90 percent of parity. It refused to endorse the Brannan formula for production payments to farmers on nonbasic crops.

The Senate Agriculture Committee spurned the Brannan plan. On the Senate floor one lone spokesman paid lip service to the Brannan proposals, but refused to offer legislation for a vote to test the sentiments of his colleagues.

Neither House nor Senate desired even to discuss the cost of the Brannan plan, or the size of a police force necessary to certify production payments, or the desirability of limiting its benefits only to the small farmers, or the feasibility of subjecting the farmer to rigid acreage and quota controls, or the advisability of requiring the farmer to spend his income on soil conservation subject to the dictates of the Department of Agriculture, or the reasonability of destroying normal markets for agricultural products on which Government subsidies are expended.

The Eighty-first Congress refused to consider new taxes sought by the President in his January message and subsequently abandoned by the administration. The Eightieth Congress, which voted tax relief, was condemned by many administration leaders this session who were embarrassed by a staggering deficit in peacetime because of excessive expenditures. Democrats were anxious to forget that the President, also, during the Eightieth Congress had proposed a tax-reduction plan. But although the Democratic leaders in some instances were willing to bemoan the loss of revenue, they did not seek to restore the tax reduction made in the Eightieth Congress and appreciated by the 7,000,000 small-wage earners of America who benefited thereby.

The President was ignored in his request for authority to build industrial plants with Government funds. The controls over private industry sought in the Spence bill to combat inflation were quickly forgotten as business conditions tended to correct themselves without Government interference.

The authority sought in the Economic Expansion Act to combat deflation appeared at the end of the first session to be likely to join the Spence bill on the shelf.

The President's program for socialized medicine was not placed on the calendar in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and it is apparent that only a minority will subscribe to the proposition that a multi-billion dollar tax be levied upon wage earners in America in order that the Govenrment may become the sole employer of the medical profession. The President's attempt to subject the Public Health Department to the complete and arbitrary authority of the Federal Security Administrator, which the administration advised in opposition to the report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, was roundly defeated in the Senate. The Democratic Congress would appear to be no more friendly to the socialized medicine of the Fair Deal than were the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress.

In a very real sense the American system of free enterprise was on trial in the Eighty-first Congress even as it had been in the Eightieth Congress. For the first time in 16 years, opposition to the growing momentum of Government spending was organized in the Eightieth Congress. For the first time in 16 years the administration in the Eightieth Congress found opposition to the ever-increasing demands for new Federal controls.

The Eightieth Congress provided a balanced budget and forced a temporary halt in the steady march toward greater Federal control of industry, labor, farming, and virtually every area of economic and social life in the Nation.

With the election of a new Congress committed to support the administration, the question arose as to whether the administration would find in the Eighty-first Congress ready support for programs denied in the Eightieth Congress.

At the conclusion of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, it becomes clear that legislation written in the last 9 months bears a closer resemblance to the record of the Eightieth Congress than to the program set forth by the President as the Fair Deal.

Only in two major respects did the Eighty-first Congress take a stand at complete variance with that taken in the Eightieth Congress. The principle of a balanced budget in peacetime was abandoned. The principle that there should be safeguards for American industry in the negotiation of trade agreements was denied.

Unwise appropriations have been enacted in the Eighty-first Congress in spite of steady opposition from the Republican minority. The administration has rallied all its forces to guarantee large peacetime spending.

The Senate has voted down numerous motions to reduce the amounts of appropriation bills, usually by slight majorities. Republicans offered four such reduction motions on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation, three on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation, two on the agricultural appropriation, and four on the civil functions appropriation.

The Senate voted down twice motions offered to the Military Establishment appropriation and to the executive pay raise bill to require an over-all reduction of all expenditures to bring the budget in balance.

The failure of the Eighty-first Congress to carry out the economy program initiated in the Eightieth Congress returns the Federal Government to deficit spending.

The Eighty-first Congress voted down, almost entirely along party lines, an amendment to the reciprocal trade agreements program adopted in the Eightieth Congress to protect American industries from cheap-labor imports. The peril-point provision adopted in the Eightieth Congress required the Tariff Commission to establish peril points in setting the rate of duty below which trade negotiators could not go without endangering American industry. If the President ignored these points, he was required to explain his action to the Congress and the people. Although this amendment was labeled "restrictive," the only restriction imposed on the President was that he should explain his actions to the people when he endangered an American business by allowing low duty imports of cheap-labor foreign production.

Although the Senate defeated the peril-point amendment to reciprocal trade in extending the trade agreements, it later adopted more serious tariff limitations, proposed by a Democratic Senator as an amendment to the farm price-support bill.

At this point I should like to present a brief summary of major legislation, Eighty-first Congress, first session (January 5 to October 14, 1949).

THE PRESIDENTIAL PAY RAISE (PUBLIC LAW 2, APPROVED JANUARY 19, 1949)

Congress suspended rules to increase the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 and that of the Vice President from $20,000 to $30,000 a year. It also voted a tax free allowance for the President of $50,000 a year; and for the Vice President, $10,000 a year.

AGRICULTURE

Farm price supports (in conference)

The flexible price support bill passed in the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress is a complete repudiation of the demands made by the administration. It continues the general provisions of the Hope-Aiken law enacted in the Eightieth Congress, which was the first law ever written to provide a permanent farm price-support program. The House bill also departs from the administration's proposals.

Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act amendment (Public Law 85, approved June 7, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, modifies the charter of the Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was given its first permanent Federal charter by the Eightieth Congress.

Rural telephones (in conference)

Introduced by a large bipartisan group, the legislation authorizes the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans to finance expansion, construction, and operations of rural telephone service.

Crop Insurance Act of 1949 (Public Law 268, approved August 25, 1949)

The legislation continues crop insurance on an experimental program begun in the Eightieth Congress, providing for gradual expansion of crop insurance to additional counties. It contains other modifications of the law pursuant to the new program initiated in 1947.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Appropriations voted in the Eighty-first Congress carried budget expenditures to the highest level of peacetime spending in the history of the Nation. The example set in the Eightieth Congress of curtailing appropriations in order to provide for a balanced budget and for debt retirement was ignored. Despite the warnings of a large minority in the Congress, the administration leaders enacted appropriations to return the Government to deficit financing. Repeatedly the administration rallied its forces in the Senate to defeat attempts to apply percentage reductions to the appropriations bills as voted on in the Senate. The leaders of the administration party in the Senate voted for virtually every amendment offered to increase spending, even voting to increase expenditures above committee recommendations in some instances. A table showing the action taken to date on appropriations bills in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

Law No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as approved	Date approved
3	Disaster relief	$1,000,000	$500,000	Jan. 28
5	do	500,000	500,000	Feb. 7
71	First deficiency, 1949	564,183,148	524,649,473	May 24
145	District of Columbia, 1950	103,878,727	102,754,447	June 29
150	Treasury-Post Office, 1950	3,176,266,750	3,090,528,903	June 30
	Treasury	1,096,594,450	1,036,318,403	
	Post Office	2,079,672,300	2,054,210,500	
141	Labor-Federal Security, 1950	2,234,389,285	2,387,799,885	June 29
	Labor	16,766,200	16,766,200	
	FSA	1,500,805,585	1,487,364,185	
	Related agencies	716,817,500	883,669,500	
355	Civil functions, Army, 1950	772,458,220	664,178,190	Oct. 13
350	Interior, 1950	624,810,436	584,098,797	Oct. 12
146	Agriculture, 1950	727,906,908	715,601,607	June 29
179	State, Justice, Commerce, 1950	740,362,956	677,972,102	July 20
	State	285,313,756	265,305,656	
	Justice	132,566,500	132,663,141	
	Commerce	301,248,500	259,269,105	
	Judiciary	21,234,200	20,734,200	
119	Second deficiency, 1949	698,028,397	854,838,710	June 23
	National military, 1950	13,248,960,700		
	Army	4,604,875,700		
	Navy	4,403,751,000		
	Air Force	4,033,887,000		
	Other	206,447,000		
266	Independent offices, 1950	8,051,343,830	7,617,739,361	Aug. 25
43	Veterans' readjustment benefits	595,890,000	595,890,000	Apr. 15
327	Foreign aid, 1950	6,322,544,000	5,659,990,000	Oct. 6
118	Legislative, 1950	73,898,184	62,262,110	June 22
343	Third deficiency, 1949	214,730,794	177,740,619	Oct. 10
215	Insect control	3,500,000	1,750,000	Aug. 28
	Supplemental, 1950	89,965,021	78,005,129	

CIVIL RIGHTS

Cloture rule (adopted March 17, 1949)

Offered by Republican leadership during the filibuster on civil-rights legislation early in the Eighty-first Congress, the rule provides that a constitutional two-thirds may cut off debate on a motion to take up legislation. The cloture rule is the most significant action taken in many sessions toward obtaining consideration for civil-rights legislation. The leadership in Congress has not brought to a vote any civil-rights legislation since the adoption of this rule although an antilynching bill has been on the Senate Calendar since June.

EDUCATION

Emergency school aid (Public Law 306, approved September 10, 1949)

The law authorizes appropriations of $7,500,000 to continue Federal assistance

through 1950 to local school agencies that are overburdened with defense-incurred school enrollments or that provide schools for children upon Federal reservations or other federally owned property.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE

Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, approved February 26, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress continues the authority of the President through 1951 to control exports of certain commodities, excluding fats and oils when in domestic surplus. The law conforms to laws passed in the Eightieth and prior Congresses.

Voluntary agreements and plans (Public Law 6, approved February 9, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress extended for 6 months the operation of a law passed in the Eightieth Congress to allow industries to make voluntary agreements and plans where shortages exist.

Import and allocation powers re tin (Public Law 153, approved June 30, 1949)

The legislation extends through 1950 import and allocation controls over tin, in accordance with legislation passed in the Eightieth and prior Congresses.

Import controls over fats, oils, rice (Public Law 155, approved July 1, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress continued through 1950 the import controls over fats and oils and rice and rice products.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Reorganization Act of 1949 (Public Law 109, approved June 20, 1949)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation carries out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch which was created by the Eightieth Congress and which submitted its report early in 1949. The act gave the Chief Executive wide powers to correct the waste and mismanagement found in the present administration. Under the terms of the act the reorganization plans submitted by the President become law if not disapproved by a constitutional majority of either the Senate or the House within 60 days. Seven plans were presented pursuant to this legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. Plan No. 1 was voted down in the Senate by a strong majority because it failed to comply with the recommendations of the Commission. Plans 2 through 7 went into effect on August 19, 1949. They are:

No. 2 transfers the Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

No. 3 strengthens top-level organization of the Post Office Department.

No. 4 transfers National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

No. 5 makes Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 6 makes Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 7 transfers Public Roads Administration from Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, approved June 30, 1949)

This legislation was enacted to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to the handling of Government property, procurement of Government supplies, and establishment of General Services Administration.

State Department Organization (Public Law 73, approved May 26, 1949)

The reorganization of the State Department provided for in this legislation carries our recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Executive pay bill (awaiting Presidential action)

Salary increases granted heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies in this legislation are in general compliance with the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission.

Federal Employees' Classification Act revision (in conference)

The legislation revises the Classification Act granting salary increase to classified employees supplementing the cost-of-living increase for Government employees granted in the Eightieth Congress.

Postal pay raise (conference report filed)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation grants postal employees a salary increase.

HOUSING

Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Public Law 31, approved March 30, 1949)

This legislation continues the Rent Act of the Eightieth and prior Congresses with an added provision for local decontrol.

Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171, approved July 15, 1949)

Introduced by 11 members of each party, this legislation is the culmination of the efforts of a bipartisan group that has worked through several past sessions to enact a comprehensive housing law.

Alaska Housing Act (Public Law 52, approved April 23, 1949)

The legislation raises the dollar ceilings on mortgage loans on housing in Alaska and provides a secondary market for securities.

Alaska Public Works Act (Public Law 264, approved August 24, 1949)

Expenditure of $70,000,000 as authorized for a public-works program in Alaska for schools, hospitals, sewers, wharfs, docks, etc.

Advance planning of public works (Public Law 352, approved October 31, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, is a renewal of a similar program authorized in 1944 and carries on through October 13, 1951.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Continuation of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 47, approved April 19, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress renewed authorization for ECA in substantially the same form as the original authorization which was enacted in the Eightieth Congress under bipartisan leadership.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (Public Law 307, approved September 26, 1949)

Extension of reciprocal agreements in the Eighty-first Congress continued a program that has been in existence since 1932. The Eighty-first Congress voted down a Republican-sponsored amendment which would have directed the Tariff Commission to set the rate of duty below which the United States could not go in trade negotiation without endangering American industry. This amendment, which was added to the bill in the Eightieth Congress and operated successfully for a year, required the President to explain his action to the Congress and the people whenever he ignored the findings of the Tariff Commission. This provision, which offered a reasonable safeguard to American industry against the competition of cheap foreign labor, was defeated by the Democratic leadership on the grounds that it was restrictive legislation although the only possible restriction under the amendment was that imposed by public opinion. Subsequently the Senate reversed its position and adopted an amendment offered to the farm bill by a Democratic Member, which imposed restrictions on the imports of agricultural commodities.

Relief of Palestine refugees (Public Law 25, approved March 24, 1949)

This legislation authorizes a special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations for the relief of Arab refugees in Palestine.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs continued (Public Law 283, approved September 3, 1949)

The Eightieth Congress merged two Government corporations to form the Institute with a charter for 3 years. The Eighty-first Congress extends the life of the charter for 5 years and authorizes an appropriation.

North Atlantic Pact (ratified by Senate July 21, 1949)

The North Atlantic Pact was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress to fulfill part of the promise expressed in the so-called Vandenberg resolution adopted in the Eightieth Congress. The pact was ratified with strong bipartisan support.

International Wheat Agreement (ratified by Senate June 13, 1949)

The International Wheat Pact, unanimously deferred in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Eightieth Congress, was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress, and the Government was authorized to pay a subsidy necessary to encourage the export of 168,000,000 bushels of wheat for each of the next 5 years.

Continuation of economic assistance to Korea (awaiting House action)

The Eighty-first Congress is considering the continuation of the program of assistance to Korea provided for in the Eightieth Congress.

Military-assistance program (Public Law 329, approved October 6, 1949)

The President's program for military assistance was completely rewritten in the Congress by a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives working under Republican leadership. The blank check authority sought by the President to send arms anywhere in the world without specific consent of Congress was turned down. A program was authorized continuing certain existing military programs and limiting military assistance to the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact. A Republican-sponsored amendment was adopted on the floor to limit the expenditures of funds to integrated programs submitted by the Defense Committee of the North Atlantic Security Council and approved by the President.

LABOR

Minimum wage increase (in conference)

This legislation was offered by a large bipartisan group and conferees have agreed to increase the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. The law was amended in the Congress to provide present coverage and did not follow the President's recommendation for greatly extended coverage.

Overtime on overtime (Public Law 177, approved August 20, 1949)

Legislation was enacted by the Congress to clarify provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The law is retroactive and results from claims filed by employees and pending in the court.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

National Security Act amendments of 1949 (Public Law 216, approved August 10, 1949)

These amendments follow recommendations of the Hoover Commission to revise the action taken by the Eightieth Congress toward unifying the armed services. The law passed in the Eightieth Congress, to which these amendments are offered, was the first unification legislation although all previous

Congresses since Pearl Harbor had voiced the need for unification.

Under Secretary of Defense (Public Law 36, approved April 2, 1949)

Following the Hoover Commission recommendation, this law revises the unification law enacted by the Eightieth Congress to create this new position.

Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (Public Law 110, approved June 20, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress revised the administration of this agency which was established under the terms of the Unification Act of 1947, enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

Career (Military) Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, approved October 12, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress enacted this law on the basis of information gathered by the Hoover Commission established in the Eightieth Congress.

Long-range proving ground for guided missiles (Public Law 60, approved May 11, 1949)

This legislation authorized expenditure of $75,000,000 for construction of installations necessary for continuance of an existing program.

Land-based air warning system (radar) (Public Law 30, approved March 30, 1949)

Continuing a long-range program for adequate national defense, this legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations and facilities and authorizes expenditure of $85,500,000.

Unitary wind tunnel plan and air engineering development center (in conference)

This legislation makes possible the continuing program of national preparedness by authorizing construction of experimental and testing facilities in the field of transsonic and supersonic aeronautics.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Hospital survey and construction amendments of 1949 (awaiting Presidential action)

This act, introduced by two Members of each party, extends an existing program from 1951 to 1955, increases the annual authorization of expenditure of $150,000,000, and increases the Federal share of expenditure from one-third to a maximum of 66⅔ percent.

President's Commission on Naticnal Employ the Physically Handicapped Week (Public Law 162, approved July 11, 1949)

Seventy-five thousand dollars is authorized for the expenses of this Commission.

TRANSPORTATON AND COMMUNCATON

Post Office research program (Public Law 231, approved August 16, 1949

This legislation provides for research on equipment used by the Post Office Department and complies with recommendations found in the Task Force Report submitted to the Hoover Commission on organization of the executive branch.

Continuation of Maritime Commission authority to sell, charter, and operate vessels (Public Law 147, approved June 29, 1949)

The legislation grants extension to 1950 of law extended in the Eightieth Congress and prior Congresses.

VETERANS

Disabled veterans' special housing (Public Law 286, approved September 7, 1949)

Expands coverage of Public Law 702 of Eightieth Congress authorizing up to $10,000 for specially adapted housing to additional groups of veterans with serious service-connected disabilities.

Omnibus Disabled Veterans' Benefits Act (Public Law 339, approved October 10, 1949)

Amending existing law, this act increases compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, provides minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increases certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizes requirement for dependency allowances, and redefines "line of duty" and "willful misconduct."

Youths and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Youths and Crime," which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of October 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTHS AND CRIME

It does not speak well for those who control the routine work of the Congress that they should allow a measure of the importance of the youth corrections bill to gather dust in the files on Capitol Hill so long.

But it speaks well for the fate of the bill that Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, has dug it out and now is putting pressure behind it. We feel that there is full sincerity in Senator KILGORE'S interest because he was identified with child welfare and youthful correctional work long before he was even thought of as a national figure. So he is eminently qualified by experience to correctly appraise the provisions of the proposed measure and to fight through for it.

The bill is sponsored by the Judicial Conference of the United States which in itself would seem to guarantee its importance. We are informed that the pressure of this influential organization is now being directed toward the measure.

The bill would create a Federal Youth Correction Board composed of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons and two other Presidential appointees. Judges would not lose their power to pass specific sentences but could also sentence youths under the age of 24 to the custody of the Board instead of sending them to prison.

Each youth so sentenced would be sent to a classification center where he would be carefully studied by competent workers. The object would be to discover the underlying causes of his delinquency and investigate his mental and physical health, traits, capabilities, past record and other characteristics that would help in mapping a course of correctional treatment, rehabilitation, and planning for his future as a good citizen.

The Board would study the report of the classification center and would decide whether to send the youth to a training school, farm, forestry camp, hospital, or prison of a specified type, or to confine him under conditions deemed essential for the protection of the public, or whether to release him under supervision. No youth could be confined for more than 4 years and every youth would have to be released unconditionally from the custody of the Board at the end of 6 years.

Upon studying criminology one is at first surprised and alarmed at the fact that a high percentage of our criminals are young. We have fought the problem from the standpoint of preventing juvenile delinquency and have not given enough attention to curing it after it appears. When it develops into criminality we have considered punishment too much in the light of revenge and with little effort to arrive at an understanding of the causes of the problem and the cure. This has resulted in an increasing horde of confirmed criminals.

"The chief trouble with the present system is that many youthful offenders are hustled off to prison without much consideration for what the effect will be," says the Washington Post in a helpful editorial. "Some of these young men need a rather stiff dose of correctional medicine. Others can best be reclaimed to useful lives by very mild punishment. Obviously it is impossible for a judge to know in advance just what treatment to prescribe in each case. Under the measure which the judicial conference is sponsoring and which has wide support among judges and correctional officers, the task of making the punishment fit the needs of the youthful offender could be left to a Federal youth correction board."

It has been asserted by competent authorities that instead of 70 percent of our youthful offenders developing into hardened criminals, more than 70 percent can be rehabilitated and made useful members of society.

Congress owes it to humanity that Government be taken out of the horrible business of punishing young men for having made one mistake and place its force behind saving them for useful lives.

We hope Senator KILGORE will ride this bill good and hard from now on in to the end that it be enacted early in the next session. We know he is busy with a lot of things of great importance, but what could be more important than this measure?

We suspect that the Senator has resolved to do this.

Eight Points on the Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the July–August 1949 issue of Equal Rights entitled "Eight Points on the Equal Rights Amendment."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT POINTS ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Florence A. Armstrong, Ph. D.)

Important changes have occurred which have altered the position of the equal rights amendment in the eyes of many people. Some of these improvements in position are:

1. The Supreme Court in the Darby Lumber case reversed its stand on the constitutionality of legislation on wages and working conditions of men. Hitherto the Court had held that men (but not women) had freedom of contract in such matters. This change removed the only important reason for excluding men from protective legislation. Now such legislation if desirable can be extended to include all workers, not merely women. If it is not desirable, such legis-

lation should be eliminated completely. Organized labor now has power to attend to this aspect of protection as it sees fit.

2. The Attorney General has stated publicly that the equal rights amendment ought to be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States, to bring it into accord with the Charter and other documents of the United Nations which the United States has ratified without reservation, and which affirms as its purpose to promote human rights without distinction as to sex.

3. It has become generally recognized that the area of discrimination against women is far greater than the area of protection of women. Since the former reason (if any) to protect some women, in industry, has now disappeared, there is no longer even the semblance of justification to discriminate against all womankind as to fundamental rights in order to favor a little, a segment of womankind.

4. Furthermore, it has become evident that the equal rights amendment would have no effect at all on the legislation in the welfare field which is based on need, not on sex; such provisions as veterans' benefits, mothers' pensions, children's benefits, etc., are not under sex legislation, do not constitute a denial or abridgment of rights.

5. The present generation of women is profoundly unsettled and discontented on account of their peculiar status—having the right of suffrage, but no other constitutional rights. For over 100 years the women of the United States have struggled for these rights. They have seen women in other countries given constitutional equality, and they are deeply wounded psychologically at this time. Only the most careless observer can fail to sense this profound dissatisfaction and distrust. The psychological value of the equal-rights amendment would be incalculably vast and precious to the United States.

6. It is generally the view of scientists that the tendency of human evolution is toward the development of individual dignity and character. The equal-rights amendment—as the sequel to the suffrage amendment—would supplement and complete and fulfill the aim of generations of women to gain equal justice for every citizen; opportunity for full development without discrimination; the privileges of education; the right to earn a living and hold property without discrimination or hindrance; the right to worship according to conscience; and the right to make contracts, hold office, and share in the control of local, State, and Federal Governments. When the equal-rights amendment confers on women equality before the law and in the participation of the blessings of the rights covered in the Constitution of the United States, from which they are now so unjustly excluded, the psychological tone of American womanhood will immeasurably improve. The effect on our society will be vastly beneficial.

7. The equal-rights amendment would insure that in the future, governmental attempts to submerge women could not stand. Recent discriminatory State laws, and pending Federal proposals to discriminate on a national scale against women—as in proposed alterations in the social-security law—would not stand against a clear-cut constitutional amendment like the equal-rights amendment. Hence the future of womankind in the United States would be far safer than it is at present. Women, who have contributed so greatly to our civilization, deserve this protection which, as one educator expressed it, "should have been our birthright."

8. As years have passed, it has become clear that to remove discriminations State by State, as some opponents of the equal-rights amendment recommend, cannot be relied upon. States can restore discriminatory provisions as well as remove them. As Susan B. Anthony saw so clearly, only a Federal amendment can secure equal justice to women.

A Needed Kick in the Pants for Santa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "A Needed Kick in the Pants for Santa," published in the Tupelo Daily Journal, Tupelo, Miss., on October 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEEDED KICK IN THE PANTS FOR SANTA

Until recently we never thought we would feel obliged to speak harshly of Santa Claus. And if he limited his visits to one or two a year we still wouldn't think of doing such a thing.

But when he starts banging on the door with a gift every time we try to settle down to work, even Santa can become a nuisance.

Thus it is with the most recent proposal that Uncle Sam pay two-thirds, rather than one-third, of the cost of building local hospitals.

Under Mississippi's present hospital-construction program each community puts up one-third of the cost of the building, the State adds another third, and the Federal Government puts up the final third of the cost.

That is a reasonably sound method of local, State, Federal cooperation. And under it Mississippi has led America in developing a program to provide a modern hospital for almost every community which wants one.

Though this three-way fund-matching plan was working with complete success even in Mississippi, poorest of all the States, the House of Representatives has now voted by the overwhelming margin of 236 to 43 for Uncle Sam to pay two-thirds of the cost of hospital construction, leaving only a third to be financed jointly by States and local communities.

For Tupelo that will be just like a gift of $300,000 if the Senate goes along with the big House majority in approving the measure. And it's mighty hard to raise a voice of protest against such a generous hand-out from Uncle Sam.

But if Santa Claus keeps dashing down from Washington with another bag of money every time we start showing a little community initiative of our own, we will soon stop assuming any responsibility at all on the local level. The tendency then will be merely to sit around and talk about the things we need until Santa knocks on our door and passes out the dough.

As long as a community has to put up half, or at least a third, of the cost of a project, it will think twice in determining how costly to make the venture.

But when a community's share in a project dwindles to one-sixth or less of the total cost, refusal to accept the biggest Federal and State hand-outs that can be obtained is like kicking old Santa in the seat of the pants.

If Congress approves the new $150,000,000 hospital-construction bill—as it probably will—we in Tupelo will no doubt eagerly ask for our share. That is only natural, for we would be needlessly cutting our own throats to do otherwise.

But there are a couple of things we can't understand about Congress' way of thinking:

1. If poor old Mississippi can make outstanding progress in hospital construction under the old program of dividing costs into three equal shares, why can't the other 47 wealthier States do the same?

2. And if local communities don't have the money to build twice as large hospitals as they are now planning, where does Uncle Sam get the idea that he has the money to do the job for them? For he already is scheduled to spend $14,000,000,000 more than he takes in during the next 2 years.

Nomination of Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "A Senate Debate That Came to the Point," by Mr. Arthur Krock, which was published in the New York Times, on October 14, 1949.

The New York Times, of course, is one of the world's most outstanding newspapers, and Mr. Krock has frequently been honored as the most influential writer reporting the Washington scene. In this column, Mr. Krock presents a very fair, objective, and well-reasoned review of the Senate debate on the nomination of Mr. Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission. Obviously, Mr. Krock took time to examine the record before he wrote, and the result of his study is a real credit to Mr. Krock, his profession, and the fine newspaper for which he writes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATE DEBATE THAT CAME TO THE POINT
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 13.—In a discussion last night of the qualifications of Leland Olds to continue as a Federal Power Commissioner, a debate that filled 30 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senate, by a vote of 53 to 15, registered the following conclusions on the issues raised by his reappointment:

1. Party discipline, mentioned by the President, did not require any Democratic Senator to support the nomination if his convictions were to the contrary; and thus abandon a Senator's constitutional prerogative to decline in such circumstances to consent to a nomination.

2. The appointment could not be established as a party matter for Democrats by a mere announcement to this effect by a President who belongs to that party.

3. The fact that Mr. Olds twice (in 1939 and 1944) was confirmed by the Senate for the same office, after he wrote the anti-capitalist articles for the Federated Press on which for the first time he was thoroughly questoned by the committee in 1949, did not make rejection on this ground inconsistent this year because—

(A) No hearings were held on the nomination in 1939 and the existence of the articles was not called to Senate attention; (B) in 1944 they did not enter the discussion until confirmation was before the Senate, there were few Members on the floor and Mr. Olds' term was to expire next day.

4. The Commissioner, after having for 9 years "interpreted the Natural Gas Act exactly as it was written," now "has advocated the assumption of complete Federal control of natural independent gas producers * * * and that he has this authority" which "the act says he does not;

the legislative history says he does not; his own words say he does not; the courts say he does not." (The quotations are from Senator JOHNSON of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee which unanimously rejected Mr. Olds.)

5. He wrote the violent attacks on capitalism when he was 40 years old, which does not fit the parallel cited by Senator MORSE and others of "those who in a spirit of bitterness expressed such extreme views [in the same period]" and then "modified" these "and became stanch suporters of our capitalistic system and democratic processes."

GROUNDS OF REJECTION

The Senate, after listening to the long and interesting debate, concluded by a large majority that Mr. Olds had neither repented nor recanted what he wrote for the Federated Press in the twenties; that he planned secretly to nationalize the industries under his control by administrative violations of the law; and that he had stimulated a campaign of smearing against fellow commissioners and FPC staff members who obstructed this design. All these considerations were fully set forth in the discussion by opponents of Mr. Olds to absolve themselves from the charge that rejection was based solely on what this newspaper termed "the false issue of communism" or "the foolish one of party discipline."

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado carefully explained the circumstances by which the Federated Press writings of Mr. Olds were "for the first time brought to the attention of the Senate and the country," and complimented the subcommittee under his Texas namesake for a hearing than which none "more searching, and at the same time more equitable" was ever held by a congressional group. He said that he, as a member of the subcommittee in 1944 voted for a favorable report on Mr. Olds' nomination, was "surprised" when former Senator Moore, of Oklahoma, quoted from them that year on the Senate floor. And he agreed with Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona, that "by reason of the fact Russia was then our ally the charges were not taken as seriously as they should have been."

Senator JOHNSON of Texas addressed himself further to this point, saying:

"Is Mr. Olds to secure an exemption now from an honest, thorough scrutiny of his record, merely because twice before he has escaped scrutiny and because twice before he has been confirmed?"

THE CHARGE OF ILLEGALITY

This struck the Senate as a good reply to those who said that, because little was made of these articles in 1944, and the few then offered to the subcommittee were not even put in the report sent to the floor, they were not fairly an issue today.

But the size of the vote against confirmation, despite the political pressures applied to Democratic Senators by the President and the Democratic National Committee, was doubtless increased by the statement of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas that Mr. Olds intended to apply FPC regulation to the production and distribution of natural gas. The Texan capped his argument that this would be illegal by quoting the following from a Supreme Court opinion of June 20, 1949, dealing with this section of the act:

"The legislative history of this act is replete with evidence of the care taken by Congress to keep the power over the production and gathering of gas within the States. * * * Failure [by the FPC] to use such an important power for so long a time indicates to us that the Commission did not believe the power existed."

The argument here made and won was definitely against Mr. Olds' current acts and policies as a Federal Power Commissioner.

Progress of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have already had published in the RECORD transcripts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of my biweekly series of radio broadcasts. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD transcripts 5 to 11, inclusive.

There being no objection, the transcripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Transcript No. 5 in biweekly 1949 series of transcriptions for Pennsylvania radio stations by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, week end of July 22–24, inclusive]

When I started this biweekly series of broadcasts late in May, on some, but not all, of the stations now carrying it, I stated that it was not my intention to duplicate the newscasters and the newspapers with a play-by-play account of everything that is going on in Congress. I did say, however, that I considered it important to you, as the citizens of Pennsylvania, for me to try to give at least a brief account of some of my own legislative interests down here, particularly those of direct importance to Pennsylvania, or to localities in the State.

In this connection, I want to report on a few developments very briefly, just to keep you informed on them, and then I will take up in greater detail two or three subjects I think will be of interest to you.

First of all, I know that in a State like ours, where the mining and production of coal is one of our most important and basic industries, and where in some areas it is the main industry, you'll be interested in knowing that the Senate Labor Committee has just this past week approved a bill introduced by Senator NEELY and myself and a number of other Senators from both parties to tighten up mine safety laws so as to make it possible for Federal mine inspectors, under certain specified conditions, to shut down any mine where there is imminent danger to employees. Safeguards have been written into the bill to prevent abuses and to give mine operators their full rights in defending themselves against arbitrary use of this power. Pennsylvania already has good mine safety laws, but as the Pittsburgh Press pointed out recently, a strong Federal law would serve to make the State law even more effective.

Item 2: The Senate Appropriations Committee in reporting out the annual appropriation bill for the Interior Department has, I am happy to say, approved my request for adequate funds for Bureau of Mines activities having to do with a variety of functions carried out in Pennsylvania, not only in connection with coal mining and coal technology, mine safety, and so on, but involving basic research in steel, synthetic oil, second oil recovery, and many others—all of them important to Pennsylvania industry. On a previous broadcast in this series, I went into these problems in some detail, and I would be happy to send copies of that to any Pennsylvanians interested in these research activities of the Bureau of Mines.

Another item of Pennsylvania interest is a new housing bill, a private enterprise housing bill, on which the Senate Banking and Currency Committee plans to open hearings next Tuesday. This bill is designed mainly to help the private building industry build homes at prices and under financing terms within the reach of the great bulk of our citizens. It thus supplements the public housing bill recently signed into law, which is designed to help those in the very lowest-income brackets.

Now let's take a look at the over-all problem of our economy in these transition days from booming inflation to what we hope and trust will be—and are determined must be—a sane, stable, prosperous, balanced economy.

Several weeks ago, when I addressed the annual State convention in Philadelphia of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I said that despite all of our problems—and we have lots of them and some are serious—this country of ours is in mighty good shape.

Now, of course, when I made that statement, I was conscious of the fact that we have pools of unemployment in some parts of Pennsylvania—more worse unemployment in New England and elsewhere—and that does not make for smugness or complacency or optimism. I was conscious of the fact that business is down, particularly in manufacturing, and that profits are down. When I told the VFW the country was in good shape, I did not mean that these economic danger signals were unimportant and should be ignored. Quite the contrary.

My position was—and is—that the thing that puts us in such good shape, fundamentally, is the fact that practically all of our adult Americans, and a lot of the youngsters, too, are acutely conscious of what is going on in our economy, and are demanding corrective action before any temporary dislocation turns into panic or depression.

We didn't have that alertness and awareness in 1928 and 1929 and in the years immediately before when the seeds of the worst depression in our history were being nourished by the apathy and ignorance of the public on economic matters generally.

And so I say we are in good shape. It's an amazing tribute to the political growth and maturity of the American people that at a time when we have, as we did in June, nearly 60,000,000 people at work, and an economic level greater than at any time in our history except last year, the people are determined not merely that we avoid a depression, not merely that we minimize the spread of unemployment, but that we keep expanding this economy of ours—expanding it so that the youngsters coming out of school, the veterans completing their educations under the GI bill, the older workers whose jobs may have been lost as a result of technological advancement and new methods of manufacturing can readily be fitted into the production and distribution and service industries of America. And that's what we're driving toward—a continually bigger and better American economy with jobs for those who need them and want them, with opportunities for profitable new businesses, with desirable openings for our young professional people.

In his economic message to the Congress earlier this month, when he sent up the mid-year report of his Council of Economic Advisors, President Truman made a great contribution towards sane thinking in this situation by pointing out the essential soundness of our economy and the almost unlimited opportunities for expanding our horizons. At the same time, however, he did not make the mistake of President Hoover in 1929 in trying to minimize the importance of the danger signals, or of suggesting that all of our current economic ills can be corrected merely by the passage of time, by waiting and by doing nothing for fear of rocking the boat.

We've got to rock the boat a little bit and throw overboard some of the dead weight in our economic thinking accumulated during the past few years of inflation, of top dollar profits, of scarcity, sellers' markets, of free and easy job openings, of low productivity, of reckless speculation.

Business, I am happy to say, is in many lines learning all over again how to get out

and produce and sell at a price people can afford to pay. Some types of merchandise which move slowly under normal circumstances at this time of year are now finding buyers, lots of buyers, because prices have been cut dramatically and sensibly.

Speaking of competition for markets brings me to the matter of unfair competition for Pennsylvania industry as a result of low-wage, sweatshop conditions in certain areas of the country where products are made which compete with ours.

Something tangible and concrete, something dramatic, even if long overdue, was done about this matter in the Senate just the other day, and I think it important enough to Pennsylvania for me to tell you a little about it. I am referring to the action of the Senate Labor Committee—of all 13 members of the Senate Labor Committee, including Senator TAFT and four other Republicans, as well as the eight Democrats—in reporting out of committee a bill these 13 are jointly sponsoring to raise the minimum wage in interstate commerce from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour, from $16 a week for a 40-hour week to $30 a week.

At first glance, this may sound like a tremendous increase, and it is, in fact, an increase of 87½ percent. If any substantial portion of our employees had been making only $16 a week, and were immediately to be raised to $30 a week as a result of a law passed by Congress, the impact on our economy probably would be jolting, inflationary, and enough perhaps to bankrupt a good many businesses.

Actually, however, a comparatively few people will be directly affected, perhaps altogether about a million and a quarter workers Nation-wide now subject to the Wage-Hour Act. And in most of these instances, their increases in wages would be something around 15 cents an hour or less, simply because most of them are now making 60 cents or more. But the point is that some employers are still paying only 40 cents.

Now, what is the importance of all this to a State like ours? Actually, there are not very many workers in Pennsylvania making as little as 40, or even 60 cents an hour, although we do have pockets of low wages in some industries subject to the Wage-Hour Act, and their workers would, of course, receive an increase—as I think most of us agree they should. I'm talking now only of businesses in interstate commerce, because the bill itself does not materially widen coverage of the Wage-Hour Act or take in those employed in industries which perhaps might be regarded as affecting interstate commerce, as one of the original bills had provided.

But if we get through this increase in the minimum wage—and it will be the first such increase since the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed 11 years ago (when 40 cents an hour was just about equivalent in buying power to 75 cents today) it will mean that Pennsylvania textile workers, pottery workers, glass workers, and many others and Pennsylvania mills and factories, most of which pay good, decent, American living wages, will be able to compete on better terms with the sweat-shop products turned out in some parts of the country where the wage level actually might be $16 a week now, where it certainly doesn't begin to approach $30 a week.

Meanwhile, it has been suggested that a prompt start on the new public-housing bill recently passed by Congress and just signed the other day by President Truman will provide a tremendous impetus to the economy. I am very proud of my cosponsorship of the bill, which represents a culmination of 4 years of effort on the part of those of us in the Congress who believe in Federal aid to communities for the purpose of providing decent minimum housing conditions for those unable to buy or rent decent shelter.

Nearly all the mayors and city officials in Pennsylvania supported me in this fight, which was essentially a bipartisan one. In this connection, I would like to read now a letter I received from a prominent Philadelphian, William Reinhardt, chairman of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, which now operates a number of large Federal-aid public-housing projects in my own city. Mr. Reinhardt receives no pay for his public-spirited work in the housing field. He is therefore not financially involved in any of the benefits accruing from public-housing legislation. I read his letter now not because of the nice things it says about me—although I am, of course, flattered by them—but because it reflects the typical view of enlightened businessmen and civic leaders on this issue of decent housing. There are political references in this letter, but they are references by a good Republican writing to a good Democrat.

Mr. Reinhardt wrote:

"Congratulations on the passage of S. 1070 of which you are one of the sponsors.

"Congratulations, also, on the unanimous support given the bill by the Democratic Congressmen from Pennsylvania.

"Many thanks for your effective work in favor of this badly needed legislation.

"Only four of our Republican Congressmen from the State voted for the bill, although all the officials who signed the telegram to you are Republicans and worked hard to win the support of their fellow Republicans in Pennsylvania's congressional delegation.

"The bill never was a partisan measure, as witness the 57-13 (Senate) victory of S. 1070.

"It is my personal belief, as I told Congressman HARDIE SCOTT, that the 34 (House) Republicans who did vote for the bill are not leaving our party, but are leading it, and that the tremendous benefits which will come to every locality and State which takes advantage of the legislation, as well as to the Nation as a whole, will bring the majority of Republicans to follow the 34 in the not-too-distant future.

"The ideals of 'a decent home for every American family' transcends partisanship.

"It is as important for the welfare of our country that it do so as it is in connection with our foreign policy, in the opinion of this Republican.

"Despite all the charges of 'socialistic' made against S. 1070, this good Republican thinks that their passage brought no joy to the Kremlin, where it will be realized that this legislation will have world-wide effect in bolstering our efforts to prove that the American system of government is the best the world ever has devised.

"Again, thanks for all your efforts.

"Sincerely yours,

"WILLIAM REINHARDT,
"Chairman, Philadelphia Housing Authority."

As I wrote Mr. Reinhardt in reply, although we in the Democratic Party are deeply proud of the solid achievement represented by the enactment of this public housing bill, we succeeded after 4 years of failures only because so many Republicans like himself, civic leaders in their communities, backed us up to the hilt.

In my next broadcast I hope to be able to report on progress in the President's plan for channeling Government activity, procurement, and construction and loans into areas where there is now widespread unemployment.

[Transcript No. 6 in biweekly 1949 series of transcriptions for Pennsylvania radio station by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, week-end of August 5 to 7, inclusive]

It is pretty evident by now that the first session of the Eighty-first Congress is still far from adjourning. No one down here is particularly happy about that, for we would all like to take advantage of a hot August as an excuse for a good vacation. If we quit now, however, most of the Government would have to shut down, too. For about $30,000,000,000 worth of appropriations remain to be acted on.

Under the law which Congress passed in 1946 to govern its own conduct, we should have been finished a week ago with all of our work this session. The Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 provides for adjournment under normal circumstances before August 1. But we are far from through, and as I say, no one is particularly happy about it.

It would be hard to determine the one main reason why this Congress appears to be so far behind in its work. There are many of them. The filibuster early in the year in the Senate against efforts to revise the rules of the Senate in order to make filibusters less effective—and as you know, we lost that fight—set the Senate back many weeks. Not only was all business on the Senate floor shunted aside by the filibuster on the rules change, but the committees of the Senate were prohibited from meeting and working on legislation to prepare it for subsequent Senate debate. Another important cause of our present behind-schedule situation was the insistence of members of the committees of both the House and the Senate on doing a thoroughgoing job on individual bills to make them as perfect as possible.

I think if we had started out in this session to enact into law virtually unchanged the major administration measures on housing, social security, minimum wage, and many others which had failed of enactment in the Eightieth Congress, we could have gotten them through rather quickly, and then have taken our time in revising or improving them, and particularly in expanding them. Instead, in many of these instances, the committees started from scratch on drafting entirely new and usually much more comprehensive bills than the ones which had died in the Eightieth Congress and which a majority of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress had been committed to support.

There is another extremely important reason for the present situation of the Congress, having reached the first week in August with most of the appropriations for the Federal Government, covering the fiscal year beginning last July 1, still not acted upon. That reason is found in the determination of this Congress to go over the Federal budget—a $42,000,000 budget—with a fine-tooth comb in order to make every possible cut in spending.

In the Senate we have a log jam of appropriation bills awaiting action—the ECA bill, the Interior bill, which includes the Bureau of Mines among others, and also the main appropriation bill for all of the military services.

The interesting thing is that on each item in most of these bills, amendments are being offered to cut either percentagewise or by some arbitrary figure and there has been extended debate, item by item, on these bills as they have come before us. In a democracy this is healthy, because by the time we pass these bills, we have a much clearer conception of what the money is being used for, and how it is being used. But it does take time—lots of it.

We spent days on the independent offices bill, until we passed it Tuesday night, a bill which in previous years used to pass after perhaps 45 minutes debate, or even as much as a day's debate unless there were one or two extremely controversial items in it, in which case the debate on those few items might be long and strong. But this time, we have had a great deal of debate on almost all of the items—items, incidentally, which totaled $7,500,000,000.

The end result of all of this tremendous study, item by item, into the appropriation bills has not, however, led to any commensurate reductions in the budget. There have

been reductions in the budget—many of them—but they seldom add up dollarwise to any substantial proportion of a $42,000,000,000 budget. On the whole, the President's budget has stood up well under the most intense scrutiny.

So when you write me, as so many Pennsylvanians do, to please cut the budget, I think you should know that Congress is appropriating no money with its eyes shut, and without a pretty good conception of how the money is to be spent, and without pretty firm convictions that the spending of this money is vital to our security and our defense, and our domestic economy, and the health and safety of our people.

On my last broadcast in this series 2 weeks ago, I said that I hoped today to be able to bring you the latest developments in the program announced by President Truman on July 11 in his midyear economic report, for combating spot unemployment. This program, as you have no doubt read in your newspapers, is designed to channel present Government spending programs, on procurement and construction, for instance, and also Federal loan and grant programs into areas of the country where there is at present a high incidence of unemployment. I am glad to be able to report today that the agencies of the Government which have been instructed by the President to carry this program into effect seem to be wasting no time and seem to be following what I regard as a rather sensible course. So far, however, the application of this program has been limited since it is brand new—under a new concept.

The day the President made his report to Congress, a 126-page report in which this particular program was disclosed in a paragraph or two, I immediately wrote to the President calling his attention to the situation in the entire anthracite region in Pennsylvania, where there is, and has been, an alarmingly high level of male unemployment. I called his attention also to the freight-car building industry in McKees Rocks, and Butler, and Greenville, Altoona, Johnstown, Berwick, Milton, Sharon, and elsewhere in Pennsylvania, where thousands of skilled workers are either now out of employment, or soon to be out of employment because of cutbacks in orders from the railroads for new cars.

On the area-by-area unemployment problem, progress is being made. Much of the emphasis on this program is going into New England where unemployment has been at the highest level of any area in the country. You have been reading, I am sure, about the conferences that have been going on up there between the governors and the Secretary of Commerce in mapping out a program that will be effective.

Department of Commerce officials, meanwhile, have just made a survey trip into Wilkes-Barre and Scranton and have prepared a report which indicates great possibilities for effective Federal aid through the channeling of Government contracts and Government purchasing into plants which have had to shut down or to lay off a large percentage of their workers because of lack of orders. I was interested to see that the Commerce experts compiled a plant-by-plant list in those areas, showing what each idle or partially idle plant could do, and what sort of orders it could take. These lists are being referred to all of the agencies of the Government which are now buying equipment and supplies, and wherever possible, efforts will be made to bring these plants into the program.

This is not a relief program, not a make-work program entailing additional Government expense or pump priming. The Government buys tremendous quantities of goods. Within the budget limitations set down by Congress, this aid would represent only a better distribution of Government ordering and Government purchasing, so that the effects of this business could help to restore employment and purchasing power in areas of temporary economic dislocation.

We've been trying to work out a similar program for the Erie area, where unemployment according to the last reports, stood at about 12 percent, a figure sufficiently high to justify its inclusion in this program. In most of the areas where this program is being studied on a preliminary basis, however, the unemployment level is even higher than that figure.

I want to repeat again that this purchasing and procurement and construction plan is no panacea for all of our economic problems. What it can do is merely to bring up the average of the employment opportunities and the purchasing power in limited areas where local economic conditions are out of balance, where cut-backs in consumer demand for local products have resulted in lay-offs and shut-downs. We have strong evidence in such fields as textiles and shoes, for instance, that inventory buying and increased consumer demand resulting from lower prices are exerting a very healthy influence at the manufacturing level. I think price by itself is one of the strongest factors in reviving manufacturing industries which have recently suffered the pinch of reduced consumer demand.

The evidence is strong that consumer demand has fallen off to the extent that it has, not because consumers aren't anxious to buy, and in many cases aren't able to buy, but because they won't buy at price levels they regard as out of line.

There are few lines of businesses, particularly in manufacturing, which would not be helped tremendously by a good healthy cut in prices. Those firms which have tried it—perhaps in desperation—are finding huge buyer response. Price cuts mean lower unit profits, but high unit profits are meaningless if sales are slow. The scarcity market is about gone now, and now is the time for private enterprise to demonstrate once again, as it has often in the past, that it can sell the goods the people want and need at prices they can afford.

The fact must not be forgotten that our national income is in the two hundreds of billions a year; that buying power is simply enormous, that wages generally have held up, thus sustaining that buying power. We have tried and tested cushions against depression which are now working and working well—particularly unemployment compensation, social security, minimum-wage legislation, bank-deposit insurance, guaranties to builders and bankers on new housing construction and housing repair, Federal housing, and numerous others—all designed to maintain a healthy economy. Nearly all of these programs require overhauling to bring them up to date in a high-level economy, but fundamentally, they're sound.

The key to their soundness is not whether they succeed in lavishing huge quantities of Federal funds in gifts and hand-outs to the people. That's the implication of the attacks on most of these programs under the term "the welfare state." Actually, all of these programs are designed primarily to strengthen the free-enterprise, capitalist system in America, and to guarantee its continuance, unchallenged by any totalitarian theory. These programs protect the health of the free-enterprise system by assuring mass purchasing power among our people—among all our people—so that all Americans are able to buy the things they help to produce. Otherwise, the automobile industry would be a luxury industry; the television industry could sell only to the rich. Our whole system would wither and die if the people—the mass of the people—were not customers as well as producers.

The final item in this broadcast is about commemorative days, particularly Flag Day, celebrated each June 14. The day is now official. Just this past Wednesday I had the honor of being present in the White House when President Truman signed a bill sponsored by Congressman WALTER, of Easton, and myself to make Flag Day an official United States observance. Up to now its observance, although widespread and although officially proclaimed in some States, has been unofficial nationally. Officials of the Patriotic Order, Sons of America, and of the American Flag Day Association have been active for years in promoting this measure, and I am happy that I had a part in the successful culmination of their campaign.

Bills to establish commemorative days by act of Congress are introduced each year in great volume, but only a tiny proportion of them ever pass. I've had good luck with most of mine, nearly all of which have become law. Among them were George Washington Carver Day on January 5, the anniversary of the death of the great slave-born Negro scientist, and also National Freedom Day each February 1, commemorating the enactment of the joint resolution which led to the thirteenth amendment ending slavery. The late Maj. R. R. Wright, venerable Philadelphia banker, also born a slave, was the originator of the Freedom Day movement.

Now a word about my next broadcast in 2 weeks over this station: I plan to discuss a program of importance to every community in the State. As a citizen in your community, and as an individual wage earner, businessman, professional worker, or homemaker, you will, I feel sure, be interested in the matter I will discuss at that time.

[Transcript No. 7 in biweekly 1949 series of transcriptions for Pennsylvania radio stations by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, week end of August 19–21, inclusive]

Both the House and the Senate have been demonstrating a good deal of snappishness and irritability recently, probably due in part to the crowded conditions in temporary headquarters. Members are anxious to go home and see what the people back home are really thinking about.

Our mail gives us a very distorted picture. People write to their Congressman or to their Senators usually only when they are upset about something, and the mail—a very heavy mail in my case, and I suppose in most other cases—reflects irritability and unhappiness, some desperation, and tremendous bitterness.

I have been more than a little puzzled by this bitterness which is evident in so much of the mail I receive. Certainly the entire State of Pennsylvania is not inhabited by unhappy men and women, resigned to all sorts of inevitable disasters unless the Congress promptly passes—or refuses to pass—this bill or that bill.

The lobbyists and the pressure groups, always active year around, seem to be operating more vigorously than ever right now in a last-ditch effort to assure congressional action on their pet measures in this crowded and far-behind-in-its-work session of Congress. And other pressure groups and lobbyists, with renewed vitality—and frankly I don't know where they get all their energy in this heat—are just as actively trying to block Congressional action on numerous bills of major importance now programed as "must" legislation in the final weeks of this session.

So the atmosphere here is one of constant clash, violent opinions, deep-seated antagonisms, and a great deal of bitterness. Perhaps that is inevitable in a free nation of free peoples shaping their destiny on the anvil of public opinion and through democratic processes allowing free reign to all shades of belief.

But it might be advisable for more of us in the Congress, and more of the general public, too, to take stock these days on the really unprecedented extent of our blessings

and our well-being here in America, of the soundness of our economy even with obvious dislocations here and there, of the basic feeling of security of most of our people working at good wages, of the complete security of our own fundamental freedoms despite the impact of a war which we were told 10 years ago would destroy every American freedom, whether we won that war or lost it.

One of the things which brought this whole subject forcibly to my mind was a rather personal experience just a few days ago, after former President Hoover had made a speech in California in which he warned with all sincerity that in his opinion this country was traveling down the last mile to collectivism, bartering away its freedoms for economic panaceas.

These words came as no surprise from our illustrious and universally respected former President, and coming as they did, on his seventy-fifth birthday, they represented the summation of an economic philosophy with which he has always been closely identified. It is an honest philosophy, based on honest convictions, and one held, I might say, by a sizable portion of our electorate as shown by the volume of minority votes in the last five presidential elections.

In any event, after Mr. Hoover made his address, the newspapermen scurried around looking for comment on this speech from representative Members of Congress for the customary reaction story. As the Assistant Majority Leader of the Senate, I was asked to comment, and this is what I said:

"On the economic front, Mr. Hoover has learned nothing in 16 years. He is raising the same cry that he and those of his political views have raised for 16 years. The whole structure of the Government is so much sounder and more stable than it was in 1932 when he was President that I think of no other answer"—I suppose a better word might have been "comment"—"and I think no other answer might have been required."

Since the news articles appeared contained this comment by me, I have received letters from all over the country denouncing me for what these writers regarded as a "base insult and dirty attack" on one of our outstanding Americans, and of course it was no such thing. I honestly and sincerely believe that Mr. Hoover, who has served his country and all humanity honestly and conscientiously and well in many outstanding ways, particularly since the war, has not been flexible in his economic thinking, did not cope successfully with the major problems which faced his own administration during a depression which nearly ended American liberties, and has not indicated since his retirement from the Presidency any conception of the merits of reforms undertaken in our national life, particularly in our economy, in the last 17 years. These programs were designed to bolster the foundations, not of statism, or collectivism, or socialism in America, but of the free enterprise, capitalist system, by making free enterprise vastly stronger and more stable than it was prior to 1933.

It is not my intention in this broadcast to argue this point, because it is a point that can be argued endlessly, and is argued in every political campaign, as it should be, because it is one of our basic issues in determining national policy.

My purpose in mentioning this incident goes back to the comments I made just a few minutes ago. Many of the people who wrote to me took the occasion not so much to disagree on the merits of what I had said, as to indulge in a blast of bitterness against the Government, and everyone in it, and to heap personal abuse on everyone who has been connected with the administrations of the last 17 years, and particularly Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. As for me, I was usually dismissed in these letters as merely a stupid follower of venal and vicious leaders like President Roosevelt in a conspiracy to destroy America. I got off easy, as a somewhat pitiful character who didn't know any better.

I have received letters such as this ever since I came to the Congress in 1939. In those days, and in the tragic years which followed, our lives and our safety and our existence as a nation hung in the balance on the decisions reached by this Government, a Government which certainly made mistakes, which certainly made some wrong guesses and bad guesses, but which on the whole did a pretty commendable job, a bipartisan, nonpartisan, unified job, in which all the people participated, most of them to the limits of their ability.

In the years since the war has ended, this unity has been evaporating alarmingly. The drive for personal advantage, for profits, for power, for selfish purposes of all kinds has been almost indecent in its excesses.

Things have been so good for so many of our people—the workers who have been earning more and living better than at any time in our history, the businessmen who made greater profits and enjoyed greater expansion than at any time in history—that the better we have done, it seems, the less each of us individually has been satisfied. Efforts to raise the living standards of all of our people, particularly those in the lowest level, have been bitterly resisted in some quarters out of fear that this might lead to slightly lower profits, and result in less competition for starvation wages—and they do exist in some parts of the country.

Each of the programs proposed by this administration to raise living standards and to improve levels of health, education, social security, and so on, can be attacked on its merits, is susceptible to opposition on the basis of the facts, and the details of the individual proposals. That is how they should be discussed. Too often, however, the opposition is based on bogeyman words, catch phrases about a welfare state, predictions of doom for the free enterprise system, as evidences of statism or totalitarianism and the demise of American freedom.

May I only suggest this: That we get on the beam, direct our arguments to the issues and not be so prompt to write off America as a lost nation in a lost world.

Within sound of my voice today are undoubtedly numerous individuals who have suffered hardships, loss of jobs, loss of income, and who are not today secure in their economic well-being. Is that true of most of us? Of the great overwhelming majority of us? I wish you would answer that question for yourself.

I have devoted a whole lot more time to this matter than I had intended to on this broadcast. But, as I said, I have been deeply impressed by how bitter so many Americans have become in the midst of plenty, in the midst of enjoyment of so many of God's blessings which have come to this land of ours, in the midst of so many physical comforts and physical conveniences, in the midst of a freedom which millions upon millions of souls throughout the world pray to achieve for themselves, suffer to achieve, give their lives—as martyrs have in some of the iron-curtain nations—to advance the day when their fellow countrymen might achieve such a goal.

Our taxes are high and often burdensome and in some instances perhaps even intolerable; our responsibilities as citizens are frequently heavy. But how little, really, is the price we pay for what we enjoy.

In my previous broadcast two weeks ago, I said I would today discuss a matter of great importance to every community in Pennsylvania. I think I had better get to that subject now. It is a bill now before both Houses of Congress to spend $100,000,000 of Federal funds—a sore point, perhaps, among some of my listeners who are already severely disturbed by the amount of Government spending which we are now doing.

This bill, however, is in a somewhat different grouping from the so-called wasteful and extravagant categories in which so much of our Federal expenditures are placed by critics of the administration. This is money which will, in most instances, come back to the Government in full.

The bill I am referring to, recently reported out favorably by the Senate Public Works Committee—incidentally, with bipartisan support—would authorize the establishment of a new fund of $100,000,000 to be available to communities all over the Nation as loans for advance planning on necessary public construction work, on highways, sewers, bridges, schools, municipal buildings, and numerous other local public works.

So that there will be no misunderstanding of the purpose of this program, I think I had better repeat that these are loans—not grants—for engineering planning work—not for construction work, not for a new WPA or PWA, but for drafting of plans and specifications only. There is absolutely no commitment that the Federal Government now—or in the future—intends to pay any part of the construction costs of these projects.

This is not a new and untried program. Shortly before the end of the war in our historic War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 a program of this sort was first authorized. The following year, when the appropriation for it came up, the House allowed only $5,000,000 instead of the $65,000,000 requested by the administration. One of my first fights in the Senate was in behalf of the full appropriation, which we finally succeeded in getting piecemeal in three separate appropriation bills over a period of 2 years. That money, just about all of it, has been used for the purposes we intended. The program expired in mid-1947, and the Eightieth Congress refused to renew it, unfortunately.

As a result of that refusal, numerous communities in Pennsylvania were left out in the cold in their efforts to obtain loans for the planning of schools, sewers, bridge improvements, water systems, and other necessary, although not immediately urgent, public works. This was particularly true in Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Schuylkill Counties, three of the worst unemployment areas in the State today, where any efforts to create employment through the construction of these necessary facilities would be handicapped now by the failure to have complete plans ready to use.

On the other hand, the records show, that out of the $65,000,000 made available in 1945 and 1946 school districts in Philadelphia, Punxsutawney, Homestead, Lancaster, and elsewhere have been able not only to plan new buildings, but to start actual construction on them and have paid in full the loans which the Government made. For about a quarter of a million dollars in such loans, these communities, and others, with water or sewer projects under way, were able to plan construction work valued at nearly $20,000,000.

Furthermore, an additional $203,000,000 worth of construction work, bridges, and sewers in Harrisburg, streets and sewers and playgrounds in Pittsburgh, a city hall in Williamsport, and sewage-disposal systems in cities and towns along all of our rivers, is all completely planned and ready to go into construction, practically tomorrow. These plans cost a little over $2,000,000. Other advance planning loans totaling a million and a half are being devoted now to similar work in towns like Allentown, Chambersburg, Blairsville, Dubois, Charleroi, Doylestown, Monessen, and many others.

Almost every community in the State which is conforming to the State's anti-stream pollution laws has been able to do so

only because of the availability of this fund in the past few years in providing money for the necessary preliminary planning work.

So here is a case of Federal expenditure, of Federal spending, which we seldom think of when we denounce Government spending as such, and yet it is typical of many programs now in our budget, which cost the Government money, but which are in fact investments in a better America, and pay us back many fold, not only in value received, but in this one program at least, will pay us back virtually dollar for dollar.

A $2,000,000 sanitation system in Johnstown, a half-million-dollar sewage system in Clearfield, five schools in Allentown (which will cost about $3,500,000), Wilkes-Barre's $3,000,000 sewage system, and a similar one in Harrisburg, a $7,500,000 one in Scranton, nearly $8,000,000 worth of school construction in Philadelphia—these are sorts of projects to be paid for locally which are speeded toward the construction stage by the Federal program we have had in the past.

When, as, and if this new bill is passed, and I hope it will be soon, your own community, if it did not do so the last time, or was unable to qualify in the previous program because there were insufficient funds available, should be on its toes and apply early.

[Transcript No. 8 in biweekly series by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS over Pennsylvania radio stations, week end of September 2–4, inclusive]

Labor Day week end to most Americans usually means a last fling before the end of the vacation season, a reminder that it's time for the children to go back to school and for the stores to bring out their fall merchandise. The lazy summer days are over.

To us in the Congress, however, Labor Day week end means a brief respite from unusually long and continuous sessions—our first vacation of any kind this year, and a very short one at that.

Since this is the Labor Day week end it might be appropriate to turn away for a few minutes from the hurly-burly of Washington, from the constant political battles of the Congress, and of national policy and pay some attention to this holiday which we are celebrating, each of us in our own way.

It is hard for anyone who has not been close to the struggles and aspirations of organized labor over the years to have much real conception of what this day means to the men and women who banded together for mutual defense and progress in labor unions in the days when there was no Wagner Act, and there were no guaranties by law of the rights of labor to organize free from coercion and from black-listing and from fear of economic vengeance by anti-union employers. In the days when many of our unions were organized it took the greatest kind of individual courage on the part of every man and woman to join a union. Men with families were particularly vulnerable, for although a man can put up with almost anything for a cause in which he believes, if he bears the full brunt of the responsibility and suffering himself; when that suffering is fastened on his wife and children it is hard for a man to take.

Today, belonging to a labor union is not only common among American wage earners in industry and commerce, but it has also become respectable. There are several reasons for this, one being the fact that our unions, despite the most intense hardships and handicaps, persevered and grew. Another was the recognition by the Federal Government that effective labor organizations were necessary institutions in a complex industrial society such as we have today where a single employer in many instances can, through his wage policies or employment policies, dominate the economic life blood of whole communities and areas of the country.

A high degree of the credit for making membership in a labor union respectable today lies in the increasing understanding of the American people—of all the American people—of political and economic issues which 20 years ago, say, were not considered of much concern to the average individual. The higher standards of wages and working conditions achieved by labor unions for their own members have had a beneficial effect on the entire economy, and have been responsible to a large extent for the steady progress we have made since the depths of the depression in establishing an American economy which rests upon a broad base of mass purchasing power in the hands of all the people.

Although I am, of course, very much aware of the abuses of some labor leaders, of the racketeering and the irresponsibility which have been found among some segments of labor, I am very much impressed—as I think most Americans are—by the fact that organized labor in America by and large has come of age, has matured, has grown up. Labor used to be concerned only with wages and hours and working conditions. Labor used to be concerned only with the benefits it could obtain for its own members in its own fields of jurisdiction.

In the last 10 or 15 years, however, the people of America have learned to expect from our major labor organizations an alert interest in every phase of our national and international problems, an interest demonstrated by these union organizations not merely as representatives of a particular group of workers in a particular industry, but as representatives of these same men and women primarily as American citizens.

This is particularly true in the field of foreign policy. The achievement of a decent world, the achievement of a world in which we can prevent wars, and in which we can maintain our own freedom and encourage the spread of freedom elsewhere is the greatest concern today of every American citizen, whether he makes stockings or steam engines, whether he clerks in a store or directs the greatest corporation on the industrial scene. Most Americans realize that, and are active participants, not merely spectators, in this crusade led by the United States for a better world. Millions of these men and women organized together in our major labor organizations are participating directly in their Government through the efforts of these union groups. Time and again I have heard leaders in our foreign policy report on the invaluable assistance they have received from the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railroad brotherhoods in finding common grounds with the working men and women of Great Britain and France and Belgium and Holland and the other countries participating with us in the Marshall plan and in the North Atlantic Security Pact.

Labor has been in the forefront of support for the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, the Voice of America program, and the world-wide battle of democracy against the totalitarian menace to free peoples represented by Soviet Union Communist imperialism.

I think all of us as Americans appreciate the effective aid which the wage earners of America banded together in labor unions have given this Nation in demonstrating to the world the unchallengeable advantages of democracy over any brand of totalitarianism. Through their unions they have been telling their counterparts in other nations, the workers of other nations, the real story of America and in terms and in language that workers everywhere can understand—in terms of opportunity, security, good working conditions, fair wages, education for their children, and the unlimited opportunities of their children to climb to the heights of success in any and every field in America.

In our drive to block the spread of communism over free nations in Europe and elsewhere, a drive which is succeeding much beyond our hopes of 3 years ago, when Europe was prostrate, and the ground for communism was fertile, we have no better ally than the true, unvarnished facts about America. No one can give those facts as convincingly to a European worker as can a worker of the United States who has learned through his union the methods of communication with fellow workers everywhere.

Labor Day, 1949, occurs during a very crucial period of labor-management relations here in the United States. The question before all of us as citizens is where our economy is headed, an economy we know is essentially sound, but which must remain dynamic if it is to survive. Employment opportunities have slackened off somewhat since the booming peak of last year, while our labor force is being expanded by veterans completing their educations under the GI bill and by the customary increment of youngsters coming out of school during a time of expanding population. Our job is to see to it that there are jobs for these youngsters, and opportunities for economic advancement for the veterans who have learned trades or have been trained in professions while at the same time making sure that our older workers, particularly those over 40, and still far from retirement age, are not pushed aside and thrown on the scrap heap, their skills wasted.

To do all these things, we can't just rest on a 60-million job economy; we must have an economy which is flexible and expanding and, as I said, dynamic—an economy which recognizes that the well-being of each of us requires continually improved economic conditions for all of us.

In this situation, labor and management alike, battling over the so-called fourth round of postwar wage-contract agreements must exercise reasonableness and fairness and industrial statesmanship on both sides. Industry must squeeze a lot more of the inflation out of its prices; labor must see to it that the price level is not jolted upward by unreasonable demands. There is a middle ground here, and it must be found by both sides.

And now for a few brief reports on what's been happening here in Washington, at least insofar as I have been directly connected with them, in the 2 weeks since my last broadcast.

The Senate before recessing passed a minimum-wage bill which increases the minimum for work done in interstate commerce by 87½ percent—which sounds like a lot—from 40 to 75 cents an hour. Actually, only a small percentage of our working population will be affected by that increase, since here in Pennsylvania and in many others of our industrial States, most workers in interstate commerce already receive more than 75 cents an hour. This was, however, a historic event for a State like ours, for, by providing a floor of $30 a week for all full-time workers affected by the Fair Labor Standards Act, we in Pennsylvania are protected against the unfair, cutthroat competition our industries face today from firms in other parts of the country making similar products in sweatshops, paying, believe it or not, as little as $16 a week—a disgraceful starvation wage.

The minimum wage should have been raised years ago from its 1938 recession level of 40 cents an hour. The last two Congresses ignored the issue. This Congress, I am happy to say, faced up to it.

Of particular interest to Philadelphia, but of interest to all Pennsylvanians, is the fact that the Senate in passing the Interior De-

partment appropriation bill accepted my amendment to provide the full amount of $4,435,000 for the Federal costs of making a national historic park of the Independence Hall area of Philadelphia. The House had provided only $500,000 in cash for this project, but the Senate has provided contract authorization for the remainder of the cost so that the work of land acquisition can go forward without delay. By having the full amount available, the Government should be able to save money in the long run instead of coming back to Congress each year for piecemeal appropriations.

I am greatly pleased by the progress being made under the President's program into areas of high, spot unemployment. In addition to Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, the Pottsville labor market area, which includes Schuylkill County, is being placed on the list of critical unemployment areas, and will benefit from this program.

Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have been approved for new low-rent public-housing projects under the Housing Act of 1949, of which I was proud to be a cosponsor. Allocations out of the new program of 5,000 units for the Pittsburgh Housing Authority, and 10,000 units for the Philadelphia Housing Authority were just announced Wednesday. Other housing authorities in Pennsylvania should shortly be notified of additional allocations for projects which they have submitted for consideration.

I hope your Labor Day week end is a pleasant one. I will be back with you again over this same radio station in 2 weeks.

[Transcript No. 9 in biweekly 1949 series by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS over Pennsylvania radio stations, week end of September 16–18, inclusive]

Some time ago, on one of the previous broadcasts I made on this biweekly series of reports to the people of Pennsylvania, I said that it might be helpful to me and to you if I devoted one of these reports to the subject of letter writing, particularly the letters you send to me in Washington.

Now, although National letter-writing week isn't until the middle of next month, I think this might be a good time for me to take up that subject for just about every day in the year is Write-to-Senator-Myers day for a lot of Pennsylvanians.

I welcome those communications and I find them extremely helpful. But I think that many of your letters can be of greater help to me and of more benefit to you in getting your ideas across if you will observe a few basic principles which I will discuss a little later in this broadcast.

First, however, I want to take a few moments to comment on one or two current developments in Washington.

The Senate has demonstrated once again in what I am sure is convincing fashion to the whole world that isolationism—economic isolationism as well as political isolationism—is out of style in postwar America in an atomic age. Let us hope it never revives.

The Senate has passed the Reciprocal Trade Act to restore the machinery by which world peace can be vigorously promoted by the flow of world trade. A little over a year ago when the Congress passed a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act with a number of very serious reservations, all of us who believe in this program were very deeply concerned about its future. The act we have had on the books for the last year has not operated successfully. The House of Representatives early this year restored the program to its original scope and now that the Senate has passed the bill, we can look forward to a renewal of the reciprocal trade program more closely along the lines of those established by our former great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Passage of the Reciprocal Trade Act following a succession of other events in the Congress—such as the extension of the European Recovery Act, that is, the Marshall plan, and the ratification by the Senate of the North Atlantic Pact—demonstrates the maturity and understanding of the American people in pressing ever forward for a better world, a world at peace, a world in which freedom can survive.

One other item, this one about our worst public enemy, our No. 1 killer, heart disease. The Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency notified me the other day that further steps toward curbing this ruthless killer are under way in Pennsylvania through grants just made to the University of Pennsylvania Hospital and to Children's Hospital, both in Philadelphia, for the construction of new cardiovascular research facilities. The university hospital will receive a grant of $373,450 and the Children's Hospital of $320,100 for new construction to house facilities to combat heart illnesses. These grants are part of a $6,000,000 appropriation recently voted by the Congress.

And now to the subject of the letters you send to your Congressman or your Senators:

I think it was Emily Post who had a column some time ago in the newspapers on the proper etiquette in writing to Members of Congress—how the Member should be addressed, the general tenor of what you should say, and since this was a little lesson in etiquette, it was recommended, as I recall, that you try to keep the letters polite.

Actually we're not much concerned about the etiquette. It doesn't make much difference whether the letter is addressed to "Dear Senator MYERS"—the usual salutation—or "Your Highness" or "Your Honor" or "Excellency" or any other such fancy terms we sometimes find in the correspondence, or starts out as some do, with "Look here, you fathead." The only important things about a letter that you send to your Senator, or to any Member of Congress, are the facts contained in that letter.

The most important fact, and the one most often omitted, by people who write in asking us to do one thing or not to do another thing, is "why."

Why should we? And also why are you interested in it? These are very important questions to answer, and often they are not answered.

I receive a simply incredible volume of form mail which says "Vote for H. R. such-and-such exclamation mark" or "Vote against Senate bill such-and-such exclamation mark." That's all they say. Usually the sender signs his name, but often they neglect to give their addresses. Let me follow up for a minute on what happens with these "vote for" or "vote against" communications which say nothing more than that. Perhaps some Senators or Congressmen keep count on these, as a sort of public-opinion poll, but any Member of Congress who has been here for any length of time realizes that these are not reliable guides to public opinion in their districts or States. All they indicate is that one pressure group or another has been extremely active in getting people to sign their names to post cards or to fill out a form letter, and very often these people are just doing a favor for a friend with no clear-cut idea of what the issue is all about or without much interest in it.

That's not general by any means, and certainly does not apply to the great bulk of the mail which comes from individuals who are personally concerned about the issue to which they address themselves. But here again I find innumerable instances of persons in an excellent position to give good, factual arguments, based on personal knowledge, and personal experience, to support the cause they write me about, and they fail to give me the advantage of this information and this knowledge. That isn't quite fair to me, and it certainly isn't fair to the person who writes such a half-letter.

I don't know whether you've ever written a letter to your Senator or your Congressman. The chances are probably 50–50 that you have. If you have, think back for a moment what you might have written, particularly if you wrote to me. Was it a complete letter—did it, for instance, translate the national issue you were writing about into terms of your own locality, your own business or job, your own neighborhood? I'll tell you that letters that do those things are effective letters. They are read, and read carefully. Every so often I put a letter of that type into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call it to the attention of all Members of Congress. Whether such a letter coincides with my point of view or not, whether it supports or opposes a point of view to which I may feel committed, it may do much more than merely notify me of your own belief—it may change my belief, and my vote; it may open up to me an altogether new course of action which had not previously occurred to me; and it will certainly, if it is an informed letter, based on facts and personal knowledge of a situation, make me hesitate, and think not just twice, but three times or more, about voting in opposition to the views expressed in such a letter.

On all of the major issues we separate out this informed mail quickly and go over it carefully. I have made many speeches in the Senate based entirely on letters of this kind, from people who knew whereof they wrote. It doesn't make any difference who they're from or the degree of education they reflect; the grammar is not important; the looks of the letter is not important; it might be a postcard scribbled hurriedly by someone on the run. More often, however, it's a letter which takes sufficient time to marshal one's thoughts.

I'm thinking particularly of the letters I receive from many Pennsylvania businessmen on the issue of delivered pricing, a very technical, complex subject deep in legal controversy, but highly important to all industry in a State like ours. I received hundreds of letters on the issue. I would say about 35 of them were actually helpful. The businessmen who sent them to me translated the issue of freight-absorption pricing into terms of their own business policy in their own firm. In several instances I asked them to have their lawyers go over certain circuit and Supreme Court decisions from the standpoint of their effect on a particular firm. When I received those replies to my inquiries, I felt that I had a much better grasp of the specifics of this issue in terms of a particular fabricating industry in Reading, Pa., or a manufacturing plant in Oakmont—and thus, I believe, a better picture of the whole problem—than I did out of the scores of other letters which merely condemned in general terms the circuit court or the Supreme Court or the Federal Trade Commission. And I felt on safe grounds in introducing the sort of legislation the facts indicated was needed. My bill has been substantially altered in both the House and Senate, but I still hope that out of it we can get a fair and workable standard for business to follow.

Thousands and thousands of Pennsylvanians wrote me for and against rent control. The helpful letters came from those tenants who explained their own specific circumstances, and from those landlords who outlined exactly where they felt they had been discriminated against by the regulations or by the law. In trying to put together a rent-control bill which would be fair to both sides, I received a great deal of helpful guidance from those letters, particularly on the matter of cruel and capricious evictions.

A young lady from Philadelphia wrote me one day expressing her thanks for the opportunity which had been provided her to go abroad for a summer's study under a special program involving the use of surplus

Maritime Commission ships. As a result of her letter—just one letter on the subject out of the many thousands of letters which come in here—I became much more interested in this subject, and subsequently participated in a movement with a number of other Senators early this year to have the program not only continued, but enlarged. In any words, that letter was effective.

A veteran who had been discriminated against by the mere circumstance, the accident of the date of his enlistment in connection with GI bill education benefits called the matter to my attention in a letter which gave all the facts, to show an obvious and glaring injustice. Corrective legislation was necessary. His one letter—the only one on that subject—is getting results.

One of the most interesting letters I received in connection with the public housing bill came from a psychiatrist. He wrote of the effects of the housing shortage, of slum housing, on family life and on mental health. I used his letter in the debate on this bill. I think it was good evidence. I believe it might have helped a little in achieving the passage of this bill which is already operating to benefit nearly 16,000 Pennsylvania families in the next 2 years—and the program has just started. If this doctor had merely written me that he supports public housing, his would have been just another letter of the thousands on one side or another of this issue.

An employer who discusses the minimum wage law, or the Walsh-Healey Act on the basis of the facts in his own business; a union man who discusses Taft-Hartley from the standpoint of his own local—these are facts we can understand. These are facts we can put some confidence in.

If there is a moral in all of this, then it is this: If you have been writing to me, or if you intend to, tell me your views, of course, but tell me also why you have them. Outline your problems in such a way that I can feel I do have the facts. And by all means, please be sure to sign not only your name—and sign it so that I can read it—but your address as well, particularly on telegrams. We try to answer all of our mail, or at least acknowledge it, but sometimes that is not always immediately practical. Often, when I am receiving a lot of mail on an issue, I hold that mail until all the facts are in, or until the bill comes out of committee, before answering it. I feel—I may be wrong on this—but I feel that you would rather have an answer, if it is possible, than merely an acknowledgement that your letter has arrived.

Well, I guess that's enough on writing letters. I enjoy reading the mail, and as I said, I find it extremely helpful. I will be with you again in 2 weeks over this same station, but for now, the clock says my time is up, and besides, here comes the postman with another big bag of mail for the office of Senator MYERS, and I better get to it right away.

[Transcript No. 10 in biweekly 1939 series by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS over Pennsylvania radio stations, week end of September 30–October 2, inclusive]

In these biweekly reports which I make to the people of Pennsylvania, I do not attempt to give you a complete review of all the news out of Washington during the preceding 2 weeks for obviously, if I tried to do so, I would be doing little more than reading headlines with which you are probably already familiar, anyway.

Instead, I try to cover a few major subjects in each broadcast and on this one I plan to discuss some of the implications as they occur to me of the news that an atomic explosion has occurred in Soviet Russia. This news is of tremendous importance to all of us, and, in fact, to everyone in the entire world. We all have our own ideas about it, its meaning, and its significance. As your senior United States Senator, I will have to act and vote in the Congress in conformance with the views I hold on this subject, and therefore, my views do become important to you. I think you should know my reaction; I am sure I will be hearing from many of you on your own views on this subject; and, of course, I welcome your communications on it.

First, however, briefly, here are a few highlights of the past 2 weeks:

A restored and revitalized Reciprocal Trade Act has now been signed into law and is operating. This is of particular importance to a State like ours which engages in such a tremendous amount of foreign trade. Much more important than that, however, is its significance in helping to restore the economies of many nations which we are now supporting with outright gifts and grants. There is in this act full and adequate protection for our own industry against unfair competition from abroad.

The advance planning fund of $100,000,000 in Federal funds, for loans—not grants, but loans—to local communities for the preparation of engineering plans and specifications on worth-while local public-works projects, like schools, and sewers, and community buildings, was approved overwhelmingly by the Senate and will soon, I hope, become law. I submitted as part of the debate the breakdown I discussed in one of these previous broadcasts showing how effective a previous program of this nature had been in Pennsylvania between 1945 and mid-1947. As I informed the Senate, practically every community in Pennsylvania located on a river and complying with our antistream pollution law has been able to do so only because of the existence of this previous fund under which loans amounting to nearly $4,000,000 were made to Pennsylvania alone.

Five communities in Pennsylvania have already qualified under the new public-housing law, of which I was a cosponsor, for allocations of Federal assistance for low-rent housing units to be built during the next 2 years. The list so far now includes Philadelphia, for 10,000 units; Pittsburgh for 5,000; Johnstown for 750; Allentown for 600; and Bethlehem for 400 units. Other communities are placing their applications from day to day and the program, designed to get Americans out of the slums and into decent housing at rents they can afford, is moving along remarkably fast and well.

There was a very interesting development a few days ago in the controversial realm of civil-rights legislation when the Senate Labor Committee voted to report out the fair employment practices bill introduced by Senator IVES of New York and myself and a group of other Senators from both parties. The committee did not approve the bill, but despite the intense opposition from some quarters, it did agree to allow the bill to go on the Senate Calendar. As most of you are well aware, this legislation faces the bitterest kind of opposition and could be passed by the Senate only if we can succeed in getting 64 votes to cut off the filibuster under the new rule of the Senate on limitation of debate, a rule which I think is much worse than the previous rule which provided that two-thirds of those Senators present and voting could shut off debate. There has been no decision yet as to whether we can reach this bill in this session.

And now to this deeply significant news of atomic development behind the iron curtain. This happens to be a rather historic week end, historic in terms of modern history, although to many of us it may sound like ancient history, as anything which happened before the last war is sometimes regarded. The anniversary I am thinking of is of an event which occurred 11 years ago this week end, and when I think of that event, I think of all these other issues and problems which we are now struggling with in the Congress, and which are really pretty closely related to that event.

It was on September 30, 1938, 11 years ago, that a gentleman with an umbrella, a frightened man, told us that his diplomatic skill had brought for the civilized world "peace in our time." The price of this victory as Mr. Chamberlain assessed it, 11 years ago, was quite reasonable—the surrender of the defenses of a land he considered a far-away land, far away from England, and far away from the interests of the other western democracies, to the peace-loving Adolf Hitler, who, of course, with this piece of Czechoslovakia added to his empire would seek no further conquests, no other lands, and live in peace with his neighbor.

How many millions have died, how many millions have been tortured and starved and persecuted, how many families have been disrupted or destroyed as a result of that miscalculation?

There is not much sense in going back over this ancient history of 11 years ago as long as we in this country, and the leaders and the people of every other free nation recognize the magnitude of errors in the reasoning and the theory of appeasement at Munich in 1938. Hitler is dead, but totalitarianism still lives and flourishes, militarism is still rampant despite the hopes which surrounded the formation of the United Nations 4 years ago and civilization and freedom are still in danger now as they were in the thirties.

And yet, when the President announced the other day in solemn words that Soviet Russia, a nation which has chosen to hide behind its wall of silence and isolation and mystery had achieved an atomic explosion, indicating that America's monopoly of the atomic bomb was either at, or near, an end, our people and the people of other free nations were able to take this news with remarkable calm and remarkable restraint, and a complete lack of terror. Have you stopped to think why?

The fear of air bombardment by Nazi Germany in 1938 had spread terror through all Europe. Some of our own public figures were warning us that this military might and power of Hitler's Germany could not be contained or opposed, that it was indomitable and irresistible.

Oh, there have been a few comments in the newspapers, mostly in the letters to the effect that now that Soviet Russia may have an atomic bomb, we should immediately dump our bombs on Russia in a preventive war. Fortunately, however, this short-sighted approach has very little support anywhere. We are not terrorized by the fact that Russia may have an atomic bomb or bombs. We are not terrorized for the simple reason that we have been expecting something like this eventually over a period of 4 years, and have proceeded consistently on a path of being prepared for the contingency of Soviet development of atomic weapons, a contingency which our scientists assured us would occur, perhaps this year, perhaps next year, certainly by 1951 or 1952.

We have atomic weapons of such magnitude and devastation as to keep us well ahead of any developments in this field. We are proud of the military power which our atomic inventions have given us. But if that is all we had between us and this new threat to peace represented by the existence of advanced atomic knowledge in the Soviet Union, we might indeed be justified in holding deep-seated fear of the future, fear of a surprise attack—which is always of course possible, but hardly likely.

In the years since we have been proceeding with our own atomic production program against this development in the Soviet Union, which has consistently blocked, and effec-

tively blocked every effort for adequate international control of this gruesome force of destruction, we have been doing a lot of other things which, taken in combination, permit us today to look on the development in the Soviet Union calmly and without terror.

We have united the entire civilized world, not behind us, but with us as partners in a common crusade for decency and for peace. And that is quite an achievement. It has, as you know, cost us many billions of dollars, for we have not only had to find means of helping these people of other nations to defend their lands against aggression from without, but we have first had to help them crawl out from under the despair and wreckage of total war, to rebuild their economies, to put their people to work, at useful jobs, and to reestablish themselves as nations of people with self-respect and confidence in their own destiny. This was the so-called cold war, a war against the conditions which breed communism, conditions which weaken a nation in civil strife to such an extent that it is defenseless because there is nothing left to defend.

The disclosure of a Soviet-created atomic explosion came as an anticlimax to this battle for the minds of men which Russia has been losing steadily, and will continue to lose.

Even without benefit of the news of this atomic explosion in Russia, the Senate steadfastly refused to cut the authorization for the military assistance program to aid the Atlantic Pact nations to defend themselves against aggression. This news, however, may have influenced the decision of the House conferees to retreat from the House cut in this authorization of funds. The fact remains that with or without the impetus which may have been given this program by the President's announcement, the people of American long ago made up their minds that there should be and would be no Munich in our dealings with totalitarian aggression, and it was this forthright determination on the part of the American people, more than any day-to-day decision made in Congress, which dominated the position we are taking.

I should say also that we revised our entire pay scale for members of the military services, an event which occurred a few days after this new development in atomic energy, not because of the news out of Russia, not as a sudden and immediate result of that development, but because of a decision we made long ago that our armed services must provide attractive careers for conscientious, patriotic, and able Americans who will give us a mobile, flexible, and effective defense arm.

I mention this only because I think the combination of events of a military nature which occurred in Washington in the last few days may perhaps have given a misleading impression. We are not conducting our national policy on an off-the-cuff, action-reaction response to Russian moves.

We discovered a few years ago that under its present leadership, the Soviet Union has no desire whatsoever to join in the collective efforts of the free world to achieve enduring peace. We tried—we tried in every possible way, we tried untiringly, sincerely, genuinely, honestly—to find a means of cooperation between us and the other free nations on the one hand, and the masters of the Kremlin on the other. In no field did we try harder than in the field of atomic energy control.

When it became evident that no agreement could be reached, this Nation of ours led the way among all peace-loving, free-living nations to mobilize a great world force for decency and for peace, fortified with great spiritual and moral strength, as well as military power, to combat the ruthless expansion of totalitarian communism.

We can all be proud at this moment of the steps this Nation of ours has taken with the support of the overwhelming majority of our own people, to lead a whole world from the depths of terror and despair to a bright new future in which man can with dignity and humility and faith in God pursue his own destiny and thus help shape a better world.

I will be back with you in 2 weeks over this same station.

[Transcript No. 11 in biweekly 1949 series by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS over Pennsylvania radio stations, week end of October 14–16, inclusive]

What has the Eighty-first Congress done in its first session, and how do these things affect you?

Politically speaking, of course, these are the $64 questions of the year. And, just as naturally, the answers you get often depend upon the politics of the expert who gives you his opinion.

Now, I don't intend to answer the $64 questions on this broadcast, although I will comment on some of the achievements and failures of this session, from a factual standpoint, and then let you decide, if you will, whether the Congress has done a good job or a bad job, and whether the actions it took affect you for good or for ill.

In connection with these broadcasts, I'd like to thank this station for providing me with this opportunity every 2 weeks to report to the people of Pennsylvania on the doings of your National Government, particularly as they affect you as a citizen of Pennsylvania; I feel that the station thus makes a real contribution to its public trust. As a United States Senator, my actions take on great importance to you, whether you agree with all of them or not, and it is equally important for you to know why I take these actions. By providing time every 2 weeks for me to report to you, this station and others participating in this series have made possible the full and complete report I feel you should have.

Those of you who are already familiar with what I have covered in my past broadcasts in this biweekly series are aware that most of the matters I have discussed have been right in the midst of some great battle in the Congress over the particular form that the various pieces of vital legislation should take. So, in large part, the measures I've discussed haven't been in the final form of a public law.

And, as you know, until both Houses do agree in identical detail on every detail of a bill—and sometimes that takes weeks or even months, as in the case of the Flood Control Appropriations bill which we finally sent on to the White House for signature last week—all we have is a combination of separate bills, one bill passed by the House, and a separate and different bill, usually, passed by the Senate. So until both Houses iron out their differences, the bills can't become law.

So what I've discussed in most of my previous broadcasts in this series was forced by events, by the inconclusiveness of legislative action, to remain restricted to the possibilities or the probabilities of proposed legislation, rather than the finished public law.

Your newspapers over the months have given you the step-by-step and play-by-play and day-by-day developments in legislation. But I gather from the conversations I've had with numerous Pennsylvanians that what most of you would really like to know is how these laws will actually be administered, how the working of those vital pieces of legislation will actually operate in their effect on you, and on Pennsylvania, and on the Nation.

I haven't had an opportunity yet to make firm plans as to the details of any future broadcasts, but what I have in mind is to bring before the microphone with me some of the top men—and also some of the operating officials who are experts on particular phases of work—from such departments and agencies as agriculture, labor, public health, social security, public housing, and others, and have them tell you in their own words, in plain and understandable terms—not in "Government-ese" or gobbledegook—just how these new laws will be administered, and, much more important, how the laws will affect you.

As I say, the details aren't worked out, but I feel you'd find such broadcasts informative and interesting. The big question in the minds of all of us when we hear or read about gigantic Government operations is why—and the why of them is what I want to help to bring to you with the assistance of these experts in the departments and agencies who do the actual administering of the laws we pass—laws we often pass in broad-gauged terms, leaving the detail determinations to the so-called bureaucrats.

I have often found it necessary to defend these officials against what I considered extremely unfair criticism voiced in general terms about all Government officials without discrimination and without identification, but on these future broadcasts I will let them speak for themselves. And in order to obtain a full and complete picture, I intend to ask all of them the hot-potato questions, including, in the case of agriculture, the one about the potato itself.

And now, let's take a look at the Eighty-first Congress. In speaking to you on this question, I am acutely conscious of my own position in that Congress as majority whip, as assistant majority leader in the Senate, a position which carries with it the obligation to lead in pushing through to enactment the administration program. And since that program, in most details conforms to the 1948 Democratic platform, and since I was chairman of the committee at Philadelphia which battled over every detail of that platform before we finally drafted it, I am in close identification with the administration point of view.

Nevertheless, I have always tried in these broadcasts to you to keep them as nonpolitical as possible, as factual and as much above partisanship as possible, on the theory that you are interested primarily in the facts, and not in the politics, and I approach this review of the Eighty-first Congress activities with that idea uppermost.

Now don't get me wrong. I personally am quite proud of the achievements of this Congress thus far. I don't hear very often anymore the term "Eighty-worst" Congress used about this Eighty-first, for the achievements in many fields, particularly in the international affairs, but also in some domestic fields, have been solid achievements, and I am proud of them. But, at the same time, recognizing this as a nonpartisan program, I would rather let the facts speak for themselves, and let you decide on our accomplishments.

On the international front, this Congress gave the President and the State Department virtually everything they asked for—not out of loyalty to the administration, or blind acceptance, but out of thorough-going, intensive, critical, and extended study of the merits.

It is still a source of amazement to me that despite a tremendous outcry in the Congress and in some sections of the public, the Congress has sent on to the President—with simply overwhelming majorities in the votes—measures which renewed the Marshall plan, ratified the Atlantic Pact, together with provision of adequate funds for the arming of the nations participating with us in that Atlantic Pact. The votes were obviously of bipartisan origin, and had almost universal public support. The credit here is not so much to the administration or to the majority leadership in the Congress—but to the people, to the public, who got behind these

programs and stayed behind them and refused to be panicked into opposing them by hysteria or by misleading and unsupportable attacks.

One other piece of significant foreign policy legislation passed by this Congress differed from the others in that strong bipartisan support for it was conspicuously lacking. The extremely successful and highly important reciprocal trade program inaugurated by our great former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull in 1934, almost had the rug pulled out from under it by the amendments put through the Eightieth Congress last year. I am pleased, and very proud, that the reciprocal trade program has been restored to its full vitality by the Eighty-first Congress, and is now effectively at work. And the bill we put back on the books this year provides ample safeguards to American industries against undercutting by vicious and unfair slave labor competition from foreign producers. The law as it now stands will go forward to produce greater wealth for all free nations through its encouragement of international trade.

But it's on the domestic front, on the legislation that begins and ends at home, that we can really take the measure of the Eighty-first Congress. Here's just a partial list, and because my time is short on the remaining part of this broadcast, it is only a list, and it is only partial:

This present Congress, the Eighty-first, has passed a new low-cost public housing bill which, during the next 6 years will permit 810,000 families all over the country to move from slums into decent and adequate American housing. This same legislation had failed to get through in two previous sessions, but this time we got it through. Even though the act is just a few months old, it has already been announced that at least 12 Pennsylvania communities have agreed to go forward with construction during the next 2 years—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Allentown, Bethlehem, Pottstown, Farrell, Beaver Falls, Aliquippa, Ambridge, Harrisburg, and Williamsport having already been approved for Federal assistance in their separate programs.

We got rent control extended, after dire prophecies that it would die in this Congress. But after a really major fight, we were able to pass, finally, a good bill which I believe is a pretty fair bill for both sides—landlords and tenants.

After years of talking about Government reorganization, the Eighty-first Congress approved six major reorganization plans submitted by President Truman on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. And in addition to the big improvements made possible under those six specific bills, there have been several other reorganization plans approved by the Congress that were passed in connection with other legislation affecting the particular agencies.

On the farm front, the Eighty-first Congress has made it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to assist in providing adequate storage facilities for grain, after this problem had haunted farmers in recent years when they saw bumper crops rot away because there were no storage facilities. Efforts had been made to pass this legislation in the Eightieth Congress, but they failed. The Eighty-first Congress, too, has provided for a gradual expansion of crop insurance, a measure of vital importance to farmers which will enable them to help themselves over rough spots when acts of nature unexpectedly wipe out whole crops in a particular neighborhood.

The Eighty-first Congress has renewed for the next 6 years the splendid program which will assist local communities in the construction of needed hospital facilities. Under the new bill, the Government will put up $150,000,000 annually to pay for two-thirds of the cost of building new hospitals, leaving to the communities the job of planning for their needs and raising the balance of the funds.

And I might mention, too, that since I last discussed it on this series of broadcasts, that the House has now approved the bill previously passed by the Senate to provide $100,000,000 in loans to local communities for use in planning schools, sewer and water facilities, and other public needs. These loans will permit cities and towns and counties all over Pennsylvania and the Nation to make plans for local improvements which they expect to put under construction with their own funds.

As I said earlier, this list of accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress—and I might mention the minimum-wage bill passed by the Congress—is only a partial one, only a part of what I proudly regard as an impressive total accomplishment. There are many, many more things, and if I am any judge of the present political scene, I believe all of you are due to hear a great deal during the next few weeks over the question of what the Eighty-first Congress has done. You will hear those who will deny with a good bit of fervor that we have accomplished much in our long months here in Washington, and you'll hear others say that we've done a great deal.

I notice that my time on this broadcast is running out, but I'd like to leave this thought with you:

When you hear a debate over the record of the Eighty-first Congress, make every effort you can to sift out the political arguments, and do your best to glean the real facts. Listen carefully to what we've done, and what we haven't done, on such failures as civil-rights legislation and the promise of this administration to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Look at the record. Weigh the good against the bad. Weigh the facts, all of them you can get. Ask yourself what the accomplishments mean to you. Then decide for yourself where this Congress stands.

I'm proud of what we've done in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and I believe, when you look squarely at the record, most of you will be proud, too.

I invite you to be with me in 2 weeks, when I hope to get underway my rather ambitious proposal to bring before you the men who will administer the laws we in the Congress have passed.

Little Guys Can Talk, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1949

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., July 15, 1949, entitled "Little Guys Can Talk, Too":

LITTLE GUYS CAN TALK, TOO

A few days ago three Westchester citizens went down to Washington and spoke their minds before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

They deserve niches in the hall of fame and for posterity we record that they were Frederick C. McLaughlin, of White Plains; A. R. Trapp, of Eastchester; and I. G. Taubeneck, of Bronxville.

They told Congress that while they were only "little guys" they represented a few millions like themselves in this Nation. They scored Congressmen who talk economy and vote for unnecessary pork barrels. They told of tax troubles at home which add burdens in addition to those put upon our shoulders by Washington. And they cried aloud for elimination of Federal bureaucratic waste and extravagance.

What those three did the rest of us can do.

If we can't go to Washington, we can telegraph; and if we can't telegraph, we can write letters. The best address might be the White House, since it is in the executive budget that the great possible economies can be effected.

The Hoover report showed that the executive branch of our National Government employs 2,092,180 persons, divided into 9 departments, 104 bureaus, 12 sections, 108 services, 51 branches, 460 offices, 631 divisions, 19 administrations, 6 agencies, 20 commissions, 3 authorities, and then after all these are tabulated there are left 263 other variegated or common garden type of miscellaneous parts of the machinery.

We might think of all these persons working for us when we read accounts of two different Federal agencies drawing up plans for a reclamation project in Idaho, each set of plans costing a quarter-million, but with estimates differing by as much as $75,000,000.

We might ask why Government hospitals cost as much as $51,000 a bed where private hospitals cost only one-third as much.

We could inquire why one employee in the Veterans' Administration handles only an average of 450 insurance policies while a private company requires that one employee handle an average of 1,762 policies.

We might even inquire why, in these days when microfilm is extensively employed by private firms for keeping records, Federal Government records last year required 18,000,000 square feet of floor space with filing equipment costing $154,000,000 and the storage space costing $20,000,000 in annual rentals.

The Government of the United States is today the biggest business in the world. You would think, wouldn't you, that it should, therefore, be the most efficient. Yet almost every newspaper reader and radio listener knows the opposite to be true.

You may say that you can't do much about it. You are, after all, just a "little guy," too.

But you can telegraph or you can write. And not even the most hardened politician or bureaucrat, we believe, would care to risk the anger of millions of voters such as you are.

Why not send the White House a "little guy" protest?

[U. S. Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, June 22, 1949]

The committee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room F-39, the Capitol, Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators MCKELLAR, KILGORE, and CORDON.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The committee will come to order.

All right, Mr. Gamble, you may proceed.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

General statement

Representative GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you very much for this opportunity that you have given Congressman GWINN, of the Twenty-seventh District of New York, and me to appear before you.

We are here at the request of a large body of our constituents to present a petition on behalf of the Small Business and Professional People of Westchester County, N. Y., to the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

Petition requests Congress to reduce appropriations

Our people are exercising the right of petition to Congress granted to them under the Constitution, and we are asking Congress to stop spending and to reduce costs of Government. I hand you this petition, Mr. Chairman, which is signed by between 1,500 and 2,000 people of Westchester County, N. Y., and ask that it may be printed in the record.

At this point I would like Congressman GWINN to carry on and he will introduce the three gentlemen "the three little guys" as they call themselves, representing our constituents.

Senator CORDON. Would you mind giving at least the substance of the petition? To what does it go?

Representative GAMBLE. I will be glad to read it.

Senator CORDON. I am interested in what you seek to have the committee do with reference to the appropriation.

Chairman MCKELLAR. As I understood him, they want the appropriations cut.

Petition on Government fiscal and budget policy

Representative GAMBLE (reading):

"Petition to the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate:

"We, the undersigned, are deeply worried about the Federal tax and spending situation and its effect on the economy of our country. As signers of this petition we represent the viewpoints of about 25,000 small-business concerns, professional men, and about 200,000 people of small means who are saving-bank depositors in Westchester County of the State of New York.

"Conditions are tightening up. Prices and services are coming down. But the price of Government keeps going up, and the spenders in Washington seem determined that it shall go much higher. The take of Government today is 29 percent of all earned income. Our people are spending more for Government than they are for food.

"In our businesses we have to balance our budgets. Our customers must do the same with their household expenses. If the income is just so much, then the outgo must be trimmed to fit. Unessential expenditures must be curtailed. It seems only right and sound for the Government to do the same thing. While it is true that the Federal budget during the past 2 years has been balanced for the first time in 18 years, the level at which it is balanced is fantastic. If budgets are balanced by taking an exorbitant proportion of what the people earn, what merit is there to Government budget balancing?

"We know that every request for a new expense may have possible reasoning behind it. This is true of a store, or a household, or government. But a line has to be drawn somewhere, and with the Federal Government wasting billions of dollars of our hard-earned income each year, it seems that Washington is the place to start drawing that line right now.

"So it is hereby resolved that we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to get out its blue pencils and begin cutting the national budget forthwith. Stop adopting new Government activities. Stop talking about imposing more tax burdens on us and begin balancing the budget the other way—by reducing expenses. Deflate the overmanned bureaucracies. The Hoover Commission's report shows where and how to start. We promise to support Congress in all efforts to peel the thick fat of wasted taxes off the fiscal hide of Washington, D. C."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you, Mr. Gamble.

We will next hear from Congressman RALPH W. GWINN.

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH W. GWINN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

General statement

Representative GWINN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate your interrupting at this point. Most any committee could have been interrupted in about the same place, I take it, but you have granted a few minutes to us and these men who have been designated as the little guys are here primarily because the little guys pay most of the taxes. For a long time they did not know it. But these little guys have wakened up, and spontaneously they have been meeting in our district asking us to come up and meet them, and now they have come to Washington.

Wants to show tax burden

They want to show you in very brief statements, three of them, how this tax burden is making it impossible for them as individuals to function and how it is impossible for the self-governing towns and county where they live to function in their municipal and self-governing features.

I should like to introduce, first of all, Mr. Frederick C. McLaughlin, who for some time was mayor of the city of White Plains in Westchester County, N. Y., and who has been an active citizen there for many years.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Mr. McLaughlin.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK C. M'LAUGHLIN, FORMER MAYOR OF WHITE PLAINS, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N. Y.

General statement

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement perhaps somewhat in the nature of a speech which I will ask permission to file and I will not inflict it upon you at this time.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You may put it in the record and then make any comments you wish.

(The formal statement referred to is as follows:)

"Statement of Frederick C. McLaughlin, of White Plains, N. Y., before the Senate Committee on Appropriations Wednesday, June 22, 1949, Washington, D. C.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Frederick C. McLaughlin. I am one of three little guys sent here by the Council of Small Business and Professions of Westchester County, N. Y., to give you first-hand information on how we feel about the growing costs of our Federal Government. I and my colleagues represent about 25,000 small-business men in our county.

"Magazine articles and newspaper reports about what has happened and what is threatened in Congress leave us cold and apprehensive. American industry, which at this hour stands between western civilization and chaos, and the American way of life, which is our priceless heritage, are threatened by the inefficiency and waste of a mammoth bureaucracy created and sustained by the votes of elected representatives in Congress who talk economy and vote for the unnecessary spending of untold billions of public funds. We are not misled by the talk. We are watching the returns. We are asking ourselves if it is possible that we the people have created a Frankenstein which will destroy our freedom and stem the life of our Nation at its source.

"The American way of life as we know it is individual freedom expressing itself in collective action of its own choosing—not collective action handed down to us from Washington. By actual count there are more than 160 civic and fraternal organizations in my home town of 45,000 people. We have 2 fine hospitals and at least 12 social agencies supported by voluntary contributions of people of limited means. Our hospitals are sustained by more than a thousand volunteer workers and contributors. Our YMCA drive mustered a staff of 190 volunteer canvassers. Not one of our local welfare agencies has been able, in this year of recession and burdensome Federal taxes, to raise its operating budget. Multiply by 10,000 my city of White Plains, which is a fair cross section of America at the community level, which is today threatened with destruction by the spenders at Washington.

"When the sixteenth amendment was debated in the Senate, the suggestion that a Federal income tax could take more than 5 percent of anyone's income was stamped as preposterous by Senator Borah. We have come a long way since that day. Under the stress of a major depression in the thirties we took a turning down a side road, falsely labeled "national welfare," that has ended in a road block. That road block is the law of diminishing returns. The unlimited power to tax for the necessary purposes of a strong National Government, which was lodged in Congress by the sixteenth amendment, is now being diverted to the uses of a so-called welfare state. Beyond the road block is the abyss of statism and socialism.

"We have followed England, which was a pauper-ridden country even in prosperous times, in trying to spend our way out of depression. We are now following England, which never had the free economy which is the colossal strength of America, down the road to socialism which ends in national bankruptcy. And this at a time when, as John Gunther says, much of the future of mankind hangs upon the ability of America to avoid a major depression.

"There are voices crying in the wilderness of national politics today. A mighty chorus is in the making. They are the voices of men and women at the community level where home and family and the job that supports them are the vital interests. They are the voices of those who love America at its best, as they find it in the friendly life of the home town. They are saying to you in this hour of peril:

" 'Let America stand today as the arsenal of the spirit as well as of the weapons of freedom. Let her stand foursquare for individual freedom and a free economy. Let Democrats and Republicans in this Congress rise above the plane of partisan politics and touch elbows in eliminating the waste, inefficiency, and useless spendng that is sapping the strength of this great Nation in time of crisis. Then, with the mighty weapons of industrial research, technology, and know-how in production, which only a free economy can produce, we shall march forward, to meet the ringing challenge of the present hour.' "

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Yes; I am just an old man.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You are not the only one.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I know, sir. I have lived for 49 years in this community of White Plains, which is a growing city of 45,000 people. It happens to be the fastest-growing retail shopping center in the United States.

I have been identified for many years with community activities and have given of my spare time to community efforts. I served for 16 years as counsel of my city, for three terms as mayor, and I served for two terms as president of the New York State conference of mayors and city officials comprising all the cities and first-class villages of the State of New York.

Apprehension over Federal spending

We are here because we are very apprehensive. We feel that American industry which at this hour stands between western civilization and chaos, and that the American way of life, which is our priceless heritage as Americans, are both threatened by the inefficiency and waste of a mammoth bureaucracy which has been created and sustained by our legislative representatives,

some of whom are talking economy and voting consistently for unnecessary spending of billions of public funds.

We are asking ourselves if it is possible that we, the people, have created in this bureaucracy a Frankenstein that will destroy our freedom and stem the life of our Nation at its source. Now, the American way of life, as we understand it, is very different from some of the things that we hear in Washington. The American way of life, as we find it, is individual freedom that expresses itself in collective action of its own choosing. It is voluntary collective action and not collective action imposed upon it from Washington.

I should just like to mention very briefly, because I will be short, Mr. Chairman, what is happening in my local community in respect to social welfare. We have two fine hospitals. We have at least 12 splendid social agencies. All of them are supported by the voluntary contributions of people of limited means. Our hospitals have more than 1,000 voluntary workers and contributors. Our YMCA drive recently, of which I was chairman this year, mustered a staff of 190 volunteer canvassers. In this year of recession and of burdensome Federal taxes, not one of our social agencies can raise its operating budget.

That is the situation in which White Plains finds itself, and White Plains is a typical American city, a fair cross section of the American life. We have all types. Multiply White Plains by 10,000, and you have America as a traditional time-honored social-welfare state, but on the community level. This that is coming to us out of Washington threatens to destroy that thing which, to my mind, is priceless.

Now, as to our local government, we are here asking for economy. Are we practicing it? I do not believe there has been any greater progress in American life than the progress in efficient local self-government in America during the last 30 years, and I speak from a very intimate acquaintance with the facts. In my own city in the last 6 years we have reduced our bonded indebtedness by 40 percent and we are on a self-paying basis; we are not borrowing money. We are on a pay-as-you-go basis, and we are doing that through rigorous economy and efficient administration.

The same thing is true of my splendid county of Westchester. They have reduced their bonded indebtedness in the last 6 years from something well over $100,000,000 down to $65,000,000. We practice economy. We practice what we are preaching here today.

Local self-government, as Cooley said, is the cornerstone of our free institutions, and I am here to speak for the people at the grass-roots level and to call upon our elected representatives in Washington to realize the nature of the crisis, the world crisis, that we are facing.

As a recent noted writer said, he agrees with Russia on one point and that is that much of the future of mankind at this moment depends upon the ability of America to avoid another major depression.

There are voices sounding in the wilderness of national politics today, and they are the voices of the people at the community level where home and family and the job that supports them are the vital issues. They know America and love America at its best in the friendly life of the home town, and in their behalf, Mr. Chairman, I make to you this appeal.

Thank you.

Chairman McKELLAR. Mr. McLaughlin, would you mind giving us the particular appropriations which Congress is making which you think it ought not to make?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No, sir; I cannot. May I answer that in a roundabout way?

Chairman McKELLAR. You may answer it in any way you wish.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In my city of White Plains we have citizens' committees who check up on our annual budget. We have subcommittees that visit the heads of each of the departments of our city and go over with them their proposed appropriations, but we never attempt to tell them how to do a thing. We tell them what we want.

Desire for strict economy

We are here to tell our representatives in Congress what we want. What we want is economy of the strictest kind, to cut out every unnecessary expenditure in this hour of crisis, and to get away from the idea of America as a national welfare state; that is, the way of spending, trying to spend ourselves out of a depression, and it will not work.

The strength of the Nation is its resources and our social welfare emanates from the community such as I have described, and we do not need these enormous expenditures running into billions and billions over a period as long as 50 years, mortgaging the life of this Nation.

We cannot tell Congress how to do this thing. Your committee has been sitting here, as I take it, for months trying to find the answer to this solution. We cannot give you the answer, but we can tell you what we want. That is the best answer I can give to your question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McKELLAR. All right.

Mr. GWINN, who is the next witness?

Representative GWINN. I might make the chairman ask the gentleman whether or not he has any suspicion about where we might begin?

Chairman McKELLAR. I will ask that question.

Representative GWINN. How about public housing, Federal aid to education?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am against all at this time. I am for the kind of economy that cuts to the bone in recognition of the fact that we are facing the greatest crisis in our history.

Chairman McKELLAR. Take your own county, your city; do you think any public housing should be built now?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No, sir. I can tell you right now last Monday night since I got here in Washington we had a public hearing on a proposal to build housing for 600 families by a private builder who will give housing for 600 families right in the heart of our city. That was before our council Monday night.

That is happening all over the country. All we need to do is to give the building a chance, give our free economy a chance to strengthen this giant of American industry which is our unique possession.

We are the only Nation in the world that ever had a free economy. England never had it. We never had the pauperism of England in America. Our problems are not English problems. We do not want to copy England. We want to stand on our own two feet in the mighty strength of our priceless heritage as freemen and rely upon our power and strength under a free economy.

Chairman McKELLAR. You do not want to copy England?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No, sir; we do not.

Chairman McKELLAR. All right, Congressmen, who is the next?

Representative GWINN. I have attempted to ask Mr. McLaughlin if, while he has been in Washington, he has found any money down here that did not first come from White Plains or some other place.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have not.

Representative GWINN. You did not find any old sock anywhere or old tin can containing some of that money?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The Federal Government is taking $4 out of the people of White Plains for every dollar we have to pay in taxes for our homes right now.

Representative GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce next a typical Main Street merchant, A. R. Trapp, of Eastchester, N. Y., an optician.

Chairman McKELLAR. All right, Mr. Trapp.

STATEMENT OF A. R. TRAPP, OPTICIAN, EASTCHESTER, N. Y., REPRESENTING THE COUNCIL OF SMALL BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N. Y.

General statement

Mr. TRAPP. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we, the small-business and professional men and women of Westchester County, N. Y., wholeheartedly urge the pressing necessity of eliminating President Truman's tax-increase proposal from the agenda of the present session of Congress. However, Congress, too, must cut out excessive spending for otherwise the disparity between Federal revenues and expenditures will inevitably produce a deficit and increase the already burdensome public debt.

An increase of Federal taxes now, for whatever reason, would seriously disrupt and impair the industrial and economic life of the country, and would thus reduce the prosperity of the people.

We feel that Congress has the good sense to see this. The honesty to acknowledge it is surely to its credit, however reluctantly the present administration may acquiesce.

If the present regime goes right on proposing excessive expenditures and Congress goes right on approving them, of course the country is going to run more and more into ruinous debt, which is just as bad as ruinous taxation.

Congress and the American people have just been given some startling facts by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, about excessive Federal spending. He cited that the recent war was always used as the justification for the swollen civilian pay rolls of the Federal Government. The war emergency has been over for 5 years, and yet over the last 15 months the administration has increased the Federal pay rolls by 146,541 persons.

The armed services are employing three times as many civilians for every man in uniform as they did at the peak of the war years. The President's budget asks still more pay rollers for next year.

Congress has already been told that 500,000 of these employees could be taken off the back of the American taxpayer without impairment of a single essential Government function. This would leave the total of 175 percent more than the prewar peak.

Congress of late has shown some consideration for the prosperity of the country in rejecting some of the President's tax-increase proposals. If it does not show, however, the same intelligent and patriotic consideration by rejecting the President's excessive spending proposals, prosperity of the country will not be improved but will continue to decline and will soon be destroyed altogether.

The substance of all this experience with excessive spending and taxation and debt is that if Congress refuses to put a reasonable restraint upon Federal expenditure, it cannot vote taxes high enough to prevent deficits.

The American people must learn one all-important thing from this experience, if they are to profit by it—and that is that if they are ever to induce our representatives of the people to practice economy they must make economy politically profitable.

In short make tax and spending and debt reduction the sure way for our representatives of the people to get votes, and they will perform this vital service in the essential interests of the country and the people in very short order.

Let me take this occasion to thank the committee for its courtesy in hearing our plea.

Chairman McKELLAR. Do you desire to ask any questions?

Representative GWINN. Thank you. I do not think I will.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Who is the next witness?

Representative GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce Mr. I. D. Taubeneck of Bronxville, N. Y., a teacher of American Constitutional Government who tells me it is a required course in his school system, and he teaches the Constitution.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, Mr. Taubeneck.

STATEMENT OF IGNATIUS D. TAUBENECK, HEAD OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT OF BRONXVILLE (N. Y.) HIGH SCHOOL, ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL OF SMALL BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N. Y.

General statement

Mr. TAUBENECK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am one of the group of three little guys delegated by the Council of Small Business and Professions of Westchester County, N. Y., to exercise our "right of petition" to you as our representative in the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, before your distinguished committee yesterday in this room we heard the word "concern" both from this table and from your distinguished members of the committee. We three little guys represent professional business men and women who, too, are concerned. We come to you because we are concerned. We come to alert you to our problems as citizens and business and professional men so that you may have first hand the facts with which to approach them intelligently. We come to strengthen the hand of those of you in both Houses of the Congress who are concerned with the mounting cost of our Federal Government, for, after all, it is we little guys, we consumers, who ultimately pay all of the taxes.

We, representing 25,000 small business and professional men and women of Westchester County, N. Y., are worried about it, too. We think that you would like to know that lots of us small fellows, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker in our county of Westchester and elsewhere, are becoming more and more alarmed about the increasing rate at which our Federal Government is spending our money. We have heard that almost all who come before you do so with hat in hand and tin cup held out.

But we are coming before you respectfully to request you to discontinue all new proposals for Federal services which mean more Federal spending, at least until further examination.

Favors Hoover Commission report

We want you to know that we are following closely the progress of the Hoover Commission recommendations which Mr. Hoover said can save $3,000,000,000. Mr. Chairman, that might be considered by the Congress which, I am informed, is concerned about the $3,000,000,000 deficit this year. Perhaps this $3,000,000,000 saving recommended by the Hoover Commission would help us meet that deficit, without curtailing services and efficiency, through proper reorganization of our Government.

We are anxious that the resources developed by good American thrift not continue to be wasted by extravagance in the Federal bureaucracy.

We wonder when we read in the newspapers and hear over the radio that the Eighty-first Congress in these short 6 months has introduced 10,000 bills. These include two deficiency bills. And we understand there will be an estimated $3,000,000,000 deficit for this fiscal year.

Federal tax dollar

Are we reaching such a stage in our extravagance and taxing as to fulfill John Marshall's dictum that the "power to tax is the power to destroy"? What does the future hold for our Federal Government if we dry up the sources of our revenue? How will our local representatives at the grass roots find the money for local government if the Federal Government demands and takes such a disproportionate share of the tax dollar to support a growing bureaucracy that in spots at least is inefficient and wasteful and follows woozy economics?

Where will we little guys find funds for our voluntary neighborhood welfare organizations? They are already falling below their minimum quotas. Where will we find funds for our spiritual organizations? And where will we find funds to maintain our education on a State and local level with local control, that fountainhead of all free people?

We respectfully submit that the remote control of Federal Government with its octopuslike tentacles reaching out into the live kernels of our Republic, the communities in which we live, is threatening to destroy not only our Federal principle but the self-determination by the people of their own destinies, that foundation upon which that Federal principle is based.

We beseech you, our distinguished Senators, to help us save not merely our resources but the roots of our Republic.

Sir, we three little guys thank you for hearing our petition. We implore you to grant it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Do you have any questions, Senator?

Senator KILGORE. I should like to ask him two or three questions, if you please.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Certainly.

Senator KILGORE. I was very much interested in your statement there about taxation.

I believe that you are the principal of a high school in New York?

Mr. TAUBENECK. No, sir; I am a mere teacher.

Senator KILGORE. You are aware, are you not, that a great part of the income that supports your schools in New York comes out of the exploited States such as the State I represent, and that the only way we can hope to equalize income and get enough to support the States is to give Federal aid to them? Do you know that?

Mr. TAUBENECK. I think that is questionable, Senator.

Senator KILGORE. You have no manufacturing in New York City except small plants, do you? From where does the enormous amount of money that supports the banking houses on Wall Street come?

Mr. TAUBENECK. I think the assumption of the correction is wrong. You should get at the problem of exploitation rather than draining away the resources of our American communities where the public taxpayers live. You are trying to cure an evil with another evil.

Taxing power of States

Senator KILGORE. I know, but you must realize that sometimes the only way we can hope to get it back and abide by the Constitution is over-all taxing power.

Now, I am as strong a believer in economy as you are, and I would like to get back to the local level. I think it is the most economical way.

Mr. TAUBENECK. And you are with us on that.

Senator KILGORE. But how can we do it with a set of laws where we cannot pursue the income across the State border?

Mr. TAUBENECK. Senator, you representatives are responsible for our set of laws.

Senator KILGORE. No; it is your State constitutions.

Mr. TAUBENECK. Then it is our lawmakers at home.

Senator KILGORE. Certainly, we could not tax a citizen of New York City down in West Virginia, although all his income may come from West Virginia. He makes the headquarters of his company in Delaware or New York City, and the dividends of his company are paid up there and they are not taxable in West Virginia.

Mr. TAUBENECK. How about the pay rolls in West Virginia?

Senator KILGORE. If you want to try to subsist on pay-roll income, and that is what we do in West Virginia, you will find it is pretty poor pickings.

Do you know the per capita cost for a schoolroom unit in the State of New York? I mean for a schoolroom unit for every 23 pupils in the elementary schools. Do you know what you are able to spend for such a unit in the State of New York?

Mr. TAUBENECK. Which is local State control. Our education is under our State control. You would not destroy our State system of education?

Senator KILGORE. No.

You are able to spend $6,000 per unit up there.

Representative GWINN. Will the Senator yield? I think your figures are entirely exaggerated.

Senator KILGORE. All I am going by are the figures prepared by Columbia University.

Representative GWINN. They are sure to be exaggerated, Senator.

Senator KILGORE. No; they are not. They were supposed to be obtained by a study by the National Education Association of all States.

Representative GWINN. That $6,000 applies to a very small percent of a few in suburban areas, not the State generally.

Senator KILGORE. Those were the figures 3 years ago. That is in comparison with other States which can spend only $600 for the same thing.

Representative GWINN. They might get a better education at that.

Manufacturing in New York

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Senator, I am a bit astounded at the picture you try to give here of New York State. I was under the impression that New York State was the largest manufacturing State in the United States.

Senator KILGORE. I said New York City. There are no large plants in New York City, for instance.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. There are thousands of them.

Senator KILGORE. Thousands of large plants in New York City?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Not great big units. Those are outside of New York City, but New York State is a manufacturing State. West Virginia produces a raw product—coal.

Senator KILGORE. Would you say that glass is a raw product?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. No; I would not.

Senator KILGORE. Would you say that pottery is a raw product?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. No. I do not deny that West Virginia produces manufactures on a large scale. I believe Pittsburgh is the glass center, if I am not mistaken.

Senator KILGORE. I take issue with you.

You would not say that chemicals are a raw product; would you?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. No.

Senator KILGORE. Or metallurgical work. But it is all foreign-owned. That is the point I am getting at; it is owned by corporations whose headquarters are in New York, Philadelphia, or Boston, and from which office the dividends are disbursed. Therefore, it is impossible for these States to tax them, to get any revenue back, other than the real property tax on their actual physical investment.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Well, of course, it is the property of the people who own it.

Senator KILGORE. Certainly.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I do not know why West Virginia should tax the people of New York for West Virginia. I do not know where that would lead us.

Senator KILGORE. That is the point I am getting at: That that income drifts out so that the State becomes what might be called a State living on wages of workers, whereas New York lives on capital investment, the income from capital investment.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. It seems to me, Senator Kilgore, that your suggestion carried to its logical conclusion would break-down our whole Federal system of Government.

Senator KILGORE. Certainly.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. And merge it into a national mass.

Senator KILGORE. All right, but that is the reason for part of these Federal taxes: That we must help these other States in some way.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I purposely avoided trying to tell the members of this committee as to just what they should do in the matter of taxes. All I am saying is that at this time they should cut taxes to the bone, cutting out everything that is unnecessary. I do not say, for instance, that a proper showing might not be made for Federal assistance to a State that needs it, that is in distress and needs help. I am not committing myself on that definite proposition.

Senator KILGORE. I am just explaining that some of these taxes on which complaint is made must be levied to raise the educational and wage standards and things of that kind.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. At this hour, Senator KILGORE, is it not a question of putting first things first, and are we not facing here a crisis that bids us exercise the most extreme caution at this hour and not to appropriate one dollar of public funds that is not absolutely necessary? That is what we are here to ask.

Senator KILGORE. We cannot cut off the interest on bonded indebtedness; can we?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. No.

Senator KILGORE. We cannot break-down national defense; can we?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Certainly we cannot. I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the necessary taxes for a strong America.

Senator KILGORE. We have to take care of our disabled veterans; do we not?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Yes; we do, but we can use judgment there. There is a wide discrimination there.

Senator KILGORE. I forget the figures produced recently, but we have to make all the cutting in 25 percent of the budget.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I think that is true; about 25 percent. That is Senator ROBERTSON'S figure.

Senator KILGORE. So that is the only section where we can cut.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. That is true.

Senator KILGORE. That is the sector that affects the individual citizens most; is it not?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir.

I might say this: That Senator ROBERTSON'S article in the Reader's Digest for May expresses pretty nearly my views of the general policy that should be pursued, and of the danger which is confronting this Congress at this hour. I think he has expressed it far better than I can.

Mr. TAUBENECK. Would you and your distinguished committee consider that there is a line that should be drawn in removing the tax dollar from local communities so as to leave more in those communities to support their local affairs? Would your committee agree to that?

Senator KILGORE. I think the committee has been trying to hew to that line as closely as it can. That is one reason why appropriation bills have been very slow coming out. I want you to get that picture that is faced by the Congress.

Mr. TAUBENECK. We appreciate that.

Senator KILGORE. Would you also believe it if I told you that there is not a Member of the United States Congress that does not constantly pick up his morning mail and receive a demand in a letter for a new airport for a certain community and have the owner of the paper write an editorial that day demanding that appropriations be cut? The same editor wrote the letter and the editorial. That is a common occurrence.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. We are for the editorial, Mr. Senator.

Senator KILGORE. If it would affect your own local airport up there?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. We will take the editorial.

Mr. TAUBENECK. In the State of Connecticut some men are working 3 days a week, 2 or 3 days a week. Families are now concerned and harassed when the tax bills come in, and, of course, it is the consumer ultimately who pays the taxes, regardless of where you tap it.

Senator KILGORE. I am glad somebody recognizes that fact.

Mr. TAUBENECK. There are a lot of us consumers all over the United States of America, 148,000,000 of us, and we represent one little section of it. We are concerned growingly over—nobody knows what to call it. Our present Council of Economic Advisers is divided on it as to what to call what we are going through, but I am sure the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee are concerned about our economic position today in the world with the danger of England devaluing her currency soon and its effect upon our economy.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any further questions, gentlemen? If not, we are much obliged to you.

Representative GWINN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy.

Foundation Stones of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Guy George Gabrielson at Sioux Rapids, Iowa, on September 21, 1949, during the celebration of "Guy Gabrielson Day" arranged by the citizens of his native community, in my congressional district, in honor of Mr. Gabrielson's election as chairman of the Republican National Committee:

I stand before you, my old friends and neighbors, with heart filled with gratitude that you have rememebered me down the years and that you have set aside this day to welcome me back to this town which lives so richly in my memories.

I do not return to you as the home-town boy who had made good, but as the home-town boy who, with the aid of divine providence, means to make good in this task which I have chosen to undertake.

I do not propose, today, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, to make to you a statement in detail of the policies and intentions of my party. My task is to organize rather than to talk; to build an effective political organization, rather than to fix or to state its policies.

On specific issues our platform will be built by Republican Senators and Republican Representatives on the floors of Congress in Washington. It is by what they do there and what they say there that our party must stand or fall. They will write the record and upon that record I, as your national chairman, must organize for victory.

But there are basic foundation stones of Republican belief upon which I may properly speak to you. There are fundamental and unchangeable tenets in the Republican creed upon which we always have stood firm, and upon which we always must stand firm if our party is to be true to its obligations to this Nation which we revere, and if we shall deserve to be entrusted with its management in the perilous years that stretch before us.

The first of these unchangeable articles of faith is this:

The Republican Party has maintained in the past, does maintain in the present, and must maintain so long as time shall endure, that each individual citizen has the right to live his own life, work out his own career, conduct his own business according to the dictates of his own judgment, and in accord with his own conscience.

We maintain that the only limits to be placed upon his free will, shall be just regulations to protect his neighbors, his competitors and his customers from greed or dishonesty; a proper framework of law to protect his employees in their just rights and their health; and to insure that the public shall be treated with honesty and fairness.

This is one of the foundation stones of liberty.

We insist that every citizen shall be permitted to choose his way of making a living. And that he shall be permitted to use in that trade, profession or business all of his integrity, his ability, his initiative, and his invention.

We state that he must be allowed free will to use his individual abilities to make an honest profit, and by his frugality to invest and receive a proper return upon his investment in order that he may make secure his future and the future of those he holds dear.

This is a second of the foundation stones of liberty.

The Republican Party abhors the proposition that more authority and power shall be invested in a central government until it shall be able to dictate the activities of every waking and sleeping hour of the citizen.

We abhor the thought that every citizen should be compelled to ask permission of Government before he buys or sells, before he cultivates or leaves fallow; before he increases or decreases his output; before he shall be permitted to make any decision in the conduct of his own life or his own affairs.

We abhor the proposition that the State shall do the thinking for its citizens instead of the citizens doing the thinking for themselves and for the State.

To counter this perilous, this un-American movement toward statism and regimentation and tyranny, we insist and shall continue to insist that this freshet of centralization must be dammed and the current be turned to flow in the opposite direction.

We insist that this great reservoir of concentrated power shall be tapped in a thousand places until streams shall flow from it back to the people from whom it was stolen.

One of the most fundamental tenets of the Republican Party is that the power of Washington must not be permitted to become so great and arrogant that it dares to ignore the will of the people and to supersede republican forms with the dictatorship of a bureaucratic state.

The control of the state by its citizens is the cornerstone of liberty.

The Republican Party believes that bankruptcy is bankruptcy no matter what you call it. We believe that bankruptcy of morals and principles is even more destructive than money bankruptcy.

We believe that when you combine the two under the name of the misbranded Fair Deal you are indeed traveling headlong toward

the destruction of all we Americans hold dear.

We believe that when a man owes more than he can pay he is bankrupt. We believe that when he spends more than he earns he is traveling the road to insolvency. We believe that when a man or a family or a nation insists upon borrowing money to buy luxuries he, or it, cannot afford, he, or it, is exercising very poor judgment. A bankrupt nation, or a nation spending beyond its means is in just as bad a state as a farmer who has contracted more debts than he can pay, or the keeper of a grocery store who buys his wife a grand piano that puts his whole business in debt.

When this condition exists the farmer loses his farm and the storekeeper his shop. A nation loses more than that. It begins by taxing its people to a point where it makes it impossible for its citizens to live in decent comfort, and ends up by taxing and controlling—and the end of their liberties.

The sensible man exercises prudence and economy in his expenditures; the sensible government should be much more prudent, because it is responsible for the security and comfort and happiness of every one of you, of every family in the land.

We have not had a prudent or sensible administration of our financial affairs in many years. The New Deal was prodigal; the Fair Deal is fantastic.

A foundation stone of Liberty is a prudent national economy.

The Republican Party believes in strong, competent local self-government as opposed to a government which aims to destroy home rule. We believe that each town and village and county understands its own particular needs and problems better than some bureau in Washington operating by absentee landlordism. We believe that authority to run their own affairs should be restored to the communities where neighborhood control has always prevailed.

Strong, competent local self-government is one of the foundation stones of liberty.

The Fair Deal believes that government should be centralized in Washington until it becomes absolute. The Republican Party believes government should be decentralized so that it may remain in the hands of the citizens where it belongs.

The Republican Party believes that there are radicals at both ends of the social scale. A radical is a person who is intemperate. We sometimes think of a radical as only a red, a Socialist, a Communist, an individual who works to destroy our way of life and our form of government.

The Republican Party understands that this is not true—that there are radicals who are as dangerous on the extreme right as there are those who are threatening upon the extreme left. Our party sees clearly that it must steer a steady course between these opposites.

It is as bad a thing for the extreme rightists to seize control as it is for the extreme radicals of the Red persuasion. We must protect our people from exploitation by men who would turn back the clock to the old, evil days of predatory wealth with as much zeal as we must protect them against those who would drag us down into the chaos of communism or state socialism.

The only hope of traveling this safe, secure, sensible middle ground lies in the Republican Party. It is a road along which we can build structures to house safety, security, happiness, decent prosperity for all of us. It is the only road along which we can walk with hope of looking to right and left, of seeing and understanding and solving the problems of poor and of rich, of labor and of industry; of farmer and teacher and preacher, of cowboy and farm hand, and miner and artisan; of white-collar worker and the widow living upon her income.

A steady journey down a middle road is one of the foundation stones of liberty.

The Republican Party sees and understands that there is but one chief issue to be debated and solved in the tragic world that seems so determined today to destroy itself.

That issue is: Shall human liberty vanish from this planet; or shall it be preserved and made permanent for ourselves and our sons and the sons and daughters that shall come after them?

Out of war has come the tragedy of hunger and disease and want and despair. These evils have loosed upon the world a poison fog, a poison red fog which has crept from shore to shore, from boundary to boundary, slaying liberty and human freedom as it moved.

It has engulfed great nations and has sapped the integrity of other great nations until they totter upon the brink. Ill winds have blown clouds of it across the ocean to our own land and many of our people have come down with the disease. It undermines reason and integrity.

It whispers a lie into the ears of our people and some of them believe it. And this lie is that there is some substitute for liberty.

It whispers catch phrases and seductive words urging us to give up our own liberty in exchange for security from cradle to the grave.

Republicans know full well that security or happiness or serenity or any other good thing can be possessed only where liberty lives.

The Democratic Party has become infected by this poison fog and has adopted some of its catch phrases and makeshifts which promise us joy in some mirage of the Garden of Eden if we will only surrender this right and that freedom—accept this restriction and that invasion of liberty.

The Fair Deal is made up of these borrowed catchwords and false gospels as proclaimed so raucously and loudly by its principal prophet.

Whatever may be the motivation, the fact remains that we are being urged on the steep incline toward the welfare state or the police state or the Socialist state, and there is no power that can stop this march except the Republican Party, which I have the honor to represent today.

Next to hope that it stands well with God, the strongest desire of the decent human heart is to possess liberty. It is unquenchable. It is a living fire that cannot be quenched; even though all be reduced to ashes, that spark remains and persists and will not die. It has endured through the centuries, now and again bursting into ardent flame; sometimes all but trampled out by the heel of tyranny.

Today in America the Republican Party is the custodian of the sacred fire of liberty. We, the Republican Party, will not lay down the sword until victory has been won and liberty once more is safe within its temple.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1949, the Atlanta Federation of Women's Clubs adopted a resolution expressing the opposition of that fine organization to legislation known as compulsory-health insurance.

Under leave previously granted, I take pleasure in inserting this resolution herewith for the information of the Members:

Whereas under a system of free enterprise, the American medical profession has established the world's highest standard of scientific performance, treatment, and research, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major nation in the world; and

Whereas the benefits of American medicine are available to the people of this country through budget-basis voluntary health insurance, the best health insurance which exists in the world today; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical services has shown that there has been a gradual erosion of free enterprise and a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Atlanta Federation of Women's Clubs does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory-health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Mrs. Norman Sharp, Chairman, Resolutions; Mrs. John Turner, President; Mrs. Shelly Davis, Health Chairman; Mrs. William Percy, Mrs. Raymond Wolf, Mrs. Oscar Palmour, Resolutions Committee; Mrs. M. T. Edgerton, Corresponding Secretary.

Dated this 22d day of September 1949.

Effects of Lifting Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith two articles from the Oregon Statesman of Salem, Oreg., written by Mr. Conrad C. Prange regarding the effect of the lifting of rent controls in that city 2 months ago. Those who are fearful of what might happen in the Nation if controls are removed might well read these excellent articles with interest.

CITY RENTS LEVELING OFF, SURVEY SHOWS

(By Conrad G. Prange)

The case of the beleaguered landlord versus the outraged tenant appears to be adjusting itself in Salem.

With but few exceptions, tenants, real-estate agents, and apartment-house managers agreed in a Statesman survey this week that rents appear to be leveling.

While most rentals in lower brackets have increased slightly, rent on some higher-priced apartments has fallen.

With Federal rent controls off for nearly 2 months now, few cases of exorbitant rent increase since then were uncovered.

Reports of proposed construction of several large apartment houses in Salem, meanwhile, appear to meet with the approval of local real-estate interests. Several spokesmen indicated this week that they felt local population is expanding enough to create a need for new rental units. These same spokesmen were of the opinion that the additional rental units proposed would not drag down other rents immediately.

The proposed apartments include a 101-unit house to be erected by Victor N. Jones, of Seattle, and 3 houses with more than 80 units, by Robert Coates Construction Co., of Portland.

Those interested in the rental business say that rents are finding their own levels because the law of supply and demand is coming back into operation. As the housing shortage eases itself, tenants are becoming more choosy and are balking at high rates.

One landlord said he has been trying for several months, unsuccessfully so far, to rent a neat, three-room redecorated apartment at $60 per month. The same landlord said he recently reduced rents on four houses in order to keep steady tenants.

An example of rent leveling is found in the following case: A group of courts in North Salem is increasing its furnished three-room apartments from $55 to $65 per month. Nearby, another landlord has reduced the rent on similar furnished apartments from $69 to $62 per month.

SALEM RENTS REMAIN LEVEL DESPITE LIFTING OF CONTROLS

Predicted stiff increases in rents have not materialized since Federal controls on rent were lifted here officially August 18, a Statesman survey showed Wednesday.

Most three-room furnished apartments are hovering at around the $50-per-month mark. More rooms mean, in most instances, higher rates. Five-room houses are averaging about $60 to $55 per month rent.

Most of the larger apartment houses in Salem have not raised rents for several months. And indications are that most of them will not greatly increase in the near future if operating expenses do not go up.

In one large apartment house where rents have not been increased for several years rates are being increased an average of about $10 per month, effective October 1. This would place a large five-room apartment, with heat, garbage disposal and refrigeration service furnished, at $57 per month. A tenant there said he felt the increase was justified.

Another establishment will raise its rents approximately 15 percent October 1, representing a $5 per month increase on a $35 per month apartment. Another furnished, five-room apartment was raised recently from $37.50 to $40 per month.

No complaints on rent increases came from two public agencies, which have in the past been unwilling participants in the tenant versus landlord battle.

Marian Bowen, administrator of the Marion County Welfare Commission, stated that her office has had no trouble recently in finding reasonable rentals for welfare recipients. Nor she said has she had trouble lately with rent increases.

H. G. (Hub) Saalfeld, Marion County service officer, whose office, in many instances, is a clearing house for veterans' complaints, said he has heard of no recent examples of outrageous rent hikes.

Burt Picha, president of the Salem board of realtors, said he has heard of only one case of rent gouging in the past 2 months.

Leo Childs, prominent realtor and himself owner of an apartment house, said that exorbitant rent increases were a thing of the past. "Most landlords are seeking only a fair return on their investments," he said.

William Bliven, long-time Salem realtor, said rents have, in the main, remained steady. In fact, Bliven declared, a number of rentals have increased in rates in recent months.

Bliven warned, however, that new apartment houses to be constructed could hardly offer rent rates cheaper than existing houses. Current costs of building materials and labor, he said, almost necessitate rentals in the $65 to $75 per month bracket to insure a fair margin of profit.

The Future of Poland Is at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, some 6 weeks ago, at meetings held throughout the United States, members of Polish-American organizations commemorated the tenth anniversary of the betrayal of Poland by Adolph Hitler and the Nazi legions. These meetings brought back to our minds eye a vivid picture of our feelings on that occasion some 10 years ago when one of the outstanding democratic nations of the world was ruthlessly invaded.

During these intervening years we have waged a war against the forces which unleashed this attack and we have apparently emerged victorious. But have we? The Nazi war machine was crushed, it is true, but have we yet gained for the people of Poland the freedom they lost in 1939? Hitler was not alone in the plan to destroy Poland. Events since then have proven that there was a master plan to divide it up between Germany and Russia. The first part of that plan was halted by the defeat of Germany but what about the planning of the other partner.

As a result of the Potsdam conference, the people of the United States felt that Poland would regain her position as one of the democratic nations of the world. It is true there were changes in the boundaries of the country but it was felt that this would be an advantage. The important thing was that the freedom-loving people of Poland could again shake off the concentration camps and virtual slavery as they had after World War I. The agreement at Potsdam has been carried out to the letter by the United States. Many of us may have had doubts regarding parts of it, but our word was given and we intend to keep it. The same is true with the other participants at this meeting with the exception of one. Over 4 years have elapsed since that meeting and it is time we took inventory. We have used every possible means to help establish the rights and individual integrity of not only Poland but all other like countries. We helped develop the United Nations and have supported it without reservations. We have tried every means known to international diplomacy.

But, Mr. Speaker, our efforts have not borne fruit.

Through our program of aid to the various unfortunate nations, we felt that we were gaining ground. We thought that we could detect a change of attitude on the part of the U. S. S. R. Even as short a time back as 6 weeks ago, when we were commemorating this 10-year anniversary, there was a feeling of hope. But in the past 2 weeks that hope has again been shattered. The freedom-loving peoples who are behind the iron curtain are being given a preview of ruthlessness which even the Nazi could not equal. We can only guess at the extent to which it has gone already.

Somewhere we have failed. These freedom-loving peoples, whose belief in democracy goes as far back in history as our own, and whose illustrious citizens contributed so much to our own struggle for independence, must be given help. I do not know the means by which this can be accomplished, but the time is drawing out. For nearly 150 years the Polish people have struggled for freedom and liberty, but concentration camps, slave labor and death will destroy the spark if we fail to find the answer soon.

Farm Groups Should Be Included in Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6000, already adopted by the House, provides vast improvements in the Social Security Act and is one of the most constructive measures of the present session. I earnestly hope it will be enacted into law. Unfortunately, it does not include provisions for farm workers and others within the farm group. I realize that the difficulties in connection with coverage for farmers are substantial but they are not insuperable. In support of the general proposition that it is inequitable not to provide such benefits for millions of Americans so classified I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, October 10, 1949:

FARM SOCIAL SECURITY

It is decidedly time for farmers to know more about the old-age and survivors insurance of the Social Security System. Congress will doubtless raise, probably next year, the now inadequate benefits for retired workers. The bill recently passed by the House boosts the payments on an average of 70 percent. When substantial monthly sums are given the elderly, many in the rural regions will doubtless question whether it is fair for the farm people not to share the advantages the same as workers in business and industry.

The 8,000,000 or more people on the farm eligible for this social insurance comprise the largest group to be omitted for the past 12 years from its coverage. The principal reason that Congress is still making no effort to bring them in is that they don't yet understand the social-security provisions for retirement, according to Washington farm observers.

The farm folks who most need the old-age insurance are the 700,000 migratory farm workers. These farm laborers who follow the harvest from one area to another have an unusual handicap in providing for their later years, and many of them also lack the necessary responsibility. The 750,000 sharecroppers of the South form another large section which would be greatly helped.

The most important and influential farm group, however, consists of the 4,000,000 farm owners. Many are uninterested, some opposed, while a minority favor. Just what the old-age insurance is hasn't yet been made

clear to the mass of farm operators. Doubtless, the old-age benefits would prove a welcome resource to many of them.

As the Government insurance is eventually broadened to take in almost everybody else, it seems doubtful if they and the rest of the agricultural world will permanently stay out. Education about this social insurance must some day come to the farm, particularly to the farm operators. If then the farmers don't want it, it is certainly their right to reject it. But if they do, the quicker the old-age protection of the social security system is made available, the better it will be for a host of farm people.

Jerusalem Is an Integral Part of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of Congress a patently unnecessary situation which persists in preventing the establishment of a permanent peace in strife-torn Near East.

Jerusalem, the mecca of three great religions, continues to be a sore point of contention between Israel and the Arab nations; this city of shrines and holy places—a city that should, of all places on earth, abound in peace and quiet—remains tense and warlike and always on the verge of open hostility.

Israel is now in possession of the new city of Jerusalem, while the Arabs continue to occupy the old city. Ninety-five percent of the inhabitants of the new city is Jewish, while at least 90 percent of the sacred shrines lie within the walls of the old city.

The Israeli Government has accorded freedom of access to all persons who wish to enter the holy places within its jurisdiction, and has indicated on numerous occasions that it is willing to accept United Nations supervision over these shrines. But only the holy places should be placed under UN jurisdiction.

In order to reach Jerusalem it is necessary to pass through Israeli territory from the sea. It is nonsense to claim that all of Jerusalem must be under UN control in order to afford access to the shrines, because that will depend upon the good graces of the Israeli Government regardless of who has jurisdiction over the Holy City, and Israel has already guaranteed that it will never interfere with the right to visit these shrines.

The people of Jerusalem are an integral part of the economic, ethnic, religious, and political life of Israel; these men and women have an inherent right to be citizens of the nation upon which their very livelihoods depend. An attempt to isolate Jerusalem from Israel would result, in a short time, in complete deterioration, not only for the city and its inhabitants, but indeed for the very holy places which we wish to preserve and protect. Can we sever Pittsburgh from Pennsylvania, can we take Seattle from Washington, or Richmond from Virginia, or Manhattan from New York, or San Francisco from California, or London from England, can we isolate a thriving, modern city from its mother state or nation and still expect life to continue normal and unchanged?

Of course, we cannot. We can no more believe that the United States would be unaffected by the loss of its steel production, or its coal mines or, indeed, its production of motion pictures, than we can honestly believe that Israel could remain the vital link of democracy that it now is, if Jerusalem were taken from it. And Jerusalem itself would become desiccated if it were cut off from the flow of economic intercourse to and from the rest of Israel.

The UN has frequently demonstrated that it will not and that it cannot dispose of any adequate force to enforce its decisions; therefore, in the present instance, a successful solution depends upon the cooperation and good will of Israel and the Arabs. Certainly it is evident that if the often-repeated assurances of the Israeli Government are rejected, the establishment of a UN regime in Jerusalem would not provide a solution to the problem.

The only appropriate settlement that can peacefully end the dangerous tension in the Near East is to recognize Jerusalem as a part of Israel, which rightfully it is, and to provide for administrative jurisdiction by the UN over the holy places proper, but not territorial jurisdiction over the city and its people.

For further clarification on the problem of Jerusalem, I hope that everyone will read the following speech delivered in the United Nations General Assembly on September 26, 1949, by the Honorable Aubrey S. Eban, the representative of Israel to the United Nations:

ISRAEL AND JERUSALEM

(Excerpts from an address by Aubrey S. Eban, United Nations representative of Israel)

Our agenda contains an item of vital importance to the relations between the United Nations and its newest member; I refer to the question of Jerusalem and the holy places. Earlier this year, when the Jerusalem problem was a subject of profound international interest, the President of Israel made a public pronouncement, to the terms of which my Government still faithfully adheres. He said:

"The Government and people of Israel are conscious of the international interest in the safety of the holy places and the right of free access to them. We pledge ourselves to insure full security for religious institutions in the exercise of their functions; to grant the supervision of the holy places by those who hold them sacred; and to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection. Just as we are resolved to give complete and practical expression to the universal interest arising from the holy places, so we expect that the international community will understand the direct and inescapable responsibility which Israel bears and exercises in the daily life and administration of Jewish Jerusalem."

On May 5, 1949, when a committee of this Assembly proceeded to discuss the Jerusalem question in relation to Israel's obligations under article 4 of the Charter, I was instructed to develop these principles by advocating the establishment by the United Nations of international agencies extending over the whole city but concerned exclusively with the control and protection of holy places and sites.

It will thus be seen that we regard the Jerusalem problem as composed of two elements. First, there is the responsibility of the United Nations for insuring that holy places and sites are reverently preserved and that religious institutions are assured full liberty in the exercise of their functions. The other purpose, no less valid, and for the Government of Israel not one whit less compelling, is the need to assure the Jewish population of the city the full enjoyment of its democratic political rights in association with the only government to which it is now prepared to offer its allegiance. We see no incompatibility between these two purposes. Conflict can arise only if there is an unjustified encroachment by one upon the other. Thus, if the political aspirations of Israel and of Jerusalem's population were carried to the point of repudiating the concern of the United Nations for the safeguarding of holy places and sites, there might be an encroachment upon a universal religious interest. No such eventuality will ever take place. On the other hand, if the United Nations were to impose upon the population of Jerusalem any burden or deprivation not strictly related to the satisfaction of universal religious interests, an encroachment would take place upon cherished political freedoms.

It must be remembered that the safeguarding of holy places and the religious rights has always been the exclusive justification of any measure of international supervision. The resolution of December 11 itself does not make an unconditional demand for "separate treatment" or "effective United Nations control" in Jerusalem. It recommends separate treatment and effective international control explicity "with a view to Jerusalem's religious associations." Once full provision has been made for the satisfaction of those religious associations under United Nations supervision, the international and religious aspects of the problem will have been settled and we shall be left only with a problem of political relations in Jerusalem, to be solved in accordance with the principle of self-determination and by the method of conciliation.

THE PEOPLE'S ALLEGIANCE

It would be a disservice to realistic investigation to ignore the exact relationship existing between the Jews of Jerusalem and the State of Israel at this time; for that relationship must profoundly affect the task of the General Assembly in the Jerusalem question. The situation may be briefly described. When a law is promulgated in Israel, the Jews of Jerusalem obey it. When a tax is levied in Israel, the Jews of Jerusalem pay it. When the parliamentary institutions of Israel are elected, the Jews of Jerusalem help to elect them and participate in their operation. When civil or criminal litigation arises in Jerusalem, it is to the courts of Israel alone that the Jews of Jerusalem take their case. The coinage and stamps of Jewish Jerusalem are the coinage and stamps of Israel. The slowly reviving economy of Jerusalem is sustained and nourished from the State of Israel, which provides from its own resources all the social services of the new city—its health, its education, its water supply, and its social welfare. The language and religion, the cultural sentiment and national allegiance of the Jews of Jerusalem are those which they hold in common with the State of Israel and its people. There is thus no link uniting a citizen of Paris to the Republic of France; there is no bond between a citizen of London and the United Kingdom which does not exist at this time between a Jew in Jerusalem and the state of Israel. For in modern society no man however conscious of civic pride, feels complete in the limits of a purely municipal allegiance; he

must reach out to identify himself with a wider political and social culture. In this respect, too, the Jewish citizens of Jerusalem are as those of all other cities.

Yet there is one particular aspect in which the link between Jewish Jerusalem and the State of Israel has an altogether special strength. In 1947 the United Nations, having undertaken full responsibility, both for the religious and secular life of Jerusalem, declined to carry out any responsibility for either one of the two. Jerusalem fell into siege and famine. Its population underwent a martyrdom unknown in post-Biblical times, while the international community looked on for several months helpless and inert. Men, women, and children fell by the hundreds, both in the city's defense and in its relief. At critical moments both its water and food supplies were cut off with no hope of replenishment. If this situation had endured for a matter of days, there would have overtaken every living Jew in Jerusalem an annihiliation more total and complete than the most effective and devastating bombardment can ever inflict. Salvation came from one quarter alone. The State of Israel, struggling against dire odds for very survival itself, girded all its strength to throw a lifeline to the beleaguered city, reopening its communication and saving it from dreadful strangulation. Every man, woman, and child in Jewish Jerusalem today can thus ascribe the very fact of his physical survival directly and concretely to the State of Israel and its Government. It is not surprising therefore that they are ready to give their loyalty and cooperation to that Government alone.

Thus the situation in Jerusalem today is both a cause and a consequence of the city's rescue and pacification, and it rests firmly upon valid armistice agreements fully entered into by the parties and endorsed by the Security Council. It is therefore a legal situation and not merely an accomplished fact. This connection between Israel and Jerusalem does not interfere in the slightest degree with the desire and the duty of the United Nations to undertake responsibilities for safeguarding the holy places and sites.

THE DISREGARD OF OPINION AND REALITY

The fact that such firm patterns of authority and government already exist in Jerusalem makes it imperative for the United Nations to seek a solution in harmony with established and legitimate interests. Indeed, in its second progress report presented to the General Assembly on April 19, 1949, the Palestine Conciliation Commission wrote that it was endeavoring to formulate proposals in conformity with the resolution of December 11 which would at the same time be acceptable to both parties. Yet the Commission has since apparently reached the conclusion that the consent of the parties is not an important or even a relevant consideration. The General Assembly may not be aware of the remarkable fact that the plan presented by the Commission in document A/973 was never discussed with the Government of Israel, which now administers almost the entire new city of Jerusalem, and does not arise out of any consultation with it. Nor was it at any time the subject of negotiation with representatives of the population of Jerusalem.

This procedural disregard of the opinion of the authorities and population directly concerned is unfortunately reflected in the substantive proposals themselves. The plan sets up organs of government as though Jerusalem had no government; it establishes courts as though Jerusalem had no courts; it makes detailed arrangements for the control of public services as though Jerusalem were now living in anarchy; it replaces independent institutions resting upon consent with new institution having no roots in the city and no duty or response to democratic processes. Not one of the administrative councils is really necessary for the protection of the holy places; not one of these courts has duties essentially related to the religious associations of the city. The whole administrative superstructure, which would revolutionize the budget of this organization, is not relevant to the primary objectives of the United Nations in Jerusalem.

Moreover, by dispensing with any effort to reach consent, the Commission sometimes collides sharply with the devout political and religious conscience of the population. Thus, for example, we have a proposal in article 5 whereby Jews might be forbidden to take up residence in Jerusalem on the ground of being Jews. My Government knows this General Assembly too well to believe that there is a chance of such a proposal being adopted, and we have no real feeling of alarm. We know this organization will not put up a notice "no more Jews wanted" at the gates of the Holy City, which was made illustrious in history through the spiritual experience of the Jewish people, wherefrom there branched off the great streams of Christianity and Islam. Yet the fact that such a proposal could be made shows how urgent it is to begin formulating the Jerusalem policy of the United Nations anew, in close association with the peoples and interests involved.

Finally, a similar criticism can be made of the proposal for demilitarization, which fails to take account of two facts. In the first place, the simultaneous dismissal of Jewish and Arab forces from Jerusalem would not create equal security for both parts of the city. It would put the entire city once more back in the situation which nearly produced its downfall last year—back to the mercy of Arab forces which, by the facts of geography, would then be free to surround it from three sides. The demilitarization program also conflicts with the armistice agreement which exclusively governs the security situation in the whole Jerusalem area, including the disposition and reduced size of armed forces.

THE SEARCH FOR A PRACTICAL SOLUTION

Irrespective of its strong feelings on the commission's report, my delegation will work earnestly and constructively in this Assembly in search of a practical and final definition of United Nations responsibilities on one hand and those of the Government of Israel on the other. We shall pursue a solution securing both the interests and concerns of the world religions and the United Nations and the aspirations of the people of Jerusalem to assure their Government and security in conformity with their national allegiance. We are already encouraged by some principles put forward in the general debate. The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands rightly ascribed primary importance to the protection of the holy places and the need for an agreed solution. The eminent Foreign Minister of France carried this discussion into new and constructive channels by concisely emphasizing three factors: The importance of carrying out the practical objectives of the United Nations without undue insistence on juridical preferences; the need to avoid imposing obligations not strictly indispensable; and the desirability of seeking the consent of the population concerned.

My delegation will propose that the General Assembly should limit the commitment of the United Nations to the safeguarding of holy places and initiate such formal agreements as may be necessary between the United Nations and the State of Irsael for the implementation of those safeguards. My Government aspires to full international recognition of the political status of the Government of Israel in Jerusalem.

A solution along these lines would have the following advantages over that proposed by the Commission; it would rest on consent and therefore present no problem of implementation or enforcement; it would terminate the long period of doubt and potential conflict that has already lasted too long; it would be financially and administratively feasible; and it would simultaneously give complete satisfaction to the interests of the great world religions and of the people of Jerusalem. In these conditions, an era of peace and development would descend upon the Holy City, while the United Nations would stand forth as the ultimate and accepted guarantor of its religious immunity.

The solution of most international problems requires an exact balance between the interests of the international community and those of an individual state. Yet when two legitimate interests face each other, it is often possible to satisfy the main substance of both.

Small nations represented here in the General Assembly must often ask themselves what they can contribute to the general welfare in a world dominated by large units of power. Perhaps in their very disinterestedness and in their passionate need for security, they are the best qualified to search out the common ground between conflicting interests, and to assert the persistent need for mediation. My Government, which has itself learned the consequences of war and the benefits of conciliation, and which represents a new political unit whose traditions and future depend on the maintenance of international peace, will join its humble effort to any movement arising here for extending the use of the methods of pacific settlement prescribed by the Charter. It is in that spirit that the delegation of Israel comes forward to undertake its duties at its first full session of the General Assembly as a member of the United Nations.

Will the Justice Department Have To Intervene To Stop the Refiners of Imported Sugar From Putting the Small-Business Man Out of Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, not only does the National Sugar Refinery of New York wish to dominate the sugar industry by high-pressuring various Government departments for lower prices on sugar, to the detriment of the sugarcane and beet-sugar growers of America, but they now have decided, along with other companies, such as the Burros Feed Co., of Fort Worth, Tex., to go into the manufacturing of sacks, bags, and bagging.

It is my understanding that the National and the Savannah Refineries, who are in the sugar-refining business, are now setting up operations in their own plants for reconditioning, manufacturing, and selling various kinds of bags. These two refineries sell both bags and bagging for the covering of cotton, a field which is entirely foreign to the manufacture and refining of raw sugar.

Mr. Speaker, how much further are these giants of business going to be allowed to go in setting up monopolies which result in the destruction and putting out of business of the small-business man? As shown above, thousands of

small bag companies will be forced to the wall if this kind of monopolistic tendency continues.

With the present actions of the Department of Justice in forcing giant monopolies to abide by the laws, it seems that in setting this example, that many other business giants are inviting and asking for similar treatment.

The Department of Justice is to be congratulated for the eternal diligence in trying to force big business to abide by our laws and thereby protecting the interest of the small-business man.

Open Letter to the Atomic Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by Mr. Amrine and E. A. Conway, which appears in the October 15 issue of America, titled "Open Letter to the Atomic Scientists":

OPEN LETTER TO THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS

(By M. Amrine and E. A. Conway)

We still need you, professors. We do not think you can save the world. But you can help the world save itself.

Now that Russia has the atomic bomb, the second phase of the atomic age has begun. The second lap of the atomic armaments race is under way.

We know that you warned against this day all during 1946 and 1947. We know that at last you gave up trying to convince our people and our policy makers of the deadly seriousness of their situation only after they had rebuffed and ridiculed you. We sympathized with you when you withdrew in disillusionment to your private laboratories.

You must come out of your laboratories again. The politicians and the militarists are floundering and blundering. They need your scientific advice today even more than they needed it when you saved them from the May-Johnson bill in 1946. Even more than your advice, they need your sense of urgency, your realization of the catastrophe they are flirting with when they talk glibly of keeping ahead in the current armament race.

You made a terrific impact on Washington back in the first months of the atomic age, when you set up the Federation of Atomic Scientists, the National Committee on Atomic Information, and the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists; when you conducted night schools in nuclear physics for the Congressmen.

We believe, however, that your successes were due rather less to your marshaling of facts and logic than they were to your feelings as human beings. You thought that Congressmen and newspapermen were listening to your polysyllables. Words are cheap in Washington. What your audiences really heard was a sound much more rare in Washington, the throbbing sound of a human heart. We deliberately speak unscientifically when we say: They heard your fears, your hopes, your emotions, as to the meaning of this new-found force.

But you failed, you say. Few in Washington caught your sense of urgency; few believed that the bomb was the Nation's No. 1 problem, to which its best energies must be devoted. Who among the 100 Congressmen who heard Prof. J. C. Stearns on November 8, 1945, believed him when he said: "Several other nations, or a group of nations, could develop the bomb as quickly as was done here, in approximately 3 years?" Negotiations with Russia in the UN Atomic Commission were turned over to men who had little talent for the delicate task. Those negotiations were allowed to drag along unnoticed and unquestioned. No one seemed concerned enough to ask how they were being handled.

All that may be true, professors, but it does not change the fact that the crisis has come.

This crisis gives you a second chance.

Americans were merely curious, before Russia got the bomb. Now they are concerned. Now all of us want to know what can be done about the sword over our heads. Tell us truly how terrified you were at Alamogordo, how appalled you were at Bikini and Eniwetok. You were the midwives of this menace. You still have the responsibility of warning the world against it. You must convince the world that the atomic armament race leads only to Armageddon.

You can do it if you will learn a lesson from your early efforts at atomic education. Your first attempts, in 1945–46, though politically inept, were effective because you concentrated on the facts of the atomic age. You began to lose influence in 1947 as you diluted and divided your efforts. You did not, perhaps, realize the size of the job of educating 150,000,000 people in such a novel and complex problem. You became bored with saying the same simple essential truths over and over again—the bomb is the absolute weapon; there is no adequate military defense against it; other nations can develop it; there must be international control.

It was a tiresome task, and we can hardly blame you for your discouragement, nor for the fact that you allowed yourselves to be diverted into a dozen different movements for world peace, in which you tried to be political scientists rather than scientist-citizens.

Do you still believe that the world is racing toward suicide? Do you believe it more than ever, now that Russia has the bomb? Then tell us Americans so, declare war on war, preach your crusade, not only through America, but through the world. That will be enough for you to do. That, as a fact, is all that you can possibly do. To do that much will alone help the world to save itself. To do it properly will require more time and energy than you were able to give before. It will require that you distinguish carefully between what society must do to survive, and what scientists must do to help it survive. You are not asked to cure all the ills of the world. You probably will not be able to tell the world what it must do positively in order to survive. But you can tell the world what it must not do.

The world, which has never really understood what terrible power is involved in fission, needs more than ever basic information about atomic energy. Since Russian possession of the bomb was announced, Americans, especially, are more at sea than ever. Yet ever since September 23 we have watched and listened in vain for any constructive contribution from any of you.

The national decisions to be taken soon must be based on absolutely accurate scientific facts and assumptions. You should be organized and alert to challenge authoritatively any inaccurate statements by Government officials, magazine or newspaper editors, radio commentators or newspaper columnists.

Organize one united, integrated committee that can speak for all of you. Today some of your organizations are defunct, like the National Committee on Atomic Information and the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists. Others are moribund, like the Federation of American Scientists and the Association of Scientists for Atomic Education. Who will blow the trumpet?

Some say that scientists are too individualistic ever to organize successfully; that they do not know the meaning of teamwork. Many of you did give us that impression when we were working with you. Many of you embarked on individual messianic missions which destroyed your usefulness to the educational campaign. But your record in the Manhattan project proved that you can work together. That was the greatest team effort in the history of science and industry. "Operation survival" calls for teamwork again.

Once you have your unified committee, you can begin to exert real influence. Make it clear from the outset that yours is not a scientists' welfare committee. Yours is a world's welfare committee. Present your recommendations formally. If the Government doesn't listen, the newspapers will. You can count on plenty of assistance. You still have the sympathy and good will of scores of publicists and leaders in Government and diplomacy.

There is no time to lose. Someone must be prepared to fight the idea of preventive war against Russia. Exposure of the facts, what that would mean in terms of Russian atomic retaliation, is the safest bulwark against the atrocious idea. As the problem of control remains unsolved, as the atomic armament race accelerates, as the tension increases, you may be sure that a preventive war will be preached. Responsible leaders opposing it will need the support of a great American conscience to resist those pressures. You will be more clear in your own consciences if you have done all in your power to resist such madness.

The bomb is not a product of reason. Nuclear physics, of course, is the product of men's minds, but the bomb is the product of war, which is to say, of men's passions. There are also in the world human passions opposed to war and the causes of wars. It is to these emotions you can appeal, and around them you can mobilize resistance to the idea of preventive war. Words and documents cannot be heard above the two main sounds which speak to the average man. One is the sound of his own heart, that is, his life. The other he calls his conscience. You will never move him to action unless you convey to him the sound of your own heart, and show him that your own conscience cries out against the world's suicide.

You know that in '45 and '46 you felt that same sense of mission which has inspired other men to other crusades. Perhaps the reason for your success was that in an age of weakened moral values you had recovered a sense of personal responsibility. You said, in effect, this bomb is something we made. We know it is dangerous; we want to help in solving the problems it now makes acute. If you had followed that line faithfully and single-mindedly, you might have changed the world. A true application of reason to the great problem of world peace, illumined by that candid humanity which brought you frightened to Washington, might have brought peace by this time. That bright flame of humanity, morality and humility which you brought from Alamogordo to the corridors of Congress, brief as it was in all truth, was the brightest flicker of hope for real peace in the world since Hitler came to power.

In fact, your early effort to become more than scientists, to become "whole men," in simple fact, your search for your own souls, impressed some as the beginning of a march away from the materialism and dehumanized reason of which the bomb is the tragic symbol.

Now, before we start on the downward spiral which threatens to lead to the disintegration, not only of our world but of all human and moral values, now is the time to ask the questions you asked yourselves at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos—and to demand honest answers.

Most of science today, at least of physics, no matter how pure it may be as research in itself is making you into armorers of Armageddon. Will you now say, "No man can do much against the system; we are committed to the practice of power politics; the military dominates our foreign policy; anyway, I will be comfortable until the deluge"?

Your own place in history is the least thing at stake, perhaps, but we might also mention it. The people who burned books in the public squares of Hitler's Germany were revolting against a world ruled by money, reason, and rules, which, they thought, had not been able to save their sons and husbands from tragedy. The people of today and the people of tomorrow, if you do not follow your consciences now, will have a hundred times more reason to curse the name of science. And in the eras to come in which western man struggles to rebuild his civilization it may be that the name of Einstein will be linked with Hitler's—the man who had the wickedness to embrace mass bombing may be linked with the man who had the genius to make mass bombing total.

Action Expected by FTC Against American Iron and Steel Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this body know, I am deeply interested in the adequate enforcement of our antitrust laws in order that our American free-enterprise system may be preserved. In this connection I am calling to the attention of Members of the House the failure of the Federal Trade Commission to follow up on a complaint which the Commission issued against members of the steel industry in November 1947. This complaint charged the American Iron and Steel Institute and some one hundred producers of steel with conspiring to fix prices on all basic steel products. The complaint charged that price fixing was brought about by collusive maintenance of a basing-point system which includes the use of identical price lists, arbitrary freight rate books, and various price discrimination practice.

The Commission counsel, during public hearings held over a period of 8 months which ended in September 1948, presented a mass of evidence and testimony in support of these charges. More than a year has passed, yet the Commission has not followed up with action of any kind. On the contrary, it is reported that certain members of the Commission are taking steps to negotiate the case. Negotiate, it appears, simply means that no action will be taken against the steel industry and that avenues of future action will be closed. All of this is planned in spite of the fact that the mass of evidence accumulated against the steel industry indicates that the companies named in the complaint have violated openly and flagrantly our antitrust laws.

For the information of the Members of this body, I am inserting into the RECORD excerpts from the complaint which was issued against the steel industry in November 1947. I hope that every Member will read this complaint, particularly the points enumerated under paragraph 3 in which the offenses charged are listed.

The following producer respondents are members of respondent institute, and they are sometimes hereinafter referred to as members: Acme Steel Co.; Agaloy Tubing Co.; Alan Wood Steel Co.; Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.; the American Rolling Mill Co.; Anchor Drawn Steel Co.; Atlantic Steel Co.; the Atlantic Wire Co.; the Babcock & Wilcox Tube Co.; Bethlehem Steel Co.; Bliss & Laughlin, Inc.; Buffalo Bolt Co.; Bundy Tubing Co.; A. M. Byers Co.; the Carpenter Steel Co.; Central Iron & Steel Co.; Chicago Steel & Wire Co.; Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.; Columbia Steel & Shafting Co.; Columbia Tool Steel Co.; Compressed Steel Shafting Co.; Connors Steel Co.; Continental Steel Corp.; Copperweld Steel Co.; Crucible Steel Co. of America; the Cuyahoga Steel & Wire Co.; Detroit Steel Corp.; Henry Disston & Sons, Inc.; Eastern Stainless Steel Corp.; Edgewater Steel Co.; Empire Steel Corp.; Firth Sterling Steel & Carbide Corp.; Follansbee Steel Corp.; Fretz-Moon Tube Co., Inc.; Granite City Steel Co.; Griffin Manufacturing Co.; Harrisburg Steel Corp.; Inland Steel Co.; Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.; Joslyn Manufacturing & Supply Co.; Judson Steel Corp.; Keystone Drawn Steel Co.; Keystone Steel & Wire Co.; Laclede Steel Co.; Latrode Electric Steel Co.; Lukens Steel Co.; the Mahoning Valley Steel Co.; the Medart Co.; Mercer Tube & Manufacturing Co.; the Midvale Co.; Moltrup Steel Products Co.; National Standard Co.; National Steel Corp.; Northwestern Steel & Wire Co.; Pacific States Steel Corp.; the Phoenix Iron Co.; Pittsburgh Steel Co.; Pittsburgh Tool Steel Wire Co.; Pittsburgh Tube Co.; the Pollak Steel Co.; Reeves Steel & Manufacturing Co.; Republic Steel Corp.; John A. Roebling's Sons Co.; Rotary Electric Steel Co.; Sharon Steel Corp.; the Standard Tube Co.; Superior Steel Corp.; Sweet's Steel Co.; the Thomas Steel Co.; United States Steel Corp.; Universal Cyclops Steel Corp.; Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.; Vulcan Crucible Steel Co.; Washington Steel Corp.; Western Automatic Machine Screw Co.; Wheatland Tube Co.; Wheeling Steel Corp.; Wisconsin Steel Co.; Worth Steel Co.; Wyckoff Steel Co.; the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

Respondents have the power to dominate and manipulate the markets in which their unorganized customers and consumers must buy their products and to frustrate, destroy, suppress, and eliminate competition between themselves. The American Iron and Steel Institute is made use of by producer respondents as a vehicle or medium for collective action and it assists the producer respondents in dominating and manipulating markets and in the carrying on of the unfair methods of competition hereinafter alleged. Collective action taken by producer respondents through respondent institute in connection with the increase in steel prices which was announced during July 1947 is an instance in point.

OFFENSES CHARGED

PAR. 3. For many years last past and continuing to the present time, respondents have combined, conspired, and agreed to act collusively and have acted collusively, and are now acting collusively, in restraining, suppressing, frustrating, and destroying competition in the sale of steel products, including but not restricted to (1) ingots; (2) semifinished rolled products (e. g. blooms, billets, tube rounds, sheet bars, tin-plate bars, and slabs); (3) finished rolled products (e. g. rails and accessory rail supplies, structural shapes, bars, wire rods, skelp, sheet steel piling, sheets, strip steel, and tin mill block plate); and (4) further finished steel products (e. g. cold finished bars, rods, sheets, and strips, galvanized sheet and strip, terneplate, and other coated sheet and strip tin plate, pipe and tubes, nails, wire and wire products) in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act and in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U. S. C. A. 45) in the commission of acts and the promulgation and use of policies, methods, and practices hereinafter more particularly set forth in subparagraphs 1 to 3, inclusive, of this paragraph 3 and in each of the succeeding paragraphs, namely, paragraph 4, paragraph 5, paragraph 6, and paragraph 7.

1. They have collusively composed, established, and announced prices—

(a) Through the maintenance and use of the basing-point practices and methods particularly described, set forth, and alleged in paragraph 4;

(b) Through the collective compilation of pricing factors more particularly described, set forth, and alleged in paragraph 5; and

(c) Through collective designation of certain steel products as "base products" for pricing purposes as is more particularly described, set forth, and alleged in paragraph 6.

2. They have directly and indirectly, through the offices and organization of respondent institute, and otherwise, collectively furthered their designs and plans to restrain, suppress, frustrate, and lessen competition in the sale of steel products—

(a) Through agreements and collective action, including those particularized, set forth, and alleged in paragraph 7;

(b) Through discussions by representatives of producer respondents in group meetings where they have reached a meeting of their minds that it would be to the self-interest of each of the producer respondents to so act as to forestall increases in steel production facilities and acting thereafter in accordance with such understandings;

(c) Through agreements, methods and practices with respect to making quotations to railroads;

(d) Through taking collective and collusive action from time-to-time to promote the making of delivered price quotations by producer respondents to customers at any given destination and in the promotion of adherence to such quotations;

(e) Through collective action with respect to resale price maintenance plans to further frustrate price competition and in so doing requiring jobbers to sell various steel products at the delivered price quotations adopted and specified by the producers respondents which were calculated in accordance with the basing point practices and methods referred to in paragraph four herein;

(f) Through taking collective action for establishment of a classification of customers designated as "jobbers" and the designation of particular persons, firms and individuals to be listed within that classification as provided for in joint action by members of one or more of the various "groups" of respondents referred to in paragraph seven herein;

(g) Through collective action in establishing and maintaining uniform terms and conditions of sale, including free credit periods and maximum cash discounts for prompt payment.

3. They have collusively acted to prevent deviations from their collusively announced prices—

(a) Through the taking of collective action to prevent diversions of shipments in transit;

(b) Through the taking of collective action to forestall and prevent reductions in railroad rates;

(c) Through the taking of collective action to curtail fabrication in transit;

(d) Through the taking of collective action to curtail price quotations on an f. o. b. mill basis when unrelated to or calculated in accordance with the basing point practices particularized in paragraph four; and

(e) Through the taking of collective action to arrive at the establishment of uniform quotations on extras as is more particularly described, set forth and alleged in paragraph six.

PAR. 4. Producer respondents have followed and do now follow a planned common and cooperative course of action in their employment and use of basing-point practices, as hereinafter particularized, set forth and alleged in this paragraph 4. The practices involve the designating of a certain location or a limited number of locations as basing points for pricing purposes. Such locations will hereinafter sometimes be referred to as basing points. For each such basing point a factor "base price" is announced. Such factor will hereinafter sometimes be referred to as "base price" or "basing-point price." The factor of "base price" thus used is announced by respondents as f. o. b. Pittsburgh, Pa., on some products. On other steel products with respect to a given delivered price quotation, the factor "base price," as announced by producer respondents, is announced as f. o. b. one or two or more locations (namely, a basing point) plus "freight applicator" therefor to said destination. Regularly, and in many instances, producer respondent produce steel at and make shipments from locations other than those designated and used as basing points in calculating the applicable delivered-price quotations.

In calculating, arriving at, and announcing delivered-price quotations, producer respondents use a formula, including the factor "base price" and a factor designated by respondents as "freight rate." The latter factor, when used by producer respondents for pricing purposes, is taken from a compilation cooperatively and collectively produced by respondents through respondent institute. The factor thus designated by respondents as "freight rate" is herein sometimes referred to as "freight applicator." Thus, the delivered-price quotations of producer respondents involve the use of a formula, namely, "base price" plus "freight applicator." The factor "freight applicator" thus utilized purports to represent the applicable freight rate on a given shipment. However, in no instance except by a happenstance does it represent the sum of the applicable freight rate on a shipment by a producer respondent where the delivered price therefor was based on the basing-point price f. o. b. a location other than that from which shipment was made. Furthermore, variances thus arising in many instances on some steel products occur because producer respondents making quotations in such instances have utilized the factor "base price" at a basing point plus the factor "freight applicator" supposedly representing freight charges from the basing point thus selected to the destination involved, although shipment is actually made from a production point much nearer freight-wise and at substantially lower actual transportation cost than the sum represented by said "freight applicator" used as a part of the formula for the delivered price. In other instances, producer respondents, although making shipments from one of the aforesaid basing points calculates delivered-price quotations with respect thereto through the use of the formula of base price plus freight applicator applicable from an entirely different basing point than the point of shipment.

PAR. 5. As a part of their common purpose and plan to lessen price competition, respondents have agreed upon a common list of charges to be added to base prices in lieu of switching, shipping, and freight charges. Such charges have been compiled and published by the respondent institute, ostensibly for the purpose of determining shipping charges, and are employed by the producer respondents in the calculation of delivered-price quotations. Each producer respondent maintains a traffic department for determining actual shipping charges, including rates and routes. Such calculations are difficult and technical and traffic experts frequently differ as to the proper rate or route involved in a particular shipment. Such calculations often differ through changes in rates or routes which may not become known to different shippers at the same time. To avoid differences in delivered-price quotations through employment of different rates, routes, or switching charges by different producer respondents, the respondents have employed in the calculation of delivered-price quotations only the rates which have been published and promulgated by the respondent institute. Thus institute freight-rate books are in reality price books.

In computing and calculating their delivered-price quotations in accordance with the aforesaid compilation or schedule of factors purporting to be all-rail freight rates and rail-ocean freight rates compiled and disseminated collectively through respondent institute, respondents frequently assess and charge amounts for delivery that are higher than those available according to official published tariffs and frequently deny purchasers the benefit of lower rates otherwise available for water or truck haul; likewise, respondents include in delivered-price quotations arbitrary amounts in lieu of actual switching charges made by the railroads for switching cars, which said arbitrary charges respondents have made available to themselves by collective collusive action through respondent institute and otherwise.

PAR. 6. Producer respondents produce and sell thousands of steel prcducts which vary in size, shape, chemical composition, physical treatment and otherwise from one another. Thus, the potentiality for price competition among these respondents is very great. To prevent this potential competition from finding expression and in furtherance of their general combination, respondents have adopted common methods of pricing and selling their great variety of products as follows: They have collectively and collusively classified their products making certain products "base" products for pricing purposes, and variations there from "extras" or "deductions." An "extra" or "deduction" is any variation in quality, size, chemical composition, physical treatment or otherwise from the "base" product. They have collectively and concertedly classified "extras" and "deductions" for pricing purposes and have concertedly and collusively established and maintained uniform prices for the aforesaid "extras" and "deductions," usually in terms of monetary amounts per hundred pounds or per pound or in terms of percent of the applicable base price factor. The said monetary amounts or per centum are added to or deducted from the applicable "base price" factor as provided for by the aforesaid collective and collusive action of respondents. Respondents have also collusively and concertedly established and maintained a system of uniform "extras" and "deductions" applicable to size or quantity of shipment or services rendered.

From time to time through agreement among themselves, respondents have arbitrarily increased the price of "extras" by substantial amounts aggregating a high percentage of the "base" product price factor and without relation to the cost of the "extra" involved.

PAR. 7. For several years last past producer respondents have been conducting their business and carrying on their activities under an agreement embodied in a formal resolution adopted on June 6, 1935, by producer-members of respondent institute representing more than 90 percent of the steel-producing capacity of the country. Under the terms of said resolution, which ratified a similar resolution adopted by respondent institute's board of directors on June 3, 1935, each of the producer respondents declared its intention of maintaining "the standards of fair competition which are described in the steel code." Said resolutions were adopted and have continued in effect after the invalidation of the National Industrial Recovery Act by the Supreme Court of the United States. Among other things said code provided that "each member of the code, by becoming such member, agrees with every other member thereof that the code constitutes a valid and binding contract by and among all members of the code." The board of directors of respondent American Iron and Steel Institute was the code authority which was entrusted by respondents with and exercised the functions of enforcing, administering, interpreting, and applying the provisions of the code regarding the standards of fair competition incorporated therein. Said institute, its board of directors, committees, and members have exercised similar functions since adoption of the aforesaid resolutions and have continued the code in effect as a voluntary agreement among the members of the institute.

As recently as July 1947, the institute was used by respondents to collusively support an increase in the price of steel which the producer respondents had announced. Respondent producers have continuously collaborated in the promotion, establishment, and conduct within the membership of respondent institute of a number of separate groups each composed of members who produce and sell similar and competing kinds of steel products, and have promoted and held frequent meetings, conferred, and systematically exchanged and interchanged information among and between themselves to carry out a noncompetitive price policy. Many of the producer respondents are producers of more than one kind of steel product and accordingly affiliated with more than one of the separate groups referred to. Among such groups are those composed of the respective producers of rolled steel products, rails, structural shapes, plates, bars, sheets, strips, tubular goods and wire products.

PAR. 8. Each of the producer respondents has contributed to the accomplishment of the acts and the effects flowing therefrom, as alleged in this complaint, by—

(1) Use of the basing point practices as particularized, set forth and alleged in paragraph 4;

(2) The practice of discrimination between and among its customers by demanding, charging, accepting and receiving higher net prices from its customers located near its plant than from its customers more distantly located for goods of like grade, quality, and quantity, and whereby it is enabled to and does match its quotations on a delivered basis with the quotations of other respondent members;

(3) Action in quoting prices to customers located in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, which are arrived at through the application of basing-point practices as particularized in paragraph 4, and in so doing quotes prices as though shipments were being made from mills east of the Rocky Mountains, although deliveries are actually made from mills west of the Rocky Mountains and in some instances near the location of the customer's business;

(4) Use of the compilations more particularly described, set forth and alleged in paragraph 5;

(5) Use of the designations of "base products" for pricing purposes in the manner more particularly set forth and alleged in paragraph 6;

(6) Use of compilations of "extras" or "deductions" more particularly described, set forth and alleged in paragraph 6;

(7) Acting in accordance with the understandings, agreements, plans, methods, policies, and practices more particularly described, set forth and alleged in paragraphs 3 and 7.

PAR. 9. The inherent effects of the adoption and maintenance by the respondent members of the practices described and alleged in paragraph 4 herein and of the collective action alleged in subparagraph 3 (d) of paragraph 3 herein include all, and singularly the following, to wit:

(1) Substantial lessening of competition among respondent members;

(2) Unfair and oppressive discrimination against portions of the purchasing public in large areas by depriving such purchasers of the advantage which would otherwise accrue to them as a result of their proximity to the factories of respondent members, and by requiring such purchasers to pay increases over what the net prices to such purchasers would have been if such net prices had been fixed by competition among respondents; and

(3) Deprivation of equal opportunities for buyers to secure supplies of steel in times of short supply when respondent producers refuse to quote and sell f. o. b. mill.

PAR. 10. The combination, agreements, and understandings of the respondents and the acts, practices, pricing methods, systems, devices, and policies as hereinbefore alleged, all and singularly, are unfair and to the prejudice of the public; deprive the public of the benefit of competition, promote discrimination against some buyers and users of respondents' products, have a dangerous tendency and capacity to restrain unreasonably competition in the sale of such products in commerce; have actually hindered, frustrated, restrained, suppressed, and prevented competition in such products in commerce; and constitute unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce, within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended.

Wherefore, the premises considered, the Federal Trade Commission, on this 13th day of November A. D. 1947, issues this as its amended complaint against said respondents.

* * * * *

In witness whereof, the Federal Trade Commission has caused this, its amended complaint, to be signed by the Secretary and its official seal to be hereto affixed, at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of November A. D. 1947.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] WM. J. GLENDINING, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

Statement of Grenville Clark Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in Support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, To Strengthen the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest in House Concurrent Resolution 64 to strengthen the United Nations, I believe the Members will find the statement of Mr. Grenville Clark very helpful. Mr. Clark is a distinguished lawyer, a former associate of Elihu Root, and an authority on international problems.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GRENVILLE CLARK BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64 TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

I am a lawyer by profession, now 66. I practiced in New York City, 1906–39, except during World War I. In 1940–44, I was active in various ways in the war effort. I have now retired from the law practice and am a resident of Dublin, N. H. For 30 years I have been interested in the effort to achieve world order, and in recent years have devoted most of my time to that purpose. I am one of the vice presidents of United World Federalists; but what I say here represents only my individual view.

This statement is in support of the world federation resolution introduced June 7 by Mr. Hays and others to seek the development of the United Nations into a world federation open to all nations. I believe that the adoption by Congress of this resolution might mark a turning point in history. I give my reasons for this conclusion and for believing that this world federation resolution is preferable to the other resolution introduced July 26 (H. R. 108), calling for a federal convention of democracies, which latter resolution should in my judgment, be disapproved.

"No peace without law, no law without government" is an inescapable truth, even though some still seek to avoid it. House Concurrent Resolution 64 recognizes that truth in calling for a world federation "with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law."

The necessity of a federation equipped to enact and enforce world law, in the limited sphere of war prevention, is now so generally recognized as the prerequisite of disarmament and peace that I need not argue that general proposition. Rather the vital questions now are: When and how do we start? Shall the United States lead? What precisely should be the structure, powers, and membership of the federation? Specifically, should an effort be now made for universal membership or should the federation be confined, at least at the start, to the democracies?

I concentrate on the last of those issues, which is sharply pointed up by the language of the two resolutions. This is because the world federation resolution, by asking the development of the United Nations into a world federation open to all nations, contemplates an effort from the start for universal membership; while the Atlantic Union resolution, in calling for a federal union of democracies, contemplates, at least at the beginning, an exclusive and partial membership. The distinction is of basic importance. It marks, I believe, the difference between peaceful evolution and a probable or possible third world war. Therefore, it profoundly affects the future of the whole world. I favor the former approach for the following reasons.

The Atlantic Union resolution asks the President to take the initiative for a federal convention confined to the seven nations which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty and such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates. Its basic thought is that we should not now try to establish a federation of all the nations, even one of very limited powers, but that only some nations shall be deemed eligible for the club. Let us consider the effect of an effort for a restricted federation of this character.

For one thing, that proposition would necessarily be construed as dividing the 2,300,000,000 people of the world into first-class and second-class citizens, with that division being promulgated by those who deem themselves in the first-class category.

The proposition would be clouded at the outset by the question of what other democracies should be invited by the original seven to participate in the federal convention. For example, would Portugal which, by no stretch of the imagination, can be called a democracy, be invited? Portugal was good enough to be a signatory of the treaty. But would she, nevertheless, be excluded from the convention? And if Portugal were invited, why not Spain and Turkey and various other countries with no genuine claim to free and democratic institutions? The question is thus raised whether the true purpose is actually to apply the principles of free federal union or to form a yet stronger anti-Communist military coalition, more or less irrespective of the form of government of the members.

Even more important questions would arise as to the inclusion or exclusion of various other nations. It goes without saying that Russia and Communist China and the so-called peoples' democracies of eastern Europe would be excluded. So also, presumably, Germany and Japan would be left out. But what about Indonesia and Indochina (if she achieves independence), Burma, Korea, and Siam? Would they be deemed democracies? Still more important, what would be the status as to eligibility of India and Pakistan with their combined population of 415,000,000? And, apart from Turkey, where would various countries of the Middle East and two or three in Africa come in?

Beyond all this, there would remain the crucial problem of the 20 countries of Latin America. It is clear that not all of them could possibly qualify as democracies. But it is equally clear that it would be invidious to take in some of them while excluding others.

Is it not plain that an effort to divide the sheep from the goats in this manner would present insoluble dilemmas? On the one hand, if various countries were included that in no reasonable sense are democratic or free, a mockery would be made of the principles of free federal union. On the other hand, by admitting some and barrings others, the utmost bitterness would be engendered.

If the frankly avowed purpose were to form a larger and still stronger military alliance than that provided by the Atlantic Treaty as an even more formidable weapon of power politics, there might be an arguable case for this plan. But, as a sound approach to disarmament and peace under world law, I respectfully submit that this Atlantic union approach is both defective and dangerous.

It is apparent, indeed, that if an Atlantic union were actually developed on the basis of including only nations that are genuinely democratic, it would necessarily exclude an actual majority of the population of the whole world. This is for the simple reason that a majority of the world's people have been born and live in countries which by no stretch of the imagination can be classified as free or as genuine democracies. Thus, by the very process of exclusion, not only would resentment be created throughout the world, but a most effective weapon of propaganda would be provided for the Soviet Union. The result might or might not be to strengthen the strictly military power of the west relative to the east. But any assertion that it would make for world harmony, world peace, and world law seems contrary to experience, reason, and common sense.

There are no other reasons that argue against the Atlantic union resolution. Thus, a restricted, but necessarily powerful, federation from which the Soviet Union and

Communist China would be excluded until they radically changed their ideas and institutions would obviously be regarded by them as a military coalition seriously threatening their existence. Their military preparations would almost surely be intensified; and world tension, instead of being allayed, would be increased.

Furthermore, it is apparent that whatever professions were made of creating a restricted federation within the framework of the United Nations, its existence would materially and perhaps fatally weaken the United Nations. Even if restricted to the 12 Atlantic Pact countries, the so-called free federation would include a preponderance of the economic and military power (although less than one-fourth of the population) of the world. United in a federal union with a single military establishment and constituting a single economic unit with, presumably, a common currency, it would completely overshadow the UN. That institution would almost necessarily shrink into insignificance and the prospect of developing the UN into an effective world federation would virtually disappear. If we are sincere in wishing not only to support and strengthen the UN, but to achieve its evolution into a truly effective instrument of world law and order, I submit that we cannot emphasize the world's division by seeking to create an immensely powerful separate federation whether or not within the framework of the UN, whatever that may mean.

There are still other arguments against the Atlantic union plan. But it is enough for me that it would, in my judgment, precipitate and confirm the world's division, make invidious distinctions, arouse strong resentments and, as I sincerely believe, tend not to disarmament and peace, but to increased tension and ultimate war.

In thus pointing out what I consider the basic unsoundness of the Atlantic Union plan, I would, of course, not be understood as questioning the motives of its sponsors. There are some points in common between them and United World Federalists. Both know that effective institutions for the creation and enforcement of world law are essential to peace. Both know the necessity for the amendment of our own Constitution to permit the entry of the United States into any effective international federation, whether partial or universal in membership. They seek in common the same broad objective of peace under law. Moreover, no one recognizes better than I the high purposes of such patriotic public servants as Justice Roberts, Judge Patterson, Mr. Clayton, and Mr. Streit. But the very distinction of these men may give an appearance of strength to an approach which, in my humble judgment, cannot stand analysis, and it serves no good purpose, I believe, to gloss over the vital differences of view in respect of means to the desired end. Moreover, I remind this committee that there is at least equally distinguished support, not only in the Congress and in the United States, but world-wide, for the other view embodied in the world federation resolution.

In this connection, it is of interest to recall the vote on this very issue at the conference at Dublin, N. H., in October 1945, on "How best to remedy the weaknesses of the United Nations." At that conference, after a searching debate by a group of very capable citizens, with Judge Roberts and Mr. Streit supporting their present thesis, that position was rejected in favor of the principle of universal membership by a vote of 5 to 1. That debate and vote confirm my belief that when the Atlantic union approach is critically examined, the Congress will find it inadequate and dangerous, rather than helpful, to the cause of world order.

There is another and a better way to seek disarmament and peace than by attempting a partial federation "within the framework" of the United Nations. That way, in the words of House Concurrent Resolution 64, is to seek the development of the United Nations itself "into a world federation open to all nations." It is the last four words which are the most important of all. They need not be construed to mean that if, after every reasonable effort, it proves impossible to obtain a universal federation, no lesser federation should ever be formed. But they do mean, I believe, that an effort should be made, a strong and persistent effort, to obtain universal membership. They mean that this effort shall be made to the end that the world division shall be healed and that there shall eventuate, if humanly possible, a genuine regime of world law to which shall be subject all rather than some of the nations and their people.

It will be asked, however, whether the realization of such a goal is a practical possibility. I believe that it is practical. I firmly believe that we will evolve in our day a world-wide federal government of strictly limited powers yet adequate to end the present world anarchy. And even if I felt less confident than I do about this result, I would repudiate the thought that in a spirit of defeatism we should cease to strive for the only solution which can bring about disarmament and the reign of genuine world law. I would say that we are unworthy of the American tradition if we did not exhaust every last persistent effort to attain that great object. It is deeply encouraging to find that the 100 and more Representatives who sponsor the world federation resolution seem to be of this mind.

But it will be further said: "What about Russia? Is there a real prospect of her cooperation in a world federation empowered to enforce disarmament?" I believe that there is. I know that it will require a well-balanced combination of firmness and patience, together with some admixture of tolerance and willingness to see the other side. But I do not think the achievement of this balance is beyond the scope of the leaders of the West while under the strong pressure of their peoples to find a way to disarmament and peace. I believe it can be done and done without appeasement or sacrifice of basic principle.

We ought always to remember that there are only two ways for the West and the East to be brought into cooperation. One way is an enforced cooperation, following the conquest of one by the other. But we know that the West cannot be conquered in the foreseeable future. And we know that while the West might well completely subjugate the East, after unprecedented slaughter, the West has no wish to do so. We realize that, as Henry L. Stimson has said: "Americans as conquerors would be tragically miscast."

The only other way is that of cooperation by the free consent of both sides, to be achieved, slowly perhaps but steadily, by mutual toleration and without requiring either to sacrifice honor or principle. That can be done and when it is achieved, the basis will exist to create the universal world federation by fundamental amendment of the United Nations Charter.

One other thing we should never forget—that however necessary our present policy under the Atlantic treaty may be, that policy can be no more than a stopgap. It embodies no element or world order under law. On the contrary, it is the essence of power politics. It may well be helpful in gaining time to seek the solution. It is in itself no stable solution at all.

The world federation resolution fully recognizes this in calling for a more fundamental objective of our foreign policy, namely, the development of the United Nations into a world federation open to all nations.

I believe that this resolution is the most important of all the measures before the Congress. I urge its prompt adoption. By so doing, I believe that the Congress would lift up the hearts of the whole world.

"It Has Been Demonstrated Many Times in This Country and Abroad That Iodine Deficiency Is Easily Corrected and Better Health Achieved Through the Daily Routine Use of Table Salt to Which Tiny Amounts of Iodine Have Been Added by the Manufacturer. This Salt Is as Pure as, and Tastes No Different From, Ordinary Salt"

REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, no greater reward can come to one in life that affords more satisfaction than does the actual accomplishment of a job well done.

For more than 20 years I have addressed my attention and given of my time and energy to investigations and studies looking to corrective, remedial measures that would abate the discomfiture and illness attending endemic goiter, prevalent in many areas throughout the United States.

It was during the Eightieth Congress that I first addressed the House on this question, pointing out then that endemic goiter was easily corrected through the daily routine use of table salt to which a tiny amount of iodine had been added by the manufacture. This salt, which I personally have used for more than 20 years, is as pure as and tastes no different whatever from, ordinary salt. It can be obtained at no extra cost and no inconvenience to the consumer, and once all become acquainted with that fact, all can voluntarily assure their supply of this food essential.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to burden my colleagues at this hour with any greatly extended remarks of my own. In order that this membership and the American people at large may acquaint themselves with the work that is to be projected by our Government public health service, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, and include therein a copy of a report, Iodine—A Food Essential, compiled by W. H. Sebrell, M. D., director of the Experimental Biology and Medicine Institute, National Institutes of Health.

That report reads as follows:

IODINE—A FOOD ESSENTIAL

(By W. H. Sebrell, M. D.[1])

In a cooperative effort, the salt industry, medical profession, public health authorities and the Federal Government are seeking to protect and improve the health of American citizens by an educational campaign aimed at getting them to use a nutritionally improved salt.

The average United States citizen enjoys better health than the average citizen of

[1] Director, experimental biology and medicine institute, National Institutes of Health. Prepared with the assistance of the study committee on endemic goiter, American Public Health Association, and of the Council on Foods and Nutrition, American Medical Association.

most other countries. His food supply is also better than average, but many people in this country do not get the full recommended allowance of all the dietary essentials. It is well known that deficiency in any of these essentials results in ill health and disease.

We know that iodine in appropriate amounts, like iron, calcium, copper, and many other chemical elements, is essential throughout life. Also it is known that many people in all sections of this country do not get enough iodine from their food to meet their normal requirements. All doctors know that long-continued iodine deficiency may result in serious disease, or at least in a chronic state of border-line malnutrition. Therefore, in connection with the food-essential iodine it is necessary to discuss the deficiency disease, goiter, which results from lack of sufficient iodine.

It has been demonstrated many times in this country and abroad that iodine deficiency is easily corrected and better health achieved through the daily routine use of table salt to which tiny amounts of iodine have been added by the manufacturer. This salt is as pure as, and tastes no different from, ordinary salt. It can be obtained at no extra cost or inconvenience to the consumer, and, once acquainted with the facts, he can voluntarily insure his supply of this food essential.

FUNCTION AND IMPORTANCE OF IODINE AND ENDOCRINE GLANDS

The newest studies of the human body emphasize the human being as a "whole man." For example, recent research proves that the pituitary gland at the base of the brain produces a secretion which stimulates the thyroid gland, and that the thyroid secretion can inhibit or stop this pituitary secretion. So important is this situation that Salter in 1940 called it the pituitary thyroid axis.

The pituitary and thyroid glands often are called ductless glands or glands of internal secretion, because their secretions pour directly into the blood or the lymph, instead of running through a tube or duct.

The pituitary (or hypophysis) is a small gland which is fastened to the base of the brain Its anterior lobe has been dubbed the "master gland" because of its importance to the body and its influence on other glands. Eleven different physiological effects or influences on body performance have been discovered in this anterior pituitary gland. At least six of these effects seem to be from distinct hormones. The action of these hormones can be classified into two groups. One group deals with effects on other endocrine glands, such as the thyroid-stimulating hormone, nicknamed TSH, mentioned already, and hormones which stimulate the adrenals, the parathyroids, the pancreas, and the sex glands. The other group of pituitary hormones acts on a variety of tissues.

The thyroid gland is a large U-shaped gland in the neck. When it becomes enlarged, it is recognized as goiter. The word "thyroid" means "shield-shaped," and was given to the gland in 1656 by a London physician, Thomas Wharton. Dr. Wharton poetically told how the thyroid contributes to the beauty of the neck by filling up the vacant spaces around the larynx, particularly in women. More matter-of-factly, the thyroid gland has been likened to a pair of Brazil nuts on either side of the windpipe. A band of thyroid tissue, called the isthmus, connects the two lobes. Sometimes the thyroid is described as a thickened U in appearance. Sometimes an additional lobe, called the pyramid of Lalouette runs upward from the upper border of the isthmus. The weight of the thyroid gland in the male varies from 20 to 60 grams, or about 1 to 2 ounces. The normal thyroid in women usually is a little heavier.

Its rich supply of blood and lymph attests to the importance of this gland to the entire body.

The microscopic appearance of the thyroid tissue shows why Dr. J. H. Means called the thyroid both a factory and a warehouse. Two kinds of tissue comprise the gland. The supporting tissue is a fibrous connective tissue, which makes the framework and the capsule of the gland.

The active, or functional, tissue consists of a number of follicles (also called vesicles, acini, or alveoli). These tiny follicles resemble sacs within an orange section, except, of course, that they tend to be spherical and are microscopic in size. It would take about 250 follicles to cross the diameter of a dime.

Each tiny follicle consists of a single layer of cells forming the outside. These epithelial cells are the actual factory which manufactures the thyroid hormone. In the center of each follicle, is the colloid fluid, which is the storage or warehouse form of the thyroid hormone or secretion. In normal health, each sphere is plumply full of colloid.

When iodine is eaten in the form of iodized salt, or iodine-rich food, such as oysters, salmon, or tuna fish, it travels through the blood in the form of a salt, an iodide. The thyroid gland, of all the body tissues, has an affinity for iodine. When the thyroid gland absorbs the iodide, it is oxidized, that is, oxygen is added, by an enzymatic process. This releases iodine in a form which readily combines with an amino acid, tyrosine, to form the long-named chemical diiodotyrosine. Two molecules of this latter compound combine to form thyroxine. Thyroxine is the thyroid hormone. After manufacture, this hormone, thyroxine, may be carried by the blood stream to produce striking effects in many parts of the body. Or it may be stored as a colloid, thyroglobulin, in the centers of the follicles to be called upon when needed.

COURSE OF FOOD IODINE IN THE BODY

Food iodine—iodized salt, sea food.

Alimentary canal—iodine absorbed by body.

Blood stream—iodine carried to the thyroid.

Thyroid gland—iodide (iodine) + tyrosine = Thyroxine + protein = Thyroglobulin.

Thyroglobulin—used as hormone or stored as colloid.

Just as the mineral calcium is essential for the formation of bones and the mineral iron is necessary to form hemoglobin for blood, so iodine is absolutely essential for the formation of thyroid hormone, or thyroxine—no iodine, no thyroxine. The thyroid normally contains from 15 to 20 milligrams of iodine. In normal adults, a supply of about 75 milligrams of iodine per year will maintain the thyroid in normal condition.

Some of the normal functions of the thyroid gland are quite popularly known. The thyroid hormone controls the rate of heat production in the body by controlling the rate of cell oxidation. Heat production is coupled with energy liberation from the cells. Basal metabolism tests measure thyroid activity by measuring the rate of heat production in a resting individual.

Other functions of the thyroid are to aid in the stimulation of normal growth of bones, hair, and skin; the normal development of the brain; the stimulation of sexual development at puberty; the maintenance of a normal pregnancy; and the production of an adequate milk supply during nursing.

TYPES OF GOITER

The word "goiter" means an enlargement of the thyroid gland. As most diseases of the thyroid gland are accompanied by an increase in size of the gland, in popular language a goiter usually means a large and conspicuous thyroid gland. Shakespeare, in The Tempest, writes of men "whose throats had hanging at them wallets of flesh." But goiter was known in ancient times when the water from certain wells was said to produce goiter.

Simple goiter

Simple goiter is by far the commonest form of goiter, and occurs in all parts of the world. But its distribution is not even. Goiter areas exist, often separated only from the next area by a change in the watershed, or the supply of salt.

Simple goiter is sometimes called benign goiter, because it often disappears when a particular strain on the body, such as puberty or pregnancy, is past. Simple goiter also been called physiologic goiter, because it so often is associated with a physiological period or situation, notably puberty, but also pregnancy, lactation, and infectious diseases with fever. But leading authorities have objected to the use of the term physiological, implying normal, because if the individual going through the period of stress is given a really adequate amount of iodine, enlargement and goiter are prevented. Also, cases do occur when a simple goiter does not subside, but progresses to a more dangerous form.

The enlargement which occurs in simple goiter may be accompanied by a mild degree of hypothyroidism, or underactivity. The enlargement represents an effort to manufacture more adequate amounts of thyroxine.

Simple goiter begins with a lessening in the amount of iodine in the colloid and an increase in the size and number of the thyroid cells. The first stage is called parenchymatous goiter. Parenchyma means the essential or functional part of an organ. As seen in the thyroid structure, the factory or working part is composed of the thyroid epithelial cells. When hyperplasia or abnormal multiplication of thyroid cells spreads evenly through the whole gland, the resulting goiter is symmetrical and firm. Parenchymatous goiter may go on to a complete exhaustion or wearing out of the cells. Or the increasing process may stop and the follicles become filled with colloid.

When the latter happens a colloid goiter results. Colloid goiters are usually symmetrical and somewhat soft. They may be very large, because each of the many additional follicles becomes distended with colloid. The total quantity of iodine in the entire gland may be close to normal, but because of the enlarged size, the ratio of iodine per gram of gland tissue is low.

Another kind of goiter is called an adenomatous or nodular goiter. Either parenchymatous or colloid goiter, which is the change to adenomatous goiter, which is the commonest type of goiter after the age of 30. Asymmetrical, or uneven, bulges or nodules form. They may increase in size from that of cherry stone to plum stone or larger.

Simple goiter is so called because it does cause any toxic or poisoning symptoms. Its importance from a medical standpoint is due to the fact that nodular or adenomatous goiter may frequently have its origin in a preexisting colloid goiter, and when this occurs nodular goiter may subsequently become toxic or poisonous; also, symptoms due to pressure on neighboring structures such as the windpipe may occasionally be bothersome in patients with colloid goiter. From a health standpoint, colloid goiter is completely preventable by taking a small but adequate amount of iodine in the food regularly. Where iodized salt is used from infancy, simple goiter, with very few exceptions, is avoided.

GOITERS ASSOCIATED WITH HORMONE DEFICIENCY

Cretinism

A cretin is a child who is dwarfed by lack of sufficient thyroid secretion during fetal life. A similar but less severe condition, myxedema, may occur by the development of an insufficiency of thyroid secretion which occurs at any time after birth. Cretins, in the past, were found in districts where goiter

was common. Among these areas are the Himalayas, the Pyrenees, the Alps, the Andes, South America, and the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence regions and Northwestern States in North America. So many of these unfortunates were found in certain localities in the Alps that government aid was necessary to support them. However, cretins do appear occasionally in all these areas.

In cretins, the mental, physical, and sexual development is greatly retarded. If these cretin dwarfs live to adulthood, they retain their childhood body build, and may not mature sexually. If untreated, their mentality may be arrested at a low level, making them unable to support themselves. The metabolism is very low, the skin has a typical dry, thick appearance, and deaf mutism is common. At autopsy, abnormal or very small thyroid glands are found.

If thyroid extract is given to cretins at an early age, marked improvements result but complete recovery does not always occur. Cretinism should be prevented by assuring an adequate supply of iodine for the mother before and during pregnancy.

Myxedema

When destruction or degeneration of the thyroid gland occurs at any time after birth the hypothyroid condition called myzedema results. Myxedema can be produced in animals by removal of the thyroid gland. Sir William Gull of England in 1874 described the defects in his patients which were associated with degeneration of the thyroid. Gull noticed several effects of hypothyroidism. A loss of mental and physical vigor; dry, brittle hair; an apathetic, lethargic reaction to mental stimuli; and a peculiar thickening of the skin are typical. Today we know by basal metabolism tests that a low metabolic rate exists. The thickening of the skin was thought to be due to the deposit of mucin, and the word myxedema means mucous swelling. Recent study indicates that the deposit is a semifluid albuminous substance, about like egg white.

The outlook for the adult with myxedema is hopeful today. Three months of administration of thyroid extract make a dramatic improvement. Thyroid extract will control the symptoms of myxedema entirely, and keep the patient in good health.

HYPERTHYROIDISM

Increased function, called an overactive, or hyperactive state, may occur in the thyroid gland. Some unknown factor, perhaps as severe emotional shock, or an infection, may start a hitherto normal thyroid on a mad race to produce thyroid hormone. Perhaps an interruption in the amicable relations existing in the pituitary-thyroid axis is the direct cause. But if something in the pituitary starts the thyroid into trouble, that something has yet to be explained.

Hyperthyroidism, or toxic goiter, may begin in a previously healthy individual with enlargement of the gland and simultaneous poisoning symptoms of rapid pulse, palpitation, tremor, nervousness, restlessness and irritability. This type of toxic goiter is called primary or exophthalmic goiter, or Graves' disease.

A severe primary toxic goiter may soon be accompanied by a pop-eyed condition, medically called exophthalmos. The metabolic rate goes up, perhaps as high as 80 percent or more above normal, and with rapid burning of fuel goes a rapid loss in weight. The animation increases to an abnormal nervousness which becomes very trying to the patient and everyone about. There may be difficulty in breathing upon exertion and severe heart symptoms. Fortunately, various methods of cure for exophthalmic goiter are known today.

Another type of toxic goiter is called secondary, because it follows a simple goiter as a complication. Usually hyperthyroidism does not occur until after an average of 15 years of simple goiter. The pop-eyed, or exophthalmic, condition does not occur and the onset is more gradual than in exophthalmic goiter. The heart shows signs of poisoning by a rapid pulse and the metabolic rate soars. The simple adenomatous goiter becomes a toxic adenomatous goiter for unknown reasons. The tragedy of toxic adenomatous goiter lies in its preventability by known methods. If we avoided simple goiter, through adequate iodine intake, we would have no secondary toxic goiter.

IODINE, AND ITS ROLE IN NORMAL AND ABNORMAL THYROID

In reviewing the thyroid gland and its function, recall how the thyroid cells took the iodine from the blood as an iodide and manufactured the thyroid hormone from it for body use or for storage. When the body is given more iodine than it needs from a diet exceptionally rich in sea food, the excess passes out in the normal person without any effect on the body.

But some entirely different situations can produce an iodine hunger in the body, and then unfortunate results follow. One situation is lack in the diet of the minimum iodine requirement.

Another situation is temporarily increased demand for iodine, which may make a previously sufficient iodine supply dangerously inadequate. The well-known situations of increased demand are puberty, pregnancy, and lactation. Since the thyroid hormone is closely associated with the gonads, or sex glands, it is natural that sexual development should make an increased call for thyroid hormone, which only can be met with iodine.

Since pregnancy is the growth period for the expected baby, a similar special demand for thyroid hormone is logical. Many obstetricians today are giving additional iodine to all their pregnant patients.

Because lactation, or the period of nursing a baby, is also a period of supplying growth for an individual, a logically extra demand for thyroid hormone occurs at this time. Proof of the need for extra iodine is seen in the enlargement of the thyroid which often exists in puberty, pregnancy, and lactation. Infections, poor diet, and poor sanitation also may make additional demands for iodine. Certain foods, notably members of the cabbage family, if taken in abnormal quantities, may do the same, and it is possible that they may cause goiter if the supply of iodine is small.

Drs. Curtis and Fertman have found that normal adults confined in bed on a monotonous diet required approximately 1 microgram of iodine per kilogram of body weight per day. An additional 2 micrograms daily are needed to take care of ordinary activities with some for reserve. Taking all needs into consideration the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council gives the daily requirement of iodine for an adult as 0.15 to 0.30 milligrams and states that this need can be met by the regular use of iodized salt. They call attention to the special importance of its use in adolescence and pregnancy.

When the single layer of flat or cuboidal cells around the edge of the thyroid follicles are offered enough iodine for their manufacturing needs, they sit quietly in their places like decent diners at a good home or restaurant. But when the amount of iodine is scanty, either from lack of iodine in the diet or because of special demands, a wild boarding-house grab ensues. Each epithelial cell seems to be stretching for all the possible iodine it can capture from the diminishing colloid supply. The cells change from their normal shape to an elongated, columnar shape. This hypertrophy, or overgrowth of individual cells, is soon followed by a hyperplasia or increase in the total number of cells. If a necessary food were suddenly rationed, a protective mother might call all her children and rush the whole family to the store to get as much as possible. These two changes in the thyroid, the stretching out of the individual cells, and the increase in the total number of cells, can be seen under the microscope.

When the rationing is over, either because the special demand ceases, or the diet is improved by additional iodine, the rush stops, but the thyroid gland never is quite the same again. For all practical purposes, the gland will function normally, and may return to its normal size. But the involution, or return to normal, is really a resting or colloid state. A woman who eats just enough food iodine for usual living may have a series of thyroid enlargements with each pregnancy.

THE SUBCLINICAL PICTURE

It is easy for individuals to look the other way if they do not recognize that the iodine problem is their own problem. Many people who take vitamin tablets and are careful about getting an adequate supply of vitamins neglect the iodized salt which will insure a health minimum of iodine for the normal person. It has been seen how the thyroid secretion with its essential iodine affects growth, health, a normal skin, and an alert mentality. Doctors have found, in practicing obstetrics, that even where goiters were not involved, the giving of extra iodine decreased the number of miscarriages and increased the number of mothers who had an adequate milk supply. How much fatigue of the adolescent may be due to iodine-hunger is only a guess.

With today's emphasis on positive health, many medical authorities are actively endorsing the use of food iodine, as a simple, cheap, easy insurance against the possible handicaps of a subclinical iodine deficiency.

WHY IODINE MAY BE INADEQUATE IN DIETS

From ancient times, goiter has been known to exist in certain regions. Endemic is a word used to describe a condition which exists all the time in a certain place. The draft boards of World War I found two endemic goiter areas in the United States, one centering around the Great Lakes region, and the other in the Pacific Northwest. In areas where endemic goiter exists, the soil, water, and vegetation are poor in iodine. Early opinion pointed a finger of warning at certain supplies of drinking water. Analysis of drinking water in United States cities shows a wide variation in iodine content, from 0.01 micrograms per kilogram (γ/kg. or parts per billion) in Duluth, Minn., and Spokane, Wash., to 73.30 γ/kg. in San Dimas, Calif.

The iodine content of plants can be increased by adding iodine-containing salts to the soil, and the iodine content of milk can also be increased by feeding suitable rations to the cow. Such practices have been considered and have been declared to be utterly impractical in meeting the goiter problem. They are too inefficient, uneconomical, and difficult to put into operation on a national scale.

Sea food is a good source of iodine, although the iodine content varies with the variety and with the iodine content of the sea water from which it comes. Sea food eating people, even in a goitrous area, are remarkably free from goiter.

Certain sea weeds such as kelp have a very high iodine content, and dried preparations in the form of tablets or powder have been widely promoted for their health value. These products have no important nutritive value other than that of the iodine they contain. While it may be possible to adjust the intake of these products so as to provide for a suitable uniform supply of iodine, the requirements for this element can be more easily and safely met by the use of iodized salt.

Some natural salt deposits contain iodine, but others do not. A dramatic demonstration of man's accidental conversion of a naturally healthy area into a goitrous area occurred in the Kanawha River Valley of West Virginia. Dr. O. P. Kimball reported the change which took place. Prior to 1900, goiter was exceedingly rare, according to local physicians. Prior to this date, the table salt came from local salt wells. It was a crude, coarse salt with brown particles. After 1900 a sparkling white salt, which the people preferred, was shipped in. This white salt contained no iodine, but it pushed the crude salt off the market. During the next quarter of a century, the goiter rate rose sharply. By 1922, a goiter survey showed that about 60 percent of adolescent girls in that Valley had goiter.

Repeatedly, civilized man has demonstrated that he is technologically ahead of his own welfare. But after harming himself, he often works out the cure. The classic story of the polishing of brown rice into white rice is a good example. The loss of thiamine (vitamin B_1) caused the development of the deficiency disease, beriberi, among those using white rice as a large item of diet. Prevention and cure were found in eating the rice polishings, or the unpolished brown rice.

Similarly, whole grain bread was robbed of iron and vitamins when white flour became popular. Now we are putting back some of the health-giving properties of the whole grain by "enriching" our white flour with several vitamins and iron.

A similar situation has happened with salt. When processing of salt became a national industry, the local salt deposits which contained iodine were no longer used. The majority of our salt today comes from iodine-less sources. Even in processing sea salt, the iodine is removed. To some extent, modern progress has neutralized the lack of iodine in commercial salt by refrigerated shipping of sea food to the interior parts of our country. But everyone does not eat fish frequently. Shipping of canned and fresh frozen vegetables and fruits from regions where the soil is rich in iodine has helped to relieve the goiter problem. However, the shopper in the city grocery has no idea whether the vegetables and fruits she buys are rich in iodine or deficient in it.

INCIDENCE OF GOITER AND RELATION TO IODINE

Because individuals cannot tell whether their natural supply of iodine is adequate, some plan of giving everyone the food equivalent of iodine has been tried in many parts of the globe for many years. The most popular and most practical way has been to add an infinitesimal (0.01 percent) amount of necessary iodine to table salt.

The name iodized salt came into use more than 25 years ago for table salt containing iodine equivalent in amount to that which would result from adding 0.02 percent of sodium or potassium iodide to ordinary table salt. About a decade ago it was demonstrated that the addition of small quantities of certain substances would greatly retard the loss of iodine that sometimes occurs in packaged iodized salt. Use of these so-called stabilizers has made it possible to reduce the quantity of iodide from 0.02 to 0.01 percent of the salt with assurance that the use of such salt will provide an adequate intake of iodine.

Since iodine occurs in nature in some sources of salt, iodized salt is properly regarded as a natural food. It is an improved salt.

Goiter occurs throughout the world, wherever the supply of iodine is inadequate. A goiter map of Europe was made in 1883, and McCarrison and Eggenberger have prepared maps showing world-wide goiter conditions.

To counteract this goiter prevalence from iodine deficiency, Boussingault in 1831 suggested that iodized salt be sold by the government of Colombia, South America, to prevent goiter. The use of iodine-containing sea salt or the addition of potassium iodide to rock salt was advocated in 1855 by Kostl.

Dr. O. P. Kimball, of Cleveland, Ohio, has told of his personal experience with the effect of iodized salt on goiter incidence in Michigan. In 1924 the salt manufacturers agreed to manufacture an iodized salt, and the Wholesale Grocers' Association agreed to handle only iodized salt for table use in Michigan. Michigan lies in the Great Lakes goiter belt. At the time iodized salt was started, a survey placed the incidence of goiter in Michigan at 38.6 percent. A reexamination for goiter was made in 1928 after 4 years of using iodized salt. The incidence of goiter was found to have decreased to 9 percent.

Even more startling proof of the importance of food iodine in salt came from Calumet, Mich. During the depression approximately two-thirds of the families in this copper-mining community were on relief. Relief officials endeavored to save money by buying bag salt (noniodized) for those on relief. The result was an upshoot in the goiter rate, occurring only in the families using the iodine-lacking salt. Dr. Kimball reported that of children not using iodized salt 60 percent had goiter, and in the same community of those who had remained on iodized salt only 3 percent had goiter.

The safety factor in administering food iodine has been the object of research. Health authorities never advocate self-diagnosis or self-administration of medicine. Treatment of such diseased conditions as toxic goiter is the duty of the physician. Because large amounts of iodine have conspicuous effects upon goiter, studies have been made to assure the toxic goiter patient and his physician that the tiny preventive amounts of food iodine in iodized salt will be safe for the sufferer from toxic goiter. Dr. Kimball personally investigated stories of persons who had complained of iodized salt having caused toxic goiter or other toxic manifestations. He was not able to find any untoward effects from the use of iodized salt.

In 1945 and 1946, the Public Health Service made limited surveys of goiter incidence. They report, "Although the population groups that were studied in Florida and Georgia were not in the so-called Goiter Belt, the prevalence of enlarged thyroid was high in both white and Negro family groups. In Mitchell County, Ga., 31.3 percent of white women and 8 percent of the males had an enlarged thyroid gland. In Alachua County, Fla., 25.6 percent of the Negro females between 13 and 20 years of age were affected."

Goiter is a problem in the United States today. Simple goiter may be prevented by eating food iodine. The use of iodized salt is the most effective way of combating this important public-health problem.

Authorities advocating table use of iodized salt are: Forty-fifth Annual Conference, State and Territorial Health Officers with Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Study Committee on Endemic Goiter of the American Public Health Association; Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association; Surgeon General, Public Health Service; Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council; Medical Research Council, Great Britain, Special Goiter Subcommittee; International Goiter Conference, held in 1927 and 1928.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Proceedings, Forty-fifth Annual Conference State and Territorial Health Officers with the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, December 2–3, 1946.

2. Iodine Facts. World Goiter Survey, Iodine Educational Bureau, London, 1946.

3. Robinson, Margaret: Hormonal Treatment of Deficient Lactation. Results With Crude Anterior-Pituitary Extract. Lancet 253: 90 (1947).

4. Robinson, Margaret: Hormones and Lactation. Dried Thyroid Gland. Lancet 253: 385 (1947).

5. Robinson, Margaret: Iodine and Failing Lactation. British M. J. 2: 126 (1947).

6. Iodine and Table Salt. Editorial. JAMA 135: 434 (1947).

7. Curtis, G. M., and Fertman, Mildred B.: Iodine in Nutrition. Handbook of Nutrition. American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., 1943, chapter VIII, page 129.

8. Iodized salt. Hearing Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, H. R. 2717, June 11, 1947.

9. Best, C. H., and Taylor, Norman B.: The Physiological Basis of Medical Practice. Ed. 4. Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md., 1945.

10. Means, J. H.: Some New Approaches to the Physiology of the Thyroid. Ann. Int. Med. 19: 567 (1943).

11. Blumgarten, A. S.: Textbook of Materia Medica, Pharmacology and Therapeutics. Ed. 7. Macmillan Co., New York, 1945.

12. Carlson, A. J., and Johnson, Victor: The Machinery of the Body. Ed. 3. University of Chicago Press, 1948.

13. Kimball, O. P.: 20 years in the Prevention of Goiter (1916–36). Ohio State M. J. 35: 705 (1939).

14. Kimball, O. P.: Iodized Salt for the Prophylaxis of Endemic Goiter. JAMA 130: 80 (1946).

15. Kimball, O. P.: Endemic Goiter—A Food-Deficiency Disease. Journal of American Dietetic Association 25: 112 (1949).

Newsprint and Devaluation of Canadian Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, publishers and printers throughout the United States are quite disturbed and resentful about the fact that Canadian newsprint manufacturers have been able to keep the base price of $100 a ton on newsprint, in spite of the devaluation of the Canadian currency.

Experts here have estimated that devaluation of the Canadian dollar and continuation of the old base price in the face of the 10-cent devaluation will give a $7-a-ton additional profit to Canadian mills. On the surface, the profit would appear to be 10 percent, but some of the difference gained by the mills will be eaten up by higher cost of chemicals, coal, and other materials which must be imported from us and paid for only by United States dollars.

To offset the increased freight charges Canadian mills shortly after devaluation put a 6-percent surcharge back into effect.

As one of the members of the Special Newsprint Committee during the Eightieth Congress, I had a chance to study the newsprint situation at first-hand, and I can assure you that newsprint manufacturers were not suffering under their former profits. Now they can stack huge profits atop those profits, all at the expense of the American printers

and publishers, who represent the biggest single market for Canadian newsprint.

Our Department of State, which through the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, seemingly is trying to wipe out entire American industries, likely will say it is sorry about all this but can do nothing. It apparently wants to encourage industrial development elsewhere at the expense of existing American industries, killing the latter, if necessary, and raising costs to all American business.

American consumers will pay for all this, of course, because the costs are passed on to them. I think it is deplorable that there is no recourse through our Government to bring pressure on the Canadians. Under the Fair Deal we give away all our bargaining rights and then cry for mercy.

Forward California!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of October 10, 1949. So many Members of this distinguished legislative body tell me that they hope to come to California and spend the last years of their life; or, that they have had so many of their former friends from their home town move to California to live, that it appears to me this brief editorial will be of value and very pertinent to all Members of Congress.

FORWARD CALIFORNIA!

Gov. Earl Warren, as reported in our editorial column last Friday, says California's population has jumped nearly 4,000,000 in the last nine busy years.

"Certainly," he says, "nothing of that kind has happened in the history of this country, and I have never read, in the history of other countries, of so many people moving peacefully and voluntarily to any comparable area anywhere in such a short period of time."

In an article entitled "Look What's Happened to California," in the current Harper's magazine, noted writer Carey McWilliams expresses the situation in these words:

"California in 1949, a century after the gold rush, is still growing rapidly, still the pace setter, falling all over itself, stumbling pell-mell to greatness without knowing the way, bursting at its every seam. Today it has 10,000,000 residents; tomorrow it may have 20,000,000.

"California is not another American State: it is a revolution within the States. It is tipping the scales of the Nation's interest and wealth and population to the West, toward the Pacific."

The Governor makes it clear that our amazing new population has created grave problems. He points out that we now have 1,550,000 more motor vehicles than in 1940, 505,000 more school children, 80,000 more college students in State-supported colleges, double the inmates in our State institutions, a 40-percent extra load on our water systems and sewage facilities—and so on down a long list. In order to build up its physical plant to handle this overload, he says the State must spend billions on highways, schools, colleges, hospitals, jails, dams, sewers, and aqueducts.

The Governor is right.

And let's face another shocking fact: unemployment among employable men is increasing. Our growing industrial plant is not yet able to absorb all who are pleading for a chance to work.

This temporary unbalance—surplus workers and industrial underdevelopment—can produce a crisis from which California would suffer for decades to come. And we would have only our stupidity to blame.

To meet the rapidly developing crisis, California does not need to invent novel schemes.

Our new population needs such old-fashioned, time-honored facilities as public schools, sewer systems, water works, hospitals, jails, health centers, parks and playgrounds, and so forth.

These should be built now—because they are needed now; because there is idle labor at hand whose time is being wasted; because there is available a superabundance of idle capital seeking investment; because supplies and services that should be used in order to keep industry humming at top level speed, are available.

We do not need to finance needed plants for a population of 10,000,000 out of State income based on a population of 5,000,000. What we need is financial management that will make necessary expenditures now, and pay for them out of future revenues derived from the added wealth and prosperity that is assured by the huge new population already here.

Through the days just ahead, the Daily News will reveal the real situation in California.—Manchester Boddy.

National Forests Should Have More Money for Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] withdrew his motion to pass H. R. 4512 by suspension of the rules. He is to be complimented for his good judgment. Also, I wish to compliment the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], for introducing the bill.

We certainly do need more money for recreation in the national forests. However, I think that the method proposed to get it was probably a wrong approach to the problem.

This matter is particularly of interest to us in California. We have some very fine national parks such as Yosemite, Lassen, Sequoia, Kings Canyon, and others. However, our tremendous increase in population and our good road system has resulted in greatly overcrowding all of these parks. Sometimes it seems as though Yosemite is as crowded as Coney Island.

This emphasizes the need for the development in the national forests. In California we have many of them and they are beautiful places to spend a vacation. The appropriations for recreation features of these parks have been woefully inadequate. For many years people rented lots in the forests on which summer homes were built. However, many people are not able to or do not think it wise to spend that much money. Consequently, recreation facilities would serve a great many people. It needs no imagination to realize that with the great volume of people that visit or camp in these parks that problems of sanitation arise which should be handled by the Government agency in charge of the forests. Supervision of and rules governing the use of these forest lands for camping and recreation are necessary to insure the maximum and best use of these lands for recreation purposes. No one who has not visited these beautiful forests realizes what a wonderful place they are to spend some time. They belong to the people and we want the widest use of these forest lands. This bill called forcibly to the attention of members of the Appropriations Committee the need for more funds for these forest lands. I hope it will be forthcoming in the next session of Congress. This is one expenditure that enhances the happiness of every person who goes into those forests.

Frederic Chopin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a tribute to the great artist, the great patriot, the great human being, Frederic Chopin, who died, an exile from the country he loved, 100 years ago today.

Members will be interested in knowing, Mr. Speaker, that this tribute was written by a young man known to many of us here on the hill, George J. Olszewski, of New York, who was an assistant clerk in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the late and beloved South Trimble in the years 1938 to 1942. I wish I could claim him as a constituent also; but at least I can say that he has many friends and relatives among the many splendid Americans of Polish extraction who live in my district and in my immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Olszewski has so well performed his self-appointed task of paying tribute to this great exponent of human freedom and dignity that there is nothing I can add, save to say that I adopt his words as mine, and join in expressing the hope that the time again will come when the unhappy land of Poland will have a truly free and democratic government again.

FREDERIC CHOPIN

(By George Olszewski)

(Eulogy commemorating the one hundredth anniversay of the death of the great Polish patriot and composer, Frederic Chopin. He died in Paris on October 17, 1849, at 40 years of age.)

One hundred years ago today on October 17, 1849, a devoted son of Poland died in exile in Paris. His beloved land was then

dominated by the Russians and other occupying forces as it is dominated by the Communists today. This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense partiot, but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by pagan hordes. He devoted all his energies and finally gave his life to the perpetuation of Polish courage and pride in their continual fight for liberty and freedom. The voice of this patriot has inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of brutal occupation for more than a century. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frederic Chopin.

Born in a small Polish village near Warsaw on February 22, 1809, Chopin was forced by the Russians, to flee his native Poland because of the revolutionary character and the message of his music. Chopin found a safe haven in Paris; here he continued to live and compose. He breathed the undying Polish love for liberty and freedom into his music. His family and his friends continued to send and to bring him messages of the dire strife of his native land. When Poland had no spokesman in the civilized Christian world, Chopin's music spoke for it.

Throughout the intense years of his short life (he died when only 40), the voice of Chopin's music rose as a hymn to liberty. It swept from his tiny cell on the island of Majorca in the Mediterranean and spread throughout France, England, and all of continental Europe. It even reached the United States which Chopin contemplated visiting at one time. It rebounded into the most remote corners of his native land to plague the oppressors.

Chopin's music inspired his compatriots to continued resistance against superior might. The occupation forces sought to suppress the voice of his music. The Germans forbade its playing, the Russians crashed his piano into the streets of Warsaw. But still the voice of Chopin's music, the voice of liberty and freedom, could not be stilled. It echoed and reechoed throughout his native land. It inspired participation in the revolution of 1848 in Poland; it kept alive the spirit of liberty throughout the century and a quarter of foreign occupation. During World War I and again when the Nazi hordes invaded Poland in World War II, Chopin's music, particularly his Polonaise Militaire and Revolutionary Etude, triumphantly led the resistance. In the last stages of the war in Warsaw, patriots fighting in the sewers were guided by his music. Even today in the Communist-dominated nation, the music of Chopin casts aside any thought of submission to a foreign ideology.

Chopin's music brought about the recognition of Poland in Wilson's 14 points largely through the efforts of another great son and patriot of Poland, Ignace Jan Paderewski. The American Nation became acquainted with Poland largely through Paderewski's superb mastery of the piano and his famous playing of Chopin's music. This great pianist, statesman, and humanitarian also devoted his unlimited talents and his fortune to the relief of suffering, oppressed humanity of all nations and creeds.

For centuries Poland has been a citadel of liberty. Its heroic sons have spread its fame wherever oppressed men sought liberty and freedom from the subservient chains of foreign yokes.

In the Revolutionary War, Pulaski and Kosciusko aided the United States in its fight for liberty. Sobieski drove back the pagan hordes from the gates of Vienna in 1815 to preserve Christianity and liberty in Europe. Pilsudski stemmed the Bolshevik tides at the Vistula and saved western Europe from bolshevism in 1920. The heroic exploits of Polish members of the Allied Armies, particularies those of Polish members of the RAF, of the First Canadian Division, and of General Ander's troops in the Battle of Monte Cassino, leave no doubt of the sterling qualities of Polish sons in their continual fight for liberty and independence.

Can the heroic deeds of such patriotic sons of an oppressed nation go unheard or unheeded? We think not. Liberty and freedom are the inherent rights of all men of all nations.

On this memorable day, when we commemorate the death and undying spirit of Frederic Chopin, let us pray that his noble spirit and undying love for his native Poland may continue to inspire and to guide the good fight for the freedom and independence, from foreign yokes and ideologies, of a truly Christian democratic Polish nation.

The Point 4 Program a Financial Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on October 12, 1949. The point 4 program will be before the second session of the Eighty-first Congress and Members should fully understand the implications of that program. I am sure that this editorial will add much to the thinking in that direction:

A FINANCIAL FANTASY

Congress is now considering legislation to put the United States Treasury behind President Truman's point 4—his "bold new program" to "develop" the "undeveloped" portions of the earth.

Significantly or not, much of the territory marked out for exploitation is in the British Empire, and not very much of it is under the American flag.

The theory of point 4 is that, since our Government cannot borrow and spend abroad more than it is now spending, private capital should be allured into foreign fields where private capital now has no inducements to go.

The argument advanced is that sawmills in Patagonia, or steel mills in Ugandi, will make industrial jobs for nonindustrial backward populations and thereby raise standards of living throughout the entire world.

The necessary trick is to influence American bankers and American investors to risk their assets or savings in these vague and perhaps visionary ventures.

Accordingly, Congress is being asked to pass a law.

The major reason why extensive regions of desert, jungle, and isolated terrain lie underdeveloped is, of course, that they have not been found to be worth developing.

Under prevailing political conditions, however, there are still other reasons why capital will not venture itself abroad even in the most favorable sections.

One reason is managed currencies.

Not only are colonial currencies tied to or identical with those of the homelands; they are also subject to the same restrictions and controls, especially blocked exchanges.

An American investor who sends his funds abroad cannot collect his profits, if there be any, nor even withdraw his investment.

A second obstacle is socialism.

Even in Great Britain the Government does not pay a full and fair value for industries which it nationalizes.

No sane investor cares to invest for the purpose of being bilked.

The third obstacle is the world-wide and spreading threat of communism—the Communist technique being to expropriate without paying any recompense whatever.

To overcome these obstacles, the administration proposes that, under "point four," the United States Government guarantee all the risks involved.

There are three bills pending in Congress to this end, which will probably not be acted upon until the next session.

The original, or administration, bill would guarantee private capital abroad against all risks peculiar to foreign investments.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has just approved a substitute bill authorizing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee American capital abroad against the specific risks of confiscation, seizure, or expropriation by public authorities.

And Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER of Massachusetts has introduced a bill—the Foreign Economic Development Act of 1949—to create a Foreign Economic Development Administration in the Department of State.

These bills are all objectionable, as is Mr. Truman's "point four" itself.

The Herter bill would convert the State Department, whose constitutional function is diplomacy, into an alien operating blue sky land promotional bureau.

The bill to guarantee investments would make the United States Government morally and financially responsible for the bad faith of foreign governments toward American citizens, for the inability or unwillingness of other governments to protect property rights within their sovereignties, and for the depredations of Communists wherever Communists may come into power.

If private investors want to incur the risks of precarious foreign investments, they have a legal right to do so.

But the United States Government has no right to guarantee such risks with public funds.

Postal Service in Freight Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. The policy of socialism is to nationalize all industries. England, under the present Socialist government, has nationalized the coal-mine industry and has nationalized the doctors, dentists, and the hospitals of that nation through their socialized-medicine policy.

The same policy to a lesser degree is being followed in this country, and the people generally, and many of the Members of Congress, do not know it is happening.

The operation and administration of our postal system, which is owned and operated by the Government, points out the following illustration:

The postal system was rightfully set up by the Government for the purpose of carrying letters, newspapers, and periodicals so that the people could communicate by mail with other persons throughout the Nation, and so that the newspapers and periodicals could be sent through the mail for the people's general information. Later on provision was

made to add a parcel-post service so that small articles could be shipped by parcel post through the post office.

Now here is the illustration of nationalization which is the road to socialism

Prior to parcel post the great express companies of the Nation, through private enterprise, employed thousands of workers for the distribution, Nation-wide, of small parcels.

Prior to this time the post office carried the normal communications of the people. The express companies, through transportation, carried and distributed to the people Nation-wide smaller packages with quicker delivery, bridging the gap between public mail and freight. General freight articles were carried by the railroads and truck service. That seemed to be a reasonable and rather ideal system of serving the people.

Since parcel post was inaugurated the major volume of prior express business is now carried by parcel post through the Post Office Department.

Since 1946, 30,000 express company employees, by reason of diverting express to parcel post, have been driven out of employment, most of such men losing their jobs after 15 or 20 years' service.

The Interstate Commerce Commission fixes the rates express companies may charge in the conduct of their business. After their business has been reduced through diversion to the Post Office Department, the Railway Express Agency has been compelled to ask for increased rates or go completely out of business even though four wage increases have been awarded express employees since 1946 which increases the cost of carrying express. The business of the railway express agency has continued to dwindle to the point where it has been necessary to vacate the jobs of 30,000 of its employees between 1946 and the present time.

On the other hand the Post Office Department has had to increase the number of its employees by over 40,000, largely due to throwing this load formerly handled by the railway express on to the Post Office Department.

The irony of such as this situation is that the big commercial business houses of the Nation now send their large packages formerly shipped by express through the Post Office Department making immense savings by reason of the fact that the postal rates are lower. This, in fact, puts the Government in the position where it, the Government, is driving the Railway Express Agency out of private business and is subsidizing through the United States Treasury these big commercial organizations and practically every one else who is using parcel post, by the Government paying the part of such transportation costs.

Today the testimony before the Civil Service Committee shows that 71 percent of the building space of the post office in New York is occupied for the handling of parcel post. This same condition in about the same ratio can be found in every large city in the Nation. The same percentage relation probably follows throughout all of the smaller post offices.

The Postal Department is today facing a fiscal deficit of approximately $700,000,000. That means that the Postal Department is spending $700,000,000 more than it takes in. in revenue. That is what a deficit means.

Over $100,000,000 of this deficit comes about because we are handling parcel post for less than the cost of transportation, because the Government by such action is in direct competition with private enterprise and is rapidly driving the Railway Express Agency out of business. This is socialism by nationalizing, or the Government taking over the work formerly done by private organizations.

A bill should be passed by the Congress at the earliest possible moment greatly reducing the size and weight of parcel-post packages. If this were done we could stop this trend to the benefit of everyone. Unless this is done many billions of dollars will have to be expended within the next few years to increase the capacity of the post offices of the Nation because through parcel post we are taking over the work of the express agency and are, in fact, by the handling of these large and heavy packages putting the post office into the freight-carrying business. The Government cannot, in the future, continue to stand this expense which will be greatly increased through the necessity of spending billions of dollars to expand the post office buildings of the Nation.

Support for Langer Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a petition signed by a number of residents of Black Hawk County, Iowa, in the Third Iowa Congressional District, in support of the Langer bill, S. 1847:

To our Congressman:

We, the undersigned voters of Black Hawk County, respectfully petition you to support the Langer bill, S. 1847, which is designed to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising, and stop its broadcasting over the air.

Nora J. Borden, Emma L. Smith, Donald L. Smith, C. A. Smith, Mrs. Elizabeth L. Blough, Mrs. Wayne Shied, Mrs. V. G. Bender, Mrs. Ethel McKinley, Mrs. Avice D. Brown, Waterloo, Iowa; Mrs. Chester J. Murray, Janesville, Iowa; Mrs. Nora Coroy, Mrs. Paul Hultman, Doretta Lamke, Mrs. D. A. Peterson, Mrs. Lois Lewis, Mrs. Mabel Behmke, Mrs. S. C. Besh, Waterloo, Iowa; Frances Wright, Mrs. Bertis Williams, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Mrs. Ida Johnson, Waterloo, Iowa; Mrs. Orbin Campbell, Mrs. Paul Andersen, Hudson, Iowa; Mrs. George Hoffman, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Mrs. M. Mable Best, Waterloo, Iowa; Alletta Dillion, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Mrs. John Warner, Jamesbills, Iowa; Mrs. Mabel B. Calkins, Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Address of Hon. John Kee, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the address of welcome made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. JOHN KEE, at the luncheon given on October 13, 1949, by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in honor of the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is not only an honor, but a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to join my colleagues and associates in the Congress of the United States in extending to our distinguished visitor and guest a cordial welcome to our Capital and our country.

From deep within the hearts of all Americans there will today well the feeling that they are signally honored by this visit to our shores of the wise counselor and guiding spirit of Indian—a great Nation of free people—people whom we are proud and happy to call our friends.

When I refer to India as a great Nation, Mr. Prime Minister, it is not a reference promoted either by the vastness of your territory nor the numerical greatness of your population. On the contrary, your country is great in its history and traditions. It is great in its contribution of culture to the world. It is great in song and story, and to speak of having the "wealth of the Indias" is to describe the epitome of all material achievement. It is great in its accomplishments of the past and in its promise for the future—a promise not born of dreams alone, but of dreams destined to be crystallized into accomplishment.

Yours today is the heritage of all men who are free. This you have achieved through an effort deserving of the world's applause. Freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of action, religious freedom, political freedom—just freedom, in every sense of the term—nothing is greater, nothing is more desirable. Without this freedom, no nation can be great, no people can prosper, none can be happy, none can feel nor be secure.

Today your country and your people are free, and we, in this land of 150 years of freedom, rejoice with you in your achievement. From now on with the exercise of that eternal vigilance which is said to be the price of liberty, your millions of unfettered men and women can march forward into a future bright with the sunlight of promise.

This American Republic is marching forward upon the same road with you and toward the same goal. We have been going forward in the same direction for the past 150 years. We do not expect nor ask your country to fall in behind us. No; we are inviting you to take your place at our side and keep step with us as we march into the dawn of a new day.

We in America realize the fact that by accepting leadership in the struggle to win the minds of men, we are assuming the task of bringing peoples everywhere back to sane

thinking. We face that responsibility without fear. Long years ago the poet Tennyson envisioned the day when—

"* * * the war drum throbb'd no longer and the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world * * *
(For) I doubt not thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

With the same prophetic vision, Elizabeth Barrett Browning looked forward to the dawn of a new day in a world united and free; to a day when—

"* * * with reachings of thought we reach down to the deeps
Of the souls of our brothers,
And teach them full words with our slow-moving lips
'God,' 'Liberty,' 'Truth'—which they hearken and think
And work into harmony, link upon link
Till the silver meets round the earth gelid and dense,
Shedding sparks of electric respondence intense
On the dark of eclipse!
Then we hear through the silence and glory afar,
As from shores of a star
In aphelion—the new generations that cry,
Disenthralled by our voice to harmonious reply,
'God,' 'Liberty,' 'Truth!'
We are glorious forsooth—
And our name has a seat,
Though the shroud should be donned
O Life, O Beyond,
Thou art strange, thou art sweet!"

Judge Medina's Charge to the Jury at Trial of the Communist Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, a deep debt of gratitude is owed the American people for this magnificent democratic way of life which was resplendently mirrored in the conduct of the trial of the 11 Communists presided over by the patient and forbearing judge, the Honorable Harold Medina, who along with the jury, prosecutors, the witnesses, and the American people at large evidenced that the Constitution of the United States not only protects its citizens but also protects this great country of ours. The judge's charge to the jury was so magnificent and such worth-while reading that I felt compelled to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEXT OF JUDGE MEDINA'S CHARGE TO THE JURY AT THE TRIAL OF THE COMMUNIST LEADERS—COURT DEFINES CRIME OF CONSPIRACY, POINTS OUT BURDEN OF PROOF AND REASONABLE DOUBT

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you now approach the performance of one of the most sacred duties of citizenship, the meting out of justice. Just after you were sworn in as jurors I took occasion to make a few remarks which I shall now repeat in somewhat different form, as the thoughts I then expressed are peculiarly applicable to the period of your deliberations in order to reach a just and true verdict. I then told you to be patient and said that there are few qualities in life so important. I said that if you once get yourself in the frame of mind where you know that you have a task ahead and it has to be done carefully and it has to be done just right and you know that it will be wrong to let little things disturb you, then there comes a certain calm and peace of mind which are of the essence in the administration of justice. When you get yourself in that frame of mind you find not only that the task ahead becomes much easier, but in addition that the quality of your work in the administration of justice is of the quality that it should be. Justice does not flourish amidst emotional excitement and stress.

ALL ALIKE BEFORE BAR

The rich and the poor, and persons of every race, creed, and condition stand alike before the bar of justice; and you must consider and weigh the evidence carefully, calmly, and dispassionately, without the slightest trace of sympathy or prejudice for or against any party to the proceeding. The very importance of the case makes it all the more urgent that you heed these words of caution. In this connection you will bear in mind at all times that these 11 men are charged here as 11 individuals, the guilt or innocence of each of whom must be passed on by you separately, pursuant to and in accordance with the instructions which I am about to give you.

Never in all my long experience as a lawyer and in my brief experience as a judge have I seen a jury exhibit so much patience and pay such careful attention at all times to the testimony of the witnesses and the reading of exhibits, despite the prolonged duration of this trial. Let me express my sincere appreciation of the way in which you have performed your functions. You deserve special commendation and you are entitled to the gratitude of all citizens of the community for the sacrifice you have made and for the services you are rendering in the faithful performance of a public duty. And so I beg of you to continue on in the same spirit until the end.

The jury is composed of 12 men and women. While undoubtedly their verdict should represent the opinion of each individual juror, it by no means follows that opinions may not be changed by conference in the jury room. The very object of the jury system is to secure unanimity by a comparison of views and by arguments among the jurors themselves, provided this can be done reasonably and consistently with the conscientious convictions of the several jurors. Each juror should listen, with a disposition to be convinced, to the opinions and arguments of the others. It is not intended that a juror should go to the jury room with a fixed determination that the verdict shall represent his opinion of the case at that moment. Nor is it intended that he should close his ear to the arguments of other jurors who are equally honest and intelligent with himself.

DUTIES OF JUDGE, JURY

The first thing I wish to make plain to you is the way in which our American system of jurisprudence defines the duties of the judge on the one hand and those of the jury on the other. It is exclusively my function clearly to set forth the rules of law which govern the case, with instructions as to their application. On these legal matters you must take the law as I give it to you; you are not at liberty to do otherwise. Thus I shall read the indictment and the statute applicable to the case and I shall construe the statute in those respects in which I think it requires construction and interpretation. I shall explain the function of the indictment, the presumption of innocence, the burden resting upon the Government of proving its case to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt and I shall give you the rules governing the trial of conspiracy cases, the rules to guide you in determining the credibility of witnesses and so on. My function is exclusively to instruct you on the law; and you must not permit any notions of your own or any matters referred to by counsel to obscure the fact that you must apply the law as I give it to you.

On the other hand, you are the sole judges of the facts and I shall refer to this circumstance again to impress it upon you. Just as you are not permitted to encroach upon my function in giving instructions on the law, so must I be careful not to encroach upon your function as the sole judges of the facts.

The relevant parts of the statute under the terms of which the indictment was drawn are as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for (1) any person—to knowingly or wilfully advocate, * * * or * * * teach the duty, (or) necessity, * * * of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, * * *;

"(3) to organize * * *any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, (or) advocate, * * * the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States by force or violence; * * *.

"SEC. 2. (b) For the purpose of this section, the term 'government in the United States' means the Government of the United States, the government of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, the government of the District of Columbia, or the government of any political subdivision of any of them.

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any person * * * to conspire to commit, any of the acts prohibited by the provisions of this title."

The indictment reads as follows:

The grand jury charges:

1. That from on or about April 1, 1945, and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the Southern District of New York, and elsewhere, William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, also known as Francis X. Waldron, Jr., John B. Williamson, Jacob Stachel, Robert G. Thompson, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Henry Winston, John Gates, also known as Israel Regenstreif, Irving Potash, Gilbert Green, Carl Winter, and Gus Hall, also known as Arno Gust Halberg, the defendants herein, unlawfully wilfully, and knowingly, did conspire with each other, and with divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, to organize as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and knowingly and wilfully to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, which said acts are prohibited by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (sec. 10, title 18, United States Code), commonly known as the Smith Act.

2. It was part of said conspiracy that said defendants would convene, in the Southern District of New York, a meeting of the national board of the Communist Political Association on or about June 2, 1945, to adopt a draft resolution for the purpose of bringing about the dissolution of the Communist Political Association, and for the purpose of organizing as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society, group, and assembly of persons dedicated to the Marxist-Leninist principles of the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

3. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would thereafter con-

vene, in the southern district of New York, a meeting of the national committee of the Communist Political Association on or about June 18, 1945, to amend and adopt said draft resolution.

4. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would thereafter cause to be convened, in the Southern District of New York, a special national convention of the Communist Political Association on or about July 26, 1945, for the purpose of considerating and acting upon said resolution as amended.

TO DISSOLVE ASSOCIATION

5 It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would induce the delegates to said national convention to dissolve the Communist Political Association.

6. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would bring about the organization of the Communist Party of the United States of America as a society, group, and assembly of persons to teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and would cause said convention to adopt a constitution basing said party upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

7. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would bring about the election of officers and the election of a national committee of said party, and would become members of said party, and be elected as officers and as members of said national committee and the national board of said committee, and in such capacities said defendants would assume leadership of said party and responsibility for its policies and activities, and would meet from time to time to formulate, supervise, and carry out the policies and activities of said party.

8. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would cause to be organized clubs, and district and State units of said party, and would recruit and encourage the recruitment of members of said party.

9. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would publish and circulate, and cause to be published and circulated, books, articles, magazines, and newspapers advocating the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

SCHOOLS TO BE SET UP

10. It was further a part of said conspiracy that said defendants would conduct, and cause to be conducted, schools and classes for the study of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, in which would be taught and advocated the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence.

In violation of sections 3 and 5 of the act of June 28, 1940 (secs. 11 and 13, title 18, United States Code), commonly known as the Smith Act.

To this indictment each of the defendants has pleaded not guilty thus placing in issue each and every one of the material allegations contained in the indictment.

As an indictment is a rather technical document, there are one or two points which require a little explanation. You will observe that it is the first paragraph which alleges the conspiracy. While it refers to a conspiring to organize as the Communist Party a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and also conspiring to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, I charge you that but a single conspiracy is alleged.

PRELIMINARY ACTION

You will doubtless remember from Mr. McGohey's opening address that the prosecution has undertaken to prove that the defendants conspired to organize the Communist Party as a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government by force and violence as a mere preliminary to the second phase of this same conspiracy which has to do with the teaching and advocacy of the duty and necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government by force and violence. Probably the prosecution could have urged me to construe the indictment as charging a single conspiracy with two separate objects or as charging two separate conspiracies, but it has not done so and the construction just given is adopted because plainly in the interest of defendants and not conceivably prejudicial to them. As there is a single conspiracy alleged, this will also simplify your labors.

Let me repeat that the crime charged is a conspiracy. The crime charged is not that these defendants personally advocated or taught the duty or necessity of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence; nor is the charge that the Communist Party as such advocates or teaches such violent overthrow and destruction. The charge is that these defendants conspired with each other, and with others unknown to the grand jury, knowingly and wilfully to advocate and to teach the duty or necessity of such overthrow and destruction and, in this connection to organize the Communist Party as a society, group, or assembly of persons who teach or advocate such overthrow and destruction.

You may have noticed, however, that the statute, which I read to you, makes it unlawful to advocate or teach the duty or necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government by force and violence and also makes it unlawful to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach or advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence. It is in the disjunctive by reason of the use of the word "or." In accordance with the rules of pleading the prosecution has in the indictment charged both, by using the conjunctive "and" in the phrase "overthrow and destruction"; but it is sufficient if the evidence adduced convinces you by the required degree of proof that defendants, or any of them, conspired as alleged, to teach and advocate either the overthrow or the destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, in accordance with these instructions.

Thus it may be said that the objects of the alleged conspiracy were the organizing as the Communist Party of a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence and the advocacy and teaching of the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government by force and violence.

PARTS OF CONSPIRACY

Now let us turn to the remaining nine paragraphs of the indictment. The conspiracy is alleged in paragraph 1. Each of the remaining nine paragraphs alleges that it was "part of said conspiracy" that defendants would do various things, such as: inducing the delegates of a special national convention of the Communist Political Association to dissolve the Communist Political Association; causing to be organized clubs, and district and State units of the Communist Party and recruiting and encouraging the recruitment of members of that party; and the publication and circulation of books, articles, magazines and newspapers advocating the principles of Marxism-Leninism; and so on. These paragraphs merely allege the means by which it is claimed the defendants agreed that the conspiracy was to be made effective. And so I shall charge you later that it is not necessary for the prosecution to prove that all these means were actually used or put in operation, provided that it be established to your satisfaction by the required degree of proof that one or more of these means described in the last nine paragraphs of the indictment were agreed upon to be used to effect the conspiracy in accordance with these instructions.

This indictment that I have read to you is merely a method by which the prosecution calls into a court of justice individuals who, it is claimed, have violated the law. It is not evidence of the guilt of the defendants nor does it detract in any degree from the presumption of innocence with which the law surrounds them until their guilt is proven. This presumption of innocence remains with them throughout the trial of the case and applies to the consideration of each of the essential ingredients going to make up the crime charged unless and until you, the jury, are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, from the evidence adduced by the prosecution, on whom is the burden of proof, of the guilt of the defendants as charged.

EXPLAINS "REASONABLE DOUBT"

And a reasonable doubt means a doubt founded upon reason. It does not mean a fanciful doubt, or a whimsical or capricious doubt, for anything relating to human affairs and depending upon human testimony is open to some possible or imaginary doubt. When all of the evidence in the case, carefully analyzed, compared and weighed by you, produces in your minds a settled conviction or belief of a defendant's guilt, such a conviction as you would be willing to act upon in matters of the highest importance relating to your own affairs, when it leaves your minds in the condition that you feel an abiding conviction amounting to a moral certainty of the truth of the charge, then, and in that event you would be free from a reasonable doubt. Absolute or mathematical certainty is not required but there must be such certainty as satisfies your reason and judgment, and such that you feel conscientiously bound to act upon it.

A conspiracy may be defined as a combination of two or more persons, by concerted action, to accomplish a criminal or unlawful purpose, or some purpose not in itself unlawful or criminal, by criminal or unlawful means. The gist of the offense is the unlawful combination or agreement to violate the law. As Justice Holmes said many years ago: "A conspiracy is a partnership in criminal purposes."

ANALYZES CONSPIRACY

However, it is not necessary in order to constitute a conspiracy that two or more persons should meet together and enter into an explicit or formal agreement for an unlawful scheme, or that they should directly, by words or in writing, state what the unlawful scheme was to be, and the details of the plan or means by which the unlawful scheme was to be made effective.

It is sufficient if two or more persons, in any manner, or through any contrivance, impliedly or tacitly, come to a mutual understanding to accomplish a common and unlawful design, knowing its object. In other words, where an unlawful end is sought to be effected and two or more persons, actuated by the common purpose of accomplishing that end, knowingly work together in any way in furtherance of the unlawful scheme, every one of said persons becomes a member of the conspiracy, although his part therein be a subordinate one, or be executed at a remote distance from the other conspirators. All the conspirators need not have originally conceived the conspiracy, or participated in its inception. Those who come in later, with knowledge of the aims and purposes of the conspiracy, and cooperate in the common effort to attain the unlawful results become parties thereto. A conspiracy is not ended

as long as the evidence shows an intention to continue it.

CITES PRINCIPLE OF LAW

Each alleged conspirator who was the agent of the others at some time during the life of the conspiracy remains an agent during all of its existence, except that a conspirator has the right to withdraw from the execution of the conspiracy, but it requires affirmative and effective action thus to withdraw and terminate his liability in the conspiracy. It is a principle of law that a condition once shown to exist continues until a different situation is shown.

Persons may be guilty of being parties to a conspiracy though the objects of the conspiracy were never accomplished. On the other hand, proof concerning the accomplishment of the objects of a conspiracy is the most persuasive evidence of the existence of the conspiracy itself. The agreement is generally a matter of inference deduced from acts of the persons accused done in pursuance of an apparent criminal purpose.

You are further instructed that where several persons are proved to have combined together for the same illegal purpose, any act done or declaration made by one of them during the pendency of the illegal enterprise, and in furtherance of the common objects, is not only evidence against himself but is evidence against the other conspirators, who, when the combination is proved, are as much responsible for such declarations and acts as if made and committed by themselves, because each is deemed to assent to or command what is done by any other in furtherance of the common objects.

URGES SEPARATE CONSIDERATIONS

It is not incumbent upon the prosecution to prove that all of the means set out in the indictment were, in fact, agreed upon to carry out the conspiracy, or that all of them were actually used or put into operation. It is sufficient if it be established to your satisfaction, and beyond a reasonable doubt, that one or more of the means described in the indictment was agreed upon to be used to effect the conspiracy.

With these general principles as a guide, you will approach the important question of whether the prosecution has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of the conspiracy alleged in the indictment, and if such a conspiracy did exist, whether the defendants or any of them were parties to it and whether such defendants entered it with knowledge of its nature and objects. It will be well for you to take up and consider separately the evidence as it relates to each defendant on trial.

You must first determine from all the evidence in the case, relating to the period of time defined in the indictment, whether or not a conspiracy existed. If you decide that a conspiracy did exist, you must next determine, as to each defendant, whether or not he was a member of the conspiracy. In considering whether or not a particular defendant was a member of the conspiracy, you must do so without regard to and independently of the statements and declarations of others.

ELUCIDATES "COCONSPIRATOR"

In other words, you must determine the membership of a particular defendant from the evidence concerning his own actions, his own conduct, his own declarations, or his own statements, and his own connection with the actions and conduct of others. However, once you have determined that a defendant was a member of the conspiracy, using this test, you may then consider as if made by him the statements and declarations of other coconspirators, made in furtherance of the conspiracy and during the existence thereof as alleged.

There has been testimony in the case of acts and declarations by persons, for example, instructors and party functionaries, who are not named in the indictment as defendants. However the indictment does refer to coconspirators unknown to the grand jury. If you find that the conspiracy charged in the indictment existed and that any of these persons acted on behalf of the defendants and in furtherance of the conspiracy, then those persons are coconspirators and their acts and declarations are binding on whatever defendants you find to have been members of the conspiracy.

HYPOTHETICAL EVIDENCE CITED

I may explain this in a different way. First, you will recall that as to every material fact the prosecution has the burden of proving such fact to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt. Let us assume then, for the purposes of argument only, and merely by way of hypothetical illustration, that after deliberating together you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that a conspiracy existed and that the defendants or some of them were parties to it and you come to the question of whether or not you should consider as binding upon such defendants the testimony of one of the prosecution witnesses to the effect that Mr. or Miss So-and-So claimed to have been one of the instructors in one of the Communist Party schools, had said thus and so about the dictatorship of the proletariat and how it would be brought about by Communists in the United States of America.

Before you could consider this evidence against the defendants or any of them you would have to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the instructor in question was a member of the conspiracy, with knowledge of its aims and purposes, and that the teaching in question was during the period of the indictment and in furtherance of the aims and purposes of the conspiracy.

For, as I have explained a moment or two ago, if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that there was a conspiracy to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence and if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more of the defendants knowingly were parties to such conspiracy, you may consider the acts and statements of coconspirators, engaged in the same enterprise, and done or said in furtherance of the conspiracy and in the time specified in the indictment, just as though such statements and acts were said and done by the defendant or defendants who were found by you to be members of the conspiracy.

Accordingly, before considering as binding on said defendants such testimony as I have above described, it would be necessary for you also to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the instructor in question was in fact a coconspirator, with knowledge of the aims and purposes of the conspiracy, and that the teaching he or she was said to have done was within the period of the indictment and knowingly in furtherance of the aims and purposes of the conspiracy. In this connection you will recall that I have already told you that all the conspirators need not have originally conceived the conspiracy or participated in its conception. Everyone coming into a conspiracy, with knowledge of its aims and purposes, is as much a coconspirator as though in it from the beginning, in the absence of some affirmative action to effect a withdrawal from the conspiracy.

GUILT OF COCONSPIRATORS

Now do not go off on a tangent and get confused about these instructors or party fuctionaries or anyone else, not named in the indictment, whom you may find to be a coconspirator. You are not called upon to name any of these persons in your verdict or to pass upon their guilt or innocence in any way. No charge against them of violating the criminal laws of the United States is before you for determination. The sole question before you is whether these defendants, named in the indictment which I have read to you, are guilty of the charge laid against them. Your only task is to determine whether they or any of them are guilty as charged. If the evidence points to the guilt of any person or persons not named in the indictment and not on trial before you, you are in no sense to consider such evidence except insofar as it bears upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the defendants or any of them, in accordance with these instructions.

In conspiracy cases there is necessarily considerable latitude of admissible evidence, so that some of the testimony may be applicable to one but not to the others of the defendants on trial. During the course of the trial certain evidence was received concerning acts, declarations, and teachings of various of the defendants during the period prior to April 1, 1945, the initial date of the conspiracy alleged in the indictment.

As I have told you, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants willfully conspired, during the period April 1, 1945, to July 20, 1948, to accomplish the two objectives which are charged in the indictment and which I have previously mentioned. The evidence which has been received relating to the period prior to the conspiracy should be considered by you only in determining the intent of the defendants concerned and in determining whether they contemplated that the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence would be taught during the period from April 1, 1945, to July 20, 1948. You may not consider such evidence in determining the intent of any other defendant to commit the offense charged, or for any other purpose.

TREATMENT OF THE PROGRAM

Government's exhibit No. 3, the "Program of the Communist International," was originally received against the defendant Stachel only. Thereafter, evidence was admitted that this program was the subject of teaching in a party school and was quoted from or referred to in one or two of the outlines distributed after April 1, 1945. If you are satisfied by the required degree of proof that the program was so used after April 1, 1945, you may consider it not only as bearing upon the intent of the defendant Stachel but also on the issue of the existence of the conspiracy as alleged.

For two or more persons to conspire, confederate, or combine together to commit or cause to be committed a breach of the criminal law of the United States is an offense of grave character which involves not only a plotting to subvert the law, but also the preparation of the conspirators for further criminal practices. It is almost always characterized by secrecy, rendering detection difficult and requiring much time for its discovery. Because of this the statute has made a conspiracy to commit a crime a distinct offense from the crime itself. From the point of view of the law there is danger to the public when two or more people conspire to do something that is unlawful because by virtue of the aggregation of numbers the intent assumes a more formidable disadvantageous aspect to the public.

For your guidance and assistance, I shall now briefly discuss the contentions of the prosecution and those of the defendants relative to the proofs adduced by each and instruct you on the rules of law which shall govern your deliberations in passing upon the credibility of the witnesses who have testified on behalf of one side or the other.

Before I do this I wish to emphasize again that you are the sole judges of the facts. In a case such as this, with hundreds of exhibits and many thousands of pages of testimony, it is impossible for me to attempt any complete and satisfactory summary. Therefore, I solemnly tell you that the brief statement which I shall make concerning the contentions of the parties is merely by way of passing remark to help refresh your recollection and get you started on your deliberations. It is solely your function to determine not only what testimony was given and by whom, but also to determine the relative importance or lack of importance of the vast number of details with which the case is replete. The circumstance—that I mention some of these and omit others—must not be taken as an indication that I have any opinion with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or any of them, or any opinion to the effect that one phase of the case is of more importance than another. It is for you alone to determine what evidence you will believe and what weight you will give it, in accordance with these instructions.

BOOKS ARE NOT ON TRIAL

But I can help to eliminate certain matters which are not in issue. Books are not on trial here nor are you concerned with the philosophical validity of any mere theories. It is not your function to pass upon the relative merits of communism or capitalism or any other "isms." You are concerned with the intent of these defendants and what these defendants, and any other persons with whom you may find they conspired in accordance with the rules already stated, did and said. The books, pamphlets, and so on come into the case only to the extent that you may be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that these books and pamphlets were used by the defendants, and those conspiring with them, if there be any such, as instruments, apparatus, or paraphernalia for the propagation of teaching and advocacy of the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence.

Nor will you be called upon to decide any of the miscellaneous matters injected into the case by counsel for the defendants and received by me on the theory that they could not satisfactorily show that the defendants at no time organized, or conspired to organize, as the Communist Party of the United States of America, a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence, and taught or advocated, or conspired to teach and advocate, the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence, without showing, to a reasonable extent, what they claim that they did teach and advocate.

I have taken great pains during the trial to keep the real issues clearly before you, lest confusion and injustice to one side or the other might result. And so I charge you now that questions or issues relative to the grievances of young people, trade-unions, farmers, working people in general, veterans, or housewives, or Jim Crow, lynching, and the like, discrimination based upon race, creed, or color, and so on, are not before you for determination. You must be scrupulously careful to see to it that the testimony on these subjects does not attract your minds away from the real issues as clearly defined in these instructions, or stir up emotions and sympathies which may make it difficult for you to consider the real issues and the evidence carefully, calmly, and dispassionately, without the slightest trace of sympathy or prejudice for or against any party to the proceeding, as I have already charged you to do. The same is true about the utterances of defendants, as contained in the proofs, on the subjects of the wisdom of the Marshall plan, the withdrawal of American troops from China, the war in Spain, and similar subjects.

FREE TO ADVOCATE REFORM

It is perfectly lawful and proper for the defendants or anyone else to advocate reforms and changes in the laws, which seem to them to be salutary and necessary. No one has suggested that the defendants transgressed any laws by advocating such reforms and changes. No syllable of the indictment refers to any such matters. Furthermore, should you find from the evidence that defendants organized or helped to organize and assumed or were given leadership in the Communist Party as a legitimate political party solely with the view of electing candidates to politcal office by lawful and peaceful means and advocating reforms and changes in the laws or the adoption of policies by the Government favorable to their contentions in the matters just referred to, you must render a verdict of not guilty. And, even if you do not so find from the evidence, you cannot bring in a verdict of guilty against any defendant unless the prosecution has satisfied you of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, in accordance with these instructions.

Put the other way around and more succinctly, I charged you that if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants, or any of them, willfully conspired to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, in accordance with these instructions, it is immaterial that they may also have contemplated the teaching and advocacy of other matters, such as rent control, civil rights legislation, or any other subject.

I need not remind you that the case bristles with issues of veracity. In instances too numerous to specify, the testimony of witnesses called by the prosecution is flatly contradicted by the testimony of witnesses called by the defendants. It is your function and yours alone to decide where the truth lies, remembering always that the prosecution has the burden of proof and this burden, as I have already told you, is that of satisfying you beyond a reasonable doubt as to each essential ingredient of the crime charged.

The prosecution claims that the defendants conspired together and with others to organize as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society, group and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and to teach and advocate the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence; that defendants as part and parcel of the conspiracy sought to mask their purposes by pretending that they were fighting always and solely for democracy and the interests and welfare of the workers and to bring about salutary reforms and even socialism as a goal to be reached in the nebulous future, all by straightforward, peaceful and strictly lawful means, whereas in truth and in fact they resorted to many clandestine and fraudulent devices in teaching those subject to their influence secretly to prepare for the coming of some crisis, such as a deep depression or a war with the Soviet Union, to spring into action when the word of command was given, to paralyze powerhouses, the transportation system and the vast industrial machine at the heart of our economic system and in the resultant chaos and confusion to bring about, by violent and unlawful means, the overthrow or destruction of the Government and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To this end, according to the contentions of the prosecution, under circumstances involving some communication from Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, a delegate of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, and an article by Jacques Duclos, a leading French Communist, the Communist Political Association was dissolved, Browder's policy of the peaceful collaboration of the classes, or revisionism was repudiated and the Communist Party was reconstituted, and an elaborate and far-reaching network of schools and classes established for the propagation of the Marxist-Leninist principles of the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence.

REFERS TO AESOPIAN LANGUAGE

The prosecution further contends that Aesopian language, only understood by Communists thoroughly indoctrinated in the use of such verbiage, was used in their constitution of 1945 and elsewhere, and that defendants also habitually used in their writings and teaching a species of double-talk which they used to convey one meaning to themselves and their followers, but which would be otherwise understood by the uninitiate and the public at large; that a rigid system of party discipline was rigorously enforced, hedged about with the appearance of prolonged democratic discussion, amendments of resolutions and so on, to becloud the fact that this discipline was enforced from above and with the active cooperation of the defendants themselves; that deliberate lying and false swearing were condoned and even encouraged, when the needs of the Communist Party so required; that the use of false names, the destruction of membership books or cards and various other secret and devious devices were resorted to; that plans were deeply laid to place energetic and militant members of the Communist Party in key positions in various industries indispensable to the functioning of the American economy, to be ready for action at a given signal; and that such action was to consist of strikes, sabotage, and violence of one sort or another appropriate to the consummation of the desired end, that is to say the smashing of the machine of state, the destruction of the army and the police force and the overthrow of the Government and what Communists call "bourgeois democracy."

PROSECUTION ON INDOCTRINATION

The prosecution further claims that the process of indoctrination at these various schools and classes was sought to be accomplished by the defendants by (1) a persistent and unremitting playing upon the grievances of various minority groups such as young people, veterans, Negroes, housewives, Jews, and those suffering from economic handicaps of one sort or another—rubbing salt into these wounds and doing their best to arouse and inflame antagonisms between various segments of the population; (2) by insistence that the Communist Party alone is qualified to assume and to retain leadership of the revolutionary movement for the smashing of the capitalist state machine, and the ushering in of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that accordingly Communists must at all times maintain what they call their vanguard role and the elimination at all times of others who claim to be seeking by various means to attain the same or similar ends; (3) by constant study and discussion of the steps by which the Communists came to power in the Soviet Union, including the details of the revolution of October 1917, in Russia, the strategy and tactics followed, including the wearing by the workers of uniforms of the Russian soldiers and sailors, the street fighting and so on; (4) by constantly stressing their claim that capitalism during the period of time specified in the indictment was on its last

legs, or moribund, that the dictatorship of the proletariat was inevitable, that the workers should hate the capitalist system and their employers, and the army and the police as mere instruments of Wall Street monopolists and exploiters, who are said to hold the Government of the United States in their clutches; (5) by picturing the Government of the United States as imperialistic and tending toward fascism and the Soviet Union as the protector of the rights of minorities, the only true and complete democracy and as dedicated to peace; (6) by inculcating the doctrine that a war with Russia would be an imperialistic and an unjust war, in which event it is said to be the duty of those subscribing to defendants' principles to turn the imperialistic war into a civil war and fight against their own government, meaning the Government of the United States.

POINTS TO "VIOLENCE" CHARGE

It is the further claim of the prosecution that defendants, during the period specified in the indictment, did and said what they did, and what it is claimed that the evidence, testimonial and documentary, shows that they did, with the specific intent and purpose of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, and doing so at the earliest time that circumstances would permit.

On the other hand, the defendants' version in this case is as different as white from black. The two versions of the facts are utterly irreconcilable. Thus defendants deny that they or any of them ever conspired among themselves or with anyone else to organize as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence or to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence; they deny that there was at any time anything furtive or deceptive about any of their acts or writings and they assert, on the contrary, that their very principles as Communists forbid them to conceal their aims and purposes from the people and that they have taught openly and for a long time the peaceful principles of Marxism-Leninism as they understand them to everyone they could induce to listen to them or to read their writings.

The defendants characterize as "unmitigated bunk," and as a vicious libel, the charges leveled against them and to some extent summarized by me in the foregoing instructions. They claim that the whole prosecution is based on a frame-up, supported by the testimony of Government agents whom defendants describe as stool pigeons. It is charged that these agents and certain of the FBI men who also testified against defendants and others, such as the witness Budenz, willfully perjured themselves and that their testimony is a tissue of lies made up out of whole cloth.

They assert that at least Dennis and Green backed up Foster in his opposition to the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association in 1944 and that the elimination of the Communist Political Association and the reconstitution of the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1945 were in no respect due to any orders from abroad or elsewhere but, on the contrary, were the result of spontaneous and growing criticism of Browder's policies, springing from the ranks of the party, as a result of general dissatisfaction with revisionist and opportunist views, which it was widely thought would wreck the party and perhaps, if continued, render wholly unattainable the ultimate goal of socialism. They point to Foster's letter of January 20, 1944, and the views which he pressed upon the members of the national committee, and Foster's position of leadership in the party, as demonstrating that the Duclos article merely helped to bring things to a head. They further assert that, while the Communist Political Association was still in existence, and long before its dissolution, the course of events had begun to demonstrate that Browder was wrong; that capital revealed itself less cooperative than Browder had anticipated, that the unity of the wartime Allies had weakened, and the United States and Great Britain had begun to show signs of adopting an imperialistic and unjustifiable anti-Soviet attitude; that, accordingly, when the Duclos article appeared, members of the Communist Political Assosiation were receptive to its criticisms, since these criticisms accorded with their own developing experience; and that thereupon as a result of a reappraisal of party politics, arrived at in a frank and democratic manner, it was decided in open convention that the policies of the Communist Political Association during the 1944–45 period were a revision of Marxism, and the Communist Party was reconstituted; that the Communist Party was then set up with its various subdivisions, and the defendants were elected, at the times indicated by the evidence, to positions of leadership in it; and that they took part in disseminating party literature and supervising its dissemination, teaching, and advocating party principles, and in setting up and supervising schools and classes for the teaching and advocating of party principles.

GOAL WAS SOCIALISM

The defendants assert that they regard the establishment of socialism in this country as necessary if the people are to live in peace and prosperity; that all their activities are directed toward the ultimate establishment of socialism, and take two major forms which interact with and influence each other: the political and the educational.

Their political activities, they contend, stem from their belief that the people of the country can attain socialism in a legal and democratic way, in spite of the opposition of the capitalists, but that socialism can never be achieved, no peace or freedom at all is possible, if the manifestations of reaction and fascism, which the defendants discern, continue unchecked, and the power of the trusts and monopolies continues to increase. Therefore, the immediate problem, according to the defendants, is to overcome the warmongers and the powers of reaction. This the defendants say they have attempted to accomplish by organizing or attempting to organize the broadest kind of national coalition of anti-Fascist and democratic forces, with strong emphasis placed upon the independent role and initiative of the working class and especially the progressive labor movement and Communists. This coalition, according to the defendants, is a political coalition consisting of the workers, the Negro people, small farmers, the city middle class, small shopkeepers, small income professionals, intellectuals, and even those of the capitalist class who desire to fight against war and fascism and in favor of peace, freedom, and security.

"PEOPLE'S FRONT GOVERNMENT"

They assert that the purpose of this broad coalition is to elect a Democratic and People's Front Government, such as was elected in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania, and that this would only come about if and when a majority of the people wanted it and were ready to struggle for it. Thus they say that their political activities are directed toward inducing the electorate to bring such a People's Front Government to power by peaceful, democratic means on the basis of a program of democratic demands; and that when such a People's Front Government is in power and is able to curb the warmongers, monopolists, and other forces of reaction, the people will then desire to move toward socialism, and, by peaceful, democratic means, will do so.

Hand in hand with the political activities of the defendants go their educational activities, for they assert that the people will be unable to appreciate their political program unless they understand the principles which actuate it and see how the application of these principles will solve the problems that beset them. As Mr. William Z. Foster testified in his deposition, which was read to you:

"The Communist Party proceeds upon the practical assumption that the question of socialism in the United States is now in the educational stage; that is, that it is a question of teaching the masses the necessities for socialism or the inevitability of socialism and the means for bringing about socialism."

The defendants contend that they engage in these political and educational activities in order to benefit the masses of the American people, and to preserve and extend American democracy. They contend that their activities on behalf of the poor and oppressed, as well as in support of liberal legislation, and their opposition to all discriminatory and reactionary policies, show that they can have no such intent as is necessary to support the charge in the indictment.

The defendants deny that the principles of Marxism-Leninism, as taught by them, have anything to do with the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence. These principles as taught by them, they assert, form a unified whole, and are a true social science.

According to some of the testimony introduced on behalf of defendants, there was taught the principle of the class struggle. This principle is said to be that the workers and farmers and other segments of the population are engaged in a constant struggle with the capitalists, since the capitalists seek to exploit them, and they naturally resist. There also was taught the principle of the increasing crisis of capitalism, which is said to be that capitalism all over the world, by its very nature, sinks into deeper and deeper crises, with ever-widening circles of economic distress; that the capitalists, seeking to preserve their tottering dominion, intensify the class struggle and increase their exploitation of the mass of the people.

SOCIALISM AS ONLY SOLUTION

The defendants contend that socialism is the only solution to the crises of capitalism, and assert they engage in the political and educational activities which I have already mentioned, looking first toward the establishment of a broad democratic coalition to restrain the abuses of the reactionary capitalist class which has been goaded to desperation by the deepening crises of capitalism, and then toward the eventual establishment of socialism.

The defendants assert that they do not believe in and do not teach the use of force and violence to gain their ends. They contend that the capitalist class uses force and violence to prevent the transition to socialism, and that they justified the use of force and violence only as a method of preventing an attempted forcible overthrow of a succeeding government which had obtained control in a peaceful manner, or as a method of last resort to enforce the majority will if, at some indefinite future time, because of peculiar circumstances, constitutional or peaceful channels were no longer open. But as long as the peaceful electoral paths are open, the defendants assert that they can meet the reactionary class at the polls and defeat them peacefully.

It is manifestly not possible for me to give any complete summary of what was taught in the various Communist Party schools, according to the witnesses called by defendants. But I shall try to refer to some of these teachings which, according to my recol-

lection, these witnesses seemed particularly to emphasize. Thus they say that the Marxist-Leninist principles taught in these schools are adaptable in various ways to a variety of historical conditions, that they cannot be applied dogmatically.

LENIN'S VIEW CITED

Lenin showed, the defendants contend, that the capitalist system has developed in an uneven manner in various countries, that the contradictions and crises of capitalism, and imperialism, the final stage of capitalism, have all manifested themselves differently in different countries throughout the course of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and that therefore the transition to socialism has occurred and will occur in different ways, based upon the unique situations at a given time and place.

Thus the defendants warn against a mechanical transference of the experience of the Russian October revolution of 1917 to the situation now prevalent in this country. The fact that socialism came to Russia in the form of Soviets following a violent revolution does not mean the same will happen here. The notion that the October revolution of 1917 in Russia can be used as a blueprint for any changes in the American political or social system, the defendants assert, is in flat contradiction of their teachings to the contrary.

With respect to the slogan "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war," the testimony on behalf of defendants is to the effect that the reference to this slogan was by way of an explanation of its use in specific historical contexts and that the use of such slogan was not for the purpose of teaching or advocating the duty or necessity of converting a prospective imperialist war between the United States and the Soviet Union into a civil war.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

One of their teachings which they say is axiomatic is that the constant interaction between theory and practice is itself a principle of Marxism-Leninism as propounded in their elementary as well as advanced and leadership schools. Thus it is possible for their day-to-day political and educational approach to vary, depending on the particular problems that have to be faced. Hence they say that prior to 1935 the issue was socialism against capitalism, although, as I understand it, every witness for the defense who was questioned on the subject vigorously asserted that at no time, prior or subsequent to 1935, did they teach that the Government of the United States or any government was to be overthrown or destroyed by force and violence in order to usher in socialism.

They further say, according to Mr. Foster, that the people's-front policy, about which I spoke a few moments ago, began to take shape at the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in Moscow in 1935, and that the development of this new policy had the effect of rendering obsolete many of the books about which Mr. Foster and others were questioned by the prosecution.

PARTY CONSTITUTION QUOTED

In this connection defendants refer to article XIV, section 1, of the 1945 constitution of the Communist Party, which provided:

"The Communist Party is not responsible for any political document, policy, book, article, or any other expression of political opinion except such as are issued by authority of this and subsequent conventions and its regularly constituted leadership."

FIGHT ON FASCISM

And so Mr. Winter, one of the defendants here on trial, testified that in his address to the 1945 convention, he said:

"It was not a program for socialism. It was a program for the strengthening of the forces of democracy in our country to save our country from the menace of fascism and thus to lay the foundation for the majority of the American people winning Government power through the free exercise of their choice."

Finally, as negativing the claim that defendants conspired to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, defendants point to article IX, section 2 of the 1945 constitution of the Communist Party, which reads as follows:

"Adherence to or participation in the activities of any clique, circle, faction or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy, whereby the majority of the American people can maintain their right to determine their destinies in any degree, shall be punished by immediate expulsion."

From this brief recital of the contentions advanced on behalf of the defendants you can see how completely irreconcilable are the versions of the facts presented by the prosecution on the one hand and the defendants on the other. And so this seems to be an appropriate time for me to amplify somewhat my statement, at the outset of these instructions, that you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts.

ON JUDGE'S OPINION

No matter how careful a judge may be to avoid it, there is always the possibility that the jury or some particular juror may get an impression that the judge has some opinion with respect to the guilt or innocence of the defendants, or that he thinks that some particular phase of the case is more important than another, or that some particular witness is more credible than another or that a certain inference or fact should or should not be made, and so on.

If any of you have formed any such impression you must put it out of your mind and utterly disregard it. Nothing I have said during the trial nor in these instructions was intended to give any such impression; nor were any remarks or questions addressed to any of the witnesses or to counsel so intended. On the contrary, I have been scrupulously careful to avoid any comment which which might even remotely suggest that I considered the subjects of the weight of testimony, the credibility of witnesses, the inferences to be drawn or the relative importance of one segment of the evidence as against another, or the determination of the guilt or innocence of the defendants, as coming within the orbit of my functions as the presiding judge in this trial. Despite the power which a Federal judge has to comment on the evidence, provided he unequivocally leaves the determination of the facts to the jury, I have refrained from any such comments in these instructions and during the trial, lest, by reason of the extreme length of the trial and the large number of witnesses and exhibits, my comments might be misunderstood.

And so I tell you again, you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts of this case; you, and you alone, will pass upon the credibility of all the witnesses, including the credibility of those defendants who testified, all in accordance with instructions on that subject which I shall give you later.

Despite anything said by me or by counsel, your recollection of the testimony must prevail wherever your recollection differs from what I have said or what counsel for either side have said in argument or otherwise; it is for you to determine what the proofs adduced by both sides disclose, regardless of anything said by me in the brief and necessarily incomplete summaries which I have given you of the contentions of the parties; and it is for you and you alone to weigh the proofs, draw such inferences of fact therefrom as you determine should be drawn and to decide each and every one of the issues of fact in the case.

ON BASIS OF EXHIBITS

By the same token and by virtue of principles of law equally fundamental to American jurisprudence, you must decide these facts solely upon the basis of the exhibits received in evidence and the testimony given from the witness chair. Arguments of counsel are entitled to respectful consideration, but arguments and statements of fact by the lawyers for either side are not evidence. This includes arguments by the defendant, Dennis, who was his own lawyer throughout the trial. Nothing said by him from the beginning of the trial down to this very moment constitutes evidence of any fact or circumstance involved in the case. For the same reason, you must utterly disregard and put out of your minds all testimony stricken by me, and all evidence offered and rejected.

I have already told you not to read anything about the case in the newspapers or listen to the radio about it, and now, in what may seem an excess of caution, I tell you that you must not consider, in your determination of the guilt or innocence of these defendants in accordance with these instructions, anything you may ever have read or heard other than the exhibits and testimony received and given in this courtroom. And when I say "anything" I mean it in the fullest sense of the word. This includes anything you may have read about this case or any other case.

ON EXTRANEOUS MATTERS

Newspapers, radio, movies, television, what people generally may think, and what you yourselves may ever have thought, about Communists or communism or the Soviet Union, all this is out. What views the public or public officials of every name, nature, and description may or may not entertain on these subjects have absolutely nothing to do with the case. Do not permit any extraneous matters affecting race or religion or color or anything else to affect you one iota. You must concentrate on the evidence to the complete exclusion of everything else. For this reason you are also to make quite sure that you are not in any manner affected by the nature of the charge made against these defendants.

You are to consider the evidence bearing on this charge of conspiring to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, just as you would consider the evidence bearing on any other charge of committing a crime against the laws of the United States; and the Government here must be considered in no different light than any other litigant who pleads for justice; and counsel for the Government must be considered in no different light than counsel for the defendants or for any other litigant. What the case requires, and what every case in this or any other American court requires, is calm, cool, deliberate consideration of the evidence. Then, when in accordance with these instructions, you find the true facts and apply the law, return a just and true verdict, no matter whom it hurts. The law does not permit jurors to be governed by conjecture, passion, or prejudice, public opinion, or public feeling.

The fact that any defendant, who has a right so to do, has not seen fit to testify in this case, cannot be considered by you as

any evidence against him or against any of the other defendants, or as a basis for any presumption or inference unfavorable to him or to them. You must not permit such fact to weigh in the slightest degree against any defendant, nor should it enter into your discussions or deliberations. The prosecution must prove defendants guilty by the required degree of proof as explained in these instructions. They are not required under our law to establish their innocence.

INSTRUCTIONS ON CREDIBILITY

And so we come to one of the crucial questions in the case. By what yardstick and in accordance with what rules of law are you to judge the credibility of the witnesses, including that of the defendants who offered themselves as witnesses?

This judging of testimony is very like what goes on in real life. People may tell you things which may or may not influence some important decisions on your part. You consider whether the people you deal with had the capacity and the opportunity to observe or be familiar with and to remember the things they tell you about. You consider any possible interest they may have, and any bias or prejudice. You consider a person's demeanor; to use a colloquial expression, you "size him up" when he tells you anything; you decide whether he strikes you as fair and candid or not. Then you consider the inherent believability of what he says, whether it accords with your own knowledge or experience. It is the same thing with witnesses. You ask yourself if they know what they are talking about. You watch them on the stand as they testify and note their demeanor. You decide how their testimony strikes you.

Take the matter of interest, for example. You may feel that some of the witnesses, whether for the prosecution or the defense, have an interest in the outcome of the case. Where the witness has a strong personal interest in the result of the trial the temptation may be strong to color, pervert, or withhold the facts.

Or with all the honesty in the world a witness who has an interest in the case may unconsciously shade his testimony. On the other hand, such a witness may be telling the exact truth, despite his interest in the outcome. You must consider all the attendant circumstances in deciding whether and to what extent interest has affected the witness.

The greater a person's interest is in a case, the stronger is the temptation to false testimony, and the interest of the defendants who took the stand is of a character possessed by no other witness. Manifestly they have a vital interest in the outcome of the case. This interest is one of the matters which you may consider along with all the other attendant circumstances in determining the credence you will give to their testimony. Here again you may find that a defendant is telling the exact truth despite his obvious interest in the outcome.

What I have said concerning the interest of any witness applies with equal force to the matter of bias and prejudice. Where you find that any witness, whether called by the defense or by the prosecution, has any bias or prejudice for or against any of the parties, or for or against Communists or communism, you will consider whether and to what extent such bias and prejudice has affected his testimony. Here again you must consider such bias and prejudice, where you find that it exists, in connection with all the attendant circumstances.

WARNS AGAINST ARBITRARINESS

You will accordingly observe that, before reaching any conclusion as to whether or not you will believe the testimony of any particular witness, or as to whether you will believe part of the testimony of a particular witness and reject the rest, it is of the essence that you give consideration to all the circumstances bearing on the question of the credibility of the particular witness, as I have just indicated. For this reason you must be careful not to act in an arbitrary manner. Thus you are not at liberty arbitrarily to say that simply because a witness happens to be an FBI agent, an informer, a present or former member of the Communist Party or a Communist official or functionary or a defendant or other witness falling into one category or another, or because a witness is called by the prosecution or by the defendants, he or she is therefore more than usually credible or less than usually credible. Credibility cannot be determined by any such rule of thumb.

While you are not at liberty to reject the testimony of a witness arbitrarily, there are occasions when you may be justified in rejecting it in toto. The law has a rule with a Latin name, "Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus," which applies to these occasions. It is: if you find that a witness willfully falsely testified to a material fact, you are privileged to reject all his testimony, or if you elect to do so you could believe part of it and accept that part of it which appealed to your reason, or which was corroborated by other credible evidence and reject the rest.

RECALLS REFUSALS TO ANSWER

It is the application of what we do every day, that when a person tells you a lie about an important matter you may say, "Well, I will never believe him again," or you may say, "some of the things he told me I will accept because they jibe with everything else in my experience, or because they are corroborated by what I am told by someone whom I believe, but where that is not so I won't accept his testimony." So here if you find a witness cannot be trusted to observe his oath in one particular, you may say that you cannot believe or trust him in any other particular.

In this connection, I charge you that a material fact includes a fact bearing on the credibility of the witness, as well as those bearing directly on the issues in this case. Facts going to the credibility of a witness who has given material evidence are facts within this rule, and if you find that any witness has willfully falsified with respect to any fact going to his credibility, you may disregard his entire testimony in accordance with the falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus rule with respect to which I have just given you instructions.

Some of the witnesses refused to answer certain questions. You may consider these refusals in connection with the credibility of these witnesses and the weight you will give to their testimony. Witnesses—and by witnesses I again mean always to include the defendants who offer themselves as witnesses—are required to answer relevant and material questions unless the court sustains some claim of constitutional privilege and rules that the witness need not answer.

Defendants need not take the stand at all, as I have told you. But if they elect to testify in their own defense, they must answer questions like any other witness. So wherever a witness thus refuses to answer questions put to him, you may take that refusal into consideration along with all the other attendant circumstances, unless the court has ruled that his refusal to answer is legally justified.

This brings me to another and a very important phase of the case. Among the most vital and precious liberties which we Americans enjoy by virtue of our Constitution are freedom of speech and freedom of the press. We must be careful to preserve these rights unimpaired in all their vigor.

Thus it is that these defendants had the right to advocate by peaceful and lawful means any and all changes in the laws and in the Constitution; they had the right to criticize the President of the United States and the Congress; they had the right to assert that World War II, prior to the invasion of Russia by Germany, was an unjust war, an imperialist war and that upon such invasion it became a just war worthy of all material and moral support; and they had the right publicly to express these views orally and in writing. They had the right thus to assert that the Government was at all times exploiting the poor and worthy workers for the benefit of the trusts and monopolies.

RIGHT TO PREFER RUSSIA

They had a right thus to assert that what they call the democracy of Russia is superior in all respects to American democracy. They had a right thus to assert that the Marshall plan was a mistake, that billions of dollars should be loaned to Russia and that legislation adversely affecting Communists should not be passed. Whether you or I or anyone else likes or dislikes such or similar and analogous views or agrees or disagrees with them is wholly immaterial and not entitled to the slightest consideration in deciding this case. Unless a minority had a right to express and to advocate its views, the democratic process as we understand it here in America would cease to exist and those in power might remain there indefinitely and make impossible any substantial changes in our social and economic system or in the texture of our fundamental law.

I charge you that if the defendants did no more than pursue peaceful studies and discussions or teaching and advocacy in the realm of ideas, you must acquit them.

For example, it is not unlawful to conduct in an American college or university a course explaining the philosophical theories set forth in the books which have been placed in evidence by the prosecution such as the Communist manifesto, foundations and Leninism and so on. Of course these books are to be found in public libraries and in the libraries of American universities.

NEED FOR WIDE STUDY

Indeed, many of our most outstanding and sincere educators have expressed the view that these theories should be widely studied and thoughtfully considered, so that all may thoroughly appreciate their significance and the inevitable effects of putting such theories into practice. Do not be led astray by talk about thought control, or putting books on trial. No such issues are before you here.

But no one could suppose nor is it the law that any person has an absolute and unbridled right to say or to write and to publish whatever he chooses under any and all circumstances. If he did have such a right and if such were the law the words

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America"

as contained in the Preamble to the Constitution would be no more than empty phrases. Doubtless you observed that I placed emphasis on the "insure domestic tranquility" and "promote the general welfare" clauses of the preamble. Words may be the instruments by which crimes are committed, as in many familiar situations; and it has always been recognized that the protection of other interests of society may justify reasonable restrictions upon speech in furtherance of the general welfare.

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTE

And so I come to the construction and interpretation of the statute. You will have noticed that, to infringe this law, a defendant must not only have conspired to organize as the Communist Party of the United States of America a society group and as-

sembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government by force and violence, and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government by force and violence. The statute makes such conduct unlawful only when persons have so conspired "willful" or "knowingly"; and the indictment so charges these defendants.

Thus the question of intent also enters into the offense charged. If you find that the defendants, or any of them, participated in the conspiracy charged in the indictment, one of the questions for you to consider and determine is whether they acted willfully. This is a question of their intent.

INTENT CALLED VITAL

You must be satisfied from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants had an intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and that it was with this intent and for the purpose of furthering that objective that they conspired both (1) to organize the Communist Party of the United States as a group or society who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the United States Government by force and violence, and (2) to teach and advocate the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence.

And you must further find that it was the intent of the defendants to achieve this goal of the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence as speedily as circumstances would permit it to be achieved.

In further construction and interpretation of the statute I charge you that it is not the abstract doctrine of overthrowing or destroying organized government by unlawful means which is denounced by this law, but the teaching and advocacy of action for the accomplishment of that purpose, by language reasonably and ordinarily calculated to incite persons to such action.

Accordingly, you cannot find the defendants or any of them guilty of the crime charged unless you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that they conspired to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence and to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence, with the intent that such teaching and advocacy be of a rule or principle of action and by language reasonably and ordinarily calculated to incite persons to such action, all with an intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of the Government or the United States by force and violence as speedily as circumstances would permit.

No such intent could be inferred from the open and aboveboard teaching of a course on the principles and implications of communism in an American college or university, where everything is open to the scrutiny of parents and trustees and anyone who may be interested to see what is going on. That is why it is so important for you to weigh with scrupulous care the testimony concerning secret schools, false names, devious ways, general falsification, and so on, all alleged to be in the setting of a huge and well-disciplined organization, spreading to practically every State of the Union and all the principal cities and industries.

MENTAL OPERATIONS INVISIBLE

It is obviously impossible to ascertain or prove directly what were the operations of the minds of the defendants. You cannot look into a person's mind and see what his intentions are or were. But a careful and intelligent consideration of the facts and circumstances shown by the evidence in any given case enables us to infer with a reasonable degree of accuracy what another's intentions were in doing or not doing certain things. With a knowledge of definite acts we may draw definite logical conclusions. We are in our affairs continually called upon to decide from actions of others what their intentions or purposes are. And experience has taught us that frequently actions speak more clearly than spoken or written words. You must, therefore, rely in part on circumstantial evidence in determining the guilt or innocence of any of these defendants.

Circumstantial evidence may be received and is entitled to such consideration by you as you find it deserves depending upon the inferences you think necessary and reasonable to draw from such evidence. No greater degree of certainty is required when the evidence is circumstantial than when it is direct, for in either case the jury must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendants. Circumstantial evidence consists of facts proved from which the jury may infer by process of reasoning other facts sought to be established as true.

DIFFERING INFERENCES POSSIBLE

Different inferences, however, may be drawn from the facts and circumstances in the case, whether proved by direct or circumstantial evidence. The prosecution asks you to draw one set of inferences while the defendants ask you to draw another. It is for you to decide and for you alone, which inferences you will draw. If all the circumstances taken together are consistent with any reasonable hypothesis which includes the innocence of the defendants, or any of them, the prosecution has not proved their guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and you must acquit them. On the other hand, if you find that all of the circumstances established by the evidence in this case, taken together, satisfy you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendants, in accordance with these instructions, it is your duty to find the defendants guilty.

Thus, if you find that the evidence has established to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt that any defendant has violated the statute as thus construed by me, you will find such defendant guilty. Otherwise you will acquit him by a verdict of not guilty. Under these instructions you may find all the defendants guilty or all of them not guilty or you may find one or more of them guilty and the others not guilty.

A MATTER OF LAW

If you are satisfied that the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants, or any of them, are guilty of a violation of the statute, as I have interpreted it to you, I find it as matter of law that there is sufficient danger of a substantive evil, that the Congress has a right to prevent, to justify the application of the statute under the first amendment of the Constitution.

This is a matter of law with which you have no concern. It is a finding on a matter of law which I deem essential to support my ruling that the case should be submitted to you to pass on the guilt or innocence of the defendants. It is the duty of counsel for both sides to present by way of objections, motions and similar procedural devices matters of law affecting the case for my consideration and determination. All such matters of law and their presentation by counsel, including motions of every name, nature, and descrption, challenges, questions relating to the admissibility of evidence and things of that sort must be entirely disregarded by you. These are matters of procedure with which you have no concern. Neither the presentation of such matters by counsel for either side, nor any argument made in support or in opposition to any of them, have any bearing upon your deliberations. Put all such matters out of your minds. They should not influence you in any way in arriving at your verdict.

COUNSEL TO BE IGNORED

I charge you that in arriving at your verdict you must not consider anything which the court has said with respect to the conduct of either the prosecution or counsel for the defense in the course of this trial as being any indication or suggestion or direction of the court to you as to what your verdict should be, nor shall you be influenced thereby in arriving at your verdict.

This brings me to certain of the requests for instructions, submitted by counsel for the defendants and by the prosecution which I have ruled to be proper. I charge them as follows:

Submitted on behalf of defendants

Request No. 38: I charge you that you cannot find any defendant in this case guilty of the crime charged against him merely from the fact, if you find it to be a fact, that he associated with any other defendant or defendants whom you may find guilty of the offense charged.

Request No. 39: I charge you that under our system of law, guilt is purely personal and that you may not find any of the defendants guilty merely by reason of the fact that he is a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, no matter what you find were the principles and doctrines which were taught or advocated by that party during the period defined in the indictment.

PARTICIPATION MUST BE WILLFUL

Request No. 75: Circumstantial evidence is not direct proof of a fact. It is that evidence which tends to prove a disputed fact by proof of other facts which have a legitimate tendency to lead the mind to infer that the fact sought to be established is true.

Request No. 76: I charge you that you may not presume the existence of a fact and then infer from such presumed fact the existence of any other fact or circumstance; nor may you infer from any presumed fact or facts that the defendants or any one of them, are guilty of the offense alleged in the indictment.

Request No. 84: I charge you that it is not enough for the prosecution to show the existence of an agreement and the membership therein of any particular defendant. This alone would not prove that such defendant participated in the agreement "knowingly and willfully." With respect to each defendant, the prosecution has the further burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that such defendant participated in such agreement willfully; that is, the prosecution must prove that such defendant entertained the specific intention to teach or advocate the duty or necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force or violence and to organize as the Communist Party a group of persons who teach or advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force or violence and that in either case that he intended to teach or advocate such doctrine with the specific intention and for the evil purpose of bringing about the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and not that he intended some result other than that.

If you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that such defendant acted "willfully," your verdict must be not guilty.

DISCUSSES PRIOR ACTS

Request No. 98: There has been testimony in this case by prosecution witnesses of acts and statements of persons other than defendants which were alleged to have taken place prior to the period defined in the indictment. I charge that you may not consider any such statement or act as evidence

against any defendant unless any such statement was made or any such act was done by the direction or authority or with the approval of such defendant. And even if you find such statement was made or act was done by the direction or authority or with the approval of any defendant you must consider such evidence only in your determination of whether or not such defendant had the specific intent to engage in the conspiracy charged in the indictment at the time alleged in the indictment.

Request No. 99: There has been testimony in this case by prosecution witnesses concerning acts or statements purported to have been done or made by certain defendants prior to the period defined in the indictment. I charge that you may consider such testimony only against the particular defendant or defendants alleged to have made such statement or engaged in such act and then only to the extent that it tends to establish the specific criminal intent of the particular defendant to commit the offense charged in the indictment in the period from on or about April 1945 to July 20, 1948. You may not consider such testimony in determining the intent of any other defendant to commit the offense charged, unless you find such statement was made or act was done by the direction or authority or with the approval of any such defendants.

"REVOLUTION" DEFINED

Request No. 107: I charge you that if you are convinced that any defendant or defendants taught or advocated any statement, principle, or program prior to the period defined in the indictment which was abandoned by any such defendant prior to the period defined in the indictment and not adopted thereafter you may not consider such statement, principle, or program in the determination of whether or not any such defendant had the specific intent to engage in the conspiracy set forth in the indictment.

Request No. 135: I charge you that even if you find from the evidence that there was such a conspiracy, as charged in the indictment, nevertheless any statements made by a defendant as to the purposes, policies, or aims of the Communist Party and any other acts or declarations of a defendant may not be imputed to any of the other defendants unless done or made in furtherance of such conspiracy and while such conspiracy was in existence.

Request No. 237: The indictment alleges that it was part of the conspiracy that "defendants would publish and circulate, and cause to be published and circulated, books, articles, magazines, and newspapers advocating the principles of Marxism-Leninism." I charge you that the words "books and articles" as thus used in the indictment include pamphlets.

Request No. 273: I charge you that the word "revolution" in its broadest significance is generally used to designate a sweeping change; as applied to political change, it denotes a change in a method or system of government or of the power which controls the government. It is frequently, though not always, accomplished by, or accompanied by violent acts, but it need not be violent in its methods. It does not necessarily denote force or violence.

Request No. 275: I charge you that the statute under which the defendants were indicted does not prohibit the teaching or advocacy of peaceful change in our social, economic, or political institutions, no matter how fundamental or far-reaching or drastic such proposals may be.

Submitted by the prosecution

Request No. 18: There are several kinds of conspiracies made illegal by Federal statutes. Some of these statutes require the allegation and proof of the commission of an overt act by one or more of the conspirators before a crime is complete. However, the statute under which this indictment was returned does not require the allegation or proof of the commission of an overt act.

Request No. 31: You are instructed that the question of possible punishment of the defendants or any of them, in the event of conviction is no concern of the jury, and should not in any sense enter into or influence your deliberations. The duty of imposing sentence rests exclusively upon the court. The function of the jury is to weigh the evidence in the case and determine the guilt or innocence of the defendants solely upon the basis of such evidence. Under your oaths as jurors, you cannot allow a consideration of the punishment which may be inflicted upon the defendants, if they are convicted, to influence your verdict in any way.

Request No. 34: During the course of the trial there have been various references to the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *Schneiderman* v. *United States*. That case was not a prosecution under the statute involved here and the Supreme Court did not determine any issue which is before you for determination.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, one last word. If you find that the evidence respecting the defendants or any of them is reasonably consistent with innocence, such defendant or defendants should be acquitted. If you find that the law has not been violated, you should not hesitate for any reason to render a verdict of not guilty. But, on the other hand, if you find, in accordance with these instructions, that the law has been violated as charged, you should not hesitate because of sympathy or any other reason to render a verdict of guilty.

The exhibits will be gathered together by counsel and will be available for the jury if the jury wish to have them.

Thoughts on October 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Augustin C. Keane, of Alameda and San Francisco, Calif., is a keen student of international affairs and a stanch supporter of the United Nations.

For many years prior to practicing law Mr. Keane was engaged in newspaper work and is recognized as a leader in that field.

He has made a great contribution to democracy and I am privileged to request that an article by him entitled "Thoughts on October 24," that appeared in the October 1949 edition of the National League for Women's Service magazine, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

THOUGHTS ON OCTOBER 24

(By Augustin C. Keane)

October 24 is the first international holiday, the first holiday to be observed simultaneously by all nations, by all races, by the faithful of all religions and as well by all unbelievers, a day observed by all kinds and conditions of men. Never in past history has there been another such holiday for universal observance by all mankind without distinction as to class, group, or association. The heads of practically all of the world's sovereign states have by proclamation declared that date a holiday, as has the President of the United States and locally the mayors of American cities—a day set apart to commemorate the final ratification and promulgation of the United Nations Charter—the birthday of the United Nations.

No other holiday resembles United Nations Day in origin or in purpose. Ordinarily holidays have come from the festival of some sacred event or sacred person or have been fixed by law to celebrate historic happenings or patriots, or have grown from the customs of particular groups of people. Holidays mature only long after occurrence or hero has passed into history. That is—all but United Nations Day which springs spontaneously from the consciousness of all peoples, that here they are reaffirming the intensity of their hope for protection in the present and of their determination that the future shall unfold with progressive betterment for the generations to come. United Nations Day is not a memorial to the past. It looks to the future. It is man's holiday of dedication.

A sense of loyalty, of devotion to the United Nations is beginning to be felt and is becoming articulate especially among younger people with their eyes to the years ahead. After only 4 years of existence, this is a remarkable manifestation of the vitality of the principles and purposes expressed in the United Nations Charter. The Constitution of the United States required the passage of almost a quarter of a century before the American people fairly began to realize its excellences and became patriotically proud of their consecration to its ideals. When the San Francisco Conference met to produce the Charter of the United Nations, the world was still at war and the delegates aspired to write a document to insure that at the war's end a better world would be served by permanent peace. But once the armed fighting was over, the organized combat of actual warfare was succeeded by a general free-for-all among the victors who were then released from the disciplines of the necessity of mutual assistance which the recent conflict had imposed upon them. In that free-for-all the United Nations seemed helpless. Sessions of the General Assembly became bedlam. The Security Council was deadlocked. Nevertheless, those who were determined that the Charter should become effective went ahead organizing this new international institution for which the hopes had been so high. The Trusteeship Council was set up to promote the development of dependent peoples for eventual self-government and independence. The Economic and Social Council was formed to assure to all mankind a progressively ascending standard of living and universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Solid work was undertaken by a wide variety of commissions and specialized agencies covering the whole field of human interest and activity. The great mass of undertakings in areas outside the field of political dispute became significant and the services rendered gave confidence to lesser peoples aside from the great powers. Small states began to speak up. They made of the General Assembly a forum before which they could declare their grievances and petition for redress. Public opinion came to their aid. World public opinion works through the United Nations and has given it force and substance.

In its early functioning the United Nations was viewed as merely another sort of conference of sovereign States. It was often derided as a mere debating society. Action to be taken would be cooperative action of the members, not independent action by a United Nations having separate and distinct entity of its own. There was no thought that the United Nations had inherent power or possessed any of the prerogatives of sovereignty. The member states were the sovereigns and it would have been foolhardy to have claimed as much for the United Na-

tions. But in 4 years the United Nations has taken on form and become imposingly substantial. And now the International Court of Justice just lately ruled that the United Nations is a corporate entity and that in a case where any of its agents have been assassinated within the territory of another state it may assert a claim for damages against that state in the exercise of a right which heretofore has been reserved exclusively for independent sovereignties. Henceforth international law will recognize the United Nations as the embodiment of the powers granted it and accord it legal identity.

The actual identity of the United Nations is not always seen in the same way by all peoples. Unfortunately, the people of the United States see the United Nations too much through newspaper accounts of wrangling in the Security Council. The problems reaching the Security Council have been mainly political ones and the clashes between international gladiators have made sensational reading. They have crowded from American attention the part played by the United Nations in helping to a settlement of the Berlin blockade, in preventing war between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, in bringing to an end war in Palestine, in resolving peaceably the inflammatory tensions in Indonesia, and in aiding South Korea to establish a government of its own choosing. These are but some of the political problems which threatened to bring on war during the past year and which were settled through the instrumentality of the United Nations. But to the peoples of other countries, the United Nations shows a different identity. Those peoples see the workings of the Economic and Social Council whose function it is to make certain that the conditions of living under the established peace are sufficiently good to justify preserving the peace. Other peoples are keenly aware of the work of the United Nations in alleviating the misery of the suffering refugees and displaced persons of Europe and Palestine and the Far East.

Equally are they aware that millions throughout the world are better off today as a result of United Nations work on problems of labor, health, nutrition, agriculture, education, child welfare, control of narcotic drugs and like persevering work in many other fields. No single episode stands out more dramatically than the suppression of the cholera epidemic in Egypt by the World Health Organization, a specialized agency of the Economic and Social Council. Cholera struck in Egypt and flashed into epidemic virulence. In a single day it killed 581 victims. The interim committee of the World Health Organization went into immediate action organizing care in Egypt, on the one hand, and on the other locating supplies of needed vaccines and blood plasma all over the world. The supplies were promptly marshalled and fleets of planes coming from every direction centered upon Cairo with the means and personnel for combating what had threatened to be the worst outbreak of cholera in more than a century. It was controlled as quickly as it had flared out. Such are some of the things by which the United Nations is known outside the United States. Of course, outstanding to characterize the United Nations are its achievements in proclaiming the universal declaration of human rights and in producing the convention against genocide and in establishing economic cooperation. And now just lately an added opportunity for aid has been opened by Ecuador's appeal to the United Nations for advice to improve the administrative system now operating in that country. So grows the work of helping man's growth.

Thus the United Nations has taken on stature and become stalwart in structure and character. In it is embodied the conscience of mankind. Observance of the birthdate of the United Nations is an acknowledgment of dedication to the achievement of its goals.

General Bradley Talks About Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, when we think of Gen. Omar N. Bradley in relation to an army, we think of the United States Army. At a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, here in Washington, on October 11, 1949, General Bradley was a guest speaker before an entirely different "army"—the Salvation Army. The occasion was the visit here of Commissioner John J. Allan, commander of the Salvation Army.

General Bradley's words on that occasion reflect a philosophy so sound, so American, they deserve recognition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. General Bradley's remarks follow:

Not many months ago I had something to do with running an Army myself, though it was somewhat different from the Army represented by Commissioner Allan.

It is heartening thing for the world to have organizations made up of men and women whose avowed mission is to save men's lives, and, at the same time, to mend their broken spirits.

As a leader in such a group, Commissioner Allan made a difficult choice in dedicating his life to his fellowman. Despite the sacrifice and hardships, I dare say he would not change one iota of it had he to do it over again.

He has lived an outstanding life of service, and after listening to his speech, we can readily feel his warm satisfaction in a service well done. He has not only worked for the Salvation Army since his boyhood; he has also served with honor and distinction in the United States Army during both World Wars. His outstanding abilities have brought him recognition everywhere he has been known. There has been one shining thread running throughout his public career from which all of us might take increased courage. It is the devotion of a man to a principle, a living illustration of the devotion which every man should feel in his heart is due to his fellows, and through them to his Creator.

During the war, I commanded the Twelfth Army Group in Europe. Since the war, I served in charge of the Veterans Administration, and later, as Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I have been in our country's service for 38 years, and during that whole period, I have been conscious of the men of the Salvation Army working steadily in their field, as I have worked in mine. We are all aware of the outstanding work done by the Salvation Army during the First World War. My considered observation since that time is that that army has lost none of its touch, none of its human appeal, none of its liberal understanding.

It has been most strongly impressed upon me, through the years, that, although the armed forces can wage wars, they cannot create peace. For true peace comes not from the council table, but from the hearts of men. Now we have developed new weapons which have greatly increased the destruction which can be wrought by war. But these weapons have not successfully established a just, enduring peace. That task falls to the people of the democratic countries, and the Salvation Army is one of their instruments best fitted to help us secure that peace.

For through war and peace, the Salvation Army, which is part of the conscience of the world, has worked tirelessly to improve the lot of our fellow men. Whatever his creed, be he white, black, or brown, be he in deep trouble, injured, or merely down on his luck, he can look to the Salvation Army for help. The man most responsible for the growth of that army, without doubt, is its founder, William Booth. But it could not have been done without the inspired leadership and selfless devotion of those who followed him.

It is with a spirit of appreciation and sympathetic understanding—humility, if you wish to call it so—that I commend Commissioner Allan for his address here tonight. I hope he will find his visit to this country pleasant, and his mission fruitful. The work he has been doing throughout his life has taken a new and far-reaching turn. Men of good will are now working tirelessly to further international understanding by applying to the relations between States, the principles first demonstrated by William Booth for relations between men. A good start has been made, but the greatest part is still to be done.

We must each do our part toward building understanding between nations which will result in true peace on earth. Since the avowed intention of communism is destruction of the individuality of man, and the institutions which uphold his freedoms, we can forestall much misery by opposing it. Faced with the determined opposition of a despotic ideology whose concepts and way of life are utterly foreign to us, we must stand firm in defense of our ideals. In the final analysis, that is the true measure of a man's life—for his ideals are the only things he can leave behind him.

Red Herrings at the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Times Herald on October 16, entitled "Eleven Red Herrings at the White House Door." When we consider that it was in the early part of President Roosevelt's first term that the Communist government in Russia was recognized, we have a right to assume that the responsibility for the development of communism in this country and all over the world was encouraged and accelerated by the attitude of the Roosevelt administration and its successor.

President Truman's silly "red herring" crack concerning the Communist conspiracy at the time of the Alger Hiss revelations now looks sillier than ever.

For a New York city jury has effectively outlawed the Communist party in this country after 9 months of hearing the truth about communism as it actually is.

SOME OTHERS ARE FOUND GUILTY, TOO

In the strict letter of the law, the jury has found 11 individuals guilty of conspiring to teach and advocate the bloody overthrow of our Government. But of course the verdict not only finds these 11 Communists guilty as charged. It not only outlaws their whole conspiracy. It is a verdict of "guilty" upon the whole Roosevelt and Truman concepts and performances in office.

This verdict demonstrates even more, that if the American people had ever in the past been allowed a fair opportunity to slap the law on the Communists these criminals would now be not merely "underground" but out of the country.

This verdict has been too long and too late in coming, and world disaster has resulted from the delay.

We only need a brief look at the hard and proven facts to see that all of this is so.

HOW IT ALL CAME TO BE

Forty years ago, communism was nothing but a European gutter cult with no prospect of rising.

But in April of 1917, the German general staff made the first of two linked historical blunders that have since brought down a curse on all mankind. The first blunder was German. The second was by a President of the United States.

The Germans, in their usual deathly love for the wrong decision at a critical moment, collected a handful of Communist crackpots out of basements in Switzerland, put them in a sealed railroad car and shipped them to the Russian border. Their idea was to turn these criminals loose upon the shaky provisional republic headed by Alexander Kerensky, that had taken power over from the shattered Czarist regime, to do what mischief they might and so force Russia entirely out of World War I.

What the Germans accomplished, of course, was the artificial establishment of the first actual Bolshevik government on earth. It was a windfall that surprised nobody more than the Bolsheviks themselves.

The proof that this fantasy had not long to live, left to its own affairs, is in its record. The leader of the Bolsheviks, promising to establish a "stateless, classless society of workers and peasants," was one V. I. Ulyanov, with the revolutionary trade name "Lenin."

He took actual power on November 6, 1917, and started his attempt to create a United Soviet Socialist Republic" on Communist lines, meaning state ownership of all the means of producing and distributing wealth.

Lenin's ambition was doomed from the start, for it was built on cruelty, oppression, and denial of human rights. In his lifetime, the Soviets never had a successful day. When he died, January 21, 1924, there came the inevitable struggle for palace power.

The two men who fought to the death for it were Joseph Vissarionavich Djugashvili and Lev Davidovich Bronstein, known to the world by their revolutionary aliases of Stalin and Trotsky.

Stalin won the first round, banished Trotsky and eventually had him murdered in Mexico City. But still he was unable to provide food and clothes to the people. He could not even stop the palace wars for power, let alone deliver the goods.

By 1933, Stalin and communism were at the edge of the pit. The United States, on recommendation of Charles Evans Hughes when he was Secretary of State, had refused to recognize the Soviet organization as a true government, and the inexorable consequences were grinding the Stalinists to pieces.

BLUNDER BY ROOSEVELT

But then occurred the second fatal blunder. On November 17, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt entered into diplomatic relations with Stalin's conspiracy.

Stalin was saved. His prestige at home was made. His gutter spies and followers in this country and elsewhere abroad were suddenly armed with power.

Roosevelt, in his vanity, extracted a "promise" that in return for recognition the Communists would end and never again resume efforts to make a revolution in this country. The jury's verdict in New York on Friday of this week is only the latest of many proofs that Roosevelt's lack of judgment was immeasurable. Where he left off, Truman has carried on, with the same tragic results.

From 1933, the Communists of the world have never looked back. The New Deal brought them to places of power and control in our own Government. It helped finance their conquest over one-sixth of the world.

Their empire is still liable to explode from within, but it is there. Its survival is a monument not to Stalin, but to the imbecilities of two United States Presidents, whose willing ignorance have been its ablest aids.

Hawaii and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii continue to live under a precarious political status that has existed for more than 100 years. Although Hawaii was in many ways an American community when California became a State in 1849, Hawaii has not yet been given the recognition which statehood would bring to her half million American citizens.

California has always had a great neighborly interest in Hawaii, both from a social and commercial viewpoint. Many Californians have made Hawaii their home over the years, and through our ports flow millions of dollars worth of goods each year.

On September 7, 1849, two days before California became a state in the Union, the Commissioner to the United States from the Kingdom of Hawaii was given secret instructions to sell the Hawaiian Islands to the United States in case they were exposed to further hostile attacks—references being to the French foray of 1848. Two years later, in 1851, the United States representative in Hawaii was given, in a sealed packet, a deed ceding Hawaii to the United States—the packet was to be opened only in the event that a foreign power attacked the Islands again.

Historical documents reveal the many times in more than 100 years that Hawaii has tried to be an integral part of the United States. In 1854, the King insisted that Hawaii be admitted to the United States as a full-fledged State, rather than as a Territory. Even while Hawaii was under the monarchy it adopted a written constitution—in 1840. The Hawaiian constitution of 1852 contained a bill of rights patterned after our own.

Again, in 1893, Hawaii requested that annexation should be conditional upon the admission to the Union as a State. The Republic of Hawaii was established in 1894. Three years later, the Republic proposed a treaty, never ratified, for entrance to the Union as a State.

The evolution of American influence in Hawaii, however, logically resulted in annexation of Hawaii to the United States in 1898. It is significant that this annexation was effected by the voluntary action of the people and government of Hawaii.

The United States Congress accepted the cession of Hawaii on the terms that the islands should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof. By the adoption of the Newlands resolution in 1900, the Territory of Hawaii was officially made an incorporated Territory of the United States. By this act, Congress committed the United States to the ultimate granting of Statehood. Corroboration of this statement may be made by the following:

One member of the commission of five appointed by the President of the United States to formulate the organic act was Senator Morgan, of Alabama. In an address in Hawaii on September 10, 1898, Senator Morgan said:

> The Territory of Hawaii has a great future before it, and with the increase of population and business that must come from annexation, and all that is implied by it, the road to statehood cannot be a long one.

The commission of which Senator Morgan was a distinguished member, drafted Hawaii's Organic Act, which was considered first in the Senate. During the debate there, Senator Platt, of Connecticut, offered an amendment proposing to add a new section to the bill as follows:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed, taken, or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will be any future time be admitted as a State, or attached to any State.

A protest against the amendment was made by Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, who raised a point of order which was sustained. Senator Platt's proposed amendment to prevent statehood for Hawaii was defeated. An amendment in the same words was also rejected in the House.

Though there may not be a legal obligation, per se, there certainly is a moral obligation on the part of the Congress to admit Hawaii to statehood in the same manner as were our other 29 territories. The fact that Congress in 1900 incorporated Hawaii as a Territory of the United States is a clear indication that ultimate statehood was expected to result.

This is further substantiated in a case that came before the Supreme Court shortly after annexation. The court held that, although the adoption of the resolution of annexation did not completely extend the United States Constitution to Hawaii, the passage by Congress of the Hawaii Organic Act did extend it completely, since the Organic Act made Hawaii an integral part of the United States.

The basic philosophy of American government has always been that government comes up from the people; under the Territorial form, government is imposed on them without their consent or act of participation. As a permanent thing, Territorial status is distinctly un-American. It not only involves taxation without representation but denies to the people themselves the right to participate in the enactment of laws by which they are governed. Such a situation

cannot possibly be accepted as permanent under the American system. Hawaii's 50 years of Territorial status is long enough.

The Territory of Hawaii has fulfilled every conceivable qualification for statehood. It now exceeds six States in population, and its half million inhabitants constitute a larger population than that of any Territory at the time of admission as a State, except Oklahoma. The annual value of Hawaii's products is double that of any of the 29 Territories when they were admitted to the Union.

Hawaii's geographic position 2,000 miles from the coast of California is no deterrent to the transaction of business or governmental affairs with the rest of the United States. Instantaneous voice reception by telephone, news relayed by teletype and rapid transportation facilities all make Hawaii a part of the mainland business world. Three of our west-coast air-line companies operate 30 flights a week to the islands. Hawaii is closer to the National Capital than Boston when our Union was formed. No one doubts that Hawaii is closer to the Capital, in point of time, than was California, Oregon, or Washington when they were admitted to statehood.

Hawaii's rights to statehood in the Nation is based on the fact that our Union of States is a constitutional Union, nor a geographical union. Louisiana was not contiguous to any other State when admitted to the Union in 1812, and when California became a State the nearest other State was Texas.

The State of California has been intimately connected with Hawaii for more than 100 years, and there has been a steady strengthening of the influences which have drawn Hawaii within the special sphere of American business and politics.

It would be difficult to determine whose idea it first was that Hawaii was destined to become a State in the Union. Records show, however, that in 1849, when California was brought into the Union, a newspaper in New York published a two-column editorial advocating the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands and their admission into the Union as the State of Hawaii. Both the east coast and the west coast of the United States, as well as the several other areas of our country, have played a part in making Hawaii the American community it is today. Because Hawaii is a modern American commonwealth, maintaining to a high degree of efficiency, the same type of educational, health, and welfare facilities to be found in the best of the 48 State jurisdictions, it must be admitted that Hawaii is ready for statehood today.

Much of the credit for Hawaii's readiness for statehood must be attributed to her highly developed educational system. American missionaries from New England inspired it early in the 1820's. One school organized by these American citizens in Hawaii celebrated its one hundredth anniversary in 1940. People from my State used to send their children to schools in Hawaii because boat travel to the islands was safer than coach travel to New England during the development of the West.

An official board of health in Hawaii preceded that of any State of the Union. The first State board of health was created by Massachusetts in 1869, whereas Hawaii had an official board of health three decades earlier. Ninety percent of all births in Hawaii are attended by physicians. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the funds for public health spent in Hawaii are appropriated by the Territorial legislature. A program of public assistance has likewise been developed by the Territory through a department of public welfare. Relief is extended through the fields of old age assistance, aid to the blind, to dependent people and general assistance to those needing medical and dental care, hospitalization and burial service. A recent summary made by the United States Social Security Board of Hawaii's welfare department's personnel requirements and salaries showed Hawaii's standards in this regard are the highest in the United States. By having the American pattern of high standards in public education, health, and welfare as a primary objective during her nearly 51 years under the American flag, Hawaii has unqualifiedly shown her readiness for statehood.

By all accounts, Hawaii is one of the most highly developed and prosperous candidates for statehood in our history. The annual value of Hawaii's products, chiefly sugar and pineapple, is double that of any of the 29 Territories when they were admitted to the Union. Hawaii's agricultural workers are among the highest paid in the world on a year-round basis. Both of Hawaii's two largest industries are highly efficient and recognized as leaders in the field of scientific agriculture. Both maintain first-class experiment stations at their own expense, staffed by scientists who are leaders in their field. My own State of California is often assisted in particular agricultural problems by experts from Hawaii. Hawaii is world famous for its pioneering work in its fields of insect control and the development of improved strains of sugar cane. The pineapple industry, Hawaii's second ranking business, had its beginning back in 1901 when John D. Dole organized the Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd. The first year's pack in 1903 totaled less than 2,000 cases. Today, Hawaii's canneries produce this much in 15 minutes. The total annual pack is about 20,000,000 cases, representing about 90 percent of the world's supply.

The statehood movement has received strong business backing both in Hawaii and on the mainland. The United States Chamber of Commerce, the State chamber of commerce of California, and numerous State and city chambers have for several years passed resolutions supporting statehood as a means of strengthening the Nation's business.

The economic development of Hawaii leaves no doubt about its capacity to meet the financial responsibilities of State government. The high degree of solidarity in Hawaii and its close ties with mainland commerce make it important to the future welfare of the entire Nation that Hawaii be given the broad powers of self-government, including representation in Congress.

Hawaii stands in the Pacific area as a most conspicuous outpost of the American way of life. It is exemplifies the very achievement which the world is striving for on a universal scale. Nowhere else has there been a more striking demonstration of the ability of people of different national origins and different cultural, social, and intellectual backgrounds to work together for the good of all as is the case in Hawaii.

Hawaii is no longer an experiment in American democracy. It is an accomplished fact. It will be a great advantage to the United States to make Hawaii a State in the Union as convincing evidence of the success of our principles of government.

Truman's Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about the welfare state which some Democrats are vocally supporting. In effect the welfare state ultimately will be resolved into the police state, no different from that of Hitler's nazism, Mussolini's fascism, or Stalin's communism. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel which is to the point:

The theory of British socialism was that it would abolish exploitation and provide a fuller life for the working classes.

During a number of years the Fabians promoted the idea and gained a considerable group of disciples.

Being alined with labor—and with left-wing labor especially—they exerted increasing influence upon British politics.

In the difficult period after World War I, the Liberal Party, under the leadership of Asquith and Lloyd-George, yielded to Socialist pressure and put a fair portion of the Socialist doctrines into effect.

Encountering what they regarded as defeats, the conservatives also diverged from their own principles.

These tendencies made it easy for the Fabians—the social and economic planners, operating through the Labor Party—to capture the Government when the opportunity arrrived.

And the opportunity arose after World War II when England had been blitzed and battered and had exhausted the larger part of its overseas wealth.

The labor government undertook, as a major project, the nationalization of British industries.

The Bank of England was nationalized, giving the Socialist politicians the full use of fiat currency and managed credit.

The coal mines were nationalized, making the coal miners chattels of the government.

Transportation was nationalized, the consequence being a deterioration in service and discontentment among the employees.

The gas and electric services were nationalized, and the Socialist Government had to increase rates to balance the books.

As an industrial program, socialism was a failure.

Taxation in Socialist Britain also continued to be high, and went higher than it had been before.

The well-informed American publication, United States News and World Report, remarked in its issue of October 7:

"The corporate tax hits so hard that most of the profit is gone before the stockholder gets a crack at it.

"Then, too, the individual's tax still dwarfs anything ever seen in the United States, even during the war.

"Personal tax burdens in Great Britain and United States can be compared most readily by giving examples.

"At $2,000 of net income, a married Englishman pays $234.

"An American at that income level pays $133.

"At $5,000, an Englishman pays $1,296; an American $631.

"At $10,000, the British tax is $3,476; the American tax is $1,621.

"At $25,000, a married Englishman pays $13,501; an American pays $5,877.

"At $100,000, the British tax is $82,126; the American tax is $46,403."

In other words, socialism is no boon to the small taxpayer and it is liquidating the job makers in Great Britain.

Furthermore, the British workingman—the backbone of Fabian socialism—is suffering other privations.

He is a helpless victim of controlled currency.

The pound sterling has been drastically devalued.

This maneuver is intended to reduce the prices of British exports and thereby increase the supply of dollars, thus helping the Socialist government.

But it also increases the prices of imports, mainly in foodstuffs and raw materials, and hence increases the British cost of living.

And there are other problems afflicting the British workingman, as our cartoon of today indicates.

Great Britain, in brief, has attempted to be a welfare state.

In this country, and also under Fabian influence, the welfare state is being advocated as something good for Americans.

Actually, by reason of our free-enterprise system, the United States has been able to help Socialist Britain to the extent of billions of dollars.

But the United States will not be able to do so if the welfare state takes possession of this country.

Socialist Britain is, indeed, undergoing a rude awakening.

It would be sensible, and also helpful to the British people, for this country to reject the British mistakes.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, ever since conservation became a public movement in this country in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, many sections of our population have given it united and loyal support. People know that our water and power, forest, soil, and mineral resources must be developed and used properly, and kept free from private monopoly and speculation.

Organized labor always has understood its stake in conservation. From the beginning it has joined forces with farmers and public-spirited citizens from all walks of life in promoting reclamation, in defending it against all attacks, in resisting the persistent encroachments of private monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an address by Hon. Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of Interior, before the California State Federation of Labor, at its forty-seventh convention in Los Angeles, Calif., September 1, 1949:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE FORTY-SEVENTH CONVENTION OF THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF LABOR, LOS ANGELES, THURSDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 1, 1949

A trip to California always renews my faith in the ability of mankind. Here, on the rim of the Pacific, you men of labor have built in one short century a civilization that is unique in history—one that comes nearer the ideal than any man has yet developed. Your society, half urban, half rural, is spacious and dynamic.

* * * * *

California has been amazingly well endowed with the things men live by: your great virgin forests; vast reaches of fertile land; abundant water and its potential by-product, hydroelectric power; oil; gold and other minerals; wildlife; and beautiful retreats for play and recreation. But over the past century these things have been rapidly and often wastefully exploited. Now the sudden, sensational increase that World War II brought in your population threatens to deplete them to the point of danger.

Your soil, once fabulously fertile and still so, has not escaped that world-wide malady known as erosion. Three million California acres have lost three-fourths of their topsoil through wind and gully erosion, and at least two-thirds of your land stands in need of soil-conservation practices. Witness to this disquieting trend is the current series of dust storms that have aroused anew the farmers of the parched southern San Joaquin Valley.

Your huge endowment of virgin pine and redwood forests—which are the natural reservoirs for your upper streams, base of your great timber industry, and retreat for your throngs of vacationists—has suffered unduly from hasty and careless logging practices, and today we are told that only 38 percent of the original stand remains. Much of your once-plentiful wildlife has gone the way of the buffalo.

California's known oil reserves, once sufficient to supply the whole Pacific area, now are estimated by your State authorities at 3,500,000,000 barrels. At the present rates of production, and under present methods, these reserves, we are told, will last little more than a decade. We are told also that California's reserves of natural gas at the present rate of consumption will not last more than 20 years.

Of all the resources with which you are blessed, the two most essential are land and water, the two resources that have been called the mother and father of food. It is of these, in particular, that I wish to speak today. And because they most directly affect your living standards, I want to urge you to continue and to redouble your concern that they be properly husbanded and developed in the years just ahead.

California, like almost all of the far West, is semiarid, and lives chiefly by virtue of irrigation. Of its 30,000,000 acres of farm land, some 5,000,000 acres are irrigated, and these 5,000,000 watered acres produce 85 percent of the State's $2,000,000,000 worth of farm crops.

The watered acres in your valleys are the fruits of great private, cooperative, and public enterprise, and years of sweaty toil. For the first quarter of this century they had sufficed largely to feed and enrich the State and its people. The influx of new farm families and high-farm prices resulting from two World Wars, however, expanded the irrigated areas and caused a heavy drain on the sinking underground-water levels. The result was that some years ago the water supplies, once sufficient, began to run short of current needs.

* * * * *

It is glaringly apparent that here is a State-wide sickness that will not wait on time to cure. You must have more water and power. You must have a State-wide program for the full and efficient development of your water resources. Your Federal Government is alert to this need and at work to meet it.

* * * * *

Just over the Tehachipis, the thirsty lands of the southern San Joaquin Valley are beginning to receive the first water from the great Central Valley project. In July, farmers of Fresno and Tulare Counties welcomed the Central Valley project's first deliveries through the Friant-Kern canal, an event so vital to these farmers that many compared it to the discovery of gold in California 100 years ago. Indeed, water in your State is "white gold," more valuable to your life and survival than the yellow gold that has been mined from your hills.

Organized labor has been active in the Central Valley project from the beginning. In the 1930's your representatives in Congress, and your State legislature, asked the Federal Government to build the first unit of dams, power plants, transmission lines, and canals, under reclamation law. Behind those requests were the ballots of the voters of California, cast at a special referendum election in December 1933.

The voters of this State wanted to create employment in construction, they wanted cheaper power and more power to create more jobs in industry at better wages, and they wanted to irrigate the failing farms of the State. The California State Federation of Labor endorsed that Central Valley project referendum of 1933, and I am sure that men sitting in this audience remember the vote they cast for it 16 years ago.

The reasons for your interest in developing the water resources of the Central Valley are simple. You cannot maintain your high standard of living in this State unless they are developed. Less than 9 years ago your population was less than 7,000,000. Today it has passed 10,000,000. It still grows by leaps and bounds, for the incoming tide is still flowing strong.

In the long run, your standard of living will go up or down with the standard of living of these newcomers to California. For them and for you, employment, wages, and standard of living depend upon the amount and cheapness of power, and upon the opportunity to grow food and fiber upon the land. That truth applies to everybody, whether he has lived here 10 months or 10 years. You can have high cost and insufficient power which means cheap human muscle; or you can have low cost and plentiful power which means employment and high wages. That is the meaning of Central Valley water development in a few words. That is your choice today as it was in 1933. Is that a labor issue?

When the Bureau of Reclamation finishes the initial features of the Central Valley project, one acute water-shortage problem will be met. Some half-million acres of presently irrigated land will be assured of a stabilized water supply, and about the same number of new acres will be given water for the first time.

* * * * *

The different river basins of our country may require somewhat different administrative treatment to meet their differing local needs. But they all require comprehensive

planning and coordinated development, like that outlined in the Central Valley Basin plan of the Department of the Interior. Nature fashioned these basins and the rivers that serve them; man is beginning to realize that they must not be put asunder by man-made political State and county lines.

Among those who live outside the Central Valley watershed are some who think that water resources development has very little to do with them. The mountains and the valley seem to be a long way off. But your members around San Francisco Bay have learned already, the hard way, that what hurts development over the valley hurts them. Because power development has been continuously obstructed by special interests in this State, and because development has been allowed to lag when it was not positively retarded, your members had their earnings cut in 1948.

They said power was short because there was no rain. But the warnings of inevitable power shortage under a retarded building program, that was given repeatedly and publicly by the Department of the Interior, went unheeded. It was not so much the failure of rain; it was rather that men lacked foresight, and special interests were willing to sell the future of California short for their own purposes.

As a result your members suffered. In 39 plants around the bay, 5,000 wage earners had their wages cut. These plants represented a great variety of industries. They had to reduce their operations because power was short. So average weekly earnings of labor dropped from $62.04 in February, to $53.17 in March.

In the southern San Joaquin Valley farmers found their pumps stopped when the power companies pulled the switches. Irrigation of crops was checked. If those of you who work south of the Tehachipis escaped having your wages cut in 1948, your escape was not by a very large margin. Power you used normally here in southern California had to be diverted into other parts of your State. Furthermore, the entire State was obliged to go on daylight-saving time in order to save power.

Perhaps you have noticed that the billboards are now trying to tell you how much is being done at this time to build power plants so that there won't be another shortage. Let me tell you one thing about this construction, and that is that most of it will require the use of oil to generate power. We already have seen that the presently known oil resources of this State at present rate of consumption will last less than a generation. What California needs is not heavier drafts upon her oil reserves, but greater use of her water. Water is a self renewing resource. Its full use assures your future. It doesn't place a mortgage against it by exhausting your limited resources.

The Department of the Interior is committed under reclamation law to develop water resources for the benefit of the many, not for the few. Reclamation law is anti-monopoly law. It is against the formation of monopoly in power or in water, and it is against private speculation in the benefits from public appropriations. The public power preference clause of reclamation law, and the 160-acre water limitation, are your guarantee that the benefits of public water development will not be monopolized.

The Bureau of Reclamation's comprehensive plan for the full development of the waters of the Central Valley calls for 38 reservoirs, 28 power plants, hundreds of miles of great canals, transmission lines, and steam plants to firm up its power supplies. If the plan should be adopted by Congress, and appropriations made, construction of the project will require perhaps a generation. The investment in Central Valley will be of a magnitude of perhaps three times that in the Tennessee Valley. It will be an investment to assure your future. Is that a labor issue?

These problems of diminishing timber and land and oil and water resources, now becoming so acute to your growing commonwealth, are vital to every man, woman, and child who lives here and to the many other Americans who are on their way to your State. When a forest burns or is ruined by careless logging practices, men lose their jobs, flock to the cities to swell the ranks of the unemployed, and depress wage rates. When a farming area is made sterile by gold dredgers or rendered lifeless by a vanishing water supply or swept clean by sand and dust storms, towns vanish and with them the means by which men live.

When oil wells fail and the essential fuel for turning the wheels of your factories is not replaced by the ample stores of hydroelectric energy latent in your undeveloped streams, your State's young industry will languish. When water tables sink out of reach and your towns and cities cry out in vain for domestic and industrial water—then this magnificent civilization out here on the Pacific is on its way to join the ghosts of Egypt, Abyssinia, and the other vanished cultures of antiquity.

On the other hand, when resources are intelligently developed, they create new opportunities for workers, raise living standards, and form the foundation for what we in America know as the Good Life.

The officials of your organization know this, and I am happy to say that they have taken a leading part in support of measures that will meet these problems now, and wisely. The basin concept of water and land and power development counts among its ablest champions the officers of the American and California Federations of Labor. My mission today is to cheer on these men and to urge them and you to an even more militant and active role. The elections of November 1948 showed that the Western States, including California, want more reclamation. But Federal development programs, including the reclamation program, are not secured without effort. They come most surely when backed by the united voice of your representatives in Congress acting in behalf of all the people of California.

When I asked you if the development of your water resources is a labor issue, or not, I knew your answer already. I have read your resolutions and the testimony placed in the public record to support them by your president, John F. Shelley, and your secretary, C. J. Haggerty.

I knew that organized labor in California has fought against water and land monopoly since the 1870's, and that the Workingmen's Party of California demanded in 1878 that land-grabbing must be stopped. I knew that the leaders of California labor in the constitutional convention of 1879 were responsible for the acreage limitation in your present State constitution; that the American Federation of Labor sponsored the original national reclamation law of 1902; and that your own federation sponsored the State Central Valley Water and Power Act of 1933.

Of my own knowledge, from what I have seen in Washington, I know that the bulwarks of reclamation law against water monopoly would be in ruins today except for the stout support of reclamation law with its 160-acre water limitation, given steadfastly by the California State Federation of Labor, by the Grange, and by church, veteran, and other citizens' organizations.

Reclamation has no party politics. Neither has this new basin-wide concept of reclamation. Leaders of both major parties have warmly supported the idea that the great western valleys must be developed with Federal help, and that this help must come through integrated planning and operation under a single agency of the Government. The late and great Franklin Roosevelt had this vision, and so has his worthy successor, President Truman. Both the national and the California Democratic platforms have insisted upon this kind of development, and so has the Commission of Government Reorganization headed by former President Hoover. Your federation secretary, Mr. Haggerty, voiced your organization's purposes when he said of the Central Valley project: "Our program is for full development of the water resources of the entire valley basin by the Bureau of Reclamation under terms of the great national reclamation law."

This kind of resource development—the kind that embraces a whole basin, that is comprehensive in plan and operation, that utilizes by multiple-purpose dams and other structures the basin's entire water resources in behalf of all the people—is fundamental Americanism. We must see that its meaning and its benefits are learned and accepted by our people and by the officials we send to our State and National capitols to represent us. We must do this because we cannot afford to do less. This is the only kind of conservation that really conserves.

Sermon of Dr. Abraham J. Klausner, Rabbi of Temple Israel, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of the Rosh Hashana—Jewish New Year—sermon delivered recently in Boston by Dr. Abraham J. Klausner, Rabbi of Temple Israel, in Boston, Mass.:

The world is ill, desperately ill, they say. From the lecture hall and from the factory, from the land and from the lungs of man issues forth the cry, the world is ill, desperately ill. The philosopher, the poet, the historian and the man in the street remorselessly repeat the refrain, the world is ill, desperately ill.

I saw the philosopher, his arched brow and penetrating eye commanding the universal mind. I heard his unbending voice avow: "The trouble with the world is that so few people in it ever grow up. Psychologically, emotionally, and intellectually immature, they perpetuate a vicious circle. Their family life, their educational system, their politics, and their entire culture cannot be mature because they are shaped by immature persons."

I saw the poet, his ear attentive to the heartbeat of the universe and heard him say:

"All our knowledge brings us nearer to ignorance
All our ignorance brings us nearer to death.
Where is the life we lost in living?
Where is the wisdom we lost in knowledge?
Where is the knowledge we lost in information?
The cycle of heaven in twenty centuries
Brings us further from God and nearer to dust."

I saw the historian, his sensitive fingers tracing the threads of past and present. I hear him sigh: "Western man in the middle of the twentieth century is tense, uncertain, adrift * * *. The grounds of our civilization are breaking up under our feet, and familiar ideas and institutions vanish as we reach for them, like shadows in the falling

dusk. Most of the world has reconciled itself to this half light, to the reign of insecurity.

The man in the street, without benefit of poetry, philosophy, or history, has taken inventory of the world, and has succinctly recorded his findings—the world is going to the dogs.

Where is this world which has been so roundly condemned? Is it not the world in which we live? It could hardly be otherwise. Does not man come to know his world through his senses? These senses have brought him no awareness of a world other than the one in which he lives.

If it is the world in which we live man has dismissed as incurable and relegated to ruin, it would be well for us to be reminded that the world has been with us for a good many centuries. During this expanse of time, poets, philosophers, historians, and men of all walks of life have oft recited a eulogy over its tragic end. But like the sickly looking gentleman in the community who evoked the sympathy of his neighbors from day to day, "For," said they, "too bad, his end is near," and has ceremoniously attended the burial of all his sympathizers, so our oft-condemned world is very much with us, amused with those who flunk it as if it were prostrate upon its death bed, subservient to the probings of those who anticipate its last breath.

The world is not ill. True there is an illness abroad in the land. It is not an illness of the world, nor is it an illness of all who man the world. It is the very thought that man carries with him that the world is ill which is cancerous in its growth and devastating in its effect.

What are the symptoms of this ailment? There are many. The most common is man blaming his failures, his lack of responsibility, his questionable integrity on the world. The world is sick, he says, and thereby justifies his sins.

A second symptom is to be found in man's offhand, contemptuous approach to the institutions of our daily living. He insists, as one of our critics describes him, that almost without exception newspapers distort and books misinform; that professors are pedants, politicians are crooks, doctors quacks, preachers hypocritical time-servers, farmers puritanical oafs, and democracy does not work. He finds satisfaction in his approach to life, for, he maintains, the world is sick, so what's the use.

A third symptom is to be found among those who diligently search for the short-cuts in life. Eagerly they seek ready-made formulae, cultural pills, which will direct them from poverty to wealth, from desperation to happiness, or from ignorance to enlightenment. They would reach out for culture rather than dig for it, purchase inspiration rather than discover it. The world is sick, they say, and accordingly take the 10-easy-lesson plan towards personal salvation.

There is yet another symptom. It is a loss of faith in the endeavors of the inspired men of all generations. It is an attempt to negate the hard-won victories of our civilization in the knowledge that the battle is only begun. "Of what use is it all," is the cry. The world is sick with fear, pestilence, famine, and war. Man is chained to his tears. His heart has tried to break his bond. Give up; he broods. I have tried. Tried with all my heart and all my soul, but there is no purpose, there is no God. Defeated, he is prepared to sacrifice failure provoking Mephistopheles to regale with laughter. It is an old cry, says Toynbee, "whenever things go awry in circumstances that seem ever more intractable, we tend to accuse the enemy of having sown tares in our field and thereby implicitly excuse ourselves for the faults in our own husbandry."

Our sacred tradition, that very tradition which bids us assemble on this appointed day to consider our place in the universe and the part we play in the drama of life, rejects the attempt made by man to excuse his failures and imperfections with a psychosematic illness attributed to the universe.

"Ye stand, all of you, before the Lord your God this day," our scripture reads. "All of you," say our rabbis, suggests, that if there be one among us who is righteous, all of us share in that deed of righteousness. If there be one among us who sinned, all of us assume the responsibility for that sin.

Our tradition unsatisfied with merely suggesting the interdependence of man instructs him in his relationship with the world. In our ancient writings man is told: "The day is short; the work is great. It is not incumbent upon you to perfect the world, but neither are you free to refrain from working toward perfection."

We are part of the world—as much a part as the star-studded heavens, the rushing sea, the undulating plain, the climbing vine, the chirping bird, storm, and devastation. The world cannot be accepted nor rejected; it is. We either live in harmony with it, as Schweitzer suggests, "World and life affirmation urges men to serve society in lively hope of realizable progress," or we place ourselves at variance with it; and, to continue the thinking of the philosopher, "We take no interest in the world, but regard man's life on earth merely as a stage play or a puzzling pilgrimage through the land of time."

Living in harmony with the world does not suggest an absence of problems and obstacles. It does, however, suggest that the problems and obstacles are part of the naturalness of life and can be coped with if man is equipped with an understanding and sympathetic approach. In a word, his way to life is through reflective and religious living.

Living in harmony with the world, or religious living, if you will, is not a matter of choice. One does not debate with himself the advisability to live or not to live harmoniously and then live in accordance with his decision. Neither is religious living a difficult way of life requiring a discipline and program of deprivation which mocks the human form. There are, however, rules or guides, or, as I choose to call them, imperatives, which must be honored by those seeking to live religiously. They are, categorically stated: Know thyself, see thyself, reason with thyself, and worship with thyself.

Know thyself, the first of the imperatives, requires that each individual know himself. The reaction to this imperative—and a very natural one—is, I know myself. But do you? In truth there are few of us who know ourselves in terms of our lives and in terms of our historical antecedents. In our own lives we attempt to destroy or negate episodes, hoping thereby to assure ourselves with a firmer footing in life. Here is a simple but pathetic example from the pages of experience: The girl was to be married. She was beautiful as he was handsome, especially in his Air Corps uniform. They had met by courtesy of the exigencies of war. The marriage would take place at the university following the end of his training course. Mother had not met the young man, but was to be invited. A crisis broke before the ceremony. Mother and daughter were at odds. What had happened? Mother brought some cookies with her she had baked and wanted to serve them after the ceremony. Daughter recognized the cookies as a strange intruder. In the cookies she beheld a reminder of the life she sought to escape in her new society. In this and a thousand ways we attempt to destroy or negate periods in our lives.

Santayana defines piety as "reverence for the sources of one's being." In this sense to know oneself is an act of piety. "I remember the days of my youth," says the pious man. "It began somewhere in the recesses of yesteryear. There I lived and there I grew and there I struggled. I searched for the light, but it was beyond me. I fled from my early years. In my youth I found myself retracing my steps. When understanding was given me, I came to know myself. I knew then what I fled was a warmth and beauty, a love that sought to bind me. I know now that I shall know myself only when I return to the source of that warmth and inspiration.

"None of us are self-made men," says the philosopher, "and those who think they are, are no credit to their Maker. We are all part of a strange and intricate history that eludes us beyond the horizons of the pagan gods. We are the offspring of changing ideals, attitudes and habits. We are the product of our heritage. To know oneself, one must know his origin. It is only by immersing himself in his history and tradition that one can hope to live a dignified self-respecting life. Knowing himself, the individual is prepared to understand the sources of life's phenomena as they manifest themselves even in hatred and discrimination and avoid being warped into blind resentment or cowardly complacency.

"We are born not only as individual men and women, but also as members of historic groups; we are reared to take pride in the achievements of one who belongs to our group. Such pride sustains our self respect, and spurs heroic achievements on our part."

As an American Jew to know thyself implies a familiarity with the Hebraic tradition as it played a part in the development of American thought and American democracy from Puritan times to this day. As an American Jew to know thyself implies a responsibility for continuous participation in this growing democracy.

See thyself is the second imperative for positive living. Here again I anticipate more than a few will say, "I see myself." But do we really see ourselves at all times through our own eyes? Are there not among those who have developed a sixth sense, not the intuitive, but the tendency to see themselves through the eyes of others? How often do we hear the expression, "What will they think?" The intonation of the question suggesting the impersonal "they" will not think well of the act and therefore should be avoided. Is not much of the criticism leveled against individuals prompted by the feeling others may not approve and not be a personal evaluation of the individual or his act? On occasions we are faced with an analysis of our own behavior. We agree that such action is not in good taste. Within our hearts and minds we are prepared to be guided by wisdom and good taste. Then the thought comes to disturb us—What will they think? A fear creeps over us and we act in accordance with the projected will of others rather than in accordance with our own evaluation.

Again I leaf the pages of experience to illustrate this imperative. You will recall not long ago a ship docked in the Boston Harbor bringing a number of displaced persons to these shores. The ship arrived on the Sabbath. There being among the passengers Jews of the orthodox persuasion, they refused to disembark on the Sabbath. "Ashamed," said some. "Ungrateful," said others. Ashamed of what? I ask. Are they to be ashamed of the fact on the shores of this democracy they remained devoted to their considered religious precepts? Ungrateful? Who is there among us who would accept an expression of gratefulness which transgresses the innermost conviction of the human being? In some cases, the criticism leveled against this group was inspired by the feeling there were others who would

neither understand nor sympathize with this behavior. They therefore would have this group sacrifice its convictions to the ignorance and misunderstanding of the impersonal few.

The imperative "see thyself" does not preclude the importance of individual and social approbation. There are standards and patterns set by society which guide and preserve the community. These standards and patterns are based upon the experience of a people over the centuries and are rooted in the thinking and faith of the builders of our civilization. These standards and patterns are not subject to individual whims nor do they warp with the sudden changes in communal behavior.

Goethe makes his contribution to this imperative when he says: "Do not abandon the idea of personality, even when it runs counter to developing circumstances. Do not give it up for lost even when it seems no longer tenable in the presence of opportunistic theories which would make the spiritual conform only to the material. Remain men in possession of your own souls. Do not become human things which have given entrance to a soul which conforms to the will of the masses and beats in time with it."

Reason with thyself is the third imperative for progressive living. With this imperative we take leave of those who would bind us to dogma. Our world is dynamic, ever changing in response to the maturing mind of man and the revealed mysteries of the universe. Our tradition, ancient and modern, pays reverence to reasoning men when it informs us, "An ignorant man cannot be a truly pious man." Our tradition, ancient and modern, recognizes man's duty to search for truth. This search, Maimonodes informs us, is the first step toward the knowledge of God. Reason with thyself implies our civilization is a movement not a condition, it is not for us to remake God and the universe, nor is it for us to subserve ourselves to a static past. It becomes us as religious personalities, in the words of Justice Douglas, "to establish ourselves as dynamic components of history."

Reason with myself. Examine life about. Is there evidence of a pernicious and malignant society? If there is, reason the evils inherent in that society and seek the relationship between their source and our being. Our men of thought tell us what should be self-evident: In politics, the evils that beset us, from the ward boss to international war, are largely manifestations of a lack of reasoning. In business, labof troubles, and cyclic disturbances are frequently attributable to personal greed rather than impersonal reasoning. In religion, the closed mind, does more damage than the wildest heresiarch. In education, obscurantism deadens the mind of the child in the hope of enslaving his will to the desparing dictates of a spiritless world.

Seek truth and be possessed of the courage to follow that truth that you may be free of prejudice and free to serve thyself, thy community, and thy God.

Worship with thyself is the last of the imperatives for effective living. Worship as perfunctory prayer where the individual is merely an organ, a sound box, or petitional prayer where the farmer prays for rain at the time the vendor prays for sunshine, or more dramatically, when opposing armies pray for victory, are responses to specific needs. William James, in discussing attitudes toward prayer in a scientific age, dismisses the question of the efficacy of prayer with the rhetorical question, "Why do men pray?"

Worship with thyself as an imperative for religious living has no relationship to perfunctory or petitional prayer. Worship with thyself is a sacrificial experience. It expresses itself in a spirit of humility. Man views himself as part of a vast universe, rational and mysterious, revealing, and tantalizing, with knowledge and power always beyond his grasp. With that reality, he humbly seeks communion.

Worship with thyself is an experience which expresses itself in reverence. It is the desire to share the virtues of civilization and the will to share the responsibility for universal punishment. It is, in a simply expressed manner, the honor given by a child to his father in refraining from sitting in his accustomed seat.

Worship with thyself is an experience expressing itself in love. A love which inspires a sharing of all that is good and beautiful, a love which increases man's capacity to do good. A love, as Rabbi Naham, of Bratzlav described: which fills the eptiness of the heart with the consciousness of the divine.

Worship with thyself is man expressing himself as part of the world where the flower turns to the sun and the earth's myriads of tiny mouths open up to catch the refreshing raindrop, and the heart of man catches the music of the spheres.

These are then the imperatives for religious living. Know thyself, see thyself, reason with thyself, and worship with thyself.

How profound and exciting it is to gather together on this sacred day of Rosh Hashana, parents with their children, children with their dreams, lonely ones with their memories—to consider the circumstances of their lives so that those who are imprisoned by their daily tasks may preserve their spiritual lives.

How profound and exciting it is to be alive. To search, to hope, to grasp, to discover oneself through vision and reason and faith and in some small measure create a portion of righteousness, of kindliness, laughter, and enlightenment for mankind. This is our prayer, the longing, the hunger of our hearts. May the New Year guide us in health and happiness through the imperatives of religious living toward the love, devotion, and sacredness of our divine beings. Amen.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to be delivered by Hon. Alf. M. Landon at Topeka, Kans., Thursday, October 20, 1949:

America, entering a new phase of the world's crisis, lacks a central purpose—because we are not getting sound, honest and courageous leadership. In this crisis a politician should not be striving for public favor but must be bound by his duty to the public.

Facing in the atomic age, the greatest threat in our history to our national security—we are not concentrating our resources to meet that situation.

Our leadership lacks either the intelligence or the guts and the honesty to face the fact that we are in a battle for survival, and to plan accordingly. Those who thought we could do business with the Communist slavers have been driven from one position to another until there is no hope left of a moderate policy. The threat of war was never greater than it is today.

Even the expected always creates a shock. The official announcement of an atomic explosion in Russia was to be expected sooner or later. Also the Marshall plan is not working as was expected—and the cold war is changing for the worse.

All that—plus our domestic situation—precipitates the question, are our defenses being adequately planned and prepared.

The race for the atomic bomb has been on since Hiroshima.

America could not retain the secret of atomic energy indefinitely.

Its exclusive possession by us—thus creating a Maginot line defense complex—prevented realistic appraisal of our military, economic and political situation.

Therefore the knowledge that the cold war and the race for atomic weapons is approaching a crescendo can be a blessing in disguise if it shocks the American people into concentrating their undivided attention on the different factors that make up our national defense in the present situation.

It would be a tragic mistake to dismiss the hearing now going on before the House Armed Services Committee as mere bickering between the Admirals and the Air Generals.

Belatedly the people are being cut in on some of the basic facts and vital decisions that must be faced in strengthening our national security.

The House committee is performing a great service to the country in holding their hearings. They must stay with their job until the vast military issues affecting life today and for generations to come—in America and throughout the world—have been fully canvassed.

These problems cannot be decided by our military men alone. They are the concern of every citizen because the make-up and effectiveness of our military establishment is decided by the man on the street.

On broad matters of military preparedness, people have got to take an understanding interest.

The question before the American people is how to meet the Soviet's threat to our existence as a free nation.

We face a real military threat. The fundamental question is whether we meet it with a balanced military establishment—or a specialized military establishment based on specialized weapons.

Reliance by a nation on a single weapon has always proven a reckless gamble which has resulted in defeat.

All of our thinking has been warped by sole possession of the atomic bomb.

Now that our atomic monopoly has been broken, our national safety demands a revision of our defense concepts.

The House Military Committee hearings are throwing a badly needed light on our war plans which personally and intimately affect the life of every American.

For these reasons I discuss with you tonight the military factors of our national defense, and the dispersal of our Nation's resources.

That may seem somewhat presumptious on the part of a civilian. But the collaboration of civilian thinking with that of the military specialist, each giving proper consideration to the other, has always proven a successful coordination of our military efforts. This kind of cooperation is more important than ever before. National security is everybody's business.

Our war experience has been costly. Costly in money and costly in American blood.

That tragic waste of American resources and American lives has been due to the short-sightedness and cowardice of politicians whose sole guiding star has been expediency. Downright dishonesty and the failure to have trained men ready has cost us Americans dearly. But political cowardice has been the most costly. The American people have been misled into every war they

have fought, including both sides of the War of the Rebellion.

We have always been taught to underestimate the enemy.

1. That the other side wouldn't fight.

2. That our allies would furnish the men and all we would furnish would be the tools.

3. That we could win the war with some marvelous new gadget—in an easy way.

You will recall that we were told that even if we did get into our recent war, it would take only the Navy and possibly an Air Force expedition.

Being a machinery-minded people as well as a peaceful people, it is easy for us to believe in a super, new gadget that will win a war for us without hand to hand fighting. Such was our attitude toward the American invention and exclusive possession—the Norden bomb sight.

Experience had to teach us that daylight bombing was a ghastly failure—until we furnished fighter plane protection for our bombers. Despite all the ballyhoo, precision bombing from high altitudes never lived up to the claims of the air enthusiasts. Of course, in the end it took the doughboy—as I repeatedly said it would.

Now I have vigorously supported an air force second to none from the beginning—and still do. But we cannot win the next war with an air force alone, especially when too much emphasis is placed on bombers. Whether we plan to use the atom bomb or not, victory goes to the side which gains command of the air. To command the air, we need both fighters and bombers.

Despite claims to the contrary, long-range bombers need fighter protection. And it is perfectly obvious that armies must have fighter-bomber support.

The present critical situation exists solely through the attempt of Russian tyrants to dominate the world in the guise of communism.

The crux of that attempt is control of western Europe.

In Europe is a well-trained industrial population and the only industrial plants in the world that match us in output.

General de Gaulle said of the Russian atomic explosion, the "Atlantic Pact is now robbed of its efficacy for Europe."

I assume that what he means is that heretofore our main contribution to the Atlantic Pact was the atomic bomb and air force.

General Omar Bradley said on his recent trip to Europe that our primary contribution to the Atlantic Pact was the atomic bomb with our air force. In last week's Saturday Evening Post he found it necessary to modify that statement. Yet he still appears to be placing too much reliance on a vanishing atomic monopoly.

Now that the Russians can threaten to drop an atomic bomb on western Europe in retaliation for atomic bombs dropped on Russia—our atomic bomb and strategic bombing has lost much of its meaning for the people of western Europe and America also. As General de Gaulle aptly points out Europe is weakest on land where it hurts. This calls for a change in our own military plans. The military assistance for Europe has to be more than dollars and weapons.

The most effective change we could make in our plans to stimulate the spirit of the peoples of western Europe would be to have more army fighting units available for immediate use than we have now in service.

History shows that nations have never been able to buy allies that have any value.

We must show the democracies of western Europe that we are ready, willing, and able to get in and fight with them—not only in the air and on the sea but on the ground also before they are actually invaded.

Therefore we must keep a sizable army equipped and ready for service—in addition, large and well trained guard and reserve forces.

A democratic people rightfully fear too large a standing army. The Russian atomic explosion has upset our timetable. There is no use beating about the bush on that. They achieved the atomic explosion several years ahead of the earliest prediction.

Therefore our present situation requires that we immediately and forthwith double the number of divisions in the Regular Army.

Overseas we only have six full divisions, four of them in Japan and two of them in Germany. The four divisions we have in the United States are too few to meet any emergency. The National Guard cannot be used immediately.

The new timetable requires in the neighborhood of 20 divisions which can be used immediately—full strength, equipped, and ready for action.

I have not picked this number out of a hat.

All the Army leaders' testimony before the committee of the Congress in 1948, and reiterated in their 1949 testimony, has been to the effect that we need between 18 and 25 divisions. And certainly the new timetable requires immediate consideration of that testimony.

It is not personally wise for a politician to favor such a policy but it is sound for our beloved country's security.

That's one vital change in our plans that should be made immediately.

Another thing, we are not handling Marshall plan funds to the mutual advantage of the countries involved—including ourselves. At the present time the Marshall plan cannot be called a success.

There is a desperate need for a drastic revision by the State Department of our political European policies and methods—in order to bring about constructive western European unification and cooperation.

An intensified program to stiffen western Europe is costly

The United States is demonstrating its intention to do our share.

Europe must carry a heavier share of the load than it has so far.

The alternative is an Asiatic despotism for the free peoples of western Europe. The alternative for Americans is unhappy life in an armed fortress—in which the democratic processes will be under constant pressure.

Any lag on the part of the peoples of western Europe must be made up by increased defenses in the United States of America.

Our Navy is the strongest in the world. With our friends and allies we control the seas. In general, we have the ascendency in the air—but it is not great enough. We need more and better planes. That's another change called for in our national defense plans.

Another one is in the miscalled unification law. It really is multiplication.

Instead of eliminating duplication, we have different departments fighting for their little bureaucratic empires. The allocation in the law itself of authority and responsibility is not clearly defined.

We have the Army—the Navy—the Air Force and the Department of Defense, the two Armed Services Committees and the two Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, the Budget Bureau, and the President all participating in shaping our national defense. It is top-heavy.

The basic flaw is in the law passed by the Congress which the country thought meant a single department of national defense. Secretary of Defense Johnson is doing the best he can—by power of this personality—to correct that. But there is so much complex organization that Mr. Johnson is finding it impossible to "bust" down through the layers of bureaucracy to eliminate the duplications and overlapping of authority.

Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee says the Secretary of Defense should have less authority. That would pile confusion on confusion. He needs more authority to have efficient unification.

Another change required is in Alaska. Military conditions there are shocking. It could be taken without much effort. We need more troops and adequate housing for them to protect our air base.

Now, of course, the Russian dictator might move into the Middle East after the Persian oil. The first thing we would have to do would be to blow up the oil wells when we can't hold them.

Now we are pretty good at desert fighting, but we need allies there also—just as in western Europe—to help hold the Mediterranean. Therefore we must continue to back Turkey to the limit.

But we must also change our Spanish policy. Its location—on the Straits of Gibraltar—the Pyrenees Mountains—all make it a key country in any defense of the Mediterranean and western Europe itself.

Spain is the one country whose record is consistent in its opposition to the Communist tyrants. Therefore we must immediately change our present policy and join forces with Spain.

The techniques of Hitler and Stalin are the same. The great success of their cold war was before the outbreak of actual fighting.

We certainly need a much more active and vigorous justice department in prosecuting Communists in this country. Admiral Zacharias, former Chief of Naval Intelligence, says that the Russian scientists didn't discover the secret of atomic energy. They stole it from us.

We need a change in the administration's tenderness for the American Communist and fellow travelers.

We need to protect Greenland and Iceland. With our Atlantic bases and control of the seas and an adequate air force and ground force, we would then be looking right down the Communists' throats. That seems to be the only road left to peace and the only way to win a war quickly and with a minimum of casualties.

We are facing the possibility of a long, grueling, costly, and bloody war. There are no words to describe the effect of atomic warfare on a people. We can save both money and blood and perhaps forestall war by preparing and training both soldiers and civilians now.

It is ruinous to assume that it is within our means to adequately prepare our national defense and at the same time continue profligate spending for new and greater government services at home. That is another change that is desperately needed in our plans—and in our thinking.

Financial chaos has always brought disaster to a country afflicted with it. A continuation of Federal deficits in peacetime, and wastes and dispersal of our resources, can be destructive to the future life of our Republic.

It is impossible for a people adequately to compensate their veterans for their service to their country. We must decide between appropriations for bonuses for everyone or appropriations for national defense. We must decide between appropriations for social security for the individual on one hand and national security for our beloved Republic on the other. It is not within our means to do both. If the country goes—social security goes.

The issue we face is not of expanding social security, but of expanding national defense. Only by arming ourselves so that no nation, or combination of nations, can hope to suc-

cessfully attack us, can we be the stabilizing force that might keep peace in the world. The huge sums necessary for national defense can only be made available by retrenchment and cuts elsewhere in present appropriations for domestic purposes and by efficiency of the military service.

The issue is simply:

For national security—a bigger and better army and suitable air forces.

For national insecurity—bigger deficits and a bigger group of pensioners.

Our national defense in our present critical situation certainly does not rest on a foundation of shorter hours, higher wages, pensions for everyone, whether they have ever worked or not, high profits, low taxes, or a diversion of taxes to other demands, however meritorious. Bitter and intemperate attacks by group leaders on all public officials who do not agree with them on social and economic problems—strikes and the threat of strikes—encourage the Communist tyrants to believe that they can capitalize on our family quarrels.

All our resources and efforts must be concentrated on protection of our country and the democratic processes both at home and abroad.

Russia's greatest hope is that the American people have become a nation of wastrels and pleasure-loving people with the idea that the Government owes them a living—instead of a nation whose citizens have a sense of keen responsibility to their country and are willing to sacrifice themselves if necessary to its safety and its existence.

We cannot support both the welfare state and the military strength we need to survive. In today's crisis we must make the choice between national security and national hand-outs.

Faith and Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from The Washington Star of October 14, 1949:

FAITH AND VISION—PEOPLE AHEAD OF CONGRESS IN CALLING FOR STRENGTHENED UNITED NATIONS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is often in a small way, in calm discussion by groups of earnest men, that profound changes in the course of history have their beginnings.

It was so with the men—elderly, middle-aged and young—who gathered in a room in Philadelphia in 1789 and wrote the Constitution of the United States which transformed a struggling, uncertain and loose confederation of jealously independent states into a strong Federal union which now, exactly 160 years later, is the most powerful single influence in the world.

It was so, very close to this time, with a group of men in the House of Representatives of both political parties who gathered together in early 1943 in the midst of war at the instance of a young Arkansas Congressman, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, now a Senator, and worked out the Fulbright resolution which, when approved by both branches, put Congress on record as favoring full cooperation by the United States with other nations after the war to maintain international peace and justice.

That, in itself, was the genesis of the United Nations.

MAY BE SO, AGAIN

It may be so, again, with the group of men and women in Congress of both parties and private citizens from all walks of life who gathered in a House committee room this week to talk and plan for the next step. This is the evolution of the United Nations of various and diverse national states into a really strong and effective world federation or union. The objective is exactly the same on a larger scale as that which the men of Philadelphia achieved so notably in 1789 when they welded a weak and loose confederation into a strong union.

We should by now have experienced enough, learned enough, suffered enough, to do the bigger job. It should be no more difficult if we have faith, persistence, and vision. A careful reading of history reveals the skepticism with which many regarded the aim of those men in Philadelphia 160 years ago. Scoffing cynics said it was impossible. But history shows how they accomplished their purpose through faith, persistence, and vision.

These essential ingredients of progress were mentioned in public hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this week on pending resolutions for a stronger and more perfect union of nations of the world, and so also were the long-ago meetings in Philadelphia and the more recent meetings here in 1943.

TWO RESOLUTIONS

Discussion centered chiefly about two resolutions. One is sponsored by nearly a fourth of Congress—105 House Members and 22 Senators. It would express the will of Congress that an objective of our foreign policy should be the strengthening and development of the United Nations into a world federation with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

The other, sponsored by a smaller but representative group of Members of Congress of both parties, would put Congress on record for creation of an Atlantic union of the Western democracies, thus excluding Russia, as the basis of an eventual world union. This project is more restricted in scope but more far reaching within its confines, since it would involve a common parliament and mutual finance and defense arrangements.

Again it was a House Member from Arkansas, Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, who led discussion in behalf of the all-embracing federation and who gave it its full meaning by expressing the hope that our Federal system that works for 150,000,000 people can be given by us to the world.

A young war veteran and freshman House Member, Representative BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, spoke for his proposal for a plebiscite or referendum of the American people on world government, which he argued was the proper way to proceed, and likewise he would have Congress spell out the powers and limits of proposed world government. To this Representative VORYS, Republican, of Ohio, veteran House Member and an original sponsor of the Fulbright resolution as of this one, replied that a resolution should be a prospectus, not a blueprint.

Another freshman Member, Representative HOWELL, Democrat, of New Jersey, told of a poll he had taken among his constituents that showed 7,000 for world federation and only 191 either against or with reservations, some minor. He concluded by expressing what is perhaps the real truth, as it often is:

"The people are ahead of us on this issue."

Reciprocal Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by Mr. Earl Richert which appeared in the Washington Daily News on October 17.

World trade today is in a very chaotic state, made so because of monetary devaluations and a general upsetting of established trade channels as a result of the war.

Today, of course, the old so-called protective tariff is a lamb compared to some of the wolves of import duties and devaluation problems. Mr. Richert's article tends to point this out.

In the midst of this comes the problem of protecting our own domestic producers from the rigors of chaotic world trade. This will require teamwork and the utilization of all of the machinery and facilities which years of experience have endowed us with. We have the Tariff Commission to call upon and make the best use of and, of course, a realistic attitude is required on the part of the State Department and others who have a part to do in the protection of our own domestic producers and their proper place in a balanced world trade.

The article follows:

"RECIPROCAL EMBARGO" IS NEARER THE TRUTH

(By Earl Richert)

There's a lot of window dressing in the recent Annecy tariff-cutting agreement—tariff reductions that don't mean a thing and likely won't for some time to come.

State Department officials have pointed out that many of the concessions granted us by the foreign countries in the Annecy, France, trade agreement are ineffective. That's because of import and dollar controls which these countries still maintain to keep out our goods.

But little has been said of the concessions we've made which also are ineffective.

Take butter. In the agreement with Denmark we agreed to reduce the United States tariff on butter from 14 to 7 cents a pound on 10,000,000 pounds to come into this country between April 1 and October 31.

In the Geneva trade agreement, effective January 1, 1948, we had agreed to make the same tariff reduction for 50,000,000 pounds of butter entering this country between November 1 and March 31. Thus with the Denmark agreement, 60,000,000 pounds of butter can now come into this country annually at the reduced tariff rate of 7 cents a pound—at least the trade agreements so provide.

But, actually, not one pound of foreign butter can come in. The Agriculture Department won't let it.

The Department now holds 90,000,000 pounds of domestic butter which it has taken off the market to hold up prices to United States farmers. And under its powers to control imports of fats and oils, it is refusing to permit imports of butter.

Department officials don't use the word "embargo," but they admit their refusal to license imports constitutes a flat embargo against foreign butter.

"I guess the State Department boys are dreaming of the bright world 5 or 10 years from now when we'll be consuming all the butter we produce in this country and can use some foreign butter," said one Agriculture Department official of the butter tariff reduction. "Frankly, the outlook certainly doesn't look bright now."

Then, there's olive oil. In the new trade agreements with Greece and Italy, we cut tariffs sizably on both olive oil in bulk and small packages—supposedly to help those countries earn more dollars.

But the Agriculture Department won't grant licenses to let more than 33,000 tons of olive oil come in annually. That's only about two-thirds as much as we imported before the war when the higher tariff rates were in effect.

Department officials admit that the import curbs are designed to protect domestic olive oil producers.

In the trade agreement with Greece, we reduced the tariff on currants from 2 cents to 1 cent a pound. Last year, total imports of currants from Greece were valued at $25.

A State Department official said our purpose in lowering tariffs on items which are barred or restricted by the Agriculture Department was to convince foreign countries of our good faith—that we'll let these commodities come in at lower rates when conditions here improve enough to lift import controls.

Among commodities on which the Agriculture Department now maintains flat embargoes are rice and rice products, cottonseed oil, flaxseed, linseed oil, lard and lard compounds, oleo oil, peanuts and peanut butter, soap and soap powders, soybeans and soybean oil, sunflower seed and oil, and tallow.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter written by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, Assistant Secretary of State.

This letter was written to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and was inspired by an article which I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on August 8, 1949. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 6, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: I refer to your letter of August 26, 1949, addressed to Mr. Peurifoy, with which you enclosed a clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, 1949, with respect to competition of imported apples with domestic apples.

I shall comment on the statement in the article quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that "the fresh fruit and vegetable industry was sold down the river by our State Department" at the Geneva trade conference of 1947. The United States duty on apples was reduced from 15 cents to 12½ cents a bushel at Geneva along with the duties on a great many other products. This reduction of only 16⅔ percent may be compared with a considerably higher average rate of reduction in the general agreement on tariffs and trade for the products imported from Canada as a whole and also with the reduction of 50 percent which was permissible under the Trade Agreements Act. The reduction in the duty on apples was made only after the most careful study by the trade-agreements organization of its probable effects on domestic interests. The fruit industry had been given ample opportunity to present any information or make any representations it desired with respect to a possible concession on this product. It had been publicly announced in advance that apples would be considered for a possible concession. It is not true, as stated in the quoted article, that the industry was invited to send a representative to Geneva. A representative of the industry was present at Geneva, as were representatives of certain other United States industries, but in order to avoid giving unfair advantage to any industries or other interests not represented at Geneva a policy of refraining from immediate discussions with any industry representatives present at Geneva was consistently followed. I know of no exception to this policy.

The article seems to imply the existence of some inherent right on the part of the domestic apple industry to have the Government establish quantitative restrictions on imports of apples. I may point out that traditionally the United States is opposed to quantitative import restrictions, and has made use of such restrictions only in the case of a few commodities, and then under special circumstances. No import restrictions were in effect on apples prior to the Geneva conference. Clearly it was not the purpose of that conference, which aimed at the reduction of trade barriers and the stimulation of healthful trade, to institute import restrictions on apples.

As a matter of fact, as is recognized in the article, Canada has for some years voluntarily limited its exports of apples to the United States in the interest of the United States apple industry. In 1940, 1942, 1944, and each year from 1946 to 1948, representatives of both industry and government in the United States and Canada reached an informal understanding just prior to the apple marketing season upon the amount of apples to be exported from Canada to the United States. This understanding has represented the maximum which the Canadians might be able to ship to our market and did not mean that the United States was committed to take that amount. Except for 1944, when apples were required here for the armed forces, imports from Canada have been considerably less than the established maximum. In August 1949 a figure for the maximum Canadian export for this coming season was set by the Canadians at 2,250,000 bushels. The Canadians also suggested a time schedule for shipments of their apples to the United States in the interest of orderly marketing.

The article states that apples imported from Canada are exempt from the rigid numerous inspection regulations which the American producer is compelled to comply with. It is not clear to what regulations this statement refers. There are no governmental regulations in the United States, other than sanitary, regarding the inspection of domestic apples. The Departments of Agriculture of the Federal and State Governments maintain a service, at a small fee, for the inspection of the grade and condition of apples, which is available to apple shippers if they care to make use of it. Acceptance of this service is entirely voluntary and domestic shippers frequently find it beneficial. Any sanitary regulations on the part of the United States Pure Food and Drug Administration relative to inspection of apples apply equally to domestic and imported apples. As a matter of fact the Canadian Government restricts the export of apples to certain grades and sizes while the United States Government has no corresponding restrictions on the shipment of domestic apples within the United States.

In general, it may be said that imports of apples into the United States, in comparison with domestic production, are not large enough to warrant concern. In 1948 they amounted to 1.5 percent of production. Furthermore, exports have consistently exceeded imports, except in certain small crop years. In 1948, imports were attracted to the United States market because of the high prices resulting from the small 1948 crop. The following figures show production, exports, and imports in recent years in thousands of bushels:

	Production	Exports	Imports
1937	153,169	7,901	23
1938	105,718	11,761	26
1939	139,247	8,379	46
1943	89,050	342	269
1946	119,410	2,864	1,038
1947	112,503	4,553	1,211
1948	88,407	1,069	1,324

At Geneva concessions were obtained from various countries on imports of apples from the United States. In the general agreement the United Kingdom eliminated its 3-shillings-per-hundredweight rate on fresh apples during our export season August 16 to April 16, and thereby eliminated the preference of 3 shillings per hundredweight enjoyed by Canada; it also eliminated the duty (and preference) of 7 shillings per hundredweight on dried apples. It may be noted that Canada gave her consent to these concessions. The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxembourg Customs Union cut the duty on fresh apples from 12 percent to 6 percent from February 1 to May 21, eliminated the monopoly fee during this period, and agreed to a ceiling of 20 percent for the combined duty and monopoly fee for the rest of the season. It reduced the duty on dried apples from 15 percent to 12 percent. Canada granted duty-free entry for fresh apples from May 20 to July 12 (that is, our early apples) and reduced the duty to three-fourths cent per pound for the remainder of the year. Tariff reductions on fresh apples were also obtained from India and Pakistan (16⅔ percent cut), Czechoslovakia (75 percent cut during United States export season), Norway (50 percent cut during part of United States export season), Ceylon (25 percent cut), and France (25 percent cut or more). France also eliminated the restrictive quota on apples. Chile, Brazil, and Newfoundland bound fresh apples on the free list. France cut the rate on dried apples by approximately one-third, Norway the rate on dried and canned apples by 50 percent, and Chile and Brazil the rate on canned apples by one-third. South Africa bound its rate of 5 percent during our season.

It is true that certain countries which have been important markets for the United States in the past have recently been forced to restrict their purchases from the United States on account of balance-of-payments considerations. The article mentions Canada, Chile, Argentina, and Australia. However, these restrictions have been necessitated by the general imbalance in trade among important trading nations in the recent past, and it is hoped that this situation will not be permanent. The United States Government has been attempting through the recent tripartite economic discussions with the United Kingdom and Canada and in other ways, such as the European recovery program, to help find a remedy for these balance-of-payments difficulties which beset many of this country's important customers.

In general, as regards the interest of the American fruit industry in exports, it may be pointed out that the value of United States exports of fruits and preparations to Canada

in recent years has averaged about 10 times the value of such products from Canada. Even in 1948, when the temporary import controls were the most restrictive on fruit, our exports of fresh, frozen, and dried fruit to Canada amounted to $25,000,000 while our imports of such products from Canada amounted to $8,000,000. It is obvious what a disproportionately large loss would be sustained by the American fruit industry if, following the establishment of quantitative restrictions by the United States on imports of apples or other fruits and vegetables from Canada, or the increase in our duty on fruits imported into the United States from Canada, Canada should be moved to retaliate by increasing the duty or otherwise adding to the restrictions on her fruit imports from us.

The article suggests that Canada might preferably send certain other products, such as petroleum or lumber, to the United States in place of apples. On this point, it may be observed that with regard to trade conducted under the system of private enterprise, it has not been customary on the part of countries with the politico-economic traditions of the United States to attempt to influence the choice of products which other countries may care to export to them.

If this Government should start telling Canada or other countries, in the interest of certain domestic industries, what we would like to have these countries send us, we might as well give up any claim to standing for private enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Whose Reciprocal Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter from Mr. Walter Hebert of Yakima, Wash.

I requested this particular letter in reply to Mr. Gross since Mr. Hebert was fully authorized to participate in the Geneva Conference by members of the Pacific Northwest Fruit Industry.

Producers in the great fruit areas of our Pacific Coast are naturally world-minded and keep abreast of all developments in the fields of world trade because so much of their security and prosperity depends upon a full participation in world trade.

Historically, better than 40 percent of our total production of winter pears has gone into the world markets annually and nearly 30 percent of our total production of apples. For that reason, great interest centers around the whole principle of reciprocity as it affects our participation in long-established markets, both at home and abroad.

Mr. Hebert's letter follows:

YAKIMA FRUIT GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Yakima, Wash., October 14, 1949.

Hon. WALT HORAN, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: I should have written you sooner in further comment on the contents of Assistant Secretary Ernest A. Gross' letter to Mr. CANNON in connection with Spike Barrigan's article. I had phoned Spike for a copy of it to have upon the arrival of your letter, which he did. I had not seen it before.

The situation in Geneva was as I described it in my telegram. It was certainly a novel experience to me to be treated as some sort of a pariah by the representatives of the State Department. I was not there in an official capacity and never had any illusions of my status before I left for Geneva. It was entirely unofficial and advisory. I went at the request of the fruit industry as represented by the National Apple Institute, the International Apple Association, the Northwest Horticultural Council, the California deciduous fruit industry, and a national industry horticultural committee which was advisory to the United States Department of Agriculture on all matters pertaining to foreign export, which included citrus as well as deciduous fruits.

I was first "put in my place" by Mr. Winthrop G. Browne when he learned of my presence at Geneva. He told me at a private dinner party given by one of the United States Department of Agriculture men in no uncertain terms where I could go—which was any place outside Geneva. The United States Department of Agriculture boys arranged for me to have lunch with him the next day, and he reiterated his statement that my presence was not wanted and no one would be allowed to advise with me on any matters under negotiation. The whole situation for several weeks was bogged down by preliminary conversations and organizational details. Mr. Will Clayton arrived on the scene sometime after the formal opening of the conference. I wrote him a letter requesting a personal interview. He answered after several days, suggesting I phone his secretary for an appointment. This I did repeatedly and finally he gave me a few minutes—just enough to tell me in no uncertain terms that I should not have come to Geneva without first having asked him. I was under the impression before leaving that my attendance was well known to State because it had been discussed with somebody in State by the men in Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and my passport had been arranged for with State prior to my arrival in Washington en route to Geneva. Anyway Mr. Clayton told me they could not recognize any representatives from industry—because they would have "thousands" of people in Geneva trying to influence them in the negotiations. So far as I know I was the only one there from any industry until Carlyle Thorpe flew over in connection with California walnuts. I wondered where the "thousands" would have stayed, as I had to stay at a little hotel about 25 miles out of Geneva and Thorpe stayed at Lausanne, about 50 miles away. There were no hotel rooms in Geneva that the State Department and other countries had not preempted.

My observations I have reported to the industry in detail on various occasions and in written reports. They have had some bearing and influence on various pieces of legislation, notably, the "peril points" amendment which was, I believe, sponsored by Congressman GEARHART, of California, in the Eightieth Congress. I personally met him in San Francisco and discussed the whole fruit-tariff situation with him.

Senator MAGNUSON'S proposed amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the one he finally succeeded in getting through the other day are along the same line. I discovered at Geneva, and so reported to the fruit industry, we could get nowhere with or through the State Department and their administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act until we got some new legislation which would tend to curb their dictatorial and arbitrary action and policy. Perhaps that was the most important result which germinated out of my Geneva experiences.

Before we can do anything to curb or control the importation of Canadian apples, and Argentine pears, etc., we must have some legislation which will make it mandatory upon the State Department to recognize the ill effects of unrestricted imports on our domestic economy, especially on agricultural and horticultural crops in years of surplus or when our domestic supply is adequate to meet domestic requirements. Until we get that in some form, we are at the mercy, not only of such theorists as now dominate our foreign policy, but we are at the mercy of such State controlled or legalized monopolies as exist in British Columbia today.

I could comment at length on Mr. Gross' letter. It sets forth the policy of the State Department and is characteristic of the replies or explanations which emanate from the State Department officials. Mr. Gross doubtless feels they are sound principles he expounds and are justified by world conditions. Maybe so, but if they are, and selected industries in this country are called upon to sacrifice themselves on the altar of a generous international policy, then the segment of the United States economy (in our case the apple and pear growers) should be adequately compensated for their sacrifice to the good of all. If this is impractical, and it may be, then the only recourse is to control or limit the imports which cause the damage to the segment of our economy which is made the scapegoat.

I note one thing in Mr. Gross' letter which deserves comment. He says, at the Geneva Conference of 1947, the United States duty on apples was reduced from 15 cents to 12½ cents a bushel which was a reduction of only 16⅔ percent, whereas a reduction of 50 percent was permissible under the Trade Agreements Act. He fails to state the tariff had been previously reduced in the first trade agreement with Canada in 1936 from 25 cents per bushel to 15 cents net weight, a reduction of 40 percent, and the decrease of 2½ cents in 1947 made a full 50 percent reduction of a tariff which already was far less than the Canadian tariff and which today is about one-third of the present Canadian tariff on our apples exported to Canada. If there is anything to this reciprocal-trade theory it should at least approximate equality of treatment.

We have an import duty on Argentine pears of about 22 cents a box. Their duty is 40 percent ad valorem at point of entry (Buenos Aires) which includes all freight costs, or on a $3 f. o. b. price, a duty of about $2 a box against our 22 cents a box. While we do not have a trade agreement with Argentina they get the benefit of our 22-cent tariff under the most-favored-nation policy. Does that make any sense to you? I am sure it does not—either to you or me or anyone outside the State Department.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER HEBERT,
General Manager.

Annecy Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, a slight indication of the reluctance of the State

Department negotiators to tell the American people what they are doing is found in the analysis of the new trade agreements made at Annecy which was released last week.

The index to this interesting document outlines, product by product, the page on which one can find the concessions obtained by the United States from other countries. This takes the first half of the book.

When it comes to listing the concessions granted by the United States, no such listing by products is provided. To find out what reductions in our own tariffs were granted, the reader has to hunt through 41 pages of tables, for which there is no index.

It is for reasons such as this that I earnestly recommend to all American producers that they become better acquainted with the United States Tariff Commission—the one real "friend in court" they have—and let the members of that body know from time to time exactly what their experiences are as a result of these tariff concessions.

In that connection, I wish to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following letter I have just received from the Tariff Commission relative to the operation of the so-called escape clause in these trade agreements:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
October 17, 1949.

The Honorable WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORAN: I have your letter of October 3, 1949, addressed to Mr. Martin, general counsel of the Commission, requesting information as to the status of trade-agreement negotiations concerning brined cherries, and also asking what steps may be taken to protect the fruit industry of the Pacific Northwest from injurious imports. Reply has been delayed to await announcement of the results of the trade-agreement negotiations conducted at Annecy, France, during the past summer.

On October 10, 1949, the Department of State announced the results of the negotiations. In the Annecy agreement no reduction in the present duties on brined cherries is provided for, but the United States has undertaken not to increase the existing duties imposed on brined cherries (5½ cents per pound on cherries with pits and 9½ cents per pound on cherries with pits removed).

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in which the United States agreed not to impose on apples a higher duty than 12½ cents per bushel, provides for two contingencies in which domestic agricultural producers may be protected against injurious imports. Article XIX of the agreement (the so-called escape clause) provides that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of obligations incurred under the agreement (including tariff concessions), any product is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or directly competitive products, the United States may, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, suspend the obligation in whole or in part or withdraw or modify the concession. The increase in imports referred to in this clause means that imports must have increased relative to domestic production.

Under Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, the Tariff Commission is vested with jurisdiction to make investigations as to whether the escape clause should be invoked, and if it finds that action is necessary to protect domestic producers from serious injury or the threat of such injury the Commission must recommend appropriate action to the President.

The other provision of the general agreement especially pertinent to the protection of agricultural producers is found in article XI, paragraph 2 (c). Article XI contains a general prohibition of import quotas. However, paragraph 2 (c) establishes an exception under which import quotas may be imposed on agricultural products if they are necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which restrict the quantities of like domestic products permitted to be marketed or produced. Paragraph 2 (c) also permits import quotas which are necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures for the removal of temporary surpluses of like domestic products by making the surpluses available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level. Quotas imposed to enforce crop-restriction programs referred to above must not reduce the total of imports relative to the total of domestic production as compared with the proportion which might reasonably be expected to rule in the absence of restrictions, and in determining this proportion due regard must be paid to the proportion prevailing during a previous representative period and to any special factor which may have affected or may be affecting the trade in the product. Quotas imposed in connection with surplus-removal programs may be as restrictive of imports as is necessary to the enforcement of such programs, but it should be borne in mind that such quotas are applicable only with respect to the removal of temporary surpluses.

There are enclosed a copy each of Executive Order 10082, the Tariff Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and Procedure and Criteria With Respect to the Administration of the "Escape Clause" in Trade Agreements. Paragraph 13 of the Executive order and part 207 of the Commission's rules (beginning on p. 16 thereof) relate to investigations under the escape clause. There is also enclosed a copy of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948. This section authorizes the President to control imports in conjunction with domestic agricultural programs.

If we can supply further information, we shall be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

Development of Recreational Facilities by the Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 Congress authorized and directed the Corps of Engineers to provide public recreational facilities at Federal reservoirs constructed and operated by the corps for the purposes of flood control and navigation. Too little is known about the program by the public generally. There appeared in the August issue of the magazine Hunting and Fishing a letter written by Lt. Col. H. C. Gee, of the Corps of Engineers, which is a résumé of the developments and activities to date under the authorized program. According to my information, it is the only official statement for general publication that has been issued by any representative of the corps on this subject. The program has produced more results in terms of land and water areas made available to the public than any other similar program sponsored by the Federal Government. This is only the beginning. I confidently expect that some day the public will realize the full importance of the recreational aspects of the rivers and harbors flood-control programs.

I believe the information contained in Colonel Gee's letter will prove to be of considerable interest to a large number of the Congressmen.

The letter follows:

A recent amendment to the legislation which created the War Assets Administration has the effect of authorizing the Secretary of Interior to transfer surplus federally owned lands to the States for use as game preserves and public hunting areas provided these facilities are operated for the benefit of the general public. There have been expressions of disappointment in most of the sportsmen's magazines because of the long delay in the transfer of surplus Federal lands under the above-mentioned legislation. Some editors point out that an aroused public opinion has finally produced the first indication of action under this new law. I feel obliged to call the attention of all fair-minded sportsmen to a program which has been making Federal land available to the public for hunting and fishing since 1944.

In 1944 Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to provide recreational facilities for the use of the general public at Federal reservoirs operated by the corps in the interests of flood control and navigation. In the 4½ years since the passage of that act, which has gone practically unnoticed by many conservationists, significant progress has been made. At present there are 91 Federal reservations surrounding reservoirs constructed for flood control or navigation in 27 States where hunters and fishermen have access to over 1,200,000 acres of land and water.

These areas are carefully managed Federal reservations where the best techniques of fish and game management are producing encouraging results. The management is not exclusively a Federal task, but has been organized to utilize fully the facilities of State and local conservation organizations. Where State conservation agencies have demonstrated their ability and willingness to assume the major part of the management job they have been given greater responsibility in the program. The results speak for themselves.

Public use of reservoir areas maintained and operated by the Corps of Engineers has increased rapidly since the war. It is estimated that approximately 6,000,000 persons visit these areas annually for recreation. A large part of these visitors are attracted to the areas for fishing and hunting. At a single reservoir over 1,500,000 pounds of fish were caught last year. New feeding and nesting areas for migratory waterfowl have been provided and are actually being used by flights of ducks and geese. The program is only well started. With the full cooperation of sportsmen throughout the country it holds great promise for significant improvement of our fish and wildlife resources.

This program has grown quietly and according to well-laid plans. It has advanced rapidly in some areas and more slowly in others. Even while this program has been

in the making, the Corps of Engineers has been subjected to much destructive criticism by individuals and organizations interested in conservation. I am glad to say that the results of our efforts are rapidly changing our former critics into willing supporters and coworkers throughout the country. It has been and will continue to be the objective of the Corps of Engineers in its civil-works program, to improve the fish and wildlife resources of this country wherever and whenever possible.

Lt. Col. H. C. GEE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Atom Bomb: 1945 Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Chalmers M. Roberts entitled "A Look at the Record of First Atom Bombing," which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, October 16, which I respectfully submit should be considered must reading for our high-ranking military leaders. I call their attention to the fact this article deals with the 1945 model.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD OF FIRST ATOM BOMBING
(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

"Contrary to popular opinion, the effect of the atom bomb, while completely devastating in the immediate vicinity of its burst, is rather limited in its area of destruction.

"You could stand in the open at one end of the north-south runway at the Washington National Airport, with no more protection than the clothes you now have on, and have an atom bomb explode at the other end of the runway without serious injury to you."—Navy Commander Eugene Tatom before the House Armed Services Committee.

Is the bomb just another kind of high explosive and not the terrifying weapon of mass devastation the American public has come to think it is?

There is a record that can be examined, the record of what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki when the only bombs yet used in war were exploded.

To those Americans, including this reporter, who have wandered through the shattered streets of the two Japanese cities, the Navy officer's statement seems an incredible minimization of the bomb's effect.

Forgetting the fact that bombs may be set off under water with a resultant deadly cloud of radio-active mist; forgetting that the newest bombs are reputedly far more powerful than those used on Japan; forgetting the argument over the moral rightness of using a bomb on civilians, let's look at the record:

Said the United States Strategic Bombing Survey report on the Hiroshima bomb:

"The impact of the atomic bomb shattered the normal fabric of community life and disrupted the organizations for handling the disaster.

"In the 30 percent of the population killed and the additional 30 percent seriously injured were included corresponding proportions of the civic authorities and rescue groups * * *.

"The bulk of the dehoused population found refuge in the surrounding countryside; within the city the food supply was short and shelter virtually nonexistent."

FEW HEALERS SURVIVED

Just what did the bomb do to Hiroshima's key facilities? Listen to the record:

Doctors: Of some 200 doctors, more than 90 percent were casualties. A month after the bomb, only 30 physicians were able to perform their normal duties.

Nurses: Out of 1,780 nurses in the city, 1,654 were killed or injured.

Hospitals: Only 3 out of 45 civilian hospitals could be used and two large army hospitals were made unusable. Those within 3,000 feet of the point over which the bomb exploded were totally destroyed, with a mortality rate among occupants of "practically" 100 percent. Two large hospitals 4,900 feet away (the Washington airport runway is 6,840 feet) from the blast remained intact, "but there was such severe interior damage that neither was able to resume operation as a hospital for some time and the casualty rate was approximately 90 percent, due primarily to falling plaster, flying glass, and fire. Hospitals and clinics beyond 7,000 feet, though often remaining standing, were badly damaged and contained many casualties from flying glass or other missiles."

Fire department: Most of the fire-fighting equipment never got out of the fire houses. Only 16 pieces were available for use, 3 of them borrowed.

Water: The main reservoir nearly 2 miles from the blast center was undamaged. Blast effects and fire, however, caused 70,000 breaks of pipe connections in buildings and dwellings. No subsurface pipes were broken but pressure fell to zero in the city center because of the connecting breaks and damage to mains where they crossed bridges.

Transportation: Streetcars, trucks, and railroad rolling stock suffered "extensive" damage. Streets were so filled with rubble that trolleys could not operate, and overhead wiring was down.

Electric power: The transmission and distribution system was "wrecked." Only power equipment of rugged construction, such as transformers, resisted the blast and heat. Instruments, switches, cables, and other equipment was made "unusable."

Telephones: The system was approximately 80 percent damaged and no service was restored for about 10 days.

Industry: Industry in the center of the city was "effectively wiped out," but the larger plants, located on the outskirts, suffered, with one exception, only superficial damage. "Since electric power was available and materials and working force were not destroyed, plants ordinarily responsible for nearly three-fourths of Hiroshima's industrial production could have resumed normal operation within 30 days of the attack had the war continued."

HILLS SAVED SOME

At Nagasaki the bomb was more powerful but the terrain offered more protection. Those lucky enough to be behind the many hills were safe. But:

More than 80 percent of the city's hospital beds and the medical college were within 3,000 feet of the center of the explosion and were completely destroyed. Of 850 medical students, 600 were killed and most of the others injured.

Both city gas plants were destroyed; there were thousands of small water-line breaks; electric power was effectively destroyed in the areas of heaviest destruction but power could be supplied to the other parts of the city almost immediately.

Railroad rails buckled at distances of 5,000 to 7,500 feet from the blast at points where burning debris set fire to wooden cross ties. The electric-signal system was severely damaged.

Only 3 of 115 streetcar repairmen lived.

The wounded had to be moved by hand stretchers, so great was the debris in the streets.

At Nagasaki, the blast effect of the bomb was striking: "Concrete buildings had their sides facing the blast stove in like boxes. Long lines of steel-framed factory sheds, over a mile from the center of the blast leaned their skeletons away from the explosion. Blast resistant objects such as telephone poles leaned away from the center of the explosion; on the surrounding hills trees were blown down within considerable areas. Although there was no general fire, as at Hiroshima, fires contributed to the total damage in nearly all concrete structures."

FIRE AT 10,000 FEET

Another report on the bomb and Japan, made by the Army's Manhattan Engineer District, which developed the weapon, reports on the effect at various distances from the point (called X) over which the bombs exploded in the air:

In both cities, mass distortion of large steel buildings occurred out to 4,500 feet from X.

In Hiroshima, multistoried brick buildings suffered structural damage up to 6,600 feet and in Nagasaki up to 6,500 feet (that Washington Airport runway is 6,840 feet).

Flash ignition of dry, combustible material was observed as far as 6,400 feet from X in Hiroshima and in Nagasaki as far as 10,000 feet. Nagasaki hillsides were scorched by the bomb's flash heat as far as 8,000 feet from X.

In Nagasaki, very heavy plaster damage occurred in buildings up to 9,000 feet, moderate damage as far as 12,000 feet, and light damage up to 15,000 feet. Very heavy damage to window frames and doors occurred up to 8,000 feet with light damage up to 12,000 feet.

Although the sources of many fires were difficult to trace accurately, it is believed that fires were started by primary heat radiation as far as 15,000 feet from X.

The actual collapse of buildings was observed at the extreme range of 23,000 feet from X in Nagasaki.

Complete window damage occurred only up to 12,000 feet but some window damage occurred up to 40,000 feet and actual breakage of glass occurred up to 60,000 feet—more than 10 miles from the point of explosion.

American cities are, of course, more substantially built than Japanese. Russian cities certainly are closer to the Japanese style, with large numbers of wooden buildings. All cities generally have fairly well concentrated medical, utility, and other public services necessary to cope with bomb damage.

Americans for Democratic Action Supports Move for Effective World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Honorable Charles M. LaFollette, a former Member of Congress and now director of the Americans for Democratic Action, which he made before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of H. R. 64:

The Americans for Democratic Action support H. R. 64 as the necessary eventual development of the United Nations. We support H. R. 64 because it realistically takes account of the necessity for moving with caution to avoid disrupting the UN and

because H. R. 64 specifically provides that any such world federation would be open to all nations.

ADA has consistently supported the efforts of the United Nations and zealously opposes any move that might endanger the great values already created by that organization.

Some resolutions labeled as plans for world alliance recommend an immediate elimination of the veto power in the Security Council and the establishment of an international police force. Such a precipitate move at this time would seem sure to destroy the United Nations.

In the Security Council as now composed the Russians and their satellites are outvoted on almost every issue. Any move to eliminate the veto would almost certainly cause the withdrawal of the eastern powers from the United Nations. We cannot afford to destroy the only organization that at present holds the world community together.

The so-called Culbertson resolution advocates the establishment of a military force recruited from the small nations to be stationed in western Germany. Such a move might well drive the world to the brink of atomic war.

In a world that hangs perilously near violent conflict we must move with patience and caution. The sponsors of H. R. 64 appear to be thoroughly cognizant of that vital fact. The establishment of enforceable international law is the only hope of order and justice in a troubled world. The task is difficult, but the alternative is too terrible to contemplate. To achieve this end we must begin now with a clear statement of purpose. If the United States makes it irrevocably clear to all other nations that our aim is to support the United Nations and develop it into a world federation with adequate power to preserve peace, we shall arm ourselves and the cause of freedom with renewed faith and renewed vigor. If we pursue this objective resolutely but with patience and tact, we shall find support among the peoples of the entire world.

In our changing times no political institution can stand still. We must develop techniques commensurate with the changing world. It is with this in mind that we feel that the UN must move forward, slowly perhaps, but firmly. H. R. 64 offers an opportunity to take the first all-important step without limiting our freedom of action as to method and procedure.

The Late Honorable Richard J. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the majority leader of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], to present for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some very beautiful verses written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Whippany, N. J., and dedicated to the memory of our late colleague, Hon. Richard J. Welch, of California:

All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies.—Psalms 25: 10.

CONGRESSMAN RICHARD J. WELCH

The Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH has passed on,
To reap his most richly deserved reward,
Into the fair land of perpetual dawn,
Where all things together work in sweet accord.
The life that he lived upon earth fitted him
For citizenship with the angels above,
Where love never dies and where lights never dim,
In heaven's sweet city of brotherly love.
The Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH had no foes,
But every acquaintance of his was his friend,
And all those who knew him, down to his life's close,
Loved him, for on him they could always depend.
With all his great heart, to his church and his State,
And his friends and neighbors, he ever proved true—
He lived by the Golden Rule—this made him great—
"To others do as ye'd have them do to you."
The Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH loved to live
In these days of struggle, of strain, and of strife—
The best that he had he was happy to give
That others might reach their objectives in life.
He's gone from the earth, but he will ever be
Revered by his friends till they're gone, every one—
He's laid by his tasks and his labors, that he
May be recompensed for the good he has done.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building:
Urge support of Anderson bill with amendment providing carrying over allowance of 10 percent in determining normal and providing quotas be not invoked until supply reaches 120 percent normal.

WARREN O'HARA,
Director, Department of Education, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge support Anderson farm bill amend to provide carry-over allowance of 10 percent in determining normal and that quotas be not invoked until supply reaches 120 percent of normal.

HASSIL E. SCHENECK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge support of Anderson bill amended to read 10 percent above estimated domestic consumption and exports to determine normal. Marketing quotas not to be invoked until 120 percent of normal supply is reached.

GEORGE H. HARVEY,
Director of Research, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 18, 1949.*
EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives:
Indiana farmers expect economically sound, flexible, permanent, long-range farm price-support program from this session. Please push Anderson bill now in conference committee amended to define "normal supply" as sum of estimated domestic consumption and exports plus 10 percent carry-over, and that marketing quotas not be invoked until 120 percent of normal supply is reached.

GLENN W. SAMPLE,
Editor, the Hoosier Farmer Magazine.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 18, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building:
Urge passage of Anderson bill with amendment to read 10 percent above consumption and exports in determining normal and that quotas not be invoked until 120 percent of normal supply is reached.

Mrs. RUSSELL CUSHMAN,
State Chairman, S. and E. Department, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge your support Anderson bill when amended to read 10 percent above consumption and exports to determine normal marketing quotas to be invoked only after 120 percent of normal is reached.

Mrs. PAUL FLINN,
Director, Farm and Home Safety, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

RISING SUN, IND., *October 18, 1949.*
Congressman EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives:
Support Anderson bill as amended normal supply meaning domestic consumption plus exports plus 10 percent carry-over marketing quotas beginning at 120 percent.

GEORGE W. ELLIOTT.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge support Anderson bill amended to permit carry-over allowance 10 percent to determine normal. Quotas not be evoked until supply is 120 percent of normal.

C. K. WHISTLER,
Director, Livestock Marketing Department, and a Farmer, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge support of Anderson farm bill amended to provide carry-over allowance of 10 percent in determining normal and that quotas be not involved until supply reaches 120 percent of normal.

ANSON S. THOMAS,
Director, Tax and Legislative Department, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.; also an Active Farmer.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge passage of Anderson bill with amendment to read 10 percent above consumption and exports in determining normal and that

quotas not be invoked until 120 percent of normal supply is reached.

PAUL NORRIS,
Assistant Organization Director, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *October 17, 1949.*
EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Respectfully request your support Anderson farm bill with amendments to provide: First, set carry-over allowances at 10 percent in determining normal requirements; second, no quotas invoked until supply reaches 120 percent of normal.

LARRY BRANDON,
Secretary, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Federal Taxation and the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk regarding economy in Government. I think it is time that more than lip-service be given this idea by providing a program of action to bring about a reduction in the heavy burden now being borne by the American people. I would, therefore, like to submit the attached editorial which appeared in the October 12 issue of the Allentown (Pa.) Chronicle and News on this subject:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS—NO GREATER PERIL

We have just read a revealing analysis of Federal internal-revenue collections showing that the Government's "take" from the pocketbooks of the American people last year averaged $1,073 per family. In the Middle Atlantic States, including Pennsylvania, it was $1,555, highest in the Nation.

The significance of the figures concerns every citizen of the Lehigh Valley.

They appear in The New England Letter, published by the First National Bank of Boston, and reminds us that the Government has no magic source of income, but must depend upon tax revenue collected from all parts of the country.

Total taxes paid by the people of all the States and Territories equal the aggregate amount of income of the United States Treasury except in case of deficit periods.

So staggering is the amount of money spent by the Federal Government that few persons can have any conception of its magnitude.

The figures carry more meaning when it is pointed out that for the year 1948 Federal internal-revenue collections, which totaled $42,302,864,000, were equal to all the wages and salaries of the 15,000,000 workers employed in all the factories and mines of the country.

State and local receipts for 1948 exceeded $17,000,000,000. This is nearly the equivalent of the wages and salaries of 6,000,000 more workers.

It would take the wages and salaries of 40 percent of all persons engaged in gainful non-Government pursuits to pay all the bills of Government.

Yet, as the letter says, the illusion still prevails that the Government has some mysterious mean of providing an unlimited source of funds.

Our margin of safety is critically narrow. Taxes have been taking one-fourth of the national income in the boom period. The proportion would rise sharply if the annual income should undergo even a moderate decline.

Our Federal debt of $250,000,000,000, or $6,297 per family, is a mortgage on future income. Notwithstanding this situation, additional commitments are being recommended under the administration's program.

The American people in every section of the country "as a matter of enlightened self-interest" should, as the letter urges, join in the crucial battle for the preservation of the solvency of this Nation, for upon this depends not only the survival of free enterprise and the democratic form of government, but also the hope of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Their welfare has never been threatened by a greater nor more sinister peril.

United States and Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a recent letter from the Department of State, which purports to set forth the attitude of our Government in regard to the question of the partition of Ireland. The State Department letter, dated August 26, 1949, was in reply to a letter of inquiry addressed to the President by Miss Delia M. Siegfried, the treasurer of the American Friends of Ireland, Seattle, Wash.

The text of the State Department letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 26, 1949.

MY DEAR MISS SIEGFRIED: By reference from the White House, I have received your letter of July 14, 1949, addressed to the President concerning the partition in Ireland.

It is the position of the Department of State that this is a matter that can be discussed authoritatively only by the two governments concerned, Ireland and the United Kingdom. It has been and remains the considered view of this Government that the constitutional relationship between Ireland and Northern Ireland, a part of the United Kingdom, is a matter which must be determined by these two governments and is not a problem with which the United States might properly concern itself.

It is our understanding that the Ireland Act of 1949 passed by the British Parliament merely recognized that Ireland, having passed the Republic of Ireland Act in their Dail, had severed her allegiance to the British Crown. It is felt that neither the Republic of Ireland Act nor the subsequent Ireland Act of 1949 affected the status of Northern Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom which dates from the Government of Ireland Act of 1920 and has been legally reasserted by both parties through the Anglo-Irish Treaty of December 6, 1921, and the Anglo-Irish financial settlement of 1925.

The Atlantic Pact is not concerned with the problem of the existing frontier between Ireland and Northern Ireland nor with their constitutional relationships. It is, therefore, felt that the Atlantic Pact would not prevent a legal solution of these issues.

Sincerely yours,
LEONARD R. COWLES, *Chief,*
Public Views and Inquiries Section,
Division of Public Liaison
(For the Secretary of State).

The second paragraph of the above letter sets forth the position of the Department of State regarding this matter. It says that this is a matter that can be discussed authoritatively only by the two Governments concerned, Ireland and the United Kingdom, and that it is not a problem with which the United States might properly concern itself.

If this is to be the position of our State Department, it would appear that it is directly contrary to the announced aim of our foreign policy. Repeatedly we have been told that we would endeavor in our foreign policy to give substance and reality to the principles of the United Nations Charter in an effort to preserve the democratic way of life. Long before this, President Wilson established the principle of the right of small nations to self-determination of their forms of government as a basic item in our foreign policy.

In keeping with the stand of President Wilson, the United Nations Charter states:

> The purposes of the United Nations are: * * *. To develop friendly relations among the nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

If this is a fundamental principle of our foreign policy, of what value can it be, if we are to ignore a situation which directly violates these repeated statements by asserting that such a situation is not a problem with which the United States might properly concern itself?

Two items are most important in considering the Irish question. At the outset it is most evident that the partition of Ireland was forced upon the Irish people through deceit in the negotiations which led up to the shotgun treaty of December 6, 1921. Everyone is aware of the fact that the Irish were forced to accept that treaty or else find themselves at war with Great Britain within 3 days. That was the ultimatum made to the representatives of the Irish people, for whom the choice of war would have been absolute folly and the acceptance of the treaty was but the culmination of the chicanery, falsehood, and deceit on the part of the British throughout their discussions concerning partition.

The second item to be considered is the fact that two elections had been held throughout Ireland, in both of which the candidates for Parliament clearly set forth their position regarding the complete independence of Ireland or its continuance as a part of the British Empire. The results of these elections definitely showed that 80 percent of all the voters throughout the 32 counties of all Ireland desired the complete independence of their country.

In view of these two facts, the conditions under which the treaty was forced on Ireland and the twice-expressed will of the Irish people to have complete independence, how can our Government

continue to proclaim that a part of our foreign policy is to give reality to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to preserve the right of small nations to self-determination of their own forms of government? How can we make these claims when we abrogate them completely in the case of Ireland? Of what value is our mouthing of principles if we are to find that the violation of those principles "is not a problem with which the United States might properly concern itself," as stated in the letter quoted above?

Referring to the third paragraph of the State Department letter, I insist that the Ireland Act of 1949, passed by the British Parliament, does far more than merely recognize that Ireland had severed her allegiance to the British Crown. The London Parliament in the Ireland Act clearly states that it "declares and affirms the constitutional position and territorial integrity of Northern Ireland" and also that "Northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's Dominions and of the United Kingdom." It even went further in declaring that the future of the six counties should be determined, not by the people of Ireland, not even the people of the six counties, but solely by the determination made by the members of the Belfast Parliament.

Article IV of the Atlantic Pact provides that the parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any signatory government, the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties, is threatened. Since the British Parliament has declared the territorial integrity of Northern Ireland and stated that it remains a part of the United Kingdom, certainly any effort to unite all Ireland must in the eyes of Great Britain be a matter of concern in the light of article IV of the Atlantic Pact. If Britain were to take further steps to thwart the will of the Irish people and prevent in other ways the unification of Ireland, would our State Department still feel that in spite of our foreign policy and in spite of article IV, that this would yet remain a problem with which the United States might not properly concern itself?

The final paragraph of the above letter states that the Atlantic Pact is not concerned with the problem of the existing frontier between Ireland and northern Ireland. It appears to me that any attempt to alter that boundary or to change the existing status would be clearly subject to the provisions of article IV. In fact, it is the provisions of this article which have forced Ireland to remain aloof from signing the Atlantic Pact, because to do so would in effect recognize the sovereignty of northern Ireland subject to the British Crown.

Contrary to the expressed opinion of the State Department, the Atlantic Pact is a definite threat to the elimination of the Irish border and does affect vitally the effort to unite Ireland. Of major importance to the United States is the fact that Ireland cannot join the pact because of article IV, and thereby we are left with an important segment in the European defenses forced to remain cut off and our own military planning grossly weakened due to the absence of Ireland as the northern anchor on the chain of bases protecting all of Europe in the west.

I sincerely hope that our State Department will reconsider their stated position regarding the partition of Ireland and very properly concern themselves with the solution of this problem. Our help in this matter could prove of inestimable value in restoring fully the frienship between Ireland and Britain as well as materially add to our own program of mutual defense in Europe. We should act before it is too late.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the fact that we have found it proper for our Government to concern itself with the problems of Indonesia and Palestine. Recently Senator MURRAY, of Montana, asserted on the floor of the Senate:

> We concerned ourselves—and properly so—in the affairs of Greece and other countries wherein democracy was imperiled; and we are now, at the suggestion of the President of the United States and Prime Minister Attlee, of Great Britain, seeking a peaceful solution of the problem of Kashmir on behalf of India and Pakistan.

Hence, I ask, why cannot we be concerned with the problem of partition in Ireland?

Secretary Louis Johnson Is a Guy With a Green Thumb, Although Few Except His Most Intimates Know It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was today in receipt of a letter from our great and our good friend, C. C. "Colonel" Hanson, executive secretary, Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

There is no man in Washington who has worked harder for the last 20 years in behalf of the cotton, the peanut, and the tobacco planters of our great country than has Col. C. C. Hanson. Colonel Hanson has written me a letter, and without further remarks I submit the same for inclusion in the RECORD.

ASSOCIATION, THE SOUTHERN COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
Memphis, Tenn., October 14, 1949.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOYKIN: For the Congress now about to adjourn sine die, I want to take the opportunity of thanking you in behalf of Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture for every help and consideration that you have afforded this writer in accomplishing and doing all things possible for the people of our great South. I want you to know that our cotton, our peanuts, and our tobacco farmers, our dairy industries, those who browse their cattle in our woodland pastures and our forests, together with all whose interests are represented here in Washington by the Association, the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture are deeply grateful to you for your help to the association through me.

This has been a troublesome, worrisome legislative session, and especially so with respect to farm legislation, and all things pertaining to the marketing and processing of our crops. I am happy that Members of the Congress will have a short respite from the arduous congressional labors to enjoy in rest and recreation.

Congressman FRANK, my secretary has just directed my attention to an article by Tris Coffin, carried on the editorial page of today's Washington Times-Herald. It is a beautiful story, written about the humanities of your great and long-time, good friend, the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense.

Like yourself, Louis Johnson is a man who believes that agriculture is the basic industry of our American life.

Like yourself, Secretary Johnson believes that as long as our American agriculture is prosperous, America will be prosperous.

Like yourself, he believes that the American farmer is entitled to an American parity price for the products of his soil and his toil—and moreover, that he is entitled to the American markets here in these United States.

It is no happenstance that this great American leader, today "The Watchdog of the Treasury"—"The Man With the Green Thumb" was born and reared on the Mason and Dixon's line, and knows the problems of our cotton, peanut, and tobacco, and truck crop farmers equally as well as he does the agricultural problems which confront the Mississippi Valley Corn Belt, as well as those who cultivate the soil and feed their cattle on the plains of Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. Indeed, he is among the few men in America who understand the problems of the American farmer.

Believe me, Congressman BOYKIN, were it not for men like Louis Johnson and your good self, who have wrested the overburden from my shoulders, my task here in Washington would have sometimes seemed insurmountable.

Because of the beautiful thoughts expressed by the nationally known columnist about your friend—by Tris Coffin—I am attaching hereto his article from the Daybook as published in the Times-Herald.

With every best thought to you, believe me, I am

Sincerely,

C. C. HANSON,
Executive Secretary.

THE DAYBOOK
(By Tris Coffin)

In the quiet week ends, a tall, erect man with keen eyes and a determined chin steps gratefully from a limousine. His eyes soften as he looks at the familiar setting—the beautiful old trees whose bright, autumn leaves scatter on the lawn and the rows of flowers.

Without stopping to go into the house, he will wander through the garden for an hour or two lost in the world of soil and seed.

This is the tough man of the administration, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. He's the fellow whose unyielding drive forced the three balky mules—Army, Navy, and Air Force—into a team. He's a man of steel who meets long hours and grinding pressures with a grin. The same job drove James Forrestal into a despairing loneliness and suicide.

Louis Johnson's secret is his hobby, gardening. He is a guy with a green thumb, although few except his intimates know it. To a writer for the magazine Flower Grower, Secretary Johnson said almost shyly in his quiet voice, "The first money I ever made was from selling string beans I'd grown. I've been a gardener since I was a kid."

The garden is 200 miles from the Capital in Clarksburg, W. Va., the Secretary's home. He has not moved his family to Washington but returns almost every week end to the tranquillity of home and garden.

He plunges into his gardening activities with the same vigor and eye for detail that

characterize his official life. Throughout the week end he makes careful notes about his gardens. On Monday mornings, he dictates meticulous orders and memos about the garden.

The casual visitor to Secretary Johnson's pleasant, old-fashioned home in Clarksburg is loaded down with flowers or "starts." He has a magnificent array of trees, bushes, flowers, ferns, and hedges—all part of his landscaping plan.

The slopes are bright with rhododendrons and azaleas around a giant beech. Native hemlocks follow the driveway. Thirty dogwoods are scattered over the lawns. Wild flowers of every kind native to this area are almost a carpet. He has his own herb garden and lily pond.

In a greenhouse, he grows everything from grapes to orchids. Another side of the hobby is the squirrels frisking in the trees. There are the usual brown and grey ones, the rare white squirrels, and some jet black brothers given him by the Governor of Mississippi.

Legislation and Plans Relating to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government Approved by the Eighty-first Congress, First Session, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, often referred to as the Hoover Commission, was created by act of Congress in 1947. It was a bipartisan mixed commission composed of 12 members appointed, four each, by the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This Commission worked about 18 months and spent approximately $2,000,000. To carry on its work, it enlisted the aid of outstanding citizens and consultants in many fields, from all parts of the country, organizing 23 task forces. The research was carried on in some cases by a specially recruited staff; in others by organizations specializing in particular fields who worked under contract. The result was a series of 18 subject-matter reports and a concluding or summary report, including, in all, more than 300 specific recommendations.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress has made an excellent beginning in enacting these recommendations into law. It is estimated that between 20 and 25 percent of the total number of recommendations have been approved by legislation, by executive action, or by reorganization plan. Some of them, like the Holifield Act, which created the new General Services Administration, and the Tydings Act, which provided for the unification of the armed services, should make possible financial savings in very substantial amounts over the years.

As already indicated, the recommendations of the Commission may be made effective in any one of three ways. Some of them relate to matters that can be handled by executive action without legislation. Others can be handled only by legislation enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. Still others may be made effective by reorganization plans. The Reorganization Act of 1949, like similar pieces of legislation in the past, authorized the President to submit reorganization plans which become effective in 60 days unless disapproved by either the House or the Senate. All three of these methods have been used during the current year.

The measures adopted during the first session include eight major pieces of legislation and six reorganization plans, as indicated in the accompanying table, the headings of which will be used in the discussion which follows. Together, these actions affect nine different principal functions or agencies of the Federal Government. There are, of course, numerous bills still pending. Two reorganization plans did not become effective. Plan No. 1, which would have transformed the Federal Security Agency into a Department of Welfare, with Cabinet status, was disapproved in the Senate. Plan No. 8 was submitted while the armed services unification bill was under consideration by the Congress; since the provisions of the plan and of the bill as passed were substantially similar, there was no need for the plan once the bill became law.

COMMERCE

Reorganization Plan No. 7 provided for the transfer of the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Administration to the Department of Commerce, thereby carrying out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. There were three major reasons advanced in support of this change: The fact that the Department of Commerce is charged by its organic law with the responsibility for promoting transportation; the fact that the General Services Administration would have been handicapped in the servicing of executive departments and agencies by the responsibility for the performance of an irrelevant function; and the fact that neither the Federal Works Agency which had previously had supervision of the Public Roads Administration, nor its successor, the General Services Administration, were major Federal agencies for construction activities or for the administration of grant-in-aid programs affecting State and local governments.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Public Law No. 73, enacted May 26, 1949, strengthens the staff of the Secretary of State and prepares the way for integration of the Foreign Service and other personnel in the State Department, in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT

The Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law No. 109, enacted June 20, 1949, directs the President to prepare and transmit to the Congress reorganization plans by which agencies may be regrouped coordinated, consolidated, or otherwise altered—with certain limitations—to promote economical and efficient operation. This basic enabling legislation permits the exercise of Presidential initiative in reorganization activities; under it, plans may be submitted by the President at any time when Congress is in session, up to April 1, 1953, and each such plan will have the effect of law after 60 days unless a constitutional majority in either House of the Congress disapproves.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 was designed to improve the staff assistance to the President by transferring the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President. The first of these agencies assesses and appraises the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States from a national security point of view, and considers policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies concerned with national security, while the latter was established to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. As President Truman stated when he submitted this plan to the Congress, it is highly desirable that these agencies created for the purpose of advising and assisting the President in his work should be located in the Executive Office of the President—as the Hoover Commission recommended.

GENERAL SERVICES

The Holifield Act, Public Law 152, enacted June 30, 1949, establishes in the executive branch of the Government an agency called the General Services Administration—again in accordance with a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This law, known as the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, deals with the housekeeping functions of the Federal Government, including the purchase, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of official records, the management of buildings, and performing of other internal services, all of which are now for the first time brought together under one central management. The new agency absorbed a number of previously existing organizations—the War Assets Administration, the Federal Works Agency, the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Office of Contract Settlement, and the National Archives. These agencies had been widely scattered, some previously enjoying an independent status, others attached to one or another of the executive departments and agencies.

LABOR

Reorganization Plan No. 2 was intended to strengthen the Department of Labor by transferring to it two, if not three, major labor programs—the administration of the public employment offices, of the unemployment compensation system, and of the veterans' placement program. The Bureau of Employment Security is responsible for the first of these functions, while the second was already in the Department of Labor. The transfer of this Bureau, long located in the Federal Security Agency, brings together in the Department of Labor two closely related functions, neither of which—by common agreement—can be fully and effectively administered except in cooperation with the other.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Two important laws were enacted relating to the Department of National Defense. The first of these, Public Law No. 36, provides for the office of Under Secretary of Defense as a first step toward a better organization of the armed forces. This is in line with the general Hoover Commission recommendation that there be an under secretary in all departments, to function in the place of the head of the department when the latter is absent, and to assist him when he is present in the handling of the vast quantity of administrative detail which always enters in the office of the head of a department or agency.

Another act, Public Law No. 216, changed the designation of the National Military Establishment to the Department of Defense, and toward the end that unification of the services might in fact become a reality, to clarify and strengthen the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense, giving him full control over the organization and administration of the Department and authorizing him to delegate authority to subordinates. Included in this legislation were important provisions designed to improve the budgetary and fiscal practices of the armed services.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Three important actions were taken relating to personnel management. The first of these was the enactment, very early in the session, of legislation designed to increase the salaries of the top executive officials; this was followed late in the session by a complete revision of the Classification Act of 1923, providing increases in salaries for most Federal employees. Still other pay legislation was adopted during the session, one measure applying to the armed services, another to postal employees.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 made effective another important Hoover Commission recommendation—namely, that in Federal administrative boards and commissions, the chairman should be vested with executive and administrative responsibility. This step should result in a significant improvement in administration without interfering in any way with the bipartisan character of these boards when dealing with regulatory problems of a judicial or quasi judicial nature. This particular plan provides that the President shall from time to time designate one of the Civil Service Commissioners as presiding head of the Commission with the title of Chairman. The Chairman shall, in turn, appoint an executive director under the classified civil service. The old titles of President of the United States Civil Service Commission, Secretary of the Commission, and Executive Director, and Chief Examiner were abolished.

POST OFFICE

In addition to the postal-salary bill, the Congress enacted Public Law No. 91, providing for a research and development program in the Post Office Department. This, too, is in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. The post office is a business undertaking of gigantic proportions. Its methods of operation have not kept pace with its own requirements; it has usually operated with a deficit. This legislation will make possible the development of new methods and procedures which should, in time, greatly improve the efficiency of the service and enable it to operate on a sound financial basis.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 represents one more step in the direction of centering of authority and responsibility in the head of a department or agency. This plan transferred to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate officers and agencies of the Post Office Department and authorized him to delegate appropriate functions to subordinate officers within his organization.

REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Reorganization Plan No. 6, based upon the same principle of centralizing authority and responsibility, applied the Hoover Commission recommendation to still another agency—the United States Maritime Commission. The plan makes the Chairman of the Commission the executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vests in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel, as well as for the supervision and direction of the activities of such personnel. This plan had also the effect of restoring an arrangement that had existed from 1942 to the end of the war when, under the First War Powers Act, the Chairman of the Commission had been vested with this authority.

CONCLUSIONS

Many other bills relating to Hoover Commission recommendations have been introduced in this session. Some are well along on the way to enactment and will doubtless be approved during the second session of this Congress. Other important questions are now being studied, with a view to the drafting of new legislation. At the White House studies are under way which will, in all probability, result in the submission of a number of reorganization plans during the second session. Thus one may safely predict that the process of executive reorganization, well begun during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, will be carried much further during the second session.

In any consideration of reorganization, however brief, it seems to me important to bear in mind some of the basic concepts. In a government as large as ours, reorganization is a huge undertaking. It was not finished in this session, nor will it be in the next, for it is necessarily a continuous and never-ending task. The primary goal is efficient organization and administration of the public service. Reorganization will produce economy in Government—which we all desire—but more important still, it will provide more efficient service to the public. It is my firm conviction that the public is willing to pay for the public services which it desires, if it believes that they will be competently and efficiently administered.

As we continue with the effort to achieve greater economy and efficiency in the Federal service through reorganization, all of the important recommendations of the Hoover Commission will, in time, be examined and analyzed. Since there seems to be a disposition on the part of some to regard each Hoover Commission recommendation as a mandate which must be carried out exactly as presented, I want to take this opportunity of saying that I do not so interpret these recommendations. I respect the Commission and the individual Commission members, but I recall that there were numerous and serious differences of opinion among them on many important questions, and that these questions are themselves of such a nature as to be constantly changing. I therefore regard these recommendations as suggestions for study and analysis, as aids in our efforts to accomplish reorganization, not as mandates to be accepted literally on faith and without question. We will strive in the future, as we have in the past, to adopt those measures best suited to the conditions and circumstances confronting the Nation, and the executive departments and agencies of the Government in their day-to-day operations.

Legislation and plans relating to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government approved by the 81st Cong., 1st sess., 1949

Subject of report	Legislation	Reorganization plans
Commerce, Department of		Reorganization Plan No. 7, transferring Public Roads Administration from General Services Administration.
Foreign affairs	Strengthened and improved the organization of the Department of State. (Public Law 73).	
General management	Reorganization Act of 1949 facilitates task of executive reorganization (Public Law 109).	Reorganization Plan No. 4, transferring National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.
General services	Holifield Act established new General Services Administration, (Public Law 152).	
Labor, Department of		Reorganization Plan No. 2, transferring Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency.
National defense	Created much needed Under Secretary of Defense (Public Law 36). Tydings Act made important improvements in organizational and financial and budgetary procedures of the Department of National Defense (Public Law 216).	
Personnel management	Increased salaries of top executive officials (Public Law 2). Rewrote Classification Act and provided increased salaries for Federal employees (in conference Oct. 18, 1949).	Reorganization Plan No. 5, placing executive responsibility in the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.
Post Office Department	Provided for a research and development program for the Department (Public Law 231).	Reorganization Plan No. 3, providing for strengthening and improving the organization of the Department.
Regulatory commissions		Reorganization Plan No. 6, placing executive responsibility in the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

"I Am Glad That Cleveland Chose the Community Fund Way To Fight the Battle for Happier, Healthier Living for Everybody—I Am Glad It Is Not Just a Few Who Provide the Services—I Am Glad That Last Year 589,633 Gave What They Could and That This Year More Will Give—That Is the Real American Way"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, somewhere, sometime, someone once said, "To be kind is to anticipate the wants and the needs of our fellow men, and in knowing these needs to provide them."

For 10 years I have sat in this House with the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Representative to the Congress from the Twenty-second District of Ohio, brushing elbows with her daily in the cloak rooms, or seated beside her on the floor of the House.

We who know Congresswoman BOLTON know her for the long, arduous hours which she spends, not alone on the important work which engrosses her on the Committee on Foreign Affairs but for the time spent in the long hearings before other major as well as minor committees, coupled with her daily attention to all bills reported to us for action.

Mr. Speaker, my father once told me that if I wanted to get a job done quickly, I should always go to a busy man, and I presume that it is because she is always helpful and busy that last week I came upon Mrs. BOLTON in the radio broadcasting room of the House making an electrical transcription by which she would launch the Nation-wide Red Feather Community Fund campaign for the school children of greater Cleveland.

It had been a particularly hard day in the House. Mrs. BOLTON had within the hour completed the presentation of a long, comprehensive report of the recent trip she had made to the British Isles and to western Europe, and a more splendid report, Mr. Speaker, was never brought before us by any single Member in the more than 20 years that I have been privileged to serve here.

Darkness had already fallen before the House had adjourned, but in the lengthening shadows of the broadcasting studio stood Mrs. BOLTON before the microphone, patiently explaining in simple, easily understandable language to these little children the beatitudes of the great Master who taught that not alone should we love one another, but that we should feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and minister to the sick.

That injunction being cut into a waxen record within the shadow of the dome of the Nation's Capitol by the gentle voice of this great American woman stirred me, to the end that I asked FRANCIS BOLTON if she would let me reduce her words to ink on paper in order that I might insert them into the RECORD of our daily proceedings, and therein let them constitute a part of the day's work done by a distinguished member of our body.

Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable to that thought that I am now asking the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my own remarks and insert into the record of our proceedings the text of a short radio talk which the Hon. FRANCIS P. BOLTON will shortly deliver to the school children of the Cleveland district in opening the annual Red Feather Community Fund campaign of that great city.

Mrs. BOLTON's statement is as follows:

Thank you, Dr. Schinnerer. I am proud, indeed, of this opportunity of opening—by way of the radio and over WBOE—the 1949 community fund campaign in the schools of Greater Cleveland.

As you know, I represent the great Twenty-second District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. My work on the all-important Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken me overseas a number of times, both during World War II and since.

On these trips I have talked with a great many people way off there who have expressed their deep gratitude for the help the people of the United States have given them.

They also, however, have often confessed that our generosity puzzles them. They just cannot understand why we here in America are always trying to help people whom we have never even seen—people who live in lands we have never visited. What is it that makes Americans so compassionate toward the needs of others they often ask?

What answer would you have given to these questions?

Why did your school send money for food, clothing, and books to schoolboys and girls abroad? Why did you and your family send packages and money to Europe—adding your own help to that given by your Government?

Some of you will answer: "It was for our relatives in the old country. It was for someone my father and mother knew—someone who is now alive because of the help that has been sent." While that is the best of reasons, it doesn't explain why the boy or girl sitting near you, and who has no relatives or friends in Europe, gave money to help people over there.

"Oh, that's easy," you say. "He was sorry for them. They needed help and he wanted to do what he could."

I think you're right. That is why your classmate helped.

Your friend felt better because he had helped—and perhaps he had a letter of thanks from a schoolboy who lived in a foreign land.

Yes, those are good reasons, and I certainly hope that you and I will continue to send help and to write letters overseas and get answers, too. They are fun.

But this is old home week, the wonderfully exciting community-fund week when this great city of ours is collecting the money needed to help our own people just around the corner.

This is the week we set aside to make sure that more and more people who are in trouble here in Greater Cleveland will be taken care of. We know we won't have thank-you letters—we don't really want them; do we?

Just feeling good inside is enough; isn't it?

Now, when I was young, Cleveland and there was no community chest. The charities were supported by a very few people and there were not too many charities. In those early days when a hospital was needed, or a home for orphans or for old people, or a neighborhood house, an individual or a church or a group of public-minded citizens built and supported it. But then the city began to grow like a mushroom. The responsible men and women sat down together and decided to try a new way to get the money needed for the hospitals, the health work, the welfare and settlement work, etc., etc. All the givers were asked if they would put their gifts into one big pot and all the charities agreed to put their needs in, too. I was one of the askers and know how exciting it was when they all agreed and our Community Chest was born.

I am glad Cleveland chose the community-fund way to fight the battle for happier, healthier living for everybody.

I'm glad it isn't just a few people who provide the services, because that would have meant we had forgotten what neighborliness means. I'm glad that last year 589,633 people gave what they could, much or little, and that every year there are more. That is the real American way.

But it isn't easy—nothing worth while ever is.

You see the red-feather agencies do their work so well that few comfortable people see the need and the suffering of which that careworn mother and her sick child on our poster are the symbol, and many people think it really isn't true. But it is all there, alas, in the shabby homes, the rented rooms, the side streets of this great industrial city. The community fund is our way of being good citizens in a free land—a way for each of us to do our part.

Let me tell you just one story—about Jimmy who needed so much done for him, poor little lad. It's a real success story.

When Jimmy was 10 a section of a very dilapidated porch he was on broke, injuring him rather terribly. Off to the hospital went Jimmy in an ambulance with the siren clearing the streets. Into a plaster cast from his waist to his toes. But in the hospital ward the other children weren't very kind. They made fun of him because he screamed at all treatments, frightened by everything. Something more than broken bones was wrong with Jimmy.

So a social worker was called in and went to see Jimmy's mother and stepfather. She soon found that Jimmy's screaming at the doctors and nurses was because he had never learned, poor lad, that people could be friendly and kind. She found that way deep inside his little soul, Jimmy was terribly lonely; he felt deserted, unwanted. Medicine for the soul is hard to find, but thanks to the red-feather agencies, Jimmy had the care of a splendid psychiatrist to help him unsnarl his feelings, and of an occupational therapist to teach him to make things with his hands as well as the hospital doctors and nurses and the understanding social worker. The best part of this story is that Jimmy doesn't need his crutches any more, and his father and mother have learned to understand him. He is no longer afraid of people. He is no longer alone in a great city.

Doesn't it make you happy to have had a part in Jimmy's happiness? Doesn't it make you feel good when you think of the boys who spend wonderful evenings in neighborhood clubs and settlement houses, and the girls who learn so much at their clubs, all of them to become better citizens because your community fund makes them possible? Isn't it wonderful to know that thousands of families are happy now because of the job you helped them get, or the advice and help they had in time of trouble, that thousands of orphans, boys and girls like you, have a chance to begin life in homelike surroundings, and that oh so many old people can live their last years in security and comfort because you gave what you could?

Doesn't it make you feel good when you think about the friendly spirit of this huge city where so many thousands of people dig into their pockets so joyously every year so

that thousands of less fortunate people can have a better chance for health and happiness?

Yes; this is an exciting, wonderful work, when Cleveland puts its great community fund over the top. Don't miss the wonder of it. Be in it.

A Threat to Health, a Threat to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous, the most vital issue confronting the American people today is the question of whether or not this Nation, with its tradition of freedom and private enterprise, its foundation of personal liberty and individual initiative, should adopt a program of national compulsory health insurance.

For some 10 years or more the bureaucratic planners in the Federal Government have been agitating for the enactment of national compulsory health insurance legislation. The ultimate outcome of this proposal will have a direct, personal effect on every American—young or old, rich or poor, regardless of occupation or political viewpoint. It is a problem that concerns our own health, our Nation's welfare, and the welfare of our families. That alone makes this issue of paramount importance. It is a problem that concerns the entire political, social and economic structure of one of the last great free nations on earth.

There have been introduced in Congress a number of bills which would adopt a system of political medicine which would make the doctor a mere cog in the wheel of bureaucracy. Instead of trying to preserve and expand the present system of medical care which has produced the healthiest country in the world, we are asked to adopt a plan which constitutes the most dangerous step toward ultimate regimentation of the people and the creation of a socialistic state. It means regulating our citizens from birth to death—always at the expense of our individual liberty and our freedom of action.

It is a plan for Government control and direction of our doctors, hospitals, clinics, and medical schools. It would set up a new national health agency with an advisory Federal health council under the supervision of the Social Security Administrator. No person appointed to this Federal health council can be a doctor. The final authority therefore is vested in a political appointee and council without any specialized knowledge in medicine.

It is proposed to spend millions and millions of dollars in grants to States if they in turn meet the regulations and requirements of the bureaucrats. We are at the present time spending $1,250,000,000 for health activities and there are already 44 agencies engaged in this work. One out of six persons received medical aid from the Government in 1948. How much farther can we afford to go?

The plan also provides for a completely prepaid health-insurance plan to be financed ultimately through a 3-percent pay-roll tax on the first $4,800 of annual income, split between employer and employee. The veteran is already entitled to free medical care if he needs it. Why tax him? Millions of other citizens are paying their good money into voluntary programs already. Why put this extra tax burden on them?

But the pay-roll tax will not be enough. It is then proposed that the Government make up any additional cost through annual Federal appropriations which according to the best estimates would run into billions annually.

The more I study the course of legislation and of Federal operating programs, the more I am impressed by the fact that great changes in our way of life are brought about by laws which begin modestly. They appear to be in the public interest. They do not involve vast sums or large administrative staffs. But after a few years appropriations and staffs grow to amazing proportions. Budget requirements never decline. As Senator Borah put it, "They start with a bureau but before long at the expense of the Government demand a whole set of furniture." Staffs dig in and seek to perpetuate themselves. A modest, innocuous Federal program, once thrown into a bureaucratic hopper, is certain to expand unpredictably and perhaps deleteriously. Therefore, in embarking on a whole new field of Federal action, namely, the field of personal health services for individuals, it would be well to look ahead a decade to see how much a program as the one proposed would be likely to develop.

This program would not and could not provide us free medicine, which is the frequent implication of its proponents. You cannot lift yourself by your own bootstraps. As I have indicated, it would be financed by another pay-roll tax plus huge appropriations taken from other taxes.

If the billions of dollars extracted from American taxpayers, in addition to their present tax, would mean improved medical care, that would be one thing, but a huge proportion of the cost would go to support a horde of clerks, bookkeepers, and administrators. Can you, as a taxpayer, risk such additional assault on your already reduced purchasing power? Can our national financial structure withstand such an additional tremendous strain without breaking our national economy which is already in a precarious condition with a national debt of $256,000,000,000?

The ultimate significance of a national compulsory health-insurance program means inferior medical care. For example, under the provisions of these bills one cannot even consult with a specialist unless he has the consent of a Government doctor. While he has the right to appeal, it probably would be too late.

The example I have cited would be the result in spite of the staggering costs and taxes, invasion of personal privacy, Government meddling in private medical institutions, and the stifling of scientific incentive. That has been the result wherever it has been tried.

But above all when the Government sees fit to take incentive and freedom from one group of citizens, the time will come when these same socializers will move against other groups. If doctors and dentists lose their fundamental rights, who will be next? Think it over.

An Onion by Any Other Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this article by Graham Patterson should be read by every thoughtful American. Statism is not an animal that walks down the street on stilts, but is rather a creeping, slimy doctrine that so insinuates itself in the mass mind that people do not recognize it until it becomes too late. This article may awaken the interest of those people who love liberty under law, and cause them to give their voice and their vote to those who are against this subversive doctrine.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting this article which appeared in the Pathfinder of October 19, 1949:

AN ONION BY ANY OTHER NAME

A rose by any other name is still a rose. By the same token, an onion is an onion, even though you douse it heavily with perfume. And statism is statism, whether it be labeled socialism, welfare state, or other high-sounding name.

Many people have heard the word "statism" used and wondered just what it meant. President Truman apparently does not like the word; he told a group of reporters that he had looked it up in various dictionaries and could not find a good definition for it. But the 1949 edition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines statism as the "concentration of all economic controls and economic planning in the hands of a highly centralized state government."

Is that what America wants? Is that what you want? Do you believe the state should regulate your life, tell you what to do, where to work, how to think, as in Mussolini's Italy, Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia? Or do you maintain that you are quite capable of doing your own thinking, your own planning? In short, do you believe the state should be all-supreme, with the citizens mere pawns, or that the state should be ruled by its citizens?

Many people are unaware that their freedom is being inexorably taken away from them. A few months ago, the eminent James F. Byrnes, himself a distinguished Democrat and former Secretary of State, said in an address at the bicentennial celebration of Washington and Lee University: "We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of

the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Another distinguished American, Senator JOHN FOSTER DULLES, said recently: "I believe that the trend to statism needs to be stopped now and here. Proposals which exalt the state at the expense of the individual, I shall be against."

The trend toward statism is not always apparent to many, as it is often concealed under the guise of social progress; the citizen may feel he is being given something, but what he forgets is that he gives in return his freedom of independent action. What the state does for the citizen, the citizen can no longer do for himself.

And what the citizen often fails to realize is that he never gets anything for nothing. He pays for everything he gets—in taxes. The British people know this only too well. The impractical planners of England's Socialist Party promised the voters protection "from the cradle to the grave"—but to pay for it a $40-a-week worker in England works one full week out of each month to pay his taxes. They call it "austerity"—a better word would be disillusionment. He has seen prices go up, the standard of living go down, production and quality of goods lowered. And he has seen his leaders having to ask the United States for additional funds, on top of the billions this "capitalistic" country has already given them—that they may continue their disastrous efforts to prove the state is better able to run the citizen's life than the citizen himself.

Yet, despite this evidence, there are politicians here who would like to foist this kind of government upon our people. Every thinking man and woman will resist such efforts toward statism, no matter by what high sounding name it may be called.

GRAHAM PATTERSON, *Publisher.*

Agricultural Conservation Program in Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent, has a total of 30,480 farms, most of which are small. On these farms there is a total of 1,097,105 acres of crop land. Thus, the average farm in my congressional district has approximately 36 acres of cropland.

Of the total of 30,480 farms, approximately 38 percent of them last year participated in the agricultural conservation program, administered by the Production and Marketing Administration and carried out some one or more of such conservation practices as terracing, the use of phosphate, basic slag, potash and lime, the planting of kudzu, lespedeza sericea, crotalaria, winter legumes, pastures, and forest trees, the construction of drainage ditches, and so forth.

The 38 percent of the farms in the Seventh Congressional District which participated in the agricultural conservation program in 1948, had a total cropland of 541,131 acres, of which approximately one-half had beneficial agricultural conservation practices carried out on them.

In 1948 the farms of the Seventh Congressional District that participated in the agricultural conservation program earned slightly more than one-half million dollars in payments under the program.

As a part of my remarks, I include a summary of the extent of the program in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama for the year 1948:

Summary of farms participating and payment earned under the 1948 agricultural conservation program, Seventh Congressional District, Alabama

County	Total farms	Farms reporting practices	Percent farms participating	Total cropland (acres)	Cropland on participating farms (acres)	Percent cropland on participating farms	Total payment earned
Blount	3,967	1,244	31.4	146,999	61,268	41.7	$57,817
Cullman	6,709	2,967	44.2	203,476	105,409	51.8	106,817
Fayette	2,513	975	38.8	96,327	48,804	50.7	40,707
Franklin	2,600	1,154	44.4	121,258	64,272	53.0	64,552
Lamar	2,556	1,237	48.4	98,562	60,829	61.7	51,261
Marion	3,493	1,145	32.8	122,647	53,412	43.5	58,601
Pickens	2,450	865	35.3	139,419	77,689	55.7	59,597
Walker	3,793	1,233	32.5	99,607	41,756	41.9	44,109
Winston	2,399	746	31.1	68,900	27,692	40.2	34,502
Seventh district total	30,480	11,566	37.9	1,097,105	541,131	49.3	517,963

Frederic Chopin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, through the world-wide activities which culminate this month, millions of peoples are commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Frederic Chopin, and paying their tribute to this man of humble origin whose music gives us the best example of the universality of a great art. While fundamentally rooted in and reflecting the spirit of the Polish Nation, Chopin's music transcended national boundaries, and became a part of our universal heritage. To this great genius, a commoner and a creator in the spirit of the universal brotherhood of man, I wish to pay my homage.

One hundred and thirty-nine years have passed since Chopin's birth in a humble hamlet outside of Warsaw. He became a composer and a child prodigy at the age of 7, and a musical genius, in the words of Robert Schumann, before he reached the age of 25. Although he left Poland on the eve of the uprising of 1831 to continue his studies in Austria and in Paris, his heart remained in the country of his birth and his works are an embodiment of the spirit of his people. He lifted Polish music, however, from the purely national to the universal—a feat in which lies his musical greatness. He never saw Poland again, but after his death his heart was returned to the country of his birth and enshrined in the pillar of the Church of Holy Cross in Warsaw, where it remains today.

Many countries can boast of composers whose works are cherished by their countrymen, and whose art has become a precious part of their cultural heritage. But there does not seem to be one composer whose work, by common consent, enjoys the same unique distinction as Chopin's does in Poland. For Poles, Chopin's music is truly unique, and he is one of their most beloved immortals.

Chopin has been a great inspirer of his nation. It is no accident that one of the first acts of the Nazi invaders of Poland was to ban his music completely. The Nazis seemed to agree with Robert Schumann that "Chopin's music is like cannon hidden among roses." When Chopin's music was forced underground, millions of Poles still listened to it, unmindful of danger. Such was the power of the emotions his music evoked, that he inspired a whole people in their struggle against total extermination, against their cultural annihilation.

Chopin's relation to his country and his people was aptly described by the late Ignace Paderewski, a world-famous pianist, who used these words in an address given in Krakow on the centennial of Chopin's birth:

> As great as a man may be, his greatness never surpasses that of his nation. He is but a part of that nation, a flower, a spike of corn. And the greater he is, the stronger and more beautiful, the closer he is to his country's heart * * *. But we know that his greatness is ours, that his power and beauty are those of our nation. He belongs to us, and we belong to him, for in him we find the revelation of the soul of all of us.

Although primarily a spokesman of the Polish people, Chopin became a brother to all mankind through the genius of his music. There is perhaps no other composer whose works have been so universally accepted and admired. There is hardly one among us who has not heard and been moved by Chopin's music.

In this day of world confusions, of political and economic strikes, of uncertainties, fears, suspicions, and challenges, Chopin's music falls with special significance upon our ears—it brings to us the courage of an unbroken spirit and reminds us of the indestructible vision of the truth toward which men shall always aspire: That humanity is one.

Panama Canal—William Howard Taft and the High Level Lake Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in two extensions of my remarks in the RECORD of October 13, 1949, I included two gravely important papers concerning the decision for building the high level lake type canal at Panama: A letter of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens of January 26, 1906 on page A6600, and a message to Congress of President Theodore Roosevelt of February 19, 1906 on page A6604.

A third paper of equal importance in this series is Secretary of War William Howard Taft's letter of February 19, 1906, forwarding the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers to President Roosevelt and supporting the minority report favoring the high level lake type.

As stated in my previous extensions the main points in the 1906 arguments as to the type of canal with some modifications apply today as well as then. The reiterated opinions of leading atomic warfare authorities that any type of canal would be vulnerable to the atomic bomb removes the question of vulnerability to atomic attack as a relevant factor in the consideration of this subject and reduces the issue as to the physical form of the future Panama Canal to: The Terminal Lake Plan versus The Sea Level Lock Proposal.

I urge the reading of all three of these papers. The full text of Secretary of War Taft's letter follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 19, 1906.

The PRESIDENT.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers for the Panama Canal, convened by your order of June 24, 1905, with the views of the Isthmian Canal Commission and of the chief engineer of the Canal.

The report shows that all plans heretofore proposed for a canal, with elevations varying from zero (sea level) up to 100 feet, have received careful consideration, but the Board was unable to reach a unanimous agreement. The majority of its members are in favor of a so-called sea-level canal, and the minority recommends a lock canal with a summit level 85 feet above the sea. A choice between the two must rest upon their relative advantages and disadvantages. Both the majority and minority contemplate "safe and commodious" harbors in Limon and Panama Bays. Though differing in details, such work in no way affects the type of canal, and consideration of the terminal harbors in connection therewith is here unnecessary.

The sea-level canal proposed by the majority consists of a continuous, winding waterway extending from Limon Bay to a properly-constructed dam near Panama Bay, provided with duplicate locks near Sosa Hill to overcome the difference in tidal fluctuations that exist at the two extremities of the Canal. The Canal prism has a depth of 40 feet, a minimum bottom width of 150 feet in earth and 200 feet in rock, with suitable side slopes for the former and practically vertical sides for the latter. The floods of the Chagres are controlled by a dam built at Gamboa to a height of 180 feet above sea level, provided with sluice gates for regulating the discharge, which is made through the Canal. Dams and levees exterior to the Canal are provided for diverting 5 of the 27 streams that cross the Canal line and for preventing overflows in the vicinity of Panama.

The 85-foot level Canal recommended by the minority has a dam across the valley of the Chagres River near Gatun, with a crest 135 feet above sea level and 50 feet above the normal water surface of the reservoir or inland lake that is formed. The dam is provided with sluice gates for regulating the height of water in the reservoir, thereby controlling the floods of the Chagres. From Limon Bay to this dam the channel is 500 feet wide and 41 feet deep at mean tide. The difference of level from the channel at the foot of the dam to the surface of the lake (85 feet) is overcome by duplicate flights of three locks. The total length of this waterway is 30 miles, extending from the Gatun Dam to Pedro Miguel. At Pedro Miguel duplicate locks, with one lift of 30 feet under ordinary conditions, connect the summit level with another waterway whose surface at normal stage is 55 feet above mean sea level. This waterway is created by dams placed across the valley of the Rio Grande and adjacent depressions, and extends nearly 5 miles to Sosa Hill. Descent to the channel—55 feet at mean tide—in Panama Bay is effected by duplicate flights of two locks to the west of Sosa Hill.

Under the act of June 28, 1902, Congress requires that the Canal across the Isthmus "shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as shall afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated."

This law, in effect, fixes the minimum dimensions of the locks and the width and depth of the canal prism. The high-level canal employs locks with 900 feet usable length, 95 feet width, and 40 feet depth over the miter sills, somewhat smaller than the tidal locks recommended for the sea-level type.

Two ships now building for the Cunard Line will be, when completed, the largest afloat. Each is 800 feet in length over all and 88 feet beam, with a maximum loaded draft of 38 feet. As the smaller of the proposed locks is capable of floating vessels of 25 percent greater tonnage than the new Cunarders, it is evident that the locks fully comply with the requirements imposed by Congress.

In the high-level canal, a vessel of the dimensions noted would have, with the exception of the 4.7 miles where the width is only 200 feet, ample leeway for safe navigation and good speed, without objectionable currents and without difficulties at the points where changes in course are necessary. There would also be ample depth throughout except at the approaches. It is true that the depth in the channel below the Gatun Dam is is 41 feet at mean tide (tidal range 2 feet) and in the channel, below the Sosa locks, is 45 feet at mean tide (tidal range 20 feet), but additional depths in both approaches, because of the character of the bottom, can be easily and economically secured by dredging, when demanded by the needs of commerce.

With the proposed sea-level canal conditions are different. The depth is but 2 feet greater than the draft of the ship, not sufficient to permit her to proceed under her own steam except at great risk; 21 miles of the canal is not sufficiently wide for two such ships to pass; currents caused by the regulation of the Chagres and by the flow of other streams into the canal, and its many curves, combine to increase the difficulties and dangers of navigation. In short, the sea-level canal recommended is not "of sufficient capacity and depth" to "afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest depth," and can be made so only by materially increasing the depth and width, and at a considerable increase of time and money. If the suggested width of 150 to 200 feet is the greatest width economically permissible for a sea-level canal, the cost of the enlargement required must be prohibitive.

It therefore follows that the high-level canal more fully meets the requirements of Congress.

The majority of the Board makes objection that locks are unsafe for the passage of the great seagoing vessels contemplated by the act, due to the disastrous consequences that might result if the gates are injured by vessels entering; that the lifts proposed are beyond the limit of prudent design for safe operation and administrative efficiency; that locks delay transit.

Lock navigation is not an experiment. All the locks are duplicated, thereby minimizing such dangers, and experience shows that with proper appliances and regulations the dangers are more imaginary than real. The locks proposed have lifts of about 30 feet, or less than those heretofore advocated by engineers of such high standing that the objection is believed to be not well founded. The delays due to lockages are more than offset by the greater speed at which vessels can safely navigate the lakes formed by the dams than is possible in the sea-level canal, and the arguments on this point in the minority report seem to me to be the more weighty.

The advocates of the sea-level canal express doubt as to the stability of the dams at Gatun and at La Boca, if founded on the natural soil, and advance the opinion that no such vast and doubtful experiment should be indulged in.

It appears, however, that the dams proposed are to be founded on impervious materials, thereby conforming to the views of the majority, and are to have such ample dimensions as to insure the compression of the mud and clay rather than its displacement. Furthermore, the estimates include an allowance for additional safeguards against seepage if subsequent detailed investigations show the necessity for extra precautions. The construction of earth dams to retain water 85 feet deep is not experimental, and as the dams proposed have greater mass and stability than similarly constructed dams of greater heights, it appears that the apprehensions as to the safety of the dams are unnecessary.

In the sea-level canal there are three stretches, aggregating 21 miles, out of about 43 miles between the shores of Limon Bay and Panama Bay, in which the bottom width is 150 feet; 19 miles have a bottom width of 200 feet; 1.5 miles near Panama have a width of 300 to 350 feet; the remainder, 1.5 miles near Mindi, has a bottom width of 500 feet.

Between the Gatun Dam and Sosa locks, a distance of 41 miles, the high-level canal has a minimum depth of 45 feet; for 19 miles of this distance the least bottom width is 1,000 feet; 4.7 miles have a width of 200 feet; the remaining 17.5 miles have widths varying from 300 to 800 feet.

The sea-level canal gives tortuous navigation for the greater distance through a comparatively narrow gorge in which the largest vessels cannot proceed under full headway, pass without risk, or turn about. The high-level canal, for the greater distance, gives practically lake navigation in which vessels can proceed at full speed along straight courses, pass each other without delays or risks, and can turn about, if necessary.

The high-level canal has the additional advantage of "greater safety for ships and less danger of interruption to traffic, by reason of its wider, deeper, and straighter channels."

It also follows from these considerations that quicker passage with larger traffic is possible with the high-level canal.

The estimated cost is $247,021,000 for the sea-level canal, and $139,705,200 for the 85-foot-level canal, a difference of $107,000,000. The Isthmian Canal Commission and the chief engineer regard the estimate for the sea-level canal as too low by at least $25,000,000, for reasons stated in their reports.

The advantage of less cost is greatly in favor of the 85-foot-level canal.

The estimated time for completing the sea-level canal is stated by the majority of the Board as from 12 to 13 years, the Isthmian Canal Commission and the chief engineer from 18 to 20 years. The minority report estimates the time for completing the high-level canal at 8½ years, and this is regarded as conservative by the other competent authorities.

The advantage in practical speed of construction is in favor of the high-level canal.

The cost of operation and maintenance is an important consideration, and if measured solely by annual appropriations therefor the advantage is in favor of the sea-level canal. It is believed, however, that the difference is more than offset by the interest on the additional investment in the cost of a sea-level canal.

Besides serving the needs of commerce, the canal will give the military advantage to the country of providing a route for the speedy reinforcement of the fleet on either side of the continent, and military considerations must have due weight. Either type of canal is vulnerable—the high level the more so because of the lift locks which can be easily injured. Protection must be afforded in either case. A concentration of the locks simplifies the defense, and as guards are necessary they should be of sufficient strength to reduce to a minimum the danger of injury to locks and dams.

In view of the foregoing, I recommend the adoption of the type of canal proposed by the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, except so far as relates to the location of the locks at Sosa Hill.

The suggestion that the lake formed near Panama will be unsanitary does not seem well founded, as I am advised by the medical authorities of this Department that unsanitary conditions with respect to the lake can be avoided by proper precautions.

The great objection to the locks at Sosa Hill is the possibility of their destruction by the fire from an enemy's ships. If, as has been suggested to me by officers of this Department entitled to speak with authority on military subjects, these locks may be located against and behind Sosa Hill in such a way as to use the hill as a protection against such fire, then economy would lead to the retention of this lake. The lake would be useful to commerce as a means for relieving any possible congestion in the Canal should the traffic be very great and would give, in case of need, a place for concentrating or sheltering the fleet. If, however, Sosa Hill will not afford a site with such protection, then it seems to me wiser to place the locks at Miraflores.

When I visited the Isthmus a year and a half ago and went over the site and talked with the then chief engineer, I received a strong impression that the work of construction upon which the United States was about to enter was of such world-wide importance and so likely to continue in active use for centuries to come, that it was wise for the Government not to be impatient of the time to be taken or of the treasure to be spent. It seemed to me that the sea-level canal was necessarily so much more certain to satisfy the demands of the world's commerce than a lock canal that both time and money might well be sacrificed to achieve the best form, and this feeling was emphasized by reading the very able report of the majority. But the report of the minority, in showing the actual result of the use of the locks in ship canals, in pointing out the dangers of so narrow and contracted a canal prism as that which the majority proposes, and in making clear the great additional cost in time and money of a sea-level canal, has led me to a different conclusion.

We may well concede that if we could have a sea-level canal with a prism from 300 to 400 feet wide, with the curves that must now exist reduced, it would be preferable to the plan of the minority, but the time and the cost of constructing such a canal are in effect prohibitory.

I ought not to close without inviting attention to the satisfactory character of the discussion of the two types of canal by the greatest canal engineers of the world, which insures to you and to the Congress an opportunity to consider all the arguments, pro and con, in reaching a proper conclusion.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM H. TAFT,
Secretary of War.

An Unsound Currency Is a Fraud Upon the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, devaluation is the method used by a reckless, spendthrift administration to rob the thrifty citizens of the purchasing power of their hard-earned money. It is political dishonesty. It is the initial notice of approaching national bankruptcy. The step England has taken will eventually be taken by the United States unless prevented by the sovereign voting citizenry. This creeping fraud, if permitted to run its course, will terminate in a socialistic regime inimical to every phase of individual liberty.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of October 18, 1949:

MONEY

In all of this world's affairs there is no mystery, except life itself, so fascinating as that of human behavior in the presence of money. And now that Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder has just loudly denied any project to cut the value of the United States dollar, it may be wise to do a little thinking about this mystery

GREATEST OF ALL OUR INVENTIONS

Unlike life, money is something entirely man-made, and it is the greatest of all man's many inventions. For money is the key that releases water from the rocks, moves mountains and explodes the atom.

Until he created money, man could not build a civilization after his own tastes. He was lucky to find a cave to hide in.

It is money that has lifted us from the company of apes. And money has driven us upward every step of the way, since. Yet what is money? Why is it so valuable sometimes and sometimes not?

Says the Bible, most often misquoted: "The love of money is the root of all evil."

The Bible, as usual, points to the center of the truth in the case. It is not the money that is the root of all evil but ungovernable passion for it, that "makes men weak and women bold." And so, special talents and virtues are required of those who watch over money.

We get no place in damning the wonderful powers and blessings of money for the behavior of mankind. Money has neither friends nor enemies. It thinks no more of the man who owns a lot of it than of one who has a little. It will work as hard for a new owner as for an old, for cook or king, without fear or favor.

But it will not keep company with fools. Treat it with disrespect and money leaves you.

Down through the ages, too, money has shown that character and wisdom are more important than cunning and guile, for successful use of its many-sided talents.

All these things have been proved again and again in blood and ruin for the innocent and the guilty alike, when men in power have denied them.

IT IS BETTER TO BE WISE THAN CLEVER

Right today, the human race is hard put to survive an age in which the central evil is that of politicians trying to be clever with money, rather than wise.

In 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt came to power promising economy of Government and the strictest of care in the handling of other people's money. Within 6 months he had not only begun history's most prodigious squandermania but had led Congress to repudiate a long-standing promise of the United States to pay in gold on demand.

The immorality of this default on gold was clearly defined by the Supreme Court, which said that wrong though it was, the citizen had no recourse since the Government, the other party to the contract, is our common agent for contract enforcement. When Government will not live up to its own contract, what is a law-abiding man to do about it?

Cunning with money has become the pastime of politicians the world over in our time, and has not diminished with accumulation of disasters but only grown more complicated and desperate.

THEY CANNOT BE TRUSTED

A noted American economist, Walter E. Spahr, in surveying the modern ruins of international monetary honesty, has summed up the story in one sentence:

"One of the fundamental reasons why a people must ultimately return to a metallic money standard and redeemable currency is that Government officials cannot be trusted."

The latest evidence on the subject involves, of course, the celebrated British pound sterling.

The British politicians on September 18 of this year, announced that the pound was worth $2.80 in United States paper money instead of $4.03. They called this devaluation.

Actually, of course, it is confiscation of wealth, for devalued money buys less on the day you spend it than it could have on the day you earned it.

On September 19, the United Press reported from London that a review of the record showed Sir Stafford Cripps denying 12 times in the 21 months preceding, that Britain's money would be devalued, his last lie coming just 12 days before the action of the devaluation itself.

THE LESSON FOR US ALL

So what is the lesson in it all for people who allow the value of their money to be manipulated by the politicians? It is as it has always been, that money must have a value, not only for the things the politicians say it is supposed to buy, but for what it actually is, wherever found and in any hand. It must have a value in itself. Then no man can deny its worth or meddle with the standard of its measurement.

The proved standard of money for all the world since civilization began remains a single one, gold.

When the United States again makes its paper money redeemable in gold, the politicians will lose the whip they hold over us all. Money will have a solid value in its own right and be no longer dependent on slippery conscience for its usefulness.

Power of self-government will flow back to the hands of the public. And the world will flourish.

Protest Against Soviet Oppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Louis Zubel, president, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., Detroit, Mich., together with the resolution adopted at a recent mass rally protesting Soviet oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we have been, as a Nation, morally dishonest to a great country and people—a people who were our allies during World War II. The Polish people have been used as pawns by our late President Roosevelt, as well as our Department of State, in order to appease Russia. I wish to join with our Polish friends making this protest. I concur in their recommendations.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
Detroit, Mich.

Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosed a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a mass protest rally held Sunday, September 18, 1949, at Dom Polski Hall in Detroit, Mich.

The purpose of this resolution was to reemphasize and point out the deplorable state of the Polish nation under the yoke of Soviet oppression. More poignant and bitter is the view when one realizes that a war time ally and an active partner in our global victory, had as her reward, been led off to bondage in chains.

In order that this great wrong to Poland be at least morally rectified, the rally sponsored by the combined Polish organizations had resolved that the United States Government:

1. Annul all obligations accepted in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

2. Restore to Poland the rightful position in the camp of free nations.

3. Restore full recognition of the legal Government of the Republic of Poland and her President in exile.

We feel that your commanding position in Congress and the great esteem which you hold among your colleagues would benefit greatly in any action you might undertake in this cause. You will surely merit the gratitude and thanks of all the American people as well as the democratic world.

Respectfully,

LOUIS ZUBEL, *President.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1949, AT DOM POLSKI HALL, DURING MASS RALLY PROTESTING SOVIET OPPRESSION

The illegal acts of the partnership formed among Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill against the faithful ally, Poland, against the integrity of her territory, against her rightful President and government, and against the existence of her brave army in exile which fought together with American and British forces on land, sea, and air, came to a climax with the signing of the infamous Yalta agreement.

This betrayal will be remembered in history as an appeasement of Russia. This fact will also be known as a renunciation of the costly victory, wasting the blood of our boys, as an aid to the expansion of communism in Europe and Asia, and simultaneously an increased menace from the Atlantic and Pacific against the United States of America.

The consequences of this infamy exist up to the present time.

In the coming struggle between West and East, Poland's place is in the part of the west. After Poland's huge losses of millions of victims for the cause, far in excess in comparison with other nations, we must replace Poland in the fight with our forces. We must also demand that her legal authorities regain their rights among the free nations.

Therefore, we request the United States Government:

1. Annul all obligations accepted in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

2. Restore to Poland the rightful position in the camp of free nations.

3. Restore full recognition of the legal government of the Republic of Poland and her President in exile.

LOUIS ZUBEL,
President.
ALEKSANDRA SZCZEPANIK,
Secretary.
JOHN S. DODATKO,
VALENTINE SZPARAGA,
ARTHUR F. RECLAW,
Resolution Committee.

Future of Butter and Cheese Import Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the October 15, 1949, Washington Farmletter, by Mr. Wayne Darrow:

Butter: Impact on butter can't be felt as long as United States keeps tight import restrictions, and then only to extent foreign countries have available surpluses.

If imports up to quota were permitted, 50,000,000 pounds could come in during November–March period at 7 cents a pound, duty—rest of year at 14 cents a pound. When new trade agreement goes into effect, an additional 10,000,000 pounds can enter at 7 cents during April–October period.

If and when 60,000,000 pounds are imported, it would represent about 4 percent of total United States butter consumption in 1948.

Cheese: Tariff concessions on a few foreign cheeses, chiefly Italian, will eventually have sharp effect on United States-produced Italian types. Duty is cut from 5 cents a pound and 25 percent ad valorem, to 3½ cents and 17½ percent.

United States Department of Agriculture expects United States cheese exports in 1950 to be lowest since 1940—not much larger than imports. Biggest reason is collapse of British market. Currency devaluations are also a draw-back.

It may not make sense to furnish feed and even hay to our European friends and then in addition give them our market as well.

Is it surprising that in 1949 farm values have declined, farm indebtedness has increased, farm income has and is decreasing, and that farm wages are decreasing?

Prayer for Peace Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." And in this day, when there is so much bewilderment and so much confusion, it is reassuring to have someone sound the "still calm voice of peace."

Under permission given by the House, I place in the RECORD the following article from the Washington Evening Star of October 16, 1949, which relates the spread of a remarkable movement for "peace through prayer." It is a welcome demonstration that Americans are fundamentally "God loving, God fearing, and peace-minded." This article deserves wide reading:

A daily prayer-for-peace movement is spreading across the country as the result of an American diplomat's desire to prove to the world that Americans really do believe in God and want peace.

It started less than a year ago when a group of war veterans at Manchester, N. H., resolved to stop whatever they were doing for 1 minute at noon each day to pray silently for God's help in securing "an equitable and abiding peace."

Since then at least 637 other organizations have adopted similar resolutions. Among them are the District Department of the American Legion and the Georgetown University student council. Several members of Congress have endorsed the idea.

VISA CHIEF HEADS MOVEMENT

Originator of the movement is Hervé J. L'Heureux, a veteran foreign-service officer, now chief of the State Department's Visa Division, who lives here at 5201 Thirty-eight Street NW.

A wounded veteran of World War I and one of the founders of the American Legion, Mr. L'Heureux is no pacifist. Like most Americans, he believes the United States must be prepared to fight if necessary to preserve liberty, but hates war and wants to do everything he can to establish a just peace. A devout Catholic, he has deep faith in the efficacy of prayer. He naturally prays for peace.

What he is promoting now, however, is more than the prayers of church people who pray for peace as a matter of course. He hopes people who normally give little thought to religious matters will adopt the idea of devoting 1 minute at noon each day to a silent prayer for peace.

During 10 years of service in consular posts in Europe before, during, and immediately after World War II, Mr. L'Heureux became convinced that "something tangible should be done to correct widespread mistaken impressions abroad by an unmistakable manifestation of the true character and ideals of the American people."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CLUB

He explained his idea to his fellow members of the Last Man's Club of the William H. Jutras Post of the American Legion at his home town of Manchester last October 28. He suggested the resolution which that club adopted to start the movement.

Mr. L'Heureux told them how he was disturbed by personal experiences in Europe that showed an astonishing lack of understanding abroad of the true character and purposes of the American people. European peoples generally regard Americans as materialistic and "addicted to luxurious living," he said. And he noted that this unfavorable impression is strengthened by Communist propaganda that we are imperialistic and warmongers.

He recalled an incident in southern France after the war, when as American consul general at Marseille he took part in a ceremony honoring resistance heroes. He suggested a moment's silent prayer for those who had been put to death by the Germans. Many of those present, he said, "expressed astonishment that I dared invoke the name of God without fear of consequence from my Government."

Mr. L'Heureux also recalled the surprise of a French industrialist visiting Washington when he noted that daily sessions of the Senate and House are opened with prayer.

These experiences impressed upon him the need for something out of the ordinary to demonstrate that the American people essentially are God-loving, God-fearing, and peace-minded.

AIDS MOVE IN SPARE TIME

Since the Manchester Last Man's Club adopted his daily prayer-for-peace idea, Mr. L'Heureux has been devoting most of his spare time to sending information about the movement to other organizations and business firms.

"This is not something you can ram down the throats of people," Mr. L'Heureux said. "All I am trying to do is to get the idea before as many people as possible. To be effective, it must be adopted spontaneously."

He has refused offers of financial contributions to help spread the movement. He wants no big organization and no money, no fame, no thanks for himself. His name is not mentioned at all in 5,400 circulars he has sent over the country.

House Democratic Leader MCCORMACK and Representative KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, have made speeches in the House indorsing the movement and paying tribute to Mr. L'Heureux for initiating it.

Mr. KLEIN told the House on August 2 that the movement "quietly started last fall by Mr. Hervé J. L'Heureux, the kindly, harassed, and always gracious chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, has grown with a rapidity most impressive, considering its spiritual nature and the lack of ballyhoo."

ADOPTED BY 638 ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. L'Heureux tries to keep track through correspondence of the growth of the movement. He believes many organizations may have adopted his plan that he does not know about, but he does have record of 638. Of these, 465 were veterans' organizations; 73 were business firms; 4 were service clubs; 41 were fraternal and social clubs; 35 were student organizations. Only six were church groups.

Strange as it might seem, Mr. L'Heureux so far has not heard of a single women's club adopting a resolution calling specifically for a daily prayer for peace, although the Gold Star and Blue Star Mothers have indorsed the idea in principle.

Mr. L'Heureux emphasizes that the movement is completely free and nonsectarian. Everyone is invited to join in the noon prayers in his own way. Among those indorsing the movement are Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant leaders.

The idea is spreading abroad, too. Sixteen foreign countries are represented among more than 6,000 letters Mr. L'Heureux has received concerning the movement. Helping to spread it in all countries in which they conduct schools are nuns of the Order of the Presentation of Mary. Mr. L'Heureux has five sisters who are nuns in that order.

He estimates that he has spent less than $400 in promoting the movement. This was for postage and paper. He depends entirely on his own spare-time efforts and volunteer assistance for spreading information about the idea.

Margaret Coyne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my address at the testimonial banquet honoring State Department President Margaret Coyne of Chelsea, Mass., auspices L. P. Lyons Post, United American Veterans, 691 Broadway, Chelsea, Mass., held on October 15, 1949 at the Knights of Columbus Building, 220 Broadway, Chelsea, Mass.:

It is a real pleasure for me to be the guest speaker at this testimonial banquet, which stands out from gatherings of a similar nature.

This is a big night for Margaret Coyne in more ways than one. In honoring her, we also honor her sex. And the United American Veterans of Massachusetts are to be complimented for their foresight in giving full and complete recognition to the equal partnership of men and women in the conduct of human affairs.

This marks a progressive step forward which should be an example for all other organizations, whether they be social, economic, or political. Women are winning their fight for genuine recognition, and the cause of democracy will be best served when they participate on an equal footing with men in positions of trust, leadership, and responsibility.

The recent war accelerated that process. It is a well-known fact that the mobilization of America's industrial might tipped the scales toward victory. But that supreme effort would have failed without the millions of American women who, in addition to their home duties, went forth to work in navy yards and defense plants. Their industry and skill put many a man to shame. But it also opened our eyes to a resource which we had long neglected. And it made for a new and healthy competition which will stimulate the latent talents of all.

The national emergency of 1941 to 1945 was the first during which women served in the armed forces of our Nation. How well they fulfilled this most arduous duty of citizenship, adds up to a new and glowing chapter of American history.

There was no discrimination when it came to shouldering the burdens of war. It follows, then, that there should be none when it comes to the opportunities and responsibilities of peace.

Faced with this record, man is beginning to realize that he needs—in business, in government, and in international relations—the neglected partner whose ability and understanding is the very heart of family life.

We have taken them too much for granted. But now we realize that we need their help in bringing harmony to the Nation and to the world. The teamwork of family life, wherein man and woman cooperate, unselfishly, for the common good of that social unit, is the pattern for solving the larger problems of the community life.

From the beginning, the experience of living has been coeducational. Too long, however, have its virtues been confined to the home. We have honored women in the home, but have excluded them from those positions of greater trust for which they have an undeniable right. This contradiction could not go on forever without man himself paying the price for such prejudice.

Women have demonstrated that they can fulfill the twin responsibilities of home and career. Already, a number of them have made a success in the business world. We have a few distinguished members of their sex in the diplomatic service and in the Congress of the United States. They participate fully in the deliberations of that body, where they show an able knowledge of the many complex problems confronting our Nation. Even in the world assembly of the United Nations, many countries are represented by women whose wisdom, mellowed by the protective instincts of their sex, brings hope that humanity's oldest plague—war itself—may some day be eliminated.

That one word in the name of your organization—United—tells us that you do not draw the line among those who served. The color or sex or race of persons is no measure of their ability or their capacity for leadership. In the best tradition to Americanism, carried into practice, you have selected the individual who, in your judgment, is most worthy to be State department president.

This reveals your awareness of the great, untapped human resources of our democracy. We do not say that some can rise to positions of leadership while others cannot. In a totalitarian nation, on the other hand, we find a self-appointed elite who seize and hold power, thereby crushing the potentialities of those they enslave. Some misguided persons, fascinated by power itself, think that this is the efficient method of organizing human society. They ignore the lessons demonstrated by the experience and not the mere theories of the free people of the United States. If they looked over the honor roll of the great men and women who are outstanding in every field of activity in our Nation they would see that most of them were of humble birth. If we had denied to them the opportunity to prove their worth by excluding them because of race, color, or creed, or had restricted their freedom of thought and action, all of us would have been the losers.

No, my friends, it is the proven facts and accomplishments of the free way of life in the United States, rather than the empty promises of communism, that light the way to a better future.

We know that the strait-jacket of dictatorship means slow death for any people who allow themselves to be bound up by it.

The democratic technique is the formula for progress because it can adapt itself to any challenge without sacrificing the fundamental guaranties of respect and dignity for the individual.

We know that there are great possibilities in every child that is born, and we intend to offer every encouragement for the development of those gifts. That is the secret of our success, both for the individual and for the society which benefits from his contributions.

Tonight we not only pay honor to the new State department president but to recognize through the special circumstances of this testimonial our joy in the ever-widening doors of opportunity in this land of ours.

Of course we make mistakes, all of us, but there is always free criticism to expose us. And then, profiting from those lessons, we do better next time.

In a dictatorship people are afraid to criticize their leaders. Every person has a blind spot, a capacity for error which can only be corrected through free exchange of information. But in a fear-ridden nation like Communist Russia, where the people do not dare to speak up for fear of reprisals, the leaders will inevitably make mistakes and persist in them, because there is no one to check their arbitrary powers. The ironic fact is that Russia is on a treadmill that is carrying her backward into the fear and ignorance and darkness of the past, even while she thinks she is going forward.

The chains which she places on her millions of slave-laborers are bad enough. But the iron curtain with which she imprisons the mind and conscience of all Russians is the self-imposed handicap which will defeat her.

Far different is the climate in which we meet as citizens of a free republic.

Yours is a voluntary association of veterans, organized by yourselves, without Government interference or direction.

This fellowship originated under trying circumstances. Conscious of what you endured and what you sacrificed, and how you supported one another during those grim days when you fought and suffered in defense of our American liberties, you have banded together in a common cause—for peace.

You want the children of our country to understand and really live in human brotherhood, without having to learn the necessity of it through the nightmare of another war.

But first you owe a duty to those comrades who were disabled in the fight, to help those who find it difficult to adjust themselves to a new pattern of living, and to assist the widows and orphans of those who did not come back.

The Congress of the United States, composed of many veterans, has done more to meet these problems, even before World War II was over, than any other legislative body in history has done for its warriors.

The most recent enactment, recently signed by the President, and effective on December 1, provides liberalized compensation benefits for veterans, their dependents, and beneficiaries.

Heretofore, only veterans with dependents who were disabled to a degree of 60 percent or more, were eligible to receive additional compensation. Now those with a 50 percent disability or more are entitled to increases.

The rate on compensation for World War I veterans with "presumed" service-connected disabilities, will be raised to the rate currently being paid to those whose disabilities are clearly service-connected.

Where veterans have arrested cases of tuberculosis, a 100-percent-compensation rating will be provided for the first 2 years following the date on which the progress of the disease was halted. For 4 years after that, the rate will be set at 50 percent. The new law also fixes disability ratings for longer periods in such cases, and requires a veteran to submit to examination and follow prescribed treatments.

An increase is authorized in the death compensation to wartime widows with one or more children.

Present rules which bar compensation for injury or disease incurred while under military or civil court confinement (other than those caused by willful misconduct) will be liberalized. Where the civil offense does not involve a felony, or where a court-martial sentence or dishonorable discharge is remitted, such confinements will be interpreted as being "in line of duty."

All World War II veterans with service-connected disabilities, and those World War I veterans whose disabilities have been determined as having been directly service-connected, will benefit from an 8.7 percent increase across-the-board. For example, in either case, a veteran who is 10 percent disabled will receive an increase in his monthly check from $13.80 to $15. Those with higher percentages of disability will get correspondingly more.

Peacetime rates for service-connected disabled veterans are fixed by law at 80 percent of wartime rates. These cases will thus benefit, automatically, under the previously mentioned increases provided by the new law.

Your Government will do all, within reason, to help compensate the veteran and his dependents, for the great sacrifices which he made during the war to protect all of us. This is only fair, and just.

But the Government needs you, and your organization, not only to protect, but to carry forward the development of greater opportunity for all which is the goal of the society we are building on this continent.

In choosing Margaret Coyne of Chelsea, to serve as president of your State department, you are leading the way.

I am sure that her administration will reflect great credit on the United American Veterans of Massachusetts, on herself, and on the women veterans who are thus so signally honored.

All members of this organization can be proud of the fact that, in taking this progressive step, they are making a vital contribution to the great cause of freedom and equality.

By this splendid and trail-breaking example, you are proving that democracy works.

The Appeal to Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received by me from one of my constituents who propounds a question I would like to submit to my colleagues for their consideration. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 17, 1949.

Hon. HERBERT A. MEYER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEYER: I read that Congress is soon to adjourn for the year and in the coming weeks there will be leisure in which to think of some matters that had to be neglected in the very busy session which is closing.

I wonder whether, on the eve of departure for your home you could lay before your colleagues a question which I think is of prime importance. I submit my question as follows:

Shall the youth of the great Middle West be deprived of the educational advantages which our President enjoyed in his formative years?

I now explain the conditions which gave rise to my inquiry.

Girard, Kans., which is in the Kansas district represented by you, was the home of a mighty publication called "The Appeal to Reason." It was one of the foremost Socialist papers in the land. Each week for years it laid bare the repulsive aspects of capitalism and advocated a program faintly similar to that which we are being exhorted today to adopt.

The publication ceased to live some years ago. The time has come to revive it. No Socialist paper of any consequence is to be found in the Middle West.

Our President, you will recall, grew up near Lamar, Mo., which is a few miles from Girard, Kans. As a boy and a young man he was in the immediate area of this mighty exponent of collectivism, statism, socialism—the label didn't matter, as the contents of the bottle were 100 proof.

I believe the Government should take immediate steps to reactivate The Appeal to Reason. Surely the superb command of socialistic doctrine which we see reflected in much of the legislation proposed by the executive department did not just happen. The "Vaughanted" smoothness of the White House in such matters could have come only through early indoctrination.

A grant-in-aid, an RFC loan (Henry Kaiser gets them, doesn't he?), or other Government assistance will restore this once-powerful molder of opinion to full vigor and usefulness. Of course it could not take up where it left off, for in the light of today's proposed program, The Appeal to Reason would be a conservative organ. That detail should not stop you. Please use your best efforts so that early action can be had.

Those Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 20,000 aluminum workers went out on strike, joining their numbers to the hundreds of thousands already idle as a result of strikes in the steel industry and the coal industry. The chief problem involved in all three of the major industrial disputes is the question of pensions. Much space has been purchased by industry to present their side of this question. I think it is important that we in Congress try to understand clearly the issues involved. Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared on October 14 in one of the weekly newspapers in the district which I represent, the Bordentown Register. The editorial, entitled "Those Pensions," gives a simple, straightforward account of the other side of this picture—the workers' side. It follows:

THOSE PENSIONS

Strikes are destructive, like wars; we all hate them. Sometimes we question "Is this strike necessary?" Like in every other phase of living, the answers seems to lie in the effectiveness of the gesture. Did the strikers win their objective?

In recent labor disturbances one thing has been the bone of contention and one thing only, job security. A pay check every week and confidence that the worker will not only hang onto his job when he is 50 years old, but will still have a reasonable income for his later days in his 60's and 70's.

There was a time in America when a man could, by hard labor and industrious effort, buy himself a home, salt away some savings in the bank or other investments, all of which brought him security for his old age.

This, however, was before the days of mechanized industry. Men are no longer individuals who can shape their own destiny. Today, workers in the great industries are

labor units. The machine has a production standard and the man who works with the machine must maintain the standard set for the machine. If he falters or fails, he is out of a job.

These are the men whom the unions are fighting for today. They want job security and pensions for the old fellows who are worn out and useless to industry but who still have from 10 to 30 years of living yet ahead.

Westbrook Pegler, that smug spokesman for the privileged and inherited wealth crowd, made a statement in a recent column, which we thought enlightening. Pegler himself is not important but he voices the opinions of a lot of folks we know. We quote:

"The proposition that industry should now shoulder the burden of the support of worn-out workers means, on its face, that the investors would be stuck for the bill. But it means, also, that industry would simply add the cost of this insurance to the price of commodities or services. With variations, the cost of everything, including labor, would go up proportionately.

"That seems not too bad except that we can't dodge around the fact that this should be the man's own responsibility. Whether he meets it by putting money in the cookie jar or buying insurance either as an individual or through his union, it is still his lookout and not his employer's."

Did anyone ever tell Pegler that it was the men and women who had saved their money for their old age who lost it in the crash of 1929 and 1930?

The workingmen will not forget those dark days of the thirties, and they will never again let anybody kid them into trusting to their own efforts for old-age security. It may be socialistic but they are for cradle-to-grave security.

Incidentally, Roebling, our neighboring industrial plant where so many Bordentown people earn their daily bread, satisfactorily settled the insurance and pension question with entire agreement between management and labor. Today they have more orders than they have had in some time. Workers who were let go many months ago have been called back to their work. There was no time lost by a strike.

One Hundred and Sixth Birthday of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., of recent date:

DEMOCRACY'S ADVOCATE

It is a pleasure for us to extend our congratulations to B'nai B'rith on the celebration of its one hundred and sixth birthday, which arrived yesterday. To be active and flourishing at the age of 106 is no small accomplishment for any organization; and when one considers that today B'nai B'rith is the largest Jewish mass membership body in the world, the conclusion is inevitable that its program must be sound, and its purpose possessed of a dynamic quality which age only intensifies and which enables it to move into its second century more vigorous and more representative of the American Jewish community than ever before.

Perhaps one of the basic secrets of B'nai B'rith's success is its identification with democracy. It is democracy in action, as it is Judaism in action, for in their ground-rock significance, both democracy and Judaism are one. From its earliest days B'nai B'rith pioneered in cultural and social programs which would help integrate Jewish immigrants into the American scene. Through widespread educational programs it underlined the meaning of democracy, and stressed the need for active participation by all citizens in the affairs of city, State, and Nation. Its Anti-Defamation League has become one of the most effective instrumentalities for democratic action and the safeguarding of human rights in the United States. Its vocational service bureau renders immense aid to young Jewish boys and girls seeking to find the right careers so that they can make the finest contribution to their country—and to themselves. Its Hillel foundations keep 150,000 Jewish students of nearly 200 college campuses within the mainstream of Jewish religious and historical experience. Its youth organizations brings these same all-important values to more than 25,000 youngsters of preuniversity age. Its Americanism and veterans' commission fulfills a tremendous need on altogether different levels. And B'nai B'rith, as one of the members of the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, a nongovernmental body with consultative status with the United Nations, has championed the cause of human rights for all peoples everywhere, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

As advocate of democracy, B'nai B'rith stands 330,000 strong—men and women who belong to its 1,600 lodges and chapters throughout the United States and Canada. They are its strength, its inspiration, and its resources. May their number ever increase, and the good they do be multiplied time and again.

World Federation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement signed by five State governors and other distinguished citizens, who support House Concurrent Resolution 64 and the hundred or so identical resolutions dealing with steps believed necessary to strengthen the United Nations:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

We, the undersigned, wish to record our full support for the world federation resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64, and to urge a favorable vote by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and passage by the House and Senate.

It is our collective judgment that this resolution, if passed by the Congress, will do much to define for the world the continuing purpose of the United States to play its full part in the construction of the international institutions essential to peace. When the development of the UN into a world federation is in fact accepted as the fundamental objective of American foreign policy, a definite goal will have been established that will place in true perspective all of our foreign policy decisions. Other nations will then have unmistakable proof of American willingness to accept with other peoples that limitation on absolute national sovereignty that is necessary to the prevention of a third world war.

This resolution does not propose an immediate substitute for existing American foreign policy. Our support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 is consistent with our continued support of the Marshall plan and of the efforts that are being made to maintain the military defenses of the United States. So long as the world continues to be divided into many heavily armed nations, each capable of attacking its neighbors without warning, just so long will the United States be compelled in self-defense to compete for armament and strategic position. However, this resolution does recognize that neither peace nor the freedoms and living standards of the American people can be indefinitely guaranteed by an attempt to maintain the lead in a world-wide rivalry for military power. Each expansion of our armed strength will be met by corresponding increases on the part of other nations, until the burden of military preparations threatens the liberties and standards of life that we seek to defend. Moreover, if such an arms race should lead eventually to war, as it always has in the past, whole sections of our urban population and industry would be subject to destruction by modern weapons against which there is as yet no foreseeable defense.

We are not forced to choose between following an arms race to its desperate end and the folly of appeasement. This resolution proposes another and better choice: That the United States join with other nations to create such world laws and governmental institutions for administration and enforcement as are necessary to keep the peace, with American military power being preserved until this structure of international security has been completed.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 does not propose that the UN be abandoned in order to achieve this objective. On the contrary, the resolution asks rather that American support of the UN be strengthened and that the necessary structure of enforceable world law be achieved through development and amendment of the UN Charter. However necessary regional agreements may be as temporary measures of expediency, a world-wide international organization remains the price of enduring peace. If finally after our most patient and thorough efforts it should prove impossible to secure the required majority agreement to the transformation of the UN into a federation, there will be time enough then to consider the advisability of a less than universal federal structure.

Finally, we believe that the congressional sponsors of the resolution were wise in not including language that would seem to commit the President and the State Department to immediate and specific steps. The resolution, when passed, will place Congress on record as being ready to accept American participation in a world federation with power to make and enforce law. The steps that our country must take to reach that broad objective will be determined by a changing world situation, and the responsibility for taking those tactical decisions belongs to the executive branch of our Government.

We believe that the 101 Representatives of both parties who have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 have acted in the best interests of the American people and we know that the standard they have raised has broad popular support both in this country and abroad. We again urge the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to vote in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 64, as it stands.

Hon. Chester Bowles, Governor of Connecticut; Lloyd D. Brace, Boston, Mass.; Harry A. Bullis, Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc.; Henry B. Cabot, Lawyer, Boston, Mass.; Cass Canfield, Chairman of the Board, Harper & Bros.; Grenville Clark, Lawyer; Dr. Rufus Clement, President,

Atlanta University; Albert M. Greenfield, President, Albert M. Greenfield & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; H. J. Heinz, President, H. J. Heinz Co.; W. T. Holliday, Chairman of the Board, Standard Oil of Ohio; O. A. Knight, President, Oil Workers International Union-CIO; Hon. William Lee Knous, Governor of Colorado; Hon. Sidney S. McMath, Governor of Arkansas; James K. Moffitt, Chairman of the Board, Crocker First National Bank, San Francisco; Rt. Rev. Henry K. Sherrill, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; Robert Sherwood, Playwright; Hon. Raymond Wilkins, Member, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts; Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan; Hon. Luther Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota.

The Role of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Role of Congress," by Edna Lonigan in Human Events, a copyrighted weekly analysis for the American citizen which was reprinted in the New Hampshire Morning Union, October 13, 1949.

Every Member of Congress who reads it will realize more fully than ever before the high privilege and heavy responsibility of service in this body during this period in our history. Every citizen who reads it will gain a new understanding of the true function of the Congress and will be less likely to be deceived by those who demand that we bow to the will of the executive and grant every appropriation for every glittering scheme that may be presented to us.

The article follows:

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress is slowly dragging to its end. President Truman denounced the do-nothing Eightieth Congress in what was perhaps the bitterest verbal attack ever made by an American President against the legislative process. Whether the President really likes the Eighty-first Congress better is not our concern here. The one important question for the citizen in regard to Congress is: What is the role of this representative organ in the fight to save the Republic?

Our political textbooks (following Montesquieu) have given us a picture of government as divided into three parts, legislative, executive, and judicial. Popular usage tends more and more to refer to the executive power alone as government.

CONGRESS MUST RESTRAIN

Actually, popular usage here is the more accurate. The executive power is profoundly different from the legislative power. The elected representatives of the people speak for the people in opposition to apointed officials responsible primarily to the Executive. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress to restrain the Government to do nothing that will improperly increase its power at public expense.

Montesquieu emphasized the English separation of legislative and executive powers because he clearly saw that this separation was necessary for freedom. If the French would deprive their absolute monarchy of the power to make its own laws, they could also enjoy the liberty for which the English so resolutely fought. The men who wrote our Constitution fully realized the importance of balanced powers.

Today that realization greatly needs to be revived. Our legislative agencies are still visibly separate from the executive arm, but under the surface the separation of powers is disappearing. The executive is regaining the power to make its own law, and to control the courts, although the structure outwardly appears unchanged.

There is no need for Congress if its function is merely to write laws conveying to the President in pleasing language the power to do what he likes. Clark Clifford or any other clever appointee could do that. The role of Congress is to do what the White House naturally resents: To lay down restraints on the Executive, to define the channels through which the executive power is to flow.

Since 1935, as a result of "must legislation," lump-sum appropriations, manufactured emergencies, and foreign entanglements, the President has been arrogating to himself the power to decide the restraints which he will heed, and to define the channels through which he will dispose of the vast resources at his command.

MILITARY POWER

We tend to forget that executive power is physical and substantial. It is the power of the military leader or commander in chief. All the elaborate developments of the executive arm partake of the nature of the Army. Whether a Government agent is arresting dope peddlers, or promising Federal subsidies to all and sundry, he is not acting in his own person, but exercising an authority derived from the ability of the government back of him to seize persons and property by force.

Legislative power, on the other hand, is not physical. It is legal and abstract. Executive power can be wielded by a strong and ruthless individual and his henchmen. But legislative power requires the voluntary support of a sophisticated and self-disciplined people.

Every city-state and nation, as it grew strong, was forced to realize that the chief could use the physical power at his command against unarmed citizens who displeased him. The history of parliaments is essentially the story of how the people, after their chief had created an army, learned how to impose restraints on the force under his control.

The great forward step was made when the English-speaking people turned from the council or mass meeting to a small body of representatives, to keep watch over the chief and his personal aides. These representatives of the people stumbled on the all-important factor, in protecting the citizens, when they learned that the ruler would be very reasonable if he needed money, and only if he needed money. The political problem of the Republic today is still as simple as that. It is to insure that the ruler is curtailed for money.

PURSE VERSUS SWORD

We call the parliamentary protection of our liberties "the power of the purse." It used to be called, more accurately, "the separation of the purse from the sword." Our forefathers knew, what we forget, that the chief of state always possesses the sword. The people can control the sword only if they keep control of the purse, which is the power to supply the ruler's armies, or, in our more refined age, to vote the salaries of the bureaucracy.

So it should be realized that Congress is not really so much a part of government as a defense against government. It is a wall which the people have built to insure that the chief cannot send his armies to punish their leaders, or to take their property, except as they decree. When the colonists said, "No taxation without representation" they knew the score. They meant that the head of the state should not collect a penny in taxes unless their own elected agents were in full control, with power to decide where and how all taxes should be spent.

The twentieth century has witnessed a world-wide abdication by the people of their dearly bought right to control the sword. The people have everywhere surrendered to the personal government of the commander in chief. They have forgotten that any party which accepts personal government thereby undermines the congressional wall protecting the unarmed people against the government's arbitrary will. But no modern dictator has been rash enough openly to abolish the legislature.

Mussolini said: "I will not take from the people their legislative toy." Hitler made the Reichstag what was well called "the world's most expensive male singing society." Stalin appears at the pageants that mark the meeting of the Soviet Congress. But in all these cases the leaders themselves usurped the power of the purse.

AND SO WITH US

Similarly, our different programs for big spending, since 1933, have been variants of one central plan—to give the President free money. In WPA, PWA, lend-lease, EESA, MAP, and all the rest of the always emergency legislation, Congress was never allowed to say just how the money should be spent, or to define the exact powers and duties of the spending agencies. That discretion is all the President needs. For if the law is not precise, Congress will never know whether or not the President obeys the law. Generalities are not law, no matter how legally they may be dressed up in sections and articles. Keeping the traditional form of law is merely part of the deceptive process. It is through vague and general language, cast in legal form, that the Executive has regained the power to decide what laws it will observe.

When appropriations grow large enough, Congress has no hope of knowing what is really done with the money. And nowadays Congress is confronted by the Executive with a budget deliberately made so huge and complex that it cannot be analyzed. Our Representatives have been driven to the expedient of suggesting that Congress tell the Executive to make its own cut of 5 to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated. But this, as Senator STYLES BRIDGES has virtually admitted, is open abdication by Congress of the power of the purse.

While Congress was deliberately immobilized by the pressure of real or fake emergencies, the executive has been using the people's money to deluge their Representatives with vials of ridicule. When ridicule was not enough the factions which we call the party in power have turned to "purging" those Members of Congress who have fought valiantly to keep the purse separate from the sword.

It is tragic to hear Americans speak of contests between the President and Congress as though we were mere bystanders at a prize fight, the Congress has no Army, no bureaucracy, no courts, no jails, no propaganda arm. Its one real power, the power to withhold money from the bureaucracy, has meaning only to the extent that people support the Representatives who guard the purse.

When President Truman denounced the Eightieth Congress as a "do-nothing" Congress he was really calling it a great Congress, one which held the line against Executive aggression. What an opportunity the Republicans missed. How richly their last candidate deserved defeat.

When President Roosevelt tried to purge Senator GEORGE he was logical. When President Truman recently attacked Senator BYRD he was consistent. These Executives merely sought to punish independent thinking in their own party, as everyone who seeks power must do. It is encouraging that among Democrats, rather than among Republicans, the plain people have risen to defend their defenders, as the colonists did.

The world-wide political crisis is in every country a struggle between the unarmed citizens and the chief, with his personal following, who directs the armed forces. It makes no real difference whether the head man is from the left or from the right—whether he is called a leader or a dictator or a president. In each case he and his personal aides have the all-essential physical power, and, if they can shake off the restraining influence of the people's representatives, they have power as absolute as that of Louis XIV. In almost every country, except the United States, this battle for the people is now definitely lost.

The people depend for their liberty on the strength with which Congress can impose restraints on their spending; otherwise the sword and the purse are reunited in the hands of the ruler and his following. Then all the gains the unarmed citizens have made in 300 years will be lost. Our Congress is the last free parliament. It contains wise and valiant men who have been fighting for 15 years to hold the line, in the hope that the people will realize in time what is at stake.

The Late Honorable Richard J. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following tribute to our late colleague, Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH, of California, which was published in the California Farm Reporter of October 1949:

SOLDIERS OF THE COMMON GOOD

RICHARD J. WELCH, FEBRUARY 13, 1869—SEPTEMBER 10, 1949

Farm-born, Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH never forgot what it meant to wrest a living from the soil. By trade he was first an iron molder, then a machinist. Throughout his long political career he used public office to better conditions of industrial workers, as well as farmers.

The following, "An Appreciation," was written by Herbert C. Jones, vice president, American River Development League, San Jose.

"RICHARD J. WELCH, Congressman, Fifth District, California, increased popular respect for public office. He held the confidence of his constituents for nearly half a century. In the State senate, on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and in Congress he strove for advancement of the public interest.

"In Congress he was in the forefront of the struggle to conserve our timber, oil, natural gas, and water, to develop electric power and to use that power to help make irrigation water cheap enough for the farmers who desperately needed it. As chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, he threw his full strength behind the comprehensive development of the Central Valley and for development of the water and public power at Folsom Dam.

"A far-sighted statesman, he realized that these great natural resources had to be conserved and developed if future generations were to grow and prosper.

"His influence, his power, his vision, grew with each passing year of service."

Another Unhappy Experience With a DP in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, I called to the attention of the House the fact that the displaced persons program, at least in North Dakota, is not working as well as some reports would seem to indicate. Another case which has just been brought to my attention is shown by a letter from Mr. Wesley E. Keller, of Minot, N. Dak. I am inserting the letter herewith for the information of my colleagues:

MINOT, N. DAK., *September 30, 1949.*
Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I have noticed in the September 26 issue of Time magazine that the administration's DP bill is now in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. Under this bill, the administration is trying to liberalize the importation of displaced persons into the United States over the usual immigration quotas

I wish to give you our personal experience with a DP in our household, which is not an isolated experience, but appears to be the general pattern of everyone with whom we have come in contact in North Dakota who have sponsored DP's.

As one of the gullible "sponsors" who believed in the displaced-persons program, we too made application for one of these "poor, homeless" Europeans, offering a home and prevailing wages for a domestic servant.

After 2 months, we are sadly disillusioned and much wiser Americans. Our homeless DP arrived, speaking no English and with just the faintest conception of housekeeping in America. After 8 weeks of constant supervision and training, we succeeded in teaching Anna enough English so that she could tell us she was quitting. She complained bitterly about working more than 8 hours and not receiving $125 a month, which is not the prevailing wage for housework in this vicinity. Regardless of language difficulty, I had no trouble in understanding that she was contemptuous of Americans and certainly had no gratitude at being here.

Since we had made application through a church agency, we complained and after checking with Washington, we find that no one has any control of the DP after their arrival in this country. They are free agents to move about the country at will and to enter any labor market they desire.

Our original understanding of the DP bill was that we, the sponsor, were to assume responsibility for a period of 1 year and that, conditions being satisfactory, they were to stay with the sponsor for that period of time before they enter the labor market. Under false pretenses, they accept domestic and farm labor jobs with no intention of staying, just in order to get to this country.

In view of our experience and that of other North Dakotans, I do not feel that the immigration quotas should be relaxed or ignored to permit these people to enter this country as DP's and in the course of a few weeks become free agents, competing with American labor.

While we are opposed to any further extension of the DP bill, we realize that the administration is for it and that it cannot be entirely defeated. Therefore, we feel definite provisions should be made protecting sponsors and insuring DP employment in noncompetitive positions such as domestic and farm labor for a stipulated period and that any violation of such stipulation will subject the violator to deportation.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY E. KELLER.

The Forgotten Pensioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago God called to his reward a great man, a man who unselfishly devoted himself to the cause of the aged citizens of our great country. That man was John Bradbury, a constituent of mine. His passing has left a great void in his home community as well as in the ranks of those who are working for better security for our old people.

Were John Bradbury alive today, he would have cause to rejoice because the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, which passed the House recently, contained many provisions which he proposed in a list of suggestions he prepared last year, at my request.

His interest in and his devotion to the cause stand out prominently in an article he wrote some time ago and which he titled "The Forgotten Pensioner."

Under leave already granted me, I include this article.

THE FORGOTTEN PENSIONER UNDER TITLE II

In 1776 our great Republic was born, and since that time we have survived a Civil War in the first century of our existence, and during the past 3 decades we have come through two great World Wars to emerge as the greatest Nation in economic wealth. The natural resources with which our country was blessed have been cleverly developed in the meantime, and so our position as a world leader has been strengthened.

Today we stand as the great Nation who is upholding the principles of democracy, and smaller nations and weaker nations look to us for example and guidance.

In 1935, our Federal legislators in Washington passed a Social Security Act which became operative in 1937. The section of the act, now known as the old age and survivors' insurance, stipulated that 1 percent should be deducted from an employee's wages for the first 5 years after the passage of the act; 2 percent for the following 3 years; and thereafter (from January 1949) 3 percent would be deducted from the worker's wages. However, not all workers in the country were in the industries or occupations covered by the act; and even at this date, many of the country's workers are still not covered. The 1 percent deduction from worker's wages is

still in effect, as it has been frozen at that figure for every date of the original scheduled change.

The amount of benefits payable at the present time are exactly the same as when the Social Security Act became operative in 1937, even though living costs have increased over 55 percent, according to our own Government figures, since that time.

It is almost impossible for an elderly couple to live decently on the miserably small pittance that the old-age and survivors insurance allows, as can be judged by the following figures. A worker who toils for 30 years, from the age of 35 until he retires at the age of 65, at an average salary of $50 per week ($216.67 per month), without any time lost for sickness or unemployment, would, on retirment at 65, be entitled to a pension of $11 per week, and his wife (if she were 65 also) would be entitled to an additional $5.50 per week. A total of $16.50 per week is scarcely adequate for an elderly couple to live decently or in any degree of comfort in these days of high living costs.

An elderly citizen under the old-age and survivors insurance may have been frugal during his lifetime and built or bought a cottage for himself and his wife to enjoy in the sunset of their lives, but the ownership of the cottage now precludes his taking advantage of the provisions of the old-age assistance, yet it may cost him more for taxes and upkeep of his cottage than if he had to pay rent to some other property owner. Moreover, he is also restricted by the Social Security Act to earn more than $14.99 per month to augment his pension. In other words, we penalize our thrifty citizens when they attain the age of 65 years.

Truly the beneficiary of the old-age and survivors insurance is the forgotten pensioner.

We boast of our American way of life and our ideals of democracy. Our politicians in Washington vote millions of dollars to aid the peoples of foreign countries, which is in itself a laudable object, as they need the food. Our politicians evidently are able to envision want and distress thousands of miles away, but they are unable to see the plight of their own elderly citizens, unable to see the need of a more decent, livable pension to our elderly people.

True, a 1-percent deduction is not much from a worker's pay envelope, but it is what the Government demanded for a pension retirement scheme. It certainly is not the worker's fault that the amount has been repeatedly frozen at that figure, when it should have been raised gradually by easy stages, as the Social Security Act originally called for when it was enacted into law.

President Truman in his message to the Eightieth Congress on January 10, 1947, recommended an increase of benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance, citing the fact that our social-security program has not kept pace with the times, nor with the increase of living standards.

Perhaps the voting strength of our elderly people who are beneficiaries is thought to be negligible, and that is a factor considered by politicians.

While I do not always believe in organized pressure groups operating in halls of Congress at Washington, because many things are enacted into law that are not in the best interest of the Nation as a whole, I firmly believe that our elderly citizens should organize themselves into a power that would attract attention when they have a cause which has such a high degree of merit and justice.

This great Nation of ours should lead the way in such humanitarianism toward its elderly citizens, who in a lifetime of work and self-sacrifice have built up this country of ours, and made it truly great. They are really entitled to an eventide of life that will be representative of our ideals of democracy.

Herbert H. Lehman Means Human Decency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered in Buffalo, N. Y., by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.:

I concur wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by Mr. ROOSEVELT; but my reason for having this speech printed in the RECORD is more far-reaching.

The choice in the election for the United States Senate in New York is clearly defined: it is a choice between American freedom and democracy on the one hand, and a philosophy repugnant to the general welfare on the other. Herbert H. Lehman represents American freedom and democracy.

I believe it is essential that Congressman ROOSEVELT'S eloquent and incontrovertible support of the achievement of a Fair Deal through such great statesmen as Herbert Lehman be read and contemplated and vigorously supported not only by those who will vote in New York on November 8, but also by men and women everywhere who wish to secure for America a vital and a dynamic democracy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT'S address follows:

I am glad to be with you here in Buffalo tonight. I am glad for two reasons: First, because of your position as leaders of the trade-union movement in the western part of our State; and secondly, because it is my first opportunity to describe the issues of this election, and to explain why I think it is vital that we elect Herbert H. Lehman to the United States Senate.

Speaking frankly, I do not believe that I need to persuade anyone in this particular audience of the necessity for voting for Governor Lehman. All too often in political campaigns, we who agree on the issues and the candidates sit around and talk to ourselves. We forget that our job is to inform the great army of voters, our fellow citizens—first, that they must register; second, that they must see the issues clearly; and finally, that they must go to the polls if they want government in the best interests of the people and not the specially privileged.

If our discussion tonight is to mean anything, it will be because we go back to the groups we represent, determined to achieve the greatest registration in the history of our State, and to bring the real issues in the election to every community in our State. We must not let the Republicans win the election by default because too few people have bothered to register or to vote.

LABOR'S PART PRAISED

I know that in recent years labor organizations, as well as the political parties, have done much to stimulate the interest, and to increase the participation, of more and more people in all of our elections. But we cannot rest on past laurels. Our job now is this election, and we must carry the message of its importance to every citizen so that he will register and then vote.

One of the reasons for the deep significance of this election is that it will fill the Senate seat which was held for so many years by our beloved Robert F. Wagner. His record will go down in history as a great American political career which was wholly dedicated to service to the people; to liberal American leadership in their search for increased equality and security for all of the American people; and I can assure you that Bob Wagner's long-time friend and associate, Herbert H. Lehman, is better qualified in every conceivable way to carry on this tradition than is his Republican opponent.

But we do not look to traditions alone for guidance in this election. Unlike our Republican opposition, the Democratic Party believes in looking and moving ahead—in building a dynamic, expanding, and prosperous future for America.

The basic meaning of this election is that it is a test—a test of whether we Americans are to abandon the social and economic advances of the last 16 years and collapse into another stretch of Coolidge bubble booms and Hoover busts. It is a test of whether we Americans are to consolidate our gains, and continue to move forward under the Fair Deal of President Truman.

Everything about this election points up this test—the records of the two candidates, the records of their respective parties in the Eightieth Congresses, and the campaigns which the two men are making.

LEHMAN'S INTEGRITY NEEDED

To put it bluntly, Herbert Lehman belongs in this Democratic Eighty-first Senate, helping President Truman and the entire Fair Deal team put our American, forward-looking program into law. His opponent looks very much out of place there; he would have felt much more at home in the Republican Eightieth Congress, which is now only a dismal memory.

In the minds of most Americans, the Republican Eightieth stands as a monument to greed, to monopoly, to contempt for the well-being of the American people.

But not so to Mr. DULLES. To him it reflects his own philosophy and the program of the Republican Party today.

That Eightieth Congress murdered the economic controls which had been carefully planned to preserve our postwar prosperity for the servicemen and war workers, for whom it was a program of absolute necessity.

And DULLES today—and on his record so far in the Senate—would rather preserve the security of his big corporation allies than the security and well-being of those same war veterans, of labor, of the farmer, in short, of the people of America.

That Eightieth Republican Congress handcuffed the labor movement so that its drive to organize the unorganized, to win industrial stability everywhere, was stopped in its tracks.

And DULLES today is committed to keeping labor in the shackles of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That Eightieth Congress soaked the poor with a fantastically unjust tax bill. That Congress had the unmitigated gall to take 750,000 workers from under the social-security laws after the Supreme Court of the United States had said they should be covered. And that Congress went to the rescue of railroad monopolists whom the Supreme Court had held to be subject to the antitrust laws. That Republican Congress did all this for big business at the same time that it ignored the desperation of millions of Americans who could not find decent homes for their families. In fact, that Republican Congress was so impractical that it even neglected to provide crop storage for American farmers who were trying to meet the needs of a hungry world.

And that policy and that program is not only today supported but advocated by Mr. Dewey's favorite architect.

The guiding spirit in that Republican Congress was ROBERT A. TAFT whom most people would agree is a pretty conservative fellow, but in New York we are now offered a candidate who makes Taft look pink by comparison. When "that man" in Albany appointed his bride on the wedding cake to the Senate 3 months ago, he came to that distinguished body with a certain amount of prestige because of his work in the United Nations. That prestige has turned to disgrace—the disgrace of wanting to drag the country back to the Eightieth Congress program, and of waging a bigoted, unprincipled, and vicious campaign against those who would tell the people what the issues really are.

REPUBLICAN DOUBLE TALK

Let me take a few issues on which Mr. DULLES has already shown his true colors. Several weeks ago, he joined the private utility monopolists in opposing public transmission of publicly developed hydroelectric power. At this very moment he is lined up solidly with the same monopoly crowd to try to prevent Leland Olds from being reappointed as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The crime of Mr. Olds is that he has been too tough for people like DULLES, because he tried to protect the pocketbook of the consumer against raids by the power people. Mr. Olds has many years of honorable service in New York State and in Washington, but this is no recommendation to a big-business spokesman like DULLES.

Let's look at education. Here we find DULLES right alongside his Albany playmate. You remember that the teachers of this very city were actually forced to strike before they could get a hearing from Dewey about their pitiful salary situation. Now DULLES chimes in against any Federal aid to education. This self-styled enemy of communism apparently doesn't think along the American way, doesn't agree, as I am sure all of you agree with me, that a well-educated people, a people to whom the doors of economic opportunity are opened wider and wider, is our strongest, our most positive defense against communism.

On civil rights, DULLES has a record of talk—when it doesn't matter—and silence—when it does. When he begs for votes he is all for civil rights. But when he is in the Senate he never opens his mouth about the hypocritical leaders of his own party who have preserved the filibuster as part of their anti-civil-rights alliance with the Dixiecrats. It was that same Republican-Dixiecrat alliance which kept us from repealing the Taft-Hartley law and restoring national labor policy to the principles set down in the great act which bears Senator Wagner's name.

We are fortunate, in a way, that the Republican Party has nominated an arch-conservative who can out-Republican even Mr. TAFT. When we defeat him, we will be striking a blow at the whole backward-looking program for which he stands.

LEHMAN'S RECORD SPARKLES

In contrast to this tight-lipped, calculating Wall Streeter, stands Herbert H. Lehman, the man who did so much to carry onward the tradition of his two predecessors as Governor of our State. I need not dwell on his record at great length. Much of what he did in Albany foreshadowed what we Fair Dealers are now trying to do in Washington. His experience and his wisdom will be of tremendous help to us in carrying through the rest of our program for the people of America.

Herbert H. Lehman will be right at home in a Congress which is giving 11,000,000 more Americans the benefit of social-security and old-age assistance, a Congress which is raising the minimum wage level in spite of the sniping of DULLES and his cronies.

Let me just tell briefly what the Democratic Party is doing. We are building 810,000 homes for people who would not get them otherwise, and still another 60,000 units at military bases. We are now working on a housing program for the great middle-income group.

In foreign affairs we are working to strengthen the economic and military arms of democracy. What an asset it will be to the Senate to have the advice and counsel of Herbert H. Lehman in reversing the inhuman, anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic displaced-persons bill which Mr. DULLES' party adopted. All the world knows of Lehman's great work among the people of the world to alleviate the suffering, the hunger and the desolation which follow in the wake of modern war.

Herbert Lehman, then, is the man for whom we must work our hearts out in the next 4 weeks—for whom we must build up a huge registration, for whom we must turn out a gigantic vote, for whom we must campaign morning, noon and night. It is our campaign; it is your campaign.

The final proof of Governor Lehman's worth, of his powerful appeal to intelligent voters, is the kind of desperate destructive campaign which DULLES and Dewey are waging against him and us, and everything we stand for.

As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." Let's see what they've said in a feeble, shameful effort to distract the voters from the real issue—Democratic progress against Republican reaction.

Some of the things they say are simply beyond me. I confess it. Take all of this dark talk by the Republican candidate about statism and the need to fight it by nothing less than a Wall Street revolution—he says. What is the purpose of this revolution of reaction? The United States is better off and stronger today than any time in our history. Our farmers, our workers, our small-business men, our professional and white-collar people—all are more prosperous, more secure than ever before. That is the very philosophy and way of life which DULLES is trying to destroy—that prosperity, that security.

Perhaps that is what Mr. DULLES wants—with a revolution if necessary. Perhaps that is his definition of statism—anything that helps the people, anything that makes it tougher for monopolists to own and run America. I cannot even keep up with these scare words and new-fangled isms the Republicans cook up during election campaigns. But they seem to me to reflect a homesick yearning of Mr. DULLES for the Republican days—the days of two empty pots for every chicken, two mortgages on every home, apple sellers on every corner and dissension, discouragement and frustration in the hearts of the American people.

Do we want to go back to that? I say no, and I know you agree with me.

REPUBLICAN HOB-NAIL BOOTS

Those are the issues before us. The desperation and defeatism of yesterday against the affirmative, powerful faith in tomorrow.

My friends, the whole Republican campaign of Mr. Dewey—America's Mr. Also Ran, and his hand-picked candidate—is designed to muddle and confuse people. Of course, Dewey is just the Little Sir Echo of this campaign. But he has done his little bit of muddling with the hilarious charge that the Kremlin shakes at the mere sound of DULLES' voice, and that only the Communists are opposed to him. The history of Russia's foreign policy tells a different story.

Actually, the Russians are counting on the collapse of the free-enterprise countries because they expect the people to revolt against the excesses and oppressions of big-business monopolists. The Kremlin would welcome the election of another arch-Republican to the Senate. In a nutshell, nothing would please the Russians more than a United States Senator made up of 96 JOHN FOSTER DULLESES. Such a Senate would strengthen Moscow's hope that the day of popular disgust with a Wall Street bossed America, is closer. On the other hand, in Herbert H. Lehman, the Communists see the stanch and stalwart advocate of liberal democracy—and that is the force which they really fear and that is what they really fight throughout the world. They have good reason to fear it for they know that it offers the people security without sacrificing freedom, and in that security, and in that freedom stands the last best hope of mankind.

Sometimes I almost feel sorry for the Republicans. In the last election they lost with a candidate in sneakers who ducked every issue; in this one they are going to lose with a candidate in hob-nail boots, whose campaign, based on bigotry, half-truths, and witch-hunting, will be long remembered as a new low in reaction.

DULLES has charged off, in a loud clash and clamor of headlines, to fight the Communists in order to keep from having to fight the Democratic Party's liberal-farmer-labor coalition. I quite understand how he feels. But I am confident that this coalition which is the American coalition will win if we urge the people to register, urge our fellow citizens to consider the real issues and urge every New Yorker to vote 4 weeks from tomorrow.

This election will be watched throughout the country as a possible straw in the wind for the 1950 election. It will be watched throughout the world as a reflection of the postwar sentiment of the American people. It will be watched because it offers a clear choice between outright Republican reaction and forthright Democratic liberalism. For all of these reasons, and because of the justice of his principles, because of his faith in, and identification with the people and the people's profoundest needs, we must and we shall elect Herbert H. Lehman to the United States Senate.

Federal Judge Harold R. Medina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., October 15, 1949:

JUDGE MEDINA ADMIRABLE

Conviction of the 11 top leaders of the American Communist party on charges of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence in Federal court in New York yesterday brought to a close one of the lengthiest and most important trials of its kind in this country's history. The charge was a grave one, of such tremendous consequence that the trial was watched with Nation-wide interest throughout the 9 months it lasted and the outcome undoubtedly meets with hearty and general public approval. Practically all Americans love their country and support its Government so sincerely that they have only deep contempt for any persons

favoring the latter's overturn and approve fully their prosecution and punishment.

Delaying and obstructionist tactics prevailed to such an extent throughout the trial that countless Americans unquestionably were fearful that it would end in disagreement or worse and that proper justice would not be done. Capably led by United States Attorney John F. X. Gohey, though, the prosecution did its work so thoroughly and the jury performed its duty so well that after the case was turned over to it for final consideration a decisive verdict soon was reached which was in accord with the evidence presented. For that splendid service, the jurors merit strong approbation. Also in line for commendation is the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its initial preparation of the case on which the defendants were indicted and their prosecution based.

Emerging from the trial as the outstanding figure, however, is Federal Judge Harold R. Medina, who conducted it in a superb manner that conformed closely to the highest judicial standards and traditions. At all times, he was extremely capable, courteous, dignified, firm, and most tolerant in the face of annoying complicating and confusing strategy by defense counsel entirely out of line with ordinary court procedure.

The judge took no action during the trial that would have given the Communists any basis for claiming that their leaders had been left unprotected during its course. As soon as the verdict was announced and the jury dismissed, though, he adjudged all the defense courtroom attorneys guilty of criminal contempt and gave them sentences of from 30 days to 6 months. Contempt sentences usually begin at once, but Judge Meding deferred those to November 15 to give those defense lawyers time to draw up appeals to a higher court from the jury's decision against the Communist leaders, which was further proof of his exceptional fairness. In short, the judge's entire conduct was of a type that merits a prominent place in the records of American court history.

The Navy and the Berlin Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House the outstanding contribution to the Berlin Airlift Operation made by the Naval Air Force. The story is told in an article by J. William Welsh called "Operation Vittles" which appeared in the October 1, 1949, issue of Our Navy:

OPERATION VITTLES

(By J. William Welsh)

"Hold it. Don't shoot that. That's a Navy plane."

The speaker was an Air Force officer. His audience was a crew of cameramen who had been exposing their film to the operations before them. The place was Berlin—Templehof Airdrome, to be exact, the terminus point of the famous Berlin airlift.

The cameramen, attached to a Hollywood firm, were busy getting background shots for a soon-to-be-released movie that has the airlift as its central theme. Assigned to them as a technical adviser was this Air Force officer who, himself, had flown the Vittles Operation.

From a perch outside the operations office in the second story of the large amphitheater-like terminal building that circles half the field, one could notice the officer directing the photographers to get this particular operation or another.

Then the Navy plane appeared, taxied into position and began to unload its coal load. Suddenly, the Air Force officer shouted his canceling order. The cameramen lighted cigarettes and relaxed. When the Navy plane moved on, they crushed out their smokes, moved back into position and took bearings on the Air Force plane that moved into the unloading area.

I had been waiting for Triple-Ace (plane No. 111) of Navy Transport Squadron VR–8 to arrive. When it did, and the chief mech aided the Berliners in their unloading operation, I climbed aboard and took my position forward preparatory to the take-off on the return trip to Frankfurt.

In the next day and a half which I spent with Air Force and Navy men operating the airlift, I was amazed by the information which I discovered. The airlift, in itself such a tremendous operation that it was amazing enough, paled in comparison with the operation which transpired, intentionally or unintentionally, on the part of the Air Force to sublimate the Navy's outstanding performance in Operation Vittles.

The movie incident at Berlin was just one of many incidents that belied the cooperation angle of the airlift which I had been told in Washington to expect. The Air Force, which deserved all of the publicity and more than that which it has received for the inception and smooth continuation of this complex operation, seemed unwilling to share even a small amount of the publicity.

True, the Air Force operated 309 C–54's to the Navy's 21 R5D's. The Air Force had set-up the operation in June of 1948, the Navy did not get its two squadrons (loaned to the Airlift from MATS) to Rhein/Main air base until November. The Air Force manned all the aerology station, the air bases, and the 200-hour check maintenance base at Burtonwood, England. Their personnel outnumbered the Navy aviation units by about 20 to 1.

But—since arriving at Rhein/Main, one of the Navy squadrons, VR–8, had led all airlift squadrons every month in tonnage hauled into Berlin, and the second, VR–6, had been either second or third in tonnage hauled each month since February. Navy and Air Force squadrons had the same number of planes, the same number of pilots, the same number of mechanics.

Yet, since March, little or nothing had been heard of Navy airlift operations. Having shame-facedly reported for the previous 3 months that the newly-arrived VR–8 was setting the record and its sister squadron, VR–6, chewing on its heels each month, the Air Force suddenly decided that all individual records of the airlift should be classified. Subsequently, the "restricted" stamp prohibiting publication, the records of each squadron no longer were published.

Morale in the two Navy squadrons was affected by the Air Force publicity stymie. Naturally, when you work like mad night and day, you expect the folks back home to know what you're doing. The squadron members thought at first that the Navy public relations had forgotten about them. They knew better in April when Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, in order to get out some word about their activities, sent a letter of commendation to each of the two squadron skippers and made the letters public in Washington.

By then, Navy men knew that the publicity stymie came from somewhere within the airlift task force command. Ideas for releases about Navy airlift operations grew stagnant in the task force public relations office. The Navy had no public relations officer, only a pilot who subbed in that capacity. All publicity had to be cleared through the task force chain of command. There was no escaping it.

It was impossible—and always will be—to qualify a statement that the Air Force tried to hold back publicity for the record-breaking activity of VR–8 and VR–6, or that publicity about the over-all operations was colored to indicate the Air Force was the whole show. But circumstantial evidence gleaned from the way in which actual operations of the squadrons were conducted, as well as the publicity, indicates that such was the case.

Here are some incidents which pyramid the circumstantial evidence:

When the Legion of Merit was presented to the commanding officer of an Air Force squadron operating in the same group as VR–6, the citation read: "For commanding his squadron in such an efficient manner that it surpassed all other squadrons in the same group in tonnage carried during the months of April, May, and June." The citation was carried verbatim in the press release that announced the award, and it was almost true. If it had read "any Air Force squadron in the same group" rather than just "any squadron," the citation would have been absolutely right. But, since VR–6 had led its respective group in tonnage since February, the citation carried a slight tinge, not, however, discernible to the press which had been restricted from seeing individual records since March.

When VR–6 flew 61 missions one day in June to set a record for single-day squadron flights to Berlin from Rhein/Main, the Air Force refused to put out a release on it. The reason: the 61-flight figure was no record, according to AF calculations. An Air Force squadron, operating from Fassberg, half as far from Berlin, had flown 70 missions the same day. The difference in ton-miles flown made little or no difference in AF treatment of the record.

On the first anniversary of the Berlin airlift, the Task Force Times, a paper put out by airlift task force personnel, came out with a grandiose edition noting the culmination of the first year's activities. Pictures galore covered the pages of the paper, but no Navy uniform was to be seen. Detailed reports covered the general over-all picture and specific exploits of Air Force squadrons. The stories emphasized the great competition that existed between airlift squadrons in respect to their performances. The thorough reader, if he was patient, was able to run across four lines devoted to a discussion of the record-holding Navy squadrons. The lines read: "We musn't forget the two Navy squadrons. They are competing against each other." Period.

In all fairness to the Air Force, it must be noted that, on occasion, they gave the Navy publicity. One such time was when a Navy plane crashed. It was the only major Navy accident, compared to numerous Air Force crashes. Yet, the Navy mishap brought forth a lengthy press release from Rhein/Main and, just incidentally, made the newsreels with particular note that this was a Navy plane which caused airlift operations to be temporarily suspended.

By the time I checked into Frankfurt in July of this year, I expected Navy morale to be very, very low. The chance for recognition had passed when the Berlin blockade was lifted on May 12. There was no definite word on when the men might be sent back to the States.

But I was never more wrong. Morale was high although the men were tired. Each of them seemed to realize what Navy participation in the airlift meant. In all sincerity, the Air Force had called on the Navy squadrons for help. The Air Force did not have the four-engine transport planes available to fill the gap in operations which had developed since the airlift began. The Navy, therefore, was getting the opportunity to

participate in one of the greatest humanitarian acts and the greatest transport air operation in history.

In addition to this, however, the Navy was slipped neatly, if inadvertently, behind the eight ball. If the Navy squadrons performed admirably, it would develop that they had been just a part of the fine over-all operation. If they showed up poorly, as well they might considering the lack of equipment available to them on their arrival, then the report would go out that the Navy's air-transport operations were nowhere near as good as the Air Force. The Navy's long-fought battle to maintain an air-transport component would probably have been lost.

So, the Navy squadrons went at their new task with an extra incentive. Their efforts were to find Air Force personnel accosting them in the streets of Frankfurt and Wiesbaden, demanding that they slow down lest the Air Force men be forced to work themselves to death to maintain the Navy pace.

Air Force personnel could not understand the eager attitude of Navy personnel. One first lieutenant, flying the lift, wrote the Kansas City Star and told one of the editors, a friend of his, about the airlift operations. His concluding paragraph noted that "there are also a couple of Navy squadrons over here, but all they are interested in is setting records and trying to get publicity." Eventually, the letter, as it appeared in the editorial columns of the Star, reached the first John's CO, an Air Force colonel not so rabidly anti-Navy as most. After first phoning the Navy across the field, the colonel called the young pilot into his office. "I have seen your letter to the Star. I thought you might be interested in knowing how the Navy can set so many records, so I have written a set of orders for you to work on the maintenance line at VR–8 for 2 weeks."

Chagrined though he was, the Air Force officer went with the Navy for 2 weeks, working with the maintenance crew. Two weeks later he reported to his CO: "I know now why the Navy is the top bunch." And he wrote the Star editor the same thing.

What the first lieutenant found was that the Navy, through hard work and an efficient maintenance system, was able to keep more planes in commission (flying) than any of the Air Force units. The Navy squadrons used what is known as a progressive-check system. That calls for checking certain parts of the plane between each hop, during the time it was being refueled. This is in contrast to the system of decommissioning the plane for a number of hours—or days—and checking the entire plane at one time. In addition to this, while the Air Force used innumerable Germans in maintenance and repair work, the Navy abstained almost entirely from shifting the responsibility from its own men. VR–8 used the Germans at first, only sparingly, but soon stopped; VR–6 never did use them. The Navy pilots, resultingly, had much more confidence in their planes and also much more use of them.

The checks which I mention here are the periodic 50-hour ones. At first, unlike the Air Force squadrons the eager Navy boys also performed 200-hour checks on their own planes. The Air Force sent all their aircraft over to Burtonwood, England, for the 200-hour check and thus lightened the load on their maintenance crews which, comparatively, were the same size as the Navy's.

When the Navy began to set record on record, due almost entirely to keeping their planes in commission longer, the task force commander ordered the Navy squadrons to send their planes to Burtonwood for 200-hour checks. He stipulated a minimum number which would go each month.

To take a plane to Burtonwood pulls it out of service 3 days. Doing the check in Frankfurt, it could be completed and the plane back on the lift in 8 hours. Furthermore, the Navy got unsatisfactory results from the Air Force maintenance personnel who worked on the plane in Burtonwood. "We always had to spend another three or four hours working on it when the pilots flew it back," one chief told me.

It may have been just a mere coincidence that the task-force commander insisted, after the Navy began to set records, that VR–8 and VR–6 send a minimum number of planes to Burtonwood for checks. On the other hand, the Navy was satisfactorily running their own checks, and the rapid fashion in which the planes were put back in commission aided the fine performance in tonnage. Forcing the planes to go to Burtonwood naturally hurt that record. Observers of this fact are allowed to draw their own conclusions about whether the move of the task-force commander, an Air Force general, was designed to impede VR–8 and VR–6 operations.

The airlift officially began on June 26 of last year, with 32 flights of Air Force C–47's carrying food supplies from Wiesbaden to Berlin's Tempelhof Airdrome. Russia's blockade of Berlin had become effective on June 21. Not expecting the blockade to last as long as it did, the Air Force was a little slow getting mass flights into the beleaguered ex-capital of Germany. But within a month, the task-force command was in shape and four-engine transport squadrons were operating from Frankfurt and Wiesbaden. The complex operation of running the lift worked smoothly, but not without the earnest efforts of all Air Force personnel involved.

It soon became evident to the Russians that unless they could scare the planes out, the airlift would destroy whatever hopes they had in establishing the blockade. Russia began to issue warnings that their aircraft would be flying through the airlift corridor. Though afraid of an "incident" which might set off a shooting war, the Air Force continued to fly through from Frankfurt and Wiesbaden as well as from the British base at Fassberg.

The Russians learned to their regret that the Air Force and, later the Navy, did not scare easily. In the first 13½ months of Operation Vittles, American planes flew a total of 184,778 flights and carried a total of 1,735,524 cargo and passenger tons into Berlin. Americans—and Britons who flew a little less than half as much—had proved that a large air-transportation project was possible.

Some observers, making the immediately preceding statement, added the two words "and practical." Others, looking with a wary eye at the volume of fuel and personnel required to maintain the vittles operation, questioned how practical the operation might be.

The airlift would have died a not-so-natural death but for the United States Navy—the surface Navy, that is—within 3 days of its inception. The reason: Shortage of fuel. Salvation came in the presence of three Navy tankers whose original destination was the Mediterranean. Diverted by radio message, the ships took their aviation-gas load into Bremerhaven where it was off-loaded and shipped immediately to Frankfurt.

Since that time, July 3, 1948, 27 shiploads of aviation gas, totaling 2,984,000 barrels, were carried by the Navy to Bremerhaven. Had the Air Force been forced to provide a support airlift for the vittles operation, it would have required a minimum of twice as many planes as used in the Berlin trek to keep the vittles planes in fuel. The difference in operating costs of 27 ships making 1 trip and of 672 4-engine aircraft operating continuously is plainly evident.

No wonder, then, that some observers take a look at the two-hundred-and-forty-six million-plus dollar figure, which it required to operate the airlift for 11 months, and shake their heads at the claim that a large airlift is practical. In an emergency, a large air-transport operation can be accomplished. But its practicality, when compared with comparable surface transportation, does not appear.

The airlift was scheduled to conclude on October 1. In August, however, the operation was slowly decreased as the bulk of the planes and personnel started home. First out—and the one plane and crew to get the publicity—was an Air Force C–54. Navy planes and crews started the homeward trek 2 days later. Their arrival at Patuxent River, Md., was greeted, with the exception of old shipmates, by a "Ho-hum, so you're back. Where you been?"

A number of enlisted personnel both of VR–8 and VR–6 came back on an Army transport arriving in New York on August 19. Met by reporters of the metropolitan newspapers, the men were quick to shout the exploits of the Navy squadrons. But the airlift was dead. News of it got little attention. The New York Times buried a 4-inch story, filled with errors, on page 6.

But the Navy fliers and mechanics, deprived of publicity which they justly deserved, have every right to be proud of their Berlin lift record. They will, most of them, go back where they were before. VR–8 is returning to Honolulu and the Pacific run. VR–6, however, goes to a new spot at Patuxent, Md., to relieve VR–3 of the North Atlantic run so that it can return to transcontinental service.

As they slip into the old regime, the heavy push of Germany behind them, they do so with the echo of the entire Navy, plus those of the Nation's populace who were fortunate to know of their presence in the airlift, ringing out, "Well done."

The Air Force did compliment the Navy, but not on its airlift record. The message to Admiral Louis E. Denfeld said:

"Throughout more than 8½ months of Navy participation in Operation Vittles no Navy Vittles aircraft was grounded for lack of a part peculiar to the Navy R–5–D.

"Your excellent support has been of great assistance to Navy squadrons and to USAFE."

Congressional Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent article from the Lynn Item, Lynn, Mass.:

PROBES SHOULD BE IMPORTANT

The United States ought to find a way to conduct major investigations on a level of impartiality and objectivity that will assure respectful attention to the results by all sides in a dispute.

With rare exceptions, Congress is the chief investigative body in this country. The power to delve into problems and controversies of all kinds is rightfully recognized as essential to a sound program of lawmaking.

But Congress, as we know, is seldom free from partisan interests in any of its operations. Usually when an inquiry turns out to be reasonably well balanced, it is because there was a balance of political forces on the investigating committee.

This, however, is not something the Nation can count upon. Too often a congressional probe degenerates into a wild political wrangle in which truth becomes lost in the shuffle.

Frequently on the flimsiest pretext, the names of innocent individuals—prominent or otherwise—are dragged through the mud. Method of inquiry so easily subject to abuse is not one calculated to serve the country's interests when matters of high policy are at stake. In such issues decisions probably should be taken outside the arena of partisan brawling.

Great Britain and our northern neighbor, Canada, provide examples of how this might be done. In those countries, when a question of paramount importance arises, a royal commission may be appointed by the executive authority. The commission is a civilian group drawn from all walks.

Because these commissions are detached from the problems they study, because they have no ax to grind, their findings are received with the utmost regard. That does not mean their conclusions are above criticism, but simply that no one seriously questions the commission's aim in fastening on the real truth.

It was such an agency in Canada which investigated Russian spy activity shortly after World War II. Without fanfare, the commission dug exhaustively into the confused situation. When its findings were made public, the people believed guilty of espionage were indicted and tried—many going to prison. The names of innocent persons touched by the inquiry were never revealed.

Contrast that performance with the irresponsible smearing and patently political jousting of the House Un-American Activities Committee in recent years. Its achievements have been relatively minor, but the damage it has done to innocent citizens has been great.

The United States almost inevitably would have had a much clearer picture of Soviet espionage and subversive doings in this country had a civilian commission done the job.

The same approach might wisely be tried now in the bitter dispute between the Navy and Air Force over their respective roles in defense.

Congressional committees have largely disqualified themselves for an objective study of the controversy, because too many of the lawmakers involved have well-advertised prejudices in favor of one or the other service.

There would be no better time to gage the worth of the independent investigating commission than in this quarrel that is doing so much to weaken the prestige and morale of our armed forces.

Nuremberg in Retrospect—Legal Answer to International Lawlessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. It is an authoritative account of the legal bases of the trials of the major Nazi war criminals before the international military tribunal at Nuremberg, written by the American chief prosecutor. Taken from an address delivered before the Canadian Bar Association meeting at Banff, Alberta, on September 1, Justice Jackson reviews in detail the legal foundations on which the trial rested and explains how the procedure used was determined.

The article follows:

NUREMBERG IN RETROSPECT: LEGAL ANSWER TO INTERNATIONAL LAWLESSNESS

(By Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States)

The Nuremberg trial of the major Nazi war criminals was an attempt to answer in terms of the law the most serious challenge that faces modern civilization—war and international lawlessness.

The legal profession, by most countries, has been conceded leadership in working out rules of law which will keep their peace, security, and liberty. As the lawyer is the most frequently chosen legislator, diplomat, executive, and political leader, the intellectual discipline which we call the law saturates Western World statesmanship and diplomacy.

Judged by its fruits, there must have been serious shortcomings in our practice, and perhaps in our teachings, of international law. Our own times may easily rate as the most bloody and cruel in recorded history. Our record includes two world wars, millions of human beings put to death for no cause other than their race, other millions seized and transported to forced labor, and a whole continent gripped by terror of the concentration camp. The worst perhaps is that these things still go on. Civilization seems to have lost control of itself. What a record for an age governed more than any other by men of our profession. Certainly here is lawlessness which challenges not only the lawyer but the law itself.

At the opening of this tortured and bloody century, law-trained men dominated the councils of most Western nations. They were thinking about problems of state in relation to certain assumptions supplied by their legal discipline. Four of these, at risk of oversimplification, may be thus condensed:

First, each state is sovereign, its right absolute, its will unrestrained, and free to resort to war at any time, for any purpose. Second, courts, therefore, must everywhere regard any war as legal, and engagement in warfare must be accepted as a good defense to what otherwise would be crime. Third, measures by high officials such as planning, instigating, and waging war constitute "acts of state," in performance of which they owe no legal duty to international society and for which there is no accountability to international law. Fourth, for obedience to superior orders an individual incurs no personal liability.

It would be hard to devise an intellectual discipline that would do more to encourage international lawlessness and aggression. German leaders who precipitated World War II were ardent disciples of these teachings. When they led to catastrophe, they all invoked the shelter of one or more of these four doctrines as a defense. They pleaded that their acts, however shocking, could not be criminal because these doctrines of the nineteenth century still stood as the law in the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century.

The Nuremberg prosecutions constitute this century's most definite challenge to this anarchic concept of the law of nations. Save the Nuremberg proceedings, too little has come out of the war to challenge the catastrophic doctrines invoked to excuse starting it. If those guilty of inciting World War II had been held immune from prosecution, any who might tomorrow plot a third one would be equally immune. Furthermore, machinery to make new international law is so inadequate, inertia is so great, conflict and suspicion are today so paralyzing, that we can foresee no time when aggressive wars will be outlawed or their perpetrators legally punishable if the Nuremberg basis for doing so was not valid.

If mankind were still helpless and hopeless in the throes of antiquated teachings it would be disheartening, for those who insist that there was no such law as Nuremberg applied generally agree that there should be such law.

CRITICS DENY VALIDITY OF TRIALS, BUT ADMIT THEIR VALUE

At the opening of the international trial, Dr. Otto Stahmer, on behalf of all defendants, asserted to the court that "a real order among the states is impossible as long as every state has the sovereign right to wage war at any time and for any purpose." He acknowledged that public opinion already distinguished between just and unjust wars and demanded that the men guilty of launching unjust war be punished. He said, "Humanity wishes that in the future this idea will be more than a postulate, that it will become valid international law. But today it is not yet existing international law." And later he declared, "In fact, this (indictment) is far ahead of its time, as is the whole way of argumentation by Justice Jackson." A German critic, Dr. Hans Ehard, Minister-President of Bavaria, recently argued strongly that Nuremberg did not apply existing law, but nevertheless said, "We must salute the Nuremberg trial as a guidepost for the further development of the law of nations."

It is illuminating that these interested and learned opponents of the Nuremberg proceedings find it impossible to condemn the trial by standards of the past without also commending it by standards of the future. Their contention is that the trial has fallen, in a legal sense, "between two worlds—one dead, the other powerless to be born."

Of course a first attempt to conduct an international criminal trial against the highest surviving officials of a once powerful state for crimes against the peace of the world and the dignity of mankind was bound to cause lasting controversy. As contemporaries we all lack the perspective to anticipate the verdict of history on this effort. Those whose energies were engaged in the struggle lack objectivity most of all. But I recognize that there is room for honest and intelligent difference of opinion as to many aspects of the enterprise. Whatever view one takes, Nuremberg witnessed a legal event of importance. So, with such detachment as I can summon, I shall try to tell something of the origin of the trial and some of its more interesting problems, and of the use we made of the lawyers' hearing procedures and trial technique in this novel situation.

One after another, a dozen unprepared countries, with each of which Germany had a treaty of friendship and nonaggression, were overrun by undeclared wars, the opinion was almost universal that the hostilities had no cause except for Germany's ambition for conquest. As it went on, the world was also shocked and horrified by Germany's wantonly brutal and savage conduct. Appeals and protests alike were scorned. Then came a series of unequivocal warnings that the course of its leaders was regarded as outside the bounds of modern warfare and criminal. In 1942 representatives of nine occupied countries met in London and issued the "St. James Declaration," that the war criminals would be "sought out, handed over to justice and judged." This brought replies from President Roosevelt that "they shall have to stand in courts of law * * * and answer for their acts," and from Mr. Churchill that they would "have to stand up before tribunals," and a Soviet declaration that they must be "arrested and tried under criminal law." As the terrorism grew, seventeen nations formed the "United Nations War Crimes Commission," headed first by Sir Cecil Hurst and later by Lord Wright. It did valiant service in gathering information as to war crimes and suspects. As the horrors did not

abate, Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt, by the Moscow declaration of November 1943, pledged the Allies to return accused Germans for trial by the country in which atrocities were committed, but declared that those whose offenses had no particular geographical location "will be punished by a joint decision of the Governments of the Allies."

Wartime accusations, of course, rested upon information that appeared credible, but in large part it did not measure up to the standard of legal evidence, and could not then be verified. But the Allies were forced to decide whether to investigate these charges or to abandon them when they found the survivors of the accused among Allied prisoners. Shortly before the German surrender, I was appointed to represent the United States in negotiating the joint decision promised in the Moscow declaration and, as chief of counsel, to conduct in its behalf such trial as might be decided upon.

TRIAL OF WAR CRIMINALS WAS ONLY COURSE

Only three dispositions have ever been suggested as possible for these accused captives. One was to free them and abandon the accusations. That course, at that time, had almost no responsible advocates. The second possible method was a political decision to execute, exile or otherwise punish them. Some favored doing this by simple fiat of the Allied powers, but others would have camouflaged it with some kind of farcial trial. For example, one periodical editorialized, "In our opinion the proper procedure for this body would have been to identify the prisoners, read off their crimes with as much supporting data as seemed useful, pass judgment upon them quickly, and carry out the judgment without any delay whatever." And a professor of political science was widely quoted in the press to this effect: "What, in my opinion, they should have done is to set up summary courts martial. Then they should have placed these criminals on trial before them within 24 hours after they were caught, sentenced them to death, and shot them in the morning." Such insistent and popular, but stultifying, counsel was rejected.

The only course remaining was to hold a good-faith trial for specific offenses, to be proved by evidence, with full opportunity to the accused to offer evidence or argument in defense or mitigation. How else than by our traditional hearing process could it be determined who was and who was not really responsible for particular reprehensible acts? How else would we discriminate among those who should be executed, who imprisoned and who exculpated? And how could anything we did be justified before the future if we did not make and act upon a record? On June 7, 1945, I reported to President Truman, recommending against undiscriminating executions or punishments without definite findings of guilt, fairly arrived at and in favor of trying the accused not only for the planned campaign of atrocities but for the instigation and waging of wars of aggression as well. This report, approved by the President, was published and became an integral part of the foreign policy and occupation program of the United States.

However, the decision to hold a trial was made in the face of obstacles so formidable that many well-wishers thought it a quixotic undertaking beyond our power to accomplish. There was no beaten path to follow, no precedents to teach former successes or failures. No court was in existence to hear such a case. The prosecution must be conducted in four languages by lawyers trained in four different legal systems, two being of the common-law tradition and two of the civil- or Roman-law school. The defense would be made by counsel whose practice, especially under the Nazis, was in many respects different from all the others. Many differences in their customs and practice in criminal cases must be reconciled in some yet undrafted code of procedure. While substantive law could be gleaned from scattered sources, there was no codification of applicable law. Moreover, very little real evidence was in our possession, the overwhelming mass of documents being still undiscovered and their existence largely unsuspected. We did not even know whether a courthouse that could house such a trial was still standing in Germany, or if so, where it was to be found. Most of our preparation and all of the trial must be carried on where we would be surrounded by enemies, and where transport and communication were at a standstill and the ordinary facilities for living, as well as for work, had been destroyed.

To try to bring some order out of this chaos, representatives of the four powers met in London in June of 1945. The published minutes of this conference record the discussions and conflicts, concessions and compromises which produced the charter of the Nuremberg international military tribunal. I doubt whether a more novel or challenging task ever was set before members of the legal profession. All countries chose delegates who were preeminently lawyers rather than diplomats or politicians, although not strangers to these activities. All had long practical trial experience and approached the negotiations as a technical professional task, with the utmost good will toward each other and a determination to succeed. All agreed in principle that no country reasonably could insist that an international trial should be conducted under its own system and that we must borrow from all and devise an amalgamated procedure that would be workable, expeditious, and fair. The conference resulted in an agreement, signed for the four powers by delegates high in their respective judicial systems, who had shared responsibility for negotiating it. These were Jowitt, Lord Chancelor for the United Kingdom; Falco, judge of the Cour de Cassation, for France; Nikitchenko, vice president of the Soviet Supreme Court, for the Soviet Union; and myself, for the United States.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOVIET AND ALLIES FACED AT LONDON

It is not easy to explain fairly and accurately all the ideological conflicts that perplexed the London conference. The chief differences, however, had their roots in two conflicting fundamental concepts—one as to the relation between a court and the government which establishes it; the other as to the nature of the criminal process.

A hasty general glance at the Soviet legal tradition will make the Soviet doctrine easier to understand, but not easier to accept. As you know, the Russian people received their philosophy of law and government from the ancient Mediterranean world through the same geographical route by which they received their religion—Byzantium and the East. Also, modern Russia remained largely insulated from the intellectual forces which liberalized western Europe and shaped the institutions of both Canada and the United States. The English conception, expressed by Coke, that "the King is under God and the law," would have been regarded by Russian jurists as treason, and French liberalism, expressed by such writers as Montesquieu, never effectively persuaded them. The authoritarianism of Russia's venerable institutions has had no amelioration over the centuries. The Bolshevist revolution appropriated, rather than reformed, the instruments of despotic power. Prime Minister Attlee recently described the Soviet Union as merely an "inverted czarism." Soviet jurists teach that this union of Marxism with czarism, through a dictatorship of the proletariat, is enough to make the Soviet Union democratic. Hence, the Soviet revolution has done very little to bring Russia legal thinking any closer to our Western tradition.

The able Soviet representative brought to London from this background his conception of a court and of the law. An earlier revolutionary writer expressed it in these terms: "The court has always been and still remains, as it ought to be according to its nature—namely, one of the organs of governmental power, a weapon in the hands of the ruling class for the purpose of safeguarding its interests." Vyshinsky's more recent book, the Law of the Soviet State, reiterates that a court is merely another implement of a dominant class in advancing its interests. He pronounces the idea of "bourgeois theorists" that courts are organs "above classes and apart from politics" to be radically false.

In accord with this philosophy, the Soviet representative took the position that any tribunal we set up must be bound by the Moscow declaration of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin that our Nazi captives were criminals and hence would consider the personal guilt of each only as a basis for sentencing him. All other delegations, of course, rejected this idea and insisted that the tribunal independently determine the whole question of each defendant's guilt or innocence upon the evidence and the law. The Soviet yielded and this Western concept of the court was finally adopted and governed the trial.

CONTINENTAL CONCEPT OF CRIMINAL TRIAL VERSUS COMMON-LAW CONCEPT

The other fundamental difference concerned the nature of a criminal proceeding and consequently the manner in which it should be conducted. Our common-law criminal trial is an adversary proceeding before a jury, in which the judge is a moderator or arbitrator between combatant counsel. The continental countries generally, including the Soviet Union, regard the criminal trial as an inquest to solve the crime, conducted on behalf of society by the court, not as a moderator, but as an active inquisitor. The Soviet delegates, with particular reference to the United States, expressed dislike for the extremes to which we carry the adversary theory, and suggested that some of our methods are unfair to defendants, tend to promote contests, and permit trials to drag out into endurance tests, like sporting events. I could not deny that these criticisms have some truth as to criminal trials in the United States, some of which have degenerated close to the limits of toleration.

These differences of fundamental theory manifested themselves in several procedural disagreements. One concerned the contents of an indictment. Soviet and also continental jurists consider that our method of providing the accused with only a skeleton statement of charges, withholding the evidence until he is in court, does not give an innocent man fair opportunity to prepare for trial, and leads a guilty one to contest charges to which he might plead guilty if he knew the government's evidence. There is much to be said in support of these criticisms. The Russians proposed that this indictment should furnish to the court and to defendants a dossier of the evidence, including statements of all witnesses, and all documents relied upon. Our compromise was that the indictment should contain much more than would be customary in the United States, while giving the defendant much less information than would be given in France, Germany, or Russia.

Another manifestation of the difference in systems concerned the relative functions of the court vis-à-vis the prosecution. We believed that the tribunal should have no responsibility for preparation or conduct of the prosecution, but should receive the indictment, hear the evidence offered by the parties, and render judgment. The Soviet idea was that the case would actively be conducted by the tribunal, with the prosecutors as subordinates. The tribunal, they thought, should decide what witnesses to call, what documents to put in evidence, and

should examine the witnesses and interrogate the accused.

The Soviet finally acceded, in general, to common-law methods of trial, saying that it was contrary to their procedural legislation, but was more widely known because it was used in the English-speaking countries.

SOLUTION ADOPTED FOR PROBLEM OF TESTIMONY OF ACCUSED

Another conflict between continental and common-law practice arose over allowing a defendant to testify under oath in his own behalf. Soviet, like continental law generally, does not permit him to do so. At one time this was the rule at common law also and it still prevails in at least one of our States. Continental and Soviet practice, however, gives the accused what is regarded as an equivalent. At the end of all proceedings except judgment, he is entitled to make an unsworn statement in which he may deny guilt, plead for mercy, attack the prosecution, or advance any arguments he chooses, and it does not subject him to cross-examination. We felt that English-speaking countries would not regard a procedure as fair which refused defendants the right to testify. Our continental associates felt that no process which denied the defendant his traditional final statement would be regarded as fair in France, Germany, or the Soviet Union. Our solution was to allow the Germans both privileges, and nearly all of the defendants testified for themselves under oath, subject to cross-examination, and also made final statements.

The rules of evidence that should govern the tribunal might have caused serious disagreement if we had insisted on our own. Continental lawyers regard our common-law rules of evidence with abhorrence. Since they were evolved in response to the peculiarities of trial by jury, we saw no reason to urge their use in an international trial before professional judges. They have not generally been followed by international tribunals. We settled, therefore, upon one simple rule: that the tribunal "shall admit any evidence which it deems to have probative value." While this vested considerable discretion in the tribunal, it had the merit of making admission of evidence turn on the value of what was proffered rather than upon compliance with some formal rule of evidence.

This compromise criminal procedure which we adopted was put to a hard test by experience. The trial extended through more than 400 sessions of court, covering 10 months. Prosecutors for the 4 nations called 33 witnesses and put in evidence over 4,000 documents. In addition to the defendants themselves, 61 witnesses testified in their behalf; 143 more gave evidence for them by written answers to interrogatories, and they offered a large number of defense documents. Yet less time was devoted to disputes over procedure and admissibility of evidence than would be so consumed in a criminal trial of any comparable magnitude in the United States. It was the demonstrated success of our procedure which led Dr. Ehard, while voicing German criticism of the legal basis of the trial, to declare that, "from a technical point of view, the trial was an important accomplishment."

Counsel representing all of the governments associated in the prosecution, as well as the judges, spared no effort to assure the fundamental integrity of the process. The charter allowed each defendant counsel of his choice, and if he had none, a German advocate was appointed for him by the tribunal. Defense counsel included leaders of the practicing and academic profession in Germany. Many were Nazis, but defendants were permitted to have their cases presented by sympathetic advocates. All such counsel were paid, fed, and housed by military government. They were furnished office space, stenographers, and supplies. Copies of documents presented as part of the prosecution's case were given to them at least 24 hours in advance of presentation in court. They were given access to captured documents that were not used by the prosecution. They were allowed, so far as physical conditions permitted, to have the deposition or presence at the trial of any witness they could convince the tribunal had information relevant to their defense. How far they were allowed to go will appear from the record showing depositions from Nimitz, an admiral of the United States Navy, and Halifax, former Foreign Secretary of Great Britain. We sent airplanes to Sweden and to Switzerland to bring defense witnesses from neutral territory to testify. A transcript of proceedings, in his own language, was furnished daily to each counsel. The prosecution made its case in 3 months, while the defendants offered evidence for nearly 5 months. Our closing speeches occupied 3 days, while defendants used 20 days to complete their argument. The trial record will stand the most severe scrutiny of history, for we knew that as we judged, so would the future judge us.

WHY JUDGES WERE NOT CHOSEN FROM NEUTRAL COUNTRIES

In prescribing the structure of the tribunal we had to consider whether to draw the judges from the prosecuting countries or to attempt to enlist some or all of them from neutral nations. The scope of the war, however, left few neutrals, and formal neutrality of a government did not mean disinterestedness on the part of all its citizens. There was no escape from selection of the judges by the victorious powers and it seems naive to believe that they would have chosen more dispassionate or just jurists from other lands than from England, France, and the United States. Those countries which enjoy the blessing of an independent judicial tradition rely upon the individual integrity, detachment, and learning of the judge to shape his decisions rather than upon the source of his commission, his nationality, or his class. In making these defendants stand trial before a court of aggrieved countries we followed an almost universal criminal law. If an offender escapes into jurisdiction of an indifferent society, he is extradited and the fugitive brought back to trial in the territory interested in his prosecution. In your courts and mine, the Government constantly litigates before the judges it appoints and maintains and it frequently meets with defeat. That, indeed, happened at Nuremberg. No men did we plead more earnestly to convict than Schacht and Von Papen, both of whom the tribunal acquitted. Indeed, all but six of the defendants were acquitted on one or more of the counts. These defendants were before judges who, with their alternates, attended every session of the trial, except one alternate who suffered an illness of 2 or 3 days. Their undivided attention to the evidence, their impartial rulings and judicial bearing and their dispassionate and discriminating written judgment won for the tribunal the commendation of all disinterested observers. It set a high standard of judicial conduct for all future international tribunals.

However, participation of a Soviet judge is a grievance much exploited by Germans. It is urged that since the Soviet Union joined with Hitler in the aggression against Poland, it was an accomplice and should not have had a seat in judgment. Regardless of the merits I do not doubt that German pride and nationalism found judgment by Russians especially objectionable and that it will always injure the repute of the trial with the German people. But I think the grievance is more symbolic than substantial.

The charter provided that convictions and sentences should require affirmative votes of at least three members of the tribunal. Hence a Soviet vote to convict or sentence could be effective only if two, constituting a majority of the remaining three judges, concurred, so the same result would be reached as if the Soviet seat had been left vacant. No defendant, therefore, was found guilty or punished because of Soviet participation. At all events, it was hardly to be expected that, within 2 months of the German surrender we would refuse the Soviet a seat on the bench and thus initiate a break in an alliance that had just won the war. Perhaps it would have been better for Germany and the rest of the world if other efforts to retain Soviet cooperation had been as successful as ours.

But however one looks at the propriety of Soviet participation, a righteous judgment is not impeached by the unworthiness of a judge, just as our clerical brethren hold that the effectiveness of the sacraments is not diminished even when they be "ministered by evil men". The ultimate question with which history will be concerned is whether the end of this process was a right judgment.

VALIDITY OF JUDGMENT RESTS UPON RECORD

No one can intelligently decide whether the legal foundation for this judgment is valid, so that it amounts to a judicial conviction and not a mere political condemnation, without consideration of the record on which it is based. The judgment, unlike the wartime accusations, rests on proved facts. Of course I can not adequately review these, but neither can I adequately discuss the law until we know just what kind of acts our opponents say are beyond the law and which we say the law may punish.

At about the time that Mr. Roosevelt was elected President of the United States, Adolf Hitler engineered what his partisans aptly called "the seizure of power". The Nazi Party overthrew the parliamentary institutions of the Weimar Republic and set up a strong dictatorship admittedly as a step toward reestablishing Germany's predominance in central Europe—by war if need be. To this end two great policies were embarked upon: one was to prepare for war; the other was to crush all internal opposition to the regime.

All constitutional liberties were suspended, courts were purged of independent judges, special "people's courts" of partisans were set up, and concentration camps were established for dissenters. Trade unions were seized and brought under the regime and Jews were excluded from all civil rights. Goering testified that "If for any cause someone was taken into custody for political reasons, this could not be reviewed in any court". He gave this summation of the ultimate achievement: "So far as opposition is concerned in any form, the opposition of each individual person was not tolerated unless it is a matter of no importance."

Meanwhile, as early as 1935, Schacht was secretly appointed to prepare the economy for war, and within a year Goering, Coordinator of Economy, brought the departments of government together and informed them that "all measures are to be considered from the standpoint of an assured waging of war." A gigantic armament program was commenced, compulsory military service was reestablished, and a military air force and a submarine navy were planned superior to any in the world. Remilitarized Germany tested its strength in several instances without encountering opposition enough to cause a war. The German Army reentered the Rhineland, an Anschluss was forced upon Austria, and Czechoslovakia was taken over. Not satisfied with this, Hitler then threw his armed forces against Poland, which constituted the aggression that plunged the world into war. It is fortunate that the first occasion on which military aggression was sought to be punished as a crime was also an occasion on which the aggression was so clear and its proof so indisputable that there was no choice except

to convict or to abandon the principle that military aggression is a crime.

In November 1937, nearly 2 years before the war, Hitler called a meeting of his high command at the Reichschancellery in Berlin. The captured minutes, kept by Colonel Hoszbach, were admitted to be authentic by defendants who attended the conference. Hitler said, "It is not a case of conquering people, but of conquering agriculturally useful space." And after reviewing Germany's needs, he concluded with this observation: "The question for Germany is where the greatest possible conquest could be made at the lowest cost." At this time he only disclosed an aim to conquer Czechoslovakia and Austria. He had them both in his possession within about a year, and without a war.

These acquisitions did not satisfy his ambitions and on May 23, 1939, he held another meeting at which he announced his intention to attack Poland—which attack was carried out 4 months later. Captured minutes, kept by Lieutenant Colonel Schmundt, record Hitler as saying, "There is no question of sparing Poland and we are left with the decision to attack Poland at the first suitable opportunity. We cannot expect a repetition of the Czech affair. There will be war." He anticipated that England and France would enter a life-and-death struggle that might last a long time, and ordered preparations made accordingly.

A final meeting was held at Obersalzburg on August 22, 1939, and again we captured minutes of Hitler's speech. He announced the decision to invade at once, and said: "I shall give a propagandist cause for starting the war, never mind whether it be plausible or not. The victor shall not be asked later on whether we told the truth or not. In starting and making a war, not the truth is what matters, but victory." His attitude is shown by his further statement: "I am only afraid that at the last moment some Schweinehund will make a proposal for mediation." Appeals from President Roosevelt, from His Holiness the Pope, and from Daladier, Prime Minister of France, to refrain from war were scorned. On the 1st of September, the German forces invaded Poland, and for the second time in a generation a world war was begun.

DEFENDANTS HAD VIOLATED INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

The tribunal found that Hitler, aided and abetted by certain of the defendants on trial, planned and waged aggressive wars against 12 nations. Invasion of similarly aggressive character of Denmark and Norway, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg, Yugoslavia and Greece, in rapid succession, followed that of Poland, and every one was in violation of repeated assurances and nonaggression treaties. I shall not detail the story of the secret and undeclared attack in June of 1941 on the Soviet Union, to whom she was then bound by treaties of friendship and nonaggression—an attack that was pursuant to a plan issued by Hitler and initiated by his high command more than 6 months before. Nor shall I recite the somewhat tentative plans which were considered for the prosecution of a war against the United States at a later date, or the plotting which ultimately induced Japan to attack us.

As the Wehrmacht expanded the area of Nazi conquest, the terrors of the Nazi regime were spread over Europe with increasing efficiency and ferocity. We paid no attention at Nuremberg to such atrocities as were spontaneous outbursts of passion. We charged systematic and planned organization to subdue populations by terror and to get rid of races the Nazis disliked and of peoples who lived on lands they wanted for themselves.

In announcing to his high command at Obersalzburg the purpose of invading Poland, Hitler twice commanded a war of cruelty. He told his generals, "Our strength is in our quickness and brutality. Ghengis Khan had millions of women and children killed with a gay heart. History sees in him only a great state builder. * * * Thus, for the time being, I have sent to the East only my 'death's head units' with the order to kill without pity or mercy all men, women and children of Polish race or language. Only in such a way will we win the vital space that we need." Again, the notes show him commanding, "Have no pity. Brutal attitude." And, "The aim is the elimination of living forces."

The two outstanding applications of this Hitler policy were the slave labor program and persecution of the Jews. In all occupied territories, compulsory labor service was instituted. A vast labor supply was recruited for shipment to labor in Germany. Defendant Sauckel, who had charge of the program, was shown by captured documents to have reported, "Out of the 5,000,000 workers who arrived in Germany, not even 200,000 came voluntarily." The largest slaving operation in history, this was also one of the most cruel. The tribunal summarizes the recruitment in occupied countries: "Manhunts took place in the streets, at motion picture houses, even at churches, and at night in private houses. Houses were sometimes burnt down and the families taken as hostages." These persons were transported under the most inhuman conditions and turned over to employers for use in agriculture and industry. Sauckel's instructions of April 20, 1942, read: "All the men must be fed, sheltered, and treated in such a way as to exploit them to the highest possible extent, at the lowest conceivable degree of expenditure." It takes little imagination to picture how German employers would behave when self-interest was added to such official commands. The slaves were treated with great cruelty and died in vast numbers. The remnants of this labor horde constitute "displaced persons" in Germany today.

The persecution of the Jews began in Germany with discriminatory laws and soon descended to pogroms organized with police approval, burning and demolishing of synagogues, looting of Jewish businesses, violence to Jewish people, and their confinement in ghettos. But anti-Semitism was a foreign as well as a domestic policy. Hitler declared that his war would bring about extermination of the Jews of Europe. As fast as his power spread, Jews were compelled to register and wear the yellow star, and were forced into ghettos where they were required to work on war material. It was in the summer of 1941 that plans were made for what was called the final solution of the Jewish problem—extermination. A special section of the Gestapo was set up under Eichmann to carry out this program of extinction. Our evidence was gruesome, ghoulish and indisputable that it was carried out with relentless efficiency. I can only indicate its character. We captured General Stroop's report of the burning of the Warsaw ghetto, in which he reported to Berlin that he had cleaned out the ghetto "with utter ruthlessness and merciless tenacity" and caused the death of a proved total of 56,005 Jews. He said: "Jews usually left their hide-outs but frequently remained in the burning buildings and jumped out of the windows only when the heat became unbearable. Then they tried to crawl with broken bones across the street into buildings which were not afire. * * * Countless numbers of Jews were liquidated in sewers and bunkers with blasting."

We also had captured reports of the operators of the gas wagons, detailing how they herded the people into closed trucks and suffocated them with the motor exhaust. Extermination squads even prepared a map, which fell into our hands, of the eastern territories with the symbol of a coffin in each province on which a figure represented the Jews exterminated and outside of the coffin another figure representing the Jews yet to be killed.

Another phase of the program was to gather Jews from all occupied Europe in concentration camps, where those fit to work were used as slaves and those not fit to work were destroyed in gas chambers and their bodies burned. Hoess, commandant of the Auschwitz extermination camp, called as a defense witness, testified that in his administration alone 2,500,000 million persons were thus done away with, and he gave lurid and technical details of the process. One extermination institution kept a death register which showed that all inmates died of heart failure, and that each day they invariably died in alphabetical order.

These were not merely sadistic deeds of unimportant people. In the vaults of the great Reichsbank, the central financial institution of Germany, we found stored great quantities of gold fillings taken from the teeth and rings taken from the fingers of concentration camp victims, which were turned over to the financiers who supplied credit to help carry on the program.

The evidence showed that at least 6,000,000 Jews were killed, of which 4,000,000 were killed in the extermination institutions. These are the things which caused Hans Frank, Nazi Governor-General of Poland, to cry out from the witness stand: "We have fought against Jewry. We have fought against it for years. And we have allowed ourselves to make utterances and my own diary has become a witness against me in this connection. Utterances which are terrible. * * * A thousand years will pass and this guilt of Germany will still not be erased."

ALL DEFENDANTS ADMITTED FACTS

Such were the courses of conduct that the German documents revealed and that all defendants admitted had occurred. The only issue of fact left was the degree of personal responsibility of those indicted for having so written German history in blood. The last stand of those implicated was not that the evidence failed to convict of the acts, but that the law had failed to make the acts crimes. Admitting that they were moral wrongs of the first magnitude, it was contended that they fell within that realm that the law leaves to the free choice of the individual and for which he must answer to no forum except his own conscience. In short, their position was that there are no binding standards of conduct for states or statesmen that they disregard at risk of answering to international law. If that is so, it is a sad conclusion for the world, for it reduces the whole body of what we have called international law to such stuff as dreams are made on. If courses of conduct that rise so far beyond injury to mere individuals, and destroy the peace of the world and subvert civilization itself are not international crimes, then law has terrors only for little men and takes note only of little wrongs.

To laymen it is incomprehensible that lawyers should be in doubt as to what law is and how it gets to be law. But that fundamental enigma is the root of the controversy as to the legal validity of the Nuremberg trial. That controversy, I think, is more interesting than important, for no matter what conclusion it reaches the result of the Nuremberg process, the execution and imprisonment of the Nazis, is valid and legitimate by the very tenets that its opponents invoke. Even by conventional international law it cannot be denied that the victors could properly impose punishments on the vanquished by political decision. Certainly what they legally could do summarily would not be less valid because they paused to hear the explanations of the accused and

to make certain that they punished only the right men and for right reasons. And, of course, if the opponents of the trial could establish that there was no law which required German statesmen to respect the lives and liberties of other peoples, it follows that no law compelled the Allies to respect the lives or liberties of Germans. In this connection, it must not be forgotten that the Allies had succeeded to the German state's own sovereignty over these defendants by the unconditional surrender. The argument of th defendants does not affect the legitimacy of the punishment; it only goes to the question whether the trial must be looked upon as a political and military measure incident to victory, or as an exercise of judicial power in applying a law binding upon victor and vanquished alike.

If no moral principle is entitled to application as law until it is first embodied in a text and promulgated as a command by some superior effective authority, then it must be admitted the world was without such a text at the time the acts I have recited took place. No sovereign legislative act to which the Germans must bow had defined international crimes, fixed penalties, and set up courts to adjudge them. From the premise that nothing is law if not embraced in a sovereign command, it is easy to argue that the Nuremberg trial applied retroactive, or ex post facto, law. European lawyers generally, and particularly those of the German school, think of the command as making the law, and of the law as only the command. And with the increasing reliance of all society upon the legislative process there is a growing tendency of common-law peoples to think of law in terms of a specific sovereign enactment.

COMMON LAW DISPROVES POINT THAT LEGISLATION IS SOURCE OF LAW

The fallacy of the idea that law is found only in such a source appears from the fact that crimes were punished by courts under our common-law philosophy long before there were legislatures. The modern law of crimes may largely be traced to judicial decision of particular cases earlier than it appeared in statute. While of late years legislation is more frequent, in England today no statute defines murder or fixes its penalty, and the same is true of many crimes. Some States of our Union still recognize common-law crimes, and those which do not, have codes which, in the main, only declare what before was common law. The early English judge was confronted with an evil act. He dealt with it, unaided by statute, as reasonably and justly as he could; what he did made a precedent. A series of leading cases, each adding something in response to its particular facts, made a body of law. This slow and inductive process of developing general rules from particular decisions is quite opposite that of the continental jurist, who starts with the general command and reasons somewhat deductively to the specific case. The common-law judge is less text-bound. Common law depends less on what is commanded by authority and more on what is indicated by reason. The judge reaches a decision more largely upon consideration of the inherent quality and natural effect of the act in question. He applies what has sometimes been called a natural law that binds each man to refrain from acts so inherently wrong and injurious to others that he must know they will be treated as criminal.

Unless international law is to be deprived of this common-law method of birth and growth, and confined wholly to progression by authoritarian command, then the judges at Nuremberg were fully warranted in reaching a judicial judgment of criminal guilt. The common-law authorship of the tribunal's judgment was betrayed by the fact that while it does not deny the authority of the London charter, it did not rest upon it, but explored its antecedents after the common-law method and rested, in part at least, upon common-law justifications as well as upon the charter.

Under this philosophy of law, it is clear that by 1939 the world had come to regard aggressive war as so morally wrong and illegal that it should be treated as criminal if occasion arose. The change in world opinion probably dates from Germany's launching of World War I, at which moment Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg was cynically telling the Reichstag "this violates the rules of international law," and added, "The wrong—I speak openly—the wrong that we now do we will try to make good again, as soon as our military ends have been reached." Men everywhere saw that civilization could not abide such irresponsible nationalism. When that war ended, the Treaty of Versailles provided for a special tribunal to try the former Kaiser for offenses not vitally different from certain of the crimes defined by the London Agreement, a fate from which he was saved by sanctuary in a country neutral in that war. Moreover, that treaty recognized the right of the allied power to try persons accused of violating the laws and customs of war, although the Hague Convention, which forbid such conduct, do not expressly name such conduct criminal, nor set up courts to try such offenses nor fix any penalties.

In 1923 a draft treaty sponsored by the League of Nations flatly declared that "aggressive war is an international crime" and that the parties "undertake that no one of them will be guilty of its commission." That treaty was not consummated because of disagreement over what would constitute aggression rather than because of doubt as to the criminality of aggressive war. The next year, the so-called Geneva Protocol, by unanimous resolution of the 48 members of the League of Nations Assembly, which at that time included Italy and Japan but not Germany, declared that a war of aggression is an international crime. In 1927 all the delegations, which then included the German, Italian and Japanese, unanimously adopted a declaration that "a war of aggression can never serve as a means of settling international disputes and is in consequence an international crime." In 1928 21 American Republics, at the Sixth Pan-American Conference, united in a declaration that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

Most important of all, of course, was the General Treaty for the Renunciation of War of August 28, 1928, known as the Pact of Paris or the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which became binding on 63 nations, including Germany, Italy, and Japan, uniting civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy and agreeing that all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or origin, shall be solved only by pacific means.

These solemn acts in which statesmen held out their promises, and in which peoples put their hopes, cannot be brushed aside as mere extravagant expressions of disapproval of war and pious avowals of a will to peace. And unless these repeated declarations are regarded as legally meaningless and the statesmen of the world have been lulling people into complacency with a gigantic hoax, the charter and judgment of Nuremberg apply law that responsible representatives of all nations had proclaimed as such before the acts prosecuted took place.

LONG-TERM RESULTS OF NUREMBERG CANNOT NOW BE DETERMINED

We must not forget that we did not invoke the outlawry of war as a sword to punish acts that were otherwise innocent and harmless. On the contrary, it was the accused who had to establish the lawfulness of their belligerency to excuse a course of murders, enslavements, arsons and violence which, except in war, is criminal by every civilized concept. They were like pirates or buccaneers who are punishable wherever, whenever and by whomever caught unless they can show that their acts fall within the protection the law always has afforded those who commit acts of violence in prosecuting war. The very least legal consequences that follow outlawing wars of aggression is to withdraw from one knowingly and voluntarily causing or promoting such aggression the defense of lawful warfare. Thus if the treaties outlawing this war did not expressly create a new crime, they took away the immunity of war makers from prosecution for old crimes.

It is much too early to appraise the influence of Nuremberg. But I would disclaim any expectation that it alone is enough to prevent future wars. When stakes are high enough and chances of success look good enough, I suppose reckless leaders may again plunge their people into war, just as men still resort to murder, notwithstanding the law's penalty. But I do think that we have forever laid to rest in the minds of statesmen the vicious assumptions that all war must be regarded as legal and just, and that while the law imposes personal responsibility for starting a street riot, it imposes none for inciting and launching a world war.

Dr. Philip Jessup, writing of a modern law of nations, has set out the two keystones of a revised international legal order. He describes the old idea of absolute sovereignty as "the quicksand upon which the foundations of traditional international law are built," and he says that "international law, like national law, must be directly applicable to the individual."

It may, too, be significant of a more promising intellectual attitude that the new organic law adopted by the Germans provides that the general rules of international law shall take precedence over German federal law and shall create rights and duties directly for the inhabitants of German territory. It also provides "activities tending to disturb, or undertaken with the intention of disturbing, peaceful relations between nations, and especially preparing for aggressive war shall be unconstitutional. They shall be made subject to punishment."

Thus the old order changeth, yielding place to new. Like much legal work, ours at Nuremberg has far-reaching implications rarely apparent to laymen and often missed by lawyers. Its value to the world will depend less on how faithfully it interpreted the past than on how accurately it forecasts the future. It is possible that strife and suspicion will lead to new aggressions and that the nations are not yet ready to receive and abide by the Nuremberg law. But those who gave some of the best effort of their lives to this trial are sustained by a confidence that in place of what might have been mere acts of vengeance we wrote a civilized legal precedent and one that will lie close to the foundations of that body of international law that will prevail when the world becomes sufficiently civilized.

Outlook and Problems Facing the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas delivered an address at the annual dinner of the oil industry infor-

mation committee in Baltimore, regarding the outlook and the problems facing the oil industry.

All those present, among whom were a large number of representative businessmen, intensely interested in the future of the petroleum industry, were enthusiastic in their comments about the able Senator's address and most complimentary as to the informed knowledge apparent therein.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be here today and share with you the pride and inspiration that you must have during the celebration of Oil Progress Week. It seems to me indeed proper that a great industry, such as the petroleum industry, should set aside from the busy days of competitive enterprise, a time to survey its accomplishments and to share with others the story of those accomplishments.

It is a compliment to be invited to meet with you. I have high respect for the men who provide the motive force of the great oil industry on which the economy and the welfare of the United States is so greatly dependent.

It has been my good fortune to see something of oil development from the standpoint of a State official, first, as chairman of the oil and gas regulatory agency in Kansas and next as Governor of Kansas and chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

We in the United States have been greatly blessed in respect to petroleum. Nature gave us enormous resources, and the founders of our form of government provided a system of basic principles which made man free to find, develop, and use these resources. The wise use of these resources and the preservation of that form of government, should be our constant responsibility.

We may look for contrast to some other countries, equally blessed with petroleum and whose form of government prevents the free exercise of its citizens' abilities. Fortunately for all of us, anyone is free to risk his judgment and his money anywhere he chooses to do so. Over and over again, throughout the history of the petroleum industry it has been demonstrated that whenever the oil producers of the country feel that conditions warrant an increase in their drilling programs, the new fields are certain to be found.

Again, our form of government inspires initiative. The States themselves regulate oil operations within their boundaries and it is to their interest that oil fields be found and wealth created for the benefit of their citizens. There is a great ground of common agreement in the industry, in that there is much oil to be found; that costs of finding it are high and likely to continue so; and that as a matter of national defense and security, as well as a measure of strength to the national economy, all possible effort should be exerted to explore for new fields and to develop them. I don't think there is anyone who disagrees with those concepts. It is on the means and the measures necessary to do this that the disagreement occurs. There is no disagreement over the possibility that we may need all of the oil we can produce in this country. The maintenance of our peacetime economy demands a constant and plentiful supply of petroleum products. Nothing could deal a more crippling blow to our industrial machinery than a future shortage of supply.

But we cannot stop by considering only our peacetime needs. If we are to be realistic we must recognize that the time may come when we will need all of the oil we can produce and its products, and need it in a great hurry. Nearly every edition of the newspapers contain some reference to the cold war and there is official speculation over the possibility that it may become a hot war. We are all earnestly praying that it may remain a war of words and that in a short time even the exchange of language will be ended, but we have no assurance of that. All that we as a prudent people can do is to make certain that no one will successfully make a sneak attack upon us as at Pearl Harbor, and that we shall have the strength, if it becomes necessary, to defend ourselves upon our own terms.

There was a statement from our Air Force not long ago which had great meaning for both us and anyone outside the United States who might be wondering how we are equipped. The Air Force said that its superbomber can go anywhere on earth at an altitude where antiaircraft fire cannot reach it and where interceptors cannot approach it. It can leave the United States with any kind of bombs; make its attack and come home from anywhere. But we must remember that this airplane, and all the others which would go into the service; the jet planes, the submarines, the surface warships, the land forces, all the means of waging war that we used before, and additional ones, will require fuel. The farther from home we fight, the more fuel it will require. There have been estimates that from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 barrels daily of petroleum products would be needed above the quantity that is being used now by our Military Establishment.

What is needed for the security of the Nation, as well as the economic well-being of the Nation in time of peace, is the fullest possible development of oil resources. We should find all the fields we can, develop them fully, produce them under sound conservation practices and use our oil as we go along. There is no practical means of financing this necessary discovery and development except by marketing the production which results.

Last year was a banner one, both in production and discovery. It was the highest production year in history and the estimated volume of oil added to proved reserves was also the greatest in history.

Not much is heard any more of the perpetual scarcity which was being so freely predicted before the industry hit its stride in 1948. It is nothing new, of course, for the oil industry of the United States to be told that it is on the western slope and traveling toward the setting sun. As a writer recently put it, "the story of American oil is replete with mortified prognosticators and humble visionaries who thought they could foresee the day when this country's crude oil reserve would become exhausted and disappear."

The domestic industry practically balanced the books last year in the matter of supply and demand, reaching a point of productivity about equal to the domestic demand for petroleum products. The reason it did this was that the price of crude oil had been increased and there was incentive to drill wildcats and development wells in known pools to the limit of the available supply of pipe. That is traditional. The periods of discovery of large amounts of crude oil have always been started by prices which afforded enough margin over producing costs to provide incentive for the exploration of still more fields. And these periods can be ended by two things, the reduction of prices below cost of discovery and production and the restriction of markets. These restrictions should be the constant concern of the industry and those in whose hands lie the economy and security of this Nation.

The more you know about this oil industry of ours, its products, and its operations, the more fascinating it becomes and the more respect you have for its record of achievements. All of us know that Colonel Drake founded the industry in 1859, when he drilled the first commercial oil well near Titusville, Pa.

To orient ourselves, to realize the full impact of the times, let's be in retrospect for a moment and consider these historical data. In 1859 the United States was at the best a third-class power of only 33 States and a population of approximately thirty million. For the most part it was an isolated affair for everyone beyond the confines of the larger cities. Transportation was limited, irregular and arduous at the best. There were no highways or luxuries such as we have today. The Morse telegraph was still a comparatively new gadget, telephones were unheard of and the Civil War had not yet burst upon the struggling young American Republic, but the ominous clouds were gathering. Indians and buffaloes still roamed the western plains and the man whom the future was to know as Buffalo Bill was a small boy of 14. Custer's last stand at Little Bighorn was 17 years in the future. Titusville itself was virtually an outpost of civilization whose population consisted of only 125 assorted souls.

The great discovery at Titusville, in the sparsely settled section of Pennsylvania, precipitated history's first oil boom and started a wave of exploration, discovery, and invention which literally catapulted the United States into the leadership of the world. The pioneers of the oil industry spread out from Pennsylvania fields like a great wave. Within the next 10 years they discovered oil in Ohio, New York, West Virginia, Kansas, Kentucky, Colorado, Tennessee, and Wyoming. In far away California the oil fever made itself felt in the early 1860's, but it was not until 1875, at Peco No. 4, that the State got its first real commercial production. Wildcatting was on in earnest and in the years that preceded the turn of the century, big discoveries were made in such fields as Coalinga, California; Nacogdoches, Texas; Fredonia, Kansas; Lima, Ohio; Corsicana, Texas and Dewey-Bartlesville, Oklahoma. Courageous, adventurous oil men carried the torch of civilization North, East, South, and West. Gamblers for big stakes they were. In 1901 the Grandaddy of the Titans came roaring in down Texas way. That was Spindletop and the 75,000 to 100,000 barrels a day that gushed up from Captain Lucas' well electrified the country.

It is easy to see that the trail of exploration and development, blazed by the oil men, contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of the United States. They opened new frontiers everywhere. They set up shop in even the most remote places and civilization followed their train in. Their work and their activities inspired invention and creativeness. The petroleum which they supplied in abundance supplied the energy that this country needed for its physical growth. Ingenious Americans put oil to work in thousands of ways. From petroleum came the high-quality lubricant which inventors had needed for their machines. From petroleum came the compact fuel that was needed for the internal-combustion engines; from petroleum radiated a ceaseless supply of light and heat and power for lusty, growing America.

In later years, as a base for chemistry, petroleum has opened up the vistas of new horizons which are limited only by the imagination of man.

But back in the days of the early discovery of oil, back in the days when Colonel Drake risked his venture in the field, when we speak of those days, those weren't the good old days by any means. Everything people used, from buttons to buggies, was made by hand with a minimum of help from water wheels and steam engines. People worked from sunup to sundown to keep body and soul together. Their homes were cold and drafty

and they depended on candles and whale oil for a little light during long winter evenings. People had to spend so much time just making a living that they had little time to travel. That was the way life was lived in the United States in 1859 when the first oil well was drilled in Pennsylvania.

The discovery of that liquid energy which could be found by drilling underground, opened a veritable treasure chest into which we have been reaching ever since. Following that day we all have benefited from the never-ceasing flow of labor-saving inventions and discoveries. From the pullman car, developed the same year that oil was discovered, the list of inventions stretches across the nine decades and many of these owe their existence directly to the energy contained in petroleum. Oil greased the bearings of the first transcontinental railroad trains and motor cars, paved highways, airplanes, tractors, synthetic rubber, and many other developments have stemmed from that first oil well drilled 90 years ago.

Today oil and its 1,200 useful products enter into transportation, manufacture, agriculture and almost every other field of human endeavor, making our daily lives happier, healthier, more leisurely and more comfortable. The work week has shrunk to 40 hours and our living standards are the envy of the world. In the past 90 years the United States has grown from that poor, third-rate country to the greatest and richest Nation on the earth. The oil industry which began with that one well in 1859 has grown into an industry made up of 34,000 different companies. The industry provides convenient service to the motorists through more than a quarter of a million service stations. Competition between those companies and between those service stations is stiff. The quality of the petroleum product you use is constantly being improved by research engineers. Over $100,000,000 a year is being expended to develop new and better products for you. To serve you better and to meet your increasing needs for oil, the petroleum industry has plowed back its profits into new and better facilities at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year for the past 3 years. Oil men and oil companies are using money that they have earned to finance these improvements and expansions in your behalf and build for the future.

I am sure that the men and women of the oil industry are justly proud of the fact that the 90 years of the greatest industrial progress that this country has ever known are the 90 years of the petroleum industry, a competitive and progressive industry which will continue to serve the Nation's progress and our people in the future as it has in the past 90 years.

I come from the great farming State of Kansas. Since my boyhood there I have seen the development of that agricultural State and have been able to witness the contribution this great industry has made to that development. While oil men supply not only the fuel needed for the tractors, but the fuel and lubricants for scores of pieces of other equipment used on the farm, the oil industry also has developed insecticides and fertilizers for the farmer. What this means is that fewer farmers can produce more food, but it also makes possible the use of more lands. Actually 63,000,000 acres have been added to our cultivated land in this country since 1918 because of a decrease in the number of work animals, and mechanized farming is growing all the time. In 1941, at the start of the war, there were only 1,675,000 tractors on American farms. Today there are 3,150,000 tractors, which operate some 15,000,000 pieces of equipment. This means that back in 1920 a farmer could raise only enough for himself and nine other persons. Today one farmer can support himself and 14 other persons. This makes it possible for more people to do other kinds of work and produce other goods.

By making efficient use of our vast resources of energy, particularly petroleum, Americans have raised their living standards until they own 47 percent of the world's radios, 49 percent of the telephones, and 72 percent of the world's automobiles.

The story of oil is a powerful one and it is one of the best examples of what we mean by free enterprise and what free enterprise means to us and to our country under a competitive system. In the countries across the sea, where many governments frown on initiative and independence, in the countries where the hand of state is heavy and restrictive, there is no parallel to the American story of oil. Nor is there any parallel to the growth and development of the United States, whose roots are firmly embedded in the rock of freedom.

The part that the oil industry has played in the winning of two world wars has been mentioned so frequently that it needs no elaboration today. Every thinking person realizes that our success depended upon the availability of unprecedented quantities of oil. Our victory was achieved because the oil industry gave us that oil. But I wonder if we are not prone to lose sight of the contributions of petroleum in peacetime. Stop for a moment to reflect upon the story we have just told. Reflect upon what kind of civilization we would have today if Colonel Drake had not made his great discovery in Pennsylvania 90 years ago and if we had never found oil in our Nation. We would find a strange picture indeed. Our standard of living, or what we call our American way of life, is in a large degree built upon the availability of petroleum and its products. The motor car, the truck, the tractor, the Diesel engine, loom large in our economy and in our society. Our cities could not attain their present size if it were not for oil. Quite obviously our network of highways which reach into every county in America could not exist and would not be needed if we did not have an abundance of this important product. The whole structure of our society would be changed. But even this doesn't give the full picture of what oil has done for us. How many schools and great universities have been built from the dollars which petroleum has produced? How many great medical centers and hospitals? How many churches and community buildings? I do not know of any industry which can match the record of the petroleum industry in the amount of its proceeds which have found their way, through tax payments in part, but through voluntary charitable gifts in a great degree, into the institutions and facilities dedicated to public enjoyment and public betterment. If these facilities, which have been built by charitable donations from oil profits were to be wiped out overnight our country would be immeasurably poorer.

Admittedly the oil business has been one involving tremendous risk. It has received its black eyes. In some instances it has deserved them. But no man can seriously question that this industry has been a tremendous force for good and for the benefit of all.

We do not live in a static world. The last 90 years are but the prelude of many times 90 yet to come. As oil, which was born in Pennsylvania 90 years ago, and which has long since started its western trek, continues into the future, we can have for it no greater hope than that it may continue to make the brilliant record which it has already started. I trust and I believe that the men of this industry will, if given the opportunity under our American system of free competitive enterprise, nobly and progressively continue to serve the demands and the best interests of all Americans, today and tomorrow.

In closing may I say that at the time of the birth of oil, and having in mind Colonel Drake's well at Titusville, that we have looked backward 90 years to a time when some thought that greasy black oil which flowed from the earth would amount to very little because they had no vision. Little did men of that day envision the 10,000 or more uses to which that fluid and its byproducts could be put, to make this world of ours a better and a more progressive place in which to live. We might say that it had to go through the crucible of fire and come out refined in its many rarefied forms. And so it has been with America in the last 90 years. Our country has moved from those perilous days. We have experienced growing pains, internal hates, hunger, and the privations and dislocations of war. We have emerged into a new position of world leadership whether we like it or not and may we, as trusted citizens of our beloved Nation, lift ourselves above the petty, the sordid and the discordant notes of the world to newer horizons of responsibility. Let us pattern our future upon the faith, resourcefulness, and energy of our pioneer forefathers and remember that the God-fearing traditions upon which America has been built will be a good pattern to follow for our future tomorrows.

Veterans' Training Under the GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of Public Law 266 on August 24, I have been deluged with hundreds and hundreds of communications from veterans who were receiving training under the GI bill. These veterans protested the extreme hardship that had been inflicted on them by the Veterans' Administration regulations that were promulgated as a result of this law.

The first one issued was the highly controversial regulation 1A, which after a great deal of study convinced me that it went far beyond the intent of the GI bill of rights and was contrary to the underlying spirit of its educational provisions. It seemed to me that the veterans should have preserved to them the right to make a free election, as provided by law, in choosing a field of endeavor. Evident abuses, which regulation 1A was intended to correct on the part of both institutions and veterans, should be corrected, but it seemed to me that penalizing those veterans who still have entitlement and eligibility is not the proper way. I personally expressed this opinion to the Veterans' Administrator and the chairman of my committee, urging that immediate action be taken to clarify and rectify this situation.

My views were apparently shared by members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for shortly after officials of the Veterans' Administration appeared before that committee, and regulation 1A was rescinded and regulation 1B effective November 1 was

issued. Almost simultaneously S. 2596 was introduced, amended, reported favorably by the committee, and passed by the Senate, thus clearing it for House action. In an effort to hasten consideration and to act remediably, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, considered the Senate passed bill rather than its own bill, H. R. 6401.

There is not a great deal that I can add to the report submitted by the committee of which I am a member, other than that I wholeheartedly supported this remedial legislation in the committee:

The bill is designed to insure the veteran the right to select a course of training under the GI bill of rights provided the course is not avocational and recreational and is in the same general field of the veteran's occupational objective. The ban on schools in existence less than 1 year prior to August 24, 1949, as contained in the proviso of Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, is modified. Certain courses are found to be avocational or recreational in character, and the veteran is prohibited from taking such courses unless it is shown that such course is for use in connection with his present or contemplated business or vocation. In addition, a Veterans' Education Appeals Board composed of three members to be appointed by the President is created to hear complaints of educational institutions concerning the decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The Veterans' Administration has, in my opinion, disregarded the will of the Congress in the issuance of regulations detrimental to the best interest of the veterans, therefore, this legislation becomes necessary and justified. I believe the passage of S. 2596 to be in the best interests of veterans' welfare.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, at the Rochester (Pa.) Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Rochester Centennial, Rochester, Pa., on September 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'm always pleased when we busy Americans occasionally lay aside our business and take time to reflect a bit about our history, our traditions, and our accomplishments. I really mean this, because now and then I meet someone who has just made his first visit to America, and I'm always a bit surprised when he tells me—and most of these people do tell me this—that we Americans are so preoccupied with our business that we take for granted all the things we have to be thankful for.

Maybe these visitors are correct, but I'm inclined to believe that they put the emphasis in the wrong place. We take a lot of things for granted, that's true. But the point is that we take most of these things for granted because no American questions their fundamental soundness. For example, we take for granted the fact that our dealings with each other—and for that matter, with everyone in the world—will be conducted in a spirit of fair play. And in a sense, we take for granted our basic liberties as set out in the Bill of Rights—simply because we can't conceive of carrying out our way of life without them.

We Americans agree also to the basic soundness of the free enterprise system as the best method for continuing the expansion of our economy, for providing the greatest opportunities for our people.

We can look back over 160 years of national life and can see clearly how well these basic things have been adapted to our needs. We recognize that these basic, taken-for-granted things have been dynamic in our society. Our freedoms have continued to grow as we have grown as a nation. We have expanded our fundamental concepts to meet the ever-changing complexities of modern life; we've discovered from experience that our great Constitution has served both to guarantee our liberties, and at the same time has been flexible enough to keep pace with scientific advances, with industrial development, and with our growing recognition of the interdependence of man upon other men.

It is no wonder, then, that we have taken these things for granted—taken for granted in recognizing their soundness, taken for granted because they have served us so well in helping America achieve its position of world leadership as a great bastion of freedom.

When, 100 years ago, the people of western Pennsylvania were laying foundations and chartering the flourishing communities which were to come, America had long established itself as a haven for the oppressed, as a land of hope for the future.

At this very time, a century ago, that Americans were busy developing this magnificent continent of ours, Europe was the scene of great turmoil, unrest, and insecurity.

In two successive years—1845 and 1846—potato crops failed in Ireland, and left millions of her people faced with poverty and starvation. Many of these people fought on an empty stomach against the heavy yoke of political oppression which hung over them. But efforts for political liberation failed, and hunger continued. In the decade or so which followed, almost a million Irish people managed somehow to scrape together enough to make the journey across the Atlantic and to take up a new life, with new hope, here in America.

Germany in those days was not a nation, but a conglomeration of squabbling, tyrannical kingdoms and principalities. Its people fought for, longed for, freedom and the kind of government which would open the way to liberty and hope. In their struggles to overthrow the shackles of oppression, hundreds of thousands of Germans found themselves beaten back into submission, and many of them were driven into exile. America extended her hand to them, and between 1846 and 1859, nearly 900,000 Germans came to America.

Thus, in the very days a hundred years ago that your towns and counties were being formed here on this spot in America, Europe seethed with great liberal revolts, revolts fired by those who sought freedom. One after another, these liberal movements were beaten down and broken, and thousands upon thousands of those who battled against oppression turned to America as the land which could offer them the liberty they had been denied in their own lands.

From all over Europe they came—from Austria, from France, from Hungary, from Bohemia—in the decade that centered around the late 1840's. America was not then the land of great riches and wealth that was to attract so many millions who came later. America offered freedom, and it was for freedom that these people came.

We think of their descendants today not as Irish, or French, or Germans—but as Americans. They—and the Poles, the Dutch, the Serbs, the Croats, the Greeks, the Czechs, the Slovaks, and all the others—injected into the life stream of our growing country new blood which had been born in the liberal tradition of freedom. These people have helped furnish the flesh and bone of our national body, and leaders in our national life.

Today, a hundred years later, there are in Europe once more millions of victims of political oppression. Thousands and thousands of these people have suffered under the grinding heel of dictatorships of the right and left. Political tyranny, twentieth century style, has been streamlined and brought up to date in the past century. The combination of concentration camps and refined psychological torments make political opposition more uninviting than ever. Yet these people—DP's we call many of them now—have stood against tyranny, have suffered, in many instances, unbelievable tortures because of their belief in freedom.

These thousands, exiled by choice or by force, have no homes to which they may return. They are ardent seekers of liberty. We in America, through our long tradition of offering a home to the oppressed, and a haven to those who share with us our trust in God and our deep belief in the dignity of man, must open our doors once more to these extreme victims of fascism and communism. Those who have escaped through the iron curtain, or who have survived German slave labor camps and death factories have much to offer us in strengthening still further the fibre of our national being.

Many of you, perhaps, who hear me today have members of your own families who are among the DP's of Europe. Some of you, more than likely, have sought admission for particular DP's or have agreed to help sponsor one or another of them who wished to become an American.

Thus it is that America stands today in its traditional position as the bright beacon of hope for troubled millions of the world's people. But that role is a much larger one now than it was a century ago. No longer do the great oceans insulate America from the strife and turmoil elsewhere in the world. The miracles of science have made "one world" a physical, if not yet a political, reality. Man's conquest of the air, and the tremendous developments in the field of communications have shrunk the world to pocket size. A race riot in South Africa and religious oppression behind the iron curtain threaten our freedom as gravely as a burning cross on a southern hillside.

America today is the symbol of freedom and the spearhead of hope in the future. We are resolute and united in our declared policy of opposing totalitarian dictatorship and tyrannical indignities to the spirit of man. We have called upon those who love liberty to stand with us in the fight—and they have answered the muster. We have offered to devote our resources, intellectual and physical, to carry forth the battle for peace.

In terms of the job ahead of us, the economic recovery of Europe is as vital to that goal as the maintenance of full employment and an expanding economy here in America. Unemployment in Italy and food riots in India are, for us, almost as real a problem as unemployment, spotty and local though it is, in some industries and in some areas of our own country.

These problems can be, and are being faced as the same problem, and they must be faced

as the same problem—for both are fundamental if real and lasting peace is to be achieved in a free and decent world.

Now obviously, we haven't licked all the problems involved—either at home, or abroad—but I certainly feel mighty encouraged about the progress we've made thus far. And I feel mighty encouraged about the spirit in which the American people have faced the realities of our role of world leadership.

The signs of our progress are everywhere we look. For example, in the past eight or nine months we've devoted a tremendous amount of attention to the course our own economy is taking. I don't think the significance of all this attention can be underestimated.

We walked blindfolded into the worst depression in our history about 20 years ago—and apart from a few college professors and a handful of acute political observers, no one had an inkling of what was about to happen. The few who tried to warn us were ignored or laughed at. When calamity overtook us, it was a matter of years—not weeks or months, but years—before any constructive suggestions were put into action for getting us out of the jam we'd got ourselves into.

What a tremendous change has taken place in our thinking in these 20 years. Eternal prosperity—which we took for granted in the late twenties—is something we aren't taking for granted this time. A few years back, a post-war goal of 60,000,000 employed was regarded as fantastic and impossible. Yet today we have 60,000,000 people at work in America, and we know that the post-war goal was set too low.

What is really significant, though, is the concern which all our people have shown over the fact that about 4,000,000 Americans are presently out of work. And this concern isn't limited to a few bureaucrats who compile statistics; it isn't limited to the Members of Congress; it isn't limited to a few college professors. No, this concern is shared by the American people, who insist that we take action before things get out of hand.

We're ready to use preventive medicine to ward off economic illness—instead of being forced to take drastic cures after the patient, our national economy, is flat on its back.

In your own communities a group of industries have been built up over the past hundred years which serve America and the world. You have been vitally interested in the health of those industries, and you realize how essential it is that our American economy continue to expand, and that world markets continue to expand, if you here in western Pennsylvania are to prosper.

So you've been watching unemployment, just as all the rest of us have. You know by now that there have been some good signs in recent weeks, and perhaps you have begun to realize that all this attention is beginning to produce some good effects. Even in spite of rent increases in localities which have been decontrolled, our national cost of living is dropping back a bit. We're gradually letting some of the air out of our grossly inflated price structures, and prices are starting to settle back to saner and sounder levels.

Some months back, the people began refusing to buy certain goods at outlandish prices, and by this simply announced that they were fed up with inventory speculation and sky-rocketing profits. The result was, of course, that industries with big inventories cut back on production, tried to unload what they had at the old high prices, and lay-offs were inevitable. Gradually, there were price cuts, inventories were reduced, and from present indications, industry after industry is beginning to move production back up again to meet current demand at lower prices.

Incidentally, one of the odd things about our rise in unemployment has been the fact that we've had just about as many people working throughout this period as we had when there was almost no unemployment shortly after the war ended; in other words, we've been able to keep 60,000,000, or very close to 60,000,000, people at work even in the face of mounting unemployment. The answer to this simply is that we must provide for an ever-growing economy to absorb new workers who come into our labor force every year.

What we can be certain of, though, is that America is mobilized to face this problem, and is determined to act. With this kind of vigilance—when there is such widespread interest in the health of our economy—you can be sure that we aren't going to stand idly by and watch ourselves plunge helplessly into depression.

Yes, we take a lot of things for granted here in America, here in our comfortable communities among our friends and neighbors, presumably far away from the turmoil of the world. But in Rochester, Pa., and in every other community in Pennsylvania, however old it may be, we are ready, and we will remain ready, to resist any challenge from any source to the way of life which we have made for ourselves, and which we want for our children.

Interparliamentary Union Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on September 10, before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Stockholm, Sweden, which I attended as a delegate of the United States Senate, I was moved to reply to certain charges made by a Communist member of the Finnish delegation to the Conference, with respect to United States foreign policy and domestic affairs. I have obtained a transcript of my remarks on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HOMER FERGUSON (United States). I come to the platform to take up a few minutes of the time of the conference, as I think there has been some misunderstanding as to facts. The great difficulty in the world today seems to be the ascertainment of facts—that is to say, the ascertainment of those facts which are to determine the course of our judgment. I believe that mankind can solve most of its problems if it can just get the true facts presented.

We find in this resolution today some very pertinent statements. It states "that the general diplomatic situation is still very strained and that the world is still divided into two hostile camps despite the fact that the existence of different economic and social systems need not exclude the possibility of agreement and cooperation." Another statement is to the effect that "without waiting for the accomplishment of the promise so often made, all governments should assist with all the means at their disposal towards achieving an improvement in the general warlike atmosphere by combating every form of propaganda in favor of aggressive war or calculated to produce a state of war hysteria and by taking effective measures to oppose any tendency of the press or radio to encourage any such activities."

In other words, this resolution recognizes a cold war of ideology, and then it goes on to assume that this war can be settled amicably if we are able to obtain effective cooperation and do not have propaganda in the world that is false to the facts. I think that that is very important, and I just wish to put forward a few corrections of what I believe has been stated upon the record. I like to keep the record clear.

One of the speakers from the Finland delegation [1] indicated that America and those who were instrumental in having the North Atlantic Pact were dealing in war ideologies and therefore were guilty of breach of the peace. I should like to read his exact language because I think it is very important. He says:

"This attitude has been amply demonstrated in the phraseology contained in the reports of such activities of an aggressive character as the North Atlantic Pact or the European Council of Mr. Churchill. If these activities shall be characterized as expressions of some kind of ideology, then, it seems to me, they must be characterized as expressions of ideologies inimical to peace; that is to say, aggressive ideologies—war ideologies."

Now, I am sure that the people who know the facts in relation to the Atlantic Pact will come to one conclusion—that America has no intention of aggressiveness by virtue of her entry into this Atlantic Pact. I want to assure every member of this conference—I want to assure everyone in the world for that matter—that there is no intention whatever of spreading any war ideology or anything inimical to peace. I speak as a duly elected representative to the legislative branch of the United States Government. The Senate of the United States approved that pact, and I know whereof I speak when I say they approved that pact with no thought of war ideology in their minds. This is not an aggressive act. America has written in the skies that all may see that there are certain things that cannot happen in the world—that cannot be allowed to happen—and that is aggression by others. If a nation has in its mind no aggressive policy, then the Atlantic Pact will in no way interfere with the peace of that nation or the peace of the world.

I think there should be more writing in the skies that all may read the foreign policy of the various nations. I think that in the last war America misled the world by her silence, by not saying where she stood long prior to the outbreak of that war. And America today has merely said, "These are the things we believe in. We are willing to put that down in writing." I hope that the world will believe America that this is not an act of aggression, it is merely a symbol of the defense of peace.

I am sure that my brother from Finland has been misled in feeling that this act of Mr. Churchill or of the North American people has been one of aggression. It is for that reason I make a few remarks on that subject. Reference has been made to "political terror and suppression of civil rights." America has been named as one of those countries guilty of active political terror and suppression of civil rights. I assure you, members of the delegations, that there is a misunderstanding. That is not the fact. It is also stated that the Mundt-Ferguson bill is one of the things that is a political terror and a suppression of civil rights. I happen to be, as a Senator from Michigan, one of the authors of the bill introduced into Con-

[1] M. Ryömä in the proceedings of Thursday afternoon.

gress this year for the purpose of, in fact, defending America against those who from without, as agents of a foreign power, would overthrow by force the American form of government. There is no intention whatever of interfering with freedom and civil rights. It is merely that those who would conspire in America under the control and domination of a foreign power substantially to overthrow the American Government are declared guilty of a crime.

If a government cannot defend itself, then what is government? What is government if it cannot have self-defense? That bill would go further merely to say this, that those who are agents of a foreign government operating within the United States, performing certain things and doing certain things, should register and identify themselves. Surely that is not an unusual provision, not an interference with civil rights.

There is one thing in which I believe firmly and sincerely, and that is the inalienable rights of mankind. I believe that the best way in which those inalienable rights of mankind can be defended is by a government of legislative parliaments where we can have a government of law. That is what each and every one of you stands for or you would not be here as members of parliament from your respective countries.

It is stated that these acts of which America is accused are all a part of war preparation in the same degree as similar acts were part of Hitler's preparation. A comparison of the United States of America with Hitler. I should be remiss in my duties if I did not express myself upon such an important matter from this platform. There are those in the world who believe that by silence you give consent and approval. "Hitler," said the Finnish delegate, "first destroyed the civil rights of the German people. When workers are shot down because of fighting for a piece of bread and against hunger—let me say that if that is an expression of humanitarianism, it is, indeed, a very peculiar kind of humanitarianism."

I want to assure the delegates that people in America are not shot down for asking for bread or for fighting against hunger. As I said before, we may be misunderstood if we do not challenge such statements. I am a believer in freedom of speech. I am not in any way criticizing the speaker. I am trying merely to put forward the facts so that you may all know them. As our President said, in this world we have a conveyor belt of propaganda. That is a sad thing, but it is true. When I say "propaganda" I do not mean just an assimilation of all the facts. We could solve many of our problems for peace if we started as representatives of the people and as governments to make sure of the facts, and ascertain all the true facts, so that our judgment may be based upon what is actually true.

A few words on the last paragraph of the resolution, about instructing the political committee to study and report on the practical considerations involved in the setting up of some form of representative world assembly, the possibility of transforming the union itself into such an assembly, and the immediate steps which should be taken to increase and develop the influence of the union. I said a few days ago from this platform that I thought a great revolutionary step was taken with the formation of this union in 1889. It has done the best it could, but I believe that the time is now here when we should endeavor by every means in our power to increase and develop its influence. I should like to see every seat in those galleries crowded with people because of the importance of this meeting. I believe that if we dedicated ourselves to developing the importance of this organization and chose rightly our topics for debate we could see every seat in the gallery filled, and a long enough press table to disseminate the news to all the world. It would be seen that here we are trying to consolidate peace, to make peace, to provide machinery for keeping the peace. When I say "peace" I mean the peace that America stands for—peace based on justice. I want, and I know you want, to eliminate from the people's hearts and souls any fear of aggression. We want to give the people the greatest freedom of expression—the right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, to have as fine an education as possible, to be able to think and work as human beings, possessing the inalienable rights of men, defended by legislative bodies elected by the people. Is not that what we are working for? Is it not what we want to try to bring into the world, so that the world may be a more peaceful and happy world in which to live? Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to make a few remarks upon this subject. I simply wanted to put forward what it is that America really stands for.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, at Convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the thirty-seventh annual convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., on October 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We in the Congress of the United States devote a simply unbelievable amount of our time to the subject of water, all kinds of water in all sorts of places. So far as the western part of the country is concerned, the problem is almost always not enough water—not enough water to drink, not enough water for irrigation—never, so far as the West is concerned, enough water. The issues from that part of the country usually come before us in terms of projects for irrigation of lands, projects for diverting water, sometimes hundreds of miles, and projects which, though small at present, seriously visualize the day that sea water can be rendered fit to drink and fit to use on the land.

In the East, it's a different question. Usually, for us in this part of the country, it's too much water—or at least, too much water in the wrong places. Getting enough water to drink is rarely a serious question for the East, though at times it's necessary to do quite a bit of work to make the water fit to drink because of stream pollution and the like.

So, our problems of having too much water in the East reach us in the Congress in terms of flood control and river channel improvements. Both of these, generally, are matters of having too much water at the wrong time, or in the wrong place. Heavy, drenching winter and spring rains combine with melting snows annually to turn quiet streams into raging torrents of devastation and death, or to transform our majestic great rivers of the Mississippi drainage system into slow-moving muddy seas which plow inexorably on to the Gulf of Mexico, sweeping with them homes and stores and whole communities.

While the losses to the Nation from floods annually cost us hundreds of millions of dollars, we are making real progress toward a safe and sane and useful harnessing of these great excesses of water.

A few of our great rivers aren't, of course, susceptible to flood hazards of this sort, or, at least, the tidal portions of our rivers are free of this, and in some instances, such as the Tennessee and perhaps a few others, our accomplishments, largely through the help of the Federal Government, have been successful in removing flood dangers altogether.

We have, curiously, another kind of surplus water problem on our great rivers that hasn't anything at all to do with floods. Instead, we have too much shallow water, too many instances in which the river bottom is built too close to the surface to permit these rivers to become and remain, broad avenues of commerce, avenues of commerce along which move, almost unnoticed by most of our people, enormous ton-mileages of coal and oil and steel and grain and countless other vital bulk commodities which contribute their essential part to giving America the highest standard of living in the world.

Water transportation in the United States has had its ups and downs. A century and a half ago, we were launched on extensive plans to construct a network of canals connecting our great river systems, plans that promised to provide a means for handling the great majority of our heavy transportation. The advent of the railroads in the early decades of the last century caused serious cut-backs in canal building, and in many sections of the East today are the remnant earthworks of what had been intended as a connecting link for our waterway system.

With more than a century and a quarter of experience now with railroading, with the rise in trucking, particularly in the last three decades, and with the enormous strides achieved, particularly during the recent war, in aviation, we stand today with a total transportation system relying on all of these which is without an equal anywhere else in the world.

But the development of our transportation system in America has been far more by accident than by design. Like Topsy, it has just sort of grown. We have achieved a balance, such as it is, between rail and water and automobile and truck and air, a balance that has more or less worked itself out by trial and error, a balance that can well be reexamined carefully and impartially at this time with an eye to making long-term recommendations in order to achieve the maximum utilization of all our facilities.

I am, at the present time, chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is making a full-scale inquiry into our domestic land and water transportation methods. At present, we are engaged largely in what we regard as the fact-gathering phase of the study. We hope first to complete our collection of facts in order that we can see the picture whole. This proves itself to be an inordinately complex job. While there have been countless studies made on various aspects of our transportation policies, the standards and definitions which have been applied, say, to our waterways, vary markedly from those applied to studies of trucking and railroading. So our initial job has been to sort these things out, to dig through mazes of complicated statistics and definitions in order to reduce the facts to some honestly comparable bases. We have made a lot of progress on this, and plan, I hope shortly after the first of the year, to have our factual groundwork pretty well in hand.

When we've accomplished this much, we'll be in the position for the first time to hold public hearings in order to work out evaluations of the facts, and thus to form some pretty definite conclusions on which recommendations may be based.

It may seem irrelevant that I mention our transportation study to you on this occasion that I have come before you to speak on the subject of the Delaware River. But I feel strongly that the materials with which we're working in our transportation study have a very definite application and bearing on the whole matter of deeper waterways on the Atlantic seaboard, and in fact on ocean-going as well as inland waterway transportation questions. I believe all of you will be most anxious to follow what my subcommittee is doing in this important field, and I wanted, briefly, at least, to bring you more or less to date on what we've already done, and on what we contemplate for the future.

I'd like to say a little bit more about the nature of the water questions which come before us in the Congress from our own State of Pennsylvania. I think in that way I can illustrate for you some of the exceedingly involved procedures through which any legislation must necessarily go before it has any practical effect whatsoever to curb flood dangers in a particular locality or to carry out a project to deepen a harbor or dredge a channel.

The first step, of course, is to have brought to our attention in Congress a particular desirable or necessary project. We do everything we can at that time to get the facts together, and when we are satisfied in our own minds that something should be done about it, we introduce a bill. Now all this bill accomplishes, if it is finally passed, is to authorize a study, a detailed study, made usually by Army engineers. The engineers, in their preliminary study, go into the economics of the project. They work out, on a dollar and cents basis, what such a project would cost, and what savings and returns would accrue as benefits. Depending on the priority given such a study, and depending on the amount of investigation the engineers are required to make, it may be a matter of many months, perhaps of years, before the results are reported back to the Congress.

Preliminary studies, and recommendations made as a result of these studies, are to be found in the history of every single flood-control project and every river and harbor project we've undertaken.

When, finally, all the facts are in, and the facts indicate the project to be economically desirable, as well as vitally important to prevent floods or expedite the use of our waterways, the Congress must start all over again. Once more a bill is introduced, this time authorizing work on the project, thus giving the Congress an opportunity through hearings and further study to reexamine the findings and recommendations of the engineers. When, ultimately, if it finally happens, the authorizing bill goes through, and work on the project is formally approved by the Congress, there is still a lot of work left to be done—the job of getting funds appropriated annually to carry out the project. This means more legislation, on appropriations this time.

Now why on earth all of this red tape, all of this delay, all of the seemingly endless study, examination, questioning by the Members of Congress? The answer, when you stop to think about it, is obvious. This is pork-barrel legislation. This is the legislation that gives reporters and columnists a field day every time it comes up on the floor of the House or the Senate. This is the legislation, so the stories go, that's dearest to the hearts of Representatives and Senators. Here is the Congress, raiding the Federal Treasury for votes back home.

Is it that, really?

In case you've never attended a committee hearing on one of these bills yourself, ask someone who has. Ask him to tell you about the penetrating questions that get fired at witnesses who come before the committee to tell how desperately this project is needed to prevent another disastrous flood, or to keep a vital artery of transportation open and functioning. Believe me, there is no legislation which goes through the Congress of the United States which is subject to closer scrutiny than public works of this sort. All of the check and rechecks are deliberately there, put there purposely to "fry the fat" out of flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations. And believe me, to run that gantlet, a project really has to have merit. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

Actually, it is far more than having a project prove it merit once of twice. It is a matter of proving that merit to enough Members of the Congress to get it through, get it through all of the many phases of investigation.

Why does it take so much effort? Because these public-works projects cost money, many of them a great deal of money—Federal money, because they are projects which only the Federal Government is properly equipped to handle. So, all told, the money we appropriate for rivers and harbors and flood control is a big item in this huge Federal budget of ours that we hear so much about. And it is an item that is freely attacked, ofttimes without much regard for the painstaking care with which the committees of the House and Senate have done their level best to exercise in processing the legislation.

During the war, of course, the Government spent next to nothing on these projects for the obvious reason that there was an even more urgent need for the money and the materials and the manpower elsewhere. We had to put up with the floods we might have been able to stop. We had to watch our river channels silt up, and we had to watch imperative harbor improvements be put aside while we got finished with the job of winning the war.

Once the war had ended, we had a tremendous backlog of work to get at in this field. In these postwar years that I have been in the Senate I have time and time again spent hours on end going over the facts, convincing myself of the need for particular projects all over Pennsylvania, in order that I could go before the Senate Appropriations Committee, or the Senate Public Works Committee, and even, on a number of occasions before the corresponding committees over on the House side, unorthodox though it may be for a Senator to put in appearance before House committees on behalf of certain legislation.

The point is, of course, that this is the only way that we can get results. It takes a tremendous amount of study, and, for that matter, a tremendous amount of explaining to everyone all along the line in order that they can understand fully the importance of maintaining, for example, the 40-foot channel in the Delaware, or the importance of seeing to it that construction is continued on the vast Conemaugh Dam which will shortly go to work forever to prevent devastating floods around Pittsburgh, and further, to cut down on the floodwaters along the Ohio River.

In the course of my years in the House and in the Senate, names like Crooked Creek, Tionesta, Lackawaxen, Punxsutawney, Sunbury, Codorus Creek, Indian Rock, and a great many others have become as familiar to me as the streets in my own neighborhood here in Philadelphia.

In the past couple of years, particularly, the House has acted with murderous intent on a lot of these appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control. It is true that the House did less of this sort of thing this year than it has in the years immediately preceding, but what usually happens is not a question of cutting out any particular project, or going into the merits of one or more of them, but rather, of an across-the-board cut of some fixed percentage of a bill which covers a great many projects. And, of course, every one of these projects suffers when something like that happens.

So, by the time the bill gets over to the Senate, we have to go to work as best we can to restore as much as we feel can be restored commensurate with the real need for the projects involved and with the other obligations we must face in carrying out a legislative program aimed at sustaining and helping in every way we can to encourage the growth and expansion of our own free enterprise system, as well as meeting the urgent needs of building for world peace.

I am sure most of you here are aware that the question of authorizing a 40-foot channel in the Delaware below Philadelphia was settled by the Congress some time ago, and in fact, the channel was cleared to that depth back in 1942. During the war, at the very time of vast shipments up and down the river, much of this work was curtailed, and as a consequence, the channel was allowed to shoal up. The Government, of course, wasn't spending much money for that purpose, and what would have been a relatively simple job of keeping the channel clear, became, after the war, a rather big job of getting the channel back into the shape it was in during the early days of the war. Now, just to keep the channel from getting any worse costs about $2,000,000 annually in maintenance costs, and the engineers estimated this year that it would cost about $6,000,000 in a lump sum to bring the channel from its present controlling depth of 34 feet back to the authorized 40-foot depth.

When the civil-functions bill was reported out to the House this year, there was a provision to allocate $4,110,000 for maintenance and channel improvement on the Delaware—in other words, enough for the ordinary $2,000,000 maintenance fund, and an additional $2,000,000 to undertake channel deepening and widening. When the bill came befor the House, Congressman GREEN, of Philadelphia, sought to amend it by proposing that the allocation for the Delaware be increased by $4,000,000—in other words, trying to get the full $6,000,000 lump sum necessary to get the channel back to the 40-foot depth. Unfortunately, there was only a handful of Representatives on the floor at the time, considerably less than a quorum, and his amendment was voted down by 54 to 38.

In my testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the same bill several weeks later, I urged the committee to give the matter the most careful consideration. I was fully aware that the committee looked skepically at my request to double the allocation for the Delaware, and I remarked about that at the time, but I went into the background of the problem for them, told them about the newer deep-draft tankers which require a 40-foot channel, and pointed out the magnitude of oil imports—around 50,000,000 barrels a year—into the port of Philadelphia, stressing the fact that Philadelphia certainly wanted to accommodate the new tankers in our waterway system. I pointed out, too, of the possible danger that might result from a collision and explosion if one of the big tankers ran aground and swung around into another vessel.

Not long after I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the civil-functions bill, I had an opportunity one week end to go by boat from Philadelphia down the Delaware and into the bay as far as Cape May. I learned quite a bit about the mechanics of channel maintenance. We stopped en route to inspect one of the dredging installations along the Delaware, and I found myself fascinated by the crisp efficiency and specialized organization of the entire operation. I had, of course, seen these dredges in the past, usually at some distance, but on this occasion we went aboard, looked over the quarters occupied by the officers and men, inspected the giant

pumping stations, and were able to see the operation as a whole, working as it does around the clock, pumping silt out of the river where it had previously been deposited by another dredge which had scoured it out of the channel.

It was a very impressive performance, and I would say that for the $2,000,000 a year required to maintain the channel we get a real bargain in efficiency.

Just yesterday the Senate-House conferees on the civil-functions bill reported it back to both bodies, and on the basis of their report we failed to win our fight to double the allocation—and however hard we try, we cannot win every one of them. But we did manage to save the $4,110,000 allocation in the conference report, as we saved it in the Senate at a time that the entire Congress was in a serious economy mood—a mood which, I might add, is our usual mood. So, during this year, we ought to be able to get, in addition to maintaining the present channel, about a third of the work done on restoring the channel to the full 40-foot depth. Next year, of course, we'll do everything we can to get that job finished up, because it is clearly the kind of thing that shouldn't wait.

But there is the kind of problem we face on our so-called pork-barrel legislation, and in reality it is the kind of problem which vexes every conscientious Member of the Congress on most of the legislation we face, whether it is for public works of the most necessary kind, or for national defense, or for our international commitments aimed at building lasting world peace on a firm and constructive basis, or for such urgently needed domestic legislation as slum clearance. Most of these measures can be justified in their own right by cold, hard logic when you sit down and really get at the facts. The really hard job, of course, is, in some instances, getting the facts in the first place—and occasionally in getting enough people to face the facts once you have them.

Looking back over almost a dozen years that I have spent in the House and Senate, I must admit that I personally have known very few Members of either the House or the Senate who would not listen to the facts. Of course, each of us has his own economic philosophy, and to some extent, what we do when the facts are before us does reflect that philosophy. The one thing that I am abundantly certain of in my own mind is that the common sense and good judgment of the American people has operated to select as a rule men and women to represent them in the Congress who in the over-all have permitted this country to rise to its present unchallenged position in seeing to it that more of its people share more of the good things in life than any other Nation in the world.

So long as we continue to produce results of this kind, so long as we keep our economy healthy and expanding, there is no cause for concern that we will ever scrap or harm our free-enterprise system.

And I am confident we shall continue to get results of this kind.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which I have received from the Dooly County bankers and Dooly County Farm Bureau, which numbers more than a thousand farmers, with reference to the farm bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIENNA, GA., *October 17, 1949.*

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Senate Office Building.

For the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: With all the wage hikes for the higher-ups in America granted by this Congress, you can well imagine how our farmers feel about the haggling over passing a bill to guarantee 90 percent of parity for farm prices. A 90-percent parity price should be, not for 1 year only, but as permanent as the salary raises are permanent.

DOOLY COUNTY BANKERS,
DOOLY COUNTY FARM BUREAU.

Address by Prime Minister Pandit Nehru at a Convocation in His Honor at Columbia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru at the convocation at Columbia University, New York, which conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. This is a fitting reward to the Prime Minister of India, a great leader of a great people who are one of the hopes of freedom in a world threatened by another monstrous totalitarian dictatorship.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to this great university and to you, sir, for the honor you have done me in inviting me today and in conferring the honorary degree of doctor of laws. It is an honor to be associated with this university and with the many men of learning and seekers after truth of this university and I shall treasure it. To have that signal honor conferred upon me by one who has played such a distinguished part in both war and peace adds to its value.

I have come to you not so much in my capacity as a Prime Minister of a great country or a politician, but rather as a humble seeker after truth and as one who has continuously struggled to find the way, not always with success, to fit action to the objectives and ideals that I have held. That process is always difficult but it becomes increasingly so in this world of conflict and passion today.

Politicians have to deal with day-to-day problems and they seek immediate remedies. Philosophers think of ultimate objectives and are apt to lose touch with the day-to-day world and its problems. Neither approach appears to be adequate by itself. Is it possible to combine those two approaches and function after the manner of Plato's philosopher-kings? You, sir, who have had the experience of a role of a great man of action as also that of a philosopher as head of this university, should be able to help us to answer this question.

In this world of incessant and feverish activity men have little time to think, much less to consider ideals and objectives. Yet how are we to act even in the present unless we know which way we are going and what our objectives are? It is only in the peaceful atmosphere of a university that these basic problems can be adequately considered. It is only when the young men and women who are in the university today, and on whom the burden of life's problems will fall tomorrow, learn to have clear objectives and standards of values that there is hope for the next generation.

The past generation produced some great men but as a generation it led the world repeatedly to disaster. Two world wars are the price that has been paid for the lack of wisdom on man's part in this generation. It is a terrible price and the tragedy of it is that, even after that price was paid, we have not purchased real peace or a cessation of conflict, and an even deeper tragedy is that mankind does not profit by its experience and continues to go the same way which led previously to disaster.

REAL OBJECTIVES FORGOTTEN

We have had wars and we have had victory and we have celebrated that victory, yet what is victory and how do we measure it? A war is fought presumably to gain certain objectives. The defeat of the enemy is not by itself an objective but rather the removal of an obstruction toward the attainment of the objective. If that objective is not attained, then that victory over the enemy brings only negative relief and indeed is no real victory. We have seen, however, that the aim in wars is almost entirely to defeat the enemy and the other and real objective is often forgotten.

The result has been that the victory attained by defeating the enemy has only been a very partial one and has not solved the real problem, or if it has solved the immediate problem, it has at the same time given rise to many other and sometimes worse problems. Therefore it becomes necessary to have the real objectives clear in our minds at all times, whether in war or in peace, and always to aim at achieving that objective.

I think also that there is always a close and intimate relationship between the end we aim at and the means adopted to attain it. Even if the end is right, but the means are wrong, that will vitiate the end or divert us into a wrong direction. Means and ends are thus intimately and inextricably connected and cannot be separated. That indeed has been the lesson of old taught us by many great men in the past, but unfortunately it is seldom remembered.

I am venturing to place some of these ideas before you, not because they are novel but because they have impressed themselves upon me in the course of my life which was spent in alternating periods of incessant activity and conflict, and enforced leisure. The great leader of my country, Mahatma Gandhi, under whose inspiration and sheltering care I grew up, always laid stress on moral values and warned us never to subordinate means to ends. We were not worthy of him, and yet to the best of our ability we tried to follow his teaching. Even the limited extent to which we could follow his teaching yielded rich results.

After a generation of intense struggle with a great and powerful nation, we achieved success, and perhaps the most significant part of that achievement, for which credit is due to both parties, was the manner of it. History hardly affords a parallel to a solution of such a conflict in a peaceful way, followed by friendly and cooperative relations. It is astonishing how rapidly bitterness and ill

will between the two nations have faded away giving place to cooperation, and we in India have decided of our own free will to continue this cooperation as an independent nation.

CITES PEACEFUL REVOLUTION

I would not presume to offer advice to other and more-experienced nations in any way. But may I suggest for your consideration that there is some lesson in India's peaceful revolution which might be applied to the larger problems before the world today. That revolution demonstrated to us that physical force need not necessarily be the arbiter of man's destiny and that the method of waging a struggle and the way of its termination are of paramount importance. Past history shows us the important part that physical force has played. But it also shows us that no such force can ultimately ignore the moral forces of the world, and if it attempts to do so, it does so at its peril.

Today this problem faces us in all its intensity because the weapons that physical force has at its disposal are terrible to contemplate. Must the twentieth century differ from primitive barbarism only in the destructive efficacy of the weapons that man's ingenuity has invented for man's destruction? I do believe, in accordance with my master's teaching, that there is another way to meet this situation and solve the problem that faces us.

I realize that a statesman or a man who has to deal with public affairs cannot ignore realities and cannot act in terms of abstract truth. His activity is always limited by the degree of receptivity of the truth by his fellow men. Nevertheless the basic truth remains truth and is always to be kept in view and so far as possible, it should guide our actions. Otherwise we get caught up in a vicious circle of evil when one evil action leads to another.

India is a very old country with a great past. But it is a new country, also, with new urges and desires. Since August 1947 she has been in a position to pursue her foreign policy. She was limited by the realities of the situation which we could not ignore or overcome. But even so she could not forget the lesson of her great leader. She has tried to adapt, howsoever imperfectly, theory to reality insofar as she could.

INDIA'S POTENTIAL RESOURCES

In the family of nations she was a newcomer and could not influence them greatly to begin with. But she had a certain advantage. She had great potential resources which no doubt would increase her power and influence. A greater advantage lay in the fact that she was not fettered by the past, by old enmities or old ties, by historic claims or traditional rivalries. Even against her former rulers there was no bitterness left. Thus, India came into the family of nations with no prejudices or enmities, ready to welcome and be welcomed. Inevitably she had to consider her foreign policy in terms of enlightened self-interest, but at the same time she brought to it a touch of her idealism. Thus she has tried to combine idealism with national interest.

The main objectives of that policy are: The pursuit of peace, not through alinement with any major power or group of powers, but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue; the liberation of subject peoples; the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual; the elimination of racial discrimination; and the elimination of want, disease, and ignorance which afflict the greater part of the world's population.

I am asked frequently why India does not aline herself with a particular nation or a group of nations, and told that because we have refrained from doing so, we are sitting on the fence. The question and the comment are easily understandable because in time of crisis it is not unnatural for those who are involved in it deeply to regard calm objectivity in others as irrational, short-sighted, negative, unreal, or even unmanly.

POLICY IS NOT NEGATIVE

But I should like to make it clear that the policy India has sought to pursue is not a negative and neutral policy. It is a positive and a vital policy which flows from our struggle for freedom and from the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi. Peace is not only an absolute necessity for us in India in order to progress and develop, but is also of paramount importance to the world. How can that peace be preserved? Not by surrendering to aggression, not by compromising with evil or injustice, but also not by talking and preparing for war. Aggression has to be met, for that endangers peace. At the same time the lesson of the last two wars has to be remembered and it seems to me astonishing that in spite of that lesson we go the same way.

The very process of a marshaling of the world into two hostile camps precipitates the conflict which it is sought to avoid. It produces a sense of terrible fear and that fear darkens men's minds and leads them into wrong courses. There is perhaps nothing so bad and so dangerous in life as fear. As a great President of the United States said: "There is nothing really to fear except fear itself."

Our problem, therefore, becomes one of lessening and ultimately putting an end to this fear. That will not happen if all the world takes sides and talks of war. War becomes almost certain then.

We are a member of the family of nations and we have no wish to shirk any of the obligations and burdens of that membership. We have accepted fully the obligations of membership of the United Nations and intend to abide by them. We wish to make our full contribution to the common store and to render our full measure of service. But that can only be done effectively in our own way and of our own choice. We believe passionately in the democratic method and we seek to enlarge the bounds of democracy both on the political and the economic plane, for no democracy can exist for long in the midst of want and poverty and inequality.

IMMEDIATE NEEDS ECONOMIC

Our immediate needs are for economic betterment and raising the standards of our people. The more we succeed in this, the more we can serve the cause of peace in the world. We are fully aware of our weaknesses and failings and claim no superior virtue, but we do not wish to forfeit the advantage that our present detachment gives us and we believe that the maintenance of that detachment is not only in our interest but also in the interest of world peace and freedom.

That detachment is neither isolationism nor indifference, nor neutrality when peace or freedom is threatened. When man's liberty or peace is in danger we cannot and shall not be neutral; neutrality, then, will be a betrayal of what we have fought for and stand for.

If we seek to insure peace, we must attack the root causes of war and not merely the symptoms. What are the underlying causes of war in the modern world?

One of the basic causes is the domination or the attempt to dominate one country by another. Large parts of Asia were ruled till recently by foreign and chiefly European powers. We ourselves were part of the British Empire, as were also Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma. France, Holland, Portugal still have territories over which they rule.

But the rising tide of nationalism and the love of independence have submerged most of the western empires in Asia. In Indonesia I hope that there will soon be an independent sovereign state. We hope also that French Indochina will achieve freedom and peace before long under a government of its own choice. Much of Africa, however, is subject to foreign powers, some of whom still attempt to enlarge their dominions. It is clear that all remaining vestiges of imperialism and colonialism will have to disappear.

ASKS BETTER RACIAL RELATIONS

Secondly, there is the problem of racial relations. The progress of some races in knowledge or in invention, their success in war and conquest, has tempted them to believe that they are racially superior and has led them to treat other nations with contempt. A recent example of this was the horrible attempt, so largely successful, to exterminate the Jews. In Asia and Africa, racial superiority has been most widely and most insolently exhibited.

It is forgotten that nearly all the great religions of mankind arose in the East and that wonderful civilizations grew up there when Europe and America were still unknown to history. The West has too often despised the Asian and the African and still, in many places, denies them not only equality of rights but even common humanity and kindliness. This is one of the great danger points of our modern world; and now that Asia and Africa are shaking off their torpor and arousing themselves, out of this evil may come a conflagration of which no man can see the range of consequences.

One of your greatest men said that this country cannot exist half slave and half free. The world cannot long maintain peace if half of it is enslaved and despised. The problem is not always simple nor can it be solved by a resolution or a decree, but, unless there is a firm and sincere determination to solve it, there will be no peace.

The third reason for war and revolution is the misery and want of millions of persons in many countries and, in particular, in Asia and Africa. In the West, though the war has brought much misery and many difficulties, the common man generally lives in some measure of comfort—he has food, clothes, shelter to some extent.

FOOD, SHELTER, BASIC PROBLEMS

The basic problem of the East, therefore, is to obtain these necessaries of life. If they are lacking, then there is the apathy of despair or the destructive rage of the revolutionary. Political subjection, racial inequality, economic inequality and misery—these are the evils which we have to remove if we would ensure peace. If we can offer no remedy, then other cries and slogans make an appeal to the minds of the people.

Many of the countries of Asia have entered the family of nations; others we hope will soon find a place in this circle. We have the same hopes for the countries of Africa. This process should proceed rapidly, and America and Europe should use their great influence and power to facilitate it.

We see before us vast changes taking place not only in the political and economic spheres, but even more so in the minds of men. Asia is becoming dynamic again and is passionately eager to progress and raise the economic standards of her vast masses. This awakening of a giant continent is of the greatest importance to the future of mankind and requires imaginative statesmanship of a high order. The problems of this awakening will not be solved by looking at it with fear or in a spirit of isolationism by any of us. It requires a friendly and understanding approach, clear objectives, and a common effort to realize them.

The colossal expenditure of energy and resources on armaments that is an outstanding feature of many national budgets today does not solve the problem of world peace. Perhaps even a fraction of that outlay in other ways and for other purposes will provide a more enduring basis for peace and happiness.

That is India's view, offered in all friendliness to all thinking men and women, to all persons of good will in the name of our common humanity. That view is not based on wishful thinking, but on a deep consideration of the problems that afflict us all, and on its merits I venture to place it before you.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an address delivered by a distinguished American, the former Governor of New York, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, Democratic nominee for the United States Senate, in which, out of a long and close identification with international problems and the United Nations, he outlines the problem of world peace as he sees it, and the responsibilities of the United States to press ever forward toward a better world in which man can live in peace and live in freedom.

His views, I think, are important to the Nation, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that his address of October 12, 1949, broadcast from Station WCBS in New York City over a Statewide hook-up in New York State, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I wish to talk to you about world peace and what we should do to attain it.

Peace has long been the prime objective of our national policy.

Now that an atomic explosion has taken place within the Soviet Union, we must pursue our aim of world peace with redoubled vigor.

This is the gravest problem facing the country today.

It is in fact the gravest problem before the civilized world.

I shall not take time to spell out in detail what you already know, that war in the atomic age would be horrible beyond description.

It would destroy our civilization, and make a rubble heap of most of what man has built throughout the ages.

Such is not the fate for which we welcomed our children and grandchildren into the world.

But the issue of peace or war does not depend upon us alone.

A new despotism on the prowl threatens our most cherished values.

With ruthless cruelty, it suppressed every vestige of freedom.

It mocks religion, and persecutes these dedicated souls who minister to the spiritual needs of mankind.

There can no longer be the slightest doubt that the Soviet leaders plan to spread the dominion of their baneful system throughout the world.

They send their agents into every land to stir up strife and confusion, knowing that communism thrives best in the soil of social unrest.

They aim to make bloodless conquests by the slow process of infiltration, but failing in this they are prepared to use the full might of the Red Army to achieve their ends.

I state these hard facts in no spirit of Red baiting, but because it is important for each of us to see clearly the immense difficulties that lie ahead.

I state these facts in no spirit of pessimism, for although we have not yet found the way to that lasting peace which is our deepest aspiration, there is no occasion to abandon hope.

On the contrary, the very difficulties challenge us to tackle the problem with greater determination than ever before.

We must leave no stone unturned in our search for a solution.

The struggle ahead may be long and trying, but we dare not shrink from it.

Free peoples everywhere, and others who would regain their freedoms, turn to us for leadership.

We have shown by word and deed that we accept this vast responsibility.

We must prayerfully consider how we may best discharge it.

Three elements of national policy are directly involved—the military, the economic, and the political—and I shall deal with each of these briefly.

Because I am deeply conscious of the fact that we and other freedom-loving peoples are dangerously exposed until our goal of peace is reached, I turn first to the military aspects of policy.

While striving for the best, we must prepare unceasingly for the worst.

I say this with reluctance, because I know the heavy burden that such a course imposes on our people.

Yet, I say this with all the emphasis at my command, because I know that until the world has been so organized that it will be safe for us to disarm, the best chance of avoiding ultimate disaster is to be so strong that no nation will dare to attack us.

To this end we must continue to strengthen our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force to the best of our ability.

We must insist on the integration of these three services, under an agreed strategic plan, so that we may have the most effective fighting force possible at the lowest cost.

Ancient rivalries of the services, and ancient concepts of warfare dating from the preatomic age must be abandoned as we fashion a striking force of incomparable power.

We must press forward without delay our program of arming our allies in western Europe.

In concert with them we must develop a comprehensive plan for the defense of the Atlantic community.

Until the nations of the world can safely disarm under airtight guaranties, we must face the might of the Soviet Union with the preponderating force of the Western World.

I am glad to be able to say that, under the leadership of President Truman, this program is off to a promising start.

But military strength is not in itself enough.

We must be strong in an economic sense as well.

And we must generously help our allies to regain their economic strength.

The Soviet leaders know that a prosperous America provides the strongest bulwark against communism.

It is on this account that they harp with such delight on the prospect of what they like to call "the coming American depression."

We must prove to them that they are reckoning without the American people.

We are not going to repeat the mistakes in policy which produced the panic of 1929 and the great depression that followed it.

In this changing world, we cannot stake the future of our economy solely on the free play of economic forces and the arbitrary decision of reactionary business leaders.

There is a prudently limited area in which in the general interest Government must play a part.

Without infringing upon the basic freedoms which are the birthright of every American, the Democratic administration has gone a long way to add to our other freedoms—freedom from fear and freedom from want.

To insure a prosperous America—and only a prosperous America is likely to continue economic and military aid to the free world beyond our frontiers—these policies must be continued.

No less important than the military and the economic is the political element in national policy.

We have a moral obligation ceaselessly to carry on the offensive for world peace.

For this purpose the United Nations is an ideal instrument ready at hand.

But while we bring it the fullest measure of support, let us do so without illusions.

We have learned the bitter lesson that, as now constituted, it is powerless to discharge the primary obligations assumed in its Charter—to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

We have come to realize that no country can at present safely rely upon it for protection against a potential aggressor.

And so, in the forum of the United Nations let us restate our purpose in unmistakable terms.

Let us make it clear that we are eager to take whatever steps may be necessary to give vitality to the Charter, which amid such high hopes we signed at San Francisco.

Let us make it clear that the cause of free peoples everywhere is our cause.

Let us make it clear that valuing freedom and the dignity of the individual above every material thing, we shall, if need be, mobilize all our resources in its defense.

In our search for the basis of an abiding peace under law, let us propose to the nations of the world that the United Nations be given the power to limit all arms—not just atomic weapons, but all weapons as well—under an effective system of international inspection and control; and to this end let us urge all the member nations to give the United Nations the power of incontestable decisions and the power to enforce such decisions under the processes of law.

Let us make this proposal, and let us make it again and again.

Let us not be discouraged by repeated refusals.

It is our moral responsibility, born of our present position in the world, to keep this great beacon of peace, enforced under law, before the peoples and governments of the world until they accept it.

Then and then only will it be possible for all nations to give up the costly and wasteful armament race, and to devote the great wealth which we are now sacrificing in this sterile endeavor to enrich the lives of human beings everywhere.

This I must frankly admit is too much to expect overnight.

There is no evidence to warrant hope that the Soviet Union would at present agree to any proposal designed to give the United Nations adequate power.

But we must not on this account abandon our objective.

Peace has become in the atomic age a matter of imperative necessity.

We must leave no possible avenue of approach unexplored.

And if in the end we can devise no formula consistent with our deepest beliefs which Stalin is willing to accept, then at least we shall have mobilized the moral force of world opinion, and drawn to our side such overwhelming strength that the Soviet leaders would be mad indeed to challenge us.

I am unwilling to believe that such madness can very long prevail.

But no one can tell how much time we have in which to convince Marshal Stalin of the utter folly of the policies he now pursues.

The civilized world turns to us insistently for moral no less than for military leadership.

We shall fail in our highest obligation unless with imagination and daring we advance a program responsive to the most pressing need of all mankind.

But as the very idea of failure is foreign to our national character, let us get on with the task without delay.

This means, as I have said, strengthening our defenses and the defenses of our allies to the best of our ability.

It means maintaining a strong economy at home based on the great productive energies of our people, encouraged and guided by the policies of an ever-watchful government.

And last but not least, it means the launching of a determined campaign to give the United Nations those elements of power which it now lacks.

It will in no event be an easy matter to attain world peace.

Yet world peace can and must be attained.

If with patience and resolution we carry forward the three-pronged attack on the problem which I have outlined tonight, I have every confidence in our ultimate success.

Displaced-Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from Mrs. Willard Hurst, of 2805 Ridge Road, Madison, Wis.

This is the story of a DP family, and what has happened to them since they came to the United States. Mrs. Hurst describes their experience in such a dramatic and informative way that I feel every Member of the Senate will want to read this letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *October 16, 1949.*

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KILGORE: I have read in the New York Times of October 13 that Senator CAIN is starting a filibuster to prevent action on the new DP bill. Here is a story of a DP family which might possibly be of use to you or other helpful Members of the Senate. Sometimes personalities tell a story more forcefully than issues can do.

Last March, the First Congregational Church of Madison sent to Germany for a family of Latvian DP's. Because of all the red tape, the family did not arrive till August. Here is how they have fitted into the community in the short time since their arrival:

The 16-year-old son had a job awaiting him as helper to a farmer about 10 miles from here. Until this boy came, the farmer tried to get other help but was not satisfied with it. In the month this boy could work before coming back to Madison to enter high school, he learned to drive a tractor although he had had no previous experience with cars or tractors. Now he has entered high school as a junior, dressed like the other boys in blue jeans and a cowboy belt, both given him by a newly made friend in school.

The 12-year-old girl is in junior high school, and I have seen her walking home from school with her new friends, looking just like them except for her long, blond braids. The 8-year-old girl has just been advanced from first to second grade, and she, too, seems to be fitting right in with her new friends.

The father, who had been an officer in the Latvian Army until it was disbanded by the Russians early in the war, had no trade, but in short order he obtained steady work in Madison's booming construction industry. After a few days' work he was home sick one day and the foreman called to see what had become of him, "He is one of our best workers and we don't want to lose him."

I have saved the best till last, and that is the mother of this fine family. She was a secretary and interpreter at the DP camp, and her English is very good. We are hoping to get some part-time secretarial work for her with the department of Slavic languages at the University of Wisconsin, where there is a shortage of just plain secretarial help not to mention help who can speak Latvian, Russian, German, and English as she can. But so far the mother's time has been full learning American ways of housekeeping and making over clothing to fit her family. (When they arrived, they had only some clothes sent to Europe by UNRRA, and now the church has given them more.) As for learning American ways, we found the family hilarious when we dropped in one evening, because the mother had just made her first lemon pie, a big job but it turned out a success. This is to show that they are trying right away to adopt American ways even in little things.

The mother has also found time to join the YWCA Who's New Club, to travel to northern Wisconsin to help out some fellow-Latvians, to visit a nearby town as translator, and to give a radio talk over WHA. She is a woman of great spirit and adaptability, and does not want to accept help any longer than necessary. The family expects to begin paying their own rent—$45—this month, just 2 months after their arrival. (I understand that it has taken an average of 6 months for the DP's who have arrived in this country so far to become self-supporting.)

The family is housed in two rooms and a kitchen made available by slightly decreased enrollment at the State University. These rooms were rented to students previously. It is not much, but since the whole family had only one room in the DP camp, it is an improvement.

If you think more letters would be of any help in getting action on the new bill, I am sure several people here would like to help. Please tell me to whom it would help most to write.

Sincerely,

FRANCES WILSON HURST
(Mrs. Willard Hurst).

The General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial entitled "The General Welfare," appearing in the Daytona Beach Evening News of August 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENERAL WELFARE

It's not regimentation; it's the people using their governmental institutions to promote the general welfare as the Constitution says they were meant to be used. It's not the welfare state; it's a state of general welfare that shows up in corporate profits as well as in the wage-earner's pocketbook and savings account.

If we listened only to the alarmists and the diehard yearners for the good old days of every fellow for himself and the devil take the hindmost—of whom there were so many millions a few years ago—we might be persuaded that the 16 years of progressiveness in National Govenment inaugurated by the New Deal had brought us to the edge of some kind of economic and social abyss.

But, listening to Senator CLAUDE PEPPER at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner here this week end we were brought up against economic facts of those years that stood out as plain as the route markers on a Federal-aid highway—facts that have been with us long enough, now, for us to know that they have become constructive integers of our history as a Nation—so essentially a part of our national being that we dare not go back on them lest we repudiate our destiny, and so sacrifice our own security.

These economic facts are, as proven by the country's history in these years of planning and working for progressive liberalism in our national way of life, that the principles and policies for which the Democratic Party has worked and fought is the best policy for all the various social and economic elements and classes that make up our complex society, because they are so inseparably related and linked together in the vast web of economic cause and effect.

That they are the best policy for the big industrialist, the small businessman, the worker, the farmer, the financier, is a fact that shows up in the Nation's composite economic ledger—in bigger corporate profits as well as in better wages and a larger measure of security for the millions, because national prosperity is one huge mass of interdependent factors.

It was by making these principles and policies work through governmental instruments that the Nation's over-all wealth potential was so vastly increased at the same time that economic practices were being regulated and stabilized for the protection of everybody.

Would any sane American wish now to undo the soil-conservation work of the past decade and a half; or the mighty land reclamation, flood control, and power achievement we call the TVA?

Would any sane American wish to scrap the financial safeguards written into our business life by creation of the Security Exchange Commission, or the Bank Deposit Insurance Corporation? They who cry alarms over a fancied, just-around-the-corner welfare state seemingly would have us forget that the bedrock of liberalism, insofar as we have permitted it to work, is material security even when it takes the shape of humanitarian reform. Seemingly, too, they would have us forget that lack of this bedrock brought us to the brink of ruin 20 years ago; would blind us to the fact that forgetting could bring us to that brink again.

Senator PEPPER was talking to Democrats the other night—loyal and zealous members of the party. We wish more of them, in Congress and back at home, would be as zealous in carrying on with its historic and

avowed principles and policies as they have been fighting for victory at the polls.

But as we listened to this distinguished statesman who has not failed the principles and policies for which the Democratic Party stands committed on the record, we were compelled to think with regret and uneasiness of the unkept pledges that stand against the record of the Eighty-first Congress. As surely as the people sent a Democratic majority to the Senate and House and put a Democratic President in the White House, they voted also for the platform that went with the Democratic victory.

But the people wait at home for promised enactment of a national health insurance program; for Federal aid to education; for constructive labor legislation; for expansion of the Nation's wealth potential with new reclamation and power projects in the Missouri and Columbia River Basins; for admission of more displaced and homeless persons of Europe, which would mean so much to our prestige abroad, so much to world confidence in our democracy.

And only a dissident bloc within the Democratic majority has blocked passage of these and other promised measures. How foolish, how blind, how dangerously frivolous, to betray those principles and policies that have carried our country through the greatest perils of its history.—From "Brother" Booth.

Who Is to Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Is to Blame?" from the Indianapolis Times of Wednesday, October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S TO BLAME

We've been waiting for a week or more now for some disavowal by Representative ANDREW JACOBS of remarks attributed to him about the United Mine Workers and the National Association of Manufacturers and this miner over in Pennsylvania who wanted to know what became of his money.

Up to now we haven't heard any denials, and till we do we suppose we'll have to assume he said what he was quoted as saying.

This miner wondered, like a good many of us have been, what had been done with all the millions of dollars poured into the United Mine Workers welfare and pension fund the last few years, and why there isn't enough left now to go on paying pensions. Having a direct, personal, part ownership of that money, this miner finally went to the courts, as any American has a right to do, to find out.

He was immediately deprived of his union membership, his interest in UMW funds to which he has been contributing for years, and in common practice, his right to work in a coal mine for the rest of his life.

This, Mr. JACOBS is quoted (and hasn't denied) saying is the fault of the National Association of Manufacturers, who ought to reimburse the man.

The NAM, according to Mr. JACOBS, published advertisements which said that a union couldn't drop a member, and bar him for life from a job, for any such offense. These convinced the miner his union membership was safe, and so made him bold enough to file his suit in court. Ergo, the NAM is responsible for his present plight.

That used to be the way it was. A union member could be dropped from union membership almost any time on the whim of a union boss, and then put off his job and in effect blacklisted for life from working at his trade.

It isn't anymore, as Mr. JACOBS ought to know.

A new law, passed 2 years ago, forbids it. Mr. JACOBS opposed that law and seeks its repeal. So do a good many union bosses. It does strip them of this almost life and death power over union members that they once had, and they don't like it. They call it a slave-labor law. Its real title is the National Labor Relations Act. Most of us know it as the Taft-Hartley law.

It specifically guarantees that where holding a job depends upon being a member of a union a member can be dropped by the union only for refusal to pay his dues—and for no other reason. He can't be dropped for asking what the union boss did with the money. That's what the law says.

What the National Association of Manufacturers has to do with that we don't quite see.

If there is any responsibility for the failure of this law to protect the people it was enacted to protect, it would seem to us to be the responsibility of those charged with enforcing it, and who try instead to weaken and discredit and ignore it.

We still haven't heard any denials from Mr. JACOBS—but maybe we will yet.

Just doesn't sound like our ANDY.

Egg Mess Baby of Agricultural Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Egg Mess Baby of Agricultural Department," written by Robert P. Vanderpoel, a financial editor, and recently published in a Chicago newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EGG MESS BABY OF AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, Financial Editor)

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Knox T. Hutchinson, speaking in Chicago before the convention of the National Poultry, Butter and Egg Association, admitted virtually every charge which we have made in this column relative to the Government's egg purchasing program.

Hutchinson, however, tried to place the blame for the disgraceful situation upon Congress and the agricultural act.

After admitting that the direct cost to the Government for the egg program during the last 4 years has approximated $340,000,000 with an indirect cost to the consumers of between $500,000,000 and $800,000,000, he said:

"As to 1950, the stage is set for a costly price-support program in eggs. Unless Congress changes the method of support, the Department of Agriculture will be faced with a serious problem in disposing of eggs purchased in any form. * * * Dried eggs certainly are not easy to get rid of."

With the Department of Agriculture holding the equivalent of approximately 2,125,000,000 eggs in powdered form in storehouses all over the country and caves in Kansas, bought at a price approximately double the current market value, Hutchinson can well say again: "Dried eggs are certainly not easy to get rid of."

NO REQUIREMENT FOR DRYING

But neither Congress nor the agricultural act requires that eggs purchased for price-support purposes be dried. Moreover, they could be separated into whites and yolks, for both of which a much better market exists. Some could be stored in shell form.

Anonymous Department of Agriculture spokesmen have said that if this were done such eggs overhanging the market would act as a price depressant. With eggs selling at 69 to 85 cents a dozen, and occasionally even more, in the city markets, no one has yet stepped forward and explained why it would not be in the general interest to have some eggs available to depress prices a bit.

Secretary Brannan, himself, in a letter to Senator LUCAS written in reply to our criticism of the egg program, declared that the eggs which the department was buying were not the fresh eggs which the housewife demanded for her breakfast table. Is there anything in the Agricultural Act which requires the Department to support eggs which are not fresh eggs?

RELAXING BILL OPPOSED

Recently a bill was introduced into Congress by Senator ELMER THOMAS, Democrat of Oklahoma, which would have eliminated mandatory price supports for eggs and potatoes the rest of the year. Ralph S. Trigg, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation and head of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, testified against this bill before a Senate agricultural subcommittee.

He appeared, he said, in behalf of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, who is attending a west coast Democratic conference.

In other words, the Department of Agriculture admits on one hand that the support program is unsound and is costing both the taxpayers and consumers a back-breaking amount while, on the other hand, it fights against any change in the law and follows policies not required by the act which are clearly against the interest of the taxpayers and the consumers and may very well be also against the long-term interest of the farmers themselves.

What the Women of Washington Can Do To Assist in Keeping the Nation's Capital Beautiful and a Safe Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include

the following address recently delivered by me:

I can scarcely think of a more difficult subject for a man to have to speak on than to tell the members of a woman's club how they should proceed or what they can do to keep the Nation's Capital beautiful and a safe place to live; however, on this occasion, I have found the subject stimulating, because it is about Washington—one of the most important cities in the world—not only the Capital of our Nation but the capital of the world—because I know that men and women are equally concerned about its welfare.

As chairman of the House District Committee, I fully realize that members of women's clubs are often put in the position of being thrown off balance and stopped in their course, by having attention directed to their method of procedure. It is unfortunate to be hampered by the problems of procedure when all the time the potential is there, if only it could be made effective. As a matter of fact, women usually have a good grasp of day-to-day reality and they are usually able to cut through hampering procedures and do a job that needs to be done. A woman knows that if there is to be peace and light inside her home, the homemaker must do something about the confusion and darkness outside. In other words, the community is not something outside of the homemaker's job, it is a part of it, and she is ready, willing and able to assume her responsibility.

Community work is a part of the everyday program for anyone who wants to play her full role in a democracy in the modern world, and it is the nature of that world in which we live that has produced such a situation. The high degree of organization resulting from the development of our industrial civilization has created a complex network of interrelations and, whether we like it or not, such organizations and such interrelations are facts of our individual lives. The question is—Who shall plan and control our common life, and to what ends and in what interests shall the planning and control be accomplished? One sure defense against the regimentation which is worrying so many liberty-loving Americans at the present moment is the vigorous exercise of our functions as citizens in our particular communities. The only people who can be certain that they will not be regimented are the people who vigorously take the initiative themselves, and the more of them there are in any community, the more confident that community may be of holding its freedom.

Women are concerned not only with order and efficiency but with health and the grace of living. For them the desirable community is not merely a place in which to eat and sleep and earn a living, but the place where people can be stimulated and helped to attain a good life That is why the women of the community can be counted on to take an interest in child welfare, education, public health, housing, art, and all the other instruments of community culture. The women of Washington face a rare opportunity of rendering service to a unique community. It is because of your particular interest in the human side of things that you can render a real service here. On the whole, your city is beautiful, well-kept and that is as it should be, since it is the Capital of the Nation. But the spot where you can play a particular role is in the area of the human side of events, the side women know so well. The human side begins right in your neighborhoods and your influence fans out beyond that.

There is a story told about the women of Prague, following World War II—when the city of Prague was a shambles with debris everywhere—several women, members of an organization, looked over the situation thinking what could they do, when one of the women turned to her friends and said, "Well, we still have our brooms, and we know how to use them." So these three women got out their brooms and started sweeping the streets of Prague, and as they went along others joined them until there were thousands working along the main streets in the city. They swept clean an area as large as the city limits of Washington. They faced a need and did something about it. Take the Red Cross, for example—a man had the idea—but a woman went out and performed the service where it was needed—right at the heart of the problem, and on the humane side.

One hears very often that we should never underestimate the power of a woman. You ladies have a way which is persuasive and convincing. Now what I have to suggest to you is to get your facts on the situation which exists in Washington, look at both sides of the issues involved, and decide on a definite program of action. Work for it, give things up if necessary, but win your ultimate objective as you have done so often before.

What can women do to demonstrate their undoubted capacity for good community citizenship? You ladies have it within you to ask questions, to conduct a survey, and to learn about your community. Much can be accomplished through reading, through study groups, through volunteer work so that you can learn first-hand about the problems which exist. For example, you all know that juvenile delinquency has been a problem in Washington. What are the questions which must be asked and answered about it? In which areas of Washington does it occur? Why does it occur there? What can be done to remedy the conditions causing delinquency? Housing is a problem in Washington which is not just left over from the crowded conditions of a wartime Washington. I am speaking of areas of slum housing which existed even before World War I. The questions to be asked are where does this bad housing exist? Who lives in it? What can be done about it?

What are the health needs of the city? A survey on this subject was reported by a committee of the District of Columbia section of the American Academy of Pediatrics. They reported that, in some respects, the city was above average. The study shows that mental hygiene clinic services for children should be developed further. In regard to school-health services, it appeared that the number of physicians was very small in proportion to the number of school children. I have quoted this statement to you to show that, in some fields, studies have already been made, and that it would be possible to proceed from the facts gathered and work out a suggested plan to remedy the situation, if that is what the group desired.

The Washington papers, a few weeks ago, stated that the FBI had reported the Nation's crime rate for the first half of 1949, and Washington's violent-crime rate, had risen 7 percent over the previous year. This makes the Nation's Capital second only to Chicago in aggravated assault. The term "aggravated assault" covers assault by shooting, cutting, stabbing, maiming, poisoning, scalding, or by use of acids—after studying the uniform crime increase, in these crimes, of over 1,600 offenses in Washington.

The whole crime situation in Washington probably needs study by interested citizens. The women of Washington can assist the law-enforcement agencies in our Nation's Capital by reducing crime by being on the alert and reporting immediately all suspects and, also, by assisting in providing clean and sane entertainment for the younger generation. The women of Washington should speak out when movies and radio cause our children to divert their minds toward gangster crime, and should bring pressure to see that no gang or murder shows are sent over radio, television, or the movies.

During the two different occasions that I have been privileged to act as chairman of the House District Committee, the women's clubs of the city of Washington have furnished me with more valuable information concerning bills vitally affecting the people of the District of Columbia than any other representative groups that appeared before our committee. You have some hard-working public servants among your women's associations and other groups here, in the District of Columbia, and they are continually assisting the Members of Congress by giving them valuable advice as to how to keep the city of Washington, our Nation's Capital, the most beautiful city in the world.

S. 2596

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state I am very much in favor of S. 2596, the Taft bill, which will be of help to veterans who are attending veterans' schools. I include some letters I have received in regard to this legislation:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your note of September 30 in which you inquire as to the status of my bill, S. 2596.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee considered the matter in executive session last Thursday. Mr. Stirling of the Veterans' Administration gave a statement and was asked a great many questions by the committee. The legislation is still before the committee and we will take it up again next Wednesday.

I am returning your telegram.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. TAFT.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
October 3, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building.

DEAR LINDY: Thanks for your note about my bill concerning veterans' training schools.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee is going to have an executive session Wednesday at 10 a. m. at which time my bill along with Senator Taft's and other bills will be considered.

I think it would be a good idea for you to let them know of your interest and pass on to them any information which might be helpful.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BECKWORTH: Returned herewith is the letter from Grand Saline Trade School,

Grand Saline, Tex., which you referred to me under date of September 30, 1949.

The letter has to do with certain language contained in Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, the Independent Offices Appropriations Act.

Three bills—H. R. 6254, by TEAGUE; H. R. 6273, PATTERSON; and H. R. 6280, WHEELER—have been introduced on this subject. Prior to the introduction of these bills Senator TAFT introduced S. 2596, and I am advised that a meeting was held in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one day last week, and another tentatively scheduled for Wednesday of this week, to discuss this matter with Veterans' Administration officials.

Very truly yours,

J. E. RANKIN, *Chairman.*

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
REGIONAL OFFICE, LOVE FIELD,
Dallas, Tex., October 13, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY A. BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Returned herewith as requested is letter to you from Mr. David V. Wright, Jr., Tyler, Tex. A copy of the letter has been prepared for our files.

Veterans' Administration Instruction 1-A, specifically referred to by Mr. Wright, has been cancelled and replaced by Veterans' Administration Instruction 1-B, Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, issued October 5, 1949. The full text of Instruction 1-B is contained in the enclosed quotation of a TWX received by this office from VA central office on October 6, 1949.

It is believed that VA Instruction 1-B removes principal objections raised by Mr. Wright. Any inquiry directed by him to this office, with respect to other or related problems, will be answered promptly and in full.

Very truly yours,

SCOTT B. HARRINGTON, *Manager.*

The Reign of Terror Spreads in Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the Soviet Union through its Communist agents is spreading terror in Czechoslovakia. We cannot remain indifferent to this added assault on freedom and human dignity. Surely the tragic lessons of two world wars have conclusively shown that when freedom is threatened abroad it is threatened in the United States. The freedom-loving people of Czechoslovakia are at this moment going through a terrible Gethsemane. They are experiencing the unbelievable horror of the Soviet nightmare with all its devilish ingenuity. Who can doubt that a similar fate would be in store for us Americans if we allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security in a dangerous world.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a brilliant and eloquent article by Anne O'Hare McCormick which appeared in the New York Times on October 17.

THE REIGN OF TERROR SPREADS IN EASTERN EUROPE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Terror reigns in the old free city of Prague. Between the wars new residential suburbs were built on the heights above the Castle Hill. The houses were mostly of the small, modest, servantless type that are going up by the thousands in the developments on the outskirts of New York, but they were somewhat more modern in design for the craze for the functional in architecture and furniture struck the old countries of Europe before it took hold in the United States. In the main these houses were occupied by small business and professional people, civil servants, teachers—the big middle class which formed a solid and comfortable segment of a population that was nearer a happy mean in its living standards than any other in central Europe.

The writer remembers looking down one evening on the noble profile of the old city, "the Florence of the East," from the wide window of the all-purpose room of one of these dwellings. The moment is memorable, not only for the view but for the almost passionate pride of the young couple whose guests we were. He was an assistant professor at the Charles University and she was a dietitian in a public hospital. They were proud of their jobs, proud of their home, proud above all of their city, and the part they were carving out for themselves in its new life.

HOMES OF FEAR

The moment is memorable because this couple, supposing they have survived the vicissitudes of a terrible decade are probably now under arrest. They are, or were, typical examples of the middle class which the present rulers of their city are rounding up by the thousands—not for anything they have done but because they have homes of their own and presumably some carefully concealed remnants of ideas of their own. Therefore they are potential enemies of the omnipotent and uncontradictable state.

If they are not arrested, they are cowering at home behind drawn curtains, afraid to appear on the streets, afraid of the knock on the door that summons them to an unknown fate. In contrast to the American Communist leaders, they are jailed without charge and sentenced without trial to prison or forced labor camps. Sometimes they disappear altogether.

The streamlined little houses on the hills are now homes of fear. And so are the historic old palaces which house the government offices. There is panic in Hradcany Castle as well as terror in the streets. In a week the government has arrested 10,000 persons. The correspondent of the Times in Prague reports that the number is expected to reach 50,000. Hundreds of Catholic priests have been seized and a bill has been passed making the church—any church—an appanage of the state, its bishops and pastors to be appointed or dismissed purely on the basis of political reliability.

The Ministry of the Interior is finding danger everywhere, and its jitters are justified. There is danger in the middle class, the churches, the intellectuals, former businessmen, anybody who clings to the concepts of liberty and independence in which the short-lived republic was nourished. The regime is too weak to stand a whisper of opposition. The purge extends even to Communist officials thought to be less than 100 percent supporters of the liquidation policy.

But at least we know what is going on in Czechoslovakia. Reporters are present to tell the story to the outside world and evidently they are free to tell it in detail. The Rajk trial in Hungary was well publicized. It was staged to prove that the No. 2 Communist in Hungary was conspiring with Tito against the rule of Moscow, but what it really demonstrated was the fear and dissension in the top Communist ranks. There is news from Poland and an occasional item from Bulgaria. A few correspondents hang on in Moscow. But not a word comes out of Rumania. Even itinerant reporters who get into other "iron-curtain" capitals never seem to break into Bucharest. The richest and, in some respects, the most potential of the satellites is the most completely blacked out.

MORE NOISE NEEDED

One reason is that the Rumanian regime is the most oppressive of all. Rumanian refugees who escaped recently to Turkey say that the whole population feels the lash and that every form of compulsion used in other Balkan states is employed in triple force in Rumania. The Rumanian National Committee of exiles has issued a detailed, well-documented and horrifying account of violations of human rights and suppressions of fundamental freedoms that should fortify the appeal of the American Government for international action on the broken pledges of the Balkan peace treaties.

The situation is really intolerable. The suffering of helpless and innocent people, deprived of any recourse to law against the arbitrary cruelty of puppet czars, is a disgrace to humanity and a mockery of the United Nations and its charter of human rights. If we cannot do anything about this crime against mankind, as responsible members of the human race, at least we can make more noise about it.

We can make more noise in the UN Assembly—and also in the United States Senate, for if the greatest democracy on earth will not give refuge to another 100,000 abandoned victims of persecution, our protests sound pretty hollow and our fight against tyranny is a very cold war indeed.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Press of September 29, 1949, entitled "Maybe Townsend Plan Would Be Better Than the Strikes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S BUSINESS

(By John W. Love)

MAYBE TOWNSEND PLAN WOULD BE BETTER THAN THE STRIKES

The way I've been trending lately, I shouldn't be surprised if I came around to supporting the Townsend plan before long.

It isn't that I'm getting up to where I will soon be on the Townsend pension, though anybody who reads the newspapers carefully must feel older each passing week.

It's just that maybe the Townsend plan or a stripped-down model might be better than the dangerous controversy over more elaborate and also more exclusive pension plans. No more people would be on the paying end under Townsend, but a lot more of us would have a chance for the money. One big strike is going on and others are threatened over schemes that will cost us all something but will benefit only the employees of the industries.

The current version of the Townsend plan differs somewhat from the original. Fifteen years ago Dr. Francis Townsend proposed that everybody over 60 be allowed $50 a week, provided he quit work and promised to spend his pension within 30 days. The money was to come from a turnover tax of 3 percent. The present plan, as written into bills in Congress, calls for only about $35 a week, to be financed by a 3 percent tax on incomes over $250.

Both plans were designed to see that "benevolence and kindly consideration for others will displace suspicion and avarice, brotherly love and tolerance will blossom into full flower and the genial sun of human happiness will dissipate the dark clouds of distrust and gloom and despair." These are the word or Dr. Townsend, now 82, of Long Beach, Calif. Maybe we can reach that golden age by way of strikes, but I wonder.

One additional requirement I would write into his plan, and that is that the pensioners spend the money where they live and not go bouncing down to Florida, the great remittance State.

The Townsend plan as embodied in the House bill provides not a great deal more money than the retired coal miners would be getting if their own plan were in working order and Government's old-age pensions had reached their full payments. The Townsenders' switch from the turn-over tax to income-tax financing was made probably to attract more supporters, but the miners' plan is based on a turn-over tax. When Secretary of the Interior Krug settled one of the coal strikes he pushed the industry into biting off a piece of the original Townsend plan.

To the extent the industrial pension plans aim to collect more than going rates of wages they edge us into the 1934 Townsend plan as to method of collections, but not as to method of payment. In the end a great many people would be left always paying but never receiving. Hence the probability that when the public wakes up it will want to have the scheme broadened either in Townsend directions or along the saner lines of the existing social security.

The Advisory Council on Social Security headed by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Prof. Sumner Slichter, brought in a program 9 months ago that deserves attention from employers and employees, as well as the self-employed. It suggested the coverage of the existing system be broadened, the benefits increased and the contributions raised.

One of the business services is recommending that clients try to get their employees to put off pension demands until they see what Congress is going to do about increases in benefits.

Smaller business concerns will certainly attempt this. Some of them could be ruined if they adopted unsound plans. One of the most dangerous is the level pension to be paid regardless of present age of the employee—widely adopted it would make it still harder for a man in his forties to get a job. It appears to originate with Murray W. Latimer, the same man who has been advising the steel union.

Record of the Lutz, Fla., Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Post of Lutz, Fla., relative to the outstanding record of the Lutz post office.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUTZ POST OFFICE HAS OUTSTANDING RECORD

It has just been learned that the Lutz Post Office holds a national record. As the result of an examination just completed by official inspectors, the local office has been granted a 100 percent rating. That means flawless, absolutely perfect service. These inspections are thorough, searching, rigid; and when a post office wins a 100 percent rating it has reason for pride. So, on the basis of this last inspection alone, congratulations are due Postmaster William R. Vosburgh and his capable and courteous staff.

But the real punch of this story is yet to be told. This last perfect rating makes the sixth that the local office has received. Six years of perfect service in every phase of operations. And, more important yet, five of these perfects were in unbroken succession.

"Almost unbelievable," is the way one postal official characterized this record of the Lutz office. According to the best information obtainable, this has never been equaled by any other post office in the United States. And it must be remember that there are over 42,000 post offices in this Nation. What a reason for Lutz to be proud of the record and appreciative of the service.

This bit of news cost the Post reporter a lot of work, for Postmaster Vosburgh was hesitant about making it public. He felt that it might be interpreted as boasting. Even at that this national record is one of which he has given Lutz the right to boast. But instead of taking that attitude, Lutz merely points to the facts with pride and in appreciation.

Assisting Postmaster Vosburgh are the following members of his staff, of whom Lutz is likewise proud and appreciative:

Office staff: Mrs. Ellen P. Baker, Miss Agatha M. Boise, Mrs. Rossie W. Farm, and Miss Bertha J. Wynn.

Rural carriers: Fred W. Polen, William M. Pickert, and K. Wayne Ward.

Hearty congratulations, Postmaster Vosburgh and staff, for putting the local office right at the national peak.

Monopolization in the Used Cotton Baling Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me on the subject of the growing trend toward monopolization in the used cotton baling market, written by Mr. Harry I. Rand, under date of October 12, 1949. Mr. Rand is a citizen of Washington, but apparently he represents the industry that makes jute and cotton bags. He seeks to explain a matter which is causing some difficulty. I ask permission to place the letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 12, 1949.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: You have been so continually vigilant on behalf of our Nation's cotton farmers that I am certain that you will be interested in a recent development which bids seriously to threaten their welfare in coming years. I refer to the growing trend to monopolization in the used cotton baling market.

Cotton ginners, particularly during large crop years, have relied heavily for their baling on reconditioned burlap bagging derived from used sugar bags. Practically the entire supply of such bags comes from the three large sugar-refining companies of the Nation. Until quite recently, those companies disposed of such bags through brokers and agents, who, by distributing them among the many highly competitive used bag processors and dealers, assured the cotton-gin consumers of baling at a reasonably low and competitive price. Recently, however, the refining companies have taken to bypassing the intermediate brokers and agents, and one company is already selling bagging directly to the ginners. This tendency toward direct sales from refinery to cotton gin must inevitably result in a stifling of the vigorous competition in the market and result in a virtual monopoly in the supply of the vital, used burlap bagging.

The National Burlap Bag Dealers Association, which I represent, has asked that I call this to your attention so that you can do whatever you can to stem this deleterious trend. We should very much appreciate it, too, if this letter can be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that more of our citizens may be made aware and may guard against this, another example of growing monopoly, so destructive of our free competitive system.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY I. RAND.

Tribute to Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, by Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, and the Gastonia (N. C.) Gazette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the editorial entitled "If There Were Only More Like Him," from the Gastonia (N. C.) Gazette for Friday, September 23, paying tribute to the courage, the wisdom, and the high principles of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], together with a brief statement of my own by way of introduction.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

The editorial tribute to Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM in the Gastonia Gazette is most richly deserved. As a moderate, Senator GRAHAM is frequently misunderstood. While sympathetic to all people, he believes that we can go only as fast as religion and education have prepared public opinion to go. He knows that legislation which is too far in advance of public opinion will be disregarded. He most certainly does not go as far as those of us in the North do in our judgment of what is possible now in race relations, but he is for a square deal for everyone.

When Senator GRAHAM was trying to bring peace and justice to Indonesia, the Russian radio and the Russian press repeatedly denounced him as the spokesman of American capitalism, and tried to undermine the faith of the Indonesian people in him. We can all be glad that despite these attacks from the left, the Indonesians learned to trust him and the principles of the Renville agreement which he helped to work out, and that his mission there was so successful in advancing the hopes for a peaceful settlement. Here at home, on the other hand, he has been equally unjustly attacked from the extreme right.

Senator GRAHAM loves the South and has repeatedly given up chances to go to positions elsewhere at salaries four to five times as great as those he has been receiving. But he has always chosen to stay with his people.

Here in the Senate we have come to appreciate his faithful attendance to committee duties, his able service on the Senate floor, and his free and untrammeled devotion to the public interest, beholden to no group, but serving all.

I am happy that his State is recognizing his unique qualities.

[From the Gastonia (N. C.) Gazette of September 23, 1949]

IF THERE WERE ONLY MORE LIKE HIM

Burden of the adverse criticism of Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM for naming a Negro youth as an alternate appointee to West Point, coming out of Washington, is that by so doing he ruined or greatly damaged his chances of reelection to the Senate.

In the Gazette's story from its Washington correspondent, Robert A. Erwin, in yesterday's Gazette, quoting North Carolina Congressmen and others, a typical utterance was this one, author unnamed: "I'm delighted; that's fine—that'll fix Dr. GRAHAM's little red wagon so we won't have to worry about beating him next year."

Another member was quoted as saying, "There may be nothing wrong with appointing a Negro to West Point, but I'm mighty, mighty glad that it's Dr. GRAHAM who's making the appointment and not me. I'd feel mighty bad about my chances of renomination next year if I'd named that boy."

There were a few complimentary remarks regarding the appointment. Most of them, however, were adverse.

All of which made us sick at the stomach. They indicated that the thought uppermost in the minds of these Congressmen is their renomination and reelection to office. A lot of little peanut politicians crowd the Halls of Congress, figuring and fuming and fussing and worrying about holding on to their jobs, while the country suffers for the lack of constructive leadership and constructive fellowship in its ranks.

Knowing FRANK GRAHAM as we do we would not hesitate to aver that, having made the unqualified statement that he would follow the civil service examination results in making this appointment, he would have gone through with it had he known for a certainty that it would cost him his seat in the Senate. He's that kind of a man. He would rather be right than be Senator; he'd prefer to be honest and aboveboard than to be bound down by the lust for office and the desire for a good-paying job. Having made the statement that he would act strictly on the results of the examination he would have gone through "hell and high water" before he would knuckle under to that group which believes that "the end justifies the means."

It is not likely that the Negro will get the appointment as he has the position of an alternate. If, however, the others fall down and the Negro comes out as top man in grade and other required qualifications we predict that FRANK GRAHAM will name him to the post. That is something no southern Senator has ever done before. But GRAHAM is not bound by outmoded sentiment and by unstable political expedients. He may be wrong at times—and no man is always right—but, right or wrong, he sticks to his guns and is, by admission even of his bitterest enemies, honest and forthright.

This country will never prosper and go ahead as it should and can as long as it is run by peanut politicians instead of by honest statesmen.

The Gazette for one takes off its hat to FRANK GRAHAM, a man who has the courage of his convictions and one whom the lust for office cannot corrupt. He's worth a dozen of that stripe of Representatives and Senators whose first and topmost thought when considering any legislation is, "What effect will it have on my reelection?" God save us from such.

Pennsylvania Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this week Pennsylvania is celebrating Pennsylvania Week. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, dated October 16, and one from the Harrisburg Press, of October 15, giving certain information regarding the State of Pennsylvania, which may be of general interest.

There being no objection, the two articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer Magazine of October 16, 1949]

PENNSYLVANIA WEEK: YOU HAVE A DATE WITH YOUR STATE

The physical face of Pennsylvania wears an amazing variety of expressions, each reflecting a different facet of its character. Even the casual traveler is impressed by the contrasts offered by a journey through the State: Its sleepy valleys and busy steel mills; its mountains and mines and forests and farm lands; its factories and parks; its historic shrines and modern highways.

With many other factors, these things help to explain why the State has adopted the official slogan, "Pennsylvania Has Everything." They also explain why the fourth annual celebration of Pennsylvania week, which starts tomorrow, will be tinged with a certain atmosphere of complacency.

For Pennsylvania does have practically everything. It has national leadership in production of such heavy materials as steel, pig iron, coal, stone, cement, and coke. It has first place in coal production, and digs 99 percent of all anthracite mined in America. It produces more shirts, hosiery, silks, ice cream, liquors, cigars, chocolate, pretzels, glass, lubricating oils and rayon than any other State. It has 19,000 manufacturing plants with more than 1,500,000 employees.

Pennsylvania has some of the happiest hunting grounds in the world. More than half its area is covered with forests, which hold more game today than they did when the Indians lived in them. The annual gunner's bag averages more than 30,000 deer, 3,000,000 rabbits, and 500,000 pheasants. The State has 200 lakes, 106 State forest parks, and public picnic grounds and 4,000 miles of forest trails, yet it also leads the Nation in towns and cities of more than 2,500 population.

Although Pennsylvania often is called the workshop of the world, it has 172,000 farms valued at more than a billion dollars. In Lancaster County, for example, is the richest nonirrigated farm area in the United States. The State also has the Nation's first capital, the Nation's first pharmacy, its first golf course, its largest railroad shops, college building, and art colony.

The celebration features of the week will include industrial expositions, plant open houses, news reels, and radio programs. There will be tree-planting ceremonies, thousands of displays by retailers, meetings and parades by civic groups, and a beauty contest for cows. The Pennsylvania week special train will tour the State, providing educational and entertaining programs at each stop. This year the tour will be stretched to 6 days and 28 communities will be visited.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Press]

STATE FARMERS CLAIM 13 FIRSTS—LANCASTER COUNTY LEADS THREE FIELDS

HARRISBURG, October 15.—Pennsylvania farmers lead the Nation in 13 farm products, the Department of Agriculture reported today.

The State's leadership in six food processing fields also was noted by Secretary Miles Horst.

More tobacco is produced in Lancaster County than in any other in the Nation. It leads all counties in the value of diversified crops grown without irrigation and is ahead of the value of farm crops used by farm households.

FARM FIRSTS

Here are the "Pennsylvania farm firsts" in 1948:

Cash income from poultry and poultry products—chickens, broilers, turkeys and eggs, $199,847,000.

Value of eggs sold, $137,508,000.

Value of chickens sold $41,267,000.

Production of mushrooms, more than 20 million pounds.

Production of buckwheat 2,322,000 bushels.

Production of cigar leaf tobacco, 61,275,000 pounds.

Production of turkeys east of the Mississippi River, 1,264,000.

SPINACH PRODUCTION

Production of spring and fall spinach, 1,485,000 bushels.

Production of nursery-grown Christmas trees.

Production of farmer-retailed milk, 199,000,000 quarts.

Yield per acre of green peas for processing, 2,600 pounds, shelled.

Volume of crops grown under glass, $9,000,000.

In food processing, Pennsylvania manufactures more ice cream, pretzels, sausage products and scrapple than any other State. It also has more soft drink plants and bakeries.

Civilian Defense and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civilian Defense and the Atom," from the Washington Evening Star of October 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVILIAN DEFENSE AND THE ATOM

Presumably, as head of the Navy's Aviation Ordnance Branch, Commander Eugene Tatom is an expert in his field. But he has gone off the deep end in telling the House Armed Services Committee that people would be safe if they stood at one end of the National Airport's 6,855-foot runway while an A-bomb exploded at the other. Not in a long time has there been such an absurd effort to belittle the preternatural destructiveness of the atom.

To lend some authority to his statement, Commander Tatom has quoted from a medical report of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, which found, in its study of the Hiroshima explosion, that radiation effects seemed to decline sharply at a point beyond 6,500 feet from where the bomb went off and that only 11 of out more than 2,000 school children were killed in an area between 6,562 and 8,202 feet away. It is silly, however, to cite such phenomena as evidence that an atomic blast is not so bad, after all. The fact is that it is almost indescribably terrible, and nobody should be misled by testimony to the contrary.

Thus, despite Commander Tatom's attempt to minimize the atom's power, the facts stand as follows: (1) In Hiroshima, one A-bomb dropped by one plane caused virtually total destruction within a radius of 1 mile from the bursting point, with heavy damage extending an additional 2 miles, and with lighter damage hitting in every direction for 3 or 4 miles beyond that. And (2) a ghastly combination of flash burns, blast effects, secondary fires, and lethal radiation killed about 80,000 Japanese and injured another 80,000 within a matter of seconds—casualties adding up to approximately two-thirds of the city's total population.

It is because of this unprecedented deadliness of the A-bomb (and the type being produced at present is considerably more devastating than the one dropped on Hiroshima) that a dark question mark hangs over the future of civilization. It is because of it, and because the Russians apparently are now able to make the weapon on their own, that the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee has scheduled hearings on the problem of civilian defense. Ever since the first atom blast that problem has been with us, but there is little evidence that we have made much progress in dealing with it, even though our concentration of big industrial cities makes us one of the most vulnerable countries in the world.

In this connection, according to the Strategic Bombing Survey, the central fact to be kept in mind is that the overwhelming bulk of the buildings in American cities could not stand up against an atomic bomb bursting a mile or a mile and a half from them. Further, because relatively few of our industrial structures are blast-resistant and because many of our great metropolises are more crowded than urban Japan, an A-bomb attack on us could cause casualties far greater than Hiroshima's and Nagasaki's. Accordingly, given the kind of world we have, with the atom uncontrolled and with war an ever-present possibility, the problem of civilian defense is an urgent one for the Nation.

Unfortunately, however, the solution is elusive. To begin with, we would have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars and disrupt our society if we tried to go underground or carry through a mass dispersal of our cities. In a practical, economic, and social sense, we can do little more than decentralize certain facilities on a small scale, seek to locate new industrial construction in noncrowded areas, fireproof the interiors of otherwise strong buildings, set up a Nation-wide network of civilian shelters, and work out long-range lifesaving, evacuation and disaster-relief programs.

Well over 3 years ago, the Strategic Bombing Survey recommended that immediate action be taken on these and similar measures. The task of the joint congressional committee will be to see what, if anything, has been done about them. Of course, as the Survey has observed, they would be merely ineffectual palliatives in the event of an all-out atomic attack on us, but coupled with a military establishment capable of swift retaliation against any aggressor, they would be far better than nothing at all.

Protect the Home and We Protect the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House I am including an informative and interesting address delivered recently by Mr. Otto Meador, of Wichita, Kans., at a meeting of the Women's Republican Club of that city.

Mr. Meador is one of the substantial and respected citizens of the community. He spent many years in the railway-train service. He has had a chance to meet and talk with men and women in all walks of life. Mr. Meador takes an active part in the affairs of his community. His views are worthy of consideration. His address is entitled "Protect the Home and We Protect the Nation."

The address follows:

PROTECT THE HOME AND WE PROTECT THE NATION

I have traveled over this State for the past 37 years. I have observed many farm communities that were once prosperous farm homes with livestock and small acres of land, well cultivated with diversified crops of grain. These communities, with their own schoolhouses and churches, appeared to be a prosperous, happy, God-fearing people who loved their community and their homes and prided their citizenship and their freedom, their right to vote as a heritage and their sacred duty to defend.

The times have made a complete change. These same farm communities are no more or are very few. What has become of these people that once possessed their homes and supported their families and communities from the use of the soil? The home has disappeared. The church and the schoolhouse are gone. The people have moved to to the thickly populated industrial centers or cities. Large blocks of the land have passed from the home owner to the landowner, from small tracts to as large as hundreds of sections. All the taxable improvements have been moved off or destroyed to avoid taxation or to make more land for the mass production of grain, while far too large a number of our Nation's farmers are in the cities with no place to call their own. A large number of these good people who have made this Nation what it is today have no place to lay their heads.

Now, what is to become of these people who have come to these cities? It is impossible for them to buy and pay for a home and even if it was possible for them to possess a small home, a few months of unemployment, old age, or sickness and they are unable to pay the high taxes that are assessed against all that possess as little as a shingle over their heads. Though we will all agree that it is as necessary that man have a place to live as it is to have clothes to wear; still, in the last 20 years the heavy hand of the tax collector has deprived far too many of our people their God-given right to have a place to call their own, a house to live in. Regardless of how humble that home may be, every meeting of our tax-raising officials results in more and more taxes on the home. The time is not too far off when these people with only a small home, whether it be in the cities or in the country, will be unable to pay their taxes, then these homes must be sold to satisfy the tax collector, with large blocks of the soil going into the possession of too few of our people, with the masses of citizens not owning their own home or the soil they work.

It has been said, and history has proved, that "we will then have a greatly dissatisfied and divided people, largely in poverty—and poverty, like grief, has an immeasurable deafness which never hears. Oration loses its edge and 'to be or not to be' becomes the only question."

It is my opinion that it will prove much wiser for our statesmen to realize that the American home is much more valuable to the citizens, the State, and the Nation than the tax dollar which will eventually destroy both home and nation. The home owner is the lifeblood of any community, state, and nation. Man will go to any length to protect his home, state, or nation that protects him in the right to own that home. No nation of home owners ever overthrew their government. It is only when man is deprived of that right through taxation or otherwise does he sink, through no fault of his own, into a state of peasantry. He then becomes a liability to his community and to the state in which he lives. This will happen when the soil gets into the possession of too few of our people. And as one of our patriots proclaimed to the world, "As our Government now stands, it is our natural right and it is infinitely wiser and safer in our cool, deliberate manner to make whatever changes necessary for the common good of our people while we have it in our power to do so than to trust such an interesting event to time and chance."

The last score of years has seen many new taxes. Many were put into effect to relieve property tax; the State income tax was to relieve property tax; the sales tax was to do something along that line, as were many other taxes. Still the taxes on the home are higher and higher. Now we have the liquor tax and the proposed severance tax—millions of dollars of new taxes and not a word about spending any of the money to relieve the burden of taxation on the home which is a nonproductive property, a mere shelter for the common people that produce the wealth of the world. Man's home, whether it be in the city or in the country, should be so sacred to man, country, state, and nation that we should forever bar our tax-raising officials from putting their heavy hands on our natural God-given right to

have a home, a mere shelter for ourselves and our posterity so, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "That this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth."

It was part of Thomas Jefferson's dream that the tiller of the American soil should also be the owner of the land. His successful attempt to change the laws of inheritance so as to break up the large estates; his plan for the distribution of Government land; and his entire attitude toward farm tenanture were all based on his firm conviction that land ownership was essential to successful agriculture and stability in government.

Jefferson was also opposed to every form of human enslavement whether it be physical, economical, mental, or spiritual and in support of this he says "If the same God that gave us life has at the same time implanted in us a love of freedom, it is a sign that freedom is a natural right; then how dare we put any of his children in bondage? This terrible contradiction can have only dire consequences for the enslavers."

"Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure," he asks, "when we have removed their only basis, the convictions in the minds of the people that their liberties are the gifts of God, that they are not to be violated, but with His wrath? I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever."

The home has so inspired man that he has done many deeds of heroism and most sublime devotion: "amidst the roar of cannon and the din of musketry and in the carnage of battle, he sinks to the dust; raising himself to take one long last look at life, he hears in the distance that plaintive strain, Home, Sweet, Home."

The home has so inspired man that he has done many deeds of heroism and most sublime.

In the light of all this shall we be free men in America, or just tax-paying serfs?

It was the basic ideal and concept of the men who formed our Government that men and women should own their own homes and the land on which they toil.

Man should be free from that ever-present fear of Government-made work under which, if they are able to get a job, they must show that they are supporting, or are willing to support, the political party in power. While our elected officers, city, county, State, and national, are running around over the world with their political seeking companions giving to their friends high sounding political jobs with large salaries for which they do little or nothing in return, our taxes grow higher and higher. As one of our Presidents has said, "This money comes from the sweat of every man that labors."

The young men of our Nation were taken from the schoolroom, the factory, and the farm, to sacrifice their lives for the sake of freedom from the tyrannical aggression of a foreign nation. When they returned from their heroic deeds and faithful service, the job well accomplished, the Congress of the United States realized these men must have homes in which to live and raise their families. In their wisdom, the GI bill of rights was passed, giving these heroic men the credit and opportunity to own a home. Then to their sad disappointment, they learned that the city, the county, and the State had levied taxes against homes to the extent that a great number of these men found themselves both unable to pay, and subject to economic slavery in the richest Nation in the world.

The American home must be protected from this sort of aggression within.

Since the birth of this Nation, which has been blessed above all other lands, almost every generation has been called upon to defend its freedom. In those efforts the home has been a most powerful weapon. It was the prayers of the father, mother, brothers, and sisters at home for the Divine protection of the boy that was called from his home to defend this heritage that gave him the assurance in his heart that God rules in the affairs of men, and enabled us to prove to the world that we are the toughest, kindest, most charitable people on earth.

Our statesmen must realize that our irresistible love for country, God, and home must be protected and as long as this is done, we shall not perish from the earth.

Our Fiscal and Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Department of State in reply to a letter I sent them on September 30 relative to a scheme to raise the price of gold, devalue our own currency by 10 or 15 percent, tie the dollar to the pound, and make other changes in our monetary system.

I also insert a memorandum for the press, from the Treasury Department, on the same subject. This memorandum to follow the letter from the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, after analyzing the letter from the State Department and the memorandum from the Treasury Department, it would seem there is no intention of devaluing the dollar in terms of gold, or of making any changes in our present monetary policy. I hope this is true.

While the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder, has stated several times that there will be no increase in the price of gold, I am reminded that England's Sir Stafford Cripps assured Britain and the world, on nine different occasions, that the pound would not be devalued. The pound was devalued.

Mr. Speaker, many signs point to the fact that the White House is turning to a speedy return to the gold standard. Personally I think we should be on a gold standard, but if and when we do return to the gold standard, it seems imperative that American citizens should be permitted to own gold just like the other peoples of the world. I would deplore the fact that we were to continue debauching our currency. The President sent a trial balloon afloat in a recent speech in which he stated in glowing terms that we should raise the national income to $300,000,000,000 annually, and that the lower-income group should have their incomes raised to $3,500 or $4,000 a year. He must know if this is done, there will be inflation. It will mean the man with a moderate means will buy less with his dollar. It will mean increased taxes for everyone. It would hardly profit the individual if the already devalued dollar would be cut another 15 or 20 percent. It would simply mean we would have more dollars, but we would buy less with the dollars we have.

I believe that the administration is in the valley of decision, as it relates to our fiscal and monetary policy. This decision may be made without consulting the elected representatives of the people. It may have a devastating effect upon all of our pocketbooks.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 10, 1949.

The Honorable ARTHUR L. MILLER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: Reference is made to your letter of September 30, 1949, regarding certain information which has reached your desk to the effect that this Government has made certain agreements with England regarding a return to the gold standard, a change in the price of gold, a conversion loan from the Monetary Fund of Great Britain, and the devaluation of the dollar. You also inquire as to what, if any, agreement has been reached regarding war bonds and whether in event of consummation of the above agreements they will be permitted to find their own level in the new situation. You state that you desire to insert the information that has reached you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless the Department has very important reasons which counsel otherwise. Reference is also made to a conversation of October 3 between you and a representative of this Department regarding these matters.

In respect to the reported agreement said to have been reached with the United Kingdom regarding the gold standard and the raising of the price of gold, the Department is not aware that these problems were discussed during the recent British-Canadian-United States discussions. As you may be aware, a resolution regarding the sale of newly mined gold in the free market was introduced by South Africa in the fourth meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund held in Washington between September 13 and September 17, 1949. In connection with the discussion of that resolution, the United States Governor, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, expressed clearly the United States Government's position regarding the price of gold, stating that he did not perceive of any considerations of monetary policy that would justify him in proposing to his Government a change in the dollar price of gold. As a result of further discussion of the South African resolution, the Board of Governors of the fund referred the matter to the Executive Directors of the fund for further study and report to the Governors. There is enclosed herewith for your information a copy of a statement which Secretary Snyder has just released to the press on this subject. So far as this Department is aware, the question of the gold standard was not discussed either at the Board of Governors meeting or in other recent international forums.

Insofar as a possible loan to the British Government by the International Monetary Fund is concerned, the present policy of the fund might, unless revised, preclude such a loan or dollar drawing by the United Kingdom or another country participating in the European recovery program. The decision taken by the fund at the inception of ERP was that participating countries in the ERP should not draw upon the fund while their dollar balance of payments requirements were being met under the recovery program, except in exceptional circumstances. While this decision would not, of course, preclude consideration by the fund of dollar drawing by the United Kingdom if such exceptional circumstances existed and if it appeared that such a drawing was consistent with the articles of agreement of the fund, the question of such a drawing has not been raised by any fund member in connection with recent monetary discussions or in connection with the currency devaluations of recent weeks.

I presume that the fifth point in your letter, namely a report that the United States is to devalue the dollar by 10 or 15 percent, relates to the reported increase in

the price of gold. Inasmuch as the recent devaluation of sterling and other currencies has had as a primary objective the improvement of the dollar position of these countries by reducing the value of their currencies in terms of the dollar, this effect would be at least partially nullified by a unilateral devaluation of the dollar. This Department is aware of no proposals now under discussion within the Government to devalue our currency or to enter into any international agreement calculated to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar or the value of war bonds.

In view of the apparently doubtful authenticity of the several points covered in the information that has reached your desk, you may not wish to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at least not without providing adequate qualification respecting its reliability.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State.)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS

The following statement was issued in response to inquiries at Secretary Snyder's press conference of Wednesday, October 5, 1949, concerning the legal authority to charge the gold content of the dollar and the Treasury's price for gold. The Secretary again stated that he had no intention of proposing a change in the dollar price of gold. He reiterated what he had said on many occasions that he does not perceive any considerations which would justify such an action.

"(a) The gold content of the dollar:

"Only an act of Congress can now alter the statutory gold content of the dollar.

"The gold content of the dollar, and hence the statutory monetary value of gold in terms of the United States dollar, was defined by the Presidential proclamation of January 31, 1934, issued under authority of title III, section 43, of the act approved May 12, 1933, as amended. The weight of the gold dollar was fixed by this proclamation at 15 5/21 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, that is, one-thirty-fifth of a troy ounce of pure gold (technically referred to as gold 1,000 parts fine). The monetary or statutory value of gold in the United States is therefore $35 per fine troy ounce. After several extensions the authority of the President by proclamation further to change the gold content of the dollar expired on June 30, 1943.

"(b) The price of gold:

"The Secretary of the Treasury has authority under sections 8 and 9 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, with the approval of the President, to purchase and sell gold at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest.

"The authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in this respect, however, is limited by a number of factors. First is the obligation undertaken by the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund. Article IV, section 2 of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund provides:

" 'The fund shall prescribe a margin above and below par value for transactions in gold by members, and no member shall buy gold at a price above par value plus the prescribed margin or sell gold at a price below par value minus the prescribed margin.'

"The fund has prescribed a margin of one-fourth of 1 percent above and below the par value for purchases and sales of gold. Accordingly, the United States has an obligation to the International Monetary Fund not to purchase gold at more or sell gold at less, than $35 plus or minus the prescribed margin so long as the par value of the dollar declared to the fund remains unchanged. The par value of the dollar can be changed only pursuant to the provisions of the articles of agreement and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, which requires the approval of Congress for any such change. Section 5 of that act provides that neither the President nor any person or agency shall propose to the International Monetary Fund any change in the par value of the United States dollar or approve any general change in par values unless Congress by law authorizes such action.

"Even without the legal obligation to the International Monetary Fund there are important considerations of policy which, in effect, circumscribe the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to change the price of gold. The gold policy of the United States has been directed primarily to maintaining a stable relation between gold and the dollar.

"Since 1934 the United States has firmly adhered to the requirements of an international gold bullion standard. We have done so by buying and selling gold freely at a fixed price, $35 an ounce, in transactions with foreign governments and central banks for all legitimate monetary purposes.

"The importance which the United States attributes to the maintenance of a stable dollar price for gold is demonstrated by other legislative provisions. The gold parity statutes contained in the Gold Standard Act of 1900 and the act of May 12, 1933, provide that the gold dollar 'shall be the standard unit of value and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity with this standard and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity'."

George B. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the memorial prepared by leaders of Oklahoma in connection with the recent death of George B. Parker, editor in chief of the Scripps Howard newspapers. The memorial, signed by Gov. Roy Turner, Mayor Allen Street, and officials and civic leaders of Oklahoma City, follows:

To the Son and Daughter of the Late George B. Parker:

We people of Oklahoma City wish to express our sympathy and register our respect for your father, whose untimely death was a shock to this—"Deak" Parker's home town.

We knew him when he came out of our State University at Norman—a raw cub reporter.

We saw him transfer to the struggling Oklahoma News and watched him walk up the success ladder to the post of editor.

We read his daily words in his column, "The Referee," and laughed at his humor—grew with his broad, free and progressive leadership in local affairs.

We admired his raw courage in the fight against Waltonism in the 20's. His virile words in the Pulitzer prize-winning editorial—"We Want Neither King Nor Klan!"—still ring out against autocracy and intolerance in Oklahoma.

We felt a dreadful loss when Scripps-Howard moved him to larger fields and there was an emptiness in this town as when a lusty, likable friend fades from the family circle.

We talked proudly of him as each new honor moved him forward in the seats of the mighty.

We took it as an accolade for Oklahoma when he became executive editor of the powerful Scripps-Howard chain which stands for the free, inquiring, liberal spirit in its 19 newspapers from coast to coast.

We cannot evaluate the extent of the influence of an editor who, from an ivory tower, guides the editorial thinking of a congeries of journals which reach 20,000,000 minds daily, but we know that few have such an opportunity.

We are impressed with the recollection that he perennially returned to Oklahoma, unchanged and unspoiled by his increasing activities and responsibilities in far away places. The utmost of success changed him not at all—and when we last saw him a few months ago it seemed to us that his heart still lived in Oklahoma.

One of his favorite passages in literature was the account in Pilgrim's Progress of the death of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth. He read from it at memorial services, in 1944, for columnist Raymond Clapper, who had gone to the South Pacific as a war correspondent and had died in an airplane crash:

"When the day that he must go hence had come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

We know that some men leave to their families a fine collection of stocks and bonds. Others pass on great factories and various material evidences of industry and achievement. Finer than these is great character, expressed in a lifetime of aggressive service for better things to be reflected in a growing, expanding nation. Of this coin, your father—our friend—left a Midas ransom. You should be proud.

Thaddeus Kosciusko, February 12, 1746–October 15, 1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the month of October has great meaning to all Americans and particularly Americans of Polish extraction. On Tuesday, October 11, deserved tribute was given to our great American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, in observance of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of his death, after being mortally wounded in the siege of Savannah. October 17 marked the one hundredth anniversary of the death of the great composer and pianist, Frederic Chopin, observances being noted by concerts featuring the compositions of this immortal musician. October 15 is a day which indicated the one hundred and thirty-second anniversary of the passing of another who is well known to American history but of whom less has been said on the floor of the House than of General Pulaski. He is Thaddeus Kosciusko. Because of this, I believe my colleagues will be most interested in a timely editorial that ap-

peared on October 15 in the Polish American Journal, a weekly published in Scranton, Pa., that is owned, edited, and printed by veterans of World War II. It follows:

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO, FEBRUARY 12, 1746–OCTOBER 15, 1817

This Sunday marks the one hundredth and thirty-second anniversary of the passing of one of Poland's greatest patriots and one of the illustrious Poles who did so much for America in its struggle for independence.

Thaddeus Kosciusko came to America in the summer of 1776, deeply moved by the American Revolution. He soon distinguished himself with his engineering skills and was responsible for the fortifications on the Delaware River constructed against an expected British attack.

Because of this work Kosciusko was commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

Then in the spring of 1777, the Polish-born soldier was assigned to the northern Colonial Army under Gen. Horatio Gates. On terrain well chosen Kosciusko fortified Bemis Heights which stopped Bourgoyne's advance at Saratoga.

To secure the line of the Hudson River, Kosciusko built the fortifications at West Point, making that vital area invincible and impregnable.

The Kosciusko installation not only denied the British the use of the Hudson as a link between their forces on the seaboard and Canada, but also insured an important river crossing for the Colonial Armies in securing essential military supplies and foodstuffs.

Today while little is left of the original fortifications, the site of Kosciusko's gardens and the monument erected in the brilliant engineer's memory at West Point by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever.

After his fine service in the North, Kosciusko covered himself with glory in the South. Under the command of Gen. Nathaniel Greene, he again had duties of a highly professional nature.

His duties were to survey areas of operations, to indicate positions for defense and attack, to arrange for food and water and to devise routes for safe and speedy movement.

During Greene's masterly retreat before Lord Cornwallis, Kosciusko was the officer in charge of transportation. Still later, in the vicinity of Charleston he served gallantly with the cavalry.

He was among the first to enter Charleston after its evacuation by the British. Before the war was over he was an adjutant to General Washington.

Kosciusko's American military service closed with honor and affection. Congress made him a brigadier, he was given the privileges of American citizenship and was granted lands and money.

Perhaps one of the insights into Kosciusko's great love for human rights was his concern for the American Negro. He willed all his property in the United States to be employed in buying slaves their freedom and in educating them.

Following the close of the American Revolution Kosciusko devoted himself to the cause of freedom in his own native land. In 1791 and again in 1793 he led his people in two desperate revolts against the Russian and Prussian invaders. But because his armies were ill equipped the efforts failed.

He was a captive of the Russians for 2 years. Finally the Czar gave him a full pardon, money, and an estate which he refused.

Kosciusko visited America later and in 1798 resided in Paris. He died in exile in Switzerland on October 15, 1817.

Friend of Jefferson and Washington, Kosciusko occupies a prominent place with Lafayette, Von Steuben, Pulaski, and De Kalb.

Convention To Draft State Constitution for Hawaii To Be Held by April 1950 Under Law Enacted by Territorial Legislature

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith an address delivered in Honolulu on the prospective State Constitutional Convention of the Territory of Hawaii by Samuel Wilder King, who served as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii from 1933–42 and is now chairman of the Hawaii Statehood Commission.

The address is as follows:

The usual procedure for the admission of a territory into the Union as a State requires as a first step an enabling act, passed by Congress, authorizing the holding of a constitutional convention.

Upon the adoption of a constitution by the convention, it is submitted to Congress and the President for approval.

When approved, the election of State officers and Senators and representatives to Congress is held, and the President then proclaims the new state officially admitted.

The first step has often been bypassed; in other words the State constitution has been adopted and submitted to Congress with no prior authorization by an enabling act.

In all, 15 States came into the Union without formality of an enabling act; namely Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Several of these States never were actually organized as territories, but nine others, including Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Oregon and Tennessee were incorporated territories, and failing action by Congress went ahead and drafted a constitution, and upon its approval qualified for admission as a State.

Such a course was seriously considered by the proponents of statehood for Hawaii over 10 years ago.

I sat in on several conferences that explored the possibilities of the plan during the middle 1930's. Hawaii might have gone ahead with the project had not the war intervened.

During our present drive for statehood the project has been revived. The plan was endorsed by both political parties and incorporated in their platforms for the 1948 elections.

The legislature in its regular session of 1949 passed Act 334, to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor.

It is this act that I want to discuss with you tonight. By carrying out its provisions we will have a constitution to present to Congress regardless of whether the pending enabling bill is passed by Congress or not.

If Congress should enact enabling legislation in its next session, what we may have already accomplished in carrying out our own program can be tied in with the enabling act without difficulty. Delegate FARRINGTON'S enabling bill and our own legislature's Act 334 contain identical provisions where possible.

As you know, the issue of communism has been raised as an argument against statehood for Hawaii. While I do not minimize the menace of communism, I cannot agree that the issue is pertinent to our just claims to statehood.

However, both Senator BUTLER, in his report to the United State Senate, and Senator CAIN, over the Town Meeting of the Air broadcast held here recently, made it clear that Congress would want some further assurances on this point before taking action on enabling legislation.

I can think of no better answer that we could make than to proceed with the convention and the drafting of a constitution on our own responsibility.

The character of the men we elect as delegates to the convention, the kind of constitution we draft, will prove our fitness for statehood or justify the apprehensions of those impressed with the statements made that our people are not loyal to democratic traditions of government.

Senator BUTLER anticipates that the delegates elected to the convention would be dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. Well, let's hold an election and verify if this would be true.

It is further assumed that our constitution will be similarly tainted. The best answer is to draft and adopt a constitution that will be neither reactionary nor radical, drawn to meet the needs of our people as the basic law of our community.

Both the enabling bill and Act 334 provide for the election of 63 delegates from throughout the Territory, to comprise the constitutional convention. For the first time in our political history the apportionment of representation is done more nearly in proportion to population.

Oahu will have 36 delegates out of the total of 63; 18 from each of our representative election districts, 6 at large from each such district, that is, 6 from the fourth district and 6 from the fifth district, and 2 at large from each of 6 special election districts made up by grouping adjacent precincts together to provide approximately equal voting strength and population. This is double our present legislative representation.

Hawaii will have 12 delegates, 4 at large and 8 from similar special election districts, a total equal to that island's present legislative representation.

Maui will have 9 delegates, and Kauai 6, to comprise a total of 27 from our three neighbor counties.

The creation of special districts, smaller than our usual election district, with fewer numbers of persons to be elected, was designed to provide a better cross-section of our community, both by geographic and economic groups. Note that rural Oahu obtains direct representation for the first time.

I proposed this plan to the committee consisting of the late Judge A. G. M. Robertson as chairman, and Senator W. H. Heen, former Senator David K. Trask, Mr. Katsuro Miho and myself as members, that was organized to redraft the former enabling bill. It was accepted by the committee, approved by the Governor's Citizens' Committee on Statehood, and incorporated into the bill introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON in this Congress. The legislature incorporated the plan in act 334.

Act 334 was approved Friday, May 20, 1949. It provides for a proclamation by the Governor ordering a primary election, the proclamation to issue not earlier than 30 days nor later than 180 days after the effective date of the act.

Thirty days after Friday, May 20, 1949, was Sunday, June 19, 1949, and 180 days after Friday, May 20, 1949 will be Wednesday, November 16, 1949.

The primary election is to be held not earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after the proclamation. Assuming that the proclamation is issued on the last possible day, 60 days thereafter will be Sunday, January 15,

1950, and 90 days will be Tuesday, February 14, 1950.

Following the primary election, a final election is to be held not earlier than 30 days nor later than 40 days thereafter. Assuming the primary election is held on the last possible day, 30 days thereafter will be Thursday, March 16, 1950 and 40 days will be Sunday, March 26, 1950.

The elected delegates are to meet on the second Tuesday following the final election (excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday). Assuming the final election is held on the last possible day, the second Tuesday thereafter will be April 4, 1950.

Tuesday, April 4, 1950, would appear a good date upon which to convene the statehood convention. Working backward from this date and assuming that a primary election on a Saturday and a final election on a Tuesday according to our usual practice would be determined to be the best procedure, the proclamation calling for the election of delegates to the convention could be issued on November 14, 1949, 2 days before the deadline. The first or primary election could be held on Saturday, February 11, 1950, 1 day less than the maximum time allowed of 90 days. The final election, within the 40 days time limit, could be held on Tuesday, March 21, 1950, and the convention meet on April 4, 1950, the second Tuesday after the final election.

The elections prescribed by Act 334 are nonpartisan; that is, candidates for delegates to the convention shall run as individuals without political label. This does not mean, however, that the political parties are barred from taking an interest in the election and making every effort to encourage outstanding citizens from their respective party members to seek election to the convention.

As the convention is being held by authority of our own legislature, the restrictions of the organic act against members of the legislature being appointed or elected to any other office of the Territory of Hawaii will be in effect. The bill removing the restriction for this particular election has passed the United States House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate committee.

If this bill is not enacted into law in time, our legislators will not be eligible for election as delegates to the constitutional convention. (Note: This bill has since passed the United States Senate and undoubtedly will be approved by the President.) However, under Act 334, the constitution as drafted by the convention must be submitted to the legislature for review, either in a special session called by the Governor for that purpose or at its next regular session.

This gives the legislature an opportunity to consider the constitution and suggest alternative provisions, so that it may not be necessary for the members of the legislature to serve in the convention.

I will not go into the detailed provisions of the act, but do wish to touch upon the importance of proceeding with the program authorized by Act 334. As you know, during the many years we have been pressing for statehood different arguments have been made in opposition.

In the period before the war it was the question of the loyalty of our citizens of Japanese ancestry and the great strategic importance of this Territory in this defense of our Nation. The war has answered for all time any concern about the loyalty of our citizenry of whatever racial descent.

It has also lessened in some degree our strategic importance in this atomic age. The leaders of both the Army and Navy have gone on record as either strongly in favor or at least not opposed to statehood.

Now we have the new arguments against statehood raised when the former points have been fully met; that is, the question of noncontiguity, and the other—communism. I suppose that if the latter issue is completely clarified some other objections might be raised.

We have ample precedent for meeting the issue of statehood without waiting for Congress to act on the enabling act. We should take the initiative and present Congress with a completed constitution. The mere fact of our having done so will serve notice to our fellow citizens of the United States that we are serious in our desire for statehood. Congress can then by mere resolution approve of the constitution. The elections called for in the document itself can then be held, perhaps as early as the fall of 1950. The proclamation admitting us to the Union can be issued in time for our Representatives to take their seats in the Eighty-second Congress on January 3, 1951.

Investigation of State Department Mexican Oil Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House on August 26 I called attention to a study of Mexican oil resources which was made by a committee of Congress representing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

In my speech I also called attention to our Department of State's inept handling of Mexican-American affairs and suggested that Congress should look into the situation.

Today I have introduced a resolution providing:

That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of facts concerning development of the petroleum industry in Mexico, including the policies of the Department of State in relation thereto.

I wish my colleagues to have the full facts on the Mexican oil situation. To accomplish this I have introduced the above-mentioned resolution for a complete investigation of the whole matter. I stated in my speech on the floor of the House on August 26 that there were rumors that certain conditions were attached by our State Department in its proposal submitted to the Government of Mexico the early part of July as a prerequisite to extending financial aid to Mexico for oil development. In that speech I asked the State Department if the reports were true and called upon the Department to make public the full contents of their proposal.

I have received no word from the Department of State and the contents of its note to Mexico still remain a secret. Mr. Acheson's letter of last month to our colleague, Mr. JOHN KEE, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 26, studiously avoids any information on this all-important question. It causes one to wonder if the State Department officials are purposely avoiding for some unknown reason the giving of this very important information.

President Truman has frequently announced an interest in the outcome of the Mexican oil talks and expressed his confidence that they will result in a satisfactory arrangement. The President's position has been fair. It appears to me, however, that the Department of State has chosen to ignore his suggestions.

Now that Russia is known to have the atom bomb Mexico's oil becomes even more important to the security of the United States. Its favorable location makes it vastly less vulnerable than the Middle East as a source of supply. It is even several thousand miles further removed from bombing range than Canada's oil.

The investigation of the entire subject of Mexican oil as provided for in the resolution would, in my opinion, contribute greatly to the reaching of an accord between the United States and Mexico on a satisfactory and mutual basis for the development of Mexican oil. Certainly it will clear up a great many points which have been puzzling not only to me but also many of my colleagues for months. Perhaps it may provide the long overdue answer to the question—Why we can win wars but always seem to lose the peace. Is our Department of State's ineptness the principal cause?

Valley of the Dammed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include parts 22 and 23 of the Valley of the Dammed, by Bigelow Neal, of Garrison, N. Dak. In these articles Mr. Neal sets forth the clever maneuvers by which the Army Engineer Corps gets the farmer's land and home for less than its real value.

It is about time that Congress make a full investigation as to just how the Army Engineer Corps and other Federal agencies deprive the owners of their property and homes without just compensation. The arrogance by which this process has been going is not limited to the Valley of the Dammed. In 1941 I had some experience with the octopus at Wahoo, Nebr., where the same method was followed that is being carried out in the Valley of the Dammed.

Congress wants justice done; so does the Government of the United States. The system by which property is being condemned and taken is not justice. It is a plain violation of the Constitution. Here are parts 22 and 23 of the Valley of the Dammed:

VALLEY OF THE DAMMED

(By Bigelow Neal)

PART XXII

Last week we dealt with the latest trick pulled from the hat of the Army Engineer

Corps' Real Estate Division. This was the one—and the daddy of them all—where they make a landowner a single offer. When he rejects it, they show no concern at all. They merely suggest that the value of real estate is going down, that they won't need the land for another 5 years and—if he wishes to run the risk of a falling market—he can keep his land.

Beyond this point the thing divides. Or at least there is a variation in the ending where, in some cases, they tell a landowner he can sit there for all they care and sue the Government when the water washes him from his home.

When I first ran across this threat, I actually took off my hat to the Real Estate Division. As immoral as it certainly is, as illegal as it may be, yet it sounded like the work of clever men. But finally it dawned on my slower mind that perhaps, they were only making the very best out of a very bad bargain—thusly:

First, it would appear that this fear of the courts which the Real Estate Division was able to instill in the minds of so many farmers, as I have told you in the past, has proved contagious. They've caught a part of it themselves. When I told you in these articles that either certain witnesses employed by the Real Estate Division had said what was untrue or else more than a dozen of my neighbors, including myself, were the biggest liars who ever grew whiskers—they began to wonder. In the long run, whom would the court believe—two of their witnesses or a dozen average farmers? Of course, I can't answer my question but the point is that they can't either. And taking everything into consideration, they probably would be just as happy if they never had to go into court again.

Next, we have the matter of the 1,830–1,850 foot level. Congressmen BURDICK and LEMKE have shown you, again and again, that they have no authority from Congress to condemn any land above the 1,830-foot level. Yet they have done so. And now they have a suspicion that not all the brains in the world are in their organization. Somebody is watching them. And so, unless they can get some misguided farmer to freely sign an option, they had better not take the land at all, rather than run the risk of having their authority tested in the Federal courts. It might bring down upon their heads the retribution they have striven so long to avoid.

Lastly, there is the fear they have for the courts, developed through long experience. They know well, that a jury will almost invariably give the landowner from 40 to 100 percent more than the Real Estate Division intends to pay. No, these are not my figures. I am taking them from a written report of the experience of the TVA and from the experience of my neighbors.

And so we have this latest stunt of telling the farmer he can keep his land and making him think its value will fall as really a clever adaptation of conditions over which the Real Estate Division has no control. Granting that they are smart people, they are not quite so smart as I had thought they were.

I wonder if I can say, without being accused of boasting, that I know about as much of the Real Estate Division, its tactics, and the way to handle it as any other man? Anyway, what I should do when the negotiator made me an offer and then told me I could keep my land for another 5 years—and maybe sue the Government for my money—would be about like this: I would say, "Good, I'm glad to hear you don't want it because the taxes are a lot cheaper than the rent and I've paid taxes so long I'm kind o' used to them." Then I'd invite the negotiator in for a cup of coffee and a doughnut and send him on his way with this statement, "Next time you have any business with me, take it up with Mr. ———. He is my attorney."

Next week I'm going to tell you how the Real Estate Division, by this latest stunt, has backed itself into a corner.

PART XXIII

Some weeks ago, I mentioned the fact that I had on hand a set of bombs which I intended to explode under the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps. You see my policy is to make a statement like that and let it worry the Real Estate Division until they finally heave a sigh of relief and conclude I was merely bluffing after all. Then I let go.

If you are one of those who believe in cleanliness and justice and fair play among men, this story will come as a shock. I know it will, because it did to me. You probably will wonder if we really live in a democracy. At least you will be ashamed that a thing like this could be perpetrated in your name.

With all figures, localities, and names omitted, but readily available to legitimately interested people, here we go. And we'll call the central character Uncle Jasper.

Uncle Jasper is an old man. As a matter of fact, he is a very old man. For some years Uncle Jasper has had an odd way of thinking. Finally it became so odd that his neighbors found they could deal with him only through his wife and children.

Uncle Jasper then was the answer to a negotiator's prayer. He was one of the kind they call, "apt and reasonable." And so one day along came a negotiator and talked right boldly to the old man. In a few moments Uncle Jasper had signed an option on his land at a figure just about as shameful as the rest of the transaction.

Usually the real-estate men tell you these papers have to go all the way to Washington for a final check. But in Uncle Jasper's case the negotiator returned in only a few days with what he called the closing paper, including a deed. And Uncle Jasper, because, when he once got on an idea usually found it difficult to get off, signed the deed. The negotiator drove happily away with the conscience of another day's work well done.

Then something went wrong. It began on a Sunday when the writer ambled into the same locality and was asked to stay and spend the evening with a couple dozen badly puzzled landowners.

The next morning the negotiator returned to the same neighborhood. He had been doing a rushing business and the outlook seemed bright indeed until he tried to talk with a farmer who would have little to do with him. So he tried another farmer with a similar result and a third farmer with a worse result. At that a horrid thought came to the negotiator.

Twisting hard on the wheel of his car and bearing down manfully on the accelerator, he raised a long ribbon of dust that stretched all the way back to Riverdale—of course, right here I am using a bit of supposition but it is the only explanation.

At Riverdale there was a conference—no supposition at all—and the result? Another ribbon of dust right back up the valley, this one carrying Uncle Jasper's deed to him literally on a silver platter. Believe it or not and laugh or not, Uncle Jasper would have none of it. And here you have the ludicrous, shameful picture of a negotiator representing the Real Estate Division of the Army Engineer Corps, trying with all his might to give back a deed. Can you imagine it?

But it was too late. Already I had the facts. And here I publish them from coast to coast and from border to gulf. How long is America going to stand for this kind of business?

No, don't worry too much about Uncle Jasper and his family. I'm very sure he will come out all right.

Out of the above story came one from which you might share a good laugh with me. On the same night I talked with Uncle Jasper I ran into another man who had just signed a deed, only to decide he had been dragged through a knothole. Really I couldn't think of much to help him. And then I did come up with an idea. "Listen," I said, "why not try an experiment? Why not find that negotiator in the morning and tell him you want your deed back? Of course, he will refuse. When he does, ask him why he tried to give the deed back to Uncle Jasper?" Ladies and gentlemen, the thing worked.

Who's Behind CVA Propaganda Drive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the October 15 issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Who's Behind CVA Propaganda Drive? Interior's Bright Boys, of Course."

Mr. Speaker, this thoughtful editorial should alert Members of Congress as to what goes on in these regional authorities. If a CVA is established, then MVA will be next.

The editorial follows:

WHO'S BEHIND CVA PROPAGANDA DRIVES? "INTERIOR'S" BRIGHT BOYS, OF COURSE

(By Robert Ormond Case)

Entangled thus far in committee, but stirring with uneasy strength, is a certain bill—S. 1645—which is bound to cause a considerable commotion on the statesmanship level when and if it appears on the floor of the Eighty-first Congress.

On the face of it, the proposal embodied in S. 1645 is not new: the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority—or Administration, as it is now called—modeled closely after the highly publicized TVA experiment. Many similar proposals have bloomed and faded in past sessions of Congress, a tribute to the unwearying persistence of the Lilienthal-Ickes-Keyserling school of authority-minded presidential advisers. Six such bills are now pending.

Nevertheless, S. 1645 towers above previous regional-authority thickets for two compelling reasons. It was written at President Truman's request, by experts of his own choosing; and—this is without historic precedent—the Administration has given the Department of the Interior carte blanche to use its propaganda resources to inform the people of the Pacific Northwest of the benefits of the CVA proposed in S. 1645.

Personally detailed by the President to head this informative blitz is C. Girard Davidson, brilliant young ex-TVA attorney, later head of Interior's Bonneville Power Administration legal staff, and today Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

To grasp the significance of this development, it should be borne in mind that the vast and multibureaued Department of the

Interior today ranks almost as a government within a government. Its budget and personnel are today larger than those of several independent nations. In the Northwest, where irrigation and hydroelectric-power development top all Federal activities in importance, Interior's grass-roots contact with the people is second only to that of the United States postal service.

Interior's Bonneville Power Administration, for example, directly and sometimes arbitrarily controls the marketing of more than half the hydroelectric energy produced in the Columbia Basin. Being itself a governmental structure in the authority pattern, BPA is almost immune to congressional direction or interference in the budgeting of its multimillion-dollar power revenues. Supported by these revenues is a considerable staff of technicians and consultants who carry Bonneville's public-ownership and other educational concepts to the farthest corners of the Columbia Valley.

Among these consultants, until recently, was the late Dr. Carl Thompson, for years the directing genius of the national Socialist Party. On the BPA staff today are ex-legislators of approved liberal background, including one of the leaders of the unsuccessful attempt to pressure a pro-CVA memorial through the 1949 Oregon Legislature. Morton Tompkins, master of the Oregon State Grange—one of the few farm organizations of the region which actively support the proposed CVA—for a time drew concurrent salaries as a Bonneville consultant and master and policy maker of the Grange.

Thus Davidson has conveniently at hand a staff of experts of proved political thought and grass-roots experience who precede or accompany him—at Federal expense, salary, and per diem allowance—on his constant tours throughout the Columbia Valley in behalf of S. 1645.

Actually, in spite of the incongruous nature of the regional battle—the people versus salaried employees of the people in a struggle to mold and control public opinion—it would seem that no more barren ground could have been selected for the extension of the regional-authority idea. The average citizen of the Columbia Valley has been reared in the self-sufficient pioneer tradition. To his thinking, the corporate structure proposed in S. 1645—a three-man board responsible directly to the President and only indirectly to Congress, whose members can neither be elected to nor removed from office by the people governed, and who will have the power to socialize the economy of the region if they like—comprises an alien and dismaying superstructure of government. At this writing, a total of 207 organizations representing every phase of Columbia Valley economy are on record in opposition to it. Six of the seven governors of the affected States are against it.

If without check or rebuke, the Government's most powerful agency is permitted to use governmental funds and salaried personnel to indoctrinate the people in the benefits of any legislation, there will have begun a new era in the evolution of representative self-government as heretofore known in this hemisphere.

The Lustron Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 I introduced a resolution authorizing and directing a special committee to investigate the Lustron loans. On the same day, I wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee requesting that resolution be considered. I was advised by the chairman that it was "rather late in the session to start taking up investigation resolutions or applications for rules on any other matters."

The Lustron loans have been the subject of inquiry by both House and Senate committees. There has never been, however, a full investigation of the Lustron situation. Meanwhile, charges of mismanagement, political intrigue, special privilege, and illegal manipulation have been publicly made.

Last week the Lustron situation was presented to Congress for the first time upon a clear-cut issue. The House registered disapproval. Since that time I understand a reorganization of the company has been instituted. This is proof that there is considerable fire in the vicinity of the smoke.

If administration leaders, therefore, take the responsibility to allow this situation to develop without congressional restraint, theirs must be the burden of the result.

I personally intend to continue a vigorous pursuit of the real facts behind this amazing experiment. Only by this method can I be fair to Lustron, to the RFC, to Congress, and to the public.

Hawaii Asks Un-American Activities Committee To Undertake Immediately Full and Thorough Investigation of Alleged Subversive Elements and Activities in the Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, at a special session for the purpose of dealing with problems arising out of the strike of longshoremen. The session was adjourned only last Saturady. The resolution request the House Committee on Un-American Activities to undertake immediately a full and thorough investigation of alleged subversive elements and activities in the Territory of Hawaii.

I have called this resolution to the attention of the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I desire also that the entire membership of the House be informed of this request.

I am in complete agreement with this request of the legislature. It is important from the standpoint of both Hawaii, and the action to establish the truths about the extent and influence of subversive activities in Hawaii.

The resolution of the legislature follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3

Concurrent resolution requesting the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America to investigate and report on un-American activities in the Territory of Hawaii.

Whereas there have been numerous allegations and charges made by many groups and organizations both local and national in character, that there are subversive elements engaged in un-American activities within the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas most of such allegations and charges seem to have arisen from the report of the hearings before the Joint Committee on the investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack, Congress of the United States Seventy-ninth Congress, hereinafter referred to as the Roberts Report in which there were named a number of residents of the Territory of Hawaii as being persons of subversive tendencies, many of whom have protested their innocence without avail; and

Whereas one of the reasons for the opposition to Statehood for Hawaii by some Members of Congress of the United States of America is that Hawaii is under the control of these subversive elements or is in danger of such control should Hawaii become a State; and

Whereas it is desirable that the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America conduct an immediate and impartial investigation on the scope of such alleged subversive elements and activities within the Territory of Hawaii, both in the interest of national defense as well as in fairness to Hawaii's aspirations for statehood; and

Whereas the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America is an experienced body of great prestige and judicial character well qualified and with sufficient power and facilities to investigate the extent of such subversive activities within the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in special session (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to conduct a full and thorough investigation of the alleged subversive elements and activities in the Territory of Hawaii and in connection with such investigation to provide an opportunity to the residents of the Territory of Hawaii who have been charged in the said Roberts report as having subversive tendencies to prove their innocence and upon completion of such investigation to make a full report; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., October 10, 1949.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in special session, on October 7, 1949.

WILFRED C. TSUKIYAMA,
President of the Senate.
ELLEN D. SMYTHE,
Clerk of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, T. H., October 10, 1949.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was finally adopted by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in special session, on October 10, 1949.

HIRAM L. FONG,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
JAS. S. ACHONG,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Excessive Imports of Foreign Oil Threat to the Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the independent petroleum industry of this country is being seriously injured and is threatened with destruction. This injury and threat comes from the excessive importation of foreign oil. We do not cry for the half dozen major oil companies of this country, because they own tremendous reserves both at home and abroad, and because they are the chief importers of foreign oil. The industry as a whole, however, and the country in general, cannot maintain a healthy economy without at least the survival of the thousands of independent oil men and other small-business men allied with them in producing and refining petroleum.

All Members of Congress should be greatly concerned with this problem. However, since Texas produces around 45 percent of the American crude oil, Texas Congressmen have become especially alarmed because high importation of foreign oil is growing even higher.

On July 8, at my invitation, Mr. Fred Shield, of San Antonio, then president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, addressed the Texas congressional delegation on this subject. He pointed out that almost 200,000 persons in Texas earned their living in the oil business; that oil paid 61.2 percent of the State's business and property taxes in 1948, accounting for around 43 percent of the State's total revenue; that our 114,000 wells were then operating on an 18-day-per-month basis; and that our State will lose this year, in tax revenues alone, more than $30,000,000 because of restricted oil production. Most of this restriction is necessary because of imported oil. Within a year the importation of foreign oil has increased to almost 700,000 barrels per day. Within a year Texas alone has been compelled to reduce its production by approximately 700,000 barrels per day. Throughout America the domestic petroleum industry is suffering from competition with foreign oil, being brought here primarily by American major oil companies.

On the home front we find exploration for new reserves seriously curtailed, refineries being closed, many persons in the oil business and allied businesses losing their jobs, and many independent oil men and small businesses allied with them being destroyed.

In an effort to get relief from excessive oil imports, a group of Texas Congressmen met in my office late in July in conference with the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Willard L. Thorp, and with Judge Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. While Judge Ryder suggested that some relief might be afforded through an escape clause in our reciprocal trade agreements, his Commission early in the year refused to recommend such relief. Mr. Thorp of the State Department showed little sympathy for our anxiety, but promised to look further into the question. After a noncommital letter from Mr. Thorp, of August 9, a group of us Texas Congressmen called on his boss, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, on September 2 and again urged that the administration, through the Tariff Commission and the State Department, take action to protect the independent-oil industry of the country from destruction. The Secretary promised to reexamine the problem and to report.

I now have that report in a letter from the State Department of the date of October 7. With the State Department's letter is attached several pages of statistics on imports and exports of petroleum and petroleum products. The State Department estimates that imports will increase and exports decrease, even though we are a surplus producer of petroleum commodities. After citing numerous facts and figures concerning domestic oil production, this letter states:

> For many years the United States has been a net exporter of petroleum. Since 1938, however, net exports have been declining and the transition to a net import position occurred in 1948.

The Department could have added that we have gone from net exporters of 204,000 barrels per day in 1936 (crude and products) to net importers of 229,000 barrels per day in the period of January to June 1949.

The Department seems to approve of this situation and seeks to justify the same on the grounds that our domestic production is considerably above prewar years. The letter indicates a complete lack of understanding of the problem and a disregard of fundamental facts and issues.

After predicting a steady but moderate increase in imports of crude oil during the balance of 1949 and the first half of 1950, this conclusion is reached:

> After further study which we have made of the problems which you presented to us, it is our conclusion that restrictions on the imports of petroleum are unnecessary and would be both unwise and detrimental to the interests of the petroleum industry of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this conclusion is absurd and fantastic. How can depriving any industry of a part of the domestic market be beneficial to such industry? Nothing in the Department's letter or in the data attached in any way remotely supports such a conclusion. The Department makes no effort to show in any way how our country or our economy is benefited by the current amounts of oil imported. Where Americans produce more of any commodity than our country needs or consumes, to deprive such producers of any part of the domestic market is certainly of no benefit to such producers or to the country. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if this policy is long continued it will be seriously detrimental to the national welfare.

The record of the American oil industry in the recent war is one of which all of us should be proud. At no time did our country suffer from a lack of oil or petroleum products. There were no strikes, slowdowns, or stoppages in the petroleum industry. No other major industry in the country can match this record. It is said our military machine rode to victory on a sea of oil.

All agree that our very survival depends upon a sound and healthy economy. In the event of another war we will have to depend not upon foreign oil, but upon oil being produced and available within this country. Not only is a healthy petroleum industry essential to our peacetime economy, it is indispensable to our wartime economy. Not only does the small man in the oil picture, the thousands of independent producers, have a right to survival, they are needed for the protection and for the welfare of the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, oil cannot be discovered or produced overnight. We must have it now and at all times in sufficient quantities to supply this country in both peace and war. If war comes we will not have time to discover new fields, drill new wells, and build new refineries. Seventy-five percent of the known reserves within our country have been found by independent oil men, by wildcatters. They do not ask for subsidies of this Government for exploration or production, they only ask some protection from unequal and unfair foreign competition. They deserve a right to exist out of the American market and the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, many of us who have supported the Marshall plan and the reciprocal trade-agreements program are keenly disappointed in the administration's policy, or lack of policy, in this matter of importation of excessive quantities of foreign oil. It is now apparent that for the foreseeable future at least the world is going to produce more petroleum than it consumes. In the face of this we learn that ECA plans to subsidize the exploration of foreign production and of foreign refining facilities.

The New York Times for October 9 carries an article by Mr. J. H. Carmichael, reporting on the ECA program. In part the article states:

> The most ambitious expansion program in the history of the oil industry is contemplated by the end of 1952 by American, British, and Dutch oil companies in areas outside North America and eastern Europe. According to figures submitted to the Economic Cooperation Administration, these companies plan expenditures in that period of two to three billion dollars. Their tentative plans call for a 65-percent expansion of facilities.

The official announcement of ECA further states:

> Installations of three French and two British oil refineries will be expanded under

industrial recovery projects approved by the Economic Cooperation Administration, it was announced today in Washington, Paris, and London.

It appears that British and Dutch oil companies contemplate doubling their crude oil production by 1953 to a total of around 5,000,000 barrels per day. In the event of war this tremendous production, mostly in the Middle East, would doubtless fall to saboteurs or immediately into enemy hands. We would then be expected to furnish the French and British refineries out of American industry which will have been weakened through loss of markets and from foreign competition.

Not only can the American petroleum industry produce more oil than America needs, not only is domestic industry being injured by competition from across the seas, but in the absence of a sound Government policy the situation will grow worse, not better, especially for American labor and American small business. Tremendous new reserves are being discovered in various parts of the North American Continent outside the borders of the United States of America. Especially is this true in Canada. The presence of large oil reserves in Canada has been known for 100 years. Large-scale production has now begun at Leduc, near Edmonton, and south of Leduc at Woodbend and at Redwater. Experts predict that these reserves will amount to at least 10,000,000,000 barrels. Already a 20-inch pipe line is being built from the Edmonton field, which will doubtless supply refineries at Regina and at Sarnia, in Canada, and at Superior, Wis. Within a comparatively few months Canadian oil will probably supplant as much as 100,000 barrels daily of American production, such amount increasing with time. If American interests develop tremendous fields in Canada, if American loans develop further reserves and production in our neighboring countries to the south, just how does the American independent industry expect to survive, much less to prosper?

Our State Department seems to overlook the fact that in most foreign oil-producing areas there are no floors under wages, no decent conditions of work and no conservation laws. The State Department overlooks the fact that if and when the lot of the small independent American producer becomes unbearable most of our wells will be abandoned, since a majority of them are of the small stripper class. Through such abandonment we will lose some 8,000,000,000 barrels of our presently known reserves, oil which cannot thereafter be recovered.

Mr. Speaker, some think that bad political considerations are back of the administration's oil policy. It is said that we kicked the Arabs in the teeth and in the pants through our material aid in the creation of the State of Israel. Now to appease our long-time friends, the Arabs, we must subsidize their treasuries through oil production in the Middle East. Again we are told that the good-neighbor policy would suffer if oil importation were greatly restricted from Venezuela and other countries to the south. Let us remind ourselves again that friendship cannot be purchased, and that appeasement is a fallacious and a discredited policy. One would not deprive his children of shelter in order to entertain relatives, much less strangers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the State Department's letter emphasizes prices and profits within the oil industry. Perhaps more persons have gone broke and have lost money in the oil business in this country than in any other business. Certainly our State Department would not want to make the oil business unprofitable as a whole, and would not want to seriously break price levels. While some reductions in price might be made, this country cannot, without serious injury, permit the destruction of any important segment of its economy. We cannot carry a $250,000,000,000 debt and maintain a forty billion or more Federal budget on a deflated price structure. We must maintain full employment at good wages and reasonable prices in order to preserve a healthy national economy.

Mr. Speaker, two serious mistakes were made in our recent extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This act should have included the peril-point provision. The peril-point provision would have given any American business a right to plead for its rights when such rights become seriously imperiled from excessive imports of foreign commodities. Again, the act should have contained the Thomas amendment. The defeat of this amendment in the Senate, by a vote of 41 to 40, was a serious blow to the great oil business of this Nation, especially to the small people and the independents of the industry. This amendment would simply, with certain exceptions, have restricted oil imports to 5 percent of the domestic demand. Since we can produce much more of petroleum and its products than we consume, this was certainly not an unreasonable amount of protection to afford a vital segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 6251, which proposes to amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and to belatedly write into law the substance of the aforesaid Thomas amendment. Since the administration seems unable or unwilling to afford the independent petroleum industry of this Nation any protection, we should write a provision similar to the Thomas amendment into the law.

Mr. Speaker, we ask this relief and this protection in behalf of a healthy American economy and in the interest of national security. We could do much more; we should do nothing less.

The Mining Bill—S. 2105

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this point that although I voted in favor of the mining bill, S. 2105, I think it is misnamed as a mines incentive bill, which it recently has been called.

I have perceived little or no incentives for mining in this measure, particularly for the small and marginal miner who has been so badly hit by economic reverses in recent months.

As is pointed out clearly by the report of the Committee on Public Lands, the committee reluctantly acceded to reporting the bill because it proposes to leave everything to the new Minerals Conservation Board, and to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, this is a blank check. We have been asked to pass the authority for a bill which would be written by the executive agencies.

There are no standards—worthy of the name—provided by the Congress.

What minerals are eligible, in what quantities, at what prices and at what time the time limits expire on the contracts—all of these are subject to executive determination. Excepting, of course, in the so-called small mines section where weasel words permit the Secretary to bar applicants for other reasons.

S. 2105 is not an incentive bill. It is a salvage bill for those who wish to be salvaged at no profit beyond their depletion allowance. And the agencies have sought vigorously to delete that allowance, as well as the depreciation allowance.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has been heralded as an exploration measure. However, I submit that few will benefit. And for those who do apply the Government's participation—this is an unknown quality.

I want to point out that the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am a member, has reported H. R. 976 after months of study and nearly 100-percent approval from the mining industry.

This legislation would have been effective; its principles are well tried. But—the administration would have none of it.

Government agencies wanted their own way. They wanted authorization to do as they pleased within their narrow concept of aiding our mining industry. And they were dealing with the very backbone of our national defense and the foundation of our national security.

We asked for bread and were given a stone.

The very concept of S. 2105 is wrong—and the members of our committee are well aware of this.

But, Mr. Speaker, S. 2105 might have helped a few people. It might have saved a few mines. Perhaps the board—and the Secretary of the Interior—would have interpreted this measure more liberally and in a more liberal manner than most of us have imagined.

I, for one, will come back next session determined to see that proper amendments are given to this bill—or that proper action is taken on the bill now in the Rules Committee. This will do the job.

Since the attempt to enact this bill under suspension of the rules has failed, let us come back next session and see that something is done for this vital,

potent part of the lifeblood of our mining States—not only those in the far West, but those States throughout the Nation where metal mining is the economy required for the very sustenance of the lives of the people, and is a vital part of their existence.

I voted for S. 2105 because I appreciate the desperate need for legislation to aid our mining people.

Frankly, the enactment of H. R. 976 is what is needed. This is a good bill and will have my continued support.

In all due respects to my colleagues from the East—many of them do not know what is going on out West. They do not realize that the population is shifting westward—that mining, lumber enterprises, and countless other natural resources and businesses are in a State where expansion on a great scale is inevitable.

At this time our miners need aid—aid for our country and our common good. Nevada—as one western State—provided that aid during the Civil War years and now is proud to term itself the battle-born State.

Enough of that. Are you, or are you not, going to realize that the "effete" East is just about there and that the West is the place which will hold the upper hand in the further development of our great country in the future.

Give the prospector and miner and the mining operator a break. He is on the Government's side on farm aid, help to the union-labor man or woman, and to all of mankind. But he has not been given any help by this Congress, despite his importance to the welfare and security and safety of this Nation.

Why the Wives of Businessmen Should Be Interested in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech I delivered on October 10, 1949, at French Lick, Ind., before the annual convention of the National Grain and Feed Dealers' Association:

Grain dealers, it is my intent to discuss with you the subject of politics—not in a partisan sense but rather in the light of our responsibility, yours and mine—as citizens of the world's one great Republic, the United States of America. If at times I seem to deviate from a nonpartisan line, please forgive me. I have served in the ranks of the Republican Party for a good many years. I am proud of my party, and it is not an easy matter to prepare or deliver a speech which is entirely nonpolitical.

You, who make up this audience, represent a good cross section of the best element in America—the successful business men and women, the churchgoers, the solid section of our national life.

In other nations you would be designated as the upper middle class, providing such classes continued to exist—which they do not—in the rest of the world. And I point out that there is no major nation outside this hemisphere within whose borders an audience such as this could be assembled, for you represent the last free stand of the successful middle class in world society.

Think that over, if you will, for therein lies the answer to what is good about America and what is wrong with the world.

I have been asked to direct my remarks primarily to the women who make up the large part of this audience. I assure you it is a pleasure to do so. After serving for 9 months in the House of Representatives, it is a comfortable feeling to stand here surrounded once again with a working majority of my own sex.

I am happy, too, and honored to see so many men in this audience. It was good of you to come.

As I said a moment ago, I want to talk to you today about our responsibilities—not as women nor as men, not as Republicans or Democrats—but our responsibilities as participating shareholders in the world's last remaining free society of free America.

You who compose this audience represent the backbone of American free enterprise. You are the operators of small business establishments. And you, whether business operator or homemaker, recognize the fact that the operation of your business requires constant attention. You know that your businesses do not operate themselves, that they are not successful beyond the amount of time, energy, and old-fashioned common sense which you as the operators devote to them.

Your American Government is no different. It does not operate successfully by itself. It does not operate successfully with part-time leadership. It does not succeed of its own nature, but only through the time, the energy, and once again, the common sense with which it is directed. And, as in the case of your own business operations, your Government will succeed or fail in direct relation to the amount of effort that you, of this audience, put into it.

Let us make a brief comparison. Of your net earnings, how much do you put back into your business? Perhaps you reinvest 20 percent, perhaps more, or perhaps less. You invest for expansion, for maintenance, for repair, for a multitude of reasons. Because of this continual reinvestment, you have a compelling reason for carefully managing your business operation in order that your investments be protected and secured.

May I point out that you have an even more compelling reason to devote the same proportion of interest to the operation of your Government? You invest, ladies and gentlemen, one-third of your net earnings each year in Government, for that is the real total of the cost of all government—local, State, and National—today.

In other words, you are spending more money on an average to maintain your Government than you are spending to maintain and expand your own individual business operations. I am speaking, of course, of net rather than of gross income. I do not believe we are inclined to give the proper importance to that comparison. If we did, there would be no excuse for what happened in the 1948 election.

How many of you, for example, failed to vote in 1948? I shall not ask for a show of hands but I shall hazard a conservative guess that for every three of you who voted, one of you did not.

Do you find that startling?

Well, even more startling is the fact that you, as an audience, have a comparatively good record in that respect and I congratulate you.

Throughout the Nation, only half the people took the trouble to vote in the 1948 Presidential election. Forty-five million voters did not go to the polls. Our President was elected by the votes of less than half of those who voted. In other words, for every citizen of this Nation who voted for the incumbent President, there are three citizens who either voted against him or did not vote at all.

This is not an indictment of the President. Under the rules, he won, fairly and squarely. It is, rather, an indictment of society, of a society in which but half the population is meeting its responsibility.

How long, ladies and gentlemen, would your own business operations, small or large, continue to prosper if you, as the owners and operators, were as disinterested in their operation and management as the American public seems to be in its governmental operations?

Superficially viewed, the case of the missing 45,000,000 votes would seem to indicate that half our citizenry does not care enough about what may happen to their country or to themselves to take the trouble to vote. I do not, however, accept this assumption at face value. I am inclined, rather, to believe that too many of us have fallen into the habit of believing that the American system of government is self-perpetuating. It is not, and the entire record of political history demonstrates the fallacy of such an assumption.

Eternal vigilance is not only the price of freedom—it is the only guaranty of freedom.

I am sure that all of us—Republicans and Democrats, too—can agree that the Republic under which we live is the best form of government ever devised by man. If we need proof of this statement—and I believe we need to be reminded of it constantly—we have only to look across the seas to other nations which have experimented with other forms of government. Today they are standing in line, hands outstretched toward America, looking for and needing our aid.

America has assumed world leadership for one reason, and for one reason only, because we have had a form of government which throughout its history has guaranteed that every citizen is entitled to the greatest proportion of the fruits of his own labor.

We shall remain strong only so long as we continue to guarantee that freedom—and I say to you in all seriousness that the guaranty is not as concrete as it was a few short years ago.

As I mentioned earlier in these remarks, one-third of our individual income today is taken from us to pay the cost of Government. The trend of Government spending is still upward, and we are back to deficit financing to meet the bill which is being totted up in Washington.

For example, I have been speaking to you for perhaps 15 minutes. During these few minutes, our Federal Government alone has, on an average basis, spent one and one-quarter million dollars. And, during these same 15 minutes, our national debt has increased by more than $200,000.

For every hour of every day in the year, we are adding approximately $833,000 to our national indebtedness, and our Government is spending $5,000,000. Or, in understandable figures, each day that goes by—each 24-hour period—sees an expenditure of $123,000,000 by our Federal Government and results in a $20,000,000 increase in the national debt.

We are prone to lose our sense of values when we start talking in terms of $42,000,000,000 budgets and $7,000,000,000 deficits. Deficit financing, pump priming, and such terminologies do not permit reasonable thinking and quick recognition.

We are awed and confused by the very magnitude of a Government which spends nearly a billion dollars a week, which employs more than 2,000,000 people, and which defies even accurate description.

No wonder that half our people do not go to the polls. And no wonder that the American system is today seriously—and I repeat—seriously threatened.

May I make another point to illustrate the size of Government and of its increasing operations in hitherto personal fields. The best insurance estimates indicate that we will soon have in our population more than 20,000,000 persons over 65 years of age.

The House of Representatives voted last week to increase average old-age social-security payments to something like $70 a month. The present average is about half that.

Should social security become universal in application, as it undoubtedly will be, the yearly cost of old-age pensions alone will approximate fifteen to twenty billion dollars. May I point out, ladies and gentlemen, that the entire cost of Government a few short years ago was but one-third of that figure. And may I point out, too, that old-age protection is but one phase of welfare, and I am not criticizing the expansion of Government aid to public welfare. It has a place in American life, provided the cloak of welfare is not used as a disguise for Karl Marx.

I said a moment ago that the awesome size of Government in itself is undoubtedly a deterrent to voting. To many of our citizens the field of politics is so complex that participation is considered futile.

I say to you that the reverse should be true, and it will have to be true if we are to save ourselves.

Big Government—as we know it today—demands personal participation by all of us. Particularly, it demands the active participation of those of our population who are by nature and by position qualified to assume positions of leadership.

You who make up this audience are so qualified. Are you playing your proper role in the field of politics, or are you succumbing to the eternal urge to "let George do it"?

Republics such as ours can maintain themselves in strength and prosperity only so long as they command the support of an informed and resolute citizenry. We are in danger in America of losing that support, not because our citizens are uninformed—for we are the best informed people of the world—but because we have become apathetic, because too many of us have not been taking our citizenship responsibilities seriously.

This Republic can continue to exist only so long as the citizenry recognizes its responsibility to support the Government, instead of claiming or asserting an alleged right to be supported by the Government. I fear that very large segments of our citizens today have been led astray into a belief that the latter alternative is possible. I say to you that it is not, and the entire course of history is tragic proof that it is not.

Nevertheless, there are those in places of power and wealth who, wishing to perpetuate their position, are all too willing to argue the contrary. We need not go back to the dim past for illustrations of how this process works.

All of us here today can remember how Adolf Hitler destroyed the German Republic and became master of that nation because gullible citizens believed him when he promised them security in exchange for their liberty. Mussolini did very much the same thing to Italy. And, at this moment, an experiment with potentialities for producing the same end is under way in England. It is axiomatic that when the people of any country are willing to trade liberty for promised security, it ends by losing both.

There are those here in America, some of them in high places, who are singing the siren song of the welfare state.

Give to me, they say, your freedom and I shall reward you with security.

Place your faith in government, for you are no longer able as individuals to secure yourselves.

The promises are alluring and they are winning millions of converts.

Bear with me a moment, if you will, while I read an editorial from the current issue of one of our great agricultural publications, the Farm Journal. It is entitled "The Farewell State" and this is what it has to say:

"An alluring, deceptive new term has been creeping into our political language. The kind of government which promises to give everybody health, houses, security, and the comforts of life is being called the welfare state.

"Nobody opposes welfare. By hard work and ingenuity we have been able, under American freedom, to produce a great deal of welfare, and to distribute it widely mong the people. The American record in this respect far exceeds that of any other nation in any time. We can carry it much further.

"Promises of abundant welfare have been made by many governments, from ancient Rome to Hitler and Cripps. And now Truman. Those governments have always eventually gone bankrupt, or to war, or both. The people have been left with less welfare than before. The only governments that have achieved truly remarkable records for the welfare of their people are the very few that, like ours, have left the people fairly free from restrictions, and fairly free from the overwhelming taxes that welfare measures cost. The people have then produced their own welfare by working for it. They have had to pay little percentage to bureaucrats for its enjoyment. They earned it and it was theirs. Having no Brannan plans, they were able to buy their own groceries. An honest name for the welfare state would be the farewell state. For once we go far enough toward Government guaranties of welfare, we can say farewell to American freedom as Americans long knew that blessed condition. And to American standards of welfare."

In this connection, I am reminded of a statement attributed to the late Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, one-time Secretary of the Interior. Doctor Wilbur, a rugged individualist of the old school, took a dim view of the increasing trend toward government-induced economic security and had this to say:

"It is common talk that every individual is somehow entitled to economic security. * * * The only animals and birds I know of that have economic security are those which have become domesticated. * * * And the economic security they have is controlled by the barbed-wire fence, the butcher's knife and the desires of others. They are milked, egged, skinned and eaten up by their protectors."

And so it always has been, and so it always will be, with a people who make the fatal mistake of trading in individual freedom for collective security.

So, if I have a message for you today—and I address my remarks particularly to the women, for it is you who have the most time and—it is this:

Take a serious interest in politics. Convince your friends and neighbors of the importance of voting, and of the importance of intelligent voting.

Do your part to reverse the trend toward absenteeism at the polls on election day.

The vote was placed in our hands by our founding forefathers nearly two centuries ago. It is designed to be used.

But beyond your responsibility to vote, you have an even greater responsibility. You have a responsibility to learn just as much as you possibly can learn about your government, not only at the national level but at the local and State levels.

You, as women, as the mothers and grandmothers of tomorrow's generation, have a further impelling reason to become actively interested in politics, for it is in your hands to determine the future of your own flesh and blood.

The battle of individualism versus collectivism, of initiative versus dependence, of freedom versus vassalage is on. It is being waged in Washington today and it is to be decided by you, as participating citizens, in the elections of 1950 and 1952.

The socialistic state holds nothing of benefit for you who compose this audience, regardless of your political affiliation; it is not your program, for it would destroy you as a class. Consequently, the trend toward statism poses a personal threat to each and every one of you within the sound of my voice, for it threatens the future of the economic system under which you have prospered.

I fear I have talked overly long. I hope I have not offended any of you. But I have been privileged to witness at close hand these past 9 months the trend toward, as the Farm Journal described it, the farewell state, and I cannot caution you too strongly to give it your most serious and critical study.

Hidden Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by K. Frances Scott, M. D., president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., delivered in Indianapolis, Ind., at the North Central Regional Conference, September 24, 1949:

For us, as individuals, our hidden wealth is the time, the energy, the thought, and the enthusiasm we have available for volunteer community service.

For us, as a group, it is the power of people gathered together into an organization, an influence now largely unused.

In earlier days and still to an extent in our smaller and more rural areas, much of the community's needs was met by volunteer services of citizens—from service in war to road mending and house raising in peace.

As communities grew larger and more complex there was greater need for government to take over community functions. But going along with that change there has been, unfortunately, a fading out of the idea that citizens can and should be voluntarily responsible for the common good.

In a democracy we have thrown over the idea of fixed classes in our social structure. Yet when there was such a class as "ladies and gentlemen" there went with that idea an obligation and responsibility to the dependent classes that insured attention to many aspects of community welfare.

In turning to a classless democracy we have transferred these obligations and responsibilities of the "lady-gentleman" class to all people, and from concern for dependent classes to concern for the common good.

In my part of the country most States call themselves officially by the title of "commonwealth," a good old Anglo-Saxon idea. We talk often in our statutes and proclamations of the common good. These words symbolize the idea on which all democracy is based—that the welfare of all is the common concern, that the common good, the good of all, is the only justification for government's existence.

We seem to have failed to inculcate this idea in the youth of the country. How often is the question asked, "What's in it for me?" We are allowing our youngsters to grow up with the idea that they owe nothing to the group in which they live; that someone owes them a living.

How else could they think when they see their elders' actions? Instead of doing what

we can for our community's needs first, we run first to the State and National Capitols with hands outstretched shouting "gimme."

Recently in an article in the Reader's Digest, Gen. Omar Bradley summed it up thus: "Why have we come to believe that democracy is a free ride without the need for earning our way? Probably the greatest single cause for delinquency in citizenship can be traced to our declining sense of responsibilty, to the community in which we live. Although many turn their eyes toward the mountainous issues that crowd our national scene, few have the humility to start down where citizenship counts.

"Our danger lies not so much in a fifth column whose enmity is avowed. It lies in a first column of well-meaning American citizens. A first column of unconscionable men who are 100-percent Americans in their daily protestations and 10-percent citizens in their daily routine of neglect."

Our democracy stands or falls on the use we make of citizens' volunteer services. It is no longer democracy when people give up their citizens' functions to government.

There should never be any question in our minds, either as individuals or as organizations, as to whether we should contribute our volunteer services in our communities—only as to when and how. How many services remain to be offered. What of education for voting? What of keeping check on our Government? What of serving on the numerous boards in a community? What of starting the projects that are needed that Government does not handle? No, there is no lack of need for citizen's service in our land today.

In times of national emergency we unearth and spend freely of this hidden wealth of volunteer service. Peace has its battles, too. Peace needs our services.

It may seem strange to you, who are members of an organization that is very internationally minded, that I am stressing so emphatically your local community affairs.

But the local community mirrors exactly the world scene. It is the world in miniature. There are found all the difficulties that face nations and there are found too all the resources to solve them. By setting our community houses in order we learn the technics that we can use in national and international affairs. Let it not be said of us that we have not the humility to start down where citizenship counts.

There is hidden wealth, too, in our organizations and it is still largely unused.

We have many organizations in this country. The great size and diversity of the United States and its people makes organizations more important to us than to other countries. Many times, however, I have heard Americans apologize for their fondness for clubs—as though there were something not quite grown up about this state of affairs.

Listen to what Laski, a visitor from abroad who studied and analyzed our life, said. He writes that "our clubs give vitality to our concept of democracy. An individual can have little influence. Only when he joins an organization can he have an influence on policy."

With all the potential power existing in an organization why do not we have more influence? Because we hesitate so often to translate our power into action. We are too satisfied with bigness or prestige, not the use of power and accomplishment. How often do we initiate or push, and finish a job of work in our communities? How much do we accomplish by the power and influence of our group?

Why is the fact that this wealth is hidden so serious? Do you remember the parable of the talents? It was not the steward who did not use his talent to the full who was condemned. It was the steward who hid his wealth and failed to use it at all. That was the great sin, nonuse of his talent.

Let us start now, to dig up this hidden wealth of our country. For our greatest sin, too, is to hide our talents and deprive our communities of their benefit.

Our democracy is truly a commonwealth and all our actions should be for the common good.

Reclamation, Irrigation, and Hydroelectric Power in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone recognizes that the two most important planks in the political platforms at the national level during the last election were labor and farm-price supports. That is true on a national basis, but in the far West and especially in California we have a third element, the development of reclamation and irrigation projects, along with hydroelectric power. In California, that issue is almost as important as the other two elements I have just mentioned. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that several political contests in the recent past have been decided on that reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power issue. In the next election it is altogether possible that one of our important contests out in California may be decided on that very issue. In the coming election, Mr. Speaker, I hope the people of California will check carefully the records and the platforms of all candidates on this important issue which is so vital to our State.

Increasing Support for World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith inserting the statement made by my able and distinguished colleague from Maryland, the Honorable EDWARD T. MILLER, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64, of which he was one of the sponsors.

Colonel MILLER served in many foreign lands in two world wars, and his views therefore should be of interest.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD T. MILLER, FIRST DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, OCTOBER 12, 1949, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

As an overseas veteran of two wars, who has served in many countries, I am keenly aware of the differences in points of view and traditions in various localities and nations, and I realize fully the dangers of foreign entanglements. I think my approach to this problem is, therefore, realistic. I certainly wish true isolationism were practical today. However, we have ample proof that it is not.

For the past 3 years I have watched with interest the development of world government sentiment in my home district, the Eastern Shore of Maryland. I have great faith in the sound common sense and judgment of the American people. I not only believe it to be my duty to represent as best I can and, whenever my conscience permits, the sentiments of my constituents, but I believe also that the best advice a Congressman can obtain often comes from that same source, especially when that opinion shows a noticeable change with regard to a major national issue.

In my section there was, until fairly recently, a widespread acceptance of the belief that the United Nations would work as a preserver of the world's peace, if it were not for Russian abuse of the veto and Russian obstructionism in general. My friends and neighbors still feel that the Russians are primarily to blame for the failure to reach an honorable peace settlement—a peace that could be preserved by the organized effort of the United Nations. But my people also seem to feel increasingly that, even if those behind the iron curtain were willing to play ball—the present structure of the United Nations would still be inadequate to accomplish the purpose for which the organization was created. They feel that it is not merely the existence of the veto, nor Russian abuse of the veto, which frustrates the United Nations. They feel that in setting up the United Nations in its present form, we have sent a little boy to do a man's work. That our plans are lacking in some essential particular just as were those of the ill-fated League of Nations.

Like all other Americans, the people of my district are loathe to surrender any part of American sovereignty. But, in spite of their natural distrust of any proposal which contemplates even a partial such surrender, they have become increasingly aware that the problem which confronts us as a nation is not unlike the problem which individual citizens have long faced. As individuals, we distrust and dislike any surrender, to the community, State, or Nation, of power to regulate our individual lives. Yet we know that the only alternative to such surrender is anarchy. We may chafe at having to wait at a red light, but we know that, unless all are required to obey traffic laws, all will suffer in the end and our children, our friends, or ourselves may be early victims of disordered traffic.

And so I have noted, among the people of Maryland, the Maryland Free State that boasts its deep seated and almost fanatical love of complete freedom, a new-found willingness to develop the United Nations into an organization that can make and enforce traffic rules and other necessary laws for the world community. Thoughtful leaders in my community are not only willing, but eager, to have the United States take the lead in bringing about such a development. They have organized sentiment, conducted an educational campaign among their neighbors, formed chapters of United World Federalists, and caused me, as their representative, to feel that I shall be carrying out their will in working for the passage of this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, fully as I recognize the superlative quality of the people of my community and of my State, I do not believe that they are in this respect any different from the general run of the people of America. I am inclined to think in this respect they do not differ greatly from the majority of the enlightened peoples of the world. I believe that civilization generally is waiting for us to undertake the action here contemplated; namely, to place the world's most powerful nation in the vanguard of the

march toward enduring peace through furthering the establishment of world law and world law enforcement.

Thank you.

How Long, O Lord, How Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it the function of President Truman to execute the laws passed by the Congress of the United States or may he refuse to do so to the injury of persons and to the property of millions of law abiding citizens? Has the power to decide this question of law enforcement been illegally transferred or delegated by the President to those who have no regard for the security and welfare of the people as a whole? What is the use of Congress passing laws to protect the public if the President refuses to enforce them?

The President knows full well that many of the strikes are Communist inspired and yet he ignores this and has steadfastly refused to use the legal machinery to stop this raid by the subversive element upon the economy of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of October 19, 1949:

HOW LONG, O LORD, HOW LONG

Nearly 1,000,000 American workmen are idle today because of the strikes in the coal, steel, and aluminum industries.

The coal strike is going into its fifth week. In that field, 380,000 members of the United Mine Workers have walked out of the soft coal mines.

On October 1, Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), ordered 500,000 steelworkers to quit work. Thirty-seven steel companies are involved.

Monday at 12:01 a. m., 16,000 workers employed in the 9 plants of the Aluminum Co. of America walked off the job.

As a direct result of the coal and steel strikes, the railroads have been forced to lay off 92,000 men and 8,500 workers are idle in the automobile industry.

The men are losing millions of dollars in wages. The companies are losing millions in income. The public will soon suffer from this economic dislocation.

And this is only the beginning. Secretary of Commerce Sawyer warns that if the strikes continue they will force 2,000,000 persons out of work by November 1 and if they go to December 1, there will be 5,000,000 unemployed.

It is the sworn duty and moral obligation of President Truman to prevent this development by using the Taft-Hartley law to bring about a fair settlement. He should stop playing politics with this law since his responsibility to the Nation is far and above his allegiance to his party and its platform.

Reports are current that he is considering calling the union heads to the White House for a talk. The time for such finger wagging is past.

He has only to announce that a national emergency exists—show the plain fact of that to a Federal court, and get an injunction that would put the men back to work for 80 days. During that time the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service would continue its efforts to bring about a settlement. If the strikes are not settled during the 80-day respite, the President can then take the case to Congress for direct legislation to save the country.

Even if the conciliation and mediation services fail, the men would be at work during the 80-day period, wages would be paid, and production continued.

Truman refused to use this power to halt the stevedore strike in Hawaii. As a result that strike continued for 159 days. The country will suffer tremendously if the coal and steel strikes run that long.

A Program for Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the most important legislation confronting Congress has been permitted to lag until the closing days of the session. I hope this will not be the case during the next session and that every Member of Congress will very soon come to the realization that prosperity for our farmers means prosperity for all.

I would like to preface my remarks by reading a most positive and important statement. The statement was made before the Republican farm conference in Sioux City, Iowa, by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council of that city. It reads as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY

Mr. Chairman, honorable guests, ladies and gentlemen, the success of any political party is its ability to solve our economic problems and maintain prosperity. The failure of our political parties to solve our economic equation can be traced to two basic factors in our economy.

1. The failure to recognize the importance of agricultural income as the source of our national income. The agricultural industry produces approximately 70 percent of all the new wealth in the form of raw materials. In the process of using the agricultural raw materials to produce and distribute goods to society, each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income. In other words, our national income is seven times the value of our agricultural production.

2. The failure to recognize that parity prices for our agricultural production is the natural price equation that must exist if we are to have full employment, a balanced national budget, and a national income large enough to create the purchasing power to consume our production.

In the past 60 years the United States has never had a depression when farm prices were at parity or above and has always had a depressive period when farm prices were below parity.

A careful examination of the record will reveal that for each 10 percent of parity, we have at stake 10 percent of our national income, 10 percent of our retail sales volume, 10 percent of our total pay rolls, 10 percent of employment, and 10 percent of our ability to buy and consume.

For example, for each $1 of gross farm income, we will have approximately $4.20 of retail sales volume and $4.20 of total wage payments. Most people think that a proper price for the farmer is a subsidy, when in reality parity prices for agriculture help protect our annual income and the wage level that can be maintained. When we as a Nation permit farm prices to fall below an average of 100 percent of parity at the market place, economic laws of exchange force nonfarm groups to drop back to farm-income levels.

For example, if gross farm income were to drop $10,000,000,000, the retail merchants would lose $42,000,000,000 of sales volume and our total wage payments would have to be reduced $42,000,000,000. If our retail merchants and working people realized this simple fact, they would demand the impeachment of any President and Congress that didn't provide such legislation as may be required to maintain farm prices at an average of 100 percent of parity at the market place.

During the past 12 months we have had a concentrated campaign in our news columns against high support prices for farm products. As a result of this agitation, farm prices dropped 20 percent from September 1948 to July 1, 1949. This drop in farm prices wiped out approximately $40,000,000,000 of earned income in the United States and approximately $50,000,000,000 in the rest of the world.

With a loss of $90,000,000,000 in potential income in the last 12 months, it is no wonder that the world is short of dollars and facing the greatest financial and political crisis in history.

Suppose we follow the advice of those who wish to reduce farm income still further and permit farm prices to drop down to 1941 levels which were 20 percent higher than in 1939. What will happen? We don't have to guess at it. Let's take a look at the record.

In 1948 we had $226,000,000,000 of national income as compared to $103,000,000,000 in 1941. A drop in farm prices to 1941 levels would force the Nation to lose $123,000,000,000 of national income.

In 1948 our retail sales volume amounted to $130,000,000,000 as compared to $55,000,000,000 in 1941. Our retail merchants would lose $75,000,000,000 of sales volume. In 1948 we had $137,000,000,000 of total wage payments to labor as compared to $61,000,000,000 in 1941. Our American workers would lose $76,000,000,000 of wages.

In short, if farm prices are permitted to drop to 1941 levels, it will mean the complete collapse of our American system.

If this advice for lower farm prices were coming from Russian Communists, it would be understandable because we know that they would like to destroy our capital economy. But, the advice is coming from supposedly intelligent American citizens, who, if the record means anything, do not understand how our economy operates.

Summing it all up, no political party can operate the economy of the United States on a basis of full employment, a balanced national budget, and pay off the national debt unless it is willing to provide such legislation as may be required to maintain an average of 100 percent of parity at the market place for our agricultural production.

A political party that has the courage to provide such legislation and is willing to stabilize farm prices at the 1948 parity level, can underwrite the national income at $225,000,000,000 annually and through production times price earn the national income to retire the Federal debt in 50 years. In my opinion, that is the kind of program that the American people want instead of uncertainty and economic confusion.

With such a program any increase in farm production can be utilized in giving our people a higher standard of living and helping the rest of the world to adjust itself to the American parity level.

Parity prices are not a subsidy but merely represent economic equality. To pay the

farmer less than parity means to deprive many of our people of the right to work at a proper wage, to produce and consume the goods which our resources can provide.

Mr. Speaker, because of its importance, I would like to stress one particular paragraph of Mr. Wilken's speech:

No political party can operate the United States on a basis of full employment, national solvency, and repay the national debt unless it is willing to provide such legislation as may be required to maintain an average of 100 percent of parity at the market place for our agricultural production.

In my opinion, this simple statement is one of the most important ever presented to the American people. We, as Members of Congress, all want full employment. We realize that a sound economy requires a balanced budget and a gradual repayment of the national debt. Mr. Wilken tells us simply and definitely that if such a goal is to be attained, then we must pay the farmer full parity at the market place.

During the debate on farm legislation on the Senate floor October 12, a Member of that body who favors 90-percent supports stated on page 14590 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If a billion dollars is added to the farm income of the Nation in any year, the national income for such year goes up $7,000,000,000. If the income of the agricultural interests of America should drop $1,000,000,000, the national income would fall $7,000,000,000.

He then inserted in the RECORD several tabulations prepared by Mr. John Baker, an expert in the Department of Agriculture, to show the loss that would result from a drop in the national income through the failure on the part of Congress to support farm prices at a proper level.

I am indeed glad to find that some Members of the other body and someone in the United States Department of Agriculture have finally recognized the important fact that each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income. This ratio is the key to prosperity in the United States.

In order to keep the record straight and give credit where credit is due, I would like to call attention to the fact that this ratio of $1 of gross farm income to $7 national income is the result of research work by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa. Mr. Wilken is well known to many Members of Congress on both sides of the House, especially to most every Republican Member from farm districts and many from industrial districts.

I would like to give you a brief history of Mr. Wilken's efforts to gain recognition for his formula.

Mr. Wilken brought the ratio of $1 of gross farm income to $7 of national income to the attention of the public at a farm hearing in Sioux City, Iowa, in 1937. At that time he pointed out that for the period 1921–37 each $1 of gross farm income had been responsible for $1 of factory pay roll and a total of $7 of national income.

Since that time he has appeared before many congressional committees and has used the relationship in pointing the way to a sound economy. In 1944, the Country Gentleman, after checking the many different graphs prepared by Mr. Wilken, published an article by Mr. Taylor, their associate editor, entitled "The Key to Prosperity." In this article they called attention to Mr. Wilken's work and the apparent accuracy of the ratio in spite of prosperity, depression, or war.

In 1947, Mr. Wilken privately arranged for the publication of a complete record of our economy under the title "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way." In his book, a copy of which was sent to all Members of Congress, Mr. Wilken not only points out the constant ratio of gross farm income to national income, but also reveals many other similar ratios in regard to total wages paid out, retail sales volume, and so forth.

Mr. Wilken has been tireless and fearless in projecting his research work. He has given the facts and let the chips fall where they may. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in 1948 as to the merits of the bill which provided for a sliding-down scale of 90 to 60 percent of parity, Mr. Wilken told the committee that if the bill was passed and became law it would legislate the Nation into a depression. To support his statement he has continually pointed out that agriculture received 65 percent of parity in 1932 during the most severe depression in our history. Because of the simple fact that each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income he points out that we cannot afford not to maintain farm prices at an average of 100 percent of parity at the market place.

When the ratio was first called to my attention as a Member of Congress in 1939 its very simplicity made it hard to believe. But as the years have passed by, no one has come forth to refute the relationship Mr. Wilken uncovered. Since his first presentation in 1937 we have been through the greatest war in history and have come back to a peacetime economy. In those 12 years from 1937–49, the gross farm income has continued to generate seven times its amount in national income.

In my opinion the ratio that Mr. Wilken has presented time and time again has had a tremendous influence on the Members of Congress. I know that it has been the primary reason why most of the Republican Members of the House now support basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity.

A Republican House in the Eightieth Congress extended the 90-percent price support because of the realization that farm income must be maintained if we are to prevent a depression. Again in the Eighty-first Congress the House Republicans joined in passing the Gore amendment which provided for a continuation of the 90-percent price support.

There has existed a different line of thought in the other body because in my opinion Mr. Wilken as an individual without a pressure group has not had the time or opportunity to properly present the facts to but only a few Members of that body. Given the opportunity, I am sure that he can prove to them also that from the records of our Nation, not only that the seven-times turn of farm income is accurate, but also that all groups of society benefit in direct proportion.

Instead of an average of parity for the farmer being a subsidy, it is, as Mr. Wilken so clearly states, a price level that any political party which wishes to operate this Nation on a sound and prosperous basis must maintain.

He points out the ratio of retail sales and total wage payments as being $4.20 for each $1 of gross farm income.

As a Member of Congress, I hope that the Members of both political parties, and the public generally, will avail themselves of the opportunity not only to read what Mr. Wilken has written from time to time, but also that they will call him in for consultation when considering basic legislation. He has the undisputed facts and figures at his fingertips and from memory can analyze almost every phase of our economy through the period 1910–49.

The figures he presents and the seven-times turn of gross farm income that he has uncovered is not some mystical conclusion. It is supported by the records of your Nation and mine compiled by the United States Department of Commerce. Its factual foundation is the reason why no one has been able to refute the seven-times turn of farm income into national income, and hence it is gradually receiving Nation-wide acceptance.

His studies, in my opinion, simplify our so-called farm problem and point the way to a sound solution. Ours will be the loss if we fail to use them.

Parity supports for the farmer are not a subsidy but merely the price tag for his product which is comparable to the hourly wages of labor and the price tag of industry on its products as they are sold to the consumer. Parity for our farmers means a prosperous Nation with full employment at a wage level which will permit the purchase and consumption of our farm and factory production or its equivalent in trade. We must bear in mind always that the wealth of any nation can only spring from Mother Earth, which generates economic power. America must never turn off that power.

Improvement of Underdeveloped Areas of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Very Reverend Monsignor John J. McClafferty, dean, National Catholic School of Social Service, Catholic University of America, for the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs hearing testimony on H. R. 5615, "A bill to promote the foreign policy

of the United States and to authorize participation in a cooperative endeavor for assistance in the development of economically underdeveloped areas of the world," October 6, 1949:

The bold program, new and long-term, envisaged by the President in his inaugural address last January, which was designed to make "the benefits of our scientific advances and our industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas," is just as necessary for our own economy as it is for the economies of the so-called underdeveloped areas. If we do not succeed in exporting our capital and skills to other countries to contribute to the upbuilding of free economies, it may be difficult for us to maintain a free economy in our own country. If the other countries of this hemisphere, for instance, are unable to develop their free economies because the United States, as a Nation, does not see its way clear to furnish material capital, and reasonable terms for the payment of interest charges and for the repayment of the principal of private and public loans, they easily may be driven into purely Socialist economies.

We are interested moreover in building up the economies of other countries, in lifting up their standard of life so that they may be in a position to purchase the products of our highly developed economy. The President, in his midyear Economic Report to Congress, stated: "The expansion of foreign investment, by making more dollars available directly to the underdeveloped countries and indirectly to the capital-goods-exporting countries of Europe, will improve the rest of the world's ability to buy from us." The President's National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, in studying the world economic problem, was reported to have observed "that United States exports to the 15 developed countries in the period 1936–40, amounted to $5.80 a year for every person in those 15 countries." Those countries were termed developed which had the highest per capita income, the longest life expectancy, the lowest percentage of illiteracy, and the highest daily per capita food supply. It was also reported that "in contrast, the United States was able to export to the 10 nations in the partially developed countries goods valued at only $1.25 a year per person, and to the 28 underdeveloped countries, only 70 cents per person a year." (The New York Times, June 26, 1949.)

There is much that we can do in the sharing of our skills with other countries. We must, however, be sure that in profiting by our skills other countries may not be copying something that is totally unsuited to their background. Already we have a number of unhappy situations in our relationships with other countries. We have promoted mechanization in certain industries in some countries to such a degree as to cause serious unemployment. We sometimes have made the mistake of assuming that other peoples were immediately ready to profit by the highly developed specializations in this country. We have failed to remember that specialization is not always adapted to the culture of many other countries. We have neglected to take under adequate consideration the cultural inheritances, the social institutions, and the indigenous agencies and resources of other countries.

Point IV divides itself into two parts. First, there is the exporting of American capital into underdeveloped areas. This involves many important considerations. Double taxation is one of these considerations immediately facing us. A practical means of facilitating the exportation of material capital from this country to the other American countries is to confine our Federal taxation of income, corporate and private, to what is earned within the United States, and leave to those countries the taxation of what is earned within their respective borders. Of even more importance, perhaps, in encouraging persons of constructive mental caliber and steadfast, wholesome character to take firm and durable root in the countries where they labor for their best working years, would be the elimination of double taxation of individual estates. European nations have built lasting and productive ties—economic, social, and cultural, by their policy of allowing the pioneer types to operate abroad with relative freedom from taxation of what they earn and save abroad, taxing them only on what they earn and accumulate at home. We could well hope to reinforce the same sort of bonds with our sister American States were we to take the same attitude of enlightened self-denial in this matter of tax burden. The enhancement of our trade will compensate by creating a broader base for domestic public revenue derived from taxation at home. We have treaties designed to eliminate double taxation with a number of European countries and with Canada; no other American State has concluded such a treaty with this country. Every reasonable effort should be made to press this particular approach, as a prerequisite to the orderly movement of material capital to those countries in need of such capital.

As a general rule, it should be pointed out that the more that can be done by private initiative and by private organizations, subject to reasonable social controls, in stimulating developments in underdeveloped countries the better it will be for the countries served as well as for our own country. Everything possible should be done to stimulate private enterprise and private efforts of all kinds.

The second part of point IV relates to the exchange of experience and information, and the supplying of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. H. R. 5615 would provide the necessary authorizations for this exchange. The exchange of experience and information, and the providing of technical skills can be done directly by the agencies of our own Government and by the various specialized agencies of the United Nations, and the Organization of American States. It is highly desirable that the United States should work through the United Nations and the Organization of American States as well as well as through bilateral arrangements. The willingness to use the instrumentalities of the United Nations and Organization of American States will be an expression of our desire to make those organizations, designed to secure international peace, more effective agencies for promoting self-help, prosperity, freedom, and justice for all the peoples of the world.

The Economic Committee and other dependent offices and groups of the Council of the Organization of American States are concerned with various plans and conditions for the importing of capital into areas in which it is most needed and with the exchange of experience and technical information. We are very much interested in the Economic Committee of the Organization of American States; we want to strengthen its work. It will help to bring the countries of this hemisphere closer together in a general relationship which will be mutually helpful both in the sharing of capital investments and of skills and techniques.

There is one very large and immediate problem which the countries of the Western Hemisphere have in common with the other nations of the Western World, and that is the resettlement of the displaced and expelled people of Europe. This does not include merely the resettlement of the United Nations displaced persons, which is the immediate responsibility of the International Refugee Organization, but also of the large number of displaced persons in Germany and Italy. These displaced persons can provide the energizing manpower that is necessary for the development of the economies of the Latin-American Republics, Canada, Australia, and other areas. These persons can also play an important part in the further development of our own economy. Too often we think too exclusively in terms of capital investment in considering the development of the economies of different countries. We must recognize that manpower contributes greatly to the building up of the economies of underdeveloped countries. We must appreciate, moreover, that there is very little hope of stabilizing the economy of western Germany until some plans are made for the resettlement of the German expellees. Furthermore, there is no real expectation of stabilizing soundly the economy of Italy until plans are made for the resettlement of a part of its population.

America, North and South, in the main, has been organized and developed by Europeans, with many very valuable contributions from peoples of African, Asiatic, and indigenous origins, and from persons representing a confluence of these several components. Europe amassed wealth from this hemisphere, and raised the level of individual comfort and security from famine and disease, over the last 4½ centuries. But Europe made all this possible by her exportation of human capital, as we may not inappropriately term the more than 100,000,000 Europeans who since the days of discovery have crossed the Atlantic to live and die in this hemisphere. The reception of displaced persons and expellees and immigrants generally will mean reenforced and ever larger markets for our own economic services and goods, and ever better prospect of a generally more desirable standard of life and effort for all who live here; and that most definitely means the indigenous peoples. There are still American countries where the indigenous peoples, numerically outnumbering those of predominantly European stock, can be aided and stimulated through the assimilation—physical, cultural, and economic—that would be consequent upon the introduction of that human capital—one of the foremost gifts of Europe, and a guaranty of the prolongation of Nation-wide prosperity in this country.

In some Latin-American countries considerable progress already has been made in improved methods of food production and conservation. This has been done through experimental stations, credit, and programs for rural education, rehabilitation, and resettlement. In our work in these countries we have recognized to a degree that you cannot have in them the same type of specialization that we have in our own country; that we cannot have a great variety of specialists concerned with a particular family; that we must develop through special training programs general technicians who can assist in food production, food conservation, basic health, and general problems of home management. We have come to see that the persons in charge of this service in the rural areas should be natives. We must have some method of training them in countries that approximate their own in culture, standards of living, and general educational outlook. We can do a great deal for them by bringing in people from nearby countries with similar conditions of life.

Our experience in dealing with the American Republics has taught us that we cannot aid them very far in their development without doing something about transportation. Many people in these countries will tell you that better transportation is their basic need. Most of these countries have very little transportation facilities except along the coast lines, the air lanes, and a few large rivers.

It is possible at the present time to have an entire lack of food in one section of a country and a great surplus in another. Without transportation it is virtually impossible to develop an adequate national food supply or even an adequate regional

food supply. After transportation and food supply we have the problems of health and education. The health problem would naturally come along with the problem of food supply, farm management, housing, and home management.

Education is a long-range problem which must challenge all groups in the different countries that are associated in basic international enterprises. As people have better health and better food they begin to move around, they look for more education, for more opportunities for formal, general, and technical instruction. As their economies develop they will have more funds that can be devoted to education, in fact to the development of all their culture as well as their basic religious interests and works.

In all the developments under point 4 of the foreign economic policy we should keep in mind the fullest participation of all voluntary organizations. Each government should encourage voluntary organizations to join in the programs. In no place should the program be regarded as exclusively governmental. Exclusively governmental programs may lay us open to the charge of economic imperialism. In the countries with which we are sharing technical guidance we should urge the fullest participation of cultural and religious groups. We should encourage these groups to do their own thinking and planning and to cooperate in formulations and activities. We should not ask them merely to accept and sanction a plan that has already been carved out for them by government. We should not develop any plan for application anywhere which in any detail violates any fundamental precept of religion and the natural law, or runs counter to valid social and cultural heritages.

God has blessed the United States with material wealth, technical skills, and spiritual ideals. In these days of decision, Divine Providence has cast our beloved land in the role of leadership. Motivated by our spiritual ideals may we find in point 4 a way to lead countries to self-help, prosperity, freedom, justice, and peace through sharing what we have in our hearts, heads, and hands.

World Government Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I feel that permanent world peace can probably only be secured through strengthening of the United Nations into a world federal government specifically limited to preserving peace and preventing aggression.

I have some definite criticisms of House Concurrent Resolution 64, however. The resolution envisions a world federation with limited powers, but no mention is made of what the limitations are to be. It is said in the resolution that the government should have powers "adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression," but it is not said that the powers are to be limited to such specifically mentioned powers.

Further, House Concurrent Resolution 64 points out objectives to be achieved without stating whether or not the achievement would be solely by the exercise of the treaty powers of the executive branch with the concurrence of the Senate. I think the objectives of any such resolution should not become effective without prior democratic submission to the people of the United States with at least as much care in the ascertainment of the desires of the American people as are provided for in the amendment of our United States Constitution. I would not like to see the United States enter into a world government without a much broader expression from the citizens of the United States than is to be found in the treaty-making powers of the President and the Senate. I think also that any resolution which we pass would be greatly improved in securing popular support for it if it specifically spelled out the methods by which the citizens of the United States were to express their support or objection to such a step. Securing a broad base of participation in the establishment of the principles involved is not only the democratic way of handling the matter but also would result in greater strength for whatever is ultimately done.

Further, I think that it would be an improvement if the resolution specifically mentioned a police force because, if a world police force, however limited or constituted, is contemplated, I think that all people dealing with the question should be apprised of the apparent necessity for such a police force.

I would like to call attention to House Concurrent Resolution 76, which I think meets all of these objections to House Concurrent Resolution 64. House Joint Resolution 270 suggests a form of constitutional amendment by which House Concurrent Resolution 64 or 76 could be implemented. I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 76 and House Joint Resolution 270. I hold no brief for their being perfect; but I do think that their provisions should be considered for what they may be worth.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a warning against the now well-established trend of our citizens to let the Government do it, and the ultimate effect it will have on our country, is contained in the following editorial from the Knoxville (Iowa) Express—Democrat—of October 13. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include this timely article:

America has degenerated. Everybody is asking for and expecting help of some kind. No one, it appears, goes out to do anything by himself. No organization can function unless the public is panhandled for the wherewithal to pay the bill. Farmers are asking for and expecting subsidies on everything; manufacturers are yelling to keep foreign goods from competing with what they make at a price far too high; coal miners are striking for fantastic wages; so are the steel workers; everyone wants a pension; everyone wants something for nothing. With America some $300,000,000,000 in debt this looks like a good way to rush headlong into a crash that will take 25 years to come out of. We are going farther and farther into debt every month. All kinds of schemes are being used to scare the Nation into more and more spending. Instead of the people supporting the Government we are trying to make the Government support the people. Dumb as we are we know it cannot work for long. The only thing the Government can do to salvage such a situation is to devalue the dollar as England did the pound sterling. By devaluing the dollar 50 percent every owner of a savings bond, every man with a dollar in the bank would automatically have just half as much as he had before. The Government, however, would under this situation be able to pay off twice as much debt as it did before. Russia claimed a few years ago that America would crack up economically—perhaps they knew what they were talking about.

Use of Public Recreational Facilities on Nonsegregated Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion, on the adjourning of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, to comment on the great and to commend the honest efforts of our Secretary of the Interior in behalf of that democracy to which we so frequently refer. I am referring, of course, to his efforts to obtain a just and peaceful solution to the problem which might be simply stated: Can all Americans use the facilities which their taxes have helped to provide?

In a hall so accustomed to political addresses, I would, for this occasion deviate and address my remarks not to Democrats and Republicans or to northerners and southerners—not even do I address you as liberals and conservatives—the question must rise above these selfish confines if America is to remain the Noah's Ark of democracy in this world, sick with the lust of totalitarianism.

Fellow Americans, all of you, consider if you will, the task which faces the Secretary, and most certainly it faces us as well. I have followed this dispute which has been developing here in Washington over the use on a nonsegregated basis of the recreational facilities which this Federal Government has provided for all of the citizens of its Capital. Because these facilities are operated under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, it has become Secretary Krug's lot to implement a program of equal access to all. I do not for one moment contend that his is an easy task,

nor do I believe that his program is moving too slowly. I do believe that it must continue and it must bring to our Capital, if only in a small way, more of the privileges which our Constitution guarantees every American.

These parks and pools are the modern means available to our city dwellers where men can rest, relax, and enjoy their leisure time. There best can we find the atmosphere in which democracy thrives, where men of all races and religions enjoy each other's companionship as fellow Americans. There least can we find nourishment for the seeds of communism which we know thrive on the persecution of or discrimination against any of our many minorities.

In each step which the Secretary has taken I have noticed that he has been particularly careful that protection has been afforded the people. When, on the occasion which was precipitated by the agitation of local hoodlums and Communists, he was faced with the alternatives of violence or closing a swimming pool, he chose to close that pool until level heads could prevail. In our absence, and before these facilities are again opened, I hope that the Department of the Interior, in conjunction with the District Commissioners and the local recreation board can effect a program which we as Americans can proudly say represents democracy in action.

I share with most Americans the great apprehension we know with the knowledge that the atom bomb is now within the reach of Russia. Within the warped minds of our Communist critics there has always been a very effective weapon in attacking our American life, and that is that our claim of democracy is a hollow, political gesture. Let us remove this weapon, step by step, and wish the Secretary and his assistants every success.

Honeymoon Is Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. GOODMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald:

HONEYMOON IS OVER

There should be no occasion for alarm in President Truman's announcement that the Russians have the atomic bomb. What he said was that there had been an atomic explosion in Russia. This raises all sorts of questions. Was it indeed a bomb, or just the explosion of atomic materials? Did an atomic manufacturing plant blow up? If it was a bomb, was it the only one they had? In any event, we can be sure from our own experience with the development of the bomb that it is a long way from the explosion of the first to the perfection of mass manufacturing techniques.

Assuming that the explosion now reported represented the initial stage of atomic production, it can be estimated that it will be another 2 years at least before the Russians could produce the bombs in any quantity even if they proceeded as rapidly as did the United States when all the incentives of actual hostilities were present. This would seem to make the predictions of the Finletter Commission (the President's Air Policy Commission) of December 30, 1947, stand up very solidly. That commission said:

"It would be safe to assume that possibly hostile powers will not be producing atomic weapons in substantial quantities before the end of 1952. We point out that this does not assume that such powers may not have a few atomic weapons prior to that date."

So we feel it safe to conclude that while the real honeymoon of atomic monopoly is over, there will still be a few years of respite before the Russians will be in a position to use these weapons militarily. It would appear that the Finletter Commission's timetable is still accurate. Its A-day was placed at January 1, 1953. This was estimated as the date at which we might expect a potential enemy to be in a position to use the atom bomb against us. It would seem unlikely that it could be any sooner than that, possibly much later, depending upon how well the Russians with the aid of German technicians can get into production of the bombs.

Even so, we wonder whether the Defense Establishment has devoted as much money and interest to the development of air defenses as the Finletter Commission urged. It may be that the Air Force has gone overboard on the B-36 to the neglect of adequate intercepter, radar, and other defensive measures. This would seem to be the right time to make sure. One thing is certain. Navy airpower has not had the support that the Finletter experts urged for it.

However, one can dwell too long upon the military consequences of the news from Russia. The United Nations General Assembly has greater reason than ever before to press for an international atomic agreement. What we hope is that the Russians, now possessed of the bomb, will be more conciliatory in the solution of grave international problems. Their inferiority complex, which has seemed to make them truculent, should be less in evidence. There is apt to be better bargaining where the bargainers are nearly equals in power.

On balance, then, we would conclude that there is more reason to be hopeful than forlorn over the President's announcement. Only the inevitable has happened. Out of it may come more good than bad.

Humorous Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HUMOROUS STATISTICS—OR ARE THEY?

It has been said that there are three kinds of lies: white lies, black lies and statistics. It is also claimed that statistics can be made to prove anything. In support of these contentions we venture to print the table below:

WHO'S DOING THE WORK?

A California construction man has figured the Nation's available manpower total at only 2 men, instead of the 61,000,000 allegedly employed. Here are his computations.

Population of the United States	135,744,328
Persons 65 years of age or older	36,941,220
Balance left to do the work	98,803,108
Persons 21 years of age or younger	54,491,337
Balance left to do the work	44,311,771
Persons working for the Government	20,011,922
Balance left to do the work	24,299,849
Persons in colleges and armed forces	10,148,202
Balance left to do the work	14,151,647
Persons in State and city offices	13,800,366
Balance left to do the work	351,281
Persons in hospitals and asylums	275,545
Balance left to do the work	75,736
Bums and others who won't work	60,244
Balance left to do the work	15,492
Persons in jails	15,490
Balance left to do the work	2

"In the final tabulation," says this Californian, "the two are you and I—and you'd better get a wiggle on. I'm tired of doing all the work!" (Courtesy of the Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va.)

Truman's Monetary and Fiscal Practices Are a Slippery Road to Misery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, No. 1 economic adviser for the Truman administration, in a speech before the National Retail Farm Equipment Association, accused the administration of using devious methods in treating the domestic economy of this country. The punch line in his address as I read it was this one:

Monetary and fiscal tricks have no power of magic, but are a slippery road to misery.

Continuing further, Dr. Nourse said:

As an economist I do not see standards of life being raised when a great labor organization insists on a reduction in hours of work and the czar of coal orders a 3-day workweek with full pay.

I am also uneasy when I see farmers demanding stimulative prices while the Government accumulates gigantic farm surpluses and pays subsidies out of Federal deficits.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Nourse also charged that if we are to have continued economic progress, private business must also adjust its supply lines and distribution patterns. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including all of Dr. Nourse's address, which I commend to all Members of this House:

THE MARCH OF PROGRESS—ECONOMICALLY

When I saw the first outline of your program, I was impressed with the strong note of courage and optimism which it expressed.

Fifty years of progress by the association; "the march of progress" in manufacturing; "the march of progress" in agriculture, in farm mechanization, and even in Government—with Senator BYRD as its prophet. Compared with his assignment, mine should be easy—"the march of progress—economically."

The economic progress of this country has been almost fabulous since its founding, or during the last century, or in the 50 years spanned by the life of your organization. All these records of progress are matters of common knowledge. As we come closer to the present day, the tempo of progress seems to be accelerating, not being arrested. Against the somber back drop of the depression thirties, the stimulus of war touched off a blaze of new achievement. It revealed latent powers for production, not demonstrated before, powers which were inherent in our natural resources, our high-grade labor force, our accumulated capital, and our capacious credit reserves. That enlarged economic power made us the decisive contributor to victory and at the same time permitted the masses of our people to enjoy a higher average of consumption than they had ever known before. As I remarked in another connection about a year ago, even a war of such gigantic proportions did not reduce us to the blood, sweat, and tears that were the lot of England and our other allies. "While individual deprivations and family losses were grievous, it could be said of the Nation as a whole that we lost some blood, shed a few tears, and got up a healthy sweat."

After the war, many people, reasoning by analogy, prophesied that we would have a postwar slump, that demobilization would throw 8,000,000 or perhaps 10,000,000 workers into the ranks of the unemployed. But we passed from victorious war to vigorous peacetime reconversion with amazingly little lost motion. Assembly lines were switched back to peacetime goods, pipe lines were filled, and trade relations were reestablished. Consumers, with plump pay envelopes and an unprecedented reserve stock of liquid savings, resumed their normal but now enlarged role in the market as stimulators and guides of the productive process.

The Employment Act under which I have the honor to serve is a march-of-progress act. It calls for maximum production, employment, and purchasing power, engendered by free competitive enterprise complemented by prudent but vigorous public enterprise and sustained over the years with only moderate ups and downs. I am not prepared to say that 1948 and 1949 precisely measure the maximum of production, employment, and purchasing power for the United States, but I venture the thought that they may be accepted as at least "a reasonable facsimile thereof." As we now approach the year end, I am not prepared to offer you any assurance, private or official, that we shall do precisely that well next year, throughout the decade of the fifties, or for the rest of this century. It is notable, however, that the events of the last 10 years or so, taken in the perspective of preceding decades, have given many thoughtful persons confidence to make projections that are about that optimistic. I need cite only two, which come from particularly significant sources and, by coincidence, both from persons whom I may call "colleague."

My former and long-time colleague, President Moulton of the Brookings Institution, in his recent book, Controlling Factors in Economic Development, envisages a doubling of population during the next century and an eightfold rise in general standards of living. My more recent colleague, Vice Chairman Leon Keyserling, in his address Prospects for Economic Growth at the Democratic Party Conference on Land, Water, and Jobs in San Francisco a month ago envisaged a march of progress for the next 10 years "founded conservatively upon rates of growth that we have achieved during good years in the past." On this basis, he said, "we can lift our total annual output of goods and services from $262,000,000,000 in 1948 to about $350,000,000,000 by 1958."

This, he estimates, would permit almost all families to "reach a minimum income level of around $4,000," with more than $40,000,000,000 left to "improve income in the higher brackets." Farm incomes would gain "almost 35 percent * * * a somewhat more rapid relative gain than the population as a whole, because our rural areas have not yet attained the parity of income and opportunity which is both just and essential for an economy healthful in all its parts."

Furthermore, social security would be improved, health and education better provided for, the long-range resource development program enlarged, and "home building for all income groups stepped up to a pace which would provide a decent home for every American family." Finally, Mr. Keyserling argued that that projected national production would also "be enough to achieve balanced budgets, make large retirements on the national debt, and leave substantial room for tax reduction."

I am not too clear as to how Mr. Moulton derived his factor of 8. Nor am I altogether sure that Mr. Keyserling could simultaneously raise wages, farm incomes, and business profits so fast and at the same time reduce the public debt and cut taxes. But "hitching our wagons to the stars" has been good American practice, and it is not my purpose to quibble with the precise terms of either of these courageous projections. I want to call your attention rather to the fact that in both cases, the prospect of great progress is made conditional.

Mr. Moulton says plainly that his projection is only "concerned with economic potentials, as governed by resources and productive power." He thereupon turns to consider the kind of economic organization and practices, public and private, that would be needed to bring these potentials to actual fruition. "What principles, methods, or policies," he asks, "must be pursued in order to realize in fullest measure our national economic goals?"

Mr. Keyserling too, after outlining his 10-year targets, undertakes to put them in the perspective of reality by adding that, to achieve them, "we need ever-improved cooperation between labor and management," price and wage policies "which will allow enough capital accumulation to expand productive facilities and provide enough purchasing power to buy the full product, * * * a satisfactory program for completing the postwar adjustments of agriculture," and Government programs to "conserve and build up our natural resources, to improve the systems which give us security against the hazards and risks of modern industrial life, and to maintain that regulatory viligance which prevents any one group from seeking to benefit unfairly at the expense of another.

Now, what does all this review of predictions of progress lead up to? To me, it proclaims an almost self-evident truth that, with our traditions, our training, and our resources, the march of economic progress from here on should be even greater—much greater—than the quite creditable record of the past. But that does not mean an easy life for a generation born with a silver spoon in its mouth. No, it underlines a tremendous responsibility. Those dreams of progress will go aglimmering unless they are intelligently and diligently brought to pass. The free world looks to us to be the pacemakers of that progress, to be the rock on which the non-Soviet future can be built. To falter or to lag in our task would be to dishonor our fathers and to defraud our sons. But in all seriousness, I must say that as I look about me I am filled with real concern. I cannot indulge in easy optimism.

As an economist, I do not see standards of life being raised adequately out of enlarged production when a great labor organization sees the current situation as "the occasion for a reduction in the hours of work, to 35 or 30, lest the productivity of the labor force exceed the power of the market to absorb the total production under prevailing and impending conditions" or when the czar of coal orders a 3-day week (21 hours) with full pay for a redundant labor force and when pensions at 60 are demanded for a population steadily becoming longer lived.

I am filled with apprehension too when I look to management and see it choosing the costs of banked fires and the demoralization of the delicate adjustments of supply lines and distribution patterns rather than capitalistically venturesome reexamination of their practices of accounting and their theories of price making.

I am uneasy when I see farmers demanding stimulative prices whilst Government accumulates gigantic surplus holdings, pays subsidies out of Federal deficits, and imposes production allotments and marketing quotas.

I am not happy either when I see Government slipping back into deficits as a way of life in a period when production and employment are high, instead of putting its fiscal house in order and husbanding reserves to support the economy if less prosperous times overtake us.

In sum, if we are to maintain the march of economic progress, we must, individually and as groups, in private business and in politics, display industry, prudence, and self-discipline, recognize that we can't get more out of the economic system than we put in, that collective bargaining in good faith and on solid facts is the road to a workable distribution of total product, and that monetary and fiscal tricks have no power or magic but are a slippery road to misery.

Resolutions of Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau recently adopted forward-looking resolutions which represent the voice of organized farmers in the county. With the thought in mind that other Members of Congress will find these resolutions worthy of consideration, I include in the RECORD the 1950 resolutions of Poweshiek County Farm Bureau. They follow:

1950 RESOLUTIONS OF POWESHIEK COUNTY FARM BUREAU

1. We reaffirm our allegiance to the United States, the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and the Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federations. We will cooperate with them to the fullest extent.

2. We pledge our wholehearted support to the churches, schools, and all other organizations in the county working for community betterment.

3. We favor the support and full participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization and the constructive programs of the Monetary Bank and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

4. We favor a permanent bipartisan farm program that gives equal consideration to producers, consumer, and soil conservation. We recommend that this program be administered by locally elected farmer committeemen up to and including the State levels.

5. The need of more soil-conservation practices in Poweshiek County is becoming increasingly evident each day. We recognize the extreme value of the soil-conservation work carried on by the Poweshiek County Soil Conservation Service and pledge our continued support to it.

6. We recognize the valuable assistance rendered to agriculture by the agricultural extension service, the experiment station, Iowa State College, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

7. We favor the county assessor law providing evaluations can be fair and equitable. We recommend that the county board of review appoint a local three-man board in each township to assist and advise the board of review in arriving at an equitable evaluation.

8. We favor the 100-percent collection of the State income tax because it is a fair and equitable tax on all, and the revenue thus obtained to be used as a replacement for property tax as far as possible.

9. There should be an equalization of taxes for schools and it is hereby recommended that a maximum levy of 15 mills be placed upon real and personal property for school purposes. Any additional revenue needed beyond the above levy should be provided by State funds or State aid. Taxes on rural property should be equalized to prevent confiscatory results occurring in some areas.

10. We believe that the Federal estate tax should continue as at the present time without rates being decreased.

11. Because of local tax inequalities, we still believe that all income-producing property held by nonprofit organizations should be taxed as other property.

12. It is further recommended that the 10 cents per pound Federal tax on colored oleomargarine be continued, but that the Federal tax of one-fourth cent on uncolored oleomargarine be discontinued.

13. We recommend that a more intensive State and Federal road-improvement program be developed for the construction of all-weather secondary roads and demand that our State and Federal money be allocated on a need basis. We think it commendable that county road-building funds are used efficiently and a more extensive use of the district plan is being made.

14. We feel that we should work for a better understanding of the new school laws and encourage further legislation for schools.

15. We recommend that better library facilities be made available to rural people.

16. We recognize the valuable training being given our rural youth through 4-H Club work and vocational agriculture and homemaking schools. We feel that every rural boy and girl should have an opportunity for the training afforded by these programs.

17. The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of everyone. We encourage better nutrition in the home, testing and remedying questionable water supplies, and further study of ways of obtaining and financing more hospital facilities in the county.

18. We recommend the employment of a full-time county nurse.

19. We recommend that the townships sponsor the education of farm, home and highway safety.

20. We affirm that all eligible voters should learn the mechanics of casting a ballot and should go to the polls for all elections and exercise the right and duty of voting.

21. Realizing that agriculture and labor have many common problems, we urge that Farm Bureau and labor cooperate to secure a better understanding.

22. We commend the Farm Service officers and manager and the general and special insurance agents for their work and the efficient operation of their groups.

23. The various cooperative associations in the county have made a successful and valuable contribution to agriculture. We pledge continued support and assistance to these organizations.

24. We recognize the value of the publicity and support which the papers of the county have given during the past year and express our appreciation to them for their fine cooperation.

Anti-Poison-Gas Protocol of 1925

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, 1949, I introduced a bill, H. R. 6290, to enact into law the Curtis atomic energy plan as proposed by Cathrine Curtis, president of Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., and national director of Women Investors in America, Inc., of Washington, D. C. When I introduced the above bill I pointed out that the proposal on atomic energy made by Miss Curtis follows, insofar as atomic warfare is concerned, the same program used in 1925 to outlaw poison gas and bacteriological warfare as war weapons. I also pointed out that the antipoison gas protocol of 1925 worked successfully in World War II in barring the use of either poison gas or bacteriological weapons in that war.

I am happy to say that Miss Curtis' proposal and my bill, H. R. 6290, has met with widespread favorable reaction and approval. The reference by Miss Curtis to the 1925 Geneva protocol has caused many to begin searching files for a copy of that document. Therefore, in order to make it readily available to all, it is as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS, OR OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE, SIGNED AT GENEVA, JUNE 17, 1925

PROTOCOL

The undersigned plenipotentiaries, in the name of their respective governments:

Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases and of all analogous liquid materials or devices has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world; and

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in treaties to which the majority of the powers of the world are parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as part of international law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations: Declare:

That the high contracting parties, so far as they are not already parties to treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves, according to the terms of this declaration.

The high contracting parties will exert every effort to induce other states to accede to the present protocol. Such accession will be notified to the Government of the French Republic, and by the latter to all signatory and acceding powers, and will take effect on the date of the notification by the Government of the French Republic.

The present protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified as soon as possible. It shall bear today's date.

The ratification of the present protocol shall be addressed to the Government of the French Republic, which will at once notify the deposit of such ratification to each of the signatory and acceding powers. The instruments of ratification of and accession to the present protocol will remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the French Republic.

The present protocol will come into force for each signatory power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each power will be bound as regards other powers which have already deposited their ratifications.

In witness whereof, the plenipotentiaries have signed the present protocol.

Done at Geneva in a single copy, this 17th day of June 1925.

Mr. Speaker, follows a list of the countries that signed the foregoing protocol: Germany, the United States, by Theodore E. Burton and Hugh S. Gibson, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, the British Empire, Canada, Irish Free State, India, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, Estonia, Abyssinia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Netherlands, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Salvador, Siam, Switzerland, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovens, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The protocol later was acceded to by the following countries: Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Liberia, Persia, and the Soviet Union.

It should be noted that, among the nations who originally signed the above protocol, two did not ratify. Those nations were Japan and the United States. It also should be noted that while neither of these nations ratified the above protocol, both adhered to its stipulations during World War II, as did all nations in that war.

Discriminatory Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Mercury:

DISCRIMINATORY TAXES

When the war-excise taxes were put into effect, it was said that they would be repealed 6 months after the end of hostilities. Yet they are still in effect, and are still acting as a burden on the consumer and a brake on business.

The taxes apply to a considerable list of commodities and services, many of which are not luxuries under any reasonable interpretation of the term. The primary reason for their enactment was to reduce civilian purchasing in time of war. That reason no longer exists, and there can be no valid excuse for continuing this drag on the economy.

A concerted campaign is now under way in favor of repeal of the levies at this session of Congress. It is sponsored by the principal associations of retailers, including both chain and independent groups, and by many manufacturers. It is also supported by labor unions, which realize that these taxes discourage buying and so prevent employment. The CIO, at its 1948 constitutional convention, passed a formal resolution urging "that all excise taxes not regulatory in character be repealed."

The National Planning Association—a nonpartisan organization representative of business, labor, agriculture, and the professions—has said: "The present structure of excise taxes discriminates between producers of taxed and untaxed goods and many of those taxes weigh most heavily on low-income families." They are simply a form of class tax, and are highly discriminatory. Their early repeal would be in the interest of business and the consumer, and would be of direct help in maintaining employment.

World Government Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the statement by Alan Cranston, president of United World Federalists, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Concurrent Resolution 64 in which I am greatly interested. The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY ALAN CRANSTON, PRESIDENT, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

I appear before you as president of United World Federalists. My name is Alan Cranston. I live in Palo Alto, Calif. I am a home builder.

The more than 40,000 Americans scattered through the 48 States who have banded together in United World Federalists—and the millions in other organizations who have demonstrated support for our objectives—are deeply convinced that we must substitute world law for world war.

We therefore support House Concurrent Resolution 64. It calls for the first step. It clearly states the objective.

Untold destruction of life, property, and human values is in prospect as a consequence of world war III—if we let it come. I shall not dwell upon that, nor shall I hazard opinions concerning the capacities of the weapons we and others are now secretly preparing for purposes of mutual destruction in that war.

I am sure that efforts have been made by experts to scare the members of this committee. I am sure you know much more about atomic, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction than I do.

I would like to talk to you, as a businessman about the consequences of the present preparedness program and the arms race. Even short of the devastation of actual war, the results of the present course—if long pursued—will plainly be catastrophic.

The United States faces a national deficit increased in this fiscal year by an additional $2,000,000,000 due to military expenditures. How can we make this up? In higher taxes? Today payment for past and preparation for future wars consumes almost 80 percent of the tax dollar. Shall we cut the preparedness program? The fact is that, far from cutting it back, we are of necessity stepping it up day by day as tension mounts. And it appears inevitable that our expenditures for western Europe will constantly increase. The requirements for direct expenditures under the military-aid program and the arming of western Europe makes a balance of payments impossible in the foreseeable future. The general estimate is that there will be a Marshall-plan deficit of $2,000,000,000 by 1952.

It is impossible to pay as you go and adequately arm for twentieth-century warfare. And so government after government prints currency, prints bonds, or prints both, and the result is a permanent lowering of the purchasing power of money.

At the end of World War I, we had a debt of $26,000,000,000—and this cut the value of the dollar to 75 cents in terms of purchasing power.

At the end of World War II, we had a debt of $300,000,000,000—and this cut the value of the dollar to 60 cents.

It is impossible to guess what the debt might be at the end of world war III—or after a sustained period of preparing for that war. Would it again increase tenfold and be $3,000,000,000,000? Or would it only triple and be $1,000,000,000,000? Either figure would mean a 10-cent dollar and the virtual wiping out of every American's capital in terms of what it would buy.

We are already marching down this road. If we proceed to wipe out the savings of the middle classes and of the workers of America we will have wiped out the last great bulwark against communism. We might defeat the Soviet Union in world war III—if we let it come—and still lose to communism.

The costs of our present course are not measurable by the dollar sign alone. I am sure that at the present stage of the arms race, the dispersal of war industries—launched with the moving of the Chance-Vought airplane plant from Hartford to Dallas, and the Boeing B–47 plant from Seattle to Wichita—is accomplished in a pleasant way. No orders need be given. But the day may well come when it will be necessary for the Government to issue peremptory orders—not only to management, but to the labor unions who must furnish skilled hands in remote places when the relocated plants are ready to operate. Already, with mounting Government expenditures, businessmen are becoming mere salaried administrators of Government contracts, and thousands upon thousands of industrial workers are in effect on the Federal pay roll.

All this is accompanied by the making of more and more secret decisions by fewer and fewer men in matters of vast import. How many voters, and not only how many voters but how many of their elected representatives, are today allowed access to sufficient information about atomic energy to enable them to think intelligently on the problem of using and controlling this mighty force? How long can our traditional civil liberties—free press, free speech, and all the rest—survive in the increasingly stifling atmosphere demanded for the grave purposes of national defense?

I do not suggest that most of this is anything but inevitable under the threat of modern war.

I want to state very flatly that the United World Federalists is not opposed to America's policy of preparedness. We recognize that it is indispensable that the United States be prepared to defend itself and its people against aggression—as long as aggression is possible. Do not misunderstand me. No responsible American will use these arguments to oppose or diminish the effectiveness of the preparedness program as long as military strength is our main hope for national security.

We are convinced, however, that it is not enough merely to prepare for the worst. We believe that our policies are incomplete as long as our resources and our talents are devoted primarily to preparing to annihilate the enemy after he has struck the first devastating blow.

We propose that the United States mount the offensive.

Let me say at once, however, that we do not subscribe to the school of thought known as B. R. N.—Bomb Russia Now. We reject the theory of the preventive war.

We also decline membership in the school of thought known as B. R. L.—Bomb Russia Later. It seems to us that the two theories really amount to the same thing, and that if you belong to the second school, which is based upon the belief that war is inevitable, you might as well belong to the first, in which case you should be realistic and pick the time and place for the first assault. It is virtually true that an administrator or a policy maker who accepts the inevitability of war conducts himself as though he were an advocate of preventive war. If he doesn't he is negligent and derelict.

The rapidly growing group of Americans who are joining together in the United World Federalists refuse to surrender themselves abjectly to the tides of the arms race. We refuse to accept the inevitability of war. We hold that there is a practical, realistic alternative—a program which would start as a supplement to our present preparedness policies but which would eventually replace them.

Our program is based upon the simple truth which led our founding fathers to create the United States of America 170 years ago—the simple truth that there can be no peace without justice, no justice without law, and no law without government to enact, interpret, and enforce that law.

Recognition of that truth now drives us to the inescapable conclusion that world peace requires world law.

We urge, with the sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, that this be accomplished by supporting and strengthening the United Nations and seeking its development into a world federation with powers adequate to enact, interpret, and enforce world law in the limited area necessary to abolish war.

We recognize the many pitfalls lying along this path. We simply believe that there are less pitfalls this way than along any other course.

We recognize that if the idea of preventive war takes hold—as well it may under the mounting stresses and strains of the arms race—it will probably not be called preventive war. It might be called a "crusade for world government." The plain fact is that the mere advocacy of world government does not necessarily make one an apostle of peace nor a real believer in a more effective United Nations.

It all depends on what you mean by world government and how you propose to get it.

It is quite possible sanctimoniously to advocate the immediate transformation of the United Nations into a world government, in order to drive the Russians out of it and provoke a crisis.

It is quite possible to use the semantics of world government while urging as intermediate steps toward that goal moves which are likely to widen rather than to diminish the gulf between the eastern and western worlds.

The fact that there are these elements within what has become known as the world-government movement should not be permitted to invalidate the purposes of House Concurrent Resolution 64 nor of the United World Federalists and the many other groups supporting it.

We set down no precise timetable. We by no means suggest that upon adoption of this resolution the United States delegation to the United Nations should forthwith press for an immediate vote in the Assembly for the convening of a review conference under article 109 of the Charter for the purpose of revising it. We do suggest that upon adoption of this resolution the administration

should make a declaration of policy consistent with it, and thereupon commence negotiations with all nations with a view to convening such a review conference when the preponderance of the members of the United Nations are prepared to join in the strengthening of the Charter. Abundant evidence is already available indicating that many nations are waiting for us to lead in this direction.

We do not feel that the advocacy of a new policy carries with it the responsibility for initially blueprinting that policy in all its details. We do not seek to prescribe the precise forms of the proposed world federation, although we are firmly convinced that it can and must be built upon the great and solid foundation of the present United Nations.

We feel that it should be of limited and carefully defined powers. I want to say to you, however, that reports from abroad show that parliamentary and executive leaders of many other nations are prepared to delegate many more powers to a world government than we as a private American organization recommend be delegated to it.

When this resolution has been adopted, the Congress and the people will have expressed their determination to find a lasting solution to the problem of ever-recurring and ever-more destructive wars. We are convinced that certain facts will become self-evident as the President and the Secretary of State, with the advice and consent of Congress, set about the charting of a new and great effort to seek that solution.

First, we will be driven inevitably to the conclusion that not only the atomic bomb but all weapons of mass destruction, and all national armies as such, must be placed under world control.

Second, it will be plain that we must strive for the participation of all nations. Neither we nor any other nation can safely disarm until all nations in the world do likewise under enforceable controls.

Third, it will be plain that neither the present assembly of the United Nations, which can only make recommendations, nor the Security Council, in which five nations possess the veto, can be relied upon to execute the world-wide inspections and controls which must be an essential element of any plan for armament control.

Fourth, it will be evident that before either the Assembly or the Security Council can be given the authority to enact and execute world laws, the present system of voting and representation must be revised. At present, each member nation in the United Nations has one vote. Iceland, with 125,000 citizens, has an equal voting power with the United States, with 150,000,000 citizens. Iceland and Luxemburg, with 250,000 citizens between them, can out-vote the Soviet Union two to one—and frequently do. This is a prime reason for the refusal of the great powers to give any binding authority to the Assembly, where all nations are represented, and for their insistence upon the veto in the 11-nation Security Council. Before the United States and the Soviet Union will relinquish the veto and increase the powers of the United Nations they are certain to insist upon some more equitable system of representation—just as some of the inhabitants of George Orwell's fabled "Animal Farm" insisted upon amendment of the principle "All animals are created equal." They added the words: "But some animals are more equal than others." It is unlikely that a system of representation based solely upon population, with no upper or lower limits, would be more acceptable or desirable—for then India and China, with their vast millions, would receive a voting power out of proportion to their present role in the world. Again, we do not seek to provide a precise formula, but we suggest that in addition to population other factors might be taken into account, such as economic development and education.

Finally, we believe that the step of reason will bring us face to face with the necessity for the development of the United Nations into a world federation of limited powers. Logically, the Assembly might be transformed into a limited legislative body, and the Security Council into a cabinet with executive powers. The world laws enacted would be applied directly to individuals by a world police force established under the executive branch. Its primary task would be to enforce disarmament of all nations down to the levels necessary for the preservation of domestic tranquillity. To assure justice, it would be necessary to grant the International Court of Justice compulsory jurisdiction over the individual—an authority it now lacks.

I stress that what is envisaged is a government federal in form, like our own, reserving to its various members all powers not specifically delegated to the world body. It would carefully reserve to each nation the right to its own political, economic, social, and religious institutions.

This is not a proposal for the abandonment or sacrifice of American sovereignty. Sovereignty is the business of doing something yourself, or, with others, choosing representatives to do for you certain things you cannot do alone. In the exercise of our sovereignty we elect representatives to the governments we have established in our towns and cities, in our counties and States, and in our Nation, for the performance of those specific tasks each can best perform. Despite the fact that national governments have demonstrated their inability to prevent war, we have not yet created a world government for that specific task. And so we lack any effective means of exercising sovereignty on the vital matter of war and peace. We do not presently possess the political institutions necessary to enable us to elect representatives of the American people authorized to sit down with the representatives of other peoples to take binding steps that can insure the peace.

Probably the most important decision in the lives of all of us was made in Tokyo. We found out about it at Pearl Harbor. And the next day, while our soldiers, sailors, and marines were busy fighting back, we exercised our so-called sovereignty as Congress declared war upon Japan.

Today, the real decision between war and peace lies more in Moscow than in Washington. It is not likely that we shall deliberately choose to go to war. But 13 men in the Politburo could today make a decision that could plunge us instantly into the most devastating war the world has ever known.

Plainly House Concurrent Resolution 64 does not propose that we give up a shred of sovereignty. Plainly it proposes a means by which we can gain the ability to exercise our presently impotent sovereignty in the vital area of war prevention. It proposes that we create a limited world government and deposit our sovereignty there on this most vital matter.

There are those who say, "world government is a fine idea, but the Russians will never agree to it, so there's no use trying to get it."

There is no doubt about the present opposition of the Soviet Government to world government. A Moscow newspaper recently assailed Cord Meyer, Jr., my predecessor as president of United World Federalists, as the figleaf of American imperialism. Molotov and Vishinsky have issued stern attacks upon the world government movement. Communist police have disbanded world government organizations in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Yet, we have seen many abrupt halts, sharp turns, and sudden about-faces in Soviet policy Responsible only to a handful of men, the Soviet Government can change its course overnight, quite unlike the United States Government which is dependent upon the will of a vast electorate.

If the Soviet Union comes to recognize, as we believe the United States is coming to recognize, that the present course leads directly to what will be the most destructive war in history, who can prove that they may not reconsider?

It is evident that in the Soviet Union, as in the United States, the task of preparing for war depletes resources, diverts manpower and machines from the production of consumer goods, and thereby depresses living standards. Under the burden of the arms race, how long can the Soviet leaders maintain morale within their far-flung political frontier?

Actually, no one can predict with certainty what the Soviet Union will do if the United States proposes the transformation of the United Nations into a limited world government. It is logical to assume, however, that the Russian reaction would depend to some extent upon the atmosphere in which the offer was made—upon whether or not it was a bona fide, serious offer made in good faith, and upon whether or not it was accompanied by threats of what the United States would do if Russia rejected the proposal.

It is our firm belief that the Russians would find it exceedingly difficult to turn down a genuine offer of world government. There is solid evidence that a great part of the non-Soviet world already favors world government, and would join with us in the effort to obtain it if we made it our objective. Faced by a demand from a great part of the world for the taking of this path, the Soviet Union, if it declined, would face complete isolation against a world united by a practical approach to the realization of mankind's age-old yearning for lasting peace.

We realize that the United Nations can really be no more effective than the great powers choose to make it, and that a greatly changed world political climate is a precondition to the establishment of a genuine world government. The passage of House Concurrent Resolution 64 would, we believe, be a concrete step toward that necessary improvement of the climate of world politics. It would cast a new light upon America's role in the world.

Believing as we do that the path to world government is through and not around the United Nations, we are lending all possible support to efforts to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations within the limitations of the present Charter. For example, United States Federalists have been fighting for the ceiling legislation which your committee recently endorsed, as well as for the United Nations Participation Act. We feel that the integrity of those who advocate world government can be measured by their support of the existing United Nations and of the other foreign-policy programs which contribute to the development of that world situation in which world government will become attainable.

Our present plea is that these and all measures of national defense can be made more meaningful if they occur within the context of the clearly defined foreign-policy objective embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 64.

We deeply believe that if the United Nations is to survive—and we with it—it must be supported and it must be strengthened.

The Late Honorable Richard J. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the passing of DICK WELCH is a great loss to the Congress and to the great State

of California, to which he was so loyal and which he loved so well.

I recall when I first came to the House of Representatives as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress how warm and friendly was the greeting I received from DICK WELCH, who was then the dean of the California congressional delegation. How willing he was to counsel and advise me as a new Member from his long experience as a Member of the House of Representatives for more than 20 years.

He was devoted to the problems of the men and women who work hard for a living. He was a vigorous advocate of the development of the national resources of the Nation and especially in California.

He had intimate knowledge of local problems having served as a Senator in the California Senate and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. He fought long, hard, and successfully for the construction of the great Bay Bridge at San Francisco and for the full development of the California Central Valley project.

We will miss DICK WELCH from the Halls of Congress. He leaves us with a great record of public service to his credit and one that his successor will find it difficult to equal or maintain.

Salvation Army Campaign in Utica, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the Salvation Army, Inc., will launch a campaign in Utica, N. Y., in my district for $100,000 to rebuild and refurnish their present headquarters, which serves the Utica area.

I think that the Members of the House will be interested in knowing of the splendid accomplishments of the Salvation Army in upstate New York, and how this new facility will enable this fine Christian organization to expand their humanitarian endeavors.

For 65 years the Salvation Army has been working in Utica, notably among the less fortunate members of society as well as being of real service to those who are in the more fortunate economic classes.

During these years its officers have made thousands of visits to private homes, prisons, hospitals, and institutions of various types comforting the bereaved, bringing cheer to the ill, and assisting the distressed by supplying material assistance and spiritual guidance.

The great works of this religious and humanitarian organization in both wars is very well known, but very often the work done locally escapes public attention as the work of the Salvation Army is done quietly and efficiently, and those who come to the army for help come in the sure knowledge that their problems will remain confidential and unpublicized.

Within the past few years, however, the character building, welfare program, youth program, and the many other activities of the local corps have been greatly expanded. The present Salvation Army Building in Utica has now become inadequate to meet future demands of service after a period of 40 years since its erection.

The Salvation Army has never before undertaken a campaign for building purposes in Utica, and it is now most imperative that proper facilities be given so that the structure may continue to serve the increasing public need.

The Honorable Earle C. Bastow, justice of the Supreme Court of New York, has consented to serve as general chairman of the forthcoming capital-fund-raising campaign for $100,000, and has been formally appointed by the president of our local citizens' advisory board, Mr. Dewey D. Hill.

The local corps commander, Major and Mrs. Royce W. Hawley, have served the Salvation Army in my district for more than 7 years with distinction, devotion, and honor, and it will afford a great sense of satisfaction and achievement to these local corps commanders, as well as to many of the citizens of Utica, to see a new building emerge from the old and dedicated to the combined great works of the Salvation Army.

Government Spending in the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, during my recent visit to the United Kingdom to study the British economy situation, I met there Constantine Brown, well-known commentator on foreign affairs. Mr. Brown was also in Europe to make some first-hand observations in order to report to the American people. I was extremely interested to read his column in the Washington Star on October 14, 1949, in which he emphasized the taxation phase of the British picture and the effect of the heavy taxation on the habits and thoughts of the average Englishman. I thoroughly agree with Mr. Brown's general views.

Taxes in this country during the past 12 years have been increasing at a fantastic rate. The Eighty-first Congress has increased expenditures enormously, over those of the Republican Eightieth Congress. The appropriations for this present fiscal year exceed those of the last fiscal year by about $5,500,000,000. Contract authorizations are one billion more than those approved by last year's Congress. So it is fair to say this Democratic Congress has approved six and one-half billion more in expenditures than did last year's Republican Congress.

In addition, other phases of the proposed Fair Deal program which have passed either one House, both Houses, or have been favorably reported by a committee of one House or the other, provide for new or additional expenditures in excess of $16,000,000,000 over and above present annual expenditures. This is in addition to the six and one-half billion referred to above. Of course, these new expenditures must mean higher and higher taxes, sooner or later. There is a real danger of our getting into the same trouble now plaguing the British economy. Indeed, we are already head-over-heels into it.

Many people in the United States today already find that a large portion of any increased earnings they may secure are taken by the Government and are not left to them to spend for their own needs and wants. This discourages these people and destroys their incentive and initiative. The pattern is identical. Only we have not gone so far along the road. In reading the article by Constantine Brown, I suggest you compare the British picture with present conditions in the United States as you yourself find them.

THIS CHANGING WORLD—BRITISH ECONOMIC RECOVERY DEBATABLE DESPITE DEVALUATION OF THE POUND

(By Constantine Brown)

LONDON.—The question of whether Britain can recover economically after devaluation of the pound is still a debatable topic in London economic and financial circles.

High taxation is killing incentive among the British people. Hence their lack of enthusiasm for work. Factory workers and other regimented classes have become used to very short rations and prefer more leisure to more work. White-collar workers feel the same way and businessmen and the few remaining capitalists are indifferent to the Government's appeal for greater effort to take advantage of the devalued pound in relation to the dollar, because there is not much profit in their increased efforts.

Most British and foreign observers attribute this state of mind to the unbelievably high rate at which the Government extracts taxes from its people.

EXAMPLES OF TAXATION

Taxation for a couple with one child starts with an earned income of 350 pounds a year (less than $1,000 at the present rate of exchange). But if the head of a family earns as much as $28,000 a year he has to hand over to the treasury $14,200. If a man—like Arthur Rankin, the movie producer—has an income of $280,000 a year, he has to pay the treasury $262,000.

Big industrialists and businessmen who are capable of earning large incomes and could invest their surplus in new enterprises are unable to do so, because the Government takes almost everything they earn.

As far as the working classes are concerned, other security taxes drain away their meager incomes. Over and above the income tax, which starts at a low level, they must pay $145 yearly for national health, unemployment, and pension benefits. A factory worker who earns $1,000 a year surrenders to the Government $160 in the form of direct taxes and contributions for his welfare, thus reducing to $840 his take-home pay. This is little over $15 a week.

But even this sum is not entirely clear. He has to pay indirect taxes, too. When he wants to buy a pair of shoes or a suit of clothes he has to pay a purchase tax which, while not very high, still makes a dent in his meager income.

The Government has guaranteed him against an increase in the cost of living. Food is strictly rationed and is bought at Government-controlled prices, which are reasonable. The lady of the house can purchase

about 25 cents worth of meat and two eggs per person per week. Restaurants and other public eating places cannot charge more than 75 cents for a three-course meal. There is no exception to this regulation.

When price controls were still in effect 2 years ago in France some industrialists, who were making good profits, contributed out of their own pockets to improve their employees' meals. They realized that it was hard to get real work out of men whose stomachs were still empty after eating a meal. They contributed substantially to give their workers a hearty midday dinner.

British industrialists cannot do this, because their earnings have been sliced so thin by taxation that they do not have enough profits left to engage in such generosity.

NO INCENTIVE TO WORKER

Devaluation of the pound could help British exports substantially. But whether the working people will be willing to increase present output, while taxes remain high, is a moot question. The existing workweek for British industry is about 40 hours, that is, 5 days of 8 hours each. From Friday evening until Monday morning English people go on holidays.

Industrialists contend that present output could be substantially improved only by working labor overtime. But so far there has been little response to this suggestion. Rank-and-file workers say that it is hardly worth their while to put in another 8 hours a week—on Saturdays, for instance—when the bulk of their additional earnings would have to go to the Government.

If a worker who makes $1,000 a year now and pays $15 income tax were to add another $140 a year to his income he would have to hand over to the Government $46 instead of $15. If by hard work he were to increase his earnings to 500 pounds a year (about $1,400) his income tax would go up to $112 a year.

There can be no incentive for any worker—unless he is under totalitarian compulsion—to increase his working hours by 8 hours a week in order to increase his net earnings by less than $4 a week.

A Congressman's Poem on Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following poem written by my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT HALE, of Maine, entitled "A Congressman's Farewell."

It has been my very great privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with Mr. HALE for a number of years, and also on the Subcommittee on Petroleum and Federal Power. He has made an outstanding record and we have profound respect and high admiration for his ability as a man and as an able Member of Congress. It has been my pleasure to know Mr. HALE intimately and we have found him to be very able in many fields. Among other things we find him writing poetry. Recently, a highly appropriate poem on the recess of the House of Representatives appeared in the New Yorker. As the Congress is adjourning, I think it highly appropriate that this poem be honored in the RECORD.

A CONGRESSMAN'S FAREWELL

Adieu, sweet dome. Ye roofless halls, adieu,
Where I have swinked and sweat the summer through,
Pondering the work of Messrs. TAFT and HARTLEY
Which we did not undo, not even partly;
Probing the problem of the Nation's health
And various plans for squandering its wealth;
Intent on coping with inflation's ills,
And with deflation's monetary chills;
Trying to chart an economic course,
Steered now by Keyserling and now by Nourse.
Now I suggest the absence of a quorum
Within the purlieus of our national forum.
No longer now the corridors athrong
With eager watchers working for the wrong.
Gone now the cameras and the lights of Klieg,
The news reporters running down intrigue,
The liberal prophets of the welfare state,
Whose minds grow narrow as their eyes dilate,
The orators who praise with deathless powers
This grea-ea-ea-ea-ea-eat land of ours.
Reigns silence now in caucus and committee
The lobbyists evacuate the city.
Investigators pause in their inquiries,
The diarists have nothing for their di'ries,
And those who've sold their worth for 5 percent
Are left to prosper in retirement.
Now may the uninvestigated Maragons
Resume their roles as princelings or as paragons.
The major generals in the Pentagon
Will not lament to see the summer gone.
The Capitol policeman on siesta
Dreams he's in Luxemburg with Mrs. Mesta.
Now pause, sweet hostess, pause in thy libation,
Nor mourn the vanished pillars of the Nation.
Peace, Wesley Heights, peace, Georgetown, Chevy Chase,
Peace, Silver Spring, peace almost any place.
A truce to dinners at the Carlton, Shoreham;
The Statler, Wardman Park, I can ignore 'em.
Adieu, sweet dome. Ye roofless halls, adieu.
I'll have you know I'm pretty pleased we're through
Until old Janus, with his double face,
Shall usher in another term of grace.

—ROBERT HALE,
Republican, Maine.

The Holiday for a Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to say "You have never been anywhere and you have never seen nuthin'," somebody said, until you have visited the Switzerland of America. I mean Vermont.

Despite all the braggadocio and the dollar language for which they pay, which the advertisers for the Northwest use, I tell you that you will never learn how complete a vacation can be had until you visit the magnificent Northeast. Why, "here in a single holiday is a delightful blending of scenic realms, the rushing rivers, the forest-locked lakes, the primitive mountain areas." You can but be enchanted with the cool, green beauty of our virgin forests, the atmosphere of mountain rangelands, the breath-taking grandeur of our valleys and our near-to-God geologic formations.

We have fine hotels, motels, cabins, woodland lodges, long trails, precipitous skiways. We have everything and a little better always than the Northwest offers. If you don't believe it, get a copy of Holiday magazine for the month of November and take a look at what Vermont has to offer.

We never did join the Thirteen Original Colonies nor the Union till we got ready. We were an independent republic. We still are such and we take no "sass" from a lot of these folks who spend their money undertaking to make you spend yours when you could spend it to greater advantage.

Come up and see us if you want to—spring, summer, fall or winter—we have something to offer for every season which cannot be equalled or excelled.

We have something to offer more substantial than scenery in a certain way—which means much to every Vermonter. The character of Vermonters, if I may be so bold as to assert the fact, is molded by the mountains. Rugged, I grant, but once you get to know us and we get to know you, which is a slow process, Vermont is the place to which to go and where to live.

An Interesting List of International Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House I am including herewith a list of international organizations, compiled by Mr. Clif Stratton, the well-known Washington correspondent of the Topeka Daily Capital, Topeka, Kans. Since our Government is more or less associated with these organizations, it occurred to me the list would be of interest. There are 227 of them. Mr. Stratton's statement follows:

Of the 227 international organizations, only 44 are directly under the United Nations Organizations, though some of the others work with UN international units.

All the 227 have at least a chairman, a secretary, and office help. Many of them have a secretariat of indetermined size; also technicians, attachés, doorkeepers, sergeant-at-arms, receptionists, stenographers, typists, file clerks, field agents, roving investigators, interpreters, chauffeurs, repair mechanics, offices and office help, counsel, assistant counsel, staffs of various kinds, and expense accounts.

Some of them undoubtedly doing worthwhile work. Others gather statistics. Others produce ideas. Others lead discussions that are even more consequential than the

Middle Age arguments over how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. Some of them just warm chairs.

Little has been overlooked. There is an International Astronomical Union; an International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation; an International Union for the Protection of Nature; an International Relief Union (not yet reorganized); a Provisional Frequency Board; a Permanent International Commission of Viticulture (dormant); a United Foreign Appeal, etc.

In the following list of international organization and their alphabetical abreviations, furnished through the research facilities and courtesy of the United States Department of Agriculture, (*) denotes an organization or commission of the United Nations; (**) a specialized agency of the United Nations:

ACWW—Associated Country Women of the World.

AEGTE—International Association for Exchange of Students for Technical Experience.

AIIPC—American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.

AIPPI—International Association for the Protection of Industrial property.

ASMFE—International Association of Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering.

BFMA—British Farm Mechanization Association

BICA—Bizonal International Control Association.

BIC—Ban for International Settlement.

CAB—Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau.

CARE—Committee for American Relief for Europe.

CC—Caribbean Commission.

CC of IAESC—Coffee Commission of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (successor to IACB).

*CCA—Commission for Conventional Armaments.

CCIF—International Telephone Consultative Committee.

CCIR—International Radio Consultative Committee.

CCIT—International Telegraph Consultative Committee.

CEEC—Committee for European Economic Cooperation (succeeded by OEEC).

CFM—Council of Foreign Ministers.

CIMTAC—Committee for International Marine Telecommunications, and Aviation Coordination.

CINA—International Commission for Air Navigation.

CIT—International Committee for Transport by Rail.

CITA—International Confederation of Agricultural Engineers and Technicians.

CITEJA—International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

CROP—Christian Rural Overseas Program.

CWCC—Children's World Community Chest.

ECA—Economic Cooperation Administration.

ECA—European Confederation of Agriculture (successor to ICA).

*ECAFE—Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (regional UN Commission.)

*ECE—Economic Commission for Europe (regional UN Commission).

*ECLA—Economic Commission for Latin America (regional UN Commission).

*ECME—Economic Commission for the Middle East (proposed).

ECO—European Coal Organization.

*ECOSOC—Economic and Social Council.

ECOSOC for OAS—Economic and Social Council for the Organization of American States.

*E and E—Economic and Employment Commission.

ERP—European Recovery Program (designates a plan, not an agency).

ETO—European Transportation Organization.

**FAC—Food and Agriculture Organization.

FBWW—International Federation of Buildings and Wood Workers (affiliate of WFTU).

*FEC—Far Eastern Commission (successor to FEAC).

FFJP—International Federation of Fruit-Juice Producers.

FITA—International Federation of Technical Agriculturists.

FWEA—International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations.

*GA—General Assembly of the United Nations.

GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (being serviced by UN).

GOC—Good Offices Committee (Indonesia).

IAA—International Apple Association.

IACB—Inter-American Coffee Board (succeeded by CC of IAESC).

IACCP—Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production.

IACW—Inter-American Commission (Congress) of Women.

IADB—Inter-American Defense Board.

IAIAS—Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

IAHA—International Animal Husbandry Association (proposed).

IAJC—Inter-American Juridical Committee.

IARA—Inter-Allied Reparations Agency.

IASC—International Association of Seed Crushers.

IASI—Inter-American Statistical Institute.

IATA—International Air Transport Association.

IATU—Inter-American Telecommunications Union.

IAU—International Astronomical Union.

IBC—International Boundary Commission.

IBE—International Bureau of Education.

**IBRD or IB—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

IBWM—International Bureau of Weights and Measures.

IBWS—International Bureau of Whaling Statistics.

ICA—International Confederation of Agriculture (succeeded by European Confederation of Agriculture—ECA).

ICA—International Cooperative Alliance.

ICAC—International Cotton Advisory Committee.

ICAE—International Commission of Agricultural Engineering.

ICAE—International Conference of Agricultural Economists.

ICAI—International Commission of Agricultural Industries.

ICAN—International Commission on Air Navigation.

**ICAO—International Civil Aviation Organization.

ICC—International Chamber of Commerce.

ICCBC—International Committee for Colorado Beetle Control.

ICCF—International Committee on Canned Foods (no longer in existence).

*ICF—International Children's Emergency Fund.

ICES—International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

ICG—International Congress of Genetics.

**ICITO—Interim Committee of the International Trade Organization.

*ICJ—International Court of Justice.

ICO—International Commission of Oceanography.

ICRC—International Committee on Red Cross.

ICRCP—International Center for Relief in Civilian Population.

ICSA—International Civil Service Agency.

ICSSW—International Committee of Schools for Social Work.

ICSU—International Council of Scientific Unions.

ICV—International Commission of Viticulture.

ICW—International Council of Women.

ICWG—International Cooperative Women's Guild.

ICWU—International Chemical Workers Union.

ICZN—International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature.

IDF—International Dairy Federation.

IDIS—International Dairy Industries Society.

IEFC—International Emergency Food Committee (of FAC).

IFAP—International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

IFO—International Fisheries Organization.

IFCTU—International Federation of Christian Trade Unions.

IFO—International Farmers Organization.

IFOG—International Federation of Olive Growers.

IGC—International Grassland Congress.

IGC or IGGCR—Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

IGU—International Geographical Union.

IHB—International Hydrographic Bureau.

IIA—International Institute of Agriculture (absorbed by FAO).

IIAA—Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

IICAF—Institute of International Collaboration in Agriculture and Forestry.

IIIC—International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation.

IIPF—International Institute for Public Finance.

*ILC—International Law Commission.

ILF—International Landworkers' Federation.

**ILO—International Labor Organization.

IMCO—Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (proposed).

**IMF—International Monetary Fund.

IMO—International Meteorological Organization.

INCAP—Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama.

IUPN—International Union for the Protection of Nature.

INS—International News Service.

IOE—International Office of Epizootics.

IOIE—International Organization of Industrial Employers.

IOJ—International Organization of Journalists.

IOPH—International Office of Public Health.

IPC—International Poplar Commission (sponsored by FAO).

IPCA—International Petroleum Cooperative Alliance.

IPFC—Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council (sponsored by FAO).

IPPC—International Penal and Penitentiary Commission.

IPU—Inter-Parliamentary Union.

IPU—International Population Union.

IRC—International Red Cross.

**IRO—International Refugee Organization.

IRSG—International Rubber Study Group.

IRU—International Relief Union (not yet reorganized).

ISC—International Sericulture Commission.

ISC—International Sugar Council.

ISI—International Statistical Institute.

ISO—International Organization for Standardization.

ISSS—International Society of Soil Science (dormant, to be reorganized in 1950).

ISTA—International Seed-Testing Association.

ITA—International Touring Association.

ITC—International Tea Committee.

ITC—International Tin Committee.

ITCOL—CFM Deputies for Italian Colonies.

**ITO—International Trade Organization (proposed).

**ITU—International telecommunications Union.

IUBS—International Union of Biological Sciences.

IUCW—International Union for Child Welfare.

IUGG—International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.
IUPAP—International Union of Pure and Applied Physics.
IUPIC—International Union for Protection of Industrial Property.
IWC—International Whaling Commission (proposed).
IWC—International Wheat Council.
IWO—International Wine Office.
IWS—International Wood Secretariat (nonofficial body).
IWSG—International Wool Study Group.
IWTO—International Wool Textiles Organization.
JATCC—Joint Aviation Telecommunications Coordination Committee.
JEIA—Joint Export-Import Agency (U. S. and U. K.).
JIC—Joint Intelligence Committee.
LAS—The League of Arab States.
LCWIO—Liaison Committee of Women's International Organization.
**MSC—Military Staff Committee.
NARBA—North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement.
NSGT—Non-Self Governing Territories.
OAC—Advisory Committee on Occupied Areas Affairs.
OAS—Organization of American States.
OEEC—Organization for European Economic Cooperation (Successor to CEEC).
OIR—International Broadcasting Organization.
OMGUS—Office of Military Government (U. S.).
PACB—Pan American Coffee Bureau.
PAFC—Philippines-American Financial Commission.
PAIGH—Pan American Institute of Geography and History.
PARC—Pan American Railway Congress.
PASB—Pan American Sanitary Bureau.
PAU—Pan American Union (General Secretariat of OAS).
*PC—Preparatory Commission (of the United Nations).
PCA—Policy Committee on Arms and Armaments.
PCA—Permanent Court of Aribtration.
PCC—Palestine Conciliation Commission.
*PCOB—Permanent Central Opium Board.
PFB—Provisional Frequency Board.
PIARC—Permanent International Association of Road Congresses.
PIBAC—Permanent International Bureau of Analytical Chemistry.
PICAO—Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.
PICU—Permanent International Commission of Viticulture (dormant).
PIN—Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
PMCC—Provisional Maritime Consultative Council.
PSFC—International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.
PUA—Pacific Union Association (Congress).
PUAS—Postal Union of the Americas and Spain.
PUC—Public Utilities Committee (of ECE).
RIIA—Royal Institute of International Affairs.
*SC—Security Council of the United Nations.
SCAP—Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers.
SCIU—Save the Children International Union (amalgamated with IUCW).
*SCTU—Security Council Truce Commission (Palestine).
SPC—South Pacific Commission.
TCC—Transport and Communication Commission (functional commission of the United Nations).
UFA—United Foreign Appeal.
UFRO—International Union of Forest Research Organizations (sponsored by FAO).
UIA—Union of International Associations.
UIR—International Broadcasting Union.
UMCC—United Maritime Consultative Council.
*UN—United Nations.
*UNAC—United Nations Appeal for Children.
*UNAEC—United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.
*UNCFI—United Nations Commission for Indonesia.
*UNCIP—United Nations Commission for India-Pakistan.
**UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
*UNCOK—United Nations Commission on Korea (successor to UNTCOK).
*UNGA—United Nations General Assembly.
*UNLC—United Nations Liaison Committee.
*UNRA—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (no longer in existence).
*UNRPR—United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees.
*UNSCOB—United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans.
*UNSCOP—United Nations Special Commission on Palestine.
*UNWCC—United Nations War Crimes Commission.
*UNTCOK—United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (succeeded by UNCOK).
**UPU—Universal Postal Union.
USUN—United States Mission to the United Nations.
WFMH—World Federation for Mental Health.
WFTU—World Federation of Trade Unions.
WFUNA—World Federation of United Nations Associations.
**WHO—World Health Organization.
WMA—World Medical Association.
**WMO—World Meteorological Organization (proposed).
WPSA—World's Poultry Science Association.
WTAA—World Trade Alliance Association.

"Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

Nourse on Way Out Lays Fire on Ills of Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred Friendly from the Washington Post of October 19, 1949:

HITS TRUMAN SPENDING POLICY—NOURSE ON WAY OUT LAYS FIRE ON ILLS OF NATION'S ECONOMY

(By Alfred Friendly)

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, resigning chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, yesterday treated himself to the pleasure of being impolitic—or nonpolitical—in public.

First, he took out directly after the Administration itself for its present deficit spending policy, and the farm program it has supported.

Second, he denounced the administration's two most potent political allies, labor and farmers, for trying to get a larger share of the economic pie through subsidies, pensions, and higher wages with less work.

HITS AT HIGH PRICES

Finally, he lashed out against his favorite economic villainy, the refusal by business to cut prices and thus maintain maximum production.

Nourse's views on these subjects are well-known within the council. In fact, controversy over these matters between him on one side and his council colleagues and the Administration on the other is one of the reasons why he submitted his resignation last August.

It may also be one of the reasons why this time, as distinct from his previous attempts to resign, the White House appears to be willing to let him go.

But yesterday was the first time Nourse has sounded off quite so uninhibited in kicking the shins of Mr. Truman, to whom he stands in the role of chief economic adviser.

The occasion was an address to the Golden Anniversary Convention of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association at the Mayflower Hotel. This was scarcely a group that would be cheered at hearing a complaint against agricultural subsidies.

REVIEWS PREDICTIONS

Nourse began by reviewing highly optimistic predictions as to the future state of our economic expansion. But those predictions, he reminded his audience, refer only to potentials. Constant improvement, with an ever-rising standard of living, is not automatic. It won't just happen.

The march of economic progress from here on in should be greater, he said, than it has been in the past. But the dreams will go glimmering, he said, unless we make them come to pass.

But, Nourse went on, when he took a look about, "I am filled with real concern. I cannot indulge in easy optimism."

Here was his pessimistic view on labor:

"As an economist I do not see standards of life being raised adequately out of enlarged production when a great labor organization sees the current situation as the occasion for a reduction in the hours of work (to 35 or 30) * * * or when the czar of coal orders a 3-day week with full pay for a redundant labor force and when pensions at 60 are demanded for a population steadily becoming longer lived."

TARGETS OF REMARKS

The crack about the reduction in hours was leveled at the AFL; that about the 3-day week in coal at, of course, John L. Lewis; that about pensions at both Lewis and the CIO.

The charge against business came in this paragraph:

"I am filled with apprehension, too, when I look at management and see it choosing the costs of banked fires rather than capitalistically venturesome reexamination of their practices of accounting and their theories of price making."

The farm bloc got its come-uppance with:

"I am uneasy when I see farmers demanding stimulative prices whilst Government accumulates gigantic surplus holdings, pays subsidies out of Federal deficits, and imposes production allotments and marketing quotas."

On Mr. Truman's fiscal policy he declared:

ON FISCAL POLICY

"I am not happy either when I see Government slipping back into deficits as a way of life in a period when production and employment are high, instead of putting its fiscal house in order and husbanding reserves to support the economy if less prosperous times overtake us."

In case anyone—particularly the folk across the street at the White House—failed to catch that point, Nourse concluded:

"We must * * * recognize * * * that monetary and fiscal tricks have no power or magic, but are a slippery road to misery."

Prize Essay of Miss Betty Ann Farrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which was written by Miss Betty Ann Farrell, of St. Xavier's Academy, Providence, R. I. Miss Farrell's article received a third place prize in the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Essay Contest held a short time ago. In view of the fact that this was a national contest I feel justly proud of her accomplishment and join with my fellow citizens of Rhode Island in extending to her our hearty congratulations. Not only has her work materially aided the cause of the physically handicapped but it has brought honor to her State, to the good sisters of mercy who run St. Xavier's Academy and in a large measure to Miss Farrell, herself. Her letter follows:

MR. AMERICAN EMPLOYER,
Everywhere, United States.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on behalf of a friend of mine, Joe Wilkes. Perhaps you remember the fellow who came to your office last week looking for a clerical position. Since he had experience and noteworthy references, you almost hired him until he turned and you noticed his left sleeve tucked into the pocket of his gray suit. Yes, Joe was an amputee; he lost his arm in an auto accident, so you stammered, "Sorry, no work just now—take your name and address." When Joe left your office dejectedly he realized, as you did, that you would never employ him because you did not want a handicapped worker. But I have one question to ask you, "Why not hire the handicapped?"

Did you fear that workman's compensation and sick benefit rates would be upped? This is an unfair, illogical rumor easily circulated because of its sensationalism. The formulas for determining rates are based on the relation of accident costs to the total pay roll and the relative hazards in work, not on the kind of personnel hired. As a matter of fact, these companies encourage the employment of the handicapped. No study has ever indicated impaired workers more liable to illness or injury. In fact, they have been proved actually safer than able-bodied workers.

Or perhaps you thought unimpaired employees achieved higher efficiency ratings. In a recent survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 87 percent of the impaired workers were reported as efficient as the unimpaired doing the same work; and the 8 percent declared more efficient outweighed the 5 percent reported less. Apparently they apply the courage, patience, and determination necessary for overcoming handicaps to their jobs. Having refuted this fallacy, let us turn to the next, the deception that absenteeism and labor turn-over increase.

The same survey disproves this by ascertaining that 49 percent of the impaired workers had a better absentee record than their fellow workers while 44 percent had no worse. Similarly job changes occurred less frequently among them with 31 percent reported as having a turn-over record comparable to that of the unimpaired and 58 percent a better record. This remarkable achievement may be ascribed to the fact that they have found it much more difficult to secure a position than their more fortunate fellow workers, and, therefore, they exert greater effort to keep it since they fully comprehend that their entire future depends upon its success.

Were you afraid that a handicap would require special attention? Most workers do not demand, even resent, this. To cite an example best proves this theory. A blind girl employed in a factory was placed in a room with only two other girls. Although her employer had thought that he was doing her a favor, she felt that she was being segregated because of her handicap. You see, they desire to prove to themselves and to others that, given equal chances, they are competent or better than their coworkers. As for the complaint that other employees would object, experience shows that fellow employees can work with handicapped persons without restraint or discomfort. Oftentimes their hiring results in better morale.

From the standpoint of money alone, it is not charity to employ the physically impaired, it is common sense. As a taxpayer and businessman, you have a financial interest in the unemployed handicapped. To deny work is an expensive mistake since the cost to maintain a disabled person in dependence year after year can never be repaid. Yet the cost to rehabilitate is an investment paid only once and every rehabilitated worker reimburses the Government with $10 in Federal income taxes for every dollar expended on him.

Can there be any more reasons for not hiring the handicapped? Their employability can no longer be questioned, so let us now proceed to the fulfillment of our responsibility. This obligation cannot be denied. All members of society, especially people like you, Mr. Employer, are concerned. When we consider the estimate of 6,250,000 disabled persons in the United States, the magnitude of the employment problem confronts us since only 6,000,000 are employed. Wasted manpower means national weakness.

Our heads and hearts alike dictate that we offer the physically impaired a job—a correct job. One that will not place undue demands on his incapacities, but will emphasize his unimpaired capabilities so that he can meet or surpass an employee's safety and productivity standards and at the same time build his own self-confidence and self-respect by not being a ward of society. Throughout all history it has been demonstrated that disability never impedes success. We know, for example, that Julius Caesar was an epileptic, Napoleon suffered from skin and stomach diseases; one of our greatest poets, Milton, was blind; the immortal musician, Beethoven, was deaf as was Thomas Edison, the renowned inventor; and our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was a victim of polio. To succeed, however, a man must be placed at work which requires his remaining abilities, a difficult task. To eliminate these difficulties, the Veterans' Administration and United States Employment Service has developed a technique called selective placement, by which they utilize and develop the handicapped person's talents to the fullest extent to insure maximum possibility of success. First they survey the physical requirements of a job's operation, then they evaluate the individual's capacities; finally, they match the man to the job. They continue his proper placement by controlling the transfer and replacement of disabled workers to prevent assignment to improper jobs and they inform the employer of his capabilities, accenting his ability not disability. Now that this service has eliminated all guesswork and complications for you, why not take advantage of it? Survey your plant, select jobs that can be handled by trained handicapped workers, then list your job openings with the local employment service. The Government has set a good example, let industry follow it.

Handicaps without employment are national liabilities, with suitable jobs they are assets to themselves, their employees, their community, and to America. They deserve your cooperation, not prejudice—they are your relatives, friends, neighbors; they live in your town, perhaps on your street. You are responsible for them. Joe may never return to your office; he was too disappointed, but I hope that when the next impaired worker comes to you, don't think of his disability, consider his ability. Shake his hand and say, "Yes, I have a job for you." With those seven words you will be doing your share for greater production, greater efficiency, for a greater America.

Sincerely yours,

BETTY ANN FARRELL.

Townsend Old-Age-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Gould Lincoln, appearing in the Washington Evening Star, which should prove of great interest to Members:

TOWNSEND OLD-AGE-SECURITY PROGRAM

(By Gould Lincoln)

Dr. Francis Everett Townsend, pioneer old-age-pension planner, says things are looking up for the Townsend program. The people, he insists, are more and more pension-conscious, demanding security for their old age. He cites, for example, the fight which is being made by the steelworkers, the coal miners, and auto workers for adequate pensions on retirement. He backs this up with the drive made by the Truman administration for a broadened and deepened Social Security Act—the House already has passed such a bill. It's all down his alley, Dr. Townsend claims.

Eighty years old and still going strong, the man who startled the country 16 years ago with his demand that a law be enacted to provide a $200-a-month pension for every person in the country 60 years old and over has again been in Washington lining up support for a revised Townsend old-age-pension bill. Under the new measure a 3-percent gross tax is to be levied on income—business and individual personal income—and the proceeds are to be distributed monthly to persons 60 years and over—if they retire—and to the incapacitated.

Dr. Townsend figures that the pension, at the start of the program, might be as low as $100 a month, but that once the program was in full swing, with the pension money expended each month and thereby increasing jobs and production, it would not be long before the pension will increase to $200, $300, or even $400 a month. The first $250-a-month income is to be exempt from the tax.

HITS PATCHWORK PROGRAM

Dr. Townsend has little use for the social-security program—which he insists the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his aides thought up to head off the Townsend plan in the early thirties. Nor does he see much virtue in the program which organized labor is demanding from management. The social-security program, he says, is a patchwork, inadequate plan at best. He does not believe the new bill is at all the answer.

So Dr. Townsend is planning a campaign for the election of a Townsend-plan Congress next year. All he has to do, he says, is get 10 percent of the voters to go along with him in each congressional district and he can hold the balance of power on election day. He contends that in the present House 139 Members had the Townsend indorsement when they were elected. He is therefore organizing in every district, so as to bring pressure on the candidates for the House and for the Senate.

As an evidence of strength, Dr. Townsend points out that a drive for signatures to discharge the House Ways and Means Committee from further consideration of the Townsend bill—sponsored by Representatives BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and ANGELL, of Oregon, and others—has already produced 167 signatures of the necessary 218. If he can get the other 51, the Townsend bill will be brought before the House for a vote. According to Dr. Townsend, the defeat of former Representative Harold Knutson, of Minnesota, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the Eightieth Congress, was brought about by the Townsendites, because of Mr. Knutson's hostility to the old-age-pension plan. The Townsend bill is sponsored in the Senate by Senators PEPPER, of Florida; DOWNEY, of California; THOMAS, of Oklahoma, and LANGER, of North Dakota.

STARTED PLAN IN DEPRESSION

Dr. Townsend is the pioneering, crusading type. A country doctor for years in the Black Hills country of South Dakota, he removed to California, where he eventually retired and lived in Long Beach. It was then he became enraged over the plight of the old people—during the depths of the depression—and started out to organize his old-age-pension campaign. His organization grew and grew. Its funds were considerable, and a House committee undertook an investigation. The line of questioning so angered Dr. Townsend that he walked out. He was later cited for contempt of the House, was sentenced to jail and to pay a fine. President Roosevelt, however, on the recommendation of the Speaker of the House and other House leaders, pardoned Dr. Townsend, just as he was about to step into the jail.

The passage by the House recently of the social-security bill brought from Representative NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, Republican, announcement he had signed the Townsend petition. He said when he compared the two programs, "I am convinced the Townsend plan is to be preferred."

The House bill, Representative MASON said, proposes the Federal Government shall collect from $6,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 a year in pay-roll taxes and spend it for Government expenses. The Townsend plan calls for raising a similar sum to be handed out immediately to the old people of the Nation.

America Needs You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Earl Bunting, managing director, National Association of Manufacturers, before the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association, Chattanooga, Tenn., on Tuesday evening, October 18. Mr. Bunting pays just tribute to the indomitable spirit of the South and calls upon businessmen and all other citizens to aggressively seek to protect the American way of life. Mr. Bunting's address follows:

Some four score years ago, on the heights around this very spot, men were engaged in a battle for their ideals—for the preservation of which neither side proposed any surrender.

Chickamauga, Missionary Ridge, Lookout Mountain—and all those other battles for freedom as men fought for it—were bitterly contested. Massed battalions of valiant men on both sides gave their lifeblood.

Great economic and political problems were involved—problems of such magnitude and extent that men were unwilling to take any answer to them except that which they met at the cannon's mouth.

Few of the men who fought and suffered agony and died were professional soldiers.

One who was wounded was asked why he fought so hard when he knew he was licked.

I think his answer is a great American answer for all time.

"I'm fighting for my rights," he said. "I'm not licked."

When he learned that individual rights were being questioned—as both sides saw it—he came to meet the issue head-on.

Americans were like that, four score years ago. And because they gave everything they had to what they stood for—their spirit, their ideals, still live in American hearts today.

You can't defeat that kind of man.

When the last smoke of battle cleared away, there was only one thing to do. In the South and in the North that kind of man rolled up his shirt sleeves and went to work—hard, purposeful building up. Out of such Americans' determined efforts came our United States—one of the few lands in all the world where individual rights and responsibilities still have a fighting chance.

This building of America's united strength—man by man, farm by farm, factory by factory, in every man's home town—was nowhere more remarkable than in the Southern States. Manpower and materials had been bled white. The entire currency was wiped out.

Dollars such as this crisp Confederate note with its steel engraving of a battle scene once represented the entire operating capital, wages, and purchasing power of the South—every dollar in any man's pocket. Overnight they no longer represented anything on God's green earth.

There was nothing left except faith, courage, the unvanquished determination and hard work that lay ahead of the southern people.

Added to their faith in the future—faith in their personal ability and responsibility to shoulder their share and to shape their part of the future of this land—was one more golden key to the American people's greatness.

Their self-determination kindled faith in other parts of this country, and in other parts of the world. From outside the South, men staked their savings on the kind of people who didn't know when they were licked. Those savings invested in the South—and invested in every community throughout our land—are what it everlastingly takes to multiply human effort and get the kind of results that all Americans hope for. Together they accomplish the all-American miracle of everlastingly having what it takes.

The battle of Lookout Mountain was only one lifetime ago. In that span of time, the spirit of individual drive and fair rewards has built our country as no other land was ever built.

Tonight this annual dinner of the Manufacturers Association of Chattanooga is living proof of the solid recovery which has been built up from bedrock throughout our great southland. Built up by men who rolled up their shirt sleeves and rolled up a record of which America is proud.

Chattanooga is a great chapter in the way the American people know how to build. It is a manufacturing center of great national importance. The productive might of the whole Nation is ably represented by some 450 factories within a 25-mile radius, making 1,500 different kinds of products.

This is the American people's enterprise system doing America's job, venturing savings, improving skills, expanding opportunities.

The creative force of these factories is broad and inclusive. They provide a richer market for the splendid farms all around us. They mean a better living to all professional people, distributors and workers in the service industries. They spell more money to buy things—more and better things to buy—and more earned leisure for the whole American people to live in—to learn in—to devote to civic progress and the self-government of a free people.

The men and women of this deep-rooted American community are still shaping their own futures—shaping their own part of the sum total of America's prosperity and cultural achievements. It is in communities like this throughout our land that Americans live their lives and America's work gets done. It is rights and responsibilities such as these—freedom to do a job well, freedom to thrive—that the whole American people do not want any government—including their own—to take from them or encroach upon.

Every step of the long road of progress along which this typical American community has come since the War Between the States was taken because the people of Chattanooga were self-reliant, they were courageous, they were determined, they were tireless.

It was taken because they had faith that their present efforts could pay off in future rewards—in fair rewards for all the economic, all the civic, and all the professional and cultural contributions it takes to make any community—and all America—forge ahead.

They bought and paid for their great progress by their own hard work, by their own thrift, and by their wholehearted teamwork.

The descendants of the lean trail blazers of Tennessee know how to meet internal dissension and infiltration and apathy—head on. They are more than a match for the domestic reactionaries who want this Government to be vested with paternalistic power—power for those who hide behind big government's coattails clamoring for more and more centralized power—more and more intervention in all other peoples' lives—to serve their own interests and to save their own hides.

I do not need to tell you that the creative, venturous spirit—this mainspring of the whole American peoples' greatness—has been seriously tampered with.

Americans have the right to be enterprising. But with every right goes an equal responsibility.

As I see it, the businessmen of America are fully answerable to the American people for their timid and totally inadequate defense of the economic freedom that has been taken from us in our time.

There was glamour for the big, top leaders in the days of the carriage trade. Today, in his dress and in his means of travel, you can't tell the head of a business from most of the people associated with him in his office or in his shop. But the same courage, determination, and ability are still in existence to perform the same useful function for the community and for the Nation. America needs them.

It is not only businessmen who can provide leadership. The educator is another who is looked up to by all the community and should be consulted on all important local and national problems.

The educator of today possesses qualities which are important to the community and to the Nation.

Dr. David Lockmiller, the distinguished president of the old but superbly new-minded University of Chattanooga, is an example to all of us. No businessman carries greater responsibility or has greater pressure to excuse himself from activities over and above his own top-flight job.

What America wants, and desperately needs, from you is full civic participation such as David Lockmiller devotes to his community to the advancement on every front of this great city.

Like Dr. Lockmiller, the men who fought for and founded this country, the men who fought out American issues and worked out the reconstruction of our reunited land, looked to themselves for leadership.

Where else, how else, can it be found today?

Our free Nation was not created without man-sized material to go into it. Men learned self-government—learned to lead—in their own self-governing communities.

It was out of these good and sufficient—responsible and responsive—individual units that our national freedom was built.

I know of no other way that it can ever be preserved.

It seems to me that of all the leaders in American communities the businessman bears the greatest responsibility for building freedom from the ground up—building good National Government out of good local government.

Too many Americans want their Government to build homes for them, pay their doctor and hospital bills, and generally guarantee their needs from the cradle to the grave.

Some Americans want the Government to lower prices of the things they buy. Others want the Government to raise prices of the things they sell.

Too many Americans want the Government to fix the wages and hours of all employees, and to provide for those who don't like the kind of employment they can obtain.

In brief, many people want the Government to support them with funds obtained by taxing away the livelihood and opportunities of the vast majority of Americans who prefer to earn their own living and lead their own lives.

Every good citizen is in favor of prosperity, security, health, good housing, and plenty of job opportunities. But it is the citizens, not their Government, who create, who produce, who earn these most desirable things.

Thoughtful Americans are opposed to promises that Government will provide these things for everyone. They are opposed to such promises, because they are false, because they cannot be kept, because Government is a consumer, not a producer.

Taxes that confiscate incentives also confiscate the American people's means to prosper and build security.

There are those who say that Government can always borrow money.

These economic assassins pretend that Government can go on borrowing and printing money indefinitely, without ever reaching the same day of reckoning that individuals reach when they borrow far beyond their capacity to pay.

If the Government supports everybody, then who will support the Government?

Big Government has definitely bulged over into the economic life of this Nation.

And I think that the public interest, the effective defense of the American people's freedom where it is most threatened today, will be best served by forthright, businesslike leadership in civic affairs where people live.

Every citizen shares this responsibility with the individual businessman. There is no monopoly on civic leadership. But there are times when I fear that many businessmen feel they are expected to take only the most passive part in civic life.

True, effective, American leadership is not and never was passive.

What true liberals once achieved, true liberals are fighting to conserve today. And the freedom which was once wrested from the tyranny of kings, is now in England and elsewhere tyrannized and taxed within an inch of its life by a new socialized force of reaction disguised as the welfare state.

The powerful few in the Kremlin never fail to cloak their most arbitrary abuses in the name of public welfare and necessity. This is the pattern for all dictatorships.

What is happening in America is what has already happened in England.

There the bureaucrats are furthering softening up a once free and mighty economy—a no longer free economy which is already on the road to total power, already in the hands of the few who plan and regiment and ration because incentives have been taxed away.

This means that there are no longer productive tools to earn fair rewards for the British Labor government's own disillusioned rank and file.

This is well illustrated by the findings of the Anglo-American Council for Productivity. One of its first teams, consisting of British representatives from both labor and management, jointly and harmoniously reported that:

"The alternative to higher production is starvation. When that is understood, not only intellectually but also emotionally, something will be achieved. * * *

"Some form of direct incentive is essential, and the incentive must be properly shared by manual workers, supervisors, managers, and technicians, and, in fairness by owners and investors also. The customers must gain through reduced prices."

Whatever happens elsewhere, America owes it to herself and to her friends to build the strength that it takes to keep freedom strong, vigorous, alert.

Americans are cheerfully and willingly honoring their obligation to our allies in western Europe. The Marshall plan was conceived with this objective as well as to give the fullest possible measure of our assistance in their economic rehabilitation.

The people of America know the problem of reconstruction. Here in Chattanooga and throughout the entire South, Americans have proved it can be done magnificently. We hope that the strength which our western European allies lost during the war can be restored, and out of that restoration will come peace built upon a better way of life for people all over the world.

We can't pay our debts of honor and we can't provide the resources necessary for economic rehabilitation unless we remain strong in our own country.

With every desire to really aid, we view with sympathetic concern the problems which those ccuntries face. But we believe that their socialistic experiments are their greatest handicap toward working out their own problems in their own countries.

Most Americans consider that the problems in England which lead to measures such as the recent devaluation of the British pound are not things we can do anything about in this country—except to avoid in America such mistakes as have been made in foreign lands.

Knowledge of American productive methods is being learned abroad—as indicated by the findings of the Anglo-American Council for Productivity, from which I quoted a minute ago. With this knowledge there often comes a new insight into the realities of the American way of life.

Not long ago, in Detroit some workers from Italy were being shown America's factories and production methods. When one of the Italians was asked what he was going to tell the folks back home about America he said: "Well, the biggest surprise is that American workers don't have to worry about having cars. What they have to worry about is where to park them."

Let us briefly note some of the obvious things that have brought and are bringing this country away from the productive strength that still makes ours the land of opportunity for all. Let's take a look at some very specific steps in our own land that are on the downhill toboggan slide of collectivism—not the American people's highway of progress and prosperity.

Specifically: Federal spending and tax policies in America are drying up venture capital—just as long continued confiscatory tax policies have already dried up British hopes for the jobs, opportunities, productive power, purchasing power, and the progress that goes with a free, expanding, everyone-rewarding economy.

Specifically again: Controls—which in Britain first cut the heart out of business and now are taking the heart out of labor as well—are attempted in this country whenever the slightest excuse arises.

There has been no lack—there will be no lack—of excuses and crises if the advocates of supergovernment have their way. In the last analysis it takes nothing short of regimentation to make controls get even half way to first base. And they know it.

You who are here with me know that American business is the most competitive on earth. And that we look to the Government to enforce the laws regarding fair competitive practices.

What we do not look to Government for is the pretense that small business should be penalized and liquidated for growing big through rendering increasing service.

What we do not look to Government for is its repeated attacks on the freedom to be enterprising, productive, or successful.

Frankly I think that the limitation of economic freedom is in no small measure due to the fact that too many businessmen take this constant interference without making it their business to arouse their own communities to an understanding of what this means to all Americans—and to their freedom.

This is not—this never could be—the issue of one political party.

Two months ago former President Hoover declared that most Americans do not realize that our Nation is blissfully driving down a back road at top speed on "the last mile of collectivism."

From the other great political party, former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes said this summer: "We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up, no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

If you—if every businessman does not now make it his personal responsibility to lead—where informed, responsible leadership counts most—where you live and where the American people live and earn their living—it is you, your fellow citizens, your fellow workers in the factory and the office—who will all pull their hearts out on the medieval oars of an impersonal, slave-propelled ship of state. It used to be called serfdom. Now it is called welfare.

As a citizen and as a businessman, I believe that every manufacturer—every member of industrial management whether foreman or factory head—and every businessman from the Gulf to the Great Lakes—has a special responsibility to his own community.

He owes it every ounce of leadership he possesses or can develop. He owes this forthright leadership in the field of public affairs as well as economics.

To be brutal about it, thousands of American businessmen are suffering from hot heads and cold feet.

And if they don't get quickly over that, they—their communities—their employees—and all their fellow citizens from Tallahassee to Tacoma—will come to the dead end of keeping their feet warm on the socialist's treadmill.

It was no time for faint hearts and weak knees in 1776, when the rest of the world was bullied and overruled by kings and their conniving henchmen.

This is no time for ducking issues and giving ground today—in a world now bullied and knocked flat by dictatorships and almost equally monopolistic forms of socialism—which regiment nations in the name of welfare—which strip labor of its rights and fair rewards under the false face of labor's own government.

Against these gigantic political monopolies of great personal power, the individual may seem tiny and ineffective—if he is willing to see himself that way.

How big is a man? They come tall in Tennessee—from the first pioneers who made it their business to be wherever freedom was threatened, whenever it was threatened.

America's problems are still man-size—or can be whittled down to just that.

Most of them can be met in our own communities—or by representatives chosen in our communities with the same care that we use in choosing our job, our doctor, or a home for our family to live in.

Good citizenship is no less important than all these things.

Problems that business faces are not ours alone. And the leadership that it takes to meet them can never come only from bankers, manufacturers and merchants. But it must also come from those other businessmen, the farmers. And from that great group of businesswomen—the home managers of America.

It must come from professional men and women of America. And it must come from the hearts of all the individual men and women who get America's work done.

All are perfectly capable of understanding that no government can support its people for the long pull. Instead, they support government. All that government can do for them is to provide and protect the atmosphere of freedom and fair play in which people can forge ahead and shape their own futures.

American intelligence, courage, and initiative is not and never was confined to top leadership.

American people should be better informed than ever before. The American home is equipped with means of intelligence such as the leaders of any age might well envy—books, newspapers, magazines, the radio and now television. There is more leisure to think America's problems through, as well as better-trained minds to arrive at sound decisions.

But this increases our direct, personal responsibility to alert * * * to inform * * * to lead America up the road on which all progress has been made. It is the road of men who forthrightly reject the whole fraud that security can be achieved by waiving a wand called welfare.

There is absolutely no getting away from the fact that security must be earned—by people. If we don't provide our own security—out of our own savings—the only possible alternative is that others have to work that much harder to foot the bill.

This means that certain, special, selfish groups are being provided special privileges and personal benefits at the expense of all the people. It is this abuse of the American people—this downhill and dishonest tobogganing of big government and its henchmen—that we forthrightly reject.

Those who are leading the downhill run into the bottomless pit of power concentrated in a few political hands, are doing an always energetic and frequently effective job of breaking down the freedom of every individual.

What are you—the individual businessmen of America—doing to defend freedom from that attack?

The front line of the battle for freedom—for individual rights, for personal, responsible action—today lies in good civic leadership throughout every American community.

It lies squarely at your doorstep.

America needs you—and all that you have to give this top-flight job.

No Welfare State for the United States of America, Says Commander of the American Legion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by National Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion before the annual AFL convention in St. Paul, Minn., October 7, 1949:

Mr. Green and my friends of the American Federation of Labor, as national commander of the American Legion, representing the leadership of a new generation of veterans, I welcome this privilege of speaking before the annual convention of The American Federation of Labor.

I am genuinely happy to repay here today, the visit of your President William Green to the thirty-first national convention of the American Legion in Philadelphia last month. I am more than pleased to continue the interchange of the top spokesmen of the AFL and the American Legion at their respective annual conventions. It was first started by that illustrious leader of American labor, the late Samuel Gompers. It has been carried on for many years by your present chief, William Green, and by a succession of national commanders of the American Legion.

For 31 years our two organizations have pursued the common objective of keeping America always American. This means specifically the preservation of all of our cherished free institutions but primarily a free labor and a free industry working together in a free economy.

I emphasize this because no man anywhere in the world can be economically dependent and at the same time politically independent.

We have made America a stronghold of human freedom because here we have built political liberty on the foundation of economic liberty. Our No. 1 common job today is to preserve the economic cornerstones of our political freedom. Those cornerstones are being hacked away at today for all sides. They are the main objectives of the onslaughts of communism and its evil handmaiden, statism. If those cornerstones should crumble, then our whole structure of political liberty will come down in a mighty crash that will mark the end of what we are pleased to call the American way of life.

For that reason I consider my appearance before you here today as the most important engagement that I shall have to keep as national commander of the American Legion. I feel strongly that the time has come when organized labor and organized veterans must understand each other better and must work more closely together.

The AFL and the American Legion are both great and influential organizations numbering their memberships by the millions. While the purposes of the AFL and the American Legion may not be the same in all respects, we are united in our broad objectives. I shall never, for my part, accept the concept that the members of our two organizations are not loyal American citizens first before they are unionists or before they are legionnaires.

As national organizations we have both demonstrated our devotion to American ideals in many ways. We have both supported our Government with our all-out efforts to win World Wars I and II. Look at how both the AFL and the American Legion have fought, are fighting and will continue to fight communism and all other un-American "isms."

The American Legion is proud of the fight which the American Federation of Labor is now conducting against communism overseas. We are aware of your effective work in Europe and in the Far East in helping to promote the development of a free labor movement. This is one of the essential foundations for establishing democratic ways of life in countries that have for ages been tied only to autocratic institutions. We think the AFL is making a grand contribution through this educational movement abroad to the building of a brave new world.

But we must fight communism at home just as strenuously as we seek to restrain it abroad.

Today the future security of our country demands as never before that organized labor and organized veterans stand shoulder to shoulder in presenting a united front against the dangers that threaten our very existence as a free people.

These dangers are real and present. I repeat—real and present.

They have already reached the point of emergency peril to all of our free institutions.

Those institutions include all of our great free organizations, preeminent among which are the grass roots American organizations of free labor and free veterans.

The chief menace of communism to human liberty lies in the versatility of its attacks.

Communism is as cunning as it is vicious. It strikes from every direction. It hits openly and it hits covertly. It masquerades under countless fronts. It has atomic bombs against both mental and physical barriers.

Today America must gear her defenses against attacks that can come from without at any moment as well as against growing assaults already under way from within.

We must be prepared against a surprise stab at our flesh and blood with the latest scientific weapons. The job of readying for that rightly belongs in the hands of our national security experts. We must back them with everything we have, including our confidence, our all-out support, and our tax dollars. This is a course of common sense and of prudence. To fail in this would be courting national suicide.

But all of our military preparedness will avail us nothing if we lose the growing battle with infiltering alien philosophies for the possession of our minds. This is the fight against the evil influences of communism that is now raging with increasing tempo within America. It is marked by the drive

of termite operations aimed at rotting the idealistic foundations upon which all the ramparts of our freedoms are built.

May I impress this upon you. This fight in our land against the inroads of communism, socialism, and every other foreign "ism" cannot be won by the American Federation of Labor alone. It cannot be won by the American Legion alone. It cannot be won by any other American group alone. But likewise, it cannot be won without them.

In this fight there are no stronger forces on the side of American freedom than the battalions of organized labor and organized veterans.

We are two powerful groups which for the welfare of America should and must make our handclasps warmer and stronger. As spokesman for a new generation of veterans, I say to you that the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion need to reappraise each other on the basis of an honest recognition of the good will and the virtues that I know we both possess. We must evaluate each other in the terms of how we can implement each other's efforts to advance the welfare of America. In that light the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion have a natural affinity for each other.

I come from the small Indiana town of Brazil. It is located 18 miles east of Terre Haute. It has a population of 9,000. It is a community that depends for its prosperity on the toil and sweat of its citizens. The major industries there are coal mining and the manufacturing of clay products and of tile. It is the tile-making center of the world, with 11 large plants in operation. It is a community where hard work and thrift are the measure of good citizenship. My home town has always been a union-minded town. The working people of Brazil are our kind of people. It is my privilege to have grown up among them, with them, and as a lawyer represented them.

I know of no greater dignity than that of honest labor.

Hard work and thrift built America. The pioneer hands that converted the American wilderness into an empire of freedom were not shackled hands. They were able hands and competent hands. Our founding fathers had to fight their own battles whether it was against boundless forests, or hostile Indians, or against the cruel elements. Because they had to depend on themselves, they developed the quality of self-reliance. That quality of self-reliance is the vital core of our individual and national independence. Without it our founding fathers could not have thrown off the yoke of a tyrannical king. When they did achieve their political independence after superhuman struggles and sacrifices, they set up a government which was erected on a foundation of economic freedom. They based that government on a written Constitution and Bill of Rights which were designed to protect the natural desire of the free American citizen to improve his condition in life and to provide security for his children through his own efforts. This principle of self-help is the greatest opportunity of them all in our American way of life. It is the very cornerstone of our capitalist democratic society. It is today just as much the tenet of the American Legion as it is of the American Federation of Labor.

This vital principle of self-help needs immediate bolstering in America today. It is something that our capitalistic system cannot live without. It is likewise something that communism, socialism, and fascism cannot live with.

Self-help is the greatest opportunity which the free American has today. It means his right to improve his lot in life through his own hard work, his own thrift, and his own enterprise. When we practice these virtues we become self-reliant because we stand on our own feet and we don't owe anyone anything. That economic self-reliance is the spirit of all of our political independence.

Hitler recognized this. So did Mussolini and so did Tojo. They saw in the principle of self-help a major stumbling block in their mad plans for the radical making-over the personality of the modern man from a master of his own fate into a creature of submission. So they started to build fences that would narrow and abridge the opportunities of self-help. It cost America a half million of precious lives and 300 billions in national treasure to tear down those fences.

Now we have communism with its ally of socialism or statism arrogantly putting up those fences again. They want them up most of all in America. The Red despots of the Kremlin know if they can fence us in here at home, then the Communist philosophy of life and government will sweep over the world.

There are Americans today who are naive enough, or foolish enough, or actually traitorous enough, to be digging the postholes for the Communist fences.

Ours is a reward system of living. It champions the individual as a sovereign citizen who is the maker of his own destiny. We call that the pursuit of happiness. Our Government was created to protect that citizen in that pursuit and in the enjoyment of the rewards of his efforts. He is the Government, because all its powers are derived from his own consent as expressed by his own ballot. The Government is his servant.

It is a dynamic system. It throbs with energy. It is continually calling for the best that is in every individual. It is the way of progress; it pays off for creative thinking and for productive working. Under it we Americans became the most prosperous Nation of pushers in all human history. We got things done. We did it ourselves. We developed ingenuity, resourcefulness, and inventiveness that amazed the rest of the world. That's why we eat better, dress better, have better homes, have more cars, have more electric refrigerators, have more telephones, have more insurance, and have more of all the good things in life than any other people on earth. We have these good things in life because we have more freedoms.

Of course, this is a vigorous and a virile way of life. But this is our proudest heritage from our founding fathers. It stems from the rugged pioneer days when the first American settlers set themselves to the task of carving an empire out of a wilderness. Our towns and our cities, our shops and our offices, our freedoms and our liberies, and our institutions and our Government didn't just grow up like Topsy. They were built, brick by brick, right by right, by men and women of indomitable spirit and will. They were a breed who considered the beads of sweat from honest toil the greatest treasures of their young nation.

It takes an effort to be a pusher. It is so much easier to be a leaner.

That is the difference which every despot seeks to exploit.

The promise of a benevolent state that would serve its citizens as a crutch without becoming a clutch on their freedoms has long been the come-on of would-be enslavers.

It is today the booby trap which socialism or statism, that front running mate of communism, is parading before the eyes of Americans who would like to eat their cake and have it too.

We have had a wonderful form of government in the United States. It is based on a written Constitution and Bill of Rights which was framed by men of unparalleled wisdom and foresight. They aimed to create a democratic society for the liberation of the individual from the tyranny of the state. But they foresaw that they must protect the citizens against the more subtle tyranny of poverty, ignorance, disease, and fear as well. So they wrote into our Constitution the provisions by which the people could amend their government to the changing conditions and new demands of the march of progress. Twenty-one times since 1787 the American people have amended their Constitution to insure that in the face of new challenges there should be no curb or limit on opportunity which might abridge human freedom in this land of ours. They can put a restraint, whenever they choose, on the powers of our Government. They can also put checkreins on the gigantic forces that have been set in motion by the processes of our vast industrial order under our dynamic system. The only thing that this amazing Constitution of ours cannot guard our people against is a weakening of their own determination to remain free and sovereign American citizens. There is no provision in our Constitution against its nullification by public apathy. It can be circumvented if we sit idly by and don't care.

Our Government and our way of life can continue to a high success only to the extent to which we as American citizens put the most of the best of ourselves into it. We have grown very materialistic. We have all of us become too intent on our own selfish pursuits. One-half of our people of voting age—some 48,000,000 of them, believe it or not—did not bother to go to the polls at the presidential election last November. To that extent they are not part of our Government today—they are only the governed.

This is no way to encourage good government. Our public officials are human. By far and large they go into office with high resolves. They try to serve all the people. The voice of the people must be their guide and mandate. That is true government of the people, by the people and for the people. You cannot improve on the town-hall type of government. The effect of public indifference and apathy is shattering to that concept of government. When the people default, it paves the way, bit by bit, to a bureaucratic concept that the Government knows what is best for its people. That is how gradually a welfare state develops. It is a state which accepts full responsibility for the economic needs of its citizens.

The American Legion wants a state of welfare in America but not a welfare state.

You cannot be dependent upon someone else without being beholden to that someone else. That is true even in the relationship between a citizen and his government.

More and more of our citizens are beginning to look upon our Government as being all things to all people.. Not that the people of America are aggressively united in behalf of any so-called welfare state as yet. But little by little, more and more of our people are accepting an increasing dependence upon our National Government, expecting more and more security, each group looking to its own particular participation in the largess of government. The security of our people will be found in proper wages—not in government dependence.

Our Government has always been responsive to our demands. But today too many of our people are making demands upon the Government for services for which it was never designed. The Government in its endeavor to please and in the absence of expressed direction at the polls by all the people, can only pay Peter by robbing Paul. If it gives us something it must also collect for it.

Of course, if we so desire, the Government can support everybody. It can level our standard of living so that all of the people participate, share and share alike, in the total national income and the total property ownership of the Nation. Men who want to earn their own living can be further divorced from the reward of their efforts while other men are being divorced from

the penalties for their nonefforts. But, do we want this system in our land? The American Legion says emphatically, "No." That is the totalitarian system of State control of the destinies, working conditions, income, and property of its citizens.

This is a pure Socialist lie that Communist leaders are trying to sell to free Americans.

Yet these evil philosophies imported from the bankrupt countries overseas are making progress in America. It is marked by a growing decay of the fundamental American virtues of hard work, thrift and self-reliance, and the will to maintain the individual right to win or to lose upon which rest our whole free economy and free government. There is a growing disposition on the part of more and more of our people to surrender their rights and freedoms, bit by bit, in return for Government guaranties of their present and future security.

Communist missionaries and their dupes are peddling the idea that our form of government could be improved by combining the best features of our constitutional Republic with statism which is their sugar-coated term for socialism.

You can't go slightly communistic any more than you can become slightly dead.

If a Socialist charter supplants our Constitution, that will be the end of our freedoms. There will be no more collective bargaining, because a boss state does not bargain when it has the power to compel.

The American Legion recognizes that our people as a whole today are committed to a growing movement to take the terrors of helpless dependency out of old age. Labor has contributed much to sparking this enlightened movement.

We are behind it 100 percent.

But we do not believe that social security should be primarily and exclusively a Government responsibility.

We believe the Government should supplement such a movement only for that segment of our population which cannot do the job for itself. War widows and disabled veterans are an example of that segment. They have earned Government protection through their costly sacrifices in defense of our freedoms, sacrifices which have placed them under lasting economic handicaps.

The American Legion will ever continue to stick to the principle that under our dynamic reward system, it is the able-bodied free American citizen's own responsibility to assure his economic security through his own hard work, thrift, and enterprise—receiving proper wages under proper working conditions.

Economic policy making in the United States must remain in free, private hands and those are the hands of labor and the hands of industry.

In free collective bargaining both labor and management have today an instrument for insuring the retention of economic policy making in these United States in private hands.

They must use it as an effective substitute for work stoppages and make it a real agency for economic progress and welfare. This they can do only by developing a positive program by which in a spirit of give and take and of fairness to all, they solve the most difficult economic problems and issues around a mutual conference table.

The right of private contract is the most precious right of our free economy. Free labor, free industry, and free opportunity cannot exist without this right. A good contract is the product of the free American's effort, clear thinking, and fair dealing, whether he be a member of a union working for a corporation or an employer of labor or in business for himself.

In the striving for security by all of our people, the American Legion believes that it should be achieved insofar as possible by contract between free labor and free management rather than by compulsory government action or by legislation.

Except in time of national emergency, the fixing of wages and of working conditions also should be left to the collective bargaining machinery.

The collective bargaining table is today the most important table in America. Understanding of mutual problems, not laws bring mutual agreement.

It is the collective bargaining table where the answer will be forged to the burning question today whether American capitalistic democracy can be made to work under the increasing pressure of economic determinism which have scuttled human freedoms in all the old countries.

It is at this table that free American labor and free American industry will succeed in revitalizing the democratic processes of all of our social institutions under the impacts of tremendous modern political, economic, and scientific upheavals, or write the finish to man's last best hope of governing himself.

Too much lies at stake for either labor or management to bring less to this conference table than their best statesmanship and their best will to work out agreements based on fairness to all.

Violence, ruthlessness, and stubbornness never won a thing for either labor or management.

The A. F. of L.'s greatest contributions to human welfare have come through educational processes. In these efforts it has been supported by progressive leaders of industry. No country on earth has seen such industrial advance as the United States has made since the turn of the century. It was so swift that it outsped our economic and social thinking.

In that process the identity of the American worker was being stripped of its human elements. He was fast becoming only a unit of work energy, a human machine. The A. F. of L. must be credited with reinvesting the American worker with his human qualities again and with restoring the personal element in industry. It brought about a recognition that the individual American worker has the right to a responsible relationship to that which he produces, and that there is more to hiring a worker than buying his time, his physical presence in a given place and contracting for a measured number of his skilled muscular and mental motions per hour or day. The A. F. of L. has shown that in human relations you cannot buy enthusiasm, or initiative, or loyalty—these things that must be earned. It has convinced industry that the organized worker, fairly dealt with, brings intelligence, personal pride, and devotion of heart and mind to his job. These qualities make American labor the best in the world.

No individual wants to be just a mere cog. No free American can be expected to be satisfied with that kind of lot. By helping to bring back the element of human values into a machine age, organized labor has done a worthy job to maintain democratic concepts. It met the basic human yearning of the individual worker, and that is the assurance of being needed. Today enlightened industry recognizes this human need. Progressive management knows today that it cannot win a worker's enthusiastic devotion unless it makes him feel that he is individually important in a common big undertaking and that he has a definite place on the varsity team. Management has gone a long way in the direction of the goal of cooperative capitalism. It has on the whole abandoned the concept that the best labor is cheap labor. It knows it receives just what it pays for, cheap labor. It now has the viewpoint that security for the worker is more than a byproduct of production. Proper wages and conditions of work spell that security. It has done many of these things as the result of the good old American way of talking it over with the other fellow.

With free collective bargaining as the cornerstone of our national labor policy, both labor and management recognize the importance of public opinion.

Organized labor has grown up today. It has achieved the recognition, the key factor in our free economy. Together with management it has become a private instrument in the shaping of our economic policies. The American Legion is for keeping it that way.

Organized labor does realize the tremendous responsibility which has come to it and which is equally shared by management in reaching fair decisions that affect our entire economy.

The Government as representing all of the American people, is within its constitutional rights in defining the social and public interests in industrial disputes. It is up to both labor and management to display an enlightened statesmanship at the collective bargaining table.

Just 2 weeks ago today at this very hour, a sobering news flash came out of the White House in Washington. It was the announcement that Russia had an atomic explosion.

I need not draw any verbal pictures for you realistic men and women of the A. F. of L. what possession of such a superweapon in the hands of a despot can mean to the American people! He is the foremost exponent of the pagan philosophy of communism whose chief doctrine is that of enslaving all mankind by any means justifying the end!

Our immunity to atomic attack may be gone! Catastrophic possibilities could confront us! There is only one way in which Americans can face this possible new threat. We must meet it with a united front—an all-American front! There is only one way to live in the shadow of a suspended atomic bomb. That is in all-out national harmony!

From here on out all Americans must close ranks! Our only hope of national survival today lies in national unification. We are confronted with a monumental challenge to our boldness, to our initiative and to our team effort. The call of the hour is to build up American military strength, American economic strength and American spiritual strength!

This is no time for feuds and quarrels. If we break up our national unity on the rocks of political, economic, racial, or social differences, we are playing right into the hands of our one greatest enemy—expanding world communism! Now is the time for patriotic collaboration—for sincere sacrifices that will make possible agreements—by all Americans in the interest of national unity.

We must have military strength. We cannot build it without economic strength. We cannot develop the necessary economic strength without spiritual strength.

We have all been guilty of overmaterialism here in America. Life has been too easy for most of us. We have forgotten that just as plants must have sunshine or wither away, so must our souls die if they fail to live in union with God! It take a real shocker to jar us into a realization that we need God far more than he needs us! Every thinking American is conscious today of his individual inadequacy to cope with the new perils of the atomic age. But that very feeling of individual helplessness brings along an equal conviction that God alone can supply the strength which the individual needs in time of crisis.

Now is the time when all of us must return to an all-out faith in God and that faith must be the new bond of our national unity. Our Pilgrim Fathers started building this Nation with prayer. The framers of our Constitution paused to pray for help from above

whenever the burden of their task seemed ready to overwhelm them. The whole concept of our democratic ideals of human freedoms has its roots in the teaching of Christianity.

In Philadelphia last month I saw a historic old church with a marker that carried a spiritual punch line. It read:

"Families that pray together, stick together."

Let us convert this to a new American people's slogan for living in this dangerous atomic age. Let us make our national motto:

"People who pray together, stick together."

I submit that this return to faith in God in our daily lives is the firmest basis on which to work out our individual, our group, and our national problems.

All-out teamwork between labor and management at this time is absolutely vital to national welfare and to national security. Our progress in making our free economy stronger depends on the ability of labor and management to get closer together. I say to you that they can get closer together if they first get closer to God.

The way to start is by asking for Divine guidance.

I should like to see every collective-bargaining conference between labor and management open with a prayer and end with prayer.

By so doing you will both be measured only by the dimensions of your good will.

If you pray together, you will stick together.

If you stick together, you will work together.

If you work together you will prosper together.

You will spark a spiritual uplift that will sweep all America.

Let us be proud of wearing the shiny armor of Christianity. We are the modern crusaders. We are today the last defenders of a way of life that was first blazed by Christ Himself. We are defending it against the pagan philosophy of communism that denies the very existence of Christ Himself.

This is a real fight for God and country, the precept of the American Legion.

It is in that spirit that the American Legion, 3,000,000 strong, is ready and willing to join organized labor—and management—in a new and patriotic alliance to work unselfishly to make America secure and to use our country's glorious strength in building that brave new world in which all barriers now fencing in the minds and bodies of freedom-seeking men and women shall be leveled everywhere.

Together we can do it.

Because no one can stand up against free Americans working together and fighting on God's side.

Secretary of Defense Praises Work of Eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a surprise to me when I read the various speeches of the Government officials serving with and under President Truman to see how they, somewhat unconsciously, keep paying tribute to the work of the Republican Eightieth Congress, which the President himself seemed to think was a bad Congress.

For instance, back 2 years ago, as the chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I introduced a measure to set up what was to be known as the industrial-reserve program. Under this program, the Government could not possibly do again what had been done after other wars—dispose of all the valuable industrial plants it had built and be caught short in case of another conflict. There were many other features in the program that have stood the test of time and I am proud of the part I could play in setting up this program, through congressional action.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the bill was passed and became law. It was passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, too, which so many thoughtless citizens were made to believe, was a poor Congress merely because Mr. Truman went out and attacked it from one end of the country to the other.

Now, you can imagine my surprise and my pleasure the other day when I read a speech made by the Secretary of National Defense, Louis Johnson, before the American Ordnance Association dinner at the Hotel Astor in New York, on September 21, 1949. This speech outlined, to an extent, the activities which are being carried on by the Department of the Armed Services under the very same industrial-reserve program sponsored by me, a Republican Congressman, and passed by that so-called terrible Eightieth Congress.

Secretary Johnson, who served as campaign finance director of Harry Truman, apparently has not learned the Democratic line very well. The Democratic line, which is fed to gullible Americans all the time, is that it is impossible for a Republican to sponsor legislation that is workable, farseeing, and in the public interest. Here is Mr. Johnson's speech praising the Republicans, either without knowing it or because he was not thinking at the time. It is true that he does not mention the Republicans, but it is just as true that, without Republican passage in the Eightieth Congress of this measure, there would not have been the Industrial Reserve Program which is operating so well today.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Johnson's address be printed in the RECORD so that the people may see and understand that even a member of the President's Cabinet knows it is eyewash when the President goes around the country making political hay by lambasting the inactivity and unprogressiveness of the Republicans.

The address follows:

When I became the Assistant Secretary of War in 1937 I found in the Army Ordnance Association a most devoted and invaluable ally in the vital cause of national defense.

You members of the Ordnance Association already had absorbed the important lessons to be gathered from World War I. As far back as 1919 you had determined that in case of another conflict America would have to be its own arsenal, that the French 75's and the British saddles and the Spanish mules that served us so well in 1917 and 1918 might not again be so readily available to us. You realized, too, as I did, that our country did not want a powerful munitions industry established in peacetime. You recognized that it preferred to put its trust into the genius and adaptability of American industry and its ability to convert its production from plowshares to swords in an emergency. You understood the meaning of industrial mobilization.

You and I recognized how pitifully inadequate were our military preparations at that time. Your help in my efforts to strengthen national defense was a great source of strength. We may not have accomplished everything we believed should be done, but we did make an appreciable start. We did get appropriations for educational orders and stock piles of strategic materials. We did allocate industrial plants for conversion to the production of specific items in time of war. We did procure machine tools and ordnance machinery. We did a great deal to awaken America to the dangers of war.

In those uphill endeavors the facilities of the Army Ordnance Association were always available to me. On a number of occasions in various parts of the country its local chapters provided me with a suitable forum for the message of national defense. I addressed the Army Ordnance in New York, in San Francisco, in Los Angeles, in Rock Island, in Pittsburgh, and in other places. You served well the cause of national defense in many ways.

I shall always remember with gratitude, too, the ordnance officers on my staff on whose loyalty and experience I learned to lean so heavily. There was Tschappat, and Wesson, and Charles Harris, and Jimmy Burns, and many others both in and out of Washington. And there were the district chiefs who did so much to keep industrial mobilization in the forefront throughout the country.

When I returned to Washington about 6 months ago it was therefore natural for me to dip into that known pool of brains and experience in the Ordnance Department, to pick out an outstanding man to help me. I have brought back to active duty from retirement an ordnance officer, well known to all of you, who, to my mind, is one of the best American Army men of all times. His remarkable ability attracted the attention of the late President Roosevelt, and he was given the crucial assignment of administering the program for lend-lease. In his historic mission he served with rare distinction. Of his pioneering contribution in an hour of peril, one national defense official said, "He gave inspiration and impetus to the program in a manner for which he forever deserves well of his country." Robert E. Sherwood in his famous biography, Roosevelt and Hopkins, praises him as a "doer" who worked fast. I refer to one I deem my elder statesman to whom I will constantly look for advice—particularly on foreign military affairs and generally on anything connected with my job—Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, retired.

And now as before I again find the American Ordnance Association in the vanguard of the patriotic organization for national defense. A little more than a month ago I had occasion to commend you on the high quality of the technical reports you submitted for expediting production in an emergency.

I note that you have changed your name. You are now the American Ordnance Association. It is a change I applaud. It is in keeping with the times, with the trend toward over-all unification. Unification in ordnance matters, however, is not new. I found it back in 1937, and commented on that fact in a speech before the Army Ordnance Association at Rock Island Arsenal, on May 25, 1938.

In that same speech I also had this to say about American industry:

"We are greatly encouraged to believe that American industry is capable of carrying a major war load and with proper education will accomplish its mission with a minimum of dislocation to its own plants and with maximum usefulness not only to the efforts of the men at the front but with a full regard for the needs of a solid civilian front behind the lines."

These sentiments of mine about American industry uttered 3½ years before Pearl Harbor proved to be prophetic. The quality of American ordnance produced by American industry, delivered where and when needed in the quantity desired by American-made means of transportation, did, indeed, save hundreds of thousands of American lives in World War II. And respect throughout the world for American ordnance and the management and the skills and the know-how behind the production of these American munitions stands out today as the greatest deterrent to any would-be aggressor to start a war which might again lead to the sacrifice of so many precious American lives.

In our democracy our supreme tenet is that American life is sacred. And those of us charged with national defense recognize our prime duty and our responsibility to protect it against war. With us the right to life is an inalienable right proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, traditionally embedded over the centuries in our heritage of the common law, and established under our Constitution.

To countries, however, governed by dictators, the life of an individual is not a matter of grave concern. Another life is just another cog in the aggressive machine, always replaceable by another spare part readily available. Nor does the dictator have an electorate before which he must account for the loss of any of these parts. War to him is, therefore, a part of his daily gamble. He will stop at nothing to win. He drugs his rivals' will to resist by vicious propaganda. He is a gambler who thrives on tips and hunches. But he does understand force and respects the meaning of odds. The one way of handing him is to convince him so conclusively that his odds against winning are so great, that he will reform.

That is why we have a preparedness program. We must let the aggressor see in advance of any hostilities what he may be up against. That is why we need the strength of American industry marshaled in support of our American forces in being. In that powerful combination we will find the road to peace—peace through strength. And it is peace through strength that is the goal of American policy today.

Our responsibilities to ourselves and to the civilized world presuppose military strength and the economic health capable of supporting that strength. They presuppose a productive economy susceptible of rapid and orderly conversion to the quantity manufacture of weapons and other implements of war of the highest quality.

Because of the amazing adaptability of American youth, we know that we can train military forces for combat more rapidly than we can produce the intricate weapons of modern warfare with which they must meet our enemies.

This fact makes it all the more imperative that we take every conceivable action to assure the mobilization of industry in the shortest possible time after the first flash of an emergency.

You and I have always subscribed to that philosophy of preparedness. With your help we adopted a plan of industrial mobilization long before Pearl Harbor. Because that plan was attacked in some quarters, it was never put fully into effect.

Today, however, we are ahead in this one respect at least. The close bearing of industrial preparedness upon our national security is no longer questioned by any segment of our people. Rest assured, moreover, that the Department of Defense is exerting every effort to perfect these industrial mobilization plans and measures in the light of our experience during World War II to meet any emergencies of contemporary international developments.

Our foremost task in the preparation of industrial mobilization plans, as you so well know, is now, as it always has been to develop a comprehensive statement of the probable wartime requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Presented simply, our goal is to determine what will be needed, when it will be needed, where these needs can be filled, and how they will be obtained. It is essential that we be able to tell industry what we want it to produce, the quantities that will be needed, and the schedules on which deliveries will be required. Had we been fully able to meet this requirement in time for World War II we conceivably could have saved a full year of hostilities.

Let us consider a few of our present industrial-mobilization plans to see where we stand now. First, let me point out that these plans are not drawn up in ivory towers by isolated theorists. They represent the best considered thinking of our top defense and industrial leaders. Let me add that while industry's participation in this planning is purely voluntary, it has proved very effective. It is participation such as this that will make it possible for industry in turn to develop its own plans for rapid conversion to wartime production when needed.

We have initiated a program of preparedness studies. Important military items have been selected. Exploratory studies are being made to discover what bottlenecks might conceivably develop in producing these items in wartime. In some cases we have procured the actual tools that will be needed, held pilot runs for test models, and produced small quantities to train production manpower or to maintain its skills.

Already we have selected some 700 items representing approximately 50 percent of the dollar value of wartime procurement for special allocation to industry and their wartime requirements will be available before the first of the year. This group may seem numerically small when compared with the 2,500,000 different items to be purchased. They are all items, however, of the highest essential importance in the waging of war.

We are working on a plan for priorities and allocations that will be the management tools to direct industrial production and distribution, and the construction or expansion of facilities.

We have lined up stand-by plants for use in emergency. During World War II, the Government built 1,595 plants at a cost of approximately $12,500,000,000. About two-thirds of them are currently held in our reserves.

We are allocating production to private industrial plants so that our suppliers will know in advance what we expect them to produce in an emergency.

We are working on a reserve of 182,000 items of tools and other equipment. One hundred and eight thousand pieces already have been placed in such reserve by the armed services. An additional 7,000 have been placed in the National Industrial Equipment Reserve. We have estimated our M-day needs, and tentative orders for new equipment have been placed with machine tools manufacturers, who can start building the tools on a moment's notice.

In the manpower field, we are working closely with the National Security Resources Board on such matters as training workers, using skills to the best advantage, placing production orders in areas where the labor supply is relatively abundant, and assisting industry with respect to manpower priorities.

We have purchased and placed in a national stock pile over $900,000,000 worth of strategic materials. We hope that pending legislation will enable us to add to its size.

We also have made substantial progress in current procurement policies.

We have assigned complete purchasing responsibility to a single department whenever the interest of the Government could in this way best be served. The Army quartermaster, for example, purchases all food for the services, the Navy all the hand tools, and the Air Force all photographic equipment. For the procurement of medical supplies, the services operate a joint purchasing agency. For procurement of aircraft, a plant is assigned to the Air Force or to the Navy, and the service selected takes care not only of its own needs but also those of its sister service.

The job of drafting new, uniform procurement regulation is about 75 percent complete.

The project of a single catalog system detailing the millions of items used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, a tough, tedious job, will be completed in 1952. Each item used by the services will then be identified under one name and description, and one identification number, and will be placed in a single commodity classification. This catalog system will supplant the 17 different systems we now have, will help eliminate duplication, reduce storage requirements, and stretch the taxpayers' defense dollar.

We are working on the standardization of equipment, the developing of uniform engineering standards, and the standardizing of specifications. Standardization in the areonautic and electrical and electronic field has made substantial progress, and ground rules and priority ratings developed for a systematic approach to the problem in all commodity fields.

These are some of our industrial mobilization plans which are designed to give America maximum security without militarizing our Nation or bankrupting our economy.

In munitions potential, the United States holds the real balance of power in the world. Because we can expect to be outmanned numerically, we must make up the difference in manpower by the superiority of our weapons. We have done it before. With your help we will continue to maintain that marked supremacy that proved so decisive of victory in World War II.

In my talk tonight I have necessarily devoted myself largely to a discussion of the material problems involved in our national defense, such as matters of production and industrial mobilization. But I could not close without some reference to the human beings behind our military program who ultimately determine its success. Civilian or military, in or out of service, these men who work so untiringly on our defense plans are devoted Americans—citizens of a democracy, fathers of sons who would be in the vanguard of our armed forces if the shooting were ever to open up again. The patriotic industrialists of our country at one time were scurrilously referred to as "war mongers." That charge was rank libel then and would be now, for they are, on the contrary, the peace mongers of America.

I conclude, therefore, in a salute to you, the members of the American Ordnance Association, whose skills in production, matching your devotion to your country, serve so well to keep America sound and secure, for ourselves and for posterity.

Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

Appendix of the RECORD a radio address, which is a progress report on the Hoover Commission recommendations, delivered by my senior colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—PROGRAM ON HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has long been a problem confronting the Congress and the Chief Executive of this Nation. The people, the average citizens of this country, have sensed the need of it and have manifested their interest by thousands of letters and telegrams to Members of Congress urging adoption of the Hoover Commission's reports. The continuous growth and expansion of Government agencies and services and the ever-increasing cost of operation of the Federal Government make it imperative that the executive branch be reorganized in order to promote greater efficiency and economy. It is apparent, however, that many who have expressed an interest in and approval of the Hoover Commission's recommendations do not understand the many ramifications and tremendous task involved in carrying out this program. Some labor under the impression that Congress could put the recommendations of the Commission in effect by passing a simple resolution. That is incorrect. The procedure and processes to be followed are by no means that simple.

The Hoover Commission after laboring for nearly 2 years submitted to the Congress 19 reports. All these reports were referred in the Senate to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am the chairman. The committee and its staff have devoted the greater part of their time to making detailed studies of these reports in order to determine what action—what new legislation—is necessary to be enacted to put such recommendations into effect.

The Bureau of the Budget points out that it will require more than 320 separate steps to activate the 281 specific recommendations contained in the 19 reports of the Commission. Some 125 to 130 of these require legislative action.

One of the most important recommendations was that the President be given authority to initiate reorganization plans for submission to the Congress. This required a special Reorganization Act, which this Congress passed, conferring such powers on the President. Acting under the authority granted in this act, the President has thus far submitted eight reorganization plans.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures reported four of the eight plans favorably. These four became effective after the expiration of 60 calendar days from the time they were submitted. Two others were approved by a vote in the Senate and one was incorporated in a legislative act.

Plan No. 1 submitted by the President, providing for the creation of a Department of Welfare to perform all the functions of the Federal Security Agency, was rejected when the Senate passed a resolution of disapproval by a vote of 60 to 32, principally because the plan failed to conform fully to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Then, too, the plan went beyond the recommendations of the Hoover Commission because it undertook to incorporate the Public Health Service and its function in the new department plan No. 1 undertook to create. This was contrary to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which had recommended the establishment of a United Medical Administration. The Senate was unwilling to vest all public-health services and functions in a Secretary of Welfare.

The Bureau of the Budget indicates that there are a total of 80 recommendations in these reports which can be effectuated by the reorganization-plan method, but only 8 plans have been submitted by the President. It is therefore expected that the President will submit in the next session of Congress a number of additional reorganization plans.

A number of the Hoover Commission recommendations affecting the National Defense Establishment, the Department of State, and other agencies were incorporated in legislation enacted in this session of Congress. This has resulted in considerable improvement in the fiscal management of those departments and in the establishment of a better integrated Department of Defense. It is estimated by competent authority—at least it is expected—that one act alone may bring about annual savings of something near a billion dollars in the National Defense Establishment.

A second major law enacted by the present Congress provides for the reorganization of the Department of State, following in general the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It deviated, I believe, from the Hoover Commission recommendations in only one important respect and that is the proposed integration of the Foreign Service with the internal administration of the Department. This will be considered, however, in the next session of Congress.

Another very important and far-reaching reorganization action taken by the Congress was the enactment of a law creating a new General Services Administration. The Senate committee made extensive studies of the various housekeeping functions of the Federal Government with a view to abolishing duplicating agencies and coordinating as far as practicable all such activities and services into a Central Service Agency in conformity with Commission recommendations. It is thought that this act will bring about annual savings of some $250,000,000 and that it will vastly improve the efficiency of the Federal services in those particular fields.

Several other recommendations of the Commission carried out by numerous laws this Congress has enacted, and by administrative actions, have surely brought about many desirable changes in the administration of the executive branch of the Government. Many of the major reports and recommendations of the Commission, however, will require much further work and study on the part of the Congress and administrative officials before final action can be taken to implement them. A number of the Commission recommendations raised questions which have been subjects of controversy and debate in the Congress over a period of years. In some instances the Commission did not agree with the recommendations of its task force and made recommendations to the Congress contrary to the studies and recommendations submitted to it by the experts it employed to serve it. This is indicative of the problems that will confront the Congress as it moves toward enactment of legislation to put many of the Commission's recommendations into effect.

As an illustration, the Congress has enacted basic statutes under which certain agencies operate. Under these statutes many regulatory commissions have been made independent in their operations, responsible more to the Congress than to the President. The Hoover Commission recommended that the chairmen of these commissions be given full administrative authority and that they be responsible to the President. Committees of Congress studying and considering legislation carrying out these recommendations will find it necessary to examine carefully the import of such recommendations which are reasonably certain to invoke serious controversy.

There have developed differences of opinion with reference to the interpretation of some of the Commission's recommendations. This is particularly true with regard to the budgeting and accounting program. Here we find the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the General Accounting Office, the agencies that would be required to carry out any such program growing out of the Hoover Commission studies, are firmly opposed to the establishment of an Accountant General, as recommended by a majority of the Hoover Commission.

There is also serious controversy with reference to the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General has one concept of reorganization. The General Accounting Office, which now conducts the accounting for the Department, has entirely different views about it. A bill has been introduced incorporating recommendations of the Commission; another bill incorporates the views of the Postmaster General; and a third bill incorporates the views of the General Accounting Office. All of these bills differ as to particular reorganizations in the Post Office Department and each of these measures has its supporters.

The committee requested the heads of every agency and department of the Executive Branch of the Government to file written comments on the findings and recommendations of the Commission which related either to the operations of such agency or department. Many of these agency and department heads took occasion to express opposition to certain recommendations. These views are being studied in the hope of fully informing the Congress on each measure or issue that becomes controversial so that the Congress may have the benefit of all related facts and the views of those agencies and departments affected.

The Senate Expenditures Committee is now in process of compiling a report setting forth a condensation of the Hoover Commission recommendations, the different agency and department heads' comments thereon, and legislative action that has been taken by the Congress to date. This report has required weeks of intensive study and preparation, but we hope to make it available soon for general distribution to the public. It is also hoped that this report may serve to indicate what further legislation should be enacted and also to point up areas where extensive studies will be required before legislation can be passed or the recommendations of the Commission be fully activated.

This report will list approximately 200 separate bills that have been introduced in this session of the Eighty-first Congress, bearing on some phase of the Hoover Commission recommendations. About one-half of these bills involve basic and important changes in present law. Some of them are duplicating proposals; others have been or will be combined into committee bills. Others are divergent in terms and provisions, and these differences will have to be resolved.

The reorganization of a $40,000,000,000 peacetime Government with more than 1,800 component parts is tremendous and difficult. We have only been able to activate about one-fourth of the Hoover Commission recommendations to date. In my considered opinion, another 2 years or longer will be required to complete the job.

It is certain that some of the Commission's recommendations will be found unwise and unsound. In my judgment, about 75 to 80 percent will be agreed to and finally put into effect. This should result in greatly improved administration and efficiency and should produce some measure of economy. This is our hope. This is our goal.

Seventy-fifth Celebration of Anniversary of Wellesley College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the people of America are cognizant of the great contribution to the cultural, civic and professional advancement of our country made by the many splendid colleges for women throughout the Nation.

Colleges of the liberal arts have played an important part in the development and thinking of our country. Outstanding among these institutions of higher learning is Wellesley College, which we are happy to congratulate upon attaining its seventy-fifth anniversary.

On the occasion of this historic observance, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] delivered a scholarly address on October 17.

As former president of one of the great institutions of learning for men with which America is so fortunately endowed, the Senator from North Carolina speaks with an authority borne of long experience in the educational field.

I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a sense of appreciation and hope that I am privileged tonight to salute Wellesley College on the memorable threefold occasion of the going out of the seventh president, of the coming in of the eighth president, and of the going on of the seventy-fifth year of this historic institution in its services to youth, to America, and the world. I come with appreciation because I have resourced my spirit in the beginnings, struggles, and growth of an American college for women, and I already know that I shall go away with new hope for the meaning of Wellesley by resolutely being a college of liberal arts, a center of ideas, a temple of freedom for intellectual inquiry and spiritual faith, and an outpost of hope in a broken world in need of the best which self-governing youth have to give for freedom, justice, and peace on earth.

The commemoration of origins, and the rededication of the loyalties and hopes of an American college make for the higher appreciation and creation of the most precious treasures of the human spirit. In the histories by Florence Converse, George Herbert Palmer, and Alice Payne Hackett we find that the story of Wellesley and its people is, in Miss Hackett's words, a part of the story of America.

In Miss Hackett's story of Wellesley is woven the threads of the story of John Eliot in 1650 preaching to the Indians in the wigwam of Chief Waban near the shores of the lake which today bears his friendly aboriginal name; of the first English Durant in Massachusetts since 1663, whose great, great granddaughter married John Fowle, captain in Gen. George Washington's Revolutionary Army, whose second daughter Harriet married William Smith, and whose fifth daughter, Adelaide, married Samuel Welles.

The fourth son of Harriet Fowle and William Smith was Henry Welles Smith, who, using family names, changed his name to Henry Fowle Durant. From Samuel Welles was to come the name of the town and from the town was to come the name of the college. Henry Fowle Durant married his first cousin, Pauline Fowle, whose father was Maj. Jack Fowle, younger brother of the famous Fowle sisters, and whose mother was the remarkable Adeline Casenove, of Virginia. Mr. and Mrs. Henry Fowle Durant became the cofounders of Wellesley College. The feminine strain runs strong and deep in its influence in the Durant-Welles-Smith-Fowle-Casenove lines with future consequences as a constructive force in the story of Wellesley in the story of America.

Henry Fowle Durant had as his first teacher Aunt Marty Smith, who herself as a pupil had caught some of the fire communicated to all her students by Mary Lyon, the great crusader for the education of women. He was taught by another strong-minded woman, Mrs. Samuel Ripley, who left a deep impression upon him in carrying on her multiple duties as the mother of seven, the wife of a minister, and the head of a household school which prepared boys for Harvard. The founder of Wellesley recalled of his teacher, as quoted by Miss Hackett: "I have seen her holding the baby, shelling peas, and listening to a recitation in Greek, all at the same moment, without dropping an accent, or particle, or boy, or pea-pod, or the baby."

Such women have been the mothers of men, the teachers of youth, and the makers of America. Add to this picture gallery of the determined mind of Henry Fowle Durant the recollection that his wife, as a baby of 3 months, was transported over rough corduroy roads from her Virginia home to the western frontier by her gentle mother, a valiant wife of an American Army officer, with whom she shared the rigors of frontier posts at Fort Brady and Fort Dearborn. At Fort Dearborn on their first Sunday, records Miss Hackett, the two of them managed to find a minister and hold a church service—the beginning of the first Presbyterian Church in what was to be Chicago.

The father of the little girl who was to become Mrs. Durant, who herself was to become the cofounder of Wellesley College, after a tour of duty as commandant of the West Point Corps of Cadets, was killed by an explosion of a steamboat on the Ohio River on his way to the Seminole War. The beautiful daughter became the companion of the widowed mother in a bereavement and struggle which prepared the daughter for the companionship of another bereavement and struggle. The daughter of a valiant mother became the wife of a valiant husband, successful lawyer and man of large affairs. When they lost their only daughter and only son, they resolved to found a college that would become the mother of many daughters who would themselves become the teachers and the mothers of legions of sons and daughters in Wellesley's great adventure of making and remaking America.

With such examples and teachings, such inheritance, association, and companionship, it is not strange that Mr. and Mrs. Henry Fowle Durant should, against tradition and frustrations, have persevered in their faith that a woman's college with a woman president could be a constructive force in higher education in America.

The past presidents, Ada Howard, Alice Freeman, Helen Shafer, Julia Irvine, Caroline Hazard, Ellen Pendleton, and Mildred McAfee Horton, have in their different and productive ways compressed in seven administrations the 75 years of the history of Wellesley. The president who has just now retired in her spiritual resources, intellectual objectivity, social sympathy, physical stamina, wit and courage, whether as honor student, athlete and intercollegiate debater at Vassar, teacher at Monticello Seminary, Tusculum College, Center College, Dean of Women at Oberlin, president of Wellesley and Commander of the Waves, Mildred McAfee Horton has been a constructive force in American higher education, herself an expression of the liberal arts and a symbol of hope in the leadership of American women in troublous times.

These seven presidents and their associates in the administration and faculty have laid broad and enduring foundations for the new president, Dr. Margaret Clapp, herself an honor graduate of Wellesley, able scholar, teacher, and author, who already gives high promise of a distinguished leadership of the mid-twentieth century Wellesley, which, 75 years ago was located by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Fowle Durant, on the north shore of Lake Waban in the town of Wellesley, beautiful in setting, historic in associations, distinguished in scholarship, and dedicated to the education of women in a college of liberal arts and to the glory of God as the motive source of its mission, power, and service in America and the world.

The American college, with its high privileges and increasing costs, in order not to lose the purpose of its foundation, must keep its doors open to youth of low income but high talent. No high-talented and worthy high-school student should be excluded from the opportunity to continue her training and development in college because of a lack of financial ability. Since the western frontier has been closed, the surest guaranties of freedom and equal opportunity in America are the open school and college doors. They should be equally open. The only way to keep the college doors open equally for all is through scholarships.

In keeping with the American way, the doors should be kept open all the way to the top. The students who, with scholarship aid and self-help, struggle successfully through the 4 years of college and who, in character, ability, and devotion, are highly qualified to enter upon postgraduate training, find the doors partly closed at the top because of a lack of fellowships for them. It is a wise people who make far-sighted investments in fellowships for multiple return to our economy and our Commonwealth.

To become noble and useful, the college must not only serve the youth, who know no class or race or creed, but also the truth, which knows no walls or boundaries. The college must serve the people beyond the college walls. A college that would be a great college cannot be narrowly confined without drying up the very springs of dedication and service to youth and mankind from which will always flow the living waters of a great college of liberal arts.

As a constructive and re-creative force, Wellesley must even more widely extend its service and influence to the Denison Settlement House in Boston, where the students come to have a practical knowledge of the personal impacts, social hazards, and ethical implications of our complex modern industrial society; to the Alice Freeman Palmer Memorial Institute in Piedmont, N. C., which was born out of the fact that a president of Wellesley stumbled upon a noble-minded North Carolina Negro girl pushing a nurse's baby carriage with one hand and reading a Latin classic held in the other hand; and to Yenching University in China, Wellesley's adopted sister institution in the now desolate land of Wellesley's distinguished daughter, Mayling Soong, who has just joined her beleaguered husband, President Chiang Kai-shek. Wellesley, to be a free and liberating force in the modern world must continue to protect the freedom of a Vida Scudder, Ellen Hayes, Emily Greene Balch, and Katharine Cowan, along with their colleagues in the liberal and fine arts, to express hon-

orably what is in them as citizens of the world and daughters of God, who in history's long struggle will continue to do their bit in the rise of women from the status of chattel property to personality, to equality, to spirituality. In this struggle, Wellesley has had a creative part, both as a college of arts and sciences and as a temple of freedom and hope.

In this day of high specialization and high mechanization of our life and thinking, it is timely that we do not allow any disintegration—in fact it is imperative that we strengthen the central core of the liberal arts in all colleges and universities. The morning news reenforces our need of the liberal arts with its basic sciences to keep America at the farthest frontiers of science and technology, with its social studies for the mastery of our mechanical civilization, and the humane studies, philosophy, and religion to give mankind the ethical motive and spiritual resources for a scientific, social, and spiritual mastery against the destruction of our race and for the creation of the nobler society of human brotherhood under God, as the Father of us all.

The liberal arts both preserve and give birth to great ideas. In this age of power of machines we need to recognize the power of ideas. In this age of mechanical invention we need the adaptations of political and social inventions. In this age of the scientific mechanism we need the saving values of spiritual idealism.

In our insistent awareness of the many different factors and forces and their interacting power in the complex of history, we find that an idea may often interfuse all other influences with its spiritual power. With due consideration of the powerful factors and forces—geographical, economic, political, religious, imperial, and traditional—which focused upon the Eternal City as the center of the ecclesiastical dominion rising upon the ruins of the old political empire, it was an idea, a great idea, the idea and aspiration of a divine compassion and of a universal brotherhood of men which transformed the sackable city of Rome into the unsackable city of God. The noble and catholic idea represents the unity of mankind and a universal sympathy of human beings everywhere in need of mercy and compassion. This idea becomes flesh, became a person in the Judean hills, whose followers have carried the cross far and near, across the seas and centuries with its call to justice and heroism in the sharing and giving of life. This idea of 2,000 years has interfused our medieval and modern Western World with hopes of human brotherhood unfulfilled to this hour.

Not only does the spread of ideas interfuse a whole society, but the lowering of the level of ideas lowers the level of the life and history of an age. It was not only the disintegration of the Roman Empire and the decline of the ancient learning in the disorder of the times, but it was also the lowering of the level of ideas for adaptation to the untutored, though vigorous, minds of the barbarian conquerors which produced the intellectual recession called the Dark Ages. Scholasticism represents the far upward climb of the western mind, under the tutelage of the church, from the ideas of the Dark Ages to the ideas of the great medieval synthesis which found its stronghold in the universities of the later Middle Ages.

The college and university, the child of the medieval church, became, within its ecclesiastical limits, the center of ideas, the center of philosophic conflict and the scholastic synthesis, intellectual energy and curiosity regarding ideas which stirred the minds and spirit of the western people and thus prepared the way for the revival of ancient ideas.

The ideas and spirit of the ancient learning, long lost or neglected, recovered to transcend medieval boundaries, blew like a fresh wind across the face of Europe, lifted to the sunrise of a new day. Scholasticism gave way to humanism, other worldly ideas to the ideas of the ancient world, ascetic self-repression to esthetic self-expression. Giving momentum and significance to the Renaissance was a great idea. The conception of the human being worthy of the dignity and joy of living; the creative impulse of self-expression in scholarship and the fine arts; the noble appreciation of the human form and the human spirit, the beauty of nature and the grandeur of life—all these were a part of the revival of learning and the new liberation of old ideas in that efflorescence of the human spirit called the Renaissance.

The colleges and universities, along with parliaments and cathedrals, towering from the later Middle Ages across all the transitions of the modern age still abide as among the most influential and noble institutions of western civilization. The medieval universities, for all their limits and lags, as centers of ideas, prepared the way for the revival of classical ideas in the Renaissance and of scriptural ideas in the Reformation. The recovery of old ideas led to the discovery of the New World and gave impulse to a new movement in religion.

The revival of learning led to the advancement of learning in the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century. The new conception of science which turned men's minds from accepting old ideas to finding new ideas, and from mere speculation to zestful experimentation with new instruments of precision, entered into the ideas of the philosophic revolution of the eighteenth century, which, in turn, produced the ideas, attitudes, and engines of the industrial revolution. These intellectual and economic revolutions led to the second scientific revolution of the last 50 years, during which the idea of the nuclear nature of the atom and the capture of its gigantic power have brought us to the outpost of the atomic age. In the long run of history, we find that ideas themselves are not only more powerful than engines; but that without ideas there would be no engines. Engines are subject to the hand of man and the hand of man is subject to the mind and spirit of man.

Modern men find themselves as biological organisms in possession of unmastered dynamic scientific mechanisms of an unchanging human nature with a slow-changing social mind and motive caught in the meshes of a fast-changing mechanical civilization; the multiplication of mechanical contacts without a deepening of spiritual content; political and economic ideas evolved in the handicraft age reaching over with their lags and controls in the age of the power engine; and the shibboleths of liberty which came flaming from the soul of a Thomas Jefferson in behalf of forgotten men in the eighteenth century turned in reverse against the freedom and equal opportunity of forgotten millions in the twentieth century.

As noble repositories of the great tradition of humane learning and as scientific guardians of the tested and true, the colleges and universities, reflective and creative parts of our modern society, are also parts of the social lag. The colleges and universities were mainly scholastic in Renaissance times, dominantly classical in scientific times, powerfully but narrowly scientific in the midst of complex economic and social change and too often reluctantly social minded and apologetically philosophical and spiritual amid one of the crucial crises of human history.

The curriculum, overspecialized too early, gives a fragmentary view of human learning, the human being, human society, and the universe. The colleges and universities in intensifying the specialization needed in the training of men and women for modern society, also need to equip the specialist to be a better specialist with an integrated view and understanding of his specialty, himself, his society, and his world. Human society, and, therefore, the curriculum of the college, needs not less science, but more thorough science in all areas of knowledge and in all relations of human beings; more social sciences as ways toward the social mastery of our technology, our haphazard political and lopsided economic processes; more first-hand understanding of the great books of the humane tradition which bring to the plastic mind and spirit of youth the fellowship of the greatest minds and noblest spirits of all nations and of all ages, whose precious wisdom and goodness provide the basis for the thoughtful perspectives and ethical valuations of our own thinking and self-expressions; and more fine arts for the fine feeling, heightened emotion, noble imagination, the beautiful creations of the human spirit, and the inner vision of the good life.

The curriculum needs more recognition of philosophy and religion as the basis of an intellectual and spiritual synthesis of the physical and moral, the vocational and liberal, personal freedom and social responsibility, stability and progress, ethics and politics, work and justice, democracy and excellence, religion and learning, and man as belonging both to the world of nature and the world of the spirit in our one world.

Youth in the college needs both the scientific view and the spiritual aspirations of the whole person for the true, the beautiful, and the good in the free and responsible self-governing campus democracy, through which the students may have a vital part in their own education in preparation for their part in the great society of men and nations in the adventure of creative cooperation toward the kingdom of God.

The colleges and universities are the outposts in the struggle of ideas. It is both in the nature of the college and in the need of the times for the college to be a center of idealism and freedom. Idealism does not cringe before power. Repression is the way of frightened power; freedom is the way of enlightened faith. History teaches beyond the denial of bigotry or the sneer of cynicism that the answer to a difference in color or creed is not the KKK, is not tomatoes and eggs, is not a concentration camp; the answer to error is not terror, but the cleansing power of light and liberty under the laws and the Constitution of the United States of America. In the days of its weakness America was the haven of heretics and should not in the days of its power become the stronghold of bigots.

To be American in the great American traditions is sometimes miscalled un-American. To stand by our historic American Bill of Rights is not a subversive activity. It is unfair to our religion and our Americanism to call communistic the most decent, humane, and spiritual hopes of mankind. The more Americans who understandingly and sincerely subscribe to the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, the better for America and the world.

The freedom of the college means not only the freedom to inquire and publish the theological implication of the geologic structure of the earth, and the biological implication of the physical structure of a fish, but also the human and spiritual implication of the economic structure of society and the international moral implication of the nuclear structure of the atom.

The Hebrews discovered the moral sovereignty of the one God. The Greeks made us aware of man as a person of noble proportions and creative capacities. Modern man

has, with microscope, test tube, and telescope, uncovered the world of nature, matter, and things. The world of science, of things, of machines and gadgets, crowds hard upon the conception of both God and man. The world of science, technology, and things, needs the saving balance and deeper meaning of the liberal arts, the humane tradition, and the spiritual conception of man and the universe. Without a sense of values, ethical and humane, and without the insights of the human spirit, the discoveries of one generation become glibly exalted above the wisdom and insights of one hundred generations. Modern science, industrialism, and materialism need the balance of the humane and social studies, need philosophy and religion to prevent a destructive impact upon the conception of the freedom, dignity, and moral autonomy of the individual human being. The ideas of biological evolution should be balanced with the ideas of spiritual evolution. The ideas of the physical descent of man from the lower animals should be balanced with the ideas of the spiritual ascent of man toward the likeness of the Son of God as the brother of all men.

The organization of the idea under God of the oneness of the family of nations in a world federal government under the Charter of the United Nations is the last desperate defense against modern civilization's powers of self-destruction. The refusal of the Soviet Union to accept the United Nations plan for the international control and inspection of atomic power was a great set-back to international cooperation. After the First World War the United States renounced the League of Nations and failed the hopes of mankind. After the Second World War the Soviet Union has obstructed the United Nations and has failed the humane hopes of the people of the world. The urgent necessity for abolition of the veto; international inspection and control of atomic power; a world court with original jurisdiction over individuals guilty of crimes against the United Nations, with the guaranty of an international bill of rights; an international police force responsible to the United Nations, and the widening of legislative powers in the assembly of the United Nations, all these needs make imperative amendments to the Charter. America and the other democracies must take the initiative for the stronger organization of peace even at the risk of war. Drift into war is immoral in the atomic age.

An idea, as old as 2,000 years and as young as the hopes of men, rejected these centuries as impracticable and impossible, has become in the atomic age the most necessary and practical, the greatest idea of them all, the idea of the Fatherhood of one God and the brotherhood of all men.

In the inauguration of a new president and in the commemoration of the 75 years of the life and service of Wellesley College may we all rededicate ourselves to the purposes of the old college and the hopes of the new college as Wellesley plays her creative part in the pilgrimage of her daughters toward the Kingdom of God.

The Usage of Fertilizers and Tag Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address made by Hon. Fred J. Woods, of Tampa, Fla., before the Florida County Agents' Association at the annual agricultural extension conference, held at Gainesville, Fla., on October 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE USAGE OF FERTILIZERS AND TAG INFORMATION

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege to have this opportunity to speak to the County Agents Association assembled at this annual agricultural extension conference. My assigned subject, The Usage of Fertilizers and Tag Information, is an easy one before this audience, for the nature of your work is such that you are already well versed in the basic principles involved.

I will first endeavor to point out some of the ways the information printed on a fertilizer tag may be used in growing better crops and then comment on the highlights of the new fertilizer law passed at the last session of the legislature.

The tag attached to each bag of commercial fertilizer, in addition to proving that 25-cents-per-ton inspection fee has been paid, tells the user just what is in the bag. This information, under the Florida law, is arranged in a manner that will give the farmer all of the information needed to intelligently purchase fertilizer to supply his crop with its plant-food needs within the present limits of chemical and agronomic science. On each tag is listed the materials used in the manufacture of that particular fertilizer. These materials are formulated to produce the analysis set forth on the upper part of the tag. The first element guaranteed is total nitrogen, which must be derived from the nitrogen-bearing materials listed upon the tag. The total nitrogen guaranty must be broken down into four separate forms of nitrogen and, of course, if all four forms are guaranteed, materials containing those specific forms of nitrogen must be used. The four forms are, first, nitrate nitrogen, and the principal materials supplying this form of nitrogen are nitrate of soda, ammonium nitrate, nitrate of potash, various nitrogen solutions, calcium nitrate, and several others, even including to a much lesser degree some organic materials, such as tobacco stems.

The second form of nitrogen guaranteed on the tag is ammoniacal nitrogen, principally derived from such materials as sulphate of ammonia, ammonium nitrate, various nitrogen solutions, including anhydrous ammonia, and several other materials, including fractional parts of the nitrogen contained in many organic materials.

The third subclassification of nitrogen is water-soluble organic nitrogen. The principal chemical sources of this form are urea compounds, including solutions, and calcium cyanamid. A fractional part of the nitrogen contained in most organic materials is in the water-soluble organic form.

The fourth, and last, subdivision of nitrogen, and by far the most expensive one, is water-insoluble nitrogen. A considerable amount of experimental work has been done in an effort to find a low-cost chemical source of this form of nitrogen, but to date this work has not shown much success; and the sources of this form of nitrogen are still the natural organic materials, such as the oilseed meals, cottonseed meal, soya-bean meal, linseed-oil meal, and, in Florida, the most important one, castor pomace; tankage, bonemeal, and blood are packinghouse byproducts, and from a practical standpoint, only those products unfit for feed purposes are used in the manufacture of fertilizer generally. The dried processed product of sewage disposal plants has been used in increasing quantities during recent years. To mention a few of the other materials used as a source of water-insoluble nitrogen, but to a lesser degree due to their low nitrogen content, we must include ground tobacco stems, tung-nut meal, the various bird and animal manures, on down to citrus-pulp meal, which usually contains little nitrogen and is generally used for mechanical conditioning.

The principal use of this information on nitrogen is to know when a particular crop will have a portion of the nitrogen, contained in the fertilizer, available to it in a form that can be assimilated by the plant. The order in which the various forms of nitrogen are listed on the tag; namely, nitrate, ammoniacal, water-soluble organic, and water insoluble, is also, usually, the order of availability to the growing plant. We know that when a fertilizer contains a high percentage of nitrate and ammoniacal nitrogen, that, with a minimum of moisture, the growing plant will have nitrogen available to it promptly.

The old theory was that, for ammoniacal nitrogen to become available to a plant, at least one chemical change in the soil had to be made before that form was as available as nitrate nitrogen, but recent work has proven that ammoniacal nitrogen is taken up directly by some vegetative plants.

Water-soluble-organic nitrogen must go through changes within the soil to become as available as ammoniacal or nitrate nitrogen.

The availability of water-insoluble nitrogen varies widely with the source material. It has been generally found that the water-insoluble nitrogen contained in such materials as sewage sludge, dried blood, and bird guanos becomes available to the plant quite rapidly; whereas, the bacteriological breakdown of such materials as castor pomace, tankage, and bonemeal takes longer, thereby releasing nitrogen slowly for some time.

In considering this fertilizer-nitrogen problem, it must be borne in mind that weather is a very important factor. The perfect fertilizer would contain the maximum amount of nitrogen that could be economically utilized by the plant and in such forms that the proper proportion of the total would become available to the plant at the exact time that the plant could utilize it most efficiently. Needless to say, soil moisture is a governing factor of great importance; for in a wet season, the water-soluble forms go into solution promptly and leech beyond the feeding area of the plant before the plant can assimilate them, causing a nutritional deficiency. Likewise, in extremely dry seasons, water-insoluble forms may not be subjected to sufficient bacterial action, due to the lack of moisture, to become available during the life of the plant; so a good general fertilizer should contain all of these forms so that, regardless of weather conditions, at least a portion of the nitrogen will be available to the plant at the time it is needed.

Due to the multiplicity of soil types found in Florida, there are many exceptions to this general rule. Fertilizers used on very alkaline soils should contain a minimum of nitrate nitrogen, and a high percentage of ammoniacal nitrogen from sulfate of ammonia; for the acid reaction of sulfate of ammonia is of value on that type of soil. Likewise, when a spring top dresser is used on citrus, nitrate and ammoniacal nitrogen are of particular value, for they are quickly available even under the normal dry-weather conditions usually existing at that time of year, and the desire to force the tree out of its dormant state with a full spring flush of growth and bloom is paramount. I have covered this subject of nitrogen with considerable detail, for at present it is considered to be of major importance.

The next item appearing on our fertilizer tag is available phosphoric acid. The principal sources of this plant food are superphosphate, normally containing from 18 percent to 21 percent available phosphoric acid;

triple superphosphate, containing from 45 percent to 48 percent available phosphoric acid; and a limited list of organic materials, principally animal byproducts and, to a much lesser degree, the oilseed meals.

The next item on our tag is of little importance. This is insoluble phosphoric acid, and seldom is this figure very high, except in those isolated cases where large poundages of either bone meal or ground phosphate rock are guaranteed.

The last item listed under the primary plant foods is water-soluble potash. The principal chemical sources of this plant food are muriate of potash, sulfate of potash, sulfate of potash-magnesia, nitrate of potash, and manure salts, which, incidentally, is the raw mined product from which sulfate and muriate of potash are refined. A comparatively small amount of potash is also supplied by a few organic materials, such as tobacco stems, castor pomace; the other oilseed meals, and bird and animal manures.

Below the listing of source materials appear the guaranties of secondary plant foods. The importance of this information has increased rapidly in recent years. Our experiment stations have found that where a serious deficiency of any of these so-called secondary plant foods exist that a plant will not thrive, even though it is supplied with ample quantities of the primary plant foods—nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash. Under the term "secondary plant foods," we could list practically every known chemical element. However, up to date, only a comparatively few of them have been found to be consumed by plant life in quantities great enough to create deficiency. The need for these secondary plant foods varies widely with soil types and different crops. For example, it is generally true that citrus cannot be produced economically on our sandy soils without supplying a regular supplement of available magnesium, manganese, and copper. In growing crops on our very alkaline soils, peculiar to the lower east coast, the addition of manganese to the fertilizer is a must if satisfactory crops are to be produced. All of you, of course, are familiar with these various deficiencies and their symptoms evident on crops in your territories, but a list of the more important secondary plant foods must include available magnesium, manganese, copper, boron, and sulfur. Aluminum and iron are sometimes used, but little is known of their value as yet. Some very interesting work is now being done at a New Jersey experiment station on the use of molybdenum, and it is entirely possible that in the future this element will appear on Florida fertilizer tags; so, gentlemen, with your academic knowledge backed up by your field experience and intimate acquaintanceship with conditions in your own particular county, the information furnished on the tag of each bag of commercial fertilizer can be of great value to you and the farmers whom you serve in determining the best fertilizer to use on a particular crop grown on a certain soil type under existing weather conditions.

I now want to briefly cover the important changes in the fertilizer law brought about by the passage of Senate bill 183 during the 1949 session of the Florida Legislature. I will not dwell on the inequities of the old law, nor its antiquity, but as passed in 1935, almost 15 years ago, it made no provisions for scientific progress in either agronomics or fertilizer manufacture. In my opinion, the most important feature of this new law is that it appoints a technical committee composed of the State chemist of Florida, the director of the Florida agricultural experiment stations, and the director of the Florida agricultural extension service. To quote the law: "The said technical committee is hereby authorized to recommend rules and regulations pertaining to the composition and use of commercial fertilizers, including, without limiting, the foregoing general terms, the establishment of tolerances, deficiencies, and penalties, where not specifically provided for in this chapter; to prohibit the sale or use in fertilizer of any material proven to be detrimental to agriculture or of questionable value; to provide for the incorporation into commercial fertilizer such other substances as pesticides and provides for proper labeling of such mixtures; to prescribe the information which shall appear on the tag, other than specifically set forth in this chapter." The law goes on to say that any person, firm, or corporation either selling or using commercial fertilizer may propose a rule or regulation to the technical committee for its consideration. If such proposal meets with the technical committee's approval, is aired publicly, and approved by the commissioner of agriculture, such proposal then becomes a part of the law as a rule or regulation. This provision is unique in regulatory legislation, for the law is flexible and can be made to best serve the public in the light of scientific developments.

Another feature of the law which may come to your attention in the form of questions from your growers is the penalty provision. This subject has been completely redrafted. First, the State chemist is directed to establish the commercial value of the various plant foods, including the various forms of nitrogen, and publish this information annually in his report.

This information, for use in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, may be found on page 8 of the annual report of the State chemist for the year ending December 31, 1948. The law establishes tolerances for the various primary plant foods, secondary plant foods, and the various forms of nitrogen. Should the deficiency in any plant food exceed the tolerance, the commercial value of the goods is computed on the basis of the values established by the State chemist and compared with the commercial value of the guaranteed analysis. If the commercial value of the analysis found exceeds the commercial value of the guaranty and no element of primary plant food is deficient more than one-half of one actual percent, when the guaranty does not exceed 10 percent, no penalty is assessed. However, if the commercial value of the analysis found fails to equal or exceed that which is guaranteed, a penalty is assessed, payable to the buyer by the manufacturer, equivalent to three times the value of the total deficiency found. This penalty provision assures the farmer of securing full commercial value and, at the same time, recognizes that the sampling of fertilizer and the chemical analysis of the sample so secured are not exact sciences and are subject to human error. The penalty for an excess of chlorine of more than 25 percent of the guaranty in tobacco brands is set at 100 percent of the invoice value of the goods, for an excess of chlorine in fertilizer used on this crop is considered very detrimental to it.

This new fertilizer law was drafted, introduced in the legislature, and fostered by the Commissioner of Agriculture and his staff. Its passage was most timely, for progress was being retarded by some of the inflexible provisions of the old act. I urge you to study this new law, and should any new rules and regulations occur to you that will improve it, send them along to the technical committee for their consideration; and I can assure you that the present personnel of this committee; namely, Dr. Taylor, Mr. Mowry, and Mr. Clayton, will give your suggestions serious thought.

The manufacturers of commercial fertilizer is an industry of major importance to Florida agriculture. Without it, the magnificent crops of this great State of ours would not be possible. The industry is continuously striving to improve its products, so that even better crops may be grown more economically. The destiny of the fertilizer industry is completely dependent upon the success of agriculture, and we know that with the help of this State's great experiment station, aided by its extension service, that Florida agriculture can look forward to even greater successes in the future.

I thank you.

Maine's Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention an outline of Maine's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, as compiled by John F. McPherson, national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his office in the Veterans' Administration Center, Togus, Maine.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Maine's veteran laws will come to their attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the résumé be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VETERANS LAWS

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowance of $100 is provided for burial of indigent veterans or their widows. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Cities and towns may pay for the burial and be reimbursed by the department of health and welfare.

Cities and towns are required to decorate veterans' graves on Memorial Day.

Provision has been made for the care of graves of veterans of any war.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces after 1 year after such declaration by the United States Army or Navy.

Disability of minority is removed for veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

Proof of wills is provided when subscribing witnesses are absent in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Voting rights are enjoyed by inmates of National Soldier's Home.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Records of death recorded under direction of the registrar of vital statistics shall state whether or not the deceased was a war veteran and, if a veteran, of what war.

The clerks of the judicial courts must furnish copies of recorded discharges for a fee of 25 cents.

Town clerks shall record discharge or release papers of persons who served in the armed forces in time of war or insurrection. The fee is 25 cents.

The department of health and welfare is authorized to receive Federal funds to be used in furnishing information to veterans concerning their rights, benefits, and so forth.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Graduation from a class A secondary school of this or another State is sufficient preliminary education under the educational requirements for taking the examination for admission to the bar by a World War II veteran.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is etxended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or II, or died as a result of such service. Amount: $150 per year per child with free tuition at State institutions of college grade.

The department of institutional service shall operate the State Military and Naval Children's Home for rearing and educating gratuitously children of soldiers and sailors of the State where such children are poor and neglected.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities and towns may appropriate funds for employment of veterans.

Honorably discharged officers or enlisted personnel who served during any foreign war and who are not members of the National or State Guard may be appointed by the Governor as staff members or aides-de-camp.

Leaves of absence are granted to county attorneys, county commissioners, clerks of the court, and disclosure commissioners in the military or naval service of the United States.

Leaves of absence are granted to public officers and employees with preservation of pension rights, seniority, and reinstatement within 90 days after discharge from military service excepting in cases of foreign service.

Preference is given to veterans or their widows and to the wives of disabled veterans (5 and 10 points) in appointments in the classified service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the retirement system for State employees.

Benefit rights are preserved under the teachers' retirement system and the Unemployment Compensation Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits in behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Children of veterans may be admitted to the State military and naval children's home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Care is provided for certain insane members of the armed forces.

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

A Soldier Settlement Act has been enacted.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

The department of health and welfare may receive Federal funds available to the State for publishing information beneficial to veterans and their dependents.

MARRIAGE

Forfeiture of tribal membership by marriage outside of certain Indian tribes is not applicable to any Indian member serving in the armed forces.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities and towns may raise funds for the purpose of erecting and care of suitable monuments or memorials in the memory of those who died in the Civil War or World Wars I and II.

PENSIONS

Pensions of $12 monthly are paid to veterans of the Civil War, Spanish-American War and of the Philippine Insurrection, their widows, dependent children, parents and sisters.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Cities and towns may appropriate funds for the rehabilitation and employment of veterans; also for physical fitness.

Inmates of Veterans' Administration Facility at Togus have their settlement in the respective towns in which they had a legal settlement when connection with such facility commenced.

The Development Commission has been expending postwar public works reserve funds.

Relief is extended to veterans and their families in their own homes.

Relief is extended to wives, children and parents of World Wars I and II veterans.

Savings banks, trust companies and building and loan associations may make loans to veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTION; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Free fishing licenses are issued to residents now serving in the armed forces and to veterans of World War II for 2 years after such war.

Soldiers stationed in the State and employees and soldiers regularly employed at the Veterans' Administration facility are classed as residents of the State for the purpose of obtaining fishing and hunting license.

Free liquor licenses are issued to certain clubs or associations for the sale of malt beverages to members of the armed forces, to be consumed on the premises where sold.

Operator's license may be removed without payment of fee upon the application of any person serving in the armed forces.

Operator's license may be renewed following service in the armed forces.

Certain veterans are exempted from poll tax.

Payment of poll tax is exempted during active service in the armed forces of the United States.

Estates to the amount of $3,500 of all veterans, or their widows, who shall have reached the age of 62 years or are receiving a pension or compensation from pension bureau or Veterans' Administration for total disability, or otherwise disabled, shall be exempt from taxation.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

Incorporation is provided to G. A. R. and American Legion posts.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veterans' organizations is punishable by a fine of not more than $20 or imprisonment not to exceed 30 days or both.

Veterans' organizations have been extended parade rights.

Veterans in receipt of compensation for service-connected disability are exempt from poll tax.

Veterans eligible for benefits under Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress are exempt from excise tax, and are eligible for free automobile registration and free operator's license.

Nantucket Sound Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Boston Herald of Monday, concerning the very serious maritime disaster which recently took place off the island of Nantucket, and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the same newspaper, on the 18th, regarding the same disaster, which goes into the lack of organization which resulted in a very serious tragedy. Both articles are by Stanley Eames.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NINE WERE DROWNED IN NANTUCKET SOUND DISASTER AND HOW COORDINATED EFFORTS MIGHT HAVE SAVED FIVE

(By Stanley Eames)

The sun rose over Nantucket at 6:19 September 10, 1949.

Two miles north, in a choppy sea which was calming after a storm that had wrecked the cruiser *Constance* 13 hours before, 5 of its 11 passengers floated in lifejackets.

IN SIGHT OF LAND

They could see the land. Scores of pleasure and fishing boats were anchored in its harbor. The Coast Guard's station there, equipped with a picket boat, a surfboat, and a duck, was situated at Brant Point.

Five hours later, all but one of the five were dead. At least four of that soaked, half-frozen little huddle of people might have lived. The fifth could possibly have been saved had there been a coordinated rescue plan.

They died because someone blundered.

But first, meet the people who died (presently, you will learn how they died):

Mrs. Mabel Marie Allenby, mother of a large and exceptional family. Wife of the Reverend Hubert A. Allenby of Oyster Pond Road, Falmouth, 52-year-old former Army chaplain.

Her daughter, Millicent A. Nairn, 22, Wellesley graduate, for three short months the bride of Robert Nairn and by all accounts a light-hearted girl who was deeply and unashamedly in love. Everybody called her Mit, and we shall, too.

Robert Nairn, 25, of Rochester, N. Y., former AAF navigator who once drifted 3 days in the Pacific—and lived to die in shallow waters off Nantucket. A graduate of Syracuse University, trainee in an engraving firm. A welcome adddition to the Allenby family.

Emily Foster, 21, of Falmouth, close friend of H. Alfred Allenby, Jr. A Mount Holyoke senior, an honor student, an attractive girl.

The one person in that group who lived is young Allenby, a Yale student and a brave, forgiving, and balanced man at the age of 23.

CHEERFUL HOUSE

He does not talk often about it, but said he would be willing to go over the facts with the Herald. "I find that it helps," he said. "It helps me to begin to understand this thing. And I don't mind telling you there's a whole lot that I don't understand yet."

As he talks of the disaster which claimed nine lives, it becomes apparent that he is comforted by the manner in which the people around him died. "I never realized people could go so bravely and well," he said.

To find him you go to Falmouth and turn left by a little sign that says, "The Allenbys." There are a lot less Allenbys now than there were on September 9.

It is a cheerful, comfortable, unpretentious house on a hill, the sort of house that has rung with a great deal of laughter. Allenby greets you at the door with a cordial, "Come right in." Immediately you are struck by the photographs in the living room.

On a card table a picture of a radiant girl in a bridal costume and a man who looks so happy he can't believe his luck—Mit and Bob. Mit, who died after she was halfway in a rescue boat. Mit, who was so in love that it bore her up through the night with unflagging determination to live for her man's sake. Bob, who spent his strength helping hold up his father-in-law and then died what was perhaps the most heart-breaking death of all—seeing safety pulling away from him as his strength flickered out.

On the mantel, many pictures, ranging from studio portraits to snapshots.

The senior Allenby, tall and a trifle stern in his chaplain's uniform. Crow's-feet of laughter around his eyes. Mrs. Allenby in a head study, serene and assured. Emily Foster, of whom Allenby said: "What kept me up was that I loved Em so."

Thousands of people like the Allenbys enjoy the Massachusetts coast every summer. They started on a pleasure cruise from Falmouth to Nantucket September 9 and all but one died the next day, when deliverance seemed closest. Besides those already named there were six others, five of whom died. There may have been no help for their deaths.

They were the elder Allenby; his son Leighton, 20; Leighton's vivacious friend and house guest, Patricia Dickinson, 18, of Verona N. Y.; John Hadley, 18, of Falmouth; and Jane Mange, also 18, of Staten Island, N. Y., a Wheaton College sophomore vacationing in Falmouth. These all died before daybreak.

Finally there was Russell Palmer, 23, of Scranton avenue, Falmouth, who skippered the boat the others had hired. He came ashore alone on Dionis Beach at 8:30 a. m. on September 10.

You should know a little of Nantucket's geography to understand fully what happened. Its north side, with which we are concerned, sweeps up in a crescent-moon, 15-mile curve. At its left, as you look at a map, Eel Point, Madaket, Hither Creek. At its right, Great Point. To the left of the island proper, Tuckernuck and Muskeget Islands.

Off to the right of Eel Point is Dionis Beach, a long sand strip. A mile out from Dionis and roughly parallel, a sandbar where the rescue attempt occurred. To Dionis' right there are jetties out from Nantucket Harbor and Brant Point, where the Coast Guard station is situated. About 10 miles northeast of Brant Point are Tuckernuck Shoals, where the *Constance* swamped and its occupants went overboard.

At 4 p. m., September 9, after a pleasant day on the island, the *Constance*, a 38-foot, twin-engine cruiser owned by Carl Palmer of Falmouth, the youthful skipper's father, was fueled at the island service wharf. The engines were running because the starboard motor's battery was defective and had to be started, as a rule, by dragging it, much as you start a car whose battery is dead by pushing it.

At 4:20 the *Constance* moved out, Palmer at the wheel, waved to the coast guard as he passed through the jetties. Cumulus clouds hung low over the horizon, but no storm warnings had been posted. Hardly a Nantucketer stirred from port. One small sailboat did.

Allenby says: "Russ Palmer didn't let us in for this. There was no discussion about not starting out. I would have, had I been running the boat."

Not far out the wind began roaring and in an incredibly short time there was a raging thunderstorm. About 50 minutes out, the party saw a sailboat on which a man and woman were furling the sails. It was the 17-foot *Dottie*, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Earle Williams, Jr., of West Dennis. They had decided to anchor and ride it out.

"We thought it might be in trouble," Allenby said. "Russ turned to port to hail it. The starboard engine stopped. He headed back into the sea. The bow swamped and the port engine stopped."

There followed a desperate attempt to dry off the soaked motors with carbon tetrachloride. Soon after, they dropped anchor—50 feet. In a few more minutes the *Constance* began breaking up.

Palmer says the boat had recently been overhauled and was seaworthy. However, the little *Dottie* rode it out—the *Constance* was out of sight when it began swamping—and at around 9 p. m. made port successfully.

TIED TOGETHER

Palmer gave each passenger life jackets, lashed them together, and the group went overboard, tied to the boat with the line, which kept them in a circle. The rope between them and the *Constance* parted in 35-mile gusts. Palmer fought his way back and tried unsuccessfully to join it again. He became separated from his passengers and the next morning landed on Nantucket without having seen them again.

In the water, drifting (as it has been established) southward and eastward from Tuckernuck Shoal, the party fought hard to live while the wind shrieked, and cold green waves slapped salt water over them.

Around midnight, maybe a little later, they began dying.

The Reverend Mr. Allenby went first; Leighton second (supported to the last by valiant little Pat Dickinson); John Hadley third; Pat, who fought for life until nearly morning, fourth. Finally Jane Mange died, too.

It is generally agreed these dead could not have been saved, but Allenby dissents. He believes flares in the water might have spotlighted their positions at night so that rescue would have been possible.

Meantime, the elder Palmer went out looking for the missing cruiser. Heavy seas forced him into Marthas Vineyard, where he telephoned the Woods Hole Coast Guard. This station notified the Brant Point station, which comes under its command, and it sent out an 83-foot cutter based at Woods Hole to search.

An alert went to the Salem search and rescue unit. It did nothing until dawn. Apparently no information was sent to the unit at the Quonset Naval Air Base.

The cutter from Woods Hole found nothing. On Nantucket Warrant Officer James Beaumont sent a night patrol to comb the northern beaches. Later that night, the elder Palmer got back to Falmouth.

When morning came, Mrs. Allenby weakened fast. No boats were in sight although Nantucketers say that, had they been asked, they would have blanketed the area with private craft from the moment of sunrise.

Mrs. Allenby died, her son says, some time after that. "I would estimate the sun had been up an hour and a half," he said. This would be around 7:30.

She died quietly after a night of suffering such as few women ever know. There was nothing her son and daughter could do for her.

Was her death inevitable? Had the Coast Guard conducted a more vigorous search, would she be alive today? The point will always be a matter for intense argument.

It is certain that the cutter from Woods Hole was searching some time before Mrs. Allenby died. But its search was much farther out into the sound than the scene of the wreck or of the survivors of the bodies. An amphibian from the Salem search and rescue unit may have been in the area.

The elder Palmer was up early on the morning of the 10th. At 6 a. m., he telephoned Marvin Odum, operator of the Falmouth Airport, and asked him to fly over the area. Odum was in the air 15 minutes later.

Odum, in his late twenties, and a native of North Carolina, is a former Navy combat pilot, a cool, capable, and resourceful man. At 6:51 he was over the north end of Martha's Vineyard. He radioed John Betts, Civil Aeronautics Administration communicator at the Nantucket station.

STEP-BY-STEP ACCOUNT

The CAA log from that moment on gives virtually the only connected version of what actually happened, a step-by-step account of the frustrated search and rescue attempts. The CAA airways communication station at Nantucket Airport is set up to aid planes in flight. It gives weather data, and aid to pilots in trouble. It coordinates with other agencies in any emergency. It has a radio, a teletype, telephones, and an interphone system linked with the Quonset station and Boston's air traffic control center.

Its chief communicator is Lester Bachman, an affable, nervous, conscientious man. Other communicators who participated in the CAA's work that morning were Betts and Henry Gabriel. After the first radio contact, the search planes were seldom out of touch with this station.

Odum searched to the east of Nantucket as Betts tried to telephone the Coast Guard, whose line was busy. Odum then swung back toward Martha's Vineyard. Very possibly he passed over the survivors. At 7:53—probably not long after Mrs. Allenby died—he radioed Betts that it was "very hard to see" anything on the water. Whitecaps were breaking high.

Somewhat later Odum landed at Nantucket and talked briefly with Allen Holdgate, proprietor of the Holdgate Flying Service, in his office-lunch counter. He called the elder Palmer, who asked him to return to Falmouth and fly him over the area.

Before Odum and Palmer took off from Falmouth, Palmer's family telephoned the Falmouth Airport to say he had learned his son Russell was ashore on Nantucket and that the rest were floating in lifejackets. A moment later the Woods Hole station—which Odum says directed the search until after Palmer came ashore—called to say young Palmer thought the survivors were afloat between Eel Point and Great Point. This left a large body of water to search.

OVER THE ROAD

Sometime in the morning—time not given—the Coast Guard's Brant Point duck was ordered to patrol from the station westward over the road to Madaket at the island's west end, and from there on the water to Tuckernuck and Muskeget Islands.

This land-and-water vehicle performed no important part in the saving of wreck survivors or the recovery of bodies. Its role has not been clarified by the Coast Guard.

The cutter was 6 miles out in Nantucket Sound—or more—during the early morning. It came in to a point less than a mile north of the sandbar during the latter stages of the rescue—and picked up three bodies.

A third boat, which comes closer than any other to qualifying as the one best suited for this type of rescue, may also have been

out early in the morning. This is a thirty-odd-foot picket boat, radio-equipped, manned by a minimum of three men (in this case) and possibly more. Sometime that morning—again the time is not given—it was sent eastward toward Great Point to search.

The cutter and the duck were at work when Russell Palmer crawled ashore at around 8:30 a. m. The surfboat which ultimately performed the rescue was moored. The picket boat may or may not have been out.

At this stage Mrs. Allenby had died. Emily Foster was weakening but still very much alive. The survivors, floating within sight of land, had seen no boats.

HOW NEWS OF SEA DISASTER SLOWLY TRICKLED ASHORE

(By Stanley Eames)

While Alfred Allenby, his friend, Emily Foster; his sister and brother-in-law, Mit and Robert Nairn, floated in lifejackets off Nantucket's north shore at around 8:30 a. m. on September 10, another man came ashore on Dionis Beach.

Dionis Beach was just under 2 miles south of the little, rope-joined group. Russell Palmer, skipper of the *Constance*, 38-foot cruiser they all had abandoned in the wild seas the previous night, had probably not been far from them all night.

TOSSED AROUND THROUGHOUT THE NIGHT

He told investigators later that he tossed around not far from Cross Rip Lightship, miles to the northwest. It is not likely he did so, it has been learned; if he had, a swift tide would have drawn him down through the treacherous Muskeget Channel to the island's west.

At the time he came ashore, nobody had seen him in the water. Sunbathers lolled on Dionis Beach, but the wavetops were so high nobody spotted him until he staggered out on the sand. Then nobody paid him any attention; he was so weak that the bathers wrote him off as a drunk who had probably slept on the beach.

A servant at the summer home of Stanley G. Fitch, on a bluff overlooking Dionic, finally realized he was in trouble, learned a little of his story, and hurried him to the Fitch residence.

Mr. Fitch cannot place the exact time at which Palmer was brought, spent, into his house. "Between 8:30 and 8:45, somewhere in there," is his best guess. Boatswain Beaumont, of the Coast Guard station, testified at the Coast Guard's subsequent hearing in Boston that he was notified at 9 a. m.

At this point it may be well to explain exactly what the Coast Guard's duties are in such emergencies.

The function of search and rescue, in peacetime, is primarily a Coast Guard duty. The Navy aids in cases where the Coast Guard makes such a request unless Navy personnel is in distress, in which case it is a Navy duty; and, of course, it aids people in distress at sea. That is an unwritten law as old as the Navy.

On the other hand, regulations are specific in pointing out that the Coast Guard is completely free to call upon the Navy for aid. "The Navy," a recent naval order said, "recognizes the need for reasonable cooperation with the Coast Guard and other agencies concerned with search and rescue."

There is the official picture: This case was the Coast Guard's responsibility.

While the Coast Guard interviewed Palmer at the Fitch home, what was the desperate Allenby party doing out in there in the water?

This is Alfred Allenby talking:

"I could see the shore, as I told you. Em (Emily Foster) couldn't, she was so near-sighted. I knew we had to do something, so I told her I was going to swim in—it was all we could do. If I went, she said, she was going with me.

"I took one line, put a noose under my arms and started swimming. * * * No, Em wasn't tied to me. She held my hand. The line ran from me to Mit and Bob. The wind and tide brought us in to something like a mile from the shore.

"After we got in a way, a plane came, flying low out of nowhere. It spotted us and wigwagged. Mit waved the purple kerchief tied to her arm. Bob didn't wave. He had used most of his strength holding Dad up through the night."

TEMPO PICKING UP

Ashore, meantime, the tempo was picking up. Here Allen W. Holdgate, proprietor of the Nantucket Flying Service, enters the picture. Holdgate is a sunburned, blond man who could be anywhere from 30 to 45 years old. The Herald flew with him over the area where so many died and it is apparent that his grasp of the situation was, and is, excellent.

Holdgate learned about the disaster when Odum dropped into his Quonset-hut lunchroom at the airport for coffee. At approximately 9:30 Odum telephoned Holdgate from Falmouth and asked him to join the air search.

Holdgate took off immediately, according to his sworn statement, with John Betts, the CAA communicator who had lately come off duty; George Lusk, first man actually to see the survivors; and Gradon Parker. He was flying a Piper Clipper; Odum a Stinson.

As he was leaving, Holdgate radioed the CAA station. Henry Gabriel, on duty, called the Coast Guard at Brant Point just after Holdgate took the air.

"It was my impression," Gabriel told the Herald, "that the Coast Guard was well briefed on it. They informed me they had a JRB (amphibian) out from Salem and that their boats were out."

FLEW STRAIGHT OUT

Holdgate, in his statement to the Coast Guard, said at this point:

"I flew straight out to Great Point and took a bearing on Eel Point and covered this area, returning on the same route to a point about 1 mile east of the jetties (which come out from Nantucket Harbor), at which time I reversed my course and headed back toward Eel Point. About due north of Dionis Beach I started making circles to check the area."

Odum, while this was happening, had returned to Falmouth and taken off again with the elder Palmer aboard. He carried an inflatable liferaft, which he put into the plane's cabin. He wrote inflating instructions on it with a pen, and put the raft on the seat beside him. Palmer was in the rear seat.

When Odum flew back over this area Holdgate still had not found the *Constance* survivors.

Ashore, faint suggestions of the situation offshore had begun to reach islanders. These people are bitter today over the fact that they were not told earlier, so they could have sent small boats out to cover the area systematically. If they had, they believe, Emily Foster, Mit and Bob Nairn, and possibly Mrs. Allenby would be alive today.

Outspoken George Mackay, World War I flying hero and expert sailor, whose boat is powered with twin Chrysler engines and can make 29 knots, says he would have been out at the crack of dawn had he been asked.

Let Mackay tell how he found out about the situation:

"I was on the Island Service dock. A jeep came and stopped at the filling station nearby and its people wanted to know how to get a boat, because 'some people were in trouble.' They left.

"The filling-station man came to me and Joe King and said: 'Can you imagine anyone in the Coast Guard asking a filling-station man where they could get a boat?' "

OFFERED SERVICES

After further inquiry, Mackay went to the Coast Guard station to offer his services. State Trooper Edgar Lindstrom was there, talking with Boatswain Beaumont.

Lindstrom's first information came at 10:21—about 2 hours after Palmer fell on the beach. He got it from the Oak Bluffs barracks radio and 3 minutes later was on his way to the Coast Guard station, where he inquired the situation of Beaumont.

"He told me," Lindstrom said, "that somebody had come ashore and they were looking for survivors."

How did the local police, an agency which normally is notified in such matters, learn about it?

Police Chief Lawrence Mooney, an elderly, mustached, cheerful man who has little crime to deal with on the peaceful island, found out about it from a newspaperman. His radio log shows the hour to be 9:45—a good hour after Palmer came ashore.

One of the earliest nonservicemen at the Brant Point station was Patrolman Wendell Howes, sent there by Chief Mooney when a newspaperman gave him the tip.

He took the cruise car there, to find a crew of Coast Guard men about to ride to Dionis, which they thought was on the island's south, or ocean, side.

"I was amazed," he said, "to learn they didn't know where Dionis was." Howes led them there in his cruise car.

"Beaumont (Coast Guard boatswain) was there when we arrived," Howes said. "He told them to patrol the beaches and then he went back to Brant Point."

The time must have been around or shortly after 10 a. m., for wreckage from the *Constance* began drifting onto Dionis a half hour before the first body came ashore. The Coast Guard's shore patrol put the wreckage in neat piles.

NOT NOTIFIED

About 10:10 Fire Chief Archibald Cartwright, a loquacious man given to high-button shoes and daily chats with his old friend, Chief Mooney, dropped into the police station. There he learned that a resuscitator might be needed. The Coast Guard, he says, had told him nothing. He hurried to the fire station and ordered the island's sole resuscitator put on a truck. Then he joined the growing group on Dionis Beach.

The Coast Guard's duck, which had started for Tuckernuck and Muskeget Islands, was flagged down at Madaket, on the island's west side, by Miss Mildred Jewett after she received a telephone call from Beaumont.

At this point it should be said that Miss Jewett, who trained war dogs during the war years, is a Coast Guard representative without portfolio. She operates from her little store at the Madaket settlement, where she presides, clad in Coast Guard clothing, with good-natured bluster. The Coast Guard is the very breath of life to her.

Miss Jewett, at any rate, relayed a message from Brant Point that two men were to take the 26-foot motor surfboat moored in nearby Hither Creek and search north of the island for "people in the water." The Coast Guard had told the CAA radio at 9:45 that "our boats are out."

At that same hour, Odum called the CAA station to inform them that he was on the way back from Falmouth to search once more. When he got over the scene again—it could hardly have been much before 10 a. m.—he says he saw the cutter "way out in the bay" and the picket boat "heading out the harbor for Cross Rip Lightship." At that time he saw no sign of the rescue boat.

Creeping Taxation—a Progressive Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by our colleague, Hon. RALPH W. GWINN, of New York:

A CONGRESSMAN REPORTS: CREEPING TAXATION—A PROGRESSIVE DISEASE

(By Hon. RALPH W. GWINN, Twenty-seventh District, New York)

Creeping taxation from Washington has deprived millions of Americans of their rent money. It has put food prices beyond reach. It has impoverished the towns and cities until they can't scrape up enough money to educate their children. Those of us past 65 years of age find our savings all confiscated and spent by the Government. Now we learn the taxpayers generally are so impoverished that they will be unable to pay sufficient taxes to make good the losses of our savings for old-age pensions. And we can't live on the printed money we are getting, worth only 50 cents on the dollars we paid in.

At last we see what ails us. It's the withholding taxes, excise taxes, income taxes, corporation taxes, inheritance taxes, stamp taxes, transportation taxes—taxes of all kinds. For years most taxes were hidden from us. We were fooled into thinking the rich man or corporation paid them. But now we feel them right down to the bone. Now we see them plainly in every item we buy. When we get sick, nothing is left to pay the hospital bills.

So the people complain and petition the Congress to reduce the burdens of taxation and free them from the Government itself. For example, millions of tenants are on the Government's back complaining about the 20-percent withholding tax. That tax, they say, would just about pay their rents. But instead of repealing the tax and reducing its costs, the Government shifts the tenants onto the backs of little-property owners and forces them to reduce the tenants' rent by 40 percent That 40-percent tax is the destruction of private property on the road to socialization.

Thus individuals and old properties are being liquidated, used up or taken over by the Government as mortgagor in foreclosure. The Government now owns one-fourth of all land in the 48 States. It holds a fourth of all mortgages outstanding on the farms of the country. It has loaned 70 percent of all the money used in building houses since the war. All this is being done by taxation. In the next depression, as our mortgagor, it can take us over or crack the whip and make us all vote for mercy.

About half of all American families or one adult person out of six are now on their knees depending on Washington for help to balance their family budgets—in whole or in part. That means that half our families are no longer a free people with the means to provide for themselves housing, food, clothing, education, and health. It also means that only half our families are still left partly free and still able to produce enough surplus to support the other half in whole or in part by paying the Government taxes now collected for their support. That overworked and oppressed remaining half are being further reduced in numbers every day. There is developing a smaller group in production that must inevitably earn less income and create smaller surpluses. From them alone can Government seize or tax for the benefit of the wards it has already made of half our population.

Obviously private property is the only source from which socialized houses and food and clothing, health, and education can be taken for less than cost and donated to others. It is equally obvious that when private property is exhausted by the robbery of one group for the benefit of another group, the latter group will surely then have to pay the whole cost of everything. They will pay in sweat to the army of entrenched one-party bureaucrats and commissars for whom they must work and from whom there can be no escape. It is all brought about in every land, as Karl Marx directed, by creeping progressive taxation.

We've already got that here in America.

Many Congressmen would like to have the people's support in a rebellion against taxation—a rebellion against Government which is becoming increasingly unmanageable, and which has all the earmarks of being our own brand of world socialism.

Report to the People of the Second District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth herewith a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The purpose of this report is to make available, in concise form, information which is scattered over thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information which, from a practical point of view, would not be available to the majority of the voters of the district which I am honored to represent here in the House.

It is my hope that this report, which includes all roll calls in the covered period, will enable my constituents to be intelligently informed of the voting record of their Representative in Congress.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote, is desired, I shall be glad to furnish that information to those who may so request:

Roll call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Selection of Speaker of the House (Rayburn, 255 to 160)	Martin.
3	do	H. Res. 5: Amendment to House Rules, permitting committee chairmen to bring to floor any measure not reported by Rules Committee within 21 days (adopted 275 to 142).	Nay.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22: Postponed date for submission of legislative budget from Feb. 15, as required by 1946 Reorganization Act, to May 1 (passed 230 to 142)	Do.
5	do	H. R. 2361: To provide for reorganization of Government agencies (passed 356 to 9)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78: To provide $200,000 for investigations by House Committee on Un-American Activities (passed 353 to 29)	Do.
7	do	Motion to recommit H R 1211: Reciprocal trade agreements bill, to committee with instructions to retain peril-point provision in law (motion lost, 151 to 241).	Do.
8	do	H. R. 1211: Extending authority of President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements (passed 319 to 69)	Do.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	do	H. Res. 99: Waiving all points of order against H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 242 to 121)	Nay.
11	do	Quorum call	Present.
12	do	do	Do.
13	Feb. 16	do	Do.
14	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill to committee with instructions to insert $9,000,000 to handle State backlog of unemployment claims (lost 148 to 237).	Yea.
15	do	H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill (passed 367 to 19)	Do.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports, instructing committee to report bill deleting such authority for agricultural commodities, supply of which certified to be in excess of domestic needs (motion lost 139 to 222).	Yea.
18	do	H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports (passed 259 to 102)	Do.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	H. Res. 75: Authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations (passed 331 to 4)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 1	Motion to recommit H. R. 199: To provide immigration quotas, to Asian and Pacific peoples (defeated 39 to 336)	Nay.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663: To provide for administration of Central Intelligence Agency (passed 348 to 4)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	do	Do.
26	Mar. 14	do	Do.
27	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 163 to 181)	Yea.
28	do	H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 166 to 176)	Nay.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	Williams "home rule" amendment to H. R. 1731: To extend rent control (adopted 227 to 188)	Yea.
31	do	Rains amendment to delete authority to recontrol hotels which had been decontrolled (adopted 237 to 175)	Do.
32	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1731: Rent control bill, instructing committee to extend existing law 3 months (defeated 154 to 260)	Do.

Roll call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
33	Mar. 15	H. R. 1731: Extending time and scope of Federal rent control (passed 261 to 153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (adopted 368 to 1)	Yea.
35	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 21	.....do	Do.
37	...do.....	H. R. 1757: Extension of District of Columbia rent control (passed 247 to 117)	Yea.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	...do.....	H. R. 1437: Authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (passed 395 to 4)	Yea.
40	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee (failed, 187 to 223)	Do.
41	...do.....	Motion to strike out the enacting clause of H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (failed 120 to 291)	Nay.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	.....do	Do.
44	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee for further study (carried, 208 to 207)	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	.....do	Do.
47	...do.....	S. 135: To authorize Board of Commissioners of District of Columbia to establish summer daylight saving time (passed, 223 to 130)	Yea.
48	...do.....	Quorum call	Present
49	Mar. 29	.....do	Do.
50	...do.....	Amendment to H. R. 3734; Appropriations for civil functions of Army, to prevent acquisition of lands at Garrison Dam, N. Dak. (failed 194 to 203).	Yea.
51	...do.....	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, providing funds for project at Clinton River, Mich. (adopted 256 to 138)	Do.
52	...do.....	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, adding $6,000,000 amount for lower Mississippi flood control (adopted 277 to 117).	Nay.
53	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for District of Columbia (lost 177 to 218)	Yea.
54	...do.....	H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (passed 216 to 180)	Nay.
55	...do.....	Conference report on H. R. 1731: Extension of Federal rent control (adopted 263 to 143)	Do.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	...do.....	.....do	Do.
58	Mar. 31	.....do	Do.
59	...do.....	H. Res. 168: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2023, to regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 383 to 9)	Yea.
60	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	.....do	Do.
62	...do.....	Poage substitute amendment to H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 242 to 137)	Nay.
63	...do.....	H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (passed 287 to 89)	Do.
64	Apr. 4	Nonsegregation amendment to H. R. 1823: To establish Women's Reserve of Coast Guard Reserve (adopted 193 to 153)	Do.
65	...do.....	H. R. 3830: To amend China Aid Act of 1948 (passed 279 to 70)	Yea.
66	Apr. 7	H. Res. 180: Providing for consideration of H. R. 4016, appropriations bill for State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and waiving all points of order (adopted 246 to 137).	Nay
67	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
68	...do.....	Motion to adjourn (rejected 145 to 212)	Yea
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
70	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 4046: Deficiency appropriation bill, with instructions to include funds for War Claims Commission (lost 149 to 190)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	...do.....	.....do	Do.
73	Apr. 11	.....do	Do.
74	Apr. 12	.....do	Do.
75	...do.....	H. R. 3748: Extension and amendment of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, Marshall plan (passed 354 to 49)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	.....do	Do.
78	Apr. 26	.....do	Do.
79	...do.....	H. Res. 191: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2032, to revise the Labor Relations Act of 1947 (adopted 369 to 6)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	.....do	Do.
82	Apr. 29	.....do	Do.
83	May 3	.....do	Do.
84	...do.....	Wood amendment to H. R. 2032; National labor relations law revision (adopted 217 to 203)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 2032: National labor relations law revision (agreed to 212 to 209)	Nay.
87	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2989: To incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation (passed 273 to 62)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2203: To provide for a decennial census of housing (passed 223 to 51)	Do.
90	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 10	Amendment to H. R. 4392: Swiss war damage claims bill, to prevent payment of interest on claims (rejected 172 to 191)	Yea.
92	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	.....do	Do.
94	...do.....	H. R. 2682: To amend Commodity Credit Charter Act, and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act (passed 326 to 52)	Yea.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
96	...do.....	Conference report on H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill of 1949 (adopted 292 to 17)	Nay.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	...do.....	H. Res. 190: Providing for consideration of H. R. 195, to assist the States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes (agreed to 322 to 24)	Yea.
99	May 18	Overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 1036: Claims bill for destroyed internal revenue stamps (overridden 318 to 49)	Do.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	...do.....	.....do	Do.
102	May 20	.....do	Do.
103	May 24	.....do	Do.
104	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 4591: Armed services pay bill (agreed to 227 to 163)	Yea.
105	May 26	Conference report on H. R. 3704: District of Columbia revenue bill (adopted 184 to 152)	Nay.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	...do.....	H. R. 4617: To liberalize the requirement for pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (passed 365 to 27)	Nay.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
109	June 16	Motion to recommit H. R. 4963: To provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges (lost 135 to 195)	Yea.
110	June 21	H. R. 4332: To amend National Bank Act and Bretton Woods Agreement Act, so as to permit national banks to deal in securities of World Bank (passed 293 to 55).	Do.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	.....do	Do.
113	June 24	.....do	Do.
114	June 27	.....do	Do.
115	June 28	.....do	Do.
116	June 29	.....do	Do.
117	...do.....	Amendment to H. R. 4009: Public-housing and slum-clearance bill, to strike out public-housing section (rejected 204 to 209)	Yea.
118	...do.....	Amendment to H. R. 4009: Housing bill of 1949, barring payment of salaries to employees who fail to sign antisubversive affidavit (adopted 283 to 129).	Do.
119	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 4009: Housing bill of 1949 (lost 170 to 241)	Do.
120	...do.....	H. R. 4009: To provide Federal aid for public housing and slum clearance (passed 228 to 185)	Nay.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
122	...do.....	Motion to recommit H. R. 4406: Yugoslav claims bill (lost 151 to 177)	Yea.
123	...do.....	H. Res. 277: To provide for consideration of S. 1008, to to define application of Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point price bill) (adopted 305 to 22).	Do.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
125	...do.....	Amendment to S. 937: Authorizing payment of certain claims, to reduce amount to be paid (adopted 167 to 142)	Yea.
126	July 13	H. R. 2960: To amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones (passed 282 to 109)	Do.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	...do.....	.....do	Do.
129	July 20	.....do	Do.
130	...do.....	.....do	Do.
131	July 21	.....do	Do.
132	...do.....	Gore amendment to H. R. 5345: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) to continue present program for 1 year (adopted 239 to 170).	Yea.

Roll call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
133	July 21	H. R. 5345: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) (passed 383 to 25)	Yea.
134	July 25	Motion to adjourn [1] (defeated 102 to 243)	Nay.
135	...do...	Previous question on approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 (carried 259 to 88)	Yea.
136	...do...	Approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 [1] (approved 285 to 54)	Do.
137	...do...	Motion to adjourn [1] (defeated 113 to 243)	Nay.
138	...do...	Previous question on adoption of H. Res. 276: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (ordered 262 to 100)	Yea.
139	...do...	Motion to adjourn [1] (defeated 110 to 252)	Nay.
140	...do...	H. Res. 276: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (adopted 265 to 100)	Yea.
141	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	...do...	Do.
143	...do...	Motion to recommit H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (lost 123 to 267)	Nay.
144	...do...	H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (passed 273 to 116)	Yea.
145	July 27	Motion to recommit conference report on S. 1184, to encourage construction of rental housing in areas adjacent to military installations (lost 52 to 289).	Nay.
146	...do...	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 1	...do...	Present.
148	...do...	H. R. 3282: To repeal Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin (defeated 131 to 168)	Nay.
149	...do...	H. R. 5602: Authorizing the Secretary of State to provide for the relief of Chinese students in United States (passed 254 to 46)	Yea.
150	Aug. 2	H. R. 5598: To increase disability and death-compensation rates, and liberalize dependency allowances for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents (passed 356 to 0).	Do.
151	...do...	Conference report on H. R. 5632: To promote efficiency and economy in National Military Establishment (adopted 356 to 7)	Not voting. [2]
152	...do...	H. Res. 289: To provide for consideration of H. R. 29, to provide parity for tung nuts (adopted 335 to 21)	Yea.
153	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	...do...	Do.
155	...do...	...do...	Do.
156	Aug. 4	...do...	Do.
157	...do...	...do...	Do.
158	...do...	H. Res. 310: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act (adopted 233 to 113)	Yea.
159	...do...	Quorum call	Absent.
160	...do...	...do...	Present.
161	Aug. 5	...do...	Do.
162	...do...	...do...	Do.
163	...do...	Motion to recommit H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (lost 124 to 187)	Yea.
164	...do...	H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (passed 183 to 131)	Nay.
165	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
166	...do...	Amendments to H. Res. 183: To provide for consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 249 to 124)	Nay.
167	...do...	H. Res. 183: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 351 to 17)	Yea.
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	...do...	...do...	Do.
170	...do...	Motion to instruct conferees to insist upon disagreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid, which amendment restored "watchdog committee" (carried 210 to 164).	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
172	...do...	Lucas amendment to H. R. 5856: Amending the Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 225 to 181)	Yea.
173	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	...do...	H. R. 5856: Amending Fair Labor Standards Act (wage and hour law) (passed 361 to 35)	Yea.
175	...do...	Quorum call	Absent.
176	Aug. 12	...do...	Present.
177	...do...	...do...	Do.
178	...do...	Amendment to H. R. 5526: To authorize the President to delegate executive powers to other officers, which amendment would confine the delegation to "routine administrative duties" (failed 114 to 162).	Yea.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
180	...do...	H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations through Aug. 15, 1949 (failed two-thirds vote for suspension of rules 176 to 145)	Nay.
181	...do...	H. R. 2734: Amending Clayton Antitrust Act to control purchase of assets of one company by another (passed 223 to 92)	Yea.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	...do...	...do...	Do.
184	Aug. 17	...do...	Do.
185	...do...	Amendment to H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations, (amendment set Sept. 15, rather than indefinite continuance of appropriations) (adopted 213 to 114).	Yea.
186	...do...	H. Res. 327: Providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, military assistance program (agreed to 275 to 47)	Nay.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
188	...do...	Amendment to H. R. 5895: Bill providing for military assistance program, reducing appropriation from 2 years to 1, and halving amount (adopted 209 to 151).	Yea.
189	...do...	H. R. 5895: Providing for military assistance to European countries (passed 238 to 122)	Nay.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
191	...do...	...do...	Absent.
192	...do...	Amendment to H. R. 6008: Supplemental appropriations bill, amendment eliminated $3,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (adopted 150 to 129).	Yea.
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	...do...	...do...	Do.
195	...do...	...do...	Do.
196	Aug. 24	...do...	Do.
197	...do...	Motion to adjourn (carried 186 to 132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
199	...do...	H. Res. 342, making suspensions of the rules in order for 1 day only (adopted 270 to 1)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	...do...	...do...	Do.
202	...do...	H. R. 4495: Postal pay raise, leave, longevity, and promotion bill (passed 332 to 2)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
204	...do...	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (lost 113 to 213)	Yea.
205	...do...	Conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (approved 224 to 109)	Nay.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
207	...do...	Motion to instruct conferees to recede and concur in Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid (amendment provided $150,000,000 additional loan authorization) (motion prevailed 177 to 124).	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
209	...do...	H. R. 5903: To amend Hospital Survey and Construction Act (passed 236 to 43)	Nay.
210	...do...	S. 2116: To provide for advance planning of non-Federal public works (passed 210 to 69)	Yea.
211	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
212	...do...	Motion to instruct conferees on H. R. 3734, civil functions appropriation bill, to disagree to any funds for flood-control project at Gavins Point, S. Dak. (rejected 101 to 153).	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
214	...do...	Previous question on H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act, under a closed rule with no amendments in order (ordered 175 to 154).	Nay.
215	...do...	H. Res. 372, providing a closed rule for the consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (adopted 189 to 135)	Do.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
217	...do...	Motion to recommit H. R. 6000, social-security bill, with instructions to substitute Kean bill, H. R. 6297 (lost 112 to 232)	Yea.
218	...do...	H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (passed 333 to 14)	Do.
219	Oct. 6	Conference report on H. R. 5300, third deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 269 to 18)	Do.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
221	...do...	...do...	Do.
222	...do...	Motion that House insist on its disagreements to Senate amendment to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (58 versus 48 air groups) (motion prevailed 305 to 1).	Yea.
223	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
224	...do...	Motion that House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (retaining appropriation for stock piling of strategic materials) (motion prevailed 305 to 0).	Yea.

[1] These maneuvers were part of filibuster against anti-poll-tax bill.
[2] Absent; if present, I would have voted "yea."

Roll call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
225	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	do	Do.
227	do	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 6008; supplemental appropriation bill, to strike out $3,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (defeated 159 to 163).	Yea.
228	Oct. 13	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1376: A bill authorizing 3 new municipal judgeships for District of Columbia (lost 30 to 286)	Do.
229	do	Adoption of rule for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, extending certain provisions of National Housing Act (adopted 290 to 34)	Do.
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
231	do	Motion to recommit S. 1008: A bill to define and permit basing-point pricing (motion failed, 138 to 178)	Nay.
232	do	Adoption of conference report on S. 1008: To permit basing-point pricing (adopted 200 to 104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present
234	do	S. 2105: To stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic minerals (failed necessary two-thirds vote for suspension of rules, 176 to 118)	Yea.
235	do	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	do	Do.

Freight Rate Increases Pricing the Pacific Northwest Off the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about rising costs of living of late in the course of which there has been a tendency to ignore the facts of life in favor of politically combustible assertions. Time after time, in debates on farm policy, we have heard ravings about what the farmer gets for his product and very little about the even greater cost of moving that product from the farm to the hands of the consumer.

In the Pacific Northwest, the railroads, particularly, have pursued a policy of increasing freight rates to offset reduced carloadings and higher wage costs. As a result, they are pricing themselves off the market, to the extent that truck hauling is steadily on the increase. This is so much true that I have asked the Department of Agriculture's Production and Marketing Administration to consider reporting of truck movements through the Market News Service, in order to guarantee a true picture of farm commodity movements.

As one example of what is happening on the Northwest freight picture, the rate of shipping a light car from Detroit to Seattle has gone up $75 since 1946. The total freight today is $227.50. Any man who can get the time off his job can buy a one-way ticket on Northwest Airlines for $148.35 (tax included), fly to Detroit, and have that $75 left over to buy gas, oil, meals, and sleeping accommodations for the trip back. In short, he gets his vacation for the cost of boxcar space. If he wants to cheat a little, he can buy his ticket in Canada, thereby avoiding the Federal tax, and have $19.35 left to bring a present home to his wife.

Unfortunately, most folks in the Northwest cannot take advantage of this plan—but thousands do every year. When it comes to buying washing machines, refrigerators, foods, clothing, and the like, he just has to pay through the nose the average 50 percent increase in transportation charges on goods bought from the East.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows whether these increases are actually justified. The Interstate Commerce Commission has granted increase after increase since the war's end, based solely on the profit-and-loss statements of the railroads. The Commission has consistently refused to examine the efficiency of the roads themselves, to determine whether they are wasting money through obsolete practices, featherbedding labor policies, or just plain poor management. In any case, the Pacific Northwest consumer or shipper must pay the freight demanded by the railroads and in addition is still penalized an extra 10 percent "war tax" which, by virtue of the distance, grossly discriminates against him.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an analysis of the effects of freight-rate increases on the Pacific Northwest, published in the October 1949 issue of Pacific Northwest Industry, a publication of the School of Business of the University of Washington:

EFFECTS OF INCREASED FREIGHT RATES ON THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

(By Stanley H. Brewer, assistant professor of transportation, University of Washington)

The location of any industry depends somewhat upon the freight rates for transporting raw materials to that industry and the finished product to market. The physical location of a plant is often dependent upon the relationships of freight rates of raw materials to the finished products, as well as the amount of shrinkage of these raw materials in production. Where many tons of raw materials go into the production of an intricate piece of machinery which weighs but a few hundred pounds, the plant facilities will be located close to the source of the basic materials. On the other hand, if the basic materials are blown up in size or weight in producing a finished product, the plant facilities will be located close to the market center. Where there is to be no change in size or weight of the article in the manufacturing process, location of plant will be immaterial.

RATE RELATIONSHIPS VITAL

These are well-founded principles of location of industry when transportation costs alone are being considered. Many other factors, of course, influence decisions pertaining to plant location. Once the means of production have been located, the success of the enterprise will depend largely upon competitive relationships in the markets available to the producer when the economics of production and transportation costs are considered. If per-mile transportation costs are constant for all producers of a given product, the most economic producer naturally would be able to distribute over the greatest area.

With these factors in mind it is easy to see how changes in freight rates affect patterns of distribution and market areas in which a given producer might sell his product. A downward adjustment of freight rates for a given producer, other factors remaining constant, would enable him to distribute profitably over a larger area. By the same token an upward adjustment of one producer's rates would tend to shrink his market area.

Producers are not greatly disturbed by changes in freight rates unless relationships are upset by these adjustments. A miller of grain, for example, would not be affected if rates on both flour and grain were adjusted proportionately, but if flour rates were raised and wheat rates remained unchanged he would find it advantageous to move closer to the market center, if other factors did not have to be considered, to benefit from the relatively lower wheat rates.

Any adjustment of rates is certain to have some effect on relationships of producers to market areas. Frequent changes in freight rates will result in a material disturbance of industry location and distribution patterns. With the rising spiral of our economy and the increased costs of operating transportation facilities have come frequent increases in the general level of freight rates throughout the United States. The railroads of the Nation have taken the lead in pushing rates upward; other forms of transportation have followed. Since 1948 there have been five percentage increases in the level of rail rates. The first two were small and did not greatly disturb relationships; also they were spaced far enough apart so that adjustments could be made. The last three, however, were inaugurated within a very short period of time. *Ex parte 162*,[1] which increased the level of rates 15 to 25 percent,[2] went into effect on its final form on October 13, 1947; *Ex parte 166* increased rates another 10 to 30 percent on June 6, 1948; and *Ex parte 168*, which granted the railroads an emergency increase of 4 to 6 percent as of January 11, 1949, provided a final increase of 8 to 10 percent effective September 1, 1949.

EFFECTS OF INCREASED FREIGHT RATES

These rapid changes have had a material effect on the movement of goods throughout the United States and will doubtless continue to disrupt marketing patterns. For ex-

[1] The term "ex parte," with the assigned number, is used in schedules of rates to indicate a particular percentage increase in rates.

[2] The percentage increase on *Ex parte 162*, on *166*, and on *168* varies by regions and by products. Generally the percentage increases have been higher in the East, where shipping distances are relatively short, than in the West and South where shipping distances are relatively long; this helps to maintain basic territorial rate relationships. Increases have been greater on manufactured goods than on raw materials.

ample, it is now possible to show perceptible changes both in markets for Pacific Northwest products sold and for those bought. The tendency is to shorten the transportation haul as much as possible in an attempt to cut costs. Changes that have occurred and are occurring may be grouped into three categories to show the consequences of increasing freight rates on marketing.

1. On certain goods coming to the Pacific Northwest: In the first category are hundreds of products, the selling or procurement markets of which have not been affected because of the nature of the commodity and of demand factors. In this group are such products as automobiles, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, and other consumer goods that entail expensive production plants and equipment. These industries cannot decentralize to take advantage of favorable transportation costs in the short run; consequently, higher freight rates are merely passed on to the consumer.

Following are four examples of how the increased freight rates have been added to the consumers' price, thus increasing the cost of living. When such calculations are made on the hundreds of items that the average family purchases each year, they indicate that a substantial portion of the additions to the family budget are the result of such increases in freight rates.

Freight charges on selected items, 1939–49

	Automobile [1]	Refrigerator [2]	Washing machine [3]	Electric stove [4]
1939	$139.28	$4.77	$3.69	$4.54
1946	152.06	5.21	3.90	4.84
1947	182.00	5.42	4.28	5.32
1948	218.00	7.71	5.78	7.13
1949	227.50	8.10	6.06	7.49
Added cost to consumer, [5] 1939–49	88.22	3.33	2.37	2.95

[1] Detroit to Seattle shipping cost of 1 lightweight automobile.
[2] Evansville, Ind., to Seattle, shipping cost of 1 average-sized refrigerator.
[3] St. Joe, Mich., to Seattle, shipping cost of 1 average-sized washing machine.
[4] Newark, Ohio, to Seattle, shipping cost of 1 average-sized electric stove.
[5] Retailers and wholesalers commonly calculate their selling prices on the basis of the cost of goods laid down in their respective establishments—which cost includes transportation charges. Where that occurs and where the wholesaler takes a mark-up of 20 percent of his selling price and the retailer 35 percent of his selling price, an increase of $5 in freight would increase the price to the consumer by $7.70.

Likewise in substantially the same category are items of consumption, such as agricultural products, which continued to be produced in areas of most economical production because of the nature of the soil, climate, or other factors. Increased freight rates for such items must be borne by the ultimate consumer in the form of higher prices. A head of lettuce, for example, grown in California or Arizona and packed in ice, shipped in a refrigerated car to Seattle, costs the housewife approximately one-half to three-fourths of a cent more than it did prewar because of the increases in freight rates. This sort of accounting applied to each of the 193 items in the consumer price index (formerly the cost-of-living index) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics would amount to a sizable figure in a year's time.

2. On certain goods leaving the Pacific Northwest: Closely allied to the first category of products is a second group which are produced in the Pacific Northwest and marketed in other areas of the United States and abroad. An attempt will be made to show how increases in freight rates on these items have disrupted or changed markets or marketing methods. Soft wheat, for example, is produced economically in quantity in the Pacific Northwest and marketed normally in population centers of the East and Southeast. As freight rates on wheat have increased, the Pacific Northwest has lost its economic advantages of lower production costs in higher transportation costs to the East and South, and with each percentage increase in rail rates the quantities of Pacific Northwest wheat and flour marketed in the East have dropped. This situation has become very serious inasmuch as the tonnage of Pacific Northwest soft wheat marketed east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio has dropped 87 percent since 1945, and to the markets south of Ohio 79 percent. If it were not for Government support price on wheat the economy of Pacific Northwest wheat farmers would be greatly imperiled, especially of late, since very little wheat is being moved into China, which was formerly a large market. The situation can best be illustrated in the following two tables.

Rail rates on wheat flour from the Pacific Northwest

[100 pounds]

	To— New York	Boston	Philadelphia	Baltimore
1937	$0.92	$0.94	$0.90	$0.89
1938	.975	.995	.955	.945
1942	1.005	1.025	.985	.975
1947	1.12	1.14	1.10	1.09
1948	1.37	1.395	1.345	1.335
1949	1.44	1.46	1.41	1.40
Total increase	.52	.52	.51	.51

Source: O. W. Hardesty, Centennial Flouring Mills, from exhibit on I. C. C. Docket, *Ex parte 168.*

Pacific Northwest sales of flour for shipment by rail

[100 pounds]

	To— Points north of Ohio River	Points south of Ohio River
1945	3,784,647	408,078
1946	2,554,379	419,049
1947	1,335,563	193,735
1948	499,013	86,954

The question arises as to what has happened to the market when presumably demand has remained constant. This situation illustrates the effect of disruption of rate relationships; eastern and southern flour demand formerly supplied by Pacific Northwest producers is now supplied by nearby producing areas. The percentage freight increases have played havoc with rate relationships on wheat and flour moving to eastern markets. Because of greater distances the base rates from the Pacific Northwest to eastern and southern points are higher than from the Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan areas of production to those points. When approximately the same percentage increase is added to a 35-cent base rate and to a 92-cent base rate, the resultant dollar-and-cent increases are greatly different. This is what has happened to the rates on flour. The freight rate on a 100-pound bag of flour from the Grain Belt area of the Midwest to eastern points has increased by approximately 18 to 20 cents, whereas the rate on the same product from the Pacific Northwest to the East has increased 51 to 52 cents, thus increasing the rate differential from 57 cents in 1937 to 87 cents at present. The 57-cent differential could be overcome by more economical production in the Pacific Northwest, but these economies cannot now overcome the 87-cent differential. Thus the Pacific Northwest has lost a substantial part of its market on soft wheat and flour.

Another example of a shrinking market is the case of a Pacific Northwest manufacturer of mineral wool, a product used as a building insulation material. This particular industry is new to the area, having been established shortly after the end of the war as demand for insulating materials increased. The product, made from slag or waste from the smelting industry as well as from other local materials, is extremely light and bulky with consequent relatively high transportation charges per unit of shipping weight. One of the major reasons for the establishment of the industry in this area was the fact that the product could not stand long-haul transportation charges from eastern producing points. As a consequence, Pacific Northwest producers immediately captured almost the entire western market upon completion of their plant in 1947. However, as freight rates increased, the market gradually shrunk from its original area as far east as the Dakotas and as far south as the Mexican border, to a present area only as far east as points in Montana and south approximately to the California-Oregon border. Production, therefore, has necessarily been drastically curtailed to supplying local markets. Other producers with higher costs of production have found it economical to start operations in those areas which cannot now be served by the Pacific Northwest industry.

The Pacific Northwest fishing industry has suffered in much the same manner; rail freight charges have increased from $2.07 per 100 pounds plus refrigeration charges in 1946, to $3.26 per 100 pounds plus refrigeration at present from Seattle to New York.

Freight rates [1] on frozen fish from Seattle [2]

[100 pounds]

	To— New York	Chicago	St. Paul
June 1946	$2.07	$1.73	$1.50
July 1946	2.19	1.83	1.65
January 1947	2.48	2.08	1.87
October 1947	2.73	2.29	2.06
January 1948	2.98	2.50	2.24
May 1948	3.10	2.60	2.24
January 1949	3.26	2.73	2.33

[1] Does not include refrigerator charges which have increased from $90 a car in 1946 to $119.03 at present for a car moving from Seattle to New York, with proportional increases on other movements.
[2] Exhibits prepared by Fred H. Tolan in ICC Docket, *Ex parte 168.*

In spite of the fact that production of frozen fish in Seattle has increased from 20,400,979 pounds in 1945 to 25,858,037 pounds in 1948, carloadings have fallen from 413 to 313 during the same period. The higher rail rate structure is not entirely responsible for the decline in carloadings as the United States is now importing considerable quantities of fish from Iceland which are being consumed in eastern markets, and truckloadings on the product increased to eastern points during this period.

One might assume from the foregoing discussion that increases in freight rates have had only adverse effects on Pacific Northwest industry, markets, and sources of supply. Such is not the case, as many examples could be cited whereby industries have profited materially by increases in freight rates. The dairy products industry, for example, has lost some of its market in Montana, Utah, southern Idaho, and southern Oregon where processing plants have been established to shorten transportation hauls and reduce transportation costs, but has gained in other markets. Chief competition for the dairy industry of the Pacific Northwest comes from the Wisconsin area. Formerly large quantities of butter, cheese, canned milk, and other products were shipped from Wisconsin

to west coast points for movement to Europe, the Orient, and Caribbean and South American markets. The higher freight rates in some respects have almost eliminated this movement, to the competitive advantage of Pacific Northwest producers who are now shipping more dairy products in the export market than ever before. Other industries have benefited in much the same manner.

3. On relocation of industry: The third general effect of the increases in freight rates might be termed relocation of industry, and here again the Pacific Northwest provides examples, although not as marked and clear-cut as in the previous categories. Industry, especially when there is a great deal invested in plant and equipment, does not shift as easily as do markets and sources of supply in response to changed conditions, in this case rising transportation costs. However, the Pacific Northwest is beginning to see some effects of higher rates on its industry.

Producers of machinery in the Seattle-Portland area formerly manufactured finished roadbuilding and logging equipment for markets in the Middle West and East. Increases in freight rates have now made it necessary to change their entire manufacturing process in order to compete with midwest and eastern producers. On one particular piece of machinery weighing 11,000 pounds the rate has increased from $1.78 a hundred to $2.73 a hundred, thus resulting in an increase in delivered cost of $104.50 which cannot be absorbed by the producer. As a result of this increase the producer has established a final assembly plant in the Middle West to which it ships rough forgings, at a lower charge than the machinery rate, for finishing and final production. This one plant has found it necessary to reduce employment by 100 to 150 persons in the Seattle area because of the changes in the manufacturing process. Similarly, these producers can no longer ship to California points where freight rates have increased from 62 to 92 cents on some items and $1.32 to $1.80 on other items.

By the same token there is evidence that some manufacturers have established assembly and manufacturing plants in the Pacific Northwest in order to reduce transportation costs. Should freight rates remain at the present high level others will follow.

If freight rates continue at their present high levels we shall probably see additional instances of transportation hauls shortened so as to reduce costs. In the long run, high costs of transportation may be a major factor in the further industrialization of the Pacific Northwest. At the same time they may mean that some Pacific Northwest industries will decrease materially in importance.

A Miamian in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 18 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of interesting articles written by Judge George E. Holt, entitled "A Miamian in Israel."

The manuscript is estimated by the Public Printer to require approximately three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald of July 11, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—SACRIFICES BUILD NATION FOR JEWS

(By Judge George E. Holt)

It was impossible to escape a feeling of history in Tel Aviv on that sunny May 4, 1949. The first anniversary of Israel as an independent nation found the people in a mood of high holiday. They had come through a difficult period, realized a dream 20 centuries old, won a war, set their feet on the path of international destiny.

The streets of the crowded city were draped with the blue and white flags of the new Jewish state. Men, women, and children paraded, danced, and sang.

The government proclaimed this first 12 months as "a year of wonders." The official announcement said: "Let the people meet in joyful assembly to offer thanksgiving. Let them honor the fallen and unite in lofty brotherhood. For on this day Israel celebrates the festival of the new freedom."

The city, the nation, and Jews throughout the world rejoiced in the reality of the ancient longing for a homeland. Yet, beneath the surface of the ringing words and pride was an almost grim note.

Said the nation's leading banker:

"Nineteen forty-nine will be a hard year. With some luck and a generous contribution from Jews abroad we can more or less attain our immigration target. But at the same time this can be reached only if (and it is a big if) we reduce our consumption to a level considerably lower than at present. In addition we must make a real effort to increase productivity.

"To tell the public that it can even improve its standard of living in the near future whilst bringing in hundreds of thousands of immigrants is grossly and irresponsibly misleading."

Israel is a nation facing gigantic problems at the beginning of its second year of life, yet facing them with a faith and determination that is one of the moving spectacles of our age. It was to learn this, to see at first hand the life and spirit of this people that we had come to this historic land.

We were a group of American non-Jews selected by the American Christian Palestinian committee for this fact-finding pilgrimage. Our mission was to study Israel in all its phases—economic, fiscal, governmental, political, religious—and report back to our local communities in an impartial manner.

It was fitting that we should be in Tel Aviv on the nation's first birthday. That morning we had special invitations to attend services in the great synagogue.

Traffic was at a standstill as pedestrians took over the streets. It seemed that the whole countryside had jammed into the city for the great occasion.

It was a strenuous task to fight our way through the crowd around the synagogue. It took the assistance of the military to get us into the building.

The sight was unforgettable. Every seat was taken. According to orthodox custom women were forbidden to mingle with the men and looked on from the galleries, two or three floors above. The cantor, brought over from London for this event, chanted the service in a moving voice.

Hundreds were standing in the rear and those in front suffered from the eager ones who tried to jam closer. Talk was incessant and applause punctuated the sermon of Rabbi Unterman.

All the high government officials were present except the president, who was in the United States on an important mission. Prime Minister David Ben Gurion helped officiate. He was a striking figure in his frock coat and silk top hat.

This, in a way, was the high point of the crowded day—the assembly of the people and their leaders in the temple of God. The theme of this meeting was joy and determination, thanksgiving, and rededication.

Later, Ben Gurion spoke to the nation by radio. His words were grave. "There is needless waste of property and effort, of manpower, and of time. We enjoy luxuries which do not benefit us. There is exaggerated profit, there is profiteering which is destroying the economy and our public spirit.

"It is imperative to bring a halt to all this, imperative for each one of us individually and imperative to the state which has to bear the heavy burden of defense and even heavier burden of absorbing mass immigration."

Israel has made amazing progress, through unbelievable personal sacrifice, during its first year of life. It faces tremendous problems undismayed and unafraid. Later articles will deal with some of these.

[From the Miami Herald of July 12, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—SOCIALIST FARM UNITS ARE BASES OF RURAL LIFE

(By Judge George E. Holt)

The creation of the new state of Israel had a world-wide impact. Yet this nation whose birth stirred the emotions of all people is only slightly larger than the State of Massachusetts and its population in the beginning was about 800,000 people.

Its first year was marked by a bitter war in which 10,000 men and women were killed or lost. That is as if the United States lost in battle more than 2,000,000 of its finest youth.

Now, following its star as the homeland of all Jews, with unrestricted immigration of the Jewish dispossessed of all lands, it is receiving new residents at the rate of 1,000 a day.

These newcomers, as well as former settlers, must be fed, clothed, housed, and the economic life of the nation placed on a sound basis. How?

It has been estimated that it will take 15 years for housing to catch up.

Palestine is not rich. There are no minerals. There is water, but the need for water control and irrigation is vital in this hot, often rainless land.

This is an agricultural country out of necessity and the basic form of rural life is the kibbutz.

We visited many of these communal farming settlements. The land is owned by the nation and leased to the communal group. In one type of kibbutz there is no such thing as private property. One earns with labor for the whole. It is a voluntary arrangement and the individual may leave whenever he desires.

Decisions are made in general meetings at which there is complete equality. People assemble at the ringing of a bell. Each member has a vote.

In this type of kibbutz, children live separately in age groups, being cared for by trained teachers and nurses. Parents are with their children only for a few hours after the day's work is done.

Everyone has a job. The men and women have complete security and medical care and the group provides for those who become too old for labor in the fields.

The conception of the kibbutz is that the nation must have an intelligent, hardworking peasantry. Everyone in Israel must be productive. This is the basic tenet of the nation's faith—a fundamental fact of life that was impressed upon us time after time.

An important personage in the kibbutz is the work organizer who assigns jobs and posts assignments on a huge board. Affairs are in the hands of an executive committee and a secretary for the conduct of outside

affairs affecting the settlement. There is a treasurer and other committees, all subject to the general meeting—final and supreme authority within the settlement.

If the kibbutz is orthodox there is a synagogue, center of religious life.

Regardless of what one has done before, everyone must do the work assigned, whether he was a stock broker in Berlin, a lawyer in Czechoslovakia or a shopkeeper in Poland. He must adjust himself to the group or leave.

What this nation needs and must have are more producers on the soil and not professional people.

Another type of kibbutz is called moshav. These are based on the family rather than the individual. They settle the land as a group with equal area of farm land and equal opportunity. Though the land is owned by the nation, each family farms that portion asigned to it. There is communal life, with volunteers taking over the work of the ill.

Workers in the moshav share in all communal farm equipment and livestock, and individual families which leave may receive its proportionate share of the joint holdings.

The newest venture in communal farming is the moshav shitufi. This means literally family kibbutz. It is collective individual living. The family lives together and each receives money in return for services. One does not receive pay for what he does, but for what he needs. The strong man and the weak woman receive equal return if the need is the same.

The succesful member of a kibbutz is one willing to make sacrifices. The sacrifices are prodigious. Life is hard and returns are small because the needs of the nation come first.

This system is socialistic and in some respects resembles communal farming under the Soviet flag. But political communism does not exist.

Does this type of endeavor stifle incentive? Time after time young people who could easily have taken over established, comfortable settlements which their elders had carved from the wilderness have chosen instead to take up the hard pioneer life in the desert-like Nagav area. This was their contribution to building up the Jewish state.

The watchword of Israel is halutz, which means more production, ever more production. This is the hope and salvation of the nation.

[From the Miami Herald of July 13, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—YOUNG NATION ATTRACTS VARIETY OF NEWCOMERS

(By Judge George E. Holt)

The keystone of policy in Israel, world's newest nation, is that it shall be the homeland of dispossessed Jews from every corner of the earth.

In following that policy, the country receives homeless wanderers into the promised land at the rate of 1,000 a day. Nothing like this has occurred in history. The movement of peoples has an emotional impact that shapes the life of the country. It struggles to absorb the human stream with a fierce determination that not one shall be turned away.

Prime Minister Ben Gurion, in his anniversary message to his people, stated flatly that "The State of Israel will rest on the absorption of mass immigration, wide settlement pioneering impetus."

This flow of humanity produces an amazing diversity of new citizens. They range from the pitiful survivors of Nazi torture camps to wealthy citizens of advanced nations, drawn by ties of ancestral memories. We saw and talked with many of all types.

During a tour into the rural area we visited the children's village supported and maintained by the Mizrochi women's organization of America. The children here are from all parts of the world. They are from 6 to 17 years old and all have lost their parents and families.

Most of them, when they arrive, are in a dazed condition. They go through a delicate process of orientation until a new interest in life is awakened.

Some of them, at first, even eat the soap provided in the bathrooms. Food seems a desperate need. Newcomers, after eating a good meal, steal bread and other articles and hide them in their clothing.

The first days are devoted to establishing a sense of security. When the children begin to lose their terror of darkness and stop screaming in fright, they are taken into town for a day where they are allowed to shop or go to the movies.

These children need rest periods, mental and physical, beyond ordinary children. They are not normal. They are the tragic result of world upheaval caused by war and the insane desires of dictators.

The selection of these children is made by a committee of the sponsoring organization, the only requirement being that they are of orthodox Jewish faith. Some are so young and unattached it seemed difficult for us to understand how this could be determined. We were informed that the child's memories invariably was an accurate guide.

The village includes a number of fine modern buildings in a lovely setting of farmland, irrigated by one of the best systems we have ever seen. Here we found a weaving shop where the children make parasols, bedspreads, and other articles.

There is a machine shop where boys are taught the fine points of welding. A model chicken farm is part of the equipment, in which beautiful white leghorns, which thrive best in the climate, have the most modern care.

Some of the dormitories are prefabricated. They are neat and well ordered. Everyone is responsible for household duties and most of the cleaning is done by the children themselves. The youngsters are taught a new way of life on a scientific basis.

There are four dormitories or pavilions, as they are called. The home is operated on the family system. Each dormitory is supervised by a man and woman and everything is done to simulate a family circle. They live together, eat together and with money they make, buy radios and other desirable things.

The authorities work hard to keep the village from being an orphanage. The family atmosphere tries to make up for the loss of real families. Older children take responsibility for the younger.

[From the Miami Herald of July 14, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—JEWS FOUGHT BRAVELY THOUGH DESIRING PEACE

(By Judge George E. Holt)

Though Israel was founded in the name of peace and brotherhood the hard fact of its first year of life has been war.

The proclamation of the new state was a signal for the defiant challenge to its existence by the Arab coalition. These nations asserted their claims to the historic birthplace of three great religions. They threatened to drown the new Israel in blood.

The Jews are proud, and rightly so, of the part they played in the struggle. The conflict has not yet been concluded. Israel exists under an uneasy truce while a settlement is sought by the United Nations. Much remains to be done.

When the British withdrew at the end of the League of Nations mandate, more than seven Arab nations, with superbly equipped armies—some led by former British officers—descended on Israel.

The Jewish fighting forces met them at the outset with only three tanks, which had been pilfered from the British. All equipment which the British could not remove by sea was plunged into a deep chasm near Haifa.

Almost without arms, the armies of Israel fought. Men and women battled side by side. A basic source of military strength was the Hagana.

Much has been said of this organization. Its enemies call it terrorist. Its defenders contend that Israel would have succumbed during the first weeks of fighting but for its heroic deeds.

The Hagana is a defense organization, rather secret in nature, to which every able-bodied Jew belonged. Even today, although a man may be discharged or released from the army, he is still a member of the Hagana, liable for service should emergency arise. Hagana proved its worth in holding back invaders until the nation gained in military strength.

Victory over the Arab armies was carved out by the Jewish troops. It was a victory achieved against overwhelming odds.

Aubrey Eban, Israel's representative in the United Nations, spoke of this victory during the birthday celebration. He said:

"Israel did not select war as the method of regulating its relations with its neighbor. That grim choice was made by the Arab governments, which thereby inherit the full responsibility for all the bloodshed and slaughter, all the suffering and privation, all the squandering of life and treasure which have resulted from the futile and unnecessary conflict.

"Since war was forced upon us, we adapted ourselves as effectively as we could, and when we read the record of Israel's performance on land, sea, and air, we are tempted to reflect that the process of adaptation was not entirely without success.

"Yet our interests and ideals command us at all times to adhere to our real preference which is for peace—peace founded upon the territorial integrity of Israel as of the neighboring states, peace on the basis of mutual respect for sovereign equality, peace within the shadow of the United Nations and upon the basis of its charter."

One glimpse of a soldier may throw in sharp relief the character of the Jewish fighting man. We visited Army headquarters on the southern front where we met Col. Yigol Alon, whose name means oak. He is handsome, blue-eyed, and 30. His chief of staff, Lt. Col. Isaac Rabin, chief of operations, is 27. Colonel Alon was born in Galilee, at Kfar Tabor. He is one of the outstanding heroes of the entire war, but his name is not well known in Israel. The authorities do not wish to publicize him too much because the Arabs have sworn to kill him because of many humiliating defeats suffered at his hands.

Through an interpreter, Colonel Alon told us he was a farmer and wanted only to return to the farm when the fighting was over. He has no political or military ambitions.

Colonel Alon said the Egyptians had the strongest and best-equipped armies to oppose Israel. The Egyptian leaders were average, their chief faults being standardization of method and inability to develop initiative. The level of the Egyptian soldiers was very low.

"In this difficult war," Colonel Alon said, "it is necessary to believe in principles. The Egyptians have nothing on which to base their reasons for fighting."

The Jewish soldier had a clear choice—win or die. He, Colonel Alon said, was fighting for liberty, freedom, and his home. This gave tremendous strength to Jewish troops and morale was high.

Scarcely a part of Israel was untouched by the war. Many towns and villages were devastated, and wounded veterans are seen everywhere. Longing for peace to develop their homeland as a refuge for all Jews, they have been forced to think and plan in military terms.

It is a source of pride and regret. "It is peace that we need, and peace we shall have—even if we must fight for it," a thoughtful citizen told us.

[From the Miami Herald of July 15, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—HARD YEARS AHEAD FOR PEOPLE OF NEW NATION

(By Judge George E. Holt)

The people of Israel have few illusions about their future. They expect the months and years ahead to be difficult beyond the comprehension of Americans used to plenty.

The nation needs a tremendous amount of capital for development—for farm equipment and fertilizer, for irrigation projects, for housing, transportation, manufactures. They have nothing in measure beyond faith and determination.

Yet the people of Israel have made incredible achievements. Desert lands believed to be unfit to sustain life have been leached and irrigated, swamps and bogs have been drained and hundreds of acres, completely deforested by Arab policy, have been replanted in trees.

Scientific fruit growing has made Palestine the second largest citrus exporting country in the world. Canned orange juice is the national drink.

Stock farming has been introduced on a huge scale and the average cow on Jewish farms produces 3,700 quarts of milk annually, compared with an average of 800 quarts on Arab farms.

The production of honey has been undertaken on a planned basis, and Israel has become a leading exporter.

The Biblical land of milk and honey, glimpsed by Moses, seems again a possibility as the result of this prodigious effort.

But as the country opens its doors to displaced Jews and fights for a place in the world, the cry is for more production, greater sacrifices, a general tightening of belts and flexing of muscles.

Israel, in its first year of existence, fought and won a war, absorbed hundreds of thousands of new citizens, and lived reasonably well, Government leaders say a change must come.

"It is irresponsible that we have lived so well," a leader said, "and the more we delay the day of reckoning the more heavily we shall have to pay.

"Had we cut our consumption to the bone from the first day of our independence, had we introduced a system of rigorous rationing, had we turned over every dollar and every pound twice or thrice before spending them and had we coordinated our import control with our foreign exchange control, we now would have appreciably larger reserves to draw upon, and the reduction in our standard of living which the present year will inevitably witness would not come as such a shock as it will now do."

A coordination board appointed by the Government has called for an estimate of all available manpower. It is believed that the nation will have about 400,000 earners during the year, a high percentage of the population. Needs of the armed forces will diminish as the longed-for peace becomes a reality.

Still, with the flow of immigration unceasing and money for development lacking, there will be many who must be employed on public works.

This study leads to a flat prediction that 1949–50 will be a hard year.

But the people of Israel are accustomed to adversity. There is the story of the people of Tel Aviv in the days when it was necessary to build a jetty into the bay to protect ships coming in to discharge and take on cargo. Cement was needed and ships carrying supplies were unable to pass through the shallow water.

The mayor called upon every able-bodied person to help. More than 75,000 persons responded. Wading into water to their chins, they took the cement on their heads and carried it ashore. The jetty was built, the harbor was transformed into a usable haven.

This exploit became for the nation a symbol of success over adversity. In this spirit the Israeli approach their problems.

While there is no outstanding industry, research constantly seeks new sources of wealth, such as recovery of minerals from the Red Sea.

Much emphasis is being put on fermentation, and in this field lies hope for new industries. Scientists have come from Germany, Poland, and the United States. They work at the Weisman Institute, one of the finest institutions we saw, which was built almost entirely with American money.

Some 120 people are employed, including a professional staff of 40. Textiles, potash, bromides, diamonds, and fertilizer are some of the products being studied.

Plastics from the castor bean are an object of research—in fact, some scientists predict that this bean, easily grown here, may be the basis of many industries, even a product to compete with nylon.

So Isreal moves toward its destiny, taking from soil and factory and laboratory, living in the hearts of men. Beyond most nations it has a spiritual mission. Looking back on the heady first year and the uncertain future, a Jewish citizen said:

"Today each Israeli carries joy in his heart and on his shoulder the burden of his brother. For when he puts his children in clean dresses and cheers proudly from the streetside, it is to honor both the deed and purpose of the state.

"And the purpose is to gather in his brethren from their exile until each man shall take another, giving him his shoulder to lean upon, his lodging and his bread to share. That is the right which has been won, and which is the deep purpose of all the brave, joyous show of statehood."

[From the Miami Herald of July 16, 1949]

A MIAMIAN IN ISRAEL—HISTORY SPEAKS DAILY TO NEW NATION

(By Judge George E. Holt)

There is a great deal in Israel to remind an American of home, it is a new land—as in Miami, one asks a friend first where he is from.

These thousands of newcomers are from all the corners of the earth—Poland and France, Germany, Great Britain, South Africa, the United States. Many tongues are spoken. It is not uncommon to meet someone who speaks easily, and often, in half a dozen languages.

But this new land is rooted in an ancient culture and history. What other people on earth could write and talk of simple, everyday matters against a background of the major prophets?

On one of our days in Jerusalem, the newspaper discussed the first year of independence.

"The Jews are a historically minded people," it said, "It is natural, however, that in their reading of the records they should give more immediate attention to the dramatic moments of their story.

"At this particularly moment of history, however, they would do well to study the more sober periods—the years of the first national settlement under Joshua and the judges, the rebuilding under Ezra and Nehemiah, the day-to-day life when the temple was the civil as well as the religious center of the nation.

"Beneath the splendors and solemnities of the kings and the priests, farmers worked in their fields and artisans at their trades * * * the Jews in their land were a working folk."

They have made themselves that again. Now is the time for work.

This sense of history is on every side, in every conversation. Even the most casual items read as if from sacred books.

"In Tiberias, people from upper Galilee and the Jordan Valley and their children danced and sang in praise." This is no ancient writing but a news report on the events of independence day, May 5, 1949.

The radio has no commercials. Each morning, the day's program opens with a Biblical quotation: "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, thy dwelling places, O Israel."

Another American, a non-Jew, made this observation after a trip such as ours:

"The more one studies the patterns of new life in Palestine, the more one becomes convinced of the enormous potentialities that this ancient land has, not only for Jews, but also for non-Jews outside of Palestine.

"The zeal of the prophets of old for social justice inspired their descendants not only to revive their nation but to create a better and more just social order.

"These pioneers have quietly, patiently, practically with their sweat and blood, converted a neglected and more or less barren land into a flourishing community and have at the same time influenced the entire social thinking of this new community."

This makes Israel unique, significant. The aims of the government turn this nation into a social laboratory, building a Jewish homeland according to a plan as definite as blueprints for a bridge. Side by side, the teachings of the Hebrew prophets and the most advanced modern thinkers in the political and social sciences, are guides.

The world works and strives to achieve its destiny in this year 1949. The Jews of Israel have a longer view. For them, this is the year 5709.

[From the Miami Herald of July 17, 1949]

GRIM EVIDENCES OF WAR CONFRONT DADE JUDGE ON PILGRIMAGE TO HOLY CITY OF JERUSALEM

(By Judge George E. Holt)

The unforgettable high point of our Israel pilgrimage was the visit to Jerusalem, holy city of three great faiths.

We approached it with a feeling of profound humility, for here was the spot toward which turned the longings and prayers of Jews through centuries of dispersion.

Here Christ had walked and taught. Here were the sacred relics and temples of the Moslems.

On the day of our arrival a newspaper carried a front page advertisement for "modern taxi service" linking Jerusalem, Tiberias, Nazareth, Beersheba—ancient shrines whose names stir the hearts of mankind.

Like nothing else, this seemed a picture of Israel today—a modern nation with ageless memories.

Approaching the beautiful city we drove on steep, mountainous, and very good roads, which were built and maintained by the British.

The mountains present a baffling appearance. There are no trees except in isolated spots. The heights seem composed of rocks.

We found the rocks actually were on the slopes, but placed there by human hands as a bar to erosion to save the pitifully thin soil.

Along the road we saw grim evidence of war. This road was the only link between Jerusalem and the coast. The heights were commanded by the Arabs. Smashed trucks remain as monuments to heroic Jewish soldiers who gave their lives in running the gantlet of enemy fire to keep Jerusalem supplied.

New Jerusalem is modern, adhering to law which requires all buildings to be of beautiful native stone. We saw quaint and moving things. One elderly Jew was peddling fish and macaroni on a street corner. He

objected angrily (in Hebrew) when I took his picture.

We went immediately to the American consulate to ask assistance in crossing the Arab lines to the old city. Israel is in a state of war and troops confront each other throughout the country. There is no passing the barriers, except for emergencies.

With characteristic American confidence we expected to visit the Arab side, dispatching a note to the commanding Arab general explaining our status.

But we were badly treated—practically insulted—by the American consulate and waited 3 days without word. Consequently we were denied a visit to the walled city, the Damascus gate through which Christ rode on Palm Sunday, the Mount of Olives, Mount Zion, where he held the last supper.

However, through the good offices of Maj. Colin Gluckman, tall, blue-eyed South African Jew, we did go to the top of the Roman Catholic monastery of Notre Dame de Zion for a long-distance view.

The monastery was ruined by shell fire. It still is heavily fortified with barbed wire.

We had a glimpse of the Dead Sea from a hillside. This also is in Arab hands. We heard here a lovely description of this historic sea. They say that the sweet waters of the Sea of Galilee flow into the River Jordan. The river says: "It is good that you fill me with sweet water. So good that I will pass it to the sea below me."

The Dead Sea says: "I am receiving now the sweet waters of the Sea of Galilee and the River Jordan and I will keep it and never give it to anyone."

And it did, and now nothing lives in these waters. More than 6,000,000 pounds of water flow daily into the Dead Sea and its level never rises. What a text for a sermon—if one seeks to retain all good things without sharing, he shall die and there will be no living thing for him.

We visited an old kibbutz (comunal village) on the outskirts of Jerusalem, almost destroyed in the fighting. From the roof of a tall building we glimpsed the tower of the city of Bethlehem, where Christ was born.

On the first floor of this building, from which the settlers were driven in fierce fighting, was a sign: "We shall return and rebuild again." The indomitable prophecy, written on stone, is being fulfilled.

That night we were guests of Mr. Agronsky, publisher of the Palestine Times and officer of public information in the Government. Here were gathered prominent leaders, among them Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett.

He told us how he was thrown into a concentration camp by the British before the mandate ended and spent 140 days behind barbed wire.

His story was a moving one. There had been much unrest, and the British were frantic. At 5 o'clock in the morning they arrested Moshe Sharett at his home.

He was placed on the cab roof of a lorry, where he clung precariously as the truck bumped on the road to prison. His thoughts were dark.

"I kept thinking that my father was a pioneer in this country, and I was born here. Did this mean the end of all our hopes and plans?"

When the lorry stopped for a moment he shouted to his captors:

"If it is British policy that I ride on top of this cab, then it is perfectly all right. If not, I would greatly appreciate it if I could be made more comfortable."

He was allowed inside and completed the journey.

From the camp he continued direction of underground activities. When the new state was born at the end of the mandate he emerged to take his place in the Cabinet.

Stories like these multiplied during our stay. Hundreds of these leaders had experiences with jails, desperate hardship, war, hunger. Out of it came the determination that Israel shall rise, that Israel shall live, that Israel shall be the dwelling place of freedom and peace and brotherhood.

Truly the spirit of this land and its people is expressed in the proclamation of the Government on its first anniversary:

"Their efforts have borne rich fruit. Let them unite for the mighty task of reconstruction that awaits us."

Traditions of Western Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an address by Sir Oliver Franks, British Ambassador to the United States.

This address was delivered at George Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., and the ambassador was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], whose introductory remarks are also included.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. BROOKS HAYS, OF ARKANSAS, IN INTRODUCING SIR OLIVER FRANKS AS THE COMMENCEMENT SPEAKER AT GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE

I am grateful to President Hill for giving me the honor of introducing our distinguished guest. My good friend, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, your able and popular Representative, stated one time that it had never been determined which I prized more, my seat in the Congress or my membership on Peabody's board of trustees.

I reflected today upon two experiences in Europe. First, during the war when I went with a congressional committee to the European theater and visited the little port of Cherbourg in France. It had been constructed for a daily peacetime capacity of 6,000 tons a day but our Corps of Engineers had developed such ingenuity and skill in organizing the traffic of goods destined for the army of General Patton moving so speedily through France that it carried each day not 6,000 but 30,000 tons. We were all greatly impressed by the spectacle. And referring to one facility I said, "Who is responsible for this achievement"? The reply was "Lieutenant Colonel Scott," and when I asked what Lieutenant Colonel Scott's civilian occupation was I received this answer, "He is the professor of Latin in an American university."

Our speaker was the professor of moral philosophy at the University of Glasgow in 1942 when he was asked to join the Staff of the British Ministry of Supply. He brought to that assignment only the experience of a classroom instructor but he demonstrated such skill as an administrator that he moved rapidly to the top until he became within a short time the responsible head of the supply branch of Britain's wartime government. Assigned to him was the duty of devising the policies of industrial production, the marshaling of Britain's manpower and womanpower, the latter a pioneering task, the directing of the nation's maximum exertions for producing the sinews of war. His record was a notable one. He demonstrated that the gulf between the academic world and the world of public affairs can be bridged.

At the end of the war he was tempted by offers from private industry and from the government but the most attractive offer came from the college which had contributed so much to his own education, Queens College at Oxford and he became its provost in 1946.

The family would probably say that it was a happy interlude though it lasted only a year. Mr. Bevin asked him in 1947 to accept a responsible position at the Paris Conference which led to the formulation of the European recovery program. He became the chairman of the Executive Committee and of the Coordinating Committee for the 16 nations participating in the Marshall plan and between July 15 and September 22 he was absorbed in these duties in the city of Paris in the hottest summer in the history of France. Mrs. Hays and I were there in August of that year and we could stand the heat only 3 days. We got relief in another part of the Continent. Working in this miserable weather, our Speaker composed the differences and directed the deliberations that led to tremendously important decisions. It has been said by some observers that next to General Marshall, our guest was chiefly responsible for the foundation policies of the European recovery program.

In 1948 he became Great Britain's Ambassador to the United States. As a very young man he had spent a year at the University of Chicago so he knew our country before moving into the exalted position which he now occupies.

But the story of a man's life is told not in the offices he has held or the honors accorded him. In this instance, of greatest importance is the influence he has imparted in the making of a finer and nobler life for our generation and the substantial contribution he has made to the preservation of values that must be identified with western civilization. It is my pleasure, therefore, to present His Excellency the British Ambassador to the United States, Sir Oliver Franks.

ADDRESS BY SIR OLIVER SHEWELL FRANKS, BRITISH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

The British Ambassador to the United States must always look forward with lively pleasure to a visit to George Peabody College for Teachers. The college is at once the child and a fitting memorial of a great American citizen to whose ideals, character, and work humanity is permanently indebted. George Peabody's life was divided between the United States and Britain. In Britain, too, we have standing monuments to his disinterested zeal for the well-being of ordinary men and women. He was one of the first men to realize the need of the people of London for decent homes that they could afford to live in. For George Peabody the generous thought was a spur to action. In the 25 years from 1862 onward homes were built for 20,000 people by his intelligent and humanitarian enterprise.

We share George Peabody with you. We are proud that he made his life with us for more than 30 years. He was always a great American and, whether at home or abroad, contributed greatly to good relations between our countries. He brought to the problems of international relations that same generous, sensible yet imaginative outlook which distinguished his more particular activities. Whatever he did and wherever he was, good resulted. Everywhere he won friendship and affection. It is characteristic that on his death Britain offered his remains a grave in Westminster Abbey. It is characteristic, too, that George Peabody wished for no pomp or circumstance at his end but directed that he should be laid in the earth by his mother in Harmony Grove, Mass., a quiet Quaker place of burial. I am very glad to be able to come here and be with you at the college which owes so much to this great man.

We are all conscious, you as citizens of the United States, and I as a citizen of Great

Britain, that we are inheritors of the western tradition. This tradition is old: Its roots go back to Jerusalem, Athens, and Rome. A civilization has grown out of this western tradition, deriving its original inspiration from the ancient civilizations which flourished round the shores of the Mediterranean. We are all members of this western civilization and in recent years we have become increasingly conscious of the facts.

The course of events in the world has led people to think much more than they did about western civilization. Our fathers and grandfathers on the whole took it for granted. In recent years we have felt our inheritance to be under a challenge and so the nature and responsibilities of our western civilization have risen up in our consciousness as things we want to be clear about to know more about and to do more about.

Western civilization is not very old. By comparison with the life of men on the earth it is very young indeed. It is youthful even in relation to that short period of the story of mankind which falls within recorded history. It is an affair of the last 400 years. Yet if young it has had more than the usual share of the vigor of youth. Its impact upon the whole world has been far greater than that of any other civilization which history records. In all other periods of human history of which we have knowledge, the peoples of the world, while in touch with their neighbors, knew little or nothing of life in continents other than their own.

At a time when the Roman Empire was at its height and to its citizens seemed to gather within its borders all the peoples of the known world, there existed in the East a great Chinese Empire which similarly gathered many peoples within its borders and seemed to span the inhabited world. These two great Empires existed side by side. They had no relations or contacts with each other. They knew nothing about each other. The most that ever happened was a whisper borne on travelers' tales that there might be another center of life and civilization far away.

Until the emergence of western civilization our one world was many worlds to the peoples who lived in it. It is the peoples of the western tradition who, in the last few centuries, have made it, from the points of view of all the peoples who lived in it, irrevocably, for better or for worse, one world.

The process started with the great voyages of discovery of the Portuguese and the Spaniards. It was continued by the French, the Dutch, and the British. The seaways of the world were opened up and trade began to move between all five continents. And then the inventive genius of western civilization discovered new means of communication and transport so that today we all live together in the same world. The radio and the aeroplane have brought the ends of the earth into contact; men, ideas, and things can be transported in a matter of days from America to Asia or to Europe.

Whether we find it comfortable or not, the fact that we live in one world, that what one nation does affects directly, and often intimately, the hopes and fears and policies of other nations, has become a part of our life. It is the result of the unprecedented impact of western civilization upon the whole world.

What is the special quality of this western civilization which has so altered the relationships of the peoples of the world? A civilization is not an easy thing to define or describe. On the contrary, it is complex and elusive; a complete way of life instinct with many traditions of the past which live on in it, and built up from many interests, beliefs, and practices which by their interplay create its peculiar flavor and quality.

THE MARK OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

There is one mark, however, of western civilization which it is comparatively easy to recognize and identify. Almost all other civilizations have looked at the future with one of two beliefs in mind. The first belief is that the golden age of man lies in the past. The present state of mankind is reached by derivation and degradation from this nobler existence. The aspect of the future must arouse melancholy for it holds no promise of anything but stages of life further removed from the past ideal. Such a view is common in the literature of the ancient world. It is found in Hesiod whose picture of history is a retrogression from the age of gold to the age of iron. Listen to Horace: "What a race the golden sires have left, worse than their fathers, and their offspring will be baser still." It is found even in the beginnings of the modern age, as when, for example, Rousseau harks back to the life of the noble savage distinguished in its simplicity and worth from later forms of society.

The second belief sees the history of man as cycles of growth and decline. Any society, mankind as a whole, even the whole inhabited universe, comes into being, matures, and decays. The pulse of the universe beats in an alternate expansion and contraction. History endlessly repeats itself. That which hath been is that which shall be. This view, too, is common. It echoes down western tradition ever since it was put forward by Virgil who thought that with Augustus the great age of gold returned.

Western civilization has never believed either that the future must be worse than the present or that the future must be a repetition of the past. It has never viewed the future with sadness or with resignation. The mark of western civilization is hope. We believe that the future can be better than the present, that what men do can affect their prospects. The world in which men live and work is of such a nature that it is reasonable to look forward with confidence, and back that confidence with enterprise. Because it has been hopeful, western civilization has also been restless and dynamic. Change could be for the better—it was man's business to make it so.

It is characteristic of western civilization that it has extended the notions of hope and confidence to men's dealings with this world. Both in the relation of man to nature and in the relations of men to each other, improvement is possible and attainable. It is often not remembered that the idea of progress is a comparatively new idea in the history of thought. It first came into existence about 200 years ago. Today we are apt to take it for granted. We argue about progress, we hold differing views about what constitutes progress, we are pleased or disappointed with the amount of progress made in any particular direction. But we normally and naturally assume that progress is possible.

It is the element of hope and confidence in western civilization which made it possible for the idea of progress to arise. It is true that the reality of progress is at times more unquestionably accepted than at others. When the First World War broke out in 1914 my father was approximately the age that I am now. Contrast for a moment the forty-odd years through which he had lived with those that have been my lot. He lived in England under the reigns of Queen Victoria and King Edward VII. No great war marred the succession of the years. Material wealth seemed steadily to increase. It seemed reasonable to suppose that health and happiness were steadily increasing too. The order of society seemed to become increasingly stable and pacific. The nations had largely learned to settle their problems without recourse to war. In short, it was a progressive age. To doubt the reality of progress was unreasonable.

In my own lifetime I have lived through two great world wars. I have also experienced the great depression of the early 1930's and the troubled uncertainties of these postwar years. My 40 years' view is very different from that of my father. It is not nearly so easy for me to assume that progress has its automatic yearly increments. It is not as clear as it seemed a generation ago that human society is steadily improving in the methods by which it solves its problems.

Yet, though by contrast I am not so sure about the reality of progress; though I am much more open to argument about what real progress consists in; though I think of progress in human society as something to be achieved painfully and with effort rather than coming almost unsought; I believe with my father that progress is possible and that it is worth human effort and human work to achieve it. Western civilization has received severe jolts in the twentieth century, but because it is western civilization it still has hope and confidence about the future. It still believes men can progress if they will.

What further condition made it possible for the peoples of western civilization to extend that hope and confidence about the ultimate destiny of mankind which they inherited from their medieval forefathers to the actual processes of living here in this world? Why should it have become reasonable for men to believe in progress? At this point there emerges another mark of western civilization. It is this civilization which has given birth to the industrial revolution.

We have only to look beyond the modern age to see how vast that revolution has been. Before it, men had inventions such as the use of the wheel, the controlled use of fire, and the making of metals and tools. Now new sources of power never before dreamt of have been harnessed to the needs of men; coal, oil, electricity, and soon, we are told, there will be atomic energy.

With these new sources of power at their disposal men have devised machines which in numberless ways multiply the producivity of human effort. As a result our whole way of life has been changed. Our great cities with their elaborate services of light, heat, water, and sanitation are products of the industrial revolution. So, too, are the new means of transport and communication which have shrunk the whole circumference of the globe to the dimensions of a short journey.

This enormous increase in productivity has made it possible for ordinary men and women at once to have more things and do less work. It is no longer necessary to use all the energy of waking life to maintain one's self and one's family at the margin of subsistence. It is now possible on a seven- or eight-hour day to earn enough greatly to raise the standard of living and for ordinary men and women to have choices unknown in any previous age except to the very few.

This is the industrial revolution which opens up the prospect that through the increase of the means of living a full and a more satisfying life can be found. The industrial revolution forged the instruments which are the conditions of the possibility of progress.

THE SPREAD OF RESPONSIBLE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

One of the ways in which we should all believe that there has been progress in the countries of western civilization in the last 150 years has been in the spread of responsible democratic government, not just in the sense that the number of peoples who have adopted and practiced constitutional democracy has increased, but much more that in our countries the base of democratic responsibility and decision has been broadened to include virtually the whole adult population. For the first time in history it has been possible for the people as a whole to have an effective voice in government and to grow in dignity, responsibility, and freedom.

This was not true of the democracies of ancient Greece. They were by comparison very small communities, but this is not the point of difference. The small society

of freemen electing their rulers by their votes rested on a much larger community which had no voice in public affairs.

But this real progress that the western democracies have made is not solely due to their increasing insight into the worth and dignity of the individual. It has been made possible by the tools and services provided by the industrial revolution. Full democracy presupposes a number of things we nowadays take for granted. It involves a certain standard of literacy; a certain ability to decide; a reasonably rapid and accurate service of information and news; the dissemination of responsible opinion. In a word it involves a certain standard of living.

The material wealth and the power we have created has been used, not to impose a binding and deadening tyranny, but to free men to grow toward their full political stature. That is progress; it is the victorious assertion of the spiritual insight of man into his own nature and the use of the wisdom he has won to make his many inventions serve the wider spread of a reasonable and ordered life fit for freemen. Progress in western civilization lies in the increase of the material standards and utilities of life and in their increasing subordination as means of life and living to the liberty and happiness of the individual.

This is a great inheritance, but it carries responsibilities with it. First of all there is the responsibility of transmitting it to those who come after us. Because western civilization is a living thing it cannot be passively handed on. We can hand on only what we make of the inheritance. It is in our power to make or mar. We cannot help doing one or the other.

The countries which inherit this great civilization are committed to a dynamic faith. Their inheritance requires them to be restless and enterprising because they have hope. It requires them to pry further into the secrets of nature and from the new knowledge won devise fresh ways of increasing the standard of living and the graces of life. It requires them, too, to abide by their deepest insight into the nature of man and use their enterprise and ingenuity and all the wealth and utilities that they produce to the advancement and adornment of the good life of a society of freemen. These tasks are never finished. What would progress mean if the end had been attained? The countries of western civilization are committed to be progressive societies and to judge their progress by their consciences. If they fail to carry forward their inheritance they must regress. They cannot be static.

We must then welcome the tensions and disagreements in which modern political and social life abound as opportunities to work out better answers to our problems. In a dynamic society of free men with free speech, disagreement and argument are healthy, provided that both sides agree on two fundamentals. They must agree to settle their disputes by appeal to reason and not by resort to force, and they must share the common aims of the civilization they have inherited. Then the differences of opinion that arise whether in your country or in mine are signs of life and vigor and are the means of progress. In the societies of western civilization we cannot expect an easy time or a life without problems to surmount and solve. The inheritance is not for lotus-eaters. It is our responsibility to build further on what we have received: it is only so that we can pass on the inheritance.

There are many peoples in the world, and many of them are the inheritors of other traditions of high civilization. We have responsibilities here too. Because the explosive energy of western civilization has made the world one, it is already true that almost every people in the world has been affected, many of them deeply affected, by western civilization.

They have been affected for example by that conscious nationalism which has been a byproduct of the western world. Today these nationalistic feelings move masses of men and women in the Far East and the Middle East in a way hitherto unknown.

Then too the inventions of western civilization, the prospects of increasing wealth and higher standards of life by the application of science and the use of machines: these are widely sought after and copied. Men often think they see in them the secret of the power of the western tradition. Here again we have our responsibilities to recognize and act on.

WE MUST BE WILLING TO SHARE

First and most obviously we must be willing to share our material advances to the general benefit of mankind, and this means not only making the goods we manufacture available in trade but helping other peoples themselves to develop their own natural wealth.

This is already being done within western civilization in the European recovery program. The American people have not only given great quantities of foodstuffs, raw materials, and manufactured products to the peoples of western Europe to assist them in their own efforts to recover economic health, but through the program provision has been made for the interchange of technical knowledge so that the standards of industrial practice may be raised all around. I have already had the pleasure of meeting the first British team to visit the United States for this purpose. They are the first of a number of such teams and they went home sure that they had learned a great deal but believing too they had been able to give something in return.

The same principles animate present British policy in regard to colonial development. We in Britain are investing large sums in the development of the natural resources of overseas territories and our great aim is so to arrange the development that education, housing, health, and technical knowledge go hand in hand so that the advent of the machines of western civilization may prove a constructive development among these peoples and not be at all a means of exploitation destructive of local traditions and culture and not offering anything in their stead.

The same motives again inspire the fourth point of the inaugural address of President Truman. The policy he announced is a policy of spreading the advantages of material development which western civilization has created to undeveloped areas and the peoples who live in them. It is a policy of technical and constructive help designed to benefit the receiver and indirectly, by increasing the world's supply of wealth, to raise the general standards of life for all.

In these ways western civilization is alive to the responsibilities its progress has placed upon it. But there is another responsibility we have to our neighbors in the world. We have inherited a certain way of life: it is the way of life to which we are accustomed and by which we live. We, therefore, most of us, assume it to be the natural way of life for men, and it is easy to think of it as the only civilized life.

Why should we think that all the wisdom of mankind is summed up in the inheritance of western civilization? It is a great civilization and in terms of material power far the most powerful there has ever been. But wisdom is more than power. It would be wrong to argue from the power that our material wealth gives us that we have a monopoly of wisdom and true civilization. We have a responsibility to take care not inadvertently to use our power to compel others, whether they want to or not, to adopt the practices of western civilization.

Let us be glad to offer all that is in our tradition to any who wish for it. But we must not try to impose it. The attempt would be against the tradition of a civilization of freemen; and it would be self-frustrating, for the practices of a tradition without the spirit which has brought them into being are only an empty shell and can easily be cast aside.

I regard the recent Commonwealth Conference held in London as of the greatest importance in this connection. The British and the Indians and the Pakistanis have mutually succeeded in so adjusting and changing the old relationship—without the discord and strong feelings that such historic adjustments almost always produce—that all concerned have agreed together to go forward as partners in the Commonwealth. This means that in the Commonwealth, perhaps in it alone of all the great political associations in the world, east and west meet on terms of equality and fraternity.

It is open to those members of the Commonwealth who are the direct inheritors of the tradition of western civilization to learn and take all that their fellow members from the east have to offer from their own tradition and civilization, while conversely these great countries of the east living in this close contact with countries of the west can adopt or adapt our ways in terms of their own inheritance. I regard the successful outcome of this Commonwealth Conference as one of the great hopes we have for a more stable, a more peaceful, and a more understanding world.

Lastly there is a special responsibility on the peoples of western civilization which flows from their belief in the possibility of progress. It is not an accident that after the First World War it was a western inspiration which led to the setting up of the League of Nations. It is not an accident that after the Second World War it was again a western inspiration that played so large a part in the movement to set up the United Nations. It is not an accident because western civilization believes that progress comes as power is used in the service of reason, morality, and freedom.

The United Nations is not an attempt to abolish power. Power cannot be abolished in a world in which the material wealth which gives rise to power exists. The United Nations represents a great vision of using power as it should be used; of transforming international relationships to the service of mankind by providing for the settlement of disputes by reason and discussion; of making power the instrument of a peaceful international order.

The United Nations in its early years has had its difficulties. There has been reflected in it and in its proceedings that great split of ideologies and policies from which the world suffers today. It has been very difficult to get as much agreed and done as we all had hoped. It seems to me a direct responsibility on the countries of western civilization in this respect to stand fast by their original inspiration and their traditions, and not to allow disappointment or frustration to weaken their resolve that the United Nations shall come through and discharge the job it was set up to do. Plato said that all great things are difficult. To substitute order and reason for disorder and force in world relationships is a very great thing. It would be most surprising if it were not also most difficult.

Here as elsewhere men have to learn to be free. Progress will be slow. It is the business of those who believe in progress as something men can achieve if they are sufficiently determined to be patient and resourceful in their strong support of the United Nations. Here just as much as in our material mastery over nature we have something to contribute to the general well-being of mankind.

There are some people today who find it hard to be hopeful. They wonder whether

the scientific discoveries and technical successes we have achieved may not have outstripped our spiritual and moral power to control their use for the good of mankind. They have lost confidence and feel the world so full of difficulties and troubles that they fear our civilization may destroy itself. This attitude is no part of our tradition. It is not what has made western civilization great. It would prevent our making the contribution we have in us to make for the future of the world. Let us stand by our inheritance and, believing in the possibility of progress, treat present dangers and difficulties as opportunities for further advancement and as problems we know we can solve if we have sufficient enterprise, patience, and wisdom.

The Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Archibald G. Thacher, a distinguished member of the New York bar, a member of the American Society of International Law, and of the Council on Foreign Relations, and a corresponding member of the Grotius Society of London, in June of 1949, wrote a most interesting and thought-provoking monograph entitled "The North Atlantic Treaty—Shield Against Aggression." This monograph deals with the treaty-making power of the United States, the powers of the President as Commander in Chief, armament implementation of the treaty, and the relation between foreign policy and military power. This monograph also contains worth-while footnotes and an appendix which includes valuable documentation.

While the Atlantic Treaty has been ratified and although the military aid program has been enacted into law, I recommend to my colleagues that they read this paper because I believe that it sheds considerable light on many of the more recondite aspects of the current international crisis.

The Honorable Joseph Clark Grew, former Ambassador of the United States to Turkey and to Japan and twice Under Secretary of State, has written an introduction which I am inserting below:

INTRODUCTION

In supporting the State Department budget before a congressional committee in 1945 I made the statement, carefully backed by official statistics, that for the money required to run the Department of State and the entire Foreign Service of the United States, our first line of national defense, for one calendar year, we could fight the war as it was then being fought for just 8 hours.

This thought gives one pause. In the face of the facts of the world situation as it exists today and in the light of the lessons of history, can we afford again to be penny wise, pound foolish, as the British were before 1914 and as we were before 1941? Even with the intense desire of our people to reduce Government spending and to balance the budget, shall we not, having read the handwriting on the wall, determine that any sensible insurance against another world war is, if one wishes to reduce the problem to dollars and cents, a thousand times worth buying?

We have approved and are carrying out the Marshall plan. We have, with the advice and consent of the Senate, overwhelmingly approved the North Atlantic Treaty. Now we are faced with the even more controversial question of implementing that treaty by helping western Europe to rearm. The debate in Congress and throughout the Nation will be intense. The problem of saving our dollars and cents will play an important part in that debate, but many other considerations will enter the picture. Shall we accept the judgment of our highest civil and military leaders that such a step will actually be a deterrent to war, or will the day be won by those who believe that this move will bring aggression earlier than would otherwise be the case? Will the expense of helping western Europe to rearm so injure our national economy that we shall be more vulnerable to increasing subversive infiltration and ultimate attack? How would this step fit in with the Charter of the United Nations? What would our founding fathers have done in such a situation as confronts us today?

This monograph undertakes to discuss some of these questions. It is written by an old friend with whom I have worked closely in our National Security Committee. His thoughts for many years have centered on this overwhelmingly important problem, our national security. He is a sound and brilliant lawyer and international lawyer, but he is, first of all, an American, a former soldier whose love of country and will for public service burn as an unquenchable flame. His timely paper, to the preparation of which he has given an immense amount of time and effort, aims to guide our thinking at what may well prove to be the crossroads in the life of our Nation. I hope that this monograph may be widely read and very carefully deliberated, for we need all the light that can be shed and all the closely focused, unprejudiced thinking we can bring to bear on this vital and momentous problem.

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Vice Chairman of the National Security Committee.

Legislative Scoreboard of First Session, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the closing day of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, our thoughts naturally turn to what has been accomplished by our labors in the past 10 months—accomplishments on the domestic front in the interest of the people at home and in the field of international affairs. As we would say in baseball language, it is time we take a look at the scoreboard—then add up the hits and the runs of the Congress.

As Members of Congress, we each have our own opinion of the accomplishments of this session and no doubt there will be varying interpretations of what appears on the scoreboard. Some would have had us do more; others less. My own personal opinion is that when the RECORD will have been fairly judged it will be found to be a good record—that this Congress has moved decisively in the direction of peace, security, and prosperity.

In the interest of world peace and security, the major achievements of this Congress have been in the field of international affairs where the working out of a program of world stability has been of the greatest and most pressing importance. But many outstanding accomplishments have also been chalked up on the home front scoreboard. A summary review of the legislation enacted in this session will indicate the tremendous task with which this Congress has labored and some of the major accomplishments.

AGRICULTURE

The welfare of the farmers of the Nation and of American agriculture has been one of the most seriously considered problems of this Congress.

More than any previous session, it seems to me, the Eighty-first Congress has been in agreement that the well-being and prosperity of the Nation as a whole depends upon the continued well-being and prosperity of the American farmer. Differences in point of view on this question have been presented in the long debates on the farm bills as to how this farm prosperity should be accomplished, but there has been a great unanimity as to the necessity for maintaining a prosperous agriculture.

The House passed a bill to continue for another year the present system of price supports on farm commodities at 90 percent of parity. After extended conferences between the House and the Senate to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the farm program, agreement was reached on a measure to extend the 90 percent of parity price-support program for an additional year, 1950, and a parity-support program of 80 to 90 percent of parity for 1951 prior to the inauguration of a so-called sliding scale of price supports which in no event may be reduced beyond 75 percent of parity. This program is intended to provide for a continuing long-range program of farm prosperity.

With abundant crops predicted by agriculture experts on the basis of greater production efforts, the farmers of the Nation are assured of adequate crop-storage space as a result of Public Law 85 enacted early in the session. Under this law, the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation was revised to permit the providing of the necessary grain-storage facilities and the exchange of surplus commodities for strategic materials. The crop-insurance program has been continued and its provisions broadened under terms of Public Law 268, Eighty-first Congress. Emergency relief and disaster loans to farmers in a revolving fund of $44,000,000 were also authorized in another enactment.

Both the House and the Senate have approved the rural telephone bill which empowers the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for improving and expanding telephone service in rural areas and communities. This is a great achievement in the interest of our farm

people and it is intended that this program be operated in a manner similar to the successful REA program. Approval of the President of this bill is anticipated.

In the vital field of soil conservation, Congress increased the appropriation for this purpose by some $257,000,000—thus making possible more extensive practices to preserve the fertility of the soil and rebuild worn-out farm lands. Of great importance, in this connection, was the approval given by Congress to increasing the amount of individual soil conservation payments from the previous maximum of $750 to $2,500 per individual farmer participating in soil-conservation practices.

Wheat farmers were benefited through approval of the International Wheat Agreement which stabilizes the price and supply of wheat in the world market. The Farmers Home Administration was extended in the further interest of our farmers.

Other agriculture aid has been provided to the States in the form of legislation for fish restoration and forest fire prevention.

Over-all appropriations provided for all agriculture purposes for the fiscal year of 1950—the period of 1 year extending from June 30, 1949 through June 30, 1950—was $716,000,000, which represents a substantial increase over the appropriation for American agriculture allowed during the previous Congress.

On the legislative scoreboard, accomplishments in the interest of farm prosperity and American agriculture must be marked high.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Historic steps have been taken by the Eighty-first Congress to secure national defense and internal security through the unification of the armed services—thus achieving greater efficiency of our defense services and greater coordination of our traditional defense units—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Much of the time of Congress has been devoted to this purpose, and—though some progress has been made—much yet remains to be accomplished in this field.

Preservation of the defensive strength of our own country is the greatest guaranty of security for the entire world of free and democratic nations against aggression and would-be attackers.

To further insure internal protection, the House and the Senate passed, and the President signed into law, a bill authorizing the construction of a series of land-based air-warning and radar-control installations.

The construction of a vast air engineering development center for purposes of experimentation and research in the field of jet propulsion and aircraft of supersonic speeds has been authorized. A system of wind-tunnel experiment stations to be located throughout the country was authorized under this bill. It is hoped that the air engineering development center will be located in the Fifth District of Tennessee.

A joint long-range guided-missiles proving ground for testing and perfecting rocket weapons was also enacted into law. Authorization for an experimental submarine program was increased, and the operation and authority of the Central Intelligence Agency was increased and strengthened.

Defenses in Alaska were strengthened by legislative action and the groundwork was laid for affirmative action in the next session of Congress for strengthening our laws against espionage and sedition by strengthening penalties for the same and extending the statute of limitations to permit greater prosecution of such cases in the interest of internal security. The composition of the Air Force was fixed at 58 air groups by legislative enactment.

Also enacted into law was a bill providing for increasing the scale of pay in the military services to attract and hold capable men in the career military service, both enlisted men and officer personnel, with inducements for in-service promotion and career advancement.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HOUSING

Social security has also been a vital issue in this session of Congress. Part of the achievement in the legislative field in recent months has been approved by the House of a bill to extend the coverage under the present social-security law and to increase payments under the public-assistance program to the aged, crippled, and dependent children. Under the House-approved new social-security bill, the average old-age benefits would be increased from $26 to $40 a month and an additional 11,000,000 persons would be covered by social-security legislation. The Senate has postponed hearings and consideration of this House-approved measure until the new session of Congress gets under way in January.

The enactment by Congress into law of the Housing Act of 1949, Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, which provides for Government assistance in the making of loans for construction of some 810,000 housing units in the next 6 years has been considered one of the major domestic achievements of this session. The bill provides also for a program of loans for farm- and rural-housing construction and repair through the Farmers Home Administration. Veterans and their families receive preferential treatment under the provisions of this act.

The Military Housing Act passed during this session, Public Law 211, Eighty-first Congress, authorizes construction of adequate housing at our air and naval stations and Army bases on a permanent basis.

VETERANS

Legislation in the interest of our veterans and their dependents was accomplished in the House during the session, although many of the bills approved by the House are still pending for action by the Senate during the next session and all, therefore, have not been enacted into law.

Among the outstanding pieces of legislation in the field of Veterans' Affairs was passage by the House of a uniform system of pensions for veterans of both World War I and World War II. Under the terms of this bill, pensions would be payable to veterans at the age of 65 at the rate of $72 a month. This measure is in line with an existing law applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Both the House and the Senate passed and the President recently signed into law the so-called omnibus veterans' benefit bill, Public Law 339, Eighty-first Congress. Under this law presumed service-connected disability rates are raised from 75 to 100 percent. Also provided in this law are liberalization of rating and benefits in connection with service-connected arrested tuberculosis cases, as well as a new disability payment schedule based on $150 for total disability. Also included is a provision for veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled to receive a proportionate additional allowance for dependents.

The issuance by the Veterans' Administrator, Gen. Carl R. Gray, of so-called Regulation I–A, crippling and impeding the veterans' educational training program under the GI bill of rights resulted in action being taken effecting a cancellation of the objectionable regulation, thus insuring to veterans a continuance of their entitlement to take beneficial and meritorious courses of training under the veterans' educational training program.

The cars-for-amputees bill—a measure to liberalize the existing law on this subject—has passed both the House and the Senate. The new bill includes World War I amputee veterans not heretofore included under this law and extends such benefits to both arm and leg amputees.

Also enacted into law is a measure permitting payments to veterans of benefits withheld during hospitalization and another measure extending the time for filing, in certain cases, for pensions and compensations.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT

Early in the session, the Congress passed the bill providing for construction by the TVA of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. This great achievement means the expansion and extending of electric-power facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the people of Tennessee and the South.

Both Houses of Congress gave approval to compacts drawn up between several States having common river borders and authorized development and expansion of several navigable streams and river basins in California, Utah, Texas, in addition to developments in Tennessee.

The extension of regional power development and reclamation projects was provided in the regular appropriation bill of the Department of the Interior. Passed by the House and sent to the Senate for approval was the bill authorizing Nation-wide improvement in rivers and harbors and flood control projects. Included in this measure, among other internal developments, are items for the completion and development of Center Hill and Dale Hollow reservoirs amounting to $6,870,000—both of these developments being in middle Tennessee and both being a part of the large and comprehensive plan of development for the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Enacted into law (Public Law 352, 81st Cong.) was a bill to authorize Federal aid to States and local governments for advance planning of public works. This is intended to provide a shelf of projects which may be brought out and put into operation in the event of a recession. Serving the same purpose, the House and the Senate have passed and the President signed into law—Public Law 105, Eighty-first Congress—authority for making plans and the purchase of sites for new Federal public buildings.

A 5-year program of public-works construction for development of the Territory of Alaska, involving an expenditure of $70,000,000 was enacted into law (Public Law 264, 81st Cong.). This can also be classified as part of the strengthening of our internal defenses and is of the utmost importance from that point of view.

LABOR

In the field of labor legislation the Eighty-first Congress has retained the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which was enacted by the previous Congress, and the repeal of which was called for by the administration. Retention of the major provisions of this bill was considered to be advisable in the interest of responsible conduct on the part of both labor and management with the Government retaining injunctive power to halt crippling strikes which affect the national interest and national welfare.

Congress amended the existing wage and hour law—the so-called Minimum Wage Act—to provide for the increasing of the minimum-wage scale from 40 to 75 cents an hour. The application of the new minimum is restricted to interstate commerce and excludes local businesses operating for the most part within the boundaries of a State.

Also accomplished was adjustment of sick leave and promotion provisions for employees of the Post Office Department and other branches of the Federal civil service employment.

EDUCATION

The Senate passed and the House took under consideration a measure to provide for substantial Federal aid to education. This measure became stalled in Committee of the House over religious issues and controversies. Advocates of Federal Aid to Education are working toward the enactment of a proper bill which would make provisions for Federal financial assistance to State and local school systems without the exercise of Federal control. A proper bill in this respect may be advanced for consideration, retaining the direction and administration of our educational systems in the hands of State and local school authorities. On the Congressional scoreboard, it might be said that this bill was "left on base."

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Authorization for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has been passed and several of the specific plans called for have been enacted into law. It has been estimated that this plan, if finally enacted in full, would save the Government between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000 a year. Accomplishment of this reorganization plan, which the Congress has authorized, would be one of the greatest achievements in the field of government economy and efficiency by the reduction of duplication and overlapping of functions in the Government that has ever been made by Congress.

Six of the seven reorganization plans submitted to Congress have been adopted and put into effect. Among the major reorganization plans is one which established and created the General Services Administration, merging into a single agency the functions of supply, records management and the administration, operation and maintenance of public buildings. Other plans approved, either separately or under the general reorganization bill, include unification of the armed services and reorganization of the Department of State and the Department of Labor—all effecting substantial economies in the cost of operation of the Federal Government.

In line with the general reorganization endeavors of Congress, the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House were increased in conformity to the great responsibilities of their respective offices.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY

In a further effort to be of tangible assistance in the restoration of the shattered economy of western Europe, Congress enacted Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, to continue the European Recovery Program with suitable appropriation. The House also approved the program of military assistance, subsequently sanctioned by the Senate, to the nations of the world participating in the North Atlantic Pact. This measure was one of the major enactments called for by the administration in the field of foreign affairs.

In a further major move toward world stability, Congress renewed and extended the reciprocal trade-agreements law. This represents the eleventh extension of this meritorious legislation in the interest of trade and commerce and world order and stability.

It has been generally agreed among Members on both sides of the party aisle that the bipartisan foreign-relations program has been continued and strengthened. It is wholesome and encouraging to note that although differences may exist on domestic issues, differences ceased to exist at the water's edge and there has been a continuation with great unanimity of bipartisan cooperation in the field of international relations and foreign affairs which is of such vital importance at this time. Constructive steps must continue to be taken to bring about restoration of order and stability in the family of nations and to promote good will and peace at home and abroad. The scoreboard in this regard is encouraging. The first session of the Eighty-first Congress has been a working session with much constructive legislation adopted. This Congress has moved decisively in the direction of peace, security, and prosperity.

White Paper on Black Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Felix Morley:

WHITE PAPER ON BLACK BACKGROUND

(By Felix Morley)

On April 17, 1934, a spokesman of the Japanese Foreign Office (Mr. Eiji Amau) made a public statement in Tokyo which our Department of State immediately challenged. Basing his argument on the Lansing-Ishii Agreement of 1917, Mr. Amau announced that Japan had "special responsibilities in East Asia" and therefore proposed to develop its political guardianship over contiguous areas in China.

The rejoinder of Secretary of State Cordell Hull was immediate and determined. In a carefully worded note, delivered in Tokyo on April 29, 1934, Mr. Hull restated certain "generally accepted principles of international law." He explained again why his Republican predecessor (Henry L. Stimson) had refused to recognize the puppet state established by the Japanese in Manchuria. He made clear that this policy of nonrecognition was a matter of principle and wholly nonpartisan in American eyes. Then, as is set forth on page 16 of the current white paper on United States relations with China, Mr. Hull concluded:

"In the opinion of the American people and the American Government, no nation can, without the assent of the other nations concerned, rightfully endeavor to make conclusive its will in situations where there are involved the rights, the obligations, and the legitimate interests of other sovereign states."

Time passed, but even at the obvious risk and eventual certainty of war both Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt stood firm on this clearly expressed principle. The Japanese argued, as Secretary Acheson now asserts, that the regime of Chiang Kai-shek was "reactionary" and corrupt. For Japan to guide and supervise Chinese politics, said Tokyo, would be in the interest of world peace. We reiterated that: "Our Government * * * has rested its policy upon an abiding faith in the people of China and upon the ultimate success, in dealing with them, of the principles of fair play, patience, and mutual good will."

The Japanese continued to protest that cooperation with Chiang Kai-shek, whom we were then backing so strongly, was impossible. Our current white paper seems designed to prove that Tokyo was right and that Secretary Hull was wrong. On November 26, 1941, Mr. Hull informed Japan that its Government must subscribe to "the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries." That virtual ultimatum, discreetly buried on pages 464–66 of the white paper, was equally categorical on the subject of Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. We laid it down, as an essential condition of peace in the Pacific area, that:

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking."

This essentially moral policy was too rigidly based, and too forcefully stated, for acceptance by the Japanese war lords. Overestimating President Roosevelt's attachment to principle, and underestimating American physical strength, they gave the fatal order. On December 7, 1941, the bombs at Pearl Harbor obliterated that line between peace and war which was already virtually erased.

II

The war dragged on—to its inevitable end. Italy surrendered; Germany crumbled; and by the beginning of 1945 the eventual defeat of Japan was also certain. But in the heat and fury of the struggle something was disintegrating in America, too. It was the moral fiber of our leadership; it was the belief in principle.

This decadence in our foreign policy is discernible throughout the nearly eleven hundred pages of the current white paper. And the evidence of degeneracy is the stronger because it was certainly not the intention of Secretary Acheson to advertise our own corruption. It is charged that some damaging documentary material has been left out. More significant is the fact that so much condemnatory evidence has been included. For this proves that our surrender of principle is an essential part of the record. The compilation, no matter how carefully edited, was bound to be shot through with appalling disclosures.

For instance, there is documentation on President Roosevelt's effort to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept General Stilwell as commander of all the Chinese military forces. Naturally this pressure was resisted by Chiang. It probably would have been resisted even if a more temperate character than Stilwell had been suggested, and even if the danger of Communist infiltration had been less obvious. But President Roosevelt was thinking only of winning the war. And on August 23, 1944—as disclosed on page 67 of the white paper—he sent to Chiang Kai-shek the following self-revelatory message:

"I do not think the forces to come under General Stilwell's command should be limited except by their availability to defend China and fight the Japanese. When the enemy is pressing us toward possible disaster, it appears unsound to reject the aid of anyone who will kill Japanese."

It is important to note the date of this observation by one who was acclaimed as a great humanitarian. For there is now a tendency to excuse the perfidy at Yalta by saying that the President was then a dying man. Actually this shameful agreement, signed by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin on February 11, 1945, was merely the logical application of Roosevelt's thought in the preceding August. Principle was even then subordinated to the sadistic desire to kill Japanese.

III

In 1934, Secretary Hull had firmly asserted that "No nation can * * * rightfully endeavor to make conclusive its will in situations where there are involved the rights * * * of other sovereign states."

That was the principle in defense of which the United States went to war. Yet at Yalta, when Japanese leaders were already seeking to negotiate surrender, Mr. Roosevelt tossed away not only the principle but also the physical fruits of victory. The text of the Yalta agreement as to China, printed on pages 113–114 of the white paper, cannot be too carefully studied. The secret concessions then made to Soviet Russia at Chinese expense insured the eventual triumph of the Chinese Communists and the rise of a threat to our Pacific interests more serious than anything ever offered by Japan.

This was the accomplishment at Yalta of Franklin Roosevelt, Ed Stettinius, Averell Harriman, Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss, and a couple more. Truly, Mr. Churchill might then have said that never before had so many owed so much disaster to so few.

The State Department's current effort to exculpate and explain Yalta is really pathetic—no other word will serve. For instance, the white paper asserts (p. 115) that: "There was historical precedent for the specific provisions of the Yalta agreement." It does not emphasize that this historical precedent was the Czarist Russian aggression against China which led to the formulation of our open-door policy just 50 years ago. What Mr. Roosevelt did was to tell Stalin that in his case the United States would underwrite a policy of aggression and infiltration which, in the case of the Czar, we had resolutely opposed. And this was done behind China's back.

Of course, it was not long before the well-informed discerned the dreadful significance of Yalta. The white paper tragically relates the effort of President Truman, soon after Roosevelt's death, to regain some of the values tossed away by his predecessor. On page 118 we read of instructions sent to Ambassador Harriman in Moscow, on August 22, 1945, telling him "as soon as possible" to get a written statement from Stalin "affirming respect for the open-door policy." Of course, no such statement was obtained.

IV

The white paper on China, we are informed, was published by the Department of State at the insistence of General Marshall. The former Chief of Staff is said to be worried over the failure of his mission to China, from 1945 to 1947, and to desire personal justification.

But all that part of the white paper is, of course, of secondary importance. At Yalta an American President in effect handed the control of China over to Soviet Russia. It was then that we actually administered the lethal dose to Chiang Kai-shek's regime. Even so, it took more than 4 years for the poison fully to undermine what Chiang had firmly built.

The white paper does demonstrate—at inordinate length—that after Yalta a number of honorable men endeavored to check the operation of the poison we had administered. But whether General Hurley or General Marshall, or the far more able General Wedemeyer, did all that was then possible to save China from communism is really of secondary importance. China was doomed at Yalta—by a President of the United States—on February 11, 1945. That day also will live in infamy.

Now the American people, like Hamlet, are beginning to find themselves forced to the realization of murder most foul. It is a reluctant realization. Indeed, it is not yet widespread. We shall, for some time, seek alibis, as Hamlet did. But the best excuse we can offer officially is that Chiang Kai-shek temporized with corruption, as the Japanese said 10 years ago. It is unfortunate that this excuse had to compete in the headlines with certain activities of General Vaughan.

The white paper—for any conscientious reader—does not exculpate. On the contrary, it only pins the stigma closer to every one of us. And while we may prefer to dodge the issue—to dally with Ophelia, so to speak—that will not serve. The Kremlin, for one, will not permit. It did not throw victory to the winds.

"To be, or not to be: that is the question." And suicide for a nation is not so complicated. It is merely a matter of officially approving and defending that which the individual moral sense can neither approve nor defend. Yalta cannot be defended on the dreadful basis of Mr. Roosevelt's lust to kill Japanese. And well we know it.

Statement of Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my frequent appearances before this committee have always been a pleasure. It would be so in this instance, if I were not averse to public discussion of matters which might compromise our national defense. While I regret the circumstances which compel me to discuss the controversial subjects before your committee, since they have already been discussed publicly, I welcome the opportunity to present my views.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony you have heard so far, and the remarks I am about to make emphasize war, and our war-making effort. I would like to express my gratitude to you for introducing into the record of this investigation last Thursday the article in the Saturday Evening Post, which I had the pleasure of writing with Mr. Beverly Smith, entitled, "This Way Lies Peace." For in that article, I tried to emphasize the importance of a steadfast and determined effort on the part of the American people for peace. It is my sincere belief that "we Americans and our friends of the free world must combine our military potential and our peaceful intent in a strategy for peace—which will ultimately make us more secure than any strategy ever designed for war."

Again, may I express my appreciation for introducing that idea into this investigation.

In previous instances, my statements have represented the views of the United States Army, and in some cases I have been a spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This time, I am appearing for neither. In my present position as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I do not unilaterally represent any service, and I have prepared this statement without reference to any of the services, or to the Secretary of Defense, or to any of the Chiefs of Staff. These remarks are my personal views.

However, since much of the testimony so far has directly and indirectly disparaged the actions and decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on national security matters, I hope you will call on all of them before you conclude these hearings. I also suggest that you may want to call on General Gruenther, who for the past 2 years has served as director of the Joint Staff.

As this investigation has proceeded, as I see it, many points of testimony, including fact and opinion, have been introduced which tend to cloud the issues at stake, and vitiate the main purposes of the committee.

The real issue to which we should devote our attention is whether or not we are providing for the security of this country with the least expense to our economy.

Everywhere in this world, where we have been attempting to carry out the objectives and ideals of our people, we have been opposed and obstructed. This ideology antagonistic to our own is attempting to penetrate into the very homes we cherish, into the labor unions which are such a vital element of our production, and into our colleges, and

schools, and churches which nurture the roots of our moral strength. We cannot afford to open the door to communism any farther.

If we are to have a proper perspective on this problem—the security of the United States—I believe it is essential that I put into the record certain basic considerations which I know to be pertinent to the investigation.

Because I believe that it is the duty of military men to continuously inform the people, as well as the Members of Congress, concerning the plans for the security of our Nation, I have enunciated these views of mine, in one form or another, in many speeches and in my testimony before congressional committees for the past year and a half. As briefly as possible, these comprise my estimate of our security situation.

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The people of the United States have as their national objective, a desire for peace and security, without sacrifice of either the basic rights of the individual, or the present sovereignty we cherish. This does not mean "peace at any price."

Secondly, we intend to maintain our political way of life and our form of government in our own country. Here, also, I think, it is important to realize that our national objectives do not demand a similar political way of life, or a similar form of government in other countries of the world.

Our third objective is to maintain—and to raise, if possible—our American standard of living.

And fourth, we Americans would like to have peace and security for the entire world and all the good that these conditions can bring.

As a means to accomplish our objectives, we believe in the successful development of an effective world organization, based on the United Nations, and we hope to attain these objectives peacefully.

Ultimately, our national objectives visualize the elimination of any type of warfare as a means for the resolution of international dispute.

Lacking more specific directives, your military planners have assumed these objectives. Meanwhile, however, they have also been charged with the preparedness for defense in case of attack. We have assumed, as any layman could assume, that the only dangerous force opposing such objectives in the world today is communism, and the only nations whose postwar actions have all indicated an opposition to this tranquility we seek, are the Soviet Union and her satellites.

It is of value then to look at the capabilities of the Soviet Union and those nations which share their resources with Russia under the duress of propinquity and armed might. The natural resources of this combination are abundant, and their industrial production, including plants in the nations that have been taken over, has been greatly increased since World War II.

Opposing this, the North Atlantic powers which have joined this recent treaty for collective security, now combine in natural resources more of the vital factors for defense than the Soviet combination, except in the case of manpower. In this, the two combinations are now approximately equal.

There are two vital military factors, however, in which we have a great preponderance, especially as related to our own defense. We have always surpassed the Soviet Union and her combination in steel production, and our transportation system is many times better than theirs.

Ideologically, communism—their prescribed political faith—is militant and ruthless, with little regard for the individual, his freedom, or his life. Militarily, the Soviet combination comprises a great land power, with a strong air force, and except for modern submarines, practically no navy.

Geographically—and this is a military factor—Russia and her satellites stand next door to western Europe, which is undoubtedly a desirable commercial, industrial, and cultural prize.

The American people have joined with allies in two costly world wars to save this prize from interest opposed to our own.

Since VE-day, our troops in Europe have continued to occupation of Germany, and we have opposed the Soviet Union's aggressive and obstructive actions with such constructive examples as the Berlin airlift.

In continuing succession, at the cost of billions of dollars and great national effort, we have underwritten the recovery and rehabilitation of Europe and we have joined in a treaty for collective defense. Congress is now considering funds for helping speed up the military rehabilitation of their armed forces.

With these national objectives, and these geopolitical military factors in mind, the Joint Chiefs of Staff in carrying out the will of our citizens, are faced with the responsibility of preparing plans and recommending the armed forces essential to the defense of this country.

Military priority, therefore, must be given to the defense of our country, and the holding of western Europe in the collective defense of free nations. No other conclusion could be drawn.

Although your Department of Defense and their military planners are not responsible for the economic planning of our Government, we are at all times cognizant of the fact that a nation's economy is its ultimate strength in modern war. We realize, too, that our Nation's economy under existing conditions can afford only a limited amount for defense, and that we must look forward to diminishing appropriations for the armed forces. We must provide the maximum security with least expense under present conditions. I say "present conditions" because, obviously, if war is thrust upon us, the American people will spend the amount necessary to provide for national defense, and to carry out their international commitments.

NEED FOR LONG-RANGE MILITARY POLICY

In order to assure the Nation of adequate military protection, I have advocated that long-range plans be developed and adopted. These long-range plans much be consistent with our political and economic objectives, and always within the means allowed. I believe that our concept of defense must combine military power and peaceful intention. And this concept, we Americans must assimilate, as part of our democratic pattern for a free society. The human prerogative for lasting peace can no longer be ignored.

Military strength cannot be a last-resort device for the extraction of poorly forged political irons from the fire. It is an unfortunate but valid criticism of modern international negotiation that a nation's voice whispers or commands in exact ratio to its moral strength and its military potential.

It is important that all responsible leaders, in civilian enterprise and in Government, fully understand this new relationship between military power and political accomplishment in the international field.

Charged with the duty, along with Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg, and General Collins, of advising the President and the Secretary of Defense on the military policy of this Nation, I have urged that if the Department of Defense is ever to contribute to the prevention of war, it must be made part of a stable long-range military policy—a policy as prolonged as the period of international tension.

If we seek to measure the stress of this tension from week to week or from month to month, we shall confuse ourselves by short-term views. Vacillation in military policy is fundamentally as perilous as vacillation in foreign policy.

These national objectives and this need for a long-range military policy, and this acknowledgment of the power of the Soviet Union and her satellites, as well as her hostile attitude, have guided my defense recommendations ever since I left the Veterans' Administration. It is essential that we all realize that a new situation has overtaken the country, and that traditional lines of security are no longer sacred. If we are ever to abandon the wishful sanctity of our previous attitudes, it should be now, after the announcement of the atomic explosion that has taken place in the Soviet Union.

World War II shifted the balance of world power—economic, political, and military—to two major powers, the United States and Soviet Russia. As far as the United States is concerned, we have sometimes shown reluctance to accept our new role in world affairs, while the Communists have not only taken their role for granted, but have eagerly assumed that it is their opportunity to gain their Marxian utopia—world communism.

This shift in the balance of power, with our new role of world leadership, has thrust us into the economic, political, and psychological struggle. And the shadow of military conflict—the fourth field of international competition for power—constantly hangs over us and our friends.

While we were slow to assume our new place in world affairs, Russia began to pick off the neighboring nations one by one, and almost toppled other governments of western Europe by Communist subversion.

As long as the Communist doctrine seeks world-wide domination, this conflict will continue unabated. We Americans must face this fact realistically, and in our plans and programs—economic, political, psychological, and military—consider carefully the time, and the space factors in this long-range struggle.

This entire discussion would be irrelevant to the matter at hand if it were not possible to derive from it, conclusions essential to our military policy. With the many opportunities and kinds of attack left open to an aggressor in total war, our military forces, as part of our over-all security, must comprise a balanced defense. This is the significant conclusion which we must reach.

BALANCED FORCES

In order to provide maximum security with minimum risk and least expense, I have advocated balanced forces. I would like to refer to some remarks I made to the students at the Command and General Staff College, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., on July 1 of this year, to enunciate clearly my definition of balanced forces, and I quote:

"Since you are students of American foreign policy as well as military preparedness, you are interested in a consideration of the basic ingredients of a sound long-range military policy for the United States, which is an integrated plan of our peaceful intention and our military potential.

"First, under present conditions, it must cost much less than we are spending now.

"Second, considering the enemies we may sometime face, our combined forces must be much more effective than they are today.

"In speaking of effectiveness—our combat readiness as the military man would term it—our greatest danger is that we will be caught up in the fancy of a futurism, and commit ourselves to unbalanced forces that will not match the forces which might oppose us.

"When I speak of balance, I don't mean the dividing of funds equally among three services, nor do I mean an equation of so many ships equal so many soldiers equal so many air groups, to create a pattern on a chart.

"When I speak of balance, I mean effective forces equal to the tasks that modern warfare may thrust upon us. And in striking this balance we must include that which can be reliably contributed by our allies. We can upset this equilibrium by committing ourselves, not strategically, nor numerically, but financially, to plans which on the surface seem proper, but tomorrow tower over us in burdensome upkeep.

"So, as a third basic ingredient, I consider balanced forces—as I understand balance—as most essential."

Budget-wise, you will note that the 1950 funds recommended to the Congress, provide the following division of our defense dollar for the three services. The Army, allotted 33.6 cents of the security dollar, has been steadily rebuilding, while carrying on the occupation duties to which it is assigned. The Air Force, given 34 cents of the defense dollar, has progressed steadily in size and ability, and the Navy, allotted 32.4 cents of the defense dollar, stands second to none in the world.

It so happens that approximately one-third of our money has been allotted to each service, but I consider this as only a coincidence, and may not necessarily hold as we continue to evaluate the capacities of the only aggressor in sight, and future developments in warfare. Certainly any material change in this proportionate division of the defense dollar would be made only after careful and complete consideration and analysis of the roles and missions of all the services.

I am convinced that further economy will be forthcoming for the over-all defense expenditures, and I have no faith that the cuts will be exactly proportional. My own opinion will be based not on dollars, but on the security problem that faces each of the armed services in carrying out its mission.

PRINCIPAL CHARGES

With this background, I would now like to discuss the three principal charges that I believe have been developed to date in this controversy.

1. That the basic concept of our defense planning is wrong and that our plans and preparations for the execution of a war are jeopardizing our national security.

2. That the offensive power of the Navy is being destroyed by action of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the detriment of our over-all national defense.

3. As a corollary to this, the testimony you have heard charges that both the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff lack an understanding of the Navy's capabilities, assigned roles and missions.

Let's first discuss the basic concept of our defense planning. As far as I am able, without violating security, I want to discuss our plans and preparations for the execution of a war, if it is thrust upon us. As I have indicated, our basic concept for defense includes protection of the United States, and this continent, in case we are attacked. It provides for early retaliation from bases which we hope to have ready at all times.

This concept includes a decision that we shall have to be ready to seize other bases that we may need, and hold those bases against enemy attack, so that we may attack the enemy country at shorter ranges, and at the same time, deny to him bases close to this country from which he could attack us.

Ultimately, however, we will have to carry the war back to the enemy by all means at our disposal. I am convinced that this will include strategic air bombardment, and large-scale land operations.

I also believe that after the initial phases are over, there will be little need for any campaign similar to the Pacific "island hopping" that took place during the last war. And as I will develop later on in my discussion, I also predict that large-scale amphibious operations, such as those in Sicily and Normandy, will never occur again.

In addition to the concept I have just outlined, we must go back to the realization that the first prize for any aggressor in the world today is Europe, with its industrial potential and its market for goods. The American people realize this and have affirmed, in economic aid and by political tie, that we are still interested in western Europe, which we have twice defended. Through the North Atlantic Treaty and with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, we have indicated that our continent is linked with theirs in peace and for collective defense.

The basic defense principle of the North Atlantic Treaty, and of the mutual defense assistance program is that each nation shall contribute those things which it can best provide in the collective security plan. And in our own strategic plans, our part in this collective international security must be given its proper perspective.

Finally, our basic concept has never for a moment overlooked the primary consideration of protecting the continental United States, its coastal waters, and the key bases for this task.

At the same time, your planners have realistically assumed that the American people would never be content to sit down in confinement to this continent and suffer a long war of attrition, carried on by intercontinental bombing, and intercontinental missiles. We have realized that if we are ever attacked, our plans must include the tenacious holding of our frontiers in Europe, and the eventual defeat of the aggressor's land army.

This discussion is all too brief. There are many detailed considerations within the basic strategic concept that must be carried out. But I cannot see any jeopardy to our national security in this strategy.

Finally, if the military continues to effect more economies in defense measures, keeping constantly aware of the drain on our economy, there will be little danger of economic collapse, and our over-all risk will be less and less.

I would like to end the discussion of this accusation right here. However, in the testimony presented to the committee, and related to this conception that our national security has been made insecure, are some specific points that I would like to deny.

STRATEGIC BOMBING

First, that strategic bombing is wrong from a military standpoint, and from a moral standpoint, and that the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have permitted an unwarranted emphasis on strategic bombing for the best interests of national security.

As a means of conducting war I define strategic bombing as violent air-borne attacks on the war-making capacity or potential of an enemy nation. I do not advocate a wanton destruction of cities or people, but it is obvious that workers live near factories, and that if you bomb the factories you may bomb the people. From a military standpoint any damage you can inflict on the war-making potential of a nation, and any great injury you can inflict upon the morale of that nation contributes to the victory. It has been proved that strategic bombing has such effect when properly applied.

I'm not begging the question of whether it is our ultimate aim to inflict such destruction, and I realize that you may win the war and lose the peace. However, we are all aware of the awful penalty if we lose the war. Your military planners must plan to win. There is no second prize for the runner-up.

Even some of the previous witnesses have indicated that our World War II strategic bombing of war industries in Germany was ultimately an effective deterrent to the success of the enemy on the battlefield. Our destruction of factories, particularly the oil-producing industry, and the transportation network and its equipment, reduced the mobility and the capability of the German army and air force. It had a decisive effect on the ultimate ability of the Allies to defeat Germany in a shorter time, saving many, many lives and many dollars. Since this is a proven military advantage of even the limited strategic bombing of World War II, I don't believe we should choose to ignore the lesson. It is worth noting that Russia who did not participate in the strategic bombing of Germany apparently changed its mind after seeing its effects. After studying its influence on the war, the Soviet Union has organized and developed a strategic air force of their own. Strategic bombing has a high priority in our military planning, because we cannot hope to keep forces in being of sufficient size to meet Russia in the early stages of war. This is particularly true since we are never going to start the war, and the Soviet Union because of their peculiar governmental organization can choose the date of starting it.

Lacking such forces in being, our greatest strength lies in the threat of quick retaliation in the event we are attacked.

A great case has been made for the moral wrong of mass bombing. I have only two comments about the morality of essential strategic bombing and the unhappy damage it might inflict by its attendant destruction of civilian lives and communities.

As far as I am concerned, war itself is immoral. And in carrying out any of our missions from the squad on the battlefield to the bomber deep into enemy territory, we Americans will seek to achieve maximum effectiveness against the enemy's armed forces, with minimum harm to the nonparticipating civilian populace.

I am reminded, however, that I don't believe a Communist ideology and the dictatorship it fosters, has any such humanitarian outlook about war. They will sacrifice human life at the slightest provocation, and would be inclined to sacrifice our lives even more quickly.

I might suggest that if our attacks are only in retaliation for an attack made upon us, the American people may feel that strategic bombing is both militarily and morally justified.

Early in this statement, I presented the view that one of our national objectives is peace and security, which automatically indicates a desire to stay out of war. If military strength, or any particular weapon, can prevent war, I have even greater respect for it than a soldier's normal attitude. Along with many others, I believe that the atomic bomb which has been derided, and the Air Force Strategic Air Command which has been denounced have contributed to the avoidance of war during the last couple of years. This combination has been, in my opinion, one of our greatest deterrents to aggression, both here and in Europe. With this in mind, if strategic bombing is wrong from a military standpoint and to be ridiculed, then I will gladly face the ridicule of those who say I was wrong.

Admiral Radford's charges would have you believe that our war plans are based solely on the so-called atomic blitz. This is not the case. Neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Air Force officers responsible with us for war planning, believe we should depend solely on strategic bombing, or atomic weapons.

Such misrepresentation only obscures the real fact that strategic bombing is important, and is our first-priority retaliatory weapon in case of attack. It performs only one of the many essential roles of our basic concept. It would affect an enemy's ability to prosecute a war and give us some needed time to mobilize our resources.

The testimony that attempts to devalue the B–36, one of the planes of the Strategic Air Command, attacks the base strategy of the United States and misrepresents how we value strategic bombing.

They have charged that the performance characteristics of the B–36 bomber in the eyes of the Navy make it an unsatisfactory weapon. In other words, that technically the B–36 airplane is no good for the mission of the Air Force.

Without going into the technical details, I will only state that, in my opinion, it is the best bomber available for production that is capable of carrying out certain required missions in the case of emergency. I believe this opinion is substantiated by the comparative statistics as previously presented to the JCS by the Air Force on the various types of bombers available when they made their selection of the B–36 to fulfill the strategic bombing role they have been assigned.

I would also like to point out that the Joint Chiefs of Staff joined in the unanimous ratification of the Air Force investment in the B–36 last February. This ratification was not made under duress of any kind. And I raise the question, if it has become so disastrous to national security now, why did the Navy concur 8 months ago?

The Navy has also made great moment of the fact that the B–36 is not the best plane for strategic bombardment, and that intercontinental bombing as such is an impracticable idea. May I point out that no member of the Military Establishment has said that better types won't be used when they are available, nor has any responsible individual indicated that there has been any cessation on the part of the Air Force in developing a better, faster, and longer-range bomber as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, I assure you that if war comes, we will make every effort to use bases as close as possible to the enemy for maximum effect and minimum expense of lives and material. The closer the range, the higher the speed for the run over enemy territory.

But I personally would hate to face the American people after abandoning any program for inter-continental bombing if we found ourselves suddenly devoid of bases, except for those on this continent, and we had to sit here and take it in the United States, with no means of reprisal. A long-range bomber can always be effective at shorter ranges, but a limited-range bomber is of little value beyond its distance.

The Air Force has facts and conclusions upon which they have based their judgment and belief that are at variance with some of the information presented to you by Navy personnel. However, to answer assertion with assertion would not only carry on this hearing indefinitely, it would serve no useful purpose. This is especially true when all of the services and their leaders are agreed that this weapon can best be tested by the Weapons Evaluation Group.

I would like to point out, in all fairness, that one service, the Navy, has taken this opportunity to publicly disparage a weapon—the B–36—that the Air Force, the service responsible, has chosen to perform an assigned mission. This is in direct contradiction to the Navy's own idea presented so forcefully and frequently to the public, that each service should be allowed to develop and have the weapons it feels it needs for the mission it is assigned.

Before concluding that the B–26 is unsatisfactory for the mission assigned to the Air Force, may I respectfully suggest that you await the results of the Evaluation Group report.

This attack on the B–36 as a weapon included two other insinuations which I do not believe are valid charges. One was the implication that from the B–36, our Air Force bombardiers cannot hit a target from high altitudes.

Yet they admit that no Navy pilot has flown a B–36, nor have they participated in any tests with this bomber. On the other hand, our Air Force bombardiers have assured us that this aircraft can perform effectively under all conditions of weather, by night or day, and can deliver striking blows against their targets. These Air Force men, who will have to face the risk of the great losses that the Navy predicts, are perfectly willing to stake their reputations and their lives on their performance. Again may I suggest that you do not reach a decision on the accuracy of high-level bombardment without consulting the men who are charged with doing it.

And too, the testimony implies that the Russians—our only possible opponents for many years to come—have the capability of causing intolerable losses on any bomber engaged in mission where the Russians have adequate defenses. They base this allegation on the creditable performance of one of the Navy's fighter-interceptor aircraft, the Banshee. However, we do not know whether or not the Russians have a Banshee. At the same time, I might point out that the Navy is anxious to have a "flush-deck carrier" so that they can use ever larger planes with longer ranges from their floating air bases. It seems to me that these larger planes would be subject to the same attack which Navy witnesses have visualized against the B–36.

This discussion of the Banshee and the B–36 does not convince me that the Russians have the capability attributed to them. It indicates only that the permanent contest between offensive and defensive weapons includes airplanes. Regardless of the planes used, I expect that some will be shot down. The number lost will be dependent upon many factors, but the fact that you may suffer some losses doesn't mean that you cannot still accomplish your mission.

And I must admit that I find some comfort in the fact that we have a long-range bomber that can fly from any base in the world and attack targets in the range of 4,000 miles, and return home. We have accomplished a tie-up of enemy men and planes, and many millions of dollars in their radar equipment and fighter-interceptor equipment, as they look around a global circumference for any approaching attacks.

Again, I respectively suggest that we heed the estimate of what the enemy might do, rather than the statistical reports of what our own Navy can perform.

Related to this entire discussion of strategic bombing is the ridiculous assertion that the atomic bomb is effective on only a small area, insinuating that we Americans have misplaced our confidence and our dollars in this weapon.

I believe that the insinuation that the atomic bomb is relatively ineffective as a weapon of war is refuted by every test that has been made. Contrary to many of the statements made before your committee, the Navy case in these matters has been presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and among other things, it has been the Navy's continuous argument that they should be permitted to use the atomic bomb, both strategically and tactically. If it is really so ineffective as some would have you believe, I wonder why the Navy is so anxious to use it.

And without clouding the issue, I would like to add one more relevant point on the atomic bomb. It is no secret the tests at Bikini and Eniwetok revealed that the Navy afloat is one of the most profitable targets for an enemy with an atomic bomb, and that its effect on ships is lasting. Even without sinking them, it promises to deny our use of them for many, many months after the onslaught. This, I know, contributes to the Navy's worries and indicates to some of their thinking members that surface fleets en masse might be a thing of the past.

Admiral Blandy also pointed out in his testimony, rightfully, that naval air protected the amphibious landing at Okinawa, and inferred that the success of this battle is largely dependent upon that arm, the Navy. Undoubtedly, without Navy support, any amphibious operation is impossible. However, by appraising the power of the atomic bomb, I am wondering whether we shall ever have another large-scale amphibious operation. Frankly, the atomic bomb, properly delivered, almost precludes such a possibility. I know that I, personally, hope that I shall never be called upon to participate in another amphibious operation like the one in Normandy.

If I may digress for a moment from my consideration of the atomic bomb, I would like to point out to those who hold that a tremendous Marine Corps is essential for future amphibious operations, and that naval air must be correspondingly large, that I have participated in the two largest amphibious assaults ever made in history. In neither case were any marines present. And in neither case were any Navy carriers used.

The A-bomb is the most powerful destructive weapon known today. Personally, I hope it can be outlawed as a weapon by the adequate international control our Government has recommended. But until that has been achieved, I shall not discredit its effect, nor shall I short-sightedly limit its role to purely strategic use.

As a believer in humanity I deplore its use, and as a soldier, I respect it.

And as an American citizen, I believe that we should be prepared to use its full psychological and military effect toward preventing war, and if we are attacked, toward winning it. The careless detractions of the power of this weapon have done national security no good, and may have done our collective security, in these precarious times, untold harm. Frankly, for the good of our Nation, I wish that such testimony, belittling one of our great deterrents to war, had never been given.

I consider this first major charge, namely, that the basic concept of our defense planning is wrong, and that our plans and preparations for the execution of a war are jeopardizing our national security, the most serious detraction brought forth in this investigation.

Navy witnesses, without proposing a better substitute, have done the Nation the disservice of attempting to belittle the strategic plans, the international commitments, and the weapons which are at hand to carry out those plans and commitments. They have matched their own assertions on these broad subjects against the best advice and judgment of our top scientists and military men. And they have distorted the proper perspective that we Americans must maintain toward war, if we are ever to prevent it, and keep the peace.

OFFENSIVE POWER OF THE NAVY

Next, I would like to discuss the second major charge which I believe has been made in this investigation: that the offensive power of the Navy is being destroyed by action of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the detriment of over-all national defense.

This misapprehension has been approached in several ways. Some witnesses have indicated that the budget reduction is an indication of this slash.

Some published statements have indicated that the Navy is being outvoted in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, due to an intrigue by the

Air Force aimed at securing naval air for their own.

Other testimony would indicate that it is the sheer ignorance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff toward the waging of war that has caused this unfortunate situation to arise.

And then the cancellation of the supercarrier, the U. S. S. *United States*, has been offered as exhibit A before this committee.

As far as budget reduction is concerned, we realize that the defense dollar has necessarily reduced the offensive capabilities of all three services. The Air Force and the Army can make the same complaint with equal or greater validity. The present international situation allows a budget reduction, and our economy demands it, and the decision has been made that all three services must be reduced in strength, and we must plan our defense on a priority basis.

Let's take the Army's case. Appropriations for 1949 provided for an Army of 790,000 men, plus 110,000 1-year trainees, or a total of 900,000. The Army today has an approximate strength of 650,000. The Army has assumed its share of the calculated risk without complaint.

The Air Force might have even better grounds for dissatisfaction. Based upon studies made by the President's Air Policy Commission and a Congressional Aviation Policy Board, it has been recommended that the Air Force should consist of 70 groups in order to carry out its mission. The Congress appropriated money last year for 58 groups, and committees in Congress, after lengthy consideration of 48 groups, have just agreed to retain the 58-group ceiling. Obviously, the Air Force has taken a great share of the reduction.

The Navy has used as an example of the out-of-line reduction of its offensive power, the situation of naval air. Yet the number of large carriers in the Navy was only reduced from eleven to eight. In my opinion, this is not out of line with the cuts made in the other services.

Let's examine the Naval Air situation for a moment, and let's examine our other air power provisions. Aviation in the Marine Corps today has 21 squadrons, which is equivalent to seven Air Force groups of tactical aviation for the support of only two Marine divisions.

In World War II, I had some experience with tactical aviation when I was in command of the 12th Army Group, comprised of three armies, with, at times, as many as 30 divisions engaged in combat. The 12th Army Group was supported by the Ninth Air Force, then commanded by General Vandenberg. This Air Force included 14 fighter-bomber groups. Under combat conditions, this allowed approximately one group for the support of each two divisions. In my opinion, this was a very successful sustained operation in the face of a determined enemy. If this is a fair comparison, then Marine aviation as part of Naval aviation seems to be overwhelmingly out of balance. This present peacetime ratio, if applied to the 12th Army Group, would have required over 100 groups for the three armies, which would be fantastic. I'm sure that the Marine part of Naval aviation has not been decreased to the point where the offensive power of the Navy has been destroyed.

Included in this charge is the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have reduced Navy carrier capabilities, and thus reduced its offensive power. This has been accomplished, according to the insinuation, by the Air Force and the Army outvoting the Navy two to one. And now that I am Chairman, I have added to that not by vote, but by influence, to make this for all practical matters three to one.

This suggestion represents so much compound folly that it is hard to answer it patiently. It ignores the fact that each of us realizes that we could never successfully project a war away from the United States without the Navy. It indicates that our representatives in the North Atlantic Treaty defense discussions are assuring our friends of collective action, and at the same time sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and voting against the one vehicle that could make such collective action possible.

It indicates that we would prefer to build up the other two services at the expense of our entire security. It even infers that the President and the Congress have allowed some of us to function in responsible positions for several years when we are unqualified to do so.

And finally, they traced the Navy's reduction through the combined efforts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff back to air power, insisting that by reducing the offensive power of the Navy, we have lost any chance to win a war.

It might well be asked—offensive power against what?

Considering again the only possible enemy we have in sight, we are faced with the real fact that the Soviet Union and her satellites have tremendous land forces and tactical aviation, but their surface navy is negligible.

Now I personally believe in naval aviation, and especially in the hunter-killer task forces that are needed to fight Soviet submarines; and I endorse wholeheartedly an adequate program of naval aviation to assure us of control over enemy navies, and the ability to subdue the sterner submarine menace.

However, in listening to the presentations before the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and these presentations were given adequate hearings many hours long—the arguments for increased large carriers have not been based for need on action against a Russian fleet, nor even on naval aviation against the menace of the submarine. Their presentations have demanded increased carrier strength to attack land targets and to oppose hostile air in limited areas for a limited time. This is not the Navy's primary mission.

Such power would be nice to have, but does it contribute as much to the requirements to meet the initial stages of a war, as the same amount spent for other more vital needs? It cannot be furnished without reducing the strength of either the Army, the Air Force, or the Navy's ability to perform its primary mission of keeping the sea lanes open.

It is easy for men to lose the perspective of long-range plans, and understandably difficult to keep a steady hand on the tiller of the primary mission. But if they can't do it themselves, then the American people must do it for them.

Just sailing the seas and preventing surface ships of the enemy from venturing far from shore will not defeat a large land power like Russia.

It would seem to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense would not be destroying the offensive power of the Navy by limiting Navy forces to those adequate for naval roles. And, in my opinion, adequate forces for their assigned missions have been provided as far as budget limitations will allow. Our plans have not given undue emphasis to the other services.

Without disclosing the details of any vote in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I may freely admit that on many occasions the Navy stands alone in its concept on a specific decision. This is not because of any "old school tie" nor any collusion on the part of the Army or the Air Force. The truth of the matter is that very few Navy men, on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations, have had any experience in large-scale land operations. Uppermost in their minds are island-hopping campaigns of the Pacific, and the battles at sea. While listening to presentations by some Navy officers before the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have heard high-ranking Navy men arrive at conclusions that showed they had no conception whatsoever of land operations. This may account for the fact that in joint planning, where knowledge of the larger continental operations which we must ultimately face if we ever go to war with a land power is a "must." Navy men frequently find their suggestions "outvoted" two to one.

This feeling may persist until more Navy men, through the education available under unification, have a broader understanding and perspective of war.

Considerable has been said about the decision made this year by the President and the Secretary of Defense to stop construction of the heavy aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *United States*.

When the Joint Chiefs of Staff failed to reach a unanimous decision on this matter, the Secretary of Defense asked each member—at that time I was Chief of Staff of the Army—to submit in writing his view on the subject.

As you know, the decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are considered secret, and until this investigation, the opinion of any particular member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has never been disclosed. In the interests of national security, I deplore the fact that there has been a violation of that security.

However, in Admiral Denfeld's statement before the committee, in discussing the decision made on the heavy carrier, he made the following remarks, and I quote:

"On April 15, 1949, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were asked for their individual opinions on the flush-deck carrier project which was well under way. The several answers were completed on April 22. It is not secret that General Bradley reversed his earlier approval of this project."

Obviously, the admiral has been carelessly misinformed.

The earlier approval, if any, of the carrier was given before I ever became a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Until the matter was brought up in April 1949, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not been asked to pass on the matter, at least while I was a member.

At the time I assumed the position of Chief of Staff of the Army in February 1948, I was given to understand that the matter of the large carrier had already been approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President and sent to the Congress. The matter of this carrier did not come up before the Joint Chiefs of Staff, while I was a member, until April 1949.

Then when I was told that the carrier project was again open for discussion, I presented, for the first and only time, my views on the subject to the Secretary of Defense.

As I stated, the decisions of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should not, in the interest of national security, be disclosed. But because my own position in the matter has been erroneously presented, in violation of our agreement, I have permission from the Secretary of Defense to give in substance the contents of my statement to him on April 22, 1949.

Incidentally, this is the only part of my entire statement here today that the Secretary of Defense has been asked to approve.

I included the following thoughts:

"In determining the requirement for a superaircraft carrier I have been governed by the prescribed functions of the Navy. If the existing carriers are adequate for these primary tasks then the construction of a supercarrier cannot be justified. The fundamental purpose for which the superaircraft carrier is designed is included within a primary function of the Air Force, which already has adequate means and capabilities to perform this function.

"The U. S. S. R., except possibly in the field of submarine warfare, is not a naval power of consequence. Further, the U. S. S. R. is not dependent on maritime shipping to reach sources of raw materials. Thus, the vast preponderance of allied naval power—which in addition to the United States Fleet, overwhelmingly the largest in the world, includes the second naval power, the British Empire, and the additional naval forces of other potential allies—will have but little opportunity to operate against Russian surface vessels and should be more than adequate to cope with the major naval threat, the hostile submarine.

"Early in any war carrier-based planes would be useful in attacking land targets prior to the time land-based aviation could be established. Because of this, I have agreed that there should be maintained a carrier task force whose planes now possess the capability of penetrating 700 miles inland. However, I believe that, except for purely naval operations, the use of carrier task forces against land targets is limited. They could be employed temporarily to reinforce Air Force units in hard-pressed areas, or they could be used in situations requiring the employment of Air Forces for a limited period only. Carriers equipped with longer range aircraft than that provided by existing carriers are not required for the above enumerated tasks. It is my conviction, therefore, that the present carrier force, active and inactive, is ample to carry out the role of the Navy.

"The budget implications are such as to interfere seriously with the efforts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to create the minimum balanced military forces, land, sea, and air, to provide for the security of the United States, within the present budget limitations. The construction of this superaircraft carrier will involve large expenditures of funds, materials, and manpower, and will require extensive accessories for its operations and protection, such as planes, antiaircraft ships, cruisers, destroyers, and other auxiliary vessels. Increasing political commitments, recently proved long-range capabilities of land-based bombers, and the calculated risks we are accepting in other important fields in all three services, are additional factors that I have carefully considered.

"Therefore, I conclude that it is militarily unsound to authorize at this time the construction of additional aircraft carriers or to continue expenditures on the United States steamship *United States*."

In the lengthy presentation that has developed this second charge which I am discussing, there has been a continuing undercurrent and an occasional specific outburst of the insinuation that those responsible for war planning—the Joint Chiefs of Staff—are ignorant as to how a war should be carried on.

Even if I were not personally involved, I would harbor a distaste for such lack of loyalty and for the unfounded insinuations about men who have earned their way on record and accomplishment to positions of grave national responsibility.

To date this committee's record has contained complete documentation of the record of the Navy witnesses, and I would like to read off a brief summary of the records of my colleagues to authenticate the background of experience upon which they draw when they make a decision.

Until recently the Joint Chiefs of Staff consisted of Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg, and myself. Since August 16 General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army, has been a member. General Collins commanded a division in combat on Guadalcanal and led his division in the attack on Munda Airport, driving the Japs from New Georgia Island. Transferring to Europe, he commanded an assault corps on the beaches of Normandy, across France, and into Germany. His corps usually consisted of three or four divisions, but at times as high as six divisions, in all cases supported by tactical air. He worked intimately with the Navy in planning and executing the assault on Utah Beach, as well as working with them in the Pacific.

General Vandenberg commanded the Ninth Air Force, which gave tactical support to the Twelfth Army Group, the largest field command ever to operate in combat under a single commander. Both General Vandenberg's and General Collins' units were in continuous contact with the enemy for 11 months in Europe. They have had wide experience in many operations, including amphibious assault and with its appropriate air and naval support.

I was not associated with Admiral Denfeld during the war, and I am not familiar with his experiences. However, his record was made known to you when he testified and undoubtedly it was because of this record that he was appointed Chief of Naval Operations.

I participated in the Tunisia and Sicily and European operations. As I stated before, the amphibious operation in Sicily and the assault of Normandy were the two largest amphibious operations ever conducted. I can assure you that these operations were ably supported by the Navy and the Air Force, and that the ground soldiers were grateful for the heroic work that was done. Our air support in both was furnished by land-based aviation.

In addition to the personal experiences of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we have had the advice and counsel of the Joint Staff, composed of approximately equal numbers from the three services and made up of some of the most capable younger officers that could be detailed to such an assignment. The war planning is done by the Joint Staff under the strategic guidance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In our deliberation, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have listened to long presentations by the members of the Joint Staff and by the various staffs of the three services, and always we have drawn heavily upon their abilities and their ideas.

If we have any consideration for the proven abilities of men, then I feel that the American people should have no fear of misplaced confidence in placing the responsibility for security planning, as far as the military are concerned, with these men. Any attempt to discredit their deliberations would impugn their motivation as well as their integrity. Since the Congress of the United States has within its power the approval of all such appointments, I do not feel obliged—nor do I think it necessary—to enter into any defense of the motivations or integrity of any officer so charged—either Navy, Army, or Air Force.

At the same time, I do not plead infallibility of their judgment or decisions. Nor do I hold that the present agreements covering our strategic responsibilities should never be changed. I view the situation rather in the same light that Dr. Benjamin Franklin held about the Constitution of the United States, and the men who wrote it at the conclusion of the Convention in Philadelphia so long ago.

I would like to quote from his letter to the President:

"I confess that I do not entirely approve of this Constitution at present, but, sir, I am not sure I shall ever approve it, for, having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged, by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise. It is therefore that the older I grow the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment of others. Most men indeed * * * think themselves in possession of all truth, and that wherever others differ from them it is so for error * * *. But though many private persons think highly of their own infallibility * * * few express it so naturally as a certain French lady, who in a little dispute with her sister, said, but I meet, with nobody but myself that's always in the right. * * *

"In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults, * * * I doubt, too, whether any other Convention we can obtain may be able to make a better Constitution, for, when you assemble a number of men, to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It therefore astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near perfection as it does; and I think it will astonish our enemies who are waiting with confidence to hear that councils are confounded like those builders of Babel, and that our States are on the point of separation only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats. Thus, I consent, sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better and because I am not sure that it is not the best. * * *

"On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may have objections to it would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility and to make manifest our unanimity put his name on this instrument."

There is a great similarity between Dr. Franklin's situation and my own. And frankly, for the benefit of the whole world, both our friends and our enemies, I would like to see some retraction of the record of the allegations made; and some statement of confidence to these responsible men that might serve as a renewed impetus to their continued cooperation and unity in approaching the responsibilities that have been thrust upon them.

NAVY'S CAPABILITIES MISUNDERSTOOD

As a corollary to this discussion of the destruction of the offensive power of the Navy, and its ultimate effect on national security, is a third charge, an underlying theme that the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff lack an understanding of the Navy's capabilities.

To the contrary, I believe that the basic strategic concept, and the careful consideration given to the offensive power of the Navy, and the outstanding qualifications of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all combine to present the fact that there has been a complete understanding of the Navy's capabilities. There has been careful consideration of the matters brought before the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Navy views, like those of the Army and the Air Force, have always been given the most careful consideration, before our recommendations were made to the Secretary of Defense, and the President.

Closely related to the charges that the Navy's capabilities are not understood by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is the corollary charge that the Fleet Marine forces are being reduced toward their ultimate destruction. This is occurring, according to marine witnesses, because the Marine Corps is not adequately represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff level, or the "little chiefs" level, or in the Planning Staff.

As we all know, the Marine Corps is under the Department of the Navy, and they are represented by their superior headquarters, by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations. And any improper representation is a problem to be resolved within that department.

The Joint Staff, which is responsible for the war planning, consists approximately of equal numbers from each of the three services, and the policy has been to date that one-sixth of the officers from the Navy shall

be Marines. This was the ratio of Marine officer strength to the total Navy officer strength at the time the policy was put into effect. The Director of the Joint Staff has followed this policy. Today, there are 102 officers in the Joint Staff; 32 of them from the Department of the Navy, and 6 of these are Marine officers. One Marine officer is in the office of the Director of the Joint Staff; two are on the Joint Strategic Planning Group; two are on the Joint Logistical Planning Group; and one is on the Joint Intelligence Group.

Further, whenever the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider any problems particular to their field, Marine officers are welcome to make their presentation as part of the Navy presentation.

And whenever a matter comes up that requires the advice and opinion of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, we would welcome an opportunity to hear him, as long as the Chief of Naval Operations feels that his appearance there will be helpful.

As long as I am Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, charged with the responsibility of preparing the agenda and guiding the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the door will always be open—both to my own office and in the Joint Chiefs' conferences—for the proper presentation of Marine problems. It is my opinion that we are observing both the spirit and the letter of the law of section 206 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended this year and providing Marine Corps representation. The membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is stated by law and it is so constituted.

Within the roles and missions prescribed for the United States Marine Corps by the National Security Act, the Marines can rest assured, as far as the Joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned, of their future. I believe that quotations from my previous testimony, as well as any general remarks today, will indicate to you that Navy bases, Air Force bases, and bases to project the Army in war are of primary consideration of our planning, and will continue to be.

As far as a recommended plan for the abolition of the Marine Corps is concerned, let me point out that any such plan would have to be approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and submitted to Congress. No legal authority for any such procedures is provided. I only point out again that all of the services have been reduced materially.

And if a decreasing budget is to be anticipated, the priorities of preparedness will made our reduction even more difficult. As long as we are charged with the preparation of a joint budget presentation for the maximum efficiency of our forces at the least expense, we can only rely on our experience and best judgment as to where the calculated risk can best be carried. The Marine Corps and its Fleet Marine forces are a part of the Navy, and the presentation of the budget is a responsibility of that Department.

No one expects the Secretary of Defense to be an arbiter of technical differences. But it is expected that he will exercise, as the final authority with the President, the will of the people for civilian control of our armed forces. When this authority is disputed, it is open rebellion against the civilian control.

There is another consideration that first prompted the reopening of this investigation, and since has been given close examination, especially as expressed by some of the keen questions on the part of the committee members. I speak of the Navy's low morale.

Now I hesitate to take part in a discussion of something which, above all others, should certainly be a problem for the Navy, and its leadership, to solve. But if you will permit, I would like to draw upon some of my experience and perhaps offer some guidance in licking this problem. After all, morale is an important, and ultimately the determining factor of the success of the Navy's capability. I have only two comments to make.

One is that the Army might have had a similar basis for a downward trend in morale if budget allocations and the reduction in the size of forces were to be the yardsticks.

As a matter of fact, last January when public thinking seemed to have accepted the idea that the Air Force might soon become the only service, there was such a danger in the Army.

But instead of sitting idly by, I took active steps to reassure the Army, and started on February 4 on a continued program of education, through public speeches to the Army and the people, that there were roles for all three services, and that we had need for qualified men now, and in the future.

The word morale was never mentioned, but we built our program of encouragement on a proper evaluation and explanation of why strategic bombing was getting an emphasis, and on the need for long-range military plans. Wherever possible I tried to assure the Army in advance that the case had been carefully considered and that their leaders were working for the best interests of the country while providing for the continued improvement of the Army as an important part of national defense.

The United States Navy, with a long record of courage and daring and accomplishment, should have no lack of morale. It would seem, however, that Navy leaders have lost sight of the fact that men, not machines, win wars and protect the peace. Senior officers decrying the low morale of their forces evidently do not realize that the esprit of the men is but a mirror of their confidence in their leadership.

Confidence in leaders is an accepted ingredient of organizational esprit. However, dissension among the top command, like a single drop of poison in the wine, can destroy all partakers.

There is another discouraging factor of unrest that merits comment. In an objective campaign for public attention, overzealous enthusiasts stepped to the forefront as self-appointed martyrs, impugning the integrity of senior officers in other branches of the service. With no malice, I would like to offer some impartial advice to all aspiring martyrs: To be successful in a sacrifice, he must be 100 percent right; to be respected, a martyr must be completely unselfish in thought and motivation; his sacrific must be for the good of the entire Nation. Under such requirements, I see few opportunities for martyrs in this defense controversy today.

If there were any indication that the Navy will not have an important role in the future defense of this country, there would be sufficient cause for alarm and dissension. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Navy's problems in future warfare could be insurmountable. Twice before in the history of our Nation, submarines from the other side of the Atlantic have all but won a war before a telling shot could be fired. Every indication today is that an improved, more stealthy, more silent, and more terrible submarine might face us in case of another war. Antisubmarine warfare is a grave concern for our Navy and merits their utmost efforts. The Navy's hunter-killer technique, where several ships, including submarines, destroyers, cruisers, and aircraft carriers team up to hunt down and sink enemy submarines, is to date their best offensive method. And here Naval Air, reaching out from the hunter-killer task force, has a role of tremendous national importance.

However, many naval airmen feel that they are not appreciated in anti-submarine warfare and in carrying out this technique. Consequently, it is not surprising that they seek other roles for their talents.

This entire problem of low morale, dissension with the assigned roles and missions, and this criticism of the operation of the other services, is significant in the final conclusion that I have drawn. That is, that many in the Navy are completely against unity of command and planning as established in the laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

Despite protestations to the contrary, I believe that the Navy has opposed unification from the beginning, and they have not in spirit as well as deed, accepted it completely to date. As a policy, yes, but as the final and authoritative vehicle for planning our collective defense, no.

This entire investigation, emphasizing the Navy's demand for more autonomy of decision and action than demanded by either the Army or the Air Force, is witness to this conclusion.

And I believe that this is a most serious matter—one which must be resolved if this organization is to be allowed to proceed effectively.

While the whole world relies upon the leadership of the United States as they face a common enemy, Americans at home are offered a spectacle of dissension within our own Department of Defense.

My philosophy, simply stated, is this: Each service is to national defense what each individual is to the service he represents.

The armed forces existence as a respected and integral part of the Nation, our happiness as members of the armed forces, and our morale as protectors of the Nation depend on this devotion of individuals to one center.

The decision for unification under a civilian leader was made in 1947 and reaffirmed only 2 months ago. Under this organization many agreements have been reached and decisions made, which the Commander in Chief has approved.

Our services belong to the people. They have decided we will have unification. They have decided we will have civilian control of the armed forces. In this, I heartily agree.

Unwavering acceptance on the part of all leaders will strengthen the will, the spirit, and the morale of all members of the armed forces, and consequently, make stronger our entire national defense.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I must apologize for the length of this statement and for taking up more time, and discussing these subjects in more detail, than might seem necessary. But I am firmly convinced that this investigation, coming at a time like this in international affairs, is one of the most important actions of Congress in its long history.

These proceedings have been indicative of nothing so much as the fact that there has been something seriously wrong within our Defense Establishment. I believe, however, that with patience, understanding, and cooperation this wrong can be corrected.

I hope that these remarks have left the deep and lasting impression that I firmly believe in a strong Navy and in the need for a naval air arm and a fleet marine force within that Navy. I hope that my criticism of the charges and my discussion of these charges have been constructive and completely lacking in any bitterness. I would like to assure the committee, and the people of the United States, that as long as I have been a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and as long as my membership continues, every decision in which I have participated was and will be made without bias toward any service or any persons, to the best of my judgment, drawing upon my entire experience in long years of service of this country.

We Americans want peace, for ourselves and for the rest of the world. We Americans

In the Department of Defense mean to build that peace and defend it if necessary.

Within the Department of Defense, we must pledge ourselves to work together. Each of our three services has much to offer the other two, and each has much to learn. I believe that time and increased education will enlarge the perspective of sincere and honest men in all the services, and quell any fears that lead to such grave misunderstandings.

Too much has been spread on the record, but now that it has, I hope that all of us, including the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, learn the lesson to be gained from this hearing.

There is a Sunday afternoon within the memory of all of us when this country was without the means of striking back from a devastating blow. Nothing stood between us and fiendish foe but an entirely inadequate Air Force, a mere handful of Regular soldiers plus a few civilian components called into Federal service a year before, and the remnants of what we had considered to be a powerful Navy.

Never again should this Nation face such a catastrophe.

Nor must we allow those friendly nations relying upon us for support to place their confidence in vain.

Americans must never forget the lessons we learned on that Sunday afternoon.

We would have welcomed then the power to strike back in retaliation. Had we been capable of retaliating in kind, we could have saved the lives of many American youths. It would have made no difference to us then which of the armed forces was capable of carrying out this job.

Probably complete understanding, cooperation, and trust could have avoided that fatal day. But it, and the subsequent lessons we learned, day by day, until September 1945, should have taught all military men that our military forces are one team—in the game to win regardless of who carries the ball. This is no time for "Fancy Dans" who won't hit the line with all they have on every play, unless they can call the signals. Each player on this team—whether he shines in the spotlight of the backfield or eats dirt in the line—must be an all-American.

I believe that the public hearing of the grievances of a few officers who will not accept the decisions of the authorities established by law, and charges as to our poor state of preparedness, have done infinite harm to our national defense, our position of leadership in world affairs, the position of our national policy, and the confidence of the people in their Government.

In my opinion, the armed forces all have a very big and very important job to do, and we should get on with it.

Record of First Session of Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Despite obstructional tactics of Republican Members and Dixiecrats much important legislation has been passed that is beneficial to the average American and to the Nation.

Liberal Democrats have faithfully stood by their promises and fought vigorously for the program which President Truman and the Democratic Party campaigned on.

They have recognized the votes of the people as a mandate for the proposals in the Democratic platform. Unfortunately, liberal Democrats lack an actual majority in Congress because some of the southern Democrats have views on many issues which are similar to those of the most reactionary Republican Members.

President Truman and liberal Democratic Members recognize their responsibility to the American people. They met their obligations by strenuously and consistently striving for the enactment of legislation the people voted for last November.

Administration Democrats were successful in passing or advancing legislation for public housing, slum clearance and community redevelopment, a 75-cent minimum wage, the extension of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville power-development programs.

In doing this they reversed the ugly trend started by the Eightieth Congress. That Republican Congress refused to enact housing legislation. It refused to increase the minimum wage beyond 40 cents and hour, and it frowned on legislation to aid public-power programs so essential to the people of the nation.

The passage by the House of Representatives of a social-security extension bill over bitter Republican opposition was one of the outstanding achievements of the Eighty-first Congress. This was the most hated of all the legislation which Republican leaders and well-financed front organizations and lobbies call welfare-state legislation.

Behind the scenes and in committees, Republican opponents of social security resorted to all sorts of trickery and filibustering to kill the legislation. In a last desperate effort, they sought to recommit the administration bill.

In the end, it was a great victory for President Truman and administration Democrats. Throughout the year in Congress and in public speeches Republicans carried on a cold war against the Truman program. Scare words were carelessly tossed around to frighten people. They raised fears of what they called welfare-state legislation.

However, on the great day of decision, Republicans lacked the courage to act as they talked. They got on the liberal bandwagon and voted for social security. Call it demagoguery or a recognition of the people's mandate last November, the facts are that all but 12 Republicans and 2 Dixiecrats voted for this welfare state social security bill.

The Republican Eightieth Congress voted to take 750,000 people from under the protection of the social-security law. The Eighty-first Congress voted to put 11,000,000 more Americans under protection of the act.

There is still much to be desired in improvements to the social security law. Veterans legislation remains unfinished. Federal aid to education has not yet been enacted. The Taft-Hartley Act remains.

However, whatever setbacks and defeats liberal legislation suffered in the Eighty-first Congress, they were due, not to a betrayal by the President or liberal Democrats of their promises, but because of those Members of Congress who refused to accept the mandate of the people.

I am aware of the efforts being made by special-privilege groups to influence the people of the nation against liberal legislation. The big-money lobbies, the daily press, and high-priced commentators are constantly at work in seeking to confuse and sway the minds of the people.

Last year they tried to beat President Truman and elect a Republican Congress with phony polls, dishonest predictions, colored news, and suppression of liberal views.

Today these same reactionary forces are trying to defeat the legislation the people voted for in 1948. They are also trying to influence votes in State and local elections of 1949.

The Republican cold war against social security and other liberal legislation by the use of scare words goes on every day of the year in an effort to warp the minds of the American people. Republicans know that a victory for them this year would be a heavy blow against all liberal legislation. It would endanger the social security extension bill which passed the House but which still faces action in the Senate.

The majority of Americans, however, have indicated by their votes in the past that they will not be fooled by false slogans and scare words. The American people believe they have a right to the opportunity for decent homes and for jobs at decent wages. They want and have a right to expect protection against the hazards of unemployment and of growing old, and in case of disability and misfortune.

The people want these things, despite such labels as statism and welfare state with which Republicans tag this legislation.

The American people want social security instead of breadlines and soup kitchens. They want public housing instead of shantytowns on the dumps of our great cities.

The votes this year in local elections will have a decisive influence on all liberal legislation. A Republican vote will be a shot at social security. A Republican trend in the Nation could yet kill the social security extension bill which passed the House of Representatives.

Now that the 1949 session is about to close we look again for a mandate from the people; 1949 is another year of decision. The hopes for prosperity and for advanced liberal and social legislation will rise or fall with the ballots on November 8.

As in 1948 the voters can, with their ballots, rebuke those who seek to confuse the people and to kill social security and other liberal legislation.

Pandit Nehru Visits Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANDIT NEHRU VISITS US

Not many foreign guests have come to Washington on missions of deeper significance or wider importance than is the case with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs of India. Momentous consequences may flow from his stay in the United States, of which his scheduled stop with us here in Washington is the first stage in a journey from coast to coast.

For Pandit Nehru this is both a diplomatic mission and a personal voyage of discovery. Widely traveled and highly educated though he is, he has never before been in the United States. And he has expressed the desire to know us better as a people, together with his wish to explore and improve the relations between the two Governments and nations. This involves personal contacts and conversations with as large and representative a cross section of our population at all levels as a tight official schedule will permit.

Pandit Nehru has in the past been critical of many aspects of American life. This is chiefly because he is a convinced Socialist, though his preference for a socialistic economy is combined with an almost passionate devotion to the democratic principles of human rights and the sanctity of the individual human being. That humane idealism sets him against all totalitarian ideologies, whether Communist or Fascist. Indeed, he envisages a sort of "third force," keeping India and the other emancipated peoples of Asia out of the camp either of east or west in the current cold war, and avoiding direct involvement if that titanic diplomatic rivalry should culminate in a hot war by embattled armies and atomic bombs.

Nevertheless, Nehru has not hesitated to take drastic action when communism challenged the authority and policies of the Government he heads. The official crack-down on the Indian Communist Party has been as severe as it is apparently effective. Stiff sentences have been meted out for overt sedition, while thousands of Red political prisoners are in Indian jails.

However, Nehru feels that much more than repression is needed to grapple with the ills on which communism feeds. Among India's many evils are mass poverty, overpopulation, and historic cleavages, largely religious, which hinder domestic cooperation and solidarity. India's economic progress can be furthered by western, and especially American, aid in the shape of loans, credits, private investment, and that combination of material assistance and technical know-how envisaged alike by United Nations' agencies and the American program expressed by President Truman's point 4. These matters will undoubtedly be discussed by Nehru with American officials, businessmen, scientists, and opinion-forming individuals of various kinds. Alongside this, there will presumably be exchanges of views, formal and perhaps even more informal, no diplomatic and political questions centering on Asia.

Pandit Nehru's authority and prestige, personal as well as official, are so outstanding with his own people that he represents and voices India as no other individual could possibly do. What he has to say to us should therefore be listened to with the utmost attention. And what he takes back to India with him in the shape of impressions and opinions even more than in concrete agreements should deeply affect our relations with India and other parts of Asia as well.

Nehru's Prospectus for India's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Thomas P. Krock, which appeared in the Washington Post of October 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMUNICATION—NEHRU'S PROSPECTUS FOR INDIA'S ECONOMY

(By Thomas P. Krock, president, Thomas Krock Associates, international public relations counselors)

The visit to the United States by Prime Minister Nehru of India, is of the utmost importance in the realm of world political-economic affairs.

Nehru is coming here for high-level policy talks that should lay the ground work for important economic developments in Asia which would go a long way towards strengthening democratic processes in this area of the world.

The American people should be vitally interested in the personality and background of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, born a Brahman aristocrat, but all his life a champion of the masses. He has served as a link between the Congress Party and the people of India. Other Indian leaders may be primarily political or mystical in their approach, Nehru is primarily economic in his thinking and approach to India's problems and place in the sisterhood of nations.

Originally, Nehru was a Socialist theorist; some considered him Marxist in his outlook. But today, although he may act politically, he may even talk upon occasion mystically, he thinks as an economist and has developed into one with an increasingly practical viewpoint.

To understand Nehru's economic creed, particularly as it has changed, developed and matured, is to form an understanding of India which is slowly stepping forth as an economic giant as well as to grasp its production and investment potentialities.

Nehru is a hero to the Indian masses and they have an unshakable faith in him. There is no doubt that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's economic philosophy will shape India's ways of work, even wealth, for many generations yet to come.

Nehru always looked upon Indian independence as much more than the release of political prisoners, or parliamentary rights. To him it meant freedom in terms of economic advancement for India. And he was the first to explain these facts to the people of India.

The meaning and word freedom as expounded by Nehru moved away from the transcendental to the tangible, while at the same time he laid the foundations for India's trade-union movement and its peasants' organizations from the year 1919 down to the present time. In 1929, at Nehru's personal insistence, the Nationalist Congress stated its firm belief in economic democracy as being hand in glove with its political goal of Indian emancipation into a democratic self-governing nation.

In the United States, and in the world in general, the thing that is not sufficiently realized is that the main force behind Nehru's career has been and still remains the burning desire to improve India's standard of living, and to remove the pauperization which binds the millions of Indians.

For more than 20 years Nehru has been a firm believer in the fact that India must have rapid industrialization to relieve the pressure on the land and to combat poverty. He knew that no country could be politically or economically independent unless it was highly industrialized by means of modern technology. He was convinced also that as long as India was industrially backward she would upset the world equilibrium and even encourage aggressive tendencies among the more developed countries against India.

Although visualizing the India of the future with heavy industries and all the other benefits of a modern, up-to-date state, Nehru was also very much aware of the dangers of industrialization without coordination and control. The unequal distribution of wealth, the profits of the few at the expense of the many, persuaded him that an unregulated anarchic industrialization would not improve economic conditions in India.

Originally attracted to socialism and Marxism as the best means of solving the many and varied problems of India, Nehru eventually found these theories wanting in many important aspects, with the consequence his thinking and ideas changed until his present frame of mind and outlook came into being.

In 1938 Nehru prepared a comprehensive report on Indian economy, issued through the national planning committee of the Indian National Congress of which he was chairman. This committee was made up of businessmen, industrialists, labor leaders, agricultural experts who assessed the various contemplated projects in sincere, concrete, down-to-earth terms which impressed Nehru greatly and lastingly and which contributed greatly towards his present economic thinking. The recommendations of this committee were more reformist than socialist in their outlook and they did not recommend rigid control by the State over all industries, but rather that the state should regulate them. The role of private enterprise was recognized, but its scope was restricted.

In the decade that has followed this report the destinies of the 350,000,000 of people of India have been, for the most part, guided by Nehru. No important plan was set into effect without his approval. In Nehru's capacity as Foreign Minister of India, he personally determined India's attitudes in international affairs, and in his present capacity as Prime Minister his views on economic affairs are firmly entranched in the Government's domestic policies.

India's hard-won freedom entailed great suffering and Prime Minister Nehru has faced, and still faces, complicated and trying issues. The division of the country into India and Pakistan had very adverse repercussions on the former's economic structure. The supply of raw materials was greatly reduced, transport dislocated, which in its turn reduced the production capacity of India. In turn inflation entered the picture and threatened to throw the nation's economy out of gear.

By 1947 the volume of industrial disputes reached their peak, resulting from the Dearness allowance (a cost-of-living bonus). Communal riots brought about mass migration and nonproduction. Floods destroyed other crops and as a result famine became a serious threat. However, by the end of the year Nehru's efforts had met with definite success. He appealed for a nation-wide effort to repair the economy and an all-out production drive to curb inflation which, in turn, would lower the cost of living and remove the primary source of labor disputes. Production showed an upward trend in all vital industries—jute, textiles, steel and sugar. Nehru declared all strikes to be an antisocial act; and as a result of his behest, together with the general economic improvement, the strike curve went down.

In April 1948 India's economic position emerged as hopeful. Nehru announced his government's economic policy for the future. The government is to exercise monopoly control over coal, iron, steel, aircraft, and shipbuilding, in addition to the railroads and the munitions plants. Existing privately owned enterprises in these fields will be allowed 10 years to develop after which period the question of their nationalization, with compensation, is to be reviewed. If they have made real contributions to national prosperity in a manner satisfactory to the Government of India they may remain in private hands.

Certain basic industries, such as salt, automobiles, tractors, machine tools, industrial and hydroelectrical equipment, rubber, paper, drugs, chemicals, textiles, and shipping are to be subject to varying degrees of government control and regulation. The government is to generate and distribute all electric light and power through its own public corporations similar to TVA. Cottage industries in weaving and manufacture are being encouraged. The rest of the industrial field is left open for private enterprise but the state would also progressively participate and would not hesitate to intervene if private enterprise proved itself unsatisfactory.

In line with announced government policy, Prime Minister Nehru promptly went ahead with the planning and development of such projects as multipurpose river dams, locomotive, aircraft, and fertilizer factories. Under his chairmanship and guidance a national planning committee was set up for the purpose of planning and developing dams for electric energy and irrigation, to reduce India's dependence on imports of foodstuffs. Projects already under construction will irrigate over 27,000,000 acres of uncultivated land and make India self-sufficient in food by 1951–52.

Nehru's Socialist reputation has caused caution on the part of foreign investors. Recently, Prime Minister Nehru stated that American investors would be compensated in dollars in the event of nationalization—which is a remote action—as long as the key industries are kept going and are employing many people. He said, "We would rather use our resources for developing new projects and employing more people. If these industries are well managed privately, we see no need for nationalization at any time."

The Prime Minister also declared that he was anxious to build in India a middle class, like the American middle class, which would prove the strongest bulwark possible against communism.

These statements made by Nehru may or may not draw foreign investments into India, but they certainly pointedly present the great change in his thinking and economic views. They show the obvious trend away from nationalization, which is the first step toward a socialistic state. His willingness to abandon nationalization refutes his own belief of 20 years ago that the principles of socialism and Marxism could be easily transferred to India, and show his great ability to adapt his thinking to the realistic thinking necessary in the world of today.

Nehru's ideas of the mixed economy are born out of his humbleness and practical mind and reflects his attempt to find a common meeting ground between the conflicting economic doctrines. How far this will be successful in solving India's manifold problems in the economic field will be revealed by the future. But the sincerity of Nehru's economic goal is unquestionable.

During his visit in the United States, Prime Minister Nehru can learn much from our way of life and economic set-up to assist him in guiding India through a most difficult period in that country's history. It is hoped that he will be given every opportunity to see and study at first hand the things that make this country great.

WASHINGTON.

Nehru Views Asiatic Pact as Premature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Ferdinand Kuhn which appeared in the Washington Post of October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN TALK HERE NEHRU VIEWS ASIATIC PACT AS PREMATURE

(By Ferdinand Kuhn)

Prime Minister Nehru of India yesterday counseled the American press and public to take a long-range view of changes in Asia.

Events in China, for example, must be viewed "in their context," he told a packed audience at a National Press Club luncheon.

"Distinctive and vital countries like India and China," he said, "are so deeply rooted in their ways and their philosophy of life that I don't think any changes will pull them out of their age-long patterns."

ANSWERS QUESTIONS

This was the nearest he came to commenting directly on Communist victories in China, although he touched on a wide variety of political, philosophical and personal subjects in a half-hour talk and in answers to half a dozen questions.

He answered one question with the assurance that India welcomed American investments, and that investors could expect "fair profit, an opportunity to take that profit away, and, generally speaking, fair treatment."

The Prime Minister said India would find ways to develop economically, with or without foreign capital, but the speed of her development would depend greatly on the extent of investments from abroad.

He replied to another question by saying that any talk of an Asiatic defense pact, similar to the North Atlantic Treaty, would be entirely premature.

Such a pact would not mean very much in a military sense, he thought, since Asia was a vast continent with vastly different regional interests. He said the non-Communist countries of Asia had not even made much progress with the limited consultations provided by last January's conference on the Indonesian problem.

MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION

Asked whether India favored a vote of the inhabitants to decide the future of Kashmir, the northern state now disputed between India and Pakistan, he recalled that his government had promised 2 years ago to let the people of Kashmir decide their own future. How it is to be done, he said, is "a matter for consideration."

The Prime Minister said his chief purpose in coming here was to get a better understanding of the United States, and incidentally, to meet American leaders. "Naturally," he said, "where there are avenues of cooperation I should like to explore them." But he insisted he had not come to make a "deal."

ALL SORTS OF PEOPLE

He said he was sorry his crowded 3-week schedule would make it hard to have leisurely talks with every-day Americans in their homes and on their farms and to visit out-of-the-way parts of the country.

He long ago learned in India, he said, that he had to mix with "all sorts of people," especially in the villages, before he could begin to understand their problems.

He had much to say about the distinctive philosophy of India and its stubborn vitality in spite of repeated shocks throughout long centuries.

"It is neither possible nor pleasant," he declared, "for the world to become one drab and uniform culture without variety."

"The United States today, not very consciously but inevitably, has become the most powerful country in the world, and a large measure of leadership is thrust upon her," he went on. "India definitely does not want leadership in Asia or anywhere else.

"But we simply cannot draw back into our shell. India has to play a part in Asia and the larger world. We are intensely interested in what is happening in Indonesia, Indochina, and the rest of Asia."

TO VISIT HYDE PARK

Yesterday, the last day of his Washington visit, the Prime Minister had interviews with Representative CELLER, Democrat, New York, a champion of liberalized Indian immigration to the United States, and with Clarence Pickett, of the American Friends Service Committee, which helped relieve suffering during the Bengal famine of 1943 and the Hindu-Moslem massacres of 1947.

This morning he plans to fly to New York for a crowded week of receptions. His only respite from the city will come Sunday when he will drive to Hyde Park, N. Y., to place a wreath on President Roosevelt's grave and to lunch quietly with Mrs. Roosevelt.

Nehru's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU'S VISIT

Pandit Nehru seems to be an exception to a rule that a lifetime spent in conspiracy unfits a man for statesmanship when the need has gone for conspiracy. Mazzini remained at home in what has been called

"masterly inactivity," that is to say, intrigue and indirectness in working toward a noble goal. Sun Yat-sen shrank from the spotlight of office, and, after an initial taste of it, returned to agitation. It has been noticeable since the war that many of the men of the resistance movements are temperamentally incapable of filling tasks of public responsibility because of their undercover habits. Nehru, as he has shown himself in Congress and to the press, does not seem to have become wedded to the devious ways which he must have contracted when he was leading his nation's struggle for independence. He looks and speaks without a trace of the rebelliousness of his background.

Mr. Nehru had many a word of wisdom in his address to Congress. There was a rule for the cold war that we all might ponder in his statement that "Even when preparing to resist aggression, the ultimate objective, the objective of peace, and reconciliation, must never be lost sight of, and heart and mind must be attuned to this supreme aim, and not swayed or clouded by hatred or fear." So spoke our own Lincoln. The counsel has an appropriateness in the interservice argument over strategic bombing. Nehru is too understanding a man, his country too important and, as he put it, "pivotal," to make neutrality a policy. The prime minister had been said before he arrived here to have espoused neutrality. But, as he said to Congress categorically, "where freedom is menaced, or justice threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral."

Mr. Nehru is now going to New York, where he may note some of the eccentricities in American life, and may be reminded of a modern Babylon. There he will stay 7 days, when he will be whisked across the country, stopping off at one or two other centers. He would prefer to see America of the back country. Why, then, not put him down at, say, Blytheville, Ark., a county seat, which thrives on cotton? Here is an out-of-the-way place where he might find the spirit of America and which he says, regretfully, his crowded program will not permit him to see. America has nothing to hide from a distinguished visitor who comes from a country which has effected, as India did hundreds of years before, a synthesis of many different elements both of thoughts and peoples—and achieved the same unity and distinctiveness without, however, sacrificing a rich and rewarding diversity.

Government Service Loses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 13, 1949:

GOVERNMENT SERVICE LOSES

The Senate's rejection of Leland Olds for a third term on the Federal Power Commission was a resounding defeat for President Truman and a major victory for natural gas interests.

The 53 to 15 vote against Olds included almost solid Republican opposition, including Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. It is significant that the majority of the Democratic opposition came from Southern and Southwestern States where natural gas is produced.

The issue on which Olds was ostensibly fought was the fact that a quarter of a century ago he wrote some radical newspaper and magazine articles. The real issue, however, as Senator AIKEN, Republican, Vermont, said, was that Olds had aroused "the undying enmity of utility interests."

The real losers in the Olds squabble were the people of the United States and the Government service. This is another example of a growing tendency to pillory capable, honest, hard-working men in Government service with the result that they are driven from service or harried to the point where their efforts to do a job are futile.

This tendency has, in the words of David Lilienthal, made Government service "increasingly unattractive and even repugnant to many specially qualified men." It is the major cause of President Truman's complaint that it is increasingly difficult to get good men to take responsible Federal jobs.

The inability to get good men in Government jobs results in many of the Government inefficiencies of which the Congress continually complains. The Congress, in its continual flurry of investigations, could do itself and Government a service by investigating the part it plays in promoting inefficiency by driving or keeping capable men from Government jobs.

Demopolis Dam—Beginning of Construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in extending his remarks which he made on the floor on October 14, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] stated that the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway "had been the laughing stock of Congress for years."

I believe that is the most ridiculous statement I have known a Congressman to make since I have been a Member of this House, and I do not believe he was serious when he made it.

He made that statement in the face of the fact that Congress has authorized this project by a vote of both Houses, and has already appropriated $858,000 for its planning—plus $1,000,000 for the construction of the dam across the Tombigbee at Demopolis, which he seemed to think was across the Warrior.

He made that statement in the face of the fact that the greatest engineers on earth have unhesitatingly approved this great project, time and time again, and have repeatedly pointed out the vast benefits it would bring to the people in every State that is drained by our great inland waterway system, as well as to the people along the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Brownsville, Tex.; from Carrabelle, Fla., to Sioux City, Iowa; from Mobile, Ala., to Chicago, Ill., and from New Orleans, La., to Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.

The gentleman from Missouri cannot any more block this project than he could stand on the seashore and argue back the waves of the ocean.

All great movements or great projects are laughed at by some men who want to destroy them by ridicule.

Certain Members laughed at me and Senator Norris when we were battling for the bill to create the Tennessee Valley Authority—which has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

They laughed at me even on the floor of the House when I first started the drive for rural electrification, which has done more for the American farmers than anything else that Congress has done for the last 50 years.

Some men laughed at the suggestion of constructing the Panama Canal, which cuts the water distance between our east and west coasts by more than 13,000 miles.

Some people laughed at the proposal to build those 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River, to make that great stream navigable the year round.

The traffic on that stream today surpasses in tonnage that of the Panama Canal.

Some of them laughed at the proposition of making the Illinois River navigable into Chicago; and some people are laughing today at the suggestion that we develop the Missouri River, harness that gigantic stream and its tributaries, for the benefit of the people of that great western country, generate power, provide navigation and irrigation, and control the floods that have cost the people along that stream millions of dollars in recent years.

If it were possible for any man to succeed in preventing the completion of this great project, then he would have the distinction of having done the people of Missouri more harm than any other man who has lived in the last hundred years.

He would have the distinction of having done the people of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and all the other States of that great midwestern country, as well as Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other Southern States from Texas to Florida, more harm than any other man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

If any man should succeed in blocking the completion of this great project, he will have done our program of national defense infinite harm in preventing the construction of this short slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, on which our country must depend for her safety and protection in case of another conflict.

Oh, I realize that a little group of railroad lobbyists have been opposed to this project from the beginning. They are opposed to all water transportation. They would abolish the Great Lakes, if they had the power, and paralyze transportation on the Gulf of Mexico. They are just as strongly opposed to the development of the Missouri River and the St. Lawrence and have fought the development of the Ohio and the Illinois, as well as the construction of those dams that were necessary for the navigation of the upper Mississippi River.

This project will not throw a single railroad man out of work. It will stimulate transportation and cause rate readjustments; and the railroads in that area will haul more freight than they ever hauled before, and therefore employ more men. That has been the history of every one of these projects.

They tried to make the railroad men believe that the construction of those locks and dams on the Warrior River up to Birmingham would throw men out of employment. It had exactly the opposite effect. Those railroads are hauling more traffic and employing more men than they ever had before this Warrior project was put into operation.

It seemed to irritate the gentleman from Missouri when he woke up and found out that the Demopolis Dam was across the Tombigbee River, and not across the Warrior.

The building of this Demopolis Dam is the first great step in the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway—which will mean a slack- or still-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., as well as to all points on the Allegheny, the Monongahela, and the upper Mississippi as far as Minneapolis and St. Paul, and to all points on the Missouri up to Omaha, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa.

At the same time, as was pointed out by General Robbins of the Army engineers, it will save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

I heard General Robbins tell the Senate committee that if he could assure them that with the money which this project would cost he could extend an arm of the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo, Ill., and provide a slack- or still-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo and back, they would "throw up their hats and shout."

Yet he said this project is far better, because it will provide a slack-water route up to the Tennessee River, at the mouth of Yellow Creek on the Mississippi-Tennessee line, and then we have a downstream route from there to Cairo, 262 miles, and at the same time it will save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

In other words, it will cost far less to ship a bargeload of goods from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, Mobile, or Demopolis, and to ship a similar load back to Paducah on the Ohio, or to Cairo, on the Mississippi, than it would to ship the same load the same distance in still water, say across one of the Great Lakes, or the Gulf of Mexico, owing to the fact that, as General Robbins said, it saves the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic, and provides a slack-water route up to the Tennessee River, and then a downstream route from that point back to Cairo.

Now, let us see what this project will mean to the people in the areas affected.

The Army engineers have worked out a set of tables to show just what the savings will amount to.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF COSTS PER TON OF UPSTREAM TRAFFIC VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE

At this point I am inserting table No. 1 showing the comparison of costs per ton of upstream traffic.

You will note that in this table the Army engineers have included the city of Amory, Miss., for the first time. It had been inadvertently left out before. Amory is right at Cotton Gin Port on the Tombigbee River, where Bienville landed his army in 1736 when he was making war on the Chickasaw Indians.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of costs per ton of upstream traffic*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi, per ton	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee, per ton	Average savings, per ton
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$2.02	$1.32	$0.70
	Paducah	2.10	1.26	.84
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.42	.99	1.43
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	.95	1.44
	Paducah	2.47	.89	1.58
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.79	.62	2.17
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	.95	2.01
	Paducah	3.04	.89	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.36	.62	2.74
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	.67	2.01
	Paducah	2.76	.61	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.08	.34	2.74
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	.51	2.32
	Paducah	2.91	.45	2.46
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.23	.17	3.06
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	.46	2.42
	Paducah	2.96	.40	2.56
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.28	.13	3.15
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	2.91	.44	2.47
	Paducah	2.99	.38	2.61
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.31	.11	3.20
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	.41	2.52
	Paducah	3.01	.35	2.66
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.33	.08	3.25

I hope every Member of Congress, and every individual who is interested in the internal development of America, will examine these tables carefully and see just what this savings will amount to.

Remember, that every vessel that goes into the upper Mississippi, or goes into the Great Lakes by way of the Illinois River, or goes into the Missouri, has to pass through Cairo, and will therefore enjoy the savings which these tables show will be enjoyed by traffic from all points along the intercoastal waterway, as well as from New Orleans, Mobile, and Demopolis, and all other points on the Tombigbee River.

All the traffic that goes to Paducah, Ky., or to any other point on the upper Ohio from Paducah to Pittsburgh, Pa., or points on the Allegheny or the Monongahela, as well as all points on the Cumberland River up to Nashville, will enjoy the savings which these tables show between the points mentioned and Paducah, Ky.; and of course all points on the upper Tennessee, including our great atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, will enjoy the savings which these tables show will be provided for traffic between the points I have mentioned and the Tennessee-Tombigee junction.

Now let us see what this will mean in dollars and cents. In addition to the great benefits which this project will provide for the people along the Tombigbee, from Mobile to the Tennessee River, I want to show what it will mean to the people of the various States beyond Cairo and Paducah.

At this point I am inserting table No. 2 showing the savings on a 3,500-ton barge load which, up to now, has been the average load carried on these streams.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 2.—*Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 3,500 tons, and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 3,500 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$7,070	$4,620	$2,450
	Paducah	7,350	4,410	2,940
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	8,470	3,465	5,005
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	8,365	3,325	5,040
	Paducah	8,645	3,115	5,530
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	9,765	2,170	7,595
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	10,360	3,325	7,035
	Paducah	10,640	3,115	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,760	2,170	9,590
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	9,380	2,345	7,035
	Paducah	9,660	2,135	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	10,780	1,190	9,599
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	9,905	1,785	8,120
	Paducah	10,185	1,575	8,610
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,305	595	10,710
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	10,080	1,610	8,470
	Paducah	10,360	1,400	8,960
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,480	455	11,025
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	10,185	1,540	8,645
	Paducah	10,465	1,330	9,135
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,585	385	11,200
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	10,255	1,435	8,820
	Paducah	10,535	1,225	9,310
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,655	280	11,375

Remember, that this means that every bargeload of 3,500 tons going up the Ohio, the Illinois, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Cumberland, the Ten-

nessee, the Tombigbee, and all points on the Great Lakes or the Intercoastal Waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Brownsville, Tex., will enjoy the savings shown in this table.

TABLE NO. 3 SHOWING COST PER TOW OF BARGES CARRYING 14,000 TONS AND SHOWING SAVINGS VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE

As I have explained before, many of our shippers are using 14,000-ton barges or tows, for transporting heavy materials. They seem to be using 14,000-ton tows more and more as time goes on.

Here is a table showing the cost of a 14,000-ton tow of barges by way of the Mississippi, and what it would cost by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee, and what the savings would amount to.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 3.—*Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee*

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$28,280	$18,480	$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

I wish every intelligent person in every State drained by the great inland waterway system, and every State that touches the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, could read, study and understand these figures.

When the Demopolis Dam is finished three-fifths of this great inland waterway, known as the Tennessee-Tombigbee, will be completed; and I predict that the entire project will be constructed within the next few years.

Last year the traffic on the Monongahela River alone amounted to more than 31,000,000 tons, or 6,000,000 tons more than that on the Panama Canal, and the tonnage carried on the Ohio River amounted to 42,000,000 tons, or 17,000,000 tons more than that carried on the Panama Canal.

I predict that within 10 years from the time this project is completed it will carry more tonnage than the Panama Canal, and that the savings in transportation costs, on the fuel bills alone, in a few years will be sufficient to pay every dollar of the cost of its construction.

As the Army engineers have pointed out, it is the greatest project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

It is the final link in the greatest inland waterway system in the world, and as I have stated before, will be worth untold billions to the people of this country in the years to come.

Let us do everything possible to hasten its construction.

Hoosier Salesman—Article on Hon. Homer E. Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The article is entitled "Hoosier Salesman," and was published in the October 25 issue of the Reporter magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIER SALESMAN

Like the phonograph that bears his name, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, is large, shiny, and full-toned. His appearance lends itself to a caricature of either the carefree fat man or the bloated capitalist; he has a double chin, he usually wears a dark, conservative double-breasted suit, and a big ring sparkles from one of his fingers.

Actually, CAPEHART is not quite a jolly fat man or a bloated capitalist. He is a salesman, and a good one. He has sold enough baking powder, farm machinery, gadgets, juke boxes, phonographs, and radio sets to acquire a million dollars or so. He has sold free-enterprise Republicanism well enough to win a seat in the Senate.

CAPEHART is so much the traditional American businessman that to characterize him is to commit a prolonged cliché. He is likable, kind-hearted, and generous—a self-made millionaire who was once a penniless farm boy. Like the copybook maxims he tends to think in, he is profoundly provincial. Sometimes he is definitely proud of this narrowness and sometimes he seems to be painfully, almost pathetically, groping for a wider perspective.

His million dollars (a minimum estimate) qualify CAPEHART as one of the richest men in the Senate, but in his business enterprises he never really got out of the minor leagues. Held up beside those of Fairless or Ford, CAPEHART's career dwindles to proper focus: He is a prototype of the successful medium-sized-business man, and his ideas are those of small-business men, not of big corporation chiefs. CAPEHART made his first, and so far only, political campaign on a platform favoring private enterprise, especially small business. Hence, he sees most political problems in simple terms of the individual entrepreneur against the Government.

This formula brought him into politics in 1938. His opposition to the "socialistic way the country is going" led him to stage a "cornfield conference" on his 1,800-acre farm in southern Indiana, with the avowed purpose of "showing the Republicans how to block the New Deal." This political scrimmage, attended by 20,000 fellow Hoosiers, cost the host $30,000. Indiana Republicans realized pleasurably that they had found another soft touch.

The trouble with the Republican Party, CAPEHART thinks, is not that its product is unsound but that its salesmanship is terrible. "I wouldn't hire one of 'em," he said scornfully of the GOP's managers after the 1948 debacle. "If I wanted a salesman, I'd hire Harry Truman.

"We me-tooed 'em. We not only failed to sell our product—the fine record of the Eightieth Congress, we got sucked in on this bipartisan foreign policy and a lot of other things besides."

The Senator's opposition to New Deal measures and the bipartisan foreign policy, as reflected by his votes, has not been quite 100 percent. He voted for American participation in the International Bank, for the 1945 full-employment bill, for the Greek-Turkish aid program, for a National Science Foundation, for a 75-cent minimum wage, and for the Atlantic Pact. In very few other cases, however, has his record been sullied by me-tooism.

CAPEHART attributes his success in the 1944 race for the Senate to the fact that he shook a hundred thousand hands and made more than 300 speeches in a 10-month campaign. In preparation for the 1950 election he is already spending as much time as possible in Indiana. Dewey carried Indiana in 1948, but the Democrats elected a Governor and 7 out of 11 Congressmen. CAPEHART won in 1944 by only 22,000 votes out of 1,630,000 cast, and at best he will have a close squeeze in 1950. At worst his prospects look bad. It all depends on whether Hoosier farmers and small-town businessmen in 1950 are in the mood of 1946 or that of 1948.

Even though CAPEHART voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, he does not understand why labor treats him as acrimoniously as it does. He has never had a strike in any of his companies, and he says he gets along fine with the United Steel Workers Union, which has a closed shop in his Indianapolis factory.

The Senator's distaste for the New Deal and his contempt for Republican strategy have not soured his disposition. At 52, his black hair is pretty thin and he wears glasses, but his pudgy face is almost cherubic and his optimism downright Pollyannaish. "When anybody hands me a lemon," he says, "I always make lemonade." Highly gregarious, he belongs to a host of organizations ranging from the Moose to the Union League.

CAPEHART is a Lincoln fan. On the wall of his office reception room hang 36 pictures of Lincoln, which he describes as one of the best collections in the country. Imbedded among the pictures is a carefully culled, carefully framed quotation from his hero: "* * * If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

Impeccable party loyalty is reflected by CAPEHART'S office trappings. They do not include an equally well-known quip by one of the Senator's former colleagues—ALBEN BARKLEY—who once observed that "the nearest the Republican Party has been to Lincoln in two generations is to quote him."

After high school and a term in the Army during the First World War, CAPEHART began to make his way in the world as a baking-powder salesman. During the next 8 years he sold for four different companies, taking time out to set up, with a partner, his own advertising agency in Green Bay, Wis.

In 1927 CAPEHART met an inventor who had been issued a patent on a device for changing and turning over phonograph records. Soon afterward the Capehart Automatic Phonograph Co. was founded to make the "orchestrope," a kind of prehistoric jukebox, which until 1930 was quite literally a howling success. But the company lost money during the depression, and CAPEHART left to become vice president of the Rudolph Wurlitzer Corp., which makes jukeboxes. The Capehart Co. minus CAPEHART, eventually merged with the Farnsworth Corp., to turn out super de luxe radio-phonographs. In 1940, CAPEHART left Wurlitzer to devote his full time to the Packard Manufacturing Corp., which he had organized in 1932, and which makes radio and phonograph parts, and a variety of other electrical gadgets.

He has been liquidating his business enterprises since he went to the Senate in 1945. Only a small part of the Packard Co. remains and that has been turned over to his 26-year-old son, Tom.

One of CAPEHART'S favorite political techniques is the use of deceptively simple prima facie logic. A typical CAPEHART syllogism might run something like this:

The Marshall plan is a program to stop communism in western Europe.

Of all western European countries, Spain has had the most experience in fighting communism.

Therefore, Spain should be included in the Marshall plan.

When the veterans' housing shortage was most acute in 1946, the administration proposed a program including guaranteed markets for certain types of houses. Said CAPEHART: "There is or there is not a shortage of houses in America. If there is a shortage, and if there is a tremendous market * * * there is absolutely no sense in the Government's guaranteeing to any manufacturer that he will be able to sell his houses. * * * Instead of trying to solve the problem in the American way, through private enterprise, the administration rushes to the Congress of the United States and asks it to vote them a few extra hundred million dollars and * * * unlimited power."

"If a tariff bill were before the Senate for the protection of industries such as big billion-dollar corporations," replied Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, "we would not hear the able Senator from Indiana * * * saying that we should dispose of the matter in the American way and allow the American consumer to buy commodities for whatever he could get them in a free American market."

If PEPPER had a legitimate point here, CAPEHART has not yet been able to find it, nor does he evince any interest in doing so. He has a simple way of disposing of New Dealers. They keep on throwing lemons at him. He goes on making lemonade.

Basing Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by W. K. Kelsey which appeared in the Detroit News of October 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The small independent businessman took a wallop from the House of Representatives last Friday when that body adopted the basing-point bill recommended by the conference committee of both branches of Congress. In effect the House majority, after having licked the big-business lobby in the preliminary rounds, threw in the towel at the end, apparently on the peculiar theory that if it gave big business what it asked for, it would behave itself.

The result is that there is a sharp division between the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission, whose powers are emasculated by the bill passed by the House, and the Department of Justice whose spokesman in this matter is Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson. And that seems strange, for Attorney General McGrath, while still a Senator, voted for the Kefauver amendments which aimed at preserving the powers of the FTC and which, along with the Carroll amendments adopted by the House were stricken from the bill by the conference committee.

It is likewise extraordinary that the House, by adopting the conference report, acquiesced in the nullification of its action by that committee in tossing out the Carroll amendments, thereby acting contrary to the advice of its chief conferee, Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee. The crucial vote was 178 to 138, with 110 Representatives absent, paired, or not voting.

The only inference the commentator can draw from these proceedings is that the House majority, composed in this case of members of both parties, didn't understand the conference report, or was so overwhelmed by the big business lobby that it voted for the so-called "compromise" just to get the bill out of the way.

The fact is, there was no compromise at all. The object of big business was to kill the Kefauver and Carroll amendments, which stood in the way of its complete freedom of action in crushing competition. It abundantly accomplished what it set out to do, so far as the House is concerned.

FAVORING THE MONOPOLISTS

The bill as passed by the House legalizes the basing-point system of price fixing by sellers acting independently. That means, for instance, that a seller may adopt Detroit as a basing point for a district, including all of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and quote one price to any purchaser within that district—the price being the same to a purchaser in Detroit, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, or Rock Island. Necessarily, the delivered price includes the average freight rate, so that the purchaser in Detroit and points near Detroit helps pay the higher freight on purchases made by buyers in distant cities.

Court decisions have not outlawed this practice, provided it is carried on without combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement, such as was proved in the famous Cement case. But the new bill goes on to say that it shall not be unlawful discrimination for a seller, acting independently to sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different delivery points or if differences between such prices are not such that their effect upon competition may be prohibited by this section.

That looks fair enough, until one comes to this definition: "The term 'the effect may be' shall mean that there is reliable, probative and substantial evidence of the specified effect."

That definition changes the meaning of the Robinson-Patman Act and knocks the ground from under the feet of the Federal Trade Commission.

Hitherto the FTC has been able to issue a cease and desist order if it saw "reasonable probability" that a discrimination in prices quoted to buyers tended to create a monopoly. That interpretation has been upheld by the courts. But under the bill passed by the House, the damage must be accomplished and proved before any action can be taken to remove it.

"Such a law as this," said opponents of this section, "might be compared to a traffic law which made it illegal for motorists to run through stop signs only if, after having run through a stop sign, the motorist found that his act had caused a substantial accident."

"GOOD FAITH" DISCRIMINATION

But the House measure goes still further. It permits a seller to justify a price discrimination "by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith or to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor, and this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains," unless there is a combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement to that end.

The Carroll amendment sought to outlaw such price discrimination if its apparent effect was to threaten or destroy competition. How, you may ask, could competition be threatened if one company cuts its price to meet the price-cut of another company? It could happen thus:

A dealer supplied by X informs his regular supplier that another company, Y, has quoted him a lower price for a certain commodity. To keep his customer, X agrees to meet the price quoted by Y, but only in this particular dealer's case. Thus the dealer secures an advantage over his competitors who must continue to pay the regular price; and if the advantage is great enough he can in time force his competitors out of business.

If you don't think this practice has been fairly common, ask the various small independent dealers' associations. It is one way by which a large selling corporation can secure complete control of outlets in any territory, if it so desires, and thereafter maintain any price it may choose to fix, to the detriment of consumers.

The defense of X would be that he cut his price to the dealer in good faith, because Y had offered a lower price; and that defense, under the House enactment, would be complete unless there was positive proof that there had been collusion between X and Y.

FAVORING THE LARGE BUYERS

Say the opponents of the conference bill: "The tendency of sellers to grant special price concessions to large buyers is one of the most widely observed characteristics of business behavior. * * * The price discrimination which is philosophically indefensible on any grounds is that which goes beyond cost savings and permits large buyers to drive small buyers out of business. * * *

"When a large seller, with national sales outlets, makes a special low price in one particular territory, at least one other seller will usually meet this special price. In this case, the 'good faith' defense would exempt the discriminations from a cease and desist order, even though the result was to drive out of business small competing sellers having only local or regional sales outlets."

Enactment of this bill clips the powers of the FTC to enforce competition, and plays into the hands of monopolists. By a well-reasoned veto, President Truman could get himself a wonderful issue for his party in the next campaign.

Federal Charters To Save Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article of mine which recently appeared in the Wisconsin Law Review, Federal Charters To Save Free Enterprise.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CHARTERS TO SAVE FREE ENTERPRISE

(By JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

John Marshall was no Jacobin. During the early days of our country he was the most effective exponent, next to Hamilton, of the idea of a powerful, if not a big, Central Government.

It was Jefferson who was called the Jacobin. He believed that the people should be as free as possible from the authority of central political power. Hamilton argued in the Washington Cabinet that the Federal Government had the authority under the Constitution to charter corporations. He wanted a United States bank. Jefferson argued against him because he was fearful that if the Central Government issued charters it would presently be creating private monopolies. He wanted the people to be economically as well as politically free. That's why he was called a Jacobin.[1]

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, SHIELD OF THE PEOPLE

Now we have the paradox that the Central Government, the authority of which was powerfully supported by the decisions of Marshall, is the only effective shield of the people from monopolies created by the States which Jefferson thought to be the dependable defenders of the people. Marshall laid the judicial basis for the power and authority of the Federal Government in the economic field in his famous decision in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* when he said: [2]

"The genius and character of the whole Government seem to be, that its action is to be applied to all the external concerns of the Nation, and to those internal concerns which affect the States generally; but not to those which are completely within a particular State, which do not affect other States, and with which it is not necessary to interfere, for the purpose of executing some of the powers of the Government."

In this case he upheld the right of Congress to regulate commerce between New York and New Jersey under the Navigation Act, enacted by the First Congress even as against a monopoly granted by the legislature of the State of New York. One of the contentions made in that case against the validity of the Navigation Act was that commerce did not include the transportation of passengers on a ferryboat. This was the first of a thousand clever arguments which have been made by business interests ever since to limit the authority of Congress under the commerce clause, but Marshall made it clear in his famous decision that the words of the Constitution "comprehend every species of commercial intercourse" save that which is so "completely within a particular State" that they "do not affect other States." [3]

Thus as the trade and commerce of the people of the United States spread across State boundaries, the power of the Federal Government also grew. The Navigation Act was followed by scores of other acts exercising the plenary power of the Congress to regulate that commerce which affects the people in more States than one. For a long time it was believed that mere production in a State was not within the commerce power of Congress. Gradually, however, it began to be clear that production within a single State for use in other States could affect those other States and their people.[4] Changing conditions brought changes in the application of the law. Philander C. Knox, a distinguished and able lawyer, who became Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Theodore Roosevelt and afterward a Senator from Pennsylvania, argued powerfully that industrial production within a State must necessarily fall within the commerce clause when it affects other States.[5] So again, for Knox was a Republican, a statesman who could not be called either a Jacobin, or a Socialist, or even a New Dealer, supported the very theory of the Federal commerce power upon which so many laws of the Roosevelt administration were based.

CONGRESS CLINGS TO DEAD PAST

Thus the paradox pursues us. Its most striking aspect in our time is to be found in the fact that, although no serious argument is made against the all-inclusive nature of the power of Congress to regulate commerce, the Congress still clings to the dead past by refusing to take the necessary step to define the powers and responsibilities of the corporate agencies which carry on the commerce everybody recognizes Congress has the power to regulate. Because it has failed to define these powers and responsibilities it has surrendered a substantial part of its inherent power to private monopolies which have been growing apace under charters issued by the States; charters which create gigantic corporate units to operate in the very field of national and international commerce, jurisdiction over which was specifically taken away from the States. The result has been that we have both big business and big government. The people in the States and throughout the United States are becoming more and more subject economically to the decisions of private managers, while to offset this development Congress creates a multiplicity of Federal boards, commissions, and corporations which also tend to exercise managerial authority. Having no power with their instrumentalities of local and State government to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, the people have been losing economic freedom. Private corporations created by the States have been privately regulating commerce, and because of the resultant growth of Big Government even the political freedom of the people is threatened.

STATE-CHARTERED FEDERAL CORPORATIONS

Long ago at the turn of the century, a talented newspaperman, Finley Peter Dunne, created a good-humored philosopher by the name of Mr. Dooley, whose wit and wisdom were quoted throughout the country. One of his most acute observations was made during the debates about the control of the trusts, when he declared that if the Federal Government wanted to have the real power to control the trusts it ought to get itself incorporated under the New Jersey law. Finley Peter Dunne died and went to his reward without ever knowing how really accurate were the words he put into Mr. Dooley's mouth. Not New Jersey but Delaware was the creator of Federal corporations established for the sole purpose of carrying out policies the Congress wanted the Federal Government to make effective. Agents of the Federal Government went to the capital of that State to secure charters for Government corporations.

Believe it or not, the "principal office or place of business" of the Federal corporation known as the Institute of Inter-American Affairs was located by its charter in the State of Delaware at "100 West Tenth Street in the City of Wilmington." The charter of this Federal corporation recited that "the name and address of its resident agent" was the Corporate Trust Co. at the same Wilmington address. The Corporate Trust Co. and the office at 100 West Tenth Street have become famous throughout the country for this is the same private corporation that represents many of the largest interstate businesses of the Nation. The incorporator, Nelson A. Rockefeller, grandson of the founder of Standard Oil, and Messrs. John C. McClintock and John E. Lockwood, all gave their addresses as Washington, D. C. This Institute performed a very valuable service during the war, and I cite it here without the slightest intention of criticizing its work, but only to point out the anomalous situation under which the Government of the United States, for the national purpose, sought charters from a State, which, under the Constitution, has no power whatsoever in the field of foreign relations or interstate commerce.

There were so many of these State-incorporated Federal businesses back in 1945 that the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law No. 248 in the first session providing congressional supervision of their fiscal operations. Congress, in this statute, did not abolish these corporations. The country needs the home-loan banks, the Production Credit Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the Crop Insurance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal land banks, and others too numerous to mention. Not all of them, by any means, were chartered under State law, and I refer to them now only to illustrate the primary fact that the corporation has become an essential instrument by which modern trade and commerce can be most effectively carried on. Just as it was not necessary to abolish State-created Government corporations in order to provide a Federal rule for their operation, so it is not necessary to abolish State-created private corporations in order to establish a rule of responsibility for them when they operate in the national field.

[1] For the text of the Jefferson opinion see Opinion Against the Constitutionality of a National Bank, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Ed. H. E. Bergh, vol. III (Washington, 1907). For the text of the Hamilton opinion see On the Constitutionality of a National Bank, The Works of Alexander Hamilton, Ed. J. C. Hamilton, vol. I (New York, 1810). These opinions were submitted to President Washington in 1791.

[2] 9 Wheaton 1, *195 (1824).

[3] Ibid at 7, 8.

[4] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1 (1937)); *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100 (1941)).

[5] 36 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 414–415 (1901).

PEOPLE ARE SOURCE OF CORPORATE POWER

Private corporations chartered by the several States to engage in interstate and foreign commerce should no more be a law unto themselves than the Federal corporation, even when chartered by the States. Corporations are instruments of commerce and they should be subject to specific regulation by the Government which has jurisdiction over the field of commerce in which they engage. I know of no better statement of this principle than that which is contained in the constitution of my own State, Wyoming. There it is written down: [6]

"All powers and franchises of corporations are derived from the people, and are granted by their agent, the Government, for the public good and general welfare, and the right and duty of the State to control and regulate them for these purposes is hereby declared."

That is an incontrovertible principle. It applies to the Federal Government as well as to the State government. It is the right and duty of the Federal Government to control and regulate all the powers and franchises of corporations which carry on commerce among the States, and with foreign nations. If the Congress does not do this it will not be done because the States have no authority over the subject matter. As the State government is the agent of the people of the State so the Federal Government is the agent of all of the people of the United States, and it is neglecting its plain duty toward those people when it permits private corporations to obtain from the States unlimited powers in the field of commerce which was committed to its care by the Constitution of the United States. It is not as though the danger to the national economy was not foreseen. President Grover Cleveland, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1888, declared: [7]

"The gulf beween employers and the employed is constantly widening and classes are rapidly forming, one comprising the very rich and powerful, while in another are found the toiling poor. As we view the achievements of aggregated capital, we discover the existence of trusts, combinations, and monopolies, while the citizen is struggling far in the rear or is trampled to death beneath an iron heel. Corporations which should be the carefully restrained creatures of the law and the servants of the people are fast becoming the people's masters."

President William Howard Taft had his Attorney General, George W. Wickersham, prepare a Federal incorporation law, and had it sent to the Congress to be introduced by the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, member of the Senate from Wyoming, Hon. Clarence D. Clark. Mr. Wickersham, a Republican, corresponding with Senator John Sharp Williams, a Democrat, about the problem of corporate abuses in March 1912, wrote to the latter, saying: [8]

"I have, as you know, thought, and frequently expressed the conviction that the Federal Government should deal affirmatively, as well as negatively, with the subject, by providing a scheme of Federal incorporation."

President Taft's bill was not enacted, nor did Senator John Sharp Williams succeed. Their general views, however, were entertained by other great statesmen, including President Woodrow Wilson who, on August 8, 1919, in a special address to Congress declared: [9]

"We should formulate a law requiring a Federal license of all corporations engaged in interstate commerce and embodying in the license, or in the conditions under which it is to be issued, specific regulations designed to secure competitive selling and prevent unconscionable profits in the methods of marketing. Such a law would afford a welcome opportunity to effect other much-needed reforms in the business of interstate shipments and in the methods of corporations which are engaged in it."

CAUSE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

The reform was never enacted. Again we encounter the paradox. Failure of Congress to act resulted from the fear of Members that to enact a Federal incorporation law would be to expand the power of the Federal Government. But expansion came nevertheless. There were 101 Federal corporations in 1945 when Congress enacted the law "to provide for financial control of Government corporations." There are far more Federal boards and commissions in 1949 than there were in 1919 when Woodrow Wilson asked for legislation, in 1911 when President Taft asked for Federal incorporation, or in 1888 when Cleveland issued his warnings that corporations were becoming the masters of the people. Big government at Washington grows because of the failure of Congress to enact the reform and it is plain to be seen that continued failure will result only in promoting the development of the authoritarian state.

Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, of the Brookings Institution, who recently published a book on little business for the Committee on Economic Development, an organization of private businessmen, cited some startling statistics which prove how right Grover Cleveland was. His figures show that of about 3,500,000 business enterprises in the United States, only 26,900, that is to say, eight-tenths of 1 percent, employ about 52 percent of the workers. The concentration of employment is even more striking, for the largest 4,900 corporations out of 3,500,000 actually employ 40 percent of all workers.[10] Thus do we create the proletariat by permitting the States to issue grants of unlimited power to the private groups which carry on the national business upon which all the people depend.

An analysis of the monster corporations which employ so large a segment of all our industrial workers shows that they are not only what Woodrow Wilson once called them, namely, economic states, but that they are in fact collectivist economic states, for they are owned by one group and managed by another. The word "management" has come into our dictionary of modern commerce because the growth of the modern corporations has established a new economic order. The characteristic business of our time is not carried on by those who are the owners and managers of their own private businesses. It is carried on by managerial employees of huge corporate units, most of the stockholders of which own so few shares that they exercise no control of any kind over the business.

United States Steel, for example, has about 244,000 stockholders, but one-half of this number own less than 14 shares each. This is characteristic of the modern corporate giants which carry on the national and international commerce upon which our whole population depends.

The little businessman, when he hears of some proposal for the regulation of these corporate giants, is asked to believe that legislation which would regulate them would injure him. He sometimes does not recognize the fact that he is utterly different from the collectivist modern corporation with its tens of thousands of voiceless stockholders, and its handful of managerial experts whose decisions affect commerce not only in every State and Territory of the United States but often throughout the world. He owns and operates his own business. He is altogether different from the great organization which can and does affiliate with an international cartel exercising frequently the very powers of government. As I pointed out in the Final Report of the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources: [11]

"The Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the Texas Co.—the four participants in the projected venture by which Saudi-Arabian oil is to be made available for distribution under a single managerial policy had a total of 470,752 stockholders as of December 31, 1945. Of course, this total includes numerous duplications, but it still is correct to say that these four companies have a larger number of stockholders in the aggregate than all but a few municipalities in the United States have inhabitants; indeed, a greater number than the population of some of the States of the Union."

I do not wish to be misunderstood as callenging the good faith or the patriotism of the managers of corporations of this character, but I say that such a corporate organization so obviously engaged in foreign commerce should not be chartered exclusively under State law. Neither New York nor California, neither New Jersey nor Texas can exercise the slightest authority over our relations with the Middle East, and with the states which surround this great reservoir of petroleum. The United States Government must do that. Yet the activities of these State-created corporations, the powers that they exercise, the contracts that they make, all intimately affect the lives and prosperity of all of the people of the United States who, under present law, exercise no authority over the form and nature of their charters.

MONOPOLY A FOREIGN IDEOLOGY

It is often charged that we are in danger here of adopting foreign ideologies. This argument has frequently been raised against the legislative programs of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Yet the fact is that the only foreign ideology which has made any progress in the United States has been that of the private monopoly. Combinations in restraint of trade have never been any part of the American way of life. They have been the almost invariable rule of European nations, and American corporate leaders doing business in foreign nations have on occasion testified in congressional hearings that they must engage in monopolistic enterprise abroad or else go out of business. Mr. Laurence B. Levi, in charge of foreign operations for the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., declared: [12]

"The one inescapable fact is that American companies, if they are to continue to carry on business abroad, must be in a position to meet, in each particular country, the conditions existing there. In other words, an American concern desiring to carry on business in those areas must 'do as the Romans do' or suffer the consequences."

Again in the same hearings he said: [13]

"Monopolies and closed economies are unsound, and we are opposed to them. Nevertheless, the trade agreements in foreign countries regulating their domestic marketing, where conditions may differ from our, are considered by many governments as meeting the needs of their national economies. There is no doubt that several foreign-owned oil companies stand willing and able to take the place of any American company which does not participate in these agreements."

Abraham Lincoln once said that this Nation could not endure half slave and half free. It can be no different in the field of

[6] Wyoming Constitution, art. X, sec. 2.

[7] 20 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 (1888).

[8] Hearings before Judiciary Committee on S. 10, 75th Cong., 1st sess. (1937).

[9] 58 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3720 (1919).

[10] Kaplan, Small Business, Its Place and Problems (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948).

[11] S. Rept. No. 9, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 33 (1947).

[12] Hearings before subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary of the Senate and the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources on S. 11, 79th Cong., 1st sess., 165–166 (1945).

[13] Id. at 164.

modern commerce. Our great organizations cannot be monopolistic in one area and competitive in another. The habits of monopolistic management which are learned in foreign countries are difficult to shake off in domestic commerce. The members of an international cartel to restrain commerce and suppress competition become the followers of a foreign ideology which is utterly hostile to the American ideal of free competitive enterprise.

We must choose now. We shall either go down the road of controlled enterprise or the road of free enterprise. We cannot hope to preserve the latter if we continue to permit the exercise by State corporations of unrestrained power to control enterprise.

CORPORATION STANDARDS ESSENTIAL

The nations of Europe when they were free—England, France, Germany, and Italy—did not control monopoly. They did not prescribe a rule of responsibility for economic organizations. So a handful of private groups took over the management of the economic scene. The result was the rise of dictatorship. If we would avoid the danger of dictatorship we must first make up our minds that the present appalling trend toward economic concentration shall not be permitted to continue. The way to prevent it is not to adopt the European ideology of the authoritarian state but to reassert once more our devotion to the American ideology of really free competitive enterprise. To achieve this end it is not necessary to expand the discretionary power of government. It is only necessary to recognize the fact that the modern corporation is an instrument of interstate and foreign commerce and as such should receive its power and authority from the only Government which has the power to regulate that commerce; namely, the Federal Government.

I have never thought that the States should be denied the power to create corporations, and the bill which I have introduced in every Congress since first I introduced it with the late Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, is designed only to fix standards of power and responsibility to which every corporation desiring to carry on interstate and foreign commerce should adhere. These standards should be designed to prevent monopolistic practices by taking away from the corporate instruments of commerce the corporate power to perform the acts which make possible both monopoly and excessive concentration of economic power.

This will not destroy big business. It will not promote big government. It will make unnecessary the expansion of the discretionary powers of Government and will set business organization free from the danger of arbitrary control. A national charter system would be a restoration of a fundamental American system. It would stop the trend toward the authoritarian state. It would open the door of opportunity to the masses of our people. It would enable us here in the United States to stabilize a free economy and it would make it possible for the people of America to stop communism by raising the standard of living of the people of America to a high and stable level which all the peoples of the world would want to copy.

United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the United Jewish Appeal is a fund-raising agency for the joint distribution committee, which helps to alleviate distress in Europe, the Far East, and other areas, the United Service for New Americans which helps to resettle displaced persons who emigrate to the United States under our laws, and the United Palestine Appeal which helps in the immigration and the settlement of new immigrants to Israel together with the correlative development of that country. A great fund-raising drive is now taking place all over the United States for the United Jewish Appeal and the appended article from the current issue of Look magazine, November 8, 1949, should prove of interest to members in describing in human terms the work in Israel made possible by the United Jewish Appeal drive:

ISRAEL REBORN—LIFE IS TOUGH, BUT MANY THOUSANDS ARE FLOCKING THERE

(By Robert Capa)

Israel has been reborn. But a year after the event, the pangs of birth are still present. The ancient land of sand and stones is one of the crudest, toughest places you can live in today.

Yet the descendants of the Jews who left its shores 2,000 years ago are flocking back to the country from all over the world. Since the British mandate ended, 300,000 have arrived, swelling Israel's Jewish population to nearly a million.

They are pouring into the country in ships like the *Theodor Herzl*, a small passenger vessel named after the founder of Zionism. There's a story in both the ship and the people.

Two years ago, the vessel was deliberately grounded in the harbor of Tel Aviv. The order was given by the skipper, an illegal sailor of the Haganah (Jewish resistance movement). It means the British were forced to let the illegal immigrants aboard come ashore. It was a desperate, hysterical scene, repeated nearly every day.

The *Theodor Herzl* is now repaired. The skipper wears the double-breasted blue uniform of Israel's merchant marine. As the ship makes its way into Haifa Harbor, the passengers stand in subdued groups. A long, terrible past lies behind many of them. But now the future holds hope.

They need it.

FUGITIVES FROM TERROR

The arm of every third passenger has a blue number tattooed on it. It marks each one of them as the survivor of scores of concentration camps and displaced-persons camps—from eastern Poland through Germany and down to the Italian coast, where they finally boarded the *Theodor Herzl*. The escapees of the barbed wire form close groups in the middle of the boat deck, and the other immigrants keep apart from them.

In the stern are young boys and girls, Zionists from England and America. They have been training and preparing themselves for years and will go on the land to start their own settlements.

Under the companionways and in the dark corners between huge piles of bundles and colorful rags are the Jews from French North Africa. They look like Arabs and have lived for centuries besides the Arabs in the Mellas (ghettos) of the Arab cities. They always kept their religion.

Between these groups, keeping to themselves, are the lonely ones. The old rabbi from Libya, coming to spend his last days in the Promised Land; the rich Egyptian with three pretty daughters.

THEY GET A HOMELAND

Then the *Theodor Herzl* docks at the pier. Lean, brown policemen hustle the immigrants down the gangplank. The boat must be unloaded in less than 2 hours. Other boats are waiting to come in.

On the pier, the passengers are hurried through a routine of getting identity cards, social-security cards, and labor-union cards. Most of the passengers for a great many years had no citizenship, no country, and no home. In a few minutes, they are full-fledged citizens of Israel. And the officials on the pier get ready for the next boatload of immigrants.

What awaits the new arrivals after they set foot on their forefathers' homeland?

Many would like to live in the big cities. But they are overcrowded, and it is hard to find a job there. At most, only one-third are really fitted for the hard work and tough conditions of the struggling new state.

But the doors of Israel are open to any and every Jew who wants to enter. The Jewish state, with a population of less than a million, is surrounded by about 40,000,000 Arabs. It desperately needs new citizens.

A high Government official told me:

"By any logic, the creation of the State of Israel was not possible. It was born through a will stronger than reason, and grew through suffering greater than human beings are expected to endure. We began on the bare hillsides under the hostile eyes of armed Arabs. Now we have the land and we have the arms. The new immigrants will suffer somewhat, but the new state needs them—and they need Israel."

The present territory of Israel, though scarcely bigger than New Jersey, extends far beyond the Biblical borders from Dan to Beersheba. It is much larger than the original partition made by the UN. In addition, there is the land left by about 600,000 Arabs who fled.

But Israel, born out of victorious battle, is granted no peace. The country faces an economic crisis as dangerous as the threat of the encircling Arabs.

Israel used to depend on four main sources of revenue: (1) The citrus groves of the coast; (2) the oil refineries at Haifa; (3) the potash works on the Dead Sea; and (4) the contributions from abroad, particularly from the United Jewish Appeal in America.

MONEY IS NEEDED

War damage was considerable, and every fighting plane bought during the blockade cost considerably more than the equipment of a new settlement. Food production fell off during the fighting. And living costs and wages are higher than in most European countries. To settle a new immigrant costs over $2,000; every cubic meter of water pipe into the desert and every sapling planted among the rocks adds hundreds of dollars of expense.

Recognizing that in the coming crucial year or two that their position will be as important to the future of Israel as their role was in the past decade, the Jews of the United States are now embarking on an intensive effort through the United Jewish Appeal. As in the case of the world economic situation, particularly the plight of the western European countries, the role of the United States is decisive. In America, the United Jewish Appeal finances the basic program of receiving, feeding, and sheltering new immigrants into Israel. Since absorbing new immigration is one of the heaviest burdens that the Israeli economy must shoulder, the continued flow of material assistance from America becomes a vital factor in the nation's life.

Everywhere, the land is alive. The people are building again on the ruins left by the recent years of fighting. Behind them they have many new legends to add to the Biblical legends of old.

In the north, on the Syrian side of Lake Tiberias, is a small and lonely settlement called Ain Geb. At the outbreak of war, the 150 settlers were told to evacuate their exposed position. They sent their children in two boats across the lake. Then they dug deep trenches around the settlement, set up barbed wire, and assembled Sten guns in their machine shop.

The head of the machine shop invented home-made land mines. While he was out laying them one night he spotted a Syrian force coming up for a surprise night attack. He made his way back to warn the settlers. They let the Arabs come in right to the barbed wire before opening fire. Afterward the settlement was subjected to artillery fire for 3 months. Sixteen men and all the livestock were lost, and the young trees of the settlement were destroyed.

Today the children are back, the houses rebuilt, and the hero of the machine shop is repairing tractors. New trees have been planted and a young forest is growing up around the 16 stone graves.

On the Lebanese border, above Safed, new settlements are founded every day. The new settlers are all young and members of the Palmach, the commando force of the Haganah. They arrive, 60 to 80 strong, at abandoned Arab border villages on trucks laden with tractors, tools, food, seeds, DDT, machine guns.

DRUSE ARABS FRIENDLY

The first day is usually given over to a celebration organized by army leaders. Representatives of the Jewish agency make speeches and the settlers sing and dance. Next day the young boys and girls set out to put up coils of barbed wire around the settlement and clean up the houses.

In the center of Galilee, where the Druse Arabs sided with the Israelis and even entered their army, the villages are untouched. The inhabitants keep on peacefully working their land. The Christian Arabs of Nazareth also stayed on and have two deputies representing them in the Israeli Government.

But the Arabs who remained in the cities face many hardships and restrictions. A great part of the Communist vote comes from their ranks.

ARABS FLED FROM ACRE

The ancient town of Acre, near Haifa, was the purest Arab town in Palestine. The surrounding land was first colonized by the tribe of Asher, and it was written in the Bible: "* * * Neither did Asher drive out the inhabitants of Acre." The Israelis may not have driven them out either, but most of the Arabs fled on orders from their leaders.

Between the walls of the old city, a few Arab fishermen and beggars still wander around. But outside the walls, where the rich Arabs used to live, new immigrants have taken over the buildings. If peace is made, though, some 5,000 Arabs could still return to the empty houses of the abandoned old city.

But Israelis have completely taken over the three biggest Arab communities—Jaffa, Lydda, and Ramle—and the villages in between. To these towns, on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road, the Arabs cannot return.

There now, live new Israeli citizens like the Hungarian music teacher I met. With his best student, he was rehearsing jazz music for the cafe to be opened soon. Another acquaintance I made was a Yugoslav economist, Tito's right-hand adviser until a few months ago. He was working in the greenhouse of a market garden he has developed.

NEGEV, LAND OF THE FUTURE

The real future of Israel, however, lies in the south. There the treeless, hot desert of the Negev stretches from a few miles below Tel Aviv down to the Red Sea. It is the wide open space in the overcrowded land.

Five of the six settlements started each week are in the Negev. In a few abandoned Arab villages live religious eastern European Jews who will work the land as individual farmers. But in the desert, the real settlements are manned by young soldiers who chased the Egyptians out of the Negev.

Only a small strip of land, from the Red Sea to Gaza, is held by the Egyptians. They are hemmed in there by new communities bristling with shiny new tractors on the land and machine guns in the cellars.

The capital of the Negev is the sleepy old Biblical town of Beersheba. Before the war, it had a population of about 2,000 Arabs. The Bedouins used to come in here to purchase their flour. All the Arabs retreated with the Egyptian Army. The town is now full of young men in khaki shorts and shirts, young girls in blue jeans and colorful Arab head scarves.

In the Negev, all the contrasts of Israel lie naked under the burning sun. The settlements are based on a collective idea. Yet private enterprise has limitless possibilities and is moving in. The man who opens a small shop in Beersheba hopes to have a department store in less than 10 years. Then the town's population should be well over 100,000.

The big, bustling city of Israel today is Tel Aviv, the capital. There, amid mushrooming modern buildings, over a quarter of a million people are trying to make a living. And it's certain the city will eventually have a population double that number.

TEL AVIV IS BULGING

The crowds already there have succeeded in making Tel Aviv one of the world's noisiest cities. Cafes cover the sidewalks of every principal street. At the tables, well-dressed women drink tea, eat austerity cakes and continue the gossip that began in the cafes of Berlin, Prague, and Vienna. The few hotels are crowded with American tourists and businessmen. The beach is as crowded as Coney Island, and so are the streets of the city.

Beyond the downtown cacophony, in the houses of the former Nazi-German colony, sits the government. David Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister, is the strong man. He works surrounded by a handful of very able men. They are the old campaigners of the Jewish agency. These men worked 16 hours a day for 30 years to bring about their dream of a Jewish homeland. But their working day is no shorter now that they have become the first Ministers of Israel's Government.

On the shoulders of these early immigrants from western Russia rest the faith and future of all the conflicting people and ideals of the new country. The problems they face now are graver than a year ago, when five Arab armies were converging on Israel.

But they have the example of patience and strength set by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel. He worked 60 years to fulfill the dream of a Jewish homeland. He lives now in a village set among beautiful trees near the Weizmann Institute of Science, 15 miles outside of Tel Aviv. His eyes are failing, and he spends his afternoons in peaceful meditation. He cannot carry the trials and errors of the new state. But he has pointed the way to the younger generation.

Not far from his house lives another old man, sitting on the dirt floor of a little abandoned Arab dwelling. He is an old rabbi from the Yemen, a small Arab state on the Red Sea, where Jews lived for 2,000 years but have now been chased away. He also spends his afternoons in deep meditation. He scarcely lifted his face from his dog-eared Talmud as I talked to him.

When I left, saying good-by with the traditional "Shalom," the old rabbi looked up. He murmured:

"Shalom, Shalom—ve-eyn Shalom! Peace, peace—but there is no peace!"

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Harrison Brown, of Chicago, on a most important subject. I offer this for printing in the RECORD because it is a thought-provoking article, and not because I subscribe to every statement in it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HARRISON BROWN, INSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I speak to you, first, as a scientist who aided in the creation of the atomic bomb. During the war I was assistant director of chemistry on the plutonium project at Oak Ridge, Tenn. I am now on the staff of the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago.

I speak to you, secondly, as a citizen who is, in common with most American citizens, desirous of preserving our American life, our American system of government, and the freedoms that have become synonymous with the term "American democracy."

I speak to you, thirdly, as a human being who is, in common with most human beings, revolted by war, by the consequences of war, and who is haunted by the conviction that another war may mean the end of our civilization.

I first became concerned about the possible effects of atomic energy, and of atomic bombs in particular, 10 years ago when, as one of many scientists, I started to work on the problem of uranium fission. As time went on, the Manhattan project came into existence, and gradually it became apparent that a workable atomic bomb actually could be made.. Then my concern grew rapidly. Shortly after Hiroshima, I placed my thoughts and fears upon paper in the form of a book which was published in 1946. In that book I stated:

"It is an inescapable conclusion that our period of grace is short. All of us must recognize that in another 3 years the United States of America may not stand alone as a possessor of atomic bombs and that in 5 to 7 years time, it is entirely possible that another country will possess a number of atomic bombs sufficient to destroy us."

The 3 years have passed and Russia now possesses the means to construct atomic bombs. We must fully expect that in about 2 to 4 years time Russia will possess a number of atomic bombs sufficient to be of real strategic importance in a war against the United States. Of even greater urgency is the possibility, even probability, that by the time another year has passed, Russia may possess a number of atomic bombs, together with the means to deliver them, to be in a position to destroy the major cities of western Europe should she feel compelled to do so.

How was Russia able to accomplish this seemingly difficult feat in such a short period of time? Did our Russian experts underestimate Russian technological resources and abilities? I do not think so. Rather (and it is most important that we realize

this) the American public and the American Government have grossly overestimated in their own minds the technological difficulties of manufacturing atomic weapons.

It is time that we awaken from our dream world and face facts in the world of reality in which we live. Let us not deceive ourselves about the ease of manufacture and destructive potential of atomic bombs. Both official and unofficial propaganda to the contrary, atomic weapons constitute by all odds the least expensive and the most effective means to kill and to destroy, yet devised by man. And I am speaking of atomic bombs as they exist today. The atomic bombs of tomorrow will be even more destructive.

Nor should we deceive ourselves by an attitude which has already been expressed publicly by prominent individuals to the effect that "We will always remain ahead" or "It will take the Russians a long time to catch up." Such statements are meaningless. It is now clear that should a war break out tomorrow, atomic bombs would be used during the war by both sides and they would be used in quantity. By the end of that war, the larger number of bombs now possessed by us would be scarcely noticed in terms of total damage done, or in terms of the initial advantage. Nor should we deceive ourselves when we consider the problem of defense against atomic bombs. There is not now, nor will there ever be a specific defense against atomic bombs. The problem of defense, as in the case of ordinary bombs, falls into two broad categories: Keeping the carrier of the bomb from reaching the point where you are; or keeping yourself as far away as possible from where the bomb will land. The first of these approaches means detection and interception; the second means dispersal. Neither approach can be foolproof. Both, if undertaken seriously, would be exceedingly expensive. Both, if undertaken seriously, would require the imposition of Government controls upon our people and our industries that would make the controls of the last war appear exceedingly modest.

It seems all too clear, that with two or more potential enemy nations in possession of atomic bombs, civilization cannot survive the war that will inevitably result in the absence of a world organization possessed of the authority and means to prevent war. Nor does it appear that our American democracy can survive even the serious threat of another major war. The requirements of both offense and defense are far too stringent.

The United States has, for the last 3 years, sought some form of international control of atomic energy such as has been outlined in the Baruch proposals. But we must by no means consider control of atomic energy alone to be a sufficient condition for survival. No matter how rigorous and effective a control system might be, if another war breaks out, plants will be constructed and atomic bombs will be made and used. Another war could start with no atomic bombs in existence in the world and it would still end in a blazing inferno of atomic disintegration. Depending upon the mechanism of control, we must expect that such bombs could be brought into action in a period of 6 to 12 months after the outbreak of hostilities.

It seems clear that our civilization and with it our democratic freedoms will survive only if we really solve the problem of peace. And the problem of peace under such circumstances cannot be solved within the narrow framework of traditional foreign policy or within the equally narrow framework of seeking international control over atomic energy without simultaneously seeking control over the other weapons of war and war itself.

I do not believe that peace can be preserved nor aggression prevented in the absence of means for the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law—in short, in the absence of a world federation. Without a world federation, the best that can be hoped for is a truce. To be sure, even a truce would be most welcome to the peoples of the world at the present time. But we must look beyond that. I believe that the United States Government should officially recognize that if we are to have peace, if we are to have freedom from the haunting fear of attack by weapons of mass destruction, the United Nations must be transformed into a world federation.

Naturally the task will not be an easy one. But that does not dissolve the problem. To the contrary, it makes it all the more imperative for us to state officially that it is our intention to work with other nations in seeking the establishment of a community of nations bound together by world laws which are enforceable.

In discussing these perilous times in which we live, I can think of no statement more appropriate than the words of the American military genius, Homer Lea, who in 1913, as a warning, outlined the strategy by which Japan eventually overran the Philippines in 1942.

"As an individual can form no conception of personal death, so neither can nations. While individuals readily realize the inevitability of death in the greatest of men or a world of them, they cannot comprehend their own extinction, though their hours be ever so pitifuly few. So it is with nations; and though the most insignificant of them can complacently witness the death throes of the greatest world empires, they are utterly unable to comprehend the possibility of a similar fate."

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr., chairman of the executive committee of the United World Federalists before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CORD MEYER, JR., CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

My name is Cord Meyer, Jr., and I am chairman of the executive committee of the United World Federalists, Inc. I appear before you as an official representative of this organization to speak in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64.

As we understand the wording of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and the purpose of the 105 Representatives who have jointly sponsored it, the resolution, if adopted by both House and Senate, would advocate that the President supplement and extend existing American foreign policy by accepting the development of the UN into a world federation as one of our basic objectives. The passage of this resolution by the Congress and its implementation by the executive branch will define and clarify for the world, the motives of our Government and inspire with new confidence the vast majority of people in every nation who are sick of war. It will be solid evidence that the United States rejects both the disastrous irresponsibility of isolationism and the temptation to rely exclusively on military force. By passing this resolution, the Congress will be saying to the rest of humanity in simple and understandable words that we stand ready to play our full part in the creation of such world laws, courts, and police forces as are essential to the common security.

It is particularly important at this time that the objectives of American policy be unequivocally stated by the Congress and clearly understood by the rest of the world. The United States is now engaged in a massive attempt to be prepared in the terrifying eventuality of a third world war, hoping that that the very thoroughness of our preparation will discourage aggression and prevent that war. Huge armament expenditures are being forced upon us by the fact that the international community is still so unorganized that superior armed force remains the price of national survival. The United States has no choice at present but to maintain its military strength in a world where every government retains the sovereign right to prepare for and wage war and where there is no legal order to insure that an impartial judgment of disputes between nations can be either rendered or enforced. Our efforts can easily be misunderstood and misrepresented as aggressive in purpose, unless we devote equal energy to a specific program for the substitution of law for naked force in the relations between states.

Moreover, if it is necessary today that American military strength be preserved, it is equally necessary that the temporary and limited effectiveness of national armaments be frankly admitted. No matter how much we spend and sacrifice for preparedness, we cannot in the long run prevent war, protect our people, or preserve our liberties by attempting only to maintain our superiority in a world-wide rivalry for arms and allies. In view of the destructiveness of the new weapons and the range of modern aircraft, which will in time be available to all industrialized countries, no informed person can any longer believe that even the best defended nation can prevent an atomic and biological air attack from destroying a large part of its cities and urban population. And the measures that must be taken in preparation for such a war will increasingly tend to undermine the liberties and living standards that we seek to defend. Already the sums we are spending on armaments lay a heavy burden on the American taxpayer and make it next to impossible to provide our people with the better housing, health, and educational opportunity that they have a right to demand. The national military expenditures of our allies and the restrictions that we have placed on international trade to prevent war material from reaching our potential enemies limit the progress toward economic recovery made under the Marshall plan. Here at home, fear of espionage and sabotage inevitably restricts the free exercise of civil liberties essential to democracy. I do not believe that the fact that the Soviet Union has broken our atomic monopoly has increased the immediate danger of war. Rather, the danger is that we will drift into an all-out atomic arms race that cannot in the end be halted short of actual conflict. Russian atomic production has not changed the essential nature of our problems, but it

has given new urgency to the search for a peaceful solution.

These enormous sacrifices for preparedness, unavoidable though they are at the moment, cannot in the long run prevent the outbreak of war. They can at best merely postpone the event. It is certain that the Soviet Union and other nations will not passively accept American military superiority. Motivated by a mixture of fear and ambition for expansion, the Russians are attempting to equal and surpass American power through rearmament and counteralliances. Since the relative size of its armed forces is the measure of a sovereign government's ability to defend its territory, not only the United States, but every nation, must seek an uncertain security through competitive armaments, and the end result of such a power struggle, if it is allowed to continue, will be open warfare, whether the final spark be an unforeseen incident or a deliberate attack.

It is quite possible that the United States might win a formal victory in another world conflict, but the moral and economic consequences are incalculable. In addition to the devastation that we might suffer at home, we should remember that atomic bombs and biological agents will be used primarily for the random and indiscriminate slaughter of entire civilian populations. However just our cause or noble our purpose, the means we would be forced to employ would be barbarically inhuman. It is difficult to imagine that freedom and democracy would flourish among the survivors of such a struggle. After millions of innocents had perished in the genocide of strategic bombing, it is more likely that new forms of society, more corrupt than any that exists today, would inherit the ruins.

It is in the light of these considerations that House Concurrent Resolution 64 should be judged. The resolution does not propose that we weaken our military strength or abandon our efforts to assist the economic recovery of other countries. Rather, the resolution if passed and accepted by the administration would supply what is lacking in existing American foreign policy. It would commit us to a positive and specific program for peace that can command the enthusiastic allegiance of both the American people and the peoples of other lands. Our American history and traditions demand a foreign policy that is more than a defensive reaction to the policies of other nations. A way must be found to give practical expression to the profound desire of our people for peace, and that need can be met by the policy this resolution advocates. Once committed to the objective of world federation, American policy will be given a controlling purpose and direction, and the false charge that we are preparing for preventive war can then be met by realistic proposals for a working international order that will test the true intentions of other governments. Armed preparedness is not an end in itself, but only a means of gaining a limited period of time that we must use to lay the solid foundations of genuine international security.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 is conservative in the best sense. It recognizes the importance of preserving the only worldwide international organization that exists, the UN. The UN does not play a useful part in maintaining international order by concentrating the moral force of world opinion and by mediation. The specialized agencies of the UN have provided assistance to many nations in their efforts to improve the health, education, and well-being of their people. This work must not only be continued, but must be expanded, because neither the United States, nor peace itself, can survive in a world where mass starvation breeds despair and violence. Both for what it has already accomplished and for what it yet may become, the UN must be supported by our Government, and you will notice that this resolution carefully avoids proposing any precipitate action that might destroy the UN or institutionalize within its competing power blocs.

However, it does not detract from the accomplishments of the UN to point out that there is a definite limit to what can be achieved by public opinion unsupported by enforceable law. The present structure of the UN has demonstrated itself to be incapable of providing genuine security to its member nations. The recommendations of the General Assembly are not binding on any nation and as a result are frequently ignored. The Security Council can only take enforcement action against such small states as are without the support of any one of the Big Five. The International Court of Justice lacks both compulsory jurisdiction over member states and jurisdiction over the individual. The UN can apply sanctions only against the entire population of a country instead of against the responsible individuals. Finally, there is no UN police force and under the Charter every member nation retains its sovereign right to prepare continuously for war. These basic weaknesses have made it necessary for the United States and for every nation to rely on national armed strength rather than on the UN for protection.

Recognizing these defects, the Representatives who have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 call for the development of the UN into "a world federation, open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law." In unambiguous language, it is proposed that the UN be given constitutional authority to administer and enforce binding law. Since it is neither possible nor desirable that the UN be given the right to regulate the internal affairs of the separate nations, this law-making authority is to be strictly limited to those powers essential "to preserve peace and prevent aggression." An exact definition of the powers that the United States might be willing to grant to a revised UN will require much study and consultation between the legislative and executive branches of this Government, but the broad outline of the minimum requirements seems clear to us. If the UN is to have a chance of preventing aggression, it seems to many of us who have been studying this problem that it must be given the power under law:

1. To prohibit the use of force by national governments and to require the peaceful arbitration or judicial settlement of their disputes;

2. To limit and regulate national armed forces so that no nation is permitted to retain more military strength than it needs for the preservation of domestic order;

3. To regulate the use of atomic energy in its potentially dangerous aspects and to control certain other types of scientific development that can be easily diverted secretly to mass-destruction purposes;

4. To raise dependable revenue independent of national taxation;

5. To maintain such international inspection forces with free access into every national as may be necessary to prevent the secret and illegal production of the prohibited types of armaments and such preponderantly strong international police forces as are required to insure effective enforcement of world laws.

Other powers may prove to be necessary in order to satisfy the demands not only of security but of justice, but anything less would open the door to successful aggression. The Baruch plan was a long step forward, but it should be obvious that the attempt to control one type of weapon will inevitably fail, if nations are to remain free to compete for every other kind of armament and so long as the only ultimate sanction is war itself. The problem we face is not the inspection and control of atomic energy but the effective control and prevention of international war.

As the resolution clearly implies, legislative, judicial and executive agencies will have to be established within the UN to provide for the just administration of this grant of authority. For example, if the General Assembly of the UN is to be given real legislative authority, some change is unavoidable in the present system of representation, under which each nation is entitled to one vote without regard to the many differences between them. Similarly the UN must be given an executive agency responsible to the Assembly for the administration of the law and with no single nation retaining the veto right. Finally, to interpret and apply the world law that this resolution calls for, a world court or system of courts must be established with compulsory jurisdiction over the individual and operating under a bill of rights to insure a fair trial. In its demand for law, this resolution correctly recognizes the futility of the league concept of attempting to prevent war by waging war against the whole population of a country. We of UWF feel that the enforcement procedure of any workable international organization must be based on the principle of individual responsibility, which can be determined only in a court according to known and established laws.

The structure of security described above is, I believe, the minimum price of even the possibility of peace and multilateral disarmament. Admittedly it calls for agreement on extensive changes in the UN and many believe that less extensive changes, for example, eliminating only the veto power in the Security Council, will make the UN an effective instrument of security. However, a close analysis of such proposals reveal their superficiality, and attempts to abolish the veto without taking into account the other related problems would certainly have dangerous consequences.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 in one important respect represents an improvement over the world federation resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 59, that was considered by this committee last year. Whereas last year's resolution would have committed our Government to the immediate calling of a review conference under article 109 of the Charter, this resolution attempts only to define an objective that the Congress is willing to support and leaves to future consultation between the executive and legislative branches, the decision as to the specific tactical steps that should be taken to achieve that objective. Once the Congress has accepted the goal of world federation by the passage of this resolution, long and patient negotiation by our Government with other nations will undoubtedly be necessary before a review conference under article 109 can be convened with any chance of success. Those who demand that the United States move prematurely at this time for an immediate review conference and that we break up the UN if our unilateral demands are not promptly accepted, do not in my judgment have in mind the best interests of the UN or the cause of peace. I believe that such tactics would have the practical effect of insuring a divided, rather than a unified world.

The phrase, open to all nations, in the resolution is crucial. It is clear recognition of the reality that final international security cannot be achieved except through an inclusive and world-wide Federal structure

with the controls of the world law extending to every country. This in turn means that the negotiations preparatory to the calling of a review conference must be carried on by our Government with all the members of the UN. Fortunately, there is evidence today that the peoples and governments of most of the smaller nations would welcome this strengthening of the UN. The delegates of the middle and smaller powers fought to increase the UN's authority at San Francisco in 1945, and it was their insistence that led to the provision of the Charter (art. 109, par. 3) that a review conference be automatically held at the end of 10 years by a simple majority vote of the Assembly, if it had not previously been called by a two-thirds vote. Since 1945, many of the leading statesmen of Europe and Asia have consistently pleaded for the development of the UN into a world federation, among them, Spaak, the former Premier of Belgium; Nehru, the Prime Minister of India; and Auriol, the President of France, and they are backed by widespread and organized popular support.

When our Government has accepted as basic to our policy, the necessity of transforming the UN into a federation, the real problem, of course, will be the Soviet Union and its allies. In spite of the fact that Russian policy is today opposed to world federation, a careful and prolonged effort must be made through the process of negotiation to persuade the Russians as well as other nations to accept the necessary changes in the UN and to cooperate in the review conference. The attempt must be made first, because no amendments to the Charter can go into effect unless they are ratified by all of the Big Five, so that the UN itself cannot be strengthened without United States and Russian agreement on the revisions. Secondly, it is to our safety and advantage to have the Soviet Union within a federation, because then, together with all other nations, that country would be subject to disarmament and inspection under the controls of enforceable law. Outside of the federation, Russia would be free to continue arming and preparing for war, and the possibility of attack would remain.

What chance there is of initial Russian acceptance depends to some extent on how the offer is made and the conditions that prevail at the time when it is made. First, we must continue to make it clear to the Russians that we are determined to maintain our military defenses and assist our allies until agreement is reached on a reliable machinery of international security. Secondly, the state of the American economy will be decisive in determining Russian reaction. If the Russians continue to think that a severe American depression is imminent they will be likely to postpone any decision in the hope that the world may fall to them by default, and they will be under no compulsion to make the compromises implicit in the creation of a federation that involve the disbanding of the Soviet Army and free inspection in their territory.

Finally, our proposal to revise the United Nations must be combined with a willingness to negotiate a general settlement of the specific issues in the cold war. When two nations are preparing for war with each other, compromise by one side only strengthens the fighting potential of the other, and is rightly called appeasement. Mutual concessions become possible, however, if both sides are willing to accept genuine guarantees of common security under law. I would suggest that issues such as the unification of Germany and the disposal of the Italian colonies will be easy of settlement once strategic considerations no longer have first priority. A settlement of these issues by international treaty between armed sovereign states, is inadequate because such a treaty can be torn up 10 days later and there is too much distrust for us to enter into that kind of agreement again. There must be assurance of effective enforcement if any settlement is eventually to be reached.

Of course, it must be admitted that under the most favorable conditions the Soviet Government might reject the most patient and thorough attempts of the United States to obtain agreement to the need for revision of the United Nations and in that event it would be impossible to amend the Charter itself over a Big Power veto. House Concurrent Resolution 64 does not attempt to lay down the course we should follow if we eventually meet an adamant Russian refusal to accept any limitation on her sovereign right to prepare for and wage war, and too much discussion now as to what we would do in that situation might create the impression that we had discounted in advance the chance of an agreement. However, if we meet Russian intransigence, our best choice from this distance would appear to be to hold together the United Nations as it is for all that it is worth as a forum for discussion and mediation, but to form also, a partial federation of all those nations willing to join. We would have to maintain the pooled military strength of such a partial federation at a level higher than that maintained by those nations outside; we would have to improve its economic health and demonstrate that it was not an instrument for American domination and control; and most important of all, we would have to hold out a standing offer of membership to those nations that had refused to participate, reaching their people with the knowledge that a fair and honorable opportunity to end the arms race was open to them. If this partial federation proved economically prosperous and politically stable, the Russians through a change in policy or leadership might reconsider an original decision to abstain, realizing that it was to their advantage to join a structure which they could not compete with and dared not attack. Only when and if a federation includes at least all of the larger nations, can there be an end to the arms race and an assurance of peace, and every step in American policy must be taken with that end in view. Neither now nor in the future can we resign ourselves to a permanently divided world, unless we choose also to believe in the inevitability of a mutually destructive war.

In closing, I would like to remind this committee of the mounting evidence of broad, popular support for the course of action this resolution advocates. The legislatures of Massachusetts and Connecticut have placed referendum questions on the official ballot, asking the voters whether they favored the United States taking the initiative in the transformation of the UN into a world federation. In Massachusetts the majority was 9 to 1 in favor and in Connecticut 11 to 1. By recent vote of the legislatures in Florida and Oklahoma, a similar question will be on the ballot in those States at the next election, and there also the response will, I think, be overwhelmingly favorable. More evidence of public support is provided by the many civic organizations of every type that have taken action in their national conventions to approve the Federalist program and which have submitted briefs in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 to this committee. In addition, five State legislatures, those in California, New Jersey, North Carolina, Connecticut, and Florida, have voted to make formal application to the Congress for the convening of a national constitutional convention to make such amendment to our Constitution as would be necessary to facilitate the entrance of the United States into a world federation. Nineteen State legislatures have passed resolutions memorializing the Congress in favor of this revision of the UN. In other words, I do not think that the 105 Representatives who have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 are ahead of public opinion. Their action is based rather on firm and strong support among the American people.

The passage of this resolution will only be the first step on a long and difficult road. There is no absolute guaranty that even a determined American policy to build the citadel of world law on the foundations of the UN will be successful, because it is not within the power of one nation to insure peace. But, when this resolution has been passed and implemented, the American people and their elected representatives will have vastly improved the chances of averting an utterly disastrous conflict, and it can never then be said of this great country that we did not rise to the challenge of our time.

I speak for all the members of the United World Federalists when I urge you to consider the full implications of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and allow for the most thorough discussion of this issue in more extensive hearings, preparatory to a vote by the House as a whole.

Address of Judge Marvin Jones at Farmers Home Administration Meeting, Dallas, Tex., October 12, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most beloved men to have served in the House of Representatives is Hon. Marvin Jones, of Texas. He was coauthor of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, which bears the impress of his statesmanship. I am sure it gives him keen satisfaction to survey the results of the program of farm ownership he helped inaugurate. It was a fitting honor for him to be the speaker at the meeting of Texas farmers who have been granted loans under the legislation. His appropriate comments on the significance of the program for the people of Texas should be an inspiration to all.

Judge Jones points to the notable record of the Farmers Home Administration and wisely urges continued support for the principles embraced in the 1937 law.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Judge Jones:

There is magic in the word "home." Around it cluster the most inspiring sentiments of the human race.

Our free Republic is anchored in the homes of its citizens. Individual home ownership is the greatest stabilizing influence a country can have and the one security that freemen most desire.

Our country has an amazing record of accomplishment. We have had 160 years of the richest experience that was ever crowded into a similar period. Starting almost on a shoestring, and having now only 6 percent of the earth's population, we still use more than half of the world's telephones. We own one-third of its railroads, and 80 percent of the world's registered automobiles, and yet

we have only 6 percent of the earth's population.

We consume and use about one-half of the world's coffee, tin, and rubber, 20 percent of its sugar and three-fourths of its silk.

We have innumerable gadgets and luxury items.

But behind all these mechanical things are the divine spark, the inventive genius, the thrift and energy that made them possible. Looking at the beautiful trees we may overlook the creative power that made the forest. We are prone to forget the simple principles that have made these things possible. We sometimes hear people sneer at the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as if they were outmoded.

We grow used to the precious things of life, and they seem commonplace to us. This is frequently true in our personal contacts, and it is also true in governmental affairs. We sometimes hear the question asked: Why should the living be "cribbed, cabined and confined" by an old dingy piece of parchment, written 150 years ago by about 50 men, all of whom are now dead, and most of whom faded into history more than 100 ago? Why should these men who lived in a different age, under different and simple conditions, "when free government was just emerging from the chrysalis," control by their fiat this great people who not only live in a complex age, but whose interests and activities encircle the earth? Is the age of the oxcart and the wheelbarrow to control the age of the automobile, airplane, and radio?

If all progress were purely mechanical or material, there could be but one answer to these questions. But all real progress is spiritual and mental, and the mechanical and material are but the outward manifestations of basic progress. We don't outgrow the Ten Commandments. Two times two will always be four among honest people, even if we should reach the point of enclosing people in capsules and shooting them across the continent. Some things are fundamental. Liberty and justice are eternal verities.

What is the secret of our Nation's greatness? What is the divine note that swells the chorus of the Union and makes of this a mighty country respected throughout the world? Up amid the hills of New England, out upon the prairies of the West where they grow corn and wheat, and down in the South where cotton is king, are folks—just plain, honest, homespun folks who act fairly, deal justly and who serve their country in peace and in war. These make a country and here, too, may be found the philosopher's stone of individual success. It all comes back to the character, the stamina, of the folks who make a country.

I do not decry our material accomplishments. I am proud of them. They are wonderful, but any time we boast of them alone and forget the human element we worship the golden calf just as did the Hebrew children in the days of old.

While we were making our great industrial progress doing all these wonderful things we were letting land tenantry increase by leaps and bounds, both in the city and in the country. As a result the fertility of our soil began to waste away. In our pride in our industrial know-how we almost forgot that "man shall not live by bread alone." Material and spiritual qualities must go hand in hand if we are to remain a strong country.

Man came from the soil and when he grows old and the tools of trade fall from his nerveless grasp he goes back to the soil.

It has long been recognized that farming is basic. For many years one of the leading papers in our State carried at the masthead this quotation: "When tillage begins the other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization."

All of our new wealth comes out of the ground, either from the crops that grow out of the soil, or from the livestock which feeds upon the grasses that the earth produces, or from the minerals that are buried underneath the soil. Our commerce and industry are built around this wealth. Industry simply changes the form and broadens the use of our natural resources and facilitates the exchange of products made therefrom.

It follows naturally that if the country is to grow and remain strong it must make the proper use of its soil and conserve its fertility. It is almost impossible to do this in a country that is operated chiefly by tenants. This is not a criticism. It is simply comment on human nature.

Practically the entire farm program that has been worked out during the last 20-year period is built around and linked to the conservation of the soil and the proper use of water which in itself is part and parcel of soil conservation. It is difficult to properly fashion a program when a majority of the people who are cultivating the soil are tenants and have only a transient interest in the conservation of the particular tract.

Then, too, there has been some difficulty in the ownership and control of tracts that are excessively large. Some of these people have taken the position that the land is theirs and that they will do with it as they please. Fortunately, this number has been comparatively small, as most of the men who own large tracts of land realize their responsibility to the public.

There are two approaches to what we know as the ownership of property. One extreme is that the property is mine and I will do with it as I please, and it is no one else's business. This is a narrow concept of ownership. If a man owns a house and burns it down he would be placed in stripes because a man has not the right to use his property in such a way as to injure his neighbor. There is no law against a man's abusing the soil, but it is just as great an injury to the public for a man to destroy the fertility of the soil as it is for him to burn down his house.

The other extreme view is there should be no ownership of the land; that it should all be held by the state and used for the common good of all. That is the Socialist philosophy. Neither of these two extremes is the proper attitude toward the land. It seems to me the middle one is the proper approach: that is, a man who owns what we call title to the land has a trusteeship or an obligation to the public. The land was here long before he came upon the earth and will remain here long after he passes from the stage of action. All he can possibly have is a life interest with the privilege of stating to whom it shall go when he can no longer enjoy its blessings.

Even this temporary control is not absolute. It is subject to state and local taxation. A man's title depends upon organized government, upon honest jurymen and the courts who see that his rights are protected, and in the event of war or foreign invasion, the willingness of young men to fight to protect him in those rights. This being true, the sense of trusteeship in the conservation and use of the soil is vital to the Nation, and to every man, woman and child in the United States and to future generations.

The greatest food-producing area now in the world is the Mississippi Valley and the land connected with its tributaries. It stretches all the way from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains. A proper use of the soil and water that falls upon the soil throughout this great area is part and parcel of the future of the United States. There are other smaller river systems that are also relatively important, but the whole question is wrapped up in the proper rebuilding and conservation of the Nation's basic wealth. This is proven by the statistics of history.

Centuries ago the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys were among the world's most productive areas. Upon this basic wealth was builded the Babylonian Kingdom, the most fabulous empire that ever existed upon the face of the earth. That whole country was criss-crossed with canals and dotted with granaries and storage places that made of that kingdom an outstanding picture. But the people of that kingdom grew wealthy. They became profligate. They neglected their soil and the use of water, and Babylonia went the way of all the other ancient nations. One can still see the markings of these canals and evidences of early soil care. They are mute warnings of what happens to a nation that neglects its land and water.

When a man owns a small tract of land that he calls his home he naturally wants to use it to the best advantage and preserve its fertility. He is not a candidate for either of the two extreme views of property ownership, and he is not subject to any of the fantastic schemers and planners who want to undermine our system of government. He quickly learns that he is part of a community and wants to be in proper relationship with his neighbors.

Many years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson made a statement that is worthy of any man's reading. He said in effect that a man takes care that his neighbor does not cheat him. After awhile in the course of his development he reaches the state of mind where he takes care that he does not cheat his neighbor. When he reaches this stage of progress he changes his gocart for a chariot in the sun.

I am proud of the development and progress made by the Farmers Home Administration in recent years in renewing the plan of individual home ownership of the family-sized farm. It has been a great contribution to our Nation's strength. It is a source of intense pride to me that so many of the Texas people who have been given this opportunity have paid out their farms and own them in fee simple, and have a place that they and their families can call their own. It is a source of even greater pride that those who have been given the privilege of thus purchasing a home realize that they owe an obligation to their neighbors. They realize that if they meet their payments, it proves the success of the program and affords others a chance to have the same privilege. At the time the program was started there were many who predicted failure. They said that tenants would not pay out their homes. How little they knew about human nature and the innate desire in every human breast to own a home.

For those of you who are not too well acquainted with this law let me review it for you briefly: The act was created to make it possible for farm tenants, sharecroppers and farm laborers to own their farms. The law provides for a 40-year loan period at low interest rates. Its purpose is to make possible adequate credit at low interest rates from the Government when such credit is not available from other sources.

The movement has been a tremendous success. More than 5,400 Texas families have purchased homes under the program.

But that's not all.

Of the 5,400 Texas families who have received loans—2,013—yes, 2,013 have already paid their notes in full. Thirty years before they were due. And, farmers in the other States of our Union are doing the same thing.

Of these 5,400 farms only 14 have been repossessed—less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the borrowers failed to meet their obligations.

That's ample reward for having faith in one's fellow man.

Yes, these Texas farmers who have participated in the program have paid back to

the United States Treasury more than $18,000,000 in principal and more than $5,000,000 in interest.

And, at the same time, they were improving their living conditions and becoming better citizens through farm ownership.

I congratulate the officials and employees of the Farmers Home Administration who have also caught the spirit and who with almost a religious fervor are carrying out the great work with which they have been entrusted. To them it is not simply a program. It is a mission.

The lure of a reward on the part of a man who is endeavoring to pay out his home and the feeling of self-reliance which comes to him as he attains this end does something for a people and to a people which I hope we may not lose in our effort to have the Government afford security to all its citizens. It is this self-reliance, strength and energy which has builded our country from simple beginnings to the proud heritage of freedom and power. That strength shall last so long as our people are self-reliant.

I congratulate all of you who have paid out your places and have become home owners in the real sense of the word.

The immortal ballads "Home, Sweet Home" and "Little Gray Home in the West" were not inspired by a rented shack, but by the dream and thoughts of a home that a man might call his own.

A nation of home owners will never go either Fascist or communistic. It will never become a prey to the wild schemes of the agitator. Its citizens in humble castles they call their own will be true to the ancient principles of God and man which must ever be the mainstay of a free people.

Donaldson Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sheboygan Press, Sheboygan, Wis., of October 10, 1949. This newspaper is edited and published by Charles E. Broughton, eminent Wisconsin leader and former Democratic National Committeeman.

Mr. Broughton deserves highest commendation for publishing Postmaster General Donaldson's straight-from-the-shoulder statements explaining the truth about the Hatch Act. The Postmaster General's defense of every citizen's right to express himself politically, to attend political meetings if he wishes, and to contribute to the party of his choice, whether he works for a private employer or the Federal Government, is based on the real meaning of the Hatch Act. It was never intended that this legislation deprive anyone of the right to declare himself politically or to openly support his party. The Hatch Act reiterates already established regulations found in civil-service laws; it goes further in only one respect: That criminal violations—participating in corrupt political practices—justify dismissal from Government employment.

It is time that someone of courage should make the statements which the Honorable Mr. Donaldson included in his speech before the 1,700 people attending the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Milwaukee on October 8.

This Hatch Act bogey has intimidated a high percentage of government workers to the point where they actually have believed that in this free country, they have been forbidden to attend meetings, talk about candidates' qualifications, discuss legislation, and above all, to contribute money to campaigns. I believe that the Postmaster General's Milwaukee speech should be publicized as a broadside against the insidious distortions of the Hatch Act.

Mr. Broughton's editorial, incorporating the Postmaster General's remarks reads as follows:

DONALDSON SPEAKS HIS MIND

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson in addressing the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner defined the real duties of citizenship, and more especially those who are in the Government service. It was the message of a man who is at the head of the postal system in the United States. Speaking for the Department and to many of those working in the Government service he said:

"I am glad to see so many postmasters and Federal officials and employees in attendance at this dinner. There are those who do not believe that a Federal employee has any right to belong to and participate in the actions of a political party. Any such thinking is not in the interest of the welfare of our country. Every citizen of voting age should register, should vote, and should take an interest in campaigns. How else can he demonstrate his interest in good government?

"There are no provisions in the so-called Hatch Act that were not included in civil-service laws and regulations prior to the passage of the Hatch Act, excepting the Hatch Act provides dismissal from service with no other alternative in the way of discipline and provides a penalty if such activity is a criminal violation. There is no prohibition in the Hatch Act against Federal employees belonging to a political party of their own choice and attending political meetings, any more than there is a prohibition against attending a church meeting of their own choice.

"There is no prohibition against a Federal employee making a contribution to a political party of his own choice, any more than there is a prohibition against making a contribution to a church of his own choice.

"Every citizen, and this includes Federal employees, should be able to express his private opinion and should take sufficient interest in his Government to do just that.

"The two-party system has been the basis of the American political life. It is essential to the welfare of the Nation that political parties make their programs clear for a democracy can function only when the issues are fully debated. They must have platforms not only to run on, but to carry out once they are in office. They must fulfill their pledges. The Democratic Party has a good program and it is not dodging issues in carrying it out. They intend to fulfill the pledges contained in the platform which were explained to the people during the last campaign. President Truman and Vice President Barkley are doing their utmost to fulfill all of the peldges made to the American people and it is the duty of all good Democrats to help them accomplish this."

The above message is a clear exposition of the Civil Service and Hatch Acts given by a man who speaks with authority. No officeholder, whether Federal or State, is asked to give up any of his rights as an American citizen. How can you have good government if you have nonvoting by those who know the affairs of Government. As Postmaster General Donaldson says, it is as important to support your party, as it is to support your church, not only by your loyalty, but by making contributions. Let us hope that those who have been using the Hatch Act to deter real Americanism and to frighten those who hold Federal offices will awaken to the realization that they, too, have a duty to perform. The strength of a party, in our two-party system, is what we make it.

Let's Stop Throwing Labels Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the prevalent habit of attaching a label to anyone in public life today is the subject of a critical editorial in the Peoria Journal, which I include under leave to extend my remarks.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic of a true liberal is tolerance for the viewpoint of those who differ with him. We can all endorse the statement in this editorial quoted from the remarks of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], who has certainly, both in his public and private life exhibited the qualities of "a good, red-blooded, patriotic American."

The editorial follows:

WHO'S A LIBERAL?

It has become the habit of supporters of President Truman's program to designate anyone who disagrees with them or votes against them as a reactionary. The same situation prevailed during the Roosevelt New Deal days.

The proponents of the reckless socialistic schemes advocated and tolerated by the Truman and Roosevelt administrations like to call themselves liberals. They designate their opponents or even those who agree in part with them but can't stomach their most radical beliefs as reactionaries or conservatives. These terms have come to carry a connotation of real repugnance.

Representative HAROLD VELDE in his Congressional Scrapbook a few weeks ago took occasion to comment upon the readiness of the self-designated liberals to label all those who disagree with them as reactionary.

He went to the trouble of looking up the word liberal in the Encyclopedia Britannica and gives part of the discussion he found there. "There has never been an authoritative definition of the doctrine or aim of Liberalism. Liberalism is a belief in the value of human personality, and a conviction that the source of all progress lies in the free exercise of individual energy * * * of affording to every citizen the means of acquiring mastery of his own capacities, and of establishing a real equality of opportunity for all. These aims are not compatible with socialism, which strictly interpreted, would banish free individual initiative and responsibility from the economc sphere."

Comments Mr. VELDE, "According to such definition, practically all of us can qualify as liberals; so let's stop throwing around

such terms as reactionary and liberal and stick to whether or not a person in public office is a good, red-blooded, patriotic American who puts forth real efforts and is determined to do the best job he knows how."

That is a bit of good advice. If we get down to cases, we will find that a lot of the people labeled as reactionaries are in reality more liberal than those who like to pose under that label. True liberalism entails a tolerance for the belief of those who might think differently and a recognition of their right to hold that belief. That is something that a good many of our self-styled liberals, especially in the political sense, do not have.

Allowance for Deduction for Expenses of a Housekeeper Necessary To Care for the Dependents of Gainfully Employed Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a single person who is the head of a family, or a married couple with both husband and wife working outside the home, must incur expenses for the care of dependent children or adults that place them at a disadvantage for income-tax purposes, as compared with a married couple with the wife working at home. The average family has the benefit of the services of the wife, but since she does not derive wages, salaries, or other financial compensation, the value of her services is not required to be reported for income-tax purposes. Furthermore, since one who works outside the home is substantially precluded from carrying out the ordinary duties of housekeeping, it can very well be argued that the expenses of hiring a housekeeper to perform such services are directly related to the production of the additional income received by the person who would otherwise be in a position to take care of the home.

While these considerations apply particularly to widowed parents who maintain a home for children, they are also applicable to married couples who find it necessary to work away from home.

In order to prevent abuses on the part of taxpayers of means, however, the deduction should be limited to the salary or wages of one full-time housekeeper. Also, in order to preclude the possibility of a wife obtaining occasional employment in order to contend that amounts expended for a housekeeper are related to her employment outside the home, there should be a limitation that the deduction for housekeeping expenses should not exceed the income of the taxpayer, or of his spouse, from gainful employment.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to include a copy of the bill I introduced today to correct this injustice:

A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes for housekeeping expenses of gainfully employed persons.

Be it enacted, That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross-income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(bb) Housekeeping expenses: In the case of an individual, the ordinary and necessary expenses paid during the taxable year for the services of a housekeeper required for the care of a dependent of the taxpayer, but not to exceed the average salary or wages on a per annum basis paid to any one person, and not to exceed the gross income of the taxpayer or of his spouse, whichever is the lesser, from salaries, wages, and compensation for personal services, and in carrying on a trade or business, minus the deductions described in section 22 (n) attributable to such gross income."

(b) Section 24 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and except housekeeping expenses deductible under section 23 (bb);"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

Some Help From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial that appeared in the issue of October 18, 1949, in the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass.:

SOME HELP FROM CONGRESS

A real source of concern to the officials of some American States with high taxes on cigarettes as a major source of public revenue is the fact that the smokes are so much cheaper in adjacent States with lesser levies that the latter attract the purchases of many of their citizens and thereby cause a serious loss in receipts. As a result, some of the affected States have been taking strong steps in an effort to cut that practice to the lowest possible minimum.

An outstanding example has been provided in Pennsylvania, where there has been criticism of the extensive use of its State police force, a body with an excellent reputation of vigorous general law enforcement, along the eastern border stopping incoming automobiles to ascertain if they were entering with cigarettes bought in New Jersey to escape the much higher Keystone State tax. The New Jersey tax is enough lower to make the purchase of cigarettes there extremely attractive to Pennsylvanians and so many of them were being drawn there that the border patrol was established to discourage them.

In addition, Jersey dealers have built up quite a substantial mail-order business that extends at least as far as Massachusetts, with numerous Bay Staters being solicited for business and many of them making purchases. More than a year ago, State tax commissioner Henry F. Long announced that he was sending bills for taxes to residents of this Commonwealth he learned had been buying New Jersey cigarettes by mail order and added his intention of extending that policy greatly. Now his problem in that respect has been enlarged greatly by the recent increase in the Massachusetts cigarette tax, which has made the price of the smokes in New Hampshire so much lower as to cause large numbers of people from this State to cross the border for carton purchases, as well as possibly buying them by mail.

In an effort to aid States like Pennsylvania and Massachusetts in this situation with the collection of their sales and use taxes. Congress has just passed a new law that may prove helpful. This act requires persons selling or otherwise disposing of cigarettes for profit in interstate commerce to furnish the tobacco tax administrators in the States to which the shipments are sent necessary information on which to base assessment and collection of State cigarette taxes. While this law apparently does not apply to the automobile and over-the-counter trade, it seems likely to put a real crimp in the mail-order business and cause embarrassing difficulties to persons securing their smokes in that way.

1950 Goal: Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 6, 1949:

1950 GOAL: CIVIL RIGHTS

The administration's decision to drop efforts to pass civil-rights legislation this year is sensible if disappointing.

Calling up civil-rights measures now would provoke another time-wasting Senate filibuster. It would block appropriation measures and other legislation that, at the moment, is more important. It would probably result in Congress remaining in session until Christmas.

Congress needs to call it quits. Members are irritable and tire after a 9-month session. They are in no shape physically or mentally, to plunge into a civil-rights fight. They need a rest. Furthermore, the country needs a rest from Congress.

Senator LUCAS, Democratic leader, has promised that the first measure to be brought up when Congress convenes again in January will be a civil-rights measure—one creating a fair employment practices commission.

When FEPC is disposed of, Congress could well take up antipoll-tax and antilynching legislation. All of these issues should be fought out when Congress meets again. If filibusters are started, they must be broken.

The time has come for the American people to quit talking and to act on these matters of equal rights and protection for all of our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed. We guaranteed equal rights in the Constitution. We fought Civil War to assure them. Both political parties have promised to provide for their enforcement. Yet, despite all this, we have permitted a sectional minority, through manipulation of our legislative processes, to keep us from this goal.

The Veteran Will Not Be Deceived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Binghamton, N. Y., Press and the Streator, Ill., Times-Press dealing with the subject of the long overdue refunds to veterans of overcharges assessed against them on their insurance premiums.

The editorials follow:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of September 1, 1949]

LET'S HAVE MORE ELECTION YEARS

Begin paying the $2,800,000,000 accumulated dividends on GI life insurance this year, urges Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York. He charges that the administration is unnecessarily delaying payment until 1950, an election year.

His charge is valid. Veterans getting the dividends will be receiving only a rebate on overpayments, a rebate that is rightly theirs. But not a few, in lack of understanding, will think the payments a token of Democratic Party love for them. Papa Truman will have whiskers and Democrats will call it Democratic Christmas.

The administration is preparing a bag of "gifts" for the "peepul" in the midterm election year 1950, including even lower taxes. The illusion of largess is always nurtured by politicians whenever elections approach. They can take 2 pounds of flesh in a nonelection year, but Jolly Kris Kringles they become in an election year. They'll return veterans' money to veterans amid ringing of sleigh bells.

[From the Streator (Ill.) Times-Press of September 2, 1949]

NOT A GIFT

Veteran organizations in Streator and elsewhere over the country are assisting former servicemen in preparing forms to secure rebates on their GI insurance which will amount to $2,800,000,000. This is not a gift to the veterans as some of the boys at Washington would like to give the impression; neither is it the result of astute financing of the Federal agency handling this insurance.

Actually, this distribution is possible only because the men in the armed services were overcharged for their insurance and are not receiving a gift or a dividend, but simply a return of excess payments.

It is estimated that each veteran will receive $175 more or less, though this figure has been questioned and of course, will depend upon many factors. Distribution is expected to start in January and Representative KEATING, of New York, is demanding that the task of rebating the overcharge be made as quickly as possible. He says, "The money should be refunded immediately. It belongs to the veterans and not to the Government. The soldiers have been overcharged and should have the money returned now rather than a year from now."

Distribution of $2,800,000,000 should be a factor in business next year for it will make available this additional purchasing power and that it will be helpful to the veteran goes without question. It will prove especially welcome, for nary a soldier knew or had any suspicion that he was saving money by paying too much for his insurance.

New York Herald Tribune Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, next week the New York Herald Tribune will hold its annual forum. This year's program promises to make a significant contribution to American political thinking. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have the scheduled program printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST SESSION, MONDAY, 7:45 P. M., OCTOBER 24, 1949

Opening of the forum: Mrs. Ogden Reid.
Dwight D. Eisenhower, general of the Army, president, Columbia University.
Framework address: Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

A political program for democracy, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator from Minnesota.
Resolved: "That the Democratic Party should seek to become a farmer-labor coalition." Affirmative: James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union. Negative: CLIFFORD P. CASE, Representative from New Jersey.
French songs: Edith Piaf, French chanteuse.
How and why the Democrats will win in 1950, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., Representative from New York.
The philosophy of the Fair Deal, Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator.
Panel: The kind of Democrat I am, Howard W. Smith, Representative from Virginia; Frank P. Graham, Senator from North Carolina; Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois.
Closing: Herbert H. Lehman, Democratic-Liberal Party candidate for the United States Senate.

SECOND SESSION, TUESDAY, 7:45 P. M., OCTOBER 25, 1949

The Hoover Commission Recommendations, Arthur S. Flemming, president, Ohio Wesleyan University.
The Hoover Report Is Up to You, Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Future of the Republican Party, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Senator from Massachusetts.
How and Why the Republicans Will Win in 1950, Guy G. Gabrielson, chairman, Republican National Committee.
A Middle Way, Philip H. Willkie, member, Indiana State Legislature; assistant, National Republican Senatorial Committee.
Rallying New Republicans Alexander M. Lankler, director, youth activities, New York State Republican Committee.
Song: Patrice Munsel soprano, Metropolitan Opera Association; Stuart Ross accompanist.
Needs the Party Must Meet, Val Peterson, Governor of Nebraska.
How Can the Democrats Help the Republican Party? ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator from Tennessee.
Panel: How Much Should Government Do—on Health, Education, and Housing? Margaret Chase Smith, Senator from Maine; Wayne L. Morse, Senator from Oregon; James P. Kem, Senator from Missouri; Harold Russell, commander of Amvets.
Closing: JOHN FOSTER DULLES, Senator from New York.

THIRD SESSION, WEDNESDAY, 1:45 P. M., OCTOBER 26, 1949

THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

Opening statement: Dr. Peter H. Odegard, rapporteur; chairman, University of California, political science department.
Discussion outline:
I. How Can the Average Citizen in His Community Exert a Maximum Influence on Government Policy?
II. Can American Political Parties Be Made More Effective Tools of Democracy?
III. What Are the Most Effective Ways of Building Political Support?
Participants: Jacob M. Arvey, chairman, Democratic Party of Cook County; William M. Boyle, chairman, Democratic National Committee; Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, Republican national committeewoman from New Hampshire; Mrs. India Edwards, executive director, women's division, Democratic National Committee; Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington, president, National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs; Mrs. Elizabeth Heffelfinger, Republican national committeewoman from Minnesota; Dr. Althea K. Hottel, president, American Association of University Women; Victor A. Johnston, campaign director, New York Republican Senatorial Committee; Mickey Levine, member, state executive committee, Americans for Democratic Action; Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, chairman, United States Committee for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; Dr. Robert F. Ray, director, Institute of Public Affairs, State University of Iowa; Mrs. Gerel Rubien, president, New York Women's Trade Union League; K. Frances Scott, M. D., president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; Miss Anna Lord Strauss, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Mrs. Cynthia Zimmerman, assistant to the campaign director, New York Republican Senatorial Committee.
Songs: Eugene Conley, tenor, Metropolitan Opera Association; Marcel Frank, accompanist.

Salut demeure chaste et pure (Faust)	Gounod
A Ballynure Ballad	arrangement, Hughes
I Know Where I'm Goin'	arrangement, Hughes
Cossack Love Song	Kountz

FOURTH SESSION, WEDNESDAY, 7:45 P. M., OCTOBER 26, 1949

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF WORLD PROBLEMS

The United Nations: John Sherman Cooper, member, American delegation to the United Nations.
Asia's Red Riddle: A. T. Steele, New York Herald Tribune correspondent in the Far East.
Message: Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India.
Asia Awake: Madame V. L. Pandit, Indian Ambassador to the United States.
Point 4: David Owen, Assistant Secretary General, in charge of economic affairs, United Nations.
Collegiate Chorale: William Jonson, director; Don Smith, accompanist.

Alleluia	Randall Thompson
Dorchester	William Billings
Assurance	William Billings
My Lord, What a Mourning	William Dawson
Ain'-a That Good News	William Dawson

Planning our Foreign Policy: Dorothy Fosdick, only woman member, State Department's policy planning staff.

What Future for Germany? Lucius D. Clay, former American Military Governor of Germany, commander in chief of American troops occupying Europe.

The Council of Europe: Sforzino Sforza, staff member of the Council of Europe Secretariat.

Partnership for Survival: Barbara Ward, foreign editor, the Economist, of London.

Closing: Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense.

Labor Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the launching dinner of the Israel Histadrut campaign in Cincinnati, Tuesday, October 18, 1949:

LABOR ISRAEL

It is not only as a Zionist that I appear before you to speak in behalf of the National Committee for Labor Israel but also, in the political sense, as a liberal.

Neither you nor I would be facing each other now if we did not share together the knowledge that the form of statehood is a shadow without substance if the welfare of the people within that state is not the primary concern. The security, dignity, freedom of the people, the health of the economy—if we lose sight of these, then the blood of the Jewish martyrs has been shed in vain. That is why I have been so eager to talk to you. As a liberal in Congress, I have learned the hard way how very much the support and extension of liberalism depends upon how much the people will do for it.

As a Zionist, I could do no better than to quote the words of Goldie Myerson, Israeli Minister of Labor, "I am thoroughly convinced that if it were not for the labor movement in Zionism we would never have had a Jewish state. I think every Zionist admits it. If it were not for the settlements of Tel Hai and Kfar Giladi down to the latest settlement in the Negeb, we would never have had a state. If there were not a body organized in the Histadrut that knew exactly what it wanted every day of the year and every year of our work in the country, and that never shirked a problem but set about solving it, we would never have had a Jewish state."

As a liberal, I can do no better than to quote the Premier of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, "Political independence is not enough, the state is not an end in itself." You know what he means. No, political independence is not enough. Along with political independence must go moral, intellectual, and economic independence. Only then can a state survive, survive in the sense of a living people and a growing nation. The people of Israel know this well, for in forming a Jewish Government they have seen to it that there was a labor majority. Government machinery cannot do everything. Nor should it, in a free and viable society. Hence, if there is any one group which has and can insure the stability and the security of Israel it is the Histadrut.

What would Israel be, what can it be without Histadrut? What would it have been without Histadrut? Histadrut was not only the major instrumentality of colonization, but its aims and operations reached for not the empty husk of a state, but for an expanding labor community and a labor economy to serve the ends of a truer social and political democracy. Through the workers' sick fund, through the invalidity fund, through its unemployment fund, through its widows' and orphans' fund, through the families-assistance fund and old-age fund, it gave social meaning to Israel's development. Through its 202 collective and cooperative worker's settlements with its total farmer population of over 40,000, it developed not only the agriculture of the country, but brought into being the new Jewish agricultural worker, taught them the feel and the joy of the soil and its dignity. Its agricultural marketing cooperative serves all the labor settlements, creating new markets and new modes of equitable distribution. Through its general wholesale supply cooperative, it checked speculation and price manipulation during the war. Histadrut provides practically all the inter- and intraurban motor transportation through its passenger and freight transport cooperatives. It handles over 7 percent of all the building construction in the land. It operates housing authority, plans and executes housing projects for the workers. Histadrut pioneers founded the first Jewish defense organization in Palestine. The Palmach commandos come from Histadrut kibbutzim.

By no means is this list of activities and accomplishments all-inclusive. I never understood so clearly until I visited Israel what Mr. Ben-Gurion meant when he said, "The Jewish Nation could never have been established without Histadrut." It has developed industry, agriculture, shipping. For in Israel, through Histadrut, is a land that is being built for people—not for institutions. Here is a land that is being built on the concepts of greater security for all. Here the dry rot of the nonsense that people are exploitable and expendable is being swept away. Here is the fresh start. Frankly, I believe Histadrut to be the most unique agency in the world.

And let me ask you this: If Histadrut, founded in Haifa, on December 7, 1920, by 4,433 workers, could under British rule, under the most adverse conditions of nondevelopment of a barren land, under the impact of war and disaster, accomplish what it did, what will it do now, with the cooperation of a friendly government, their own government, with the knowledge they have gained over the years, with the know-hows they have developed.

Now Histadrut faces the task of rehabilitating and integrating a million Jewish immigrants. At least 400,000 of this million will be turned into workers enriching the life stream of Israel.

Only Histadrut can bring that acclimatization through it education and cultural activities, through its vocational and training schools, through its health and social services. The responsibility falls upon Histadrut, as well, to save and expand the collective settlements. There is a dearth of personnel and equipment in these settlements. The strength of pioneer Israel lies in these collective settlements to which chalutzim gave the years of their lives so that one day Israel, free and self-sustaining, will march in liberty with the free nations of the world. If these settlements are permitted to lapse, to dissipate, an integral and, yes, indispensable, part of Israel will be lost. The collective settlement is being watched with singular interest by the political and social scientists all over the world. The collective settlement has proven, they believe, that communal endeavor and democratic procedures are not incompatible; they can coexist, side by side, keeping men free from social exploitation and free as well from political tyranny.

Moreover, in addition to housing for immigrants, Histadrut is filling a need which neither government nor other organizations can fill. This involves a program of building 6,000 housing units for the low-income group of workers. No other unit can undertake this, all the facilities of the Government having been dedicated to provide housing for the new immigrants.

I do not believe I am making any grandiose statement when I say that the eyes of an informed world are upon Israel, with a hope that has found no match since the cry of the French Revolutionaries, "Liberty, fraternity, and equality." In Israel you can see a new world aborning where man may walk in freedom and in plenty; where social experimentation is vigorous and productive; where the evils of preventable disease, poverty, and illiteracy will be crowded out to make room for four freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Labor Israel has set that pattern, a pattern which does not divorce security from democracy, nor cooperative ventures from freedom. This is the pattern the world watches and in this pattern is the hope of the world. It is a pattern for survival and for peace. I say, and I believe it to be no exaggeration whatsoever, that if we share in the expansion of that pattern in Israel, we are working not for Israel alone but for all the world. And not only will Israel and Israel's children share in the fruits but your children and mine. A sturdy, healthy Israel, economically, socially, morally, and politically, means small as the country is, it can live and grow despite international rivalries and intrigues.

Let's ask ourselves, How much do we care? after the decimation of almost one-half of world Jewry in Hitler's gas chambers, after the war for Israel's independence, after the triumph of Israel over nations of power and wealth—How much now do we care whether Israel survives and in what manner? We know the high drama of the war drums, the momentum of military victory, the tense pitch that was maintained throughout the whole political struggle for independence are withdrawing. We must acknowledge this, because if we don't, all unseen, and very slowly, the greatest enemy of mankind—lethargy and indifference—will overtake us. It is easy enough to be swept along in the stream of excitement, to understand and to help and to sympathize and to participate. Now is the period of digging and grubbing and building. Now all the achievements of Israel must be gathered together and tied in an enduring knot.

As the world has found to its dismay, the problems of peace are tenfold more intricate, more delicate than the problems of war. In peacetime, the sense of sacrifice seems to dim, the unity and coordination fall apart, the grumbling and the indifference set in. We have seen it happen the world over. We stand warned. Let us see that it does not happen to and in Israel.

What I am telling you today is not hearsay. I have seen with my own eyes the miracle that is Israel. I have traveled in many parts of the world and there is no other country, save the United States, where there is a sense of growth, where the promise of the future is in the very atmosphere of the land, where hope and enthusiasm run through the country like a scarlet thread. Everywhere else I found despair, a sense of futility and fear—not so in Israel. Despite the magnitude of the tasks before them—thousands of new immigrants, the lack of physical resources, the dire need for housing, the cost of living, the rebuilding of the ruins of the war, the complexity of amalgamating dozens of different cultures into one, the international game of cat and mouse that is being played with Israel—despite these, the people of Israel wear the badge of courage, wear it proudly but with humor and with wit and with warmth. Please believe me when I tell you that despite all the ob-

stacles they have yet to conquer, they are a happy people. The question now lies before us—will we in our ease and in our own security forget them and fail them?

We have by no means reached the stage that we can afford the luxury of complacency. Neither internally nor externally can Israel's ship of state move serenely and relaxed. We know that Israel will never be the aggressor, but we know too that Israel for a long time to come must keep her fences mended and protected. I have tried to point out to you some of the internal distresses and needs which only Histadrut can mend.

I want to point now to some of the external dangers that we as Americans must watch, and by pressures of informed public opinion help avert. For example, the fate of the new city of Jerusalem hangs in the balance. Once again there is talk of the internationalization of the Holy City. Internationalization of that area has proved to be a tragic error. I know. I saw it. I saw the tragedy of Jerusalem when it was taken out of Israeli control by United Nations resolution. Death hovered in the streets and in the air. Only the bravery and the sacrifices of the Israelis kept Jerusalem alive. The United Nations had proposed international machinery which broke down completely when put to the test. It had neither the heart nor the equipment for the task of administering the Holy City. It has neither the machinery nor the equipment today. The United Nations could not save Jerusalem; it did not even try. Today every inhabitant of the new city of Jerusalem mourns its dead and keeps the resolution firm in his heart that now the new city must be forever a part of Israel. It will be remembered that prior to Arab aggression, the Israelis, in the interest of peace, had consented to the internationalization of Jerusalem and had cooperated with the appointed authorities. But it failed and failed miserably. Jerusalem survived today only because the Israelis fought and died for it. Today Jerusalem is occupied with peaceful pursuits and the task of restoration is well on its way. Again it must be remembered that the United Nations' international machinery, as such, took no part in the war and none in the peace. It must also be remembered that the new city of Jerusalem is inhabited by 100,000 Jews, comprising 90 percent of the population and 95 percent of the Holy Places which are so much a concern of the world outside the new city's limits. It must also be remembered that the Israeli Government has pledged itself and has honored that pledge to permit complete accessibility to all Holy Places within its jurisdiction and has protected and preserved all Holy Places in and out of Israel against wanton destruction. What purpose then will it serve to place all of Jerusalem juridically under international control? The United Nations has neither the military nor the administrative staff nor the military tools with which to govern and control the area. Peace and stability in Israel can only be assured when the new city of Jerusalem is an integral part of Israel. The cultural, lingual, and religious ties between Jewish Jerusalem and Israel are inextricably woven together. The people of Jerusalem, after the terror of the siege, will never, never consent to decapitation. This is one problem we must watch closely.

Another lies in the external threat and pressures placed upon Israel to persuade her to relinquish a portion of the territory she now holds, more particularly, in the Negeb. Again powerful interests in the United States and in our State Department are bent upon pursuing either the treacherous course of appeasement or the debasing road of greed. As Americans, as loyal Americans, we have the right, or rather I should say, the solemn duty to concern ourselves personally and intimately with the foreign policy of the United States whether that policy is related to Greece, Turkey, Spain, Egypt, or Israel. We have the duty to speak up, to make our opinions felt and to apply the democratic processes to the expression of sentiment. You can be assured that I shall never rest where there is even the faintest suggestion of immoral political practices in any branch of our Government. Pressure on Israel to relinquish the Negeb is, I do not hesitate to state, an immoral political policy.

Another problem that confronts Israel nationally is that of the Arab refugees. There again pressure is being applied to Israel to permit the Arabs to return. Israel has offered to take 100,000 of the refugees, has offered to contribute moneys to the resettlement of the remainder elsewhere. To permit the refugees to return now would mean the creation of economic chaos in Israel, which, of course, is the Arab motivation for their insistence upon treating the refugee problem in this manner. It would likewise serve the Arab purpose to establish a heavy fifth column in Israel for reasons too obvious to state. But dwelling on the Arab refugee problem to the exclusion of all other problems confronting the Arab countries in Israel, the Arabs have succeeded in raising a smoke screen. Having created the problem themselves by their aggression against Israel and against the United Nations they now seek to avoid all responsibility therefor by insisting that the problem is exclusively Israel's.

In short, what they could not do by direction they seek to do indirectly. The propaganda wheels are turning swiftly to engage the sympathy of the whole world for these Arab refugees. Not that it is not a problem for the humanitarian; human suffering always is. But the known neglect of Arab leadership for its population, for its downtrodden, diseased, and illiterate population, did not change overnight. Obviously this sudden concern for the welfare of the Arab refugees is being used as a military weapon aimed against Israel. The only practical solution lies in the resettlement of those Arabs, who are actually victims of their own leadership, in underpopulated Arab countries.

I do not believe I have gone too far afield in touching on these questions. They are intimately related with the work of Labor Israel and related most certainly to your attitude on American foreign policy.

There is much hope, I believe, in the economic mission headed by Mr. Gordon Clapp which will explore the economic potential of the Middle East, for it is recognized universally, within and without Israel, that economic stability more safely and surely precedes political stability. Israel cannot exist healthy and prosperous without neighboring countries likewise economically sound.

I have wanted to point out to you how crucial a moment it is for Israel externally and internally. It is up to you now to show how much do you care.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix, I include a statement made by me on October 7, 1949, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the subject of a world federation:

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that the formation of a world federation is a spendid idea, and is one of many avenues of approach toward the solution of the problem of establishing permanent peace. Naturally, it cannot be said that it will be a guaranty, but I feel confident that it will result in more good will and better relationships between the countries which are members of the federation, and perhaps also with other countries which are not members.

I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs will act favorably on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement which I made before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on October 12, 1949, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64—a resolution to seek development of the United Nations into a world federation:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we now know that Russia has the atomic bomb. The suddenness of President Truman's announcement should drive home the fact that the world can no longer afford fundamental disagreement—at least when it comes to controlling the forces of physical destruction.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am particularly aware of the urgent truth of that statement. It is for that reason that I appear before this committee to urge favorable consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 64. I was one of those who introduced this resolution in the House, because I believe that a world federation is the surest way of permanently controlling the forces of mass destruction that are now at large.

It must be admitted that in some fields, the United Nations has demonstrated that international consultation and cooperation are not entirely things of the future. Yet it cannot be realistically denied that where the major nations are fundamentally at loggerheads, the United Nations has been unable to take any effective action.

In my opinion, the United Nations falls short of complete success because it is too much like the old League of Nations. It is still an organization of sovereign nations—that is, of nations each of which insists that it be able to decide what it will do in all cases.

Here in America, the various States decided that, in some fields, they would give up that right of complete free choice and agree that all should submit to majority decisions. Through this agreement, each State gained strength from the others. As an obvious example, no State could hope to defend itself alone nearly as well as with the help of 47 other States.

I think that the United States stands to gain strength from other nations in a similar manner—that is, by entering into an agreement with them to submit to group decisions in certain limited fields. Our purpose

in doing so, as stated in the resolution under consideration, would be to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

Note those words "and enforcement." We have tried writing world laws before. We even tried to outlaw war, by the Kellogg-Briand treaty. But that treaty never amounted to more than a piece of paper, because there was no force in the world capable of enforcing it. If the limited powers of which this resolution speaks are vested in the United Nations, that force will exist and world law will be something more than paper, ink, and sealing wax.

As I see it, vesting the necessary powers in the United Nations means that all nations must agree to submit to majority decisions all matters regarding the use of physical force. That applies to the use of conventional arms as well as to the use of atomic energy.

This country has already proposed this in the field of atomic energy. We should continue to press for abolition of the veto in the field of conventional armaments control as well.

In assessing the wisdom of this policy, we should consider just what America stands to lose and gain in agreeing to submit to majority decisions in the control of physical force.

As I see it, all we lose is a right which the people of no nation wish to exercise: The right to wage war—the right to send some citizens into battle and the right to subject the rest to hardship—and possibly destruction—at home.

Balanced against that, I believe we stand to gain the surest hope that has ever been offered that we will never again have to exercise those awful rights.

The United States is in a most commanding position to shape the course of world events. Where we lead, most of the world follows. As the leader in the field of atomic energy, America has a moral obligation to lead the world into an organization which will mean the effective control of the atom.

If the United States expresses, through this resolution, its willingness to enter into a limited world government, surely all the Western World will follow.

It does not seem impossible to me that if that should occur, the Eastern World might deem it to its own interest to join the federation, as the surest course for maintaining a permanent peace.

But without the leadership of the United States, which Resolution 64 calls for, world federation will probably never be more than a noble ideal in which many believe but toward which no one has the courage to act.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

A COSTLY "COMPROMISE"

Senate and House farm bill conferees agreed yesterday on what they are pleased to refer to as "compromise" legislation.

It is estimated that by the end of the present fiscal year the Government will have had to take title to more than $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus farm commodities. In the face of this state of affairs; in the face of the admonitions of the Nation's principal farm organizations, and in flat violation of the platform pledge of the Democratic party, these conferees have agreed to go along, to all intents and purposes, with the very policy that has produced the present glut of farm products. Flexible price supports are promised, it is true, for sometime in the early future, but even if one could accept that promise at its face value—which in view of the farm bloc's postwar record, one obviously cannot—it would hardly help in the present mounting emergency. The conferees' "solution" of that problem is to continue the wartime policy under which farmers are encouraged to produce, not for the market but for what they can get from the Government for their products.

In only one sense can this measure be described as a "compromise." It is a compromise in the sense that the consumer, the taxpayer, and in the end the farmer himself, all stand to share alike. They stand to share alike because, as a result of this thoroughly irresponsible act of Senate and House conferees—openly encouraged by the administration—they all stand to lose heavily.

All the People Pay All the Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hugh J. Rafferty, a prominent citizen in the State of Wisconsin, recently addressed a letter to the editor of the Kenosha Evening News on the subject of taxes. He presents the tax problem in a way that can be understood by any citizen. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of said letter:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

TAXES

TO THE EDITOR:

Do the steel mills pay taxes? No.

Do the railroad companies pay taxes? No.

Do the department stores pay taxes? No.

Does the corner grocery store pay taxes? No.

It is true that the tax records show how they do pay taxes, but they cannot do so, because no business concern of any kind, big or little, has as much as a slick nickel until it sells its products or services.

To get money for taxes, business concerns must sell their merchandise and services at a profit. The business concerns, therefore, are merely tax collectors, taking the money from the people and passing it on to the tax collector.

Consider a pair of shoes. The leather in shoes comes from the tanner, who buys the cattle hides from a packing house and the tanbark to tan the leather from a sawmill. The sawmill, the timber companies that cut the oak or hemlock trees, the packing house and the tanner all pay taxes and pass them on to the shoe manufacturer. He adds their taxes and the taxes he pays himself and passes them on to the retailer. The retailer pays taxes. He adds his taxes plus all the taxes passed on to him to the price of the shoes.

The consumer, who may think all the taxes he pays are the withholding taxes taken by his employer from his pay check, actually pays the taxes that are hidden in the price of the shoes he buys, the food he eats, the clothing he wears, and the cost of everything he buys for his family.

A very large share of the increased cost of goods bought today as compared with prices of 10 years ago is due to higher taxes.

Higher taxes are reducing the standard of living of the American people. The more the Government costs the less a consumer can buy for his family.

The businessman is reluctant to pass on taxes, for he knows that every time taxes go up and he marks up the price of his product he is pricing somebody out of the market.

The businessman knows that the higher the taxes he must pass on to his customers the fewer customers he will have. He knows that the biggest competitor for his customers' dollars is the Government.

We are fast drifting down the way of Socialistic England, where a single man with an income of $1,450 pays $272 in income tax. With an income of $3,600 he pays $1,234 in tax.

Isn't it time that those who run our Government should think of the people? Everyone who eats food, wears clothes, or sleeps in a house should write his Congressman and Senators telling them he is tired of paying for the high cost of Government in direct and hidden taxes.

HUGH J. RAFFERTY.

Statement by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Membership of this House and Americans everywhere have for several weeks past been reading of the statements made by naval officials in their appearances before the Committee on Armed Services of this House.

Today Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, appeared before that committee.

A direct question was put to General Vandenberg asking that he express his personal views with respect to the use and value of naval air carriers in the event of war.

I am sure that Members of the House will be interested in reading his reply, which I include herewith as part of my remarks:

The subject of carrier aviation is a complex one. It is not simply a question: Are you for them or against them? There are carriers of different types and for different purposes. There are carriers which are necessary against some enemies and not necessary against others. Confusion can easily arise and I should like to try to clear it up.

If I were to state my position on this subject in one sentence it would be this: I am in favor of the greatest possible development of carrier aviation to whatever extent carriers and their aircraft are necessary for fulfillment of a strategic plan against the one possible enemy we may have to face. Less than this would be unsound; more than this is an unjustifiable burden upon the American taxpayer.

II

In the Second World War we fought two different enemies in two hemispheres.

In Europe our enemy was essentially a land power with a large submarine fleet and a few surface units designed for commerce raiding. In that theater of war the Allied Powers undertook two great amphibious operations—the landings in north Africa and the landing in Normandy. As any student of history will recall, carrier aviation performed a significant, but not a predominant, function in the war against Germany. Carriers participated in antisubmarine warfare and in the protection of our supply lines in Europe. In the initial support of the north African landing certain tactical aircraft operated briefly from carriers. No carrier task groups were used.

In the war against Japan the situation was entirely different. We faced an island empire. The Japanese home islands were dependent upon ocean commerce for raw materials and even food. This empire had a major surface fleet, including many aircraft carriers. Our intermediate objectives were island outposts, and our ultimate objective was the Japanese home islands themselves. In this war grew up that powerful sea weapon, the carrier task force. The fleets that operated under Admiral Halsey, Admiral Mitcher, and Admiral Spruance drove enemy fleets from the seas and were important factors in the island-hopping campaign. The student of history need only recall the Coral Sea, Midway, and the Philippine Sea to understand the nature and importance of those operations.

Any war we may have to fight in the future will obviously be unlike the Pacific Ocean war against Japan. It will tend to resemble the war against Germany, though with certain differences. There will be the same problem of killing submarines, and the enemy submarines seem likely to be greater in number and more capable in performance than anything we faced in World War II. There will be the same problem of protecting Atlantic Ocean supply lines, although the threat to our shipping will come almost wholly from the submarine since the potential enemy has no surface units of the character of the *Bismarck* and the *Tirpitz*. There may or may not be amphibious landings; but if there are, they will be like the landings in north Africa and Normandy and not like the landing in the Pacific islands. Finally, the industrial heart of the potential enemy lies, not on any seashore, not on any island, but deep inside the Eurasian land mass.

It is to that type of war that we must adapt all of our forces, including carrier aviation.

III

What does this mean in terms of specific decisions about carriers as a part of our total national defense equipment? I will try to be very specific.

First, I am not only willing but insistent that the types of carriers which can help meet the threat of an enemy submarine fleet shall be developed fully and kept in instant readiness. The sea lanes must be kept open. There is no dispute on this matter; you have heard none and you will hear none.

Second, I do not believe there is justification for maintaining large carrier task forces during peacetime unless they are required by the strategic plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In my judgment they are not required by those plans. I do not believe that it is consistent with the requirements of military secrecy to make a further statement on that matter.

Third, I do not believe that it is sound to construct the ship of which the hull was designated CVA–58, which was given the name U. S. S. *United States*, and is popularly known as the supercarrier. I accept the statements of the Navy people that so many aircraft can operate from this ship, that the ship will have a given speed, and that its aircraft (when they are designed, constructed, and manned) will be able to operate from that carrier at the stated range. In other words, I accept the military capability of this ship as stated by the Chief of Naval Operations. My opposition to building it comes from the fact that I can see no necessity for a ship with those capabilities in any strategic plan against the one possible enemy.

IV

I wish to emphasize that I have no wish to diminish carrier aviation as such, or to restrict it to smaller types of carriers. My one purpose is to provide the weapons which the Nation needs to carry out a strategic plan in the event that we shall be forced into war with the one possible enemy. My views stem from the nature of that enemy's forces, his geographical position, and the type of war that will have to be fought against him if any war should come.

I do not believe that we can afford to purchase weapons or equipment for any purpose other than that. Limited defense funds impose on us the necessity of never buying a second priority item when first priority items are still unbought.

I further assure you that at all times I am ready to reconsider this military problem, or any other, and to approach it with an open mind and the single purpose of solving the problem in the national interest.

Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement by the Honorable Forrest Smith, Governor of Missouri, in regard to proposed flood-control reservoirs at Doniphan and Blair Creek on Current River:

STATEMENT ON DONIPHAN AND BLAIR CREEK RESERVOIRS BY FORREST SMITH, GOVERNOR OF MISSOURI, OCTOBER 12, 1949

This statement has been compiled after consultation with all interested agencies of the State of Missouri. Representatives of those agencies met in my office on October 4, 1949, for the specific purpose of considering the proposed Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs. The statement has been endorsed by each of the agencies represented. It is not customary for me to comment on projects until such time as they are submitted to me officially by the chief of engineers. However, I feel that, in this particular instance, it is advisable for me to make a statement at this time. The interests of the State are so vitally affected, the issues are so clear-cut, and there is such an unanimity of official opinion in the State that there can be no doubt as to the position the State should take regarding the Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs.

The State of Missouri cannot at this time, or under foreseeable conditions in the future, approve the construction of any reservoir or dam on Current River. Although sufficient study of the Current River Basin has not been made on which to base a complete pattern of resource development, certain valuable resources are predominately in evidence and certain definite trends in proper development are indicated. Until such time as national policy becomes comprehensive enough to include consideration of all these resources and indicated trends, the State cannot approve any project by the Federal Government which may prevent proper resource development in the area.

The State favors sound resource development and in no way seeks to offer any obstacle to such development in the White River Basin of which the Current River is a part. The State recognizes the value of upstream flood-water storage to downstream interests. It should be pointed out that existing projects including Wappapello, Clearwater, Norfork, and Bull Shoals do provide for such storage. It would appear that Missouri has, in no way, shirked her responsibility in providing flood-control storage in the national interest. The State further recognizes the true value of hydroelectric-power production. The State contends, however, that broader considerations transcend these values in the Current River Basin.

The natural scenic beauty and attractions peculiar to the area make the Current River Valley of ever increasing value to the State and to the Nation as a recreational area. Without minimizing the recreational opportunities which reservoirs afford, the fact remains that because of the large numbers of reservoirs which have been constructed and which are authorized for construction, the value of individual reservoirs for recreational purposes will progressively decrease. For the same reason, the value of an area like the Current River Valley under proper conditions will progressively increase. The type of recreational demand which this area fulfills cannot be satisfied by reservoirs. The State parks, the fish and wildlife resources and especially the large springs of the Current River Valley are unique and irreplaceable.

Timber has been the greatest single contributing resource to the economy of the Current River area. This resource has been badly depleted, but it is a renewable resource. Timber should continue to play a major role in the economy of the area. In recent years, important steps have been taken by Federal, State, and private interests toward bringing this resource back to a sustained-yield basis. A good land management program including proper reforestation and forestry management should be accelerated. Such a program is not offered as a substitute for flood-control storage. However, such a program would enhance the local economy, improve recreational, fish and wildlife resources, and contribute to the national timber supply. This would appear to be of much more value to the region, to the State, and to the Nation than any flood-control storage that might be placed on Current River.

Part of the flood protection which the reservoirs would afford could be provided locally downstream. The value of such storage in producing substantial benefits on the Mississippi River has never been demonstrated satisfactorily to the State.

Undoubtedly, the power which could be generated at the Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs would be used to good advantage. It appears doubtful if this power would prove to be of any considerable importance in attracting industry into the area. The types of industry which this area could support are likely to be much more interested in sources of raw material, availability of markets, and transportation costs than in power costs. There are sufficient coal reserves in the State of Missouri to supply all the power the citizens of the State could conceivably use. The Current River will continue to flow for a long time. In the event, growing power needs and exhausted fuel reserves should become critical, the power resources of Current River could be developed at that time. It should be pointed out that the proposal now made for Doniphan and Blair Creek

Reservoirs would by no means fully utilize the power potential of Current River or even of those reservoir sites.

There are streams with natural attributes which, in their total, are so unique as to warrant the preservation of the streams, simply because they are unique. If all other factors were ignored, it is apparent that the Current River is such a stream. This proposal to impound the waters of Current River has even broader and more serious implications. It emphatically points to a deficiency in national policy which ignores such values in planning for comprehensive development.

The Corps of Engineers has shown that the Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs are not economically justified. Mention is made of certain intangible benefits which would make the reservoirs feasible. The State contends that if all the costs, damages, and benefits, both tangible and intangible, are considered, the reservoirs would not be justified under any circumstances.

The State requests that authority for the construction of Doniphan and Blair Creek Reservoirs be withheld and that they be eliminated from consideration in any long-range plan of development for the White River Basin.

FORREST SMITH,
Governor.

How Long Must the People Wait?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the steel and coal strikes are still attracting much attention in the daily press and among the people, but the Executive of our Government does not seem to recognize its seriousness.

The President has the authority under the Taft-Hartley law to step into this dispute.

Why does he wait? Do peoples' houses have to become cold before it is a national emergency? How long do steel furnaces have to be closed down before the President recognizes that this steel strike can throw millions not in steel industry out of employment?

In this morning's press Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the President's No. 1 economic adviser, seems to recognize these elemental facts.

Dr. Willford I. King, noted economist, issued a statement which calls again our attention to needed legislation. Dr. King's statement is as follows:

Dictators of labor monopolists have rapidly brought on crises endangering the Nation's whole economy by the ruthless use of monoply powers over whole industries. These uncontrolled industry-wide powers could bring on economic crises that would destroy our republic and open the way to Fascist labor dictatorship.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer predicts that, if the coal, steel, and aluminum strikes continue until December 1 they will cause 5,000,000 workers to become unemployed. Are our people so spineless that they will wait helplessly while production is thus strangled, scarcity replace abundance, and our whole economy is disrupted by giant labor monopolies following the orders of ruthless self-seeking bosses. Should the welfare of millions be sacrificed merely because union leaders object to having the workers pay part of the cost of their own pensions?

Long ago, it was found necessary to enact the Sherman Antitrust Act to prevent employers from combining to monopolize industries in order to fleece the public. Is it not evident that the time has now come to put an end to the equally destructive blundering of the people by uncontrolled labor monopolies?

Congress should pass a law prohibiting any organization comprising the employees of more than one employer combining to bargain concerning the wages or hours, making it a criminal offense for any employee to violate this law.

The most effective way of putting teeth into such legislation and punishing any person who quits work at the behest of such illegal combination would be to forbid any employer to pay within 2 years to any such striker an hourly wage or piece rate higher than 85 percent of the hourly wage or piece rate last paid to said person. Any grant of additional fringe benefits to such persons should also be prohibited.

The law could be enforced more easily by thus acting through the employer, than it could be by attempting to punish all violators directly.

Congress should also forbid unions engaged in interstate commerce to indulge in mass picketing or in intimidation of persons desiring to work.

Congress itself, by the enactment of the Wagner Act and other bad legislation fostering labor monopolies created this Frankenstein. Congress should stay in session, or reconvene to curb the evil powers of labor monopolies reaching for power over the National Government itself and the people.

Legislation of the type suggested will break the power of the self-constituted autocracies which the labor monopolies have gradually built up in this country. It would restore authority to the Government established by our Constitution. Is not such legislative action by Congress imperative now?

WILLFORD I. KING,
Chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Resolution of Iowa Motor Truck Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution of Iowa Motor Truck Association, dated September 30, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I join heartily in this commendation given Hon. Richard F. Mitchell, Commissioner of Interstate Commerce. I have known Dick Mitchell for many years, and can personally attest his personal integrity, and his eminent qualifications for the high office he now holds. I join in strongly urging his reappointment as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Whereas the Honorable Richard F. Mitchell has a long and distinguished record of faithful service to the people of Iowa and the Nation; and

Whereas he has been a lifelong resident of the State of Iowa, and has served with distinction and integrity in the practice of law and the performance of his duties in high public office, including 10 years as a justice of the Supreme Court of Iowa; and

Whereas in his years as a Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, he has served the Nation with outstanding diligence and ability and with eminently fair and impartial consideration of every form of transportation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by members of the Iowa Motor Truck Association, in convention assembled in the city of Des Moines on September 30, 1949, That we do hereby respectfully recommend and urge the reappointment of the Honorable Richard F. Mitchell as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Know-How Through Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

FOWLER, HAWES & SYMINGTON,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 11, 1949.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: I think you will be interested in the enclosed copy of an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on September 29, 1949. You may wish to consider its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in view of the current discussion of point 4.

CARE is extremely grateful to you for your sponsorship of H. R. 5953 and for your efforts to secure its adoption in the House. We are looking forward hopefully to the early passage of the legislation at the next session of Congress. If there is any assistance which we can give you in this matter, I hope you will let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER B. HAWES.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 29, 1949]

KNOW-HOW THROUGH BOOKS

Point 4 has a little brother. It is the CARE book program, which is replacing scientific, technical, and professional literature lost during the war years in Europe and Asia.

Books, it is obvious, are the one vastly important means of spreading know-how of all sorts and of developing undeveloped areas of knowledge. They go where American engineers cannot be spared to go. They raise standards of living by raising standards of thinking.

Senators SPARKMAN and SALTONSTALL and Congressman JUDD have introduced bills for a contribution to CARE for its book program. During the war, employers to whom conscientious objectors were assigned for work were required to pay regular wages, but the payments were made into the Treasury. The proposed bills would take an amount equal to the fund thus created ($1,327,641) and use it to support the CARE program.

A poll of the men whose earnings created the fund showed that they preferred the money to be used for relief purposes, and the National Service Board for Religious Objectors has specifically asked that it be used for the book replacement program. There can be little objection to so constructive an end product of the objector's wartime services. Here is a relief program which can pay back in general enlightenment.

Congressman Dollinger Reports to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, as the first session of the Eighty-first Congress reaches adjournment, it is my desire to report to the people of my congressional district.

My report will deal primarily with labor legislation, civil rights, housing, and rent control, and other matters of vital daily importance to my constituents.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law is a must and one of my very first acts, as your Congressman, was to introduce a bill for its repeal. In an effort to bring Taft-Hartley repeal legislation before the House of Representatives for action, I signed the necessary discharge petition, and shall continue my efforts toward repeal of this antilabor law. In the consideration by the House of the Lesinski labor bill, I refused to vote for the Sims amendment which provided for court injunctions in national emergency strikes. The newspaperman, Charles VanDevander, in his column Washington Memo of May 4, 1949, said: "DOLLINGER had the right idea. The effort at appeasement was futile, as the result abundantly proved." Let me emphasize, at no time will I vote to permit injunctions against labor.

MINIMUM WAGE

I introduced a bill to fix a new minimum wage of at least $1 per hour. I voted for the minimum wage of 75 cents per hour which passed the House of Representatives. In my opinion, the coverage was not complete, nor is the minimum wage sufficient. I shall continue to exert my efforts for the passage of legislation providing for the minimum wage of at least $1 per hour, and making the coverage broader in scope.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Discrimination has no place in this country. It is undemocratic and un-American. That being my firm conviction, I introduced the following: First, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment, known as the FEPC; second, a bill to prohibit the poll tax; third, an antilynching bill; fourth, a bill to prohibit segregation of passengers because of race or color; fifth, a bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces; sixth, a bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate against students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; seventh, a bill providing that Federal funds shall not be used in housing where there is discrimination in occupancy.

Passage of all the above bills is a must—for we cannot have a free America without the enactment of such bills into law. How long must we attempt to explain to our children that some cannot gain admittance to colleges because they operate on quota systems. Why should our colleges discriminate against students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin?

Also on the subject of discrimination, I spoke out in protest against the mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which pointed out that the Cardinal's trial was a blow against freedom of religion, in general, and the independence of churches, in particular.

When the displaced persons bill was before the House, I spoke on the floor and fought for a bill which would conform with American democratic principles. I urged that we permit the entry of at least 400,000 persons, and strongly objected to the discriminatory provisions of the bill.

Let me make my views clear and unmistakable. Discrimination cannot be compromised; it must be eliminated. I shall actively oppose, and take action to end, discrimination against any person because of race, creed, color, or religion, whether the discrimination is in employment, housing, education, voting, or in any other field.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

The housing bill came before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, of which committee I am a member. I vigorously fought in the committee to obtain a really liberal housing program. Later, when the Housing Act of 1949 came before the House, I spoke from the floor and continued my fight for a good and effective housing bill.

I favor continued and strengthened rent control. I fought in the committee and led the fight on the floor of the House for effective rent control. I foresaw and spoke out against the fair net operating-return provisions of the rent-control bill on the ground that they would permit inequitable and unjust rent increases.

ISRAEL

Early in the session I advocated complete de jure recognition of the new State of Israel, as well as the granting to it of a $100,000,000 loan. It was a privilege for me to address the Members of the House, and, in the name of the people of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, to thank the President of the United States for his recognition of Israel.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I favor the liberalization of our social-security law and testified before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, urging its favorable action on necessary legislation toward that objective. When the social-security bill came before the House, I spoke from the floor and urged that old-age and survivors insurance be extended to cover all persons and that proper provision be made for our needy aged, the blind, widows, and dependent children.

CONSUMER RELIEF

I introduced a resolution calling upon Congress to investigate and study the spread between the prices received by producers of goods and commodities and the prices paid by consumers, for the purpose of reducing the high cost of living and raising the American standard of living by elimination of excess profits.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES

My efforts in behalf of the underpaid postal employee is a matter of public record, both before the committee and on the floor of the House. While some improvement in their working and pay conditions was obtained, I regret that it was not more liberal and beneficial to the postal employees. I pledge to continue my efforts to obtain a fair living wage for our postal employees.

HUMAN RELATIONS

The entire Nation acclaimed the law which I sponsored, permitting Jacob Gross, a 2-year-old orphan, to come to the United States. This child, at the age of 11 months, was the sole survivor of a plane crash in Europe. It was aptly said that two miracles occurred: one, when this child alone survived the plane crash, and the other when Congress passed the law I introduced to permit this orphan to come to this country. I was happy to have had a part in this "miracle."

I am proud to have the opportunity to serve you as your Representative in the Congress of the United States. As your Representative, I have tried to carry out your wishes to sponsor, urge, and vote in the Roosevelt tradition for the Fair Deal program. I appreciate the responsibility you have entrusted to me. My record as your Representative, I believe, proves my sincere efforts in behalf of legislation favorable and important to your welfare.

I trust that you, my constituents, will be pleased with my efforts in your behalf. Robert S. Allen, substituting for Drew Pearson in his column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, said:

"DOLLINGER is one of the able, courageous, new Members of the Eighty-first Congress."

I pledge my best efforts to continue to earn this commendation and your approval.

Democratic Dialog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem

by a prominent Democrat of the State of Georgia:

DEMOCRATIC DIALOG

Father, must I go to work?
No, my lucky son.
We're living now on Easy Street
On dough from Washington.

We've left it up to Uncle Sam,
So don't get exercised.
Nobody has to give a damn—
We've all been subsidized.

But if Sam treats us all so well
And feeds us milk and honey,
Please, daddy, tell me what the hell
He's going to use for money.

Don't worry, bub, there's not a hitch
In this here noble plan—
He simply soaks the filthy rich
And helps the common man.

But, father, won't there come a time
When they run out of cash
And we have left them not a dime
When things will go to smash?

My faith in you is shrinking, son,
You nosey little brat,
You do too damn much thinking, son,
To be a Democrat.

Government Within the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to hereby make available to the Members of Congress and the public at large an address of unusual merit on the Constitution of the United States.

The address was made by the Honorable Timothy F. Ryan, of Pittsburgh, Pa., at a luncheon meeting of the Pittsburgh Chapter Sons of American Revolution, Pittsburgh Chapter Daughters of American Revolution, and Lafayette Chapter Sons of American Revolution at the William Penn Hotel on Saturday, September 17, 1949, upon the occasion of the observance of Constitution Day.

GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION

Almost 175 years ago there rang throughout this land the stirring words of our Declaration of Independence which announced that a new nation had been conceived. The dark days from Concord and Lexington to Yorktown are known to each of you. Exactly 162 years ago this week the founding fathers formulated and adopted the plan whereby to govern that new nation. In glorious and unmistakable language they set forth this plan within the four corners of a great document which Prime Minister Gladstone termed "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man" and which is held in deepest reverence by all of us as the Constitution of the United States of America.

With utmost precision a broad highway is laid down therein to guide for all time the full course and career of the Republic then launched into the arteries of international traffic as a new vehicle of state. There was invented a Federal agency vested with specifically limited powers to propel this new political vehicle along the road plainly designed for it.

No departure whatsoever from that highway is envisioned by a single syllable in the Constitution. Rather in express metes and bounds the route is clearly limited by curbs and checks to continue straight and true without devious turns, crooked bypaths or tempting detours. On occasion and by proper amendment an old curb has been lifted out and a new one set in its place. However none such was intended or contemplated as a substitution for the main road or as permitting any departure therefrom.

Appearing in retrospect as daring supermen, those who labored so well, although of mortal clay, were fired nevertheless by the steadfast glow of patriotism. Reference to the preliminary debates and resulting compromises will suffice to demonstrate that the creative task was not undertaken frivolously and that final accomplishment was not achieved lightly. Each word was carefully weighed both alone and in context. There is nothing to suggest that these plain words are to be taken otherwise than in their clear meaning. Never should one iota thereof be taken as a matter of course. That type of careless acceptance is tragic to say the least.

Constitutional freedom is the chief heritage of our people, a gem so precious as to require the guard of our constant vigilance and lively concern. It is the principal target of enemies who seek to weaken or destroy this republic because freedom is the very bedrock of our spiritual greatness and our material prosperity. I use the word "freedom" in its generic sense as including all our personal, economic, social, and political freedoms—the right to vote, to worship, to work, to save, and to assemble—all these are part of a single whole. Each is an indispensable part and the destruction of one will lead inevitably to the disintegration of all.

The essence of our Constitution is that all power is in the people and fully retained by them to every extent not expressly delegated. The familiar result is a Federal entity with strictly limited powers and paramount authority solely within the area so prescribed. The States continue separate and distinct, each sovereign and supreme within its own field. Unvariable and inviolate is the fundamental theme that all powers not delegated are reserved to the people.

Through succeding generations that Constitution has led this country to a place at the very top among the galaxy of nations. Various tests of its stability have been met and overcome, the most serious being attempted secession by the Southern States when the answer was written in the blood of Civil War.

During more than a hundred years consistency of interpretation preserved our Constitution just as written. However, more recent trends produce an occasional tremor of apprehension. Direct assault, such as by communism, can be faced and repelled. Flanking attack by indirection which gives lip service at the altar of constitutional reverence is the real danger confronting us today.

Concededly that great document of human principles is sufficiently elastic to meet changing times. No difficulty was encountered in the transition from covered wagon and stage coach to the modern railroad and automobile. Constitutional processes kept pace with industrial expansion, population increase and urban growth. Nothing in our Constitution inhibits progress and advancement.

Hence when a course of public action has become so long and thoroughly established as to demonstrate its permanency as part of our way of life, there should be no question about adaptation of our Constitution to the definitely resulting situation. The atomic developments of tomorrow ultimately will come within the framework of our Constitution just as did the telegraph, the telephone, and the radio.

Our concern must ever be that the Federal Government continue to operate strictly within the limits of such powers as have been delegated to it. The Constitution is not to be tampered with nor should it become the subject of experimentation.

Of late, however, it would appear that in some instances the car of state may have gotten off the road. Out of constitutional control, it may be careening down uncharted paths leading to we know not where—a very juggernaut unless returned to the prescribed route with its directional curbs and checks. While the motive power is still of apparent or pretended constitutional form yet the fuel is extracted from strange ideological concepts and alien philosophies of government. Bad habits of constitutional thinking accept as sensible what are no more than the wildest phantasies.

Our people are being taught some rather odd and startling things, among others such as that all human effort must first be controlled and then subsidized and that government may use tax money to compete with private enterprise in proprietary function.

It is not my intention to engage in a controversy about definition of so-called liberalism and conservatism. My whole insistence is upon government within the Constitution. If these other things are wanted by the people let them be established by proper constitutional processes through amendment. As written, nothing in the Constitution permits stateism, collectivitism, or socialism. The Constitution makes no provision for regimentation of our freedoms. Nothing therein authorizes seizure of the powers of the States by purchase through bribes of direct and indirect money grants. The certain result of all thereof is eventual impairment of our Constitution.

Today it would appear that government is attempting fanciful journeys beyond the confines of constitutional limitation. This can bring tragedy and catastrophe as do so many joy rides. If complacency permits these wanderings from the designated road a new system, entirely beyond the limitations of the Constitution, may be fastened insidiously upon our people and this would mean the end of truly free government. It behooves us to become alerted against government by indirection and by encroachment upon powers reserved to the States and to the people.

Remedies there are but we must adopt and follow them energetically. Every activity must be halted which is designed to create division in the ranks of our people or to array class against class for the purpose of achieving political power. Operation without the Constitution must cease. The remedy still lies in peaceful though forceful action.

Our forbears acted to throw off a long train of despotic usurpation. The words of our Constitution provide guards against any repetition thereof. Today much less is demanded of us. Retention of our freedom demands constant vigilance and definite action. Let us now rededicate ourselves to the declared principle that powers not expressly delegated are still reserved to the people. Let us put a stop to attacks upon the Constitution by stealthy indirection. Let us work for restoration and continuance of that government within the Constitution which has sustained us for almost a century and three-quarters and which has brought about a nation of cultural progress and material wealth beyond all dreams of the founders. The challenge is squarely facing us to guard our constitutional freedoms.

My message is for concerted action and I know of no better address for delivery than to the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution. With its true word and spirit deeply engraved upon our hearts and minds,

let each of us determine to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America so that we and our children and our children's children may ever enjoy the blessings of constitutional freedom. Thank you.

Report of Visitation of the Four Bergius Hydrogenation Plants and the Six Fischer-Tropsch Plants in the Ruhr Area, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

REPORT OF VISITATION OF THE FOUR BERGIUS HYDROGENATION PLANTS AND THE SIX FISCHER-TROPSCH PLANTS IN THE RUHR AREA, GERMANY, SEPTEMBER 5-18, 1949

(By Paul H. Fall, president of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, since 1940; professor of chemistry at Hiram College, 1920-36; at Williams College, 1936-40; secretary of the division of chemical education of the American Chemical Society since 1939)

ORIGIN OF MISSION

In response to a cablegram received the latter part of July, sent in the name of officials of the Catholic and Protestant Churches of Westphalia and officials of industry and miners union and chemical trade-union, I went to the Ruhr area to study conditions pertaining to the dismantling of three Bergius hydrogenation plants and six Fischer-Tropsch plants in western Germany.

OBJECTIVE AND INDEPENDENT STUDY

On this mission I went as a private citizen, not as the representative of any industry or governmental bureau. My study was entirely objective with no motive other than to try to discover the facts and then base my convictions on these, coupled with an earnest desire to do all in my power to prohibit another war and to foster peace on earth and good will among men.

PERSONAL CONVICTIONS

Based on observations made by visiting all four Bergius hydrogenation plants and the six Fischer-Tropsch plants in western Germany; reading official reports and talking with various people—Germans, Americans, French, and English—it is my considered judgment that it is a grave mistake for the Allied governments to insist that these Bergius and Fischer-Tropsch plants be dismantled.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF THE CONVICTION THAT THESE PLANTS SHOULD NOT BE DISMANTLED

For at least four reasons, which are discussed more fully in the unabridged report, I am opposed to dismantling these peaceful industries. These reasons are:

1. These plants are not in reality war potential: With the controls which the Allied Powers now exercise (prohibition of manufacture of any airplanes—with not even gliders allowed, and control of all crude oil purchases) these plants cannot be considered as war potential no matter how large a quantity of oil they are potentially capable of producing.

2. Dismantling is economically wasteful. The people who will pay the bill for this colossal waste are not the English, nor the French, nor the Germans, but the American taxpayers.

3. To dismantle these plants (as well as other peaceful industries) will greatly retard, if not entirely prevent economic recovery in Germany. This is almost axiomatic—one cannot remove essential industries from a highly congested industrial area such as the Ruhr without destroying the opportunity for the group (and the country as a whole) to become self-supporting.

4. To dismantle these plants is exceedingly bad psychology, and especially so when the Western Powers are attempting to demonstrate the blessings of democracy and thus decrease the effectiveness of Communist propaganda.

Dismantling of peaceful industries fosters distrust and disloyalty when we should be fostering international friendship and good will.

One phase is particularly bad psychology. With the consent and approval of the Allied Powers the Germans spent 4½,000,000 Deutsche marks reconstructing four of these plants. Some had operated a year, one only a month, one was not yet in operation when the Washington agreement included them on the list to be dismantled. Such action cannot help but foster discouragement, distrust, and disloyalty, because it is so unjust.

CONCLUSION

On page 1 of the pamphlet European Recovery Program—Western Germany Country Study, by Economic Cooperation Administration, February 1949, Washington, D. C., is this statement:

"The economic recovery of western Germany is necessary to enable it to become economically self-supporting and to avoid the political dangers which might well resolve from economic distress."

We may well ask, How will this be possible if we remove from Germany or destroy her peaceful industries?

Near the entrance to the Rheinpreusser plant, painted in large letters and in German was this quotation from Colonel Smith, legal adviser of General Clay:

"Everyone who participates in the dismantling of a peaceful industry commits a crime against humanity."

OCTOBER 17, 1949.

Lithuanian American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that Americans of Lithuanian descent representing about 1,000,000 Lithuanian Americans will assemble a congress in New York City early in November.

This gathering under the sponsorship of the Lithuanian American Congress comprised of representative Americans from all parts of the country will, it is expected, give expression to the aspirations and views of this particular group with respect to various current foreign and domestic problems.

Like all true Americans, members of this group, which has served the Nation unselfishly in war and peace, are vitally interested in all measures affecting the cause of freedom throughout the world and the perpetuation of democratic ideals. They will be concerned with the great problem, which is of such deep concern to every liberty-loving American, of the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other peoples whose individual rights and civil liberties have been suppressed. They will strive for, as they have in the past, and as every real American should, the release of the Lithuanian people and other peoples similarly situated from political bondage and economic slavery. They will urge the reestablishment and fresh recognition of the principle of self-determination and the right of each nation desiring to be free to secure the blessings that flow from a government of their own choice. They will plead for liberation from oppression, for helpless small nations, and for millions of afflicted people suffering under the lash of tyranny and dictatorship. Every American and every Member of Congress must be deeply moved by their pleas and their aspirations in behalf of the cause of liberty and justice for the downtrodden and the oppressed of the world.

Moreover, it is my understanding that this Congress will also consider the ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States, problems of displaced persons, particularly as they relate to present inadequate immigration quotas of the Baltic countries and fair proportionate distribution of eligibles for admission to the United States under the displaced-persons program.

In addition, it is believed that this Congress will deal with, declare upon, and urge the strengthening of the United Nations, the effectuation of a strong, vigorous, unyielding foreign policy which will seek to revise and eradicate the errors and maladjustments imposed upon freedom-loving peoples by the agreements arrived at in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam—agreements never ratified by the United States Senate, and yet which have been responsible for the extinguishment of the lamps of liberty in so many small nations.

I can heartily subscribe to the objectives of this conference and want to assure the Lithuanian people who are second to none among our very best American citizens that I wholeheartedly approve of their aims to combat oppression and dictatorship and to secure freedom and democracy for the gallant people from whom they have sprung as well as other peoples who are presently suffering under the yoke of cruel oppression.

Our own great Government, born of sacrifice and bloodshed in the name of liberty, is under a direct obligation to furnish the leadership for reestablishing the freedom and self-determination of these oppressed nations and their heroic people. I hope the day will soon come, when through our appropriate intercessions and great influence in international affairs, we may be able to blaze the way for the liberation of all oppressed nations and the reinstitution of freedom and democracy.

Indirect Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a radio speech made by me over Stations WHP, Harrisburg, and WLRB, Lebanon, on October 2, 1949. This points up, in a small way, the numerous tax burdens of all kinds now borne by the American people. With the steadily increasing spending of the Federal Government, the future looks bleak. Clearly, the present deficit spending will have to be paid for by higher taxes in the future. My radio speech was limited to 13½ minutes. You can only mention a tiny fraction of the taxes in such a short period of time. It would take closer to 13½ weeks rather than 13½ minutes to list the innumerable taxes paid by every American citizen today.

The address follows:

INDIRECT TAXES

In watching the Government's spending spree, the average American has difficulty in understanding that this is not some mere abstraction like the moon, but is in fact paid directly by him. It is hard for him to realize that he is the one actually paying the bill. The Government does not have one penny of money of its own. All it has or can ever have is what it takes from the citizens in the form of tax levies. And every President down to and including Franklin D. Roosevelt has pointed this out time and time again.

Many of those who do not have a large income think that these moneys come solely from direct taxes levied on the rich. However, few are exempt from the direct income tax today. But everyone pays the indirect taxes because all of them directly affect the price of everything he buys. If this is called to his attention, he is apt to be far more worried about the existing spending orgy in Washington.

Furthermore, expenditures are again exceeding Government income by a wide margin. That can only mean far higher taxes in the future if this trend is not reversed. And the only large future source of revenue lies in tapping the pocketbook, wages, and salaries of the lower middle group and the lower income group, because the higher and higher middle income group are taxed so heavily now that no large sums can be taken from them. These groups are relatively few in number. While the others are thirty or forty millions in number. They are the ones who will bear the brunt of the present spending. To illustrate what I mean: Betty Grable is one of our popular movie actresses. Her income last year was the highest of any actress in her field. It was about $230,000. That sounds like a lot of money, and it is a lot of money. But when Miss Grable paid her taxes, she had a little over $33,000 to keep for herself. Now, $33,000 is a lot of money for one person. But it's penny ante for our Government, which is now spending at the rate of $47,000,000,000 per year and which wants to spend at the rate of $62,000,000,000 per year or more. Only a handful of people earn as much as Miss Grable. Why, even if all of her remaining $33,000 was taken by the Government and all similar sums from all people of like earning capacity, it would only raise a few million dollars—not billions, only millions. To those who think that American free enterprise and individual initiative is outdated and would like to substitute some other form of government, the surest and simplest way to do that is to raise income taxes to the point where there is no income. Then all incentive is removed. Where incentive is removed the Government invariably resorts to compulsion and coercion. Witness the example of England. So the impact of future heavier taxes which must follow present excessive spending, as the night follows the day, must fall on the little fellow. So he is the one who should be concerned about it.

I would like to give you some information based largely on statistics compiled by the Tax Foundation, generally regarded as a careful and reliable nonpartisan publication. I am sure you will be as amazed as I was to find how much of your money was being taken from you without you being aware of it.

According to this information there are about 150 taxes paid on every woman's hat between the hat shop and the ribbon-fabric mill. The ribbon maker pays a Federal corporation income tax, a Federal stamp tax on his security transfers and issues, a Federal telephone tax of 15 percent on local service and 25 percent on long-distance calls and telegrams, a Federal transportation tax of 3 percent to get his goods hauled, a Federal tax of 20 percent on his lease of a safety-deposit box, and the 1 percent social-security tax for his employees—or eight Federal taxes by the ribbon maker alone.

The trucker who hauled the ribbon from the mill to the jobber paid Federal corporation, telephone, social-security, and safety-deposit taxes.

The jobber who sold the ribbon to the hat manufacturer paid the same taxes as the trucker and, in addition, a 3 percent Federal transportation tax.

Now we come to the manufacturer of other accessory articles, such as flowers. He paid six Federal taxes. The manufacturer of veiling paid eight. So did the straw importer.

The hat manufacturer himself paid seven, including the 15 percent rail- and air-transportation tax for his salesmen.

The trucking firm which hauled the hat from the manufacturer to the jobber paid four Federal taxes, and the hat jobber who sold the hat to the retailer paid five. The express company which hauled the hat from the jobber to the hat shop paid five Federal taxes, and the retailer paid five.

This makes 65 separate taxes paid to the Federal Government, all of which had to be added to the cost of manufacture.

Now, of course, we also come to the State and local taxes. Here, the researchers found 43 State and 41 local taxes. In a typical trip between a New Jersey ribbon mill and a Connecticut hat shop, "The State taxes included the Connecticut sales and business gross income taxes, the New York franchise and gross earnings taxes on railway express, and the trucking firm which hauled the hat from the manufacturer to the jobber, as well as such commonly recognized taxes as gasoline, motor vehicle registration fees, licensing and inspection fees, unemployment compensation, etc."

The 41 local taxes included property taxes, license and inspection fees, and in New York City, an occupancy tax, and sales taxes on electricity, telephone, and telegraph service.

For every pack of cigarettes sold, there is 11½ cents in tax. The United States gets 7 cents per pack, the State taxes average 3½ cents per pack. On top of these direct taxes come indirect taxes of about 1 cent a pack, which are also passed on to the consumer. In some States these cigarette levies are even higher. Louisiana has an 8-cent per pack tax.

The report also estimates that there is a tax of about $450 on the average automobile in the low-price bracket. James D. Mooney, retiring president of Willys-Overland, makes the following estimates. On a moderate priced car, there is a Federal excise tax of about $90 or more, together with State and city sales taxes that usually run about 3 percent of the tax, plus license plates and registration fees. There are also the income and withholding taxes paid by the men who make and sell the vehicle, as well as the corporation taxes, the property taxes, the transportation taxes, etc. Stated Mr. Mooney: "In the end, all taxes must come out of the pocket of the consumer. When the Government slaps a heavy tax on the corporation, it is really taxing the man who buys the corporation's product. This is because of the simple economic fact of life that all costs that enter into the manufacture of a product must be covered by its selling price."

Granting that the dealer's commission of approximately 23 to 25 percent would be paid from the smaller manufacturing figure which would result after these hidden taxes have been eliminated, the price to the customer presumably could be around $1,200 for the same car (for which he has just paid $1,800) if taxes were not present.

The same study indicates that there are at least 100 taxes involved in the process of producing an egg and the final sale at the grocery.

The grocer pays 14 Federal, State, and local taxes. The trucker pays about 20 taxes. The egg wholesaler about 17 taxes. The poultry farmer who brought the eggs to the big city wholesale center, paid at least 10 Federal, State, and local taxes. The feed store who sold the farmer his poultry feed paid another 14 taxes. The railroad that brought the feed from a processing company paid another 11 taxes. The milling corporation paid still another 14 taxes—100 taxes in all in the start-to-finish process of producing an egg.

The same study also indicates that motoring vacationers pay over $212,000,000 in taxes just for the gasoline used on their trips. The American Automobile Association estimates that the average vacationer drives 2,500 miles, averaging 15 miles to the gallon. He buys 166 gallons of gasoline and pays a national average tax of 6.4 cents per gallon (or about 25 percent of the price of the gasoline), or $10.62 collected by both State and Federal Governments.

The motorist also pays a Federal tax of 1½ cents on every quart of oil he uses. He pays a hidden Federal manufacturer's excise tax of $1.47 on each new tire. On all new windshield wipers, spark plugs, or other parts he pays a manufacturer's excise tax of 5 percent, which is covered in the price charges. If he takes pictures, he pays a Federal excise tax of 15 percent, which is added to the price of the film he uses. Ten percent is added in Federal Government tax levies on a new tennis racket, or a new golf club; and 11 percent for any cartridges he uses.

The vacationer who uses the common carriers, going by rail or air, pays a Federal tax of 15 percent. The Federal tax on a first-class rail passenger ticket, including lower berth, from New York to Los Angeles, amounts to $39.66, which logically could be considered by the payer as his contribution to the current Government's extravagance.

Jap Naval Base Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in Doris Fleeson's column in the

October 10 issue of the Washington Evening Star, my colleagues might be interested in the following reference to the fortification of Guam. It states:

ADMITS SOME ERRORS

Admiral Decker doesn't claim he's always been right. About Guam, for instance—"I was a damn fool, like everybody else. I screamed when we didn't fortify it. Well, we would have been doing it for the Japs' benefit."

As he sees the island situation, all that's needed is to retain title so we can move back in at will, keep a major on them with plenty of cigarettes to give a couple of men whose job would be to run up the American flag in the morning and take it down at night. Then we've got them when we want them but no money wasted on maintenance that doesn't maintain in tropical climates, anyway.

Just think of all the propaganda and political utterances that were broadcast in connection with the fortification of Guam. Truth will out.

Spirit of Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, October 18, 1949:

TOWARD TEAMWORK?

Unification so far looks more like fission. Splitting the armed forces into three instead of two services didn't increase unity. It facilitated decisions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it also destroyed the balance between Army and Navy and resulted in repeated 2-to-1 decisions. The resultant divisions and suspicions have been vividly portrayed in the hearings before the House Armed Services Committee.

The story told by admiral after admiral for the Navy was persuasively stated for the Marine Corps by its respected commandant, General Cates. It described a whittling process which the Navy is convinced is intended gradually to abolish the Marines and naval aviation.

Judgment should not be pronounced on the basis of testimony heard so far.

Secretary of Defense Johnson will also have something to say in support of his recent decisions when he comes to the stand. He will have to defend himself particularly against Chairman Vinson's charge that he made a "grandstand play" in cutting the defense budget far below the levels set by Congress. The public has been inclined to welcome cuts in expenses. But it wants to know whether waste has been eliminated or essential services. Moreover, considerable uneasiness has been caused by his reported political ambitions and the impression of arbitrary action.

The big question in the public mind is, How can teamwork be obtained? The American people should not give up on unification simply because it has not succeeded as expected. But perhaps before these hearings are over they will have obtained clearer concepts of what unification entails and how to get it. Many thoughtful people question whether complete merger of the Services is today desirable. Certainly it cannot be achieved by passing a law.

Drastic measures will be required to restore harmony and morale in the armed services. Secretary Matthews has apparently forfeited the confidence of his own department. Secretary Johnson has aroused deep distrust not only in the Navy but in Chairman Vinson and other Congressmen. Possibly some fears can be removed if Congress clearly limits his powers to reduce the Navy and Marines. Some of the questions about the B–36 should be answerable by unbiased tests.

It should be possible for such matters to be handled by the weapons evaluation board. The big problem of two-to-one decisions in the Joint Chiefs of Staff remains. Possibly one remedy will be to bring more civilian judgment to bear in the larger decisions. Help also can be found in greater interchange of officers among the Services. For much less depends on laws and the machinery of unification than on a spirit of teamwork. General Cates put it eloquently when he asked for "a simple show of loyalty and good will in complying with the spirit of the law we have."

World Organization for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement I made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the hearing on House Concurrent Resolution 64:

I was one of the 84 Members of the Eightieth Congress who, in the second session of the Congress, sponsored a resolution similar to House Concurrent Resolution 64 upon which hearings are today being held. I think the fact that the number of sponsors of the resolution has increased to 104 is significant.

Moreover, recent world events have made it crystal clear that something of the kind as provided in House Concurrent Resolution 64 is absolutely necessary if civilization is to be preserved. It seems perfectly obvious to me that either the Government of the United States and the Soviet Union must go forward with an intensified armament race, which will undoubtedly culminate in war, or the United Nations must be strengthened so as to convert it into a world federation with clear-cut but limited powers and authority to preserve the peace of the world. I am firmly convinced that eventually our international differences and difficulties will be settled in international courts as our personal differences and problems are settled in our State and national courts.

I call especial attention to the proposal and I quote from the original House resolution on the subject introduced a year ago: "A federation of universal membership with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

I do not advocate the surrender o. American sovereignty to any sort of world organization, except upon the very limited and clearly defined provisions which would give such international organizations the power to preserve the peace of the world.

Of course, I realize fully that such an organization cannot be completely successful until Russia can be brought to see the futility and folly of war. In the meantime we must remain strong in a military sense and sound economically, and firm with our dealings with Russia and other would-be aggressors.

We cannot appease Russia, but we can let her understand that the door for agreement on international disputes is always open.

I am constrained to believe that the possession of the bomb by Russia may take away a certain feeling of inferiority and frustration that must have been present in the minds of the Russian rulers so long as they did not have the secret of the bomb.

It seems to me that this is the hour to strike a telling blow on behalf of world peace and stability by the promotion of the idea of a world organization for the preservation of peace.

I am, therefore, happy to appear before your committee as one of the sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64.

In conclusion I thank the distinguished chairman and the members of the committee for their courtesy in permitting the sponsors to appear before you today.

Appraising the Opposition to United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following speech by Mr. Stanley A. Weigel which, I think, deserves the consideration of the Members of Congress and the people of the Nation:

APPRAISING THE OPPOSITION TO UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

(By Stanley A. Weigel, chairman, northern California division, United World Federalists, Santa Barbara, Calif., October 8, 1949)

We of United World Federalists have come to the point, I believe, where we can, with profit, pause in the advocacy of our cause to appraise the opposition to it. By doing so, we can reassess the merit of that cause and our effectiveness in championing it.

The first step in measuring our opposition requires an exact understanding of what we are for and what they are against. While it may be unnecessary, even presumptuous, to define our beliefs to a group of our own members, I think it vital that we all have clearly in mind the exact essence of what we champion. I know of no better brief statement than the 12 words on the letterhead of our national office. Those 12 words show we are, and I quote:

"For world federal government with powers limited but adequate to assure peace."

That statement is but an effective condensation of our official statement of beliefs that:

We believe that peace is not merely the absence of war, but the presence of justice, of law, of order—in short, of government, and the institutions of government; that world peace can be created and maintained only under a world federal government, universal and strong enough to prevent armed conflict between nations, and having direct jurisdiction over the individual in those matters within its authority.

Before discussing the character of our opposition and making some attempt to clarify it, let us note that what we are for is

frankly general. We offer no detailed plans and specifications for world government. We are not that arrogant because we know that the detailed structure of limited world government cannot be the product of any single group or, for that matter, of any single nation.

So we advocate basic and essential principles and not a take-it-or-leave-it application of those principles. We are, then, as American citizens, dedicated to no more than convincing others of the soundness of the principles for which we stand.

Knowing what we are for and what our opponents are against—who are our opponents and for what reasons are they against our principles? It seems to me that both our opponents and their reasons can rather readily be classified in five groups.

First, there are those who oppose yielding even the minimal amount of national sovereignty necessary for the accomplishment of limited world government. They range from the isolationists, at one extreme, to the imperialists at the other. In the middle are a good many who believe that our only safe course is to maintain military supremacy. A generic and a fair name for all of them is nationalist.

Second, there are those who predict that Russia will never join a world government and that a world government without Russia is a contradiction in terms.

Third, there are certain ax-grinders, men of ill will, evil purpose, and obscure motives, mysteriously vociferous of late, who would, if they could, discredit us with smear labels.

Fourth, there are those who accuse us of being too general and demand of us a detailed blueprint.

Fifth and finally, there are those who consider us and our purposes as visionary and impractical.

These classifications are not exhaustive.

You will observe that I do not include the adherents of the American Association for the United Nations nor of the Union Now group. Our differences with these groups are differences of degree only—really, of time only. We believe in the United Nations, but want to strengthen it faster than our friends of the AAUN. The champions of the Union Now idea want to start world government with a few select nations. Because both of these groups have limited world government as their ultimate objective, the logic of events—recent events especially—can be counted upon to bring them soon to our point of view on the matter of time. By saying this, I do not mean to imply that we have no basic differences with the philosophy and wisdom of the Union Now approach to limited world government.

To the extent that the five classifications I have made are accurate, they are somewhat arbitrary, in that there are many who oppose us on more than one ground. I think you will agree with me, however, that the grouping does show the different emphasis of the attacks of the different groups and individuals who oppose us. Let's have a good look at them and their objects, one by one.

Of the nationalist group, the isolationists and the imperialists are almost beyond the pale of salvation.

The isolationist, in their thinking and their arguments are of the era of the bow and arrow, the outrigger canoe, and the smoke signal. Since they have yet to advance to the era of the 16-inch cannon, the 30 knot steamship, and the wireless telegraph, I submit that it is pretty much a waste of time to try to convince them of the reality that they now live in the world of the atom bomb, the supersonic jet plane, and radar.

The imperialists, who include the preventive war advocates, are in rather serious trouble. The President's announcement of September 23 covering the atomic explosion in Russia indicates, to put it mildly, that effective opposition to American imperialism is by no means limited to the great majority of Americans who want none of it.

The nationalists who believe that our best course is to maintain indomitable supremacy in the arms race now going on are inescapably impaled upon the horns of a fearsome dilemma. In all of recorded history there has never been an arms race which has ended in anything but war, so their choice ultimately becomes one between a defensive war waged for survival and an aggressive war waged for the same purpose.

No American who really believes in democracy and who thinks it through will want what is offered by any of the nationalist groups, because, whatever the stamp of their nationalism, the path they would have us take is inevitably into world war III. Even if world war III does not mean the end of the world, it does mean the end of free institutions during the regimentation which must inevitably accompany preparation for it, the waging of it and its aftermath.

There is no new answer to give those who object on the ground that Russia will never join a world government. We are not in a position to deny their prophecy, nor are we in a position even to deny that there is evidence to support their prophecy.

There are, however, two pertinent facts which should be noted. The first is that they are prophesying. It is dangerous, is it not, to decide clear and present issues on the basis of clairvoyance? The second pertinent fact is that there are only two basic possibilities. Either Russia will not join a world government or Russia will. Let us analyze these possibilities.

Preliminarily, we must all recognize that no meaningful answer can come from Russia unless and until the question is effectively put. And the United States cannot put the question effectively until we ourselves have answered it for ourselves. "There is the devil within as well as the devil without." So our work is in the interest of making sure that the people of our country are prepared to have Russia asked—by our Government or any other—an effective and real question, not merely a hypothetical one.

If Russia says "Yes" to that real question—and it must be assumed that the question presupposes a world government effectively safeguarding our legitimate interests as well as Russia's—the problem is solved, subject only to a qualification I shall later make. If Russia answers "No"—which we have no right whatever to assume until we have answered the question for ourselves and then put it to Russia—then the issue will be crystal clear.

It will be the issue of world government or world anarchy. And the alinement will be crystal clear. It will be Russia and her satellites for anarchy, standing against the rest of the nations of the world, who await only our leadership to join the side of world government.

That alinement in itself would be the most effective possible deterrent, short of true world government, against World War III. And I think, too, that it would allow not only plenty of time, but rather compelling reason for Russia to reconsider her negative answer as time went on. The men now in the Kremlin may not forever rule Russia.

Even assuming the worst—that world war III would one day come after such an alinement on such an issue—will it not be much better, if we have to pay that fearful price and make that fearful fight, to pay it and make it in the cause of once and for all substituting world government—justice, law, and order—for mass murder as a means of settling international disputes?

This brings to mind the qualification to the comment that Russia's joining the world government would solve the problem of world peace. While history teaches that federation is the best possible means of containing human conflicts within the forum of law and justice, history teaches also, in our own Civil War, for example, that federation is no absolute and iron-clad guaranty. So suppose Russia joins, or for that matter any other nation, and then is false to the promise and the principle of federation. At the very least, we have gained world acknowledgment of the moral principle and if the promise should be broken, the onus will be upon the breaker. The issue then, too, will be clear and there will be some point in fighting to preserve the principle of peace—the principle of world government. On this phase of the question, we should not overlook the fact that the capacity of any nation to break the federation, even if it so willed, will be greatly reduced by the rigid inspection and other safeguards necessary to a world government limited but adequate to assure peace.

As to the ax grinders, those men of ill will, evil purpose and obscure motives, mysteriously vociferous of late, who would, if they could, discredit us with smear labels—we must hold them in nothing but contempt. And we must be careful not to dignify them with notice beyond nailing their lies. Frustrated individuals, inordinate egotists, stifled souls, venomously twisted, they are in a sense the spawn of a complex civilization beyond their comprehension. They will, in the end, attract none to themselves but their own kind. They can be cured neither by facts, logic, nor reason. Psychiatrists might help. And the more lawless of them must one day be brought to account before the bar of American justice.

Turning now to those who demand the blueprints, the organizational charts, and the detailed definitions and delineations. They have no real quarrel with us and we have none with them. The problem here is one of—and I dislike using the over-used term—semantics. The trouble is that they do not understand our purpose. Our task in bringing them into the good fight with us is one of clear communication.

We must make them appreciate that we fully realize that the ultimate accomplishment of world government does require a definitive constitution and organization documents, as well as organizational charts and blueprints. We must convince them, too, that we neither want to buy nor to sell a pig-in-a-poke or a grab-bag world government. We must make it clear to them that we are as much interested as are they in preserving the United States, its institutions, its ideals, and its essence.

They assume that we offer them a world government, tailor-made and finished. We do no such thing. We are not so immodest. What we say and urge is that there can be no effective plan for a world government with powers limited but adequate to assure peace until the minds of free men and women are imbued with the desire for it. We believe only that our United States—the moral, cultural, and physical leader of the nations of the world—should officially and actively orient its foreign policy toward the achievement of such a world government. That requisite first step cannot be taken until the men and women of the United States make known to their public servants that they want such a world government.

When our Congressmen, our Senators, and our President realize that a majority of Americans want such a world government, then and only then can our national administration securely and effectively so orient American foreign policy.

And what will follow such an orientation? The imposition, willy-nilly, upon the United States of a distasteful supergovernment? Of course not. The only thing which can follow, under our American Constitution, and the only thing we want to have follow, is the dedication of the talents of our Government to bringing back to us, the people, subject to our approval, a detailed plan for such a world government which we—all the American people—can examine, debate, consider, and finally put to the supreme test of the American ballot box.

So we must let those who demand details know that we have no quarrel with them and that we recognize that their demand for details—indeed, our own—must be satisfied in good time. If they understand, they will agree that the desire and will must precede the accomplishment. The articulate desire and the effective will to create a United States of America had to precede the calling of the convention at Philadelphia and the making there of the Constitution of the United States.

I have saved for the last the best and, paradoxically enough, the worst of our opposition—those who call us visionary and impractical.

For some reason or other, the man who says of a new invention or of the proposed application of old principles to a new situation, the man who says "it won't work" is the most disheartening and the one who most readily evokes some sympathetic chorus. It is not quite enough to answer that such men said the same thing about the Sermon on the Mount, about the proposal of Columbus to prove that the world was round, about the Constitution of the United States of America, and about every significant proposal there has ever been for forward movement in every field of human endeavor—law, medicine, the sciences generally and, especially, political science.

But in the case of convincing such men of the need for world government and the feasibility of its accomplishment, we have to meet something deeper than the gloomy prophecy "it won't work." As applied to what we are seeking, "it won't work" has in it the ingredient of the cry of resignation "there'll always be war—you can't change human nature."

We have, it seems to me, a means of meeting this combination of skepticism and pessimism—especially in those individuals in whom it has not reached neurotic proportions. It is simple and lies in making articulate the great majority of men and women who believe with us that mankind is capable of progress; that human beings are essentially good, not bad; and, in the immortal words of a vice president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Robert J. Bishop:

"That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations * * * that if the nations of the world continue down the road of nationalism, each jealously guarding the ultimate bit of its so-called sovereignty, they will one day be very rudely shocked into recognition of the higher 'sovereignty' of the power of the atom."

There we have perhaps the best answer. I think we have another good answer to the "it won't workers"—one they cannot deny—the atom bomb does work.

Surely the genius which produced that means of world destruction is equal to the task of producing a means of channeling the power of the atom to the service of man in an orderly world, a world which can be achieved only through world government with powers limited but adequate to assure peace.

It is on these grounds and along these lines that we must continue the fight for ourselves, our children, our fellow Americans and all humanity.

The Road to Statism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am including a radio address made over Station WHP in Harrisburg and Station WLRB in Lebanon on September 18, 1949. This calls attention to some of the basic problems facing us here in America today. I have been delighted at the reception given this particular talk by my constituents and the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, comprising Dauphin and Lebanon Counties. They realize the issues are real and not imaginary.

THE ROAD TO STATISM

I prefer the word "statism" or "totalitarianism" to "socialism." It is more accurate. The accepted definition of "socialism" is a classless, fully democratic society with a strong international flavor. Those are good objectives. And I am all for them. But ever since our Nation was formed—and today under our republican form of government—we've come the closest to that type of society—to that utopia—here in the United States of any place on earth. When socialism takes over the control or ownership of the means of production and of the distribution of the products created by men and tools, then and forever thereafter socialism frankly admits its plan to use the state to suppress and quell all opposition to its goal. By the time the mask is off, freedom has gone. That is where it differs from democracy. That is why, in the last analysis, it is just the same as communism. Once either is adopted, the result on your life and mine is the same—state control over the lives of everyone at the whim of officials responsible to no one and with no one able effectively to challenge their power. The only difference is in the way in which the two seek to win. The Socialists advocate peaceful means to gain the government; the Communists frankly advocate violence and revolution to overthrow it.

By three main roads, the United States is rapidly slipping toward statism. First, there is a real danger of one-party government. Being a Republican, I do not like to admit this; yet it is true. Sixteen years of unbroken successes in national elections have given the Democratic Party overwhelming power, influence, and organization with a Government pay roll in excess of 2,100,000 employees, and steadily growing. They have countless millions to spend on propaganda of one kind or another to further their aims and interests. Information services—so-called—are easy to slant. Many Republicans tend to go along with this True Deal philosophy in whole or in part, differing merely in degree rather than in principle—"me tooism."

We are living on our fat—on what we have accumulated by the toil, saving, and work of the past generations. Our condition today compares with that of England in the 1930's. There is a good chance for those of us over 50. We may coast along, keep a good standard of living, and continue to live our full lives on this backlog before any serious crisis occurs. It is a mighty serious matter for the younger generation—even more so for their children. No one has more at stake in reviving the Republican Party and preventing the growth of one-party rule—the ya and nein of a prewar Hitler election—than do the young men and young women of America. If they don't do something about it—and quick—they will have to work and pay dearly for our folly.

Now, here is the second road: We have reached the point where about 30 percent of our annual income is taken in taxes. Economists and students of history all claim that no free enterprise system can ever survive if the Government takes over 35 percent of the national income from those who do the work. In July, our Government was spending at the rate of $46,400,000,000 per year. Present Government plans, if carried out, can put this figure up to $60,000,000,000 for this fiscal year, the one ending June 30, 1950. Today more than $16,000,000,000 in new and additional contract authorizations have been either finally approved or have passed one or the other of the two Houses, or else have been favorably reported by a committee of either the House or Senate. In addition to all this, State and local taxes take an annual toll of $22,000,000,000 more. So, to date, the total tax burden of the United States is the staggering figure of $68,600,000,000, with a much too good prospect of its rising to $82,000,000,000 within the next 12 months. Put another way, $1 out of every $4 you earn is taken by the Government. You can see where this will soon be $1 out of every $3.50; and not long thereafter, $1 out of every $3. When the Government takes most of your money and spends it for you, instead of letting you spend it yourself, that is statism. You cannot thereafter oppose the Government, no matter how arbitrary or unjust its actions may be, because you are dependent upon it for your bread and butter.

Throughout the world, a strong drift toward centralized power has been in progress for years. It has gone far already. It is steadily growing faster. In my judgment, this drift will keep on faster and faster, no matter what we do, because the basic causes are the great impersonal forces operating in our society and our economy—modern inventions, modern business methods and techniques, and the impact of the world outside. I am not assessing blame. I am trying to tell you with complete truth what's happening.

For example—and it is a striking one—the Federal Government today has full ownership of atomic energy—research, production, distribution, and control of raw materials, even a complete censorship of news over what goes on in the laboratories. Scientists agree that atomic energy is the great source of future power. Hiroshima and Nagasaki bear witness to this. Coal, oil, and electricity will be replaced by it in the course of time. Therefore, the Government now holds full ownership of the energy and power of the future. Government agents will decide who can have it and on what terms. Individuals and businesses who cannot obtain a license from the Government will not be able to operate at all.

This had to be done. There was no alternative. By its nature, atomic energy must be under Government control. No one has paid much attention to this, because it affected no vested interests, and because there was no political discussion about it. But, remember: First, the Government has it; secondly, there was no other choice.

The Government already has huge interests in the field of power through the manufacture and distribution of electricity generated by water. Why? The Constitution vested control over navigation and flood control in the Central Government. They are recognized Federal functions. Dams were the best known method to improve navigation and help flood control. The mechanically minded engineers learned how to build huge ones. When dams are erected, hydroelectric power is a natural byproduct. Since the Government was building the dams for

recognized Federal functions, it was almost inevitable to have the Government use the byproduct and sell it for the benefit of the general public. You can well regard this as inevitable also.

Since so many of these things could not be avoided, it is all the more important to keep the Government out of those areas where individuals or local units can do the job. There is this drift. So we must do our best to hold it in check, rather than to hasten it by plunging our Government into the field of house construction and the 101 other new and unnecessary activities now being urged. Incidentally, all of these cost huge sums and mean more taxes. All remove tangible property from the tax rolls, thereby making it inevitable that the Government will take more and more of your daily wage in taxes. Not only is the annual cost of Government pyramided sky high, but the amount of taxable property is steadily decreasing. Personal incomes will finally be the only thing left to tax. In other words it will all come out of your pay check.

There is nothing morally or inherently wrong in having the Government in business. The danger comes when all economic power is combined in one place with the political power. As long as the economic power is dispersed, men and groups of men in combination can effectively oppose arbitrary action by the Government. If the Government secures complete control over the everyday lives of the individual citizens; if the Government can decide who is to have what, when, and how much; if it is the sole employer and therefore can decide who is to have a job and who is to be blacklisted with no place to go, the means and will for effective opposition no longer exist in the people. When the union of the two elements—political and economic—becomes complete or even overwhelming, then you have the same kind of statism you had in Hitler's Germany and which you now have in Russia, by whatever name you choose to call it.

Power corrupts. The founders of our Government knew that. That's why they set up a system whereby they tried to make sure that power would be spread out widely. Church was separated from state; the economic power from the political power; the State powers from the Federal power; even the three branches of the Federal Government (the legislative, judicial, and executive) were each given certain powers and certain powers denied to them. Those checks and balances have protected us for over 160 years. Let us not give them away now. They were put there for a purpose. They have accomplished that purpose so far. They are still needed to protect that same purpose.

Some people say to me: "Why don't you mention the dangers from too much economic power in the hands of too few individuals?" I not only mention this, I emphasize it. This is the main reason why we have a strong demand for Government ownership and control. We are all too familiar with the evils of great concentrations of economic power in the hands of individuals and big corporations. But the Government has always been able to step in at some point and stop those abuses. When big business got bad, the Government could order it to stop. The same was true in the case of big labor. But if you turn over all these many separate big business units (and there are many of them even though they are big) and, in addition, big labor into the hands of big Government, then who is going to police the policemen? Who is going to protect the consumer? Who will guard the rights of the man in the street? The answer is, there is no one left to do it. What is going to happen to little business when the Government operates all big business? After the Government becomes the sole owner and the sole distributor, then the price of the product is inevitably fixed to produce revenue. Competition no longer determines price. The Government fixes prices. The tendency is to use price as a means of levying taxes. The Kings of France did this for centuries when they had a monopoly on the sale of salt in France. Indeed, they even forced the French citizens to buy salt whether they wanted salt or not.

It is sad, but all too true, that we have too much concentration of economic power and too many partial monopolies in our economy today. We see the evils resulting from too great power getting into too few hands. But wouldn't it be a weird and strange remedy to try to cure this disease by vesting all this power in one set of hands? And that set of hands the ones in which the political power is already centered? Really, that's like curing heart disease by giving the patient 20 grains of strychnine.

Too great collectivism will not reform man's lust for power. It will increase it. To unite economic power with political power in our present state of civilization, until human nature improves, would only be the transfer of power from one class to another. At the same time you would give this new class or group the arsenal of modern science to use in making and keeping their authority supreme. We have the example of Hitler in Germany and the Communist Party in Russia. Hitler took control in Germany by vote of the people's representatives duly elected. Most free governments have eventually died by vote of the people. So watch and study trends in Government and do not let it happen here.

Until we can end human selfishness through love and Christianity, let us harness it. By using incentives let us cause this innate selfishness, these natural human desires, to be channeled into directions and paths helpful to the general benefit and welfare of mankind.

Love of money is the root of all evil. I do not believe it is. Power is the root of all evil. The secret of a free democratic government is the limitation of power, which can only be done by keeping power separated and dispersed among the many.

Since 1787 the art of government has not progressed much. The founding fathers were the most amazingly keen and intellectual group of students of government in the history of the world. This is the age of science. That was the age of government. When you analyze their deliberations you perceive more and more their concern over power and its proper dispersal in a way to prevent its consolidation. They had had vivid personal trials and tribulations with abuses of power in the Old World before they migrated; and with the Crown during the colonial period. They knew the dangers of centralized control from personal experience. Don't destroy the system they created for our protection.

Chelsea Soldiers' Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter which appeared in the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, Thursday, October 20, 1949:

PRAISES TREATMENT IN CHELSEA HOME

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The veterans here in Massachusetts are fortunate indeed in having the John Adams and the Lawrence Ingley Hospitals situated on Powder Horn Hill in Chelsea, just across the Mystic River from Boston.

This group is known among veterans as the Chelsea Soldiers' Home, a term of love and respect, where all veterans, either service-connected or non-service-connected are given the best of treatment. At this time I will only speak of the most excellent out-patient department and its most efficient staff of nurses and doctors. Once one is registered he is given a card which entitles him to all services by doctors and all up-to-date equipment.

The entire organization from then on strive to do everything possible to make his visit pleasant. Everyone is greeted with a smiling good morning and a cheerful word. This same spirit is carried along by the doctors.

This is one place in Massachusetts where veterans are welcome and treated with kindness, consideration and some of the best medical skill obtainable. This wonderful organization is headed by John L. Quigley who, as the son of the most beloved former commandant, Lawrence Quigley, and is now following closely in the footsteps of his father whose love and respect for the USWV will never be forgotten.

This speaks only of the out-patient department, but the same service and treatment exists all through the hospitals and dormitories.

WALDO E. CUSHING,
1654 Massachusetts Avenue,
Cambridge, Mass.

Student Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech made by Dr. Arthur W. Watwood, dean of the Los Angeles University, College of Law, before Washington's Free Open Forum, September 28, 1949:

Mr. Chairman, the late Walt Whitman said: "All are brothers in destiny; none goes his way alone. All that we put into the lives of others comes back into our own."

Educators, as a whole, I think, have a feeling, underpaid as they are, that by helping to educate and train young Americans the good work done by such young men and women reflects glory to the educators' work.

The truth is, however, that millions of our young Americans are unable to take advantage of advanced training or complete a high-school education.

STUDENT LOANS

To overcome this situation I have urged many of my friends in Congress to sponsor a bill which loans students money to complete a high-school course, or a college or university course. Under this bill, the students would be permitted to repay the Government after graduating and entering upon a career.

It would seem to me that if our Government is able to spend billions of dollars for war programs, we should be able to spend more and more money to harness the brain power of young Americans who will become our leaders of tomorrow.

The late Horace Mann said: "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity." I feel that each American would gain a real victory by adopting such a universal program of education.

Potato Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the House took its unofficial summer recess, Mr. John W. Ball, of the Washington Post, wrote a series of highly misleading articles in regard to the potato price-support program in Aroostook County, Maine.

Mr. Ball's articles were so apparently editorializing for the already discredited Brannan farm plan, that those who are accustomed to reading his writings were quick to catch on that this was inspired propaganda for the Brannan plan.

This series on the potato program in Aroostook County was published throughout the country. Therefore, many readers who are not familiar with Mr. Ball's politics had no way of knowing that he is one of the chief supporters of the Brannan plan.

How do you think Mr. Ball managed to get all of the figures in the official records? Do you think he would have had such ready access to them if he had been going to write a story against the Brannan plan? Do you think he would have gone all the way from Washington to Presque Isle, Maine, if everything had not been greased for him beforehand?

I know at least one Member of the House—Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Minnesota—who has been trying for months to get the Department of Agriculture to give him, for his official use, payments under some of the farm programs, and he has never been able to obtain them. I wonder if he would have any better luck if he were to agree to use them in support of the Brannan plan?

But, to go back to Mr. Ball: After getting the figures, Mr. Ball made a great hullabaloo over the fact that—and I quote the Washington Post of Thursday, August 18, 1949—"at least 31 farmers of Aroostook County got more than $100,000 apiece from the Government potato price-support program last year."

Mr. Ball listed those firms and those figures, but he deliberately misled his readers by failing to state that these men and firms are certified dealers as well as growers.

He did not tell his readers that these firms buy and ship potatoes for other eligible producers.

He did not tell his readers that these growers with the big checks were handling potatoes for scores of other farmers on a dealer basis.

I have in my possession the financial statement of one of the 31 firms listed by Mr. Ball as having received more than $100,000. The total of all Government checks to this firm actually amounted to $210,097, of which $148,555 was paid out direct, as a dealer, to other growers who were complying with the Government program.

There goes roughly $150,000 of Mr. John Ball's loaded figures. That leaves Mr. John Ball about 75 percent wrong, which has been his batting average for the seasons I have been around Washington.

In addition, this particular set-up is a family partnership, with 13 families sharing in the $61,533. This is an average, in this particular case, of $4,733.33, as compared with Mr. Ball's distorted $100,000.

Mr. Ball also failed to tell his readers that the potato program checks in Maine were large because Maine is the largest potato producing State in the United States. The State of Maine produces 15 percent of the total United States potato production, and of this amount, 90 percent is produced in the one county of Aroostook.

Neither did Mr. Ball tell his readers that potatoes are the only cash crop in that area. The farmers in Aroostook County are too far north to produce anything else at all on a commercial basis that can qualify under the Government price-support program. They do not get any support or loans or anything else for cotton, wheat, tobacco, corn, rice, peanuts, nor any of the other crops, because they do not grow commercially that far north.

Contrary to the impression created by Mr. Ball's articles, the Maine potato industry is composed almost exclusively of numerous small growers. In 1948, the commercial acreage was produced on 5,074 individual farms of which number 79 percent were farms growing 50 acres of potatoes or less, 16.8 percent were farms growing 51 to 100 acres, and only 4.2 percent were farms producing over 100 acres.

These farms are farmer owned and operated, with 95 percent of the growers actually living on the farms and owning the equipment which they operate.

This, therefore, indicates that the Maine potato industry is based on a multiple, small, family unit farm operation as contrasted with large corporate combines characteristic of production patterns for some other commodities. This situation in Maine represents an agricultural economy advocated by economists as being the most ideal for the general welfare of the Nation.

Each of these farms is a separate business entity; each with its own problems of production and marketing dependent upon the judgment and ability of the farmer-manager. Each farm must carry its own fixed investment charges relating to machinery and equipment, buildings, taxes, insurance, and other miscellaneous operational expenses. In 1948, machinery and building depreciation and replacement alone amounted to $25 per acre or $1,250 for each farm producing 50 acres of potatoes.

The inherent risk and tremendous cost connected with potato production can never be overemphasized. The per acre investment in Maine for 1948 amounted to approximately $386 from the initial operations in the spring up to and including grading prior to bagging and loading. The following break-down shows each of the respective costs of production contributing to this per acre investment figure:

Fertilizer	$60.00
Seed	50.00
Dusting or spray materials	15.00
Gasoline, oil, and grease	13.50
Labor (including harvest)	125.00
Insurance on buildings and equipment (including storage)	15.00
Telephone and lights	$2.00
Taxes (real estate)	18.00
Fuel for warehouses	1.50
Service fees (certification, PMA, etc.)	2.00
Liming essential to potato production	1.00
Repairs	20.00
Depreciation on buildings and equipment	25.00
Grass seed and/or other expenses rotation land	8.00
Interest charges	25.00
Supplies and miscellaneous	5.00
Total	386.00

Based on Maine's 1948 commercial acreage of 182,928 acres, it is immediately apparent that this one industry required in this 1 year in excess of $24,000,000 worth of machinery, chemicals, and other goods procurable only from the industrial segment of the national economy. Nor does this staggering procurement commitment take into consideration the labor, distribution (including transportation), taxes, insurance, interest and marketing service charges required for ultimate delivery of the crop to the consumer's table.

Many consumers have the idea that they were forced to pay exorbitant prices for potatoes last year. At least as far as farmer returns go and after considering these production costs, the facts do not show that to be the case.

It is true that prices last year were high by comparison with most years. The grower did do better than usual, but his usual is not very hot.

According to the best estimates available the average Maine farmer cleared somewhere around 30 cents a bushel—60 pounds—last year in addition to hired-hand wages for himself for the days he worked. Last year was one of the good years. Many years he has gotten only part wages. Some years he worked the whole year for nothing or mortgaged the farm to pay up the losses. That is when potatoes were cheap.

To the consumer it means this: When she bought a 10-pound bag of Maine potatoes last winter the grower netted about 5 cents on them. That is what he got for management and risk and to offset the losses in the bad years. Potato growers in Maine are among the most skilled and efficient in the country. Only by using the very latest in scientific methods and working from dawn to dark through the rush seasons did the grower succeed in clearing that 5 cents.

Different consumers paid different prices for those 10-pound bags, anywhere from 39 to 69 or 70 cents. The grower got in total about 24 cents out of it. Five cents of that was net. The rest went to the people who packaged, transported, wholesaled, and retailed the potatoes. It was out of that 24 cents that around 5 cents was net. And that is after giving full credit for all he got in the way of Government payments.

If potatoes had sold cheap enough so that the farmer cleared nothing the average consumer would have saved 50 or 60 cents on his year's food bill and in fact, if the potatoes were given away at the farm, the consumer would still have to pay more than 3 cents per pound to cover the costs of transportation and selling.

These are some of the facts that any unbiased writer would have wanted to put in his articles.

These are the important facts that John Ball deliberately left out in his determined effort to turn the so-called news columns of the press into biased editorials to sell the American public on the socialistic Brannan plan.

Stevens Against Blackney Contested Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1949, at page 13177 of the RECORD, the Honorable Speaker laid before us a communication—House Document 336—from the Clerk of this House. The pertinent part of this communication is as follows:

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Michigan, George D. Stevens against William B. Blackney, notice of which has been filed in the Office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony, papers, and documents presented to the House by this communication contain matters which challenge the dignity and integrity of the House and its prerogatives and processes. To appreciate the challenge, it is indispensable that we follow the chronological sequence of the various steps taken by the parties involved, before this testimony, these papers and these documents were made available to this House. As a service to the Honorable Speaker and the Members of the House, I submit the following chronological chart of these steps and their relation to the contest:

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART

(R, refers to printed report of testimony, papers and documents)

1. November 2, 1948, is the date of the election.

2. On November 10, 1948, George D. Dunn, clerk of the board of canvassers for the county of Genesee, petitioned the State court of that county for a writ of certiorari directed to the election board of precinct 48, city of Flint, to certify the records and proceedings of their count to the court and that a recount be held of the ballots cast. This petition alleges that the records of the precinct shows that although 723 voters voted, the Board has tallied 945 votes for the office of Governor (contestant's exhibit 7, R. 38). The same records also show that a total of 919 votes were counted for the office of Representative in Congress (Dunn's testimony, R. 15).

3. On November 19, 1948, after a recount of the ballots cast in precinct 48, the contestant's vote was corrected from 438 votes to 359, and the contestee's vote from 481 votes to 323 (contestant's exhibit 7–A, R. 40).

4. Upon petition duly filed, the said Dunn, clerk of the board of canvassers, also recounted the ballots cast in precinct 14, city of Flint. As the result of this recount, the contestant's vote was corrected from 415 votes to 315 and the contestee's from 545 votes to 515. The petition for this recount was based on the fact that the records of the election board disclosed more votes cast for the office of Representative in Congress than voters who had voted (R. 16).

5. The said Dunn also found that in precinct 22 the election board had counted the "split-ticket" votes for the office of Representative in Congress but had failed to count the "straight-ticket" vote. Upon a recount of the ballots in this precinct, the contestant's vote was corrected from 102 votes to 476 votes, and contestee's from 83 votes to 227 votes (R. 16).

6. Upon the recount in precinct 27, contestant's vote was corrected from 71 votes to 388, and the contestee's from 64 to 187 votes (R. 16).

7. On December 1 and 2, 1948, the contestant filed complaints praying for restraining orders, in the chancery courts in Ingham, Livingston, and Genesee Counties (contestant's exhibits 9, 10, and 11, R. 42, 45, and 48). The orders issued on the complaints commanded the custodians of the ballot boxes to preserve the same and the ballots therein "during the pendency of the taking of testimony" in the contest or until the further order of the court (contestant's exhibits 9–A, 10–A, and 11–A, R. 44, 47, and 50).

8. On December 7, 1948, the State Supreme Court denied the contestant a canvass of the poll lists and tally sheets of all the precincts in the congressional district (par. 4, notice of contest, R. 1). The decision of the court recognizes that this was an issue concerning a Federal and not a State matter.

9. On December 10, 1948, the State Board of Canvassers denied contestant the remedy sought in 8 supra (par. 4, notice of contest, R. 1). The State Board too recognizes that this was a matter concerning the Federal and not the State government.

10. On December 10, 1948, the proper State officers certified the results of the election. The result gave contestee 73,465 votes and contestant 72,681 (par. 3, notice of contest, R. 1).

11. On January 6, 1949, the contestant served a timely and particular notice (R. 1) upon the contestee of contestant's design and intention to contest the election, under the Constitution of the United States and 2 U. S. C. 201–226 (par. 4, contestee's petition, R. 33).

12. On February 3, 1949, the contestee made timely and particular answer (R. 3) to contestant's notice of contest.

13. About February 3, 1949, the contestant served timely and proper notice upon contestee of the taking of the deposition of Albert C. Hull, clerk of the city of Flint. The deposition would be taken before Allen R. Hartingh, a notary public, on February 14, 1949. The subpena would command the witness Hull to have with him the poll lists, registration books, ballot boxes, ballots, tally sheets, and statements of returns pertaining to the election of Representative in Congress (par. 6, contestee's petition, R. 33).

14. About February 7, 1949, a subpena duces tecum for the purpose set forth in 13 supra was timely and regularly served upon the witness Hull (contestant's exhibit 2, R. 11).

NOTE.—Here commences a course of events which show the earmarks of bad faith and a design to obstruct the procedure authorized by 2 United States Code 201–226.

15. On February 10, 1949, the contestee and his attorneys filed a complaint (R. 33) in the chancery court of Genesee County against the contestant, the witness Hull, and the notary public, Hartingh. The complaint prayed the court to enter orders against the defendants:

(a) To show cause why a temporary injunction should not issue during the pendency of said cause, restraining the defendants, their attorneys and agents, from interfering with the ballot boxes of the city of Flint and restraining them from opening, causing to be opened, or allowing to be opened the ballot boxes or the ballots contained therein at the time of the testimony of said Albert C. Hull, or at any other time, until a recount has been authorized by the House of Representatives or its duly authorized committee.

(b) To issue a restraining order upon the filing of the petition restraining the defendants, their attorneys and agents, from opening, causing to be opened, or allowing to be opened, the ballot boxes or the ballots contained therein, and from interfering with the ballot boxes or the ballots therein of any township, precinct, city, or county in the Sixth Congressional District until such time as a recount has been authorized by the House of Representatives or its duly authorized committee or agent.

(c) And that the preliminary injunction be made permanent upon final hearing. (Order to show cause and temporary restraining order, R. 32.)

In paragraph 12 of the complaint (R. 34), the contestee and his attorneys give as their grounds for asking for this extraordinary remedy, the following:

(a) In the opinion of the petitioners, the Notary Public, Allen R. Hartingh who issued the subpena duces tecum to the clerk of the city of Flint, had no authority from the House of Representatives to open or cause to be opened the ballot boxes nor could he be given such authority by the House until such time as the contestant had petitioned for a recount and the same acted upon by the House or its duly authorized committee;

(b) If the notary public is qualified and has power under 2 United States Code 206, 207, and 219 to issue the subpena duces tecum to the clerk of the city of Flint, the ballot boxes and the ballots contained therein are not papers within the meaning of the act of Congress relating to contested elections; and that even if they are, they cannot be opened, molested, or tampered with until the contestant has completed his testimony and a recount has been authorized by a committee of the House;

(c) The clerk of the city of Flint is restrained by the orders entered by the court, on December 1 and 2, 1948, (see 7, supra), from producing the ballot boxes and recounting the ballots contained therein, during the pendency of the taking of the testimony in the contest, before the House of Representatives;

(d) A committee of the United States Senate has requested the clerk of the city of Flint to preserve the ballot boxes and ballots contained therein in connection with a recount involving the seat of the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON, in the Senate;

(e) No recount has been ordered by the House of Representatives or any committee or agency thereof;

(f) Only the House of Representatives or its duly authorized agents may order a recount;

(g) The clerk of the city of Flint is without authority to open, cause to be opened, or allowed to be opened, the ballot boxes or the ballots contained therein until proper

authority is received under the seal of the House of Representatives; and

(h) The contestant, his attorneys and agents, and the notary public, have no authority to open, cause to be opened, or allow to be opened, the ballot boxes and the ballots recounted until a recount has been authorized by the House of its duly authorized committee, and until such proper authority has been received under the seal of the House.

The complaint shows on its face that the contestee and his attorneys have full knowledge—

(1) That a contest of contestee's seat was pending before the Congress of the United States;

(2) That the contestant had lawfully impounded and preserved the ballot boxes and the ballots therein (7 supra) for the express purpose of preventing their destruction under the State law;

(3) That the contest was taking place through the procedure authorized by Congress under the Constitution of the United States and 2 United States Code 201–226 (par. 17, notice of contest (R. 3));

(4) That the gross errors and irregularities recited in supra 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 had occurred in the city of Flint.

16. On February 14, 1949, the witness Hull appeared before the notary public. He admitted under oath (R. 7) that he had appeared in response to the subpena served on him as stated in 14 supra. He was represented by counsel as was also the contestee (R. 6). The witness Hull disobeyed the command of the subpena to bring with him the poll lists, registration books, ballot boxes, ballots, tally sheets, and statements of returns pertaining to the election. He refused to answer questions put to him. The refusal was under advice of his attorney and concurred in by contestee's attorney (R. 8). The advice and refusal are based on these grounds:

(a) The restraining orders in 7 supra; and

(b) The restraining order in 15 supra.

It is difficult to understand how restraining order (a) can justify the advice given by the attorneys. Paragraphs 8 (R. 43, 46, and 50) of the petitions upon which the orders were issued, specifically aver that the relief prayed for is under Michigan Election Act 187, PA 1947, MSA6.454, for the express purpose of preventing the destruction of the ballots. The petitions and the orders both show on their face that the ballots are to be impounded and preserved for use in the contest.

Restraining order (b) was issued at the instance of the contestee and his attorneys. It was a flagrant use of a State court to obstruct the orderly procedure of 2 United States Code 201–226. The chancery court that issued the order was either ignorant of or held in contempt the prerogatives conferred upon Congress by article 1, sections 4 and 5 of the Federal Constitution. Further, the court was also either ignorant of or held in contempt the views of the supreme court of its State. In the case of *McLeod* v. *State Board of Canvassers*, (304 Mich. 120), the Michigan State Supreme Court stated:

"The weight of authority in other jurisdictions adheres to the rule of law that where constitutional or statutory provisions make a legislative body the sole judge of the election and qualification of its own members, the final decision rests in such body and courts cannot interfere. * * * The same rule obtains in this State."

17. On February 25, 1949, the contestant removed the obstructive restraining order issued by the chancery court in 15 supra, to the United States District Court (petition for removal, R. 30). On this same date, the United States Court dissolved that order and thereby liquidated its obstructive force (order dissolving restraining order, etc., R. 29).

18. On March 2, 1949, the contestant again gave notice to the contestee of taking of depositions under 2 United States Code, page 204. On the same date, a subpena and a subpena duces tecum (R. 27) were duly served upon the witnesses. The subpena duces tecum was served on and commanded the witness Hull to "bring with you the poll lists, registration books, ballot boxes, ballots, tally sheets and statements of returns pertaining to the election of Representative in Congress, Sixth Michigan District, held November 2, 1948, in the city of Flint." The subpena duces tecum show on their face that they are issued under the authority of 2 United States Code 206, 207 and 219.

19. On March 8, 1949, the taking of depositions pursuant to 18 supra, came underway (R. 11). The witness Hull was sworn. He was asked the questions and answered as follows:

"Question. You are the city clerk of the city of Flint, Mr. Hull?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. You were served with a subpena duces tecum to appear at this time?

"Answer. I was.

"Question. I will repeat my question. You are the city clerk for the city of Flint?

"Answer. I am.

"Question. And you were served with a subpena duces tecum to appear here at this time?

"Answer. I was.

"Question. By this subpena you were instructed to bring the ballots?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. You were once here on subpena on the 14th of February?

"Answer. I was.

"Question. And do you have the ballots with you?

"Answer. I do not" (R. 12).

The witness gives as justification for his disobedience of the subpena duces tecum, the following:

(a) An understanding with the contestant (Hull's testimony, R. 12).

(b) A communication addressed to him by Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, chairman of Subcommittee on Elections, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. (Contestant's Exhibit No. 4, R. 28); and

(c) The order of preservation issued by the State court, as recited in 7 supra.

Justification (a) is captious and untenable. The understanding referred to by Hull was purely a figment. This is established by Hull's sworn testimony, as follows:

"Question. That understanding was solely because of the letter that you had from the House wasn't it Mr. Hull?

"Answer. I don't know what his reason was, or the understanding.

"Question. Now, you personally did not talk with Mr. Stevens at any time on this matter, did you?

"Answer. No, I haven't talked with Mr. Stevens regarding——

"Question. The producing of the ballots?

"Answer. The producing of the ballots, except at the last hearing that was held here.

"Question. Which was February 14?

"Answer. I don't remember the exact date. I believe that date was mentioned before, that that was the date of the previous hearing" (R. 13).

Justification (b) presents a serious and difficult problem. It involves a communication over the name of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration. The communication is unfortunate because it sets at naught the provisions of 2 United States Code 201–206, without the proper authority of the House of Representatives. Neither the chairman of the subcommittee nor the subcommittee itself have the power to set aside the provisions of that statute; that power lies with the House alone. Further, on the date of the communication (March 2, 1949) there was nothing before the subcommittee or the House with the exception of contestant's notice of contest (R. 1) and contestee's answer to that notice (R. 3). The notice of contest (par. 17, R. 3) is specific on the point that the contest is commenced "under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, being Constitution, article 1, sections 4 and 5, 2 United States Code, sections 201–226." It is evident from a perusal of section 223 of the statute that there is nothing before the House of Representatives and its committee until the contestant and contestee have completed the taking of testimony. That section provides:

"All officers taking testimony to be used in a contested-election case, whether by deposition or otherwise, shall, when the taking of the same is completed, and without unnecessary delay, certify and carefully seal and immediately forward the same, by mail or by express, addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, District of Columbia. He (the clerk) shall carefully seal up and preserve the portions of the testimony not printed, as well as the other portions when returned from the Public Printer, and lay the same before the committee on elections at the earliest opportunity."

Since the testimony was not filed with the clerk until May 25, 1949 (21 under) it is certain that there was nothing before the Committee on Elections on the date of the communication. A reading of the communication will disclose its unfortunate character. It is in answer to a telegram sent by the witness Hull to the Honorable Mr. Harrison. The material part of the telegram reads as follows:

"Have been served subpena with duces tecum issued by a notary public at request of George Stevens to produce ballot boxes and ballots for a recount in the Blackney-Stevens congressional race. What is present status of procedure before House? Kindly instruct me as to whether or not I should permit recount or if I should keep ballot boxes intact until an official order from the House of Representatives."

The communication consists of six sentences which we will analyze in sequence. The first two sentences are as follows:

"The Subcommittee on Elections has ruled that a recount of the ballots at this time is premature and irrelevant. There is no process under Federal law whereby a notary public can be directed to take possesion of ballots in an election contest."

This advice to the witness Hull was certainly unwarranted. The subcommittee was without power to make such ruling until such time as the matter was referred to it by the House of Representatives. Further, it is a flagrant violation of contestant's rights under 2 United States Code 201–226. If the statute permits the examination of the ballots and other election papers to be made before the notary public designated under the statute, then, admittedly, the communication is wrong; and if it has resulted in denying the examination, the contestant has been deprived of a substantial item of evidence. That an examination of ballots is authorized by the statute before the notary public, is beyond question. The notary public was an officer of the House of Representatives, under and by virtue of 2 United States Code 206. This latter was held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *In re Loney* (124 U. S. 372). The language used by the Supreme Court is as follows:

"Anyone of the officers designated by Congress to take the depositions of such witnesses (whether he is appointed by the United States, such as a judge of a Federal court, or a register in bankruptcy or by a State, such as a judge of one of its courts of record, a mayor or recorder of a city, or a notary public) performs this function, not under any authority derived from the State, but solely under the authority conferred

upon him by Congress and in a matter concerning the Government of the United States."

The precedents of the House of Representatives are in line with this view. In the Illinois election case of *Kunz* v. *Granata* in the Seventy-second Congress (6 Cannon 186), the House held (March 11, 1932) that the notary public designated to take testimony and under whose direction the recount was made was an officer of and the Representative of Congress for that purpose. In the South Carolina election case of *Stolbrand* v. *Aiken* in the Forty-seventh Congress (1 Hind 719, Apr. 6, 1882), the House dismissed the election contest because the testimony was taken before an officer not specified in the statute. In the Alabama election case of *Goodwyn* v. *Cobb* in the Fifty-fourth Congress (1 Hind 720, Apr. 4, 1896), the House rejected testimony taken before a notary public outside the congressional district in which he was empowered to act by the law of the State. The rejection of this testimony was based upon 2 United States Code 206, which provides that the notary public who is designated for the taking of testimony must reside within the congressional district in which the election to be contested was held. Certainly, the official capacity of the notary public is unquestionable in the matter before us.

The next four sentences of the communication read as follows:

"I do not know whether under the law of your State a notary public has the power to issue a subpena duces tecum and as to this, and as to whether the subpena has been issued in accordance with the law of the State, you are referred to your own attorney.

"Precedents of the House of Representatives clearly establish that in a contested-election case ballots should be inspected and preserved in strict conformity with State law so that their inviolability is unquestioned. No action should be taken by either contestant or contestee with reference to ballots that does not follow the law of the State.

"The official count of the ballots is presumed correct, and I am certain that this presumption will not be brought into question by any unauthorized recount which is made contrary to State law or under circumstances which do not give full protection to both contestant and contestee."

It is manifest that the writer of the communication is confused as to the laws and rules that govern the case. Firstly, the authority of the notary public in this case stems from 2 United States Code 201–226, and not from any State law. The power of the notary public to issue a subpena duces tecum emanates from 2 United States Code 219, and not from any State law. The subpena duces tecum is issued in accordance with 2 United States Code 201–226, and not under the law of the State. Secondly, the precedents of the House of Representatives do not "clearly establish" that in a contested-election case ballots should be inspected and preserved in strict conformity with State law. While it is true that before a recount of the ballots can be had the contestant must show the preservation and inviolability of the ballot boxes and their contents in strict conformity with State law (Illinois election case of *Gartenstein* v. *Sabath* in the Sixty-seventh Congress (6 Cannon 115, December 20, 1922)), it is not true that the ballots must be inspected in conformity with the same law. The House in deciding an election case, acts in the capacity of a court, and decisions of State tribunals are not binding on it (Michigan election case of *Carney* v. *Smith* in the Sixty-third Congress (6 Cannon 91) January 30, 1941). In the New York election case of *Brown* v. *Hicks* in the Sixty-fourth Congress (6 Cannon 143, January 22, 1917), the House held that its authority to judge the elections and qualifications of its Members, and its power to examine ballots and correct returns is infinite and inherent and cannot be circumscribed by State statutes or decisions of State courts. Thirdly, while it is true that the official count of the ballots by the State election officers is presumed to be correct (Massachusetts election case of *Galvin* v. *O'Connell* in the Sixty-first Congress (6 Cannon 126) June 13, 1910), it is not true that this presumption can only be brought into question by a recount under the State law. As indicated above, the power of the House to examine ballots and correct returns is infinite and inherent and cannot be circumscribed by State statutes or decisions of State courts. Further, and also as indicated above, the House has established 2 United States Code 201–226, as the law through which this infinite and inherent power may be invoked by a person desiring to contest an election. The law, so established, designates a notary public as an officer of the House before whom the ballots and returns may be examined and a report of the same submitted to the House for its judgment pursuant to its infinite and inherent power. In 2 United States Code 219, the House has so stated by this language:

"The officer shall have power to require the production of papers * * *"

In the Pennsylvania election case of *Greevy* v. *Scull* in the Fifty-second Congress (2 Hind 1104, Jan. 19, 1893), the House held that the ballots are among the "papers" of which the officer taking testimony in an election case may demand the production. *In Re Voorhis et al.* (291 Federal 673), the notary public designated to take testimony in a contested election under 2 United States Code 206, issued a subpena commanding the New York City Board of Elections to produce for examination all the ballots voted at the election for Members of Congress. The board disobeyed the subpena on the ground that obedience to the subpena would have violated the State statute regulating the production of ballots. The United States district court in refusing to quash the subpena said:

"The position of the Board of Elections may prove embarrassing assuming it has no choice but to disregard one law or the other. Yet it is clear either the State or the United States must prevail."

In the Illinois election case of *Kunz* v. *Granata*, (6 Cannot 186), the House held that the authority conferred by 2 United States Code 219 "to require the production of papers" confers authority upon the notary public to require the production of ballots, in an election held under the Australian ballot system. A recount was made before the notary public in this case and as a result of the recount, the sitting member was unseated. The House, in this latter case, overruled the opinion of the Attorney General of the State that ballots could not be produced before a notary public under 2 United States Code 201–226." Suffice this on justification (b).

Let us now explore justification (c). Here the witness contends that the preservation orders made by the State court in 7 Supra enjoins him against obedience to the subpena. This contention is remarkable in view of the learned capacity of the witness and his attorneys. A grade-school child upon casual reading of the petitions and orders will appreciate the captiousness of this contention. A studied reading of them might well warrant a mentally honest person in holding that the disobedience is contumacious and reprehensible. The petitions show on their face that the restraining orders are for the preservation of the ballots under the State law.

The relevant part of the orders read:

"It is ordered that the defendants and each of them are restrained from interfering with the ballot boxes, the seals or locks thereon, or the ballots therein, used in connection with the election for Representatives in Congress of November 2, 1948, during the pendency of the taking of testimony in plaintiff's contest before the House of Representatives or until further orders of this court. It is further ordered that this restraining order may be served, together with a copy of the petition, upon which the same is based, upon each of the defendants herein by registered mail pursuant to the statute, being MSA-6.493."

Since the ballot boxes and the ballots contained therein were ordered to be preserved for use in the contest before the House of Representatives, and since the notary public is the officer of that House with power to subpena the ballots for examination, the untenable nature of justification (c) is self-evident. If sinister motives are attributable to the witness Hull for his disobedience to the subpena, they can be supplied by his disobedience of the communication addressed to him by the Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, dated March 4, 1949 (R 13–14). In that communication, the witness Hull was authorized and commanded as follows:

"Mr. ALBERT HULL,

"Clerk of the City of Flint, Flint, Mich.

"DEAR MR. HULL: On December 15, 1948, you were directed by telegraph to securely preserve intact, subject to further notice, all of the ballot boxes, ballots, and other official records and returns pertaining to the United States Senatorial Election of November 2, 1948.

"This committee has been notified by the attorney for the contestant, Stevens, in the congressional election of the Sixth District, Michigan, that the taking of evidence and counting ballots in connection with this congressional contest, is to commence March 8, 1948.

"You are hereby authorized to make available to all proper parties concerned with the taking of evidence and counting of ballots, the ballot boxes, and other official records and returns pertaining to the congressional election, subject to the following restrictions:

"As soon as the taking of evidence and counting of ballots are completed, you shall thereupon return the ballots and records to their respective boxes, and deliver the boxes with keys and election seals to the officer or officers having the custody thereof. The ballot boxes, their contents, keys, and the election seals are to be securely preserved intact, subject to further notice from this committee.

"Respectfully yours,

"FRANCIS J. MYERS,
"Chairman,
"By GEORGE J. SHILLTO,
"Chief Investigator."

Hence, neither justification (a), (b), nor (c) relied upon by the witness Hull and his attorneys, and collaborated in by the contestee and his attorney, can be sustained. They are figments of designing minds and lend no help to the House of Representatives to determine the purity and accuracy of the election. This disobedience to the subpena shows bad faith and a design to obstruct.

The next witness called by contestant at this hearing was Mr. George G. Dunn, clerk of the board of canvassers for the county of Genesee. The testimony of the witness (R. 15–17) bears out the facts set forth in 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 supra. His testimony firmly establishes that the returns of the precinct election boards from the city of Flint were grossly and manifestly irregular. He testified (R. 15–16) to the following irregularities:

(a) In precinct 48, the board counted 919 votes for Representative in Congress. The voters list showed that only 728 voters had voted (2 and 3 supra).

(b) In precinct 14, the board counted 960 votes for Representative in Congress. The voters list showed that about 830 voters had voted (4 supra).

(c) In precinct 22, the board counted 185 votes for Representative in Congress. The voters list showed that more than 703 voters had voted (5 supra).

(d) In precinct 27, the board counted 136 votes for Representative in Congress. The voters list showed that more than 575 voters had voted (6 supra).

(e) In an undisclosed number of precincts, as stated by the witness, "there was a few votes cast over" the number of voters shown to have voted by the voters list (R. 16). In these precincts no recount was made.

The witness, Francis H. Bancroft, a challenger at the polls has testified to the following irregularity:

(f) In precinct 61, ballots marked "straight" and also for a particular candidate of the opposite party were counted for the latter candidate and were not counted for the remaining candidates on the straight ballot (R. 17–18).

The witness, Bessie Jane Gretzinger, a paid worker, has testified to the following irregularity:

(g) In precinct 13, the checkers who were tallying the vote fell asleep and, in the words of the witness, "They weren't marking" the vote when the caller was calling from the ballots (R. 20).

The witness, Mrs. Mary Pohly, a paid city worker, has testified to the following irregularities:

(h) In precinct 68, the checker fell asleep and did not tally the vote called by the caller, during the momentary dosing of the checker (R. 21).

(i) In the same precinct, when the tally sheets failed to correspond, tallys were arbitrarily taken from one candidate and given to the other (R. 22).

We will now pass over the testimony of the contestant and take up the significance of these irregularities to the election contest at hand.

Irregularities (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) were detected by the county board of canvassers before the date of the notice of contest. They all took place in the city of Flint. The recount based on the irregularities picked up 512 votes for the contestant to only 79 votes for the contestee. The recount was made in only 4 precincts out of the 68 in the city of Flint. Before the recount the contestee held a plurality of 1,217 votes; after the recount it was only 784 votes. If it is reasonable to assume that similar errors exist in the remaining precincts of the city, is it not equally reasonable for contestant to assume that a correction of these errors in the remaining precincts will overcome contestee's plurality?

In the Iowa election case of *Steele* v. *Scott* (6 Cannon 146) the House held that proof that the law has been innocently disregarded in the counting of ballots opens the door to an examination of the ballots as effectually as if deliberate fraud had been committed.

In the Massachusetts election case of *Galvin* v. *O'Connell* (6 Cannon 126) the House held that if it is reasonable to suppose there was error in judgment in counting ballots cast in a portion of the precincts in the district, it is equally reasonable to assume there was error in judgment in counting the ballots of the remaining precincts.

In the Illinois election case of *Kunz* v. *Granata* (6 Cannon 186) the House held that the failure of a candidate to receive a number of votes equal to the number of straight tickets cast in an election was held to constitute such conclusive evidence of fraud as to warrant an examination of the ballots cast.

It is notoriously evident in the case now before the House that the bad faith and the obstructive tactics which have denied the contestant an examination of the ballots in the remaining precincts in the city of Flint, are designed as a travesty upon the prerogatives of the House of Representatives and the purity of the election. The contestee, the witness Hull and their attorneys are the participants in this projected travesty.

Irregularities (f) to (i) are corroborative of contestant's belief that there are errors in the counts of the remaining precincts of the city of Flint, similar to those found in supra 3, 4, 5, and 6.

20. On April 13, 1949, the contestee designated a notary public under 2 United States Code 201–226, and took evidence to contradict that taken by contestant. It is ironical that the contestee should invoke the provisions of this statute. Not long before, he and his attorney had brazenly held the statute in contempt, when its provisions were invoked by the contestant.

21. On May 25, 1949, the testimony, papers, and documents were filed with the Clerk of the House, as provided by 2 United States Code 223.

22. On September 22, 1945, the Clerk communicated a printed report of the testimony, papers, and documents to the Speaker of the House, and the same was referred to the Committee on House Administration (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13430) and by the latter to the Subcommittee on Elections.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this matter has been withheld from the consideration of the House during this session of the Eighty-first Congress. It is a disservice to the dignity and integrity of the House, by those whose duty it was to expedite the consideration of so grave a matter. The adjournment sine die will leave the House under the deep and ugly reflections that are manifest from the printed testimony, papers, and documents. These reflections result from our inaction on this matter, in view of the following situations:

First. Although the contestant has acted in strict and meticulous obedience to the statute—2 United States Code 201–226—he has been denied the processes authorized for his use by that statute.

Second. The contestee and his attorneys have acted obstructively and disobediently to the processes authorized by the statute—2 United States Code 201–226.

Third. The witness, Albert C. Hull, has acted contumaciously and reprehensibly to the processes authorized by the statute—2 United States Code 201–226.

Fourth. The purity of the contested election is impeached by the positive proof of gross errors and irregularities in the count, tally and returns of the ballots and votes cast for the office of Representative in Congress, in seven precincts of the city of Flint.

Fifth. There is reasonable ground to assume that similar gross errors and irregularities exist in the remaining precincts of the city of Flint.

Sixth. It is reasonable to assume that an examination of the ballots cast in the congressional district will show that the contestant has received a plurality of the votes cast.

Seventh. The erroneous communication of the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections, to the witness Albert C. Hull was derogative of the processes authorized by the statute, 2 United States Code 201–226.

Hence, Mr. Speaker this matter should have been brought to the floor of the House for prompt and just consideration, before the impending adjournment.

Farmers Union on World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a statement by President Patton of the National Farmers Union on world federation. Reserving my right to disagree with Mr. Patton, after I have thoroughly studied House Concurrent Resolution 64, I recommend his statement as worthy of the careful consideration of my colleagues.

STATEMENT OF JAMES G. PATTON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The National Farmers Union, an organization representing some 460,000 members, wholeheartedly endorses House Concurrent Resolution 64, the passage of which by the House and Senate would open up an entirely new area of American foreign policy.

We take this action at this time on the basis of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of our organization in March 1949, which reads as follows:

"We endorse all efforts to strengthen the UN and its technical agencies, and approve such movements as those looking toward a constitutional world federation with defined and limited powers."

We believe it to be of the utmost importance that the United States take the lead in recognizing that the present structure of the United Nations is inadequate to preserve the peace and that this structure must be developed into that of a world federation capable of enacting and enforcing world law. This is not only necessary in order to create an organization capable of preserving the peace, once a peace is made; it is equally necessary in order that it may become possible to make a peace settlement. There is no way to make a peace settlement without halting the arms race in which the two halves of a divided world are now wasting their substance. There is no way to halt the arms race except through the establishment of world law and world law enforcement. We therefore, support House Concurrent Resolution 64 because it provides the fundamental precondition both for making and for preserving the peace which the whole world so ardently desires.

The National Farmers Union does not believe that a negative policy of merely trying to stop the spread of communism will lead to peace. It believes that the way to stop communism is to achieve this purpose as the byproduct of an imaginative constructive policy for peace.

The present arms race is a vicious circle of mutual provocation which, sooner or later, will lead to war. In the atomic age, victory and defeat in war have become almost indistinguishable. It believes that there is no surer way to destroy the free world we seek to preserve than to permit a third world war to ravage the world.

The proposal to make the development of the United Nations into a world federation

the avowed aim of American policy would, if adopted, provide an over all constructive framework for our present largely negative foreign policy.

While fully and unreservedly supporting this proposal, the National Farmers Union opposes with equal vigor any proposal which at this time goes beyond the fundamental declaration of national purpose. It rejects all proposals which would attempt at this time to commit this Nation to certain methods and procedures for the attainment of world federation, because it believes that in this rapidly changing world progress toward the desired goal can be attained only through a patient and careful step-by-step procedure. It is just as necessary to preserve freedom of action with regard to method and procedure as it is necessary to commit ourselves irrevocably now in defining our ultimate objective.

Specifically, the National Farmers Union opposes the resolutions sponsored by the Atlantic Union Committee and the so-called Culbertson committee. We opposed both resolutions for the general reason just stated; namely, that they tie our hands as to methods and procedures. In addition, we oppose the Atlantic Union proposal because it seems to us not only to commit us as to procedure, but to commit us to a most unwise procedure, in that the exclusive federation proposed would merely serve to freeze the present cleavages and make them more difficult to heal.

We oppose the Culbertson resolution for the same general and specific reasons just stated, and also for the additional reason that it would, in our opinion, bring about the immediate withdrawal from the United Nations of the Soviet Union and the nations of the Soviet orbit. We oppose any plan of action which contemplates with equanimity the disruption of the present United Nations and the severance of the slender threads which now hold together the world community.

Most of our members are descendants of men who fled from other parts of the world in order to escape from tyranny and from the burdens imposed by recurring wars and preparation for war. Most of our members are hard-working citizens who wish to see the fruits of their toil help to feed and clothe the ill-fed and ill-clad millions with whom they share the common aspiration of justice, freedom, and security. Most of our members feel that the armament race in which we are now engaged preempts the resources which should be devoted to the promotion of such things as health, housing, and education, and—beyond that—endangers even their present precarious security.

On behalf of these men and women—on behalf of their families—I wish to express profound gratitude to the originators and sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, which lights a beacon of hope in the present dismal darkness. On their behalf, I urge your committee to report out this bill with a unanimous recommendation.

Columbus Day Address of Dr. Silvio Daneo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which was made by Dr. Silvio Daneo, Italian consul general of Philadelphia, Pa., at the forty-first annual Columbus Day banquet, in Hotel Casey, Scranton, Pa., on October 12, 1949:

We are here today to celebrate the 457th anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, and in doing so, many of the distinguished speakers at this table have chosen this opportunity to pay a tribute to the land where Columbus was born and which I have the honor to represent in this beautiful State.

Let me, therefore, express my thanks, gentlemen, on behalf of my country, for your kind words of appreciation, and let me give you the assurance that the spirt which presided over Columbus' enterprise is the same that inspires the policy of the new democratic Italy.

In fact Christopher Columbus, in preparing his epoch-making voyage, was not seeking conquests for himself, his descendants, or his country; he was only trying to prove a scientific truth and to open new roads to the maritime trade. He died as poor as he was born, after dedicating his discoveries to the glory of God and the good of Christianity.

In the same spirit of humility, the Italy of today is not seeking an empire for herself or for her children when she is asking for an outlet to her exuberant population. Be it in Africa, where she has already worked wonders in the past half century turning the desert into gardens, or be it in the New World under a form of increased immigration, you may rest assured that the Italian laborers will carry a message of peace and good will everywhere. The gentlemen of Italian origin who are here tonight, and who are, I believe the best example of what the Italians can do when they are given, as in this country, a fair opportunity, will vouch for what I am saying.

The guiding star of Columbus was pointing to the west, and 457 years after, Italy is still looking to the west, for assistance and comprehension. Let us hope, ladies and gentlemen, that under the name of Christopher Columbus and for the sake of a civilization which is dear to all of us, she will not be disappointed.

Battle of the Giants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press Scimitar for October 17, 1949:

BATTLE OF THE GIANTS

Congress moves toward adjournment, unconvinced that an onrushing crisis of frightening proportions demands its continued presence on the job in Washington.

Two weeks hence, if the coal and steel strikes go on, it will be evident that Congress should have remained in session, prepared to assert its authority for the country's protection.

But by then, it seems probable, the Members will have scattered to their homes or be junketing abroad.

John L. Lewis proposes that his coal miners' union and the American Federation of Labor spend $2,500,000 a week to aid Philip Murray's CIO steel workers in which he terms their "vital economic conflict" with "adversaries of limitless financial credit and powerful beyond compare."

Murray suggests that all unions pool their resources in support of the mine workers, the steel workers, and any others who may be "forced into necessary strike action by the opposition of the monopolists and financial interests who dominate the great industries of this country."

It is true, certainly, that the steel industry, the coal industry, and others have great power.

But no combination of industrialists and financiers could exercise such supermonopolistic power as Lewis and Murray can wield—and do—because Congress sanctions industry-wide bargaining and has given unions immunity from the antitrust laws.

No group of mine owners would dare cut the country's supply of coal to a trickle as Lewis has done repeatedly. No group of mill owners would dare to shut off all but a minor part of the supply of steel, as Murray has done.

As to organized labor's financial strength, Lewis says that his union and at least nine AFL unions could each disburse one-quarter of a million dollars per week for an indefinite period without strain, burden, or inconvenience to their membership.

And as to political power, the President of the United States so values the votes which union leaders say they can deliver that he promises to abolish even such mild safeguards as the Taft-Hartley Act places on their use of economic force.

We are seeing a struggle between giants of labor and giants of industry, with the American people helpless in the middle.

Our jobs, our hopes of prosperity, our influence for world peace are at stake, and it is no exaggeration to say that even our form of government may be endangered.

This menacing situation should not be left to Truman and the implied powers which he has said are adequate to meet any industrial emergency. No one has told the people what those powers are. No one in authority has explained what Truman might undertake to do with them.

Congress should stay on duty. If Congress will not do that, the adjuornment resolution should authorize its leaders to call it back to Washington on short notice at any time before the new session convenes next January.

Proposed Veterans' Hospital at Fort Slocum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, a veteran who needs mental treatment should not be compelled to wait 1 day for medical attention. Need one recall the promises that were made to these men as they marched away? I trust they were not empty promises.

In New York State out of our 10 veteran hospitals only two provide facilities for war mental cases, one at Northport, Long Island, and the other at Canandaigua. The Northport Hospital has a waiting list of 2,724 patients while the Canadaigua Hospital has a waiting list of 427. These veterans are not receiving adequate care. They are not receiving

the hospitalization to which they are entitled. There may be many others who are mindful of these conditions and are reluctant to apply for that to which they are justly entitled.

Sometimes the solution of a problem is not immediate but here we have the answer in the splendid recommendations made by County Commander Wilfred A. Waltemade of the Bronx County American Legion. Fort Slocum, long used by the Army Air Force, has now been abandoned. The site is ideally located to care for those veterans who are mentally ill. It is an island base. It is conveniently located for the relatives of the veterans residing in Greater New York.

If this property is disposed of by public sale as is presently contemplated, it will be lost forever. It would indeed be a short-sighted policy to dispose of this land for a few paltry dollars and leave those men who need care still on a waiting list. We should start the battle cry—Fort Slocum for veterans. No waiting lists for veterans.

I earnestly hope that our Government will follow the suggestions of County Commander Waltemade and make this island available to our veterans who need mental treatment.

The Late Mrs. Katherine Fowler Richey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, It is my sorrowful duty to report to the House that Mrs. Katherine Fowler Richey, widow of Rear Adm. Thomas Beall Richey, United States Navy, died on October 14 at Stamford, Conn.

I bring this sad event to the attention of my colleagues because of the fact that Mrs. Richey made a specialty during her life of restoring and preserving our historic American flags and battle flags. These flags are an important part of our inheritance. They are symbols of our glorious past. They constitute a link with past generations of Americans who fought for the ideals which have been the principal factor in propelling America on her exciting adventure.

I extend my condolence to Mrs. Richey's family and friends. In her passing America has lost a skillful and devoted patriot.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article which appeared in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

MRS. T. B. RICHEY DIES IN STAMFORD—ADMIRAL'S WIDOW RESTORED HISTORIC FLAGS; BURIAL IN ARLINGTON

STAMFORD, October 15.—Mrs. Katherine Fowler Richey, 60, widow of Rear Adm. Thomas Beall Richey, United States Navy, known for her work in restoring and preserving historic flags, died yesterday at Stamford Hall after a long illness.

Private services will take place here and burial will be beside her husband in Arlington National Cemetery, Monday.

Mrs. Richey learned the skill of restoring flags from her mother, Amelia Bold Fowler, of Boston, and passed it on to her daughter, Mrs. Katherine Elizabeth Richey, of New York City. The method is one modeled on the stitching of the Bayeux Tapestry, made almost 900 years ago, but preserved by an interlocking net of threads.

When she was 18, Mrs. Richey started work on her first flag, the banner young Captain Lawrence hoisted in the War of 1812 on Lake Erie, on which in white letters on a dark blue ground is the historic command, "Don't give up the ship." As her skill and fame grew, Congress and State legislature appropriated funds for her to work on the restoration of flags.

Among the individual banners she restored and preserved are the original Star Spangled Banner which flew at Fort McHenry and is now in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington; Gen. Sam. Houston's San Jacinto flag, which is in the capitol building in Austin, Tex., and the flags flown on the carrier *Hornet* and the battleship *South Dakota* in World War II.

Perhaps her most extensive work of restoration was on the 200 banners in the Gothic chapel of the United States Military Academy at West Point. She also worked on the Navy's battle trophies in Bancroft Hall, the Naval Academy at Annapolis; the collection at the Seventh Regiment Armory, Park Avenue and Sixty-sixth Street, in New York City, and the flags in the Chapel of St. Cornelius the Centurion, on Governor's Island.

Mrs. Richey also restored the collections of Confederate battle flags in the museum of the Virginia State Historical Society, in Richmond, and at Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Va. She preserved the collections of historical State flags on display in the State capitols of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Texas, and California.

A son, Thomas Beall Richey, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., also survives.

A Lesson From the Red Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and report:

[From the New Orleans States]

A LESSON FROM THE RED TRIALS

The trial of the 11 Communists, which has been going on, it seems, since Marx and Engels first developed their devilish doctrines, is finally coming to its end.

For months in a Federal court in New York City the Communists defendants and their supporters have been mocking the judge, belittling the jury system, picketing the courtroom and generally making nuisances of themselves.

They are charged with conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force. During their trial their every move was made with an eye to the propaganda it might provide Moscow. Even on the stand, in their own defense, they used the opportunity as a sounding board for attempts to tear down our way of life.

The picketing of the courts was the most flagrant example of a flaunting of American court procedure. Such action has no place in fair trials; it imputes judicial integrity; it might intimidate officers of the court or witnesses. It is an alien thing, and the sooner it is no longer allowed, the better off our courts will be.

Judge Medina sentenced two or three defendants to contempt of court for their behavior in the precincts of his courtroom, but he never took issue with those who derided his court, the jury system or the trial procedure on the outside.

There are many judges and lawyers who believe as he apparently did: That his powers of contempt did not include actions outside his immediate ken. But there can be no doubt that his court was condemned time after time, day after day, all in keeping with orders transmitted through the Communist network from Moscow.

So shocking was the action of the Reds in their picketing that bills were offered in the Congress—bills which originated through a local member of the bar, Mr. Cuthbert Baldwin—by two Louisiana Congressmen, Senator ELLENDER and Representative BOGGS. The Boggs bill was passed by the House, but the Ellender measure was held up in the Senate by the objection of one man, Senator LANGER of North Dakota, when Senator ELLENDER asked that his bill be taken up by consent.

The measures will lie over now probably until the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. By that time the trial of the Communists in New York will be done. But whether they are convicted or freed, mistried and tried again, the lesson that can be got—and should never be forgotten—comes through their picketing. The Congress ought to make these bills the first order of the day when it meets next January. It it does, some good will come out of this trial in any event.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF FEDERAL JUDGES APPOINTED BY THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT PICKETING OF THE COURTS

At a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held March 24–25, 1949, a resolution was passed condemning picketing of the courts and expressing the view that effective means should be taken to prevent such practice. It was resolved that the subject matter be referred to the district and circuit judges for discussion and for the purpose of obtaining their views, and that a committee be appointed to make a study and report and to make recommendations to this conference on legislation which had been proposed on the subject.

The Chief Justice appointed as such committee District Judge Hayes, of North Carolina, Nordbye, of Minnesota, Hulbert, of New York, McColloch, of Oregon, Wilkin, of Ohio, Clifford, of Maine, and the chairman.

On April 28, 1949, the director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts circularized all United States district and circuit judges, advising them of the resolution passed by this conference, and enclosing copy of bills H. R. 3438 and H. R. 3766, and soliciting their viewpoints and recommendations. A number of judges responded, and the committee has carefully considered their views and suggestions.

In the past, American citizens generally have taken pride in the orderly administration of justice in this Nation. As people of a free state, they have felt secure in their fundamental rights as they observed, in the Federal system, the impartiality and indepence of the Federal judiciary. Attempts to influence judicial processes and decisions by mass pressure were unknown.

However, in the latter part of 1948 a new technique was developed and used by Communists and their sympathizers solely in connection with legal proceedings against alleged members of the Communist Party in New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other places. Hundreds of persons gathered at various times outside Federal court buildings where legal proceedings were in progress, who then marched, in the manner of pickets, carrying signs, chanting slogans, and distributing literature. On one occasion such a crowd surged into the court building, overcrowding the courtroom and adjacent corridors. At another time such a group utilized a sound truck in a manner which disturbed and interfered with customary orderly court procedure.

News of these picketing demonstrations created a widespread demand throughout the country that something be done to stop this seemingly growing practice. On February 1, 1949, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association by resolution condemned picketing of courts as an interference with the orderly administration of justice. Local and State bar associations took similar action. Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana introduced H. R. 3438 and H. R. 3766 to prohibit picketing of courts, and a bill identical to the latter, S. 1681, was introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER. Before your committee had sufficient opportunity to meet and agree upon a recommendation regarding these proposed measures, a joint meeting of the Senate and House subcommittees of the respective Committees on the Judiciary was called to consider these bills. At that hearing the American Bar Association was represented by a committee of which Mr. Charles Rhyne, of Washington, D. C., was the chairman, who made an excellent presentation of the problem involved. Attorney Cuthbert S. Baldwin of New Orleans had been very active in arousing the bar to the menace of picketing courts and the need to keep it from getting out of bounds, and he was extremely helpful in presenting the subject to the committee. The chairman of this committee communicated his viewpoint as an individual to the joint committee, and recommended the passage of the proposed legislation.

The sentiment of bar associations and individual lawyers has been and is practically unanimous in favor of legislation to prohibit picketing of courts. Several circuit judicial conferences either specifically endorsed the pending bills or endorsed them in principle. It is true that very few judges are opposed to such legislation. Several of them indicated that in their opinion proceedings in contempt were adequate to cope with such situations, and several others seemed to resent the idea that a judge could be influenced by picketing demonstrations. In this respect your committee agrees with the statement of its chairman presented to the joint Congressional committee in his personal statement: "I have no doubt that a judge's decision or action could not be so influenced. But the judge is not the entire court. I am apprehensive that jurors and witnesses might well be influenced by such intimidating outside pressure. I think the Ellender bill will provide the proper insulation."

The House Committee on the Judiciary have subsequently reported favorably upon a substitute bill, H. R. 5647, which states:

"Whoever participates in picketing, parading, or causing noises in or near a building wherein a court of the United States is being held, or which is being used by a judge, juror, witness, or other court officer, in a manner which impedes, obstructs, or interferes with the administration of justice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary has reported favorably on S. 1681, as amended, which provides:

"Whoever, with the intent of interfering with, obstructing, or impeding the administration of justice or with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, in the discharge of his duty, pickets or parades in or near a building housing a court of the United States, or in or near a building or residence occupied or used by such judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or with such intent uses any sound truck or similar device or resorts to any other demonstration in or near any such building or residence, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

The Senate bill further provides:

"Nothing in this section shall interfere with or prevent the exercise by any court of the United States of its power to punish for contempt."

It will be noted that in the House bill anyone who participates in picketing, parading, etc., in a manner which impedes, obstructs, or interferes with the administration of justice is guilty of an offense. In the Senate bill anyone "with the intent" of interfering with, obstructing, or impeding justice, or "with the intent" of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, pickets, parades, etc. is guilty of an offense. In addition, the Senate bill covers the use of a sound truck or similar device, and contains a proviso that the inherent power of the court to punish for contempt is not affected by the proposed legislation.

On the question of the adequacy of procedure by contempt, the report of the House Judiciary Committee by Mr. HOBBS states:

"However, there is serious question as to whether or not the power to punish for contempt or the section dealing with the obstruction of justice is broad enough to cover this new technique of picketing. Irrespective of the remedy for contempt, the proposed bill would permit a criminal prosecution in a proper case rather than require a judge to institute contempt proceedings. The enactment of this legislation would in no way impair the power of a judge to punish for contempt as it presently exists in the law; but by making such act a crime, it completes the statutory authority to take whatever action the particular facts of the case indicate as proper."

On the constitutional question, the same report States:

"Serious consideration has been given to the possibility that this legislation would interfere with the fundamental rights of picketing and free speech. However, it is the opinion of the committee that this statute does not interfere with those rights to such an extent as to render it unconstitutional. It is submitted that this bill is a proper and constitutional restriction on the right of picketing. Nor does your committee believe that it is an undue restriction on freedom of speech within the area protected by the first amendment of the Constitution. The legislation denounces as a crime only that picketing, parading, or causing noises which interferes with the administration of justice.

"The individual liberties which are fundamental and necessary to a democratic form of government are not absolute, but are relative, in that they must always be balanced with their broader interest of the body politic."

Mr. Norman THOMAS, whose political views are well known, made the following statement:

"The problem is too serious to be dealt with by a judge through contempt procedure. Picketing of trials should be definitely forbidden by law as in itself a violation of the order upon which the basic right to a fair trial depends."

At the recent meeting of the American Bar Association in St. Louis, the House of Delegates adopted a resolution approving S. 1681; however, the resolution included the following:

"That picketing of the courts is punishable both summarily and as a crime; and any legislation which specifically applies to picketing should expressly recognize and preserve the power of the court to punish such conduct summarily in a contempt proceeding."

It is of interest that Public Law 250, Eighty-first Congress, first session, approved August 18, 1949, contains the following:

"SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in the Supreme Court Building or grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement."

As far as the House of Representatives is concerned the question at this time may be considered moot, for on August 26 last H. R. 5647 passed the House under unanimous consent by a voice vote. However, in the Senate, on August 9 last, bill S. 1681 was passed over on the call of the calendar, at the request of Senator LANGER. On August 26, bill H. R. 5647 was placed on the Senate Calendar, and was passed over on August 27, on objection by Senator WHERRY, at the request of Senator LANGER.

RECOMMENDATION

Judicial proceedings should always be conducted in an atmosphere of dignity and decorum. Ignoring attempts by mass pressure to influence judicial proceedings and decisions can only lessen respect for law and constitutional government.

It is the opinion of this committee, substantiated by a great preponderance of the sentiment of judges who have expressed their views and of the bar of this country, that the enactment into law of either H. R. 5647 or S. 1681 is desirable.

FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the 2d session of the 81st Congress will act favorably on the proposed fair employment practice bill. The people of the State of Washington are keenly interested in this proposal. The Washington State Legislature this year took a decisive step forward by adopting an FEPC Act.

I wish to extend my remarks to include a statement on this subject which I made before the House Committee on Labor and Education during hearings on H. R. 4453.

The statement is as follows:

To the members of this committee I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear in support of the FEPC bill, H. R. 4453. The principle of fair employment proposed in this bill is of great interest and concern to me, because of the place it has in the American program of improved welfare and security for all. In testifying for FEPC legislation, I feel that my views will meet with the approval of the great majority of citizens in my

State, for our State legislature recently has taken positive action in this field. The same is true of the Oregon State Legislature.

It has been argued before this committee, I understand, that fair employment practices legislation would disrupt the economy of the South and cause untold damage and disaster. We cannot deny the vexing problems that would be presented to the South by such legislation. Neither can we deny that progress has been made in improvement of race relationships and in broader opportunities for Negroes. However, I wish to record with this committee my profound conviction that the South will make even greater progress, its people in the days to come will be happier and more prosperous, if its economy is grounded squarely on the principle of equal opportunity for all. No nation, no part of any nation, was ever destroyed by vesting in its government the responsibility for promoting greater equality among its citizens.

Our Nation was founded on the concept that all men are created free and equal, that they are entitled to seek their livelihood and pursue their callings to the fullest extent of their individual capacities. The Old South was destroyed by slavery, not by freedom. The South of today, a region of change and progress, will gain in the long run by utilizing to the utmost the talents, skills, and abilities of all its people.

What I say regarding the South applies equally well to any other part of the country. America is a land of people ever moving in search of greater opportunity, of better livelihood. The interchange of population among States creates special problems in the labor market and responsibilities on the part of government to keep open the avenues of employment for all people regardless of the color of their skin, the way they worship, or the place they were born. A number of States already have taken steps to minimize discrimination in employment. I am happy to report that the present sessions of the Washington and Oregon legislatures, in my part of the country, have enacted FEPC laws, rather similar in their set-up to the bill now being considered by the committee.

In the Pacific Northwest we pride ourselves generally on the fair-minded and democratic way in which we regard all people. As an area of rapid growth, accustomed to receiving large numbers of new settlers, we are eager to facilitate their adjustment and integration into community life. Recognizing problems of discrimination in employment, some precipitated by the influx of recent newcomers, some of longer standing, we have created a State agency to help in the solution of those problems.

The law passed by the State of Washington this session with bipartisan support is modeled very closely on the one which created New York State's Commission Against Discrimination. I am confident that this law will work successfully in the interests of the greater number of our citizens. Its very presence on the statute books, as a full-informed declaration of policy against discriminatory employment practices, will conduce to the elimination of many such undesirable practices without the need for applying punitive measures.

While this law is important as a declaration of policy, it also provides enforcement machinery, for experience has shown that a policy without the means of its execution will not suffice. The neighboring State of Oregon found this to be true. An earlier law of that State merely declared a policy against discrimination in employment, and, lacking teeth, was unable to make a dent in discriminatory employment practices. Therefore, this year the Oregon State Legislature undertook to give effectiveness to its earlier-enacted policy of treating each individual according to his merits. The new measure, signed on March 25, provides for enforcement (after judicial review) by means of mandamus, injunction, or a suit in equity to compel specific performance. Although the measure differs from the Washington law and the bill we are now considering here, in that it provides for administration by the Bureau of Labor rather than by an autonomous agency, nevertheless it appears reasonable to believe that progress will be achieved in furthering more equitable employment practices in the State of Oregon.

With the history of these and other FEPC developments in mind, gentlemen, I urge you to report favorably on H. R. 4453. It is obvious that today many men and women are denied the opportunity of working in the jobs for which they are best fitted. This hurts them; equally important, it hurts America, both in the direct economic sense of denying to American production the best available skills, and in the moral sense of weakening our claim to world leadership in the ways of democracy. Discrimination in employment is a wastage of human resources and a blight on the democratic spirit. Let us declare as a national policy and be prepared to carry out those democratic and humanitarian principles to which we are already committed by a covenant with other nations.

My favorite report on State FEPC laws should not be taken to mean that local measures, however well-intentioned and valuable, will suffice to cope with this problem. The problem is a national one because of the national dimensions of the labor market, and legislation on that level is necessary, as with the problems of old-age security and labor relations. Local laws are perforce limited in their jurisdiction. The great interstate corporations recruit their personnel, the great national unions draws their membership, from all parts of the country. For personnel supervisor and union alike, a national laws is needed to insure adherence to the desired employment practices.

Section 7 of the bill recognizes that State or local agencies have an important place in promoting fair employment. But it is not enough to stop short with local agencies where national standards of decency and fair play must prevail. Just as collective bargaining is a national policy supported by commensurate legislation, so must we proceed in the case of fair-employment practices, which likewise involve our economic and physical well-being, as well as our international security.

Accordingly, I urge this committee to report H. R. 4453 favorably, and express my earnest hope that this Congress will in turn report favorably to the Nation.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we will probably adjourn today, and certainly before next Saturday, I am going to do a rather unusual thing. I will insert in the RECORD a speech which I will deliver at 8:30 p. m. on Saturday evening, October 22, 1949, to the Indiana Joint State meeting of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Ladies Auxiliary at Indianapolis, and over radio station WISH.

My reasons for releasing this speech in advance are as follows:

First. An Indianapolis Times editorial—October 12, 1949—referring to my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1949, page 14026, twisted those remarks as a part of a propaganda campaign to make people believe the Taft-Hartley law protected union membership of union people who oppose misconduct of union officers.

Second. The senior Senator from Indiana, Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART, with apparent approval of the editorial and its purpose, placed this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday—Appendix of the RECORD, page A6467.

Third. Inasmuch as I customarily speak for myself, I offer for the consideration of the Members this speech, which is in answer to that Indianapolis Times editorial, which my esteemed senior Senator [Mr. CAPEHART] apparently adheres to.

In conclusion I should like to invite your attention to the remarks of the able and fearless junior Senator from Oregon, Hon. WAYNE MORSE, upon this general subject. His able address upon the matter is also in yesterday's RECORD, pages 14898–14916.

Mr. Speaker, no greater problem confronts our domestic front than labor relations. While the junior Senator from Oregon is of my opposite political faith, nevertheless, I must say that if many Members of both Houses of this Congress and both parties would emulate his statesmanship, we could solve those problems.

I commend Senator MORSE's speech to the editor of the Indianapolis Times, as well as all Members of Congress; not because of what he said of me, which is purely incidental, but for which I am deeply grateful.

Rather I should be happy, if before we convene again, all our colleagues could capture the full courageous spirit of statesmanlike vision Senator MORSE has shown, and then approach these questions with the sense of fairness born of such courage and vision. If we did, our success in serving all the people would be assured.

For two reasons I am mighty glad to be here tonight. First, it is a pleasure to publicly commend your great organizations upon the service you have been to your country and the railroad workers. There are no finer citizens than our good neighbors who keep our railroads running. To publicly acknowledge your service to them and your country, and to wish you continued success and happiness is my prime pleasure tonight. It is unnecessary to dwell upon your record, which is indelibly written upon the pages of history. Nothing I might say could add to or subtract from it.

So with your indulgence, I shall tonight perform what I consider a public service by straightening both a general and a specific record in regard to a matter that has been grossly misrepresented to the people. History generally distinguishes fact from fiction.

But in order that fact be not confused by fiction, it is often necessary to challenge a powerful medium of public information. The fact that I do not have equal facilities to constantly reach the public does not excuse me from my responsibilities in this regard so long as I am in public office.

Because I find such a challenge necessary tonight, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to correct a matter which is indeed clear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—but which was, nevertheless, misstated by an Indianapolis Times editorial. I have sent the editor a copy of this address and invited him to either share this radio time or tune in and listen. I assume he is listening as he said he would.

I shall deal in no personalities. Rather, I shall cite cold, hard facts that are matters of record.

On October 6, 1949, I spoke very briefly on the floor of the House of Representatives. My exact words were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now I have distributed my limited quota of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not on any political basis, but to persons who can best use them in the public interest. Although the Indianapolis Times opposed my election in Congress, I, nevertheless, put them on my limited mailing list in order to enable them to be accurate regarding what occurs on the floor of Congress.

However, in this case, the Times, by its editorial (which I will presently quote) told you I said things in this speech that I did not say. I will also presently read the speech, which is only half as long as the editorial. Strange as it may seem, the Times, in criticizing it, never quoted a single sentence or phrase from that speech.

The editor actually said he relied upon some report, which he didn't identify, but he has since told me it was an AP dispatch. He then criticized me for not denying that unidentified report, which, indeed, I never saw until after I read the editorial.

But if it was the AP dispatch, it stated that the speech was in the House of Representatives. So the Times editor had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my exact words, and he knew, or should have known, it when he wrote the following:

"We've been waiting for a week or more now for some disavowal by Representative ANDREW JACOBS of remarks attributed to him about the united mine workers and the National Association of Manufacturers and this miner over in Pennsylvania who wanted to know what became of his money.

"Up to now we haven't heard any denials, and until we do we suppose we will have to assume he said what he was quoted as saying."

I do not say the Indianapolis Times editor so intended; but this language is clearly capable of indicating that I objected to a union member having a judicial accounting of union funds.

Now, in order to see if such an inference was warranted, I will read the speech to which he referred:

"UNION DEMOCRACY SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

"Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me a half-page advertisement that was published by the National Association of Manufacturers in numerous newspapers throughout the United States in May 1947. In it the NAM told the people that the Taft-Hartley law would 'guarantee to the American worker the right to speak his own mind regarding his own welfare without fear of being kicked out of the union or fined.'

"I also have an article from the Washington Post, issue of October 4, 1949, which discloses that a man by the name of George H. Livengood was expelled as a member of the United Mine Workers Union because he filed suit for an accounting of the miners' welfare fund.

"The last paragraph of that article reads as follows: 'At the time the suit was filed, the veteran miner said he believed the Taft-Hartley Act would prevent his expulsion from the UMW.'

"I wish to call your attention to the cruel hoax that was perpetrated upon the American people by the National Association of Manufacturers and I wonder what responsibility it will assume for their deceiving men like Mr. Livengood. I also bring to your attention the real purpose of the Union Democracy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor which was unceremoniously dissolved during the recent recess.

"It is also interesting to note that this morning's issue of the Washington Post informs us that the officers of the International Printing Pressmen's and Assistants' Union of North America has filed suit against the estate of the late president of that union. You will recall that this subcommittee of which I was chairman, with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SIMS], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] as members, brought to light the facts upon which this action is based. At that time those officers indicated they would not bring this action. In fact, they threatened economic reprisals against their local organizations which insisted that the action be brought. That was the real interest our committee had in the case—to protect, by law, the rights of members to govern their own organizations.

"First. I express no opinion regarding the merits of the mine workers' accounting case. I do claim that the courts should be open, and economic coercion to prevent any person from seeking a judicial remedy should be forbidden.

"Second. Every member of an economic organization, employee or employer, should be protected in his right to express his opinion and exert his influence in the government of his organization.

"Third. Presumably those who approve dissolution of the union democracy subcommittee do not share these views."

That is the specific record I wanted to set straight.

I offer no apologies for that speech. It contains the absolute truth. It also punctured the general propaganda balloon of Taft-Hartley enthusiasts to the effect that the Taft-Hartley law protects union membership. That is the general record I wanted to set straight. As we progress, you will see how closely the two are related.

The National Association of Manufacturers did tell the people the new labor law would protect union membership. It is interesting to note that it took four pages of questioning by me to get Mr. Ira Mosher of the NAM to grudgingly admit to the House Labor Committee that this statement was false. But he did admit it, and that is printed in the record of the hearings at pages 833 to 838. And now this Indianapolis Times editorial repeated that incorrect statement over 2 years after the Taft-Hartley law was passed; and after NAM concedes its error on the record.

Here are those exact words from the Times editorial:

"It (the Taft-Hartley law) specifically guarantees that where holding a job depends upon being a member of a union, a member can be dropped by the union only for refusal to pay his dues—and for no other reason. He can't be dropped for asking what the union boss did with the money. That's what the law says."

Now there is the issue. The Times says the Taft-Hartley law prohibits expulsion of a union member for demanding an accounting of union funds. I say the Taft-Hartley law does not so provide. Let's settle this issue once and for all time. Here's my proposal. I'll pay you, Mr. Editor, a reward of $1,000 if you will print in the Times any provision of the Taft-Hartley law that prohibits the expulsion of a union member under any circumstances or for any cause.' And I'll let Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, be the judge of the contest. Fair enough. As your old friend Pegler would say.

Now, Mr. Editor, what you are doing, generally, is striving to uphold the Taft-Hartley law—and that is your right. What you did in particular was to try to sell Taft-Hartley to the people by representing that it contains a nonexistent provision—and that you have no moral right to do. The Taft-Hartley provision that you apparently referred to is section 8 (a) (3), which provides that a union-shop contract will not justify an employer discriminating against a worker if the union refuses to accept, or expels such worker from membership, for any reason other than nonpayment of dues and fees.

This section proceeds upon the theory that the union is of no earthly benefit to the worker. It proceeds upon the belief that the union is a villain whose sole function is to prevent people getting jobs. It says in effect that a man can work in a union shop without belonging to the union by simply paying or tendering his dues. I do believe that where a union has a closed or union shop, it should be required to accept all qualified workers. That is in keeping with the philosophy of these great railroad brotherhood unions. Nor have I paid mere lip service to this principle. I have introduced and actually supported legislation to so provide.

But make no mistake about this issue—because it marks the distinction between those who would destroy unions and those who would strengthen and sustain unions by requiring those unions that refuse to do so, to nevertheless meet their responsibilities.

The Taft-Hartley law and the NAM and the Times editor proceed upon the theory that all unions and union officers are bad—and, hence, workers should be induced to refuse to join them and locals should secede from and destroy their parent organizations.

I proceed upon the theory that unions are necessary to protect the workers—that workers want this protection—that some union officials have used their power to abuse their members and government should prohibit those abuses.

The Times editor and NAM know that the public, including good union people, agree with me. Hence, they strive to convince the public that the Taft-Hartley law is in line with my views, and the Times editor has tried to picture my views as supporting these abuses, apparently trying to destroy my effectiveness.

The sole purpose of this address is to turn the pitiless light of truth upon those efforts. I have told you exactly what section 8 (a) 3 provides and what it does not provide. It does not protect union membership and other attendant rights thereof. Among those rights, to mention only one class of benefits, are pension and other welfare benefits.

The Times editor recognized these rights by saying: "He was immediately deprived of his union membership, his interest in UMW funds to which he has been contributing for years * * *."

Then the Times editor claims these rights of membership are protected by the Taft-Hartley law. But, of course, he naturally did not quote such provision, for the very good reason that there is no such provision.

The editorial then states further: "What the National Association of Manufacturers has to do with that, we don't quite see."

If what the Times and NAM told you is true, I agree. But if what they told you is incorrect, they have a responsibility to make a correction.

The Times editorial continues: "If there is any responsibility for the failure of this law to protect the people it was enacted to protect, it would seem to us to be the responsibility of those charged with enforcing it, and who try instead to weaken and discredit and ignore it."

Is that not equivalent to telling the public that there is a Taft-Hartley provision that would reinstate this miner in the UMW?

Mr. Editor, you have made a serious charge against Mr. Robert Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, who, like you, thoroughly approves the Taft-Hartley law. Please print this widely heralded provision so that at least Mr. Denham can commence its enforcement. He, like you, Mr. Editor, is a Taft-Hartley enthusiast. Help Mr. Denham. He hasn't found that provision, either. In fact, Mr. Editor, only you and the NAM seem to know anything about it.

The editorial continues:

"We still haven't heard any denials from Mr. JACOBS—but maybe we will yet."

Mr. Editor, I sent you a copy of this speech and invited you to listen. And the public is going to watch for your answer in the Times. So am I.

And I still assert that this miner's membership in the UMW and his right to his financial benefits are not protected by your beloved Taft-Hartley law. And I again remind you that you can collect a $1,000 reward by merely pointing out a section of Taft-Hartley that actually so provides, and getting Senator TAFT to agree with you.

And I hope that when you find that it is not in the Taft-Hartley law you will be fair enough to admit it in the Times and to accept your responsibility for having published this misinformation. That is the responsibility both you and the NAM owe the public in this regard.

Now I am not through straightening this twisted record—nor with my suggestions that you correct further misinformation that is clearly your responsibility.

Aside from this clear and basic error, Mr. Editor, your editorial gave the public three other separate and distinct impressions that are not in keeping with the facts, but which are in line with the general effort to picture the Taft-Hartley law in a better, and myself in a worse, light than the facts warrant. I hope you will prove your fairness by publicly correcting them. You and I have been friends for years. I would still prefer to enjoy and cherish your friendship. As a public official, I naturally prefer to be on good terms with a powerful newspaper.

But I stood on this same platform just 1 year ago tonight. I told the people that if they elected me to Congress I would always tell them the truth. I also pledged that no organization nor person or newspaper would ever dictate to nor intimidate me. I pledged I would sponsor legislation I considered just, regardless of who opposed it; and oppose legislation I deemed unjust, regardless of who wanted it. I have been condemned and praised by both sides in the labor-management field and, for that matter, in some other fields. But I stand here again, 1 year hence, to renew those pledges and to defy any man to show wherein I have broken any one of them.

And, in keeping with my pledge to make the truth known, I am obligated to, and I do hereby, further challenge the editor of the Indianapolis Times upon three separate specifications of error capable of impairing the accuracy of public understanding. I do this without rancor or vindictiveness. I hope he will respond in the same spirit.

Specification No. 1: Mr. Editor, you told the people you had been waiting for a week for me to deny the unidentified report of my speech. Will you be fair enough to tell your readers—

First. That it is a fact that you had, upon my personal order, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my exact words; and

Second. That you have a Washington correspondent who sees me and communicates with you daily; but that you never asked him to check with me the unidentified report, which you, yourself, said didn't sound like me.

Third, you told the people you had waited a week or more for my denial and further that your unidentified report "just doesn't sound like our Andy." Now, Mr. Editor, will you please affirm or deny that the day before you published this editorial you, Mr. Editor, personally talked to me on the telephone and you never even mentioned the matter?

Fourth, if the matter slipped your mind in this particular telephone conversation, did you not think my reputation as a public official or the Times' reputation for accuracy was worth a long distance call to clarify that concerning which you admitted doubt?

The Times has often called me to clarify routine news. You, Mr. Editor, and your writers have also often called me for legal background on technical news. And won't you admit I have never misled you?

Then why, Mr. Editor, did you not avail yourself of one of these many opportunities to acquaint yourself with the true facts; especially when you state your report didn't sound like me?

I could claim that you wanted to sustain the Taft-Hartley law at all costs; that compared to that objective neither fairness, nor my friendship, were worthy of your consideration. But I refuse to so believe. Rather, I will cling to the hope that you were merely overzealous; that you do want to and will yet be fair in these matters.

Specification No. 2: Mr. Editor, your editorial dwelt at great length upon two things. First, your amazement that I had not denied your unverified report; and, secondly, you put great emphasis upon the right of this member of the miners' union to have an accounting of union pension and welfare funds.

Your readers are mighty apt to conclude that my opinion, as their Congressman, is that a union member is not entitled to such an accounting. Now, is it not true that you and I have often personally discussed my strong conviction that union membership should be protected when they demand such accounting? Won't you be fair enough to tell your readers that you personally knew that to be my unyielding opinion? Is it not a fact I have introduced such legislation—that I sent you a copy of the bill—and that we have personally corresponded and discussed this legislation, of which I am the sole author?

You knew I campaigned on that platform; that I put these views in writing on labor questionnaires and signed them. Less than 60 days prior to your editorial I publicly reaffirmed this stand in my column, which was then still running in the Times. Just 30 days ago my Times column pointed out that it was men like Pegler, who made fat fortunes writing about union abuses, that vilified me most for trying to correct those abuses. You refused to publish that column, Mr. Editor, and I refused to write the column again under such censorship. And within 2 weeks you have joined Pegler to infer that I do not support remedies that are actually provided in legislation I am sponsoring.

I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Editor, if I ask you: Were you not aware of the fact that I am nationally known and recognized as the champion of these rights? Then why, Mr. Editor, did you leave the innuendo without mentioning a fact so well known to you?

Were you really that anxious to give that unwarranted credit to the Taft-Hartley law? Certainly my advocacy of this measure is awakening many people to the fact that Taft-Hartley does not protect union membership, as you would have the people believe.

Do you really want these abuses corrected or do you want them to continue so as to furnish you an excuse to fight all unions, the many that are good as well as the few that are bad?

You may hammer at me from now to doomsday, Mr. Editor. Politically I know it is unwise to engage in this controversy, for I do not have equal facilities with which to answer back. But I repeat that it is my duty to set the record straight, and to the best of my ability I will always do so. The public is entitled to the truth regarding public affairs, and if I didn't employ every means available to make the facts known, I would not be worthy to represent my constituents in Congress.

Spectification No. 3: In this editorial, Mr. Editor, you told the people "this (miner's expulsion), Mr. JACOBS is quoted (and has not denied) saying is the fault of the National Association of Manufacturers, who ought to reimburse the man."

Of course, you literally misquoted me. And the AP report I saw was not responsible either because it did not quote me as saying one word about reimbursement. I asked what responsibility the NAM would assume for "deceiving men like this" miner about what the Taft-Hartley law provided. Since you republished the same misinformation, I ask you the same question, Mr. Editor.

But when I speak of responsibility, I can think in terms other than dollars and cents. Perhaps others cannot, and this may have caused this confusion.

But somehow I cannot escape the firm belief that one assumes a tremendous responsibility to tell the truth when he speaks before a microphone, as I am doing now, or when one puts on a national advertising campaign as did the NAM; or when one, like you, Mr. Editor, publishes a powerful daily newspaper.

We are all human—hence subject to error. In any large undertaking we all make mistakes. Then comes the real responsibility—the acid test of manhood—the responsibility to retract the erroneous statements and state the truth.

You and I have so often discussed this responsibility that it should have immediately occurred to you that that is a real responsibility, and the one I had in mind. I was not thinking alone of the miner in Pennsylvania—but also of the hundreds of thousands of my constituents and the millions of Americans to whom you and the NAM have given this misinformation.

Since you so clearly associate money and responsibility, I offer you a money reward to arouse your sense of responsibility. Surely you will accept the responsibility I mentioned and frankly tell the people you were in error, or print the provision that no one save you and the NAM appear to have ever seen.

And I believe it is fair to ask the people to watch carefully and see if this correction is made.

May I repeat, in closing, that I am deeply grateful to you of the Railroad Brotherhood and the Ladies Auxiliary for this opportunity to speak publicly, and to publicly, though briefly, salute your great organizations—as well as to state these facts to you and the people.

I am always grateful when I use the radio for the purpose of straightening the record. The radio is indeed a great competitive equalizer in the field of public information. Created in the framework of natural laws, ordained by the bountiful hand of divine providence, radio is one of God's greatest gifts to democracy. Radio helps bring true the prediction of William Cullen Bryant when he wrote:

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again:
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshipers."

Summary of Eighty-first Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress is now history. Much will be said and written regarding the work accomplished by this session. For the benefit of those who wish to consider objectively the actual laws passed during this session, I wish to include a full summary of congressional action.

SOCIAL SECURITY HEALTH, AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

1. Expanded social-security program and increased the benefits of old-age-survivors insurance and public assistance. H. R. 6000 passed the House October 5, 1949, is now pending before the Senate. Eleven million persons will become beneficiaries, added to the 35,000,000 now covered. The average old-age benefits will be increased from a minimum of $26 to $40, and the maximum from $85 to $150 per month. The bill also permits higher part-time earnings and provides for temporary and permanent disability insurance.

H. R. 6000. Passed House October 5, 1949.

2. Increased aid for the construction of hospitals and other medical facilities where needed. Doubles amount of aid from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. Passed House and Senate August 9. October 3, 1949.

3. Granted special appropriation of $1,500,000 for crippled children, in addition to regular annual grants to States, to meet emergency needs resulting from the polio epidemic and lack of hospital facilities. Public, No. 42.

4. Authorized $100,000,000 for State and local public works plan and specifications. This allows advanced local construction plans which could be used to provide employment where unemployment develops. Passed House October 3, 1949; Senate October 6, 1949. Public, No. 352. October 13, 1949.

VETERANS

1. Passed H. R. 4617 which liberalizes pensions to veterans, widows and surviving children of veterans. Passed House June 1, 1949.

2. Passed S. 2115, providing for the purchase by the Veterans' Administration of automobiles for crippled veterans.

3. Passed H. R. 5598 which increases the rates of payment for presumed service-connected disability from 75 to 100 percent. Public, No. 339, October 10, 1949.

4. Extended time for filing in warranted cases, for pensions and compensations. Public, No. 195. August 1, 1949.

5. Authorized $5,000,000 for hospital for Negro veterans at birthplace of Booker T. Washington. H. R. 6034. Passed House September 26, 1949.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Enacted Public, No. 47, authorizing continuation of the European Recovery program. This is designed to aid European nations to restore their economies. April 19, 1949.

2. Extended reciprocal-trade agreements, without restrictions, for 3 years. Public, No. 307. September 26, 1949.

3. Ratified the North Atlantic Pact (Senate, July 21, 1949) and approved a program of military assistance to the signatory nations. Public, No. 329. October 6, 1949.

4. Passed legislation revising the United Nations Participation Act in order to strengthen our representation in that body with delegates of Ambassador status. Public, No. 341. October 10, 1949.

5. Revised displaced-person legislation by removing provisions which were written into the act by the Eightieth Congress and which forced discrimination against persons of the Catholic and Jewish faiths. Passed House (H. R. 4567) June 2, 1949.

6. Adopted a Palestinian refugee program and granted a special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations to aid displaced persons in the Palestinian war. Public, No. 25. March 24, 1949.

7. Enacted a law providing that payments on old World War I debts by Finland be used for scholarships for its citizens here. Public, No. 265. August 24, 1949.

8. Passed legislation to extend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to continue cooperative projects to improve the health, education, agriculture, and living standards of our neighbors in South America. Public, No. 283. September 3, 1949.

9. Authorized continuation of economic assistance to Korea. Third deficiency bill.

10. Extended America's contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund. This provides aid to children of Europe who are suffering from malnutrition. Public, No. 170. July 14, 1949.

HOUSING

1. Passed a new national housing law providing for construction of 810,000 dwelling units in 6 years. This $308,000,000 program will be financed over 40 years. It also authorized $1,500,000,000 in Federal aid to communities for slum clearance, for a farm-housing program of direct loans and grants and for housing research. Preference to veterans and families of deceased veterans. Public, No. 171. July 15, 1949.

2. Passed H. R. 6070, which provides for liberalized financing of the housing program through the mortgage-insurance authority of the FHA and the RFC. Passed House August 25, 1949.

3. Extended rent control. Public, No. 131. March 30, 1949.

4 Provided in S. 851 for aids toward Alaska housing construction. Public, No. 52. April 23, 1949.

5. Authorized a 5-year program of public works for development of Alaskan community facilities. Public, No. 264. August 24, 1949.

Passed S. 1184 which permits private industry to construct rental housing on or near military installations and authorized insurance of $500,000,000 additional mortgages. Public, No. 211.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. Passed authorization for establishing and developing radar screen (land-based air warnings). This provides for a full radar screen to warn of any enemy aircraft. Public, No. 30. March 30, 1949.

2. Enacted legislation which provides for unification of the armed services, defining the powers of the Secretary of Defense and generally streamlining whole defense set-up. Public, No. 216. August 10, 1949.

3. Increased authorization for an experimental submarine program. Public, No. 213. August 8, 1949.

4. Adjusted military pay, generally increasing pay or related benefits of all ranks in service. Public, No. 351. September 27, 1949.

5. Passed H. R. 6303 which provides $137,000,000 for the construction of housing, utilities, and defense stations in Alaska and in the Island of Okinawa. Passed House October 11, 1949. Passed Senate October 17, 1949.

CIVIL RIGHTS

1. Passed a bill to remove payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to right to vote. Passed House July 26, 1949.

2. Passed a bill to equalize the opportunities for residents of the United States to become naturalized citizens. Passed House June 6, 1949.

3. Created a select committee to investigate and regulate lobbying activities. H. Res. 298. Passed House August 12, 1949. No Senate action required.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

1. Enacted a statute calling for the reorganization of the Executive Department of the Government in order that greater efficiency and economy can be obtained in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Public, No. 109. June 30, 1949.

2. Created a unified property management system in order more economically to purchase, use, and dispose of Government property. Public, No. 152. Approved June 30, 1949.

3. Approved all seven of the seven reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President on June 20, 1949.

(a) To establish a Department of Welfare to replace the Federal Security Agency. (This resolution was disapproved by the Senate on August 16, 1949.)

(b) Transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

(c) Strengthened the top-level organization of the Post Office Department.

(d) Transferred the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

(e) Made Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

(f) Made Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

(g) Transferred the Public Roads Administration from the Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

(h) Unifies Armed Services under authority of Defense Secretary.

4. Authorized reorganization of State Department. Public, No. 73.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

1. Passed a bill continuing for 1 year, Federal aid to schools with war-swollen populations and for education of children on Federal reservations. Public, No. 306. September 10, 1949.

2. Authorized hearings in areas with school accommodation problems (including Seattle and Bremerton on November 15, 16, 17) toward adoption of a school-construction program (H. R. 5718, Mitchell bill) which would provide for both emergency and long-range school needs. Identical measure, S. 2317 (Humphrey bill) has been passed by Senate.

AGRICULTURE

1. Passed bill which will allow the REA to make loans for the construction of rural telephone lines. This will enable farm co-ops and organizations to construct their own telephone lines. H. R. 2960; Conference report October 18, 1949.

2. Enacted legislation revising the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation to permit it to provide the necessary grain-storage facilities and to exchange surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials. Public, No. 85. June 7, 1949.

3. Approved a bill continuing 90-percent price-support levels for farm products through 1950, revising to sliding scale and new parity thereafter.

4. Continued the crop-insurance program and broadened its provisions in order to cover additional commodities. Public, No. 268. October 25, 1949.

5. Granted emergency appropriations for relief loans to farmers whose crops were destroyed in western blizzard. Public, No. 5.

LABOR

1. Passed a fair labor standards bill increasing the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Passed House August 11, 1949; Senate August 31, 1949.

2. Clarified the overtime pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Public, No. 177.

3. Increased the travel allowance for civilian Government employees. Public, No. 92.

4. Liberalized compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in line of duty. Public, No. 357.

5. Provided pay increase and improved working conditions of Postal Service employees. H. R. 4495. Passed House September 27, 1949; Senate September 30, 1949.

6. Revised the Classification Act and increased pay of classified employees. H. R. 5931. Passed House September 28, 1949; Senate September 30, 1949.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. Authorized establishment of guided missile proving ground for testing rockets, etc. Seventy-five million dollars. Public, No. 60.

2. Authorized 5-year housing and operations building program at stations of the Alaska communications system. S. 1578. Passed House October 19, 1949; Senate June 21, 1949.

3. Authorized survey for potential construction of link to connect U. S. Canadian Railway with Alaskan Railway. H. R. 2186. Passed House August 24, 1949; Senate October 17, 1949.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

1. Extended rent control for 15 months from March 31, 1949. Public, No. 31.

2. Extended President's authority to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, speculative trading in commodities affecting cost of living, and for allocation of key materials in short supply. Public, No. 6.

3. Authorized $40,000,000 appropriation for sites and planning for new Federal public buildings, and $30,000,000 for modernization of existing structures. Public, No. 105. (This includes the Seattle Post Office Terminal Annex. Appropriation covering initial steps was included in the second supplemental appropriation bill.)

4. Tightened antitrust laws. (H. R. 2734) to prohibit acquisitions or mergers which lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. Passed House August 15, 1949.

NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Authorized 15-year program to recover forest acreage and grazing lands. Public, No. 348.

2. Passed H. R. 5472 authorizing improvements to rivers and harbors and the construction of flood-control projects. Passed House August 22, 1949.

3. Appropriated $21,500,000 for Eklutna hydroelectric project, Alaska. H. R. 940. Passed House July 13, 1949.

4. Increased Federal aid to States in cooperative programs for forest-fire prevention. H. R. 2296. Passed House May 16, 1949; Senate August 9, 1949.

5. Authorized increase in appropriations for first national survey of forest resources. Public, No. 128.

APPROPRIATION BILLS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Title	Budget estimates [1]	Amount as passed House	Amount as passed Senate	Public Law
Labor	$16,766,200	$16,550,000	$16,766,200	$16,766,200
Interior	624,832,270	536,461,908	595,262,257	584,098,797
Agriculture	727,906,908	701,122,079	723,083,249	715,601,607
First Deficiency, 1949	564,183,148	471,895,177	542,303,473	524,649,473
Second Deficiency, 1949	698,038,397	671,069,672	862,563,510	854,838,710
Third Deficiency, 1949	214,730,794	127,032,293	193,078,469	177,740,619
Veterans' Readjustment	595,890,000	595,890,000	595,890,000	585,890,000
Foreign Aid	6,322,200,000	5,617,470,000	5,647,424,000	5,659,740,000
First Supplemental, 1950	89,965,021	72,790,521	104,172,589	78,005,129
Second Supplemental, 1950	1,064,633,695	1,038,506,380	1,076,661,658	1,079,082,880

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND APPROVED

House bills	6,532
House joint resolutions	382
House resolutions	405
House concurrent resolutions	149
Senate bills	2,765
Senate joint resolutions	137
Senate resolutions	191
Senate concurrent resolutions	65
Public laws approved to date	403
Private laws approved to date	347

From the Ends of the Earth Nations Proclaim United Nations Day—Peals of Hope Ring for World at Peace—High and Lowly Alike Lift Voices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the great poet Whittier has said:

His fame who led the storming van of battle well may cease;
But never that which crowns the man whose victory was peace.

Today when one speaks for peace and for understanding and agreement between peoples and nations too many are prone to call it appeasement. Just to think that world war III, with the atomic bomb, germ warfare, and the mass slaughter of innocent children, women, and men as a means of solving our international problems is mad insanity. Wars have failed to settle anything, and by now we should all realize that peace cannot be kept by force; it can only be achieved by mutual understanding. The United Nations representatives are working for peace. Where direct diplomacy has failed, the United Nations has won. The United Nations has handled many dynamite-laden problems such as Palestine, the Berlin blockade, and has emerged successful. It has weathered four of the most critical years in the world's history and is now stronger than ever.

I should like particularly to extend my congratulations and best wishes to Frank B. Frederick, the Boston attorney who launched the movement for establishing United Nations Day, and is now vice-chairman of the National Citizens' Committee for United Nations Day. I will predict that this world holiday for peace and understanding will be celebrated and hailed more and more every year until it shall become the greatest holiday in the world. Thousands of "blue and white" United Nations flags flew over the British Isles to celebrate United Nations Day. They appeared on all public buildings, schools, and town houses. France has issued a special United Nations postage stamp in honor of this great holiday.

At this point I wish to insert an article written by Homer Metz, chief of

the United Nations News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor:

Today is United Nations Day.

As holidays go, it is practically an infant. There is no long and hallowed tradition behind it. It does not stir the imagination like a Fourth of July in the United States, a Bastille Day in France.

Yet it is a holiday pregnant with hope and promise. It is unique in that it is the only nonreligious holiday that is truly international. Future generations may value it above all other secular holidays.

October 24 is the birthday of the United Nations. On this day in 1945 all the required ratifications of the Charter had been deposited. The United Nations came into existence, and its Charter took effect as world law.

Two years ago—in 1947—the General Assembly decided unanimously that this date should be commemorated as United Nations Day and should be devoted to making known to and keeping fresh in the minds of the peoples of the world the ideals, objectives, and achievements of the organization.

It is a day on which the high and the lowly of the world are invited to avail themselves of the opportunity of reflecting on the organization and dedicating themselves anew to its success.

A DAY FOR ALL

A few weeks ago in Washington, President Truman told the American National Citizens' Committee for United Nations Day: "I think that the United Nations is the only bulwark we have to the peace of the world, and our support of the United Nations is absolutely essential—with everything we have."

The very same day, a small boy in Warri, Nigeria, wrote the following letter to UN headquarters at Lake Success:

"Please to send me loveable pictures. I am pleased to hear of your unity you people have."

The little boy—Amos Omoshare—added that he was preparing to celebrate United Nations Day in his small village.

Thus the day has taken on the character that was intended for it: A day for all peoples everywhere to realize and understand that their only hope lies in unity and common effort.

Contrasted to but no more significant in ultimate value than the simple celebration in which Amos Omoshare took part in Nigeria is the ceremony which was held in New York today when President Truman laid the cornerstone of the UN's permanent headquarters and addressed a special open-air plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

HOLIDAYS PROCLAIMED

In many countries public holidays were proclaimed. In those where this was not done, there were speeches by public figures, public meetings, the flying of the UN flag from buildings, school pageants, film exhibitions, special radio programs, and so on.

In preparation for the universal observance of United Nations Day, more than 1,000,000 pamphlets, leaflets, and posters were prepared at Lake Success and distributed in almost every region of the world. Besides being issued in the five official languages of the UN—English, French, Spanish, Chinese, and Russian—this information material was translated into innumerable languages from Pushtu to Arabic.

In one typical day at Lake Success, requests for pamphlets and posters were received from Burma, Chile, Indonesia, Monrovia, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines.

For all its shortcomings, for all its disappointments, the UN retains a strong hold on the minds and hearts of the ordinary "little" people of all nations. If the organization is to achieve the aims and purposes laid down for it by its founders, this hold must grow progressively stronger as time goes by.

ACHIEVEMENT EXHIBITION

In London, there was an exhibition of the practical achievements of the UN. The Rotary International of Britain and Ireland sent a letter to 660 clubs making suggestions for special meetings. The Trades Union Congress made arrangements for ceremonies in factories and among trade-union members.

Especially encouraging is the fact that the United Nations center in Moscow—staffed and directed by Russians, incidentally—requested large supplies of posters and literature to be distributed throughout the Soviet Union. In addition, the information center arranged to have motion pictures shown and special lectures on the UN delivered in Moscow.

In Mexico City, UN Day observance included a poster competition, an essay competition, a parade at the Olympic Stadium attended by about 50,000 children, a competition among commercial houses for the best UN window display, a public message by the minister of war, and a special ceremony at the Teatro de Bellas Artes.

In The Hague, a special UN flag was flown over the International Court of Justice. In addition, newsreels of UN activities were shown throughout the Netherlands, and all Dutch radio stations had announcers read the preamble to the UN Charter.

In Czechoslovakia, there were a series of special broadcasts to schools, an hour-and-a-half UN program over the nation's entire radio network, and other special ceremonies.

In Thailand, where a national holiday was proclaimed, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs arranged a series of programs and there was a UN Day meeting sponsored by Premier Field Marshal Phibum Songkram and the Thailand Cabinet. There were also UN film exhibitions and special addresses.

SPECIAL CELEBRATIONS

Universities, secondary schools, and primary classes in Argentina all had special celebrations.

In India UN Day coincided with the great Indian holiday of Divali, or Feast of Light, which is celebrated by the population for several days and which this year was combined with celebrating the United Nations and its work.

In Australia, a national committee was formed with headquarters in Sydney and with a local committee in each state. As a result, a variety of forms of celebrations were arranged. There was an Australian edition of the UN pamphlet, How Peoples Work Together, distributed throughout each state.

A UN Day proclamation was read in all schools in Burma, and there was a brief talk by the head of each school on the structure and function of the United Nations and its achievements.

In 1 minute of silence the children were asked to join in united prayer for the peace of the country and of the world. There were also school debates, essay competitions, sports festivals, and plays dealing with the UN.

At this point I also wish to insert the splendid address delivered by President Truman at the United Nations cornerstone-laying ceremonies. In my opinion this is the greatest speech that President Truman has ever delivered. I am sure that it will be so recognized, not only by the American people, but by all peace-loving people in the whole world.

President Romulo, Mr. Lie, distinguished representatives, and fellow guests, we have come together today to lay the cornerstone of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations. These are the most important buildings in the world, for they are the center of man's hope for peace and a better life. This is the place where the nations of the world will work together to make that hope a reality.

This occasion is a source of special pride to the people of the United States. We are deeply conscious of the honor of having the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in this country. At the same time, we know how important it is that the people of other nations should come to know at first-hand the work of this world organization.

We consider it appropriate, therefore, that the United Nations should hold meetings from time to time in other countries when that can be done. For the United Nations must draw its inspiration from the people of every land; it must be truly representative of and responsive to the peoples of the world whom it was created to serve.

NEW STAGE

This ceremony marks a new stage in the growth of the United Nations. It is fitting that it should take place on United Nations Day, the fourth anniversary of the day the Charter entered into effect.

During the 4 years of its existence this organization has become a powerful force for promoting peace and friendship among the peoples of the world. The construction of this new headquarters is tangible proof of the steadfast faith of the members in the vitality and strength of the organization, and of our determination that it shall become more and more effective in the years ahead.

The Charter embodies the hopes and ideals of men everywhere. Hopes and ideals are not static. They are dynamic and they give life and vigor to the United Nations. We look forward to a continuing growth and evolution of the organization to meet the changing needs of the world's peoples. We hope that eventually every nation on earth will be a fully qualified and loyal member.

NEW STRENGTH

We who are close to the United Nations sometimes forget that it is more than the procedures, the councils, and the debates through which it operates. We tend to overlook the fact that the organization is the living embodiment of the principles of the charter—the renunciation of aggression and the joint determination to build a better life.

But if we overlook this fact we will fail to realize the strength and power of the United Nations. We will fail to understand the true nature of this new force that has been created in the affairs of our time.

The United Nations is essentially an expression of the moral nature of man's aspirations. The Charter clearly shows our determination that international problems must be settled on a basis acceptable to the conscience of mankind.

Because the United Nations is the dynamic expression of what all the peoples of the world desire, because it sets up a standard of right and justice for all nations, it is greater than any of its members. The compact that underlies the United Nations cannot be ignored—and it cannot be infringed or dissolved.

We in the United States, in the course of our own history, have learned what it means to set up an organization to give expression to the common desire for peace and unity. Our Constitution expressed the will of the people that there should be a United States. And through toil and struggle the people made their will prevail.

COMMON EFFORTS

In the same way, I think, the Charter and the organization served by these buildings express the will of the people of the world that there shall be a United Nations.

This does not mean that all the member countries are of one mind on all issues. The controversies which divide us go very deep. We should understand that these buildings are not a monument to the unanimous agreement of nations on all things.

But they signify one new and important fact. They signify that the peoples of the

world are of one mind in their determination to solve their common problems by working together.

Our success in the United Nations will be measured not only in terms of our ability to meet and master political controversies. We have learned that political controversies grow out of social and economic problems. If the people of the world are to live together in peace, we must work together to establish the conditions that will provide a firm foundation for peace.

For this reason, our success will also be measured by the extent to which the rights of individual human beings are realized. And it will be measured by the extent of our economic and social progress.

FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

These fundamental facts are recognized both in the language of the Charter and the activities in which the United Nations has been engaged during the past 4 years. The Charter plainly makes respect for human rights by nations a matter of international concern. The member nations have learned from bitter experience that regard for human rights is indispensable to political, economic, and social progress. They have learned that disregard of human rights is the beginning of tyranny and, too often, the beginning of war.

For these reasons, the United Nations has devoted much of its time to fostering respect for human rights. The General Assembly has adopted the universal declaration of human rights and the convention on genocide. Other important measures in this field are under study.

I am confident that this great work will go steadily forward. The preparation of a covenant on human rights by the Human Rights Commission is a task with which the United States is deeply concerned.

We believe strongly that the attainment of basic civil and political rights for men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—is essential to the peace we are seeking. We hope that the covenant on human rights will contain effective provisions regarding freedom of information. The minds of men must be free from artificial and arbitrary restraints, in order that they may seek the truth and apply their intelligence to the making of a better world.

ECONOMIC PROGRAMS

Another field in which the United Nations is undertaking to build the foundations of a peaceful world is that of economic development. Today at least half of mankind lives in dire poverty. Hundreds of millions of men, women, and children lack adequate food, clothing, and shelter. We cannot achieve permanent peace and prosperity in the world until the standard of living in underdeveloped areas is raised.

It is for this reason that I have urged the launching of a vigorous and concerted effort to apply modern technology and capital investment to improve the lot of these peoples. These areas need a large expansion of investment and trade. In order for this to take place they also need the application of scientific knowledge and technical skills to their basic problems—producing more food, improving health and sanitation, making use of their natural resources, and educating their people.

To meet these needs, the United Nations and its agencies are preparing a detailed program for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

BASIC RULES DEFINED

The Economic and Social Council last summer defined the basic principles which should underlie this program. The General Assembly is now completing and perfecting the initial plans. The fact that the Economic Committee of the Assembly voted unanimously for the resolution on technical assistance shows that this is a common cause which commands united support. Although differences may arise over details of the program, I fervently hope that the members of the United Nations will remain unanimous in their determination to raise the standards of living of the less fortunate members of the human family.

The United States intends to play its full part in this great enterprise. We are already carrying on a number of activities in this field. I shall urge the Congress, when it reconvenes in January, to give high priority to the proposals which will make possible additional technical assistance and capital investment.

I should like to speak of one other problem which is of major concern to the United Nations. That is the control of atomic energy.

Ever since the first atomic weapon was developed a major objective of United States policy has been a system of international control of atomic energy that would assure effective prohibition of atomic weapons, and at the same time would promote the peaceful use of atomic energy by all nations.

PROBLEM FOR UN

In November 1945 Prime Minister Attlee, of the United Kingdom, Prime Minister King, of Canada, and I agreed that the problem of international control of atomic energy should be referred to the United Nations. The establishment of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was one of the first acts of the first session of the General Assembly.

That Commission worked for 3 years on the problem. It developed a plan of control which reflected valuable contributions by almost every country represented on the Commission. This plan of control was overwhelmingly approved by the General Assembly on November 4, 1948.

This is a good plan. It is a plan that can work, and more important, it is a plan that can be effective in accomplishing its purpose. It is the only plan so far developed that would meet the technical requirements of control, that would make prohibition of atomic weapons effective, and at the same time promote the peaceful development of atomic energy on a cooperative basis.

We support this plan and will continue to support it unless and until a better and more effective plan is put forward. To assure that atomic energy will be developed to man's welfare and not to his destruction is a continuing challenge to all nations and all peoples. The United States is now, and will remain, ready to do its full share in meeting this challenge.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Respect for human rights, promotion of economic development, and a system for control of weapons are requisites to the kind of world we seek. We cannot solve these problems overnight, but we must keep everlastingly working at them in order to reach our goal.

No single nation can always have its own way, for these are human problems, and the solution of human problems is to be found in negotiation and mutual adjustment.

The challenge of the twentieth century is the challenge of human relations, and not of impersonal natural forces. The real dangers confronting us today have their origins in outmoded habits of thought, in the inertia of human nature, and in preoccupation with supposed national interests to the detriment of the common good.

As members of the United Nations, we are convinced that patience, the spirit of reasonableness, and hard work will solve the most stubborn political problems. We are convinced that individual rights and social and economic progress can be advanced through international cooperation.

Our faith is in the betterment of human relations. Our vision is of a better world in which men and nations can live together, respecting one another's rights, and cooperating in building a better life for all. Our efforts are made in the belief that men and nations can cooperate, that there are no international problems which men of good will cannot solve or adjust.

ACT OF FAITH

Mr. President, Mr. Lie, the laying of this cornerstone is an act of faith—our unshakable faith that the United Nations will succeed in accomplishing the great tasks for which it was created.

But "faith without works is dead." We must make our devotion to the ideals of the charter as strong as the steel in this building. We must pursue the objectives of the charter with resolution as firm as the rock on which this building rests. We must conduct our affairs foursquare with the charter, in terms as true as this cornerstone.

If we do these things, the United Nations will endure and will bring the blessings of peace and well-being to mankind.

The Effect of the Double Corporation Tax on Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am, by request of a life-insurance policyholder, including as an extension of my remarks a statement made to life-insurance policyholders by the Life Insurance Policy Holders Protective Association.

The statement explains why the purchasing value of life insurance has declined, why life-insurance dividends have been cut, and why life-insurance premiums have been raised, as it discusses the effect of the double corporation tax on life insurance.

Fellow Policyholder:

You took out a life-insurance policy for the protection of your wife and family. Now you are worried because they no longer have the protection you planned for them when you took out your policy. You have cause to be concerned because the bread-and-butter value of your policy has declined about 60 percent since 1933. In terms of food, the purchasing value of your life insurance is about 40 percent of its 1933 value.

American life-insurance companies are the strongest in the world and have a remarkable record of performance. Your life-insurance company will promptly pay the full number of dollars called for under your policy—but your insurance company has no control over what those dollars will buy. Our Government's future spending and taxing policies will largely determine the real value of your life insurance.

NINETEEN MILLION AT THE TROUGH

Our National Government is spending so lavishly that our tax burden has become terrific. It has piled agency on agency, bureaucrat on bureaucrat, and subsidy on subsidy. Since 1932 it has quadrupled the number of bureaucrats on the public pay roll and has made subsidies to many millions more. More than 14,000,000 persons now reply upon our National Government, in whole or part, for their livelihood. When State and local employees are added, we find that 19,000,000 persons are feeding at the public trough. It is therefore easy to understand why the cost

of our National Government has increased 800 percent since 1932 and why one-third of our food cost is taxes.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS SHRINKS TO FOUR HUNDRED DOLLARS

Corporation taxes have increased 1,000 percent since 1932 and these taxes, being a business cost like labor and materials, increase production costs and selling prices accordingly.

For example, when we pay 15 cents for a can of beans, we pay 10 cents for the beans and 5 cents for taxes—taxes previously paid by various business corporations but passed on to us in the shape of a 5-cent higher retail price. That is one of the reasons why the housewife who spent $10 per week for food in 1932 paid $26.40 for the same food in 1948—why the life insurance policy which gave her $1,000 of "bread and butter" protection in 1932 had shrunk to $400 by 1948—the $10,000 policy to $4,000.

THE DOUBLE TAX ON CORPORATION EARNINGS

In addition to the heavy State, county, and city taxes, license fees, etc., which a corporation pays, our National Government imposes a tax of up to 38 percent on corporate earnings. The balance, after payment of these taxes, is used partly for improvements and expansion and parity to pay dividends to its stockholders. Then the National and State Governments step in and levy a second and additional tax on that portion which is used to pay dividends. These National and State taxes on dividends are paid by the stockholders, and the national tax alone may run as high as 77 percent. This double tax has serious consequences.

First, its causes higher living costs and thereby lowers the real or purchasing value of life insurance and savings.

Second, it so discourages investment in corporation stocks that individuals are forced to compete with life insurance companies and banks for the purchase of high-grade bonds. This competition so lowers the interest rate on bonds that the earnings of life-insurance companies are correspondingly reduced and they are forced to increase premium rates on new policies and reduce dividends on those outstanding.

Third, the double taxation of corporation earnings causes investors to shy away from the purchase of corporation stocks, excepting those with long-established earning records. Consequently it is difficult, if not impossible, for new concerns to start up in business and create new jobs for our expanding population.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

Many Members of Congress realize that the double taxation of corporation earnings is forcing up the cost of living; is reducing the purchasing value of insurance and savings; is preventing the expansion of the Nation's mills and factories; and is causing unemployment. Such outstanding leaders as Hon. Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; Hon. Walter F. George, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; and Hon. Noah M. Mason, of the House Ways and Means Committee, have publicly urged that legislation be enacted which will correct this unfortunate situation.

When Congress reconvenes next January appropriate legislation will be proposed. It is to your personal interest and the welfare of your country that your Senators and Representative support such legislation.

We policyholders have a double interest in correcting the unfortunate situation which results from the double taxation of corporation earnings. There are 78,000,000 of us policyholders in the United States and we have the influence and numerical strength to bring about the necessary reform. You owe it to yourself and family to raise your voice and place the weight of your personal influence on the side of less spending and fair and rational corporation tax reform.

Asia Speaks to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has come to the United States to help America know what kind of ally India might be in the world struggle for freedom, and to see what kind of ally America might be. He has said he wants no Marshall plan for India. All he seeks for his countrymen is a decent standard of living and a place of influence among the nations of the world. A stable Asia where democracy can flourish depends first on the well-being of the peoples of Asia, and most particularly of India.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, published on Wednesday, October 19, 1949, which I think is an excellent commentary on the value to America of Pandit Nehru's visit:

ASIA SPEAKS TO AMERICA

"In this world of incessant and feverish activity men have little time to think, much less to consider ideals and objectives."

The words are Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's in his speech at Columbia University on Monday night. They are also the expression of an Asia which has always valued contemplation above action, intentions above results. They bring to the very heart of the Western World's bustling preoccupation with technological power the reminder of another world's judgment on that concern.

Mr. Nehru arrived in the United States soon after the news of Russia's atom bomb. He is a good corrective to the unthinking impulse to "do something" quick in order to combat—and perhaps by that very fact to increase—the threat suggested by the news. He has had plenty of time to think. Thirteen years in jail have given him ample occasion to ponder the nature of the western imperialism which put him there and the doctrines of force and violence opposed to his master Gandhi's potent gospel of nonviolence.

Out of this experience has come a deep humanitarian emphasis in his thinking. To practical western minds it may seem tinged with unrealism—and, indeed, Mr. Nehru may well learn on this trip how large a part of America's roaring energies serve humanitarian ends in a very practical way. Yet it is true also that too many Americans believe that guns in Asia are practical politics in a world power struggle, whereas talk about racial equality and help for Asia's poverty-stricken millions is visionary irrelevance.

It is not irrelevant—not even to the power struggle. For power is ideological as well as technological, moral as well as military. A continent that feels itself to be despised by its erstwhile white masters is a poor bulwark against the glowing promises of communism. An America which has worked miracles through mass production without yet achieving the miracle of sharing its benefits more widely with the world's masses is still a poor candidate for world leadership.

The domestic attacks on President Truman's point-4 program—which remains the most constructive part of America's foreign policy—show how much need there is for the "imaginative statesmanship" for which Mr. Nehru calls. There is profoundest truth in his statement:

"The colossal expenditure of energy and resources on armaments that is an outstanding feature of many national budgets today does not solve the problem of world peace. Perhaps even a fraction of that outlay in other ways and for other purposes will provide a more enduring basis for peace and happiness."

This is not to ignore the relative necessity for force to restrain aggression in today's unhappy world. It is to acknowledge—and perhaps some of our practical men of affairs could use a season of solitary confinement in order to think about this—that peace must finally be won with spiritual weapons.

India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George Crews McGhee and myself over Voice of America, October 14, 1949, on the significance of Nehru's visit, as a part of a 15-minute daily broadcast to India during the visit to United States of the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharal Nehru:

INTERVIEW WITH GEORGE CREWS M'GHEE

1. How do you think Prime Minister Nehru's visit to the United States will affect relations between this country and India?

Mr. MCGHEE. Long before the Indian people had won their independence, the people of the United States had expressed their sympathetic interest in their strivings for freedom. We admired and respected Prime Minister Nehru as one of the great leaders of the independence struggle.

Despite the strong bonds of sympathy between us, and modern developments which in a sense have brought us and all nations closer together, India has to many Americans seemed a distant and unfamiliar place. There have been times when our respective points of view have not been understood, or the full meaning of some difficult problem facing one of us has not been appreciated by the other.

The Prime Minister's visit will help to bring to our people an increased understanding of the great importance of our relations with India. We also hope that the visit will assist the Prime Minister in arriving at a true appraisal of our country, our national hopes and aspirations for a better world, and the position of responsibility we have assumed in world affairs—we feel that this process cannot but be beneficial, that our existing ties with India will be strengthened, and that our friendship will become deeper and more understanding.

2. What position do you see India taking as a leader in Asian affairs?

Mr. MCGHEE. One has but to glance at a map showing India's geographic position in Asia to appreciate its potentialities in Asian affairs. Its land mass is huge, its resources are vast, and in addition a great newly awakened population is responding to the influence of an enlightened leadership.

We believe that India will take a positive constructive role in Asian affairs. It has a spiritual heritage and a deep appreciation of the fundamental values in human and international relations, together with a willing-

ness to assume responsibility, which admirably equip it for leadership. It is striving to educate its people, to make them politically conscious, and to instill in them the full meaning of the obligations of citizenship in a free nation. Similarly it is devoting great thought and effort to the development of its resources, the expansion of its industry, the improvement of its agricultural methods, and the development of its trade relations.

The leaders of that country seem to have a full appreciation of the power that will rest in the hands of a politically conscious Indian people supported by an industrialized economy. It is to be expected that the realization by the people of India of the obligations of this power, together with the flowering of the generous and chivalric spirit of India, will lead to the assumption of an increasingly important role in the affairs of Asia as a whole.

3. What about her role as a world power?

Mr. McGHEE. If we think of might when we visualize India's position as a world power, we can reflect on its area, its resources, and its manpower. The Indian leaders are determined to develop the talents of their people and the resources of their country.

The spread of nationalism and the beginnings of industrialization in Asia, together with many other diverse factors of a political and economic nature, have placed Asia in a much more significant position in world affairs than in the past. There is every reason to believe that Asia will in the future assume an even more important place. India's inherent importance in Asia has been enhanced by a stable government supported by a loyal people. India has a tradition, a history, and a culture which accord great value to the spiritual, moral, and mental attributes of man. The country has been swept by a nationalism which is intense and dynamic, yet India has already played a role in the United Nations which indicates great potentialities for leadership in international affairs.

4. In what ways can you foresee a further strengthening of ties between United States, India, and the other friendly democratic nations of the world?

Mr. McGHEE. As we get to know one another better we develop a greater appreciation of our mutual problems and the inevitability of our dependence each upon the other. India, a new nation, has been confronted by many perplexing obstacles which are unique to that country. It has had many important decisions of a political, administrative, and economic character to make, and it has been endeavoring to find new and satisfactory answers to questions which have plagued it in the past. As the leaders of India have progressed toward solutions to their internal problems, they have been able to devote more and more time and effort to their relations with the other nations of the world. It is to be expected that as normal trade and commercial activities develop between our two countries, as our knowledge of each other increases through increased travel and exchange of information, and as a greater realization of the magnitude of our community of interests develops, India's ties with us and the other democratic nations of the world will be greatly strengthened. We for our part will welcome this development, and are prepared to support it by friendly cooperation, by working toward mutually satisfactory arrangements in trade and commerce, and by lending appropriate assistance, whenever it is desirable and practicable.

ADDRESS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

My interview with Jawaharlal Nehru gave me a thorough understanding of his firm hold on the people of India. It showed me why throngs of his people swarm to hear him when he speaks. There is a transcendental quality about this great man—an aura of the spiritual seems to hover over him. Yet his words are those of a man who understands the meaning and significance of the practical needs of day to day living. He lives by, of, and for the people of India.

This cultured, sensitive, and sensible man is one to inspire and lead India forth out of her present economic difficulties. His ambition is to expand food and factory production in his country so that India might become the "workshop" of Asia. For this purpose, India would need machinery and agricultural equipment, and dollars—not rupees or blocked sterling are required. I feel America would do well to lend a helping hand in this regard.

India needs food and our warehouses are bursting with surplus wheat, corn, and eggs. The Commodity Credit Corporation might trade those food surpluses for our much-needed strategic materials like manganese and other minerals of India. The resources of our Import-Export Bank, as well as the World Bank, could be tapped by India to help her divert the fresh waters of the Himalayas and other regions for purposes of irrigation, land reclamation, and electric power.

Nehru represents the liaison that exists between the two peace-loving nations of India and the United States—a liaison which should grow stronger with time. Negotiations are now pending for the formulation of a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between our two countries. I express the hope that this treaty will soon be consummated. It will mark another milestone on our mutual road of cordiality and good will.

We are, indeed, fortunate in having a great man like Nehru visit us. His people will be able to see us through his eyes as he notes the eagerness of our people to be of help to his country. Our people want India to prosper and succeed. They recognize in her a true exponent of the democratic way of life.

One readily recognizes in Nehru the genuine statesman whose life has been one of self-sacrifice for the independence of his country, and who has been an opponent of imperialism everywhere as well as a champion of all the peoples of Asia.

Pardon Me, Your Red Slip Is Showing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jo Duvall:

PARDON ME, YOUR RED SLIP IS SHOWING

(By Jo Duvall)

A struggle of tremendous significance rages in eastern Asia, a struggle clouded by a dust storm of political confusion which is blinding us both to our own impending peril and our opportunity to thwart it.

At the moment the conflict is in China, but it is by no means a struggle of Communists versus Nationalists there. It's bigger than either adversary. It is at once our challenge and our opportunity.

Whether we expected or even wanted the job, we are answerable for the destiny of millions throughout the world. Do we have what it takes? We have the finest form of government, the highest standard of living, and the fairest way of life thus far devised. If we don't bring these achievements in some degree to other peoples we shall inevitably lose them ourselves. The Communists are determined that our way of life shall not spread.

The Communist tactic is propaganda, indirect penetration of weakness. The American philosophy, or so we say, is to try to help our neighbors improve their condition. We try to promote and build, while the Communists drive forward from Russia in their totalitarian objective of world conquest.

Why are we so blind to our own interests, as well as to our obligations in China? Have we forgotten so soon that the Chinese Nationalist Government for almost a quarter of a century has been fighting totalitarianism in Asia? Has it escaped our notice that this government has been consistently friendly to America, while the Communists have been consistently pro-Russian and anti-American? Why are we muffing our opportunity in China? The situation there is custom-tailored for us.

Ever since VJ-day we have been shilly-shallying around with our repeated pledges of help to the Chinese Government, but our help has been about as practical as telling a drowning man you have a good stout rope if he wants to swim ashore and get it.

And now our State Department has made its unique contribution to Chinese-American understanding and cooperation. In 1,054 pages of fine print it has proved to the complete satisfaction of its all-wise and unprejudiced authors that all of China's woes are due to the fumbling and corruption of the Nationalist Government and to the stupidity and stubbornness of Chiang Kai-shek. It solemnly concludes that our own Government is entirely blameless, that "nothing this country did or could have done * * * could have changed the result; nothing that was left undone by this country could have contributed to it." Since such lofty statesmanship must be wholly devoid of any sense of humor, it would never occur to those who chastely christened this masterpiece of diplomacy that it would immediately become known throughout the world as "The Whitewash Paper."

Some mighty peculiar events have happened in China. If they had happened to you or to me I think we would be considerably disturbed. I know I wouldn't be pleased if one of my neighbors sold his old metal to my enemies so they could mold bullets and take potshots at me. Neither would you. And it would raise my blood pressure if someone gave away a valuable corner of my property, and kept the deal a secret to boot, while I was fighting for his skin as well as my own. And if I had my back to the wall, trying to fight off a pack of armed bandits, and one of my friends sent me a gun but neglected to include any ammunition, I wouldn't like it. Neither would I like it if he yelled across the back fence that he'd be glad to send me some more bulletless guns if I'd keep on fighting with both hands but still manage to find time to repair the roof and reform Junior. And also kick out some colleagues who were helping me in the fight just because in extremity they'd filched a few things that didn't belong to them. And I wouldn't take kindly to my friend offering advice that might work well in his house but not in mine or prying into my personal affairs and broadcasting the skeletons in my closet. And just when the going was roughest I wouldn't like it if he published three pounds of alibis to try to justify letting me down. No, sir; that would put quite a crimp in our friendship. The Chinese, like us, have a lot of pride. Like us they have much to be proud of—but you'd never suspect it, the way we've been acting of late. Stepping on pride is a very effective way to lose friends, and for keeps.

Our loose and usually uninformed talk about China's deficiencies hasn't boosted our stock with the Chinese. They've taken a dim view of our unofficial investigators who have traipsed over there in gross lots. As a matter of fact, it's quite a sore point with them.

Superficial observers of the Chinese scene, together with the more subtle Communist propagandists, have peddled a convincing line. It makes very interesting reading, especially when the readers are so far away that they can't check up on what's true and what isn't. A hopeless mess, China! To hear a lot of people talk you'd think China is lost forever and we might as well make the best of it and cuddle up to the victors. Poor, poor China. Soon to be completely engulfed by the Communists. Too bad, but what else could you expect? What with the much-advertised corruption and inefficiency of the Chinese Government, the incompetence of Chiang Kai-shek, the squeeze system, and various other deficiencies indigenous only to Nationalist China.

It's late, but not too late, to examine this bill of goods sold to Americans with almost incredible success. It's not too late to search for the facts instead of accepting the white paper as omnipotent; instead of listening to inexperienced would-be journalists who made a week-end survey of China and then hurried back to spread the impression that they absorbed all of China and are now fully qualified to solve her problems—journalists incidentally who are well aware of the monetary value of the sensational; instead of swallowing the bait of the fellow travelers who have been systematically trying to build up anti-Chinese feeling in America and anti-American feeling in China—and succeeding very well, too.

We are told we shouldn't help China because of the corruption in the Chinese Government, that the Communists aren't really Communists but just dear, agrarian reformers who will pull another Tito. That we've already dropped a billion—or was it three billion—dollars down the rat hole. That Communism in China doesn't concern us. And anyhow, it's too late to help.

Some of the kinks in that line of propaganda need a bit of straightening. First, those juicy tales about corruption. Sure, the Chinese Government has been afflicted with a sprinkling of comparable Hagues, Kellys, Tammany Halls, and lesser small-time chiselers. But a glance at any daily newspaper would indicate that political skullduggery is an occupational disease that is fairly well distributed around the world. Why pick on China for more than its share of the general cussedness of the human race?

It isn't so easy to be honest on an empty stomach, when your wife and children are hungry too, but the vast majority of Chinese officials manage, and they don't judge too harshly their brethren who occasionally slip. In China there are many hard-working, underfed, ill-clothed men and women of unquestioned integrity who have been working for years to help throw out the Communists. I know them personally. But nobody ever hears anything about them. They're not good copy.

Then we hear that we shouldn't help because of the squeeze system. Well, a rose by any other name. We might be able to give the Chinese a few pointers on the finer techniques. Take rent gouging, for instance, and cases where to get a roof over your head you buy a few pieces of old, broken-down furniture on the QT. Or "selling" your car to a landlord to get an apartment. Oh, yes; and weren't there devious ways of obtaining meat, gasoline, and cigarettes during the war? Then there's the customary ransom for checking your hat. The police fix. The protection racket. The "5 percenters." The tie-in sales. The kickback. The political pay-off. The swindle sheets. The gravy train. Here at home we are used to living cheek by jowl with such banditry, but in our high-minded idealism we condemn the Chinese as utterly depraved for countenancing similar goings-on under a different name.

And then comes a crack at the nepotism in China. A nice, high-sounding word which we don't use much in this country. We say "wire pulling" or "contacts." Like if you want a job it won't hurt your chances of getting it if your old man owns the business. Nepotism echoes in, "It's not what you know but who you know." "Tell Joe I sent you." "I can get it for you wholesale." "Use my name," or "Harvard is a good school to make contacts." Somehow I doubt whether the Nationalists thought up that practice all by themselves.

We hear we shouldn't help because the Nationalist armies won't stick together. Just recall that they've been fighting since 1931, and on their own soil! Morale goes down with no support, no equipment, only promises from their best friend, the United States. Discouraged people have a habit, as we know, of letting themselves be carried along by the current, of drifting with the political tide of the moment. There was quite a political turn-over in this country in the early thirties, when we were in an economic predicament.

Now let's look into this two or three billion dollars that went down the rat hole. Right into the pockets of Kung and Soong. There are appalling discrepancies in the reports as to the amount of aid and the use made of it. The fact is that we gave the Chinese a mere pittance, unaccountably delayed at that, and expected them to work miracles with it. Accusations of corruption provide a handy alibi for not giving adequate help, but they don't hold water. Two or three billion? The Chinese issued receipts for only $105,400,000 of military equipment and supplies between VJ-day and the arrival in November 1948 of the first of the material appropriated by Congress in April 1948. Credits, not cash, were placed at her disposal to be applied against the purchase of goods. High officials of any government often are possessed of information which could be used to their personal advantage in world markets, but that is a horse of a different color. Whether any Chinese officials profited in that manner it is up to the Chinese to decide. There is no substantiation whatsoever of any charges of misappropriation of American help for private gain.

In this country the procedure in regard to libel is to name names, dates, and places, but our State Department blandly indicts a whole government—and a friendly government at that—on vague charges and without giving the libeled a chance to defend themselves. We've shed quantities of our blood to safeguard the rights of the individual and the dignity of man. Is it any wonder that the Chinese are appalled at this application of our professed principles?

And now we come to the prize argument against helping. This centers around China's War Criminal No. 1, archfoe of peace. Alas, poor Chiang Kai-shek, so incompetent! Just couldn't hold his army together. What was that about George Washington begging frantically for help at Valley Forge? He didn't exactly get what you'd call a rousing vote of confidence, either from his soldiers or from Congress. And many a discouraged man up and went home without the formality of a discharge. Incidentally, does anyone doubt that Washington would have failed had he not received outside help from France in the nick of time—just when things looked the blackest?

On practically any street corner in America you can hear in detail what's wrong with Chiang Kai-shek. His faults and weaknesses are freely aired by members of the sidewalk superintendents' clubs who could have told him how to lick the Communists any day before breakfast.

If Chiang would only get out, we used to hear, everything would be all right. Well, he got out, with the approval—and what looks suspiciously like the connivance—of a few bright boys down in Washington. He got out and the Kremlin's jubilant grunt of relief has been largely overlooked.

The late Al Smith always suggested looking at the record. Chiang didn't sell out to the Japs, and some of the offers were right tempting. He keeps his word. He's immune to defeatism. He's got guts. He's managed to keep his eye on the same ball for some thirty-odd years, while apparently we are still trying to locate the ball.

Chiang has made some serious mistakes, and his methods haven't always jibed with Western notions, but it might just be that Chiang knows more about his people and his country than we do. He has sometimes listened to bad advice, but we might cite similar chapter and verse concerning our own leaders. Yalta, for instance. Or the time Americans bulldozed him into halting the fight while they tried to get the Communists to eat out of the same trough. A nice breathing spell for the Communists.

When Chiang departs this life you can lay a little bet that he will be a national hero for generations to come. He hasn't accomplished all he set out to do, but 22 years isn't much time to forge a strong, new form of government—it took us much longer than that. He's had problems completely beyond the comprehension of most Americans—and of most Chinese, for that matter. After World War II he had to cope not only with economic damage but with a foreign-inspired rebellion. And all he got from us—his allies—was a kick in the pants.

We hear that he's lost the confidence of his people. Who are the ones who have been sniping at him all this time, and what has been the motive? It might be a good idea to slit open a few pumpkins in China and see whether they contain only seeds. For instance, last fall, when material was scheduled to be shipped to China, was the strike on the west coast a mere coincidence?

Of late Chiang has been on the losing end. However, no set-back he ever had in China contributed so much to his loss of face as America's forsaking him. It isn't the American way to kick a man when he's down. What's got into us that we eulogize a man while he's fighting at our side and who turned down every enticing bribe for peace, and then turn our backs on him when he is fighting to fend off the same foreign tyranny we spend millions to oppose in Europe?

This smear of Chiang Kai-shek is a part of the whole calculated, diabolical plan to discredit the Chinese Government and hoodwink the United States into sending no help to oppose communism in China.

The question of whether we will help China cannot and must not be decided solely upon what is best for the United States, but also upon what is best for China. It's quite true that there have been some evils in the Nationalist Government, as there are in all devastated, war-weary countries. But does it make better sense to substitute a new set of evils, or help eliminate the evils and preserve and strengthen the good already there?

Communism is not the answer to any problem—and certainly not to China's. Let's take a loser look at this "agrarian reformer" nom de plume, which in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary is still being dished out as gospel truth. So Chinese Communists are different! Nonsense. A

Communist is a Communist, and they all use the same language, whether it's in Moscow, Korea, the Americas, or China. Always "the people's liberating army," which yearns so passionately for peace that it foments war all the time! Many of the Chinese leaders were trained in Moscow, among them Li Li-san, who is married to a Russian. They've all been rehearsed to shout, "Down with American Imperialism." Who is supporting this Chinese Communist army? Who equipped it? American supplies, such as they were, wouldn't have been enough, even if they had been captured or turned over in toto, as we are asked to believe.

So they're not Communists! Mao Tse-tung has publicly stated that his armies would stand on the side of Russia in the event of a third world war, that they belong to the anti-imperialist front headed by the U. S. S. R. Our State Department, having played this agrarian reformer theme song, now deciares it knew the Moscow tie-up all along! Russia and her satellites lost not a minute in recognizing the Communist regime in China. And Russia kicked like a roped steer when the accredited Chinese delegation to the United Nations brought charges of assisting a revolutionary movement to overthrow the legal government of China. The Soviets waxed eloquent in their denial and used, ironically enough, the infamous White Paper in support thereof. Not Communists? What other proof is lacking, Stalin's fingerprints?

But just wait and see, we are advised, nobody can "communize" the individualistic, bull-headed Chinese. Perhaps that's true, but it isn't necessary to communize people in order to control them. The people in Outer Mongolia have never been "communized." Does anyone doubt they are under Russian control? Why should we believe that Russia will make an exception of China? It's also true that China once kicked out the Russians, but now conditions are not so favorable. It will not be so easy as it was in the early days of Chiang. And it simply isn't practical to assume that Tito-minded leaders will develop in China.

We are instructed that the Chinese people welcome Communism. Of all the preposterous nonsense! The majority don't even know what the word "Communism" means. They're interested in food, not in "isms." Naturally they fall for any sweet talk that promises them something better. Probably most of you who read this are well fed and reasonably well blessed with worldly goods. Most of us in the United States learn the Ten Commandments, or something similar. But if every bone in our children's bodies showed and their eyes were sunkén and their little tummies bloated by starvation, we would probably be inclined to take anything anybody offered and trust the good Lord to overlook the source. The pious over here would do well to examine the Chinese situation for cause and effect.

We are asked to believe that Communism is a godsend to China. That seems a little unfair to the Deity. In North China there is now a record of disillusionment, terror, suppression, and despair. Always the Communist technique is one of conciliation and cooperation as the first stage of infiltration into any country or government, withholding oppressive tactics until they have full control of the situation. They stoop to any form of duplicity, trickery, and double-talk. Look at the record!

The Communists' exemplary behavior a short time ago when they took over Shanghai is a case in point. A gangster can assume the semblance of a gentleman when it is expedient to do so. In Shanghai the Communists at first put their best foot forward to keep their propaganda machinery from breaking down. The mask was discarded with surprising rapidity, as a number of Americans who were there can already sadly testify.

Who says the Communists are doing a good job in the north? The Communists do. They have reported land reforms and redistribution of land. Redistribution of land is both complicated and difficult, particularly so in China. There is no confirmation that they have done it. And suppose they have—does ownership of property represent capitalistic tyranny? Is confiscation proper? Is the Communists' purpose equalization of wealth or consolidation of gains? What has happened to the wealth? No one denies that the rich are getting poorer and the poor are staying poor.

The Communists have deceived many in China, just as they have fooled many in our own country. Is the food in a restaurant good just because the front window is freshly painted? The surface of Communism has tricked many a hungry peasant, blind to the ultimate motive. Well out of the spotlight stands Russia, the puppeteer, but very few people see the strings.

Communism will help the Chinese? China's great problem is economic. Can Communism supply the solution? Communism stands everywhere as an enemy of capitalism. This is one of its fundamental principles. And China must develop steadily for many years in order to provide adequate living standards. China needs a vast amount of capital investment in order to develop her resources. Who will invest money in China? Obviously Russia can't. We can. And with mutual trade advantages for both countries. But only if we help the Chinese free their country from Russian strangulation. If we don't, the economic noose will soon be around our own necks.

Ah, but some say it's too late to help now. It's all over but the shouting. Who's going to do the shouting? Shall we leave it to the Kremlin? The ingenuity and duplicity of Communist sympathizers passeth all understanding. After VJ-day they said Communism in China was of no consequence—that it was too early to send any help. The Chinese Government sent repeated pleas to us and warned us of the Communist peril. Whereupon the apologists craftily announced that Communists in China aren't Communists but an entirely different breed of cat. Now that developments are giving the lie to that propaganda, undismayed they switch to the new line that it's too late to help.

Before we chant the dirge and place the lily let's be sure there's a corpus delicti. Let's hop off the mourner's bench and stop wringing our hands and start doing something. The imminent collapse of the Nationalist Government has been predicted so often since 1937 that it would make a self-respecting fortuneteller cringe.

We can cross China off as hopeless, as Uncle Joe so fervently hopes we will do, or we can build a few bonfires of our own that will eventually scorch his Russian shirt tail. China is a big country, a very big country. The Communists control very little more than the Japs did during the darkest hours of the war. Communists number the impressive total of less than 1 percent of the population. The other 99 percent? Well, that's up to us.

At some point we're going to have to face the facts of life in Asia, before all of it swings into the Russian orbit. The place to take a stand is in China, and fast. The only organized force opposing Communism in China is the Nationalist. The longer we wait the more it will cost. We must provide economic and military aid which will be sent, not impressive statistics on paper. The morale of the Chinese will be restored like magic if they know that aid is really coming.

The time is past when we can indulge in diplomatic protocol and try to save everybody's face, lest we discover that face was the only thing saved. There are more precious values than the tender sensibilities of diplomats. There's freedom, for one thing, ours and China's. There's integrity, there's common sense, and international honor.

The white paper declares that we are writing off Nationalist China. It's only if Uncle Joe spreads out to other parts of Asia that we will stick out our tongue at him, or make some gesture equally effective—judging from the position we've taken thus far.

Apparently as an afterthought the white paper naively asserts that we won't help Chiang and his allegedly corrupt cohorts but we'll be glad to help any others who want to revolt against Communism in China! Just whom are we going to help—and how? Are we to bypass the established opponents of Communism and foster a revolution on our own?

That technique works out very neatly in mystery thrillers, wherein a smart lad ignores the trained police department and rescues the damsel single-handed, but this isn't quite the same situation. This is reality, and it's a grim business that may well seal our own future and that of the entire world. It would seem wiser to work through a group of people who for over twenty-five years have been combating Communism and who need only a reasonable amount of help to win. Obviously the cost would be far less. It would be sheer folly for us to drop Chiang Kai-shek who, even his enemies admit, has a deep moral conviction against Communism. That alone is a powerful weapon.

Let's be practical. Who's going to organize these revolutionists in China? Are we going to arm them? And what reason have we to believe that the Chinese will trust us a second time? The Chinese are undernourished physically, but they're not underdeveloped mentally.

Won't we find that the Chinese will say, "No, thank you. We're fed up with fighting. This is your battle as well as ours. You wouldn't help bail out the boat so now we'll all sink together." And many of them are saying precisely that—and with understandable logic.

But, argues the white paper, Russia might step in if we help the Nationalist government and then World War III would begin. Russia already has stepped in. History may prove that World War III has started, just the same as World War II started at Marco Polo Bridge in 1937, although few if any people were aware of it at the time. But assuming that it hasn't started, if we help the Chinese now there's a chance of preventing World War III. If it can't be prevented, what chance have we of winning with all of Asia on Russia's side?

We must adopt a strong and vigorous bipartisan policy to restore our prestige and security in Asia. We must let China and the rest of the world know exactly where we stand, and then firmly stand there.

We must aid in the development of a Pacific pact, rather than put all our eggs in the Atlantic basket.

The $75,000,000 recently appropriated by Congress for use at the discretion of the President should be allocated immediately for China to aid the forces already opposing Communism there.

We must stop blinding ourselves to the truth about the Soviet strategy in Asia. We must carry through on our pledge to support the Chinese Nationalist government. We must uphold that government in its charges, now pending in the United Nations General Assembly, of Soviet infringement of China's political independence and territorial integrity.

And we must give positive assurance that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime, notwithstanding the pressure—both American and foreign—from short-sighted individuals and groups like those who once thought they could do business with Hitler.

Upon many occasions we Americans have saved our skins because we miraculously had a second chance. But playing out our luck is neither the better part of wisdom nor of statesmanship. There is still time to save an independent China, and ourselves.

Contributions of the Screen Writers' Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, few groups of professional workers in America have contributed so freely of the time and talents of its members to public causes than the Screen Writers' Guild of America. All during the war, the members of this organization provided thousands of hours of effort without cost and with little public acclaim; they produced pamphlets, scripts for motion picture short subjects, speeches, and material for all educational and informational media. The members of this organization have made a major contribution to every Treasury bond drive. They have participated without reward in nearly every campaign for the betterment of our country—those for Community Chests, for the Red Cross, for the eradication of Tuberculosis and Infantile Paralysis. The list would be almost endless.

Today I have seen an article by Darr Smith in the Los Angeles Daily News, which tells of a new and significant group project of the Screen Writers' Guild. Because of its great interest and importance, I am placing this article in the RECORD so that the whole country will have the opportunity to learn of the way in which the Screen Writers' Guild is serving the national welfare:

Quietly, without a tap of the usual publicity drums, an amazingly creative project is under way in this movie-making community.

Seventy-five top Hollywood screen writers are collaborating upon one A production. The issue of this mass literary effort, which puts you in mind of the way the Bible was written, is expected to be one of the biggest money makers of the year.

The writing budget to date is running about $100,000 a week. Yet, everyone is working for free; even the secretaries are paying their own salaries.

Industry estimates expect the finished production to gross about $5,000,000 during the coming 20 years, because the story has everything; love interest, menace, suspense, and a happy ending.

Yes, and it's a message picture.

THE SLEEPER

The title of the "sleeper" is the Polio Story, and it's an all-out exposé of a tragic situation right here in our own town. It's an A production in the strictest sense of the phrase, because every written word from the typewriters of the high-powered task force is in support of a wonderful ideal called proposition A.

Let certain critics of our motion-picture industry read carefully the following:

The Screen Writers' Guild volunteered to help community leaders in the current emergency, and that's what is being done, without ballyhoo.

The 75 writers are turning out special material for the biggest stars in town. Dramatic skits, radio shows, television plays, recordings, monologs, and movie shorts will carry the story to the public. The message is that if proposition A is passed in the November election, a modern $5,000,000 polio hospital will rise to make a happy ending out of a current tragedy.

THE PLOT

The plot of the Polio Story is to stop the audience from making a mistake. Frantic families are rushing to invest in polio insurance, unaware that all the insurance on earth can't keep them out of the present disgracefully overcrowded communicable disease center—if they are so unfortunate as to be stricken.

No citizen in the entire county has any choice but to be treated in this ancient charity edifice with an original capacity of 200 beds. As many as 397 sufferers are now crammed side by side.

Polio plays no favorites; all patients are now forced to go to this outmoded and dingy pesthouse; so the story has menace. There is a dramatic necessity for a new hospital, so the story has urgency. Surroundings have great effect upon a nervous disease such as polio.

Here in the old crowded hospital children often sustain permanent shock and lose the will to fight for recovery after watching patients die on either side of them. One little girl told her father, "I have to die, too, don't I?" Yes; this yarn has heartthrobs.

A decent hospital for communicable diseases would allow patients and their families a little privacy by enclosing each bed in a glass cubicle where curtains could be drawn. Visitors could then observe the sick without interfering with the overtaxed staff.

At present families wait for hours on the steps outside or perch on parapets similar to the startling "preview" pictures in last week's Life magazine. We have it right here in Los Angeles, too.

NO FLOWERS

Flowers are not permitted; the hospital is understaffed now. A mother smuggled in a rosebud. Her son hid it under his pillow—and grinned all afternoon. Others are less lucky. Their flowers come later.

These are the grim touches of reality the Guild's volunteer writers are discovering and revealing in their epic documentary. Unsanitary conditions due to overcrowding caused over 300 nurses and doctors to contract polio themselves in the present inadequate hospital building during the last great epidemic.

A patient's guardian or family is required to sign away all responsibility when he enters here—and no other hospital in town will take polio cases.

Taxes will rise if another emergency epidemic requires fast funds from the tax money on hand, instead of raising it by a bond issue. Voting "yes" on proposition A is the greatest protection for all of us. This is the theme of the polio story.

A stubborn bloc in certain areas automatically opposes any bond issue, causing 90 percent of such proposals to be defeated. These are the "heavies" in this drama.

A two-thirds majority is required for passage of proposition A.

Since no one ever knows who will be next on the polio list, the suspense in the polio story grips us all. So this epic does have unusual "rooting interest." We can identify ourselves with the cast of characters very easily.

Soviet Union Exercises Veto Right 41 Times—United States Exercises Right Zero Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, so frequently have I been asked as to the number of times the Soviet Union has exercised its right of veto in the United Nations Security Council—also the subject matter of the veto and the dates thereof—that, after giving the matter some study, I asked our very able and helpful Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to give me the exact detail which herewith follows my own brief remarks.

I am sure that this specific data will be of more than ordinary value to all Members of the Congress and, likewise, to all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore said that the United Nations must be made stronger; it must be kept stronger. It is our first hope for an enduring world peace. Nor am I one who feels that the United Nations has failed. Indeed, it has not. The United Nations has been most triumphant in its achievements. Never before in the world's history have so many nations, for so long a time, conscientiously considered together the welfare of all mankind. Nor, will I, at this time, make any conclusions or deductions from the factual data which clearly shows that the Soviet Union has exercised its right of veto under the United Nations Charter 41 times while the United States of America has not exercised its right a single time.

In the memorandum from the Library of Congress, transmitting this important data to me, you will note that subdivision 2 thereof specifies that "a tabulation of the record votes will be forwarded as soon as completed." At a later date, therefore, I will furnish the record votes of the nations on each of these 41 vetoes.

You will also note, in item 3 of the memorandum, that Great Britain and China are two other nations which have also not used their right of veto in the Security Council and that France has only invoked it once.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM

To: Representative CLYDE DOYLE.
Subject: The veto in the United Nations Security Council.

The following information is submitted with reference to your inquiry of October 19:

1. The Soviet Union has exercised its right to veto 41 times in the United Nations Security Council.

2. Attached is a list of the proposals vetoed by the Soviet Union and the dates on which the vetoes were cast. A tabulation of the record votes will be forwarded as soon as completed.

3. The United States has never exercised its right of veto in the Security Council, nor have Great Britain or China. France invoked the veto once in connection with the Indonesian problem and once joined with the Soviet Union in a veto on a procedural point in the case of Spain.

MARY SHEPARD,
Foreign Affairs Section.

OCTOBER 19, 1949.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet stated reason for use
Feb. 16, 1946	1	United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.	Disapproval of the wording of the proposal.
June 18, 1946	2	Resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime in Spain to the General Assembly.	U. S. S. R. maintained that the Security Council should order a worldwide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly.
June 26, 1946	3	British-Australian resolution to keep Spanish question on the agenda "without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly."	Same as in veto 2.
Do	4	A contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural and therefore not subject to the veto.	U. S. S. R. vetoed this contention on the basis of a San Francisco agreement which stated that: "The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not * * * a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of 7 members of the Security Council including the concurring votes of permanent members."
Do	5	Reintroduction of previous resolution (veto 4)	Same as veto 4.
Aug. 29, 1946	6	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations	U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan.
Do	7	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations	Same as veto 6.
Do	8	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Sept. 20, 1946	9	American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece.	Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them," as well as on Albania.
Mar. 25, 1947	10	British resolution stating that the Corfu minefield could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities.	Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident.
July 29, 1947	11	United States resolution to maintain Balkan Investigating Commission in power for 2 more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation.	U. S. S. R. held that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications.
Aug. 18, 1947	12	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations	Same as veto 6.
Do	13	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Do	14	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Aug. 19, 1947	15	Resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia "to cease all acts of provocation" and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border problem.	U. S. S. R. contended that nothing had transpired to alter its views on the Greek situation.
Do	16	United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.	U. S. S. R. pointed out that if action on the Australian proposal above (veto 15) was inacceptable, then this proposal "should be considered inacceptable even to a greater degree."
Aug. 21, 1947	17	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations	Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership, pending ratification of peace treaty.
Do	18	Resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations	Same as veto 17.
Sept. 15, 1947	19	United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and make recommendations on its solution.	U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of resolution would be a confession of the Security Council of its inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility.
Do	20	Whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive.	See veto 4.
Oct. 1, 1947	21	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations	U. S. S. R. contended that it would at any time admit Italy together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.
Do	22	Resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations	Same as veto 21.

Sources: Charles Gellner, Use of the Veto in the Security Council (Legislative Reference Report July 30, 1947); New York Times, United Nations. Weekly Bulletin.

F. R. VALEO,
General Research Section.

OCTOBER 16, 1947.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.[1]

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet stated reason for use
Apr. 10, 1948	23	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations	The U. S. S. R. agreed that Italy was eligible for membership but that she must be admitted simultaneously with 4 other ex-enemy states—Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Finland.
May 24, 1948	24	Vote on whether a proposed joint Chilean-Argentinian resolution to set up a subcommittee to hear charges against the Soviet Union in connection with the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia last February was procedural or substantive.	See veto 4.
Do	25	Vote on the joint Chilean-Argentinian resolution above	Gromyko made it clear that he would fight an attempt to force an investigation into the events that led up to the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia.

[1] Supplement No. 1 (revised), to a report prepared by F. R. Valeo, Legislative Reference Service. Oct. 16, 1947.

F. R. VALEO,
General Research Section.

JUNE 18, 1948.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet stated reason for use
June 22, 1948	26	United States resolution proposing approval of the UN Atomic Energy Commission's majority plan for atomic control.	U. S. S. R. insisted on its own minority plan.
Aug. 18, 1948	27	Vote on Ceylon's application for membership in the United Nations	The Soviet representative asserted that despite a proclamation of independence Ceylon was still a British colony dominated by a Governor General appointed in London.
Oct. 25, 1948	28	Resolution providing for the lifting of the Berlin blockade and simultaneous discussion of means of establishing the Soviet mark throughout Berlin.	Vishinsky favored partial lifting of blockade as negotiations over currency proceeded, blockade to be lifted completely at the moment that the Soviet currency was completely established as the sole currency in Berlin.

MARY SHEPARD,
General Research Section.

OCTOBER 31, 1948.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

(Supplement to report of Oct. 31, 1948)

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet stated reason for use
Dec. 15, 1948	29	Vote on Ceylon's application for membership in the United Nations	See veto No. 27.
Apr. 8, 1949	30	Vote on Korea's application for membership in the United Nations	Described setting up of the state as illegal, and its character that of a puppet government. Declared elections falsified under conditions of harsh police terror imposed by the United States.

JULY 6, 1949.

L. M. MANROSS,
International Affairs Section.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

(Supplement to report of Oct. 31, 1948)

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet-stated reason for use
Sept. 7, 1949	31	Admission of the Kingdom of Nepal to the United Nations	The Soviet Union was not against the admission of Nepal as such but could not consider the case in isolation from other membership applications sponsored by the Soviet Union.
Sept. 13, 1949	32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38	Admission of Portugal, Jordan, Italy, Finland, Ireland, Austria, and Ceylon to the United Nations.	Its stated position was that it would vote for admission of these states to the United Nations if 5 Soviet-sponsored states were also admitted.
Oct. 11, 1949	39	Approval of a report by the Commission on Conventional Armaments of the Security Council.	Disagreement with a number of conclusions in the report.
Oct. 18, 1949	40 and 41	Proposal for a world census of armed forces and nonatomic weapons	The proposed census would not include atomic weapons.

OCTOBER 19, 1949.

MARY SHEPARD,
General Research Section.

Statement of Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York, Before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H. R. 87, granting postal employees credit for service in armed forces during World War II:

It is a privilege for me to speak in favor of H. R. 87 which is drafted to correct certain inequities in the salaries of some of our postal employees. Most postal employees have been given credit for service in the armed forces during World War II. One group, however, has been excepted—those veterans who entered the postal service after completion of their tours of military or naval service. Veterans of World War I were given the benefits provided in H. R. 87 as long ago as 1925 (39 U. S. C. 107). The Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 and Public Law 577 of the Seventy-ninth Congress extended the benefits to those employees who entered the armed forces from positions in the postal service. It is evident, therefore, that only those veterans who entered the postal service after completion of their active duty in World War II are excluded from the benefits and privileges extended to other members of the postal service.

Section 1 of the bill H. R. 87 is intended to grant this group of World War II veterans consideration of their military service as the equivalent of postal service, for pay purposes. It is only fair and just that veterans should receive the same consideration that was accorded nonveterans who entered the postal service while the veterans were serving their country in the armed forces. I do not mean to imply that the nonveteran employees are unworthy of any and all benefits they have received or may receive in the future. On the contrary, I am firmly convinced that the postal employees constitute perhaps the finest group of Government employees in the United States today. I am just as firmly convinced, however, that it would be unfair to deprive our veterans of the promotional opportunities which were denied them by reason of their service in the military or naval forces. The duties performed by the overwhelming majority of these men while in the military service were certainly equivalent to those duties which they are now called upon to perform in the postal service. Undoubtedly, many of these men who would be affected by the provisions of H. R. 87 held positions, in the Army or the Navy or the Coast Guard or in whichever branch of the service they found themselves, which enabled them to maintain a standard of living higher than is possible with their present salaries. For these reasons, I believe that veterans entering the postal service subsequent to their honorable discharge from the military or naval forces should be given benefits equivalent to those granted to other postal employees.

Another provision of H. R. 87 states that employees on active military or naval duty on June 30, 1945, shall, upon appointment to a regular position, be advanced on a calendar basis as provided in Public Law 35, Eightieth Congress. Public Law 35 amended Public Law 317 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and assured substitutes who were in the postal service on June 30, 1945, of the four-grade promotion granted to regular employees by the act of July 6, 1945. Coverage is extended by H. R. 87 to those who were in the military services on or before June 30, 1945. This provision is essential if we are to achieve the objective of exact and equal justice for all employees.

The other major section of H. R. 87 provides that a substitute employee who, due to administrative error, failed of promotion to a regular position in the postal service while he was serving in the armed forces shall for salary purposes be held to have been promoted as of the date of a vacancy to which he, as a senior substitute, could have been promoted. It seems to me that there can be no argument as to the fairness of this provision. It merely corrects an injustice or oversight and is in accord with the practice of other governmental units.

To my knowledge, no other Government agency has a promotion scheme based solely on length of service as is the case in the postal field service. Thus it cannot be fairly said that H. R. 87 is in any sense discriminatory as far as other Government employees or other veterans are concerned.

In bringing my remarks to a conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the men who are most directly concerned with the provision of H. R. 87. Practically all the new men recruited into the postal service during the last 4 or 5 years are veterans of the military or naval service. Furthermore, most of the men now serving in the four lower grades of the postal service are young men honorably discharged from the armed forces of World War II. The present entrance salary in the postal service is only $2,250. Each grade advances by $100 so that a grade 4 employee receives $2,850 a year. This certainly is far from a munificent salary for young men who, having been delayed by their war service, are now anxious to establish their homes and raise their families. It is far from easy for these young men to live on equal terms with their neighbors and to make their contribution to the life of the community in which they live while they must struggle to eke out an existence on these relatively meager salaries. H. R. 87 would help to alleviate that situation. We have heard a great deal of talk about the problem of keeping good men on the job at the top levels of the Government. We should not forget that there is also a problem of keeping good men on the job at the lower levels. If given a fair opportunity, many of those men now at the lower levels will continue to give the Federal Government loyal, devoted, and efficient service for many years to come. H. R. 87, by eliminating some of the injustices now present in the pay administration system, will help induce competent men to remain in the postal service.

Alleged Investigation of the Veterans' Administration in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter and a statement issued by Mr. Chauncey Camp, head of the Veterans' Administration at Jackson, Miss., relative to an alleged investigation of the Veterans' Administration in Mississippi.

I hope everyone who is interested in veterans' affairs will read Mr. Camp's letter and his report.

The matter referred to follows:

REGIONAL OFFICE,
Jackson, Miss., August 18, 1949.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: I am enclosing two copies of letter to Mr. H. V. Stirling, Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, in reply to report of J. Robert Brown, investigator for the Committee on House Expenditures.

The delay in submitting this reply was occasioned by my waiting for the FBI report. This report was received today, and consequently my reply is going forward without delay.

It is regretted that so much time has to be devoted to replying to groundless charges by two nonveterans, one an ex-convict and the other with motives hard to understand. Needless to say, the same number of man-hours could have been spent much more profitably in the care of disabled veterans.

Mr. Brown has severely criticized me and three members of my organization, namely, Mr. McGuire, Mr. Fatherree, and Mr. Payne. As explained in my letter to Mr. Stirling, Mr. Payne had excellent service in the Air Corps in the past war, Mr. Fatherree served with distinction in the Pacific, and Mr. McGuire is a veteran of World War I. As for my own record, I am sure you are familiar with that, both in the European and Pacific theaters. In any event, neither Mr. Brown nor Mr. Totten is in a position to criticize the records or abilities of any of us, in view of their nonmilitary records. It seems that Mr. Brown has relied upon Totten for practically all of his information, and he would probably prefer that we not select as our key employees men who have served with honor and distinction in the armed forces and have had great experience in training, but had rather that we select our employees from the alumni of Mr. Totten's alma mater, the Federal penitentiary at El Reno, Okla.

I have recently received a copy of a statement made by Mr. Totten before the Senate subcommittee and will forward an answer to that statement tomorrow.

Very truly yours,

C. CAMP, *Manager.*

[Enclosure.]

REGIONAL OFFICE,
Jackson, Miss., August 18, 1949.

To: Mr. H. V. Stirling, Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Report of J. Robert Brown re Mississippi Trades Schools.

1. Reference is made to the subject report and to your request for the comments of this office on it.

2. I am delighted to have the opportunity to comment on this document, both generally and specifically. Since it levels a sweeping indictment against me, my office, and many of the key members of my staff, I hope you will understand the necessity for my commenting on it at length and in detail.

3. As a general statement, prefatory to my comments on the report, I should tell you that this investigation by a staff investigator of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments came as a distinct surprise to me. You will recall that several months ago when Congressman DAWSON, chairman of the committee, first questioned the manner of our operations here with respect to certain trade schools, both Mr. Payne, Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, and I journeyed to Washington where in company with Mr. Monk, your Director, Training Facilities Service, we visited with Congressman DAWSON. After an extended conversation with him, during which we explained the necessity for the action we took with respect to the Booker T. Washington and Pike Trade Schools, Congressman DAWSON finally said that he could understand how, in our anxiety to protect the interests of veterans, we took the action we did, and that under the same circumstances he would have done the same thing. I thought then, as I am sure Mr. Monk did, that the matter ended there.

4. As to the investigator's report, I must first say that in the course of some experience in reading, reviewing, or otherwise acting upon investigative reports, I have never read a more unusual document than that authored by Mr. Brown. Members of my staff with considerable experience in such matters, men who have directed the activities of an investigative force and one who has conducted investigations for a committee of Congress, agree with this observation.

5. Mr. Brown has made no pretense of hiding his bias, or of being an impartial gatherer of facts. Instead, he quite obviously conducted his investigation in a manner designed to permit arrival at a predetermined conclusion. This is a common fault of inexperienced investigators and bears witness to Mr. Brown's statement while in Jackson that this was his first investigation for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

6. Mr. Brown's report is unusual in the style of writing which he adopts. Were this not such a serious matter one could be almost amused by the resemblance of his style to the sophomoric outpourings of a high-school student, armed with a Thesaurus, and eager to earn an "A." In utmost seriousness, I contend that phrases such as the following by Mr. Brown are either indicative of immaturity of judgment or of a singularly vicious attempt to color the reader's mind:

"The crowning blow that marks the very peak of asininity. * * *"

"Fatherree * * * proceeds to becloud the issue by confusing in his own befuddled mind. * * *"

"Confusion and muddlement is heaped upon confusion when Fatherree * * *."

"He (Fatherree) soars to even greater heights or depths of obfuscation * * *."

"* * * God help Woullard and his creditors."

"* * * they (VA employees) have compounded their errors by stubborn stupidity."

"(VA employees) are seemingly bereft of reason and blinded by occupational myopia."

7. These, as you know, are but typical examples of similar phraseology throughout the entire report. Unless they are simply the product of juvenile thinking and expression they necessarily represent a crude but deliberate attempt to impugn, by expressions of personal opinion, the motives, integrity, intelligence, and personal behavior of the individuals whom Mr. Brown castigates.

8. It is not my intention to answer Mr. Brown's report in the same vein in which it was written. However, it is extremely difficult to reply to charges, which on analysis resolve themselves mostly to expressions of opinion and conclusion without any foundation in fact. It follows, that if I ignore mere expressions of opinion and conclusion I necessarily must ignore practically the entire report. If I take cognizance of them, as it seems I must, then I must necessarily question Mr. Brown's knowledge, his reasoning, his investigative methods, and occasionally his motivation and ability.

9. With one exception, the first three and one-half pages of the report are not properly for comment by this office since they purport to cover legislative interpretations and general VA policy and authority in connection with veterans' education and training.

10. The exception is the statement: "The officials and some employees of the Jackson regional office were also interviewed and given every opportunity to present their side of the picture."

11. Mr. Brown states that he toured the State of Mississippi from May 2 to 20, 1949. He first appeared in this office on the afternoon of Monday, May 16, 1949. At that time he told me that he had been sent here by Congressman DAWSON as a formality to pacify the persons who had made complaints to him and that Congressman DAWSON was satisfied with the action we had taken. Mr. Brown told me that he would report to me and give me the opportunity to reply to any charges which might be made to him as they came up, and that, if it became necessary to write a report, which he doubted, he would leave a copy with me. The obvious impression this left with me was that he was just beginning his investigation.

12. The record now discloses that he had been carrying on his investigation in Mississippi for over 2 weeks before he first appeared in this office. It follows that either all, or a very major part of all the complaints against us had already been gathered. Yet neither I nor the key members of my staff with whom he talked were advised of the nature or sources of these complaints. In fact, after the original interview with Mr. Brown, I saw him only once more, and that was a few days later when he passed me in the corridor, at which time we merely exchanged greetings. Even more important, perhaps, is that although Mr. Brown levels numerous charges against Mr. McGuire throughout his report, he did not request an interview with Mr. McGuire nor did he ever meet him during his 3 weeks' stay in Mississippi. Similarly, although numerous charges are leveled against Mr. Fatherree, his interview with that gentleman lasted only a few minutes and consisted of a discussion as to certain files he desired to review. How then can Mr. Brown state so earnestly that "the officials and some of the employees were also interviewed and given every opportunity to present their side of the story?"

13. Insofar as it directly affects this office, Mr. Brown's report begins with the Story of the Booker T. Washington Trade School. His facts as to the length of time the school had been in business, the existence of a tuition rate of $25 per month per trainee, the negotiation of a contract calling for $39.68 per month and the subsequent disapproval of the contract by T. B. Payne, Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, are correct. However, I must take issue with the statement: "When questioned about this reluctance to sign the contract, Mr. Payne was not able to give any convincing reasons why he had not signed except some vague words about not being satisfied with the cost data, and a thinly veiled hint that he questioned the integrity and honesty of both Woullard and his accountant, B. A. Totten."

14. The reason Mr. Payne felt he could not approve a tuition rate of $39.68 without further check and analysis of the cost data, was because this rate appeared altogether excessive despite the figures which purported to justify it. He was aware that the average tuition rate being paid to all other schools offering the same type of training offered by Booker T. Washington is $28.67 per month. In my opinion, Mr. Payne, as the final reviewing authority in his division on contracts with schools, exercised sound judgment in questioning a tuition rate higher than any being paid for that particular type of training and $11 higher than average. Subsequent developments verified the correctness of his action. I must, therefore, disagree completely with the opinion expressed by Mr. Brown that Payne's unwillingness to approve the contract was not indicative of good management nor good sense on the part of Payne and the Veterans' Administration he represents.

15. Is it not somewhat incongruous for a staff investigator representing the very committee which is supposed to act as watchdog on the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars to criticize an employee for doing his best to see that those dollars are not spent extravagantly in the form of excessive tuition payments to a profit trade school?

16. Mr. Brown indicates his ignorance of what happened in connection with the Booker T. Washington School when he states: "If something were wrong either with the operation of the school, or with the cost data as presented to the Veterans' Administration by the school, then the regional office in general and one T. B. Payne, in particular, were both seriously derelict in their duties in not so informing the branch office and the central office." The record clearly shows that the matter had been presented to the branch and central offices before Mr. Brown began his investigation.

17. In addition to mentioning Payne's thinly veiled hint that he questioned the integrity and honesty of both Woullard and his accountant, B. A. Totten, Mr. Brown states: "their (the VA's) records are significantly silent also as to any documentation or evidence substantiating Payne's implied reasons for distrusting Woullard and Totten." He goes on to say: "It should be inserted here that an exhaustive check was made on both Rev. R. W. Woullard and B. A. Totten and both were given the very highest recommendation and endorsement by every source that was interviewed."

18. Mr. Payne has assured me that he did not question Woullard's integrity in his conversations with Mr. Brown. He did express doubts as to the trustworthiness of cost data compiled and submitted by Totten. In charity to Mr. Brown, we conclude that because both Woullard and Totten were discussed he innocently misunderstood Payne's remarks and took them to include both men.

19. As to Totten, we are afraid that Mr. Brown's exhaustive check is typical of the kind of exhaustive treatment he gave to all phases of his investigation. Mr. Totten's past record is, we believe, sufficient to warrant the utmost caution in dealings with him. In fact, our dealings with him have served to substantiate rather than alleviate the suspicions which his record arouses.

20. Official records reveal that Totten has on two occasions been indicted, tried, and convicted of violation of Federal statutes. On one occasion he participated in a conspiracy which resulted in swindling an aged couple of their life savings. On the second occasion he persuaded a woman to invest $3,000 in a small loan company which he formed and subsequently defrauded her, hiding the fraud for some time by means of false bookkeeping entries in the company's books and false and fictitious financial statements. His last jail sentence was for 2 years at the Federal prison at El Reno, Okla.

21. In view of this record it is not felt that Totten has been done any injustice by our careful scrutiny of financial statements and cost studies which he has submitted.

22. It should be pointed out that the foregoing is simply official confirmation of what has been general knowledge for some time on the part of a great many people in Mississippi and particularly in Jackson. If Mr. Brown made an exhaustive check it would most certainly have uncovered information on Totten's record. We can only conclude that Mr. Brown's check, if any, was most superficial and that this superficial coverage is fairly typical of all of his investigative efforts in this case.

23. The remainder of that section of Mr. Brown's report covered by the title "Story of Booker T. Washington School" is summed up in seven numbered paragraphs, which he refers to as the high lights of the investigation and as objective evidence on the Veterans' Administration's high-handed and unbridled tactics. These points and our answers follow:

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that this regional office closed down schools abruptly, dramatically, and illegally, without the consent, approval, or any advance notice to the school or the State approval committee, and cites the Booker T. Washington and Pike Trade Schools as examples.

Reply: We did not close down schools in the sense indicated by Mr. Brown. We did withdraw benefits from veterans whose entitlement was being wasted because they were receiving completely inadequate training. That this action had the effect of closing down the school was due purely to the fact that these two schools had organized solely to train veterans for profit, and had no nonveteran students. Nor was our action abrupt, dramatic, or without notice. Both schools and the State approval committee were advised orally and in writing as to the inadequate training being furnished. Time was given for the correction of what, to our qualified training specialists, was a deplorable training situation. Letters or memoranda are on file in this office to the Booker T. Washington Trade School dated May 21 and June 9, 1945, to the Pike Trade School dated December 11, 1947, January 21, 1948, and January 7 and March 25, 1949, and to the State approval agency, dated January 20, 1948, and January 11, January 17, February 25, and March 17, 1949, pointing out the deficiencies in the training being provided.

When after these repeated efforts, it became clear that the schools had no apparent intention of providing adequate training, the veterans enrolled in the schools were withdrawn from training for their own protection and to prevent a further wastage of their training entitlement. This action was taken under the authority contained in Technical Bulletin 7-87, paragraph 1-f, which reads:

"Where the Chief, Education and Training Section, or his designate, finds that the training situation of a part VIII enrollee or of part VIII enrollees, does not meet the requirements and criteria of the law the matter will be referred to the Training Facilities Section for notification to the approving agency of the State. The VA is not authorized to continue benefits under part VIII in such instances unless reasonable assurance is given by the school or the State approving agency that appropriate correction will be made."

It should be pointed out that before taking action under the above-cited authority, we first telephoned the then existing branch office at Dallas, Tex., and in conversation with Mr. V. B. Watson, then Chief, Education and Training Division, were assured by him that the action we proposed was correct. It should also be mentioned that ample precedent existed for our action. Under similar circumstances many months earlier, all veterans were withdrawn from training in a large Dallas, Tex., trade school at the direction of the Director, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Service, of the Dallas branch office.

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that we have forced schools to buy equipment and tools over and above those required by the State approval committee and cites the Booker T. Washington and Pike Trade Schools, Southwest Mississippi State College, and Charleston, Miss., College of Watchmakers as examples.

Reply: This charge is typical of the many half-truths in Mr. Brown's report. Training specialists from this office in the course of making checks of schools for the adequacy of the training offered disabled veterans under Public Law 16 and in connection with spot checks of the training being provided Public Law 346 trainees have advanced suggestions to schools (frequently at their request) as to ways and means in terms of additional instructional material, tools, lesson plans, etc., to provide a better training situation for veterans. It is noteworthy that most schools have expressed their appreciation for such suggestions. It is possible, perhaps probable, that in their endeavor to insure that veterans receive the best possible training, our training specialists have argued forcefully for improvements in the way of additional tools. Within our experience, the schools which have resented their efforts are uniformly those which place profit far ahead of their supposed educational mission. Nevertheless, no school has been forced to buy additional equipment over and above the set minimum requirements

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that we delve into personalities as an excuse for doubting accuracy of figures, and cites statements alleged to have been made by us about R. W. Woullard, B. A. Totten, and the "Branch brothers and cousin."

Reply: We deny any statements which impugned the character or integrity of R. W. Woullard or the "Branch brothers and cousin." We freely admit statements to the effect that cost figures submitted by B. A. Totten required the closest scrutiny and that we suspect their accuracy because of the many instances of inaccuracy which have been found in his submissions.

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that we obstruct rather than facilitate the education and training of veterans by our constant intimidation of operators in front of students and by questioning the students in front of their classmates in a crude and superior manner.

Reply: This we categorically deny. Mr. Brown cites no examples nor do we believe he can.

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that our alleged experts in training and education seem woefully weak in background and experience, and in actual performance, and states further that Payne, Fatherree, and McGuire are experts by osmosis in the educational and training fields.

Reply: In order to pass upon the qualifications of our education and training specialists, Mr. Brown himself necessarily must qualify as an expert in these fields. We doubt if he can do so. The gentlemen to whom he refers are qualified by all civil service standards, and in the case of Payne and McGuire, were approved by your staff representatives in the former branch office No. 10 at Dallas, Tex. As a sidelight, it may be of interest to point out that during the war Mr. Payne, as school secretary, held the key executive position at the Army Air Forces training center at Chanute Field at a time during which that school had in training over 10,000 officers and men in over 55 tech-

nical courses. While here, Mr. Brown indicated that he had not seen military service during the war, and it is understandable, therefore, why he failed to consider or understand the experience which can be gained from such an assignment.

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that we have protracted contract negotiations to a point where owners and operators of schools are forced to take our arbitrarily fixed lower rate or else go into bankruptcy, and cites two schools in this area as examples: Booker T. Washington and Lexington Trade Schools.

Reply: We categorically deny that we protract contract negotiations in the manner indicated by Mr. Brown, or that tuition rates are arbitrarily fixed at a low figure. In the course of the review of hundreds of contracts by your representatives, none has ever been returned suggesting a higher rate. On the contrary, some have come back at a lower rate than we initially approved. As to the protraction of contract negotiations, an analysis of all contracts over the past year shows that the average contract was consummated within two months from the first submission of cost data. When it is considered that B. A. Totten delayed for nearly two and a half months before even submitting the cost data on the Booker T. Washington School, the time it has taken our limited force to check cost data items and carry on negotiations is not excessive. This is more particularly true because the contracts of a very great number of the 228 schools with which we enter into contract agreements expire at about the same time each year.

Allegation: Mr. Brown alleges that we "force owners and operators to sign blank contracts or else wait months for payments," and that we "jam illegal and unenforceable policies down the throats of schools and make these policies part of the contract." He cites a time and attendance policy, and indicates that we have collected astronomical sums for schools for their failure to observe this policy.

Reply: Mr. Brown's statement with regard to forcing owners and operators to sign blank contracts does not even attain the dignity of a half-truth. As a matter of fact it does not contain the least semblance of truth. As to policies and collections thereunder, the facts are that in a meeting of approximately 50 school operators held in Jackson in the fall of 1948, at which Veterans' Administration personnel were not active participants but acted, rather, in an advisory capacity, a committee composed of several school operators and a representative of the State approval agency drew up the final draft of the time and attendance policy which was later incorporated in contracts with the schools. That the VA has since in the course of routine audits taken exception to certain payments made in instances where the contract provisions as to time and attendance were violated, is perfectly true. That astronomical sums have been collected is not. In all, less than $20,000 has been recovered from all schools. The single instance in which a substantial amount is involved is at the Pike Trade School, where it has been necessary to take exception to approximately $25,000 worth of payments. It is interesting to note that the worst offender in this connection is the school whose name weaves in and out of Mr. Brown's report as one of the chief complainants against this office.

24. The next section of Mr. Brown's report deals with VA Form 7-1965. We do not believe it within our province to comment on Mr. Brown's legal interpretations as to the alleged infringement of the form on the authority of schools, or of the State approval agencies, knowing that the professional legal staff of the VA must already have passed upon this question and doubting the existence of any background in law on the part of Mr. Brown which would serve to qualify him to render an opinion on legal matters which would warrant serious consideration.

25. However, Mr. Brown devotes a considerable amount of space and intemperate language to a Form 7-1965 survey which was made at the Booker T. Washington Trade School. Early in his coverage of this subject, Mr. Brown states that Mr. Rogers, the assistant manager, said he found the survey quite incomprehensible. Because it is indicative of the credence which should be given to Mr. Brown's subsequent statements on the subject, I am quoting below a memorandum which I have received from Mr. Rogers concerning this point:

"1. On page 12, paragraph 3, of Brown's report, he states with reference to a Form 7-1965 survey made on May 4, 1949, of the Booker T. Washington Trade School, 'Norman Rogers, the Veterans' Administration deputy manager, said he found the survey quite incomprehensible.'

"2. This statement by Brown is a flat lie. At the time I talked with Brown I had not seen the Form 7-1965 on the Booker T. Washington School, nor, in fact, have I ever seen it. I could not, therefore, have found it 'incomprehensible,' nor did I ever make such a statement to Brown."

26. In referring to the Form 7-1965 survey on the Booker T. Washington Trade School, Mr. Brown uses such terms as "befuddled," "confusion," "muddlement," "obfuscation," and "asininity." We are afraid that some of the befuddlement and confusion must have its origin in Mr. Brown's own mind, for he fails quite completely to understand that the Form 7-1965 survey treated the school as one continuous operation and did not recognize for survey purposes the change of ownership. Nor should it have, for as far as veterans' attendance, records, and progress through the training program are concerned, the change of ownership had no bearing. Had Mr. Brown kept this in mind, he would not have committed himself to so many confused statements.

27. A few of his points warrant detailed comment. In referring to an interoffice memorandum signed by Mr. McGuire, he states that: "In that bit of choice prose, he soars to even greater heights or depths of obfuscation by writing about violations of a contract which does not and never did exist."

28. Had Mr. Brown read the memorandum a little more closely, he would have realized that the contract referred to was that which existed between April 12, 1948, and September 30, 1948.

29. Mr. Brown states in connection with our letter to the Booker T. Washington School of May 16, 1949, in which acknowledgment is made of improvements in the school's training situation, that "the truth is there were no major or substantial changes made at the school. Nor have there been since the days when it was operated by R. W. Woullard. That fact is irrefutably established by the investigation."

30. It is necessary to say that Mr. Brown's "irrefutable fact" is quite refutable, and is in fact in a class with his "exhaustive check" of B. A. Totten.

31. The improvements in the school which were made subsequent to the change of ownership and prior to the day Mr. Brown visited the school with representatives of this office are listed below:

(a) A new transformer has been installed by the Mississippi Power & Light Co., thus providing sufficient electric power to operate such power equipment as the battery charger and the motor analyzers, the latter having been stored in a latrine during Woullard's operation, since neither it nor the battery charger could be used for lack of sufficient current. It almost goes without saying that equipment which cannot be used is no better than no equipment at all.

(b) A ceiling has been installed, a vitally necessary item since, on visits to the school last winter, it was noted that with the school's heating facilities in full use it was necessary for the veteran trainees to wear overcoats while working on books in the academic classroom.

(c) A new force of instructors and a school director have been employed. The instructors are far better qualified than those who formerly attempted to give training—a fact borne out in part by their average pay of $3,862 per annum as compared to an average of $2,002 per annum under Woullard's operation.

(d) Complete lesson plans for the entire course of instruction have been drawn up. No lesson plans whatever had been developed under Woullard's operation.

(e) The cost data presented by Woullard indicated that the school owned $7,035 worth of equipment. Cost data submitted by the new owners indicated that the school now owns $7,946 worth of equipment, plus $815 worth of hand tools. (This, in spite of Mr. Brown's statement that "not one penny's worth of equipment or tools have been added to Woullard's inventory.")

(f) An additional room for training has been opened up, increasing the training area by approximately 20 percent.

(g) The entire training program has been reorganized with an adequate number of work stations, and a proper degree of organization. Under Woullard's operation, the number of work stations was inadequate, and in some shops nonexistent.

(h) Under Woullard's operation engine blocks lay on the floor and could not be used adequately for training purposes. The new owners have constructed engine stands and mounted the motors thereon. This one small item makes for a substantial improvement in the training situation.

(i) Additional lighting was installed by the new owners, despite Mr. Brown's statement regarding a photograph of the school when under Woullard's operation, that it is "sufficient to show any fair-minded individual that the lighting of the school was better than adequate." It is obvious that the new owners certainly did not agree with his conclusion.

32. Numerous minor improvements could also be listed, however, we believe the foregoing is amply sufficient to refute Mr. Brown's "irrefutable fact."

33. Mr. Brown heads the next section of his report, Veterans' Administration and Cost Data. A careful sifting of this section to separate the wheat of facts from the chaff of opinion has left us with all chaff and no wheat.

34. Nevertheless, I feel impelled to comment on some of Mr. Brown's remarks. He states that the real difficulty lies with our "unwillingness to accept even the cost analysis as presented by a certified public accountant." This office has no record in its files of any cost analysis ever having been certified to us by a certified public accountant.

35. Mr. Brown questions our request of the Booker T. Washington Trade School to obtain from the Mississippi Tool Co. the invoices which would prove the prices which that company paid to the manufacturer. He asks the reader to "imagine the reaction of any retail or wholesale tool distributor to such a request."

36. Nothing in Mr. Brown's report more clearly damns his motivation in its preparation. While he was here Mr. Payne carefully explained to him the unique status of the Mississippi Tool Co. and its creation for the purpose of inflating the cost data of the Booker T. Washington and other trade schools. Mr. Brown has chosen to ignore these facts and lead the reader to believe that the Mississippi Tool Co. is a bona fide business concern engaged in the sale of tools to all purchasers.

37. The facts are:

(a) The Mississippi Tool Co. exists on paper only. It has no retail or wholesale outlet and

no warehouse. Its address is the residence in Hattiesburg of its listed owner, Mr. J. F. Coleman, who is shown in the cost data for the Bluff City Trade School, owned by B. A. Totten, as a supply clerk at $3,000 per annum. It is not shown on any of the public records in Hattiesburg. Surely a bona fide wholesaler or retailer would obtain a license to do business.

(b) The Mississippi Tool Co. is one of several such paper companies which have been established by a few trade schools in Mississippi to enable them to inflate the cost of operation and thereby justify a higher tuition rate. The method is simple. The fictitious company buys tools at the price the school would ordinarily pay and then sells to the school at a much higher price. Actually no money changes hands since the school owners and the tool company owners are either one and the same or the tool company owner is an agent or employee of the school owners.

(c) A striking example of this practice was uncovered recently when one of these fictitious companies "purchased" a 10-year-old tractor from the school owner. The tractor had been worn out in use on the school owner's farm. The machine was hauled to the school, stripped down and cleaned by veteran trainees, and the individual parts billed to the school by the fictitious tool company at a higher rate than new parts would have cost. For example, the 10-year-old radiator cap was billed for 60 cents. Again no money changed hands, but on paper the school paid out a considerable sum for parts which it attempted to use to justify a high operating expense and, in turn, a high tuition rate.

(d) This regional office has uniformly disallowed such excessive costs whenever it has uncovered fictitious transactions such as the above.

38. Mr. Brown states that in the case of Woullard our "actions speak louder than words. He has not been paid and if the Veterans' Administration continues its present dilatory tactics it may be months before he is paid."

39. We cannot pay Mr. Woullard without a contract. Mr. Woullard, for his own reasons, has not yet responded to our letter of June 22, 1949, in which we stated that we continue to stand ready and willing to negotiate a contract with him.

40. It is in this section of his report that Mr. Brown accuses Messrs. Payne, Fatherree, and McGuire of studied insolence, rude, boorish, and insolent behavior and ungentlemanly conduct. He also refers to affidavits as to my gruff and rude attitude.

41. Unfounded character assassinations of this kind do not justify the dignity of an answer. Nevertheless, hoping that it will be recognized that B. A. Totten was one of Mr. Brown's star witnesses and, in fact, the motivating factor behind Mr. Brown's investigation, I invite comparison between the records as public servants and gentlemen of Payne, Patherree, McGuire, and myself with that of Totten.

42. The next section of Mr. Brown's report is headed "Recapitulation of R. W. Woullard's case." In this section Mr. Brown simply repeats with variation of phraseology and considerably more intemperate language all of the allegations made in earlier parts of his report. Since these allegations have been answered, no comment on this section seems necessary.

43. Mr. Brown then takes up his recommendations, of which there are five. One of his recommendations bears directly on this office. The others are in the realm of high policy and suggested legislation.

44. Mr. Brown recommends that in R. W. Woullard's case we have the basic humility to admit that we have erred from the beginning and that we have compounded our errors by stubborn stupidity. He also recommends that we have the basic honesty and sense of fair play to settle the contract fee now at the figure they offered Woullard in December 1948.

45. If we have erred in the case of the Booker T. Washington Trade School it was in being taken in by the original cost data submitted by B. A. Totten which purported to justify a tuition rate out of all reason with the actual cost of the training offered by the school. Mr. Brown takes the unique position of berating us for having uncovered the mistake before it was too late and goes on to insist that we conveniently ignore the facts uncovered and by so doing, consummate a contract against public interest. Again it is cause for wonderment to see a representative of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recommending against rather than for the taxpayers' interest.

46. Although it is not properly within our province for comment, we feel that it might be helpful to give you reaction at the regional office level to one other of Mr. Brown's recommendations—that which asks Congress to "take a more critical look at the appropriation now requested by the Veterans' Administration to put on an 'economy drive' and determine whether or not they are not pouring more money down the drain in salaries and travel allowances for protracted haggling with the State officials and the schools."

47. We presume Mr. Brown refers to funds needed to carry out periodic audits of the operations of profit trade schools in their training of veterans. First, these audits do not involve any "haggling" whatever with State officials since they are in no way involved. Second, the few audits which we have so far been able to make in this area within our limited resources of personnel and travel funds, have returned to the United States Treasury and, in effect, to the taxpayers' pockets, many dollars for each dollar spent in conducting the audits. Once more one wonders whether Mr. Brown is for or against the taxpayer.

48. The final section of Mr. Brown's report is headed "Conclusion." Once again, the lack of any facts and the abundance of personal opinion make the framing of a reply most difficult. To Mr. Brown's charges that we are "blinded by occupational myopia" and that we need to be led "back into the line of correct and adequate public service," we can only let the record speak for itself. As you know, in the interest of having that record viewed by impartial eyes, I have requested the Deputy Administrator to have a thorough investigation made of the administration of this regional office. He has granted my request and the investigation is now being conducted. I am confident of its outcome.

C. CAMP, *Manager.*

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

QUESTION: HAS THE ADMINISTRATION DONE ALL IT CAN ON BEHALF OF CIVIL RIGHTS?—YES; SEES TRUMAN DEDICATED TO CAUSE, CIVIL RIGHTS BECOMING REALITY

(By Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, Democrat, Brooklyn)

I would like to say at the outset that there are three things which the Truman administration has not done about civil rights, which it could have done. It could have suspended constitutional process, declared an emergency, and forced action by ukase when willful men seemed temporarily to prevail. But that is not the Truman method and, however righteous the cause, it is not the democratic method. He knew, as all good Americans know, that we cannot maintain our rights as citizens by surrendering them. Or the President could have chosen the way of expediency or compromise: yielding on 30 issues to gain 1. Finally, as has too frequently been the custom in the past, he could have confined himself to inspiring but general phrases and avoided specific issues. I name these alternatives because they are the best demonstration, I believe, of the fact that the President has done everything within his power for a cause to which he is dedicated.

The Truman administration has, from the beginning, been notable for the broad base set for a modern charter of civil liberties. We can all remember back in 1946 when, with victory in war just behind us, Mr. Truman designated the extension of civil liberties as a major cornerstone of peace. To show that he meant it, he set up a Committee on Civil Liberties authorized to study and recommend those revisions and extensions which would insure to all Americans the rights for which they had fought. But even after the names of the members of that committee were published—for they were obviously an able and fearless group—many people dismissed the President's action as a gesture which would produce another Government document and little else.

What was President Truman's answer? In his message to Congress on January 7, 1948, 6 months before the political conventions, he spoke of "five great goals toward which we should strive in our constant effort to strengthen our democracy and improve the welfare of our people. The first of these is to secure fully our essential human rights." Less than a month later, on February 2, 1948, and again in a special message to the Congress, the President spelled out in unmistakable language just what he meant by "essential human rights." He presented a 10-point program, based on the report of his Committee on Civil Rights which, he said, called for immediate action.

Talk of a new party came from the South—a fourth party some men called it since the Wallace Progressives had already entered the campaign. The President knew, when he sent the special message, that he did so at great risk to his chances for nomination or for election in the fall. He knew he would lose southern votes if he persisted in one of the most courageous acts of his administration. He did persist. He was convinced that his party—and his country—must take a stand before the world on an issue which stands for the essence of democracy.

In his capacity as an executive, the President has put his civil-rights program into action. On July 26, 1948, by Executive Order 9980, he established fair-employment practices in the executive departments.

On the same day another Executive order (Executive Order 9981) set up a Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces (the Fahy committee) to find answers for a problem which many men called insoluble. A year later, two branches of the service—the Navy and the Air Force—have launched a specific and thorough nonsegregation program. Of equal significance, perhaps, is the fact that the Army's plan, presented on August 10, 1949, was refused as not being sufficiently inclusive, and is now in the process of revision.

The appointments made during the Truman administration which have blazed trails in the cause of civil rights are too numerous to mention. I should like, however, to mention especially the appointment of William H. Hastie as Governor of the Virgin Islands;

of Irvin C. Mollison as judge of the United States Customs Court; of Brig. Gen. Benjamin C. Davis as assistant to Inspector General, War Department; of Dr. Ralph Bunche, of United Nations distinctions, as Acting Chief of the Division of Dependent Areas in the State Department and member of the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission; of Dr. R. O'Hara Lanier as United States Minister to Liberia.

The answer to the question of what this administration has done on behalf of civil rights can be summarized in a sentence which suggests that history will record the restatement of civil rights as one of its major achievements. President Truman first went after the facts by setting up an able and comprehensive research project; his citizens' committee published their courageous and inclusive recommendations on the basis of this research; the President followed through by naming the program as a legislative "must" in the Eightieth Congress—and again in the Eighty-first Congress he made civil rights—and deliberately—a fighting issue in a nominating convention and in a presidential campaign; and he has now presented them to Congress in four important bills labeled "Administration."

In his own department Mr. Truman has acted where he had the power to act. His policy has been firm and persistent but never dictatorial. Where he could not act, he has called for action. The President has conviction in this matter; he has courage—and he has the persistence which will win the cause and win it magnificently.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 64 has received widespread public support. It is a living answer to the deep fears of our people about the consequences of an atomic war and their determination to maintain world peace and security if humanly possible. World federation appears to be the most hopeful path to this goal and can be brought about through the strengthening of the United Nations. There follows a statement in support of the World Federation resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) by a list of distinguished authors:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

The undersigned American professional writers respectfully urge that House Concurrent Resolution 64 be reported favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee as soon as practicable.

As writers we have a special and intense concern with this statesmanlike effort to organize the world for peace. Freedom of expression is an essential condition for the exercise of a writer's function in society, and that freedom is not only violated by war but is also endangered by the threat of war and preparations for it.

We feel strongly that freedom of expression, along with the other democratic freedoms, is in real and imminent danger unless the people of the world, through their chosen representatives, take prompt and practical action to prevent the catastrophe of another world war, and House Concurrent Resolution 64 is such a step. Therefore, we support it, both as citizens and as writers, and earnestly request our elected representatives to establish it as a basic principle of our country's foreign policy.

Wording of House Concurrent Resolution 64:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Writers who have signed the above statement, October 1, 1949: Margaret Culkin Banning, Louis Bromfield, John Mason Brown, Henry Seidel Canby, Marc Connelly, Russell Crouse, John Dewey, Clifton Fadiman, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, John Gunther, Oscar Hammerstein II, John Hersey, Laura Z. Hobson, Marquis James, Christopher La Farge, Howard Lindsay, Arthur Miller, Merle Miller, Quentin Reynolds, Elmer Rice, Vincent Sheean, Samuel Shellabarger, Rex Stout, Lyman Beecher Stowe, Frank Sullivan, Carl Van Doren, James P. Warburg, Glenway Wescott, Thornton Wilder.

Federal Government Is Siphoning the Wealth of States Into Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, almost unbelievable is the way the Federal Government is siphoning the wealth of the States into Washington. No State in the Union gets a full dollar back out of the money sent to Washington. The brokerage charges of the bureaucracy in handling the money is terrific.

A table showing the Federal taxes paid and the Federal payments to the several States follows:

Total Federal tax collections by States and total Federal aids and grants by States, fiscal year 1948

State	Federal taxes	Federal payments
Alabama	$276,943,828	$133,399,689
Arizona	83,813,697	31,856,988
Arkansas	121,751,193	96,956,563
California	3,103,679,127	393,448,101
Colorado	291,848,648	77,986,957
Connecticut	664,939,280	57,223,656
Delaware	308,240,962	9,708,920
Florida	393,355,704	105,738,895
Georgia	439,033,999	133,655,573
Hawaii	108,177,886	17,573,197
Idaho	79,868,935	32,503,039
Illinois	3,785,815,370	278,727,363
Indiana	1,011,921,119	112,934,031
Iowa	446,799,961	98,776,448
Kansas	406,084,637	70,166,727
Kentucky	780,530,271	104,128,415
Louisiana	354,272,182	106,289,991
Maine	130,747,191	31,505,558
Maryland [1]	1,148,315,806	159,555,921
Massachusetts	1,347,084,092	177,786,157
Michigan	2,252,280,551	193,467,807
Minnesota	706,239,359	124,051,188
Mississippi	106,838,130	102,524,955
Missouri	1,114,993,503	189,206,485
Montana	85,184,256	33,125,458
Nebraska	323,448,438	56,062,223
Nevada	$41,838,676	$8,373,423
New Hampshire	85,443,959	20,301,942
New Jersey	1,272,223,662	114,510,488
New Mexico	55,320,140	31,694,444
New York	7,975,513,716	432,941,740
North Carolina	1,238,661,994	146,069,821
North Dakota	69,240,059	31,476,258
Ohio	2,665,707,099	236,982,646
Oklahoma	368,486,098	142,324,863
Oregon	316,843,555	63,494,304
Pennsylvania	3,222,789,298	359,300,954
Rhode Island	236,234,082	31,848,753
South Carolina	207,471,906	82,867,725
South Dakota	76,211,983	29,320,957
Tennessee	359,088,285	148,998,840
Texas	1,285,123,045	352,855,457
Utah	92,246,133	38,390,034
Vermont	46,900,540	16,736,663
Virginia	768,646,376	80,933,425
Washington, including Alaska	533,126,028	99,179,683
West Virginia	236,727,119	60,487,207
Wisconsin	799,502,104	99,936,367
Wyoming	38,988,288	19,713,316

[1] Includes the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

Total Federal tax collections by States and total Federal aids and grants by States, fiscal year 1948—Continued

Ambassador Claude G. Bowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago it was my privilege to have been a member of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which visited all of the capitals in South America except three. During that visit we were received most graciously by Ambassador Bowers, the very able American representative in Chile. Recently the Chilean Chamber of Deputies held a special session to honor Mr. Bowers. I include a statement describing the meeting and Mr. Bowers' address replying to the complimentary speeches referred to:

On September 7, 1949, the American Ambassador to Chile, the Honorable Claude G. Bowers, celebrated his tenth anniversary in that high capacity. A tribute unique in Chilean annals was arranged to him by the Committee of Foreign Relations of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies. A special session was held in honor of Ambassador Bowers, attended by the Foreign Relations Committees of both the Senate and the Chamber, by former President Alessandri, by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and by all the ambassadors of the American republics stationed in Santiago.

Dr. Enrique Cañas Flores, president of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Chamber, in his address pointed out that no similar tribute had ever been paid a foreign diplomat in Chile. Dr. Cañas Flores emphasized the outstanding contribution made to Chilean-United States' relations by Ambassador Bowers in his 10 years of service in Chile and declared that the decade of his service "will figure among the finest chapters in relations between the United States and Chile."

Following complimentary speeches delivered by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. German Riesco, and by Deputy Raul Juliet, of the Foreign Relations Committee (and a former Foreign Minister), Ambassador Bowers replied as follows:

"This occasion reminds me of my last appearance before a Committee on Foreign Relations in the city of Washington when it entertained at a luncheon in honor of the President of Chile and his party. The present president of the chamber of deputies was there, and I am sure he can testify to the fact that in my talk I took advantage of the opportunity to explain and defend the democratic institutions of this country and to wipe out certain misconceptions inspired by misunderstanding.

"I came to Chile on the personal urging of President Roosevelt. I brought with me some preconceived ideas about this nation stretching between the mountains and the sea. I understood it was a soundly functioning democratic nation, its democratic institutions resting on the inherent democracy of the people; and these ideas have been verified by my observations.

"I felt at home from the moment I came, not only because your institutions are similar to ours, but because your political traditions and your background of pioneering resemble ours; and because the people here are temperamentally so similar to ours. I am sure this similarity in temperament is due in large measure to the fact that in the Western Hemisphere the two great melting pots of peoples are Chile and the United States. I am sure the merging of the bloods of the various peoples found in Chile and the United States has had precisely the same effect in forming the character of the two countries.

"In these days of fantastic mechanical achievement the one-time barrier of the mountains and the sea has been wiped out. The genius of invention has eliminated distance. With Santiago but 1 day distant from New York by air, we are neighbors physically as well as spiritually—and we are friendly neighbors.

"In the old days it was assumed that a diplomat was sent abroad to lie for his country; and to treat the nation to which he was sent as at least a potential enemy; and by an attitude of belligerency to get every possible advantage to his own country at the expense of the people to whom he was accredited. I am afraid I do not qualify for diplomacy in the grand manner of the old days. My idea of diplomacy is that a diplomat is expected to cultivate friendly relations, that the most important function of a diplomat is honestly to interpret one country to the other, to wipe out false impressions with the truth, and that I have constantly sought to do.

"I have served here through the tenure of nine ministers of foreign affairs. I am sure that everyone of them will testify that in innumerable conversations, my attitude, like theirs, has been that of a friend; that these conversations have all been conducted by the representatives of the two nations in an atmosphere of perfect amity and as equals in their sovereignty, independence, dignity, and pride. And while as is inevitable, there may have been occasions when we have not seen eye to eye, never once in these years has an angry word been spoken on either side.

"I have faith in Chile's inherent devotion to the ideology of democracy; faith in her adherence to her plighted word in international intercourse; faith in her financial integrity; faith in her industrial and general economic future; faith in the sincerity of guaranties to foreign capital operating here in partnership with Chilean capital; faith, perfect faith, in the vision we all have of a nation of industrial and agricultural prosperity where, protected by the law, men may enjoy the fruit of their labor in peace and security.

"I see rising more and more the chimneys of factories, a more intensive and mechanized cultivation of your fertile acres, and the harnessing of the sea, with all its wealth to the economic progress of a naturally progressive people. And, as a North American, I rejoice in the vision since your prosperity contributes to ours and ours contributes to yours. In these days no nation can live unto himself alone. Economically no nation can be self-sustaining.

"May I avail myself of this opportunity to express in my behalf and that of my family a keen appreciation of the cordiality and hospitality of the Chilean people and of their sense of humor which is the saving salt of human intercourse. Like all foreigners who sojourn here I have come to love the incomparable beauty of your lakes, the charm of your countryside, the friendliness of your cities and small towns, the thrill of your lovely coast, and the gorgeous sunsets that tip the peaks of the mighty mountains in the background that look down as guardians, like the sea of the independence of a proud and liberty-loving nation.

"I assume that you have shown me this attention as a dependable friend of Chile. I have tried to be. I know my interpretations and representations have been friendly; and in serving her I serve not only my country but the ideal of the solidarity of the nations of America. I hope you will believe that it is with humility that I accept this attention for which I thank you."

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. A. S. Cobb, of Atlanta, Ga., giving his views regarding some of the problems which face us today.

Under leave previously granted, I am inserting this letter herewith.

AMERICAN ADVISORY ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 24, 1949.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: We have read and studied your wonderful speech, delivered in the House of Representatives on February 10, 1949. The facts you brought out in that speech should be memorized by every balanced, sensible-minded American citizen.

Our Government vehicle is comparable to a vehicle on our present-day highways. In 1929, this vehicle was cruising along the country at a reasonable rate of speed. It reached the peak of a long hill, at the bottom of which was a great unbridged chasm, unknown to the driver. When he reached the peak, he evidently threw his machine out of gear, and coasted down into the unknown. All through the years up to 1949, we gained momentum at an alarming rate of speed, and we now realize we have almost reached this unbridged spot of destruction, and the question is in the driver's mind, Have we got time to check the vehicle before we go over this precipice? But from your figures, it is evident that the driver, after seeing his danger has become excited, and stepped on the accelerator instead of the brakes. This is indicated by the increase in Federal appropriations from year to year since the war ended.

In the beginning God blessed this country with an abundance of natural resources, which should have been ample to carry this Nation for untold generations, but we as a nation have seen fit to squander and waste these resources until they are almost depleted, as stated in your speech. If these things are true, and we have no reason to doubt them, the American people will wake up 20 years hence in the greatest nightmare the world has ever known. The old saying is still true, "Waste not, want not," and that applies to our Government as well as to the individual.

Mr. DAVIS, we find in studying your speech, you have covered one-half of the question wonderfully. But, it would indicate to the average layman that you only studied one-half of the subject. We agree that the increase in civilian Federal employees of from approximately one half million in 1929 to the present-day two and one-quarter million is out of line. Also the expenditures of four billion in 1929 to the present day forty-two billion goes without saying is unthinkable, and something should be done about it, especially when none of this forty-two billion goes to retire that ungodly debt which we have accumulated. But, if we cut our Federal budget and fire an estimated 50 percent of the Federal employees, where are these people to get jobs, and how are they to live? Sometimes economy at the expense of want and hunger among the people proves to be bad.

We know quite well that you 435 Representatives are amply able to devise plans to cut off this number of employees, and also to cut the Federal budget, but we wonder why you don't spend more time in devising ways and means to furnish every person a job year in and year out at a livable wage. With the increasing unemployment in this Nation from month to month, which today has reached approximately 4,000,000, or more if the Government should throw another million out of work, we respectfully ask the question where would these people get another job? Don't you think, Mr. DAVIS, that you fellows up there should start on the other end of the road, and as you travel, create jobs for the people who are now out of work before you start firing others? We don't mean jobs like the WPA furnished during the early thirties at a wage of $2.40 per day, 3 days a week, paying for the time of an able-bodied man to carry a rock from one place to another until he wore it into dust, serving no useful purpose whatsoever, but sponsor and create useful jobs for the unemployed at a decent wage, such as flood control, power development, soil conservation, and last but not least, decent homes for all of our people. All of these things could be done over a period of less than 40 years (which is a short span in the life of a nation) at not one dime increase in taxation or cost of operating our Government, and would provide jobs for all our people at decent wages. The services rendered by these projects would pay for themselves. We don't mean to put the Government in business, developing these projects. Our wishes are to take the Government out of business, and let the Government do as it should, and what it was set up to do, act only as sponsor and protector. Neither do we mean for all this work to be given to the big corporations of this Nation on a cost-plus basis, as we have seen done for the past few years, but for contracts to be awarded strictly on a competitive base, dealing fairly with competitors large or small.

The time has come when the people's elected representatives have got to put more thought to a sound, constructive program for the good of all the people instead of flimsy starve-to-death dole system. Provide jobs for everybody at a livable wage instead of doling it out $20 per week, and loaf the streets, that system has ruined a lot of good men already. And the present dole system which we now have covers only a small percent of the people.

Our national income, after taxes in 1933, was approximately $36,000,000,000. This year it will be more than $170,000,000,000 after

taxes, and we feel ourselves drifting into another period such as the early thirties. What if our income should drop as it did in 1933? Will any of our flimsy preventive measures which we now have prevent such a drop? If this drop should come, and it will, have we got another Franklin D. Roosevelt in this Nation to pull us out? We love this country as Americans, and we hate to see selfishness and bad management drag us down to the level of our greatest competitor, Joe Stalin. Joe and his gang are only waiting for us to dilly-dally around, and bring another depression on this Nation.

Mr. DAVIS, we feel that it is time for you fellows to look at both sides of that board instead of one, and devise constructive plans to give all the other people jobs instead of throwing people out, who now have jobs. You officials up there may not know, but the tension and uncertainties among the people today are great, and something constructive has got to be done, except a lot of expensive talk. This is only the thoughts of one American. You might read this letter on the House floor (it might cause some of the other fellows to start thinking, too), which I seriously doubt you will do, and put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and send me a copy. Past letters I have written to other Congressmen have been shown that much consideration.

We know this Nation has as much money, resources, and know-how during a depression as we have during boom times. When God created this Nation and the world he balanced the production so it would supply the needs of the future population, honest distribution and management was left for the leaders of the people, unfortunate greed and selfishness has become so great that special favors for the few has caused, and is causing, millions of our people to suffer. All we need in this country is honest unselfish application.

The above subjects are food for thought, even for our governing body, and it would be good to remember that the people are thinking more today than ever before.

Yours respectfully,

A. S. COBB.

Rehabilitation of Palm Springs Indians and Their Freedom From Indian Bureau Supervision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding H. R. 6464, concerning the Palm Springs Indians of California by F. G. Collett, executive representative, Indians of California, Inc.:

H. R. 6464, introduced by Congressman BURDICK, on October 18, is designed to facilitate an early and orderly withdrawal of the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs from the State of California in accordance with the desires of the Congress and the Bureau.

This bill does not require any Federal appropriation. Upon the contrary its enactment will immediately and substantially reduce the expenditure of Federal moneys for the administration of Indian Affairs in California.

This bill relates only to the problems of the Agua Caliente band of Mission Indians at Palm Springs, in Riverside County, Calif. The problems of these Indians are unique and require special treatment because: (1) of the relation of the Indians' lands to the developed areas of the famous Palm Springs resort; (2) of the dependence of a realization of the potential income from these lands, upon their proper integration in the future development of this resort; (3) more than two-thirds of the members of this tribe are minors; (4) about 4,000 acres of this land are now being allotted to the members of this tribe under the act of Congress of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 975); the decisions (1944) of the United States Supreme Court on the law in the Arenas Case (322 U. S. 419), and of Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor as United States district judge, at Los Angeles upon the subsequent trial of this case (60 Fed. Supp. 411), and of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (1947) affirming that judgment (108 Fed. 2d 876), and (5) after these allotments are completed, a very substantial portion of the reservation of this tribe will retain tribal status and require administration for the benefit of the descendants of these Indians and the preservation of their ancient burial grounds; church yards, and landmarks including the famous Palm Springs Canyon.

This need is emphasized in the report of the California Indian Agency to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, of date June 1949, on the program for the termination of Indian Bureau activities in the State of California, wherein it is said:

Page 7: "The United States, State, and county officials favor the gradual, carefully considered removal of restrictions and transfer to the Indian owners of control over their property."

Page 13: "In any program for Indian Bureau withdrawal, full consideration must be given the problem of protecting the homes of those Indian families on allotted and unallotted trust lands."

Page 35: "Indians living on or having an interest in lands held by the United States in trust for them will not be injured by such withdrawal if they are protected against loss of their lands."

Section 1 declares the congressional policy which conforms to the Government's historic promises to these Indians. It declares the competency of these Indians to manage their own business. This competency was declared in the 1917 statute, abovementioned, and is confirmed by the decisions of the Supreme Court, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, above-mentioned, and by the plan proposed by these Indians and embodied in this bill, for the future administration of their allotted and unallotted lands.

Section 2 implements this policy by transferring the business management of the tribal property, from the Indian Bureau to an elective tribal business committee. It protects the disposition of tribal moneys by an appropriate, responsible, corporate trusteeship which conforms to the approved practice of competent white businessmen in the administration of trust funds.

Section 3 enlarges the jurisdiction of the State of California over offenses committed by or against members of said tribe.

Section 4 submits the determination of the competency of any Indian, whenever questioned, to a court of competent jurisdiction. This is a desirable and necessary substitute for the present inadequate and unfair method of such determination.

Section 6 authorizes Indians who desire to do so, to place their allotted lands in trust under a trust indenture to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. These trusts are designed to avoid any future pauperization of these Indians by any improvident disposition of their allotted lands, by prohibiting a sale of the lands and providing for their development under long-term ground leases.

Section 7 authorizes these Indians to create a nonprofit, memorial foundation trust to be administered by an elective board of nine Indians. It provides for the conveyance to a corporate trustee upon the approval of the Secretary, of unallotted lands of the reservation, which these Indians desire to preserve, and have developed, for public use, and for the benefit of the tribe as a whole.

This plan is most commendable. Its conception evidences a deep interest, on the part of these Indians, in the proper development of a civic community as a memorial to this tribe. It evidences a sound appreciation of the great value, both as to capital and income, which such a development will add to their lands. It will establish a fund which will serve as a social security backlog for these Indians and their posterity, and practically eliminate any possibility that any of them will ever become a public charge.

Section 8 provides appropriately for the protection of these objectives in the patents issued on allotments, and for the adequate compensation of any allottee from whom land may be taken for these purposes.

Section 9 provides a simple method for the permanent control by these Indians, of the waters which occur upon this reservation, for the benefit proportionately of all of the members of this tribe, and of their allotted lands. This is a most necessary and indispensable provision. It is an indisputable fact, as stated at page 22 of the report to the Commissioner, above mentioned, that "the water appertaining to Indian lands in California is one of the most valuable parts of the total Indian assets." This is peculiarly true of this reservation, because substantial areas of this reservation are nonwater bearing due to natural faultings. The report of the water engineer who, during the past 18 months, has made a comprehensive study of the water resources of this area for these Indians (the only one ever made of this area) confirms this fact and emphasizes the economic impracticability of any effort to determine the precise boundaries of such areas.

Section 10 provides a formula for resolving conflicts in allotment selections. The priority provided is the only just solution of the problem of conflicts among the Indians. It provides that all Indians now living who were living on the effective date of the Allotment Act of March 2, 1917, have equal right in selections, and that otherwise the Indians have preferential rights in the order of their births. This is a simple and effective formula, which preserves to each Indian the full value of his right of selection as it existed at the time when he should have been permitted to exercise it, namely, at the time of the enactment of the act of 1917, if he was then living, and at the time of his birth, if born subsequently, and in respect of which he was frustrated by conditions beyond his control until the end of the recently completed litigation.

Section 11 nullifies any effort to restrict these Indians as to the land which they may select for allotments. It declares their right to select for allotment the most valuable lands of their reservation, subject only to a fair apportionment thereof among the Indian allottees.

Section 12 provides that the allotted lands shall be subject to taxation just as soon as it becomes so improved that it may reasonably bear its tax burden. It is believed that this plan is reasonably designed to permit these Indians, and their lands, to assume their reasonable share of the tax burden of this community, without unreasonable hazard during their transition period. It is obvious that the limited protection afforded is required, because, otherwise, these Indians would be forced into an improvement program to raise tax money, which would not be justified by any economic demand or market for such improvements,

and would result in a very substantial loss to the Indians and to their competitors, in land values and future income.

Sections 12, 13, 14 and 19 are procedural provisions deemed desirable to the full realization of the benefits of this act to the Indians.

Section 16 is intended to remove unnatural and provocative restrictions upon the present method of enrollment. Its enactment would not deprive any Indian of any land for his allotment. There is an abundance of good land in their reservation for purposes of allotment for several generations to come.

Section 17 is a reasonable and a necessary provision for the just compensation of any Indian who may be required for the general good, under the action of the tribal business committee, to yield some land which he desired to have.

Section 18 is an obvious necessity for the benefit of these Indians as they take their proper and desired place in American citizenship. It is wholly undesirable and unnecessary to restrict these Indians where the white men are not restricted, in the leasing of their lands. In the healthful competition which is bound to ensue, these Indians should stand on a parity with their white neighbors as to the inducements which they can offer to investors of large capital in long-term improvements. To deny these Indians this right is to unjustly prolong a slavery they do not deserve, and which our Government has long and often promised to abolish.

This proposed legislation is designed to provide for an immediate measurable withdrawal of the Federal Government from the administration of the affairs of this tribe of Indians, and for the assumption by these Indians of a much larger share of the responsibilities of their American citizenship, and for a greater incentive for the improvement of their cultural, spiritual, and material, status, and for an ultimate withdrawal altogether of Federal control and supervision, as desired by the Congress. This is the first serious step that has been taken in respect of these Indians since the enactment by the Congress of the special mandatory Allotment Act of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 975), the policy of which is just now coming into fruition.

The plan to be integrated by this bill, is the product of many minds. It has been the subject of serious study for more than 10 years. During the past 14 months it has received intensive consideration by lawyers employed by the Indians, and by experts in land planning; municipal planning; water conservation and development; the creation and management of trusts; banking and securities investments; and real-estate trends. It represents their collective informed judgment. During this later period it has been the subject of cooperative conference, on many occasions with the responsible representatives of the flood-control district of Riverside County, and of the city of Palm Springs.

The enactment of this legislation will conform to the declared policy of the Congress, and will measurably fulfill the obligations to these Indians assumed by our Government under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, whereby we acquired the lands that are now California.

The Federal Government will relinquish its active control over these Indians and their lands. It will approve a well-considered plan for the emancipation of these Indians, and yet one which protects them against the hazards of their own inexperience, and the covetousness of designing white men. It will retain only a limited veto in cases of abuses, which probably will not occur. Its reserved powers can be exercised at Washington, D. C., at only nominal expense.

The increase in tax revenue to the city from the improvements to be made, and the fee patents which will be issued, in the near future, will be of inestimable value to the city, and a definite credit to the increasing capacity of these Indians to assume and discharge the responsibilities of their American citizenship. This is their earnest desire, and it can be frustrated only by a failure to enact the substance of this proposed legislation into law.

Respectfully submitted.

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
F. G. COLLETT,
Executive Representative.

He's Desnobbing the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Saturday Evening Post, dated August 27, 1949, written by Hugh Morrow and entitled "He's Desnobbing the State Department":

HE'S DESNOBBING THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Hugh Morrow)

(John E. Peurifoy, who ran an elevator before he began running the Department of State, is injecting some efficiency into our least efficient branch of Government. Meanwhile, he is making striped pants and the old-school tie very unpopular items of diplomatic haberdashery.)

In the Congress of the United States, where "bureaucrat" is a swear word, a bureaucrat named John Emil Peurifoy holds a unique and happy distinction. Instead of being regarded as one of the lower forms of animal life, he is looked upon with favor, even affection, by both Republicans and Democrats. This is more than a matter of personal gratification to Peurifoy; it has a positive bearing upon the effectiveness of this Nation's foreign policy.

Peurifoy is an easygoing former farm boy from South Carolina who only 11 years ago was shoveling snow in a menial job on Capitol Hill. Today, he is the third-ranking official of the State Department. His rise to prominence is no more astonishing than his ability to win friends and influence Congressmen. "Jack Peurifoy," a Republican Senator remarked recently, "is the best lobbyist Harry Truman has."

Peurifoy's title is Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration. He is the quartermaster of diplomacy's army in the cold war. Peurifoy is in charge of hiring, firing, promotions, demotions, communications, passports, and the elimination of Communists and other dubious characters, to mention only some of his duties. For practical purposes, in day-to-day operations, he runs the State Department. His biggest job at the moment is to bring order out of mossgrown chaos by reorganizing the entire Department, an institution which has been called a loose confederation of tribal chieftains. He is doing this under legislation which he planned and lobbied to unanimous approval by both Houses of Congress.

Most important of all, Peurifoy bears the main burden of wheedling State Department funds from a suspicious and critical Congress. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee puts it, "If it weren't for Jack, I imagine we'd cut the State Department to ribbons; as it is, we let 'em off with a few major lacerations."

No casual passer-by would suspect Jack Peurifoy of being a State Department official. He has appeared at the Department for a bit of week-end work in slacks, old shoes, and a lumberjacket. On weekdays he wears an ordinary business suit, but his neckties would blind a prairie dog at 50 paces. He ventures into cocktail-party society only when his position compels it; he is more apt to be found at a baseball game, sitting in the bleachers with his shirt off.

Peurifoy is a handsome man of average height, with jet-black hair, brown eyes, and an easy smile. He has lost so much of his South Carolina accent that he is comprehensible to most Americans and even many Englishmen. Once, however, when he was testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a South Carolina Congressman queried him about career employees of the State Department.

"What about careeah?" the Congressman asked.

"Well," Peurifoy began, "you know we are pulling the Army out of Korea, and we'll have to send State Department people in."

This threw the committee into an uproar, and an Ohio Congressman whooped joyously, "Oh, boy; I've heard of Georgians who couldn't understand South Carolinians, but this is the first time I ever heard of two South Carolinians who couldn't understand each other."

This was unusual, for Peurifoy rarely is confused about anything. Since he hit his stride in the State Department, he has been confused least of all about where Jack Peurifoy is going. At 42, he not only holds an important position in the Federal Government, but has his choice of at least eight jobs in private industries at salaries many times the $12,000 a year which he is now paid. Peurifoy may eventually succumb to the lure of high pay, but his wife is doubtful. "It would take a whip to get Jack out of the Government," she says. "He feels that he has a job to do."

For years Peurifoy was a hard-luck boy. He had to leave West Point in his second year because of illness and his father's death. He wanted to be an aviator, but got no closer to it than operating an elevator. Peurifoy worked, successively, as a private tutor and a bank clerk in Kansas City, Mo., and as an insurance salesman and night cashier of a chain restaurant in New York. Once, in New York, he stood in line an hour and a half to deposit $20 in a bank. Later he discovered why the line was so long. There was a run on the bank.

Peurifoy came to Washington in 1935 looking for work, and wound up on an elevator in the Senate Office Building at $90 a month. A few months later he landed a $1,620-a-year job in the Treasury Department, married a pretty fellow employee named Betty Jane Cox, of Oklahoma, in October of the following year, and settled down in a one-room apartment in one of the worst sections of Washington while his pay moved upward with the inexorable lassitude of the civil service to $2,000 per annum. Mrs. Peurifoy, whose parents had been well to do, dreamed of an apartment in the suburbs. In November 1937 she rented one and called Peurifoy at his office.

"Hold everything, honey," he said. "They've just abolished my division and I'm out of a job."

The Peurifoys found work in a department store for the Christmas season. After the holiday rush, however, Mrs. Peurifoy was employed only on a part-time basis, and Peurifoy not at all. There was, he was told, a chance to get a job as a floorwalker. He spruced himself for the interview and, although he had never smoked, carried an un-

lighted cigar to bolster his confidence. The employment manager turned him down cold; the cigar annoyed him.

Jack returned to Capitol Hill and found a job in the Botanical Garden. He washed flowerpots, mixed manure, cleared snow from sidewalks, and did manual labor on a small park near the Capitol. Late in 1938, after a month at the Labor Department, Peurifoy finally landed a $2,000-a-year job in the State Department. He not only needed the money; diplomacy had always seemed glamorous to him. Mrs. Peurifoy finally got her suburban apartment—although they had to sell their jalopy to buy furniture—and the hard-luck period was over.

In 7 years Peurifoy rose from the bottom to the top of the civil-service ratings, or from $2,000 a year to $10,300. This is not an unparalleled feat, but it takes about 20 years for most of the comparatively few who achieve it. When Gen. George C. Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, one of his first official acts was to name Peurifoy Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration, substantially the job he holds today with higher rank. This event scarcely rocked the world, but it did attract attention within the Department.

"Isn't it a pity," an American diplomat remarked in Paris, "that we should have as Assistant Secretary a man who used to run an elevator?"

When the remark got back to Peurifoy, he boiled, then he cooled off. Ultimately, he approved his detractor's promotion to ambassador "He was qualified," Peurifoy says. "Besides, I'm proud of having run an elevator."

The incident confirmed Peurifoy's suspicion that it was time to do something about snobbery in the Foreign Service, that elite corps of diplomats who at times seemed to be operating entirely outside the State Department itself. Peurifoy had his first brush with this attitude back in 1942 during an inspection tour in Latin America. In the American Embassy at Buenos Aires, upon entering the men's lavatory, he found four booths, three accessible, the other locked and bearing a sign, "For Foreign Service officers only." Though not then a Foreign Service officer, Peurifoy demanded the key so vehemently that he got it, then dispatched a scathing report to Washington.

The Foreign Service is only a symptom, however, not the basic problem. In the past 10 years there have been five Secretaries of State and seven Assistant Secretaries for Administration. Administering the State Department is not easy; one of Peurifoy's predecessors had a nervous break-down. With each new Secretary, there has been a new plan of reorganization. But not until the Peurifoy plan became law this year, with the Hoover Commission generally supporting it, was there an opportunity to correct the fundamental inefficiency—"parallelism," which might better be described as "paralysis."

Formerly, the State Department was organized horizontally. To solve one problem, perhaps four different sections would have to agree. Major questions could be resolved only by the Secretary himself. Minor ones might never be solved. Peurifoy told the House Appropriations Committee, "A telegram might come out of one office and, if a man in another office did not like it, he might hold it indefinitely."

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, a Minnesota Republican, adds a footnote. "When I first knew Washington officialdom 10 years ago, everybody called the State Department the least efficient department in Washington. It was commonly said that there were at least five major factions, no two of which spoke to each other except on State occasions."

Peurifoy, undertaking to clean up the situation, provided for a vertical instead of a horizontal set-up. Now there is a clear line of authority from top to bottom. And no longer does the Foreign Service recruit its own personnel, handle its own budget, or do its own management planning; in effect, it has joined the State Department. The old-school tie has become unfashionable.

Peurifoy's success in persuading Congress to pass the reorganization bill was, essentially, an easy victory. The need was painfully obvious. The real test of his skill as a lobbyist—and lobbying is one of the most important jobs of the executive branch of the Government—comes when he faces the hard-boiled Appropriations Committees. Any member of these committees who is worth his salt becomes a watchdog of the Treasury, usually with distemper. For example, the record of this year's hearings on the State Department appropriation, before a House subcommittee, fills 1004 printed, book-sized pages, only 33 pages less than in Gone With the Wind. While of lesser literary merit, the hearings at least suggest where the wind may have gone. Peurifoy sat through the hearings, testifying himself and acting as a one-man rescue squad when others from the State Department got into trouble, until he was stricken with pleurisy. The subcommittee sent him flowers at the hospital—an incident still regarded in Washington with dazed unbelief. "The only bouquet those babies ever sent me," one bureaucrat commented, "was deadly nightshade and rue."

The secret of Peurifoy's success with Congressmen is the utterly preposterous notion that he ought to tell them the truth. The average bureaucrat facing an appropriations committee is conditioned to reject the idea that anything could be wrong in the department he represents. Usually he fails to realize that the Congressmen are likely to assume in advance that hardly anything could be right. There is something depressingly fascinating about a quick tour through the Government of the United States with JOHN TABER, the wittily splenetic Congressman from upper New York State who headed the House Appropriations Committee when the Republicans controlled Congress and who is presently its ranking minority member.

"The State Department," TABER says, "probably is the most demoralized set-up in the Government. Commerce is bad and Interior is terrible—it might be the worst. Agriculture is awful, and Treasury is bad enough. The Atomic Energy Commission is an outstanding example of bad administration, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force arrangement is no good, although the Navy is not quite so bad as the Army and Air Force."

However, he is willing to say this about Peurifoy: "He is a fellow of quite a little ability; generally he will give us the correct information; he probably knows as much about the details of the State Department as any of them."

A Republican Senator who has dealt with TABER in House-Senate conferences on appropriations quotes TABER more colorfully. "I don't like any of those bastards from the State Department" he'll say. "They come up here and they lie and they hedge and they don't know what they're talking about. All except Jack Peurifoy."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, TABER's opposite number in the Senate, has become a warm friend of Peurifoy's. "He will sit there with the Appropriations Committee for hours," the Senator reports, "and sooner or later, a State Department witness will talk himself into a box. Then Jack will go into action. 'Senator,' he'll say, 'I don't believe the witness meant to say so and so. I imagine that what he intended to convey was as follows.' The witness will flash him a look of undying gratitude, and the whole thing will be straightened out."

Peurifoy's success as a lobbyist must be measured against the prejudices he must combat. Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the Senator from Maine, summed it up in her United Feature column in these words: "Congress doesn't like the State Department. Congress loves the Air Force. State Department proposals are argued almost endlessly, with the Department taking a verbal thrashing. Air Force proposals breeze through Congress by almost unanimous votes. The State Department has brought upon itself much of the bad feeling that exists toward it. It has lived too much within itself. It has done nothing to combat the tea-parties-and-striped-pants reputation that it unfairly has."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, pointed up another of the Department's congressional headaches when he told Secretary of State Acheson recently, "I am not in favor of your policy with reference to Spain, and until that policy is changed I am going to examine your appropriations with a fine-tooth comb."

Against the ancient prejudices Peurifoy pits frankness, calmness, and an ingratiating personality. Louis B. Mayer, the movie magnate, observed recently, "He wears terribly well."

Peurifoy comes from a politically active family. The Peurifoy name is of French origin, but the family migrated to England in the eleventh century in the wake of William the Conqueror. The first Peurifoy to come to America established a plantation in Virginia in 1619 and became a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses. Jack's great-grandfather married a Byrd, of Virginia, and was a circuit-riding preacher in Florida. One day he returned from his round of soul saving to discover that Seminole Indians had burned his home and slaughtered his three children. Mrs. Peurifoy had escaped by hiding in a swamp. They rebuilt their home and raised a new family, from which Jack is descended.

In Walterboro, S. C., Jack's home town, his father was a prosecuting attorney, one uncle was a judge, and another uncle a plain lawyer. Once there was a mule-stealing case in Walterboro, with one of the Peurifoy brothers on the bench, another prosecuting the case and the third acting as counsel for the defense. The case ordinarily would have been settled in 30 minutes, but this one required a week; old-timers at the courthouse say they never heard such a wonderful display of legal forensics wasted on one scrawny mule. "Never knew a Peurifoy who wasn't a silver-tongued orator," Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, testifies.

Peurifoy's recollections of his boyhood are nostalgic. He would get up at 2 o'clock in the morning and ride in a wagonload of cotton from the family plantation to the gin, dozing while the old Negro driver sang softly in the warm southern night. There were ponies to ride, and water moccasins to shoot with his .22 rifle on the way to the swimming hole. There was the high hilarity of butchering time, and Peurifoy smacks his lips as he recalls the home-cured hams and a wonderful southern concoction known as sirup pie. But there was also tragedy. Jack's mother died, when he was six, of heart disease, and his father was stricken in his prime with tuberculosis. Illness and bad crops gradually depleted the once-considerable family fortunes.

Walterboro is a quiet southern town of about 5,000 population, its streets lined with giant oaks hung with Spanish moss. A one-block walk from the main street is like stepping back 100 years in time. Jack, as a schoolboy, literally grew up on the town, living with various families during the week and returning to the plantation on week ends. He started reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the age of 12, and became so authoritative on national issues that he was admitted to the endless discussions which took place beneath the sycamores lining the

courthouse square. His father and the other men treated him as an adult. It was perfect training for a future lobbyist * * * or politician.

In high school Jack played football and outalked his teachers. Friends called him by his middle name, Emil, which he detests, or by his nickname, Sonny Boy, which is best forgotten. He always had at least two girl friends on the string. Barely passing subjects which bored him, he led the field in subjects which intrigued him. He shone, particularly, in Mrs. Ruth Thomas' history class; Jack and one brilliant girl would get into such protracted and heated arguments, with members of the class taking sides, that Mrs. Thomas found herself a moderator rather than a teacher. "I learned a lot of history myself," she recalls.

Peurifoy set out from Walterboro for West Point when a high-school classmate who had priority for the congressional appointment to the Military Academy decided, instead, to get married. Jack regrets today that he was unable to complete his education at West Point, but for years after he joined the State Department he took night-school courses. "I didn't earn a college degree," he says, "but neither did Secretary Byrnes or Secretary Stettinius."

The difficult years prior to his entering the State Department taught Peurifoy lessons he never forgot. In high school he was a bit of an acid-tongued wise guy, and as a young man he had a quick temper. One old friend was with Peurifoy when he was arrested for speeding; Jack gave the cop a piece of his mind and also gave up $10. Eight years later the same friend was with him when Jack was again arrested for a traffic violation. This time Jack was so affable and pleasant about the whole business that the incident wound up with the cop shaking his hand and tearing up the ticket. "My," his friend remarked, "how Jack has mellowed."

Peurifoy's rapid rise in the State Department was due in part to assiduous practice of the ambitious young man's standard virtues. He didn't watch the clock, got along well with everybody, kept the boss happy, and studied to improve himself. But he also saw to it that he was always working in a division in which there was plenty of activity and a chance to get ahead. First he was in munitions control, then liaison with the Board of Economic Warfare, then liaison with the War Production Board. He was not afraid to speak his mind, either. In the Government, where so much is done by rote, where security becomes such a shibboleth that men degenerate into mice, an outspoken and vigorous operator naturally stands out. "To tell the truth," Peurifoy says, "the State Department was ripe for guys like me."

Furthermore, he was not afraid to take a chance. Early in 1945 he took on an assignment which could easily have marked him for oblivion if he had botched it. The citizens of Bedford Springs, Pa., were up in arms because Japanese diplomats were quartered in a local hotel, and there were dark mutterings about burning down the hotel, Japanese and all. Peurifoy went there for the State Department, quietly lined up the support of a few key civic leaders, then held a mass meeting in the hotel that was attended by 500 irate citizens. He took off his coat, then his necktie, sat on a desk, and dished up a blunt patois which would have horrified an old-school diplomat into apoplexy. If the citizens of Bedford Springs had a low opinion of the Japanese, it seemed that the man from the State Department had an even lower one. With that established, Peurifoy slipped in the gimmick. One American boy was worth more than the 200 Japanese designated for roasting alive. If anything happened to them, there would be reprisals against Americans imprisoned in Japan. After talking and answering questions for 3 hours, Peurifoy got a big round of applause. Next day the local newspaper published an editorial supporting him, and nothing more was heard about fricasseeing the Japs.

Soon afterward, Peurifoy got the biggest break of his career—again with an unparalleled opportunity to make a total mess of it. He was sent to San Francisco to arrange for the conference at which the United Nations was born. All he had to do was to find 5,600 hotel rooms in our most crowded wartime embarkation port, set up worldwide communications, arrange for the feeding, transportation, and diversion of the delegates, provide for translation services in five official languages, smooth ruffled feelings every few minutes, and handle the Russians.

Peurifoy went to considerable pains to arrange for the Molotov suite at the St. Francis Hotel. The Russian Foreign Minister showed up and announced that he was staying, instead, at the Soviet consulate. Late one night a Russian delegation arrived at Peurifoy's office and demanded four Russian typewriters * * * instantly. Peurifoy preserved the honor of the United States; he sent men to steal four Russian typewriters from a State Department translation office until replacements could be flown from New York. The Russians wouldn't use the communications we arranged; they steamed a communications ship, the *Smolny*, into San Francisco harbor. Peurifoy spent hours on his direct telephone to Washington straightening that out, for wartime regulations prohibited ship messages from the harbor.

Then the Russians invited Peurifoy and several others to a party aboard the *Smolny*, at which beautiful Russian stewardesses kept filling the guests' glasses with vodka, or wine, or champagne, the moment they were empty. Peurifoy worked out a technique; he would engage a Russian in earnest conversation near a deck rail, then dump his vodka overboard while the Russian was talking. Peurifoy is a very moderate bourbon-and-branch-water man himself; besides, it rather offended his sense of technique as a handler of people to observe the Russians' extremely unsubtle efforts to get the Americans drunk and babbling.

There were others who made problems for Peurifoy in San Francisco. An eminent United States jurist arrived to mediate a labor dispute and was shunted to a fifth-rate hotel. He threatened to telephone President Roosevelt. Peurifoy had, by then, established such friendly relations with the manager of the Mark Hopkins that he was able to arrange a room commensurate with the judge's conception of his dignity.

As usual, Peurifoy made many friends. Roger D. Lapham, the ebullient mayor of San Francisco, called upon Jack at his hotel and was greeted by the State Department's representative clad only in a towel—Peurifoy had been taking a shower. Thus started a beautiful friendship which gave Peurifoy the loud-tie habit. Until then, Jack had always worn ultraconservative neckwear. Lapham noted for his gay ties, presented Jack with a few gaudy numbers, and he hasn't worn a quiet one since. Gov. Earl Warren, of California, became a close friend. Hollywood celebrities, including Louis Mayer, joined the Peurifoy circle. Peurifoy may have left San Francisco, utterly exhausted, but he also left with two motion-picture-company offers as a personnel man, the suggestion that he should be president of a San Francisco bank, a proposal that he join a major automobile-manufacturing company, and a feeling that it was a job well done.

More important, Peurifoy attracted the attention of Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary of State. Acheson made Peurifoy his assistant, and later advised General Marshall to place him in charge of State Department administration. Marshall agreed, brushing aside Peurifoy's suggestions that four other men, whom Peurifoy named, might be better qualified. He did, however, accept Peurifoy's suggestion that the job be taken on a 6-week-trial basis. When the 6 weeks ended, Marshall sent Peurifoy's nomination to the White House and left for Europe without a further word.

Success has not changed the man who used to shovel snow on Capitol Hill. The Peurifoys' friends are still the friends of leaner times. Little more than a year ago, Jack drove to work in his battered old car and returned that night to their $80-a-month apartment in an expensive new one.

"Ha!" Mrs. Peurifoy snorted. "Talk about your southern aristocracy. You're just like all the white trash; you spend all your money on a car and leave me living in a barn."

Jack made amends by purchasing a three-bedroom house—with 3½ baths, he points out proudly—near the Washington Golf and Country Club in Arlington, Va., across the Potomac River from Washington. Mrs. Peurifoy still has no maid, just a cleaning woman twice a week, and Peurifoy figures he can't afford to join the country club yet, although the swimming pool would be nice for their two small sons. Peurifoy has learned to wait—if not too long. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, eyeing the Peurifoy influence with Congress, has wooed him flatteringly, but unsuccessfully. There are all those offers from private industry. And no one who knows Jack doubts that he will go even higher in the Government, if he stays.

Back in 1926, when he was graduated from Walterboro High School, a classmate was summing up Sonny Boy Peurifoy for the senior yearbook. He mentioned that "Emil" was the handsomest boy in the class, was the most sarcastic, that his favorite saying was "I object," and that his ambition, naturally, was to be President of the United States. And then, with the prescience and candor vouchsafed only to the very young, the biographer added: "Idea of misery—to meet his match."

The Administration of Congress—An Article From the Public Administration Review, by Gladys M. Kammerer, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the article from the Public Administration Review on the administration of Congress by Gladys M. Kammerer, associate professor of political science at the University of Kentucky.

It points up strongly the need for modernization of the housekeeping services of the Congress, the elimination of duplication, and the lack of direct administrative responsibility for many of the services now rendered to the Congress.

The article in part follows:

THE ADMINISTRATION OF CONGRESS

(By Gladys M. Kammerer, associate professor of political science, University of Kentucky)

Little thought has been given by Congress itself, students of administration, or the gen-

eral public to the development of efficiency or responsibility in the management of the daily routine business that makes our national legislative body function. Its personnel and management practices, developed gradually over the years, are now sanctioned by hoary usage. A relatively small number of Members of the two Houses have had enough management experience to recognize the weaknesses in administrative organization on the Hill. Few Members can spare the time from legislative debates, answering correspondence, the pressure of committee work, speech-making around the country, campaigning for reelection, and other assorted legislative and political tasks to devote any attention to the improvement of the management of Congress.

The housekeeping functions of Congress—handling of pay roll and accounts, recruitment and selection of personnel for administrative duties, library and informational services, bill drafting, reporting of debates, printing, handling mail, police and guard protection, and building maintenance—are not managed with any unity of direction. Instead, they are scattered among many offices that are independent of one another. By the very nature of the bicameral system, there is a dichotomy in the execution of most of these functions. Two parallel offices, one at each end of the Capitol, perform most of these duties with little or no relation to each other. Thus, diffusion of responsibility and separation of the Houses make easy the survival of archaic and sometimes cumbersome modes of handling the housekeeping duties.

ORGANIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATION OF HOUSEKEEPING FUNCTIONS

In considering the management of the routine functions of Congress the student of administration is compelled to examine the offices of each branch of Congress independently. A somewhat greater simplicity characterizes the Senate than the House side.

Under the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms, both elected by the Senate, are found most of the Senate administrative offices. The Secretary of the Senate supervises the Chief Clerk, chief bookkeeper, principal clerk, financial clerk, legislative clerk, clerk of enrolled bills, registration clerk, parliamentarian, journal clerk, printing clerk, enrolling clerk, librarian, executive clerk, keeper of stationery, superintendent of the document room, and editor of the Senate section of the Daily Digest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Secretary of the Senate is responsible for financial management on the Senate side, and all moneys are disbursed under his authority. For this purpose a disbursing office is operated by the financial clerk, who maintains a record of all Senate employees as well as the retirement roll, administers the pay roll, pays travel expenses, performs accounting functions, and disburses moneys appropriated to the committees. The Chief Clerk exercises a general supervision on behalf of the Secretary of the Senate over all other clerks under the supervision of the Secretary's office; in addition, he is the reading clerk for the Senate. The administrative duties of the Parliamentarian are to route bills and executive papers to the relevant committees. His legislative functions are, of course, implied in his title, as are those of the journal clerk and the enrolling clerk. The executive clerk keeps a record of and routes such executive matters as treaties, nominations to office which require senatorial confirmation, Presidential messages, and communications and reports from the executive branch. Records and printing of all bills, as well as the printing of reports on bills, are under the direction of a bill clerk. The legislative clerk prepares the calendar of the Senate and endorses action on bills and executive business. In addition, he acts as assistant reading clerk. The keeper of stationery directs the work of the stationery room, keeps it stocked, makes purchases, and records the stationery accounts of individual Senators and committees. However, office items may also be obtained from the folding room, which represents a duplication in services. The printing and binding of all Senate bills, hearings, reports of committees, and papers from the executive branch fall under the direction of the printing clerk, but custody of this printed matter and distribution to Senators are duties of the superintendent of the document room.

The Senate Library, which is also under the authority of the Secretary of the Senate, is completely independent both of the Library of Congress and of the House Library. Operated primarily as a legislative reference library, it gives assistance to the Senators on the floor, to their office staffs, and to committee staffs. It is neither a law library nor a general library, for Members can turn to the Library of Congress for more specialized types of information. Only in 1947 did the Senate Library commence the cataloging of its material; until that time the Senate librarian alone knew where to find many items in the collection, and much material thus remained generally inaccessible.

The Sergeant at Arms directs work of a police nature in addition to discharging the duties of preserving order on the floor of the Senate. He also has a few supervisory duties not particularly related to these responsibilities. Under him are a Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Capitol guides, Capitol police on the Senate side, Senate Office Building police, the folding room, and the Senate post office. Keeping order in the galleries falls within the scope of his duties, in connection with which he supervises the gallery doorkeepers. Doorkeepers on the floor are also under his command. The Deputy Sergeant at Arms not only assists him directly but serves as storekeeper, purchasing agent, and keeper of records on Senate property, such as office equipment and supplies for the cloakrooms, reading rooms, and business offices on the Senate side. The distribution of public documents by Senators and of office supplies to the Senators is the responsibility of the folding room. The Senate post office maintains an office in the Capitol as well as in the Senate Office Building to receive and deliver mail. The Senate Office Building police serve as building guards in the same fashion as do similar employees in other Federal buildings. Such supervision as is given to the Capitol guides is shared by the Sergeant at Arms of the House. Such sharing of authority is equally characteristic of direction of the Capitol police who are under the immediate supervision of the Capitol Police Board. This force polices the Capitol building and grounds.

Directly answerable to the President of the Senate pro tempore is the Office of the Legislative Counsel, which specializes in bill-drafting services to individual Senators and committees. It employs a technical staff of eight lawyers for this work. The official reporters of debates who are employed under contract to make verbatim stenographic reports of Senate proceedings are also responsible to the President pro tempore.

In addition to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, the Senate elects a Chaplain. Each party elects a secretary and assistant secretary whose duties are parallel. The secretary serves as pair clerk for his party, supervises pages, distributes bills and amendments on the floor, and manages business connected with the calling of and attendance at party conference or caucuses.

Organization of the House of Representatives roughly parallels that of the Senate, with a few significant differences. The House has more elective offices: The Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Postmaster, the Doorkeeper, and the Chaplain. The Sergeant at Arms of the House directs the guides and police and guard work for the House; he also exercises certain fiscal functions. For example, Members' salaries and mileage allowances are paid by his office through a cashier who supervises several tellers and bookkeepers. The cashier's office also serves as a bank to cash Members' and employees' checks. The House Doorkeeper supervises assistant doorkeepers, cloakroom attendants, telephone "managers," pages, messengers, and janitor service as well as the superintendent of the document room and the superintendent of the folding room.

The Clerk of the House has a jurisdiction roughly analogous to that of the Secretary of the Senate. Responsible to him are reading clerks, a stationery clerk, tally clerk, file clerk, bill clerk, enrolling clerk, disbursing clerk, supervisor of the Clerk's document room, the property custodian, House librarian, supervisor of the telephone exchange, and staff of the House section of the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some of these positions are self-explanatory in the light of the description of their opposite numbers in the Senate. The disbursing clerk administers the pay roll for all House officers and employees, pays all operating expenses of the House covered by appropriations, and performs all accounting functions relevant to these expenditures. The Clerk's document room processes orders for binding documents for Congressmen and directs distribution of both House and Senate Journals, the statutes, and the biweekly index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; it also has charge of the filing of both House and Senate documents. The single telephone exchange serves both House and Senate.

Directly under the Speaker of the House are the official reporters of debates, official stenographers to committees, the Parliamentarian, the office of the legislative counsel, the House Office Buildings Commission, and the coordinator of information. The first four of these sets of employees perform duties identical to those of similar Senate employees. The House Office Buildings Commission is actually a committee consisting of the Speaker and one member each from the majority and minority parties which makes space allocations to Members, committees, and administrative offices and makes rules governing the use of the buildings. The coordinator of information, whose position was created in the Eightieth Congress, obtains spot information for Congressmen, especially for use in floor debates, from the more obvious and readily available sources. His staff which is small and unspecialized attempts no original research.

The majority and minority organizations in the House are each entitled to employ a legislative clerk, secretary, clerk, and assistant clerks in the offices of the respective floor leaders. The majority leader, in the Eightieth Congress, however, had failed to appoint a clerk or assistant legislative clerk. The minority party is in addition allocated a special clerk to the minority, a minority pair clerk, and three other minority employees of no defined status. The Rules Committee staff and the Speaker's office staff serve in somewhat the same capacity to the majority party as the secretary to the majority party and his staff serve in the Senate.

The office of the Architect of the Capitol directs the custodial, engineering, and repair work as well as elevator operation for Hill buildings in addition to strictly architectural duties. Although the architect is a presidential appointee, the office is considered a congressional agency and is in part under congressional patronage. Roughly one-eighth of the employees in this office are selected through patronage methods.

The Capitol Police are under the general direction of a board consisting of the House and Senate Sergeants at Arms and the

Architect of the Capitol. Immediate supervision of the force falls to a captain appointed by the Board. Lesser police officers are divided between the two Houses and selected by patronage.

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL

The only elective administrative positions in the two Houses are those in the top echelon. In the Senate they are the Secretary, Sergeant at Arms, and Chaplain; in the House they are the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Chaplain, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster. In practice these officers are selected by the caucus of the majority party at the time the floor leader and Speaker or President pro tempore nominations are decided. When a new House Clerk is to be selected, the Speaker has preponderant influence in the choice. The minority party determines the minority assistants for each of these key positions. Thus when a change in party control occurs, the assistants are trained and ready to exchange places with their predecessors who step down into minority posts to bide their time for a return of their party's fortunes. * * * The Doorkeeper of the House, a Missourian, had been minority pair clerk in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. On the other hand, the Sergeant at Arms of the House had been minority Sergeant at Arms for 6 years preceding 1947. The Secretary of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress was a career employee of Congress, having begun as a page in 1889 and worked up through many varieties of senatorial administrative operations. The Senate Sergeant at Arms was, in contrast, entirely new to the Hill.

Lesser positions are filled for the most part by patronage, with a few notable exceptions. A high degree of turn-over, therefore, occurs with any change in party control. The majority party naturally takes virtually all positions for its own patronage except those technical or near top-level positions where the continuance of trained assistants of the minority party is essential to keep the legislative gears meshed in the period of change. Personnel turn-over is extremely high in the more menial jobs, not only because of changes in congressional seats but also because many of the positions are held by young men who are students in the various educational institutions in Washington.

Each House vests the dispensing of patronage in a patronage committee appointed at the beginning of a new Congress. The House committee consists of three members selected by the Speaker, one of whom is usually chairman of the powerful Rules Committee. House patronage is allocated in two ways. First, each member of the party in power is granted at least one patronage position among such routine categories as elevator operators, pages, Capitol Police, guards, messengers, document room, folding room, and postal employees. Many Congressmen find the task of assigning their patronage onerous because of the pressure for these petty positions. Some Members refuse to be bothered with the filling of page positions because parents of the boys expect a degree of oversight. * * *

The Senate during the Eightieth Congress had a personnel committee of five Republican Senators chosen by the majority conference. Today the Democratic patronage committee has three members. Each majority Senator receives three positions of a routine nature. The entire minority party of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress was allocated four pages, one elevator operator, and 10 percent of the policemen. As in the House, positions in the Senate administrative offices are given special consideration by the personnel committee which screens applicants in a rough way to insure the possession of certain minimum qualifications. No attempt is made at geographical distribution in filling positions in the administrative offices.

Committee staff positions in both Houses are still considered the province of the chairmen, although the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 stipulated that selection of professional staff appointees be made by majority vote of the entire committee. Some committees award one professional staff member and an assistant clerk to the minority. Others make no attempt to divide positions in this fashion on the ground that an attempt is made to fill all posts on a nonpartisan basis. Practice varies in the use of a personnel subcommittee by chairmen to aid in screening applicants and making final recommendations. * * *

Some positions are not disturbed by party turn-over. For example, it is traditional to retain the Parliamentarian and all employees of the Office of Legislative Counsel in each Chamber. In 1947, in addition, the disbursing clerks, telephone operators, one woman clerk in the office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms who had been employed for 35 years, a number of clerks in the office of the Secretary of the Senate,[1] janitors, and maintenance men were not disturbed by the patronage committees.

The House retained the disbursing clerk and his staff, the reading clerks, assistant reading clerk, assistant tally clerk, stationery clerk, and property custodian at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress. The office of the Sergeant at Arms in each House is traditionally subjected to an almost complete turn-over when party control changes, as is that of the House Doorkeeper. * * *

With respect to the Parliamentarian and legislative counsel positions in each House, the duties are technical and require a degree of expertise not satisfied by patronage methods. The legislative counsel on each side is given a free hand by the Presiding Officer to recruit his own staff. Normally he accomplishes this through his wide acquaintance with law-school facilities. Each counsel prefers young recruits who can be trained in the work of bill-drafting as a career. As a result turn-over is low in these offices.

For such professional work as that of the Library, however, professional training has not been sought on the House side. No member of the present staff is a trained librarian. Moreover, in the past persons barely literate have obtained these positions through the patronage system. The patronage system bears some not wholly unexpected results. One employee had to be retained in the turn-over of 1947 because he had developed a unique system of cataloging incomprehensible to anyone else. He alone had found the key to security.

The Senate Library has had persons more competent in the field of library science. The present librarian was for years employed in the Library of Congress. * * *

* * * * *

For some of the least important positions on the Hill, Congress undoubtedly obtains many persons far superior in training to the requirements of the tasks involved.* * *

FISCAL CONTROLS

Fiscal management in the House is divided tween the offices of the Clerk and the Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms manages the pay roll and mileage of Members; the Clerk through a disbursing clerk pays all employees salaries and appropriations and allowances to committees and makes payments from the contingent fund. The bookkeeping records in the Clerk's office are audited regularly by the General Accounting Office.

A General Accounting Office audit in January 1947, the first audit of any kind made in 15 years, of the funds handled by the cashier in the office of the Sergeant at Arms revealed serious defalcation. After the new Speaker and the new Clerk had been elected at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, they requested a GAO audit. Almost immediately discrepancies were discovered, and the work of the new cashier had to be suspended for some time. The shortage, which amounted to $143,863, had accumulated over a period of more than 20 years and had been concealed by the fact that the Sergeant at Arms had served in that office since 1931 and continuously from 1915 to 1931 as either cashier or assistant cashier.[2] * * *

* * * * *

The Senate consolidates the management of all funds under the Secretary of the Senate and subjects the records to a regular audit by the General Accounting Office.

NEEDED CHANGES

Present administration of Congress probably stands in need of drastic reorganization more seriously than does the executive branch. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 did not reach into the managerial offices on the Hill nor did it touch the antiquated patronage system. This statute, a necessary first step in the modernization of the national legislature, should be followed by other measures.

One of the steps which should be taken is the introduction of modern methods of office management. For example, folding of documents is a hand operation in the folding rooms on both sides of the Hill.[3] No systems of forms control or numbering systems for ordering items, such as characterize modern business or administrative offices, have ever been introduced. No stock catalog for ordering office items has ever been developed. Mimeographing and multilithing facilities are inadequate to meet demands. Telephone facilities are overburdened. Business machines, except for typewriters, are absent from virtually all central offices of both Houses. No regular messenger service is provided for the Senate. Desks, chairs, desk lamps, and other office furniture, however ornamental, are reminiscent of the nineties.

Modern office management would require the centralization of managerial authority in the hands of one person in each House. Moreover, such an individual could scarcely be selected under the present patronage system or by party caucus. However useful such methods of selection may be for filling political posts where duties are executed under much the same procedures as were used a half century ago, they could not be relied upon to unearth a person with enough experience in office management to bring order out of the present confusion. Such officers must be granted authority to make procedural analyses and recommendations for change to the presiding officers of each House. Some of the functions that have developed under the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper on the House side should be transferred to a business manager.

The only businesslike solution would be the nonpartisan selection in each House of a business manager who is guaranteed tenure so long as satisfactory service is rendered and who would be delegated authority and responsibility for the direction of all fiscal, procurement, supply, space, and distribution services to the membership at large on each side as well as to the committees. He should have authority to make organization and

[1] Those retained in the 80th Cong. were: journal clerk, chief bookkeeper, executive clerk, principal clerk, legislative clerk, printing clerk, keeper of stationery, assistant superintendent of the document room, and registration clerk.

[2] See the New York Times, January 4, 1947, p. 3; January 15, 1947, p. 1; February 11, 1947, p. 34; May 13, 1947, p. 20; May 16, 1947, p. 44; and May 24, 1947, p. 2.

[3] Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Evaluation of Effect of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (S. Rept. No. 1175, 80th Cong., 2d sess., April 28, 1948), pp. 5–6.

methods analyses; combine, reorganize, or eliminate unnecessary offices or positions; and select and dismiss employees under his direction on a nonpolitical, merit basis. This would constitute an heroic step for the Congress to take, but an inevitable one if it desires to rationalize its underlying services.

Another step equally essential to good management on the Hill is the abandonment of the antiquated patronage system. Although Congress has relinquished large areas of patronage in the executive branch in the last decade, both Senators and Representatives seem to clasp to their bosoms the petty privilege of naming a page, a messenger, a policeman, an elevator operator, or a building guard. Indeed, hours may be spent by a congressional office in trying to arrange a satisfactory work schedule for one of the patronage appointees of the office who is attending a university in the District of Columbia. If these sinecures are worth anything as scholarships to students, a sensible solution might be competitive examinations and allocation of positions by geographic areas. Thus Members of the Congress would be relieved of pressures from home, and the channeling of appointments to the better caliber of students would be assured.

Types of work which require professional training for efficient performance are not a proper area for patronage committee operations. Already Congress has recognized this in the selection of employees for offices of legislative counsel and the parliamentarians. The two libraries should be the next offices divorced from patronage control. Were a business manager employed, many more positions of a clerical, fiscal, and routine administrative nature should be divorced from patronage. Nothing would be left to the individual Congressman to dispense except the positions in his own office, and for the parties as a whole only a few decisions would be required for the filling of elective offices and the staffing of those lesser positions dedicated to strictly legislative work, such as executive clerk, legislative clerk, pair clerk, tally clerk, and enrolling clerk. The Senate in practice has now had so little turn-over in these positions that some employees in the secretary's office, although superannuated, are indispensable because neither party has trained any replacements.

A reform such as the abandonment of patronage would indicate the need for a central personnel office on the Hill. Recruitment and examinations could be conducted through such an agency for positions in the central service offices. Appointments could be made by the higher ranking administrative offices from registers which would allow more freedom of choice than the usual Civil Service Commission certification procedures permit. There is no logical reason why Congress should tie itself down to the rule of three as sacrosanct. This office could also develop with the cooperation of various officers some systematic training for the more important categories of positions. A rational salary schedule should be established and the techniques of position classification applied to bring similar types of work together into classes and grades of positions.

If Congress is to meet the legislative needs of the Nation, multiplying in complexity as they are day by day, it must cut itself out of the administrative jungle on the Hill. By simplifying and centralizing its own administrative management, freeing itself from outmoded and undignified patronage demands, and recruiting more competent and more vigorous employees, it could set an invaluable example to the Nation of the application of the American flair for economy and efficiency it professes to esteem so highly.

California Opposes Arizona's Claim to Colorado River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on August 24 last I included under an extension of remarks an analysis of part I of the hearings on H. R. 934, presenting the affirmative argument, as prepared by J. H. Moeur, of Phoenix, Ariz. This analysis was very helpful in sketching the main points for the convenience of Members and others who had not heard the oral testimony. Under leave to print, obtained October 14, I wish to present Mr. Moeur's analysis of the opposition argument as found in part II of the hearings on H. R. 934. His summary is as follows:

One of the first witnesses appearing in opposition of the bill was Mr. Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general for the State of California (pp. 703 to 789, inclusive). Mr. Shaw submitted, as part of the record, a resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, the substance of which was to urge judicial determination of the legal rights on the river before further consideration of the central Arizona project bill (pp. 705 and 706). He also offered, for the record, a resolution of the State Water Resources Board of the State of California (pp. 706 and 707). Other resolutions and correspondence that were offered by Mr. Shaw included copies of correspondence between Gov. Earl Warren, of California, and the late Sidney P. Osborn, then Governor of Arizona. The text of this correspondence is well known and has often been discussed before various committees of Congress. California attempted, by the use of this correspondence, to show that California has always been ready to arbitrate or negotiate for division of Colorado River water. The truth of this statement was refuted by testimony of Mr. Charles A. Carson, which will be more fully discussed later in this summary.

Apparently some members of the committee were skeptical of the position taken by California, as was evidenced by questions asked by Mr. FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, of Mr. Shaw and the answers thereto as appear on page 744:

"Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Shaw, I was concerned about one point raised by Governor Warren. That was the question of arbitration.

"Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

"Mr. BARRETT. Has that method ever been used between the States?

"Mr. SHAW. I cannot answer that specifically. It is a well-known method of disposing of controversies, if people choose to do it.

"Mr. BARRETT. I understand that. I am just wondering if it has ever been used on a controversy between States.

"Mr. SHAW. On principle, I do not know why it should not be, but I do not know that it has ever been done. That sort of action would have to be taken by agreement. The States must determine what they want to arbitrate, and how they want to arbitrate, and whether they will be bound by the decision or not.

"Mr. BARRETT. And probably it would require an act of the legislature to bind the States?

"Mr. SHAW. I suppose so."

The position of Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho, was shown by certain questions and answers appearing on page 747:

"Mr. WHITE. Have we reached a stalemate, so that the waters of the Colorado River must flow away to the sea unused because we cannot get the proper procedure from Congress?

"Mr. SHAW. Partially so, Mr. WHITE. There is a stalemate in the lower basin until the Supreme Court decides who is entitled to this water. We think that is so.

"Mr. WHITE. Do you not think the best way to get the Supreme Court to decide who is entitled to this water is to authorize this project?

"Mr. SHAW. We do not think it is necessary at all. We think there is a justiciable cause of action today. We think there is a threat of injury.

"Mr. WHITE. In the event you are unsuccessful in getting the bill through the Judiciary Committee, how does California propose to proceed then?

"Mr. SHAW. I cannot answer that. It is pretty 'iffy.'

"Mr. WHITE. There is just one 'if.' If the Judiciary Committee says that they do not approve the bill, then the water must flow unused to the sea?"

Again, on page 748, Mr. WHITE directed questions concerning the California Limitation Act:

"Mr. WHITE. What happens to the rest of the water, if it does not run away into the sea?

"Mr. SHAW. If we could use that, we would not be arguing with Arizona. The unfortunate part is that Arizona cannot get this water without taking the water away from California and rendering a $200,000,000 aqueduct that we have built utterly useless.

"Mr. WHITE. You do not hold that the act of the California Legislature which imposes the limitation of 4,400,000 acre-feet is a scrap of paper?

"Mr. SHAW. No.

"Mr. WHITE. You think that is valid?

"Mr. SHAW. It is valid, and we expect to honor it and abide by it.

"Mr. WHITE. You are limited to 4,400,000 acre-feet; are you not?

"Mr. SHAW. No, sir. That has been stated to you, but it is not the truth. We are limited to 4,400,000 acre-feet plus not to exceed one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact, and that half of the excess or surplus is where we have provided for the 962,000 acre-feet that our contracts cover in excess of 4,400,000 acre-feet.

"Mr. WHITE. Who gets the other half of that excess?

"Mr. SHAW. Arizona, presumably, or Mexico. Remember that Mexico is to be served out of surplus.

"Mr. WHITE. Mexico already has an allocation?

"Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WHITE. Of 1,000,000 feet?

"Mr. SHAW. One million five hundred thousand acre-feet. That is one of the things that has precipitated this trouble, because Arizona supported that treaty and we opposed it, and the treaty has very much increased the pinch on the lower basin.

"Mr. WHITE. I would not want to suggest that California is putting itself in the position of opposing Arizona's use of her share of the water, but it certainly takes that appearance."

On this cross-examination, Mr. Shaw finally admitted that Bridge Canyon Dam should be built and went so far as to admit that the other features of the proposed project, except for the aqueduct, should be built. On being questioned by Mr. WESLEY A.

D'EWART, of Montana, Mr. Shaw stated (pp. 759 and 760):

"Mr. SHAW. * * * Now, if Bridge Canyon is to be built, as we think it should be, of course, there should be a power plant provided and presumably transmission lines, so that item is obviously in order. * * *

"* * * What I would like to call your attention to is that there are six or eight more or less independent projects in Arizona which seem to be justified independently of the importation of water of the Colorado River. I am referring to the Buttes Dam on the Gila River, the enlargement of the Horseshoe Dam on the Verde River, the building of the Hooker Dam in New Mexico on the upper Gila, the building of the Charleston Dam on the San Pedro in southern Arizona, and the municipal aqueduct to Tucson. Those things appear to be entirely independent of the central Arizona aqueduct, so far as we can see it, and we think that they can be built far more promptly and afford relief to the area more quickly than the aqueduct proposition, which will take many years to build."

Finally, Mr. Shaw's position was summarized by Mr. D'EWART in a question, as follows (p. 761):

"Mr. D'EWART. As I understand your testimony, your main objection which California has to this legislation, is in the item No. (2); that is, speaking generally and not specifically.

"Mr. SHAW. Well, sir, that is the thing which steps on our toes, and which we think would have to be supplied with our water.

"Now, I do not want to be put in the position of calling names. Arizona says we are stealing her water. We think they are stealing ours. That is the kernel of the debate.

"If this extremely expensive aqueduct, which we think throws the economy of the Southwest more or less out of joint, were not to be built, we would not have any objection whatsoever to the local improvements in central Arizona which, at the Bureau's estimate, would supply, I believe, 168,000 acre-feet for the central Arizona irrigated area.

"Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. D'EWART. I understand that the water supply figures given us are such that even California concedes some 400,000 acre-feet of water that are not claimed at all by California and are still in the river.

"Mr. SHAW. No, sir. As you will remember, at the time of authorization of the Gila project we considered that the allowance of the 600,000 acre-feet for that project would exhaust the noncontroversial water.

"As we see it now, there is a slight deficit in the water in the lower basin, a shortage.

"Mr. D'EWART. In looking over a study that was made in your appearance before the Senate committee the other day, I understand that Arizona claims there is some 2,600,000 acre-feet in the river that belongs to Arizona. The same table of figures show 2,273,000 acre-feet.

"This table shows that California, in the presentations they made before the Senate committee, thought there were some 400,000 acre-feet.

"Mr. SHAW. I think that is an erroneous figure, Mr. D'EWART."

Mr. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, made a fair summary of the situation by his question which appears on page 762:

"Mr. ASPINALL. I just wish to ask a question there of Mr. Shaw to see if I understand what he is saying. You do not object, Mr. Shaw, or California does not object to any improvements in California, just so long as it does not take any water from the Colorado River?

"Mr. SHAW. You mean any improvements in Arizona?

"Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

"Mr. SHAW. Of course not. The issue is as to who is entitled to this Colorado River water, and whether this project can be built without taking water from existing projects in California. That is the crux of it."

It is of interest to note Mr. MURDOCK's comment thereon and Mr. Shaw's answer (p. 762):

"Mr. MURDOCK. Is this a fair statement, then, Mr. Shaw: That you would approve these improvements within the State of Arizona, so long as they do not call for any water out of the Colorado River? For instance, the Buttes Dam on the Gila River, the Charleston Dam on the San Pedro, those might be justified; and you have no objection to them so long as they do not call on the Colorado River for any water?

"Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir. We have been a little surprised and a little perplexed as to why these local improvements, which justify themselves and which can be constructed independently and quickly, have been thrown into this great project which seems to involve them all in a controversy. There is no controversy, so far as we are concerned, on the Buttes Dam or the enlargement of the Horseshoe Dam, or the Hooker Dam, or the Charleston Dam."

The fact that both Arizona and California agree that Bridge Canyon Dam should be built and also a dam at Glen Canyon was emphasized by Mr. D'EWART and Mr. MURDOCK (p. 763):

"Mr. D'EWART. What I am trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is this: Is there any area in which California and Arizona are in agreement? I was hoping we could develop some area on which there is an agreement.

"Mr. MURDOCK. Here is a very small area. Mr. Shaw, as I understand it, has said that there ought to be a dam built at the Bridge Canyon site, as this bill provides.

"Mr. D'EWART. Yes.

"Mr. MURDOCK. And there should be a dam built at the Glen Canyon, which is not mentioned in the bill, but which he thinks is implied.

"We are all agreed that there are two great dams on the main stream of the Colorado River above Hoover Dam that ought to be built. The point is that he would like to have them produce power for a power-hungry area—and so would I—but he is not willing that any water shall be diverted for irrigation in Arizona.

"He says, of course, that Arizona does not have any water coming, and I firmly believe that the Angel Gabriel would say that we do have some water coming—more than is called for in this bill. That is my opinion.

"Mr. D'EWART. Well, at least it appears that we are in agreement as to building those dams, anyway."

Mr. WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, had a number of pertinent observations to make—the first dealing with the question of nonreimbursables (p. 764):

"Mr. D'EWART. If Mr. LEMKE will yield to me for just 1 minute, may I say that the Hoover Commission has made, in their report, considerable comment on that, and they name seven different methods by which a yardstick for figuring nonreimbursables can be established.

"In addition to that, I am advised that the Bureau has made an extensive study of this matter of reimbursables and they have an extensive report. However, the report is not yet complete and has not yet quite reached the stage that they would like to have it to present it to Congress. There is a study, and they do have quite an extensive report on it.

"Mr. LEMKE. I am glad to know that, because to me these so-called fantastic intangibles are just as real as an acre of land.

"Mr. SHAW. I wish to concede that.

"Mr. LEMKE. They should be taken into consideration and they should be willing to pay for those.

"Mr. SHAW. I concede that fully.

"Mr. LEMKE. I think they ought to be allowed, and it ought to be a part of this project."

Further, dealing with the power situation, Mr. LEMKE pointed out that apparently California's main objection to the bill was based on the assumption that California power users would be called upon to pay a portion of the irrigation features of the project. He pointed out that as far as he was concerned it made no difference where the power was sold and that California should not have any objection to Arizona furnishing them power if they got it at a reasonable price (p. 764).

Mr. LEMKE then proceeded to comment on the general situation, stating (p. 765):

"Mr. LEMKE. As I understand you, finally, the trouble between California and Arizona is solely a question of who is entitled to a certain amount of water that, to a certain extent, at least, was supposed to have been settled by the compact. Am I right on that?

"Mr. SHAW. Well, you are right as to the first part of the question, as to the essential issue being that of water supply. I do not quite understand the second part, that that was supposed to have been settled by the compact. The compact was only a division between the two basins, the upper and lower basins, and it did not assign any water to any particular State, so it did not settle that question.

"Mr. LEMKE. But the States got together and you agreed that California was to have 4,400,000 acre-feet of water out of the 7,500,000?

"Mr. SHAW. Plus half of the unapportioned excess of surplus.

"Mr. LEMKE. O. K. I feel that you had the best of the bargain, but that was Arizona's own fault, if they were sleeping at the switch. However, I still feel that outside of that there is considerable water, according to the testimony here."

Again Mr. LEMKE commented (p. 765):

"Mr. LEMKE. So, building this dam so far as I can see it—I may be wrong; you correct me if I am—cannot take any water from California that California is entitled to under its agreements and compact.

"Mr. SHAW. That is absolutely clear."

Finally, in response to a question by Mr. CLAIR ENGLE, of California, Mr. LEMKE made this pertinent statement (p. 766):

"Mr. POULSON. Will the gentleman yield? However, when the Supreme Court makes a decision we are going to have to comply with it, whether we like it or not.

"Mr. LEMKE. It is final, until they reverse themselves.

"Mr. SHAW. I would like to be frank. Mr. Carson sat here the other day and pounded the table and said: 'California cannot possibly be right about any of these issues.' That is a firm position to take about a lawsuit.

"Mr. LEMKE. I do not take it. Even lawyers admit that anything is possible in a lawsuit.

"Mr. ENGLE. Fifty percent of the lawyers are wrong in any lawsuit.

"Mr. LEMKE. I do not agree with that. Fifty percent of them may be right and the court may be wrong. However, then you have the issues determined finally, and that, it seems to me, cannot affect this project so much one way or another. You want the power. Why not go ahead and build it and then let the court decide who is entitled to the water?

"Mr. SHAW. I think that is a rational approach, Mr. LEMKE, and before you get through with your deliberations, it may be suggested to you that this bill be revised to provide for the things that are not in dispute. Let them go ahead today. Plainly the Bridge Canyon Dam is the thing that is going to take the longest time to build. It

may be 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 years until that is built, and there cannot be any diversion of water to central Arizona because there will not be the power to pump the water.

"It would seem, just as an offhand suggestion, which I think may be followed up by members of the committee later on, possibly, that it might be good judgment to go ahead and authorize the things which are not in dispute, before the Bridge Canyon Dam can be completed. Then this lawsuit can be tried and be disposed of and the decision rendered, and then you will know whether you should build an aqueduct to central Arizona for 1,200,000 acre-feet or for 500,000 acre-feet, or for 300,000 acre-feet, or else you will know that there is no water for it at all. Then you would be in a sensible position to decide the merits of the central Arizona aqueduct. Before that you are not."

Mr. TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma, advanced the suggestion that if the bill were reported out, California could then probably come in and enjoin, or seek to enjoin, Arizona from diverting water from this dam (p. 770). Again commenting on the situation, Mr. MORRIS, on page 775, said:

"The power to pass this act is the power to impound water, and that will give irrigation facilities to Arizona. The only way in the world the Court could determine it would be to determine whether or not they had a right to impound that water and use that water. You cannot escape that. If they can sue without bringing the United States in, they certainly can determine that issue. They would have to determine the issue to determine the injunction. There is no way to get around it."

The desirability of building Bridge Canyon and the other dams on the Colorado River to conserve oil and gas was emphasized by Mr. RICHARD J. WELCH, of California (p. 776):

"Mr. WELCH. May I ask a question before you proceed, Mr. Chairman?

"Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, Mr. WELCH.

"Mr. WELCH. The question of oil and electricity was raised here a few minutes ago.

"Mr. SHAW. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WELCH. What is the objection to building the dams and generating electricity pending litigation?

"Mr. SHAW. We think there is no objection to it. We are firmly of the belief that the duty of the United States is to do so.

"Mr. WELCH. In the committee just a few days ago I recited certain facts which I secured from the Department. On December 31, 1947, California's known oil reserves were 3,295,000,000 barrels. In 1948 California produced 340,000,000 barrels of petroleum for that year.

"Thus, it will be seen that California's known oil reserves will be exhausted in approximately 10 years. Despite that alarming fact California uses more petroleum in the generation of steam than any other State in the Nation.

"Gentlemen, we might as well look at the facts. We are talking about water. Southern California will run out of gasoline and oil long before it will run out of water. There is no reason that I can see why they should not proceed to get authorization from the Government by an act of Congress to build those dams and generate electricity and save this oil which cannot be reproduced. If you build the dam you can reproduce electricity so long as the stream flows down the Colorado River, but every barrel of oil taken from the ground is gone forever. Our oil reserves are within 10 years of exhaustion.

"Mr. SHAW. We firmly believe, Mr. WELCH, that your position is unassailable; that on any consideration of a broad national policy there must be a duty upon the part of the Federal Government to conserve its oil supplies and that the obvious and plain way to do that is to get these large productions of hydroelectric power into operation as soon as can be."

Another witness that appeared for California was Raymond Matthew, chief engineer, Colorado River Board of California (pp. 790 to 815, inclusive). Mr. Matthew's paper consisted largely of criticism of findings of the Bureau of Reclamation. It was summed up by a statement from Mr. MURDOCK (p. 815):

"It seems your view in general that the Bureau of Reclamation engineers are wrong on all points. That is the way I got it. So you really have taken issue here with the Bureau of Reclamation estimates and computations. But the thing I want to thank you for particularly, beside my general education, is this: It is comforting for me to know that there is no real water shortage in central Arizona. That will be news to a number of people out home. Here is a reporter, and I hope the press makes a note of that."

Mr. Matthew concluded the presentation of his formal statement the afternoon of Friday, May 13. The committee recessed and convened again Monday, May 30. On that day the committee diverted somewhat from its program to listen to witnesses from New Mexico and attorneys for the Hualapai tribe. The statement of these witnesses will be commented on later in the summary.

On Tuesday morning, May 31, the committee proceeded by listening to witnesses appearing in opposition of the bill and first resumed questioning of Mr. Matthew. Mr. Matthew, in his statement, had expressed the apprehension that Bridge Canyon Dam would be filled with silt in a relatively short time. Mr. FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, expressed considerable interest in this proposition, as evidenced by the following questions and answers (p. 861):

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Will you yield for a question, Mr. POULSON?

"Mr. POULSON. Yes.

"Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason for the reservoir upstream is to keep the silt from flowing into the lower basin, prevent it from coming down into the lower reservoir?

"Mr. MATTHEW. That is correct, in addition to river regulations.

"Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the answer; is there any definite period in which these big reservoirs will be silted up? What is the ultimate answer, say, in 50 years, or even assuming it takes 70 or 75 years from now if these reservoirs have filled up with silt? Is there any answer to that?

"Mr. MATTHEW. There is no answer as yet, Mr. CRAWFORD. The estimates, for instance, in regard to silting of Lake Mead, which is a very large reservoir, some 32,000,000 acre-feet, without any further storage upstream, have been made by various engineers ranging from 150 years all the way up to perhaps 200 years.

"Now in the meantime, of course, there are going to be large storage developments upstream that are planned for construction which will prolong the life of Lake Mead. However, when we look at it over a very long range, we know these reservoirs are going to be gradually silted up unless some preventive solution can be found. Whether it will be 300 years, 500 years, or 600 years, that has not been studied out, and plans have not been worked out finally.

"Now, also, of course, the Department of Agriculture has under active consideration ways and means of reducing erosion, and it may be that techniques will be developed for reducing the amount of erosion on the watershed. Geologic erosion may be impossible ever to stop. But the erosion due to man's use of the land, by means of reforestation and various methods that the Department of Agriculture has had under consideration for many years and is still working on may alleviate the problem of some of the erosion.

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Here we are in 1949 with a population increase running at around 2,000,000 a year, and it may go to 3,000,000 with reasonably full employment, if we do not have periods of deflation and periods of unemployment, because the population curve goes up fairly rapidly in periods of full employment, and assuming it is at the rate of 2,000,000, in 20 years there will be 40,000,000 additional people. Now what percentage of the present population, plus the future population for the next 20 years, say, will be going into California, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Arizona, and New Mexico and where will they get the water say in 20 to 40 years from now to meet the demands of the increased population, even assuming that the siltation, the accumulation of silt is at the minimum?

"We might just as well begin to think about the question, because somebody has got to put up several billions of dollars. And I can see anywhere from ten to twenty-five billion dollars of Government construction out in that area needed within the next 4, 5, or 6 years even when we have the present water-supply problem involved. That is a big problem, as big a problem as this country faces, outside of national defense. If you are going to supply water for the people in that area, with the increase in population——

"Mr. MATTHEW (interposing). It is certainly true, Mr. CRAWFORD, that we have got to plan very carefully for the future."

Mr. BARRETT'S comments on this particular proposition are expressed in statements appearing on page 863:

"Mr. BARRETT. I would like to have my colleagues get the import of the witness' testimony to the effect that the amount of siltation and erosion in the high mountain areas of the Colorado River is negligible, and is not man-made. The big problem of silt in the Colorado River Basin arises from the destruction after it leaves the high mountain area and comes down approaching the Colorado River itself.

"I agree that Mr. Matthew is correct on the matter; yet I believe also, as he has indicated, that when this river is fully developed and we have a number of storage dams in the upper basin and we have each of these tributaries properly dammed and used for irrigation purposes that the net result of the entire network of dams will be the correction of the situation that he complains about; and while the dams will not last forever, I am sure that if that did take place he would revise his estimate of complete loss of this Bridge Canyon Dam by siltation in a period of 40 or 50 years upward to a century or more, anyway."

The next witness appearing in opposition of the bill was M. J. Dowd, representing the Imperial irrigation district of California (pp. 868 to 937). Mr. Dowd made a statement describing the features of the Imperial irrigation district, the history of the development of that district and was questioned by Mr. A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, concerning the east and west mesa (pp. 874–875):

"Mr. MILLER. Do I understand that the people in the east and west mesas now have their land bonded for irrigation purposes?

"Mr. DOWD. The east and west mesas are not developed, but the area is all part of Imperial irrigation district, and the people of the presently developed area signed a contract by which they mortgaged their land to pay the entire cost of the project back.

"Mr. MILLER. But the people in the east and west mesa districts have not bonded their lands?

"Mr. DOWD. There is no one living on the lands in either mesa at this time.

"Mr. MILLER. Who owns that land?

"Mr. DOWD. The east mesa is practically all public land of the United States, which was withdrawn from entry many years ago.

"Mr. MILLER. What about the west mesa?

"Mr. DOWD. Something over half of that land is public land and the balance of it is private land."

He commented on Secretary Krug's letter of March 25, 1949 (p. 878), then proceeded to say there was no waste of water into the Salton Sea. This, of course, is contrary to a number of witnesses who appeared to support the bill (p. 879). He proceeded with a dissertation on the present water supply in Arizona and the cost of the proposed project. His observations were not well-founded—they were based on distorted statements and half-truths, as is evidenced by the fact that he injected into the project the Big Sandy Tunnel.

He attempted to set up a calculation on the power situation, charging the proposed project with the energy required to lift the water from Lake Havasu. In this connection, he entirely ignored the fact that a part of the cost of Bridge Canyon Dam and transmission lines will be charged as part of irrigation costs. That, in short, the proposal is that the irrigation project will help build the dam and thereby would acquire an interest therein. Approximately one-third of the power developed at this dam will be used in pumping the water into the aqueduct. He again pointed out that California does not object to Bridge Canyon Dam (pp. 889 and 890):

"Mr. DOWD. * * * As has been pointed out, no objections have been made to the Bridge Canyon Dam portion of the proposed project. It may also be assumed that the feasibility of a project to include the proposed local features for further conservation and utilization of the waters of the Gila River system, with the possible exception of the Hooker Dam and Reservoir, can be established."

This witness seemed particularly concerned with some questions Mr. White had directed to him concerning the operation of the Imperial irrigation district and the possible interest which that district and certain of its stockholders might have in acreage in Mexico that could be irrigated from the Alamo Canal. This subject invoked a sharp exchange of remarks between Mr. WELCH and Mr. Dowd, and later on Mr. Dowd and Mr. MURDOCK (pp. 892 to 894).

Mr. MURDOCK concluded the colloquy with this statement (p. 902):

"Mr. MURDOCK. Just one moment, please. Let me finish.

"No; Mr. Dowd has not convinced me that there are not possibilities of the Imperial irrigation district profiting by the use of water which belongs to other people and which might be used in the United States which, if used as he indicates, would be forever lost to the United States. I will dwell on that at a later time.

"Mr. Dowd points out that one of my own projects, the Yuma project, is benefiting from the power developed at Siphon Drop. I interrupted him to say I would like to see power developed at Siphon Drop, and I would like to see power developed at Pilot Knob, but in both cases with qualifications. It is going to take me too long now to adequately indicate what those qualifications are, but, naturally, I mean that power at those points must be produced by water which could not possibly be used elsewhere in the United States for irrigation, would not be used, and could not be used, and would otherwise be wasted. That is what I meant by part of the qualifications.

"Now, if I ever find anybody coming to Washington from Yuma County, Ariz., or anybody coming from Arizona fighting against any bill to put water on land in Wyoming, in Colorado, in New Mexico, or in Utah because they want that water to go on down the river and drop at Siphon Drop to produce power for that area, I will certainly let my objections be known to that. Production of power is entirely secondary to the use of water for life-giving purposes.

"I recognize the great importance of hydroelectric power, but I want to make that distinction and make it so clear that nobody can possibly misunderstand."

Mr. MURDOCK further questioned Mr. Dowd concerning the east and west mesa of the Imperial irrigation district. When questioned as to the land now in cultivation in the east mesa, Mr. Dowd said (pp. 906–907):

"Mr. MURDOCK. Has any of the land now included as you say on the east mesa been in cultivation other than as experimental plots?

"Mr. DOWD. There is just one other tract that is now being irrigated. That is a section of private land near the northerly end of the east mesa which was leveled and a sprinkler system provided during this past winter and is now being planted to crop. Outside of that one private piece and two demonstration farms, that is all the land at present being irrigated on the east mesa.

"Mr. MURDOCK. The rest of it is public land, then?

"Mr. DOWD. Practically all; yes. There is a little private land on the east mesa, but it won't run over 4 or 5 percent of the total area on the east mesa. The balance of it is public land, withdrawn many years ago. Under our contract with the Secretary of the Interior, it provides that within a reasonable time after water is available for and can be delivered to these mesa lands, the Secretary of the Interior will open them for entry in units of not to exceed 160 acres each, with veterans of the World Wars having a 90-day preference right of entry."

Of particular interest is the discussion between Mr. Dowd and Mr. WHITE concerning the use of water in Mexico through the Alamo Canal (pp. 927–928). Mr. Dowd's testimony was concluded at noon on Thursday, June 2.

On Friday morning, June 3, the committee resumed hearings with the testimony of William S. Peterson, assistant chief electrical engineer, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles, Calif., on pages 939 to 970, inclusive. Mr. Peterson's testimony was directed largely to criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation findings in their report. He also agreed that Bridge Canyon Dam should be built for power purposes, conceding that all the reservoirs built upstream would protect those below. He expressed great concern over the future domestic water supply of the city of Los Angeles but did not give any opinion as to any priority domestic water would have over irrigation uses.

Mr. MURDOCK, answering Mr. Peterson, said (p. 970):

"Mr. MURDOCK. I do not believe my bill jeopardizes your city's water supply at all when the true relationships are understood. Arizona does not ask for water belonging to Los Angeles. The fact that the quantity is the same may be made very confusing. But it is not the same water and there is ample water in the river for both."

The next witness for California was Clay C. Elder, hydrographic engineer, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. He attempted, by a strange course of reasoning, to show that there was ample water in central Arizona to take care of all the needs in that locality. His absurd contentions are fully answered by the statement of Mr. W. W. Lane, appearing on pages 1274 to 1281. In this statement, Mr. Lane pointed out (p. 1276)—

"The fact is that the water level is receding and upon an accelerated rate as shown in my preceding paper quoting records of the United States Geological Survey. The farmers are drilling deeper wells and lowering their pumps in many instances trying to keep pace with the drop. Some wells on the fringe of the valley in the shallow alluvial fill areas are now dry. The new wells that are being drilled on the presently irrigated lands are in many instances not increasing materially the total withdrawal but are to some extent reducing the production of surrounding wells. The deeper wells are proving that the deeper water-bearing strata are tighter and not as productive of water as the more recent and less compacted upper strata."

Mr. Lane clearly demonstrates that the complete report on the central Arizona project took into consideration all reasonable additional development of water in central Arizona and that with all of this potential development there would still be a serious shortage in central Arizona unless a supplemental supply is brought in from the Colorado River.

Other witnesses appearing in opposition to the bill were Mr. Gilbert F. Nelson, deputy attorney general of the State of California (pp. 1015 to 1050); Mr. Rex Hardy, assistant city attorney of the city of Los Angeles (pp. 1050 to 1064); Mr. Donald M. Keith, deputy general counsel, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (pp. 1064 to 1070); Mr. Northcutt Ely, special counsel, Colorado River Board of California (pp. 1071 to 1230); and Mr. James H. Howard, general counsel, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (pp. 1231 to 1248). All of these last-mentioned witnesses discussed the legal question involved in the controversy.

Arizona's answer to the legal presentations were made by Cleon T. Knapp (pp. 158 and 159 of part 1 of the hearings), and by the presentation of Charles A. Carson (pp. 519, 618, 657, and 662 of part 1 of the hearings). As pointed out in the summary of part 1 of the hearings, these legal proposals which involve an interpretation of the various documents constituting the so-called law of the river, particularly what is meant: (a) by the use of the phrase "beneficial consumptive use" in the Colorado River compact; (b) whether or not 3b water is apportioned water; and (c) the question of who must bear the burden of evaporation losses; all of these questions become moot if the amendment to Senate bill 75, as reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is adopted by the House Committee on Public Lands.

If this amendment is adopted, all the apprehension and fears that California has expressed must be dismissed. California agrees, as is shown by this summary, that Bridge Canyon Dam and the appurtenant power works and distribution system should be built and, also, that the additional features of the proposed project, other than the aqueduct from Lake Havasu to central Arizona, should be built. The amendment, of course, does not authorize the building of this aqueduct until the question of the legal right to use the water is determined. Therefore, California's opposition to the bill is fully met by this amendment. In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that, as pointed out by Mr. Carson in particular, there can be no determination of the rights of the respective States of Arizona and California as to use of Colorado River water until there can be alleged an injury or a present threat of injury, and no such allegation can be truthfully made until by some act there is an actual threat to use water that some State may maintain it has an exclusive right to use. The cold facts shown by the record of this hearing are that California is not now using the 4,400,000 acre-feet described in its limitation statute and therefore California cannot complain that Arizona is now using any water that California can legally claim. If the central Arizona project bill is authorized, then that authorization might conceivably constitute a threat on the part of Arizona to use water that California claims. All of this is answered by the amendment adopted by the Senate committee and, if California is sincere, it will have its day in court where it can assert its rights and they can be legally determined.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing interest arising in the proposals for a world federation, a problem which should be given a lot of thought and which I do not think will come in our time, but one that should not be entered into blindly, I wish to include in the RECORD the resolutions passed by the four major veterans' organizations, for example, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the American Veterans' Committee at their recent national conventions. I think the veterans' organizations of this country will have a powerful voice in the founding of a world federation.

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1949.

The Honorable OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLIN: I am enclosing another set of the veterans organization resolutions on foreign policy.

Would you be willing to put the excerpts from the American Legion resolution in the RECORD?

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE WALLER.

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.,
FOREIGN AFFAIRS RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1949.

Because of the great advances which the world federation movement has made in recent months, many organizations are taking positions on this subject.

I think you will be particularly interested in the resolutions passed at recent national conventions of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans of World War II, and American Veterans Committee, which I am enclosing.

Many organizations are strongly supporting House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the world federation resolutions. Statements from such organizations will be presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the hearings which the committee expects to hold sometime during October 1949.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE WALLER.

EXCERPTS FROM RESOLUTIONS ON FOREIGN POLICY BY AMERICAN LEGION, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION (AUGUST 29, 30, 31 AND SEPTEMBER 1, 1949), AMERICAN LEGION

We support the United Nations. We urge that its charter be so strengthened that it can effectively stop aggression. We again restate the legion plan to strengthen the United Nations by limitation of the use of the veto in matters of aggression, international control of scientific weapons, and the establishment of an effective international police force.

We urge the pact countries to help in the strengthening of the United Nations Charter so that eventually it will be the United Nations and not the North Atlantic countries that will police world aggressors.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS RESOLUTION NO. 27—OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas it has been proposed that the United States of America become a part of a world federal government; and

Whereas the individuals and organizations supporting this program are advocates of theory of world government which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty and would bring into being a form of government whose authority would supersede that of the United States Government; and

Whereas such a world government would institute a system of laws whereby American citizens could be tried by aliens in controversion of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars is composed solely of men who have worn the uniform of the United States on foreign shores and in hostile waters in time of war and from their personal experiences are familiar with the traditions and operations of other countries; and

Whereas many of our comrades rest forever in foreign soil and their sacrifices were made to retain the dignity and sovereignty of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to any program which would entail the surrender of any part of the sovereignty of the United States of America in favor of a world government; and be it further

Resolved, That our legislative representatives on both the State and national level be directed to use every effort to oppose any effort to place the United States of America in a position which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty in any form whatsoever.

RESOLUTIONS OF PEACE AND PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE, AMVETS NATIONAL CONVENTION, DES MOINES (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II), SEPTEMBER 4, 1949

Be it resolved, That the following long-range program be pursued:

1. It should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federal government open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment and enforcement of world law.

2. Revise the United Nations Charter, with or without Russia, to eliminate the veto in matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

3. Eliminate the present armament race and the threat of atomic war by the international control and inspection of heavy armaments through the use of a quota system, and treat any violating nation as an aggressor against member nations of the United Nations.

4. Strengthen the United Nations by creating therein an international court with jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression, and an international police force to carry out the court's decisions.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE PLATFORM, 1948–49

We reaffirm our conviction that peace in the world can be achieved only through the establishment of a genuine, federal world government, and we hope for the development of such a world government.

STATE BAR OF TEXAS,
Fort Worth, Tex., September 20, 1949.

Judge GORDON SIMPSON, Dallas, chairman; Judge W. ST. JOHN GARWOOD, Austin, vice chairman; Mr. MAJOR BELL, Beaumont; Mr. ELMORE BORCHERS, Laredo; Mr. M. G. COX, Cameron; Mr. J. CHRYS DOUGHERTY, Austin; Mr. W. H. FRANCIS, Jr., Houston; Mr. CLARENCE GUITTARD, Dallas; Mr. THORNTON HARDIE, El Paso; Mr. MANSON HARRIS, Dallas; Mr. GILLIS A. JOHNSON, Fort Worth; Mr. HART JOHNSON, Fort Stockton; Mr. FRANKLIN P. JONES, Marshall; Mr. LEE JONES, Jr., San Antonio; Mr. JOE A. KEITH, Sherman; Mr. SAM LIPSCOMB, Beaumont; Mr. LLOYD LOCHRIDGE, Mission; Mr. ROBERT C. MCGINNIS, Austin; Mr. MAURY MAVERICK, San Antonio; Mr. FRED MINOR, Denton; Mr. HENRY PENIX, Wichita Falls; Mr. Z. J. SPRUIELL, Tyler; Judge W. N. STOKES, Amarillo; Judge BENJAMIN M. TIREY, Waco; Mr. JOHN J. WATTS, Odessa; Mr. JOE A. WORSHAM, Dallas.

GENTLEMEN: Each of you has been appointed a member of the State Bar Committee on World Peace through the United Nations for the fiscal year ending July 1950 and your names will be published in the October journal. Your chairman's address is Republic Bank Building, Dallas. I hope that each of you will write him and each other and exchange views and suggestions. The chairman must submit his report before April 25, 1950, to the State bar secretary for the convention issue of the journal.

I suggest that each member read the report of this committee published in the June 1949 issue of the Texas Bar Journal. If your committee has any recommendations to make to the board of directors, they should be sent to me at 1109 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, so that I may present them to the board. Copies of your replies and suggestions should be sent to the State Bar secretary, 930 Littlefield Building, Austin.

Your service on this committee will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

ALLEN CROWLEY, *President.*

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The record includes all roll-call votes, all quorum calls and my votes on other important measures on which there was no record taken. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish a more complete description of any particular bill as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my position.

This continues a service I began in the Eightieth Congress. The purpose of these reports is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I do not believe my constituents should be deprived, through the sheer impossibility of getting the facts, of an easy-to-read, compact record of my stand on the issues. I believe it is my responsibility to furnish that record.

The report follows:

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (81st Cong., 1st sess.)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker	Martin.
3	Jan. 3	H. Res. 5, calling for adoption of an amendment to the rules of the House permitting chairmen of committees which have favorably reported legislation to move for the adoption of a resolution providing for the consideration of such legislation if the Committee on Rules has adversely reported or failed to report within 21 calendar days such a resolution for consideration. On adoption. (275-142.)	Nay.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22, postponing consideration of a legislative budget until May 1, 1949. On adoption. (230-142.)	Nay.
5	Feb. 7	H. R. 2361, authorizing President to reorganize executive departments in line with Hoover Commission report. On passage. (356-9.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78, providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. On adoption. (353-29.)	Yea.
	Feb. 9	H. R. 1211, reciprocal trade agreements, repealing Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 and extending until June 12, 1951, the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements:	
7	Feb. 9	On recommittal with instructions to provide that Tariff Commission shall make findings as to limit to which modification in duties may be made without causing serious injury to domestic industry. (Rejected, 151-241.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 9	On passage. (319-69.)	Nay.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 15	H. Res. 99, providing rule for consideration of H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which waived point of order against provision for rehiring certain persons discharged from Reclamation Service because of incompetence. On adoption. (242-121.)	Nay.
11	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
12	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
14	Feb. 16	On recommittal with instructions to increase to $14,000,000 the amount for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment-service administration. (Rejected, 148-237.)	Yea.
15	Feb. 16	On passage. (367-19)	Yea.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1661, providing for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports:	
17	Feb. 17	On recommittal with instructions to provide for a 1-year extension of the present controls with an amendment prohibiting control over commodities in surplus supply. (Rejected, 139-222.)	Yea.
18	Feb. 17	On passage. (259-139.)	Nay.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	Feb. 21	H. Res. 75, authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (331-4.)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 199, providing privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, and to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples:	
22	Mar. 1	On recommittal with instructions to report the bill forthwith, with amendment "except those in West Indies Archipelago." (Rejected, 39-336.)	Nay.
	Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663, granting Central Intelligence Agency the authority necessary for its proper administration. On passage. (348-4.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3347, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
27	Mar. 14	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 163-181.)	Nay.
28	Mar. 14	On passage. (Rejected, 166-176)	Yea.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1731, providing extension of Federal control over rents:	
30	Mar. 15	Amendment providing for decontrolling areas when requested by a resolution from the duly-elected local representatives of any State, county, or city. (Adopted, 227-188.)	Yea.
31	Mar. 15	Amendment deleting from the bill authority to recontrol hotels which have heretofore been decontrolled. (Adopted, 237-175.)	Yea.
32	Mar. 15	On recommittal with instructions to report bill back with a 90-day extension. (Rejected, 260-154.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 15	On passage. (260-153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148, providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States. (Adopted, 368-1.)	Not voting.[1]
	1949		
35	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Absent.
36	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 21	H. R. 1757, extending rent control in the District of Columbia. On passage. (247-117.)	Yea.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	Mar. 22	H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and Air Force of United States and other purposes. On passage. (395-4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World War I and II based on attained age (First Rankin pension bill):	
40	Mar. 22	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 187-223.)	Yea.
41	Mar. 22	On move to strike out enacting clause. (Rejected, 120-291.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
44	Mar. 24	H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on attained age:	
		On recommittal for further study. (Adopted, 208-207.)	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
47	Mar. 28	S. 135, authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District. (On passage, 223-130.)	Yea.
48	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950 and for other purposes:	
50	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment barring use of funds for acquiring additional land in connection with Garrison Dam in North Dakota (Rejected, 194-203.)	Yea.
51	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment providing that of the amount appropriated $500,000 shall be used for the Red Run-Clinton River, Mich., project. (Adopted, 256-138.)	Nay.
52	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment changing amount from $57,000,000 to $63,000,000. (Adopted, 277-177.)	Nay.
	Mar. 29	On passage of bill. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
53	Mar. 29	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 177-218.)	Nay.
54	Mar. 29	On passage. (216-180)	Yea.
		H. R. 1731, extending rent control:	
55	Mar. 29	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 263-143.)	Nay.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
58	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
59	Mar 31	H. Res. 168, providing for consideration of H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine. (Adopted 383-9.)	Nay.
60	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine:	
62	Apr. 1	On adoption of amendment inserting provisions of H. R. 3, permitting shipment of oleo across State lines and removing all taxes upon its sale. (Adopted, 242-137.)	Nay.
63	Apr. 1	On passage. (287-89)	Nay.
		H. R. 1823, establishing a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve:	
64	Apr. 4	On adoption of Marcantonio antisegregation amendment. (Adopted, 193-153.)	Nay.
65	Apr. 4	H. R. 3830, amending the China Aid Act of 1948 and authorizing reappropriation of $54,000,000 of funds already appropriated but not obligated and an interim advance up to $50,000,000 of such funds by the RFC pending action on the appropriation bill. (Passed, 279-70.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4016, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
66	Apr. 7	On adoption of H. Res. 180, making in order consideration of H. R. 4016 and waiving of points of order that might be raised. (Adopted, 246-137.)	Nay.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
67	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
68	Apr. 7	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 145-212.)	Yea.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4046, second deficiency appropriation, appropriating $671,047.84 to supply general deficiencies in various branches of Government departments:	
70	Apr. 8	On recommittal with instructions to provide funds for War Claims Commission and relief of American citizen internees and prisoners of war of the Japanese. (Rejected, 149-190.)	Yea.
	Apr. 8	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
73	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Absent, would have voted "Yea."

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (81st Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
74	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
75	Apr. 12	H. R. 3748, amending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and continuing the European recovery program until June 1950. (Passed, 354–49.)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
78	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2032, repealing the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and reenacting the National Labor Relations Act of 1935:	
79	Apr. 26	On adoption of H. Res. 191, providing for 8 hours of general debate and waiving points of order. (Adopted, 369–6.)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
82	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 3	On adoption of amendment substituting provisions of H. R. 4290 (Wood bill), as amended, for H. R. 2032. (Adopted, 217–203.)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 4	H. R. 2032. On recommittal. (Recommitted, 212–209.)	Nay.
87	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2989, creating Virgin Islands Corporation under Federal law to succeed the Virgin Islands Company. (Passed, 273–62.)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2203, providing for a decennial census of housing. (Passed, 223–51.)	Nay.
90	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4392, authorizing payment of not to exceed $16,000,000 for compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces:	
91	May 10	On adoption of amendment to prevent payment of interest on Swiss war-damage claims. (Rejected, 172–191.)	Nay.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
92	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 11	H. R. 2682, amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act by providing acquisition of storage facilities and providing exchange of surplus United States agricultural commodities for stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad. (Passed, 326–52.)	Yea.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
96	May 16	On adoption of conference report. (292–17)	Nay.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	May 17	H. Res. 190, providing for consideration of H. R. 195 to assist States in collecting sales and use tax on cigarettes. (Adopted, 322–24.)	Yea.
99	May 18	H. R. 1036, paying $8,437.98 to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps which were completely destroyed by fire. On passage notwithstanding President's veto. (Passed, 318–48.)	Yea.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
102	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
103	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4591, providing increased pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the uniformed services:	
104	May 24	On recommittal for further study. (227–163)	Yea.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for District of Columbia:	
105	May 26	On adoption of conference report. (184–152.)	Yea.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 1	H. R. 4617, providing pensions for veterans without regard to service-connected injuries or unemployability at attained age. (Second Rankin pension bill.) (Passed, 365–27.)	Nay.
	June 2	H. R. 4567, amending the Displaced Persons Act. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4963, providing for appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges:	
109	June 16	On recommittal with instructions to include language barring appointment of more than ⅔ of new appointments from same political party. (Defeated, 195–135.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
110	June 21	H. R. 4332, amending the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to permit national and State banks to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed, 293–55.)	Nay.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
114	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4009, Housing Act of 1949:	
	June 28	On amendment providing that low-rent housing projects must be approved by majority of qualified voters in a referendum conducted by local governing body. (Rejected, division vote.)	Yea.
	June 28	On amendment striking out authorization permitting housing authority to issue tax-exempt securities. (Rejected, division vote.)	Yea.
	1949		
	June 28	H. R. 4009—Continued On amendment prohibiting discrimination against any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin in the rental or occupancy of any housing constructed under the program. (Rejected, division vote.)	Yea.
116	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4009, the Housing Act of 1949:	
117	June 29	On amendment, deleting title II, providing for public housing. (Rejected, 204–209.)	Yea.
118	June 29	On amendment, barring payment of salary to any employees who fail to sign an affidavit stating they are not members of a subversive party and do not belong to an organization that may strike against the Government of the United States. (Adopted, 283–129.)	Yea.
119	June 29	On recommittal with instructions to report revised bill eliminating public housing:	
		Rejected. (170–241)	Yea.
120	June 29	On passage. (228–185)	Nay.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission appointed by Secretary of State and providing for settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments:	
122	July 6	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 151–177).	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
123	July 6	H. Res. 277, providing for consideration of S. 1008, legalizing basing-point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws. (Adopted, 305–22.)	Yea.
	July 7	S. 1008, legalizing basing-point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 937, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of four claims against the United States in behalf of foreign claimants:	
125	July 11	On amendment deleting from the bill 1 claim amounting to $3,024.38. (Adopted, 167–142.)	Not voting.[1]
126	July 13	H. R. 2960, amending the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones. (Passed, 282–109.)	Yea.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 21	Quorum call	Absent.
	July 21	H. R. 5345, the Agricultural Act of 1949:	
132		On amendment, extending for 1 year the present farm program. (Adopted, 239–170.)	Yea.
133	July 21	On passage. (383–25)	Yea.
134	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 102–243)	Nay.
135	July 25	On motion that Journal as read stand approved and motion moving the previous question. (Previous question ordered, 259–88.)	Yea.
136	July 25	On motion approving Journal of last day's proceedings. (Adopted, 285–54.)	Yea.
137	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 113–243)	Nay.
138	July 25	On ordering previous question, making in order rule for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 262–100.)	Yea.
139	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 110–252)	Nay.
140	July 25	H. Res. 276, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 265–100.)	Yea.
141	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3199, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers:	
143	July 26	On recommittal. (Rejected, 123–267)	Yea.
144	July 26	On passage. (273–116)	Nay.
		S. 1184, encouraging private construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to military installations:	
145	July 27	On recommital of conference report. (Rejected, 52–289).	Nay.
		On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, voice vote).	Yea.
146	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3282, repealing Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin:	
148	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (Defeated, 131–168).	Nay.
		H. R. 5602, authorizing an allocation of $4,000,000 of China's ECA funds for relief of Chinese students:	
149	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (254–46)	Nay.
		H. R. 5598, increasing compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, providing minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increasing certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizing requirement for dependency allowances, and redefining the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct":	
150	Aug. 2	On suspension of rules and passage. (354–0)	Yea.
151	Aug. 2	H. R. 5632, military reorganization and unification bill. On adoption of conference report. (356–7.)	Yea.
152	Aug. 2	H. Res. 289, providing for consideration of H. R. 29 amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide parity for tung nuts and honey. (Adopted, 335–21.)	Yea.
153	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Absent, would have voted "Yea."

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (81st Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
155	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
157	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
158	Aug. 4	H. Res. 310, providing for consideration of, and 3 hours of debate on, H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938. (Adopted, 233-113.)	Yea.
159	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
160	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
162	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1758, clarifying the Natural Gas Act to exempt independent producers and gatherers from regulation by Federal Power Commission:	
163	Aug. 5	On recommittal. (Rejected, 124-187)	Nay.
164	Aug. 5	On passage. (183-131)	Yea.
165	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 183, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3910, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by expanding its coverage and increasing the minimum wage:	
166	Aug. 8	On adoption of committee amendment making rule applicable to H. R. 5856, a modified version of H. R. 3910, and ruling out consideration of H. R. 3910. (Adopted, 249-124.)	Nay.
167	Aug. 8	On adoption of H. Res. 183, as amended. (351-17)	Yea.
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, making appropriation for foreign aid for fiscal year 1950:	
170	Aug. 9	On motion to instruct the conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment providing for continuation of watchdog committee. (Passed, 210-164.)	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5856, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act:	
	Aug. 10	On adopting amendment to raise minimum wage provided in bill from 65 to 75 cents per hour. (Adopted, division vote.)	Nay.
172	Aug. 10	On adoption of amendment, substituting the provisions of H. R. 5894, as amended, for the text of H. R. 5856. (Adopted, 225-181.)	Yea.
173	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 11	H. R. 5856, providing for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Passed, 361-35.)	Nay.
175	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
176	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5526, authorizing the President to provide for the performance of certain executive functions by other officers of the Government:	
178	Aug. 12	On amendment limiting authority to administrative duties. (Rejected, 114-162.)	Yea.
	Aug. 12	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. J. Res. 339, extending indefinitely the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills:	
180	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and adoption. (176-145.) (⅔ majority vote required.)	Nay.
		H. R. 2734, amending the Clayton Act, relative to acquisition by one commercial corporation of the assets of another corporation:	
181	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and passage. (223-92)	Nay.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
185	Aug. 17	H. J. Res. 339, extending until Sept. 15 the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills. (Adopted, 213-114.)	Yea.
186	Aug. 17	H. Res. 327, providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations. (Adopted, 275-47.)	Nay.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, promoting the foreign policy and providing for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations:	
188	Aug. 18	On adoption of amendment to reduce the amount provided for rearming the North Atlantic countries from $1,160,990,000 to $580,495,000. (209-151.)	Yea.
189	Aug. 18	On passage. (238-122)	Nay.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6008, making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
192	Aug. 19	On amendment deleting $3,000,000 for expenses of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. Adopted. (150-129.)	Yea.
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6070 to amend the National Housing Act:	
	Aug. 24	On amendment to provide direct loans for home purchase and construction. (Adopted, division vote.)	Nay.
	Aug. 24	On amendment prohibiting discrimination by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin. (Defeated, division vote.)	Yea.
197	Aug. 24	Motion to adjourn. (Adopted, 186-132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6070, to amend the National Housing Act:	
	Aug. 25	On motion to substitute new bill eliminating provision for direct loan and prohibition against discrimination:	
		On adoption of amendment to insert provision prohibiting discrimination. (Rejected, division vote.)	Yea.
		On adoption of amendment to provide for direct loans. (Rejected, division vote.)	Nay.
		On adoption of motion to substitute new bill. (Adopted, division vote.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
199	Aug. 25	H. Res. 342, providing that motions to suspend the rules may be in order on Aug. 25, 1949. (Adopted, 270-1.)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
202	Sept. 27	H. R. 4495, providing additional benefits for certain postal-service employees with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion. (Passed, 332-2.)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, providing military assistance to foreign nations:	
204	Sept. 28	On recommittal of conference report. (Rejected, 113-213.)	Yea.
205	Sept. 28	On adoption of conference report. (224-109)	Nay.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, foreign-aid appropriations for 1950:	
207	Sept. 29	On amendment providing that the Administrator of ECA be authorized to issue $150,000,000 of notes for purchase by Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of providing loans. (Passed, 177-124.)	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5903, amending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, to extend its duration and to provide double amount Federal financial aid for assistance in the construction of hospitals:	
209	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (236-43)	Nay.
		H. R. 5739, providing for advance planning of public works by providing for Federal loans to States to aid in surveys and plans for State and municipal public works:	
210	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (210-69)	Nay.
211	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, the Army civil-functions appropriation bill:	
212	Oct. 3	On motion to instruct conferees to insist on disagreement to an allocation of any funds for flood control for Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River. (Rejected, 101-153.)	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, the Social Security Act, under closed rule prohibiting amendments:	
214	Oct. 4	On adoption of motion ordering previous question on resolution. (175-154.)	Nay.
215	Oct. 4	On adoption of resolution. (189-135)	Nay.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act:	
217	Oct. 5	On recommittal with instructions to report provisions of bill H. R. 6297. (Rejected, 112-232.)	Yea.
218	Oct. 5	On passage. (333-14)	Nay.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for 1950:	
219	Oct. 6	On adoption of conference report. (269-18)	Nay.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
221	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
222	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendments providing for 48 air groups instead of 58 air groups as passed by the House. (Adopted, 305-1.)	Yea.
223	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
224	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendment rescinding $275,000,000 previously approved by Congress for stock-piling strategic materials and banning long-range contracts for the purchase of critical or strategic materials abroad. (Adopted, 305-0.)	Yea.
225	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, Eighth District, Wisconsin (81st Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
		H. R. 6008, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1950:	
227	Oct. 11	On recommittal of conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to amendment relative to $3,000,000 for National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. (Rejected, 158-165.)	Yea.
		H. R. 1370, authorizing the appointment of 3 additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribing the qualifications of appointees:	
228	Oct. 13	On recommittal. (Rejected, 30-286)	Yea.
		H. Res. 390, for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, to extend certain provisions of the National Housing Act under a rule prohibiting amendments:	
229	Oct. 13	On adoption. (290-34)	Nay.
	1949		
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1008, legalizing basing-point system when not in conflict with antitrust laws:	
231	Oct. 14	On recommittal to conference. (Rejected, 138-178)	Nay.
232	Oct. 14	On adoption of conference report. (200-104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2105, authorizing an appropriation of $240,000,000 to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
234	Oct. 17	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Rejected, 176-118.) (⅔ majority required.)	Nay.
235	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.

Action Too Late Is a Tragic Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country do not want Congress to be a mere rubber stamp for the executive department. They do not want the executive department to exercise dictatorial powers.

Nor do the people of this country want the courts to usurp legislative functions. They expect the Congress to discharge its responsibility.

In great measure the freedom and liberty of the individual in this country depends upon the maintenance of three separate and independent departments of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. Each of these departments must remain strong and vigorous, but neither should invade the field of the other two.

If any such attempt is made, it should be promptly and effectively resisted.

The DeKalb New Era, of Decatur, Ga., in a recent issue carries a strong, logical, and convincing editorial dealing with this subject. I believe that this editorial should have wide circulation and attention, and pursuant to leave granted, I insert it herewith:

ACTION TOO LATE IS A TRAGIC THING

We have frequently commented in these columns on the well-known fact that the original concept of this Government of the United States was comprised of three integral parts—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The original intent was that the people through their chosen representatives should form the legislative branch and that this branch was to make the laws the people wished. The executive arm of the Government was to execute these laws and the judicial branch was to enforce them and decide controversies as to their constitutionality. Each branch was to be separate and were to be checks on each other, the final authority as to making and repealing valid laws to be in the hands of the legislative branch that was directly answerable to the people. Such was the intent of the founders of this Nation and such was the method of operating it for years.

But what now is the situation? Who does the average man unconsciously think of when one says that the Government does anything? Is it not true that he thinks of the President? We have delegated so much power to that office that such a popular opinion as to who the Government is, is quite natural.

And why is this alarming fact true? Is it not because the President now sends to Congress his so-called recommendations as to what legislation should be passed and then exerts whatever pressure his high office can muster to see that his recommendations are carried out? He even designates some of his recommendations as "must" legislation. Thus it has come about that it is common practice for some confident of the President to write the laws that Congress enacts. In many respects Congress has simply become a rubber stamp to make legal what he wishes to do. In other words the legislative branch of our Government has taken over the function of making the laws of our land. If such practices continue there will become very little if any need for a Congress at all.

And what about the judicial branch? This is just as great a tragedy as the relegation to the discard of the legislation. We all remember well in the middle thirties when the executive branch determined and publicly announced that he wanted to change the Supreme Court in various ways. This suggestion was immediately opposed by many and the method suggested was frowned upon so universally that other methods had to be adopted. That it was ultimately changed as desired by the legislature cannot be denied and is now an open secret.

For nearly the last two decades the executive branch has been given extraordinary powers. The familiar terminology applied to these powers is "emergency power." We, during this period have had economic, social, and actual emergencies. On each instance we have delegated to the executive vast powers that have resulted in a situation that has vested in the executive gigantic factual control of the Government and unhappily and tragically control of the lives of the citizens in all too many instances.

Even the actual emergencies created by the late war and for that reason necessary, are still existant. Officially the war is not yet over and the executive still holds many of the war powers given it in a time of perilous emergency.

These things ought not be. If they are continued the whole fabric of our Government will be destroyed and the people will be stripped of their inherent rights under our Constitution. Already that instrument has been changed in effect though not in language, to such an extent that its principles are hardly recognizable.

The head of the executive branch of our Government is, under our Constitution, the commander in chief of all our armies and navies. Vested in it by virtue of this fact is the greatest police power on earth. It is a terrifying realization that we are vesting in that same branch, contrary to our Constitution, such vast power over the life of our entire Government and the lives of our citizens.

It is high time the people looked into these matters. If it is not done soon the high of destruction will have struck and the American people will suddenly awaken to the awful fact that it is too late.

Statement of Hon. John Taber, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The Truman administration has made no effort to halt inflation. On the contrary, every effort has been made to encourage inflation. It is no secret that Government officials are considering further devaluation of the American dollar. A 40-cent dollar would devalue every savings account, insurance policy, and Government bond but it would also give Mr. Truman an opportunity to pay off some of his political obligations by supporting wage increases which would increase the Government's tax take from the workingman and the farmer. The average citizen does not understand such high-handed money manipulations, and if the truth were known, there are few men in Congress today who fully comprehend such financial shenanigans. Furthermore, there are few men in public life today who are able to withstand the vicious pressure of organized groups who want something for nothing out of the Government.

It is beginning to dawn on the American family that there is something fishy with Washington's welfare and prosperity propaganda. Millions of wage earners have had one to several increases in wages over the past few years and today they are no better and in some cases, worse off, than they were before. Anyone concerned with the average family's food and clothing bills should keep in mind the billions of dollars the Roosevelt-Truman administrations have spent in subsidies to boost prices and then consider the cost of such staples as milk, butter, eggs, meat, etc.

Here are some figures which the public forgets too easily. They are taken out of

newspaper advertisements and do not reflect the special interests of the administration or any business group.

Commodity	1935-39 average price	Present price	Increase
			Percent
Milk.....per quart..	$0.09	$0.19-$0.20	110
Butter.....per pound..	.32	.73	128
Eggs.....per dozen..	.30	.65	116
Bacon.....per pound..	.32	.59	84
Ham.....do....	.24	.53	120
Coffee.....do....	.22	.53	140
Sirloin steak.....do....	.35	.79	125
Porterhouse steak..do....	.37	.89	140
Frankfurters.....do....	.26	.49	88
New potatoes.....do....	.015	.03	100
Ground beef.....do....	.15	.39	160
Men's white shirts.each..	1.25	2.70	116
Men's summer suits each..	17.00	34.00	100
Gasoline.....per gallon..	.14	.28	100
Cash wheat in Chicago per bushel..	.85	2.03	138
Cash corn in Chicago per bushel..	.73	1.32	80
Cash oats in Chicago per bushel..	.35	.70	100

The farmer does not get these increased prices because most of them represent a pryramid of hidden Federal taxes.

An obvious interpretation of these figures is that 10 years ago 45 cents bought as much and more than $1 does now. If a man who earned $1,500 annually before the war now earns $3,000 he is at least 10 percent worse off on account of price increases and an additional 10 percent worse off on account of the tax increase. Thus as a result of Mr. Truman's planned inflation, the low-income family is 20 percent worse off than it was before. That is part and parcel of the Truman welfare state.

Statement of Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York, on the Bill H. R. 5325

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me regarding H. R. 5325 to amend the veterans' pension laws on behalf of widows and children of deceased veterans of the First World War:

In 1939, an amendment to the act approved June 28, 1934, placed ceilings on benefits to be paid to widows and children of deceased veterans of the First World War, when those veterans prior to their death had a disability incurred in or aggravated by their war service for which compensation would be payable.

Under this amendment no compensation, pension, or retirement pay is allowed to a widow without child, or to a child, whose annual income exceeds $1,000, and no payment is allowed to a widow with a child, or with children, whose annual income exceeds $2,500.

These limitations have become unrealistic at the present time, and the intent of Congress in 1939 has been practically defeated by the advance in the cost of living in the 10 years which have elapsed. As against the average of August 15, 1939, the following changes have taken place, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (the figure 100 represents the cost-of-living index for 1935-39):

	Aug. 15, 1939	Mar. 15, 1949
All homes	98.5	169.5
Food	93.5	201.6
Apparel	100.3	193.9
Rent	104.3	120.1
Fuel, electricity, etc	97.5	138.9
House furnishings	100.6	193.8
Miscellaneous	100.4	154.4

It is clear that all items of expense for these widows and children have gone up. The most urgent necessities, which all families must have, with the exception of rent, have gone up most. The provision which Congress formerly made has now become obsolete and inadequate by the turn of events.

This bill aims to rectify the situation, which can be done at some increase of cost to the Government. The number of deceased veterans of World War I whose dependents were receiving compensation for service-connected disability, on June 30, 1948, was 74,400. The corresponding figure for World War II is 236,514. It may be presumed that under the proposed change these numbers would be somewhat enlarged.

There is no class of dependents for whom the Government has more responsibility than for the aging widows and children of those who served their country in time of need, and who suffered because of their service. As Lincoln said in his Second Inaugural Address, we have an obligation to the widows and orphans of those who have borne the battle.

A Cruel and Brutal World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we live in a world without a rudder—in a war-mad world—in an atom-bomb world. In a world where half is arming itself against the other half. In a cold war that may at any time end in a hot war. There is chaos and fear in every nation of the world. There are rumors of war, rumors of communistic imperialism, and rumors of financial imperialism. Let us pause for a moment and find out what brought about this dangerous and deplorable situation—this condition of confusion, revenge, hatred, and fear.

Were we culpable? Did we help to bring about this frightful condition? Our answer is that we played a major part. We were nosed into World Wars I and II by unconscionable men whose greed for power knew no bounds. We were manipulated into both wars by a small clique of profiteers and patrioteers who wanted our sons to save imperialistic and decaying nations in which they had investments.

We, as a nation, are largely responsible for the present conditions because our Presidents at Quebec, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam accepted the revengeful and hateful doctrine of intellectual pygmies. We were responsible when we demanded unconditional surrender of our vanquished foes in place of a negotiated peace of complete disarmament and justice to all nations. We were responsible when we continued giving aid and assistance and participated in the unlawful execution and enslavement of war prisoners.

We were responsible when we halted General Patton and his army for weeks so that Russia could invade Germany, and not only take Berlin but march some hundred miles beyond. The world is now paying for that mistake. General Patton blamed General Eisenhower for this blunder. General Eisenhower, however, was simply carrying out the policies laid down by his superiors in Washington.

We now know that Germany attempted to surrender to us but we refused their offer. We insisted that they surrender to the Allied nations. If we had only had a Lincoln for President, the world would not be in the mess it is in today. Russia would have been kept in her own boundary and peace would long ago have been established and the threat of Russian domination of Europe would have been impossible.

Again we were responsible when we unnecessarily prolonged the war with Japan after she had offered to surrender. We were responsible when we invited Stalin to enter Mongolia and Korea, and gave him the Kuril Islands in accordance with secret commitments made at Yalta. It is because of these blunders that communism has spread throughout Europe. If we had dealt with Russia as we should have, she would still be within her own boundaries and the squandering of billions would not have occurred and the threat of atomic war would not now endanger the world.

If, at Yalta, our President had accepted the advice of Churchill rather than that of Stalin, and we had entered Europe under its soft belly, then Russia would have been prevented from taking over the Balkan States. If we had not halted our army for weeks so that Russia could take over Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and resubjugate Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and then take Berlin as well as east Germany and east Austria, the world would be happier today. If General Patton had not been ordered to withdraw from Czechoslovakia in order to please Stalin, the Communists would not have been successful.

How different this world would be if we only had had an Abraham Lincoln for President, who at the end of the Civil War voiced these noble sentiments "with malice toward none and charity for all." Unfortunately in place of that we had unconditional surrender, vengeance and hatred, faked courts and prosecutors executing generals, and others who were no more to blame for World War II than many of the rulers of the so-called 52 peace-loving nations.

Now we are confronted with the reality of how to get out of this mess. Let us go back to the sentiment expressed by Abraham Lincoln, when he said "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Let us understand clearly that there can be no peace as long as half of the world

is arming against the other half. It makes no difference whether it is communistic imperialism or capitalistic imperialism. An armament race always has and always will, unless discontinued, end in war.

There can be no permanent peace in this world as long as there is dictatorship, enslavement, and liquidation—murder. There can be no peace as long as there are aggressor nations, whether they consist of dictatorial imperialistic Russia and her satellites or capitalistic imperialistic nations consisting of some of the 52 peace-loving nations.

"Of all sad words of tongue or pen the saddest are" the false slogans by which America and the world were betrayed. There was the slogan "he kept us out of war," when the facts show that Britain was told that if she could hang on until after election, the Yanks would come. Then followed the slogans "make the world safe for democracy," and "war to end all wars." The Yanks did come—many did not return. They won the war that others started. The world was made safe for dictatorship—not for democracy.

The egg for World War II was laid at Versailles. This was followed by international intrigue, secret and undercover diplomacy—the betrayal of smaller nations and by World War II. Then came the slogans, "I said and I say again and again your sons will not be sent to fight on foreign battlefields," "the Atlantic Charter," and the "four freedoms." Time proved these slogans false.

Then came manipulated Pearl Harbor and we got into World War II according to prearranged schedule via Japan. The Yanks were sent to the four corners of the world—many did not return. They again won the war that other nations started. We again lost the peace—this because of the blunders of our Presidents.

Again the egg for world war III was laid at Quebec, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Now we have another false slogan "the world is small." Yes, made small because of our inventive genius. Made small because we have the telephone, the radio, television, airplanes, including jets and bombers. Because of this, our internationalists—for a profit—tell us that we must take part in every international or civil conflict throughout the world. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We are being maneuvered into world war III just as we were into World War II because of false slogans. Let us hope that we will still be able to avoid this catastrophe—that the egg will not hatch—that calmer judgment and American sanity may again prevail. That we may learn that even though the world be small we can still mind our own business. Let us again accept our forefathers' warning and avoid foreign entanglements.

The Nation has just celebrated the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of constitutional government. For 147 years we got along splendidly under our Constitution. During that time we became the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth. We achieved a higher standard of living than any other nation. For 147 years we defended and revered our Constitution and form of government—a republic.

Unfortunately for the last 17 years a subversive element has sprung up in our midst. This element consists of Communists and one-worlders, who would substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes. It also consists of a multimillionaire gang, who want our sons to protect and defend their ill-gotten goods throughout the world. These would adopt a conglomeration of flags for the Stars and Stripes.

These tell us that because of the radio and airplane the world has gotten so small that there is no longer any room for our Republic. These betrayers of our Nation and our Nation's honor are again sponsoring candidates for President, who brazenly say that we must surrender a part, if not all, of our sovereignty to other nations. They would substitute an international dictatorship for our Constitution.

While we were celebrating the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, dictatorship was on the march throughout the world. In spite of the lip service given us by the former President about four freedoms and self-determination, constitutional government is on the decline.

If we are to protect and defend our Constitution—continue as a republic—then it is up to us to insist that all live up to its mandates. We know that the Constitution has been flaunted and ignored by all three branches of our Government, the executive, the judiciary, and the legislative. It has been ignored and trampled upon by the people themselves on election day when they elected the same man President four times.

The world may have become small because of scientific discoveries and our inventive genius. Our neighbors are much closer to us now than a generation ago, but individually we still have sufficient sense to keep out of their family quarrels. The same doctrine should and can be applied among nations. It is not necessary to immerse the whole world in war just because two nations may disagree.

The time has come that we realize that we, a little over 6 percent of the world's population occupying less than 7 percent of its area and possessing now less than 8½ percent of its natural wealth, cannot play Santa Claus to the rest of the world without depleting our natural resources. We cannot look after all the beggars of the world. We cannot much longer act as an international WPA.

We have a grave decision to make, a decision whether we are going to continue the America we know, or substitute an America we know little about, the America of the internationalists for a profit, and their stooges the one-worlders.

What is treason? In its broader sense it consists of a desire to overthrow the Government. This by force or other unconstitutional means.

The Communists want our Government overthrown and the Russian dictatorship of liquidation and enslavement adopted. The innocent victims of so-called Russian communism are not aware that the Russian form of government is not communistic. It is the exact opposite—dictatorship, liquidation, and enslavement. These victims do not know that in Russia some 75 percent live in constant fear and poverty—that 75 percent are in rags and live on a mere subsistence.

On the other hand, our internationalists—for a profit, also have innocent victims—one-worlders. Some of these are State and National legislators who in their innocence would surrender our sovereignty, unwittingly betray our Government and substitute a world government.

The objective of both the Communists and the internationalists is the same—the destruction of our Government. We feel sorry for those who blindly follow either of the above groups. They have been deceived by false propaganda. May God forgive them. They know not what they are doing.

In the past we have had one world government. Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, Caesar, and Napoleon all were one-worlders. Their governments all crumbled because of arrogance, dictatorship, and corruption. Idealistically we too may dream of a perfect world government. Realistically we know it is but a dream.

We have hard enough time to keep Washington in the straight and narrow path. How much harder would it be if we had to go to Moscow or London where all the other nations would gang up on us? We have already gone too far with the insane policy of the internationalists and the one-worlders. The time has come that we throw up the blinds and let in the white light of publicity on these internationalists. They are more dangerous than the Communists.

The question is shall we deplete our natural resources? I submit we have no moral, legal, or constitutional right to do so. These resources belong to unborn millions as much as they belong to us. It is the property of future as well as living Americans.

The course we are now following is a betrayal which leads to inevitable depletion and destruction. Lincoln was right when he said that this Nation would never be destroyed unless we ourselves were its destroyers. We are now asked to accept without question the false propaganda of the internationalists that infest the various departments of our Government.

Take the profits out of the Marshall plan, out of the foreign aid, and the rearmament program, and there would be no Marshall plan, or rearmament program, and foreign aid would long ago have ceased.

These profiteers are interested in advancing their financial gains by selling products to foreign nations that rightfully belong to Americans. They are interested in having these nations pay for these goods with our American dollars—gifts. This at the taxpayers' expense. They would deplete this Nation of all its raw materials to further enrich themselves.

The responsibility for this disastrous costly foreign policy rests with you more than with the Members of Congress. You elect every Congressman and one-third of the Senators every 2 years. It is easy for you to ascertain whether your Congressman and Senator prefers the foreign beggars to the American people. It is up to you to see that there is a candidate in each party who believes that Americans come first—who prefers Americans to foreign beggar nations.

Here is the price we pay because of our stupid foreign policy. Our annual Federal expenditures are over fifty billion. This alone, on an average, is equal to $1 a day for every member of your family, including the baby in the cradle.

Your Uncle Sam has become the greatest extortionist. In orde. to pay for these foreign flirtations, the Government is compelled to take 57 cents on an average, directly or indirectly, out of every dollar you earn on which you pay an income tax.

In addition we already owe six hundred and sixty-three billion, including future commitments and obligations. This is about twice the normal value of all our property. Every baby, the moment it is born, has a tax lien against it for $4,756. That is the share of the Federal debt for every man, woman, and child. It is a tax lien on all your property and on all your earnings, and the future earnings of your baby. It will be collected from you in income tax and 100 other unseen taxes.

The total Federal, State, and local expenditure per capita is $410.76 per year, or for a family of four, $1,64ɔ.20.

This situation threatens the very foundation of our Government. I am confident, however, when the people fully understand the cost of our foreign flirtations, they will with a determination equivalent to a devotion put a stop to it. They will again accept our forefathers' warning and avoid further foreign entanglements.

"The Greatest Security to the American, or for That Matter to Any Other People in the World, Is the Knowledge and Understanding of the Words of God Transmitted Through the Scriptures and the Strict Adherence by All to the Teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the Fellowship Class of the Chickasaw Methodist Church.

It is a short, simple, factual request. I would have you believe that so long as American citizens give their time and thought to questions such as that under study by this group, and by enlightenment yield up personal opinion and prejudice to truth and principle, there will be no force on earth that can destroy the American system of Government and our American way of life.

It is my ardent wish that similar meetings could at this critical hour of life be projected into every similar study group in these United States.

What follows is a copy of the letter I received from my constituent friends and my answer to them:

CHICKASAW, ALA., *October 12, 1949.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On Sunday, October 23, 1949, at the Chickasaw Methodist Church in Chickasaw, Ala., a large group of men will discuss what constitutes our Nation's primary security.

If it is possible, I would like to read to the group your statement on this vital question.

I can promise you that any information you can give us will be treated with the utmost seriousness and respect, and that it will not be used to further any political objective.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) C. A. GENTRY, Jr.,
Teacher, the Fellowship Class,
Chickasaw Methodist Church.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1949.

Mr. C. A. GENTRY, Jr.,
Teacher, the Fellowship Class,
Chickasaw Methodist Church,
Chickasaw, Ala.

DEAR MR. GENTRY: You indeed paid me a signal honor in asking that I outline to your fellowship class just what, in my opinion, constitutes the primary security of this Nation.

Over and above all other things in life, the greatest security to the American people or to any people in the world is the understanding of the word of God recorded and transmitted in the Scriptures and the strict adherence to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ by all people on the earth.

In so far as material values are concerned, all of life's experiences, all that the years which have passed have taught, coupled with my experience in the Nation's Congress here in Washington, D. C., I state without fear of successful contradiction from any source whatever that American manhood and womanhood constitute the prime and basic security of this Nation.

A little story is told about Benjamin Franklin at the time our founding fathers were writing the Constitution of these United States. Mr. Franklin was leaving Independence Hall one evening when someone called after him, asking, "Franklin, what are you and the other gentlemen in there trying to give us?" "We are trying to give you a republican form of government," he replied, "do you think that you can keep it?"

Now, my friends of the Chickasaw fellowship class, when today I say a republican form of government, I do not mean to infer anything connected with the Republican Party of these United States.

By a republican form of government is meant an institution of government set up by the people and under which no law will be legal or recognized as such unless it is written, enacted, and approved by those citizens to whom the electorate have delegated the power to make, enact, and enforce the law.

I mean the form of government in which men are free, free to make contract, free to cultivate their soils and harvest, process and market their crops in such amounts and at such time and place as in their judgment seems meet, fitting, and proper, and to do all of these without interference of any kind from government, so long as they as individuals do not transgress the right of another to do the same.

The republican form of government of which Franklin spoke was a type of government which recognizes the inalienable and sacred rights of minority groups. It is not a government wherein a small organization or group can say to any man, "inasmuch as we today are not going to work, therefore, you must not go to work, we today are going on strike, therefore you must go on strike, we do not work unless we receive so much wage, and despite all of your vast experience, training, skill, you may not henceforth receive more wages than do we."

I could go on indefinitely and tell of the seemingly endless encroachments now being made on the type of government which Benjamin Franklin told that historic crowd in Philadelphia—that he and his fellow workers, delegates to the Constitutional Convention, were attempting to do in formulating a new, just, equitable, and enduring government for these United States.

It is unnecessary for me to point out that the Preamble to the Constitution opens with this significant statement: "We, the people, in order to form a more perfect union," etc.

Therefore it becomes apparent that the people themselves wrote the Constitution.

In doing so they set up three arms of government, the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary. The people outlined in the Constitution the duties of each one of the separate branches, but, most important, they established what is now called the Bill of Rights.

When the people established the Congress as the legislative body of the great Union of States, they did not give the Congress unbridled power. They made it clear to all that there were certain inalienable and inherent rights belonging to man which no government in the world could in any sense contravene or take away.

Among these were the right of contract, the right to freedom of worship, the right to freedom of speech, the right to freedom of assembly, the right to petition the Government for the redress of wrong, the right to bear arms, the right to trial by jury, etc.

But that was not all, the Constitution of these United States spelled out in ink on paper certain injunctions telling the Congress not alone the things about which they could make law, but specifically enumerated the things about which they could not make law. For instance, the Constitution provides that the Congress may make no law with respect to the right of worship or to abridge the freedom of speech, etc.

Again I point out that that was not all. The Constitution, as it was drafted and ratified, specifically provides that if the Constitution does not expressly delegate to the Congress of the United States the authority to do certain things, then that authority continues to be reposed in the legislative body of the sovereign States themselves.

My friends of the Chickasaw Methodist fellowship class, I would have you believe with me that no greater doctrine, other than the Holy Bible was ever stricken off by the hand of man than is the simple but profound writing which the world has come to know as the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, I now say that the strict adherence of the people to the Constitution can easily constitute and be recognized as the primary security of the United States today.

On the economic front, I would say that the ability of the American farmer to produce fats, food, fiber, and forest products necessary to furnish the bread, meat, raiment, and shelter is altogether primary and

basic to our Nation's security. Should ever those who till our soil forsake their labors, America and all human kind would perish almost overnight.

May I take this opportunity of pointing out that in the last analysis there is no wealth in all the world with which to prime the pump of industry except the wealth that is annually gleaned from out of the sea and out of the soil.

That wealth is basic to all economics, for there are but two types of goods in the whole world: those things which are indispensable to life and those which are dispensable.

Farmers create indispensables. They produce the wheat, the food, and fiber without which all life would pass from off this planet. Therefore I say now that it is the agronomist and the agriculturists who constitute the basic part of the Nation's primary security and that is particularly true at least in so far as life's necessities are concerned.

On the foreign front it becomes more apparent with each passing day that the will and the ability of the American people to impose their God-given sense of righteousness and justice on the world is that thing above all others that makes for world peace and security.

From a standpoint of national security I don't think that any contemplative mind will gainsay the fact that American air power is American peace power.

I do not mean to infer that armies and navies are no longer necessary in order to achieve victory in war, but my own good and eminent friend, the Honorable Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, and a greater Navy advocate never lived, recognized that fact when he spoke these words—

"For good or ill, air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man."

Now, my friends, when I say air power I do not mean the United States Department of the Air Force, that newly created department of government of which the American people, not alone from Maine to California and from Canada to the Gulf but all in the Western Hemisphere, are justly proud. I mean all air forces, including what is known as the United States naval air arm, the marine air arm, and the air forces of the several State militia, the Air Force Reserves, as well as civil aviation in these United States.

Moreover, as Secretary of Defense Johnson once said, "American air power is all-inclusive of those who work in the mines, mills, and factories of the land producing the materials which when molded and shaped in ponderous presses and on the aviation production lines, are fabricated into massive craft which fly the air with speeds in excess of that of sound itself."

Of all the marvels I have ever beheld was a United States B–36 continental, long-range bomber, a machine so large that it covered virtually an acre of land, weighing in excess of 300,000 pounds loaded, or more than the weight of the Diesel locomotive that pulls the transcontinental passenger trains, a machine made of iron, steel, aluminum, magnesium, lead, copper, glass, rubber, wood, wool, oils, and fats, a machine that can rise up off the earth, fly outward with a pay load of bombs to practically any point in the world, and, after having dropped its cargo, return to its home base in the United States.

I am frequently reminded of the saying of that young, forceful, and dynamic business-minded Secretary of the Department of the Air Force whose motto is: "American air power is American peace power":

"We have learned that we can fly anything, anywhere, any time. Climate, mountains, oceans, weather—they cannot stop the United States Air Force."

It is because of the wonders of the air age, apart from the development of the atom bomb itself, that I say to you that in so far as the making of war or the assurance of our national peace and security are concerned that America's supremacy in the air is of essence to the security and peace both of America and the world.

I am sending you under separate cover a beautiful facsimile of the two documents basic to our historic institution of free government: the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of these United States. Please accept and hang these documents in some place appropriate to their treasured worth.

So long as Americans everywhere will guard these two precious writings of early American structure and defend them against all enemies, as we would defend the Holy Bible, just that long and no longer will the sacred institution of American Government and the way of American life survive.

Truly appreciative of this opportunity of addressing a few words to the discussion programmed for your fellowship class, and with God's blessing on you all, believe me,

Sincerely your friend,

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress.

Farm Implement Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the farm implement industry is an important industrial group in my congressional district. The J. I. Case Co. is one of the pioneer farm implement manufacturing concerns. Its president is Mr. Theodore Johnson, and on October 4, 1949, he addressed the Farm Equipment Institute on the subject of the agricultural-equipment industry. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including excerpts from the address delivered by Mr. Johnson:

PRESIDENT OF CASE CO. TELLS OF FARM-IMPLEMENT PROGRESS

Year-around buying of farm machinery was described in Washington today by Theodore Johnson, president of the Farm Equipment Institute, as beneficial to farmers and the national economy as well.

Speaking at the golden anniversary convention of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association, Johnson said this development in recent years had tended to stabilize employment, not only in the plants of farm-machinery manufacturers but also in the thousands of plants which supply materials for the industry.

Johnson, who is president of J. I. Case Co., Racine, said: "One of the objectives of the manufacturers is to provide year-around work for their people. It is desirable to stabilize employment as much as possible. Would it not be in the interest of farmers if they purchased out of season the machinery they know they expect to buy the next season, and thereby create a more stable market for their own products?"

AN ENORMOUS JOB

The farmers' annual work job is enormous. Preparation, cultivation, and harvesting each year amount to the equivalent of working over about 1,800,000,000 acres. It would not be possible to perform this big job without farm machinery, Johnson said.

Reviewing 50 years of progress in farm-machinery manufacture, Johnson said if it were possible to present an exhibit of the machinery and implements of 50 years ago and those of today we would be greatly astonished by the progress.

"Greater mechanical progress was made during these years than in all previous history," he said.

As engineers of concerns in the highly competitive industry "vied with each other to bring new machines into production and to improve machines, the farmer benefited," he remarked.

"The United States has more farm tractors than all the rest of the countries of the world," he said, "more combines, hay balers, corn pickers, plows, harrows, cultivators, planters, grain drills, more milking machines, and irrigation equipment; in fact, more farm machinery and equipment of all kinds than all the rest of the world. This, I believe, is highly significant. The farmer, the farm machinery manufacturer, and the retail dealer have made an extraordinary contribution to the high standard of living in the United States—a standard not equaled anywhere on earth."

CONSERVATION URGED

"The soil-conservation program fostered by the National Retail Farm Equipment Association continues to be of vital importance," he said. "All the people of our country, whether their business is directly with the farmer or not, are affected by this program, and therefore they should be very much interested in it."

Johnson predicted increasing mechanization of farms to keep pace with the demands of the growing population. "There may come a time when we will need to worry about adequate farm productivity to meet our population increase. However, I think this is a long time away, particularly if we continue the use of improved farm equipment, the improvement and development of agricultural products, the soil-conservation program, and at the same time educate our youth in advanced farming methods."

War Is Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 27, 1949. Although the House has already passed the European arms bill, I still feel that this article is deserving the attention of Members of Congress.

I voted against the arms bill because this is not the road to peace. We are stepping into a dark abyss from which we will not be able to extricate ourselves. This armament race can only lead to world bankruptcy. English bonds are selling at 70 percent of their value, and the British bond market went into a panic. The same thing can happen to us if we keep spending billions of dollars which the taxpayers of our Nation cannot raise. It is clear now that we shall have a $7,000,000,000 deficit next year. Which class of taxpayers, I ask you, will

carry this additional burden? Will it be the laboring man and the farmer, or will it be the businessman and the corporations? We promised to remove the special excise taxes; now it is clear that this shall not be done, but instead, additional billions of taxes will have to be levied against our people.

The rearmament by the United States of the non-Communist world against the Communist world is not only beyond our capacity, but, if we could bear the burden, it would result only in the final war of our civilization. World-wide misery, chaos, and dictatorships would follow.

True statesmanship should be able to develop, not by unprincipled appeasement but on lines that have been tentatively suggested in the Quaker Report on American-Russian relations. This report was not given the proper publicity by the American press. It was issued on July 18 and shows methods whereby capitalist and Communist nations can live together profitably in the same world without destroying each other, as Islam has learned to live with Hinduism and Christianity. This statement can be obtained by writing to the American Friends Society, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A program of peace through war, whether the war be cold or hot, must be tabled by the Congress of the United States.

WAR IS PEACE?

(By Vermont Royster)

The newest truth which we are being asked to absorb in our catechism is that the clanking war-god Mars is the only true apostle of peace.

This view is implicit in the message which President Truman this week sent to Congress and in the ready-made arms bill which accompanied it. The philosophy underlying these two State papers and the process by which that philosophy was conceived are, indeed, more significant and interesting than the exact proposals made.

The present legislation is unlikely to become law, at least at this session, for the political dangers in the suggested act are so apparent that in due time they will be noted. But the proposed law is likely to be rejected, or modified, mainly because of the powers it would give the President, not because its philosophy is denied.

We have been led so slowly to the view that war is peace—to borrow a phrase from Orwell's best-seller Nineteen Eighty-Four—that the wisdom of martial armaments is rarely questioned. The arguments tend to boil down to how much we can afford and to who shall hold the powers, Congress or the President.

Yet the greater danger is in accepting the President's philosophy, in not understanding how he came to it and in lacking vision as to its consequences. Even if the law is rejected at this session, so long as the philosophy behind it remains acceptable we risk swallowing the whole thing at some future date.

What the administration says in effect is that peaceful measures cannot preserve peace and therefore we must turn to warlike measures to get peace.

THE LAST OF UN

That, of course, means the end of the United Nations, as a good many observers pointed out when the Atlantic Pact was first mentioned. The pact itself avows faith in the UN, but Mr. Truman now no longer makes any pretense about it. It is an unfortunate truth that the UN has failed. It is also an unfortunate truth, in his view, that Russia is out to control the world. From this he argues that the United States must control it; only we, naturally, will control it in the interests of peace.

We are to preserve the peace by turning the world into an armed camp. We preserve it by announcing to our enemy that we hate him, despise him, and hear him, and that we intend to crush him if need be. That if need be is supposed to allay him; we are peace-loving, and neither we nor any of our allies whom we arm would hurt anybody.

To see how quieting this will be on the world's nerves, it is only necessary to imagine yourself a Russian reading this week's name-calling blast from the State Department and the concurrent promise that the United States will give guns to anybody who sides with it against Russia.

But even if this program does alarm the Russians, we are told, it will still preserve peace by instilling fear. The Politburo is to be so frightened by this vast armada arrayed against it that it won't stick its collective nose out of the Kremlin. Power begets fear and fear begets peace.

We are to achieve by force what Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler failed to achieve by force, a universal peace. We are, indeed, more ambitious than that triumvirate; we do not limit ourselves to a small corner of the world, a continent or two, but are to achieve peace for the whole globe.

BUYING COOPERATION

We are to keep the Russians at bay with our great alliance. And we are to keep the alliance under control by our power to give or withhold arms and money. To those whose policies are friendly, we give; from those whose policies fail of approval, we withhold. We thus apply our power to both our enemies and our friends in the interests of peace.

The logic of all this is supposed to be no more than an extension of the sound view that strength in a potential victim deters an aggressor; that is, that a big dog is less likely to jump a dog that is his match. Strength, in other words, begets respect.

Now, no one is likely to deny either that power begets fear. But fear begets many things. It may, if it is strong enough, spawn an unstable peace; but it also seeds jealousy and hatred and desperation. And these in time can overcome fear.

We are already both hated and feared by our enemy; their government preaches it just as ours does hatred and fear of them. How far along toward desperation they are, no one knows or can know. But the first question to be asked is: Will our proposed actions take them toward or away from desperation?

And there is another question, even if we ignore the Russians' reactions—which everyone seems to be doing. That is: Will this use of power endear us to our allies, or will they, too, come to fear and resent us? Will we have both fearing enemies and fearing friends?

QUEER REWARDS FOR KINDNESS

Since we are using our power to protect our friends we should expect gratitude. Yet past uses of our benevolent power have returned us strange rewards. "Yankee imperialism" is a catch-phrase south of the border. In the chancelleries of Europe there is no love for America, only for its gifts. They bow because they need us, but it is a resentful obeisance. The fact is that the world already fears us; it only, for the moment, fears Russia and starvation more. Now that we are to throw around at our whim military might as well as dollars, will they love us more?

And beyond all this, there is a more encompassing question. Does the way to peace, in all wisdom and in truth, lie in turning the world into two camps which are not only separated ideologically but which are armed to the teeth? We have already accepted the division—the very phrase "cold war" acknowledges the existence of enemies. Shall we keep them at peace by being more warlike?

If it be so, then the world has wasted many centuries searching for the way to peace instead of war. For the goal has been at hand right along. War is peace, and the way to preserve the peace is to keep the war, cold or hot, going on forever.

War Is a Snare and a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I enlisted in World War I because I believed devoutly that the world must be made safe for representative government; that the right to liberty and freedom for the individual must be preserved. Woodrow Wilson sold me a bill of goods. The principle involved was a moral one and it was my duty, so I rationalized, to offer my services and my life, if necessary, to attain it. The Wilson argument thereby fixed the theme for our entry in that first global contest. The principles declared were based on the moral law. Free people everywhere subscribed to them. And so we justified participation in two world wars on a base that was consistent with age-long Christian concepts. From this we surmised that when wars were won, the permanent victory must be a moral one. Did we achieve a moral victory in either war? No.

We temporized with the moral law. It is clear now that what appeared as victories at the conference tables turned out to be moral defeats, which must have been realized by Roosevelt and Churchill. At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the spirit of vindictiveness was so high that the fundamental rights of human beings and of nations were blacked out; all moral principles were jettisoned for expediency. Those leaders said in their defense that a calculated risk was involved. This country approved the partition of Poland and joined hands in the imposition of communism on a people who fought and died for liberty and freedom for many, many years. Thus a calculated risk is now an excuse for failure, for that is what it is.

Our leaders approved and supported the mass deportations of people from their homes. And today they are wandering nomads in western Europe. In Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia we have remained dumb and inert while freedom has been crucified. These same leaders approved ex post facto tribunals where men and women were accused and tried and put to death under a set of rules heretofore unknown to international law or the laws of war. In these instances and many more, we suffered moral defeat. The pronounced objectives for our entry into the war were ignored. It was Winston Churchill who said during the

war that he would make a bargain with the devil just so long as it would bring victory. Surely this is contrary to the moral law and it is not the philosophy of the British nor the American people.

Today the world is divided between two ideologies—two ways of life. One is the Christian way founded on a belief in God, which imposes certain imperative rules of conduct on individuals and on nations. Communism is geared to economic determinism and founded on atheism. One writer has said that it is an economic religion of expediency. In judging the value of these two concepts we look to conduct rather than theory. If our rules are right—based on the moral law—then we must stand by them in war and in peace. Those rules are as unchangeable as the laws of God—the same yesterday, today, and forevermore. A defeat on the battlefield may be disastrous at the time, but a moral defeat is an utter calamity and it can never be retrieved.

Europe today is an economic shambles. Japan fights for its life economically and morally. All the world is in a turmoil and confusion reigns in every land. One fact becomes clear—that the destruction of one nation requires the rehabilitation of it by the victor. Is it not paradoxical to have spent billions of dollars to win the war and now be called upon to spend billions more to reconstruct it? That is what we did in Europe and Japan. Think of the destruction by air in Germany and the devastation in Japan by the atomic bomb. We destroyed factories and cities, and when cities were wiped out industry was idle and people were unemployed. It was apparent that when both were destroyed mankind reverted to barbarism.

War is obviously the enemy of civilization. Two military victories in two world wars have brought home the fact to all of us that we did not win the objectives which we sought. We have neither peace nor security. General Sherman once said: "The legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace." It follows that such a peace is impossible if during a war we abandon the very principles for which we say we are fighting, and economically wreck the civilization to which we and our enemy belong. Military victory alone is not sufficient. This lesson is costing the taxpayers of the United States untold wealth, and today we are on the way to world war III, with a $15,000,000,000 defense budget to support a military alliance with European nations designed to preserve the peace. History, however, shows that such a scheme has never prevented war.

Mr. Speaker, as this first session of the Eighty-first Congress ends, we must view the future with grave misgivings. We seek peace and security behind our own "iron curtain" in western Europe by agreeing to arm the Atlantic Treaty countries. Word comes to me that France and England are asking that we insure their security with a minimum of 20 full divisions, plus air power. No mention of this possibility was made during the debate on the arms aid bill. The cost of such an expeditionary force will be $6,000,000,000 a year, in addition to our yearly national defense budget. The American people have not asked for this, Mr. Speaker, but our leaders are determined that they will get it. God help the United States and forgive those who are responsible for this diabolical program. We have chosen to put the moral law in the ashcan. The god of war is in the saddle.

Los Angeles Tidings Editorial Written Before Conviction of 11 Communists Prophetic in Its Vision of What the Verdict Would Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Judge Medina and the stalwart jury that assisted him in the recent long drawn out trial of 11 Communists have lived up to the sacred tradition of American constitutional justice. The people of the Nation should be justly proud of them.

Here is an editorial written before the verdict was rendered by the editor of the Los Angeles Tidings which is well worth reading. It is titled "The Natural Law and Freedom."

Judge Medina is a man in whom the quality of mercy is not strained. He has successfully outwitted attempts to perturb unduly the judicial calm. His aplomb remains unruffled after a 9-month harrassment that would have dismayed a lesser man.

The defense of the 11 Communists on trial in New York for subversive activity rests its case, out-maneuvered in its hope for a mistrial. The decision will be rendered in the verdict of 12 tried citizens and true.

The west, in the silence of its great newspapers, has been denied a day-by-day recital of the brazen tactics of these defendants and their counsel in their sustained attempt to mock the dignity and sacredness of American courts of law. Here is a revealing chapter on Communist patterns of thought on human rights and judicial processes, of more service to the stability of the Nation than the tedious coverage of gangster and glamor exploits on the local scene.

Nor has contrast been made with the staged trial of Laszlo Rajk and his accomplices abruptly ended in Budapest with the death verdict joyfully accepted as expiation for supposed guilt.

The story is a familiar one these past 20 years depressing in the routine of its regularity. It is the story of the purge, when men once high in the Soviet hierarchy divest themselves of the stature of human beings and prate as robots of their guilt and crime. The horror of the system is all the more starkly exposed in this sham pretense of legal forms.

The majesty of law as emanating from the mind of God, characterizes the courtrooms of this land still of the free. In this heritage of liberty, certain rights are presumed to be self-evident. Moreover, the accused are supposed innocent until proved guilty. They have their day in court and may appeal to the highest tribunal. These rights have their roots in the natural law which is not a figment of man's mind but a product of God's will. Any other concept of jurisprudence is tyranny.

The Communist defendants in New York made high sport of the sacred temple of our judicial system the while they were protected within its sheltering precincts. They hindered and obstructed where they could the ordered proceedings. The preternatural patience of the presiding judge in upholding the dignity of the court was finally forced to remand several of the defendants. A picket line paraded its invective and derision.

What manner of mind it was that judged such conduct helpful, is foreign to the American temper which expects justice to pursue its sure and steady paths, unimpeded and unafraid, as far as it is given to fallible human minds to come to the truth. The shame of the simultaneous Budapest purge only kindled the frenzy of these partisan dupes.

America can with renewed admiration look to its courts of law as shrines of justice and sanctuaries of human rights. Alien ideas find little welcome there. Our jurists with startlingly few exceptions have been men of probity and integrity. In a mighty stream of even-handed justice, they have washed the years of much strain and corruption.

The people's confidence in our judicial system is undiminished even with the recent infiltration of the prophets of pragmatism, who would loosen the blind from the eyes of justice to survey the whims of the moment or the winds of expediency and compromise.

The natural law can alone safeguard our basic freedoms, and a continuing dedication to its imperious claims must be the constant concern of the legal profession. The law is not merely what a court or judge says it is. There is change upon change in the world in which we live, but there are also unchanging principles of law which do not change with the changing times.

What the law most needs today is to reexamine its parentage. That parentage is to be found in the concept of the natural law that pushed itself up from its dim apprehension by the early Greeks to its position of splendor in medieval thought—whence it flowered vibrant and vital in the great charters of human liberty.

This is the stream which watered the rush of our own documents of liberty, and should we strip the Constitution of the natural law enshrined therein, only empty words remain luring a confused people to dance to the measured beat of a dictator's baton.

The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, from the sidewalks of New York to candidacy for the exalted office of President of the United States, as the nominee of our greatest and most progressive political party, is a long leap; but the late and beloved Alfred E. Smith made that leap.

Since Alfred E. Smith was the victim, in his lifetime, of bigotry carried into the political arena, it is especially fitting that prominent citizens of all faiths and denominations, dedicated to the common cause of humanity, should have banded together to establish the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation; and that the object of this foundation is to build a living monument to the memory of the late

Governor Smith in the form of an addition to St. Vincent's Hospital.

It is with pleasure that I insert, under leave, the moving speech of my good friend, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, at the annual meeting in New York:

Your Eminence, Governor Dewey, Mayor O'Dwyer, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, for the fourth consecutive year, it is my privilege to preside at the annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. I want at this time to express my appreciation for the honor which my colleagues on the committee have conferred upon me by asking me to act as chairman. To be an active participant of any movement or cause bearing the name of Alfred E. Smith is in itself a high distinction. To carry on in his tradition and humanitarian ideals is evidence that we firmly believe in our way of life.

You have probably read that during the year the cornerstone of the Smith Memorial Addition to St. Vincent's Hospital has been laid; but that my friends, is not the whole story. For the building itself is now in the process of construction. Every day brings us closer to our objective which is to make available greater facilities for the sick and ailing and helpless of every race and creed.

I think that it is entirely fitting and proper that I should refer this evening to one in whose mind and heart was born the idea of a memorial to a great and beloved American and a son of our own city. He conceived a monument not merely in stone with words of praise upon it, but an institution that would serve the community unselfishly every hour of the day and night.

No obstacle seemed too hard for him to overcome. Despite the difficulties that arose because of adverse economic conditions and wartime restrictions, in the face of rising costs of materials and labor, he never faltered in his determination to carry on the work that had been originally planned. He felt that there could be no moratorium on sickness. The welfare of the individual, struck down by illness, was for him a matter of prime consideration.

For all of us owe to him a debt of gratitude. He has given of himself fully to this noble cause. Yet I am sure that he neither seeks nor desires any thanks. But I care not in what church or synagogue one may worship, he must recognize in this man one who is imbued with compassion and love for his fellow man, one who has never turned away from those who sought his help, either in a spiritual or material way.

The Alfred E. Smith memorial is a monument to a great humanitarian, and it is also the creation of another outstanding humanitarian, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman.

Those of us who have been closely associated with his eminence in this great project realize that without you who have attended this dinner and those in previous years it would have been impossible to make any substantial headway.

You, my friends, are partners in this venture to bring relief and healing to unfortunate men, women, and children. It is, indeed, a pleasure for me to acknowledge publicly the fine cooperation from all of you. Your response must not be measured in terms of dollars and cents but rather in terms of human values.

For it is due to your willingness to join with us in these annual dinners that it has been possible for his eminence and his associates to carry through the plans that were evolved several years ago.

To me, my friends, this wholehearted support from you of every race and creed, in every walk of life, is an open expression of men and women who are doing what they want to do, and not because they are told to do it. The building of a memorial to one of the Catholic faith with the help of thousands of the Protestant and Jewish faiths is democracy in its finest flower.

The Smith memorial, when completed, will be a visual and eloquent answer to those who question the wisdom of our democratic principles. It will proclaim to the whole world that its walls of brick and girders of steel have been welded together like thousands of similar structures in this country which serve, without financial return or profit, those who come to them for help.

Its portals will never close. Through it will pass Catholic, Protestant, and Jew; and none will be stopped at the threshold. It will be more than iron and steel; it will be the symbol of the spirit, tolerance, and understanding which is part of our daily lives. And within its walls the men and women in white will go quietly about their tasks making every effort to replace the expression of suffering with the welcome smile of relief.

In these critical days in the life of our Nation, we must turn to phases of our domestic life which are rooted in the genuine democratic ideal. Fate has thrust upon us world leadership; we have accepted the challenge. By joining the Atlantic Pact and through the Marshall plan we have served notice to the world how we stand. Each day, almost each hour, brings some new problem, some unforeseen development which calls for the highest and wisest type of leadership. For our leadership as the great Nation of the world must be conditioned by the power and courage of the people at home.

Who can say how this new world role of our country will develop? Speaking for myself, as one more individual who loves his country, I am not only hopeful but optimistic. My friends, my optimism, to a considerable extent, is based on your presence here this evening. For under this roof we have come to pay tribute among other things to the basic philosophy that human dignity is the motivating force of our way of life and none will turn from our destined course.

There are millions like you in this country. They will decide the road which we shall follow and they will support the leadership, which I believe, will guide the world toward the path of peace and happiness.

The spirit of Al Smith hovers over us tonight. It is the eternal spirit of our beloved country. For we believe with Al Smith that each shall worship in accordance with his belief, that each should have compassion for those who are unfortunate and helpless, that each should be a good neighbor. We are a nation which would rather love than hate. It is so much easier and more pleasant. We believe in peace, shall strive for it, and the world will follow us on the road ahead to peace and universal brotherhood.

Conservation of Our Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third prize essay in the Nation-wide contest on conservation of our soil resources, sponsored by the National Grange and American Plant Food Council, Inc. The winner was Jack Hardy, age 13, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Arthur Hardy, Blackstone, Nottoway County, Va.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION OF OUR SOIL RESOURCES

(By Jack Hardy)

We, the youth of America, must learn to safeguard our soil in order that it may safeguard our future. King Midas with his golden touch was starving to death in the midst of wealth as our posterity will starve in the midst of our miraculous mechanical developments if we neglect our source of bread. Since the beginning of man's existence on earth, he has depended upon the soil, either directly or indirectly, for the production of materials necessary for his food, clothing, and largely for his shelter and fuel. The average person is just beginning to realize the importance of soil conservation. In 1908 President Theodore Roosevelt said, "When the soil is gone, man must go, and the process does not take long."

It takes nature from 200 to 800 years to build 1 inch of top soil. This thin layer covering the land, made from decayed plant and animal life through a slow, natural process, is rich in minerals and organic matter. If unprotected, this fertile cream of the earth can be washed away in a few weeks.

When our forefathers landed on these shores nearly 350 years ago, there stretched before them 2,000,000,000 acres of untilled, fertile soils and virgin forests. They cleared the forests, plowed the land, and planted tobacco, cotton, and other crops. As the population increased they expanded westward, continuing this process until the whole country was settled. Conservation was not considered important. Grasses and forests, which reduce erosion by absorbing the force of the elements, were ruthlessly uprooted. As the early settlers moved westward to meet the demand for new land, they left behind worn-out soil. Land without protection—protection being plant growth—will lose 66 tons of top soil per acre in a year on a 10-percent slope. The average 9 inches found here has been reduced to its present average of 6 inches.

America now finds herself with no new lands to conquer. Our frontiers are gone. We must, therefore, first, protect our present soil resources, and second, rebuild the soil that is depleted. These ends must be accomplished by the practice of definite soil-conservation programs.

In 1935, the Soil Conservation Service was established under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, its purpose being to demonstrate to farmers of the Nation ways and means of combating soil erosion. Skilled technicians are employed by the Soil Conservation Service whose assistance and device is free to the farmers of our land. Soil conservation is just good farming.

Various methods are practiced to accomplish the saving and building up of the soil. A regular system of crop rotation, which slows down erosion will not alone prevent ultimate loss of soil although it is important. Around my home where the land is rolling and hilly, farmers are learning about contour farming. This is done by running fences and crop rows on the level, by contour strip farming which means alternating row crops, small grain, and grasses in contour strips, by using meadow strips which means leaving strips of grass in the lower areas for carrying the water off slowly, and by terracing in order that the water may be carried to meadow strips and prevented from taking soil and making gullies. Contour rows hold the water, allowing it to sink into the soil. Land that is too steep and worn out for cultivation should be planted to forests or permanent grasses. This not only will keep the land from washing, but also will provide the farmer with an additional source of income.

To rebuild and replenish the soil, we must put back those materials which have been used and taken out. The acidity of the soil can be counteracted by the use of lime. A fertilizer should be used to replace nitrogen, phosphates, potash, and other less-used minerals. The plowing under of certain green manure crops, crop residue, and the use of animal manure add organic matter and certain minerals. Nitrogen may also be added by the growing of legumes. Rebuilding is a slow process.

Our young people not only must be taught the methods and the importance of conservation, but also must be made aware of their personal responsibility for action in arresting soil losses and reclaiming natural resources. Proper training for future action can be accomplished through the schools, 4–H Clubs, granges, vocational agricultural classes, Boy Scouts, and special programs sponsored by the agricultural Department. We must use our heritage wisely so that those who come after us may enjoy the benefits that our foresight will make possible. I for one accept the challenge.

Gen. Joseph T. McNarney Chosen Ambassador of Pennsylvania During Pennsylvania Week—Citation and Plaque Presented by Former Pennsylvanian, Congressman Gordon L. McDonough, at Emporium, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in response to the invitation of the Committee for Pennsylvania Week in Emporium, Pa., I had the singular privilege and pleasure, as a former Pennsylvanian, of presenting to Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, with whom I grew up as a boy, the citation and plaque awarded to him as an ambassador of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, at Emporium, Pa.

It was a most enjoyable task especially because the presentation ceremonies were held in the beautiful town of Emporium where General McNarney and I were kids together years ago. Following is the presentation speech I made:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot recall of any duty I have been called upon to perform in my 16 years of public service more pleasant or enjoyable than the privilege I have here tonight of presenting this deserved recognition of the ability and distinction of one of my boyhood pals—with whom I grew up, attended school, played baseball, played in the home-town band (Joe played clarinet, I played alto), played penny ante (Joe usually won), sold newspapers, was a member of the Boys Brigade, skated on Howards Pond in winter, swam in the ole swimmin' hole in the summer—Joe and I did all of these and the other things that healthy kids of those days did together, many years ago. I am sure you know I am referring to the distinguished United States Army Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, who to his many dear friends in Emporium is simply Joe McNarney, and who we are proud to say has become a great figure in American, yes in world affairs, and who will be recorded in the annals of this Nation as a great United States Army general, an efficient organizer, and a capable administrator of unmatched ability.

It seems appropriate that this is the time and place to say something about the present high assignment General McNarney has just received from the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, and a little of his background which has qualified him to receive this deserved recognition. Here is an article from the October 21 issue of the United States News which reads as follows, with a few corrections and additions of my own:

Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, a veteran Air Force man, has bobbed up as a figure of influence in the big Navy-Air row. General McNarney is having an important say about how the Nation's defense money shall be divided among the services.

The general's influence goes with his position as chairman of the National Defense Management Committee. Its members, aside from the general, are civilians. It was created to save the armed services some money by eliminating the unnecessary expenditures that result from duplicated activities, needless overhead costs, overstaffing, and other causes.

The general is a quick-minded man of 56, with more than 30 years in military aviation. He is tall and dark and handsome, I add, with a high forehead, an easy smile, a relaxed manner, and a casual, drawling way of speech. He is well liked by his colleagues.

The latter, however, know him as a tough administrator. They sometimes have referred to him as "Little Caesar," as an executive who speaks his mind, makes his decisions, and sticks to them. They scarcely forget the uncompromising way in which he drove through the wartime reorganization of the Army, a reorganization that, incidentally, resulted in giving air power a much increased proportional representation on the War Department's General Staff.

The Secretary of Defense had promised a congressional committee that, if given additional unification powers, he could lop $800,000,000 off the total spent on the services. He was given the powers he requested and has ordered a cut of that amount.

In general, he turned the problem of how the slash should be allotted over to General McNarney and his committee.

General McNarney tends to dominate his committee as he does most situations in which he finds himself. And dealing with budgets and organizational details has been a prominent part of his distinguished career.

General McNarney transferred to air service as soon after West Point graduation as regulations would permit. He grew up with the air service and still is rated a command pilot, combat observer, and technical observer. When making a flight, he usually takes over the controls.

And yet his reputation was built as an administrative rather than as a combat or tactical officer. This trend set in early. In France, during World War I, he participated in every major offensive, but his assignments usually were at command posts.

Between wars, it became apparent that the general was headed for high places. He made a name for himself in the Army's various schools. Pearl Harbor day found him in England, where he had been observing aerial warfare over Britain. Gen. George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff, hustled General McNarney back to Washington. He had important work for him as Deputy Chief of Staff, and the first of his jobs was to reorganize the War Department.

He gave the Department an epic overhauling, the first of its scope since 1903. It set up a pattern of administration and command that lasted through the war and continued with slight modifications until unification. And he was hard-boiled in making it effective.

Abruptly he told a gathering of ranking officers, assembled, they thought, to discuss the reorganization plan and make changes in it, that the plan stood as it was, that the meeting was for the purpose of issuing the orders that would put it into practice. In other words no changes would be made. He had a pat hand and was going to stick to it. You can readily see now why he usually won in those penny-ante poker games, I referred to.

It was at this time that he acquired the nickname of "Little Caesar." There were allegations of heavy-handed methods, but, in the end, most objectors credited General McNarney with logical reasoning and considered fairness.

The general, meanwhile, was anxious for field service. He got it, finally, as deputy Allied commander in the Mediterranean. The war over, he succeeded Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as topman in Europe. Then he became the first military governor of Germany, with Gen. Lucius D. Clay as his deputy and economic helper.

Since returning to the United States, General McNarney served for a time with the United Nations and as commanding general of the Air Material Command. Secretary Johnson called him to Washington last March to advise him on the consolidation and elimination of boards and committees.

I am sure you will agree with me that Secretary of Defense Johnson could not have found a better man to do a most difficult job than our own General Joe, in whom the people of Emporium take great pride as a native son, and who has every right to be proud of himself for the record he has made. But General Joe is modest. I think sometimes his modesty almost approaches humility, and perhaps it's his modesty that makes him a great soldier, a great military organizer, and a great man.

A moment ago I referred to the many years ago when Joe and I were kids together here in Emporium. It seems like a long time ago yet again it seems but a short while ago. Much has occurred during those years. Years of great progress, years of war, years of sadness and suffering for millions in all parts of the world. With the victory that has come to us as a result of the ability of General McNarney and his associates in the armed services has come a heavy and burdensome responsibility. Someone has said that "we cannot afford to win another war," and yet on the other hand it is certain that neither can we afford to lose, if we are to retain the freedom and independence which has become our inheritance from our forefathers.

The trust, the confidence, and the future of the people of this Nation is reposed in you and your associates, General McNarney. We feel secure that because of your proven ability that you can and will assume that heavy responsibility.

The sincere good wishes of the folks of your home town and the Nation go with this deserved award which I have the singular and happy privilege to present to you.

Increase in Salary for Federal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee urging an increase in salary for Federal workers:

It is a privilege for me to speak in favor of legislation providing an increase in salary for our Federal workers. The whole scale of Federal salaries, from top to bottom, must be raised. Our Government is faced with the crippling loss of trained personnel due to inadequate wages. Salaries for junior officials must be sufficient to attract a fair share of the very best young minds that come out of our colleges and universities each year. In addition, salaries for the top civil-service jobs must be sufficient to enable Federal officials to maintain their families in comfort while providing for their children's college education.

Government employees, whose pay rates are fixed by Congress in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, are in need of a pay increase, because they have steadily lost purchasing power, and no raise they have received has fully restored it. Beginning in 1945 there have been three increases in the salaries of Classification Act employees. The first Federal Employees' Pay Act, effective July 1, 1945, employed a graduated formula which increased rates 20 percent for the first $1,200 salary a year, then 10 percent up to $4,600, and 5 percent above that amount. This gave the largest increases to employees in the lowest pay brackets. The second increase, effective July 1, 1946, raised salaries by a uniform 14 percent, with the proviso that the topmost rate could not exceed $10,000. The third raise, effective at the beginning of the first pay period after June 30, 1948, gave an additional $330 a year to all employees paid according to the Classification Act.

Each of these general raises fell short of doing what the employees had hoped for—not that they hoped to be placed in a better position than they had been, by getting their pay raised—but merely that they had tried to regain the purchasing power they had lost. It may be shown to what extent Government salaried employees have suffered from rising living costs by comparing the effect of price increases during the intervals between pay raises with the prewar purchasing power of the average salary in 1939.

In August 1939, the month immediately prior to the beginning of hostilities in Europe, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Living Index—later renamed Consumer's Price Index—stood at 98.6. As this index began to rise, Government workers lost ground.

These employees received additional income in December 1942 from the War Overtime Act, but their pay was raised by lengthening their hours, not by increasing rates. Before the war there was a 39-hour week for the greater number of clerical employees. This was increased to 48 hours. Since it was a case of raising earnings by lengthening hours, it was in reality no salary increase. The War Overtime Act continued until April 30, 1945. It barely covered the increase in living costs when it was enacted in December 1942, since prices had risen 22 percent by that time over August 1939, and the war overtime increase in earnings averaged about that same figure.

Living costs continued to rise until, by July 1945, they had advanced 31 percent. When the first increase in rates became effective July 1, 1945, it amounted to an average of about 16 percent above August 1939. Thus living costs had advanced almost twice as much as the amount of the first pay raise. The employees had to absorb the remaining 15 percent of the increased cost of living.

Another year passed and prices continued rising. The second Pay Act, effective July 1, 1946, increased wages 14 percent. The total increase resulting from the two raises was 31 percent, although by June 15, 1946, the price index had advanced 35 percent above August 1939. By July 15, 1946, the price index had gone to 141.2.

Living costs rose still more during succeeding months, but it was not until 2 years later that salary rates were increased again when the $330 raise was given to Classification Act employees, effective July 1, 1948. Employees in the postal service were given $450 at the same time.

The combined effect of the three increase for Classification Act employees was to raise the average salary 46 percent above the average of August 1939. The first raise increased the average salary nearly 16 percent; the second, 14 percent; and the third approximated an additional 11 percent. However, the cost of living, as measured by the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, had advanced to 173.7 by July 1948. This was 76 percent above August 1939.

The peak in prices was reached last September when the index reached 174.5. Although it dropped to 169 in February 1949, it was still 71 percent above August 1939 or about 17 percent above the 46-percent increase that has taken place in the average salary of Classification Act employees.

Trained personnel are being lost throughout the Government because of the low pay scales. During 1947, 3,687 postal employees were separated from the Chicago post office due to resignations and other causes. An indication of the financial loss to the Government of this kind of turn-over can be seen when we consider that it cost at least $15 to add and subtract each of these persons from the Federal pay roll. This adds up to a loss of $55,305 for Chicago alone. The projection of these figures for the country as a whole would result in a sizable figure.

Startling, too, are the losses in trained people in top positions caused by salary limitations. Examples are the resignations of Harold Smith as Budget Director, Ganson Purcell as Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman, Charles Denny and Paul Porter as Federal Communications Commission chairmen, and Robert Freer as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. On the lower levels there is a fearful loss every year of patent and tax attorneys, food-processing specialists, and so on, who leave the Government to trade their expert knowledge and experience for the greater rewards of private business.

It is not only necessary to increase the salary scales of Federal employees, but it is equally important to revise the salary schedules of the Classification Act. The maintenance of a salary ceiling has served to compress pay rates in the upper brackets and to disturb proper differentials in compensation which should exist between various types of positions. The Salary Acts of 1945, 1946, and 1948, which afforded some financial relief, tended further to distort the whole compensation schedule.

At the time President Truman signed the Federal Employee Salary Act of 1948, he said the act met neither the needs of the employees nor those of the Government. He added, "In the interest of correcting this intolerable situation and strengthening and improving the career service, I shall urge that the Congress pass legislation which will set Federal pay scales at the proper levels for all employees, including members of the Cabinet and the heads of the independent agencies, as well as persons who are occupying key positions in the professional, scientific, and technical fields, and modernize and simplify the Classification Act of 1923, and once again provide a proper relationship between jobs."

Nehru Speaks—Voice in Mad World—Nehru Calls on World To Cast Out Fear and Bring Cold War to End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the days are brighter and more cheerful since the visit of Prime Minister Nehru. His visit to Washington has been like a fresh breeze, blowing the gunpowder and war fumes out of this city. His call for peace and friendship within the family of nations will be gratefully and wholeheartedly received by 99 percent of the people in the world. Yes, millions of our people have sincerely believed that our chief duty is to free men's minds from bias and prejudice and to enlarge our perceptions of the world about us. Yet, too many of us have had our voices stilled because of the fear of the saber rattlers. The great disciple of Mahatma Gandhi has come from the East not to ask for money for war, but to plead for peace. Let us listen to his plea. It is indeed gratifying to see that the American press has given Prime Minister Nehru the courteous reception and the publicity which his remarks deserved.

I wish to include some excerpts from the newspapers: An editorial from the Detroit Free Press, an article by Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Star, an Associated Press article in the Washington Star, and an article by Lowell Mellett in the Washington Star:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press]

A STATESMAN'S WARNING—NEHRU SPEAKS

The address delivered by Prime Minister Nehru, at Columbia University, was an appropriate contribution to United Nations Week.

The objective of the UN is peace. That, too, was Pandit Nehru's theme. The way to achieve it is not by talking and preparing for war, said India's philosopher-statesman, but by working to remove the basic causes of war and revolution.

Among these domination of some countries by others, assumption of racial superiority leading to discrimination, and the misery and want of millions of people in many countries are present dangers.

Asia, as Mr. Nehru reminded his American audience, was the birthplace of nearly all the great religions of mankind and "wonderful civilizations grew up there when Europe and America were still unknown to history."

Yet "the progress of some races in knowledge or in invention has tempted them to believe that they are racially superior and has led them to treat other nations with contempt."

Asia and Africa have seen the widest and most insolent exhibitions of this fallacy. "The west has too often despised the Asian and the African and still in many places denies them not only equality of rights but even common humanity and kindliness."

"All remaining vestiges of imperialism and colonialism," said Mr. Nehru emphatically, "will have to disappear."

The representatives of the powers now fighting at Lake Success over the bones of Italy's African empire are thus forewarned.

A new and dynamic India with upward of 300,000,000 people can be a bulwark for the west against Soviet communism or it can be driven into Moscow's arms. The modest terms upon which its friendship may be gained were outlined by its brilliant leader. Chief among them is equality of treatment of Asia and Africa with Europe and America.

A follower of Mahatma Gandhi but also a graduate of Cambridge, Jawaharlal Nehru recognized that ideals must be adapted to realities. Yet he refuses to sacrifice the one to the other. The pursuit of truth and fairness and decency among all men must go on in spite of all obstacles and temporary setbacks.

The goal of global peace is perhaps a little nearer because of this visit to the West by a statesman from the East, where the idea that all human problems can be settled with gunpowder is in bad odor.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

VOICE IN MAD WORLD—NEHRU'S APPEAL FOR PEACE BARELY HEARD ABOVE JANGLE OF ARMS FOR THE NEXT WAR

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is good that we have provided a forum for a visitor from the other side of the world to talk about peace, even though he has some difficulty making himself heard above the jangle of arms, the swish of jet planes, and the angry bickering about whether a certain type airplane can deliver atom bombs the necessary distance.

The voice of Pandit Nehru, Prime Minister of India, is the still small voice of spiritual values in a mad world and, sad to relate, it is almost as if he were a visitor from another planet speaking a language that nobody can understand.

Why has not some one of our own leaders in this Nation with the greatest potential moral influence in the world said the very simple truths that he spoke at Columbia University—that mankind can never get peace by dividing up the world into two armed camps, that peace does not come through armament races, that peace is not possible so long as we do not provide for the simple, daily needs of human beings all over the world and lift the pall of poverty and hunger and fear?

WHY NOT MR. TRUMAN?

Why not President Truman, who knows these truths and could speak with a voice that would be heard all over the world?

It would be most interesting to know what our Indian visitor really thinks of us at this moment as we are presented to him in the noises that go on about him wherever he goes in our country.

When he spoke here before Congress the Army and Navy were at each other's throats in a nearby committee room pursuing that war of the Pentagon, so that the headlines were full of talk about "the next war."

TAKES THE LONG LOOK

While Pandit Nehru was here, too, angry and embittered men in a committee room were trying to stop the bill to increase the number of desperate, homeless, displaced persons from Europe who might come here where there's so much room to make a new start for themselves, which somehow seems a contradiction of those words on the Statue of Liberty about a haven which is the first thing that visitors to our shores see. That bill now is held up until next year.

Our visitor is saying frankly some things that indicate he is discovering our current attitude and mood, of which we can't be very proud, and of which it is well for us to be reminded by someone from afar who can take the long look, such as:

"The very process of marshaling the world into two hostile armed camps precipitates the conflict which it is sought to avoid. It produces a sense of terrible fear and that fear darkens men's minds and loads them into wrong courses. There is perhaps nothing so bad and so dangerous in life as fear. As a great President of the United States said, there is nothing really to fear except fear itself.

"Our problem, therefore, becomes one of lessening fear and ultimately putting an end to this fear. That will not happen if the world takes sides and talks of war. War becomes almost certain then."

A point well taken. Right here in Congress we vote seventeen billions for Army and Navy without the bat of an eye and quarrel like angry cats about comparatively negligible sums for hospitals and schools and the more enduring bases for peace and happiness.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

NEHRU CALLS ON WORLD TO CAST OUT FEAR AND BRING COLD WAR TO END

NEW YORK.—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India called on the world last night to cast out fears and bring the cold war to an end.

He said it could be done through the teachings of Mohandas K. Gandhi, apostle of nonviolence who led India to independence and then was slain.

Mr. Nehru told 1,600 persons at a public dinner in his honor that the world is suffering from a "fear complex."

Fear, he said, is a contagious thing: "One nation gets afraid and the other gets afraid, and the fear rises and makes deplorable consequences."

SAYS INDIA IS UNAFRAID

Mr. Gandhi, he said, made his people unafraid and as a result they could "look evil in the face" and finally became free. Even today, he said, India is unafraid—"not only have we not got an atom bomb, we rejoice in not having an atom bomb."

India has refused to take sides in the cold war. Mr. Nehru said last night that is because his people want to be "left in peace to work out our problems."

He assured his audience that his country will not be isolationist—that it "has to play an important role" in world affairs.

This trip to the United States has been "completely justified" by the warm welcome he received in his first 8 days in this country, Mr. Nehru said, and by the new understanding of American views he will take back with him.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced Mr. Nehru to the audience, which paid $12.50 a plate to dine and hear him.

MIGHT LEAD TO PEACE

Mrs. Roosevelt described Mr. Nehru as a man who might "help to lead us into a period of peace and better living," and urged those who heard him to be "ambassadors to carry his message to as many persons as possible."

The dinner, in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, was sponsored by the American Institute of Pacific Relations, Indian League of America, East and West Association, and the Foreign Policy Association.

Mr. Nehru will speak here again tonight, addressing a dinner meeting in his honor sponsored by the National Foreign Trade Council and the Far East American Council of Commerce and Industry. He will fly to Boston tomorrow morning on another leg of his good-will tour of America.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

ON THE OTHER HAND—NEHRU'S MESSAGE TO AMERICA DOES NOT TOUCH OUR JITTERY CONGRESS

(By Lowell Mellett)

A wise man came out of the East the other day and rode up Broadway. New York turned out to meet him in the manner our greatest city reserves for persons who have deeply stirred the emotions of the population. Crowds cheered and applauded, the press reports, with an enthusiasm seldom seen on such occasions.

Yet this is a man about whom most Americans know very little, a man whose name very few have even attempted to pronounce—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, disciple and successor to Mahatma Gandhi, martyred apostle of peace.

Before the day was done, the visitor delivered the message he had brought to the American Government and the American people. He answered the question uppermost in the mind of the Government at least: Where does India, or he as India's leader, stand in the cold war between the United States and Russia? The answer, in effect, is that India wants no part of that war.

REFLECTS WORLD'S EXPERIENCE

Nehru may not be all-wise, but he was reflecting the whole world's experience when he said:

"The very process of marshaling the world into two hostile camps precipitates the conflict which it is sought to avoid. It produces a sense of terrible fear and that fear darkens men's minds and leads them into wrong courses. There is nothing perhaps so bad and so dangerous in life as fear. * * *

"Our problem, therefore, becomes one of lessening and ultimately putting an end to this fear. That will not happen if all the world takes sides and talks of war. War becomes almost certain then."

This was not said by the spokesman for a fat and contented land, free of the troubles and problems that beset other countries. No country is faced with more danger, from within and without, than India. But, said Nehru, "I do believe, in accordance with my master's teaching, that there is another way to meet this situation and solve the problem that faces us."

Even as he talked the elected representatives of the American people were bringing to a grotesque climax the consequences of the fears Nehru deplored. A jittery Congress was engaged in forcing on the President and his administration the expenditure of vastly more money for national defense than the President had asked for or was prepared to spend. Scrap the plan for a 48-group Air Force, Congress told the President; give us 58 groups. Congress, says Congress, knows best. Anyhow, Congress is scared and isn't taking any chances. Who are these people in the Military Establishment that refuse to join us in our jitters? Bring 'em in, we'll show 'em. Fifteen billion dollars? Make it seventeen.

The man from India must find the mood of our highest law-making body anything but reassuring. He knows what it will mean to his country if fear rules the decisions made in Russia and the United States. India will be caught squarely in the middle of the resulting conflict and the independence achieved by peaceful patience will be lost more quickly than it was gained. He can only hope that one of the two contending countries will listen as he says:

"The colossal expenditure of energy and resources on armaments that is an outstanding feature of many national budgets today does not solve the problem of world peace. Perhaps even a fraction of that outlay in other ways and for other purposes will provide a more enduring basis for peace and happiness."

Congress is going home now to cool off. Perhaps as it does so it will see some significance in the warmth of the welcome given to India's man of peace as he rode through the main street of New York.

Challenge to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Challenge to Freedom," delivered by Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president, American Watch Workers Union, before the Illinois-Eastern Iowa district convention of Kiwanis International, at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on September 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

When one speaks to a group of Kiwanians, or the members of any other of the service clubs in existence in America, one cannot help but get the feeling that here is the true America which most of the world knows nothing about. The true purpose of a service club is good fellowship, understanding your neighbor, extending a helping hand to those that need help, and understanding human nature.

The trouble with most of us in America is that we utilize too many catch phrases and fail to realize the true meaning of words. When we disagree with someone, we tag them with a name. When we disagree with a group, we put a name on them that is disagreeable. We refuse to look at the other fellow's viewpoint from his eyes as well as our own. We do this in business; we do it more in politics and in the operation of our Government. We call names without realizing the effect of it. It is time in America that we understood what the challenges to freedom are. Calling names does not accomplish anything. It's time for action; it's time for constructive action in fighting those things which challenge our freedom.

This summer, I had the opportunity to visit eight European countries—England, Scotland, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. In 60 days, I had the opportunity to go through 73 industrial plants and watch the citizens of those countries at work. I had the chance, and took advantage of it, to look over their living conditions; the stores in which they made their purchases; the places where they entertained themselves; and I can assure you that no college education could give to a man the understanding of economics that I was able to view first-hand. Communism is not rampant in those countries, but the reactionary forces which do not give men and women the chance to live as middle-class have set the stage through corruption and bankruptcy in government for the Soviet Union to move in.

For the first time in my life, I believe I know what communism means. It does not mean what we in America commonly believe it to mean. It is not the philosophy of Karl Marx; it is not the philosophy that the planned economists are selling in England and are selling here at home. Communism is a catch word by which planned economists destroy government.

Justifiably, at this point, you say "What else could communism mean?" To find the true answer to what communism means, one must talk to men and women who have left the countries behind the iron curtain, and who are today the floating population of European countries. Persons who would rather be without a home, rather than comply with the system which was being instituted by the Soviet Union.

Most everybody refers to the home of communism as Russia and considers it an ideology that people of their own free choice vote for and adopt as a form of government; nothing could be further from the truth.

Every Soviet official in the Berlin zone resents being called a Russian; he wants to be known as a member of the Soviet Union, and because he wears the uniform of a Soviet Union does not mean that he is a Russian, for he might be a member of any of the nations that are now under the control of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is an economic system which is entirely controlled by the Politburo. In English-speaking language, the Politburo is the executive committee or the steering committee; the group that is in complete control.

The group that is in control of the Soviet Union is the equivalent of the czar of yesterday, the king of the early centuries, the emperor of yesteryear.

In order to properly understand the authority and control of this group, one must go back in history to the days before the Magna Carta of King John, when the divine rule of kings was assumed by human beings. The authority of this controlling group is as absolute over their subjects as the authority of Queen Antoinette.

The first rule of the Soviet Union is obedience. If a citizen of the lands under the control of the Soviet Union acquiesces to complete control of his mind and body, he will have no problems with the controlling group. This means that he shall work where he is told, live where he is told, eat where he is told, and have his planned recreation where he is supervised. If he is willing to do this, he will be fed and clothed; if not, he must face the same terrors that many persons did in the years before the Magna Carta.

This small group that is in control demands obedience to their control in the same manner that kings demanded it of their subjects in previous years. And because they recognize that the human mind, when it becomes educated, refuses to be herded, the controllers of the Soviet Union have installed their own method of education for their subjects.

Within this method of education there can be no meetings of men like Kiwanians and Rotarians. There can be no religion where men can worship their God in their own way, for religion represents a threat to the authority of the state, and these men can tolerate no challenge to their authority. There can be no free use of textbooks and literature which has been handed down through the ages, for varying viewpoints might give men the use of reason to doubt the system. There can be no choice of the listener in the type of music he would want to hear, for music sometimes stirs men to action, to challenge injustices.

There can be no social gatherings or sports affairs without government supervision, for when men and women get together without such supervision they might organize for action to challenge the injustices which their minds can observe.

The challenge of control of the mind is what the Soviet Union is most concerned with, and within the iron curtain today one conforms to the control of the mind or one does not continue to exist.

Contrast this totalitarian way with what the illusionary lefts within our Nation and other countries of the world paint the picture of the philosophy of Karl Marx, with all its contradictions, as a means to better the lot of human beings to be.

It is interesting to note here that the fight for freedom of minds, freedom of religion, freedom of education, freedom of opportunity has only made headway and real headway for less than 300 years. Monarchies existed throughout this world everywhere less than 300 years ago. Starting with the Magna Carta of King John in the thirteenth century, and every living person in the world ought to read that Magna Carta and truly understand it for the living document which it is, and continuing on with the French Revolution and the Revolutionary War of the United States, and so on for the next 150 years, have men become freemen and allowed to select their own governments.

One must realize that the exploitation of man by governments continues even now after World War II through the use of the colonies in Africa by foreign governments.

The rulers of the Soviet Union are as much absolute monarchs as any humans that were ever in control of any government. What the long-haired men and the short-haired women who wander throughout the United States preaching the gospel of communism fail to tell is that they themselves have no understanding of how the Soviet Union rules and what it stands for.

The Soviet Union does not want the citizens of any nation to freely vote to annex themselves to their form of government, for such a free choice would make it too difficult to install their system into being in any nation.

The Soviet Union wants to expand its system and intends to expand its system by the default of governments which become corrupt or bankrupt.

They are willing to wait for their opportunity, as they waited for World War II to develop. They planned, they worked with Hitler to start World War II; they were his allies. And after they got him in, they turned on him and joined the Allies, and then became the only victors of World War II, for war-devastated countries like Poland, eastern Germany, and the Balkan countries had no choice but to accept the rule of occupation, and with that rule of occupation came obedience to the Soviet Union. When you consider the expansion of the influence of the Soviet Union, one only then can realize the price that we have paid in World War II in settling the peace.

The Soviet Union can only expand its system by natural boundaries. It cannot skip a nation and annex another nation; it cannot skip western Germany and take over Belgium or Holland; it cannot take Italy and forget about Greece; it cannot move in on Korea and forget about China; it cannot take over Persia and not have India.

The Soviet Union must extend its control by natural boundaries. It must have western Germany if it is to control Belgium, Holland, France, and the British Isles. It must have Finland if it is to have the Scandinavian countries, as it must have Greece if it is to have Italy. That is why China is so important to it in the Asiatic nations.

As it extends its control, it removes its trade and its economics from the free markets of the world. Its only purchases are those materials which it needs to supplement its own production, and as its sphere of influence moves on, these needs become less.

The Soviet Union is an economic system ruled by absolute monarchs who are willing to wait for governments to become corrupt or bankrupt so that they can move in, and we in the United States had better realize what those two words mean if we are to combat the extension of influence of the Soviet Union.

To take loyalty oaths, to profess allegiance to our flag, to tell ourselves we are good Americans, and then pursue economic policies which will bankrupt our country, plays right into the hands of the Soviet Union.

What do I mean by this? When a nation starts taxing its citizens to the breaking point, that is when those citizens turn against their form of government, and no nation can owe money without some day paying it back to those from whom it borrows. No nation can have a centralized government without shutting out of its government the abilities and minds of many men and women at the local and State leval who have no opportunity to contribute abilities or intelligence to the functions of government.

The leaders of the Soviet Union well know that a strong centralized government functioning over several generations, destroys the participation in government of the citizens of that government, and that the laws of the land are left in the control of a few; and whether or not we like it, 435 Congressmen and 96 United States Senators are only a few out of 150,000,000 people. It is impossible for 531 men to be experts in all the fields which our Government participates in, as it is impossible for administrative officials to be practical men in all the fields they administrate in.

A centralized government always controls and never regulates. The true function of the Constitution of the United States was to bind us together as a free people for the pursuit of happiness. The pursuit of happiness, as we understand it, means freedom of action for its citizens in conformance with sound regulations that bring about a good society.

The pursuit of happiness means to me just that. It means the pursuit of education, the pursuit of religion, the pursuit of opportunity—and I emphasize the word "pursuit." It does not mean necessarily that the pursuit means the realization or the accomplishment of the objective. The planned economists believe it is the function of government to take care of one from the cradle to the grave, regardless of one's initiative or intelligence. To me the function of government means that all should take care of themselves except those that are old and indigent. Those that are able-bodied should work within the framework of the capitalistic system to achieve productivity and to carry their own weight in the boat.

The founding fathers of our country recognized this and spelled it out so carefully in our Constitution. The Constitution provided for strong State governments and strong community government. No group from within or without could ever take over the United States with 48 strong State governments and strong community governments within those States. But, when we surrender the right to rule ourselves to our Federal Government, we turn over our rights and prerogatives to a Federal Government so far removed from our control.

The advocates of the Soviet Union want us to have strong federal government, for they realize that with a strong federal government which will give away and dissipate its assets, that they then can undermine that government.

If you are careful to observe those members of the illusionary left, you will note that they are for the Government controlling everything. They want the Federal Government to control health insurance, housing, banks, our economic system, for they want the Federal Government to be bankrupt. They do not want housing projects financed within the community; they do not want local privately run insurance and hospitalization plans; they do not want the banks to be locally owned and regulated by the Government. They want everything controlled at the top level where the people can't observe the operation and can't put the checks and balances that a democratic people should always have on their Government.

How can we, as a nation, give leadership to the other nations of the world in the fight against extension of influence of the Soviet Union if we do not maintain a sound economy here at home? No economy can be sound unless it is on a pay-as-you-go basis. A nation such as our cannot fight a war such as World War II without paying for it. Who in America has made any sacrifice to pay the cost of World War II other than those who died and were wounded on the battlefields. Many billions of dollars were spent to win the war, and we still owe those billions of dollars, and we go on in our heyday of spending more and more every day.

We all want more services in our Government and we think that it's all right to run up the bill. We are devastating our economy; we are milking corporate enterprise so that it can no longer maintain alert engineering and research facilities. We are milking corporate enterprise so that it can no longer attract new working capital to finance its inventories and accounts receivables, as well as expansion of its facilities.

The planned economists advocate to the worker: Produce less and get more, raising the prices of goods beyond our reach. We insist that our Government make payments to people who are able-bodied and who can afford to do without such payments. We insist that our Government give help to many who do not come in the category of the aged and the indigent.

Yes, we're for making every man a king without realizing that every king had subjects to provide for him. We in the United States have no subjects. If we are to receive, we must produce. If we receive from our Government, we must pay for it, and government is no different than individuals are; when you borrow, you must repay.

If everyone in the United States realizes this, we would then insist on the return of the functions of government to where we could do something about it, and that is properly in the hands of our community and State governments.

The words "Federal aid" should disappear from our language. The function of our Federal Government should be to regulate abuses, whether those abuses fall in the field of industry, labor, or agriculture. Government's function should never be the distributor of funds. We must not take away from those who have to provide for those who have not by confiscatory taxation. Abraham Lincoln spelled out the way when he said, if you see a house that you like that a neighbor owns, don't tear it down but build one yourself. There is enough opportunity in America for everyone to progress if they are willing to work for it; and the power of taxation is what we fought the Revolutionary War over, and the power of taxation, when it becomes confiscatory, destroys the foundations of government.

The power of taxation and the way it is being utilized today in the United States is confiscatory. Chapter 102 of the Internal Revenue Act does not allow enough to any concern for depreciation so that it can maintain a modern, up-to-date plant, with new technological improvements, new machinery, and up-to-date know-how.

Our Federal income taxes today destroy the initiative of men of brains and talent so that they do not want to exert themselves to create new ventures which create jobs. Our Federal income taxes today do not permit corporations to earn enough profit so that they can pay dividends and plow back enough earnings to attract new working capital. This can be easily proved by taking the assets of many of the corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and you can buy these corporations outright for less than the quick assets or the break-up value of those companies.

When corporate enterprise cannot obtain new money to finance its inventories, its accounts receivables, and its expansions, it means that it cannot create new jobs, and it means that our economy is deteriorating, regardless of the optimistic statements of men high in our Government.

When an economy deteriorates and cannot provide new jobs, it means unemployment. Much unemployment means depressions. Depressions mean chaos in government; that's when the agents of the Soviet Union move in to take over. And when you have a centralized government, all you have to move in are a few men in key places and it's all over but the shouting. That's why the men and women of America must become cognizant toward their responsibility to their own Government, and we must work toward the end of strong community government and strong State governments.

Whether you're working in a factory or an office worker, or on a farm; whether you're management or a banker, you have a stake in seeing to it that we have sound government that is neither corrupt nor bankrupt, for if you don't, regardless of all the breast-beating you may do as to your loyalty to our form of government, you are surrendering the only weapon that you have to combat the extension of the influence of the Soviet Union.

What is true here for us is more true for the peoples of Europe, for they have never enjoyed a capitalistic system with a virile labor movement working within its framework to create a great middle class. The rich get richer, the poor get poorer in European countries, and all the aid that we can give through the Marshall plan isn't going to aid the people to become middle class, and if we are to prevent an extension of the influence of the Soviet Union in European countries, it is imperative that as religion sent their missionaries to teach Christianity, that the labor movement of America and corporate enterprise of America teach cooperative capitalism to the peoples of Europe.

As we in America built our economy on cooperative capitalism, which simply means prosperous corporate enterprise which pays adequate dividends to the stockholder, adequate salaries to management for furnishing the brains of direction, a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, with the accompanying job security that a prosperous enterprise can give to employees, and lowered prices to the consumer through high productivity on the part of management and labor, so must we teach the peoples of Europe the way to achieve economic security.

To build modern plants in Europe is not enough, you must have an economic system there that creates a middle class with consumer income to purchase consumer goods. Of what value is it to a man to work 48 hours in a week on a nice new machine and then find that he does not have enough money to eat, let alone dress himself and his family. That is the exact fate of the peoples of Europe today, and unless something is done, and done soon, to educate the working man and woman of Europe as to what a virile labor movement can accomplish at the collective bargaining table for them, all we will have accomplished in this postwar world is to set up modern plants with new roads and public works for the Soviet Union to move into.

As one who believes in the capitalistic system and is firmly convinced that Government's function is to serve the people, not to boss them, I reiterate to you that the influence of the Soviet Union cannot be extended unless we ourselves in western Europe and in North and South America allow our governments to become bankrupt or corrupt. We can't let it happen if we are to preserve the gains that free men and women have made since the days of the Magna Carta.

Legislation Benefiting Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on behalf of legislation benefiting our postal employees:

It is a pleasure for me to speak in the interest of our worthy postal workers. I have long been interested in their welfare, and it is my hope that legislation will be enacted which would permit them to enjoy a higher standard of living—a standard becoming to those in their country's employ.

Before entering Congress I was well aware of their many problems. Since taking my oath of office on February 28 I have been in frequent touch with the representatives of the postal employee groups in various sections of the country, especially in the Greater New York area. During the last few months I have held regular conferences with heads of the various postal organizations. It has been a pleasure to associate with them and to have the benefit of their opinions on matters relating to the welfare of their members.

Here in Washington I find that the National Federation of Post Office Clerks commands the respect of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Long before the United States Government inserted no-strike provisions in laws affecting Federal and postal employees, their labor organizations had voluntarily given up all rights to engage in strikes. Thus, the postal employees are without, what labor regards, a most effective weapon.

Also, they are prohibited from engaging in political activity. Congress, therefore, is the principal forum to which postal employees can go for relief on major issues.

The task of making their wants known in the matter of wages and conditions of employment is, to put it conservatively, most difficult. They must rely upon their reputation as hard workers and as loyal citizens to win the support of those who have the power to grant their requests. These are some of the limitations under which they and their organizations must operate. Because of this fact, it is up to us, the Congress, to see that they are treated justly and fairly. I am anxious that their hopes be realized, and their natural and justified aspirations not be ignored.

At the present time, there are pending before this committee many postal bills worthy of immediate consideration. Many of my colleagues and I have been striving to insure their enactment into law before this session of Congress adjourns. I am especially interested in helping the employees obtain a salary increase of at least $650 per annum.

Postal salaries have not been adjusted adequately to meet the present inflationary prices. Last year, in order to restore the prewar purchasing power of the postal employees, a minimum salary increase of $800 was absolutely necessary. However, the Eightieth Congress passed a bill providing an increase of only $450. It will be recalled that when President Truman signed the bill, he expressed disappointment at this small amount and indicated that, when the opportunity would again arise, he would support a more adequate increase in pay. I wholeheartedly support the President in this objective. We must see to it that our postal workers are granted the purchasing power which they have lost.

I know of no more deserving group. These postal employees are young family men trying to meet their obligations on an annual salary of $2,550 which is totally inadequate to meet today's cost of living. The members of this committee should be interested in knowing that as against the average of August 15, 1939, the following changes have taken place, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (the figure 100 represents the cost of living index for 1935–39):

It is clear that all items of expense have gone up. The most urgent necessities, which all families must have, with the exception of rent, have gone up most. The small increase granted the postal workers during the Eightieth Congress has become obsolete and inadequate by the turn of events.

Trained personnel are being lost throughout the Post Office Department because of the low pay scales. During 1947, 3,687 postal employees were separated from the Chicago post office due to resignations and other causes. An indication of the financial loss to the Government of this kind of turn-over can be seen when we consider that it cost at least $15 to add and subtract each of these persons from the Federal pay roll. This adds up to a loss of $55,505 for Chicago alone. During the fiscal year 1949, throughout the country (excluding the railway mail service), 22,346 postal employees were separated from the postal service, and it cost the Government $335,190 to add and subtract this number of employees from the rolls.

Another legislative item which is deserving of consideration by this committee is that of longevity legislation on behalf of those clerks, carriers, supervisors, and mail handlers rounding out 25, 30, and in many cases more than 40 years of service. In 1945, a law was enacted by Congress creating three longevity grades of $100 each for these older employees. However, it was found that the service already given was disregarded.

	Aug. 15, 1939	Mar. 15, 1949
All homes	98.5	169.5
Food	93.5	201.6
Apparel	100.3	193.9
Rent	104.3	120.1
Fuel, electricity, etc.	97.5	138.9
Housefurnishings	100.6	193.8
Miscellaneous	100.4	154.4

A further matter which I wish to discuss is that of vacation and sick leave as regards postal employees. All other United States Government employees get 26 days' annual vacation and 15 days' sick leave. I am in wholehearted accord with this privilege and deem it necessary to the high morale essential to their occupations and to the health and to the well-being of themselves and their families. However, postal employees receive only 15 days' annual vacation and 10 days' sick leave. I see no reason whatever for this discriminatory treatment. Postal workers are certainly entitled to the same privileges in the matter of vacations and sick leave as all other Federal employees. This is an old and manifest injustice.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the problem of keeping good men on the job at the top levels of the Government. We should not forget that there is also a problem of keeping good men on the job at the lower levels. If given a fair opportunity, many of these men now at the lower levels will continue to give the Federal Government loyal, devoted, and efficient service for many years to come. By eliminating some of the injustices now present, we will help induce competent men to remain in the postal service. I strongly urge this committee to take immediate action and report out legislation which will correct these intolerable conditions and strengthen and improve our postal service.

There Is No Question But What Air Force Secretary Symington Yesterday Made One of the Most Convincing of All Statements Heard to Date by the House Armed Services Committee in the Matter of the Army-Navy-Air Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, today's press headlines advise that Russia's Andrei Y. Vishinsky states that the atomic bomb has been a real Russian weapon since 1947.

Another headline tells that the United States Government has ordered a speed-up in the production of the atom bomb.

Still another headline reads as follows:

Symington reaffirms B–36 faith; hits critics; Air Force Secretary defends strategic atomic bombing.

All of the above are front-page articles carried in today's issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that after we in Congress have appropriated sums running into the billions for the production and development of atom bombs, having voted in this fiscal year alone more than a billion and a quarter dollars for their further manufacture and production, that from top flight United States naval officers now comes a sharp criticism and statements that atom bombs are not alone largely ineffectual but that their use in strategic warfare is not only ineffective but immoral as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress yesterday sent to the White House a bill appropriating the huge sum of $15,585,000,000 for this fiscal year, the most stupendous sum ever voted in peacetime for the defense of this or any other nation in the history of the world.

The Committee on Armed Services of this House is at this time holding a series of hearings on one of the most important subject matters which ever came before that committee.

Within a few hours, if not minutes, this House will adjourn sine die.

The important testimony rendered by the Secretary of the Air Force at the committee hearings of yesterday, and the all-important testimony given to our committee by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as well as the testimony of the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, will not be published nor will it be available for use by the Members of the House for some weeks to come.

Because of the national interest in this controversy, I include the statements

made by Secretary Symington before the House Armed Services Committee.

The statement of the Secretary of the Air Force is as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. STUART SYMINGTON, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING THE B-36 AND RELATED MATTERS, OCTOBER 18, 1949

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have already once testified in these hearings, as have the responsible military leaders of the Air Force, each of the latter giving to this committee and to the public his views on the matters which lie within his professional competence. It would be fruitless to indulge in repetition at length of what has already been said by me and by these Air Force leaders.

I have followed in detail the testimony which has been given before this committee during the last 2 weeks. The assertions that have been made are not new. For many years these assertions have been presented to various levels in the structure of the Military Establishment, up to the very top. In considerable measure they have not been accepted as the basis of national military policy, and the decisions not to accept them have been deliberately and thoughtfully arrived at by the persons who have the responsibility of decision.

During this period these assertions have also been carried to the public, through the various channels available; and from sources sometimes disclosed, sometimes undisclosed. If these matters are to be discussed in public, it is well that the discussion should take place before this committee, where a full presentation of all views is guaranteed.

One series of assertions that have been made in the last 2 weeks deal with the structure of the Nation's armed forces, particularly with reference to equipment for conducting offensive bombing operations against the industrial sources of an enemy's war-making capacity. This attack, similar to the attacks of recent years, has now focused upon the B-36 and the functions for which it is designed.

It has been said that: First, the Nation should not equip itself with the means of conducting an atomic offensive because an atomic offensive is militarily unsound, and also immoral. Second, that the B-36 cannot do the job of delivering the atomic bomb, even if it were desirable to conduct an atomic offensive. Third, it has been repeatedly suggested that the Air Force believes in, and advocates, the concept of a "blitz," overnight war. And fourth, again the specter of irregularities in B-36 procurement has been encouraged to walk through the halls of Congress. I will take up this latter point first.

When I last appeared before you, the committee was near the end of its investigation on the procurement of the B-36; and shortly afterwards you passed your resolution exonerating the Air Force of all charges raised in the anonymous document.

On October 5, when you opened the second phase of your investigation, the distinguished Member from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] made the following statement: "This whole thing, I think, as far as the public is concerned, and the welfare of our people, and the security of the Nation, has been more or less unfortunate. We have disposed thoroughly, I think, of items 1 and 2 on the agenda. I am glad that that chaff has been blown clear out."

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that some of that chaff has blown back in again.

I refer to the charge, recently made and repeated, that I went over the head of the Secretary of Defense in authorizing the purchase of additional B-36 airplanes.

In reply to this misstatement, may I refer you to the previous testimony given to this committee by myself and by other Air Force witnesses. In the history of B-36 procurement, presented to you by Gen. F. H. Smith, Jr., he went into great detal to describe facts regarding the purchase of additional B-36 airplanes. These facts are in the record and are available to anyone interested in knowing the truth.

Those who were surprised at learning on January 12 of the Air Force intention to order 39 more B-36 airplanes should have looked up the facts. They had no reason to expect a cut-back, instead of an increase, in the B-36 program because the Air Force had decided as far back as June 24, 1948, to continue the original contract in full. That was promptly told Secretary Forrestal, was known throughout the industry, and certainly was no secret kept from anybody who professed interest in this airplane.

I, myself, learned of the recommendation of the senior officers board to purchase additional B-36's just 5 days before anybody could have read it in the newspapers, since the Air Force board, in which the recommendation originated, only closed its proceedings January 6.

The certification procedure set up by the Secretary of Defense stipulated that the purchase of all aircraft by the Air Force, and also by the Navy, must be approved by the President before funds appropriated under Public Law 547—the fiscal year 1948 supplemental appropriations bill—can be released. This fact, known to any interested person, in the Navy as well as in the Air Force, meant not only that it was necessary for the Air Force to obtain the approval of Secretary Forrestal to purchase additional B-36 airplanes, or any other type airplane, but also that Mr. Forrestal had to make a written recommendation for such purchase to the President. In other words the procedure required that the approval of both the President and the Secretary of Defense be obtained.

In accordance with this procedure, the Air Force request for the release of funds was submitted to Mr. Forrestal in an official document on January 28, 1949. The Secretary of Defense in turn forwarded the Air Force request to the Research and Development Board, to the Munitions Board, and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for comment and recommendation. All three agencies are joint boards on which the Navy is represented; and this procedure is also a prerequisite to the purchase of any Navy plane.

In addition, General Vandenberg informed the Joint Chiefs of Staff on January 19 of the Air Force intention to increase the number of B-36 bombardment groups in the fiscal year 1950 budget program from 2 to 4; and to make a corresponding reduction in the medium group program.

Mr. Forrestal also personally discussed this matter of more B-36 planes with Dr. Karl Compton, Chairman of the Research and Development Board; and with General Eisenhower, before passing on to the President his own recommendation for purchase.

The President in turn submitted the proposal to the Bureau of the Budget for review; and later it was referred back again to General Eisenhower, who was then acting as advisor to Mr. Johnson, who had just replaced Mr. Forrestal as Secretary of Defense. It was only after the President had received comments and recommendations from all the many individuals and agencies referred to above that he approved the release of the necessary funds on April 8.

Apart from this formal and, in my opinion, far too complicated certification procedure, I had frequent occasion to discuss the B-36 program with Mr. Forrestal, and kept him constantly informed of our plans with regard to that airplane. My views regarding the improvement in its performance were made known to Mr. Forrestal, in writing, as far back as May 1948, and were repeated to him on the numerous occasions this matter came up for discussion. He followed closely the performance growth of this plane.

A similar procedure was also followed later in the case of the second purchase of 36 additional B-36's which brought our total B-36 purchases for the fiscal year 1949 to 75 airplanes.

It should be obvious that the 3 months during which the entire Military Establishment was on notice of the Air Force intention to buy additional B-36 airplanes was ample time for anybody to make his views known to the Secretary of Defense. In addition, all three services are represented on the joint agencies required to pass on requests for the release of aircraft procurement funds. That makes it not only possible, but mandatory for each service to be informed of any plans regarding the B-36.

Based on these facts, Mr. Chairman, already made known to your committee, as part of the record, the charge that the Air Force went over the head of the Secretary of Defense in the purchase of these additional B-36 airplanes is not only untrue—it just doesn't make sense.

Now as to the equally false story that the Air Force is putting all its eggs in one basket by overemphasizing strategic bombing through the purchase of too many B-36 bombers.

This assertion is also ridiculous on the face of it. In previous testimony I pointed out that only 4 out of 48 groups are to be equipped with B-36 bombers. (Two of the six reconnaissance groups take reconnaissance B-36's, but there has been no criticism of this plane for that purpose.)

In any 58- or 70-group structure, the Air Force still plans to have four B-36 bomber groups, totaling 120 planes, plus 39 reserve planes to preserve unit equipment strength; or a grand total of 159 bombers.

On the basis of any contemplated group structure, therefore, a maximum of 8 percent of all groups would be equipped with B-36 bombers.

In previous testimony during these hearings I said, "As of July 20 the Air Force plan under consideration provided for the procurement of 5,309 planes during fiscal year 1949, 1950, and 1951. Of these 5,309 planes only 154, or 2.9 percent, are B-36's. Because of its size and performance, the B-36 costs more than most airplanes, yet the estimated costs of these 154 strategic bombers is but 16.3 percent of the estimated cost of all 5,309 Air Force planes just mentioned."

I further pointed out at that time that upon mobilization, more than 80 percent of the Air Force would consist of groups primarily equipped for purposes other than strategic bombardment.

In recent testimony by a sister service, full approval was given to the purchase of the first 100 B-36's.

I would now like to point out that the cost of all additional B-36 bombers purchased since the original contract for 100 was placed, represents less than 1¼ percent of the estimated budget of the Military Establishment for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

That figure cannot but be impressive, not only because it so completely destroys the all-eggs-in-one-basket fallacy, but also because it illustrates so well the relatively very little amount of money that has been, and is, being spent on the surest way to deliver the atomic bomb or any other type bomb, against any aggressor, and from our own shores.

Recently there has been a lot of loose talk designed to catch headlines in connection with the B–36 as a billion-dollar blunder.

After the B–36 bomber program is completed, however, including all expenditures, past, present, and estimated future, the total cost of the program will be considerably less than $1,000,000,000.

To any of us, to all of us, the question must arise, "Why this bitter and continuous attack over a period of years against this one weapon, chosen and backed without reservation by the using service?"

The first additional order of B–36's was proposed last January in place of another bomber, the B–49 flying wing. The second additional quantity of B–36's was proposed last March, to replace another long-range bomber, the B–54, when the latter proved to be inferior in every way to the improved B–36.

But there was no criticism from anybody when the B–54 was ordered.

So, again, why this continuous criticism of the relatively small purchase of the B–36, the best long-range bomber known?

The answer is now obvious. Over the years nearly all critics of the growth of air power have concentrated principally in opposing one performance characteristic—range.

Back in 1936, it was decided that no Air Corps plane would be permitted to fly further than 100 miles to sea; and when one did, there was an uproar.

To the best of our knowledge, nobody has ever tried to limit or criticize the development of plane speed, or altitude, or weight-carrying capacity; but each time there is a major increase in range, the storm breaks.

Any objective person will now agree that the reason this storm is so great over the B–36 today is because it has intercontinental range.

Last March, however, the Air Force flew a B–50 bomber around the world nonstop by means of refueling; and today we have developed a new refueling system, one which I have seen work, and one which is as much an improvement over the old hose method as a modern Cadillac is over the ancient model T Ford.

This development is not surprising, because there is no more reason why an airplane cannot now be refueled in the air than a ship at sea, or a tank on the ground; and that fact should end forever the chief objection over the years to the growth of airpower—namely the growth of range.

America can never win another war on a quantitative basis.

Even if we wanted to, which surely we don't, we can't swap the life of one of ours for each soldier of the many millions under arms in the totalitarian states. American soldiers are not cogs in a dictator's machine; their lives are precious and it has never been part of our military tradition or our national philosophy to expose them carelessly even in war.

So let's continue to concentrate on America's greatest asset, quality of product, superior weapons capable of development and mass production in our system of free economy—weapons like the B–36 with its intercontinental bombing range without refueling, and other modern bombers and planes with their projected intercontinental range with refueling.

The Air Force fully realizes that the closer we can get to the enemy by means of utilizing land bases in other countries, the better the chances of speeding victory; but those bases might not be available in sufficient quantities at the start of a war.

For the relatively little money required, the ability to fight from our own shores at the start of any war should not be looked on with contempt.

Most technical developments invariably start small and then expand. As one illustration, take the telephone. At first its range was very limited but it grew steadily, and now intercontinental telephoning is routine. Equipment for the latter, however, is infinitely more complicated than what is required to just talk across town.

The significance is that in both cases, bomber range and voice extension, there was an increase in power which gave greater flexibility.

In testimony before you last summer I stated the following: "Another built up rumor is that the Air Force considers the B–36 invulnerable. That of course is sheer nonsense. No weapon of war is invulnerable. What we do say, however, is this: If the Air Force did not buy the B–36, it would have only two choices—(1) to buy an inferior bomber which would require overseas bases; or air refueling; or missions planned as one-way strikes, the latter anticipating loss of the airplane, and possibly the crew; or (2) to buy no bombers. In which case, why build bombs, especially the tremendously expensive atomic bombs?"

In this connection the United States Air Force is not the only air force which believes in this bomber. After recently inspecting the B–36, Arthur Henderson, British Secretary of State for Air, said the plane was "undoubtedly the best bomber in the world at the moment. Its performance borders on the fantastic."

Now it would be wrong for me a civilian to come before this committee and attempt to justify the B–36 or any other weapon on the basis of its capacity to perform its mission. That should be a matter for professional military men, for General Vandenberg and General LeMay and their staffs, and for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its agencies, including the Weapons System Evaluation Group.

It is my duty, however, to see that the capabilities of all our weapons are continuously and conscientiously evaluated by these men. I declare for your assurance, Mr. Chairman, and that of this committee and the country, that the men who have analyzed the capabilities of the B–36 are men of recognized military competence, with battle experience, and that they know far more about the grim business of strategic bombardment than any other group in the world today.

I have stated before my belief in the B–36 and its ability to perform its assigned task. I repeat and reemphasize my confidence in this aircraft.

In addition, however, I am sure your committee will carefully weigh the testimony of these military men who have done the strategic bombing job before; and who, if need be, are the ones who would do it again.

In closing this part of my testimony, may I respectfully request that both this committee and the public keep constantly in mind one indisputable fact—no United States bombing mission in the last war was ever stopped by enemy opposition.

Another subject before this committee, and one of paramount importance, is the place of atomic bombing in our national war plans. This is not an Air Force decision, for the Air Force is but one of three partners in the work of preparing strategic plans. It is the business of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to be passed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Commander in Chief, and coordinated with the total strength of the United States and its allies. Nevertheless, in testimony before this committee, misstatements have been made as to the position of the Air Force on strategic plans.

The first misstatement is that the Air Force proposes an "atomic blitz"—is offering a "quick, easy and painless war."

In reply I can do no better than repeat the testimony I presented before this committee last August:

"The anonymous document accuses the Air Force of fostering the idea that an atomic bombardment offensive 'can reduce warfare to a clean, quick, inexpensive and, to our side, painless procedure,' and that the B–36 could wage this type of warfare. This has now become a familiar charge.

"In the first place, the Air Force believes that the atomic bomb, plus the air power necessary to deliver it, represent the one most important visible deterrent to the start of any war. I want to repeat what General Vandenberg has said: 'The only war you really win is the war that never starts.'

"Secondly, if war comes, we believe that the atomic bomb, plus the air power to deliver it, represent the one means of unloosing prompt crippling destruction upon the enemy, with absolute minimum combat exposure of American lives. If it is preferable to engage in a war of attrition, one American life for one enemy life, then we are wrong. That is not our way. That is not the way in which the mass slaughter of American youth in an invasion of Japan was avoided. To whatever extent we can bring it about that weapons fashioned at Los Alamos, and carried in aircraft fashioned at Fort Worth, can destroy or diminish the power of an enemy to kill American soldiers, sailors, and airmen, we are for pursuing that method.

"We can hope, but no one can promise, that if war comes the impact of our bombing offensive with atomic weapons can bring it about that no surface forces ever have to become engaged. Disregarding such an illusory hope, we do know that the engagement of surface forces will take place with much greater assurance of success, and much fewer casualties to the United States and its allies, if an immediate, full-scale atomic offensive is launched against the heart of the enemy's war-making power."

That was my considered judgment then. That is my considered judgment now.

Secondly, it has been stated that the Air Force favors mass atomic bombing of civilians. That is not true.

It is inevitable that attacks on industrial targets will kill civilians. That is not an exclusive characteristic of the atomic bomb, but is an unavoidable result of modern total warfare.

Many millions of civilians were killed in Russia, although no atomic offensive was ever launched against Russia.

In our testimony during the first part of this investigation, we stated Air Force policy on the matters you are now considering. The record is clear on where the Air Force stands.

In the hearings which have taken place in the last 2 weeks, however, witnesses have made statements as to national military policy, Air Force policy, the nature and purpose of strategic bombing, and the weapons of the Air Force. The cumulative impact of these statements can be, in my judgment, misleading to the committee, to the press, and to the public.

General Vandenberg and I are answering some of these statements at this time—most of our answers being restatements of what we had already sought to make clear during the first phase of these hearings. The record should once again be set straight, however, so far as the Air Force can set it straight; and with that in mind, a point-by-point analysis of the testimony before this committee of the last 2 weeks is being made.

I will submit this analysis to the committee as soon as possible, and respectfully request that it be incorporated in the printed record of these proceedings.

There are two items of this recent testimony, however, on which I would like to comment at this time.

First is the recent testimony that a high-level joint committee had been appointed in October 1948 to appraise the results of the delivery of the atomic bomb.

When your committee members, through questioning, made effort to get further information on the subject, it was refused on the grounds of secrecy.

The questions and answers about this top-secret paper appeared to imply that the report supported those who expressed themselves as against the concept of atomic bombing.

Under the circumstances I felt it advisable to ask the chairman of that committee, Gen. H. R. Harmon, to comment on this testimony; and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will now read into the record the reply of this officer:

"On Thursday, October 13, 1949, in his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Admiral Denfeld made reference to a high-level joint committee appointed for the purpose of appraising the results of delivery, under specific war conditions, of atomic bombs.

"As chairman of the committee in question, I am very much distressed to learn that this reference, taken together with subsequent questions and answers between members of the committee and Admiral Denfeld and Admiral Hill, seem to have left the impression in press, and perhaps congressional circles that the conclusions of my committee were such as to minimize, if not discredit, the military effectiveness of the air atomic operations under consideration.

"Inasmuch as you may not have taken the time personally to read the committee's report, I feel it my duty to suggest that you do so. You will find that any impression of ineffectiveness as concerns the atomic bombing is wholly at variance with the conclusions of the committee.

"H. R. HARMON,
"Lieutenant General, USAF."

The day after the Harmon report was referred to before your committee, a newspaper columnist wrote, "Considerable pressure, it was said, was brought on General Harmon to change his views, but he refused."

A letter from General Harmon in comment on that statement, which I would also like to place in the record, reads as follows:

"I understand there has come to your attention an article by Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times, of October 14, 1949, concerning Admiral Denfeld's statement before the House Armed Services Committee on October 13.

"Admiral Denfeld made guarded reference to the report of a Joint Army-Navy-Air Force Committee of which, as you know, I was chairman.

"Mr. Baldwin in his article elaborates this subject, implies the report of the committee was damaging to the Air Force and goes on to state, 'Considerable pressure, it was said, was brought on General Harmon by the Air Force to change his views, but he refused.'

"It is to be noted that in the statement quoted above, Mr. Baldwin uses the qualifying words, 'it was said.' Whoever said it, lied. At no time before, during, or after the preparation of the committee's report did any officer or civilian of the Air Force, in any degree, however slight, attempt to guide, direct, or influence me in my approach to, or solution of, the problem before the committee.

"The statement which Mr. Baldwin attributes to some undisclosed source is not only completely false but it impugns the integrity of every senior officer in the Air Force. That such tactics should be used in an attempt to influence the outcome of vital national issues before the Armed Services Committee is to me a startling and disheartening revelation.

"H. R. HARMON,
"Lieutenant General, USAF."

Second, it was said in the recent testimony before this committee that "The precipitate action by the Air Force in January 1949 placed Mr. Forrestal and the Chief of Naval Operations, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the difficult and anomalous position of either going along with the Air Force plans or of repudiating them after they had been announced to the public and to the aircraft industry."

There are two grave errors in that testimony:

First, neither Mr. Forrestal nor any other official was ever put in the difficult and anomalous position claimed.

Second, had Mr. Forrestal felt himself in that position, he would not have hesitated to repudiate plans which he believed to be opposed to the national interest. To imply otherwise is to misjudge the character of a great American.

You are all now familiar with the first anonymous document; and some of your members are aware that a second anonymous document, entitled "The Strategic Bombing Myth," is now circulating throughout the country.

This second anonymous document falsifies the contents of the United States strategic bombing survey reports. Authorship of this second document is not revealed. There is a disturbing similarity, however, between the contents of this Strategic Bombing Myth and some of the testimony recently presented before this committee.

Radio Address of Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WMCA, June 10:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate this opportunity provided by the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks to talk to the people in the New York area about the men and women of the United States postal service. I have long been interested in the welfare of postal employees. It has been my hope that postal employees might enjoy a higher standard of living—a standard becoming to those in their country's employ.

Before entering Congress, I was well aware of their salary—and some of their problems. Since taking my oath of office on February 28, less than 4 months ago, I have been in frequent touch with the representatives of the postal-employee groups in the Greater New York area.

During the last few months, I have held regular conferences with Patrick J. Fitzgerald, president of Clerks' Local 10, and, David Silvergleid, president of the New York Joint Conference of Postal Employees. It has been a pleasure to associate with them and to have the benefit of their opinions on matters relating to the welfare of their members.

In Washington, I find that the National Federation of Post Office Clerks commands the respect of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Long before the United States Government inserted no-strike provisions in laws affecting Federal and postal employees, their labor organizations had voluntarily given up all rights to engage in strikes. Thus, the postal employees are without, what labor regards, a most effective weapon.

Also, they are prohibited from engaging in political activity. Congress is therefore the principal forum to which postal employees can go for relief on major issues.

The task of making their wants known in the matter of wages and conditions of employement is, to put it conservatively, most difficult. They must rely upon their reputation as hard workers and as loyal citizens to win the support of those who have the power to grant their requests. These are some of the limitations under which they and their organizations must operate. Because of this fact, I am hopeful that they are treated justly and fairly. I am anxious that their hopes be realized, that their natural and justified aspirations be not ignored.

At the present time, there are pending before Congress many postal bills worthy of immediate consideration. Many of my colleagues and I are striving to ensure their enactment into law before this session of Congress adjourns. I am especially interested in helping the employees obtain a salary increase of at least $650 per annum.

Postal salaries have not been adjusted adequately to meet the present inflationary prices. Last year, in order to restore the prewar purchasing power of the postal employees, a minimum salary increase of $800 was absolutely necessary. However, the Eightieth Congress passed a bill providing an increase of only $450. It will be recalled that when President Truman signed the bill, he expressed disappointment at this small amount and indicated that, when the opportunity would again arise, he would support a more adequate increase in pay. I wholeheartedly support the President in this objective.

Another postal objective which I am most happy to support is military credits legislation. At present, there are bills before Congress proposing that veterans of World War II be given credit for their military service in promotions. The enactment of this bill would mean that these young veterans who have entered the postal service since the end of World War II would receive increases of from one to four hundred dollars annually.

I know of no more deserving group. These postal employees are young family men trying to meet their obligations on an annual salary of $2,550, which is totally inadequate to meet today's cost of living.

Another legislative item which is deserving of attention by Congress is that of longevity legislation on behalf of those clerks, carriers, supervisors, and mail handlers rounding out 25, 30, and in many cases, more than 40 years of service.

In 1945, a law was enacted by Congress creating three longevity grades of $100 each, for these older employees. However, it was found that the service already given was disregarded.

In still another respect I find that the postal workers have made out a good case.

When I first came to Congress, it was quite a shock to learn from President Fitzgerald, of the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks, and officials of the national federation in Washington, of the discriminatory treatment in the matter of vacation and sick leave as regards postal employees. All other United States Government employees get 26 days of annual vacation and 15 days of sick leave. I am in whole-hearted accord with this privilege, and deem it necessary to the high morale essential to their occupations and to the health and to the well-being of themselves and their families. However, postal employees receive only 15 days of annual vacation and 10 days of sick leave.

I see no reason whatever for this discriminatory treatment. Postal employees are certainly entitled to the same privileges in the matter of vacations and sick leave as all other Federal employees. This is an old and manifest injustice.

In closing, let me state that I am happy to be here this evening on behalf of postal employees, and to present this subject of public interest with the cooperation of the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks, whose

president and officers are in close touch with me on all of these matters.

I want to thank the postal clerks, and carriers, mail handlers, and all other postal employees for their many friendly letters they were kind enough to send me in recent weeks.

I hope to see this session of Congress give the relief by way of salary, military credits, longevity, and other legislation which all post office people so richly deserve.

Cuban-American Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on Thursday, October 6, 1949, before the Senate Finance Committee, in opposition to S. 501, which provides for the repeal of section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I trust that this bill will not be a case of somebody treading where angels dare not, but I do know that after I get through, my plea will be only one that is very, very ethereal, and one which has but a single interest, and, that is, the building up of decent relationships between those states which we call the Americas. No one has worked longer, harder, to make the Union of the Americas come true than I have. I have been a sentimentalist about it, but I worked for years to get rid of the words "Pan American" just because I did not like it. I thought that the Union of the Americas sounded better, and put all of these states on an equality.

Without knowing a thing about the provisions of the Sugar Act, excepting for the fact that I do know the background, but being on the floor when it was considered, I do know what a time we had adopting the sugar policy which we now maintain. I do know that as far as the people out in my State, Senator BUTLER'S State, and Senator MILLIKIN'S State are concerned, that it seemed to them to be a revolutionary move when Senator Costigan tried to bring about the change in sugar policy, and I know that if the sugar policy does not work, that spirit will arise again, and we will have it in our midst once more, and I found myself very much alone among my constituents in defending what we have done.

I want to show just one thing, and that is that there was not any new plan adopted when this provision was put in the Sugar Act, that it was consistent with what has happened before, that it came at the request of the State Department and was put in the bill with the understanding not only of the State Department, but the Agriculture Department; and that Senator MILLIKIN, in supporting the bill on the floor of the Senate, made it perfectly plain that there was complete understanding that the State Department was going to have full control of the administration of this provision. Those things I will read.

Now comes, of course, the question about who is responsible and what is responsible for the change. I do not know. But the State Department evidently has changed its mind and decided that it is better to have this provision out of the law for the sake of developing better understanding between the American states than to keep it in there. And the word in regard to our Pan-American relations, our relations within the states, and the unity of the Americas, has been mentioned in connection with the good-neighbor policy.

Now I am going to just say that you cannot build any kind of a good-neighbor policy upon dishonesty, that you hurt the man who acts expediently quite as much as you hurt the victim of that expediency. Those are strong words to use here, but Cuba has got to make her way in the world by herself. She is in debt, and she has got to make loans. Does anyone think that Cuba can get a loan from honest bankers if, for example, it is pointed out that Cuba herself repudiates and defaults on claims which Cuba's own state courts grant? There is nothing that hurts a state more than a state's going back upon the actions of its own instruments of government, and when a claim has been presented in the Cuban courts, has been adjudicated, and the claim has been granted, and the court of Cuba has said that Cuba owes this money, and nothing is done about it, then Cuba's credit falls just that quickly.

We know about the rise and fall and better relations in regard to some of the other Latin-American states. We know the experience we had over the Johnson Act. We know all of these things, and we know, too, that we are trying to build a community of states here that are interested, not only in one another, but interested in seeing that their own citizens and all that stands for citizenry in each country, stands for something in the international community. So my plea is wholly that sort of a plea, Mr. Chairman.

I think that the Congress of the United States, if it repeals this provision, does a disservice to Cuba, hurts Cuba's credit in the international-finance world, and will make it impossible for her, probably, to finance her affairs in such a way that she can meet these adjudicated and properly adjudicated claims.

You have all been bankers. You know what is good paper and you know what is bad paper. But, surely, the worst paper on earth is the paper that comes to you from an individual or corporation, or, now, a nation, whose own court has acted upon it, called the claim just, and then the government refuses to do anything about it.

I do not know what was in the mind of the State Department when they asked for this provision. Probably it was to help our claimants. I do not know the name of a single claimant. I am not interested in anybody. I am interested in building up the structure of the Americas and seeing that Cuba takes her proper place in the world, but she cannot take her proper place if she repudiates what her own courts have done.

Now, then, it is necessary to just show, Mr. Chairman, by the record, how I happen to get into this discussion and the results of getting into it, and what was told the Senate of the United States when they passed this bill. And I think I remember reading the paper when the President signed the bill that the Executive said something, I should not perhaps attempt to quote it, I do not remember it exactly, it was very, very secondary, it was a newspaper report that he would not ask the State Department to enforce this provision. And then, too, I think that the State Department has not lived up to what may not be called a mandate of Congress, probably, because this is not a mandate, it is a bit of moral suasion, but nothing has been done in regard to it, which shows that the State Department has not wanted to live up to its own recommendations. That is bad for our Government. That is bad for Cuba. And that is bad for the Congress of the United States.

I think that any department that sort of ignores or brushes over or recommends or makes promises of any kind of a representative from a foreign government to change existing legislation, whether it be a diplomatic representative, or a representative of a lobbyist, that any department that does that sort of thing is not building up good will between states and decent understanding.

And that the State Department has changed its mind and decided that this is not a mandate of Congress is proved by the fact that they came here and ask you to change it. To me this shows a sort of a moral reproach that I think can be questioned.

Another thing, in the whole history of Cuba, she is more prosperous than she has ever been. In the whole history of our relations to Cuba, she stands stronger. And if there was ever a time when she could take care of her obligations, she could begin to take care of them now, take care of them by planning some kind of a claims arrangement, doing something, but just to ignore and say that she cannot do it when their own courts have adjudicated it, take no action when we know they can start action, is wrong. The history of the Mexican claims proves what can be done, and the history of Mexico's financial condition in the world is the result of what was done.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the Sugar Act I asked if Senator MILLIKIN would yield.

"Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before we leave this subject, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. In the committee report, page 4, there is the following paragraph:

"'It is the intent of the committee that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).'

"That is from the report, Senator MILLIKIN.

"My question is, the Sugar Act is administered by the Department of Agriculture. Is there a concurrence of opinion between the Department of Agriculture and the State Department in agreement with the paragraph which I have read?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. Whether there is a concurrence I cannot say, but the State Department has approved the paragraph and the Department of Agriculture has approved the bill.

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There would be only one department to pass upon what would be done to a defaulting nation and that would be the State Department.

"Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

"Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wondered about this because the question arose in the House of Representatives. The understanding is completely within the committee, is it not, that the Agriculture Department will accept the judgment of the State Department?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes; the Agriculture Department would have nothing to do with the prosecution of those claims or with the diplomatic interchanges necessary to have something done about them."

The next part that I want to get into my statement is a part where Senator CHAVEZ asks me a question, and I think it is quite important for us to see just exactly what was done when the bill was enacted.

"Senator CHAVEZ. I refer to the last paragraph of the report:

"'Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language in section 202 (e).'

"That is the language of the bill. Did the committee inquire from the same representative of the State Department whether they approved of the language?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. I have made inquiries and the State Department approves.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee have any statement in writing from the State Department?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. No; we had nothing in writing.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator think that in a matter of this importance the committee should have something in writing from the State Department? Whom in the State Department did the Senator ask to say that they approved of that particular language?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. I made inquiries of the gentlemen who are in the division of the State Department which would be concerned with matters of this kind and they told me that the State Department approved of that language.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator."

The President pro tempore said:

"May the Chair ask the Senator on that point for his opinion whether similar language appears in some other international documents?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, I shall come to that right now. I had intended reserving it until the Senator brought up this amendment. There is nothing new whatever about language of this type to protect the nationals of the United States from being discriminated against. The Trade Agreements Act under which we make our reciprocal trade agreements contains this language. I quote from the United States Code, title XIX, section 1351:

" 'The proclaimed duties and other port restrictions shall apply to imports, the growth produce or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly or indirectly, provided that the President may suspend the application to articles, the growth produce or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section.'

"Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

"Mr. PEPPER. The only concern I have about this matter is whether it imposes upon the Cuban Government and people any obligations with respect to nationals of this country which is not a reciprocal obligation upon the Government of this country with respect to the nationals of Cuba.

"Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the language of this bill which we are discussing is associated with a definite privilege which we are extending to Cuba. Whether Cuba makes the same claims with respect to any privilege that she extends to us I am not in a position to say. I do not think that this pretends to be a complete statute of reciprocity. It is not a reciprocity statute at all. It is a unilateral action in which unilaterally we confer great benefits on Cuba, and attach what seems to me to be the modest provision that our nationals shall not be discriminated against."

And then during the discussion we find that the same sort of thing is in the Philippine Trading Act.

Then Senator O'MAHONEY comes into the discussion, and he says this:

"I will say to the Senator from Florida" in answering Senator PEPPER'S question, "that it is my understanding that the provision was written into the bill at the request of the State Department. It did not come from any Members of the Senate." And there I think, he is speaking for us western Senators who are interested in western sugar. "It did not come from any Members of the Senate, or so far as I know from any Members of the House who have been interested in securing extension of the Sugar Act."

And Mr. MILLIKIN comes and says:

"The State Department initiated the inclusion of the paragraph in the bill."

Now, Mr. Chairman, you have there a record from the testimony of these gentlemen who handled the bill of Congress doing what the State Department asked them to do. If this is repealed, and it is going to be repealed, and I am not going to make any suggestion of reconsideration, because I have not that right, I am not going to talk on it on the floor of the Senate, I have made my plea, and it is simply a moral plea, it has no bearing in law or in the interpretation of the law, but I think it has great bearing upon whether we are going to make the good-neighbor policy work or not.

We have therefore to repeat the question about whether the executive department should live up to an act of Congress which they themselves asked Congress to enact, whether they are to change their minds and say that they failed, or whether they should do something about it in such a way that the interests of American citizens are properly taken care of. Everyone knows that any claimant after an action has been taken like we took in their behalf, and then that action is repealed, that those claimants stand in a very much weaker position to ever get a hearing in front of the Cuban Government than they did before the Congress of the United States mixed into the affair, and to analyze it on the basis of ordinary morals, it seems to me that the kindest thing you can do to make the good-neighbor policy work is to help Cuba to understand that the basis of all relations between nations in a democratic world will be on common consent of the people, and an outright and absolute support of an adjudicated action on the part of courts that have been set up by governments to take care of their interests, and the interests of their people, and the interests of those with whom they deal.

I thank the gentleman very much, Mr. Chairman, for listening to me and I appreciate the opportunity I have had.

Senator GEORGE. We are very glad to have you.

Senator CHAVEZ. Will you permit me a couple of minutes?

Senator GEORGE. Let me say, first, though, Senator THOMAS, while the committee tentatively approved, it was on the express condition that the committee hear from you, that you wished to present views and I would regard the matter as open before the committee entirely.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is a committee matter, and I do not want to interfere with that.

Senator MILLIKIN. As a general matter of procedure, what do you suggest we should do to help bring about a situation of honesty in the Americas so far as debts between the countries and between the nationals of countries is concerned?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I can only suggest what we have been successful in doing in the past, Mr. Chairman, and Senator MILLIKIN, and that is, to bring about a situation where both countries are willing to leave to third parties, some sort of a claims commission or something of that kind, and start definitely an attempt to restore their credit which has been injured by failure to pay off adjudicated claims. There is some difference between the Mexican claims that ran so long, but you can date the restoration of Mexico's credit in the economy of the world from the minute almost they agreed to leave to the Mexican Claims Commission the settlement of these great claims.

I have suggested to the State Department, in talking to them, that the weakness of what they are doing is that they throw morals out of the window. And under the good-neighbor policy the American States stand as the leader of those things and when once we throw morals out of the window, how in the wide world can you go to a small state which accepts in a way a code which is recognized throughout the world, that a state is not bound by any morals excepting what it makes for itself. That is our great contest with what we call Russia today, with totalitarian states. It had its origin in modern times in the doctrine laid down by Germany that there are no morals excepting what the state makes. And I witnessed the handing over of the judiciary to Hitler in Germany, and I know what it meant. The courts became political.

All of the discussion that we had in regard to the Court Packing Act was just simply a hint. We knew that our courts would not become political, but we said, "We are afraid of that sort of thing," because it was happening in the world.

If the dignity of the Cuban courts is not sustained by the Cuban Government, and the whole of the Latin-American people switch to the basis of mere expediency of governmental action—"We will pay what the government will pay," "We will live up to whatever morals the government decides are morals, but we will not be bound by any kind of consideration outside of our own government."

It is interesting to note that of all of the international law organizations that the world has, the Latin-American group is just about as well respected, just about as honorable, just about as ideal as any other group of international lawyers in the world, and they are against this sort of thing, because they want to bring about a condition where the states will respect their own institutions.

That is my plea. And as I said to Senator GEORGE, I was going to make a Sunday-school speech. I made a Sunday-school speech, and I leave it right there. But, in the economy of nations there is just nothing quite as fine as being able to live up to a moral principle which is higher than that laid down by your state, and that is what makes America great. I dislike to see us slip. I am not getting after the State Department, but if they want to take this chastisement, they are perfectly welcome to it. Thank you.

Dismantling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of dismantling.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD some facts on the subject of dismantling. I am aware of the fact that the Senate failed to act on this subject twice during the past week, and I cannot but feel that this failure to act is a result of insufficient knowledge concerning the dismantling program. I therefore submit the following facts:

Of 167 plants covered by the original Humphrey committee recommendations, 159 have been removed from the reparation list. Only eight of those plants are still to be dismantled. Because this figure appears to be so low, we are inclined to believe that dismantling is no longer important. The fact is however, that these 8 plants are the largest of their kind in Germany, that their monetary value is more than one-half of that of the 159 plants taken off the dismantling list and

that they are capable of production amounting to almost two-thirds of the total of the entire 167 plants originally considered for dismantling. Bearing those facts in mind, the importance of those eight plants can readily be seen.

The largest of the eight plants, August-Thyssen-Hütte, with a capacity of about 2,000,000 tons of pig iron, is valued at 300,000,000 deutsch-marks. Its demolition will cost 60,000,000 deutsch-marks. This plant is generally accepted to be the lowest-cost steel producer in Europe. It is ideally situated at the junction of the Ruhr and Rhine Rivers. The Humphrey committee, considering the world scarcity in steel, made a special report on this plant, urging that at least it be allowed to work for another 5 years. The United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the CIO have endorsed this recommendation. These widely diversified organizations agree that enlargement of European industrial potentiality is an absolute necessity both for world peace, world prosperity, and to relieve the United States of a very considerable burden. So why destroy the lowest-cost and largest steel production plant in Europe?

Another plant which deserves special attention is the Bochum Verein. This plant is in two parts, the highly valuable iron steel works at Bochum and an almost completely destroyed plant at Weitmar. The plant at Weitmar was taken from the dismantling list; but the urgently needed one at Bochum was ordered to be dismantled. The Bochum Verein plant is particularly important, because it is one of the few plants in Europe producing electrosteel, a commodity in great shortage and one vitally needed to allow Germany to earn her needed dollars. The third of the four plants which I wish to discuss is the Tiegelstahlwerk in Bochum. This plant is in a unique position in the German industrial machine. It is invaluable to supply the repair demands of mine and smelting works and to a lesser extent for all other branches of the industry. It was considered of such importance that it was given first priority in the very limited reconstruction that commenced immediately following the war. Even English experts classed the products manufactured here as absolutely essential. If the plant is dismantled, there will be no alternative but to rebuild another almost exactly similar.

The last plant upon which I wish to comment is the Klockner-Werk AG located in Dusseldorf. The plant is 76 years old and represents a very large group of workers, most of whom have been employed here for generations. The plant is Germany's largest producer of refined steel wire. It is and has been supplying peace requirements exclusively. It is impossible to understand the reasons why this plant has been put on the dismantling list, particularly in view of the fact that the wire industry has insufficient capacity in regard to even the conceded raw steel production. Why was the recommendation of the Humphrey committee to take this plan from the reparation list ignored? The demands of competitors in other countries, men who are acting with fine disregard for the good of the world and for the good of their own nations, is one of the reasons.

We have been told that an increase in the German industrial potential would be a great danger. The vice president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., Mr. Honeycutt, who learned the conditions of the German steel industry by personal inspection, has this to say: "I personally believe an increase of western German steel production to 15,000,000 tons in any case not dangerous but necessary with respect to world politics. The French demand for security by means of a mutilated Ruhr industry and the English fear of west Germany heavy-industry competition abroad will not change either the political or economic conditions of the world."

Mr. Stokes, a member of the British House of Commons, has said, "I believe reparations * * * are nothing but plunder." The same Mr. Stokes in a letter to the editor of the London Times of June 16, wrote, "The British steel interests were not unrepresented when the decision not to allow the export of German steel was made, which, with Europe starving for steel, was surely the height of insanity."

The British newspaper, Spectator, in its issue of May 13, said, "The most efficacious step to support the new west German Government is the stoppage of all further dismantling. * * * Even if this measure might be justified, the continuation would be in any case inexpedient."

Mr. President, as I have said, I believe the reason this body has failed to take positive action to stop the dismantling of German plants is insufficient knowledge on the subject. The majority of us have been extremely busy on other matters and have been content to take the State Department's testimony that dismantling is not a serious issue. I cannot say with assurance what prompts that Department to deliberately deceive the Senate. Perhaps it is that some of the personnel of the State Department are more sympathetic to certain foreign ideologies than to our own. I am aware that it is a harsh thing to accuse some members of the administration of knowingly and deliberately following a course which does great damage to this Nation. It is even more serious when I say that this group is acting in this way for the purpose of aiding a nation which is the ostensible enemy of the United States, a nation which is sworn to the task of wiping our political and economic system from the face of the earth. I wish that I could believe that the State Department supports dismantling for some other reason—I wish some Member of this body could give me some reason why dismantling is of benefit to this Nation; but they cannot, for no such reason exists.

In this connection, I would like to quote briefly from the column of Austine Hearst in the Washington Times-Herald:

"Gen. Patrick Hurley, white-maned former roving envoy to China, former Secretary of War, also former mule skinner, has a pot boiling on the back of his stove. * * * And he's ready to let the lid blow off before Congress adjourns. * * * Sent to China by F. D. R., Hurley wandered around to see what he could gather. * * * Now he will permit Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, (once a medical missionary in China), to make public on the floor of the House the first of a series of dynamite documents. * * * They were in Hurley's secret files when he resigned as special envoy to Chungking.

"The first document should set the State Department on its ears.

"Written by the Department's John S. Service, dated October 10, 1944 (Service was then attached to the staff of 'Vinegar Joe' Stilwell, commanding general in China), this document was a memo to Stilwell making recommendations on the situation in China. * * * Service virtually urged abandonment of the Nationalist Government and support of the Chinese Communists. * * * He told Stilwell that the Commies were the only hope for China. * * * That Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek should be driven out.

"This was an official suggestion by a United States official. It was the beginning, according to General Hurley, of the State Department's efforts to undermine the Chinese Government.

"And what makes this up-to-now secret paper of Hurley's especially interesting is the author, Mr. John S. Service. * * * You may remember, Service was one of the persons arrested in 1945 in connection with the discovery by the FBI of some 200 stolen documents in the offices of Amer-Asia-magazine. * * * Filched from the restricted files of the State Department, the Army, Navy, and OSS, the papers contained information valuable to the Chinese Reds. * * *

"The case against the defendants, including Mr. Service, was dropped by the Department of Justice. * * * It was charged at the time on the floor of Congress that this had been a whitewash.

"Anyway, Service, a top official in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, was exonerated and was restored to duty.

"Today he's in charge of personnel and passes on recommendations for promotions in the State Department."

This is merely one example of the Communists or the communistically inclined individuals who are determining the policy of our State Department. The reason I cite this case particularly is because John S. Service was the pioneer in the State Department's great task of successfully torpedoing the Chinese Government, the government which stuck by us during the entire war—and in the State Department's successful attempt to bring victory to the Communists in China. Today this man, with that background, has an important position in charge of personnel—this great champion of communism now passes on promotions in the State Department.

Everyone, outside the administration, who is acquainted with dismantling and its results has condemned it as senseless and brainless. Industrial leaders, labor leaders, the United States Chamber of Commerce, columnists, military government personnel—everyone who has examined the dismantling program—agree that it is doing this Nation irreparable damage, and that there is simply no reason for continuing it. Time and again, the utter ridiculousness of dismantling has forced people to describe it as "brainless." But I am afraid that it is not brainless. I am afraid that there is great cunning and great reason behind the refusal of the State Department to reconsider, to halt dismantling. If I were a Communist, or were in sympathy with the Communists, I can think of no single action which would more effectively weaken our position in Germany than dismantling. Dismantling has become a synonym for despair, suffering, unemployment, antidemocratic feeling, and enmity toward the western democracies.

Let me quote to you from some of the reports received from responsible German leaders.

From the Workers Council, August Thyssen Steelworks at Ernestling, May 17, 1949:

"Through dismantling of Thyssen Works, Hamborn, about 13,000 workers lose working possibility forever and the basis of subsistence for their 40,000 dependents. Transfer to work elsewhere is impossible because of nonavailability of housing. Therefore, the number of unemployed is rapidly increasing. Increasing influence of extreme groups since dismantling order became known. This makes position of democratic workers extremely difficult and threatens to destroy democratic educational work of 5 years. German workers are threatened with hunger and misery by destruction of German steel-producing capacity."

Hans Boeckler, chairman of German Trade Union Federation of British zone and of Trade Union Coun[illegible] for bizone area, May 19, 1949:

"* * * dismantling of these works would imply loss of places of work for 30,000 workers and at least 90,000 dependents. Average age of workers concerned is 45 to 50 years. Transfer and resettlement elsewhere is impossible because of the tremendous destruction in Germany and loss of 4,000,000 homes. Dismantling decision from Washington means 90 percent of the original dismantling plan for iron-producing industries to be carried out. There is danger of serious political developments if condition of hopelessness and despair further increases. Works to be dismantled are part of peace industry

urgently needed for European reconstruction."

Workers Council, August Thyssen Works, Hamborn, July 18, 1949:

"Moreover, owing to the continuation of the dismantling policy, the social tensions in Germany seem to come to a critical point which might entail a new focus of dangers in Europe. The growing party propaganda of the Communists causes the influence of the democratic trade unions to diminish more and more. The hopelessness of the disappointed workmen is the best fostering soil for national-communistic propaganda."

The dismantling program is in direct conflict with the aims of ERP. One of the major causes of the disruption of normal trade channels is that Germany, formerly the heart of European trade and the greatest continental producer, is still prostrate. In the last quarter of 1948 the index of industrial production in France was 108. In Belgium it was 115. In the United Kingdom it was 121. In Germany it was 51. I know of no more convincing argument against destruction of additional means of production. We are supporting Germany, we are spending billions on European recovery, and yet we make that recovery impossible by further destroying German production.

Within the past few months the Office for Military Government of Germany published an exhaustive report on unemployment in Germany, saying that to avoid a severe depression, industry must be expanded and efficiency improved. Is this to be done by tearing down the August Thyssen Works, the lowest-production-cost steel plant in Europe, a plant which gives employment to over 10,000 workers?

By the end of June of this year unemployment in the bizone area had reached 1,238,000, almost 10 percent of the dependently employed group. From December to June the number of unemployed almost doubled. It is still growing, rapidly, alarmingly.

The German people are asking only to be allowed to work. This does not seem to be a great deal to ask. I know of nations which desire a great deal more. Experts on Germany have pointed out that only through unemployment was Hitler able to come to power. They are alarmed, and I am alarmed, at the increase in German unemployment today. They do not want, nor do any of us want, another Hitler.

In this connection this body should know of a report published recently by the Office of Military Government. I quote:

"There are more unemployed persons in Schleswig-Holstein than there were in 1932 when Hitler was about to ride to power on promises to lead the people out of the economic morass existing at that time." I wish to emphasize that this parallel was not drawn by me. It was drawn by our personnel in Germany, today, reporting, without bias, what they see. I think you will all agree that this view is very disturbing.

The political damage caused by the dismantling program is common knowledge, and it is irreparable. The suspicions, hates, disillusionments that it has caused cannot be soon undone. But additional damage need not follow. Expert opinion is almost unanimous that dismantling, more than any other single issue, has caused the rise of communism in the western zones, the rejuvenation of German nationalism, the rejection of democracy, and the continued economic difficulties under which Germany struggles. Must such a policy be continued?

I have read to you from some cablegrams, the effects of dismantling. But it is not necessary to have such messages to understand the extent of the damage caused. Read any newspaper, any article, concerning the campaign recently concluded in Germany. They give eloquent testimony to the insanity of dismantling. Every party from the Communist to the Christian Democratic has condemned and attacked this policy, time and time again. Indeed, the bitterness in Germany is so extreme about this policy that it would be impossible for any party to exist which did not spend a good deal of its time reviling the dismantling program. Is this the policy to make friends of the German people, to give them trust and confidence in democratic processes? Of course it is not.

I must point out that this issue is supposed by some to be water over the dam because commitments have been made with other nations. Inasmuch as the commitments involve continuing expense to us, reconsideration should not be too difficult. In any event it seems not unfair to assume that America is always ready to reconsider her blunders.

Then why is it continued? Why does the administration through its State Department adamantly and unreasonably refuse to even halt dismantling long enough to have it thoroughly and impartially examined By the time this body meets again in January the damage will have been done. By the time we realize the utter insanity of continuing dismantling we will be faced with an accomplished fact—and will have only the sense of a job badly done—but irrevocably and inexcusably done.

I ask again: Why does the State Department insist on dismantling? Can someone supply a more charitable answer than the one which I have suggested? I hope so, but I do not think so.

Political Terror in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, again and again over the many years that I have been a Member of this House, I have taken the floor to plead the cause of the people of Puerto Rico.

They are a fine and noble people who for the past 50 years of occupation of their land by the United States have suffered a mounting toll of disease and poverty.

They are a proud people who—as American citizens—in moving to the mainland, in a desperate effort to better themselves, have found nothing but slums, discrimination, and low-paid jobs as their lot in our cities.

They are a people whose treatment every day gives the lie to the fine talk of our delegates to the United Nations—talk of the dignity of the human person and of the equality of economic opportunity.

The Puerto Rican people know nothing of these fine things in their lives, and as they read of our delegates to the UN arguing fervently for human rights for men everywhere, they have but to look at themselves and their children, at the disgraceful hovels in which they are crowded, at the walls of discrimination surrounding them, to dismiss all such talk by their own UN representatives as the sheerest hypocrisy.

As I have said again and again—and as I repeat here today—there can never be a solution of the economic difficulties of Puerto Rico, the root of every other ill suffered by the Puerto Rican people, until independence is granted to them. So long as Puerto Rico remains a colonial appendage of the United States, an exploited, one-crop sugar economy, it will continue to wallow in disease and poverty.

There can only be a resolution of these many problems by the Puerto Rican people themselves, working energetically and purposefully in their own interests and in their own sovereign independent land.

Despite this fact, despite the increasing conviction among the Puerto Rican people that only through independence can they ever hope to build decent lives for themselves and their children—the Nationalist Party is daily harassed and terrorized by the police and the territorial government of the island. And the leader of that party, Pedro Albizu Campos, is hounded like a common criminal.

In 1947 he returned to his home after 10 years of exile in the United States. And to the eternal disgrace of our country, which itself was born out of a bitter struggle for independence and today still honors as its greatest heroes those men who led this struggle, this leader of Puerto Rican independence spent 6 years of his exile in the penitentiary in the United States.

Today he lives in San Juan under the type of police surveillance and intimidation that could only have been duplicated in Hitler Germany.

The home of Pedro Albizu Campos is surrounded day and night by police patrols, police cars, and jeeps with mounted machine guns. When Dr. Albizu Campos walks along the streets of San Juan, he is closely followed by four or five plainclothes policemen on foot and a load of fully armed policemen in a car a few paces behind.

Every shop he enters, every person to whom he talks is subsequently visited by representatives of the police department. A reign of terror descends on the luckless citizens of Puerto Rico who spend a few minutes talking to Dr. Albizu Campos.

When the leader of the Nationalist Party leaves San Juan to attend a meeting or to make a speech, his car is trailed through the countryside by an armed column of police cars and jeeps. Every hotel or home in which he stays is immediately surrounded by a cordon of police. Every meeting of the Nationalist Party takes place behind police lines.

The Nationalist Party is a legal party in Puerto Rico. Its leader is an American citizen, supposedly enjoying all the rights and liberties of any other American citizen. Yet both he and his party are harassed and intimidated at every turn.

This absolutely unjustified and inexcusable conduct upon the part of the police and the higher authorities of Puerto Rico must stop at once.

This is still a Government of laws and not of man. We have laws to protect us and to punish evildoers. We need no Gestapos in the United States.

The situation which I have described here is an outrageous example of police intimidation.

This House should take notice of what is happening in Puerto Rico and should see to it that the Territorial government and the Territorial police are put on notice to cease these activities at once.

Tribute to the Memory of the Honorable John Joseph Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to pay a tribute of honor to my distinguished predecessor in Congress. The Honorable John J. Delaney was a Member of this body in whose place in this House it is an honor to stand, but whose place in the hearts of the Members of this House and the folks of his home city, Brooklyn, N. Y., no one can take.

John Delaney was a genial man, who loved his fellowmen, and his sincere interest in them evoked a similar response on their part. It is an old allegory that life is like a mirror, and society returns to us the faces we make before it. When John Delaney looked at his fellowmen it was with a countenance so full of warmth and wit that people returned his glance with affection and respect. For 10 successive terms he was returned to the House by his constituency; and though on the last occasion he was too ill for active campaigning, his constituency rolled up a great vote for him just the same.

Citizens had come to know that John Delaney was a liberal and that his sympathies were not with the powerful and opulent, but with the under dog. They trusted his character. They knew that he always dealt fairly, and that he was loyal to his friends.

His citizens knew, too, that he could be counted on to be present in the House when any vote was called for, and would vote his convictions. His voting record was an enviable one. In the early days of the war, the record shows that his every vote was on the side of a strong and patriotic defense, and that subsequently the vote could be counted upon in the interests of humanity whether here or in the stricken nations abroad. There was never any wavering in his consistently liberal attitude.

John Delaney was a deeply religious man, walking humbly with his God and loyal to the worship and institutions of his church. He gave much personal effort to the promotion of religious causes.

Though his career was a characteristically American "success story," and he arose from simple beginnings to a place in the exalted councils of the Nation, John Delaney was always modest and humble and unpretentious. It would seem that he looked for the higher approval described in a poem which he loved:

And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of the working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the God of things as they are.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER: Mr. Speaker, another year of admirable achievement will be written into the annals of Jewish war veterans' history, when the Jewish War Veterans of the United States convene in Miami Beach, Fla., this Wednesday, October 19, 1949, for their national convention.

Last fall, the national convention was held in the State of New York, and in past years it has been customary to make the proceedings part of the RECORD in the Appendix. I have collected and condensed this material and now insert this material as an extension of my remarks.

Last year's national commander, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, was the national leader of the Jewish War Veterans during a most successful period in its history.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States was founded 53 years ago, and, with the exception only of the Grand Army of the Republic, whose gallant ranks grow thinner with each passing year, is the oldest organized group of American war veterans.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States have regularly adopted annual resolutions advocating legislation to provide this Nation with a military and civil defense establishment of sufficient strength and training to cope with any possible emergency. To speed the economic rehabilitation of all war veterans, they have repeatedly appealed for national conferences of business, labor, and governmental representatives so that a constructive program might be formulated to absorb the disabled and the jobless into the Nation's productive economy. They have consistently supported programs that would extend humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nations overseas whose struggles to establish free governments have been handicapped by hunger and illness, by inadequate shelter and lack of productive machinery. And from the very beginning of their existence as an organized group, they have vigorously affirmed their opposition to totalitarianism of any kind by closing the doors of membership to believers in, or servants of, political extremism, whether of the left or right.

Such organizations as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America can have a vital place in our national scene.

In their unceasing efforts to establish an ideological beachhead in this country, ruthless and skillful totalitarian forces constantly seek to gain the support of minority elements in our population by passing themselves off as friends and defenders of the oppressed and persecuted throughout the world. The frequent attacks by Communist instruments in this country on the Jewish War Veterans of the United States attest eloquently to this organization's effective work of unmasking totalitarian pretenses and exposing the true doctrines motivating the scores of front groups who have sought to gain a foothold among the confused and the troubled.

The first midwesterner to have been elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans since the organization was established, General Klein is well known as a veteran journalist, editor, and soldier. He saw long and arduous service in both world wars and as a teen-age war correspondent; later, a member of the Army during the First World War, he won the praise of the Honorable James W. Gerard, our great Ambassador to Germany during the adson. In World War II, he served for ministration of President Woodrow Wilmore than 6 years, and more than half that time as a commander of 10,000 combat troops in the Pacific and the Philippines.

He holds the Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star, the Soldier's Medal for heroism, the ribbon of the French Legion of Honor, and the Philippine Distinguished Service Star, awarded him personally by the late President Osmena. In the period immediately following the cessation of hostilities with Japan, he served as special assistant to the former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who commended him for his outstanding service in the difficult readjustment period following the termination of the war.

In 1933 and 1934, General Klein, then a member of the Illinois National Guard, was assigned to conduct an investigation of subversive activities in the Middle West. His findings led to formulation of the first comprehensive dossier on disloyal elements in this country.

His election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America was not to the liking of the disloyal and the subversive. Communist publications on the one hand denounced him as a tool of reactionary big business and wept crocodile tears for the dire fate that awaited the Jewish war veterans organization. On the other hand domestic admirers of Nazi and Fascist doctrines, among them individuals who had been brought into court on charges of sedition, reviled General Klein as an adherent of that dangerous and decadent philosophy, democracy.

His devotion to the ideals and principles that motivate the great organization he commanded was dramatically expressed a few months after he took office at a brilliant dinner gathering held in New York in observance of the Jewish War Veterans' fifty-third year of service to the Nation and to the veteran.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote to General Klein:

> Under your leadership I am certain this fine association of service men and women will uphold the patriotic ideals which have characterized it throughout its history.

Gen. Omar Bradley, now Chief of Staff of the United States Army, said:

> In addition to being one of our foremost veterans organizations, your group has consistently demonstrated the true spirit of service to the veteran and to the Nation.

General MacArthur cabled the Jewish War Veterans from his headquarters in Japan on the occasion of General Klein's induction into office as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans for 1947–48, asserting that "No better choice could have been made by your organization."

Former Governor of New York Herbert Lehman wrote:

My heartiest congratulations on your election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans. I am sure that you will discharge your very arduous and important duties with great distinction.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, retired, took occasion to note:

In following the convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, it came to my mind that men of the Jewish faith have always been fearless in the defense of our country. It is Navy Day as I write, and names like Jones, Barry, Truxton, Decatur, and Perry are in the minds of the American people. Too few know of the tremendous importance to our early American history of names like Salvador, Lushington, Franks, and Russell. Theirs, with Commodore Ordroneaux' and Commodore Levy's, are names reflecting great bravery and the names making great naval traditions. To all of these men of the Jewish faith, our country is grateful.

Former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson congratulated General Klein upon his election as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans and wrote:

I know that you will have a most useful term of office.

Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., under whose command General Klein served in the Pacific, wrote:

With your rich experience on all levels of the Army and with your fine background and knowledge of the world, you will be able to do a great deal for the organization and be a real power for good in the country.

With former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, presiding, an assemblage of the Nation's foremost military, civic, and community leaders heard General Klein in an address from which I take the liberty to quote in part:

Because America was the world's first great haven of refuge from tryanny and oppression, the Jewish people of this country have since been privileged to defend freedom as every man who is given such a privilege should defend it—in the uniform of his country. In America, a man may serve his God and his country by no other dictates than those of his own religious convictions and a set of laws he himself helps to establish. That is why Jews have served equally and proudly in every war of this Republic. They have served as Americans and they knew only one allegiance. That loyalty was to our country, because America asked only if they wanted freedom; if they wanted freedom enough to do battle for it. The answer in every war, since the War of Independence, has been in the affirmative. That is why the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America is in existence.

The men who organized the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America sought to insure that their descendants would carry on, in years to come, the ideals that made our country the freest in the world. The Jewish immigrants who came from lands ruled by Czars and Kaisers found that in the United States a Jew could wear a badge of service but never one of servitude. It is no coincidence that in all the wars in which our country has been engaged, the number of Jewish men in the armed forces has been larger than the ratio of the American Jewish people to the total population of our country. Many Americans of Jewish faith who wear the Purple Heart today are descendants of men who were forced to wear a yellow Star of David in the European slave states of yesterday. In our armies of World War II there were many whose families were either in concentration camps or en route to Nazi crematoria. To preserve our country, to preserve freedom itself, these American veterans, Jew and Christian alike, became casualties in order that no American—whatever his religion, whatever his race—should ever become a victim.

General Klein's emphatic affirmations of the principles that guide the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America took on added significance during his tour of duty as the organization's national commander when it became apparent that the age-old hopes of the Jewish people for an independent political state in Palestine were approaching fruition. Under the tremendous stress of international tensions incidental to the decisions of our own and other countries with respect to the efforts of the Jewish people to establish a sovereign state, the emotions of common men everywhere ran high.

It was during the climactic moments of this highly controversial issue that General Klein, addressing an outdoor meeting in New York City of more than 50,000 American veterans of all faiths and more than 300,000 other spectators, declared that the first consideration of every American who supported the claims of the Jewish community of Palestine must be the welfare and security of the United States. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America under General Klein's leadership based their support for the cause of Israel on much more than religious affinities. That support took into consideration the record of Palestine's Jewish community in volunteering military manpower for the Allied cause in both World Wars and in supplying labor for Allied bases and installations in the Middle East during both conflicts. In addition, the Jewish War Veterans were motivated by a sincere belief that a stable and independent Jewish government in the Middle East would constitute a bulwark of free government, oriented in the direction of the western democracies, in an area of great strategic importance. Subsequent history has borne out this belief in full. The Jewish military forces of Israel have clearly shown themselves to be the single most effective fighting force in the Middle East, and they won their battles in spite of great odds against them because they had high democratic ideals to fight for.

From the beginning, General Klein insisted that a people who had twice proved their allegiance to democracy by contributing their blood and toil in world wars against totalitarianism could be counted upon to remain loyal and devoted to the free way of life. By the same standard, he insisted from the first that this was an issue that far transcended political partisanship. And he maintained with equal firmness that for Americans—whatever their religious beliefs, however sympathetic they might be to the cause of the Israeli people—there could be only one national loyalty, the allegiance to the security and welfare of the United States.

He had occasion to emphasize this view repeatedly during the tense days of the fighting in Palestine. He restated this position at another great veterans' meeting in the city of Chicago, attended by throngs as great as those which had heard him in New York. It was some 2 weeks after this latter occasion that Communist organizations in the east, seeking to capitalize on the war in Palestine, sent a large delegation to Washington for the ostensible purpose of appealing for aid to Israel. General Klein, who had consistently warned against Communist attempts to reap rich propaganda harvests from the indecision of western nations with respect to Palestine, was the first to expose this ruse for what it was. In a statement issued to the press and given national circulation, he denounced the Communist visitors to the Capital as a group that is motivated neither by concern for the interests of the United States nor by any genuine desire to further the welfare of the people of Israel.

Further recognition of the high ideals that had characterized General Klein's administration was expressed in scores of messages sent to the fifty-third annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America by the leadership of Government, the armed forces, the veterans' organizations, business, labor, and community life. Among those who participated in the encampment program personally were the Honorable Tom C. Clark, the Attorney General of the United States then—now Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court; the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Department of the Air Force; the Honorable Carl R. Gray, Jr., the Veterans' Administrator; and the Honorable Joe R. Hanley, lieutenant governor of the State of New York. On this occasion, which marked General Klein's retirement from office, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, now Vice President of the United States, praised "the most valuable contributions General Klein has made for the general welfare and national security during his distinguished tenure as national commander," and added, "may he and men like him continue to assist in guiding the destinies of your great organization."

Secretary for Air W. Stuart Symington, speaking before the assembled Jewish war veterans, lauded General Klein and said:

For me it is an especially fortunate occasion to be able to thank the people who served under him, and for whom he served during the past year.

Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS remarked:

I have wondered always—and I am sure you have wondered always—why we have a Jewish War Veterans, and why we Jews have a veterans' organization. In the case of this particular organization, I think there is a very special reason for it—because what we are doing is binding ourselves together to dedicate ourselves to a special job, a special

work, which we feel called upon to do more than most others, and that job is to concentrate and make valid a democracy for us as citizens of equality with all other citizens; a democracy built into the law, not granted by decree or permission or toleration. And a democracy, therefore, which we are building constantly to make impregnable as far as minorities are concerned. Hence, the very special interest which binds us together, as veterans who have risked our lives in this cause, in a Jewish War Veterans' organization.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower declared:

I join the National Encampment of the Jewish War Veterans in paying tribute to Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, whose distinguished service merits the respect and honor of all Americans.

United States Senator ROBERT A. TAFT wired:

Gen. Julius Klein has served your organization as well as he served his country during the war. I know personally that General Klein's constant activity in behalf of the Jewish veterans has accomplished real results in national legislation.

Louis B. Mayer, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, sent the following:

Not only has General Klein made great sacrifices to serve his country, but he has served his people, his State, and city where he has lived all these years. I am very proud to be counted as one of his close and enthusiastic friends. My congratulations to the leaders of this banquet for having the inspiration and the constructive imagination to hold this banquet to honor this fine American. It will be an inspiration to other men younger to emulate the conduct of your guest of honor.

The national commander's banquet, held Saturday evening, September 18, 1948, was a vivid expression of the regard the rank and file of the Jewish war veterans held for their retiring commander. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States then and now Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, speaking on that occasion, expressed it this way:

Julius, I think the greatest tribute that can be paid you tonight is this great audience that is here—these fellow-Americans who came here to honor you and to pay you tribute not only as a great commander of a great veterans' organization, but as a great American who has rendered valiant service to his country.

For that reason it is a particular pleasure to break bread with your lovely wife and you, and to say to you godspeed in all of your endeavors, because I know that you will continue in the future as you have in the past, perhaps not as the commander of the JWV, but as a great American citizen—that you will continue to render great service to your country.

Senator IRVING M. IVES, speaking to the assembled guests, had the following to say:

I am here tonight to pay tribute to your great national commander. I know his record; it's been recited here tonight several times. I know not alone what he has done as a great American citizen, as a great soldier, as a great leader of your splendid organization, but I know the tremendous influence which he has exercised during all this period of time, and I want to say to you that you have been most fortunate and most blessed in having had General Klein as your leader during these particularly trying times.

Representing Dwight H. Green, then Governor of the State of Illinois, Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Buchanan expressed the Governor's sentiments:

Your home State was proud, indeed, when you were elected national commander of one of the oldest, most active, and representative veterans' organizations in America. Illinois is proud, now, of the splendid accomplishments you have achieved in office, and the remarkable strides made by your organization under your capable leadership during the past year. Illinois is elated that one of her distinguished sons has been able to contribute so much that is vital to the patriotic welfare of our own country as well as to that of the new nation in Palestine which has risen as a proud symbol for those of the Jewish faith.

To our service roll of many distinguished warriors of the Jewish faith—Gens. Milton J. Foreman, Abel Davis, and Samuel J. Sawton, and many others who have achieved national fame and honor in the discharge of their patriotic duties—Illinois is immeasurably proud to add your own name. All have brought historic credit and a rich blessing to our State.

Edward N. Scheiberling, past national commander of the American Legion, representing James O'Neil, then national leader of the Legion, had the following to note:

Jimmy O'Neil asked me to express to your national commander, Julius Klein, his intense feeling of personal friendship, coupled with his admiration for a job well performed. This has been a most difficult year for your national commander. He has rendered signal service.

Representing Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff, Brig. Gen. T. C. "Buck" Lanham offered the following remarks:

I am very happy and proud to bring to your great leader and our great friend, Gen. Julius Klein, and to this distinguished organization, the greetings and the best wishes of our Chief of Staff and the Department of the Army as a whole.

Secondly, I should like to comment very briefly upon your commander, General Klein. It has been my fortune to see a good deal of him in the past 3 years. I see him as he goes by. I started to say that if we could put about 8 feet of tail on him, he would resemble a kite. I defy anyone to know where he is for six consecutive hours. I learn 1 minute he is in the White House; then I see him the next minute in the Senate Building; and a few minutes later he is with Dr. Weitzmann, the provisional president of the new great State of Israel; and then I see him barging out of General "Ike's" office; and then General Bradley's office—and you say, "Where's Julius Klein?"; and somebody says, "God knows. He's just too fast for us." Now, I have seen signs around the country, as you most likely have—and they made a movie out of it, too, saying "George Washington Slept Here." I would suggest that we might start a new industry in this country if JWV were to undertake to post signs "Julius Klein Slept Here."

Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Veterans' Administrator, expressed the following:

Yours (as you and I know) is the oldest of the veterans organizations today. And you founded it and started it for the purpose of being good Samaritans. I have just gone through many veterans installations from Togue, Maine, to Seattle, Wash., and as far south as Fort Congress, Ky., and soon I shall start out again to make a tour of the southern half of the United States. I have found, and I know I am going to find, in each of those installations and in each of those hospitals results of your unselfishness and your thoughtfulness. On behalf of the Veterans' Administration, I thank you, and say that I know the boys and the girls appreciate what you have done and are doing. I ran into a fellow yesterday whom I hadn't seen in about 15 years. I'll bet Julius would know him if I mentioned his name, but I am not going to mention his name other than to say that from the very beginning of my acquaintance with him, at a time when he was really engaged in making a living doing something else, that fellow had more knowledge of subversive activities that were going on in the United States (back in the twenties) than I think the United States Government had itself, because they used to come to him to get the data.

Just off his regular office was a room, the rental of which he paid himself. In that room was the greatest cross-reference record of matters that had something to do with the United States of America's Government being undermined that existed, I think, in the United States.

The views of these and other military leaders were echoed by the leadership of our major political parties, the most notable figures of Jewish religious and community life, by newspaper editors and State officials in every section of the country, and by thousands of former enlisted men who served under General Klein in wartime.

One expression, which, I am sure, General Klein will cherish deeply in the years ahead, came from the distinguished national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, Mr. Anthony H. Forbes, one of the honored guests of the Jewish War Veterans Fifty-third Encampment. In a brief ceremony, Commander Forbes presented General Klein with the national commander's citation of the Catholic War Veterans.

General Klein was honored for "his great contributions, not only in behalf of the Jewish War Veterans, but all veterans of the United States." The citation added:

Commander Klein's actions have been such as to reflect the greatest credit upon the organization which he leads.

The deep sense of duty which General Klein brought to his high office was expressly set forth in his final report to the membership of his organization. I take the liberty to quote a few pertinent passages from this report:

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America is an organization of men who have met the first responsibility of good citizenship. We have defended our country and her way of life in time of war. But our obligations did not cease when we exchanged a soldier's uniform for civilian clothes. Our primary responsibility has not changed. Our first duty has been, and must always be, to work for the security of our country and her free institutions both at home and abroad. We are an organization of men who know that wars cannot be won by service on a part-time basis. We have learned that you cannot watch the clock on peace, either. Freedom is a full-time job. We Jewish War Veterans have worked for peace and freedom fulltime and overtime. We must continue to do so. We seek for our country in peace nothing more than we sought for her in war. We want her to endure as the freest nation in the world. We want her major export always to be the principles of human liberty and equal opportunity upon which she rose to become the great hope of mankind.

A worthy successor to General Klein as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans is Mr. Myer Dorfman, of St. Paul, Minn. A man of great stature in his community, a Navy veteran of World War I, Mr. Dorfman has greatly distinguished himself as leader of the Jewish War Veterans and has accomplished much in helping to preserve the principles and ideals which are the foundation of the Jewish War Veterans.

The Fifty-fourth Annual Encampment of the Jewish War Veterans will be held in October of this year in Miami, Fla., and after those proceedings are concluded, I hope to be able to report to this assembly on their progress and advancement for the cause of American veterans under the able leadership of the present national commander, Mr. Myer Dorfman.

Mission Completed, the graphic account of General Klein's stewardship during his tour of duty as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, is, in a sense, a misnomer. It reflects the activities of one of America's most useful citizens in his capacity as a leader of one of the oldest and most respected of our veterans' organizations. The ideals of sound Americanism he translated into action during his term of office as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America make it plain that the mission he has assumed—that of service to the Nation and the veteran—is one that will keep him engaged in all the busy years that lie ahead of him. It cannot be doubted that when this mission has been completed in fact—when a power greater than man's writes finis to his tireless work—it will reflect the highest credit on one of our finest citizen-soldiers and the country he was privileged to serve with such great devotion.

State Department Displays Two-Faced Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Richard L. Stokes on State Department foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT DISPLAYS TWO-FACED FOREIGN POLICY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

Hosts of American Christians must be scandalized by the gulf dividing United States policy in Occident and Orient. Billions are poured into western Europe to delay the advance of Marxism upon the English Channel. At the identical hour, the Department of State is playing the Soviet game in the Far East—and, incidentally, abandoning to Communist extermination, without a visible qualm, nearly 3,000,000 Chinese Catholics and 600,000 Chinese Protestants.

The discrepancy makes sense only on the supposition that the Truman regime treasures the Roosevelt myth and the reputation of Gen. George C. Marshall as political weapons for maintaining itself in power after 1952. Under this theory, it is to save face for the Roosevelt of Yalta and the Marshall of Chunking that Washington is striving to destroy its solitary friend and official ally in the Orient, the Kuomintang government of Chiang Kai-shek; and it has thus cleared the way for Soviet domination of China and southeast Asia.

Pugilists take particular care to guard vulnerable nerve centers. In his preface to the recent China white paper, Secretary of State Acheson lavished his most frantic ingenuity upon a defense of General Marshall's mission to China. The American record is limned in pure white, and that of the Nationalist government, in unrelieved black. There is not a hint that the picture could have another side. Because the reverse of the medal has been concealed studiously from the public, it will be presented here. The account is drawn not from Chinese but American sources. It goes far to explain why Chiang Kai-shek's soldiers—if Acheson's charge is true—have lost the will to fight.

As the personal representative of President Truman, with the title of Ambassador, General Marshall arrived in China in November 1945. His instructions had been drafted by the left-wing cell which then controlled, and still controls, the State Department's far-eastern division. He was to end the civil war and set up a coalition government of Communists and Nationalists.

The program enjoyed Marshall's personal sympathy. In Roosevelt and Hopkins, et al., Robert E. Sherwood relates that Marshall, chief military adviser to the President, was vehemently on the side of Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, American commander in the China-Burma-India theater; and that Stilwell had faith in the Chinese Communists as forming a stronger and more reliable fighting force against the Japanese than the Nationalist troops.

Sherwood quotes Roosevelt as declaring that Stilwell obviously hated the Chinese, and describes the latter as being unquestionably a serious nuisance, whose recall the President was many times on the verge of ordering. Marshall defended his protégé as long as possible with the lame excuse that he was the only high-ranking American officer able to speak Chinese.

Marshall found Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at the point of crowning with triumph his 18 years' war against the Chinese Communists. North of Hankow, 200,000 Government troops had surrounded 70,000 Communist soldiers and were making a methodical job of wiping them out. Near Canton, on the East River, 100,000 Communists were trapped by Nationalist forces.

With victory in his grasp, the Generalissimo was compelled by Marshall to unclench his fist by accepting a truce, under which the doomed Communist armies marched happily forth from their nets. The American envoy had applied pressure after the Stilwell manner by shutting off American military aid, including war surplus already paid for by the Chinese. Marshall revoked a Sino-American pact dated 2 months earlier, whereby the United States agreed to supply China with planes and equipment for an 8⅓ group air force, containing four-engine bombers.

Chiang Kai-shek was stripped of his most potent weapon by Marshall's ban against the use of the existing Chinese air force against the Communists, on the ground that this would constitute offensive action. It was also suggested that discussions regarding a proposed $500,000,000 loan to China would not be resumed until an armistice was signed.

The worst of all was that General Marshall coerced Chiang Kai-shek into opening the Kalgan Pass, historic gateway between Manchuria and China, to nearly a million Chinese Communists, sealed off by a Nationalist offensive that had captured the defile. Communist hordes flooded into Manchuria, where the Soviet Union placed in their poorly armed hands the fresh, unworn equipment of Kwantung arsenals previously surrendered by Japan. It is estimated that this stock pile contained enough material to supply 500,000 soldiers for 10 years.

Secretary Acheson has acknowledged that subsequent Communist victories were won mostly with Japanese and not American weapons. Note has often been taken of an instinct which irresistibly impels American statecraft to weaken its friends and strengthen its enemies. Here was an outstanding example. At the moment when military help was being refused to the Nationalist government, Washington was making it possible for Chinese communism to build a modern and powerful armed force.

Having yielded everything else, Chiang Kai-shek rebelled at last when General Marshall commanded him to admit Communists into his government. As an expert on Soviet technique, the generalissimo knew that such a measure would toll the death knell of free China. Later in Czechoslovakia, Marshall was to learn what a Communist minority could do in a coalition government. But he never forgave Chiang Kai-shek's disobedience. When the Marshall plan was formulated, China was pointedly excluded from its benefits.

Congress took the bit in its teeth and voted $500,000,000 to China of which $125,000,000 was specifically earmarked for military aid. But it was contrived, through technical hocus pocus with the War Department, to prolong the arms embargo for nearly a year, until the fall of 1947. If Chinese informants of highest station may be credited, only $20,000,000 of military supplies ever reached the Nationalist Army, the rest having been held up at Okinawa. Most of that which actually arrived is declared to have been noncombatant materials, such as vehicular replacements and signal corps apparatus.

When the final show-down came, the Chinese Red armies, with new and plentiful equipment, found an easy prey in the Nationalist forces. Two years of hard campaigning had worn their rifle barrels smooth, exhausted their ammunition, and battered their transport and supply trucks. Their equipment was wholly American. Without American spare parts, replacements, and ammunition, it became all but hopeless. Having mopped up Manchuria, the Communists burst out of that province into China proper, swept on to Nanking and Shanghai, and then, as this is written, advanced into reach of Canton and Hong Kong.

Appalled by the tragedy that it had helped bring upon China and its own country, the State Department strove as desperately to cover up as a prizefighter who has suffered a surprise smash to the solar plexus. The most obvious defense was to blackguard Chiang Kai-shek. The smearing job accomplished by Secretary Acheson was masterful.

A hostile witness, Theodore H. White, a former correspondent of Time magazine, has testified in print that the generalissimo is incorruptible, a man of stern and puritan fiber. For American consumption, he was transformed overnight into the venal boss of an infamous graft ring. General Marshall detested Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, founder of the Flying Tigers and commander of the legendary Fourteenth United States Air Force, but confessed that he was probably a tactical genius. In his book, Way of a Fighter, Chennault cites repeated and impressive cases in which Chiang Kai-shek's military judgment was proved to have towered above that of the CBI commander in

chief, General Stilwell. In Acheson's caricature, the generalissimo became a strategist inferior to any reasonably bright sergeant.

There is frequent complaint that the United States has no foreign policy. But critics must concede that in one respect it has shown entire consistency. That is in the creations of vacuums to be occupied by communism. The first was dredged by the precipitate break-up of America's armed forces at the end of the war, leaving Russia the sole military power in Europe. A second is preparing in the Near East through procedures calculated to fling the Moslem world into Soviet arms. A third yawns in Korea, and a fourth some day will probably engulf Japan. But the most enormous and terrifying void is in China—a continental chasm into which Communist power is storming like a deluge set free by collapsing dams.

The Legislative Reference Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, as the session closes, some of us want to take the occasion to pay tribute to the assistance which the Legislative Reference Service has given us in our official duties. We are doing this so that the Members who are not familiar with the work of the Service may know what the facilities are that are available.

Although the Legislative Reference Service was founded in 1914, it was not until the late 1930's that the number of inquiries handled were much above 2,000 a year. Yet, in the month of March alone, of this year, 3,019 separate commissions were given the Service by our membership. The total for the year just passed was the largest in the history of the Service, amounting to just under 25,000. Every year, in recent years, has seen an increase. This increase has averaged 2,000 a year, and is still continuing.

The types of service they render are legion. They range from a simple legal citation or bit of information on geography or etiquette all the way to complete reports on the great problems facing Congress. Recent reports cover matters as varied as the Atlantic Pact, the minimum wage, treatment of witnesses before congressional committees, the reorganization of the armed services. It is fair to say that there has not been a single major measure before Congress this session on which the Legislative Reference Service has not done work either for committees or for individual Members or for both.

Moreover, more and more the Members of Congress and the committees are calling in consultation the experts of the service. We have found we can do this without prejudice because of the tradition of the service of giving basic and unbiased analyses of problems.

Members are aware that the number of public general bills introduced this year was the greatest of recent years. The Digest with which we are provided each month is the work of the Legislative Reference Service and, in spite of the increase in the number of bills, it has appeared on schedule.

Translations, drafts of speeches, charts and graphs, replies to constituent inquiries, all are cheerfully and promptly furnished within the limits of the staff available. The quiet and palatial congressional reading room of the Library is also managed under the efficient direction of the Legislative Reference Service.

I strongly urge any Member who is not now making full use of the Service to talk with Mr. Griffith, the Director, with a view to seeing what the facilities really are. You will be amazed at how much help they can give you.

THE INTEREST OF CONGRESS IN THE SERVICE

The Legislative Reference Service is Congress' own. In many instances it is the only place to which a Member can go for research and analysis or even for information and be certain that he will receive material as unbiased and as accurate as it is humanly possible to make it.

The consciousness of the possibilities of the Service has gradually spread among the Members. When the Librarian of Congress first proposed in 1940 that the Legislative Reference Service should be the medium through which Congress might obtain top flight research assistance, the reception to the suggestion was distinctly cool. However, Congress did appropriate $20,000 additional that year. By 1942 and 1943, Congress had become more conscious of its need for staff assistance, and 12 Members of the House, 6 from each party—under the leadership of Members like Everett Dirksen and JOHN SPARKMAN, met with the Librarian and the Director of the Service to explore ways and means by which they could obtain the assistance they needed in their daily work. This group presented its case to the Appropriations Committee, and four outstanding specialists were added on an experimental basis. These four men—Francis O. Wilcox, in foreign affairs; Gustav Peck, in labor relations; James P. Radigan, Jr., in Federal law; and Raymond E. Manning in taxation—still occupy these positions, although Dr. Wilcox has been loaned to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for several years now as its staff director.

About the same time the unrest in Congress at its own limitations of organization and staff grew more and more intense. Members will remember how the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was set up under the leadership of former Senator La Follette and Congressman MONRONEY and how its report became the basis for the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Under this act, the Legislative Reference Service was assigned the responsibility of serving as the primary facility for individual Members and as a supplementary facility for committees for information, research, and staff assistance generally. Congress through appropriations provided for about one-third of the proposed expansion.

Members who were here at the time will remember that questions were raised concerning the orientation of the Service and the need for it—questions which had to be answered before expansion went further. Under searching examination of the Service came through with a clean bill. Meanwhile its use continued to grow.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on House Administration was charged with the responsibility for adequate staffing for Congress and its committees. It seemed appropriate therefore that relationships should be set up between this committee and the Legislative Reference Service. With the full support of both parties the committee decided that it should assume the responsibility for formulating the duties and functions of the service. Through its Library Subcommittee, this past year, an exhaustive investigation was conducted into the whole problem. The Director of the Service met with the committee on several occasions. The recommendations of the Library Subcommittee were to the effect that the Service should be further expanded. This was unanimously endorsed by the full committee. Committee spokesmen—Chairman NORTON, former Chairman LECOMPTE of the full committee, and Chairman REGAN and former Chairman BISHOP of the Library Subcommittee—all appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to indicate what they believed to be the needs of Congress for such facilities and their confidence that the Legislative Reference Service was the place in which to provide them. The upshot was the recommendation from the Appropriations Committee to Congress that 40 positions be added to the Legislative Reference Service. By January 1, 1950, it is anticipated that these positions will be filled, and that Congress will at last have a Legislative Reference Service staff that approaches adequacy both in quality and in number.

THE TRADITIONS OF THE SERVICE

One of the most remarkable things about the Legislative Reference Service is the support which it enjoys from both parties. This support rests fundamentally upon confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its staff. We Members of Congress have become conscious that certain traditions have been established in the Service and that it is loyalty to these traditions which is the basis for our trust.

In the first place, its functions are designed as far as possible to save the time of the Member of Congress. Numerically speaking, the inquiries are themselves mostly of this nature. Summaries of material are repeatedly called for, and the digest of public general bills has become an established institution.

In the second place, the responses of the Service are personalized. It is their effort, always within the necessary limits of scholarly integrity, to give to a Member what he wants, when he wants it, and in the form desired. Each inquiry is handled separately, and every effort is made to learn from the Member the purpose for which it is intended to use the reply.

In the third place, speed is more often than not an essential characteristic of usefulness. By one device or another, the Service aims to turn out reports in

record time, reports which at the same time will be accurate and adequate.

Obviously sound scholarship is the cornerstone of reliable research. It is the primary basis for selection of staff and the primary emphasis in the preparation of the major reports. Where, in a particular case, scholarship must be sacrificed to speed, the Member is warned.

Work of the Service, if it is to survive, must be without bias—unconscious as well as conscious. The principal trouble with reports prepared for Congress in many quarters is not that in a technical sense they are untrue, but rather that they select from the truth or that the words used often prejudice the reader, even though the facts themselves may be quite correct. To tell not only the truth, but the whole truth, to give pros and cons, and to give the essential basic data, all these are ideals of the Legislative Reference Service.

Finally, the Service renounces any attempt to influence legislation other than through the most complete and impartial factual analyses possible. It does not make recommendations, it does not suggest to Congress lines of action. Rather it covets the kind of confidence that can come only to persons whom the Members can freely consult on a factual basis, with the full knowledge that the individual concerned will present all the relevant facts without bias and without prejudice.

THE PERSONNEL OF THE SERVICE

Few Members of Congress realize that we have at our disposal some of the greatest authorities in the Nation on the staff of the Legislative Reference Service. This is as it should be. There appear before committees of Congress representatives of special interests with resources running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. These business, labor, and farm groups have funds to pick from among the best economists in the country. Moreover, there also appear before our committees representatives of the executive branch. They are spokesmen with research divisions that likewise have millions of dollars at their command. If Congress is to legislate intelligently it is absolutely imperative that there be at its disposal analysts of comparable ability. The Legislative Reorganization Act took no chances in this regard. In the language of the act itself it specified that these senior specialists were to be men on a par as regards salary and competence with the best which the executive branch possessed. We have not been disappointed. Let me call the roll of the senior specialists as it now stands. I will do this in alphabetical order:

Eisbree, Hugh (public administration and government). Formerly on the staff of the Bureau of the Budget, professor of political science at Harvard and Dartmouth.

Fauri, Fedele (social legislation). Formerly director of welfare for the State of Michigan.

Galloway, George B. (congressional organization). Formerly staff director of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Hoskins, Halford L. (international relations). Formerly director of the School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, and prior to that dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy of Tufts and Harvard.

Jacobstein, Meyer (money and banking). Formerly president of the First National Bank of Rochester, N. Y., staff member of the Brookings Institution.

Kalijarvi, Thorsten V. (international relations). Author of many books in the field. Formerly director of the State Planning Council of New Hampshire.

Kreps, T. J. (industrial organization). Formerly staff director of the Temporary National Economic Committee; professor of economics, Graduate School of Stanford University.

Mahoney, J. R. (resources and conservation). Director of the Bureau of Economic Research, University of Utah.

Manning, Raymond E. (taxation and fiscal policy). Formerly secretary of the National Tax Association.

Peck, Gustav (labor relations). Formerly Secretary of the Labor Advisory Committee of the National Recovery Administration, and representative on the War Manpower Commission for the War Production Board.

Piquet, Howard S. (international economics). Formerly Director of Research for the United States Tariff Commission and Secretary of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

Radigan, James P., Jr. (American law). Formerly Chief of the Federal Law Section, now the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service.

Schaffter, Dorothy (American government). Formerly president of the Connecticut College for Women and vice president of the American Political Science Association.

Wilcox, Walter W. (agriculture). Professor of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin.

By January, it is my understanding that other top-rank specialists will also have been added—in housing, veterans' affairs, public works, national defense, and transportation.

It is my belief that members of the committees who have used these specialists have found them, without exception, competent, helpful, self-effacing, desiring only to be of service to us by helping to bring to bear upon the problems facing us the best and most competent information available. Members may well be proud of the caliber of the men who assist them. I commend them to all of you. If you have a problem in their field, call the director of the service and tell him your needs. A staff member will be at your command.

Let Us Promote the General Welfare Properly by Adopting the Townsend Bill Instead of H. R. 6000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it has taken a long time for the public and the Members of Congress to realize and comprehend the benefits of the Townsend bill, ever since the House of Representatives argued and passed the hodgepodge social security bill, H. R. 6000, for the expansion of old-age pension I have heard more favorable talk among Members of Congress than ever before for the Townsend bill, H. R. 2135, introduced by Mr. BLATNIK; or the companion bill, H. R. 2136, introduced by Mr. ANGELL.

In my opinion, which is shared by many other Members of the House if the Townsend plan had been adopted years ago, the senior citizens of the Nation would now be receiving adequate pensions and the cost in hard-earned tax dollars would be much less to the public than the amount we have spent and will spend under the patchwork social-security program as provided for in H. R. 6000.

This bill has not yet passed the Senate, and it is my hope that they will fully realize the glaring difference between H. R. 6000 and the Townsend bill, and substitute it for H. R. 6000 insofar as the aid to our senior citizens is concerned.

The Townsend bill provides for a fair, honest, and equitable method of collecting and distributing the funds necessary to provide an adequate pension to our senior citizens and further provides that the money collected must be used exclusively and specifically for that purpose.

H. R. 6000 provides for collecting funds from the people, which funds go to finance the current costs of Government expense, and the people are charged interest on these funds which increases the cost to the extent that it will eventually cost us nearly $1,000,000,000 per year in interest alone. All of this can be avoided by the Townsend plan.

Since we agree that we should provide adequate pensions to our senior citizens, let us do it the right way by adopting the Townsend bill. We will then be "promoting the general welfare" as provided for in the Constitution of the United States in the best interest of all the people of the Nation.

Nantucket Sound Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Boston Herald and which is the third of a series by Stanley Eames, the first two of the series having appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19. This article completes Mr. Eames' story telling, for the first time, the complete story of the loss of the cruiser *Constance* in Nantucket Sound September 9, and how four of the nine who died after 17½ hours in the water might have been saved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THREE DIED AS AID REACHED THEM

(By Stanley Eames)

Alfred Allenby, his girl friend Emily Foster, his sister and brother-in-law Mit and Bob Nairn, were made of strong stuff. They had

to be, to be alive at 10 a. m. that bright, sunshiny morning of September 10. By that time they had been in the wind-tossed water north of Nantucket Island some 17 hours.

They had seen five members of the party that left Nantucket the previous afternoon die. They had resolved to live if they could. They had not spoken of the possibility that they might die.

After morning came, with land 2 miles away and gradually getting closer, the thought that all but one of them might die did not enter their minds.

They had seen planes. Allenby to this day is not completely clear as to when and in what order he saw airplanes. He saw the early Nantucket-to-Boston Northeast Airlines flight pass over them. He says he saw an amphibian flying high early in the morning. There were plenty of indications rescue was near.

None saw any boats until they sighted the craft that took Allenby and the body of Emily Foster ashore. But their hopes skyrocketed when they saw a light plane dipping and wigwagging its wings over them. They knew then they had been spotted.

At 10 a. m.—the hour is fixed by CAA radio log—Holdgate's observer, George Lusk, shouted, "There they are—I see them waving." CAA radio asked if Holdgate was sure, so he made another pass low over the survivors. The CAA radio immediately notified the Coast Guard, which was that agency's first real knowledge of how many people were alive in the water.

"A plane came in flying low," Allenby picked up the narrative's thread, "spotted us and wigwagged. Mit waved her kerchief. I don't know whether all four of us were alive then. I had Em floating on my chest. The last thing she told me was to let her go. I cut her off quickly with a refusal and tried to put some fight into her, but after that she didn't say anything."

There is no doubt, however, that Emily Foster, weak though she was, was alive at that time. This is what Holdgate says in his sworn statement:

"We noticed a group of survivors and they were all waving and seemed very much alive, except for one girl, whose head was being held up but who was alive and making her feet go * * * I made a report to the CAA that they seemed in a weakened condition and needed immediate assistance. We made numerous passes over the group and were joined by Marvin Odum in his Stinson. I repeatedly called for more aid and expressed its urgency without any delay."

And Odum says:

"After seeing Holdgate over the group, I quickly went over and saw the survivors. They looked pretty well preserved. There were four, all waving, very much alive, with dead bodies right near—10 or 20 feet away. The four were sort of interlaced, one head on another chest, keeping each other up. It looked as if Allenby were kissing the girl.

"Actually, he was slapping her face (to keep her conscious). I thought help was so close there would be no reason for them to die, so I decided not to ditch (crash land in the water beside them.)"

The main reason for not landing in the water Odum says, was that the elder Palmer was in his plane and had been physically sick since spotting the survivors. Odum did not know whether Palmer could swim.

The CAA station was taking a host of radio messages by now. It was 10:20 when Holdgate definitely established that people were alive in the water. At this time, the two pilots agree, they were not more than 1,000 feet off the sandbar a mile out from Dionis Beach.

RADIO MESSAGE

Holdgate's radio message to the CAA at this point placed the Coast Guard's power surfboat, which had been moored in Hither Creek early in the morning as "moving very slowly toward the group."

He asked the CAA station to ask the Coast Guard whether the people could be beached at Dionis. Henry Gabriel, the communicator, relayed the message. Gabriel also called the police station and asked Chief Mooney to attend to the medical problem. Mooney agreed.

Odum, meanwhile, had tried and failed to reroute the Coast Guard picket boat, which was far better equipped to save the four in the water than the 26-footer which finally came alongside.

The picket boat at this moment was cruising out of the harbor toward Cross Rip Lightship, far to the northwest.

"I went over," Odum said, "and waved to them and dived toward the survivors. They were 4 miles away from the survivors. They just waved back. There were three men at least—and it looked like more—on the boat.

"Out in the harbor something was floating with a black flag. They looked at that—I don't know what it was. After 5 minutes of trying to make them understand what I meant, I gave up in disgust and went back over to the survivors."

EARLIER SEARCH

The picket boat cruised away in the opposite direction.

The CAA radiomen later learned that this boat, like others on the search (with the possible exception of the cutter) had no radio in operating condition.

Earlier, the picket had searched east of the Brant Point Station. When Boatswain Beaumont needed it most, when he ran to the beach at Brant Point and frantically waved it westward, he could talk to it only by arm signals—because the radio, which worked the day before, was inoperative.

It was 10:34 when the CAA, in a conversation with the Coast Guard station, asked it to contact its boats and learned that "we have no radio available in the boats."

Just before that, Holdgate told the CAA station: "I don't know what in hell is the matter with the Coast Guard. They're still a mile away."

In a few more minutes, in another telephone conversation with Boatswain Beaumont at Brant Point, the CAA learned, according to its log:

1. Beaumont had "just learned" the survivors were sighted.

2. He had sent in a routine overdue report on the *Constance* the previous evening.

3. He had notified no local agencies, such as State and Nantucket police, firemen, and doctors.

4. He "couldn't say" as to whether Search and Rescue had been "directly notified." This, presumably, was not Beaumont's function, but that of his superiors at Woods Hole. They had notified Search and Rescue.

ACCOUNT OF SURFBOAT

This was Holdgate's account of the surfboat which was to reach the survivors:

"I noticed a Coast Guard lifeboat anchored close in to shore between Dionis and Eel Point. I made a pass over the boat and it seemed as though they were working on the engine * * * Shortly afterward I noticed the boat underway, so I made passes at it indicating the direction I desired it to take and continued making passes over the group of survivors, who at this time were about a quarter-mile north of the bar."

Odum saw the surfboat, too. At that time it was off Dionis Beach. He says: "It looked to be plodding at 1 knot and as if didn't know where to go. The CAA radio said, 'Buzz it.' I think it took 5 or 10 minutes to get it through their heads. Then I headed out to sea in the general direction of the survivors. They had to slow down for the shoal * * * finally they got to the survivors." He said it took at least 30 minutes.

At just about this time, the CAA log reveals the Coast Guard was urgently requesting the CAA to radio the planes to keep buzzing the survivors, so that boats would be guided to them.

For the next half hour or so, the Coast Guard rescue effort boils down to two people, Boatswain's Mate 1c Harold J. Thurston, a big, rugged, curly-haired man, and Seaman Gerald O. Makell, a small, but nevertheless determined man.

NOT ENOUGH

They were aboard the surfboat, dispatched there from the duck. Plainly, there were not enough of them. Plainly, their rescue attempt ended tragically. Just as plainly, they gave every bit they had to give.

Guided by the planes, they beat their way out through the chop to the sandbar where the four survivors had drifted, straight out from Dionis Beach.

"Mit spotted the boat first" (remember, Mit and Bob, joined by a rope, were also joined at a greater distance to Allenby and Emily Foster), Allenby said, "and she hollered. I turned at the top of a wave and could see the bow. It was quite near. It circled. I don't know what it did just after that."

What it did, as Holdgate and Odum saw from the air, was this (Holdgate talking):

"It cast a line which fell short of the group. The boat then made a circle outside of the survivors, coming in downwind. * * * They threw another line, which landed amongst the group." At this time, Holdgate flew out of range.

HE REMEMBERS

But Allenby was lucid until moments after his rescue, and he remembers what happened.

"I felt Mit and Bob were strong enough to wait. I said, 'Get this girl in first.' They pulled Em and me in. We tried to pull Mit in—and she was trying to get one leg up over.

"The boat rolled deeply. I fell back. She slid under the boat. The little fellow (this would be Makell) who held her hand, held on, and went down into the water holding onto her. The big guy (Thurston) was holding Bob and trying to help Mit at the same time.

"After Mit went under, they both tried to pull Bob in and the boat (which was rolling broadside in the choppy shoal while its men tried to save the victims) rolled again and he went under, too.

"There were two or three lines, you understand, trailing around us—one around me, one around Mit and Bob * * * I'm not critical of anyone in that boat. I feel they did all they could."

Emily's body (nobody will ever know just when she died, but it is very possible that she died just before or during her "rescue") was lying in the stern. Allenby, exhausted, had fallen on the bow. Mit and Bob, both still alive, were on the shore side of the surfboat, toward the bow.

As the boat rolled over so far it was in imminent danger of swamping, Thurston and Makell had to abandon their rescue attempt. The lifelines trailing from Mit and Bob Nairn fouled in the surfboat's propeller. One line tightened and dragged Mit Nairn back along the boat.

There she drowned, after a 17½-hour fight for her life.

LINE PARTED

Nairn's line parted and he drifted astern, his hope of salvation fading. Using the last iota of his strength, he put up a brief battle for life.

As Odum saw it: "The boat drifted away from this fellow in the water. He made a frantic, 5-foot swim and then just quit and drowned. When I left, they were rowing in with one guy floating free, face down, in the water. I can't help wondering why they didn't use a boathook."

Here is Holdgate's version of Nairn's death: "All during this time I had relayed to the CAA the progress of the rescue and said that something had fouled things up as they had only been able to save one person.

"On the next pass, a man was swimming about 30 feet astern of the boat. By this time, operations were inside the bar. This

person seemed quite strong, and was trying his best * * * but on our following pass, George Lusk said, 'He's all done. He has just waved his last.'

"* * * We noted he had dropped his head in the water. * * * I made one more pass and noticed the men getting ready to row."

REVEALED BY LOGS

The times at which these last acts of the tragedy happened are revealed by the police and CAA logs:

10 a. m.: Holdgate sighted the survivors. CAA notified the Coast Guard.

10:20: Holdgate gave position as not more than 1,000 feet off a sandbar a mile north of Dionis Beach; reported four persons definitely alive.

10:20 to 10:30: Odum tried in vain to direct picket boat to the scene. Holdgate made passes over a Coast Guard surfboat under way from Hither Creek.

10:26: Howes radioed Chief Mooney: "Two planes flying around a surfboat and going off to some object."

10:34: Holdgate swore angrily that the boat was still a mile away. The Coast Guard told CAA it had no radio communication with its boats.

10:49: Howes to Mooney: "Surfboat in trouble, rowing." This refers to the return trip. In 5 minutes four live people had been reached, three had died, and a surfboat was shoreward-bound, with propeller fouled and one lone survivor.

10:50: CAA, talking with Quonset by interphone, learned that no unifying card had been posted on any alert in the area.

11:01: The Coast Guard alerted its net of stations by teletype.

The surfboat came ashore at or a moment before 11:05 a. m. with one survivor.

The Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which has just adjourned, will go down in history as the tree which bent before the gale of statism. I wish I could find it in my heart to say that the Eighty-first Congress had the keen realization of the Eightieth Congress that President Truman's program was basically designed to change the American form of government.

When the Republican-controlled Congress ceased to exist on January 3 of this year, the cost of Government stood at approximately $39,000,000,000 a year, due to reductions in cost insisted on by Republicans in Congress. The budget was balanced for the first time in a generation, and the ever upward trend in the national debt had been reversed.

When the Eighty-first Congress convened on January 3, the Democrats controlled the Senate by a majority of 12 votes and the House by a majority of 92 votes. Mr. Truman had at last obtained his wish—he had a Democrat Congress with which to enact a program that he had said the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress could pass in 15 days. It has been 15 months since Mr. Truman made that statement and only a fraction of that program has yet been enacted into law. But, it is a fraction that is significant when weighed on the scales of Americanism versus statism.

The administration's program contained elaborate schemes to socialize agriculture, socialize medicine, socialize food, socialize housing, and socialize power.

For most of these schemes the administration offered no estimate of cost and has not to this very day. However, experts who have examined the complexities of the administration's proposals have estimated that if they were enacted into law the cost of Government must eventually rise to approximately $84,000,000,000 a year, or more than twice what it was when the Eightieth Congress ceased to exist on January 3. In the rise in the cost of Government lies the secret of the program to socialize America and it is little wonder that for most of its proposals, the administration flatly declined to estimate the cost.

With the cost of all government, Federal, State, and local, now taking more than one-fourth of our national income it is easy to see that if you double the cost of Federal Government and double or possibly triple the tax burden, then Americans in every walk of life will find themselves helpless to provide for their families and will have no recourse but to depend on Government for sustenance and livelihood. We have seen that happen in Russia, Italy, and Germany. We are now watching it happen in Britain. No thinking person who loves America could possibly subscribe to such a program.

Yet the fact is that this Congress has at the behest of the administration increased the cost of Government to $45,000,000,000, and once again the White House has embraced deficit spending in the face of repeated warnings by economists that it places an undue burden on an already shaky economy. Once again the national debt is on its way up and it is clear that we are entering a new era of irresponsible spending which only an alert American people can stop.

The Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress have dedicated themselves to fighting this headlong rush toward statism. They have battled ceaselessly to bring expenditures down to meet revenue and virtually every cut in this session was sponsored by a Republican. But the White House using tactics that would cause a ward politician to blush, and driving the heavy Democratic majority in both the House and Senate under the leash of patronage and reprisal, has so demolished the fiscal order established by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress that the Government faces a deficit of nearly $6,000,000,000 next June 30.

The President recently issued a statement in which he professed to find improvement, according to his standards, in the comparative performances of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress. If anyone will examine those claims carefully, they can see for themselves that most of the accomplishments were extensions or continuations or implementations of constructive acts taken by the Eightieth Congress—which Mr. Truman so vigorously denounced. The plain truth is that the administration has been proposing for over a year that Congress vote the Nation into a socialistic state, and the further truth is that Mr. Truman so far has been unable to sell either the Eightieth or the Eighty-first Congress that we should abandon the American form of government and embrace statism. The administration has been waging a delaying fight and has simply postponed a show-down battle until next year when Congress reconvenes.

There can be no mistake about what the year 1950 holds for America. Mr. Truman's socialistic program must be stopped in the months ahead. It is evident that the White House intends to drive Congress into a corner where it will be as helpless as the American people will be if this program is carried out. If we are to stop this reckless plunge toward statism Americans must rise to a great crusade to save their country. Their Congressmen are now returning home to their districts. I hope and pray that every American who wants to help save our country will make his wishes known directly to his elected representative either in person or in writing in the next 2 months before Congress reconvenes. The year 1950 may well see the American form of government, with its precious guaranties of freedom and liberty for everyone, triumph or fall.

Economic Mission to Far East Recommended To Increase Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Philippines are today the third largest customer of the United States, and the markets of the Far East offer unlimited possibilities for the future. These markets are important to American business and we should make every effort to develop and expand trading with the Far East.

Mr. Herman Yaras, of Beverly Hills, Calif., who is president of one of the largest import-export companies on the west coast, returned from the Far East recently and emphasized this point in his statement which was reported in articles appearing in the Journal of Commerce, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, and New York Sun of October 19, 1949. Mr. Yaras recommended that the Government of the United States appoint an economic mission to go to the Far East and make a comprehensive study of business conditions there. The economic mission could then, from its findings, propose ways and means by which mutually beneficial commercial contacts can be put on a paying basis and increase our trade with the Far East.

Mr. Yaras has specialized in trade with the Far East for many years, and I believe his suggestions and recommendations should be recorded as reference material for those in the United States who are interested and may wish to use it in their study of this important subject.

[From the New York Times of October 19, 1949]

MISSION TO COMBAT REDS IN EAST URGED—YARAS, BACK FROM JAPAN, ASKS COMMISSION OF GOVERNMENT, BUSINESSMEN FOR SURVEY

Naming of a high-powered economic commission, composed of both businessmen and Government representatives, to make a survey of trade conditions and combat communism in the Far East was urged yesterday by Herman Yaras, president of Yaras & Co., import-export representatives for major American manufacturers. He has just returned from a business trip to Japan, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.

"We must know where we are going," Mr. Yaras said at a luncheon at the Roosevelt Hotel. "If we want to eradicate or contain the Communists in the Far East, we must stabilize existing governments, and that can be done intelligently only if we possess absolutely reliable information assembled by top experts in the field. A joint economic mission is needed to make a thorough survey."

In response to questions, Mr. Yaras said it was feasible for the United States to establish commercial relations with China on a barter basis without recognition of the Communist regime.

He expressed agreement with the views attributed to General MacArthur that triangular trade can function between Japan, the United States, and China, with China supplying Japan with coke, coal, and iron, and the United States taking manufactured goods from Japan in payment on an initial basis of $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. Yaras revealed that while he was in Japan in August he learned of a four-man Communist trade mission which arrived in that country by plane.

Reporting that the dollar shortage in the Far East is even more acute than in Europe, Mr. Yaras declared private interests must take the initiative in making investments in and promoting imports from the far eastern countries. Government loans and grants are not the long-range answer to the dollar shortage, he declared, yet Government policies and programs of a character that will give maximum safeguards to investments abroad and encourage both exports and imports are absolutely essential.

Mr. Yaras said that establishment of a free zone in the Philippines would be extremely helpful in rebuilding that country's economy as it would induce American manufacturers and exporters to take a closer look at that country and discover its potentialities as a market. From a short-range standpoint, Mr. Yaras said he anticipated further tightening of Philippine import restrictions, as the Government there is trying to save $20,000,000 a month in strengthening its reserves.

In Tokyo, Mr. Yaras met with General MacArthur. He had high praise for the general who has done an outstanding job in the over-all picture. He cited as one weakness that General MacArthur is forced to rely too much on subordinates, who, he said, lack knowledge of the Far East. He declared the Supreme Command for the Allied Powers has done a good job and gradually Japan is moving forward to self-sufficiency, but it is an uphill climb. The unionization of heretofore unorganized Japanese labor moved forward too rapidly, according to Mr. Yaras, and Communist agitators took advantage of the situation.

He predicted expropriation of American business interests in China and urged that General MacArthur be given opportunity to handle the situation.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 19, 1949]

YARAS FAVORS UNITED STATES-RED CHINA BARTER SYSTEM—FOREIGN TRADE FIRM HEAD WOULD ACCEPT NEW TRENDS

The United States must accept political and economic trends in the Far East and expand trade under them or withdraw and see this vast export-import business go to the British and other nations, Herman Yaras, president of the foreign trade firm of Yaras & Co., said here yesterday. Mr. Yaras has just returned from a business trip to Japan, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.

Speaking before a press luncheon at the Roosevelt, Mr. Yaras advocated barter trade between the United States and Communist China. Otherwise, he added, economic deterioration in China will lead to chaos. The British, he pointed out, are trading with China and Japan and is as much in need of Chinese imports as the Chinese are of Japanese goods. Mr. Yaras said four Communist representatives were in Japan recently investigating the trade possibilities between Japan and Communist China. He said they were especially interested in railway equipment.

FREE ZONE IN PHILIPPINES

Private interests, he said, must take the initiative in making investments and promoting imports from the Far East. Government loans and grants, he added, are not the long-term answer to the dollar shortage. However, he added, Government policies and programs that will give maximum safeguards to investments abroad are essential.

Establishment of a free zone in the Philippines, he asserted, would be helpful in rebuilding that nation's economy and would induce American manufacturers to discover the huge potentialities of the Philippines as a market.

Mr. Yaras praised Gen. Douglas MacArthur but said that he is forced to rely too much on subordinates who, while doing their best, lack knowledge of the Far East. The Army has sent civilian employees to General MacArthur who do not meet requirements. Experienced businessmen and administrators would be of greater value to him.

JAPAN FOUND GAINING

Japan is gradually moving forward to self-sufficiency, he said, adding that two factors need to be watched: Japanese bureaucracy with its tendencies toward monopolistic practices and labor strife inspired by Communist agitators. The men who replaced the purged top business leaders, he said, lack experience in handling the problems caused by rapid unionization.

He predicted expropriation of American business interests in China. In conclusion he urged appointment of an economic commission to make a thorough survey of far eastern conditions.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of October 19, 1949]

EXPORTER URGES UNITED STATES BARTER TRADE PACT WITH RED CHINA

An American exporter, representing several prominent manufacturers in their trade with the Far East, yesterday recommended that the United States establish commercial relations on a barter basis with Communist China without formal recognition of the new regime.

Herman Yaras, president of Yaras & Co., said at a press conference at the Hotel Roosevelt that General MacArthur indicated to him in a personal interview on a recent trip to Japan that he favors the initiation of a triangular trade movement covering the United States, Japan, and Communist Chinese areas.

RED MISSION IN JAPAN

Mr. Yaras said that a four-man trade mission from the Communist government in Peiping arrived in Japan by plane August 10. The exporter said that he did not know whether the mission had been received by American occupation authorities but that they "presumably" had knowledge of its presence.

He told reporters that he had personally spoken with two members of the mission who were interested in securing rolling stock and rails for railroads in Communist areas from Japan. Mr. Yaras said that his office in Japan was handling submission of quotations on these products to the mission.

Among the United States companies represented by Yaras & Co. are National Biscuit Co., F. A. Ferris Co. (Stahl-Meyer), Comstock Canning Co., Gould Storage Battery Co., Anaconda Copper Co., Emerson Drug Co., Old Gold Cigarettes, American Chicle, Diamond Match Co., and Wyandotte Chemical Co. A Yaras & Co. representative said that the export-import house also has "working arrangements" with several other firms, including Standard Brands, American Thread, William Wrigley, Jr., Co., and American Potash & Chemical Corp.

URGES BARTER AGREEMENT

Mr. Yaras, in response to questions said that he did not believe the Communist government has ample dollar exchange to buy directly from the United States in any substantial volume and therefore a barter agreement would be most practical to restore trade relations.

He recounted that General MacArthur's headquarters favored a triangular trade whereby the Communist government would ship coke, coal, and iron ore to Japan. In return, Japan would ship manufactured goods to the United States to compensate for United States exports to China. He estimated that the coke, coal, iron ore shipments could amount to $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 a year initially.

Communist China, Mr. Yaras said, needs from the United States certain types of machinery, raw cotton, chemicals, and fertilizer. The Chinese could ship the United States in return under any barter agreement such products as bristles, wood oil, and manganese.

He said he knew of no United States Government regulations which would prohibit barter trade between the United States and Communist China, although, admittedly, the establishment of a trade agreement would constitute tacit recognition of the new regime. Mr. Yaras recommended that such a barter agreement could be effected on a government-to-government basis, or among private firms, or through a combination of the two.

SCAP COOPERATION PLEDGED

He told the conference that while in Tokyo he had been assured by a member of the Supreme Command for the Allied Powers, whom he identified as Gen. W. F. Marquette, of SCAP cooperation in shipping goods from Japan to Communist Chinese areas.

Commenting on SCAP operations, Mr. Yaras said that General MacArthur had done an outstanding job but that he had been forced to rely too heavily on subordinates who lack knowledge of the Far East.

He warned that although Japan is moving toward self-sufficiency more progress could have been made if more experienced men were available to SCAP. Mr. Yaras urged that two factors in Japanese developments should be given close attention: (1) Japanese bureaucracy with its tendencies toward monopolistic practices and, (2) labor strife, inspired by Communist agitators.

Reporting on his trip to the Philippines, Mr. Yaras stated that the island's economic situation is precarious and the Philippine Government faces serious problems with re-

gard to preservation of dollar reserves. Philippine progress since the end of the war has not kept pace with reconstruction in Japan, he said.

[From the New York Sun of October 19, 1949]

ECONOMIC MISSION URGED FOR EAST

An economic commission of businessmen and Government representatives to survey trade conditions in the Far East is a prerequisite to any American effort to extend trade and combat communism there, Herman Yaras, president of Yaras & Co., import-export representatives for major American manufacturers, declared yesterday at the Hotel Roosevelt. Yaras has just returned from Japan, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.

"We must know where we are going," he said. "If we want to eradicate or contain Communists in the Far East we must stabilize existing governments and that can be done only if we possess absolutely reliable information assembled by top experts in the field."

It is feasible for the United States to establish commercial relations with China on a barter basis without recognition of the Communist regime, Yaras added. He agreed with views attributed to General MacArthur that triangular trade can function among Japan, this country, and China.

Noting that the dollar shortage is more acute in the Far East than in Europe, Yaras said that private interests here must take the initiative in making investments in and promoting imports from the far eastern countries. He urged the establishment of a free zone in the Philippines as a helpful step in rebuilding the insular economy.

Notes from Harry Hershfield, Eminent Humorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith bits of legislative humor, given to me by that eminent humorist, Mr. Harry Hershfield:

In the early days of our Supreme Court, members of the pioneer stock were prone to imbibe a little too much. To prevent its increase, they ruled among themselves that they would engage in drink only when the weather was inclement—as a medicinal benefit. The rule was adhered to for months, but was finally broken by one of the bolder members. The Chief Justice reprimanded his associate: "Didn't we agree that we would drink only in inclement weather? Today the sun is shining brightly." "Yes," replied the guilty one, "but as members of the Supreme Court, we represent the whole United States, don't we?" "Yes, that's true," answered the Chief Justice. "Well," said the associate, "it must be raining or snowing somewhere in the country."

President Grover Cleveland was always at odds with the Senate over his proposed legislation, and claimed that half of the Members had no right to be in the Senate. With the House, however, he was on friendliest terms. He praised the House at every turn. One night, he retired after a terrific tussle with the Senate.

No sooner had he fallen asleep when he was awakened by his frightened butler: "Mister President—I think there are intruders in the house." "In the Senate, maybe," groaned Cleveland, "but not in the House."

In the Congress, there are two committees with the same function, but with different names. In the Senate, the committee is called Committee on Foreign Relations. In the House, it is called Committee on Foreign Affairs, proving that in the Senate, "they're too old for affairs," remarked a Capitol reporter.

A novice Congressman issued unconstitutional directives to his district. He was brought before a legislative committee, which informed him: "You have violated amendments 9, 12, and 14 of the Constitution." The puzzled legislator replied: "I didn't know it was against the law." Again he was informed: "Ignorance of the law is no excuse." "Gee," he answered, "that I positively didn't know."

President Coolidge was not only reticent in his own performance, but demanded little talk from others. He was against conversation in general. Going to a strange barber one day, he hoped the tonsorial artist would go about his work without talking. But no—the barber chinned and chinned till Coolidge finally summoned the boss and complained about it. "Sorry," replied the boss. "I can't stop him. According to the Constitution, he can talk as much as he likes." "I know it," retorted the President, "but the United States has a Constitution that can stand it. Mine can't."

Kennamer Reunion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the strength of any nation largely rests upon the family life in it.

The American home always has been the solid rock in the foundation of our Nation's structure and the strong ties that bind the members of a family together are the patriotic threads in the fabric of our national life.

Among one of the great families of our Nation is the Kennamer tribe in the State of Alabama. They have contributed much, not only to their respective localities in the State of Alabama, but to many different parts of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article which appeared in the Jackson County Sentinel, Scottsboro, Ala., August 30, 1949:

KENNAMER REUNION

The twenty-first Kennamer reunion was held at Pisgah, Kennamer Cove, Marshall County, Ala., Saturday, August 27, 1949.

A larger number of the clan attended this reunion than has been at any reunion during or since the late war. There were about 500 present; many coming from other States.

I shall make no effort to give the names of all in attendance—only a few of those from other States: David W. Kennamer, Northport, Long Island, N. Y.; Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Kennamer, Jr., and two daughters, Carolyn and Helen, Washington, D. C.; Judge Franklin E. Kennamer, Tulsa, Okla.; Mrs. Effie Sauls, Odonald, Tex.; Ray Alexander, Miss Cleo Alexander, Mrs. Ollie Sanders and son, Jimmie, Grapevine, Tex.; Mr. and Mrs. Henry Clay Kenimer, Dalton, Ga.; T. F. Gilley, Daylight, Tenn.; Mr. and Mrs. Sam Prince and son Roland, Mr. and Mrs. Milton Kennamer, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Fifteen came from Chattanooga, Tenn. They were present from many places in Alabama—Montgomery, Sheffield, Huntsville, Guntersville, Boaz, Scottsboro, and other places.

Raymond A. Kennamer, president of the Kennamer Family Association, presided.

The following were elected as officers for the association for the next 2 years: President, Judge Charles B. Kennamer, Montgomery; vice president, Lawton C. Kennamer, Scottsboro; secretary, David C. Kennamer, Sheffield; treasurer, Elmer Page, Woodville; historian, Willard C. Kennamer, Yonkers, N. Y.; committee on business, Talmage Kennamer, Murral Kennamer, and Lendon Kennamer, all of Woodville.

The Scottsboro Band, under the direction of Mr. Foley, furnished music.

The dinner was superb, delicious, and in abundance as usual, for the ladies well know how to put on a real feast.

I am sure no other family in America can boast of two living Federal judges, brothers, born in a log house in Kennamer Cove, Ala. They are Judge Charles B. Kennamer, Montgomery, Ala., and Judge Franklin E. Kennamer, Tulsa, Okla. They both made short talks at the reunion. Ralph Kennamer, Montgomery, Ala., Roland Prince, Oak Ridge, Tenn., and H. C. Kenimer, Dalton, Ga., were the main speakers.

It is good to have so many members of this large family from over the Nation to meet once a year, where Hans Kennamer and family settled 140 years ago, and to renew acquaintances and imbibe anew the sterling qualities of honesty, self-reliance, love of God, love of liberty and freedom and independence and country.

The reunion is always held the last Saturday in August.

JOHN R. KENNAMER, Sr.
WOODVILLE, ALA.

Suits Indicated If Steel Union Wins Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, under authority of the order of the Senate of the 19th instant, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of October 17, 1949, entitled "Suits Indicated If Steel Union Wins Pensions."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUITS INDICATED IF STEEL UNION WINS PENSIONS—HOLTHUSEN TELLS TWO FIRMS THEY FACE HOLDER FIGHTS

Two of the steel companies now being struck by the CIO United Steel Workers of America on the pension issue have been advised that if they accede to any pension or insurance plan for employees wthout having first obtained authorization to do so from the stockholders an injunction will be sought to prohibit such payments, and that if the payments are made the directors will be sued personally.

This new legal turn of events in the steel strike came to light yesterday when it was learned that Maj. Henry F. Holthusen of the law firm of Holthusen & Pinkham, 5 Maiden Lane, and for many years a substantial stockholder in Inland Steel Co. and Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., had so warned the managements of the two steel concerns.

Major Holthusen is a former special assistant to the Attorney General, an author and, in 1931, was named by President Hoover as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia. He has tangled with corporations several times over the last two decades, sometimes representing them and at other times attacking bonus, special incentive, and pension plans.

In 1931 he represented a minority stockholder group in the Burns Bros. recapitalization and refinancing plan; in 1932 he was attorney for a creditors' committee which took over the operation of the Dimon Steamship Corp.; in 1933 he helped organize the Association of American Tories; in 1935 he was counsel for New York Shipbuilding Corp. during a strike, and in 1943 he fought a long legal battle with Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Corp., finally succeeding in getting the court to enjoin a proposal to give options to 161 officers and employees to buy stock of the company at a concession.

AUTHORITY IS QUESTIONED

In his present surprise action Major Holthusen questions the authority of the management of the steel companies to pay out a substantial sum for a pension plan, when such payments could constitute disposing of valuable assets of the stockholders, and without their approval.

Any such payment, he said, especially payment of a large lump sum, such as would be required to start the pension plan, "would seem to have no reasonable relation to future services and to be without consideration. When attempts have been made to create somewhat similar bonus and pension plans for management, legal controversy has arisen and, as you know, many such plans have been struck down by the courts."

The quotation is taken from a letter written by Major Holthusen to Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel Co., Chicago. A similar letter was sent to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

In his letters he says he recognizes that collective bargaining of managements with unions on rates of pay and working conditions are an obvious function of management, and that on such matters there has been no reason to consult stockholders, the real owners of the business and the assets.

"The present drive for pension and insurance funds is something different," he said. "These proposals are designed to force the employer to pay the employee and his immediate family during periods when the employee is not producing. Moreover, these plans, as proposed by labor, generally involve a substantial cash payment, out of the corporate treasury, either to trustees or to an insurance company, for the purpose of putting the plan into immediate operation."

MUST INCREASE AMOUNTS

Amounts presently contemplated are insufficient to achieve the objectives of labor, he pointed out, and if all employees are to receive sums adequate for medical treatment during illness and comfortable sustenance during old age the amounts now under discussion will have to be doubled and trebled.

"We shareholders are the owners of the business," the letter to Mr. Randall continued. "Once money has been accumulated by the corporation, it belongs to us. Since you have repeatedly and publicly stated that these pension and insurance plans will fix a pattern which may have a disastrous effect upon the future of the business, how can you act without consulting the stockholders?"

Major Holthusen then pointed out that Inland Steel has more stockholders than employees, and asks: "Are we to be utterly ignored while management—most of the members of which have no financial interest in the company except the preservation of salaries—bargains with a labor union which has no interest whatever in the business except to take as much out of it as possible for its members?"

"In reality," he added, "the controversy is not between management and the union, it is between the shareholders and the workers." If, at a special meeting of stockholders, the holders of a majority of the stock favor pensions then the management can meet the union demands without fear of litigation or criticism, he said; but if the majority votes "no," then management's problem will be as clearly solved.

"They (the shareholders) have power to bind the management and the board," he said. "Further bargaining with the union on this subject will be eliminated. You can then advise the union officials that you lack power to meet their demands."

Investigation of Atomic Energy Commission—Minority and Separate Views (Pt. 2 of S. Rept. No. 1169)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, under authority of the order of the Senate of October 19, 1949, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views on the investigation of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the separate views of Hon. CARL HINSHAW.

There being no objection, the minority views and separate views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1169)

The undersigned members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who disagree with the report of the majority of the committee on the investigation of the Atomic Energy Commission, file the following views:

We actively support the most vigorous development of our atomic-energy program. It is vital to our country and to the free nations of the world that we maintain our preeminence in this field. We cannot tolerate a leisurely, wasteful, or incompetent administration of our program.

While publicity and emphasis have been given to public hearings, it should be noted that much important evidence has also been developed in the many hearings by the joint committee, over the past 2½ years, in which secret information and testimony were received. This has all been considered in reaching our conclusions.

The necessary secrecy involved in this program and the wide scope of responsibility of the joint committee impose a corresponding public trust upon its members.

We would fall short of our obligation to the Congress and to the American people if we gloss over or excuse the weaknesses in the operation of this program.

Therefore, based upon the cumulative information which we, as members of the joint committee, have received, we conclude that:

PROGRESS

1. That although we now have more atomic weapon strength by a wide margin than any other nation, nevertheless, our national security demands bolder, speedier, and more effective development of our atomic program to meet the vital necessity of constantly maintaining and expanding our preeminence in this field.

Since the establishment of the Commission almost 3 years ago, it has been aware, through authoritative recommendations, of the pressing urgency of putting into action certain programs that will strengthen our reserve of atomic materials and aid the objective of capturing and having available for effective use the largest practicable degree of the power of those atomic materials for weapons and other purposes.

The Commission's approach to this supreme task has been leisurely, has been characterized by indecision, and a number of the most important of these recommended projects have not developed into operating plants.

SECURITY

2. Although numerous provisions to preserve security of information and processes wisely characterize the Atomic Energy Act, security has been so loosely administered in violation of the law that widespread opportunity has been provided for infiltration of subversives and for loss of secret information. For example, several thousand alleged emergency employees have been cleared for access to restricted data without prior FBI investigations. Radioactive isotopes have been shipped abroad for industrial and military research. Known Communists have been admitted into educational programs in atomic science supported by Commission funds.

Moreover, the Commission would exchange our atomic information with certain other nations. Such action, halted only by congressional protests, would put the circulation and use of such information beyond our control.

We call attention to the fact that the testimony shows that Commissioner Lewis L. Strauss has strongly opposed the Commission's desire to exchange atomic information with other nations.

These and other related policies have been repeatedly and vigorously crticized by members of the joint committee.

MANAGEMENT

3. We recognize that the size of the program justifies suitable delegations of the Commission's authority. The Commission has made large delegations of its authority to area managers and to contract operators. But in many instances it has failed to maintain adequate supervision of these delegations. The result has been that in certain important projects the Commission has been insufficiently informed of what has been going on. This has importantly and adversely affected the security of the program and has produced inefficiencies and considerable waste of public money.

With the exception above stated, we have directed these criticisms to the Commission as a whole. This is compelled by the fact that we requested and by committee vote were denied the opportunity to hold executive hearings to determine the nature of the dozen formal voting disagreements by Commissioner Strauss and the individual views thereon of the other Commissioners.

It should be added that Dr. H. D. Smyth and Mr. Gordon Dean did not become members of the Commission until after the hearings had been determined upon, and, therefore, we do not include them in these criticisms.

The announcement by the President of an atomic explosion in Russia emphasizes the

necessity for the prompt and thorough correction of the practices which we have criticized so that we can maintain and constantly expand our supremacy in atomic energy.

We believe that the investigation was thoroughly warranted and that it has already produced some constructive results.

Respectfully submitted by the following members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate.
W. STERLING COLE,
CHARLES H. ELSTON,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF HON. CARL HINSHAW

OCTOBER 22, 1949.

The report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of its investigation into the United States Atomic Energy Commission, is an interesting and informative essay compiling quantities of information from a number of previously published sources, interspersed here and there with subject matter and long legal dissertations related to the investigation conducted by the committee at the instigation of Senator HICKENLOOPER. As a document it is smartly designed to both give due credit to the Atomic Energy Commission for its many accomplishments and at the same time to indicate to the careful reader that there is plenty of room for criticism of its failures and shortcomings. However, the criticism is well hidden in the haystack of language.

As examples, I quote the following from the report:

Page 18 (re Hanford overrun): "No extenuating testimony can gloss over the fact, however, that the Commission did not grasp the situation until far more than a reasonable time had elapsed."

Page 30 (referring to the natural-gas pipeline at Oak Ridge): "Considering all these factors, whatever added protection may be gained through two basic fuel sources, instead of one, is to the last degree marginal."

Page 32: "The joint committee believes that reactor development should proceed with all possible speed, and disappointment therefore follows from reflection that, in 2½ years, the Commission has not broken ground on a single new-type high-power reactor."

Pages 39 to 40 (here the committee took the Commission seriously to ask for its views on the Atomic Energy Commission fellowship program and indicated the concluding action of the Congress itself. The following is pertinent quotation from the report): "No man has a vested right to Government financial aid; and the people of the United States are justified in attaching such conditions as they, through their representatives, deem fit in making fellowship awards."

Page 86: "In proportion to the scope of the account books, debit entries are well scattered through pages of accomplishment * * * in operations of such a unique character mistakes and errors of judgment are bound to occur."

In view of the foregoing remarks contained in the report and others of similar but less pointed nature, I, as one member of the Joint Committee, cannot "disagree" with the report as such. At the same time, it is my belief that the report, in its context, and, in addition to being an excellent compendium of information concerning the atomic energy projects of the United States, is a document containing political implication both by direction and indirection. I regret the circumstances which impelled the majority to rise to defend the Commission and its chairman politically, and feel, at the same time, that the best interests of the United States would have been served by ignoring politics in the report. It is my firm opinion that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has an exceedingly important duty to perform for the people of the United States, which far transcends any other consideration.

CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress.

Something About the Work of Our Immigration and Naturalization Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Naturalization Service performs a most significant task in our Government. It is presided over by Commissioner Watson P. Miller and an excellent staff. My work, as a Member of the House and as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, brings me into close and daily contact with the many officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. My correspondence with them covers the Nation, and I can testify to the loyalty and industry of the officials and of the rank and file of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They carry out with splendid efficiency the well-nigh insuperable burdens imposed on them, but unfortunately they are frequently the targets of unjustified criticism.

In order properly to offset this criticism and to bestow upon this service the tribute I believe it deserves, I have drawn up the following report of its activities:

Although earlier laws were directed to the regulation of immigration to the United States, the Service as an organization of the Government began with the act of March 3, 1891—section 7, Twenty-sixth Statutes, page 1084. That act set up the office of Superintendent of Immigration in the Department of the Treasury. Four years later, by the act of March 2, 1895—section 1, Twenty-eighth Statutes, page 780—the title of Superintendent was changed to Commissioner General of Immigration. In February 1903 Congress—Thirty-second Statutes, page 825—also act of April 28, 1904—Thirty-third Statutes, page 591—authorized the transfer of the Immigration Service from the Secretary of the Treasurer to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. Under the terms of the act of June 29, 1906—Thirty-fourth Statutes, page 596—which provided for the Federal supervision of naturalization, the Bureau of Immigration became the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. On March 14, 1913—section 3, Thirty-seventh Statutes, page 737—the consolidated Bureau was transferred to the new Department of Labor and divided into two bureaus known as the Bureau of Immigration and the Bureau of Naturalization. At the head of the Bureau of Immigration was a Commissioner General, while at the head of the Bureau of Naturalization was the Commissioner. These bureaus continued to function separately until June 10, 1933, when, by virtue of Executive Order 6166, the President, acting pursuant to congressional authority, directed that the Bureaus of Immigration and of Naturalization be consolidated as an Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor, and that the head of the Service should be known as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. By Reorganization Plan No. V—volume 5, Federal Register, page 2223—the President, on May 22, 1940, acting pursuant to the provisions of Reorganization Act of April 3, 1939—Fifty-third Statutes, page 561, Fifth United States Code, pages 133–134—submitted to Congress a proposal to transfer the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice. The plan was approved and the transfer became effective June 14, 1940. Since the last-mentioned date the Service has continued to operate as a division of the Department of Justice under the general direction of the Attorney General.

The Commissioner is appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. All other members of the Service, including the Commissioner's immediate staff and the directors of field districts, are career employees. These staff officers and directors are employees of long experience in the Service who have attained their positions because of proven ability and specialized knowledge in their field.

The functions of the Service, broadly speaking, relate to the admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens, the registration and fingerprinting of aliens, the naturalization of noncitizens lawfully resident in the United States, the investigation of alleged violations of the immigration and nationality laws, and the prevention of unauthorized entry of aliens into the United States.

The principal acts now administered by the Service are as follows: The act approved February 5, 1917, as amended—Thirty-ninth Statutes, page 874, Eighth United States Code, page 173; the act of July 1, 1924, as amended—Forty-third Statutes, page 153, Eighth United States Code, page 201; the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended—Fifty-fourth Statutes, page 1137, Eighth United States Code, page 907; the act of October 16, 1918, as amended—Fifty-fourth Statutes, page 673, Eighth United States Code, page 137; and title III of the Alien Registration Act—Fifty-fourth Statutes, page 673, Eighth United States Code, page 451. These acts in their order relate to the individual qualifications of the alien, the application of the quota provisions, the determination of nationality, and the naturalization of aliens, the exclusion and expulsion of aliens of the subversive classes, and the registration and fingerprinting of aliens.

Functionally, the Service activity is directed by the Commissioner and his staff from the central office located in Washington and operating through 17 field districts. The geographical area of the Service activities includes the continental United States, Alaska, and the islands of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the

Virgin Islands. The coastal and land boundaries of the United States and its Territorial possessions have 416 designated ports through which aliens may lawfully apply for examination and admission to the United States. The land boundaries of the continental United States extending for more than 5,000 miles require vigilant guarding at all times to prevent surreptitious entries at other than designated ports of entry. And in some instances, as for example along the coasts of Florida, similar vigilance is necessary to prevent unauthorized entry from the sea. To prevent clandestine entries the Service operates a border patrol which presently is composed of about 1,100 personnel. It is necessary to man the 416 ports of entry by trained and experienced personnel, presently totaling approximately 1,000, who examine applicants for admission to the United States. Because of the magnitude of the borders of the United States and vast numbers of persons who seek to enter the United States, the Service must conduct nearly 90,000,000 inspections each year. The great majority of these relate to persons who reside in adjacent countries along the land borders and who habitually cross and recross the frontier. However, in order to assure complete observance of the immigration laws and to prevent violations, it is necessary for Service officers to examine each person who seeks to enter the United States, whether he claims to be a citizen or an alien, and to determine his qualifications for entry.

Enforcement of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States is a highly complex and difficul task, involving many diversified duties. In enforcing the immigration laws Service officers must examine each arriving alien, conduct board of special inquiry hearings, patrol the border, investigate suspected violations of the immigration and naturalization laws, apprehend persons charged with illegal entry, conduct deportation hearings, and deport aliens who eventually are found deportable. The administration of the naturalization laws, for which the Service is charged with a major share of responsibility, requires the examination of each applicant for naturalization, the investigation of his qualifications, making recommendations to the naturalization courts, promoting citizenship education of aliens who desire citizenship, and exercising administrative supervision over the work of the naturalization courts who have the ultimate responsibility for granting or denying naturalization.

The importance of the tasks performed by the Service is self-evident. The activities of the Service concern the rights and status of large numbers of human beings. It determines, under applicable statutory directions, whether applicants for admission may enter the United States and whether aliens within the United States are subject to deportation. It has an important share of responsibility in determining whether alien applicants may be granted American citizenship. Concededly the rights and privileges with which the Service deals are among the most cherished aspirations of the modern world.

Moreover, the activities of the Service bear a direct and important relationship to the national security of the United States during this disturbed era in world affairs. In a world convulsed by wars and political and ideological upheavals the Service is entrusted with primary responsibility for safeguarding our people against the entry of undesirable and subversive aliens while dealing justly and, so far as possible, showing mercy to those unqualified to enter. The Service cooperates closely with other agencies of the United States in the field of national security. In addition, the Service must seek out and expel those aliens in our midst who have betrayed our trust and who constitute a threat to our national safety.

In carrying out these manifold duties the Service has a total personnel of slightly less than 6,900.

Poem Written by Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Joseph Harris Stonestreet, of Barnesville, Md.:

Forty years on, when afar and asunder.
Parted are those who are singing today,
When you look back, and forgetfully wonder
What you were like in your work and your play;
Then, it may be, there will often come o'er you
Glimpses of notes like the catch of a song—
Visions of boyhood shall float them before you,
Echoes of dreamland shall bear you along.

Strategic Metals and Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two series of statistical tables relating to strategic metals and minerals. The source of the data from which the tables in these series were prepared is the United States Bureau of Mines and are revisions bringing up-to-date the tables prepared last year for the National Resources Economic Committee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I am chairman. The original tables appeared in the May 26, 1948, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 6479 and 6480, and in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A5139 to A5144 inclusive. They were reprinted in the 1948 reprints of my debates on the Senate floor.

The first series consists of two tables relating to group A strategic minerals. Table I shows the grade and unit for each strategic mineral and its average price in 1939, 1948, and the latest month in 1949. Table II shows for each strategic mineral its prewar 1938 domestic production and imports and similar figures for the latest year, 1948, as well as figures for a late war or early postwar year. The use of three such years permits a comparison of prewar with the latest postwar year and a comparison of the trend during the past 3 or 4 years.

The second series consists of 16 tables. The first two tables deal with five strategic metals, the second two tables with the three metals—copper, lead, and zinc—showing prices and production for the last 3 years. Each of the remaining 12 tables relates to one strategic metal only, and covers in detail its general statistical position, the source and amount of imports by country, and, in some instances, the stocks on hand in the United States as of the end of one or more postwar years.

The titles of the 2 tables in series 1 and of the 16 tables in series 2 are as follows:

SERIES 1

Table I. Comparison of 1939, 1948, and present prices of group A strategic minerals.

Table II. Prewar and postwar United States production and imports of group A strategic minerals.

SERIES 2

Table I. The domestic production of five important strategic minerals expressed as a percentage of world production, 1944–48.

Table II. The domestic production of five important strategic minerals expressed as a percentage of domestic consumption, 1943–48.

Table III. Average prices of the principal nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc) for 1947, 1948, and 1949 with percentage change, fiscal year 1949 compared with fiscal year 1948.

Table IV. Production of the principal nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc), fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, with percentage change, 1949 compared with 1948.

Table V. Copper:
(A) Statistical position of copper.
(B) Imports.

Table VI. Lead:
(A) Statistical position of lead.
(B) Lead stocks at end of year in the United States, 1943–48, in short tons.
(C) Source of imports.

Table VII. Zinc:
(A) Statistical position of zinc.
(B) Domestic slab zinc stocks at end of year, 1943–48, in short tons.
(C) Source of imports.

Table VIII. Mercury: (A) Salient statistics on mercury, 1943–48, by years.

Table IX. Tin:
(A) Statistical position of tin.
(B) Tin stocks in the United States, in long tons of tin content.
(C) Sources of imports.

Table X. Nickel:
(A) Statistical position.
(B) Source of imports.

Table XI. Antimony:
(A) Statistical position.
(B) Source of imports.

Table XII:

(A) Statistical position, manganese ore.

(B) Source of imports—manganese ore (35 percent or more Mn) imported into the United States, 1947–48, by countries.

Table XIII. Chromite:

(A) Statistical position.

(B) Source of imports—chromite imported for consumption in the United States, 1947–48, by countries and by grades.

Table XIV. Tungsten:

(A) Statistical position.

(B) Source of imports—tungsten ores and concentrates imported for consumption in the United States in 1948 (short tons, 60 percent WO_3).

Table XV. Asbestos: (A) Statistical position.

Table XVI. Bauxite: (A) Statistical position.

These data supply important material for study in connection with Senate bill 2105, known as the O'Mahoney-Hayden-MacFarland-Malone bill for the development and conservation of strategic and critical minerals.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of 1939, 1948, and present prices of group A strategic minerals*

Mineral	Grade	Unit	Average price, 1939	Quoted price, 1948	
				Month	Price
Antimony	99½ percent	Pound	12.36 cents	October	32 cents.
Asbestos	Rhodesian	Short ton	$300	do	$500 (approximate).
Do	South African	do	$260	do	$140 (approximate).
Bauxite	48.52 percent	Long ton	$4.50 to $5	do	$4.50 to $5.
Beryl	10 to 12 percent, B_2O	1 percent ton	$3 to $3.50	September	$30 to $35.
Bismuth	None	Pound	$1.05 to $1.25	October	$2.
Cadmium	do	do	64.1 cents	do	$2.
Celestite	92 percent strontium sulphate	Short ton	$37.49	September	$54.
Chromite, metallurgical	48 percent (3 to 1)	Long ton	$23.50 to $27	October	$39.
Cobalt	97 to 99 percent	Pound	$1.36 to $1.50	do	$1.80.
Columbite	65 percent (10 to 1)	do	49 cents	do	Nominal.
Copper	Electrolytic	do	11.07 cents	do	17.625 cents.
Corundum	None	Short ton	$53	do	$145.
Industrial diamonds	do	Per carat	$2.73	do	$1.50 to $40.
Graphite	Ceylon lump	Short ton	$50 to $70	September	$210.
Do	Flake	do	$90 to $125	do	$210.
Kyanite	None	Short ton	$14	do	$50 to $55.
Lead	do	Pound	5.05 cents	October	14.25 cents.
Manganese, metallurgical	48 to 50 percent	Long ton	30 to 50 cents	do	81.8 to 83.8 cents.
Mercury	None	Flask	$103.94	do	$73 to $75.
Mica	Muscovite, sheet and film	Pound	30 cents to $10	September	$1 to $12.
Do	Splittings	do	22 cents	do	42 cents to $4.75.
Do	Phlogopite splittings	do	do	do	70 cents to $6.
Monazite	None	Short ton	$75	do	$230 to $245.
Nickel	Electrolytic	Pound	35 cents	October	40 cents.
Platinum	None	Troy ounce	$36	do	$72.
Quartz crystal	100 to 10 M gram size	Pound		September	$1.20 to $37.
Rutile	94 percent concentrate	do	10 cents	October	4 to 6 cents.
Talc, steatite	Block or lava	Short ton	$64 to $78		Not available.
Tantalite	60 percent concentrate	Pound	$1.50 to $2.50	October	$2 to $2.50.
Tin	Grade A	do	50.2 cents	do	96 cents.
Tungsten	65 percent WO_3	Short ton unit of 20 pounds	$17.11	do	$28.50 (nominal).
Vanadium	V_2O_5	Pound	27½ cents	do	27½ cents.
Zinc	Prime western, East St. Louis	do	5.12 cents	do	9.25 cents.
Zircon	65 percent ZrO_2	Short ton	$55	do	$45.

Source: Bureau of Mines, U. S. Department of the Interior, May 25, 1948.

TABLE 2.—*Prewar and postwar United States production and imports of group A strategic minerals*

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Antimony (content, in short tons):		
1938	650	9,143
1946	2,505	5,905
1948	6,489	13,532
Asbestos (in short tons):		
1938	[1] 9,471	179,490
1946	[1] 14,075	456,688
1948	37,092	647,881
Bauxite (in long tons):		
1938	323,818	455,693
1946	1,018,774	852,005
1948	1,457,148	2,558,037
Beryl (in short tons of ore):		
1939	95	459
1945	39	1,201
1948	99	1,337
Bismuth (in pounds):		
1938	[2]	92,298
1946	[2]	[3]
1948	[2]	299,824
Cadmium (in pounds):		
1938	4,184,000	22,582
1946		[3]
1948	7,775,657	9,809
Celestite (in short tons):		
1938	[4]	276
1944	3,005	3,691
1948	[4]	21,771
Chromite (in short tons):		
1938	909	394,335
1947	948	1,107,128
1948	3,619	1,542,076
Cobalt (in pounds):		
1938	1,075	1,249,000
1944	828,515	[5] 3,801,441
1948	[3]	8,821,000

[1] Sold or used.
[2] Not published.
[3] Not available.
[4] None listed.
[5] In oxides, metal, and ore.

TABLE 2.—Continued

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Columbite (in pounds):		
1938	2,000	645,141
1945	1,149	4,277,152
1948	100	1,966,802
Copper in (short tons):		
1938	557,763	252,164
1947	847,563	413,894
1948	834,813	507,251
Corundum (no domestic production except some synthetic made from bauxite).		
Diamonds, industrial (all but a fraction imported).		
Graphite, natural (in short tons) (crystalline only):		
1942	7,120	10,183
1946	5,575	3,393
1948	9,949	4,025
Kyanite, Indian (United States kyanite is not equal to the Indian product):		
1938	[3]	3,964
1946	[3]	11,374
1948	[3]	17,091
Lead (in short tons):		
1938	369,726	112,371
1947		[6] 211,773
1948	333,413	347,262
Manganese (in short tons of ore, containing 35 percent or more of manganese):		
1938	[7] 28,359	[8] 541,616
1947	131,627	1,541,818
1948	131,100	1,256,597
Mercury (in flasks of 76 pounds):		
1938	17,991	2,362
1947	23,200	13,008
1948	14,338	31,951

[3] Not available.
[6] Ore, base bullion, etc.
[7] Shipments.
[8] For consumption.

TABLE 2.—Continued

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Mica (pounds of uncut sheet and punch):		
1938	939,507	391,125
1946	1,078,867	4,499,562
1948	270,042	2,829,335
Monazite (in short tons) (commercial quantities are imported):		
1938	[3]	456
1945	[3]	549
1948	[3]	[3]
Nickel (in short tons):		
1938	416	26,200
1946	352	92,500
1948	883	96,900
Platinum group metals (in troy ounces):		
1938	[9] 36,213	161,189
1946	[9] 101,778	407,210
1948	[9] 39,591	272,956
Quartz crystals (in pounds) (strategic quartz):		
1940	[3]	126,521
1945	[3]	1,329,798
1948	[3]	1,236,520
Rutile (short tons):		
1939	[3]	442
1947	8,562	12,637
1948	7,380	8,771
Sapphire and ruby	[10]	
Talc (black type talc)	[3]	28
Tantalite (in pounds)	560	116,886
Tin	[11]	
Tungsten (in short tons containing 60 percent of WO_3):		
1938	4,000	171
1947	3,200	6,300
1948	4,210	7,931
Vanadium (in pounds):		
1938	1,613,155	1,384,320
1946	1,272,148	791,057
1948	[3]	1,051,675

[3] Not available.
[9] New metals refined.
[10] No total production figures available. Some sapphires are mined domestically; no rubies are mined in the United States.
[11] Not domestically produced.

TABLE 2—Continued

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Zinc (in short tons):		
1938	516,703	25,813
1947	[12] 787,764	[12] 357,501
1948	[3]	17,707
Zirconium ores (no accurate statistics available, baddeleyite is not found in the United States).		

[3] Not available.
[12] Mine production of recoverable zinc.
[13] Zinc in ore, pigs, slabs, and blocks.

TABLE I.—*The domestic production of 5 important strategic minerals expressed as a percentage of world production*

	Bauxite	Chromite	Manganese	Mercury	Tungsten	Average
1944	40	3.0	8.0	24	19	19
1945	28	1.0	4.0	23	22	16
1946	24	.3	3.2	18	24	14
1947	19	.1	2.8	14	12	10
1948	18	.2	3.0	12	11	9

NOTE.—Nickel was omitted; domestic production is negligible. Tin was omitted; there has been no domestic production since 1944.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TABLE II.—*The domestic production of 5 important strategic minerals expressed as a percentage of domestic consumption*

	Bauxite	Chromite	Manganese	Mercury	Tungsten	Average
1943	131.0	16.6	12.9	95.0	58.8	45.8
1944	81.6	5.4	15.5	87.8	51.2	49.3
1945	40.1	1.7	12.3	49.3	37.1	28.1
1946	56.8	.6	12.6	80.3	76.4	45.3
1947	47.3	.1	9.3	65.3	37.8	32.0
1948	49.8	.4	8.5	31.1	45.3	27.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TABLE III.—*Average prices of the principal nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc)—fiscal 1947 compared with fiscal 1948 and 1949*

	Cents per pound			Percent change, 1948 over 1947	Percent change, 1949 over 1948
	Fiscal 1947	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949		
Copper	18.10	21.20	21.87	+16	+3
Lead	11.89	15.60	18.51	+31	+19
Zinc	9.85	11.17	14.96	+13	+34
Average				+20	+19

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TABLE IV.—*Production of the principal nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc)—fiscal year 1947 compared with fiscal years 1948 and 1949*

[Unit: Short tons]

	1947	1948	1949	Percent change 1948 over 1947	Percent change 1949 over 1948
Lead	357,548	388,800	402,700	+8.7	+3.6
Zinc	621,573	593,100	651,400	−3.6	+9.8
Copper	801,047	856,008	777,000	+6.8	−9.0
Total	1,780,168	1,837,900	1,831,100	+3.2	+0

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TABLE V.—*Copper*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION OF COPPER

[Quantities in short tons]

	World production	Domestic mine production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1943	3,038,000	1,090,818	36	716,596	294,459	1,502,000
1944	2,848,000	972,549	35	785,211	237,515	1,504,000
1945	2,409,000	772,894	33	853,196	132,555	1,415,000
1946	2,046,000	608,737	29	393,275	97,475	1,391,000
1947	2,481,000	847,563	35	413,894	196,999	1,286,000
1948—January	[1]	73,088	[1]	29,665	17,819	[1]
February	[1]	68,876	[1]	50,471	18,297	[1]
March	[1]	73,922	[1]	48,582	15,043	[1]
April	[1]	74,045	[1]	41,186	23,272	[1]
May	[1]	74,891	[1]	35,312	19,861	[1]
June	[1]	75,601	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
1948	2,581,000	834,813	33	507,251	206,567	1,214,000

[1] Data not available.

(B) IMPORTS—COPPER (UNMANUFACTURED) IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES, 1948, IN SHORT TONS [1]

Country	Ore (copper content)	Concentrates (copper content)	Regulus, black or coarse copper and cement (copper content)	Unrefined black blister and converter copper in pigs or converter bars	Refined in ingots, plates, or bars	Old and scrap copper fit only for remanufacture and scale and clippings
Australia	2	767				801
Bolivia	804	5,925				
Canada	34	20,726	813	120	17,127	4,749
Chile	5,052	14,480	341	70,542	230,288	
Cuba	41	16,134				16
Ecuador		482				
Mexico	1,011	7,482	1,485	46,651	947	37
Newfoundland and Labrador		3,665				33
Northern Rhodesia [2]		131	14	18,916		
Peru	431	4,582	638	13,434	233	
Philippines, Republic of	[3]	[3] 2,125				
Union of South Africa	794	1,636	2	3,321		143
Yugoslavia				2,297		
Other countries	28	2,988	334	555	529	3,555
Total	8,197	81,103	3,657	155,836	249,124	9,334

[1] Data include copper imported for immediate consumption plus material entering the country under bond.
[2] Tonnages credited to Southern Rhodesia by the Department of Commerce have been added to Northern Rhodesia.
[3] Some copper in "ore" and "other" is not separately classified and is included under "concentrates."

TABLE VI.—*Lead*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION OF LEAD

[Quantities in short tons]

Year	World mine production	Domestic mine production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1943	1,170,984	453,313	39	319,038	2,003	1,113,000
1944	968,000	416,861	43	319,071	15,523	1,118,643
1945	979,673	390,831	40	300,326	1,407	1,051,602
1946	909,826	335,475	37	159,238	597	956,476
1947	1,251,800	375,267	30	227,870	1,514	1,172,000
1948	[1]	390,476	[1]	347,262	399	1,113,900
January	[1]	33,306	[1]	21,534	49	92,226
February	[1]	32,407	[1]	26,686	12	87,226
March	[1]	35,802	[1]	23,726	39	97,376
April	[1]	35,512	[1]	23,145	34	89,869
May	[1]	33,652	[1]	26,263	[1]	[1]
June	[1]	34,507	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]

[1] Not available.

(B) LEAD STOCKS AT END OF YEAR IN THE UNITED STATES, 1943–47, IN SHORT TONS

	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
Producers' stocks, all lead	129,540	125,134	161,812	189,741	128,413	46,754
Consumers' stocks, refined lead	115,152	86,908	102,937	41,914	51,619	62,077
Government-owned stocks, pig lead	173,875	90,454	68,700	40,963	4,996	
Grand total, lead stocks	418,567	302,496	333,449	272,618	185,028	208,831

TABLE VI.—*Lead*—Continued

(C) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—TOTAL LEAD IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES IN ORE, MATTE, BASE BULLION, PIGS, BARS, AND RECLAIMED, 1943–48, BY COUNTRIES, IN SHORT TONS [1]

[U. S. Department of Commerce]

Country	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
Ore and matte:						
Africa	16,438	3,459	2,338	399	5,616	10,142
Argentina			4,716	2,112	6	
Australia	19,743	27,130	17,913	8,341	7,054	9,017
Bolivia	6,934	1,093	1,580	2,202	6,234	20,369
Canada	6,828	9,909	8,687	4,940	4,310	3,488
Chile		4,247	2,330	1,456	3,048	3,430
Mexico	2,931	3,093	667	376	3,065	2,702
Newfoundland and Labrador	13,473	32,273	17,046	19,037	10,523	4,800
Peru	3,426	11,205	14,524	5,192	10,477	8,548
Other countries	172	471	204	352	419	1,411
Total	69,945	93,570	70,005	44,407	50,752	63,907
Base bullion:						
Australia	3,846					
Korea					285	82
Mexico	639	11	8		1,255	6,455
Peru	94	47		125	40	619
Other countries	4					30
Total	4,583	58	8	125	1,580	7,186
Pigs and bars:						
Africa					78	510
Australia	8,994	560	13,747	8,190	10,639	30,469
Canada	16	8	19,389	22,822	59,079	53,940
Japan				12,126		24
Korea					1,659	
Mexico	214,865	167,704	160,179	53,534	85,783	98,233
Peru	20,158	54,486	34,153	15,568	1,151	23,559
Yugoslavia					1,120	2,889
Other countries			1	1	4	1,662
Total	244,033	222,758	227,469	112,241	159,513	247,368
Reclaimed, scrap, etc.:						
Belgium and Luxemburg						986
Africa					478	341
Australia		2,738	1,470	1,337	1,111	3,690
Canada	348	488	1,374	1,078	8,070	11,649
Canal Zone				9	202	447
Chile		15			62	
Italy					69	2,304
Japan					5,336	
Malta, Gozo, and Cyprus					78	155
Panama, Republic of	128			12	41	223
Philippines, Republic of					433	2,341
Other countries	1	74		29	145	6,665
Total	477	3,315	2,844	2,465	16,025	28,801
Grand total	319,038	319,701	300,326	159,238	277,870	347,262

[1] Data include lead imported for immediate consumption plus material entering the country under bond.

TABLE VII.—*Zinc*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION OF ZINC

[Quantities in short tons]

Year	World mine production	Domestic mine production	United States percent of world production	Imports [1]	Exports [2]	Consumption [3]
1943	2,112,500	744,196	35	595,204	100,606	816,777
1944	1,753,600	718,642	41	486,320	25,596	888,626
1945	1,570,000	614,358	39	478,835	14,017	852,311
1946	1,561,000	574,833	37	376,799	51,277	801,242
1947	1,633,600	637,608	38	370,271	117,567	786,360
1948	[4]	629,977	[4]	357,501	77,539	817,735
January	[4]	48,124	[4]	24,672	[5] 11,420	67,214
February	[4]	47,612	[4]	29,449	[5] 5,918	65,211
March	[4]	54,545	[4]	28,600	[5] 8,682	73,399
April	[4]	53,042	[4]	27,074	[5] 5,335	66,742
May	[4]	51,422	[4]	22,235	6,346	64,561
June	[4]	51,342	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]

[1] Ore (zinc content) plus blocks, pigs, and slabs.
[2] Blocks, slabs, and plates plus sheets, strips, and other form n. e. s.
[3] Domestic consumption of slab zinc based on canvass of approximately 600 plants.
[4] Not available.
[5] Slab zinc only.

(B) DOMESTIC SLAB ZINC STOCKS AT END OF YEAR, 1943–48, IN SHORT TONS

	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948
Producers	170,606	233,696	256,216	176,342	68,300	20,848
Consumers	90,356	64,772	72,381	92,988	80,849	96,590
Total	260,962	298,468	328,597	269,330	147,666	117,438

(C) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—ZINC IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES IN ORE, BLOCKS, PIGS, OR SLABS, BY COUNTRIES, 1964–48, IN SHORT TONS [1]

[U. S. Department of Commerce]

Country	1946	1947	1948
Ores (zinc content):			
Argentina	8,295		77
Australia	3,780	864	495
Bolivia	26,207	17,176	4,515
Canada	57,298	42,430	55,386
Italy		11,613	11,288
Japan			5,018
Korea			1,902
Mexico	127,685	163,726	142,134
Newfoundland and Labrador		8,873	9,753
Peru	48,791	49,952	22,475
Spain		3,321	9,101
Union of South Africa		4	2,035
Other countries	(2)		39
Total	272,056	297,959	264,218
Blocks, pigs, or slabs:			
Australia	3,221	3	75
Belgium and Luxemburg			1,145
Canada	85,194	54,954	77,711
Italy			1,579
Japan		10,927	4,686
Mexico	15,777	332	5,737
Norway			2,240
Other countries	551	96	110
Total	104,743	72,312	93,283

[1] Data include zinc imported for immediate consumption plus material entering country under bond.
[2] Less than 1 ton.

TABLE VIII.—*Mercury*

SALIENT STATISTICS ON MERCURY, 1943–48, BY YEARS

[In flasks of 76 pounds]

Year	World production	Domestic production	United States percent of world	Imports for consumption	Exports	Consumption
1943	236,000	51,929	22	[1] 47,805	[1] 385	54,500
1944	163,000	37,688	23	19,553	750	42,900
1945	131,000	30,763	23	68,617	1,038	62,429
1946	144,000	25,348	18	13,894	907	31,552
1947	164,000	23,244	14	13,008	884	35,581
1948	120,000	14,388	12	31,951	786	46,253

[1] Large quantities were reexported in 1943.

TABLE IX.—*Tin*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION OF TIN

[Quantities in long tons]

	World production	Domestic production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1943	142,000	6	Nil	33,776	1,770	46,253
1944	102,000	5	Nil	48,886	843	59,156
1945	86,000	------	Nil	42,020	882	55,642
1946	89,000	------	Nil	53,658	881	54,627
1947	175,000	Nil	Nil	53,264	420	59,106
1948	153,500	Nil	Nil	86,688	91	59,863

(B) TIN STOCKS IN THE UNITED STATES, IN LONG TONS OF TIN CONTENT

	Concentrate	Pig tin		Total
		Government	Industry	
Dec. 31, 1946	25,006	30,493	15,656	71,155
Dec. 31, 1947	19,638	36,695	14,438	70,771
Dec. 31, 1948	19,352	24,322	14,777	58,451

(C) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—TIN [1] IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION IN THE UNITED STATES, BY COUNTRIES, 1948

[U. S. Department of Commerce]

Country	1948	
	Long tons	Value
Belgian Congo	2,046	$4,463,295
Belgium and Luxemburg	6,874	15,355,653
Bolivia	49	95,279
British Malaya	34,176	71,389,379
China	1,615	3,172,982
Indonesia		
Japan		
Mexico		
Netherlands	843	1,899,249
Portugal	95	195,223
Siam	2,978	5,591,093
United Kingdom	520	1,160,799
Total	49,196	103,322,952

[1] Bars, blocks, pigs, grain, or granulated.

TABLE X.—*Nickel*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Short tons, nickel content]

Year	World production	Domestic production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Domestic consumption
1943	184,000	642	0.35	122,500	7,700	[1] 115,400
1944	173,000	883	.57	118,300	6,300	[1] 113,000
1945	160,000	1,155	.72	107,400	2,800	96,300
1946	136,000	352	.26	92,500	5,500	80,100
1947	153,000	646	.42	80,700	8,200	80,800
1948	165,000	883	.54	96,900	5,900	93,600

[1] Apparent consumption

INDUSTRY STOCKS

Stocks at plants of consumers were 21,600,000 pounds (nickel content) on December 31, 1948.

B. SOURCE OF IMPORTS—IMPORTS OF NICKEL INTO THE UNITED STATES IN 1948

Country:	*Pounds of nickel*
Canada	185,714,000
Norway	6,163,000
United Kingdom	1,648,000
U. S. S. R.	113,000
Union of South Africa	56,000
Italy	28,000
Netherlands	18,000
India	20,000
Total	193,760,000

TABLE XI.—*Antimony*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Unit: Primary antimony in short tons]

	World production	Domestic production			United States percent of world production	Imports [1]	Consumption
		Ore	Antimonial lead	Total			
1943	53,200	5,556	1,591	7,147	12.99	29,969	19,508
1944	36,400	4,735	2,015	6,750	17.85	17,761	23,756
1945	26,900	1,930	1,749	3,679	12.60	24,649	25,761
1946	25,400	2,505	1,231	3,736	13.61	8,742	17,515
1947	34,800	5,316	1,460	6,776	19.47	15,365	16,647
1948	41,300	6,489	2,190	8,679	16.41	18,790	15,455

[1] Includes antimony contained in ore, type metal, antimonial lead, oxides and compounds and as metal, imported for consumption

(B) SOURCE OF IMPORTS

Country	Total	Percent
China	5,832	38.4
Mexico	6,138	40.3
Bolivia	2,435	16.0
Chile	348	2.3
Other countries	451	3.0
Total	15,204	100.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines, and Department of Commerce.

TABLE XII.—*Manganese ore*

(A) MANGANESE ORE—STATISTICAL POSITION

[Short tons]

	World production	Domestic production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1943	4,392,000	205,173	4.7	1,429,599	(1)	1,588,323
1944	3,044,000	247,616	8.1	1,157,932	(1)	1,593,098
1945	4,256,000	182,337	4.3	1,461,945	(1)	1,485,859
1946	4,500,000	143,635	3.2	1,749,223	(1)	1,136,687
1947	4,664,000	131,627	2.8	1,541,818	(1)	1,418,261
1948	4,300,000	131,100	3.0	1,256,597	(1)	1,538,398

[1] Negligible.

(B) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—MANGANESE ORE (35 PERCENT OR MORE MANGANESE) IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES, 1947–48, BY COUNTRIES

[U. S. Department of Commerce]

Country	General imports [1] (short tons)				Imports for consumption [2] (short tons)					
	Gross weight		Manganese content		Gross weight		Manganese content		Value	
	1947	1948	1947	1948	1947	1948	1947	1948	1947	1948
Belgian Congo	2,854	2,688	1,484	1,371	2,903	2,688	1,608	1,371	$42,257	$65,393
Brazil	184,050	143,917	74,971	57,954	157,804	160,479	70,234	71,561	1,957,910	1,933,867
British East Africa	530		267			530		281		9,187
Canada	257	348	138	177	257	348	138	177	7,425	11,025
Chile	43,450	10,843	20,523	4,873	42,078	10,303	19,930	4,927	1,341,484	164,471
Cuba	57,089	32,843	26,893	15,931	57,089	32,843	26,893	15,931	1,224,880	810,321
France		1		(3)		1		(3)		245
Gold Coast	192,277	132,971	99,563	70,306	217,317	218,164	112,102	112,503	3,316,990	3,269,203
India	421,121	213,445	206,705	103,217	284,535	314,799	140,007	152,852	3,497,822	4,331,225
Mexico	56,642	61,568	25,558	27,498	50,890	53,754	22,805	23,894	737,724	812,382
Morocco, French		300		166		300		166		12,696
Mozambique	567		283							
Peru	448		215		448		215		14,739	
Philippines, Republic of	2,376	10,120	1,141	5,099	2,376	10,120	1,141	5,099	37,800	219,774
Portuguese Asia		1,109		455						
Portuguese Guinea and Angola	448	2,607	229	1,408	448	1,630	229	880	8,052	43,214
Turkey		33		17						
Union of South Africa	248,703	216,575	109,838	98,514	192,871	283,376	87,154	130,114	2,205,279	3,394,517
U. S. S. R.	331,006	427,229	162,297	201,409	288,976	384,118	141,975	182,455	6,898,819	8,242,804
Total	1,541,818	1,256,597	730,105	588,395	1,297,992	1,473,453	624,431	702,211	21,291,181	23,320,324

[1] Comprises ore received in the United States during year; part went into consumption, and remainder entered bonded warehouses.
[2] Comprises receipts during year for consumption and ore withdrawn from bonded warehouses during year (irrespective of time of importation).
[3] Less than 1 ton.

TABLE XIII.—*Chromite*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Short tons]

	World production	Domestic production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1943	1,982,000	160,120	8.1	928,576	26,259	964,600
1944	1,488,000	45,629	3.1	848,390	1,019	848,449
1945	1,200,000	13,973	1.2	914,765	12,366	808,129
1946	1,260,000	4,107	.3	757,391	2,158	734,759
1947	1,819,000	948	.1	1,106,180	3,435	833,357
1948	2,329,000	3,619	.2	1,542,076	(1)	875,033
January						
February	500,000	1,886	.4	337,436	(1)	215,014
March						

[1] Not available.

TABLE XIII.—*Chromite*—Continued

(B) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—CHROMITE IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1947–48, BY COUNTRIES AND GRADES

[U. S. Department of Commerce]

Country	Chemical grade			Metallurgical grade			Refractory grade			Total		
	Short tons		Value	Short tons		Value	Short tons		Value	Short tons		Value
	Gross weight	Cr_2O_3 content		Gross weight	Cr_2O_3 content		Gross weight	Cr_2O_3 content		Gross weight	Cr_2O_3 content	
1947												
Canada				68	34	$2,316				68	34	$2,316
Cuba				18,130	7,010	327,508	146,861	52,389	$1,701,059	164,991	59,399	2,028,567
India and dependencies	3,548	1,739	$68,691	6,162	3,326	59,945				9,710	5,065	128,636
New Caledonia [1]	8,049	3,809	110,171	12,555	6,376	290,197				20,604	10,185	400,368
Philippines, Republic of				8,691	3,853	120,250	197,964	67,940	1,524,675	206,655	71,793	1,644,925
Sierra Leone [2]				7,762	3,648	152,460	10,640	5,320	180,500	18,402	8,968	332,960
Southern Rhodesia	4,519	1,988	29,217	59,529	29,271	835,633	7,053	3,236	105,683	71,101	34,495	969,933
Turkey	1,120	538	28,000	59,042	27,196	1,681,454	2,240	1,120	80,000	62,402	28,854	1,789,454
Union of South Africa	145,748	66,973	1,027,665	53,775	24,696	551,301	62,990	28,684	476,440	262,513	120,353	2,055,406
U. S. S. R.	6,720	3,226	224,390	215,945	110,546	7,660,888	42,438	22,249	1,070,733	265,103	136,021	8,956,011
Yugoslavia				24,631	10,824	558,319				24,631	10,824	558,319
Total	169,704	78,273	1,448,134	466,290	226,780	12,239,671	470,186	180,938	5,139,090	1,106,180	485,991	18,866,895
1948												
Brazil	1,792	860	35,275							1,792	860	35,275
Canada				145	56	5,526	49	26	1,964	194	82	7,490
Cuba	3,903	1,874	49,661	24,806	8,428	378,154	134,792	47,511	1,574,895	163,501	57,813	2,002,710
Guatemala				1,416	680	53,088				1,416	680	53,088
Malta, Gozo, and Cyprus	5,455	2,509	126,420							5,455	2,509	126,420
New Caledonia [1]				46,452	24,884	1,168,960				46,452	24,884	1,168,960
Philippines, Republic of	3,369	1,483	28,353	21,624	9,438	306,312	210,591	70,748	1,877,249	235,584	81,669	2,211,914
Sierra Leone [2]				8,288	3,481	140,900				8,288	3,481	140,900
Southern Rhodesia	1,117	525	16,674	108,345	51,224	1,992,107	16,918	7,871	311,578	126,380	59,620	2,320,359
Turkey				232,954	109,875	7,177,814	20,532	9,771	728,748	253,486	119,646	7,906,562
Union of South Africa	159,230	73,174	1,268,659	67,437	31,072	902,334	66,077	29,252	520,299	292,744	133,498	2,691,292
U. S. S. R.	17,668	8,481	602,663	376,298	181,637	13,421,492				393,966	190,118	14,024,155
Yugoslavia				12,867	5,863	361,763				12,867	5,863	361,763
Total	192,534	88,906	2,127,705	900,632	426,638	25,908,450	448,959	165,179	5,014,733	1,542,125	680,723	33,050,888

[1] Classified as French Pacific islands.

[2] Classified as British West Africa.

TABLE XIV.—*Tungsten*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Tungsten ore and concentrates, short tons 60 percent WO_3]

Year	World production	Domestic production (shipments)	United States percent of world production	Imports for consumption in United States	Exports [1]	Domestic consumption
1943	65,000	11,945	18.4	20,431	868	20,300
1944	53,000	10,283	19.4	19,330	1,978	20,100
1945	24,000	5,534	23.1	5,016	724	14,900
1946	19,000	5,193	27.3	7,218	153	6,800
1947	27,600	3,094	11.2	6,323	34	8,200
1948	35,000	4,005	11.4	7,931	500	9,300

[1] Figures represent ferrotungsten; exports of domestic ore and concentrates are negligible.

INDUSTRY STOCKS

Stocks of tungsten concentrates at plants of consumers and dealers and at domestic mines were 6,145 short tons (60 percent WO_3 basis) on December 31, 1948.

(B) SOURCE OF IMPORTS—TUNGSTEN ORES AND CONCENTRATES IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1948

[Short tons, 60 percent WO_3]

Argentina	9
Australia	4
Belgian Congo	122
Bolivia	533
Brazil	891
British East Africa	12
Canada	382
Chile	43
China	3,887
French Indochina	----
Japan	75
Korea	1,030
Mexico	161
Peru	166
Portugal	13
Southern Rhodesia	13
Spain	191
Thailand	399
	7,931

TABLE XV.—*Asbestos*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Short tons]

	World production	Domestic production [1]	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports [2]	Consumption [3]
1943	698,600	6,014	0.86	440,255	367	445,902
1944	663,400	6,667	1.01	383,049	475	389,241
1945	697,100	12,226	1.77	374,354	8,550	378,030
1946	799,800	14,075	1.76	456,688	11,011	459,752
1947	955,500	24,035	2.5	594,839	2,087	616,787
1948	1,090,600	37,092	3.4	647,881	6,530	678,443

[1] Sold or used.

[2] Strategic amosite and chrysotile: 1943, 19067 short tons; 1944, 14,698 short tons; 1947, 8,431 short tons.

[3] Strategic amosite and chrysotile: 1943, 15,046 short tons; 1944, 16,163 short tons; 1947, 8,000 short tons.

TABLE XVI.—*Bauxite*

(A) STATISTICAL POSITION

[Quantities in long tons]

	World production	Domestic production [1]	United States percent of world production	United States imports	United States exports	Consumption [1]
1943	13,734,000	6,232,883	45.4	1,547,854	417,186	4,760,848
1944	6,990,000	2,823,724	40.4	560,461	146,638	3,459,761
1945	3,464,000	981,000	28.3	739,581	126,023	2,433,112
1946	4,493,000	1,104,054	23.9	852,005	97,788	1,889,156
1947	6,386,000	1,202,055	19.0	1,821,580	94,369	2,564,442
1948	8,116,000	1,457,148	----	2,488,915	54,113	2,705,140

[1] Dry basis.

Vilification Impedes Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to justify my competency to speak about what I have in mind to say, may I inform the newer Members of the House that I have had over 30 years' experience, actively, in and along military lines. Fourteen years as president of the oldest military-collegiate institution in the country—Norwich University— and over 16 years as a Member of this body in which I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs for years, as well as for at least 10 years member and

onetime chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy.

I insist that I know something about the matters whereof and concerning which I speak and that I qualify to talk about them understandingly.

So, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to reemphasize to the Members of Congress the existence of certain most disquieting conditions affecting national security which were brought to light as a result of the House Armed Services Committee's investigation of the B–36 and related matters. They are conditions which, in my considered opinion, must be remedied forthwith.

It is a distressing thing that one of our great military leaders, occupying the topmost military position in this Nation, should demonstrate such intolerance of dissenting opinions as General Bradley displayed in his testimony before the congressional committee. I would not have believed that a man in his position would publicly castigate honorable military colleagues, charging them with what is tantamount to treason, because in response to congressional summons they testified to their honest convictions on an agenda prepared not by the Navy but by the committee itself. I deplore the strong inference throughout his testimony that responsible naval officers are lacking in a broad "understanding and perspective of war," that "high-ranking Navy men arrive at conclusions that showed they had no concept whatsoever of land operations," and that as a result of this ignorance, they may expect to continue to find their "suggestions" in defense councils outvoted two to one. When we arrive at a stage in defense planning where the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff publicly characterizes the Navy's share in these councils as "suggestions," I do not wonder that the Navy finds cause for profound exasperation and serious concern. I believe this concern should be shared by the Congress.

I do not propose to go into the controversy as to the merits or the demerits of the B–36; that is a question which in my view can best be settled by the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group who are now studying the problem. I hope they give us their findings as soon as possible. I must say, however, that I find nothing in the testimony of the Air Force witnesses which factually refutes the points raised by the Navy witnesses; and I do not believe that the Congress or the country will be satisfied to dismiss them from further consideration as the Secretary of the Air Force attempted to do by his blanket characterization of them as "false," "senseless," and "misstatement."

Nor can I support the Army, the Air Force, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their assertions, often repeated, that the Navy has imperiled the national security by testifying honestly to the agenda questions prepared by the House Armed Services Committee. I think the gentleman who made these charges must have forgotten that after hearing the testimony of Admiral Radford, it was the congressional committee, not the Navy, that decided to hold the hearings in open session. And after a careful review of all of the testimony given to date, I am of the opinion that this breaching of the iron curtain behind which the affairs of the Department of Defense have been conducted lately will, if properly followed up by the Congress, contribute substantially to rather than detract from the national security. I wholeheartedly support the expressed conviction of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, that while I can understand the view that it is regrettable that the basic issues at stake have been aired in public, it would have been immeasurably more regrettable had these issues remained hidden and a false sense of security been permitted to prevail.

The Navy has long been charged, before the Nation, with opposing unification and hampering the national security by so doing. Secretary Symington in his testimony stated:

> It is now obvious that the fundamental question is control of the military by civilians and, therefore, the preservation of constitutional government.

General Bradley, in his statement, made these accusations:

> No one expects the Secretary of Defense to be an arbiter of technical differences. But it is expected that he will exercise, as the final authority with the President, the will of the people for civilian control of our armed forces. When this authority is disputed, it is open rebellion against the civilian control. * * *
>
> The final conclusion that I have drawn is * * * that many in the Navy are completely against unity of command and planning as established in the laws passed by the Congress of the United States. Despite protestations to the contrary, I believe that the Navy has opposed unification from the beginning, and they have not in spirit as well as deed accepted it completely to date. As a policy, yes, but as the final and authoritative vehicle for planning our collective defense, no.
>
> I believe that the public hearing of the grievances of a few officers who will not accept the decisions of the authorities established by law * * * have done infinite harm to our national defense, our position of leadership in world affairs, the position of our national policy, and the confidence of the people in their Government.

Gentlemen, these are as deadly serious charges as could possibly be laid against anyone in the military service. But they contain, in my opinion, the kernel of the nut; the decisive factor which impelled the Navy to lay all its cards on the table before the congressional committee. The fundamental question at issue is this: In what manner, and by whom, shall civilian control of the military be exercised?

My own concept, and the one which it is obvious to me is the Navy's concept, is: Civilian control over the military requires that this control be exercised not by any one individual or group of individuals holding appointive office, but by the citizens of the United States through their elected representatives—the President and the Congress of the United States. With respect to the military, the will of the people is set forth in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended in 1949.

In his testimony before the Armed Services Committee on October 13, 1949, the Chief of Naval Operations, the senior military spokesman for the Navy and a man eminently qualified to express the Navy point of view, categorically stated that the entire Naval Establishment strongly advocates unification of the armed forces of the Nation and believes this can be achieved under the present law. The Navy believes that unification means a coordinated effort of all services, but it does not mean merger, absorption, or elimination. Furthermore, unification should not mean that two services can control a third. He pointed out in his testimony that there have been many instances in which two services have controlled the third; and that regardless of laws intended to preserve naval aviation and the Marine Corps, if the funds to sustain them are choked off or if the composition of the Navy is determined by a 2-to-1 vote regardless of funds available, then naval aviation and the Marines will be put out of business as surely as if there had been no law. He further stated that in his opinion failure by the armed services to follow the purpose of the unification law is neither the fault of the law nor of its intent; failure is due to the fact that the law has not yet begun to function as Congress intended it should.

I think it pertinent to review here the intent of the Congress in passing the National Security Act of 1947. This intent was—

First. To affirm civilian control of the military departments.

Second. To provide an efficient team of land, naval and air forces.

Third. To spell out the definition of the Navy to include naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps, and to guarantee to the Marine Corps certain amphibious and tactical air functions.

Fourth. To deny an intention of merger.

Fifth. To prohibit establishment of an Armed Forces General Staff.

Sixth. To prohibit establishment of a single Chief of Staff.

Seventh. That the Armed Forces were to receive strategic directions, as opposed to operational direction, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Specific roles and missions for each of the three services are specified in this act. These have been detailed and amplified by the Key West agreement which was approved by the Secretary of Defense and by the President on April 21, 1948. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were in unanimous agreement with the provisions of the Key West agreement, now called the functions paper. It is now apparent that although this paper has been in effect for only 18 months, the period has been characterized by persistent attempts to make basic changes and modifications in the roles and missions of the services, a situation conducive only to instability. As Admiral Denfeld pointed out, instability is one of the means by which any system of controls may be rendered ineffectual. These attempts to restrict assigned functions of the Navy and Marine Corps by interpretation of language, reduction-of-

force requirements, and by changing assigned functions to joint functions—most of which, significantly, have been directed at Naval aviation or the Marine Corps, and its support air—have been made despite the provision in the 1949 amendment to the National Security Act that—

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof, shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished or consolidated.

Admiral Denfeld in his testimony gave specific and cogent examples of the inadequate or improper operation of unification. The fact that the Navy has not been admitted to full partnership in the national defense structure, the procedures by which additional procurement of the B–36 airplane was effected in January and April of this year, the procedure leading up to the cancellation of the carrier *United States*, and the situation with respect to the 1950 budget, are among the examples which he stressed. In this latter connection, there are two important points, as I see them: the combatant forces of the Navy were for the first time determined by arbitrary decision rather than by budgetary ceiling; and even before the appropriation bill was passed by the Congress, the Navy was directed by the Chairman of the Secretary of Defense's Management Committee to make an arbitrary reduction of approximately $350,000,000 in its obligating authority for fiscal year 1950 without even being asked what implications would be involved by a reduction in funds of this magnitude. As Admiral Denfeld indicated, because of the lateness in the fiscal year when this cut was ordered, it was necessary for the Navy to apply the major portion, $203,000,000, to procurement of naval aircraft, since due to the lateness of the fiscal year, the only area susceptible of the reduction of the magnitude imposed was that in contractual obligations for aircraft procurement. The cumulative effect in the years to come of this reduction in aircraft procurement forced upon the Navy will result in a substantial decrease in the number of replacement aircraft in the next 2 or 3 years when these new aircraft otherwise would be coming off the production lines; hence in a reduction in the degree of modernization of naval aviation and in its combat effectiveness. Furthermore, what Admiral Denfeld did not say, but what I know to be a fact, is that the Budget Office of the Secretary of Defense, in making up the 1951 budget, took approximately $100,000,000 from naval aircraft procurement and increased the Air Force procurement fund by a corresponding amount. It was my understanding that in amending the National Security Act of 1947, the purpose of the Congress in inserting section 202 (c) (3), "the Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds in the Department of Defense in such manner as to effect the results prohibited by paragraphs 1 and 2 of this subsection"—transference, reassignment, abolishing, or consolidation of combatant functions assigned to the military services—was to erect a safeguard against exactly what has happened in this instance.

As Admiral Denfeld stated, if funds to sustain naval aviation are choked off, then naval aviation will be put out of business as surely as if there had been no law.

As I have stated, Admiral Denfeld declared it to be his belief that failure of the armed services to follow the purpose of the unification law is due to the fact that the law has not yet begun to function as the Congress intended it should. The Commandant of the Marine Corps, more forthright, specifically charges that a group of people in the Defense Establishment who advocate a different system of national defense from that contemplated by the Congress and expressed in the National Security Act are using the very authority granted it under that act to evade those portions of the law of which it does not approve. I want to draw the specific attention of Congress to these extracts from General Cates' testimony:

During the past 2 years, the time, energy, and attention of our leadership has been steadily consumed by the effort necessary to resist the inroads and incursions of those who appear unwilling to accept the verdict of Congress. A constantly increasing effort is required to withstand those who would circumvent the plain provisions of the law or extend its terms toward ends repeatedly denied by Congress.

It follows that, at a time when the great requirement within the services is for a continuous integrated effort, uncertainty and instability are the rule. As long as this persists and the services are kept off balance and in a constant state of flux there can be no effective organization of this Nation's military potential in the manner envisaged by the National Security Act.

Except in Washington, there is little controversy among the services themselves. It is only here, in the Nation's Capital, that we find elements within the defense establishment still engaging in the type of activity which Congress sought to end by passage of the National Security Act.

The Congress was acting in the discharge of one of its greatest responsibilities when it enacted that law and reestablished the defense structure for the postwar period. The Congress acted in accordance with its best judgment, and with the full advice of the Nation's civilian and military leadership.

Unfortunately the judgment of the Congress has not been accepted by all. I believe there are those in the Defense Establishment who advocate quite a different system of national defense from that contemplated by the Congress. This group has used the very authority granted it under the National Security Act to evade portions of this same law of which it does not approve. In so doing it would render ineffective and meaningless the intent and purpose of the Congress. In so doing it is striking a telling blow at our national military strength.

As Admiral Denfeld has already pointed out, the status accorded the Marine Corps is one portion of the National Security Act which has never been accepted in all quarters.

As an example of what I mean let me invite your attention to the experience of the Marine Corps since the enactment of the National Security Act.

The Marine Corps emerged from the last war feeling that it had performed creditably. * * * Thus it came as a great surprise to find ourselves at the war's end placed almost in the capacity of a culprit or a defendant.

Three stated demands relative to the Marine Corps were made by the War Department General Staff:

First. That Marine Corps units be limited in size to the regiment and the Corps itself reduced to 50,000 to 60,000 men.

Second. That it be recognized that amphibious warfare is an Army function.

Third. That the Marine Corps not be appreciably expanded in time of war.

These proposals did not find favor with the Congress. In the National Security Act of 1947 careful provision was made to safeguard the Marine Corps, give recognition to its amphibious functions, and provide for its integrated mobilization in time of war. In this way the Congress sought to nullify as specifically as words would permit each one of the General Staff's three objectives.

Yet despite the consideration extended to us by Congress I have to inform you that the Army General Staff group today stands within measurable distance of achieving each one of its three ends against the Marine Corps despite the provisions of the law.

As the new institutions authorized by Congress for the coordination of the national defense began to function, it became apparent that a statutory safeguard, such as the Congress had given us, is not a refuge at all but a battle position which must be defended in full force.

It would not be difficult to present a bill of particulars of imposing length. I am far more interested in showing you where, through injury to the Marine Corps, substantial harm has been done to the national defense itself.

I refer specifically to what has been happening to our Fleet Marine Forces.

When the National Security Act was passed, the Marine Corps' authorized strength was 100,000 men. In the ensuing years, our actual strength has been reduced progressively from 85,000 in fiscal year 1947 to 67,000 at the end of fiscal year 1950. * * * By great effort, we continued to provide the size field force which I regarded as the bare minimum for our mission.

Hereafter, however, no such course of action will be permitted. It is not merely to be a question of cuts in men and money—although they are severe enough. We are being told in detail—and told by the Department of Defense—where and how those cuts are to be made—by striking into the heart of our combat forces. By specifically reducing—over my strongest objections—the number of battalions in the Fleet Marine Forces to the point where our two marine divisions will no longer be the effective forces of the combined arms which the Congress enjoined us to maintain. By specifically and drastically reducing the number of our close support air squadrons to a figure far below what I would for a moment regard as the barest minimum requisite for our mission.

This is a severe and telling blow; a blow which can destroy a valuable and highly professional fighting force. I cannot agree that a cut so pointedly directed at reducing the combat strength of this highly effective organization is an economy. I ask the members of this committee to take note that when this is accomplished the Army General Staff's first specific objective with regard to the Marine Corps will have been accomplished to the letter and despite the express provision of the law.

It is * * * difficult to visualize the strategic considerations which require such a drastic reduction in the number of Marine Corps combat organizations alone.

Although I am sure that the Congress expects the Marine Corps to continue its amphibious mission, I am equally certain that elsewhere there is a contrary intention. It will be recalled that the second War Department General Staff objective relative to the Marine Corps was that it be recognized

that future amphibious operations be undertaken by the Army.

The Congress, in 1947, took quite a different view. They recognized the naval character of amphibious warfare and to resolve the doubt, if one existed, provided specifically for the amphibious status of Marines.

This became the law of our land but it has not been accepted. At Key West where the National Security Act was implemented there was an unremitting effort to deprive the Marine Corps of the status which the Congress had given it. This was successfully resisted at the time but the underlying effort to contravene the act of Congress has never subsided. Even today * * * fresh proposals to transfer and reassign our functions have been made. The proposals are not suggestions that the matter of which the Army General Staff disapproves be placed before the Congress for reconsideration. Far from it, they represent proposals that the Army, Navy, and Air Force themselves enter into an agreement now to revise functions assigned by the Congress.

I think it * * * pertinent * * * that for the current fiscal year at least, there will be no opportunity for our Fleet Marine Forces to participate in major fleet exercises. Substantially the entire allocation of amphibious training facilities available for training afloat has been preempted for the use of the Army to the exclusion of the Marine Corps. Our state of training and experience render this of little practical consequence for the time being but there is no assurance that this will not become a permanent process. It is another application of the now familiar exclusion device which is being used to our detriment and to the detriment of the national defense as well.

I submit here that the Marine Corps can exercise * * * its * * * functions more satisfactorily than any other agency and at less cost. Nevertheless, our next budget is now being subjected to certain arbitrary cuts which will prevent our carrying on necessary tests pursuant to a responsibility assigned us by the Congress.

The third objective relative to the Marine Corps specified by the Army General Staff is summed up in the words "Marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war."

This is a strange proposal indeed. It says in effect that the Regular and Reserve Marine Corps, as a reservoir of professionally skilled men, cannot be employed to impart their knowledge and training to others in time of war. In the light of the foreseeable need for the best utilization of every asset of skill and manpower available this proposal suggests an appalling waste of a great national asset.

It must have so appeared to the Congress for they specifically provided that the Marine Corps shall be expanded in time of war in accordance with integrated plans for mobilization.

I have well-founded fears as to the manner in which this provision of law is being implemented. I am of the opinion that even our primary mobilization asset which lies in the organized and trained battalions and squadrons of the Marine Corps Reserve is to be disregarded and our mobilization potential thus ignored. It would be a strange mobilization that requires us to disband existing combat organizations.

Let me summarize the Marines' case as follows: We do not believe there has been a complete acceptance in all quarters of that part of the National Security Act relating to the Marine Corps. On the contrary, it appears to us that the power of budget, the power of coordination, and the power of strategic direction of the armed forces have been used as devices to destroy the operating forces of the Marine Corps.

This cannot have been inspired by economy because the cuts were pointed directly at the combat power of the Marine Corps.

This has not been in the interest of strategic direction because the manifest combat power of the Marine Corps is being destroyed and dissipated and its mobilization potential ignored.

This has not been in accordance with law, because these are things specifically forbidden by the law.

This has not been in accordance with the national interest, because in the light of today's realities the United States cannot afford to destroy an irreplaceable source of military strength.

These matters point to a fundamental disagreement. They suggest the sobering thought that if this course of circumvention of the law is permitted its eventual result will be the effective denial of congressional authority over the national defense. It is a question that the Congress sooner or later will have to decide.

So far as I can glean from the testimony given, General Cates' assertions remain to be refuted.

The Members of Congress will recall that the Congress amended the National Security Act of 1947, to give added powers to the Secretary of Defense, with a certain degree of reluctance. In so doing, we deliberately wrote into the act certain safeguards designed to prevent any abuse of power by an individual or group in the Department of Defense.

The Congress must carefully consider the developments during the Armed Services Committee investigation, and take steps to insure that the intent of the Congress shall not continue to be in any way circumvented.

Humboldt and Muddy Rivers Upstream Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from the office of the junior Senator from Nevada dated September 27, 1949, on the subject of upstream storage on the Humboldt and Muddy Rivers and an outline of such contemplated storage on the Humboldt River and tributaries, together with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the Muddy Valley Wash and Lower Muddy River upstream storage in the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMBOLDT AND MUDDY RIVERS UPSTREAM STORAGE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Early construction of the Humboldt and Muddy River flood control, drainage, and irrigation project was moved ahead Monday by approval of both by the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE announced.

"Approval of the committee means favorable action by Congress," Senator MALONE said, "and action at this time advances by from 2 to 3 years the saving of river resources for water users as there is not likely to be another omnibus flood-control bill before 1952 or 1953.

"I am extremely gratified that the committee approved these two projects, climaxing many years of hard work and persistent effort begun by me while State engineer to get them started, and I am grateful for the support given me by the residents within the area involved.

"The Muddy River project, above Caliente, will cost $1,986,000, and the total Humboldt River project first cost to the Federal Government, not repayable, is estimated at $11,399,000," Senator MALONE said. He continued:

"The Muddy River project includes the Pine and Matthews Canyons reservoirs, both to be earth fill structures, 97 and 68 feet high, and storing 7,840 and 6,260 acre-feet of water, respectively.

"Average annual benefits are estimated by the Army engineers at $110,000 as contrasted to annual charges of $82,200 showing a favorable benefit ratio of 1.3. The additional water will be of tremendous benefit value to the entire area of 220 square miles, an area rich in farming and mining development.

"Under the program, local interests must assure, to the satisfaction of the Army, that they will adjust all water rights and claims and agree to keep flood-control channels downstream free of man-made obstructions.

"In addition to protecting our farms, producing alfalfa, lettuce, tomatoes, cantaloupes, sugar beets and other high-valued crops, the dams will protect the main line of the Union Pacific, major artery from Los Angeles and Los Vegas to Salt Lake City and eastern farm markets.

"Approval of the Humboldt River project for upstream dams on both forks, climaxes a campaign started nearly 25 years ago," the Senator said, when he was State engineer of Nevada. "As projected, there will be three major dams and many channel improvements, the dams to be at the Hylton site on the south fork, impounding 120,000 acre-feet and at the Vista site on Mary River, 50,000 acre-feet.

"Major drainage improvements, main drains, a pumping plant and protective dikes in the Lovelock Valley, without repayment to the Government, complete the project as approved Monday.

"I made the original surveys and reports on the lower river for the Rye Patch Reservoir and organized the Pershing County conservation district in the area before becoming State engineer. In that period, I said that the proper program would be proper distribution of the natural flow of the river in accordance with the order of determination, later the Humboldt River decree; construction of a reservoir in the lower river to prevent water from wasting into the Humboldt sink, and providing sufficient upstream storage to regulate the flow of the river and protect thousands of acres from erosion.

"I am gratified that the third and last part of the program has been approved. The upstream storage, together with the lower river water district storage under the jurisdiction of the State engineer, will conserve and provide for the beneficial use of all the water in the river system.

"Water-users of the stream system ultimately must determine the method and the amount of repayment, cooperatively with the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the State engineer.

"Then, if further congressional legislation is needed, it can be enacted at the proper time. Meantime, action now advances water-conservation work at least 2 and probably 3 years in these areas.

"Authorization of the upstream Humboldt River project is needed primarily to furnish a basis for negotiations between the water-users of the Humboldt River Valley and the Corps of Engineers. Such authorization will

expedite the completion of these negotiations and undoubtedly result in a complete solution of the water-conservation problems of the Humboldt River.

"The report of the Chief of Engineers recommends a preliminary division of the cost and repayment for the project which is subject to negotiation with the water users of the stream system.

"The division of cost recommended by the Chief of Engineers is essentially the same as that which would obtain under reclamation law as administered by the Bureau of Reclamation. However, both computations are entirely theoretical at this point and negotiations must be begun at an early date between the water users and the Corps of Engineers to work out a mutually satisfactory method of financing the project. In addition, the question of the 'tight' dams must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the State engineer, and the Corps of Engineers.

"The authorization of this project by the Congress will constitute an important step forward in the development of the Humboldt River Valley and its authorization sets the stage for the opening of negotiations with the water users at a very early date.

"Total upstream flood control and irrigation storage in the three reservoirs authorized Monday is 250,000 acre-feet. Total capacity of the two downstream existing reservoirs for irrigation is 213,000 acre-feet, making a total of 466,000 acre-feet of flood control and irrigation storage for full control and regulation of the stream system."

UPSTREAM STORAGE, HUMBOLDT RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEVADA (81ST CONG., 1ST SESS.)

Location: The Humboldt River rises in northeastern Nevada, flows westerly for about two-thirds of its length to Winnemucca, and then southerly to end in Humboldt Lake and Carson Sink. The basin has an area of about 16,700 square miles and is a high, semiarid plateau crossed by numerous steep mountain ranges separated by broad, flat valleys. The river valley is about 300 miles long, but the river is much longer due to meandering. The principal headwater tributaries are North and South Forks and Marys River. Reese River, which enters Humboldt River near Battle Mountain, contributes little flow, and Little Humboldt River, which formerly joined the main stream near Winnemucca, is no longer a surface tributary due to a sand barrier at the lower end of its valley. Elevations in the basin vary from about 12,000 feet in the headwaters of the South Fork to about 4,000 feet in Carson Sink. The population of the Humboldt River Basin was estimated at 16,200 in 1940. The larger towns are Elko, Winnemucca, Lovelock, and Battle Mountain, with populations in 1940 of 4,094, 2,485, 1,294, and 1,120, respectively. The principal activities are raising livestock, with supporting forage production, and mining. About 213,000 acres of land along the stream and major tributaries are irrigated. The principal crops are hay and alfalfa for livestock feeding. Rye Patch Reservoir, built by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in 1935, is on Humboldt River about 22 miles northeast of Lovelock, has a capacity of 180,000 acre-feet, and, in conjunction with the Pitt-Taylor Reservoirs, irrigates some 33,000 acres in the Lovelock District. Other reservoirs on Willow and Bishop Creeks and other tributaries provide additional water. Practically the entire valley area along the river and the lower reaches of its tributaries is subject to flood overflows, affecting farm and urban developments, crops, livestock, railroads, highways, and irrigation structures.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal flood-control project on the Humboldt River Basin.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for improvements for flood control, water conservation and redistribution, and drainage, involving three storage reservoirs on headwaters tributaries, minor supplementary channel improvements at critical locations along Humboldt River above Rye Patch Reservoir, and a system of drainage canals, a pumping plant, and a dike to confine water to the lower portion of Humboldt Lake. Data on the proposed reservoirs are shown below:

Reservoir	Location	Storage capacity, acre-feet		Dam		Drainage area controlled, square miles
		Active	Total	Type	Height	
Hylton	South Fork	111,000	120,000	Earth	99	970
Devils Gate	North Fork	75,000	80,000	do	124	830
Vista	Marys River	45,000	50,000	do	73	385
Total		230,000	250,000			

Estimated cost to the United States: $7,679,000.

Local cooperation: Local interests must furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (a) furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the channel and major drainage improvements and make all utility revisions required; (b) construct all lateral drains and appurtenant facilities needed to supplement the major drainage improvements and to secure effective drainage in Lovelock Valley; (c) maintain and operate all channel and drainage improvements and appurtenant works after completion, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; (d) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction of channel and drainage improvements and appurtenant works; and (e) enter into an agreement among themselves as to the method of operation of the reservoirs for conservation subject to flood control priority; and providing further that prior to initiating construction of the reservoirs local interests contribute $2,762,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction costs.

Benefits: Total average annual benefits from the plan of improvement are estimated at $723,500, consisting of $207,100 from flood control, $207,400 from water conservation and flow redistribution, and $309,000 from drainage. The total estimated annual charges are $593,800. The ratio of benefits to costs is favorable and is 1.22 to 1.

MEADOW VALLEY WASH AND LOWER MUDDY RIVER, NEV.

BOARD OF ENGINEERS
FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1949.

To: Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

1. Local interests were informed of the division engineer's recommendations and were afforded opportunity to submit additional information to the Board. Careful consideration has been given to the communications received.

2. The Board concurs in the views of the reporting officers that the proposed improvements will provide, in addition to the tangible benefits, many important intangible benefits including alleviation of flood hazards to human life. It believes, however, that the tangible indirect benefits from prevention of rail-service interruptions in the area now subject to floods have been seriously underestimated and that benefits from prevention of such interruptions in wartime, rather than being intangible, are susceptible of monetary evaluation. The Board finds that complete interruption of freight and passenger traffic on the main-line transcontinental railroad through Meadow Valley Wash Basin and its rerouting over the shortest alternative route would cause a peacetime loss of at least $72,000 per day on perishable freight and $28,000 per day for passenger traffic, making a minimum total indirect daily loss of $100,000. During the peak years of the last world war, the transportation burden on the railroad involved rose to 210 percent of the average for the preceding 20 years. Therefore an interruption at that time would have caused proportionately higher tangible losses apart from the hazard to national security. It is to be noted that the Nation has been engaged in foreign wars during about 10 percent of the period of its existence. The Board evaluates the long-term average annual tangible benefits from the proposed flood-control reservoirs at $110,000 by taking into account the prevention of indirect losses from interruption of railway traffic on the basis of the above factors weighted according to the rate of occurrence and severity of floods in Meadow Valley Wash.

3. The Board finds that the cost estimates for the two flood-control reservoirs do not contain sufficient allowances to provide, in this relatively isolated area, for contingent construction costs such as construction camps, water and power supply, mobilization, demobilization, and clean-up. It believes that the contingency allowances should be increased from 10 to 25 percent which would add $210,000 to the first cost of the projects thereby raising the total estimated cost to $1,986,000. Corresponding annual carrying charges would be $83,200, including $3,700 annually for maintenance. The ratio of the estimated annual benefits of $110,000 to the estimated annual carrying charges of $83,200 is 1.32, therefore the Board concludes that the proposed improvements are economically justified.

4. Accordingly, the Board recommends construction of two flood-control reservoirs in the Meadow Valley Wash drainage area, one in Pine Canyon, the other in Matthews Canyon, in Nevada, generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost to the United States of $1,986,000 for construction and $3,700 annually for maintenance, provided that responsible local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will adjust all water rights claims resulting from the operation of the improvements and keep the flood channels below the flood-control reservoirs free from man-made encroachments.

R. C. CRAWFORD,
Major General, Chairman
(For the Board).

The New Social Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on October 5 the House of

Representatives passed, by the overwhelming vote of 333 to 14, the Social Security Act amendments of 1949, H. R. 6000. The bill has now been sent to the Senate which will hold public hearings in January. Because the bill is so important to so many millions of people I am summarizing the main provisions of the bill.

INCREASED BENEFITS TO PRESENT BENEFICIARIES

How does the new bill increase the insurance benefits now being paid? At the present time there are about 2,600,000 individuals drawing benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors program. Among these 2,600,000 persons are retired workers and their wives, aged widows, widowed mothers with dependent children, and dependent parents. These beneficiaries would have their monthly insurance benefits increased on the average by about 70 percent. Increases would range from 50 percent for those now receiving the highest-benefit payments to as much as 150 percent for those receiving the lowest-benefit payments. For example, a retired person receiving $25 a month now would receive $44 a month under the new bill. A widow with young children now drawing $50 a month would receive $97 a month under the new bill. Illustrative figures for individual retired cases are shown in the table below. Similar increases would be made for widows and orphans.

TABLE 1

Present primary insurance benefit to an aged retired person under existing law	*New primary insurance benefit to an aged retired person under H. R. 6000*
$10	$25
$15	31
$20	36
$25	44
$30	51
$35	55
$40	60
$45	64

INCREASED BENEFITS FOR FUTURE BENEFICIARIES

H. R. 6000 provides for increased benefits to individuals who retire after the bill goes into effect and to the widows and dependent children of insured workers who die after the new bill goes into effect. The changes for future beneficiaries are based upon a complete revision of the various provisions of the insurance system. Taking all these various changes into account the result is that the benefits are very substantially increased as shown in the following tables:

TABLE 2.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for retired workers*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Present law		H. R. 6000	
	Single	Married [1]	Single	Married [1]
	Insured worker covered for 5 years			
$50	$21	$32	$26	$38
$100	26	39	51	77
$150	32	47	56	85
$200	37	55	62	92
$250	42	63	67	100
$300	[2]	[2]	72	108

TABLE 2.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for retired workers*—Continued

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Present law		H. R. 6000	
	Single	Married [1]	Single	Married [1]
	Insured worker covered for 10 years			
$50	$22	$33	$26	$39
$100	28	41	52	79
$150	33	50	58	87
$200	38	58	63	94
$250	44	66	68	102
$300	[2]	[2]	74	110
	Insured worker covered for 20 years			
$50	$24	$36	$28	$40
$100	30	45	55	80
$150	36	54	60	91
$200	42	63	66	99
$250	48	72	72	107
$300	[2]	[2]	77	116
	Insured worker covered for 40 years			
$50	$28	$40	$30	$40
$100	35	52	60	80
$150	42	63	66	99
$200	49	74	72	108
$250	56	84	78	117
$300	[2]	[2]	84	126

[1] With wife 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

NOTE.—These figures are based on the assumption that the insured worker was in covered employment steadily each year after 1949 (or after 1936 as the case may be).

TABLE 3.—*Illustrative monthly benefits for survivors of insured workers*

[All figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Average monthly wage	Aged widow [1]		Aged parent [1] or 1 child alone		Widow and 1 child		Widow and 2 children		Widow and 3 children	
	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000	Present law	H. R. 6000
	Insured worker covered for 5 years									
$50	$16	$19	$10	$19	$26	$38	$37	$40	$40	$40
$100	20	38	13	38	33	77	46	80	52	80
$150	24	42	16	42	39	85	55	113	63	120
$200	28	46	18	46	46	92	64	123	74	150
$250	32	50	21	50	52	100	74	133	84	150
$300	[2]	54	[2]	54	[2]	108	[2]	144	[2]	150
	Insured worker covered for 10 years									
$50	$16	$20	$11	$20	$28	$39	$38	$40	$40	$40
$100	21	39	14	39	34	79	48	80	55	80
$150	25	43	16	43	41	87	58	116	66	120
$200	29	47	19	47	48	94	67	126	77	150
$250	33	51	22	51	55	102	77	137	85	150
$300	[2]	55	[2]	55	[2]	110	[2]	147	[2]	150
	Insured worker covered for 20 years									
$50	$18	$21	$12	$21	$30	$40	$40	$40	$40	$40
$100	22	41	15	41	38	80	52	80	60	80
$150	27	45	18	45	45	91	63	120	72	120
$200	32	50	21	50	52	99	74	132	84	150
$250	36	54	24	54	60	107	84	143	85	150
$300	[2]	58	[2]	58	[2]	116	[2]	150	[2]	150
	Insured worker covered for 40 years									
$50	$21	$22	$14	$22	$35	$40	$40	$40	$40	$40
$100	26	45	18	45	44	80	61	80	70	80
$150	32	50	21	50	52	99	74	120	84	120
$200	37	54	24	54	61	108	85	144	85	150
$250	42	58	28	58	70	117	85	150	85	150
$300	[2]	63	[2]	63	[2]	126	[2]	150	[2]	150

[1] Age 65 or over.
[2] Present law includes wages only up to $250 per month.

NOTE.—These figures are based on the assumption that the insured worker was in covered employment steadily each year after 1949 (or after 1936 as the case may be).

PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY BENEFITS

One of the most important provisions of the new social-security bill is the provision for the payment of insurance benefits to individuals who become permanently and totally disabled. This is a very valuable part of the new program. Every year thousands of individuals in the United States become disabled by heart disease, chronic illness, or accident, which makes it impossible for them to continue to earn their living. Under H. R. 6000 an individual who is permanently and totally disabled for 6 months and who is insured under the bill will be able to draw benefits under the insurance system. These benefits will be equivalent in amount to those which an individual would draw if he had become age 65 at the time he became permanently and totally disabled. The benefits will be paid to him regularly each month for the entire period of his or her disability.

The amount of benefits are the same as those shown in table 2 for a single retired individual. Thus, an individual earning $200 a month who has been insured for 5 years would draw about $62 a month under the disability-insurance provisions of the bill. An individual earning $300 per month who had been insured for 10 years would be eligible to receive about $74 per month.

CONCLUSION

H. R. 6000 not only increases the benefits under the insurance program and adds provisions for the payment of permanent disability-insurance benefits, but it also extends the coverage of the insurance program to many millions who are not now included under the program. The bill also provides for improvements in the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act. It is not a perfect bill but it does provide for improvements in the program which are long overdue. It is expected that the Senate will pass the bill sometime during the spring of 1950 so that the bill will become law during the summer of 1950.

Conservation of Our Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wilfred M. Schutz, the 19-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Martin J. Schutz, of Eustis, Nebr., has brought honor to our State by winning first prize in the essay contest sponsored by the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council, Inc.

Because of the value of this fine essay, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting Mr. Schutz' essay which is as follows:

In this atomic day and age we are inclined to look with horror upon the destruction that can be wrought by atomic bombs, as demonstrated at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But, sad to say, very few people realize that a single flooding rain removes in a few hours

or even minutes countless tons of fertile topsoil, which required many centuries to form. The dropping of the first atomic bomb made headlines in every newspaper in the world, but very little attention is excited by the fact that each year inestimable amounts of the very soil upon which the people of the world subsist is being lost. Something must be done, and done quickly, if we hope to preserve for ourselves and for future generations the oldest possession in the world, the soil. If we are to maintain our position as the bread basket of the world, we must begin at once to follow a rigid system of soil-saving operations.

Terracing and contour farming are two of the most important means of checking water erosion. Both of these methods lead the run-off water to a gentler slope, where its progress will be much slower and consequently will do much less damage. The grassing of field waterways is one of the most important and convenient methods of stopping the small amount of washing that might result from terracing, or of holding the soil in waterways where terracing is not practical. Hand in hand with these operations go the practices of mulching to prevent run-off, and the regrassing of slopes too steep to be farmed without serious depletion of the soil by erosion. The practice of allowing crop residue or mulch to remain on top of the ground is a comparatively simple one. The subsurface is tilled in such a way as to leave the bits of stalks and stubble on the surface of the ground, where they act as a buffer to break the force of the raindrops and as a filter to hold back the soil particles if run-off occurs. The grassing of steep slopes in many cases increases the value of the farm by giving it an increased livestock capacity as well as preventing erosion. Strip cropping, as well as mulching and grassing, is an effective means of combating that other great element of erosion, the wind.

The other highly important factor with which we must contend is the depletion of our soil resources through unwise cropping methods. It is estimated that the richest bottom land contains enough nitrogen to grow a 60-bushel-to-the-acre corn crop for 65 years if it is cropped continuously and nothing put back. This example shows us that we must expect to put something back into the soil if we are to continue to receive profitable yields.

In spite of the fact that commercial fertilizers have been an important aid to the farmer in maintaining soil fertility, there is a tendency to rely on them too completely. There is an old Flemish proverb that says "Without forage, no cattle; without cattle, no manure; without manure, no crops." If it were true then, it certainly is true now. Farmers that specialize in selling only cash crops, and attempt to maintain the fertility of their land through the use of commercial fertilizers alone, are not adequately providing for the needs of the soil. A soil that is in good condition possesses not only abundant fertility, but a satisfactory tilth as well. A good tilth can be maintained only by plowing under from time to time, a liberal supply of barnyard manure as well as any crop residue that remains on the land. Tilth is one of the most important determining factors in the ability of a soil to hold water, and hence to check erosion.

A good farmer should not overlook the opportunity of renewing his soil fertility by means of crop rotations, especially a rotation that includes legumes. A well inoculated legume crop serves a threefold purpose; it greatly increases the nitrogen content of the soil; it helps pulverize the subsoil by means of the numerous tap roots which it sends down, and it is beneficial to the tilth of the soil. All of these make for better conservation of our soil resources.

The idea of the conservation of our soil resources is not a new one, but it is certainly more important now than it has ever been before. Our Nation and the world must realize now that a high standard of living, and a healthy economic status cannot be maintained if our oldest and most important natural resource is allowed to deteriorate. Only through an intelligent system of terracing, contouring, crop rotation, and fertilizing can our present methods of intensive agricultural production be maintained and improved.

To Outlaw Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter to the editor of the New York Times dated October 15, 1949:

TO OUTLAW GENOCIDE—ADOPTION OF CONVENTION IS URGED IN CITING SOVIET ACTIONS

TO the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In September 1949 your correspondent Cyrus L. Sulzberger reported new waves of genocide perpetrated by the masters of the Kremlin on the Armenian, Estonian, Greek, Iranian, Jewish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Turkish, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian peoples.

The convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, currently pending for ratification before the United States Senate, fills an acute need of our times and is of especial relevance to the fate of a number of nations now under Soviet rule. Every sentence of this convention is borne out by the sufferings of millions of innocent men, women, and children who are being destroyed en masse as part of a gigantic plot to obliterate certain peoples.

The text of the convention was not made as broad as it might have been. Nevertheless, the definition of genocide includes willful destruction, in whole or in part, of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group and embraces such acts as (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

NOT PROPAGANDA

It was reported that at a recent meeting of the bar association a delegate claimed that the stories of genocide in the Baltic countries were propaganda. He can rest assured that these stories are as much propaganda as the former, and present, existence of the Buchenwald and other concentration camps in Germany; and that thousands of American families are directly affected by the Russian-conducted genocide in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine. In every one of the 124 Lithuanian-language Roman Catholic parishes in this country families are mourning members who were either murdered or exiled by the Russian invaders. At least one American, Dr. Michael Devenis, of Waterbury, Conn., has come out of a Soviet Artic camp, and other native Americans of Lithuanian extraction are still unaccounted for in Siberia.

The pattern of genocide in Lithuania and the other Baltic States conforms to the letter of the definition of the crime in the convention—under all five counts.

The direct killings and mutilation of the clergy and intellectuals of this predominantly Roman Catholic country failed to bring about a surrender of the remainder of the nation to barbaric alien rule. So, the Russians deliberately inflicted conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, by intensified mass deportations and forcible collectivization.

Since the infamous "Serov Instruction," whose original is in this country, deportations proceed without fuss or panic, in the dead of night, and families are invariably split up. The instruction provides that families be driven intact "to points of concentration," and there be separated under the pretext of sanitary inspection. Thereafter, heads of the families are put on board one train and members of their families are boarded up on other trains going to destinations thousands of miles apart. Such measures clearly prevent births within the group and disrupt the continuity of the nation. This last form of genocide acts like a time bomb—the nations subjected to Russian rule are doomed to extinction.

Finally, children are taken away from parents, to be brought up as Russians and atheists. In 1941 thousands of Lithuanian children were taken to "summer camps" at Palanga, Druskininkai, and elsewhere, and thence were removed to the Urals and Turkestan. Nothing was known of their fate until, late in 1946, one of them, an American boy visiting Lithuania since 1939, made his way from the Urals to western Germany. Men of Lithuania sleep outside their homes. For this reason, most of the more recent deportees are women, children, and babes in arms. It must be noted that more than 700,000 persons had disappeared from the country under Soviet auspices prior to 1948. Some 200,000 persons vanished in 1948, and other victims are rounded up to this date.

FATE OF BALTIC NATIONS

Lithuania was the last European nation to embrace Christianity. The Christian world looks with seeming indifference on the willful destruction of the eastern European Catholic and Protestant nations in the midst of the twentieth century. Destruction of the Baltic nations with their original cultures, with their ancient languages, proud traditions, and a great devotion to western civilization and Christianity, should not only shock the conscience of mankind but should start a strong movement of protest throughout the world. This is not propaganda or a domestic concern of Russia—to whose rule these nations were betrayed by the Ribbentrop-Molotov pacts of 1939. This can happen to any people anywhere on the globe. Just as anyone may fall a victim of homicide, so any nation may become a victim of genocide.

We greet wholeheartedly the action of the United Nations in adopting the Genocide Convention. We express our gratitude to the 29 nations which have already signed it (Russia was not one of them), and to the 4 nations which have already ratified the convention. Human conscience must redeem itself by finding a legal form of condemning the barbarity of genocide.

We hope all the signatory nations will follow soon with their ratification, and we appeal to the distinguished Members of the United States Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Michael L. Kruszas, Pastor, St. George's Parish, Chicago, Ill.; the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph K. Miliauskas, Pastor, St. Joseph's Parish, Scranton, Pa.; the Right Reverend Monsignor John Ambotas, Pastor, Holy Trinity Parish, Hartford, Conn.; the Right Reverend Monsignor Casimir Urbonavicius, St. Peters' Rectory, South Boston, Mass.; the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph A. Lipkus, Pastor, SS. Peter's and

Paul's, Grand Rapids, Mich.; the Right Reverend Monsignor Stanley A. Dobinis, Pastor, Holy Cross Parish, Mount Carmel, Pa.; the Very Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, Pastor, Transfiguration Parish, Maspeth, N. Y.; the Very Reverend Monsignor A. Briszko, Pastor, Immaculate Conception Parish, Chicago, Ill.; the Very Reverend Monsignor B. Urba, St. Casimir's Academy, Chicago, Ill.

CHICAGO, *October 15, 1949.*

Construction and Operation of Rare and Precious Metals Experiment Station in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of H. R. 2386, providing for the construction and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev., together with an explanation of this bill. It has passed the House of Representatives, has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on October 18, 1949, and is still pending and will be considered at the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the bill and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 2386

A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain a research laboratory at Reno, Nev., for research, investigation, and as a center for information and assistance in matters pertaining to the mining, preparation, metallurgy, use, and conservation of the rare and precious metals of the Sierra Nevada mining region, and pertaining to other problems affecting the mining industry of that region.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to acquire land and interests therein; to receive and accept money and property, real or personal, or interests therein, and services as a gift, bequest, or contribution; and may conduct activities or projects in cooperation with any person, firm, agency, or organization, Federal, State, or private. Money so received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund or funds for disbursement by the Bureau of Mines and shall remain available for the purposes for which received and accepted until expended.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of (a) $750,000 for the erection and equipment of a building or buildings, including plumbing, lighting, heating, ventilation, general service, experimental equipment and apparatus, the necessary roads, walks, and ground improvements; and (b) $250,000 annually for the maintenance and operation of the experiment station, including personal services, supplies, equipment, and expenses of travel and subsistence.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of H. R. 2386 is to authorize the construction and operation by the Bureau of Mines of facilities at Reno, Nev., for experimental work relating to the mining and metallurgy of rare and precious metals vital to the national security and for medical and scientific development.

Since 1920 the Bureau of Mines has used facilities at Reno contriouted by the University of Nevada. The favorable report of the Bureau, dated June 2, 1949, to the Chairman of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee states that among the achievements of the station has been its assistance in the production of radium from western carnotite used in the treatment of cancer and which is now contributing to our knowledge of nucleonics at Oak Ridge.

The committee invites attention to the full report of the Bureau of Mines, quoted below, setting forth some of the accomplishments of the station.

Due to wartime expansion of the program of strategic mineral investigation, activities of the station increased appreciably, and the Bureau in 1942 was forced to rent space in Reno in addition to that supplied by the University of Nevada. Not only are the present facilities inadequate and inefficient, but there is danger that the university may be forced to discontinue the existing arrangements. However, the university has contributed 2 acres of land on its campus for the station without cost to the Government.

The Public Buildings Administration and Bureau of Mines have estimated that maximum expenditures necessary at present costs to construct and equip an adequate station would be approximately $750,000, and appropriations up to this amount are accordingly authorized in the bill, as are maximum appropriations of $250,000 annually for maintenance and operation.

An identical bill, S. 1117, was introduced into the Senate by Senator PAT MCCARRAN (and Senator MCCARRAN telephoned to the committee from overseas to request enactment of the bill).

The Nevada State Legislature, with the approval of Gov. Vail Pittman, has memorialized Congress to enact this legislation.

A & P Civil Suit Necessary Development To Insure Obedience of the Orders of the Courts in Upholding Our Antitrust Laws—Text of Offenses Charged in the Civil Suit Against A & P Were All Predicated on Prior Criminal Convictions—Civil Action Will Prevent a Recurrence of Criminal Acts by A & P

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 18, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is, I believe, well for each Member of Congress and for the public to be advised of the text of the offenses charged in the Government's complaint against the New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc., and others. These charges are not new charges, for as the complaint states, on September 21, 1946, the defendants—A & P—were convicted of conduct substantially identical with the conduct charged in the present complaint and these convictions were sustained by the Court of Appeals. A & P did not appeal its criminal conviction to the United States Supreme Court. It paid its fine and went its way—free at least until caught again. Fines under the antitrust laws are not sufficient to deter giants like A & P from going right back to the practices on which they are convicted.

NOT A SINGLE A & P STORE WILL BE CLOSED BY CIVIL SUIT

The Government does not suggest that a single A & P store be closed, but simply asks that a recurrence of these criminal acts by which A & P was convicted be prevented. In order to accomplish this purpose this unlawful combination already convicted should be broken up into its 10 or more component parts. This will mean more competition, and more competition means lower prices to the consumer.

A & P MULTI-MILLION-DOLLAR PROPAGANDA DRIVE INDIRECT METHOD OF INTIMIDATION AND CONTEMPT

The continued propaganda drive of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc., before its case is tried in the courts appears to me to be a bold attempt at intimidation. It would appear from the thousands of advertisements, in which A & P tries its case in the newspapers, that it has utter contempt for the courts of this land. A criminal standing denuded of its cloak of respectability, such as A & P has proven to be, comes with bad grace to the public to plead its cause. There are those who say that A & P's deceptive and pernicious propaganda campaign will backfire. This may be true, for when the criminal facts of A & P's conviction became fully known the public will become aware of the falsehoods contained in A & P's full-page advertisements. Once the public is aware of A & P's methods of doing business, for which they have been criminally convicted under the antitrust laws, A & P will have shot its last bolt. The fact is that thousands of hometown merchants and small manufacturers have taken up A & P's propaganda challenge. The public—the housewife, the breadwinner—in countless numbers now understands A & P's mad-dog tactics. A & P runs wild snipping here and biting there, but the cold, hard facts of its criminal conviction stand unchallenged.

The offenses charged against A & P in the civil suit as contained in the Government's complaint against the New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Inc., and others, as contained in part IV of the complaint, follow:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. THE NEW YORK GREAT ATLANTIC & PACIFIC TEA CO., INC., ET AL.

COMPLAINT

Part IV. Offenses charged

21. Beginning in or about the year 1925, and continuing thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this complaint,

the defendants, each well knowing all the matters and things hereinbefore alleged, have been and now are engaged in a combination and conspiracy to restrain unreasonably, and pursuant to said combination and conspiracy, have in fact unreasonably restrained the aforesaid interstate trade and commerce in the production, manufacture, distribution, and sale of food and food products among the several States of the United States, and have combined and conspired to monopolize a substantial part of the aforesaid interstate trade and commerce in food and food products produced, manufactured, distributed, and sold throughout the United States, in violation of sections 1 and 2 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies" (26 Stat. 209, 15 U. S. C. sec. 1 and 2), as amended, commonly known as the Sherman Act. Defendants threaten to continue such offenses and will continue them unless the relief hereinafter prayed for in this complaint is granted.

22. The aforesaid combination and conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce and to monopolize a substantial part of trade and commerce, has consisted of a continuing agreement and concert of action among the defendants the substantial terms of which have been that the defendants agree:

A. To obtain for themselves, under the dual threat to withdraw their patronage or to manufacture for themselves, systematic discriminatory price preferences over their retail competitors in the purchase of manufactured and processed foods and food products—

(1) By compelling suppliers, between 1925 and 1936, to pay so-called brokerage fees to defendants' own employees on food and food products purchased by defendants.

(2) By inducing suppliers, between 1936 and 1940, to reduce invoice prices on food and food products purchased by defendants by the amounts theretofore paid to defendants' employees as so-called brokerage fees.

(3) By requiring suppliers, since 1940 to discontinue selling food and food products either to defendants or to any of defendants' competitors through brokers.

(4) By coercing suppliers to secretly maintain two price structures on their food and food products, the lower of which would be charged to defendants and the higher to defendants' competitors.

(5) By requiring suppliers to give defendants secret preferential prices and secret preferential discounts on food and food products purchased by defendants.

(6) By coercing suppliers to grant preferential allowances and rebates to defendants upon various pretexts unrelated to any actual savings by or services to such suppliers—

(a) By systematically exacting from suppliers large and arbitrarily fixed rebates called advertising allowances in return for merely token advertising performance.

(b) By encouraging suppliers to violate the Robinson-Patman Act through the use of rigged-up contracts describing defendants' unlawful discounts as costs savings allowances or purporting otherwise to justify such unlawful discounts.

(c) By demanding from suppliers special newspaper supplement allowances and special circular allowances for the publication of advertisements in which only defendants' merchandise is advertised and for which suppliers are required to pay defendants' entire publication costs plus 100 percent.

(d) By demanding preferential discounts and allowances from suppliers for so-called floor-space rentals, stores sales service, feature payments, label and container allowances, sign space rentals, mass displays, and collateral merchandising support, all of which are pretended services that defendants purportedly render on behalf of suppliers but which are in reality performed by defendants in their own behalf in the ordinary course of retailing defendants' own merchandise.

B. To obtain for themselves, under the threat to withdraw their patronage, systematic discriminatory price preferences over their retail competitors in the purchase of produce—

(1) By compelling growers, shippers, and jobbers, between 1925 and 1936, to pay so-called brokerage fees to Acco, on its purchases of produce for defendants' retailing subsidiaries.

(2) By inducing growers, shippers, and jobbers, between 1936 and 1940, to reduce invoice prices on produce purchased by Acco for defendants' retailing subsidiaries by the amounts theretofore paid to Acco as so-called brokerage fees.

(3) By causing Acco to undertake a series of inconsistent functions and obligations including, among others, its activities—

(a) As selling broker for shippers and as buying agent for defendants' retailing subsidiaries from the same shippers.

(b) As buying broker for jobbers and as LCL buying agent for defendants' retailing subsidiaries from the same jobbers.

(c) As auction seller for shippers and as auction buyer for defendants' retailing subsidiaries on the same auctions.

(d) As a consignee selling consigned produce both to defendants' retailing subsidiaries and to defendants' competitors.

(4) By causing superior quality produce handled by Acco to be diverted to defendants' retailing subsidiaries and inferior quality produce handled by Acco to be diverted to defendants' competitors.

(5) By compelling shippers to extend so-called cash discounts to Acco, on its purchases of produce for defendants' retailing subsidiaries, without requiring Acco to assume the usual risks proper to and normally undertaken by cash buyers.

(6) By causing Acco to refrain from taking so-called cash discounts on produce bought or procured by Acco for its patrons other than defendants' retailing subsidiaries.

(7) By insisting that shippers that sell produce to Acco on sales arrival terms surrender to Acco the right to fix unilaterally the prices to be paid for such produce.

(8) By requiring independent produce jobbers to buy through and pay Acco a profit or brokerage fee on car lots of produce as a condition of selling less than car lots of produce back to defendants' retailing subsidiaries.

(9) By selling car lots of produce to independent jobbers under agreements providing that defendants' retailing subsidiaries repurchase parts of the same produce from the same jobbers in LCL quantities at the same prices paid by the jobbers for car lots.

(10) By collecting unnecessary and duplicate brokerage fees, on produce transactions among others than defendants; where no brokerage service has been rendered by defendants and where the actual brokerage service has been previously performed and collected for by independent brokers.

(11) By secretly organizing, controlling, and dominating cooperative associations of growers and shippers handling substantial portions of the annual fresh fruit and vegetable crop of the United States and inducing such associations to turn over such produce to Acco for disposal to defendants' retailing subsidiaries or to others on such terms, conditions, and prices as defendants elect.

(12) By organizing contract committees of growers and shippers of produce in order to bring such producers more closely within Acco's influence and thereby to increase Acco's preferential buying opportunities.

(13) By allocating Acco's profits, on sales to defendants' competitors and on brokerage transactions on behalf of others than defendants, to defendants' retailing subsidiaries in the form of credits to their retail operations.

C. To interfere unreasonably with the buying opportunities of competing retailers—

(1) By requiring many suppliers to increase prices charged and to be charged to such competing retailers for store door delivered food and food products.

(2) By requiring many suppliers to discontinue the offering of premium deals to such competing retailers in connection with their purchases of food and food products.

(3) By entering into a series of agreements with many suppliers providing that competing retailers, whose lack of capital and storage facilities requires them to buy in job lots through brokers, would no longer be permitted to buy the food and food products of such suppliers through brokers.

D. To utilize their food manufacturing and processing plants and facilities in such manner as to insure that defendants secure food and food products both from their own manufacturing subsidiaries and from other manufacturers at lower buying prices than those paid by their retail competitors for the same food and food products—

(1) By selling the foods and food products manufactured in defendants' own plants (a) to defendants' competitors at regular billing prices, and (b) to defendants' retailing subsidiaries at less than regular billing prices when necessary to circumvent State minimum mark-up laws or to underprice other retailers handling brands of comparable quality manufactured by other manufacturers.

(2) By entering upon, withdrawing from, or agreeing to abstain from the manufacture of particular foods and food products primarily with the intent and purpose of thereby depressing buying prices to be offered and quoted to defendants for similar products of comparable quality manufactured by other manufacturers.

(3) By coercing other food manufacturers to sell particular foods and food products to defendants at discriminatory prices by means of threats that defendants will themselves enter upon the manufacture of such products if such discriminatory prices are not granted.

(4) By utilizing the profits of defendants' manufacturing subsidiaries, on sales to defendants' competitors, first to offset losses or profit reductions occasioned by their reduced billings to defendants' retailing subsidiaries, as aforesaid, and then by allocating all residual profits to defendants' retailing subsidiaries in the form of credits to their retail operations.

E. To expend their retail sales, increase their percentage participation in selected retail areas, and to suppress and to eliminate the competition of independent grocers, meat dealers, and local food chains—

(1) By crediting to retail operations the savings resulting from their discriminatory buying program so as to permit them to undersell retail competition.

(2) By selling below their cost of doing business in selected retail areas and recouping such losses by selling at higher prices in less competitive retail areas.

(3) By utilizing the profits secured from Acco's inconsistent functioning on behalf of defendants and defendants' competitors as credits to defendants' retail operations for the purpose of underselling retail competitors.

(4) By utilizing the profits secured from their manufacturing operations, on sales to their retail stores and on sales to their retail competitors at proportionately unequal

prices, as credits to defendants' retail operations for the purpose of increasing defendants' ability to undersell their competitors at retail.

(5) By selecting local areas throughout the United States wherein defendants sell at retail below their cost of doing business at retail and below their prices in other retail areas until the desired percentage occupation of such selected retail markets is achieved, using income from other retail areas and from Acco and their manufacturing subsidiaries, as well as from the savings accruing from discriminatory buying practices to offset the losses or reductions in profits incident to such selected area price cutting.

22. During the period of time covered by this complaint, and for the purpose of forming and effectuating the aforesaid combination and conspiracy to restrain and to monopolize the interstate trade and commerce hereinbefore alleged, the defendants by agreement and concerted action have done the things which, as hereinbefore alleged, they conspired to do.

23. On February 26, 1944, all the defendants named herein were named as defendants in a criminal information filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois, which criminal information charged such defendants with combining and conspiring to violate sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act by virtue of conduct substantially identical with the conduct charged in this complaint. On September 21, 1946, such defendants were convicted of conduct substantially identical with the conduct charged herein (*United States* v. *The New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Inc., et al.*, (67 Fed. Supp. 626)), and these convictions were sustained on appeal (*United States* v. *The New York Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Inc., et al.*, (173 F. (2d) 79)), on February 24, 1949.

Location of Supersonic Laboratory at Las Vegas, Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force and an outline of the basic data and information relative to the location of the supersonic laboratory at or near Las Vegas, Nev.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Pentagon Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with our conversation, I am enclosing a brief statement of what I believe to be the information needed by your new committee which I understand, you are setting up to determine the best available location for the high-power supersonic laboratory.

Of course, you are familiar with the general development of the region of southern Nevada near Hoover (Boulder) Dam, where there is nearly 700,000 firm horsepower at a very low cost at the switchboard and as included in the statement a large power capacity of off-peak or secondary power that would meet the average requirements.

Of course, you are also familiar with the fact that Bridge Canyon and other developments will probably come along on the Colorado River in due time and also the fact that some of the best coal in the country is available within just a few miles of eastern Nevada, in Utah, and that plenty of cooling water is available in the reservoir so that very low-cost steam power could be developed.

It is not necessary to say that there is adequate water supply.

Of course, I, like you, want the most feasible and most efficient site for this important work, but I would be remiss in my duty if I did not give you the basic information from which your committee may complete the investigation.

I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

LOCATION OF SUPERSONIC LABORATORY AT LAS VEGAS, NEV.

A suggested location for the high-power supersonic laboratory in the vicinity of Las Vegas, Nev., has the following advantages to recommend it:

(a) The nearby location of the Hoover Dam power plant and its interconnected system provides an assured power supply, ample for the requirements of the laboratory. Large power capacity can be made available at off-peak periods and continuous power in sufficient amount can be made available to meet the average requirements.

(b) Potential developments at Bridge Canyon and other points on the Colorado, which will be interconnected with the present power system, will assure ample capacity to meet any future requirements.

(c) Location of the testing laboratory can be provided within a short distance of railroad facilities, water supply, and adequate shopping centers. A suitable terrain for such a laboratory is available and for the location of an adequate community center, yet far enough removed from any present urban center to avoid disturbance to existing residents.

(d) An airfield adequate for testing-center facilities and for Army requirements already exists. This airfield is apart from and isolated from the commercial airport at present serving this area.

(e) The dry climate is ideal for the testing laboratory purposes.

(f) The climate is pleasant and suitable for locating personnel. Good shopping and recreational facilities exist and this area is rapidly developing into a desirable residential location, as attested by the rapid growth of Las Vegas and Boulder City, Nev. The national park located at Lake Mead, and to be extended down the Colorado to Davis Dam, 85 miles downstream, provides increasing recreational facilities.

(g) Los Angeles is 1½ hours' distant by plane and overnight by train. Transcontinental railroad and air line facilities are available.

Address of Chief Justice John P. Higgins of the Superior Court of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a eulogy rendered by our former colleague, Hon. John P. Higgins, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on the occasion of the burial services of the late Abraham Pinanski, an associate justice of said superior court.

Judge Pinanski was an outstanding American, an outstanding lawyer and jurist. He devoted his unusual talents in the best interests of his fellow men, giving untiringly of his time and energy in all good causes, and particularly without regard to race, color or creed in the religious and charitable field.

His death is felt keenly by the people of Massachusetts.

Rabbi Klausner, Rabbi Mandel, Judge Kaplan, the family, and friends of the late Justice Pinanski, as we, the members of the judiciary of Massachusetts, assemble in this house of God to pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleague, we are mindful of the value of his friendship and the heritage of a model public life that he has bequeathed to us.

It is only a few weeks ago that he worked by our side and gave us the benefit of his counsel, the joy of his companionship, shared our tasks, and strove with his valiant heart and mind to improve our personal happiness.

Who can reflect upon the nature of this man, his will, his heart, his conscience, his dignity and not believe that he was made to be one with God, a partaker of His blessedness, and a companion of His eternity.

Few men have played so brilliant a role in the judicial life of Massachusetts as did our departed colleague. For nearly 40 years he has been a leader at the bar and on the bench.

Truly "a great oak has fallen in the forest of public life. It fell not when its leaves had gone and its branches were bare and it had lost its beauty but rather at the very height of its perfection, of its usefulness, and its charm. It was still putting forth its branches, its leaves were yet green; its roots struck daily deeper into the soil of our affection."

Justice Pinanski faced a sequence of events in his life from early boyhood to the time of his death for which his ability, his character, and his personality were exactly fitted. The tumult of our times with its complexity of problems enlarged his capacity for human service. He could combine with symphonic ease any discordant elements about him. Indeed he made such use of his talents that the people of the Commonwealth he served looked upon him as a model of representative government and its finest personal embodiment.

He brought to judicial life the rich experience of many years as a trial lawyer. He was incorruptible and honest. He was sincere and dependable. In any society the was genial and charming company, and in any life his was a friendship worth forming and keeping.

He was generous to a fault and his patience was monumental. He loved life and valued the friendships of all classes of people, helped many, hurt very few—and those not by intention. The ordinary things about him were discernible at a glance. However what seemed ordinary was merely a cloak draped around a man of uncommon ability and uncommon fineness of character.

If I were to single out one attribute of his character, I would designate kindness as the outstanding quality that drew to him so many friends and admirers. Although possessed of the world's goods as measured in a material sense, there was nothing of an aristocrat in the life and character of our friend. He scattered his benefactions among the lowly and needy of society. Race and color were never considered by him when

dispensing charity and there was no ostentation in the manner of giving. His fundamental trait of kindness is so well expressed in a poem by John Boyle O'Reilly:

"What is the real good?
I asked in musing mood.
Then within my bosom
Softly this I heard:
Each heart holds the secret;
Kindness is the word."

His death coming at any time would have been a tragedy. However, coming as it did in the zenith of his life and as he was approaching the fullness of his capacity to serve makes the loss to the people of Massachusetts more irreparable and profound. He, however, leaves behind the supreme achievement attainable by any man, a legacy of love and respect by all who knew him.

Status of Irrigation and Reclamation Developments Under the Bureau of Reclamation, 17 Western States, June 30, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement outlining the status of irrigation and reclamation developments under the Bureau of Reclamation, 17 Western States, June 30, 1949.

This statement is a supplement to the report included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 9950 to 9953 of the second session of the Eightieth Congress in 1948 and in the 1948 reprint of my debates on the Senate floor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, 17 WESTERN STATES, JUNE 30, 1949

A little over a year ago, on August 6, 1948, to be exact, I had the pleasure of reporting on the status of irrigation and power development under the Bureau of Reclamation. At that time my remarks along with complete tabulations relative to the program appeared on pages 9950 through 9953 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and in the 1948 reprint of my debates on the Senate floor. Today, I should like to bring you up to date on the reclamation program.

As is well known, the limiting factor on irrigation in the West is the availability of water that can be economically delivered to land that can be made productive through the artificial application of irrigation water. Generally speaking, the limit of irrigation in the West has been placed at approximately 40,000,000 acres out of a total of areas in the 17 Western States of 1,162,000,000 acres.

About 22,000,000 acres are now under irrigation principally through private enterprise, but including about 3,150,000 acres which have been brought under irrigation (full supply) by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Indian Affairs.

In addition to this acreage Reclamation provides supplemental water for 2,800,000 acres.

The following tabulation shows the significant increases in Reclamation's irrigation program:

Area for which constructed works are capable of providing full water supply increased 100,000 acres while the area for which supplemental water is available increased 380,000 acres. Project areas under construction or on which work has been authorized increased almost 600,000 acres (full supply) and 170,000 acres (supplemental supply). The under-investigation or potential catagories increased 3,100,000 acres for the full supply and about 1,000,000 acres for the supplemental supply. This represents approximately a 5,200,000 increase in the total project acreage. The installed power capacity has been increased by approximately 500,000 kilowatts.

The Bureau of Reclamation, greatest single agency in the world engaged in the conservation and development of land and water resources is the primary factor in the development of the western United States. This agency was created more than 47 years ago when President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act introduced by the great legislator from our State, the late Senator Francis G. Newlands.

This great organization has invested more than a billion and one-half dollars in reclamation projects which have contributed many times that sum to the wealth of the Nation in taxes. The greatest part of this investment will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States by the water and power users of the West. Every State in the Nation benefits from reclamation dollars which are appropriated annually by the Congress. From Connecticut to California, and from Maine to Mexico reclamation projects create employment and contribute to the economic welfare of these communities. Because it is from the many areas outside the reclamation region that the major portion of equipment and supplies used in reclamation structures are built and manufactured. Benefits to areas other than the reclamation area do not end here with construction materials. The wealth created on these projects automatically causes a demand for millions of dollars worth of clothes, household equipment, farm equipment, and thousands of other items manufactured in the East, North, South, and Central States.

In this connection it will bear repeating that the economy of the 11 States of the mountain and Pacific regions is almost wholly dependent on the irrigation developments that have led to the tremendous growth in population since the turn of the century. It will be irrigation expansion as well as the hydroelectric power developments in multiple-purpose reclamation projects that will enable the West to continue to grow and to continue to be a major factor in the future development and security of the entire country.

The people of the 17 far western States which make up the vast arid and semiarid areas are deeply concerned with the Federal reclamation program for complete conservation of water resources for the development of irrigated lands, with the development of hydroelectric power, to assist in repayment of costs and to assure maximum use of the water and land resources. The country at large was likewise concerned with this great reclamation conservation program which was initiated under President Theodor Roosevelt when the Congress adopted the reclamation law of 1902; and it has continued its interest and concern for furthering the reclamation program during the 47 years since the national irrigation policy was written into the Federal statutes.

These figures are, in the main, taken from the Bureau of Reclamation's official crop report, the Reclamation Program, and from data available in the official records.

The table which is an inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States with details by States on the reclamation program is as follows:

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Hydroelectric power is a vital factor in repayment of costs and for pumping in the irrigation development of the Federal reclamation program. Presently installed on Bureau of Reclamation projects are a total of 2,632,277 kilowatts. Authorized for construction are about 4,500,000 additional kilowatts, including the installations of about 1,400,000 kilowatts at Army dams in the Missouri Basin, where the power production will be distributed over transmission lines to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. A tabulation which shows a schedule as of January 1949 for installations through 1953 is as follows:

The importance of hydroelectric power in connection with the reclamation program is highlighted from the financial side, for returns from the production and distribution of power will not only repay the cost of power facilities with interest but will materially assist in the repayment of the construction costs of irrigation facilities in many instances.

For instance, on a project like the presently authorized Central Valley in California, the irrigation facilities will represent something like two-thirds of the entire construction costs of the project. While power facilities will cost only about one-third of the entire investment, the revenues from power will repay approximately two-thirds of the over-all costs. A similar ratio of the assistance by power to irrigation will prevail, I understand, in the Columbia Basin project and to some extent in the Missouri Basin project where nonreimbursable flood-control and navigation benefits are an essential part of the over-all financial picture.

Reclamation appropriations for irrigation are traditionally repayable without interest by the immediate beneficiaries who are the water users on the various projects. The Flood Control Act of 1944 which authorized the Missouri Basin project sets a new standard on repayment. The investment in power facilities bears interest, of course, but the power facilities that are a part of the irrigation development are interest free. Flood-control allocations in reclamation projects are nonreimbursable under the national flood-control policy just as the Army dams constructed for flood control represent nonreimbursable funds of the Federal Government.

From statistics on the total investments, on construction costs already incurred or presently contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the program, the following tabulation is a summary:

Total expenditures by Bureau of Reclamation on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to June 30, 1948	$1,443,391,000
Estimated cost to complete irrigation and multiple-purpose projects under or authorized for construction, including transmission facilities (but not power plants of Army dams)	4,214,434,000
Total estimated cost of completed and authorized projects	5,657,825,000

Thus, the reclamation program, including projects constructed, those under construction, or those authorized for construction represent an investment by the Federal Government of $5,657,825,000. An additional amount is represented by potential projects under investigation or proposed for investigation.

Inventory of irrigable acreage in 17 Western States

State	Area of State	Area works were capable of supplying with water, 1940	Irrigated in 1939 other than Federal	Area irrigated in 1948 on Indian reservations	Federal reclamation projects						
					Constructed works irrigable, 1948		Under construction or authorized, 1948		Under investigation or potential		Total project acreage
					Full supply	Supplemental [1]	New lands	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	
Arizona	72,691,200	844,212	245,537	94,361	323,221	103,683	89,219	0	37,000	686,000	1,239,123
California	100,353,920	7,398,576	5,127,254	4,017	70,747	742,087	584,600	575,900	2,809,000	1,738,000	6,520,334
Colorado	66,538,880	3,913,542	3,117,599	8,743	132,661	61,507	91,700	1,421,800	983,000	505,000	3,195,668
Idaho	52,997,120	2,593,534	1,051,631	32,675	441,297	955,226	110,800	653,225	1,012,000	575,000	3,747,548
Kansas	52,552,320	142,409	99,980	0	0	0	168,100	500	0	0	168,600
Montana	93,642,240	2,344,390	1,585,040	144,376	335,683	0	705,600	230,200	394,000	140,000	1,805,483
Nebraska	49,057,920	992,957	352,978	0	195,562	123,239	1,289,800	24,100	337,000	263,000	2,229,701
Nevada	70,273,280	841,304	745,301	25,305	69,472	67,942	0	0	93,000	175,000	405,414
New Mexico	77,767,040	731,990	428,597	17,899	138,079	0	19,700	0	324,000	42,000	523,779
North Dakota	44,834,560	36,522	7,337	7	27,843	0	1,738,700	0	0	0	1,766,543
Oklahoma	44,341,120	8,624	3,826	0	30,558	0	18,600	0	291,000	0	340,158
Oregon	61,664,000	1,261,081	827,463	1,910	209,019	192,924	15,000	5,600	1,148,000	220,000	1,790,543
South Dakota	48,983,040	121,847	25,161	277	72,431	10,735	1,275,800	74,800	0	0	1,433,766
Texas	168,732,160	1,773,812	966,280	0	67,000	30,851	148,000	552,000	485,000	185,000	1,467,851
Utah	52,701,440	1,357,714	917,567	61,052	42,190	275,881	0	56,200	366,000	277,000	1,017,271
Washington	42,865,280	731,527	167,516	126,343	256,066	191,440	[2] 1,051,300	17,000	586,000	85,000	2,186,806
Wyoming	62,403,840	1,913,527	1,308,766	33,951	194,773	17,898	320,700	169,500	369,000	219,000	1,290,871
Total	1,162,399,360	27,007,568	16,777,833	550,916	2,606,602	2,773,413	7,627,619	[3] 3,780,825	9,234,000	5,107,000	31,129,459

[1] Includes supplemental water supply under Warren Act and special contractors.
[2] Ultimate irrigable, includes lands withdrawn since Columbia Basin project authorization by Atomic Energy Commission.
[3] Does not include 200,000 acres, Anderson Ranch.

United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation—Summary of estimated schedules of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1955)

January 31, 1949

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity (kilowatts)	Existing capacity (kilowatts) Jan. 1, 1949 [1]	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year							
				1949 [2]	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	After 1955
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
REGION 1											
Idaho	Boise:										
	Black Canyon	8,000	8,000								
	Boise River	1,500	1,500								
	Anderson Ranch	40,500	0	0	27,000	0	0	0	0	0	13,500
	Minidoka: Minidoka	13,400	13,400								
	Palisades: Palisades	[3] 54,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,000	18,000	18,000
Montana	Hungry Horse: Hungry Horse	285,000	0	0	0	0	71,250	213,750			
Oregon	Deschutes: Cove [4]	1,500	1,500								
Washington	Columbia Basin: Grand Coulee	1,974,000	992,000	108,000	334,000	324,000	216,000				
	Yakima:										
	Chandler	12,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000		
	Prosser	[5] 2,400	2,400								
	Rocky Ford	187	187								
	Roza	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	10,000			
	Total, region 1	[6] 2,400,087	1,018,987	108,000	361,000	324,000	287,250	223,750	30,000	18,000	31,500
REGION 2											
California	Central Valley:										
	Shasta	379,000	304,000	75,000							
	Keswick	75,000	0	0	75,000						
	Delta Steam	240,000	0	0	0	0	0	160,000	80,000		
	Total, region 2	694,000	304,000	75,000	75,000	0	0	160,000	80,000		
REGION 3											
Arizona-California	Parker: Parker	120,000	120,000								
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon: Hoover	1,322,300	1,034,800	0	0	0	165,000	122,500			
	Davis Dam: Davis	225,000	0	0	0	180,000	45,000				
California	Yuma: Siphon Drop	1,600	1,600								
	Total, region 3	1,668,900	1,156,400	0	0	180,000	210,000	122,500			
REGION 4											
Colorado	Grand Valley: Grand Valley (Palisades).	3,000	3,000								
Nevada	Newlands: Lahontan [7]	[8] 1,920	[8] 1,640	[8] 140	[8] 140						
Utah	Strawberry Valley:										
	Spanish Fork (upper)	900	900								
	Spanish Fork (lower)	250	250								
	Payson	400	400								
	Total, region 4	6,470	6,190	140	140						
REGION 5											
New Mexico	Elephant Butte: Elephant Butte	24,300	24,300								
	Total, region 5	24,300	24,300								

[1] Salt River Valley Water Users' Association hydroelectric plants (8 plants with an existing capacity of 70,950 kilowatts; Imperial Valley district hydroelectric plants (2 plants with a capacity of 14,400 kilowatts, ultimate of 28,800 kilowatts) on All-American Canal and the Enterprise irrigation district hydroelectric plant (1 plant with a capacity of 500 kilowatts) on Klamath project are not included.
[2] Capacity scheduled to be added after Jan. 1, 1949. (From July 1, 1948 to Jan. 1, 1949, the following capacity was added: Shasta, 75,000 kilowatts; Heart Mountain, 5,000 kilowatts. These additions are included in column 4.)
[3] Capacity is tentative only, and may be revised.
[4] 1 unit installed adjacent to private utility's power plant.
[5] Prosser power plant will be removed when Chandler power plant is built.
[6] New windings installed in generators, thereby increasing capacity from original value of 1,500 kilowatts.

United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation—Summary of estimated schedules of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1955)—Continued

January 31, 1949

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity (kilowatts)	Existing capacity (kilowatts) Jan. 1, 1949 [1]	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year							
				1949 [2]	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	After 1955
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
PLANTS CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION											
REGION 6											
Montana	Missouri Basin:										
	Angostura [7]	1,560	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,560
	Canyon Ferry	50,000	0	0	0	0	0	50,000			
	Lower Marias (Kenil)	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,000			
	Lyon	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,000
	Mission	50,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50,000
	Portage	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000
	Yellowtail	[5] 120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120,000	
North Dakota	Missouri Basin:										
	Crosby	[3] 70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
	Des Lacs	[3] 70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
South Dakota	Missouri Basin: Miller Drop	180,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180,000
Wyoming	Missouri Basin:										
	Bald Ridge	30,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30,000
	Boysen	15,000	0	0	0	0	15,000				
	Hunter Mountain	12,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000
	Sunlight	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000
	Thief Creek	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
	Tongue River	25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000
	Riverton: Pilot Butte	1,600	1,600								
	Shoshone:										
	Shoshone	5,600	5,600								
	Heart Mountain	5,000	5,000								
	Subtotal (Bureau)	(762,760)	(12,200)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(15,000)	(53,000)	(0)	(120,000)	(562,560)
PLANTS CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS (Power marketed by Bureau of Reclamation)											
Montana	Fort Peck: Fort Peck	85,000	50,000	0	0	0	35,000				
North Dakota	Garrison: Garrison	400,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160,000	240,000
South Dakota	Gavins Point: Gavins Point	[3] 20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	
	Fort Randall: Fort Randall	320,000	0	0	0	0	0		160,000	40,000	120,000
	Big Bend: Big Bend	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120,000
	Oahe: Oahe	[3] 450,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450,000
	Subtotal (Corps of Engineers)	(1,395,000)	(50,000)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(35,000)	(0)	(170,000)	(210,000)	(930,000)
	Total, region 6	2,157,760	62,200	0	0	0	50,000	53,000	170,000	330,000	(1,492,560)
REGION 7											
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson:										
	Green Mountain	21,600	21,600								
	Mary Lake	8,100	0	0	8,100						
	Estes	45,000	0	0	45,000						
	Quillan	28,500	0	0	0	0	0	28,500			
	Cottonwood	11,500	0	0	0	0	0	11,500			
	Rattlesnake	13,500	0	0	0	0	0	13,500			
	Flatiron Mountain	41,000	0	0	0	0	0	41,000			
	Big Thompson	6,700	0	0	0	0	0	6,700			
Wyoming	North Platte:										
	Lingle	1,400	1,400								
	Guernsey	4,800	4,800								
	Kendrick: Seminoe	32,400	32,400								
	Missouri Basin: Kortes	36,000	0	0	36,000						
Nebraska	Missouri Basin: Harlan County (Army Corps of Engineers dam) [7]	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200
	Total, region 7	251,700	60,200	0	89,100	0	0	101,200	0	0	1,200
	Total, all regions	[8] 7,203,217	2,632,277	183,140	525,240	504,000	547,250	660,450	280,000	348,000	1,525,260

[1] Salt River Valley Water Users' Association hydroelectric plants (8 plants with an existing capacity of 70,950 kilowatts; Imperial Valley district hydroelectric plants (2 plants with a capacity of 14,400 kilowatts, ultimate of 28,800) kilowatts on All-American Canal and the Enterprise irrigation district hydroelectric plant (1 plant with a capacity of 500 kilowatts) on Klamath project are not included.

[2] Capacity schedule to be added after Jan. 1, 1949. (From July 1, 1948 to Jan. 1, 1949, the following capacity was added: Shasta, 75,000 kilowatts; Heart Mountain, 5,000 kilowatts. These additions are included in column 4.)

[3] Capacity is tentative only, and may be revised.

[5] Prosser power plant will be removed when Chandler power plant is built.

[7] Construction deferred due to present high costs.

[8] Increase of present tentative capacity of 120,000 kilowatts to 200,000 kilowatts is now under study.

SUMMARY

	Kilowatts
Existing capacity (on reclamation projects, Jan. 1, 1949)	2,632,277
Capacity programed for fiscal year 1949 through fiscal year 1955	3,048,080
Capacity programed for after fiscal year 1955	1,525,260
Total ultimate capacity for program	7,203,217

PURCHASING POWER OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation has been paying back the Government's investment at gilt-edge security rates. When people of the West are able to raise their own standard of living and guarantee their purchasing power through stabilized irrigation agriculture, it means prosperity for them. But more important, it means prosperity to the manufacturers and merchants of the entire country. They buy more and more consumer goods as their incomes increase. Proof of this vast purchasing power can be found in the report on the incoming and outgoing railroad shipments to a typical reclamation area during the year of 1948. This area is the Ada and Canyon County region of Idaho where the Boise project is located.

Approximately one-third of the volume and two-thirds of the value of all railroad shipments of freight into these counties were from the 37 States east of the Rocky Mountains. For every carload shipped out of the area one and one-half carloads were shipped into the area. Thus we see how the rest of the Nation benefits from newly created or expanded reclamation developments.

In 1948 the shipments to the Boise project totalled 21,900 cars valued at $117,000,000, and the out shipments amounted to 14,500 cars valued at $55,000,000. Truck freight shipped in would increase these figures by approximately one-fourth. Thus, the total in and out shipments approximated an equivalent of 45,000 cars valued at $215,000,000.

On the basis of the data obtained for the Boise project conservative estimates show the value of interarea shipments from the

Middle West, East, and South to all Federal reclamation areas in 1948 to be about $1,655,000,000, and intraarea shipments within the 11 Western States at about $1,050,000,000, a total of $2,705,000,000.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Willford I. King has made an observation we should record. His telegram to the President and the Members of Congress follow:

Dictators of labor monopolies have repeatedly brought on crises endangering the Nation's whole economy by their ruthless use of monopoly powers over whole industries. These uncontrolled industry-wide powers could bring on economic chaos that would destroy our Republic and open the way to a Fascist labor dictatorship.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer predicts that, if the coal, steel, and aluminum strikes continue until December 1, they will cause 5,000,000 American workers to become unemployed. Are our people so spineless that they will wait helplessly while production is thus slowly strangled, scarcity replaces abundance, and our whole economy is disrupted by giant labor monopolies following the orders of ruthless, self-seeking bosses? Should the welfare of millions be sacrificed merely because the union leaders object to having the workers pay part of the costs of their own pensions?

Long ago it was found necessary to enact the Sherman Antitrust Act to prevent employers from combining to monopolize industries in order to fleece the public. Is it not evident that the time has now come to put an end to equally destructive plundering of the people by uncontrolled labor monopolies?

Congress should pass a law prohibiting any organization comprising the employees of more than one employer from combining to bargain concerning either wages or hours, making it a criminal offense for any employee to violate this law.

The most effective way of putting teeth into such legislation and punishing any person who quits work at the behest of any such illegal combination would be to forbid any employer to pay within 2 years to any such striker an hourly wage or piece rate higher than 85 percent of the hourly wage or piece rate last paid to said person. Any grant of additional fringe benefits to such persons should also be prohibited.

The law could be enforced more easily by thus acting through the employer than it could be by attempting to punish all violators directly.

Congress should also forbid unions in industries engaged in interstate commerce to indulge in mass picketing or intimidation of persons desiring to work.

Congress itself, by the enactment of the Wagner Act and other bad legislation fostering labor monopolies, created the Frankenstein. Congress should stay in session or reconvene to curb the evil powers of labor monopolists reaching for power over the National Government and the people.

Legislation of the type suggested would break the power of the self-constituted autocracies which the labor monopolists have gradually built up in this country. It would restore authority to the Government established by our Constitution. Is not such legislative action by Congress imperative now?

WILLFORD I. KING,
Chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government.

Hull Trade Agreements Program a Sound Basis for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I had prepared relative to the reciprocal trade program. I had intended to use this material at the time the measure extending the trade-agreements program was debated, but unfortunately when the matter was brought up I was in Europe.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most indestructible force in the world, Mr. President, is an idea—a sound idea springing from the mind of a man of good will, integrity, patience, and conviction. Such an idea and such a force, Mr. President, are embodied in the legislation we are now considering. It has weathered the stress and storm of world-wide depression and world-wide conflict. It has often been the target for attack by blind selfishness and by lack of understanding. It is an old and simple idea—that one person or one nation can prosper and be secure only when others prosper and are secure. A great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who held that high office longer than any other man in our history, long ago recognized the significance of this truth as it applies to international commerce.

Thirty years ago, in 1919, Cordell Hull, then a Representative in Congress from my own State of Tennessee, spoke eloquently in the House on a joint resolution which he had introduced in 1917. This resolution requested the President to call an international conference in Washington "for the purpose of a permanent international trade-agreement congress * * * to comprise the consideration of all international trade methods, practices, and policies which in their effects are reasonably calculated to create dangerous and destructive commercial controversies or bitter economic wars; and to formulate treaty agreements with respect thereto designed to eliminate, prevent, and avoid the injurious results and dangerous possibilities of economic warfare and to promote fair and friendly trading relations among all nations of the world."

In discussing his resolution Representative Hull said, in part: "If a real economic peace can now be effected it will afford the greatest possible assurance of permanent world peace. The accomplishment of this is most desirable and would in nowise conflict with any suitable plan for a league of nations that may be devised but, on the contrary, would supplement, strengthen, and make easier its operation, in that there would be far fewer commercial and trade controversies for settlement."

From that time until today Cordell Hull has never relinquished his fight for elimination of trade discriminations and for lowering unnecessary, selfish, and artificial barriers in world trade. He has held firmly to his conviction that such trade obstructions are not only barriers to the economic welfare of all peoples but are fruitful causes of political instability and of hostility among nations.

Neither Cordell Hull nor any of his associates ever said that the reciprocal trade-agreements program is a guaranty against war. But neither have the opponents of the program been able to deny that the unfair trade practices and the barriers against which it is aimed have many times helped to bring on international disputes and that if these trade obstacles had been removed there would have been far fewer causes of war.

Cordell Hull's idea was not instantly seized upon and put into operation. There ensued the frenzied period of the "twenties" when, on an artificial and unsound basis practically everyone thought he was prospering mightily and didn't want to be bothered with such tiresome matters as tariffs and other international trade problems. Then, when it was rudely and suddenly awakened from that fantastic period, this country led all the rest of the world in taking the wrong road out of the difficulties.

This road was not taken without another warning from Cordell Hull. On May 13, 1929, when the House was debating the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, Representative Hull spoke, in part, as follows:

"We behold * * * a typical old-time Republican tariff revision, with its logrolling, bargaining, and intriguing, trading and trafficking, and other conditions bordering on open scandal, from all of which most people would gladly turn away. Instead of a new policy of moderate tariffs and fair and liberal commercial or trade policy, based on the favored-nation doctrine in its unconditional form, it is now proposed further to build all our economic policies around the doctrine of extreme nationalism or isolation, with discrimination or retaliation as our chief commercial policy, ignoring the patent fact that the future progress and prosperity of this country require expanding production and expansion of foreign markets." Representative Hull also quoted from President Hoover, as follows:

"In determining changes in our tariff we must not fail to take into account the broad interests of the country as a whole. * * * It is obviously unwise protection which sacrifices a greater amount of employment in exports to gain a less amount of employment from imports."

The next 3 or 4 years showed that the voice in the wilderness had been crying the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was highly effective in keeping foreign goods off the United States market. Our imports fell in 3 years by some two-thirds from the 1929 level. Of course, the act also provoked resentment and retaliation from every other country in the world and thus resulted in cutting down American exports by even more than it reduced imports. It helped to close American factories and throw their workers into the breadlines. It helped to build up huge unsaleable farm surpluses which bankrupted American farmers. The economic isolationism against which Cordell Hull had warned in 1929 was a potent factor in the world-wide depression of the early 1930's.

Out of this depression, however, there came from the people a demand for a new vision, and this demand led to the opportunity for a new and sound economic foreign policy for this country. Cordell Hull became the chief builder on the cornerstone which he had laid more than a decade before.

Under his sponsorship the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was adopted and under his administration the trade agreements program was launched and carried on

for 10 years. It faced colossal handicaps from the beginning because it had been too long delayed. Nevertheless it made progress. Steadily and carefully, through the trade agreements, this country's excessive barriers against needed and legitimate imports were lowered while, at the same time, foreign countries lowered their barriers against American exports which gave jobs to American workers and remunerative prices to American farmers.

But the forces of political and economic aggression had already begun to move toward World War II, which wiped out the economic structures of vast areas and distorted that of all the world.

Even before the shooting was over, however, plans were under way in Washington and in consultation with other governments, for picking up the pieces of the world economy after victory. The same principles which Cordell Hull had offered in 1919 for preserving the world economy were adopted for restoring it after World War II. They had already been translated into the established economic foreign policy of the United States.

Again that policy was facing tremendous difficulties in the world of economic chaos left behind by the war. It is not gross materialism to recognize that economic welfare and security contribute to political stability and to good will among nations. That plain fact is readily demonstrated by comparing the political and social conditions which occur when peoples are impoverished and denied equality of economic opportunity. Economic factors are not the only ones which motivate human reactions and national policies, but they exist and they are highly important.

From his sick bed last year Cordell Hull issued this statement:

"Today our Nation and all nations need more than ever before to cooperate wholeheartedly in establishing, in as large an area of the world as possible, the conditions of political liberty, economic progress, and enduring peace. The attainment of these conditions of civilized life especially requires that the peoples of the world have an opportunity to trade with one another to their mutual benefit and with a minimum of stultifying restrictions. The trade-agreements program provides the most effective framework for the realization of that opportunity."

But that same year there was a vigorous and partly successful attempt in Congress to sabotage the reciprocal trade-agreements program which had been established as an integral part of American economic foreign policy. The principles upon which it is based are unassailable, and so the attack had to be made from the flank and under camouflage. The program was impeded and hampered through changes in the sound and successful administrative procedure which had been followed for 14 years.

It was stated last year that there was no issue regarding the continuance of the program but only regarding how it should be carried on. But that attainment was sheer pretense. The forces and the individuals who supported the so-called changes in procedure were and still are the very same who have always opposed the program in its entirety and who have tried again and again to destroy it utterly. By hampering its operation and by shortening the usual period of extension they hope to—and did, in part—weaken the program, lessen its effectiveness, and thereby destroy the confidence of other nations in the good faith of the United States.

The device chosen by these opponents of the trade-agreements program—in addition to curtailing the renewal period—was to insinuate into the trade-agreements law two new requirements. From the beginning of the program the United States Tariff Commission had been one of the most important and effective of the Government agencies comprising the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization which formulates trade-agreements provisions and recommends them to the President. The 1948 act put an end to the chief usefulness of the Tariff Commission. I quote from section 4 of that act: "Neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings as provided in section 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign-trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement."

Thus the 1948 act deprived the trade-agreements organization of the advice and counsel of the most expert agency on foreign trade in the United States Government. It furthermore deprived that agency of any voice in determining trade-agreement provisions. The Tariff Commission can only supply figures and facts. Its expert opinions it must keep to itself.

In the second place the backers of the 1948 act, having effectively muzzled the Tariff Commission so far as its most useful function was concerned, briskly reversed their field and required the Commission to prepare and present to the President an exhaustive, detailed, impractical, and economically biased report that ties his hands in trying to conclude a trade agreement that is in the general public interest.

That is the effect of the so-called peril-point provision of the 1948 act which opponents of the trade-agreements program are now trying to retain. It is ironic that they should piously allege that they had merely brought about some slight improvements in administration of the program and should label their bill "The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948" when its true label should have been "The Would-Be Trade Agreements Extermination Act."

Let us look a little at this so-called slight procedural improvement against the background of past, established procedure. Under that established procedure the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization, which includes representatives of the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, the Treasury, and Labor, the National Military Establishment, the Economic Cooperation Administration and—until 1948—the Tariff Commission, publishes in advance of trade-agreement negotiations a list of all imports on which United States tariff concessions may even be considered in the contemplated negotiations.

In the process of selecting the items on this list the Tariff Commission, under Executive order, is required to provide the trade-agreements organization with a digest of information on each item considered. That digest must include the estimates of the Commission as to the probable effects of granting a concession on the item. Before the 1948 law went into effect the commission's representatives on the trade-agreements organization took part in the discussions of its digests and had a vote in decisions based upon them. But the 1948 act shut them out of the discussion and took away their vote.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information, with the same members as the Committee on Trade Agreements, holds public hearings on the list. The law itself sets the limits by which tariff rates may be changed. Thus any interested person knows in advance whether any concession will even be considered on a product in which he is interested and he knows the maximum concession that can be made. He has full opportunity to give his views and any information on whether any concession should be made and, if so, how much. He is assured that his views and information will be fully considered by the trade-agreements organization before any recommendation is made to the President.

But under the peril-point provision the list is also turned over to the Tariff Commission—which has already given to the trade-agreements organization its estimates of the probable effect of concessions on the listed items—and the Commission is required to hold hearings duplicating those already held by the Committee for Reciprocity Information and to report to the President, in not more than 120 days, the limit of the concession which may be made on each individual item without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or similar article. The Commission must also report whether additional import restrictions more stringent than those already in effect must be imposed in order to prevent such injury or threat.

This forces the Tariff Commission to do some very fancy long-range crystal gazing in deciding just what tariff rate will be required, at some indefinite future time, to prevent even the threat of injury to some unspecified industry which may not even be in existence at present. It also requires the Commission experts, when considering a given item, to shut their eyes to all other items and especially to any benefit that American producers, exporters, or the whole national economy, may obtain from foreign concessions in the proposed agreement. Only the narrowest and most rigidly protectionist viewpoint can be used as the basis of this report.

If the United States is to be able to offer in a trade-agreement negotiation only such concessions as are possible under this protectionist, isolationist report, the United States can hope to obtain from any foreign country only such concessions as are equally meager and limited. Neither country need expect more than a scanty benefit from such an agreement.

The supporters of the peril-point provision try to brush off some of the arguments against it by saying that, after all, the law permits the President to go ahead, if he sees fit, and make concessions beyond the limits set in the peril-point report; that the law merely requires him, if he does so, to report the agreement to Congress and tell why he did it. This brush-off is so transparent and so unrealistic that it should fool no one. No President would be so politically naive as not to hesitate a long time before concluding an agreement exceeding the limits set by even so biased a report, and submitting it to political attacks from vested interests and their Representatives in Congress, regardless of the advantages to the national economy as a whole.

The claim that the peril-point report is needed as an additional safeguard for American agriculture and industry is absurd on its face. In 15 years no American industry has shown that it has been seriously injured by a trade-agreement concession nor that it needs any more safeguards than are provided by the sound and careful formulation and administration of the agreements.

Most of the agreements now contain, and, by Executive order, all future trade agreements must contain, the general escape clause under which this Government, on its own motion, can modify or withdraw a concession found to be injuring or even threatening serious injury to a domestic industry.

By Executive order the administration of this escape clause is solely under the Tariff Commission, not the State Department nor even the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization. Furthermore action under the escape clause may be taken without the consent of other governments, and even, when necessary, without previously consulting them. These two facts are frequently and often knowingly misstated by opponents of the program.

American exporters should keep in mind the fact that application of the escape clause by one country entitles the other party or parties to the agreement to modify or withdraw concessions of their own. If the United States invokes the clause and cancels its concessions foreign countries are entitled to, and will cancel or modify their concessions on American exports.

It is puzzling that the very same interests and individuals who are loudest in their demand that the Tariff Commission make the peril-point report are not willing to trust the Commission to administer the escape clause effectively. There have been claims that the escape clause is not an adequate safeguard for frightened American industry groups. How do they know it isn't? Among all those frightened groups and their spokesmen only nine have ever even asked the Commission to make an investigation under the escape clause. Thus far in only one case, that of spring clothespins, has the Commission received facts that persuade it that even an investigation was warranted. Three recent applications are still pending.

H. R. 1211, as passed by the House and as recommended for passage by the Senate Finance Committee, will return the trade-agreements program to that sound administrative procedure under which it was successfully carried on for 14 years with the full, effective, and unshackled cooperation of an expert Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, the idea which Cordell Hull enunciated 30 years ago has gone forward and expanded until 43 countries, including the United States, which among them carry on more than four-fifths of the world's international commerce, have subscribed to it by signing trade agreements negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which has been five times renewed by Congress. In Annecy, France, the representatives of the United States and of 22 other nations are now negotiating with 11 new countries for mutually beneficial tariff reductions and for adherence of the new countries to the nondiscriminatory general provisions of the general agreement on tariffs and trade concluded at Geneva in 1947.

Nor has the program reached its full fruition. As is proper, the terms of our trade agreements are limited to trade—to commerce and the exchange of goods. There are other fields of international economic relations in which the same principles of cooperation, nondiscrimination, and liberalism are equally vital, both to the United States and to other countries. Some of these fields are foreign investment, correlation of national employment and economic development programs, regulation of cartels, and international agreements on trade in surplus primary products. But the United States proposal to establish sound principles in all these fields is being used by opponents of the trade-agreements program as a stuffed club to attack the trade-agreements program itself.

At Habana in March 1948 representatives of the United States and 53 other nations agreed on a charter for a proposed International Trade Organization—an arm of the United Nations—which would set up an international code of fair practices in the economic fields which I have enumerated, as well as in the field of trade. The President has presented that charter to the Congress for consideration and approval. It is not my intention to discuss here the question of its approval but I do intend to discuss the baseless assertion that, through the trade-agreements program, someone is trying to "slip the ITO over" without the approval of Congress. This far-fetched theory seems to be related in some way to the fact that the charter provisions regarding commercial practices are parallel with the trade-agreement provisions.

It would be strange indeed, and a repudiation of our commercial foreign policy, if the trade agreements and the trade provisions of the ITO charter were not parallel. The charter provisions were derived from and based upon the tested provisions of the trade agreements. They were drafted by the same experts and they are aimed at the same objectives.

The trade agreements do not go beyond trade, but the charter covers a far wider range of subjects and includes the commercial-policy principles which have been found sound and effective through experience. There is nothing in the trade agreements—including the general agreement—about employment or investments, economic development, or cartels. But the charter covers all these fields. There is nothing, in short, in the trade agreements that goes one inch beyond the authorization in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended.

Whether the ITO charter will go into effect depends upon the action of Congress. If it does go into effect it will extend into related economic fields the principles already basic in the trade agreements. If it does not go into effect these principles have already been established through the trade agreements in the commercial area to which the agreements apply.

The President, in a letter of January 8, 1949, to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said in part:

"In my message on the state of the Union I asked the Congress to act promptly to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the hampering restrictions placed on it by the last Congress. * * *

"The trade-agreements program has proved itself to the people of the United States. It has justly earned their overwhelming support. We must be in a position to press that program forward with vigor."

Mr. President, I have traced the course of a sound idea sponsored and patiently pressed by a great man. We can forward the development and expansion of that idea by passing H. R. 1211 as it comes to us from the Committee on Finance, and by striking down the crippling amendments by which it is sought to hamstring the trade-agreements program.

John Dewey Is 90 Years Old!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow thousands of our fellow citizens, particularly leaders in education, will celebrate the ninetieth birthday anniversary of one of the Nation's great men—John Dewey. This quiet philosopher and teacher has made a profound impression upon our institutions. His position is unique. Without seeking honor or power he has come to exert a tremendous influence in our school system and has placed us all under a great debt.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following tributes to this distinguished American:

"And so, John Dewey, on this festive occasion I want to congratulate you once more, on behalf of all who share your common faith that human intelligence and resolution can better the condition of mankind. You are devoted to the common man, but the reason we love you is not that you are a common man yourself. You are unique and incomparable—one of the few saints America has produced." (John H. Randall, Jr., in The Survey.)

"John Dewey is the foremost philosopher in the history of America. His influence on education is unequaled both in extent and in depth.

"Each public-school child in our country lives a happier and a better life because of Dewey; and the same holds for most pupils of the nonpublic schools. And not simply in this country; in most other countries of the world is his influence felt." (William L. Kilpatrick, professor emeritus of Columbia University.)

"As educator, his contribution has been monumental, has revolutionized the schools of America during the past half century. Education (not restricted to schooling) is, he maintained, 'the supreme human interest in which, moreover, other problems, cosmological, moral, logical, come to a head.'" (Mildred Sandison Fenner in NEA Journal.)

Status of Reports on Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Calif. and Nev.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by H. C. Gee, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, Deputy Chief of Civil Works for Flood Control, on the status of the reports of the flood control, water storage, and power reports on the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers rising in the California and Nevada watershed.

The preliminary report on the Truckee River was submitted to the local agencies in October 1946, with recommendations that it be studied and comments submitted by these participating agencies. The latest information available is that the local agencies are not in agreement among themselves as of this date.

In answer to my inquiry, the Chief of Army Engineers has stated that, at my request, the reports on the Carson and Walker Rivers will be completed not later than early in 1951.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In compliance with your telephone request I am pleased to present the status of reports on Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Calif. and Nev.

As you are aware, preliminary examination reports were submitted by the division engineer, south Pacific division, on these streams in 1939 recommending that investigations of survey scope be prepared. The Board of Engineers concurred in these recommendations and a comprehensive report of survey scope covering the Truckee, Carson, and Walker River Basins was assigned in 1945. Authority to investigate the problems on Truckee River in an interim report was also provided in 1945.

The interim report on Truckee River was completed by the district engineer, Sacramento district, in 1946. In order to review and comment on recommended projects and arrange for the necessary local cooperation, the report was submitted in October 1946 to the local agencies interested in the improvement, including the States of Nevada and California. As of this date, comments have not been received from these participating agencies. Inquiries as to reasons for not commenting indicate that the local agencies are not in agreement among themselves in regard to (1) the improvements recommended and (2) providing the required local cooperation. In view of the fact that this disagreement has existed now for 3 years and no indication of a settlement is apparent, the district proposes to complete the report recommending that no improvement be authorized for construction at this time by the Federal Government because of lack of local cooperation. The tentative date of submission of this report is October 1, 1950.

The preliminary investigation on Walker River indicated that about 20 percent of benefits applicable to the development of the water resources of the basin could be obtained from elimination of flood damages, of which damage to United States Highway No. 395 comprised the major item. Since this report was completed, the highway has been relocated above the flood stage of the river. Therefore, under existing conditions over 95 percent of benefits that might be applied to the water-resources development of this basin would accrue from power development. The flood damages consist of relatively minor overflow and erosion problems along an extensive reach of the stream, which precludes the feasibility of levees or channel improvements for flood protection. Flood control could be obtained by constructing a dam at the Pickle Meadows site. However, local ranchers and the State of Nevada have expressed very little interest in the progress of this investigation. Also, the local power company has indicated that it will oppose development of power in the Walker River Basin. In view of these circumstances it is anticipated that a favorable recommendation for this basin will not be forthcoming when the report is completed.

I am pleased to inform you that progress is being made on the investigation on Carson River. Representatives of the district engineer met with the local interests at Minden, Nev., on September 29, 1949. A local water-users committee is now being formed to provide the cooperation required for completion of the report. The report is now tentatively scheduled for submission to this office on January 1, 1951.

I trust the foregoing information meets with your immediate needs. If I can assist you further in this matter, I shall be pleased to do so promptly upon your request.

H. C. GEE,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Deputy Chief of Civil Works for Flood Control.

Democracy in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in common with many other Members of both Houses, it was my pleasure and profit to gain acquaintance, in the time he spent here in Washington during and subsequent to the war, with Prof. John T. Salter of the University of Wisconsin faculty. Dr. Salter is not only a professor of political science of note; he is also a distinguished historian and commentator on the American scene.

I learn through a letter from him that he is now teaching in the University of Manila under the auspices of the United States Department of State. Aside from his teaching, he is lecturing on frequent occasions, taking as his theme "The Individual and Democracy," arguing that each citizen, "in his eachness," must be alive to every issue and must express his views through suffrage.

Dr. Salter enclosed with his letter a copy of another letter from the father of one of his students which so strikingly illustrates the progress of democratic processes in a country unaccustomed to them, and at the same time shows us that our problems are not unique, that I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD. The text follows:

LEGASPI, *September 17, 1949.*

DEAR MINNIE: Your air-mail letter about Dr. J. T. Salter has come to hand. I hope nothing would stand in the way, to cause his projected trip to this side of our country, to fail to be realized. I am sure your eminent professor will have no regret in his life if he can realize the trip and I am certain it is going to be a trip which he cannot forget in his lifetime—particularly when he comes to find Mayon Volcano in her stately, majestic beauty. I shall be glad to welcome Dr. Salter and I would be most happy to offer him company to visit interesting places during his short sojourn with us. If Dr. Salter would have no objection, if he would find time to speak in a convocation of teachers, normal school and high-school students, we would like to take advantage of his visit to listen to him on a subject which he would be most willing to discuss.

Mr. Escarilla, when I informed him of the proposed visit of Dr. Salter instructed me to invite the professor to speak at the normal-school auditorium even for 1 hour only if that is the longest he can spare to give the Albay and Legaspi people to listen to him. If the proposed trip is realized and the professor would not object to our listening to him on democracy, such a talk on this subject would be most timely, because some of our politicians, particularly those who are very eager to get elected, are forgetting that ours is a democratic country inhabited by people who have free and secret ballots and free press but no public opinion as yet as far as my observation is concerned. Despite the supposed free ballot and free press (which I believe in most cases is not free), most of the nearly illiterate voters are helplessly in the hands of the politicians that are in power and have money, from pork-barrel funds, and public works, which are most often unnecessary except to fish for votes, to entice adherents who are like jellyfish. Dr. Salter's visit with us, if he can give us the benefit of his wisdom, I repeat, is most timely. The eminent professor is welcome to the city of Legaspi and to the province of Albay. * * *

You might advance the information to Dr. Salter that I am hoping to be able to take him to the Tiwi Hot Springs, the Mayon Rest House, and the buried town of Cagsawa where the ruins of the buried church building, belfry, and the old convent, and would be glad to give him some information that I might know about the places we would visit.

If the professor would only make up his mind to stay longer than what he has planned to do I shall be glad to take him to some of our schools, for a visit and would introduce him to some of the prominent citizens in Legaspi and in Albay—politicians and otherwise. All the school people here would be very happy to receive a visit from him, Dr. Salter. We are starving for a visit of prominent educators like Dr. Salter. A visit of a man like him is a rarity. We really hope to meet him and enjoy his visit with us.

Because I told Mr. Escarilla about the coming of Dr. Salter, although he would be taking the plane next Tuesday for Manila, he is going to write him for a visit to our normal school and high school and for a convocation of which Dr. Salter would be the sole speaker.

With my warmest regards to the Santiagos, I am,

Very affectionately yours,

———.

List of Public Laws Enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, First Session, Affecting Veterans of World Wars I and II, Including Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of the public laws enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, first session, affecting the veterans of World Wars I and II and including the Spanish War veterans.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC LAWS ENACTED, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

APPROPRIATIONS

Public Law 42: Authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

Public Law 43: Making additional appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for readjustment benefits.

Public Law 62: Making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1949.

Public Law 71: Making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. This provided amounts for the Displaced Persons Commission; expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission.

Public Law 119: Making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. This provided additional funds for the National Military Establishment; Civil Service Commission; and other agencies.

Public Law 141: Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

Public Law 154: Making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950.

Public Law 162: Appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Public Law 179: Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: It provided funds for Civil Aeronautics Administration research program in field of all-weather flying control devices.

Public Law 266: Appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. This made appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission; Civil Service Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

Public Law 343: Third deficiency appropriations for 1949. This contains funds for automobiles for disabled veterans and for the War Claims Commission.

Public Law 355: Army civil-functions appropriations for 1950.

Public Law 358: Supplemental appropriations for 1950.

BENEFITS

Public Law 194: Modifies a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional, or domiciliary care.

Public Law 195: Adjusts the effective date of certain awards of pensions and compensations payable by the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law 339: Omnibus benefits bill for service-connected disabled veterans.

Public Law 286: Provides certain additional assistance for certain seriously disabled veterans in order to remove an existing inequality. This defines the law giving housing to paraplegics, etc.

EMPLOYMENT

Civil service

Public Law 17: For the relief of certain postal employees who received overpayments in reduction to substitute status.

Public Law 167: Amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Public Law 257: Amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide annual automatic within-grade promotions for hourly employees of the custodial service.

Public Law 316: Extend the benefits of the annual and sick-leave laws to part-time employees on regular tours of duty, also to validate payments heretofore made for leave on account of services of such employees.

Public Law 357: To amend Federal Employees' Compensation Act by extending coverage to civilian officers of the United States and by making benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates.

Public Law 359: To increase rates of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Civil service retirement

Public Law 98: Enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest.

Public Law 123: Amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to grant credit in accordance with such section for service for which, through inadvertence, no deductions from salary are made.

Public Law 180: Repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and section 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable.

Public Law 212: Amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to officers or employees whose disabling condition is essentially chronic, deteriorative, or progressive in nature.

Public Law 235: Amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide that the annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States shall be computed on the basis of their average basic salaries for any 5 consecutive years of allowable service.

Public Law 254: Extend the time within which legislative employees may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Public Law 267: Extends the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55.

Public Law 310: Amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under the act.

Veterans' preference

Public Law 269: Amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans.

INSURANCE

Public Law 69: Clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. This provides for payments of unpaid amounts to the estate of the insured.

TERMINAL LEAVE

Public Law 239: Extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946.

Public Law 314: Provide terminal-leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Public Law 67: Provides that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service.

Public Law 188: Extends for 1 year the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs respecting leases and leased property.

Public Law 349: Increasing the rates of compensation of certain employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

HOUSING AND RENTALS

Public Law 31: Extend rent control to June 30, 1950, and otherwise amending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Public Law 52. Promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein.

Public Law 65: Authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising.

Public Law 171: Establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing.

Public Law 211: Encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations.

Public Law 361: Enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen.

WAR CLAIMS

Public Law 17: Authorizes payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies.

Public Law 75: Amends the War Claims Act of 1948 to extend time for filing claims.

WAR DEAD

Public Law 233: Grants time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial.

AMERICANISM

Public Law 13: Provides for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States.

Public Law 203: Designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Alien fiancées

Public Law 51: Authorizes completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act.

Alien veterans

Public Law 140: Amends the Nationality Act of 1940. Corrects typographical error.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Public Law 306: Provides assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Public Law 329: Foreign Military Assistance Act of 1949.

Public Law 47: Extending the Economic Cooperation Act.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Armed services

Public Law 16: Amends section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

Public Law 21: Relating to the pay and allowance of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral.

Public Law 41: To prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve.

Public Law 60: Authorizes the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles.

Public Law 96: Authorizes the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army.

Public Law 103: Repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.

Public Law 104: Relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades.

Public Law 108: Provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training.

Public Law 110: Provides for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947.

Public Law 131: Amend section 312 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, so as to provide for the retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy.

Public Law 144: Repeals certain obsolete provisions of laws relating to the naval service.

Public Law 173: Provides for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army.

Public Law 184: Amends section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards. Record of proceedings and decision of board in each case shall be transmitted to Secretary of the Navy for his approval or disapproval, or orders in the case.

Public Law 207: Revise, codify, and enact into law, title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard."

Public Law 210: Authorizes the adjustment of the lineal positions of certain officers of the naval service.

Public Law 213: Amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947. Increased funds for the work.

Public Law 308: Provide for crediting civilian service in computing military pay of former civilian employees of certain Government departments who were transferred to Coast Guard in military status.

Public Law 342: Clarify the active-duty status of certain officers of the Army and Air Force.

Public Law 351: Provide increased pay, allowance, and physical disability retirement for members of the uniformed services.

Atomic energy

Public Law 347: Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, with respect to Military Liaison Committee.

Merchant marine

Public Law 50: Extend the time for use of construction-reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Public Law 247: Provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Retirement

Public Law 297: Amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that each year of Reserve service count as a year of service toward retirement up to July 1, 1949.

Unification

Public Law 216: Reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency. This provides for further unification of the armed services.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Public Law 7: Extend the Office of War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

TERRITORIES

Public Law 264: Authorizes a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Public Law 193: Authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to lend certain property to national veterans' organizations.

BILLS APPROVED BY CONGRESS AND AWAITING PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

S. 2115: The American Legion bill to authorize payments by the Veterans' Administrator on purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by World War I and World War II veterans with service-connected loss or loss of use of one or both arms, one or both legs or sights of both eyes.

H. R. 6301: The American Legion bill to correct a discrepancy in the American Legion omnibus bill H. R. 5598. H. R. 6301 provides for increase in compensation for approximately 150,000 World War I veterans being compensated under Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress.

H. R. 5856: To amend the Fair Labor Standard Act, including an increase from 45 cents to 75 cents of minimum wage.

H. R. 3826: To amend the act of January 16, 1883 an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, regarding State quotas.

H. R. 5931: Providing increase in pay for classified Federal employees.

H. R. 4495: Providing increase in pay for postal employees.

H. R. 6427: Making appropriations of $1,314,010,000 to help rearm Atlantic Pact nations and other free countries against Communist aggression.

Senate Joint Resolution 134: To amend the National Housing Act, including provision for national banks to purchase securities and otherwise participate in the military rental-housing program and to establish a 100-percent secondary market for GI loans.

H. R. 4146: National military appropriations for 1950, providing $15,585,863,498. The bill provides for a 58-group air force and $175,000,000 for stock piling.

H. R. 2186: Construction of railroad connecting the existing United States-Canadian railroads with the Alaskan railroads.

H. R. 6427: Providing $15,000,000 additional for the Veterans' Administration for the 1950 fiscal year.

H. R. 6259: Provide for installation of a carillon in the Arlington National Cemetery in memory of World War II dead.

H. R. 5465: To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act relative to computing annuities to employees paid on a fee basis.

H. R. 4767: To clarify the active duty status of certain officers of the Army Air Force.

H. R. 2619: To extend the benefits of annual and sick leave laws to part-time employees on regular tours of duty, also to validate payments heretofore made for leave on account of services of such employees.

S. 1267: Promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transsonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an Air Engineering Development Center.

S. 614: Amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals.

S. 2282: To authorize construction of research laboratory for Quartermaster Corps.

S. 2668: To amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1950, relating to construction project of Atomic Energy Commission.

H. R. 6303: Authorize certain construction at military and naval installations.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE AND THE HOOVER REPORT

An analysis is submitted of some of the changes with reference to veteran preference in the Federal service which would be necessary if the entire recommendations of the Hoover Commission are put into effect.

First, it is proposed that 10-point preference would be limited to those persons having 10 percent or more of service-connected disability. As the law now stands a service-connected disability, even though no percent disabling, entitles the veteran to a 10-point preference. The Hoover Commission proposes to do away with numerical ratings and establish in lieu thereof certain categories such as "outstanding," "well qualified," "qualified," and "unqualified." It is proposed that veterans who are ranked in these separate categories would receive preference. However, a veteran who was ranked in the qualified category would not be in competition with nonveterans who were placed in the outstanding or well-qualified categories.

In this connection the Hoover Commission proposes that practically all the examining be done by the agencies themselves. In other words, applications would be filed with the agencies and the grouping as to their qualifications would be done by the agencies subject only to inspection as to general compliance by the Civil Service Commission. Under the present law, a veteran who qualifies with his preference points added if in the 10-point group goes to the top of the register except in positions in the professional and scientific series paying $3,000 or more whereas the 5-point veteran receives his earned place on the register plus his 5 points. The category system would eliminate much of this procedure and would effect preference to the 10-point veteran materially.

At present the Civil Service Commission has delegated much of the examining load to agencies in those jobs that are peculiar to the agencies but has retained the examining job for all positions that are common to many or all agencies—this because of economy resulting therefrom. Therefore the principle of decentralization to the agencies where feasible is one that is now in force. The Hoover Commission proposal would go beyond that and would not, therefore, be economical.

Under reduction in force section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act gives veterans with good or better efficiency ratings high priority retention preference over all other employees. That is, they are placed in the last category to go when reductions in force are considered necessary. The Hoover Commission proposes that this be changed and that efficiency ratings be done away with and that reduction in force registers be set up on the same basis as entrance qualifications. That is, that an agency would place their employees regardless of veteran preference in outstanding, well qualified, or qualified groups and then would reduce the force on that basis. The system does not provide any appeal as to the ranking which is workable.

The Commission has made a complete report to the Civil Service Committee of the Senate giving a break-down as to the effect of the Hoover Commission proposals on the civil service of the Government. This, no doubt, is available to you through the committee—a copy of the report. The purpose of this communication is merely to advise you of the effect of the proposals without in any way attempting to be critical or to indicate counterproposals. There is much good in the report, and it will, of course, be up to the Congress to determine in the final analysis how much of it should become law. The veterans' organizations are unanimously opposed to the report as it affects Federal personnel for the reason that they believe it completely destroys the Veterans' Preference Act.

Very sincerely,

BRUCE STUBBLEFIELD,
Associate Chief, Veterans' Service Section.

Economic Rehabilitation in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in connection with the recent observance of Columbus Day, October 12, in our State of Maryland, and elsewhere, I had occasion to prepare a statement regarding the excellent progress toward economic rehabilitation which has been made by the people of Italy since the war's end.

The data presented, collected during my recent visit to Italy and supplemented by personal observance and conferences while there, indicate a spirit of resolve and a determination to recover all that had been lost following Italy's unfortunate adventure into totalitarianism, which deserve world-wide understanding and commendation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

While other countries of western Europe, blessed with far richer natural resources than Italy and which have received far greater outside help, have been stumbling along with little to show for their efforts, Italy has, indeed, made remarkable progress.

Italian authorities whom I had the pleasure of meeting on my recent trip to Europe, were enthusiastic about what had been done, but hesitant to claim too much because of the work that still remains before they can be certain that Italy's economic course for the future is on a stable foundation. American officials in Italy, however—the Ambassador, the Administrator of the ECA, attachés of the Embassy, and of the various American agencies represented there, all were most gratified. They considered that Italy had made marvelous progress, and from the facts I gathered and personal observations during my stay in Rome and elsewhere, there was ample basis, indeed, for gratification.

First of all, America's representatives gave Italy full credit for stopping the westward progress of communism in Europe. When the war came to an end, they recalled, there were present in Italy, in abundance, all the elements of want and suffering, and economic chaos upon which communism feeds. With its excess of population, and with its lack of foodstuffs and basic natural resources, Italy's economy in those uncertain days was further disrupted by the dislocations of the war and the dearth of industrial output to support the international trade which had always been Italy's salvation in the past.

The seeds of democracy had been planted where fascism had recently withered and died, but democracy's growth was threatened by the aggressive and ruthless forces of communism. However, UNRRA stepped in, and then the American relief program which was known to all Italians as AUSA (aid from the U. S. A.).

For the year 1946 Italian production stood at approximately 50 percent of the 1938 level; by contrast, and what a happy contrast it is, Minister of the Treasury Pella recently revealed figures showing that production in July 1949 stood at 114 percent of the 1938 level. The result had been that food rations have been met without difficulty. In fact, the food supply, through increased production and imports together, has reached a level permitting the termination of all rationing. Moreover, and this is highly significant, pricing has been kept under control. Italian exports for 1948 have enjoyed a tremendous increase, showing the way to most European nations in this respect, and, vitally important, unemployment has fallen. What this means can be seen from another angle when it is recalled that the Italian lire lost in value only 10 percent during the recent world-wide devaluation of currency, while Great Britain and most other countries were forced to reduce the value of their currency 30 percent.

As American citizens of Italian birth or ancestry you undoubtedly have been most gratified, as I have been, that our own country has been able to play such a great part in helping Italy to her feet. In the year ending June 1940, Italy received about $500,000,000 of aid from the United States, and in this fiscal year she will continue to receive additional hundreds of millions of dollars.

But one has only to visit, and to see at first hand what has been accomplished, to know that the Italian people will perform the necessary work, will have the courage to suffer the necessary sacrifices, to bring their native country back to its former plane of culture and democracy among the nations, and thus justify the confidence of the American people and leaders that Italy can and will contribute in a most emphatic way to world peace and stability.

It was with good reason, and also because of Italy's admitted genius for pioneering and colonization, that she embarked on the program of expansion which included large-scale development of Tripolitania, Eritrea, and Italian Somaliland.

The Independent Finns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "United Finland" by the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, from a recent issue of the Washington Post. I commend this article, which combines clarity with sound thinking, to all who are interested in following the affairs of the independent and forthright Finnish nation:

UNITED FINLAND
NATIONAL UNITY AND STRENGTH
(By Marquis Childs)

HELSINGFORS, FINLAND.—For a decade now, with one interruption, American newspaper correspondents have been flying into Finland for a quick look at the little country on the doorstep of Russia. Their attitude has varied with the changing winds of world conflict.

Ten years ago, during the winter war, the Finns were brave heroes resisting in the blood-stained snow the brutal Russian aggressors. Then in the period when the Finns became allies of Germany against a common foe, they were Fascists or, at best, Nazi fellow travelers.

Once again they are heroes, this time heroes of the cold war. The Americans come now determined to find the smoke of battle and to see the Finns in the role of martyred victims of the east-west feud. One consequence has been a great deal of exaggerated writing about life behind the iron curtain in Finland.

The error may have its origin in that unfortunate phrase—iron curtain—itself. One thing the curtain does protect, and that is a great American ignorance about the complexities and varieties of life on the other side of the eastwest boundary. It is much easier to fall back on a catch phrase.

This applies with special force to Finland. First and foremost, Finland is not behind any curtain. Second, the Finns during the past 10 years have been just what they have been for a very long time.

That is to say they are hardy, courageous people with an unflagging belief in their right to independence. With tenacity and skill they have defended that right for more than a century against the threatening and often real hostility of the Russian colossus.

They are doing that today. It is because visiting Americans ignore this background, in their determination to put the Finns in the framework of the cold war, that they do a disservice to Finland.

They see the Finnish people as a miraculous little Daniel in a den of Russian lions. In order to get into the act, they feel they must prod the lions and make them roar. Doubtful Daniel does not altogether appreciate this attention.

Actually the Finnish achievement is much greater than this naive attitude implies. It is the achievement of national unity and national strength in the face of overwhelming obstacles and dangers and in spite of real political and economic differences among the Finns themselves.

I would guess that when a Finn says "we believe," he comes closer to expressing what almost all Finns believe than can be said of any other nationality.

What is notable today is the recovery that has come about through unity and heroic national effort. The Russians levied $300,000,000 in reparations and this, mind you, in a country of 4,000,000 people. The sum was later reduced to $226,500,000. It has all been paid off, except for about $25,000,000 in goods sent to Russia.

The evidence of healthy, vital reconstruction can be seen everywhere. Since the end of the war, a children's hospital and clinic have been built here that for modernity and clean, bright attractiveness would put most American hospitals to shame.

A large new school is going up in the center of the Helsingfors that would be the envy of any American city. In the lower schools, which are free, there are only 24 pupils on the average to a teacher and in the high schools, most of which are free, 18 pupils for each teacher.

Here in the capital, two theaters and an opera subsidized by the government are so popular it is almost impossible to get tickets.

I know this account should be full of tales of cold-war encounters between sinister Russians and brave Finns. But that happens to be almost entirely nonsense.

The Finns as a strong and independent people have achieved a sovereign and independent relationship with the Soviet Union. The wounds of the war, and particularly the loss of vital territory to Russia, go deep, but the Finns have not spent their time mourning or complaining. Anyone who tries to break down this relationship is, in my opinion, doing a great disservice to a proud and worthy people who have suffered much. And this goes double for meddlesome Americans who are carrying on their own childish version of the cold war in northern Europe.

Availability of Power to the State of Nevada From Shasta, Keswick, and Folsom Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD, my comments on a report by A. J. Shaver to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada on the availability of the power from the Shasta, Keswick, and Folsom Dams to the State of Nevada.

A contract offered the Colorado River Commission of Nevada by the Bureau of Reclamation dated June 17, 1949, contemplates that the initial contract rate of delivery shall be not more than 50,000 kilowatts with provision for a later increase to 90,000 kilowatts.

It is understood that no financial responsibility for payment for such power is undertaken by the commission until contracts have been secured guaranteeing repayment.

The report by Mr. Shaver indicates that the offer to the commission has not been entirely understood and the junior Senator from Nevada hopes that he will again review the proposal when it is more thoroughly understood.

The importance of such a contract to be made by the Colorado River Commission of Nevada with the Bureau of Reclamation up to 90,000 kilowatts of firm, hydroelectric power from the Shasta and other dams on the Central Valley project is to provide northern and western Nevada with a firm load of hydroelectric power which does not vary in price very much over the years ahead—in the same manner that southern and eastern Nevada have been provided with a firm hydroelectric load from Hoover—Boulder—Dam, through the withdrawal privilege accorded the State of Nevada and written into the contract for the sale of such power while the junior Senator of Nevada was State engineer and Colorado River commissioner for the State.

It is extremely important that the base hydroelectric power load be available for both northern and western—and southern and eastern Nevada so that as transmission lines become feasible, they can be constructed from north to south, connecting the two areas and providing lower cost power for the irrigation, mining, and domestic users throughout the State in accordance with the power map submitted by the junior Senator from Nevada last year and printed in the 1948 reprints of debates on the Senate floor.

If dependence is placed on the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to furnish the State of Nevada after they have contracted for the entire hydroelectric load from Shasta and other dams, then whenever the northern California area is short of power, the State of Nevada will be short of power and if the price for such power increases due to the large proportion of the steam power load for that area dependent upon fuel costs and inflationary trends, the northern and western section of the State of Nevada will never have a dependable supply of power upon which industry can depend for a stable price of such power over the years ahead.

There being no objection, the comments on the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON REPORT OF A. J. SHAVER TO COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA ON SYNOPSIS OF SHASTA POWER REPORT

Mr. Shaver has included in his report, and has used throughout that report, the October 21, 1947, draft of Bureau of Reclamation proposed contract instead of the more recent proposal (draft June 16, 1949) submitted to the commission on June 24, 1949.

Mr. Shaver's elaborate rate comparisons are based on the P. G. & E. rate to the Sierra Pacific Power Co. for delivery at Donner Summit and the Bureau rate at the same point with an added amount representing transmission charges to Reno. Mr. Shaver has erred in this respect. In a letter dated April 9, 1949, from the Secretary of the Interior, to Mr. Shaver, there are numerous references, direct and indirect, to delivery at Reno of Shasta power by the Bureau of Reclamation at Bureau rates. No additive amount should be considered for transmission between Donner Pass and Reno. On the other hand, to make a true comparison between the cost at Reno of power from the two sources considered, there should be added to the P. G. & E. rate at Donner Summit proper charges for the handling of this power by the S. P. P. Co. from Donner Summit to the Reno load centers.

Using question 3 of the Secretary of the Interior's letter of April 9, 1949, Mr. Shaver has included a misleading and useless tabulation showing absurdly high costs of comparatively small loads with a 90,000 kilowatt contract rate of delivery and a corresponding $90,000 monthly minimum charge. Secretary Krug used this only "as an illustration" probably taking the amount of 90,000 kilowatts due to the fact that Mr. Shaver had used it in question 2. Actually the Bureau's contract draft of June 17, 1949, provides that the initial contract rate of delivery shall be "not more than fifty thousand (50,000) kilowatts," with provision for later increase to 90,000 kilowatts. It is understood that in the initial period the contract rate of delivery and therefore the minimum charge would be based on the summation of the contract rates of delivery of the customers includin the Sierra Pacific Power Co. of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada. It is contemplated that the power withdrawn by the commission would be furnished to the S. P. P. Co. without profit to the State.

Mr. Shaver has at some length pointed out the limitations of the Bureau of Reclamation's Central Valley power system and the copiousness of the P. G. & E. system. Mr. Shaver points out that the Bureau contemplated construction of only one transmission line to Donner Pass. Actually the Bureau contemplates that the loads in the Nevada area will be such that two transmission lines to Reno together with such feeder lines as are desirable and feasible will be constructed. Mr. Shaver points out that the Bureau is limited to 450,000 kilowatts of rated capacity in the Shasta and Keswick power plants. This is far in excess of the probable requirements in western Nevada. Also, the development of American River has been authorized by the Congress which will result in additional sources of Bureau power being available in the proximity of the Reno area.

Mr. Shaver has computed costs of power plus transmission on the basis of loads of only 2,500 kilowatts. Obviously, the Bureau cannot build into the Reno area for a load of only 2,500 kilowatts. The use of such a small amount of power for such computations serves no useful comparison and only results in erroneous conclusions.

In his conclusions Mr. Shaver brings in the extraneous subject of possible removal of taxable capital wealth from the tax rolls presumably under the theory that public power will replace private power. In other parts of the report Mr. Shaver leaves the impression that the principal purpose of Shasta power is to bring about a change from privately owned power systems to municipally owned systems. Such is not the case. The objective is to bring into the State of Nevada low-cost Federal power to be distributed to ultimate customers by either privately owned or publicly owned systems—whichever the people prefer. It is easy to visualize that the advent of low-cost Federal power would actually increase the taxable capital wealth of the State of Nevada by the bringing in and development of industries. It is probable that low-cost Federal power will increase the business of the local power company, the S. P. P. Co., to the extent that its system grows instead of declining, providing they are willing to contract the lake load of hydroelectric power from the Colorado River Commission.

Mr. Shaver takes the pessimistic view that only about 2,500 kilowatts of load is available to the Bureau of Reclamation in western and northwestern Nevada. Such should not be the case. It is understood that the present contract between the P. G. & E. and S. P. P. Co. prevents the latter company from purchasing low-cost Federal power either directly from the Bureau or indirectly through the Colorado River Commission of Nevada. That is hard to believe, but if such is the case, prompt action should be taken by the Public Service Commission of Nevada to nullify such power contract in order to protect the people of the State and the local power company from a Pacific Gas & Electric Co. power monopoly. Such an action would pave the way for S. P. P. Co. to purchase low-cost federally produced power and extend the benefits thereof to the people whom it serves.

The Sierra Pacific Power Co. cannot exercise a priority to withdraw the base hydroelectric power from the Central Valley projects under the Bureau of Reclamation law—only the State or municipalities can do that—but the State, through the Colorado River Commission, can withdraw the power and transfer it to the company without profit to the State.

This is the only source of such power for northern and western Nevada—and the company should cooperate in making it available.

The Service Star Legion, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a resolution from the members of the outstanding patriotic organization, the Service Star Legion, Inc., together with a petition adopted at their thirty-second national convention in Des Moines, Iowa, early this month with regard to the urgency of securing action on S. 280, to provide a national charter for the Service Star Legion.

The very commendable activities and objectives of the Service Star Legion, Inc., and the unimpeachable loyalty and patriotism of the ladies comprising its membership merit for this distinguished group the utmost consideration on the part of members of the Senate. I therefore, ask permission to have the resolution and petition, with all the signatures from members in the various States, published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas our national charter bill, S. 280, was not reported out of committee in this Eighty-first Congress; and

Whereas we of this Thirty-Second Annual Convention of the Service Star Legion, Inc., assembled here in Des Moines, Iowa, feel the despairing need of a national charter: Be it

Resolved, That a written petition be prepared here, for the signatures of all assembled, and this petition be mailed immediately to the Honorable HERBERT R. O'CONOR, United States Senator; and be it further

Resolved, That this petition inform the Senator how necessary it is a national charter be granted at this time, owing to the many divisions of territorial regions desiring to be chartered under one national program.

CORA W. BAKER,
Legislative Chairman.

PETITION

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

In witness hereof, we, the undersigned, as members of the Service Star Legion, Inc., assembled here in the Fort Des Moines Hotel, Des Moines, Iowa, for our thirty-second national convention, October 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 1949, petition you, Senator O'CONOR, to use all available power, to have the bill, S. 280, brought out for its final hearing, and to help the granting of our national charter, at this most important time, namely, while so many of the charter members are able to be with us, and while so many are still active, even though in the sunny days of life, many reaching their nineties. What they have made possible, what they have given of their time, strength, and gifts could be more than repaid by the words "charter granted." With knowledge of the new incentives, the new outlines involved, we sign this petition in full obligation to work, live, and give for the advancement of service to God, country, and humanity, and to promote peace and brotherhood among men and nations, to protect and preserve American ideals and traditions.

Cora W. Baker, Legislative Chairman; Carrie L. Davis, National President; Mrs. Duane Lower, Ogden, Utah; Mrs. Fred Roehe, Evansville, Ind.; Mrs. Vern Anderson, La Porte, Ind.; Mrs. Frank Werdner, La Porte, Ind.; Mrs. F. A. Miller, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mrs. H. B. Graham, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Mae Ward, Eddyville, Iowa; Mrs. A. M. Fleming, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mrs. Mary M. Fitzpatrick, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. J. A. Schulte, Jefferson, Iowa; Mrs. Lillian Schulte, Elkader, Iowa; Mrs. Lillian Milewsky, Steubensville, Ohio; Mrs. Ina Yost, West Virginia; Laurabelle Tremaine, Lorain, Ohio; Edith Dally, Lorain, Ohio; Hilda Clark, Lorain, Ohio; Mrs. William W. Baldwin, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. John Reid, Milton, Wis.; Mrs. Luella Koller, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. W. W. Lorimar, Oskaloosa, Iowa; Mrs. E. A. Altpeter, Fort Atkinson, Mo.; Ruth Anne Steber, Elkader, Iowa; Mrs. Elmer Jaques, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. B. A. Dziennik, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Anna E. Ward, La Porte, Ind.; Mrs. J. W. Eraus, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mrs. Mae Greer, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. Lilla A. Whitmore, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Mrs. Anna Lett, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Leo F. Curran, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Lena Reichwein, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. John Ebbe, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. John Stevens, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. H. J. Meyer, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Mrs. Zella Klaaren, Eddyville, Iowa; Mrs. Carl L. Taylor, Antigo, Wis.; Mrs. W. J. Teckemeyer, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Jennie College, Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. Robert B. Monat, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Benjamin F. Gooden, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Maybelle E. Huber, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Jessie B. Ford, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Maud Chappell, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. Pearl Davis, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. J. C. Mellichamp, Past National President, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Irene Polito, National Regional Director, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. Mildred M. Lang, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Florence Callis, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Inez Albertson, Fremont, Iowa; Mrs. Ira Swartz, Estherville, Iowa; Mr. R. O. Shay, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Ellyn Colyn, Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. Pearl Ferrell, Wilkinsburg, Pa.; Mrs. Lucy W. Caldwell, Swissvale, Pa.; Mrs. Marie Eckert, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Emma Miller, McKeesport, Pa.; Mrs. Allie McEntire, Clarion, Pa.; Mrs. Ida M. Suber, New Castle, Pa.; Mrs. C. F. King, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. M. M. Price, Jr., Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Clara Krueger, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. David Blaine, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Flora G. Ervin, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Ada H. Anen, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Angelina A. Johnston, Erie, Pa.; Mary A. Meyer, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Norma Collins, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Nory Kersky, Milwaukee, Wis.; Amalie Pheiffer, West Allis, Wis.; Mrs. Louis Manegold, Kenoska, Wis.; Mrs. Mary P. Jones, Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. Lena McVay, Des Moines, Iowa; Mrs. Lillian Breever, Wheeling, W. Va.; Mrs. Ermin Pantel, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Mrs. Lloyd Lein, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Mrs. Frank Jutten, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Emma Blanchard, St. Joseph, Mo.; Mrs. Elma Anderson, Estherville, Iowa; Mrs. Anna M. Altmeyer, Wheeling, W. Vo.; Mrs. Mary Nicholson, Estherville, Iowa; Mrs. Aurelia B. Pike, Storm Lake, Iowa; Mrs. Charles E. Ward, Fort Atkinson, Iowa; Mrs. J. Musell, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. Peter Merluzzi, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. John W. Ryan, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Carl Streitzer, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Gertrude Hoffman, Toledo, Ohio; Mrs. Rosa Lewis, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. Mary J. Schneelock, New Sharon, Iowa; Mrs. L. S. Tyson, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Delia McDowell, Rippey, Iowa; Mrs. Childa McClune, Rippey, Iowa; Mrs. Leva Zanatti, Rippey, Iowa; Mrs. Harriet B. Lowery, Jefferson, Iowa.

Bureaucrats and Politicians Get the Welfare in a Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, who gets the welfare in a "welfare state?" That is easy: the state. Which is to say, the bureaucrats and the party politicians.

There is a formula. You have seen it. Be sure you recognize it next time. Here is how it goes:

Somebody promises to give you something—a subsidy, or a wage increase without a production increase—if you will give him a little something in return—just a little something—a vote, perhaps. That is where the party politician comes in.

So, you give and you get. Or you think you do. Maybe what you get increases the national debt or decreases corporation profits. What do you care? Let us see:

National debt? That is mortgaging your child's future. Let the rich pay it? That is silly. Take every penny every one of them has, and you would not make more than a dent in the national debt. Every dollar added to it by the give-away bureaucrats has to be paid back by you and your children and your grandchildren.

Take it out of corporation profits? If all the profits of all the corporations were taken, you would pay only a tiny fraction of the national debt.

The plain truth is that no one can give you anything. Last year the Federal Government said it gave to the States $5,500,000,000. That money, of course, first came from the States. But $625,000,000 of it never got back to the States—that was the cost of taking it away from you, and giving part of it back.

When anyone promises you something for nothing, you can be sure he gets a lot of the something, and you get a lot of the nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the above thoughts were originally expressed by the Warner & Swasey Machine Tool Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

The Men From Chelsea, Mass., Who Died for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to speak of the few who died to protect the many.

From time to time in this great land of ours—in the largest cities and the smallest villages—the citizens meet to dedicate a memorial to the dead and the missing of World War II.

On November 6, 1949, the people of Chelsea, in Massachusetts, will gather together in the brotherhood of their community to unveil a monument in honor of the brave and unselfish few.

November 6 is a Sunday.

It is a time when men and women of different faiths congregate in their separate temples to honor the Creator of life.

But at this dedication they will join in reverence to the spirit of their young rel-

atives and neighbors and friends—ordinary human beings like themselves—who measured up to the highest test of courage, devotion, and sacrifice.

What belief inspired these young people to give up the great expectations of life?

It was their faith in us, their faith that we would go on working for the eventual oneness of humanity as God intended, where "doing unto others as we would have others do unto us" will become the preachment fulfilled in practice.

They believed that our free way of life, as we learn from past mistakes that freedom and responsibility merge in growing wisdom, offers the best hope for human progress.

That is the lesson they taught us at the price of their precious youth. It is the lesson that we dare not forget.

And so we raise this memorial to their valor lest we forget.

Their names are imperishably American, because out of their variety they came together in the unity of their self-respect and their respect for one another.

They nourished this faith with the sacrifice of their lives to save that faith for us.

Here are the names that Chelsea, Mass., asks you to read with a silent, humble prayer of gratitude:

NAMES OF CHELSEA SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN WORLD WAR II

Sgt. Louis T. Annese, Pvt. Benjamin Arazva, Staff Sgt. Francis E. Bangs, Jr., Corp. Francis V. Barbieri, Pfc Harry Baritz, Pvt. Louis A. Barone, PhM2c Israel D. Barr, Pfc Hyman Belsky, Pvt. William A. Berkowitz, Sgt. Louis C. Bial, Sgt. Adolph Bialecki, Corp. Milton G. Bloom, Pvt. Sidney Bloom, Pvt. Edward F. Brennan, Pvt. Melvin Brodie, CBM Charles Brodsky, Pfc Jack R. Brodsky, Pvt. Charles J. Burke, MB2c Richard R. Burns, Pvt. Delmar Cadle, Sgt. Wilfred J. Caissie, Pfc Michael J. Cimino, Pfc Joseph J. Campedelli, Sgt. Paul V. Connors, Sgt. William S. Cucciniello, Sgt. Vahe Dadourian, S1c Israel W. Davis, Corp. Norman E. Denning, S1c Herbert L. Dennis, Sgt. John L. Doran, Pfc Thomas G. Downey, S1c James F. Duval, Jr., Tech. Sgt. Walter A. Falta, Pvt. Leonard Fleischer, Pfc Thomas A. Flight, Sgt. George F. Garden, Pvt. Martin Gates, Corp. John H. Gavin, Lt. Harry S. General, Pfc Francis H. Gillooly, Pfc Fred B. Ginsberg, RDM Norman D. Glick, Pvt. David Glickstein, Pfc Lester F. Glover, Jr., Walter Glowacki, Pfc Charles J. Green, Pfc Vincent Gregoire, Pfc Stephen J. Hagan, Pfc Joseph J. Hamilton, Jr., Lt. Edward J. Hannabury, Jr., Pvt. Irving S. Hyfer, Pfc Floyd O. Illingsworth, Sgt. William R. Irons, CCM Paul Kachuk, Pvt. Peter Kallitkewicz, Sgt. John D. Kane, Pvt. Jacob H. Katz, S2c Edward Kazanjian, Pfc Frank Kectic, Pvt. Robert Kilduff, Lt. Allen I. Klarfaen, Pvt. Arthur W. Keenan, Lt. Harry A. Kepnes, Pvt. Henry S. Koslowski, Pvt. Charles Kostopoulos, Pvt. Joseph P. Kowalczyk, Sgt. Chester S. Krolikowski, FC2c Anthony J. LaRiccia, Pfc Thomas G. Lawless, Corp. Ralph LeGrow, RM3c Bleeker Lettin, Pvt. Louis J. Levine, Staff Sgt. Frank C. Logan, Staff Sgt. Jacob Luster, Pvt. Lawrence P. Lyons, Jr., Lt. Sidney J. Malatsky, Pvt. Samuel Margolis, SF3c Howard N. Marshall, AOM John F. McDonald, Lt. William Meehan, Capt. Homer P. Menard, Staff Sgt. Bernard Miller, Pfc Leroy F. Mitchell, ARM2c John C. Mowatt, BM1c Frederick P. Myers, Pvt. Michael Nadworney, FO Michael J. Nemerokski, Lt. William L. Nolan, Pvt. Sidney Noretsky, Lt. John E. O'Keefe, Pvt. Nicholas Opolka, Pfc Charles J. Ostler, Lt. George Pantano, S1c Chester J. Peach, Pvt. Eben C. Peach, Pvt. Maurice P. Penan, Lt. Morris M. Pinks, Pvt. Harry Potter, S1c James E. Powers, Pvt. Donald Randazzo, Pvt. Michael J. Repucci, Pfc Guido Rosati, F1c Bernard Ross, Pvt. Joseph M. Ross, CPO Felix Rowinski, Pvt. Nicholas Salerno, Lt. Harold K. Searle, Jr., Sgt. George Sevkarian, Lt. Charles W. Shannon, Jr., Pfc Israel D. Shapiro, Capt. George Shatzman, Corp. Gregory Shoohigh, Pfc Raymond M. Skoczylas, CM Clarence Snow, Sgt. Charles J. Socha, Lt. Carl Spragg, Pvt. Peter Stamulis, Pvt. Raymond Stickney, Pfc Dennis J. Sullivan, Sgt. John D. Sullivan, Sgt. John E. Sullivan, Pfc Lawrence Suszinski, Corp. George Takessian, Pvt. Leonard Tannen, Pvt. Hyman Taylor, Lt. Justin A. Taylor, S1c Samuel H. Taylor, TM3c Jerry I. Thibeault, Pfc Andrew Tomasello, Pvt. Michael Varricchio, Sgt. Thomas Voltero, BM1c Raymond O. Waggoner, Staff Sgt. Sumner Walker, Pfc Manuel J. Weiner, Ensign Herbert Winfrey, Pvt. Jan Wolinski, Lt. Howard Woodell, Pvt. George Yanover, Pvt. Walter F. Young, Pvt. Ignati Zawacki, Pvt. Israel Zide, Pvt. Aldo Zinetti.

Socialism Unadulterated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am inserting as an extension of remarks the following short speech I recently made at Woodstock, Vt., at a banquet held by Associated Industries of Vermont:

Mr. Toastmaster, always when the legislature is in session somebody writes me seeking to learn what I think about the wisdom of this or that prospective legislation. I have made it my policy always to refrain from attempting to influence pending legislation and have uniformly declined to express an opinion one way or the other.

But as a citizen and a taxpayer, when the legislature is not in session, I feel I have a right and I think it may be my duty to say what I think should or should not be the policy and program of the State with respect to matters being generally discussed.

This is as good a place as any for me to say that I am opposed to the socialistic experiment involved in the creation of a legislatively created power authority for Vermont.

It follows directly and specifically the theory of civil polity which aims at the public collective ownership, management, and control of land, water, and capital, and sets the pattern for the public collective management of all industries. It is an opening wedge which might and, if experience of other States and countries is a guide, surely would result in the establishment of a socialistic state, called welfare.

It is socialism, pure, undefiled, and exactly as defined by all political economists and even by the dictionary itself.

Inherent in the proposition is the philosophy which holds that the modern social and economic conditions make for a socialist order and which favors the principle of such an order as against the prevailing social system. It is a threat to free enterprise as well as destructive of individualism. I am opposed to it as a matter of principle.

I am opposed to it because of what its adoption similarly as a policy has done worldwide to those who have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage.

Time and again, over the span of the last 700 years, it has been proved that those who know our way of life place upon one thing greater value than upon any other—and that priceless thing is individual liberty. This requires a system of self-government, which recognizes that every person possesses certain inalienable rights and that rules and regulation for the common good may be imposed only by the ultimate authority of the citizens themselves.

This individual freedom is not the product of accident. To gain and retain it our forefathers have sacrificed material wealth, have undergone suffering, indeed have given life itself. So it is easy with us today.

Socialism is directly opposed to American constitutional freedom. Socialism and democracy are inherently inimical, yet socialism and absolutism and communism are natural partners.

It is my well-considered judgment and long-entertained opinion that no government-controlled regime can equal a competitive system in furnishing to men and women producers the incentives to lead them to do their best along all lines. Only where everyone is free and rewarded adequately for services rendered are human energies released to the limit. Only under such conditions could the United States of America have become the world power that it is and only under such conditions can all classes really prosper and enjoy life. Soft socialism, the idea of the welfare state, the steady increase in the Government's power over the lives and purses of our citizens, are the greatest menaces confronting us today, not excluding Russia.

The American people have deceived themselves far too long in thinking that our variety of socialism is different from the slave state of the Marxist. The trend in this country today is identical in principle to that in operation in other central governments which manage their people and their people's property. We are just about halfway toward total socialism, the adoption of which, or the acceptance of which may have been caused by ignorance; which does not change the awful fact.

I am of the opinion, based upon years of experience as a public servant, that Americanism, liberty, free enterprise, the American way, and all the other expressions we use to describe the living we have here, are more than words.

Freedom exists only where the people take care of the government. There is no freedom where the government takes care of the people.

In fact—

"All we have of freedom,
All we have, or know—
This our fathers bought for us
Long and long ago—
Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law.
No men enjoy freedom
Who do not deserve it.
No men deserve freedom
Who are unwilling to defend it."

Flood Control and Storage for Irrigation on the Little Humboldt River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Louis

A. Pick, major general, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, relative to the investigation for flood control and storage for irrigation on the Little Humboldt River together with a bill, H. R. 5472, providing for such investigation which was passed in the House and is now pending in the United States Senate and will be considered following the opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 27, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: Reference is made to your recent discussion with representatives of this office concerning the flood situation in Paradise Valley on the Little Humboldt River, Nev.

I took the liberty of requesting the latest information on the flood problem in Paradise Valley from our district engineer at Sacramento, Calif., within whose district the Little Humboldt River Basin is located. I now have his reply and I am pleased to submit the following information.

The Little Humboldt River, draining 2,700 square miles in north central Nevada, formerly joined the Humboldt River near Winnemucca, but is now cut off therefrom by sand dunes at the lower end of the valley. Paradise City is located on Cottonwood Creek, a tributary of Martin Creek which is the principal tributary of Little Humboldt River. The principal economic activity in the Little Humboldt Valley is the raising of feeder cattle. Paradise Valley is used primarily for wintering of about 75,000 head of cattle and some sheep and horses. About 20 ranches and 200 persons are located in the valley.

About 46,000 acres are intermittently irrigated by the waters of the Little Humboldt River, generally by deliberate flooding. About 18,000 acres are meadow land, 23,000 acres are in pasture, and 5,000 acres are in alfalfa and other crops, the greater portion of the irrigated land being in Paradise Valley. Overflow of stream bottom lands is accomplished by means of tight dams, and of bench lands, by canal diversions.

The maximum flood of record on Martin Creek occurred on January 21, 1943, was caused by heavy rainfall on a relatively snow-free basin, and had a peak discharge of 9,000 cubic feet per second. The present channel capacity of Martin Creek, at the mouth of the canyon where damage might occur, is between 500 and 1,000 cubic feet per second. It is not believed that hydrologic conditions this spring are such as to produce a flood on Martin Creek which would seriously threaten the area, unless an unpredictable heavy rainstorm should also occur.

Potential flood damages would probably occur at two or three ranches, principally to buildings and to a few acres of orchard land. There appears to be no danger to human life from floods in the area.

Although presently available information does not indicate a very serious flood problem in Paradise Valley, or that economically feasible means of flood control could be achieved, further investigation would be desirable before deciding finally on the matter.

As you may know, a bill, H. R. 5472, was recently introduced which would authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Martin Creek at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev., by the Secretary of the Army. Should the bill be adopted, you may rest assured that the Corps of Engineers would proceed with the investigation without delay, and would submit its report at the earliest practicable date.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

H. R. 5472

A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Martin Creek at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Martin Creek at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev., for flood control and other purposes. The cost of the examination and survey authorized by this act shall be paid from appropriations heretofore and hereafter made for examinations, surveys, and contingencies for flood control.

"The Organizational Structure Which the Congress Has Set Up Is a Good One—I Wholeheartedly Support the Form of Unification Which Has Been Enacted Into Law—I Believe in the Roles and Missions of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, within a few hours, the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, will appear before the Committee on Armed Services and make a statement with respect to his principles and policies he is following in the administration of his office.

Like all self-made men, Louis Johnson is a realist, strong, rugged, and certainly one who uses no double talk.

He addresses himself directly to the question under discussion. Certainly when he speaks, no one ever misunderstands what he says, nor did the Committee on Armed Services when he appeared before it.

Louis Johnson makes it clear that he feels it his job to carry out the unification law as it was enacted by this Congress—in its spirit as well as in its letter.

Mr. Speaker, previously this House granted me the privilege of extending my remarks and including the magnificent and all comprehensive talk and statement made by our great Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Francis P. Matthews. The House did likewise with respect to the statement made by the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force.

In the extension of my present remarks, I submit to the consideration of this House the presentation made by my friend and our great Secretary of Defense and without comment, except to say that I am equally in hearty support of facts as expressed by all three of these distinguished public servants, among whom it now becomes apparent, there exists no differences whatever.

I am extending my remarks in the RECORD and including Secretary Johnson's statement because, as I have said before, some weeks will elapse before it will be printed and available to all members, and so without further expression, I submit the presentation made by Louis Johnson to the Armed Services Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to you for giving me this opportunity to testify today. I asked to be permitted to appear as a witness before your committee when it became apparent that the basic problem to which you were addressing your attention was the subject of unification of the armed forces.

My own recent connection with the Department of Defense, of course, goes back only 6 months. The controversy over unification, which is the central theme of your hearings, goes back over a period of years. I cannot speak with personal familiarity, therefore, of all of the chapters of this controversy, but I should like to review them briefly in the interest of furnishing a certain degree of perspective for the remainder of my remarks.

The National Security Act—the Unification Act—was passed by Congress in 1947. Before it was passed, it was subjected to months of the most intense scrutiny by congressional committees which heard scores of expert witnesses—military and civilian—and took thousands of pages of testimony. During all these months, the press reported the testimony in committee and the subsequent debates on the floor of Congress. Editors and writers on military subjects lined up on both sides of the question, and pointed out the advantages, or disadvantages, depending on the point of view, which might be expected to flow from unification. Rarely in the history of the country has a piece of legislation received the attention that the National Security Act received during its legislative journey. More recently, and to a somewhat lesser degree, the amendments to the National Security Act—enacted 2 months ago—benefited from the same relentless exposure to the democratic process.

Before the 1947 act was passed, detailed studies of the subject were conducted, over a period of several years. These studies included the work of the Woodrum committee of this House, the work of a special committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the work of a group appointed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Since the 1947 act was passed, we have had the benefit of Secretary Forrestal's experience in administering the act, together with the report of the Hoover Commission and its task force. In short, unification has been under constant public discussion for over 5 years.

Tradition, opposing interests, and fear of loss of identity have all played a part in the turmoil on the subject of unification, and in the operation of the unified Military Establishment since you first established it in 1947. The present controversy, in my opinion, is a continued adherence to the abovementioned considerations. It differs from earlier resistance to unification, however, in this important respect: by action of two successive Congresses, unification is now the law of the land.

The issues before you would present serious questions under any circumstances.

They are doubly serious when they apply to a military organization, where maintenance of a sense of discipline may ultimately spell the difference between national survival and national disaster.

In my opinion, the organizational structure which the Congress has set up is a good one. It should be allowed to function.

I believe in, and wholeheartedly support, the form of unification which you have enacted into law. I believe in the roles and missions of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, as provided in the National Security Act and as agreed to and as spelled out in greater detail at the Key West and Newport conferences.

There exists in our present strategic concept of national defense an essential and honorable role for each of the armed forces. For security is a cooperative venture to be gained with cooperative effort. Obviously, a lack of cooperation by any one of the services could jeopardize both national security and effective unification. National security is not a competitive enterprise where one service can profit at the expense of another. It admits of neither preeminence nor first emphasis. To provide effectively for security, the Department of Defense must adjudge impartially the representations of our armed forces in weighing the priorities of their needs.

It was not intended by Congress, nor is it feasible, for unification to be conducted the Navy way or the Army way or the Air Force way. The Congress provided for authority, direction, and control in the Secretary of Defense, in order to insure appropriate participation of all services in the interest of national defense. Successful unification assuredly means that no service can control another, but, just as assuredly, successful unification means that no service can be wholly independent of its sister services.

I believe in the concept of a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; but I categorically assure you—despite rumors that have been circulated to the contrary—that I do not advocate a single Chief of Staff. I believe in the concept of a Joint Staff to assist the Joint Chiefs of Staff; but I categorically assure you—despite rumors to the contrary—that I do not advocate imposing on any service, nor on all of the services, a General Staff type of organization. I believe in a Marine Corps trained and equipped for amphibious operations; and I categorically assure you—despite rumors to the contrary—that I do not advocate transferring the Marine Corps out of the Navy.

I have no doubt that the rumors I have just mentioned, with respect to my alleged views, have caused concern, particularly in the Navy. I think it is just as necessary to expose their falsity before this committee as it was for you to expose—as you did—the falsity of the rumors in the anonymous document.

In the same category, there is a rumor which would discredit the Department of Defense economy program by charging a lack of good faith in the recent cut of 135,000 civilian employees. The charge is that the cut was announced for publicity purposes, but was never really intended, since 54,000 employees are being rehired. This is incorrect on two counts. First, none of the employees are being rehired. Secondly, although it is contemplated that approximately 14,000 civilians—not 54,000—will be employed for the military assistance program, none of them will be on Department of Defense pay rolls. They will be paid exclusively from MAP funds, and will be hired to do that job only. The rumor of rehiring falls into the same category as all the other false rumors.

Next, I would like to refer briefly to the rather obvious fact that the strains and stresses upon the national economy which we have with us at the present time make it impossible for any service to get all that it wants, whether in dollars, in manpower strength, or in matériel. Thus, all of us would have liked to keep in commission during fiscal 1950 the 11 large carriers which the Navy had in commission last year, but it was impossible for us to do this under the $14,400,000,000 budget ceiling which considerations of the national economy imposed upon us; all of us would have liked for the 1950 budget to have made provision for a 70-group air force, but under the $14,400,000,000 budget this was impossible; the same sort of factor operated also to reduce the size of the Army to a figure less than that we would like to see. But in considering the impact of the budget ceilings on the individual services, it should be borne in mind that the 1950 budget—and the 1951 budget as well—is based on an over-all plan for the defense of this Nation—a plan evolved by the best military minds in this or any other country—a plan which was evolved and subscribed to by all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General Eisenhower.

The same sort of factors as those which entered into the 1950 budget have, of necessity, entered into our thinking with respect to the 1951 budget. The Department of Defense budget ceiling for 1951 has been set at $13,000,000,000 for planning purposes. This compares with the $14,400,000,000 which was our ceiling, for planning purposes, last year. We will have to effect the maximum possible savings within the Department of Defense in order to meet the $13,000,000,000 figure, and we will also have to make those reductions which the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel can best be made with the least impact on our military readiness.

As the chairman and a number of the members of this committee have pointed out on several occasions, a saving is one thing, and a reduction is something else again. Later in this statement, I shall discuss both our savings and our reductions. In any event, we shall have to make both savings and reductions in order to fit within the ceiling of $13,000,000,000.

I have mentioned the figure of $13,000,000,000 as a controlling figure for planning purposes. I realize that it is highly unusual for any such figure to be mentioned, prior to the submission of the budget to Congress by the President in January of next year. But I have taken this unusual step, with the full approval of the President, in order to convey to you the dimensions of the problem to which we are addressing ourselves, in our effort to maintain a military establishment of maximum preparedness at the least possible cost. Obviously, we are already making plans to shape the military establishment we will have during the remainder of fiscal 1950, in order that we may enter fiscal 1951 with approximately the military establishment we will be able to maintain during that year. Some adjustments are therefore necessary in order to meet future plans. In making these adjustments, we have had to face an unusually thorny problem, because of the fact that Congress, as of mid-October, had not enacted our appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Faced with this situation, and also to assist us in carrying out the National Security Act amendments of 1949, we set up on August 15, after thorough discussion with the departmental secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff in War Council, a Defense Department Management Committee, consisting of one representative from each of the three military departments, together with one representative from my office. This committee consists of Secretary Gray for the Army, Under Secretary Kimball for the Navy, Assistant Secretary Zuckert for the Air Force, and General McNarney for my office. This committee, working with officers from the three Services, has addressed itself to the preparation of a target program designed to effect the maximum possible economies and designed also to meet the objective of having our 1950 activities flow as smoothly as possible into our contemplated 1951 budget. In working on this target program, the Management Committee—and the rest of us, as well—have had to realize that no one Service can be as strong in peacetime as we would like it to be. All Services—Army, Navy, and Air—are much weaker than ideal military appraisals might call for. However, we have facts to face as well as theories.

The problem of effecting adjustments in the programs of the three Services is an extremely difficult one, and must, of course, be tied in directly with the strategic and logistic planning which is the statutory duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. You will recall that both the National Security Act of 1947 and the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 provide that one of the chief duties of the Joint Chiefs of Staff consists of "preparation of strategic plans and provision for the strategic direction of the military forces."

It may come as something of a surprise to this committee, in the light of the testimony you heard last week, to be told that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously agreed on an emergency war plan, involving the maximum utilization of Army, Navy, Marine, and Air forces. In my letter to your chairman, I suggested that General Eisenhower and the Joint Chiefs of Staff be given an opportunity to testify before your Committee, for I thought it would have been unfortunate in the extreme for you to be misinformed as a result of some of the things that had been said here. Just by way of illustration, several of the earlier witnesses made a series of statements with respect to our failure to stage tests between the Banshee and the B–36. As a matter of fact—and as your committee records will show, if you will look back to the communication I sent to you several months ago—the Joint Chiefs of Staff, over the signature of their then senior member, Admiral Denfeld, recommended unanimously that the request of your committee for a test between the Banshee and the B–36 be declined. I would like to incorporate in the record of these hearings the communication which I sent to you at that time, and I would also like to mention the fact that your committee—quite properly, in my opinion—agreed to abide by the unanimous judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the tests between the Banshee and the B–36.

I realize, of course, that it is very difficult for you to separate the wheat from the chaff in all that you have been hearing. The testimony you have heard has been addressed, in the main, to the relative vulnerability or invulnerability of the B–36—but the continuous overtone has been an attack on the theory and the administration of the unification law. I believe that the testimony you have heard earlier this week has restored some perspective to the matter.

Much of what has recently taken place was very aptly described by this committee in a statement which your chairman released to the press the day after I was sworn in, last March. You will recall that at that time you said: "The Armed Services Committee wants it clearly understood that if persons in the armed services or in their employ continue to pass statements to the press which are calculated to depreciate the activities of a sister service and which, at the same time, jeopardize the national security, the Committee will step in with a full scale investigation. We will not tolerate the continuance of this practice."

I think the hearings which you are presently conducting are of the utmost importance. I am glad that you have continued them in order to hear from all qualified witnesses. It was most important for you to hear from all qualified witnesses, because you had in the record, as of last week, many

misleading statements with respect to the war plans which this country would carry out in the unfortunate event that we should again be faced with aggression. The war plans which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously evolved bear only the slightest resemblance to the erroneous picture that was painted by some of your witnesses. To the extent that security permits, General Bradley and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have discussed with you the situation as it honestly exists. Some of the testimony you heard earlier on this point might have been amusing, if it ware not so tragic. A strawman was built for you, by those who would have you believe that we expect to win a war by push-button tactics and atomic blitz. To the extent that an attempt was made by some witnesses to have your committee believe that our war plans contemplate such a sudden victory, I submit that your committee was misinformed by those witnesses. I do not know of any competent military man who thinks that we could win a quick and easy victory.

You have been similarly misinformed by witnesses who would have you believe that a 2-to-1 vote in the Joint Chiefs of Staff can decide any given issue. This concept is a fallacy, from start to finish. In the first place, the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not vote; neither do they decide. Instead, the Joint Chiefs recommend; and the Secretary of Defense, as the representative of the Commander in Chief, and where appropriate the President himself, does the deciding. In the second place, the ultimate decision of the Secretary of Defense or the President is not governed by the fact that two of the Chiefs may recommend substantially identical courses of action, while a third Chief recommends something quite different. All that such a difference of opinion means is that the issue is one which must be decided by someone other than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

You have also heard a long line of testimony designed to prove that the B–36 is vulnerable. To this, I would only say that the B–36 is, of course, vulnerable. The bomber that is invulnerable does not exist—and I doubt that it ever will. Under given conditions, a bomber can always be destroyed. This was true of the B–17 at the outset of the war, just as it was also true of the B–29 in the latter stages of the war. I do not doubt that it is also true of the B–36.

You have heard from fervent adherents of both the Air Force and the Navy. From what you have heard, I believe you will agree with me in commending the wisdom of Secretary Forrestal, who established the Weapons System Evaluation Group for the express purpose of obtaining competent and objective professional judgment on a matter where virulent unilateral attitudes have heretofore been the rule. It is our hope, through the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, to bring the capabilities of various weapons and weapons systems—including the B–36—out of the area of interservice controversy and into the area of fact. The arguments which have been presented to you, both pro and con, in connection with the B–36, are based on such an oversimplification of the problems of bombing and bomber interception that it is probably true that there is no single statement made by either side which cannot be questioned. A comprehensive and detailed analysis on which we can place confidence can only come finally from such an agency as the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group.

Turning now to the witnesses whom I suggested your committee might find it desirable to call, I would like to invite your particular attention to the name of former President Hoover. I recommended that you hear from him because of the fact that the bipartisan Commission which he headed made an objective and impartial study of the entire sweep of the executive branch of the Government, including our organization for national security. Based on this study, the Hoover Commission recommended substantially the form of organization which you, the Congress, subsequently enacted. The essential core of the present organizational arrangement which the Congress enacted into law 2 months ago is to be found in the work of the Hoover Commission, in the work of the task force of the Hoover Commission, in the recommendations which Secretary Forrestal submitted to the President and the Congress, in President Truman's recommendations to Congress, and in the work of your committee and the Senate Armed Service Committee on the legislation that became the National Security Act Amendments of 1949. I believe Mr. Hoover is an eminently qualified witness on the broad subject of governmental organization, on the vital subjects of the national economy and economy in government, and on the particular subject of unification, and I greatly appreciate the cooperation you have extended to us in asking him to testify before you at these hearings.

One of the strongest recommendations of the Hoover Commission was to the effect that substantial economy could be brought about within the Military Establishment. I have been attempting to carry out that recommendation with every means at my command. When I testified here, in the course of your hearings on the amendments to the Unification Act, I stated that within a year we expected to be effecting savings at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year, and within 18 months, we expected to be effecting savings at the rate of one and a half billion a year. I am speaking of savings, as distinguished from reductions.

I am convinced that savings of the magnitude I have mentioned are possible; I am also convinced that they must be brought about, in the interest of a solvent America and a Department of Defense that gives the taxpayer an honest return for the tax dollar which he invests in national security. Such savings can only be brought about by eliminating unnecessary personnel, eliminating unnecessary overlaps and duplications, and by otherwise curtailing expenditures which—though perhaps desirable in some degree—are not sufficiently desirable to warrant expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Inevitably, such savings invite loud cries of anguish. Those of you who attended a meeting in the Pentagon some time back, when we announced the savings that would be accomplished through certain civilian personnel cut-backs for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, heard similar cries of anguish on behalf of all three Departments.

I am sure that you also recall the criticism to which I have been subjected for my insistence that the Air Force remain within the President's budget this year. Specifically, I have testified in behalf of the 48-group air force, whereas the House of Representatives—and subsequently the Congress—voted sufficient funds for 58 groups.

Any attempt, such as that we are making, to provide no more than the money which the national economy can afford for purposes of national security, invites criticism and attack. I have been attacked for my recommendations with respect to the Air Force, at least equally as much as I have been attacked for my recommendations with respect to the Navy. If you should think that the Army has been strangely silent in all of this hullabaloo, I can only say to you that the Army also feels strongly that it, too, needs more funds. The Army has made strong representations to me in this regard—and my office, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Armed Forces Policy Council, are always available as forums in which such complaints may be heard and evaluated, not alone from the Army, but also from the Navy and the Air Force.

In this connection, I would like to refer briefly to testimony you have heard to the effect that the Navy is not accepted in full partnership in the national defense structure. I should also like to mention the claim you have heard that the Navy does not have adequate and appropriate representation in key positions within the Department of Defense.

What are the facts?

In my office and the related boards and agencies, the Navy has, if anything, more than its share of key positions. Rear Adm. Arthur Davis is the Director of the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Capt. William Lalor is the Secretary of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Vice Adm. John McCrea is Director of the Staff of the Personnel Policy Board; Rear Adm. Morton Ring is Deputy Director of the Staff of the Munitions Board; Capt. Harold Houser is Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison and will become Director later this month; Capt. Binnie Williamson is my aide; Rear Adm. Joel Boone has been serving as our top military medical officer, under our civilian Director of Medical Services; and Rear Adm. Charles Wellborn is Deputy to the Chairman of the Defense Department Management Committee.

In addition, of course, Admiral Denfeld represents the Navy on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Navy has equal representation with the other services on the various committees and working groups of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Research and Development Board, the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, the Munitions Board, the Personnel Policy Board, and so on. To mention only one of these key committees, Vice Adm. Robert Carney has represented the Navy within the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization, in the crucial work of preparing the military budget.

It is evident from this list, I believe, that the Navy—contrary to its statements here—has "appropriate representation in key positions." The Navy's other complaint—that it does not have adequate representation—seems to me to be a comment on the quality, rather than the quantity, of its representatives. Speaking personally and across the board, I think that they are extremely able—a grand lot.

Earlier, I mentioned that we were laying our plans in the light of the fact that our budget ceiling for fiscal year 1951 is $13,000,000,000. This figure, representing as it does a lower figure than the ceiling to which we addressed ourselves in the current year, has made it necessary for us to phase this year's operations into next year's budget. This, in turn, will make it necessary—if military readiness permits—for the Military Establishment to refrain from spending some of the money which Congress appropriates this year. I believe that your experience will agree with mine in saying that none of the three services is likely to refrain from spending any money, if left to its own devices. Under the circumstances, therefore, we are having studies conducted looking to a program of limiting the obligation of funds during the current year to the lowest level which can safely be attained, within the figures which you appropriate. We have set tentative targets for this purpose, and, subject to these targets, have asked the three military departments to make their own plans for how any such limitation would be carried into effect. To the extent that these limitations can be met out of the savings we are making, that is, of course, the first place to which the Departments will look, in addressing themselves to the tentative target figures. You have had testimony here with respect to the possible impact, in terms of reductions rather than savings, which these targets, if implemented, might have on the Navy. I am sure that you could receive similar testimony with respect to the Army and the Air Force.

Secretary Matthews has informed your committee that he has pending at the present time a request for a full and detailed hearing with respect to the impact on the Navy of the proposed target figures. As soon as the Navy presentation on this subject is ready, I expect to devote as much time as may be required to Secretary Matthews and his top naval advisers. I hope that my record as Assistant Secretary of War from 1937 to 1940 will stand me in good stead in attempting to convince you that no one is more anxious to have a ready America than I am—and I will listen with the greatest of attention to what Secretary Matthews and his advisers have to say, and will take such action on the strength of their presentation as the merits of the case may indicate.

There are several other matters that I would like to touch upon in this statement. Your chairman has been good enough to give me a list of some of the principal problems which these hearings have developed, from the committee's standpoint, and I would now like to address myself to some of these problems.

The first of these has to do with the carrier.

I have not heretofore commented on the carrier decision, but I am glad to do so at this time. Let me give you a chronology of the events leading up to the carrier decision.

On April 8 the Joint Chiefs of Staff went to Key West to join General Eisenhower who was recuperating from an illness. The chiefs met with General Eisenhower from April 8 through April 12. I joined them the evening of April 10, and participated in the meetings that were held throughout the day on April 11. The carrier was discussed in the April 11 meeting, though not in any great detail.

On April 12, after my return to Washington, I was asked about the carrier at a press conference. On that occasion, I said that a statement about the carrier would be made available "in due course."

On Friday, April 15, after a preliminary discussion of the subject with the President, I wrote a letter to General Eisenhower, with a copy to each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asking the advice of the chiefs on the specific question of "the advisability or inadvisability of continuing to go forward with the construction of this carrier." Copies of this letter were delivered to each of the chiefs on April 15.

Throughout the ensuing week—from Friday, April 15, through Friday, April 22—I was in daily communication with the individual Chiefs of Staff, and I was also in almost daily communication with the President. Copies of preliminary drafts of the views of the individual chiefs were made available to me in advance of actual signature by the respective chiefs. Admiral Denfeld communicated his views to me several days in advance of their formal transmission to me, and the fact that he had signed a statement setting out these same views was made known to me on April 22. As of Friday, April 22, I had read this statement of Admiral Denfeld's, had read the compafable statements of General Bradley and General Vandenberg, and had discussed the matter by phone with General Eisenhower. I had also discussed the matter on several occasions with the President.

Admiral Denfeld's memorandum of Saturday, April 23—to which he referred in his testimony here—was a two-paragraph forwarding document, formally transmitting the previously signed views of himself, General Bradley, and General Vandenberg. Admiral Denfeld signed this document in his then capacity of senior member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Admiral Denfeld's memorandum of April 23 was merely a ratification of the discussions that had taken place throughout the week of April 15–22. The first paragraph of Admiral Denfeld's memorandum of April 23 stated that the Chiefs had failed to reach unanimous agreement, and that their separate views were therefore attached. (The attached views were identical with those I had informally received earlier in this week.) The second paragraph of Admiral Denfeld's memorandum of April 23 said that the Chiefs had agreed unanimously that their separate views should not be made public.

In some of the testimony that has been given before this committee, the impression has been given that my decision to cancel the carrier was made in the relatively brief interval between my receipt of Admiral Denfeld's April 23 memorandum, and the announcement of my decision later the same day.

Actually, Admiral Denfeld's memorandum of Saturday, April 23 had no bearing on the matter, one way or the other. His memorandum of Friday, April 22 constituted a definitive statement of the views of the Navy—and these views, as I have already mentioned, had been made known to me well in advance of April 22.

As of the evening of April 22, I had reached the decision that the carrier should be canceled. On that day, as well as on several previous days, I had discussed the matter with the President. He had given his approval to the course I proposed to follow.

Out of courtesy to the position Admiral Denfeld was filling as senior member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I withheld action until after receipt of his memorandum of Saturday, April 23. Had that memorandum contained any new material, I would of course have reopened the matter. But the memorandum of April 23 contained no new material whatsoever. I therefore phoned the President once again, in order to advise him that there were no new developments, and immediately after advising the President I made my decision public.

Nothing that has happened since April 23 has caused me to feel that I was in error in the action which I took. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the views you so generously expressed on the floor of the House on April 26 still reflect your own appraisal of the matter. Because of what you were kind enough to say on that occasion, I would like to read into the record of this hearing your statement of April 26:

"Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, made a courageous and a momentous decision. He ordered the termination of the construction of the 65,000-ton so-called supercarrier.

"In years past I helped build a two-ocean Navy. I am proud to think that was correct for we need a two-ocean Navy to fight any war that comes.

"Now we know that if war should ever come again, it will be a struggle with a land power.

"It is simply a matter of the proper allocation of war missions between the Navy and Air Force.

"It is the business of the Air Force to use long-range bombers in time of war. And yet this carrier was to accommodate such long-range bombers.

"We cannot afford the luxury of two strategic air forces. We cannot afford an experimental vessel that, even without its aircraft, costs as much as 60 B–36 long-range bombers.

"We should reserve strategic air warfare to the Air Force.

"And we should reserve to the Navy its historic role of controlling the seas. I do not now—and I never will—advocate depreciation of our Navy.

"Secretary Johnson is to be commended both for the nature of his decision and for moving promptly to resolve this important matter."

That ends the quotation, Mr. Chairman, and I can only repeat to you now what I said to you then, that I am deeply grateful to you for the support and cooperation you have given us.

Another matter which the Chairman has mentioned and which I have already touched upon, is the matter of proposed savings under the 1950 budget. I would like to discuss this matter now in somewhat greater detail than I have heretofore done.

Proposed savings have been under study by the management committee for some time, in connection with the 1950 budget. As I have already mentioned, the management committee was established in August, after extensive discussions in the War Council with the departmental secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff. It has been obvious for some time, as was pointed out by the Hoover Commission, that a continuing program to reduce Department of Defense expenditures is necessary. Consistent with military effectiveness, the taxpayers are entitled to greater economies and more efficiency. Duplication, waste, and extravagance must be eliminated. To assist in accomplishing these objectives, arrangements were made with Robert Heller and associates of Cleveland, Ohio, to provide personnel for an advisory group to the management committee. Mr. Heller, who has an international reputation in the business-management field, testified here yesterday, and I am glad that he could give you his observation on Department of Defense management policies.

In addition to the necessity of establishing the management committee in order to institute the foregoing program, it was obvious that waste would be incurred if we did not, in an orderly manner, phase our fiscal year 1950 expenditures into the lower 1951 budget ceiling. Accordingly, one of the first jobs given the management committee was to determine how this problem would be approached.

Inasmuch as Congress had not, as of that time, passed the Department of Defense Annual Appropriation Act, the management committee decided to use the budget requests submitted to Congress by the President as a basis of calculation. At its meeting on August 25, 1949, the management committee considered two alternate methods of approach. They could approach their task by either adopting as a target a flat cut of 10 percent in the 1950 budget (increased by the estimated cost of the military pay raise, but not including public works and stock piling), or they could take a project-by-project approach, in which cumulative amounts of money would be impounded on each project. It was emphasized, under the first alternative, that the military departments would have to revise their budgets by detailed cost categories, which would be reviewed and reconciled by the management committee. After considerable discussion, the committee unanimously agreed that the flat 10-percent-budget-cut method was the better way to approach the problem.

After adjusting the President's 1950 budget requests to include the estimated military pay increase, it was found that a 10-percent target would reduce Army funds $346,000,000 below the amount in the President's budget. For the Navy, this would have been $353,000,000; for the Air Force, $404,000,000. A comparison of these targets with the planned 1951 budget showed them to be unrealistic, inasmuch as they would have, at least in one instance, cut the 1950 budget below the planned 1951 budget. Upon further study, flat 10-percent cuts were also found to be unrealistic with respect to the inclusion of the amounts required to absorb the military pay increase, inasmuch as it appeared that the Army and Navy would be able to recoup large amounts in military personnel costs due to a descending troop basis, while the Air Force would slightly increase its military strength and would, therefore, incur additional expense in this area. In addition, the cut in civilian employees already under way would result in greater potential savings for

the Army and Navy than for the Air Force. Further, since the costs involved in stock piling of strategic materials would not be a charge against the fiscal year 1951 budget I agreed that logically they would not be included in my target ceiling for fiscal year 1950.

We realized that no worth-while studies could be instituted by the services unless firm target figures were adopted. Considering all the above factors, the following revised target figures were adopted: A cut of $357,000,000 for the Army, a cut of 376,000,000 for the Navy, and a cut of $196,000,000 for the Air Force. After deducting stockpiling costs, these revised target figures were within my over-all goal and permitted a reserve of $43,000,000 for allocation where most needed. I directed General McNarney to inform the services to work on the basis of the above figures which had already been discussed by the management committee. He did so in his memorandum of September 8. This memorandum has been referred to as a secret order directing arbitrary cuts in the services. It was, and is, nothing of the kind. It is an unclassified memorandum which makes firm, for planning purposes, target figures for the services to try to meet. It is that and nothing more.

It was clearly understood that the services would examine their 1950 budgets and examine the effect of such a cut on their operations. You have heard that the Navy feels that the only way it can put into effect the proposed saving is by reducing aircraft procurement. Whether this is the only method by which the saving can be made will depend on the validity of the Navy analysis which was first presented to my office in skeleton outline on October 6. As I have told you, I intend to consult with Secretary Matthews and his top naval advisers in order that I may carefully study the whole problem.

The Army analysis of the method by which it would effect the savings assigned to it was received in my office on Tuesday of this week. We have not, as yet, received the Air Force analysis. When they are all available and when the services are ready to make their presentations, the whole problem will be carefully reviewed.

I can only repeat: There was no arbitrary cut. As a matter of fact, there have been no cuts at all, as yet, and the final rate of spending will not be determined until a full hearing is held.

I do feel, however, that I should point out that the facts as I have just outlined them were made known to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate prior to final congressional action on the Military Appropriation Act. We informed the committees of contemplated gross savings totaling approximately $287,000,000, and we also informed the committees that we were striving for—but could not yet identify by appropriation title—substantial additional savings. As you know, we have a total of about 140 separate appropriation titles for the 3 services, and many of the anticipated savings have not yet been firmed up to a point where we can complete the very complex task of identifying the savings by appropriation title. The Appropriations Committees did reduce our appropriations, with respect to those savings where identfication of appropriation title was possible, an amount in excess of $200,000,000, and the committees also recognized that we would be able, during the fiscal year, to make additional savings which we were not yet able to identify with finality.

Next, I should like to refer briefly to testimony you have heard concerning the difficulties faced by the individual chiefs in understanding the problems of services other than their own. I do not think that this problem creates an unbridgeable gulf, and I should like to tell you why.

Once the military capabilities of any given weapon are agreed upon or determined—and we now have the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group to help us in this regard—then the establishment of a strategic plan based upon existing weapons or possible future weapons is not a matter of specialized technical service knowledge. It is perfectly clear that some authority somewhere has got to make a strategic plan. Among the possible authorities who could do that job I can conceive of no better group than the Joint Chiefs of Staff. To whatever extent any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has not had experience in certain types of campaigns—whether sea campaigns or land campaigns—he must do his best to inform himself on these matters and give due weight to the experienced views of those who have participated in that type of campaign. As cross-education and joint training become more prevalent, we can expect that service officers who acquire authority will have had a broader experience than may now be the case. In those cases where the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not in agreement, the necessity for determining a strategic plan then must be placed upon higher authority. Under the Constitution the President is Commander in Chief. It was the thought of the National Security Act, as I understand it, to provide the President with an official, the Secretary of Defense, who would be capable of spending full time in the consideration of military issues. It was always contemplated by the Constitution that ultimate decisions of broad military policy would be determined by a civilian—the President of the United States. They are still determined by him but he now has the assistance and advice of a full-time official, the Secretary of Defense.

One further subject: It has been mentioned in these hearings that the Air Force has not made a B-36 available for Navy experimentation. It has also been mentioned that Navy flyers have not heretofore participated in B-36 operations.

As to this, I believe you know that we are now accelerating our program of exchanging flying personnel between Air Force and Navy. Such exchange exists for several purposes:

First, to familiarize pilots of one service with comparable weapons of the other service and with tactics in the use of those weapons, so that, upon returning to his service, he may give to his own service the benefit of his experience.

Second, during the course of his training, to give to the sister service the benefits of lessons he has learned in his own.

Third, to familiarize himself with weapons and tactics of the other service which, in some circumstances, may engage in joint operations with his own service.

It is undoubtedly true that our program in this regard has not yet advanced as far as it should. Some of our top-ranking officers have only recently taken their first trip aboard a carrier. We will broaden our program to encompass cross-education concerning the B-36. The Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, in fact, has for a number of months been working on some phases of the problem.

This program does not require that a B-36 be turned over to the Navy, however—any more than it requires that a carrier be turned over to the Air Force. It does require that our cross-training of flying include the B-36 and all other planes as well—and to the extent that we may have lagged, I would say that we have been wrong.

Your chairman has also called my attention to a number of other matters that have been of concern to the committee in the course of these hearings. Among these matters I would enumerate the following:

Statements you have heard concerning the degree of emphasis which tactical aviation is receiving; statements concerning the chances of accurate bombing from high altitudes by unescorted B-36's; and statements concerning the procurement, earlier this year, of 75 additional B-36's.

In the main, these are all matters of concern to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It might have been desirable for me to discuss all of them in considerable detail, if it had not been for the excellent and comprehensive statement which Gen. Omar Bradley presented here 2 days ago. General Bradley's statement, together with the other statements you have heard in the last 2 days, has rounded out the picture you had received earlier, so that you now have the benefit of the opinions of all of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I shall of course be glad to answer any questions you may still have on these points.

Before I conclude, and in view of the fact that this will probably be my last appearance here before the members of this committee return to their homes, I should like to comment on something that is completely extraneous to this hearing. I want to say, on behalf of the military and civilian personnel in each of the armed services, and on behalf of myself and for my staff, that we deeply appreciate the cooperation and the unprecedented volume of legislation which this committee has given the Department of Defense this year.

A comprehensive list of the legislative proposals which have been thoroughly screened by this committee and launched on their congressional voyage in this session of Congress is amazing. It would take more time to list them than it is fair to take at this hearing. To mention just a few which have been enacted into law: The radar fence legislation; the first comprehensive revision of military pay legislation in 40 years; the long-range guided missiles proving ground; remedying a serious inequity in the law providing disability and death benefits for members of the Reserve components on active duty for training. By general legislation early in the session you recognized the administrative burden on the Secretary of Defense and provided him with an Under Secretary. Later in the session you reviewed the entire statutory pattern of unification and enacted the National Security Act amendments. These are but a few of the bills which this committee cleared and which have been enacted into law. In addition, it has given long and serious thought, conducted extensive hearings, and forwarded to the floor of the House with favorable recommendations a great many items of legislation among which were the following: Army and Air Force enabling legislation; the Uniform Code of Military Justice; the first comprehensive military public works bills, and a second public works bill designed to provide emergency housing and facilities in the Alaska and Okinawa areas.

I know that your work on our program has been a heavy burden. As sincerely as I am able to do so, I would like to express to you my thanks for what you have done to make a stronger America.

In conclusion let me say this to you: This country needs, and will have, a strong Army, a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force. Congress and the President have seen fit to place upon me heavy responsibilities for the strength and fighting readiness of all our armed forces. It is a responsibility which I have not lightly embarked upon, and with the continuance of the cooperation and assistance this committee has always given us it is a responsibility which I hope to discharge in such a manner that the chances of world peace may be increased thereby. This committee, in its work on the amendments to the Unification Act earlier this year, emphasized once again a cardinal principle of our democracy, namely, that our military forces shall at all times be under civilian control. Specifically, at the suggestion of your chairman, the declaration of policy that precedes the detailed provisions of the Unification Act was reworded. As so reworded,

this statement of policy declares that "it is the intent of Congress * * * to provide for * * * authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control of the Secretary of Defense."

National defense should not be and will not be run in the interests either of professional seamen, professional airmen, or professional soldiers. It should and will be run solely in the interests of the American people and for the furtherance of world peace. It is my sincere purpose to see that the money gathered by taxes from the American people be put into the development and acquisition of only the most modern and efficient defense equipment, so that the people get 100 cents' worth of defense for every dollar expended.

I am proud to be an American in the service of my country; and I am at your service for any questions you may wish to ask.

Summary of Plans for Conservation and Development of the Water Resources of the United States—Flood Control Program of the Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of plans for conservation and development of the water resources of the United States as of October 1949, and the general flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, these two reports are prepared from data furnished by the Corps of Engineers in the United States Army.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PLANS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES (REVIEW AS OF OCTOBER 1949)

1. In accordance with the request of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, then chairman of the Flood Control and River and Harbor Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, the Chief of Engineers on June 15, 1948, prepared a summary of plans for conservation and development of the water resources of the United States. The purpose of that paper was to summarize briefly the growth of Federal interest in the conservation and use of our water resources; to indicate the scope of river problems and potentialities; and to show in general terms the magnitude of the task of controlling the rivers of the United States and of conserving their waters for useful purposes. The summary also showed the progress which had been made and the general accomplishments of the river improvements. Although the paper was based primarily on data from studies of the Corps of Engineers it also presented information on related water resource accomplishments and plans of other Federal agencies, in order to give an essentially complete summary of the problem of water-resource development.

2. Senator MALONE has requested a review of the summary of June 15, 1948, to bring up to date the costs shown therein. This paper has been prepared for that purpose.

I. COSTS

3. In brief, the problem of controlling, conserving, and developing the water resources of the United States was summarized as follows:

Subject	Previous estimates	Present-day costs
Works already completed	$4,779,700,000	
Projects under construction	4,593,000,000	$5,330,000,000
Projects definitely planned	18,980,000,000	22,030,000,000
Projects planned for long-range future	29,152,600,000	33,840,000,000
Total	57,506,200,000	61,200,000,000

Therefore, as of the date of the summary, the work under construction and planned (and excluding completed work) was represented by an estimated cost of $52,726,500,000. This large estimate was presented for the information of Congress, and plainly described in the summary provided by the Chief of Engineers, as a measure of the magnitude of the over-all task of water control and conservation in the United States. It was not in any sense a water-development program proposed by any Federal agency for the approval of Congress.

4. The foregoing costs may be considered as based generally on 1947 price levels. The Engineering News Record index of construction costs for 1947 was 413.16. Although construction costs have stabilized somewhat, there has been a rise since that time and the same index stands at 480.43 for October 1949. This increase in construction costs amounts to about 16 percent and if applied to the estimate given in the preceding paragraph would show a present estimated cost of work under construction and planned of about $61,200,000,000. Subject to the application of the cost index it is considered that the costs given in the summary of June 15, 1948, present a reasonably accurate measure of the magnitude of the water-conservation problem. As indicated in the Chief of Engineers' summary the plans and costs presented should be considered only as a guide to proper river-basin development over a long period of time. Individual projects for carrying out such development would be undertaken only after careful consideration and authorization by Congress.

5. Estimates of cost of public works presented to the Congress by the Federal agencies as a basis for authorization are not static. Although these estimates predict as nearly as possible the probable cost of a project as of a certain time, the project may not be constructed for many years after the original report was made to Congress. During that period construction cost may experience large fluctuations. The Engineering News Record cost index has risen with intermediate fluctuations, from 100 in 1913 to 480 in October 1949. This indicates that, in general, construction costs for the country as a whole are now almost five times those of 35 years ago.

6. Since there has been a general upward trend in construction costs, it is obvious that many projects will cost more than the amounts estimated when they were authorized. It is interesting to note, however, that projects of the Corps of Engineers as a whole are being constructed within the original cost estimates presented to Congress as a basis for authorization when proper consideration is given to the rise in the cost index. For example, there are some 400 general flood-control projects and river-and-harbor projects (all flood-control and navigation work exclusive of that in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi) now under construction. The sum of the costs of these projects estimated when they were authorized totals $3,096,000,000. Practically all of these projects have been authorized within the last 25 years. During that year period the construction cost index has risen 118 percent, or more than doubled; and even in the past 10 years, when the bulk of the projects were authorized, the index has risen over 90 percent. If this latter rise in index is applied to the original estimated cost it would amount to $5,880,000,000. The Corps of Engineers' present estimated cost of these 400 projects now under construction is $5,387,000,000.

II. CURRENT FLOOD SITUATION

7. The annual threat of floods still exists in many river and stream valleys in the United States, and will remain in a diminishing degree until the flood-control program is completed. Since June 1948 the Nation as a whole has suffered no major flood. However, serious damage has occurred in certain areas and the threat of a major flood in the Midwest passed in the spring of 1949 with the gradual dissipation of the snow cover on the Great Plains.

8. In New England, major floods occurred during the closing days of December 1948 in western Connecticut and Massachusetts and in southern Vermont. The damage in the Connecticut River Valley alone from these floods is estimated at $7,000,000, and five lives were lost. The flood-control works completed and in operation saved an estimated additional amount of $11,000,000 in damage.

9. Damaging floods occurred along the upper Hudson River during the last part of 1948 and the first part of 1949. Some of the flood crests were greater than any of record, and the general flood situation was the worst since 1913. One death at North Adams, Mass., was attributed directly to the flood. About 2,000 persons had to be evacuated from their homes. The total flood damage was estimated at $4,600,000.

10. Record stages were exceeded in Georgia and Alabama during November 1948, and major flooding occurred in Mississippi, South Carolina, and portions of Tennessee. During January 1949, floods which set new records were experienced on the White and Black Rivers and tributaries in Arkansas. Flooding also occurred in Indiana, Illinois, Missouri and Oklahoma. In the Missouri Basin during March and April 1949 some flooding of major streams and tributaries occurred in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, as a result of melting snow and ice jams, with damages to croplands, highways, and railways.

11. In the area farther south, where the high Rocky Mountains feed the Rio Grande, a very grave threat hung over the heads of the people in the Rio Grande Valley because of the abnormally great snow depth and water content. Conditions were such that the record flood heights of 1941 might easily have been exceeded and the flooding of communities along the Rio Grande, particularly the city of Albuquerque, would have been disastrous. Again, fortunately, rapid thawing and heavy rainfall did not occur to make the flood threat a reality.

12. In August 1949 the Lake Okeechobee-Everglades section of southern Florida was struck by the most severe hurricane of record in that area. Winds with a velocity of 150 miles an hour drove across Lake Okeechobee and raised the waters of the lake 10 feet above its elevation before the storm and dashed 5-foot waves against the system of levees protecting seven towns and adjacent farming areas. This was the second and most severe test of the Okeechobee levees constructed by the Corps of Engineers. They retained the hurricane-driven waters and prevented a repetition of the disaster of 1928 when over 2,000 people were drowned in a

single day during a hurricane of lesser magnitude.

III. LEGISLATIVE ACTION

13. Late in June 1948 Congress passed water resource legislation now referred to as the Flood Control Act of 1948, which was approved by the President on June 30, 1948. This act authorized a number of projects for navigation, flood control, and water conservation. Among these was the first phase of the important project for flood protection and water control in central and southern Florida authorized to be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers; and the comprehensive plan of improvement for the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico to be accomplished jointly by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The importance of these two new projects was recognized when Congress appropriated money for their initiation in the fiscal year 1950.

14. In the spring of 1949 the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives began hearings on an omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, with a view to authorization of additional improvements; and the bill H. R. 5472 was passed by the House of Representatives on August 22, 1949. Subsequently, in September and October 1949, this bill and additional authorizations based on new reports and recommendations completed by the Chief of Engineers, were considered at hearings before the Committee on Public Works of the Senate. The bill H. R. 5472 as reported out by the Senate contained the following (with estimated Federal costs):

92 new authorizations for rivers and harbors	$228,169,000
35 new authorizations for flood control and 28 increases in previous monetary authorizations or project modifications	1,336,645,000
Total	1,564,814,000

15. One of the important reports considered by the Public Works Committees in formulation of H. R. 5472 was the report on the Columbia River and tributaries, dated June 28, 1949, which was prepared by the Corps of Engineers in coordination with the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies. This report presented a comprehensive plan of water conservation and development for the entire Columbia River Basin with a total estimated cost of $3,224,000,000. Included in this plan of improvement are plans of the Department of the Interior for irrigation and fisheries and power transmission. Other important reports considered by the committees included those for the South Platte River in Colorado, the Humboldt River in Nevada, the Santa Ana River in California, and the Grand (Neosho) River in Kansas and Oklahoma.

16. The bill H. R. 5472 as reported out by the Public Works Committee of the Senate has not been acted on by the Senate and remains for further consideration. Enactment of authorizing legislation of this kind by Congress is a logical and necessary step in the prosecution of an orderly program of Federal water-resource development.

General Flood Control Program of the Corps of Engineers, 1949

I. The general flood-control program.
II. Progress to date.
III. Accomplishments of the program.
IV. River basin plans.
V. Multiple use aspects.
VI. Coordination with other agencies.
VII. Administration of completed projects.
VIII. The survey program.
IX. Future plans and progress.

I. THE GENERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM

1. Although flood control was originally recognized as a Federal activity in 1879 when the Mississippi River Commission was created by Congress, it became a Federal responsibility of Nation-wide scope as recently as June 1936, when the first general flood-control legislation was enacted. This legislation, as you know, set forth the basic policy that flood control throughout the United States is a proper activity of the Federal Government, in cooperation with States and local communities, and that the Federal Government should undertake flood-control improvements or participate in them, if such projects are economically justified and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected. This act also set forth certain requirements for local cooperation, and authorized the construction of a large number of projects and the prosecution of additional examinations and surveys on rivers in various parts of the United States.

2. Since that time Congress has enacted additional authorizing legislation, usually referred to as Omnibus Flood Control Acts, in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1944, 1946, and 1948. These acts have clarified the original law with respect to local cooperation, recognition of the rights and interest of the various States, coordination with other Federal agencies, and consideration of water uses related to flood control.

3. The original act of 1936 also provided that investigations and improvements for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Army under the direction of its Secretary and under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and this assignment of responsibility has been reaffirmed in all subsequent flood-control acts.

4. The general flood-control program which has been authorized by the various flood control acts from 1936 to 1948 inclusive includes:

(a) Authorization by name of specific projects.

(b) Approval of comprehensive river basin plans, with authorization of the appropriation of funds for initiation and partial accomplishment.

To date, Congress has provided in these acts a monetary authorization of $2,508,784,400 for flood-control work. Under these authorizations Congress has appropriated a total of $1,333,365,925 for the prosecution of the general flood-control program. These appropriations began with the fiscal year 1938 when they totaled $47,000,000. Flood-control appropriations were naturally reduced during the recent war years and reached a low of about four million in 1944, largely for continuation and maintenance of projects essential to the war effort; but they rose to three hundred and thirty-nine million for the fiscal year 1949 to carry out the augmented postwar program. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1950 is $430,000,000.

II. PROGRESS TO DATE

1. Noteworthy progress has been made in execution of the general flood-control program. This is particularly true when it is realized that this work has been under way for only about 10 years—since the first flood control appropriation was made in 1948; and that this decade includes the mobilization and war period of five years, extending from 1941 to 1945 inclusive, when Federal Civil Works were at a standstill.

2. In this brief period, however, up to June 30, 1948, the Corps of Engineers has completed 172 projects for local flood protection of cities, towns and agricultural areas; and 56 reservoirs, some of which are for flood control only while others are for flood control in combination with related uses such as development of electric power, navigation and water supply. The cost of all flood-control projects completed through June 1948 is $483,000,000.

3. Some outstanding examples of work completed under the general flood control program are as follows:

(a) Local flood protection:

Hartford, Conn.: Levees, flood walls, pumping plants.

Tell City, Ind.: Levee, flood-wall.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Flood wall, barrier dam.

Johnstown, Pa.: Channel improvement.

Los Angeles, Calif.: Paved channel (project in operation, though some elements still incomplete).

Tulsa, Okla.: Levees, flood walls, and pumping plants.

(b) Reservoirs:

Connecticut River Basin: Surry Mountain Reservoir, New Hampshire; Birch Hill Reservoir, Massachusetts; Knightsville Reservoir, Massachusetts.

Upper Susquehanna River (New York State reservoirs): Whitney Point Reservoir, New York; Arkport Reservoir, New York.

Ohio River Basin (protection for Pittsburgh area): Tionesta Reservoir, Pennsylvania; Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania; Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pennsylvania; Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pennsylvania; Youghiogheny Reservoir, Pennsylvania.

Willamette River Basin: Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oregon; Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oregon.

Arkansas River Basin: Fort Supply Reservoir, Oklahoma; Canton Reservoir, Oklahoma; Great Salt Plains Reservoir, Oklahoma; Blue Mountain Reservoir, Arkansas; Nimrod Reservoir, Arkansas.

4. The Corps of Engineers during the fiscal year 1948 continued construction work on 82 flood-control projects located throughout the country, of which 35 were reservoirs and 47 were local protection projects, such as levees, flood walls, channel improvements. At the same time construction was initiated on 42 new flood-control projects, of which 9 were dams and reservoirs. Some outstanding examples of the work under way are as follows:

(a) Local flood protection:

Missouri River agricultural levees.

Indianapolis, Ind.: Levees, flood walls.

Shreveport, La.: Revetment, dikes.

Tacoma, Wash.: Channel improvement and levees.

(b) Reservoirs:

Pick-Sloan plan reservoirs, Missouri River Basin: Garrison Reservoir, North Dakota; Fort Randall Reservoir, South Dakota; Harlan County Reservoir, Nebraska.

Savannah River Basin: Clark Hill Reservoir, Georgia and South Carolina.

Trinity River Basin: Benbrook Reservoir, Texas; Lavon Reservoir, Texas; Grapevine Reservoir, Texas.

Willamette River Basin: Detroit Reservoir, Oregon; Dorena Reservoir, Oregon; Lookout Point Reservoir, Oregon.

5. An important byproduct of progress with the general flood-control program is the development of hydroelectric power. At this time the completed power plants authorized by Congress at flood-control dams have a total installed capacity of 106,000 kilowatts. Projects of the flood-control program now authorized will result in the installation of an additional 5,000,000 kilowatts. This does not include the additional power that will be developed in connection with projects of the river and harbor (navigation) program.

III. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PROGRAM

1. The flood-control program has already proved itself to have been a sound investment from the standpoints of the Federal Government and of the national economy as a whole.

2. Benefits of flood-control works are returned to the people of the country and to the Federal Government in many ways. The first and most immediate return is in flood damages prevented. For example, estimates

show that in the short period since 1938 the works which have been completed at a cost of $483,000,000 have prevented flood damages of over $500,000,000. Thus they have already paid for themselves; and during their useful lives we may anticipate that they will return their cost many times over by prevention of damages.

3. Wide publicity is naturally given to flood damages which still occur throughout the country. It is unfortunate, however, that so little is known of the flood damages which do not occur because of the Federal flood-control program. It is estimated that the flood-control works which have thus far been completed, or which are effective, under the general flood-control program now prevent an average annual flood damage of over $130,000,000.

4. This average annual flood damage will, of course, vary widely from year to year. The past year, 1948, experienced some notable floods. That in the Columbia River Basin in May and June 1948 was one of the most destructive; and caused the loss of some 50 lives and over $100,000,000 in flood damage. Some 582,000 acres of land was inundated in that basin. It is not generally known, however, that the relatively small amount of flood-control work which has been completed in the Columbia River Basin by the Corps of Engineers prevented damages estimated at over $40,000,000.

5. In late December 1948 and early January 1949 a major flood occurred on the Connecticut River and its tributaries in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Completed flood-control works which were in locations to operate effectively during this flood included the Knightville Reservoir and local protection works at Hartford, West Springfield, and six other cities along the Connecticut River. These works were highly effective and prevented damages of about $11,000,000 which would otherwise have occurred during a flood of this magnitude. The remaining flood damage which actually occurred in the basin was reduced to $1,100,000.

6. Of even greater importance than the elimination of property damage is the value of these works in preventing the appalling loss of life that often results from great floods. For example, in 1928 a hurricane-driven flood on Lake Okeechobee in Florida caused the loss of 2,000 lives in a single day. As a result levees and control works were constructed by the Federal Government to prevent a repetition of this disaster. In 1947 similar hurricane-driven floods occurred on Lake Okeechobee, but the Federal works prevented overflow from the lake, which would have been more destructive because the area has developed greatly and population has increased. We do not evaluate the protection of human life in monetary terms but I am sure that you will agree that in many cases it is of overriding importance. And, of course, it is not practicable to estimate how many lives the effective flood-control works have saved.

7. Flood-control works also produce a return to the United States and strengthen the national economy by reclaiming or improving vast areas of agricultural land. This land being located in our river valleys is the richest and most productive in the Nation. The project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is of course the prime example of this benefit, as without flood control that entire fertile valley would be alluvial river swamp. The smaller and more widely distributed works of the general flood-control program are, however, accomplishing the same conservation of land in 37 States; as follows:

(a) Land protected wholly or in part by completed projects, 4,000,000 acres.

(b) Land that will be protected wholly or in part by projects started but not yet complete, 14,000,000 acres.

The flood-control program will permit increased use of these productive lands, with great benefit to farmers and property owners. The Federal Government has a direct stake in this phase of the accomplishment because of augmentation of the food supply of the Nation and because of increased tax returns from the protected lands.

8. In addition Federal flood-control works produce a number of benefits which we may term "intangible," but which are of very real importance. The removal of flood hazard from a river valley immediately produces a sense of security and public confidence which is reflected in improvement of living conditions, establishment of new industries and a general upward trend in the social and economic structure of the area. During the recent war flood protection of important industrial areas and centers of transportation has been of vital importance. Floods in 1943 and 1944 caused serious disruption of transcontinental rail and highway traffic. The important rail center of East St. Louis, the gateway to the West with its rail yards and transfer facilities was seriously threatened but the Federal levees were held and a disaster was averted.

9. The Federal flood-control program also produces many collateral benefits which may be enumerated briefly as follows:

(a) Development of hydroelectric power.

(b) Water supply for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use.

(c) Recreational values—particularly associated with reservoirs.

(d) Preservation of fish and wildlife.

(e) Abatement of pollution and improved sanitary facilities.

At its present stage of progress all of these types of benefits are being returned to the Nation.

IV. RIVER BASIN PLANS

1. Major elements of the general flood-control program are the comprehensive river basin plans of improvement. Such general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes were first authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 1938. This act and legislation on a basin-wide basis were influenced by the destructive flood of 1937 in the Ohio River Basin. Flood-control plans prepared for that basin indicated the necessity for considering our large river basins as units in the planning and prosecution of works for control and conservation of floodwaters.

2. At the present time, Congress has authorized 15 comprehensive river-basin plans under general flood control. These include the Connecticut, Ohio, Missouri, upper Mississippi, Arkansas, Rio Grande, and Willamette River Basins; and the programs for central and southern Florida and for the Los Angeles River in California. Congress has recognized the importance of these basin plans in flood-control acts subsequent to 1938 by increasing monetary authorizations until the authorized expenditure for partial accomplishment now totals $1,507,000,000. This is 60 percent of the total monetary authorization for general flood control.

3. Since these plans include work in the major river basins of the country, where the greatest flood hazards exist, they are being prosecuted vigorously. The cost of projects completed and under way in these 15 major river basins is estimated at $1,961,000,000, at present price levels. Thus completion of work under way now requires a total additional monetary authorization for the basin plans of about $450,000,000. It should be noted that the total cost of work now under way in the various basins would have been well within the monetary authorizations but for the constantly rising index of construction cost which results in costs more than double those of 1938 when the original basin authorizations were made by Congress.

4. It is important that these basin plans be prosecuted at a uniformly rapid rate, in accordance with efficient scheduling and planning. This procedure actually results in ultimate savings in construction costs to the Federal Government. Of even greater importance, however, are the facts that floods continue to occur and that flood losses will continue until these plans are completed and in operation. Consequently, sufficient additional monetary authorizations should be made to enable the progressive initiation of new elements of the basin plans. Unless this is done in the near future, progress on the approved plans will be delayed for lack of an adequate backlog of monetary authorization.

5. It is estimated that continuation of desirable progress on basin plans to provide for completion of work under way, and for initiation of an appropriate number of new projects requires an additional total monetary authorization of about $1,500,000,000. While appropriations against this authorization would probably extend over a longer period of time, it is desirable that all works initiated be covered by adequate monetary authorizations.

V. MULTIPLE USE ASPECTS

1. The flood-control program is actually a program for control and use of flood waters, and for conservation of the water resources of the Nation. Congress has specifically directed that the Corps of Engineers in reporting on projects for flood control and other purposes must consider all related water problems and uses such as navigation, power development, water supply, recreation, preservation of fish and wildlife, and abatement of pollution.

2. As early as 1925 Congress authorized the Secretary of the Army to prepare an estimate of cost of surveys of the rivers of the United States with a view to formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purpose of navigation and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the most efficient development of potential power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation. The actual surveys were authorized by the River and Harbor Acts of 1927 and 1928 in accordance with House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. Accordingly comprehensive surveys and reports have been completed by the Corps of Engineers on essentially all of the major rivers of the country. These reports furnished the factual basis for the original Flood Control Act of 1936. These reports have also served other Federal agencies as a source of basic river basin data.

3. Beginning with these initial surveys and in accordance with congressional directive the Corps of Engineers has always developed and recommended plans which consider all water uses and problems.

4. Hydroelectric power: In many cases dams required for flood control also afford opportunity for development of economical hydroelectric power. A total of 106,000 kilowatts of power have already been installed at completed flood-control reservoirs; and power installations now authorized by Congress under the general flood-control program will result in an ultimate installation of about 5,000,000 kilowatts. Anticipated rates of installation for the next 6 years are as follows:

	Kilowatts
1949	70,000
1950	89,000
1951	48,000
1952	426,000
1953	718,000
1954	612,000

Since there is a general power shortage throughout the Nation, this is an important collateral aspect of the flood-control program.

5. When flood-control dams are built which have possibilities for future power development provisions are made for such development during construction of the project so that the full potentialities of each site may be utilized when the demand for power warrants such action and it is authorized by Congress.

6. Major drainage: In the Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress specified that the term "flood control" should be construed to include channel and major drainage improvements. This was legislative recognition of the fact that drainage is an essential part of and complement to flood control improvements. All studies of the Corps of Engineers recognizes this relationship, and certain projects involving major drainage features have already been authorized by Congress. The drainage problem in the United States is one of great magnitude. Our estimates show that there are almost 24,000,000 acres of undrained potential farm land in the United States and that about 15,000,000 acres of this land can be brought into production or have its production improved by a combination of drainage and flood control. The Corps of Engineers has been working closely with the Department of Agriculture in planning for drainage improvements and a memorandum of understanding setting forth the functions of each agency in drainage activities was signed by the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service on June 1, 1948.

7. Water supply: Control of floodwaters by storage in flood-control reservoirs produces large additional benefit if these waters can be put to beneficial use. In California the reservoirs that are being constructed on the American, Kings and Kern Rivers will make available supplemental water supplies in a country where there is a serious water shortage. Similar conservation storage is being made available in reservoirs in Texas and in other parts of the country. The comprehensive plan for flood control for central and southern Florida, of which the first phase was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1948, provides for maintaining water levels for thousands of acres of agricultural lands and for improving the water supplies of the cities of the lower east coast of Florida by increasing underground supplies and preventing salt water intrusion. Another investigation recently completed involves flood control, drainage and water supply for the rice-producing Bayou Meto-Grand Prairie region in Arkansas. This proposed improvement contemplates using the augmented flow of White River, made possible by authorized flood control reservoirs on that stream, to replenish the diminishing water supplies of a unique agricultural region. It is an excellent example of how flood control, drainage and water supply improvements can be combined to effect the full conservation and development of the water resources of an area.

VI. COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

1. The flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers is thoroughly coordinated with the requirements and plans of other agencies, local, State, and Federal.

2. Close cooperation with the local people who are directly affected by floods and by flood-protection works has been an essential characteristic of the program from its inception. Projects actually originate in the problems and desires of local interests. These find expression through their representatives in Congress and result in the authorization of examinations and surveys, which are the initial step in development of a project. These surveys and plans are prepared by engineers in the 11 divisions and 42 districts of the organization of the Corps of Engineers, which cover the entire country and are staffed with engineers who are thoroughly familiar with local problems Public hearings are held at intervals during preparation of the studies so that the views of local interests may be known, and may be incorporated into plans of improvement.

3. The Flood Control Act of 1944 recognized the interest and rights of the various States in the development of watersheds within their borders and their interests and rights in water use and control. In order to carry out this policy reporting officers consult with State officials and agencies during the preparation of reports and plans; and before completed reports are transmitted to Congress they are referred to the Governors of affected States for such comments and recommendations as they deem appropriate. These comments and recommendations of the States are made a part of the report as transmitted to Congress.

4. Because of the comprehensive nature of plans prepared by the Corps of Engineers, for control and conservation of flood waters, extensive coordination with other Federal agencies is a part of the regular procedure in development of projects. The original Flood Control Act of 1936 provided that Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture. Consequently the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture coordinate closely in working out their respective parts of the over-all flood-control program. The Corps of Engineers also works with the Federal Power Commission in determining potentialities for development of hydroelectric power. Also in view of the interest of the Department of the Interior, and particularly of the Bureau of Reclamation, in water resources in the West, all reports dealing with waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian are referred to that department for coordination and comments prior to transmission to Congress. In appropriate cases reports and plans are also coordinated with other Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, and the International Joint Commission when Canadian boundary waters are involved. Reports and development of projects are also carefully coordinated with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and with the various State fish and game commissions, to insure the preservation and improvement of this resource. In carrying out this coordination prescribed by law and interagency procedure, there is a large amount of cooperative effort at field level among the various Federal agencies involved.

5. The Flood Control Act of 1944 also provides for marketing of electric power developed at flood-control projects by the Secretary of the Interior, and provides a procedure for disposal of irrigation water made available by such projects.

VII. ADMINISTRATION OF COMPLETED PROJECTS

1. The general requirements of local cooperation set forth under flood-control law are as follows:

a. Provide necessary lands, easements and certain relocations, which usually include relocation of utilities, highways and highway bridges.

b. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and

c. Maintain and operate the projects after completion.

There are some variations of these local requirements in connection with projects of various types.

2. In the administration of completed projects, the law contemplates generally that works whose benefits are local in nature should be maintained and operated by local interests. Accordingly, local protection works such as levees and channel improvements are usually turned over to local agencies for maintenance and operation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. As more and more projects of this nature are completed, it has become increasingly apparent that proper maintenance and operation is of the greatest importance if these works are to serve their intended purposes. With the growth of the flood-control program, the Corps of Engineers is giving increasing attention to this phase of the operation, by study of procedures for maintenance, and by furnishing advice to the local agencies charged with maintenance and operation.

3. Some larger projects which involve water control over large areas are maintained and operated in part by the Federal Government and in part by local interests.

4. Reservoirs, however, which are constructed for flood control or for multiple purposes, are maintained and operated by the United States at Federal cost, since works of this type generally produce benefits which are effective over a wide area. Their operation in flood time is a highly technical operation of emergency nature which must be coordinated with other reservoir systems and works of the Corps of Engineers, and with projects of other agencies. It requires the services of an organization which has the experience and facilities to perform this difficult task.

5. Reservoirs of the flood-control program provide additional benefits as recreational facilities, which can be realized with proper management at small cost. Congressional authority for development of such facilities at reservoirs of the flood-control program is contained in the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946. Large Federal projects, such as our reservoirs, are inherently public attractions and to some extent symbolize the Government, and particularly its public-works program. It is prudent, therefore, that these projects, including the reservoir lands as well as the dams and other structures, should be managed for the greatest public benefit from all standpoints. To this end the Corps of Engineers, under congressional authority provides recreational areas at the reservoirs including land picnic areas and water areas for boating, swimming, and fishing, with access roads and necessary modest facilities to preserve and insure the value of the project. Leases satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army are granted to achieve this purpose. The leasing of Federal land for agricultural use is another part of the reservoir management program which must be administered in the public interest.

VIII. THE SURVEY PROGRAM

1. In all of the flood-control acts Congress has authorized continued examinations and surveys of rivers and streams throughout the United States, for flood control and other purposes. This survey program is the basis for continued progress in flood control and water conservation.

2. At the present time there are about 300 authorized preliminary examinations and surveys which are being prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers as rapidly as funds appropriated by Congress for this purpose will permit. At present appropriations available for carrying out this basic phase of flood-control activity total about 3.5 million dollars annually.

3. The studies and surveys necessary for development of sound projects are of basic importance. These surveys produced the reports upon which Congress takes legislative action in authorizing the projects. Detailed engineering and economic studies must be completed before the Chief of Engineers can make his recommendation to Congress. With the increasing complexity of the flood-control program and its interrelation with the projects and plans of other agencies, the necessary studies have increased in difficulty and in cost. Improved techniques and pro-

cedures are being established constantly, however, and the Congress may rest assured that the reports of the Corps of Engineers will continue to be comprehensive in scope and factual in content.

IX. FUTURE PLANS AND PROGRESS

1. The further development of the general flood-control program should be considered in proper perspective against the magnitude of the problem of control and development of the water resources of the United States. The continental area of the United States comprises the basins of 160 separate rivers, and the valleys of innumerable small streams. Most of these valleys are subject to flooding in varying degrees of destructiveness. Under present conditions, average annual flood damages are estimated at $466,000,000. This is the damage which occurs in over and above that now prevented by existing flood-control works. It is not possible within the realm of practical engineering and economics to prevent all of this remaining flood damage; but the flood-control works planned for the future, together with those under construction and not yet effective, will, when ultimately completed, prevent about 75 percent of the remaining flood damage. This degree of protection would result in estimated annual savings of about $356,000,000 annually. This ultimate objective of the flood-control program will, of course, require many years for completion.

2. As the result of the continuing program of examinations and surveys a large number of investigations have been completed since the war and in many cases the Chief of Engineers has been able to make a favorable recommendation because of the engineering and economic merit of the plans which have been developed. These new projects represent the first approach to solution of the remaining flood problems. The plans presented are comprehensive in scope and involve conservation and use of flood waters as well as their control.

3. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has completed its review of numerous reports; and the Chief of Engineers has made his report on these projects. They are now either before Congress, with the Bureau of the Budget on their way to Congress, or awaiting comments of the governors of affected States. The work involved in these projects has a total Federal cost estimated at several million dollars. These new projects include the upper Allegheny River in and around Bradford, Pa.; the Bayou Meto-Grand Prairie region, Arkansas; the Yellowstone River and tributaries in Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota; the South Platte River in Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska; the Santa Ana River in California; and the Anacostia River in the District of Columbia.

4. In addition the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has completed its consideration of the review report on the Columbia River and its tributaries. This is a comprehensive study of outstanding importance which sets up a plan of improvement to meet the immediate and long-range needs of the Pacific Northwest, for flood control, navigation, development of hydroelectric power, irrigation, and other purposes. It has been carefully coordinated with the States and other Federal agencies concerned. The Federal cost of this entire plan of improvement is estimated at $2,973,000,000.

5. The Corps of Engineers has also completed some 30 other surveys and reports, which will soon be available for consideration by the Congress. These reports include projects with an aggregate cost of about $600,000,000. Included in this group of reports are the upper Cumberland River in Kentucky, the Ouachita River in Arkansas, the Osage River in Kansas and Missouri, the Juniata River in Pennsylvania, the Brazos River in Texas, the Humboldt River in Nevada, and the Green-Duwamish River in Washington.

6. The cost of these comprehensive plans for control and development of our water resources is large, but in all of the new projects referred to above the benefits will exceed the costs by a substantial margin. These projects, therefore, represent a backlog of sound civil-works projects, for continuation of a program which has already contributed largely to the strength and economy of the Nation.

We Need a Strong United Nations With Authority To Insure World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the hope of the world was centered in the United Nations when it was established to insure peace, and there is no reason to assume that this goal cannot be successfully achieved if all of the member nations work together in honest, unselfish cooperation.

The United Nations in operation has shown certain weaknesses and defects which are now apparent. But these faults can be corrected by strengthening the United Nations and by amending the Charter of the United Nations if necessary to give that organization all the authority necessary to preserve the peace of the world.

The United States has consistently shown itself willing to aid the less fortunate nations of the world, and our Government has already expended billions in tax funds and in our natural resources to rehabilitate the people of war-torn nations of Europe and Asia, and to stabilize free democratic government.

Our Nation is willing to lean over backward to cooperate with other nations to insure peace, and our President has offered a plan for atomic control which could outlaw the atomic bomb and regulate atomic production through the United Nations if all member nations of that organization would agree to the plan and its enforcement, including Soviet Russia.

We have proved ourselves as a nation to be international cooperationists on a global scale, and to be willing to help all other nations enjoy the freedom and independence we enjoy, and at the same time we are cooperating with all nations to preserve world peace.

Isolationism in America is now in the past with the covered wagon of yesteryears. Today the United States is dedicated to a policy of international cooperation. But we must remain strong economically and militarily to preserve our own standard of living and to insure that of other nations who are less fortunate but willing to help themselves.

I believe world peace is possible if men of good will work together. And we must let the United Nations prove its worth before attempting any new and untried method to bring about world peace.

If we do not, we may "jump from the frying pan into the fire," and the Lord knows the cold war is hot enough now.

Furthermore we must not become confused and frustrated by trying out too many schemes and plans before we have allowed one plan to work itself out.

The United Nations needs time to develop and strengthen its organization and to correct its faults. The United States as a member of that organization must support it and work to perfect it through our representatives on its councils.

We must not forget that it took many years before our forefathers decided to break away from the tryrannical rule of George III of Britain, and set up our own Government. It then took many years and many difficult trials and struggles to make our constitutional government work.

Let us benefit by our own experiences and let us work to make the United Nations a successful international organization and the safeguard of world peace.

White Christian Americans Still Have Some Rights Left, and Those Rights Should Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a bill, H. R. 6519, which I have introduced to outlaw the so-called Anti-Defamation League.

This organization, which is a gestapo for an organized minority, is carrying on the most vicious persecution of white gentiles ever known in all the history of this country.

They are attempting to control the press, the radio, the motion picture shows, and every other method of communication. They have virtually driven Christian American actors and actresses from the moving-picture field.

They are now carrying on a drive to fasten upon the American people the infamous FEPC law, which would result in driving white Christian Americans out of business in every State in the Union.

The white gentiles, the white Christian Americans, if you please, still have some rights left in this country. They are the ones who have made this country great. Their sons have fought the Nation's battles in times of war and sustained its institutions in times of peace. And it is an outrage for Congress, and the administration, to sit idly by and see them persecuted in this un-American manner.

I am calling upon the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate this subversive outfit, and I am calling upon the Congress of the United States to protect white Christian Americans from such persecution as is now being perpetrated by this subversive organization.

If the committee or the Congress desire to amend this bill, that will be in order; but something should be done to stop the outrages which this un-American organization is now perpetrating against loyal Americans all over this country.

The bill referred to follows:

H. R. 6519

A bill to prohibit membership in, or participation in the activites of, the Anti-Defamation League

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any individual to be a member, or to participate in the activities, of the un-American subversive organization known as the Anti-Defamation League.

Any individual who violates this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

S. 2726, To Abolish Functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Senate bill 2726 to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934—Forty-eight Statutes, page 984—as amended.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2726

A bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That within 10 years from the date of the enactment of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have caused the complete emancipation of the Indians by the removal of guardianship over such Indians, and trusteeship over property both real and personal belonging to individual Indians and recognized tribes; shall have liquidated all tribal organizations including disposal of their assets, provided any indebtedness to the United States has been repaid. All lands and buildings and appurtenances on any such land whose ownership or inherited rights cannot be determined shall be conveyed to the State in which located.

SEC. 2. (a) On or before June 30, 1950, the moneys to the credit of each Indian on deposit in the Treasury of the United States designated under the title "Individual Indian Moneys" shall be paid to such Indian in cash: *Provided,* That funds belonging to minors shall be paid to a guardian duly appointed by the court of the State in which such minor is domiciled.

(b) The pro rata share of the tribal funds of each recognized tribe shall be paid in cash, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, to each member appearing on the rolls of such recognized tribe, except that the shares of members thereof who are minors shall be disposed of as provided in subsection (a).

(c) Any indebtedness to the United States shall be satisfied before any payment shall be made under this section.

SEC. 3. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 378), supplementary thereto; and the acts of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and June 26, 1936 (40 Stat. 1967), are hereby repealed. The unexpended balance in the "revolving fund" established pursuant to section 10 of said act of June 18, 1934, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. The unexpended balances on the date of enactment of this act of funds advanced to corporations created pursuant to the said act of June 18, 1934, from such "revolving loan fund," together with interest due thereon, shall be collected by the Secretary of the Interior at the earliest practicable date and shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. All school, hospital, and agency buildings and property now under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be offered for sale to the State in which located at the prevailing inventory value, and such property as is not acquired by such State shall be offered for sale to the highest bidder, the proceeds therefrom to be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 5. (a) The functions, powers, and duties of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with respect to irrigation projects on Indian reservations are hereby transferred to, and shall be administered by, the Bureau of Reclamation.

(b) All records and property (including office equipment, contracts, agreements, and leases) and all personnel used primarily in the administration of such projects, are hereby transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation for use in the administration of the functions, powers, and duties transferred pursuant to subsection (a): *Provided,* That any of the personnel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs transferred by this section found by the Commissioner of Reclamation to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the efficient administration of the functions so transferred shall be retransferred under existing law to other vacant positions if any in the Government service.

(c) The unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds (including repayments), heretofore or hereafter made available for carrying out such projects, shall be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation and shall be available for such purposes, subject to any conditions and limitations (including obligations chargeable to such appropriations, allocations, or other funds) that existed prior to such transfer.

SEC. 6. There is hereby established a board of liquidation consisting of the Comptroller General of the United States who shall be its chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Administrator of General Services. It shall be the duty of the board to assist the Secretary of the Interior in liquidating the assets of Indian tribal organizations under this act. Such personnel as may be required by the board shall be detailed from the offices of each of the above members, the salaries and expenses thereof to be paid from funds to be appropriated therefor. Members of the board shall serve without additional compensation.

SEC. 7. Such records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as may be determined to be of current or future value shall be placed in the custody of the Archivist of the United States and shall be made available in the prosecution of any claims against the United States before the Indian Claims Commission created pursuant to the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049).

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, kindly permit me to quote the text of the announcement made in a publication known as Carta Aerea, with reference to one of my friends, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. It must be borne in mind that this valuable news letter is distributed by the Organization of American States, which has its headquarters in the Pan American Building, Washington, D. C. Indeed, it is most gratifying that a news service of this quality has been established to promote the noble cause of inter-American amity, a cause for which Dr. Thorning has labored brilliantly. In reality, this friend of mine is an apostle of the true, the good, and the beautiful in all that concerns the good neighbor policy. Consequently it is extremely encouraging to note that Dr. Michael Lever and his colleagues in the press division of the Organization of American States are calling the attention of all our friends in the other American Republics to the fact that, for five consecutive years, the Congress has invited Father Thorning to initiate the ceremonies of Pan American Day on Capitol Hill. Each one of his prayers has been splendidly inspired; and we have always counted ourselves fortunate to have in our midst this champion of truth, liberty, and of democracy. In this body his friends are legion. Recently, on St. Patrick's Day, Dr. Thorning was presented by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to recite the prayer on the Feast of St. Patrick. He implored a special benediction on the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, as well as upon all the representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. He begged Almighty God to grant us "those gifts of imagination, good humor, poetry and song which have made the sons and daughters of Ireland ambassadors of God for the whole world." Dr. Thorning himself is an ambassador for God for all our good neighbors, especially for those who reside in the lovely island of Cuba, with whom we have such magnificent ties of affection, of understanding and good will.

This has special significance, because el picúo de Herminio, as a certain leftist individual is known in his own country, has had the bad taste to publish positive falsehoods about my dear friend, Father Thorning, without having taken the least trouble to investigate the truth or to find out the facts with reference to the respected priest whom I have mentioned. After setting down a series of unproved and unprovable assertions, this character admits that "he has no way of proving whether or not it is the

truth." But this was precisely what he was obliged to do, as a matter of honor, as a journalist and a citizen.

They tell me—

Exclaims el picúo de Herminio—

that during the war his influence was so great that he obtained permission for new automobiles, in spite of all prohibitions; that he brought about the transfer and even the dismissal of functionaries, by a single word; that he effected the adoption of this or that policy. It has even been said, it was added, that the termination of aid which for a time the valuable "Hispanic American Historical Review" received in order that it might be distributed freely to a number of historians in Latin America was the penalty which Thorning imposed because that excellent publication printed an article about the present situation of Spain.

What is the truth? In the first place, there were no such prohibitions with respect to the purchase of automobiles for clergymen in the United States during the war, because they were classified as essential workers, whether they were Catholic priests, Protestant ministers, or Jewish rabbis. Consequently, if Father Thorning had desired an automobile—and provided he could have paid the money necessary to buy it—he could have secured such a vehicle. Nevertheless, it is certain that Dr. Thorning neither sought any such permission for a car, for himself or any one else, during the war. Indeed, it is an interesting commentary on the work of this illustrious priest that he never had to buy an automobile in his life: the one he now uses was the gift of some of his one-time students from Loyola University, Chicago. These young men, now prominent in industry and in the social life of the Republic, were so grateful to Father Thorning that, in return for his helpful spiritual lessons, they volunteered their own funds to give him a new Mercury. And that took place, not during the war, but long after Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini had been defeated, as Dr. Thorning had so often predicted and announced.

It is evident that el picúo de Herminio does not know that Dr. Thorning was the first intellectual in the United States to have made a systematic and scientific analysis of nazism; that he often condemned, in unequivocal terms, the totalitarianism of fascism in Italy, in the same way that he has denounced the Soviet imperialism of Generalissimo Josef Stalin. Dr. Thorning is a well-known resident of the State of Maryland; he is a friend of President Truman; and is a trusted counselor of numerous Members of this body. In all respects and in his procedures, he is honorable and upright.

It is absolutely false to contend that Dr. Thorning had anything to do with the termination of economic aid of any kind to the Hispanic American Historical Review. Indeed, he knew nothing of such a suppression of help until he read the report in a Cuban magazine.

With respect to the transfer or dismissal of one of the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency—a citizen of the United States now resident in Cuba—this action was taken because of the employee's unethical conduct. All citizens, who are patriotic, have the right and the duty to denounce wrong conduct.

With reference to the speeches and articles of Dr. Thorning about Spain, el picúo de Herminio obviously does not know that the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 18 to 1, agreed to keep the embargo on arms to Spain in the spring of 1939. Who was the one and only Senator to vote in favor of this, his own motion, in the committee? It was Mr. Gerald P. Nye, who is no longer in the Senate, inasmuch as he was defeated in the following election.

It would be prudent for a journalist of few scruples to make a study of contemporaneous history. In this way the individual could understand that Dr. Thorning and a majority of the House Members have the right to maintain their respective points of view about Spain, as has every other person in the Western Hemisphere, or in the world.

The truth is that, with the exception of the hierarchy in the Soviet Union and Soviet satellite states, there is a growing understanding of the importance of Spain. This is a realization that is shown by the gradual reestablishment of diplomatic relations, a measure that is not only useful, but also becoming each day quite indispensable for freedom.

Abolishing Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Public Law 166 repealing the authorization for the maintenance on Swan Island of an international animal quarantine station—Eighty-first Congress, chapter 307, first session, passed as a result of the introduction of Senate bill 1105 by the junior Senator from Nevada and H. R. 3717, and the report by the Committee on Agriculture on the bill.

There being no objection, the bill and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[PUBLIC LAW 166—81ST CONG.]
[Ch. 307—1st sess.]
H. R. 3717

An act to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 633), authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain on Swan Island an international animal quarantine station, is hereby repealed.

Approved July 13, 1949.

SWAN ISLAND

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 3717):

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3717) to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to Swan Island animal-quarantine station, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill, H. R. 3717, was considered jointly with House Joint Resolution 177. Both measures have as their objective the repeal of the act of July 24, 1946, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an international animal-quarantine station on Swan Island.

Swan Island is in the Caribbean Sea (latitude 17°26′ N., longitude 83°56′ W.) and is under the sovereignty of the United States. The land on which the quarantine station is located was leased from private owners at an annual rental of $200 and buildings and equipment costing about $85,000 have been installed there. The quarantine station has not yet begun operation.

The purpose of the act of July 24, 1946, was to provide an animal quarantine station which could be used not only by the United States but also by Mexico and the Central American nations. Its essential function was to permit importation of breeding stock from all parts of the world and still to protect the United States and the North American Continent against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease and other highly infectious livestock diseases.

Since the enactment of the legislation authorizing the station, foot-and-mouth disease has become established in Mexico so that the primary reason for the quarantine station—to keep the disease off the North American Continent—no longer exists.

Representatives of the livestock industry and of the Department of Agriculture are in agreement that the establishment of the proposed quarantine station is now neither necessary nor desirable. The committee, therefore, recommends that the enabling legislation be repealed by this bill and that the Department of Agriculture proceed to dispose of its installations on Swan Island.

The committee understands that the Bureau of Animal Industry has the authority under its general appropriation to continue the lease of the site for another year, so that there will be time to dismantle and dispose of the facilities.

Arizona Refutes California Opposition Testimony Against the Central Arizona Water Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 14, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the long drawn-out testimony on H. R. 934, covering nearly 1,400 pages, is so voluminous it is difficult for Members and other interested persons to grasp all of the items involved. This lengthy testimony may be divided into three parts: first, the affirmative testimony, which was analyzed by Mr. J. H. Moeur, of Arizona, and printed in the RECORD of August 24; second, the opposition testimony, also analyzed by Mr. Moeur and appearing elsewhere in this RECORD under date of October 14; and third, the rebuttal by the supporters of the measure, which has also been summarized by Mr. Moeur. Since H. R. 934 is my bill,

designed to bring 1,200,000 acre-feet annually of Colorado River water into central Arizona, I wish to add a few words of rebuttal and refutation and then present Mr. Moeur's summary.

First, the California opposition declare that there is not 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually flowing in the Colorado River to which Arizona has a legal title. My answer is that it is a mathematical fact that there is more than that amount of water physically available to Arizona and that Arizona is legally entitled to a gross of 2,800,000 acre-feet annually of main-stream water, under the existing law of the river. If there is a question as to legal title which can only be resolved by the highest court of the Nation, then H. R. 934 must be amended as S. 75, an identical bill, was amended when reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and then any State contesting Arizona's title to what she regards as her share of the water may have its day in court.

Some of the opponents in south California have said that even if the Court should uphold the title to the water as claimed by Arizona, this project is not "economically feasible nor engineeringly sound." Let me point out that these same southern California opponents want to have the dams which are mentioned in H. R. 934 built, and furthermore that they and others will insist that the dams eventually be built, regardless of what happens to H. R. 934. Moreover, in building those dams—which soon must be built and which the opponents of my measure want built for power purposes—three-fourths of the cost incurred would be for power production alone, only a part of the estimated cost being for reclamation. Conveniently ignoring that fact, these opponents from southern California seek to becloud the issue and charge against the proposed irrigation project in Arizona the total cost of the entire project, three-fourths of which cost will be spent in any case to provide power and other benefits, even if not a drop of water is diverted into Arizona.

A third point made by the opposition is that this is an expensive irrigation project to put water on some land owned in large holdings by a few individuals and that these few will be enriched at the expense of the taxpayers. Actually, my bill provides for the work to be done by the Bureau of Reclamation, under existing reclamation law which requires small family-sized units. The 160-acre limitation has always been a part of reclamation law, and this limitation will be applied in the proposed Arizona project, just as it was applied in the eastern Washington project. In eastern Washington, hundreds of thousands of acres were owned by a few great landlords, but an antispeculation law was passed to prevent owners of vast holdings from applying water on those holdings and thus enriching themselves at public expense. So will it be in Arizona, under the reclamation law, confusing and fallacious arguments of the opponents to the contrary notwithstanding.

The opposition have tried to make it appear that because Arizona is asking for 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually, and because the Los Angeles aqueduct has capacity to carry 1,200,000 acre-feet annually, that Arizona seeks to take from Los Angeles and neighboring cities their vital water supply. Actually, the 1,200,000 acre-feet which could be conveyed to Los Angeles and nearby communities through that aqueduct is safely within California's legal share of Colorado River water, as provided in the same agreements which gave to Arizona her legal share. Arizona does not question California's right to the amount of water within the limits set in the Santa Fe Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the California Limitation Act. However, Arizona does feel that she is equally entitled to her allotment, a part of which she is now seeking, and she is confident her contentions would be upheld by the Supreme Court if and when the high court takes jurisdiction.

All parties agree that Arizona needs water and that California needs water, but it is not true that the Colorado River is California's "last water hole." However, it is tragically true that the Colorado River is Arizona's "last water hole."

Mr. Moeur's summary follows:

REBUTTAL

In rebuttal, a number of witnesses appeared in support of the bill. First, a letter was introduced by Mr. Miles, of New Mexico, from Mr. John H. Bliss, the concluding paragraph of which is pertinent (p. 819):

"New Mexico believes that there is adequate water for the central Arizona project in accordance with the terms of the Colorado River compact. It is the view of this State that, for the good of the Nation, the benefits resulting from the use of Colorado River water should be spread over as large an area as is possible and practicable. This State favors the construction of the central Arizona project."

Next, the statement of Mr. Stuart Stirling, agricultural agent of Grant County, N. Mex. This statement is an endorsement of the proposed legislation. Some questions were asked Mr. Stirling concerning the Gila River decree. Mr. Stirling, not being a lawyer, could not answer all these questions and Mr. Charles A. Carson explained to the committee the effect of this decree which was entered in the Federal court, in Arizona, at on the Gila River, explaining that this decree fixed the rights from the head of the Virden Valley down to and including the Indian reservations which are irrigated now through the San Carlos irrigation district; that this was a suit that neither the State of New Mexico nor Arizona was a party to. He emphasized that the construction of Hooker Dam in New Mexico was an integral part of the central Arizona project and that it was essential that the central Arizona project be authorized so that an exchange of water could be effected and give the upper stream users on the Gila River the right to use more of the natural flow of that river. Mr. Carson's comments were followed by the statement of Mr. John T. McMillen, president of the New Mexico Reclamation Association (pp. 833 to 838). Mr. McMillen summed up the position taken by the people he represents in the following language (p. 834):

"We are very much in favor of the whole Arizona project. We feel that those Arizona people down there should have that. We do not know all the answers, as the engineers and other people probably do. But we feel that they should have it. We also have this gentleman's agreement which was entered into at Phoenix, Ariz., by a group of individuals, including myself, that if the central Arizona project is agreed to and is approved, that the people of New Mexico and Arizona could get together and decide who should have what, and so forth."

Two other witnesses appeared before the committee following the New Mexico witnesses. These were Felix S. Cohen, associate counsel, Tribe of Hualapai (pp. 838 to 854) and Barnett E. Marks, attorney, Phoenix, Ariz. (pp. 854 to 858). These witnesses pointed out that Bridge Canyon Dam, when built, will be built on the Hualapai Reservation. They suggested some amendments to the bill that, in their opinion, would give more protection to the Indians. Their discussion was largely confined to these proposed amendments. They both admitted that the only interest the Indians had in the project arose from the fact that part of the land would be flooded by the proposed dam and another part of it would be used as a site for a construction camp. It is probable that the bill, as reported by the Senate Committee on Insular and Interior Affairs, disposes of some of the questions raised by these two witnesses.

Further witnesses appearing in support of the bill and reporting testimony offered thereto are Mr. W. W. Lane, consulting engineer, Phoenix, Ariz. (pp. 1274 to 1281). Mr. Lane's statement has heretofore been commented on fully. Mr. K. S. Wingfield, engineering consultant to the Arizona Power Authority (pp. 1265 to 1267). Mr. Wingfield, for once and all, disposed of California propaganda that Arizona wanted California power users to pay for Bridge Canyon Dam. He stated that the Arizona Power Authority had just completed a State-wide survey, which indicated that the need for power in Arizona would probably increase to the point where all firm commercial power likely to be available from Bridge Canyon would be required to meet such need. He then stated that the Arizona Power Authority had made formal application to the Secretary of the Interior for all available power from Bridge Canyon and that a copy of the application had been filed in the record of this hearing. He assured the committee that Mr. Peterson was in error when he said that Arizona would probably not be able to take the output at Bridge Canyon by the time such would be available and told the committee the Arizona Power Authority had for some time firm applications for power which greatly exceed all the available power from Parker, Davis, and Hoover, and that mechanical difficulties had been partly responsible for the delay in withdrawing Hoover energy. He pointed out other discrepancies in Mr. Peterson's statement, showing that electrical energy distributed in the State in 1930 was over 240 percent of 1920; that in 1940 it was about 200 percent of 1930; and that in 1948 was again about 240 percent of 1940—this despite discouraging of power use throughout the State (p. 1266).

Mr. Wingfield's statement was followed by the statement of Mr. Henry B. Sargent, president, Central Arizona Light & Power Co. (pp. 1267 to 1274). He pointed out that, in the year of 1949, the power load in Arizona had so increased that in order to carry that load it was necessary to operate old, inefficient and almost obsolete plants. Mr. Sargent stated that his company, and the groups that they work with, are now well aware of the fact that Arizona is in a period of rather acute power shortage (p. 1268). He detailed the present and future power requirements for Arizona; and pointed out that, in the last 5 years, the power loads in this State had doubled and that the load in his own company had doubled in the last 3 years and they are estimating only an 80-percent increase in a 10-year period in order for it to be possible for Arizona to take the entire output of the central Arizona project at Bridge Canyon Dam (pp. 1268 and 1269). He also commented on the cost of the power,

stating that the proposed price of 4.82 mills for Bridge Canyon was substantially less than it was going to cost the company to generate power in a new modern steam plant that they are now installing; that this plant was going to be operated by natural gas at the cost of 18 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, which compares with oil at a price of $1.02 a barrel; and that Mr. Peterson had stated that the cheapest price at which oil could be purchased in Los Angeles was $1.54 per barrel. He stated that, in his judgment, if the supply of oil continues to diminish on the west coast as it has in the past 10 years, that there will be an increase in the price of oil rather than a decrease. He concluded (p. 1269):

"So it is my considered judgment, first, that the distributors within the State of Arizona will be able to absorb the entire output of Bridge Canyon Dam and, second, that the price of 4.82 mills is a price at which anyone in Arizona or California would be glad to buy it at. Thank you, sir."

Mr. E. B. Debler, consulting engineer for the State of Arizona, made a very complete statement (pp. 1294 to 1303, inclusive). Mr. Debler was well known to the committee, having for many years been associated with the Bureau of Reclamation—an engineer who has made a lifetime study of the Colorado River. In this particular paper he showed the amount of water that California needed to carry through with her projects, for which she claims she has expended a half-billion dollars. He showed that these California claims contemplated a total use of 5,362,000 acre-feet per annum (p. 1294). He analyzed the potential projects in California in detail, the water needs of each, and then showed beyond doubt that they could not use beneficially the 5,362,000 acre-feet, but, that on the contrary, their total requirement, including future needs, would be as follows (p. 1301):

"The maximum water requirements would then be as follows:

	Acre-feet
"Palo Verde Valley and scattered areas	139,000
"Yuma project	31,000
"All-American Canal (Imperial and Coachella Valleys)	2,800,000
"Metropolitan water district (including San Diego authority) without reuse of sewage and without a real effort to reduce flood run-off	1,212,000
"Total	4,182,000

"The listed water requirements may well be considered the maximum needs for the authorized projects and are likely to prove to be too high for the following reasons."

A statement prepared by Mr. O. L. Norman, general manager, Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, was then introduced as part of the record (pp. 1303 to 1307). Mr. Norman, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, with 25 years' experience in engineering, construction, and management, testified in his official capacity with the water users, pointing out that this is one of the few irrigation districts that went through the depression of the early 1930's without being refinanced; that this association distributed water to 242,000 acres of land in the south-central part of Arizona; and that it is the largest single producer and distributor of electric power in the State of Arizona. He gave a detailed history of the underground water situation in that area and then, answering some of the testimony of opponents to the bill, stated (pp. 1305 and 1306):

"I've heard testimony before this committee to the effect that all the water that is needed for the entire central Arizona areas is approximately 300,000 acre-feet. As general manager of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association I can tell you that although our area comprises only about a third of the area covered by the central Arizona project we expect to apply for, purchase if allotted, and put to beneficial use approximately that much water in our own right and we are the only project in the entire area that has a substantial surface supply and are not primarily dependent upon pumping for our requirements."

He concluded his statement as follows (p. 1307):

"In summing up my remarks I request that this committee consider the following facts:

"1. We are mining our water in central Arizona.

"2. That two-thirds of the area now under cultivation is entirely dependent upon pumping from the underground for its water supply, and that the other one-third is dependent upon underground pumping for its supplemental supply.

"3. That the area is desperately in need of a supplemental supply of water from the Colorado River, otherwise thousands of acres of productive land now contributing to the general economy of the Nation will be taken out of production.

"4. That central Arizona is very conscious of water conservation and is and has been taking all steps that are practical to conserve its water supply.

"5. That statements to the effect that there is a great underground basis of water in central Arizona, which only needs tapping and pumping to supply an adequate amount of water for irrigation purposes are entirely misleading.

"6. That no simple and practical method of eradication of phreatophytes has yet been developed and that any insinuation that all we have to do is to pump the water out from under the phreatophytes to kill them off is an impractical supposition.

"7. That it is not necessary for California to spend any money for power from the Bridge Canyon development and therefore carry any of the burden of financing the central Arizona project. The utilities in central Arizona need and are ready and anxious to purchase all of the power so produced for use in Arizona.

"8. That it is more important to the economy of this country to use revenues from power sales to assist agricultural development in Arizona than it is to expend Government moneys in constructing facilities to produce low-cost power for California."

Of particular interest was the statement of Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, introduced in the record (p. 1308). Senator HAYDEN gave the complete details of authorized flood-control projects in California and Federal reclamation in California (pp. 1308 and 1309). He gave a complete history of the negotiation of the Colorado River compact and, particularly, the passage of the Boulder Canyon Act. This was first-hand information that he acquired at the time the act was before Congress. He demonstrated clearly that Members of Congress, in passing the Boulder Canyon Project Act, considered that the Gila River belonged to Arizona; that California would be limited to 4,400,000 acre-feet of allotted water plus half the surplus, and that Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico would have the use of the remainder of the allotted water and half the surplus. He emphasized the necessity of securing this water for use in central Arizona and concludes with the following statement (p. 1316):

"There is only one place to obtain the water to replenish the underground loss and to save the civilization that we have built up in central Arizona—and we say it is as fine as there is anywhere in the world—and that is to go to the Colorado River and get it.

"We claim we have a perfect title to enough water to do the job. We claim that the project is feasible, both from the angle of reimbursement as provided in this bill; and, second, that if that wealth is preserved we will continue to pay millions of dollars in taxes into the Federal Treasury and be a prosperous community.

"To deny us this relief, to simply say, 'Congress is never going to do it'—what is sure to happen? If the farmers of Arizona are convinced that there is no hope at any time, they are going to pull the pumps and leave. At least 240,000 acres of land will go back to the desert, and a quarter of a million people will have to move out of there. They would become just as much a class of displaced persons as there is anywhere in Europe. They would have to go because the entire economy of that area cannot live without water. It is a must in central Arizona, exactly as it was in central California.

"Congress never has failed to act in any case like this. Congress did not fail to act in authorizing the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. There was a large area of fine land on the eastern slope of the Rockies which ordinarily had enough water during the early part of the year. But irrigation water was wanted to finish out the crops which were lost year after year. What did Congress do? Money was provided to dig a great tunnel through the backbone of the Rocky Mountains. Power was generated and a great agricultural area was supplied with water.

"Congress has never failed in these great causes and Congress, in my judgment, is not going to fail in this instance. We ask the help of this committee that there be no failure, that we do get relief by authorizing the construction of the central Arizona project.

"I thank you."

As a part of the record, there is included a statement submitted by Mr. J. H. Moeur, which contains extracts from Senator HAYDEN'S statement (p. 1345). This statement shows California's inconsistency in asking for reclamation funds for the development of that State and opposing similar development in other States, particularly Arizona.

Mr. Charles A. Carson concluded the rebuttal for Arizona with a brief statement (p. 1325). He emphasized he did not have time to rebut in detail many of the arguments advanced by California. He placed particular stress on the fact that as far as some of the questions are concerned they are settled, and that his opinion in this matter is shared by lawyers and engineers from other States (p. 1325):

"The Utah lawyers, the Utah engineers, the Wyoming lawyers and engineers, the Colorado lawyers and Colorado engineers, and the New Mexico engineers and lawyers all agree in that brief that those two questions are now settled and that there is no necessity for a compact between California and Arizona. The only thing necessary and required is for California to live within her limitation act, and then they have no quarrel with Arizona."

He discussed somewhat in detail again the questions of III (b) water and the question of beneficial consumptive use. He quoted, in support of his position, the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Arizona* v. *California* (292 U. S.), reading from page 358. The substance of his contention is as follows (p. 1327):

"Now, on both points, then, the III (b) question and the question of how to measure beneficial consumptive use, California is defeated by the language of the Court, to which they now say they seek to return. That Court has already decided it."

He was questioned at length by Congressman ENGLE, of California, particularly with reference to Arizona's ratification of the Colorado River compact, and he summarized his position in this matter as follows (p. 1332):

"So, we are bound by the compact. We have a right under the compact and under the contract with the United States Government, and this water which we claim cannot lawfully be used in California, Mr. ENGLE,

or any other State in the basin, and not one drop can lawfully be used in California or any other State in the basin, and it is just a question if this Congress of the United States is going to permit one State to exercise a veto power against the Government of the United States and its sister States to prevent their utilization of a natural resource, which would either go to waste or go to a foreign country, and it is that simple and that clear."

Another witness to appear in support of the bill, but who perhaps should not be classified as a rebuttal witness, was Mr. E. G. Nielsen, whose testimony begins on page 1249. Mr. Nielsen is regional planning engineer, region 3, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. He explained that he appeared at the invitation of the chairman and not as a rebuttal witness, and yet he took sharp issue with some of the statements made by California witnesses, first with Mr. Elder, who he said "assumes the power of clairvoyance." He emphasized that, contrary to Mr. Elder's statement, there was no hesitancy on the part of the Bureau in making their recommendation on the project. He further commented on Mr. Matthew's testimony on the alleged inadequacy of the Bureau's cost estimates. In that connection he stated (p. 1250):

"Out of the Bureau's collective experience, we state that we have made an adequate appraisal of the cost of the central Arizona project, and we are willing to answer to Congress as to that adequacy. We are not prophets, of course, and cannot provide guaranties against the inflationary effects of world wars, as demonstrated by our experience with the Colorado-Big Thompson project cost estimates. Present costs are about 2½ times those which prevailed when those estimates were submitted to the Congress."

Further commenting on Mr. Matthew's testimony, he observed that after 11 months of study on the Bureau report, Mr. Matthew arrived at the conclusion that the requirements of Arizona could be met if 300,000 additional acre-feet of water were available. These comments were dated December 29, 1948, and, at the time Mr. Matthew testified before this committee, in the summer of 1949, he found that his estimate was 67 percent in error; and his latest conclusion was that 500,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River represented the requirement. He observed that if Mr. Matthew had given the problem detailed consideration, he would probably again revise his estimate upward (pp. 1250 and 1251).

The prepared statement of Mr. Nielsen begins on page 1252. In this prepared statement he took sharp issue with Mr. Matthew, Mr. Engle, and Mr. Peterson in the power questions, and with Mr. M. J. Dowd. His paper is a complete answer to the presentation made by the California witnesses. It is very difficult to summarize because all parts of the paper are very pertinent. He was cross-examined very sharply by Mr. POULSON, of California, but that cross-examination did not, in any way, change his presentation.

Frédéric François Chopin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a tribute to the great artist, the great patriot, the great human being, Frédéric François Chopin, who died an exile from the country he loved 100 years ago today.

Members will be interested in knowing, Mr. Speaker, that this tribute was written by someone known to many of us here on the Hill, George J. Olszewski, of New York, who as a young man was an assistant clerk in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the late and beloved South Trimble during the years 1938 to 1942. Many of you will also recall it was Mr. Olszewski who composed House Resolution 269 of the Seventy-seventh Congress on the occasion of the death of another great Polish patriot and musician, Ignace Jan Paderewski, in which the House of Representatives conveyed its expression of sympathy to the grief-stricken Polish Nation and Polish people throughout the world. I wish I could claim Mr. Olszewski as a constituent because of his deep knowledge of Chopin's life and music, but at least I can say that he has many friends and relatives among the splendid Americans of Polish ancestry who live in my immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Olszewski has so well performed his self-appointed task of paying tribute to this great exponent of human freedom and dignity that there is nothing I can add, save to say that I adopt his words as mine, and join in expressing the hope that the time again will come when the unhappy land of Poland will have a truly free and democratic government again.

FRÉDÉRIC FRANÇOIS CHOPIN

(By George Olszewski)

One hundred years ago today on October 17, 1849, a devoted son of Poland died in exile in Paris. His beloved land was then dominated by the Russians and other occupying forces, as it is dominated today by the Communists. This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense patriot but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by occupation forces. He devoted his life to the perpetuation of the spirit of freedom, liberty, and independence. For more than a century the voice of this patriot had inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of bloodshed and brutal occupation. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frédéric François Chopin.

Born in the tiny Polish village of Zelazowa-Wola near Warsaw on February 22, 1810, Chopin was forced into exile in his youth by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Chopin found safe haven in Paris, where he continued to live and to compose in the freedom which France has traditionally extended to the persecuted of all nations. In exile Chopin was kept informed by family and friends of the dire plight of his native land. Throughout his life a goblet of Polish earth remained in Chopin's room to remind him of his origin. He breathed into his music the undying love of an exile for his homeland.

Despite the racking pain of pulmonary disorders and financial difficulties, Chopin's genius and intense patriotism gave him no respite from the unceasing demands of creative inspiration. Although the oppressors used every means at their disposal to destroy Polish culture and decimate the race, Chopin's music spoke for Poland when that nation had no audible spokesman in the civilized Christian world. His entire life was devoted to the preservation of Polish nationality and ideals.

Throughout the intense 39 years of his life, the voice of Chopin's music rose as a hymn to liberty. It swept from his tiny cell on the island of Majorca in the Mediterranean. It spread throughout France, England, and all of continental Europe. It penetrated the most remote corners of his native land to plague the oppressors.

The occupation forces sought to suppress the compelling, arousing voice of Chopin's music. The Germans forbade its playing; the Russians crashed his piano into the streets of Warsaw. But the jangled crashing of Chopin's piano became transmuted into the noble strains of the Revolutionary Etude itself. What a supreme weapon. The voice of Chopin could not be silenced, for music was the weapon beyond compare. The oppressors could not grasp it; they could not silence it; they could not tear it from the hearts of a people seeking liberty.

Throughout the years this vital weapon has retained its mystic potency. During World War I and again when pagan hordes invaded Poland in World War II, it was the music of Chopin which majestically sounded the call to battle from the Warsaw radio and triumphantly led the resistance. Throughout the bitter struggle which followed, Polish sons and daughters were inspired to untold feats of heroism. They rose from prisons and concentration camps; from hidden caves and dugouts in the woods; from the sewers, rubble and ruins of Polish cities. They struck a last blow for Polish independence to the penetrating, commanding, and awe-inspiring themes of the Polonaise Militaire. Chopin's music symbolized the united response of a nation which resisted the onslaughts of its oppressor.

NATIONALISM AND ROMANTICISM

What were the dominating influences which molded such a significant Polish spirit into Chopin's music? How did this frail genius succeed in portraying the vital spirit of a nation in chains? What were the driving forces of his soul? Perhaps the answer can be found in an examination of the era in which Chopin grew up in Poland.

It may be recalled that the nineteenth century in Europe was an era of political and intellectual ferment. The success of the American and French Revolutions in the last quarter of the eighteenth century had aroused a new spirit of nationalism which swept across Europe, influencing not only the political life of the Continent but also literature, art, and music.

Poland by this time had gone through the agonies of three partitions—the first in 1772 between Prussia and Austria; the second in 1793 between Prussia and Russia; and the final, or third, between all of the partitioning powers in 1795. By the Treaty of Tilsit of 1802, however, the Duchy of Warsaw had been reconstituted as a source of manpower for his armies by Napoleon, whose star was then sweeping Europe. With his defeat and retreat from Moscow in 1812, the Duchy of Warsaw perished. Under the terms of the final act of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Poland was definitively partitioned between Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

In a vain attempt to win the Poles to her side, Russia set up the congress kingdom in Poland in 1815 under a Russian Constitution. Warsaw was its center. Diametrically opposed to the liberal principles of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1795, however, this final act brought about a wave of intense nationalism and rebellion throughout Poland. It culminated in the ill-fated Polish uprising of 1830, so brutally suppressed by the Russians. The end was not far off. The year 1831 marked the total occupation of Warsaw by the Russians and the complete extinction of Poland as an independent political entity. In 1832 Warsaw was declared to be an integral part of the Russian Empire.

These events were but part of a long series of attempts to subjugate the Poles. The policy of the occupation powers was the decimation of the Polish race and the extinction of Polish thought and culture. In 1832, for instance, 50,000 volumes of the library of the Society of the Friends of Knoweldge, founded by the Polish historian, Tadeusz Czaski and several contemporaries, was carried off to St. Petersburg (now Leningrad).

Polish literature had by this time entered the so-called third period or era of romanticism. It had been ushered in by the appearance of the great Polish poet Mickiewicz in 1822, who, together with his contemporaries Slowacki and Krazinski, formed the triumvirate of Polish thought of the period.

Chopin was the only world-renowned Polish composer of this era who reflected the new thought and spirit of romanticism in Poland. His development was marked by a militant spirit in his music and the evolution of new and daring styles and revolutionary techniques of his compositions. This won for him the wrath of the die-hards of his day, the admiration of the concert-goers, and the undying devotion of the Polish masses.

HIS SOUL WAS MUSIC

Chopin's music was, therefore, the poetic echo of the era. His subtle, passionate, at times violent themes became the basis of his claim to lasting musical fame. Throughout his compositions the simple folk rhythms of the Polish countryside, as well as the more subtle dances of the Warsaw salons, are heard. The themes of the mazurka, the krakowiak, the polonaise, and of ancient Polish songs abound in Chopin's music. He gave them a dignity and hitherto unknown majesty. It was his great creative genius which enabled him to weave into his compositions a pattern which expressed the nationalistic longings of his sorrowful nation.

The militant nationalistic spirit is but one facet of the genius of Chopin. He speaks not only for the physically and spiritually oppressed of his own nation but for all humanity. His music carries a message of spiritual tranquillity to the oppressed of all nations, for its appeal is varied—to some it may be emotional or spiritual, to others artistic and intellectual. All agree, however, on its benign influence, for the power of Chopin's compositions stems from the very foundation of music which is an expression of life itself. It stems from the forces of creation and the depths of the human soul. His music lives in the breath of the wind, in the murmur of the forests, and in the flow of the rivers. It lies in the very blood of our veins reflecting every sensation of joy, grief, sorrow, happiness, anguish, delusion, and ecstacy which grips the heart and soul of man. The melodies of Chopin's music flow unbroken across the starry pathways of the sky. They flow unbroken above the range of human speech and sweep the entire universe.

Chopin's music shall live on through the endless eons of time, its voice shall carry his message to countless unborn generations. As the heroes of the past have fought for their precious ideals and inherent rights, may Chopin's clarion message inspire the generations of the future.

In closing, let us pause a minute to recall the words of another heroic Pole. Speaking at the opening ceremonies of the Chopin Centenary Festival in Poland in 1910, the great Ignace Paderewski said:

"Here, at this moment, there rises amid us, above us, the radiant spirit of one who was. What light, what valor, what energy were his. What strength of endeavor he showed in the midst of suffering. Through trouble and affliction, through heartache, through creative pain, he marked to his country's glory the burning trace of his existence. By a bloodless fight on the plains of peace, he assured the victory of Polish thought.

"Blessed be the past, the great, the sacred past, which brought him forth."

Therefore, on this memorable day when we commemorate the death and enduring spirit of Frédéric François Chopin, let us pray that his noble spirit and undying love for his native Poland may continue to inspire and to guide the good fight for the freedom and independence from all foreign yokes and ideologies of a truly Christian and democratic Polish Nation. May its leaders see the light and be guided by the most sacred symbols of its past.

"As a Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Military Head of the United States Air Force, I Believe the Public Is Entitled to Assurance as to the Care, the Thoroughness and Soundness With Which Strategic Decisions Are Worked Out as Well as to the Adequacy of the Weapons With Which the Country's Armed Forces Are Provided"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental cause of the Army-Navy-Air controversy with respect to their respective roles and missions, together with the question raised as to the value of strategic bombing and the efficacy of the atom bomb, becomes more puzzling with each passing day.

Nothing that I have ever read expresses the relevant facts in such simple, understandable language than does the testimony of the Honorable Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, before the House Armed Services Committee.

We have heard a lot about the strategic bombing program to be carried out by our Air Force through operation of the land-based, long-range, intercontinental B–36 bomber dropping atom and other types of bombs. Some testimony was offered before the committee that the use of the B–36 and the atom bomb for such purpose was immoral. I hold a strongly dissenting viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, war itself is immoral, and why condemn the marvelous B–36 and the atom bomb. I, for one, am pleased to learn that if any enemy of this Nation—and the American way of life—should ever attack us, that within a matter of but minutes our Air Force men in a great B–36, loaded with death and destruction, would be riding high in the heavens straight to all enemy targets, there to pulverize and cripple their every railroad, munition plant, armament factory, concentrated troop headquarters, communication, bridgehead, and every other vulnerable point, and render them impotent to make successful attack upon us in these United States.

It would be sheer folly to let them bring the war—with its death and destruction—to our own shores.

Mr. Speaker, what I was pleased to learn from General Vandenberg's testimony was that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a group created by this Congress when it passed the National Security Act of 1947, and made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army, United States Navy, and the United States Air Force, and the Chairman of that Joint Staff, appointed by the President, are the ones who have the prime authority to determine all points which should immediately become the targets for those two great national weapons that have done so much to secure the defense of this Nation today—the B–36 long-range bomber and the atom bomb.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, I was agreeably surprised to learn that these great national weapons have long since been placed not under the service orders of the United States Air Force itself but under interservice orders emanating from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, the strategic air command, as disclosed by General Vandenberg's testimony before the Armed Services Committee, is the only command charged with the strategic bombing by our Air Force and that command is a major command of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Moreover, it receives its directives solely from the Joint Chiefs and not from the Chief of the Air Force alone.

Thus it becomes apparent that the national strategic plans for the defense and security of our beloved country are not worked out on any lone-wolf basis as has been implied.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time which has been allotted to me for discussion of this very vital question, I shall not be able to discuss the same at any great length.

In fact I have reached conclusion that no man could more thoroughly present the true picture to the Members of this Congress and to the people of these United States and the world than has that great American, battle-trained and seasoned veteran of modern air warfare, the young, vigorous, far-seeing, heroic, respected and distinguished Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg.

Mr. Speaker, his statement, which I now present as an extension of my own remarks for insertion in the RECORD, constitutes a saga that should be read not alone by the Members of this body, but by all Americans.

The statement was as follows:

TESTIMONY OF GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before this committee for the second time with some concern, and yet I feel that it is proper and necessary that I should do so. I believe that, both as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as the military head of the United States Air Force, I should appear for two overriding reasons: First, to give certain assurance to the American public; and, second, to answer any questions which may lie in the minds of the members of this committee as representatives of the people.

The public is entitled to receive assurances as to the care and thoroughness with which strategic decisions are worked out, as to the soundness of the decisions made, and as to the adequacy of the weapons with which the country's armed forces are provided.

I. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT AS A MEANS OF ASSURING FULL EXPRESSION OF VIEWS, THOUGHTFUL DELIBERATION, AND CAREFUL DECISION ON IMPORTANT MILITARY ISSUES

In matters of strategy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff hold the position of primary authority. That is the law, and I believe it to be sound. Each of these Chiefs has the assistance of his own service staff, his own choice among the best minds in his service. Within any one service there are bound to be conflicts of views and it is well that this should be so. Your committee may have most vividly in mind certain conflicts in the Naval Service in view of testimony within the last 2 weeks; but I recall to you that in the first phase of these hearings it appeared that there were conflicts of views in the Air Force, particularly in the years 1947 and 1948—conflicts which were studied and then resolved.

Furthermore, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a national military body, has available to it the services of the Joint Staff, a group created by the National Security Act of 1947, and comprising substantially equal numbers of officers from the three services. Every shade and variation of military viewpoint has its opportunity for expression in the Joint Staff. All views cannot prevail. Decisions must be made. But it is important for the country to realize that this is an interservice body with free opportunity for expression and evaluation of ideas. It is insurance against ill-considered judgments which might not take account of important factors. The Joint Staff operated for 2 years under the direction of Major General Gruenther, of the United States Army, and is now operating under the direction of Rear Admiral Davis, of the United States Navy. As an Air Force officer, I testify to the demonstrated ability of both of these officers of sister services to broaden his scope from service thinking to national thinking.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have available to them the guidance of the Research and Development Board and its group of agencies and committees. This Board is headed by one of the country's great scientists, Dr. Karl T. Compton, and it comprises able officers of all three services who have full access to all information relating to problems of research and development. One of the agencies now operating under the combined sponsorship of the Research and Development Board and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, of which much has been said in these hearings. This group also comprises officers of all three services. Its director is Lieutenant General Hull, of the United States Army, and the director of its scientific staff is Dr. Philip W. Morse, who, before his appointment, had already served his country well as Chief of the Operational Research Group on Antisubmarine Warfare in the Navy Department.

The Munitions Board does not have heavy responsibilities on the matters with which this committee has been dealing, but it too is a three-service organization under civilian direction.

I state these well-known facts to remind the committee that the Military Establishment provides balanced representation of all the services. It is so constructed as to insure careful professional examination and reexamination of issues of strategy and the weapons to implement strategy.

II. NATIONAL AND INTERALLIED STRATEGIC PLANS, PARTICULARLY WITH REFERENCE TO THE ATOMIC BOMB

As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is my duty to consider, in collaboration with my three colleagues, the strategic plans for the defense of the country. In my previous testimony before this committee, I invited your attention to the agreement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff upon the strategic concept. At that time I quoted you the following sentence, which I here repeat:

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff separately and jointly are of the firm opinion that the concept of strategic bombing, and the extent of its employment as now planned, are sound."

During the past 2 weeks, however, I have heard testimony to the effect that this strategic concept is unsound and that it is based on inadequate evaluation of incomplete information.

I therefore find it necessary to invite your attention to two other paragraphs of the same Joint Chiefs of Staff document:

"Since the passage of the National Security Act greater emphasis has been placed on joint development of strategic studies and on planning for the national defense. As these studies have been completed, they have been scrutinized by each of the three services and have been agreed to only after most careful analysis. The results of our analysis confirm our opinion that present plans offer the most effective methods of securing our national defense from the standpoint of loss of life, expenditure of national resources, and the ability of the Nation to provide support forces in being which will be capable of maintaining the United States in a position to defend itself successfully."

Continuing from the same document:

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff and their joint boards and committees have been and are continuously exploring all significant weapons and weapons systems. As an essential part of this program, all aspects of strategic air operations will continue to be under constant examination and review. Under present circumstances exploitation of our advantage in atomic weapons is dependent on a strategic air campaign. Failure to provide adequate means to assure our ability to utilize these weapons effectively would not be in keeping with the requirements of our national security."

In these hearings it has been repeatedly suggested that strategic bombardment is an Air Force concept and an Air Force plan. Originally this was true. But it evolved from an Air Force plan to a national and international plan almost as soon as the bombs had fallen on Pearl Harbor. It was the plan of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. It was the plan of the wartime Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff. It was the plan out of which grew the enormous and costly national effort in the development and manufacture of the atomic bomb. It was the plan against Germany and the plan against Japan. After the most thorough evaluation which any military operation has ever received—an evaluation by an exclusively civilian body reporting to the President of the United States—it is a significant factor in planning for the troubled period in which we find ourselves as an aftermath of World War II. It was the plan under Secretary Forrestal. It is the current national plan.

Moreover, this national weapon has been placed under interservice orders. The Strategic Air Command, the only agency charged with strategic bombing by the Air Force, is a major command of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It receives its directives from the Joint Chiefs, not from the Air Force. Its targets and target systems are selected by the Joint Chiefs as part of national war plans.

Our national strategic plans are not worked out on a lone-wolf basis. The free peoples of western Europe are working with us in increasingly close cooperation. We have made common cause with these friendly countries in preventing the outbreak of a war or defeating an aggressor if a war should start. The dread of war is even more acute to them than to us due to the devastation they have suffered in two wars in this century and their geographical nearness to the possible aggressor. No informed person doubts that Mr. Winston Churchill spoke the mind of the European democracies when he said:

"I must not conceal from you the truth as I see it. It is certain that Europe would have been communized and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States."

Witnesses have here recommended that we cancel out this country's capability of conducting a strategic offensive with atomic weapons. Adoption of this proposal would, in my judgment, destroy the one greatest equalizing factor in the balance of military power between a potential enemy and the western democracies and could only be received with contempt or despair by those who have joined together for common defense.

III. "ALL EGGS IN ONE BASKET"

When this committee was investigating the allegations of dishonesty which were raised by the anonymous document of Mr. Worth, I presented to you the composition of the Air Force and described in some detail our organization. This was done for the purpose of demonstrating the inaccuracy of the oft-repeated report that we were "putting all our eggs in one basket." However, in the last 2 weeks, reference to "all our eggs in one basket" has been made repeatedly before this committee and in the press. It appears necessary, therefore, that I demonstrate in greater detail what the facts are in the case.

First, I will give a comparison on the basis of aircraft. The Strategic Air Command has assigned to it a total of 942 aircraft. In addition to its bombers of all types, this figure includes 132 tankers, 96 reconnaissance aircraft, 150 fighters, and 24 transports. The remaining tactical groups and squadrons of the Air Force, including MATS, operate 2,304 aircraft. Thus, the Strategic Air Command operates only 29 percent of the combat and combat support aircraft of the Regular Air Force. Only 5 percent are B–36's.

The Air National Guard, which is an essential part of our M-day force, consists wholly of tactical aviation and air-defense units. The 27 Air National Guard groups operate 2,258 aircraft. Hence, of the total M-day force, the Strategic Air Command, on the basis of assigned aircraft, represents less than 20 percent, and the B–36 component only 3 percent.

There are four major Air Force commands and the Military Air Transport Service, the missions of which are air defense and/or the support of all three services. The total strength of these commands is approximately 160,000 personnel, or 38 percent of the over-all strength of the Air Force. On the other hand, the Strategic Air Command has a personnel strength of 65,000, or 16 percent of the over-all strength of the Air Force. The B–36 units themselves contain 17,715 personnel, or only 4 percent of the over-all strength of the Regular Air Force. These facts, together with those presented by the Secretary of the Air Force, will, I hope, finally put an end to these assertions of unbalance and over-emphasis—of "putting all our eggs in one basket."

IV. THE SUGGESTION FOR CURTAILING LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC AVIATION AND CONCENTRATING ON TACTICAL AIR UNITS: WHAT THE NATION WOULD GIVE UP AND WHAT IT WOULD GET IN RETURN

You have heard statements made here that the long-range strategic bombardment force is of no value as a national weapon; that attacks on the industrial heart of a country are of doubtful effectiveness, at best, and that they should be made only at short range. You have heard recommendations that we place less emphasis on strategic bombardment and devote more resources to tactical aviation—fighters, fighter bombers, and light bombers of relatively short range and relatively small load capacity, designed mainly

for the attack on enemy troops and their supporting aircraft.

It is important that the implications of this suggested change be pointed out, as no one of these witnesses has undertaken to do. If we should decide to make this change, here are the things that we would give up:

First, we would give up the deterrent value of this country's atomic weapons and we would place ourselves in disagreement with all of those people who, on both sides of the ocean, believe that Soviet aggression is in fact now being deterred.

Second, we would inform the Russians that they need now take no defensive measures against a possible atomic attack on their heartland. Much has been said here about an enemy capability of stopping bomber attacks. They can locate the bombers with a radar screen, it is said. They can put thousands of jet fighters into the air and shoot them down, it is said. Their guided missiles defending their cities can hit them if the fighters do not, it is said. The people who have said these things seem not to realize that B–36's, B–47's, and B–50's by merely existing can and do force the Soviet Union to channel its industrial power, technological skill, manpower, and money into purely defensive measures and thus cut down resources which could otherwise be devoted to offensive purposes. Let me remind the committee that the reason why our enormous troop concentrations in the United Kingdom were never disturbed by German bombers, the reason why our invasion of western Europe was not inhibited by a German bombing force was, in large part, that the strategic offensive conducted by the allied air forces compelled German aircraft production to be channeled into fighters—a purely defensive allocation of war-making power. Let us apply that lesson to the present situation. It cannot be disputed that our strategic bombing force would push any possible enemies into serious defensive preparations. Do those who propose to cancel out that force relish the thought that these resources required for defensive measures should be channeled into offensive enterprises aimed at western Europe and at us?

Third, if war is forced upon us this proposal deprives us of the opportunity of choking off enemy warmaking power at its source. It brings it about that the enemy's weapons have to be met and destroyed by our soldiers and tactical airmen while these weapons are shooting at them. It eliminates the possibility of destroying these weapons in the production stage before they can shoot.

And what is the alternative presented by the curtailment of long-range strategic bombing and the concentration of our effort on tactical aviation? It is this: Tactical aviation supports ground troops and ground divisions. Is it proposed that we build and maintain a standing army capable of meeting the masses of an enemy army on the ground in equal man-to-man, body-to-body, gun-to-gun combat? This alternative offers us the prospect of a wholly defensive war. We wait until we are attacked. Then we undertake to hold the masses of enemy troops on the ground. Finally, if we seek victory, we undertake to provide the ground force power to press the enemy back into his homeland until he gives up—and in this we might be following the fairly unattractive example of Napoleon and Hitler.

Mr. Chairman, this alternative is militarily unsound. A prime objective of this country must be to find a counterbalance to the potential enemy's masses of ground troops other than equal masses of American and allied ground troops. No such balancing factor exists other than strategic bombing, including the atomic bomb. Only by that method can these masses of ground troops be weakened at the source of hostile military power.

Lest this statement be again tortured into a declaration that strategic bombardment can win a war alone, let me restate my belief that, if a future war comes, ultimately it must be concluded on the ground, like most of the wars of the past. But it is the objective of the strategic bombardment program—an objective which has been proved in battle—so to weaken the sustaining sources of enemy troops that they can be defeated in less time at less cost.

V. THE CAPABILITIES OF THE B–36 AS A STRATEGIC BOMBER

This committee and the country have heard assertions during the last 2 weeks that the B–36 cannot do its job. These assertions have been repeated by witness after witness in carefully organized presentations on which, as we are informed, a task force has been working for months. The assertions have been made categorically and dogmatically. None of the witnesses was beset by doubts—none appeared troubled by the fact that substantially all of the professionals in this type of operation held an exactly contrary view. But when all is said and done, what you have received is nothing but a series of assertions.

I think the country should know that the officers who are in charge of the strategic bombing program—the 4 groups of B–36's and the 11 groups of other types of bombers—have heard these assertions again and again, have examined into them with professional diligence and care as they apply to any possible war we might fight, and have concluded that the assertions are unfounded. The men who have arrived at that conclusion are the most experienced men in the world in conducting long range bombing operations, escorted and unescorted, in all conditions of weather and enemy opposition.

I think that I too must stand up and be counted. My war experience was largely in tactical air operations. I was assigned to a big bomber unit at one time during World War II, but my principal command responsibility was for tactical aviation and I am convinced of the great importance of tactical aviation in its proper function and its proper timing.

The unsupported assertions that the task of the B–36 is impossible will not force me into the position of stating that it is easy. It is in fact difficult in the same sense that all military tasks in the face of the enemy are difficult.

I have considered the questions as to the capabilities of our strategic bombers and I have arrived at the clear conclusion that they can do their job. As the professional military head of the United States Air Force I so assure the country and so declare to the world, especially to our friends.

I further assure you that the confidence of myself and of my senior officers in this matter is not complacency. As I have stated before, we are constantly laboring to improve the equipment and the tactics with which this job may have to be done. There is no sentimental attachment to any aircraft and, as has been abundantly proved, no personal or political attachment to any aircraft manufacturer. Newer, faster aircraft will be brought forward just as quickly as our most strenuous efforts and the appropriations with which we are supplied will permit.

This process of assertion and counter-assertion cannot fail to confuse and deeply disturb the public. I am sure that the public realizes that we of the Air Force must resist the temptation to describe publicly and in detail our equipment, our tactics, our knowledge of the resources and weaknesses of a potential enemy, and other matters upon which our military success may depend. I am sure the public realizes that these matters must be evaluated by professional bodies under the strictest safeguards of secrecy. But there may be certain matters, already in the field of public knowledge, to which I should call attention by way of relieving fears which the public might now reasonably have.

The public should recall an historic fact: No bombing mission set in motion by the Army Air Force in World War II was ever stopped short of its target by enemy opposition. This includes small missions and big missions, escorted and unescorted missions, missions against Germany, and missions against Japan. We want the missions to be big if that is possible. We want them to be escorted if that is possible. But when they start out they have never been stopped, even by enemies who had long experience in trying to stop them.

The public should take the glib and positive assertions that have been made before this committee and put these statements beside known facts or contrary statements. As an example, you have heard it testified with great conviction that the atomic bomb is not so fearsome a weapon, with certain details involving the runway at National Airport. Fortunately, the facts on this matter have been so much matters of public interest and are so well documented in professional literature that the positive young man who made this assertion was quickly corrected.

Many of the statements that have been made are in the same category.

Radar detection of attacking bombers is no novelty to us; during the last war we developed tactics and equipment designed to baffle detecting systems, and we have carried this much further by continued tests and developments.

It is no news that fighters fly faster and higher than bombers; it has always been true, and bombing missions have always got through. We spend a great deal of time in analyzing the types of tactics that can be made on various aircraft and then devising means to frustrate or defeat these attacks.

It is no news that it is difficult to bomb from high altitudes; but we are engaged in constant improvement of visual and radar bombing methods, and recent tests have established to my satisfaction that necessary accuracy can be consistently attained.

To summarize: In the performance of my official responsibilities I wish to assure the American people that in the strategic bomber force, as it exists and as its development is planned, they have an instrument which can do the job assigned to it. I further assure them that the Air Force has no complacency within it and is constantly laboring at improving its weapons and techniques.

VI. CERTAIN EFFECTS OF THESE HEARINGS

As these hearings approach their end—hearings which are, I believe, without precedent, not only in the manner in which they were induced, but in the nature of the subject matter and the opinions that have been spread before those who would destroy us—I am led to the belief that this committee should consider the effect the hearings have had upon the security of the country. Freedom of speech and freedom to petition the Congress are enshrined in our constitutional system. Yet, the fact that regulations as to military security exist, and that there are criminal statutes imposing penalties upon the disclosure of military secrets indicate that these freedoms are not unlimited, particularly as regards those members of the armed services who are entrusted with what we call classified information. The reconciliation of those freedoms with the military security of the country is for the legislature to decide. This is a difficult problem which cannot have failed to present itself to any thinking person who has followed this extraordinary episode. As a military man I do not presume to offer an answer. But as a citizen I cannot refrain from stating the question and underscoring its importance.

In honesty I must state that the current episode has shaken the military establishment. Serious problems of official and personal relationships have been added to the serious military problems with which we were already faced. But there is one final assurance that I wish to give to this committee: Nothing which has occurred in these hearings will in any way diminish the determination of the Air Force to cooperate effectively with its two sister services in providing for this country the greatest possible military security.

A Report to Milwaukeeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT TO MILWAUKEEANS

During recent weeks, it has been my pleasure to get back to Wisconsin's largest city and to report to its people. I have had the opportunity to attend many State conventions held in Milwaukee as well as to speak before many purely Milwaukee gatherings. It has been a particular pleasure to be back in this city which has always been a pride of the State and the Nation in health, sanitation, police protection, safety, and many other wholesome civic standards.

MILWAUKEE'S 20,000 JOBLESS

Naturally, those of us who are deeply interested in Milwaukee's future are following very closely its serious unemployment reports. Right now, around 20,000 Milwaukeeans are jobless. We know moreover that Milwaukee is very sensitive to upswings and downshifts in national production and employment. Why? Because Milwaukee is mainly a manufacturing city. Over 40 percent of the workers in Milwaukee County have manufacturing jobs of some kind.

In fact, the Wisconsin State Employment Service lists some 362,000 folks in the labor force in Milwaukee, wholly aside from agricultural workers. Of those 362,000 workers, 167,000 are engaged in manufacturing. In turn, 48,000 of those workers are in machinery and allied industries, 20,000 are in the food industry, 17,000 in transportation equipment, and so on down the line. There are 68,000 workers engaged in wholesale and retail trade, 29,000 in the service industries, 27,000 in utilities. It is our task to protect those jobs and to assure continued high income for this great city.

FIGHTING FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

How are we going to do that? Well, in part Congress can help. As Milwaukeeans know, I have been striving to get action on the St. Lawrence seaway which has been cooped up in a hostile Foreign Relations Subcommittee. This great project could be of immense aid in protecting and increasing Milwaukee jobs. Another front on which we have been active is to increase package-freight shipping on the Great Lakes, thus helping to utilize further the great port facilities of this mighty city.

Among other bills that I have introduced and of interest to Milwaukeeans is S. 2574, to establish a national air academy at Billy Mitchell Field. This would be in honor of the great Wisconsin aviation martyr and pioneer whose home was in Wisconsin's largest city.

Still another bill, this time of deep interest to the 16,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in Milwaukee is my Emblem Day bill, Senate Joint Resolution 62, in honor of the great American eagle, symbol of the FOE and symbol too of our entire American way of life. This bill has already passed the United States Senate and is pending before a House Judiciary Committee.

MY EFFORTS FOR NUISANCE-TAX REDUCTION

Other legislation which I am pushing is designed to cut nuisance excise taxes on jewelry, cosmetics, furs, theater admissions, union dues, and hundreds of other items on which the average Milwaukeean has to pay through the nose when he goes to the store.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

In talking to Milwaukeeans I have found these among the major topics of our conversation in addition to the question of aid for housing, social security for old folks, aid to the schools.

Moreover, folks ask: "What is Congress going to do about displaced-persons legislation?" As Milwaukeeans know, I have been striving to amend the present inadequate displaced-persons law. A new version of the law was passed by the House of Representatives but is stymied in the Senate. If we succeed in passing it in 1950, we will facilitate the admission of heroic veterans of the Polish Army, of thousands of folks of German ethnic origin, as well as groups representing other nationalities, all of whom can make an important contribution to Wisconsin's and the Nation's future. All American church, farm, labor, and business groups have endorsed this displaced-persons legislation and sentiment for it is particularly strong in Milwaukee.

Milwaukee is interested, too, in the funds which the Federal Government has appropriated for advance planning of public works designed to take up any slack which might develop in Milwaukee, and they are interested in a wide variety of other foreign and domestic bills.

LETTERS AND REQUESTS TO SENATOR WILEY INVITED

I hope that I may be hearing from the folks who read this report. It is always a pleasure to get their reactions. If any of my readers would like to read a sample issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for example, I hope that they will not hesitate to drop a note to my office, room 427, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. After all, I am in Washington to serve the citizens of Milwaukee and every other citizen of the Badger State.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARDIE SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I delivered in Philadelphia, Pa., at memorial services on the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. This great son of Poland and hero of the American war for independence will live forever in the minds and hearts of liberty-loving people everywhere.

We honor Gen. Casimir Pulaski not only because of his zeal, his skill, and his courage as a soldier. We honor him not only because of his military exploits, and his contribution to the history of Poland and of the United States. Most of all, we honor this great patriot of Poland and this great friend of the United States because of his unselfish devotion to the cause of freedom.

To the cause of freedom he dedicated his life. For the cause of freedom he gave his life. To liberty-loving people everywhere he has come to be known as the great soldier of liberty.

In this grave hour of world uncertainty and confusion, there is much about the life of Casimir Pulaski that should give us inspiration and renewed courage.

He was born more than 200 years ago. While October 11 is the anniversary of his death, he is still living. He lives today in the minds and hearts of the brave people of Poland who are under the yoke of Russian Communists. He lives today in the minds and hearts of all of us who believe in freedom as man's inalienable right.

The facts about General Pulaski's life are so well known that they hardly need repetition. But they cannot be repeated too often as we seek to hold high the torch of liberty in a world struggle against the steady march of Russian enslavement.

While he was born to great wealth and a noble station in life, he inherited from his father, Joseph, a burning desire for freedom, freedom for his native land from the oppressive yoke of Russian domination. As you know, he served with his father in 1769 in the rebellion against King Stanislas who had been put on the throne of Poland by Catherine the Great. Against the greatest of odds—without adequate organization, resources, and men to bear arms—these patriots joined in a movement to free their native land from Russian control.

From that day until his death, Casimir Pulaski allowed no thoughts of personal comfort, ambition or romance to interfere with his great inspiration of serving liberty. While his older brother took over the diplomatic and political aspects of the freedom movement, General Pulaski busied himself with military affairs.

In a guerrilla warfare against the enemies of his beloved country, his fame as a skilled soldier spread throughout Europe. Again and again his meager troops were forced to fight against overwhelming odds. He was faced with the never ending task of securing more men and more supplies. But he never lost heart or despaired of final victory for the restoration of liberty to his country.

But day by day the Russian, Prussian, and Austrian troops cut deeper into the country. And day by day the field of operations for Pulaski and his patriots grew smaller and smaller.

Finally, recognizing that he was surrounded and that there were no sources of supply available for him and his men, he was obliged to make a momentous decision. It was whether to make a last desperate stand in battle with the enemy and face extermination, or to disband his loyal followers that they might later reorganize to carry on the fight for liberty. Pulaski made a bold and courageous decision to leave Poland for the purpose of seeking foreign aid. After preparing the plans with his followers to seek that much-needed aid from other countries, Pulaski prepared a farewell order to his troops and left in the belief that he could rush aid for Poland's fight for freedom. But he was destined never to return to his native Poland.

First he turned to Prussia. Then he spent several years trying to persuade Turkey to

attack Russia, but in all his endeavors he was unsuccessful. His heart must have been heavy. He had seen his family decimated by war. His father and one of his brothers were dead. Another brother was in captivity. Countless relatives had been slain on the field of battle. His estates had been ravaged and he found himself a penniless wanderer in exile.

Casimir Pulaski paid a heavy price for his devotion to freedom. But from that devotion, however great the price, he never once wavered.

Finally he decided to go to France, and late in 1775 he reached Paris, where he met that great Philadelphian, Benjamin Franklin, in whose heart, too, burned the cause of liberty for his native country. Instinctively recognizing in Pulaski his great devotion to the cause of freedom, Franklin gave him a letter to General Washington, and in 1777 Pulaski came to the United States to join the Army of the new American Republic.

In many respects, the problems which confronted Washington, in the lack of men, supplies and organization, were the same problems that had confronted Pulaski in his fight for liberty in Poland. Many of the trained professional soldiers from Europe who were offering their services to the United States complained bitterly of these difficulties with untrained troops and meager supplies.

But Casimir Pulaski understood. What did it matter if the men did not march in faultless precision and did not have conventional military uniforms with fancy markings? From his experience in Poland he knew that the important thing was devotion to the cause.

At first Pulaski held no official rank or commission in the American Army, but in spite of this lack of recognition, he joined the continental troops on the battlefield. On September 11, 1777, he distinguished himself for his resourcefulness and courage in the Battle of the Brandywine, just about 25 miles from where we are this evening, in Delaware County. Four days later Congress voted him a commission as brigadier general and "commander of the horse," or the light dragoons as they were then known.

With the Americans retreating and the British General Howe entering Philadelphia in triumph, it required a trained soldier and a diplomat to reorganize the little material at hand and discipline the men to create an efficient cavalry force. It was a heartbreaking task. But Pulaski set himself to it with his customary vigor and determination.

As winter approached, Washington and his small army were encamped at Whitemarsh, just outside the limits of Philadelphia. Washington had planned to winter his troops in our great city, but the British had beaten him to the draw and got here first.

The great question then arose with Washington and his staff whether to continue to give battle or go into winter quarters. Pulaski opposed stopping operations during the winter. Here again he acted in accordance with his own experience in Poland. In winter warfare he had distinguished himself. He had found that in the winter months he could do much damage to a superior force with only a small band of men by the simple device of surprising the enemy, striking quick and hard, and disappearing like magic. But in this idea of winter operations, Pulaski was overruled by Washington's council of war, which decided to winter at Valley Forge. And so Pulaski and his troops marched with the Continental Army—many barefooted and partly clothed—from Whitemarsh, through Conshohocken to Gulph Mill and on to Valley Forge. General Pulaski took up his headquarters in an old farmhouse owned by John Beaver, which still stands today in almost its original condition.

Pulaski did not stay long at Valley Forge. He was ordered to Trenton with his troop of horse to harass communication between Philadelphia and New York.

Pulaski fought gallantly for American independence, and his fame grew throughout the land. His command of horse came to be known as the Polish Legion. Finally, at Savannah, on October 10, 1779, he was mortally wounded. For his daring, skill, and courage, he had won the admiration and respect even of his enemies. It is recorded that when he was shot from his horse, the British ceased firing so that he could be carried from the battlefield for medical aid.

The following day he died on an American ship which was taking him to Charleston in the hope of obtaining sufficient medical aid to save his life. He was buried at sea off the Georgia coast.

Pulaski died as he would have wished, in the very thick of battle for liberty. He is mourned to this very day. He will be mourned forever.

It is ironic indeed that the mother country of this great champion of liberty is today again under the oppressive heel of Russia. The very people who, over the years, have suffered the most for the cause of freedom find themselves today without their freedom.

In 1939 a free and independent Poland was brutally attacked by Hitler. It was attacked because the people of Poland loved freedom more than life itself, and refused to yield to Nazi demands.

No words can possibly describe the ruthless destruction, the wholesale murder, and countless crimes visited upon these gallant people in their determination to preserve their national integrity and liberty. Block by block, and house by house, the beautiful city of Warsaw was reduced to a city of rubble, mud, blood, and corpses. It has been estimated that 8,000,000 people from this small but mighty country of Poland gave their lives in the last war.

The American people saw and deeply felt the suffering of the Polish people. We promised in the name of the Atlantic Charter that at the end of the war both Germany and Russia would leave Polish soil. We solemnly promised that Poland again would be free.

But that solemn promise was never kept. On the contrary, Poland was betrayed. She was not only the sad victim of the onslaught of her enemies, but she also has been the victim of the cruel deceit of her friends.

At Yalta the fifth partitioning of Poland was sanctioned and at Potsdam it was confirmed by President Truman.

Yes; we won the war. But we have yet to win the peace. We have failed to win the peace because our national leadership lacked that courage and devotion to the principle of freedom that characterized the life of Casimir Pulaski. Our national leadership was willing to compromise principle for expediency. And on the altar of expediency the freedom of the people of Poland, indeed the freedom of the people of half the world was sacrificed.

It is my firm conviction that if the President of the United States had uncompromisingly adhered to those principles in which the people of America believe, Poland today would be free. We would have real peace in the world and there would be no need to spend billions to rearm Europe to try to stem the steady march of Russian communism.

The American people believe in such principles as were enunciated by Woodrow Wilson as the "right of self-determination" and "open covenants openly arrived at." The secret agreements made at Tehran and Yalta were in direct violation of those principles. Poland was not present when the decisions were made with respect to her future. Indeed, the American people themselves, not even their representatives in Congress, knew what decisions were made, much less have any voice in either the making or even the ratification of the agreements.

This is a tragic chapter in American foreign policy which, although they had no direct voice in it, weighs heavily on the conscience of the American people. We are the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. We were a decisive factor in winning the war, not only with our actual fighting forces but also with our production. We had the strongest Navy in the world, the greatest and most modern Air Force, and almost unlimited capacity for industrial production.

In short, this great free country was in a position to insist upon a peace that was based on the principles of freedom and justice. But instead our President followed a policy of compromise. Chamberlain betrayed Czechoslovakia to buy peace with Hitler; the men in power in Washington betrayed Poland in the same futile effort to buy peace with Communist Russia.

We owe a great debt to Gen. Casimir Pulaski. There is no more fitting acknowledgment of that obligation than to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom, for which he dedicated and gave his life.

Freedom can never be secure so long as we are not prepared to defend it against all enemies, at home or abroad. It is a priceless heritage. Once we lose our freedom, we know from history it can only be regained by long and arduous effort, by sacrifice, and often by bloodshed.

The spirit of Casimir Pulaski lives on in the hearts of the people of his native land. It will be that spirit—devotion to freedom, courage, and determination—that will ultimately remove the shackles of Russian communism from the Polish people, and Poland will again take her place in the family of free, independent nations.

And let us here in America be ever vigilant against any inroads on those principles of government that guarantee our individual rights and liberties, and that give to each man equal opportunity to make himself count for what he is worth.

When we look abroad we can see the pattern by which people lose their freedom to all-powerful governments. We have seen how a handful of Communists have gained oppressive control over whole nations. We have seen the sinister methods of Communists working throughout the world. Yes, we have seen those monsters at work here in our own United States.

America today is the last great citadel of freedom. Liberty-loving people everywhere look to us for assistance. If we are to help the weak, we ourselves must remain strong. And let us remember that only the free can be productive, and only the productive can be strong.

We here honor the distinguished soldier who helped give us our freedom. Let us honor him by rededicating ourselves to the preservation of our great heritage of freedom, the freedom he sought for Poland and helped us to attain.

Excerpts From Remarks of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Banquet of the Twenty-fourth Ward Republican Club, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from remarks made by me at the annual banquet of the Twenty-fourth Ward Republican Club, in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Tuesday evening, October 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Local elections are the foundation upon which the pioneers of American freedom established our system of self-government.

Local control of local affairs is government by the people. It is home rule—a policy that I advocated throughout my public career.

The closer government is brought to the people the more efficiently and the more economically it is administered.

Good government starts in the cities, counties, boroughs, and townships. That is why local elections are so important.

We cannot have good government at the higher levels unless we begin in our own home communities.

We cannot have good government unless we elect to public office men of outstanding ability, upright character, and unquestioned integrity, who are devoted to civic betterment and the public welfare.

With that thought in mind I can say to you men and women that never in my long experience has a political party offered candidates of more superior qualifications than those of the Republican Party right here in Philadelphia.

Every honest, right-thinking man and woman can support your Republican ticket with pride and with complete confidence that they represent the highest type of public-spirited, civic-minded citizenship.

The city of Philadelphia is famous all over the United States as the stronghold of republicanism. It's up to you to keep it that way.

You are armed and equipped for victory. You have hard-working, able, and conscientious leadership. You have the finest candidates I have ever known.

With such a splendid ticket you should be inspired to go out and work and fight for great and overwhelming Republican success on election day.

No Republican who is interested in the future of America can possibly justify his failure to work and fight for this outstanding ticket.

Always remember that victory never comes to those who ignore or neglect their responsibilities. Victory rewards those who do their duty faithfully, loyally, and vigorously.

I want to repeat what I said about the importance of local elections. What happens here in Philadelphia at the November election is the forerunner of political battles to come next year and in 1952.

You know what that means to the future of Pennsylvania and the Nation.

Next year we will elect a new Republican governor of our Commonwealth. We will send another Republican to the United States Senate, and we will greatly increase the Republican delegation in Congress.

In the present campaign you are putting down a solid foundation for those contests. The help you give today will build up Republican strength and that will mean a Republican President in the White House in 1952.

If we are to save America from the clutches of the free spenders at Washington who are driving our Nation along the road to bankruptcy and the loss of freedom, it must begin here at home.

We are fighting to get rid of the fuzzy-minded socialistic crackpots at Washington. I'm sure you don't want any of them running the city of Philadelphia.

I congratulate this splendid assembly of men and women who are loyal to Republican principles on the wonderful beginning you have made. I am sure you will do a magnificent job on election day.

Accomplishments of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee During the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to present for the benefit of the Members a brief statement concerning the activities of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The committee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, has held extensive hearings on the following subjects: First, postal rate revision; second, revision of the Classification Act of 1923; third, increases in compensation for heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; fourth, salary increases and other benefits for postal employees; fifth, appointment and promotion of veterans of World War II in the Postal Service; sixth, census of housing; seventh, legislation requiring Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, and subversive organizations to identify matter sent by them through the mails; and, eighth, more liberal survivorship benefits for civil-service annuitants.

During the first session 413 House bills, 23 Senate bills and 29 resolutions were referred to the committee. The committee took favorable action on 39 House bills and 6 Senate bills, of which 36 became law. Four House bills are presently pending in the House Rules Committee, one House bill was vetoed, two House bills have passed the House and are pending in the Senate, and two House bills passed the House and their provisions were later incorporated in other legislation.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for their fine work. Each member conscientiously assumed responsibility for his part of the committee work, and the excellent record of the committee demonstrates the cooperative attitude of the members. The staff of the committee has worked industriously and has provided the members of the committee and other Members of the Congress with fine service.

Listed below are all of the bills and resolutions which the committee reported favorably to the House, together with brief explanations of the bills and the status of such legislation:

Bills reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during 1st sess. of the 81st Cong.

Bill No.	Explanation of provisions	Status
H. J. Res. 84	To provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States during the period ending July 5, 1951.	Approved Mar. 2, 1949. Public Law 13.
H. R. 1432	To provide for the issuance of a 6-cent air-mail postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va., in lieu of provision in Public Law 807, 80th Cong., providing for the issuance of a 5-cent air-mail stamp.	Approved Feb. 25, 1949. Public Law 9.
H. R. 20	To authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The employees who occupy such positions will supervise and direct scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.	Approved July 13, 1949. Public Law 167.
H. R. 2660	To prohibit the parking of vehicles on post-office property. This legislation is designed to correct conditions where individuals have blocked access to the post-office loading areas by parking motor vehicles on post-office property.	Passed House Apr. 1, 1949. Reported in Senate by Public Works Committee.
H. R. 253	To provide for eliminating the necessity for reappointment in cases of postmasters whose post offices are advanced from fourth class to a higher class or where post offices of a higher class are relegated to fourth class.	Approved Mar. 29, 1949. Public Law 29.
H. R. 1599	Private bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece, to provide that she shall have an extension of time for filing her application for disability retirement.	S. 1459 which became Public Law 212 applies to this case.
H. R. 969	To authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.	Approved Mar. 15, 1949. Public Law 19.
H. R. 997	To provide retirement benefits for certain employees with 25 years of service involuntarily separated from the Federal service between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947.	Approved Aug. 25, 1949. Public Law 267.
H. R. 2944	To provide for extending survivorship benefits to widowers of employees retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 (present law extends such benefits to widows), and changes the reduction factor in the annuities of the retiring employees, who desire to provide survivorship benefits, from 10 to 5 percent on the first $1,500 per annum of such annuities and retains existing law of a 10 percent reduction factor on that portion of the annuities exceeding $1,500.	Approved Sept. 30, 1949. Public Law 310.
H. R. 459	To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept reimbursement for overtime paid to employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry who prepare virus, serum, toxin, etc.	Approved Aug. 4, 1949. Public Law 206.
H. R. 3445	To provide for the repealing of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act and the Canal Zone Retirement Act and to bring all employees to whom such acts apply withing the terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act.	Approved July 21, 1949. Public Law 180.

Bills reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during 1st sess. of the 81st Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Explanation of provisions	Status
H. R. 5100	To grant a retroactive (July 1948) $330 annual pay increase to employees of the Foreign Service and classified employees in or under the municiapl government of the District of Columbia. (These employees were excluded from the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1948.)	Approved July 6, 1949. Public Law 166.
H. R. 3383	To provide that with respect to the computation of night differential for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., and either standard or daylight saving time shall be used, depending upon whichever time is observed where such night work is performed.	Approved Sept. 7, 1949. Public Law 288.
H. R. 1516	To provide that automatic promotions for part-time employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department shall be based on a calendar year rather than on present procedure requiring 2,024 hours of service.	Approved Aug. 22, 1949. Public Law 257.
H. R. 5168	To clarify laws relating to the compensation of postmasters by providing the Postmaster General with authority to retain 4th class post offices in the salary grade and class to which they were advanced because of "unusual conditions" until the annual adjustment is made at the end of the fiscal year.	Approved Aug. 8, 1949. Public Law 214.
H. R. 3637	To provide the Postmaster General with authority to reduce postal rates to 1 cent per pound for braille writers and other appliances for the blind, or parts thereof, which are the property of State governments or subdivisions thereof, and of public libraries or of private agencies for the blind not conducted for private profit, or of blind individuals, under such regulations as he may prescribe.	Approved Sept. 7, 1949. Public Law 290.
H. R. 3512	To exempt from the Civil Service Retirement Act certain employees of the Library of Congress and the judicial branch of the Government whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration.	Approved Aug. 2, 1949. Public Law 199.
H. R. 4498	To grant the Postmaster General additional authority to award star route contracts for transportation of mail where no air-mail service exists and where the airplane is the most practical medium for transporting mail.	Approved Aug. 30, 1949. Public Law 277.
H. R. 3338	To provide retirement credit for Federal service when, through inadvertence, no deductions from the salaries of Federal employees were made.	Approved June 24, 1949. Public Law 123.
H. R. 3756	To provide that the civil-service annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States shall be computed on the basis of their average basic salaries for any 5 consecutive years of allowable service. (Under present law the basis for computing annuities of such persons is last 5 years of service.)	Approved Aug. 16, 1949 Public Law 235.
H. R. 2020	To allow certain employees of the Government separated between Jan. 23, 1942, and Apr. 1, 1948, with less than 20 years' civilian service, to obtain refund of retirement deductions in lieu of annuity at age 62.	Approved June 10, 1949. Public Law 98.
H. R. 2619	To extend pro rata annual and sick leave benefits to part-time employees on regular tours of duty covering not less than 5 days in any administrative workweek, and to validate payments previously made to certain part-time employees.	Approved Oct. 5, 1949. Public Law 316.
H. R. 3826	To provide for granting the Civil Service Commission discretion under the Civil Service Act of 1883 to authorize appointments in the departmental service without regard to the apportionment laws when persons are not available from States whose quotas are not filled. Also, this legislation codified statutes governing the residence requirements of persons seeking positions in the departmental service.	Approved Oct. 28, 1949. Public Law 425.
H. R. 2662	To provide that Federal employees who are veterans may be granted time off, not to exceed 4 hours in any 1 day, to participate as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned for burial.	Approved Aug. 16, 1949. Public Law 233.
H. R. 142	To provide that no charge shall be made by the Bureau of the Census for supplying population data to members of the armed services or persons honorably discharged therefrom, or to persons requesting information as proof of age for the purpose of establishing claim to old-age assistance or old age and survivorship insurance benefits.	Passed House and Senate and was vetoed on Aug. 9, 1949
H. R. 2203	To direct the Bureau of the Census to take a census of housing in each State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska in the year 1950 in conjunction with the decennial census of population.	Incorporated in the Housing Act of 1949, Public Law 171.
H. R. 91	To establish within the Post Office Department a research and development program and to insure the continuation of such program by substantive law.	Approved Aug. 16, 1949. Public Law 231.
H. R. 3198	To provide continuing authority for the Bureau of Census to use other Government employees for field work in connection with the decennial censuses, and providing that during the taking of the next and subsequent decennial censuses enlisted men and officers of the armed forces may be appointed and compensated for the enumeration of the personnel of the armed forces.	Approved July 6, 1949. Public Law 158.
H. R. 1689	To establish rates of annual compensation for the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and agencies from $14,000 per annum for certain bureau chiefs and board members, to $22,500 per annum for members of the Cabinet.	Approved Oct. 15, 1949. Public Law 359.
H. R. 86	To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf	Approved Oct. 19, 1949 Public Law 362.
H. R. 3444	To provide for an improvement in the administration of the collection of cotton statistics by requiring the Bureau of the Census to furnish information regarding cotton statistics only to interested parties.	Approved June 28, 1949. Public Law 133.
H. R. 5465	To provide that in computing annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act for employees paid on a fee basis, the maximum basic salary upon which retirement may be based shall be $10,000 per annum.	Approved Oct. 5, 1949. Public Law 320.
H. R. 4495	To provide increases in the basic pay rates of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department by $120 per annum for all postmasters and employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters who receive an increase of 5 percent and employees paid on an hourly basis who will receive an increase of 2½ cents per hour. Supervisors and postmasters are granted longevity pay increases of $100 (5 percent for fourth-class postmasters) at the end of 13, 18, and 25 years of service, counting all years of postal service. Three longevity grades are provided for classes of employees not now entitled to any, 1 longevity grade to those now entitled to 2 so that all employees having automatic grades will also have a series of 3 longevity grades. Also, it provides that all new appointees to regular positions will be appointed to grade 3, present appointees in regular positions in a grade lower than grade 3 will be placed in grade 3, and substitutes and temporary employees will be placed in grade 3 after 1 year's service. In determining longevity grades provided for in this legislation and in Public Law 134, 79th Cong., postal employees may be given credit for all years of service for which credit has not been received.	Approved Oct. 28, 1949. Public Law 428.
H. R. 4285	To provide an upward adjustment in the rates of pay of certain employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, who, by reason of military service, are not receiving the benefits of Public Law 577, 79th Cong.	Reported on Oct. 14, 1949; passed House Oct. 17, 1949.
H. R. 5931	To provide for the repeal and replacement of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by revising and simplifying the classifications and pay schedules of 885,000 classified employees, an average $140.50 annual pay increase, and longevity step increases in all of the CPC grades and below grade 11 in the new general schedule. New procedures for allocating positions are provided for the classified Federal service subject to the control and supervision of the Civil Service Commission. A general schedule of 18 grades and a crafts, protective, and custodial schedule of 10 grades replace the present schedules and grades. 3 additional salary ranges are provided above the present ceiling of $10,330 with limitations upon the number of positions in each such grade as follows: 300 in GS-16 ($11,200 to $12,000), 75 in GS-17 ($12,200 to $13,000), and 25 positions in GS-18 ($14,000). A new procedure is established to grant employees promotions or cash awards for contributing to outstanding efficiency and economy in administration.	Approved Oct. 28, 1949. Public Law 429.
	HOUSE BILLS REPORTED WHICH ARE PENDING IN RULES COMMITTEE	
H. R. 87	To grant certain employees in the postal field service credit toward their automatic promotions for all time spent in the military service between Sept. 16, 1940, and June 30, 1946, and to grant such employees who were in the military service prior to July 1945, 4 additional grades as of the date they received their regular appointments.	Reported on July 12, 1949. In Rules Committee.
H. R. 4295	To provide that each civil-service annuitant who retired prior to Apr. 1, 1948, under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, may retain or accept an increase in his annuity of 25 percent or $300, whichever is lesser, and at the same time designate his surviving spouse to receive one-half of his annuity (but not to exceed $600). Under present law such annuitants were granted the privilege of accepting one or the other of the above alternatives.	Reported on June 6, 1949. In Rules Committee.
H. R. 5265	To require Communist, Fascist, totalitarian and subversive organizations to identify matter sent by them through the mails.	Reported on Oct. 4, 1949. In Rules Committee.
H. R. 2945	To provide for the readjustment of postal rates and fees in all classes of mail and special services. (It is estimated that this legislation will increase postal revenues by $130,000,000 annually, to offset a portion of the deficit of approximately $500,000,000 for fiscal year 1950.)	Reported on Oct. 17, 1949. In Rules Committee.

Bills reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during 1st sess. of the 81st Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Explanation of provisions	Status
	SENATE BILLS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE WHICH BECAME LAW	
S. 1459	To authorize the Civil Service Commission to extend from 6 months to 1 year the time within which application may be filed for disability annuity.	Approved Aug. 8, 1949. Public Law 212.
S. 974	To permit mothers and widows who acquire veterans' preference under the Veterans' Preference Act, and then lose such preference by remarriage, to regain such preference after divorce, legal separation, or death of such husband.	Approved Aug. 26, 1949. Public Law 269.
S. 1977	To extend the time within which legislative employees may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act.	Approved Aug. 19, 1949. Public Law 254.
S. 1479	To convert village letter-carrier service at second-class post offices to city letter-carrier service	Approved Oct. 29, 1949. Public Law 431.
S. 1825	To provide automatic promotions for temporary employees in the mail equipment shops of the Post Office Department.	Approved Oct. 29, 1949. Public Law 432.
S. 1232	To provide an increase in equipment maintenance allowances for rural carriers of 1 cent a mile	Approved Oct. 25, 1949. Public Law 381.

An American Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, America should immediately arm and equip a strong modern army in western Europe and a similar force in eastern Asia. No American with whom I am acquainted wants to provoke war. No American wants his country to engage in aggressive war, but we cannot afford to continue shaping our defense policies on the assumption that we will be protecting McComb, Ill., or Gatesville, Tex., from an invasion of foreign infantry. We all know that our American defenses must be in western Europe and in eastern Asia—and 100 other spots from pole to pole. It is understandable that the Swiss should build a national defense based upon defending each mountain pass and each river route. Such a fixed defense is doubtless in keeping with the needs of the people in Switzerland.

It may have been realistic in this country 150 years ago, but today we can all agree that our plans for defending America must involve meeting and defeating the enemy as far from our shores as possible. Nor need we waste any time or effort preparing a defense against our friends from South America or the colonial empires of Africa or the wide-open spaces of Australia. Every reasoning human being knows that if war breaks out that we will need to defend western Europe and eastern Asia. This, of course, does not mean we should ignore other vital spots in the world, but it does mean that an army well trained and well equipped already in Europe will be of infinitely more defense value than an Army of many times that size in the continental United States. We can hardly hope to move an army from the United States to either Europe or Asia against effective enemy resistance in less than 24 months. We cannot afford to lose that much time nor can we afford to sacrifice our friends and allies.

Today we say to the nations of western Europe, "Join us in an obligation to resist any Communist aggression and we will assure you of the aid of America's great productive capacity." Undoubtedly, the nations of western Europe believe, as I do, that in the event of an East-West conflict, the western group, with American aid, would ultimately prevail, but what do we offer these people in the meantime? We promise them that our one combat division in Germany will perform the best holding effort that its resources permit. Possibly we could evacuate most of our civilian and military personnel across the Rhine. On the Rhine we would expect the French, the Belgians, and the Dutch to help us maintain a temporary line. Possibly this line could be held for a few weeks—a month at most. Then the real retreat would begin as we fell back to the Atlantic coast for a second Dunkerque. We could assure our allies only that we would do a far better job of destroying transportation and productive capacity than any of the other armies who have rolled across this territory for the last 1,000 years. We would not leave a bridge standing—we would flood every coal mine—we would level the smokestacks in Belgium and northern France—we would destroy everything that might be serviceable to the Communists. With the cooperation of our allies we might be able to evacuate our own troops and fly most of our planes to Britain, but we certainly cannot, in good faith, encourage these people to believe that we could save their armies from capture much less save their land from destruction. Certainly we would tell our friends that in the words of General MacArthur "We will return," and we would return, in the course of 2 or 3 years. In fact, we would apparently expect these people to maintain their morale under Communist rule with the hope that their American allies would again be marching toward the Rhine and, I have no doubt, but what this would ultimately happen, but I am under no delusion and I doubt that the people of western Europe are under any delusion as to what would happen to their lands as we pushed the Red Army back. The experience of Finland and eastern Germany should be sufficient to warn us that any reconstruction that may have occurred during the Russian occupation would now disappear. True, western Europe would be liberated, but what would there be left to liberate save the rivers and the hills.

I think we owe our allies a sincere effort to save them from such a fate. I think we can save them and at the same time save the lives of millions of American boys by the maintenance of a hard, effective mobile force in western Germany right now.

I do not propose that we draft American boys to go to Germany. I do not propose that we incur the expense of sending additional American troops with their families and the type of accomodations that we want to provide for our men overseas. I do not propose that we call on the boys of France, Belgium, or Holland to make further sacrifices, but I do propose that we divert some of the funds that we are now putting into equipment in the United States to equip troops at a point where it will be most helpful and useful. I do propose that we divert some of the dollars that we are pouring into Germany to give them dollar buying power into the pay of say 25 divisions of German nationals. I would, of course, see that all of the senior officers of such a force are American. I would equip them with the best and most modern weapons, but I would keep the supply of ammunition in American hands. Such a course should still any fears that would otherwise disturb the people of France and Belgium. I would divert some of the funds that we are now advancing for the arming of the western European nations. This force in Germany would give those nations the most effective kind of defense and would enable them to somewhat reduce their own individual armaments. At the same time it would, in my opinion, give them such a lift in morale that we might expect smaller total forces to be more effective than they would under the present hopeless prospects. What would be more reasonable than to expect in France and Belgium soldiers to fight with increased determination if they knew that their fight had a real prospect of saving their homelands.

How can we give the people of these western lands any real hope unless we maintain a real effective force capable of at least slowing down and offering a chance of stopping the Red hordes if we are not going to send our own boys to do this job. Frankly, I do not propose to send American boys to do it if I can find others who are willing and indeed anxious for the opportunity. How can we accomplish this without the enlistment of German nationals? Germany has tremendous manpower. Millions of refugees have crowded into western Germany. It is difficult to find food and shelter for these people.

America is pouring approximately a billion dollars a year into western Germany to help maintain her economy. Why not require something in return? I have no doubt that we could recruit 25 divisions of the toughest kind of fighters with no trouble at all and we could do it at a fraction of the wages that we pay American troops. We could do it

with the distinct understanding that we undertook to provide no veterans' benefits for these mercenaries except such as the German states themselves were willing to provide. We could pay these troops in American dollars and the dollars would create the same purchasing power in Germany that we now create by our direct contributions or if it was felt that direct payments to the troops in American money was inadvisable we could arrange for the new German Republic to make the payments in marks with the United States putting the dollars directly into the German public treasury. In any event it would create dollar purchasing power where it is needed and it would do it without resorting to the kind of direct gifts that we have been making. I think that it would result in a great deal more respect for the United States in Germany and in all Europe than our present program generates. At the same time it would create a wholesome respect in Moscow.

Russia has no desire to start a conflict where no easy victory is in sight. I think it is true that our evident long-term superiority has restrained the Russians in the past and might restrain them in the future, but as long as we leave the prospects of quick and easy victory laying around we are holding out a temptation to the Red generals that they may not be able to resist. On the other hand if we let Russia know that she cannot hope to occupy western Europe without meeting a serious and determined resistance on the ground as well as from the air, I think the chances of an aggressive move on her part are minimized. I have no patience with those Americans who seem to be disturbed at the thought of employing mercenary troops. I have been unable to determine who they thought they were protecting. As far as I am concerned, I want first to prevent the outbreak of war. I think this plan offers the most practical and most hopeful method of achieving that result. Secondly, if war does break out, I want to be certain that we will be on the winning side. I think that the existence of a force such as I have proposed in Europe would immeasurably improve our chances of ultimate as well as prompt victory. Third, even if we have to fight a war, I want to fight it in a way that will result in the loss of as few American lives as possible. I know that the kind of force I have proposed would save countless American boys.

When we further consider the fact we can have such a defensive force with the very money that we are now using to rehabilitate Germany without lessening her dollar-buying power, with the money that we are spending for military equipment which would otherwise be 3,000 miles from the place where it is needed and with the money that we are contributing to the establishment of 12 separate western European armies which without some such hard core would probably be destroyed one at a time, it seems to me inconceivable that our Military Establishment and our State Department should object to such a program.

Of course, at the same time that we were building up a force in western Europe, we could and I think should, build a similar force in Japan. It will be recalled that I urged such a force in Japan 2 years ago. I am now convinced that had we had such a force in operation in Japan, events in China might have been very different. Let us not delay in Europe until we experience a repetition of what has happened in China.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Eighty-seventh Annual Pennsylvania Sunday School Convention, Johnstown, Pa., October 12, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me at the Eighty-seventh Annual Pennsylvania Sunday School Convention, at Johnstown, Pa., Wednesday evening, October 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many elements of national strength and character have entered into the building of American greatness.

Extreme hardship, oppressive toil, resolute courage, love of liberty, heroic sacrifice, and the shedding of blood and tears—all have had a part in developing the unparalleled growth and progress of our Nation.

But supporting and sustaining all these qualities was the great spiritual strength gained from an abiding faith in God and profound reverence for the teachings of the Holy Bible.

The church and state in our country are totally separate. However, one cannot live without the other.

Always, through our history, has run a golden thread of deep religious conviction.

The brave and sturdy people who settled the North American continent prized freedom and religious liberty above life itself. In the New World they found a haven where each could worship in a manner dictated by his own conscience, free from tyranny or persecution.

One of the objectives of Christopher Columbus, whose memory is honored today, was to spread religion all over the world. His prayer of thanksgiving for safe deliverance was the first uttered in the land of his discovery.

The spirit of religion guided the Pilgrim fathers to our shores. In framing the Mayflower Compact they started with the words: "In the name of God—Amen."

The illustrious founder of Pennsylvania, William Penn, established his Holy experiment on the spirit of tolerant religion.

"If we are not ruled by God," he asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

George Washington, kneeling in prayer in the snow at Valley Forge, has given patriotic inspiration to many generations of Americans.

Firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence is set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Benjamin Franklin suggested prayer for divine guidance in framing the Constitution. That practice continues today in almost all our legislative halls.

President Lincoln, in his immortal Gettysburg Address, referred to the United States as "this Nation under God."

Now, let us briefly consider the American plan of government:

Our Republic was established on the proposition that human dignity and individual freedom are divine blessings, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. Its survival depends upon reverent submission to the will of God as revealed in the Holy Bible.

Our great men have accepted that concept and have lived by its teachings. If all of our people would willingly do the same we would be in a better position for world leadership.

Our Government was based on the premise that all men are divinely endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our founding fathers put particular stress on the pursuit of happiness. Always remember that they did not attempt to guarantee happiness.

In adopting the Bill of Rights, they did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, or religion, to to protect the right of property.

The founding fathers recognized these rights as God given and sought to protect them from violation or encroachment by an all-powerful government.

They knew from the pages of history that centralized authority in the hands of tyrannical rulers could be used as an instrument of oppression to rob the people of their freedom. They planned a government that would defend the liberty of the citizen.

Faith in God, firmly established in an atmosphere of individual freedom, has been the most potent influence in the growth of America.

I recall the statement of a South American visitor who was asked to explain why the material prosperity of North America has so vastly outstripped that of South America.

This was his reply: "The people who settled North America came here seeking God. The Spaniards came to South America in search of gold."

Not our material possessions, but our spiritual resources, increased and strengthened through the years, are the real wealth of the United States.

In less than 200 years we have become the foremost nation in the world. We have the greatest culture and the highest living standard of any nation in all history.

We have more than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogs, and temples, with a membership of 77,000,000.

We have more homes, automobiles, radios, telephones, savings accounts, life-insurance policies, private foundations, and hospitals than any other nation of all world history.

In less than half a century medical science, magic drugs from our laboratories, and high living standards have increased the American span of life over 16 years.

Our inventive genius, combined with unlimited opportunity in a free land, have given the average American more of the good things of life than have been enjoyed by any other people since the world began.

This is a beautiful picture. Many of our people think its beauties will continue forever. They are unaware of the dangers that are ahead.

Let me say to you that we have taken too much for granted. We are too complacent. We talk of our rights but have forgotten our obligations.

Instead of considering the welfare of the whole Nation we have become selfish. We seek special privileges and advantages for

ourselves, our own group, or our own locality. We have become a "give me" people. We go to government asking for favors, but forget to perform our obligations as citizens.

This applies to all classes, rich and poor, management and labor, business and agriculture, individuals and organized pressure groups.

We want security. We want our investments guaranteed. We want to borrow money from the Government. We want to sell our products at Government-supported prices.

What has brought this about? What has been responsible for these departures from the American tradition of initiative and self-reliance?

To a large extent it is the result of indifference and neglect of our civic duties.

It is because we have demanded that the Government do for us more of the things that we used to do for ourselves as individuals and as communities and which we should still do.

Too many have been led to believe that what they get from the Government costs them nothing.

Too many have given their support to demagogs who offer gifts and benefits to be paid for with the people's money. That caused the downfall of many nations from ancient days to our own times.

Too many otherwise well-meaning and intelligent citizens have combined into pressure groups demanding that government money be spent for special regional or sectional advantage.

The demand for new functions, new services, and new frills in government is continuous and grows stronger with each passing year.

Our Government has grown so big and so costly that it endangers our freedom of action.

Let us consider some figures.

In 50 years the cost of government has increased more than forty fold. In the same period the population has a little more than doubled.

In 1929, only 20 years ago, the Federal Government spent less than $4,000,000,000. In this fiscal year, our Government will spend more than 11 times that amount, or approximately $46,000,000,000.

The tax collections for this year will not be sufficient to cover the expenditures and we will undoubtedly end this fiscal year with a deficit of at least $6,000,000,000.

In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

In 1929 the Federal Government had less than 600,000 civilian employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

In 1902 the cost of the Federal Government was 35 percent of the total tax collections by all levels of government. At that time State and local government collected and spent 65 percent of the total.

Today Federal Government spends 74 percent, while the share of State and local government has been reduced to 24 percent.

Those figures clearly demonstrate the trend toward centralization of power, authority, and control at Washington.

This development should give us deep concern because it cannot fail to have a profound effect upon the structure of our Government.

Through the system of grants in aid, almost one-third of the total revenue expended by the local government is supplied from State collected taxes.

Through the same system, almost 18 percent of all the money spent by State governments come from taxes collected by the Federal Government.

The process in these grants is as follows: First there is advice, next supervision, and finally complete control.

With money goes power. With power goes control. And concentration of authority in the Federal Government endangers the American system of local self-government which is home rule.

The founding fathers feared centralized government. They knew it could destroy initiative, opportunity, and individual freedom.

That is what has been going on in America during the whole lifetime of our young people.

Today in Congress we are faced with a program which, if enacted into law, would transform our whole system of government and would place us under the rule of socialism or the so-called welfare state.

When we have socialized medicine, Federal control of education, Federal regulation of agriculture, Government competition with business and industry, and a planned economy controlled by bureaucrats in Washington, then the freedom of the individual will be lost.

The loss of one freedom eventually means the loss of all freedom.

Freedom of religion is the most important. Men have suffered torment, persecution, imprisonment, and death to attain it. Remember that the loss of one freedom will mean the loss of all freedom.

Mark this—in 1948 our church contributions were only $1,340,000,000.

With the ever-rising cost of government and increasing taxes, the men and women who have supported the churches, libraries, hospitals, charitable institutions, research foundations, and educational centers will no longer have the income necessary to continue their support.

These institutions will be forced to make increased demands for governmental aid and will finally become totally dependent upon Government for their existence.

What are free Americans to do?

To hold the line in America we must have a total mobilization of all the moral forces.

Our churches must be the armories of trained battalions of men and women working for God and country.

The battalions must be formed into armies under courageous and righteous leadership. With flags flying, they must march forward to fight the evils which endanger our country.

Men and women of the church should take an intelligent and militant part in government. Yes, I mean take part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government.

We must fight big and costly centralized government. We must oppose controls and regimentation because they destroy freedom.

We must wage relentless war against those who would weaken the moral fiber of our people, the racketeer, the chiseler, and the law evader.

We must drive out of office those politicians whose objective is personal gain and personal power, not public service.

We must fight intolerance, bigotry, deception, and selfishness.

We want a God-fearing nation comprised of people who practice love and good will.

We want peace on earth. This can be brought about by spreading religion throughout the world.

The Ten Commandments should be our basic law. They should be our rule of action. They should guide governmental activities.

What we need is courage and faith. We need the courage and faith we get from God's word. We must learn the truth through study of the Holy Bible.

Horace Greeley once said:

"No Bible-reading nation ever becomes mentally or socially enslaved."

We need more of the deep religious conviction of the William Penns, the Muhlenbergs, the Beechers, and the Conwells.

We must, as individuals, live so we may become spiritually fit and mentally qualified to govern ourselves. We must all, willingly and with one accord, obey the laws of God and man.

With faith we can preserve American liberty and bring peace into the world.

All faiths have done so much to bring about the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

A Catholic wrote Lead, Kindly Light. A Presbyterian wrote Rock of Ages.

Martin Luther, the founder of the Lutheran Church, wrote A Mighty Fortress Is Our God.

A Methodist wrote Jesus, Lover of My Soul.

An Episcopalian wrote All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name.

A Jew wrote "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want."

These have been a light of love in sadness—our inspiration in joy.

Let us cleanse our hearts of every jealousy, hatred, and discord, and turn our hearts toward God.

May the Lord help us to curb the drift of our country toward the bondage of the state. Because from that bondage there is no return.

Yes, there is hope. But let us remember that men, in order to have freedom, had faith. They practiced "it is better to suffer for doing right than for doing wrong." They wanted to be on God's side.

The late Sol Bloom, a great authority on the American Constitution, was so right when he said, "God and one is the majority."

Let us all be a part of that majority. Let each of us practice Christian citizenship in our own community.

A Report to Wisconsin's Great Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report to Wisconsin's great medical profession.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT TO WISCONSIN'S GREAT MEDICAL PROFESSION

"What has the first session of the Eighty-first Congress done with respect to Wisconsin's physicians, dentists, and nurses?"

This is a question which might rightly be asked by all practitioners of medical arts in the Badger State.

I would like to present therefore a summary of some of the most important actions taken by your Congress from January to mid-October 1949. Of course, when Congress reconvenes next year, it will pick up the loose ends where it left off and will continue its work on many pieces of still pending legislation.

REJECTION OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

1. Perhaps the most important single action taken by the Congress was its overwhelming rejection of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. We felt that this scheme would have been a dangerous stepping stone toward socialized medicine. Therefore both

Republicans and Democrats helped to defeat it.

Although my colleagues and I are overwhelmingly in favor of Federal streamlining, economy, and greater efficiency, it was obvious that this particular reorganization plan—which would have set up a Cabinet Department of Welfare undoubtedly under the leading advocate of socialized medicine—that this particular reorganization plan would not have saved a taxpayer's dime. On the contrary, it would have cost tremendous amounts in the long run to the American people both in loss of freedom as well as in costs of medical bureaucracy.

WISCONSIN MEDICINE'S GREAT RESPONSE TO MY VOTE AGAINST SOCIALISTIC SCHEME

Previously, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have reported the magnificent response to me from all over Wisconsin from individual physicians, dentists, county medical societies, county dental societies, nurses, superintendents of hospitals, etc., endorsing my vote in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I should like to quote from a few of these messages, not because they support my position or praise my stand, but rather because they evidence grass-roots thinking on this vital issue:

A physician in Marshfield writes:

"I am very pleased to get your letter and in behalf of the medical profession in this area, I wish to thank you very much for your vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1.

"I am also glad to see that you are putting up a good fight to try to hold down Government spending and boost the Hoover Commission recommendations. I imagine it is a very discouraging situation, at least it looks that way to us back home, but we are pulling for you very hard."

A prominent official of the American Dental Association in Watertown, Wis., writes:

"Just a line to thank you for your vote of disapproval to Reorganization Plan No. 1 to establish a Cabinet Department of Welfare. It is my firm opinion that your vote was to the best interests of the American public."

HOSPITAL AID LEGISLATION FOR BADGER STATE

2. A second major action of the Eighty-first Congress' first session was to liberalize the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Throughout Wisconsin I have heard from public-spirited individuals, from chambers of commerce, from physicians and others pointing out that this or that little town of 5,000 or 10,000 or larger cannot possibly collect enough funds by itself to expand its sorely pressed medical facilities. Under this new law, a copy of which is gladly available from my office, Uncle Sam will help carry an increased load of hospital aid.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE LEGISLATION ITSELF STILL PENDING

3. Now, what about the actual socialized medicine legislation? The answer is that both Senate and House committees have completed their studies of the proposed legislation which would set up Federal compulsory health insurance. But no additional committee action has been taken.

It appears that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people in opposition to socialized medicine is beginning to take effect even on heretofore strong supporters of this socialized scheme. Yes, even some of the most fervent advocates of a bureaucratic health set-up have now indicated that the President's socialized health legislation may be shelved in 1950 and held over for reintroduction in the Eighty-second Congress.

HUGE NEW SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

4. Of interest to all of America's physicians will be old-age security legislation which has been passed by the House of Representatives in the form of H. R. 6000. This huge 201-page bill which will be studied in detail by the Senate Finance Committee affects so many areas of old-age pensions and aid to needy children and to widows, etc., as to make it impossible to summarize briefly. Most of us recognize the importance of liberalizing the present pitifully low pensions of $25 and $35 a month paid to old folks. But there are so many controversial features in this huge bill that it will require the very close study of members of the Senate.

MEDICAL SCHOOL-AID BILL

5. Another major bill enacted was S. 1453 for aid to medical schools and scholarships for student physicians, nurses, sanitary engineers, etc. This legislation amending the Public Health Service Act unanimously passed the Senate on September 23 and is now pending before the House Interstate Commerce Committee.

MISCELLANEOUS HEALTH BILLS

Still pending before the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee is S. 2008. This bill represents the Hoover Commission suggestion for a united medical administration which would take over all functions of the United States Public Health Service as well as hospitals now operated by the Veterans' Administration, the Army, and the Navy.

Another bill pending, this time on the House side, H. R. 4874, would create a bipartisan seven-member commission to survey hospital and medical care in the United States and to report findings and recommendations to the Congress within 18 months.

I FEEL IT MY OBLIGATION TO REPORT TO YOU

I hope to prepare other summaries from time to time during the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress. I feel it is the obligation of a legislator to report to his constituents and particularly to that fine group of men and women who have devoted their lives to the healing arts. Yes, Wisconsin's medical profession which has pioneered in voluntary systems for medical insurance and which has contributed immeasurably to medical research deserves particular attention on the part of myself or any other legislator.

HELPING ASSURE A FREER AMERICAN MEDICINE

America has achieved the highest medical standards of any large nation in the world and our progress is due in large part to the freedom of our medical profession.

I have hopes that we in the Congress will never lose sight of that fact but will strive to ever enhance that freedom and to promote conditions most conducive to progress in a free American medicine.

WISCONSIN DOCTORS RECOGNIZE THEY MUST PLAY ACTIVE ROLE IN POLITICS

One of the vital conclusions which has been reached by more and more physicians is this: "The present administration in Washington, D. C., seems to be intent on pushing politics into American medicine, on making what was heretofore a purely private profession the pawn of Federal bureaucrats. Moreover, there are many administration Senators and Representatives who seem eager to further this process of pushing politics into medicine."

Thus America's physicians conclude:

"The only way by which we can keep politics from corrupting medicine is by making sure that we physicians play an active role in politics. In other words, in 1950 many Senators and Representatives will be up for reelection who are either: (a) committed to support socialized medicine; or (b) committed to fight against it. If we allow politicians who favor socialized medicine to be reelected to public office, obviously we are by our apathy causing the downfall of the freedom of American medicine.

"But if on the other hand we vigorously support free-enterprise Senators and Representatives, if we go to the polls in both the primary and general elections, voting for conscientious public servants, then we will in effect be helping our own profession.

"We are scientists as well as practitioners. Ordinarily we dislike all thought of getting mixed up in politics. But the administration has given us no alternative. It has announced its intention to purge free-enterprise Senators and Representatives, to purge opponents of the Taft-Hartley law, to purge enemies of socialized medicine. If we want to show our deep feelings on these issues, it is up to us to stand by the men who have stood by our medical profession and who in turn have stood by the system of free choice by the American people of their own physicians and dentists."

CONCLUSION

That in summary is the conclusion being reached by more and more physicians as the 1950 election battles approach, and I say: more power to them. I hope to hear further from our doctors on their problems, on ways and means by which I can be of service to them and to their associates.

Thanks very much for your kind attention to this report.

Comprehensive Review and Digest of the Visa Work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, most of us have requests for assistance in immigration and international travel matters, and in my office they constitute more than half of all the cases in which my aid is sought.

Even after many years points of confusing obliqueness continue to require my telephoning to one of the agencies having jurisdiction for clarification.

It was, therefore, with great gratification that I found in the Department of State Bulletin for October 10, 1949—volume XXI, No. 536—a scholarly and comprehensive review and digest of the visa work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service.

The article is written by Mr. Eliot B. Coulter, assistant chief of the Visa Division, a gentleman known, I believe, to every one of us and to our office staffs. His unfailing courtesy and patience and great knowledge has made our official duties easier on many occasions.

It is with pleasure that I insert this excellent article in the RECORD, where I am sure it will prove useful and helpful to many.

VISA WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Eliot B. Coulter)

It is generally considered under international law that permission to enter a country is a privilege granted to an alien as distinguished from a right to which he is inherently entitled. The United States Government under its general sovereign and constitutional powers, has enacted numerous laws relating to the entry and departure of aliens.

Under the laws of the United States, jurisdiction in immigration matters is vested in

the Department of State and its officers abroad over aliens before they arrive in the United States. This jurisdiction is exercised in general through the issuance or refusal by consular officers abroad of visas which are permits to apply for admission at a port of entry to the United States. In general, the Department of Justice and the officers of its Immigration and Naturalization Service have jurisdiction over aliens after they arrive in the United States.

In general, consular officers and officers in diplomatic missions are responsible for making findings of fact under the law in visa cases, for evaluating the facts and for reaching conclusions of law relating to the qualification of applicants for visas. The Department has supervisory responsibility for issuing regulations and for seeing that officers at consular offices and missions properly discharge their responsibilities under the law and for instructing them, when occasion arises, regarding the law and questions pertaining to uniform visa procedure and standard practice.

Briefly, the Visa Division has the functon of formulating and coordinating policy and action in all matters pertaining to (a) alien visa control; (b) the issuance of exit permits; (c) the control of immigration quotas; and (d) collaboration with other divisions of the Department and other agencies of the Government concerning the control of travel of aliens to and from the United States.

ALIENS REQUIRED BY LAW TO HAVE VISAS OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION

Section 30 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, provides in part that:

"Any alien seeking to enter the United States who does not present a visa (except in emergency cases defined by the Secretary of State), a reentry permit, or a border crossing identification card shall be excluded from admission to the United States."

Under the foregoing provision of law, visa requirements may be waived in individual cases arising at a port of entry involving an emergency, as in the case of a nonimmigrant arriving without a transit visa or a returning resident alien arriving without a visa or reentry permit, provided justifiable reasons of an emergency character exist for his failure to obtain such documentation. A number of general emergency waivers of nonimmigrant documentation have been granted. For example, a waiver exists for Canadian citizens and British subjects domiciled in Canada who enter the United States temporarily for a brief period. This waiver is in effect because of the great volume of travel across the Canadian border with which available consular visa facilities are unable to deal adequately, thus constituting an emergency. The general waivers granted for nonimmigrants are covered in the Visa Regulations, which are published in the Federal Register from time to time and are subsequently incorporated in title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

General procedure

In general, aliens are required to obtain visas or other specified documentation from American diplomatic or consular officers abroad and to present such documentation when they apply to the immigration authorities at a port of entry in the United States for permission to enter for such period and under such conditions as the Immigration and Naturalization Service may impose under the applicable immigration laws and regulations.

Advantage of visa documentation

The visa documentation required by law is helpful to the United States Government by reducing detention costs at ports of entry, by providing an orderly procedure for determining the classification of an alien and his qualifications under the immigration laws and by providing suitable security screening before he comes to the United States. It is also helpful to the alien himself since the possession of a visa facilitates examination and possible admission at the port of entry. The refusal of a visa to an unqualified applicant obviates a useless journey to a port of entry in the United States and the expense, hardship, and embarrassment incident to such a trip.

Classification of aliens

All aliens coming to the United States are classified under the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, as "immigrants" unless they come within an excepted category of "nonimmigrants" specified in that section.

Nonimmigrants

The categories of nonimmigrants enumerated in section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, are briefly as follows:

1. Government official, his family, servants, and employees.

2. Tourist or visitor for business or pleasure.

3. Transit alien passing through the United States.

4. An alien lawfully in the United States who goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory.

5. Seaman (or airman) entering the United States in pursuit of his calling.

6. Treaty alien entering the United States solely to carry on trade between the United States and the country of which he is a national under the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation and his wife and his unmarried children under 21 years of age;

7. Representative of a foreign government in or to, or an officer or employee of, an international organization designated by Executive order pursuant to the International Organization Immunities Act and the family, attendants, servants, and employees of such representative, officer, or employee.

Visa Documentation of Nonimmigrants

A diplomatic visa is granted to a diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign country or to a person coming within a limited category of individuals specified in the diplomatic-visa regulations. Such a visa is granted to the alien as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (1), 3 (3), or 3 (7) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if the alien is coming to the United States on official business for his government, or as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (2) of the act if he is coming to the United States for personal reasons.

An official visa is granted to an official of a foreign government (other than a person entitled to a diplomatic visa) as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (1) of the act if coming to the United States on official business for his government or as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (2) or 3 (3) of the act if he is coming to the United States for personal reasons.

A passport visa is granted to a tourist or temporary visitor as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (2) of the act; to a transient alien as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (3) of the act; to a treaty alien as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (6) of the act; and to an international-organization official as a nonimmigrant under section 3 (7) of the act.

A limited-entry certificate is granted to an alien seeking to enter the United States as a tourist or as a temporary visitor for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the intention of departing through the port of arrival, as in the case of a through passenger on a vessel, landing temporarily for sightseeing purposes while the vessel is in port.

A nonresident alien's border-crossing identification card is issued to a Canadian citizen or British subject domiciled in Canada or to a Mexican citizen who has occasion to make frequent visits to the United States not to exceed 29 days each, as in the case of persons residing in border communities.

A transit certificate is issued to an alien seeking to enter the United States on a single occasion in continuous transit to a foreign destination.

A crew list visa is granted on a crew list to cover the alien members of the crew of a vessel or aircraft, seeking to enter the United States solely in pursuit of their calling.

Procedure To Be Followed by Nonimmigrant Visa Applicant

An alien desiring to come to the United States as a nonimmigrant may apply to the American consular officer in the district where the applicant is residing for a suitable visa or other documentation. The burden of establishing admissibility is placed by section 23 of the Immigration Act of 1924 upon the alien. An alien is therefore required to show by appropriate evidence that he comes within the nonimmigrant category claimed by him, that he intends and will be able to proceed to some country other than the United States upon the termination of the temporary period for which the immigration authorities may admit him, and that he holds valid documentation which will enable him to enter the country to which he intends to proceed after departing from the United States. The applicant must also show that financial provision has been made to cover the expenses of his journey and return abroad.

Temporary Employment in the United States

An alien may not accept employment while in the United States as a temporary visitor unless permission has been obtained from the immigration authorities. He may not obtain a visa for the purpose of accepting temporary employment unless he establishes that he is a person of outstanding distinction in his line of work and is coming to a temporary position calling for ability of such distinction.

Domestic Servants

An alien seeking to enter the United States as a domestic servant is generally regarded as an immigrant but may be granted a nonimmigrant visa when coming to the United States under section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924 as a servant in the household of a foreign-government official, or under section 3 (7) of the act as a servant in the household of an international-organization official, or under section 3 (2) of the act as a visitor when accompanying an employer who is coming to the United States on a temporary visit, provided the servant will depart from the United States with or before his employer.

Students and Trainees

Students and trainees under a recognized training program may accept employment after permission in each case has been obtained from the immigration authorities.

Exchange Visitors

Under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, an existing United States agency or reputable institution, public or private, may file application on form DSP-37 with the Department of State for designation of a program under its sponsorship as an exchange visitor program. If the application is approved, a serial number is assigned to the program and the American consular offices concerned and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are notified. An exchange visitor under a designated program, whether a student, trainee, teacher, guest instructor, professor, or leader in a field of specialized knowledge or skill, may then apply to a consular officer for a visitor's visa under section 3 (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

Passports

A nonimmigrant alien is generally required to present a passport issued by the government of the country to which he owes allegiance and which is valid for at least 60 days beyond the expiration of the period for which he seeks entry. If a passport is not obtainable, as in the case of a "stateless" person, he may present a travel document in lieu of a passport, or if such document is not obtainable, any other travel document in lieu thereof, which is valid for entry into a foreign country after a stay in the United States.

Validity of Passport Visa

Diplomatic, official, and ordinary passport visas are generally granted to be valid for use in applying to the immigration authorities at a port of entry in the United States on one or more occasions during a period of 12 months from the date of issuance, provided that the alien's passport or other travel document continues to be valid for such period; but the visa may under certain circumstances be limited to use for one entry. On a reciprocal basis, visitors' passport visas may be made valid for use during 24 months from the date of issuance if the country of which the alien is a national grants a similar privilege to American citizens.

The period of validity of a visa does not relate to the length of an alien's stay in the United States. This stay is determined in the first instance by the immigration authorities at the time of arrival. Application for an extension of temporary stay may be made to the immigration authorities, usually in the district of the alien's residence.

Revalidation of Visas

Under certain conditions, a visitor's visa may be revalidated by the office of issuance for use in making an application for admission during a further period.

Registration and Fingerprinting

Section 30 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, provides, in part, that "No visa shall hereafter be issued to any alien seeking to enter the United States unless said alien has been registered and fingerprinted in duplicate." Section 32 of the act provides, in part, that "No foreign government official, or member of his family, shall be required to be registered or fingerprinted." The same exemption is granted to international-organization officials and the members of their families. Section 31 of the act provides, in part, that "It shall be the duty of every alien now or hereafter in the United States who (1) is 14 years of age or older, (2) has not been registered or fingerprinted under section 30, and (3) remains in the United States for 30 days or longer, to apply for registration and to be fingerprinted before the expiration of such 30 days."

Under the above requirements, all visa applicants other than foreign government officials, international-organization officials, and the members of their families are required to to be registered and fingerprinted in connection with their individual visa applications. Applicants for transit certificates, limited-entry certificates, alien's nonresident border-crossing cards, and aliens included in collective or crew list visas, as seamen or airmen, are not required to be registered and fingerprinted prior to entry but are subject to such requirement if they remain in the United States for 30 days.

Refusal of Nonimmigrant Visas

A consular officer may refuse nonimmigrant documentation in any one of the following cases:

1. If the alien fails to establish nonimmigrant status.

2. If the alien is coming to the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety.

3. If the alien's entry would be prejudicial to the public interest under the wartime regulations.

4. If the alien's entry is forbidden by the act of October 16, 1918, as amended. (This act relates to Communists or other aliens who advocate or who are members of organizations which believe in the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or are or have ever been members of organizations which so advocate.)

5. If the alien has been deported or removed from the United States and permission has not been granted to him to reapply for admission.

If an alien is not subject to refusal of a visa on one of the above grounds but is believed to be inadmissible into the United States under section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended, as for example, an alien who is illiterate or has an excluding medical, mental, moral, or physical defect, the consul may grant a visa and warn the alien and advise the transportation line that he appears to be inadmissible into the United States and may be excluded at a port of entry unless authorization for temporary entry has been granted by the Attorney General.

The Attorney General has discretionary authority under the ninth proviso to section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended, to admit temporarily, an excludable alien if he arrives at a port of entry seeking temporary admission. If the Attorney General, upon the petition of an interested person, authorizes the temporary entry of an alien, as in the case of an alien afflicted with tuberculosis who desires to come to the United States for treatment, the Department of State is advised and in turn notifies the consul who, if satisfied that the alien is a bona fide nonimmigrant, may grant a visa.

Immigrants

The categories of nonquota immigrants which are exempt from the numerical restrictions of the quota and are enumerated in section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, are briefly as follows:

(a) Member of immediate family of United States citizen wife, husband by marriage prior to January 1, 1948, and unmarried minor child of a United States citizen. (A petition on form I–133 must be filed by the citizen with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in these cases.)

(b) Returning resident alien previously lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, returning from a temporary visit abroad.

(c) Native of Western Hemisphere country, alien born in Canada, the Canal Zone, or an independent country of the Western Hemisphere; his wife and unmarried children under 18 years of age.

(d) Minister or professor who has carried on his vocation for 2 years immediately preceding his application and who is coming to the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on his vocation.

(e) Student. (Although classified as an immigrant, a student at least 15 years of age may be admitted into the United States for a temporary period only for the purpose of study at an educational institution approved by the Attorney General.)

(f) Former United States citizen woman who lost her citizenship by reason of her marriage to an alien or the loss of United States citizenship of her husband or by marriage to an alien and residence in a foreign country.

Other special categories of aliens not subject to the numerical restrictions of the quota are briefly as follows:

1. Alien born in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

2. Certain Spanish nationals returning to Puerto Rico (act of May 26, 1926, 44 Stat. 657).

3. Certain former United States citizens who served in the armed forces of a foreign state.

4. Philippine citizens coming within the provisions of section 231 of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

Preference Quota Immigrants

Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, provides that within the immigration quota preference status shall be accorded, as follows:

1. First preference, up to 50 percent of the quota, to—

(a) Members of family of United States citizen husband by marriage on or after January 1, 1948, and parents of a citizen who is 21 years of age or over. (A petition on Form I–133 must be filed by the citizen with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in these cases.)

(b) Skilled agriculturists in quotas of 300 or over.

2. Second preference, within the quota, after providing for the first preference, to—

(a) Member of immediate family of lawful resident alien wife and unmarried minor child but not the husband.

3. Within the Chinese racial quota and the Indian quota, preference up to 75 percent is granted to persons born and residing in China and India, respectively.

Nonpreference Quota Immigrants

Quota immigrants who are not classified by law as "preference quota immigrants" are "nonpreference quota immigrants." Any quota numbers remained after first and second preference quota demands have been satisfied are available for qualified nonpreference applicants in the order of their priority. Priority among nonpreference quota immigrants is granted by regulation as follows:

1. First priority:

(a) Alien member of the United States armed forces, alien who served honorably in the United States armed forces between September 1, 1939, and December 31, 1946.

(b) Certain relatives of United States veteran citizens who served honorably in the United States armed forces between September 1, 1939, and December 31, 1946. (Widows, parents, unmarried minor child, and unmarried minor stepchildren.)

(c) Seamen who served honorably for at least 1 year on vessels of countries of the United Nations engaged in sailing to and from ports of the United States during the period September 1, 1939, and December 31, 1946, such persons not having voluntarily abandoned such service so long as they were not physically incapacitated for such service and provided that the seamen filed a registration form at a consular office on or before December 31, 1947.

(d) Aliens recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as persons whose admission is highly desirable in the national interest.

2. Second priority:

(a) Aliens who filed BC form of preliminary visa applications with the Department of State between July 1, 1941, and June 30, 1945, under the wartime visa review procedure, provided that the alien informed a consular officer prior to December 31, 1948, that he desired to immigrate to the United States.

3. Nonpriority nonpreference quota immigrants are those not entitled to first or second priority.

Procedure To Be Followed by Intending Immigrants

Aliens desiring to obtain immigration visas may apply to the immigration-visa-issuing consular office of the United States nearest to their place of foreign residence. In the case of an alien chargeable to an oversubscribed quota, application should first be made for registration on the waiting list of the appropriate quota. The applicant must then wait until his turn is reached and he is called by the consul to make formal application for a visa.

Documents To Be Submitted

Under the provisions of section 7 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 the applicant, when requested by the consul, must present a valid passport or travel document in lieu thereof, two copies of his birth certificate, police certificate, prison record if any, and of all other public records concerning him kept by the government to which the alien owes allegiance, as may be required by the consul, if the documents are available. If the documents are not available, which means obtainable or procurable by the exercise of reasonable effort and diligence, the consul may require some other suitable and available documentation in lieu thereof.

The applicant may also be required by the consul to present any other documents necessary for the determination of the facts in his case, such as evidence of his assurance of support, marriage certificate, or divorce decree.

Applicants May Not Be Granted Visas Out of Turn

Applicants may not be granted immigration visas out of their proper turn within the respective categories, since such action would amount to the granting of unauthorized preference.

Removal of Name of Intending Immigrant From Quota Waiting List

The registration of a quota immigrant is canceled, and his name is removed from the waiting list in the following cases:

1. If the registrant dies or abandons his intention to immigrate.

2. If the registrant enters the United States unlawfully or in a temporary status, except in the latter case when he enters the United States as a nonimmigrant under one of the following categories:

(a) Government official under section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

(b) Temporary visitor under section 3 (2) of the act if he is engaged in a business or profession which by its inherent nature requires him to enter the United States.

(c) Seaman or airman under section 3 (5) of the act in pursuit of his calling.

(d) Treaty alien under section 3 (6) of the act.

(e) International organization official under section 3 (7) of the act.

An alien who finds it necessary to come to the United States as a nonimmigrant in transit or as a visitor for urgent reasons and who establishes the facts of the urgency to the consular officer and is granted such documentation and whose name has been removed from the waiting list, may, upon prompt departure after the termination of the emergency, apply to the consul for reinstatement of his name on the waiting list under the original registration date.

Determination of the quotas

Section 11 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, provides that the annual immigration quota of any nationality shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin whose birth or ancestry is attributable to a particular geographical area bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920, but that the minimum of any quota shall be 100. This ratio is known as the national-origin basis for determining the quotas. A Presidential proclamation is required to establish new quotas after changes in political boundaries have occurred and are recognized by the United States. (A list of the present immigration quotas is given in the appendix.)

Quota nationality

Section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 provides that (quota) nationality shall be determined by the country of birth, treating as separate countries the colonies, dependencies, or self-governing dominions, for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1890, except that—

(a) A child under 21 years of age shall be charged to the quota of the native country of the accompanying parent or of the father when both parents accompany the child, regardless of the country of the child's birth unless the child was born in a nonquota country. A minor child desiring to accompany a parent who is entitled to nonquota or preference status may be charged to the quota for the country of the child's birth rather than to that of the parent's birth if such action will enable the child to accompany the parent.

(b) A wife may be charged to the quota of her husband if the monthly quota to which she would ordinarily be chargeable is exhausted, provided she is accompanying him, he is entitled to an immigration visa, and the monthly quota to which he is chargeable is not exhausted.

(c) An immigrant born in the United States who has lost his United States citizenship shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country, then in the country from which he comes, which means the country of his residence or domicile.

An alien husband who is a lawful permanent resident of the United States may go abroad in order to confer upon his wife and his minor children the benefits of his quota nationality if they are to accompany him to the United States.

An alien has the burden of establishing facts which will enable a consular officer to determine his correct quota classification.

An alien of the Chinese race, regardless of the country of birth is chargeable, if a quota immigrant, to the Chinese racial quota.

An alien of a race indigenous to India, if a quota immigrant, is chargeable to the quota for India, regardless of the country of birth. The Chinese wife of an American citizen, however, a returning resident alien as defined in section 4 (b) of the Immigrant Act of 1924, a Chinese or Indian minister or professor as defined in section 4 (d) of the act, or a Chinese or Indian student as defined in section 4 (e) of the act, is entitled to nonquota status.

The term "Chinese person" signifies any person who has as much as one-half Chinese blood and who is eligible to naturalization under section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940. The term "persons of races indigenous to India" means any person who has as much as one-half of the blood of a race indigenous to India and who is eligible to naturalization under section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The act also provides that any quota immigrant who is of one-half Chinese blood and one-half the blood of a race indigenous to India shall, if born in India, be chargeable to the quota for India; if born in China, to the quota for the Chinese, or if born in neither of these countries, to whichever of the quotas has the least applications for visas against it at the time the application for a visa is made.

Monthly limitation on the issuance of quota immigration visas

Section 11 (f) of the Immigration Act of 1924 provides that there shall be issued not more than 10 percent of the immigration visas issuable under any quota of 300 or more in any calendar month.

Allotment of quota numbers

Consular officers throughout the world report to the Department quarterly the number of qualified applicants under the various quotas according to the dates of registration, without giving the names, except in preference cases. These reports furnish information on the total number of qualified applicants under the various quotas throughout the world. As quota numbers become available, they are allotted to consuls for the issuance of visas to qualified applicants who registered prior to a basic date applicable to all consular offices. Therefore, in effect, quota immigration visas are issued on a world-wide priority basis and applicants having the same registration date at any office are considered at the same time.

REFUSAL OF IMMIGRATION VISAS

Section 2 (f) of the Immigration Act of 1924 provides that—

"No immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant if it appears to the consular officer, from statements in the application, or in the papers submitted therewith, that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws, nor shall such immigration visa be issued if the application fails to comply with the provisions of the act, nor shall such immigration visa be issued if the consular officer knows, or has reason to believe, that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws."

Grounds of inadmissibility

The immigration laws (particularly sec. 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended) list various categories of excludable aliens, including the following:

1. Mentally defective aliens (insane persons, idiots).

2. Paupers and vagrants.

3. Diseased persons (persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease).

4. Mentally or physically defective aliens, the physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of the alien to earn a living.

5. Aliens who have been deported from the United States or those who have departed to avoid or evade training or service in the armed forces of the United States.

6. Aliens who applied for exemption from military service in the armed forces of the United States.

7. Criminals (persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed, a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude).

8. Polygamists.

9. Anarchists, Communists, and other politically undesirable aliens (aliens who at any time shall be or have been a member of any of the classes excluded under this category, regardless of their present classification).

10. Prostitutes and procurers.

11. Contract laborers (persons induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate by offers or promises of employment. The contract labor clause applies to persons coming to accept employment predominantly involving manual labor).

12. Public charges (persons likely to become public charges).

13. Persons deported, unless authorization shall have been granted for them to reapply for admission.

14. Persons financially assisted (persons whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another unless it is affirmatively shown that the persons do not belong to any of the foregoing excluded classes and persons whose ticket or passage is paid for by a corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government).

15. Stowaways.

16. Children unaccompanied, not coming to one or both parents (such persons may be admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General if in his opinion the child is not likely to become a public charge).

17. Natives of the Asiatic barred zone, except where permitted under special legislation.

18. Illiterates (except as indicated in the act in the case of certain relatives of persons in the United States).

19. Aliens applying for admission from foreign contiguous territory (unless the line which brought them to such territory entered into certain agreements with the immigration authorities or unless the aliens have lived in such territory for 2 years).

20. Aliens removed from the United States at the expense of the United States (unless permission to reapply for admission is granted to them by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State).

21. Aliens ineligible to citizenship (but such persons may apply as nonimmigrants, or as returning resident aliens under sec. 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, or as ministers or professors under sec. 4 (d), or as students under sec. 4 (e) of the act).

22. Aliens whose entry would be contrary to the public safety or prejudicial to the public interest.

PROVISOS

Seventh proviso to section 3, act of February 5, 1917, as amended

Under the seventh proviso, the Attorney General may admit an excludable alien who is returning after a temporary absence to an unrelinquished domcile of seven consecutive years in the United States.

Ninth proviso to section 3, act of 1917, as amended

Under the ninth proviso the Attorney General has authority to prescribe regulations to admit an excludable alien temporarily.

Tenth proviso to section 3, act of 1917, as amended

Under the tenth proviso accredited officials of foreign governments, their families, suites, and guests are exempt from the excluding provisions of the act. This exemption does not apply to officials entering the United States for personal reasons. The benefits of this proviso have been extended to international-organization officials.

WARTIME REGULATIONS

Wartime regulations governing the entry and departure of aliens have been issued under the authority of the Presidential Proclamation No. 2523 of November 14, 1941, issued under statutory authority of the act of May 22, 1918, as amended by the act of June 21, 1941. In general, these regulations provide for the exclusion of aliens whose entry into the United States would be prejudicial to the public interest. The regulations also provide for denial of permission to depart from the United States in certain cases.

Alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces

The act of December 28, 1945, authorized for a period of 3 years the admission without documents of the alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces. The act exempted the aliens from exclusion as physically or mentally defective aliens or as aliens ineligible to citizenship. The act expired on December 28, 1948.

Fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States

The act of June 29, 1946, as amended, authorized the issuance of visitors visas to the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, provided the alien was not subject to exclusion from the United States under the immigration laws and that a bond was furnished to cover the cost of deporting the alien if the marriage should not take place within 3 months after the date of entry. The act was extended and amended by the act of April 21, 1949. As amended, the act provided that the fiancé or fiancée should not be racially ineligible to citizenship, should arrive in the United States on or before September 21, 1949, should be destined to the United States citizen whom she or he personally met before the issuance of the visa and who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and should be otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. The act expired on September 21, 1949.

ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES

An alien who is in the United States and who entered illegally may not file a registration form at an American consular office.

An alien chargeable to an oversubscribed quota may not spend his waiting time for an immigration visa in the United States and may not, therefore, have his priority determined by a date earlier than his last departure from the United States. This provision applies except when an alien who entered the United States lawfully as a nonimmigrant prior to September 10, 1946, and who has remained in the United States and was permitted to register at an American consular office prior to July 1, 1949. If such alien subsequent to September 10, 1946, proceeded abroad on an urgent and brief visit and reentered the United States as a nonimmigrant, his last entry is considered to be the date on which he last entered the United States prior to September 10, 1946.

An alien in the United States who is the beneficiary of a petition for first preference status as the parent or husband or an American citizen may not have his first preference priority antedate his departure from the United States unless he comes within one of the excepted classes of aliens whose names may be retained on a waiting list while in the United States.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Displaced Persons Act of June 25, 1948, superseded the previous displaced persons program based on the President's directive of December 22, 1945, and his directive of October 31, 1946.

The Displaced Persons Act provides for the establishment of a Displaced Persons Commission and authorizes the issuance of immigration visas to 205,000 displaced persons during the period from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, and for the adjustment of status of a maximum of 15,000 displaced persons in the United States. The act also provides for the use of one-half of the German and Austrian quotas during the period indicated for the issuance of immigration visas to certain persons of German ethnic origin.

Eligible displaced persons

(a) Two hundred thousand displaced persons who are eligible under the International Refugee Organization Constitution, who entered Germany, Austria, or Italy between September 1, 1939, and December 22, 1945, and who on January 1, 1948, were in Italy or in the American, British, or French zones of Germany or Austria; or sectors of Berlin or Vienna, or who having resided in Germany or Austria, were detained or had to flee as a result of persecution by the Nazi Government and were on January 1, 1948, in Germany or Austria and who have not been firmly resettled. Visas issued to these persons will be charged to the quota for the countries of their birth up to 50 percent of the current quotas. Up to 50 percent of the quotas for future years may be used as needed.

(b) Two thousand natives of Czechoslovakia who fled that country since January 1, 1948, as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution and who on June 25, 1948, were in Italy or the American, British, or French zones of Germany or Austria, or sectors of Berlin or Vienna. Visas issued to these persons will also be charged to the quota of the country of their birth as indicated in (a) above.

(c) Three thousand displaced orphans, under the age of 16 at the time of application for a visa, to be issued nonquota immigration visas, who on or before June 25, 1948, were in Italy or in the American, British, or French zones of Germany or Austria or sectors of Berlin or Vienna.

The spouse and unmarried dependent children under 21 years of age of an eligible displaced person may also be qualified as eligible displaced persons.

Conditions to be met by displaced persons

Applicants for visas as displaced persons must qualify under the immigration laws except for the provisions of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, relating to the exclusion of persons who are contract laborers and persons whose transportation is paid by another person or by any corporation, society, or foreign government. They are also exempt from head tax and visa fees.

Assurance must be given to the Displaced Persons Commission that the displaced person will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, that he and the members of his family accompanying him will not become public charges, and that they will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing.

Numerical restrictions, preferences and priorities for displaced persons

1. Not less than 40 percent of the visas shall be available exclusively to eligible displaced persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power. (This group includes nationals or natives of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.)

2. Within the quota, preference is to be given to the following categories:

(a) First, persons previously engaged in agricultural pursuits who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits and their wives and unmarried children under 21 years of age. (It is provided that not less than 30 percent of the visas issued under the act shall be "made available exclusively" to such persons.)

(b) Second, persons who are household, construction, clothing and garment workers, and other workers needed in the locality in the United States in which they propose to reside; and persons possessing special educational, scientific technological, or professional qualifications.

(c) Third, persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or permanent resident aliens within the third degree of consanguinity according to the rules of the common law.

3. Within the preference groups priority in the issuance of visas is to be accorded—

(a) First, to persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the country of their nationality because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

(b) Second, to eligible displaced persons who on January 1, 1948, were located in displaced-persons camps and centers. Only in exceptional cases may visas be issued to persons located outside of displaced-persons camps and centers "upon a showing of special circumstances which would justify such issuance."

Procedure in displaced-persons cases

The Displaced Persons Commission, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., has prescribed regulations relating to displaced persons under the act. The Commission is responsible for certifying to the consular officers that an individual is an eligible displaced person, that the general requirements of the act have been met, and that the preference and priority stipulations have been met.

Only after an individual has been formally certified by the Displaced Persons Commission as a displaced person, will a consular officer examine him under the general immigration laws, and if the alien is found qualified, issue a visa.

All preliminary inquiries regarding displaced persons, and the furnishing of assurances on their behalf should be made to the Displaced Persons Commission.

Adjustment of status of displaced persons in the United States

The Displaced Persons Act provides for the adjustment of status to that of permanent resident of displaced persons in the United States on April 1, 1948, who entered the United States as nonimmigrants under section 3 or as nonquota immigrant students under section 4 (e) of the Immigration Act of 1924 to the number of 15,000.

Grounds of ineligibility to receive visas

The Displaced Persons Act provides that the following persons shall be ineligible to receive visas under that act:

(a) Any person who is, or has been, a member of, or has participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of Government of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully makes a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person.

This applies to displaced persons and to persons of German ethnic origin.

Persons of German ethnic origin

The Displaced Persons Act provides that between July 1, 1948, and June 30, 1950, 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia, and who on June 25, 1948, resided in Germany and Austria. This provision of the Displaced Persons Act is administered solely through the Department of State.

In order to qualify for an immigration visa under the German ethnic origin portions of the German and Austrian quotas, the burden of proof shall be upon each applicant to establish that he is not subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws and to establish the following qualifications as a person of German ethnic origin as intended by Congress in enacting the provisions of section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of June 25, 1948:

1. That he was born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia. (The statute specifically requires this as an element of classification.)

2. That he resided in any part of Germany or Austria on June 25, 1948, when the Displaced Persons Act became effective. (This is also a specific statutory requirement.)

3. That he does not come under the jurisdiction of the International Refugee Organization;

4. (a) That he is a German expellee, or the accompanying wife or minor child of a German expellee, pursuant to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, from Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, or (b) that he is a refugee, or the accompanying wife or minor child of a refugee from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia, or (c) a person of Germanic origin born in any of the five countries mentioned, or the accompanying wife or minor child of such a person, who is unable to return in safety to his former home district in Germany.

5. That he is characteristically Germanic, a status which is to be determined upon the basis of the following combination of factors, the presence or absence of any particular one of which will not, in itself, be considered as conclusive, but any combination of which may be considered as providing satisfactory evidence of German ethnic origin:

(a) Antecedents emigrated from Germany.

(b) Use of any of the German dialects as the common language of the home or for social communications.

(c) Resided in the country of birth in an area populated predominantly by persons of Germanic origin or stock who have retained German social characteristics and group homogeneity as distinguished from the surrounding population.

(d) Evidences common attributes or social characteristics of the Germanic group in which he resided in the country of his birth, such as educational institutions attended, church affiliation, social and political associations, and affiliations, name, business or commercial practices and associations, and secondary languages or dialects.

6. Any person who fails to qualify under 1 or 2 is statutorily ineligible to receive an immigration visa under the "German ethnic origin" clause in section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act, but such person may apply in the usual manner for an appropriate immigration visa under the quota of the country of his birth, at such time as his turn is reached on the waiting list, and his priority on such waiting list shall be determined as of the date of his registration for an immigration visa under the "German ethnic origin" program.

APPENDIX

RECIPROCAL VISA FEE AGREEMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS

List of countries and areas for whose nationals, and in some cases residents, passport visa fees have been reciprocally reduced or waived. Notices of changes in the list appear from time to time in the Federal Register, title 22.

Country or area	
Argentina	Gratis
Austria [3 4]	Gratis
Bahama Islands [3 4]	Gratis
Barbados [3 4]	Gratis
Belgium (not including Belgian Congo) [3 4]	Gratis
Bermuda [3 4]	Gratis
Brazil [1]	Gratis
Bulgaria	$2.00
Canada [3 4]	Gratis
Chile	$1.75
China	$2.50
Colombia	Gratis
Costa Rica	Gratis
Cuba [3 4]	Gratis
Denmark [3 4]	Gratis
Dominican Republic	Gratis
Ecuador	Gratis
Egypt	$2.00
El Salvador [3 4]	Gratis
Finland	Gratis
France: [5]	
3 (2) 12 months	$3.50
3 (2) 24 months	$6.75
3 (3) 1 journey	$2.25
Great Britain [2]	$2.00
Greece	Gratis
Guatemala	Gratis
Guiana (British) [3 4]	Gratis
Haiti	Gratis
Honduras	Gratis
Honduras (British) [3 4]	Gratis
Hungary	Gratis
Iceland [3]	Gratis
India	$2.00
Iran	Gratis
Iraq	$2.00
Ireland [3 4]	Gratis
Italy [3 4]	Gratis
Jamaica [3 4]	Gratis
Leeward Islands, B. W. I. [3 4]	Gratis
Liberia [3]	Gratis
Liechtenstein [3 4]	Gratis
Luxemburg [3 4]	Gratis
Mexico	$2.00
Miquelon: [5]	
3 (2) 12 months	$3.50
3 (2) 24 months	$6.75
3 (3) 1 journey	$2.25
Morocco (French) [3 4]	Gratis
Netherlands [3 4]	Gratis
Netherlands East Indies	Gratis
Netherlands West Indies [3 4]	Gratis
New Zealand [3]	$2.00
Nicaragua	Gratis
Norway [3 4]	Gratis
Panama [3]	Gratis
Peru	Gratis
Siam [3 4]	Gratis
St. Pierre: [5]	
3 (2) 12 months	$3.50
3 (2) 24 months	$6.75
3 (3) 1 journey	$2.25
Surinam [3 4]	Gratis
Sweden [3 4]	Gratis
Switzerland [3 4]	Gratis
Trinidad [3 4]	Gratis
United Kingdom [3 4]	Gratis
Venezuela	$2.00
Windward Islands, B. W. I. [3 4]	Gratis
Yugoslavia	$2.00

[1] Reduction applies only to citizens of Brazil domiciled in Brazil.

[2] Reduction applies to all holders of British passports not otherwise exempt from the payment of nonimmigrant passport visa fees.

[3] Passport visas may be granted for an initial period of 24 months only to nonimmigrant aliens who are proceeding to the United States as temporary visitors within the meaning of sec. 3 (2), Immigration Act, 1924, as amended.

[4] Visas are not required for American citizens entering country or area for temporary stay.

[5] French nationals resident in Metropolitan France, Andorra, Algeria, Morocco, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guiana, Réunion, Tunisia, and Territory of the Saar, and French members of delegations representing warveteran organizations temporarily visiting the United States will be granted gratis nonimmigrant passport visas, and such French nationals who are proceeding to the United States as temporary visitors within the meaning of sec. 3 (2), Immigration Act, 1924, may be granted nonimmigrant passport visas valid for 24 months. All other French nationals are subject to the prescribed fee.

TREATIES OF COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION IN FORCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND OTHER COUNTRIES CONTAINING PROVISIONS TO WHICH SECTION 3 (6) OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924, AS AMENDED, IS APPLICABLE

Argentina: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. II). Signed at San Jose July 27, 1853. Treaty Series 4 (10 Stat. 1005; 18 Stat. (2) 16).

Austria: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Vienna June 19, 1928. Treaty Series 838 (47 Stat. 1867).

Belgium: Treaty of commerce and navigation (art. I). Signed at Washington March 8, 1875. Treaty Series 28 (19 Stat. 628).

Bolivia: Treaty of peace, friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. III). Signed at La Paz May 13, 1858. Treaty Series 32 (12 Stat. 1003; 18 Stat. (2) 68).

Borneo: Treaty of peace, friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. II). Signed at Brunei June 23, 1850. Treaty Series 33 (10 Stat. 909; 18 Stat. (2) 79).

China: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. II). Signed at Nanking November 4, 1946. Department of State press release No. 773 of November 2, 1946.

Colombia: Treaty of peace, amity, navigation, and commerce (art. III). Signed with New Grenada at Bogota December 12, 1846. Treaty Series 54 (9 Stat. 881 18; Stat. (2) 550).

Costa Rica: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. II). Signed at Washington July 10, 1851. Treaty Series 62 (10 Stat. 916; 18 Stat. (2) 159).

Denmark: Convention of friendship, commerce, and navigation (arts. II and VI). Signed at Washington April 26, 1826. Treaty Series 65 (8 Stat. 340; 18 Stat. (2) 167).

El Salvador: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at San Salvador February 22, 1926. Treaty Series 827 (46 Stat. 2817).

Estonia: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Washington December 23, 1925. Treaty Series 736 (44 Stat. 2379).

Ethiopia: Treaty to regulate commercial relations (art. I). Signed at Addis Ababa June 27, 1914. Treaty Series 647 (41 Stat. 1711).

Finland: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Washington February 13, 1934. Treaty Series 868 (49 Stat. 2659).

Great Britain: Convention to regulate commerce and navigation (art. I.) Signed at London July 3, 1815. Treaty Series 110 (8 Stat. 228; 18 Stat. (2) 292).

Greece: Treaty of establishment (art. I). Signed at Athens November 21, 1936. Treaty Series 930 (51 Stat. 230).

Honduras: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Tegucigalpa December 7, 1927. Treaty Series 764 (45 Stat. 2618.

Hungary: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Washington June 24, 1925. Treaty Series 748 (44 Stat. 2441). (The following reservation to the treaty was made by the United States and accepted by Hungary in exchanges of notes on the occasions of the signing and the exchange of ratifications of the treaty: "Nothing contained therein shall be construed to affect existing statutes of either country in relation to the immigration of aliens or the right of either country to enact such statutes."

Ireland: Convention to regulate commerce and navigation (art. I). Signed with Great Britain July 3, 1815. Treaty Series 110 (8 Stat. 228; 18 Stat. (2) 292).

Italy: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. I). Signed at Rome February 2, 1948.

Latvia: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Riga April 20, 1928. Treaty Series 765 (45 Stat. 2641).

Liberia: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. I). Signed at Monrovia August 8, 1938. Treaty Series 956 (54 Stat. 1739).

Norway: Treaty of commerce and navigation (art. I). Signed with Sweden and Norway at Stockholm July 4, 1827. Treaty Series 348 (8 Stat. 346; 18 Stat. (2) 736).

Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights, and additional article (art. I and additional article). Signed at Washington June 5, 1928, and February 25, 1929. Treaty Series 852 (47 Stat. 2135).

Paraguay: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation (art. II). Signed at Asuncion February 4, 1859. Treaty Series 272 (12 Stat. 1091; 18 Stat. (2) 594).

Poland: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights (art. I). Signed at Washington June 15, 1931. Treaty Series 862 (48 Stat. 1507).

Siam: Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, final protocol, and exchange of notes (art. I and art. XVI). Signed at Bangkok November 13, 1937. Treaty Series 940 (53 Stat. 1731).

Spain: Treaty of friendship and general relations (art. II). Signed at Madrid July 3, 1902. Treaty Series 422 (33 Stat. 2105).

Switzerland: Convention of friendship, commerce, and extradition (art. I). Signed at Berne November 25, 1850. Treaty Series 353 (11 Stat. 587; 18 Stat. (2) 748).

Turkey: Treaty of establishment and sojourn (art. I). Signed at Ankara October 28, 1931. Treaty Series 859 (47 Stat. 2432).

Yugoslavia: Treaty for facilitating and developing commercial relations (art. I). Signed with Serbia at Belgrade October 2–14, 1881. Treaty Series 319 (22 Stat. 963).

There has been no judicial determination as to the effect of World War II on the legal status of article I of the treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights with Germany, signed December 8, 1923.

IMPORTANT IMMIGRATION LAWS

Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C. 132). The Immigration Act of 1917, a basic immigration act, lists in section 3 many categories of aliens who are excluded from the United States.

Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 153; 8 U. S. C. 201). The Immigration Act of 1924, a basic immigration act, provides for the numerical limitation of immigrants according to quotas for various countries established according to "national origins."

Act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559; 22 U. S. C. 223; 55 Stat. 252, act of June 21, 1941). This act relates to the prevention in time of war of the departure from or entry into the United States of aliens contrary to the public safety.

Act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012; 8 U. S. C. 137). This act relates to the exclusion and expulsion of alien anarchists and similar classes.

Act of February 25, 1925 (43 Stat. 976; 8 U. S. C. 202). This act authorizes the President in certain cases to modify visa fees for nonimmigrants.

Act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456; 48 U. S. C 1232, Philippine Independence Act).

Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 458, Alien Registration Act, 1940).

Act of June 28, 1940 (55 Stat. 252; 22 U. S. C. 223). This act authorizes the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

Act of December 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 600; 10 U. S. C. 903). Act to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts and to establish an immigration quota for Chinese.

Act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 659; 8 U. S. C. 232). This act provides for the entry of the spouses and children of service personnel for a period of 3 years.

Act of December 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 669; 22 U. S. C. 288). International Organizations Privileges and Immunities Act provides privileges and immunities for members of and representatives to international organizations designated by the President and provides a special nonimmigrant status, section 3 (7) which is similar to that of foreign government officials, section 3 (1).

Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 128). An act to rehabilitate the Philippines and provides nonquota status for certain Philippine nationals.

Act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 339; 50 U. S. C. 1851). This act provides for the admission under bond as nonimmigrant temporary visitors of alien fiancées of service personnel. The act as extended expired December 31, 1948.

Act of July 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 417; 8 U. S. C. 2126). This act provided for the establishment of an Indian immigration quota.

Act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 6; 22 U. S. C. 1431 Note). United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 provides for the admission as exchange visitors of students, teachers, etc., from foreign countries on a reciprocal basis.

Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1009; 50 App. U. S. C. 1951, the Displaced Persons Act).

Act of April 21, 1949 (Public Law 51, 81st Cong.). Amendng and extendng the Fiancée Act of June 29, 1946 (Public Law 471, 79th Cong.).

Memorandum on Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum on Jerusalem prepared by the American Zionist Council.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON JERUSALEM

(By the American Zionist Council)

The United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission has presented to the General Assembly a draft instrument establishing a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area.

All will agree that the fundamental object of an international regime for Jerusalem is to safeguard the holy places which are sacred to Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, and to insure free access to them. The Commission was instructed by the General Assembly to present detailed proposals which would attain that objective.

In examining the instrument submitted by the Palestine Conciliation Commission, two questions arise:

1. Is it faithful to its objective?
2. Is it practical?

To safeguard the holy places it is necessary to establish an international regime whose duties and functions are concerned with the holy places. Such a plan would respect the religious sentiments of all faiths. But the instrument drafted by the PCC provides for an international regime which would not only supervise the holy places, but would also intrude into the secular and political life of the people residing in Jerusalem. Such a regime, encroaching on the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the inhabitants themselves, could be established only with the consent of the parties directly concerned. Patently, such consent, involving the voluntary surrender of rights won at great sacrifice, would not be forthcoming.

By proposing the impossible, the Commission has thus defeated its objective; but it has rendered a useful service, for an analysis of the draft instrument reveals the impossibility of devising an international government, superimposed upon a population, without regard for its own problems and legitimate interests.

When one contrasts the theoretical blueprint of the Commission with the realities of life in Jerusalem itself, one must conclude that if the United Nations wishes to safeguard the holy places, it should do precisely that. To go beyond is to venture into the realms of futility and failure.

It is not intended to analyze the draft instrument in detail, for a plan that is fundamentally and basically unacceptable to the people whose consent is a condition precedent to its peaceful implementation cannot be saved by patchwork revision. In this connection, it is of interest to note that the peoples directly concerned were never shown the draft instrument or acquainted with its broad outlines or provisions. It is curious that an undertaking where consent is so essential an element to success, there was no consultation of any kind. Yet in another sense, the procedure is not surprising, for it is in keeping with the character of the plan itself. The plan does not consult the interests of the people. It ignores them. Indeed, it does them injury.

The proposed draft is unacceptable because:

1. It is detached from the realities of life in Jerusalem.
2. It violates fundamental principles of the United Nations.
3. It ignores all past experience.
4. It imposes an impossible burden on the United Nations itself.

I. IT IS DETACHED FROM THE REALITIES OF LIFE IN JERUSALEM

The Conciliation Commission's plan was drafted as though in a vacuum. It seems to treat Jerusalem as some devitalized

antiquity inhabited by a population entirely devoid of national, communal, and cultural sentiment. The city of Jerusalem is not a museum. It must not be regarded as a relic to be wrapped in wax. It is a living city. It is conscious of its rich historic and religious tradition, but at the same time it is a modern city. It looks with keen interest to the future and the welfare of its people.

The people of Jerusalem are devoted to their city. They have a most devout reverence for its history and sanctity. This reverence is entirely compatible with the maintenance of normal every-day secular life. Like every other intelligent people, they want to elect their own government officials, decide how much they will pay in taxes, control the expenditures of their government's revenues. They desire self-determination and independence in association with their own people. Of this they gave clear evidence within the last 2 years when they fought for their freedom and won it at great cost of life.

Under the proposed draft, the peoples of Jerusalem would be denied self-determination. Decisive powers would be vested in external agencies outside their control. Jerusalem would be divided into two zones. But neither the Arab nor the Jewish zone would be integrated with the continguous Arab and Jewish states. They would be separate zones. People of each zone are euphemistically referred to as residents. Apparently they are to be citizens of no state. They are to bear allegiance to no national authority. In short, they are to be stateless.

Internationalization is not a concept readily acceptable to any people. Many sentiments, pride in common history, and devotion to common destiny, give content and meaning to the concept of national allegiance. For the Jews in Jerusalem this concept, cherished for long generations, is all the more precious since it was only recently realized. Until some 18 months ago, most of these people were known as displaced persons, refugees, stateless. Many of them were homeless refugees in Europe, uprooted by the Nazis and set adrift for 5, 10, 15 years. The establishment of the state of Israel and the stout and successful defense of Jerusalem had made it possible for them to assert their own nationality. Now to deny them this newly won right, to render them stateless once again, would be a cruel blow which none would understand. But this would be more than a mere psychological disaster. Statelessness has physical, economic, juridical disabilities. The residents of these zones, citizens of no country, residents of no nationality, would ask themselves: To whom shall we turn for passports? Who will represent us in world commerce? Who will protect us from personal indignities abroad? Who will defend us from external agression? Who will stand up as our spokesman in international councils, there to defend and advance our interests, to assert our rights, to express our views, to make our proper contribution to international affairs? It is a curious paradox that the proposal to internationalize the city removes its population from the international arena. Deprived of nationality, they would be unrepresented in the international forum.

The Jews of Jerusalem are Israelis. They regard themselves as nationals of the new state. They consider the Jewish sections of Jerusalem to be an integral part of that state. They could not be deprived of that citizenship without their consent. And in no condition would they give their consent.

To sever modern Jerusalem from the State of Israel is a surgical amputation critically injuring the health both of the city and the state. For the first time, the city now enjoys self-government and it is bound to develop far more rapidly in the future than it has done in the past. But this promise of growth and expansion is clouded by the threat of denial of self-rule. Past experience amply justifies that fear. It is fortified by the explicit provisions of the draft document. The decisive vote of the proposed general council is to be cast by those whom the people themselves do not elect. This council determines levies to be paid. Here is taxation without representation—aggravated by the likelihood that one part of the city will be asked to subsidize the other at the expense of its own growth and development.

The primary requisite of any community's growth is people. On this point the draft document proposes a curious strait-jacket. Article 5 declares the responsible authorities shall take no steps in matters of immigration which might alter the present demographic equilibrium of the area of Jerusalem. This is a bald—if unspoken—ban on Jewish immigration into Jerusalem. This in itself is an evil proscription, reviving the bitter memories of the Palestine white paper of 1939 which all but prohibited Jewish immigration into Palestine and which set in moton the train of events that led finally to the end of the mandate. The all-compelling incentive of the Jewish struggle for independence in Israel was the universal demand of the Jewish people to open their country to Jewish immigration. Now it is proposed that there be a limitation on Jewish immigration into Jerusalem. Are conditions to be created which will compel Jews to organize "illegal" Jewish immigration into Jerusalem? Will Jews be driven to organize a new underground to carry on that immigration and to defend it?

Moreover, it must be recognized that the ban falls with unequal weight, for the new international authority is not to attempt to control a population increase resulting from birth. The Arab birth rate in Palestine has always been much higher than the Jewish birth rate. In fact, the rate of population increase of the Arabs has been the highest in the world. Obviously, a rule which limits Jewish immigration but ignores the natural Arab increase will weight the demographic equilibrium in favor of the Arab zone.

Put bluntly, this clause asserts in the name of the UN: "No Jews are welcome here." Such a proclamation would not only create a most violent reaction inside Israel. It would be deeply resented by Jews all over the world. It would be welcomed only by those who preach racial and religious discrimination.

II. IT VIOLATES FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE UN

It does not require detailed discussion to conclude that the proposed draft is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. The proposal to denationalize in the name of internationalization is objectionable not merely because injury is done to a people. It is objectionable because violence is done to fundamental principles. There is some irony in that article 7 of the proposed document calls upon the local authorities of the Arab and Jewish zones to insure human rights and fundamental freedoms. But such rights and freedoms which have been acquired by the people of Jerusalem and which are now being exercised by them are to be abrogated by this very same document.

Article 1 of the UN Charter affirms the principle of equal rights and self-determination and declares it to be the purpose of the United Nations to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The obligation of the United Nations to assist peoples toward self-government and independence is clearly expressed in article 75 of the Charter. Nowhere is the United Nations or any of its organs empowered to help people to non-self-government or to assist in the establishment of non-self-governing territories.

For the United Nations to embark on such a program would be to retreat ignominiously from high principle and purpose. Thus to announce to the world in the name of the United Nations that Jewish immigration to Jerusalem is to be barred is to suggest that the United Nations has a low estimate of the value of people themselves and it is prepared to make invidious distinctions between peoples. It would be a strange undertaking for the United Nations to attempt to withhold from people the exercise of their right of self-determination. Such proposals are neither within the competence of the United Nations nor in accord with its conscience.

III. IT IGNORES ALL PAST EXPERIENCE

For three religions—Christianity, Islam, and Judaism—Jerusalem is sacred, an eternal shrine. For the Jewish people, Jerusalem holds cultural and national as well as spiritual associations. It is the center of their national history. It was the capital of the first and second Jewish commonwealths. For 2,000 years of Jewish exile and dispersion Jerusalem was not merely a city of a revered past. It was the promise of a glowing future. To sever Jerusalem from the Jewish state is to do violence to Jewish history. It offends the sensibilities of every Jew in Jerusalem and Israel. It arouses the deepest reaction among Jews as a people, for it would be a crushing blow to their national honor and dignity.

The plan quarrels with recent history, including the experience in the United Nations itself. It ignores completely the events of the past 24 months. It is as if the history of Jerusalem began on the day the draftsmen placed their proposals on paper.

When the General Assembly began consideration of the report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, the representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine made it clear to the Assembly that they believed Jerusalem was irrevocably linked with the proposed Jewish state, and they advocated that the modern sections of Jerusalem, built and inhabited by Jews, be made part of the Jewish state. This proposal was not accepted by the General Assembly, and in deference to the wishes of that body and to the sentiments expressed by religious spokesmen of the world, the Jewish Agency representatives assented to the proposal that Jerusalem be internationalized. Having given their assent, the Jewish representatives then did everything in their power to implement the plan. Representatives of the Jewish Agency, accepting the declaration of the General Assembly on Jerusalem as a promise that Jerusalem might be spared conflict and its shrines safeguarded from war, worked with organs of the United Nations to draft a statute for Jerusalem. But confronted with Arab resistance and boycott, the organs of the United Nations failed to assume the responsibilities to which they were pledged. The Trusteeship Council, on April 21, 1948, abandoned its efforts to draft a statute for Jerusalem. It adopted a resolution referring the matter back to the General Assembly.

By that action, the Jewish population in Jerusalem was abandoned by the world and left to itself in the face of grave danger. Fighting broke out in Jerusalem within a few hours after the General Assembly adopted the resolution of November 29, 1947, and from that time on the Jewish population of Jerusalem was subjected to sniping, shellfire, starvation, and siege. In May 1948 the position grew even more desperate, for Jerusalem was separated from the newly established state of Israel and isolated from the world itself.

The Jews of Jerusalem, the Jews of Israel, yield to no one in their devotion to the sacred city. It was not the Jews who shelled its shrines. It was not the Jews who destroyed its water supply. It was not the Jews who blockaded its roads to deny it food. It was not the Jews who blew up its holy places. On the contrary it was the Jews who de-

fended Jerusalem and sought to save it from destruction. Nothing that happens to Jerusalem is ever forgotten in history, and the world will long remember the ordeal through which Jerusalem passed. Hundreds, thousands of its people today carry wounds which painfully recall that struggle. For months the people were reduced to a pitiful ration of food and water. Many literally faced death by starvation. And those who died were unburied for days. In this crisis the international community which had assumed the right to exercise jurisdiction over Jerusalem failed to discharge its responsibilities. Jerusalem, its people and its sacred places were rescued for civilization by the people of Israel who, by a herculean effort, opened a road to the beleaguered city, brought it food, water, arms, and life itself.

No monument to this saga in Jewish history has yet been erected. No memorial attests to the city's suffering and agony unless it be the charred skeletons of trucks and convoys which lie along the road from Bab-el-Wad up to the Holy City—silent sentinels of the youth who fought and died to liberate Jerusalem. The story of this struggle is etched in the mind and heart of every Jew in Jerusalem and in Israel. The bond between Jerusalem and Israel is the bond of common struggle and survival. It cannot again be severed.

In this light, the bland suggestion that the new city, surrounded as it is on three sides by Arab forces, be again rendered defenseless, seems totally unrealistic. In these circumstances it is inconceivable that the people would agree to divest themselves of military forces, essential to life itself. The United Nations may not ask any people to commit suicide.

IV. IT IMPOSES AN IMPOSSIBLE BURDEN ON THE UNITED NATIONS ITSELF

Past experience of the United Nations itself should deter it from an undertaking beyond its competence and capacity. It is no disrespect of the United Nations to suggest that that organization is not equipped at this stage to impose upon an unwilling people a superstructure of government which abridges the rights of the people concerned and violates the Charter of the United Nations. The chief purpose of such a commission—the safeguarding of the holy places—is defeated from the outset if it attempts to do more than to achieve that purpose.

It is essential, if the holy places are to be protected and maintained, that a practical and workable plan be adopted. The Government of Israel has repeatedly affirmed its support of the principle of full international control for the protection and immunity of the holy places. The Government's attitude was submitted to the Ad Hoc Political Committee of the General Assembly by the representative of the Government of Israel on May 5, 1949. At that time, the representative said in part:

"1. The Government of Israel cooperated to the fullest extent with the statute drawn up in November 1947. It bears no responsibility for the failure of that project, a failure which arose through the deliberate armed resistance of the Arab States and the refusal of the organs of the United Nations to ratify or assume the obligations necessary for the fulfillment of the statute.

"2. The Government of Israel advocates and supports the establishment by the United Nations of an international regime for Jerusalem concerned exclusively with the control and protection of holy places and sites. If such a regime for the holy places is established, my Government will cooperate with it.

"3. The Government of Israel will also agree to place under international control holy places in other parts of its territory outside of Jerusalem. * * *

"4. The Government of Israel is prepared to offer the fullest safeguards and guaranties for the security of religious institutions in the exercise of their functions. The Government of Israel is prepared to negotiate immediately with all religious authorities concerned with this end in view. * * *

"5. The Government of Israel will persevere in its efforts to repair the damage inflicted on religious buildings and sites in the course of the war launched by the Arab states.

"6. The Government of Israel regards with pride and satisfaction its part in the restoration of peace and order which are the essential requisites of any reverent care for the holy places and sites.

"7. The integration of the Jewish part of Jerusalem into the life of the state of Israel has taken place as a natural historical process arising from the conditions of war, from the vacuum of authority created by the termination of the mandate, and from the refusal of the United Nations to assume any direct administrative responsibilities on the scene. This integration, which is paralleled by a similar process in the Arab area, is not incompatible with the establishment of an international regime charged with full juridical status for the effective protection of the holy places, no matter where situated. * * *

"8. The Government of Israel will continue to seek agreements with the Arab interests concerned for the maintenance and preservation of peace and the reopening of blocked access into and within the city of Jerusalem. Such negotiations now proceeding, however, do not affect the juridical status of Jerusalem, which we shall seek to define by international consent. * * *

"11. The Government of Israel draws attention to the existence of profound Jewish religious interests, which give Jerusalem a central and abiding place in Jewish spiritual life. All the sacred associations of Jerusalem derive ultimately from its Jewish origins. The preservation of synagogs, the right of access to the Wailing Wall, and of residence within the walled city require international guaranties and implementation."

This position remains unchanged. The Government of Israel advocates the establishment of an international regime for the holy places. It will help to establish such a regime. It will fully cooperate with it. It earnestly hopes that the United Nations will concede to the people of Jerusalem an appreciation of their rights and responsibilities in a measure equal to that people's understanding and respect for universal interest in the Holy City.

To keep Jerusalem sacred it is unnecessary to profane every democratic principle. The national interests of the people of Jerusalem can be reconciled with world interest in the city's shrines without violating either. These interests are not in conflict.

Federal Charters To Regulate Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview on Federal charters in which I engaged with the editors of the United States News and World Reports. The questions and answers were printed in the issue of October 14 of this nationally known and circulated publication.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CHARTERS TO REGULATE BUSINESS?—NATIONAL STANDARDS URGED FOR THE RIGHT TO OPERATE A CORPORATION—MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES WOULD BE DEFINED AND FORBIDDEN IN ADVANCE—TAX ADVANTAGE FOR "LITTLE MAN" IS ADVOCATED

(An interview with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, has long advocated that corporations be required to operate under Federal standards which would regulate the conduct of business enterprises so as to achieve various objectives now sought under the antitrust laws. Mr. O'Mahoney plans to renew his pressure for such legislation. He was invited to the conference rooms of United States News and World Report to give his views on the question of concentration of economic power. This is one of a series of interviews with spokesmen of business and Government.)

Question. Do you think, Senator O'MAHONEY, that what is being done under the Sherman antitrust law is sufficient to insure competition?

Answer. The Sherman law alone is not sufficient to insure competition because the assets of large enterprises are so great that by Fabian tactics in the courts they can wait out almost any antitrust suit. Large-scale national enterprise is a technological and almost an economic necessity in our time, but national business is beyond the power of the States to regulate in the public interest. Consequently, the Sherman law is inadequate because it is a punitive method of preserving competition, whereas we need a preventive method.

Question. How would you alter that situation?

Answer. I would adopt a Federal charter system for corporations in interstate commerce.

Question. How would that accomplish the purpose?

Answer. It would define specifically the powers, responsibilities and duties of corporate enterprise, and, having done so, it would also release all enterprise from continuing interference by discretionary mandates of national Government.

The basic fact is that a corporation is an exercise of a special privilege. We've fallen into the habit of issuing blank checks through the States to corporations which operate in interstate and foreign commerce. In other words, the States create the agencies which carry on the commerce which the Constitution of the United States provided should be regulated by Congress.

Question. You're regulating a good bit of it now, aren't you?

Answer. We're attempting to regulate it through the discretionary powers of Federal commissions because we have failed to prescribe clearly by law the powers and duties of the organizations which carry on interstate and foreign commerce.

Corporations receive blanket charters from the States with unlimited power to do what they please anywhere in the United States and abroad. As a result, we set up Federal commissions to which we tend to give similarly broad powers. The Department of Justice cannot possibly keep pace with corporate activities, and consequently Congress continues to delegate its powers to boards and commissions.

Question. You mean you would require a corporation to get a Federal charter before it could do business?

Answer. Not exactly. My bill for a Federal charter system simply provides national standards with which corporations created by the States must comply to engage in that

commerce which, under the Constitution, only the Congress may regulate. This bill recognizes State charters.

Question. How would you, by setting up standards, regulate the conduct of corporations? Would you fix limits to the size of companies, volumes of sales?

Answer. I would hesitate to do that because I don't think anybody is wise enough to foresee what kind of productive units the future may demand. I feel, however, that corporations should not be permitted to engage in utterly irrelevant businesses. Conglomerate corporations I think are hard to justify. I think the industrial holding company also leads to concentration of economic power.

When under these blanket charters the State-created corporations clothe their officers with unlimited planning power, there is set up a private managerial system in both national and international commerce, the result of which is often the creation of private international economic government.

Question. Would you maintain competition through a charter law?

Answer. Competition would be sustained by taking away corporate power to engage in basic monopolistic practices—division of territory, fixing of prices, and restraint of production.

Question. You can control those now under the Sherman law, can't you?

Answer. But you cannot enforce the Sherman Act except at great expense of money and time. I say it is more practical to take away the corporate power of the corporation to agree with any other corporation, for example, to fix prices. By acting in this way we would deprive the artificial persons, the corporations, of the power to do the things which are the cause of monopoly.

Question. How would you penalize them?

Answer. When a corporation doesn't have the corporate power to do a particular thing, its officers cannot do it. Without national standards established by national law, the officers of State-created corporations find little difficulty in entering implied agreements or understandings in violation of antitrust laws.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CHARTER RULES

Question. That isn't a usual form of monopoly, is it? Isn't it one company competing with another, using ruthless methods in agreement with some other company? How would a national charter stop that?

Answer. Well, no corporation could perform any corporate act except that which it is authorized to do in its charter. Now because we have grown accustomed to the unlimited powers which corporations exercise under blanket State charters, we seem not to understand the perfectly plain, simple fact, that, if the charter of a corporation says that the corporation shall not have the power to enter into any agreement, express or implied, with any other corporation, to divide territory, to fix prices or to restrain production, then neither the corporation nor its officers can follow such practices.

It would be provided by law that any officer or director of a national corporation who participated in any of these forbidden transactions would be guilty of an offense punishable by fine and imprisonment. Thus, the condition would be created whereby corporation president X would not go to the telephone and call the president of a competing corporation and say: "When I raise my eyebrows at the trade conference tomorrow, that will mean I agree."

Question. Would one of the penalties be to revoke their charter?

Answer. Yes, I should think so.

Question. Well, under this plan, the Department of Justice would prosecute these cases, wouldn't it?

Answer. My bill authorizes the Attorney General to file suit to revoke the authority of any corporation which willfully and knowingly violates the charter law by engaging in forbidden monopolistic practices.

Question. Therefore litigation could keep on just the same as under the Sherman law, couldn't it?

Answer. No, I don't think so.

Question. You would put a firm out of business this way?

Answer. Yes, you could, but I don't think you'd ever have to. That would be the extreme penalty. I think there has been much improvement in business ethics in recent years. It's so much better than it used to be.

Question. According to the number of antitrust suits filed by the Department of Justice, it's worse, isn't it?

Answer. But there is much more national business now than ever before. This is what you must understand, it seems to me. The modern corporation is one of the most dominant social institutions of our time. It shapes our way of living. And I think the national corporation with unlimited power threatens the very existence of the American system of free private enterprise and free government.

Question. When you speak of unlimited corporations—they are limited now by the Federal laws on labor relations, on securities exchanges, and a number of things, aren't they?

Answer. Yes, but again those are all more or less in the category of discretionary controls by boards and commissions which change with the personnel. We have a system, therefore, which, in effect, results in a change of the law with a change of administrators. If you want a government of law instead of men, then the Congress ought to define the law as clearly as possible.

Question. Would you tell us what would be the impact of this charter proposal on the investment field?

Answer. I think it would help the investment of private capital by inspiring confidence that corporations were not being run by and for the insiders.

Question. Would you regulate insurance companies? Are they corporations?

Answer. They are corporations. I think they ought to abide by national standards. I don't pretend to say dogmatically what those standards should be—but we ought to have a national rule of conduct for these organizations which carry on the national business upon which the standard of living of all of the people depends.

Question. Would you say that the proposed solution would be so explicit that it would prevent the Big Threes and Big Fours in these major industries?

Answer. I don't know that it would solve that problem completely, except to the degree that competition is preserved. I think the best solution is the incentive-tax program, recommended in the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee to stimulate investment of private capital.

Question. How would that work?

Answer. I would try to reduce the rate of taxation on private capital invested in new competitive enterprise.

Question. You mean that a new corporation would get a lower rate?

Answer. It might be so.

Question. Would you do it by rapid depreciation? You would give the new competitor a tax exemption?

Answer. That's right—a new competitive industry.

Question. That's subsidizing, isn't it?

Answer. Well, we're not afraid of subsidies, are we? We have subsidized the aviation industry to the tune of $500,000,000, but an act of Government which creates opportunity for private profit by encouraging the expansion of business is hardly a subsidy.

Question. In other words, you would give an advantage financially to the newcomer?

Answer. That's right. Let me give an example of what I have in mind. When the tax bill was under consideration in the last Congress, I proposed an amendment to provide accelerated depreciation for capital invested in plant or equipment to make liquid fuel out of coal or oil shale. The amendment was rejected.

GIVING THE LITTLE MAN A STAKE

Question. Other than specific proposals on taxation, what else do you think might be forthcoming out of your investment study?

Answer. I'm not prepared at this moment to try to make predictions. But I would say that tax reform is essential to preserve capitalism—by which I mean the system of private property—and I think it is highly important in the state of world affairs that we do preserve capitalism, or else it will be hard to avoid the totalitarian state.

I would say that we must encourage the owners of private capital, small owners, to get into businesses of which they are managers as well as owners. My feeling is if we are going to preserve free enterprise and the system of private property, we've got to give the little fellow, the little man, a stake in industry, for economic collectivism leads to political collectivism.

Question. We have given loans to many of them to go into business, haven't we?

Answer. Yes, but I don't think Government loans are a solution. What I want to see is the investment of the savings of the people.

Question. Aren't there a great many people who believe that the large enterprises have efficiency and quality on their side? That's the big problem, isn't it? How are you going to overcome that?

Answer. Up to a certain point, large enterprises do have efficiency and quality on their side. Frequently they produce so large a proportion of the total output that, as in the case of steel today, the whole country depends for its needs upon the private judgment of private managers. Efficiency and high-quality production, however, are not a direct result of size. There comes a point at which big enterprise runs up against the law of diminishing returns.

Question. Take the three tobacco companies, for instance. How does anybody go into the tobacco business under your charter system—or any system—and compete with those three fellows?

Answer. With respect to the tobacco and cigarette business, I think a change of the tax law—a graduated tax—would help.

CONGLOMERATE CORPORATIONS

Question. You spoke of conglomerate corporations. What is your chief objection to investments in an unrelated enterprise? When a company goes as far as it should in one industry and wants to invest in another industry, what is your objection to that?

Answer. I think it tends to discourage competition and new enterprise.

Question. But wouldn't it be competing in a new line? Isn't that more competition?

Answer. I think it suppresses competition and tends toward concentration of power. If you permit the control over our economy to be concentrated in a few hands, you can't avoid the inevitable result which will be the concentration of our Government.

Question. Now, if you can get 16 soap companies and three coal companies into the oil business, you've got more competition in the oil business; isn't that so?

Answer. No; because your concentration of control will drive the little fellows out and your concentration will be greater.

Take the report of Dr. [A. D. H.] Kaplan, of Brookings Institution, who wrote a book for CED (Committee for Economic Development) on the place of small business. He presented a table there showing the relationship of workers to employers, and the figures show, as I recall it now, 4,900 businesses out of more than 3,000,000 in the United States em-

ploy between 52 percent and 56 percent of all the workers in industry.

That means we are producing a proletariat by concentration of economic power. We are developing a class who do not control or have any chance of controlling or exercising any managerial power over the businesses out of which they must make their living.

Question. You would want the workers to exercise control over the business. Is that what you mean?

Answer. Yes; I would have workers and investors share in management and in profits.

Question. How would you bring that about?

Answer. I would give workers the right to elect a director or two.

Question. You would want them to participate in the management of the company?

Answer. Certainly, so that they would be part of it instead of mere tools, as they are now.

Question. Isn't that the CIO proposal? For years Phil Murray has urged these management councils in which the management would be partly labor——

Answer. That is a different proposal.

DIVIDED MANAGEMENT?

Question. Doesn't your proposal divide management between labor and employer?

Answer. No; I wouldn't say that, but I think that the worker ought to have some sort of representation in management. He ought to have a stake in the business.

Question. The war, of course, brought some concentration. Now, since the war, what are the evils of concentration as you see them? How do they affect the economy?

Answer. Concentration destroys local economic independence. It undermines small business. It gives a comparatively few managers in the big cities control over the economic life of the Nation and it causes the Government at Washington to expand.

Question. You're getting it now through a big union in the coal industry, aren't you?

Answer. Well, you're thinking that this is a conflict between big business and big labor, for example. It isn't. Or that it is a conflict between big business and big government. It isn't. It is a conflict between the people and central management of their affairs.

I want to see the free-enterprise system maintained and preserved, and I say to you that it cannot be maintained in the face either of central management of our economy in private hands or in public hands. They're both equally bad. I say to you that political dictatorship, like the dictatorship of Mussolini, of Hitler, or of Stalin, is the direct result of dictatorship in business.

Question. Do you think the British have any solution in their nationalization?

Answer. No. That's pure socialism and state management. That's statism. Now if by statism you mean that the government shall render the decisions whereby the masses of the people live, it is absolutely opposed to the American system and I wouldn't want to see it because it would destroy the individualistic system on which free government depends.

Question. And yet the standards that you put in your law would have to be set forth and interpreted every day by government, wouldn't they?

Answer. They would not, sir.

Question. You mean they would be so explicit that you wouldn't have to have any interpretation? Why not put them in the law you have now?

Answer. No corporation has any power except that power which is given to it by some State. When you take away from the corporation the broad and unlimited powers it now has and make those powers specific and then provide your sanctions in the law for the violation of those powers, you create a psychological barrier in the mind of every corporate manager against the violation of the antitrust law.

Its most effective enforcement would be by way of prevention, rather than by punishment after the fact.

The point is this, that the antitrust law was devised at a time when most of our business was personal and not corporate. At that time, the corporation was not the dominant social institution it is now. The Sherman Act was a restatement of the old common law that restraint of trade was illegal and that contracts in restraint of trade could not be enforced.

Now we have moved into another era in which technology has so increased the radius through which men can operate, and the blanket State charter has given them such an instrument of organization that we have a centrally managed economic system regulating the lives of millions in every part of the land.

This economic system is being carried on by managers whose word is law in the economic field and who can restrain trade with little danger of discovery by the Department of Justice unless the Congress gives the Department of Justice a tremendous appropriation to support a tremendous staff.

I believe in self-government and what I want is a charter plan which will make organized business self-governing by so clearly prescribing its powers that all will understand.

Question. But do you think Congress will undertake to fulfill this plan? Is your bill making much progress?

Answer. No; and the reason for that is perfectly plain. We had this recommendation in the TNEC report filed in March 1941. We were moving right into the war and nobody in Congress could pay any attention to it then, so it went right up on the shelf.

OBSTACLES TO LEGISLATION

Question. Do you think the temper of this Congress suggests it will go in for trust-busting legislation?

Answer. Well, this Congress is about to adjourn.

Question. You've got another year yet, haven't you?

Answer. But the next year we will be running into an election.

Question. During an election year are they of that temper?

Answer. I am not concerned in making issues with which to fight campaigns. I'm concerned in obtaining an understanding on the part of leaders in business and government that the capitalistic system is in jeopardy because we have permitted collectivism to take over big industry through concentrated control, and that the result inevitably will be concentration in government unless we stop concentration and save competition.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a group of 102 residents of Maryland has addressed to me a communication expressing their opposition to compulsory health insurance, and protesting against H. R. 6000 now pending in the Congress.

From the great volume of correspondence that has come to me on this matter, and as a result of discussions with a great number of my constituents regarding this very controversial issue, I am convinced that the views of the signers of this communication represent the feelings of a majority of the people of Maryland on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the communication be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *October 4, 1949.*

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: In the interests of humanity and for the cause of democracy, we, the undersigned, are definitely opposed to compulsory health insurance and as voters are protesting against bill H. R. 6000:

Neil W. Reid, 2917 St. Paul Street; Douglas H. Stone, Raymond M. Curtis, 2919 St. Paul Street; Jean Mullinix, 3409 Guilford Terrace; Eunice M. Love, R. N., 3301 Guilford Avenue; Mary Godfrey, R. N., 221 East Thirty-third Street; Jesse Young, 103 West Thirty-ninth Street; Ruth A. Warner, R. N., Homewood Apartments; Wm. P. Horton, 3411 Guilford Terrace; Nora C. Kaufman, R. N., Blackstone Apartments; Anita S. Ferrari, R. N., 1611 Kingsway Road; John A. Nesbitt, 20 East Preston Street; Grace Birmingham, 2917 St. Paul Street; Mary Y. Baldwin, 3408 University Place; Anna E. Headrick, 613 North Calvert Street; Evelyn M. McCullough, R. N., 2921 Windsor Avenue; Louis J. Snehla, 1321 North Patterson Park Avenue; May Ellen Hance, 4410 Roland Avenue; Morton I. Suzewold, M. D., 1109 St. Paul Street; Paul E. Gorden, M. D., Union Memorial Hospital; Mary V. Graham, R. N., 2718 Winchester Street; Virginia Lawson, R. N., 1800 North Charles Street; Helen A. Maguire, R. N., 1001 St. Paul Street; Iolynn B. Connolly, R. N., 3201 North Calvert Street; Ruth H. Topper, R. N., 4402 Ridge Avenue; Mora M. Berryman, R. N., 2114 West Fayette Street; Isabel H. Pue, R. N., 3022 North Calvert Street; Virginia M. Ray, 4 East Thirty-second Street; Harry Schwartz, 2901 Norfolk Avenue; Frank Curlson, Jr., M. D., Union Memorial Hospital; Rose Harvey, 3008 Barclay Street; H. R. Shoemaker, M. D., 205 East Thirty-third Street; Richard R. Beach, Thirty-third and Calvert Streets; Martha Libby, R. N., 1210 Windemere Avenue; Elizabeth W. Ghio, R. N., 3401 North Calvert Street; Lee Mallory, 701 Cator Avenue; Claribel C. Veckers, R. N., 3103 Glendale Avenue; Webb K. Adams, 3216 Guilford Avenue; Bessie Brown, 625 West Lexington Street; Donald L. Someville, M. D., 116 East Thirty-third Street; Maud V. Hobbs, 2126 Maryland Avenue; Henry C. Gighial, M. D., 3229 St. Paul Street; Edna Liedtke, R. N., Fork, Md.; Elizabeth Mace, R. N., 1713 East Thirty-first Street; Glenn P. Grove, Marshall S. Carriet, Jr., Thirty-third and Calvert Streets; J. Frank Supplie III, 3201 Guilford Avenue; A. Ruth Aentley, Union Memorial Hospital; Parke B. Estep, R. N., 1914 Park Avenue; N. R. Smith, Homewood Apartments; Mrs. Nellie McCann, 727 Beaverbrook Road; Mrs. Sarah W. Kahl, 2728 Guilford Avenue; Mrs. Lena N. Reed, 923 North Hill Road; Mrs. Daisy P. Dewitt, R. N., 209 East Thirty-third Street; Laura E. Arnold, R. N., 3 East Twenty-seventh Street; Mrs. S. Dewitt, R. N., 1415 Homestead Street; Mary L. McHale, 221 East Thirty-third

Street; Ruth Galbraith, R. N., 209 East Thirty-third Street; Rebecca W. Cain, R. N., 1639 Northgate Road; Elizabeth Nelson, R. N., 1800 North Charles Street; R. M. Iemiss, R. N., 3 East Twenty-seventh Street; Virginia S. Bidgood, 3209 North Charles Street; Ethel Belle Hurley, 116 East Thirty-third Street; Ruth West, R. N., 3201 Pretty Hill Road; Virgie M. Crouch, 2823 Bauernwood Avenue; Betty W. McElderry, Greenway Apartments; Rowena H. Brown, 4037 The Alameda; Betsy Bacon, R. N., 3109 St. Paul Street; Mrs. W. M. Jones, 3008 Barclay Street; Miriam McKean, 369 Evesham Avenue; Mary C. M. Whelan, Gilman Apartments; Mrs. Frederick W. McComer, 1628 Bolton Street; Mrs. R. C. Walker, 3405 Greenway; Mrs. Elizabeth M. Merrick, 756 East Thirty-sixth Street; Mrs. Oland C. McCauley, 436 East Twenty-eighth Street; Pearl E. Merrill, 811 Gorsuch Avenue; Elizabeth H. Worthington, 3405 Greenway; Mary E. Tieaker, 3711 Greenmount Avenue; Anna W. Martin, 2824 North Calvert Street; Francis W. Gluer, 3405 Greenway; Narrie E. Yor, 3921 Keswick Road; Gertrude H. Wacker, 4433 Alan Drive; Anne Garbert, 2613 Guilford Avenue; Florence W. Long, Cambridge Arms Apartment; Ruth Birmingham, 2917 St. Paul Street; Mrs. D. J. Grinsfelder, 2915 St. Paul Street; Anna B. Gardner, 213 East University Parkway; Elizabeth L. O'Connor, 2324 Aiken Street; Ruth V. Funk, 1320 Winston Road; Donnie M. Bay, 3624 Greenmount Avenue; Madeline Van Gook, 606 Lennox Street Walter C. Merkel, 1800 North Charles Street; Louise M. Morton, 727 Deepdene Road; Grace H. Birdroll, Union Memorial Hospital; H. G. Walters, 202 East Thirty-fourth Street; Audrey Tyrrill, 2560 Aisquith Street; C. H. Watt, Jr., 4521 Worthwood Drive; Dorothy Gudgins, 1607 Chilton Street; Mrs. Wm. L. Blackford, Eccleston, Md.; Iris M. Weems, 540 Beninghaus Road; James S. Arnold, 303 Edgevale Road; Marie L. Whitridge, 12 St. Martins Road.

Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four editorials from the Illinois State Register, Springfield, Ill., and the News Gazette, Champaign-Urbana, Ill. These editorials pay tribute to the outstanding service to the public which has been rendered by my friend and colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], our distinguished majority leader.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Illinois State Register, Springfield, Ill., of October 8, 1949]

SCOTT LUCAS GAINS STRENGTH

Ability, experience, and integrity as Congressman, Senator, and majority leader of the upper House of Congress have caused SCOTT W. LUCAS to become an outstanding national figure.

One who has stood forth so boldly and with such uncompromising championship of fundamentals which he believed to be right would naturally invite the opposition of organized privilege which has nothing in common with the Truman-Barkley-Lucas policies of government for the people.

Though not always in complete accord with the Roosevelt-Truman-Barkley policies, Senator LUCAS has been a tremendous force in enactment of liberal legislation and in support of policies to promote progress and peace here and abroad.

He has exercised a powerful influence in synchronizing the support of liberal Republicans and Democrats alike in placing the welfare of all of the people over and above any individuals or groups seeking to profit politically or otherwise through special privilege.

The Republican Party is now divided against itself because a small cabal of isolationists who have been repudiated time and again by the people, seek to control the party.

That little isolationist group seeks to drive such Republicans as Senator Vandenberg, Governor Dewey, Harold Stassen and other forward-looking leaders out of the party because they cannot control them.

It is significant that Senator LUCAS has found common ground with forward-looking Republicans in the Senate who have joined with Democrats in meeting issues which transcend party considerations and which do not yield to party expediency.

It is because of that fact that Democratic leaders in Illinois, in Cook County and down-State, are united in urging reelection of Senator LUCAS.

Never have the Cook County organization, headed by Jacob M. Arvey, and the State Democratic organization, headed by George D. Kells, of Chicago, enjoyed such complete harmony as they do today because of freedom from selfish motives which for so many years caused schism in the party.

Today Democratic leaders in Cook County and Chicago are forward-looking. They are as free from domination by selfish interests as are leaders down-State. There is a new and stronger unity of action than has ever existed because of devotion to such leaders nationally as Truman and Barkley, and such leaders of democracy in this State as United States Senators Lucas and Douglas, Governor Stevenson, other Democratic elective State officers, Democratic Members of Congress from Illinois, Mayor Martin H. Kennelly, of Chicago, State's Attorney John Boyle, of Cook County, and others.

As Chairman George Kells said in a statement in this newspaper yesterday, Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS is "an outstanding champion of good government with such a brilliant record for faithful public service that he must and will be reelected."

That significant statement means that the democracy of the entire State will present a solid front in support of Senator LUCAS whose renomination is favored by thousands of liberal Republicans. They cannot and will not be dominated by a selfish isolationist group directed from the so-called "ivory tower" of isolationist Colonel McCormick in Chicago.

The entire Nation will look to Illinois to renominate and reelect Senator LUCAS. He is a popular national figure because of his consistent support of men and measures dedicated to the public welfare. Call it "welfare state" if you wish. The expressions are identical in meaning and accomplishment.

[From the Illinois State Register, Springfield, Ill., of July 17, 1949]

ASSORTED SMILES

(By V. Y. Dallman (admiral))

TALL, HANDSOME SCOTT LUCAS, SENATE LEADER, LIONIZED BY ANALYTICAL NEW YORK TIMES

Tall, handsome, six-foot-three SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Havana, whom we have supported in all of the steps which mark his rapid rise to a national and world figure, is surpassing even the loftiest ambition which we had for him when he stepped from a State job into the lower House of Congress.

As majority leader of the United States Senate, SCOTT is now being photographed and written about to a greater extent than such veterans as Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG. He is now as much under the glaring lights of political analysis as his Republican rival, concededly a great genius, Senator TAFT, of Ohio.

Most significant, accurate, and impressive by its integrity is a special article by William S. White in the New York Times Sunday magazine. It is written around a colorful picture of Senator LUCAS as he stands leaning upon his desk and looking meditatively out of the window as the soft rays of light accentuate the attractive outlines of his classic features and towering figure.

Another photographic highlight reveals Senator LUCAS flanked by House Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Speaker RAYBURN as he advises with President Truman relative to congressional action on a measure of momentous importance.

This special Times article presents with intense dramatics the story of the herculean task placed upon the broad shoulders of Senator LUCAS, leader of 54 Democrats, but never sure of more than 40 because of secession of the South, while opposed by 42 Republicans who take demoniacal delight in uniting with the insurgent Dixiecrats to oppose anything and everything the administration wants because of the Lincoln like civil-rights program.

Says the Times story:

"Senator LUCAS understood rather early the implications of this menace to the administration's program. He sensed in time, had not the President overridden him, that the armistice was likely to be brief, and that it would be well to hurry on to what could be accomplished before challenging the southerners to formalize, on the civil-rights issue, their latest alliance with the Republicans."

In other words, the President pressed his cause prematurely and against the judgment of Senator LUCAS, who might have accomplished much without offending the southerners if the skeleton of civil rights had been locked in the closet of diplomatic strategy while the southern Democrats were being lured into cooperative action by the sonorous bray of the Democratic donkey.

The New York Times describes Senator LUCAS in a very fantastic way as "a victim of what Hollywood calls 'type-casting.' A very tall man with a hawk-like, saturnine face, a sort of dark, Mephistophelian handsomeness, he looks a little angry even when he isn't and this often tends to set men against him. Then, as is common with men new to power and responsibility in the Senate, he had a tendency to fight every issue with a zealous violence that irritated that august and complex body. * * * His voice often sinks so low it can hardly be heard at all, then, suddenly, rises to a harsh, pounding volume, while his cheeks sink into black, sardonic lines.

"In these scenes, quite unintentionally, he presents an almost menacing figure, his heavy

fists raised as if to strike. His words, meantime, seem to rise, half-strangled through a fog of bitter indignation. The eeeble (able) Senator * * *' he will cry his eyes all but closed in a scowl."

Qualities which make Senator LUCAS a favorite for reelection next year and which may possibly place him on the national Democratic ticket are emphasized in the following closing paragraphs of the interesting story in the Times:

"He has been a courageous Senate leader—showing a patient good will to the rebellious southerners but never allowing friendship to sink to toadyism, and marching loyally with his administration colleagues without permitting the more extreme of them to call the tune.

"He calls his wife 'Mom,' is speechlessly proud of his prep-school son and is just the sort of man to be found in countless reasonably well-heeled American country clubs.

"He would be a good man to go hunting with, a good man to play poker with, a good man to go to an American Legion convention with, a good man to have a glass of bourbon whisky with, and an excellent man to have around if trouble started. He would be a good man, also, to have around if anyone started abridging the Bill of Rights.

"Having said all this, it is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say that he is a good sport about criticism—unusually good for a man engaged so endlessly in politics at its most punishing. In the language of baseball, of which he is, of course, fond, he never really complains to the umpire who calls them. About the strongest protest he ever makes about unfavorable publicity is the mild complain: 'You fellows got me wrong on that one, I think.'"

[From the Illinois State Register, Springfield, Ill., of September 17, 1949]

LUCAS AND FARM PLAN

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS comes from the Illinois farm lands and knows the farmers' problems. He is a practical man given to getting results, and he knows that asking too much can and often does result in receiving too little.

Discussing his opposition to the Gore farm bill passed by the House of Representatives Senator LUCAS, in the sixth of a series of radio reports to his home State of Illinois, said:

"We cannot go on with the wartime all-out price-support program which was hastily extended into these peacetime years by the Eightieth Congress. If we keep on as we have been forced to do during the last 2 years, the American people may decide that it is not in the public interest to continue farm price supports. Our entire program for farm prosperity might be destroyed."

As a realist, Senator LUCAS is strongly in favor of the compromise farm program contained in the Anderson bill. Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, who also had a farm bill—and a very widely discussed one, at that—is not opposed to a compromise agreement.

As the guest of Senator LUCAS on his program, he said, "I believe that we must devise an effective production and distribution program which will enable us to enjoy the abundance of American agriculture. I have made recommendations for dealing with farm surplus and price problems. Members of Congress have advocated different ideas. I am always willing to work in harmony with leaders of Congress."

The attitude of neither Senator LUCAS nor Secretary Brannan is demanding or arbitrary. Both want to work out in all sincerity the most practical and feasible plan for aiding farmers and continuing the present farm prosperity that can be arrived at.

Senator LUCAS favors a farm measure that will include on a strictly experimental basis, some of the features of the Brannan plan. Both men, although holding differing views are anxious and willing to agree on a satisfactory compromise.

This is the kind of attitude, free of partisan and selfish motives, of which our Government is greatly in need. It is a business-like, logical approach that seeks to solve a problem rather than distort it into a political issue.

Farmers, who as a whole are as realistic and practical as any class in the Nation, will appreciate Senator LUCAS' honest and objective approach to their problems. He is attempting to work out the program that will function most successfully. A distinct improvement on the ancient political strategy that has been employed by some, of promising everything that sounds good, and then later letting the project die a natural death of its own inadequacy.

[From the Champaign News-Gazette of Urbana, Ill., October 2, 1949]

SENATOR LUCAS GOES TO BAT FOR AIR SERVICE HERE

Whether you agree or disagree with Senator SCOTT LUCAS' political philosophies, you have to admire his willingness to go to bat for his constituents' interests before Washington bureaucracy.

Even though he now represents President Truman as majority leader of the United States Senate, LUCAS demonstrated he hasn't forgotten the people back home when he went before the Civil Aeronautics Board the other day to plead for air service for Champaign-Urbana and other central Illinois cities.

It is rare for a Senator, especially the majority leader, to appear at hearings conducted by administrative agencies. But the top Democrat in the Senate did appear and he was about as belligerent as a Republican as he told the CAB: 'There have been too many delays in the establishment of an air-line network for these cities. There have been too many postponements for technical reasons. There have been too many involved procedures and too many wrangles among lawyers representing various air lines. The people of these communities deserve better treatment."

Champaign-Urbana, and undoubtedly other central Illinois communities are grateful to Senator LUCAS for telling the CAB: "These cities are entitled to good, efficient service at the earliest possible date."

These communities, which have struggled for 4 years to get air service, were glad to know that the Senator agrees they have waited long enough. The record shows that the CAB agrees central Illinois is entitled to air service, because 3 years ago it awarded franchises for the area to Oliver L. Parks, a fast-talking Missourian who was never able to get his air line into operation.

Now the Board is involved in another complicated procedure to determine which air line should take over the franchises Parks couldn't handle. Effect of Senator LUCAS' eloquent plea will be shown by the speed which the CAB works its way through the latest red tape it has created.

The Democratic leader of the United States Senate should be able to cut the red tape of a Democratic administration if anyone can.

If he can, scheduled air lines may soon be flying from the $2,000,000 airport that Senator LUCAS helped to get for the University of Illinois. If he can't the Senator will be hard put to sing the praises of Washington bureaucracy when he runs for re-election next year.

"One Who Did Not Know the Whole Story Might Well Gather From the Testimony Presented Thus Far in This Inquiry That Since the Passage of the Unification Act Only the Navy, Including the Marine Corps, Has Received Cuts in the Strength of Its Combat Units—This Is Far From the Fact"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, those are words spoken by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in testifying before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives.

The more one clearly reads the various viewpoints with respect to unification, the more one is convinced that Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson is certainly doing a splendid job—doing it impartially and without service prejudice.

The American people support his belief that the future security of this country is as much dependent upon a sound financial economy as it is upon its wartime service forces. It is absolutely necessary to preserve the financial integrity of this Nation. Let us weaken our fiscal structure and our armed service forces would wither and become impotent and useless.

That is the one great lesson which we in this Congress have learned from the reams of testimony that has been presented to our Armed Services Committee by both the civilian and military heads of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Efficiency and economy, coupled with the maximum of national security, by the minimum expenditure of taxpayers dollars, is the shibboleth of the Secretary of Defense. We in this Congress can do no less than support his great right arm in helping him to achieve that all desired objective.

Mr. Speaker, I have just concluded reading, yes, and rereading, a copy of the statement of Gen. J. L. Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army. I find it to be a fair, unprejudiced, unbiased military report made by the highest ranking officer in our Army. He addresses himself directly to the questions which are of such vital interest to that committee. His statements are factual rather than personal opinion.

What General Collins says is so altogether illuminating, so replete with axioms, and so thorough that I hope that every Member of this House who has an interest in the present controversy—and I am sure all have that interest—will read its every last word.

It is a magnificent, factual rendition made by a great American and a great soldier.

The statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. J. LAWTON COLLINS, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE B-36 INVESTIGATION

Mr. VINSON, members of the committee, it is always an honor and a pleasure to testify before this distinguished committee.

As you know, I have just been recalled from an inspection visit to our troops in the Far East in order to appear before you. While in Japan, I conferred with General MacArthur. He assured me that unification is working well in his theater and that he is squarely behind Secretary of Defense Johnson in his efforts to carry out the unification law.

In the short time that I have been back, I have studied much of the testimony of the witnesses who have preceded me, but it has not been possible to read it all or to prepare a polished statement to submit to you. However, what I will say is based both on the record and on my personal observations and experience after some 32 years of commissioned service.

First, I want to dispel any notion that may have arisen during these hearings that the Army is pro-Air Force and anti-Navy. Nothing is further from the truth. We are pro-Air Force and pro-Navy, because the Army is dependent to a large degree on both of these great services in playing its own role in defense of our Nation, just as each of them, in turn, is dependent upon the Army. While I have always held that one of the major lessons to be learned from the past war is the tremendous importance of air power, I think there is an even greater lesson and that is this: That no single service can achieve victory alone. This can be done only by a team of Army, Navy, and Air Force working together under unified direction and control.

The strength and composition of the security team must be so designed as to assure that the cost of our military forces is accommodated to the domestic economy. Certainly, if there is any single factor today which would deter a nation seeking world domination, it would be the great industrial capacity of this country rather than its armed might. But this industrial capacity is dependent upon a sound economy, which must not be thrown out of balance by excessive costs for military preparations.

For these reasons, then, the Army has consistently championed true unification. Even though we knew that we would have much less to say about our own affairs under such a system, we were in favor of this partial relinquishment of our autonomy because we felt that only by integrating direction of the armed forces could an efficient team of land, sea and air provide maximum security at minimum cost.

Unification has brought about many significant changes in the structure of the Army.

First of all, the Army acceded to the independence of the Air Force. This involved two things: First, the surrender of tactical aircraft designed primarily for close support of ground operations, and second, the loss from immediate Army control of the air transports required to move our air-borne divisions. We did this with our eyes open on the theory that we were part of the team for national security, and that when we needed tactical air support or transport for air-borne operations, the Air Force member of the team would be prepared and willing to supply our needs.

Similarly, only recently, on the suggestion of the Army, and with the approval of the Joint Chiefs, the water transport system of the Army was transferred to the Navy. We initiated this latter move in the interest of economy because the Navy was already operating its own transport system, because in wartime the Navy has to convoy all shipping, is responsible for guarding the sea lanes, and must therefore control all movement by sea. We are confident that the Navy will furnish the Army effective and economical water-transport service.

I can assure you that the Army's acquiescence in relinquishing tactical air was not arrived at idly or without doubts and misgivings in some quarters. General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and I had much to do with supporting this move, because we had all seen in action the great flexibility of tactical air forces.

I had the privilege of commanding the Seventh Corps of the First Army in the Normandy invasion. This corps proceeded through the capture of Cherbourg, to the break-out in Normandy, and to the meeting with the Russians on the Elbe. During this period, the divisions in my corps were given daily close support by the Ninth Air Force, commanded by General Vandenberg, present Chief of Staff of the Air Force. However, there were times when there was a lull in our actions, or when a great strike of strategic air was being directed on the heart of Germany. On those occasions, our quota of air support was sometimes reduced or even eliminated, while the same planes then took off to shepherd the long-range bombers across the remainder of France into Germany. However, these planes would then be returned promptly to Army support missions.

In this manner, with one group of tactical air, we were able both to support the ground forces and to assist in the safe conduct of our strategic bombers in their missions of destruction and isolation of the battlefields.

Had the Army insisted upon retaining its own tactical air arm solely for close-support missions, an inevitable duplication of costly requirements paralleling the Air Force's would have followed. The Army, therefore, willingly agreed to the transfer to a Department of the Air Force of tactical air along with air transports. We were confident that when we needed it, the Air Force would make these two services available to us.

On the question of tactical air support of the Army, there has been serious criticism leveled at both ourselves and the Air Force. Some say that the Air Force isn't ready to support the Army, that the number of groups is insufficient. For the ground support of the Normandy invasion, the Ninth Air Force alone had 46 groups under its control. Of course, we would like to see the Air Force provide more air groups for direct ground support. Under the 48-group plan, 28 groups could be so utilized. Under the 58-group plan, which Congress acted upon favorably recently, 38 could be so utilized. Is the Air Force cooperating? My answer to that is definitely "yes." I am confident that we will get the fullest cooperation.

We are likewise confident that the Navy will provide adequate amphibious equipment for landing operations in which Army divisions may participate, as was the case in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, Normandy, and southern France.

Since the passage of the National Security Act, we have been going through the initial growing pains in developing sound processes of integrating the armed forces under the budget ceilings that the country can reasonably be expected to afford for its military security. Throughout this period, the Army has given honest and loyal support to the Unification Act. We have recognized that economies are essential, that centralized civilian control must prevail, and that we in the Army must be ready to adjust our honest convictions as to what we feel we need with what the Nation can afford and with what best fits into the over-all strategic picture.

One who did not know the whole story might well gather from the testimony presented thus far in this inquiry that, since the passage of the Unification Act only the Navy, including the Marine Corps, has received cuts in the strength of its combat units. This is far from the fact.

We ended the war with 89 combat divisions, of which all but one actually saw action. Six months later, we were down to 43. Now we are down to 10. We have also had to operate on limited funds for antiaircraft, and for research and development, particularly in the guided missiles field, as well as in the procurement of new and modern equipment.

Only day before yesterday, en route from Japan, I stopped at the Army's Detroit tank arsenal for a few hours and saw our proposed changes in tank design. These plans are splendid and show that we have the know-how. Only one element is lacking—the money. However, even if the funds were made available tomorrow, it would still be 2 years before new and improved tanks would be in production.

We have taken all these reductions in stride and without complaint.

I regret very much that it should be necessary for me to refer to charges made against the Army General Staff by my good friend, General Cates. Unfortunately, however, he appears to believe that there is some sinister plan on the part of the Army seriously to curtail the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps. I was fortunate to have had considerable experience with the Marine Corps during the war. I respect 150 years of proud tradition behind this fine corps. I have great admiration for General Cates personally. My answers to his charges are made in a cooperative spirit in the hope that I may be able to correct a series of unfortunate misunderstandings.

General Cates believes that the Army General Staff wants to limit Marine Corps units in size to the regiment and to reduce the corps itself to from 50,000 to 60,000 men. Neither of these allegations is correct. In the short time I have been a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have supported the present organizational structure of the Marine Corps whenever that matter has arisen in connection with war-planning activities.

It is true that in April 1946, General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff of the Army, submitted a memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff proposing that Marine units be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and a Marine Corps strength of 50,000 to 60,000 men. Those proposals were not approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I have never heard anything more about it.

In 1947, when testifying before the House Armed Services Committee on the National Security Act, General Eisenhower told why he made that recommendation. He said:

"I arrived at a figure of fifty to sixty thousand as postwar peacetime strength for the Marine Corps by multiplying their prewar strength of 18,000 by 3. I did this because I felt that all military establishments, with the exception of the Air Force, which was practically nonexistent in the prewar establishment, should be expanded threefold as a basis for a postwar establishment."

There has been a considerable amount of talk about the so-called Collins plan. Insinuations have been made that this plan is part of the over-all plot to eliminate, or drastically reduce, the effectiveness of both the Marine Corps and the fleet air arm. I should like to clarify the record on this point.

In 1945 the President designated the War Department to monitor the development of a unification plan for submission to Congress. I was named as the spokesman of the Department in presenting such a plan, which had been developed by a joint group over a period of more than a year. It was in no sense the product of one individual.

I have placed before each of you a photostat of page 156 of the record of the hearings on unification of October 30, 1945, before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. On this photostat you will see a copy of the chart that outlined the plan as proposed by the War Department. It should be emphasized that this plan was intended merely as a vehicle to initiate a study by the Senate committee of the problem of unification.

I would like to invite your attention particularly to the three blocks on the chart that indicate the composition of the forces to be provided: the United States Air Force, the United States Army, and the United States Navy. Under the Navy, you will note that there is indicated the United States Fleet, including the fleet air arm, and then the Marine Corps and Navy service forces. Furthermore, I've reviewed my testimony and find that six times during the hearing, I reiterated that there was no intention to eliminate the Marine Corps, or to eliminate the fleet air arm, or to transfer the latter to the Air Force. I would like to quote you one of the statements that I made at that time:

"The proposed integration of the War and Navy Departments will still retain the Air, Army, and Navy (the latter with its fleet air arm and Marine Corps), each with a maximum autonomy consistent with military efficiency and necessary economy."

It has been alleged during this hearing, and widely reported as a result, that the Army General Staff is attempting to usurp the functions of the Marine Corps in the field of amphibious operations. I should like to outline for you the action taken by the Army that may have caused that erroneous impression.

As you know, the National Security Act prescribes responsibilities for each of the three services. For the Army and the Air Force, these are stated in broad general terms; for the Navy they are outlined in greater detail.

After passage of the National Security Act, it was considered necessary that a more detailed statement should be prepared by the services themselves as a basis for planning. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff met at Key West in March 1948, and drew up a statement of functions of the armed forces and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—more commonly referred to as the Key West agreement, or the "functions paper."

The "functions paper" represents an agreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was later approved by the President and promulgated by the Secretary of Defense. It was recognized that this document should be revised from time to time as experience might indicate. The provision for modification is a wise one, for you will agree, I am sure, that it would be most difficult for anyone to predict the changes which are likely to develop in the art of warfare as a result of new weapons, techniques, and scientific progress.

About a year ago, the Joint Chiefs of Staff set up several joint committees, consisting of equal numbers of representatives from all three services, to develop joint doctrines and procedures.

I think it is appropriate at this point to tell you that, in general, Army members on joint committees are not instructed as to the line of action they should follow in committee meetings. I should like to read an extract from a memorandum signed by Secretary Gray on September 16, 1949, addressed to Army members of joint boards and joint committees:

"It is a basic premise that the Army is an essential and inseparable part of the defense team and that we must contribute unselfishly all we can toward the success of that team. It follows that each proposal or problem must be considered in terms of national security as a whole, and must not be affected by partisanship or special interests. On the other hand, it follows with equal logic that no Army representative is under obligation to accept a proposal merely because it is advanced in the name of unity or cooperation since it is manifestly the substance, not the name it bears, which determines its merit.

"Every Army representative naturally will be expected to know and to express fully the Army implications of proposals or problems and to synthesize these with the corresponding expressions of the other services in the process of arriving at an over-all solution. It is the duty of each to exercise his own judgment on the basis of the facts and in the best interests of national security aside from all other considerations."

After considerable study Army members of the committee we were discussing came to the conclusion that certain changes were desirable in the "functions paper." Some of the proposed changes were editorial; others were changes in substance. One of the changes which the Army members recommended provided for the establishment of four types of joint centers, namely, air-borne, air tactical support, air defense, and amphibious, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These would be charged with the development of joint doctrines, tactics, and techniques, joint training, and joint testing of equipment.

When the Army proposal for the changes in the "functions paper" was considered by one of the senior joint committees, it was rejected by the Navy and Air Force members. One member thought that it involved a transfer of responsibilities which were prescribed in the National Security Act. Another member objected to the proposal because he felt it violated the principle of primary responsibility.

I regret that some of our Marine friends have misinterpreted this proposal as an attempt on the part of the Army to deprive the Marine Corps of responsibilities in the amphibious field. That was not, and is not, our intention. Our main object in making the joint center recommendation was to facilitate joint work in air-borne operations. It is my personal conviction that significant developments are possible in this type of operation. It was a natural sequence that the joint center idea should include the other three installations I have already named. Incidentally, our proposal envisaged that the Chief of Naval Operations would be designated as executive agent for the joint amphibious center. Presumably he in turn would designate the Commandant of the Marine Corps to assume that responsibility.

Whether we were right or wrong in making our proposal, the fact is that it was not accepted by the Navy and Air members of the appropriate committee. The subject will now be considered in due course by the operations Deputies—Admiral Struble, General Norstad, and General Gruenther. It will then be studied by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If the Navy and Air Force still do not favor the suggested changes in the "functions paper," it will be up to me, as Chief of Staff of the Army, to decide whether or not I desire to have the matter presented to the Secretary of Defense. Even he will not have the final decision, however, since it has been made clear that changes in roles and missions must have the approval of the President. Surely this process is not a hasty one. I believe it provides ample insurance that the will of Congress will not be thwarted.

Because it is most important that air-borne and tactical air-support activities should progress at full speed, we have made arrangements with the Air Force, pending final resolution of this issue, whereby appropriate personnel from both the Air Force and the Army will be assembled at Fort Bragg, N. C., the home of our Eighty-second Airborne Division, to work full time, not only in training but also in the development of tactical doctrine of air-borne and close-support operations, as well as the development of proper equipment.

Again I desire to stress the fact that the suggested revisions are not part of a plot by the Army General Staff to deny the Marine Corps its right to fight. I believe that the suggested revisions have considerable merit and that they would contribute materially toward welding the services into a more effective team. We will argue our case, however, within the established procedures in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Department of Defense organizations, and, of course, will abide by any decision that is reached.

It is with utmost reluctance that I am compelled further to refer to certain other statements made in testimony before this committee. It was asserted that the Marine Corps constitutes the Nation's only emergency force in readiness. To establish this point, General Cates testified that—

"Let us not forget that in World War II troops from the Fleet Marine Force occupied Iceland because no others were prepared to move and later defeated the Japanese at Guadalcanal at a time when Army divisions, although present in the Pacific, were not ready to undertake an offensive mission. The Fleet Marine Forces as elements of the balanced fleet were ready for these emergencies."

First, with reference to Iceland: On July 1, 1941, before Pearl Harbor, the Icelandic Prime Minister requested that the United States station an Army garrison in Iceland. This request came at a time when selectees had entered Army units. As you will remember, the law then prohibited the sending of selectees and Reserve officers outside the continental United States except in an emergency declared by Congress—a law which did not apply to the Marines—so Marines were sent until the Army units could replace their restricted personnel with Regular Army troops. One month later, our Army units arrived in Iceland.

Second, as to Guadalcanal: I happen to know something about that personally, because I was in Hawaii at the time, commanding the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division of the Hawaiian defense forces. Since the Navy was the executive agent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pacific, the allocation of units was the prerogative of the naval commander there. If it had been desired to send an Army division to assault Guadalcanal, I can assure you that my division was fully prepared.

After the First Marine Division had gone into Guadalcanal and had secured Henderson Field, the Japanese reinforced the island and attacked the marine position. It was then necessary to reinforce the Marines with elements of the Army's America Division which was then being assembled on New Caledonia. The One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry of the America Division, under the command of now Gen. Bryant Moore, participated in the defense of Henderson Field, and won a Marine decoration.

About this time, it became evident that the First Marine Division would have to be withdrawn. My division had left Hawaii and was then en route to Australia. We were turned in at New Caledonia for 48 hours, after which we proceeded to Guadalcanal where we relieved the First Marine Division.

We jumped off with part of the Second Marine Division and part of the American Division (the Army's Twenty-fifth Division making the principal attack). In repeated operations, the Japanese were driven off the island with heavy losses.

As for the state of readiness of Army troops, let me remind you that if we should have a war, the first troops that would be hit—as was the case in the Philippines at the initiation of World War II—would probably be Army troops. We have in Europe forces in three areas that would be immediately under

the gun—in Germany, in Austria, and in Trieste. I inspected these troops within the last several months, and I will guarantee that they are ready today.

Furthermore, the Army's troops in Japan and Okinawa constitute our farthermost outpost should an emergency occur in that area.

I have just returned from an inspection of these troops. I can assure you that their training is progressing in excellent fashion, and they are ready to take on any aggressor. As for the Army's readiness here at home, thanks to the wisdom of Congress, we have been able to reestablish a mobile striking force—of two air-borne, two infantry, and one armored division. Although it is true that all are not up to strength, I witnessed a demonstration for the President at Fort Bragg 2 weeks ago and I will guarantee you that the Eighty-second Airborne Division is ready to fight anywhere, at any time, right now.

It is my earnest wish that no one misunderstand or misinterpret what I have said today with reference to the testimony of General Cates. I repeat that my only purpose has been to set the record straight. This I have done in the profound hope that the subject can be closed and that the unity of purpose we share with all elements of the armed services can be served in harmony and teamwork.

I am deeply sensible of the critical responsibilities which my colleagues and I share as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The sacred duty we owe to serve the cause of national security demands the highest order of objective judgment, judgments which will provide a balanced resolution of needs measured by what our Nation can afford—not by what any one of the services may earnestly believe it must have. These difficult tasks manifestly require more than an exchange of service viewpoints, more than mere cooperation. They require mutual trust, confidence, wisdom, and the broadest understanding. I pledge myself and the Army as a whole to the continuing effort required of us to achieve these ends in the national interest.

Gentlemen, my primary purpose has been to assure you that the Army, and I as its Chief of Staff, wholeheartedly support both the spirit and intent of the Congress in establishing unification. We have no slightest purpose to impose the Army's will upon a sister service. To the contrary, we are keenly sensitive to the interdependence of effective land, sea, and air power. If either the Navy or the Air Force were rendered impotent, the Army would be unable to fulfill its vital role. Within this framework of interdependence, the capabilities and readiness of each service measure largely the capabilities and readiness of the others.

And thus it is that I say to you gentlemen, "What is good for the Nation is good for the armed forces—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force."

The Impact of Free Trade on American Labor and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address which I delivered over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network on June 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I thank the National Broadcasting Co. for making its coast to coast facilities available to me tonight. In coming into your home through the medium of radio I have something to talk over with you that is of tremendous importance to both of us. That something is your job and jobs of the 65,000,000 other employable Americans caught in the current recession.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Today, many of you found a pink slip in your pay envelope. Many more of you are about to join the ranks of the many millions already unemployed. Government sources tell us that already unemployment has reached some 4,000,000. Business publications estimate the total to be 5,000,000 with probably an additional 10,000,000 on part-time work.

In the Western States, most of our copper mines are closed. In New England, the woolen mills and shoe factories are operating on only a part-time basis. The same is true in pottery, glassware, cotton and rayon textiles, in fisheries, and, yes, even in the automobile industry. Everywhere, business and industry seem to be in a spiral of retrenchment.

Now there is a rather startling paradox to this unemployment picture. It comes at a time when economists tell us that we are still operating in a buyer's market.

FACTORS IN RECESSION

The American people today are hearing a great deal about a business recession, fear of large-scale unemployment, threatened devaluation of the British pound and dollar shortages in foreign countries. It is unfortunate that the separation of these items in the news makes them appear as separate problems. In fact, they are only different aspects of the same problem.

They all are directed to the American market which is the one market in the world which every nation would like to have.

It is the fear of American businesses that it will be deprived, through Government interference, of a share of its own market, that causes uncertainty and retrenchment. It is this new factor—dividing the source of our income—our own markets—an accurate forecast of the future based on past experience.

THREE-PART FREE-TRADE PROGRAM

The Congress of the United States has been plunged into a disastrous foreign economic undertow by a State Department operating through its three-part "free-trade" program, which can only result in leveling the American standard of living to that of the low-wage living standards of Europe and Asia.

The ECA through its director, Mr. Hoffman, is now advocating and financing an industrial-production program, through the 16 ECA European nations which will not only make them completely self-sufficient but in the Director's own words, will increase their exports 65 percent, chiefly to the United States. This is a frank admission of a program to transfer American jobs to the foreign low-wage and slave labor of Europe.

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

In order to do the same thing on a world scale, the President has proposed a bigger and better Marshall plan, known as a "bold new program." This guarantees foreign investments of manufacturers and processors not only in Europe but also in Asia and Africa—its magnitude will be sufficiently colossal that it will not only supply the foreign market that the original Marshall plan was supposed to develop for American wage earners and industry—but the surpluses that will stream into America ports from all over the globe will supply a large part of the American market itself and displace the American workingmen.

The three-part "free trade" program will then be complete and American jobs will be transferred to foreign soil under the guise of promoting world peace.

I have coined a phrase to describe our present program. I call it the three-part "free-trade" program designed to level our standards of living with the nations of the world, and it includes:

1. Appropriations from American pocket books to make up the "trade balance" deficits of the European nations in cash each year—currently labeled ECA—our chief export is cash.

2. Extend the selective "free trade" principle adopted by the State Department through a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

3. The copper rivet in the free trade program will be the proposed adoption of the International Trade Organization—58 nations with 58 votes—each with one vote will meet each year to distribute among themselves the remaining production and markets of the world.

Since the end of the war, under the guise of making up trade balance deficits, we have fed into the bottomless maw of Europe and Asia, the fantastic sum of $41,000,000,000. I wonder if you fully appreciate the magnitude of that sum.

Forty-one billion dollars is $5,000,000,000 more than the combined assessed valuation of the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon and Washington—and the 14 Southern States, including Texas, and accounts for approximately 60 percent of the area of the United States. At this rate we can dispose of the whole business in a very short time.

THE FRENCH TRADE CONFERENCE

For some three months now the American delegates have been in France in an international conference designed to again slash United States duties rates. This is the second general slash in 18 months, despite complete ignorance of the effects of the first slash. When as a result of horse trading methods the foreign nations finally agree what the United States duty rates shall be, these rates will then be made permanent by signing an international agreement.

CURRENCY MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

Now, in the beginning of my talk, I mentioned the current lively interest in the value of the British pound and said that its value had a direct bearing on the present business uneasiness. I will now tell you why. As soon as the ink is dry on the international agreement fixing American duty rates, any lowering of a foreign currency, such as the British pound, renders worthless the entire agreement. The present pegged but artificial value of the pound is $4.03 and the international tariff agreement is being signed on the basis that the pound will continue to be worth $4.03.

If the pegging of the pound is discontinued and it is permitted to fall to the level of its real worth its value would be between $2 and $3. For example, a British imported item worth £1 now sells for $4 in our market, in competition with American items worth $4. After devaluation, the same British item would promptly be offered for sale in our market at a price reduced anywhere from 25 to 50 percent.

A flexible import fee bill which I have recently offered would automatically take into account the depreciated value of the British pound and our duty or import fee would vary in direct relationship to the economic situation. This would take away

the incentive foreign nations now have to circumvent American duty rates by tinkering with value of their currencies. This flexibility permits immediate adjustments to changing circumstances which is impossible under a duty rate frozen by international agreement for an indefinite period.

The second step in the three-part free-trade program was inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the State Department has adopted the selective free-trade principle, and which is to be extended for 3 years at this session of Congress.

Free trade has been sold to this country through the catchword "reciprocal trade."

CATCH PHRASE TO SELL FREE TRADE

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the act is not reciprocal and does not operate that way—but is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people, cloaked in more involved and less understandable phraseology.

Until recently each of the three-part program—the ECA, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and the International Trade Organization were each represented to Congress and to the Nation as great emergency legislation in itself. Now, however, even the Secretary of State admits that it is all one program.

TRADE TREATIES A ONE-WAY STREET

No other nation wants this so-called trade-agreements program which our State Department is pushing to apply to their own trade treaties. Last week Britain made a bilateral agreement with the Argentine in direct violation of this program and over the violent opposition of our State Department. Today's papers announced a similar treaty between Britain and Yugoslavia, which is equally contrary to the program, and, of course, our State Department in due time will make its routine but ineffectual protest.

Britain has already made similar trade treaties with other European countries, including Russia. There are some 88 bilateral treaties made by these very Marshall plan countries with Russia and her satellites behind the iron curtain. Thus every important trading nation in the world has evidenced its opposition to the program by ignoring and disregarding it. However, these nations are always willing to sit down at any international conference and watch the United States reduce its remaining tariffs to whatever point these nations suggest—but as for reducing their tariffs, well, that's a different thing.

They give that well-known diplomatic lip service to this program and promptly nullify every concession they have made through quotas, manipulation of their currencies for trade advantage, and in other ways. Of course, these nullifications are couched in Alphonse and Gaston language, and our State Department never fails to extend its sympathetic understanding.

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE BEING WRECKED

The Members of Congress are kept busy on legislation to correct the problems of constituents who have been hurt, or afraid they will be hurt by some action of the administration taken under a previous congressional act, while the program to wreck the fundamental economic structure of this country is supposed to go through almost without debate.

It is just like a mustang "eared down" by a buckaroo in a western rodeo—and bites his ear while the saddle is being cinched on him. The ear hurts so bad that he can only think of one thing at a time and when the buckaroo lets go of the ear, the saddle is on and he cannot buck it off.

Recently, however, a considerable number of Senators have denounced the State Department's free-trade program.

ASSIST FOREIGN NATIONS WITHOUT WRECKING ECONOMY

We can assist foreign nations by feeding emergency hungry people to the extent of our ability without injuring our economy.

We can loan money to private industry within the foreign nations whose integrity is important to us, in the same manner as the RFC loans money to our citizens in times of stress.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE

We can adopt the flexible import fee system to establish a market for the goods of foreign nations on a definite basis of bringing such goods in on our basis of costs—thereby maintaining our standard of living through the floor under wages while we are assisting other nations in raising their own.

I have recently introduced a bill in the Senate with the sole aim of restoring fair and reasonable competition in the American market between foreign products and those that we produce, and I intend to offer it as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when it comes before the Senate for the 3-year extension. Under the present Trade Agreements Act, as amended last year, the United States Tariff Commission is directed to determine after investigation the rate of duty which should be applied to an imported item so that the rate below which the duty might not be cut, without endangering American industry will be known in advance.

This is the so-called peril point to which the State Department has objected because they do not want that point to be a matter of public record. My bill would simply make the peril point the tariff or import fee, thus correctly representing the differential of cost of production due mostly to the difference in the standards of living and preserve our own standard of living while assisting other nations in raising their own.

The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States at San Francisco Emphasizes the Rare Opportunity of This Denomination in Collaboration With Many Others To Promote Better Conditions in the World and Ultimately Permanent Peace

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am taking this opportunity to bring to the attention of Congress and the people of the United States the great significance of the Triennial Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America just closed in San Francisco, Calif.

This militant church denomination, of which I am honored to be a member, represents 2,436,589 Christian men, women, and children residing in this great country who can make a priceless contribution in promoting better conditions in the United States and in the world generally, and in cooperation with movements of all other worthy organizations bringing about permanent peace to the troubled peoples of the world. When the efforts of this denomination are combined with the plans and efforts of the other great Christian denominations, including Catholics and Protestants, the great Jewish organizations, and other noble organizations struggling to bring about permanent peace, it is awe inspiring what can and should be accomplished by these great forces for good and peace in the world and especially in promoting our concept of life and emphatically combating the false ideologies of communism. I appeal, therefore, in this brief article taking this occasion of the meeting of a Christian denomination to urge the other powerful church organizations such as the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Congregationalist, Reformed Church, Christian Scientists combined with the strong Roman Catholic Church and Jewish religion and many other church organizations to present a solid front against the efforts to weaken and destroy our traditions and beliefs and substitute for them the cruel and heartless teaching of communism.

May I now in returning to the Fifty-sixth Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, just held in San Francisco, set forth some of the most able, churchly, moral, and Christian remarks and utterances made by the leaders in this great convention which included 150 bishops, 1,500 deputies, and 6,000 visitors from all parts of this great country, the statements which I shall quote coming from church and lay leaders of this denomination.

Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, who made the opening address, absolutely hit the mark when he said:

> The time is fast approaching and I believe may already be here when those who believe in God will have to stand shoulder to shoulder regardless of incidental differences, against those who not only do not believe in God but are determined to attack and destroy that belief wherever it exists. This defense of freedom cannot be guaranteed by bullets or bombs or bayonets. Today it is completely clear that man's freedom stems from man's spiritual nature * * * we look to our church for the leadership in a struggle that is not political and not economic but is fundamentally a moral and spiritual battle to maintain freedom to worship God. Without that freedom, freemen, free insitutions, and free nations will perish.

Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman of the presiding bishop's committee on laymen's work, made most forceful remarks to the same point:

> It has become increasingly clear that there are forces abroad in the world which seek to destroy all religions and to wipe out from the minds of men all spiritual and moral precepts. They have declared the State supreme. They have tried to shackle the church and have turned their backs on God. They are well aware that their doctrines can never be accepted by those who believe that God is the Supreme Ruler of men and nations * * * people everywhere are looking to the church for leadership in promoting brotherhood among all men of all nations, all races, and all creeds. We have a tremendous task. May the men of the church with the help of God accept and meet the challenge of opportunity to help to make a more effective church and a better world.

The Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United

States, spoke spiritually on the same point:

Let me state clearly that I am not asking for a retreat from life. Sometimes people mistakenly use the word "spiritual" to mean just that. We cannot escape the burdens and responsibilities which rest upon all men today. We should not wish to do so. The great contribution we can make rests upon the extent to which we can be channels of the grace and compassion of God.

The Right Reverend John Blair Larned, bishop in charge of European churches and leading figure of the World Council of Churches, said:

You cannot fight communism with a glove. You can only destroy it by presenting to your world a stronger ideology of the Christian gospel.

The Right Reverend Angus Dun, bishop of Washington, representing the Episcopal Church in the World Council of Churches, said in part:

The purposes to which the member churches are committed together are to carry forward the work of the two world movements for unity in faith and order, and in life and world; to facilitate common action by the churches; to promote the growth of ecumenical consciousness, to establish relations with denominational federations of world-wide scope * * * and to support the churches in the task of evangelism.

The Most Reverend and Right Honorable Cyril Foster Barbett, archbishop of York and primate of England, who was a guest of honor at the general convention, made a keynote address based squarely on the point that I am trying to convey declaring that one of the great contributions which the Anglican Communion can make to Christendom is ordered freedom and toleration.

Within it there is room for both Catholics and Protestants, for the liberal and the literalist. * * * The Anglican Communion has no fear of new discoveries for it recognizes that all truth comes from God and should be welcomed as a new stage in our knowledge of Him and His creation. * * * World influence which once belonged to Great Britain has now very largely passed to your great country (the United States). With your immense power and prestige in the world, you have now unique opportunities of spreading the gospel.

For these most important illustrations of the point that I am trying to drive home as set forth in the quotations from some of the leading speakers at the fifty-sixth triennial convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, I am indebted to Miss Gertrude Orr, able director, department of promotion of the diocese of Washington, D. C., who attended the convention.

I consider it most fitting that the Congress of the United States and many of our church citizens be impressed from time to time with the powerful latent strength that lies in the foundation of the church organizations of the world. If the average Congressman or Senator would analyze his thinking, in most instances he would find that his belief in the cardinal principles that have made this country great and have developed it into probably the foremost nation that has ever existed in this world come from influences that have been brought to him by great church organizations which he has been affiliated with or influenced by throughout his life. Otherwise his thinking would probably be in another direction and possibly end on the hopeless shoals of the ideologies of communism. It takes no great stretch of the imagination to appreciate the latent power that rests in the great church organizations not only of the United States but of the world, promoting and advocating as they do the brotherhood of nations and of creeds and accepting as they should the challenge of opportunity to help make a more effective church and a far better world.

It is a tragedy that, after the shedding of so much blood and after the noble efforts of free people to rid themselves of the yoke of man-made tyranny, we find the world 5 years after the war anxious and apprehensive about threats to free men, free institutions, and free nations.

So in conclusion I appeal to the leaders of all churches and each and every person who believes in the principles and doctrines of our founding fathers to combine in one masterful unified effort in presenting a solid front to dissipate all communistic teachings from our midst and safeguard our security in a world menaced by an unpredictable and aggressive totalitarian force bent upon conquest and subjugation.

List of Legislation Passed and Status of Pending Bills Relating to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress, first session, and the status of pending bills relating to education.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

LIST OF LEGISLATION PASSED AND STATUS OF PENDING BILLS RELATING TO EDUCATION, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

LEGISLATION ENACTED

Public Law No. 266: Under the heading Veterans' Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act there is a provision barring use of funds under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 for courses determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character. Provides an equitable method of determining tuition rates for institutions having no customary cost of tuition.

Public Law No. 306 (H. R. 3829): Authorices the General Services Administrator to make contributions for the maintenance and operation of schools during fiscal year 1950 to certain local school agencies overburdened financially by defense-incurred enrollments or by reductions in school revenues resulting from the acquisition or ownership of land by the United States. Also authorizes contributions to local school agencies providing schooling for children living on Federal reservations or other Federally owned property.

Authorizes $7,500,000 for fiscal 1950 and limits total Federal contribution for the school year to any local school agency to the amount of the actual deficit in the agency's operating budget for the year.

STATUS OF PENDING BILLS

S. 110, the Labor Extension Act of 1949, was reported in the Senate March 4, 1949 (Report No. 92).

S. 246, the Educational Finance Act of 1949, was passed by the Senate May 5, 1949.

S. 1411, the National School Health Services Act of 1949 was passed by the Senate April 29, 1949.

S. 2596, relating to courses veterans may take under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, etc., was passed by the Senate October 12, 1949, and reported in the House October 14, 1949 (Rept. No. 1444).

S. 2317, relating to survey of school construction needs and emergency grants, was passed by the Senate October 17, 1949.

S. 1453, Public Health Service Act (relating to construction grants to medical colleges and scholarships for students), was passed by the Senate September 23, 1949. A companion bill, H. R. 5940, was reported in the House October 11, 1949 (Rept. No. 1406).

JOHN WOODS,
American Law Section.

S. 110. Reported in Senate March 4, 1949 (Rept. No. 92).

Labor Extension Act of 1949—Establishes in the Department of Labor a Labor Extension Service to promote the welfare of wage earners through a program for the dissemination of useful knowledge and information, in cooperation with colleges, research agencies, etc., but prohibits the establishment of requirements regarding curriculum, materials, instruction or methods of instruction. Creates a Labor Extension Division headed by a Director at $10,000 a year to administer the program, and an advisory National Labor Extension Council of 12 members, the majority of whom shall be chosen from a panel submitted by national labor organizations, the remainder to include representatives of cooperating institutions, research agencies, etc. Provides for Federal aid to the States based on the number of wage earners in each State and prescribes a plan for participation in the program. Funds must be expended without discrimination on the basis of race, sex, etc.

A just and equitable basis for provision of health services in a State which maintains separate public schools for minority races means a basis which provides the same health services provided for children in other public schools in the State.

S. 246. Passed by Senate May 5, 1949.

Educational Finance Act of 1949—To aid the States, Territories, and the possessions of the United States in financing their public elementary and secondary school systems, and to more nearly equalize such school opportunities throughout the States, there is authorized $300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950, and each year thereafter.

The basic allotment to each State shall be either (1) the excess of $50 per child over 1 percent of a 5-year average of annual income for the State, or (2) a flat amount of $5 per child, whichever is greater. The number of children on which the computation is based shall be the number of persons from 5 to 17 years of age, for the third year next preceding the year for which computation is made. Income payments in each State means the average of annual income payments for 5 years (third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh years next preceding year for which the computation is made). If a State spends less than 2.5 percent (2.25 percent for the first 2 years) of its anual income for schools, the amount of Federal aid shall be

proportionately reduced, except that in no case shall it be less than $5 per child. For any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, a State, to be eligible for more than $5 per school child of Federal aid, must spend at least 2 percent of its annual income payments from State and local sources for schools.

Federal funds shall be available only for current expenditures; they may be used for aid to nonpublic schools in a State only where non-Federal educational funds may legally and constitutionally be so expended. States shall have the right to appeal questions of administration to the Commissioner of Education and to the Federal courts.

Requires an equitable apportionment where separate public schools are maintained by law for minority races. Apportionments shall not be used to reduce State expenditures for public elementary and secondary school education. No Federal agency or officer shall exercise any control over any school or any State educational institution or agency with respect to which funds are made available under this act.

S. 1411. Passed by Senate April 29, 1949.

National School Health Services Act of 1949—Authorizes $35,000,000 and necessary administration expenses for each fiscal year beginning with the year ending June 30, 1950, for the Federal Security Administrator to aid the States in making more adequate provision for health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of mental and physical conditions. The allotment to each State shall be based on the number of school children between 5 and 17 years of age and on relative per capita income within the State. The Federal Security Administrator shall promulgate each State's allotment percentage biannually.

To become eligible for aid each State must submit a plan setting forth a school health program (1) providing for the expenditure of State funds in an amount not less than the State percentage as set forth in the act (between 25 percent and 50 percent of the total sum to be expended in the State), (2) providing that the State shall utilize all existing services and shall cooperate with a to be created State advisory committee with respect to the operation of the plan, and (3) providing from time to time detailed audits for the Federal Security Administrator. The Federal Security Administrator shall approve all State plans; in case of failure to approve the State may appeal to the United States court of appeals.

In any State where the law will not permit a disbursement of funds to nonpublic schools, the Federal Security Administrator shall withhold a proportionate amount of funds and make direct provision for children attending such schools, subject to the same conditions required with respect to funds for children attending public schools.

S. 2596. Reported in House October 14, 1949.

Prohibits the Veterans' Administrator from promulgating regulations which deny the right of selection of educational courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Provides that schools in operation less than 1 year shall not be disapproved for that reason if they are tax supported or are a branch of a parent institution within a 25-mile radius and do not completely depart from the subject matter taught in the parent school. The Administrator is authorized to certify other new schools as they become necessary. Authorizes the holding of consultations before a student changes course but does not permit disapproval of a change unless the student is making unsatisfactory progress. Bars entitlement for any course entered into after July 1, 1948, which is avocational or recreational in character. Sets up equitable procedure for determining customary cost of tuition in courses where there is no established charge, with any institution having the right to appeal to the Administrator for an adjustment in tuition. Directs the Administrator to apply a semester-hour measure unit in determining full and part-time training for law students in State approved schools [amending Veterans' Regulation 1 (a) and Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress].

S. 2317. Passed by Senate October 17, 1949.

Authorizes $5,000,000 to be paid to the States for an inventory of existing school facilities and for a survey of the need to construct additional facilities.

Federal funds for the survey shall be allocated to the States on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis in the proportion that their school-age population bears to the school-age population of the United States, but no State shall be allotted less than $10,000.

Describes the plans which must be submitted by a State desiring to take advantage of this Act and authorizes the Commissioner to withhold funds when a State agency is in noncompliance.

Authorizes appropriation of necessary sums for grants to school districts for emergency school construction the need for which has resulted from Federal activities or war or defense-incurred enrollments. The amount of the grant shall be proportionate to the Federal responsibility for the shortage of school facilities as determined by the commissioner. Provides for equitable treatment of different racial groups in States where separate school facilities are maintained. The act shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education under the direction of the Federal Security Administrator. Directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the Act, and of this amount not over $1,000,000 may be used to initiate surveys and State plans.

S. 1453. Passed by Senate September 23, 1949.

Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1949—Amends Public Health Service Act (U. S. C. 42; 6A (II)) to increase the number of trained personnel in medicine, nursing, dentistry, dental hygiene, hospital administration, and public health, by building new schools, and by attracting additional students through scholarships. (A) Specifies payments from $150 to $1,000 per student up to average past enrollment and from $150 to $1,000 for each student in excess of average past enrollment in professional schools, and from $50 to $150 per student for schools of nursing, to be paid for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1950, and each of the four succeeding years. Payments in any event shall not exceed 40 percent of the costs of instruction. (B) Authorizes $5,000,000 per year for 4 years to build new facilities, to enlarge existing ones, and to purchase equipment, not more than 50 percent of the cost to come from Federal funds. To receive aid a school must provide assurance to the Surgeon General that it will continue for at least 10 years, and must not impose unreasonable restrictions against out-of-State students. (C) Authorizes such sums as necessary to permit scholarships and maintenance to students entering the health professions. Each recipient of aid shall repay in service 1 year for every two academic years either in the medical service of the United States or in an area designated by the State agency as medically deficient. The Surgeon General is directed to set standards and promulgate regulations with the cooperation of a 12-member Council on Education for Health Professions.

Authorizes $2,500,000 yearly for 5 years plus administration expenses to support approved State plans for practical nurse training, under the direction of the United States Commissioner of Education. Money distribution is to be on the basis of population and estimated efficient usage.

Rural Wisconsin Comments on America's Problems and Senator Wiley Reports to Rural Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on America's problems affecting the people of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"What are those fellows in Congress doing anyway? Why all this spending spree with the people's money? Why aren't these heavy Federal taxes cut? How about it, Senator?"

These are the straight-shooting comments, advice, and able criticism from the good folks at the grassroots of Wisconsin on rural route 1 or 2 or 3 and on the star routes and at the country crossroads.

VISITING ALL OVER WISCONSIN

Since Congress recessed in October, it has been my pleasure to visit county areas all over America's dairyland in seeking the sound advice and thinking of our Wisconsin people.

"What do the home folks think of their Congress? What do they think of America's basic problems? What do they want Congress to do in 1950?" Those are questions which I have asked myself and which I have asked others. I have sought the answers not only in Wisconsin's larger cities: In Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Janesville, Beloit, Superior, Eau Claire, Sheboygan, Appleton, Green Bay, La Crosse, Fond du Lac, Wausau, Manitowoc, Neenah, Menasha, Rhinelander, Wisconsin Rapids, and elsewhere, but in the little villages, on the farms, in the country stores.

Naturally, to folks at the country crossroads, things seem somewhat different than to their city brothers. Why? Well, because the way of life of those who live close to the soil is naturally different from that in a major city.

Here are the problems that the folks in rural Wisconsin have raised:

OUR WISCONSIN MILK CHECKS ARE DROPPING FAST

"Senator, we are mighty interested in this new farm law that Congress has enacted. You know from your own experiences on your dairy farm in Barron County that the dairyman's milk checks are dropping fast. He is facing the problem of conforming with new State dairy regulations issued at Madison. He faces high machinery costs, high feed costs, high costs of hired help. We are hoping and praying, therefore, that this new flexible parity law enacted by the Congress works out well for Wisconsin's 175,000 farms, yes, for its great canning industry, too."

WE'VE GOT TO INCREASE EATING OF MILK, BUTTER, CHEESE

I have assured these folks that I for one am going to do everything possible to make sure of just that, namely, to make certain that the Badger farmer is given a square deal under this new parity law. There is nothing more basic than maintaining the health of America's agricultural segment. No, sir, there is nothing more basic than maintaining the nutritional standards of our people and making sure that they eat more wholesome dairy products—milk, cheese, butter.

WISCONSIN SUPPORTS WILEY PRO-BUTTER AMENDMENT

And speaking of these natural products, I've been gratified by the tremendous support of the Wiley probutter amendment to the oleo bill. This is, of course, the amendment designed to protect the natural color of butter in interstate commerce from imitation, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Well, let's go on and listen to other voices in rural Wisconsin—to voices of members of REA's, of livestock co-ops, voices of Badger fur farmers, voices of county agents, home demonstration workers, ladies' church groups.

WE'VE HAD OUR BELLYFUL OF STRIKES

"Senator, we are mighty concerned about the big strikes that have been hurting the Nation—the steel strike, the coal strike, and all of the other types of stoppages—the strikes against farm co-ops and other walkouts. We here in rural Wisconsin by and large work with our hands. We know the problems of labor, but we know that labor does not gain when unnecessary strikes are called.

"We are hoping, therefore, that you will keep up your fight to retain the fair Taft-Hartley law. We know that this vital law has been smeared. We know that certain labor czars have announced that they are going to try to purge you and other Senators merely because you have stood up for that law. We hope that you will not be disturbed by these labor big shots, but that you will keep up your fight for protection of the public welfare. We don't want Commies or racketeers to be running and ruining the unions."

WE WANT THESE NUISANCE TAXES REDUCED

The folks at the country crossroads are deeply disturbed, too, by the huge tax burden of the Federal Government. They say this, "We know that 1 day out of every 5 we are working for Uncle Sam merely to pay Federal taxes. That's in addition to State and local taxes. Moreover, the President has threatened to increase taxes next year. We know you, Senator WILEY, are fighting against that tax threat and are trying to economize.

"We know, too, that you are in favor of eliminating hundreds of nuisance excise taxes, like the taxes on ladies' cosmetics, drugs, leather goods, photographic equipment, movie admissions, tickets to agricultural fairs, dues, etc. We are all with you on this vital issue of tax reduction. Keep up the good fight. Get the Wiley tax-reduction bill passed."

KEEP UP THE FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALISM

Now, on another issue, what do the homefolks think about the trend away from free enterprise, the trend toward socialism? Well, many a man in rural Wisconsin has said to me in effect: "What are those guys trying to do in Washington—socialize this country? The President seems to recommend more and more legislation to push businesses to the wall and substitute Government operation for private enterprise. He wants to socialize medicine. And there are lots of folks in his administration who seem to want to socialize the steel industry, insurance, banking."

WE'VE GOT TO SUPPORT REPUBLICAN SENATORS IN NOVEMBER 1950

"We know that in 1950, we are going to have to troop to the polls in full strength to make sure that free enterprise-minded Senators are returned to public office. There is only a handful of you Senators in Washington who are holding the bridge against the forces of socialism. If men like BOB TAFT and you and others who have fought for freedom go down, then this country and its traditional Republican system of government will go down with them. Senator, we're not going to let that happen."

LET'S NOT ALLOW COUNTRY LIFE TO BE HURT

Here's another matter. "Senator WILEY, we know that you come from a small town of 10,000—Chippewa Falls—and that you understand the value of small towns. You appreciate the need for adequate planning to decentralize American population, industry, defense plants—to get them out to the grassroots instead of being all congregated in huge, choking cities. We are all for that idea of decentralization.

"Let our youngsters grow up where they can see trees and flowers, where they can go out in the country and breathe some real fresh air, where they can go fishing and hunting, where they can think for themselves, and perhaps work for themselves on their own little farm, in their store, or business."

NATURALLY THERE ARE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION IN RURAL WISCONSIN

Of course, there is not complete unity of opinion out in rural Wisconsin any more than there is in the big cities. There is, however, basic agreement on those issues that I have mentioned—support of the Taft-Hartley law, support of tax reduction, support of the free-enterprise system, and the figh against socialism, support of free enterprise Senators and Congressmen in the 1950 election battle, support of the way of life in small towns and villages and on the farms. Moreover, there is, of course, support of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for which I've always fought against the opposition of the South and East.

I am hoping that other Senators and Representatives will have abundant opportunity to get out on the country cross roads, because I think that their eyes will be opened in learning what the people have to say about the failings of their Government.

WISCONSIN COUNTRY FOLKS TALK PLAINLY

Folks at the grassroots talk frankly and plainly, without pussyfooting or hemming and hawing around. I've benefited tremendously from their straight-shooting comments, from their constructive criticisms. They've told me where and when I've been wrong and where and when I've been right. They've called the shots as they see them. That's what a United States Senator or a Congressman needs more than anything else—the frank, sound judgment of people at the grass roots. So let's hear more from you whenever the spirit moves you and whenever I can be of service. That's my job and it's a privilege to perform it for you. Thanks very much.

Farmers and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 4, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following fine editorial which appeared recently in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

FARMERS AND POLITICS

Congress has finally reached agreement on what it terms a compromise farm bill. It accepts the principle of flexible price supports but puts off the effective date of this new system until at least 1951.

Meantime, supports will be maintained at the same rigid 90 percent of parity where they have been held for several years.

Parity is a price plane computed to give farmers a fair purchasing power, the theory being that they should get enough for their products to be able to buy the things they need.

A 90-percent-of-parity price means that the Government guarantees the farmer that figure even if the open-market price sags far below such a level.

Keeping this plan in effect can hardly be hailed as a show of good sense and courage on the part of Congress. It is estimated that by July 1950 the Government will have to buy more than $2,000,000,000 worth of farm commodities at the support levels.

The system unquestionably encourages farmers to produce not for market but for what they can expect to get from the Government for their crops. The result is a glut of markets that can be relieved only by Government buying.

In the face of the serious confusion and inequity already disrupting the farm economy, Congress has responded by postponing decisive action. With the known strength of the farm bloc in mind, who is bold enough to say that the lawmakers will stand by their compromise and actually introduce a sliding scale of supports some 2 years hence?

The evident fact is that Congress has made a political choice. Warned by President Truman that abandonment of rigid supports might cost the Democrats the farm vote in 1950, the party leaders have done their bit to keep the farmers "in the bag."

Acceptance of the sliding-scale principle represents a victory of doubtful proportions for the Senate. It kills the Aiken law which would have put into effect a 60- to 90-percent scale starting next January.

Still another result is that it may have postponed indefinitely any detailed consideration of the controversial Brannan plan. That system called for outright subsidies to farmers on perishable crops, with consumers getting the benefit of real market prices.

The lesson here would seem to be that our lawmakers would rather stick with a plan whose bad features are at least partly evident than plump for something they fear might turn out much worse. But none of this sounds like a very sensible way to make laws, does it?

Rule of Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of October 4, 1949:

RULE OF JERUSALEM—ISRAELIS SUCCEEDED WHERE UNITED NATIONS FAILED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Despite the proved unworkability of an internationalized Jerusalem, it is still being proposed with utter disregard for the facts of life, within that area and their relationship to the State of Israel and the rest of Palestine. It is proposed once again, with some modification, that the United Nations accept the task of administering Jerusalem, a task in which it has signally failed before, having, frankly, neither the heart nor the equipment therefor.

The opposition of the New York Herald Tribune to the proposal as expressed in its

editorial of September 15, 1949, was as right as rain, particularly when it stated, "internationalization of Jerusalem, whatever its theoretical attractiveness may be, appears to have been far outrun both by time and events."

In the resolution of November 29, 1947, a special regime was advocated for Jerusalem, which would accept the responsibility for law, order, peace, security, and well-being of the inhabitants of the Holy City, including the protection and preservation of the unique spiritual and religious interests located therein. It was a blueprint, admirable on paper, and, in the interests of peace, the Israelis undertook to cooperate with the United Nations.

The failure of the United Nations to discharge its appointed duties resulted in tragedy. Arab violence began in the city of Jerusalem. Communications were destroyed and the water supply completely cut off from the new city. The siege of Jewish-inhabited Jerusalem brought with it bombardment, starvation, pestilence, and thirst. I saw the evidence of this senseless destruction when I was in Jerusalem about a year ago. The Trusteeship Council of the United Nations took no action to meet its responsibilities. It turned the question over to the General Assembly, which likewise would issue no instructions, save that it appointed a municipal commissioner who, at the height of the siege, arrived in Jerusalem and then very shortly thereafter left, unable to cope with the situation.

The wheels of international machinery refused to turn, and the task of saving Jerusalem, its inhabitants and its holy places was left to Israel. This they did, with a tremendous loss of life and resources. The Israelis built alternate roads to Jerusalem (the Latrun Road was entirely in Arab hands), bringing water, food, and supplies to the 100,000 Jews in the new city. The Israelis fought with small arms throughout days and nights of terror until peace was restored. Where internationalization had failed, the Israelis succeeded.

It is inimical to the peace of the Middle East to dismiss that fact.

The internationalization of Jerusalem would keep the area in constant ferment; it could not now, as it could not before, preserve and protect the holy places. The Arabs and Jews must keep and make their own peace therein, with the new city of Jerusalem an integral part of the state of Israel. It must not be forgotten, as I stated before, that the Israelis were willing to try internationalism of Jerusalem, but now see clearly how inadequate was the blueprint in terms of security and peace.

It would indeed be folly to repeat a demonstrated error. International control of Jerusalem should be restricted so as to be concerned only with the protection and preservation of the holy places.

EMANUEL CELLER.

NEW YORK, *September 29, 1949.*

We Can Give Away Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me for the August issue of the American Magazine, 1949, entitled "We Can Give Away Too Much."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN GIVE AWAY TOO MUCH

(By GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada)

The principal export of the United States today is cold cash, every cent of which comes out of the pocket of the American taxpayer and not one cent of which this Nation will ever get back.

At the same time, our principal import today consists of low-priced commodities, produced by cheap foreign labor, living at standards far lower than ours, the sale of which can destroy the wages and jobs of our own working people.

Since the end of World War II the Congress of the United States has gift-loaned $24,000,000,000 to the nations of the world and has pledged $17,000,000,000 more under the Marshall plan, making a total of $41,000,000,000 exported or earmarked for export since the cessation of hostilities.

Most of the money we are sending abroad is going to Europe, ostensibly for the purpose of rehabilitating the industries of war-torn nations, thus making their people self-sufficient and more resistant to the Red bacteria of communism. When I was in Europe in the late fall of 1947 some of the nations I visited had already recovered economically and actually had no need of our funds. Of this I informed the Congress, but my testimony was of no avail.

By profession I am an engineer. I started my working life as a miner in Nevada. Altogether, I have lived an honest, rough-and-tumble life. I have been a soldier and a boxer and a lot of other things. I am no mathematician or statistician. I am pretty much of a plain, ordinary citizen and hard-headed businessman who knows how to add and subtract and to fight for what he wants. The Marshall plan for administering our money to war-torn nations for the purpose of rehabilitating their industries and making them self-sufficient, and all of these other plans for giving away money, were thought up by men who, in a lot of ways, are far smarter than I am. General Marshall, former Secretary of State, who was the originator of the idea, has been honored in many high places for his accomplishments and recently was given an honorary degree by some big university. It is in all humility that I oppose his conclusions and those of many other big men in Government. But with my 2-times-2-make-4 mind and with my realistic western upbringing, I simply can't go along with their ideas.

When I was last in England many industries were not only proceeding full blast, but were expanding. One British Government leader told me outright that England had recovered and now wished to double its production. He said, as a matter of fact, that Marshall plan moneys were not needed in the British Isles but were needed principally for the development of British colonies. In British East Africa I saw vast peanut plantations being planted with Marshall plan money in acreages large enough to offer dangerous competition to the peanut industries of our Southern States.

In 1948 Great Britain's industrial production had recovered 121 percent as compared with 1935, presumably a normal production year. As a matter of fact, it had recovered 109 percent in 1947 before the Marshall plan became effective. France had recovered by 108 percent last year, as compared with 1938. Even hard-hit Italy is up to 107 percent in recovery as compared with 1947.

As a matter of fact, all 15 of the European nations which are being paid under the Marshall plan had fully revovered by last year, except Austria, Germany, and Greece. Germany would have recovered had not France, England, and Russia wrecked her industrial plants and in many cases removed the salvage to build industries for themselves, salvage which they claimed for reparations. Thus France, England, and Russia killed two birds with one stone. By wrecking German plants they forestalled Germany's return to international trade, and at the same time increased their own production and servicing of the markets of the world.

Holland, which has recovered her industrial production 121 percent as against 1935, is spending about $1,000,000 a day of Marshall-plan money for the purpose of subduing Indonesia, where she produces tin, oil, spices, and other things with what economically amounts to slave labor. For these commodities Americans pay through the nose, although we defended the Netherland colonies in the last war with our substance and our lives.

Certainly we should have access to the markets on which our boys left their bloody footprints. Instead, we are digging down in our pockets to pay taxes to provide appropriations under the Marshall plan, part of which are being used, as I have shown, to subdue the ragged and half-starved natives of Indonesia.

Some time ago a French financial leader was telling me about a new 5-year plan in France under which a lot of new factories were to be built with Marshall-plan money.

"As I understand it," I said, "these factories will be free of all encumbrance at the end of 5 years and ready to produce for the markets of the world. What lucky people you are. That could never happen in the United States. When we build a factory, as a rule, we buy machinery on credit and amortize it, say, on a 25-year note at 3 percent. When the machinery is paid for it is worn out, and we replace it with another 25-year amortization program. You boys really are going to be in a position to do some cut-throat trading in a few years; aren't you?"

He smiled and said that was so. Do you think we can compete with him in world trade? I don't. I think his benefactor, Uncle Sam, is really Uncle Sap in this case.

Next spring we are going to be called upon to export another $5,000,000,000 or so to the nations of Europe to make them invincible to communism and, indeed, invincible eventually to world-trade competition. I had no objection to the feeding of starving Europeans in grave emergencies, but I most bitterly oppose the continuance of giving them billions of our hard-earned money to exploit the markets of the world. We have given away enough. Nobody in Washington seems to know it, but we can give away too much—enough to make coolies out of American workers and a poorhouse out of America.

Under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which was passed originally as a defense measure, tariffs on American imports were reduced from an average of 45 percent to an average of 15 percent. Gradually, since that time, this country has been increasingly swamped with goods from abroad, produced by low-cost labor. During the war, of course, imports were limited, but now that the Marshall plan has brought many foreign industries into surplus production, the low-cost goods are returning.

As I write, I have in my office textiles from England and goods from other countries that radically undersell similar commodities produced in this country. Some of these goods, it can be assumed, are coming from Marshall-plan-financed plants, and more will be coming in the near future.

We already have 5,000,000 men out of work and more than 10,000,000 in part-time employment. If we don't cut out this funny business, we are going to have 20,000,000 more selling Marshall-plan-grown appies on the streets of this Nation before very many years have elapsed. By the end of the first

year of the Marshall-plan expenditures, our imports increased by $1,700,000,000, while our exports, which we were told would be increased by the Marshall plan, had decreased nearly $3,000,000,000.

You remember how it was: We would send them the money and they would spend it over here, keeping our plants running three shifts a day. Well, no such thing has happened. Just a few days ago, manufacturers of printing equipment, for instance, complained to our Government that large European printers were buying their machinery from European factories, which were built or rehabilitated with Marshall-plan money.

Even at that, I have not told you the worst. Conditions in parts of Europe are so favorable to low-cost industrial production that many American factories are moving abroad, where they can produce so cheaply that they are enabled by our low tariff, under the Trade Agreements Act, to undersell American industries here at home. One large manufacturer of typewriters and electric razors is shutting down several of its plants in New England and New York and moving, bag and baggage, to Scotland, where labor is one-third cheaper than it is in the United States, and where the Government, loaded with Marshall-plan money, offers every encouragement to American industrialists.

In addition to the typewriter concern, a cash register company, an electrical products plant, a sewing machine concern, and a soft drink corporation are all setting up businesses in Scotland. A large motorcar company has set up a plant in England, and cars, made abroad with cheap labor and favored with an almost nonexistent tariff, are coming into this country in increasing numbers. Workers in Detroit will begin to ask questions when they begin to see a lot of guys in suits made of foreign textiles driving foreign-made cars through the streets.

In the meantime, are we getting any tariff breaks abroad to enable us to increase our exports and our world trade in general? Recently a Sir Robert and Lady Craigie imported an American car, valued at $4,000, into England. On this they paid an import duty of $1,600 and a purchase tax of $3,200, making a total duty and tax of $4,800—in substance, a tariff of more than 100 percent. Thus the car cost the British consumer $8,800. We charge only 10 percent ad valorem on imported motorcars. In 1947, we imported 48 of these vehicles from Europe; in 1948, we imported 25,000 motorcars. Pretty soon it may pay Detroit to move to Europe to get a fair break in competition with European manufacturers, many of whose plants probably were built with gift-loans from Uncle Sap, bearing no interest.

This thing is sneaking up on us. If the average American, as he shops, will examine the labels on his purchases, he will find that more foreign-made goods are getting into this country than he dreams of—vacuum cleaners, electrical equipment, toys, cutlery, textiles, plastic goods, and almost anything you can name. The prevalence of these cheap goods is closing factories or moving factories, and, in both cases, dispossessing the American worker, who, we boast, has the highest living standard on earth. The Trade Agreements Act in 1934 is coming up in Congress for a 3-year extension one of these days, and I am putting myself on record now as one who will fight it till the last factory in America is shut down.

The Marshall plan and Trade Agreements Act were dreamed up, of course, along with other panaceas, to stop the Red glacier from sliding farther into Europe—that is, to enable the free and democratic countries to recover economically and so keep faith with democracy. I should like to say here that in my judgment most of them had recovered before the Marshall plan went into effect. The Europeans for hundreds of years have been masters of rehabilitation. I may add that they also have been masters at barter and intrigue.

While we have been saving Europe from communism, Europe has been helping to save communism for Russia by sending the Soviet Union everything from steam locomotives to jet planes—commodities, in many cases, manufactured by plants built or rehabilitated with Marshall-plan money. Both England and France have nonaggression pacts with Soviet Russia, by which they are obligated to furnish economic assistance to the Reds. Moreover, 16 Marshall-plan countries, including France and England, have made some 88 trade deals whereby they agree to supply the Soviet Union with such potential war materials as ball bearings, tool steel, and locomotives. These commitments were made prior to the North Atlantic Pact and, while they conflict with the pact, have been winked at so far by our State Department.

Just what is a nonmilitary supply? As I recall it, everything that may be listed as a product of this country had some use during the last war. One ordinarily would not think of a hairpin as a military supply, but there were times in the last war when you couldn't buy one for love or money. The material that goes into a hairpin no doubt may be used in the manufacture of ordnance or the building of ships. A good many million hairpins went to the WACS and WAVES. Russia is buying steam cranes for loading and unloading trains. This is not a military machine, necessarily, but we suffered during the war from having too few of them.

England and France are not the only offenders in this respect. Sweden, a large beneficiary of Marshall-plan money, is sending colossal quantities of iron to Czechoslovakia, one of Russia's satellite nations, where it can readily be fabricated into supplies, military or nonmilitary, for the use of the Soviet war machine. Not long before Pearl Harbor we were sending boatloads of scrap iron and tankers loaded with oil to Japan. Our boys had to go over there and face that scrap iron, as it came hurtling out of howitzers and cannon.

More than one prophet called attention to the danger of our ways, but we went right ahead, just as we are now, arming Russia with our own money. It doesn't make much sense, does it?

The smart boys used to say that we were invincible as long as we kept our industrial techniques, our know-how, at home. They said Europe didn't have the know-how to compete with us in industrial production. Our own industrialists are taking the know-how to Europe, and it has even been proposed that we send technicians to Europe to help the boys progress a little faster. We have left our industrial designs scattered over the battlefields of the world. We have given Europe our know-how, our designs, our matériel, and our cash. Don't you think we can give too much?

If we don't extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when it comes up in Congress, we still have to face a continuance of free trade in what is known as the International Trade Organization. Congress will consider joining this organization after we have passed on the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The organization will meet once a year and do nothing but perpetuate the fundamental free-trade intent of the 1934 act, which will enable 58 nations to raid American industry and displace the American worker.

Now, I ask you, "Are we nutty?" We are getting the biggest economic pushing around in the history of the world and we are paying them to do it to us. I can't believe the taxpayer knows what is going on, even though he is footing the bill. Sometimes I think he doesn't understand the gobbledygook that comes from the offices of the great in Washington.

I have always had the greatest respect for Yankee trading. It would seem, however, that in our eagerness to prove to the world that we are not "Uncle Shylock" we have made fools of ourselves. Europeans respect thrift and distrust frenzied generosity. If they fail to perceive our motive for it, they assume, of course, that, true to our tradition for shrewd dealing, we are holding an ace up our sleeves. If there is an ace, I'd like to see it. The fact is, as most recent travelers to Europe will testify, the common people there don't like us, no matter how much we spend on them.

The continuance of some of our old legislation and the program for the new, as I have outlined it in this article, are so illogical and so destructive to our economy that at times I am almost tempted to suspect a conspiracy to undermine our whole industrial structure and standard of living.

I would propose, first, that we abolish or greatly curtail the Marshall plan as such. I would substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act a flexible import fee system, under which the peril point automatically becomes the tariff or import fee. That is to say, that the difference in price between imported products and home-produced products would become the tax on the imported commodity, thus insuring the wage and living standard of the American worker.

Second, I would rebuild our national defense organization, enabling it to protect us from any other government system that sought to penetrate our territory or the territory of any nation whose integrity and survival are necessary to our ultimate peace and safety. To these nations necessary to our well-being, I would extend the Monroe Doctrine and open-door policy, which has worked so well for us for 125 years in South America.

Third, I would substitute for our give-away policy, under the Marshall plan, a policy of lending money to private industry of impoverished foreign countries on a strictly business basis. I would take liens and mortgages on properties and charge a reasonable rate of interest for the use of our funds. This policy could be applied through a kind of International Reconstruction Finance Corporation administered on a world-wide basis, just as we administered it here as the RFC. At least, it would get some of our money back for us. We will get none of it back under the present system.

I am completely of the opinion that we should continue to feed hungry people of other countries to the best of our ability without endangering the welfare of our own people. We can't hope to feed all the hungry people of the world. In some areas they have been hungry for 2,000 years. Our economy wouldn't stand the strain of feeding them all.

Leaders of other nations are thinking about their own people and trying to look after them, if necessary, at the expense of A ericans. I think the leadership of this country is obligated to look after our people. I don't think our leaders are doing it. I think they are selling our people down the river.

Investigation Justifies Return of Malmedy Prisoners to New German Government at Bonn

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a report and recommendations of the National Council for Prevention of War on the subject of the Malmedy massacre investigation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About a year ago the National Council for Prevention of War, in the interest of promoting peace and reconciliation with Germany, asked for an investigation of the United States war crimes program in Germany, with particular reference to the trial of the Germans accused of the Malmedy shootings.

A congressional subcommittee, headed by Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, was appointed and conducted lengthy hearings in Washington and in Germany.

On October 14 last Senator BALDWIN reported to the full Senate that certain things were pretty bad about the Malmedy trial. He and his committee made a few recommendations, mostly procedural and for the future, and that was that.

At the same time, Senator BALDWIN used the making of his report as an occasion for hinting that sinister forces operating behind the scenes might be using the National Council for Prevention of War, the Catholic and Protestant bishops in Germany, and American as well as German lawyers, to foster a rebirth of nazism in Germany.

This cloak and swastika touch in the report, unfortunately, captured the spotlight in the news report and some of the committee's minor but positive accomplishments were overlooked. The staff of the National Council for Prevention of War followed the hearings closely, presented evidence to the Baldwin committee, and has now analyzed the Baldwin report.

It concludes, disappointedly, that on the whole the Baldwin committee did a timid and inadequate job, that it ignored some evidence presented to it, undervalued other evidence, avoided some obvious conclusions, and made only minimum recommendations, which might, however, be of some value.

The national council fears that the Baldwin committee's failure to speak out forcefully and draw the proper moral from its own record, might be interpreted in some quarters as a documented approval of the more sordid aspects of the United States war crimes program.

To nip this fallacy in the bud the council appends a short story of the original crime, the so-called Malmedy massacre, the frame-up, the trial, and an analysis of the Baldwin investigation.

This story must become known, and the United States must atone for its misdeeds, else the unfair Malmedy trial will remain salt in the unhealing international wound opened by the war. The six Germans under death sentence in the Malmedy affair and 23 other Germans under similar United States death sentences must be saved. We cannot afford to give any more martyrs to German nationalism or any more ammunition to the critics of America's international morality.

THE MALMEDY MASSACRE

In a war in which there was much bitter fighting and atrocities on both sides, some of the bitterest fighting and some of the worst atrocities took place toward the end. In December 1944 the Germans made an onslaught against a weak but heroically defended section of the Allied line in Belgium. United States and British troops retreated before smashing tank advances. Tens of thousands of Americans and British fell. Scores of thousands of Germans were killed, too.

During this welter of blood and fire one particular group of American prisoners was mowed down near the Malmedy crossroads. Someone got a photograph of the bodies lying in the snow. Out of the many wholly immoral incidents of the war, this one was blown up and ballyhooed around the Allied world as the "Malmedy massacre."

When victory came, the German troops who had been near Malmedy at the time were put in United States prison cages. Then began the grisly process of extracting confessions. Then was made the attempt to make a simple, right or wrong, black and white murder trial out of all the confused slaughter and counterslaughter that took place.

To make sure they got convictions, the United States prosecutors added several hundred deaths taking place at 11 other places besides the Malmedy crossroads to the charge, and placed 74 German soldiers on trial for all of them. They convicted 73. The seventy-fourth was turned over to the French, who freed him.

THE MALMEDY INVESTIGATION

This mass trial was so confused that the men were convicted for murdering a woman in a town where subsequent investigation showed no woman was murdered, and for killing American soldiers in front of a grocery store where subsequent investigation showed no Americans had ever been killed (pp. 14517–14519, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

In other words, the German soldiers confessed to crimes that neither they nor anyone else had committed.

And no wonder.

These confessions were wrung from them by United States interrogators and prosecutors, using the following third-degree methods. They are taken from the Baldwin report of October 14, 1949:

The prisoners were put in solitary confinement (p. 9).

In death cells (p. 7).

On bread and water (p. 10).

Black hoods were placed over their heads (p. 11).

They were slapped, shoved around, struck (p. 17).

Told their families would lose their ration cards (p. 19).

Spied upon by stool pigeons (p. 20).

Given mock trials (p. 8). (Page numbers are from the mimeographed transcript.)

In addition the Baldwin committee reported, that although it could not quite bring itself to accept the following charges as proven, it had received considerable evidence indicating the American prosecutors also—

Knocked out teeth (p. 19).

Forced prisoners to drink from the toilets (p. 10).

Issued false promises of acquittal (p. 20-21).

All this was before the trial.

THE MALMEDY TRIAL

Softened up by this, the prisoners then went to trial under the following circumstances, as reported by the Baldwin committee:

"The rules of procedure under which this case was tried were not those that are used by the Anglo-Saxon nations in regularly constituted military or civilian courts" (p. 22, report).

Hearsay evidence was admissible (p. 23).

"* * * due to the limited time available (4 weeks), the defense was considerably handicapped in preparing its case for trial" (p. 22).

Experience of the lawyers was of only average caliber (p. 35).

The difference in language made it difficult for prisoners to converse with their lawyers (p. 25).

Defense lawyers were forbidden to cross-examine prosecution witnesses (p. 12).

The complete record of the trial was not made available to all defense counsel (p. 29).

(All page references are to the official mimeographed transcript.)

After putting these things, to which they could not shut their eyes, into their report, the Baldwin subcommittee then blandly concludes, in the words of Senator BALDWIN, as he read the report on the floor of the Senate: "There may have been failings on the part of the Army—and there were failings; this was not a first-class job in any sense of the word; we say so in our report, and we make recommendations to deal with it in the future" (p. 14520, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

The Baldwin committee's incapacity for indignation in the face of these violations of accepted American judicial principles is matched only by the temerity with which they buried or ignored other parts of the evidence presented to them and which are actually printed in their hearings. The committee's record is studded with voluntary admissions by our overzealous officials.

For example, Col. A. H. Rosenfeld, Jr., one of the judges of the Malmedy court, on whose supposed impartiality the life and death of the Germans rested, revealed that—

He had named one of his dogs after a German prisoner, and that the German knew about it (p. 3219 ff., hearings).

The first 10 lawyers that appeared before him didn't know the proper manner of introducing a statement into evidence (p. 3216, hearings).

"Several of the rules had to be made up as we went along" (p. 3213).

He and the rest of the judges, who were judge and jury rolled into one, deliberated and found the men guilty at an average speed of 2 minutes per man (p. 3255).

When a reviewing officer started to make one of the first critical surveys of the Malmedy trial, Rosenfeld managed to have him transferred to another assignment (p. 3226). (All page numbers citing Rosenfeld are from the official stenographic transcript of the hearings.)

THE BALDWIN INQUIRY

When the committee, receiving these disclosures, should have been stung with angered American pride, and ready to slash out at the offenders in an attempt to restore the damaged bases of that pride, it kept quiet, or merely said what amounted to "Boys will be boys." It failed to call a spade a spade, to say bluntly that we had violated the Geneva Convention, the Articles of War, the fifth amendment to the Constitution and the statutory law.

Why this shameful silence? It is difficult to assess motivations, but it is a fact that one of the American "defendants," a member of the Malmedy prosecuting team, is a law partner of Senator BALDWIN. His name is Maj. Dwight F. Fanton. The National Council for Prevention of War protested this in a letter to Senator BALDWIN, April 7, 1949, before the hearings started, predicting it might "turn the hearings into a whitewash."

BALDWIN replied, refusing to step down.

Capt. Paul Shumacker, another one of the American "defendants" in the hearings, used to be in the same law firm with Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, another member of the Baldwin subcommittee.

In addition to the ex parte status of two of its members, the Baldwin committee suffered from other infirmities. Through a misguided sense of melodrama and a misconception of its duties it tended to minimize its mandate (S. Res. 42) to search into American wrongdoing and instead wasted much time and money playing Dick Tracy with the character of the American lawyers, the German bishops, and the American organizations who are protesting the medieval methods of the Malmedy trials. It tried to discredit the American judge, E. L. van Roden, who officially recommended commutation of sentence for all the Malmedy death sentences.

This tack was suggested to them during the hearings (p. 1126, printed hearings) by one of the American defendants, Lt. William Perl. Perl is the man of whom an American witness said:

"I saw Perl slap 'em and knee 'em double in the groin" (p. 161, printed hearings).

The committee was continually chaperoned by representatives of the Department of the Army, whose expert presence was needed, but whose ever-present inferiority complex and resentment of any criticism apparently were contagious.

In addition the committee still suffered from the spirit of '46. They were still apparently under the influence of VE-day emotions. The effect of this emotional lag was described by then Secretary of the Army Royall when, testifying before this committee on its opening day, he stated:

"I am positive, for example, that a criminal, many war criminals tried immediately after the war were convicted who would not have been convicted 2 years later; and that is human nature" (p. 17, printed hearings).

The committee undoubtedly was also laboring under a repressed sense of our own national guilt which taints all our considerations of war-crimes matters. It consistently tended toward leniency in probing the bestialities of "our boys," an attitude which is understandable and in a certain distorted sense commendable, but hardly justified in a probe of this sort.

The Baldwin committee became then in effect "the Committee for the Defense of the Occupation Sadists."

Their report naturally became vague, vacuous, and deliberately evasive. They even double-talked their way around the damning findings of the United States doctors who examined the Malmedy men this summer, recasting it as:

"Ten (prisoners) showed physical findings which might possibly have resulted from physical mistreatment, but none of these 10 showed evidence of the severe acts alleged by the prisoners" (p. 17, mimeographed transcript of report).

Their attempt to double in the role of prosecutors and defendants resulted in a final absurdity. They wound up their report with recommendations for reform of such proceedings in the future, recommendations which belied the whole tenor of excuse and exoneration dominating the main body of their report.

They said, in short, "Although you didn't do it, we don't want you to do it again," or, "O. K.; nobody there but you chickens."

Fortunately the committee did not have the temerity to recommend the Malmedy men be executed. The final decision in the matter of the executions, they said, is up to the Secretary of the Army (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14531).

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT BALDWIN COMMITTEE

Having examined the evidence received by the committee, and having read the report made by the committee on the basis of that evidence, we must reluctantly conclude that the committee did not do its job.

It did not do its duty by the German prisoners who looked to it as a last forum of justice.

It did not do its full duty to Congress, which asked it to report the facts. (Other Congressmen, including Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Senator JOE MCCARTHY, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, and Representative LAWRENCE SMITH had not pressed their own inquiries into military justice partly on the assumption that Senator BALDWIN would do a thorough job.)

It did not do its duty by the Americans of all faiths and backgrounds who were concerned and shocked by the charges. They must still remain perturbed, knowing that we have failed the critical test of passing judgment on our own deeds.

It did not do its duty by the people of all countries who base their hopes for a lasting peace on fair and equal treatment of all peoples, including the vanquished.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR

The national council recommends that the Malmedy men and other alleged German war criminals be turned over to the new German Government at Bonn. President Truman sent his best wishes of congratulation and support to that new government the day it began to function. This would evidence we mean something by those friendly words.

This would be turning over to the Germans themselves an unpleasant task for which we have shown ourselves patently disqualified.

We should turn the prisoners over without strings, beyond a recommendation for retrial in capital cases, and implementation of the officially proposed Simpson-van Roden clemency program in all the hundreds of others.

Appeasement the Only Consistent Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, about the only consistent foreign policy of the Roosevelt-Truman New Deal has been its appeasement of Russian communism.

Early in his first administration—November 16, 1933—the late President negotiated an agreement to recognize the Soviet. That old smoothie, Litvinov, represented the Red revolutionaries, and after making many promises to Roosevelt on freedom to worship, and so forth, full recognition of Russia was granted. Certainly the revolutionary character of communism was known to every citizen at that time; in fact, for many years prior to 1933, all the great patriotic organizations in the United States were pointing out the menace of communism. The veteran organizations, the DAR, the Catholic Church, and many other groups, pointed out that the Russians could not be trusted. The aim of their philosophy was to crush the American way of life, by violence and bloodshed if necessary. But the man in the White House appeased the Reds by granting full recognition. That was the initial sin which has precipitated the present situation of world communism.

This was the signal for a campaign of attrition against our form of government by Communist organizers and sympathizers within our borders. Underground organizations of fellow travelers soon had American Communists in responsible governmental positions from which they could spy and report to the Russian secret service. Sabotage and espionage prevailed. Earl Browder was having a field day sending Americans to Moscow to be trained and indoctrinated for the day when they would overthrow this Government. The forging of passports was a common practice, yet the State Department and the Department of Justice closed their eyes to what was going on. Even Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt went to the rescue of Mrs. Earl Browder who came into this country illegally. So the administration appeased Russia by recognition of it, and then it appeased the Soviet underground and party workerts by permitting them to be placed on the Government pay roll. Chambers, Hiss, and Elizabeth Bentley, are prize examples of this practice, committed under the pretext of liberalism. From 1933 to the present, the American people have been compelled to live with these rats because the Democratic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman have coddled them. This has been, and still is, the greatest crime ever committed against the people of the United States.

We entered World War II to defeat nazism and fascism. Hitler, we said, was a threat to liberty and freedom and this required the use of our military might. When Hitler and Stalin, both thieves and murderers, fought over the spoils in Poland, and Germany attacked the Soviet, all the United States Reds and Mr. Roosevelt came to the rescue of Stalin. First, our experts went to Joe in Moscow with many promises of our help, and a few weeks later at Tehran, the United States and Great Britain were appeasing Russia in order to make certain that it would remain in the war. Then later, at Yalta, Roosevelt and Churchill sold out Poland and China. According to Churchill, Roosevelt promised Stalin that he could have Manchuria and the Kuriles, without notice to our ally China. Roosevelt did not live to see what his double dealing and appeasement of Russia was to mean. His successor, Harry Truman, then went to Potsdam and there consummated the Roosevelt bargain with Stalin. He no doubt was helpless under the circumstances. Out of it, we got the blockade of Berlin and Russia the dismantled German industries, at a total cost to the American taxpayers of billions of dollars. This was unadulterated appeasement. There was no excuse for it and the many apologies made since are futile; the guilt cannot be explained away.

Early in the Truman administration, he sent Gen. George Marshall to China in an effort to solve a critical internal situation existing there. His recommendation was that Chiang Kai-shek should form a coalition government and take in Chinese Communists. This was the same proposition that Stalin made to China in 1938. So the left wingers in the State Department were only following the "commy line." Today, China, our friend and ally, is lost, and the Communists are overrunning most of Asia. What people in the future will trust us? We have failed to support the free people in China, in Poland, Yugoslavia, in the Ukraine, in Lithuania, in Latvia, and in Estonia. It is little wonder then that the free people in Europe are asking, can we rely on the United States or are they ready to make a deal with Stalin when it appears advisable? These are fair questions when we look at our record of appeasement.

In western Europe, in Greece, and Turkey, we are spending billions of dollars to contain communism under the Truman doctrine, yet with the wink of an eye we move to appease the Communist Dictator Tito in Yugoslavia. He boasts that he is opposed to western capitalism; that he will always remain a Communist. At the moment, he is quarreling with his old master Stalin. And once again, American diplomacy is playing the appeasement game. Mr. Truman has rationalized that this is the time to wean Tito from Stalin, so we are sending him steel plants, raw materials, and machine tools. So it was that Roosevelt rationalized with Stalin, and look what we have. The American people are asleep at the switch.

It has been said that we have tried to win and then to buy a facsimile of "love thy neighbor," all over the globe, and we have reaped a subsidized pandemonium. The world is so weak today that we cannot make peace or wage war. We are powerless to act constructively for peace while we beat the drums of war and appease dictators who aim to destroy our way of life. There is no difference between Stalin and Tito. Both stand for the same thing—a world revolution.

Aid for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the fifth annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was launched in Washington by the annual kick-off luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel.

A distinguished gathering of men and women attended this luncheon, which was held under joint auspices of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, the District of Columbia Lions Clubs, and the District of Columbia Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Hon. Jennings Randolph, former Congressman from West Virginia, and now assistant to president, Capital Airlines, presided as toastmaster, and among the speakers were Harold Russell, star of Best Years of Our Lives, and present national commander, AMVETS; Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, Chief of Staff of our armed forces; Miss Clara Longstreth, of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Albert E. Brault, district governor of Lions' International; Paul A. Strachan, national president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped and author of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; and Miss Hazel Arth, noted contralto, herself a victim of polio, accompanied by Kathryn Hills Rawls at the piano, rendered several selections.

The chief speaker was our distinguished and eloquent colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], whose tribute to the handicapped of the world brought tears to the eyes of his audience.

I ask, Mr. President, that the address of Senator NEELY be printed in the RECORD as a mark of our appreciation for the noble purposes of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and its splendid results in aiding our disabled American men and women, and enabling them to lift up their heads and assume their rightful place as tax-paying, responsible citizens of their respective communities.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA, DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE KICK-OFF LUNCHEON OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN THE GRAND BALLROOM OF THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL IN WASHINGTON, D. C., ON THE 3D OF OCTOBER 1949

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, for the rare privilege of enjoying your unusual entertainment, which, to the present moment, has been wholly delightful, for the cheering revelations provided by your cast of diversified, hopeful, heroic characters, and for this hour's lofty inspiration to increase our service to those who have been handicapped by accident or hindered by affliction, I sincerely thank you again and again.

Please be assured that my gratitude to you will not be diminished by your now repeating John Gay's appropriate couplet:

"So comes the reckoning when the banquet's o'er—
The dreadful reckoning, and men smile no more."

While the magic spell of the minstrelsy we have just heard lingers, let us hope that the District of Columbia will sometime have a grand opera house in which the people may be entertained and exalted by music such as that with which Miss Hazel Arth, accompained by Miss Kathryn Rawls, has charmed our ears and thrilled our hearts. It has been my undeserved good fortune to see many beautiful faces and hear many melodious voices, but Miss Arth is the first, the last, and only one who, within the range of my hearing, visions, or dreams, ever sang as a nightingale and looked like a bird of paradise.

In the interesting story told by the distinguished toastmaster, contrary to the experience of all the innumerable hosts of married men who have come and gone since Adam, the husband, instead of his indispensable helpmeet, won the argument and gained the privilege of the last word. Notwithstanding my great affection for Congressman Randolph I must restore to the women the microscopic fragment which he, in jest, pared from the vast domain that the wives of the world have, through ages of oral conquest, acquired from their laconic husbands. Let me begin the true version of the Congressman's story at the point at which the wranglers observed the team of horses cooperatively drawing a heavy load uphill. Said the husband to his wife, "Mary, we are also a team. Why can't we pull together just as those two horses do?" Mary retorted, "Because you are a jackass instead of a horse." [Laughter.]

Passing from light to serious vein, I improve this opportunity to express my deep and lasting appreciation of the generous, beloved Paul Strachan and his never-failing, never-faltering assistant, Miss Scott, who are rendering priceless service to the so-called handicapped of the Nation. [Applause.]

Let me, in similar spirit, attest my gratitude to my dear friend, West Virginia's distinguished statesman, Jennings Randolph, who was for many years an illustrious Member of the Congress and a most faithful chairman of the House Committee that has long served the people of the voiceless, voteless, undemocratic island known as the District of Columbia which is surrounded by the United States of America—the greatest ocean of democracy in the world. To hear Jennings laughing—

"You would think he's all fun,
But the angels laugh, too, at the good he has done;
The children laugh loud as they troop to his call,
But the poor man that knows him laughs loudest of all!"

Jennings, may you live long and prosper, and generously continue to lend your effectual aid to the physically marred to the end of the trail.

At the moment, my fervent prayer for means with which to aid the handicapped is, subject to appropriate changes in phraseology, identical with the following supplication offered by the beloved Robert Burns—

"That I, for poor auld Scotland's sake,
Some useful plan or book could make,
Or sing a song, at least."

Thrice and four times happy we would be to know that the consequences of this timely meeting would be such as to brighten the hopes, lighten the burdens, and multiply the blessings of all who are the victims of unkind fortune or adverse fate.

We rejoice in the fact that, through the operation of some mysterious law of compensation, for the afflicted of earth there is no day without a glorious sun of promise and no night without a gleaming star of hope.

There is manifest cause for me to have more than an academic interest in the important subject under consideration. Without mentioning names, I am thinking of a boy who, on one of the hilliest farms in West Virginia, in the eighteenth year of his life, lost half of his left hand. But for that physical handicap that boy of the long ago would, this very day, be on that steep and sterile farm guiding a plow, milking a cow, or feeding a sow, and you would not be saying or thinking:

"Of all sad words of tongue or pen
The saddest are these—it might have been."

And you would not be wondering, "Why did he not remain on the farm, and send us the cow or the sow?"

In order to fortify the courage, increase the hope and heighten the happiness of the handicapped, and contemporaneously stimulate ourselves to an intensification of our efforts to help them reach their coveted goals, we briefly mention a few of the many who have shown that the accomplishments of those who have suffered bodily affliction frequently, if not invariably, surpass the achievements of those upon whom misfortune never laid its heavy hand.

Two of the world's immortal poets, Homer and Milton, were totally blind.

Prescott, the famous author of the masterpiece entitled "The Conquest of Mexico," could not see the paper on which his deathless thoughts were penned.

Alexander Pope, whose poems will live as long as time endures, was for many years so seriously afflicted that only after his body had been securely wrapped in heavy canvas could he stand upon his feet.

Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott—heirs to everlasting fame—each limped on a crippled foot from the cradle to the grave.

Demosthenes, the grandest master of oratory mankind has ever heard or seen, overcame a distressing handicap by the long continued practice of speaking with his mouth filled with little stones.

The mighty Samson, who for twenty years was a judge of Israel, was overpowered by the warlike Philistines who put out his eyes. But the sightless strong man on the last day of his life slew 3,000 of his enemies—many more than he had slain in all his seeing years.

Turning from ancient to modern biography, we find innumerable examples of the rendering of surpassing service and the winning of immortal fame by the blind, the halt, and the lame.

The beloved Fanny Crosby lived in utter blindness for 95 years. To cheer the disconsolate millions of the earth, she joyfully wrote 6,000 hymns including—

"Blessed assurance, Jesus is mine,
Oh, what a foretaste of glory divine!"

"Jesus kept me near the cross
There a precious fountain."

"Once I was blind, but now I can see,
The light of the world is Jesus."

The inspiring William Cowper, who suffered frequent attacks of insanity, gave to the world numberless gems of thought such as—

"God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform
He plants his footsteps in the sea
And rides upon the storm."

During the administration of President Coolidge, the famous Helen Keller, who in childhood lost her faculties of hearing, speech and sight, gave a remarkable performance before an audience that filled every seat in Washington's Constitution Hall.

After Miss Keller had, with the aid of the wonderful woman who had trained her, delivered a short, brilliant address, Doctor Van Dyke announced that the blind prodigy would answer the first three questions asked her by the audience. The first question was unimportant. The second was, "Helen, does not your blindness make you unhappy?" As she pressed to her breast a bouquet of beautiful roses which the President had given her at the White House an hour before, she joyfully replied, "No, I am so busy thanking the great God for the beautiful world in which He lets me live that I have no time to be unhappy." The third question was, "Helen, when will wars cease?" She instantly answered, "When Christians practice what they preach."

Oh, that all the handicapped and the unhandicapped would transmute that answer into reality throughout the length and breadth of every land.

But the supreme example of record-breaking achievements by one who had been seriously afflicted was set for us, largely in this very city, by the greatest humanitarian since the Crucifixion who has immeasurably loved and served and blessed his fellow men. Patiently, persistently, and heroically he slowly fought his way from a bed of racking pain to achieve a distinction that no other human being has ever won, or will ever win.

The people attested their undying gratitude to this matchless man, this incomparable statesman, this paragon of official service by four times electing him President of the United States.

From the Presidency the peerless Franklin Roosevelt—

"Ascended fame's ladder so high,
That from the round at the top
He stepped to the sky."

By a myriad of additional illustrations it could be demonstrated that an investment in the physically hindered is one of the very best the world affords.

Throughout the ages, the handicapped have consistently proved that they are especially alert, efficient, and faithful in the discharge of their duties. The employment of one of these martyrs of misfortune serves many desirable ends. It makes the employed self-supporting; it makes them independent; it makes them self-respecting; it makes them happy. It enriches the employer. It helps to satisfy the economic wants of the people. It promotes the general welfare in many ways.

Let us resolve and reresolve to do everything in our power to bring together every employable, handicapped, jobless man or woman in the United States and a satisfactory job. Let us do this, not only on the days of the week that have been officially designated for that purpose, but on every day in the year until complete and lasting victory shall have been won.

For the spirit and manner in which we should address ourselves to this momentous undertaking, let Tolstoy's stirring story entitled "The Three Questions" point the way. In substance, it is as follows:

Once upon a time it occurred to a certain king that he could become the greatest monarch in the world if he could obtain the correct answers to these three questions: First, What is the most important thing in the world to do? Second, Who should be consulted about the action? And third, When should it begin?

Thereupon the king assembled the wisest of his country and asked them his questions. The answers were conflicting, confusing, and useless. Later the king was informed that a feeble old hermit who lived in a distant forest could answer any question, no matter how difficult it might be, but that he would see and serve only the common people. So the king disguised himself as a peasant and, guarded by a troop of cavalry, proceeded to the forest. After the guard had been concealed near the hermit's home, the disguised king, unattended, approached the old man, who was spading in his garden. The king said, "I have come, wise hermit, to ask you to answer three questions," which were then stated just as they had been to those who failed to supply the desired information.

The hermit courteously listened, but without answering he continued to work with his spade. The old man's manifest physical weakness prompted the king to say, "Let me spade a while and you rest." The hermit thanked the volunteer and sat down in the shade of a nearby tree.

The king spaded until he became tired. He then renewed his request. The hermit simply replied, "Let me spade, and you rest." But the king continued to spade until sunset and then said to the hermit, "If you can give me no answers to my questions, tell me so, and I will return to my home." At that moment a noise was heard in the distance and, as the king and the hermit turned in the direction from which it came, they saw a bearded man running out of the forest. His hands were pressed against his stomach and blood was gushing from beneath them. He fell unconscious at the feet of the king. The hermit and the king not only examined the man's wound, but with a towel the king brought from the hermit's cabin and with water which he brought from a nearby stream, the wound was dressed, and the unconscious man was carried into the cabin and laid on the hermit's bed.

The king was so wearied by his unusual exertion that he lay down on the floor and immediately went to sleep, and did not awaken until the following morning.

The first thing he noticed in his strange surroundings was the wounded man still lying on the bed, now conscious, and intently gazing at the monarch. The man said, "I beg your majesty to forgive me." The king said, "I do not know you and I have nothing to forgive." The other replied, "You do not know me, but I know you. I am that enemy of yours who swore he would kill you because you had executed his brother and seized his property. I learned that you were coming here to see the hermit. I followed you for the purpose of taking your life. But as I came from my ambush, your bodyguard recognized me and wounded me. I escaped from your soldiers, but I would have bled to death if it had not been for your service. If I live, and you wish, I will serve you as your most faithful subject to the end of my days, and will bid my sons to follow my example. Again I beg you to forgive me."

The king gladly complied with the wounded man's request, and not only forgave him but promised to send his own physician to the cabin to restore his former enemy to health.

The king then returned to the garden and found the hermit who was down on his knees, sowing seed in the ground that the king had spaded for him the evening before. The king said, "For the last time, I pray you, oh wise man, to answer my three questions." The hermit replied, "They have all been answered." "How have they been answered?" asked the king. The hermit said, "Do you not see that if you had not pitied my weakness yesterday, and had not worked in my garden, the bearded man would probably have killed you? A little later, if you had not helped to dress the injured man's wounds, he would have bled to death. In the humanitarian service you rendered the wounded man and me is the answer to your first question. The greatest thing in the world to do is to serve God's needy children.

"It was not necessary for you to consult anyone about aiding me or the wounded man. Your conscience—the spark of divinity within your breast—told you what you should do, and you did it. So the person to consult about any important enterprise will always be your better self, and if you follow that better self's advice you will never go astray. This is the answer to your second question.

"When you saw that I was too weak to continue my work you knew that the most important time to help me was the moment when I needed you. Afterward, when the bearded man fell at your feet, you knew that the most important time was the instant in which it became possible for you to save his life. Remember that there is only one time that is important. That time is now, because the present is the only time that anyone can call his own. Thus your third question is answered."

Mr. Emerson impressively emphasized the value of the present when he said, "Write it on your heart that every day is the best day in the year. No man has learned anything rightly, until he knows that every day is doomsday." And Mr. Longfellow contributed this prudent admonition on the subject:

"Trust no future howe'er pleasant!
Let the dead past bury its dead!
Act, act in the living present!
Heart within, and God o'erhead!"

A concrete application of the preceding generalities will demonstrate that it is vitally important for us to "throw out the life line" to every handicapped person in the Nation, consult and obey only our conscience as to the amplitude of our service to these deserving ones, and realize that this day, this very hour, is the time for us to begin to discharge our duties.

In an eastern city, a few years ago, a poverty-stricken widow from her deathbed obtained a promise from her 12-year-old little girl that she would support her youthful brother and sister and keep them out of the poorhouse, regardless of cost in toil or tears.

After the mother's funeral the little girl bravely struggled to redeem her promise. But, as a result of overwork and exposure, scrubbing floors and cleaning windows, she was soon stricken with pneumonia. A generous doctor, without compensation, diligently treated her, but in vain. The last

night of the little girl's life, when she knew that she was about to pass to the great empire of the dead, a neighbor girl stood at her bedside and held her tiny hands that were as rough as rasps. Said the rapidly sinking child to her companion, "I am not afraid to die, but I am so ignorant that I am afraid I will not know what to say to Jesus when I meet him in the better land." The little neighbor girl with tear-dimmed eyes and angelic voice replied, "Mary, you needn't say a word to Jesus—just show him your hands."

Ladies and gentlemen, let us so serve our handicapped brothers and sisters that when our "summons comes to join the innumerable caravan which moves to that mysterious realm" from which there is no return, we may, with undoubting faith and unlimited hope, show Jesus our hands, and hear from him the enrapturing words, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."

Importing Foreign Labor Through Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered over the American Broadcasting Co.'s national network on Friday, August 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTING FORIEGN LABOR THROUGH FREE TRADE

Not content with sharing our income in financing the Socialist governments of Europe, the administration is determined to divide the source of that income through the division of our markets with the foreign nations of the world. This means the deliberate transfer of American jobs to foreign soil.

This long-range objective is being brought about through the wholesale, across the board, slashing of our tariffs and import fees below the differential of cost of production, which is due principally to the difference in the wage-living standard in America and in such foreign countries.

CHEAP FOREIGN LABOR PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO AMERICA

With the millions of unemployed and with foreign products produced by the low-cost foreign labor being increasingly imported into this country, the administration is still pressing to extend for 3 years the 1934 trade agreements act to further decrease and lower the floor under wages. The tariff and import fees are the means, if properly adjusted, to provide a market for such foreign low-cost labor goods on our basis of costs.

I see no difference in importing the products produced by such low-wage living standard labor in competition with the American workingman and in importing the cheap labor itself. The result is exactly the same.

AMERICAN JOBS TO FOREIGN SOIL

Through the removal or substantial reduction of the tariffs and import fees, many of the American copper-mining jobs have been removed to Chile and South America where top wages are $2 per day. The tungsten-mining jobs have been removed to the 40-cents-per-day China and Burma labor. The mercury-mining jobs to the Spanish $2-per-day labor. The New England and Southern textile jobs are on the move to Scotland and England. The precision-instrument industries are going to Japan and Germany. The lumber, pulp, and wood products labor will be located in Canada and Sweden; the livestock labor in Australia, New Zealand, and South America, the petroleum and coal-mining jobs to the 50-cents-per-day Middle East labor, and many other industries can see the handwriting on the wall.

THE WELFARE STATE

In a desperate attempt to reverse the resulting trend of unemployment in this country a group of administration Senators have recently offered a bill in the United States Senate which would set up and finance another Government board to loan more billions of dollars to new and established businesses under the condition that such borrowers would submit to a virtual public utility regulation by applying to the board for a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

The first estimated cost of this welfare state would be about $15,000,000,000—$4,000,000,000 of which would go for administration costs.

Congress first creates its own problems—and then appropriates more money in a frantic attempt to cure them.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

The administration's four-point program, which adds up to putting the American workingmen in direct competition with the low-wage and slave labor of Europe, Asia, and Africa, includes:

1. Making up the trade-balance deficits of the European countries each year in cash. Our chief export is cash, starting as the Marshall plan in 1948 and currently called the ECA.

2. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, upon which the State Department has based a selective free-trade policy on the theory that the more we divide our markets with the foreign countries, the more of their products they can ship into this country, and as a result, the less their trade-balance deficits will be. The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the act, but was invented to sell free trade to the American people.

3. The International Trade Organization—ITO—an organization made up of 58 nations, to which we would assign all of our rights to fix our tariffs and import fees—this organization would meet at least once each year and divide the remainder of our markets among the membership. We would have one vote in the International Trade Organization the same as Siam, for example.

4. The bold new program, or point 4, is really only a bigger and better Marshall plan on a world scale. It guarantees foreign investments of manufacturers and processors not only in Europe but also in Asia and Africa.

Its magnitude will be sufficiently colossal that it will not only supply the foreign markets which it was promised the Marshall plan would develop for American wage earners and industry—but the foreign produced surpluses that will stream into American ports from all over the globe will supply a large part of the American market and displace the American workingman.

LOWER AMERICAN WAGE STANDARD OF LIVING

The result of such a program can only be the leveling of the American standard of living with that of the low-wage foreign nations of the world, with the inevitable result of a substantial lowering of our own wage-living standard.

It means that the workingmen of America will have to meet the foreign lower labor wage-living standard—50 cents to $4 per day plus the freight of such products to this country, or have mass unemployment—and of course such wages would not enable them to keep the children in school and pay the taxes and provide the simple comforts for their families that our standard of living demands—so without doubt they will choose to be unemployed for awhile anyway.

The workingmen of this country are being given lip service through a promise of labor legislation if they will support the administration's program, while the economic rug is being pulled right out from under the feet of the Nation and American jobs transferred to foreign soil through the free-trade policy of importing the products of such low-wage foreign labor.

AN AMERICAN POLICY

The desperate need of America and the American people at this time is for an American program—a program which is pointed toward keeping the United States economically strong, while we are assisting the foreign nations to raise their living standards.

Such an American program would include a floor under wages, which is a tariff or import fee representing the differential of the cost of production in the low living standard European and Asiatic labor as compared to the cost under American standards.

The combination of our machinery and supervision in foreign countries coupled with the cheap foreign labor together with their government block buying and currency manipulation, can and is producing goods for our markets that will undersell the products of American labor.

An American policy and program could be very simple and very effective—and should include:

1. A floor under wages determined by a flexible import fee administered by the tariff commission which would be known as the foreign trade authority. I proposed such legislation in 1948 and again this year—and I intend to offer it as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, when that act comes before the Senate for the proposed 3-year extension.

The flexible import-fee provision would be adjusted at all times to provide fair and reasonable competition and provide a market for the products of all nations on a definite basis, namely, our level of wage-living standard of costs.

The Foreign Trade Authority would be given the same general latitude in the adjustment of import fees as the Interstate Commerce Commission is charged with in the adjustment of freight rates, on definite principles laid down by Congress.

Under the flexible import-fee principle foreign nations would be encouraged to raise their living standards, since they would immediately be given credit for any such rise through a corresponding lowering of the import fees or tariffs, and when their wage-living standards were approximately equal to our own then free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

2. An extension of the Monroe Doctrine or the open-door long-established policy of this Nation to embrace all foreign nations whose integrity is considered important to our ultimate peace and safety. Such a pronouncement would be a continual and effective warning to all empire-minded nations which might seek to extend their governmental systems into such areas that we would consider any such attempt dangerous to our peace and safety, just as the Monroe Doctrine served as a warning to such nations for 125 years that we would consider any effort to extend their system into the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; and as our

China open-door policy was effective until abandoned by the administration.

Under the Monroe Doctrine and the open-door policy we would continue our 173-year-old policy of going to war only when we consider our peace and safety threatened, and we would be the sole judge in that event.

3. Rebuild our national defense organization to the point that it can protect us against any overt gesture from any nation or nations which may seek to extend their system of government to the Western Hemisphere, or into any territory whose integrity we consider important to our ultimate peace and safety.

Such a defense organization should be spearheaded by an Air Corps prepared to keep any possible enemy grounded in any emergency.

FEED HUNGRY PEOPLE—LOAN MONEY TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

We can then assist foreign nations within that area to the extent of our ability without unduly injuring our economy—including feeding emergency hungry people on a charity basis. We cannot, of course, attempt to feed those that have been hungry for 2,000 years; our economy would not stand the strain.

We could loan money to private industry within such needy countries on a business basis to the extent of our ability in the same manner and on the same basis that the RFC loans money to private industry in our own country. Such loans could be handled through the World Bank without any further machinery set up for the job.

HYBRID NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

The evidence is overwhelming that our hybrid national and international policy is not successful—the money we give the foreign nations to make up their trade balance deficits is being utilized to finance socialist governments throughout Europe and to make bilaterial trade treaties with Russia, the iron curtain countries and South American nations within the sterling bloc areas with the deliberate intention to exclude American trade.

TRADE TREATIES—NONAGGRESSION PACTS

The ECA countries have made 88 trade treaties with Russia and the countries behind the iron curtain since World War II and have agreed to and are shipping them everything from tool steel to locomotives and ball bearings—most everything that they need to arm themselves for a third world war.

England and France each have a nonaggression pact with Russia—startlingly similar to the North Atlantic Pact just signed with us. In these pacts each of them agree not only to assist Russia economically but to not join any other alliance that would not be to the best interest of Russia. They now have such pacts with both nations so it is difficult to see how they can lose.

MANIPULATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCY FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

The manipulation of their currencies by the foreign nations for trade advantage is a form of piracy. It is dishonest and makes any form of trade agreement with them a farce on the face of the transaction.

In other words, any agreements made with England, France, the Netherlands, or any other nation which manipulates its currency for trade advantage under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is a farce on its face.

They simply do not have to keep the trade agreement. They do not violate the trade agreement. There is nothing in the trade agreement itself which says that they may not change the value of their currency which immediately makes their promises and agreements with us ineffective—so it is a one-way street and we are left without protection of any kind.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD TAKE STOCK

It is time that the American people took stock of the grandiose long-range plans to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world, without hope of return.

It is time that they called their officials to account—and ask for an accounting of the $41,000,000,000—expended throughout the European and Asiatic areas since the close of World War II.

It is time to ask them why world peace seems further removed than on VJ-day in 1945.

It is time for the American people to lay it on the line with the officials of their Government and ask them why, after 4 years, we do not yet have an American policy and program that makes sense.

Investigate the Conduct of the Steel Companies in Bringing About the Current Strike, a Mystery That Has Sinister Overtones, the Elements of Bold and Arrogant Open Conspiracy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that appropriate committees of the Congress will investigate the conduct of the steel companies in bringing about the current strike.

It seems to me to be an unnecessary, unjustified and brutal course of cold-blooded provocation. The colossal hypocrisy of steel officials in attempting to deny to workers $100 a month pensions on a noncontributory basis when those officers themselves are assured of noncontributory pensions of $50,000 a year is beyond understanding. The attempt to make this attempt at discrimination a matter of "principle" would be absurd if the tragic costs of the strike did not make the attempt an insult to the intelligence and good sense of the American people.

The cost of the pension and health plan, totaling 10 cents an hour, has been estimated at about $200,000,000 annually. Certainly the steel corporations do not hope to avoid this cost nor any important part of it. The President's fact-finding board has found that the industry should and can afford to meet this cost, as a prime operating expense, just as they have always allowed for worn-out machinery, plant and other nonhuman equipment.

WHY HAVE THE STEEL CORPORATIONS TURNED DOWN THE FACT-FINDING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATIONS?

Why have the steel corporations chosen to turn down the President's fact-finding board's recommendations, which scaled the steelworkers' original demands down from 30 cents to 10 cents an hour, the remaining 10 cents to be in the form of pension funds and health services?

Why have they offered the American people the dishonest and insulting excuse of principle when the very men who say noncontributory pensions demoralize the beneficiaries are themselves the beneficiaries of pensions more than four times the $1,200 a year proposed pensions for the men who make and fabricate the steel?

The only "principle" here involved is the principle, if it can be called principle, of rank discrimination. It is the "principle" of the double standard; what strengthens the morale of such steel officials as Mr. Benjamin Fairless, who received a salary in 1948 of $207,900 and is eligible for a noncontributory pension of $50,000 when he is "too old to work and too young to die" is alleged to rot character and destroy morale when applied for steelworkers to the extent of $100 a month or $1,200 a year.

Why is the steel industry foregoing hundreds of millions of dollars in production and many millions of dollars in profits that would otherwise be available for dividends to stockholders in order to continue this stoppage by refusing to bargain with the steelworkers union on the rock-bottom basis of the noncontributory pension plan recommended by the fact-finding board?

This, Mr. Speaker, seems to me and other Americans, to be a mystery that has sinister overtones and undertones.

THERE ARE PLENTY OF CLUES

There are plenty of clues for any congressional committee to follow up. In fact, we have before us, in the public record, the elements of a bold and arrogant open conspiracy.

Item 1. The steel industry refused flatly to bargain with the steelworkers on the pension issue last spring and early summer. So-called collective-bargaining sessions were a sham because the industry simply said "No." There was no genuine bargaining in good faith, so far as I can find out.

Item 2. When a strike was imminent as a result, the steel industry at first defied President Truman's request that it appear before his fact-finding board. Later, after President Truman had publicly raised the question of whether the industry was afraid to present the facts, the industry gave in, but grudgingly and with bad grace.

Item 3. In appearances at the fact-finding board hearings, the industry representatives' attitude was one of studied contempt for the committee and the President's efforts to promote a settlement on the equities and with consideration for the human values in the industry. It was, I feel, one long insult to the American people.

Item 4. The steel corporations yielded some of their time before the board for harangues by representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. In addition, Mr. John Hancock, a Wall Street figure, spoke a piece for which the steel corporations did not take responsibility, although the time for it came from the corporation's time. The presentation made to the board on the corporations' time appeared to be an attempt at a united front—a very broad front, indeed; it was much broader than

just the steel industry; it came very close to being a united front of big business and big finance.

Item 5. When the President's Fact-Finding Board's recommendations were first announced, much of the press seized upon the board's objection to a cash wage increase at this time and praised the board's findings. The fact that the board also said if the industry did not cut prices the workers would be justified in asking for wage increases later was not emphasized.

THE WEIGHT OF THE CASE

But, Mr. Speaker, when the steel industry rejected the Board's recommendations for a 10-cent package for pensions and health services, many of the same papers that had found good in the board's recommendations switched from accenting the negative to attempts to negative the positive recommendations of the board. One of the exceptions to this was the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which found that "the weight of the case, as it stands now, is against the steel companies."

I ask that an excerpt from this editorial be printed into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Let me quote at this point from an editorial statement by Edward R. Brennan of the East Gary (Ind.) Herald:

The position taken by the steel companies in regard to the payment of pensions to their employees has probably done more to lower public esteem for the industry than anything that has happened since the Republic Steel massacre of strikers when the CIO was starting to organize the industry.

Already, widespread condemnation of the steel companies' stand is being heard on all sides—not only from laboring men but from business men as well.

Status of the union in the mills here has improved markedly. Many workers, formerly not much interested in the union and definitely cold toward the idea of a strike, are embittered by the company stand and are now willing to "go to bat" on the issue.

Item 6. In a page ad the McGraw-Hill Co., publishers of Business Week and other journals, called on the public to help the steel corporations break the myth of union invincibility. The ad amounted to an attempt to glorify the steel corporations for their rejection of the board's pension recommendations. It went further to suggest that unions should be challenged all along the line. Then, if a rash of strikes developed, public opinion would sanction amendments to make the Taft-Hartley Act even tougher, more restrictive on unions than it is now.

These are a few of the clues at hand.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that an investigation is in order.

It appears that the current strike is going on to a costly test of economic strength between the steelworkers and the steel corporations. On the basis of the evidence at hand, I agree with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch that "the weight of the case, as it stands now, is against the steel companies."

WE NEED TO KNOW THE ANSWERS

Because of the adjournment of Congress, it may not be feasible to investigate the causes of this unnecessary, costly, and tragic strike before we return next January. If possible, it should be investigated during the recess, so that the facts can be unearthed, pieced together, and conclusions reached by the American people and the Congress. Sooner or later such a job must be done.

We need to know, Mr. Speaker, the answers to the questions I have raised, not because they are in my mind, but because they are in the minds of the steelworkers and their families, the minds of all workers, and in the minds of all Americans of good will.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the texts of, first a statement by Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America and of the CIO, dated October 2, 1949; second, a statement by 34 citizens, including myself, as released by Americans for Democratic Action, October 12, 1949; third, a news report by Labor Press Associates, an anti-Communist news service serving A. F. of L., CIO, and unaffiliated union newspapers, summarizing a speech delivered at Gary, Ind., by Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America and of the CIO; fourth, the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch to which I have previously referred.

They follow:

STATEMENT OF PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA AND OF THE CIO

The union has done everything within its power to avert this strike.

The union has labored night and day since June 15, the opening date of its contracts, to conclude a fair settlement. The steel industry, on the other hand, made no genuine effort to reach agreement with the union.

From the very outset, the steel industry has sought to force this strike on the union and on the American people.

The industry in the collective bargaining conferences with the union said "No" to the union on wages, "No" to the union on decent social insurance, and "No" to the union on pensions.

The Steel Industry Board, appointed by the President, held extensive hearings. After due deliberation, the board on September 10, 1949, recommended as a fair and equitable settlement of the issues in dispute that—

1. The union withdraw its wage demand.

2. A noncontributory social-insurance plan costing 4 cents per hour per worker be established in the steel industry, to be paid for by the employer, and that the details be worked out through collective bargaining.

3. A noncontributory pension plan costing 6 cents per hour per worker be established in the steel industry to be paid for by the employer, and that the details be worked out through collective bargaining after an appropriate joint study of such details.

The union was keenly disappointed with that part of the recommendation of the board denying the union's just wage demands. Nevertheless, in the national interest and for the purpose of averting a steel strike, the union accepted the recommendations of the Steel Industry Board in their entirety as a fair and equitable settlement of the dispute in the steel industry. The steel industry, on the other hand, with the exception of a few companies, has refused to accept the recommendations of the board and to conclude a fair and equitable settlement with the union.

In the hope of averting a strike the union, at the request of the President of the United States, agreed to three extensions totaling 77 days. During this entire period, the union has made every effort to conclude a settlement and thereby to avert a strike. The industry, however, has made no bona fide attempt to resolve the issues in dispute.

The industry is unwilling to establish the modest 4 cents per hour noncontributory social-insurance plan recommended by the board. The industry is unwilling to establish the modest 6 cents per hour noncontributory pension plan recommended by the board.

In its report, the Steel Industry Board appointed by the President said:

"No matter what the source is of modernization and expansion funds, however, the steel companies have, with some exceptions, overlooked the fact that the machines and plant on which the industry has prospered, and on which it must depend in the future, are not all made of metal or brick and mortar. They are also made of flesh and blood. And the human machines, like the inanimate machines, have a definite rate of depreciation. Of all our natural and national resources, our human resources are the most precious and useful and should be most carefully hoarded and protected. These human machines need the same kind of treatment for depreciation and disability that the other machines are getting. Earnings are being used for rebuilding, replacing, and for maintaining the efficiency of plant; a part of these earnings should be used to take care of wear and tear and maintenance of the human machines in the industry—the workers.

"What does that mean in terms of steel workers? It should mean the use of earnings to insure against the full depreciation of the human body—say at age 65—in the form of a pension or retirement allowance. It means insurance to take care of maintenance and provide against break-downs in the human body caused by accident or disease. When a machine is laid up it must still be provided for. Human machines that are laid up have to continue to eat and pay rent. Taking care of the human machine means also that when the worker dies his widow and dependent minor children must be given a chance to avoid becoming immediate objects of charity. Above all, we must remember that the human being has the dignity of man which he has a right to have preserved; he should not be cast aside when laid up temporarily or when used up permanently by a lifetime of labor."

The union accepted this recommendation of the board. The industry, with a callous disregard for its social responsibilities, in denying the obvious truth of this statement has forced a strike on the Nation.

In its report, the Steel Industry Board further said:

"In our consideration of this program we have therefore placed much greater emphasis on the social considerations than on ability to pay. As hereinafter amplified, we think that all industry, in the absence of adequate Government programs, owes an obligation to workers to provide for maintenance of the human body in the form of medical and similar benefits and full depreciation in the form of old-age retirement—in the same way as it does now for plant and machinery. This obligation is one which should be fulfilled by enlightened business management not when everything else has been taken care of but as one of the fixed costs of doing business—one of the first charges on revenues before profits. It should be viewed as somewhat comparable to the necessity of making maintenance and depreciation allowances on nonhuman machinery. In this way practical effect will be given to the modern social consciousness on the subject of security for workers in industry."

The union accepted this recommendation of the board. The industry refused to accept this recommendation of the board. In denying the obvious truth of the board's statement, the industry has forced a strike on the Nation.

The Steel Industry Board recommended that the proposed social insurance and pension plans be noncontributory, that is, paid for by the industry. The board came to this conclusion for the following reasons:

1. The general trend is in that direction. Most existing plans are financed entirely by the employer and the substantial trend during the recent years has been toward noncontributory forms of social insurance and pensions.

2. Noncontributory plans cover all workers in a plant or industry instead of merely those workers who can afford to forego part of their take-home pay for the purchase of such benefits.

3. Noncontributory plans prevent wage cuts, while contributory plans are wage cuts in disguise.

4. Noncontributory plans promote stability.

5. Noncontributory plans permit the purchase of greater benefits for a lesser sum of money.

The union and informed public opinion accept this basic recommendation of the board that the insurance and pension plans be noncontributory.

The industry, without advancing any good reason, refused to accept the board's recommendation for the establishment of noncontributory plans.

The industry claims that its refusal to accept the fair and equitable noncontributory plans recommended by the board is a matter of principle. The union asserts and the board has found, after an impartial investigation into the facts, that there is no genuine principle involved in this stand of the industry.

This is best evidenced by the fact that most of the companies in the industry provide substantial pensions for their executives on a noncontributory basis. Obviously, the companies cannot validly maintain noncontributory and munificent pensions for their high-paid executives, and at the same time assert that principle compels contributions by their workers toward modest pensions. The union will not submit to this double standard on the part of the industry.

The present inadequate pension plans of most of the companies are noncontributory. The only principle now involved is that such plans should be made more adequate on the noncontributory basis recommended by the board.

The companies in the industry have not permitted the so-called principle they now assert to preclude the establishment of noncontributory pensions for their nonsteelworker employees. Similarly, important employers in other industries have not asserted any such principle in establishing noncontributory pension plans.

The unanimous recommendations of the Steel Industry Board provide a statesmanlike formula for the fair and equitable settlement of the dispute in the steel industry. This is recognized by the President of the United States and by the American people. The union measured up to its responsibilities in accepting this formula. A strike could have been averted if the industry had shown a similar regard for the national interest by likewise accepting.

In agreeing to the board's recommendations the union made it clear that if the industry did not similarly agree, the union would reinstate its original demands. The union's fair offer of settlement has not been accepted by the industry.

By reason of this arbitrary stand on the industry's part, the parties failed to conclude mutual agreement on the disputed issues under the collective-bargaining agreements. This left me with no alternative but to call this strike against the industry. There are no contracts between the industry and the union by reason of the failure of the industry to reach agreement with the union. Our cause is just and righteous. We will continue this strike until a mutually satisfactory agreement is arrived at between the union and the companies.

STATEMENT OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Thirty-four prominent Americans joined today with HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator from Minnesota and national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, in urging the steel industry to accept the steel fact-finding board's report and conclude "an immediate settlement" with the steelworkers.

In a statement that criticized the steel industry for deciding "in favor of its profits and against the national interest," the 34 liberals, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and 5 members of the Senate Labor Committee, called upon President Truman "to speak to the American people in support of the board's findings and in explanation of the seriousness of the companies' refusal to accede to them."

"If the companies remain adamant in their rejection of the board's fair and equitable proposals, they must be charged with the economic consequences," the statement said. "They must accept the responsibility of pushing the country toward a depression."

Among those who signed the statement were Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General; Bryn J. Hovde, president of the New School for Social Research; Roger Baldwin, chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., author and Harvard professor; Nathan Straus, former United States Housing Authority Administrator; Lillian Smith, author; George Edwards, president of the Detroit Common Council and candidate for mayor; Howard Lindsay, playwright and producer; Robert F. Wagner, Jr., candidate for borough president of Manhattan; and 13 Members of Congress.

The statement said the steel industry's failure to accept the pension and social-insurance recommendations of the board "creates a conflict deeply involving the public interest." It pointed out that the stoppage of work in the steel industry "is a direct and serious threat to the national economy." The steelworkers union, the statement continued, "has demonstrated its concern with the public interest through its acceptance of the fact-finding board's denial of a wage increase. We urge the representatives of the industry to likewise demonstrate their sense of public responsibility by accepting the report of the board and by concluding an immediate settlement."

Although fact-finding boards are "not necessarily desirable in most labor disputes nor should their findings be considered sacrosanct," the statement declared the appointment of a board in this case was "clearly justified." The findings, the signers said, "must be recognized as not only equitable to the union and the industry but consonant with the general welfare of the country."

The text of statement and list of signers follow:

"The refusal of the major steel corporations to accept the pension and social insurance recommendations of the President's Steel Industry Board creates a conflict deeply involving the public interest. The cessation of work in the plants of the vast steel empire and its subsidiary organizations is a direct and serious threat to the national economy. If the companies remain adamant in their rejection of the board's fair and equitable proposals, they must be charged with the economic consequences of their decision. They must accept the responsibility of pushing the country toward a depression.

"Recent slight decreases in unemployment figures have been heralded by industry leaders as a sign that a threatened serious recession had been averted. The steel stoppage will offset this gain in a few days. If prolonged, it will surely lead to an aggravated and accelerated trend toward depression levels.

"The profit position of the steel industry has been demonstrated by the fact-finding board to enable its acceptance of the pension and insurance proposals. Major corporations in other basic industries, notably the Ford Corp., have accepted such plans. The steel industry, in its refusal to go along with the recommendations of the board, has decided in favor of its profits and against the national interest.

"The union involved in the steel dispute has demonstrated its concern with the public interest through its acceptance of the fact-finding board's denial of a wage increase. We urge the representatives of the industry to likewise demonstrate their sense of public responsibility by accepting the report of the board and by concluding an immediate settlement.

"Free collective bargaining must be maintained as the democratic mechanism of labor-management relations. The appointment of public fact-finding boards is not necessarily desirable in most labor disputes nor should their findings be considered sacrosanct. The stalemate in the steel dispute, where collective bargaining had unproductively run its full course and a major strike impended in an industry uniquely essential to the American economy, clearly justified the appointment of a fact-finding body in the effort to avoid such a strike. There has been no challenge of the integrity and objectivity of the Steel Industry Board. Its comprehensive inquiry and the recommendations growing out of that inquiry must be recognized as not only equitable to the union and the industry but consonant with the general welfare of the country.

"Because the issues of the steel dispute are of such vital concern to the Nation as a whole, both from the point of view of our domestic economy and of our commitments to maintain peace abroad, we respectfully call upon the President to speak to the American people in support of the board's findings and in explanation of the seriousness of the companies' refusal to accede to them."

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana.

ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah.

CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator from Florida.

WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon; former public member National War Labor Board.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, United States Representative from Wisconsin.

THOMAS H. BURKE, United States Representative from Ohio.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, United States Representative from California.

CHARLES H. HOWELL, United States Representative from New Jersey.

CHET HOLIFIELD, United States Representative from California.

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, United States Representative from Minnesota.

HUGH B. MITCHELL, United States Representative from Washington.

SIDNEY R. YATES, United States Representative from Illinois.

Dewey Anderson, director, Public Affairs Institute.

Elizabeth Christman, secretary-treasurer, National Woman's Trade-Union League.

Howard Lindsay, playwright, producer, actor.

Dr. Robert Stevens, professor of economics, University of Michigan.

Byron J. Hovde, president, New School for Social Research.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., author, Harvard professor of history.

Nathan Straus, radio executive; former head United States Housing Authority.

A. Powell Davies, Unitarian minister, Washington, D. C.

Miles Pennybacker, Connecticut industrialist.

William G. Rice, professor of economics, University of Wisconsin.

George Edwards, president, Detroit Common Council.

Daniel W. Hoan, former mayor of Milwaukee.

Lillian Smith, author.

Roger Baldwin, chairman, American Civil Liberties Union.

Wendell Berge, former assistant United States Attorney General.

Jonathan B. Bingham, New York attorney.

Albert S. Coolidge, professor of chemistry, Harvard.

Mortimer Hays, New York attorney.

Alfred Baker Lewis, Connecticut businessman.

Robert F. Wagner, Jr., chairman, New York City Planning Commission.

STEEL HEADS "HYPOCRITES," MURRAY SAYS IN GARY

GARY, IND.—"The steel industry is assuming a definitely immoral attitude not only against the steelworkers' union but also against the American people," Steelworker's president Philip Murray charged in a rousing speech before an overflow crowd of 12,000 persons.

In his 80-minute off-the-cuff talk, which he called "a report on my stewardship," Murray said that the strike issue boils down to this question: "Is a man who is a creature of God as valuable to his community and Nation as a machine? It's just as simple as that."

He added: "This union is fighting and striking to compel the steel industry to give the human machine the same kind of treatment it accords its inanimate machinery."

Murray said that United States Steel last year spent $148,000,000 for wear and tear on machinery, but only $5,000,000 for the "depreciation of human beings" through pension and insurance benefits.

Murray ripped into the steel owners for pretending to oppose noncontributory pensions on principle.

He then proceeded to explain how A. B. Homer, president of Bethlehem Steel, got $263,000 a year in 1948 and will get a $110,000-a-year pension when he retires. The crowd whistled.

"And it's all for free, for nothing, noncontributory—he doesn't pay a cent into it."

Murray listed more than a dozen steel executives now receiving annual salaries of from $50,000 to $75,000 a year when they retire.

"None of these men pays a cent into their pension plans," he said. "And yet these are the men who are fighting us—on principle. These are the men who proclaim to the universe that they are against noncontributory pensions to workers. They are merely a bunch of sanctimonious hypocrites."

Murray pointed out that he had been viciously criticized "both by Communists and by capitalists." he said:

"If the Communists and the steel industry want to stick together in this strike, that's their business.

"I have absolutely and positively no use for atheistic communism as it is preached and practiced in Soviet Russia and elsewhere. And I certainly have no more use for atheistic capitalism than for atheistic communism. They are both diabolical, and they are both evil."

Tracing the history of the strike, Murray pointed out that the union had "time and time again listened to reason," had postponed strike action for more than 2½ months, and had brought its demands down from a 30-cents-an-hour package to a "rock bottom" of 10 cents an hour in noncontributory pensions and social insurance.

"What more can a union do?" Murray demanded. "It cannot permit the industry to trample the union down into the dirt."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

WEIGHT OF THE CASE IS AGAINST THE STEEL COMPANIES

Last week was the second week of the steel shut-down. Jobless pay claims increased by 63,000. This unemployment was known to be of the "secondary" variety, caused in plants which lacked steel and coal for operation.

Director Goodwin of the Bureau of Employment Security reported the national total of jobless pay claims to be 309,000, a figure representing increases in applications in every State except Maine. Nineteen States said the steel strike was a cause of the increase.

The weight of the case, as it stands now, is against the steel companies. The President's fact-finding board recommended against a fourth-round wage increase and the unions accepted that recommendation. In fact, the union yielded on one point after another, as the fact finders recommended. The one issue that remains is who is to pay for pensions—are they to be contributed to by the employees or are they to be noncontributory?

The opposition of the companies to noncontributory pensions is embarrassed by the fact that many of the executives who oppose such pensions for union members are themselves beneficiaries of pension plans to which they do not contribute.

A further embarrassment to the steel companies is the fact that an increasing number of people regard the depreciation of workers as a responsibility of industry no less than the depreciation of machines. Industrial production wears out men just as it wears out machinery. This point was well made in a letter to the Post-Dispatch by former Gov. Henry S. Caulfield.

Expressing wonder that Benjamin Fairless of United States Steel should resist so firmly the idea of noncontributory pensions, Mr. Caulfield quoted the Steel Industry Board's statement:

"Social insurance and pensions should be considered a part of normal business costs to take care of temporary and permanent depreciation in the human 'machine' in much the same way as provision is made for depreciation and insurance of plant and machine. This obligation should be among the first charges on revenues."

With this the former Missouri Governor concluded that the stand of the steel companies, "which presently threatens the Nation's prosperity, is contrary to reason and against the trend of the times."

If Mr. Fairless and his fellow executives in the steel industry have a strong case for their stand, they have failed to make it before the public. In the end, steel pensions will be paid for by the users of steel, just as steel wages and salaries are now paid. Pensions, therefore, should be established on the basis which will provide the most for the money.

From this point of view, is not the contributory pension the more expensive of the two alternatives? Under it, would not the employees have to pay Federal income taxes—and probably State taxes, too—on that part of their earnings which they contributed to the pension fund? On the other hand, would not this tax be legitimately avoided if the company directly contributed the full amount to the pension fund?

There are many intricacies and complications in the setting up of an actuarially sound pension plan. It does seem, however, that these are fair questions to ask with the steel shutdown in its third week. The industry ought to answer them.

Our National and International Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered to the Republican Women of Pennsylvania, Inc., in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have no national or international policy—in their place has been substituted a hybrid three-part free-trade policy entirely controlled and directed by a European-minded State Department—and if allowed to be continued can only result in world economic socialism. The administration is giving the workingmen of America lip service through promised labor legislation—and pulling the jobs out from under their feet through a three-part free-trade program which places them in direct competition with the low-wage living standard European and Asiatic labor.

I propose an American policy:

1. A flexible import-fee system to hold our high standard of living while we are assisting the nations of the world to improve their own—in place of the three-part free-trade program of the administration.

2. An extension of the Monroe Doctrine, or open-door policy to include the nations in Europe and Asia whose integrity we consider important to our ultimate peace and safety—thereby putting all empire-minded nations on notice against attempting to extend their system of government into such areas.

3. Rebuild our national defense organization, spearheaded by an Air Corps that can keep any nation on the ground, within a reasonable time, that seeks to extend its system of government into the areas whose integrity is deemed important to our ultimate peace and safety.

4. As a condition of further assistance to Europe:

a. Complete free convertibility of their currencies in terms of the dollar.

b. A United States of Europe, including Germany, with no trade restrictions between them.

c. Equal access to the markets of the nations of the world, subject only to the actions of each individual nation.

THE THREE-PART FREE-TRADE PROGRAM

The administration's three-part free-trade program includes:

1. Appropriations to make up the "trade balance" deficits of the European nations in

cash each year—formerly the Marshall plan and currently the ECA—our chief export for cash.

2. Extend the selective free-trade principal adopted by the State Department through a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

3. Adoption of the International Trade Organization—which will consist of 58 nations with 58 votes—each with 1 vote, and they will meet once each year and divide the remaining production and markets of the world among the 58 nations eventually on the basis of population.

GIFT—LOANS—FREE TRADE—ITO

The first step of the three-part permanent free-trade program is that of making up the trade balance deficits of the European nations in cash each year, started with random gift-loans including UNNRA—and then the $3,750,000, to England in 1946—and including the $17,000,000,000 4-year program first labeled the Marshall plan and currently known as the ECA—and is soon to be followed by the new suggested global recovery program.

The Congress of the United States has gift-loaned $24,000,000,000 to the nations of the world, plus the $17,000,000,000 pledged under the Marshall plan, making a total of $41,00,-000,000 since World War II ended.

The second step was inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle—and which is to be extended 3 years at this session of Congress—on the theory that the more they divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the world, the less their trade balance deficits will be each year.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has been named reciprocal trade by the administration—the act is not reciprocal, was never intended to be reciprocal. The phrase reciprocal trade does not occur in the 1934 act, but is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people, cloaked in more involved and less understandable phraseology.

The third and final step of this very clever plan of this three-phase free-trade program to divide the market of the world and to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world, is the International Trade Organization, including 58 nations, each with one vote—we would have the same vote as Siam for example—designed to make permanent the selective free-trade principles adopted by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. They will then become the settled policies of this Nation.

Each nation assigns its tariff or import fee-making power to the International Trade Organization. They will meet at least once each year and divide the remaining production and markets of the world among the 58 nations ultimately upon a basis of population.

THE RUSSIAN THREAT AND EUROPEAN TRADE TREATIES

We are appropriating $15,000,000,000 annually for national-defense purposes—presumably on account of a threat of war with Russia—yet the 16 Marshall plan or ECA European nations have made at least 88 trade treaties with Russia and the iron-curtain countries—and have agreed to ship and are shipping them almost every possible manufactured and processed material including tool steel, ball bearings, engines and locomotives, needed to fight a war with us—while we piously refrain from trading with a possible enemy country.

It is simply a manufacturing in transit role. We are arming Russia for the third world war just as we armed Japan for World War II through the shipments of scrap iron and petroleum out through the Golden Gate from San Francisco from 1936 to Pearl Harbor in 1941—then we sent the boys and girls out into the Pacific to catch that scrap iron in their bare hands coming back out of Japanese guns—it was not pretty—and so unnecessary.

WORKINGMEN AND IMPORTERS OF AMERICA

It has long been a paradox to me why the workingmen of America were supporting the same program as the wealthy importers and internationalists. The answer has now become evident—the workingmen have been promised labor legislation in return for accepting the remainder of the administration's program, and the importers and internationals are getting the free trade necessary for them to import the products of the low-wage-living-standard countries of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the American workingman.

Capital is fluid; it can be invested in the competitive countries where the lowering of our import fees places the industry, but the American workingman does not want to and cannot follow capital to the low-wage countries and does not want the products of such low-wage labor coming here.

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION

I see no practical difference between importing the goods produced by low-wage European and Asiatic labor and importing the cheap labor itself; as a matter of fact unrestricted immigration is a part of the long-range plan of the economic one-worlders. No one can be for free trade, in my opinion, and vote against unrestricted immigration from the low-wage countries of the world, because the effect is exactly the same in the last analysis.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT—THREE-PART PROGRAM

Willard H. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, testified for the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act on January 24 of this year and said that—

1. The trade agreements program is an integral part of our over-all program for world economic recovery.

2. The European recovery program (Marshall plan) extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

The International Trade Organization upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action provides a long-term mechanism by which all countries commercial policies, in the broadest sense of the term, may be tested and guided into conformity with a pattern which will maximize trade and minimize friction arising out of expectations. Each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole.

It is evident from the State Department's spokesman that no one part of this three-part program can be considered separately, but must be viewed together to understand the objectives of the administration which is a division of the markets of this Nation with the nations of the world—and bringing the wage living standard of American workmen down to the level of the low-cost living standard of European and Asiatic labor.

INDUSTRY ON THE MOVE

As a result of this well-established program our own industry is on the move. The Ford Motor Co. is now manufacturing automobiles under a different name in England.

Jim Rand, of the Remington Rand Co., has announced that they are closing down or curtailing their operations in four of their New York plants and one in Connecticut and have transferred these operations to Scotland, England, and Ontario.

A similar situation exists with respect to the Burroughs Adding Machine Co., the E. W. Bliss Co., Apex Products Co., the Easy Washer Corp., and many other individual companies and corporations in this Nation—all are moving to the cheap-labor areas where they cannot only furnish the markets of these areas with the products of cheap labor, but can return the products to the United States and displace the American workingman.

FREE TRADE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

There are now nearly 4,000,000 full-time idle men in this country and probably more than 10,000,000 partially unemployed—and these figures do not include the railroad men on the extra board waiting for the call boy. We may recover a part of this employment temporarily, but if the administration insists on its long-range free-trade program, the workingmen of America will have their choice of either accepting a lower-wage living standard and continue in their work, or unemployment.

In the face of such unemployment, the obvious results of the administration's policy, the President has now announced—what has become known as his fourth proposal that such investments in foreign nations may be guaranteed against loss by our Government. The effect of such a policy, in addition to furnishing the markets abroad which the ECA program was supposed to open up for our exports, will be to import the products of low-wage foreign labor into this country in direct competition with the workingmen of America.

It is the crowning insult of all time to the intelligence of the working men and women of this Nation to expect them to continue to support a program designed to displace them in their work.

THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE VERSUS FREE TRADE

I suggest a flexible import fee principle of adjustment of the tariff rates on import fees, which will furnish a definite market basis in this Nation for the goods of the foreign countries, and let them be the judge of their own living standards.

Such a flexible import fee would put a floor under wages and would represent the differential of costs of production between this country and where the competition is located on each specific product, due principally to the difference in wage living standards.

Under a flexible import bill which I introduced last year and which I intend to offer as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when it is brought before the United States Senate next week, the Tariff Commission would be called the Foreign Trade Authority, and given sufficient authority to adjust the flexible import fees to correctly represent such differential of cost—and when the nations raised their general wage standard of living they would be given a corresponding credit through a reduction in the import fees—and whenever their standard of living approximates our own, the common objective of free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

All agree that the ultimate objective is free trade—we disagree on the methods of reaching such objective. Under the free-trade theory we would be drawn down to the living standard level of the nations of the world—and under the flexible import method we would retain our standard of living while helping the other nations to raise their own.

CONGRESS MUST CHOOSE

This Nation is at the cross roads—Congress must choose the route we will take.

The administration has chosen the three-part free-trade program which will level our living standards with the low wage and slave labor of the European and Asiatic countries of the world, or create the greatest unemployment and consequent depression ever experienced in this country.

NATIONAL SECURITY—TAXABLE PROPERTY—EMPLOYMENT

Our national security makes it mandatory to maintain our position in the mining, fuels, agricultural, and industrial fields—and the

necessity for employment and taxable property to maintain our national income is imperative.

This position can only be maintained through a flexible import-fee method adjustable by the Tariff Commission or Foreign Trade Authority to correctly represent the differential of cost of production mostly due to the difference in wage-living standards between this country and the foreign competitive nations.

Our mines are closing down—our agricultural production is being held up through subsidies—and already petroleum imports have doubled, resulting in curtailing domestic production and development—so necessary in the event of another war—and so important in the economic life of this Nation, including employment and taxable property.

TRADE AGREEMENTS IMPOSSIBLE

It is impossible to make effective trade agreements with a nation that manipulates its currency for trade advantage, since any such trade agreement can be immediately nullified through a change in the price of their currency—and England, including the 58 nations and entities of the Sterling bloc area, is notorious for such manipulations as are French, Belgium, and the Netherlands—such agreements are a form of piracy.

If the Administration is successful through the adoption by Congress of the three-part free-trade program including the three-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the Senate approval of the International Trade Organization—the Truman depression and unemployment will make them forget Mr. Hoover.

NONAGGRESSION AND ECONOMIC PACTS

We find also—I brought out the fact in the ECA debate starting on March 30 of this year—that both England and France have nonaggression and economic pacts with Russia—made and signed in 1942.

These pacts closely resemble the mutual assistance pact which England made with Japan subsequent to World War I—which resulted in building the Japanese nation up to a formidable foe in the Pacific—and which turned into our problem in 1941—we were alone in that fight.

All of these agreements resemble the North Atlantic Pact which both England and France have signed—while their respective pacts with Russia are still in full force and effect.

England has announced from the end of World War II that she intended to trade with Russia and the Communist nations as usual—that she has been successful in this ambition is evidenced by a trade agreement with Russia on December 27, 1947 in Moscow providing for the delivery to Russia of practically every type of manufactured and processed product.

Perhaps the answer may be found in the 1942 nonaggression pact with Russia which says in article VI that—

"The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view to facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity."

Then in article V, the pact says that—

"The high contracting parties undertake not to include any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties."

Further, it must be remembered that English authorities have repeatedly announced from Hong Kong that they intend to trade with the Communist conquerors of China as usual.

And most will recall that in 1947 Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson of the English Labor Government announced that they wanted to be neutral—that they wanted to be the "bridgehead" between the Soviet Communist Government and the capitalist Government of America.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

Under the proposed North Atlantic Pact we are changing our 125-year-old policy under the Monroe Doctrine where we are the judge when our peace and safety is threatened—to a policy of declaring war when the peace and safety of any European nations signatory to the pact, are threatened.

Through Senate approval of this treaty, we will be in effect, changing the Constitution of the United States—since a treaty is held to have that effect—without recourse to the procedure laid down in the Constitution—where a two-thirds Senate approval is required and then the approval of three-fourths of the 48 States.

It is my current conviction that this Nation should continue its 173-year-old policy of declaring war only when our own ultimate peace and safety is threatened.

If we are to change this procedure—and in effect change the Constitution of this Nation—the question should at least be submitted to the people for a referendum vote.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICIES

Much has been written about a United States Senate bipartisan foreign policy.

There is no bipartisan foreign policy as such—in the first place, we do not have a foreign or international policy—we have a succession of administration programs of financing foreign nations as already described—to which some of the Republican Senators subscribe.

There can be no bipartisan foreign policy. First, until there is a foreign policy, and second, until such policy is confined to foreign affairs and not at the same time designed to control national economic affairs through the State Department, as the present programs are set to do.

LOSING ALL OF ASIA

We are in a fair way to lose all of Asia, the Middle East, and the South Seas through our lack of decision and vacillating tactics. Furthermore, our action in Yalta in giving Manchuria and Berlin to the Russians could well prove to be the two major mistakes of the century.

SUPERB PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Through the superlative propaganda masquerading in each case under a Washington Government department news service the public mind is being focused upon special group legislation, while the national economic rug is being literally pulled out from under our feet.

The finest example of the selling job accomplished by the greatest public relations steam roller ever built up in the Nation's Capitol, is that practically all of the time of the Eightieth Congress was used up, and most of the time of the Eighty-first Congress will be consumed in committee hearings and debates on the floor of the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives on highly controversial group legislation, including farmers, manufacturers, veterans, and labor.

While at the same time the basic three-part economic legislative program designed to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world is in high gear, and if their plans are successful, will be adopted by this Congress with a minimum of debate. This three-phase program provides for making up the trade-balance deficits of all of the European nations in cash each year, currently called the Marshall plan, a 3-year continuation of the selective free-trade policies adopted by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to divide the markets of this Nation with the low-wage living standard countries of the world and the creation of a permanent international-trade organization made up of the nations of the world to meet each year and to divide the remaining production and markets of the world among them, eventually on the basis of population.

DID NOT COME TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE TO DISTRIBUTE THE WEALTH OF THIS NATION

I recall the reply of Winston Churchill to President Roosevelt when asked to give up Hongkong—the British Empire to relinquish its claims in China—his famous reply was that he did not become the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire. Well, I hold that same position in the United States Senate. I did not come to the Senate of the United States from the State of Nevada to distribute the wealth of this country at random throughout the world without hope of any return.

FORTY-ONE BILLION DOLLARS—60 PERCENT OF UNITED STATES AREA

The Congress of the United States has gift-loaned $24,000,000,000 to the nations of the world plus the $17,000,000,000 pledged under the Marshall plan, making a total of $41,000,000,000 since World War II ended.

Forty-one billion dollars is $5,000,000,000 more than the combined assessed valuation of the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington, and the 14 Southern States, including Texas, and accounts for approximately 60 percent of the area of the United States. At this rate we can dispose of the whole business in a very short time.

AVERAGE OUR STANDARD OF LIVING WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

The three-part free-trade program resulting in a division of the markets and distributing the wealth of this Nation with the countries of the world is based upon the announced objectives of raising the standard of living with the remainder of the world through the division of our wealth and markets with them.

All of this is like trying to average the level of the water in a water glass with that of a city reservoir; you could empty your water glass in the reservoir without having very much effect on the height of the water.

The administration has been building the "free trade" loop for 16 years—and this is the year selected to fasten it on this Nation through the three-part program culminating in the International Trade Organization—immediately following the proposed 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

It has become a custom, during the last 15 years, for the State Department and the executive department to sell the country a bill of goods on something before it is presented to Congress. On the theory that the Senators and Congressmen will not have the guts to vote against anything the country is temporarily sold that it is the thing to do. I anticipate that when the country finally wakes up and knows exactly what we are doing, selling the workman down the river, through this three-phase free-trade program that will put him in direct competition with the low-wage living standard and slave labor of Europe and of Asia—there will be a change in the trend of national legislation.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party must offer the country a positive program to protect the workingmen of this Nation, while we are assisting the nations of the world, on a business bas to raise their own living standards.

This could be a long pull since it must be remembered that many of the Asiatic and European countries have had access to all of the raw materials now available to us for 2,000 years of recorded history and have not perceptably raised their standard of living—while we have done the job in a comparatively few generations.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the protector of the living standards and the creator of legitimate employment and taxable property of the nations.

We have lived off our fat for 16 years—now all of the European nations are included in our budget—the President has now suggested that we guarantee foreign business investments.

All that is necessary is for such foreign nations to turn honest and protect the integrity of private investments and they will not need gift-loans from our country—businessmen will take the business risk, but they cannot take the risk of nationalizing or confiscation of their capital.

EQUAL ACCESS TO MARKETS OF AREAS WE ARE COMMITTED TO DEFEND

This Nation should have equal access to the markets of the areas that we are committed to defend.

Twice in my lifetime we have left bloody tracks throughout the western rim of the Pacific to recapture the colonial areas for the Empire-minded nations of England, France, and Holland.

All these countries in Asia, the near East, the South Seas and Africa want to adopt a tariff or import fee to build up their own country that is their right—but no third nation should force them to adopt empire preferential rates favoring the mother country which cannot offer them protection and whose only ambition is to farm such countries to increase their income.

All of these problems can be successfully approached through an American policy. First, a flexible import fee to protect our standard of living while offering assistance to foreign nations on a business basis; second, a definite foreign policy through an extension of the Monroe Doctrine principle extended to the European and Asiatic areas judged important to our ultimate peace and safety; and, third, building a national defense organization spearheaded by an air corps that can keep any nation on the ground that seeks to extend its system of government into the area judged important to our peace and safety and, fourth, as a condition of further assistance to Europe:

1. Complete free convertibility of their currencies in terms of our dollar.

2 A United States of Europe including Germany with no trade restriction between such countries.

3. Equal access to the markets of the nations of the world—subject only to any action by such individual nations.

It is high time that the women of America undertake to understand and to carry their part of this load in peacetime—since they are now to be drafted along with the men in wartime.

The Wisdom of Goethe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WISDOM OF GOETHE

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe was born on August 28, 1749. On the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of the German poet, the American University, with the cooperation of the Library of Congress, held a memorial celebration. The importance of the occasion was amply emphasized by the fact that the admirers of Goethe turned out in such numbers that the ceremony had to be moved from the Whittal Pavilion to the Coolidge Auditorium.

The Library of Congress presented a historic display of Goethe materials and arranged for the microfilming and projection of these.

The Goethe celebration committee was headed by Dr. Paul F. Douglass, American University president, as chairman, and was composed of Prof. Benson S. Alleman; Mr. Walter Camp, president, Concord Club of Washington; Prof. Ernst Correll; Prof. John G. Frank; Mr. Otis Jenkins, president, Deutscher Verein of the American University; Dr. Max Lederer; Dr. Severino Montano; Prof. Ernst Posner; Prof. Huberto Rohden; Miss Anita Schade, president, German Literary Society of Washington, D. C.; Mr. Jacob Schwalb, president, Washington Saengerbund; Prof. Rudolph von Abele; Mr. Hermann G. Winkler, Washington Journal; and Prof. Kathryn Day Wyatt.

In his address Dr. Douglass forcefully epitomized Goethe's sane wisdom of life and work.

"Goethe became the advocate of genuine humanity. 'Humanity,' Voltaire had said, 'had lost its title deed.' It became the task of the eighteenth century to recover its evidence of ownership.

"Goethe propcsed a completely developed individual for the uses of the world. In many ways his sane voice speaks a language alien to the twentieth century. Our vocabulary today describes the disorders and defects of the personality, the schizophrenic and paranoid psychoses, the hypertensions and psychosomatic manifestations of the psychoneuroses and other psychopathologies. Goethe before us was speaking with simple passion of active self-abandonment in devotion to an appropriate work. He proclaimed boldly that growth comes by exercise and objective action in a rational world, not by retreat into the self.

"To aspire not to a fragment of living but to a full manhood remains a bold appeal. We must discover our appropirate work and do it with all our power as we incorporate ourselves into the lives of our fellow men.

"Irving Babbitt in our century has said that modern man suffers from an anarchy of the imagination. Goethe before us insisted on a classical sanity of the imagination as he fashioned into new substance everything that was best in the preceding experience of man.

"Goethe said to men aspiring a full life:

"1. Be sincere.

"2. Be men of integrity.

"3. Limit yourself to action in a field where you can achieve your purpose.

"4. Discipline yourself to usefulness.

"I recommend to you the therapy of Goethe—a useful, disciplined, and active life made rich by fellow-feeling for others."

Testimonial to Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a testimonial to Hon. Leland Olds from the staff of the Federal Power Commission.

There being no objection, the testimonial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL TO LELAND OLDS

We, members of the staff of the Federal Power Commission, present this testimonial to Leland Olds as an expression of our appreciation for his long, energetic and sincere devotion to his work in the service of the public as a member of the Commission and for his unique contribution to the progress which has been made in utility regulation. We are also appreciative of the many improvements he has fostered in personnel matters and for the devoted interest he has consistently shown for the welfare of each member of the staff.

We are proud to have been associated with Leland Olds in the work of the Commission. We applaud his courageous and valuable service to the American people in the fields of public utility regulation and conservation of natural resources. We admire his humanitarian qualities and his indomitable faith in the growth of American ideals. We honor his sterling integrity, unswerving loyalty, and inspiring leadership.

We regret that our official relationship must end after 10 years together. We know, however, that the depth of our mutual affection will always bind us together in the common cause of serving our fellow man. We extend to Leland Olds our best wishes for his happiness and success in the years to come.

THE STAFF OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION.

OCTOBER 21, 1949.

The Notable Record of the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress convened on January 3, 1949, it was faced with many complex problems. It has labored long and exhaustively, and its legislative achievements compare favorably with outstanding past sessions. The fact is that its accomplishments in certain fields have transcended that of any other session of Congress. The final record for the session just closed is far better than one has been led, by improper suggestion, to believe. In the interest of truth and accuracy, let it be known that the party which introduced the spirit of humanity into our law is moving steadily toward the enactment of its program.

Despite some early delays, major progressive legislation was enacted in the fields of agriculture, housing, minimum wage, Federal service and national defense. In addition, much progress has been made and the groundwork laid for the final enactment in the second session of legislation on a variety of pledges, including social welfare, labor, and civil rights. Long committee hearings and exhaustive study, as well as considerable debate in the Congress, have brought the legislative cycle of these important matters close to final enactment.

Further, the Congress moved efficiently in its careful study and enactment of legislation in the fields of international affairs and finance. The enactment of this legislation will stand as a real record of achievement for the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Thus we see the political and economic policy which has guided the Democratic Party and our Nation. The American people know these principles well. They are principles which have brought them more effective leadership, greater prosperity and security.

The following outline of the major pieces of legislation enacted into law or under consideration by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress will reveal the wealth of this program:

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

Public Law 85, approved June 7, 1949, amends the Commodity Corporation Charter Act to allow the CCC to acquire storage facilities for surplus farm products, if private enterprise is unable to do so.

Public Law 423, approved October 28, 1949, authorizes the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans to small telephone companies, cooperative, nonprofit, or mutual associations to extend and improve the telephone service and facilities in rural areas.

Public Law 439, approved October 31, 1949, establishes a long-range price-support program. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make price support available to producers whose planted acreage does not exceed his farm acreage allotment for basic commodities—corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat—at a level of parity as follows: First, for 1950 not less than 90 percent; second, for 1951 not less than 80 percent; third, for 1952 and thereafter between 75 and 90 percent depending upon supply. Support level for tobacco is 90 percent. Support level for cooperators, when marketing quotas have been disapproved, is 50 percent except that tobacco is not supported. Support for corn cooperators outside the commercial producing area is limited to 75 percent of the support given cooperators in such area. The act continues the authority of the CCC to make loans to cooperators on fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco.

Price support for wool, including mohair, is set to vary between 60 and 90 percent as proves necessary to encourage annual production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. Tung nuts, honey, and Irish potatoes are to be supported at between 60 and 90 percent of parity, and whole milk, butterfat and related products at between 75 and 90 percent of parity in order to insure adequate supplies.

Federal Antilynching Act, on which the House has held hearings and which the Senate committee has reported, makes lynching a Federal offense and establishes severe penalties on those who violate the law.

Federal Antipoll Tax Act, which has been passed by the House, makes it unlawful for any individual, State, municipality or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at a Federal election.

Fair Employment Practice Act, which has been reported to the House, makes it a Federal offense to discriminate against an employee because of race, religion, color or national origin.

Public Law 339, approved October 10, 1949, is the so-called omnibus veterans' benefit bill. Under this law presumed service-connected disability rates are raised from 75 to 100 percent. Also provided in this law are liberalization of rating and benefits in connection with service-connected arrested tuberculosis cases, as well as a new disability payment schedule based on $150 for total disability. Veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled will receive a proportionate additional allowance for dependents.

The House passed a veterans' pension bill liberalizing pensions to veterans, widows, and surviving children of veterans. It further raises the income limit under the test of need from $1,000 to $1,200 for single men, and provides for an increase in monthly payments from $72 to $100 per month for a veteran who must have full-time aid and attendance.

Public Law 393, approved October 26, 1949, increases the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour for all employees engaged in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production of goods for interstate commerce.

The House passed amendments to the present Social Security Act, extending the law's coverage to an additional 11,000,000 persons and increasing the benefits an estimated 80 percent. It further provides insurance for those who are permanently and totally disabled and permits higher part-time earnings.

The Senate has passed legislation authorizing Federal grant-in-aid to State school systems and the bill is now pending in the House.

Public Law 352, approved October 12, 1949, authorizes Federal aid to States and local governments for the advance planning of needed public works.

Public Law 109, approved June 20, 1949, authorizes the President to reorganize the executive departments in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report. The program is already under way to effect savings estimated at several billions of dollars a year.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Public Law 47, approved April 19, 1949, continues the European recovery program until June 30, 1950, and authorizes the necessary funds. In addition, the Economic Cooperation Administration is authorized to guarantee private American investors that any foreign currency earned under their approved operations abroad can be converted into United States dollars, and to look after the interests of small business.

The North Atlantic Pact, ratified by the Senate, has been signed by the President.

Public Law 329, approved October 6, 1949, reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and authorizes military aid to the nations participating in the North Atlantic Pact.

Public Law 307, approved September 26, 1949, restores to the President the full power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements, thus promoting world trade, commerce, and economic stability.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Public Law 216, approved August 10, 1949, reorganizes and unifies the armed services, thus achieving greater efficiency in our national defense units.

Public Law 60, approved May 11, 1949, establishes a long-range proving ground for guided missiles and for scientific research into rocket weapons.

Public Law 30, approved March 30, 1949, authorizes the construction of a radar air-warning network.

Now pending in conference is legislation fixing the composition of the Army and Air Force, thus assuring us of a strong manpower and national defense program.

Public Law 351, approved August 30, 1949, provides for an increasing scale of pay 'n the military services to attract and hold capable men in the armed services.

Displaced Persons Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1949, I submitted a statement on the displaced-persons situation to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. Since submitting that statement I have had an opportunity to personally visit Germany and see for myself the conditions prevailing with reference to the displaced persons and also to consult personally with the responsible civilian and military authorities there.

All that I have seen and heard confirms everything I said in that statement and proved to me the necessity for the immediate enactment of this legislation. I fervently trust that the other body will lose no time in passing this bill which will go a long way toward relieving a most distressful situation. We must do everything possible to aid these helpless people.

The statement I submitted to the Senate subcommittee is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to submit to your committee this statement in support of the bill now under consideration.

If enacted into law, this bill will liberalize the displaced-persons law enacted by the last Congress and go far toward ameliorating if not completely curing a bad condition still extant in the world and created by World War II.

The United States has been in the forefront to find a speedy and satisfactory solution of the European displaced-persons problem since the end of that war. This country has contributed substantial sums for maintenance of the displaced persons in the camps.

Last year's legislation provided for the admission of 205,000 displaced persons, and this bill will increase that number to 339,000. Other countries have followed our example by admitting considerable numbers, outstanding among them being the little state of Israel, which to date has admitted about 150,000 displaced persons or more than twice as many as have entered the United States thus far.

The International Refugee Organization, which has been handling the European displaced-persons problem, is now in its last year of existence and is scheduled to terminate its activities by June 30, 1950. It is estimated that about a quarter of a million displaced persons in Europe will still need partial or complete support, unless the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is amended by Congress to increase the number eligible for admittance to this country to 339,000 and other countries will agree to admit the remaining 100,000 to 150,000 displaced persons. We have reason to hope that a final solution is in sight. Passage of this bill by your honorable body will practically assure this solution.

Of the 60 displaced-persons camps which existed in 1947 in the American zone, at the end of June of this year there were only 12. Of the 35,000 Jews who in 1947 lived in these camps, there were in June, according to recent reports, only 24,000; actually they numbered no more than 20,000. Of those 20,000, during July and August, about 8,000 left for Israel and about 4,000 for the United States. Of the 25,000 Jewish refugees who in 1947 lived in cities outside of the displaced-persons camps, there were in June only 19,000, and now only about 7,000.

I cite these figures so that there will be no mistake about my plea to you. I am not here as a special pleader for my coreligionists. I am here pleading for humanity for an oppressed segment of our unfortunate brothers, regardless of their race or creed.

The fact that all religions have united in pleading for this bill should be sufficiently indicative to you of the nonsectarian nature of this bill. Its early enactment is essential if we are to retain our own self-respect as well as that of nations abroad.

Permit me to comment at this point upon the plea made to your committee last week. Inadvertently, or otherwise, those statements have clouded the issue in confusion.

Get this clearly. I second their plea to admit 10,000 Arab refugees into this country. I sincerely and most strongly urge it. But let us be realistic about it.

You will not find 10,000 Arabs willing and able to immigrate here who can qualify under the most liberal terms of our laws, even when amended by this bill. I sincerely wish it were otherwise. What better way of spreading our ideals of democracy could be found. Bring them over and let them become exponents to their families and friends back home of the American way of life. Isn't that what we are spending billions of dollars for? This will cost us next to nothing, certainly far less than supporting them where they are.

But admitting 10,000 Arabs to America will not solve the refugee problem in the Near East. It will not even make a dent in it.

Let me here clarify for you the statements about the number of refugees from Israel.

It is a fact that no authoritative census of the Arab refugees has been taken since this problem has arisen. The United Nations Conciliation Commission's Technical Subcommittee on Refugees recently suggested such a census, but as yet we have no official figures.

The best available objective calculation indicates a total of Arab refugees from the territory presently held by Israel at about 520,000. Not over a million is claimed by Arab sources. According to official statistics published by the British Palestine Government in April 1945, there were 736,000 Arabs residing in the area comprising the state of Israel. Today, there are 170,000 Arabs in Israel. Furthermore, the British mandatory's figures were later shown to have been excessive by 6 percent, or 45,000. By deducting these two figures from the total of 736,000, it is difficult to see how the number of Arab refugees from Israel can exceed 520,000.

It is possibly true that there are more than 520,000 Arab refugees, but the additional numbers came from areas outside of Israel, most probably from the Arab part of Palestine. Destitute people have flocked to the refugee camps in the hope of obtaining relief. The inflated figure of a million refugees is said to have been achieved by adding indigent Arabs who have applied for aid to the International Red Cross. They are refugees from poverty, but not from Israel.

Remember the area originally promised the Jews for the home state was 45,000 square miles. All that was given to them by the United Nations was 5,500 square miles. Almost 40,000 square miles of Palestine is today Arab and not Jewish or Israeli occupied.

Let me add a word from personal observation made when in the Near East last September. The Jews and Arabs can live together in peace. They live together in peace and would still be living in peace side by side in Israel, if they had not been disturbed by outsiders.

The charge that Israel atrocities aroused fear among the Arab population and this led to the refugee problem is part of the propaganda which aims to give a wholly inaccurate picture of the realities of the situation. Several months ago the charge was made that the Arabs were driven from their homes by the Jews; today, fear of Jewish atrocities is blamed as the cause of Arab flight. The truth of the matter is that the Arab refugee problem is a direct result of Arab aggression and the Arab invasion of Israel. The Arabs began a war which ended disastrously for them. Some of the Arabs of Palestine supported the war on Israel in the hope of driving the Jews into the sea and inheriting their cities and farms, but when the Arab forces were defeated much of the civilian population retreated with them under fear and duress of the Arabs not of the Israeli. In other instances, Arab authorities ordered the departure of the Arab population from various communities in the hope of choking the roads with refugees and for other strategic military purposes. The Arab refugees have their own leaders to thank for their present misery. Nevertheless, we must help them now, to help themselves.

The charge that Israel refuses to allow any Arabs to return and contributes nothing for their aid, is also untrue. When the state of Israel first came into being, it numbered an Arab population of about 60,000. As a result of the warfare and the subsequent armistice agreements with Egypt, Transjordan, Lebanon, and Syria, small areas of territory were annexed or granted to Israel whereby its Arab population grew to about 145,000. In the last few months about 25,000 Arabs, former residents in the territory now comprising Israel, returned illegally. They are permitted to remain in the country by the government of Israel. It is also a matter of record that Israel has offered to readmit relatives of its Arab citizens and it is estimated that some 15,000 Arab women and children are thus enabled to leave the refugee camps and are even now rejoining their relatives in Israel.

Furthermore, the state of Israel has offered as its share in the over-all solution of the Arab refugee problem to take back a total of 100,000 Arabs. This decision has been reached despite the violent objection from opposition parties and despite the fact that the press and radio of the Arab states are openly urging a second round against Israel.

It should not be difficult for anyone having honest and objective views to realize that repatriation of a larger number of refugees would prove disastrous for the security of Israel and would constitute a serious hindrance to the economic development of the infant Jewish state. Israel would be committing national suicide if it admitted an Arab fifth column at a time of Arab hostility and rearmament. Furthermore, the very existence of Israel means that its doors must be kept open for the homeless Jews in the displaced persons camps of Europe and elsewhere, lest its very reason for existence would be nullified.

The charge of atrocities committed during the hostilities will not withstand analysis. There is not a single authenticated instance of the gutting, disembowling or mutilation of war dead, wounded, or of prisoners by Israeli soldiers. A people whose religion prohibits an autopsy for medical purposes would never countenance such conduct. The innumerable instances of such conduct by Arabs needs no recounting here.

I do not wish to dwell at this time on some of the other charges and implied threats made by the Arab spokesman, such as, the implication that the Jews of Israel are spreading communism in the Middle East, the warning that if the Arabs are not permitted to return to Israel it will encourage communism among them or will lead to a renewal of the war on Israel, or the open threat by Dr. John G. Hazan of retaliation on the 1,000,000 Jews who live in the Arab countries. We are all aware that the Arab refugees constitute a tragic human problem which must be solved quickly and in the most logical way.

It has been stated on several occasions that the best and most logical way to solve this problem is to resettle the bulk of these refugees in the Arab countries. If given sufficient international support, the Arab states will be enabled to absorb large numbers of refugees, people of their own kith and kin and their own flesh and blood. Most of the Arab countries are economically underdeveloped and their social and economic rehabilitation is dependent upon additional population.

The most striking example is that of Iraq, which in antiquity had a population of some 30,000,000 people and today numbers less than 5,000,000. For the past several decades attention has been repeatedly focused on Iraq's need for additional population and the vast opportunities existing there for agricultural development. When Britain still held the mandate over Iraq it was interested in large-scale development. Iraqi leaders discussed such possibilities on several occasions. International experts in economics, nutrition, and soil development pointed out the vast possibilities in Iraq. Back in 1945, when there was no Arab refugee question as yet, former President Herbert Hoover suggested large-scale resettlement of Palestinian Arabs in Iraq. Mr. Hoover said then:

"My own suggestion is that Iraq might be financed to complete this great land development on the consideration that it be made the scene of resettlement of the Arabs from Palestine. There is room for many more Arabs in such a development in Iraq than the total of Arabs in Palestine. The soil is more fertile. They would be among their own race, which is Arab-speaking and Mohammedan. The Arab population of Palestine would be the gainer from better lands in exchange for their present holdings. Iraq would be the gainer, for it badly needs agricultural population. It would be a solution by engineering instead of by conflict."

The existence of the Arab refugee problem today only lends further strength to Mr. Hoover's proposal. Any attempts to foist them upon Israel and to squeeze them into the narrow confines of the Jewish state are doomed to failure because it will not eliminate the problem nor end the friction. Planned resettlement is the only answer, and not the piecemeal and unrealistic solutions

advocated by the Arab spokesman before this subcommittee.

The United States is willing to lend its support. Our policy is, and has been all along, peace and stability in the Middle East. The Arab spokesmen tried to leave the impression with the subcommittee that adverse feeling is rising against the United States in the Middle East. This is again propagandistic nonsense. The Arab nations know that we have no imperialistic designs on their countries, and the Arab peoples today look to this country for moral and material support more than ever before. No one can name a better, more friendly and more understandable nation which is earnestly interested in the welfare of the Middle East than the United States.

As so well stated by President Truman on August 26, 1949, upon the occasion of the naming of Gordon H. Clapp as Chairman of the new United Nations Economic Survey Commission for the Middle East, and I quote:

"This Government now pledges full support to the newly created economic mission and stands ready to give careful consideration to such assistance as we might appropriately render, under the auspices of the United Nations, in carrying out the recommendations of the mission. I am confident that the United Nations and its member states which are in a position to render assistance will do likewise.

"I am convinced that if the Near Eastern nations affected by the recent hostilities will put aside their differences and bend their energies to constructive cooperation, they can find a basis on which to build permanent peace and stability. The United States stands ready to lend a firm and helping hand in such an endeavor."

Thank you, gentlemen, for the opportunity to present this statement.

Independent Business and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram addressed to me from the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *October 17, 1949.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Just completed Nation tour conferring with business and professional men in Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, New Orleans, and Atlanta. At all meetings it was unanimous opinion of these business and professional leaders that any attempt by the Congress to vote legislation to amend by weakening Sherman-Clayton-Robinson-Patman laws will result in the complete destruction of independent business and our free-enterprise system. Recent decisions of the United States courts basing point Standard Oil of California, Indiana, all leading to the protection of independent business and our free-enterprise system. Both Republican and Democratic platforms pledged to independent business "All-out enforcement of antitrust laws" the National Federation of Independent Business having the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation insist that party pledges be kept by all Members of Congress and urge you to read this message on the floor of the Senate today so that no action will be taken by the Senate: One, to weaken antitrust laws; two, to destroy independent business of this Nation. Thank you.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

Message to West Virginia Federation of Republican Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a message delivered to the annual conference of the West Virginia Federation of Republican Women's Clubs on October 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, October 7, 1949.

Mrs. E. WYATT PAYNE,
President, West Virginia Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, Huntington, W. Va.:

In accordance with our telephone conversation this morning, I am devastated that I cannot leave the Senate floor to be with you tonight, but the Democratic agricultural bill which we sent back to committee on Tuesday is again on the floor this afternoon and they intend to hold the session late into the night to complete it.

I believe that the legislation is more important to you than I am to your meeting tonight since you will have Mrs. Joseph Farrington, Walter Hallanan, and Chapman Revercomb, and I know that you would want me to stay on the Senate floor during the debate on the amendments and votes on one of the most important two or three vital pieces of legislation confronting the Congress in 1949.

However, if you will, convey this message to your meeting from me:

That, first, I deeply appreciate the honor of being chosen as the speaker on the occasion of the 1949 annual convention of the State Federation of Republican Women's Clubs and hope you will keep me on your list; and, second, that I believe the women of West Virginia and of the other 47 States can contribute immeasurably to a complete reorganization of the Republican Party, which is sorely needed if we are to win in 1950 and 1952.

It is my opinion that with our new national chairman, Guy Gabrielson, heading the National Republican Committee, and with Betty Farrington heading the women's organization, the job can be done.

At this time the only really unorganized group in the United States is the Republican Party.

Also, the Republican Party has had no definite principles upon which it could take an independent stand for 16 years.

In every major campaign for 16 years our candidates have ended up running tandem with the Democratic candidates and it is my opinion that unless we turn to a definite Republican platform based on American principles and fight it out on the ground floor we will never win another major election.

It is well known that the Democratic administration has removed the floor under wages and the protection of American investments through its 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, and is putting the lower living standard and slave labor countries of the world in direct competition with the American workingmen through lowering the tariffs and import fees without any reference to the difference in the wage standards of living.

It is well known that we are throwing billions of dollars away in Europe without any constructive idea of what the end will be.

The so-called bipartisan foreign policy has practically destroyed the Republican Party. It is impossible to have a bipartisan foreign policy until we have a foreign policy that stops at the water's edge.

The State Department under the Democratic administration has bound our domestic economic policy to their foreign policy and it really amounts to a three-part free-trade program for this Nation, including: First, making up the trade balance deficits of the European countries each year in cash—our chief export is cash.

Second, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, under which the State Department has adopted a selective free trade policy on the theory that the more they divide the markets of the United States with the countries of Europe and the world the less their trade balance deficits will be; and

Third, the International Trade Organization—the ITO—which would consist of 54 or more nations, each with one vote. We would have the same vote as Siam or the smallest nation in the group and they would meet at least once each year and divide up the remainder of our markets between them.

That is the program that the so-called bipartisan group has been and is supporting. It has wrecked the Republican Party.

It is my opinion that the Republican Party must adopt an American program for 1950 and 1952 if they are to stand any chance at all of winning.

We cannot adopt the socialistic program followed by the Democratic administration and simply promise the American people to do it faster and better, as we have been doing.

I proposed as an American program that we start with an American domestic economic policy which would include a definite plank in the Republican platform in 1950 and 1952 calling for the adoption by Congress of the flexible import fee and tariff principle.

The flexible-import-fee principle would guarantee fair and reasonable competition, since the import fees would be fixed on that basis on the fair and reasonable competition principle in the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes freight rates for the carriers on the principle laid down by Congress on a reasonable return on the investment.

The flexible import fee would at all times represent that difference in landed value or offered-for-sale price of foreign competitive goods in this country and our own production cost.

Under the flexible-import-fee principle there would be no consideration of a high or low tariff or import fee, but that differential of cost, a floor under wages and a protection of American investments, would be represented by the import fee or tariff.

Through the flexible-import-fee principle a market is immediately established on a definite basis for the products of all foreign

nations on a fair and reasonable competitive basis, and as they raise their general wage-living standards the flexible-import fee would be lowered accordingly and when they had reached our approximate level the general objective of free and unrestricted trade would be the almost immediate result.

All nations now have access to our most up-to-date machinery and know-how, and we no longer can depend upon more efficiency to offset the low wages in foreign countries.

Such a principle adopted by the Congress would welcome all competition on our wage-living standards, but it would automatically reject all unfair competition with American labor and investment standards. They cannot in good conscience ask for more.

Our foreign policy would be considered entirely separate and apart from the national economic policy and would be on a basis of constructive internationalism.

Aid extended to Europe would be on condition first that all European currencies, including the pound sterling, the franc, the guilder, and all other moneys would be on a freely convertible dollar basis.

We would then be on a dollar standard, since we have on gold standard and the currencies of the foreign nations would be worth whatever the market says they are worth in terms of the dollar. Then such foreign currencies could be used to buy goods and products anywhere in the world, including the United States.

Recent international conferences are teaching the public that there is something the matter with the dollar. They call it dollar trouble, dollar shortage, and in some mysterious manner blame such trouble on the United States.

There is no dollar trouble at all, and there is no pound sterling, franc, or guilder trouble that simple honesty will not cure, and that is to cease all manipulation of the values of their currency and allow them to reach their level on the markets of the world in terms of the dollar.

Second, that they form a United States of Europe which would include the 16 Marshall plan countries, including Germany, on the same basis as the United States of America with no quotas, embargoes, currency manipulations, or any other maneuvers for trade advantage between them.

It would then be possible to deal with a government, including all of the areas and peoples of Europe the same as other nations deal with the United States of America and the future would immediately be much brighter, both economically and in a military way, and further assistance should be conditioned upon such action by them.

Third, we should have equal access to the markets of the nations of the world subject only to individual action by such individual nations.

It is my considered opinion that if an American policy along the lines just described were laid down for a national and international policy for the United States of America and included in the Republican platform that the Republicans would win in 1950 and 1952 by one of the greatest majorities of any election in our time.

It would mean a complete reversal of both our present national and international policies. There is no room for bipartisanship because you cannot be on both sides of these questions.

As I have previously stated, the so-called bipartisan policy has ruined the Republican party and has just about ruined the country.

All industries are beginning to suffer severely, including the minerals industry, the agricultural industry, the textile industry, the pottery industry, the precision instrument industry, the lumber industry; and practically all of the products produced in this country except the heavy machinery and automobile industries have suffered severely; and their turn is coming just as soon as the administration is able to guarantee the investments of businessmen in foreign nations to put in the machinery to manufacture these products—such investments being guaranteed by the Government through the bold new program, also known as point 4 of the President's program.

The bold new program would guarantee American businessmen's industrial investments throughout the world to not only furnish the foreign markets that the Marshall plan and ECA money was supposed to develop for American workers and industries, but through the free-trade policy would ship the goods into the United States markets and render idle millions of our own people and ruin American investments.

Middle eastern and South American oil is being imported into this country and is slowly choking our own oil and coal industries down and could conceivably, if allowed to go unchecked with an import fee or tariff, making up the differential of costs due mostly to the difference in the living standards, close a large part of the coal mines and oil fields which furnish fuel at some distance away from the field for the production of steam power and for furnaces.

It is a great disappointment to me that I am not able to be with you tonight because I had hoped that the Republican women of West Virginia would start the ball rolling through their convention by a firm demand that the flexible import fee principle be adopted as a definite plank in the Republican platform in 1950 and 1952 as a domestic program and that they demand that any further assistance to European nations be conditioned upon the formation of a United States of Europe; a freely convertible currency in terms of the United States dollar; and equal access to the markets of the nations of the world.

The Republicans should stand firm for a floor under American wages and investments.

Please convey my congratulations to the Republican Women's Club of West Virginia for their energy and ability to keep alive such a strong organization and wish them a very successful convention.

I should like to receive a copy of any resolutions passed by the convention.

Best regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of Sutton Farmers Union, local No. 70, Sutton, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY SUTTON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 70, ON SEPTEMBER 30, 1949

Whereas farmers in northern Griggs County, N. Dak., were victims of devastating hail storms in 1948 and serious drought and hail in 1949; and

Whereas farmers in northern Griggs County have depleted their resources of credit through local loan channels; and

Whereas funds in FHA for this area are exhausted, with none additional available until July 1950, unless emergency funds are provided earlier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sutton Farmers Union local urges that this area be declared a disaster area and disaster funds be immediately made available through FHA to relieve suffering in this area.

SUTTON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 70,
By ROBERT BRASTRUP, *Secretary.*
SUTTON, N. DAK.

Record of the Eighty-first Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a final statement of the legislative record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, TOGETHER WITH A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT RELATIVE THERETO PURSUANT TO THE REQUEST OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH S. WHERRY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT BY KENNETH S. WHERRY

The record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress demonstrates that the conflict within the Democratic Party makes it an unsafe agency for the translation of the will of the people into law.

It is a record of reckless disregard of the taxpayers and the importance of stability in our national economy. Appropriations to continue waste and inefficiency in the overswollen bureaucracy reached a new high for all peacetime.

Through its loose fiscal policies the Eighty-first Congress has plunged the Federal Government once more into deficit spending, borrowing to spend, which is a dangerous policy. Time and again the Republican membership sought to cut appropriations, but the high spenders under administration leadership prevailed.

The $8,500,000,000 Treasury surplus accumulated under the wise policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress is gone. Instead of the $7,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt acocmplished by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the country is now confronted by a constantly rising public debt.

This mortgage upon the backs of the people has increased from the postwar low of $251,349,380,305, reached last April 8, to $256,538,816,324 on October 12, 1949. This is an increase of $5,189,436,019. Present indications point to a Federal Treasury deficit for the present fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000.

Contrast the $5,000,000,000 deficit of the Eighty-first Congress with the record of the Eightieth Congress, which was able to reduce taxes by $5,000,000,000 and still provide an operating surplus for the Federal Government.

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the administration Democrats voted

down the numerous motions offered by Republican Members to reduce appropriations. Republicans in the Senate made four attempts to reduce the total amount of the "Labor-Federal Security" appropriation, three to reduce the "Treasury-Post Office" appropriation, two to reduce the "Agricultural" appropriation, and four to reduce the "Civil Functions of the Army" appropriation.

Attempts to direct the President to reduce expenditures and balance the budget were equally unsuccessful.

The Senate voted down twice motions offered to the "Military Establishment" appropriation and to the executive-pay-raise bill to require an over-all reduction of expenditures to bring the budget in balance.

The entire approach of the leadership of the Eighty-first Congress to appropriation bills was irresponsible and dangerous.

The provision for a legislative budget, as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, was ignored. The Congress made no attempt to establish a legislative budget that would constitute an early appraisal of revenue and expenditures as required by the 1946 law.

The Congress likewise ignored that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which sets the day for adjournment on the last day of July. The lack of leadership in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress produced such a log jam on appropriation bills that adjournment on the date set by law would have left more than half of the departments of Government without funds on which to operate.

On four different occasions after the beginning of the fiscal year 1950 on July 1, 1949, the Congress was forced to adopt special resolutions to provide operating funds for the Government.

On October 1, 1949, 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year 1950 and 9 months after the organization of the Eighty-first Congress, regular appropriations for Army civil functions, for the Interior Department of the National Military Establishment, and for foreign aid were not enacted and the third deficiency appropriation for fiscal 1949 was still pending.

This was the record of the Eighty-first Congress on the financing of the Government. The administration Democrats mustered the votes to appropriate borrowed money for the extravagant and wasteful bureaucracy that has grown up over the past 16 years and which threatens the solvency of the Nation through deficit spending. The President was successful in winning from Congress appropriations that will enable him to spend billions of dollars more than the Government takes in through taxes and other revenues.

The President was successful also in persuading the Congress to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program without the peril-point amendment, written into the law by the Eightieth Congress to offer protection to the American people, their jobs, their homes, and their businesses.

The peril-point provision adopted in the Eightieth Congress required the Tariff Commission to establish "peril points" in setting the rate of duty below which trade negotiators could not go without endangering American industry. If the President ignored these points, he was required to explain his action to the Congress and the people. Although this amendment was labeled "restrictive," the only restriction imposed on the President was that he should explain his actions to the people when he endangered an American business by allowing low duty imports of cheap-labor foreign production.

But if the administration was successful in writing a program of deficit financing and in removing the protection of the peril-point provision in spite of Republican opposition, it failed in other major respects to enact some of the unwise legislation sought by the President.

When the Eighty-first Congress organized January 3, 1949, there were majorities in both Houses of Congress for the party of the administration. In the Senate, Democrats outnumbered Republicans 54 to 42; in the House the voting strength was 263 to 171. The Congress was greeted by a reelected President who claimed a mandate to initiate vast spending programs which had been turned down in the Eightieth Congress, and to wipe out laws enacted for the general welfare by the Eightieth Congress.

For nearly 10 months, meeting 4 or 5 days a week for an average of 5 or 6 hours a day, the poorly organized and weakly led Eighty-first Congress dragged out one of the longest peacetime sessions in the history of the Republic. Night meetings and Saturday sessions, often employed in previous Congresses to drive through important legislation, were a rarity in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Although the Democratic Party had a majority in both Houses of the Congress, it is perfectly clear in the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress that the Fair Deal of the President is meeting with little more success than it met in the Eightieth Congress. The extravagant promises of a political campaign, in which the President offered everything to everybody and a paternalistic government to distribute the booty, have turned out to be empty promises.

Most of the legislation enacted in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress spells out a general endorsement of action taken in the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress.

In the field of foreign relations, labor-management legislation, and domestic problems, the Eighty-first Congress has subscribed to the political philosophy of its predecessor. The President has found little sympathy in the Eighty-first Congress for new taxes, wage and price controls, restrictions on consumer credits, priorities on materials in short supply, compulsory health insurance, farm production payment subsidies, and authority for the Government to build industrial plants.

The Taft-Hartley law was not repealed.

The President and the leaders of the Democratic Party seeking reelection won support from the labor bosses by voicing their eagerness to erase the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 from the statutes.

In the House, the administration forces failed completely and bottled the Taft-Hartley repeal bill in committee.

In the Senate, responsible members of the Democratic Party joined with the Republicans to amend sensibly the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The bill that passed the Senate subscribed to the 1947 legislation, offering justice to labor while it recognized also the rights of management to an honored contract and the rights of the general public to protection against Nationwide tie-up in key industries.

In fear of complete repudiation, the administration leaders in the House have not dared to bring the Senate bill out of committee onto the House floor for a vote.

The Brannan farm bill was not considered.

The Brannan farm plan, lauded by the President in his political speeches around the country, has been an unrecognized child to administration spokesmen in the Congress. The House leadership adopted a bill to continue for another year existing supports at 90 percent of parity. It refused to endorse the Brannan formula for production payments to farmers on nonbasic crops.

The Senate Agriculture Committee spurned the Brannan plan. On the Senate floor one lone spokesman paid lip service to the Brannan proposals, but refused to offer legislation for a vote to test the sentiments of his colleagues.

Neither House nor Senate desired even to discuss the cost of the Brannan plan, or the size of a police force necessary to certify production payments, or the desirability of limiting its benefits only to the small farmers, or the feasibility of subjecting the farmer to rigid acreage and quota controls, or the advisability of requiring the farmer to spend his income on soil conservation subject to the dictates of the Department of Agriculture, or the reasonableness of destroying normal markets for agricultural products on which Government subsidies are expended.

New taxes were not enacted.

The Eighty-first Congress refused to consider new taxes sought by the President in his January message and subsequently abandoned by the administration. The Eightieth Congress, which voted tax relief, was condemned by many administration leaders this session who were embarrassed by a staggering deficit in peacetime because of excessive expenditures. Democrats were anxious to forget that the President, also during the Eightieth Congress, had proposed a tax-adjustment plan. But although the Democratic leaders in some instances were willing to bemoan the loss of revenue, they did not seek to restore the tax reduction made in the Eightieth Congress and appreciated by the 7,000,000 small-wage earners of America who benefited thereby.

Controls over business and industry were not considered.

The President was ignored in his request for authority to build industrial plants with Government funds. The controls over private industry sought in the Spence bill to combat inflation were quickly forgotten as business conditions tended to correct themselves without Government interference. The authority sought in the Economic Expansion Act to combat deflation appeared at the end of the first session to be likely to join the Spence bill on the shelf.

Compulsory health insurance was not voted.

The President's program for socialized medicine was not placed on the calendar in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and it is apparent that only a minority will subscribe to the proposition that a multi-billion-dollar tax be levied upon wage earnings in America in order that the Government may become the employer of the medical profession. The President's attempt to subject the Public Health Department to the complete and arbitrary authority of the Federal Security Administrator, which the administration advised in opposition to the report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, was roundly defeated in the Senate. The Democratic Congress would appear to be no more friendly to the socialized medicine of the Fair Deal than were the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress.

In a very real sense the American system of free enterprise was on trial in the Eighty-first Congress even as it had been in the Eightieth Congress. For the first time in 16 years, opposition to the growing momentum of Government spending was organized in the Eightieth Congress. For the first time in 16 years the administration found in the Eightieth Congress opposition to the ever-increasing demands for new Federal controls.

The Eightieth Congress provided a balanced budget and forced a temporary halt in the steady march toward greater Federal control of industry, labor, farming, and virtually every area of economic and social life in the Nation.

The principle of a balanced budget has been abandoned this year, but the largest of

the new spending programs which the President seeks have not been enacted.

At the conclusion of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, it becomes clear that much of the new legislation bears a closer resemblance to the record of the Eightieth Congress than to the program set forth by the President as the Fair Deal.

In the nearly 10 months that the Eighty-first Congress met for its first session, nearly 10,627 bills were introduced for consideration and 793 bills were enacted into law.

Many important bills received no final action and may be considered in the second session. This group includes all civil rights legislation, a new displaced persons bill, compulsory health insurance, Federal aid to education, a new labor bill, a bill on basing-point procedure, tidelands legislation, the St. Lawrence seaway, repeal of oleo taxes, extension of social-security benefits, major tax revision, a middle-income housing bill, and Point 4 legislation.

Of the bills that have become law in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, here is the record of major legislation on which the Eighty-first Congress must be judged:

MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

The Presidential pay raise

(Public Law 2. Approved January 19, 1949)

Congress suspended rules to increase the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 and that of the Vice President from $20,000 to $30,000 a year. It also voted a tax-free allowance for the President of $50,000 a year; and for the Vice President, $10,000 a year.

Agriculture

Farm Price Supports

(Public Law 439. Approved October 31, 1949)

The farm price support bill rushed through in the closing hours of the session compromised the Senate revision of the Aiken law and the House demands for 90 percent support levels. The Brannan plan was not even put to a vote by administration leaders who found no support for its production-payment provisions in either House of Congress. The new farm law provides that basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—will be supported at 90 percent of parity in 1950, at 80 to 90 percent of parity in 1951, and at 75 to 90 percent thereafter. Farmers are given the option of two parity formulas to achieve maximum support levels. Milk and milk products will be supported on a sliding scale of 75 to 90 percent of parity. Wool, potatoes, and a few other nonbasic crops will have 60- to 90-percent support. Other commodities will be supported at levels up to 90 percent at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. When the law becomes finally operative after 1950, it will resemble the Aiken law passed in the Eightieth Congress, which was the first permanent farm bill ever written.

Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act Amendment

(Public Law 85. Approved June 7, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, modifies the charter of the Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was given its first permanent Federal charter by the Eightieth Congress. The charter also was revised early in the session to provide for storage facilities for agricultural products.

Rural Telephones

(Public Law 423. Approved October 28, 1949)

Introduced by a large bipartisan group, the legislation authorizes the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans to finance expansion, construction, and operations of rural telephone service.

Crop Insurance Act of 1949

(Public Law 268. Approved August 25, 1949)

The legislation continues the crop-insurance program on an experimental basis as begun in the Eightieth Congress, but provides for gradual expansion of crop insurance to additional counties. It contains other modifications of the law pursuant to the new program initiated in 1947.

Appropriations bills

Appropriations voted in the Eighty-first Congress carried budget expenditures to the highest level of peacetime spending in the history of the Nation. The example set in the Eightieth Congress of curtailing appropriations in order to provide for a balanced budget and for debt retirement was ignored. Despite the warnings of a large minority in the Congress, the administration leaders enacted appropriations to return the Government to deficit financing. Repeatedly the administration rallied its forces in the Senate to defeat attempts to apply percentage reductions to the appropriations bills as voted on in the Senate. The leaders of the administration party in the Senate voted for virtually every amendment offered to increase spending, even voting to increase expenditures above committee recommendations in some instances. A table showing the action taken to date on appropriations bills in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress follows:

Appropriation and contract authorization comparisons, 81st Cong., 1st sess., excluding permanent and trust fund accounts

	Approved by 80th Cong.	1950 request	House action	Senate action	Public law	Public-law increase or decrease over 80th Cong.[1]
Appropriations:						
Independent offices	$6,787,102,402	$7,775,566,830	$7,103,506,553	$7,663,429,323	$7,617,739,361	$830,636,959
Civil functions	641,575,666	767,733,220	593,292,270	751,440,690	664,178,190	22,602,524
State-Justice-Commerce	511,129,662	740,023,456	684,616,102	671,782,281	677,972,102	166,842,440
Labor-Federal Security	1,866,053,700	2,235,065,685	2,211,794,085	2,409,827,265	2,387,799,885	521,746,185
Treasury-Post Office	2,244,727,680	3,172,666,750	3,072,817,903	3,113,068,503	3,090,528,903	845,801,223
Agriculture	577,546,953	726,879,908	943,117,979	965,079,149	[2] 957,597,507	380,050,554
District of Columbia	99,729,483	103,321,427	98,923,621	103,132,153	102,754,447	3,024,964
Government corporations	38,479,061					[38,479,061]
Interior	407,836,974	616,805,020	536,461,908	595,262,257	584,008,797	176,171,823
Armed services	11,403,477,413	13,219,835,700	13,272,815,800	12,731,834,478	12,949,562,498	1,546,085,085
Deficiencies and supplementals	2,034,554,306	3,232,431,055	3,048,328,965	3,399,669,699	3,327,472,761	1,292,918,455
Foreign aid (ECA)	6,030,710,228	[3] 6,322,200,000	5,617,470,000	5,723,724,000	[3] 5,809,990,000	[220,720,228]
Legislative	56,140,401	73,898,184	62,200,705	62,262,110	62,262,110	6,121,709
Total	32,699,063,929	38,986,427,235	37,245,345,891	38,190,511,908	38,231,866,561	5,532,802,632
Contract authority:						
Independent offices	577,851,500	983,500,000	942,314,628	922,189,628	922,189,628	344,338,128
State-Justice-Commerce	76,400,000	68,000,000	62,600,000	68,700,000	68,200,000	[8,200,000]
Labor-Federal Security	114,745,750	97,377,300	106,707,300	125,582,300	109,207,300	[5,538,450]
Treasury-Post Office		211,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Agriculture	400,000		100,000	100,000	100,000	[300,000]
Interior	51,547,500	55,300,000	42,112,500	74,051,700	66,251,700	14,704,200
Armed services	220,000,000	2,058,546,000	2,636,301,000	2,058,546,000	2,536,301,000	2,316,301,000
Deficiencies and supplementals	2,866,447,499	927,972,470	884,566,470	911,966,440	911,966,470	[1,954,481,029]
Total contract authorization	3,907,392,249	4,401,695,770	4,924,701,898	4,411,136,068	4,864,216,098	956,823,849
Grand total	36,606,456,178	43,388,123,005	42,170,047,789	42,601,647,976	43,096,082,659	6,489,626,481

[1] Figures in brackets are deductions.
[2] Adjusted to include a $242,000,000 loan authorization granted in lieu of appropriations.
[3] Adjusted to include $150,000,000 loan authorization.

Civil rights

Cloture Rule

(Adopted March 17, 1949)

Offered by Republican leadership during the filibuster on civil-rights legislation early in the Eighty-first Congress, the rule provides that a constitutional two-thirds may cut off debate on a motion to take up legislation. The cloture rule is the most significant action taken in many sessions toward obtaining consideration for civil-rights legislation. The leadership in Congress has not brought to a vote any civil-rights legislation since the adoption of this rule although an antilynching bill has been on the Senate Calendar since June.

Education

Emergency School Aid

(Public Law 806. Approved September 10, 1949)

The law authorizes appropriations of $7,500,000 to continue Federal assistance through 1950 to local school agencies that are overburdened with defense-incurred school enrollments or that provide schools for children on Federal reservations or other federally owned property.

Finance and commerce

Export Control Act of 1949

(Public Law 11. Approved February 26, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress continues the authority of the President through 1951 to control exports of certain commodities, ex-

cluding fats and oils, when in domestic surplus. The law conforms to laws passed in the Eighteenth and prior Congresses.

Voluntary Agreements and Plans

(Public Law 6. Approved February 9, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress extended for 6 months the operation of a law passed in the Eighteenth Congress to allow industries to make voluntary agreements and plans where shortages exist.

Import and Allocation Powers on Tin

(Public Law 153. Approved June 30, 1949)

The legislation extends through 1950 import and allocation controls over tin, in accordance with legislation passed in the Eighteenth and prior Congresses.

Import Controls Over Fats, Oils, Rice

(Public Law 155. Approved July 1, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress continued through 1950 the import controls over fats and oils and rice and rice products.

General government

Reorganization Act of 1949

(Public Law 109. Approved June 20, 1949)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation carries out some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch which was created by the Eighteenth Congress and which submitted its report early in 1949. The act gave the Chief Executive wide powers to correct the waste and mismanagement found in the present administration. Under the terms of the act the reorganization plans submitted by the President become law if not disapproved by a constitutional majority of either the Senate or the House within 60 days. Seven plans were presented pursuant to this legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. Plan No. 1 was voted down in the Senate by a strong majority because it seemed to jeopardize creation of a separate governmental unit to direct public health activities, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Plans 2 through 7 went into effect on August 19, 1949. They are:

No. 2. Transfers the Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

No. 3. Strengthens top-level organization of the Post Office Department.

No. 4. Transfers National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

No. 5. Makes Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 6. Makes Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 7. Transfers Public Roads Administration from Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

(Public Law 152. Approved June 30, 1949)

This legislation was enacted to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to the handling of Government property, procurement of Government supplies, and establishment of General Services Administration.

State Department Organization

(Public Law 73. Approved May 26, 1949)

The reorganization of the State Department provided for in this legislation carries out recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Executive Pay Bill

(Public Law 359. Approved October 15, 1949)

Salary increases granted heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies in this legislation are in general compliance with the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission.

Federal Employees' Classification Act Revision

(Public Law 429. Approved October 28, 1949)

The legislation revised the Classification Act granting salary increases to classified employees, supplementing the cost-of-living increase for Government employees granted in the Eighteenth Congress.

Postal Pay Raise

(Public Law 428. Approved October 28, 1949)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation grants postal employees a salary increase.

Housing and community facilities

Housing and Rent Act of 1949

(Public Law 31. Approved March 30, 1949)

This legislation continues the Rent Act of the Eighteenth and prior Congresses with an added provision for local decontrol.

Housing Act of 1949

(Public Law 171. Approved July 15, 1949)

Introduced by 11 members of each party, this legislation is the culmination of the efforts of a bipartisan group that has worked through several past sessions to enact a comprehensive housing law. Construction of 810,000 low-rent housing units in the next 6 years is authorized. Federal aid is provided for slum clearance and for construction of farm dwellings.

Alaska Housing Act

(Public Law 52. Approved April 23, 1949)

The legislation raises the dollar ceilings on mortgage loans on housing in Alaska and provides a secondary market for securities.

Alaska Public Works Act

(Public Law 264. Approved August 24, 1949)

Expenditure of $70,000,000 is authorized for a public-works program in Alaska for schools, hospitals, sewers, wharfs, docks, etc.

Advance Planning of Public Works

(Public Law 352. Approved October 13, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, is a renewal of a similar program authorized in 1944 and carries on through October 13, 1951. Appropriation of $100,000,000 is authorized for loans and grants to States and other non-Federal public agencies to undertake advance planning of public works.

International affairs

Continuation of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948

(Public Law 47. Approved April 19, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress renewed authorization for ECA in substantially the same form as the original authorization which was enacted in the Eighteenth Congress under bipartisan leadership.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

(Public Law 307. Approved September 26, 1949)

Extension of reciprocal agreements in the Eighty-first Congress continued a program that has been in existence since 1934. The Eighty-first Congress voted down a Republican-sponsored amendment which would have directed the Tariff Commission to set the rate of duty below which the United States could not go in trade negotiation without endangering American industry. This amendment, which was added to the bill in the Eighteenth Congress and operated successfully for a year, required the President to explain his action to the Congress and the people whenever he ignored the findings of the Tariff Commission. This provision, which offered a reasonable safeguard to American industry against the competition of cheap foreign labor, was defeated by the Democratic leadership on the grounds that it was restrictive legislation although the only possible restriction under the amendment was that imposed by public opinion.

Relief of Palestine Refugees

(Public Law 25. Approved March 24, 1949)

This legislation authorizes a special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs Continued

(Public Law 283. Approved September 3, 1949)

The Eighteenth Congress merged two Government corporations to form the Institute with a charter for 3 years. The Eighty-first Congress extends the life of the charter for 5 years and authorizes an appropriation.

North Atlantic Pact

(Ratified by Senate July 21, 1949)

The North Atlantic Pact was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress to fulfill part of the promise expressed in the Vandenberg resolution adopted in the Eighteenth Congress. The pact was ratified with strong bipartisan support.

International Wheat Agreement

(Ratified by Senate June 13, 1949)

The international wheat pact, unanimously deferred in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Eighteenth Congress, was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress, and the Government was authorized to pay a subsidy necessary to encourage the export of 168,000,000 bushels of wheat for each of the next 5 years. The Congress later authorized Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out operations to fulfill United States commitments under the agreement (Public Law 421, approved October 27, 1949).

Military Assistance Program

(Public Law 329. Approved October 6, 1949)

The President's program for military assistance was completely rewritten in the Congress by a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives working under Republican leadership. The blank-check authority sought by the President to send arms anywhere in the world without specific consent of Congress was turned down. A program was authorized continuing certain existing military programs and limiting military assistance to the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact. A Republican-sponsored amendment was adopted on the floor to relate the expenditures of funds to integrated programs submitted by the Defense Committee of the North Atlantic Security Council and approved by the President.

Labor

Minimum Wage Increase

(Public Law 393. Approved October 26, 1949)

This legislation, offered by a large bipartisan group, increases the minimum wage to 75 cents on hour. The law does not follow the President's recommendation for greatly extended coverage. The new law clarifies that status of retail-store employees and others where administrative decisions were overriding congressional intent.

Overtime on Overtime

(Public Law 177. Approved July 20, 1949)

Legislation was enacted by the Congress to clarify overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The law is retroactive and results from claims filed by employees and pending in the court.

National defense

National Security Act Amendments of 1949

(Public Law 216. Approved August 10, 1949)

These amendments follow recommendations of the Hoover Commission to revise the action taken by the Eighteenth Congress toward unifying the armed services. The law passed in the Eighteenth Congress, to which these amendments are offered, was the first unification legislation enacted although all previous Congresses since Pearl Harbor had voiced the need for unification.

Under Secretary of Defense

(Public Law 36. Approved April 2, 1949)

Following the Hoover Commission recommendations, this law revises the unification law enacted by the Eightieth Congress to create this new position.

Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949

(Public Law 110. Approved June 20, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress revised the administration of this Agency which was established under the terms of the Unification Act of 1947, enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

Military Career Compensation Act of 1949

(Public Law 351. Approved October 12, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress revised the military-pay schedule on the basis of information gathered by the Hoover Commission established in the Eightieth Congress.

Long-Range Proving Ground for Guided Missiles

(Public Law 60. Approved May 11, 1949)

This legislation authorized expenditure of $75,000,000 for construction of installations necessary for development of an existing program.

Land-Based Air Warning System (Radar)

(Public Law 30. Approved March 30, 1949)

Continuing a long-range program for adequate national defense, this legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations and facilities and authorizes expenditure of $85,500,000.

Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan and Air Engineering Development Center

(Public Law 415. Approved October 27, 1949)

This legislation enlarges the present program of national preparedness by authorizing construction of experimental and testing facilities in the field of transonic and supersonic aeronautics.

Social welfare

Hospital Survey and Construction Amendments of 1949

(Public Law 380. Approved October 25, 1949)

This act, introduced by two Members of each party, extends an existing program from 1951 to 1955, increases the annual authorization of expenditure of $150,000,000, and increases the Federal share of expenditure from one-third to a maximum of 66⅔ percent.

President's Commission on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

(Public Law 162. Approved July 11, 1949)

Seventy-five thousand dollars is authorized for the expenses of this Commission which promotes national interest in the employment of handicapped persons.

Transportation and communication

Post Office Research Program

(Public Law 231. Approved August 16, 1949)

This legislation provides for reseach on equipment used by the Post Office Department and complies with recommendations found in the task-force report submitted by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Continuation of Maritime Commission Authority To Sell, Charter, and Operate Vessels

(Public Law 147. Approved June 29, 1949)

The legislation grants extension to 1950 of law extended in the Eightieth Congress and prior Congresses.

Veterans

Disabled Veterans' Special Housing

(Public Law 286. Approved September 7, 1949)

Expands coverage of Public Law 702 of Eightieth Congress, authorizing up to $10,000 for specially adapted housing to additional groups of veterans with serious service-connected disabilities.

Omnibus Disabled Veterans' Benefit Act

(Public Law 339. Approved October 10, 1949)

Amending existing law, this act increases compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, provides minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increases certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizes requirement for dependency allowances, and redefines "line of duty" and "willful misconduct."

Address of Hon. George W. Malone, of Nevada, at the Annual Republican Conference of 11 Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered to the annual Republican conference of the 11 western States in Los Angeles, Calif., on June 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have flown 3,000 miles to be with you today because I still have a firm conviction that there is a lot of red blood left in the Republican Party—and that a good share of it is west of the Rocky Mountains.

DEFINITE PROGRAM

It is also my firm conviction that a majority of the American people are waiting and hoping that the Republican Party will come up with a definite program that makes sense, and that your western conference might kindle a spark that would sweep across the country from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast.

AFFIRMATIVE PRINCIPLES—NOT CAMP FOLLOWERS

This cannot be done by a simple endorsement of a Republican policy which has varied only slightly from the Democratic platform for 15 years.

It is useless to hold these regional meetings if we are to continue as camp followers and "me-tooers" of an administration program that has as its only ultimate objective the dissipation of the wealth of the United States, and the division of our markets with the foreign countries of the world at the expense of the jobs of the workingman of America.

We must formulate affirmative principles which are sound and stop our almost indecent haste to grab and call our own any policy announced by the administration which initiates a new line of appropriations from the United States Treasury and believes that the cure for every problem either national or international is in simply making up the deficit, called picking up the check, and for an administration policy that was obviously wrong to start with.

THE BIPARTISAN POLICY MYTH

There can be no bipartisan foreign policy, first, until there is a foreign policy that stops at the water's edge and that does not depend upon the deliberate dissipation of American wealth and the division of the markets of this Nation with the nations of the world, and since our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, has said: "It is hardly possible any longer to draw a sharp dividing line between the economic affairs and political affairs—each complements and supplements the other. They must be combined in a single unified and rounded policy."

Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, was for the first time very definite in testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when on January 24 of this year he said:

"The European recovery program—Marshall plan or ECA—extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

"The trade-agreements program is an integral part of our over-all program for world economic recovery.

"The International Trade Organization, upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action, provides a long-term mechanism—each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole."

It will be seen from the statement of the administration spokesmen that there positively cannot be a bipartisan foreign policy without extending it to national economic affairs, in which case the Republican Party simply becomes a camp follower and there would be no need whatsoever for a two-party system if all were agreed on national and international policy.

The administration has for the first time, admitted that the three-part free-trade program is all one great plan—again quoting Mr. Thorp, the Assistant Secretary of State, "each contributes to an effective and consistent whole." Up to this time each part of the program was held up to be a great emergency in its own right.

GIFT-LOANS—FREE TRADE—ITO

The administration's combined national and international policy consists of a three-part free-trade program which is slowly but surely pulling the jobs out from under the feet of the American workingmen and driving American industry to the wall, to open competition with the low-cost and slave labor of the world.

The first step of the three-part permanent free-trade program makes up the 16 European nations trade balance deficits in cash each year, started with random gift-loans including UNRRA—and then the $3,750,000,000 to England in 1946—and including the $17,000,000,000 4-year program first labeled the Marshall plan and currently known as the ECA—and is soon to be followed by the now suggested global recovery program—our chief export is cash.

The Congress of the United States has gift-loaned $24,000,000,000 to the nations of the world plus the $17,000,000,000 pledged under the Marshall plan, making a total of $41,000,000,000 since World War II ended.

The second step was inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle—and which is to be extended 3 years at this session of Congress—on the theory that the more they divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the world, the less their trade-balance deficits will be each year.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act has been labeled reciprocal trade, yet that phrase does not occur in the 1934 act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade under a more appealing name. It is scheduled to come before the Congress for a 3-year extension period.

The third and final step of this very cleverly designed three-phase free-trade program is the International Trade Organization, including 58 nations, each with one vote—we would have the same vote as Siam for example—designed to make permanent the selective free-trade principles adopted by

the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. They will then become the settled policies of this Nation.

Each nation assigns its tariff or import fee-making power to the International Trade Organization. They will meet at least once each year and divide the remaining production and markets of the world among the 58 nations ultimately upon a basis of population, thus leveling the living standards of the world.

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

Every newspaper reader and radio listener knows that the values on the New York stock market are falling day by day. The loss to the American investor totals something like $4,000,000,000 since May 16.

The American investor has seen the handwriting on the wall—he can see a terrible economic collapse in the United States unless the administration policies are reversed.

GOVERNMENTAL INTEGRITY

One of the great frailties in any trade agreement is the fact that there is no governmental integrity outside the United States. The proof of this is the fact that they consistently repudiate their debts and their currencies. This has happened time and time again in the past. The American people now face the danger of it happening all over again in the next few months.

CURRENCY MANIPULATION—DISHONEST TRADE ADVANTAGE

The British Government is at this moment debating whether to devaluate the pound sterling. The day that Britain devalues her pound the whole sterling block of nations devalue their currency. The purpose of this on the part of the British would be to increase her trade in the United States. The purpose of the other sterling countries would be to increase their trade in the United States. This is a simple thing. A British woolen sock which must sell for $3 in the United States today with the pound valued at $4.03, to give the British manufacturer a good profit would sell for only $2.25 if the British pound here were devalued 25 percent, and come in under any trade agreements thus far made.

This means that the American manufacturer would either have to cut his cost of doing business or go out of business. Where can he cut that cost? That is the point—labor takes the major cut. The only place that producers could make a substantial cut in cost today would be in the wages in their pay rolls, meaning a direct and substantial lowering of the American living standards.

It is impossible to make effective trade agreements with a nation that manipulates its currency for trade advantage, since any such trade agreement can be immediately nullified through a change in the price of their currency—and England, including the 58 nations and entities of the sterling bloc area, is notorious for such manipulations as are France, Belgium and the Netherlands—such manipulations are a form of piracy—automatically making all prior trade agreements ineffective.

If the administration is successful through the adoption by Congress of the three-part "free-trade" program including the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the Senate approval of the International Trade Organization—the Truman depression will break all records.

Another result of this debasing of currency or trade advantage is that you have a solid block of nations doing business together and invading the American market. On the outside, stands the United States, Russia and its satellite nations are within the iron curtain—and Spain and maybe Portugal will be isolated under the present administration's system. The rest of the world will be against this Nation in a trade war that can only result in the wrecking of American economy.

TWO SPHERES OF INFLUENCE—MILITARY AND ECONOMIC

The world is being divided into two spheres of military influence—the United States and Russia; our sphere of influence is further being divided into two economic spheres—the sterling bloc including 58 nations and entities extending around the world—and the dollar area confined technically to the United States proper. The economic spheres may prove more dangerous to our peace and safety than the military spheres.

EUROPE TO INVADE AMERICAN MARKETS

The propaganda on the Marshall plan was that we were developing markets for American products. The talk has now changed to not only making Europe self-sufficient but encouraging an increase in her imports into the American market.

Mr. Hoffman, the Director of the ECA, has recently said in an article appearing in the April issue of the American Magazine, "Merely to become self-supporting, western Europe must have a further increase of at least 25 percent in industrial production, 30 percent in agricultural output, and 65 percent in exports to the outside world. A tough assignment, but it can be done. In fact it must be done."

He further says in the same article, "Another way Europeans can increase their sales to us is by letting us see exactly what they do offer. Perhaps a fair train touring the country with displays of European merchandise and taking orders from wholesalers and department stores would help."

NATIONAL SECURITY—TAXABLE PROPERTY—EMPLOYMENT

Our national security makes it mandatory to maintain our position in the mining, fuels, agricultural, and industrial fields—and the necessity for employment and taxable property to maintain our national income is imperative.

This position can only be maintained through a flexible import fee method adjustable by the Tariff Commission or Foreign Trade Authority to correctly represent the differential of cost of production mostly due to the difference in wage-living standards between this country and the foreign competitive nations.

Our mines are closing down—our agricultural production is being held up through subsidies—and already petroleum imports have doubled, resulting in curtailing domestic production and development—so necessary in the event of another war—and so important in the economic life of this Nation, including employment and taxable property.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND FREE TRADE

Abraham Lincoln made some observations on foreign trade that are as sound today as when they were made. It will be remembered that he said, in effect, on one occasion when the matter of import fees versus the free-trade principle was under discussion that "when we buy goods within our country we have both the money and the goods; when we buy goods from foreign countries we have the goods and they have the money."

Were he alive today he probably would add that when we give money to foreign governments to buy goods in countries other than the United States we have neither the money nor the goods, but probably a good measure of hate for our industry and ability that put us in so favorable a position.

The Lincoln principle is still sound and we must not confuse the assistance we are rendering other nations with any profit that we might secure for ourselves.

COPPER MERELY AN EXAMPLE

I am not trying to get a scare headline by warning you that these policies are going to wreck the American economy. We already have an instance of it. Several months ago, I warned the United States Senate about free trade and its effect on copper. Now it has already happened. The American copper industry is practically shut down and who has benefited. The independent copper companies are wiped out—copper has come in from abroad and the American workmen are out of work and looking for jobs. Copper is simply an example of what is to come in hundreds of other industries. While I was successful in cutting the proposed 3-year extension of the free trade on copper to 1 year on the Senate floor—the administration insisted upon extending it for 1 year, and the damage is done.

INSIDIOUS POLICIES

These policies are like polio to the human being. You cannot see the thing in the air or the sky. But suddenly it strikes your child. He is a polio victim. Now our whole industrial economy is threatened by an economic polio. It seeps in from across the seas—the proposals and policies come from foreign low-standard-of-living countries—and simply adds up to dividing the American wealth and markets with the nations of the world under the guise of preventing war.

Soon, if these policies are not curbed, you are going to find other industries shut down, or severely curtailed, just as the copper industry was shut down—just as the textile industry, the oil industry, the precision-instrument industry and hundreds of other American industries are now feeling the pinch of the administration's free-trade policies.

And the administration meanwhile proposes to guarantee American investors against loss if they will erect their factories in foreign lands. That is the "bold new program"—to shift American jobs to foreign soil.

"The bold new program," proposing as it does, to only guarantee the investments of our industrialists who build factories and mines in foreign countries to serve the markets in such areas—and through the free-trade program, utilizing the low-cost foreign labor—proposes to displace American jobs.

Does this mean, the American citizen one of these days will have to face the choice of moving to Britain to make stockings, to Czechoslovakia to make shoes, or to France to raise wheat—or stay in America and live upon the charity of his fellow men. But that day is coming if these policies are not changed.

It is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon the workingmen of America and is a fitting climax to the three-part free-trade program which has started the Nation on the downward economic cycle.

FORTY-ONE BILLION DOLLARS—60 PERCENT OF UNITED STATES AREA

The Congress of the United States has gift-loaned $24,000,000,000 to the nations of the world plus the $17,000,000,000 pledged under the Marshall plan, making a total of $41,000,000,000 since World II ended.

Forty-one billion dollars is $5,000,000,000 more than the combined assessed valuation of the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington—and the 14 Southern States, including Texas—and accounts for approximately 60 percent of the area of the United States. At this rate we can dispose of the whole business in a very short time.

GREATEST ECONOMIC PUSHING AROUND

An observer of the actions and maneuvers of the principal beneficiary nations under the ECA—the Marshall plan—and the effects of the trade agreements—can lead to only one conclusion—that the United States of America is getting the greatest economic pushing around that any major nation ever

received in 2,000 years of recorded history, and paying the bill ourselves.

STOCK MARKET A BAROMETER

The stock market is simply a barometer of the business pulse of the United States. On Monday, June 6, the loss in depreciated stocks totaled $1,000,000,000. A 2-year low was reached on that day.

The Associated Press reported that its average price on 60 top stocks had dropped to 59.30—the lowest average price for a 2-year period. They also reported that Monday's loss raised the total losses on all stocks to $4,000,000,000 since May 16 of this year—in less than 30 days.

At no time in its history has the Republican Party faced a greater challenge than today. There never was a greater opportunity for a clear-cut statement of principles.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

The administration has no definite national and international policies as such, but has adopted the hybrid, three-part proposal that points to a one-world government in which American principles will be entirely missing, and with an average standard of living throughout the world which can only result in a substantial lowering of our own.

We can blindly fall in with that so-called policy; lose our own identity at once; and become bipartisan pawns to an administration which is taking its pattern from Europe. Or we can clarify our principles at once and stop the rising tide of world economic socialism on our own shores.

AN AMERICAN POLICY

The problem is not so difficult and complicated as the administration's propaganda machine would have us believe. It can be approached through a workable American policy, which will protect our economy both on the domestic and foreign front.

As I see it, this American policy must include:

NATIONAL POLICY

1. A flexible import-fee system to maintain our high standard of living while we help other nations to raise their own. Such a system is the only logical substitute for the administration's three-part free-trade program, which gives American workingmen the lip service of promised labor legislation, and then plunges them into direct competition with the low-wage living standard slave labor of Europe and Asia.

I will offer the flexible import-fee bill which I have already introduced, as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—when that act comes before the Senate for the 3-year extension. Under the flexible import fee the peril point automatically becomes the tariff or import fee.

2. The adoption of the parity principle for the raw-materials production.

3. The rebuilding of our national defense organization to the point that it can protect us against any overt gesture from governmental systems that seek to penetrate either our territory or those whose integrity is important to our ultimate peace and safety. Such a defense organization should be spearheaded by an air corps prepared to keep any possible enemy grounded in any emergency.

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

1. An extension of the Monroe Doctrine to embrace all nations in Europe and Asia, whose cooperation and integrity we consider necessary to our own peace and safety. Such a measure would be a continual and effective warning to all empire-minded nations which might seek to extend their governmental systems into such areas, just as the Monroe Doctrine has served as a warning to the European empire-minded nations for 125 years that we would consider any effort to extend their system to the western hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

2. Feed emergency-hungry peoples of other countries, to the extent of our ability, without endangering the welfare of our own people. We cannot feed all of the hungry people in the world, since in some areas they have been hungry for 2,000 years, and our economy could not stand the strain.

3. Lend money to private industry of needy foreign countries on a business basis. This measure could be handled in much the same way that RFC loans are made to industries that need emergency rehabilitation in our own country through the World Bank, to gradually build up their standard of living to increase efficiency and production.

4. Condition any further assistance to Europe upon—

(a) Complete free convertibility of the currencies with the dollar.

(b) A United States of Europe, including Germany, without trade restrictions of any kind between them.

(c) Equal access to the trade of the nations of the world, subject only to the action of such individual nations.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party must offer the country a positive program to protect the workingmen of this Nation, while we are assisting the nations of the world, on a business basis, to raise their own living standards.

This could be a long pull since it must be remembered that many of the Asiatic and European countries have had access to all of the raw materials now available to us for 2,000 years of recorded history and have not perceptibly raised their standard of living during that time—while we have done the job in a comparatively few generations.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the protector of the living standards of the workingmen of America and the creator of legitimate employment and taxable property in the Nation. They have followed the policy of keeping a floor under wages through a tariff or import fee roughly equal to the difference in living standards—for more than 80 years.

INTEGRITY OF PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

We have lived off of our fat for 16 years—now all of the European nations are included in our budget—the President has now suggested that we guarantee foreign business investments.

All that is necessary is for such foreign nations to turn honest and protect the integrity of private investments and they will not need gift-loans from our country—businessmen will take the business risk in any country in the world, but they cannot take the risk of a nationalizing or confiscation of their capital.

I suggest that this 1949 annual 11 Western States Republican conference break the trail for the Nation.

The American people are ready for an American national and international policy.

Supreme Court Justices Should Be Barred as Character Witnesses in Federal Courts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include recent editorial comment from the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, the Union City (N. J.) Dispatch, the Perth Amboy (N. J.) News, and the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union dealing with my bill, H. R. 5671, to bar Supreme Court Justices from testifying as character witnesses for defendants charged with crime in our Federal courts.

The editorials follow:

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, of July 18, 1949]

A COGENT ARGUMENT

Representative KEATING, of New York, who studied law at Harvard under Felix Frankfurter, says that the Nation has been "shocked by the impropriety" of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed appearing as character witnesses in the perjury trial of Alger Hiss.

He plans to introduce a bill to forbid Supreme Court Justices from being character witnesses in court cases.

KEATING makes a very good argument in support of his point. If Hiss had been convicted, he says, and appealed to the Supreme Court for redress, both Reed and Frankfurter would naturally be expected in the interest of judicial impartiality to disqualify themselves from reviewing the case in which they themselves had appeared as witnesses.

And if Frankfurter and Reed can put themselves into such a position, there is nothing to prevent all nine Justices from doing the same thing or even from being forced by subpena to do the same thing in a particular case. All nine might then disqualify themselves and in effect we would have no Supreme Court and the ends of justice would be defeated.

That is a very cogent argument. Surely Justices Frankfurter and Reed must have thought of it before they appeared, apparently of their own volition and without subpena, as character witnesses for Alger Hiss. But be that as it may, the implications of the precedent set, by Justices Frankfurter and Reed are serious enough to deserve the careful attention from Congress.

[From the Union City (N. J.) Dispatch of July 19, 1949]

SHOULD BAR JUSTICES AS CHARACTER WITNESSES

As a result of the unprecedented appearance of two Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses in Federal court, New York City, at the trial of Alger Hiss for perjury, a bill has been prepared for passage by Congress before adjournment that would prevent this in the future. When Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley F. Reed appeared to testify to their opinion of Mr. Hiss, controversy was set off in Congress as to the propriety of members of the highest court in taking roles as character witnesses.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, has prepared a House bill that would prohibit members of the Supreme Court from testifying as to the character of any person on trial in any court. The proposed law would not go into effect until July 1, 1950, Mr. KEATING says, so that counsel for Mr. Hiss would not be deprived of the testimony of the same two justices if they were disposed to appear again at the second trial.

The bill would not prevent Supreme Court Justices from appearing as witnesses to testify to facts of material evidence in the courts of justice, just as any other citizens might do.

We think that this is a good bill because it would prevent members of our Highest Court from having to disqualify themselves should an appeal come before them from a case in which they had appeared in the lower courts. Suppose five members of the Supreme Court should testify as character witnesses in the lower court and the defendant were convicted, and later appealed, there would not be a majority of the Court to consider the case after five character witnesses had disqualified themselves. This would be an unthinkable situation, and probably never would occur even if the Keat-

ing bill does not become law. The impropriety of a Supreme Court Justice becoming a character witness prevented such action in the long history of the Supreme Court up until Justices Frankfurter and Reed shattered precedent.

[From the Perth Amboy (N. J.) News of July 21, 1949]

CHARACTER WITNESSES

Before it adjourns Congress is expected to consider a bill which, prepared by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, would prohibit members of the Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses in any court trial. This bill should receive favorable support.

The legislation comes about as the result of the unprecedented appearance of two Supreme Court justices as character witnesses in Federal court in New York at the perjury trial of Alger Hiss. The appearance there of Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley F. Reed set off in Congress a controversy as to the propriety of members of the Nation's highest court taking the roles of character witnesses.

The Keating bill would prevent Supreme Court justices from having to disqualify themselves should an appeal come before them from a case in which they had appeared in the lower courts. In the Hiss case Frankfurter and Reed have already disqualified themselves in the event the case should eventually go before the Supreme Court on appeal.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

BOOST TO KEATING BILL

The American Bar Association is inquiring into the propriety of judges' testifying in civil and criminal law cases. While no names were used it is apparent the action comes from the appearance of two United States Supreme Court justices as character witnesses in the trial of Alger Hiss.

Hiss was accused of perjury for denying that as a State Department officer he passed state papers to a Communist spy. The jury disagreed.

Appearance of the two justices shocked Representative KENNETH KEATING into introducing a bill to prohibit such conduct by judges. He has mustered considerable support for his bill. Action by the American bar should assist in its passage.

Resolutions Passed at Convention of North Dakota Dairy Industries Association and the North Dakota American Dairy Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE CONVENTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA DAIRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION AND THE NORTH DAKOTA AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION IN MINOT, N. DAK., ON OCTOBER 10 AND 11, 1949

We wish to express our appreciation to the city of Minot and the association of commerce for their cooperation in making this convention a success and our stay in Minot pleasant.

We also wish to express our gratitude to all speakers who contributed materially to our convention by giving of their time so that those of us in attendance could obtain information of value to our industry.

We wish to extend our appreciation to our Congressmen and Senators for the active part they took in protecting the dairy farmers and consumers during the congressional fight on the bill to legalize the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow to resemble butter.

We wish to thank the creamery supply men for the refreshments furnished to this convention group Sunday evening, October 9.

We wish to express the appreciation of the entire dairy industry to the businessmen of Jamestown and to all others who contributed so freely of their time and energy to make the 1949 State dairy show an outstanding success.

It is the wish of this convention to extend to Marjorie Burnham our deepest sympathy on the death of her brother.

Whereas a questionnaire submitted to member creameries has shown overwhelming sentiment in favor of early closing of cream stations and creameries Saturday afternoon;

We therefore urge that a definite item of our association program in the coming year be a campaign pressing toward such obligatory closing, with the suggested Saturday closing hour at 5 p. m.

We suggest this resolution be submitted to the legislative committee with request that this committee submit to the annual meeting of the North Dakota Dairy Industries Association in 1950 for approval a plan to implement the mandatory closing of cream stations and creameries at an early hour on Saturday.

Effect of Extension of Free-Trade Agreement on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relative to the effect of the extension of the free-trade agreement on copper brought about through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended.

Mr. President, some of the representatives of the fabricating brass and copper industry have testified against the tariff or import fee on copper that would make up the differential of cost between the wage-living standard in this country and that of our foreign competitors, and have stated that they do not want a tariff on their products.

Quoting Mr. Roger Eliot Gay, president of the Bristol Brass Corp., 580 Broad Street, Bristol, Conn.:

I don't care about an import fee on our products, sir. I do not ask a tariff on brass products.

Further quoting Mr. Gay, in answer to a question that fabricators have asked for tariffs and import fees on their goods:

Sure, I agree with you, but I don't agree with that philosophy. If I cannot make and sell a better product than anybody from abroad can, I will get out of business.

Quoting Mr. Gay further:

I appear here representing our company (Bristol Brass Corp.). I believe also I represent the feeling of the entire brass-mill industry.

Continuing to quote Mr. Gay:

I might add parenthetically that we are the salesmen of the copper industry. In my 23 years in the business I have yet to meet a copper salesman. No one sells copper. We buy copper, sir. I have never met a salesman, and a tariff is a poor substitute for a salesman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the point indicated in the statement a list of fabricated articles manufactured from brass which contains, according to Mr. Gay's further testimony, approximately 70 to 80 percent copper.

This list of many articles shows not only a duty per pound in many instances, but an ad valorem duty of as high as 66 percent, showing conclusively that in order to sell the fabricated articles and make up that differential of cost between the standard of living in this country and where our competition is located, due mostly to the cost of labor—that in order to stay in business the fabricators and processors of brass products containing an estimated 70 to 80 percent copper must have as high as 66 percent ad valorem import fee or tariff to stay in business.

Mr. Gay, then, is against the raw materials producer having an import fee or tariff to make up that differential, but wants to buy the copper from foreign sources and then ask for that same protection in order for his customers to stay in business.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORT DUTY ON VIRGIN COPPER AND METAL SCRAP

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1949.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, in my previous statement before your committee on February 24, 1949, I said at that time that whenever the world price of copper dropped below the cost of domestic production—that the independent copper mines in our country would close—and production would generally be curtailed causing unemployment and loss of taxable property.

The amendment to the scrap-metal bill would restore the copper tariff that was repealed or the time of such repeal extended on March 18, 1949. Of course, the State Department has reduced the 4-cent-per-pound tariff or import fee to 2 cents per pound under the authority granted them under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—so it would only be a token protection now.

General problems

First, the problem is general. It is unfortunate that copper has been singled out because practically all the strategic and critical minerals produced in this country, including practically all other products—I mention briefly livestock, sugar, lumber, textiles, precision instruments, and many other industries—and the workers in those industries are affected in exactly the same manner.

The wage-standard of living in these industries has been raised above the world

average through protection, and as a result the standard of living in such industries and the standard of living of the workingmen of America are far above the standard enjoyed in any other country.

Therefore, there are only a very few industries, and those only temporary, in my opinion, in which the workingmen of America can compete with the lower wage-living-standard countries of Asia, Europe, Africa, and South America in production.

First, it was generally considered that with our know-how and our up-to-date machinery, we could still compete with foreign cheap labor; that, however, is no longer true, because our machinery and assembly line methods, together with our trained superintendents and foremen are all available to their countries.

Money is fluid. It can and does go anywhere. Capital investment follows wherever the economic adjustment places the industry. When a tariff is removed or adjusted or in some manner the economics of the industry is changed and made more economically feasible in another country than it is here, it immediately locates there. That is simply business. No one is to blame but ourselves.

When we continually tinker with the tariff or import fee, which establishes the floor under wages for the workingmen of America, it is simply to give notice to the public that capital investment is no longer safe in that field, therefore, experience shows that no further capital investment will be attracted to that industry; simply because of the fear that when the investment had been made that Congress or the State Department would again remove the differential in cost of production which is represented by the tariff or import fee.

I am not discussing a high tariff or low tariff. I am referring to that differential in cost of production between producing an article in this country and in the low-wage foreign country, due mostly to the wages paid and the standard of living enjoyed by the workingmen of the competitive countries, as against the standard enjoyed in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the flexible import fee which I introduced in 1948 and again in 1949—and which I intend to offer this year as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—when that act comes before the Senate for the 3-year proposed extension simply is based on fair and reasonable competition. The fair and reasonable competition can easily be determined from the declared customs value and from the offered sale price.

It will take into account the manipulation of currency by the foreign nation for trade advantage—and also the block buying and selling that some foreign nations now are practicing—where they undersell in this country for dollars and then sell the dollars at a higher price in another country which in many cases makes up for more than the loss in the first instance. All of the foreign nations manipulations are rather complicated, but the flexible-import fee would automatically take all of such intrigue into account. I will go into it at the proper time on the Senate floor.

My second point is that it is practically impossible to get new capital investment into any industry where labor needs such protection when Congress is continually fiddling with the amount of such protection, on no principle whatever except whatever influence and whatever immediate shotgun opinion can be brought before the committee.

Capital is invested only where it has a reasonable chance for success and where there is no reasonable protection against the low-cost foreign labor, then little new capital investments will be found.

Mr. Chairman, those are my two main points in this particular instance.

I understand that since the Congress removed the tariff on copper early in 1947 for 2 years, and extended it again for 1 year in 1949, that the State Department has reduced the tariff to 2 cents through a trade agreement with Chile. The 4 cents of production—the differential of cost, import fee, or tariff or excise tax, whatever you choose to call it—has been reduced to 2 cents through the exercise of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act provisions.

The 2 cents of course is no protection at all. The floor under wages has been lowered so there is no recourse but the resulting unemployment and loss of taxable property.

It is a parallel case of the tungsten import fee—we had a 50 cents a pound tariff on contained tungsten for many years. Just prior to the war we were producing about 45 percent of the tungsten used in this country. Such import fee does not stop imports. What it does is bring them in on our level of costs and keeps our own people working on their standard of living.

So we were importing the required 55 percent. When they hit Pearl Harbor and cut off the Burma and China—the world supply—shipments, we raised the domestic price slightly and within about 6 months we were practically self-sufficient in the production of that metal.

I was special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee during the war, and very familiar with the operation. I was not in the Senate. The State Department lowered the tariff from 50 to 38 cents per pound of contained tungsten and almost immediately shut down every tungsten mine in America except three. Two of the remaining mines closed down very soon. There is one running now and it will probably be closed in a very short time. They are running on developed ore and will quit when it has been worked out.

I mention this as an illustration of interfering with that differential of cost due to the difference in the wage-standard of living, without proper information. A State Department official with whom I was discussing it informally said, "We didn't lower it very much. We only lowered it to 38 cents, lowered it 12 cents."

I said, "Yes, but you can take a blow torch and cut 2 feet off the Potomac River bridge. You wouldn't cut much off it but you wouldn't have a bridge left either—and you couldn't swim the river because it would block the channel."

That is what we have done to tungsten, and that is what you are doing to copper. All the independent copper mines are now closing because of removal of the 4-cent tariff, and the big operations are curtailing their work.

Inexperienced people juggling the tariff or import fees is just like a blacksmith working on a Swiss watch. This flexible import-fee legislation which I shall again propose would turn the Tariff Commission into a foreign trade authority and give them the same latitude in that field that we give the Interstate Commerce Commission in fixing the freight rates.

Mr. Chairman, if I might be allowed to round out this testimony with any facts I think might be helpful to the committee, I think that completes my statement. If there are any questions, I would be very glad to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. You may round out the statement if you wish to submit additional facts.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am including a table showing the world production, domestic production, the United States percent of world production, imports into the United States, United States exports, and the domestic consumption:

Amounts in short tons

	World production	Domestic mine production	United States percent of world production	Imports	Exports	Consumption
1940	3,000,000	878,086	30	491,342	427,650	1,008,785
1941	3,000,000	958,149	32	735,545	158,893	1,641,550
1942	3,100,000	1,080,061	35	764,393	210,518	1,678,091
1943	3,038,000	1,090,818	36	716,596	294,459	1,502,000
1944	2,843,000	972,549	34	785,211	237,515	1,504,000
1945	2,425,000	772,894	32	853,196	132,555	1,415,000
1946	2,023,000	608,737	30	393,275	97,475	1,391,000
1947 estimate	2,458,000	846,400	35	413,890	196,999	1,290,000
1948 estimate	2,400,000	834,813	35	466,112	146,000	1,202,000
1949		[1] 385,655		[1] 303,898	[1] 72,665	[2] 316,661

[1] 6 months.
[2] First quarter.

It will be noted that imports were not restricted or in any way retarded through the 4-cents-per-pound tariff which prevailed up to and including the year 1947—until removed by congressional act—but the 4-cent tariff representing the "floor under wages"—the differential of the cost of production in this country and where the competition is located, due mostly to the difference in the wage-living standards.

Wage comparisons

The following wage comparisons for skilled and semiskilled labor prevailing in several of the foreign nations and in the United States are self-explanatory:

Country	Group	Rate	Date
Sweden	All industrial groups—men	68.5 cents per hour	November 1948.
Canada	Manufacturing	95.9 cents per hour	December 1948.
Great Britain	Including Scotland. Average of 16 major industries—men.	59 cents per hour	October 1948.
Australia	All industrial groups except shipping and agriculture.	56 cents per hour	March 1948.
New Zealand	Skilled labor	72 cents per hour	September 1948.
Chile	Average industries	30 cents per hour	December 1948.
China (Shanghai)	Textiles, printing, machine making	5.26 cents per hour	August 1948.
India	General engineering	13 cents per hour	1946.
Iran (Tehran)	Plumber. Wage rates vary greatly, less than a dollar for unskilled workers up to $5 a day for highly skilled workers. Hours of work not available.	$1.50–$2 per day	September 1948.
Spain	Skilled single men	23 cents per hour	1947.
	Skilled married men with 3 children	40–45 cents per hour	
Burma	Information not available		
Iraq	do		
United States	Copper mines	$1.40 per hour	1947–48.

Prevailing tariffs on copper and brass products

There is a tariff on brass sheets, strips, rods, and plates of 4 cents per pound.

The tariff on the lipsticks which are often made of brass is 20 percent ad valorem.

Copper Ore and Fabricated Goods Tariffs

Copper acetate and subacetate (verdigris): Free plus 4 cents a pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper concentrates, for smelting or refining and export: Free.

Copper concentrates—product of Cuba: Free.

Copper concentrates (taxable: Free plus 4 cents a pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper, cuprous oxide; 35 percent ad valorem 3 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code)

Copper in rolls, sheets, or rods: 2½ cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper ore and concentrates—product of Philippine Islands: Free.

Copper ore, for smelting, or refining and export: Free.

Copper ore (taxable): 4 cents per pound on copper content.

Copper ore—product of Cuba: Free.

Copper, other than ore and concentrates—product of Philippine Islands: Free.

Copper oxides, n. e. s.: 25 percent ad valorem plus 3 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper, refined, in ingots, plates, or bars—for smelting or refining and exports: Free.

Copper, refined in ingots, plates, or bars (taxable): Free plus 4 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper sulfate (blue vitriol): Free plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper tubes, brazed: 11 cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper tubes and tubing, seamless: 7 cents per pound plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper, unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs, or converter bars—for smelting or refining and export: Free.

Copper, unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs, or converter bars, free for United States Government: Free.

Copper, unrefined black, blister, and converter, in pigs, or converter bars (taxable): Free plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Copper wire, not specially provided for: 25 percent plus 4 cents per pound on copper content (Internal Revenue Code).

Rates of duty applicable to manufacturers and fabricators of brass products

Tariff par.	Item	Rate of duty	
		Tariff Act of 1930	Current rate
346	Buckles (belt, trouser, waistcoat, shoe or slipper) and parts:		
	Valued not over 20 cents per 100	5 cents per 100 plus 20 per-cent.	Same.
	Valued over 20 cents, not over 50 cents per 100	10 cents per 100 plus 20 percent.	3½ cents per 100 plus 10 percent.
	Valued over 50 cents, not over $1.66⅔ per 100	15 cents per 100 plus 20 percent.	5 cents per 100 plus 20 percent.
1527	Earrings, bracelets, and other jewelry:		
	Valued over 20 cents, not over $5 per dozen pieces or parts	110 per-cent.	55 percent.
	Valued over $5 per dozen pieces or parts	---do---	Do.
1527	Watch chains	---do---	45, 55, or 65 percent.[1]
1541	Musical instruments: Brass winds, with cup mouthpieces	40 percent	$2 each, but not less than 20 percentnor more than 30 percent.
339	Table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow or flat ware (jardinieres, flowerpots, bowls, vases, book ends, trays, etc.).	---do---	15 percent.
397	Slide fasteners:		
	Valued at 4 cents or more each	45 percent	40 percent.
	Valued at less than 4 cents each	---do---	66 percent.
	Parts	---do---	Do.
397	Blowtorches and incandescent lamps operated by compressed air and kerosene or gasoline.	---do---	25 percent.
397	Manufactures of brass, not elsewhere shown:		
	Trouser and suspender clamps	---do---	45 percent.
	Perfume and other fancy bottle caps	---do---	Do.
	Bases for electric-lamp bulbs	---do---	Do.
	Electric fixtures	---do---	Do.
	Curtain rings	---do---	Do.
	Automobile key blanks	---do---	Do.
	Desk furnishings	---do---	Do.
	Printers' rules (column markings)	---do---	Do.
	Hardware	---do---	Do.
	Plumbing fixtures	---do---	Do.
	Other familiar, typical, and widely used articles	---do---	Do.

[1] Rate depends on value and type of chain.

Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that the brass manufacturers, the manufacturers of the fabricated articles made from the raw brass and copper are all supported by a substantial tariff or import fee. (The copper content of brass averages approximately 70 percent.)

The raw material—the copper which is the basic material used in the manufacture of such fabricated articles and products is on the free list—there is no floor under wages—so the workingmen in the industry must meet the foreign wages plus the freight to keep their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, copper is high on the list of strategic minerals and materials necessary in an emergency; it is high on the list for stock-piling purposes. National security is the paramount consideration, and it is well known and recognized that it is necessary to have a healthy "going concern" copper-mining industry in addition to a substantial stock pile to meet a real emergency.

The employment and taxable property furnished by this important industry is important to our national economy.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions for Senator MALONE?

Senator MILLIKIN. I might invite the Senator's attention to the fact that it is our trade agreement with Chile that rules the copper tariff, the 2-cent tariff, to which the Senator referred. The trade agreement with Chile was made at the conference in Geneva in 1947. That agreement, happily, contains an escape clause. If the President is of a mind to do so, if we should restore the tariff to 2 cents, the President would have it within his power to restore it to 4 cents.

Senator MALONE. I might say to the Senator from Colorado I appreciate the question, but there is no matter of record that I can find where the President has used the escape clause to restore anything that looks reasonable.

Senator MILLIKIN. I was not putting that out as an assurance, Senator. I was putting it out as a possibility.

Senator MALONE. I would take the entire matter of adjusting tariffs and import fees out of the President's hands, out of the State Department's field—and away from Congress—put it under the Tariff Commission—turned into a foreign trade authority—to be adjusted under the flexible import fee principle laid down by Congress—just as freight rates are adjusted under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We have transferred the copper jobs from the independent copper mines of America to Chile, South America, and Africa. We all know with $2 and $2.50 labor in Chile, they can produce copper much cheaper than we can here. They can add the freight to it and still the wages must be substantially lowered in this country to meet the low-wage living standard foreign competition.

I say again, if we could put the emphasis where it belongs, which I shall do on the floor of the Senate when the 1934 trade agreements come before us for the 3-year extension, we will understand that what we are doing is lowering the floor under wages—and destroying an important source of employment and taxable property.

What we do when we remove the import fee on copper or any other mineral, when we lower it on textiles, or precision instruments or any other industry, is to say to the workingmen of America that we are lowering the floor under wages.

When we lower the floor under wages, the workingmen must meet the labor in Chile, on copper for example, at $2.50 per day with the freight to America added and our people must work for the resulting wage or become unemployed. Take precision instruments. Competing countries are paying 8 to 10 or 12 cents an hour. We pay $1.80 to $2.40 here. They are transferring those copper jobs to Chile, the precision instrument jobs to Japan and Germany. If it were examined in that perspective, I do not think the people would let it be done.

It means that the people have their choice. They can come down to the $3.50 or $4 a day, or they can have mass unemployment. If they come to the $4, when they have been getting $11.17 a day in the copper mines, they cannot keep the kids in school or pay their taxes, and they cannot buy radios or keep carpets on the floors or live on any standard that befits the American workingman, so naturally we are going to have mass unemployment, and then the Congress will be passing bills appropriating money to relieve the unemployment.

Poem in Commemoration of Thirtieth Anniversary of the Steuben Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Steuben Society of America.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA, 1919–49

On Harlem's ancient battleground
Into a world by hatred torn,
Under a patriot's sturdy roof
Great Steuben's spirit was reborn.

Franz Koempel steeled our harried ranks
And marked the course to which we hew,
To ever honor Washington
And his most faithful comrade, too.

Defying insult, slander, threat,
We bent not knee, we lost not face,
And proudly reproclaimed our troth
To both—our country and our race.

The heirs of Steuben and of Schurz,
Like Concord's valiant men we stood;
Our fealty to the Stars and Stripes
Did not impugn our German blood.

We spent that blood in Freedom's wars;
Each gave his service, gave his mite;
Columbia, when she called on us,
Could count on every Steubenite!

We cling to Washington's Farewell
With wisdom wrought and courage rare;
Wherever Steubenites are met—
Benedict Arnold is not there.

We spat not on our father's graves
When a malignant spell was cast
Upon their land; but, come what may,
We are Columbia's first and last!

—*By Bertha Koempel.*

Statement on the Jerusalem Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the text of a statement on the Jerusalem issue which was signed by prominent Christian leaders and sent to President Truman, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The future of Jerusalem has been placed on the agenda of the United Nations by the recent report of the Palestine Conciliation Commission. To us as Christian ministers and laymen, the status of Jerusalem and its future are a source of anxiety. We therefore urge that the proposed solution of internationalization, while seemingly impelled by support of the principle of internationalism, be subjected to careful scrutiny in the light of the political and economic realities in Palestine today.

We are deeply concerned that the holy places be effectively safeguarded, an objective which is, without question, the goal of the United Nations Conciliation Commission. Each religious group—Christian, Moslem, and Jewish—must enjoy free access to its shrines in both the Arab-held old city of Jerusalem (in which practically all of the shrines and sacred sites are to be found) and in the Israel-held new city.

We share unreservedly the Conciliation Commission's concern for the sanctity of Jerusalem's holy places. We believe, however, that the plan the Commission has proposed is neither desirable nor practicable.

The peace of Zion, a concept so sacred to Christian tradition, cannot be erected upon the discontent and resentment of civilian populations who are averse to being governed by an international regime and are desirous of union with the national entities to which they, as Israelis and Arabs, rightfully belong. We are convinced that international comity cannot be brought about by invoking the panacea of internationalization when the region to be internationalized is not—geographically, economically, socially or politically—a workable unit.

International supervision of Jerusalem's holy places may be achieved without involving the United Nations in unworkable administrative and police responsibilites. A special United Nations Commission should be entrusted with the responsibility of guarding all shrines and holy places and guaranteeing worshipers free access to them. The administration of the secular areas—the shops and homes, the workaday cities proper—should, with justice, rest with the people of each city and the national states of which they are logically a part. Citizenship in the State of Israel is the inherent right of the Jews of Jerusalem.

As Christians, we have been particularly concerned with the relationship between the state of Israel and the Christian institutions and population of that part of the Holy Land under Israeli jurisdiction. We have closely followed the development of this relationship, and are convinced that the state and people of Israel would, in administering Jerusalem, abide by the principle of freedom of religion as formulated in the Israeli draft constitution, as repeatedly pledged by official spokesmen of the government, and as now practiced in the state of Israel.

The new city of Jerusalem is the natural and historic capital of the state of Israel. Its location militates against its use as an industrial center. Its past growth has, indeed, been due to the concentration of cultural and administrative functions within its boundaries.

The realization of the universal interest in Jerusalem and the fulfillment of the national aspirations of the people of Israel are in no way incompatible.

We trust that our Government, in the course of the discussions of this issue, will support a just and practical solution of the Jerusalem problem, based upon a clear-cut distinction between the temporal and eternal aspects of the question.

Such a solution will insure the peace of Zion.

INCOMPLETE LIST OF SIGNATORIES TO THE JERUSALEM STATEMENT SENT TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Dr. James Luther Adams, professor, University of Chicago.

Dean Alfange, attorney, New York City.

Dr. Paul R. Anderson, president, Pennsylvania College for Women.

Rev. W. Waldemar Argow, minister, Baltimore First Unitarian Church.

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary, Church Peace Union.

Dr. Habib Awad, American-Lebanese scholar.

Rev. Karl Baehr, executive secretary, American Christian Palestine Committee.

Dr. L. M. Birkhead, executive director, Friends of Democracy.

Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor, the Watchman-Examiner.

Dr. Dwight J. Bradley, psychological counselor and author.

Rev. Emory Stevens Bucke, editor, Zions Herald.

Dr. George Walker Buckner, editor, World Call.

Rev. Roger T. Burton, minister, Congregational Church, Irvington, N. J.

Rev. Charles H. Campbell, minister, Reformed Church, Flushing, N. Y.

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky, minister, Third Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. Dr. Henry H. Crane, minister, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Bartley C. Crum, New York attorney and former member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

Bishop Ralph S. Cushman, St. Paul Conference Methodist Church.

Marshal N. Dana, editor, Oregon Journal.

The Very Reverend Raimundo de Ovies, dean emeritus, Cathedral of St. Philip, Atlanta, Ga.

Judge James W. Donoghue, municipal court, Bronx, N. Y.

Rev. Amos I. Dushaw, Presbyterian clergyman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dr. William W. Edel, president, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

Mrs. Louise Sammons Freese, journalist, Sioux City Journal-Tribune.

Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, minister, First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. Jesse Halsey, professor, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Dr. Georgia E. Harkness, professor, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, professor, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Rev. Ladislaus Harsanyi, minister, First Magyar Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Dr. Joseph C. Hazen, secretary, Northern Baptist Convention.

Hon. Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts Congressman.

Gen. John Hilldring, United States Army (retired), of Washington, D. C.

Dr. Fred G. Holloway, president, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, pastor, Community Church, New York City.

Judge George E. Holt, circuit judge of the eleventh judicial district.

Dr. Robert M. Hopkins, secretary, National Stewardship Institute.

Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, president, New School for Social Research, New York City.

Rev. David R. Hunter, religious educator, director of Protestant Episcopal Diocese, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, president, Worldover Press, Bronxville, N. Y.

Spencer D. Irwin, associate editor, Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Dr. Theodore R. Jackman, Biblical archeologist, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rev. Dr. John Paul Jones, minister, Union Church of Bay Ridge, N. Y.

Dr. Frederick D. Kershner, dean emeritus, school of religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. John A. Lapp, educator, Chicago.

Dr. Howard M. LeSourd, dean of school of public relations, Boston University.

Rev. Donald G. Lothrop, minister, Community Church Center, Boston, Mass.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Methodist Church, Lucasville, Ohio.
Dr. Oscar E. Maurer, former moderator, Congregational Christian Churches.
Dr. F. F. Moore, president, Rider College, Trenton, N. J.
Bishop Arthur W. Moulton, Episcopal diocese, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Edgar Ansel Mowrer, journalist and author.
Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of applied Christianity, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
Robert Norton, director, League for Fair Play.
Rev. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, minister, First Unitarian Society, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Wendell Phillips, minister, Christ Church, Rye, N. Y.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, Christian Herald.
Dr. Thomas Clark Pollock, dean, Washington Square College of New York University.
Rev. Ralph Read, minister, Community Church, Maplewood, N. J.
Rev. Herman F. Reissig, secretary, international relations department, Council for Social Action.
Dr. Ralph Riley, president, American Baptist Theological Seminary, Nashville, Tenn.
Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, president, Meadville Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Arthur A. Rouner, minister, Cadman Memorial Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Robert St. John, foreign correspondent and author.
Rev. Arthur A. Schade, field secretary, South Dakota Council of Churches.
Rev. Waitstill H. Sharp, secretary, Chicago Council Against Discrimination.
Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, editor, Churchman.
Dean Claud W. Sprouse, president of board of deputies, Protestant Episcopal Churches in the United States.
Dr. Russell Henry Stafford, president, Hartford Seminary Foundation.
Dr. A. H. M. Stonecipher, dean, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.
Judge Frederick L. Strong, magistrates court, New York City.
Ted O. Thackrey, editor, the Compass, New York City.
Dr. J. S. Ladd Thomas, dean, School of Theology, Temple University.
Dr. Paul Tillich, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
Rev. Dr. Earl Hollier Tomlin, executive secretary, Rhode Island Council of Churches.
Dr. Harry Trust, president, Bangor Theological Seminary.
Dr. Charles J. Turck, president, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
Rev. Frank M. Vanderhoof, minister, Presbyterian Church, New York City.
Pierre Van Paassen, journalist and author.
Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, chairman, executive council of the American Christian Palestine Committee.
Rev. Dr. Howard B. Warren, minister, South Norwalk Methodist Church.
Rev. Hugh Weston, minister, First Unitarian Church, Natick, Mass.
Rt. Rev. John S. White, retired bishop of Springfield, Ill.
Dr. Henry N. Wieman, professor, University of Oregon.
Dr. Clair S. Wightman, president, State Teachers College, Paterson, N. J.
Dr. Alan S. Wilson, president, Hillyer College, Hartford, Conn.
Rear Adm. P. D. Workman, United States Navy (retired).
Dr. Harry N. Wright, president, College of the City of New York.
Gov. Luther W. Youngdahl, of Minnesota.

Address of Hon. George W. Malone, of Nevada, Before the Young Republican National Convention, Salt Lake City, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the Young Republican National Convention in Salt Lake City, Utah, on June 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is m· firm conviction that the future of this country now depends on the vision, courage, and common sense of the Young Republicans.

This is a grave responsibility; and as you consider the political and social maladjustments all around you, you may wonder how any group of any age can be expected to bring order out of the current chaos. But mistakes in the immediate past, mistakes now in the making, and the threat of your own security are guides that will show you the way.

You are the hope of this country, because the Democrats are committed to the ruinous combination of national and international programs—and unfortunately our regular Republican organization has been trailing in their footsteps for 17 long years.

PROFIT BY MISTAKES

You have a tremendous advantage over some of your predecessors. You can profit by their mistakes. You can see that their ill-advised tendency to be "me tooers" and camp followers of administration policies has already plunged this country into a dangerous national and international situation. You know that a reversal of those policies must be brought about at once in order to ward off a depression that could easily result in submerging our country beneath the rising tide of global socialism before it ran its course.

THERE IS STILL TIME TO SAVE ECONOMY

There is still time to reverse those policies. There is still time to stop that rising tide. There is still time to separate our national from our international policy and to establish a national and international program that will salvage the economic security of this country and make of it an example and a beacon light to other nations struggling toward the same goal.

One of the great fallacies of the current administration policies is the State Department's selective free-trade program based upon the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, where they deliberately encourage the imports of the products of cheap foreign labor on the theory that the more they divide the markets of this country with the European and Asiatic countries the less their annual trade-balance deficits will be.

TRANSFER OF AMERICAN JOBS TO FOREIGN SOIL

This short-sighted attempt to divide the source of our income—the American markets—with the nations of the world simply results in the transfer of American jobs and industry to foreign soil.

When, as a matter of fact, we divide the markets of this Nation equally among the nations of the world—we have roughly 7 percent of the more than 2,000,000,000 people of the earth—it would be like averaging the water in your water glass with the water in the city reservoir—you can empty your glass of water in the reservoir and your glass will be empty, but the water level in the reservoir will not be affected very much.

Already, its effects are ominous. Already, we are hearing gloomy forecasts of a business recession and fear of large-scale unemployment in this country, and of threatened devaluation of the British pound and dollar shortage abroad. It is unfortunate that the separation of these items in the news makes them appear as separate problems. Actually, they are only different aspects of the same problem.

EVERY NATION AFTER AMERICAN MARKET

They all revolve around the American market, which is the one market in the world every nation would like to have * * * the one market in the world which must remain the American market.

THREE-PART FREE-TRADE PROGRAM

I have coined a phrase to describe this combined national and international policy which the administration is pleased to publicize as its program for world recovery.

I have named it on the Senate floor—the three-part free-trade program, which includes:

1. Appropriations from American pocketbooks to make up, in cash, the trade-balance deficits of European nations each year. This is currently called the ECA—our chief export is cash.

2. Proposed 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. This is being poured down our throats as the reciprocal trade dosage, even though the phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

3. Proposed adoption of the International Trade Organization, which would include 58 nations, each with one vote (we would have the same vote as Siam) to which we would assign our rights to fix tariffs and import fees and they would meet annually to distribute the markets equally among the nations of the world.

TRADE-BALANCE DEFICITS AND $41,000,000,000

Since the end of the war, under the guise of making up trade-balance deficits, we have fed into the bottomless maw of Europe and Asia, the fantastic sum of $41,000,000,000. That is $5,000,000,000 more than the combined assessed evaluation of the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington, and the 14 Southern States, including Texas; in other words, the combined assets of 60 percent of the area of the United States. But that $41,000,000,000 is only the beginning of a program which has been whipped up piece by piece to meet the recurring so-called world emergencies.

But where is this program leading us?

FREE TRADE—LOW-WAGE FOREIGN LABOR—AMERICAN LIVING STANDARD

It is leading us into a position in which ECA-subsidized foreign factories already are underselling us in our home market. Unless we call a halt to the entire three-point free-trade policy, the products of the low-living standard European and Asiatic countries will drive the living standard of American workingmen down to their own and bring about permanent mass unemployment in this country.

The entire picture of supply and demand has changed radically in recent months. United States imports on the whole have not increased. Now foreign industries are

fighting for a share of the shriveled demand. A seemingly endless number of our own industries, therefore, are feeling the pinch of foreign competition built up by ECA appropriations.

California fruit growers are bothered about Italian competition. Florida merchants are worried about Mexican tomatoes, Italian sponges, and Chinese tung oil. New England textile mills are competing with British woolens, and New England fishermen are complaining about the import of fish from Iceland, Newfoundland, and Canada. Canadian beef and veal are making inroads into markets of our northwestern packers, and our dairy men are hurt by imports of New Zealand butter. Independent oil producers in this country want curbs on petroleum imports, and our watchmakers complain about imports from Switzerland. Chinaware and glassware producers fear Japanese and Czechoslovak competition.

In the Western States most of our copper and other mineral mines are closed. In New England the woolen mills and shoe factories are operating on part-time basis. All over the country business and industry seem to be in a spiral of retrenchment.

It is high time we throw away the administration's "soothing sirup"—analyze the symptoms of this contagious disease and work toward a real cure.

THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE BILL

Recently, I introduced a Senate bill with the sole aim of restoring fair and reasonable competition between foreign products and our own, and I intend to offer it as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when it comes before the Senate for a 3-year extension. This bill proposes that we adopt a flexible import fee system to establish the market for the goods of foreign nations on a definite basis of bringing such goods in on our basis of costs. Such a measure would maintain our standard of living—would place a floor under the wages of our workers while we are assisting other nations in raising their own living standards.

When all nations achieve a level whereby production is based on a wage living standard as high as our own—then under the flexible import fee system we would automatically have free trade.

WRECKING OF AMERICAN JOBS AND INDUSTRY CAN BE HALTED

It is within your power to bring a halt to the systematic destruction of job opportunity which is now taking place for the American workingman. It is within your power to preserve our high standard of living and bring a halt to a systematic campaign that is now squandering our wealth in exchange for world poverty. It is within your power to release the workingman of other countries from virtual serfdom. It is even within the power of the Young Republicans to put a Republican in the White House in 1952 and I challenge you to do it because you can do it.

KARL MARX AND FREE TRADE

We say we are fighting Communists—let us look at the record. Karl Marx, the greatest Communist of them all, said on January 9, 1948:

"But generally speaking the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free-trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND DANGER TO AMERICA

Abraham Lincoln once said in speaking of the safety of this Nation:

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us, it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide. I say that if America is ever to be destroyed it will be an inside job."

The three-part free-trade program will destroy America through the destruction of our economic stability and through industrial and business failures, and there can be no permanent recovery because we have divided the source of our income.

It is an inside job—just as Lincoln indicated it must be.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND FREE TRADE

Abraham Lincoln made some further observations on foreign trade that are as sound today as when they were made. It will be remembered that he said, in effect, on one occasion when the matter of import fees versus the free-trade principle was under discussion that "When we buy goods within our country, we have both the money and the goods; when we buy from foreign countries we have the goods and they have the money."

Were he alive today, he probably would add that when we give money to foreign governments to buy goods in countries other than the United States, we have neither the money nor the goods, but probably a good measure of hate for our industry and ability that put us in so favorable a position.

The Lincoln principle is still sound, and we must not confuse the assistance we are rendering other nations with any profit that we might secure for ourselves.

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

Soon, if these policies are not curbed, you are going to find other industries shut down or severely curtailed just as the copper industry was shut down, just as the textile industry, the oil industry, the precision-instrument industry, and hundreds of other American industries are now feeling the pinch of the administration's free-trade policies.

The administration meanwhile proposes to guarantee American investors against loss if they will erect their factories in foreign lands. That is the "bold new program"—to shift American jobs to foreign soil.

"The bold new program", proposing as it does, to only guarantee the investments of our industrialists who build factories and mines in foreign countries to serve the markets in such areas, and through the free-trade program, utilizing the low-cost foreign labor, proposes to displace American jobs.

Does this mean, the American citizen one of these days will have to face the choice of moving to Britain to make stockings, to Czechoslovakia to make shoes, or to France to raise wheat—or stay in America and live upon the charity of his fellow man? But that day is coming if these policies are not changed.

It is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon the workingmen of America and is a fitting climax to the three-part free-trade program which has started the Nation on the downward economic cycle.

GREATEST ECONOMIC PUSHING AROUND

An observer of the actions and maneuvers of the principal beneficiary nations under the ECA—the Marshall plan—and the effects of the trade agreements—can lead to only one conclusion, that the United States of America is getting the greatest economic pushing around that any major nation ever received in 2,000 years of recorded history and paying the bill ourselves.

THE YOUNG REPUBLICANS AND ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

The administration has no definite national and international policies as such, but has adopted the hybrid, three-part proposal that points to a one-world government in which American principles will be entirely missing, which will tend to average standards of living throughout the world and can only result in a substantial lowering of our own.

We can blindly fall in with that so-called policy, lose our own identity at once, and become bipartisan pawns to an administration which is taking its pattern from Europe, or we can clarify our principles at once and stop the rising tide of world economic socialism on our own shores.

AN AMERICAN POLICY

The problem is not so difficult and complicated as the administration's propaganda machine would have us believe. It can be approached through a workable American policy which will protect our economy both on the domestic and foreign front.

As I see it, this American policy must include a separate national and international policy:

NATIONAL POLICY

1. A flexible import-fee system to maintain our high standard of living while we help other nations to raise their own. Such a system is the only logical substitute for the administration's three-part free-trade program, which gives American workingmen the lip service of promised labor legislation, and then plunges them into direct competition with the low-wage living standard slave labor of Europe and Asia.

I will offer the flexible import fee bill which I have already introduced in the United States Senate as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—when that act comes before the Senate for the 3-year extension. Under the flexible import fee the peril point automatically becomes the tariff or import fee.

2. Adoption of the parity principle for the production of raw materials.

3. The rebuilding of our national defense organization to the point that it can protect us against any overt gesture from governmental systems that seek to penetrate either our territory or those countries whose integrity is important to our ultimate peace and safety. Such a defense organization should be spearheaded by an air corps prepared to keep any possible enemy grounded in any emergency.

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

1. An extension of the Monroe Doctrine, or open-door policy, to embrace all nations in Europe and Asia, whose cooperation and integrity we consider necessary to our own peace and safety. Such a measure would be a continual and effective warning to all empire-minded nations which might seek to extend their governmental systems into such areas, just as the Monroe Doctrine has served as a warning to the European empire-minded nations for 125 years that we would consider any effort to extend their system to the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

2. We are the sole judge, then, of when our own peace and safety is threatened, and we would feed emergency-hungry peoples of other countries, to the extent of our ability, without endangering the welfare of our own people. We cannot feed all of the hungry people in the world—since in some areas they have been hungry for 2,000 years, and our economy could not stand the strain.

3. Lend money to private industry of needy foreign countries on a business basis. This measure could be handled in much the same way that RFC loans are made to industries that need emergency rehabilitation in our own country through the World Bank, to gradually build up their standard of living to increase efficiency and production.

4. We should condition any further aid to the European nations upon:

a. Complete and free convertibility of their currencies in terms of the dollar.

b. A United States of Europe—including Germany—without trade restriction of any kind between them.

c. Equal access to the trade of the nations of the world subject only to action of such individual nations.

A POSITIVE AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM

The Republican Party must offer the country a positive program to protect the workingmen of this Nation—while we are assisting the nations of the world, on a business basis, to raise their own living standards.

This could be a long pull since it must be remembered that many of the Asiatic and European countries have had access to all of the raw materials now available to us for 2,000 years of recorded history and have not perceptibly raised their standard of living during that time, while we have done the job in a comparatively few generations.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the protector of the living standards of the workingmen of America and the creator of legitimate employment and taxable property in the Nation. They have followed the policy of keeping a floor under wages through a tariff or import fee roughly equal to the difference in living standards for more than 80 years.

INTEGRITY OF PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

We have lived off of our fat for 16 years—now all of the European nations are included in our budget—the President has now suggested that we guarantee foreign business investments.

All that is necessary is for such foreign nations to turn honest and protect the integrity of private investments and they will not need gift-loans from our country; businessmen will take the business risk in any country in the world, but they cannot take the risk of a nationalizing or confiscation of their capital.

I suggest that this Young Republican national convention break the trail for the Nation.

The American people are ready for an American national and international policy.

Expellees Present Serious Social Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, and of the people of the United States, the tragic plight of the German expellees. There are nearly 13,000,000 of these unfortunate people in the western zone of Germany. They are not recognized as Germans, or as nationals of their country of birth, or as displaced persons. They are at present living in Germany, but their status is confused and their future uncertain.

The expellees include members of six separate groups: First are the so-called ethnic Germans, the volksdeutsche, whose ancestors migrated years ago from Germany to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania. They were born in those countries and held and exercised full rights of citizenship in them; their only connection with Germany being one of language, and, in some cases, of culture. The second group were ethnic Germans formerly located in the Baltic States and Russia. Third, were the Germans from those northeastern German provinces now undern Russian and Polish domination, expelled from that area. A fourth group includes returning prisoners of war whose homes were in the northeastern provinces, or were destroyed. The fifth group are known as the IBC's, for illegal border crosses, refugees from the Russian zone who have fled for political, economic, or family reasons. The sixth group comprises a miscellaneous group who do not fit into any other category; they are not German nationals and they are not legally displaced persons.

These people are truly men without a country—and women and children, too. They are not subject to the care or the rulings of the International Refugee Organization. Many of them are young people separated from their families, without education or vocational training. Many of them are ill or disabled. Most of them were expelled from their countries of origin, either driven from Germany's enemy countries back to Germany before and during the war, or driven out of the former eastern German provinces at the end of the war by the Poles and Russians. Others fled voluntarily but in fear of their lives. Included among them are many families of soldiers loyal to the allied cause, who lost their lives fighting against Hitler.

Today these people are crowded together in temporary or permanent camps or with rural families. Their care is a heavy charge upon the local areas receiving them and there is frequently no employment for those able to work. There is no adequate provision for educating and training the children.

In Schleswig-Holstein the expellees represent one-third of the total population of the province. Lower Saxony and Bavaria have over a million and a half each, over 20 percent of their total population. And many other provinces are trying in vain to cope with the problem of the expellees, on top of all the other difficulties they face. It is an impossibly heavy burden for the local governments and inhabitants to shoulder, and the miracle is that they have been able to manage at all, not that they have failed to manage better.

The biggest human problem in Europe today is the problem of these expellees. Discontented and unassimilated, ill-housed, ill-fed, and unemployed, they form a terrible breeding ground for a new totalitarian movement. The Germany of today cannot absorb them, unless we reverse some of our economic policies and encourage the reestablishment of industries to put people to work. They will not be permitted to apply for entry into the United States under the displaced persons law, as they are not considered bona fide displaced persons. They have been sent into rural areas, regardless of employment opportunities, because the cities where they might find work suited to their skills have no room for them.

The situation among the children is the worst, in terms of the future. One-fourth of the expellees are under 14 years of age. Hundreds of thousands more are between 14 and 20. Many of them have received little or no education as their wandering lives have made it impossible. Like the gangs of wild boys in Germany after the last war, they will form gangs of lawless delinquents if they are not given hope, and training.

When I was in Germany in September I discussed this problem with officials of the International Refugee Organization, who were well aware of its dangers, but are forbidden to do anything about it. Preliminary reports from the immigration subcommittee headed by Representative FRANCIS WALTERS, which investigated this problem during August and September, indicate that they are rounding up important facts and will suggest a program of action.

Meanwhile several immediate steps suggest themselves to us to help solve this great human problem. The first is an immediate moratorium on the dismantling of German industry and lifting of restrictions so that those industries which can have no military significance may resume work, offering needed employment and providing needed goods.

Marshall-plan funds should be directed to provide machinery and raw materials to help German industry get under way. Particular emphasis should be placed on public works, and the production of food, clothing, and shelter for the expellees themselves, and the remainder of the German people who need them.

Serious consideration should be given to amending the DP Act to permit inclusion of the expellees under the nonquota status of the act. Most of these people would make desirable citizens and would be readily assimilated in this country, where their skills would find employment.

American Municipal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the American Municipal Association weekly Washington News Letter.

The American Municipal Association is the national federation of 10,000 cities, towns, and villages all over America and is the national spokesman of American municipalities. A number of important actions by the Eighty-first Congress in its first session were in line with the national policies adopted by the municipalities.

The association's Washington News Letter is read by thousands of municipal officials and by many Members of Congress and is as follows:

THE FIRST SESSION

The national municipal policies adopted by representatives of the 10,000 municipalities in AMA and the State leagues of municipalities showed their effectiveness in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Several points in the AMA program were spectacularly achieved. The policies were successfully implemented in some of the Federal bureaus and departments. All in all, the municipalities had a good congressional year in Washington.

Frequent references by Senators and Representatives to AMA policies and to the AMA program on legislative proposals indicated increasing recognition of the fact that AMA is the authorized and qualified spokesman of the Nation's municipalities. Congress showed appreciation of the significance of the new unity of purpose of the towns and cities. Through AMA the municipalities are working toward common goals mutually agreed upon in advance.

Every Member of Congress had an opportunity to read the statements of AMA's policies—published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Hundreds of Representatives and Senators were contacted in some fashion, either in their offices by AMA staff members, by letters or telegrams from individual cities with reference to legislation in which the cities had a national municipal policy interest, by municipal officials or the executive director testifying at hearings on many occasions, by communications from the several hundred members of AMA's national legislative committee, or in other ways.

AMA's prestige nationally and at Washington reached the highest level in the Association's 25-year history.

MAJOR GOALS

During the first session AMA concentrated its fire on four major legislative objectives. These were social security for municipal employees; reallocating government responsibilities and revenue resources among the various levels; payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities on Federal properties; and the housing bill, which was enacted. This is one down and three to go on the major national legislative aims.

HOUSING

Probably the principal accomplishment in the first session from the municipal point of view was enactment of the United States Housing Act of 1949, better known as the Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment Act. The legislation was vigorously supported by AMA because the municipalities wanted it—by testimony of witnesses at committee hearings, by communications from many city officials, by joint petitions, and in other ways, in line with AMA policies on low-rent housing and urban redevelopment issues. Sponsors of the bill said it could not have been enacted without the activities of the association and the member municipalities.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Progress on social security was considerable. A bill passed last year by the House discriminated against small towns by denying coverage to some of their workers and prohibited coverage of municipal employees who are under an existing state or local retirement system. AMA opposed the bill, and the Senate Finance Committee refused to consider it.

The social security bill passed last month by the House is consistent with practically all the recommendations of the American Municipal Association. If the States permit, it will extend social security's old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits to all municipal employees who are now without pension protection or who want the coverage. It fails, however, to give the power of option to the municipal governments, giving the decision instead to the State legislature.

AMA is the only organization of public agencies or officials who supported and testified for social security for the municipal worker. AMA's effort will continue in the coming session when the bill goes before the Senate Finance Committee for rewriting, and later before the Senate.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL PROBLEMS

More was accomplished this year toward solving the knotty problems of intergovernmental tax conflicts than during all previous years. In April the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and their assistants representing the top side of the Federal Government's fiscal policy officials, joined with the presidents and executive directors of the major organizations of the State and local governments in the first high-level discussions of the possibilities of equating the tax sources among the levels of government. AMA's president and executive director represented the member municipalities at this important 3-day conference at Washington. The discussions were first proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury at AMA's annual conference last year.

Agreements reached at the April meeting have been published and are well known. Comprehensive studies were planned to form the basis of future discussions. Particularly significant was a better understanding demonstrated by the Federal officials of the problems engendered in municipalities by the acquisition of property values by the Federal Government and removal of these values from the local tax rolls.

NATIONAL COMMISSION

A broadened recognition of the intergovernmental tax conflicts produced important though inconclusive results in Congress. For many years AMA has urged Congress to take the necessary steps toward withdrawing the United States from certain fields of taxation in favor of the municipalities. This year a measure sponsored by 29 Senators, and also introduced in the House, was approved by the Senate Expenditures Committee. At the close of the session it was on the Senate calendar with committee approval.

The bill would establish a commission of Federal officials at the Cabinet level and of Members of Congress and representatives of the State, county, and municipal governments, to examine the responsibilities and the tax powers and policies of the units at the various levels and to recommend revisions. The bill had sufficient opposition to prevent approval by the Senate on the unanimous-consent calendar (without long debate). Treasury Department spokesmen indicate a preference for dealing with the parts of the intergovernmental fiscal problems in their order of urgency, rather than attacking the situation comprehensively through a congressionally created committee.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU

The sufferings of a number of municipalities because of the large volume of tax-exempt federally owned real estate in the communities is evidence of the existence of inequitable fiscal relationships between the Federal Government and the communities. It is not fair that the taxpayers of a relatively small number of municipalities and counties should bear the burden of cost of local government services to Federal installations serving all the Nation. The United States Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget appear to regard Federal tax exemption as the intergovernmental fiscal problem which is nearest to solution. Congress shows considerable interest in the matter.

AMA has been at work on the pay-in-lieu issue for 12 years, and each year's acquisitions of property by the Federal Government have compounded the injustice to the municipalities. After having gone through scores of hearings where witnesses for AMA and the affected municipalities have stated their case, there is at least a favorable prospect. The House Public Lands Committee gives promise of approving next year a pay-in-lieu-of-tax bill to provide payments equal to full taxes on virtually all Federal real properties, with the exception of properties used for specified Federal purposes such as post offices, customs houses, national cemeteries, and perhaps a few more, and with the further exception of Federal properties of classes which would be exempt if privately owned. The bill now before the House committee proposes to require reductions in the payments in proportion to benefits conferred on the community by the Federal installation—an unsound idea which few if any municipalities can be expected to endorse.

The Bureau of the Budget is preparing a pay-in-lieu bill for the administration. It has a staff of experts studying the millions of words of testimony taken by House and Senate committees in the past, and assembling new data, some of which are being supplied by AMA and the municipalities.

SLEEPERS

AMA's work at Washington involves much more than promoting three or four municipal legislative items. It is on guard constantly, watching for sleepers in congressional actions that might be inimical to the municipalities. AMA keeps track of the progress of every bill that could possibly affect municipal governments, and reports all congressional developments each week in the News Letter. In addition, as occasion requires, it communicates directly and quickly with the State leagues of municipalities and the member cities.

An example was a provision in the first version of this year's slum clearance and urban redevelopment bill. A paragraph inserted at the last minute before the bill's introduction removed the exemption of public-housing bonds from Federal income taxation. A prompt mustering of expressions of municipal opinion inspired the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees to revise the bills in their early stages by striking out the offending provision. AMA's work meant that when the bills reached debate the exemption-removal amendments proposed by the opponents were quickly and effectively disposed of. Finally, all of AMA's recommendations relative to the urban redevelopment and slum clearance legislation were enacted.

HOUSING PAYMENTS

Near the end of the session the ban on low-rent housing project payments in lieu of taxes was repealed by the Congress. In fiscal 1948 and 1949, and again for fiscal 1950, Congress voted to hold the payments down to the terms of agreements in original public housing contracts between the various municipalities and the Public Housing Administration. This meant about 100 municipalities would continue to receive no payments at all, and others would receive various amounts up to 5 percent. The United States Housing Act of 1949 authorized payments at 10 percent for fiscal 1950 (the rate paid prior to 1948) and also authorized payments retroactively up to 5 percent for fiscal 1948 and 1949. Municipal action was largely responsible for the 10-percent level in the United States Housing Act, and AMA and the cities gave Congress the information which led to repeal of the 1950 ban. Thus this national municipal goal was achieved. The municipalities will receive the payments promised in the United States Housing Act.

OTHER HOUSING ITEMS

AMA also urged that disposition of temporary war housing not be undertaken except

after mutual understanding between municipal and Federal officials, and that none of the temporary housing be sold to private interests. This formal policy of AMA is also the Federal policy, and has been carried out.

Two years ago, AMA urged that temporary war housing transferred conditionally to municipalities for reuse by veterans be given to the municipalities on a fee-simple basis. This was accomplished this year by congressional action.

AMA has urged that other temporary war housing be granted to the municipalities. The House this year refused to act on legislation providing for the transfer to the municipalities. A Senate committee approved a bill authorizing the grants, but the House refused to act on somewhat similar legislation. A new bill covering disposal of temporary and permanent war housing will be introduced next year.

AIRPORTS

A number of other bills which progressed in Congress this year fell within the frame of AMA's national municipal policy interests.

AMA renewed its opposition to the proposal that Federal airport aid be granted exclusively to State agencies for grants by the State to municipalities. The municipalities' opposition is responsible for the lack of progress of legislation to require State channeling of the funds.

Several bills to perfect and liberalize the Federal-aid airport program were supported by AMA. New laws permit a 10-percent increase in amounts of Federal aid, permit a 75 percent Federal share of the cost of airport lighting, and remove projects under $2,000 from minimum-wage specifications. Another permits industrial use of airport properties transferred as surplus by the United States to municipalities. AMA is supporting legislation to permit reapportionment of funds which have not been matched.

AMA's active opposition to the practice of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit exclusive gasoline and oil sales franchises resulted this year in repeal by CAA of its nonexclusive contract requirements on Federal-aid municipal airports. AMA acted on a policy laid down by the 1948 conference. As a matter of continuing policy, AMA urged Congress to continue Federal financing and operation of airport control towers; and this was done.

PUBLIC WORKS

Several actions in the public-works field had municipal-interest and AMA-policy support.

AMA requested an extension of time during which planning projects could receive public-works planning advances from the United States under the original planning-advances program. Congress voted a 1-year extension. Of more interest to a number of municipalities, Congress also enacted an extensive new program of public-works planning advances and provided $25,000,000 for advances this fiscal year. The legislation was supported by a number of State leagues of municipalities and by many cities, though it was not a part of the national municipal program.

Twice as much Federal aid for hospital construction by municipalities in the next 5 years, at a somewhat larger Federal share for most projects, was authorized in a new enactment. Many cities wanted the new legislation.

Only $200,000 was voted for sewage-plant planning grants to municipalities, and no funds for construction loans were provided, despite scattered municipal efforts to get the water-pollution control program under way this year.

CIVIL DEFENSE

With reference to the national municipal policy on civil defense, AMA staff personnel conferred frequently during the year with officials of the National Security Resources Board, the National Military Establishment, and the General Services Administration. Though very little of the Federal activity in this field could be divulged because of security restrictions, AMA was selected by NSRB as a channel of information to the municipalities.

Legislation providing loans and grants to develop local disaster relief organizations was sponsored by 42 Senators. The administration decided not to push it until next session, when probably some amendments will be offered.

TIDELANDS

An AMA policy decision last year was to urge Congress to correct injustices arising from the Supreme Court decision in the tidelands case. House and Senate Committee hearings on the various tidelands bills were conducted during the year.

EDUCATION

AMA's executive committee endorsed the principle of Federal aid for construction of school buildings in areas where the State or local governments cannot meet the needs. A bill for this purpose passed the Senate last week. Neither the AMA conference nor the executive committee endorsed the proposed program of Federal aid for school operations.

TAXES

Another resolution of last year called for reduction of Federal admissions taxes and release of this source of revenue for State and local governmental use. The matter was discussed at length at the conference with the Secretary of the Treasury in April. Several State leagues of municipalities adopted resolutions along similar lines.

Another AMA policy is to urge reasonable contributions of Federal and State highway user revenues for municipal streets. The question of Federal revenue for road and street construction in municipalities was not before Congress this session, but will be considered next year when the national-highway program is extended or revised.

WITH THE BUREAUS

A good example of AMA's accomplishments in the Federal bureaus and departments was the success in obtaining repeal of CAA's ban on nonexclusive gasoline sales contracts. The outstanding effort was with the top Federal fiscal officials best exemplified by the meeting with the Secretary of the Treasury in April. In addition, working closely with the Housing and Home Finance Agency AMA surveyed the municipalities over 25,000 to discover their plans to apply for loans and grants under the United States Housing Act of 1949. The HHFA budget was based to some extent upon the findings. Throughout the year AMA's Washington staff has been in contact with all Federal agencies which operate in the field of municipal interest. AMA was the center of information on rent decontrol actions by municipalities under the United States Housing and Rent Act of 1949. It kept track of such things as municipal claims for Federal damages to municipal airports, applications for loans and subsidies under the low-rent housing program, progress of the program of Federal aid for hospital construction, and the figures on local unemployment. It supplied copies of revised regulations, such as those assigning radio frequencies for fire, police, and highway departments. At the same time the Washington office serviced hundreds of inquiries from the State leagues of municipalities and individual cities, supplying copies of many bills, committee reports, and new laws, as well as agency regulations. AMA's special reports on specific bills or groups of bills under one subject were requested by many readers of the News Letter.

Monsignor Swanstrom Relates Tragic Plight of Expellees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there is no more tragic human problem in the world today than that of the seven to eight million refugees in Western Germany, sometimes called expellees, and also referred to as volksdeutsche. Msgr. Edward Swanstrom, executive director of war relief services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, recently returned from an inspection trip of relief installation in Europe and has written an interesting series of articles dealing with the problems posed by the expellees. I have found these articles so interesting that I am inserting some excerpts from them in the RECORD:

As a result of a special agreement reached at Potsdam, the Germanic groups living in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, were to be sent back within the borders of Germany in an orderly and humane manner. The Allies only took responsibility for the expulsion. German welfare organizations, both public and private, were to take care of all housing, food and other needs of the expellees. German authorities were told to expect an influx of 6,000,000 people.

However, the idea of mass expulsion was catching. Before long, Yugoslav citizens who had settled in certain sections by special invitation more than 300 years before, were gathered into camps or driven across the border into Austria. Native Germans living in East Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia were also driven from their homes, while those who had fled before the armies in what they thought was a temporary exodus, were forbidden to return to their businesses, homes, and well-kept farms.

With its welfare set-up weakened, without adequate resources, its housing already 40 percent damaged or destroyed, all social life in chaos, rump Germany accepted a flood of 12,000,000 men, women, and children. They were destitute, carrying with them hardly more than the clothes on their backs.

These new refugees are known as the expellee group. Their problems are not as well-known as those of that other homeless, exiled group, the displaced persons. DP's rightly became the concern of the Allied Nations and are being resettled under the direction of IRO (International Refugee Organization).

At this moment, about 600,000 DP's remain out of the 1,500,000 which UNRRA took over after the war. Donations of United States Catholics to the bishops' leatare Sunday collections have made it possible to approach a solution of the DP problem.

No international agency has protected the millions of expellees. No group of governments has banded together to solve this problem which was internationally created. The expellees have been solely the concern of local German agencies, including the public-welfare agencies, and the Catholic charities.

The problem of expellees was not new to me, since I had been in Germany in 1945, right after the end of hostilities. I had come to set up a program for the displaced persons, innocent men and women and even children who had been impressed into slave labor for the Nazi war machine, or who had

fled from the Baltic States before the second arrival of the Red army.

The bishops of the United States spoke up against these mass punishments in no uncertain terms. In 1946, when the deportations were at their height, and few voices were heard in defense of a recent enemy, the administrative board of NCWC, in the name of the United States bishops, made the following statement:

"Something has been happening in Europe which is new in the annals of recorded history. By agreement among the victors, millions of Germans who for centuries have lived in eastern Europe are being forced from their homes, without resources, into the heart of Germany. The suffering of these people in their weary travels, the homelessness of them and the hopelessness, make a sad story of the inhumanity of their transplantation. Had there prevailed in the councils of the victor nations a right appreciation of the dignity of man, at least arrangements would have been made for transplanting these people in a humane way. We boast of our democracy, but in this transplantation of peoples we have perhaps unwittingly allowed ourselves to be influenced by the hard theory of heartless totalitarian philosophy.

"The reports of the deportation of thousands in areas of Soviet aggression to remote and inhospitable regions just because they cannot subscribe to communism tell of a cruel violation of human rights. These men are men and have the rights of men."

The bishops, as fathers of the poor, spoke out for all the poor, and who could be more poor than those driven like herds of cattle across frontiers without homes or bread.

These are those, who, unconsciously sharing the un-Christian concept of mass guilt, do not press for help to the expellees, or for a solution of the immense problem. Because of lack of full information, many do not yet realize the importance to the recovery of Europe of an organized approach to the matter of integration and resettlement of the expellees now living in camps and barracks and overcrowded barns. It is not yet understood that this group hangs like a dead weight to impede the recovery of all of western Europe.

In the darkness of their bitter exile, homelessness, abandonment, in the hopelessness of their outlook toward the future, these expellees, driven so heartlessly across frontiers, are truly, in the words of the old hymn, Pilgrims of the Night.

One dull and overcast day I drove with some of our European staff workers to an industrial area in mid-Germany. It was in the Diocese of Hildesheim, one of the so-called "Diaspora" dioceses of Germany which were flooded after the war with destitute expellees. These expellees, mainly Catholics, landed by the hundreds of thousands in areas without sufficient Catholic churches to serve them.

I knew that many industrial plants in the area had already been dismantled as producers of materials that could be turned to war purposes. No protest had accompanied these dismantlings since no working people anywhere want a repetition of the holocaust of blood and broken steel and stones that they knew in World War II.

However, part of the steel works, which use the large deposits of ore found in this area, known as Salzgitter, are still operating, and more particularly the railroad repair shops. The Allies decided, after dismantling a great rolling mill and crating it for shipment to Yugoslavia as reparations, that three out of four smelting furnaces could continue working, in order to make use of the special smelting process necessary for the particular type of ore mined in the vicinity. Coal was needed for the Ruhr, and as not enough was shipped, only one smelting furnace is actually in operation.

In the meantime, by the Potsdam decision of the Allies, Silesia was given to the provisional Polish regime, which unexpectedly began to thrust out the native population. Of the millions of homeless, nearly 60,000 landed around the Reich Steel Works of Salzgitter. As soon as the infamous slave labor camps of Salzgitter were emptied of their Polish, Russian, German, and other inmates, these men, women, and children, victims of the peace, were herded in. This was part of the famous Operation Swallow by means of which close to 3,000,000 helpless people were led from their ancestral homes and dumped into any available barracks or cellars in the chaos and misery of the first months of peace.

These men, women, and children are still living in the obscene barracks. I visited one barrack which served as a provisional hospital and home for the aged and infirm among the expellees. More than 400 old people, weakened by the deportation, consequent hunger, and lack of care, died in this barrack right after the expulsion.

In the meantime, the men among the expellee groups found work in some sections of the Reich Steel Works. In this way, they bought bread for their wives and children. Other men, released as prisoners of war from Russia and Poland, found that their families had already been resettled in the slave-labor barracks in Operation Swallow. They also came, and many were able to use their industrial skills in the steel works.

What amazed me when I visited these desolate barracks on a damp, dreary day was the lack of complaint at the obvious lack of decent comfort and privacy in their lives. In one medium-sized room, I found four families living. Their quarters were separated by blankets hung on ropes. One primitive stove for four families. Some of the men and one of the women (together with her daughter) had known from months to years of slave labor, and felt that this freedom in the west, though it was a freedom bounded by blanket partitions and barracks built for Hitler's slave labor, was a beautiful thing.

"We are grateful to God to be here," this woman told me. "I am glad that my daughter and husband are alive and will make no complaint."

But with the men it was different. They pointed to a tremendous lettered message, painted in white and a great gas tank that dominates this woebegone community of rows upon rows of rough wooden barracks. "We want to live. Stop the dismantling," read the sign. One of the men explained: "We want to support our families—even if we can hardly buy the few things that are listed on the ration card. Now most of us who work, only have work because we are dismantling. Every day we destroy our own livelihood. What will become of us all when there is nothing more to dismantle? By Christmas, everything will be still."

The Catholic charities director for the Hildesheim diocese who was with me said: "That is true. We fear that by Christmas all will be still. Only about 800 men will have work in the ore mines, which will then send the ore to the Ruhr."

The sign "We want to live; stop the dismantling" stared at me wherever I went in this community of desperate people. I am not competent or concerned in the larger aspects of dismantling. Any steps to prevent another war should be taken at the earliest possible moment. There is, however, in this one spot, the question of nearly 60,000 expellees from Upper and Lower Silesia in a much larger native population. These heads of families have found a livelihood for themselves and their families in works that have been turned to peacetime uses. Now, at one stroke, they will all be rendered exiled paupers who will depend on the pittance of the local public-welfare set-up and the local religious welfare agencies. Already Caritas, the local Catholic charities, is spending 85 percent of its budget and of its donations from the outside to meet the needs of the hundreds of thousands of expellees in its area.

Between the borders of the western and eastern occupation zones are such camps as Uelzen and others, where as many as 500 people daily cross the frontier of their own free will, trying to find freedom or economic betterment in the western zones, which have become known as the golden west. Many families cross to find a livelihood. A great number of those who cross clandestinely are men fleeing in fear of many things. A large number are young men fleeing from the enforced labor in uranium mines.

If they find work, they see to it that members of their families in the eastern zone join them later. Though the wanderings are wholesale—1,300,000 crossed into the western zones last year alone—no one is ever forced back across the frontier. Never in Europe's history have there been so many wanderers on the roads as in these past 4 years.

The problems of the men among the 12,000,000 expellees are heavy and not easily solved. Besides the large numbers who fear to lose the precious livelihood just found, there are the hundreds of thousands who must remain separated from their families so that they can hold down some job in a city. Another aspect of the condition of expellee men is the fact that it often happened that transports of people from farming areas landed in an industrial center, and thousands from towns were herded into agricultural areas. Men are separated for years from the work in which their skill could be productive.

This, then, is undoubtedly a social and human problem that goes far beyond the realm of politics. Those who agreed to the creation of this double problem, must have an answer adequate to meet it. That answer has not been forthcoming from governments as yet. Up to now, only local German agencies, and the Protestants and Catholics of the United States, have been active in trying to salvage the human material of these mass expulsions, mass misery, and unemployment. War Relief Services—NCWC—has been sending large quantities of food and clothing to answer the desperate appeals of the German Catholic Charities for continued help.

Salzgitter, with its thousands of desperate men, first rendered destitute and homeless, and now rendered unable to earn bread for their families, is a meeting place of the burning social problems of Europe as a whole. America and the Allies can only ignore this problem at their peril, because these forgotten men with their expelled destitute families can become a dead weight on the spiritual and material revival of western Europe.

Underlying Causes for the Rise and Decline of Nations: The Fall of the Roman Empire; the French Revolution; the Rise and Decline of the British Empire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the history of the rise and fall of nations

is the story of good and bad money. The principal contributing cause of the fall of the Roman Empire was Rome's inability to redeem its currency in gold and silver. The ancient Romans, like many moderns, thought the power, wealth, and credit of a great nation was sufficient to give stability to its currency without the guaranty of redemption; so they traded their gold and silver for the luxuries of the Orient—silks, jewels, spices, and so forth; and their currency went the way of all irredeemable currency; and the power and the glory of Rome went with it, for when a nation's money loses integrity, the people of that nation also lose their integrity.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The irredeemability of the French assignats precipitated the French Revolution and caused hundreds of heads, including the heads of the king and queen, to roll from the guillotine. In 1789, France had backed the assignats with nearly one-third of her land and property. Never before had an irredeemable currency been so strongly supported, but the fact that the assignats were not redeemable in gold and silver caused them to go the way of all other irredeemable currency and brought about the fall of the French Empire.

France learned the hard way that a so-called managed irredeemable currency is nothing more nor less than fiat money which inevitably leads to total economic and political collapse.

Will we profit by France's bitter experience or stupidly permit ourselves to suffer a similar fate? For the full story of the French assignats—irredeemable currency—read the little book titled "Fiat Money—Inflation in France" by the brilliant Andrew D. White, late great president of Cornell University; or my condensation of his book in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1949, page A4916. History repeats, and it can happen here unless we replace our so-called managed currency with sound redeemable currency.

RISE AND DECLINE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

In the nineteenth century, the integrity of her money made England the greatest shipping, commercial, and banking nation on earth. But when, in the twentieth century, England was no longer able to redeem her currency at face value on demand, the British Empire began to disintegrate.

Instead of recognizing the cause and applying the proper remedy, England listened to the siren song of Prof. Harold Laski, of the London Socialist School of Economics, and plunged into state socialism which is in reality a throwback to absolutism.

There is no hope for England's recovery under socialism because recovery can come only through increased production and everywhere that socialism has been tried, it has succeeded only in curtailing production. While England's Socialist-Labor regime is spending billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money on socialistic experiments, we are taxing free enterprise in the United States to build up Marxist socialism in England, which is committed to the destruction of free enterprise everywhere.

In the meantime, English capital is fleeing to the United States for investment; and because of our fantastic monetary policy, which permits foreigners and international bankers to buy our choicest industrial stocks and bonds at 37½ percent discount, they are gradually gaining control of American industry. Foreign investments and dollar credits in the United States are now in excess of $26,000,000,000.

We are not only wrecking our own economy, but are antagonizing a majority of the English people who, in recent by-elections, have shown that they are opposed to their Socialist regime and feel that the Socialist Government has remained in power only because of the billions of dollars we have loaned it.

But England's Socialist Government is not entirely to blame for this situation. It is being aided and abetted by Professor Laski's American friends, associates, and converts—many of whom hold key positions in our Government, particularly in the State Department.

Under the guise of fighting communism in Europe, the apparent objective of Laski's followers in our State Department is to supply European governments with American dollars so these foreign governments can pay interest on their bonds which are held by the international bankers.

Under such circumstances, the insistence of Messrs. Cripps, Bevan, Attlee, and Bevin that we again bail their Socialist regime out to hock to the international pawnbrokers is nothing short of unmitigated gall.

ONLY COMPASSION FOR ENGLISH PEOPLE

The above statement is not inspired by animosity toward the English people. They have my sincere sympathy in this, their hour of trial. But it is saddening to note that Englishmen, who struck such a mighty blow for human freedom in 1215 by demanding that King John affix the royal seal to the Magna Carta—which took from the state its power of absolutism and granted civil liberties to the people—have now reversed England's traditional policy.

Under England's present Marxist regime, the power of absolutism has been restored to the state, while the people have been deprived of many of the rights acquired by them in the 734 years that have elapsed since the signing of the Magna Carta.

This is particularly tragic because England has had a glorious history. The integrity of her money, the integrity of her businessmen, and the intrepidity of her soldiers and sailors made England the greatest power in all the world.

England gave us our language, laws, and many of our customs. We are proud of that heritage.

We thrilled at the clarion challenge of her great leader after Dunkerque; thrilled at the spartan courage of that few hundred British men and boys who flew so gallantly into the sky against odds of 10 to 1 and threw back the mighty German Luftwaffe. A country that produces men and boys like that is entitled to its place in the sun.

No foreign foeman brought England to her present sad estate. The blow was struck from within by those inoculated with the poisonous virus of collectivism. Under that deadly doctrine, free enterprise is being supplanted by state monopolies; her money has lost its integrity; her economy has collapsed; and jackals that once trembled when the British lion roared nom snap at her heels.

We trust the malady with which England is afflicted is but a mild case of socialist measles from which she will soon recover, and that she will refuse to drink deeper from the hemlock cup brewed for her by Laski, Cripps, Attlee, et al. Freedom is too much a part of the British fiber to submit for long to the regimentation of a totalitarian state; and it ill becomes the Government of the United States to finance a Marxist socialist regime which is forging new chains to enslave the English people.

Socialism is directly opposed to American constitutional freedom. There is not the slightest doubt but that the socialist governments of Europe are closer ideologically to Communist Russia than they are to the United States; and we should not be surprised if the arms we are now supplying them will be used against us. Right now, England's Socialist Government is preparing to recognize the Communist Government in China. It advised Russia well in advance of the devaluation of the English pound, while keeping that information from France, thereby bringing about the fall of the French Government, and thus giving Russia the opportunity to set up a Communist regime in eastern Germany when France, because of economic chaos resulting from the sudden devaluation of the pound, was in no position to protest. If we fail to recognize the pro-Russian leanings of Attlee, Cripps, and Bevin, we must be blind, indeed.

A STRANGE, UNHOLY ALLIANCE

A strange, unholy alliance exists between one-worlders, international banker-racketeers, and Communists; and while the objectives of these three groups differ somewhat, their methods of obtaining their objectives are practically identical; and all feel that an economic collapse in the United States will further their plans. The Communists, of course, see in our economic collapse, the chance to spread communism throughout the world.

The international bankers hope to gain control of American industry and the control of strategic materials throughout the world; and are using the Communists to gain control of raw rubber, tin, bauxite, manganese, and other strategic materials in the Orient. They recognize Communist Russia for what it is—the greatest economic hoax in all history—ready to fall apart from internal weaknesses when they withdraw their financial support or the rest of the world adopts a sound monetary system.

The one-worlders are playing along with both of them, and trying to frighten the American people into surrendering their national sovereignty to a world federal government, in which we will be outnumbered and outvoted 15 to 1. What

they are really proposing is a world dictatorship. The majority vote would be in countries which have made a failure of handling their own affairs.

Of course, each of the three groups mentioned above hopes to come out on top and are probably secretly conspiring right now to throw their present confederates to the wolves when their der tag comes; and while that is a consummation devoutly to be wished, it will avail us little if, in the interval, they collectively destroy our country.

The principal argument of the one-worlders is that a one-world government will end wars. That is the sheerest nonsense. The way to end war is to eliminate the causes of war. Every war is, in essence, an economic war. Every war and every major depression that has afflicted the United States and the rest of the world in the past 75 years can be attributed to unsound monetary and fiscal policies of governments.

The greatest contributing cause of wars and depressions was the crime of 1873 when the imperial nations of Europe joined with the international bankers in bringing about the demonetization of silver. Their objective, of course, was to exploit and pillage the silver-money countries of the Orient and Middle East, and the silver-producing countries of North and South America.

By manipulating the price of silver, they were able to pillage and keep in poverty millions of people whose money was exclusively silver. How futile to talk of helping backward peoples while permitting them to be exploited this way.

Having pillaged the rest of the world by the demonetization of silver, they are now proceeding to pillage us by demonetizing gold and debauching our currency. The interest of the international bankers in a world government is motivated by the expectancy that such a government would maintain the "status quo" and protect them in their ill-gotten gains once they have succeeded in gaining control of American industry and the strategic raw materials throughout the world.

An unsound monetary system, such as is current throughout the world today, is more dangerous than the atom bomb—more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence and famine—and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever written.

Sound money will do more to bring peace and prosperity to the peoples of the world than all other proposals combined because money is the measure of the value of all goods and services; and unless that measure is honest, constant, and invariable, millions of people will be cheated in the sale of their goods and services while others will profit unjustly. Of such stuff are wars and depressions made.

We must be blind, indeed, if we fail to see that a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable currency is supplying the tools with which subversives work in their efforts to wreck our domestic economy and replace our system of government with some form of totalitarian state.

The tragic part of all this is the fact that we could correct this situation in 90 days—without cost to American taxpayers and without economic disturbances of any kind—by simply putting into effect legislation already on our statute books—section 311, United States Code, Annotated, chapter 8, Twenty-eighth Statutes, page 4.

THE SO-CALLED DOLLAR SHORTAGE IN EUROPE

The so-called dollar shortage does not mean that there is any lack of money in Europe. It merely means that there is a mad scramble for American dollars, because those fortunate enough to convert foreign currencies into American dollars at the current rate of foreign exchange can make 60 percent or more profit on the transaction. In many instances they can double their money. The answer is simple. With 35 American paper dollars they can buy an ounce of our gold, and with an ounce of our gold they can buy 56 or more American dollars.

With that kind of racket, it is not difficult to see how foreign nations and international bankers are able to keep our stock market depressed so that our choicest industrial stocks are listed at only 60 percent of their real worth while they can buy them at 37½ percent below their list price, and sell them at 60 percent above the list price by demanding payment in gold. So skeptical are many people of irredeemable currency that gold purchased from us at $35 per ounce can be sold as high as $100 per ounce; and there is a flourishing black market in gold.

The extremes to which many people will go to secure gold is shown by the following news item from the Washington Post of September 30, 1949:

INDIANS DISCOVER GOLD IN THEM THAR ARABS

LONDON, September 29.—X-rays disclosed that Arab travelers arriving in India smuggled gold by carrying strips of it in their intestines, the Times reported today from Bombay.

The report said that 70 out of 110 Arabs arriving were given a medical and X-ray examination which yielded 850 strips of gold, weighing about 218 pounds and valued at roughly $200,000.

Each Arab was said to have carried an average of 10 to 13 strips of bullion in his alimentary tract.

The Arabs were described as part of a smuggling ring, and the haul was said to have been one of the biggest ever made in Bombay.

INFLATION BY LEGISLATION

In my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18, 1949, page A4572, I endeavored to show, by simple arithmetic, just what has happened to our money, and how our fantastic monetary policy is subsidizing imports 60 percent, thereby closing our mines and factories, and making it possible for foreign interests to gain control of American industry by permitting them to buy our choicest stocks and bonds at 37½ percent below the listed market price.

Public Law 84 of 1945 is largely responsible for this and should be titled "Inflation by Legislation" because it depreciated the dollar 37½ percent, forced commodity prices to advance 60 percent, and started the vicious cycle of rising prices and the resultant demand for higher wages which brought about the strikes and economic disturbances of 1946.

You will recall that under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the price of gold was raised from $20.67 per ounce to $35 per ounce. That depreciated the dollar 41 percent and gave us the so-called 59-cent dollar which was equivalent in value to one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. To maintain that value, however, all currency in circulation had to be backed by a gold reserve of 40 percent because it has been universally recognized for more than a century that whenever monetary reserves fall below 40 percent, the currency depreciates in exact proportion. Thus it became axiomatic that currency is worth only 2½ times the reserve back of it.

The danger of permitting monetary reserves to fall below 40 percent was well demonstrated by the 1929 depression which was precipitated when European banks permitted their reserves to fall to 21 percent. But right in the face of this terrible example, Public Law 84, 1945, reduced our monetary reserves from 40 percent to 25 percent. This was a drop in reserves of 37½ percent, and since the value of the dollar falls in exact proportion to the drop in reserves below 40 percent, our dollar lost 37½ percent of its value, so that instead of being worth one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold, it became worth only one fifty-sixth of an ounce of gold, or the equivalent of 37 cents prior to 1934.

To protect our gold supply and prevent economic chaos throughout the world, the price of our gold should have been advanced to $56 per ounce with a gold reserve of 40 percent. You will note that a 40-percent reserve, when gold is $56 per ounce, is exactly the same as a 25-percent reserve, when gold is $35 per ounce, so raising the price of gold to $56 per ounce with a reserve of 40 percent would not affect in any way the value of the dollar, which is worth only two and one-half times the reserve back of it.

SECRETARY SNYDER IS NOT TO BLAME

In a letter to Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, dated May 4, 1949, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, William McC. Martin, Jr., said:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is required by statute to maintain all forms of United States money at a parity with the gold dollar. Since the gold dollar contains one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold, this means that the Treasury should maintain the price of gold at $35 an ounce in legal gold markets in the United States.

If Mr. Martin is interpreting the statute correctly, then Public Law 84, 1945, has made it impossible for the Secretary of the Treasury to obey that statute, for "all forms of United States money" are not maintained at a parity with a gold dollar of one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold.

However, do not blame Secretary of the Treasury Snyder for this. He is in no way responsible for Public Law 84, 1945—that was put over on us by his predecessor, Henry Morgenthau, Harry D. White, and Marriner Eccles; and is probably the most vicious piece of legislation ever enacted.

It is my firm conviction that world peace, economic stability, national security, and the survival of our system of constitutional government are all predicated upon the adoption of a sound monetary system; and that since there is not enough gold in the world to supply an adequate, redeemable monetary reserve, silver must be joined with gold at fixed and proper ratio.

The decision rests with the American people.

NOTE.—Total world production of gold since the discovery of America in 1492 has been only 1,500,000,000 ounces. Total world production of silver in same period, only 17,000,000,000 ounces. There seems to be some confusion about the terms "pure gold" or "pure silver" and "standard silver" or "standard gold" money. In minting gold or silver coins, a hardening alloy of 10 percent is added, and such coins are referred to as standard gold or standard silver; 900 fine meaning that they have a pure gold or pure silver content of 90 percent. This does not affect the amount of pure gold or pure silver in such coins.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address prepared by me for radio delivery:

The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am a member, considers immigration and naturalization laws. In Europe during the month of September we conducted an intensive investigation of the displaced-persons problem and the related problem of the expellees and refugees in western Germany and Austria.

I need not dwell at length on the displaced-persons problem. It is, in large part, already solved. I expect that the Senate will concur with the House in the further liberalization of the displaced-persons law when Congress reconvenes in January. As of August 1, out of an original 11,000,000, there remain only 562,000. Of these 362,000 are in camps and 202,000 are out of camps. It is estimated that as of June 30 of next year, there will remain only about 125,000 displaced persons throughout Europe. There will be the so-called hard core, who are aged, sick, infirm, and unemployable. Negotiations will soon be started with European and other governments in an attempt to place these unfortunates under institutional care.

A problem of far greater magnitude engaged our attention while in Europe. It involves about 8,500,000 so-called expellees and refugees now resident in western Germany. None of these victims of war's aftermath is recognized as a displaced person. Neither UNRRA nor the International Refugee Organization, to which we have contributed $70,000,000 a year, has taken any responsibility for them. Our official position to date has been that they are a purely German problem.

The largest group of expellees comprises the volksdeutsche, descendants of Germans who settled in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and prewar Poland—some of them centuries ago. They were summarily deported after the war by German-hating governments, and dumped, without previous preparation, upon a devastated Germany which had lost one-fourth of its prewar territory.

Besides the volksdeutsche, about 6,000,000 Germans were expelled from the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line, under the Potsdam agreement, to which our Government was a part. Many of these Germans reached western Germany. Added to these two larger groups of expellees are thousands of new refugees—Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, who have escaped from behind the iron curtain. Then too, there are the thousands of Russian Army deserters and the democratic Germans who have been fleeing, during the last 6 months, from the Russian zone of Germany.

It is difficult for one who has not been in Germany recently to imagine the size of the problem which the presence of these newcomers has made in Germany. Nearly all of them have reached Germany with only the belongings they could carry. A devastated Germany was in no condition to help them. Their presence has further complicated German efforts at reconstruction. This situation arises largely from the fact that distribution could not be planned because of the suddenness of their coming. Great waves of volksdeutsche and expellees were simply routed to those parts of Germany which had suffered least from the war, but those sections economically were least fitted to maintain them. Forty percent of the entire population of Schleswig-Holstein, for example, is made up of these newcomers. Schleswig-Holstein, it is well known, is probably the poorest of the German states. On the other hand, there are no more than 3 percent in the French zone for the simple reason that the French refuse to permit their entrance. That is a part of Germany that could well sustain thousands of these people.

This inequality of distribution has complicated the already serious unemployment situation in many of the German states. It has meant that large numbers of the refugees remain either unemployed or in occupations for which they are not fitted. It has meant further that many states have had to allocate funds for relief which could otherwise have been devoted to rehabilitation.

On September 8 Cardinal Frings of Cologne presented to Gen. Brian Robertson of the British zone, a report on the effect the expellees and refugees have had upon the German economy, and suggested steps that must be taken to ameliorate the situation. He emphasized especially the need for an extensive housing program in connection with a well-planned program for redistributing the manpower which they represent. The housing shortage, as it exists in Germany today, is so acute that it is appalling. No less than 2,500,000 housing units were destroyed by Allied bombing and artillery fire during the war. These must be replaced for the normal population of western Germany. Additional units must be built for the 8,500,000 additional inhabitants. At present no less than 350,000 newcomers are still living in camps in the state of Schleswig-Holstein, lower Saxony, and Bavaria.

The report by Cardinal Frings cites an impressive record of German self-help in attempting to relieve the housing shortage, but the report confesses that the task is so great that the Germans themselves cannot accomplish it.

Neither, it seems, can private organizations, which have done so much already, be expected to cope with this long-range extensive project. Cardinal Frings paid special tribute to the great-hearted efforts of private American organizations to help the Germans, but he admits that they cannot be asked to carry the heavy burden involved in the complete program. That program would call for the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money. Such amount would be necessary for immediate relief, for resettlement according to economic capacities, for housing, and for economic rehabilitation.

This problem, immense as it is, cries for early solution. A stable Germany is absolutely essential to a stable Europe. As long as it remains unsettled, Germany cannot move forward to a stable economy. Furthermore, there is grave danger of political, social, and economic upheavals in the present unsettled situation. The Western Powers, who are coming to see more clearly every day how intimately their own fortunes are involved in the final solution of the German question, cannot shrug off responsibility for action. I believe they should seriously consider international action without further delay. The International Refugee Organization is scheduled to go out of existence on June 30, 1950. Before that time the United Nations should be asked to decide whether the IRO should be reconstituted or a new organization set up with the specific purpose of coping with this problem. The original purpose of the IRO was largely the repatriation of refugees and stateless persons. The radical revision of its constitution would be necessary in view of the fact that today there is not a question of repatriation, but rather of resettlement and rehabilitation within Germany or probably immigration to other countries.

Convention of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, the Convention of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the United States of America, at their recent national convention in Buffalo, N. Y., adopted resolutions which I herewith bring to the attention of the Congress. These resolutions were forwarded to me by Mr. Charles F. Foell, secretary, branch No. 4, Federation of American Citizens of German Descent in the United States of America. I am sure they will merit the serious consideration of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I am also herewith including a letter and resolution submitted by Mr. Charles F. Gerhard, chairman of the United Action Committee for Expellees, recommending that expellees of German ethnic origin in Germany be included in the Displaced Persons Act.

The matter referred to follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GERMAN DESCENT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1949

I. We urge that an early peace treaty be made between the United States and Germany, and, if necessary, without the consent of the other powers. We maintain that conditions in Europe cannot be settled until a just and fair peace has been made with Germany.

II. We protest vigorously further dismantling of German plants and factories, destruction of German industry, and the wholesale removal of essential material.

What has been and still is being done is mainly designed to destroy competition of German industry with enterprises of countries other than our own. This stripping is preventing needed German economic recovery, resulting in added financial burden to American taxpayers.

These startling disclosures are revealed in Freda Utley's book, The High Cost of Vengeance, the reading of which we recommend to our members.

III. We demand a fair percentage of expellees in displaced-persons legislation, and we urge further study of the conditions of said expellees, provided that the available information presented in the Senate DP hearings is not ignored.

Removal of the ethnic discrimination from the DP law would permit many thousands of them to come to their waiting relatives here on the same basis as other displaced persons, thus giving partial but effective relief of the expellee burden.

We endorse the amendment of section 2 (b) of the DP Act of 1948 to the end that the status of displaced persons shall no longer be withheld from expellees solely because of their ethnic origin; and that expellees and expellee orphans shall hereafter be admitted in fair proportion and on the same terms as other displaced persons.

IV. We urge reduction of postage from 14 to 10 cents per pound in the Russian zone to encourage shipping of packages to Europe.

V. We earnestly recommend that any naturalized citizens working for the State Department or United States military forces in Germany be naturalized citizens for 15 years or longer.

VI. We favor the employment by the United State Department of State for work in civilian capacity in Germany citizens of German descent. We feel that this will lead to greater efficiency and a mutual understanding, and establish better relationships between Germany and the United States of America.

UNITED ACTION COMMITTEE FOR EXPELLEES

DEAR FRIEND: Many Americans still think that a DP (displaced person) and an expellee are one and the same; that expellees are getting the same medical care, the same supplementary food and clothing rations, and the same immigration privileges as the DP's. In truth, they are not.

Broadly speaking, a DP is a displaced person of any other nationality or racial origin than German. An expellee, on the other hand, is a person only of German origin and for that very reason is automatically, by law, excluded from the above-mentioned forms of aid. The constitution of the IRO (International Refugee Organization) expressly denies aid of any kind to persons of German ethnic origin.

The expellees were ruthlessly evicted from their homes in eastern Germany and other areas and deprived of practically all their possessions. This happened not only without protest from our Government but was actually sanctioned in principle by a pact agreed to by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia.

We are a group of American citizens who feel it our duty to do whatever possible to right this grievous crime against an innocent people. We offer to those who share our viewpoint the following possibilities to help:

1. Write at once to your Senators, enclosing signed copies of the attached resolution.
2. Interest others to follow your example.
3. Inform yourself fully about the expellees. We shall be glad to furnish additional information based on carefully assembled facts from reliable sources.

The act just passed by the House does not provide for immigration rights for expellees on an equal footing with other DP's. We urge you to write your Senators at once for their support in having the amendment, stated in the resolution as below, added to the present DP legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. GERHARD.

RESOLUTION RE EXPELLEE LEGISLATION

Whereas, twelve surviving millions of displaced persons called "expellees" are now in Germany and Austria, who are excluded from the care of the IRO (International Refugee Organization) because of their German ethnic origin; and

Whereas, these people were for that reason again excluded from consideration as displaced persons by the DP Act of 1948 although they have fled or were deported from their homelands because of their religious beliefs, cultural traditions or national origin; and

Whereas discrimination on account of race, creed or nationality is inconsistent with the great and noble traditions of these United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this joint conference does request our Congress to amend Public Law 774 to include those of our relatives and friends who were deported or fled from the countries of their birth because of their religious beliefs, their racial or their national origin; and be it further

Resolved, That as a means to this end, section 12 of the act, which gives these people a token recognition be broadened to admit not less than 54,000 of them on the same basis as other DP's, without unfair and irregular reductions of the German and Austrian quotas, and that the visas so available be effectively allocated, in the spirit of the following amendment to correct the discrimination of subsection (b) section 2 of Public Law 774:

"*Provided,* That 'displaced person' shall also mean any person who otherwise complies with the requirements of annex I of the constitution of the IRO who solely because of his ethnic origin has been excluded from the concern of the IRO by subsection (a) section 4, part II of annex I of the constitution of the IRO."

Italo-Americans Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an account appearing in the Clinton Item of October 17 of my address before the membership of Fratelli Bandiera Lodge of Marlboro on the occasion of the thirty-fifth anniversary celebration of this outstanding Italo-American organization:

HAILS ITALO-AMERICANS—CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN SAYS THEY ARE ONE OF THE TRULY GREAT ENERGIZING FORCES OF AMERICAN LIFE

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, addressing the thirty-fifth anniversary banquet of Fratelli Bandiera Lodge, Marlboro, Sunday night, hailed Italo-Americans as "one of the truly great energizing forces of American life. They have defended the Nation in war and they have developed it in peace," he declared. "As citizens they occupy a unique place because of their industrious habits, exemplary family life, civic loyalty, and passion for freedom. I can therefore heartily commend this lodge for its solid contributions to Marlboro which are so deeply appreciated by every group in the community."

Declaring that "unflinching courage is needed at the moment to turn back the tide of Marxist communism from the battlements of western civilization," Congressman PHILBIN asserted that the Italian people have already given a striking example to the world in smashing the plot to communize Italy.

"That was one of the great achievements of our times. But we must remember that not every nation is given the opportunity to vote for the government of its choice. Some nations are victimized by shameful diplomatic deals, while others are ruthlessly undermined by Communist conspiracy and beaten into submission.

"Nothing is sacred to these evil forces. They destroy free institutions with the same immunity with which they imprison and slay the ministers of God. Fortunately for democracy and civilization, the rank and file of the people are increasingly aware of their malign purposes and will, in time, stand as an impregnable fortress against their wiles and their aggressions.

"Our Nation will fulfill its great destiny to mankind in accordance with its time-honored example. Our people do not propose to tolerate Communist activities directed at our own Government and economic system and aimed to destroy democracy throughout the world. Until this grave peril is passed we must gird the Nation with unmatched armed strength even as peace is in our hearts and on our lips, even as we sincerely work to establish a lasting peace upon earth."

The Clinton Congressman congratulated the Lodge upon honoring such a fine young American as Father Masciarelli, who, he said, was on the threshold of a most promising career.

Hobbying and the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 14 (legislative day of Thursday, October 13), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Hobbying and the American Way of Life."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOBBYING AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Are hobbies important? Do arts and crafts work, postage stamp collection, photography, bird raising, model railroads, antique collection, and hundreds of other types of avocations—do they really count?

This is a question which many folks might ask themselves in this atomic age. To some folks, it might seem strange that tens of millions of Americans devote a lot of time in their den or in their attic workshop or cellar or photographic dark room to these leisure-time activities, while all the world is so seriously concerned about major international problems.

Yet, the very fact that Americans do have these leisure-time pursuits symbolizes our wonderful standard of living. A portrait of an American puttering in a rose garden sym-

bolizes the pursuit of happiness of Mr. Average Man, John Jones, and Mrs. Average Woman, Mary Jones, and by our youngsters. It symbolizes the fact that this country recognizes the priceless right of each individual to enjoy himself in the way he best sees fit.

Recognizing those facts, many of my senatorial and congressional colleagues and I are glad to devote whatever limited time is available to fulfilling requests from hobbyists in our home States, particularly when the process serves important functions like aid to disabled veterans, to the blind, prevention of juvenile delinquency, etc.

FIRST THINGS IN LEGISLATION COME FIRST

Of course, not much legislative time is available and, as every citizen agrees, first things necessarily come first. As our people know, there are over 10,000 bills pending before the Congress covering hundreds of crucial subjects affecting American peace and prosperity. These, of course, are our primary concern. Mail on them runs to hundreds of letters per day.

FIFTH ANNUAL HOBBY EXPOSITION IN MILWAUKEE

Yet, I am glad to call attention to hobbying because I feel that it is so important in the free American way of life.

I am happy, particularly, to mention this subject because my own State of Wisconsin has been in the fore of avocational encouragement. In Milwaukee Auditorium from November 24–27, there will be held the fifth annual Wisconsin hobby exposition. This is a nonprofit civic, State-wide educational exposition designed to promote interest in hobbies and recreational activities for boys and girls, men and women. Community leaders always go all-out in their efforts to make this show a certain success. I know their effort is repaid a hundredfold by the wholesome influence it has on the attendants of the show. If any of my colleagues or readers are in the vicinity of the Badger State during Thanksgiving week, I know they won't want to miss our fifth annual Wisconsin hobby exposition.

HOW CONGRESSMEN ARE IN CONTACT WITH HOBBYING

My colleagues and I have almost continuous contacts with hobbying in at least four ways:

1. We receive mail, phone calls, and visits from hobbyists from our State or district on hobby matters and legislation.

2. Occasionally, we speak to vital organizations like the Red Cross, the YMCA's, and YWCA's, library groups, church groups, Boy and Girl Scouts, 4–H groups—all of which encourage the arts and crafts.

3. We have contacts with businessmen who serve the hobby trades.

4. Many of us, insofar as our limited time will allow, enjoy ourselves in personal avocations.

CONSIDER THE INDEX OF AMERICAN DESIGN, FOR EXAMPLE

Yes, hardly a day goes by here in the Senate that my colleagues and I do not have some contact with one or more hobby topics. Thus, I may receive mail from such organizations as the American Angora Rabbit Breeders Cooperative, or a phone call answer may come from the Smithsonian Institution informing me of an exhibit they are having, or some Wisconsinite may drop up from the National Art Gallery to tell me about a Badger item in the Index of American Design. (This Index includes native American patterns and prints from the earliest log-cabin days plus fascinating imported items like the intricate designs of decorated German style beer mugs.)

Indeed, we have contact with hobbying not only in our own offices but on the Senate floor when legislation comes up, affecting hobbies, for example, commemorative-stamp policy, tariff bills affecting hobby items, postage-rate bills, etc.

NOMINALLY PRICED HOBBY PUBLICATIONS AND FREE GPO LIST

Naturally, we in the Congress are glad to be of service to our hobbying constituents. Sometimes this can be done by the sending of appropriate literature. Of course, we all appreciate the fact that most sizable Government publications must bear a charge, because alert hobbyists know how heavy is Uncle Sam's financial burden.

The Government Printing Office keeps my colleagues and myself informed of various booklets which it and other agencies issue on hobby topics. In fact, the GPO has summarized a list of its principal hobby booklets in a free leaflet entitled, "What Is Your Hobby?" Incidentally, this free list is so popular that it has gone into its fifth edition.

LIST OF A FEW FEDERAL HOBBY BOOKLETS

And while I am mentioning pamphlets, let me point out specifically some other representative literature (mimeographed or printed) available from Federal agencies upon request. The address to which to write is in all instances Washington 25, D. C.

List of Books on Angling and Fishery Equipment, Fishery Leaflet 218, 7 pages, Fish and Wildlife Service; free.

Publications on Cage Birds, Wildlife Leaflet 285, 11 pages, Fish and Wildlife Service; free.

Growing Crops Without Soil, Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture; free.

Maps, Their Care, Repair, and Preservation, 45 pages, Card Division, Library of Congress; 30 cents.

Some Tropical Aquarium Fishes, Fishery Leaflet, 165, 16 pages, Fish and Wildlife Service; free.

Mechanical Practice (about radio tinkering), 82 pages. Government Printing Office; 15 cents.

Roses for the Home, Farmers Bulletin, 750, 34 pages, Government Printing Office; 10 cents.

Etching of Designs and Lettering on Metals, Letter Circular LC 952, 12 pages, National Bureau of Standards, Washington 25, D. C.; free.

United States Government Motion Pictures, 104 pages (lists moving-picture reels that can be rented from the Federal Government), Government Printing Office, 40 cents.

Twentieth Century Poetry in English (a catalog listing records, available for purchase by the public, of great poets reading selections of their own poetry), 12 pages, Recording Laboratory, Division of Music, Library of Congress; 5 cents.

WISCONSIN'S FINE FOLK MUSIC COLLECTION

Incidentally, while I am on the matter of recordings, I might mention the folk-music collection of the Library of Congress. Its central collection of American folk music recorded on the scene throughout America is an adjunct of regional archives administered locally.

It is with pride that I note that the music department of the University of Wisconsin was the first to cooperate with the Library of Congress in that aim. On several of my radio broadcasts, I have had played folk tunes recorded right in Wisconsin—a Polish dance, a Swiss yodel, a German lied, a Norwegian schottische, as sung by real Badgers who recall the lovely melodies of the Old World. And, too, I've played tunes like the Dying Wisconsin Soldier, a plaintive Civil War folk song as recorded in Berlin, Wis.

We in the Badger State are particularly proud of the Old World cultures from which most of us derive. When our dad or granddad or mom came here, invariably they brought with them the arts and crafts like Norwegian rose-maling of their native hearths. These avocations have been passed on down through the years.

HOBBIES CAN BE PROFITABLE, TOO

As I have previously indicated, a real advantage of hobbies is that they help keep our economy and our standard of living on a high level by providing the hobbyist with a commodity or an ability that he or she can sell. Thus, the aim of one of the leading publications in the hobby field—the Profitable Hobbies magazine—is to help the individual make his hobby a profitable one. Articles tell how John Jones earns a profit by selling his hand-carved wooden figures, or Mary Jones supplements her income by teaching canaries to sing or perform tricks, thus encouraging the readers to earn a profit from their favorite hobby. The very fact that Profitable Hobbies has a regular Washington column and correspondent indicates the fact that our Nation's Capital is a hobby news making center in addition to the more crucial domestic and foreign news it originates.

Hobbies involve a tremendous amount of business volume as any look at the advertisements in daily newspapers, magazines, or particularly hobby magazines will show. Literally thousands of workers are engaged in Wisconsin and other States' business enterprises, small and large, designed to make available avocational tools and supplies for pleasure to their fellow men.

HOW HOBBIES AID HEALTH AND VETERANS' WELFARE

One great advantage of hobbies, as has been previously pointed out, is their great benefit to people who are mentally or physically ill, folks with nothing interesting to keep them occupied, as well as people who have no sense of contributing, of being useful. The fact that hobbies can help such people, even heal such people, has been proven by the wonderfully constructive work done by the Red Cross Arts and Crafts organization, by the Goodwill Industries, Inc., by the Division of the Blind in the Library of Congress, and, along a different line, by such fine youth groups as the Boy Scouts, the Metropolitan Police Boys Clubs, the YW and YMCA's, as well as the YW and YMHA's.

There is hardly a town or hamlet in our great United States that hasn't heard of the magnificent work the Red Cross does by helping our sick and discouraged veterans back to health. Paraplegics with useless legs are taught to hammer metal into beautiful designs and utilitarian objects, so that they strengthen and use the upper parts of their bodies while at the same time they gain a sense of satisfaction from the metal objects they make. The deafened may be taught the fine art of photography so as to sharpen their sense of sight, while the mentally ill may be taught to relax and keep calm through the love of music.

THE FINE WORK DONE BY GOODWILL INDUSTRIES

Organizations, such as the Goodwill Industries, Inc. (which is, of course, well represented in my own State of Wisconsin), do work along a slightly different line, but equally constructive and valuable. Started back in 1902 in Boston, this organization today consists of over 90 local organizations which provide about 20,000 jobs annually to disabled people reconditioning toys, clocks, clothes, and so forth, for which they are paid about five and one-half million dollars annually in wages. Goodwill further widens the circle of its benefits by cooperating with State vocational rehabilitation services and the Veterans' Administration in helping to train the handicapped in a useful occupation. A particular reason for mentioning Goodwill along with hobbies is because they teach their disabled hobby-type occupations—woodcraft, needlecraft, toycraft, leathercraft, clock mechanics, and so on.

HOW HOBBIES AID THE BLIND

Hobbies are a great comfort to folks who live perpetually in darkness—our blind. The Division of the Blind of the Library of Congress has done a tremendous piece of work

in this connection by distributing thousands of "talking books" and books in braille all over the country. These books are a hobby in themselves, since reading is considered one of the most popular hobbies of all. In addition, these books open the way up to new hobbies by describing such topics as knitting, fishing, ceramics, and other such hobbies that the blind can learn.

CURBING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Along a somewhat different line is the invaluable work done to prevent juvenile delinquency in our young folk. Boy Scout groups teach our youth to tie knots, to create beautiful wallets, belts, and other objects in leather, to cook and bake in the outdoors, to become acquainted with nature's flora and fauna, and to participate in other wholesome, healthful activities with clean-minded, clean-spirited young friends.

Metropolitan Police Clubs, the Y's and other such groups too numerous to mention, carry out hobby activities along a somewhat different line, but their aim and achievements are the same—to build our youth of today into the leaders of tomorrow. Incidentally, I might mention that our Federal and State prisons from time to time have contacted me personally to request information and booklets on hobby activities for the inmates of their institutions.

HOBBYISTS PERFORM VITAL INTERNATIONAL AND EMERGENCY DUTIES

Few folks need be told how hobbyists aid Uncle Sam in times of war, during civilian emergencies and disasters and in other national and international matters. Thus, it is a generally accepted fact that the technically able hams or amateur radio operators formed the backbone of the armed services radio corps. So valuable were their services during the war that a Military Amateur Radio System (MARS) has been established as part of the National Guard, the ROTC, and the Organized Reserve Corps, vital elements of our present peacetime military program.

Another great service performed by hams is for no less a vital organization than the United Nations. Through the fine medium of the International Amateur Radio Union, hams have been relaying United Nations news bulletins around the world. Over 2,000 hams are signed up as UN amateur radio aides. Through the use of K2UN, the United Nations amateur station at Lake Success, they keep the airwaves humming 6 to 8 hours a day with vital international messages. As if these two national and international contributions were not sufficient, hams are also of great help in times of national emergency and disaster, such as flood, earthquake, typhoon or tornado, and so on. Many a life has been saved by the Johnny-on-the-spot ham who sent urgent messages for help over his radio outfit.

OTHER HOBBIES PROMOTE GOOD WILL

Other hobbies are beneficial in national and international matters. Thus, the stamp hobby helps create international good will by acquainting hobbyists with facts about foreign countries, their customs, their religions, their leaders, their history, their shrines, and so on. The collecting of autographs and historical documents has a similar salutary effect for much the same reasons. The same holds true for the collection of foreign dolls, or of old books, of old laces, of silver and china. A greater appreciation of our Indian problem is the result of the collection of Indiancraft, while understanding of problems comes about from such hobbies as fishing and hunting, collecting of birds eggs, imitation of bird whistles, study of flora and fauna, etc.

MODEL AVIATION VITAL IN THIS AIR AGE

Model airplane enthusiasts have long been recognized as real contributors to our civilian and military air progress, while the tinkerer or amateur inventor has been responsible for some highly valuable inventions. Along the same lines, the hobbyist who raises bees, angora rabbits, angora goats, gamecocks, mink, chinchilla, domestic fox, badgers, and other such animals, has helped these industries progress far more rapidly than might otherwise have been possible.

There are, of course, numerous other reasons why the hobbyist should be saluted and why I personally always try to give as much attention in a crowded day as possible to avocational matters raised by my constituents.

CONGRESSMEN HAVE HOBBIES, TOO

The heavy schedule of a Congressman does not, of course, permit much leisure time for their own pursuit of hobbies. However, as some of my colleagues put it, the very heaviness of that schedule (an 80-hour workweek) sometimes requires that a hobby be practiced so as to provide an outlet for the tensions that are built up. Many of our national magazines and newspapers have written up the wood-carving hobby of Congressman WALT HORAN, Senator MARTIN'S collection of Currier and Ives prints, Congressman BOYKIN'S rescue of dogs in pounds, etc.

SENATOR WILEY'S CHEESE RECIPE HOBBY

My own hobby comes about as the result of the fact that my home State of Wisconsin is the biggest and best cheese producing State in the Union. Its tempting, tasty, nutritious, delicious cheeses are known throughout the world. So, you've probably guessed it. My hobby is collecting and concocting cheese and other dairy recipes.

CONCLUSION

Well, in answer to my opening question, hobbyists do count even in the Atomic Age, in fact, especially in the Atomic Age.

If but a few of the peoples who are caught behind the iron curtain could see John Jones, average American, working at his metal working hobby, or having fun in any other type of way, I think that these folks in lands across the seas would have a better idea of the priceless blessings that Americans enjoy.

Good luck, hobbyists.

What the Eighty-first Congress Has Done for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address delivered by me to the people of Illinois.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends in Illinois, I am back again to give you another radio report from the Capital of America.

For several days and nights during the past week Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate struggled to reach agreement upon a satisfactory farm price support bill. As one of the conferees, I took my stand in favor of the flexible sliding scale contained in the farm bill submitted by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, who served with distinction as Secretary of Agriculture and has had long experience in farm legislation.

The 1948 platform of the Democratic Party called for a system of flexible supports for farm commodities. I took part in the deliberations of the resolutions committee which created the platform and helped to write the section pertaining to agriculture. The Anderson bill seemed to me definitely in keeping with my thinking and philosophy on the farm program based upon my 15 years as a Member of Congress from one of the great farm States of the Union. I knew that the people of Illinois expected me to express my own ideas.

As your Senator, I tried to find a solution beneficial to all the people of America, and I think we succeeded in shaping a farm bill which will be a vast improvement upon our past farm legislation.

As every farmer knows, we have been operating under wartime price supports. Our program has been on a year-to-year basis. But 4 years have passed since hostilities ceased, and it appeared very clear to me that the time had come for the enactment of a permanent price-support program.

The Anderson bill, as it was passed by the Senate under my leadership, was well designed to meet the needs of American farmers and American consumers. The Gore bill approved by the House of Representatives simply continued high wartime price props. There was a vital difference in the meaning of these two bills. You can readily see that, when we reached a conference of spokesmen for the House and Senate, it was very difficult for us to iron out our differences.

The bill we finally agreed to recommend for action by both Houses did not fully satisfy the desires of either the House or the Senate. Yet legislation under a Democratic system is always the product of reasonable compromises. To obtain agreement, the conferees of each House yielded some ground.

As you are well aware, the Anderson bill provided flexible supports for basic commodities at 75 to 90 percent of parity, with a guaranty of 90 percent of parity for the first year of its operation. On milk and butterfat, the Anderson proposal called for a mandatory sliding scale ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The bill also contained a sliding scale of from 60 to 90 percent of parity on honey, mohair, potatoes, tung nuts, and wool. The question of supporting other nonbasic commodities was left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. He could give no support or some support, depending upon the economic circumstances. He was required to take into consideration many factors, including the important factor of how much support operations for these nonbasic products would cost American taxpayers.

I have always advocated the granting of discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in order to keep our farm program on a flexible basis. And I backed the sliding scale of price supports with table in the Anderson bill because I am thoroughly convinced that the principle of flexibility is fundamental for the success of a long-range farm program.

The bill which emerged from the conference was not all that I hoped it would be, but I think it is an excellent farm bill. Let me tell you how we developed some of its provisions.

Soon after we entered the conference the spokesmen for the House insisted on a plan for 5 years of price supports at the high level of 90 percent of parity. This would have stimulated overproduction and would have created surpluses so large that at the end of the 5-year period our farm-price program would have collapsed of its own weight.

The conferees representing the Senate refused to accept the extension of 90 percent of parity price level for another 5 years, or another 3 years, or even another 2 years. We finally suggested what seemed to us a sensible compromise.

Under the Anderson bill, as approved by the Senate, we had authorized the establishment of a modernized parity formula. In the conference with the men from the House, we suggested that the old formula, based upon economic conditions from 1909 to 1914, should remain in the law temporarily and that the farmer should be given his choice between the two.

This was a compromise I had hoped we would not have to make but I knew it was absolutely essential to the people of Illinois and the Nation that we should get a permanent farm program launched in this session of Congress. I found that my colleagues of the Senate agreed with me on the necessity for creating the foundations of a lasting farm program.

After some discussion we proposed that the two parity formulas should be continued with equal force for the next 4 years. After that, the whole parity formula would be dropped and the modernized formula would remain in effect.

Another principal feature of the compromise bill is the provision to guarantee price supports for 1 year at 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities, 80 to 90 percent of parity during the second year, and 75 to 90 percent of parity during the third year and thereafter.

Among the amendments eliminated by the conferees was the so-called Magnuson amendment, which was directly contradictory to our reciprocal trade policy and would have compelled the President to veto the entire bill. I was very glad indeed to find that my colleagues in the conference were able to see the dangers of this amendment.

I regret to say, however, that the conferees would not accept my perfecting amendment which gave a realistic definition of normal supply. In the bill which came from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, normal supply was defined in terms which included the quantities of a commodity which the Government had to dispose of at a loss. It seemed to me that if such quantities were included, the normal supply would always be abnormally large. I drafted an amendment to make sure that abnormal uses of a commodity such as Government disposal of some quantities at a loss should not be considered in defining normal supply. My amendment was designed to protect the integrity of the entire farm program, by preventing the maintenance of too high price supports and the consequent cost to American consumers.

All in all, I am confident that we have passed a farm bill which will guarantee prices for basic and nonbasic farm commodities, and at the same time will eliminate the scandalous losses incurred by the Department of Agriculture supporting such products as potatoes and eggs. We will stop the process under which many millions of dollars were paid out for commodities over which the Government had no production controls through quotas or marketing allotments.

When you analyze our farm-price program for the entire 16 years between 1933 and 1949, you find that the cost of the program was very small after elimination of the losses due to potatoes, peanuts, and eggs. In that 16-year period, support operations for potatoes resulted in a loss of $339,000,000. Egg operations led to a loss in the same period of more than $38,000,000. At the same time, however, the Government had a total net gain for support of all the basic commodities of $129,000,000. In other words, my friends, it cost the taxpayers nothing to support the basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, etc.

Remember these facts when newspaper commentators tell you about the cost of our farm program. Remember these facts when such commentators make wild estimates of the cost of the new farm bill. I do not believe the new farm program will be at all burdensome over the long run.

My friends, every member of the conference on the farm bill signed the compromise agreement. I regard their unanimous acceptance of the bill as a clear indication that we were doing something constructive and worth while for American farmers. We all know that, unless farmers are prosperous, American business cannot thrive. Unless farmers are prosperous, labor cannot obtain full employment and good wages. Unless farmers are prosperous, the Government cannot obtain the Federal income necessary to finance our foreign policy and our social legislation.

In several other farm bills, already passed by this Congress and signed by the President, we have improved upon the record of the last Congress. Let me review some of those measures for you.

We amended the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act to finance additional storage facilities for the huge crops American farmers are producing. You remember how Illinois farmers were forced to dump part of the 1948 crops on the market at low prices because adequate storage spaces had not been provided.

In Illinois the sound of workmen building grain bins can be heard in every corner of the State. New bins to be owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation will hold 66,500,000 bushels, and bins owned by farmers and constructed under 5-year loans will hold another thirty-five or forty million bushels. I am proud of the fact that I took the initiative in seeing that this legislation was passed this year.

Think of what that means to Illinois farmers, my friends. These figures, supplied to me by the Department of Agriculture, reveal that the storage capacity for the 1949 crops in Illinois alone has been increased by more than 100,000,000 bushels. Surplus ordnance plants, unused airplane hangars, and other buildings owned by the War Assets Administration have been opened to Illinois farmers for the storage of grain.

The fertile land of Illinois has sprouted one of the greatest corn crops on record. The Agriculture Department estimates that the total will be 558,000,000 bushels, a larger crop than last year's tremendous outpouring, and 160,000,000 bushels above the 10-year average of 398,000,000 bushels.

As the owner of an Illinois farm, I am very glad that new grain bins are being finished every day under legislation passed by the Eight-first Congress.

Another agricultural achievement of this Congress is the extension of the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Under the bill, which I expedited through the Senate, three counties in Illinois were added to the wheat-crop insurance program and four counties to the corn-crop insurance program.

I have already discussed with you the value of the international wheat agreement ratified by the Senate this year. Under that agreement, the United States will be able to support 168,000,000 bushels of wheat each year for the next 4 years at guaranteed prices ranging from $1.20 to $1.80 per bushel.

I have also told you about the rural telephone bill, which will bring new enjoyment of life and a better standard of living to many Illinois families. Too many of our farmers are handicapped because they do not have any telephone service at all, or the service is not efficient or reliable. The program approved by this Congress will not be at the cost of the taxpayer. It will pay for itself.

We also extended the time for farmers to file their income tax returns, a convenience sorely needed by many farmers in Illinois and other States.

My friends, I regret that I do not have enough time to tell you about all the gains we have made in legislation for American farmers at this session of Congress. I must leave you now, but I will be with you again next week with another report from the Capital of America.

Thank you very much for listening. Let me assure you again that your comments, criticisms, and suggestions for my radio programs will be welcomed.

Statism: A New Name for Old Landon Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I referred, in an address I made October 8, 1949, before the representatives of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League at Philadelphia, to the charge of "statism" as merely a " 'new look' for the same old charges of socialism and communism used in the Landon presidential campaign of 1936, and just about as effective."

I pointed out in my remarks that we must address our attention to the merits of any proposal and not to the label which some might seek to tack on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release of my address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS DESCRIBES "STATISM" CHARGE AS "NEW LOOK" FOR OLD LANDON CAMPAIGN

PHILADELPHIA, October 8.—Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, majority whip of the United States Senate, tonight described the political charge of "statism" against the Truman administration as "the 'new look' for the same old charges of 'socialism' and 'communism' used in the Landon Presidential campaign of 1936, and just about as effective.

"It's a fancy covering for the same old bone structure," he added. "Since we've all seen those bones before, the camouflage of a 'new look' doesn't fool us."

MYERS spoke at a dinner commemorating the one hundred and first anniversary of the credit union movement. He told representatives of the Philadelphia chapter of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League present at the dinner in the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot that if they took the charge of "statism" seriously, "then you too must consider yourselves wards of a paternalistic statism because you accepted and continue to accept Federal or State guidance in the operation of your own credit unions."

In a good-humored talk on national political issues, MYERS said that the credit-union idea can also be attacked as a foreignism because it was first conceived by a German a hundred and one years ago.

"Of course, as all of you know, the credit-union idea is only about 40 years old in the United States," he continued, "but its growth over that period of time is a convincing demonstration of its merit and its strength. I think you could be safe in saying the various States didn't have to pass credit-union statutes, and it probably wasn't really necessary for the Federal Government to pass a credit-union law 15 years ago.

"No, it wasn't necessary. But it was certainly desirable. It was desirable to have these laws so that the States and the Federal Government could assist in giving guidance to interested groups of people who wanted to join together in a cooperative effort to promote thrift, accumulate savings, and provide a pool of funds they could draw on for worthwhile and necessary small loans to meet some immediate situation.

"I suppose you could call this guidance and this 'clearing house' function of the State and Federal Governments as a sort of benevolent statism if you wished, but that isn't really the point. And it isn't the point, either, that an idea was first hatched in Germany or in Japan or in England—or even in the United States.

"The point is, rather, whether an idea is a good idea or a bad idea. Whether it's the best way to handle a particular problem. Whether it fits within the framework of our Constitution. And whether it's compatible with our ideas of liberty and justice.

"These are the only criteria we can use. The label we attach to an idea doesn't mean a thing.

"Take, for instance, atomic energy. If you really need a label, the way the Government is handling our atomic development is out-and-out socialism. The Government owns and controls the atom from one end of the chain to the other. Believe me, the Congress really struggled with that one, but it is the only feasible way that the question can be handled, and still protect America the way it must be protected.

"The same sort of thing happens when you start considering international control of the atom. Every nation in the world except one—Russia—agrees that we have got to do away with national sovereignty in the atomic field if we are ever going to get any effective control over this terrible force. And, yet, all of us guard our sovereignty proudly and this isn't a matter of whether you favor world government or not. It is simply the unavoidable fact that this is the only effective solution that can be worked out.

"So there's no question about it. You can't decide an issue by looking at the label. We've got to ask ourselves questions about its merits, the need for it, and its suitability in terms of the way we do business and the way we regard our liberty."

Minnesota State CIO Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of resolutions adopted by the Twelfth Annual Convention of the Minnesota State CIO Council in September 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS

Whereas President Truman and Rights Committee pointed out that there are four basic American fredoms:

1. The right to safety and security of the person;

2. The right to freedom of conscience and expression;

3. The right to citizenship and its privileges;

4. The right to equality of opportunity; and

Whereas the committee pointed out that unfortunately there were many violations of these basic rights which caused untold harm to the Nation, such as the denial of the right to vote to many millions of Negroes in the South through legal means and violence or the threat of violence; the creating of an atmosphere of hysteria and witch hunt through the loyalty-oath requirements for Government employees, and the denial of equality of oportunity in employment, health, education, transportation, and other public facilities; and

Whereas these violations hurt the Nation's economy, drag down wage scales, are a blot on our national character, and is ever one of the greatest hindrances to sound American foreign policy; and

Whereas organized labor supports a program intended to improve the dignity of the individual and the welfare of the public; and

Whereas President Truman's Civil Rights Committee recommends that National and State fair employment practices legislation, national antilynching, antipoll tax laws, improved educational opportunities for all citizens, and other legislation intended to improve and define the rights of individuals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this twelfth convention of the Minnesota State CIO Council support the objectives of the report of the President's Committee for Civil Rights and work to secure its recommendations into legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Truman, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator EDWARD THYE, all Congressmen of Minnesota, and to the national CIO.

UNITED STATES DEMOCRACY IN THE FIELD OF BUSINESS

Whereas in the United States today we have about 200 large corporations which control nearly half of the business assets of the Nation and the tendency toward monopoly by these large corporations not only threatens the continuance of free enterprise, real meaningful competition, resulting low consumers' prices, and the growth in the number and strength of small businesses, but it gives rise to an autocratic economic government within our political democracy as well; and

Whereas political candidates and legislators are sometimes unduly influenced by the power of big business; and

Whereas most large corporate combinations are controlled by small groups of self-perpetuating directors; and

Whereas although ownership of the modern corporation is nominally held by common stockholders, the great bulk of common stock actually is only temporarily held by investors seeking short-term profit. These individuals have no control over, or interest in corporation policies of prices, wages, or production policy. Real control rests with a small group of stockholders and their hired managers. These simple basic facts have been well documented by President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers and the Congressional Temporary National Economic Committee; and

Whereas although the great mass of American people have a direct voice in their political democratic government through free elections they have no similar voice in the management of the enterprises in which they earn their living. Three out of four Americans who are wage earners do not share in the fruits of their labor through the enjoyment of a share in the profits; and

Whereas if America allows the continuation of this drift toward growth of the number and strength of monopolies, our free economic system and thus our free political system may well be severely endangered by minority control of the majority of our Nation's financial controls. And financial controls are the life line of any business, large or small. Minority controls of such life lines may, as in 1929, mean sudden financial catastrophe, and with the destruction of the money market, the destruction of many businesses, the mushrooming of unemployment; and

Whereas under conditions of unemployment, relief, soup kitchens, apple stands and the fear and unrest such conditions create the radical proposals of Communists and Fascists will gain rapid support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. This convention urges the national and State CIO to engage in continuing research to find ways and means of extending democratic principles and practices in the economic field of American life. The economic freedom and individual rights of all Americans must be the basic consideration in all such studies.

2. Specific measures for introducing a greater measure of democracy into the economic activities of this Nation should be investigated. Possible measures which would help and assist our Nation in regaining industrial democracy are extension of cooperatives in all fields of American business activities, opportunities for employee ownership of common stock, labor-management councils, Federal incorporation of corporations, more effective prosecution of antitrust laws in those cases where selfish un-American minority business groups are engaging in practices harmful to the prosperity of our country, and the use of fair Federal income taxes and price controls as a means of protecting the public interest from monopolistic growth.

3. A copy of this legislative resolution be sent to each member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, each Congressman and Senator from Minnesota, and a copy to the Governor of Minnesota.

FORESTRY PROGRAMS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas research by the Federal Forest Service shows that nearly 80 percent of the logging on private lands is destructive to future forest growth. Since the great majority of our timber comes from privately owned lands this situation is gradually leading to the creation of large areas of unproductive land which will not produce a timber crop for another century. If proper minimum cutting practices are established by law a much greater opportunity for the establishment of young timber is possible. Such a measure has been introduced into the Eighty-first Congress by Senator ANDERSON (S. 1820) and it includes provisions for Federal control over forest cutting to assure proper regrowth. This law would only apply to those States which have not enacted proper forest regulation laws of their own; and

Whereas opposition to this bill has already developed through the powerful American Pulp and Paper Association, the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, and other industry groups. However, this opposition is difficult to understand in view of the many news releases and bulletins published by industrial associations showing the excellent job of forestry now being practiced; and

Whereas another matter of concern is the need for salvaging the millions of board feet of logs which are lost each year through fires and insect damage on the national forests. In Colorado alone 4,000,000,000 board feet of timber has been killed. Other millions of feet stand on fire-swept areas which should be salvaged and used to build houses and furnish the raw materials needed by industry. Yet the Forest Service is power-

less to carry on logging operations and private industry is not interested in logging these areas where the profit margin is low and the risks are high; and

Whereas the United States Forest Service should be authorized by law to carry on salvage logging operations in these areas to prevent waste. As yet no bill has been introduced in Congress to provide for this emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention goes on record supporting:

1. The Anderson forest cutting regulation bill (S. 1820) to stop forest destruction on private logging operations.

2. The introduction of a measure in Congress empowering the United States Forest Service to carry on logging operations on the national forests wherever such are deemed necessary in order to salvage timber which might otherwise be wasted.

PULPWOOD PRICES

Whereas many farmers and small loggers in northern Minnesota earn their livelihood by cutting and selling pulpwood to a few large paper mills; and

Whereas the price of pulpwood has dropped nearly 25 percent from the 1948 high while other prices have not dropped proportionately and has caused great hardships on the pulpwood producers; and

Whereas there appears to be collusion on the part of the large mills in this uniform drastic cut in prices which is not warranted by the market in finished paper: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention requests the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the reasons for this severe cut in pulpwood prices, and further, to investigate possible collusion in price-making of pulpwood by the paper mills.

REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES

Whereas the Seventy-eighth Congress did pass legislation known as the Revenue Act of 1943 which placed additional taxes upon many articles of commerce including furs, leather goods, cosmetics, transportation, beer, other alcoholic beverages, and numerous other items; and

Whereas these added wartime excise taxes were to be of a temporary nature and were therefore accepted by the American people without complaint; and

Whereas 4 years after the cessation of hostilities these wartime excise taxes are still with us; and

Whereas the continued application of said wartime excise taxes places an unequal burden upon working people and others of limited income and has a depressing effect upon industry and employment, thereby aggravating the conditions of unemployment and business recession, particularly in the industries affected by such taxes and their allied industries; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced to repeal all wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943 with the exception of the alcoholic beverage excise tax of said revenue act; and

Whereas the alcoholic beverages industry is the Government's largest industry taxpayer, having paid to the Federal Government alone the enormous sum of $26,823,255,944 from 1943 to 1948; and

Whereas due to the high excise taxes placed upon the products of this industry, bootlegging, moonshining and other practices of the prohibition era are encouraged and are on the upward trend, thereby causing the Government large losses of revenue and resulting in the loss of thousands of jobs in the industry; and

Whereas the repeal of all wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943 would stimulate business in the fur, leather goods, cosmetics, transportation, beer, liquor and allied industries, and would greatly increase consumer buying power in all industries affected by said taxes as well as in industry generally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Industrial Union Council, CIO, and its affiliated unions assembled in convention this 9th day of September 1949, hereby demand that the President and the Congress repeal all of said unfair and discriminatory wartime excise taxes of the Revenue Act of 1943; and be it further

Resolved, That President Truman, the majority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and all Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota be advised by written communications or other means of this action.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Whereas the Senate of the United States recently disapproved the section of the Government reorganization plan setting up a Welfare Department with a Cabinet rank; and

Whereas the CIO has constantly looked beyond the welfare of our people in plants and has supported measures benefiting the vast majority; and

Whereas the CIO is a leading force for economic good in our country and must assume the leadership on questions affecting the well being of so many: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Minnesota State Industrial Union Council supports the establishment of a Welfare Department with full Cabinet rank.

Republicanism Must Be Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD a summary of my remarks before the Republican National Committee in the Fontenelle Hotel in Omaha, Nebr., on the evening of January 26, 1949:

When Chairman SCOTT requested me to address this gathering of the Republican National Committee, it was with some little trepidation that I accepted the invitation.

I wondered, of course, just what I would say—what I could say—under the circumstances.

The Republican Party has just suffered another Nation-wide defeat at the hands of the New Deal. In five successive national elections, beginning with 1932, we have failed to impress upon the voters of this Nation the necessity or the advisability of entrusting the White House to our care.

Last November, seemingly with everything in our favor, we suffered another repudiation at the polls.

We are meeting here in Omaha to discuss that defeat and, if possible, to take a lesson from it. Only through such discussion, only by means of a thorough discussion of that defeat, can we hope to gain an insight into the future.

I do not propose to set myself up as an oracle.

My own election in my first campaign for public office did not constitute in the least an overwhelming mandate. In fact, I won by an extremely slight majority. I do not, therefore, have any magic formula to offer for surviving what was in general a landslide for the opposition party.

But I do not believe we can do without a thorough discussion of last November 2 and I propose to offer some thoughts concerning the lessons we as a party must learn from the results of last November's voting.

We learned, for example, that we have been in the main extremely poor salesmen.

We failed to sell the Eightieth Congress to the public. Rather, we allowed Mr. Truman to use that Congress as his personal whipping boy.

We failed to sell the Taft-Hartley Act. And we allowed Mr. Truman and certain union leaders to distort the provisions and the effect of that law to a point where it became a detrimental factor in the campaign.

We failed to sell the farmer and allowed Mr. Truman to take full credit for the present satisfactory economic conditions of the farmer.

And this was despite the fact that the Congress had passed the first long-range agricultural program in history—a program of immense benefit to the farmer.

We failed in selling many other phases of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress—of the Republican position on issues before that Congress.

Let us explore for a moment our position on the Taft-Hartley law.

Did opposition to Republican candidates who had voted for Taft-Hartley arise because the law is a bad law?

I do not believe so. I believe it has been pretty well established by clear-thinking persons that the Taft-Hartley law, while not perfect, represented a forward step in labor-management relations, particularly in the effect of those relations upon the public as a whole.

What, then, caused the militant opposition of the average laboring man to Taft-Hartley?

The answer, to me at least, is simple—salesmanship.

The opposition did a bang-up job of selling. We did not.

Union leaders, aided and abetted by the President and his administration leaders, used the Taft-Hartley law as a rallying point around which labor could be organized to vote as a bloc against Republican candidates.

Taft-Hartley was sold to the American workingman, and sold as no other political issue has ever been sold before, as a bad law, as a law which would destroy unions.

So impressive was the propaganda barrage leveled by the President, certain administration leaders, and most union bosses that the Republican Party was placed on the defensive even before the law was passed.

Every medium of propaganda was utilized. The President's veto of the law constituted a masterpiece of demagogery and misrepresentation.

Unions bought full-page newspaper ads. Government officials holding New Deal patronage positions took to the air waves. For weeks and months the barrage continued.

The Republican Party was on the defensive before the campaign of 1948 actually opened. And we never did regain the offensive position throughout the campaign.

It seems to me quite possible that this could have been avoided—that we can avoid such tragedies in the future—if we have learned our lesson.

Our failure, to me at least, on Taft-Hartley was that we did not as a party, as the majority party in the Congress, spend sufficient time in acquainting labor with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill before we enacted it into law.

That is the time for an offensive—before a thing is done, not after.

I am not indicting the Taft-Hartley law. I believe that most of its provisions are proper, that the law is much better than its predecessor, the Wagner Act. I do not believe the law is antilabor. On the contrary, I believe the safeguards it sets up in behalf of the laboring man are necessary if we are to keep labor free and progressive.

But I finally believe we have so failed to convince the individual union member of the worthiness of the Taft-Hartley law that we must expect its revision in this Congress.

I do not mean to maintain the Taft-Hartley law defeated us in the 1948 election. But it was a contributing factor, and it need not have been.

Many Republican voices were raised on behalf of the Eightieth Congress during the campaign. But too few were heard during the months that the Congress was in session.

Consequently, as in the case of Taft-Hartley, the Republican Party shot its ammunition from the defensive side of the battlefield in September and October.

I am not exactly a sports enthusiast but I do enjoy an occasional basketball or football game in my home State of Indiana. And I have often heard it said that in sports the best defense is a good offense.

The same principle holds true in politics, also.

But we lacked the offense in 1947 and 1948, and we lost the ball game.

We spent far too much time on defense, far too little on offense.

We took the farm vote for granted and let the Democrats take the offensive. While we were gazing elsewhere, the Democrats not only took the offensive, they took the farm vote, too.

We took an anti position on inflation. We were sincerely against inflation. We said price control wouldn't work, that things would settle down. We were absolutely correct. But the voters weren't satisfied. While we were conducting a wait-and-see campaign in regard to inflation, the New Deal was calling for price control.

The New Deal said price control would stop inflation. The President, while talking earnestly about bringing our economic base back to earth, was promising another 4 years of wild and reckless spending which could lead only to more and more inflation.

We pointed this out in our campaign, but it didn't go over.

I wonder if this isn't the answer.

Although our position was right, we didn't dramatize it. We had a negative position. We were against more spending, against more controls. Our program was not a program of action and the Truman price-control proposals constituted a program of action.

The average voter understands price control as an immediate, an active, means of preventing price increases on commodities.

He does not necessarily understand that price control to be effective must eventually result in control of wages, of production, and, ultimately, of our entire economic life.

Price control, to the harried housewife in the lower income brackets, sounds like an immediate means of reversing the upward trend of prices, of bringing back the good old days. It is a positive program. It sounds simple.

With it, the New Deal had the offensive again and we of the Republican Party had the defensive position.

I do not mean to say that our position was not fully set out during the course of the campaign. It was. But I do not believe our language was clear enough, our opposition advanced with sufficient clarity. And we lacked a clear-cut, down-to-earth program of our own.

The New Deal platform, the Truman campaign, were fantastic. The President's state of the Union message and his budget message were likewise fantastic. The New Deal still believes in the theory so ably advanced by the late Harry Hopkins—tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. That theory has been proven in five national elections. It does get votes. It does elect Presidents and Senators and Congressmen.

We, as Republicans, are placed at a tremendous disadvantage. Our expenditures are limited to the funds we collect during campaigns. The New Deal campaign fund is practically inexhaustible. Congress replenishes it with each appropriation bill.

We must spend our own money in getting our campaigns across to the voters. The New Deal spends everybody's money.

What, then, can we do?

I believe it is our job—the job of every Republican whatever his position or lack of position in the party—to become individual salesmen of republicanism.

We must halt the march of socialism, halt the ever-increasing strides toward the superstate.

We must convince the American people that their liberties are not just in danger, but that they are rapidly disappearing.

We are a minority party today. We must be a militant minority party. We must adopt a clear-cut program of opposition to state socialism. We must dramatize our position, sell our product, give the people the facts in unmistakable language.

We cannot do so in the few short months of the average political campaign. We must begin at once.

I do not believe that the people of this Nation favor replacing our republican form of government with state socialism. I do not believe the American people desire to sell their liberties for a mess of bureaucratic pottage.

I believe, rather, that the American people are basically opposed to the trend our domestic affairs has been taking for these past 16 years.

The average American, I believe, longs for more rational government, for a return to government based upon law rather than upon men. And I am supremely confident that once the Republican Party marshals its forces together and advances a concrete program for a revision of this trend toward socialism the American people will rally behind us in overwhelming numbers.

We must stop quarreling among ourselves. We must stop identifying each other as liberals or conservatives or reactionaries. We must as a party have but one label—the label of the Republican Party which it has been our privilege to wear since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

And we must go to the people with an aggressive program, militantly presented, if we are to fare any better in 1950 or 1952 than we did in 1948.

I speak to you as a woman. There are more of us on the voting rolls than there are men. I speak to you as a former precinct committee worker. And the workers in the precincts form the backbone of our party.

I speak to you as vice chairman of my own county Republican organization, as vice chairman of my district Republican organization, as a member of my State Republican committee.

I have been fortunate to serve on the national committee for several years. And I have been highly honored by the people of my district who chose me to represent them in the Congress.

I feel, therefore, that mine is a heavy responsibility. And I feel that the responsibility of the Republican Party as a whole is greater today than it was even four short months ago during the heat of the Presidential election campaign.

It is our responsibility to correct the mistakes we made in 1948 and in 1944 and in the campaigns preceding those.

If our Republic is to be preserved, if freedom of personal initiative is to survive, it is up to us. The New Deal is not going to change. Rather, it is to continue to lead us down the road of the super-state.

No third party is coming along to do the job of saving America. It is wholly our responsibility. And the time is growing very short. We must adopt a program, clear-cut and understandable. Then we must sell that program. We must take it to every man and woman in America. We must take it to our young people, our women's organizations, our business people, our farmers, and our workers.

We must dramatize its principles, publicize its proposals.

It is a tremendous job of salesmanship. And to accomplish it, we must all become salesmen—salesmen of Republicanism and of Americanism.

I am optimistic enough to believe it can be done.

Has the Eighty-first Congress Made Good?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which I prepared for the United Press entitled "Has the Eighty-first Congress Made Good?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, October 19.—Has the Eighty-first Congress made good?

Of course, I may be a little prejudiced on that matter, but—even allowing for that, and even considering all of the many things we have not accomplished in this first session but have postponed until next year—I think this Congress has done a generally excellent job, a simply amazing job.

No, we have not yet passed in full the Truman program. We haven't, it's true, written into law every one of the planks of the Democratic platform adopted at Philadelphia in 1948.

But we have made a start—in most cases a pretty solid start—on nearly all of those planks in our platform and in the Truman program, and we have already enacted into law extensive portions of that program, including some which have been blocked and killed in a succession of previous Congresses.

The Congress which was elected in 1948 was selected for 2 years. The platform which we drew up at Philadelphia in 1948 was to chart our party's program—project it—over a period of the 4 years of the Truman administration.

Looking at the record of this first session, we find that the most important single phase of our program—the achievement of a decent world of free peoples at peace—has been adhered to by this Congress with a devotion, an intensity, and a willingness which has seldom been equaled by any Congress in our history.

Programs like the Marshall plan, reciprocal trade, United Nations participation, Voice of America, and others—which were fought over bitterly in the Eightieth Congress, attacked ferociously, nibbled at, and, in fact, were almost destroyed—were pushed through the Eighty-first Congress this session in full vigor, and for one reason only, because the

Democratic majority which believed in these programs held together and pushed them through. And then we followed through, with the North Atlantic Pact and the arms program.

From the moment the Eighty-first Congress took office there was no longer the haunting fear which had gripped the country during the regime of the Eightieth Congress that this Nation might turn away from our policy of world leadership toward a better world at peace.

On the domestic front, our achievements have not yet been as voluminous but they are no less dramatic.

Despite the widest public support for public housing legislation, it took the Eighty-first Congress finally to get through a bill establishing a vigorous program of getting more of our American citizens out of the slums and into decent American homes. The Senate had passed similar legislation in both the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, but it was always pigeonholed in the House. This time it got through. It is now operating.

Social-security reform has been a crying need in this country for years. The Eightieth Congress didn't even bother considering the matter. This year, the House has drafted, considered, and passed a comprehensive bill which substantially increases pensions and widens coverage, and the Senate is certain to act on it next year.

Legislation of this sort takes time and more time for study, for amendment, for the most careful sort of consideration. It's not a matter of introducing a bill one day and passing it the next—or the next month, either. Legislation such as the middle-income housing bill, social security, civil rights, and many others, affecting millions upon millions of Americans, are long-range legislative assignments. And our committees have been working on them with remarkable devotion.

Perhaps we cannot in these 2 years accomplish all of the legislative goals we have set. We do not admit that, however, and we have no intention of slackening our efforts. On civil rights, although we have now been saddled in the Senate by a bipartisan coalition of Republicans and anticivil rights Democrats, with a horribly retrogressive rule for attempting to shut off filibusters, we are going to fight down the line for the passage of the bills we promised in our 1948 platform.

Other Congresses in the past have undoubtedly been speedier in the passage of certain types of recurrent bills, particularly appropriations. But none, certainly none in the 11 years I have served in the Congress, has worked harder, more conscientiously; none has been better informed on the issues and the facts. And few, if any, have tried harder to do a good job in the national interest.

Instead of talking economy, we have tried to put it into effect through careful review of appropriations and large-scale reorganizations in government to promote efficiency along the lines of the Hoover report; instead of screaming "statism," we have worked zealously at maintaining a free, prosperous free-enterprise system; instead of deploring conditions among underprivileged Americans, we have put through a higher minimum wage, housing legislation, and a farm program designed to protect the farmer against natural disaster and bankruptcy.

Yes, I firmly believe this Congress has done a good job—a simply amazing job when compared to the Eightieth, and when compared to the crapehanging predictions last spring of our failures.

Next year, and next year's achievements will give the final standards by which to gage the Eighty-first Congress. In the meantime, don't let the Republicans fool you with their howls. Look at what they did.

The Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three newspaper columns entitled the "Washington Scene" by George Dixon.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 11, 1949]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

Miss Reid came back from Capitol Hill, after listening to President Union on the State of the Truman, looking very perplexed.

"What," she asked in her girlish shrill, "is a mandate?"

"Well," I said, "let us put it this way: Supposing a guy comes in from Hollywood and says he is a pal of Bill Frawley, and that the last thing good old Bill said was to be sure and call Marion Reid the minute he got to Washington, and are you free for the evening because——."

"Oh, fudge," the damsel screamed profanely. "I know about that kind of mandate. This is President Truman's mandate."

"I wouldn't know about that," I admitted, "although I suppose if some Democratic committeewoman from Macon, or maybe Mrs. Mesta, inveigled him into coming to dinner she could call it a Presidential mandate. Who's been mandating our Chief Executive?"

"Practically everybody. To hear him tell it his whole job is just one man damdate—I mean darn mandate—after another.

"He has had a mandate from labor. Another mandate from the farmers, another from the veterans. And mandates from business, capital, reclamation and power groups, the military, and foreign aid—whoever the latter may be. How can he get along with all those mandates?"

"It's a cinch," I said. "I thought the President put it very clearly and simply. He is just going to perform a latter-day miracle."

Miss Reid asked if I would mind saying that again. I begged her to wait a minute until I could get my tongue inserted in my cheek, and said:

"It goes this way: High wages, low prices, increased taxation—and business to expand with the profits from same."

Having been lying out in the Mexican sun one day and shivering on Pennsylvania Avenue the next, I should be accustomed to the idea of modern rapid transit.

Nevertheless, I was still surprised to find a letter, postmarked Johannesburg, South Africa, from Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada—and learn, a few minutes later, that the Senator was back here in Washington.

It developed he had come hopping home to attend the Republican caucus, having passed up a date with Franco in Spain to make the meeting on time.

The date with Franco was all set—but, because of the importance of GOP caucussing, the Senator will never be able to regale his grandchildren, if any, with what Franco said to him and what he said to Franco.

Nevertheless, I am pretending Senator MALONE is still in Johannesburg, because his observations from there are extremely pertinent—particularly as his tour was conducted in the capacity of chairman of the National Resources Economic Committee.

Johannesburged Senator MALONE:

"We should arrive in Washington early in January. (Note.—No kidding?)

"I have taken a look at nearly all the nations since World War II, except Russia.

"My object was to determine the effect of the factors influencing the availability and cost of the minerals and materials throughout the world which we either do not produce at all or in insufficient quantities for our use.

"The picture is not pretty.

"The Empire preferential rates, the sterling bloc, the manipulation of their currencies for trade advantage and other factors tend to make us pay through the nose in many of these countries for such materials as tin, nickel, manganese, chromite, asbestos, tungsten, hemp, quinine, and spices."

Senator MALONE then proceeds to some chit chat which I found equaly absorbing:

"Visited Rangoon in Burma. They are very playful down there. The morning I was to leave they woke me up at 3:30 a. m. I thought they were waking me to take the plane, so I said 'Yes, I'm getting up.' I got up, but the noise did not stop. They were firing volleys in the street.

"A few weeks before they had shot the entire cabinet—no favorites—so I just visited the new premier. I went back to bed after that; there seemed nothing else to do at the moment.

"Note that they just shot the Prime Minister of Egypt—had a nice visit with him anyway. Guess the Republicans will have to take a leaf out of the Egyptians' book if they are ever to get in.

"Are you still baffled about the election? It could have been like the case of a westerner who got elected to Congress and went to Washington. Someone asked him how he got elected.

" 'Well,' he said, 'I did not like what the incumbent Congressman was doing so I ran against him.'

" 'But how,' persisted the questioner, 'did you get elected?'

"He answered: 'I guess that everyone who knew me voted for him, and everybody who knew him voted for me—and he knew more people.' "

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 31, 1949]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, has just returned from a round-the-world personal inspection tour with this firm conviction:

That it's wasted money and effort trying to help any foreign nation which does not adhere to the principles of ordinary business integrity.

"No private individual in his right mind will make a loan unless he is assured of the ordinary safeguards of business," said the Senator. "He makes sure first that the only risk he is taking is a business risk."

Senator MALONE said the tip-off is that capitalists in many of the loan-seeking nations will not invest in their own countries if they can get their money out of the homeland. They will resort to every known trick of international finance to pry their money loose so they can invest it in the United States.

"Foreigners are investing $14,000,000,000 here," he said. "At the same time they are howling that we should take 'loan' risks abroad that they won't take themselves.

"A nation whose government does not accept the principles of business integrity is no nation to do business with. And by this I don't mean only Communist-dominated countries. A country tending heavily toward nationalization is an impossible business risk.

The investor never knows when his investment will be wiped out through Government decree."

Senator MALONE declared we could use one simple yardstick in considering foreign loan applications—the yardstick we employ every day here at home.

"We should make loans to foreigners," he said, "on the same terms—no better, or no worse—than we make them to Americans."

While I was with Mr. MALONE he received at least a dozen long-distance calls from Nevada, where livestock is threatened with extinction from the snow. The question of Government loans to hard-hit ranchers to tide them over until they can get back on their feet came up.

"The money will have to be paid back," he said. "But some kind of long-range, easy terms should be worked out. The loans should be made on the ability and willingness of the rancher to keep going so that he can eventually pay back.

"We should put our loans to foreign nations on the same basis."

In his inspection tours, Senator MALONE has visited virtually every country since World War II. He is convinced we have embarked on a lending and gift spree which can only result in our own ruination, without any permanent good to those we are trying to rescue.

He sums up his findings in this terse manner:

"We can only help those who sincerely want to help themselves. And the only way we can get a nation to do anything is to make it realize it is in its interest to do it."

"Freshman" Representative STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, was standing impatiently in line at the House disbursing office the other day. He was trying to get a pay check.

Mr. YOUNG explained, vehemently, that he just had to get dough because he had to go home to Cleveland and pick up some decent clothes.

"I have just been appointed to the Ways and Means Committee," he said. "It is a very important committee, and I've got to look dignified."

The reason I put quotes around "freshman" in referring to Mr. YOUNG is that he was here before. But he has been out since 1942, when he was defeated by George H. Bender, the hymn-singing solon.

YOUNG and Bender have carried on quite an election feud. YOUNG defeated Bender three times and Bender defeated him twice.

In 1940 they both won. This was because a population increase gave Ohio two Representatives-at-large. But redistricting ensued and now there is only one again and YOUNG is it.

The Navy is getting out a textbook for its Reserve officers. It contains many interesting items not matters of general knowledge. For instance:

Did you know it's a bread-and-water offense for a naval officer to wear nonregulation socks with a regulation uniform?

Outside of that, how've ya been?

[From the New York (N. Y.) Daily Mirror of February 10, 1949]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—"Lookit," said Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, stabbing a knobby finger under my snoot, "let's employ some sense in this thing. You can't be for both a high standard of living and a free trade."

We had been talking about the reciprocal trade thing now agitating Congress and the big fellow from Nevada had been getting himself more and more worked up as he analyzed its possibilities for dumping this country in the soup. He said we seemed to be walking into something like blindfolded idiots.

"They call it 'reciprocal' trade," he snapped, "But 'reciprocal' in this case is just a trick word to sell us the free-trade idea. How, in the name of all that is sensible, can you have reciprocal trade with a country that doesn't do business our way?"

The solon, who used to be a box-fighter around the mining camps until he managed to get himself an education, said a bunch of CIO leaders out in his State had come to him a couple of years ago saying they were for free trade. He turned schoolmaster on them.

"How," he asked the unioneers, "can a $10 or $12 a day miner here in Nevada expect to compete against a 40-cent a day miner in Burma? You try it—and you'll be out of work so fast your heads'll swim."

The upshot, observed Senator MALONE, was that these unioneers thought it over and reacted by divorcing themselves from the national CIO.

"We don't want fixed trade agreements for a stipulated time," he continued. "What we need is a flexible import fee, with the Federal Tariff Commission given the power to raise or lower as costs of production in the country of origin go up or down.

"Here's what I mean: We base our import fee, or tariffs, or whatever you want to call them, on what it costs the country in question to produce. If its standards of living are away below ours we impose a high duty. As it improves its standards of living we lower the duty.

"This discourages the country from the old practice of paying coolie wages because it just has to pay the difference to the United States Treasury. It decides it might as well pay it to its own people instead."

Senator MALONE said a fixed tariff doesn't work well because the economy of the various nations is in a continual state of flux.

"If we sign an agreement for a definite period, say 3 years, we can't change it during that period," he said. "And in that time the nations can change their standards of living by manipulating their currency—and we're stuck with the 3-year agreement."

He added: "I've said this over and over until I'm tired of hearing it myself. But I've been all over the world studying this thing. And I am convinced the only way we can get other countries to do anything is to make it in their own interest to do it.

"If we can't make it to their own interest to raise their own standards we can't do business with them—and that's that."

I asked Miss Reid if the above were thoroughly clear to her. She said it would be clear to a child.

"As a matter of fact," she added, "it would be clearer to a child. A kid won't trade unless he things he is receiving value for value. But kids seem to have more sense than some of our international thinkers."

Bill To Prohibit Supreme Court Justices Testifying as Character Witnesses Commended

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable KENNETH KEATING, who has made vital and significant legislative contributions both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, has introduced a bill which would prohibit members of the Supreme Court of the United States from testifying as character witnesses in Federal courts.

This is a thoughtful measure which has already received much approving comment and substantial support.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am including two recent editorials from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post which are most enlightening and which give our colleague, Congressman KEATING, the accolade which he deserves:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of August 8, 1949]

JUDGES SHOULD WELCOME LAW

There has been little if any public comment made by Federal judges on the bill introduced in the House by Representative KEATING, of New York, which would prohibit members of the Supreme Court from testifying as character witnesses before other judicial tribunals. It would seem that such a measure would be welcomed by the justices.

The principal value of such a measure would lie in the protection it would give judges from unreasonable demands upon them, as well as to bar them from appearing in court voluntarily to aid a personal friend.

At present, of course, they have no choice in the matter of testifying before trial courts if they are subpenaed. Ordinarily, it is our opinion that judges on any bench are reluctant to go on the witness stand. Such an appearance has at least the tendency of removing from them their essential roles as impartial agents of justice.

When an accused person asks a friend, who happens to be a judge, to testify for him, he is actually putting the jurist in a very uncomfortable position. If the judge should decline, his action would be regarded as unfriendly and even cruel to the accused. Yet, by accepting the invitation to testify he not only becomes embarrassed himself but his action tends to reflect upon all other judges. This is particularly the case in a trial which is widely publicized because of public interest, such as the Alger Hiss trial from which all this discussion emanted.

The law which is before Congress would remove this dilemma from members of the bench, but does not bar judges from testifying under subpena when they have knowledge which is pertinent to a case, and when facts which they possess are necessary for the administration of justice.

There is no reason for limiting the measure to members of the Supreme Court, and if it is found to be a wise measure, should be extended to cover all Federal jurists, in the district and appeals courts. It is a serious matter and one on which the best legal minds in the country should take the opportunity to express themselves.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of July 25, 1949]

UNITED STATES JUDGES ON THE STAND

Complaints from all parts of the country concerning the four Federal judges who appeared as character witnesses for Alger Hiss have not only reached the newspapers, but were echoed in Congress as well.

Representative SMITH of Wisconsin has called the action of the jurists in the Hiss perjury case a degrading precedent. Backed by seven of his congressional colleagues, he has proposed legislation to bar the judges from such action in the future.

Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter says he testified for Hiss as a duty, and asserts that defense counsel had a right to his testimony, because under the Constitution "every accused has the right to produce evidence relevant to determining his guilt or innocence." No one will quarrel with the learned Justice on that point. The only com-

plaint is that he, a Supreme Court Justice, testified voluntarily for a man alleged to have been mixed up in a spy ring and charged with perjury.

Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, in opposing a bill introduced by Representative KEATING of New York, to prevent repetition of such testimony, says it's none of Congress' business, and characterized the bill as an improper interference with the judiciary.

What reasoning. If anything, the appearance of these judges has been an improper interference with judicial processes and should not be repeated. Up to now, at least, the judges acted with legal propriety, but not with common sense. Of course the defense had a right to their testimony because of associations with Alger Hiss. But that doesn't mean the people are wrong if they want to change the law. The high-ranking jurists, although they may not think so, are still the servants of the people. It will be no lessening of their value as citizens or Justices if they are barred from testifying in criminal cases as character witnesses for defendants.

The judiciary of course must be kept free from interference. As arbiters of judicial conduct they should strive not alone for freedom but for the unqualified respect of the American people. A man on that bench is something more than an ordinary citizen.

Needed, a Study of Business Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, all of us in the Congress are well aware that Federal regulatory legislation in the field of business is a source of perennial debate. We know, too, that most of the arguments surrounding the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act, or the Miller-Tydings Act or the Robinson-Patmon Act are old arguments that all of us have heard many times before.

The fact nonetheless remains that our legislation embodied in these various laws contains contradictions and has given rise to uncertainty in the business community. Businessmen and Members of the Congress have not been the only ones to bring these contradictions to our attention. The President's Council of Economic Advisers has commented on several occasions concerning the conflict between the "hard" competition doctrine found in our earlier antitrust legislation and the "soft" competition theory spelled out in later business legislation.

At the time I introduced my basing point moratorium bill on February 17 of this year, I observed that the Congress might well wish to take a good look at our conglomeration of statutes in the business field with the view of streamlining our whole concept and application of the antitrust philosophy.

Mr. Irwin D. Wolf, vice president of Kaufman Department Stores in Pittsburgh, and a progressive and successful businessman, made an address on June 21, 1949, entitled "Needed, a Study of Business Laws." In it he enumerated a number of thought-provoking suggestions as to what he felt the Congress might undertake in considering legislation affecting business. Mr. Wolf candidly prefaced his remarks by saying that there will undoubtedly be those who honestly disagree with some of his remarks and suggestions, and of course on a complex and technical subject like our antitrust laws, the honest disagreements are broadminded.

Nevertheless, since I have proposed a broad and intensive study of these laws for the purpose of determining exactly how they do complement or contradict each other, and since Mr. Wolf speaks as an experienced and successful businessman, I think what he has to say should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wolf's address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED, A STUDY OF BUSINESS LAWS

Probably every businessman in the United States has often thought what I now have the opportunity to say. I welcome the occasion and feel grateful for the privilege.

There will undoubtedly be those who honestly disagree with one of my words here, a sentence there, an entire thought perhaps, or a suggested procedure. I am not apprehensive about that, because the basic ideas are so much more important than their presentation. Nor do I anticipate that I shall be accused of offering criticism for its own sake, since what I have to say is followed by suggestion. In that spirit I want to confer with you.

We are participants—you and I—in combat that is realistic and purposeful. Ours is more subtle battle than armed conflict. Economic power, political philosophies, and national resources are the weapons with which our war is being waged. The scope of our conflict is international; it extends to the far borders of those nations who have signed the North Atlantic Pact. American business, because of its part in this battle, stands at bay to the forces of regimentation, almost as did England not quite 10 years ago. If we fail in our battle, the last substantial bulwark of free enterprise will be swept away, and American business will be swept away with it.

Ever since the end of World War II, American business has been the big force used to influence, if not to shape, the political pattern of the world. To make the point clear, I need only cite the billions expended to date for European recovery. Our very way of life and the product of our sweat have been used, and are still being used, as potent instruments of persuasion on the international scene. Substantial alteration, if not destruction, of our standard of living has long been the target of our nation's political antagonists.

As world events took form, American business became an instrumentality of state. As world affairs have now evolved, American business will be employed as a continuing instrumentality of state.

Business must accept that responsibility and must equip itself to meet the demands which that role entails. Government, on the other hand, must now make it possible for business to discharge the responsibilities which have been thrust upon us.

Greater responsibility has never rested upon any element of society than has devolved on business in consequence of its part in world politics. Upon our success in meeting these obligations depends not only the strength of our own government, but also the welfare of untold millions who thus far have had the courage to decline the embrace of autocratic philosophies.

The very scope and importance of the role which our statesmen have assigned to business make it the prime duty of government to strengthen business and foster conditions under which it will thrive. Specifically, the structure of business endeavor must be reenforced and, at the same time, outdated concepts and outmoded techniques must be discarded. Unnecessary and useless procedures, with which we have been burdened, must be eliminated. All of this is imperative if we are to succeed in the policies we have undertaken to support. For if we fail, there will be no future. In war we were the arsenal of democracy; today we are the arsenal of peace.

But are we equal to the responsibility which has devolved upon us? Are we able to maintain the velocity of business necessary to support our own standard of living, provide for our own needs, meet our own fiscal problems, and at the same time contribute to the welfare and needs of others throughout the world? I am confident we can, provided we recapture for business the basic principles of democratic life which have made our Nation great. To a large degree they have slipped from our hands, and we must set ourselves to the task of regaining them. While they are lost to us momentarily, those great principles are still within our reach.

Nothing that I have just said is even remotely in the nature of an attack on this administration or any single administrator. I am entirely aware, as are all of you, that many of those things which we businessmen seek to remedy are consequences of rapid growth and the increasing complexity of the world in which we live. But I do challenge Government to eliminate an evil which, like any other parasitic growth, has attached itself to a strong body and is feeding upon it.

All right, then, what must we do? At the outset, we must examine the position in which we find ourselves. It is not a happy one. There is danger from within as well as danger from without. Business, instead of being the prime concern of Government, is once again the favorite whipping boy of Government administrators. Although the velocity of business is of vital importance to the Nation, hardly a day passes without presentation to Congress of additional and dubious proposals for further regulation or control of some phase of commerce.

We have developed a singular and highly unique tendency to label every disputed practice as a national menace. Our legislators are urged toward indignation at such practices and to legislate on ever-broadening fronts to suppress what is invariably a narrow and often isolated evil, fully capable of being suppressed through the enforcement of existing local law. The very number of such regulations often provides legal justification for fringe operations. And it frequently happens that Federal regulations create the very evils they are designed to eliminate; for example, some retailers have been forced into manufacturing, in order to avoid conflict with the Robinson-Patman Act. Many manufacturers are determined to sell only large users to avoid the awkward policies by which this act has been administered. The integrated operation has made its debut—why—because of such laws and the way they are administered. And those who begot such laws are now sponsoring divorcement legislation to eliminate their self-created evils. That is our example of how ill-conceived our business laws are.

Unfortunately the moving considerations which underlie most of our Federal laws governing business are those which were generated in a spirit of suppressing evil practices and abuses. Many other regulations were born in the clamor and outcry generated by

those who desired to attract votes or to extend the boundaries of their own private kingdoms.

We have become so zealous in our endeavour to discourage what some are pleased to call sin, or at any rate what politicians conveniently call sin in order to denounce it, that we legislate and administrate against those who are innocent. Why? Because of fear and apprehension that, unless they are regulated, they may tend toward forbidden practices. And when we do legislate in these matters we invariably use such loose terms as to authorize political appointees not answerable to us and obviously unschooled, to do such things and promulgate such regulations as in the judgment of such administrator may be necessary.

However, we are a Nation richly populated by far-sighted administrators—some, in fact, are really seers—who unblushingly profess to be expert in all things. Hence, it is said, we are safe from error or abuse. But experience and fact deny such assertions, and the contrary is true. From those to whom we have entrusted the power and authority to encourage a high velocity of business, we have received nothing but a high velocity of regulations.

Our administrators have really labored. They have formed a gantlet of penalties for business to run. They have constructed a Chinese Wall to circumscribe our activities. They have erected an enduring monument which arrogantly challenges what man has known for many long years—"Those are governed best who are governed least."

Laws enacted by Congress, having as their objective the protection of commerce, have been so administered and interpreted as to have a burdensome and deterring effect. Others have given rise to administrative techniques from which the specter of another NRA is already plainly discernible on the immediate horizon.

Our administrators are indeed prolific. All the laws enacted by Congress in the period from 1789 to date have been codified in four volumes known as the United States Code; whereas the rules and regulations of Federal agencies known as the Code of Federal Regulations comprise 47 volumes of substantial size. Do not think for a moment that their job is ended. Not at all—in fact theirs is an unending project. Not a single issue of the Federal Register fails to carry voluminous additions to the mass already in existence.

Rulings by administrators embodied in hundreds of volumes of agency reports bid fair to overshadow in immensity the reported opinions of our busiest judicial tribunals. The Harvard School of Business Administration has published three volumes on the Robinson-Patman Act alone.

Business, of course, and businessmen are supposed to keep abreast of all this prolific outpouring. Where, indeed, is the fortunate individual who can operate a legitimate enterprise for 1 day without innocently tangling in some thread of this incredible web. And once you have tangled, you have sinned. If this be sin, are you free from it?

We have had some odd and startling results from our Federal business laws and their administrators; for example, the portal-to-portal controversy, the wage-and-hour rulings, overtime on overtime, the basing-point controversy, and the frantic appeals which they have caused to be presented to the legislative and executive branches of our Government. What man is bold enough to say that he can reconcile the administration and interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Miller-Tydings Act, the Sherman and Clayton Acts, the fair-trade laws of our various States, and other such regulations, with the needs and best interests of our Nation.

It is utterly wrong for the business of this Nation to be conducted in an atmosphere of doubt, uncertainty and apprehension. It is utterly wrong for business today to be governed by the existing patch-quilt of legislation which has been sewn without an over-all or cohesive pattern in mind. It is utterly wrong for business to be subject to the personalities and whims of transient administrators and the philosophies they harbor. It is utterly wrong for business to be subject to the rule of men and not the rule of law.

Why is there no tribunal, with judicial status, to function in the sphere of business law and the problems arising under it? Almost every other specialized disagreement may be resolved in an appropriate Court. I submit that business is entitled to the advantages of orderly process and unbiased rulings, which such Court would render. The determination of problems under business laws ought to be free of the considerations which motivate, impel and influence our present administrators and administrative tribunals. Let our administrators concern themselves only with administration of the law. Let us take away their present license to be investigator, prosecutor, judge and jury.

The boundaries of lawful and allowable conduct for business endeavor ought to be the subject of uniform and simple laws and no longer a hazardous field of conjecture and doubt in which even the justices of our highest Court can rarely agree.

There is ample hazard in business itself. The creation and perpetuation of additional hazards by the legislative or administrative route is totally unwarranted and a risk we cannot afford to take.

The task we have before us is plain. There are certain things we must do. And here they are:

1. We must no longer endure the merger, in the administration of Federal business law, of legislative and judicial and executive functions. In the structure and enactment of laws affecting business, and in their administration, we must insist upon adherence to the doctrine of the separation of powers which made this Nation strong and protected its people from Star Chamber rule.

2. We must no longer endure Federal business laws, which are so loosely phrased that they leave doubt as to the allowable limits of appropriate conduct for men of legitimate endeavor. We must strive for simplicity and uniformity in all laws governing business and commerce, and for simplification and uniformity in their administration.

3. We must resist further Federal centralization. We must encourage action by State and local government in local affairs, as a means of discouraging the expansion of Federal power and forestalling its further expansion into, and interference with, local business.

4. We must promote the elimination of State burdens upon, and barriers to, interstate trade. Such regulations tend to incite demands for Federal regulation.

5. We must insist upon recognition of the indisputable fact that the overwhelming percentage of businesses are honest * * * must be so or they would not prosper. It is a retail maxim that an unscrupulous competitor will eventually crowd your store; and what is true of a store is equally true of all business. We must seek greater freedom in business by promoting self-regulation as distinguished from government regulation.

6. We must foster a study of business laws by all segments of business and we must propose the adequate revision of existing law with unselfish interest for the welfare of the Nation.

7. We must encourage the Government to reactivate the Department of Commerce so that it may function as a more effective voice in national decisions as have, for example, the Departments of Agriculture and Labor for so many years past.

These are not easy tasks. They constitute a challenge which every sound-thinking citizen of our Nation should accept. It is a goal to which we must dedicate our thoughts and our deeds.

We who cherish freedom, its institutions, and all the priceless liberties we hold indispensable to worthy survival, will be opposed by those who lust for greater and greater authority. Their power is entrenched and their resourcefulness is substantial. Courageous and wise statesmanship, coupled with forthright action, is needed now. Make no mistake about it—the rewards are high and very precious—the battle lines are drawn.

The part you play by actively espousing our cause will count on our side of the ledger. The part you play through inactivity, through mere passive interest or polite but meaningless applause, will militate against us and give aid and comfort to our antagonists.

If American business is to succeed in discharging the task to which it has been assigned by our statesmen, the dead hand of bureaucracy must be lifted from the shoulders of legitimate business enterprise. Just as the tenets of political freedom for man were wrested from despots by the Magna Carta, so now we must unshackle business from bureaucratic control by formulating and causing to be ordained a business bill of rights. It should be backed up, as I have already suggested, by a business practice court in which the business bill of rights will be dispassionately enforced according to rules of law and not to fancies of administrators.

Men who are eager to support their Government rather than be supported by it will champion our cause. Distinguished statesmen in public and private life have long recognized our need and will rally to our support.

Let the retailers of America come to the forefront in launching this worthy, urgent, Nation-wide effort. Let us invite retailers, manufacturers, and all other business to join in a coordinate effort to assure study and revision of all business laws in order that they may be classified, codified, and simplified. Let us prove by our fight to regain Democratic procedures, that we are worthy of the liberty to which we aspire.

Let all who feel as I do join with me in this enterprise.

Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the village of McKinley, Minn., in October 1949.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there exists an economic situation on the Iron Range the duration of the said economic situation is uncertain; and

Whereas it is necessary to obtain Federal assistance to alleviate the jobless situation that now prevails in the respective municipalities on the Iron Range; and

Whereas 85 percent of the iron ore is mined in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this financial and economic situation be called to the attention of the Federal Government by sending a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the two United States Senators from Minnesota, and our Representative in Congress, and that you be requested to put forth all efforts at your command to obtain Federal aid before the severe winter season is upon us.

The foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted.

J. C. MURPHY,
Mayor.

Attest:

OLAF E. ERICKSON,
Village Clerk.

Warmongers Are Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the esteemed Clinton Daily Item of October 17 containing part of my remarks at the Gold Star Mothers' banquet sponsored by the Fitchburg DAV Auxiliary No. 30:

WARMONGERS ARE ASSAILED BY CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN AT GOLD STAR MOTHERS' BANQUET, IN FITCHBURG

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, addressing a Gold Star Mothers' banquet, sponsored by DAV Auxiliary No. 30, Saturday night, at Fitchburg, assailed the forces presently working throughout the Nation and the world to start world war III and thus cause another generation of American mothers to suffer the loss of their sons just as the Gold Star Mothers of our past wars.

"No one could possibly make greater sacrifices than these mothers," he said. "If we would be true to the high purposes for which we fought our wars, this Nation will exert every effort to secure effective international cooperation for peace. Shame on the warmongers seeking profits out of war, shame on the jingoists who are fomenting trouble, but most of all, shame on organized Marxist communism which is now busily engaged laying the very groundwork which will make war inevitable.

"The sons of these mothers died to preserve democracy. Yet, the forces of communism are blacking out the light of freedom in many nations.

"In the name of these noble American boys and their brave mothers, to vindicate their cause, we must press for a peaceful world. Communism and no other ism can deter or obstruct us from dauntlessly pursuing that aim. Let us hope the day of another war will never dawn.

"But we cannot afford to be unprepared. If force is the only language which these evil forces respect, let us resolutely mobilize our resources in such a demonstration of overwhelming strength that not even the fanatical Reds will dare to challenge free institutions. Let us make it unmistakably clear that the American people will not tolerate brazen assaults upon our liberties and upon the liberties of mankind."

Congressman PHILBIN extended his greetings and profound appreciation to the assembled mothers and complimented the DAV Auxiliary for feting them.

Address by the Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address made by Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder before the annual meeting of the American Life Convention, Chicago, Ill., Thursday, October 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The year 1948 marked a milestone in the history of life insurance in this country. Life insurance ownership passed the $200,000,000,000 mark—twice the total only 13 years ago, and nearly 30 times the amount in force as little as a half century ago.

From my acquaintance as a banker, I came to know the field of insurance as a great and fascinating business.

The history of insurance probably goes back to the time of the ancient Egyptians and Hindus when mutual benefit societies were formed to aid unfortunate members through the contributions of all the members. And in Roman times, the medieval guilds assumed obligations which today would be regarded as life, accident, or health-insurance contracts.

But the broad use of insurance as a device for distributing loss developed among the merchants of Venice, Florence, and Genoa during the middle of the fourteenth century and from there it spread over the whole of Europe.

The development of the life-insurance contracts was slow. Many countries condemned life insurance as immoral wagers on human life and prohibited it by law, or at least regarded such insurance with disfavor. Today, we think it strange that the life-insurance contract was prohibited in France until 1820, and until the early part of the eighteenth century was not actively favored in England.

The life-insurance business in the United States, as you know, had its beginning in the organization of a religious mutual benefit association in Pennsylvania in 1769. However, as late as 1815 courts in Massachusetts questioned whether a life-insurance contract was not repugnant to sound morals and, therefore, contrary to public policy.

It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that the insurance business in the United States really began to develop. This seems odd to us today when insurance is one of our largest and most important business fields.

In reviewing its record of growth, it is clear that the life-insurance business built its remarkable success on two simple principles: faithful observance of the highest fiduciary standards, and faithful discharge of all contractual obligations.

In a broader sense, these two principles are, of course, the foundation of all sound business, public as well as private. Over 150 years ago, the first Secretary of the Treasury wrote in his Report on Public Credit, that it is "by good faith, by a punctual performance of contracts" that "States, like individuals, who observe their engagements, are respected and trusted."

It is pertinent to remind ourselves that these words echo down to us from a time when our Nation was new and struggling for its existence. In 1790, there was nothing to back up the credit of our Government except the belief of our citizens in themselves, and in their future.

Today, the credit of the United States Government has behind it a long history of faithful fulfillment of contractual obligations. Our national credit rests also on the foundation of the entire wealth and resources of this country. In 1949 as in 1790, however, our most precious asset remains the confidence of our citizens in the future of our country.

Confidence, in fact, built this Nation. As our people moved westward, confidence enabled them to face the hardships of their new environment with courage and determination. When the frontiers disappeared, other problems in our development as an industrial Nation arose. These, too, were tackled in the confident belief that they could be worked out successfully, without endangering any of the institutions we cherish.

Confidence that we will carry out our present domestic and international responsibilities is based essentially on our belief in the fundamental economic strength of this country. And it is clear that the success of all our efforts in maintaining a high level of production and business activity here at home depends upon a full utilization of our economic strength.

There are a number of elements in our postwar economic situation which lend great strength to our present position. Notable among these has been the prudence of American business ever since VJ-day, in the field of credit extension, in both business and consumer credit. It has been evident in the stock market and generally in the commodity market. It was inevitable that businessmen should make strenuous efforts to reduce inventories as soon as the first signs of a buyers' market began to appear. Postwar inventories, in the aggregate, were not at any time excessive in relation to the volume of sales. Nevertheless, they were sharply reduced in many lines earlier this year in the belief that demand was falling back. But the tower of strength in the American economy was the continued flow of consumer income at a high rate. Average income of individuals for the first 7 months of this year ran at a higher rate than for the comparable 7-month period last year, and indeed, for the entire calendar year 1948.

Retail buying has also been remarkably well sustained. The most recent figures for total retail sales—which include, in addition to department-store purchases, such important items as expenditures for food, automobiles, and gasoline—show a dollar volume only slightly below the corresponding months of a year ago. In physical volume, the sales are running slightly above last year.

Another most important element of strength in our present situation is the backlog of individual savings which today are at a record level.

Thrift has again become a vital factor in our present day life. This is particularly important when we recall that it was the thrift of individuals or groups of individuals that furnished the capital funds needed for our industrial development. Someone's savings helped to build our railroads, develop our petroleum industry, and create our steel empire. Thrift, in other words, has made a major contribution to the attainment of our present high level of production and employment.

Since the end of 1945, the savings of individuals in the United States have risen by the following percentages: United States Savings Bonds, 13 percent; life insurance, 30 percent; shareholdings in savings and loan associations, over 60 percent; deposits in mutual savings banks, 25 percent; savings accounts in commercial banks, 15 percent; Postal Savings accounts, about 10 percent; and checking accounts of individuals, about 10 percent. Of the various forms of liquid

assets, only holdings of currency in the hands of individuals fell off.

In short, the purchasing power is there—in pay envelopes, in Government bonds, and in the bank. Our financial structure is sound, and credit conditions are encouraging. It is true that there is a new need for business to get out and sell. Now that conditions of ample supply have returned, the primary need of our domestic business situation is to supply real customer demands.

In the 4 years since VJ-day, businessmen in this country have spent the tremendous sum of about $85,000,000,000 for new equipment, and in construction and modernization of plants. Over $15,000,000,000 of this amount has been spent during 1949.

By far the largest portion of postwar expenditures for capital purposes, however, reflects in one way or another the determination of our businessmen to make use of the recent discoveries and improved techniques to increase the efficiency of their plant operations, improve their products, and thus broaden their markets.

The war compressed many decades of experiment and research into a few brief years. As we all know, there have been tremendous developments in the fields of physics, chemistry, plastics, and synthetics of all types. Industry has ingenious new ways of doing things. By the use of large quantities of oxygen, steelmakers have found they can increase their production from blast furnaces by 20 percent. New high-speed machine tools are doing three times the work of 1940 tools. A new coal-mining machine will multiply a miner's daily output 10 times. Diesel locomotives do the work of three steam locomotives on many jobs.

All these factors indicate that we have it within our power to maintain prosperity in this country. But we must also keep in mind that our prosperity at home depends in important measure on the economic progress of our neighbors in this hemisphere and across the seas. We must work out ways and means of sharing the special talents, skills, and resources the nations separately possess.

To develop our world trade to the best interests of our people and of the people of other parts of the free world, it is necessary to promote the greatest possible free movement of goods and services between the trading countries of the world. When each country sells to other countries what it can produce with particular efficiency and cheapness, it earns foreign exchange with which it can acquire from other nations the things that they can produce most efficiently and cheaply. This type of trade is obviously beneficial to both sides. There are many things which it is to our advantage to acquire from other countries rather than to produce ourselves. Within our own frontiers the kinds of industry in which a given city or State specializes are determined by the interplay of prices and the cost of production in that particular area, when compared in terms of dollars with the cost of producing similar goods in other parts of our country.

However, other nations have their own currencies and compute their costs and prices in terms of those local currencies. When we compare the cost of production of a particular article in this country with the same article in other countries, we have to convert the foreign price into dollars at the applicable rate of exchange. The foreign producer who sells in the United States receives the dollar price converted into his local currency at the established exchange rate. By comparing his proceeds from sales to the United States with the proceeds which he might earn from sales at home or to other areas he decides where to market his products. Similarly, our own producers measure the advantage of foreign trade by converting into dollars, at the current exchange rate, their proceeds in sterling, francs, or other foreign currencies. When it is profitable to sell abroad they do so.

Most of the exchange rates against the dollar have, until recently, remained unchanged since shortly after the end of the war. In the meantime, prices and costs have risen in many foreign countries to a greater extent than in the United States. As a result it became increasingly less attractive to sell goods for dollars, than for the so-called soft currencies. Moreover, the relatively high prices of goods abroad made them unattractive to American importers. At the same time, these exchange rates, which were considered by many people as overvalued, made American goods appear cheap in terms of the foreign currencies. Hence, the public in the foreign countries had a strong preference for dollar goods which were restricted by direct rationing of dollars through import licenses and other measures.

The adjustments of exchange rates which have been made during September by a number of foreign countries tend to remove many of these artificial price relationships which previously existed. These adjustments bring the prices of dollar goods back into a more appropriate relationship with the prices of other goods in foreign countries. They increase the incentive to foreign businessmen to expand their efforts to earn dollars through foreign trade. At the same time they reduce the excessive demands for dollar exchange in foreign countries and ease the pressure on the foreign exchange control systems of these countries. They point to a higher level of trade in both directions, for only by expanding their dollar earnings can foreign countries continue to purchase, by their own means, the American goods which they require, thus reducing the need for assistance from the United States.

To put this matter in concrete terms, we now export goods at the rate of about $12,000,000,000 a year to foreign countries. Our imports of goods are running at a level of about $6,000,000,000 to $6,500,000,000 a year. It is desirable to maintain a high level of American exports, for this is beneficial both to us and to the rest of the world. It provides employment and incomes to our people, and makes available needed goods to foreign countries.

Foreign trade is also advantageous to the American people, because it enables us to obtain goods which we cannot produce here, or which other countries can produce more cheaply.

It is clear that foreign countries cannot continue to spend $12,000,000,000 a year in our markets unless they can earn the dollars. That means that we must import more, spend more on tourism and other services, and make sound capital investments abroad if we are to maintain the level of our own export trade. At the present time a large part of the gap between our exports and our imports is covered by American foreign-aid programs. The bare and simple logic of arithmetic makes it apparent that the gap must be closed as this assistance is reduced.

The recent adjustments in exchange rates should help to improve the dollar position of foreign countries. However, this action does not constitute a cure-all for the difficult and complex problems currently faced in international payments. Exchange adjustment is merely a step which helps to clear the way by removing some handicaps to the effective and fluid functioning of a world price system in accordance with the economic incentives to free enterprise. It does provide an environment in which friendly governments and business enterprises may work more hopefully toward the common objective of expanding world trade.

We Americans face many difficult problems, both domestic and international. We are meeting these problems squarely, and I believe we are making real progress in helping to solve them. But I do want to leave with you members of the life-insurance industry—an industry which has played such an important part in the growth and development of this country—the reminder that these problems will continue to require full energies and efforts of all our citizens. For it will take all the ingenuity, courage, and steadfastness of purpose that we can individually and collectively muster to insure a prosperous and peaceful world.

Social Security and Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House passed the revised and expanded social-security bill before adjournment. Many of the provisions of this legislation are similar to those contained in the bills which I have sponsored ever since I have been in Congress.

While the legislation is not completely satisfactory in every aspect, it does sharply increase benefits and expands the coverage. I hope the Senate will pass this important bill as soon as Congress reconvenes in January.

In this connection I include with my remarks a letter from Wilfred Nordstrom, of Ahmeek, Mich., a friend and constituent of mine, which was recently published in the Houghton Mining Gazette. Mr. Nordstrom's views are similar to those of millions of other citizens who are rightfully demanding a better social security pension law.

AHMEEK, MICH., *October 18, 1949.*

EDITOR, MINING GAZETTE.

To All Whom It May Concern Regarding Social Security and Old-Age Pensions:

Although the Michigan State pension for the aged is not too bad, it could be a little more liberal to take care of the old and feeble.

But social security, with some getting $21, some $23, and the most about $40 a month, no one will board or keep anyone these days for that sum of money.

Instead of social security I and many others will call it social starvation. And it is really a disgrace in a country which is supposed to have an abundance of everything to have these old people who worked for at least 40 years, paid taxes, and pioneered this country into what it is today, live their remaining lives in fear of starving and freezing.

If our Congressmen and Senators wrote and told each one on social security how to balance their budget with the small sum each receives, just like they tell those on foreign relief how to spend billions of dollars sent to foreign countries, this information would be welcome.

But to tell you the truth no Congressman or Senator could stretch $30 a month very far today.

So is it any wonder that today in America we have our troubles?

Do you blame the union leaders for demanding an old-age pension and social security adequate enough to keep the old and feeble in a state of mind so they can live and enjoy the profits off their labor?

The troubles of today should be laid upon the doorsteps of our Capitol in Washington.

Our whole Government—Representatives and Senators and all—have neglected the old and it is now time to act.

If you are young and able, some day you will be old and disabled.

Take a few minutes of your time and write to Congressman BENNETT and Senators HOMER FERGUSON and ARTHUR VANDENBERG and tell them frankly that a bill must be passed and at once to raise social security at least two and one-half times higher than it is today.

We under 65 will gladly pay a penny or two more tax on a dollar when we can work to see that those who are unable will live in peace and comfort.

So please write today. When you help those who are old today, you will help yourself tomorrow.

WILFRED NORDSTROM.

Apples for School Lunches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on October 10, 1949, I announced that the school-lunch program which was enlarged by the Eighty-first Congress, would shortly undertake the purchase of surplus United States No. 1 apples all over the country in order that we could put to best use any surplus of this valuable—and perishable—fresh fruit.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release of my announcement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS ANNOUNCES SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM WILL BUY PENNSYLVANIA APPLES

WASHINGTON, October 10.—Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, majority whip of the United States Senate, announced today that the Federal school-lunch program will purchase 21 carloads of Pennsylvania apples weekly during the picking season.

The Pennsylvania senior Senator explained that the Department of Agriculture has completed its plans to purchase 4,000,000 bushels of U. S. No. 1 apples—about 3 percent of the total crop—in order to provide, first, that children in schools all over the country may be assured of getting an adequate amount of fresh fruit, and, secondly, to aid in stabilizing apple prices.

"The school-lunch program," MYERS said, "is simply one more illustration of the many activities of the Federal Government which assist groups of our people to work out their mutual problems. It means, on the one hand, that children, whatever the kind of school they attend, may be assured of an adequate noon meal—and on the other hand, that farmers may see their products put to good use and at prices which will enable them to live on a decent American living standard.

"Under the Pennsylvania portion of the program, 12 of the weekly carloads will be used in our own schools, and the other 9 carloads will be used in States which are not important apple producers.

"I might point out," the Pennsylvania Senator concluded, "that apple growers have a second line of defense if the purchasing under the school-lunch program is not quite sufficient to assure a reasonable market price for apples, and that is the possible purchase of the surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation for use in the export market."

Statement by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee on Work of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, today.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, today paid high tribute to the Democratic Members of the Eighty-first Congress for their achievements in the long session which has just ended.

"The record of the Eighty-first Congress," Chairman Boyle said, "affords a striking contrast to the record of its Republican predecessor, which was faced by many of the same problems which beset this Congress."

Mr. Boyle pointed out that both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses compiled good records on legislation involving international problems, but that the Eighty-first Congress was far superior in enacting progressive domestic legislation.

Chairman Boyle's full statement follows:

"Members of the Eighty-first Congress should be proud of the achievements they have accomplished by their hard work in one of the longest peacetime sessions ever held.

"The Eighty-first Congress has faced difficult problems in a troubled postwar era where events outside our own borders have made it impossible for us to return to normal peacetime government or to a normal peacetime economy.

"The record of the Eighty-first Congress on domestic issues at its first session affords a striking contrast to the record of its Republican predecessor which was faced by many of the same problems which beset this Congress.

"Both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses compiled good records on legislation involving international problems. I believe that one action of the Eighty-first, however, places it head and shoulders above the Eightieth in the wisdom of its international legislation. The Eighty-first undid the harmful amendments to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act imposed by the Eightieth Congress and continued our reciprocal trade program in a workable form.

"However, I do not believe that Democratic Congressmen and Senators will wish to make political capital out of their fine record in international legislation, because they will want to continue the bipartisan cooperation which Democratic leadership has brought about in this field.

"But many Republicans have issued bitter attacks upon the action of the Eighty-first Congress in restoring the reciprocal trade program to its full usefulness. I am confident that Democrats will be glad to debate this issue and that we will find that the American people approve our enlightened trade program.

"In the field of domestic legislation, I believe that the Eighty-first Congress was far superior to the Eightieth Congress in many ways. Some of these are set down briefly.

"Direction of legislative activity: The Eighty-first moved forward in the fields of housing, minimum wage, stronger social security, health, and education programs, public power and reclamation, and in protecting our farm economy. The Eightieth, when it moved, moved in the opposite direction, weakening and crippling these programs or refusing to act on them at all, as in the case of the housing bill.

"Volume of achievements: The Eighty-first Congress passed more major legislation in one session than the Eightieth did in its entire life. At the close of its session it had many other important measures advanced to the point where action can easily be completed in the next session.

"Careful study of legislation: Both the Senate and the House lived up to their responsibilities of giving careful study to the measures before them, both in committee and in debate on the floor. This required a longer session than is customary, but it enabled the Eighty-first Congress to make great strides in carrying out the platform of the Democratic Party and the program recommended to it by the President without being a rubber-stamp body.

"Development of leadership: Veteran legislators in both Houses successfully assumed new responsibilities in the Eighty-first Congress and new Members developed into seasoned lawmakers in one session.

"Despite these achievements, the Eighty-first Congress has not escaped criticism. The Republicans, who have sought to delay action and to block passage of most of the progressive domestic measures advocated by the President, have launched a double-barreled attack on the Democratic majority. In one breath they have accused it of enacting too much progressive legislation and of failing to pass all of the progressive legislation on the party's program.

"This charge fails of its own absurdity. The Eighty-first has not been a perfect Congress, nor has there ever been a perfect Congress. I am sorry that this session has ended without repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and enactment of a labor-management relations bill which would better promote industrial peace, and I am sorry that the Republican Senators who repudiated their party platform and voted to strengthen the power of the filibuster have blocked action on civil rights measures.

"I am confident that these measures, which are widely supported by enlightened public opinion, will be urged upon the Members of the Congress when they return to their constituents, and I am hopeful that they will be given early and careful study at the second session so that action on them will not be too long delayed.

"I am not going into a detailed analysis of all of the legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress, because the President, and our leaders in the House and Senate have all released factual surveys of these accomplishments. The Democratic Party is proud to present those factual reports to the citizens of our Nation and stand on the record.

"Few, if any Congresses, have enacted in one session as much legislation to promote the general welfare as has the Eighty-first. I know its members will be proud to say so when they return to their constituents."

Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Village Council of Hibbing, Minn., on October 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there exists an economic situation on the Iron Range, the duration of the aforesaid economic situation is uncertain; and

Whereas it is necessary and highly desirable to obtain Federal assistance to alleviate the unemployment situation that now prevails in the various municipalities on the Iron Range; and

Whereas 85 percent of the iron ore is mined in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Village Council of the village of Hibbing, Minn., at a regular meeting thereof, duly called and legally held on the 18th day of October 1949, a quorum being present, That this financial and economic situation be directed to the attention of the Federal Government by forwarding copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the two United States Senators from Minnesota, and to our Representative in Congress, and that they be requested to extend all efforts at their command and to do everything within their power to assist in obtaining Federal aid prior to the coming winter season.

The motion to adopt the foregoing resolution was duly supported by Clerk Grady, and upon being put to vote carried as follows:

For adoption: Mayor Gerald M. Thomas, Clerk Gene J. Grady, Trustee Homer W. Manney, Trustee Charles G. Johnson.

Absent: Trustee Edwin T. Nelson.

Against adoption: None.

Adopted and passed this 18th day of October 1949.

GERALD M. THOMAS, *Mayor.*

Attest:

GENE J. GRADY, *Village Clerk.*

St. John's Parish, of Clinton, Mass., Celebrates Its One Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a second article which appeared in the pages of the Clinton Daily Item outlining the history of St. John's Parish in Clinton, Mass.

This article is the work of Peter J. O'Toole, of Clinton, who has carefully gone over the early church records for his well-documented account of the history of St. John's Parish.

The article follows:

PARISHIONERS AID IN ST. JOHN'S PROGRESS—EARLY IMMIGRANTS STRIVED FOR RELIGION AND EDUCATION; MANY NOTED MEN AND WOMEN AMONG ITS COMMUNICANTS

Consideration has been given to the principal contributions of the pastors of St. John's Church in rounding out a century of deep and abiding fulfillment in the realm of the spiritual. Necessarily, the priests as leaders performed their tasks admirably and edifyingly. But their achievements were rendered the more complete by the wholesale cooperation and inspiration of the parishioners who have always responded unstintingly for their church.

These early immigrants, equipped with the armor of spirituality, sought solace in the practice of their faith, living with God, and indoctrinating principles of righteousness and morality to their offspring, and soon their example was reflected in the community life. The moral tone of Clinton has been high and reflects the example of these early pioneers.

At first unskilled mainly, these early immigrants entered into the factories run by the Bigelows and soon became weavers, spinners, carders, and other operatives.

STROVE FOR EDUCATION

The new community in which these exiles from their homes served as an outlet for their ambitions and aspirations. The sacrifice for religion was accompanied by sacrifice for education. When one considers the low wages made by these wage earners in an era when there were no boons bestowed by a benevolent government, their accomplishments are indeed well-nigh incredible. Soon these humble homes would be producing leaders in the professions. Physicians, teachers, lawyers as well as priests and sisters, would be the product of these people who made the most of their intellectual abilities.

Sacrifice for higher education seemed to complement sacrifices for spiritual things. One marvels at the accomplishments when the will was determined. Hardly a family that did not send at least one son or daughter to higher education. Think of the proud achievements of Mr. and Mrs. Michael O'Malley and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Shaughnessy who saw three sons each become priests. Then the Coyne family with two sons priests, one physician and one lawyer. And the recent death of Dr. McLaughlin recalls the results of that union: one priest and three physicians.

FIRST IN POLITICS

The first selection of Irish descent was Thomas McQuaid, who served 1872–74.

Thomas McQuaid was the father of Miss Mary P. McQuaid, former teacher in the Corcoran School and past president of the Catholic Women's Welfare Council, and of Mrs. James J. Goodwin, whose husband, the late lamented Dr. James J. Goodwin, was the esteemed president of the Holy Name Society of the parish for many years. His grandson, Dr. Paul Goodwin, is a member of the centennial general committee.

Felix Nugent, a leading grocer, after several years in New York, came to Clinton in 1853 and long was prominent in community affairs, serving during the Civil War as a member of the local board selecting recruits for the Union cause. His grandchildren include John, Joseph, and William Nugent, and Mrs. Daniel Driscoll. His great-great-grandchildren reside in Clinton. In 1873 Dr. Philip O'Brien, whose untiring works are remembered by the old timers, came to this town and opened his office. He had his office where Dr. P. A. S. Grady is now located. In addition he operated St. Mary's Hospital wherein his patients could be treated. He served for many years on local boards and was a member of the Clinton School Committee for years. He passed away in 1913, leaving three children: Mrs. Frank McSherry, wife of the former principal of the Clinton High School; Father Charles O'Brien, S. J.; and Attorney John H. O'Brien. Patrick O'Connor, of Summit Street, also followed in the same pattern. Three of his daughters became school teachers in Clinton and Worcester. His son, Dr. Thomas O'Connor, died at an early age at Nice, France, in 1899, where he had gone to ameliorate his condition.

MADE BASEBALL HISTORY

In the period described Clintonians were becoming prominent even beyond the confines of the community. Baseball history was being made by such players as Frank Connaughton, Malachi Kittredge, Jack McGeachy, and Shavey Ryan. It became so that when one mentioned his nativity in Clinton, the response was "Oh, that's the town where all the great baseball players come from." Clinton was having a veritable field day in the national pastime. In a day later Clinton would become synonymous with statesmen.

PROMINENT PARISHIONERS

Mention of the parish would not be complete without mentioning some of the parishioners who contributed far beyond the confines of the parish. The first of these was the Honorable John W. Corcoran, a cousin of the late Senator Walsh. John Corcoran has with the years become a symbol of honor and uprightness in the community which honors his memory in the school building on Walnut Street. He was a recognized leader in his party, running for attorney general and lieutenant governor several times, the last with Billy Russell. He was appointed a member of the superior court but remained only a short period, resigning to devote himself to his flourishing law practice.

Another Clinton priest was Very Rev. Francis M. Kirby, vicar general of the LaSallette Order, and now stationed in Rhone, France. His brother, Very Rev. Charles Kirby, is at St. Joseph's in Fitchburg.

ESTEEMED STATESMEN

Prominent statesmen who were former parishioners include Judge John W. Corcoran, superior court justice, candidate for attorney general and lieutenant governor, regarded as the father of the Metropolitan reservoir system. John A. Roche, famous engineer who later became reform mayor of Chicago, 1887–89. Senator David I. Walsh, the most outstanding public figure from the parish, was a devout and faithful communicant, gladly giving of his time and efforts in furthering parish activities. He was the first Catholic governor of the Commonwealth and thus far the only Catholic United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts. Joseph E. Casey represented the Third Congressional District in the House of Representatives for four terms. Edward J. Kenney, a former parishioner, served in Congress from New Jersey. Senator Walsh, Congressman Casey and Kenney were at one period simultaneously in the Congress—an honor that it is doubtful any parish has achieved.

Matthew J. Connelly, President's executive secretary, is a former parishioner.

In the entertainment world, such composers of national acclaim as Billy Heagney and John Redmond proudly claim St. John's as their parish. Across the ocean, Carrol Gibbons with his Hotel Savoy orchestra, is an expatriate parishioner who has become famous in English musical circles. Eddie O'Connor, associated with the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer interests, is stationed at Hong Kong.

No matter how far removed Clinton's St. John's parish strikes a responsive and sentimental chord in the hearts of those who rather modestly acclaim St. John's as the outstanding Catholic parish in New England.

CONTRIBUTES MEMORIAL GATE

The illustrious Senator David I. Walsh's family which consisted of three lawyers and two teachers reflects the attainments possible by these early parishioners. His contributions to the advancement of his race and religion were tremendous, particularly in his long years in the Senate of the United States where he conducted himself with credit, winning the merited approval of his constituents. Ever a loyal and devoted son of St. John's, he contributed the Walsh Memorial Gate which will long, in its resplendent beauty, signify the accomplishments of this true son of St. John's whose career inspired many a local boy to successful attainment.

St. John's looking back upon a century of rich fulfillment proudly anticipates the future. Its sons and daughters have received inspiration and seek to preserve this priceless legacy of faith and morality.

FORTY-EIGHT KILLED IN WARS

The parish honor rolls list the names of 48 boys who paid the supreme sacrifice in America's wars.

Civil War, 1861–65: Patrick Burke, Matthew Burns, John Gately, John Gibbons, Edward Malloy, Henry McGrath, John Quinn, John Tracy.

Spanish-American War, 1898: Henry M. Broderick, Patrick Garvey, Thomas F. Gibbons, William Gorman, Henry J. Jennings, John J. McGann, Henry J. McMinn, John M. McNamara, Michael F. O'Malley, Jr., Timothy O'Malley, Austin L. O'Toole, James P. O'Toole, Michael F. O'Toole, Thomas A. O'Toole, James V. Welch, Thomas Welch, Joseph F. Kearns.

World War I, 1917–18: George H. Burbank, William S. Carlisle, Thomas F. Hoban, James R. Kirby, William F. Kittredge, John J. Mitchell, John F. Queeney, William A. Tierney.

World War II, 1941–45: William J. Casey, George R. Coppenrath, Kiernan F. Culliton, Owen A. Duffy, Joseph Ferrecchio, Thomas A. Ferguson, Joseph A. Garvey, James J. Grady, Edward R. Griffin, Marvin J. Kittredge, Timothy McNabara, Pasquale Minniccuci, Peter J. Parow, William J. Praderio, James J. Salmon.

The Record of the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the long march of mankind toward a final destiny, the year 1949 proved to be one of the decisive years. During this tremendous year, the struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny deepened and widened throughout the world.

The Eighty-first Congress of the United States, elected to represent the American people in this decisive time, was called upon to face more fundamental questions, more direct challenges, and more difficult problems than any other Congress in the history of American democracy.

When the President came before the Congress to deliver his message of the state of the Union in January of 1949, he asked the Congress to enact legislation to strengthen the foundations of peace, to sustain and expand American prosperity, and to keep the United States in the forefront of world progress.

"We stand at the opening of an era which can mean either great achievement or terrible catastrophe for ourselves and all mankind," the President declared. He presented a series of proposals which affected the lives of every human being on earth. He expressed his conviction that the hope of mankind for a fruitful future rested upon the leadership of America.

His program was vast in scope, daring in vision, high in its objectives. His goals ranged from the creation of a decent home for every American family to the creation of a better living standard for the hungry millions in other countries to enable them to buy American goods. Yet his proposals were realistic, founded upon his appraisal of American genius and American resources.

In its essentials, the President's program was based upon the statement of principles and plans offered by the Democratic Party to the people in the national election of 1948. The Democratic platform had received the endorsement of 24,000,000 voters, and it had aroused the bitter opposition of the extremists in American life, the reactionaries and the radicals.

During a session which extended for nearly 10 months, the Congress labored to shape the Democratic program into the laws desired by many millions of Americans. The leaders of the Congress fought to overcome the determined resistance of the obstructionists and the special-interest groups.

By patience and persistence, the Eighty-first Congress reached many of the great goals cited by the President. Progress toward other goals gave promise that more objectives would be reached at the second session. In some instances, it appeared likely that the legislation sought by the people could not be obtained until another election had removed those who blocked the path of progress.

The early weeks of the first session were consumed in making the necessary changes in the organization of the Congress required by the fact that there had been a complete shift in the political control of both Houses. The failure of the Eightieth Congress to meet its responsibilities had led to the elimination of Republican rule in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Preparations for the inauguration of the President and the Vice President of the United States also occupied some of the time before the inaugural ceremonies occurred on January 20.

In the first month of the session, the principal legislative actions consisted of the passage of bills to give emergency relief to agricultural areas of the Nation devastated by winter storms.

By February, the standing committees of both Houses had begun to report their recommendations on the important measures submitted to carry out the program of the President. Thorough study and examination of all proposals by congressional committees have always been fundamental in the operation of the American system of government.

The Senate was moving forward steadily late in February, when the introduction of Senate Resolution 15, to improve the rule for limitation of debate set off a filibuster which absorbed the efforts and energies of Senators for several weeks.

It was generally known that bills to establish a fair employment practices commission, to make lynching a Federal offense, and to abolish poll taxes, could not be passed by the Senate under the existing rules. Enough Senators were opposed to such laws to prevent bills for these objectives from coming to a vote on the floor of the Senate.

The purpose of Senate Resolution 15 was to clear the way for legislation in the field of civil rights. But the majority of the Republican Members of the Senate joined ranks with other Senators who were opposed to additional Federal legislation in this field, and succeeded in securing Senate approval of an amendment submitted under the sponsorship of the Republican floor leader.

This modification of the Senate rules, hailed by the Republican Members as a satisfactory compromise, called for the signature of 64 Senators—two-thirds of the entire Senate membership—to cut off debate upon any motion to take up any measure. Because it would be virtually impossible to get the backing of 64 Senators for a stoppage of debate upon a controversial measure such as a civil-rights bill, the amendment to the rules made it much more difficult to obtain final votes on the important measures in this field of legislation.

The protracted debate over the proposal to alter the Senate rules came to an end in the third week of March. The outcome had revealed the moral bankruptcy of the Republican leaders in the Senate, and had clearly indicated that they were determined to follow a policy of obstruction and delay, of parliamentary tricks and maneuvers, to prevent the American people from attaining the benefits for which the people had voted in the election of 1948.

The next major measure taken up by the Senate was the bill to extend the authorization of the European recovery program for another year. When the bill came to the Senate Chamber from the Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the committee and his associates predicted that it would be quickly approved by an overwhelming majority, after a few days of discussion.

Aware of the achievements of the Marshall plan, knowing that the recovery program had brought new hope and new strength to the free nations of Europe, the leaders of the Senate did not anticipate that any serious objections would be offered against the bill to continue the great bipartisan program for another year.

In a little more than 1 year of operation, the Economic Cooperation Administration had transformed the social and political atmosphere of battered Europe. The countries of western Europe had increased their production with American aid to levels near the prewar standards, or above the prewar points. The countries of eastern Europe, held in bondage by the commissars of the Soviet Union, looked with longing at the miracles of economic recovery occurring in the western nations.

Facts and figures demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that the Marshall plan in its initial stage had stemmed the tide of communism, and had begun to restore western Europe to conditions of economic health. It seemed unthinkable that Members of the Senate, who had been informed of the

steady development of the plan, would try to obliterate it, to wreck it, or to cripple it.

But in the face of all the evidence assembled by experts of the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration, a group of Republican Senators headed by the Republican floor leader tried to damage and delay the European recovery program.

The Republican leader, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, proposed an amendment to slash 15 percent from the ECA budget, which would have wrecked the entire recovery effort in Europe and would have created disastrous repercussions upon American business and American export trade. This proposal was voted down by the majority of 68 to 14.

The debate upon the extension of the ECA continued during the last weeks of March and finally reached a turning point in the first week of April. All the crippling amendments were defeated, with the superb cooperation of the senior Republican Senator from Michigan, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, one of the architects of our bipartisan foreign policy.

By a final vote of 70 to 7, the Senate gave its approval to the magnificent cooperative program which has saved Europe from communism and has enabled the people of western Europe to regain their economic and social strength. For each Senator who embraced the ancient and discredited doctrine of isolationism, there were 10 Senators who accepted the responsibilities of America's world leadership.

Yet the resurgence of the isolationist ideas which had caused so much harm to America was one of the most astonishing and threatening developments of the entire session. The fierce insistence of the isolationists upon arguing at exhaustive length upon every measure of America's policy in foreign affairs made it impossible for the Senate to act upon some of the important bills in the domestic legislative program.

Under the Constitution of the United States, the Senate must give its advice and consent to treaties signed by the President and Secretary of State. The House of Representatives is concerned primarily with the internal affairs of the Nation. Since the most far-reaching issues which came before the Congress were matters of foreign relations, the Senate had to carry a double load of responsibility. The Senate had to take up the major measures in the domestic program while it continued to grapple with proposals in foreign policy which involved the lives, the fortunes, and the security of the American people.

The three vital aims of the United States from the very beginning of the Nation have been peace, progress, and prosperity. The achievements of the Eighty-first Congress can be viewed significantly in the light of these three goals of freemen everywhere.

STEPS TOWARD PEACE

Between the day in January when the President unfolded his vast program and the day in October when the Congress adjourned for the year, the world moved toward the crucible of another testing time for mankind.

The explosion of an atomic weapon in Soviet Russia echoed across the the globe, alerting America and her allies to the knowledge that the free nations must renew their ties of friendship and increase their power of defense.

Before the Russian blast occurred, the Senate of the United States had demonstrated its vision and courage by ratifying the North Atlantic Pact, which linked America in a strong alliance with eleven other nations to stop the advance of any aggressor. The existence of the alliance would help to prevent the outbreak of another war. But if war did come, the pact was proof of the fact that America would not have to stand alone.

The Senate gave a thorough scrutiny to the Atlantic Pact. Before giving their consent to a treaty which was designed to endure for at least 20 years, Senators examined the world situation to decide whether the time had come for such a long step in the development of our foreign policy. Members of the Senate who faced the truth could find no alternative which offered any hope of maintaining world peace. The evidence in favor of the Atlantic Pact was placed before the Senate by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.

As an agreement designed solely to preserve peace and stability, the pact was wholly consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. Although the preservation of peace and international security in all parts of the world would affect the United States, the tragic events of the twentieth century had made it evident that the North Atlantic region had a special significance for American defense. America was drawn into the First World War through a European conflict, and the Japanese assault on Hawaii in the second world struggle was stimulated by the rulers of Germany, after attacks had been made upon American ships in the Atlantic.

The lessons of history had made it plain to most Americans that the United States could not stand aside if an aggressor invaded the western European countries. The Atlantic Pact signaled to the world that America was committed to a course of cooperation for security in an area vital to the American people. In the treaty, we simply stated the policy which we would be compelled to follow in event of aggression in that region.

To enable the free nations of western Europe to continue the great economic recovery which had begun under the Marshall plan, the Congress had to give the people a definite assurance of where we stood. The Senate recognized the imperative necessity of driving out the last traces of defeatism and despair by pledging America to its share in protecting the ramparts of the free world. The overwhelming majority of Senators knew that the pact would help to release the western European nations from the paralyzing fear of a sudden invasion by the huge armies of Soviet Russia.

Yet there were some Members of Congress who refused to grasp the actual truth of the world situation. There were some who declared that the United States could never encourage the people of the free nations to defend themselves. There were some who sought to pull America back into the dangerous dream-world of isolationism and self-sufficiency.

These spokesmen for a policy of retreat and withdrawal, a policy of panic and fearful flight, found dangers and disasters hidden in every step the Congress took to build a more secure and stable world. These men, representing a powerful element in the Republican Party, believed that America could not afford to pay the price of peace. These men would have permitted the reins of world leadership to slip from the hands of the United States.

Before the Senate acted upon the Atlantic alliance, the isolationists were given every opportunity to express their beliefs in the press, over the radio, and in the halls of Congress. The men who had tried to cripple the Marshall plan were most active in striving to scuttle the Atlantic Pact. Although they were sincere and highly patriotic in their motives, they found themselves in the camp of the Communists and the fellow travelers who worked to advance the cause of the Soviet Union.

Turning their backs upon the Soviet conquests of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Balkan countries, the deluded victims of the isolationist fever cried that America could not spend the money for a strong national defense, America could not fulfill her obligations to the free nations in the pact, America could not contribute her human and material resources for the survival of our civilization. These frightened men ignored the fact that another war would cost the United States countless billions. They pushed from their memories the fact that America had to spend more in a single month during World War II than the annual cost of the Marshall plan.

But the isolationists did not arouse a response from the American people. The Senate, representing the wisdom of the people, ratified the pact by a vote of 82 to 13.

After a debate, which raged in the Senate Chamber for more than a month, only 13 Senators refused to see the urgent necessity for the alliance. For each Senator who closed his eyes to the threat of aggressive communism, there were more than six who approved the pact. Out of the 13 Senators who clung to isolationism, 11 were Republicans and 2 were Democrats.

The parliamentary battles over the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Treaty delayed the Senate for many weeks. The third vital measure in the foreign policy program of the Eighty-first Congress—the proposal to send arms to our friends abroad—led to another extended debate. Again the fearful men, the short-sighted men, were beaten in the hour decision. The military assistance program was endorsed in the Senate by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

The leaders of the Congress were well aware that each of the major measures in our foreign policy involved a possibility of risk. But no other course seemed safe and sensible. No other

course seemed to offer the promise of keeping war away from the shores of America. No other course seemed to meet the implacable demands of the world struggle between democracy and communism.

The Eighty-first Congress demonstrated, again and again, that the elected representatives of the American people would do everything in their power to increase the chances of peace and protect America from the agony and devastation of war.

THE PATH TO WORLD PROSPERITY

In several legislative achievements, the Congress took positive action to widen the channels of world trade and to promote closer relationships among the nations of the free world.

Over the protests and the objections of those who wanted to take America back to the dark and disastrous days of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs—and again the isolationists took the lead in challenging our policy—the Congress restored the reciprocal trade program to the liberal plan originally developed by Cordell Hull and the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Reduction of trade barriers has been one of the major goals of the American Government for the last 15 years. The success of this program has been very evident in the rise of American export trade from $1,600,000,000 a year in 1932 to nearly sixteen billion in 1947—and the rise in value of our imports from one and three-tenths billion to approximately six billion a year.

The bill passed at this session of Congress extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act until 1951, and permits the United States to reduce tariffs by as much as 50 percent, provided that other nations give American products the same treatment.

Nothing is more important for the establishment of a sound and stable prosperity for America and the entire world than the constant expansion of an exchange of products and materials by all countries for the mutual benefit of the trading nations.

This Congress registered another great accomplishment in the ratification of the International Wheat Agreement, which gives American farmers a guaranteed market for 168,000,000 bushels of wheat a year for the next 4 years at prices ranging from $1.20 to $1.80 a bushel. The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress failed to act upon a similar agreement which had been negotiated in 1948. This year, the Democratic leaders of the Senate obtained ratification of the agreement for the benefit of the Nation's farmers.

Other important measures to promote world prosperity included bills to give aid to the Republic of Korea to establish a sound economy, a bill authorizing extension and expansion of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to June 30, 1955, for the continuance of health, sanitation, agricultural, and educational projects in the American Republics, and a measure to permit National and State banks in the Federal Reserve System to deal in securities of the International Bank.

The Congress also authorized an appropriation of $16,000,000 by the United States to the United Nations for the assistance of more than 500,000 refugees in Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, Egypt, and Iraq. Twenty-one nations contributed funds for food, clothing, shelter, and medical supplies.

For continuance of American contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund, the Congress authorized American participation until June 30, 1950. Through this fund, many thousands of children in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and north Africa have received medical aid, clothing, and health care. Thirty countries have made contributions to the children's fund, recognizing the humanitarian necessity of helping the youth of the world to survive in order to build a better future for all mankind.

THE ROAD OF PROGRESS

The record of the long first session of this Congress demonstrates conclusively that a Congress guided by democratic principles can make progress at home and abroad.

American commitments in the field of foreign policy showed clearly that the United States had grown wise enough and mature enough to accept the challenge of world leadership.

In dealing with the vital issues of the domestic program for American advancement, the Congress revealed the same spirit of progressive wisdom.

The determined efforts to write a decent labor law to replace the repressive Taft-Hartley Act were temporarily defeated by the pressure groups defending that restrictive and unfair act, which had interfered with the free process of collective bargaining and had loaded upon the courts a whole series of labor disputes. But an amendment to eliminate the use of court injunctions as a weapon against American labor came within one vote of approval in the Senate. The Senate finally approved a bill which contained some slight modifications of the Taft-Hartley Act, but the fundamental evils of the act remained.

The failure to expunge the Taft-Hartley law from the statute books ranked with the blocking of civil rights as one of the regrettable losses suffered by the forces of progress in this session of the Congress.

An analysis of the vote in the Senate on the Lucas amendment to remove the injunction club from the labor law showed that 73 percent of the Democrats favored the elimination of injunctions, while 84 percent of the Republicans voted to retain the injunction as a weapon against labor. The vote on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois found 46 Senators for injunctions, 44 against. Of the 46 supporting court edicts to break strikes, 32 were Republicans. Thirty-eight Democrats voted against injunctions, backed by six Republicans.

Aside from the field of labor legislation and civil rights, the Eighty-first Congress in its first session achieved many great successes in domestic legislation.

The Congress passed a gigantic housing bill, designed to clear away slums, to provide for the construction of 810,000 low-cost units in public-housing projects, to launch a comprehensive research program to improve building methods and to aid private contractors in constructing millions of new homes at reasonable prices. The passage of this bill took America a long way toward the national goal of a decent home in a good neighborhood for every American family.

The minimum wage for millions of working Americans rose to 75 cents an hour in 1949, compared with 40 cents an hour in 1948, because the Eighty-first Congress acted to lift the wages of working people. As a result of this action, the purchasing power of American wage-earners increased by an estimated $300,000,000 a year.

The American people are well along the road to a better social-security system because the House of Representatives in this Congress approved a bill which will add 11,000,000 Americans to the security rolls and will greatly enlarge the benefits paid to those protected under the Social Security Act. This measure will be among those to receive early consideration by the Senate in the second session of the Congress.

Much progress was made toward the creation of a program for Federal aid to education. The Senate approved an act which would enable millions of children in the poorer States to gain a better education in better schools. The Senate bill proved to be acceptable to representatives of all faiths, and offered a sound basis for action by the House.

To maintain the prosperity of American farmers, the Congress finally reached agreement upon a price-support program for agricultural commodities. Because of the difficulties involved in the problems of American agriculture, the bill which emerged from conferences of the House and the Senate spokesmen contained many features which represented compromises. But the bill did give America a farm bill which was far better than the one adopted in 1948 by the Eightieth Congress.

Under the new farm bill, the basic crops of the Nation—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—are to be supported on a sliding scale, the level of support depending upon estimated production in relation to normal demand. Price supports at 90 percent of parity are required for the 1950 crops. In 1951, the support level will range between 80 and 90 percent. Thereafter, it will range from 75 to 90 percent.

For the next 4 years, there will be two parity formulas and the farmers may choose between them. There will be the old formula, based on conditions existing between 1909 and 1914, and the modernized formula submitted by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico. After a period of 4 years, the old formula will be dropped and the new formula will become the only basis for determining price supports.

Among the vital achievements of this Congress was the revision of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act to provide adequate crop storage facilities, to enable farmers to market their crops at the most profitable times. In view of the

huge crops produced in our farm States, this legislation met an urgent need. Because the Republican Eightieth Congress took away from the Secretary of Agriculture the power to provide sufficient storage capacity for 1948 crops, many farmers were compelled to sell their surplus products at relatively low prices.

To keep America in the forefront of world progress, and to continue our successful programs for promoting American prosperity and social welfare, it was necessary for this Congress to approve large appropriations. One-third of the budget—an appropriation of more than $15,000,000,000—was set aside for the military forces. At a time when the aggressive forces of communism threatened the security of America, the Members of the Eighty-first Congress approved the expenditures considered necessary for our national safety. All appropriations were carefully and thoroughly considered, and reductions of hundreds of millions of dollars were made in several important categories of the budget.

Many other important measures were enacted by one branch or another of this Congress, and will be given final form before the Eighty-first Congress goes down into history.

But the record of the first session is certainly one of significant accomplishments, and gives many reasons for Americans to have faith in those elected to represent them in times of changes and challenges.

Here is a detailed summary of the major legislation considered by the Congress in the session of 1949, the year of vital decisions:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (JANUARY 3 TO OCTOBER 19, 1949)

AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Act of 1949

(Public Law 439. Approved October 31, 1949)

This act provides a permanent price-support program for agricultural commodities. The basic crops of the Nation, corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, are supported on the basis of a sliding scale with supports ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity the level of support depending upon estimated production in relation to normal demand. Price supports at 90 percent of parity are required for the 1950 crops and not less than 80 percent for 1951 and, thereafter, may range from 75 to 90 percent, the minimum level varying by the degree of supply in relation to the demand. Mandatory flexible price supports are provided for certain special commodities, such as whole milk, butterfat, et cetera. One important section of this act lodges major discretionary power in the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to price supports for a great number of nonbasic commodities. To the modernized parity formula established, there has been added the factor of farm labor which increases parity prices on an average of approximately 6 percent. The old parity formula also remains—and the farmer may select either.

Commodity Credit Corporation

(Public Law 85. Approved June 7, 1949)

Revises charter of Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate crop-storage facilities and exchange of surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials. This enables farmers to market their crops at the most profitable times, by making available to them vastly increased storage bins. In view of the huge crops now expected, this legislation meets an urgent need.

Disaster loans

(Public Law 38. Approved April 6, 1949)

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make production-disaster loans to farmers from a $44,000,000 revolving fund. In the past, Congress has been forced to act hastily to meet disaster conditions. This act sets aside money which will be readily obtainable by farmers in future emergencies. It is designed to help prevent economic emergencies caused by natural disasters affecting agricultural production.

Rural telephones

(Public Law 423. Approved October 28, 1949)

Amends the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 authorizing the Rural Electrification Administrator to finance, or refinance (not to exceed 40 percent of existing indebtedness), for the improvement, expansion, construction, acquisition, and operation of telephone lines, facilities or systems to furnish and improve telephone service in rural areas. Loans will be made at 2 percent annual interest. All loans will be self-liquidating.

Crop insurance

(Public Law 268. Approved August 25, 1949)

Provides for expansion of crop insurance on a sound business basis which will avoid the losses previously experienced. Offers farmers the types of insurance they want and are willing and able to pay for. Gives recognition to a new and promising form of insurance known as multiple crop insurance. Under this policy, all the major crops on a farm are insured. While the crops are considered separately in establishing the amount of coverage and the premium rate, the insurance contract is farm-wide, guaranteeing the farmer a return from all the insured crops equal to the agreement of his insurance. This kind of crop insurance is highly desirable in diversified farming areas. The act authorizes this new form of insurance in 50 counties, with provisions for the addition of other counties over the next 4 years.

Cotton marketing quota

(Public Law 272. Approved August 29, 1949)

Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that whenever the total supply of cotton in any year exceeds the normal supply, the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for the crop of cotton produced in the next current year. Referendum procedures are required in general accordance with marketing quota programs for other farm products. The act deals with the three major problems confronting the cotton industry: establishment of a system of marketing quotas to adjust the flow of cotton into the market; to make sure that adjustments reflect current trends in production and assumption; to avoid too drastic a cut in cotton acreage in any one year on farms in any area.

Insect and plant diseases

(Public Law 215. Approved August 8, 1949)

Making an additional appropriation for control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases, in the amount of $1,750,000.

Reforestation

(Public Law 348. Approved October 11, 1949)

Launches a long-range program to restore American forests. There are about 4,000,000 acres of denuded and unsatisfactorily stocked lands in our national forests. Reforestation of these lands is required to bring them back into timber production. During the war reforestation work was virtually suspended. This act enables the Forest Service to resume its essential job of restoring millions of acres to productive use.

Provides for an enlarged program to restore about 4,000,000 acres of grazing land in the national forests which are in a seriously depleted condition. Depleted range and watershed areas can be restored to productivity and made to support from 5 to 10 times the number of livestock now carried.

Forests

(Public Law 392. Approved October 26, 1949)

Amends the Clarke-McNary Act, which is the basic legislation establishing Federal-State cooperation in forestry activities. Provides for a gradual increase in Federal participation in the forest-fire-prevention program over the next 6 years. Also increases the authorization for Federal cooperation with the States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plans.

Farm loans

(Public Law 433. Approved October 29, 1949)

Provides for the amendment of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to allow the installation of national farm-loan associations in Puerto Rico and Alaska; provides that the maximum limitation for any loan shall be raised from $50,000 to $100,000, but loans to any one borrower shall not exceed $25,000 unless approved by the Land Bank Commissioner.

Rural rehabilitation

(Passed the Senate September 23, 1949. Pending in House)

Provides for the liquidation of various trusts created under transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations. The Secretary of Agriculture, at present, acts for the United States as trustee for about $50,000,000 worth of assets acquired under agreements from 43 State rural rehabilitation corporations. These corporations were organized in 1934–35 to assist the Federal and State governments in the administration of funds provided by the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933. The funds set aside for rural rehabilitation were used for loans providing seeds, livestock, equipment, additional lands, training in farm and home management, and relocating displaced farmers.

Appropriations

To meet American responsibilities for world leadership and to continue our successful programs for promoting American prosperity and social welfare, it was necessary for this Congress to approve huge appropriations. One-third of the budget—an appropriation of more than $15,000,000,000—was set aside for national defense. At a time when the aggressive and expanding forces of communism threatened the security of America and every other free nation, the Members of the Eighty-first Congress approved the expenditure of the vast amount considered necessary for our national safety. All appropriations were thoroughly studied, and reductions totaling several hundred million dollars were made in several major categories of the budget.

Public Law		Amount approved
	REGULAR ACTS	
146	Agriculture	$715,601,607.00
145	District of Columbia	102,754,447.00
266	Independent offices	7,617,739,361.00
350	Interior	584,098,797.00
141	Labor, Federal Security and related agencies	2,387,799,885.00
118	Legislative	62,262,110.00
434	National Military Establishment	12,949,562,498.00
355	Civil functions, Army	664,178,190.00
179	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	677,972,102.00
150	Treasury, Post Office	3,090,528,903.93
	Total, regular acts	28,852,497,900.93

Public Law		Amount approved
	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL	
71	First deficiency, 1949	$524,649,473.59
119	Second deficiency, 1949	854,838,710.27
343	Third deficiency, 1949	177,740,619.02
43	Veterans' Administration	595,890,000.00
327	Foreign aid, 1950	5,659,990,000.00
358	First supplemental, 1950	78,005,129.95
430	Second supplemental, 1950	1,079,082,880.41
	Total	8,970,196,813.24
	MISCELLANEOUS	
	Public laws	[1] 2,929,807.79
	Private laws	[1] 1,500,000.00
	Total	4,429,807.79
	Grand total, regular annual deficiency, supplemental and miscellaneous acts	[1] 37,827,124,521.96
	PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS	
	Interest on public debt	5,450,000,000.00
	Refund of taxes	2,160,000,000.00
	Sinking fund and other debt retirement funds	629,191,100.00
	All other permanent and indefinite, general and special accounts	419,642,299.00
	Total	8,658,833,399.00
	Grand total, regular annual, supplemental, deficiency, miscellaneous acts, and permanent appropriations	[1] 46,485,957,920.96

[1] Estimated.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Home rule for District of Columbia

(Passed Senate May 31, 1949. Pending in House District Committee)

Without a dissenting vote, the Senate passed this bill to give home rule to the people of the District of Columbia. The Senate action was in accordance with the 1948 platforms of both major parties. Action on this measure to give the rights of suffrage and self-government to District of Columbia residents has not yet been taken by the House of Representatives.

Federal antipoll tax

(Passed House July 26, 1949. Pending in Rules and Administration)

The requirements that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to vote or registering to vote at primaries or other elections has been abolished in all but seven States. The retention of a poll tax is completely contrary to our present international policy but, more important, we are nourishing racial and economic discrimination in our own election laws. The removal of this restriction is only one of the civil-rights measures which the Eighty-first Congress hopes to enact in its second session.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND INDUSTRY

Voluntary agreements

(Public Law 6. Approved February 9, 1949)

Extended to September 30, 1949, the President's authority to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, speculative trading in commodities affecting cost of living, and for allocation of key materials in short supply.

Export controls

(Public Law 11. Approved February 25, 1949)

Extends until June 30, 1951, the President's authority to control exports in order to protect our domestic economy by limiting shipments of scarce materials, and to channel exports to countries where needs are greatest and where our foreign policy and national economy will best be served.

Copper taxes

(Public Law 33. Approved March 31, 1949)

Suspends the import tax on copper entered for consumption or withdrawn for warehouse consumption during the period between

Tin control

(Public Law 153. Approved June 30, 1949)

Continues until June 30, 1950, certain powers conferred upon the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 relating to tin and tin products.

Import controls

(Public Law 155. Approved July 1, 1949)

Continues until July 1, 1950, the import controls on fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products, under title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942. Careful consideration revealed that the continuation of such controls are essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Federal Government.

National rent control

(Public Law 31. Approved March 30, 1949)

Extends rent control for 15 months from March 31, 1949, with provisions designed to guarantee fair treatment for tenants and landlords.

Public Buildings Act of 1949

(Public Law 105. Approved June 16, 1949)

Authorizes the appropriation of $40,000,000 for comprehensive planning, site acquisition, design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, transfer of jurisdiction of certain lands between departments and agencies of the United States, and $30,000,000 for modernization of existing structures.

Advance planning of public works

(Public Law 352. Approved October 13, 1949)

Authorizes $100,000,000 to aid States and local governments in making plans for public works. Encourages States and other public agencies to maintain reserves of fully planned public works to be available for quick construction if economic conditions should make such action desirable. Funds are to be appropriated for a 2-year period, and will be divided among the States by the Administrator of General Services under a percentage arrangement laid down in the bill.

Monopolies

(Passed House August 15, 1949. Pending in Senate Judiciary)

Tightens antitrust laws to prohibit acquisitions or mergers which lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

HEALTH

Hospital Survey and Construction Act

(Public Law 380. Approved October 25, 1949)

Increases aid for construction of hospitals and other medical facilities where needed. This act authorizes an appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $150,000,000 for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals. The Federal share of the cost cannot exceed 66⅔ percent of the State's allotment percentage. It further authorizes $1,200,000,000 in Federal funds for aid to States, political subdivisions, universities, hospitals, and other nonprofit institutions for research or experimental projects relating to hospital services, facilities and resources.

Physically handicapped week

(Public Law 162. Approved July 11, 1949)

Appropriates $75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. This appropriation is to provide the committee with means of carrying out a program to promote the employment of physically handicapped persons by creating Nation-wide interest and by obtaining and maintaining cooperation from all public and private groups in the field.

Crippled children

(Public Law 42. Approved April 15, 1949)

Appropriates $1,500,000,000 emergency funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for payments to States to provide necessary services and care for additional numbers of crippled children, in addition to the regular annual grants to States.

Arthritis research

(Passed Senate September 27, 1949. Pending in Interstate)

As passed by the Senate, this bill amends the Public Health Service Act to provide research and training in arthritis, rheumatism, and multiple sclerosis.

Public health units

(Passed Senate August 27, 1949. Pending in House Interstate)

As passed by the Senate, this bill amends the Public Health Service Act by authorizing assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units. This bill authorizes the establishment and maintenance of local public-health units under approved State plans, aided by Federal grants, and administered by the Surgeon General.

School health services

(Passed Senate April 29, 1949. Pending in House Interstate)

This bill provides for development of school-health services, for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions. Authorizes an appropriation of $35,000,000 to provide Federal aid to States for periodic health examinations and diagnosis, including dental examinations, for all school children.

Medical-dental scholarships

(Passed Senate September 23, 1949. Pending in House Interstate)

Provides grants and scholarships for education in the medical, dental hygiene, nursing, public health, and sanitary engineering. The bill provides that funds for construction and equipment will not exceed 50 percent of cost. It authorizes an appropriation of $2,500,000 and administrative authorizations are included under title II. Appropriations are limited to a 5-year period.

HOUSING

Housing Act

(Public Law 171. Approved July 15, 1949)

This is an act to establish a national housing objective of a decent home for every American family. It provides Federal aid for slum clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects, and Federal assistance for the construction of decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings. It authorizes the building of 810,000 low-rent housing units over the next 6 years, for the use of American families with small incomes. It is also designed to stimulate the private building industry to construct more than 1,000,000 housing units a year to overcome the severe housing shortage in the United States.

Military rental housing

(Public Law 211. Approved August 8, 1949)

The purpose of this act is to encourage private enterprise to construct rental housing to serve the needs of personnel at military installations through (1) a special form of mortgage insurance, (2) the leasing of sites by the Military Establishment under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable or under a lease for a period of not less than 50 years to run from the date the

mortgage was executed, and (3) the provision of utility services by the Military Establishment.

Alaska housing

(Public Law 52. Approved April 23, 1949)

This act is designed to promote the settlement and development of Alaska by alleviating the major obstacles to housing construction through Federal programs aiding private residential construction. Provides that the Federal Housing Commissioner may increase the dollar amount limitations for insured mortgages on housing to the extent he finds necessary to compensate for higher costs in the Territory of Alaska. Broadens the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages or partial interests, make advances during construction, provided such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska.

Mortgage insurance

(Public Law 387. Approved October 25, 1949)

Extends to March 1, 1950, various titles of National Housing Act and increases insurance authority under title II, pending long-range legislation.

National Housing Act amendments

(Passed House August 25, 1949. On Senate Calendar)

Provides for revision of Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance provisions, increased authorizations under titles I, II, and VI of the National Housing Act, and for revision of the home loan guaranty provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be authorized to make loans to educational institutions of higher learning for their housing requirements.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International Wheat Agreement

(Considered and ratified without amendment or reservation June 13, 1949)

Ratified International Wheat Agreement which provides a guaranteed market for 168,000,000 bushels of American wheat annually for the next 4 years, at prices ranging from $1.20 to $1.80 a bushel. Although all parties to the wheat agreement are governments, article III provides that the guaranteed quantities of wheat may be supplied through private trade channels. This provision is new and was designed as an encouragement to private enterprise. Signatories of the agreement, who are also members of ECA, have committed themselves to take 320,000,000 bushels of wheat annually from the wheat-exporting countries. Thus, ECA and the International Wheat Agreement complement each other.

To give effect to the International Wheat Agreement

(Public Law 421. Approved October 27, 1949)

This act enables the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. Acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the President directs the operations to fulfill our commitments under the agreement. For the first year, at least, this will involve payment of a subsidy representing the difference between the cost of the wheat and wheat flour and the maximum price allowed under the terms of the agreement.

North Atlantic Pact

(Ratified July 21, 1949)

By a vote of 82 to 13, the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Pact linking 12 nations in a defensive alliance to maintain peace and stability in the Atlantic area. The 12 signatories of the treaty are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The treaty establishes a collective defense for the North Atlantic area within the framework of the United Nations Charter. The treaty is subject to review at any time after 10 years and any party may cease to be a party after 20 years. The security of the North Atlantic area is vital to the national security of the United States and world peace.

To implement the North Atlantic Pact

(Public Law 329. Approved October 6, 1949)

Furnishes essential military assistance to enable the United States and other nations, dedicated to the purposes of the United Nations Charter, to create an effective system of individual and collective self-defense in support of those purposes. Provides for an arms program to give the free peoples of the world a reasonable amount of military strength to resist direct or indirect aggression and to maintain internal security. At least 50 percent of the armed cargoes must be shipped in American vessels at American rates. The following appropriations to finance this program through June 30, 1950, were authorized:

One hundred million dollars to be immediately available upon appropriation.

Four hundred million dollars to be available when the President approves recommendations for an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area which recommendations may be made by the Council and the Defense Committee to be established under the North Atlantic Treaty.

Two hundred and eleven million three hundred and seventy thousand dollars for Greece and Turkey.

Twenty-seven million six hundred and forty thousand dollars for Iran, Korea, and the Philippines.

Seventy-five million dollars for China.

Five hundred million dollars for contract authorizations not to be obligated until after June 30, 1950.

Authorizations total $1,314,010,000 and, of this amount, $814,010,000 has actually been appropriated.

Foreign aid

Extends the Marshall plan until June 30, 1950, and authorizes funds totaling $5,430 million for the nations participating in this vast program of mutual economic cooperation. Crippling amendments were defeated and the final bill received overwhelming approval by both Houses of Congress; passing the Senate by a vote of 70 to 7, and the House by a vote of 354 to 48.

Palestine refugees

(Public Law 25. Approved March 24, 1949)

Authorizes an appropriation of $16,000,000 as a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for relief of more than 500,000 refugees in Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, Egypt, and Iraq, who were in dire need of food, clothing, shelter, and medical supplies. Twenty-one nations have announced their intention to contribute to the United Nations fund for these refugees, which will total $32,000,000. The American contribution amounts to 50 percent of the total.

Reciprocal trade agreements

(Public Law 307. Approved September 26, 1949)

Extends for 3 years the President's authority to enter into trade agreements with other nations without the restrictions enacted by the Eightieth Congress. Restores our foreign trade policy to the program inaugurated by the late President Roosevelt and former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, under which new markets have been opened for American business in all parts of the world.

State Department

(Public Law 73. Approved May 26, 1949)

Strengthen and improve organization and administration of the State Department. Provides for the reorganization of the State Department whereby the Department was authorized an Under Secretary of State and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State. Control of Foreign Service was vested in the Secretary of State instead of the Director General of Foreign Service.

Switzerland—reparations

(Public Law 136. Approved June 28, 1949)

Authorizes the Secretary of State to pay to the Government of Switzerland compensation for losses and damages inflicted on persons and property in Switzerland during World War II by units of the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, provided the total amount shall not exceed $16,000,000.

Finland—war debt

(Public Law 265. Approved August 24, 1949)

Authorizes that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland, and to provide opportunities for American citizens to carry out academic and scientific enterprises in Finland.

Inter-American Affairs

(Public Law 283. Approved September 3, 1949)

Continues and expands the work of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to June 30, 1955. It enables the Institute to carry on its programs in public health, sanitation, agriculture, education, and related fields in cooperation with the American Republics.

Children's Emergency Fund

(Public Law 170. Approved July 14, 1949)

Provides for continuance of United States contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund through June 30, 1950. Out of this fund many thousands of children, who suffered from the devastating effects of World War II, were given health care, medical aid, and clothing. Although operations under the fund have thus far occurred principally in European countries and China, the fund's program also includes relief for mothers, and children in the four zones of Germany, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and North Africa. Thirty countries have made contributions to the Children's Fund.

UN Participation Act

(Public Law 341. Approved October 10, 1949)

This act strengthens the United States representation at the United Nations by authorizing the appointment of a Deputy United States Representative, and both the representative and deputy representative shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.

International Bank securities

(Public Law 142. Approved June 29, 1949)

Permits National and State banks in Federal Reserve System to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Korean aid

(Passed Senate October 12, 1949. Pending on House calendar)

As the bill passed the Senate, assists the Republic of Korea by enabling it to establish a sound economy and to maintain its democratic form of government. Authorizes the appropriation of not more than $150,000,000 for the present fiscal year. Directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance sums for Korea not in excess of $50,000,000 pending approval of the appropriations. (Stopgap aid in third deficiency bill.)

United Nations—Headquarters

(Passed Senate October 18, 1949. Pending in House Foreign Affairs)

This resolution would have enabled the President, at the November conference, to offer financial assistance to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for the construction and furnishing of a permanent headquarters in the vicinity of Washington, D. C. Since FAO is the last of the existing permanent specialized agencies to select a site, much interest has been displayed by other countries, including Denmark and Italy, in having their country selected as the permanent site for this organization. It is believed that the United States, as a great agricultural nation, would be materially benefited by having the permanent home of the FAO located in the Capital City area.

Displaced persons

(Passed House May 16, 1949. Recommitted with instructions to Senate Judiciary Committee to report the bill by January 25, 1950)

Amends the Displaced Persons Act to remove provisions which were regarded as discriminatory and restrictive. This bill changes the cut-off date of prospective immigrants from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949; eliminates certain percentage preferences; authorizes issuance of 339,000 visas to displaced persons through July 1, 1951; extends to people of German ethnic origin the same waiver of provisions of Immigration Act relative to prepaid transportation to United States as extended to other DP's; also requires the taking of the non-Communist oath upon arrival in the United States.

LABOR

Minimum-wage increase

(Public Law 393. Approved October 26, 1949)

Raises the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents; would permit the Wage and Hour Administrator, with the employee's written permission, to sue for back wage claims on behalf of employees, or to seek out of court settlements with their consent; employees of retail firms doing more than 50 percent of their business within a State would be exempt, as would newsboys, Western Union messengers, and taxicab operators. It is estimated that between one and two million workers will receive increases.

Overtime on overtime

(Public Law 177. Approved July 20, 1949)

Outlaws overtime on overtime claims covering all industry. The ban is both retroactive and prospective.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

National Military Establishment

(Public Law 216. Approved August 10, 1949)

Brings all branches of the armed services under the unified directorship and control of the Secretary of Defense, but does not merge them. Provides for the effective strategic directorship of the armed forces and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

Under Secretary of Defense

(Public Law 36. Approved April 2, 1949)

Provides for the appointment of an Under Secretary of Defense to be appointed from civilian life by the President, and with the consent of the Senate. The duties of the Secretary of Defense are of such magnitude and diversity as to require an additional official, such as an Under Secretary, to assist in the performance of those duties.

Guided missiles

(Public Law 60. Approved May 11, 1949)

Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons. This proving ground will be used jointly by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific study, testing, and training purposes. The required facilities for such a proving ground are: (1) A base area with suitable launching site, technical and administrative facilities; (2) a flight-test range at least 3,000 miles long, thoroughly instrumented by means of observation stations for the first 500 miles and with impact areas at various points along the line of flight; (3) a suitable climate for year-round operations.

Guided-missile laboratory

(Public Law 386. Approved October 25, 1949)

Authorizes construction and equipment of guided-missile research laboratory for National Bureau of Standards. This laboratory building is to play a part in an extensive guided-missile program which is being expanded as an important factor in the overall development of arms.

Land-based air warnings

(Public Law 30. Approved March 30, 1949)

Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a system of land-based aircraft warning and control facilities for the defense of the United States against attack by enemy aircraft. The system of land-based air warning is the indispensable element without which there can be no effective defense at all against approaching hostile aircraft. Its most important function is the detection of enemy aircraft in sufficient time to permit fighter aircraft to intercept and destroy them before they have reached their targets.

Central Intelligence Agency

(Public Law 110. Approved June 20, 1949)

The purpose of this act is to grant to the Central Intelligence Agency the authority necessary for its proper administration. It protects the confidential nature of the Agency's functions and makes provisions for the internal administration of the Agency.

Transsonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities

(Public Law 415. Approved October 27, 1949)

Authorizes the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Secretary of Defense to develop and direct jointly a unitary plan for the construction of transsonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an Air Engineering Development Center for the purpose of research development, and evaluation problems in aeronautics.

Experimental submarines

(Public Law 213. Approved August 8, 1949)

The purpose of this act is to remove existing limitations on the cost of the construction of two prototype, experimental submarines. The submarines will embody all of the new developments in submarine warfare, including higher speeds, snorkel devices, and other highly classified ordnance and electronic devices.

Armed forces—pay

(Public Law 351. Approved October 12, 1949)

Revamps the pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement provisions for members of the Armed Services, Public Health Service, National Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Military installations—construction

(Public Law 420. Approved October 27, 1949)

Provides construction authorization for specific projects required immediately by the Department of Defense at locations in Alaska and Okinawa and to authorize the appropriation of funds to carry out these projects.

Army Quartermaster Corps—research laboratory

(Public Law 424. Approved October 28, 1949)

Authorizes the acquisition of land and the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps. The construction of the laboratory will facilitate the work of quartermaster research and will result in greater efficiency and economy, and will enable the employment of competent scientists.

Atomic energy

(Public Law 347. Approved October 11, 1949)

Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 by authorizing the reorganization of the Military Liaison Committee. The committee shall consist of a chairman, without regard to civilian or military status, a representative or representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in such number as the Secretary of Defense may determine. The committee chairman is to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate prescribed by law for the chairman of the Munitions Board. The Atomic Energy Commission will consult with the committee on all atomic-energy matters which the committee deems to relate to military applications, including the development, manufacture, use and storage of bombs, the allocation of fissionable material for military research, and the control of information relating to the manufacture or utilization of atomic weapons. As amended, any active or retired officer of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may serve as chairman of the committee without prejudice to his commissioned status.

Atomic energy appropriations

(Public Law 422. Approved October 28, 1949)

Amends the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1950 removing the restriction relating to construction projects of the Atomic Energy Commission. Enables AEC to move ahead on projects necessary for defense and security.

Alaskan Railroad

(Public Law 391. Approved October 26, 1949)

Authorizes survey for potential construction of link to connect United States-Canadian Railway with Alaskan Railway.

Alaska communication system

(Public Law 414. Approved October 27, 1949)

Authorizes the Secretary of Army to proceed with 5-year housing and operations buildings program at stations of the Alaska communications system.

Security information

(Passed Senate April 11, 1949. Pending in House Judiciary)

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the disclosure of important information about the United States communication intelligence activities and all direct information about all United States codes and ciphers. It would strengthen the Espionage Act of 1917 and the act of June 10, 1933, thereby increasing our security measures.

NATIONAL RESOURCES

Alaska—Public works

(Public Law 264. Approved August 24, 1949)

The purpose of the act is to foster the settlement of Alaska and increase its permanent population, stimulate trade and industry, encourage commercial and private investment, develop its resources, and provide facilities for community life through a program of useful public works. Authorizes the Administrator of General Services to accept applications for public works in the Territory of Alaska and each application must include a statement by the Governor of the Territory indicating the need for the project as well as the applicant's financial ability to defray the cost of the public works.

Folsom Dam

(Public Law 356. Approved October 14, 1949)

Extends and reauthorizes the Central Valley project, California, to include the Folsom Dam and Reservoir as a part of that project. Provides for the construction by the Corps of

Engineers of Folsom Dam and Reservoir on the American River, Calif., with a storage capacity of approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet; authorizes construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of certain facilities on Sly Park and Camp Creeks for irrigation of lands, of a hydroelectric plant at Folsom Dam with an installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts, of smaller power plants downstream, and of all necessary transmission lines from these plants to load centers. Folsom Dam and Reservoir will become an integral part of the Central Valley project. Its surplus power revenues will become available to aid irrigation developments in the Central Valley area which could not otherwise go forward.

National parkway

(Public Law 262. Approved August 24, 1949)

Provides authority for making a survey of the proposed Mississippi River national parkway so that its feasibility may be determined by Congress. The survey would determine the extent to which portions of existing highways and roadways could be used, possibilities for development and administration in cooperation with the State highway departments, and estimates of the cost. Development of a national parkway along the Mississippi River would provide a major north-and-south route of travel.

Arkansas River compact

(Public Law 82. Approved May 31, 1949)

Purposes of this compact are: To settle existing disputes and remove causes of future controversy between the States of Colorado and Kansas, between the citizens of the States, concerning the waters of the Arkansas River, their control, conservation, and utilization for irrigation; equitably divide and apportion between these two States the waters of the Arkansas River and their utilization as well as the benefits arising from the construction of the John Martin Reservoir project.

Colorado River Basin compact

(Public Law 37. Approved April 6, 1949)

Gives Federal approval to compact between States along the Colorado River, namely, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. This compact provides for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system; establishes the obligations of each State of the upper division; promote interstate courtesy, and removes causes of present and future controversies.

Pecos River compact

(Public Law 91. Approved June 9, 1949)

Gives Federal approval to compact between Texas and New Mexico relative to the uses, apportionment, and deliveries of the water of the Pecos River.

Yellowstone River

(Public Law 83. Approved June 2, 1949)

Gives approval to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

Forest fire protection compact

(Public Law 129. Approved June 25, 1949)

This compact is to promote effective prevention and control of forest fires in the northeastern region of the United States and adjacent areas in Canada by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services, by the provision of mutual aid in fighting forest fires, and by the establishment of a central agency to coordinate the services of member States.

Federal reclamation projects

(Public Law 335. Approved October 7, 1949)

Authorizes the repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs of Federal reclamation projects, to be scheduled in accordance with the repayment ability of the water users. This act will permit, in those cases where current financing of the necessary rehabilitation work is beyond the means of the irrigation water users, the deferral of payment to the extent necessary.

Missouri Basin project

(Public Law 337. Approved October 10, 1949)

Renews expired authority of Department of Agriculture to develop 18,000 acres for irrigation farming and settlement of the Angostura unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

Strategic materials

(Passed Senate October 6, 1949. Failed to pass the House October 17, 1949)

To stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic minerals. Authorizes the establishment of a Mineral Conservation Board consisting of Secretaries of Treasury, Defense, Commerce, and Interior. Private enterprise would be encouraged to supply the industrial, military, and naval requirements of the United States.

Flood control

(Passed House August 22, 1949. Pending on Senate Calendar)

This major omnibus bill is a step forward in the important national programs for development and improvement of rivers and harbors and for protection against the ravages of floodwaters.

REORGANIZATION, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AND DEPARTMENTS

Reorganization Act of 1949

(Public Law 109. Approved June 20, 1949)

Authorizes the President to reorganize the executive departments in order to accomplish the following purposes: (1) to promote better execution of the laws, more effective management, and to improve the administration of the public business; (2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy; (3) to increase the efficiency of the operations; (4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government; (5) reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head; (6) to eliminate duplication of effort.

Reorganization plans of 1949

(Plans 2–7, inclusive, became effective August 19, 1949)

Plan 1: To establish a Department of Welfare to replace the Federal Security Agency. Rejected by Senate August 16, 1949.

Plan 2: Transfers the Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency to Department of Labor.

Plan 3: Reorganizes the Post Office Department and strengthens the top-level organization.

Plan 4: Transfers National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Plan 5: Reorganizes Post Office Department and makes the Chairman its chief executive and administrative officer.

Plan 6: Reorganizes Maritime Commission and makes the Chairman its chief executive and administrative officer.

Plan 7: Transfers Public Roads Administration from Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

Plan 8: Unification of armed services already accomplished by enactment of Public Law 216.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

(Public Law 152. Approved June 30, 1949)

Establishes a General Services Administration to include Bureau of Federal Supply of Treasury Department, National Archives, Federal Works Agency, War Assets Administration, and certain contract settlement functions of the Treasury Department. It is felt that the provisions in this legislation for uniform policies and methods of procurement, supply, and related functions will bring about a great savings through the elimination of competition among executive agencies for similar articles in the same markets, unnecessary purchasing and lack of quantity purchases. This act is another step toward a more economical and a more efficient governmental service.

Development program in the Post Office Department

(Public Law 231. Approved August 16, 1949)

To improve existing equipment, supplies, methods, procedures, and devices used in the postal service and to become familiar with new types of equipment and generally improve the service in order that the business of the Department may be more efficiently operated.

Postal employees' pay increase

(Public Law 428. Approved October 28, 1949)

To provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service concerning annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion.

Government employees' travel allowance

(Public Law 92. Approved June 9, 1949)

Increases the per diem from a maximum of $6 to $9 per day for Government employees traveling on official business away from their designated posts of duty.

Presidential pay increase

(Public Law 2. Approved January 19, 1949)

Increases rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Government employees' pay inequities

(Public Law 160. Approved July 6, 1949)

To correct inequities in the pay of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia.

Government agencies

(Public Law 359. Approved October 15, 1949)

To increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Government Employees Classification Act

(Public Law 429. Approved October 28, 1949)

Revises the Classification Act and increases the pay of classified employees.

Compensation benefits

(Public Law 357. Approved October 14, 1949)

Liberalizes compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in line of duty. Extends coverage to civilian officers of the United States.

Additional judges

(Public Law 205. Approved August 3, 1949)

Creates 27 new Federal judgeships to strengthen the administration of justice.

Maritime Commission

(Public Law 147. Approved June 29, 1949)

Extends authority of United States Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels to June 30, 1950.

Virgin Islands Corporation

(Public Law 149. Approved June 30, 1949)

Provides for the creation of a new Federal corporation with broad powers designed to encourage the inhabitants of the islands to develop an economy that would enable them to be self-supporting.

Executive Mansion

(Public Law 40. Approved April 14, 1949)

Establishes a commission to be known as the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion. It will be the duty of the

Commission to supervise and approve all construction plans and work necessary for remedying the unsafe conditions in the Executive Mansion.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Schools—Aid

(Public Law 306. Approved September 10, 1949)

Continues for 1 year Federal aid to local school agencies for the operation and maintenance of school facilities for children residing on Federal reservations or other federally owned property, or living in districts overburdened financially by wartime school enrollments.

School Construction Act

(Passed Senate October 17, 1949. Referred to House Labor Committee)

As passed by the Senate, this bill authorizes an appropriation to assist the several States to inventory existing school facilities, to survey the need for the construction of additional facilities in relation to the distribution of school population, to develop State plans for school construction programs and to study the adequacy of State and local resources available to meet school requirements. Also provides Federal aid to the States in building schools in overburdened areas and, until funds are appropriated, the RFC is authorized to advance funds to carry out the program.

Federal aid to education

(Passed Senate May 5, 1949. Pending in House Labor Committee)

As passed by the Senate, this bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $300,000,000 for aid to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. The bill contains three fundamental principles which proved satisfactory to an overwhelming majority of the Senate. These principles are: (1) preservation of State and local control—administration of school systems is left completely in the hands of organizational units within the States; (2) the principle of equalization—the purpose of the bill is to provide, through Federal funds, vital assistance to those school systems which are in greatest need of such assistance. Allotments to States are variable, from $5 per child to $25 or more per child depending upon the financial ability of the State concerned; (3) maintaining reasonable levels of State and local efforts—it is believed that Federal funds for the support of Federal education should not be used to replace State efforts to support public schools. Under the bill, States are not eligible to receive Federal benefits unless they are expending a minimum percentage of the income for public, elementary, and secondary education.

National Science Foundation

(Passed Senate March 18, 1949. House companion bill pending in Rules)

As passed by the Senate, this bill authorizes the establishment of a National Science Foundation. Hearings conducted by the Congress revealed a shortage of skilled scientists. The imperative need for greatly increasing our activities in basic research was repeatedly brought to the attention of the Senate Committee which considered this bill. The measure approved by the Senate is designed to meet the objections raised by the President in 1947 when he vetoed a National Science Foundation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Old-age and survivors insurance

(Passed House October 5, 1949. Pending in Senate Finance Committee)

As passed by the House, this bill provides an average increase of 70 percent to present beneficiaries; a new formula allowing all States to receive additional funds for old-age assistance; a new category to cover totally and permanently disabled persons regardless of age; a wage credit to veterans of World War II of $160 per month for time spent in military service; and an increment of one-half of 1 percent for each year of coverage. Also extends coverage to about 11 million people not now covered.

TAXATION

District of Columbia Sales Tax Act

(Public Law 76. Approved May 27, 1949)

Provides additional revenue for the District of Columbia by levying a tax on gross sales and increasing rates on various existing taxes.

Cigarette tax

(Public Law 363. Approved October 19, 1949)

This act is designed to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes, and to prevent avoidance of such taxes the tobacco tax administrator, in the State into which the shipment is made, must be furnished necessary data upon which to base assessment and collection of the State cigarette tax.

Gift importation—Servicemen

(Public Law 241. Approved August 17, 1949)

Extends for 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad.

Time extension—Powers of appointment

(Public Law 137. Approved June 28, 1949)

Extends to July 1, 1950, the period for tax-free release of powers of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942; extends to June 30, 1950, the period of time within which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without, after separation from the service, being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served. Provides that certain disqualifications applicable to persons prosecuting claims against the United States under existing provisions of law shall not be applicable to retired officers, not on active duty, of the armed forces of the United States; except that such a retired officer may not, within 2 years after his retirement, prosecute or assist in prosecuting a claim against the United States involving the department in the service of which he holds a retired status, or involving any subject matter with which he was directly connected while on active duty.

Free importation—Foreign armed forces

(Public Law 271. Approved August 27, 1949)

Extends to members of the armed forces of any foreign country on duty in the United States, its Territories or possessions, exemption from duties and internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of the importation or withdrawal of articles, for the official use of a member of the armed forces of a foreign country, or for his personal use or any member of his immediately family: *Provided*, reciprocal treatment is accorded.

Malt liquor tax

(Public Law 261. Approved August 23, 1949)

Amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors; provides for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises.

Tax law revisions

(Public Law 378. Approved October 25, 1949)

Amends certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code including sections on farmers' return, foreign tax credit, charitable deductions by corporations, transfer of stocks between corporations and nominee, employee annuity contracts, and relinquishment of powers in case of reciprocal trusts.

VETERANS

Benefits for Reserves

(Public Law 108. Approved June 20, 1949)

Provides benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training.

Disabled veterans

(Public Law 194. Approved August 1, 1949)

Removes a discriminatory limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay, withheld for an incompetent veteran, without dependents, during hospitalization or institutional care. Prior to the passage of this act, a single veteran who regained his competency was not allowed to receive any amounts over $500 which were withheld during his period of incompetency. This act removes this limitation by providing that if a veteran is still declared competent 9 months after his release, all benefits due him and withheld for him during his hospitalization or institutional care will be paid to him.

Disabled veterans—Housing

(Public Law 286. Approved September 7, 1949)

Removes an existing inequality by authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assist any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States who is entitled to compensation under the provisions of this regulation for permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, by reason of amputation, ankylosis, or paralysis of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair, in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor. This act extends this assistance to certain groups of veterans with serious service-connected disabilities of the lower extremities who have a particular need for specially adapted housing but who were not eligible for such assistance under the former law because it was confined to certain veterans whose paralysis resulted from service-connected spinal cord disease or injury.

Veterans' pensions

(Public Law 195. Approved August 1, 1949)

Authorizes retroactive awards of compensation, pension, or increases of either, for those persons now on the rolls who were prevented from filing their claims at an earlier date because of capture, interment, or other enemy action during the World War II. This act applies to all veterans, widows, and dependents. Provides for the award to be adjusted so as to be effective as of the date the award would have been effective had claim been filed on the date of death, discharge, or the occurrence of age or any disability or increased disability.

Disability compensation

(Public Law 339. Approved October 10, 1949)

Increases from 75 percent to 100 percent the rates of payment for World War I presumptive service-connected cases; provides minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; increases certain disability and death compensation rates; liberalizes the requirements for dependency allowances; and redefines the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct."

Readjustment benefits

(Public Law 43. Approved April 15, 1949)

Authorizes an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "readjustment benefits" in the amount of $595,890,000, to remain available until expended.

Parity in compensation

(Public Law 436. Approved October 29, 1949)

Provides parity in disability compensation for service-connected veterans of all wars.

Veterans—Postal employees

(Passed Senate August 9, 1949. H. R. 87, companion bill, on House Calendar)

To permit certain postal employees or substitute postal employees to receive credit for military service in order to adjust the apparent inequities which postal employees have suffered in comparison with veterans of World War I. This legislation is intended to give credit for military service to veterans of World War II who are now in, or who within 3 years enter the postal field service but who did not leave the postal service to enter the armed services.

Arlington National Cemetery

(Public Law 388. Approved October 25, 1949)

Provides for installation of a carillon in Arlington National Cemetery in memory of World War II dead.

Educational benefits

(Passed Senate August 9, 1949. Pending in House Veterans' Affairs Committee)

Provides educational benefits to veterans who enlisted before October 6, 1945.

Disabled veterans—Employment

(Passed Senate August 9, 1949. Pending in House Post Office and Civil Service Committee)

To provide greater retention preference for severely disabled war veterans in reductions in force in classified Federal employment with good or better ratings. The service-connected disability must have a rating of at least 40 percent.

Veterans' education

(Passed Senate October 12, 1949. Pending on House Calendar)

This bill clarifies the intent of Congress on the proper interpretation of the GI bill regarding veterans' educational training benefits. Specifically, it provides that new courses, or new branches of existing institutions, are to be considered newly established schools. It clarifies Congress' policy on avocational training; it provides for tuition to be determined on the realistic basis of current expenses; and, it finally requires the equality of treatment between long-established night law schools and day law schools.

Liberalization of pensions

(Passed House June 1, 1949. Pending in Senate Finance Committee)

To liberalize pensions to veterans, widows, and children at an estimated cost of $67,000,000 to the Government.

Basing Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a telegram which I received from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation Independent Business, Inc., of Atlanta, Ga.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 17, 1949.

HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building:

Just completed Nation tour conferring with business and professional men in Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, New Orleans, and Atlanta. At all meetings it was unanimous opinion of these business and professional leaders that any attempt by the Congress to vote legislation to amend by weakening Sherman-Clayton-Robinson-Patman laws will result in the complete destruction of independent business and our free-enterprise system. Recent decisions of the United States courts basing point Standard Oil of California, Indiana, all leading to the protection of independent business and our free-enterprise system. Both Republican and Democratic platforms pledged to independent business "all-out enforcement of antitrust laws." The National Federation of Independent Business, having the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation, insist that party pledges be kept by all Members of Congress and urge you to read this message on the floor of the Senate today so that no action will be taken by the Senate. One, to weaken antitrust laws; two, to destroy independent business of this Nation. Thank you.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation Independent Business, Inc.

Quaker Pamphlet Suggests Solution for Expellee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Friends Service Committee, widely and favorably known for its humanitarian work, has recently published a pamphlet entitled "The Problem of 12,000,000 German Refugees in Today's Germany." This pamphlet is written by Betty Barton who has been associated with UNRRA, the American Friends Service Committee, and Cralog in relief work in Germany.

The pamphlet is an interesting account of the origin of the refugees, their distribution in Germany, the economic and social problems created by their presence in Germany, and some suggested solutions to those problems. The pamphlet can be obtained from the American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the full text of the last chapter entitled "What Are the Possibilities for German Refugees":

The physical, economic, social, and political difficulties of these 12,000,000 refugees are too complicated for simple solution.

Keenly aware of the "cold war" between East and West, many of the refugees imagine that a real war might bring about their return to their former homes in the east. Local Germans, oppressed by the overcrowding caused by the superimposed population, also speak of this as a way out. This negative approach reflects the despair of the people who have been presented with no more constructive alternatives.

EMIGRATION

Emigration from Germany is widely discussed—by the refugees, by indigenous Germans, and by many groups who wish to help. At best it can be the solution for only a few hundred thousand able-bodied persons. The IRO experience with displaced persons has shown the complications and limitations of large-scale resettlement plans.

The U. S. S. R. has proposed one type of emigration by asking Czechoslovakia to accept the return of 300,000 Sudetens from the Russian zone. Such a move would relieve over-population pressures in the zone and would provide Czech industries with urgently needed manpower. Eventually quite a number of the refugees may be invited to return to their former communities. This is particularly true for those from the eastern provinces, even if the final boundary determinations favor Poland. The total number involved, however, would not be sufficient to alter the over-all problem.

ASSIMILATION

Under present circumstances the only practical solution of the problem of German refugees appears to be their absorption by the German population. In western Germany the legislative groundwork is laid for this eventuality. From an economic standpoint it is possible, if increased industrial production is permitted. Germany can produce 60 percent of the food necessary for its present population. Forty percent must be imported. The exporting of industrial products could make this trade exchange possible.

Given such foreign trade, Germany can absorb the refugee workers, even the marginal ones, into her labor market. The primary requisite for such employment stabilization is the redistribution of refugee labor. To match the available skills of the refugees with job openings a national employment service is needed.

Social absorption can be expected to follow individual economic security. The attitude of ostracism and bitterness in some communities has been largely due to the competition of these strangers with the old-timers for food, shoes, textiles and housing. There has been far too little of any commodity to go around. Following the currency reform there has been an upswing in the availability of consumer goods but the quantities on hand are still far below the demand. Housing is the most serious shortage. Time and materials and a large-scale building program will be necessary to alleviate this basic human need. Given these, it is still estimated that it will be two generations before the average individual can have a room of his own. This factor will delay the completion of social absorption for many years.

COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

Given assimilation by Germany as the practical solution for the problem of these refugees, changes in static conditions of the present must be introduced on many levels. On the local or community level there must be a change of attitude toward the newcomers. To accomplish this an educational program is necessary to provide an understanding of the background of the refugees and of the problems which they face. Individuals and groups in each community must take the initiative for the development of such activities as will further the integration of the refugees. Women's clubs, schools, churches and social agencies must lead the way. The attitude of neighborliness in all its aspects must supplant that of suspicion.

Among the vast number of unassimilated refugees themselves there must be a reorientation of thought. The lethargy and hopelessness into which so many have fallen must be supplanted with a new outlook. They must be helped to relinquish dreams of a

return to the past. Only by facing the realities of their present situation, as they must begin to realize, can they contribute toward a better future for themselves and their families. There must be a rebirth of individual initiative and a willingness to participate as members of a community. Leadership for such reorientation should come primarily from the refugees themselves, but it can be stimulated and assisted by local community groups and by national and foreign agencies.

GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

German governmental authorities deserve great credit for the responsibility which they have assumed in the administration of refugee matters since the end of the war. Their task has been surrounded by insurmountable difficulties. But a growing recognition of the extent of the problem and a gradual increase in the availability of consumer goods will make their task an easier one. In the immediate future the municipal authorities must carry out the practical application of the refugee bill of rights in every community. Governmental means must be developed for the coordination of activities regarding employment, housing and educational facilities for refugees, both on an intercommunity basis within the land and on an interstate one among the various laender.

ALLIED OCCUPATION AUTHORITIES: THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

The Allied occupation authorities have stated repeatedly that the volksdeutsche and reichsdeutsche refugees are a German problem. By occupational policy they have made it impossible for the German authorities to administer this in a practical manner beyond the local communities. The valueless reichsmark was also a German problem, but the occupation authorities instigated and gave financial backing to currency reform. The same acceptance of responsibility is necessary with regard to the refugees, a problem frequently cited as the most pressing in Germany today. It would appear that the Allied military governments must come to recognize that money reform, educational reform and political reform can be no more than partly effective while the unmet problem of 12,000,000 refugees burdens Germany.

Unfortunately, the Four-Power Allied Control Council in Berlin is not currently capable of approaching the refugee problem on an all-Germany basis. Until East-West relationships have been clarified, this problem as well as others affecting all Germany must be handled on the basis of a divided Germany. Eight of the 12 million refugees are now in western Germany. The western occupation authorities have made a beginning in unified action with the establishment early in 1948 of a Tripartite Commission on refugee problems. The Commission recommended that 300,000 refugees be moved from Schleswig-Holstein (British zone) and Bavaria (U. S. zone) into the French zone. French zone authorities stressed that only those refugees assured of employment should be authorized for removal ipso facto. They also urged that there be an employment drive with the aim of finding work contracts for as many refugees as possible.

It is hoped that further steps can be taken to level off the uneven distribution. A centralized labor index, large-scale housing projects, and a work program for the employment of refugees in rural areas are additional programs which could be initiated under Tripartite Commission auspices. ECA counterpart funds might be drawn upon to finance such programs.

The military governments of western Germany are the agencies for carrying out the policies of their respective governments. Their major policies are determined in Paris, London, and Washington. The funds to implement these policies are appropriated in Paris, London, and Washington. Therefore, occupational policy as to German refugees in trizonia is the responsibility of the citizens of the democracies of France, Great Britain, and the United States.

NEEDED: INTERNATIONAL ACTION

Responsibility toward constructive solutions for the refugees in Germany is broader than the local community, the German Laender, and the occupation powers. It is an international problem. As has been pointed out, the Governments of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Austria, the U. S. S. R., Poland, Denmark, the Netherlands, France, Great Britain, and the United States have all been involved in the development of the problem. These nations, plus all nations which have agreed to the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights, have an obligation toward the German refugees. The problem, therefore, becomes one for the United Nations, the organization which these nations have established for action on international problems.

The United Nations has established the precedent for its responsibility for refugees by creating the International Refugee Organization for the care of displaced persons. More recently it has set up the United Nations program for Palestine refugees. Numerically, the problem of German refugees far exceeds either of these groups. Historically, it is international in causation. It may be hoped that the United Nations will develop an organization within its framework to deal with the problem of the German refugee.

THE ROLE OF FOREIGN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

There is a large place for the foreign voluntary agencies in connection with the problem of the German refugees. Such welfare agencies are needed to supplement the efforts of the private and governmental German agencies, and to work with a United Nations organization, if one should be created. To be most effective, the work of foreign organizations in Germany must be coordinated in an interagency body; and the foreign personnel must work in close cooperation, at all levels, with the German private agencies and the German administration.

The need for material supplies—for soap, textiles, food, and shoes—is still great, particularly in the static camps. To a large extent, such supplies should be given on a self-help basis. Specifically, textiles can be given to refugee camp sewing rooms. Seeds can be given for garden projects. Leather and shoe-repair equipment can be provided instead of the finished pair of shoes. In addition to extending the agency's resources, this method has the concrete value of helping the recipients to improve their condition by the work of their own hands. It leads to the organization of group efforts and to an oportunity for community participation in constructive projects.

Carefully selected foreign-agency personnel has a great opportunity to offer services of a recreational, educational, and cultural nature to refugee communities. Play centers, youth groups, hobby clubs, libraries, forums, and concerts are needed to give color to a life which has become pathetically drab. Once again, the function of the agency is to stimulate such group activity and to make possible the opportunity for self-expression.

The function which the foreign voluntary agency can perform better than any other body is the important one of spreading interpretation and an awareness among individuals, groups, and private and governmental agencies of the problem of refugees.

Finally, it is through such foreign voluntary agencies that individuals in Great Britain, Sweden, Switzerland, France, Holland, Norway, Denmark, and America can express their personal concern for the individual misery, the poverty, and the family disruption which has overtaken 12,000,000 human beings—men, women, and children.

The Future of Our Displaced Persons Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it was my privilege and pleasure to address delegates to the Eastern Regional Resettlement Conference at Philadelphia. The delegates at that conference were public officials of a number of Eastern States and also present were representatives of the great voluntary agencies which have done so much to make possible whatever success we have been able to obtain under our existing and unfair displaced persons law.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address which I made on this occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed, as follows:

In meeting with you today, I wish we might have been able to celebrate a new, a dignified, and a decent displaced persons law. But we haven't got a new DP law, yet.

However, if I leave no other thought with you, I wish to make it very clear that I regard the action in the Senate 10 days ago—when it sent the House version of the DP bill back to the Senate Judiciary Committee—as an action which is merely a set-back, and not in any permanent sense, a defeat.

It would be a tragic mistake if the millions of people who anxiously hoped the Senate would give us a new DP law at this time were to view the recommittal vote of 36 to 30 as an indication that a majority of the Senate disapproved the amendment of the distorted and inadequate law we now have on the books.

It would be a tragic mistake—and I am utterly sincere about this—for the officials of government, for the officials of the IRO, for the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, and for the millions affiliated with the great voluntary agencies to relax their efforts for a moment because they believed nothing further will be done to give us a just, workable, and adequate DP law. It would be a tragic mistake—because we're going to get a good law, and get it before many more months have passed.

In all frankness, I do not fear there will be an relaxing of these efforts. The fine idealism, the human decency, and the wholehearted efforts which have motivated all those who have made possible the great achievements we've seen in the past year—under the present grossly unfair and grossly difficult law—serve to refute any fears of a let-down on their part, or of an admission by them of any defeat.

In my remarks today I don't intend to discuss what I know about the details of the displaced-persons program. The knowledge I have—and I feel I have learned a good bit about the details of the program—is second-hand knowledge that I have acquired through countless letters on the subject, through discussion with many people directly connected with the problem, through poring over many pieces of documentary evidence, and—this has been extremely important to me—through the splendid assistance I have had from the three Commissioners and their staff at the Displaced Persons Commission. I realize that for many of you

here the displaced-persons problem is a matter of first-hand knowledge, a matter very close at hand indeed.

I feel, instead, that I will be most helpful to you if I can develop in the space of a few minutes some of the mechanical, professional aspects of getting legislation enacted by the Congress, and further, if I can summarize for you, as I understand them, the sentiments of the Congress on the displaced-persons question.

I believe that a great and useful purpose is served when Members of the Congress devote their attention to assisting the American people to a greater understanding of the fashion in which the legislative affairs of their Government are carried out.

When the first session of the Eighty-first Congress ended almost a week ago, 2,675 separate bills had been put in by the 96 Members of the Senate, and 6,532 bills had been introduced by the 435 Members of the House—a total, as you can see, of more than 9,000 bills in the course of 9½ months.

With that volume of business, it's obvious that to do anything thoroughly, we must divide the work up among ourselves, and take every step possible to simplify the process and reduce it to some system of order.

So, like any other business or organization, the Congress has to rely on the time-honored system of special committees. In this complex world we live in, we find ourselves with the habit of setting up another committee to cope with some new development that crops up. Thus, after a time, we collect a hopeless hodgepodge of committees which continue to hang on long after their original purposes have vanished.

We had our last big congressional house cleaning back in 1946 when the Reorganization Act of that year lopped off a lot of our useless appendages, consolidated a great many functions, and set up new committees in an attempt to fix the jurisdiction of each.

Thus, each new bill introduced is assigned to one of the standing committees unless, as happens in unusual circumstances when there is reason for great haste and the measure is beyond the pale of controversy, there is unanimous consent to consider the bill at the time it is introduced.

On any particular issue, and especially if it's an important issue, there may be dozens or perhaps a hundred or more bills and amendments to bills introduced in the course of one Congress.

DP legislation is a good example of this. The law we now have was passed late in the last regular session of the Eightieth Congress, after many months of hearings and study conducted by the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House. Coming before the Senate, as the DP bill did, just before the 1948 conventions of both parties, the Congress was in a hurry to adjourn and had a lot of other work to do. So, as quickly as the DP bill got on the Senate floor last year, it was threatened with a filibuster, and after a couple of days of debate, it was clear that a bad bill was the only bill we had any chance of getting. The alternative was no bill at all.

What we finally got was a bad law—the present law—but at least it was able to do some good.

After the national political conventions were over, President Truman called the Congress back in a special session and one of the things he urged was that the DP law be corrected at that time since both major parties had pledged themselves to getting rid of the discriminatory features of the recently passed act. But rather than face another filibuster, the Congress was anxious to get away from Washington and get on with the political campaign.

Throughout the 1948 campaign, the DP law was bitterly attacked, and when the Eighty-first Congress convened in January of this year, it was not surprising at all that Republicans and Democrats, Senators and Representatives alike, introduced bill after bill to amend the vicious existing law.

Depending upon the views of the particular sponsor of a given bill, these amendments variously proposed to extend the life of the law beyond July 1, 1950, to increase the number of eligible persons, to strip out the discriminatory features which had made the law so difficult to administer.

It was evident that a great deal of work would be necessary in committee to go into the merits of the various proposals, that hearings would have to be conducted, and a lot of study done. So as each new bill was introduced, it was ordered to the respective Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House.

By June of this year, after the House Judiciary Committee had reported the bill, the House passed a pretty good bill. True, the bill passed by the House June 2, 1949, did not go as far as the bill I introduced on January 5, 1949, for myself and Senator McMAHON, of Connecticut, and it did not go as far as bills such as the McGrath-Neely, and many others. But, essentially, the House bill was a good one, and was a big step in the right direction.

But as the months dragged along in the Senate, and hearings were scheduled to run on for many more weeks before the Senate Judiciary Committee, it begun to appear by later summer that we weren't going to get a bill reported out to the Senate during this session.

Now heaven knows I would be the last person in the world to suggest that we do away with committee consideration of legislation. When we are dealing with complex legislation, and many different and controversial proposals have been offered, it is obvious that these proposals have to be given a full and expert airing. Senate and House committees become, over the course of time the recognized experts in the Congress on the legislation that comes before them. They hear arguments for and against the measures they are dealing with, and are charged with the duty of reporting out to the Senate a piece of legislation that may be an amalgamation of many bills, a piece of legislation which is usually accompanied by a report recommending the proposals incorporated.

If in the judgment of a majority of a committee a given piece of legislation is not desirable, the committee can, by failing to report out a bill, keep the matter bottled up, and thus let the proposal die without ever coming out on the Senate Calendar.

I think you can all understand that legislative committees should be given some discretion to kill a bad bill, and there is certainly no reason in many cases where a stupid bill is introduced that a committee should be required to report it out to the calendar, wasting their time and everyone else's when there is so much other work to be done.

Because the congressional legislative committees are expert on matters within their jurisdiction, they are regarded with considerable respect, and a respect to which they are fully entitled.

Occasionally, of course, it is possible that a committee may abuse its discretion, and manage to bottle up legislation that a majority of the Congress wishes to enact. But this is an unusual circumstance, and it is the overwhelming rule that both the Senate and the House are content to wait until a committee has completed its consideration of a measure before taking any steps leading to passage of the bill.

Now, so far as displaced-persons legislation is concerned, I regard it as more of a sectional issue than as a partisan one. The situation obviously isn't as simple as my last remark would make it appear, because there were many other issues than sectionalism involved. But generally speaking, you will find support for the philosophy behind the DP measures comes from both major parties, and so does opposition to it. And, of course, support for DP legislation is a relative thing, too, with some support for a severely limited DP program, and other support for a liberal program which meets what most of us here would regard as our full share of the job involved in settling the DP problem.

Thus, with so many different shades of opinion in the matter, it is understandable the Senate Judiciary Committee might have desired to prolong its deliberations in order that it could do the best job possible.

On the other hand, the House had, by late spring, already given us what seemed to be a fair and reasonable bill, a bill that didn't do everything that would ultimately have to be done, but nonetheless a bill which made it quite clear that America intended to live up to its international responsibilities to achieve real and lasting peace.

When it became evident that we might not have a chance to get DP legislation before the Senate this session, 16 of us in the Senate took an extraordinary step. Eight Republican and 8 Democratic Senators gave their names to what was introduced on August 24 as Senate Resolution 160.

I must repeat, this Senate resolution was an extraordinary step, something that is almost never done. That resolution proposed to take away from the Senate Judiciary Committee the bill which had been passed earlier in the year by the House.

As I have indicated in my earlier remarks, both the Senate and the House are content to wait until a committee has completed its work on a bill, and thus a resolution to discharge a Senate committee from further consideration of a bill is a very unusual thing. A resolution of this sort is regarded by many Members of the Senate as an affront to the dignity of an expert committee. And in a sense, I agree with that viewpoint. On the other hand, a discharge resolution is only resorted to as an extraordinary move, and one that is taken only under circumstances where it is clear that a committee, representing as it does only a small minority of the whole Senate, has adopted a view contrary to that of a substantial number of Senators.

In order to carry such a resolution, it is necessary to have the support of a majority of the Senators voting. The difficulty with a discharge resolution in this instance was that the issue involved ceased to be the merits of the legislation which the Senate was attempting to bring forth from the committee. Instead, the issue was complicated by the fact that an unusual move was being taken, a move which invaded the prerogatives of a Senate committee. And for that reason, the vote of many Senators turned on the question of whether such prerogatives should be invaded.

Senate Resolution 160 was sponsored, as you already know, by an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. Senator TAFT and Senator SALTONSTALL, minority whip of the Senate, were among the Republican leaders who joined in signing it, and on the Democratic side the resolution was signed by Senator LUCAS as majority leader, and I, as majority whip of the Senate, also signed it. The others who joined with us were also prominent Members of the Senate who felt strongly that action should be taken before this session ended.

This first session of the Eighty-first Congress, as you know, was one of the longest peacetime sessions in our history, and in the closing months there were loud and insistent cries that we adjourn.

When it became clear, however, that those who signed the discharge resolution did in-

tend to bring it up before we went home, the Judiciary Committee undertook a step just as revolutionary as the resolution itself, and by a vote of 7 to 3, sent the House bill to the Senate. The Senate Judiciary Committee is ordinarily composed of 13 members, but the death of Senator MILLER, of Idaho, just a few days before the committee acted, and the absence of 2 committee members, including the chairman himself, reduced the number present at the time of the vote to 10.

The most unusual aspect of the committee move in voting out the House bill was the fact that the bill was reported without any recommendation whatsoever. This is most unusual in itself, because the Senate ordinarily relies to a considerable extent upon the expert opinion of its committee members, and thus pays careful attention to the recommendations made when a bill is reported.

So, by the time the DP bill finally got on the Senate Calendar, the issue was tremendously complicated.

Now, because both major parties were pledged to change the DP law, I think it is perfectly fitting to ask why, once the bill was finally before the Senate, it was sent promptly back into the committee.

No single reason answers that question, but I believe I can throw out to you a few suggestions which may be helpful. Recall that the vote which sent the bill back to committee was 36 to 30—a total of only 66 Senators out of 96. The vote came at the time that adjournment was a matter of days, and among the 32 absent Senators were more friends of DP legislation than opponents. These absent Members were away on official business, looking into matters of housing and other very important questions—and some of the absentees were ill.

The small group of resolute opponents began a filibuster of the bill, a filibuster which stopped abruptly when they felt they could probably hold up action this session by recommitting the bill.

That group then introduced a motion to send the bill back to the Judiciary Committee for further consideration there. It was the 36 to 30 vote on this motion that recommitted the bill. I would like to point out, however, that had we been successful in blocking the motion, and we came close to doing so, we would have seen the filibuster resumed.

Now earlier in this session of the Eighty-first Congress, the rules of the Senate which apply to filibusters were changed—changed, I feel, in a manner which makes it more difficult than ever to block a filibuster. Under the new rules, a total of 64 Senators must vote to block off debate—in other words, two-thirds of the Senate. Yet we had only 66 Senators voting on the question of sending the DP bill back to committee, and we obviously didn't have enough people present to stop a filibuster by applying cloture.

That would have meant that we would be forced to sit out the filibuster until it finally dried up. In the meanwhile, our list of absentees was growing because the session had been 9½ months long, and everybody was exhausted. We were also fearful that we might not be able to round up a quorum later on. Of course, the minute we failed to call a quorum together, the DP bill would have been licked another way. And remember, too, that opponents of any legislation, when there are many Members absent, can make it more difficult to obtain a quorum by deliberately staying away.

So, with all these things in mind, 36 Senators decided, for one reason or another, to send the bill back to committee. I am sure that many of the 36 will support the legislation when we return to it—and some of them voted to recommit the bill simply because they did not feel any great harm would be done by postponing things for several more months. They felt, too, that the postponement would be short since the recommittal motion ordered the Judiciary Committee to report a bill to the Senate Calendar by January 25, 1950.

I do not need to tell you that I disagree with that feeling. My heart on this matter is on my sleeve. I believe the IRO should have had a clear notice that we were going to stay in this thing. I believe the operation of the present law during the next few months will be much more difficult because for the first time we will begin to see the real effect of the discriminatory provisions as they force us to reduce the number of people admitted each month far below the present fifteen to eighteen thousand monthly rate. I feel the voluntary agencies should be given assurance too, in the same manner. And above all, I feel we should announce to the world at this time that we are committed by the force of law to do the decent thing. However, the bill is back in committee.

Now just where do we stand?

I believe that we are infinitely better off than we were before the bill was sent out to the Senate floor by the action of the Judiciary Committee several weeks ago. I believe we are infinitely better off, in fact, than we were at the time the initial legislation was brought up and passed in the days shortly before the national political conventions back in 1948.

Why? First, the opponents of the DP bill realized they would not be able to send the bill back to committee without a promise that the Senate would have an opportunity to reconsider the bill in a few more months. So that was why the recommittal motion added the provision that the Judiciary Committee was to report the bill back on the Senate Calendar on the 25th day of January 1950.

That provision is a guaranty that DP legislation will not stay bottled up in committee after that time, and had that not been provided for in the motion to return the bill to committee the opponents would never have been successful in rounding up the 36 votes they got.

Thus, when the bill is returned to the calendar in January it will be incumbent upon the Senate leadership to call the bill up as quickly as they have a chance to do so.

This means, of course, that the issue before the Senate, when the bill comes up for debate, will be squarely on the merits of the DP bill, and will not have associated with it all the complicated overtones of invading Senate prerogatives, of a weary bunch of Senators anxious to leave Washington, of a filibuster which could not have been broken because there were so many absentees.

That is why I feel I can tell you with considerable confidence that we are much better off now than we were late in the summer.

That is why I feel we have merely suffered a set-back, and not a defeat, and that is why I feel you must not relax in your efforts.

I would like to point out in closing that we have already committed ourselves to consider a number of very important measures early next session which are potential filibuster material. Among these almost certainly will be the oleomargarine bill, the fair employment practices bill, and the DP bill.

We will have an opportunity to test the mechanics of our new cloture rule to stop a filibuster. As I have already said, I was very much opposed to the rule we got, and I regard it as a backward step in many ways. Whether the rule will permit us to close off a filibuster remains to be seen. We may have, in some of these issues, to sit out a filibuster because we are unable to obtain the necessary 64 votes. We know from past experience that there have been very few times indeed that 64 votes have been obtained on a cloture resolution out of all the resolutions we have voted on.

While I would not venture to make a prediction about that cloture rule, I do know that the success or failure of the rule will depend a lot upon the situation in which we seek to apply it, and I do know that when the Senate is off to a fresh start in January that, whether we will be successful in applying cloture on the DP bill or not, there will not be the disposition on the part of some of those who support the bill to give up their fight in the face of a filibuster, because we have the whole of the next session ahead of us, and further, because at that time the argument that we can postpone action on DP legislation will no longer have any force whatsoever.

So I am very encouraged about the future of our displaced persons policy, and I feel strongly that we will have a law which is compatible with our American standards of decency and fair play, a law that will help to round out our over-all international policy of building a constructive peace, and a law which will truly reflect the generous and sympathetic feelings of our people.

Sound Principles Overlooked in Amendments to Minimum-Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not support the proposed changes in the minimum-wage law. I opposed the 75-cent minimum because I believe it will cause some unemployment and will work an injustice upon some businesses, particularly small plants. The fact that sweeping exemptions were voted is of itself evidence that many Members question the economic character of the new minimum.

I am not opposed to general legislation of this type. If the law takes account of the vast differences in our industrial system and the need for flexibility in the wage structure, seeking only to provide protection of workers against exploitation, it would be difficult to make out a case against such a wage policy. The 1949 legislation, however, represents a departure from the theory of the 1939 statute. The Government has to an extent abandoned the role of rule maker and has entered the management field in ordering an 87½-percent increase in the minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I do not enjoy opposing increases. My natural sympathies are with the low-wage workers. In 1927 it was my honor to represent the State of Arkansas in a case testing the constitutionality of the State's first minimum wage law, a measure designed to require employers to pay at least $7 a week to women workers. That a single employer would have dared to raise objections to so mild an approach to the wage problem is perplexing. Strangely enough it was a Federal court that invalidated that statute, following the Adkins against Children's Hospital decision. Later I served as legal adviser to the Arkansas office of NRA. Important gains were made for

the workers as a result of that experiment and the guaranties for collective bargaining.

During the NRA days I conducted a hearing involving a small lumber mill operator. In the vernacular of western Arkansas he operated a "peckerwood mill." Our investigator found that he was paying less than the code prescribed. He was confronted by our staff and an investigator from the Washington office. Suddenly the mill owner stood up and pointed at each of us individually and said "Wait, you tell me what I have to do. What do I have to do? I have to pay this wage, you say, but there is something else I have to do. I don't get a salary like you do. When the first of the month comes, your pay is there and you can buy groceries. What do I have to do? I have to keep that little mill running so that there will be groceries for 13 families, that's what I have to do." He was thinking in terms of continued employment for this little stranded group in the hills. If he could not supply jobs for them, public relief would have to carry the load.

I regret that the advocates of the Lesinski bill were unmoved by the evidence that the changes will put some out of work. Remember, we are talking about the little mills and factories, the little plants, the small operations—which are going to be most vitally affected. Look at the lumber industry. The survey of 1946, which is the latest full survey I have seen, showed that in southern lumber operations, 81 percent of all employees received less than 75 cents an hour. The Department of Labor figures indicate that this would probably now range between 55 and 60 percent. In cotton garments, here are some interesting figures for the Southwest. The average for four States in that region was 58 cents, and 87 percent of all workers received less than 75 cents an hour. In some parts of the industry, I understand, the average hourly earnings have gone up since that time by 3 percent. In fertilizer plants, 46 percent in the Southwest received less than 75 cents. This is the March 1948 figure. In hosiery, and here I use the figures for the Southeast, where there is considerable industry, 31 percent received less than 75 cents, despite the average of 90 cents in the region. In the grain mills in the Southeast, 66 percent are below the 75-cent figure, 22 percent in the Southwest. The situation is not so bleak in furniture. There is one small area in North Carolina, I am told, where only 15 percent of the workers are below the 75-cent figure.

It is known, too, that the wholesale industry would be affected. Last summer's survey in the Atlanta, Ga., area shows that 42 percent of employees received less than 75 cents. I am not familiar with northern industry but I noticed that in New England as a whole, 15 percent of the employees in the shoe industries would be affected by an increase to 75 cents. One of the best letters my office received in opposition to the bill was from a Boston employer in the stamp collecting business.

The above listed industries appear to be the ones most likely to be affected substantially by the 75-cent-minimum proposal. There are many little industries, closely related to agriculture, that would be affected, and I fear in many instances they would completely fold up. There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, a 75-cent rigid minimum will result in some unemployment.

Now this is not a regional question. I fully understand how the northern competitor of a southern operation with lower wages feels about equalizing these requirements, and if there was ever in the South a belief that industrial progress should be at the expense of a wage policy, that view has been discarded. We have no right to develop our industrial system by such means. It has been renounced by our leaders and our people.

Two things occur to me as pertinent to this discussion, however. One is that the North and West have a tremendous stake in a well-balanced and soundly conceived industrial expansion for our region. It is a new market of vast potentialities for northern and western industries. For the lumber industry of the South to be in distress is no boon to other parts of the country. Even in cotton garments, where there is a competitive situation, other producers cannot hope to profit by the deterioration of our industry. The other point is that the wage differential, which is so vital to an intelligent handling of this problem, is greater in many instances between large cities and the rural areas of the same State than between the various large regions of the country. There is a greater disparity between the average wages for Little Rock and a community of 1,000 people a hundred miles from Little Rock in Arkansas, for example, than between Little Rock and Chicago. A small town in southern Illinois or southern Indiana has a lower wage rate than Chicago or Indianapolis. The pressure from highly organized metropolitan centers should not be permitted to retard their industries.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports confirm my impression that in the following industries it is unlikely that there would be significant effects of a 75-cent minimum: Steel, machinery, automobiles, nonferrous metal products, glass, cement, paper, chemicals, petroleum, rubber, coal mining, metal mining, public utilities, transportation, and communications. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be honestly argued to the home folks that anything has been done by the Lesinski bill for the workers in these industries. The impact is upon the little operators and chiefly in the smaller industries.

It sheds little light on our present problem to point to the fact that southern industry accepted the 40-cent minimum and the intermediate increases between the passage of the original act and the imposition of the 40-cent wage in 1944, and took such increase in its stride. Overlooked is the fact that the tremendous boost in prices caused by the war overshadowed any effect the wage increase might have otherwise produced. If we could be sure of expanding prosperity, a large part of our industry could pay a high minimum, even 75 cents. It is the uncertainty of the future that accounts for much opposition to the Lesinski bill. Management did not oppose the increases between 1938 and 1944 when expanding markets and rising prices justified these increases. The tri-party committee for the lumber and timber products industry, for example, voted for the 35-cent minimum when 44 percent of their workers were earning less than that amount. In the pants, shirt, and allied garment industry, a 40-cent minimum wage was approved when it affected two-thirds of their labor forces. Half of the tobacco workers were benefited by the adoption of a 40-cent minimum for that industry. I cite these as examples of the fact that management, through the industrial committees, cooperated and cheerfully accepted minimum-wage increases when conditions justified. But there are shadows on the economic horizon now. One does not have to be a prophet of doom to insist that these uncertainties must be considered in determining the relationship of government to the great problems of American industry.

Some of us believe that the free industrial society in which we have such a pronounced stake may soon be required to meet the sternest tests. One of the wisest labor leaders I know, Marion Hedges, who for 20 years was connected with the AFL electrical workers union, used to say that the success of the capitalistic system depends upon four things: First, progressive increases in wages occasioned by technological advances; second, benefits to the consumer through lower prices, expanding the markets and producing a rise in the total income; third, satisfactory teamwork between labor and management, and fourth, rules prescribed by the Government that make for harmony and a maximum degree of freedom. Government cannot bungle its part and expect industry to thrive.

Can we justify a 75-cent minimum? The committee appointed by the Council of Economic Advisers and transmitted to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report does not think so. On page 82 the report states:

> No one could say with precision whether a minimum wage rate of 60 or 75 cents an hour would be the upper limit at which such a law should operate. Analysis of the evidence supports the view that a minimum wage law somewhere within this range would be desirable. It is obvious that a minimum wage should not be set independently of movements in the general price level. While a minimum wage probably has some effect in maintaining a floor under commodity prices if these prices did decline substantially, it would be essential that the minimum wage be adjusted downward. It would be just as true that a minimum wage level should have upward flexibility in case the general price level increased. An effort to write such flexibility into any minimum wage legislation would be highly desirable.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe it would have been better for our economy to prescribe a 60- or 65-cent minimum with a flexibility feature that would relate the minimum rates to the cost of living with mathematical precision.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks I made at a wreath-laying ceremony here in Washington on October 11 commemorating Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a man beloved alike by the Polish people and by the American people for his devotion to the cause of freedom.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this occasion when we meet in the memory of the great Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, whose service on behalf of the struggling American colonies more than a century and a half ago played so great a part in the successful founding of the United States, it seems most fitting that we recall for all Americans the deep-seated love of freedom of the Polish people.

But the people of Poland live in a captive country today, a country no longer capable of exercising the freedom of the individual which we here in America hold to be so fundamental and so dear.

More than 10 years have passed since Germany, followed shortly thereafter by the Soviet Union, turned on Poland and threw over Poland and its people the dark and heavy blanket of oppression and devastation which has lain there over this decade.

Perhaps one of the greatest tragedies of our day lies in the fact that the end of the war, or at least what we regarded as the end of the war in Europe, has not resulted in the liberation of the Polish people. Instead, we have a Poland knuckled under the merciless hand of Communist masters, and living in the very real and terrifying shadow of the Red Army.

What do we, as Americans, have to say to the people of Poland? We say this:

People of Poland, we know your love of liberty. We know this not only from our experiences of this day and year, or of the first day of September 1939, but we know how you have loved and fought for liberty far back in your own history. We know this from your own patriot—and our patriot—General Pulaski, who did so much for us in our fight for freedom when our own Nation was born.

We know, too, that love of liberty does survive the long night of oppression, and we know that you will not give up your fight. Remember, that in America and in the democracies of the west, there are hundreds of millions of people who are doing their utmost to keep democracy and liberty alive, hundreds of millions who suffer in watching you suffer.

We Americans are doing our level best, and we will continue to exert ourselves in every way that we can to see to it that your freedom is restored. We are doing now, through the operation of our DP program, what we can to make a home here in America for Polish patriots who may find a haven in America until the day comes that they may return triumphant to their homeland.

I have often wondered whether it was clear to all the Polish people how much they have been able to benefit from the DP law. The latest figures I have been able to obtain indicate that out of almost 90,000 American visas which had been issued under the DP program by the first of September of this year, just about one-half of them have been issued to people of Polish birth.

Now I don't think there is any disagreement among any of us that the DP Act which has been on the books for more than a year now has been an exceedingly difficult law to administer. It has been a discriminatory law, and it has, in a great many ways, been a grossly unjust law.

I am happy, however, to report to you that we in the Senate, I hope beginning this afternoon, will undertake to correct most of the really discriminatory features of last year's act. We hope to provide a new act which will advance the date of eligibility from December 22, 1945, to January 1949—thus allowing those who remained in Poland and the other countries behind the iron curtain in the hope of seeing freedom restored—and who have since been exiled by Communist usurpation—to become eligible under our laws for admission to this country as displaced persons. That they are such persons, no one can deny.

We are hoping to enlarge the total number of eligible DP's from 205,000 to 339,000. We are hoping to rid the present act of its worst discriminatory features. Let us hope that within a few days we will have a decent, American piece of legislation. I believe we will.

There is no better answer to oppression anywhere in the world than the proof that democracy—our kind of democracy—really works. We are proving this today, and the proof that our democracy does work will penetrate the iron curtain. It will pierce the iron curtain, and some day roll it back, roll it back in order that all the people in the world may know freedom as we know it here. That is the task we are dedicated to, and we will succeed. That is our pledge to the people of Poland.

Report on Project Developments in Western Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include with my remarks a summary of appropriations approved by the Congress for specific reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Indian, and Army engineers projects in my district. The time covered by these appropriations is for the period during my service as Representative from the First District of Montana and follows up a similar summary sent out by me in 1948:

Reclamation projects

1. HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

1946	$1,700,000
1947	867,210
1948	2,500,000
1949	14,611,650
1950	22,093,125
Total	41,771,985

2. CANYON FERRY PROJECT

1946	236,270
1947	106,205
1948	775,000
1949	2,950,000
1950	7,928,300
Total	11,995,775

3. HELENA VALLEY PROJECT

1946	----------
1947	----------
1948	$29,000
1949	21,000
1950	90,000
Total	140,000

4. JEFFERSON RIVER PROJECT

1946	----------
1947	25,945
1948	80,000
1949	82,500
1950	236,000
Total	424,445

5. THREE FORKS PROJECT

1946	----------
1947	----------
1948	151,000
1949	299,600
1950	104,000
Total	554,600

6. BITTERROOT PROJECT

1946	----------
1947	89,238
1948	----------
1949	40,000
1950	50,000
Total	179,238

7. MISSOULA VALLEY PROJECT

1945–47 (completed)	269,355

Bonneville power projects

	Cash	*Contract authority*
1950: Hungry Horse-Kerr No. 1 transmission line	$167,450	--------
1950: Hungry Horse-Kerr No. 2 transmission line	99,450	$408,850
1950: Kerr-Anaconda transmission line	--------	323,000
1950: Kerr-Spokane transmission line	271,150	1,544,450
1950: Kalispell substation addition	4,250	57,800
1950: Kerr switching station	4,250	153,250
1950: Bonneville office for western Montana (estimate)	30,000	--------
Total	576,550	2,487,950

ARMY ENGINEERS

1949: Orchard Homes flood-control project	$140,000

INDIAN OFFICE

1. Indian Tuberculosis Hospital, Warm Springs:	
1949	750,000
1950	750,000
Total	1,500,000
2. Polson drainage project:	
1950	100,000

Rural electrification projects

1. Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corvallis, Mont. (it includes Ravalli and Missoula Counties):

	Customers	*Farms*	*Amount of loan*
1943–46	568	546	$272,800
1946	637	592	--------
1947	744	728	73,000
1948	784	765	150,000
1949	800	772	--------
Total			495,800

2. Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc., Twin Bridges and Dillon, Mont. (it includes Jefferson, Madison, Silver Bow, Beaverhead, and Broadwater Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	1,016	545	$960,000
1947	1,305	687	405,000
1948	1,434	787	100,000
1949	1,547	829	278,000
Total			1,743,000

3. Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Missoula, Mont. (it includes Ravalli, Granite, Powell, Missoula, Mineral, and Lake Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	505	306	$505,000
1947	546	337	--------
1948	629	394	450,000
1949	704	465	--------
Total			955,000

4. Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kalispell, Mont. (it includes Flathead and Lake Counties):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1943–46	777	551	$413,700
1947	1,098	702	--------
1948	1,323	777	635,000
1949	1,623	824	--------
Total			1,048,700

5. Elmo Electric Cooperative, Inc., Polson, Mont. (it includes Lake County):

	Customers	Farms	Amount of loan
1949	216	135	$110,000

6. Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Fortine, Mont. (it includes Lincoln and Flathead Counties). Construction not completed: 1949 ---------- 415,000

Farm Legislation in the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I take great pride in submitting to the Congress and to the farmers of the Nation a brief report on the work of our committee during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

At the outset I desire to congratulate publicly and to commend all of the members of this great committee upon the splendid manner in which they have discharged their duties. Each member of the committee has applied himself to the faithful performance of every assignment and each member, by his devotion to duty, has with becoming dignity and great competency, demonstrated a true friendship for the cause of agriculture. I have never worked with a more sincere or patriotic group. While each member of our committee has earnestly worked in behalf of agriculture, no member has specialized to the extent that his other important official business has been neglected and each man has worked in the interest of the general welfare of our country. During the 15 years that I have served on this great committee, partisan politics has seldom, if ever, influenced the deliberations or the decisions of the members of this very important committee.

I would not be true to my own feelings if I did not likewise, Mr. Speaker, compliment and commend each and every member of our staff. Our professional and clerical staff has worked early and late and each member of the staff has demonstrated a true interest in the work of the committee and in all of the problems of American agriculture. No group of people could have worked more willingly, diligently, or faithfully than the members of our staff and they, too, have made a real contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

During this session 264 bills and resolutions have been referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Hearings have been held on 160 days or at a rate of 20 hearings a month. Seven subcommittees have been constantly at work. Consideration has been given to every single bill and resolution referred to the committee, and hearings have been held on every important measure. The committee reported 44 bills to the House, and 39 of these have been passed by the House during this session. Of these, 27 bills have been passed also by the Senate and enacted into law.

I shall not attempt to discuss or explain in minute detail all of the many measures to which I have referred, but to the end that you may have some idea of the achievements of our committee, I shall discuss briefly some of the most important bills which have been enacted—not necessarily in the order of their importance.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Certainly the most important measure is that which deals with all of American agriculture—the Agricultural Act of 1949. When Congress convened in January and even before the House was organized, I appointed a special subcommittee and designated the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the honorable STEPHEN PACE, as chairman of that subcommittee. The subcommittee was directed to study general farm legislation—including the Aiken bill, legislation which had been recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, the program under which we were currently operating, and all other measures of similar character. The Aiken bill, legislation which had been session of the Eightieth Congress, was studied thoroughly. Attorneys and experts analyzed for the subcommittee each line and paragraph of that measure. No committee ever worked more faithfully. Extended hearings were held. Every person desiring to be heard was accorded a full, free, and frank hearing. Finally a bill was reported. Unfortunately it did not meet with the approval of all of the members of our committee. The subject became highly controversial and when the bill reached the floor of the House a substitute was adopted. Even the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was far from perfect and was highly objectionable. The amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] a member of the committee, and approved overwhelmingly by the House, at least provided for the repeal of the Aiken bill. The Aiken bill undertook long-range stabilization of production by means of an unstable price and production control methods which would have achieved stabilized production by literally starving out of business many of the producers of our basic agricultural commodities.

When the House bill was sent to the Senate, even in its amended form, it did not meet with the approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Another measure was prepared by the Senate committee and reported to the Senate. It too, was controversial, imperfect, and objectionable. When final action was taken in the Senate, conferees were appointed and all of the pending measures were thrown into conference. The conferees met day in and day out and sat for long hours both in the day and at night.

The managers on the part of the House went to conference with open minds and with a willingness to compose differences, but with a determination to insist upon the repeal of the price-support program contained in the Aiken law and with a further determination to insist upon a support program of 90 percent of parity for the producers of basic commodities when the producers of such commodities were willing to approve and to accept acreage allotments and marketing quotas. For many long hours it appeared that no agreement would be reached and that no bill would be approved. The Senate conferees finally voted to report a disagreement and to abandon all efforts to compose differences.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House conferees, both Democrats and Republicans, upon the fact that they stood together through all the conferences in an honest effort to vindicate the position of the House and to write a measure which would be in the interest of the farmers of the Nation and in the welfare of our country. Never once during any of the conferences did partisan politics enter our deliberations. No group of men could have worked more sincerely. When the Senate conferees voted to end the conference disagreement, as spokesman for the managers on the part of the House, I stated to the conference, with the approval of my colleagues, that we were unwilling to leave the conference and abandon our efforts to reach an agreement. I stated that we were willing to remain all night, all the week, or all the month, if necessary. Notwithstanding our views, however, that session of the conference ended in disagreement.

Upon reflection and further consideration the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, that outstanding friend of the farmer, Senator ELMER THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in a final effort called the Senate conferees together and agreed to continue the conference with the House conferees. We composed some of our differences and reported a bill which was approved by both Houses of Congress. The bill which was finally approved, the Agricultural Act of 1949,

is one of the most important, and perhaps the most beneficial, farm measures that has been enacted in more than a decade.

ANALYSIS OF THE ACT

The bill as recommended by the conferees and adopted by the House and Senate—now Public Law 439—repeals the price-support sections of title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 and establishes a permanent support program for agricultural commodities embodying the following major factors:

First. Establishment of a modernized parity formula that includes wages paid hired labor in the computation of parity prices.

Second. A provision that for four crop years beginning with the 1950 crop year, in order to cushion the transition from uncontrolled to controlled production or marketing of basic commodities and the shift to the new parity formula, that the parity price for the basic commodities shall not be lower than the parity price for such commodities as computed under the parity formula now in effect.

Third. A classification of agricultural commodities under three main groups for purposes of price support—(a) basic commodities, (b) designated nonbasic commodities, and (c) all other nonbasic commodities.

Fourth. In order to cushion further the transition from wartime production, the act also provides that, regardless of the supply position, the support level for the six basic commodities shall not be less than 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop and not less than 80 percent of parity for the 1951 crop, provided producers have not disapproved marketing quotas and acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect on such crops.

TITLE I—BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mandatory price supports are provided to cooperators for the basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. For the four crop years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, in order to cushion the transition period during which producers are required to reduce production, support levels for the basic crops are to be computed both under the existing parity formula and under that established in the act, and producers given the advantage of the higher of the two parity prices, hereinafter referred to as "alternative parity." It is estimated that for the first few years the existing formula will provide a higher parity for certain of the basics, while the new formula will provide a higher parity for livestock and certain other commodities.

The support level for the basic commodities will be 90 percent of parity for the crop year 1950 and not less than 80 percent for the crop year 1951, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas and if acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect. Tobacco is to be supported permanently at 90 percent of parity whenever marketing quotas are in effect. The alternative parity will be available each of these years and it is estimated that for the years 1950 and 1951, the level of support to producers of cotton and probably other basic commodities will be higher than it would be at 90 percent of modernized parity. After the crop year 1951, the support level for all of the basics, except tobacco, will be not more than 90 percent of parity and not less than the minimum level specified in the tables in this title, and the alternative parity will continue through the crop year 1953.

In computing the parity price under the existing formula, the weights and factors used to make up the parity index at the time of the conference (Oct. 18, 1949) will continue to be used.

This title of the act contains schedules which establish minimum levels of price support in relation to supplies. In carrying out the mandatory price-support program for the basic commodities, however, the Secretary is not bound to fix the price support at the minimum level prescribed by the schedules, nor shall he be bound in any respect by the factors set forth in section 401 (b), but is given full discretionary authority to establish the support level at any point up to 90 percent of parity.

If producers disapprove marketing quotas, the support level will be 50 percent of parity except in the case of tobacco, for which there will be no price support if marketing quotas are disapproved.

The level of price support for corn to cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area will be 75 percent of the level of price support to cooperators in the commercial corn-producing areas.

TITLE II—DESIGNATED NONBASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Beginning in 1950 permanent mandatory price support is made available for certain nonbasic agricultural commodities, at levels to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture within the minimums and maximums provided in the act. Wool, including mohair, is to be supported at such levels between 60 to 90 percent of the parity price as the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary, in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. Tung nuts, honey, and Irish potatoes are to be supported within a range of 60 to 90 percent of parity. Whole milk, butterfat, and the products thereof, are to be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. The Secretary is required to provide price support for milk, butterfat, and the products thereof, through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

In providing price support for milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, it is intended that programs will be carried out through loans on, or purchases of, butter, cheese, evaporated milk, and dry milk powders so as to assure to the producers of milk and butterfat the benefit of the price support authorized by the act.

The requirement that the price of wool, including mohair, be supported at not less than 60 or more than 90 percent of parity contemplates that separate parity price will be computed for sheep's wool and mohair, respectively. The level of support for mohair may vary from that for sheep's wool within the range indicated. The level of support for sheep's wool must, however, be such as to encourage an annual production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool independent of pulled wool or mohair. In establishing the level of support for mohair within the 60 to 90 percent of parity range the Secretary would, of course, be expected to take into account the level of support established for sheep's wool and to establish a level of support for mohair in proper relationship to the level of support for sheep's wool. The term "wool" includes both shorn and pulled wool.

TITLE III—OTHER NONBASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Under this title of the act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to support any agricultural commodity other than those designated title I and title II at levels not in excess of 90 percent of the parity price.

Within the availability of funds for mandatory price-support programs, and after consideration of certain factors enumerated below, price support is required, insofar as feasible, to be made available to producers of any storable nonbasic agricultural commodity for which a marketing quota or marketing agreement or order program is in effect.

The factors to be taken into consideration by the Secretary in determining whether price-support operations shall be undertaken, and the level of such support, are as follows:

First. The supply of the commodity in relationship to the demand therefor;

Second. The price levels at which other commodities are being supported and, in the case of feed grains, the feed values of such grains in relationship to corn;

Third. The availability of funds;

Fourth. The perishability of the commodity;

Fifth. The importance of the commodity to agriculture and the national economy;

Sixth. The ability to dispose of stocks acquired in price-support operations;

Seventh. The need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets;

Eighth. The ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

In the case of any commodity for which price support is not mandatory, the determination as to whether a price-support operation shall be undertaken and the level of such support is to be made after consideration of the factors enumerated above.

These factors are substantially the same as contained in title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948, the main exception being the addition of the reference to feed values of feed grains in relation to corn.

CHANGES IN THE PARITY FORMULA

The act continues the provision of title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 for a modernized parity formula to become

effective in 1950, with the additional provision that wages paid hired farm labor are to be used in computing the parity index and that wartime subsidy payments to producers to maintain ceiling prices under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 shall be taken into consideration in determining parity prices.

The parity formula thus established sets up a parity price structure favorable to a livestock agricultural economy. The parity prices for most livestock and animal products are relatively higher under the new parity and those for the grains and certain other basic commodities are relatively lower. In order to bridge the transition from the existing parity formula to that established in the act of 1949, the provision has been included which requires that for the first 4 crop years after the effective date of the act (1950 through 1953) support prices for basic commodities shall be based upon the higher of the two parity formulas—that established in the new act and that now in operation—thus setting up the existing parity for the basic commodities as an effective minimum parity for the next 4 years.

METHODS AND PREREQUISITES OF PRICE SUPPORT

The Secretary is authorized to require such compliance by producers with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (including marketing quotas when authorized by law) as he determines necessary, in order to be eligible for the price support. This provision is substantially the same as the provision contained in the Agricultural Act of 1948 and, among other things, will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to condition price support for potatoes and other nonbasic agricultural commodities upon producers agreeing to use marketing agreements and orders issued pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, with respect to such commodities in such production or marketing areas as the Secretary may designate.

FORWARD PRICING

The act provides for forward pricing and directs the Secretary of Agriculture, insofar as practicable, to announce the level of price support for field crops in advance of the planting season and for other agricultural commodities in advance of the beginning of the marketing season. The level of price support so announced may not exceed 90 percent of the estimated parity price, but in no event shall the level of price support so announced be reduced if the level provided in the schedules in the act is less than the level so announced.

The words "insofar as practicable" were included in this section so as not to preclude the Secretary from providing price support in instances where no announcement was made prior to the planting or marketing season. For example, situations might arise under which conditions might not have warranted the announcement of a price-support program with respect to a nonbasic agricultural commodity until after the planting season or the beginning of the marketing season had passed. This provision would permit the Secretary to provide price support for such a commodity even though he had made no announcement prior to the planting or marketing season.

DISPOSAL OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

In determining general sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture are required to establish such prices, terms, and conditions as will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, or dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the current crop of the commodity. The Corporation is not permitted to sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 percent above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. In determining reasonable carrying charges the Secretary or the Corporation is not required to compute the actual cost incurred in carrying the commodity, but it is intended that there should be established a reasonable amount for carrying charges sufficiently realistic to discourage manufacturers, processors, and dealers from relying on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks as a source of supply rather than carrying normal inventories of their own.

In order to prevent waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized, upon such terms and conditions as may be deemed in the public interest, to make such commodities available to the Munitions Board or any other Federal agency for use in making payment for commodities not produced in the United States. Any such commodities not disposed of in the manner referred to above may be made available at point of storage, at no cost except handling and transportation costs incurred in making delivery, in the following order of priority: First, the school-lunch program and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Federal, State, and local public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; and third, to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States.

RICE

The new act completely revises the method of establishing and apportioning acreage allotments and marketing quotas for rice, and authorizes allotments to farms upon farm history, upon the recommendation of the State committee and approval of the Secretary, instead of to producers upon personal history, as was previously the case.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT ACT

The Farm Credit Act is amended to authorize banks for cooperatives and the Central Bank for Cooperatives to make loans to cooperative associations for the purpose of financing up to 80 percent of the cost of the construction of structures for the storage of agricultural commodities (other than structures to provide refrigerated cold storage or structures in areas in which existing privately owned storage facilities for the commodity concerned are adequate). Such loans are not authorized unless the cooperative association making application for the loan shall have furnished the bank an appropriate commitment from the Commodity Credit Corporation that the Corporation will lease or guarantee the utilization of not less than 75 percent of the storage space contained in such structures, when completed, for a period of at least 3 years in the case of completely new structures or 2 years if such structures are an addition to existing structures.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Price support in excess of 90 percent of the parity price may be made available for any agricultural commodity if the Secretary of Agriculture determines, after reasonable notice and public hearing, that price support at such increased level is necessary in order to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of any such agricultural commodity essential to the national welfare, or in order to increase or maintain production of any such commodity in the interest of national security.

Appropriate adjustments are authorized to be made in the support price for differences in grade, type, staple, quantity, location, and other factors. Middling ⅞-inch cotton is made the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support, continuing the policy which has heretofore prevailed with respect to cotton and is in accord with a similar provision contained in Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress.

Sums made available under section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935, which represent 30 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws, are directed to be devoted principally to the support of perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities other than those designated under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The act amends section 344 (f) (3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, which relates to cotton, so as to authorize county committees to reserve not in excess of 15 percent of the county allotment for the uses authorized therein.

BENEFITS BOTH PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

The Agricultural Act of 1949 will be beneficial to farmers because it assures them a stabilized market for the things that they produce and a sound marketing program to prevent the accumulation of price demoralizing surpluses.

It is in the best interest of consumers because one of its basic objectives is the stabilization of agricultural production so that there will be an ample and constant supply of the farm products which consumers want and need to buy.

Consumers naturally want to buy their food as cheaply as they can. Farmers naturally want to sell their products at the best possible price. The basic pur-

pose of this agricultural legislation is to harmonize these two divergent interests in a manner most beneficial to the Nation as a whole.

Farm commodities move almost immediately from the producers to the consumers, on the freest market remaining anywhere in the world. If farmers are to produce abundantly so that consumers may be assured an adequate supply of food and fiber, they must be protected against the violent price fluctuations which may result from even a temporary oversupply of the things they produce.

Stabilized ample production is the greatest of all benefits to the consumer. Unstabilized production inevitably results in alternating surpluses and scarcities. Any consumer who can remember as far back as the recent war and immediate postwar years, knows that shortages mean high prices.

The objective of good farm legislation, therefore, is the stabilization of both prices and production to assure an ample supply of farm products at all times, at fair prices, and without unreasonable or unnecessary regimentation of the farmer. The Agricultural Act of 1949 achieves this objective to a greater extent than any other act in recent years.

Other plans that have been proposed would attempt to stabilize both prices and production by supporting all farm commodities at a high level, requiring the regulation by Government edict of virtually every acre of cropland planted, or an untold drain on the Public Treasury to maintain the price of unregulated commodities.

In understanding the Agricultural Act of 1949, these important provisions should be remembered:

First. The basic principle is to provide high-level price supports only for those commodities the producers of which are willing and able to stabilize production by the acceptance of such controls as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary.

Mandatory high-level supports for the basic commodities are operative only when producers have not disapproved marketing quotas or acreage allotments proposed by the Secretary.

Discretionary supports for nonbasic commodities are to be available only if certain standards are met, including the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Second. The act encourages (through parity revision, mandatory supports for milk, butterfat, and wool, and other provisions) greater production of livestock products. This will eventually make more of these healthful foods available at reasonable prices to consumers, and result in the shift of land from surplus-producing crops to livestock.

Third. The act terminates the mandatory-support programs for certain perishable commodities entered into during the war in order to encourage production. Support of perishable commodities under the new act is generally discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and the programs authorized for their handling and disposal are the best that have yet been established.

Stable farm prices not only assure adequate production to meet the needs of consumers, they also give them the greatest assurance of reasonable prices. This fact was clearly demonstrated by our wartime experiences. Likewise, low or unstabilized farm prices do not necessarily mean low consumer prices. For example, the price of wheat to the farmer has declined one-third within the past year, but the retail price of cereals and bakery products decreased less than 1 percent between August 1948 and August 1949.

Farmers are as interested in reasonable prices as anyone. They are consumers as well as producers and parity itself is merely a yardstick by which the prices a farmer receives as a producer are related to those he pays as a consumer.

Farmers recently have seen their prices fall to the lowest level since 1942. For example, within the past year wheat has declined 34 percent, corn 51 percent, cotton 10 percent, and hogs over 30 percent, while the things farmers must buy in order to continue producing, have increased in cost. Gasoline has increased approximately 2 percent, milk cans approximately 9 percent, tractors approximately 17 percent, and grain drills approximately 26 percent.

The importance of farm price stability should never be forgotten, since it has been demonstrated repeatedly that the rest of our economy cannot prosper unless farmers also prosper. Most depressions have been farm-led and farm-fed. Historically farm prices go down first and fall faster and further than other prices. As the income of farmers declines and their purchasing power is lost, industry finds a greatly reduced market. This causes unemployment and reduces the purchasing power of industrial wage earners, which in turn further reduces demand for farm commodities, and farm purchasing power is cut further. This is the depression formula. While farm price supports such as those provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 cannot and should not become a substitute for good markets, they can and do establish a measure of stability between farm and nonfarm prices which is so essential to a prosperous nation.

PERISHABLE COMMODITIES

No real friend of agriculture has advocated or will advocate a high support program for the producers of any commodity when the production of that commodity is unlimited. Almost every time the Government has attempted to support prices on unlimited production, we have sustained great financial losses. The support program on basic commodities has been highly successful and not financially burdensome. The press and the radio and the consuming public speak loud and long about the losses sustained, but no one seems to speak about the profits which have been made on the program for basic commodities. On the cotton program alone the Government has made a profit in excess of $225,000,000. On the tobacco program the Government has sustained no loss. Tobacco farmers have accepted the burdens as well as the benefits of their program and the program has not been expensive to the consumer.

On the other hand, we have suffered substantial losses on potatoes, on eggs, on wool, and on many perishable commodities. We have sustained an accumulated loss of $425,000,000 on the potato program alone. We have sustained a loss of more than $84,000,000 on the wool program, and we now have on hand 78,000,000 pounds of powdered eggs in which we have an investment of perhaps more than $100,000,000. These three programs alone have done more to bring the national farm program into disrepute than all of the other programs put together. It was with these three commodities that we sought to try out a new and a different program. It was with these and other perishable commodities that our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture was so vitally concerned. The proposal which provided production payments on the three commodities I have mentioned was presented by our committee to the House, but it was defeated by a substantial majority. This proposal was an honest and a sincere effort to deal with a very perplexing and distressing problem. Secretary Brannan has tried in vain to remedy this deplorable situation but his hands are tied and he has no alternative other than to administer the law according to the letter and the spirit of congressional action.

While the Brannan plan was disapproved, we have at least provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949 ways and means to prevent losses of surplus perishable commodities through spoilage and deterioration. Under the new law, to prevent deterioration and waste, the Secretary may use perishable commodities in barter transactions and exchange such commodities for strategic materials which we need to acquire from other countries. Such commodities may also be made available to the school-lunch program, to charitable institutions, to the Indians on our reservations, to public and private welfare agencies either at home or abroad. So under the new law we will not witness the sorry spectacle of vital foods being permitted to deteriorate and rot while hungry people are deprived of the life-giving qualities of such foods.

1949 COTTON ACREAGE (H. R. 128, PUBLIC LAW 28)

One of the first jobs facing the committee when Congress convened was the cotton problem. No cotton acreage limitation or marketing quota programs have been in effect since 1943. The Secretary of Agriculture had also announced that there would be no acreage or marketing quota restrictions in effect for the 1949 crop. Because the large cotton crop in 1948 made it virtually certain that acreage and marketing controls would be required in 1950, cotton farmers had an incentive to plant heavily in 1949, in order to give them a larger base history for allotment purposes. In order to remove this incentive so that farmers would not overplant cotton for the purpose of enlarging their quota base, the committee reported and the Congress enacted Public Law 28, to eliminate 1949 cotton acreages and yields in the establishment of

future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. As a result of this measure, no farmer could by excessive plantings in 1949 increase his allotment for future years.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS (H. R. 5738, PUBLIC LAW 272)

Following the committee's efforts to prevent excessive cotton plantings in 1949, the committee was immediately confronted with the major task of revising and modernizing the control measures for adjusting cotton supplies with demand. The carry-over of cotton as of August 1, 1949, was estimated at 5,500,000 bales, and it was estimated that the 1949 cotton acreage would be about 3,000,000 acres larger than in 1948. The cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 were inadequate to cope with these conditions. The minimum acreage that could be allotted under this act was about 27,000,000 acres, substantially in excess of that required to produce the supply of cotton needed.

The committee developed an entirely new cotton acreage allotment and marketing quota law under which cotton acreage in 1950 could be reduced as low as 21,000,000 acres, and thereafter could be reduced, if necessary, to an amount necessary to produce 1,000,000 bales of cotton less than the estimated amount required for domestic consumption and export.

In providing for the distribution of the national acreage allotment among the States, counties, and farms, provision was also made to reflect current trends and shifts in the production of cotton in the United States compared to the prewar pattern of production. Greater flexibility was also provided to meet the requirements of small farms and to meet local conditions by giving more discretion to State and county committees.

The new law, in substance, will enable the necessary reductions to be made in cotton production so as to bring about a better balance of supplies with demand. The act will enable this objective to be accomplished in a way that is fair and equitable to all cotton farmers.

This act also amends the provisions of law relating to the establishment of wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas by establishing minimum farm acreage allotments for the 1950 crop. This provision will give relief to farms and areas which in the last year or two have greatly expanded wheat production and, but for this amendment, would be required to bear acreage reductions in 1950 greatly out of proportion to the reduction in acreage on wheat farms generally. The amendment also gives recognition to good farming practices by taking into account summer-fallowed wheat land in establishing base acreage and will tend to place those farms on equal footing with farms that have been fully cropped.

The act also amends the provisions of law relating to the establishment of peanut-marketing quotas. The present law contains provisions establishing minimum State acreage allotments, which give protection to the older peanut-producing areas. The amendment will give similar protection to the newer peanut-producing areas. The present law by virtue of the operation of the State minimum provisions, fixes a minimum national peanut-acreage allotment of about 1,900,000 acres. The amendment made by this act will fix a minimum peanut-acreage allotment of 2,100,000 acres for 1950. Thereafter, the acreage may be fixed at whatever levels may be necessary to adjust supplies with demand. The amendment makes provision for an equitable distribution of the national acreage allotment among the States.

IMPROVING ALASKAN AGRICULTURE

The growing size and importance of agriculture in Alaska was recognized by the committee in favorable action on several bills to assist the development of agriculture in that Territory. Chief among such bills were H. R. 133 and H. R. 212. Both these bills had been introduced in previous Congresses but this was the first time they had been acted upon. H. R. 212 received final action in both Houses and is now Public Law 417.

H. R. 133 places Alaska on the same basis as the States in receiving Federal funds for agricultural experiment station work. Under the existing law, the Territory had been receiving only about half the proportionate amount of such funds made available to the various States. This bill passed the House but was not acted on in the Senate. H. R. 212 extends to Alaska the full benefits of the laws authorizing and making appropriation for agricultural extension work, such as that carried on through the county-agent system and the 4-H Clubs. Other legislation, making additional agricultural credit facilities available in Alaska, was reported favorably by the committee.

BETTER AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Several bills improving the agricultural credit system were acted upon favorably by the committee during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress:

Banks for cooperatives: H. R. 848 makes important changes in the law relating to the banks for cooperatives. These banks were established under the Farm Credit Act of 1933. Their purpose is to provide a permanent and dependable source of credit for farm cooperative associations. The banks were started with about $178,500,000 of Government capital and they have managed their affairs so well that they are now in a position where they can retire that capital. The bill authorizes the banks to retire the Government capital and to become entirely farmer-owned, as are the Federal Land Banks. It also authorizes the banks for cooperatives to sell their own obligations for the purpose of obtaining additional loan funds. It increases participation by borrowers in the management of the Central Bank for Cooperatives by changing the manner in which the bank's board of directors is selected, so that farmers and the regional banks for cooperatives will have a greater voice in the selection of the directors. This bill passed the House May 2, but was not acted on in the Senate.

Storm emergency loans, H. R. 2101: The severe cold and heavy snows of the past winter brought great hardship and severe financial burdens on farmers and stockmen in many parts of the country. Some emergency source of credit was necessary to enable them to get their farms, orchards, or herds back into production again and to pay the heavy bills for feed, protection, replanting, and replacement that had been incurred because of the hard winter. Looking around, the committee found approximately $44,000,000 in the revolving fund of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation which could be used for this purpose with some additional enabling legislation. The RACC was practically a defunct organization, however, and rather than reactivate it for the purpose of making these loans, it was abolished and its functions and funds were transferred to the direct administration of the Secretary of Agriculture with authority to use them in making storm emergency loans. The bill became law April 6, 1949—Public Law 38—the program is now in operation, and the loans are being administered in the storm emergency areas through the facilities of the Farmers Home Administration.

Water facility loans, H. R. 3181: The act of August 28, 1937, and the act of August 11, 1939—known respectively as the Water Facilities Act and the Wheeler-Case Act—authorizes the Department of Agriculture to make loans to associations of farmers and other similar groups for the purpose of installing and establishing local water facilities such as irrigation systems, wells, ponds, and so on. Under existing law, however, the amount of the loan to any one association or for any one project is limited to $50,000. This amount was adequate at the time the law was passed, but the postwar cost of materials and services is so great that it is now far too small to accomplish its purpose. This bill, now Public Law 99, increases the maximum amount of such loans to $100,000 and will permit many water projects which have been held up because of inadequate funds now to get under way.

Federal land banks: H. R. 3699, which was reported favorably by the committee on May 27, 1949, makes several important improvements in the operation of the Federal land banks. It extends the full operation of these banks to Alaska and Puerto Rico. Probably most important to ranchers and large-range operators, it increases to $75,000 the limitation on loans to any one borrower. In the past, the limitation in the act has prevented the banks from making loans on many ranches and other types of farm operations where relatively large acreages were involved. The bill also returns to the United States Treasury some $189,000,000 in Federal funds which have been carried in a surplus reserve, leaving the banks entirely farmer-owned. The bookkeeping system of the banks is changed somewhat to bring it into line with usual banking practice and assures more efficiency. This bill is now Public Law 433.

H. R. 5512 was also reported by the committee, to improve the operation of the Federal land bank system. It

authorizes the land banks to borrow money from the Federal Reserve banks to meet their short-term credit needs. Such loans are limited to not more than one year and may be made at the rate of interest charged by Federal Reserve Banks to members of the Federal Reserve System. This bill passed the House August 15, 1949, but did not get final action in the Senate.

Loans to homestead entrymen: H. R. 2514 liberalizes the loan provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Water Facilities Act in order to make possible extension of this type of credit to farmers who are acquiring farms by homestead entry or purchasing lands on reclamation projects. Under the existing law, loans of this type can be made only on the security of a first mortgage on the land. Homesteaders and reclamation project settlers cannot give such mortgages because they do not acquire title to the land until they have resided thereon for a certain period and have complied with annual cultivation and other requirements. This has prevented new farmers from taking advantage of this type of Federal credit. The amendment to the law made by this act—now Public Law 361—will permit the Government to take a lien on the homestead claim or the reclamation project purchase contract in lieu of a first mortgage, as security for such a loan. It will greatly aid many young farmers, most of them veterans, who are beginning farming operations on this kind of land.

RURAL REHABILITATION TRUST FUNDS

In the years 1933 through 1935 considerable sums of money were granted by the Federal Government to the several States for the purpose of alleviating hardships. Some of this money was earmarked for relief and rehabilitation in rural areas, and the money so earmarked was administered in the States by State corporations known as State rural rehabilitation corporations. The corporations used this money to establish rural community projects and for rural rehabilitation loans and grants of various types to farmers.

In 1935, 1936, and 1937 the corporations, at the request of the Resettlement Administration, transferred their assets to the Federal Government in trust to be administered for rural-rehabilitation purposes within their respective States. In some cases the agreements provided specifically for termination of the trusts and return of the assets to the State corporations at the end of a specified period. In the other cases the trust agreements provided that if the Federal Government's authority to act as trustee were terminated, the assets would be returned to the State corporations or other State agencies designated by the State legislatures.

The trust assets are now being administered by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. The Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed to liquidate these trusts as expeditiously as possible, but gives him no specific instruction as to the disposition to be made of the trust assets.

Following the enactment of the 1946 law, a controversy arose as to whether the funds should be returned to the States to be used for rural-rehabilitation purposes, or should be turned into the United States Treasury upon liquidation of the trust assets—this in spite of the explicit provision in the trust agreements that the funds were to be returned to the States. Some of the States are prepared to assert in the courts their claim to the assets as set out in the trust agreements. In view of these circumstances, nothing has been done by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Farmers Home Administration to carry out the liquidation of the trusts as directed by the 1946 act.

Bills which would have turned the entire trust assets over to the United States Treasury, and other bills which would have made mandatory the return of all of the trust assets to the various States, were introduced in the Eightieth Congress but reached no final action.

In the Eighty-first Congress this committee considered the matter at length and reported out a bill, H. R. 2392, which establishes a most equitable and acceptable compromise on this matter. The bill directs the immediate liquidation of these trusts and gives those States which want the assets returned to them for rural rehabilitation purposes 3 years in which to demand the return of their assets. If the State does not take such action within 3 years, or if it indicates earlier that it does not desire the return of the funds, the assets of that State corporation are to be turned over to the Farmers Home Administration for use within the State pursuant to titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The bill was acted on by the Rules Committee so late in the session that there was not time for House action before the session ended.

LIQUIDATION OF OLD FEED AND SEED LOANS

Another bill relating to farm credit which was drafted and reported by the committee was a bill to liquidate emergency crop, feed, and seed loans which are long past due and, to a large extent, uncollectible. Since 1918 the Department of Agriculture has been making emergency crop and feed loans to farmers who were in distress because of weather or crop conditions and who urgently required short-term credit in order to continue farm operations. In 1934–35 many such loans were made because of drought conditions.

Although these loans have been made under many different statutory authorizations, they have several characteristics in common. They are—and were intended to be—"soft credit," financial assistance to farmers who had no other source of credit. They were loans to purchase seed or feed for livestock. The whole collateral in most cases was the crop to be grown with the seed or the livestock for which the seed was purchased. Many of these loans were made to farmers in the depression years when others were receiving direct financial assistance without any repayment obligation—and when the crop or the livestock held as collateral was not worth enough to pay the interest on the loan.

In spite of the conditions under which these loans were made, the collection experience of the Department of Agriculture indicates clearly that farmers in general will pay off these loans if they are able to do so. More than 81 percent of all such loans which have been made from 1918 to May 31, 1949, has been paid in full. In the case of the loans made since 1936, 91.2 percent has been paid. But in the case of those loans made in the years 1918 through 1936—most of them in the depression years—only 78 9 percent of the principal has been collected—and for the drought loans of 1934–35, only 62.2 percent has been collected. Many of the farmers using those loans are no longer in business.

Examining more closely into these old loans, the committee found that out of 712,752 such loans outstanding on May 31, 1949, 473,729 were emergency feed and seed loans made prior to 1937, and 101,556 were 1934–35 drought loans. Thus, more than 30 percent of such loans now on the books—a total of 575,285 out of 712,752—were made in the year 1936 or before. Repeated attempts have been made without success to collect these loans. If it is costing only $1 a year to service each of these old loans, which seems like a conservative estimate, it is costing more than a half-million dollars annually just to carry on the books loans which are to all practical purposes uncollectible.

Under existing law the Department has the authority to compromise and adjust, and under certain circumstances to cancel, these old loans. Under this authority a total of 288,460 delinquent claims comprising an aggregate unpaid balance of $41,459,718 have been settled, and for its efforts the Government has collected a total of $4,117,557, about 10 percent of the amount due and only $14.28 per claim, including those which have been canceled outright.

The committee was of the opinion that it was time, in the interest of good business, for the Government, to take these old loans off the books. Many bills to cancel or liquidate these old loans, or to establish a statute of limitations against the Government, have been introduced in recent years. The committee was not satisfied with any of the bills referred to it, however, and proceeded to write its own bill, which was reported to the House and adopted unanimously.

This bill—H. R. 5592—does three things: First, it directs the Secretary to collect, liquidate, compromise, or adjust within 2 years all such loans made after January 1, 1936, which were mature or past due on January 1, 1949; second, it cancels outright all claims and judgments arising from loans made prior to January 1, 1936; and, third, in the case of loans made between January 1, 1936, and January 1, 1942, it authorizes the Secretary to payment in full of the principal as full satisfaction of the claim, if such payment is made before a collection suit is filed. The bill passed the House August 1, 1949, but has not yet been acted on by the Senate.

CROP INSURANCE (H. R. 3825)

A bill to extend the experimental crop insurance program to more crops and

additional counties was reported favorably by the committee early in the session. In 1947 the crop insurance law was completely rewritten—after several years of near-disastrous results under the old law—and was put on an experimental basis with the number of crops and the number of counties in which insurance could be written sharply restricted.

Under the terms of the 1947 law, the number of counties in which crop insurance could be written for the various commodites was limited as follows: Wheat, 200; cotton, 56; corn, 50; flax, 50; tobacco, 35; and not more than 20 counties each in the case of any other commodities, with the stipulation that not more than three new commodities could be insured in any 1 year.

The bill as agreed on by the House and Senate this year—Public Law 268—will permit a gradual increase in the number of counties in which insurance is offered by permitting the Crop Insurance Corporation to increase each year the number of counties for each commodity by half the number authorized in the 1947 act. There have been only 2 years of operation under the new law, and while the experience in each of those 2 years has been favorable, so have the growing conditions throughout the United States. The committee feels that it is far better to proceed cautiously, so that farmers and Congress know at all times that the insurance is on a sound basis, than it is to expand too rapidly with the danger that the program will again suffer staggering losses and reach the point—which it had reached in 1947—where farmers had lost confidence in it and Congress was thinking of abandoning the whole program.

Another important change made in the law by the bill worked out by the committee this year is the recognition given multiple crop insurance. This is a new type of insurance, written for the first time under the 1947 act, and offered in 1948 in only two counties. Under this type of insurance, the Corporation insures not just one or two specified crops on a farm but insures the farm as a whole with insurance on all the major crops produced. It is the type of insurance which is best calculated to help farmers in all the general farming areas of the country where diversified crops are produced. The bill passed this year authorizes the corporation to write multiple crop insurance in 50 counties, and to increase this by 25 each year if the experience with this type of insurance is favorable.

In rewriting the crop insurance law in 1947, the committee instructed the Corporation to give particular attention to the development of local responsibility for and administration of the insurance program. At that time the committee visualized the possibility of a type of organization in which each county unit would be almost like a small, mutual insurance company, with the local farmers constituting its board of directors and handling its business, with rates based entirely on local loss experience, and with the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation acting largely as a reinsurer of the local group. The Corporation has gone far in developing this type of organization. Its efforts in this direction were assisted substantially by a provision in the bill written by the committee this year which writes off the books the losses that had been incurred in the years previous to the start of the new program in 1948.

What this means to farmers is that these losses, to the extent they occurred in their county, will not now be carried on the books against their county. The premium which farmers in any county must pay for their insurance is based in part on the surplus reserve which the insurance in that county is able to build up. After a sizable reserve has been built up, the rates can be reduced, as is the case with any good insurance. If the old losses had stayed on the books, some counties would have had a very considerable deficit, incurred under the old program, to overcome before they could build up any surplus reserve. Under the law passed this year, those old deficits are written off and each county will start from the time the insurance was first written under the 1947 act to build up its reserve credits with the Corporation.

Another improvement made by the bill was the authority given the corporation to insure tobacco while it is being cured. Under the 1947 law insurance was limited to crops "while in the field." This is adequate in the case of most crops, but it falls short of complete crop insurance for tobacco because the value of a tobacco crop cannot be determined until the tobacco has been put into a barn and cured. The bill permits the extension of crop insurance on tobacco until it is ready for market.

The committee believes that farmers are entitled to sound crop insurance and it is determined that they shall have it. It rescued the program in 1947 when it seemed doomed to abandonment and it will watch it carefully year by year, so that it may be extended as rapidly as possible to all major crops and all farmers but most of all so that it may be improved and developed, along sound lines, as experience indicates.

FARM LAND MINERAL RIGHTS (H. R. 4800)

The Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 provides that any conveyance of real estate by the Government under the provisions of that act shall include conveyance of all the mineral rights connected with the land. Prior to that act, however, there had been no definite and uniform policy governing the conveyance of mineral rights on farm lands acquired by the Department of Agriculture under its various credit and agricultural development programs and subsequently resold to farmers. As a consequence of this lack of definite policy in the years 1933 to 1946, some of the farm lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Act and similar programs, and by foreclosure of land-bank loans, and other means, had been sold with all or part of the mineral rights reserved to the Federal Government.

In many cases the mineral rights under the farm lands involved have no market value whatever. In other cases these rights are valuable. In all cases, the lack of full ownership of the mineral rights connected with his land have been a source of complication and embarrassment to the farmer and a definite handicap in financing or in conveying his property. To the committee it seemed inequitable that the Government should have taken over these farm lands, by foreclosure or otherwise, with all the mineral rights included and then reconvey them with part of the mineral rights reserved.

In recent Congresses a large number of bills have been introduced to relieve this situation. In the Eightieth Congress, nine such bills were referred to the committee and in the Eighty-first Congress there were five such bills referred.

The committee considered carefully all the bills referred to it on this subject but felt that none of them completely accomplished the purpose the committee had in mind. It, therefore, wrote its own bill on this subject, combining in part the principles of several of the bills before it, but establishing a uniform principle for the conveyance of all the mineral rights in all the farm lands which had been conveyed to farmers by the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to agricultural improvement or agricultural credit programs.

The bill reported by the committee and passed by the House authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the present owners of the farm lands involved, for a fair market value, all the mineral rights and interests owned or reserved by the Government. It authorizes the sale only to the owner of the surface rights and places on the owner the responsibility of making application and proving his title. In order to cut down the administrative expense involved, the bill provides that in areas where there are no known mineral rights, the Secretary may dispense with a separate evaluation of each tract and may authorize the sale of such rights, throughout that area, at the flat rate of $1 an application. This applies only to areas where the mineral rights have no known market value. Where they have a value of any kind, the owner of the surface rights is required to pay the fair market value for the mineral interests held by the Government.

The bill makes this policy applicable also to mineral rights in farm lands which have been acquired by the Federal land banks and later resold. It has not yet been acted on by the Senate.

FORESTS AND FORESTRY

No Committee on Agriculture in recent history has considered and reported as much legislation to advance the interests of forests and forestry in the United States as the Agriculture Committee of the Eighty-first Congress. Among the important bills on this subject are the following:

The forest survey, H. R. 2001: The forest survey was started in 1930 under the authority of the McSweeney-NcNary Act, which is the basic law of forestry research in the United States. As part of the research necessary to plan intelligent production and use of our forests, the act directed that the Secretary of Agriculture make and keep current a comprehensive survey of the present and prospective requirements for timber and other forest products and of timber supplies and the productive

capacity of the Nation's forests. The survey thus directed was the first organized effort to inventory scientifically the forest resources of the country.

The survey was started in 1930 but was only partially completed when the war caused a discontinuance of the survey. By the time work could be resumed, the cost of equipment and services had increased to the point where the original law did not provide sufficient authorizations to permit the survey to be completed.

Over the opposition of some interests which felt that the survey should be discontinued, the committee reported this bill which authorizes funds with which to complete the initial inventory of the country's timber resources and a resurvey every 10 years, in order to keep the information current. It is now Public Law 128.

Cooperative forestry programs, H. R. 2296: The basic act establishing Federal-State cooperation in forestry programs is the Clarke-McNary Act, which was adopted June 7, 1924. There has been relatively little change made in the act since that time and while it has been of tremendous benefit in establishing cooperative action by the Federal Government and the States in forestry programs, there has developed during the years the need for amending and improving the basic act. The committee undertook that job in the Eighty-first Congress and reported out this bill—H. R. 2296—which passed the House and was amended in the Senate. The bill makes several important revisions in the Clarke-McNary Act.

First. It increases the authorization for Federal participation in cooperative forest-fire-fighting programs. The States are now spending about $15,000,000 annually on the cooperative fire-control program to the Federal Government's $9,000,000. The bill increases the possible Federal participation to $20,000,000. This will be sufficient not only to permit the extension of the cooperative fire program to areas now not protected, but will permit the improvement of existing protection activities by a nearly matching contribution on the part of the Federal Government.

Second. It improves the section of the Clarke-McNary Act authorizing the cooperative production and distribution of forest tree seeds and seedlings, and authorizes considerably larger Federal contributions for this purpose. Reforestation is basic to the maintenance of adequate forest growth and the program authorized by this bill will provide for the first time an adequate quantity of tree seeds and seedlings for this purpose.

Third. The bill defines clearly, and for the first time authorizes adequate appropriations for, two very important phases of forestry work—the education of small-forest owners and farmers in the value and the methods of sound forestry, and direct technical assistance to farmers and small-forest owners in planting, developing, and marketing their timber and forest products. Less than one-tenth of the commercial timber area of the United States remains in virgin timber. The remainder is second-growth forest and it is obvious that in the measurable future we must depend entirely on second-growth timber for our supplies.

Out of the 461,000,000 acres of commercial forest in the United States, 345,000,000 acres are privately owned, and 261,000,000 acres of this privately owned land is in the hands of small owners whose holdings comprise not more than 5,000 acres each and average only 62 acres each. These small holdings are in the hands of more than 4,225,000 different private owners. In all, the Forest Service estimates that 85 percent of all the private forests in the United States are in tracts of less than 100 acres each.

From this it can readily be appreciated how great a proportion of our future timber supplies must come from these small forest holdings and farm wood lots and how vitally important it is to the Nation that the owners of these small tracts handle them in such a manner that our timber resources are preserved and improved.

Basically, the problem is that of demonstrating to the small-forest owner and the farm wood-lot owner that their timber can be a profitable source of income to them. Small owners can make good profits out of small timber holdings if they follow sound forestry practices and handle their woodland to its best advantage. The knowledge that timber can be a profitable crop to them is the most certain way of assuring their adoption of sound forestry practices, just as they adopt sound practices in other forms of agriculture when they know that it is profitable for them to do so and learn the methods to be followed.

In this bill the committee provided for the first time a clearly defined program of forestry education and direct technical assistance for owners of farm wood lots and of small forest tracts. The educational part of the program would be carried on through the land grant colleges and the county agent system, and the direct technical assistance through the State forestry agencies.

The bill passed the House in the form it was reported by the committee but in the Senate opposition to some features of the technical assistance program caused that section of the bill to be dropped. In order to obtain the benefits of other sections of the bill the House agreed to the Senate amendment and the amended bill became Public Law 392. The committee believes, however, that the provision for technical assistance is the most important part of the whole bill and that an acceptable compromise, meeting the objections raised in the Senate, can be worked out in a separate bill at the next session of Congress.

Reforestation and revegetation, Senate Joint Resolution 53. The bill discussed above—H. R. 2296—applies exclusively to forest lands not owned by the Federal Government. Even in the national forest areas owned by the Federal Government, however, reforestation of cut-over areas and revegetation of grazed-out range lands has not been carried on at a rate sufficient to maintain the productivity of these forest and range lands. There are at the present time 2,200,000 acres of national forest timberlands requiring artificial replanting and about 4,000,000 acres of national forest grazing lands in need of revegetation.

The Forest Service has worked out a program for accomplishing this reforestation and revegetation in 15 years. That program is incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 53 and authorizations for the needed appropriations set up. A similar resolution was introduced in the House but the committee reported the Senate resolution, which had already passed the Senate, in order to expedite enactment of the legislation. The resolution was approved by the House and is now Public Law 348.

Improving and facilitating Forest Service operations, H. R. 5839: Many of the laws under which the Forest Service operates have been on the books for a long time. Some parts of them have become obsolete, changes and developments brought about by time have made some amendments to them desirable, and the Forest Service's experience over the years has indicated some places where deficiencies exist or changes which would facilitate and improve operations can be made.

These amendments, changes, and additions to existing law have been incorporated in an omnibus bill, H. R. 5839, which was reported favorably by the committee, after thorough study, and adopted by the House. Some of the more important provisions of the bill are—

First. Authority to erect structures such as lookout towers on leased land. Previously such structures could be placed only on land owned by the Federal Government and this has prevented their construction in some places where they are needed.

Second. Better authority to contract for aerial facilities for forest operations such as fire lookout and fire fighting, patrols, seeding, and so forth.

Third. Authority for the Forest Service to carry on forest improvement and protection work on non-Federal lands within the boundaries of national forests and to charge the owners of the land for such work.

Fourth. Authority to set aside part of the grazing fees received for grazing on Forest Service lands for installation of wells, construction of fences, weed eradication, brush removal, reseeding, and other range improvements.

The bill passed the House August 15, 1949, and was favorably reported by the Senate committee, but did not receive final action in the Senate.

Improvement of recreational resources H. R. 2419: One of the important features of the Nation's forests is their value to the people for recreational purposes. Every year outdoor recreation is becoming more popular with Americans, and every year it is becoming more necessary as a relief from the man-made environment of our cities and the hurry and stress of modern living conditions.

The national forests offer the best possible opportunity for this type of recreation. Although everyone is agreed on the value of and necessity for such recreation, it is always difficult to obtain adequate appropriations for the development of recreational resources and fa-

cilities. The appropriations made to the Forest Service have never been adequate to enable it to give the best kind of service to those seeking recreation in the national forests and, because they have varied in amount from year to year, they have never made possible coordinated long-range planning for the development of such facilities and resources.

This bill provides that 10 percent of the receipts from the national forests shall be set aside for use in developing and operating the recreational resources and facilities within the national forests. The committee believes that this is the best and most equitable method of financing this work and that the funds so provided will be sufficient to accomplish the purpose for many years to come. The bill has not yet been acted on by the House.

RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

One of the most important bills acted upon by the committee during this session of Congress was H. R. 2960, authorizing loans for the establishment and improvement of rural telephone service. Since the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, which makes loans for the extension of electric lines into rural areas, the number of farms with electricity has increased from about 10 percent of the total to approximately 78 percent. During the same period, however, there has been no corresponding increase in the number of farms receiving telephone service and, in fact, there are probably fewer telephones in farm homes today than there were in 1920.

The reason for this is threefold: First, the disappearance of many small rural telephone companies whose equipment had become obsolete and worn out, or who were forced out of business during the depression; second, the tendency of the larger companies to "skim the cream" of the rural areas, taking the most profitable business in the thickly settled areas along main highways and relegating the farmer on the back roads to be forever without a telephone; third, the difficulty of small telephone companies, who want to expand and improve their rural service in obtaining adequate financing.

The answer to the rural telephone problem is to provide some adequate form of credit for companies that want to extend their lines in rural areas, and to insist that rural-telephone service be developed on an area-coverage basis. This means extension of service to farms where the service will never be profitable, as well as to profitable locations, so long as the whole system is established on a sound basis and the area coverage will pay for itself at a reasonable rate fee.

The bill reported by the committee and now Public Law 423 is very simple in principle. It amends the Rural Electrification Act so as to authorize the REA to make loans for the extension, expansion, and improvement of rural-telephone service, on the same terms under which loans are now made for the expansion and improvement of rural electric service.

It is not anticipated by the committee that it will be necessary to form new cooperatives to provide this telephone service, as it was in the case of electric service. There are few parts of the country today where there are not telephone lines and small companies operating in towns in rural areas. The bill is specifically designed, first of all, to help these small companies extend their service into rural areas on an area-coverage basis.

The provisions of the bill are by no means limited to small companies, however, and even the largest telephone companies could qualify for a rural telephone loan for the purpose of extending and improving rural service. Only in those cases where there is no telephone company serving a rural area—or where the company theoretically serving the area fails or refuses to provide adequate rural service—is it anticipated that it will be necessary to set up a new company or association to provide such service.

Telephones have become as great a necessity to rural living as electricity and the enactment of the rural telephone bill will be as great a milestone in the history of rural America as was the enactment 13 years ago of the Rural Electrification Act.

OLEOMARGARINE

Since 1886 there has been some form of Federal regulation of oleomargarine through exercise of the taxing power. In recent years there has been a growing demand for the removal of Federal taxes, particularly those on the manufacture and distribution of yellow oleomargarine which have constituted an artificial barrier to the natural competition of this cheaper spread with butter.

In the Eightieth Congress extensive hearings were held on several bills to remove the taxes from yellow oleomargarine but after prolonged consideration the committee refused by a majority vote to report out a bill. A bill repealing oleomargarine taxes was then brought to the floor by petition and was adopted by the House, but was not acted on in the Senate.

In this Congress, 47 bills proposing to remove oleomargarine taxes were introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them were identical. In general, they fell into three categories: First, those which simply repealed the taxes relating to oleomargarine; second, those which repealed the taxes but prohibited, either directly or by indirection, the movement of yellow oleomargarine in interstate commerce; three, those which removed the taxes and established certain safeguards to prevent sale or use of colored oleomargarine in fraudulent imitation of butter.

The bill reported by the committee and passed by the House is of the last type. It is a reasonable compromise between the extreme positions represented by the bills of types (1) and (2). The bill repeals all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, both white and colored. It makes the sale or serving of colored oleomargarine anywhere, without its clear identification as margarine, a violation of the pure food and drug acts, and requires that all margarine served in public eating places shall be clearly identified as such. The bill also stipulates clearly that it is not meant to contravene State laws relating to the sale or serving of oleomargarine and does not authorize such sale or serving in any State where it is prohibited or restricted by State law. No final action has yet been taken by the Senate.

DRY LAND AND IRRIGATION FIELD STATIONS (H. R. 5679)

In the years 1905–15 a number of field stations and experimental farms were established by the Department of Agriculture in the Great Plains area of the United States for the purpose of assisting in the development and demonstration of the types of farming best suited to that area. Some of them were established in the dry farming areas and some in irrigated areas.

In the past few years, the use of these farms for their original purpose has greatly decreased or ceased altogether. The types and methods of agriculture best suited to the Great Plains is now well known and further general experimentation and demonstration by the Federal Government is unnecessary. The stations have for the most part fallen into partial or complete disuse or are being employed, in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations on matters of purely local interest such as soil testing, development of locally adapted varieties of crops, and so on.

Appropriations by the Federal Government for these stations have decreased year by year until they are currently little more than enough to provide for mere maintenance of the properties. In the meantime, some of the States have provided funds for operation of the stations on matters of interest to farmers within the States and several States have indicated the desire to take over the stations and operate them as State properties.

This bill authorizes the Department of Agriculture to deed the stations in fee simple to those States which indicate a desire to take them and operate them as State property for some agricultural purpose. It does not require the Secretary to transfer the stations to the States but merely authorizes him to do so when the State makes such a request and indicates that it is ready and able to take over the station and operate it. The bill passed the House August 15, 1949, but was not acted on in the Senate.

MARKETING AGREEMENTS (S. 1089)

Under the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act, marketing agreements and orders may be established for any commodity included within the scope of the statute. Such agreements and orders are set up to regulate the size, type, maturity, and quality of a particular commodity sent to market and to otherwise promote orderly marketing of the commodity within a specified area. This bill adds filberts and almonds to the list of commodities for which marketing agreements and orders may be established. It was passed by the House June 20, 1949, and is now Public Law 139.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR TUNG NUTS AND HONEY (H. R. 29)

In reporting favorably on the bill to provide price support for tung nuts and honey, the committee demonstrated that

the mere volume or aggregate value of an agricultural commodity is not the only determining factor in deciding whether or not it is entitled to mandatory price support—but that even relatively insignificant and specialized commodities may receive such support when matters of paramount national interest are involved. Both tung nuts and honey fall into this category.

Tung oil is an essential ingredient of high-grade paints and of certain fine insulation materials. It is a native product of China and before the recent war virtually all the tung oil used in the United States was imported from China. During the war, however, tung trees capable of producing about one-tenth of our normal requirement for tung oil were brought to production in the United States. Now that relatively free commerce with China has been resumed, tung oil may be imported from that country, and is being imported, at a price which American producers cannot meet, due to the difference of labor costs in the two countries. In the absence of a high protective tariff, which would raise the price to the consumer of all tung oil, or of a price-support program which will guarantee American producers a fair price for their product, the tung industry in this country would have to go completely out of business and the United States would again be left entirely dependent on imports for its supplies of this strategic material. The committee considered it better that price support be provided for American tung production.

In the case of honey, the committee was confronted with another commodity which is relatively insignificant in itself. In this case the importance to the national welfare lies not in the product itself, but in the bees which make the honey. Honey bees do about 80 percent of the pollinating job for those plants and crops which are not self-pollinating. This includes almost all of our fruits, all clovers and legumes, and many other important agricultural crops—more than 50 major crops, altogether, which are dependent on insects for pollination.

In recent years the cleaning out of wild areas and, more importantly, the widespread use of new and powerful insecticides have so decreased the wild bee population that in many areas they have virtually disappeared. In these areas, unless domesticated honeybees have been brought in to do the pollinating job, the yields of fruit, clover seed, and many other crops have dropped sharply and seriously. Bees are absolutely essential to the production of these crops, but domestic bees, too, are in danger of disappearing almost altogether because the price of honey for the past 2 years had been so low that beekeepers could not afford to operate and have rapidly been going out of business.

In order to maintain the stands of bees needed to pollinate important crops, therefore, the committee has recommended in its bill—and the House has adopted—a program of mandatory price support for honey. The cost to the Federal Treasury will be relatively small and the benefits to agriculture and the national welfare as a whole will be very great. The bill passed the House August 2, 1949, and was included in the Agricultural Act of 1949—Public Law 439.

PEANUTS FOR OIL (H. R. 4081)

This bill recognizes the two major uses to which peanuts are put—cleaning and shelling for edible purposes, and crushing for oil. This bill restores the right of peanut growers to deliver to a Government agency for crushing into oil excess peanuts grown under acreage-allotment programs. This policy was in effect until 1947 when it was repealed, apparently by inadvertence, in an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The bill passed the House May 2, 1949, but was not acted upon in the Senate.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT (H. R. 5511)

Since 1930 the movement of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate commerce has been regulated by the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. The act provides for collection of a fee of $10 a year from each of the registered handlers coming within the scope of the act, presumably for the purpose of financing operation of the act. The fees have never been applied directly to the administration of the act, however, and in recent years the funds appropriated each year by Congress have not been sufficient to provide the kind of administration required for the most satisfactory operation of the program. This bill, which has the support of the representatives of all the handlers affected directly by the law, will make the act self-financing by increasing the annual fee to $15 and providing that the funds received shall be available for administration of the act. The bill did not reach the floor of the House during the session.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL LABOR

The two bills relating to the use in the United States of foreign agricultural labor were acted upon favorably by the committee during the session:

H. R. 2906, provided a 1-year extension of the time given the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of the farm-labor camps which had been turned over to the Department of Agriculture for disposal by the act of July 31, 1947. That act authorized the Secretary to dispose of the camps to any public or semi-public agency or nonprofit association of farmers which would agree to operate the facilities for the housing of migratory farm labor. The bill reported by the committee, and now Public Law 80, extends until June 30, 1950, the time in which the Secretary may dispose of the camps.

H. R. 5557, authorized the Farm Placement Service of the Federal Security Agency to coordinate and supervise the use of foreign agricultural workers in the United States, when and if it is determined that such workers are needed to supplement domestic labor forces. Feeling that the authority contained in this bill was not necessary if satisfactory working arrangements could be made with the countries from which the workers were imported, this bill was not called up for House action during the session.

SWAN ISLAND (H. R. 3717)

In July 1946, prior to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, a law was enacted authorizing the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture to establish an international quarantine station on Swan Island in the Caribbean Sea, to be used not only by the United States but by other North and Central American countries. It was thought that by establishing a regulated, legal procedure by which animals might be brought into those countries the illegal traffic in live animals might be discouraged and better protection afforded against foot-and-mouth disease and other animal scourges.

Later in 1946, before any active steps could be taken to put the quarantine station into operation, foot-and-mouth disease was discovered in Mexico—having been brought in presumably by cattle which had been imported illegally. The disease spread rapidly in Mexico and is still endemic in that country, although apparently under control as the result of positive and effective action by the Governments of the United States and Mexico.

Since foot-and-mouth disease was the primary disease against which it was hoped to guard by establishing the quarantine station, and since the purpose of the station (to keep the disease off the North American Continent) has already been nullified, there appears to be no reason for putting the quarantine station into operation. This bill, therefore, repeals the act of 1946 authorizing the establishment of the station. The bill became Public Law 166.

ERADICATION OF INSECT PESTS (H. R. 4263)

The authority of the Department of Agriculture to carry on year-round campaigns against insect pests is derived from section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act, in which the specific insects against which such campaigns are authorized are named. Insects and plant diseases now enumerated in the section include: Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitfly, gypsy and brown-tailed moth. Dutch-elm disease, corn borer, cereal rusts, pink bollworm, and others. This bill adds to this list the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, wheat-stem sawfly, Oriental fruitfly, and Hall scale. All these insects and diseases have now gained such a foothold in or near the United States that they need to be subjected to year-round campaigns of prevention and eradication. The bill passed both Houses and is Public Law 106.

BILLS OF LOCAL INTEREST

In spite of the many matters of great national interest which were before the Committee on Agriculture during the present session of Congress, the committee has found time to consider—and in several instances to act favorably upon—a number of measures which are local in character. These bills have little national significance, but they are of great interest and concern to the communities and areas involved. Many of the bills have been before Congress for several years without finding a committee that had the time to act upon them.

Buffalo Rapids irrigation project, H. R. 829: This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to accept, in satisfaction of a loan made to the association, the buildings and improvements on an irrigation project of about 30,000 acres on the Yellowstone River near Glendive, Mont. The loan was made to the association so that the project could be put into agricultural production during the war. The purpose of the loan has been accomplished; the buildings and improvements are valued at more than the outstanding balance on the loan; and the authorized transfer will permit liquidation of the loan at this time instead of waiting until the buildings and improvements are paid for over a 30-year period by settlers purchasing the farms. Passed House, August 15, 1949. No action in Senate.

Robinson Remount Station, H. R. 1242, Public Law 100: Authorizes the sale to the city of Crawford, Nebr., of a tract of land which is part of the Robinson Remount Station, on the outskirts of the city. The city has been using the land for a park and recreation area and wants to obtain title to it so that it may construct thereon permanent city buildings and structures.

Land exchange with Grand Rapids, Minn., H. R. 2015, Public Law 315: This bill authorizes the Department of Agriculture to return to the town of Grand Rapids a small tract of land deeded to the Government for use as a Civilian Conservation Corps automotive repair depot and no longer needed. The Forest Service will obtain, in return, land within a national forest in Minnesota equal in value to the buildings and improvements on the land being retransferred to the town.

Angostura project, H. R. 2538, Public Law 337: This bill authorizes the completion of a 20,000-acre irrigation project in South Dakota, which was started before the war but on which work had to be suspended because of the war. The project could not be completed without this new authorization because of the fact that the previous statutory authority had expired.

Pomona Remount Station, H. R. 3003, Private Law 88: In 1922, W. K. Kellogg of Battle Creek, Mich., purchased a tract of land of about 800 acres near Pomona, Calif., and established there a ranch for the breeding of pure-bred Arabian horses. The ranch was operated for that purpose by Mr. Kellogg, by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and by the University of California until 1943, when it was transferred to the United States to be operated as an Army remount station, with the understanding that the Government would continue there the breeding of Arabian horses. At the end of the war the Remount Service was discontinued and the Pomona Station would now be disposed of as surplus war property, except for this bill. This bill returns the property to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, a nonprofit institution devoted to educational purposes, for the purpose of continuing there the breeding of Arabian horses and of continuing agricultural development work.

Delta Branch Experiment Station, H. R. 3680, Public Law 165: This bill returns to Mississippi State College a small tract of land at Stoneville, Miss., which was deeded to the United States in 1934 for use in connection with the Delta Branch experiment station, but which has never been used for that purpose.

Norbeck Wildlife Preserve, H. R. 3926, Public Law 326: This bill transfers to the Forest Service some land that is now part of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Reservation in South Dakota, makes the land part of an existing game sanctuary in the national forest, and renames the game sanctuary "Norbeck Wildlife Preserve," in honor of former Senator Norbeck, of South Dakota.

Tucson, Ariz., land exchange, H. R. 3982, Public Law 229: This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and exchange land near Tucson, Ariz., in order to enable a Tucson hospital to secure the land on which to construct additional buildings.

Puerto Rico extension work, H. R. 4090, Public Law 406: Extends to Puerto Rico the full benefits of the various acts making and authorizing appropriations for cooperative agricultural extension work in the States and Territories. Heretofore Puerto Rico has obtained only partial benefits under these acts.

New England Forest Compact, H. R. 4535, Public Law 129: Grants the consent of Congress—as required by the Constitution—to an interstate compact entered into by the New England States and New York relating to cooperative action in forest-fire control and related forestry activities.

Plumas County, Calif., land exchange, H. R. 4641: Authorizes the Forest Service to transfer to Plumas County, Calif., the land on which a Forest Service airport is now located—so that the town of Chester can take over maintenance and operation of the airport—and receive in exchange some 21 acres of land to be used as a forest service headquarters and ranger station. Passed House August 1, 1949. Not acted on by Senate.

East Tawas, Mich., land exchange, H. R. 5601, Public Law 403: Authorizes the forest service to exchange with the town of East Tawas, Mich., some Federal land on which the people of the town want to build a church and a municipal building, and to receive in exchange land of equal value within a national forest in Michigan.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, even though we have had a long and rather hectic session of Congress, during all of which time the members of our committee have worked faithfully and well, each member of the committee, after a brief vacation at home, will return during the recess of the Congress to take part in important studies, investigations, and hearings in different parts of the country. By appropriate resolution, the House authorized our committee to meet at such times and places as the committee may determine to be necessary and advisable.

Subcommittees will visit terminal markets in metropolitan areas and make an on-the-spot study of marketing facilities, and methods. A subcommittee will visit the important commodity exchanges in connection with our consideration of proposed changes in the Commodities Exchange Act. Another subcommittee will further investigate and study methods of preventing or controlling the devastation of foot-and-mouth disease. The entire membership of the committee will be almost constantly employed on committee work from now until the convening of the next session in January.

We all may take great pride in the achievements of the House Committee on Agriculture during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and we may all now be happy at the glad thought that farm legislation has been removed from partisan politics; and all sincere friends of agriculture should hereafter insist that farm legislation be nonpartisan, in the interest of both farmers and consumers and in the interest of all the people of our country.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit a résumé of the general legislation acted upon by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the first session of this the Eighty-first Congress. The legislation, as will be noted, covers a wide field of subjects affecting the national economy, especially in the fields of housing, banking and finance, agriculture, and industry. A number of the measures are of major importance to our domestic economy, and established or expanded programs designed to further secure and advance the national security and welfare.

For easy reading and continuity of subject matter, the legislation has been grouped under general headings and subjects dealing with those general headings are described thereunder. For the further convenience of the Members the public law number and the House report numbers—including conference reports—are listed immediately under the heading of each measure for ready reference to more detailed descriptions and analyses of the matter concerned.

All but three of the measures acted upon by the Committee on Banking and Currency have been enacted into law. Of these three, two have passed the House and are pending in the Senate, and the other is pending before the House Committee on Rules, having been reported by the Banking and Currency Committee at the close of the session.

The résumé follows:

HOUSING

HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Public Law 171—House Reports Nos. 590 and 975

The act establishes national housing objectives and the policies to be followed in attaining them.

It provides that private housing enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; that local public bodies shall be encouraged to undertake positive programs to assist the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, the development and redevelopment of communities, and the production at lower costs of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life; and that governmental assistance shall be given to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, to provide adequate housing needed for urban and rural nonfarm families of low incomes where such need is not being met through reliance solely upon private enterprise, and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings and related facilities where the farm owner demonstrates that he lacks sufficient resources and credit to provide such housing.

The act requires the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and any other departments or agencies of the Federal Government having functions with respect to housing to exercise their functions consistently with these national housing objectives and policies and in such manner as will encourage and assist (1) the production of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life; (2) the reduction of the costs of housing without sacrifice of such sound standards; (3) the use of new designs, materials, techniques, and methods in residential construction and the increase of efficiency in residential construction and maintenance; (4) the development of well-planned, residential neighborhoods and the development and redevelopment of communities; and (5) the stabilization of the housing industry at a high annual volume of residential construction.

Title I—Slum Clearance and Community Development and Redevelopment

The title authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans and grants to localities to assist locally initiated, locally planned, and locally managed slum-clearance and urban redevelopment undertakings. A local public agency would, after public hearing, acquire (through purchase or condemnation) a slum or blighted or deteriorating area selected in accordance with a general city plan for the development of the locality as a whole; then it would clear the land and make it available, by sale, or lease, for private or public redevelopment or development in accordance with a predetermined local redevelopment plan for the area.

The act authorizes $1,000,000,000 in loans over a 5-year period.

The act also authorizes $500,000,000 in Federal capital grants over a 5-year period, in order to help meet the loss involved in connection with slum-clearance operations. This loss would be shared on a 2 to 1 basis—the Federal Government making up two-thirds of the loss and the local government making up one-third. The local public agencies may provide their share either in cash or through the provision of parks or schools or other public facilities necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project areas, the installation of streets, utilities, and other site improvements, or the use of municipal labor and equipment to clear a project area. While Federal loan assistance is available for projects involving open land, no capital grants may be made for such projects.

As a further condition to Federal aid there must be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the project area and the permanent provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings at prices and rents within the financial means of such families. The demolition of residential structures in connection with slum clearance projects is prohibited until July 1, 1951, if the local governing body determines that it would create undue housing hardship in the locality.

Not more than 10 percent of the funds provided for loans or grants may be expended in any one State.

Title II—Amendments to National Housing Act

This title provided for temporary extensions (through August 31, 1949) of FHA's title I and section 608 mortgage insurance operations; also for a $500,000,000 increase in its title II insurance authorization. (These titles of FHA were further extended and the insurance authorization increased by Public Laws 278 and 387 as noted hereafter under the caption "Interim Extensions of FHA Insurance Programs.")

Title III—Low-Rent Public Housing

This title amends the United States Housing Act of 1937 by authorizing Federal contributions and loans for local programs involving not to exceed 810,000 additional units of low-rent public housing over a 6-year period. The Public Housing Administration may authorize local authorities to commence construction of 135,000 units each year. The President, however, is authorized to accelerate the program to not more than 200,000 units per year or to retard the program to not less than 50,000 units per year, subject to the total authorization of 810,000 units, if he determines, after advice from the Council of Economic Advisers, that such action is in the public interest.

Federal annual contributions may not exceed the amounts which, with the required local tax exemption, are necessary to make up the difference between the rents which the low-income families can afford to pay and the annual costs incurred in the operation of the projects, including interest and amortization of all capital borrowings. In no event may they exceed the aggregate annual contributions authorization, reaching a maximum of $308,000,000 per year after the total program is in operation.

The act authorizes a total of $1,500,000,000, available as a revolving fund, to be used for loans, primarily for construction advances or commitments pending permanent financing through sale of bonds on the private market.

The act reduces the maximum period for loans and annual contributions from 60 to 40 years and adjusts the basis for Federal contributions in accordance with the increased annual amortization requirements.

Provisions in this title strengthen the statutory safeguards to assure that occupancy of projects is limited to low-income families in need of adequate housing. As in the past, annual incomes of families on admission may not exceed five times the rent, including utilities, but the act recognizes the needs of larger families by exempting from income $100 per year for each minor dependent. The title further requires local authorities (1) to establish upper rental limits for admission to projects at least 20 percent below the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing an adequate supply of decent housing in the respective localities, (2) to provide maximum income limits for admission and continued occupancy, (3) to require the removal of families found to be ineligible as the result of periodic reexaminations of tenant incomes, (4) not to discriminate against welfare cases, and (5) subject to specific preferences stated below, to give preference to families having the most urgent needs.

Families who are otherwise eligible and who are displaced or are about to be displaced by public slum clearance, redevelopment or low-rent housing projects will be given a first preference for admission to low-rent housing. Among such displaced families, veterans with service-connected disabilities have first preference, families of deceased veterans and servicemen whose death was service-connected have second preference, and other veterans or servicemen have a third preference. As among families who have not been displaced by slum clearance, preference shall be extended to veterans and servicemen and among such families, veterans with service-connected disabilities have first preference and families of deceased veterans and servicemen whose death was service-connected have second preference. These preferences are extended to veterans and servicemen of World War I and World War II.

The act fixes the limitation on the cost of construction and equipment of dwelling facilities to $1,750 per room. An increase in this cost limitation of not more than $750 per room is authorized in areas where it would not be feasible without such increase to construct sound housing. In no event may a project be undertaken which is of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

The act repeals existing equivalent elimination requirements, but substitutes a requirement that no financial assistance (other than preliminary loans) shall be made available for any low-rent housing project unless the governing body of the locality involved agrees that there will be eliminated within 5 years after completion of the project unsafe or insanitary dwellings substantially equal in number to the number of newly constructed dwelling units provided in the project. The elimination requirement does not apply to rural nonfarm housing projects or to any public housing projects located on a slum site that has been cleared for urban redevelopment under title I of the act. The Public Housing Administration may defer beyond 5 years the required elimination in any locality or metropolitan area where there is an acute shortage of decent, safe, or sanitary housing available to families of low income.

Title IV—Housing Research

This title authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to undertake and conduct technical research and studies which will promote reduction in housing construction and maintenance costs and stimulate the increased production of housing.

Title V—Farm Housing

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend financial assistance to farm owners to enable them to construct, improve, or repair farm housing or other farm buildings as follows:

1. Loans up to 33 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest, to owners of self-sustaining farms who are otherwise unable to finance adequate housing or other needed building improvements for themselves or others working on the farms.

2. Similar loans, supplemented by annual contributions, to owners whose farms are not presently self-sustaining but which may be brought up to a self-sustaining level through a satisfactory program of enlargement, improvement, or adjusted farm practices. The subsidies, applied as a partial credit on interest and principal payments, could not be made available to an owner for more than 5 years and, in the aggregate, could not exceed $5,000,000 annually after the third year of the program; lesser amounts would be authorized for the earlier years.

3. Loans and grants for minor improvements and minimum repairs to farm dwellings and buildings on farms which cannot be made self-sustaining. The amount available would be limited to $1,000 for any one farm or dwelling or building owned by one individual and the grant portion with respect to any one dwelling or building could not exceed $500.

4. Loans to encourage adequate family-size farms where a farm needs enlargement

or development in order to provide income sufficient to support decent, safe, and sanitary housing and other farm buildings.

This title authorizes loans aggregating $250,000,000, contributions for a period of 5 years not exceeding $5,000,000 per year, and loans and grants for a period of 5 years totaling $25,000,000 for minor improvements and land purchases.

Title VI—Miscellaneous Provisions, Housing Census

Among the miscellaneous provision in the bill, the Director of the Census is directed to take a census of housing in 1950 and decennially thereafter.

This title amends and supersedes existing provisions for the conversion of eligible State-aided low-rent or veterans' housing projects to low-rent housing assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

The National Banking Act is liberalized with respect to the authority of national banks and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to purchase or underwrite certain obligations of local public-housing and slum-clearance agencies.

This title also restores the right of the National Capital Housing Authority (which is the low-rent public-housing agency for the District of Columbia) to acquire sites within the District of Columbia for low-rent public-housing projects.

The District of Columbia is also authorized to participate on the same bases as other authorized localities, in the slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment benefits authorized in title I of the act, but no loans or grants under title I may be extended for the District of Columbia with respect to any project for which Congress, after being presented with a budget estimate to make an appropriation under provisions of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, makes no funds available.

INTERIM EXTENSIONS OF FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

During the first part of the session it was necessary to provide for interim extensions of the FHA mortgage insurance programs to insure their continuance and effectiveness in our home-building program until the committee could work out a comprehensive measure revising in the light of current conditions both the FHA insurance and GI guaranty home-loan programs. It should be noted that the home-building program for the first 9 months of 1949 exceeds the comparable period for 1948. Housing starts for January through September 1949 totaled 741,400, and final totals for the year may exceed our all-time record set in 1925. This comprehensive revision was contained in H. R. 6070 (which is summarized under the heading "Housing amendments of 1949") which passed the House and is still pending in the Senate. The first interim extension was contained in section 304 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 which extended FHA title VI from March 31, 1949, to June 30, 1949. The second extension was contained in title II of the Housing Act of 1949, and its provisions will be found in the summary of that act. The other extensions are as follows:

Public Law 176—House Report No. 1009

This act increased from $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000 the amount of FHA and GI mortgages that could be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association—the Government secondary mortgage market.

Public Law 278—House Report No. 1324

This act provided for a continuance of the title I and title VI insurance programs from June 30, 1949, to November 1, 1949, and increased the insurance authorizations under title VI an additional $500,000,000.

Public Law 387—House Report No. 1396

This act provided for a continuance of the title I and title VI insurance programs from November 1, 1949, to March 1, 1950, and increased the insurance authorization under title I by $250,000,000, under title II by $750,000,000, and under title VI by $500,000,000. This act also removed the 50-percent limitation with respect to GI mortgages that can be sold to the Federal National Mortgage Association, by providing that all such home mortgage loans (under $10,000) guaranteed after October 20, 1949, are eligible for purchase by the Association. This act also increased the purchase authority of the Association an additional $1,000,000,000; extended the removal requirement with respect to temporary Lanham Act housing from January 1, 1950, to January 1, 1951; amended the Federal Reserve Act so as to permit banks to participate fully in the financing of the military rental housing program; and provided that the FHA could use certain income from fees and premiums for current nonadministrative expenses in order that it might better handle the work load of inspection and processing insurance applications at the field level.

ALASKA HOUSING ACT

Public Law 52—House Report No. 396

The housing problem in the Territory of Alaska is a serious one. The rigors of the climate have always caused housing in this area to be expensive, in addition to the higher cost of materials and labor in Alaska. Aggravating these factors has been the tremendous increase in population of Alaska during the past 10 years, and the fact that it is a focal point of increasing importance in our relationships in the Pacific with Japan, Korea, and Russia.

The Alaska Housing Act is designed to alleviate this critical housing shortage by affording stimulants to the construction of housing in Alaska in several ways. First, FHA costs limits are increased to take practical cognizance of the increased construction costs. Second, the Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to make construction loans on FHA insured mortgage loans, and purchase FHA-insured mortgages on property located in Alaska without regard to the otherwise applicable $10,000 maximum. Thirdly, the Alaska Housing Authority is authorized to make loans aggregating not more than $15,000,000 to public agencies or private nonprofit corporations for the purpose of undertaking housing projects, or to undertake these projects itself if private sponsorship is not available. The Authority is further authorized to make character loans up to $500 for the purpose of improving, converting, or construction of dwellings in remote areas. These stimulants to an area of increasing importance to our national security are expected to overcome in part the serious problem of housing, not only with respect to the civilian but to the military population.

MILITARY RENTAL HOUSING

Public Law 211—House Reports Nos. 854 and 1127

Private enterprise is encouraged under the provisions of this act to construct rental housing to serve the needs of personnel at military installations. The Federal Housing Administration is authorized up to July 1, 1951, to insure mortgages under the military housing insurance fund in an aggregate amount of $500,000,000, which limit can be increased to $1,000,000,000 with approval of the President. With insurance of a 4-percent mortgage up to 90 percent of a $9,000 value per dwelling unit, the program is similar to that provided for conventional rental construction under FHA, but is adapted to the particular problems encountered in financing rental housing construction on or in the vicinity of military bases. Such insured mortgages are eligible for secondary-market purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association. To further stimulate the interest of private enterprise in military rental housing, provision is made for the leasing of sites by the Military Establishment free from the right of revocation, and under appropriate restriction, for the provision of utility services by the Military Establishment on a long-term basis.

As with other FHA mortgage-insurance programs, appropriate insurance premiums will be charged for mortgages insured by the military housing insurance fund. Through such mortgage insurance, private enterprise should be attracted to providing a substantial volume of badly needed rental housing at military installations which if otherwise provided through the use of public funds would require a substantial expenditure by the Federal Government.

DISPOSITION OF GREENTOWN PROJECTS

Public Law 65—House Report No. 402

The three Greentown projects constructed by the Government in the middle thirties are located in Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wisc.; and Greenhills, Ohio. They were developed out of funds appropriated by the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

This act authorizes the Public Housing Commissioner to sell these three projects with first preference to veteran groups organized on a nonprofit basis. Protection is given to tenants of the projects who are not veterans if they desire to participate in the purchase, and provision is further made for the financing of the sale in the event of a sale for other than cash. It is expected that the sale of these projects will not only result in direct benefit to the purchasers and the Government, but also that the undeveloped areas of the projects will provide land for the construction of additional thousands of dwelling units.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1949

H. R. 6070—House Report No. 1295

This bill, passed by the House on August 25, 1949, and not yet acted upon by the Senate, is designed to make the necessary revisions to the systems of FHA and GI mortgage insurance and guaranty to adopt them to changed economic conditions and to expand them in fields where it appears desirable incentives can be afforded to encourage private industry in the financing of the housing requirements of the people. These systems of mortgage insurance and mortgage guaranty together with the secondary mortgage market provided in the Federal National Mortgage Association play a most important part in the home-building and home-purchasing segments of our economy. Illustrative of their importance is the fact that since inception of the FHA mortgage-insurance programs in 1934 through June 30, 1949, approximately $14,500,000,000 of mortgage insurance has been written; and since the inception of the GI home loan guaranty program in 1944 through June 25, 1949, GI home loans have been approved by the Veterans' Administration in the cumulative amount of approximately $8,500,000,000.

Specifically, this bill provides for the following:

1. Extends the life of, and increases the insurance authorization of, the FHA title I modernization, repair, and alteration insurance program.

2. Provides a new system of mortgage insurance on small low-cost homes under title I by providing mortgage insurance on the individual property in lieu of the existing system which insures, not the individual property, but up to 10 percent of the lender's portfolio of such loans.

3. Increases the insurance authorization under title II of the National Housing Act, the permanent FHA system of insurance, and makes several changes in the methods of insurance presently available under title II for the purposes of providing incentives for the construction of homes in the lower price

ranges and thus reach a greater segment of the people who desire to own their own home.

4. Provides a revised system of cooperative housing mortgage insurance covering both the construction of individual homes and multiple-unit dwellings. Under this program nonprofit cooperatives or trusts could be formed (with technical advice and assistance being made available by the Federal Housing Commissioner) to construct housing projects for their occupancy and become eligible for FHA insurance up to 90 percent of the cost of the individual housing unit (not to exceed $8,100) at not to exceed 4 percent interest with a mortgage maturity up to 40 years. Veterans would be given additional financing preferences as they would be eligible for FHA insurance up to 95 percent.

5. The purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association would be increased, and the 50 percent portfolio limitations with respect to mortgages they now can purchase would be eliminated in most instances, thus affording a continuance of the assistance that this secondary mortgage market has been furnishing to the home-building program.

6. Increases the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation commensurate with that of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

7. Extends the life of, and increases the insurance authorization of, the FHA title VI multiple unit rental insurance program.

8. Increases GI home-loan maturities from 25 to 30 years.

9. Increases guaranty of GI home loans from 50 percent up to $4,000 to 60 percent up to $7,500 of the individual home loan.

10. Authorizes the Veterans' Administrator to guarantee loans to veterans seeking homesites in rural areas, and authorizes the taking of second liens as security for loans for the improvement or construction of a farmhouse.

11. Authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make 40-year loans to colleges for the construction of housing for their students and faculties.

12. Makes other technical and necessary amendments to the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the so-called Lanham Act.

RENT CONTROL

Public Law 31—House Reports Nos. 215 and 332

Under the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, authority to control rents was continued from March 31, 1949, to June 30, 1950. In addition to continuing the authority to control rents, the act made several amendments to the then existing law in order to correct abuses and insure a law that could be administered in a more equitable manner.

The principal provisions of the act are summarized as follows:

1. Continued veteran preferences in the purchase or rental of newly constructed housing accommodations.

2. Provided for assistance to tenants and small landlords in securing fair adjustments by requiring the Housing Expediter to designate personnel to assist tenants and small landlords in preparing applications for adjustments and acquainting them with conditions under which adjustments may be made.

3. Corrected abuses relating to non bona fide housing conversions.

4. In making adjustments to correct hardships or other inequities, provision was made that the landlord receive a fair net operating income.

5. Provided for court review by the Emergency Court of Appeals of recommendations by Housing Expediter and local advisory boards with respect to general rent adjustments or decontrol recommendations upon petition of a representative group of tenants or landlords.

7. Provided for the recontrol of rents in any area decontrolled by action of the Housing Expediter where such is necessary to prevent skyrocketing of rents.

8. Provided for decontrol by action of State legislatures, and local governing bodies when approved by the Government.

9. Strengthened enforcement provisions and reinstated control over evictions in the Housing Expediter.

COMMODITIES

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT AMENDMENTS

Public Law 85—House Reports Nos. 418, 643, and 723

This act restored to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to supervise and direct the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and restored the authority of the Corporation to acquire plants and facilities necessary to provide storage adequate to carry out effectively any of the Corporation's programs. This legislation was necessary to correct the action of the Eightieth Congress which so limited the authority of the Corporation that it was unable to serve the American farmer by assisting him in the serious storage problems and consequent loss of the benefits of the price support program which he encountered.

Special provision was made in this act to encourage the storage of grains on farms by authorizing the Corporation to make loans to grain growers who need adequate storage for their grain crops. In addition to making it possible to provide storage to the American farmer, the act also makes it possible for the Corporation to acquire storage facilities by lease or purchase for commodities it acquires under its price support and other operations. The acquisition of such facilities is conditioned upon a finding that such storage facilities are not otherwise available in the area. The authority to provide storage facilities is an absolute necessity to prevent not only the wastage of foodstuffs, but to secure to the farmers the fruits of his labors.

Provision was also made authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation. Other technical amendments were made to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to enable it to better carry out its functions and to better serve the farmers of America.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT OF 1949

Public Law 421—House Reports Nos. 1395 and 1455

The International Wheat Agreement was ratified by our Government last June and became effective August 1, 1949. The Agreement will be a stabilizing influence in the international wheat market by assuring supplies of wheat to importing countries and markets for wheat to exporting countries within equitable and stable price limits arrived at by negotiation. The United States participates as an exporting country and, under the Agreement, American wheat farmers are assured a minimum annual export market for 168,000,000 bushels of wheat for the next 4 years. Exporters are only obligated to sell wheat at the maximum price of $1.80 per bushel and importers are only obligated to buy wheat at minimum prices which are set at $1.50 per bushel in 1949–50 and decline yearly by 10 cents per bushel to a minimum of $1.20 a bushel in 1952–53.

This law provides for implementation of the Wheat Agreement through authorizing the President, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to make available the quantities of wheat and wheat flour at prices necessary to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits, and fulfill the commitments of the United States under the Agreement. Depending upon the market level for wheat, the Government may or may not have to absorb a loss in carrying out the Agreement. If it is necessary to absorb a loss this would be met by the Commodity Credit Corporation on a basis of authorized reimbursable appropriations. The President is given the necessary regulatory powers with respect to the exportation and importation of wheat and wheat flour to implement the Agreement.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Public Law 11—House Report No. 18

This act provides for authority to exercise export controls until July 1, 1951, to accomplish these three important objectives, (1) cushioning the domestic economy from the inflationary impact of foreign demand; (2) influencing the geographic distribution of such quantities of scarce materials as can reasonably be spared from our economy; and (3) exercising the necessary vigilance of exports of industrial commodities significant from the standpoint of the national security.

The Export Control Act of 1949 has established a method of channeling exports into friendly countries, notably those participating in the European recovery program, and has been an effective instrument in assisting that program. As domestic supplies of scarce commodities improved, the controls have been relaxed or terminated entirely, except where security policies otherwise required. In authorizing exports full utilization of private competitive trade channels are required to be encouraged, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters and producers, old and new exporters, and the act further provides that provision be made for representative trade consultations to that end.

The President has delegated the responsibility of administering this act to the Department of Commerce.

BANKING, CREDIT, AND FINANCE

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Public Law 142—House Report No. 708

This act amended the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to facilitate the marketing of securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Forty-eight governments are members of the bank, including most of the important countries of the world with the notable exception of Russia. The bank will have an increasingly important role in the future development of the international capital market, and to make its role more effective it was necessary to broaden the market for its securities. This was done in this legislation which permits national banks and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to deal in bonds issued by the bank, thus not only broadening the market for the securities, but at the same time tending to make that market a more stable one. Adequate protection was provided in the legislation for investors in the securities and the general public.

REDUCTION OF PREMIUMS OF FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

H. R. 6316—House Report No. 1385

This bill, passed by the House on October 13, 1949, and not yet acted upon by the Senate, provides for a reduction from one-eighth to one-twelfth of 1 percent of the premium paid by insured member institutions of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporations. Insured savings and loan associations are the principal originators of home mortgage loans in the United States and play a most important part in the field of home financing and the promotion of thrift. These institutions held home mortgages in an amount of $8,283,649,000 as of June 30, 1949.

Since its inception the insurance corporation has had only 35 loss cases with a net aggregate loss of only $5,200,000 in this whole period. As of June 30, 1949, the Corporation's reserves and capital stock amounted to over $200,000,000. Insurance premiums collected by the Corporation during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, was approximately double the amount of its entire losses over the 15-year period of its operation. In addition to revenues from premiums, the Corporation realized investment income approximating $4,500,000 during fiscal 1949.

A reasonable premium reduction as provided in this bill is more than justified by the experience of the Corporation during its existence, and more particularly when one realizes that a debt secured by a mortgage upon the home of an individual represents an extension of credit involving the highest degree of character security.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

Public Law 376—House Report No. 1397

This act amended the Federal Credit Union Act in the following three respects:

1. Increased from 2 years to 3 years the limit for maturity of loans made by a Federal credit union.

2. Increased from $300 to $400 the maximum dollar limit for unsecured loans.

3. Placed a ceiling upon the regular reserves required to be maintained by Federal credit unions and provided that special reserves could be required when necessary.

CONVERSION OR CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS INTO STATE BANKS

H. R. 1161—House Report No. 1083

This bill passed by the House on August 3, 1949, and not yet acted upon by the Senate, is designed to place national banks on a more equal basis with State banks with respect to transferring from one banking system (State or national) to the other, by way of conversion, merger, or consolidation. At the present time a State bank can convert into, or consolidate with, a national bank by obtaining the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, unless it is forbidden to do so by the law of State in which it is located. On the other hand, a national bank has no statutory right to convert into a State bank, or to consolidate with a State bank under the latter's charter. This bill would provide such a right without the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, if, under the law of the State in which the national bank is located, a State bank may, without the approval of any State authority, convert into or merge or consolidate with a national bank in accordance with Federal law, with certain restrictions aimed at preventing undue reduction of capital funds in the process of conversions or consolidations. In other words the bill provides a more equitable "two-way conversion street" for national and State banks. Adequate provision is made for the protection of stockholders and depositors in the event of a merger or consolidation or conversion.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FOREIGN INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

H. R. 5594—House Report No. 1384

In point IV of his inaugural address the President outlined a broad program designed to assist underdeveloped areas of the world to improve the economic status of their peoples. One phase of this program, namely, the encouragement of private-capital investment abroad was the subject matter of this bill which was reported by the committee and now awaits action by the House. To induce and encourage the flow of private capital abroad the Export-Import Bank would be given discretionary authority to insure such private investment against risk of inconvertibility and risks incident to loss resulting from expropriation, confiscation, or seizure by action of public authority. The proposed authority would not permit guaranties covering ordinary business risks.

Private capital in this country is potentially the greatest external source of investment funds for development abroad. In addition, private investment carries with it the technical skills, managerial experience, organizational talents and incentives which are essential to put capital to effective use. Productive investment of capital abroad permitting increased living standards in underdeveloped areas will provide expanding markets for our own industry and agriculture and will be a powerful force in the working together of peace-loving peoples of the world.

MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC MEASURES

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

Public Law 6—House Report No. 8

This act continued from March 1, 1949, until September 30, 1949, the authority conferred upon the President regarding the making of voluntary agreements by persons engaged in business, industry, and agriculture for the purposes, among others, of promoting the orderly and equitable distribution of goods and facilites, and aiding in preventing maldistribution of goods and facilities which basically affected the cost of living or industrial production.

The majority of voluntary plans effected under this authority provided for the allocation of steel products to certain consuming industries or to meet certain Government national security requirements. The plans that were operated under this program were successful in overcoming many of the problems arising from the shortages of goods and facilities resulting from the war and postwar demands. As production of the scarce materials increased and their distribution was effected more equitably, the voluntary plans were eliminated, and upon its expiration date the authority was no longer needed and consequently was allowed to lapse.

EXTENSION OF SECOND DECONTROL ACT

Public Law 153—House Report No. 804

Of the limited economic controls provided for under the Second Decontrol Act (expiring June 30, 1949) only allocation powers with respect to tin and tin products were continued by this law to June 30, 1950. Such extension with respect to tin and tin products was highly desirable in view of the vital importance of tin to national defense as well as the peacetime industrial economy and the existing grave dangers to continuity of production overseas.

IMPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO FATS AND OILS, AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

Public Law 155—House Report No. 868

Under the provisions of this act import control authority with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products is continued until July 1, 1950, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government. Provision is made that such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

MISCELLANEOUS

DOMESTIC SMELTING OF LOW-GRADE TIN CONCENTRATES

Public Law 148—House Report No. 792

Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the Government owns the only commercial tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere. Tin-ore concentrates are acquired under exclusive purchase contracts. To encourage research techniques and production by private industry of smelting of tin from low-grade tin-ore concentrates, this law authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to sell low-grade concentrates to private companies for smelting into grade A pig tin. Such sales, made to the highest bidder, are made at a price which represents no less return to the Government than would result if the Government itself treated such concentrates and sold the pig tin recovered therefrom. Private industry is doing some very promising development work on tin recovery from ores. Through the provisions of the law such work will be encouraged and at no loss to the Government.

USE OF GREENBELT LAND FOR NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY

Public Law 218—House Report No. 1082

This act provided for the transfer of a tract of land in Greenbelt, Md., consisting of approximately 8.03 acres, owned by the Federal Government, to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard armory. The conveyance is to be made by quitclaim deed, without consideration, when the Governor of Maryland notifies the Secretary of Defense that such land is needed by the State of Maryland for the purposes of a site for a National Guard armory and for training the National Guard or for other military purposes. Provision was also made that if the grantee fails or ceases to use the land for the purposes intended, the land shall revert to the United States at its option.

Attorney General McGrath Explains Policy—A & P Case Involves Two-Price Policy Which Bankrupts Independents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith bring to your attention an extremely timely address given before the Connecticut Bar Association by the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, on October 18.

The Attorney General presents a straightforward and simplified explanation of the civil suit now pending against the Atlantic and Pacific monopoly. He states what the public in general does not seem to know—that the A & P suit is not being prosecuted in an attempt to close down A & P stores. On the contrary, it is merely trying to kill the two-price system expertly maneuvered by the A & P and which has kept prices up while throwing smaller competition out of business. The announcement of this case brought on a deluge of pleas induced by the Great A & P Nation-wide advertisements based on the inference that without the A & P no one could afford to buy food. Even well-informed buyers patronize the A & P, with their consciences whispering their guilt in condoning this outrage against fair practice. It had gone that far when the Attorney Gen-

eral opened up this civil suit following the conclusion of the criminal suit which cost the A & P a total of $175,000 in fines.

The Attorney General also talks of his official and solemn duty to preserve and defend the equal treatment of all men, under law. He speaks of the need for sharpening or replacing the worn tools of equal rights so that the Civil Rights Section in the Department of Justice can effect justice parallel to the needs of our times.

The speech is a vigorous summation of Attorney General McGrath's militant stand against all criminal infractions, whether individual felonies or monopoly interests.

I commend the following speech, printed in full, to your careful attention:

ATTORNEY GENERAL MCGRATH EXPLAINS POLICY

It always brings me pleasure to meet my brethren of the bar. As a long-time practitioner before the bar of Rhode Island I am particularly pleased to greet members of the bar of this neighboring State of Connecticut, with whom we Rhode Island lawyers share a common background and so many traditions.

In 1636, the same year that Roger Williams rebelled against the intolerance of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and commenced the colonization of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, the Rev. Thomas Hooker pushed his way westward from Massachusetts to the Connecticut Valley to found this city of Hartford.

Hooker established here a plan of popular government on a broad democratic basis, a plan often characterized as the first written constitution of modern democracy.

A similar system of government was established very soon thereafter in Rhode Island.

So it occurred that at the time of the Revolution only Connecticut and Rhode Island deemed it unnecessary to adopt constitutions, and, after making some changes in their royal charters, continued to govern themselves for a considerable time as before.

I am particularly honored to appear before you tonight as Attorney General of the United States. The State of Connecticut has, I believe, produced two Attorneys General, the latest of whom was a man we all know and whom we admire for his legal ability and his human qualities—Homer Cummings, one of the greatest public servants of our generation.

It is with a sense of great humility that I have approached the duties of the office of Attorney General, with its tremendous responsibilities. The office brings to a lawyer not honor alone. For ours is a government of laws, which makes heavy demands upon those who administer the law. The Attorney General has placed upon him the solemn duty to administer the law equally, without favor and without prejudice, but with faithful adherence to the basic principles of our legal system.

One of the great law enforcement tasks of the Department of Justice is in the field of antitrust actions. It is my firm conviction that the antitrust laws are the cornerstone of our American system of free competitive enterprise.

As Attorney General I gladly accept responsibility for the enforcement of those laws. And I promise continued vigorous and effective enforcement.

One of my very first decisions as Attorney General was to authorize filing of the civil complaint against A & P—the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

The reaction of A & P to the filing of this complaint was, under the guise of outraged innocence, a Nation-wide advertising campaign to discredit the Government's case. The truth is that A & P has been convicted in a criminal case of substantially the same practices charged in our complaint. The truth is that A & P's slick advertising is designed to deceive the American public.

The criminal conviction of the A & P was unanimously affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and A & P paid maximum fines totaling $175,000.

In that criminal case the court found that A & P's bigness was not due to efficiency and enterprise, as A & P would have us believe, but to the "predatory application of its mass purchasing power" and the abuse of that power through boycotts, blacklisting, preferential rebates, price wars, and below-cost retailing in strategic areas to eliminate competition. The Government's action in the civil A & P case is not and is not intended as an attack against bigness or efficiency. It is an attack against A & P's vicious practices and restraints.

According to the court, in the criminal case, the A & P had operated a vicious squeeze against both suppliers of food products and competing retailers. This squeeze resulted from the abuse of its mass purchasing power to obtain preferential rebates. As a result, the alleged lower prices of A & P were financed by A & P's competitiors, who were required to pay higher prices. This has been referred to as a two-price system. One price to A & P and a different price to A & P's competitors.

This civil case will abolish the illegal two-price system. Accordingly, the price of merchandise sold to competitors of A & P should be reduced. This in turn should enable them to reduce their prices to consumers and compete with A & P on a fair basis. As over 90 percent of the American public buy their food from retailers other than A & P, the general public benefit should be substantial.

In the criminal case the court also found that A & P's prices were deliberately reduced in particular stores and heavy net losses were sustained for long periods in order to drive out competition. To compensate for these losses retail prices in A & P stores in noncompetitive areas were increased. As the court of appeals put it: "There must inevitably be compensation somewhere in the system for losses somewhere else, as the overall policy of the company is to earn $7 per share per annum on its stock." It would appear that once A & P has eliminated competition the purchaser may expect to pay higher prices in order to offset planned losses of A & P stores in competitive areas.

The successful prosecution of the pending civil suit—contrary to A & P's misleading advertising—will not increase but should decrease grocery prices. It will reduce prices in those A & P stores which must now maintain a sufficient profit to pay for the losses sustained in planned price wars by other A & P stores. It will decrease the cost of food to A & P competitors who were forced to pay higher prices to producers and suppliers to finance A & P.

This suit does not seek the closing of a single A & P store. If any stores are closed by the A & P Co. it will be in a lock-out against the public interest.

The A & P case is part of a planned antitrust program to attack restraints of trade that may ultimately lead to monopoly power. We did not invite this contest but we will not shrink from it. It is our duty to enforce the law. That duty we are honor bound to discharge. No amount of paid advertising can deter us from vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The existence of monopoly power and its ruthless use in disregard of the public interest threaten economic freedom, retard efficiency, and curtail progress. Our system of free enterprise cannot survive unless the advantages of competition accrue to all of us.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Another of the great tasks of the Department of Justice is the protection of the civil rights—the human rights—of the American people. I regard this as one of the most important of our functions. As each of us here knows, not only Connecticut and Rhode Island, but the United States were born out of the universal search and longing of men for freedom.

The founders of our great democracy, through the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, defined and fashioned a form of government which recognizes the inalienable rights and the dignity of man—a form of government which is the servant of its citizens. With the Bill of Rights they strove to guarantee that the people under this Government would forever retain their essential human freedoms.

All of us here, as lawyers, are sworn to defend these keystones of American democracy, but Government lawyers and the Attorney General have a special responsibility for preserving and defending the principles of supremacy of law over all men and equal treatment of men under the law.

The Bill of Rights embodies, not by indirection but in the explicit language of law, our belief in freedom. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution give even more explicit voice to the urge of the people of the United States for freedom. After the adoption of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments the Congress, in a series of statutes known as the Civil Rights Acts, sought to insure equality in the rights and privileges which all citizens might enjoy, but over the years this legislation has been reduced and nullified to a few remnants of the original laws.

I think it important to reiterate, as did the President in a message to the Congress on this subject, that our basic human freedoms are now better cared for and more vigilantly defended than ever before, but any thoughtful observer will note that there remains a serious gap between American ideals and some of our practices.

There is in the Department of Justice a Civil Rights Section which is engaged in a continuing effort to enforce the basic human rights. But the laws now available to it for this purpose are dull and unwieldy tools.

I believe deeply in equal rights and privileges for all under our Government. As a Member of the United States Senate I worked for the enactment of legislation adequate to assure these purposes. As Attorney General I shall continue to urge the enactment of such legislation and shall enforce, to the very utmost of my ability, existing laws in the civil-rights field.

One of the constant dangers in our failure to provide equality of treatment for all individuals is that of dividing our people.

There are among us in the United States purveyors of hate and bigotry who, willingly or unwittingly, represent ideologies which are alien to our way of life. These are disciples of confusion, who would divide and deliver us to the forces of evil which are abroad in the world—to slavery for a foreign state. Behind the iron curtain there has been imposed a system of government that subjugates a man to the service of the state. This system recognizes no rights in man, no freedom for him—it crushes his mind, blocks his social and cultural progress, and kills his joy in living.

There are among us also organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, whose leaders,

demagogs, thrive on confusion, fear, and racial and religious tensions.

We would be false to ourselves and untrue to our cherished American ideals if we failed to recognize the threats which these false prophets present.

Each time these misled and altogether un-American groups meet they contradict, by their very abuse of the right of free speech and free assembly, the principles to which the United States is dedicated and which it must maintain before the world.

In my capacity as Attorney General of the United States I wish to state here and now that all the Federal laws at my command, and all that Congress deems fit to give me in the future, will be enforced to the very limit in routing and stamping out any organization or group which aims at extermination of our priceless liberties.

I shall approach in the same spirit the other manifold functions which rest on the Attorney General in the administration and interpretation of the law. He is the legal adviser to the President and the executive branch of the Government, and in this capacity, participates in the formulation of legal policies in a field which is as broad as are the operations of the Federal Government. He is himself an administrative officer called upon in many important matters to determine the rights and privileges of citizens. He is also chief counsel for the United States in the courts of the land, with special responsibilities for the direction and supervision of the litigation of the United States.

The Department of Justice has a staff which totals over 26,000 persons. Approximately 9,000 of these are in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 7,000 in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and 4,600 in the Bureau of Prisons. About 1,650 attorneys, including United States attorneys and their assistants, carry on the legal work of the Department.

The Department of Justice also, of course, has a deep interest in the general prevention of crime and the punishment of criminals. While the tremendous crime wave that so many expected as an aftermath of the war fortunately has not developed, a study of trend reflects some very alarming increases in serious crimes.

It is shocking to realize that during 1948 a serious crime was committed at the rate of one every 18.7 seconds. Moreover, the increase in the number of crimes involving violence and brutality has been too great to pass unnoticed.

It is my intention, as Attorney General, to wage a relentless war on criminality. Every effort will be made, not only to apprehend and secure the punishment of criminals, but to discover, study, and analyze the causes of this dangerous crime trend in the United States and to devise methods to improve and remedy the situation. I shall support vigorously the fine work which Mr. Hoover and the FBI are doing, and shall see to it that the other branches of the Department lend every possible effort to this end.

When I took the oath of office as Attorney General I undertook to discharge faithfully the duty of enforcing all the laws of the United States. That I shall endeavor to do, and not in any temporary campaign or crusade, but throughout my term of office.

I shall do this without witch hunts. The clock will not be turned back in my term to the time when such activities took place in the historic cradle of liberty. I have studied carefully the Bill of Rights, the priceless charter of human liberties which guarantees to the American citizen that his basic freedoms shall not be invaded, and I shall faithfully support and defend it.

Political Issues and the Private Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, a critical issue of freedom of speech has arisen in Greenwich, Conn., not far from my district. It involves points of law and problems of the right of protest, which are important to every citizen of the United States.

Mrs. John T. McCullough, a citizen of the town of Greenwich, Conn., protested vigorously when an organization to which she belonged decided to present Paul Draper, a dancer, and Larry Adler, a harmonica player, who each had a long record of friendly relations with many organizations known to be Communist fronts, and so described by the Attorney General.

The concert was held, and Mrs. McCullough protested again in the local newspapers against the choice of artists known to be working for pro-Communist groups, when there were many nonpolitical artists available.

Draper and Adler immediately filed suit for a hundred thousand dollars each, for the damage they had suffered from Mrs. McCullough's "libelous and slanderous statements."

That would have been serious enough because it subjected Mrs. McCullough to the nuisance and expense of a lawsuit, which she could not win unless she, a private citizen, conducted what was practically a full public investigation costing many thousands of dollars, to get legal evidence to satisfy a court of law.

The further difficulty was that, under an old Connecticut law, the plaintiffs were allowed to attach all Mrs. McCullough's property, including her house and her bank account, until the case was decided. This meant that Mr. and Mrs. McCullough could not sell their house, which was up for sale. Nor could she draw on their bank account to pay for her defense.

This case shows clearly two things that are serious infringements on the right of private citizens to express their opinions on political issues without being punished for it.

The first is the decision of the United States Supreme Court that calling a man a Communist is libel, if you cannot produce legal proof. The Communist Party is still legal in this country. It is not libelous for a writer or speaker to call a man a Democrat or a tory or a Dixiecrat. But it is a suable offense to call him a Communist unless you can do what amounts to making him produce his party card.

Now we know that many activities of the Communists are carried on without open connection with the party. We know that party memberships are often secret. The ordinary private citizen or political commentator does not have the power to subpena people and ask them to testify under oath. He cannot get the party card of a Communist any time he wants or needs it.

If citizens are compelled to give judicial proof that a man is a Communist, they are really compelled to undertake investigations so difficult and costly that only the Government, or an individual or group with great wealth, can undertake it. That means that private citizens or writers or commentators are today barred from calling any writer or actor or movie actor or political leader a Communist unless they can afford the time and money to get legal proof.

The FBI has evidence on the subject, but it can furnish it only to Government officials. If the administration does not wish to publish the facts about the Communists then private citizens can get no benefit from their investigations, and have to spend their own money to do the work all over again.

Congress has set up a committee to report such information to the public; and private citizens can repeat their statements without fear of libel suits. That is why the Communists have carried on such a violent, unremitting, and devious campaign against the Committee on Un-American Activities from the day it was first organized to the present, and has alerted all its fellow travelers to keep smearing the committee and the Congress which set it up to protect the public.

Only as the Congress publishes, through its committee, the names and affiliations of Communist sympathizers, can private citizens, including all writers, exercise the right of freedom of speech and of the press, with reference to one of the political parties, that which owes its allegiance to a foreign power.

This court decision has been of enormous value to the Communists in their attempt to keep the American people from finding out about what the Communists are actually doing in the arts, in Government, in the churches, in magazine and book publishing. Editors and writers cannot call a man a Communist, no matter how notorious his support of subversive activities unless they are prepared to spend money and time enough to satisfy a court with legal proof.

This is pure censorship of the press with regard to political parties just as effective as the attempts by the royal governors in the time of Peter Zenger, to control freedom of discussion by smashing the printing presses, and imprisoning the printer. It is censorship by judicial decision holding it libelous to call a person a Communist in spite of a judicial decision that the Communist Party has legal status.

The special angle of this case, the issuing of an attachment against all Mrs. McCullough's private property, is not an accident. Many people have criticized Adler and Draper. But the Communists have people with nothing to do but search out the places where such a suit would do the most harm and be most likely to discourage others from tangling with Communist writers or actors or dancers again. They found the old

Connecticut statute, and so Mrs. McCullough was picked as the innocent scapegoat.

Mrs. McCullough is a plain American citizen. She has carefully refrained from joining any organizations because she believes the issue is the right of private individuals to speak their minds free from coercion. Her husband is a photographer with Time magazine. They have one child. They need their home and their capital for their own family.

They had no means with which to defend so costly a suit. The expenses are expected to be at least $25,000. They have received about $10,000 in contributions from people who were aroused at the invasion of our freedom of speech as a result of Nation-wide reporting of the case by Westbrook Pegler, George Sokolsky, and others. The rest they have had to borrow.

This is a test case of the restraints on freedom of speech in politics with regard to a political party that are most dangerous for our time. The method is to subject people to loss of time and money instead of fines and imprisonment, but its purpose is censorship, just as truly as in the case of Peter Zenger.

The defense of Mrs. McCullough concerns every citizen of the United States who wants to have the same freedom of speech with respect to the Communists that he has with respect to any other political party or movement—who wants his newspapers and magazines as free to report on Communist leaders as they are to report on Republicans. If Mrs. McCullough is not vindicated and reimbursed for the heavy loss of money and peace of mind which she has suffered, then no writer, editor, speaker, or citizen who wants to send a letter to his editor will be able to speak his mind about the most dangerous Communist supporters—those who hide their affiliation with Moscow.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Cloud (Minn.) Register.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL MINNESOTA FOLLOW SUIT?

In the past two sessions of the Minnesota Legislature, bills to establish a fair employment practices commission were turned down by the legislators.

Several other States now have FEPC. Will Minnesota follow suit next year or will it renege again?

Minnesota citizens ought to be thinking and talking about this issue now so that they can express their views to their senators and representatives in the State legislature come next year.

FEPC goes back 8 years to when President Roosevelt established such a Commission. Its job was to see that discriminatory practices in defense industries and Government service were eliminated. Msgr. (now Bishop) Francis J. Haas was appointed first head of FEPC.

Minority groups made big gains during the life of the Federal FEPC. No defense plant could refuse a man a job because his skin was of different color or because his name had an odd ending. Men were hired the Christian way—for their ability, not for their religion, race, or color.

FEPC died after the war emergency. It was killed by Congress. But State legislatures took up the fight from there. New York was first, in 1945. Then came Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey, to be followed this year by Rhode Island, Washington, New Mexico, and Oregon.

How has FEPC worked out?

Take New York State and the city of Pittsburgh as examples.

In New York, where FEPC has been in force for 4 years, the State commission against discrimination says it has "changed the entire pattern of employment of the most populous State in the Union in less than 4 years."

Here are some of the changes:

References to race, color, or religion have been eliminated in application forms by nearly all employment agencies.

Every trade-union in the State which had discriminatory provisions in its constitution or bylaws has either eliminated this clause completely or made it invalid in New York.

All daily newspapers in the State of New York now omit discriminatory specifications from "Help Wanted" or "Positions Wanted" classified ads, except for domestic help.

New York department stores and specialty shops now hire Negro sales help. They have learned that their fears about white customers not accepting colored help were without grounds.

The story in Pittsburgh is just as promising.

With no FEPC law in Pennsylvania, department stores would hire only white workers for their sales and office force. Management would not change this policy. They said the public and the present sales staff in their stores would resent Negroes.

After pressure from local community organizations, newspapers, and other quarters, department-store managements went into conference with the trade-unions.

The outcome was a victory for fair employment.

"There will be no discrimination in the upgrading and employment of Negroes from this day forward," the department-store heads declared in a statement on January 25, 1947.

"Because of different problems which exist in the stores," they went on, "there will be simultaneous hiring. Negro applicants will take the same chance as whites. They will be hired on their ability and fitness for the job. Negro employees already on the job will be given all the opportunity that white employees are given for upgrading. While there is still a problem of customer acceptance to be studied in certain stores, the practice will be that of no discrimination."

Unions cooperated. They educated their members. They made it clear to their members that unions had been founded on the basis of equal opportunity for people of all races and religions.

When the first Negro salesgirls appeared on the floor there were no disturbances. Customers failed to act one way or the other. Management's fear that customers would only be served in a "lily-white" store were found to be entirely groundless.

Minnesota, it's your play.

Address of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath on Statue of Liberty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, prepared for delivery on Statue of Liberty Day, Bedloe Island, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is the custom to speak of statues as representing the dim and remote past. My friends, if there is any monument on this earth that belongs to the present and to the future, it is this Statue of Liberty.

As men and women of various religious faiths and nationalities gather today on this hallowed spot, it is stirring to recall the deep and powerful urges that caused liberty-loving peoples to establish on these shores a Nation dedicated to freedom, justice, and opportunity. Standing at the gate of our country, no emblem so graphically symbolizes the heart and soul of our great Republic as this glorious shrine.

This little light sheds a grand luster from these shores to all mankind. Its beams, burning eternally, disseminate a message in spirit to the farthest corners of the earth, notifying peoples everywhere that freedom is universal and is not alone the cherished possession, or the exclusive blessing, of the people of our own land. To us this magnificent Goddess of Liberty, dedicated here 63 years ago, is a vivid reminder of the beginnings of our Nation.

This gift of the citizens of France to the citizens of the United States, is an unforgettable memento of the French contribution in ideals and practical aid that was so vital to creation and the building of our country. It especially recalls the immortal Lafayette who fought side by side with Washington throughout the dark, dismal days of our early struggle for independence.

Yes, Ambassador Bonnet, the sons of France not only brought to America ideals of freedom and sturdy devotion to its cause, but your people brought us advanced ideas in education, science, music, sculpture and architecture. These contributions enriched our national life, making our democratic way an example to oppressed humanity.

Just as Lafayette's inborn yearning for liberty transcended the horizon of nationality, representatives of at least 15 other nationalities took prominent parts in the long war of suffering and sacrifice for a free America.

Brilliantly emblazoned across the pages of history ring out the names of such racially diverse heroes as Patrick Henry, John Paul Jones, Crispus Attwacks, Von Steuben, Pulaski, Haym Solomon, John Barry, Ethan Allen and legions of others of equal glory and service.

Today, over 100 nationalities, peoples from every corner of the earth, now citizens of the United States of America, are living side by side in peace and harmony, a concrete fulfillment of the promise made in the deeds of the men of the past to whom we do honor.

Mayor O'Dwyer, I wish that television were sufficiently advanced so that peoples throughout the world could get a glimpse of the

daily life of the great metropolis of New York. Your city is a striking and teeming illustration of people living together in mutual understanding, mutual trust, mutual benefit—their deep-rooted prejudices erased in the working of a true democracy. This is convincing evidence that our philosophy of government which guarantees liberty to all under the law meets the requirements of mankind.

Through the participation in this ceremony of President Jules Basdevant, President of the International Court of Justice, we see the global significance in the progress that mankind is making in striving to achieve international peace.

The Goddess of Liberty holds in her hand a scroll with the inscription "July 4, 1776," the date of our Declaration of Independence, this divinely inspired document declaring to the world that all men are created equal.

Proclaimed in the Declaration and guaranteed in our Bill of Rights, this sacred concept of human rights became the foundation upon which this Nation was built and prospered.

All this may be read in the light that shines from this statute.

Within a stone's throw of where we now stand there is rising a new monument—a world monument to liberty—the home of the United Nations. President Harry S. Truman participated in the laying of the cornerstone just a few days ago.

We hope and pray that the United Nations will proclaim an international bill of rights to guarantee the worth and dignity of mankind everywhere and bring the light of this statue to all peoples. With God's help, may this world organization establish a temple of brotherhood out of which will go forth philosophies of life that will banish war forever and bring about enduring and universal peace.

Medical Society of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Chester D. Bradley and Miriam D. Bradley, of Newport News, Va., which appeared in the Virginia Medical Monthly for September 1949.

The article is as follows:

HISTORICAL SETTING—ANNUAL MEETING, MEDICAL SOCIETY OF VIRGINIA

(By Chester D. Bradley, M. D., and Miriam D. Bradley, Newport News, Va.)

For over 340 years history has been made on the Virginia Peninsula. This narrow strip of land between the James and York Rivers has been the setting for three great events which shaped your Nation's history: The Jamestown Settlement, the birth of the Revolution at Williamsburg, and the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. In 1862 naval warfare was revolutionized by the famous "Battle of the Ironclads," which took place several miles off the peninsula's southern shore. For 4 hours the Union *Monitor* and the Confederate *Merrimac* pounded one another in a no-decision fight. From that day on wooden warships the world over were obsolete.

At Old Point Comfort the first Englishmen found in 1607 a channel which "put them in good comfort." Beyond the Point they discerned the Indian village of Kecoughtan where they stopped to exchange presents with the Indians before going on to Jamestown island. Old Point Comfort is to be the place of the one hundred and second annual meeting of the Medical Society of Virginia. We will meet in the sumptuous Chamberlin Hotel whose red brick mass dominates Old Point Comfort as it towers high over the buildings and fortifications of Fort Monroe. On a clear day the distant silhouette of "Old Point" stands out against sky and water, red against blue, with all the exquisiteness of a picture on a china plate. The waters of Hampton Roads teem with the shipping of all nations. The great roadstead affords a protected anchorage to vessels waiting their turn to enter the harbors of Newport News and Norfolk. From the Chamberlin's windows one sees a constant procession of ships—merchant vessels, warships, fishing smacks, pleasure craft, and ferry boats. Here at Old Point Comfort is one of the outstanding tourist resorts of the world.

Believe it or not, old Chief Blackhawk, of Illinois, was responsible for making Old Point Comfort a tourist resort. In 1832 this grim warrior and some of his braves were brought to Fort Monroe for confinement after their defeat in battle. Tourists flocked to stare at the fierce redskins from the wilds of Illinois. There was a humble inn on the point for workmen. Its proprietor shrewdly saw the possibilities and converted it to a tourist hotel. That is how the tourist industry grew up on Old Point Comfort under the guns of Fort Monroe. The present Chamberlin is the inheritor of more than 100 years of hostelry tradition.

Fort Monroe is the third fort on Old Point Comfort, the first having been built in 1609. The present fort was begun in 1819 and was named after President James Monroe whose administration is nostalgically known as "the era of good feeling." Edgar Allan Poe was once a private at Fort Monroe under the assumed name of E. A. Perry. Robert E. Lee was stationed there prior to the Civil War and supervised part of the construction of the fort. The outstanding tourist attraction on Old Point Comfort is the fortress (a fort within the fort) surrounded by a broad water-filled moat. The fortress which is now obsolete must be entered by bridges like a medieval castle. In the walls of the fortress are chambers or casemates which were once occupied by the garrison. In one of these casemates Jefferson Davis was confined for a while following the Civil War. This casemate is indicated by a historical marker. The United Daughters of the Confederacy have also placed a plaque in appreciation of Dr. John J. Craven, of the United States Army, "whose humanity, intelligent companionship and professional skill lightened the monotony, the loneliness, and the physical suffering of Jefferson Davis."

On the green inside the fortress stands the lovely Chapel of the Centurion, the post chapel of Fort Monroe, which is open daily for prayer and rest. It was erected in 1858 through the efforts of Lt. Julian McAllister, of the Ordnance Department, as a thank offering for an almost miraculous escape from death. This officer and two others were working in a laboratory when an explosion occurred. McAllister escaped with his life but the two other officers were killed, and this chapel is his recognition of the divine providence which spared his life. The Chapel of the Centurion was dedicated in 1858 by the Episcopal bishop of Virginia. It is dedicated to St. Cornelius, the patron saint of military men. Cornelius was a Roman centurion (captain) stationed in Palestine who was converted by Peter. His story is related in the tenth chapter of Acts where he is described as "a centurion of the band (company) called the Italian band." The lighting of the chapel's interior is greatly subdued by the deep colors of the stained-glass memorial windows dedicated to artillery and engineer officers of the last century. Standing out boldly over the altar is a lighter-colored stained-glass window with a life-size representation of Cornelius the Centurion. The altar is bathed by the golden light filtering through the image of St. Cornelius. The beautiful green altar frontal was a gift of the St. Hilda Guild, New York City. Hanging from the walls of the chancel and nave are the flags and colors of old regiments of the United States Army. These are interestingly described in a free booklet prepared by the post chaplain, Maj. W. Hubert Bierck.

President Woodrow Wilson was especially fond of worshiping in the Chapel of the Centurion when he and Mrs. Wilson would come down to Old Point Comfort on the Presidential yacht, the *Mayflower*.

Not far from the Chamberlin Hotel are the twin spires of St. Mary's Star of the Sea, which is often mistaken for the post chapel. It is, however, a civilian church which grew up on Old Point Comfort in pre-Civil War days to minister to the spiritual needs of Catholic workmen engaged in work on the fort. Its cornerstone was laid in 1860 by Bishop John McGill. During the Civil War the Sisters of Charity did heroic work in taking care of the sick at Fort Monroe. The church draws its parishioners from the civilians of Phoebus, Hampton, and Newport News, but due to its early establishment on Old Point Comfort the United States Government has permitted it to continue standing on the grounds of the fort. St. Mary's Star of the Sea is named after the patron saint of the Portuguese navigators who charted much of the New World.

In front of the Chamberlin Hotel is the boat dock where the arrival and departure of the Baltimore and Washington steamers provide a colorful spectacle, especially if an Army band happens to be giving a concert in the nearby bandstand. Midchannel on the ferry course between Old Point Comfort and Willoughby Spit is the fortified island of Rip Raps which was created by piling rocks on top of a submerged shoal. The garrison of this satellite fort which is officially known as Fort Wool must lead a lonely life. During World War I defense nets were spread from its foundation to trap submarines.

The approach to the gate of Fort Monroe is through the town of Phoebus named after Harrison Phoebus, a famous Old Point Comfort hotelier of the post-Civil War days. This polished and energetic businessman established the tradition of elegance and comfort which the present Chamberlin maintains today. Roseland Manor, the magnificent estate of Harrison Phoebus (now owned by the Kenyon family) is open to visitors annually.

Hampton is the next town west of Phoebus. It is the oldest continuous English-speaking settlement in America, having been settled in 1610. (Although Jamestown was settled 3 years earlier, it was abandoned after 1699.) Hampton had the first free school in the Colonies which was established by Dr. Thomas Eaton, a physician, in 1634. The town was originally called Kecoughtan after a tribe of Indians which the first Englishmen found there in 1607. White settlers drove away the Indians and later changed the name of the settlement to Hampton after the Earl of Southampton. This nobleman was one of the principal stockholders in the London company, which owned the Virginia colony before it was taken over by the English Government. Although Hampton dates from 1610 its architecture does not reflect its history for it has been burned two times, once by the British in 1812 and once again during

the Civil War by the Confederate General Magruder as a sort of scorched earth measure. No building of any consequence survived the last fire and all of the town's valuable archives perished.

The most historic and also the most charming structure is old St. John's Episcopal Church, whose tightly packed graveyard shaded by giant trees is a refreshing retreat from the busy main street. Established in 1610, St. John's is the oldest Protestant parish in continuous existence in America. There were three earlier church buildings. The present structure was built in 1727 and has survived three wars, undergoing bombardment in the Revolution, pillage in the War of 1812 and the final disaster of fire in the Civil War. However, the old walls honestly built by colonial workmen stood firm and the church was restored in 1869. The graveyard is still in use as a burial ground, many of the headstones being so old that they are illegible. The grave of Hannah Nicholson Tunnell, the Confederate female Paul Revere, is marked by a large rough-hewn granite block near the west door. On June 10, 1861, Hannah Tunnell warned the Confederates of the approach of the enemy at Bethel. Also, buried in the churchyard is Hugh Smith Cummings, Surgeon General of the United States, who was a native of Hampton.

St. John's Church is built in the form of a cross. Its interior is characterized by a simple beauty. The pure white marble of the altar, baptismal font, lectern, and pulpit are in effective contrast to the dark oak beams of the ceiling. The stained glass windows are outstanding in workmanship and design. Especially interesting is a window dedicated to the 21 colonial rectors of St. John's which shows a clergyman with an open Bible standing in the prow of a boat approaching a shore where savages are capering. Another window depicting St. Luke, the physician, is dedicated to George William Semple, thirty-fourth president of the Medical Society of Virginia. The presence of a stained-glass window representing the baptism of Pocahontas, may lead the tourist to suspect that St. John's parish had some link with Pocahontas. This is not so, for the window dates back to the 1880's when Sioux Indians from the Dakotas, who were attending Hampton Institute, used to worship at St. John's. (A large portion of the Sioux Nation were converts to the Episcopalian denomination.) These Indians from the far West were intensely interested in the story of Pocahontas and they donated the Pocahontas window to St. John's. A large number of these young Indians unfortunately died of tuberculosis during their stay in Hampton and they are buried in the old cemetery on the campus of Hampton Institute.

Five generations of the Jones family worshiped in St. John's from 1781 to 1919, according to a plaque over a pew near the south door. Solomon Fosque, a devoted Negro sexton, is commemorated by a plaque in the west vestibule. A complete list of all the rectors of St. John's from 1610 to the present day, 45 in all, hangs in the south vestibule. The present rector, Carter H. Harrison, is a direct descendant of Benjamin Harrison, who settled in Jamestown in 1635. He is also a descendant of Pocahontas. The church possesses a silver communion service which was brought from London in 1619.

Hampton may be called a city of sea food and institutions. Fishing, crabbing, oyster-farming, and sea-food packing are the native industries. Every September Hampton celebrates its annual sea-food festival with the crowning of a sea-food queen, a grand parade, and street dancing. Also contributing heavily to the town's economy are the Government institutions such as the aeronautical research laboratories (National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics), the Veterans' Administration, the military establishments; also, the faculty and students of Hampton Institute. The core of the town's population is soundly southern but since Hampton is located at the tip of the peninsula the currents of commerce and war have brought to it people from all points of the compass. For instance, there is a small group of prominent families whose founders came from New England and other northern places soon after the Civil War. Energetic and enterprising they made fortunes in the sea-food industry later branching into vaster realms such as real-estate developments and street railways. Still prominent in the business and professional life of the town are a number of families whose residence in Hampton dates back to the days of the Royal Colony, such as the Bookers, Seldens, Joneses, Tabbs, Chismans, Hopes, Holts, and Lees, to mention but a few. Another distinct native group in the town's population is formed by the "Poquosonites" and the "Fox Hillians," who are derived from a cluster of fishing villages some miles north of Hampton. In early days these people lived in virtual isolation because of the lack of communication, consequently they are so intermarried that the same family names occur over and over. Accustomed for several centuries to wresting a living from the sea and the soil with their own hands, they turned their energies to business with great profit when after the dawn of the automobile age they began to settle in Hampton. Today "Poquosonites" and "Fox Hillians" are very important in the business life of Hampton.

Hampton's population has been greatly increased in recent years by aeronautical research workers who have come from all over the country—South, North, and West—to work at the Langley Field Air Base. Many of the workers in the Newport News Shipyard have made their homes in the Hampton area. A familiar figure in Hampton is the retired Army officer, a major, a colonel, or even a general, who fell in love with the town during a tour of duty at Fort Monroe or Langley Field, many years ago. In some cases he bought his home long in advance of his retirement and rented it out while he was serving out his time in humdrum posts elsewhere in the United States and in the tropical heat and squalor of foreign assignments. Once back in Hampton in his dream house with time on his hands, he fishes, gardens, boats, dabbles in civic affairs, or may even take an executive job in business.

Hampton is cut up by the jagged arms of Hampton Creek. Along its waterfront are giant mounds of oyster shells and the commingled odors of fish and crabs. Housewives go to the wharves to buy seafood fresh from the briny deep. The town is knit together by a number of graceful bridges from which one obtains a beautiful view of the snug little harbor with its fishing fleet and the yacht club. The Hampton Yacht Club is a rendezvous for yachts bound to and from Florida and is the scene of annual regattas. In front of the yacht club entrance stands the Braddock Cannon which marks the spot where General Braddock landed in 1755 with two regiments of British regulars to open the campaign to drive the French away from what is now Pittsburgh. Unaccustomed to wilderness fighting Braddock's forces were ambushed by French and Indians in the wilds of Pennsylvania. Braddock was killed after four horses had been shot from under him and the young Washington who had accompanied him as an aide-de-camp barely escaped with his life. The Braddock Cannon points to a tongue of land at the mouth of the harbor known as Blackbeard's Point after the famous pirate, Capt. Edward Teach. Exasperated by the pirates' attack on Hampton shipping, Capt. Henry Maynard, of Hampton, led an expedition against their lair in North Carolina in 1713. Defeating Blackbeard, he severed the bloodthirsty rascal's head from his body and placed it on a pole at the entrance of Hampton Harbor to warn any mariner contemplating piracy as a career.

Across the harbor opposite the Yacht Club one sees the towers and gables of Hampton Institute, one of the greatest centers of Negro education in the world. This school had its beginning in a group of illiterate, runaway slaves who sat under the trees at the feet of missionaries and shouted out the letters of the alphabet. Today Hampton Institute has grown to an aggregate of 139 buildings occupying 75 acres of land with an enrollment of over 1,500 young men and women. Students are trained in hand as well as mind and taught primarily to make a living in accordance with the ideal of the founder, Gen. Samuel Chapman Armstrong (1839–93). The trade school teaches everything from bricklaying to tailoring while the collegiate schools teach agriculture, arts and sciences, business, education, home economics, library science, and nursing. Ogden Hall seats 2,000 people and the yearly concert season which features internationally famed artists, symphony orchestras, ballets, and opera companies, is patronized by the entire population of the peninsula. On Sunday evenings the students assemble in Ogden Hall to sing spirituals and other typical Negro music.

In 1878 Indian prisoners of war from Florida were sent to Hampton Institute to be educated and Indians from all over the country continued to be enrolled until 1923. A large number of Sioux Indians from the Dakotas are buried in the old cemetery at the southeast corner of the campus. A trip to this cemetery is worth while to read the picturesque Indian names on the tombstones, examples of which are Daniel Fire-Cloud, Virginia Medicine-Bull, Benjamin Bear-Bird, Lora Bowed-Headsnow, Mary Red-Bird, John Blue-Pipe, George Sharp-Horn, and Walter Little-Eagle. This cemetery also contains the ivy covered tomb of the founder, General Armstrong, who was born in Hawaii of American missionary parents, was a general in the Union Army during the Civil War, and later made Negro education his life work.

General Armstrong persuaded the American Missionary Society to buy the land on which the institute stands and formal instruction was begun in 1868 in a converted Union hospital with himself as principal, two teachers to assist him, and 15 ex-slaves as pupils. Funds granted by the Federal Government at the outset were soon exhausted and the continuance of the work has since depended on contributions from friends of the institute and what the school could earn for itself. One building was "sung up," for General Armstrong took the Hampton Institute singers on a tour of the United States and Canada where they gave 500 concerts. They brought back $20,000 for the construction of Virginia Hall. The Huntington Memorial Library was donated by Collis P. Huntington, the railway magnate who built the Newport News shipyard. This library is one of the finest in the South, containing 77,674 volumes, including a special collection dealing with the Negro. Among Hampton Institute's famous graduates are Booker T. Washington who walked all the way from West Virginia to enroll in the school and Dorothy Maynor, the well-known concert singer.

Directly behind the campus is a Civil War cemetery belong to the Kecoughtan Veterans Administration. It is beautifully laid out and contains several interesting monuments and cast iron plaques. It was started at the close of the Civil War with the bodies of soldiers who had died in fighting between Hampton and Richmond. Over 400 of the

bodies were those of unknown soldiers. Later burials have been those of inmates of the National Soldiers' Home now known as the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration lies between Hampton and Old Point Comfort on the approximate site of the old Indian village of Kecoughtan. This is why the name Kecoughtan was revived as a post-office address for the institution by Col. Keith Ryan, former head of the local Veterans' Administration. The National Soldiers' Home was established in 1871 in the building formerly occupied by the Chesapeake Female Seminary. Continued as the Veterans' Administration it has long imparted a specific flavor to Hampton life. The older veterans amble along the streets, stand on the street corners or lounge contentedly on the wharves. Some hawk knicknacks of their own making such as canes, leather belts, or metalware. The Kecoughtan Hospital, a magnificent 600-bed hospital fronting on Hampton Roads, surrounded by beautiful grounds, ministers to sick veterans of all United States wars. The last Civil War veteran expired several years ago and the Spanish-American War veterans have taken over the ancient status formerly occupied by the Civil War veterans.

Several miles to the north of Hampton is the Langley Field Air Base. It is not only an important Army Air Force post, but it is the home of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) where scientists toil night and day in the giant wind tunnels to unlock the secrets of the air. Founded in 1917 with about a dozen employees its personnel has grown to 3,300. Its pay roll is over $1,000,000 per month and the plant is valued at $50,000,000. The organization's aim is to assure American leadership in aeronautics. At present tourists are allowed to drive through the Langley Field Air Base. Northeast of Hampton is Buckroe Beach which is located on Chesapeake Bay. It is a summer resort for salt-water bathing, fishing, and dancing and also has a large amusement park. In 1620 the London Company sent Frenchmen to Buckroe to teach the colonists silkworm culture. Because the early navigators had confidently expected to find India instead of America when they sailed due west, the London businessmen could not rid themselves of the idea that the New World must have the same possibilities as India and other oriental countries. Silkworm culture at Buckroe soon failed and the colonists turned to tobacco raising which was to be the peninsula's main industry for several centuries.

Newport News is a thriving seaport and shipbuilding center located on the western shore of the peninsula at the mouth of the James River. "The world's greatest harbor" is the city's proud boast. Although settled in 1619 it remained an unimportant fishing village until 1880 when it was chosen as the Atlantic deep-water, coal-shipping terminal for the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway system. Today it is the world's largest coal-shipping terminal. In 1889 Collis P. Huntington built the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. and since then the growth of the city has been rapid. During World War II about 30,000 men were employed in the shipyard, many of whom remained in Newport News. The shipyard stretches a mile or so along the James River and covers 125 acres. Huntington's motto is inscribed on a monument just inside the shipyard gate: "We Shall Build Good Ships Here at a Profit if We Can, at a Loss if We Must, but Always Good Ships." This shipyard is proud to have built the steamship *America*, the largest passenger ship yet built in this country. Among the many famous fighting ships it has turned out are the *Yorktown*, the *Hornet*, the *Midway*, and the *Coral Sea*. The keel for the $189,000,000 supercarrier, the *United States* was laid in the Newport News yard. During both World Wars, Newport News was a major supply and embarkation port for the European theater of war. Under the Victory Arch at Twenty-fifth Street and West Avenue there marched 441,146 homecoming World War I veterans in 1918 and 1919.

Newport News boasts three unique and outstanding museums on its outskirts. The Mariners' Museum is located in a park of more than 800 acres, and contains a vast collection of ship figureheads, prints, and marine paintings, ship models, anchors, marine engines, deck, and steering gear, and navigation instruments. It also houses a library of over 32,000 books and manuscripts. The War Memorial Museum of Virginia contains a collection of Army guns, tanks, and other military equipment of World Wars I and II. It is also the official museum of the NACA and has working models of the great wind tunnels of Langley Field. The James River Golf Museum is considered one of the finest of its kind outside of St. Andrews, Scotland. It was established by Archer M. Huntington. All these museums are free of charge.

The town of Newport News has all the flavor of a seaport. Its streets are enlivened by the uniforms of sailors from warships out in the harbor, soldiers from Langley Field and Fort Monroe, military and naval police assist the civilian police in keeping order on the town's main thoroughfare, Washington Avenue, which reminds the midwesterner of a smaller edition of State Street in Chicago. Groups of swarthy, gesticulating foreign merchant seamen from the Mediterranean countries give an exotic touch. One even sees an occasional turbaned Lascar sailor from the Far West. Newport News has a festive air when the shipyard launches a new vessel with the ceremony presided over by visiting high dignitaries. The city is connected with the mainland by ferry and by the almost unbelievably long James River Bridge which stretches 5 miles from shore to shore. Viewed in the distance from the north end of the city it makes a sight that one does not soon forget.

Farther up the peninsula are the historic shrines of Williamsburg, Jamestown, and Yorktown. The attractions of these places are too well known and too thoroughly catalogued to need space in this article. Suffice it to say that Jamestown will have a special interest for the Medical Society of Virginia because it is the home of the colorful Dr. John Pott who was the official physician in the early days of the Jamestown Colony. Pott was a highly respected physician but he made many enemies because of his hot temper, impulsiveness, and his taste for politics. However, he was always clever and resourceful enough to extricate himself from whatever scrape he got into. Pott did not like to have other people's hogs feed in his cornfield. Therefore, he had a standing rule that all trespassing hogs were to be summarily executed and served up on his table. This did not endear him to some early settlers. Pott and Governor Harvey conducted a bitter feud during which Pott was several times clapped in irons, but at last he won out by securing the Governor's recall. In 1626 Dr. Pott was sued by his apprentice for failing to teach him his craft. Pott died in 1642 after 20 years of a busy medical and turbulent political career in the Jamestown Colony.

On October 9, 1949, the medical profession of the Virginia Peninsula will welcome the Medical Society of Virginia back to Old Point Comfort where it last met in 1881. In 1881 our president was Hunter Holmes McGuire, of Richmond, the South's leading surgeon. In 1949 our president will be M. Pierce Rucker, of Richmond, one of the country's leading obstetricians and a medical historian as well. Pierce Rucker was born in 1881, the same year our society last met at Old Point Comfort. Since 1881 the historic lower peninsula has changed from a sleepy fishing and farming community to an urban area of 150,000 people concentrated in the towns of Newport News, Hilton Village, Hampton, Phoebus, and their satellite communities. There is no physical dividing line between these places, the only division being political. Our activities are many: Shipbuilding, the port, the sea-food industry, areonautical research, the care of disabled veterans, the military establishments, education, and the tourist industry. It is now 343 years since the first Englishman landed on the Virginia Peninsula. Their leader, Capt. John Smith, wrote back to England, with prophetic insight, "So then, here is a place, a nurse for soldiers, a practice for mariners, a trade for merchants, a reward for the good."

Pensions and Social Insurance for Steelworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 19 (legislative day of Monday, October 17), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution pledging support to the United Steelworkers of America for pensions and social insurance, which was adopted by the Council of the City of Eveleth, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution pledging support to United Steelworkers of America for pensions and social insurance

Whereas inasmuch as the United Steelworkers of America are on strike for Pensions and Social Insurance as recommended by the Presidential fact-finding board: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the members of the City Council of the City of Eveleth, Minn., pledge our support to the United Steelworkers of America for pensions and social insurance as outlined by the Presidential fact-finding board and further urge that the steelworkers demands be accepted in full by the steel corporation involved in this dispute.

Passed October 18, 1949.

JOSEPH J. PRIMOZICH,
Mayor.

Attest:

J. E. PLEBAN,
City Clerk.